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This dissertation is an attempt to identify the operative pneumatology of the Second Vatican Council. The study will probe not only the final documents but also the event itself by looking for the pneumatology that guides the changes in the conciliar processes and procedures and in the speeches of the participants. There are two warrants for grounding the study in pneumatology. The first is that the activity of the Holy Spirit is intimately and inextricably associated with the life of the Church. The second is that the council is often called a "Pentecostal event." Gustave Thils offers a method for such an exploration of the Council's underlying pneumatology. He suggests that we interpret the Council as a event by attending to the "trajectory" in the various theologies at the Council. This trajectory indicates which ideas acquired increasing importance and which ideas and concepts consistently lost in importance. By tracing the various conciliar notions of God's presence and activity in the Church and in the world, as manifested in the speeches, processes and texts, this dissertation seeks to describe and clarify this "trajectory." Such a clarification may then be applied when the final documents
themselves are interpreted. Using pneumatology as a basis of measurement, we shall study the varying understandings of the Holy Spirit of the Council members, their theologian advisors, the powerful Vatican Cardinals and, of course, the two Popes of the Council, John XXIII and Paul VI.

The study will compare the pneumatology developed during the Council and the theology that was available at the time. Placing the dominant pneumatology that emerged from the Council in dialogue with the state of pneumatology in contemporary Catholic thought will provide a corrective for pneumatological discussions that fail to account for the intimate relationship of the theology of the Holy Spirit with the life of the Church. In addition, the theological description of the pneumatology of the Council may be used in the further interpretation of the Council’s texts.
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INTRODUCTION

This study is an exploration of the Second Vatican Council for the purpose of formulating a theological description of the notion of the Holy Spirit that was operative there. There are three primary reasons for such an exploration. First, during the Council itself there were competing understandings of the Holy Spirit that influenced the Council's developing ecclesiology. Because of the close relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology, identifying the primary pneumatology of the Council can help us identify the primary ecclesiology of the Council. Second, pneumatology is currently a popular topic in systematic theology.¹ The study is in part an attempt to advance the discussion of pneumatology by grounding it more deeply in the life of the Church. This will be done by analyzing the Council as a critically important event in the on-going life of the Church. Traditionally, critical events in the life of the Church have been seen as particular locations of the Holy Spirit's action. Vatican II was one such event, and a paradigmatic one at that. Third, the reception of the reforms of Vatican II is

stalled; it is stalled because we have not yet arrived at the proper ways to interpret the conciliar texts, especially the "twin pillars" of the Council's ecclesiology, *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. By comparing and contrasting the underlying pneumatologies in the formulation of the documents of the Council and then following them through as those pneumatologies emerge in the documents themselves, the dissertation will demonstrate which theological expressions of God's presence and activity in the world, in history and in the Church were most clearly and forcefully affirmed by the Council and which ones where either subordinated or rejected. Once the underlying dominant pneumatology has been determined, it will serve as a principle of interpretation for the documents themselves and thus contribute to a deeper understanding and reception of the Council.

Notwithstanding the centrality of pneumatology in this study, Vatican II was primarily an ecclesiological council; its task was to express "what the Church considers herself to be." As the Council members drafted the texts that would go on to initiate the reform of the institutional Church, their notions of the Holy Spirit's presence and activity in the world, i.e. e., their pneumatology, shaped their ecclesiology, to one degree or another. However, we currently lack

---


agreement on the nature of the Council's ecclesiology. The German ecclesiologist Hermann Pottmeyer inspired this dissertation by identifying this lack of agreement about *Lumen gentium* in particular. He argued that we are currently stalled in the second phase of the reception of Vatican II, the first phase having been marked by excitement and movement towards the application of the Council's reforms. The second phase is marked by a failure to advance the further reception of the Council. Pottmeyer argued that there was a theological "trajectory" at the Council. This trajectory displays which ideas and concepts acquired increasing importance during the Council debates and which ideas and concepts consistently lost importance and support. Pottmeyer claimed that the Council must be interpreted as "an event, an opening, a movement." He also observed that many interpreters of the Council fail to recognize this trajectory, and this is the reason for the current impasse. These interpreters claim that, instead of a developing movement, there is only a simple "juxtaposing" or compromise between conflicting positions in the documents. This, Pottmeyer insists, is an erroneous interpretation. Because the Council's intended purpose for the juxtapositioning has not been established, those with both

---


7 Ibid.

8 Ibid., 30.
reformist and restorationist proclivities use the same conciliar documents to make conflicting claims. This often happens particularly in the interpretation of *Lumen gentium*. Pottmeyer suggested that in order to resolve this stalemate, we must interpret the Council as an event by attending to the forward movement of its various theologies. He called for an alternative hermeneutic to those which claim that the conflicts in the texts were simply a matter of compromise. For Pottmeyer pneumatology is an essential component of this alternative hermeneutic.

Our task requires that we theologically connect the history of the Council itself with the theology that emerged during the conciliar event and that shaped its texts. Too often discussions of the conciliar texts become merely explications of the history of each document rather than analyses of the theology embedded in the documents. While history is critically important, we will not illuminate the theology of the texts unless we move beyond the level of history; the texts are not only a matter of historical interest. They contain resilient principles that were designed to function as a source for further theological reflection and to make an impact on the teaching, worship and witnessing of the Church. The teachings of *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* in particular are foundational. They have yet to be exploited as fruitfully as the Council members intended.

Pottmeyer described the trajectory at the Council with reference to the fundamental method that the Council used in order to link its two ecclesiological concerns. Those concerns were, on the one hand, the renewal of the Church and, on the other hand, the need to maintain

---

continuity with the past, and especially with Trent and Vatican I. Pottmeyer observed that these concerns were indeed linked primarily through "juxtaposing" concepts relative to each. For example, both the People of God model and the hierarchical model of the Church are included in *Lumen gentium*. For Pottmeyer, the key to interpreting *Lumen gentium* and other documents lies in how we understanding the purpose of placing two seemingly opposed models or concepts in the same text. He is critical of the widespread view that this juxtapositioning was merely a function of compromise, as though both concepts were equally important to the texts and thus to the Council itself. If that were the case, he argued, then nothing creative or genuinely new was achieved at the Council. Pottmeyer claimed that this view leads to a "selective interpretation" which ends in a stalemate. The purpose of the juxtaposing, according to Pottmeyer, was not to effect a compromise between two positions but to place one in a superior position over the other. The failure to recognize the true function of the juxtapositioning in the texts has led us to the present stalled situation with regard to the reception of the Council documents and thus of its intended reforms.

Yves Congar's work also inspired this dissertation. The most eminent ecclesiologist of the 20th century, Congar provided a critical spark for the renewed interest in pneumatology. His work was also critically important for the Council's ecclesiological reforms. Congar was a central figure in the drafting of the texts and exerted profound influence upon both Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI. He had discovered in the course of his research prior to the Council that, during the Church's formative period, pneumatological reflection was strongly linked to the

---


life of the Church. Intent upon contributing to the reform of the institutional Church, Congar grounded his ecclesiology in the Biblical sources as well as subsequent theological, doctrinal, spiritual and liturgical texts. He discovered the link, in both the formative and subsequent periods of Church history, between critical reflection upon the nature and mission of the Church (ecclesiology) and reflection about how God is present and active in the lives of human persons and in human history in light of Jesus Christ's death and resurrection (pneumatology). He also concluded that much of the discussion of 20th-century pneumatology revolved around either communio ecclesiology or the state of the filioque question, to the neglect of the actual life of the Church.\textsuperscript{12} This disconnection between pneumatology and ecclesiology also manifests itself in the interpretation of documents of Vatican II.

By attempting to reconnect the pneumatology and the ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council, this dissertation hopes to provide a tool for overcoming the current under-use (or ineffective use) of the conciliar documents in both the life of the Church and in some currently popular discussions regarding the Holy Spirit. We shall try to contribute to overcoming the impasse in the reception of the Council by offering a theological description of the pneumatology

\textsuperscript{12} Congar's observation is verified in more recent theological writings in the United States. See, for example, the \textit{Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America} and of dissertations on pneumatology since the late 1960's. See also, Catherine M. LaCugna, "Persons in Communion," in \textit{God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life} (San Francisco: HarperCollins: 1991), 243-318. Also, Catherine M. LaCugna and Killian McDonnell. "Returning from the Far Country: Theses for a Contemporary Trinitarian Theology," \textit{Scottish Journal of Theology} 41 (1988), 191-215. See also David Coffey, "The Incarnation of the Holy Spirit in Christ," \textit{Theological Studies} 45 (1984), 466-80. By way of contrast, another article of McDonnell's pays careful attention to the relationship between ecclesiological and pneumatological reflection. For example, "The Spirit who is experienced in history is that point of contact between God and humankind, the point where 'the Perfect Father' through the Son touches history and therefore the Church, but in another direction the Spirit is the point of entry into the mystery of Christ through which the mystery of the Father is attained." Killian McDonnell, "A Trinitarian Theology of the Holy Spirit?," \textit{Theological Studies} 46 (1985), 191-227.
that informed and shaped the ecclesiology of the Council, not only in its final documents but also in the process of formulating them. In following this trajectory, the dissertation will identify the pneumatology that gradually achieved the greatest currency, notwithstanding vestiges of other pneumatologies that remained in the documents themselves. Pottmeyer argued that as a transitional council, Vatican II began the process of a critical distancing from the previous ecclesiology that had become inadequate in the eyes of the great majority of conciliar bishops. In exploring this process, one can use pneumatology as a kind of marker. It is because of the close bond between the Church and the Holy Spirit that pneumatology can serve to accomplish the task that Pottmeyer laid out for theologians as their particular responsibility in the process of reception. He wrote: "An interpretation of the kind that Thils calls for requires an intensive study of the conciliar acts and debates." We shall explore these sources and identify the pneumatology that dominates them; this pneumatology can then serve as an important critical principle for the interpretation of the documents as a whole, and particularly of *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. For example, if claims are made about authority in the Church that ignore, or are at odds with, the pneumatology the Council expressed, that pneumatology can function as a corrective principle. When traces of the ecclesiology from which Vatican II wished to distance itself are nevertheless found in the documents (especially *Lumen gentium*) and are used as though they reflect the primary ecclesiology of the Council, the on-going reception of the Council is hindered. Hence the specific task of this dissertation is to articulate the dominant


14 Juan Luis Segundo. *Theology and the Church: A Response to Cardinal Ratzinger and a Warning to the Whole Church*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985. In this work Segundo argues with Cardinal Ratzinger's interpretation and application of the Council itself and specific documents. By way of a pastoral example, I have served on two
pneumatology of *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* in particular since they most fully implement the Council's stated intention: to give an accounting of its nature and mission.\(^{15}\)

Even though *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* are the particular objects of the study, they will be studied in the context of the Council as an event, including procedures and speeches, etc. Reflection on the Holy Spirit, which ought to contribute significantly to the interpretation of Vatican II, in fact, often does not.\(^{16}\) Conciliar texts are too often severed from the larger context of the Council as an event and from their underlying theological

---


16 Note the lack of reference to the Council in recent theological work on pneumatology. Thomas G. Weinandy, *The Father's Spirit of Sonship* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995) and Blair Reynolds, *Toward a Process Pneumatology* (London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1990); provide two examples. Note also that in 1992 the Continuing Seminar on Trinitarian Theology of the Catholic Theological Society of America devoted two of its sessions to the *filioque*. Mystagogy and Photius are treated as major topics in these sessions but nothing on the Council. In the 1996 *Proceedings* this situation begins to change when the society took as its theme for that year, "Toward a Spirited Theology: the Holy Spirit's Challenge to the Theological Disciplines." One of the plenary session presentations was entitled, "Do Not Stifle the Spirit!: Karl Rahner, the Legacy of Vatican II and Its Urgency for Theology Today." In this talk, John Randall Sachs points to some of the same concerns as Pottmeyer. See John Randall Sachs, *Proceedings of the Fifty-first Annual Convention of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 51 (June, 1996), 14-38. Congar also stands over against a pneumatology that is fundamentally metaphysical. For example, see *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, Vol. I, trans. David Smith (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 167-73.
(pneumatological and anthropological) principles.\textsuperscript{17} As a result of this cleavage, the conciliar documents are often improperly interpreted and fail to serve as sources of on-going theological reflection.

This leads to the situation that Pottmeyer described above: the documents become mines for proof-texting from either a reformist or restorationist position.\textsuperscript{18} The Council's capacity to speak to the present is thereby eroded in two ways. First, its dominant underlying pneumatology is not incorporated into the current retrieval of pneumatology in theological discourse. Pneumatology remains disconnected from the rich ecclesiological reflection that it yielded at the Council. And second, the texts themselves suffer because they continue to be interpreted in such a variety of seemingly contradictory ways. Like all theological texts, they have to be interpreted carefully according to fundamental principles that respect the intentions of their authors and Vatican II's actual place \textit{(Sitz im Leben)} in the life of the contemporary Church and in the history of the councils.\textsuperscript{19} By looking at the event of the Council, with the hope of articulating its pneumatology in a concise way, we intend to provide at least one principle for the ongoing

\textsuperscript{17} The Council should be a source for all of theology. I am concentrating on pneumatology in my study. This does not mean that other areas under the wider category of theology could not be studied in the Council as an event; it only means that I am restricting my project to pneumatology.


\textsuperscript{19} See the discussion of the use of Scripture in relationship to the Church and Jesus' intentions for its structures in Richard P. McBrien, \textit{Catholicism: Completely Revised and Updated} (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1994), 570-602. Much of the current pneumatology is not anchored in the wider discussion of the Church's life. This must be one of the operative criteria in any discussion of the Holy Spirit. If it is not, the discussion too easily becomes ahistorical.
interpretation of the conciliar texts, especially *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. So the task of the dissertation is not the interpretation of the documents per se; it is to offer a tool for textual interpretation. In this way we intend to respond to Pottmeyer's call for a "hermeneutic that does justice" to the Council.\(^{20}\)

By contrasting the commonly-held notion of "juxtaposing" with a forward-moving development in the Council's theology, Pottmeyer provided us with a fuller account of how this trajectory was expressed during the Council. He inspired this study's effort to discern the content and character of the event of the Council itself. His notion of the Council as event is critical for this project. For this reason, we quote him at length.

The postconciliar process of reception and interpretation thus includes more than the reception of conciliar texts. Vatican II was not only a body that turned out decisions; it was an event, an opening, a *movement* in the course of which the Church elaborated a new interpretation of itself. The Council was therefore first experienced, then understood and received. It launched a conciliar movement that manifested itself in a new kind of synod, in the establishment of permanent synodal structures, and in the rise of base communities, but also in the acceptance of dialogue with separated Christians and with non-Christians and, not least, in the new liturgical forms that more adequately reflect the nature of God's people as a community.\(^{21}\)

Our study follows the lead that Pottmeyer has given us. In so doing, this study will also attempt to grasp something of the original experience of the Council as it was happening. Pope

\(^{20}\) Pottmeyer, "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II: Twenty Years of Interpreting the Council," 43. See note 1.

John XXIII called the Council a "new Pentecost." Its Pentecostal character is seen in the struggle to articulate this "new interpretation of itself." An essential aspect of that new self-understanding is the pneumatology that guided the Council as that self-understanding emerged. By looking into the ways in which the Holy Spirit was understood at the Council, we intend to provide a hermeneutical tool that enables the event of the Council to inform the interpretation of the texts that it generated and, also contribute to the wider pneumatological discussion as well.

There are two bookends to this study: the "Opening Speech" of Pope John XXIII at the first session of the Council and Pope Paul VI's inaugural address opening the second session following Pope John's death. We locate the starting-point for what became the dominant pneumatology in Pope John's highly significant speech. In his bull of December 25, 1961, convoking the Council, he sketches the ideas that are developed in his "Opening Speech." The intentions the Pope John described in both were extremely influential at the Council. In that speech, the Pope John described Divine Providence as "leading us to a new order of human relations" which is directed "toward the fulfillment of God's superior and inscrutable designs."

---


24 The official name of Pope John's text is *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*. This speech is found in Anderson, Vol. 1, 25-29. Pope Paul VI's address is found in AS II/1 and in *Insegnamenti* (1963) in the original language. It is also in Anderson, Vol. 1, 143-150. See note 3.

25 Walter, M. Abbott, *Twelve Council Fathers* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1962). The late Archbishop Marcos McGrath of Panama claimed that the shape of the entire council can be found in the early speeches of Pope John XXIII before and at the convocation of the council. Presentation of Archbishop McGrath in the doctoral seminar in Ecclesiology at the University of Notre Dame in October, 1996.

In the bull he acknowledged the "divine presence" that has always been "alive and active" in the Church. The task that he described (and elaborated in greater detail later in the body of the text) was to bring the modern world "into contact with the vivifying and perennial energies of the Gospel." He expressed his confidence in "Our Savior, Who has not left the world which He redeemed." Recognizing with Congar "the Christological reference which is fundamentally Biblical and the essential condition for the soundness of any pneumatology," Pope John had the seed of a pneumatology in his expression of confidence that the Spirit is present and active in both the world, in history, and in the Church. As the Council sought to renew the Church's understanding and expressions of its mission to proclaim the Gospel, this incipient "Johannine" pneumatology guided it. This study will identify and articulate the pneumatology that developed from Pope John's initial intentions. In his address opening the second session of the Council, Pope Paul VI developed Pope John's pneumatology and re-established the bond between reflection about the Holy Sprit and the Church's self-understanding. These two speeches are the most significant moments in the trajectory of theological progressive ideas and pastoral approaches at the Council.

While John XXIII provides the study with the seed of the pneumatology that we are seeking, the growth and development of that seed will be discerned by identifying the pneumatological signals in the Council's procedures and activities as the documents were being

---

27 Ibid., 6.

28 Ibid.

formulated, and especially in various speeches. These signals are marked by three characteristics whereby the human person, the human community as a whole, and the Church in particular are most open to the activity of the Holy Spirit. We shall point out these kinds of activities as we study the Council as an event. While Pope John provided us with the starting-point, Congar's theology provided us with a way to make judgments about the pneumatological character of various procedural changes or speeches at the Council. Indeed, his historical studies are the source of the three characteristics we identified for a proper pneumatology: collaboration, respect for personal competence and dialogue.

It is important to note that we shall be operating with an overarching understanding of the Holy Spirit's presence to human persons in the world, in history, and in the Church that are the elements of a working pneumatology. The pneumatology we are presupposing is relational in character. This is so because Christian theology makes claims about God's relationship with human persons and all of creation. In addition, discourse about the Holy Spirit has a relational character because the notion of the divinity of the Holy Spirit emerged while the early community struggled to find the appropriate language to describe the Father's relationship to Jesus Christ. We see this same struggle in the early language of the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of God, especially in the Pauline epistles. Therefore, an appropriate pneumatology must be

---

30 I am presupposing Bernard Lonergan's categories of understanding and judgment as I trace the pneumatology. It begins as Pope John XXIII's understanding of God's presence and develops into a richer pneumatology that becomes the dominant understanding of the Holy Spirit at the Council. In the dissertation, these characteristics act as the signals that the Holy Spirit is being discussed, however implicitly. See Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (New York: Seabury, 1979), 3-20.

attentive to the way in which the Church's reflection on the Spirit of Jesus Christ emerged and became the distinctively trinitarian insight of Christianity. The description of God as triune is a theological reflection upon God's presence as experienced in the person, life and mission of Jesus of Nazareth both before and after his crucifixion and resurrection. God's relationship to human persons and creation was described by Jesus as one of loving care. In both his mission and in his death and resurrection, relationships of love between God and persons, and between persons themselves, are described as everlasting. In Jesus' characterization of the Reign of God we find the promise that relationships of love with God and with each other are everlasting. The goal of all creation lies in the fulfillment of this relationship of loving care that is sustained by God.

What we know as the Church is the community of persons who live their lives by construing reality in this way. Richard McBrien summarizes this insight: "God is present to history in Jesus Christ and in a special way in the Church, where the human community has become explicitly conscious of itself in its ultimate relationship with God." Pneumatology is, therefore, a theological expression of how God's presence and activity inform and direct this on-going relationship. When we reflect theologically about this presence, we name that presence Holy

---


33 McBrien, Catholicism, 314. See note 19.
The Holy Spirit is thought to be particularly present in the activities of the Church. This loving presence, together with the ways in which it is made concrete, can be described theologically. It encompasses more than the power associated with ritual action or official teaching, on the one hand, or personal piety, on the other.

This study will be successful if the pneumatology of the Council is clarified well enough so that, when it is used in wider theological discourse, it actually advances the discussion of the role of the Holy Spirit in the world, in history and in the life of the Church. Often when the word pneumatology is used, it is really an escape-hatch into speculations that are not anchored in ecclesial and secular reality: in real people, in real conflicts, or in real events of historical significance. Such an anchoring is necessary, however, if we are to be theologically faithful to the Bible's initial expressions of pneumatology. If the dissertation remains true to its objective to identify, compare and contrast, and evaluate the pneumatologies in the minds and hearts of the Council members, as they struggled (often against one another) to confront the challenges and pressures of modernity at the century's most important religious event, then the dissertation's purpose will have been achieved. As the new millennium approached, there was increased discussion of the Holy Spirit, just as there had been at the turn of the previous millennium. The study will be successful if it helps to shape this discussion by clarifying how we should describe God's presence and activity in the world, in history, and in the Church, that is, pneumatologically.

---

34 Of course, we use this same language in our prayer.

35 A case in point is how Scripture (and therefore the reflections of the early community) is used in recent trinitarian theology. For excellent examples of this see again, William Hill, *The Three-Personed God* and Walter Kasper, *The God of Jesus Christ*. See notes 30 and 31 respectively.
Our study has four chapters. Chapter One will explain the task of the dissertation and its contribution. This chapter will include an explanation of the dissertation's distinctive method of looking at the Council as an event. It will also place the Council in its historical context and describe the problems that influenced the conciliar participants. Chapter Two will attempt to describe in a highly schematic fashion the historical relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology, with particular reference to Yves Congar's scholarship. It will review the biblical foundations of pneumatology and sketch the development of pneumatology over the course of centuries, with particular reference to the pneumatology that flourished just prior to the Council. Chapter Three will describe the "pneumatological moves" of the Council, especially with reference to the changes in processes and procedures that reflected the conciliar intention for renewal in response to contemporary pastoral problems. This chapter will probe the council speeches for the various pneumatologies they reflect. It will also show how one of the various pneumatologies came to dominate. Chapter Four will describe the pneumatology of the Second Vatican Council as embodied in *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. This chapter will note the contrast between the dominant pneumatology of the Council and the prevailing pneumatology of the pre-conciliar period. This chapter will show how the dominant pneumatology of the Council shaped these documents. The conclusion will attempt to recapitulate the whole dissertation and identify future trajectories for theological reflection. Finally, we shall raise some critical questions that are invited by the dissertation.
CHAPTER ONE

THE IMPASSE IN IMPLEMENTING VATICAN II

A. Preliminary Remarks

Why the pneumatology of Vatican II? We know, of course, that Vatican II was primarily about the Church, not the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, because pneumatology is the theological reflection upon God's on-going presence to human persons, in the world and in history, and the Church is the institution that claims to be the particularly intense location of God's on-going presence, pneumatology and ecclesiology are constitutively linked. While Vatican II has affected the life of the Church in many very important ways, the central ecclesiological reforms found in Lumen gentium and Gaudium et spes have, in large part, not been implemented. In this chapter we shall be making a case for understanding the Council's explicit ecclesiology in light of its often implicit pneumatology. The failure to implement the reforms of Vatican II does not lie in the texts themselves; it is a result of the restorationist interpretation of the texts. We call these restorationist interpretations because they claim that Vatican II did not significantly change the Church's self-understanding. They use the vestiges of the preconciliar ecclesiology found in the texts to justify this interpretation. The texts do represent compromises. However, they also
display a reformed ecclesiology. We propose using the Council's understanding of the Holy Spirit as a corrective for the revisionist interpretations of the Council that downplay and sometimes ignore the reformed understanding of the nature and mission of the Church.

After the Council, the great ecclesiologist who also became known for his essential work in pneumatology, Yves Congar, described pneumatology this way:

> By pneumatology, I mean something other than a simple dogmatic theology of the third Person. I also mean something more than, and in this sense different from, a profound analysis of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in individual souls and his sanctifying activity there. Pneumatology should, I believe, describe the impact, in the context of a vision of the Church, of the fact that the Spirit distributes his gifts as he wills and in this way builds up the Church.\(^1\)

For Congar, the on-going presence of the Holy Spirit is not simply a bifurcated presence that is the "principle of holy living in the souls of individuals," on the one hand, and the guarantor of infallible teaching, on the other hand.\(^2\) God's on-going presence as Holy Spirit is particularly present to the Church because the Church is "always in the process of being built, or rather built by God."\(^3\) In this way, pneumatology is strongly connected to ecclesiology. Congar's historical studies of the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Church were instrumental in the Council's formulation of its ecclesiology. Congar argued that the essence of the Church is the activity of the Holy Spirit. He observed that in the period immediately prior to the Council the Spirit's activity had become located primarily in private charisms or in the ritual

---


\(^2\) Ibid, 156.

\(^3\) Ibid., 157.
action of the Church. Congar argued for a "full theology of the Church" that is the "actuality" of what the "glorified Lord and his Spirit do in the life of the Church." In this chapter we shall explain why it is that this reformed notion of the Church's nature and mission has not been implemented to the degree it could have been these 40 years after the Council. We shall also suggest one way to get beyond the impasse.

**B. Procedure**

This chapter shall proceed in three steps. The first is a description of the impasse that has been created by revisionist interpretations of the Council texts. This description involves the historical background that supports our claim that the interpretation of the Council's reception is at a standstill. This includes a summary of the argument made by our primary dialogue partner, Hermann Pottmeyer. Pottmeyer, is a German ecclesiologist whose work inspired this dissertation. A priest in the Diocese of Muenster, he received his doctorate in theology from Rome's Pontifical Gregorian University in 1964 and completed his "Habilitation" at the University of Muenster in 1973. Beginning in 1974 he was a professor of fundamental theology at the University of Bochum, moving to retired status in 1999, but still teaching part-time. He has served as a theological advisor to the German Bishops Conference since 1980, a consultant to the Central Committee of German Catholics since 1987, and a member of the Vatican's International Theological Commission since 1992. He called for a hermeneutic that interprets the Second Vatican Council as "an event, an opening, a movement." The overriding intention of
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this dissertation is one we take directly from Pottmeyer. His central concern in the book chapter that inspired this study, "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II: Twenty Years of Interpretation of the Council," is the reception of the Council. The problems in ecclesial leadership notwithstanding, the stalemate in the Council's reception is caused to a great degree because of the difficulties involved in interpreting the texts that we hinted at above. Pottmeyer argued that one of the reasons that the first phase, which he characterizes as the "phase of excitement," yielded disillusionment is because the "enthusiasts now discovered to their disillusionment the inertia characteristic of so great an institution and its historical forms. They came to realize the weight of tradition, even of immediately preconciliar tradition, present in the conciliar texts and their footnotes and often latent in an unmediated tension with the new beginnings." The Council texts are new kinds of texts that require new methods of interpretation. It is important to note that Pottmeyer only obliguely addressed the political causes that are hindering the further reception of Vatican II. The institutional bureaucracy of the Church that could implement further reception of the Council's ecclesiology is often guided by what we have been calling a restorationist interpretation of these texts. The problem is with the restorationist interpretation of the texts and the political power to promote and enforce this interpretation. It is not with the texts themselves although they represent compromises that are the natural features of texts composed by what Pottmeyer calls a "transitional council."


Ibid.
Pottmeyer's main argument has two parts. First, he describes the current state of the Council texts as a "phase of disillusionment" and suggests that we are entering a third phase. Second, he challenges systematic theologians to craft a more effective way of interpreting the Council texts. Currently the reception of the Council's reformed ecclesiology is, in some significant measure, hindered, and will no doubt remain so as long as the conciliar texts are used to claim that the Council changed little or nothing regarding our understanding of the structure and mission of the Church. In the minds of some, the Council may actually have corrupted ecclesiology.

---


In the second step, we shall explain what we mean by the Council as an event. Event is a technical term formulated in sociology that distinguishes what are labeled "occurrences" from "events." The designation event identifies a set of happenings that cause transformation of some kind, usually structural, institutional. Vatican II is a transformative event from both theological and sociological perspectives.  

Sociology is an important cognate for ecclesiology and so we shall look to it to further warrant our method. Andrew Greeley notes that critical events "should be conceived of as a sequence of occurrences that result in the transformation(s) of structures. Such sequences begin with a rupture of some kind -- that is a surprising break with routine practices. But whatever the initial rupture, an occurrence becomes a historical event only when it touches off a chain of occurrences that durably transform previous structures and practices." Such chains of occurrences converge into what is called a "trajectory." This is what Pottmeyer is describing when he calls the Council "an event, an opening, a movement." A trajectory is the forward movement caused by the "rupture" or "surprising break."

Exploring the Council in terms of the trajectory that defines it as an event allows us to more easily deal with the vestiges of the preconciliar theology in the documents without ceding them equal importance in the overall Council. The path of the trajectory which is away from one understanding of the Church's nature and mission towards a new understanding will help us navigate our way through to a description of the difference between the actual reforming
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12 Andrew M. Greeley, 15. See note 9.
tendencies in the texts and the revisionist interpretation of the texts. The Council became a
distinctive, transformative event because its trajectory of progressive ideas durably transformed
previous theologies, especially pneumatology and ecclesiology. These theologies, in turn,
allowed the Council participants to lay the foundation for the transformation of Church structures
and practices.

Thirdly and in conclusion, we shall return to Pottmeyer’s description of the
problem to make the transition between Chapter 1 and Chapter 2. We must describe the problem
as Pottmeyer sees it in order to provide even more justification for the hermeneutic we are
proposing.

C. The Impasse

How have we arrived 40 years later at this impasse? There are several factors
which have frustrated the reception of the Council. Three ecclesiologists describe these facto
rs quite well: Hans Küng, Richard P. McBrien, and Hermann Pottmeyer. Küng was a
_peritus_ at the Council. McBrien and Pottmeyer are arguably the most important ecclesiologists
with regard to the period after the Council, and its reception in particular.¹³ Pottmeyer will
become our primary dialogue partner as the study proceeds because this study is fundamentally a
response to his analysis of the reception of the Council's ecclesiological reforms. McBrien and
Küng contribute other insights that assist us in building our argument, especially when it comes
to the historical background of the Council.

¹³The greatest ecclesiologist of the Council itself was Yves Congar. As we shall see,
he will have a particular role in this study. For now, we turn to these three theologians.
Pottmeyer says,

Despite all the theological expertise that is gathered at a council and accompanies its work, a conciliar text is not controlled by a unified systematic intention.... The needed synthesis is a task the Council sets for the Church and for theologians; it is a task of reception, which is far from being a merely passive process.  

Pottmeyer describes what he calls the "method of juxtaposition" whereby the Council members included the ideas of the minority and the majority voices at the Council. As we shall see, what Pottmeyer calls the "minority" was a small faction of institutionally powerful Council members, members of the Roman Curia in particular. Pottmeyer argues that the Council members still achieved a synthesis in the face of including these conflicting positions by laying greater stresses on the majority positions. Pottmeyer claims that "the conciliar battles beween majority and minority" were "brought to an end" by the Council's "method of juxtaposition" in the texts. He argues that outside of the texts themselves however, the battle is still "being fought." He describes what we have been calling a revisionist interpretation of the Council by identifying its primary characteristic: "the selective interpretation" of the texts. These interpretations "seize" upon one thesis in the text without paying proper attention to the other emphasis in the text and thus ignoring the synthesis whereby the preconciliar understanding of the nature and mission of the Church is subordinated to the reforming ecclesiology in the text. He says, "Fidelity to the Council requires that both juxtaposed theses be taken seriously and that

14 Pottmeyer, "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II," 39. See note 9. As we shall see later in the study there are other theologians who will either nuance this argument or disagree about the amount of agreement between the minority and the majority. Having said that, we accept Pottmeyer's analysis as foundational to our project.

15 Ibid.
an attempt be made through more penetrating theological reflection and a renewed ecclesial praxis to reconcile them in a synthesis that will allow further advances."\textsuperscript{16} We shall attempt such a fidelity to the Council by following the forward movement that occurred at the Council when the preconciliar ecclesiology of the Council was subordinated to the reformed ecclesiology again and again so that a "chain of occurrences" yielded one of Greeley's breaks with the prior understanding. This chain of occurrences became the trajectory of progressive theologies at the Council. Pottmeyer argues that the "break" with the preconciliar understanding of the Church begins with progressive orientation that Pope John gives to the Council. That orientation is taken up and quickly, as early as the very first session, becomes the tendency of the Council. Its tendency is reform and renewal. We are at an impasse because the conciliar texts are used to claim that the Council changed little or nothing regarding our understanding of the structure and mission of the Church. People who have fundamentally different notions of the Church and of its mission can defend their positions using the very same document. These conflicting interpretations of the legacy of Vatican II are the result of the failure to establish theologically that the Council did update the life and structure of the Church as well as our theological understanding of it. Pottmeyer claims that we can overcome this situation by following the trajectory in the texts themselves by way of reading those texts in light of the event itself.

Paying "heed to the stress that the Council itself laid on one or the other thesis" is equivalent to following the trajectory of the Council. As we shall see when we present our methodological proposal in greater detail, this "method of juxtaposition" that Pottmeyer describes, demands attention to the forward trajectory of the Council. It presupposes

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
reception as an active, and not a "merely passive process." For Pottmeyer, this trajectory is necessary for the fullest reception of the Council. So, for Pottmeyer, the "Church in conflict" is a result of the inadequate interpretation of the Council texts. He argues that the Council members knew that their particular texts would require "synthesis." He argues further that the methods that are currently used are not faithful to the Council. The council members expected that those with competence would craft such a synthesis. The reforms of the Council will remain unfulfilled until such a synthesis is achieved.

In addition, Pottmeyer argues that the relationship between Vatican I and Vatican II is critical for recognizing the "internal contradiction" that "has helped form the contemporary picture of "a Church in conflict." We continue to hear Church leaders and even some theologians claim that there is no difference between the notion of teaching authority at Vatican I and the notion found in Vatican II's texts. This is one specific reason why of the Council's teachings must be identified. The "aggiornamento" or "bringing up to date" that occurred at the Second Vatican Council involved the quest for a deeper understanding of how the Gospel of

\[\text{Ibid.}\]

\[\text{Küng says in this introduction to his short history, "I have written this history as someone who is involved in it. I can 'understand' phenomena like intellectual repression and the Inquisition, the burning of witches, the persecution of the Jews and the discrimination against women from the historical context, but that does not mean I can therefore 'forgive' them in any way. I write as one who takes the side of those who became victims, or already in their time recognized and censured particular practices as unchristian." }\,\text{The Catholic Church: A Short History, trans. by John Bowden (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2001), 1.}\]

\[\text{Avery Dulles is a representative theologian who takes this position. See "Vatican II and the Purpose of the Church," The Reshaping of Catholicism (San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers, 1988), 132-53, especially 140-1.}\]
Jesus Christ might speak more effectively to the modern world through the Catholic Church. The Council also sought to identify practical and pastoral ways of applying the Gospel not only to society at large but to the Church itself as well. When asked to comment on how well Vatican II accomplished this task, Cardinal H. E. Johannes Willebrands, President Emeritus of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity, called it "a masterpiece." Others have called it "a revolutionary event," "the most significant religious event since the sixteenth-century Reformation," "a new dawn" and "a watershed event in the history of Catholicism." Vatican II cannot be the most important religious event of the century or a watershed in Catholic theology if its ecclesiology is simply a reiteration of Vatican I.

In addition, there are other differences between Vatican I and Vatican II. Of the 774 participants at Vatican I, two-thirds were European; their concerns had as much to do with
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25 Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger often takes this position. For example, see "The Cardinal, in Summary," *New Blackfriars* 66 No. 780 (June 1985), 263.
European social institutions, as they had to do with the Universal Church. Over 2600 bishops attended Vatican II from all over the world. Vatican I cannot be understood apart from the internal conflict among the council participants regarding ecclesiastical authority in general and papal infallibility in particular. By contrast, Vatican II was a global council that made reforms in important teachings such as the understanding of the nature and mission of the Church, the Church's relationship with other Christians and with other faith traditions, the relationship between the Church and secular government and the religious freedom of the human person. It is true that one of the reasons that Vatican II was called was to complete Vatican I's teaching on the relationship between the episcopacy and the papacy -- a process that had been interrupted by
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27 McBrien notes that 2,908 bishops would have been eligible to attend the first session and that the total number of participants exceeded 3,000. See Richard P. McBrien, "Vatican Council II," in *The HarperCollins Encyclopedia of Catholicism*, 1300. See note 18.

28 In *Lumen gentium* Chapters 1 and 2 describe the Church as sacrament, mystery and people of God. Chapter 3 describes the hierarchical aspects of the Church. While it is true that Chapter 3 is an attempt to clarify the relationship between the bishops and the Pope and in so doing to affirm collegiality, many interpreters use this chapter to define the primary structure of the Church.
political turmoil in Italy. However, Vatican II was much more than the other bookend to Vatican I.

Pottmeyer gives this summary description of the distinctive character of Vatican II:

Vatican II can be best described as a \textit{transitional council}. This is what the pope who convoked it and the majority of the council fathers intended it to be; this was the intention that determined the choice of subjects and the language. For this reason, Vatican II is a challenge to its interpreters.\textsuperscript{29}

Pottmeyer writes that the Council texts are challenging because the tools that had been used to interpret previous conciliar texts are of little use in interpreting the texts of Vatican II. Pottmeyer notes several reasons why this is the case. First, while these texts deal with doctrines, they are of a different character than the texts of Trent and Vatican I. They do not have the "conceptual precision" of those texts. They are modern texts framed in modern categories. They do not use the same genre as those councils used. In addition, they make use of modern Biblical interpretation. They use experience as the primary starting point and use historical analysis as well as descriptions of the contemporary situation. While they make use of these modern forms they also make use of citations from previous councils and papal teachings. Even when the traditional forms from papal teachings and prior conciliar formulations are used, they are used in a modern context that begins in experience. In the texts the Council does what Pope John asked the Council to do: to read the signs of the times first and respond to them. They do not follow

\textsuperscript{29} Pottmeyer, "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II," 27. See note 13.
the pattern most usually followed at Trent and Vatican I which was to make an "unambiguous definition" of the position. Not did these new texts follow a technical form; they invented a new one. Bringing the Council as an event to this new form helps us to see the dominant ecclesiology in the texts. Pottmeyer goes on to conclude that we are at the impasse that he labels the "second phase of reception." He describes this phase as the phase of "disillusionment." He writes, "No wonder, then, that the interpretations given during the first twenty years after the council present a bewildering picture and display a great deal of insecurity." Pottmeyer argues that this insecurity along with a lack of clarity as to how to approach the texts has brought us to the current state of affairs which Pottmeyer thinks is dangerously close to an actual "interruption" of the process of reception. He concludes that the reception of the Council is "incomplete" and it is in danger of becoming halted unless the Council's particular challenges of interpretation and reception are met. Pottmeyer argues that we must enter a "third phase" where we "incorporate what is still binding in preconciliar theology into the newly acquired foundation, that is, onto a communio ecclesiology and a Christian anthropology that calls for a commitment to human dignity."

As we indicated above, Pottmeyer deals with the political aspects of this incomplete reception obliquely. He recognizes that the Council's intention to reform institutional
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30 Ibid.
31 Ibid., 34.
32 Ibid., 36.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid., 34.
structures are "unfinished business." He notes that some of the reforming developments in the local Church since Vatican II have been "subordinated" to the concerns of the "universal Church" in ways that run counter to Vatican II's notion of a pastoral Church in contrast to a view of the Church as "lawgiver." He recognizes that "restrictive legislation" can obstruct our entrance into the next phase of reception. However, his emphasis is upon the need for a "hermeneutic" for interpreting the Council texts that attends to the "trajectory" that was traveled at the Council where new doctrines "acquired increasing importance" as the Council went on. When compared with the doctrines "which consistently lost in importance," Pottmeyer argues that these paths disclose the dominant teaching of the Council.

Hans Küng draws a similar picture in his book *The Catholic Church: A Short History*. His analysis, like Pottmeyer's, corresponds to watching the forward movement of the Council in light of Pope John's intentions. He wrote:

"An overall assessment of the Second Vatican Council (1962-5) is by no means easy. But as one who witnessed the council at the time and has criticisms of it today, almost four decades after its conclusion, I maintain my overall verdict: for the Catholic Church, this council represented an irrevocable turning-point." Küng argues that even in spite of the Roman system that was operative in the Roman Curia at the time of the Council and is still operative in general today, the Council implemented Reformation values and brought the Church into the modern world. He argues that the Council fully responded to the Enlightenment.


We share Küng's assessment; Vatican II was an irrevocable turning-point. However, Küng himself recognizes later in the same chapter of his book that not everyone agrees with this assessment of the Council. In the minds of some, the Council may actually have corrupted ecclesiology. Küng characterizes the pontificate of John Paul II as a "betrayal of the council." Küng writes, "By comparison with the seven fat years of the Catholic Church which coincided with the pontificate of John XXIII and the Second Vatican Council (1958-65), the three times seven years of the Wojtyla pontificate are lean in substance." For Küng, the forces that led to these "lean years" began as soon as the Council ended. "Almost immediately after the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council it was obvious that, despite concessions over the reform of the liturgy, the renewal of the Catholic Church and ecumenical understanding with the other Christian churches wanted by John XXIII, the council had got stuck." Küng summarizes the thinking of many theologians, not to mention pastoral leaders and active Catholics. The strong forward movement of the Council did appear to stall soon after the Council.
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41 Küng, 200.

42 Ibid., 201.

43 Ibid., 197.
Both of these theologians' analyses involves the process of reception. So we agree with Pottmeyer and Küng that the turning-point occurred but we also agree that the ecclesiological teachings of the Council in particular have not achieved the degree of reception that one might have expected in 1965. McBrien defines reception as "the process by which official teachings and disciplinary decrees are accepted, assimilated, and interpreted by the whole Church."\(^4\)

Particularly with regard to the importance of the local Church and the strengthened role of the local bishops, the process of reception does indeed appear to be "stuck." So that, currently, the reception of the Council's reformed ecclesiology is, in some significant measure, impeded. Reception will no doubt remain at this impasse as long as the conciliar texts are used to claim that the Council changed little or nothing regarding our understanding of the nature, mission, and structures of the Church.

The Council did intend to apply the traditional principle of *Ecclesia semper reformanda* whereby the Church engages an on-going process of conversion and reform. This principle also indicates that the Church must continually weigh its institutions and activities against the Gospel of Jesus Christ. In short, Vatican II very deliberately intended to reform the Church. As we shall see in Chapter Two, Pope John and Yves Congar are the two central figures in our study; more than any two people, they were responsible for the forward trajectory of the Council, certainly with regard to ecclesiology and pneumatology.

They were convinced of that the process of reception is constitutively Catholic. From Pope John's perspective, this inspired his desire to renew the pastoral life of the Church. For Congar, this inspired his work of historical scholarship whereby he made the history of this

reforming tendency available to the wider Church. This led to the recognition that the sources of this reforming tendency are found in the life of the Church from its very origins. And the worldwide pastors of the Church who were present at Vatican II attempted to shift the focus toward reform and away from the more juridical forms of Church life and teaching that had taken hold in the Church's way of life, especially its institutional life, during the second millennium.

If Pottmeyer provides us with an analysis taken primarily from the nature of the texts themselves, and if Küng's vantage point is the long history of the councils, McBrien's analysis is focused more on the leadership in the Church that is equally important for the process of reception. Pottmeyer's analysis above corresponds to one aspect of the Council as an event: the framing of the texts. McBrien's observations correspond to the whole trajectory especially to Pope John's intention for reform. McBrien describes what happened to the trajectory after the Council. He gives us a broader view of why we are in this phase of disillusionment. He describes the promise of the Council this way:

Catholic theology enjoyed something of a renaissance during and immediately following the Second Vatican Council. The names of Congar, Rahner, Schillebeeckx, and Küng were as celebrated at Vatican II as were those of Montini, Suenens, Frings, and Alfrink. Cooperation between the hierarchical magisterium and theologians had rarely been closer or more productive.\textsuperscript{45}

McBrien credits two events that brought this cooperative climate to a standstill:

the 1968 birth control encyclical of Pope Paul VI, \textit{Humanae vitae}, and the 1978 election of Pope John Paul II. He calls attention to the "storm of dissent" that followed the 1968

encyclical and argues that this demonstrates that a new relationship was formed between the bishops and the theologians at the Council. The theologians continued to function as though they were collaborative partners with the bishops, the pope, and the Vatican bureaucracy. They have come to see themselves as partners with competencies that could serve the Church. After *Humanae vitae* they exercised those competencies and in many cases found the encyclical wanting. This event displayed the new found freedom of the theologians and lay people as well. It also displayed the animosities left over from the Council. This situation reveals the early stages of the impasse. With regard to those who did not agree with the Council's reforms, McBrien writes, "They insisted, especially in private communications, that 'something be done.'" However, Pope Paul VI was an obstacle. McBrien argues that Pope Paul VI "had no stomach" for the kind of actions that these traditionalist Catholics had in mind. He observes that it would have been contrary to Pope Paul's background especially his involvement with Catholic intellectuals and with university students where freedom and questioning are essential. To squash either Curran or Küng, both of whom were attacked from a "militant" faction, would have been contrary to the reforming role Paul VI played at Vatican II.

With regard to the pontificate of John Paul II, McBrien argues that his background with repressive political regimes led to his "strong-willed exercise of papal authority." McBrien writes, "Cardinal Wojtyla had known only two kinds of political regimes
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his entire adult life: nazism and communism. In the absence of a free press, an independent labor movement, and a flourishing system of higher education, the Catholic church for him and for all Poles, became, almost by default, the one countervailing institutional force against a hostile government. Under the pontificate of Pope John Paul II, what Pottmeyer calls "selective interpretation" of the Council texts has flourished. The reforming themes, especially with regard to a less centralized church governance, of the Council texts have frequently been subordinated to the preconciliar notions of the Church. Pottmeyer calls for the "abandonment of selective interpretation" so that we might enter into the next phase in the Council's reception.

McBrien's observations provide a succinct description of the how this centralized exercise of authority eventually led to the impasse. The way authority was exercised in the formation of that text eventually swamped Vatican II's further reception. Up to the 1968 encyclical, the forward movement continued even when Pope Paul's sometime reluctance slowed it down. We see the forward movement, what Pottmeyer labels the period of excitement, in the way theologians and the faithful alike, as well as many pastors, rejected the reasoning of Humanae vitae. That encyclical returned to very method that the Council had rejected. For example, Gaudium et spes introduces and legitimates a more historical, non-classicist theological method. That documents says,

Since the Church has a visible and social structure as a sign of her unity in Christ, she can and ought to be enriched by the development of human social life, not that there is any lack in the constitution given her by Christ, but that she can

\[\text{Ibid.}, 296.\]

\[\text{Pottmeyer, "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II," 39. See note 13.}\]
understand it more penetratingly, express it better, and adjust it more successfully to our times.\textsuperscript{53}

*Gaudium et spes* applies an inductive method that takes human experience as its starting point. Contrary to the process of the Birth Control Commission itself, Pope Paul appealed to timeless principles rather than to the inductive method that the Council had embraced. The preferred method for framing new teachings for the Council was to look to the "signs of the times." McBrien rightly notes that Curran's response was emblematic of many theologians who had already embraced the Council and had begun actively to adjust their theological reflection in light of it. Conflict over this text was indeed a harbinger of the conflict that has suspended the use of the Council texts for the purpose of greater reform. A significant contributing factor to the situation of the Council texts is leadership in the Church, especially papal leadership which has diminished the episcopal leadership that Pope John so strongly promoted.

In *Lumen gentium* in particular, the Council picked up the collaborative style that Pope John modeled in the preparatory period of the Council. Pope John said in his *motu proprio* that he issued one June 5, 1960 that he had received the collaboration of the bishops. Pope John wrote,

> The antepreparatory commission has, with the greatest diligence, concluded the task we entrusted to it. It has made contact with all the bishops in order to obtain their advice and suggestions touching the matters to be treated in the council. It has carefully arranged the material contained in more than 2,000 replies which bishops and prelates gladly sent with messages of good will…. We have personally followed these exploratory labors, conducted with accuracy and care, and we have undertaken to examine personally with the greatest attention the suggestions and advice of the bishops, the proposals of he

\textsuperscript{53} *Gaudium et spes*, article 44.
sacred congregations of the Roman curia, the desires and studies of the universities.\textsuperscript{54}

We have cited Pope John at some length because in this \textit{motu proprio} he describes the kind of collaborative attitude he had towards the world-wide bishops. It also displays the value he placed, and wished the up-coming Council to place, on the local Church. This message was not addressed to functionaries but to fellow pastors, fellow bishops.

McBrien and Küng rightly hold the leadership in Church government primarily responsible for the present impasse. Pottmeyer acknowledges this failure of leadership but his primary focus is on the distinctive nature of the Council's texts and the need for a systematic hermeneutic for interpreting them. All three theologians argue that we are in a holding pattern in the reception of the Council. Both McBrien and Küng suggest that until we have a new pope who is cut from the same cloth as John XXIII, little will change. McBrien says about John XXIII, "Every pope, before and after him, is to be measured against the standard he set."\textsuperscript{55} Küng makes a similar claim. "If the (Roman) Catholic Church is to have a future as an institution in the twenty-first century, it needs a John XXIV."\textsuperscript{56} This is what Küng is referring to when he speaks of a betrayal of the Council. There are ecclesiological principles in the actual conciliar texts that are at the very least ignored in the day to day life of the institutional Church. A pope who follows in the tradition of John XXIII would not ignore, much less subvert, these ecclesiological principles.

\textsuperscript{54} Anderson, 4. See note XXX


\textsuperscript{56} Küng, 211. See note 14.
Küng's analysis of Pope John's role at the Council includes a fine sketch of the reforms that await greater reception. Küng writes, "It was John XXIII (1958-63) and no one else who, in a pontificate of barely five years, ushered in a new era in the history of the Catholic Church.... In all this, Pope John showed a new pastoral understanding of the papal office." Küng argues that "through his collegial behavior" Pope John was "able to he strengthened the role of bishops" in spite of "massive resistance" from the Roman Curia. During those five years the Church, with the leadership of Pope John, was able to open the Church up to the modern world and modern forms of scholarship. By way of his own historical training and pastoral experience, he was able to explain the message of Jesus Christ without dependence upon medieval or Counter-Reformation categories. He overcame the anti-modern stance that had prevailed in the preconciliar Church and was thereby able to create dialogue with the other Christian churches, and with Judaism and other world religions. He built upon the foundation laid by his pastoral experience with the Eastern states and promoted human rights and the international movements which were already doing social justice work.

The forward movement of the Council originates with Pope John. His intention to reform the Church was displayed in the way he exercised leadership. Vatican II was Pope John's Council. Its texts must be interpreted in light of this fact. When Pottmeyer suggests that we must create a hermeneutic that expresses "fidelity to the Council," one of the aspects of this hermeneutic will be an understanding of this direction that Pope John gave to the Council. He initiated the collaborative style; he applied modern forms of scholarship as well as modern

57 Ibid., 190.

58 Ibid.

59 Ibid., 190.
movements and ideas to his understanding of the Church. Even the Council format itself, with its consultative processes, was greatly influenced by this Pope John's openness and spirit of collaboration.

We close this section with yet another theologian's similar description of the trajectory and its historical context. Gustave Thils recognized this evolving tendency at the Council and he called it the Council's "trajectory of progressive ideas." Pottmeyer draws upon Thils' work in framing his own argument about the texts. Thils taught at the University of Louvain from 1947-1977, was a peritus at Vatican II and was a “major contributor” to Unitatis redintegratio and Gaudium et spes. Thils gives us a succinct description of the forward movement of the Council. According to Thils, a new Christian anthropology launched the reforming movement at Vatican II. The anthropology that Thils observed steering the forward movement of the Council's theology was more compatible with modern interpretations of history. He noted that, as the Council progressed over the four sessions, there was a growth and development of a conciliar theology that advanced beyond the preconciliar theology that had shaped the original schemata. This observation is important both because it supports our description of the trajectory and because we shall see that Congar places a similar emphasis upon anthropology as

---


he develops his understanding of pneumatology. As we shall see, Congar's writings before the Council influenced Pope John. At the Council itself, Congar continued to influence the pope. (Pope John was after all not a systematic theologian; it would be inappropriate to describe his notion of the Holy Spirit as systematic. He wisely turned to the systematicians to do that.) Congar makes a significant contribution to the way the Council members frame the pneumatology of the Council.

According to Thils, the Council was guided by this new Christian anthropology. With the direction presupposed by a modern notion of the human person, the Council moved forward toward a notion of the Church that was more compatible with this new anthropology. Thils interprets the whole Council through the lens of this theological anthropology. He argues that it is the guiding force in the development of the reformed theologies of the Council. He further argues that to interpret the Council it is necessary to study the conciliar acts and debates. His observations also presuppose exploring the Council as an event because he suggests that to understand the Council we must look at the path that the Council "traveled in the course of the debates." It is this direction that causes Vatican II to become an event. In the next section we shall clarify in greater detail what it means to see the Council as an event.

D. The Council as an Event: Sociology's Contribution

We turn to sociology because it provides the categories that identify Vatican II's transformative character. We find what sociologists call "breaks" or "surprising occurrences" at

---

63 Ibid.

64 Pottmeyer, 41. See note 13. xxx
The first such break is in various specific behaviors of the Council members that caused the emergence of new patterns of relationship between the worldwide bishops and the Vatican bureaucracy. For example, one of the very first actions of the Council participants was to insist that the conciliar Commissions be selected by the whole body of the Council; they rejected the Commissions that had been selected by the Curial cardinals. A second break is found in the groundbreaking speeches concerning *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. The trajectory of the Council is found in the speeches regarding the other schemata as well; for example, both *Sacrosanctum concilium*, "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy" and *Dei verbum*, "Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation" lay the foundation for *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. When we begin to travel the paths that Thils noticed in Chapters 3 and 4, we shall see that this was the case.

A third such break at Vatican II is the influence of several reform movements that had already begun in the worldwide Church. The liturgical movement and the worker-priest

---


66 The term "schemata" refers to the texts that were compiled by the preconciliar commissions. These texts were used to begin the process of drafting the council documents. During the pontificate of Pius XII, preparations for a council were made and the Head of the Holy Office, Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani made use of these texts in his work on Pope John’s council. It appears that Pius XII did not think that a council that required a meeting of the world's bishops was necessary. Instead he issued encyclicals that dealt with many of the topics. There are many works that address this situation. Two representative ones are: Bernard Botte, *From Silence to Participation: An Insider's View of Liturgical Renewal* trans. by John Sullivan (Washington, D.C.: Pastoral Press, 1988) and Richard A. McCormick, *The Critical Calling* (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1989), 3-208. Also see the discussion in McBrien, *Catholicism: Completely Revised and Updated*, 655-782. See note 33.
movement are just two examples.\textsuperscript{67} These movements were becoming a part of the life of the Church but were still not fully accepted by the Roman Curia in the Vatican bureaucracy which used the deductive method to address pastoral issues.\textsuperscript{68} By contrast, the members of these reform movements used the inductive method that examines the actual historical situation in formulating pastoral action. For the most part, the Roman Curia began with what they regarded as timeless principles and articulated how Catholics were to demonstrate their obedience to these truths. Because of this, the reform movements had not significantly influenced the formation of the initial schemata, which were written primarily by the members of the Roman Curia. Only the initial schema on the Liturgy was framed by those associated with the contemporary liturgical movement. As the Council progressed, many of these reform movements transformed the schemata.

A fourth break is seen in another theological movement at the Council: new movements in education. Theological education that still took place primarily in seminary situations not readily open to the non-ordained was often a stale, neo-Scholastic reinterpretation of Aquinas.


and other theologians.\textsuperscript{69} This is how the Curial cardinals themselves were trained. The work of many theologians was reduced to propositions and formulas precisely for seminary education.\textsuperscript{70} The sacraments were often reduced to transactions that fulfilled obligations rather than rites that deepened the spiritual life for service to the Reign of God.\textsuperscript{71} Moral theology was embedded in the casuistry of what is now called the "manual tradition" rather than in analysis of the free human person as a disciple of Christ in the Church and in the world. This preconciliar, propositional, seminary theology was not the primary theology that actually shaped the changes in the \textit{schemata} as the Council progressed.\textsuperscript{72}

New theological ideas and their dialogue with modern thought that were suspect before the Council, grew in influence at the Council itself. The situation of the person in the Church and in the world was addressed in terms of human freedom and responsibility rather than by

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{69} Karl Rahner took the work of Aquinas which had been so reduced and demonstrated that one of Aquinas' greatest contributions to theology was his understanding of the human person as a free and responsible being with a constitutive orientation towards God.
\item \textsuperscript{70} For a detailed discussion regarding method see Bernard Lonergan, \textit{Method in Theology}, 149-368. See note 8. For a discussion of the influence of Thomas Aquinas and theological education in particular see Thomas F. O’Meara, "Traditions, Schools and Students," \textit{Thomas Aquinas Theologian} (Notre Dame, IN and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 152-200.
\item \textsuperscript{71} A notably clear article that describes this situation with reference to the sacrament of penance (as it was called then) is in Charles E. Curran, “The Sacrament of Penance Today,” in \textit{Contemporary Problems in Moral Theology}, 1-96. See note 49.
\item \textsuperscript{72} This is not to say that all seminary education occurred this way. There were professors who were reading the work of Congar, Rahner, Schillebeeckx and others. In general though, the theological education that influenced the Council in the form of its initial schemas was this kind of education. See P. Joseph Cahill, "Theological Education: Its Fragmentation and Unity," \textit{Theological Studies} 45 (June 1984), 334-342.
\end{itemize}
forms that were often incompatible with modern philosophical categories.\textsuperscript{73} And these notions of freedom and responsibility did not ignore or reject modern thought, but precisely embraced it and were in dialogue with it. With regard to the study of the Church and its adjacent discipline, moral theology, ideas were introduced (influenced by historical and theological studies) that would eventually replace the manual tradition in both.\textsuperscript{74}

The Vatican bureaucracy's negative treatment of several individuals who went on to become prominent at the Council precisely illuminates this changing theological viewpoint, and in addition constitutes another, the fifth, break with the previous situation. Karl Rahner, whose Christian anthropology would eventually influence the teachings of the Council, had difficulty with the Vatican before the Council.\textsuperscript{75} Yves Congar was another theologian whose writings became central to the Council's teaching. Before the Council many of those teachings were viewed suspiciously, and in some cases, they were rejected. In 1937, after the publication of his Divided Christendom, his Dominican superior was called to the Vatican for an investigation of Congar's theology.\textsuperscript{76} This began a period where Congar's work was regarded suspiciously by the Vatican bureaucracy.\textsuperscript{77} In 1954, just eight years before the Council, the translation of Congar's

\textsuperscript{73} We shall explore this turn from obedience to freedom and responsibility in greater detail later in the study when we describe the actual dominant pneumatology.

\textsuperscript{74} Adolphe Tanquerey, \textit{Brevior synopsis theologae dogmaticae}, 9th ed. (Paris: Desclée, 1952). The original edition was published in 1931.


Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Église was prohibited and he was told to stop teaching and leave France. By 1959, however, he was named as a theological consultant to the preparatory commission of the Council. He went on to become a major peritus who had a profound influence in the actual composition of Lumen gentium and other documents. The suspect Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Église actually inspired Angelo Roncalli in his developing thinking about reform before he became Pope.

American theologian John Courtney Murray had similar trouble. Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani managed to have Murray silenced for his writings on the relationship between the Church and state and on religious freedom. This previously silenced theologian also became a peritus at the Council, and a mere ten years after he was silenced, Murray's ideas became the official teaching of the Church, especially in Dignitatis humanae, "The Declaration on Religious Freedom."

In addition to these men, Giovanni Battista Montini's story is also pertinent. After having served as assistant secretary of state at the Vatican, he organized the Holy Year in 1950 and the Marian Year in 1954. He appeared to be progressing toward appointment to the College of Cardinals. However, amid rumors that he had fallen from favor with Pius XII, Montini was

---


"banished" most probably because of his openness to the worker-priest movement. He was named archbishop of Milan but was not made a cardinal during Pius XII's pontificate. He went on to become Pope John's first cardinal and was elected Pope between sessions of the Council itself.\footnote{Richard P. McBrien, \textit{Lives of the Popes: The Pontiffs from St. Peter to John Paul II}, 375-76. See note 34.} One of the most striking indications that Vatican II was a break with the previous situation is the way in which so many of the people who emerged as leaders at the Council had been viewed suspiciously and treated negatively by the Roman Curia before the Council. In addition to these breaks, Vatican II "durably" transformed "previous structures and practices." It transformed the very structure and meaning of an ecumenical council. Its place in conciliar history demonstrates the transformative character of Vatican II.

By exploring Vatican II's place in conciliar history in greater detail we not only buttress Greeley's sociological argument, we further justify our use of the pneumatology of the Council to disclose its reformed ecclesiology. The fresh way that Vatican II functioned in the life of the Church involved an equally fresh understanding of the way the Holy Spirit functioned in collaboration with the Church's authoritative teaching. In the formative texts and in the earliest ritual forms, the Holy Spirit was understood to be particularly involved in the life of the Church. When Catholic theology reflects upon the Holy Spirit, it does so most often with reference to the life of the Church. The Second Vatican Council was a crucial event in the life of the Church. It marks a break seen only once before in the history of the Church's self-understanding and the way of teaching that flows from that understanding. That break was at the so-called Council of Jerusalem. Contrary to the assessment of those whom Greeley calls "restorationists" Vatican II was not simply an "occurrence." It was a distinctively new and critical event. However, such
critical events have a dynamism that cannot be distilled easily into the rather flattened form of texts. Because of this dynamism, formulating the new teaching on the Church at Vatican II requires that we explore the Council as an event. It became a distinctive and critical event because its trajectory of progressive ideas durably transformed previous theologies, especially pneumatology and ecclesiology. These theologies, in turn, allowed the Council participants to lay the foundation for the transformation of Church structures and practices in the reformed self-understanding of the nature and mission of the Church. They did indeed include this transformation in the Council texts. We require a fresh way of dealing with the texts so that the transformation can be more fully effected in the life of the Church.

Any time we make an evaluation about the relative important of a point in history, we are making judgments about things that happened and deciding which ones were just occurrences (also referred to as incidents or happenings) and which were aspects of what we designate as an event. An event has an impact beyond the moment when it happened. Many things happen; relatively few of them contribute to the meaning of anything beyond the discrete moments themselves. This use of judgments that discloses a trajectory can be seen in the most specialized and sophisticated academic instances, such as the trajectory of human language found in alphabets and lettering. It may also be found in the most mundane and common attempts to

---

describe the character of a person by showing a trajectory in her or his personal history. (For example, one who lies becomes a liar and one who loves becomes a lover.) Following a trajectory requires making judgments. If the occurrences that happened follow an identifiable trajectory, they form a coherent event. The Council so consistently chose a pastoral, collaborative approach that this approach shaped the event. The event in turn, had an impact beyond its own moment. The pastoral approach becomes the pastoral event and eventually yields a pastoral Church.

Unless we make some critical judgments that legitimately demonstrate how the Council was an event, theological discussions of the documents will remain at the level of a history lesson. Taking up Pottmeyer's challenge for systematic theology, we must find a way to incorporate the Council's forward movement into a synthetic interpretative method. We agree with Thils' observation about the "progressive ideas" at the Council. That trajectory is one of the factors that makes Vatican II an event and not simply past experience in the life of the Church.

E. The Council as an Event: The Contribution of the Principle of Sacramentality

Another feature of the Council as an event is illuminated through the theological principle of sacramentality which describes the characteristically Catholic notion of how the divine is available and related to the human. It states that "all reality is potentially and in fact the bearer of God's presence and the instrument of divine action on our behalf." The Church claims to be a particular "instrument" of God's presence and action. The activities of the Church are all

---

83 We see this same structure in the use of Scripture in the Liturgy. The Liturgical Year is arranged along a trajectory that tells the story of salvation and proclaims the Reign of God.

84 Ibid., 1250. For a detailed discussion of sacramentality see Catholicism, 9-11.
sacramental in that they, in some way, intend to "bear" God's presence or are the "instruments" of God's activity in the Church. When an ecumenical council succeeds in being a "truly convincing event," it becomes what Küng calls the concrete "representation" of the Church's attempt to proclaim the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the changing circumstances of human history. This is particularly the case when it comes to ecclesiology. And even more so to the ecclesiology of Vatican II precisely because it was a function of the Church at the same time that it was teaching about the Church. Thus, Vatican II itself is a source for theological reflection with regard to the Church.

Theology is embedded in the whole life of the Church; it is found in its rituals, in its spiritual traditions, as well as in its practice of social justice. Theology is found in the history of those committed to the ascetic life, on the one hand, as well as in the stories of those involved in the Church's political life, on the other hand. We explore the writings of individual Christians, pastors, bishops and theologians to discover their critical reflections upon their experiences of God. We read sermons and we read treatises; we read diaries and prayer books. Texts such as these, however, are not the only sources for theology. We might read love letters in search of the story of a marriage, for instance, but we would hardly stop there; we would also explore the actual events in the life of the spouses as much as possible. For the same reason, theological reflection upon the Church requires that we look at the specific events and moments in the life of the Church because they disclose this Catholic ecclesiology.

---

Exploring the Council in terms of the trajectory that defines it as an event allows us to more easily deal with the vestiges of the preconciliar theology in the documents without ceding them equal importance in the overall Council. Both Pottmeyer and Thils claim that reading the documents in light of the forward movement and development of progressive ideas demonstrates the subordinate and not equivalent position of the preconciliar ideas. Taking Pottmeyer's and Thils' insights together, our claim is that the progressive movement coalesces around the notion of the Holy Spirit. The Christian anthropology that Thils identified converged with Pope John's notion of God's on-going presence as Holy Spirit, and a pneumatology emerged that connected all the other theological concerns of the Council in a distinctive way. The trajectory builds around a pressure point: that is a new understanding of the Holy Spirit as God's on-going presence to the individual, to the human community and to the world in history. This understanding reflects the principle of sacramentality because in it there is a balance between the human and the divine. The Spirit is neither over-supernaturalized and thus distanced from the human person, nor overly domesticated and thus easily identified with rubrics and rules. The Holy Spirit is identified as God's on-going personal presence. Pope John introduced this new understanding; it was the insight behind his pastoral motivation for the Council. His intention was to move away from teaching through the demand for obedience and the threat of punishment. Instead, he emphasized pastoral care that allows and encourages the truth to emerge by its own intrinsic force; he saw this as a much more effective way to both teach and preserve authority.

The overwhelming majority of Council participants embraced Pope John's way of thinking about the Holy Spirit and shaped the ecclesiology of the Council with it. It is this orientation that allows Vatican II to achieve its place in conciliar history. A fuller account of
Vatican II's place in conciliar history is necessary as we build our case for a using the implicit pneumatology of the Council to identify the explicit reformed ecclesiology of the Council. The trajectory of progressive ideas can be traced by traveling with one idea, the view the Council members had of the Holy Spirit. This path allows us to distinguish the dominant ecclesiology from ecclesiology it supercedes.

**D. Vatican II as an Event in Conciliar History**

The Council’s progressive movement is not only found between 1962 and 1965; it is a signal event in the whole history of the Church's self-understanding. Vatican II occupies a distinctive place in the whole history of councils and therefore in the history of ecclesiology. In the next section, our task is to provide an explanation of what Pottmeyer means when he calls Vatican II a "movement." We shall do this by telescoping our perspective; in so doing, we look back over the event as it is now situated in the history of councils.

The first indication that Vatican II would become a signal event in the life of the Church comes from Pope John's own orientation of it. This orientation is revealed in his announcement on January 25, 1959 of his intention to call an ecumenical council. He made the announcement on the anniversary of the Conversion of St. Paul in the Basilica of St. Paul-Outside-the-Walls. The orientation that would guide the Council is given at the beginning of this speech. He said in this address that St. Paul's conversion "prompts" him to "open his mind" to the "spiritual needs of the present hour." His response to these "needs" was his "decided resolution to recall certain ancient forms of doctrinal affirmation and of wise provision of ecclesiastical discipline, which in

---

the history of the Church in an epoch of renewal yielded fruits of extraordinary efficaciousness, through clarity of thought, through the solidarity of religious unity, through the living flame of Christian fervor...."87 His "decided resolution to recall certain forms of doctrinal affirmation" displays the orientation of the Council.88 He sets the Council's compass with reference to the dramatic conversion of St. Paul that helped to transform Christianity into a worldwide faith. And like St. Paul's conversion, the orientation is fundamentally pneumatological. The Council is described in terms of "renewal" that will address the "present hour." Pope John places the Council in the line of all the councils that have generated "doctrinal affirmation, ecclesiastical discipline and solidarity."89 This same orientation is extended and developed in Pope John's now famous "Opening Speech" at the Council itself.90

The tepid response of the Roman Curia to Pope John's speech at St. Paul-Outside-the-Walls is a further indication of the distinctiveness of Vatican II. It is emblematic of the resistance to reform that was displayed at the Council. Pope John said that he was disappointed by the initial lack of response to his announcement of the Council.91 "Humanly speaking, we would have expected that the cardinals, after listening to our address, might have crowded round to express their approval and good wishes."92 In his diary Pope John says that the idea of calling

87 Ibid.

88 Ibid.

89 Ibid.

90 Ibid., 25- 9.


92 Ibid.
a council came to him as he said goodbye to the non-Roman cardinal electors immediately after
the Conclave that had elected him in 1958. He said that these conversations helped him to see
"the expectations of the world and the good impression that the new Pope could make. I
listened, noted everything down, and continued to wonder what to do -- concretely and
immediately."93 The Vatican bureaucracy resisted Pope John's attempts to create an open
dialogue with these cardinals and other bishops before the Council began. Consequently, the
schemata that were written primarily by the Vatican bureaucracy did not respond to the "needs"
of the "present hour." nor were they attempts at "renewal."94

When we read both speeches with reference to that period of preparation, we see
the signals of the Pope's direction for the Council.95 As we shall see, the pope wisely did not

93 Hebblethwaite, 307. See note 66.

94 Étienne Fouilloux, "The Antepreparatory Phase: The Slow Emergence from Inertia
(January, 1959-October, 1962)," and Joseph A. Komonchak, "The Struggle for the
Council During the Preparation of Vatican II (1960-1962)," History of Vatican II, Vol. I,
eds., Giuseppe Alberigo, Jean-Pierre Jossua and Joseph A. Komonchak, eds. (Maryknoll,

95 See Osservatore Romano, 14-15 November 1960. In an address entitled "Toward
the Ecumenical Council," John XXIII correlates Vatican II and the long history of
councils. "This council of Ours is not named after Jerusalem or Nicea. But it is only
natural for the soul of the humble present-day successor of St. Peter and of Pope
Sylvester, on fire as it is with plans for this great undertaking, to apply itself, among other
things, to pondering first of all over the historical unfolding of those twenty events of
similar or vaster proportions that have followed one upon the other over the course of two
thousand years to signalize the specialized pastoral interest and care of the Church--to
pondering, We say, over the special circumstances and serious situations that went with
the celebrations of these memorable meetings, and over the difficulties and contradictions
that were posed by the course of events in different periods, some of which were even
stormier and more difficult than Our own….The ecumenical councils of the past for the
most part furnished the answer to a need for exactness in doctrine, and dealt with various
important matters that had to do with the lex credendi because heresies and errors were
attempting to imbed themselves in the ancient Church in the East and in the West…. The
force his will upon the Council. When he did intervene, he did so judiciously. It is fair to say that, given his knowledge of history, the preconciliar activities of the Roman Curia and the opening speech itself, the Pope was aware of how the Council might become a significant event in the long history of councils. Karl Rahner provides us with a theological interpretation of the Council that affirms this judgment. In so doing, Rahner's assessment harkens back to one of the more famous moments of the Council: when Cardinal Leo Josef Suenens suggested that the Council address itself to both its own internal life as well as its relationship with the wider world. In addition to this moment during the Council, Cardinal Suenens was influential even before the Council. His own pastoral letter to his diocese also influenced Pope John's opening address to the Council.

Cardinal Suenens, the archbishop of Malines-Brussels, was indeed a leading figure at Vatican II. He was also one of the presidents of the Council. He suggested that the Council must address itself to the Church’s relationship to the world as well as to its internal concerns regarding its nature and mission. Echoing Cardinal Suenens' request that the Council address the Church *ad extra* as well as *ad intra*, Rahner widens our view and places Vatican II's reform in the same sweeping horizon. This wider horizon not only further warrants studying the Council as an event, it also illuminates the ecclesiology of the Council. Just as the fifth century christological Council of Chalcedon (451 CE) yielded a classic dogmatic teaching on the

occasions for assembling the other fifteen ecumenical councils,…were furnished by a variety of circumstances and to some degree, it is true, by concern for safeguarding the purity of the Church's teaching, but also by an interest in reassuring and directing consciences that had been upset by events of a religious and political nature in different countries and different sets of circumstances. However, even these latter matters almost always had some reference to the supreme tasks of the magisterium of the Church, and to the achievement and preservation of order, balance and peace in society."
humanity and divinity of Jesus Christ that is commonly referred to as the Chalcedonian formula. That formula set the boundaries for theological discourse about the nature and person of Jesus Christ. Vatican II intended to formulate a similar dogmatic teaching on the Church. The Council members entitled the first of Vatican II's two ecclesiological documents "The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church" (Lumen gentium.) This title is not accidental; it locates the teaching alongside the Chalcedonian formula with regard to its authoritative status. We turn to Rahner to deepen this line of reasoning.

Rahner's wider vista discloses a "basic theological interpretation" of Vatican II. Rahner describes how the history of the Council itself and the Council's place in the history of the Church's self-understanding are at least two of the components necessary for a theological interpretation of the Council. He notes, however, that neither, nor even both, are sufficient. "The assumption of this basic interpretation is of course the fact and assurance that this Council, despite the historical contingencies involved in such an event, was not merely an arbitrary accumulation of individual events and decisions, but an internal essential coherence of incidents..."

---

96 This has not been emphasized enough in the discussion of the meaning of both mystery and sacrament as they frame the whole document. As we shall see, a theological interpretation of the Council will go a long way toward remedying this. Hermann Pottmeyer made this point in his presentation, "The Papacy in the Third Millennium," (Paper presented for the Max Kade Foundation Lecture at the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame IN, November 4, 1999). Pottmeyer noted that the notion of mystery used in Lumen gentium is a complex theological idea that has not been understood as such. In many interpretations of that document, it is not interpreted as a theological concept as much as it is used as a simple description of the supernatural aspects of the Church. In practice, it has not been consistently applied to the government of the Church. The open dialogue between the Church's government and the theologians has been weakened since the Council.

which was not produced merely by its formal juridical character." When Rahner says that the Council has "an essential, internal coherence" that is not a product of its "formal juridical character," he is pointing to its particular, unique status in the conciliar tradition. The way the Council actually functioned has become an essential factor in the interpretation of the Council's teaching. The teaching cannot be understood apart from the event itself because Vatican II was a watershed moment in ecclesiology. In order to understand its "essential coherence," we must explore the Council as an event in the history of the Church and in the history of the Church's own self-understanding. What we are calling the Council as an event, Rahner refers to as this "essential coherence." Rahner's analysis does not draw as explicitly upon sociology as we have done. Nonetheless, there is a resonance between what he calls the "essential coherence" and what we call the Council as an event. Since councils are acts of the Church itself, they reflect and sometimes implicitly develop the Church's own self-understanding. Rahner claims that the councils contribute to the actual teaching on the nature and mission of the Church, not just by their juridical texts but also by the way that the Church "discovers and realizes" itself in the event of a council, precisely as Church. This will especially be the case when the topic that a council is considering is the Church itself, as was the case at Vatican II. All councils reflect the Church's contemporary self-understanding; Vatican II did so in a sustained and distinctive way. Rahner's insight, like Pottmeyer's, is in part determinative of our proposed solution to the problem of the stalled reception. Our use of Rahner's argument requires further background material on conciliar history, which will, in turn, help us demonstrate how pneumatology, ecclesiology and the Council as an event converge to produce a coherent basis for interpreting the Council texts.

---

98 Ibid., 77-78.
E. Background to Conciliar History

We cannot overemphasize the importance of the fact that Pope John was himself an historian. He had a more heightened awareness of the way councils function than many other members of the hierarchy. He saw them as "outstanding points of apostolic activity." At a general council of the Church, the world-wide pastors converse and explore more effective ways of proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Councils are often responses to crises in the Church. Councils have dealt with a variety of theological concerns that were the focus of the various crises; for instance, the great christological councils of Nicea, Ephesus and Chalcedon addressed the issues raised by the claim that Jesus was divine. The Council of Trent addressed the questions regarding revelation and sacramental theology that were central to the Reformation controversies. Regardless of what other theological questions are present, all councils are a part of a developing self-understanding of the Church (i.e., ecclesiology) because in them the Church is acting as the authoritative teacher regarding the central truth claims of the Gospel. How the Church acts magisterially at a given council is indicative of how its sees its role as the authoritative teacher of the Gospel.

So, the actual history of the Church is one of the principal sources for the theology of the Church. For Rahner, a council will have significance not only in its actual doctrinal content but also in the way that it functioned at, and subsequent to, its own point in history. Just as
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100 We are using "crisis" in the manner that Richard McBrien uses it in the first edition of Catholicism. "A crisis is, literally, a turning point, a moment or stage at which a process of whatever kind can go in two or more different directions. It is a time of separating out, of deciding (krinein). To be in crisis -- whether political, medical, or indeed, religious -- is to be at the threshold of decisive change, usually, but not always, attended by considerable risk and suspense." See Catholicism (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1981), 5.
individual theologians reflect upon experience in order to make judgments about God's presence and activity in history, the reflections of a council's participants emerge from an experience. In the case of Vatican II, this experience was a distinctive event where the Church's leaders met to discuss issues that were crucial for the Church at that time. The previous understanding of the Church had been increasingly losing its effectiveness in its central mission to proclaim the Gospel. The Church was ripe for transformation.

In the case of Vatican II, the "transformation" that occurred within the Council, within the contemporary Church and within the post-conciliar Church makes it an event that marks the shift from a Western, Roman-centered ecclesiology to a "global" ecclesiology. This shift, according to Rahner, is one of only two fundamental shifts, or caesurae, in the Church's history. Rahner's argument in the article just cited is that there have been only two councils that mark paradigm-shifts in this developing understanding of the nature and mission of the Church. He proposes that the first transformation happened when Christianity made the transition from Judaeo-Christianity to Gentile Christianity at the so-called Council of Jerusalem. Before this transition, the Gospel of Jesus Christ was directly linked to Judaism. After it, however, Christianity's identity became tied also to international cultures and thought forms (which, at that time, meant European and African) and remained that way until the next fundamental transformation, or caesura, at Vatican II. At the Council of Jerusalem, a pastoral crisis made a new paradigm necessary: whether or not to baptize Gentile converts without requiring of them all
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of the Jewish practices, especially circumcision. Rahner calls "Western Christianity" lasted from its beginnings in first-century Gentile Christianity until Vatican II.

Rahner argues that his division of church history is "theologically correct" because the initial proclamation [of the Gospel]

derives its peculiarity and singularity from the fact that its mental climate is that of the fundamental Christian salvation-event as such -- the death and resurrection of Jesus himself -- and the proclamation of this event within its own historical situation (not any other situation) is in fact proclamation in Israel and to Israel. Precisely because something like a mission to the Gentiles had become completely conceivable on this basis, it is clear that what Paul inaugurated -- the transition from Judaeo-Christanity to a Christianity of the Gentiles as such -- is not something theologically obvious, but introduces a radically new period of church history, a Christianity that was not an export of Judaeo-Christanity to the Diaspora, but -- despite its relatedness to the historical Jesus -- a Christianity that grew out of the soil of paganism.

It was the "salvation event" itself that gave the first period its orientation. The ecclesiology of that period was necessarily grounded in the historical situation of Jesus himself. The mission, death and resurrection provided the internal coherence. When the Gospel was "exported," a new orientation was required. When Pope John alluded to "apostolic activity" in his speech at St. Paul-Outside-the-Walls, he was making a connection between his Council and Paul's mission. The mission to the Gentiles required not just a new brand of Christianity but
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102 The so-called "Council of Jerusalem" was not an ecumenical council in the commonly accepted sense of that word. It does have enormous historical significance nonetheless.

103 Rahner, "Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council," 83. See note 76.
almost a brand-new Christianity that was a break from the historical situation of Israel and from Jewish theology.

Küng also analyzed the history of the councils theologically. His analysis contributes to a deeper understanding of Rahner's larger claim. Küng characterized the theology of ecumenical councils as a "prism" through which we can view the nature of the Church.

Ecumenical councils were never merely innocuous, periodic, ecclesiastical general assemblies held in times of peace and tranquility. They were always gatherings of the Church held in times of unrest and of danger from without and within. In each case the hour of the ecumenical council struck whenever the conscience of the Church was alarmed by heresies or by still-unmastered historical tasks challenging the whole Church to a decision. In such times of unrest, of gathering storm and of new decisions, much will depend upon whether the representation of the one, holy, Catholic Church is an event hastily contrived in some way or other, or a good, that is, a truly convincing event for people in and outside of this Church.¹⁰⁴

Both of these analyses presuppose the presence of the Catholic principle of sacramentality, which is the most important of the three principles that under-gird Catholic systematic theology.¹⁰⁵ Just as the Council of Jerusalem determined that the Gospel could be carried to the Gentile community without imposing all of the traditional Jewish laws about circumcision and diet, at the Council of Chalcedon clearer shape was given to the Christian insight about Jesus' identity as God's Son and as humanity's Savior. These "new decisions" became part of the teaching tradition because the Councils of Jerusalem and Chalcedon were the


kind of "truly convincing" events that Küng describes. In the case of Vatican II, because the Council's main topic was the Church, Rahner marks it as a "radically new period in church history."

A further comparison with Chalcedon is worth describing here. Presently, we think of the Chalcedonian formula as a doctrinal, and hence, a nearly timelessly-true declaration, but it began as a theological and pastoral attempt to clarify timely and highly controverted issues regarding the Gospel of Jesus Christ. At councils, the Church often extends and develops the insights of that Gospel to meet new pastoral challenges and address new theological questions. It is only when they accomplished this in (nearly) universally approved ways that teachings acquire the authority which we accord them today. As Christianity grew from being a reform movement within Judaism into a distinct movement of its own, the proclamation of the Gospel required that its claims be distilled into teachings. Küng alludes to the necessity for clear teaching when he describes the threat of "heresies and still-unmastered historical challenges." As the community that makes truth-claims about reality grows, encounters new situations and generates ever-newer truth-claims, it is also, and thereby, forming its own identity.

The Church's identity -- the way it worships, the way it describes itself, the behaviors it affirms and condemns and the way it carries out its mission -- must all be grounded in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The conciliar teachings of Jerusalem and Chalcedon are with us to this day because they responded to new questions with resilient and coherent answers, even if not always with comprehensive precision or application. The Church leaders at these councils successfully maintained the Christian truth-claims by crafting a language that met, for the most part, the
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conceptual challenges of their time. That language was both clear and flexible enough to be effectively taught in the variety of ways that any trans-temporal and trans-cultural teaching demands.

These teachings, which claim to be grounded in, and faithful to, the teaching of Jesus Christ, come to us by way of actual historical individuals who participated in a process that confronted questions regarding the Gospel and its proclamation. The Gospel's message makes truth-claims about reality. The teaching Church is truest to that Gospel when its teaching has an impact upon the way the Church and its members actually function with regard to their historical reality. Both Rahner and Küng describe the theological insight found in conciliar history: teaching insights emerge in a process of dialogue where the leaders of the Church craft new ways to describe the enduring Gospel of Jesus Christ. Vatican II's teaching is more difficult to describe than Jerusalem's or Chalcedon's. In the case of the Council of Jerusalem, a general principle begins to be applied; in the case of Chalcedon, we have the Chalcedonian formula that has endured as a starting point for Christology since the 5th century. Because Vatican II's teaching is ecclesiological, it will be constitutively linked to the Church's expressed self-identity in the significant acts of the Council as well as in its texts. As Rahner observes, "theology and church history" converge in ecclesiology, in reflection upon the "nature of the Church." For these reasons, in order to glean Vatican II's central ecclesiological teaching we must trace it in the actual process of the event itself. After Vatican II, we cannot understand the Church apart from that event. And, in turn, we cannot understand its texts without Rahner's "theological interpretation" of them.
The aspects of the Council that Rahner and Küng describe are discernible in the bull Pope John XXIII issued on December 25, 1961, convoking the Council that was to begin in the following year.

Today the Church is witnessing a crisis underway within society. While humanity is on the edge of a new era, tasks of immense gravity and amplitude await the Church, as in the most tragic periods of its history. It is a question in fact of bringing the modern world into contact with the vivifying and perennial energies of the Gospel, a world which exalts itself with its conquests in the technical and scientific fields but which brings also the consequences of a temporal order which some have wished to reorganize excluding God.... Indeed, we make ours the recommendation of Jesus that one should know how to distinguish the "signs of the times" (Matt. 16, 4), and we seem to see now, in the midst of so much darkness, a few indications which augur well for the fate of the Church and of humanity.  

For Pope John, Vatican II was the way the Church would bring the modern world into contact with the "vivifying and perennial energies of the Gospel." The Pope describes his vision for Vatican II's place in conciliar history very explicitly later in the same text. He said, "The forthcoming council will meet therefore and at a moment in which the Church finds very alive the desire to fortify its Faith and to contemplate itself in its own awe-inspiring unity." John XXIII went on to describe the Church's "urgent duty" to make sure its teachings were expressed with the vitality that they deserve. He further describes the Church's mission in terms of its duty to "promote the sanctification of its members" as well as its responsibility to the
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proclamation of its revealed truths. One of the reasons he gives for calling a Council was to
demonstrate that the Church is "always living and always young." Thus the Church "feels the
rhythm of the times" which each era brings. This project of calling an ecumenical council
corresponds to "the wishes of the Divine Redeemer" who expects that the Church will constantly
renew and refresh its doctrinal teachings. The Church, according to Pope John, also is coming
together as a council to reach out to other Christians in "charity" and in the hope for unity with
them. For Pope John a council was where the Church could "give greater efficiency to its
sound vitality." Its purpose was to contribute something crucial to the world: things "spiritual"
and "supernatural realities." A council then is a crucial way in which the Church actually
functions as a teaching Church.

Right teaching (orthodoxy) serves the mission of the Church in two ways. The first way
is by the teaching itself in its actual formulations and/or principles. The second is in the way that
it teaches. While it is also the case that all human communities will organize themselves into
some kind of structure, beyond and hence including the Church's secular goal, its ultimate goal is
the Reign of God that Jesus proclaimed. Because the Church's ultimate goal is a supernatural
one, it "must offer a possibility for all men of good will" to see this supernatural reality. Pope
John oriented the Council with both ways of teaching in mind. He understood that unless the
way the Church teaches is "vivifying," no level of doctrinal clarity would make any difference.
This is a theological insight, not simply a tactical one. The "signs of the times" demanded a new
understanding of the way that the Church teaches. This new way of teaching is instantiated at
the Council itself and in the reformed ecclesiology that is embedded in the documents it
produced. Because of the complex nature of these theological texts, Vatican II's place in
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conciliar history is a necessary aspect of the hermeneutic that will effectively interpret these documents.

**IV. Getting Beyond the Impasse**

Early in our discussion we proposed that this stalled situation can be addressed by systematic theologians. What can we do until Church leadership changes? We can interpret the ecclesiology of Vatican II pneumatologically, that is, with special reference to the John XXIII's notion of the Holy Spirit. We can interpret the texts of the Council by using the convergence of pneumatology, ecclesiology and the Council as an event as a basis for interpreting them. We suggested that identifying the dominant pneumatology of the Council will yield a theological description of the reformed ecclesiology of the Council. We shall consider these two theologies in greater detail in Chapter 2. However, in preparation for that discussion we must return again to Pottmeyer's analysis of the particular problems that the texts present and to his suggestions for a method of interpreting them. He identifies the tools that will help mine the reforms in the Council texts.

Pottmeyer describes the relationship between the character of the Council texts in particular and the Council's stalled reception.

> It is clear that the transitional character of Vatican II has also played a part in its reception. The condemnation of an error is immediately operative. And yet when earlier councils condemned errors it often took decades before orthodoxy prevailed. When the issue was church reform, centuries were sometimes required.\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{112} *Ibid.*, 28.
The idea of Vatican II as a "movement" is central to Pottmeyer's analysis; it is also central to reception. He rightly notes that correcting errors is a much more straightforward exercise than the process that Pope John named aggiornamento. The Council issued only one anathema and that was not against a person or a teaching but against war. The actual process of renewal and reform is necessarily less tidy and much more complex. In fact, the desire for tidiness or uniformity contributes to the stalled situation. Pottmeyer argues that we must turn both to the texts and to the nature of the Council to address this situation. He claims that in order to begin a more "active reception" of the Council we must craft a "proper hermeneutic for the Council." He begins by identifying a fundamental internal structure that is common to the Council documents. He suggests that recognizing this structure is essential as we establish a basis for the interpretation of the texts.

Pottmeyer's description of the structure of the texts hinges upon what he calls the method of juxtaposition that we find in the texts: "...alongside a doctrine or thesis couched in preconciliar language is set a doctrine or thesis that formulates some complementary aspect." This juxtapositioning demonstrates that the texts were written by an assembly; they understandably will have features that are distinct from texts crafted by an individual and that do not require the kind of compromising that Vatican II's texts required. For example, in Lumen gentium the primacy of the pope is affirmed and in the section that follows, the document also says that the college of bishops "possesses" the "supreme authority over the whole church." Pottmeyer claims that this method of juxtaposition is a coherent description of what the Council members

\[113\] Ibid., 29.

\[114\] Ibid., 37.

\[115\] Lumen gentium 22.
actually achieved in the documents. He argues that the Council members understood that their documents would mark the beginning of a new direction with regard to the self-understanding of the Church in particular. This argument follows from his understanding of the Council as a movement. The Council was the beginning a movement whereby one way of viewing the Church's teaching was superseded by another. The way the texts did this was to provide an overarching change of direction, such as the change in Lumen gentium that defines the Church first and foremost as a mystery and sacrament rather than as an hierarchical institution. The Council members understood that, because of the revolutionary nature of the changes they were making, they would not be able to accomplish them in a manner anything like previous councils. Pottmeyer argues that to discover the main teaching of the documents you must read them with reference to the overall direction that is set in them. He says we must also bring the direction of the Council as an event into the actual interpretation of the documents. The Council as an event, then, must be a significant aspect of any hermeneutic that interprets the Council texts.

For Pottmeyer, it makes sense that the Council members would frame texts that take the nature of the Council itself, in its historical and theological context, seriously. Vatican II did not function in the same way as councils had in the past. Pope John made it clear in his "Opening Speech" that he had called Vatican II not to issue condemnations but to find expressions of the Church's "perennial teaching" that were better suited to the times. A condemnation is a much more straightforward text; in the nature of the case it will tend toward a method that involves "either/or" rather than "both/and." Most of the earlier councils had been reacting against some teaching or practice or other. Vatican II was not so. So the historical pattern whereby conciliar texts contained condemnations was not realized in Pope John's Council. The Council members took up Pope John's charge to form a Council "primarily pastoral in character." In so doing they
also had to find a new way to frame their conciliar texts. Pottmeyer argues that this makes a distinctive method for interpreting Vatican II necessary:

> It is customary in dogmatic hermeneutics to interpret the statements of a council as corresponding exactly to the errors the council intended to condemn. This principle cannot be applied to Vatican II, because this council did not intend to condemn any errors. As a reform council with a pastoral goal it aimed rather at a renewal of the Church by concentrating on the heart of the Christian message and in this way serving the Church in its mission, which is to be a sign of salvation in the modern world. Connected with this was the intention of correcting those developments in the life and structure of the Church that had proved themselves one-sided when judged by sacred scripture and the overall tradition of the Church or by the development of ecumenism.\(^{116}\)

In the nature of the case, one cannot change a "development" overnight. Pottmeyer's analysis reminds us that Vatican II must be interpreted in light of the kind of council it was. Note that Pottmeyer describes two intentions of the Council: "renewal of the Church by concentrating on the heart of the Christian message" and "correcting those developments in the life and structure of the Church that had proved one-sided." Neither of these intentions could be best accomplished by condemnations.

Pottmeyer argues that such a hermeneutic must attend to the fact that Vatican II broke new ground in the way that it functioned as an authoritative assembly. He argues that the current
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\(^{116}\)Pottmeyer, 31. See note 13. Pottmeyer gives three examples: "Here are three examples. In the "Constitution on Revelation" the theses on the unity of revelation and on the magisterium's mission are set alongside the Tridentine thesis on scripture and tradition. In the "Constitution on the Church" the thesis of Vatican I on the primacy of the pope is followed by the thesis on the equally supreme authority of the episcopal college. In the "Decree on Ecumenism" the thesis on the truth of the Catholic Church stands side by side with the thesis on the elements of truth in the other churches." Pottmeyer, 37.
phase of disillusionment is understandable given both the distinctively new nature of the Council and the fact that the wider Church (theologians, pastors, and the rest of the Church community) have not fully grasped the next tasks that are required in order to facilitate reception. He called for the creation of a "hermeneutic" that takes this distinct nature of the Council as an event seriously.\footnote{Ibid., 39.} It is necessary to quote him at length on this point since this dissertation is based upon his analysis and our attempt at synthesis was constructed as a response to his work.

This hermeneutic will concern itself, first of all, with the interpretation of the conciliar texts. Each of these texts has a history within the Council, and, since that time, a postconciliar history or history of influence exercised. The preconciliar history includes the texts drafted by the preparatory commissions; these reflect in varying degrees post-tridentine, neo-scholastic, and post-Vatican I theology, but also preconciliar movements of renewal, such as the liturgical and biblical movements. The history of the texts within the Council includes the alternative drafts and suggestions for wording that were offered by the council fathers, the conciliar debates and votes, the addresses and wishes of John XXIII and Paul VI, the work of the commissions, and the successive redactions of the texts. A development is discernible both in the overall history of the Council's work and in the history of the individual texts: a development, over the course of four years, in the council fathers' level of theological information, in their understanding of one another's positions, and in their awareness of the problems. Among the 2,200 Fathers who were in attendance on the average, this development brought with it the formation of an increasingly clear majority who found themselves united by a desire for renewal. This majority was opposed by a minority of about 220 Fathers, some of whom, especially those who were members of the Curia, exerted no little influence. The minority group was concerned primarily with the preservation of continuity and the abiding validity of Trent and Vatican I. The wishes expressed regarding formulations and alterations, the interventions in which council fathers justified these wishes during the debates,
and the votes taken all manifest a clear tendency that expresses the will of the Council no less than do the new approaches introduced into the texts as a result of the tendency. An appropriate hermeneutic requires, therefore, that the texts be interpreted in light of the evolution both of the Council and its texts, and of the tendency manifest therein. \footnote{Ibid., 39-40.}

This study is one such "attempt" to perform a "more penetrating theological reflection and a renewed ecclesial praxis to reconcile them in a synthesis that will allow further advances." For Pottmeyer, the "internal contradictions" in the conciliar texts do not justify "reproach." It is unhelpful to stand towards them as failed texts that are unable to be received because of their own internal inconsistency. He argues that the Council members knew that they were on the growing edge of a new beginning. They wrote the texts with the confidence in the dynamic of the Council itself where the Church actually functioned under the principles of the new ecclesiology. The hierarchy, the theological and historical experts and the local Catholic communities, as represented by their local bishops, collaborated. The Council members expected this same collaboration in the reception of the Council's teaching. \footnote{See Giuseppe Alberigo's assessment of the Council's momentum in his chapter "The New Shape of the Council," in History of Vatican II, Vol. III., Giuseppe and Komonchak, eds., 510- 13.}

We accept Pottmeyer's description of the method of juxtaposition; if we do not recognize this guiding structure, the texts do appear to be internally inconsistent. For example, the Council's whole teaching depends upon what it says about the nature and mission of the Church. However, its most ecclesiological document, the one that was crafted to define the Church's nature and mission, displays two distinct ecclesiologies. The first, and the one with the greater
emphasis, or as Thils put it, the one which "acquired increasing importance" is the reformed ecclesiology of the Council. This ecclesiology takes pastoral care as its starting point and presupposes the freedom of the human person and the importance of the local Church. The second is the ecclesiology that "consistently lost in importance" that is a remnant of the preconciliar ecclesiology which places centralization and the values of the institutional Church before all others aspects of the Church's mission. In *Lumen gentium*, the Church is described as a mystery, a sacrament, the people of God, and as a hierarchical institution and a pilgrim Church. The Council intended to subordinate the hierarchical features of the Church to the understanding of the Church as mystery, sacrament and as the people of God. Many, or perhaps most, postconciliar acts of the Pope John Paul II in particular, and to a lesser degree, of Pope Paul VI, and of members of the Roman Curia, however, give pride of place to the hierarchical aspect of the Church's central government and either de-emphasize or ignore the other features.

The understanding of the Church as a mystery and a sacrament is one of the most important "new beginnings" undertaken by the Council majority; they intended it as the theological source (or starting point) for a renewed vision of the Church's nature and mission. In *Lumen gentium* the purpose of the hierarchical structure of the Church is to help fulfill its mission; hierarchy serves the mystery, the sacrament, the people of God. In this way the hierarchical structure supports the more primary or fundamental description of the Church as mystery and sacrament. A desire for
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121 This is seen both in the authoritarian exercise of primal papacy by Pope John Paul II as well as in the exercise of power and control by the Roman Curia. For representative discussions of these, see Richard P. McBrien, *Lives of the Popes: The Pontiffs from St. Peter to John Paul II*, 441-42 and Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley eds., *The Exercise of the Primacy: Continuing the Dialogue* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1998), 11- 22, 31- 45, 62- 69 and 75- 88.
the collegial exercise of authority, the importance of the local Church, and the need for dialogue and collaboration are a few of the emphases of *Lumen gentium*. Instead of these emphases, the actions of the government of the institutional Church strengthen the bureaucratic, centralized power of the Vatican. This diminishes the teaching of *Lumen gentium*. Identifying the dominant pneumatology of the Council, and then showing how it is parallel to the reformed ecclesiology and not compatible with the preconciliar ecclesiology, will demonstrate which the notion of the Church is primary. Pottmeyer argues that these distinct ecclesiologies remained in the texts because they mark the beginning of a process of transition. The conflicted nature of the texts was recognized quickly. Very soon after the Council, McBrien argued that the presence of the former ecclesiology reflected the Council's "theological schizophrenia." In order to overcome the impasse, identifying why the competing ecclesiolgies are in the texts will help identify which one the Council meant to emphasize.

In contrast to the dominant ecclesiology of *Lumen gentium*, the appointment of bishops, the investigations of prominent and respected theologians, the interference and mistrust of local bishops and the refusal to dialogue with women about women's concerns are all examples of how the hierarchical aspect of the Church is given priority over its sacramental nature. The hierarchical structure of the Church was explicitly subordinated to the Church understood as mystery and sacrament. When they are inverted and the Church as mystery and sacrament are subordinated to the hierarchical structure, the renewed ecclesiology of Vatican II is left in a state of suspension. Pottmeyer is right to characterize the texts as transitional. However, in the
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current situation of the interpretation of the Council's ecclesiology, as displayed in the kinds of actions by the institutional church mentioned above, Pottmeyer's characterization is not even acknowledged. This is what Pottmeyer means when he says, "I am referring to the selective interpretation -- "conservative" or "progressive," depending on the viewpoint of the interpreter -- that seizes upon one thesis in a pair without attending to the other and incorporates it into a given line of argument."\footnote{124} The ecclesiological presuppositions reflected in the actions above, lack Pottmeyer's "synthesis."

Pottmeyer argues that this internal incoherence discloses more than a simple coexistence of two equal but non-identical positions. Thus he writes:

> Canonists in particular have complained about the lack of precision and the "ambiguity" of the conciliar texts.... Dogmatic theologians, on the other hand, find it easier to live with the Council. The reason is that they all, whether "conservative" or "progressive," feel able to base their own positions on the conciliar texts. But this kind of treatment of the Council, one not based on any common interpretive approach, will help little to agreement among theologians or in the Church at large.... The widespread view that sees in the juxtaposition of two theses nothing but a compromise (in the pejorative sense) at the level of formulas is therefore too superficial.\footnote{125}


\footnote{125} Pottmeyer, "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II," 28 and 38. See note 15.
If the relationship between the two ecclesiologies is a simple compromise, the reformed ecclesiology is in fact nonfunctional since it requires concrete changes in Church structures. Specific processes and procedures must be created to implement the values of collegiality, the importance of the local church, individual freedom and dialogue. These concrete changes will, in turn, require the reform of, and, in some cases, the actual elimination of some structures presupposed by the preconciliar ecclesiology.

This is why a "common interpretive approach" to the Council's texts is needed. Theologians must be able to agree upon the nature of the reformed ecclesiology of Vatican II if the Council's transitional character is to be fulfilled. Transition presupposes an eventual advancement or, at the very least, movement from one state to another. Instead of "agreeing to disagree" about the meaning of the internal incoherence, or making what Pottmeyer calls "a selective interpretation" of the Council texts, dogmatic theologians must find a systematic way to actually make use of and advance the rich teaching of this Council. This is crucial with regard to ecclesiology in particular; ecclesiological teachings have little or no meaning unless they are lived out in the actual practices of the Church.  
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institutional Church deals with the internal incoherence of the conciliar documents. "In fact," he writes, "many regulations give the impression that the concerns of the conciliar minority, which made their way into the texts of the Council because the majority was willing to compromise, have been given greater weight than the new beginnings supported by the will of the majority."  

To overcome this selective interpretation we will describe the intention that the Council members had in mind when they wrote the texts. Pottmeyer claims that we will remain in this second phase, or period of disillusionment, unless we find a way to effectively interpret the Council and, in particular its texts. "The abandonment of selective interpretation and the resultant beginning of a third phase of reception require a hermeneutic that reflects fidelity to the Council, its intention, its procedure, and its transitional character."  

Pottmeyer is suggesting that we interpret the texts with reference to the Council itself. But how does one interpret the texts in light of the Council itself? We shall see that approaching the Council as an event will provide at least an initial step towards a synthetic interpretation of the Council's text and, hence, its greater reception. We shall do this in theological terms, using the speeches and the behaviors in the construction of this hermeneutic we have presupposed Bernard Lonergan's work on method as well as Karl Rahner's insights about the use of method in ecclesiology. In fact, Lonergan's work on the functional specialties and Rahner's work on the dynamic element in the Church both shaped it. See Bernard Lonergan, Method in Theology, note 8 above. Also see Karl Rahner, The Dynamic Element in the Church (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964).
of the Council participants as they formulated the theology at the Council. The speeches indicate
their theological intentions. Without a clear description of these intention, we are left with
incompatible interpretations of *Lumen gentium, Gaudium et spes* and the other conciliar texts.
For our purposes, the first step in a such a synthesis will be to provide a kind of theological
marker that will allow us to trace, and thus follow, the forward movement of the reformed
ecclesiology throughout the text. This is where pneumatology comes into play.

**G. Conclusion**

The design of our triangulated hermeneutic is rooted in the speeches and writings of John
XXIII who connected ecclesiology and pneumatology all the way from his announcement at St.
Paul-Outside-the-Walls, through the Council, to the very end of his life. Pope John rightly
understood that pneumatology would give an orientation to the event itself because in
ecclesiology the notion of God will shape all theological reflection regarding the Church. By
tracing the development of this incipient pneumatology through the Council as an event, we shall
be able to critically describe the reformed ecclesiology of the Council.

As Pottmeyer says, we are stalled in the second phase of the reception of Vatican II. The
next phase will not begin until a theologically coherent description of the reformed ecclesiology
is identified in the Council texts. Without such a description, conflicting interpretations of those
texts will continue to impede the fruitful use of those texts and to justify ecclesiastical
procedures that are antithetical to the intention of the Council. By employing systematic
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130 We shall support this claim further in Chapter Three.
theology's close connection between ecclesiology and pneumatology, we shall identify the dominant pneumatology that guided the trajectory of the Council. This trajectory of progressive ideas becomes the reformed, de-centralized ecclesiology of Vatican II.

In Chapter 2 we shall consider the relationship between ecclesiology and pneumatology in greater detail. We shall describe this historical relationship in a highly schematic fashion. In this chapter we also focus more specifically on our two central figures: Pope John and Yves Congar. Making use Yves Congar's pneumatology and ecclesiology, and some limited use of Rahner's of theological anthropology, we shall follow the trajectory of the Council.
CHAPTER TWO

PNEUMATOLOGY AND ECCLESIOLOGY AT VATICAN II

A. Preliminaries

Both Pottmeyer and Rahner described Vatican II as "transitional" periods. When completed, this chapter will have provided an answer to Rahner's question in his basic interpretation of Vatican II. Rahner asks "…in what precisely does the theological and not the merely cultural-historical singularity of such a transition, or such a caesura, consist? and secondly, what follows if we apply the theology of this transition to the transition in which we are living today and for which Vatican II was a kind of ecclesiastical beginning?"¹ Our claim is that during two key transition periods, the so-called Council of Jerusalem and the Second Vatican Council, a new theological anthropology emerged that yielded a strong bond between pneumatology and ecclesiology. This bond in turn allowed for a burst of creativity in ecclesiology that caused a new self-understanding of the Church's nature and mission to emerge. This chapter is an extended explanation of our answer to Rahner's question.

In Chapter One we claimed that pneumatology, ecclesiology and the Council as an event converge to produce a coherent basis for interpreting the Council. Having established the coherence of exploring the Council as an event, we now turn to explain in greater detail why

pneumatology is the key to that exploration; the theological singularity of Vatican II lies in the way pneumatology is strongly connected to ecclesiology. The understanding of the Holy Spirit will act as the "critical conceptual tool" in order to identify the dominant ecclesiology of the Council.\(^2\) In this chapter we shall be tracing the pneumatology of the Council as it emerged during the event. We shall proceed in three steps. First, we shall discuss the relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology, paying special attention to theological anthropology as the "glue" that optimally holds them together. Second, we shall look at Yves Congar's understanding of the relationships among these three concepts, and focus especially on his description of the Holy Spirit as the principle of communion. The particular convergence of theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology that occurred in these two transition periods assured an understanding of the Church that was creative enough to affect the passage from one kind of Church to another. Finally, we shall critically survey what we shall call Pope John XXIII's incipient pneumatology as evidenced in some preconciliar addresses. He was not the systematic theologian that Congar was, of course, and so of necessity we shall have to tease out this pneumatology from a combination of actions, texts, speeches and radio addresses.

**B. The Relationship Between Pneumatology and Ecclesiology**

Sometimes when the word "pneumatology" is used, it is really an escape-hatch into speculations that are not anchored in ecclesial and secular reality: in real people, in real conflicts, and in real events of historical significance like the Council. In this section we shall clarify how to describe God's presence and activity in the world, in history, in such a way that the discourse

---

\(^2\) James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, U. K.: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 433. We shall consider Dunn's work in greater detail when we discuss the biblical foundation of pneumatology.
about the Holy Spirit remains connected to discourse about real flesh-and-blood people who attempt to live lives of discipleship, particularly within the Catholic Church. To describe the connection between pneumatology and ecclesiology at its best, we shall also turn to the biblical moorings of pneumatology. Initial expressions of the theology of the Holy Spirit developed alongside the initial expressions of the theology of the Church. This is because God's on-going presence as Spirit is experienced, particularly but not exclusively, in the concrete activities of the Church.

Ecclesiological reflection is most closely related to reflection upon God's on-going presence as Holy Spirit; this relationship also involves all the other sub-disciplines in systematic theology. While these two mysteries have an especially close relationship, the theology of the Church functions in a distinctive way in systematic theology. The mystery of the Church is axial; the other mysteries of Christian existence are held together in the theology of the Church. Characterizations of the Church will necessarily reflect all the other Christian mysteries because the Church is where they all converge, where they are all displayed and acted out in one way or another. So, even though we shall be describing the particular relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology, because the Church is the axis around which all the Christian mysteries

---

3 A case in point is how Scripture (and therefore the reflections of the early community) is used in recent Trinitarian theology. For excellent examples of this, see Walter Kasper, *The God of Jesus Christ* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984), and William Hill, *The Three-Personed God: The Trinity as a Mystery of Salvation* (Washington D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1982).

4 For another description of systematic theology, see J. Matthew Ashley, "The Turn to Spirituality? The Relationship Between Theology and Spirituality," *Christian Spirituality Bulletin* 3 (Fall 1995), 13-8, especially 14. "By theology I mean the disciplined and self-critical attempt to construe all of reality -- God, the human person, society, human history and the natural cosmos, individually and in their inter-relations--in the light of the symbols and narratives of the Christian tradition, and in dialogue with other disciplines in the academy that attempt to understand and interpret reality."
mysteries turn, reflection upon these other mysteries will never be far removed. We shall see this especially in the Council as an event.

The Council members often pointed out that the ecclesiology of the Council texts influenced its other reflections on liturgy, revelation, salvation among others. Ecclesiology presupposes the more foundational theological topics such as the Mystery of God, Christology and the notion of grace and Christian anthropology. Ecclesiology depends upon and presupposes these topics but it is also related to these questions in its own particular way. Understandings of God's character, notions of Christ's presence and of the human person before God are played out most concretely in the actual life of the Church itself. The way we perceive human existence, understand Jesus Christ and grace will in turn reflect the perceptions and understandings regarding the Church. In this way, ecclesiology is not the most foundational of the systematic sub-disciplines, but is rather the most central regarding a comprehensive theological picture. All of the other sub-disciplines of theology intersect with ecclesiology.

Ecclesiology is, however, saturated with pneumatology. Without a rich pneumatology, ecclesiology becomes mere institutional analysis. And reciprocally, without a rich ecclesiology, pneumatology can become idiosyncratic spiritual reflection or reflection upon the Holy Spirit as a distance guarantor of truth. When this happens, ecclesiology will emphasize rituals and rules and regulations; pneumatology will be primarily individualistic and too directly tied to personal piety. Ecclesiology, which can be at the center of systematic theology precisely because it is so constitutively connected to the notion of God's on-going presence, is often relegated to the periphery. And pneumatology, which for the same reasons must be explored in tandem with the nature and mission of the Church, often ends up ignoring the study of the Church and its life.
altogether. As we discuss the relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology we must keep this theological partnership in mind. Ecclesiologies that ignore this partnership eventually shrink and become disconnected from the rich life of discipleship to which they ought naturally be bound. This was the case in the several decades before the Council.

Within the matrix of all the mysteries which Christian theology considers, the strongest bond is between the Holy Spirit and the Church. What binds them together, the "glue," is the underlying notion of the human person. Richard P. McBrien clusters the mysteries that are central to this chapter this way: "God is present to history in Jesus Christ and in a special way in the Church, where the human community has become explicitly conscious of itself in its ultimate relationship with God." The Church emerges when the "human community" becomes "explicitly conscious of itself in its ultimate relationship with God." When we look at this "ultimate relationship" from the human side, another name for it is theological anthropology; when we look at it from the divine side, we can label it Holy Spirit. An essential feature in our discussion of the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Church will be the understanding

---

5 This observation comes as a result of perusing both The Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America 51 (1996) and of dissertations on pneumatology since the late 1960's. In 1996 the Convention Theme for the Catholic Theological Society was "Toward a Spirited Theology: the Holy Spirit's Challenge to the Theological Disciplines." See also David Coffey, "The Incarnation of the Holy Spirit in Christ," Theological Studies 45 (September 1984), 466-80. By way of contrast, an article by Kilian McDonnell pays careful attention to the relationship between ecclesiological and pneumatological reflection. For example, "The Spirit who is experienced in history is that point of contact between God and humankind, the point where 'the Perfect Father' through the Son touches history and therefore the Church, but in another direction the Spirit is the point of entry into the mystery of Christ through which the mystery of the Father is attained." Kilian McDonnell, "A Trinitarian Theology of the Holy Spirit?," Theological Studies 46 (June 1985), 191-227.

of the human persons to whom "God is present." The character of God's on-going presence as Spirit must be described in conversation with the character of the human persons to whom God is present. And the features of the Church where this "ultimate relationship" is most "conscious of itself" are also reflections of both our understanding of God and of human persons.

Pneumatology is the study of the Holy Spirit's activities and effects in human life and history. It is a currently popular topic in theology. However, much of current pneumatology fails to make effective use of the life of the Church as a source. This was not the case in the Church's formative period. Critical reflection upon the nature and mission of the Church (ecclesiology) and reflection about how God is present and active in the lives of human persons in light of Jesus Christ's death and resurrection (pneumatology) were strongly linked during that formative period. The fact that increased reflection on the Holy Spirit has not had a significant impact on the stalled reception of Vatican II illustrates a disconnection between pneumatology and ecclesiology. If pneumatology and ecclesiology were as strongly connected as they ought to be, the increased attention to the Holy Spirit would have brought with it an increased attention to the theology of the Church and thus to Vatican II's further reception. Instead, much of the current discussion of pneumatology revolves around either communio ecclesiology or the current state of the filioque discussion. Such discussions about the Holy Spirit often neglect the actual life of the Church by focusing on texts disconnected from their historical and wider theological contexts. To re-invigorate the partnership between reflection upon the Holy Spirit and reflection upon the Church, we shall return to the time of the emerging Church and thus to

pneumatology's and ecclesiology's origins. As we address Rahner's question and "apply the theology" of the first transition period (The Council of Jerusalem) to Vatican II, the second definitive transition, we must begin where the theologians and pastors of that first transition began. That starting point was theological anthropology.

C. Theological Anthropology

Recall from Chapter 1 that Gustave Thils credited "a new Christian anthropology" as the fundamental source of the Council's reforms. All Christian theology is anchored in theological anthropology; we noted this above in our discussion of the relationship between the Gospel of Jesus Christ and its impact of deepening reflection upon God's relationship to the human community. Of course, both pneumatology and ecclesiology also presuppose Christology. We must, however, specifically address how theological anthropology flows from Christology as we begin this step in applying the first transition to the second. It is insufficient to stipulate the relationship. This is what Thils was getting at in his observation about the "new Christian anthropology." Unless what is "new" about this notion of the human person in relationship to God is recognized and articulated, an important feature of the Council's equally new pneumatology and ecclesiology will remain missing. As long as this feature is missing, neither the pneumatology or the ecclesiology of the Council can be as richly received as they might.

---

Just as one should not disconnect pneumatology and ecclesiology, one cannot actually separate theological anthropology from Christology and the Gospel. Concerning the relationship between the two, Rahner says,

Theological anthropology must particularly attend to the relation between itself and Christology. The Incarnation is not rightly apprehended if Christ's humanity is seen as the mere instrument -- ultimately external, after all -- through which an ever-invisible God makes himself known. It must be seen as precisely what God himself becomes when, whilst remaining God, he empties himself into the dimension of that which is other than himself, the non-divine.⁹

Rahner argues that the notion of the human person must be attentive to the Incarnation in such a way that God's involvement in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ is not merely instrumental. By this he means that God is related to human persons because God dwells in the "non-divine" dimension. God is present as God with the human person. Theological anthropology attempts to describe this unity between the divine and the "non-divine." The Council of Jerusalem did indeed "attend" to the new understanding of the human person that was revealed in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. In that first transition, a necessarily re-configured theological anthropology and the attendant Christology were essential for making the "abrogations and interruptions" that marked that "caesura" or transition. The transition from Jesus' mission as a reform of Judaism into another related but distinct way of thinking about God's presence to and intentions for the human community came by way of a new theological anthropology. As we shall see below, Paul the Apostle was the primary framer of this new anthropology.

Yves Congar also recognized the significance of Christology and the anthropology that flows from it in the second caesura at Vatican II. In his assessment of the pneumatology of Vatican II he argues that the "Council preserved the Christological reference which is fundamentally biblical and the essential condition for the soundness of any pneumatology."\(^{10}\) In a frequently cited passage that is axiomatic for Congar, he says, "If I were to draw but one conclusion from the whole of my work on the Holy Spirit, I would express it in these words: no Christology without pneumatology and no pneumatology without Christology."\(^{11}\) In the same introduction, he comments further, "the vigour of a lived pneumatology is to be found in Christology."\(^{12}\)

Theologians who maintain Rahner's attention to the Incarnation and Congar's "Christological reference" in pneumatology and in ecclesiology do so by making sure that the theological anthropology that bonds them is sufficiently attentive to the unity between God and the human person found in Jesus' person and in his ministry. This is, of course, a foundational move in theology. However, as we argued above, what should be a tight partnership can often devolve into separate and unconnected, or weakly connected and rather esoteric, theologies. An inadequate theological anthropology is often the source of the breakdown. An adequate theological anthropology will closely follow the principle of sacramentality which states that God's presence and activity is available through all of reality. Divine presence is disclosed through the finite. If the anthropology attends to the principle of sacramentality, that is,


\(^{11}\) Ibid., 1.

\(^{12}\) Ibid., 6.
maintaining a balance between the human and the divine, then it will serve as a stabilizing bond for theologies of the Church and the Holy Spirit. In the first transition period, the relationship between Jesus Christ and the human community yielded a new theological anthropology that forged the strong bond between the Holy Spirit and the Church that marks Paul's theology in particular.

Our application of the first transition to the second must therefore attend to the Christian anthropology of both transition periods. McBrien describes the centrality of theological anthropology this way:

    The question of human existence is as fundamental for Christian faith and theology as is the question of God. Indeed, the question of human existence and the question of God are two sides of the same theological coin. Our statements about God and Jesus Christ, about creation and redemption, about life and death, about grace and salvation, about sin and judgment, about the Church and morality, are always in some important measure a reflection of our understanding of human existence and of the human condition.13

Pneumatology is the divine side of McBrien's theological coin in this case. Given the Council's place in the history of the Church's self-understanding, the underlying notion of the human person was an "important measure" of the other side of this coin. A new theological anthropology was essential in order to re-think the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Church during the transition at Vatican II. Both the identity of God as Holy Spirit and the identity of the Church flowed from a fresh notion of the human person.

In the same way that an ecclesiology disconnected from a rich notion of the Holy Spirit can lead to a shrunken institutional Church, an inadequate theological anthropology can also

13 McBrien, Catholicism, p. 157. See Note 6 above.
constrict our understanding of the Holy Spirit. If the underlying theological anthropology is not sufficiently attentive to both the individual and communitarian aspects of human existence, and thus to the Catholic principle of sacramentality, the relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology will be weakened. If it is not also directly connected to Jesus Christ's person and mission, the understanding of the Holy Spirit can become attenuated into a separate treatise that leads to the privatization of the Spirit, on the one hand, and the identification of the Spirit with the ritual and legal action of the Church, on the other hand. Congar gives this description of the Church that echoes McBrien description of the interrelationships among theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology. He writes: "To live in the church -- that's to be a living part of an organic totality of which the Holy Spirit is the interior principle, in which the incarnation of Christ continues, and which Incarnates itself or 'gives itself a body' in dogma, worship and the social or hierarchical institutions."14 For Congar, the Holy Spirit is both an objective reality in the world and in history that is revealed through Christ's mission, death and resurrection and it is also the subjective, active principle of the activity of the Church.

1. The Biblical Foundations

For biblical scholar James D. G. Dunn, the key to the theological anthropology of the first transition period is to return to Paul's attempts to describe the way that the human person experiences the Spirit of Jesus Christ. Paul fashioned the matrix around the human person, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Church in the first transition period. Theological anthropology is

---

Paul's starting point. Dunn's description of the way Paul functioned during the first period makes reference to Paul's multiple concerns:

Paul's theology is practical and not merely speculative. Paul wrote as a missionary and pastor, and not as an academic theologian; or to be more precise, he wrote as a missionary-pastor theologian. Paul spoke of God and Christ because the reality of God and Christ impinged directly on himself and his Churches.¹⁵

Dunn echoes McBrien's description of the Church above. The "reality of God and Christ" impinged upon Paul's personal understanding of God. His translation of that understanding into categories that made sense of the communitarian experience of God in the Church mirrors McBrien's view of the Church as the special location where the human community works out the implications of their "ultimate relationship with God." Paul is concerned first and foremost with God’s on-going presence and not first about doctrines or legal structures, even though prior to his conversion he had been highly concerned with such matters. It was no small matter, as Rahner argued in this theological interpretation of the Council, to abrogate the ritual, communitarian, moral and Scriptural matters that Gentile Christianity did.¹⁶

The "theology" of the first caesura grows out of Paul's solutions. It involved a notion of the human person, the identity of the Spirit, and an understanding of the nature and mission of the Christian community. For Paul, the three were inextricably bound. The bond that yielded


¹⁶ Rahner, "Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council," 84-5. See note 1 above. Rahner says of Paul, "For him this transition really involved a caesura in the original sense of the term. It should also be remembered that many other abrogations and interruptions in salvation history were linked with the caesura: the abolition of the Sabbath, the transference of the centre of the Church from Jerusalem to Rome, far-reaching modifications in moral teaching, the emergence of new canonical Scriptures with priority over the old, etc."
the partnership between the Holy Spirit and the Church was the new understanding of the *imago Dei* that resulted from the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Paul drew upon this concept from Hebrew Scripture as he calculated what to abrogate and what to maintain of the notions of faithful life that flowed from those Scriptures. When Paul forged these bonds he did so as a faithful Jew who was also attempting to understand Jesus' claims about God.

We know that nearly all subsequent theologies of the Holy Spirit have strong roots in Paul's correspondence to the communities of the first caesura. This is why we turn to Paul for important features of the biblical foundations of the notion of the human person, of the Holy Spirit and of the Church. Paul's theology involves both a new theological anthropology and an emerging notion of God's on-going presence to the human community. The Hebrew concept of the *imago Dei* allowed him to deal with the challenges presented during this definitive period, particularly the relationship among the God of Israel, Jesus Christ and the human community. This concept from Hebrew Scripture allowed Paul to handle the questions raised about the connection between "salvation-history" and the "the Church of the Old Testament." As he handled these questions, his pneumatology emerges. We might say, he "answered" Rahner's question, "what could and must remain from the salvation-history and the Church of the Old Testament" by re-inspecting his own understanding of the human person with regard the "interruption" that Jesus' resurrection caused for his previous understanding of God's relationship to the human community. A similar re-inspection happened at Vatican II; hence Rahner's application of one to the other.

---

2. Hebrew Scripture's *imago Dei*

We must consider how Paul used this insight from the Hebrew Scriptures in greater detail. After his conversion, Paul looked to the ancient Jewish notion of the *imago Dei* through the lens of his experience of Jesus Christ. Like the solid relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology that flows from it, this disclosure (the human person as *imago Dei*) illuminates both the individual and the human community's relationship with God. Paul turned to this notion of the human person to deal with the challenges of the Gospel of Jesus Christ because it provided him with the categories to describe God's on-going, personal presence. In addition, when he called Jesus "Lord," he did so with the God of Israel in mind. He did not abandon what Dunn calls the basic theocentrism of the Hebrew Scriptures. Dunn points out that in order to rediscover Paul's pneumatology we must recognize that there are two essential elements that are "hidden" in Paul's actual writings but that are nonetheless crucial: his Jewish monotheism and his anthropology. This commitment to the one God of Israel shapes his Christology. Even though theological anthropology is Paul's starting point, his understanding of and desire to proclaim the person and mission of Jesus is always present. Thus we see Dunn's characterization of him as a "missionary-pastor theologian." We shall see the same tendencies in Congar's expression of the partnership between pneumatology and ecclesiology during the second transition period. Both Congar and Pope John, as well, could be similarly described as missionary-pastor theologians when they crafted their understandings of the matrix among Christology, theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology. Hence another parallel between the two transition periods; the leaders of each shared very similar concerns.

---

18 Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 51. See note 2 above.
Dunn claims that the heart of Paul's theology lies in the way he confronted the "tensions" caused for monotheism's truth claims by the resurrection of Jesus and the experience of the risen Lord's on-going presence to the community. Dunn writes, "But these were tensions which could not be coped with as beliefs in other gods had been coped with. Rather, they stimulated an elaboration of the older tension between Creator God transcendent and Spirit of God immanent, a process which eventuated in the Christian conceptualization of God as triune."\(^{19}\) In the Pauline corpus, the primary focus is upon God. The religious significance of Jesus Christ is held firmly within the framework of the Jewish (as well as Christian) axiom that God is one. Dunn continues argues that we "can indeed speak of two levels in Paul's theology, of two stories, the story of Israel and the story of Christ. The interaction (dialogue) between these two is one of the most fascinating features of Paul's theology."\(^{20}\) This interaction to which Dunn refers provides the anthropological foundation for his notion of God present as the in-dwelling Spirit of the risen Lord. For Paul, the one God was present in the early community which proclaimed Jesus as the Risen Christ.

Because he was a faithful Jew, Paul had to contend with what this new experience of God's on-going presence meant for his essential Jewishness. His solution was to bring forward the concept of the *imago Dei*, and transform the person who is made in God's image into the person who lives "the life of the Spirit." Just as Congar will do in the second transition, Paul maintains a cluster of theologies. Dunn describes the challenge Paul faced this way:

Paul's experience of God as Spirit, as mysterious vivifying and inspiring power, was of a piece with the experience of *ruach* attested by Moses (2 Cor. 3. 16) and the prophets

\(^{19}\) *Ibid.*, 718.

before him. That experience could be more clearly defined
and recognized by reference to Christ, as the Spirit of
Christ. But it was not another Spirit which was so
designated, only the Spirit of God, the Spirit given by God.
If the character of Christ had now defined the character of
the Spirit, it was the Spirit of God which was so defined.\textsuperscript{21}

Given the particular kind of Jew that Paul was, this required a new stance towards the law. He
came to see that the law was subordinate to "life in the Spirit." Reception of the Spirit is what
made a person a Christian for Paul. And the possibility of such a reception was given by God to
every human person.

This "life in the Spirit" was a challenge for Paul with regard to his own previous
emphasis upon legal formulas. He expressed his answer to this challenge at the Council of
Jerusalem, thus inaugurating the first transition period.\textsuperscript{22} Dunn notes that Paul's break with
Judaism would have been consistent with what Paul knew of Jesus' teachings. Rahner observes
that in so doing Paul follows Jesus' own well-established pattern. "Few were so careless of
orthodox formulas as Jesus, and there is something more than a little precious in affecting greater
concern for orthodoxy than his."\textsuperscript{23} The first move in this first caesura is the subordination of
legal formulas and ritual structures to the "life in the Spirit." The human person is defined by her
or his relationship to Jesus Christ whose Spirit is the Spirit of the God of Israel. As Dunn
indicated, this will eventuate "in the Christian conceptualization of God as triune;" its genesis is

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 717.

\textsuperscript{22} Rahner, "Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council," 83. See
note 1.

\textsuperscript{23} C. K. Barrett, \textit{The Signs of an Apostle: The Cato Lecture, 1969} (London: Epworth,
1970), 88.
participation in the emerging Church. Paul’s new theological anthropology (following Jesus’ ministry) rejects the claim that any external structure or condition determines the human person's relationship with God. The Church serves this relationship and illuminates it, but does not determine it. Only "life in the Spirit" does that. Dunn summarizes Paul's anthropology this way:

…Paul's theology is relational….. As the opening exposition of the gospel of Rom. 1. 16ff. clearly shows, his concern was rather with humankind in relation to God, with men and women in their relationships with each other, and subsequently with Christ as God's response to the human plight. In other words, Paul's anthropology is not a form of individualism; persons are social beings, defined as persons by their relations. In Pauline perspective, human beings are as they are by virtue of their relationship to God and his world. His gospel is of God in Christ reconciling the world to himself. His doctrine of salvation is of man and woman being restored to the image of God in the body of Christ. And so on. This context is vital to a proper understanding of Paul's anthropology.  

We have cited Dunn at length here because when Congar studied the biblical heritage of Christian pneumatology, he also noticed this relational, communitarian emphasis in Paul. As he traced the historical development of pneumatology after the biblical period, Congar discovered that Paul's insights were maintained in much of patristic ecclesiology and pneumatology. The theology of the Holy Spirit begins in human persons made in God's image. This "image" belongs to individual human persons at a level of intimacy only fully understood in light of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This intimate relationship with God animates all other relationships; thus it is fundamentally relational and communitarian.

For Paul, the human person is constituted as person by her or his individual relationship with God and that relationship itself is the very principle, as God's in-dwelling presence, for

communion with all other persons. While the communitarian aspect is not completely new to Paul's Hebrew consciousness, the Gospel of Jesus Christ's demands about the value of each human person and its intensification of the level of intimacy between God and human persons contain a deeper insight. That insight is that God's own Spirit is united with the human spirit as what Congar calls the "principle of communion." Neither the Church, nor Scripture, nor ritual practices, nor membership in a specific group, bestows God's Spirit upon human persons. Nor can any of these things control the "life in the Spirit." Life in the Spirit belongs constitutively to human persons both individually and in communion with others.

For Paul, the revelation of Jesus’ own intimate relationship with God is not so much a new understanding as it is a deepening of the earlier understanding of the *imago Dei*. In this deeper understanding the human person actually shares in God's very Spirit. So the human creature is united with the divine. God’s divinity is involved in the very existence of the person as person. Humanity is not diminished by God’s presence. The Old Testament notion of *ruach*, to which Dunn referred, is maintained. God continues to be found in law and in ritual. As the early Christian community experienced and recognized, God is indeed found in the Church. But first and foremost God is found in the graced existence that Jesus claimed for his own and disclosed as belonging to every human person as well. Paul maintains Congar's "Christological reference" while at the same time developing a rich notion of the life in the Spirit that animates the life in the Church. Dunn describes it this way:

The "in Christ" motif is as widespread in Paul's letters, but mostly presumes an established condition and status -- being "in Christ." The talk of participation "into Christ" is much less frequent as an aspect of the whole motif. In contrast, the Spirit motif embraces both the event of the Spirit given and received, and its consequent outworkings.
It is the given/received Spirit which determines life and living as "Christian."\(25\)

For Paul "the Spirit of Christ" did indeed function as a "critical conceptual tool."\(26\) Paul's understanding of the relationship of the law to the Gospel lies in the recognition that God, not the law, is primary. The law must be understood "not as a life-giver, but as an orderer of life for the people of God."\(27\) For Paul, the key to characterizing the Holy Spirit is participation in this "life in the Spirit" of Christ, and, as we shall see, Congar and Pope John XXIII shared this emphasis. All three, Paul, Congar and Pope John, insisted on maintaining the strong bonds among the Gospel of Jesus Christ (otherwise understood as discipleship), life in the Holy Spirit and life in the Church together. All three anchored these bonds in their understanding of the human person. While we are not suggesting the anachronistic claim that Congar and Pope John were explicitly applying the theology of one caesura to the other, nevertheless, when applied, Rahner's framework does fits what Congar and the pope actually did when they were challenged with re-connecting the life of the Spirit, the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the Church. Even though they do so in different ways, Pope John by turning to Paul's conversion as a model and Congar by inspecting Paul's "speculative" theology, both look to Paul's clustering of anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology.

When he suggests the application of the theology of one transition to the other, Rahner argues that the theological problems posed by the transition from Jewish Christianity to what he

\(\text{Ibid.}, 425.\)

\(\text{Ibid.}, 433.\)

\(\text{Ibid.}, 179.\)
calls "European Christianity," have "never been properly cleared up." He writes that even so, the transition itself, from one historical and theological situation to another one that is essentially a new situation, has happened only twice, at Jerusalem and at Vatican II. It makes sense to Rahner that we should look to the first for the theological cues for understanding the second. The theology required for "an actual world-religion" will share features with the theology that enabled the break with culture-bound framework of Judaism. That break allowed Christianity to become a "world religion." Christianity becomes culture bound again as its thought forms are growingly married to European categories. Rahner writes that the theological adjustments demanded by such transitions are "not at all as simple as people think." One feature that can be oversimplified is the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Church. This discussion of Paul's solutions to the problems posed by the transition will help us identify how Congar and Pope John solved the similar problems of their time in similar ways. As Dunn notes, Paul's theology of the Holy Spirit "gave the conception of the Spirit a sharpness and clarity which it had been lacking." As we shall see, Congar returns to Paul when he tries to describe the close relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Church that flows from the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Dunn thinks that Paul’s most significant contributions to pneumatology are often overlooked; this may be another way of making Rahner's point that the theology is more complex than it is often recognized to be. If it is the case that the complexity lies in the close partnership that Paul forged between pneumatology and ecclesiology by bonding them in the Christian anthropology of the Gospel, it is small wonder that the theology of the Holy Spirit and

---


29 Dunn., The Theology of Paul the Apostle, 433. See note 2.
the theology of the Church became disconnected. Such a rich matrix is challenging to maintain especially as it becomes involved in creedal formulations and ritual actions. This is particularly the case, according to Dunn, because "the Spirit" was relegated to institutional structures so early in the history of the Church.\textsuperscript{30} Both Pope John and Congar identified this same diminution of the emphasis upon the Holy Spirit with the increased emphasis upon institutional structures and forms. Dunn's claim also supports Rahner's historical schematic. By exploring Paul as a "missionary-pastor theologian" we encountered the aspects of Paul’s ministry that had the greatest impact upon the theology of the Church and the theology of the Holy Spirit. Dunn describes the challenge this Pauline theology raises for our time. "If the experience of the Spirit is to be given a more prominent place, then it inevitably follows that less prominence must be given to the other elements -- elements which have in fact usurped the role of the Spirit."\textsuperscript{31} Creedal formulations and ritual and legal forms are subordinate to the experience of God present as Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the personal in-dwelling of God in the human heart and in the human community. As Pope John will say on the first day of the Council, claims of faith such as this are one thing and their expression is another. For Paul, the most "prominent place" for the Holy Spirit is in the Spirit's presence to the human person. He described this in Christian terms that did not completely abandon the Jewish tradition about God's involvement with the human community. Both Congar and Pope John will follow Paul when they try to achieve a balance.

\textsuperscript{30} As Congar shows, the close bond was not always maintained in the Church. Paul’s insights endured in various historical forms but the strong relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology as it applied to the institutional Church was obscured for a variety of reasons. For example, as early as \textit{I Clement} (ca. 96), the bond is already being identified in more juridical terms. See Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, Vol. 1, 65-72. See note 10.

\textsuperscript{31} Dunn, \textit{The Theology of Paul the Apostle}, 55. See note 2.
between the individual and the corporate experience of the Spirit during their own transition period twenty centuries later.

D. Yves Congar's Theological Anthropology, Pneumatology and Ecclesiology

So, our answer to Rahner's question is that the "theological singularity " of the first transition period was the way that Paul used a new theological anthropology to forge the strong bond between pneumatology and ecclesiology. Yves Congar will make the same theological move during the second transition period. Congar was, of course, an ecclesiologist; his primary concern was the theology of the Church. As early as 1930 he understood his vocation was to assist in the reform of the Church. He wrote that he intended to make a life's work of studying the Church in order to show the "true face of the Church." He exerted a great influence upon the reconnection of pneumatology and ecclesiology. And, like Paul, Congar constructed his pneumatology using theological anthropology as the foundation. In this section we shall explain Congar's understanding of the relationships among theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology. It is through a fresh reconfiguration of these three that Congar was able to make the great strides in the reform of the Church that he did at the Council. He made very significant contributions to the "theological singularity" of the second transition period.

In his later work, Congar made important studies of pneumatology. Congar mined the historical sources about the Holy Spirit and thus paved the way for the renewal in pneumatology. While Congar is now often associated with pneumatology, he was first and foremost an ecclesiologist. His historical work that had such an impact on so many areas of theology,

---

especially pneumatology, was done in service to his larger project of rediscovering a balanced,
non-juridical ecclesiology. Thus the life of the Church was always a central concern for Congar.
So even when he addressed the specific topic of the Holy Spirit, he did so with the Church in
mind. McBrien provides this assessment of Congar and his influence this way:

By any reasonable account, Yves Congar is the most
distinguished ecclesiologist of this century and perhaps the
entire post-Tridentine era. No modern theologian's spirit
was accorded fuller play in the documents of Vatican II
than Congar's. Vatican II was a council of the church, and
Congar has been a theologian of the church _par excellence_.\(^{33}\)

Jean-Pierre Jossua claims that Congar is "emblematic" of the theology of the Council.\(^{34}\) By the
opening of the Council, Congar's "life's work" was well underway and his historical studies were
widely read and influential.

During his years of studying the history of ecclesiology he discovered very different
notions of the Church than the one that prevailed in the preconciliar period. In his article, "The
Council as an Assembly and the Church as Essentially Conciliar," Congar summarized his
observations this way: "Perhaps the greatest difference between ancient patristic ecclesiology
and modern ecclesiology is that the former included anthropology, while the latter is merely a
system, a book of law; one may ask if the system requires men of a certain quality, or if it


considers them interchangeable.\textsuperscript{35} In this article he goes on to describe the "anthropology of the patristic ecclesiology" as one of communion.\textsuperscript{36} By this he means that the "authenticity" of the theological anthropology lies in its understanding of the human community's "resemblance to God."\textsuperscript{37} Human persons are authentically human "in and through" communion with God. Congar writes, "This is the meeting place of the anthropology and the ecclesiology, it is this "communicating humanity" which is the subject of the Church's actions and attributes."\textsuperscript{38} A tradition exists on this question that should be one day restored and infused with new life.\textsuperscript{39} For Congar, the communion between God and human persons that is revealed in the mission and life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ becomes the relational basis for communion with all other persons. As such, for Congar not only does communion animate the human relationship with God, it particularly animates the relationships among persons both in the Church and from the Church to the whole human community. God is intimately present to the individual person and that presence causes the communion among all of humankind. Because of this Congar concludes that this feature of patristic ecclesiology should be applied as the Church is reformed. He


\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Ibid.}
suggests: "A tradition exists on this question that should be one day restored and infused with new life."\textsuperscript{40}

The "tradition" that "exists on this question" is the one that Congar brought with him to the Council. As a \textit{peritus} there he was able to educate and influence other Council members who had similar reforming instincts as a result of their own pastoral experience but who needed the theological tools with which to effect reform in the Church. Congar took this anthropology of communion and helped the Council craft an ecclesiology that was similar to the more ancient forms. He began by exploring the biblical sources of ecclesiology and then moved chronologically through the historical sources. As he constructed his own ecclesiology, Congar, like Paul, used theological anthropology as the foundation for the essential partnership between ecclesiology and pneumatology.

Congar emphasized the importance of theological anthropology in both ecclesiology and pneumatology. He described the appropriate anthropology as "a consideration of the perspective of the mystical body moving from within outwards to what constitutes the Christian living in communion with brothers and sisters."\textsuperscript{41} For Congar, anthropology was central to ecclesiology because the Church's central concern is the relationship between God and human persons. He said, "...the church is the true reality of that relationship."\textsuperscript{42} The inadequacy of the ecclesiology of the Church in which Congar found himself was, of course, the central reason for his "vocation." Because of this, he often compared what we are calling the preconciliar ecclesiology to the richer ecclesiolgies that he discovered in the long history of the Church.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{41} O'Meara, "Beyond 'Hierarchology,'" 178. See note 14.

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Ibid.}, 179.
In the pre-conciliar ecclesiology, the underlying theological anthropology described the person in terms of the human need for rules and regulations that are necessary to guide Christian behavior. The theological anthropology that dominated at Vatican II describes the person in terms of the human freedom that enables full discipleship for the sake of the Reign of God. Both theological anthropologies yield different ecclesiologies. The difference between the two is the difference between a Church that demands obedience and a Church that displays care. Vatican II's move beyond this pre-conciliar notion of the human person was crucial for the development of its understanding of the Holy Spirit. In turn, the influence of the notion of the Holy Spirit was central to the Church's self-understanding and identity at Vatican II. Congar's historical studies demonstrated that, even though pneumatology had become peripheralized or shrunken in pre-conciliar ecclesiology, that was not the case during the formative years of the Church. He sought to "restore" these features of those prior ecclesiologies; he understood that if that happened, the Church would be "infused with new life."

One of the primary features of the preconciliar ecclesiology is the observation that Congar made above; it did not actually have a true theological anthropology. Congar argues that since the understanding of the Church was as a system, people were seen as simply parts of the system; they were "interchangeable." This is a description of the an institution where members were often seen as functionaries rather than as active participants. Congar writes elsewhere that this notion of the Church as a system rather than as a living organism is particularly evident in the Church's operative understanding of teaching. The pre-conciliar Church often taught through condemnation. He wrote:

My God, why does your Church always condemn? True, she must above all guard the "deposit of faith"; but is there no other means than condemnation, especially condemning so quickly?… My God, why has your Church, which is
holy and one, unique, holy and true, why has she so often such an austere and forbidding face when in reality she is full of youth and life?43

It was the Church that "is full of youth and life" that Congar wanted to re-introduce to the Christian community, both the Catholic community and the other Christian communities which were so alienated by the Roman Church at that time. To overcome this understanding of teaching as condemnation, Congar turned to a the more ancient understanding of the Holy Spirit that reflected an "authentic" theological anthropology rather than the more diminished notion of the human person of the preconciliar Church.

Recall McBrien's description of the human community's explicit consciousness of "itself in its ultimate relationship with God."44 This description emphasizes the anthropological feature. One of Congar's descriptions of the Holy Spirit resonates with McBrien's. Congar says, "[The Holy Spirit] enables us to conform to the filial life of Jesus, that life which Jesus led, in a humanity that is similar to our own, as a perfect human expression of orientation towards the Father, (pros ton Patera, 1Jn 1:2; Jn 1:1-2)."45 In Christian theological anthropology human persons are constituted by their ultimate relationship with God, or as Congar writes, their "orientation towards the Father." Congar's studies demonstrated that the Holy Spirit is the divine presence that is the source of the orientation both in the human person individually and in the Church. His studies took him to the biblical foundations of theological anthropology and there he discovered Paul's matrix of the human person before God, the Holy Spirit and the Church. In


44 McBrien, Catholicism, 314. See note 6.

Paul he found descriptions of the Holy Spirit as the one who animates the Church's activities; in Paul, the Church's activities are the Spirit's own activities. He argued that Paul saw the Holy Spirit as the agent of the process of renewal in the interior life of the human person, in history as a continuation of Jesus historic mission of salvation and in the whole cosmos as it moves forward toward the ultimate destiny which God intends for it. So for Paul, Congar argues, the Holy Spirit is an interior principle of freedom and creativity. Congar writes that notions of the Holy Spirit's relationship with the Church must be such that they encourage freedom and creativity.\textsuperscript{46}

Institutional forms and ritual practices ought to display this understanding of the both the human person and the Church. Congar argues that life in the Church involves the "continuation" of the history of salvation. It is the Spirit who animates this "continuation" through the indwelling with the individual and in the Church. In the communion among persons, of which the Church is the preeminent example, "organs" and "expressions" display this presence "throughout the Church's duration."\textsuperscript{47} Congar did not find this emphasis upon freedom and creativity in the preconciliar Church.

Congar characterized the ecclesiology of the nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries as juridical and as unconnected to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit as an outward principle of the whole Christian life. In the century prior to Vatican II, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit was confined either to personal, private piety or to juridical power bestowed with clerical office. Because of this, theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology did not form the tight matrix that they formed especially in Paul's theology as well as in what Congar labeled "ancient patristic ecclesiology." When theological anthropology acts as the bond between the

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Ibid.}, 122-24.

pneumatology and ecclesiology, Congar noticed that the principle of sacramentality was
operative. In his historical studies on the Church, he noticed that sacramentality acted as a
corrective principle that informed the most fruitful theologies. With regard to theological
reflections upon the Church, he found that theologians described the "action" of the Holy Spirit
in preaching, in authoritative teaching and, of course, in the sacraments as well as in other
activities of the Church. In all of these, God's self-communication comes to the human
community through concrete persons, places, events, etc. God makes use of the finite to
communicate the infinite. God's on-going presence as Spirit is experienced precisely in the
concrete activities of the Church. In this way, the principle of sacramentality is operative.

However, when the principle of sacramentality is ignored or diluted, he found that
ecclesiology adopted one of two extremes. The first extreme is excessive juridicism; this
overemphasizes God's presence in the finite or natural. When the Holy Spirit's presence in the
Church overemphasizes concrete, communal and intersubjective aspects at the expense of its
interior aspects, the Church becomes a series of legal rules, regulations and rites. The second
extreme is the over emphasis upon interiority; this position emphasizes God's presence
supernatural or infinite. When the overemphasis is upon interiority, the Holy Spirit's presence in
the Church becomes privatized and individualistic. Congar noticed that the richest ecclesiologies
involve both the interior and the exterior aspects of God's presence. As we have noted, he
emphasized that the Holy Spirit is the source of the human capacity to unite in relationship with
God individually and with God and all other persons in communitarian activities. The interior
will be involved in the corporate and the corporate requires the interior.

With this in mind, Congar referred to the Holy Spirit as the "principle of communion."
encourage communion if its ecclesiology is properly connected to pneumatology. For Congar, if communion is the principle, there will be a reciprocity between pneumatology and ecclesiology. He found this reciprocal movement beginning with Paul and traced it through the patristics period on through to Aquinas and Bonaventure and up to the Council of Trent. Congar found that this reciprocity between pneumatology and ecclesiology was lacking in the prevailing ecclesiology prior to the Second Vatican Council. He described the pre-conciliar ecclesiology this way.

The spiritual and personal aspects of the Holy Spirit were treated of in "Spirituality," in an atmosphere of what would now be called "privatization." The indwelling of the Holy Spirit as systematized by Saint Thomas was thoroughly and lengthily discussed. But this had little influence in ecclesiology because the anthropology of the Christian sprang from the latter, and this was often excessively juridical.\(^4\)

Note Congar's observation that the "anthropology of the Christian sprang" from an "excessively juridical" notion of the Church. For Congar, Christian anthropology binds pneumatology and ecclesiology. All the way through the history of ecclesiology Congar observed that the "spiritual and personal aspects of the Holy Spirit" were emphasized throughout the life of the Church, in its various institutional forms and in its wide range of vocations. The Christian life as understood in these ecclesiologies involved a rich assortment of expressions. The anthropology that undergirded these notions of the Church must sprang from "the Spirit" that comes "from within" but that moves outwards as "the inspiration towards communion." In Aquinas, the Holy Spirit was not "privatized." When the underlying anthropology upon which Thomas drew became privatized, it led to the juridical understanding of the Holy Spirit's action in the Church.

Congar lamented that because of the loss of this richer anthropology, "personal vocation" could be seen as distinct and unconnected to the "structural value of the Church." He argued:

Even charisms were seen in the sense of the personal vocation without structural value for the Church. These charisms were discussed, above all in connection with Saints and with holy founders for example. It was said that God always provided in each succeeding age just what his Church needed. It was, one might say, one manner of justifying the institution.\(^49\)

Thus does Congar fault an inadequate anthropology as the underlying source of the Holy Spirit's circumscribed place in pre-conciliar theology. A new Christian anthropology was Congar's starting point just as it had been Paul's. This theological anthropology played a role similar to the one played in the construction of Paul's pneumatology in the first caesura. It, in turn, influenced the construction of the reformed ecclesiology of Vatican II.

What Congar calls "ancient patristic ecclesiology" takes its pedigree from the first transition. When Congar founded the *Unam Sanctam* series in 1937, he did so from this same intention to enlarge the understanding of Catholic ecclesiology by a return to "a large, rich, vibrant, fully biblical and traditional idea of the Church...."\(^50\) For Congar, the richest ecclesiolgies are the ones that display a recognition of the Holy Spirit as the sustaining force of all the Church's activities. In order to describe how this is the case Congar turned to theological anthropology. In the ecclesiology of the period just prior to the Council, Congar found the underlying theological anthropology wanting.

\(^{49}\) *Ibid.*

In his analysis of the biblical foundations of pneumatology, James D. G. Dunn claims from that period on there is a "movement of emphasis, from the Spirit to baptism as the vehicle of grace, and from Spirit as experience to Spirit as dogmatic deduction." Dunn's assessment echoes Congar's judgment (and Pope John's as we shall see) about the place of the Spirit in pre-conciliar ecclesiology. Congar saw this same "movement of emphasis" from the Holy Spirit as the experience of God's on-going presence to the Holy Spirit as a kind of commodity dispensed by the institutional Church or as the guarantor of the various powers of officials in the Church. Dunn argues that the Spirit's activities become attenuated when they begin to be located in ritual action. Congar makes similar observations.

This citation from Tradition and Traditions provides the central themes in Congar's characterization of the Holy Spirit which he repeats in various ways in many of his works.

...through the Spirit, the truth taught by Jesus Christ is gradually assimilated more and more intimately and, through love, becomes the inspiration towards communion. The Spirit creates, from within, the unity of community, and also the organs or expressions of its special genius, i.e., its tradition. The heart of all of these theological perspectives is the identity of the principle which acts throughout the Church's duration, and is at work in the activities by which it builds itself up, with that principle which was at work from the beginning in the revelation made to the prophets and the apostles, and in the saving actions of the incarnate Word.

For Congar, the "truth taught by Jesus Christ," can be recognized because of this "original," intimate, and personal reality inner presence of the Spirit. The Spirit's presence and activity takes the form of "organs or expressions" when it come to the life of the Church. Elizabeth

---
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52 Yves Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 340. See note 47.
Groppe argues that Congar "should be remembered as a great theologian of the Holy Spirit, a man who gave new life to a tradition in which pneumatology, theological anthropology and ecclesiology were once seamlessly united." His recovery of this seamless unity greatly influenced the pneumatology of the Council.

For Congar, this concern to describe and understand the Holy Spirit informed and shaped the early Church's notion of itself as Church. As the community of Jesus' disciples began to express and organize itself after the resurrection, it reflected upon the ongoing presence of Jesus in its life. Especially in the Pauline writings, a variety of functions were ascribed to the "Spirit of Christ Jesus" because of the community's experience of God's ongoing presence in these activities. This led to the "conviction" that "the Church is constituted by the Holy Spirit." The emerging theology of the Holy Spirit and the emerging understanding of the nature and mission of the Church were partners from the very beginning. Both theologies presupposed an understanding of the human person that had been shaped by the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The way


these three coalesce and are arranged around each other is crucial for understanding Congar's notion of the Holy Spirit that was so influential in the reforms of Vatican II.

Congar argued that the principle of communion relies upon the "liberty" of the human person. The new Christian theological anthropology at Vatican II was framed in terms of an expansive notion of human freedom as well as in terms of a modern notion of history. Freedom refers to both the individual freedom to make a response to the Gospel of Jesus Christ and to the freedom that allows for changes in structures in the Church and the freedom necessary for new forms and structures to emerge. For Congar, the signal of the presence of the Holy Spirit is freedom. This freedom will be expressed in the more specific activities of reconciliation, renewal and originality. However, unless freedom is the prior condition, these more specific activities cannot sustain the connection between the individual and the corporate. Each member of the Church must be free to participate in the life of the Church and the Church must be free to continue to provide arenas for such participation. Freedom allows the Christian to recognize the truth of the Gospel and to act upon that truth in creative liberty. For Congar, the Church does not dispense the graced existence revealed by Jesus Christ but, instead, helps the human person to flourish. Any institutional forms are subordinate to the Gospel that is the source of the Church and which the Church proclaims.

Since our project is concerned with the Council as it happened, an anecdote that Congar shared from his experience of the Council is worth repeating. It captures the atmosphere of the Council with regard to the difference between people like Congar and the small faction who were steeped in the ecclesiology of the nineteenth century. Congar was asked to draft a chapter of what would become Gaudium et spes. In his draft he referred to the Holy Spirit. He reports that, a "prominent theologian of preconciliar mentality congratulated me on my Latin and then
said, 'You speak of the Holy Spirit, but that is for the Protestants. We have the teaching authority.'

This "prominent theologian's" understanding of the teaching authority of the Church displays the dominant notion of the Church before the Council. According to Congar, from the late nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth, Roman Catholic pneumatology was relegated to the private experience of the individual human soul or to the power bestowed with clerical office. Because the Holy Spirit was located in personal piety, Congar observed that the "Holy Spirit is not even mentioned" in the ecclesiologies of the time.

The stalemate that Pottmeyer observes lies in the gap between what Congar intended and actually accomplished in the texts at Vatican II and the meager degree to which the reformed ecclesiology actually functions in concrete processes and procedures at the present time. The texts themselves do reflect an anthropology and an ecclesiology where the Holy Spirit is "the meeting place" between God and human persons. The texts are framed in a way that displays that "the church is the true reality of that relationship" between the human person and the personal presence of God's in-dwelling Spirit. As we saw in our consideration of Paul, discourse about the Holy Spirit has its relational character because the notion of the divinity of the Holy Spirit emerged while the early community attempted to find the appropriate language to describe the Father's relationship to Jesus Christ and, in turn, their own on-going relationship with the divine. We saw this in the early language that characterizes the presence of God as "Spirit of

56 Ibid., 436.

57 Yves Congar, "The Council as an Assembly and the Church as Essentially Conciliar," 45. See note 35.

Christ" and "Spirit of God," especially in the Pauline epistles.\textsuperscript{59} By building upon a fresh notion of the human person who was addressed as a subject of care and not as an object of obedience, the texts did presuppose a "pneumatological anthropology." As McBrien observed, Congar's theology was "accorded fuller play" in the texts of the Council than any other theologian.\textsuperscript{60} This is one feature of his theology that was richly incorporated in the texts. Elizabeth Groppe describes Congar's "pneumatological anthropology" this way:

Congar's theological anthropology affirmed that God has created humanity in the divine image and destined us for divine communion. The \textit{imago Dei} is manifest in our capacity for knowledge and love, our active freedom, our existence as unique persons who share a common nature, and our vocation to bring the entire cosmos to spiritual expression…. For Congar, a pneumatological anthropology was inconceivable apart from a pneumatological ecclesiology -- an account of the action of the Spirit in the ecclesial communion.\textsuperscript{61}

Groppe describes Congar's matrix among theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology using the same starting point that Paul used: the \textit{imago Dei}. This description stands in contrast to the way the three were related in the preconciliar period.

Congar lamented the disconnection between Christology and pneumatology that prevailed before the Council. He observed that the dominant ecclesiology before the Council


\textsuperscript{60} McBrien, "Church and Ministry: The Achievement of Yves Congar," 203. See note 33.

\textsuperscript{61} Groppe, \textit{Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit}, 195-97. See note 51.}
was one where "the Holy Spirit was connected in an indefectible manner to the Mystical Body and that the union between the two was similar to the hypostatic union." Congar argues that Cardinal Manning, who was so influential at Vatican I, is representative of this widely-held ecclesiology. Congar finds Manning’s pneumatology lacking in both an understanding of the proper relationship between Christology and pneumatology and in an appropriate recognition of the "historicity of the life of the Church." Congar cites Manning’s summary of Manning's own book on the Holy Spirit that was published in 1875, *The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost*. Congar regards it as "highly representative of the Catholic approach to the Spirit [since the Counter-Reformation]." The Manning text reads:

I have pointed out how the Church or the Mystical Body of Christ is in its structure imperishable and in its life indefectible, because it is indissolubly united to the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver; I have shown also how, because it is indissolubly united to the Spirit of Truth, it can never fail in knowledge of the perfect revelation of God; and how, because its knowledge can never fail, its voice is also always guided by the continual light and assistance of the Spirit of Truth. It can therefore never err in enunciating or declaring the revealed knowledge which it possesses.

This structurally determined pneumatology was the operative pneumatology for a small restorationist faction of the Roman Curia at the Council. While this faction was indeed small compared to the 2500 plus Council members, it did determine the operative pneumatology of the Council as it was beginning because that faction controlled the texts.

---
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The Holy Spirit was seen as the "soul" of the Church. This notion of the Church as "one mystical person" via an "analogous… hypostatic union" of the Holy Ghost and the Church was the functional notion of the Holy Spirit for this small but highly influential group. Instead of the personal in-dwelling of the Holy Spirit to every Christian that became the heart of Vatican II’s pneumatology, Manning described the Holy Spirit as dwelling in the structure of the Church. This was the functional understanding of the Holy Spirit’s activity prior to Vatican II. The notion that Congar will articulate, that the Holy Spirit is the personal presence that creates communion between God and the human creature and among all humankind, is the notion of the Holy Spirit that will come to dominate the Council texts. Below is Congar’s summary of the problems with construing the person and activity of the Holy Spirit the way Manning did.

I feel justified in having given rather lengthy analysis because Manning’s very forceful approach is characteristic of the situation in which the Holy Spirit was placed in Catholicism of the period we are considering here [since the Counter-Reformation]. At that time, the Spirit was seen, on the one hand, as the principle of holy living in the souls of individuals -- this was the "internal mission" -- and, on the other, as guaranteeing acts of the institution, especially its infallible teaching. This certainly does not constitute a pneumatology. By pneumatology, I mean something other than a simple dogmatic theology of the third Person. I also mean something more than, and in this sense different from, a profound analysis of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in individual souls and his sanctifying activity there. Pneumatology should, I believe, describe the impact, in the context of the Church, of the fact that the Spirit distributes his gifts as he wills and in this way builds up the Church.... The encyclical Mystici Corporis of 1943 contains a profound theology of the Holy Spirit, but it never reaches the point where it becomes a full

---

pneumatology because it is restricted by its concentration on the institution. There is no separation of the activity of the Spirit from the work of Christ in a full pneumatology. Everything that I have said so far points to the impossibility of making such a division. A pneumatology of this kind, however, goes beyond simply making present the structures set up by Christ; it is the actuality of what the glorified Lord and his Spirit do in the life of the Church, in all the variety of forms that this activity has assumed in time and space.  

We have cited Congar at length because he addresses the central issues in the main assessments of the Council’s pneumatology. For Congar, pneumatology must have a stereo concern for "the work of Christ" that is, Christian theological anthropology and the Spirit’s activity in the "life of the Church." Congar did find reflection upon the Holy Spirit that described "the actuality of what the glorified Lord and his Spirit do in the life of the Church." He found it especially in Paul's theology and all the way through the patristic period. He discovered this same dual concern that the "sanctifying activity" of the Spirit be described in with regard to "individual souls" and with regard to the Spirit's "gifts" that "build up the Church" in Aquinas. He observed that Thomas' schema is one of return to God that occurs in and through the Church. For Aquinas, the Church is that structure, visible and invisible, that encourages and directs the life of human persons with God. Aquinas begins his *Summa* in theological anthropology by starting with the *imago Dei*. For Aquinas, the life in the Church is all about how to be a fitting creature for a life in and toward God. Congar's excavation of these sources uncovered a rich relationship among theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology. He argued for the fresh use of these sources, and contrasted the insights of these sources with the ecclesiology that dominated the preconciliar period.

---

Congar's own assessments of Vatican II's role in "the history of the nature of the Church" are similar to Rahner's. Congar observed in 1987, "[I]f the council has had any significance, it has been that of a transition from the ideal or the ideological sphere to the everyday life of the Church." He characterized the previous understanding of the Church as "Tridentinism." Congar explained Tridentinism this way:

...I do not mean the Council of Trent itself but Tridentinism as it was defined by Giuseppe Alberigo, in particular in his three lectures at the College de France. This Tridentinism is a system developed after the Council of Trent under the influence of three very conservative Popes -- Paul IV, Pius V and Sixtus Quintus -- who were followed by others. It was a system which took in absolutely everything: theology, ethics, Christian behaviour, religious practices, liturgy, organization, Roman centralization, the perpetual intervention of Roman congregations in the life of the Church, and so on.

This "centralization" led to the disconnection between the institutional Church and the changing circumstances of the world. When Vatican II makes the reconnection, it does so by starting with the identity of the human person as constitutively related to God, rather than by giving primacy to the institution as a collection of structures and offices.

The human person as related to God is a mystery. The human community related to God is also first and definitively a mystery. In the period prior to Vatican II, the Church was often viewed as a timeless institution which did not concern itself with adjusting to the world. For

---
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Congar, the Church is an institution that is incarnational in the same way that human persons are incarnational. It is a real, actual communion of persons in the real actual world. In addition, the Church displays the same unity of the human and the divine that is displayed in each person. In sum, theological anthropology necessarily plays out in ecclesiology. Any ecclesiology that does not reflect this theological anthropology that is anchored in the Gospel of Jesus Christ will not be properly attentive to the incarnational principle of sacramentality.

Congar's description of "Tridentinism" echoes Dunn's description of the ascendancy of ecclesiolgies where "the Spirit became less the subject of experience and more the object of dogma." This change in emphasis plays out in the shift to the activity of the Holy Spirit in ritual action and magisterial teaching. This usurpation of pneumatology by "baptism, the clerical domination of the Church, and the creed" began the process whereby pneumatology was seen as either highly personal and private, on the one hand, or as the source of the magisterium's power, on the other hand. Anthropology was vital for the move at Vatican II from what Congar calls "hierarchology" to a "pneumatological ecclesiology." In describing the position of pneumatology in the Church's developing self-understanding after the Council, Congar wrote this observation in 1973.

Lay people have shoudered their responsibilities as Christians, taking as their starting-point the precepts of the Gospel as seen by their conscience. They go further than ecclesiastical directions -- sometimes they ignore them (often these are non-existent!) and sometimes even, in temporal matters they go against them. In this way they have restored what I call the "fabric" of a Christian…. At the same time the revival of Bible reading and the study of the early Church Fathers as well as ecumenical contacts have worked in the same sense, which is to make us consider the Church less as


"the Establishment" than as a community of believers and thus to reintroduce anthropology into ecclesiology. This meant the reintroduction of pneumatology, for it is the Spirit who makes Christ dwell within men, prompts consciences and suggests initiatives.\footnote{Ibid., 440.}

Congar is describing the kinds of activities that display ways that lay people connected the "conscience," or the call to personal responsibility for the Gospel, with activity in the Church. One of the most noticeable of these activities was "ecumenical contacts." These contacts also presupposed an anthropology not defined by ecclesial membership but by the human relationship with God.

The characterization of other Christians as heretics or schismatics that obtained before Vatican II disguised, and perhaps at times, ignored, what Congar took to be an appropriate theological anthropology. The polemic between Protestants and Catholics that impeded Congar's anthropologically based pneumatology is also a legacy of Trent. This tendency of the Catholic Church to define itself in opposition to Protestantism was displayed in Congar's anecdote above; it was one of the emphases that both Congar and Pope John wanted to reform.

To make the transition from Congar's pneumatology to the final section of this chapter where we shall turn to Pope John's understanding of the Holy Spirit, we shall construct a working definition of pneumatology that is taken from Congar's work. It comes directly from Congar but is friendly to Pope John's understanding of the Holy Spirit as well. As we indicated in our introduction, we shall have to tease out Pope John's pneumatology because he did not speak or write in systematic categories at the Council. We shall use Congar's systematic categories to identify Pope John's pneumatology.
E. Congar's Pneumatology

For Congar, the Holy Spirit is the foundation of the relationship between God and the human creature and among all persons; as such, the Holy Spirit is "the principle of communion."

This communion has two aspects. The first is the inward movement of the those beings who are created as *imago Dei* to be in personal union with God. The second is the communion with the whole human community who are also created in God's image. Human nature is fulfilled in the Holy Spirit because in the Spirit persons are able to be agents of communion. People are not unified by doctrine, liturgy or the reparation from sin but by the return to God in communion.

Doctrine, liturgy and forgiveness of sins are sacraments of a deeper reality and that is the deification of the human person by God's on-going presence. The Holy Spirit animates and enables the human activities, both personal and corporate, whereby human persons exercise the free response to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. On the personal level, the Holy Spirit is God's on-going presence that enables Christian discipleship. On the corporate level, the Holy Spirit animates the whole life of the Church in all its forms of worship, teaching, and service.

We suggest the following working definition of the dominant pneumatology of Vatican II: *The on-going presence of God in the human person, in the world and in history that is manifest in the reality of human freedom that is exercised from two directions: the personal and the communitarian.* The criterion that signals God's presence as Holy Spirit is freedom. We see this freedom from the two different directions. God's presence as Holy Spirit is experienced and exercised on the personal level in the freedom exercised through the conscience and through participation in discipleship in areas where one is responsible and competent. This is what Congar means when he says "for it is the Spirit who makes Christ dwell within men, prompts
consciences and suggests initiatives." From the corporate or community direction, freedom is experienced and exercised in three ways. First by the change or the rejection of previous forms or expressions. Second, by renewal where a previous form or expression is given a new life and re-vitalized expressions. And thirdly in the creation of new forms or expressions. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit enables human freedom with regard to the relationship with God that constitutes human beings as persons; this relationship plays out as human persons respond to the Gospel of Jesus Christ both individually and in their participation in the life of the Church. Both expressions of freedom flow from the Gospel and are enlivened by the Holy Spirit. This understanding of the Holy Spirit is rooted in the biblical tradition and in the theological anthropologies that pay closest attention to the Catholic principle of sacramentality.

For Congar, the Holy Spirit is God's on-going presence that enables human communion with God and with the whole human community. For Congar, communitarian activity, which is a constitutively human activity, is found in the person's inner life with God that enables both the recognition of Jesus Christ as God incarnate and all service of the Gospel that Jesus proclaimed. That Gospel is served most fundamentally through the communion of all human beings. The Holy Spirit is the principle of that communion. To describe this communion, Congar includes theological anthropology, Christology and ecclesiology (as implied in discipleship) in this description:

Subtlety is one of the properties of the spirit (of the Spirit). Therefore, one and the same, he can fill the universe and be in the interior of each person while at the same time respecting each person and his or her originality…. We speak, then, as we can, of the liberty of the Spirit. But unless we consider him as a perfect "Vicar of Christ," a perfect functionary of Christ, we cannot attribute to Him freedom in the work to be realized. The Holy Spirit cannot
be separated from Christ, for it is the Holy Spirit who gives reality to the events which characterize Christ's work.\textsuperscript{75}

Congar maintains the three-way relationship among theological anthropology, Christology and ecclesiology in order to construct his understanding of the Holy Spirit. He identified that same three-way relationship, or matrix in Paul's pneumatology, in patristic pneumatology and in Aquinas as well. He found the functional beginnings of a similar pneumatology in the lay initiatives after the Council. As we shall see, in great part because of Congar's influence, Vatican II does craft its own pneumatology with these three parts.

In general terms the most important characteristic of Vatican II's dominant understanding of the Holy Spirit is freedom. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit enables human freedom with regard to the relationship with God that constitutes human beings as persons. Our working definition incorporates the central features of Congar's pneumatology. We shall apply it to the Council as an event and thus follow the trajectory of its development at the Council. This trajectory begins with its incipient stage that is found in Pope John's functional understanding of the Holy Spirit and moves through the events at the Council to a fully formed understanding of the Holy Spirit that is in place by the end of the first session. In the next section we turn to describe the incipient stage of the Council's pneumatology. The theology that we have described in this section helped to develop Pope John's more functional pneumatology into the pneumatology that we have summarized in our working definition above.

The section that we are leaving was an application of the first transition in the history of the Church's self-understanding to the second such transition. In the process of making this application we demonstrated that Christian anthropology, pneumatology, and Christology are

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., 444-45.
bound together upon the axis of the Church. Each interpenetrates the other when they attend to
the principle of sacramentality. The Church is the axis upon which they turn or, stated another
way, the center of the matrix among them. Hence, each one can disclose and illuminate the
understanding of the Church around which it circles. At Vatican II, the notion of the Holy Spirit
is most disclosive of its adjacent theology of the Church because of the pneumatological
emphasis from Yves Congar, Pope John and eventually from the majority of the Council
members. Pope John provides the starting point; the rest develops from there. Just as
pneumatology was the "critical conceptual tool" for Paul's transition time, so it was at Vatican II.

We turn now to our consideration of Pope John's understanding of the Holy Spirit. We
shall apply our three expressions of the freedom and creativity that the Spirit animates to Pope
John's actions, speeches, texts and other addresses. All three are particular instantiations of the
theological anthropology anchored in an expansive understanding of human freedom that Congar
described but that had been diminished in the preconciliar ecclesiology.

F. Pope John XXIII's Pneumatology: Preliminaries

Before we begin to identify Pope John’s pneumatology, we must build upon Rahner’s
schematic one more time; in this way, we continue our application of the theology of one to the
other. The two caesurae to which Rahner refers belong in a category of their own with regard to
the convergence of theological anthropology, ecclesiology and pneumatology. The same
theological matrix obtains in Pope John's thought as in Paul's and Congar's. Theological
anthropology, the Christology that flows from the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and the understanding
of the Holy Spirit are bound on the axis of the Church. This convergence is not as explicit for
Pope John because he was not a speculative theologian like Paul and Congar. We shall tease out
his pneumatology in three steps. First, we must expand upon Rahner’s schematic to demonstrate the parallel between Pope John’s period of transition and Paul’s. Second, we shall describe Pope John’s ecclesial context. This context will assist us when we demonstrate that his notion of human freedom is the foundation for the incipient pneumatology of the Council. Pope John ushered in a reform like Paul’s. We explored Paul’s adjustment of his understanding of God's relationship to the human community in light of the experience of Jesus’ Gospel. We saw that Paul was willing to leave behind some of the features of his previous understanding of that relationship. Pope John was also willing to abrogate what appeared at the time to many to be essential features of the Catholic Church. We must also explore, in a summary fashion, the Catholic Church that Pope John was leaving behind as he moved into a new era at Vatican II. The way that Pope John saw God as present in and to the Church discloses how he saw God’s relationship with human persons. The heart of that relationship is his freedom-centered theological anthropology. As with Paul and Congar, his understanding of the Holy Spirit builds upon his understanding of the human person.

Pope John was a pastor above all else. Because of this, his pneumatology will be less readily identifiable than Paul’s or Congar's. In addition, no systematic description of the human person under-lays Pope John's understanding of the Holy Spirit as there is in Congar. And while Paul is surely not a systematic theologian in the modern sense, his letters contain critical reflections about the relationship between the human person and God. Pope John’s theology is functional; his theological anthropology and his pneumatology must be seen through his ecclesiology. Indeed, it is nearly impossible to identify his notion of the human person except through his understanding of the Church. Effects disclose causes. Pope John’s notion of the human person is embedded in how he expected the Church to deal with real human persons and
human situations. In these effects we find the same expansive notion of human freedom presupposed by Paul and affirmed by Congar. We shall read the effects that Pope John intends the Church to have with regard to human persons and trace them back to the notion of human freedom that they presuppose. From this we shall be able to identify what we shall call the incipient pneumatology of the Council. Pope John understood human persons in terms of the biblical concept of *imago Dei* as did Paul and Congar. His understanding of God's on-going presence to those persons created in God's image flows from this notion of the human person's constitutive dignity and value.

We characterize his notion of the Holy Spirit as "incipient" because it was only through the Council as an event that the pope's initial insights were developed into the pneumatology that came to dominate the Council. With the assistance of the Council members and other theologians along with Congar, the notion of the Holy Spirit developed beyond Pope John's initial genius. The pope's ideas went through a process of maturation at the Council. It is important to identify how this happened because of the particular use we wish to put this pneumatology. Recall Pottmeyer's judgment that, in order to move on to the "third phase of reception" of the Council texts, a hermeneutic must be crafted that "reflects fidelity to the Council, its intentions, its procedures, and its transitional character."  

The pneumatology that we shall identify as the dominant one at the Council reflected the reality of the Council itself. This pneumatology developed at the Council; it is a child of the Council. So the "critical
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conceptual tool" that we shall use to identify the pre-eminent ecclesiology of the Council does indeed "reflect' the character of the Council itself.

The Council was Pope John’s idea; it became the culmination of his whole life’s work. It should not be surprising that his theology comes to us through his understanding of the Church. By exploring the ways that he expected the Church to function in relation to all people, its own members as well as wider society, we find his basic understanding of humanity. When combined with his understanding of the Gospel and its relationship to the institutional Church, this theological anthropology discloses the distinctive notion of God's on-going presence that emerged at the Council.

1. Pope John's Council as the Second Caesura in the History of the Church

While Pope John, of course, did not use Rahner’s language that characterizes Catholicism as a "Western export," he did consistently use words that indicated his intention to return to a more universal Church, what Rahner called a "world-Church." His outlook was global. In his announcement of the Council, Pope John began the process whereby Catholicism could function as a world-Church. This announcement began the process that Rahner called a "qualitative leap." The majority of the Council members responded positively to this invitation by the Pope. Rahner characterizes their response this way:

These bishops did not come as individual, simple visitors, ad limina to give an account of their dioceses and to take home missionary alms; Vatican II was really a first assembly of the world-episcopate, not acting as an advisory body to the Pope, but with him and under him as itself the supreme teaching and decision making authority in the Church. There really was a world-council with a world-
episcopate such as had not hitherto existed and with its own autonomous function….\textsuperscript{77}

With the pastoral instincts and intentions of Pope John and the help of theologians and observers, some of whom had had been experiencing the tension and some of whom were active in building the tension required for this "leap," the bishops did indeed act like a "world-Church" at Vatican II. When it comes to the life of the Church, Rahner is not unwarranted in placing these two pastors in a single class. One of the ways that Pope John ushered in this new world-church was by the use of what Italians call the \textit{bella figura}. These are gestures or symbolic actions that convey some important content; in the case of Pope John, the content was theological.

Pope John’s pontificate, indeed his whole ministry, is marked with signs that indicate how well he understood these symbolic actions. Pope John announced his intention to call the Council on the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul the Apostle.\textsuperscript{78} He used symbolic action to draw the first parallel between his Council and Paul’s churches. He made the comparison as much through his actions when he announced his intention to call a council, as he did in the words of the announcement itself. This action is also significant because of where he chose to make the announcement; he did not make it from St. Peter's basilica. He traveled to one of Rome’s other basilicas, St. Paul-Outside-the-Walls. This was significant for several reasons. The first is that St. Paul-Outside-the-Walls is one of the major basilicas of Rome which makes it

\textsuperscript{77}Rahner, "Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council," 80. See note 1.

one of the principal papal churches in the city. Papal basilicas are required to pay more attention to feast days that are related to the Petrine ministry. In addition, these basilicas have historical importance; Pope John signaled that his announcement was historically important by choosing that place.\(^7^9\) So, making the announcement on a Pauline feast day in a setting that has a special connection to the Petrine ministry makes a strong symbolic statement about how Pope John sees his own pontificate. He wanted to emphasize both aspects of the papal ministry; the Petrine which calls attention to the unity among the world's Catholics, and the Pauline, whereby the papacy is responsible for proclaiming the Gospel to the entire human community. Secondly, Pope John recognized the need for conversion in the life of the Church and he looked to Paul as a model of the kind of conversion he intended to incite. Third, St. Paul-Outside-the-Walls is not in the heart of Rome but on the "Ostian way." It is a part of Rome but it also faces out, to the rest of the world. This signals that, while he is speaking as the earthly head of the Catholic Church, his starting point is where the world and the Church come together. Pope John was exercising the Petrine ministry in calling the Council; he wanted to emphasize the Pauline influence upon that papal ministry as well. He actually links them in his announcement. After framing his announcement with Paul's conversion and thus with his ministry, he referred to himself as "a successor of St. Peter" and follows from there to describe the "double responsibility as Bishop of Rome and Shepherd of the Universal Church."\(^8^0\) By linking his announcement of the Council with Paul’s ministry, he signaled that like Paul, he was interested in the Church’s relationship with wider society. By calling attention to Peter's ministry, he indicated that his actions as


Bishop of Rome would involve an extension of "his watchful care to the whole world, to whose spiritual government he is made responsible through the divine mission entrusted to him in the succession of the supreme apostolate!" Thus, before he even begins his announcement, he has indicated a connection between his own ministry and Paul's. In addition, he made the connection explicit in the text, thus cementing the parallel.

If Paul was the missionary-pastor to the Gentiles, Pope John was the missionary-pastor to the modern world. In both cases, their theology emerges from their pastoral insights. As pastors, both had revolutionary impacts upon the Church’s self-understanding. Pope John’s personal warmth and holiness could draw attention away from the shrewdness with which he navigated his pontificate; his announcement of the Council displayed this shrewdness. We move from this specific instance of his understanding of his role in the Church to a broader vantage point. We shall now explore how Pope John's understanding of his ministry in the Church was formed. Since his pneumatology is functional this background discussion is important.

2. Pope John's Ecclesial Context: His Ecclesial Hero

Some of the most important things that disclose Pope John’s theology are personal. Pope John’s life-long role model as a bishop was Bishop Charles Borromeo, who emphasized the pastoral dimension of the Church. When he was 24 years old, Pope John (then Angelo

81 Ibid.

82 He did write some texts of critical importance, for example, his encyclicals *Pacem in Terris* and *Mater et Magistra*. Acknowledging this, the fact remains that he was trained as an historian, not as a systematician.

Roncalli) discovered the 39 volumes of Borromeo’s archives. He would work on editing them for the rest of his life. Pope John’s devotion to Borromeo influenced his whole understanding of the Church. Borromeo was a reformer. He was bishop of Milan and worked on the reform of that diocese after the Council of Trent. Borromeo’s archives described the way he thought that any bishop could reform his diocese. He chose a "constitutional" method. His method involved episcopal visitation of all the parishes and religious houses in the diocese. After the visitations, a diocesan Synod was held. Borromeo thought that the best person to lead a reform was the local bishop in consultation with the pastors and people of the diocese. This understanding of the role of bishop as pastor that he learned early in his own priestly ministry was further developed in Pope John’s own ministry as bishop of Rome. We see it from the very beginning of his pontificate. It was no accident that Pope John chose to hold his coronation as Pope on the feast of St. Charles Borromeo, which was a Wednesday rather than the traditional (and logistically simpler) Sunday for papal coronations. Pope John summarized his appreciation for St. Charles Borromeo thus:

The Lord’s Church has had its moments of stagnation and revival (stasi e ripresi). In one such period of revival Providence reserved for St. Charles Borromeo the lofty task of restoring ecclesiastical order (ricostituzione dell’ordine ecclesiastico). The part that he played in implementing the reforms of the Council of Trent, and the example he gave in Milan and other dioceses of Italy, earned him the glorious title of teacher of Bishops, and as such he was adviser to popes and a wonderful model of episcopal holiness.85
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Here Pope John describes Borromeo's reform as a period of "revival." This citation also indicates the new pope's view of effective bishops. They advise the pope and they are models of "holiness." Pope John will go on to treat bishops as such at the Council so great was the respect he had for the episcopal ministry.

In fact, Pope John thought of himself first as a bishop. Pope John closed one of the bulls regarding the Council in this way: "Given at Rome at St. Peter's, December 25, feast of the birth of Our Lord Jesus Christ, 1961, fourth year of our pontificate. I, John, Bishop of the Catholic Church." His pontificate was subordinated to his episcopacy; he sees himself as a "Bishop of the Catholic Church" even in such an historic papal text as this one where he convoked his council.

Pope John’s determined choice of Borromeo’s feast day for his coronation indicates what he intended for his own ministry as pope. Pope John signaled two attitudes in his coronation homily, (which, contrary to tradition, he delivered himself), attitudes that would be echoed in other similar actions taken early on in his pontificate. The first was his attitude toward the situation of the Catholic Church at that time. He saw it as Borromeo saw his own time: as a time of revival, a time for hopefulness and renewal. He characterized each of these times as times of important concerns, but he did not characterize them as causes for despair. Second, he signaled that he saw himself as a pastor, a shepherd, and not as a monarch or ruler. He intended to follow the pattern of Borromeo. He learned from Borromeo the adage for which he himself became

---
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known, "History is the teacher of life." Pope John had been studying this reformer his whole adult life, and it makes sense that he would look to Borromeo’s history as he shaped his own ministry.

3. The Announcement of the Council: The Transition Begins

In his study of the Council, Giuseppe Alberigo claims that Pope John "placed the decision for a Council in an epochal context, assessed on the basis at once of historical judgments and of intuitions of faith, the conclusions of which significantly coincided." Here Alberigo affirms our observation that both Pope John’s training in history and his own personal understanding of his ministry were involved in his decision to call the Council. They both shaped his intentions for it.

We turn now to consider this first speech about the Council in greater detail. This speech further supports Rahner’s framework of the two caesurae or transitional moments in the history of the Church's self-understanding. Pope John opens his announcement with a reflection upon Paul’s conversion and then moves quickly to identify his "new pontificate" in terms of its "apostolic activity." He describes the "two-fold duty entrusted to the successor of St. Peter" as responsibility to be "Bishop of Rome and Shepherd of the Universal Church." In so doing, he aligns himself with the "Princes of the Apostles" (as he calls Peter and Paul in closing his announcement). He ends where he began, reminding the gathered cardinals of Paul’s conversion on the road to Damascus.

---

Pope John uses these actions and his words to send a message about the Council. By framing his announcement with Paul’s conversion, he indicates that his emphases would be similar to Paul’s. Like Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, Pope John laid the foundation for the transformation of the Church in this first speech about the Council and in the other speeches that follow it. Through them, we can see that Pope John intended to use his pontificate to effect a major change in the Catholic Church. Garry Wills describes how Lincoln began a similar transformation in his speech at Gettysburg:

Lincoln is here not only to sweeten the air of Gettysburg, but to clear the infected atmosphere of American history itself, tainted with official sins and inherited guilt. He would cleanse the Constitution -- not, as William Lloyd Garrison had, by burning an instrument that countenanced slavery. He altered the document from within, by appeal from its letter to the spirit, subtly changing the recalcitrant stuff of that legal compromise, bringing it to its own indictment. By implicitly doing this, he performed one of the most daring acts of open-air sleight-of-hand ever witnessed by the unsuspecting. Everyone in that vast throng of thousands was having his or her intellectual pocket picked.89

Tucked in between the formal lines of his announcement of the Council, if we look closely, we see Pope John perform another "sleight-of-hand." In a similar move from "letter" to "spirit"

Pope John reveals a parallel vision for his pontificate:

We have before us the sole prospect of the good of souls and of the very clear and definite correspondence of the new pontificate to the spiritual needs of the present hour. We know that the new Pope is watched by many fervent and friendly elements, as well as by those which are unfriendly or uncertain, seeking to discover from what is most characteristic what one may have the right to expect
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from him…. Well, venerable brothers and our beloved sons, thinking again of the twofold duty entrusted to a successor of St. Peter, there immediately becomes evident his double responsibility as Bishop of Rome and Shepherd of the Universal Church. These are two expressions of the one single suprahuman investiture: two attributions which cannot be separated, which must be mutually inclusive, for the encouragement and edification of the clergy and the entire Christian people.90

Pope John was not transforming a document as Lincoln clearly was transforming the U.S. Constitution. He was instead transforming the purpose of the papacy into the "encouragement and edification of the clergy and the entire Christian people." Anyone present who defined the papacy in primarily juridical, bureaucratic or authoritarian terms did indeed have his "pocket picked." Alberigo makes this observation about the Pope's use of Peter and Paul: "The pope saw catholicity ensured by the union of the Petrine and Pauline heritages; both points of view had to be brought out at the Council. John XXIII also made it clear where the Roman Church had to catch up when he dealt only briefly with the internal manifestations of the Church’s life and more extensively with its external manifestations."91 In his address one month before the Council, he again made this connection between Peter and Paul. Using a hymn from the 5th century he says: "…at Rome the two princes of the apostolate, Peter and Paul, are always in attendance…. [T]he humble successor of Peter and Paul in the government and the apostolate of the Catholic Church, on this vigil of the council, loves to address all his children throughout the

---


world, from the East and the West, of every rite, of every language.... Pope John makes it plain that he shall be doing far more than adjusting or tinkering with institutional forms.

He acknowledges that he is being "watched," that his measure is being taken both in Rome and around the world. He directly addresses the situation and describes how he himself sees his role. He "measures" himself against Peter. By using his understanding of Peter, like Lincoln, he subordinates other notions of the papacy to those of "bishop" and "shepherd." In this speech he nods to the more institutional, bureaucratic definition for the papacy; he nods, but then rejects it for himself.

The Cardinal Vicar has with great care acquainted us with the spiritual position of Rome from the viewpoint of religious practice, of the arrangement of the various institutions of parochial character, of worship, of assistance and of Christian instruction, and we are pleased to take this opportunity of paying homage to the reality of a commendable effort on the part of the Cardinal and his collaborators who have been zealous and tireless in vigilance and in the apostolate, exercised from the center to the outskirts of the city by both secular and religious clergy as well as by their collaborators in Catholic associations. All have been motivated by right and clear intentions with a constant and sincere diligence. On the other hand one must note that there is repeated that episode in the Gospels when the crowds called upon to follow the Lord and gather around Him were helpless and unable to find the nourishing food of grace. This episode is repeated and it touches the troubled heart of the Shepherd. A few loaves: a few fishes: "What are these among so many?"

In this section, Pope John aligns his mission with that of Jesus’ own; his mission is to help the crowds to "find the nourishing food of grace." He subordinates "religious practice," "various
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institutions of parochial character," and "Christian instruction" to "grace." He carefully describes the "various institutions" and commends the Curia's vigilant work. He then describes two concerns to which he will attend. He separates the two with "on the other hand," thus indicating which is more important. It is where the 'crowd' is hungry for the nourishing food of "grace."

He characterizes the scene of the modern world with a central scene in the Gospel. Like Lincoln, he appeals to the primary source. In Pope John’s case, the primary source is the Gospel of Jesus Christ itself. He placed himself in a similar pastoral situation to Jesus. His "heart is troubled" by a scene similar to one Jesus saw. He does not discount the work of diocesan administration but it will not be the work that defines his papacy. In this way he "cleanses" the papacy. Its definition is no longer primarily juridical or bureaucratic.

After noting that the "new Pope is watched by many fervent and friendly elements, as well as by those which are unfriendly or uncertain, seeking to discover from what is most characteristic what one may have the right to expect from him," he describes the way he would like to be seen. He describes a papacy that is a pastoral apostolate like Peter’s:

Oh what a wonderful spectacle if the Bishop of Rome extends his watchful care to the whole world, to whose spiritual government he is made responsible through the divine mission entrusted to him in the succession of the supreme apostolate! It is a happy spectacle…where the grace of Christ continues to multiply the fruits and portents of spiritual elevation, of health and sanctity in the whole world…. This observation arouses in the heart of the humble priest whom the manifest indication of Divine Providence led, though unworthily, to this height of the Supreme Pontificate -- arouses, we say, a decided resolution to recall certain ancient forms of doctrinal affirmation and of wise provision of ecclesiastical discipline, which in the history of the Church in an epoch of renewal yielded fruits of extraordinary efficaciousness, through clarity of thought, through solidarity of religious unity, through the living flame of Christian fervor in which we continue to see, even in regard to the well-being of life
Like Lincoln, Pope John went back to Christianity’s roots, reapplied them to a new and unenvisioned context and thus redefined them. He defined those roots, "ancient forms of doctrinal affirmation and wise ecclesiastical discipline," for his own time. As in the case of the carnage at Gettysburg, the whole world was still bruised by the violence of the first half of the 20th century and lived under the shadow of the possibility of even more violence. Like a low-grade fever, the memory of the world wars and of Hiroshima and Nagasaki lingered just below the surface of the global, political culture. Pope John did what Lincoln had done a century before: he interpreted a new moment in the life of his particular institution, the Church. Using his authority as pope, he re-defined the relationship between that institutional Church and the world. He turned to the normative Gospel the way Lincoln turned to "The Declaration of Independence."

In both cases, we have a return to essential principles in order to deal with an utterly new situation. For Lincoln, the principle of equality becomes the center; for Pope John, the Church is now a servant, no longer a ruler or judge. The Church is re-defined with service as the starting point. Its relationship to the truth is not that of ownership. Instead the Church exists to serve the communication of "doctrinal affirmation." Truth is not achieved through negatives; it is found where Jesus located it: in mercy and fundamentally in loving care for the world. Pope John's emphases as pontiff were not discipline and rule-making but "encouragement and edification."

To use Pope John’s own words, the Church should be primarily pastoral in character.  

94 Ibid., 2.

95 Ibid., 27.
As we shall see, during the Council, these themes were picked up and they helped to transform conciliar activity and teaching. The Council was much more than a juridical exercise. The Council made this shift by linking conciliar teaching with its initial purpose: effective teaching for the sake of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Francis X. Murphy tells us that when he heard Pope John's "Opening Speech to the Second Vatican Council," wherein Pope John makes good on the intention he described in the Announcement of the Council, to return to the Gospel, the hairs on the back of his neck stood up.\(^6\) Murphy’s reaction indicates that Pope John was performing a "sleight-of-hand" similar to the one that Lincoln performed.

Another aspect of this announcement that requires further explanation is the reference that Pope John makes when he says early in the speech that "the new Pope is watched by many fervent and friendly elements, as well as by those which are unfriendly or uncertain, seeking to discover from what is most characteristic…" There are important issues with regard to the papacy just under the surface of this comment. A brief consideration of the "characteristics" of the popes just prior to John XXIII will further illuminate Pope John's intentions. He makes plain in this speech that he is aware that some members of the Roman Curia will not be pleased by his understanding of the papacy, nor with the kind of council he was announcing.

4. The Papacy before John XXIII's Pontificate

A description of the kind of pontificates that preceded Pope John's illustrates the kind of "qualitative leap" Pope John was making with regard to the exercise of the papacy. In Lives of

the Popes, Richard P. McBrien claims that the "modern" papacy began as a result of the loss of the Papal States.⁹⁷

The transition to a modern papacy in the mid-nineteenth century occurred primarily through the loss of the Papal States, an event that Pius IX (1846-78) interpreted at the time as gravely inimical to the Church, but that, in fact, allowed the Church, for the first time in centuries, to redirect its full energies to its spiritual mission and thereby to elevate the papacy’s moral authority to levels theretofore rarely attained. Ironically, the first of the modern popes was the least modern of them all.⁹⁸

McBrien’s last point is of particular interest for our purposes. While these popes mark the Church's entrance into the modern world and society, they each brought with them vestiges of a pre-modern understanding of the Church, the world and human persons. Several members of the Roman Curia to whom Pope John announced his intention to call a council saw the papacy in much the same way that Pius IX, the "least modern of them all," had exercised it. Papal primacy and papal infallibility are emblematic of Pius IX’s pontificate; many of the cardinals in the Roman Curia defined the papacy in authoritarian, juridical terms. In fact, many people still associate the papacy with the definition of doctrine more than any other function that the office might have. This relationship between the pope and the exercise of authority, especially with regard to doctrine, has a curious history.

McBrien notes that papal primacy and papal infallibility as defined at Vatican I (under Pius IX) "could not have been further removed from the teaching of the Council of Constance (1414-18), from the theology and practice of the Eastern Churches, and from the practice of the

---


⁹⁸ Ibid.
universal Church, West and East alike, of the first Christian millennium.99 For each of these the emphasis was on the unifying ministry of the papacy. In the Christian East, the pope is regarded as one of several patriarchs. For the Eastern Church, the pope is not juridically superior to any other patriarch. They recognize that the pope holds a place of preeminence by reason of the fact that his patriarchal see was sanctified by the blood of Peter and Paul. During the first Christian millennium, the pope was seen as a "brother bishop" and member of the college of bishops. At the Council of Constance, the Church was trying to deal with the fall-out from the crisis about papal authority as a result of the Great Schism (1378-1417) during part of which there were as many as three claimants to the papacy.100 The document *Haec Sancta* from the Council of Constance is considered the classic formulation of "conciliarism." This formulation states that an ecumenical council is the most authoritative "teacher" in the Catholic Church. Accordingly, the pope does not exercise superiority over a council but teaches in communion with it.

Congar, a careful student of the papacy, described the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073-85) as the "great turning point" in the exercise of papal authority.101 Gregory gave the papacy its monarchical character by emphasizing the juridical exercise of power. He triggered the trajectory that found its apex in Boniface VIII, who claimed authority over both the spiritual and temporal worlds. Boniface appealed to the "two swords" theory of ecclesiastical and temporal power in his papal bull issued in 1302, *Unam sanctam*. This more juridical understanding of the papacy (re-affirmed at Vatican I) was the operative understanding of the papal office when Pope


John’s pontificate began, even though the "modern" popes had made progressive movements in several areas.\textsuperscript{102} Certainly the papacy had, since the time of Gregory VII, tended toward the centralization of authority in Rome. Alberigo marks the 16\textsuperscript{th} century as a high point in the Catholic Church’s view that it was "under siege" and therefore must protect its authoritarian structures, especially the papacy.\textsuperscript{103} This defensive mentality contributed to the preservation of the more centralized, juridical model of the papacy. Alberigo summarizes it in this way: "On the whole, despite changes aimed at improving its efficiency, changes it would be idle to deny, Roman Catholicism under Pius XII [Pope John’s predecessor] resembled what it had been under Pius IX more than it would be under Paul VI."\textsuperscript{104} All three, McBrien, Congar and Alberigo notice that in the long history of the Church, the papacy was understood differently than it was understood by most of the members of the Roman Curia to whom Pope John made his announcement at St. Paul Outside-the-Walls. Pope John the historian knew these other views of the papacy and they were in the background of this important speech.

Certainly for many Catholics of the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries doctrine was determined by those in authority.\textsuperscript{105} Truth was often viewed as a static reality graspable primarily by those who

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid., 341-343.


\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., 81.

\textsuperscript{105} The popes of this era were not equally authoritarian. Leo XIII was very progressive for his time with regard to biblical research and social ethics in particular. See McBrien, Lives of the Popes, 341 and 347-351. See note 97.
held the proper office. In this view, the major purpose of the papacy was the definition of doctrine. By way of contrast, councils and their teachings had initially emerged as occasions for the Church to clarify and enrich its understanding of its teaching apostolate and its articulation of the Gospel. Doctrine was first taught through councils; it was not defined by the pope. As the Catholic Church became more centralized in the papal office, its teachings became further removed from their transparent connection to this initial conciliar tradition.

Imagine how the section of Pope John’s "Opening Speech at the Second Vatican Council" below might have been heard in that earlier context described above. In this speech the pope lays out his vision for the Council. In it we find that Pope John had a different notion of doctrine and of the teaching Church’s relationship to it.

[I]t becomes clear how much is expected from the council in regard to doctrine. That is, the 21st ecumenical council, which will draw upon the effective and important wealth of juridical, liturgical, apostolic and administrative experiences, wishes to transmit the doctrine, pure and integral, without any attenuation or distortion, which throughout 20 centuries, notwithstanding difficulties and contrasts, has become the common patrimony of men. It is a patrimony not well received by all, but always a rich treasure available to men of good will. Our duty is not only to guard this precious treasure, as if we were concerned only with antiquity, but to dedicate ourselves with an earnest will and without fear to that work which our era demands of us, pursuing thus the path which the Church has followed for 20 centuries. The salient point of this council is not, therefore, a discussion of one article or another of the fundamental doctrine of the Church which has repeatedly been taught by the Fathers and by ancient and modern theologians, and which is presumed to be well known and familiar to all [emphasis added]. For this a council was not necessary. But from the renewed, serene

---

106 Pius XII asked Cardinal Ottaviani to begin work on texts for an ecumenical council. His intention seems to have been to essentially write the texts that would become the documents of the "council" after only minor contributions by the bishops.
and tranquil adherence to all the teaching of the Church in its entirety and preciseness, as it still shines forth in the acts of the Council of Trent and the First Vatican Council, the Christian, Catholic and apostolic spirit of the whole world expects a step forward toward a doctrinal penetration and a formation of the consciences in faithful and perfect conformity to the authentic doctrine which, however, should be studied and expounded through the methods of research and through the literary forms of modern thought. *The substance of the ancient doctrine of the Deposit of the Faith is one thing, and the way it is presented is another* [emphasis added]. And it is the latter that must be taken into great consideration with patience if necessary, everything being measured in the forms and proportions of a magisterium which is predominantly pastoral in character.  

Pope John did what Lincoln did: he interpreted a new moment in the life of the Church, using his authority, to re-define the relationship between the institutional Church and the world. He turned to the normative Gospel the way Lincoln turned to "The Declaration of Independence." In both cases, there was a return to essential principles to address an utterly new situation. Pope John re-defined the meaning of a council by saying that a council is not "necessary" to discuss "one article or another of fundamental doctrine." In this he parts company with Vatican I. At Pope John’s council, study, methods of research, and modern thought will be used. The Church's service to the truth is its "patrimony." All of these processes are approached pastorally, not in an authoritarian fashion. And the truth is not found through negatives; it is found where Jesus located it: in mercy and loving care for the world.

In summary, these speeches and an exploration of the context in which they were given support Rahner’s framework once again. Pope John rejected one understanding of a council and chose another that was the functional equivalent of the Council of Jerusalem. The task at hand

---

was like Paul’s: "a step forward toward a doctrinal penetration and a formation of the consciences in faithful and perfect conformity to the authentic doctrine." Paul had to make a similar "penetration" into what is central to Christianity. Pope John said that his council would "draw upon the effective and important wealth of juridical, liturgical, apostolic and administrative experiences." It would do this in order to illuminate a "patrimony," that is, an inheritance, a legacy that belongs to all humankind, not just to the Catholic Church. The Pope describes the Gospel as "a rich treasure" that is "available to men of good will." The Council then, would be responsible to the whole world, to all of humankind. Paul had a similar understanding of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it saturates his letters.

After this speech was given, Pope John’s voice became closer to Paul’s than it was to any prior pope’s. This is but one indication of how he transformed the papacy. As McBrien argues, all popes must be "measured against the standard" set by Pope John. Pope John's re-definition of the papacy also reflects his understanding of the human person. If the pope, and by inference the institutional Church, saw authority in this way, a new stance was required towards the other members of the Church as well. By transforming the intersection between the Gospel and the world, the pope allowed for a whole new configuration of relationships among the members of

---

108 There is yet another parallel with Paul. John XXIII and Paul had similar notions of their "apostolic" responsibilities. We know that Paul repeatedly appealed to his position as "apostle" to secure his authoritative standing. For Pope John "apostolic" was not a juridical and authoritarian category but a ministerial and authoritative one. By the time of the Council the word "apostolic" had become overburdened with legal and juridical emphasis that diminished its central idea: authority to proclaim the gospel.


the Church. This new configuration was built upon Pope John's expansive notion of human freedom, to the consideration of which we now turn.

5. Pope John’s Expansive Understanding of Human Freedom

In this section we shall cull the texts that Pope John wrote about the Council to find his more expansive notion of human freedom. In so doing, we continue to be guided by the framework of the Council as an event. Even though the total number of words is miniscule compared to the work of the whole Council, we shall see that there is a trajectory in these texts as well. His understanding of freedom is similar to Paul’s and Congar's. Pope John's expansive understanding of human freedom is based upon two fundamental principles: God’s promised care and emphasis upon the human person’s free constitutive relationship with God. Our purpose here is to explore the official, public words of the pope about the Council. These words began to have an impact as soon as the participants at the Council became aware of them. We cannot explore how this was the case for every participant nor is that necessary for our project. We are in search of the threads of Pope John’s liberating ideas so that we may identify them in the Council as an event in the two chapters that follow. Pope John's understanding of God's ongoing presence flows from his more expansive notion of human freedom. This freedom can be seen in the activities that the pope expects from the cardinals, the whole church and from he, himself, as he functions as pope. In particular freedom is inferred by the pope's repeated requests for collaboration and active participation.

111 This exercise is not comprehensive. For a more comprehensive description of other references and conversations that about the possibility of a council see Alberigo and Komonchak, Vol. 1, Chapter 1 "The Announcement of the Council: From the Security of the Fortress to the Lure of the Quest," in History of Vatican II, 1- 55. See note 55.
We must also say a word about the chronology of these speeches before we proceed. In our description of the Pope’s ecclesial context we gave great currency to *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*, or "The Opening Speech at the Second Vatican Council." That speech was critical for that section because it supports Rahner's argument that Vatican II and Paul's churches mark similar transitions in the history of the Church. It also contains Pope John’s expansive notion of human freedom. We shall not consider that speech here, however, because it belongs more properly in the next chapter. In that chapter we shall begin our description of the trajectory regarding the Holy Spirit; that speech is the starting point for that trajectory during the *event* of the Council. So even though that speech could be included in this section for material reasons, for methodological reasons we shall delay our further discussion of it until Chapter 3.

**6. Pope John's Announcement of the Council: Analysis**

We briefly cited this speech above because of what it reveals about the context of Pope John’s pontificate. Now we shall explore the speech for the ways in which Pope John expected the Church to deal with human persons, both members of the Church and in wider society. By looking at how he expected the Church to treat people, we shall infer Pope John’s view of the human person. As we noted, effects are disclosive. In this section we proceed in search of the notion of the human person that is disclosed by Pope John’s agenda for the Council. In this first text we find threads of the freedom of the human person this is anchored in a hopeful trust in God’s care and guidance in the face of the problems of the current situation. For Pope John, trust in God is the flip-side of the freedom. Human persons have freedom because of their relationship with God.

---

The first thread occurs early in this speech. He states that his "new pontificate" will attend to the "spiritual needs of the present hour." He intends a "very clear and definite correspondence" between the "good of souls" and his own ministry as pope. As we saw when we briefly described Pope John’s ecclesial context, most previous popes of the last century had a more defensive, "fortress" mentality toward the problems of modern society.\textsuperscript{113} For Pope John, the "good of souls" cannot be separated from the "needs of the present time." This connection between the constitutive gift of God’s presence to human persons and God’s presence in the situation of the whole world, is the source of human freedom. "The good of souls" acknowledges the human relationship with God. He does not disconnect that relationship from the "present hour." "Spiritual needs" are a part of the world, to be addresses in the "present hour." The characterization of needs as "spiritual" can become a code that locates such needs solely in the inner life. Pope John does not make such a characterization. These needs are found in concrete human situations, not just internally. Spiritual needs have expression in external realities as well. In this simple second paragraph of his announcement to the Roman Curia at St. Paul-Outside-the Walls, we have the first signal of Pope John’s revolutionary program for the Church: "We have before us the sole prospect of the good of souls and of the very clear and definite correspondence of the new pontificate to the spiritual needs of the present hour."\textsuperscript{114}

When Pope John describes the "single suprahuman investiture" of the pontificate, he sees two duties. His ministry is as "Bishop of Rome" and as "Shepherd of the Universal Church." Later on in the speech he also announces the synod for the diocese of Rome. He signals that he intends to be a pastor to the people of Rome. He will not completely delegate that ministry to

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., 1.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.
someone else. This emphasis echoes the thoughts he recorded when we was asked to become patriarch of Venice in 1952:

> It is interesting to note that Providence has brought me back to where I began to exercise my priestly vocation, that is to pastoral work…. To tell the truth, I have always believed that, for an ecclesiastic, diplomacy (so-called!) must be imbued with a pastoral spirit; otherwise it is of no use and makes a sacred mission look ridiculous. Now I am confronted with the Church’s real interests, relating to her final purpose, which is to save souls…. This is enough for me and I thank the Lord for it.\(^{115}\)

His characterization of how a "sacred" mission can come to look "ridiculous" is telling and informs our understanding of this speech at St. Paul-Outside-the-Walls. Even though he is exercising the power of the highest ecclesiastical office with this speech, he sees that office as a pastoral ministry. His emphasis is not on power but upon "a pastoral spirit."

In his announcement, Pope John continues with a description of the relationships among persons, the problems of the day and the Gospel. The situation is "happy" when the "grace of Christ" contributes to the "health and sanctity in the whole world." The situation is "sad" when "liberty" is compromised or abused. When this "liberty" is not illuminated by "the redeemer of the world and the founder of the Holy Church," confusion, deception and eventually "ruin" follow. For Pope John, the Gospel is necessary for both "truth" and human "welfare." He uses the city of Rome as the central example of the current human situation: "It is becoming a real human beehive from which emerges an uninterrupted buzz of confused voices in search of harmony, a hubbub in which they easily become mixed and lost. Thus there is rendered toilsome and slow the effort for the unification of spirits and constructive energies which tend to an order

corresponding to the requirements of the religious, civic and social life of the city.¹¹⁶ This description of Rome, and thus of urban life all over the world, is not an abstract description of an internal struggle; it is a picture of ordinary life in the city where Pope John is pastor. His language is concrete; he uses words such as buzz, beehive, and hubbub. This is a description of the world not a description of a perfect society or an supernatural realm. Like Lincoln transforming a battle field and newly consecrated graveyard into a "new birth," Pope John begins his description of the Church with real concerns in human society.

Pope John continues this emphasis upon the present situation's needs when he mentions his project for the Code of Canon Law. The process of revision will "lead happily to the desired and awaited bringing up-to-date of the Code of Canon Law" that will, along with the diocesan synod and the ecumenical council, involve "the practical application of the provisions of ecclesiastical discipline, as the Spirit of the Lord will suggest…along the way."¹¹⁷ Pope John intended to make sure that the purpose of the Gospel, which is human welfare, shaped "ecclesiastical" activities. This served his larger goal of attending to the concerns of his present situation. Members of the Church are first described as people in the world of specific problems. The Gospel must be applied to this situation from the beginning.

Another indication of his underlying notion of freedom in this announcement is in his treatment of and stance toward the Roman Curia. He asks for their "intimate" and "confident word" indicating their attitude towards his announcement. He invites collegiality and cooperation. He also invites their suggestions. He states plainly that he is hopeful and encouraged. "The knowledge which was already fairly familiar to us, and which has been


¹¹⁷ Ibid.
amplified by these three months of our introduction to the service 'of the servants of God,' encourages us to trust in heavenly grace."\(^{118}\) Having said this the pope asks for specific intercessions of "the Immaculate Mother of Jesus and our Mother," Saints Peter and Paul, his "special patrons John the Baptist and John the Evangelist."\(^{119}\) He hopes that the "great work" of his "proposals" will lead to "enlightenment, edification and happiness of all Christian people."\(^{120}\) This indicates that he is beginning a process that he does not intend to control nor does he know its outcome.

This is a shift from a notion of the papacy as a magisterial office where the pope can clarify doctrine personally to an understanding of the papacy as a fundamentally pastoral office that exercises its pastoral activity in collaboration with others. The language of obedience and certainty is absent in this text. It is filled with language that invites dialogue and discussion. The words that are used to indicate these attitudes are ones such as "kindness," "understanding," and "encouragement." When speaking of the separated Christian churches he does not use the language of error or schism but changes the character of the papal stance towards those communities as well by saying, that he intends to issue "a renewed invitation to the faithful of the separated communities that they may follow us amiably in this search for unity and grace….\(^{121}\)

Furthermore, this announcement's language indicates that the project of a council is a search for "renewal," "religious unity," "edification," "fecund parochial and diocesan life," and

\(^{118}\) Ibid.

\(^{119}\) Ibid.

\(^{120}\) Ibid.

\(^{121}\) Ibid.
"health." These are positive goals; they display hope, not pessimism. Pope John closes by returning to the framework of St. Paul’s conversion. He cites a Sermon given by Leo the Great in celebration of Paul’s ministry. He uses Leo’s words to describe his own "wish" for his projects that he has just asked the cardinals to help him undertake. This "wish" is directed to the cardinals to whom the pope is speaking: "You are my crown and my joy, if your faith, which from the beginning of the Gospels is preached throughout the world, perseveres in sweetness and holiness." ¹²²

In Pope John's description of the way he wishes to function with regard to the situation in the Catholic Church, as well as towards the wider world during his time, we see indications of his understanding of human freedom. Even in a short "announcement" such as this we see the beginning of the transition from one notion of membership in the Church to another, from one kind of church to another. We return to McBrien to clarify this point. He says of Pope John's pontificate: "In a period of less than five years he almost single-handedly transformed the Catholic Church from a clericalistic, monarchical, unecumenical, and theologically rigid body to a community of radical equality in Christ -- laity, religious, and clergy alike -- open to dialogue and collaboration with other Christian and non-Christian communities, with nonbelievers, and with the world at large." ¹²³ When we look closely at the change in emphasis in this speech it becomes clearer how he was able to do so in "less than five years." In a short speech he asked for dramatic and decisive changes in the way the Church functioned.

¹²² Ibid.

7. The *Motu Proprio* on Commissions

In the next text under consideration, "The Motu Proprio on Commissions," we continue to see this same attitude of collaboration that presupposes active freedom in the Church. While this text is "bureaucratic" in nature and thus does not allow or invite the kinds of discourse that the Pope’s speech on the feast of St. Paul did, it does contain glimpses of Pope John’s expectation of how the institutional Church will function under his watch.

Pope John refers once again to the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul and then cites his first encyclical *Ad Petri Cathedram*, where he stated the Council’s primary objective: "The growth of the Catholic Faith and the renewal along right lines of the habits of Christian people, and the adapting of ecclesiastical discipline to the needs and conditions of the present time." Unlike his predecessor, Pius XII, who instructed members of the Roman Curia to help him write texts for a possible future council, texts that Pius fully expected that council to accept uncritically, Pope John’s antepreparatory commission was instructed to contact all the bishops of the world for their "advice" and "suggestions." From the outset the Council was collaborative.

He also requests the same kind of advice and suggestions from the "Catholic universities, and institutes of ecclesiastical studies." The Pope had "personally" examined these texts and determined the kinds of commissions necessary for the next step in the preparation for the

---

124 The Latin in the title means, "by one's own initiative" which refers to the fact that the document is issued by the Pope as a decree or a legislative document. It is a text issued at his initiative and not as a response to a request. This text set out some basic terms and conditions and processes for the Council.

125 We are not considering this full text because we have made a judgment that it does not belong in the same category as the texts that are directly concerned with the Council. Like the Pope’s own journal, other texts such as his encyclical might further illuminate Pope John’s notion of the human person and his pneumatology. However, a consideration of such texts is beyond the scope of this study.
Council. He did not simply turn the idea over to the bureaucracy of the Vatican. Even in this small way, he was moving the institutional Church from one way of being to another. While the organizational structure of this document at this stage was hardly constitutional, it was more collaborative and collegial than previous such commissions had been. It was organized to give voice to all the constituencies from whom the Pope had requested input. In addition, he created a "special 'advisory board'" to facilitate Christian Unity. This is not the full-blown Secretariat for Christian Unity that it will become under Cardinal Augustin Bea, but it marks a new attitude towards the "separated Christians." As we shall see, the structure of these commissions will change. However, as early as June of 1960, Pope John was moving the Council in an open, collaborative direction.

As we can already see, there is repetition and overlap in these texts. This repetition, however, is the beginning of a trajectory. Pope John's fundamental goals are repeated in these early official texts and they are developed even further towards collaboration and participation when the Council actually convenes. The convocation document that we shall consider next also contains signals of the pope's desire that the Council respect and build upon human freedom. The text convoking the Council has a high level of attention to sacramentality. The pope issued this document on Christmas Day, the feast that celebrates the Incarnation, the most intense instantiation of sacramentality. In it, we have a very clear expression of the two foundations for Pope John’s theological anthropology: fundamental trust in God’s promised care and the emphasis upon the human person’s constitutive relationship with God. This understanding of the relationship with God is a strong theme in all of Pope John's writings. It is based upon the *imago Dei* from Hebrew Scriptures. Just as Paul and Congar make use of this insight from Scripture, so does Pope John.
8. The Bull Convoking the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council

As we approach this text, we shall highlight the places where this intimate relationship between God and the human person is signaled. In this text Pope John directly acknowledges the voice of atheism during his time. The basic choice of whether or not to believe in God was a central question for Pope John. The more expansive notion of salvation that will emerge at the Council grows, in part, from Pope John’s willingness to deal with the issues raised by atheism. He dealt with the challenges of atheism by returning to the fundamental claims made by the Gospel of Jesus Christ about God’s care for and presence to human persons by virtue of their humanity. We shall discuss these issues as they emerge in order in the text.

The Pope once again begins with an apostolic reference: Jesus’ "mandate to preach the Gospel to all peoples." Here we also have a glimpse of Pope John’s incipient pneumatology embedded in the "comforting promise" that should motivate the apostles’ ministry: God’s on-going presence through "all the days even unto the consummation of the world" (Matt: 28: 20).

This divine presence, which has been alive and active in all times in the Church, is noticeable above all in the most grave periods of humanity. It is then that the spouse of Christ shows itself in all its splendor as the master of truth and minister of salvation. And it is then also that it deploys all its power of charity, prayer, sacrifice and of suffering, invincible spiritual means, and the same used by the divine Founder, who in the solemn hour of His life declared: "Have faith for I have overcome the world" (John 16:33).

---

126 A bull is the "common term applied to documents stamped with a lead seal," and issued as a papal document. This seal, "embossed with the facial imprints of the apostles Peter and Paul on one side and the signature of the pope on the other," such a document intends to have "substantial" importance for the Church. See the article, "bull, papal," in McBrien, HarperCollins Encyclopedia of Catholicism, 201. See note 79.

Pope John began by locating the rest of his text within Christianity’s fundamental truth claim: the God of Jesus Christ is present to people and to the world. The rest of the text is framed by this opening; the Pope harkened back to it often. He recognized that his time was a "grave" time. But his very next sentence was positive. During those "grave" times in human history, the Church, "the spouse of Christ," has shown "itself in all its splendor as the master of truth and minister of salvation." These words should be seen in contrast to the triumphalistic descriptions of the Catholic Church that prevailed in the preconciliar church, especially with regard to other Christians and to atheists. Then the Church was often described in terms of its privileged access to truth and salvation. Pope John was changing the direction of this line of thinking. For him, the Church has a relationship to the "truth" insofar as it proclaims the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Truth is aligned with proclamation and pastoral care; it is not described in juridical or authoritarian terms. The Church will show its "splendour" through its "ministry." For Pope John, the exercise of that ministry will be different from what it has often been in the recent past.

This new characterization of the Church echoes an observation that Dunn makes about Paul's churches. Dunn's characterization of Paul's understanding of the Church’s mission resonates with Pope John's: "The Church exists to enable the same quality of discipleship as that to which Jesus called his first disciples."\(^{128}\) Pope John explained that the Church must attend to this most basic message precisely because God has chosen to be involved, through loving presence, with the human situation. Pope John described the mission of the Church twenty centuries later in this way:

Though not having direct earthly ends, [the Church] cannot however, in its mission fail to interest itself in the problems and worries of here below. It knows how beneficial to the good of the soul those means that are apt to make the life of those individual men who must be saved more human. It knows that by vivifying the temporal order with the light of Christ it reveals men to themselves; it leads them, therefore to discover in themselves their own nature, their own dignity, their own end. Hence, the living presence of the Church extends, by right and by fact, to the international organizations, and to the working out of its social doctrine regarding family, education, civil society and all related problems. This has raised its magisterium to a very high level as the most authoritative voice, the interpreter and affirmer of the moral order, and the champion of the rights and duties of all human beings and all political communities. In this way the beneficial influence of the council deliberations must, as we sincerely hope, succeed to the extent of imbuing with Christian light and penetrating with fervent spiritual energy not only the intimacy of the soul but the whole collection of human activities.  

The Church should be the "champion" of human rights and duties; its "magisterium," its "most authoritative voice" exists for the purpose of serving the human good. While it is involved with the "spiritual," for Pope John spiritual realities are not disconnected from the real, human situation. Instead, spiritual values are achieved by dealing with "civil society and all related problems." The Pope has already linked leadership in the Catholic Church with Jesus’ own mission and concerns. This section of his speech develops his understanding of leadership. According to Pope John, authority exists in order to serve Jesus’ mission. He gave a description of Church leaders who are not first and foremost bureaucrats but who are first and always, disciples.

---

Pope John saw discipleship as the answer to the crises in the world in which he lived. And at the heart of discipleship is the "light of Christ that leads [persons] to themselves." The "reign of the Divine Saviour" invites people to discover "in themselves their own nature, their own dignity, their own end" [emphasis added]. In other words, "in themselves" refers precisely to what Jesus revealed about all human persons: they are most fully alive when they experience themselves in terms of their relationship with God, as *imago Dei*. For Pope John this is the central meaning of human dignity; the human person as "enlightened and guided by God the Creator and the Redeemer of humanity."¹³⁰ For Pope John, discipleship is illuminated by the notion of the *imago Dei*. The central work of his pontificate is fueled by this theological anthropology. He did not talk about the mission of the Church apart from its mission of service to the individual human person who faces, on the one hand, the difficult "tasks" of his era and, on the other hand, the social order of the entire world.¹³¹

Another place where we foundation of the *imago Dei* is in Pope John’s understanding of the "crisis underway in society."¹³² Note that he does not see it as a crisis of discipline or obedience to rules and regulations, nor does he see it as a crisis brought about by the improper teaching of doctrine. The cause of the crisis is "great material progress" without "a corresponding advance in the moral field." This could appear as a criticism of the "world" in contrast to the Church. He did not describe it that way. He pointed out the challenges of his era


¹³¹ This is the case in all the speeches to and about the Council. An initial incarnation of this study was to inspect only Pope John's speeches before or about the Council for his pneumatology. That study is one that would also serve the conversation regarding pneumatology. All we can do here is briefly indicate Pope John's theological anthropology as it contained within it the nascent pneumatology of the Council itself.

to both the whole world and to the Church as well. The Church and the world are not separated; they are not at odds with each other as they were in the eyes of many in the Vatican bureaucracy. He did not presuppose a notion of the Church as a "perfect society" that is distinct from the world but instead is true to the principle of sacramentality.

Pope John also criticized the Church itself. He had already made clear the gravity of the Church’s responsibility to the world. By that calculus the Church can never be exempt from critique when there has been a failure to "advance" in the moral, spiritual areas of human life. If there is a lack of spiritual values in the world, since the proclamation of those values is the Church’s primary responsibility, the Church must recognize where it has fallen short of its primary mission. True to his own notion of pastoral care, Pope John made this criticism gently; he is interested in the remedy, not in naming or punishing the culprits. He described the situation this way:

Today the Church is witnessing a crisis underway within society. While humanity is on the edge of a new era, tasks of immense gravity and amplitude await the Church, as in most tragic periods of its history. It is a question in fact of bringing the modern world into contact with the vivifying and perennial energies of the Gospel, a world which exalts itself with its conquests in the technical and scientific fields but which brings also the consequences of a temporal order which some have wished to reorganize excluding God. This is why modern society is earmarked by a great material progress to which there is not a corresponding advance in the moral field. Hence there is a weakening in the aspiration toward the values of the spirit. Hence an urge for the almost exclusive search for earthly pleasures, which progressive technology places with such ease within the reach of all. And hence there is a completely new and disconcerting fact: The existence of a militant atheism which is active on a world level.  

---
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For Pope John the "temporal order" involves spiritual as well as material values. "Humanity" was entering a "new era" and Pope John thought that the Church had a responsibility to assist humanity by "bringing the modern world into contact with the vivifying and perennial energies of the Gospel." Note that the Church's contribution to this crisis is the Gospel. His language here did not refer to Catholic membership or any exclusive rights that Catholicism has to salvation. The Gospel is salvific. The Church is salvific insofar as it brings "the modern world into contact with" the Gospel. His language was not narrow or legalistic; it was broad and responsive to the problems he was addressing.

9. Pope John’s Radio Address One Month Before the Council

On September 11, 1962, one month before the Council’s opening, Pope John gave an address that was broadcast by radio to several countries. Several important newspapers in Europe reported on this address the next day. Many of the bishops and theologians who went on to become important figures at the Council commented positively on it in their journals and in other writings. Pope John continued to emphasize the consultative character of the Council in the opening lines of this address. He began by first noting the contribution of "an array of chosen minds assembled from all parts of the world and of every tongue, united in sentiments and in purpose." From the very beginning, the text is marked by an emphasis upon collaboration and openness.

This address has motifs in the areas of ecclesiology, theological anthropology, and pneumatology that the Council will embrace and develop. The leading motif is ecclesiological.

---


It is a theme that has run through every speech and document issued by Pope John about the Council: the Gospel is the "light of humanity." The purpose of this gathering of "the episcopate of the entire world" was the "wise application of the Gospel teaching of Christ which for 20 centuries has been the light of humanity redeemed by His blood." He elaborated upon this theme in several ways. First, Pope John used what he called the "painful considerations" from his previous speeches and texts about the Council and he transformed them into something positive. He cited Jesus' words, "pronounced in view of the final consummation of the world," so that they will inspire a "fresh start." He echoed Luke's Gospel, "Lift up your heads, because your redemption is at hand (cfr. Luke 21: 28-33)." Such words can "inspire the good and generous dispositions of men -- especially at certain periods in history.…" For Pope John, this time of crisis in human history was also a time for hopeful opportunity. He observed that in the past such times of crisis had often incited renewals in human society.

Second, he linked the activity of the Council, which is one form of "ecclesiastical discipline" with the Reign of God in a new way. In the ecclesiology of the time, the hierarchical Church had become identified with the Reign of God. In his radio address, Pope John insisted that the purpose of the Council was to "express" the Reign of God that the Church signifies. The Church in this case, however, is a worldwide body; he did not identify it with the Roman bureaucracy. The Council would accomplish this expression of the Reign of God by "multiplying the victories of the spirit.…" These "victories" are "of truth over error, of good over evil, of love and peace over division and opposition." His emphasis was on the broad

---
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values and insights of the Gospel and on Christian unity regarding those values. The Pope did not mention doctrinal, ministerial, or liturgical rules. He linked Christ, the Church and all of humanity when he compared the Church's light to the light of Christ. He said, "Lumen Christi; Lumen ecclesiae; Lumen gentium."\(^{139}\) He summarized his vision for the Council: "What else has a council ever been, in fact, but a renewal of this meeting with the countenance of the risen Christ, glorious and immortal King, radiant for the whole Church, for the salvation, the joy and the splendor of mankind."\(^{140}\) For Pope John, this Council would have the possibility that all councils had had: they can be avenues of renewal for the "salvation, the joy and the splendor of mankind."

Thirdly, the Pope concentrated on the positive and chose to ignore the negative, which as an historian he certainly knew. He knew that, as a matter of fact, not all councils had been times of renewal. He knew this just as well as he knew that Vatican I expressed more regressive tendencies than progressive ones. In this way, the Pope was following an un-codified protocol used in many encyclicals. He described the way that he wants the Church to become by saying that it has indeed always been that way. Charles Curran claims the words, "as the Church has always taught," act as a kind of code to signal a new teaching or, at the very least, a progressive development of a prior teaching.\(^{141}\) In this address Pope John indicated that Vatican II would not be a council on the model of Vatican I. Instead, he wished it to follow the reforming impulse

\(^{139}\textit{Ibid.}\)

\(^{140}\textit{Ibid.}\)

\(^{141}\)Charles E. Curran, Summer MA level course entitled, "Catholic Social Teaching," University of Notre Dame, 1986.
that ought to be operative in all councils. He knew that this impulse had been operative in many, but not all, councils and he wanted it to be at the heart of Vatican II.

Fourthly, Pope John makes another important ecclesiological point. We see it in his description of the "preeminent task of the Church." The Church is a servant and its task is "to vivify, to teach and to pray."142 This task comes as a result of the Church’s "vitality" which has been displayed in history "in the act of presenting anew, above all to her children, the treasures of enlightening faith and of sanctifying grace."143 The Church’s main purpose is to enliven and to teach the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It does this through the constant renewal of that teaching that will be life-giving for the members of the Church (her children) but it must also be the "door" that leads to the "exterior" and therefore "apostolic" activity of the Church. The Church’s vitality will act as an invitation to the rest of the world, by its examples of truth, goodness, love and peace.

The final ecclesiological point from this address is, again, one that the Pope had made in other speeches and texts. Nonetheless, his choice to re-affirm it here is significant. It is that the "world indeed has need of Christ."144 The "anguish" of the world is the business of the Church. "[T]he Church must bring Christ to the world."145 The Pope’s descriptions of where human persons seek relief from anguish are quite ordinary; they are not primarily internal struggles but are instead, external, quite mundane ones. They are found in the things that human beings "seek." The implication is that the Church must be utterly concerned about these things. They
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are "love of a family around the domestic hearth," "daily bread," peace among the nations of the world, education and the improvement of human situations, and human "liberty" that is exercised with attention to social responsibilities.

Man seeks the love of family around the domestic hearth. He seeks daily bread for himself and for his dear ones, his wife and his children. He aspires toward and feels the duty to live in peace both within the national community and in relation with the rest of the world. He is aware of the attractions of the spirit which leads him to educate and raise himself. Jealous of his liberty, he does not refuse to accept its legitimate limitations in order to correspond more fully with his social duties.\(^{146}\)

These are the concerns that the Pope John wanted the Council to address. Through "attentive study" the Church would address these problems through the lens of the dignity of the human person. The Pope’s vision for the Council, and for the Church of the Council, was collaborative and collegial. The concerns of daily life would be the central concerns of the Catholic Church. The way to deal with these concerns was to renew basic teaching about God’s care for redeemed humanity. This was not a juridical, authoritarian vision. The language of this address and of the other speeches and texts about the Council that we have considered is not authoritarian; it is not the voice of a disciplinarian. It is instead a warm voice that is filled with concern and care.

We now turn to the motifs regarding the human person. The anthropological motif is implied in everything that the Pope says about the Church. Again, effects disclose causes. The way that the Pope expects the Church to deal with human problems displays the Pope’s attitude towards the persons who live with those problems. The Pope continues to build upon the foundation of the human person made in God’s image, the \textit{imago Dei}.\(^{146}\)

\(^{146}\) \textit{Ibid.}
The pope's understanding of the human person as the image of God is most frequently signaled by references to "Providence" which bestows human dignity and directs the human community towards the Reign of God. He does this from the beginning in the announcement of the Council. He refers to the Holy Spirit as "Divine Providence" who has led him to his pontificate. In that speech he said that it was Divine Providence who "arouses, we say, a decided resolution to recall certain ancient forms of doctrinal affirmation and of wise provision of ecclesiastical discipline." For Pope John these "forms and disciplines" were the avenues by which the Gospel is proclaimed. He consistently connected Christianity with the "well being of life here on earth." For Pope John, the human person must be understood in light of his or her relationship to God; God is involved in the life of every person because God has given human beings their dignity. One responsibility of the "Bishop of Rome" is to give "watchful care to the whole world; the duty to proclaim and guard human dignity is a papal "apostolate." It is the "grace of Christ" that brings about "spiritual elevation," and the "health and sanctity in the whole world." The activity of "Providence" was found in the "new political world" that was emerging at that time. Once again Pope John shows how the dignity of the human person is connected with the Gospel.

One of the fundamental rights which the Church can never renounce is that of religious liberty, which is not merely freedom of worship. The Church vindicates and teaches this liberty, and on that account, she continues to suffer anguishing pain in many countries. The Church cannot renounce this liberty, because it is inseparable from the service she is bound to fulfill. This service does not stand
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as a corrective of the complement of what other institutions ought to do, or have appropriated to themselves, but it is an essential and irreplaceable element of the design of Providence to place man upon the path of truth and liberty which are the building stones upon which human civilization is raised.\textsuperscript{150}

The "mystery of Divine Providence" inspired Pope John's understanding of his own "duty."\textsuperscript{151} It was a duty that involved "service" to human dignity which "embraces the destiny of all humanity." Pope John's ecclesial ministry was ultimately for the service of the whole human community. The need for this service is displayed in the "spiritual" impulses of human beings, particularly in the exercise of freedom. Thus did Pope John connect the religious liberty more deeply with human dignity. During this period religious liberty had become associated primarily with the relationship between Church and state. Pope John re-connected this specific exercise of the "spiritual" impulses with all other features of human dignity. And in turn he strengthened the emphasis upon the source of this dignity in God's on-going presence to and care for the human community which he called "Divine Providence."

Pope John's understanding of the human person is also disclosed in his response to atheism. For him, the central negative feature of his time period was the rejection of God as the source of human dignity. Pope John points directly to the divine and human relationship in describing "doctrines which favor religious indifference or denial of God." He did not approach the situation of atheism and the over-secularization of modernity by condemning it but, instead, he appealed to the presence of "Providence in history."\textsuperscript{152} "Those doctrines which favor

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid., 18- 19.

\textsuperscript{151} Ibid., 20.

\textsuperscript{152} Ibid.
religious indifference or denial of God and of the supernatural order and those doctrines which ignore Providence in history and exalt out of all proportion the person of the individual man, with the danger of removing him from his social responsibilities, should hear again from the Church those courageous and sublime words already expressed in the important document *Mater et Magistra*, in which is summed up the thought of 2,000 years of the history of Christianity.\textsuperscript{153}

While the document to which the Pope refers follows in the line of Catholic social teaching and is concerned with the relationship between "Christianity and Social Progress," the reference to it here is for even broader purposes.\textsuperscript{154} In that encyclical he had described the institutional Church's defining relationship with the Gospel. The Gospel of Jesus Christ describes the human person’s relationship with God. For Pope John, the Church has a responsibility to be the fundamental teacher of the Gospel. This is the "supernatural order" to which he referred. The human person is related to all other members of human society because of God’s intimate, providential relationship with every human person. This providential relationship with God is seen in the most fundamental "yearning" of the human person: "It is natural that the council in its doctrinal structure, and in the pastoral action it promotes, should wish to express that yearning of people’s to travel upon the path which Providence has assigned to each one; to cooperate in the triumph of peace and to render it more noble; more just and more meritorious for all this earthly

\textsuperscript{155} *Ibid.*

\textsuperscript{154} The subtitle of this encyclical is "Christianity and Social Progress." The Pope issued it on May 15, 1961, on the seventieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*, in order to develop the teaching of that document in the tradition of Pius XI’s *Quadragesimo Anno*. In that document Pius XI began the tradition of developing Catholic social doctrine on anniversaries of Leo XIII’s *Rerum Novarum*. 
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existence." Here the Pope was affirming the human desire to make decisions about their lives and about the larger problems of society. All human persons, especially those who follow Jesus Christ should find ways that they can contribute to peace in the world and other human goods, goods for "this earthly existence." This supports the impetus of modernity toward individual freedom and participation in the decisions that impact all individuals.

This is a move away from a previous anthropology where persons were expected to find their place in the world by listening to people who were above them in authority. According to the Pope's reasoning, one purpose of the Council is "express" the human desire to "travel upon the path which Providence has assigned to each one." For Pope John, this confidence in "Providence" or God's destiny for each human person, is the reality that the Church ought to both further illuminate and serve. The natural inclination of the human person is towards the recognition and exercise of her or his human dignity. He acknowledged that the working program of the Council reflects a Church that "knows how beneficial to the good of the soul are those means that are apt to make the life of those individual men who must be saved more human. It knows that by vivifying the temporal order with the light of Christ it reveals men to themselves; it leads them, therefore, to discover in themselves their own nature, their own dignity, their own end." This description of the Council's program displays a theological anthropology that emphasizes the participation of the human person in the life of the Church; it displays a notion of the Church that guides and "reveals" and "leads." Pope John did not use juridical language nor does he describe human persons as passive beings. Another way that the

---
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pope describes his understanding of the human person is through what he called "natural needs."\footnote{157}  

The Pope described "the natural needs of man" in this way: "The council desires to exalt, in a holier and more solemn form, the deeper application of fellowship and love which are the natural needs of man and imposed on the Christian as rules for his relationship between man and man, between people and people."\footnote{158}  In this section of the address, the Pope asked the Church to find "deeper applications" of the concept of the *imago Dei*.\footnote{159} The source of Christianity’s "rules" of fellowship and love is in the very nature of the human person. The Pope wished to attend to the teaching regarding this "in a holier and more solemn form." To do this, the Council will move away from juridical categories of obedience and from the often truncated forms of the natural law tradition.

The last motif has to do with the Holy Spirit as "Providence." As we saw when we considered this designation with regard to the human person, when Pope John referred to Divine Providence, he was describing the Holy Spirit. Providence refers to a notion of God as present to human persons both internally, as a condition of their humanity and externally, in the world and in history. He consistently connected Providence to either the Savior or the Creator, thus drawing of upon the Trinitarian insight in Christianity. The Gospel, by which the human community comes to know Divine Providence, is consistently described with reference to its historical roots in events in Jesus’ life. Providence is also consistently linked to the continuation

\footnote{157}{Ibid., 20.}

\footnote{158}{Ibid.}

\footnote{159}{For a summary of how this shift away from juridical categories of the natural law see, Jean Porter, "natural law," *HarperCollins Encyclopedia of Catholicism*, Richard P. McBrien, gen. ed., 907-08. See note 79 above.}
of redemption and God’s activity in the present. This present activity points towards a final goal:
"the final consummation of the world." When Pope John addressed the relationship between
"the Church and civil society," he described the Church’s responsibilities in light of God’s on-
going presence:

We are living in the midst of a new political world. One of
the fundamental rights which the Church can never
renounce is that of religious liberty, which is not merely
freedom of worship. The Church vindicates and teaches
this liberty, and on that account, she continues to suffer
anguishing pain in many countries. The Church cannot
renounce this liberty, because it is inseparable from the
service she is bound to fulfill. This service does not stand
as the corrective or the complement of what other
institutions ought to do, or have appropriated to themselves,
but it is an essential and irreplaceable element of the design
of Providence to place man upon the path of truth and
liberty which are the building stones upon which human
civilization is raised.

The tasks of the Church that are directed specifically to the material, historical world are
grounded in its relationship to Providence. The Pope made an intrinsic connection between the
spiritual realities that come from God and the real, historical world. For Pope John, the
quintessential way that Divine Providence functions in history is through the Church. The
Church's purpose is to bring Christ to the world. In this way, Pope John's notion of the Holy
Spirit also maintains Congar's "Christological reference." "The world has need of Christ, and it
is the Church which must bring Christ to the world. The world has its problems and it is with

anguish at times that it seeks a solution." For Pope John, the Church proclaims the Gospel by addressing these problems. He continued:

These most grave problems press ever upon the heart of the Church. Hence, she has made them an object of attentive study. The ecumenical council will be able to present, in clear language, solutions which are demanded by the dignity of man and of his vocation as a Christian.

The Pope also refers directly to the relationship between the Council and Divine Providence: "O mystery of Divine Providence, by which the imminent celebration of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council once again uncovers and exalts, in a incomparable light, the duty of service and spiritual dominion of the apostolic chair, a duty which embraces the destiny of all humanity." The ministry of the "apostolic chair" is one of service given for the sake of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. That Gospel is expressed through spiritual values. The Pope has consistently linked these spiritual values with the Church’s task of contributing to the Reign of God on earth. In so doing, the Pope has securely placed what he earlier called "supernatural realities" in the context of actual, human activity, no matter how mundane. Providence then, is concerned with the actual world and its concrete and historical problems. Humanity’s worldly life is not in un-connected to its spiritual life. Providence is involved in both. For Pope John, it not actually possible to disconnect them.

Pope John finished this address by coming full circle and echoing his speech announcing the Council. He did this by making reference to the apostolic ministries of Paul and Peter. We
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noted this reference in our description of the motif of freedom; it also applies here because both Peter and Paul exercise ministries of the Holy Spirit. In this move he strengthened his expression of the Church’s mission of service to the whole human community; this mission of service began at Pentecost for Peter and at his conversion for Paul. The pope alluded to both to make the connection between those activities of the Spirit and the Council which he also saw as the Spirit's initiative. He referred to Paul's "election" to "announce the Gospel" to those "who have not yet received it…." He described Peter’s papal ministry as a pastoral ministry through which Peter acted as leader of the Christian world. He placed his own Petrine ministry in a line with both of their ministries. He "loves" to address "all his children throughout the world, from the East and West, of every rite, of every language…." Pope John saw the ministries of Paul and Peter converging in his own. All members of the human community were his "children" and therefore his responsibility. He intended to exercise his responsibility to them through the Council where the Church would renew its application of the Gospel to the concerns of the current situation. In this address, Pope John expected the work of the Council and his own work as pope to be done in cooperation with Divine Providence.

G. Conclusion

In this address one month before the Council, we have the first indications of what would become the pneumatology and ecclesiology of the Council. Neither are fully formed and so we label them incipient. The incipient pneumatology is that God’s presence saturates the human person, the world, and history and has a particular servant in the Catholic Church. The nascent
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ecclesiology is found in the descriptions of the Church’s nature as primarily apostolic rather than juridical. The Church's purpose is the service of the Gospel both through the teachings of the Gospel itself and through the practical applications of the Gospel that address the concerns of the modern world. Both are strongly grounded in the principle of sacramentality. Even in these incipient forms, they both affirm divine presence to actual human persons, individually and to the whole human community. They maintain a balance between concrete human situations and the spiritual values that are disclosed in the life, mission, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

In this chapter we have given at least a partial answer to Karl Rahner's question: "what follows if we apply the theology of this transition to the transition in which we are living today and for which Vatican II was a kind of ecclesiastical beginning?"168 We extended his analysis of the two most ecclesiologically significant moments in the life of the Church: the Council of Jerusalem and Vatican II. Then we used theological anthropology, with its characteristic emphasis upon the concept of the imago Dei to demonstrate a further connection between the churches of Paul and the Church of the Second Vatican Council. This connection also disclosed the notion of the human person shared by Paul and Pope John XXIII. Because of the expansive understanding of human freedom that is the signal characteristic of both Paul's and Pope John's view of the imago Dei, we described the notion of the Holy Spirit that also marks these two significant sites in the history of the Church. For this we turned to the historical/ systematic work of Yves Congar. Congar provided the systematic categories necessary in order to begin to cull Pope John's notion of the Holy Spirit from his texts about the Council.

In Chapter 3 we shall describe how this expansive notion of human freedom yields a similarly expansive notion of the Holy Spirit's presence to the human community in the world and in history. These first two chapters have established the theological foundations of this pneumatology. In Chapter 3 we shall begin to follow the trajectory of the Council as an event by tracing the development of this pneumatology at the Council. That trajectory begins with Pope John's "The Opening Speech," *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*. Chapter 3 describes the emergence of the Council's pneumatology which, in turn, lays the foundation for Chapter 4, which identifies that same pneumatology in Vatican II’s most important documents: *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. 
CHAPTER THREE

THE TRAJECTORY OF PROGRESSIVE THEOLOGY AT VATICAN II:
TOWARDS A WORLD-CHURCH

A. Preliminaries

The purpose of this chapter is to show that the trajectory of progressive ideas came to dominate during the first session and that, in turn, an identifiable pneumatology emerged at the Council. As we illustrate this, we shall keep in mind the insights from the theologians whose work has influenced this study. First, Yves Congar's pneumatological principles guide this chapter. In Chapter 2 we described the pneumatology that emerged under his influence as reflection upon the on-going presence of God to the human person, in the world and in history manifest in the reality of human freedom that is exercised from two directions: the personal and the communitarian. This theology of the Holy Spirit is manifest through the developing theology of the Church where the Church's self-definition requires that its teachings, practices and rituals display the recognition of the importance of collaboration, the respect for personal competence and the necessity of dialogue. We find the emerging notion of the Holy Spirit in the ways in which the Council expects the Church to act towards its members. Second, we shall keep in mind Hermann Pottmeyer's claim that the key to interpreting the Council texts is to recognize that the Council was a transitional council. And third, we shall continue to build upon Karl Rahner's argument that, to a degree, the Council began to see itself as a world-Church, in Rahner's language, in actu. While the Church has not maintained the impetus towards a new way of being in the world, during the Council itself, the seeds of such a Church were sown at Vatican II.
Pope John XXIII started the Council down the road towards this theology of the Holy Spirit. He grounded his whole understanding of human dignity in the notion of God's presence as that which constitutes persons as persons. God's presence and the free human response to that presence were equally important to Congar. For Congar, it is God's very presence as the principle of communion that binds and "builds up" the Church.¹ As we noted previously, the Council's pneumatology was functional; it emerged when the Council was trying to refashion a description of the nature and mission of the Church. To craft an ecclesiology that would address the questions and concerns raised by Pope John, the Council had to revisit its understanding of the Holy Spirit as well. In this chapter we shall describe how the Council's restoration of the strong relationship among theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology led to a less juridical, legalistic understanding of the Church and instead to one that emphasizes collaboration, participation and dialogue. As we have seen, the Church is what Richard McBrien called a "cluster concept."² It is best understood in relationship to its adjacent ideas. In the case of ecclesiology, Congar demonstrated that ecclesiology clusters with both theological anthropology and pneumatology. Thus does Congar assist us in identifying the shift that took place at and through the Council. The Council placed the Gospel before the institution; for the Council, the purpose of the institution was service to the Gospel. In this way, the human person, the Holy Spirit and the Church were "clustered" in a new and different way at Vatican II. The strong connection between individual discipleship and communal discipleship that had been weakened as a result of an inadequate theological anthropology and a juridical ecclesiology was


reestablished at Vatican II. This yielded a Church that expressed itself primarily in terms of pastoral care rather than in juridical or legal terms. In this chapter we shall provide a description of how the pneumatology that was a key element in this new configuration, "acquired increasing importance" while the preconciliar pneumatology "lost in importance."\(^3\)

We shall identify Congar's "elements" of this "true pneumatology" by describing the way the Council expected the Church, and the people in the Church, to act. If we trace these actions and functions back to their sources both in the life of the Church, and in the inner life of human persons, we find the understanding of God's on-going presence that is presupposed by each. With regard to the Church, the Council's emerging pneumatology was also displayed functionally. This notion of God's on-going presence was manifested in three general ways that occurred as a result of a Council member's initiative or as a result of the actions of the majority of the Council members. First, a change in or rejection of previous forms or expressions was requested. Second, a renewal of a form or expression was requested. And third, the creation of new form or expression was requested. With regard to the interior aspect of Congar's understanding of the Holy Spirit as the "principle of communion," the characteristics of this expansive notion of human freedom are collaboration, personal competence and dialogue. When the Council called for and affirmed these characteristics, it was manifesting its emerging pneumatology.

---

We shall also describe how the fresh pneumatology took hold in the minds of the Council members so that they included it in their speeches and actions during the first session of the Council. Both the human response and God's involvement in that response gain strength to such a degree that Congar can accurately claim, "there are signs of a true pneumatology in the teachings of the Second Vatican Council." More than any other feature of the Council, it is the emergence of a new understanding of the Holy Spirit that puts the Council in the category of "event" rather than as just another "occurrence" that we described in Chapter 1. By the end of the first session, the trajectory of the emerging pneumatology had reached its crest and the Council had become an event. We shall demonstrate that this was the case in this chapter.

1. Procedure

We shall proceed through the significant moments in the Council where this foothold for pneumatology can be seen. We shall describe the moments themselves, as well as important speeches that were part of each particular moment. In so doing we cannot refer to all of the speeches connected with each moment; that is beyond the scope of this project. We shall, however, describe the most important speeches with regard to the Council's three characteristics of the Council's pneumatology: collaboration and participation, respect for the personal competence of the members of the Church and dialogue. We shall also describe the three different ways of adapting institutional forms which are a change in or rejection of previous forms or expressions, a renewal of a form or expression or the creation of new form or

---


5 Pottmeyer, "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II: Twenty Years of Interpreting the Council," 40. See note 3.
expression. As we do, we shall proceed to build the case that a fresh pneumatology emerged at Vatican II and that this pneumatology yielded a reformed ecclesiology.

In Chapter 2 we saw that an appropriately sacramental, or incarnational understanding of the biblical concept of the *imago Dei*, and the notion of freedom that accompanies that characterization of the human person, provide the strong bond between pneumatology and ecclesiology. These emphases and adaptations mark the times when the pneumatology and ecclesiology were being drawn closer together at the Council. They were all reflections of Pope John's greater emphasis upon freedom as the constitutively human activity. Pope John saw God's presence as the Holy Spirit displayed particularly in human activities of freedom. As we shall see, when the freedom that underlies participation, respect for personal competence and dialogue coalesced with Pope John's pastoral emphasis, Vatican II became an expression of a world-Church whose self-understanding was animated by a reformed ecclesiology that presupposed both a re-invigorated theological anthropology and a fresh pneumatology. As we indicated above, when the Council emphasized collaboration, personal competence and dialogue, it was in the process of shifting from the preconciliar understanding of God's presence to the more Gospel-centered understanding that was the hallmark of Vatican II. In addition, when it rejected inappropriate or outmoded ecclesial forms, the Council was also displaying the elements of its "true pneumatology."

**B. Significant Moments in Vatican II's Trajectory of Progressive Ideas**

There are five significant moments that we shall consider in this chapter. All five involve both significant actions and speeches in varying degrees. The trajectory actually amounts to the growing preference for progressive movements over the movement that we shall call the "anti-
progressive" movement. What we mean by "anti-progressive" was the tendency to look to existing or past forms to deal with a problem in the present. The progressive movement tended to look for new or reformed forms to solve problems. The trajectory of progressive ideas at the Council was launched immediately during the opening session by our first moment: Pope John’s "Opening Speech," which occurred on the first day of the Council. This speech became the watershed for the Council's theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology at the Council. The second moment was the Council’s rejection of the Roman Curia’s plan for the election of the conciliar commissions. This happened on the third day of the Council under the leadership of Cardinals Liénart of Lille and Frings of Cologne. This action was an affirmation of the more collaborative style that was desired by the majority of the bishops. The majority of the Council participants wanted consistent processes and procedures established by the Council, for the Council. They argued that as world-wide pastors they had a particular competence to bring to the Council and they expected to exercise that competence. The third significant moment was the debate over the document on the liturgy. With regard to the draft text, i.e., schema, the division between traditionalists and progressives was displayed more in the establishment of procedures and processes than in speeches. One specific procedural example has become

---


7 Ibid., 1304.

emblematic of this third moment.\(^9\) That was when, on October 30, 1962, early in this first session, Cardinal Ottaviani’s microphone was turned off because he refused to yield the floor even though he had passed his allotted time to speak and had been asked to yield. The fourth significant moment was the debate on the document on revelation.\(^10\) There are many specific speeches that disclose the trajectory in this moment, which consisted of the essential theological discussions whereby the Council members began to reflect upon the theological implications of Pope John’s “Opening Speech.” Within this moment, one of Pope John’s most dramatic and courageous actions also took place: his removal of the schema regarding revelation, *De Fontibus*. That schema was framed by the Curial cardinals using theological categories that were not congenial to the modern world, or compatible with the emerging self-understanding of the Church as a world-Church. The fifth and final significant moment was the debate on the Church that also began during the first session.\(^11\) Cardinal Suenens’ crucially important speech, where he called for a whole new framework for the schema on the Church, has become emblematic of this moment. The "prolonged applause" in response to this speech was a sign that the majority now favored a complete redrafting of the schema on the Church. While this speech and the applause in response to it were not procedurally the same as John XXIII's removal of the initial schema on revelation, they had the similar effect.

Several theologians have argued that by the end of the first session the Council's trajectory of progressive ideas was on its way forward. They recognized that there were many


\(^10\) Ibid.

struggles yet to come but argued that the movement towards reform could not have been reversed after the first session. Hans Küng, writing in 1962 just after the end of the first session, argued that the first session had "already yielded" several "firm and irrevocable results."\textsuperscript{12}

Richard P. McBrien also argued that these are the most important moments in the first session. He described the first session as the "most dramatic and most important of the four sessions."\textsuperscript{13}

Peter Hebblethwaite wrote that even when it appeared that the first session might end in chaos, Pope John "rescued it."\textsuperscript{14} Hebblethwaite emphasized that Cardinal Suenens effectively sealed the reforming plan of the Council. He argued that with Suenens' speech the movement forward was firmly in place. At the end of the first session, Henri Fesquet wrote, "Vatican II, it is not exaggeration to say, has put an end to the age of the Counter-Reformation and it doctrinal inflexibility."\textsuperscript{15} Fesquet made the claim that so many theologians and other observers have made: by the end of the first session the Council had brought the Church into the modern world in such a way that is was no longer possible to turn back.

C. The First Moment: Pope John XXIII's "Opening Speech" and the Council's Opening

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{13} McBrien, "Vatican II," 1302. See note 6.
\item\textsuperscript{14} Peter Hebblethwaite, John XXIII," in \textit{Modern Catholicism: Vatican II and After}, Adrian Hastings, ed. (New York: Oxford University Press and London: SPCK, 1991), 27.
\item\textsuperscript{15} Henri Fesquet, \textit{The Drama of Vatican II}, trans. Bernard Murchland (New York: Random House, 1967), 100.
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It is striking how influential Pope John’s "Opening Speech" was in the actual debates at the Council; it was referred to again and again throughout all the sessions of the Council. Ideas from this speech also animated many of the activities wherein the Council came to function as a representative expression of the world-Church. This address became the formative, authoritative touchstone for the Council. Council members used it to defend specific ideas as well as to warrant new processes and procedures.\textsuperscript{16} We saw in Chapter 2 that this speech was critical for establishing the Council's emerging pneumatology because it described the pastoral notion of the Church that enlivened Pope John's thinking. It did indeed become "The Gettysburg Address" of the Catholic Church as world-Church.

Our description of this first moment has two steps. First, we shall consider the "Opening Speech" as a moment in Council's developing identity that was shaped by Pope John's understanding of the Holy Spirit. The Pope wanted the Council to be a collaborative effort of the world-wide bishops and it became such a collaborative body by the end of the first session. In this way, the Council members took actions that expressed Congar's understanding of the Holy Spirit's influence upon renewal and creativity in the Church. The second step is a description of how the notion of a pastoral Church began the process that led to the reformed ecclesiology of the Council. In both of these steps we find the new emphases of the Council. We also find rejections of certain previous ecclesial forms as well as calls for changes in some forms and the creation of new forms.

We turn to one Council member's analysis in order to provide some background for this moment in the trajectory. Abbot Christopher Butler's assessment is that, in general, the

movement consists of moving from one way of being Church towards a radically new way.

Butler studied at Oxford University, became a Catholic in 1928, and was ordained priest in 1933. He was elected Abbot of Downside Abbey in 1946 and was president of the English Benedictine Congregation. At Vatican II, he was a member of the Doctrinal Commission. He characterized the preconciliar Church in this way:

> Like a stratified rock to the geologist, she was a fascinating object for the historian, not to say the antiquarian…. Her law was articulated on principles, not to say in a spirit, which were ultimately those of the Roman civil law. Her central administration was redolent of the *familia* of the Roman Emperors, as her ceremonial reflected that of a Byzantine court. ¹⁷

Butler’s comparison of the Church to an antique sets the stage for our discussion of Pope John’s opening speech nicely because Pope John made similar comparisons. Butler’s assessment of the preconciliar Church supports the claim that, by the end of the first session at Vatican II, the Church’s self-understanding had undergone a radical change. He argued that the Council had not simply begun a "gradual" but non-substantive shift. He wrote, "although the Church cannot evolve into something other than herself, the fact that she is a communion of human beings means that, grace aiding, she can achieve ever new solutions…. Such new solutions will have a radical quality and will entail a searching discrimination between what is, after all, of the immutable essence of the Church, in all her contingent existence that, however venerable, is yet - - at least in principle -- expendable." ¹⁸ Butler saw glimpses of new solutions in the first session.

---


The "searching discrimination" that Butler recognized required all of the conciliar emphases upon freedom: collaboration, personal competence and dialogue. Freedom was necessary to begin the process; it allowed the Council to actually confront the situation before it. A new solution could only arise if the Council members were competent to craft one; by way of collaboration and dialogue they did so. Pope John recognized and validated their competence in this "Opening Speech" and invited the Council members to full participation.

Butler noticed the "radical" character of Vatican II in Pope John's description of it as a "new Pentecost." While many members of the Roman Curia held to the "stratified rock" view of the Church throughout the Council, the majority of the Council members were invited to make the "radical change" that Butler had in mind in the citation above. Butler argued that Pope John brought a pastoral insight to the Council. He described an insight as a "new solution" to a new problem; insights do not occur as a result of gradual adaptation and adjustment. Butler wrote that the majority of the Council members were given such an "insight" by Pope John, from which they developed the necessary theologies that caused the Church to make a more radical change.19 Pope John’s insight was anchored in the word "pastoral." This characterization might appear mundane or even simplistic but in the Pope John's hands it was anything but. It provided the key that kept the Church from lapsing into what Butler called a "backwater existence."20 Echoing McBrien's cluster concept, we might call "pastoral" a cluster concept as well. It presupposes all the emphases of the Council; Pope John's notion of "pastoral" action includes them all.

Butler framed his remarks on "radical change" this way:

19 Ibid., 5.

20 Ibid., 7.
A species, when no longer adapted to its actual environment, can evolve, or it can perish. The Church cannot perish. But there is a third possibility. Sometimes a species succeeds in taking refuge in a backwater existence, where -- in diminished numbers and with no further relevance except to historians of past evolution -- it prolongs an insignificant story. As we look back on the Church before 1962, do we not sometimes seem to be catching a glimpse of what might have become a monumental irrelevance?21

When Pope John referred to the Council as a "New Pentecost," he was inviting the Council members to forestall this "third possibility." He wished the Church to adapt to the needs of its current situation.

Andrea Riccardi, one of the contributors to Alberigo's and Komonchak's History of Vatican II, said of this speech: "The allocution Gaudet Mater Ecclesia [we are using the more common title of the "Opening Speech"] is one of the most complete expressions of Roncalli's vision of the Council. The text of the discourse was due entirely to John XXIII, who intended to give the fathers of Vatican II a personal and authoritative instruction that would link this assembly with the great conciliar tradition of the Church."22 Recall that Pope John had compared the Council's task with Paul's ministry to the whole world. The Pope drew many parallels between that first mission to the whole world and what he regarded as a similar mission for the Council in 1962.

In fact, Pope John opened his address by locating Vatican II within the entire history of Church councils. "The councils -- both the 20 ecumenical ones and the numberless others, also

21 Ibid.

important, of provincial or regional character which have been held down through the years -- all prove clearly the vigor of the Catholic Church and are recorded as shining lights in her annals." ²

The Pope began with a move towards collegiality and away from Roman centralization by placing "provincial and regional" discussions in the same category as the 20 previous ecumenical councils. This fits the process that he created in the ante-preparatory period where he called for consultation with all the world's bishops. The speech functioned as the Pope's challenge to the Council members that they follow in the conciliar tradition by responding to the situation in which they found themselves. He asked that they do this in order that the Gospel proclamation would be fruitful, what he called "efficacious." Here is the first example of one of the three specific expressions of a new understanding of freedom in the Church: the creation of new forms or expressions for the Church's mission. In the ante-preparatory period the Pope had actively consulted the Council members and asked them to come prepared to the Council. This was a creative adaptation of this "ancient" conciliar form to which the pope referred.

Pope John continued, "In calling this vast assembly of bishops, the latest and humble successor of the Prince of the Apostles who is addressing you intended to assert once again the Church's magisterium, which is unfailing and perdures until the end of time, in order that this magisterium, taking into account the errors, the requirements and the opportunities of our time, might be presented in exceptional form to all men throughout the world." ² Pope John was asking that the Council members return to the biblical vision of their apostolic mission; he wanted them to have a focus similar to Paul's in that he expected them to address the whole


world situation and not just internal, structural concerns. He characterized the work of a council this way: "Ecumenical councils, whenever they are assembled, are a solemn celebration of the union of Christ and His Church and hence lead to the universal radiation of truth, to the proper guidance of individuals in domestic and social life, to the strengthening of spiritual energies for a perennial uplift toward real and everlasting goodness."25 As we saw in Chapter 2, Pope John returned to the Gospel and made it normative again for the self-identity of the Church in the same way that Lincoln returned to "The Declaration of Independence" and made it normative for the identity of the United States. If the "Opening Speech" is "The Gettysburg Address" of the Council, the Gospel is its "Declaration of Independence." In this way, the text reflects the second example of institutional change: the renewal of a previous form or expression.

As he continued his address, the Pope described how the process of the Council began with this return to essential principles. "There have elapsed three years of laborious preparation, during which a wide and profound examination was made regarding modern conditions of faith and religious practice, and of Christian and especially Catholic vitality. These years have seemed to us a first sign, an initial gift of celestial grace."26 Pope John was letting the Council members know that the process he started of collegial and de-centralized dialogue was not by accident and that he intended it to continue at the Council. In describing his own pontificate as one that would not focus upon rule-making but, instead, would attempt to encourage and edify, he gave a further clarification of how a pastoral Church actually functions. "Illuminated by the light of this council, the Church -- we confidently trust -- will become greater in spiritual riches and, gaining the strength of new energies therefrom, she will look to the future without fear. In

25 Ibid.

26 Ibid., 26.
fact, by bringing herself up-to-date where required, and by the wise organization of mutual cooperation, the Church will make men, families and peoples really turn their minds to heavenly things." Pope John clearly directed his attention to the future with confidence and asked that the Council members do the same. This was another example of the free collaboration and dialogue that he promoted and encouraged.

He also provided his assessment of the Church's current situation. This, too, contributed to a new vision for the Church’s self-understanding. During the preparatory period, Pope John learned, especially by reading the preparatory texts, that there was a small but influential minority who disagreed with his assessment of the situation and with his approach to the Church's response to that situation. In contrast to this small group, the majority of the Council members from the around the world who actually responded to the Pope's requests shared his view. His now famous description of the Church’s situation follows. It is one of the most important sections of this speech with regard to Pope John's understanding of God's on-going presence as Holy Spirit. "There is, moreover, venerable brothers, another subject which it is useful to propose for your consideration. Namely, in order to render our joy more complete, we wish to narrate before this great assembly our assessment of the happy circumstances under which the ecumenical council commences." Pope John characterized the circumstances "under which" the Council opened as "happy." He would go on to describe the modern world very concretely. This was an early signal that, for Pope John, the modern world, in spite of all its problems and challenges, was essentially good.

---
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As he continued, he contrasted himself with those who had a negative view of the world. Some of these people even saw the world as fundamentally alienated from the Reign of God because of they saw the world through the lens of the preconciliar ecclesiology. Under this ecclesiology, the Church was so identified with the supernatural, non-historical aspects of the Reign of God that the actual, historical world was seen increasingly in opposition to God's Reign. Pope John parted company with those who held this view.

In the daily exercise of our pastoral office, we sometimes have to listen, much to our regret, to voices of persons who, though burning with zeal, are not endowed with too much sense of discretion or measure. In these modern times they can see nothing but prevarication and ruin. They say that our era, in comparison with past eras, is getting worse and they behave as though they had learned nothing from history, which is, none the less, the teacher of life. They behave as though at the time of former councils everything was a full triumph for the Christian idea and life and for proper religious liberty. We feel that we must disagree with those prophets of gloom, who are always forecasting disaster, as though the end of the world was at hand.\[^{29}\]

Pope John pointed out that "history" is "the teacher of life."\[^{30}\] This was a very important aspect of Pope John's thinking. In order to be taught by history, one must be willing to acknowledge mistakes and to make changes. One must also be willing to set aside ineffective ways of doing things in order to respond to the new historical situations. And of course, one must also be open to creative new initiatives. He described how he found God's presence in the historical situation at the time of the Council. "In the present order of things, Divine Providence is leading us to a new order of human relations which, by men’s own efforts and even beyond


their very expectations, are directed toward the fulfillment of God’s superior and inscrutable designs.\textsuperscript{31}

For Pope John, God continues to be involved with the human community. "And everything, even human differences, leads to the greater good of the Church…. [W]e see today, not without great hopes and to our immense consolation, that the Church, finally freed from so many obstacles of a profane nature such as trammeled her in the past, can from this Vatican basilica, as if from a second apostolic cenacle, and through your intermediary, raise her voice resonant with majesty and greatness."\textsuperscript{32} He made a reference to the first apostolic action from the "upper room" or "cenacle" where the Apostles began their mission to bring the Gospel to the world. He hoped that St. Peter's Basilica would become an analogous "second apostolic cenacle." He was making reference again to the apostolic mission with which he had framed the "Announcement of the Council." By connecting Vatican II with apostolic activity, Pope John was inviting the Council to make the same kind of open response to new thought forms and cultural situations. More than the other conciliar emphases, this invitation by Pope John acknowledged the personal competence of the world's bishops and other pastoral leaders.

John XXIII also did several important things in this section of this speech to establish the "pastoral character" as a methodological principle and not simply as a personal attitude of a kind and simple pontiff. First, he affirmed the principle of sacramentality. For Pope John, the modern world situation at that time may have been flawed, but like all of creation, it was fundamentally good and positive because it was permeated with the presence of God. Second, he located Vatican II in a new "cenacle," which was an allusion to the apostles' experience of the

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Ibid.}
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Holy Spirit. In so doing he compared it to the apostolic mission of all the disciples. The result was that the Church’s self-understanding should begin with the initial ethos of Gospel proclamation instead of a self-definition that reflected the political structures of European history. He distinguished Vatican II from the majority of the past councils where, because of the presence and influence of the "princes," the councils "were often held to the accompaniment of most serious difficulties and sufferings because of the undue interference of civil authorities."3

In addition, when he placed Vatican II in this apostolic category, he also rejected the notion that the Church ought to be connected in any privileged way with any government or nation state. Riccardi wrote: "In the Pope’s view, the age of the Catholic state and a Christian regime was no golden age of the Church in the history of the world, after which Christian life had progressively declined."34 Riccardi argued that Pope John had a generally positive assessment of the world. This is reflected in his observation of the modern world as "a new order of human relations."

For Pope John, the Church’s relationship to the world was one of service; the Church had riches to offer the world, but these riches were spiritual, not political. The disconnection of the Church from politics freed the Church to be more itself. This supports Rahner’s analysis of the Church's self-understanding as world-church that emerged at Vatican II; Pope John's "Opening Address" was essential for that emergence. As we have previously indicated, the Council members appealed to the "Opening Speech" as the touchstone for many of their interventions regarding the various conciliar documents. They used it as well to defend their call for more transparent procedures and consensus-building processes, i.e., collaboration.

33 Ibid.

After the Pope made clear what was not the purpose of the Council, he described its true purpose. This description was constitutive of the self-understanding of the Church that emerged.

"The greatest concern of the ecumenical council is this: that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously." Implied in this positive description was a negative assessment of the state of teaching at the time of the Council. Notice that the Pope moved to theological anthropology in his next statement:

That doctrine [the Christian proclamation] embraces the whole of man, composed as he is of body and soul. And, since he is a pilgrim on this earth, it commands him to tend toward heaven…. This demonstrates how our moral life is to be ordered in such a way as to fulfill our duties as citizens of earth and of heaven and thus to attain the aim of life as established by God…. The Lord has said, "Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice" (Matt. 6, 33). The word "first" expresses the direction in which our thoughts and energies must move…. In reality, there always have been in the Church, and there are still today, those who, while seeking the practice of evangelical perfection with all their might, do not fail to make themselves useful to society.

The principle of sacramentality (which is so essential for an appropriate theological anthropology) was present here where a religious "practice" such as "evangelical perfection" made concrete human life better; the Pope did not simply focus on life after death. For Pope John, the human lives were "ordered in such a way as to fulfill" the "duties" of both "earth and heaven," which he did not separate into two distinct categories but instead brought together because they have the same "aim." That aim is "established by God" and is directed towards the "kingdom of God." He affirmed the intention of

those who follow the "evangelical counsels," but then called for the creation of new ways to "seek" the God-given aim of life.

Indeed, it is from their constant example of life and their charitable undertakings that all that is highest and noblest in human society takes it strength and growth. In order, however, that this doctrine may influence the numerous fields of human activity, with reference to individuals, to families and to social life, it is necessary first of all that the Church should never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers. But at the same time she must ever look to the present, to the new conditions and new forms of life introduced into the modern world, which have opened new avenues of the Catholic apostolate. For this reason the Church has not watched inertly the marvelous progress of the discoveries of human genius and has not been backward in evaluating them rightly. But, while following these developments, she does not neglect to admonish men so that, over and above sense-perceived things, they may raise their eyes to God, the Source of all wisdom and all beauty.37

He described his desire that the Church "may influence the numerous fields of human activity," not just those that can be influenced by "charitable example."38 He affirmed the movements where the Church had observed "the marvelous progress of the discoveries of human genius." Pope John reflected his own theological anthropology that grew out of his understanding of the imago Dei. "Human genius" comes from God who is the "Source of all wisdom and all beauty."39

37 Ibid.

38 Ibid.

39 Ibid.
The most important lines in the entire address are the often-cited, "The substance of the ancient doctrine of the deposit of faith is one thing, and the way in which it is presented in another. And it is the latter that must be taken into consideration -- with patience if need be -- while weighing everything in the forms and statements of a teaching activity that is predominantly pastoral in character." Riccardi’s assessment echoes our analogy with Garry Wills’ Lincoln and "The Gettysburg Address." "This was an important methodological guideline, since it situated the work of the council fathers at the heart of the Christian message, while at the same time urging them to present this message to the world in an updated way." For Pope John, the Church had a gift for the world. "[T]he Church does not offer people today riches that pass, nor does she promise them a mere earthly happiness. She distributes to them the goods of divine grace which, by raising human beings to the dignity of children of God, are the most efficacious safeguards and aids toward a more human life." Pastoral care, for people in the institutional Church and for all people as well, was directed towards making human life better; divine grace was given so that human persons would flourish. For Pope John, any proper self-understanding of the Church began with this pastoral care.

In summary, the "Opening Speech" contains Pope John’s suggestion of the kind of method that the Council members should use in approaching their work. He described this method in concrete terms: "Nowadays...the Spouse of Christ prefers to use the medicine of mercy rather than severity. She considers that she meets the needs of the present day by

---
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demonstrating the validity of her teaching rather than by condemnations.\textsuperscript{43} The Pope wished to promote a new approach to the use of authority that included a new understanding of its true purpose. We shall see later on, and in Chapter 4 especially, that this reflected the rejection of a framework of often questioning obedience in favor of a framework that was rooted in the dignity of human freedom. Riccardi summarized the Pope's intention this way:

This was something more than a program of work; it was the attitude which the Pope was asking the Council fathers to adopt, while leaving them free to be the active agents of the Council. He was asking them to plunge into the heart of the Christian message and at the same time to present it in a renewed form to a changed world. The Pope's allocution was the act, not of a "sovereign" imposing his will but that of the primate among Catholic bishops, providing authoritative suggestions about the path their work should take.\textsuperscript{44}

In asking the Council members to act as free and active "agents," Pope John was inviting a new way of imagining the Church that was very similar to the one Congar had been suggesting in his work for several decades before the Council. The Council members were ready to receive the Pope's suggestion and to develop it at the Council. The fact that they cited this speech so often, as we shall see later in this chapter, suggests just how strongly they agreed with the emphasis upon collaboration, personal competence and dialogue.

The spontaneous address that Pope John gave from the Apostolic Palace on the evening of the opening day is another feature of this first moment of the trajectory. The people of Rome came in a candlelight procession to St. Peter’s Square in remembrance of a similar procession

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.

that the Christians at Ephesus made at that ecumenical council in 431 C.E. On that evening Pope
John displayed the same attitude of openness. He did not see the Council itself as having a
predetermined agenda. In this address he also displayed his understanding of authority in the
Church. He told the people:

> When you return home you will find your children: Caress them and tell them: "This is a caress from the Pope." You will find some tears to dry. Speak words of comfort to the afflicted. Let the afflicted know that the Pope is with his sons and daughters, especially in hours of sadness and bitterness.\(^4\)

Regarding the work of the Council he also said that night:

> It can rightly be said that today we are beginning a year that will bring outstanding graces. The Council has begun, we do not know when it will end. If it is not to end before Christmas, because we shall perhaps not manage to say everything by that time and to take up various subjects, another meeting will be necessary.... And therefore let these days go well; we look forward to them with great joy.\(^6\)

This attitude of care and of genuine expectation of a future yet unknown influenced the
trajectory of Vatican II. This stance reflected a new understanding of the identity of the Church,
especially as related to the human person. While these words were, indeed, the words of a kind
and loving elderly pastor, they were much more than that. The Christian love that was so much a
part of Pope John’s own personality and ministry was also meant to be the fundamental
framework for the self-defining work of the Council. Pope John expected care and mercy to be
the hallmarks of the Church’s "up-to-date" self-expression. The Church's primary mission is one
of bringing the Gospel to the service of the entire human community. For Pope John, this

\(^{45}\) Ibid., 20.
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required care and mercy. Everything about the Church must flow from these precisely because they are the reflection of God's relationship with the human community. As the primary representative of the Church, Pope John expressed this understanding of God's care for the world. In so doing and in conjunction with his "Opening Speech," he signaled the possibility of a new understanding of the Church.

We indicated above that with regard to this first moment we would also explore this speech for the freedom-centered theological anthropology that informs it. This is primarily because a large number of the Council members refer both directly and indirectly to Pope John’s "Opening Speech" and thus affirm its underlying theological anthropology. As we have indicated, Pope John's pneumatology was anchored in the dignity of the free human person. We shall now explore this address for the signals that Pope John gave us of his notion of the human person.

a. Freedom and the Human Person in the "Opening Speech"

The first place we see Pope John’s notion of the human person is in the way he characterized the exercise of authority. As we have noted, Pope John's theology was functional; we must find it by looking at the ways he expected the Church to treat people. Particularly with regard to authority, the way the Church functions towards people displays an underlying notion of the human person. The way some leaders in the Church exercised authority disclosed that they viewed lay people as the "simple faithful," a term which characterized them as immature and childlike. Pope John operated with a much richer notion of the faithful. He expressed his way of understanding authority at the beginning of his address in his

______________________________
characterization of the "Church’s magisterium." He did not describe an imperious ruling structure but instead says this: "In calling this vast assembly of bishops, the latest and humble successor of the Prince of the Apostles who is addressing you intended to assert once again the Church’s magisterium which is unfailing and perdures until the end of time, in order that this magisterium, taking into account the errors, the requirements and the opportunities of our time, might be presented in exceptional form to all men throughout the world." The Council’s audience was all people; its project involved taking into account "errors" and "opportunities." These words expressed a dynamic understanding of both teaching and the human person to whom teaching was directed. They also parted company with a view of the human person as a passive recipient. In addition, the Pope's words expressed a view of the Church that admits mistakes and that responds to the situation in which it finds itself.

Pope John's notion of the human person is presupposed by his description of the purpose of ecumenical councils. "Ecumenical councils, whenever they are assembled, are a solemn celebration of the union of Christ and His Church and hence lead to the universal radiation of truth, to the proper guidance of individuals in domestic and social life, to strengthening of spiritual energies for a perennial uplift toward real and everlasting goodness." His emphasis here was upon the general search for the truth; he was not describing a legalistic program. He described the relationship between the Church and the Council with a similar focus. "Illuminated by the light of this council, the Church -- we confidently trust -- will become greater in spiritual riches and, gaining the strength of new energies therefrom, she will look to the future...

---


This statement, full of confidence as it was, came quickly after Pope John had described the enduring problems that confronted the world as "bitterness in human relations" and "the constant danger of fratricidal wars." These problems, however, did not make Pope John afraid. Instead, he said in the next paragraph that he had confidence in the ecumenical council because it could "lead to the universal radiation of the truth" and to "the strengthening of spiritual energies" that lead "toward real and everlasting goodness." He described the Church's response to these problems with a lack of fear. Instead, he concentrated on the trustworthiness of Christ’s Gospel-promises that was a constant feature of the Pope’s understanding of human life. He continued: "In fact, by bringing herself up-to-date where required, and by the wise organization of mutual cooperation, the Church will make men, families and peoples really turn their minds to heavenly things." In referring to "heavenly things," Pope John was not referring to the ethereal, non-bodily realm, but to the values of the Gospel. He insisted that the human person is utterly related to God and in the constant presence of God’s loving care, even in the midst of the most mundane experiences of this world. In this section of his speech Pope John continued to describe the activity of the Church dynamically. Its stance towards human persons ought to be positive. He insisted "And everything, even human differences, leads to the greater good of the Church." When describing the "greatest concern of the ecumenical council," Pope John said that it was to guard and teach the Christian doctrine. That "doctrine embraces the whole of man,
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composed as he is of body and soul. As the Pope continued, he provided a summary of his theological anthropology.

And, since he is a pilgrim on this earth, it commands him to tend always toward heaven. This demonstrates how our mortal life is to be ordered in such a way as to fulfill our duties as citizens of earth and of heaven and thus to attain the aim of life as established by God. That is, all men, whether taken singly or as united in society, today have the duty of tending ceaselessly during their lifetime toward the attainment of heavenly things and to use only for this purpose the earthly goods, the employment of which must not prejudice their eternal happiness.55

In this section, human life is "ordered" towards fulfillment in God. Christians have duties to both "earth" and "heaven." "Earthly goods" are for the purpose of expressing and acting out the life that was "established by God." This reflects the principle of sacramentality; it also includes the two kinds of communion that Congar indicated were emphasized at the Council: the individual relationship with God and the relationship with God displayed in human society.

In one of the more famous sections (which we have mentioned elsewhere), Pope John described his notion of the Holy Spirit’s on-going presence in the world. Having already rejected the view of the "prophets of gloom," he described why he disagrees with that negative, defensive stance. "In the present order of things, Divine Providence is leading us to a new order of human relations which, by men’s own efforts and even beyond their very expectations, are
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directed toward the fulfillment of God’s superior and inscrutable designs.” For Pope John, the Church was threatened neither by the wider world nor the modern situation.

After he described the "greatest concern" of the Council as the efficacious teaching of the Christian faith, he described the relationship between this teaching and the present situation.

In order, however, that this doctrine may influence the numerous fields of human activity, with reference to individuals, to families and to social life, it is necessary first of all that the Church should never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers. But at the same time she must ever look to the present, to the new conditions and new forms of life introduced into the modern world which have opened new avenues to the Catholic apostolate.... Our duty is not only to guard this precious treasure, as if we were concerned only with antiquity, but to dedicate ourselves with an earnest will and without fear to that work which our era demands of us, pursuing thus the path which the Church has followed for 20 centuries.

In this section, he called upon the Church to look for the "new avenues to the Catholic apostolate," which have been "opened" by the modern situation. For Pope John, "new conditions and new forms" were not a threat to the "sacred patrimony" but were instead, necessary and even welcome. He noted that the Church had been adapting such new forms for "20 centuries." This "sacred patrimony," otherwise described as "the Catholic apostolate" is the where theological anthropology and pneumatology converged for Pope John. "Divine Providence" was leading the human community to a "new order of relations." The human community knew how to respond to the lead that God was providing because of the "sacred patrimony," i.e., the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Divine Providence was the characterization that Pope John used to describe God's on-
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going presence to the human community. Pope John continued to describe the purpose of the Council. The next section that reflects his theological anthropology is the same frequently cited excerpt we noted with regard to the conciliar method above.

Pope John explained that the purpose of the Council was not "a discussion of one article or another of the fundamental doctrine of the Church." He did not think that such discussions were sufficient to warrant a council. He said, "For this a council was not necessary." What he did find necessary was "a step forward toward a doctrinal penetration and a formation of consciences in faithful and perfect conformity to the authentic doctrine, which, however, should be studied and expounded through the methods of research and through the literary forms of modern thought." This reasoning brought the Pope to his most important idea. "The substance of the ancient doctrine of the Deposit of Faith is one thing, and the way in which it is presented is another. And it is the latter that must be taken into great consideration with patience if necessary, everything being measured in forms and proportions of a magisterium which is predominantly pastoral in character." The way that he expected the Church to teach also reflected his understanding of the persons who were being taught.

Here we find Pope John’s notion of human freedom as experienced and exercised both individually and in the Church. In Pope John's notion of the truth, the truth does not exist in the "Deposit of Faith" as a static principle but, instead, is available as a feature of the human person’s permanent relationship with God. Truth is present in the same way that goodness is present; they are both indications of God’s very presence. The purpose of authority is greater
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"penetration" of this truth, which means that faith is a dynamic reality that is served by "pastoral" teaching. Pastoral teaching presupposes a relational dynamic and not a timeless programmatic. This theological anthropology is fully compatible with the more theologically developed anthropologies of Paul and Congar that we have previously discussed.

Pope John also elaborated on his meaning of "pastoral in character." We consider it here because it provides another description of his notion of the human person. He began this section by addressing one of the traditional purposes of a council: to repress or correct errors. He minimized the importance of the changing "opinions of men" after he stated that "the truth of the Lord will remain forever." He compared "errors" to "fog before the sun." In making this comparison, he indicated how unnecessary it is to make severe responses to errors. He said of the Church in history, "Frequently she has condemned them with the greatest severity." He explained the method that he wished the Council to use:

She considers that she meets the needs of the present day by demonstrating the validity of her teaching rather than by condemnations. Not, certainly, that there is a lack of fallacious teaching, opinions, and dangerous concepts to be guarded against and dissipated. But these are so obviously in contrast with the right norm of honesty, and have produced such lethal fruits, that by now it would seem that men of themselves are inclined to condemn them, particularly those ways of life which despise God and His law or place excessive confidence in technical progress and a well-being based exclusively on the comforts of life.
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Pope John regarded most errors as self-evidently opposed to the dignity of human persons; he argued that people would judge for themselves what was worth condemning. In this way, he again affirmed his confidence in the capacity of human persons to recognize God's presence. He finished his argument by again turning to his understanding of human persons.

They are ever more deeply convinced of the paramount dignity of the human person and of his perfectioning, as well as of the duties, which that implies. Even more important, experience has taught men that violence inflicted on others, the might of arms and political domination, are of no help at all in finding a happy solution to the grave problems afflicting them… [The Church] distributes to them the goods of divine grace which, raising men to the dignity of sons of God, are the most efficacious safeguards and aids toward a more human life. She opens the fountain of her life giving doctrine which allows men, enlightened by the light of Christ, to understand well what they really are, what their lofty dignity and their purpose are, and, finally, through her children, she spreads everywhere the fulness (sic.) of Christian charity, than which nothing is more effective in eradicating the seeds of discord, nothing more efficacious in promoting concord, just peace and brotherly unity in all. 

For Pope John, "the paramount dignity" of human persons and their "perfectioning" come from the relationship with God. The Church's main duty is to assist the human community in recognizing this dignity and working towards the "perfectioning" which is achieved through the kind of "charity" that Jesus proclaimed in his descriptions of the Reign of God. This is how human dignity is related to the mission of the Church. The Church’s purpose is to assist human persons so that they will "understand well what they are." Without using the explicit language of *imago Dei*, Pope John provided a description of the human person that echoes the theological anthropology of Paul and Congar that we considered in Chapter 2. The Church that Pope John
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described gives "aids," "safeguards," and the "goods of divine grace." This description of the Church is dynamic; it invites collaboration and participation. It is through the acts of the members of the Church, "her children," that the "fullness of Christian charity" is spread. Once again, these descriptions of persons, of the Church and of God's presence and care are not framed in passive language nor are they framed in categories of obedience and rules and regulations. They reflect the conciliar emphases of collaboration, personal competence and dialogue.

Pope John included this understanding of the Church’s relationship to the human community as he brought his address to a close.

Venerable brothers, such is the aim of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, which, while bringing together the Church’s best energies and striving to have men welcome more favorably the good tidings of salvation, prepares, as it were, and consolidates the path toward that unity of mankind which is required as a necessary foundation in order that the earthly city may be brought to the resemblance of that heavenly city where truth reigns, charity is the law, and whose extent is eternity (cfr. St. Augustine, Epistle 138, 3)…. We might say that heaven and earth are united in the holding of the council -- the saints of heaven to protect our work, the faithful of the earth continuing in prayer to the Lord, and you, seconding the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in order that the work of all may correspond to the modern expectations and needs of the various peoples of the world. This requires of you serenity of mind, brotherly concord, moderation in proposals, dignity in discussion and wisdom of deliberation. God grant that your labors and your work, toward which the eyes of all peoples and the hopes of the entire world are turned, may abundantly fulfill the aspirations of all.67

In this last section John XXIII described the self-identity of the Church with a strong emphasis upon the principle of sacramentality. As we have seen, the way the Church functions towards

persons displays the theological anthropology presupposed by its self-understanding. He said, "Heaven and earth are united in the holding of the council." He clearly described that the tasks before the Council were quite "earthly"; they required great attention to the specific situation of the world at that time. He made it clear that the Council's concerns ought to be for the "uplifting" of human life. His concern created a balance between the human and the divine. His clear dependence upon the divine is found in his description of the "inspiration of the Holy Spirit" and in his prayer that "God grant your labors and your work...may abundantly fulfill the aspirations of all." On the human side, he described the Council’s success as being dependent upon specific actions and behaviors of the Council members. Human and divine were united in the "work" of the faithful of the earth continuing in prayer to the Lord, "and in the Council members" whose "work" he hoped would "correspond to the modern expectations and needs of the various peoples of the world." Their "work" was not a preset program that prescinded from the modern situation; that had been the primary way that the institutional Church responded to the world in the decades that preceded Vatican II. He characterized the work in specifically human ways: "serenity of mind, brotherly concord, moderation in proposals, dignity in discussions and wisdom in deliberation." In sum, he described the very concrete work that needed to be done that corresponded to the method of dynamic dialogue that he had been elaborating in the entire address. In this way, he presupposed a notion of human persons that freely responded to the situation of the world in light of the Gospel message.

The citations above from the "Opening Speech" describe the kind of theological anthropology that Congar identified in previous periods when he traced the history of ecclesiology. Pope John returned to this anthropology that emphasizes that human persons and God are in communion. He grounded all of his remarks in the relationship between the human
community and God from whom human dignity comes. This dignity, as well as the destiny that flows from it, is proclaimed in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which the Church intends to "open" and "spread" as a gift to the world.

D. The Second Moment: The Council Begins to Form Its Own Identity

We return to Rahner to frame the discussion of this second moment. He argued that the Council "is the beginning of a tentative approach by the Church to the discovery and official realization of itself as world-Church.…" During the first General Congregation, the Council made its first "tentative approach" towards becoming a world-Church when the Council members asked that they be allowed to get to know each other better before they voted for the various commissions. The Council members recognized that without this delay, the "elections" would be in name only; they understood that they needed more information before they could actually exercise the kind of carefulness that Pope John asked of them in his speech. In various ways he had asked for their "best energies."

Each commission needed sixteen elected members who would work with the eight members who had been appointed during the preparatory period. This was a strong and early sign that the Council members favored a collaborative process. Cardinal Liénart of Lille read a prepared statement wherein he requested that the Council members be allowed time to meet in national or regional groups. He suggested that they follow the pattern of the forty-seven existing
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Cardinal Frings of Cologne supported this proposal. Frings said that he spoke for Cardinal König and Cardinal Döpfner as well as the other German-speaking cardinals. Long and loud applause followed both of these short speeches, even though applause was "not allowed" by conciliar rules. The voting that was scheduled for the first working day did not take place because the Council had refused to "vote" on the commissions without first becoming better acquainted with one another. Because no other business was planned, the meeting was adjourned. The Pope granted the Council members' request and they were given more time before they voted to form the commissions. Cardinal Liénart reported that Pope John said to him later: "You have done right in expressing your thoughts aloud; that is why I called the bishops to a council."71

The Council members did form national and regional groups, and from these the identity of the Council began to take shape. They held meetings in the evenings where they got to know each other. They also made use of theologians and other periti as resources. Their initiative represented the first step towards the formation of a world-Church at the Council. In this moment of the event all the conciliar emphases were present. The image of over 2,500 bishops leaving St. Peter's in a precipitous fashion in contrast to the image of the solemn procession that had taken so long in the morning displayed the kind of turn-around that began with the rejection of the pre-established commissions.


When he was a *peritus* at the Council, Joseph Ratzinger observed that "the great, surprising, and genuinely positive result of the first session" was the fact that no document had been approved. Ratzinger was referring to the fact that some people expected the Council to meet and validate the Romans Curia's agenda and then return home fairly quickly; they expected a *pro forma* council. What actually took place in the first session stands in marked contrast with suspicions at the beginning of that session that the Council would be nothing more than an affirmation of the decisions that had already been made. At the Council's opening Hans Küng saw it this way:

> It is not giving away any secrets to say that morale on the eve of Vatican II, even in Rome itself, was none too good. Optimism was not in evidence. There was nothing but problems, worries and questions in all directions: How is anything going to work, with these delegations and these schemata? Is not the "open" element only an insignificant minority amidst this multitude of over two thousand bishops? What is it possible to achieve here? Hasn’t everything really been settled and finished in advance by all that anything-but-reassuring process of preparation? The ghost of the Roman Synod walked again, and there was talk of a *concilio lampo*, a lightning council with no real discussions.

This was the context that prompted Ratzinger to notice the contrast between the moods at the beginning and at the end of the first session. He observed that the "truly epoch-making character of the Council’s first session" was demonstrated by the strong reaction against the mentality
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behind the preparatory work.... Küng’s characterization is similar to Ralph Wiltgen’s description of the bishops' demeanor during the procession on October 11, 1962.

Not all of the bishops were smiling as they passed. Many believed that the Council had been convoked simply to rubber-stamp previously prepared documents. Some United States bishops had intimated that they would put in a token appearance for two or three weeks, and then go home. And all the bishops of Paraguay had been informed by a high ecclesiastical dignitary that everything had been so well prepared in Rome that the Council would soon be over.  

There were strong leaders among the Council members who were very clear even in the very first days of the Council that they had come to Vatican II not to make an "appearance" but to take up the charge that Pope John had issued with his "Announcement of the Council." Many of these bishops had been thinking about and working towards the Council ever since the Pope had solicited their input. Many others, who had not taken up the charge as aggressively, quickly responded to the Pope's vision in the "Opening Speech."

In preparation for the Council, Pope John had sent a letter to all the bishops that set the stage for this second moment. It displayed Pope John's collaborative, open style. The letter said in part:

> The Venerable Pontiff wants especially to know the opinions or views and to obtain the suggestions and wishes of their excellencies the bishops and prelates who are summoned by law (Canon 223) to take part in the ecumenical Council. For His Holiness regards as highly important the views, suggestions, and wishes of those who will be the fathers of the coming Council. These will be most useful in preparing the topics to be discussed at the
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Council. I urge your Excellency, therefore, kindly to communicate to this pontifical commission the critiques, suggestions, and wishes which your pastoral concern and your zeal for souls urges you to offer in connection with matters and subjects of possible discussion at the coming Council, and to do so with complete freedom and honesty. The subjects for the Council can be points of doctrine, the discipline of the clergy and Christian people, the manifold activities of today's Church, matters of great importance with which the Church must deal nowadays, or, finally, anything else that Your Excellency thinks it good to discuss and clarify. In tackling this task your Excellency may make discreet use of the advice of expert and prudent churchmen. This venerable pontifical commission will give full and careful consideration to whatever Your Excellency thinks will be to the advantage of the Church and of souls.\footnote{Alberigo and Komonchak, eds., \textit{History of Vatican II}, Vol. I, 94. See note 8.}

Some members of the Roman Curia had wanted the Pope to send a much more restrictive questionnaire that did not address the central issues and problems of the day.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 92.} Pope John was present at the meeting of the antepreparatory commission and there he made sure that instead of a questionnaire that would control the issues before the Council, this letter was sent.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 93.} In the letter he continued to invite the bishops to full participation and collaboration in the Council. He asked for their "full and careful consideration." He invited them to consider the texts but also to bring forward "anything else that Your Excellency thinks it good to discuss and clarify." He hoped that they would do so with "complete freedom and honesty." He called upon them to bring their "pastoral zeal" to bear as they reflected about their own "critiques, suggestions, and

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 92.}

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 93.}
wishes." This letter reflected Pope John's view of his brother bishops as competent and careful pastors. It also reflected a strong invitation to dialogue.

We move now to describe how this invitation to free and full participation played out in the Council's third significant moment. This moment, especially the way it shaped the procedures at the Council, had a great impact upon the theology that the Council developed.

E. The Third Moment: The Debate on the Liturgy

The debate over the text on the liturgy displays the trajectory more through processes and procedures than through specific speeches, even though there are some classic statements during this debate. For example, Cardinal Montini of Milan said, "The Liturgy was instituted for men and not men for the Liturgy."\(^7\) Cardinal Lercaro of Bologna spoke similarly with regard to the adaptations of the liturgy: "They do not proceed from some sterile archaeologism or from a senseless itch for novelty, but from the daily urging of pastors and from pastoral exigencies, since, as St. Pius X said, active participation is the first and indispensable source of the Christian spirit."\(^8\) While these statements are indeed memorable, the most significant aspects of the trajectory itself, disclosed by the debate over the schema, are more readily found by looking at the things that happened during that debate as part of the conciliar event itself.

The first aspect of this third moment concerning the liturgy is the decision to use a variety of liturgical traditions in the worship employed at the Council. Archbishop Marcos McGrath of Panama and a member of the Council's Theological Commission, claimed that the most
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influential, "shrewd" action of the entire Council was to use different Eucharistic forms at the daily celebration of the Mass.\footnote{Archbishop Marcos McGrath, Philosophical and Systematic Theology Colloquium, September 20, 1996, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN.} Archbishop McGrath thought that this, more than any other aspect of the Council, facilitated the development of dialogue among the Council members.\footnote{Ibid.} Through the experience of these liturgical forms the Council members became aware in a new way that a world-Church did indeed exist. Many discovered for the first time that the Catholic Church was not simply a Roman Church transplanted in various parts of the world. A signal instance of how liturgical variety helped to form the Council’s identity was Pope John’s choice of Cardinal Montini to preside at the Feast of All Souls, November 2; on this occasion the Council also celebrated the fourth anniversary of Pope John’s coronation, which had occurred on November 4, the feast of St. Charles Borromeo. That liturgy was celebrated with the Ambrosian rite and not with the Roman rite. Pope John’s homily affirmed the reforming impulse of the Council because he spoke in honor of the reformer-bishop, Charles Borromeo (whose influence on Pope John we described in Chapter 2). Pope John called Borromeo "the perfect model and most splendid light of bishops."\footnote{Xavier Rynne, \textit{Letters from Vatican City: Vatican Council II, The First Session} (New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1963), 121.} The Pope connected the liturgy with the bishops’ work at the Council in saying: "It is perfectly natural that new times and new circumstances should suggest different forms and methods of transmitting externally the one and same doctrine, and of clothing it in a new dress. Yet the living substance is always the purity of the evangelical and apostolic truth, in perfect conformity with the teaching of the holy Church, who often applies to
herself the maxim: 'Only one art, but a thousand forms.' The Pope had previously signaled his understanding and explicit use of the ancient axiom, \textit{lex orandi, lex credendi} when he removed the prayer for the "treacherous Jews" (\textit{pro perfidies Judaeis}) from the Good Friday liturgy. This also signaled what he hoped the Council would do when it addressed the relationship of the Catholic Church to the Jewish community.\footnote{Hans Küng, \textit{The Catholic Church: A Short History}, trans. John Bowden (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2001), 190-91. See also Richard P. McBrien, \textit{Lives of the Popes}, (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1997), 374, and Alberigo and Komonchak, eds., \textit{History of Vatican II}, Vol. I, 22. See note 8.} The Council followed the pattern that Pope John established whereby liturgical changes invited doctrinal changes. From the very beginning of the Council, the use of liturgical forms deepened and nurtured the Council's own identity. This new identity was different from the one that the Roman Curia had in mind before the Council members had even convened in Rome.\footnote{Alberigo and Komonchak, eds., \textit{History of Vatican II}, Vol. I, 54. See note 8.}

The second aspect of this moment is disclosed when Abbe Aimée-Georges Martimort, who had been a leading figure in the liturgical movement for several decades, suggested that the Commission use procedures that had been fruitful in that movement, such as the formation of working groups and daily revisions of texts that indicated the changes that had been suggested at the meeting before. This suggestion is best understood in light of a conflict that was brewing just days into the debate on the liturgy. Arcadio Maria Cardinal Larraona was the president of this Commission. His actions at the very first meeting can be characterized as an attempt to resist the influence of the decades-old liturgical movement itself. He attempted to give the advantage to the members of the Liturgy Commission who were members of the small faction opposed to the
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progressive moments at the Council. The other members who came from the mature liturgical movement had been influential in framing the schema on the liturgy. At that first meeting, Larraona tried to control the debate and to minimize the influence of people from the movement. He replaced Bishop Annibale Bugnini, another leading figure in the liturgical movement, with a member of the Curia as secretary of the Commission. Larraona also "passed over" Giacomo Cardinal Lercaro, who had an international reputation as a liturgist, for the position of vice-president of the Commission.87 Alongside this slighting of Cardinal Lercaro, Annibale Bugnini, who had been the secretary of the preparatory commission for the schema on the liturgy, was the only such secretary not appointed to the "corresponding conciliar commission."88 Larraona also made sure that Bugnini was "dismissed" from his teaching position at the Lateran University and also tried to take away Bugnini's chair of Liturgy at the Pontifical Urban University. The reasons given for Bugnini's dismissal were that he was "a progressivist," was "pushy," and was an "iconoclast" -- accusations emanating from the Congregation of Rites, the Congregation of Seminaries, and the Holy Office. Both Augustin Cardinal Bea and Cardinal Lercaro tried in vain to intervene on Bugnini's behalf.89

Bugnini reported that, before Martimort’s shrewd procedural suggestions were made, Larraona's stalling tactics controlled the first six meetings. All six meetings were taken up with "trifling matters of juridical procedures."90 The Council members were ready to give "definitive
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approval" to the schema on the liturgy very early and thus were frustrated with the "delaying tactics" employed at the sessions of the Commission. Martimort seems to have recognized this from the first day. Early in the debate, which began on October 22, Martimort began tracking a list of changes in the schema that the Commission had suggested. As the debate proceeded, criticisms of these changes were made and several of the members requested that they be given another copy of the original schema and a copy of the changes that had been suggested so that, as they continued their discussion, they could answer criticisms or make clarifications. The opportunity to make such a comparison was "repeatedly" called for but did not occur. To address this procedural difficulty Martimort drew up a structure of "internal regulations" that would act as a guide for the continued work of the Commission on this text. This is a very important instance of the collaborative style that emerged and flourished at the Council in the face of strong resistance. Bugnini summarized the impact of the debate on the schema on the liturgy this way:

Of the seven drafts contained in the first volume of the *Schemata* to be examined at the Council, the first four, which were doctrinal in nature, found little favor. The fact that the Council began by discussing these schemas meant that it had to enter into, and get lost in, a maze of theological discussions. It was precisely this that the bishops, in agreement with the intention of Pope John XXIII, wanted to avoid, in order to give an essentially pastoral stamp to the great ecumenical meeting. The members of the presidency and many bishops told the Pope of their misgivings. As a result, it was announced at the second general congregation on October 16, 1962, that the sacred liturgy was the first item on the agenda for examination by the Fathers. This action was an implicit acknowledgment of the maturity and importance of the
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theme. But this new agenda also had its risks, since being the first document also meant being a test case for the procedures of the Council. The Constitution passed the test. The large number of interventions showed the interest that the schema aroused among the Council Fathers.93

Because of the liturgical movement’s long history of collaboration and consultation, this Commission had ample resources from which to draw in order to comply with Pope John’s methodological guidelines. By using some of the processes and procedures employed in the liturgical movement, this Commission overcame the efforts of the Curia, and began to instantiate the new self-identity of the Council. The procedure that was most effective was supplying revised texts at each meeting. With this procedure in place, the Commission had texts ready at hand to use to show where the members had already discussed an issue and how they had moved on from it.

The final aspect of this third moment is the vote taken on the amended text of the liturgy schema on December 6, 1962. The total number of Council members voting was 2118. 1992 voted in favor of the schema without conditions. 180 voted in favor with the possibility of further changes (iuxta modum). Only 11 Council members rejected that version of the schema outright. Pope John’s words about this vote in his speech closing the first session affirm our claim about the strength that the trajectory had attained by the end of that session. He actually linked the revised schema to theological anthropology: "It was not by chance that the first schema to be considered was the one dealing with the sacred liturgy, which has to do with man’s relationship with God. This relationship is of the utmost importance which must be based upon the solid foundation of revelation and apostolic teaching, so as to contribute to man’s spiritual

good and to do so with a broadness of vision that avoids the superficiality and haste which often characterize human relationships." He also commented on the rocky beginning and claimed a solid victory for the forces that favored reform. His assessment of the first session supports Rahner’s claim that a world-Church was present and beginning to function at Vatican II.

The first session was like a slow and solemn introduction to the great work of the council -- a generous willingness to enter into the heart and substance of Our Lord’s plan. It was necessary for brothers, gathered together from afar around a common hearth, to make each other’s closer acquaintance; it was necessary for them to look at each other squarely in order to understand each other’s hearts; they had necessarily to describe their own experiences, reflecting the conditions of the apostolate under the most varied climates and circumstances, in order that there should be a thoughtful and profitable interchange of views on pastoral matters. In such a vast gathering it is understandable that a few days were needed to arrive at an agreement on a matter on which in all charity there existed with good reason sharply divergent views. But even this has a providential place in the triumph of truth, for it has shown to all the world the holy liberty that the sons of God enjoy in the Church.

In his characteristically positive style, Pope John managed to show how this conflict demonstrated both the appropriateness and the resiliency of human freedom at the Council. He recognized "the sharply divergent views" and used the fact that they "existed with good reason" to demonstrate the freedom of thought and dialogue he expected of the Church. A small faction was not pleased with the fact that the bishops had demanded "thoughtful and profitable interchange of views on pastoral matters." But Pope John made plain that he saw this as a positive and "providential" development at the Council. As he looked forward to the next

---
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session of the Council in his closing speech, he gave this description of what he hoped the next session would be like. "It will be a 'new Pentecost' indeed, which will cause the Church to renew her interior riches and to extend her maternal care in every sphere of human activity. It will be a new advance of the Kingdom of Christ in the world, an elevated and persuasive reaffirmation of the good news of redemption, a clarion call of God's kingship, of the brotherhood of men in charity, of the peace promised on earth to men of good will in accordance with God's good pleasure." In these remarks he echoes and advances the themes of his "Opening Speech." In so doing, he gives his approval to the Council's progressive movement. The strongest instance of this is when he refers to this progressive development as "providential" because, as we have seen, for Pope John, Providence is another way to describe the presence of the Holy Spirit.

a. The Liturgy Debate and Other Aspects of the Trajectory: Interpretations of Pope John’s Pastoral Method

In addition to the procedural aspects of the debate on the liturgy that fueled the trajectory, there are some texts and speeches concerning the liturgy that are also important to mention here. These speeches and texts had an impact especially with regard to the meaning of the word "pastoral." They occur early in the Council and display the conflict over the use of that word as a vague attitude, on the one hand, (which is how the anti-progressive faction used it), or, on the other hand, as the foundation of the Council's activity as the majority meant it. The meaning of the term "pastoral" is critical for describing the character of the trajectory. These texts and speeches will demonstrate that pastoral is another "cluster" word that gathers together the
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emphases of collaboration and confidence in the personal competence of the Council members with the Council's openness to dialogue with the world.\textsuperscript{97}

The first of these texts was issued in the name of the entire Council. As early as October 20th, just over a week after the Pope’s address, the Council members issued their own "Message to the World." The act of issuing such a message displayed the Council's growing acceptance of the Pope's request for collaboration; the Council members also instantiated their own pastoral competence in this message. This text began with the Pope’s pastoral focus on the proclamation of the Gospel for service to the human community.

We wish to convey to all men and to all nations the message of salvation, love and peace which Jesus Christ, Son of the Living God, brought to the world and entrusted to the Church. In fact, it is for this reason that we, the successors of the apostles, all united in prayer with Mary, the Mother of Jesus, forming one single apostolic body whose head is the successor of Peter, are gathered here at the invitation of His Holiness Pope John XXIII. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we intend in this meeting to seek the most effective ways of renewing ourselves and of becoming increasingly more faithful witnesses of the Gospel of Christ.\textsuperscript{98}

The Council members' message goes on to explain that they saw themselves as "pastors" who are responding to the "mandate of Christ" that they should devote all their "energies" toward giving greater understanding of God's "glory" to all people of the world.\textsuperscript{99} They wrote that the Council was "not estranged from earthly concerns and toils." In this way, they hoped to contribute to

\textsuperscript{97} We are referring again to McBrien's characterization of these kinds of concepts. See McBrien, \textit{Church: The Continuing Quest}, 67. See note 2.

\textsuperscript{98} \textit{Ibid.}, 45.

\textsuperscript{99} \textit{Ibid.}
"human welfare." They made plain that they intended to draw upon "science, the progress of the arts" as well as the progress of "technology" and "culture." They described themselves as those who are "entrusted" to convey God's care for "all peoples."

United here from every nation under heaven, we carry in our hearts the anxieties of all peoples entrusted to us, the anxieties of the body and soul, sorrows and desires, and hopes. We turn our mind constantly toward all anxieties afflicting men today. Our concern is directed especially to the more humble, the more poor, the weaker, and, in keeping with the example of Christ, we feel compassion for the throngs who suffer hunger, misery and ignorance.  

This message was not that of a pro forma gathering. It was a message from a group that shared an identity and mission, and who had been inspired by Pope John in his "Opening Speech."

The Council members concluded their message by aligning themselves with the heart of Pope’s John’s pastoral vision:

Here are two great problems facing us: In his broadcast of September 11, 1962, His Holiness Pope John XXIII stressed two points especially. First of all, he recommended everything that favors peace among peoples. There is no man who does not detest war and who does not ardentlly desire peace. This is the greatest wish of the Church who is the mother of all....

Because the Council members came from all over the world, this was particularly meaningful.

The message would eventually lead to the only anathema that the Council issued: the
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condemnation of war in *Gaudium et spes*. The message continued with Pope John's second concern:

Secondly, the Pope urges all to social justice. The doctrine outlined in the encyclical letter, *Mater et Magistra* (Mother and Teacher), clearly shows how the Church is needed by the world today to denounce injustices and shameful inequalities and to restore the true order of goods and things so that, according to the principles of the Gospel, the life of man may become more human. Therefore, we humbly and ardently invite all to collaborate with us to establish in the world a more ordered way of living and greater brotherhood. We invite all, not only our brothers of whom we are pastors, but all our brothers who believe in Christ and all men of good will whom "God...wishes...to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2: 4).

The last reference, to First Timothy's notion of universal salvation, would also become a central feature of the Council's document on the Church. The presumption of that document is that the human community is saved. (See *Lumen gentium*, 9.) This understanding of salvation is displayed very early in the October message. Referencing Pope John’s "Opening Speech" (as

---

102 *Gaudium et spes*, 77. "[T]he council proposes to set down the true and noble nature of peace, to condemn the savagery of war, and to encourage Christians to cooperate with all in securing a peace based on justice and charity and in promoting the means necessary to attain it, under the help of Christ, author of peace."


104 We find these references in the text of *Lumen gentium*, 9. Referring to the Church its says: "Established by Christ as a communion of life, love, and truth, it is taken up by him as the instrument for the salvation of all; as the light of the world and the salt of the earth it is sent forth into the whole world." It applies the principle of sacramentality in this section: "All those, who in faith look towards Jesus, the author of salvation and the source of unity and peace, God has gathered together and established as the church, that it may be for each and everyone the visible sacrament of this saving unity. In order to extend to all regions of the earth, it enters into human history, though it transcends at once all times and all boundaries between peoples."
well as other addresses he made prior to the Council) was a central tactic used by those in favor of reform. This "Message to the World" is one example of that strategy. It clearly followed the intentions that Pope John described in his "Opening Speech." As the Council continued, many of the Council members explicitly aligned themselves with that address.

Another way to clarify the meaning of "pastoral" as understood by the Council's majority is to describe how the anti-progressive faction understood it. Such a description can be seen in the lengths to which Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, Prefect of the Holy Office, went in trying to combat the influence of the more progressive Council members. One of the first tactics he used was to try to redefine the word pastoral; he attempted to show that what the Pope had really meant by this word was something altogether different than what most of the Council members took it to mean. Thus, in his intervention on November 14, 1962, he declared:

As regards the "pastoral tone," might I remind you that the foundation of all pastoral theology is provided by safe doctrine. The fact that this schema deals with primarily doctrine renders it likewise pastoral. These proposals have been prepared for a Council, hence they have nothing in common with an encyclical or a homily or a pastoral letter. Regarding the complaint that it has not been inspired by the so-called New Theology, might I remark that our teaching is traditional and will and must ever be the same.  

Cardinal Ottaviani's understanding of the word pastoral is not compatible with the Pope's "Opening Speech." For Pope John, "safe doctrine" did not necessarily eventuate in "pastoral tone." Pope John made his thinking clear in the "Opening Speech." The purpose of the speech was to explain the reason for calling the Council and his expectations for it. In it he said that the

\[\text{AS 1/3, 27. See also Xavier Rynne, Vatican Council II (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1999), 77. It is interesting to note that Cardinal Ottaviani's episcopal motto was "Semper idem" (Always the same).} \]
Council "was not necessary" to discuss "one article or another of fundamental doctrine." For Pope John the Council was necessary to bring a new pastoral approach to the way the doctrines are taught. The anti-progressive faction did not agree with this stated purpose.

Giuseppe Ruggieri, another contributor to Alberigo and Komonchak's *History of Vatican II*, offers this analysis of Cardinal Ottaviani’s tactic:

> The objection about the pastoral orientation was the real enemy to be overcome. Although he thought the objection without basis, Ottaviani could not say this openly, given the stance taken by the Pope. To his own mind the objection ignored the fact that the foundation of pastoral practice is concise clear teaching and that the conciliar style had been "stamped by the practice of centuries." Look elsewhere, not to a council, to find the pastoral expression of dogma. Without ever citing it, then, he could not have distanced himself more clearly from the Pope’s opening speech. Another objection, which pointed to the lack of any "breath of the new theology," ignored the fact that the "breath" of a council is that of the centuries, and not of one or another theological school, which is here today and tomorrow may be "cast into the oven."  

So while attempting to define the term "pastoral" to serve his understanding of the Council, Cardinal Ottaviani actually helped to crystallize the conciliar body's understanding of Pope John's intentions. In the citation above Cardinal Ottaviani does indeed "distance" himself from Pope John's understanding of the term.

Cardinal Ottaviani's secretary, Msgr. Salvatore Garofalo, made a report for the Theological Commission that also provided a description of the Cardinal's interpretation of the word "pastoral."

---


Our constitution is dogmatic, not disciplinary; even though what is said occasionally reflects the circumstances of the time, it must nonetheless be valid for the ages, since doctrinal statements of councils, even if they may be made more complete, are irreformable. Although errors are here and there explicitly mentioned and condemned..., this is because they are among the things which, as the Supreme Pontiff said in his opening allocution, "are so obviously in contrast with the right norm of honesty" and from their effects are easily seen by all to be erroneous.... Finally, the constitution is to be described as pastoral in character, since the clear statement of doctrine and its safeguarding and defense are very closely connected with the pastoral task and provide any pastoral undertaking with the solid foundation it needs.\textsuperscript{108}

This description of Pope John's understanding of "pastoral in character" ignores the surrounding language that the Pope used as well as his underlying notions of the Church and of the human person. The section that ends with the Pope's request for a "magisterium which is predominantly pastoral in character" reads this way: "But from the renewed, serene and tranquil adherence to all the teaching of the Church in its entirety and preciseness, as it still shines forth in the acts of the Council of Trent and First Vatican Council, the Christian, Catholic and apostolic spirit of the whole world expects a step forward toward doctrinal penetration and a formation of consciences in faithful and perfect conformity to the authentic doctrine which, however, should be studied and expounded through methods of research and through literary forms of modern thought."\textsuperscript{109}

Pope John brings the "dogmatic" and "disciplinary" aspects of teaching together; Garofalo draws a distinction between them. For Pope John the teaching should be "presented" in such a way that it provides a greater "penetration" into the mystery of God that it expresses. In addition, the

\textsuperscript{108} \textit{Ibid.}

teaching ought to actually influence the human conscience in such that it enables "conformity" to these same mysteries. Disciplines that flow from doctrines should do so as transparently as possible.

The contrast between these interventions by Cardinal Ottaviani and Mgr. Garofalo, on the one hand, and the majority of the Council members, on the other, display the two different ways of understanding the action of the Holy Spirit. The first understanding, the one held by Cardinal Ottaviani, regards the action of the Holy Spirit as a rather impersonal, supernatural power that resides most appropriately in the category of a thing; it can be possessed. It "belongs" to an office or a ritual action or a teaching. The understanding of the action of the Holy Spirit that was emerging at the Council in the first session displayed a different understanding of the Holy Spirit's "power." The actions of the Holy Spirit were seen as indications of the personal presence of God that enlivens the actions of human persons. These activities generate new life. They flow from a relationship; they do not flow from an impersonal power. When Pope John used the word pastoral, he was using a term that emphasized this long-standing relational approach to the action of the Holy Spirit. As James D. G. Dunn argued, the initial Christian insights about the Holy Spirit had to do with a new life in the Spirit. It is this new life with God, as personally present, that gives the Church and individual disciples whatever "power" they have. Dunn argues that Paul understood the life in the Spirit as flowing from "the long term experience of being shaped in accordance with the image of God in Christ." Dunn locates Romans as the central articulation of Paul's pneumatology. In that letter he finds the notion of "liberty" as the

---

central feature of Paul's pneumatology. The basic experience and manifestation of the Spirit, for Paul as for those before him, was life -- the Spirit as the animating breath of life. The distinguishing mark of the Spirit and the manifestations of the Spirit was their Jesus character -- the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ. This life in and with the Spirit was characterized by the free response to a relationship with God that is displayed particularly in the life Pope John's notion of a pastoral magisterium fits into this more relational understanding of the action of the Holy Spirit. As displayed at Vatican II, and in the mind of Pope John, the purpose of the Church is to enhance and enliven the Christian life as well as all human life. Because of this, it was necessary that the teaching magisterium be conversant with the actual life experience of the human community as it framed its teachings.

When Pope John used the word "pastoral" he presupposed this human capacity for freely judging goodness and truth; the "solid foundation" of his pastoral approach is confidence in the people's ability to recognize the stability of the fundamental truths even while the way those truths are expressed may vary and change over time. In this regard he echoes the Pauline emphasis on human persons as "shaped in accordance with the image of God." Msgr. Garofalo, on the other hand, used the term pastoral differently. He argued that texts that are "pastoral in character" are ones that fulfill the pastoral responsibility to condemn errors. He argued this way even though Pope John explicitly said that he did not want the Council to issue any condemnations. Pope John said that going to the "trouble" of calling a council was not necessary in order to point out errors. He said that it was no longer necessary for the Church to issue condemnations. When considered in light of the pneumatology that it presupposes, Garofalo's
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interpretation implicitly contradicted what Pope John meant by pastoral. Pope John called for a new life in the Church that flowed from the actual life on the Holy Spirit; he reminded the Council members of the Church's long history of reform. He described the process that was operative at an ecumenical council as both the guarding Christian doctrine and of teaching it "more efficaciously."1 This more efficacious teaching led to the various reforms that have occurred over time. Pope John called for new reforms directly in his "Opening Speech." He said, "[The Church] must ever look to the present, to the new conditions and new forms of life introduced into the modern world which have opened new avenues to the Catholic apostolate."1

He explicitly denied the notion of the irreformability of doctrine when he said that "the substance of the ancient doctrine of the Deposit of faith is one thing, and the way it is presented is another." Garofalo, in speaking for Cardinal Ottaviani, offers a stark example of the anti-progressive faction's attempts to resist reform while claiming to be working towards reform. It was a tactic employed repeatedly in the first session. The minority, or more properly the faction, did indeed understand the importance of the word "pastoral;" they saw that it was essential to the reforming identity emerging at the Council. This faction tried to undermine the reforming tendency by providing their own interpretation of the word. Various Council members responded by clarifying and thus strengthening what it meant for the Council to be "primarily pastoral in character."1

Several important interventions occurred during the General Congregation on October 23, 1962. Again we hear echoes of the "Opening Speech." When the discussion on the liturgy

---


moved into the discussion of episcopal conferences and of the use of the vernacular in the liturgy, many Council members expressed their support for the fact that the schema was "eminently pastoral." Melkite Patriarch Maximos IV Saigh put flesh on the bones of "pastoral" in his intervention. It is also worth noting that the Patriarch refused to speak in Latin (he spoke in French) and thus rejected the primacy of that language. In this he followed the pattern of the bella figura for which Pope John was so famous. In his Eastern garb and through his use of a non-Roman language, he illustrated how different forms can convey the same truth.

Even though the schema de sacra liturgia concerns only the Roman rite may I be permitted to bring to this debate the testimony of a Patriarch of the East who follows with interest the progress of the liturgical movement within the Latin Church.... I just want to comment on the principle involved in the heading that is given to paragraph 24 by saying that this heading is too absolute: Latinae linguae usus in liturgia occidentali servetur ("Latin must be preserved in the liturgy of the West.") It would seem to me that the nearly absolute value given to Latin in the liturgy, teaching, and administration of the Latin Church represents for the Oriental Church something abnormal.  

This speech is frequently quoted in studies of the Council because of the Patriarch's commanding presence and reputation and also because his intervention raised several theological issues. He began his argument against the principle that says, "Latin must be preserved in the liturgy of the West" by noting that Jesus spoke the language of his "contemporaries." He noted that the apostles and other disciples spoke the "language of the people." He argued that they "would never have thought" to "read passages from Scriptures" or "sing Psalms" or preach or "break bread" in a language that the people could not understand.  

---

116 AS 1/3, 377-79.

117 Ibid.
Paul for the heart of his argument. The situation in Paul that the Patriarch used involved language. St. Paul said he preferred using whatever language that would help people to best understand the Gospel; he cautioned against speaking in tongues because such speech might not be understood. He said that speaking in "this spiritual fashion" would not help the "uninstructed." The Patriarch said that the use of Latin had created similar problems in the global church. He, like St. Paul, would choose the language that communicated best.

St. Paul tells us explicitly: "If thou dost pronounce a blessing in this spiritual fashion, how can one who takes his place among the uninstructed say Amen to the thanksgiving. He cannot tell what they are saying. Thou, true enough, are duly giving thanks, but the other’s faith is not strengthened. Thank God. I can speak any of the tongues you use; but in the church, I would rather speak five words which my mind utters, for your instruction, than ten thousand in a strange tongue" (I Cor. 16-19). All the reasons invoked in favor of an intangible and liturgical Latin -- yet a dead language -- must cede before the clear and precise reasoning of the Apostle.\(^{118}\)

He noted that the Roman Church used Greek in the liturgy up until the third century because that was the language of the people. In this way, the Roman Church was applying a different principle than the one that sought to preserve Latin. He asked this rhetorical question about the Church's change to Latin in the 3rd century: "And if at that date she started to abandon Greek for Latin, it was precisely because Latin was becoming the language of the people. Why would she stop applying the principle today?"\(^{119}\)

\(^{118}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{119}\) *Ibid.*
The Patriarch observed that after the "first generations of Christian," new languages were introduced as the Church grew in different regions of the world. The first new language was Coptic and then others followed. "Starting from the fifth century" the language moved "in turn" to Armenian, Georgian, Ethiopian, Arab, Gothic, and Slavic. He contrasted this diversity in the East with the Roman Church.

As for the Western Church it was only during the Middle Ages that Latin came to be considered as the only universal language of the Roman civilization and of the Holy Empire in opposition to the tongues of the barbarian states that dominated Europe. It was then that the Church made Latin her official and sacred language. In the East, in contrast, we have never had the problem of liturgical language. All languages, in effect, are liturgical, according to the Psalmist, *Laudate dominum omnes gentes* -- in every language, whatever it may be, we must glorify God, preach the Gospel, and offer sacrifice. And we in the East, can never conceive bringing the faithful together and allowing then to pray in a language that they do not understand.\(^{120}\)

One of the things that made the Patriarch's interventions so memorable was that he spoke so directly and was not at all intimidated by the Roman bureaucracy. This is evident in the next part of his argument. "The Latin language is dead; but the Church remains living: and language, the vehicle of grace and of the Holy Spirit, must also remain living for it is for men and not for angels: no language should be considered untouchable."\(^{121}\) He argued that the decisions about language and its uses should be left to the local bishops; this emphasis upon the local community was central to the reasoning whereby the liturgy was adapted to different regions and cultures.

\(^{120}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{121}\) *Ibid.*
He made the following proposal which would have an impact on other Council documents, especially *Lumen gentium*, because of the way he construed episcopal authority.

I would propose to leave to the episcopal conferences in each region the responsibility of deciding if, and in what measure, it is convenient or not to adopt the living language in the liturgy. The text of the schema allows the episcopal conferences the right only to propose changes to the Holy Roman See, but an episcopal conference is not needed to make propositions. The episcopal conferences should not just have the power to propose but also to decide, reserving to the Holy See the right of approbation.

Here Patriarch Maximos IV Saigh displayed the important contribution that the patriarchs from the Eastern churches made at the Council. The Eastern churches understood the bishop of Rome to have the same unifying function in the Latin Church as the patriarchs have in their churches. Earlier in the Council they had expressed their displeasure at being seated after the Roman Curia. They correctly viewed the curial cardinal as bureaucrats; they were not leaders of local church communities. In addition, the patriarchs saw themselves in a distinct category from the individual bishops in the Western Church. They affirmed the papal ministry of unity for the Roman Church but they did not grant a view of the papacy that minimized the role and authority of the local bishop's responsibility for his church.

In this speech the Patriarch emphasized two components of a Church that is "pastoral in character." The first is the desire to take the worshipping community seriously. In this he enlisted the sacramental principle. His citation of St. Paul amounted to a description of that sacramental principle in action. Second, a pastoral Church will also take the local pastor seriously. Those bishops in the various local churches are the best judges of what liturgical rites

---

fill the needs of their communions. Maximos IV Saigh noted that this was the pattern of the early church. He wanted the bishops to be recognized in Rome as true pastoral leaders. When he also noted that an "ordinary layman" could make a proposition, he was emphasizing the freedom of the layman, while, at the same time, distinguishing the need for the freedom of the bishops as well. Other interventions on this day contained similar descriptions of this pastoral emphasis.

Maximos IV Saigh and Cardinal Ottaviani exemplify the opposing understandings of the pastoral emphasis. At the General Congregation on October 30, 1962, Cardinal Ottaviani protested the changes that were being suggested for the Eucharist. He asked, "Are we seeking to stir up wonder, or perhaps even scandal, among the Christian people, by introducing changes in so venerable a rite, that has been approved for so many centuries and is now so familiar? The rite of the Holy Mass should not be treated as if it were a piece of cloth to be refashioned according to the whim of each generation." His attitude towards the people was telling; they are characterized as those whom he does not wish to "stir up" or "scandalize." This indicated that Cardinal Ottaviani thought that the avoidance of scandal was more important to the people than was their wish for greater and more meaningful participation in the liturgy. Moreover, Ottaviani's use of "scandal" was theologically off the mark. A scandal is that which gives moral offense or has to do with leading another into sin. Sin was not at issue here; the long tradition of adapting liturgical forms was the issue. His understanding of the rite itself appeared to be precisely what Pope John had rejected just a week later as a "museum piece." A pastoral emphasis attends to both the experience of the people and the fundamental message of the
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Gospel for purposes of enabling people to live that message more deeply and more fully. This is the pastoral mission of the Church that was accepted and became an aspect of the trajectory in the first session. Patriarch Maximos displays the Council's willingness to reject one form and replace it with a new form.

While the trajectory was propelled into movement by early November, the anti-progressive minority was still powerful because of their control over the bureaucracy. What Giuseppe Cardinal Siri of Genoa had written in his diary the night before the Council opened was the stance of this faction throughout the Council.

I am afraid that at this Council we shall feel the influence -- not for good -- of a habit of activism that causes people to think little, study even less, and cast into the shadows the great problems of orthodoxy and truth. A pastoral outlook is taken to be a necessity, whereas, even besides being an inferior method, it is an erroneous intellectual position. In the second place, the cross, if I may use the word, will come as usual from the French and German worlds and from the underbrush of each, because they have never completely freed themselves from Protestant pressure and the Pragmatic Sanction. They are fine people, but they do not realize that they are the heirs of a mistake-ridden history. I believe, therefore, that the role of the Italians, of the Latins along with the men in the Curia, should be to settle matters, whether by filling in holes or by correcting false turns. Roman calm will help.¹²⁵

The French and German cardinals, whose actions the majority of the Council members applauded on the first day, and whom the Pope himself affirmed, are seen as "underbrush." Siri did not see Cardinals Liénart, Frings, Döpfner and König as apostolic pastors who are leaders of local churches, but rather as "heirs of a mistake-ridden history." In addition to this negative and

condescending assessment of theologically astute pastoral leadership, Cardinal Siri explicitly called the Pope’s methodology both an "inferior" and "an erroneous intellectual position."

While the progressive majority was functioning by the end of the first session of the Council, the anti-progressive faction continued to operate. Pope John continued to monitor the situation without directly interfering with the emerging identity of the Council as a body. After the General Congregation on November 7, 1962, Pope John granted a public audience to the some of the bishops who had requested it. His remarks described his understanding of the emphasis of the Council once again:

The business at hand is not to make a careful study of some old museum or of some school of thought from the past. No doubt this can be helpful -- just as a visit to ancient monuments can be helpful -- but it is not enough. We live to advance, appreciating at the same time whatever the past has to offer us in the line of experience. But we must move ever further onward along the road which Our Lord has opened up before us. The Christian life is not a collection of ancient customs.126

The Pope said that the "Christian life" requires moving "forward along a road which Our Lord has opened before us." The "customs" such as doctrines and ritual forms are not a "collection" of historically interesting items. For Pope John, these forms serve the Christian life; such service requires both an appreciation of the past and advances beyond it. He encouraged the rejection of forms that no were no longer fruitful by comparing them to "ancient customs." He said, "We live to advance…." Pope John was supporting the progressive majority's willingness to reject forms that had simply become customs" and to renew other forms and even to create new ones.

126 Wiltgen, The Rhine Flows into the Tiber, 40. See note 75.
By way of summarizing this section, we look to Hans Küng’s assessment of the first session. He described the "theological task" of the Council in his 1963 book, *The Council in Action: Theological Reflections on the Second Vatican Council*. Küng provided a summary description of the meaning of the pastoral quality of the Council: "The theological task of the Council can only consist in service of the Word of God. This means, in proclaiming the Gospel." Küng argued that the heart of this "service of the Word of God" is preaching. He recognized that it would be an "exaggeration to think" that an ecumenical council is primarily for preaching. But he also recognized that given the "great technical" forms of communication, Vatican II had a new opportunity. He suggested that the Council could "make the service of a positive proclamation of the Gospel its special aim." He pointed out that Pope John had already done so in his "Opening Speech" and that the Council members had also expressed this "aim" in their opening message. Here is his description of the kind of proclamation that the Pope and the Council members had already made:

A proclamation of the Gospel, then, for a new age with new needs and new difficulties, new anxieties and new hopes. A proclamation of the Gospel not stopping short at general and abstract statements but clearly focused on the special problems and possibilities of the actual present situation. A proclamation of the Gospel not in the language of the Middle Ages, or of Baroque, or of the nineteenth century, but talking the language of modern man -- soberly, relevantly, hopefully -- so as to reach the ears and hearts of modern men.\(^{128}\)


Küng said that he hoped that the Council would continue this kind of "proclamation." He argued that the central task of the Council is "to help the Church and Christendom and the whole world by what it proclaims." He further hoped that Vatican II would be "pastoral" and "directed towards the care of souls." He wrote, "It should not consist of scholastic or neo-scholastic textbook theology, full of terminology and concepts intelligible only to theologians, but to the truth of the Gospel, presented in terms intelligible to modern men; that truth which illuminates and comforts and gives joy. The proclamations of a council cannot simply be preaching, but they should be on the way towards preaching and the care of souls." Küng succinctly describes the progressive majority's intention: to reject forms of teaching, practice or ritual where necessary, to renew the same kinds of forms in light of the needs to the day and the willingness to create new forms to deal with new situations in the life of the Church. Küng’s analysis was verified by the contrast between the anti-pastoral faction and the emerging identity of the Council during the debate on the liturgy. It was also displayed in the fourth movement, to which we now turn.

F. The Fourth Movement: the Debate Regarding Revelation

Our description of the process that yielded Sacrosanctum concilium concentrated more on how the Council members instantiated the new theological anthropology and its attention to collaboration, respect for personal competence and dialogue, through the actual processes that they used in the formation of that document as well as in some of their interventions. The whole
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Council went on to be influenced by those processes because other Commissions adopted them in various ways. In addition to the substantive ideas that found their way into the document on the liturgy, (the full participation in the liturgy and the willingness of the Church to adapt the liturgy for the sake of greater participation) the way the debate on the liturgy was conducted makes it one of the most significant debates in the formation and forward movement of the trajectory of progressive ideas. The debate on revelation is equally important for advancing this trajectory. In this section we shall describe the debate on revelation; by the end of this debate, the trajectory is fully formed and well on its way. The first place in which we see the trajectory, then, is in the conciliar procedures more than in the speeches. Once the procedures were in place, their force began to be exerted primarily through key interventions. A theological consensus was developing among the bishops and theologians that would be displayed in the debates over the schema on revelation. In this section we shall follow our trajectory not by concentrating so much on how the Council developed procedures that displayed an expansive notion of freedom but, instead, we shall follow a more doctrinal path. Because there was a body of doctrine about revelation, especially from the Council of Trent, the issue of what the Church was going to teach about revelation was crucial in this debate. Of Dei verbum, which is the document that emerges from this debate, Archbishop Ermengildo Florit of Florence said "Because of its inner importance, as well as the many vicissitudes that it has undergone, the history of the draft of the constitution on Divine Revelation has fused with the history of this Council into a kind of unity." Archbishop Florit's observation is also an indication of the importance of this moment in the trajectory of the Council. He recognized this debate's crucial role even as the Council was going on.

Joseph Ratzinger, writing in 1969, argued for the importance of what he called the "human factor in Scripture" as a central issue in the debates over this text. He wrote that the emphasis upon the "human factor" was "theologically legitimate on the basis of the Christian conception of God, which has been shaped by the idea of incarnation, and which is centered precisely on the idea of the historical and human mediation of the eternal in the revelation of Christ." It was not so evident in 1962 that the debate would turn out the way that both Florit and Ratzinger observed. On November 12, 1962, Karl Rahner wrote to his friend and colleague, Herbert Vorgrimler, about the beginning of the discussion of the schema on revelation:

So this week the dogmatics is beginning here. I’m eager to see what happens, but I don’t have great hopes. Recently I wrote a Latin counter opinion on the first dogmatic schema [de Fontibus]. This afternoon all the German bishops were given it. The German speakers have produced 400 copies of it in fine style. Tomorrow I have to give a lecture to the South American bishops. Perhaps we shall collect a good one-third minority, which can prevent the worst. Frings is optimistic. Others like me are less so. Videbimus. Frings is also circulating about 2000 copies of a kind of schema which Ratzinger and I have produced. In my view its prospects are nil.

Rahner’s pessimism, although realistic at the time, turned out to be wrong. Perhaps Cardinal Frings, who was more optimistic at the time, was able to be more hopeful because he saw the Council’s identity emerging. In any case, the "kind of schema" that Ratzinger and Rahner produced proved to be very influential in the shaping of Dei verbum.

---


The discussion of the schema on revelation would turn out to be the most important debate of the entire Council in terms of doctrine. That debate laid the foundation for the debates on the rest of the texts, *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* in particular, because the debate on revelation presupposed a new pastoral ecclesiology that departed from the former juridical ecclesiology. We shall follow this discussion in order to show that by the end of the first session of the Council the majority of the Council members had begun to operate with the new theological anthropology that emphasized human freedom and required participation, respect for personal competence and dialogue. This understanding of freedom shaped all the other aspects of the Council’s dogmatic teachings. Because the discussion on revelation involved the operative understanding of the Church’s hierarchical magisterium, it necessarily made use of the fresh theological anthropology that we described in Chapter 2. In this section we shall demonstrate that the teaching of *Dei verbum* that emerges does indeed affirm this expansive notion of human freedom. With its acceptance and promulgation, the Council departed from the previous understanding of the human person in the institutional teachings of the Church. In so doing, it departed from the prior understandings of the Church and of the Holy Spirit as well.

*Dei Verbum*'s theology is central to the entire Council and to all of its documents because it deals with how the Church understands the truth of God's self-communication to the world. At the time of the Council, there were many people, especially in the curia whose rejected modern thought forms and who thought that they led to heresy. Modern Biblical scholarship was seen as a threat to the stable and unchanging interpretation of Scripture. In the preconciliar understanding of the Church's relationship to revelation, the teaching magisterium was responsible to interpret Scripture; modern historical consciousness was rejected by the magisterium especially what was labeled "modernism." In addition to this, the Holy Spirit was
seen as the guarantor of the magisterium's interpretation. The Council, in dialogue with Protestant biblical scholars in particular as well as under the leadership of Catholic biblical scholars like Cardinal Bea, wished to broaden the notion of revelation so that is made greater sense in terms of the emerging historical consciousness and its growing body of research. The Council also wished to deal with the alienation between the separated Christian communities and the Catholic Church. This too required rethinking God's self-communication to the human community.

a. The Schema *De Fontibus Revelationis*

Pope John’s "Opening Speech" is, once again, the point of reference in the speeches from this debate that display the progressive trajectory. Early in this debate the Pope himself noted the importance of his address for the future of the Council. On November 14, 1962, Pope John wrote in his diary:

> That disputes will arise can be foreseen. On the one hand, the draft [the preparatory schema] does not take into account the specific intentions of the Pope in his official discourses. On the other hand, a good eight cardinals, relying on these discourses, have discredited the main point of the draft. May the Lord help us and make us one.  

The tone of the debate on this schema was actually set on November 13, 1962, when the Theological Commission met to discuss the 160 observations sent by the bishops prior to their arrival at the Council. Sebastian Tromp, a Jesuit who was the secretary to this commission, referred to many of the observations as "heretical," thus dismissing them and in so doing turning

---

the atmosphere "icy." This idea that the purpose of the Council was to confront heresy ignored the Pope's "Opening Speech." It reflected Tromp's failure to accept that Vatican II was already in a different category from previous councils. Tromp and others in the anti-progressive faction did not agree that heresy was not at issue. This became especially evident because the topic of revelation involved a central doctrine of the Church.

There were several issues at stake in the "icy" atmosphere. The majority of the Council members who were on the Commission that met to discuss the schema *De Fontibus Revelationis* had already taken up Pope John’s challenge and were not interested in discussions that used the language of "heresy." As we have discussed, Vatican II was not called in the midst of an "outbreak" of heresy that threatened the universality of Church teaching. Nor was it called to discuss contemporary errors. Teaching encyclicals had become the method for dealing with such errors and Pope John had in fact, already continued in that papal tradition himself. The purpose of Pope John's Council was different from these others.

During the debate on revelation, several regional groups of bishops began to meet outside of the General Congregations in order to discuss the issues involved with the schema. One was led by Dom Helder Camara, Archbishop of Recife in Brazil; the intention of these meetings was to create an "affective geography" whereby representatives from all over the world could communicate and share ideas. So while the anti-progressive faction was thinking about "heresy," the majority of the Council members were gathering in order to strategize about how they would take up the Pope’s challenge. In this way, the bishops were actually instantiating the


characteristics of collaboration, respect for personal competence and dialogue that would eventually emerge as the characteristics of the Council's pneumatology.

b. Strategies of the Anti-Progressive Faction

The strategy that the anti-progressive faction used was to block the forward movement of the progressive trajectory; this involved rejecting Pope John's desire for a characteristically pastoral council. Cardinals Ottaviani and Manuel Cerejeira of Lisbon are representative of this posture. Instead of using their interventions to discuss the schema *De Fontibus*, they used them to critique the process. First, Cardinal Ottaviani criticized the Council members who had been discussing the schema with their *periti* and among themselves outside of the Congregation. He explained that in so doing they had usurped the prerogative that belonged only to the "Supreme Pontiff." This is a particularly ironic argument because the majority of the cardinals who opposed the schema did so on the ground that it did not reflect the intentions that Pope John XXIII described in his "Opening Speech." This small faction also criticized the fact that there were alternative schemata being drafted by some of the *periti*. Of these alternative schemata, one of the most important was crafted by Joseph Ratzinger and Karl Rahner. As Cardinal Ottaviani put it, "Here in the Council we have the right to propose amendments, but only to the schema proposed, not any other." Cardinal Cerejeira criticized the way the schema had been "leaked" to the press. Cardinal Siri appealed to Pius X’s condemnations of Modernism and

---
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claimed that the current situation required the same kind of action. Cardinals de Barros Camara, McIntyre, Caggiano and Ruffini all asked for debate on *De Fontibus* rather than on any alternative schema even though the majority of the members of the commission continued to argue that *De Fontibus* should simply be dismissed because it was completely inadequate. The interventions from the anti-progressive faction were designed to restrict freedom of dialogue and to retain control for the Roman Curia. The concern not to "spiritually disturb" the seminarians of the world was a particularly telling instance of this attitude. Cardinal Urbani of Venice, who voiced this concern, demonstrated that he thought of the seminarians as passive, easily misled people rather than as future pastoral leaders.

In contrast, Archbishop Emile Maurice Guerry of Cambrai in France framed one of the sharpest critiques that he made with reference to the "Opening Speech." "Our first duty as pastors is to teach our people doctrine that is complete and unadulterated, but in such a way that they can hear the word of God, understand it, accept it in faith, and finally, put it into practice in every area of their lives.... It is not the teaching that must be adapted but the way in which the teaching is presented." The reason for Cardinal Frings’ "optimism" that Rahner had described to his fellow theologian, Herbert Vorgrimler, was evident in the majority at this meeting; they voiced strong opposition to the schema because its notion of revelation was faulty and its notions


of Scripture and Tradition would offend the other Christian communities.\textsuperscript{144} And, they did so while also trying to counteract the kinds of interventions made by the anti-pastoral faction described above. These interventions that are cited above were made at the first meeting of the Commission for the document on revelation. They set the tone for the rest of the debate. The majority members were already well on the way to an outright rejection of the curia's schema, \textit{De Fontibus}. The anti-progressive faction began using their strategy of trying to block any changes in the text. In this way, they hoped to push \textit{De Fontibus} through.

Next we shall consider some of the important speeches surrounding the debate on \textit{De Fontibus} that moved the trajectory forward. These interventions constituted the most powerful strains in the trajectory; they will be picked up and expressed again and again. By the end of this first session debate, the trajectory was fully formed and had become the primary stance of the Council.\textsuperscript{145}

c. The Progressive Response

On November 14, Cardinal Liénart defined the position of the majority. He opened with a terse rejection of the entire schema.

\textsuperscript{144} \textit{Ibid.}, 80. See also Rynne, \textit{Vatican Council II}, 82. See note 105.

This schema does not please me. It is not adequate to the matter it purports to deal with, namely *Scripture and Tradition*. There are not and never have been two sources of revelation. There is only one fount of revelation, the word of God, the good news announced by the prophets and revealed by Christ. The Word of God is the unique source of revelation. This schema is a cold and scholastic formulation, while revelation is a supreme gift of God, God speaking directly to us. We should be thinking more along the lines of our separated brothers who have such a love and veneration for the Word of God. Our duty now is to cultivate the faith of our people and cease to condemn. Hence I propose this schema be entirely refashioned.\textsuperscript{146}

Liénart's suggestion that the schema be "refashioned" was prophetic. *De Fontibus* was rejected so strongly that Pope John eventually removed it from the Council and called for a new draft text. Before that happened however, many Council members explained the problems with the text. Criticisms similar to Liénart's were voiced again and again during the debate. The problems with *De Fontibus* were both political and theological. They were political in the sense that the "two sources of revelation" was an obstacle to the ecumenical dialogue that was so important to Pope John, as well as to other Council members. Cardinal Bea in particular, who was a biblical scholar, was greatly interested in ecumenical dialogue. Many Council members expressed the concern that the schema might in fact offend their guests from the other Christian communities. There were also grave theological problems with the text that many Council members pointed out.

Cardinal Frings spoke next and supported Liénart's position.

\textsuperscript{146} AS 1/3, 32. See also Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 77. See note 105.
professorial tone of the schemata, particularly those proposed by Professor Franzelin and also Professor Kleutgen… Here that approach is even further exaggerated. But what is even worse than the manner of presentation is the doctrine itself. Why speak of two sources of revelation? This is not traditional. Neither the Fathers, nor the scholastic theologians, nor St. Thomas himself, nor the previous councils knew anything about this way of explaining our teaching. It is not traditional and only in recent centuries, as a result of a false historicism, have certain theologians tried to explain the matter thus. What is said here about inspiration and inerrancy is at once offensive to our separated brothers in Christ and harmful to the proper liberty required in any scientific procedure. We are facing a conflict of schools given to diverse procedures, as was realized at the Tridentine synod four hundred years ago. It is not the business of a council to enter into discussions between Catholic theologians. Its task is to react against heresy, but not to interfere when there is no danger of such errors.¹⁴⁷

Frings' criticism of the text began with the purpose of the Council. He shrewdly appealed to Vatican I and to the complaints that where made during that council about the "professorial tone" of the texts. In this way he undercut the position of Cardinal Ottaviani and others of the same mind. They appealed to Vatican I often, and particularly to the need to remain in step with that council. Cardinal Frings also echoed the Pope's "Opening Speech" when he reminded the Council members that their task was not to correct errors; there were no such fundamental errors threatening the Church at that time. He argued that a conciliar text is influenced by theological discussions but it is not identical with such discussions. He characterized the arguments about "inspiration and inerrancy" as offensive to the other Christians at the Council. In addition, he pointed out that they ignored and were even "harmful" to the methods of modern research that the Pope affirmed in his "Opening Speech." The way inspiration and inerrancy were

characterized in the schema did not allow for the kind of "liberty" necessary for those modern methods.

Cardinal Bea also called for the rejection of the schema. He said in his intervention that the schema did not fulfill the Council’s task as described in the Pope’s "Opening Speech" nor did it respond to the "pastoral purpose" in the Council’s "Message to the World." \(^{148}\) Cardinal Bea claimed that the best way to instantiate the pastoral work called for in both addresses was to reject this schema that "runs counter" to the pastoral character of the Council. He directly cited the Pope John’s address in his intervention:

> This council has a message for the entire human community.... "The salient point of this council is not, therefore, a discussion of one article or another of the fundamental doctrine of the Church which has repeatedly been taught by the Fathers and by ancient and modern theologians, and which is presumed to be well known and familiar to all. For this a council was not necessary. But from the renewed, serene and tranquil adherence to all the teachings of the Church in its entirety and preciseness, as it still shines forth in the acts of the Council of Trent and the First Vatican Council, the Christian, Catholic and apostolic spirit of the whole world expects a step forward toward a doctrinal penetration and a formation of consciences in faithful and perfect conformity to the authentic doctrine which, however, should be studied and expounded through the methods of research and thought. \(^{149}\)

Cardinal Bea was deliberate in taking so much of his intervention time to quote Pope John's speech. In so doing, he claimed the intentions and methods of that speech for the majority of the Council members. All the members knew of Bea's stature as a biblical scholar and as a leading figure in ecumenical dialogue. When he cited Pope John, he laid down a marker of sorts that indicated the direction of both the document on revelation and of the Council as well.


\(^{149}\) *Ibid.*
Bea emphasized the pastoral character of the Council as Pope John defined it and said that *De Fontibus* "did not agree with the purpose set down by the Holy Father in summoning the Council." Rhetorically he asked, "What then did the pope have in mind?" Bea answered his own rhetorical question. He said that what the pope had in mind was: "...that the faith of the Church should be presented in all its integrity and purity, but in such a manner that it will be received today with benevolence. For we are shepherds.... What our times demand is a pastoral approach, demonstrating love and kindness that flow from our religion."\(^{150}\) Once again, the term pastoral had to do with an "approach" that was dialogic and open.

This line of reasoning continued on November 17th. Julius Cardinal Döpfner of Berlin raised the issue of tactics. He too picked up the ecumenical aspects of Pope John’s "Opening Speech." He asked the Council members to act in a "truly ecumenical" fashion instead of simply validating the teaching of the Roman Curia.\(^{151}\) Döpfner used his intervention to indicate the inappropriate stance of the Roman Curia towards the worldwide bishops.

The president of the Theological Commission [Cardinal Ottaviani] has informed us that in the preparation of this schema, which took two years, there was a general accord on the part of the participating theologians and prelates. Cardinals Liénart, Frings, Léger, Alfrink, Silva Henriquez, Bea and many others, however, have indicated just the opposite. Hence there is at least some doubt as to this accord and alleged unanimity. The regulations under which we operate specify that we can either accept, amend, or reject the schema. My impression is that the Theological Commission was too much under the influence of one school.... [T]here was no concern for any other tendencies. As an instance of this intransigence, I cite the fact that a proposal made by the Secretariat for Promoting Unity


[Cardinal Bea], with a view to collaborating with the Theological Commission, was turned down. It was therefore easy to foresee that dissension would arise in the Council, because in the Council one can speak freely and openly. This is no sign of any irreverence toward the Holy Father, for he is the one who has given us permission to discuss, amend or reject. Our right to judge is complete and we must finally vote. The schema, that we would like to propose, has been drawn up by theologians of various tendencies and is quite different in spirit from the one before us.\textsuperscript{152}

This speech made reference to the repeated criticisms of some curial cardinals, Cardinal Ottaviani in particular, who argued that the schema should be accepted because the commission had worked so long on it. The intervention also addressed the criticism that the Council members ought not challenge the text as a whole. Döpfner used the strong language of "intransigence" to describe the attitude expressed by Cardinal Ottaviani. He also refuted the characterization of those who rejected the text as one of "irreverence towards the Holy Father." He reminded the Council that Pope John is the very person who "gave us permission to discuss, amend or reject." Several council members noticed that the anti-progressive faction tried to use the person of the Pope to justify their own contradictions of him as well as their rejections of his intentions for the Council.

Even in the face of this speech (which was strongly applauded even though applause was not "allowed"), Cardinal Ottaviani insisted that under the Council rules members had only the options of accepting or amending a schema. He continued to claim that they were not allowed to reject one, as so many of the cardinals had requested. So, a point of order was called and Article 33.1 of the "Rules of Procedure" for the Council was read to the Congregation and recorded in the \textit{Acta}. It stated: "Each father may express his opinion with regard to each schema presented

\textsuperscript{152} \textit{Ibid.}
and ask either for its adoption, rejection or amendment."\textsuperscript{153} This demonstrated that the parties understood the high stakes in the debate over this text. Neither side moved from their position. However, both Article 33.1 and the large number of Council members who rejected the text supported the desire for a new text. The mind of the majority of the Council was clearly displayed during this debate. They rejected both the content and the approach of \textit{De Fontibus Revelationis}.

Another intervention during this debate actually harkens to Rahner’s argument regarding the relationship between Vatican II and the Council of Jerusalem. Bishop André Marie Charue of Namur, Belgium, said:

\begin{quote}
It is not up to the Council to do the work of the Holy Office or of theologians, but it is up to the Council not to set the stage for another Galileo incident! Our Council should imitate the Council of Jerusalem, and not put unbearable burdens on those outside the Church or the faith. The fact that the Church can house men of diverse opinions and attitudes gives us hope for the future.\textsuperscript{154}
\end{quote}

Emiel-Jozef de Smedt, the bishop of Bruges, in Belgium gave another speech which is important for both its contribution to our trajectory and because it is indicative of the new consciousness of a world-Church. He said that he spoke as a member of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. The Council members would have understood him to mean that he spoke for Pope John. This was the case because the Pope had created this Secretariat for the Council itself. This body did not emerge from the Roman Curia but was unique to the Council and had the same authoritative status as the Commissions from the Preparatory Period. (One might even argue that

\begin{footnotes}
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it had a *greater* authoritative voice precisely because it emerged as a part of the Council itself.) Bishop de Smedt informed the Council that the Secretariat for Promoting Unity head, Cardinal Bea, had offered to collaborate with the Theological Commission; however, the Theological Commission "never wished to reciprocate."\(^1\) We saw above that Cardinal Döpfner had alluded to the same invitation from Cardinal Bea. Cardinal Bea had suggested that the two commissions, the Theological Commission and the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, collaborate on their texts because of the importance of fundamental theology and ecumenical sensitivity for each. Bea’s invitation was rejected. In addition to reminding the Council of these events, Bishop de Smedt argued that the schema had "grave faults."\(^2\)

> It will not encourage a dialogue with non-Catholics, or represent progress, but a retreat... Today a new method has been discovered, thanks to which a precious dialogue has begun. The fruits of this method are apparent to all from the presence of the observer-delegates in this council hall. The hour is providential but also one of great seriousness. If the schema prepared by the Theological Commission is not modified, we shall be responsible for causing Vatican Council II to destroy a great hope. I speak of the hope of those who, like Pope John XXIII, are waiting in prayer and fasting for an important and significant step finally to be made in the direction of fraternal unity, the unity of those for whom Christ Our Lord offered this prayer: *Ut unum sint*.\(^3\)

Bishop de Smedt felt that the schema might "destroy" a hope of the Council: to make progress in ecumenical dialogue. He referred directly to the "observer-delegates." He again echoed Pope John when he referred to the prayer of "Christ Our Lord: that all may be one."

---
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Cardinals Bernard Jan Alfrink of Utrecht and Suenens made similar interventions.\(^{158}\)

Cardinal Ritter of St. Louis echoed the emphatic opening lines of the speeches of Cardinals Liénart and Frings: "The schema, *De Fontibus* must be rejected."\(^{159}\) The Melkite Patriarch of Antioch, Maximos IV Saigh, whose interventions were so important with regard to the liturgy schema, argued along the same lines. He too rejected the schema outright. He went on to explain his reasons for doing so. He pointed out how crucial the Council’s description of the Church would be in addressing the underlying problems displayed by the schema. He continued to address the Council in French, even though the Council members had been reminded that Latin was the official language to be used during the Congregations. Thus, by both his words and his actions, he was unrelenting in his rejection of the insular attitude of the Roman Curia.

What we expect is a peaceful and positive message, worthy of the attention of our separated brethren. The spirit of this schema is once again the spirit of the Counter-Reformation.... Since Vatican Council I only a partial and incomplete picture of the Church has been presented. The prerogatives of the Visible Head have been put in evidence in such an isolated way that the rest of the body of the Church seems dwarfish in comparison. We must reestablish the true proportions between the body and its head and thus give a truer and more complete picture. I ask once again that the schema on the Church and the hierarchy be submitted as soon as possible. Everything depends on that schema, because we can then take up pastoral and social questions. All of us await that moment.\(^{160}\)

Patriarch's intervention is was similar to Cardinal Liénart's, cited earlier. Patriarch Maximos called the Council's attention to another significant problem with the schema: the flawed

\(^{158}\) Ibid., 45-7.
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ecclesiology presupposed by it. His intervention was another indication of how strong the level of pressure for reform was in this first-session debate. The Council's identity was by now so well formed, as the Patriarch saw it, that he could refer to the actions it had taken in the past, albeit quite recent past. He could refer to this newly formed identity and he could depend upon it to apply to this flawed text in the same way that it had applied to the flawed procedures and to the weak parts of the schema on the liturgy. Most importantly, the Patriarch called attention to the central task before the Council: the completion of the "partial and incomplete picture of the Church" that was the legacy of Vatican I. Pope John had cited the need for a richer understanding of the Church's nature and mission in his inaugural speech. In that address his language was more subtle than in his previous texts announcing and describing the Council. Nonetheless, when Maximos requested a different ecclesiology he was building on Pope John's intentions for openness, collaboration and dialogue. One notices the attitude that the Pope expressed towards voices other than the Roman Curia:

The Council now beginning rises in the Church like daybreak, a forerunner of most splendid light. It is now only dawn. And already, at this first announcement of the rising day, how much sweetness fills our heart. Everything here breathes sanctity and arouses great joy. Let us contemplate the stars, which with their brightness augment the majesty of this temple. These stars, according to the testimony of the Apostle John (Apoc. 1: 20) are you, and with you we see shining around the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles, the golden candelabra. That is, the church is confided to you.\footnote{Anderson, \textit{Council Daybook}, 29. See note 23.}

Pope John identifies the gathered bishops, cardinals, and patriarchs as "the church." They are the "new dawn" and the "daybreak" of the Church. This is a new vision of the role of the
worldwide pastors in the Church. They are not functionaries or bureaucrats; they are the "brightness" of the "majesty of the temple."

Pope John developed this image of the Church as the finale to his opening message. "We see here with your important personalities, present in an attitude of great respect and cordial expectation, having come together in Rome from the five continents to represent the nations of the world." The Pope was referring to the experts and guests at the Council. They too were essential for the work of the Council. Pope John continued:

We might say that heaven and earth are united in the holding of the council -- the saints of heaven to protect our work, the faithful of the earth continuing in prayer to the Lord, and you, seconding the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in order that the work of all may correspond to the modern expectations and needs of the various peoples of the world. This requires of you serenity of mind, brotherly concord, moderation in proposals, dignity in discussion and wisdom in deliberation. God grant that your labors and your work, toward which the eyes of all peoples and the hopes of the entire world are turned, may abundantly fulfill the aspirations of all. Almighty God! In Thee we place all our confidence, not trusting in our own strength. Look down benignly upon these pastors of Thy Church. May the light of Thy supernal grace aid us in taking decisions and in making laws. Graciously hear the prayers which we pour forth to Thee in unanimity of faith, of voice and of mind.  

The Melkite Patriarch keenly drew upon this vision of the Council. Instead of a "dwarfish" body, he reminded the Council of that there is another picture of the Church. He underscores the importance of Pope John's vision of the "pastors of the Church" as being essential to all the Council's texts.

---
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Thus was Pope John’s "Opening Speech" the point of reference for the majority’s speeches regarding *De Fontibus*. Cardinal Silva Henriquez of Chile also appealed to this speech reminding the Congregation that the Pope had called for the "medicine of mercy."¹⁶⁴ Liénart, Frings, Léger, König, de Smedt, Alfrink, Suenens, Bea, Caggiano (who cited it extensively), Bengsch, Hoa Nguyen Van Hien, and Battaglia all cited directly from the speech. Ritter, Saigh, De Barros Camara, Guerry, Gargitter, Clemens Alba Palacios, Dom Butler, Lercaro, and Martin cited the main ideas of the speech without directly quoting it. By the end of the discussion on *De Fontibus* Archbishops Garrone of Toulouse and Hurley of South Africa, and Bishop Ancel of Lyons, summarized the majority position. Archbishop Garrone made the specific proposal that a new mixed commission be formed that would prepare an entirely new draft for the Constitution on Revelation.¹⁶⁵ Archbishop Denis Hurley said that the work of the preparatory commission was so "defective" that it was the "original sin of the Council."¹⁶⁶ Bishop Alfred Ancel suggested that, since it was clear that they would never achieve a two-thirds majority, they should ask the Holy Father to set up a new group in order to propose a new schema.¹⁶⁷ The majority was clearly united in both their rejection of *De Fontibus* and the reasons for that rejection. They appealed directly to Pope John’s vision of a pastoral Council and they made use of modern scholarship and methods of research as he had asked them to do.


¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 190-1


On November 21, 1962, Pope John intervened and withdrew the schema. In taking this action he gave his support to the Council's emerging self-consciousness. He also took a risk in doing this because he wanted to be seen as a "brother bishop" and not as the Supreme Pontiff who would subvert procedures. He did not want to appear to use the same tactics as the anti-progressive faction. However, many Council members had been seeking his help precisely because the anti-progressive faction was ignoring the mandate of the "Opening Speech." On November 20, Pope John had granted an audience to the Canadian bishops and it was there that Cardinal Léger asked to speak to the pope privately. With Cardinals Meyer and Montini, Léger suggested that the Pope's intervention was crucial. He also made the suggestion that the documents continue to be rewritten during the intersession.

Pope John responded to this debate and to the personal pleas of many Council members and withdrew the text. This action expressed important features of Pope John's understanding of the Petrine ministry. The first was his willingness to take the initiative. He had displayed this before, most notably in the announcement of the very Council itself and in the removal of the anti-Semitic Good Friday prayer. Secondly, he thought the "primacy" of his office was best displayed and exercised by listening to his brother bishops. Giuseppe Ruggieri argued, "It can be said, in still more relevant language, that the decision gave concrete expression to the synodal nature of the Petrine primacy." Another new stance was John XXIII's willingness to discuss

---


169 Of course, he would also include patriarchs, other pastors and all members of the Church as well as the human community. In this context though, what was under scrutiny was his stance towards the other bishops. That was a central issue before the Council.

teachings that had been codified since Trent. Especially for the Protestant observers, this sent a welcome signal that dialogue would actually occur. Pope John had not predetermined that certain topics were off limits; there would be open dialogue.171

During this debate on De Fontibus, a genuinely pastoral Council emerged because the pastors of the world-Church had begun to function as such. The Pope himself acted as the primary bishop among his brother bishops and not as a "Supreme Pontiff." By intervening, the Pope validated the activity and theology of the majority of the bishops. By now the trajectory had the momentum that would be sustained in the rest of the Council actions. Precisely when the trajectory was resisted, it gained strength and moved forward.

G. The Fifth Moment: The First-Session Debate on De Ecclesia

By the time this moment begins, the trajectory of progressive ideas had become the central movement of the Council. It is important to note that one speech that is very pertinent to this moment is Pope Paul VI's speech opening the second session; we shall deal with it in the next chapter. In this chapter our focus is on the first-session debate. This last movement requires less detailed discussion because the work of the progressive majority of the Council had coalesced by the time this debate opened. The most significant aspect of this moment is that it demonstrated what the leading cardinals had learned from the previous debates and procedural scuffles. They had learned specifically how to draw upon the existing processes and procedures of the Council, to craft new ones, and how to delegate important figures to speak for the majority. In this last movement, Cardinals Suenens, Lercaro and Liénart had consulted with one another before the debate and then made interventions that continued to push the Council in the

171 Ibid.
progressive direction. As we indicated earlier, Cardinal Suenens' speech is emblematic of this moment.

When the debate on the schema on the Church, *De Ecclesia*, began on December 1, we saw a similar movement from an anti-progressive text to one that was much closer to Pope John’s vision. However, this time the trajectory was in motion and the anti-progressive faction was not as effective when this debate began as it had been in slowing down the debates on the liturgy and on revelation. While the inadequate initial schema was never "removed" from discussion, Cardinal Suenens gave his speech that would yield a wholly new draft, during the intersession. It was so new, in fact, that it retained only remnants of ideas from the first schema.

Suenens’ speech, which had grown out of a pastoral letter that he had written to his diocese, reflected the thinking of many of the Council members. He suggested that, when the Council was drafting its texts on the Church, it should consider the Church’s "inner life" as well as the Church’s stance towards the wider human community. He used the terms that are now emblematic of this important speech: *Ecclesia ad intra* and *Ecclesia ad extra*. The Council responded with loud applause. In this speech, the foundation was laid for a more productive and, of course, pastoral approach to the text on the Church. This speech was given on December 4, 1962, just before the first session closed. It was affirmed in a speech on the next day by Cardinal Montini and on the 6th by Cardinal Lercaro. These were followed by the plan of work for the intersession. This plan's framework was the pastoral intention embodied in the Pope's "Opening Speech," which had provided the impetus for the progressive trajectory at the first session.

---

We shall consider some of these speeches in greater detail in the next chapter where we trace the trajectory in the texts of *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. While Cardinal Suenens' speech established the forward movement of the trajectory beginning with the debate on *De Fontibus*, that speech occurred on December 4, 1962. There are interventions beginning on December 1st that are also indicative of the fact that pastoral methodology had been embraced by the vast majority of the Council members. We shall take them up in the next chapter.

It is worth noting here that the majority of the members of the anti-progressive faction were not pastors of individual dioceses but were members of the Roman Curia and served bureaucratic functions. Many bishops followed the lead of figures like Liénart, Lercaro, Suenens and others in distinguishing between the bureaucratic and pastoral experiences. Many bishops and cardinals had to grow in their understanding of the importance of their role. However, they did so rapidly and the Council's identity as a pastoral council was in place by the end of this session. As we shall see when we consider the debate on the Church in greater detail, even this brief debate in the closing days of the first session displayed the Council's emerging self-consciousness as a world-Church.\(^\text{173}\) We turn to Pope John's reflections about the first session for a summary of this chapter.

**a. Pope John’s Closing Speech**

To summarize this moment, we shall note several remarks that Pope John made in his address that closed the first session. His description of the Council has the features of the

\(^{173}\) We are building upon Rahner's argument here. He wrote: "What we are saying is that the Second Vatican Council is the beginning of a tentative approach by the Church to the discovery and official realization of itself as a world-Church." See his "Basic Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council," 78. Also see 79-82. See note 68.
Council's emerging self-consciousness as a world-Church that was displayed in the first session. Pope John referred to the opening day of the Council as being still "vivid" in his mind. "[T]he vast assembly of bishops of the entire Catholic world, a gathering unique in history. The one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church was revealed to all humanity in the splendor of her perennial mission, in the solidity of her organization, in the persuasiveness and attractiveness of her teaching." The Pope continued with a brief commentary on the whole session and personal reflection on the future of the Church.

The first session was like a slow and solemn introduction to the great work of the council -- a generous willingness to enter into the heart and substance of Our Lord’s plan. It was necessary for brothers, gathered together from afar around a common hearth, to make each other’s closer acquaintance; it was necessary for them to look at each other squarely in order to understand each other’s hearts; they had necessarily to describe their own experiences, reflecting the conditions of the apostolate under the most varied climates and circumstances, in order that there should be a thoughtful and profitable interchange of views on pastoral matters.

Pope John described a world-wide community of bishops who came to the Council in order to reflect upon "the heart and substance" of the Gospel. He reminded the Council that they had had to "make each other's acquaintance." Having done so, they went on to become the kind of assembly for which he had hoped. These reminiscences lend support to the Council majority's progressive theology that served the pastoral intentions that they shared with Pope John. He described the way that the Council picked-up the ideas in this "Opening Speech" and developed

---


them in the debates over the various texts. Having made these observations about what the Council had done, he reflected upon the work that remained.

Today’s celebration does not bring the work to an end, rather the work that awaits all of us is of the greatest importance, which certainly was not the case during the recesses of previous councils. The conditions of modern life, however, make it easy to have rapid communications on all types of business, personal and apostolic. That activity will continue is made clear by the institution of a new commission composed of members of the Sacred College and of the episcopate and representing the universal Church…. Thus, the council really remains open during the next nine months of suspension of the ecumenical sessions properly so called. Each bishop, although preoccupied with his pastoral administration, should continue to study and investigate the schemata provided and whatever else may be sent later.  

The Pope said that even though the Council would not be in active session, it would continue to function. It could not have done this, nor would it have made any sense for Pope John to ask the Council members to do it, had not an identity been formed. He said that Council members would be able to sustain their work using "rapid means of communication" and other forms of on-going contact. Pope John described his hopes for the next session.

It will be a "new Pentecost" indeed, which will cause the Church to renew her interior riches and to extend her maternal care in every sphere of human activity. It will be a new adventure of the Kingdom of Christ in the world, an elevated and persuasive reaffirmation of the good news of redemption, a clarion call of God’s kingship, of the brotherhood of men in charity, of peace promised on earth to men of good will in accordance with God’s good pleasure…. There is much yet to be done, but you know that the Supreme Shepherd will have loving care of you in the pastoral activity which you exercise in your own dioceses, an activity which will not be dissociated from the

\[176\text{Ibid.}, 122.\]
preoccupations of the council.\textsuperscript{177}

Pope John indicated that he supported the work that the Council had done but that he also was well aware of the challenges that the Council would face in the future. As he had done in his "Opening Speech," he emphasized the positive aspects of the challenge and expressed his confidence in the bishops.

H. Conclusion

By the end of the first session of Vatican II, the Council has begun to operate with the kind of theological matrix that Congar described. By overcoming and moving beyond scholastic theological anthropology and then by drawing a closer connection between the Church and a developing notion of the Holy Spirit as a personal presence rather than as an impersonal power, the Council had begun to craft new teachings about the liturgy, Scripture and the Church in particular.

Giuseppe Alberigo argued in support the framework we have been employing. He wrote, "[T]o transcend the scholastic anthropology, to reintegrate pneumatology into ecclesiology, to go beyond the Church-State problematic, and to promote the unity of Christians without uniformism or "return"-- these were the great challenges that appeared already in 1962-1963."\textsuperscript{178} Alberigo observed a new theological anthropology at work. He also recognized that the Council had overcome the disconnection between ecclesiology and pneumatology which Congar had described in the decades before. Alberigo insisted that Pope John's call for a "leap forward"

\textsuperscript{177} \textit{Ibid.}, 120-21.

actually began at the first session.\textsuperscript{179} He described a collaborative, open conciliar meeting. He did not describe just another council that fit the pattern of most other councils. This observation supports Rahner’s argument that the world-Church did actually emerge at the first session.

Alberigo argued that this Council “involved all of Catholicism.”\textsuperscript{180}

We agree with him and claim further that it did so by its affirmation of the emphases that we distinguished: collaboration, the recognition and embrace of personal competencies and dialogue. This fundamentally sacramental tradition of collaboration and the underlying notion of the person that it presupposes was further ratified by the Council’s willingness to reject or change ritual or doctrinal forms that no longer effectively expressed the Gospel. In addition, the Council was willing and ready to re-vitalize older expressions or create entirely new ones. As we have seen, the pastoral approach and the progressive movement survived the anti-progressive faction's attempts to obstruct them. We shall see in the next chapter that this pastoral trajectory was so resilient that \textit{Lumen gentium} and \textit{Gaudium et spes} are saturated with its characteristics.

\textsuperscript{179} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{180} \textit{Ibid.}
CHAPTER FOUR

THE DOMINANT PNEUMATOLOGY IN LUMEN GENTIUM AND

GAUDIUM ET SPES

Pneumatology, like ecclesiology and theology as a whole, can only fully develop on the basis of what is experienced and realized in the life of the Church.¹ Yves Congar

A. Preliminaries

Yves Congar's historical and theological studies regarding the integration of theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology assisted the Council members as they re-established the proper bonds among these three. In this chapter we shall identify the pneumatological piece of this relationship since it is such a signal marker for the reformed ecclesiology. Congar's theology helped the Council to shift the understanding of the Holy Spirit towards the recognition of the Spirit as a personal presence and away from viewing the Spirit as an impersonal power. The Council drew upon this insight, and putting it together with its theological anthropology, it was able to craft a reformed theology of the Church. The pneumatology that had come to dominate was critical as the Council fashioned this reformed theology of the Church. In this reformed ecclesiology, the activities of the Church that are most open to the action of the Holy Spirit are participation, respect for personal competence and dialogue. These activities signal the Council's preferred pneumatology. They also often mark the Council's ecclesiology as well.

After the Council, Congar argued that "the elements of a true pneumatology" were indeed "present at the Second Vatican Council."² We have described most of the process that yielded

---

this new re-configuration; it occurred in the first session of the Council. In the second session, the relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology was solidly established. We argued in Chapter 3 that Pope John XXIII provided the Council with the theological and tools for the first part of the reforming movement. Pope Paul VI provided the next important step in this process by giving the Council a definition of the Church that was strongly bonded to Pope John's understanding of both the human person and of the Holy Spirit. In our study of the Council, we have discovered that Pope Paul's leadership with regard to the Council's definition of the Church was essential to the formulation of Lumen gentium and Gaudium et spes in particular. Pope Paul strengthened the bonds among theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology by using the concept of mystery. This concept lies at the heart of both the pneumatology and ecclesiology of the Council.

When we apply the understanding of the Council as an event and its dominant pneumatology to Lumen gentium and Gaudium et spes, we discover mystery's importance in both texts. Both texts understand the Church as a mystery of the human community's salvific relationship with God. Applying our hermeneutic legitimates our claim that the definition of the Church as a mystery is not just one of many statements that Lumen gentium makes about the nature and mission of the Church, it is the determinative one. It functions as a principle and guides the rest of Lumen gentium and other texts of the Council. The function of this principle is not to provide a balance with other ecclesiological ideas (such as the Church's hierarchical features); it dominates all the other ecclesiological statements. In addition, it acts as the key interpretive principle for the entire Council and for all of its texts.

\[2\text{ Ibid., 167.}\]
In 1967 Cardinal Suenens made this observation about Vatican II: "Because of the interplay of circumstances -- and of men -- certain emphases did not manage to have their full force for renewal. But the seeds are there, like unopened buds awaiting the sun: it will be the task of men moved by the Holy Spirit to draw out all the vital riches contained in the conciliar texts -- and, for that matter, in all that was said both inside and outside the Council hall, but which has become an integral part of Vatican II."³ In this Chapter we shall be identifying these "seeds" and "unopened buds." We shall apply the trajectory of progressive ideas and the Council's dominant pneumatology to the interpretation of the Council's two principal, Lumen gentium and Gaudium et spes. Our hope is that this interpretation will facilitate the next step towards the reception of the Council's "vital riches." The Council's pneumatology supports the claim that there is a dominant ecclesiology in the texts. We need no longer view the two descriptions of the nature and mission of the Church as equal. The reformed ecclesiology does dominate and it will be the one that guides the Church into the future. So, where we find the pneumatology, we also find the initial codifications of the reformed ecclesiology of Vatican II.

In addition to Congar, we shall continue to draw upon Karl Rahner's framework to illuminate the distinctive character of the Council. While he recognized that the characteristics of the "older European church" were still operative at Vatican II, he argued that "a qualitative leap" in the Church's self-understanding took place during the Council as well. He called this the "world-Church in actu."⁴ This "qualitative leap" is embedded in the two principal


ecclesiological texts of the Council. *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* are initial codifications of the reformed ecclesiology that was crafted by this emerging world-Church. This leap helped create Cardinal Suenens' "vital riches."

**a. Procedure**

We shall explore *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* in three ways. First, we shall explain in greater detail what we mean when we describe *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* as the initial codifications of the reformed ecclesiology. This reformed ecclesiology is anchored in the Catholic principle of sacramentality. Second, we shall explore Pope Paul VI's address opening the second session along with some limited discussion of the early debate on the Church. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate that the trajectory actually made it into the Council texts. Third, applying the Council as an event, we shall identify the Council's dominant pneumatology, in the texts themselves. This identification will also yield the Council's reformed ecclesiology. (This section has several parts because it involves a detailed exploration of the texts themselves.) As Congar has shown us, the best theology is most often a cluster of theologies; in framing its ecclesiology, the Council gathered together theological anthropology, Christology and pneumatology. Our application takes this theological integration into account.

**B. The Council's New Dogmatic Teaching on the Church**

*Lumen gentium* is the result of the Council's desire to formulate a comprehensive dogmatic teaching on the nature and mission of the Church. Such a teaching had never been officially crafted before Vatican II. Congar explained that this was not because the Church and
its theologians were unconcerned with ecclesiology but that ecclesiology was presupposed by other formulations about God, grace, Jesus Christ, etc.\textsuperscript{5} Formulations regarding these other topics were demanded by particular historical circumstances. Vatican II's time called for a formulation on the Church because of the challenges of modern society and thought forms especially historical consciousness. Hermann Pottmeyer observed that even the most definitive formulations of earlier councils underwent a process of reception that took decades and sometimes centuries.\textsuperscript{6} Conciliar teachings intend to codify or formulate the accrued wisdom of the Church's experience while remaining faithful to the Tradition. Only by being rooted in the Tradition can such teachings be received and thus incorporated into the life of the Church. They should not be understood as periodic teachings. When they emerge from a council, they do so with the expectation that they will serve the Church for a long time.\textsuperscript{7}

The most stable, and at the same time resilient, conciliar teachings are ones that reflect the principle of sacramentality. That fundamental principle undergirds all other principles in Catholic theology. It guards and maintains a proper balance between the human and divine in articulating God's on-going incarnate presence in the world. Vatican II's articulation of God's


\textsuperscript{7} While there have been twenty-one ecumenical councils, not all of them have turned out to be important. Hans Küng argued, "Every council and every decree of a council is to be understood historically and to be interpreted in relation to its time period." See "ecumenical council," in \textit{The HarperCollins Encyclopedia of Catholicism}, Richard P. McBrien, gen. ed., (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1995), 455-6.
on-going ecclesial presence in the world maintained this balance in its understanding of the nature and mission of the Church.

Sacramentality is crucial in the formulation of all theological teachings because of the nature of the divine/human encounter. Teachings about the Christian mysteries do not function as simple declarative statements but serve instead to guide the way the community thinks and speaks about the mystery of the relationship between God and the human community. Many theologians have pointed out the importance of understanding the way subjects and predicates function when they are used to described the mystery of God. Rahner observed that conciliar and theological formulas are "constantly in danger of being interpreted falsely." He noted that theological formulas are often interpreted in a monophysitic way that does not capture the truth of the divine and human relationship. Rahner argued that these formulations do not function in the same way that everyday statements function. Instead, they supply a framework or principle that, when applied, is faithful to the experience and tradition of the Christian community. Such formulations do not "explain" but they do "clarify." They provide a critical norm that can be

---

8 This is, of course, one of the most foundational principles of theological reflection. It is not, however, often recognized in the actual life of the Church as the Council documents are interpreted. It needs to be reinvigorated for use in interpreting conciliar and other magisterial documents.


11 Ibid., 290.

12 Ibid., 289.
interpreted as the Church comes into contact with new experiences and new ways of thinking about that particular mystery. Vatican II's formulations are concerned with God's presence in and involvement with the world and the human community; they too are concerned with a mystery of faith and not with a simple subject and predicate statement about things in the world. In order to have the kind of "fidelity" to Vatican II that Pottmeyer suggested, we must recognize that Vatican II's ecclesiological principle functions in this same way.

In addition to this basic characteristic, when theological principles are put to use, they also disclose a position that they are rejecting. For example, by applying the principle of sacramentality, the Christological formula from the Council of Chalcedon rejected monophysitism; it rejected an over-emphasis upon Jesus Christ's divinity. The principle of the Church as a mystery brings with it a similar rejection. It rejects an overly supernatural understanding of the Church. Richard McBrien argued that "Monophysitism is no less heretical for ecclesiology than it is for Christology."13 The over-emphasis upon the divine at the expense of the human in any sacramental reality is faulty. Attention to the principle of sacramentality requires keeping the human and the divine in proper balance, giving proper attention and emphasis to each. McBrien further argued that "if the Church were not so constitutively human as it is divine, it could not be called a mystery or a sacrament, just as earlier denials of the integral humanity of Jesus had the effect of undermining his role as a sacrament of encounter with God and, therefore, of redemption."14 The Church is also a mystery of redemption and must be understood as such. Any over-emphasis upon either the human or the divine "undermines"


14 Ibid., 109.
the Church's self-understanding. As codified and formulaic as conciliar teachings can be, they must be flexible enough to influence the actual life of the Church as they endure over time.

The best teachings are shaped by the sacramental principle that maintains this unity between the human and the divine. In order to properly interpret the teaching of *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*, we must identify the similar sacramental principle that shapes them. Vatican II's ecclesiological teachings are shaped with a similar attention to the unity between the human and the divine but they are framed in ways that take the historical, institutional character of the Church as their starting point.

Granting the character of these conciliar teachings, how do we establish that *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* do indeed have such an overarching principle? We do so by applying the Council as an event to the texts themselves to show that the character and concerns of the emerging world-Church *in actu* found their way into the text in the form of a principle.\(^\text{15}\) This task is another response to Rahner's question, "[W]hat follows if we apply the theology of this transition to the transition in which we are living today and for which Vatican II was a kind of ecclesiastical beginning?"\(^\text{16}\) Following the vision of Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI, the Council members understood that the Church had to re-conceive its relationship to the human community. We have established that this realization was building in the first session. During

---

\(^\text{15}\) When we use Rahner's language of the world-Church *in actu*, we understand that the Council did not fully become a world-Church. We follow Rahner and claim that during the Council, this self-understanding of the Church as a global Church did emerge but it did not fully achieve this self-understanding. Rahner argued that because it emerged and functioned at least to some degree, we can build upon that promise. Our argument is that there are traces of that self-understanding of the Church in the texts, especially *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*.

\(^\text{16}\) Rahner, "Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council," 84. See note 4.
the second session, under the leadership of Pope Paul VI, the Council was able to arrive at the initial re-definition of the Church that would allow for the transition toward a reformed Church that the Council members were determined to make. With the help of theologians like Congar and Rahner and others, and by drawing upon their own personal charisms, the Council members prudently crafted ecclesiological teachings that are anchored in the principle of sacramentality.

C. The New Pope Advances the Trajectory of Progressive Ideas

In 1970 McBrien described an "ambivalence" in the Council's texts especially with regard to the nature and mission of the Church. His summary analysis of the Council predicted both what Cardinal Suenens called "counterbalance" and what Pottmeyer called "juxtapositioning."

McBrien argued:

The drama of Vatican II consisted mainly in the historic struggle between the forces of change and the forces of conservatism, between proponents of essentialist thinking and the practitioners of historicist thought. But the underlying issues were not always resolved. And these unresolved conflicts are the basis of the council's theological ambivalence.\footnote{Richard P. McBrien, \textit{Church: The Continuing Quest} (Paramus, NJ and New York, NY: Newman Press, 1970), 25-6.}

McBrien's observation supports our claim that the trajectory of progressive ideas made its way into the texts along with vestiges of the "essentialist thinking." Using imagery from psychology, McBrien argued further that the conflicting notions of the Church especially in \textit{Lumen gentium} caused a "theological and spiritual schizophrenia" for many Catholics.\footnote{McBrien, \textit{The Remaking of the Church}, 20. See note 13.} What
McBrien called ambivalence and schizophrenia is the fundamental cause of the stalled reception of Vatican II. The conflicts that marked the event itself endure in these texts.

While this "theological ambivalence," this "theological and spiritual schizophrenia" resides in the texts, the trajectory of progressive ideas resides even more strongly. Because the Council achieved the status of an event, we can bring the character of that event to bear as we interpret the texts themselves. This trajectory trumps the ambivalence because it contains the Council's dominant pneumatology. Because of the close relationship between the Church and the Holy Spirit, this bond between pneumatology and ecclesiology, in *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* in particular, indicates that an essential principle is at work. In the event itself, the progressive ideas shaped a new identity for the Church. That new identity supercedes any vestiges of the former self-understanding of the Church and so must be included when the texts are interpreted. The Council as a body was not ambivalent about its new understanding of the Church's nature and mission. Because they understood the close relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology, (in large part because of Congar's influence) the Council members were very careful to craft their ecclesiology in light of their renewed understanding of the Holy Spirit.

We credit Pope Paul for taking the vision of Pope John and distilling it in such a way that the Council members were able to produce the sacramental teaching on the Church that is found in *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. While Pope Paul did not have the extraordinary personal warmth of Pope John, he was both pastorally and theologically astute. In his role as leader of the Council, he was able to draw upon the work of theologians like Congar and Rahner in order to give the Council the kind of theological tools necessary for framing the dogmatic statements about the Church that the times demanded. He provided the principle that the Council
went on to develop into its definition of the nature and mission of the Church. As we shall see, his description of the Church as "a mystery imbued with the hidden presence of God" has the potential to become a durable conciliar teaching.\(^{19}\)

Pope Paul understood that the Council's central task was a new teaching on the nature and mission of the Church. His speech opening the second session functioned for *Lumen gentium* as Pope John's inaugural address had functioned for the Council as a whole. The new Pope's opening address both acknowledged and advanced the reforming identity of the Council. In addition, Pope Paul gave the Council the fundamental principle that shaped *Lumen gentium*: the Church as a mystery of salvation. One way he did this was by clearly affirming the vision in Pope John XXIII's own opening speech at the first session.\(^{20}\) Pope Paul knew from his experience in the first session how intensely the anti-progressive faction disagreed with Pope John's vision. With full knowledge of the lengths to which that faction had gone to impede Pope John's vision, Pope Paul returned to *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia* in order to align himself with Pope John and with the Council's progressive impulse. In his opening address to the second session Pope Paul said, "[T]he principle concern of this session of the council will be to examine the intimate nature of the Church and to express in human language, so far as that is possible, a definition which will best reveal the Church's real, fundamental constitution and manifest its manifold mission of salvation."\(^{21}\) Pope Paul went on to lay down topics that signaled strong


\(^{20}\) Xavier Rynne claimed that then Cardinal Montini "had a hand in" Pope John's Opening Speech. He observed that Montini was the only Cardinal invited to stay in the papal apartments during the first session and so had easier access to Pope John. See Xavier Rynne, *Vatican Council II* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1999), 145.

support for the trajectory of progressive ideas. Because of this signal from Pope Paul, early in
the debate on the Church, the Council members were able to maintain the reforming tendency
that had been established in the first session.

Congar wrote a detailed summary of Pope Paul's address in his diary. We follow
Congar's description and analysis. He observed:

A very long, very structured address, read at some
moments with lively and eloquent feeling. The pope
clearly underscores the role of the bishops, whom he calls
"brothers in the episcopate," and says that they are heirs of
the apostolic college. He says that he wants to pray, study,
and discuss with them during the Council…. For quite a
while he addresses John XXIII directly, thus making him
present. He emphasizes the usefulness of the council,
something that some were a short while ago doubting, as if
papal authority were enough! He also emphasizes the
pastoral character of the present Council. There is no
question of simply preserving. What path is to be taken?
What is to be the starting point? Where are we to go?
There is only one answer to these key questions: Jesus
Christ. It is he who is our source, our way, our goal. The
pope says as much and develops the thought with a great
deal of power and emotional intensity…. A very strong,
very structured address which gives precise guidelines for
the work of the Council.\footnote{Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak, eds., \textit{History of Vatican II,} Vol. III,
(Maryknoll, NY: Orbis and Leuven: Belgium: Peeters, 2000), 38-9, note 151.}

Congar noticed that Pope Paul appealed to Pope John's vision of a pastoral Council. The new
Pope also indicated that the first session of the Council had laid to rest at least one aspect of the
pre-conciliar ecclesiology: the idea that the pope no longer required the episcopate in order to
formulate Church teaching. Pope Paul explicitly asked for the assistance of the bishops. He

\begin{flushright}
\footnote{Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak, eds., \textit{History of Vatican II,} Vol. III,
(Maryknoll, NY: Orbis and Leuven: Belgium: Peeters, 2000), 38-9, note 151.}
\end{flushright}
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cited the actions of the Council members that had already occurred in the first session to suggest the pattern that he hoped they would use as a guideline for the rest of the Council.

Alberto Melloni made an observation similar to Congar's that shows that the Council members sustained their progressive momentum and did indeed pick up Pope Paul's insights. He observed that even though the anti-progressive faction continued to make similar kinds of interventions, the bishops who spoke for the majority, and thus who supported the progressive movement, now spoke with a new confidence. They were able to disagree "calmly and without fear" because of the new self consciousness that had been established in the first session.23

Building upon this confidence, Pope Paul gave the topic of the Church new and sharper focus. When the majority of the Council members met with the same resistance that they had encountered in the first session during the debate on the Church, their new self-consciousness had become functional. From the very start of the second session they tried to act as the leaders of a new "world-Church" who functioned as "heirs of the apostolic college." Because they were framing the text on the Church, the way they functioned reflected the emerging understanding of the Holy Spirit's relationship to the Church. This underlying pneumatology had informed Pope John's vision and as Congar observed, Pope Paul very carefully structured that vision into his address. Because of this, the characteristics that signal the dominant pneumatology began to appear. Thus, as early as the second draft of the schema on the Church, our signal characteristics of collaboration, respect for personal competence and dialogue are displayed. Pope Paul VI's strong affirmation of Pope John's pastoral intentions and the Council's own self-consciousness as a reforming body of the world-Church contributed to the presence of the dominant pneumatology in *Lumen gentium*. A closer inspection of Pope Paul's address supports this claim. Pope Paul's

23 *Ibid.*, 44.
address helped generate the principle that is codified in *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. In the address, he brought Pope John's vision forward and in so doing, he gave impetus to the trajectory that was already well in motion.

There are several ways in which Pope Paul both affirmed and extended Pope John's vision. He described the Church as "one mystery of unity" that is "joined to another mystery of catholicity." He reflected the principle of sacramentality early in the text when he described the Church as a "human and divine phenomenon." He returned to Pope John's Pentecost theme by calling St. Peter's Basilica "a new cenacle," a new upper room. He ended his opening section by reminding the Council that the Holy Spirit was "present." He characterized the Spirit's activities as "vivifying, teaching, strengthening." In his greeting to the Council members, he displayed all three of the characteristics of the emerging pneumatology: collaboration, recognition of the personal competence of members of the Church and dialogue.

We find these characteristics first in his description of himself as "the least among you, the Servant of the Servants of God." He continued by saying that he regarded himself as a servant "[E]ven though he bears the keys of supreme office consigned to Peter by Christ the Lord." He told the Council members that he wished to "pray with" them, "speak with" them, "deliberate with" them and "to work with" them. He continued to strike this collaborative stance
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when he said, "[W]e declare to you that in our mind there is no intention of human predominance, no jealousy of exclusive power, but only the desire and the will to carry out the divine mandate which makes us, of you and among you, Brothers, the supreme shepherd, and which requires of you that you be His joy and glory, the 'communion of saints,' offering your fidelity, your loyalty, your collaboration." This is a description of a relationship among brother bishops and fellow ministers in the Church. It is not a description of the relationship between a superior and his subordinates.

One of the most important sections of Pope Paul's address is the long section where he praised Pope John. In this section, he addressed his remarks to "dear and venerated Pope John." Pope Paul placed himself alongside Pope John and explicitly affirmed John XXIII's "Opening Speech" and thus affirmed "the preeminence of the pastoral nature" of the Council. Pope Paul then said "That speech still echoes in our minds, pointing out to the council the path it has to take, thereby freeing us all from doubt and weariness which we may encounter along the difficult road we have undertaken." Thus did the new Pope acknowledge that there had been conflict and that there would be more. In so doing, he let the Council members know that he supported the progressive side of the conflict.

This section is worth citing at greater length because it contains Pope Paul's affirmation and extension of Pope John's intentions for the Council.
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O dear and venerated Pope John, may gratitude be rendered to you for having resolved -- doubtless under divine inspiration -- to convoque this council in order to open to the Church new horizons, and to tap the fresh spring water of the doctrine and grace of Christ our Lord and let it flow over the earth. Moved by no earthly motives or particular circumstances, but as if by divining heavenly counsels and penetrating into the dark and tormented needs of the modern age, you have gathered the broken thread of the First Vatican Council, and by that very fact you have banished the fear wrongly deduced from that council, as if the supreme powers conferred by Christ on the Roman Pontiff to govern and vivify the Church were sufficient without the assistance of ecumenical councils.  

There are several important points in this section of the address. Pope Paul described John XXIII as beloved and holy. The beginning of this section, where he is addressing Pope John directly, is framed like a prayer. In this way, Pope Paul echoed Pope John's own "Opening Speech." John XXIII had framed his beginning in a similar prayer-like fashion when he opened the Council "under the auspices of the Virgin Mother of God." Then Pope John had placed Vatican II in the context of the other ecumenical councils. Following him, Paul VI was even more explicit about Vatican II's relationship to the other councils and especially to the First Vatican Council. Pope Paul gave a very strong indication that he supported the direction that the Council had achieved under John XXIII's guidance.

The new Pope continued to address Pope John as though he were present. In this way, Pope Paul indicated that the second session was in continuity with "Pope John's council." Paul VI was not opening a new and different council.
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You have summoned your brothers in the episcopate, the successors of the Apostles, not only to continue the interrupted study and suspended legislation but to feel united with the Pope in a single body, to be comforted and directed by him "that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine be guarded and taught more effectively." But to the principal aim of the council you added another which is more urgent and at this time more salutary -- the pastoral aim -- when you declared: "nor is the primary purpose of our work to discuss one article or another of the fundamental doctrine of the Church," but rather, "to consider how to expound Church teaching in a manner demanded by the times."

Notice that Paul VI quoted directly from Pope John regarding the purpose of the Council. He also re-affirmed Pope John's "pastoral" style along with John XXIII's familiar desire to pay attention to what was "demanded by the times." He made use of Pope John's authority to re-affirm that the central topic of the second session would be the Church. These are instances of the affirmation of the trajectory of progressive ideas.

As Pope Paul continued, he elaborated on specific parts of John XXIII's speech. He described the tasks that Pope John had put before the Council. Some had just been initiated; some had actually been accomplished. For example, regarding the teaching authority of the Church, he described an "awakened" conscience which was "vital" and life-giving. He noted that the Council had already begun to teach in a "positive" way rather than by "condemning errors."

You have awakened in the conscience of the teaching authority of the Church the conviction that Christian doctrine is not merely truth to be investigated by reason illumined by faith, but teaching that can generate life and action; and that the authority of the Church is not limited to condemning contrary errors, but extends to the communication of positive and vital doctrine, and the source of its fecundity. The teaching office of the Church, which is neither wholly theoretical nor wholly negative,
must in the council manifest ever more the life-giving power of the message of Christ who said "...The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life" (John 6:64).

His description of the Council thus far supports our claim that it had come to function as Pope John had hoped it would.

Paul VI finished his invocation of Pope John by once again ratifying the "pastoral character" of the Council.

Hence we shall ever keep in mind the norms which you, the first Father of this Council have wisely laid down and which we may profitably repeat here: "Our task is not merely to guard this precious treasure, namely our Faith, as if we were only concerned with antiquity, but to dedicate ourselves with an earnest will and without fear to that work which our era demands of us, pursuing thus the path which the Church has followed for nearly 20 centuries. Hence, that method of presenting the truth must be used which is more in conformity with a magisterium prevalently pastoral in character."  

This address displayed the characteristics of the theological anthropology that underlay both the pneumatology and the reformed ecclesiology of Vatican II. However, the most important feature of the address is its strong affirmation of Pope John's pastoral approach. If there were any doubt that the new Pope would support John XXIII's agenda and vision, his opening words laid it to rest. Giuseppe Alberigo argued that with Pope Paul's opening address the Council "began for a third time." Alberigo argued that during the first session of the Council, Paul VI, then Cardinal Montini, was "unequivocal" in his support of Pope John's vision;
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the new pope was "explicit" in his determination to continue the Council as soon as he was elevated to the pontificate. Like Pope John, Cardinal Montini brought his own configuration of pastoral sensitivity and theological acuity to his role as pope. Even though Pope John was a trained historian, he did not consider himself, nor present himself as an intellectual. He was first and foremost a pastor. During the first session, Cardinal Montini had also displayed a similar pastoral focus and commitment to his local Church as had Pope John. But, in addition, Montini was an intellectual and seemed to have considered himself as such. Once he became pope, not only was he in support of John XXIII's reforming movement, he was personally attracted to the dynamic theological discussions that had become characteristic of the Council because of the presence of theologians like Chenu, Rahner, de Lubac, and Congar, not to mention many others. The new Pope indicated that the creative movement in which he had a hand in the first session would be extended in the next sessions.

Amidst these positive factors, Pope Paul was not ignorant of the tension that had surfaced in December of 1962 especially over the beginning debate on the Church. Paul VI had been actively involved in the intersession conflicts and he was well aware of the fact that, while the consensus of the large majority of the Council supported the pastoral aggiornamento -- over 80 percent, as Alberigo figured it -- the anti-progressive faction was more determined than ever. That faction also recognized that the consciousness of the Council had been transformed from a disparate group of bishops, many of whom were unprepared for the revolutionary character of Pope John's vision, into a still-maturing but functioning body that represented the newly emerging world-Church. Pope Paul was aware that the central issues of the Council had "come
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to light." These issues would require the acceptance or rejection of collaboration, the recognition of personal competence and dialogue, each in their own way. The primary issue where this conflict would play out was the nature and mission of the Church. This happened particularly with regard to its structure, the relationships between the Roman Church and other Christian traditions as well as other faith traditions and the relationship between Christian discipleship and contemporary society. So Pope Paul was very careful to quote directly from Pope John's inaugural address as a way to indicate that he would follow in Pope John's footsteps. Nevertheless, while Pope Paul's leadership was fruitful at this point in the Council, we must acknowledge that that is not the end of the story. Had it been, we may not have had to deal with the "schizophrenia" in the texts. However, since we must, it is important to acknowledge Pope Paul's role in that outcome as well.

While Pope Paul intended to support the progressive trajectory, at least as expressed in this address, he was eventually unable to fully resist the anti-progressive faction as strongly as had John XXIII. Some historical background will illuminate this fact and it is important to consider it because it helps further explain the ambivalence in Lumen gentium. This background has to do with the structures at the Council. Writing in December of the second session, Congar described the on-going impact of Pope John's conciliar structure that he called "John XXIII's original sin." The schemas had been written mostly by, and certainly under the direction of, the curial bureaucrats. The Commissions at the Council were framed around the offices in that same bureaucracy. The very structure of the Council gave a defining importance to the Congregations
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in the Vatican bureaucracy. This structure led to the tendency of some Commissions to act as experts in their area and thus to claim a higher authority than the Council members. Cardinal Ottaviani is the primary example of this autocratic style.

Congar and others recognized how troublesome this structure was. This was the case not only because it provided disproportionate power to the anti-progressive faction but also because it was ultimately ecclesiologically unsound. McBrien described one of the consequences of this situation as a "theory-and-practice gap."\(^{41}\) The new functions of the Church that would emerge as consequences of the reformed ecclesiology require collaboration, recognition of personal competence and dialogue. However, the underlying theory of the Church has not been stabilized as the new reformed ecclesiology and thus often does not leave room for collaboration, etc. This does not mean, however, that these characteristics did not make their way into the Council documents. As Pottmeyer argued, just because the reformed ecclesiology has not made it into the regular practice of the institutional Church, does not mean that it cannot be identified in the texts. We must not conclude that, because of this gap, the texts cannot be brought forward into the next phase in their interpretation.

The "theory-practice gap" can be mitigated by recognizing that *Lumen gentium* contains the new principle, of the Church as a mystery of salvation. That principle and its applications are structured into the text like a theme and its variations. In its day-to-day operation, the Congregation that was directing the debate on the Church, Cardinal Ottaviani's Holy Office, focused its attention upon specific applications of various principles rather than on the principle upon which the majority agreed. Because his office was accustomed to dealing with specific applications, it should be no surprise that it would follow this pattern. This led to mistaking the

applications for the principle itself. Because of this, the anti-progressive faction often insisted upon defining the forest in terms of individual trees. Congar observed, "This council still bears the weight of John XXIII's original sin, that of thinking of the commissions as corresponding to the Roman congregations. Not only did he make the presidents of the Congregations the presidents also of the commissions (first the preparatory, then the conciliar), but he conceived of the commissions on the model of the congregations, that is, as permanent committees dealing each with one area of business." In this way, the theory-practice gap can be traced back to the original conciliar structure. While the texts are not the only cause, they have contributed to the "gap."

Pope Paul did make several adjustments but never fully defined them and so the basic structure continued to function. However, if the Council as an event and the theology of the Holy Spirit, along with its underlying notion of the human person, are brought to bear on the interpretation of *Lumen gentium*, we can recognize the ambiguities that emerged for what they are. They are more accurately what McBrien called "residue." They are traces of the preconciliar ecclesiology that were left in the texts as a part of the conciliar process that strove for consensus; they were left in to satisfy the anti-progressive faction, as we saw in Chapter 3. In any case, they contradict the principle and are thus overwhelmed and superseded by it. *Lumen gentium*’s teaching is built upon a principle. Teachings endure when crafted in this way. It was left to the living Church to describe the particular applications of the new constitution on the Church. There is yet more to say about the attempts to deal with "John XXIII's original sin."
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Alberigo described the relationship between the various Commissions, the Coordinating Commission and the Secretary of State, Cardinal Amleto Cicognani, as a "new parallelogram of forces" that grew in influence during Pope Paul's leadership of the Council. While Pope Paul expanded the structure somewhat by strengthening the College of Moderators, Cardinal Felici was a member of that College which led the general meetings of the Council and he continued to be intransigent with regard to progressive ideas. Pope Paul never intervened strongly enough, nor did he ever fully define the relationships among all these Commissions, the Moderators, and the cardinals (and bishops) who, like Bea and Suenens, had become powerful voices at the first session. Nor did Paul VI clarify his own role at the Council. Thus, while it is true to say that Paul VI affirmed John XXIII's vision, the traction that the progressives had generated in the first session continued to be thwarted as the Council proceeded. Pope Paul never drew clear lines of authority; the failure to do so played out in many ways, the most stark example of which is the "Explanatory Note" that was added to Lumen gentium.44 So, while the trajectory was in full motion at the beginning of the second session, the same anti-progressive forces continued to try to counteract it. Nonetheless, we maintain our argument that the Council itself, as an event, was a progressive event and that the emerging self-consciousness of the Church as a world-Church did function at times. So, while Pope Paul was a force in this progressive movement early on in his pontificate, we recognize that he was not able to resist the anti-progressive faction's tactics. This is part of the reason why Rahner wrote that while the world-Church existed in actu at the Council, it is currently only in potentia. However, it was in actu often enough to frame a new ecclesiology. At the Council, the world-Church did function but it did not do so fully, nor in

such a way that its identity as world-Church could be sustained after the Council itself. Rahner wrote that the Council was "the event in church history in which the world-Church began hesitantly to act as such." He argued further that "it cannot be denied that the Church was officially manifested at the highest level at Vatican II for the first time as world-Church" even while he recognized that the European church still functioned at the Council and has continued to function in its aftermath.

Recognizing this historical background, it was still the case that Pope Paul's speech advanced the Council's forward movement so forcefully that the vision he shared with Pope John found its way into the texts. In addition to the general affirmation of John XXIII's vision, the address also contained the three characteristics that signal the pneumatology that we have identified. Dialogue is the characteristic that is given the most attention in the long citation above. He called for dialogue in his initial veneration of Pope John when he said that Pope John sought "new horizons" as well as "to tap the fresh spring water of the doctrine and grace of Christ." He rejected approaches that are nearly opposites to dialogue: condemnation, "wholly theoretical" or "wholly negative" ways of teaching, and the protection or "guarding" of doctrine as though it were an antique. Dialogue was displayed in his emphasis upon conscience, which presupposes personal competence as well. He used words such as "positive and vital" and
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"fecundity" to describe the approach to teaching Christian doctrine. Pope Paul also displayed a desire for collaboration and the recognition of the personal competence of the Council members in the section where he described the relationship between Vatican I and Vatican II. As he continued to address Pope John, he brought the Council members into the conversation when he rejected the incomplete ecclesiology of Vatican I with these words: "[A]s if by divining heavenly counsels and penetrating into the dark and tormented needs of the modern age, you have gathered the broken thread of the First Vatican Council, and by that very fact you have banished the fear wrongly deduced from that council, as if the supreme powers conferred by Christ on the Roman Pontiff to govern and vivify the Church were sufficient without the assistance of ecumenical councils." This is a strong rejection of the style of the papacy that marked the pontificates of many modern popes, Pius X and Pius XII especially. Pope Paul had already described the bishops as the "authentic successors" of the Apostles. He had in a fashion similar to John XXIII, compared the Council to a "new cenacle," a new upper room where the Apostles had experienced the presence of the Holy Spirit. Thus he saw the bishops as apostles; their origin was apostolic. He described the relationship between the bishops and the pope as one of unity; he assured them that he was not "motivated by a quest for human domination or by a concern for his own authority."
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deduced' understanding of the papacy's relationship to the episcopacy, he provided the theological foundation for such a rejection. The foundation was Christological; the Council members' fundamental purpose for gathering at Vatican II was "to proclaim Christ," to both themselves and to the rest of the world. He anchored the Council's work in the mission and person of Jesus Christ. He said, "Christ our beginning, Christ our life, and our guide, Christ our hope and our end." This Christological focus will be important when we describe the debate over *Lumen gentium*. The central section where we find this focus is below; Pope Paul gave an extended reflection upon the relationship between the Council and Christ and thus upon the Church's relationship to Christ:

O let this council have the full awareness of this relationship between ourselves and the blessed Jesus -- a relationship which is at once multiple and unique, fixed and stimulating, mysterious and crystal clear, binding and beatifying -- between this holy Church which we constitute and Christ from whom we come, by whom we live and toward whom we strive. Let no other light be shed on this council, but Christ the light of the world! Let no other truth be of interest to our minds, but the words of the Lord, our only master! Let no other aspiration guide us, but the desire to be absolutely faithful to Him! Let no other hope sustain us, but the one that, through the mediation of His word, strengthens our pitiful weakness.

Here we have what Congar might have called a carefully articulated "Christological reference."

Pope Paul wanted all the Council's deliberations to be framed by the person and mission of Jesus
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Christ. In this way, he subordinated all descriptions of the Church to this more fundamental reality.

Pope Paul explicitly said that the Council must carefully frame its teachings on the Church with "the full awareness of this relationship between ourselves and the blessed Jesus." He continued and said that "Christ is the source of redeemed humanity." The Church is the "earthly and mysterious" extension of that redemption. Given the context of this speech, the Pope was making plain that the Church cannot be seen as the "source" of redemption. Its self-understanding needed to be reconfigured in a new ecclesiology that recognized Christ as the source and center. In a very important section Pope Paul laid out the proper relationship. He prefaced the relationship by acknowledging Christ as "the Incarnate Word, the Son of God and the Son of Man, the Redeemer of the world, the Hope of humanity and its Supreme Master, the Good Shepherd, the Bread of Life, the High Priest and our Victim, the sole Mediator between God and men, the Saviour of the world, the eternal King of ages." He charged the Council to use the relationship between Christ and the Church as their "starting point." He described the Church as "His chosen ones, His disciples, His apostles, His witnesses, His ministers, His representatives and His living members together with the whole company of the faithful." He included both the principle of sacramentality and the eschatological character of the Church when he described it as "spiritual and visible, fraternal and hierarchical, temporal today and eternal tomorrow." He told the Council that if they kept these things in mind they would be
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"able to better understand the main objectives of this council." Since this section comes at the end of Pope Paul's reflection upon the Christology of the Council, is it fair to interpret these descriptions of Christ as the Pope's strong emphasis upon the relationship between the Christ and the "entire theology of the Church" which he expected Christ to "pervade." He used a variety descriptions of Jesus to make the point that only by making sure that Christ is at the center and foundation of the theology of the Church would the Council achieve its most important objective.

Pope Paul directed the Council to see their objectives first in terms of Jesus Christ. No other criterion outflanks this Christological focus. Having set up this theological framework, his next move was to name the explicit "objectives" of the Council in "four points." They were: "the knowledge, or -- if you prefer -- the awareness of the Church; its reform; the bringing together of all Christians in unity; the dialogue of the Church with the contemporary world." Here we have the Pope's full embrace of the reforming impulse of the Council up to that point. The preconciliar ecclesiology was rejected. It had to be rejected if the Council intended to frame a new theology of the Church. According to Pope Paul, that new theology must be saturated with Christ, and further, to achieve such a theology, the Council had to focus upon these four specific objectives.

Having already described the First Vatican Council's view of the ecumenical councils as "wrongly deduced," in this next section he continued to build towards his famous definition of the Church. That definition, which closes the Christological reflection, is: "The Church is a
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mystery; she is a reality imbued with the divine presence..."\(^{61}\) Pope Paul brought both Vatican I and *Mystici Corporis* into his discussion. In this way, he continued to demonstrate the level of theological reflection he expected from the Council. He was not calling for a simple re-iteration of either Vatican I or of *Mystici Corporis*. He was calling for a development beyond both. Immediately prior to this definition, he referred to the "celebrated encyclical of Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*.\(^{62}\) He said that it had "in part answered the Church's longing to express her nature in a full doctrinal form." "But," he said, it had features that also "served to spur" the Church to craft "a more exhaustive definition." He described the relationship between Vatican I and Vatican II this way:

The First Vatican Council treated of the subject and many external influences have caused it to receive attention from our students, both within the Church and without. Among these influences are the intensification of social life in temporal matters, the development of communications, the need to judge the various Christian denominations according to the true and univocal conception found in divine Revelation. It should not come as a surprise that, after 20 centuries in which both the Catholic and the other Christian bodies distinguished by the name of church have seen great geographical and historical development, there should still be need to enunciate a more precise definition of the true, profound and complete nature of the Church which Christ founded and the Apostles began to build.\(^{63}\)

There are several affirmations of the progressive movement of the Council in this section. The first is the Pope's judgment that both Vatican I and *Mystici Corporis* are incomplete expressions of the Church's "nature" in "full doctrinal form." Thus, he lends his support to the progressive
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group's argument that emerged from the debate over the schema on revelation. This argument stated that there is only one source of revelation as opposed to "two sources," one of which belongs exclusively to the Catholic tradition.

The consequence of this argument was that the other Christian communities should be "judged" not by their relationship to the Catholic tradition but, instead, by their relationship to Jesus Christ. Pope Paul called them "Christian denominations," not heretical or schismatic communities. This description of the "other Christian bodies" acted as a transition to the Pope's next set of reflections which concerned the Council's responsibility to dialogue with the situation of the whole human community. This required dialogue with wider society and culture. This marked Pope Paul's support for Cardinal Suenens' now famous two audiences for the Council: the Church *ad intra* and the Church *ad extra*. This was another way of rejecting the anti-progressive faction. One of the tactics that group had used to try to maintain control was to keep the conversation and the topics internal. With this fourth objective the Pope made plain that the Council should direct its gaze externally as well. The concerns of the human community must be the Church's concerns because they are Christ's concerns. In these ways, he signaled support for the progressive theology of the first session.

Next we move to explore how the Pope unpacked his "four objectives." The first is the "knowledge" or "awareness" of the Church. This objective required the crafting of a full definition of the self-understanding of the Church. Pope Paul said, "[T]he principle concern of this session of the council will be to examine the intimate nature of the Church and to express in human language, so far as that is possible, a definition which will best reveal the Church's real, fundamental constitution and manifest its manifold mission of salvation. The theological doctrine has the possibility of magnificent developments which merit the attentive consideration
of our separated brethren also and which, as we ardently hope, may make the path toward common agreement easier." The Pope called for a description of both the nature and the mission of the Church. Immediately after this explanation of the first objective, he indicated that such a "theological doctrine" will include the "attentive consideration" of the other Christian communities. In other words, the definition of the Church must include the other churches. This was yet another indication of the way the Pope parted company with the preconciliar ecclesiology and invited a truly reformed understanding of the Church.

The next objective is the reform of the Church. In this section Pope Paul linked this objective with the quest for holiness in the Church. He said the following of the reform and renewal of the "teaching regarding the different components of the visible and mystical body:"

"The importance of this doctrinal aspect of the council's work will be obvious to all: from it the Church can draw an illuminating, uplifting and sanctifying self-knowledge." In his explanation of this objective, the Pope returned to Christ. He asked that the "deliberations" be made with "the awareness of the relationship by which Christ is united to his Church." From this Christological starting-point he introduced the idea of the Church's sinfulness. He had, of course, framed the objective with the search for holiness, for sanctity and so the theology that follows here is sound. In searching for sanctity, one may find "a shadow, some defect, some stain." Finding such defects, the Pope said, would require the Church to "reform, correct, and set
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herself aright." These reforms should happen so that the Church would better conform to her "divine Model."\(^6\) The pope continued to connect Christ to each objective.

In the rest of his explanation of the objectives of the Council, Pope Paul called for renewal and reform. Like Pope John, he used language that invoked images of new life. Pope John had said that it was "only dawn."\(^6\) He also said, "The council now beginning rises in the church like daybreak, a forerunner of most splendid light."\(^6\) Pope Paul used language that harkened back to John XXIII. He called the Council a "new spring," and hoped that "energies" might be awakened that "at present lie dormant."\(^7\) He hoped for "rejuvenation" and used an image from John's Gospel that he thought gave a "good summary" of the process of reform. It is an image of fruitfulness and new life. He introduced it this way:

[The reform is] an honoring of tradition by stripping it of what is unworthy or defective so that it may be rendered firm and fruitful. Did not Jesus say to his disciples: "I am the true vine, and my Father is the vine-dresser. Every branch in me that bears no fruit he will take away; every branch that bears fruit he will cleanse, that it may bear more fruit" (John 15:1-2).\(^7\)

He ended his explanation of the objective of reform by again echoing Pope John's famous pair: the "deposit of faith" and "the way in which it is presented."\(^7\) Pope Paul said, "If faith and
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charity are the principles of her life, it is clear that no pains must be spared to make faith strong and joyful and to render Christian instruction and teaching methods more effective for attaining this vital end."

When he moved to the third objective, Christian unity, Paul VI called it the Council's "spiritual drama" and made direct reference to Pope John once again. He said this concern was "put before us by Pope John XXIII." Having invoked Pope John's authority, he advanced Pope John's vision. "The council aims at complete and universal ecumenicity -- that is what it desires, what it prays for and prepares for." Pope Paul was well aware that such an intention would never come about under the influence of the anti-progressive faction. As we have previously seen, in the first session that faction continued to define Protestants and Catholics in opposition to one another.

Having said this, Pope Paul turned to the representatives from the other Christian bodies. He greeted them and thanked them for their participation. He told them of his "deep sadness" because of their "prolonged separation." He asked their forgiveness. He said that the Church forgave any "injuries" that it had suffered. He told them that he recognized how "serious and complicated" were the questions that remain. Congar may have had the following section in mind when he described sections of the Pope's speech as "eloquent."

Our manner of speaking towards them [the Christian communities, including the ones that declined the invitation to observe] is friendly, completely sincere and loyal. We lay no snares. We are not motivated by temporal interests. We owe our Faith -- which we believe to be divine -- the most candid and firm attachment. But at the same time we are convinced that this does not constitute an obstacle to the
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desired understanding with our separated brethren, precisely because it is the truth of the Lord and therefore the principle of union, not of distinction or separation. At any rate we do not wish to make of our Faith an occasion for polemics. Secondly we look with reverence upon the true religious patrimony we share in common, which has been preserved and in part even well developed among our separated brethren. We are pleased to note the study made by those who seek sincerely to make known and to honor the treasures of truth and of genuine spirituality, in order to improve our relations with them…. Finally we wish to say, that aware of the enormous difficulties still in the way of the desired union, we humbly put our trust in God.\textsuperscript{75}

This third objective was part of Pope John's legacy. Pope Paul, however, advanced beyond Pope John both with his apology and with his detailed and informed description of the issues that unity would entail. On October 17, 1963 Pope Paul had an audience with the observers from the other Christian denominations. Congar was present at this event and he described Pope Paul's "spirit of openness" as even greater than Pope John's had been.\textsuperscript{76} This is an advance or development of Pope John's own vision.\textsuperscript{77} The Council members, (including Pope Paul while he was still a cardinal), had embraced John XXIII's vision, thus had they prepared the way for this advance.

Pope Paul called the fourth objective building "a bridge to the contemporary world." This objective came from Pope John and had also been developed by the initiative of the emerging world-Church that had come to consciousness at the first session. As we shall see, the famous Schema 13 that becomes \textit{Gaudium et spes}, will become the focal point for this

\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Ibid.}


\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Ibid.}
objective. In his address, Pope Paul gave his support to a document that would speak directly to the modern world. He began this way: "While the Church seeks to revive her interior life in the Spirit of the Lord -- thus distinguishing and separating herself from secular society in which she exists -- at the same time she is signalized as the life-giving ferment and the instrument of salvation of the world, both revealing and strengthening her missionary vocation, which is to treat mankind, in whatever condition it may be, as the object of her dedicated mission of communicating the teachings of the Gospels." As he continued, once again he invoked Pope John explicitly, "You yourselves, Venerable Brethren, have experienced this remarkable phenomenon. Indeed, you yourselves, when you were undertaking the labors of the first session, aglow with the opening words of Pope John XXIII, instantly felt the need of opening, as it were, the doors of this assembly, and shouting to the world a message of greeting, of brotherhood, and of hope." Pope Paul reminded the assembly that Pope John's vision for the Council had incited them to write their own "Message to the World." Reminding them of that message was another way that he affirmed the emerging self-consciousness at the first session. That message was the first, even if inchoate, action of that emerging world-Church. When he ended his discussion of this last objective, once again he echoed Pope John's speech. He took up the notion of a "new Pentecost" that has been so identified with Pope John and he made it his own. Describing the "bridge toward the contemporary world" he said:

78 We have discussed this history elsewhere. For good summaries see Xavier Rynne, Vatican Council II, 342-51, note 20 above; Alberigo and Komonchak, eds., History of Vatican II, Vol. III, 402-19, note 22 above; and Enda McDonagh, "The Church in the Modern World (Gaudium et Spes), in Hastings, ed., Modern Catholicism, 96-112, note 44 above.
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Singular and remarkable gesture this would be; it could be said that the prophetic gift of the holy Church had suddenly burst into expression. And as Peter on the day of Pentecost felt the impulse at once to raise his voice and to speak to the people, so you also have unexpectedly determined to treat no longer of your own limited affairs but rather those of the world, no longer to conduct a dialogue among yourselves but rather to open one with the world. This means Venerable Brethren, that the present council is characterized by love, by the most comprehensive and compelling love, by a love which thinks of others even before it thinks of itself -- by the universal love of Christ.\textsuperscript{81}

This is one example of what Congar described as the "very structured" quality of the address.

Paul VI returned again and again to Pope John and to Christ. This structure was threaded throughout the address.

Pope Paul affirmed the direction that the Council had achieved by the end of the first session and thus helped to cement the presence of both the renewed theological anthropology and pneumatology in the Council texts as they were completed in the ensuing sessions. In each of his four objectives we can see the characteristics that signal the pneumatology that found its way into \textit{Lumen gentium} and \textit{Gaudium et spes}. Pope Paul's opening address validated both Pope John's vision and the intentions of the progressive trajectory at the first session. In this address, Paul VI explicitly supported the emerging world-Church of the Council. When taking up the objectives that the Pope outlined, the Council members were able to take the progressive ideas and include them in their texts. They used Pope Paul's definition of the Church as a mystery and his four specific objectives to do this. We now turn to identify the traces of the reformed theologies, especially pneumatology, beginning with \textit{Lumen gentium}. Our description of these traces in \textit{Gaudium et spes} will follow.

\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Ibid.}, 149.
D. The Progressive Trajectory Embedded in *Lumen Gentium*

Since the notion of mystery lays the foundation for the Council's understanding of both the Holy Spirit and of the Church, we shall begin with a discussion of that notion specifically. It is the foundational principle to which all the structures, practices and teachings of the Church must answer. It is the central theme of the document. The subsequent chapters are all applications of this principle, variations upon this theme. They cannot be appropriately understood as equally important themes in themselves. For example, Chapter 2, "The People of God" is dependent upon the Church's definition as a mystery first and foremost. Thus, mystery is both methodologically and materially central to the text. This notion of mystery is the focal point for the principle of sacramentality in the text. Gérard Philips called *Lumen gentium* the "vitally important centre" of Vatican II and argued that all the other documents "must be read in the light of the mystery of the Church."82 The Church as a mystery of salvation, at the invitation of Pope Paul, was properly grounded in what Congar had called the "Christological reference."83

In addition to other theologians, who like Philips, contributed to the important *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, once again, we shall draw primarily upon Congar to explain how mystery is used in *Lumen gentium*.84 We enlist Congar because his work has assisted us in identifying a true pneumatology in the Council's texts.85 We saw in Chapter 2 that

---


84 Congar also contributed to the *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*.

85 Congar was, of course, a *peritus* at the Council and helped to write both *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. 
Congar was very influential in the re-configuration of the relationships among theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology that occurred at Vatican II. The first instance of this re-configuration is in the actual methodology of *Lumen gentium*. Recall that Congar argued that a proper theological anthropology was essential for the theologies of the Church and the Holy Spirit. A highly sacramental, incarnational theological anthropology must be the foundation of the methodology for both. By way of the notion of mystery, we find such an anthropology in *Lumen gentium*.

Recall also from our previous discussions that Congar's re-configuration accounts for modern thought and the new disciplines that it brought with it, new notions of the Church and richer understandings of the Holy Spirit. He used the descriptions of "pneumatological anthropology" and "pneumatological ecclesiology" to provide focus for reforms. Thus did he attach the Holy Spirit and the Church by aligning them with a proper understanding of the human relationship with God. He also located this attachment between the Church and the Holy Spirit in his notion of a Christological reference. With each of these moves, Congar re-aligned the human and the divine thus overcoming McBrien's ecclesiological "Monophysitism." When we apply Congar's Christological reference, which is an expression of the principle of sacramentality, we can identify where his more complex theological integration is present in the documents. The Christological reference is one of the signals of the integration among theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology.


In his Chapter on the pneumatology of Vatican II in *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, Congar argued:

The Council preserved the Christological reference which is fundamentally biblical and the essential condition for the soundness of any pneumatology. The pneumatology of the Council is not pneumatocentric. It stresses that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ; [the Spirit] carries out the work of Christ and builds up the Body of Christ. Again and again, the Holy Spirit is called the principle of the life of that Body, which is the Church.  

We agree with Congar that the pneumatology of the Council was not pneumatocentric. Rather, it was anchored in the reality of God's relationship to the human community as proclaimed by Jesus Christ's mission; it was Christocentric. Congar understood that the emphasis upon Jesus was the necessary first step towards a renewed understanding of the Holy Spirit. Because the Council laid the foundation of the human community's relationship with Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit came to be seen once again as God's on-going personal presence rather than as an impersonal "power." When the Council members sought to maintain this Christological reference in such a way as to account for the Holy Spirit's in-dwelling presence in the human person and in the community, they did so by turning to a principle that would unite them. That principle is mystery; it both presupposes and maintains the Christological reference.

Mystery points to the human community's constitutive relationship with God. The Church is first a sacrament of this mystery. By anchoring the Church in this foundation, the Council used the notion of mystery to test whether or not an ecclesial form was life-giving, or a teaching was fruitful, or whether a liturgical ritual ought to be preserved or a new one invented. In other words, using Pope Paul's definition of the Church, "a reality imbued with the hidden

---

88 Ibid., 167-8.
presence of God," the Council crafted a new ecclesiological principle. The Council applied this definition of the Church to the questions raised by its time and re-configured structures, practices, and teachings accordingly. Such a method reflected Congar's understanding of the Council's pneumatology where he observed a notion of the Church that was grounded in the entire mystery of God's involvement with the human community. Congar argued:

The Council went beyond what Mühlen called a "pre-Trinitarian monotheism." Whereas the idea of God that predominated in Vatican I was not explicitly Trinitarian, the teaching contained in several of the documents of the Second Vatican Council is based on a Trinitarian view of the "economy" of creation and grace. This applies to the principle that the Father's initiative led to the mission of the Word, the Son, and that of the Spirit.…

In the preconciliar ecclesiology, the activity of the Holy Spirit had become disconnected from the "actions" of Creation and Incarnation and Redemption; it was understood most often as either a highly impersonal power that "belonged" to the Church, particularly to its rituals and official teachings, or as a highly individual experience that was most often located in private devotion. In this way, the Holy Spirit was seen less as God's personal presence and more as a supernatural power. This did not enrich the Christian understanding that God's unity is tripersonal. As we have previously argued, this led to a and understanding of grace as a kind of commodity in contrast to the proper understanding of grace as "God's free and forgiving self-communication that enables humans to share in the Trinitarian relationship of love."  


of defining Church as mystery and proceeding to apply that notion in the rest of the text is a move towards describing the action of the Holy Spirit in the Church in this more relational, less impersonal way. Beginning with the mystery of the relationship between God and the human community opened the way for an understanding of the third person in the Trinity as a personal presence to the Church rather than as the power behind the juridical structures in the Church.

In contrast to the preconciliar notion of the Holy Spirit, Congar argued that Vatican II's pneumatology is properly Trinitarian. The Theological Commission laid the foundation for this in the chapters for the working schema during the second session. They were: 1. The Mystery of the Church, 2. The Hierarchical Constitution of the Church and the Episcopate in Particular, 3. The People of God and the Laity in Particular, and 4. The Call to Holiness in the Church. All four of these topics reflected the attention to the broader question of the nature and mission of the Church rather than to the more narrow questions of the first schema. Congar argued that the acceptance of this framework was a "definitive 'parting of the way'" at the Council. By placing the institutional character of the Church within the context of the Church as a mystery, the Council had set the parameters for the definition of its nature and mission soundly within both "pneumatological anthropology" and "pneumatological ecclesiology." This framework allowed the Council to recognize and consider the institutional aspects of the Church which had grown so complex over time. In addition, the Council was able to attend to these institutional aspects.

---
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95 Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 122. See note 86.
aspects in such a way that some of those aspects could be recognized as dependent upon, and secondary to, the more fundamental aspects of the Church's mission: namely the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Once again, we see Congar's Christological reference.

After Pope Paul's address, his ideas were taken up in the Commission that was drafting the Constitution on the Church. On October 1, the first vote of the second session on the overall acceptability of the new 4 chapter schema was taken. Melloni described it as a "plebiscite" on the new "base text." The new text was approved by 2231 Council members; only 43 voted against it. This vote reflected what Phillips called the "two tendencies" among the Council members that persisted into the second session. One tendency was concerned with "abstract principles and clear definitions" while the other was "more realistic" in its own concern that the text be anchored in the "sources of faith." The 2231 members who voted in support of the schema belonged to the group that emphasized "sources of faith" over "abstract principles and clear definitions." We see again how strongly the progressive self-consciousness had come into its ascendancy.

The anti-progressive faction also seems to have come to a new self-consciousness. They recognized that their primary focus ought not be trying to convince the majority of the Council members. They would not be able to succeed with them precisely because the Council's pastoral identity was firmly in place and the trajectory towards reform was in full motion by the second session. They chose a new tactic which was to work directly on influencing Pope Paul. One of

96 Ibid., 45.

the ways that they did this was to "demonize" the majority. This shift in tactics had an impact on several other texts and it eventually led to the addition of the "Explanatory note," to *Lumen gentium*. Whatever other consequences these tactics brought, they did not prevent mystery from becoming the framework for *Lumen gentium*. With this overwhelming vote, a new methodology for the "Constitution on the Church" was accepted at the Council.

E. Mystery as Methodological Principle in Chapter 1 of *Lumen gentium*

In this section we shall proceed through *Lumen gentium* and identify where the trajectory of progressives ideas found its way into the actual text. As we noted in the previous section, the notion of the Church as a mystery operates in two ways in the text. It provides the methodological principle that guides all the chapters. It also introduces substantive new teaching on the Church. This section is a discussion of mystery as the methodological principle in the text.

Pope Paul had been explicit in anchoring his understanding of the Church in mystery. Early in his inaugural address Paul VI had said, "It is not futile to realize, right from this first moment, the human and divine phenomenon that we are bringing about." The first place where we find mystery used as a principle is when the Council members echoed Pope Paul's inaugural address in their own opening of *Lumen gentium* when they wrote: "Since the church, in Christ, is a sacrament -- a sign and instrument, that is, of communion with God and of the unity of the

---

98 Alberigo and Komonchak, eds., *History of Vatican II*, Vol. III, 498. See note 22. This tactic is well documented; however, that story is not one that we need recount here. Our task is to demonstrate that the notion of God's on-going presence we have described actually made it into *Lumen gentium* and then later into *Gaudium et spes*.
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entire human race -- it here proposes, for the benefit of the faithful and of the entire world, to
describe more clearly, and in the tradition laid down by earlier councils, its own nature and
universal mission."\textsuperscript{100} This opening was not only an introduction; it was the conceptual frame for
the rest of the text. If the Council can only be understood in terms of the trajectory that gave it
its identity, as Pottmeyer and others have claimed, \textit{Lumen gentium} can only be understood in
terms of the trajectory that is found in this first Chapter. The shift from defining the Church as
an institution, to defining it as a mystery, also grounded the Church's nature and its mission in
the principle of sacramentality. The understanding of a sacrament, a visible sign of an invisible
grace, is actually a corollary to the Catholic notion of mystery. The rest of the text must be read
in light of this foundation in sacramentality. Because it carries with it a theological anthropology
that is properly sacramental, it is also a marker for the pneumatology of Vatican II.

We find this principle articulated in other places in Chapter 1. The second most
important instance of this methodological use of the notions of mystery and sacrament occurs in
article 8.

\begin{quote}
The one mediator, Christ, established and constantly
sustains here on earth his holy church, the community of
faith, hope and charity, as a visible structure through which
he communicates truth and grace to everyone. But, the
society equipped with hierarchical structures and the
mystical body of Christ, the visible society and the spiritual
community, the earthly church and the church endowed
with heavenly riches, are not to be thought of as two
realities. On the contrary, they form one complex reality
comprising a human and a divine element.\textsuperscript{101}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{100} \textit{Lumen gentium}, 1. We are using this translation of the documents: Austin
Flannery, gen. ed., \textit{Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents} (Northport, NY:

\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Lumen gentium}, 8.
Here the text describes the bond between the human and the divine in all facets of the Church. The text did not abandon the emphasis upon institutional forms but it did bring them into line with the greater reality towards which they must always point and by which they must always be judged and evaluated: God's on-going presence to the whole human community. And the understanding of that presence is explicitly recognized as a "truth and grace" communicated to "everyone" not only to members of the Church. In this way, the text returned to the teaching of the *imago Dei* in a way that dealt with the problems of the modern world. Pottmeyer argued that this is where the text overcame "confessional narrowness" and found "elements of sanctification and of truth" beyond the "visible confines" of the institutional Church. The text was able to display this openness because it had defined the Church as a mystery.

Congar identified Article 8 as the foundation of the Council's "resolution" of the problems created by the preconciliar definition of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ. He argued that this text, in contrast, included the best aspects of the Mystical Body ecclesiology while it also maintained a Christological reference that was able to include a Trinitarian focus, or to use his language, it made room for the doctrines of Creation, Redemption and Grace. In *Lumen Gentium*, there is a comparison between the visible and the spiritual, between the human and the divine, aspects of the Church and the union of the two natures in Christ. This comparison is made for the purpose of attributing to the Holy Spirit the task of animating the Church as an event here and now: "Just as the assumed nature inseparably united to the divine Word serves him as a living instrument of salvation, so, in a similar way, does the communal structure of the Church serve Christ's Spirit who vivifies it by way of building up the body" (LG 8, 1).

---


The Spirit, then, is not an impersonal force -- the creed, after all, describes him as "Lord." He remains the Spirit of Christ.\textsuperscript{104}

The text Congar cites occurs in Article 8. It summarizes and seals the methodology of the rest of the text. It is a distillation of the trajectory of progressive ideas that was strengthened by Pope Paul in his address. It describes God's on-going presence to the human community in ecclesiological terms as the Holy Spirit which animates the Church's relationship to the saving action of God in Christ. The rest of the text follows this pattern that emphasizes the unity between the human and the divine. Thus the presence of God to the Church is, as Congar said, no longer seen as an impersonal force but instead as a living relationship. In such a relationship, the theological anthropology that is a consequence of the mystery of the Incarnation, is an essential component of the theology of the Church. Thus \textit{Lumen gentium} achieved the "pneumatological anthropology" that Congar had observed in the richest ecclesiologies in the Church's past but that was nearly absent in the preconciliar ecclesiology.

The next chapters: "The People of God," "The Church is Hierarchical," "The Laity," "The Universal Call to Holiness," "Religious," "The Pilgrim Church," and "Our Lady," all display attention to this same integration among theological anthropology, ecclesiology and pneumatology. They develop the methodology of the first chapter on mystery by applying it to distinct, substantive features of the Church. Each chapter introduces new content to the description of the nature and mission of the Church. But each is anchored in the Church's constitutive characteristic: the Church as a mystery of God's on-going presence. Using our hermeneutic, each of these subsequent chapters is an application of the first chapter. Thus, "The

\textsuperscript{104} \textit{Ibid.}
People of God" is one way to characterize the mystery of the Church. Chapter Two: "The Church is Hierarchical" is not another parallel description of the Church, but, is instead, a rediscovery of how the hierarchical structure of the Church also displays the mystery of the divine and human encounter. As we identify these substantive changes in the ecclesiology, we shall continue to demonstrate how the principle of mystery shapes Lumen gentium using the three characteristics we identified as signals of Vatican II's pneumatology: collaboration, respect for personal competence and dialogue. We shall also identify the presence of the Council as an event and Congar's Christological reference since they also signal the presence of the pneumatology and the reformed ecclesiology that it yields. Because they are often quite well integrated, at times ecclesiology will disclose pneumatology and, at other times, pneumatology will disclose ecclesiology.

F. Mystery's Material Presence in Lumen gentium

Defining the Church as a mystery is not just a methodological reform, it is also a substantive reform in Lumen gentium. The opening lines of Lumen gentium reflect the Church's desire for collaboration, its recognition that human persons are valued, competent partners in relationship at the same time that it states the Church's invitation to dialogue.

Christ is the light of the nations and consequently this holy synod, gathered together in the holy Spirit, ardently desires to bring all humanity that light of Christ which is resplendent on the face of the church, by proclaiming his Gospel to every creature (see Mk 16: 15)…. The present situation lends greater urgency to this duty of the church, so that all people, who nowadays are drawn ever more closely together by social, technical and cultural bonds, may achieve full unity in Christ.105

105 Lumen gentium, 1
The Council described a Church that respects all of the human community. The Church "desires" that all humanity be unified in the "light of Christ." The language displays not a "Church militant," as did the initial schema, rather, it describes a Church that invites participation and dialogue. It describes the Church's task as the proclamation of the Gospel. According to this Gospel, God desires "communion" with the "entire human race" and further desires the unity among all people. This is the "mission" of the Church. This mission is described as urgent. In order to accomplish this mission, the Church recognizes the importance of the "social, technical, and cultural bonds." The Church is described as wishing to "benefit" both the members of the Church, that is, "the faithful" and also "the entire world." There is an attitude of service instead of coercion in the opening. The Church is not described in terms of its possession of the power of the Holy Spirit. Rather, its relationship to the Holy Spirit is one of cooperation; the Church is "gathered together in the Holy Spirit."

In Article 2, *Lumen gentium* describes the Creation and connects God's "mysterious design" with God's desire to "share God's own divine life" with men and women. This relationship is given as an offer. As Article 3 continues, it describes the "work of redemption" that is "carried out" in the "sacrament of the Eucharistic bread." This sacrament is "expressed and achieved" by way of the "unity of believers." The sacramental action is not described as a power that is passively received by the community; God's "power" is described as growing "visibly in the world."

The richest section of Chapter 1 with regard to collaboration is Article 4. Here the pneumatology is quite explicit. This section is an extended meditation upon Pentecost. The text
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describes that event in terms of the nature and mission of the Church articulated at the beginning
of the constitution. The Holy Spirit was sent to "sanctify the Church continually." God's
presence is described as on-going and stable. God is described in terms of a continual presence,
not as an impersonal power. And further, the purpose of this presence is so that "believers might
have access to the Father through Christ in the one Spirit." The language of access develops the
notion of an invitation to a collaborative relationship. The activities that characterize this
relationship "in the Spirit" are creative. The Spirit is described as the "spirit of life" and
compared to "water springing up." The Spirit "dwells" both in the Church and in the "hearts of
the faithful." The Spirit "prays," and "bears witness." The Spirit guides, unites, bestows, directs
and adorns. The Spirit's action upon the Church "rejuvenates" and renews. The Spirit leads the
Church towards its goal of union with the human community and with God. These actions all
call for the collaborative participation and response of the human community. When power is
described it is not linked to office, teaching or ritual but is connected to the "access" to the
relationship with God.

Article 5 contributed to the reformed ecclesiology of the Council by subordinating the
institutional Church to the Reign of God. The purpose of the Church is the service to the
ultimate fulfillment of the Reign of God. This involves first and foremost service to the human
community. The pneumatology is implicit in this move away from the Church as fundamentally
organizational and towards a more pastoral Church that brings the Gospel of Jesus Christ to bear
as it responds to its own mission to help bring about the Reign of God. Article 5 states that "the
Spirit promised by the Father" enables the Church to receive "the mission of proclaiming and
establishing among all peoples the kingdom of Christ and of God." The Spirit "equipped" the
Church with "the gifts" of Jesus Christ. This is one of the most significant ecclesiological
changes of direction at Vatican II. Article 5's emphasis upon the Church's eschatological character signaled the Council's rejection of the triumphalism of the preconciliar ecclesiology where the Catholic Church was viewed as the earthly equivalent of the Kingdom, or Reign of God. In this application of the principle of mystery, the Reign of God and the Church are "inseparable" but they are not the same. The Spirit's presence in the Church allows it to be "the seed and the beginning" of God's Reign.

Article 6 shifts into a description of the biblical images for the Church. Each of these descriptions is pastoral. None are images of power or control. They describe places where relationships occur and are nourished, and thus, it displays collaboration, respect for personal competence and dialogue. The Church is a sheepfold, a farm, a vineyard and "true vine," God's building that is likened to a household "where a family lives." The Church is compared to a temple, where God makes the world new "like a bride adorned for her husband." The Church is described as a "holy city." This turn to biblical images also reflects the judgment of the majority at the Council that we saw in the Council as an event. It is another turn away from a primarily organizational view of the Church. Each of these images is relational; they come from the everyday, mundane and therefore actual, life of the people during biblical times. In this way, the mystery of the Church was further anchored in the everyday, actual lives of people in the modern world. This was one of the collaborative intentions of the Council members. They made sure that their openness to relationship with the modern world was in this foundational Chapter of Lumen gentium. Aloys Grillmeier's observation in his commentary on Chapter 1 supports this.

106 McBrien, The Church (Lumen Gentium)," in Hastings, ed., Modern Catholicism, 90. See note 44.

107 Lumen gentium, 5.
claim that the intention of the Council made its way into the text. He observed that the choice of
the biblical understanding of mystery allowed for a better articulation of the relationship between
the visible reality of the Church and its invisible "inward reality." He argued that this
compensated for the one-sided view of the Church that had prevailed since Trent and replaced it
with a "more adequate view."  

This "more adequate view" of the Church as mystery is illustrated in Article 6's biblical
imagery. There is a direct line between this article and Pope Paul's address. Pope Paul had set
the stage for this "deliberate effort at a synthesis." Pope Paul had called for a return to the
biblical understanding of the Church. Once again, Lumen gentium displays how the Council
picked up strands of Pope Paul's opening speech and expanded upon the notion of mystery.

Immediately after he told the Council members his "main objectives" for the Council, the
Pope made his list of biblical images of the Church. Note how the text from Lumen gentium
echoes this section from Pope Paul's speech.

There can be no doubt whatever of the Church's desire and
need and duty to give a more thorough definition of herself.
We are all familiar with the magnificent images by which
Holy Scripture describes the nature of the Church; the
building raised up by Christ, the house of God, the temple
and tabernacle of God, God's peoples, God's flock, God's
vine, God's field, God's city, the pillar of Truth and finally,
the Bride of Christ, God's Mystical Body. In meditating on
these revealing images of the Church has come to see

---
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herself as a historic, visible, and hierarchically organized society, animated by a mysterious principle of life.\textsuperscript{111}

This section of Pope Paul's speech reflected the identity of the Council that had formed in the first session. It supported a pastoral approach to the Church's nature and mission. This section of the speech also instantiated that same nature and mission primarily in terms of the Church's salvific mission rather than in terms of its institutional, organizational structure. In Article 6 of \textit{Lumen gentium} we find many of these biblical images, and thus, also discover one of the ways the Council responded to Pope Paul's requests.

Article 7 of \textit{Lumen gentium} displays the pneumatological anthropology which Congar discovered in the ecclesiology of the first millennium. It is an anthropology where the entire human community is united with the "son of God" by "human nature." All of humanity is "a new creation" through Jesus' death and resurrection. All persons are members of Christ's "body" by Christ's Spirit. All members cooperate in the life of this "one body" and the Eucharistic "sharing" is the highest expression of this unity among all persons. In this section, the Spirit is described from both of Congar's directions as the principle of communion internally and externally. "The same Spirit who of himself is the principle of unity in the body, by his own power and by the interior cohesion of the members produces and stimulates love among the faithful."\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Lumen gentium} developed this reflection upon how the human community shares the Spirit.

All the members must be formed in his likeness, until Christ is formed in them (Gal 4:19)…. From him "the

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Ibid.} Note that we have used "God's" where the Anderson text translated the word "His."

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Lumen gentium, 7.}
whole body, supplied and built up by joints and ligaments, attains a growth that is of God" (Cor 2:19). He constantly makes available in his body, which is the church, gifts of ministries through which, by his power, we provide each other with the helps needed for salvation so that, doing the truth in love, we may in all things grow into him who is our head (see Eph 4:11-16). In order that we might be unceasingly renewed in him (see Eph 4:23), he has shared with us his Spirit who, being one and the same in head and members, gives life to, unifies and moves the whole body. Consequently, his work could be compared by the Fathers of the church to the functions of that principle of life, the soul, fulfills in the human body.\footnote{113}

Once again we see Congar's pneumatological anthropology. God's on-going presence to the redeemed human community is found in the "principle of life" which is the Spirit. In this article, \textit{Lumen gentium} appealed to Patristic ecclesiology, not to the ecclesiology of the Counter-Reformation that was favored by the anti-progressive faction.

At the beginning of this section we discussed Article 8 in terms of its methodological impact on the text. Here we turn to focus more on the material aspects of that article. Grillmeier argued that Article 8 is the most explicit presentation of the theme of Chapter 1: "the Church as mystery in its sacramental structure."\footnote{114} This article is also one of the most explicit locations of the theological anthropology which binds pneumatology and ecclesiology. Once again, Congar's influence is evident. Grillmeier observed "a deliberate effort to go beyond the notion of Cardinal Bellarmine," for whom the Church was "as visible and tangible as the union of the Roman people or the kingdom of France or the republic of Venice."\footnote{115} By ending Chapter 1 with a

\footnote{113} \textit{Ibid.}


\footnote{115} \textit{Ibid.}
return to the Church as mystery, *Lumen gentium* rejected Bellarmine's ecclesiology, which was also the ecclesiology of the anti-pastoral faction. Instead it embraced a reformed notion of the Church because it sealed the notion of mystery as the interpretive framework for the rest of the text. Of course, the idea that all of the subsequent chapters in *Lumen gentium* were subordinated to Chapter 1 is not a new idea. It is however, an idea that is strengthened and advanced in conjunction with the Council as an event and with the identification of the dominant pneumatology. In this definition of the Church as a mystery of salvation we have the foundation of the reformed self-consciousness of the Church. This is a substantive change.

McBrien has repeatedly argued this position. In 1998 he wrote, "Ever since the council adjourned in December 1965, Vatican officials have been trying to regain the enormous power they had lost at Vatican II. The concept of the monarchical Church, with the pope at the top of a pyramid, aided by the Roman Curia, was set aside in favor of a collegial Church, that is, one in which all of the bishops of the world, not just those working in the Vatican, collaborate with the Bishop of Rome in the governance of the universal Church."\(^{116}\) This is a substantive, material change in ecclesiology. It is not only a rhetorical device. McBrien continued and described some consequences of this new self-understanding of the Church. "The verb is crucial. The bishops do not simply 'cooperate' with the pope, loyally carrying out his orders. They truly 'collaborate' with him because they, like him, are bishops, with pastoral responsibility for the universal Church."\(^{117}\)


\(^{117}\) *Ibid.*
In addition to this new understanding of the relationship between the bishops and the pope, which does away with the prior understanding, McBrien described another consequence that contains all three characteristics of the Council's dominant pneumatology. This consequence is a renewed emphasis upon the local Church. "At the same time, the council restored the local church, or diocese, to its rightful dignity as the Body of Christ in a particular place. The local church is not merely an administrative sub-division of the universal Church, analogous to a franchise created and controlled by central corporate headquarters and wholly dependent upon it." This kind of local Church presupposes dialogue because of its connection to all other local Churches. It presupposes the competence of the local pastors by recognizing them as collaborating leaders and not as functionaries.

When the notion of mystery is identified as both a methodological and substantive feature, and, the two are recognized as expressions of the dominant pneumatology of the Council, they yield the corollary reformed ecclesiology of the document. Interpreted this way, Lumen gentium is not a fundamentally conflicted text. It is instead a text that clearly inaugurates a new self-understanding of the Church, even while it nods to the prior understanding. We learned in our discussion of the Council as an event that it was both a water-shed and a transitional event. The traces of the prior situation belong in its texts in the same way that they remain in most situations during the first step in a transition. They remain as vestiges of the old that will fade as the new is received into the life of the Church. The application of both the Council as an event and the dominant pneumatology warrants this claim. McBrien summarized this substantive change this way: "The council, for example, replaced the late medieval view of the Church as a pyramid, with the pope at the top and the laity at the bottom, by a profoundly  
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traditional view, rooted in the Bible, the writings of the early Fathers of the Church, and much of
the Church's lived experience during its first millennium." Lumen gentium subordinates the
vestiges of the prior ecclesiology by establishing mystery first, as the methodological principle
and, then, second, illustrating how that leads to a substantive change in the Church's self-
understanding in each of the subsequent articles of Chapter 1.

Rahner also argued for the theological importance of the Church's definition as a mystery
and sacrament. He also observed the substantive importance as well as the methodological
importance of defining the Church as a mystery. Rahner argued that returning to the notion of
sacrament allowed the Church to take its early steps as world-Church. He wrote that Vatican II's
intention was to place the Church in the category that he called "archsacrament." This kind of
sacrament "embraces the individual and his personal history but is in itself Christ or the abiding
continuity of his existence in history which is the Church." Rahner's notion of
"archsacrament" is another way of characterizing Congar's Christological reference. Article 8
begins by describing the constitutive link between Christ and the Church and thus returns to a
more ancient notion of the Church that McBrien observed. The Church is first and foremost a
corporate expression of the relationship with Christ; its institutional forms are important
precisely because they are sacramental. But mystery shapes the forms; they do not shape the
mystery.
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The important Article 8 begins this way: 'The one mediator, Christ, established and constantly sustains here on earth his holy church, the community of faith, hope and charity, as a visible structure through which he communicates truth and grace to everyone."¹²² Pottmeyer argued that this was a central aspect in correcting the idea that the Church is "only an external organization."¹²³ Grillmeier also argued that Article 8 was not "concerned with a full description and enumeration" of the visible and invisible elements of the Church.¹²⁴ Since this article contains perhaps the most important "unopened bud" of the Council we shall cite it much of it below; note that Congar cited it in part above.¹²⁵ The substantive teaching in this section connects Christ's humanity with the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church especially with regard to the Church's social structures. The Church is the sacrament of salvation that has an actual life "of its own" because it is animated by the "Spirit of Christ" whose life giving presence is found in "the building of the body" of the Church.¹²⁶ Grillmeier argued that in Article 8 the Church "becomes the sacrament of salvation in imitation of Christ the head." In this article he found Lumen gentium's development of the "special spiritual ("pneumatic") life" in the various

¹²² Lumen gentium, 8.


¹²⁵ We cited this article in part in our discussion of Pope Paul's opening speech.

forms of the institutional Church "which are proper to it as a social structure in the Spirit." He argued that this pneumatic character of the Church is crucial for a rich theology of the Church.

Having established an understanding of the Church as a sacrament of salvation, *Lumen gentium* moves on to its teaching regarding the Church's apostolic character. Here the constitution is treating the two aspects of a sacramental reality: the divine relationship and its human, concrete, historical expression. These are not two separate realities but one reality with two features. This is where *Lumen gentium* teaches that while the Roman Church is a concrete form of the Church of Christ, it is not the "whole" of the Church of Christ. *Lumen gentium* says that the "one true Church of Christ" does indeed exist, it should not, however, be identified exclusively with the Roman Church because "many elements of sanctification and of truth are found outside its visible confines." The section reads:

This is the unique church of Christ which in the Creed we profess to be one, holy, catholic and apostolic which our Saviour, after his resurrection entrusted to Peter's pastoral care (Jn 21:17), commissioning him and the other apostles to extend and rule it (see Mt 28:18, etc.), and which he raised up for all ages as the pillar and mainstay of the truth (see 1 Tim 3:15). This church, constituted and organized as a society in the present world, subsists in the Catholic Church, which is governed by the successor of Peter and by the bishops in communion with him. Nevertheless, many elements of sanctification and of truth are found outside its visible confines. Since there are gifts belonging to the church of Christ, they are forces impelling towards catholic unity.128

This section ends by reconciling the Catholic Church and the Church of Christ by claiming that because of the "gifts" that flow from the nature of Christ's Church, these same gifts are moving
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the whole Church towards "catholic unity." Here the constitution makes use of the creedal	onotion of the word catholic and not its more exclusive use as identified with the Church of Rome.
This is another signal that the Council as an event found its way into *Lumen gentium*'s reformed,
world-Church ecclesiology. The Church of Christ is not confined nor controlled by the Roman
Church. The Catholic Church at Rome that sees itself linked to Peter and the apostles, is indeed
the "unique church of Christ" as a "concrete fact of history" but it is not the only location of the
Church of Christ.\textsuperscript{129}

Thus does the text bring together this historical, Roman Church and the other Churches.
Because sacraments occur in history where the Incarnation occurs; history and these concrete
forms must be taken into account. Christianity is an historical, sacramental faith where the
invisible "Church of Christ" is also visible in its own unique way. The other Churches are a part
of the whole Church of Christ to the degree that they are sacraments of salvation. This is how
*Lumen gentium* uses the methodological shift to the notion of sacrament in order to craft a
substantive reform in its teaching about the relationship among all Christians.

Grillmeier argued that the "problems" that this self-understanding invites are not all
worked out in the constitution.\textsuperscript{130} As we saw, most conciliar teachings take the form of a
principles that in turn requires further theological reflection that takes time. In addition to that
methodological point, the presence of unanswered questions is yet another indication of the truth
of Pottmeyer's assessment that Vatican II was transitional. Further, we saw in Chapter 3 that the
Council members were well aware of the fact that their work marked only the first movement

I, 150. See note 82.
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towards a world-Church. Rahner argued that "the second caesura -- to the world-Church -- has or must of course have a material content quite different from that of the first, to the Gentile Church of antiquity and the Middle Ages." Article 8 of *Lumen gentium* provides one feature of such "material content." McBrien noticed this same new understanding of the Church. He contrasted it with the ecclesiology of the manuals and textbooks about the Church.

The first and methodologically most significant point to be made about *Lumen gentium* is that it begins with a chapter on the "mystery" of the Church, unlike the traditional textbooks and catechisms which began with the Church, as an "hierarchical" institution…. This is more than an editorial move. It reflects a fundamental shift in the way we understand the reality of the Church. Thus, when we confess "we believe in the Church," the act of faith is centered on the presence on God who is in the Church, and not on the hierarchy or on the Church simply as a religious institution or ecclesiastical organization.**1**

*Lumen gentium* declares that the institutional Church is a mystery in which the Church of Christ "subsists" while, at the same time, it recognizes that "many elements of sanctification and of truth" can be found outside of the Catholic Church. When it does so, it is applying the notion of the Church as a mystery of God's presence in the world and in history. That application makes God's presence primary and any institutional forms secondary.

As Article 8 continues, it offers a framework for dealing with the questions that will emerge from this new ecclesiology. The Church must of course attend to its institutions and its internal concerns. It can only be a sacrament to the degree that it does become the "body" that

---


**1** McBrien, "The Church, (*Lumen Gentium*)," in Hastings, ed., *Modern Catholicism*, 88. See note 44.
has "social" and "hierarchical" structures. However, as the Church works out its mission, it must do so the way Christ did; he did not emphasize himself or his own needs. The relevant section of the article reads:

Just as Christ carried out the work of redemption in poverty and oppression, so the church is called to follow the same path if it is to communicate the fruits of salvation to humanity. Christ Jesus, "though he was by nature God… emptied himself, taking the nature of a slave" (Phil 2:6-7), and "being rich, became poor" (2 Cor 8:9) for our sake. Likewise, the church, although it needs human resources to carry out its mission, is not set up to seek earthly glory, but to proclaim, and this by its own example, humility and self-denial.\(^{133}\)

Rahner described this section as the "image of the Church as world-Church."\(^{134}\) He wrote that interpreting the Council in a way that is faithful to the Council itself would require the same "reduction of the Christian message to its ultimate basic substance as a first step…." \textit{Lumen gentium} ends its first chapter by returning to this "reduction," to its first principle.

\textit{Lumen gentium}, like the Council which produced it, anchored its understanding of the Church in the proper tension between the human and the divine found in the Incarnation. As we have seen, this relationship was displayed through the sacramental character of human existence. This conclusion to Chapter 1 in Article 8 returns to these two: mystery and sacrament. With regard to this emphasis upon the Incarnation, notice that this article displays an understanding of the Holy Spirit that is not "pneumatocentric."\(^{135}\) It maintains Congar's "Christological

\(^{133}\) \textit{Lumen gentium}, 8.

\(^{134}\) Rahner, "Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council," 86. See note 4.

Indeed, the article is saturated with the dominant notion of the Holy Spirit even as it introduces one of the most important aspects of the Council's dominant reformed ecclesiology.

Grillmeier argued that *Lumen gentium* was advancing beyond the notion of J. A. Möhler's notion of "perpetual incarnation." The document did intend to unite the human and divine in its ecclesiology, and, it did so by emphasizing the presence of the Holy Spirit as the indwelling, life-principle of the Church. In this way, the sacramental character of the Church was reaffirmed. Chapter 1 comes full circle and returns to the notion of the Church as a sacrament of the mystery of God's relationship with the human community. Grillmeier discovered an anthropology that fits Congar's "pneumatological anthropology" in Article 8. He discovered that the same Spirit that "animates" the humanity of Jesus Christ also animates the Church. The Spirit belongs to the whole Church and to each of its members. The relevant section in Article 8 reads: "As the assumed nature, inseparably united to him, serves the divine Word as a living instrument of salvation, so, in somewhat similar fashion, does the social structure of the church serve the Spirit of Christ who vivifies it, in the building up of the body (see Eph 4:16)."

Grillmeier further argued that *Lumen gentium* united the human and the divine by describing the Spirit as the principle that animates the social structures of the Church. In this way, the Church "becomes" the sacrament of salvation. The life of the Church plays out in all the forms that reflect this unity between the human and the divine, not only in the Roman forms
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that do so. In this article, the Spirit animates both the human person and the Church. This displays Congar's pneumatology wherein the Spirit is an interior and exterior presence.

If defining the Church as a mystery is the first substantive reform in *Lumen gentium*, the next most important material change is also found in Article 8. It is *Lumen gentium*’s solution to the question of the identity of "the Church of Christ." The preconciliar ecclesiology claimed that the Catholic Church was the Church of Christ. This ecclesiology labeled other communions as either heretical or schismatic. *Lumen gentium* moves away from the exclusive identification of the Catholic Church with the Church of Christ.

This section is also a source of the stalled reception; it has not been adequately received in the life of the Church since Vatican II. It is often "juxtaposed" with other sections of *Lumen gentium* that contradict it, especially Article 14 which reads in part:

This holy council, first of all, turns its attention to the catholic faithful. Relying on scripture and tradition, it teaches that this pilgrim church is required for salvation. Present to us in his body which is the church, Christ alone is the mediator and the way of salvation. He expressly asserted the necessity of faith and Baptism (see Mk 16:16; Jn 3:5) and thereby affirmed at the same time the necessity of the church, which people enter through Baptism as a door. Therefore, those could not be saved who refuse either to enter the church, or to remain in it, while knowing that it was founded by God through Christ as required for salvation.\(^{140}\)

There are, of course, problems with the use of Scripture in this text; we shall not address them here. We are more concerned with the way the citation contradicts Article 8 where the Catholic Church is described as the Church of Christ but not as either exclusively so, nor as the only means of salvation. This contradiction is one of the primary examples of Pottmeyer’s

\(^{140}\) *Lumen gentium*, 14.
"juxtapositioning" of conflicting theologies in the documents. Instead of interpreting the conflict as two equal descriptions of the Church, we interpret Article 14 as an example of what McBrien called "residue." These claims are not compromises but are the leftover traces of an earlier and inadequate ecclesiology that were left in the text for reasons that can be understood by looking at the Council as an event. Where Article 14 conflicts with Article 8, it must be subordinated to the understanding of the Church that reflects both the method and the substance of mystery in the text. If we buttress Article 8 with the Council as an event and with the dominant pneumatology of the Council that we have described, the idea of juxtapositioned and therefore equal, understandings of the relationship among the Christ of Christ, the Catholic Church and all other Christian Churches becomes much less credible. Lumen gentium did not intend to fashion an notion of the Church that excludes whole groups of humanity. Nor did it affirm the previous ecclesiology which refused to recognize the groups who understand themselves to be full members of the Church of Christ outside of Roman Catholicism. Bringing the Council as an event and the dominant pneumatology into the interpretation allows us to advance McBrien's insight. The Council as an event and the dominant pneumatology that is grounded in the principle of sacramentality both bolster McBrien's claim that while there is "residue" of preconciliar ecclesiology in the texts, that is all that it is, the tailings left over from the process of creating a new vision of the Church.

141 McBrien, Do We Need the Church?, 151-66. See note 3.
G. Chapters 2-8 of *Lumen gentium*

We turn now to the rest of the Chapters in *Lumen gentium*. As we have indicated, these chapters are all variations on the theme of mystery and sacrament from Chapter 1. Our consideration of each of them is less extensive. Once again the foundation is the Council's pneumatological anthropology which allows the nature and mission of the Church to fit so well with the historical consciousness that shaped the Council. This anthropology plays out in the return to the principle of mystery and in examples of the three characteristics of the dominant pneumatology.

a. Chapter 2: The People of God

This chapter centers on the discipleship all of members of the Church. Discipleship is a further application of the principle of sacramentality and its central characteristic is collaboration or participation. This chapter is one of the places where the influence of modern biblical scholarship is found. It emphasizes the common priesthood in which all disciples share.\(^\text{142}\)

According to Chapter 2, the Church is composed of the unity of persons. However, this description of the "People of God" was not intended by the Council members to be a contrast to the next chapter on the Hierarchy. The "People of God" refers to the entire Church, including the hierarchy. This is one of the most common misinterpretations of *Lumen gentium*.\(^\text{143}\) As a variation on the theme of mystery, the People of God is an attempt to view the "whole reality of


\(^{143}\) *Ibid.*, 53.
the Church" in terms of its characterization as a people. This characterization served several
thelogical purposes. First of all, it called attention to the continuity between the Old and New
Testaments. It also linked the ecclesiology of the East and West. It returned to themes that are
similar to the *communio* ecclesiology of the East. In addition, it appealed to Protestants because
it echoed the notion of the Church that was so essential for these communities. Finally, it
maintained the Christological reference because Jesus used the language and imagery of the
people gathered. The notion of the Reign of God presupposes the people who believe in that
Reign and are faithful to it. It is also an attempt to reconcile the image of the Body of Christ
with the image of the People of God. The theological roots for this can be traced back to Paul's
thology. Recall from Chapter 2 that when Paul was trying to re-configure Israel with
Christianity he turned to the same two images for the Church.

The text describes the people of God this way: "At all times and in every nation, anyone
who fears God and does what is right has been acceptable to God (see Acts 10:35). God has,
however, willed to make men and women holy and to save them, not as individuals without any
bond between them, but rather to make them into a people who might acknowledge God and
serve God in holiness."144 In this opening to Chapter 2, we find an expression of Congar's
internal and external relationship with God. All people are acceptable to God as individuals; this
flows from the underlying theological anthropology of the Council. All people at all times and
from every place are related to God. In addition, precisely because of this relationship with God,
all people can be united in one community, one people. The Chapter 2 also describes this in
Christological terms.
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God therefore chose the people of Israel to be his own people and established a covenant with them. Christ instituted this new covenant, the new covenant in his blood (see 1 Cor 11:25); he called a people together made up of Jews and Gentiles which would be one, not according to the flesh, but in the Spirit, and it would be the new people of God. Established by Christ as a communion of life, love and truth, it is taken up by Christ also as the instrument of salvation of all; as the light of the world and the salt of the earth (see Mt 5:13-16) it is sent forth into the whole world.145

Notice that this is a universal description; it is not a description of one group in the Church or another. It is a reflection upon the nature of human existence in relationship to God's intentions for all human persons. The texts reflect the principle of sacramentality particularly through its emphasis upon history. God is described acting in history; God's actions come through the "medium" of history.146 The people of God is constituted as such by the salvific relationship with God.

The relationship between the people and God has four features. They reflect the Council's pneumatology because the people share in the same Spirit with Christ. The first is that the relationship is given by Christ; it is not contingent upon, nor controlled by, any human group or organization. The second feature is freedom. The "sons and daughters" possess "dignity and freedom" because of God's indwelling presence.147 Neither of these first two features are passive; they presuppose participation and competence. The third feature is that the people of

145 Ibid.
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God is governed by the "law of love" along the pattern of Christ. The fourth feature is the eschatological character of this people. The people act as an instrument of the salvation that has begun but which is not finished. Salvation happens through an historical process that will only be fulfilled when the Reign of God is fully realized at the end of time. These features describe a people who are responsible to be the "instrument" of salvation through actions that affect the world. This people has been "sent" by God to do the work that is invited and encouraged by God's reign. The work involves "life, love and truth" that will help all of humankind. The relationship between the people and God is dynamic; it is anchored internally even at the same time that it takes shape externally. The characteristics of participation, recognition of personal competence and dialogue are presupposed in such a relationship. This is because God's people is expected to actually work towards the fulfillment of God's Reign.

This description of the people also displays the theological anthropology that emerged at the Council. The people of God is not a passive body characterized by its obedience to authority. Such a characterization belongs to the preconciliar ecclesiology. Instead, the people of God is an empowered and responsible community of persons. This active people of God is the primary instantiation of the mystery of the union between God and the human community as a consequence of Christ's mission, death and resurrection. The relationship between God and the people of God is the primary historical manifestation of God's on-going presence to the human community as Holy Spirit. In other words, the people of God is a foundational expression of the Church as a mystery of salvation.

148 Ibid.
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Thus does Chapter 2 display the pneumatological anthropology for which Congar argued. Because of the Church's continuity with Israel, the notion of the *imago Dei* is the starting place. The notion of the human person did not fundamentally change from Hebrew Scripture's notion as the community reflected upon the revelation of Jesus Christ. It was instead, further illuminated, as we saw in our discussion of Paul's theological anthropology and pneumatology. In Chapter 2, the historical relationship with the people of Israel disclosed God's salvific relationship with the whole human community. However, with the Incarnation where Jesus Christ is disclosed as the "head" of all humankind, "the community of salvation" has a new basis.\textsuperscript{150} Grillmeier wrote this summary analysis: "The fullness of revelation has come in the 'Word of God,' and a truly inward and deeply personal attribution of salvation has become possible on the basis of the full knowledge of God and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit."\textsuperscript{151} *Lumen gentium* acknowledges the saving presence of God in the covenant with Israel and anchors its own notion of the Christian community in that prior relationship. This is another example of what Congar called the Council's "Trinitarian view of the 'economy' of creation and grace."\textsuperscript{152} Having explained the people's relationship to God and to God's Reign, the text moves on to explain how the people participate in this relationship.

The starting point for participation as a member of God's people is in the common priesthood of all believers. Chapter 2 explains this priesthood in articles 10-12. Grillmeier argued that this is another place where the fact that the Council distinguished between the


\textsuperscript{151} *Ibid*.

common and the hierarchical priesthood is often falsely interpreted. Once again, the methodological function of the Church as a mystery is necessary for a proper interpretation. The common priesthood flows from the central mystery of God's intimate union with the human person. Any more specialized ministry for the sake of the Reign of God is a function of the prior priesthood which belongs to all members of the Church. When the Council distinguished between the common and the hierarchical priesthood, its intention was to describe the distinction between the priesthood of all believers and the special priesthood of ordained office. They took care not to designate the special priesthood as the "sacramental priesthood" precisely because of the new emphasis they wanted to place upon the notion of sacramentality. The texts reads:

The baptized, by regeneration and the anointing of the Holy Spirit, are consecrated as a spiritual house and a holy priesthood, that through all their Christian activities they may offer spiritual sacrifices and proclaim the marvels of him who has called them out of darkness into his wonderful light (see 1 Pet 2:4-10)…. Though they differ essentially and not only in degree, the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood are nonetheless interrelated; each in its own way shares in the one priesthood of Christ.

Once again Lumen gentium does not answer all the questions raised by its theology; once again we see its transitional quality. It has not arrived at an all-encompassing distinction between
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common and hierarchical priesthood; that was not the intention of the text. It left room for the necessary development of new notions of ministry. Its purpose was to apply the principle of mystery from Chapter 1. A key step in this process was a description of how the internal presence of God was worked out in the lives of all persons. The Council wanted to make a positive statement concerning the priesthood of all the faithful. This was, of course, in part a rejection of the passive notion of the person that had prevailed in the Church in the recent past. And it was also a rejection of an overly supernaturalized notion of the hierarchical priesthood.

The Council overcame this over-emphasis upon hierarchical priesthood by grounding it in the commonly shared priesthood of Christ. While it is distinct and has a necessary function for the sacramental community, it flows from the same source as does the common priesthood. Priesthood is a form of service to the Gospel that flows from Christ's own priesthood through baptism into the life of the Church. The text reflects upon the participation in each of the Sacraments and then summarizes this way: "Strengthened by so many and such great means of salvation, all the faithful, whatever their condition or state are called by the Lord -- each in his or her own way -- to that perfect holiness by which the Father is perfect." Notice that the text returns again to the foundational relationship with God. In this way, the Council's understanding of ministry displays the theological anthropology suggested by Congar.

In addition to this corrective regarding priesthood as a category of the people of God, there are several places where the action of the Holy Spirit is explicitly discussed in Chapter 2.
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While we share Congar's caution that simply citing explicit mention of the Holy Spirit does not amount to a true pneumatology, there are remarks about the Holy Spirit that display the dominant pneumatology rather explicitly.\textsuperscript{159} The first of these is in the discussion following the priestly function of the people of God: the prophetic function. The text reads:

The holy people of God shares also in Christ's prophetic office: it spreads abroad a living witness to him, especially by a life of faith and love and by offering to God a sacrifice of praise, the fruit of lips confessing his name (see Heb 13:15). The whole body of the faithful who have received an anointing which come from the holy one (see 1 Jn 2:20 and 27) cannot be mistaken in belief…. Allotting gifts "at will to each individual" (1Cor 12:11), the Spirit also distributes special graces among the faithful of every rank. By these gifts, the Spirit makes them fit and ready to undertake various tasks and offices for the renewal and upbuilding of the church, as it is written, "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to everyone for profit" (1 Cor 12:7).\textsuperscript{160}

This section deals with the truth of the faith and thus includes the notion of infallibility. It also marks a rejection of a narrow, juridical understanding of the Holy Spirit as the source and guarantor of "truth." Infallibility had been too one-sidedly concentrated in the papacy. Article 12 extends its reasoning to counteract this overemphasis. Truth is maintained in the Church dynamically; it involves the active participation of the whole people and their various gifts. The truth of God's salvific covenant with humankind was given to the whole people of God and the whole people participate in its transmission and preservation. Article 12 cautions against the ignoring the active work of the Church in all areas. It cites First Thessalonians and exhorts those who "have charge over the church" not to "extinguish the Spirit" but instead take care to judge

\textsuperscript{159} Recall that Congar argued that the Council's pneumatology was not "pneumatocentric." Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, Vol. I,167. See note 1.

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Lumen gentium}, 12.
the "genuineness and orderly use" of the gifts of the whole people.\footnote{Ibid.} Grillmeier observed that 
*Lumen gentium* displays an understanding of the presence of the Spirit that is so constant and so pervasive that the entire people "cannot but be preoccupied with its mystery."\footnote{Grillmeier, in Vorgrimler, ed., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, Vol. I, 165. See note 82.}

The capacity to recognize truth, or the "sense of the faith" belongs to all members of the people of God because it is a gift of the Spirit. The whole people of God is responsible for the truth and thus infallibility belongs to the whole Church. When the magisterium exercises its particular gift with regard to the preservation of the truth, it must do so with attention to, and the assistance of, people at "all levels" of the Church. This discussion of infallibility displays the dominant notion of the Holy Spirit; it does not display the overly supernatural and exclusive notion of the Spirit's action in the clerical and papal offices. The Spirit animates the magisterial offices; this is displayed in the guidance that is a gift from the Spirit. The truth belongs to "the whole body of the faithful who have received an anointing which come from the holy one (see 1 Jn 2:20 and 27) cannot be mistaken in belief." The gift of infallibility belongs to the Church. The Church displays "this characteristic through the entire people's supernatural sense of the faith, when, from the bishops to the last of the faithful, it manifests a universal consensus in matters of faith and morals."\footnote{*Lumen gentium*, 12.} Infallibility is thus broadened by *Lumen gentium* because it is described as a dynamic process whereby the Holy Spirit's relationship with the whole Church is displayed. This understanding of infallibility reflects participation and the personal competence of the Christians for the sake of recognizing the truth. It also describes the action of the
magisterium in dialogic terms. The people are not described as passive receivers of the magisterium's judgments.

The principle of sacramentality and the three pneumatological characteristics are reflected in the rest of Chapter 2. The renewal of the Church is described as a sacramental action because it involves participation between the Holy Spirit and God's people. By affirming the diversity of charisms that the people possess, the text restores the balance between all gifts and the "special" gifts that rightly belong to the "bishops." And once again, the text appeals to the Paul's reasoning and authority about the relationship between the Church and the Spirit. The renewal of the Church flows from the fundamental relationship with God that belongs to the whole people. This displays the new theological anthropology not the more passive notion of the individual. Recall that in the previous understanding of the members of the Church, the gifts of the Spirit were often viewed in overly individualistic terms. The text explicitly parts company with this understanding when it cautions against viewing the gifts in "extraordinary" terms. The gifts of the Spirit occur in the ordinary life of the Church in all the "various tasks" required to sustain it and to help it flourish.

Another explicit reference to the Holy Spirit in Chapter 2 that displays the dominant pneumatology of the Council is in article 15 where the people who do not belong to the Catholic Church are described. The text addresses the "separated" Christians first. In contrast to their characterization as heretics or schismatics, in this article they are described by their relationship to Scripture, and to Christ. The text describes their relationship to the Holy Spirit this way: "Indeed, there is a true union in the holy Spirit for, by the Spirit's gifts and graces, the Spirit's sanctifying power is active in them also and the Spirit has strengthened some of them even to the
shedding of their blood."\textsuperscript{164} Once again, discipleship, and thus membership in God's people, is determined by God's on-going presence not first by an external form. The reference to martyrdom makes the Council's intention plain; these are Christian who express their discipleship outside of the Catholic community even to the point of death, but they are not inferior Christians. They share in the life of the Spirit.

Finally, even those who do not explicitly accept the Gospel are "related to the people of God in various ways."\textsuperscript{165} The text returns to the divine plan from its opening sections and describes Jews and Muslims as those who "acknowledge the Creator." This move locates their identity in the relationship with God, not in their confessional differences with Catholicism. In addition to these faith traditions, there are those "who do not know the Gospel of Christ or his church." Here the text is describing the rest of the human community. Besides the Muslims and the Jews, there are those who believe in God but who do not belong to a tradition and there are atheists who do not believe in God but do seek justice and goodness. Once again, because of the theological anthropology that is anchored in the mystery of God's relationship to the human community, the text can unify these groups. This article is highly pneumatological even though it makes slight direct reference to the Spirit because it presupposes God's personal indwelling in the whole human community.

This Chapter includes another often-cited teaching that is best understood if we recognize its transitional character. We see some early steps of the world-Church in its acknowledgment of global traditions and other intellectual frameworks that are constructed without an involved and caring God. The text reads:

\textsuperscript{164} \textit{Lumen gentium}, 15.

\textsuperscript{165} \textit{Lumen gentium}. 16.
Finally, those who have not yet accepted the Gospel are related to the people of God in various ways…. Whatever of good or truth is found amongst them is considered by the church to be a preparation for the Gospel and given by God who enlightens all men and women that they may have length of life.\footnote{166}

When this section is interpreted with reference to the dominant pneumatology, the invitation to actual dialogue with the world traditions reads emphatically. In today's global situation where the relationship among religious traditions has become so crucial for peace and human rights, it is even more important that the Church receive and develop this teaching. The highly sacramental understanding of God's on-going presence to the human person, in the world and in history can be used as a starting point for these important dialogues.

\textbf{b. Chapter 3: "The Church is Hierarchical"}

Congar argued that one of the most important ways in which the Council "restored" a "pneumatological ecclesiology " was in the sphere of charisms.\footnote{167} Rahner thought that the most important feature of the Council's ecclesiology was the renewed emphasis upon the local Church.\footnote{168} Both of these features are found in Chapter 3 of \textit{Lumen gentium}. As we approach this chapter, recall that we must interpret it as we have been doing: the hierarchical character of the Church is an application of the Church's more fundamental character as a mystery of God's salvific plan. In addition, the hierarchical character of the Church is described in terms of the


dominant pneumatology. This description is in conflict with the prior overly supernaturalized pneumatology where clerical office was seen as a privileged location of God's on-going presence as Holy Spirit. This chapter is an attempt to reinvigorate the hierarchical structures with a proper understanding of the mystery of God's presence. This hierarchical feature is subordinate to the Church's nature as mystery. Rahner wrote this analysis of this chapter: "It is only because the Church is the fellowship of the redeemed that it can also be constituted as a hierarchical society and so be the means of salvation and the primordial sacrament for the world. The Church is primarily the fruit of Christ's redemption in the Spirit, and it is through this Spirit that it lives and is sustained as an institution."¹⁶⁹ This chapter includes the participation with the rest of the people of God in its defining purpose of the hierarchical Church.

In his commentary on the first ten articles of Chapter 3, Rahner described the emerging world-Church as it is displayed in Lumen gentium. "An ancient truth was reappearing in a new situation of the spiritual and historical development of the Church and giving a completely novel impulse to the life and practice of the Church."¹⁷⁰ Rahner argued that the whole text takes a negatively critical stance towards "certain type of Roman centralization and curial administration."¹⁷¹ The text does so primarily by distinguishing between this centralized form of Church government that now belongs to a previous era and the "primacy and its exercise."¹⁷² In
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¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Ibid.
his commentary Rahner acknowledged, and even emphasizes, the transitional character of this text.

An observation from Rahner’s commentary frames our discussion of this section. Rahner argued that the Council was "sure" of its understanding of the episcopate; it had arrived at a vigorous notion of the bishops in the Church.\textsuperscript{173} However, because the Council had to deal with papal primacy, the Council members took care to try not to answer "all the logical and constitutional questions" that would still arise after their description of the episcopate.\textsuperscript{174} He noted that the repetitions of the doctrine of the papal primacy found \textit{Lumen gentium} are a result of the "over-anxiety" of several Council members.\textsuperscript{175} In other words, the conflict in the Council as an event is writ large in this section of \textit{Lumen gentium}. Pottmeyer’s claim that the Council was a transitional council is supported by this observation of Rahner’s. As Rahner noted, we cannot expect this chapter to have worked out all the "constitutional" aspects, both theoretical and practical. It did not intend to. It was intended as an extension of the definition of the Church as a mystery of salvation as we have been arguing. The chapter of the hierarchical character of the Church was crafted as both a response to Vatican I’s incomplete teaching on the pope and the bishops and as an application of the Council’s reformed notion of the Church.

The pneumatology of the Council is thin in Chapters 3 and 4. Chapter 3 is concerned with the institutional forms and Chapter 4 attempts to invigorate the role of the laity. However, neither of these chapters have significant expressions of the pneumatology. Chapter 4 does describe the laity in the collaborative, responsible and dialogic fashion of Chapter 2, "The People

\textsuperscript{173} \textit{Ibid.}, 196.
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of God," and thus is a further expression of the ideas in that chapter. It certainly affirms the discipleship of the laity but it does not add much that is new to the pneumatology; instead, it builds upon the pneumatology of Chapter 2 on God's people.

c. Chapter 5: The Universal Call to Holiness

Chapter 5 has an obvious pneumatological dimension. "The Universal Call to Holiness," is a meditation upon God's indwelling presence. Because Lumen gentium has already been solidly anchored in mystery, this call is an essential part of a reformed understanding of the Church. It begins explicitly in mystery once again. "The church, whose mystery is set forth by this sacred synod, is held, as a matter of faith, to be unfailingly holy." By opening the section this way, the Council is once again putting to rest the idea that the Church's holiness derives from a passive power or condition. And, once again, we find an echo of Pope Paul's inaugural address. Pope Paul had said to the Council:

> It is only after this work of internal sanctification had been accomplished that the Church will be able to show herself to the whole world and say: "Who sees me, sees Christ," as Christ said of Himself" "He who sees me also sees the Father" (John 14: 9). In this sense the council is to be a new spring, a reawakening of the mighty spiritual and moral energies which at present lie dormant…. The council is striving, that is, to enhance in the Church that beauty of perfection and holiness which imitation of Christ and mystical union with Him in the Holy Spirit can alone confer.\(^{176}\)

Pope Paul subordinated the "canonical structure and liturgical forms" to "holiness." They serve holiness and the Church's striving towards its own holiness and its encouragement

\(^{176}\) Anderson, Council Daybook, 147. See note 19.
of the each individual's "imitation of Christ and mystical union" with Christ in the Holy Spirit.

This chapter is filled with traces of the dominant pneumatology. Its description of the holiness of the Church and of persons in the Church shifts away from the idea that holiness is identical with moral perfection. This is a signal shift because it displays an emphasis upon full participation rather than on keeping rules and regulations that are primarily external. Here holiness flows from a relationship of grace and not from keeping laws. Keeping laws or attending to rules can become disconnected from what Congar called the interior principle of communion, that is, the Holy Spirit. In article 40 we find Congar's understanding of the interior and exterior features of the Holy Spirit's presence.

The Lord Jesus, divine teacher and model of perfection, preached holiness of life, which he both initiates and brings to perfection, to each and every one of his disciples no matter what their condition of life: "You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Mt 5:4-8). For he sent the holy Spirit to all to move them interiorly to love God with their whole heart, with their whole soul, with their whole understanding and with their whole strength (see Mk 12:30), and to love one another as Christ loved them (see Jn 13:34; 15:12). This interior movement of the Spirit "must" be played out by showing "compassion, kindness, lowliness, meekness, and patience." They reach the "fullness of Christian life" through the "fruits of the Spirit" by which they are "sanctified." Because they have been "conformed" to Christ's image, they can become saints "as is clearly shown in the history of the church."
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This description of holiness is another way that *Lumen gentium* subordinates the institutional forms in the Church to a more primary mission of the Church which is to enable and enrich the whole of Christian living. This article also reflects the more pneumatological anthropology because it contains references to the humanity's creation in God's image. The "Christian life" is "conducive to a more human way of living." The Church encourages this kind of holiness and thus expects the participation of all its members for the sake of its mission. The text reads: "The followers of Christ, called by God not for what they had done but by God's design and grace, and justified in the Lord Jesus, have been made sons and daughters of God by the Baptism of faith and partakers of the divine nature, and so are truly sanctified."\(^1\) The texts goes on to state that all Christians are invited to this kind of holiness and all are capable of achieving it because of God's indwelling presence. The text continues, "It is therefore quite clear that all Christians in whatever state or walk of life are called to the fullness of Christian life and to the perfection of charity, and this holiness is conducive to a more human way of living even in society here on earth. In order to reach this perfection the faithful should use the strength dealt out to them by Christ's gift, so that, following in his footsteps and conformed to his image, doing the will of God in everything, they may wholeheartedly devote themselves to the glory of God and to the service of their neighbor."\(^2\) In other words, striving for holiness builds upon the human impulse to serve the human community. The human image is so fitted to God's own image that it strives after this kind of holiness. Holiness and the recognition of the neighbor's

\(^{180}\) *Ibid.*
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human dignity and the desire to serve that dignity, flow from the same source according to 
*Lumen gentium*.

Article 41 contains the descriptions of all the various forms that holiness takes. It moves beyond the previous understanding of evangelical counsels by recognizing the variety of gifts that God's gives. Holiness is described this way: "[A]ll Christians, in the conditions, duties and circumstances of their lives and through all these, will grow constantly in holiness if they receive all things with faith from the hand of the heavenly Father and cooperate with the divine will, making manifest in their ordinary work the love with which God has loved the world." Lumen gentium's understanding of holiness presupposes the capacity for such holiness in all persons; the Church invites all persons to strive towards it, and, the Church needs such strivings so that it can achieve its central mission. In this way, the Church has a claim on its members to work towards its goal. Holiness, which is described as flowing from the relationship with God, is the intense participation in the work for the sake of the Reign of God.

In Chapter 6, Lumen gentium gives special consideration to the Religious Life. Once again, this chapter is an application of the notion of the Church as a mystery but it is not as rich as either Chapter 2 or Chapter 5. This chapter's attempt at shaping an new place in the Church for the Religious Life is another example of Pottmeyer's observation that the texts are transitional. The Council members wanted to shift away from the overly individualistic idea that the Religious Life is primarily a personal gift rather than a gift for the sake of the whole Church. Its major themes are expressed Chapter 5, "The Universal Call to Holiness."

---
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d. Chapter 7: "The Pilgrim Church"

In this chapter, *Lumen gentium* explores yet another essential feature of the Church: the relationship between the Reign of God and the institutional Church. Once again we find the application of the notion of the Church as a mystery; here the Church's eschatological nature is the focus. By describing the Church as the Pilgrim Church, *Lumen gentium* recognizes that the institutional Church cannot properly exist as Church unless it is grounded in its recognition of the future fulfillment of God's Reign that was proclaimed by Jesus and has already begun through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Since the veneration of the saints had become such a part of the fabric of Catholic life, the Council reflected upon the saints in order to explain the eschatological nature of the Church. This is yet another expression of the sacramental character of *Lumen gentium's* view of the Church. The saints are the concrete embodiments of the Church's pilgrim status.

The chapter opens with a Trinitarian description of human destiny. "The Church, to which we are all called in Christ Jesus, and in which by the grace of God we attain holiness, will receive its perfection only in the glory of heaven, when the time for the renewal of all things will have come (Acts 3:21). At that time, together with the human race, the universe itself, which is closely related to humanity and which through it attains its destiny, will be perfectly established in Christ (see Eph 1:10; Col 1:20; 2 Pet 3:10-13)." This opening displays the Council's intention to emphasize the Church's provisional nature which, in turn, requires the constant

---
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process of renewal. Every dimension of the life of the Church must be envisioned in terms of its eschatological nature.185

This chapter also reconfigures other features of the institutional Church by rejecting aspects of the preconciliar ecclesiology. One such rejection is the notion of the Church as a perfect society. The chapter reads, "Already the final age of the world is with us (see 1 Cor 10:11) and the renewal of the world is irrevocably under way; it is even now anticipated in a certain real way, for the church on earth is endowed already with a sanctity that is true though imperfect. However, until the arrival of the new heavens and the new earth in which justice dwells (see 2 Pet 3:13) the pilgrim church, in its sacraments and institutions, which belong to this present age, carries the mark of this world which will pass, and it takes its place among the creatures which groan and until now suffer the pains of childbirth and await the revelation of the children of God (see Rom 8:19-22)."186 This first section describes the Church as the "universal sacrament of salvation" from Lumen gentium's earlier articles 1 and 9 and thus, once again, applies the notion of mystery. The second a half of the text is a reflection upon how the saints display both the sacramental principle and eschatological character of the Church.

As "companions" with all Christians, the saints display all the characteristics of the Council's dominant pneumatology. "When we look on the lives of those women and men who have faithfully followed Christ we are inspired anew to seek the city which is to come (see Heb 13:14 and 11:10), while at the same time we are taught about the safest path by which, through a changing world and in keeping with one's state of life and condition, we will be able to arrive at
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185 Otto Semmelroth, "The Eschatological Nature of the Pilgrim Church and her Union with the Heavenly Church," in Vorgrimler, ed., Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, 281. See note 82.
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perfect union with Christ, which is holiness. In the lives of those companions of ours in the human condition who are more perfectly transformed into the image of Christ (see 2 Cor 3:18) God shows, vividly, to humanity his presence and his face.\textsuperscript{187} In this application of mystery to a long-standing Catholic form, \textit{Lumen gentium} accomplishes several important things. First, it reaches out to the Protestant churches by explaining the saints in terms that are friendly to Reformation theology. Second, it connects extraordinary holiness and ordinary holiness. This chapter shows that while there are degrees of intensity in the relationship with God between the saints and the people of God, there is no category difference. Everyone is called to holiness and the saints model holiness in various ways. Thirdly, the text de-emphasizes the supernatural aspects of sainthood and emphasizes the human aspects. This is yet another use to which the Council put the pneumatology that emerged.

e. Chapter 8: "The Role of the Blessed Virgin Mary of God, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church"

This chapter on Mary contains traces of many issues that arose at the Council and it actually says more about those issues than it does about pneumatology. We shall not discuss these issues because they do not illuminate the pneumatology of the Council.\textsuperscript{188} The chapter begins by linking Mary and the "mystery of salvation" which is "revealed to us and continues in

\textsuperscript{187} \textit{Lumen gentium}, 50.

the church…." The text does not reject the understanding of Mary's special place because she is the "mother of God," but it does re-affirm her connection to the whole human community. This chapter is distinguished for its movement away from the over-supernaturalization of Mary and the return to her place in the Incarnation. Thus, it displays the theological anthropology upon which the pneumatology is based. However, because Mary was the focus of so many larger questions, the pneumatology remains implicit in this chapter.

H. Gaudium et spes

This distinctive text was also formed by both the trajectory of progressive ideas and the dominant pneumatology. This document is often discussed in terms of its relationship to the tradition of the social encyclicals and the developing Catholic social doctrine. We shall not rehearse that material here; our task is to apply our hermeneutic to Gaudium et spes.\(^{189}\) We shall do so by identifying the traces of the dominant pneumatology in the text. We shall not, however, consider this text in the same way that we considered Lumen gentium. Gaudium et spes is mainly a development of Lumen gentium; like some of the chapters in Lumen gentium itself, its pneumatology is found in the way the mystery of the Church from the "Dogmatic Constitution of the Church" is applied.

---

*Gaudium et spes* has two main parts. The first part lays out its principles and inductive methodology. The second part considers "Some Urgent Problems." Many scholars have analyzed and commented on these features of *Gaudium et spes*. We shall make some reference to the anthropology and methodology but will do so for the larger purpose of identifying the understanding of the Holy Spirit in the text. We shall focus on identifying how the constitution describes the Holy Spirit and in pointing out instances of the pneumatological characteristics.

This text has proven to be enduring and resilient. It has been received by Catholics and by other traditions as well. We shall provide some tools for its further reception, especially within the Catholic community. Because of the profound connection between *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*, McBrien argued that the two constitutions are the "twin pillars" of the Council's ecclesiology. The relationship between the two texts echoes the relationship between Chapter 1 of *Lumen gentium* and all its subsequent chapters. "The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," is one long application of *Lumen gentium*'s definition of the Church as a mystery to the Church's relationship with the world. As we identify *Gaudium et spes*' pneumatology, we shall continue to focus on Congar's understanding of pneumatology. We shall not move through this text chapter by chapter; instead we shall highlight the sections where the Council's pneumatology is most evident.

The first trace of the Council's pneumatology is found in its approach, in its method. This approach presupposes the kind of theological anthropology upon which Congar built his argument that, as the principle of communion, the Holy Spirit is present in both the individual person and in the world. *Gaudium et spes* displays both this theological anthropology and this

---

notion of the Holy Spirit. Congar argued that the Church must create avenues of dialogue with human persons as true subjects who search for the truth with the aid of their own interior consciences. Charles Curran observed *Gaudium et spes*’ emphasis upon the conscience as well when he argued that the foundation of this new anthropology in *Gaudium et spes* is the dignity of the human person.¹⁹¹ This new anthropology makes way for a view of the world where the world itself has the capacity to be the starting point for the coming of God’s Reign. In *Gaudium et spes*, the conscience is emphasized as the "innermost depth" of the human person where she or he encounters God.¹⁹² *Gaudium et spes* emerged at the Council because the Council members recognized the need for the Church to create avenues of dialogue with the world precisely because of *Lumen gentium*’s claims about God's presence in the world.

Using this theological anthropology that views human dignity as a consequence of God's relationship with the human community, *Gaudium et spes* in turn reflects upon the how the whole of creation, including human history and culture is related to God. While the world cannot be a "subject" in the same way that an individual person can, *Gaudium et spes* does attempt to show that God is related to the world in ways that are parallel to the way God is related to persons. The methodology of the constitution rejects both the overly privatized notion of the Holy Spirit and the overly mechanistic notion of the Holy Spirit's activity in the world that marked preconciliar ecclesiology. Its method moves inductively rather than from established principles. In this way, it reflects the Council majority's intention to read the "signs of the times." Because the human person and the world are understood as subjects, room is created in

---


the Church for participation, respect for personal competence and dialogue. Congar argued that both *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* mark the return to a proper understanding of the two missions of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. He wrote:

> The Church, then, is historical and visible and its "founder" is Jesus, who is always living and active in it and is its lasting foundation. The Spirit gives life to the Church and enables it to grow as the Body of Christ. Both in its life and in its origin, the Church is the fruit of two "divine missions", in the exact and very profound sense in which Thomas Aquinas uses this phrase.\textsuperscript{193}

Congar saw the first mission of Jesus Christ in the theological anthropology that the Council developed out of Pope John's "Opening Speech." This mission was anchored in the human dignity that flows from the internal principle that is at work in all human person's because of God's presence through the Holy Spirit's mission. For Congar, the new ecclesiology of *Lumen gentium* was applied by *Gaudium et spes* so that the Church could describe how it participates in the mission of the Spirit. In all cases, Congar emphasized the principle of sacramentality. He observed that *Lumen gentium* contains a proper understanding of the foundation for the Spirit's activity in the Church. This is worth noting because *Gaudium et spes* will expand upon this. It also anchors its arguments in sacramentality. That principle creates the bridge between the missions, between the individual person and God, and between the whole human community and God. Congar cited *Lumen gentium*, 8 as the pivotal section of *Lumen gentium* for understanding *Gaudium et spes*. The section reads:

> As the assumed nature inseparably united to the divine Word serves him as a living instrument of salvation, so, in a somewhat similar fashion, does the social structure of the church serve the Spirit of Christ who vivifies it in the

\textsuperscript{193} Ibid.
building up of the body (cf. Eph 4:16). This is the unique Church of Christ, which in the Creed we profess to be one, holy, catholic and apostolic which our Saviour, after his resurrection, entrusted to Peter's pastoral care (Jn 21:17).194

For Congar, the Spirit is always the Spirit of Christ; its activity in the Church must always be grounded in the mystery of his resurrection and in the community that was formed around that event, and that as the Church, continues to be formed as "a living instrument of salvation." He argued that Lumen gentium contained a theologically sound articulation of the relationship between the Church and the world and that it did in ways that are compatible with Aquinas' notion of the divine missions. In this way, Lumen gentium returned to the insights of the earlier ecclesiology that Congar had brought to the Church's attention. Gaudium et spes is constructed upon the foundation laid down by Lumen gentium. This was a critical point for Congar. For Congar, the inseparable unity between the human and the divine that was disclosed by Jesus Christ also belongs to the communal structure of the Church because of the on-going, "vivifying" presence of Christ's own Spirit. For Congar, what Gaudium et spes says about the world can only be understood in terms of this underlying theology.

He argued that there was no reason for a disconnection from or suspicion of modern ideas or modern disciplines. He said that "unbelievers, politicians and sociologists" were not a threat to the Church even though many saw them as such.195 He wrote that the "Church is everything that is made of the material in this world."196 The two ecclesiological constitutions return to an
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understanding of the Church that recognizes it as a "terrestrial and historical reality" even while it is the "mystery" of God's activity on behalf of the human community.\footnote{Ibid.}

*Gaudium et spes* is a long reflection upon how the Church can fulfill its responsibility to be the "living instrument of salvation." Congar emphasized that it while it is communal, it is "inseparably united to the divine Word." In *Gaudium et spes*, Congar found instances where the theological anthropology (that results from this unification with Jesus Christ) played out in a proper Thomistic understanding of the Holy Spirit's presence and activity.

According to *Gaudium et spes*, the Reign of God, which involves both missions, is found in the world; it is not located outside of the world nor is it alien to the world. We saw in *Lumen gentium*, that the God's Reign is more than the world but it does involve the world and its fulfillment is the ultimate destiny for the world. So *Gaudium et spes*, explores how the Church, which has the special responsibility for the Reign of God, ought to stand towards, and relate to, the world. In *Gaudium et spes*, the Council recognized that with regard to the Reign of God, the present is both the already and the not yet, the in-between time when the God's Reign has been disclosed by Jesus Christ's person and ministry but it is not yet fulfilled. However, the world does have the capacity to move towards that Reign and that capacity must be taken seriously by the Church. As Congar wrote, the Church is the "means" of God's intervention in the world. The world can be seen as a subject in relationship to God in ways that are analogous to the individual's relationship with God. This is what Congar had in mind when he argued that the Holy Spirit is the principle of communion both on the individual level and on the corporate level. When we discuss the text below, we shall highlight the places where *Gaudium et spes* displays this theology.
*Gaudium et spes* displays the Council's pneumatology primarily through its stance towards the world. In *Gaudium et spes*, the world is the location of the work towards the Reign; the Church and the world are thus partners. The Reign is not distinct from, nor ultimately at odds with, the world. Instead, it is the graced location of God's on-going presence as Holy Spirit. In addition to the attention it gives to sacramentality, anthropology, and the two missions, *Gaudium et spes* includes the three characteristics of the Council's pneumatology. The world can be called upon to participate and collaborate for the sake of the God's Reign because the world brings its own capacities which can be brought to bear for the Reign of God's sake. And dialogue with the world is necessary since the Reign of God's fulfillment begins in the world. Of the three pneumatological characteristics, the most important one in the constitution is dialogue. Because *Gaudium et spes*' method is inductive, it is not surprising that the characteristic of dialogue is the most important one for this text. The method itself requires dialogue with the world. That the dialogue is legitimate is explained with reference to collaboration and competence. Both of these are expressions of the Incarnation and the principle of sacramentality because they recognize God's presence in the human and in the world.

To identify these characteristics, we shall focus on Congar's commentary on this constitution. According to Congar, the passage that most succinctly states the document's message is in Chapter IV, "The Role of the Church in the Modern World," Article 45: "Whether it aids the world or whether it benefits from it, the church has but one sole purpose -- that the Kingdom of God may come and the salvation of the human race may be accomplished."\(^{198}\) Congar argued that Chapter IV makes the case for the external activity that is inspired and demanded by the internal, spiritual presence of God. He argued further, that this chapter's notion

\(^{198}\)*Gaudium et spes*, 45.
of the Church's responsibility to the Gospel goes beyond the ecclesiastical activities such as worship and devotion. With regard to the notion of the Holy Spirit in *Gaudium et spes*, he wrote that the Church "goes beyond the purely transfiguring activity of celebrating the sacred mysteries and the life of Christian asceticism: it already in fact does so in Chapters I-III of Part I. It obliges men to action and even to a programmed of action." He observed that *Gaudium et spes* "mode of expression" was not formal nor was it only addressing members of the Church. In Chapter IV of *Gaudium et spes* Congar identified the link between the theological anthropology and the problems of the contemporary world. Thus, for Congar, Chapter IV is the crucial chapter in the constitution.

Congar argued further that the foundation of this chapter was both "theological and Christological" thus referring to his own claim that theologies of God, Christ and the Holy Spirit must coalesce in order for a proper ecclesiology to emerge. He observed a Trinitarian movement in *Gaudium et spes*. This movement begins with the notion of the People of God who had been called to a covenant relationship with the Father. This relationship had been fulfilled in the person and mission of Jesus Christ and it has consequences for the whole world and indeed, the whole cosmos, because of the on-going presence of the Holy Spirit in individuals and in the entire human community. So, in Chapter IV Congar found an ecclesiology that displayed his own understanding of the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit. That indwelling must be taken into account as the Church structures its relationship to the world. Congar argued that Chapter IV of *Gaudium et spes* contains the heart of the Council's understanding of such a relationship.

---

Congar began his analysis by citing two interventions at the Council itself that display how the Council as an event actually found its way into the text. In this way, he actually applied a hermeneutic similar to our own. These interventions are representative of the 2149 Council members who voted in favor of the text as a whole, leaving only 75 who did not fully support the text. The first intervention was made by Archbishop Pedro Cantero Cuadrado of Saragossa who said, "The activity of the Church among men is regarded as an answer to their questions and as a sharing in their joys and anxieties, whereas it flows above all from the Church's own nature as an instrument of salvation for men."\textsuperscript{200} The second intervention was by Bishop-Coadjutor Léon-Arthur Elchinger of Strasbourg. Bishop Elchinger said, "The schema speaks at some length of what the world has to do, and says very little about what the Church is proposing to do in order to make contact with the world and form a true estimate of it. People nowadays pay more attention to deeds than to words and they would like to know how the Church can reform itself in its relations with the world."\textsuperscript{201} Congar argued that \textit{Gaudium et spes} reflects the Council's embrace of these interventions. He noted that the ecclesiology of \textit{Gaudium et spes} rejected what he called "a long favoured" and "'certain contempt for the world."\textsuperscript{202} Congar cited several articles from the constitution that reject this position. We shall discuss them each in turn.

Congar noted that Chapter IV reiterates the opening of the constitution where the Council gave the basis for the Church's relationship with the world. The constitution says that the Church

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{200} \textit{Ibid.}, 202.
\item \textsuperscript{201} \textit{Ibid.}, 202-3.
\item \textsuperscript{202} \textit{Ibid.}, 206.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
is "inserted" in the world because that is where God invites the human community into relationship.\textsuperscript{203} The opening of \textit{Gaudium et spes} provides the methodology for the rest of the text. Articles 1 and 2 presuppose a Trinitarian framework that expresses Aquinas' theology of the missions.

The joys and hopes, the grief and anguish of the people of our time, especially of those who are poor or afflicted, are the joys and hopes, the grief and anguish of the followers of Christ as well. Nothing that is genuinely human fails to find an echo in their hearts. For theirs is a community by the holy Spirit in their pilgrimage towards the Father's kingdom, bearers of a message of salvation for all humanity…. Now that the Second Vatican council has studied the mystery of the church more deeply, it addresses not only the daughters and sons of the church and all how call upon the name of Christ, but the whole of humanity as well, and it wishes to set down how it understands the presence and function of the church in the world today…. The world which the council has in mind is the world of women and men, the entire human family seen in its total environment.\textsuperscript{204}

We have cited this opening at length because Congar argued that Chapter IV reiterates and expands upon it. In it, the human community has been "freed by Christ" as a part of God's saving plan for the world. This world, which is the "entire human family" and its "total environment" and in the "theatre of human history," was created by God and "is sustained by the love" of God. The principle of sacramentality under girds the constitution's opening. Human and divine are united; the entire creation is involved in God's "design" as well as in the "fulfillment" of God's saving plan. In this opening Congar found the connection between the "programme of action" for the Church and the sacred mysteries. According to Congar, these

\textsuperscript{203} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{204} \textit{Gaudium et spes}, 1-2.
mysteries had been confined to either "Christian asceticism" or to ritual practice in the preconciliar period. *Gauidium et spes* draws them together again and describes how the Church will participate in wider society in order to fulfill its mission to the Reign of God.

Congar connects the two mission of the Son and the Spirit by starting with Galatians 4:6. It reads, "God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts." He derives his description of the Holy Spirit as the principle of communion from this text. The presence of the Spirit binds God to the human person and binds human persons to each other. The Church is responsible to help people to recognize the in-dwelling of the Spirit in both directions. *Gauidium et spes* focuses upon the corporate activity of the Church with regard to the whole human community. Congar found this developed in the opening of Chapter IV in Article 40. It reads:

> Proceeding from the love of the eternal Father, the church was founded by Christ in time and gathered into one by the holy Spirit. It has a saving and eschatological purpose which can be fully attained only in the next life…. Made one in view of heavenly benefits and enriched by them, this family has been "constituted and organized as a society in the present world" by Christ and "provided with means adapted to its visible and social union." Thus the church, at once, "a visible organization and a spiritual community," travels the same journey as all of humanity and shares the same earthly lot with the world: it is to be a leaven and, as it were, the soul of human society in its renewal by Christ and transformation into the family of God.\(^{205}\)

The quotations are from *Lumen gentium* Articles 8 and 9 when it says, of the Church that is "constituted and organized as a society in the present world; that it is "a visible organization and a spiritual community," and that it has been "provided with means adapted to its visible and social union." These direct citations signal *Gauidium et spes*' connection to *Lumen gentium*.

\(^{205}\) *Gauidium et spes*, 40.
Having made the connection with the "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church" and thus indicating that *Gaudium et spes* intends to speak at the same level of authority, albeit with a different focus, Chapter IV echoes its own earlier Article 11. According to *Gaudium et spes*, human history is the "scene" of God's saving plan. In addition, it is in and through this history that the human community asks the questions which only the Gospel can answer. Congar emphasized this connection between Article 11 from Part One of *Gaudium et spes* and Chapter IV's argument. The section from Article 11 reads:

The people of God believes that it is led by the Spirit of the Lord who fills the whole world. Impelled by that faith, they try to discern the true signs of God's presence and purpose in the events, the needs and the desires which its shares with the rest of humanity today. For faith casts a new light on everything and makes known the full ideal which God has set for humanity, thus guiding the mind towards solutions that are fully human. The council intends first of all to assess by the light those values which are most highly prized today and to relate them to their divine source. For such values are very good, in so far as they stem from the God-given character of the human person…. What does the church think of humanity? What measures are to be recommended for the building up of society today? What is the ultimate meaning of human activity in the universe? These questions call for answers. From the answers it will be increasingly clear that the people of God, and the human race of which it forms a part, are of service to each other; and the mission of the church will show itself to be supremely human by the very fact of being religious.

This section clusters together the reformed ecclesiology of *Lumen gentium* and its underlying anthropology as well. The "mission of the church" is described as "supremely
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207 *Gaudium et spes*, 11.
human" at the same time that it is religious. The "human" and the "religious" cannot be separated. Thus, the Church and the world cannot be separated but are united in all the ways in which goodness is manifest. When the Council affirmed the "values which are most highly prized," it was referring to scientific development and other developments in modern thought. Once again we find the link between the Church and the world that displays Congar's pneumatological anthropology. The Church and the human community are both searching. The "answers" will disclose God's presence. As Article 11 said: "From the answers it will be increasingly clear that the people of God, and the human race of which it forms a part, are of service to each other; and the mission of the church will show itself to be supremely human by the very fact of being religious." Once again we see the link between the Church and the world. The link is the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit.

The new reformed ecclesiology rejects the previous ecclesiology that had either fear or contempt for modern thought. It does this on the basis of the theological anthropology of the Council which returned to the biblical insight that the values that bring about human progress, which is good, have their source in the human relationship with God. They "stem from the God-given character of the human person." Congar found an echo of this opening in Article 40 of Chapter IV: "All we have said up to now about the dignity of the human person, the community of men and women, and the deep significance of human activity, provides a basis for discussing the relationship between the church and the world and the dialogue between them." In other words, Gaudium et spes is the Church's description of its own relationship to the world, the reasons for it and the consequences that result from it.

208 Ibid.

209 Gaudium et spes, 40.
Congar further explained his observation about the Trinitarian pattern in *Gaudium et spes*. He said that this pattern "pervades Lumen gentium" and was also embedded in *Gaudium et spes* because that text develops the former. He credited *Lumen gentium’s* notion of mystery to the analyses of Maurice Blondel and Karl Rahner whose theological anthropology provided the foundation that made the text compatible with modern thought forms. *Gaudium et spes* declares that God's presence, the indwelling Spirit, "guides" the human mind toward solutions to the problems that confront the world. It also says that God is the source of the all human questions and that the human search for answers, which is "supremely human" is also "religious" because the character of humanity is "God given." Congar argued that using the Trinitarian pattern and linking it with the human person's openness to the transcendent, Vatican II was able to craft a description of the Church's identity that could be expressed both to members of the Church and to the wider world. Congar wrote, that by beginning with the dignity of the human person, which is the case because of the in-dwelling Spirit, the Church "can contribute" to the activities that free the human community from those things that impede human flourishing and thus do not reflect the values of the Reign of God. These values, Congar reminded us, are those things that the whole human community will recognize as good because of the unity among persons as a consequence of God's presence.

Staying within a Trinitarian pattern (that is, from the Father back to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit) Article 42 also contains the dominant pneumatology while, at the same time, it maintains Congar's own Christological reference. It reads,
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The union of the human family is greatly consolidated and perfected by the unity which Christ established among the sons and daughters of God. Christ did not bequeath to the church a mission in the political, economic, or social order: the purpose he assigned to it was religious. But this religious mission can be the source of commitment, direction, and vigor to establish and consolidate the human community according to the law of God.... It shows to the world that social and exterior union comes from a union of hearts and minds, from the faith and love by which its own indissoluble unity has been founded in the holy Spirit. The impact which the church can have on modern society is due to an effective living of faith and love, not to any external power exercised by purely human means.212

This article emphasizes the relationship of unity among all members of the "human family." It says that the Church is "obliged" to take actions that benefit "everyone." The constitution acknowledges the goodness of the world and the progress that it has made and is making. It describes the Church as a sacrament directly echoing Lumen gentium and it attributes the expression of unity to the Holy Spirit.

In article 43, the constitution extends this description of the Church's sacramental nature by rejecting the "dichotomy" between Christian faith and activity in the world that Congar found particularly troubling about the preconciliar ecclesiology. The relevant section reads:

It is a mistake to think that, because we have here no lasting city, but seek the city which is to come, we are entitled to evade our earthly responsibilities.... One of the gravest errors of our time is the dichotomy between the faith which many profess and their day-to-day conduct.... Let there, then, be no such pernicious opposition between professional and social activity on the one hand and religious life on the other.... Let Christians follow the example of Christ who worked as a craftsman; let them be proud of the opportunity to carry out their earthly activity in such a way as to integrate human, domestic,

212 Gaudium et spes, 42.
This section argues that the position that the Gospel is opposed to the world is an erroneous position. Religion that is "nothing more than the fulfillment of the acts of worship and the observance of a few moral obligations" is not true religion according to Gaudium et spes. The religious aspects of life and the "professional and social" are not in opposition; such a position is "pernicious."

The final reason that Congar found this chapter of Gaudium et spes so important is because it echoes Lumen gentium's admissions of guilt, the like of which the Church had never made before. This is yet another rejection of the preconciliar ecclesiology and an instance of how the trajectory of progressive ideas found its way into the text. Congar argued that Article 44 contains an understanding of dialogue which is truly reciprocal. It says that the Church has benefited from the wisdom of the world in the past; it must continue to do so into the future.

Article 44 reads in part:

Just as it is in the world's interest to acknowledge the church as a social reality and a driving force in history, so too the church is not unaware how much it has profited from the history and development of humankind. It profits from the experience of past ages, from the progress of the sciences, and from the riches hidden in various cultures, through which greater light is thrown on human nature and new avenues to truth are opened up.... With the help of the holy Spirit, it is the task of the whole people of God, particularly of its pastors and theologians, to listen to and distinguish the many voices of our times and to interpret them in the light of God's word, in order that the revealed
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The truth may be more deeply penetrated, better understood, and more suitably presented.215

This article also echoes Pope John's description of how the "truth" may be interpreted so that it is "more deeply penetrated, better understood, and more suitably presented." The truth endures but it must also be adapted over time and in light of changing circumstances. This description of the Church's self-understanding contrasts with the way the Church was described in the preconciliar ecclesiology. In Chapter IV of Gaudium et spes we find a reformed ecclesiology of the Church that is built upon the Council's dominant pneumatology. Its primary pneumatological characteristic is this dialogic and open relationship with the world.

Collaboration and respect for personal competence are discussed most directly whenever human freedom is discussed and these characteristics are found throughout the text. These characteristics are developments of the expansive notion of freedom that Pope John introduced and that we considered in greater detail in our Chapter 3. According to Gaudium et spes, with human dignity as a basis, human persons possess authentic freedom. Once this freedom has been recognized, the Church's emphasis shifts towards the interior conscience and away from the regulation of behavior through objective laws. Such a shift invites responsibility and participation. And both involve Congar's understanding of the Holy Spirit as the principle of communion. Internally, the conscience assists discipleship as persons make decisions about their relationship with God. Externally, this same relationship is displayed in the actions that help to bring about the Reign of God. And because the presence of the Reign of God in human culture is explicitly acknowledged by Gaudium et spes, collaboration is invited and competence is presupposed. By recognizing the world as a true partner and thus inviting an equally true

215 Gaudium et spes, 44.
dialogue, *Gaudium et spes*, paints a functional picture of a Church where the Holy Spirit is understood as God's on-going presence to the whole human community for the sake of the mission of the Church which is the fulfillment of God's saving plan in and through human history.

*Gaudium et spes* concludes by summarizing its concerns with a call for dialogue. The pneumatology is embedded in the summary. "In virtue of its mission to enlighten the whole world with the message of the Gospel and to gather together in spirit all women and men of every nation, race and culture, the church shows itself as a sign of that amity which renders possible sincere dialogue and strengthens it." 216 The constitution does indeed describe specific situations where collaboration, respect for personal competence and dialogue are recognized and invited. However, the conclusion reminds us that in *Gaudium et spes*, the very fact that the Church was compelled to address the whole human community regarding the concrete situation of the world displays the Council's underlying notion of the Holy Spirit. Archbishop Marcos McGrath sought the advice of *peritus* John Courtney Murray in the last days of the Council when it looked like *Gaudium et spes* might not be promulgated because of the thousands of changes that had been requested. McGrath lamented the length and often awkward style of the text. Murray told him not to worry but to make sure that it was promulgated as a constitution. Murray said, "It does not matter what it says at this point; what matters is that it is." 217 Murray recognized even then that *Gaudium et spes*' greatest value is in its reformed understanding of the relationship between the Church and the world. Perhaps Murray also recognized that the basic

---

216 *Gaudium et spes*, 92.

217 Archbishop Marcos McGrath, Doctoral Seminar in Ecclesiology with Professor Richard P. McBrien at the University of Notre Dame, Fall 1996.
theology was so sound, that, to use our language, the trajectory of progressive ideas was stable enough to mitigate any other problems in the text.
CONCLUSION

One way to think about what happened at the Second Vatican Council is to say that the relationship between the Church and the Kingdom, or Reign, of God was reconfigured in order to better understand and implement the Church's mission to the world.¹ The emphasis upon this relationship displays the eschatological character of the reformed ecclesiology of Vatican II. It is also a pneumatological statement because it presupposes a particular way in which God's presence and activity are recognized in the world and in history. Vatican II subordinated the Church to God's Reign; Vatican II created more vigorous pneumatological features for the Church that reflected the Council's embrace of modern thought forms and historical consciousness. This embrace was inspired by Pope John and displayed in his vision for a new kind of ecumenical council: one that was "primarily pastoral in character." We have seen that this kind of council marked a shift away from magisterial teaching as primarily juridical, and thus rule-centered, and towards a more relational approach. In contrast to the ecclesiology of the period immediately prior to Vatican II, this new style of teaching reflected greater attention to the theology of the Holy Spirit.

Yves Congar was highly influential as the Council developed its understanding of the Holy Spirit that yielded its reformed ecclesiology. In the preconciliar ecclesiology, the Church was often equated with God's Reign on earth as a result of the Holy Spirit's action. Congar argued that this was a profound misunderstanding of the activity of the Holy Spirit. He recommended that Vatican II fashion a pneumatological ecclesiology where God's indwelling Holy Spirit was recognized as the principle of communion between God and human persons and between each human person and the entire human community. This understanding would more properly reflect the nature and mission of the Church as it had been understood by the early Christian community and in subsequent historical periods.

Richard McBrien summarizes this more pneumatological ecclesiology this way: "God is present in history in Jesus Christ and in a special way in the Church, where the human community has become explicitly conscious of itself in its ultimate relationship with God."\(^2\)

McBrien includes what Congar called the "Christological reference" that is necessary for both pneumatology and ecclesiology. Just as Jesus Christ expresses and embodies humanity's relationship with God in a uniquely normative way, so the Holy Spirit is the living symbol of God's presence to human persons through the Spirit's indwelling love. That presence belongs to the Church in a particular way. Pope John XXIII described it as the Church's new style of teaching as applying the "medicine of mercy" rather than a style that demanded certain behaviors. Mercy flows from the indwelling, loving presence of God. The heart of a

pneumatological ecclesiology is the "ultimate relationship with God." We have discovered that Vatican II ushered in this new emphasis upon a relationally-based understanding of the Church.

With the guidance of Yves Congar, we identified the dominant pneumatology of the Council, both as an event and as the generator of magisterial texts, *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* in particular. Because the pneumatology of the Council is relational, it is best disclosed functionally. We discovered the Council's understanding of the Holy Spirit most distinctly when the Council was describing the ways in which the institutional Church was expected to relate to its own members and to the rest of the human community. We identified three characteristics of the pneumatology that underlies the reformed ecclesiology of the Council: collaboration, respect for personal competence, and dialogue. These characteristics will need to be applied to a greater degree in the institutional life of the Church so that we might move beyond the current impasse with regard to Vatican II's reception.

Overcoming this impasse, that is, facilitating greater reception of the Council, was the ultimate purpose of our exploration. We crafted the kind of hermeneutic that Hermann Pottmeyer had suggested, namely, one that "reflects fidelity to the Council, its intention, its procedure, and its transitional character." We offered our hermeneutic in order to move the discussion out of the current stalled situation and into what Pottmeyer labeled as the third phase in the interpretation of the Council texts. The proposed hermeneutic includes all the features that Pottmeyer had suggested. First, it takes into account the special characteristics of conciliar
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documents, Vatican II's in particular. Second, the hermeneutic is faithful to the Council because it is mindful of the Council's status as a distinctive event in the history of the Church, marking the transition from the Eurocentric Church towards one that is multi-cultural and global in character -- a "world-Church," to use Karl Rahner's term. Third, the Council's intentions and procedures are included in the hermeneutic by way of the trajectory of progressive ideas that emerged at the Council itself. Vatican II articulated a new understanding of the Church's nature and mission; the movement towards this new understanding and away from the previous understanding must be a part of any interpretation of the documents. The Council sometimes changed or rejected a previous form of teaching; sometimes it renewed and revitalized previous forms; and sometimes it created new forms and expressions. By the end of the first session of the Council, this trajectory of progressive ideas was firmly established as characteristic of Vatican II.

By attending to this trajectory of progressive ideas, the transitional character of the Council is thereby taken into account. One recognizes that Lumen gentium and Gaudium et spes mark a beginning; they do not constitute the end of, or the final word on, the reform initiated by Vatican II. However, these two Constitutions do signal one kind of end: the end of the juridical, exclusivist ecclesiology of the preconciliar period.

The texts are indeed transitional, but the transition has a direction. Vatican II's direction was toward reform, toward a new way of imagining and of being the Church. At the same time that Lumen gentium and Gaudium et spes mark the rejection of the preconciliar understanding of the Church, they announce a new understanding, a new ecclesiology rooted in a new pneumatology. Both Constitutions display this new direction.
In addition to this observation about the Council's transitional character, we have also built upon Karl Rahner's argument that Vatican II was a "qualitative leap" in the Church's self-understanding.² At the Council, a new self-consciousness developed among the its members, which caused the Council to achieve the status of an event. We explored the Council as an event in four steps. In Chapter 1 we explained its meaning and suggested how it might help solve the problem that the study addressed: the stalled situation with regard to the interpretation of the conciliar texts, particularly *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*. In Chapter 2 we discovered that during the preconciliar period the theology of the Holy Spirit had become disconnected from a rich theological anthropology and became associated primarily with ecclesial power and ritual action. The bonds among theological anthropology, pneumatology, and ecclesiology were more properly established at Vatican II than they had been in the preconciliar period. In his exploration of the understanding of the Church in history, Congar had discovered a theological integration among these three. Any reform that Vatican II hoped to make would require the re-establishment of the proper relationship among them. All three cross-fertilized at Vatican II. Congar had found this same kind of relationship among theological anthropology, pneumatology and ecclesiology, especially in the earliest Christian communities and in the Patristic and Medieval periods. He noted that the richest ecclesiologies were anchored in what he called a pneumatological anthropology.

The Council made great strides towards achieving the kind of theological anthropology that had shaped earlier notions of both the Spirit and the Church. It was based upon a notion of the human person that is sufficiently open to modern thought-forms and historical consciousness.
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Its pneumatology describes the Holy Spirit as the in-dwelling presence of God that enables communion with God and with the whole human community. Chapter 3 involved an exploration of the Council as an event that yielded a trajectory of progressive ideas. In Chapter 4 we examined *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* and identified the dominant notion of the Holy Spirit therein. We described how the ideas central to Pope John XXIII's opening address were picked up by the Council members in the first session and developed in the various subsequent debates. In the second session, Pope Paul VI's initial activities as the new Bishop of Rome continued to develop and extend Pope John's intentions for the Council. Paul VI's definition of the Church and the method that he suggested for its deliberations were eventually incorporated in *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes*.

Rahner directed our attention to the Council as an event, while Pottmeyer focused our attention on the internal character of the texts themselves. McBrien's work also contributed to our approach. He asked a question that is also directed towards the greater reception of Vatican II. Specifically, "[W]hat theological principles ought to be incorporated in any process designed to facilitate the remaking of the Church?"\(^6\)

So we end where we began, with the questions posed by McBrien, Pottmeyer, and Rahner. Pottmeyer asked how we might move "beyond the Council out of fidelity to the Council?"\(^7\) Rahner asked: "[W]hat follows if we apply the theology of this transition to the transition in which we are living today and for which Vatican II was a kind of ecclesiastical


\(^7\) Hermann J. Pottmeyer, "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II: Twenty Years of Interpretation of the Council," 41. See note 4.
beginning? With a more sharply focused notion of how the Council members understood the person and action of the Holy Spirit, we can lay to rest interpretations of the Council that deny the reformed ecclesiology in its texts. Our exploration of the Council as an event yielded a theological tool that provides a partial answer to the questions Pottmeyer and Rahner raised. And our exploration of *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* in Chapter 4 provided the beginning of an answer to McBrien's question. These texts do contain principles for "remaking the Church."9

*Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* can be used to move the Church more fully into the next period of its life: the truly global period. With the insights of these two Constitutions we can begin to reshape actual processes, procedures and institutional forms in the Church. The pneumatology that we have identified can be used as a pastorally practical theological principle. Structures that presuppose and promote the Council's understanding of the Holy Spirit's on-going presence to the human person and the whole human community in the world and in history can be built around the Council's reformed ecclesiology.

Vatican II was indeed a transitional council. If we move successfully into what Pottmeyer calls the third phase in the reception of Vatican II by using the hermeneutic that we have proposed, the following critical questions arise. First, how will the Church continue to instantiate the new theological anthropology that emerged at Vatican II? This theological anthropology is shaped by a more expansive notion of human freedom that makes the kind of advances in our time that St. Paul's development of the *imago Dei* made in his time. Congar
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argued that ecclesiology must be built upon this kind of pneumatological anthropology. We need theologians to explore the ecclesiological implications of this anthropology in even greater depth. We need to address how our understanding of the Church will incorporate the non-European understandings of the human person that are a part of the global culture. Ecclesiologists will have to explore how to overcome the Roman centralism that is such an obstacle to developing processes and procedures. Whole new forms of Church life that are compatible with other ways of understanding the human person and the human community will have to be developed.

Second, Congar also argued for a pneumatological ecclesiology. Theologians will need to attend more carefully to the relationship between the life of the Church and the person and mission of the Holy Spirit as they continue the pneumatological renewal in systematic theology. They shall have to find ways to remain faithful to the dogmatic insights regarding the redemptive Incarnation while at the same time developing an understanding of the Holy Spirit that embraces religious pluralism and interreligious dialogue. Our reflections on the Christ event and upon the whole economy of salvation including the outpouring of the Spirit that has always been at work in the world, must be done in ways that recognize the salvific value of other religious institutions.\footnote{Ad gentes, 4} Theological reflection upon the mission of the Holy Spirit will have to be incorporated into the way in which the institutional Church actually functions with and towards other religious communities.

Third, modern thought-forms were recognized and invited by Vatican II. The characteristics of the Council's pneumatology invite further dialogue with several disciplines. Feminist theory, and the ethics of care in particular, could contribute greatly to the formulation

\footnote{Ad gentes, 4.}
of new processes and procedures in the Church's institutional life. For example, in the previous ecclesiology there were paternalistic parent-child models underneath the relationship between the hierarchy and the laity. However, there are new models of relationship that emphasize the exchange between the receivers of care and the caregivers that could be used to fashion new structures in the Church. Insights from various disciplines that emphasize nurturing rather than control are being discussed widely. Insights regarding care rather than control have been developed from these various sectors: psychology, education, and sociology, for example. If the recent scholarship on care were applied to the Church, it could serve to facilitate and promote the greater reception of the Council.

Fourthly, both Pope John and Pope Paul demonstrated the effects of good leadership on the institutional Church. Currently the Church in United States is in the midst of a crisis of leadership. A dialogue that links the characteristics of the Council's pneumatology with new studies on leadership could also facilitate the greater reception of Vatican II. Fourthly, lay people are exercising more and more functions in the Church. The Council's dominant pneumatology could be used to develop structures in the Church that take lay leadership more seriously than before. Fifth, there are many religious orders that have more constitutional, de-centralized, and democratic forms of governance than the current Vatican bureaucracy. How might the institutional Church learn from these orders? Might they not also further reception of Vatican II and its reformed ecclesiology?

Finally, we return to Rahner's question: how will the Church actually become a true global institution and not simply a European import? The Church's dialogue with the cultures of the world will involve concrete changes and the development of new forms. How will the institutional Church incorporate the insights of cultures that are quite different from the
European ones upon which it is built? To instantiate the new ecclesiology of Vatican II we shall have to create new ways of being Church; we shall have to renew previous forms. For example, can Canon Law, which is such a product of Western, Roman culture continue to be a central form of Catholic life and teaching? Now that we have global leaders from other traditions, how must the papacy change so that those leaders are recognized as well? Catholic Social thought has been an important advocate for human rights. How will it change and adapt to the reformed ecclesiology? These are just a few of the practical considerations that will benefit from careful theological reflection upon both the Council's ecclesiology and pneumatology.

We have explored the Council as an event, especially through important speeches and interventions, in search of the understanding of the Holy Spirit. Of all the citations that we used in this study, the most important one remains one of the earliest in Council's history. It comes from Pope John XXIII's bull convoking the ecumenical council. "Distrustful souls see only darkness burdening the earth. We, instead, like to affirm all our confidence in Our Savior who has not left the world which He redeemed." The reception of Vatican II requires that we continue to develop this open and hopeful stance towards the actual, concrete world of real human persons and cultures. This notion of the redemption displays the very best of the Catholic principle of sacramentality. That principle has been applied to one degree or another throughout the life and history of Catholic theology. We would do well to apply it as well in the task of interpreting the Council and its teachings.

---
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