
EXCERPTA E DISSERTATIONIBUS IN SACRA THEOLOGIA

CUADERNOS
DOCTORALES
DE LA FACULTAD DE TEOLOGÍA

PUBLICACIÓN PERIÓDICA DE LA FACULTAD DE TEOLOGÍA
UNIVERSIDAD DE NAVARRA / PAMPLONA / ESPAÑA



Universidad
de Navarra

JAMES PATRICK HURLEY

Newman and Twentieth-
Century French Theology

The presence of J. H. Newman
in Y. M. Congar, H. de Lubac
and J. Daniélou

VOLUMEN 61 / 2014

SEPARATA

Universidad de Navarra
Facultad de Teología

James Patrick HURLEY

Newman and Twentieth-Century
French Theology

The presence of J. H. Newman in Y. M. Congar,
H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou

Extracto de la Tesis Doctoral presentada en la
Facultad de Teología de la Universidad de Navarra

Pamplona
2014

Ad normam Statutorum Facultatis Theologiae Universitatis Navarrensis,
perlegimus et adprobavimus

Pampilonae, die 24 mensis iulii anni 2013

Dr. Ramirus PELLITERO

Dr. Ioseph MORALES

Coram tribunali, die 19 mensis maii anni 2010, hanc
dissertationem ad Lauream Candidatus palam defendit

Secretarius Facultatis
D. nus Eduardus FLANDES

Cuadernos doctorales de la Facultad de Teología
Excerpta e Dissertationibus in Sacra Theologia

Vol. LXI, n. 1

Presentation

Resumen: En esta tesis se analiza la presencia de John Henry Newman en tres teólogos franceses del siglo XX, a saber: Yves-Marie Congar, Henri de Lubac y Jean Daniélou.

En los tres primeros capítulos se traza la introducción del pensamiento de Newman en la teología católica, a través del mundo francófono. A pesar de los primeros intentos de mostrarlo –erróneamente– como el padre del modernismo, Newman gradualmente llegó a ser reconocido como teólogo innovador, pero ortodoxo. Sus contribuciones más importantes son en las áreas de desarrollo doctrinal y la racionalidad de la fe.

El capítulo cuarto considera a Newman como profeta y a Congar como perito del Concilio Vaticano II. Los dos capítulos siguientes están dedicados a un análisis de citas de Newman por Congar, de Lubac y Daniélou. Los tres lo citan en sus obras, aunque Daniélou considerablemente menor que los otros dos.

El último capítulo tiene un propósito cuádruple: en primer lugar, identificar las citas directas de Newman en discursos de los padres conciliares en el Vaticano II; en segundo lugar, recordar la importancia de Newman para varios peritos francófonos; en tercer lugar, comparar brevemente el pensamiento de Newman con la enseñanza conciliar; en cuarto lugar, estudiar algunas interpretaciones posconciliares de Newman.

Se concluye que el ilustre pensador inglés influyó en el contenido del Concilio a través de intermediarios fieles –entre ellos sus verdaderos «intérpretes franceses»–, por estar realmente presente en sus conciencias mientras redactaban los textos del Concilio Vaticano II. Esta influencia newmaniana francesa sigue después del Concilio.

Palabras clave: J. H. Newman; Teología francesa del siglo XX; Concilio Vaticano II.

Abstract: In this thesis, we examine the presence of John Henry Newman in three twentieth-century French theologians, namely, Yves-Marie Congar, Henri de Lubac and Jean Daniélou.

In the first three chapters we trace the introduction of Newman's thought into Catholic theology, via the Francophone world. Despite early attempts to portray him –erroneously– as the father of modernism, Newman gradually came to be recognized as a highly innovative, yet orthodox theologian. His chief contributions are in the areas of doctrinal development and the rationality of the faith.

Chapter four considers Newman as prophet and Congar as peritus of the Second Vatican Council. Two subsequent chapters are dedicated to an analysis of citations of Newman by Congar, de Lubac and Daniélou. All three cite him in their works, although Daniélou considerably less than the other two.

The final chapter has a fourfold purpose: firstly, to identify direct citations of Newman in Council fathers' addresses at Vatican II; secondly, to recall Newman's importance to several Francophone conciliar *periti*; thirdly, to briefly compare Newman's thought with conciliar teaching; fourthly, to survey some postconciliar interpretations of Newman.

We conclude that the Englishman influenced the Council's content through faithful intermediaries –among them his genuine «French interpreters»– by being really present in their consciences as they drafted Vatican II. This French Newmanian influence continues after the Council.

Key words: J. H. Newman; 20th century French Theology; Second Vatican Council.

In this study we explore the relationship between John Henry Newman and Francophone theology. In particular we focus on the presence of Newman in three twentieth-century French theologians whose paths are inextricably interwoven, namely: Yves-Marie Congar, Henri de Lubac and Jean Daniélou.

Besides their extensive theological work, all three served as *periti* at the Second Vatican Council. Congar founded the important ecclesiological collection *Unam Sanctam*. At his invitation, de Lubac wrote arguably the best-known individual work of the collection, *Catholicisme*. Daniélou co-founded with de Lubac the renowned patristic collection *Sources chrétiennes*, and invited Congar to work on the Vatican II schema *De Ecclesia*. The recent publication of Congar's Council journal and de Lubac's conciliar notes have furnished scholars with fresh research material.

As regards the present study, our predominant approach has been to identify and analyze direct citations of Newman in the writings of these authors. Although a brilliant thinker, Newman did not bequeath a rigorous system of theology to later theologians. Similarly, in studying his thought, we do not employ a rigid framework of analysis, nor are the terms we use to describe his ideas univocal¹.

For convenience of analysis we group points in common between the Frenchmen and the English theologian under the two principles of development of doctrine and rationality of the faith. These categories are neither exhaustive nor discrete, but rather mutually overlapping. Moreover, they are complemented by a host of other «secondary» categories. Thus, while the principle of «development» is well elaborated by Newman himself, the principle of rationality of the faith is not always expressed explicitly. Nevertheless, it occurs abundantly, being implicit in his writings on faith and reason, in the principle of «antecedent probability», in his correlating of the natural with the supernatural and in his psychology of the act of faith².

1. For example, the term «rationality of the faith» –which we shall invoke frequently– encompasses a range of possible meanings from the reasonableness of supernatural revelation to the role of reason in the act of faith. Notwithstanding the concept's breadth of possible interpretations, it is in no way interchangeable with «rationalism», in so far as that term was understood and employed by currents of thought which Newman vigorously opposed in his own lifetime.
2. For instance, Newman places the «illative sense» –key to the acquisition of religious knowledge– in the intellect.

We find that all three French theologians cite Newman in their works, although Daniélou considerably less frequently than Congar and de Lubac. De Lubac acknowledges explicitly his debt to Newman. From Congar's plentiful references to Newman, a similar debt may also be inferred. By contrast with his evident prominence in many of the latter two Frenchmen's writings, the presence of Newman in Daniélou is often indirect, be it through his brief period in the 1940s as director of a thesis on the Englishman's spiritual journey or his postconciliar identification with the figure of Newman as cardinal.

Be that as it may, we feel that there is sufficient evidence to establish a link between the gradual reception of Newman in twentieth-century French theology and the relative prominence of Newmanian concepts at the Second Vatican Council.

We conclude this thesis extract with a brief overall evaluation of the relationship between Newman and the Council *periti*.

Index of the Thesis

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	9
PART I	
Introduction	17
Chapter One	
THE INTRODUCTION OF NEWMAN'S THOUGHT INTO CATHOLIC THEOLOGY	19
I.1. NEWMAN'S MAIN THEOLOGICAL INTERESTS	23
a) Newman's spiritual life as interpretative key	24
b) Newman on history, tradition and development	24
c) Newman and religious experience	28
d) Other Newmanian themes: the laity, sacramentology, etc.	30
e) Newman's literary output	31
I.2. AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL TRANSPARENCY	33
a) Newman's rich and subtle character	42
b) Certain paradoxical features of Newman's character	47
I.3. NEWMAN, MODERNISM AND CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGY	58
Chapter Two	
A TENTATIVE SYNTHESIS OF NEWMAN'S PRINCIPAL THEOLOGICAL THINKING	65
II.1. APOLOGIA PRO VITA SUA	66
a) Background and context	66
b) Content	85
II.2. ESSAY ON DEVELOPMENT	105
a) Background and context	105
b) Content	113
II.3. GRAMMAR OF ASSENT	128
a) Background and context	128
b) Content	139

PART II

Introduction	151
--------------	-----

Chapter Three

PRECEDENTS OF MID-20TH-CENTURY FRANCOPHONE INTEREST IN NEWMAN'S WRITINGS	153
--	-----

III.1. EARLY STUDIES, TRANSLATIONS AND INTERPRETERS	154
a) 1st biography – <i>Essay on development</i> & other writings	154
b) <i>Loss and gain, Callista, Sermons, Apologia</i> , Poetry	156
c) Thureau-Dangin – Dimnet and Bremond – Rousselot	162
III.2. LATER NEWMAN STUDIES AND SYNTHESSES	179
a) German Newmanists: Laros, Przywara	179
b) <i>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</i>	186
c) Nédoncelle, Bouyer...	192

PART III

Introduction	197
--------------	-----

Chapter Four

NEWMAN AND CONGAR: PROPHET AND PERITUS OF THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL	199
--	-----

IV.1. THE MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE OF NEWMAN'S «CONVERSION»	201
IV.2. THE FORMATION, VOCATION AND ECCLESIOLOGY OF CONGAR	208
a) Congar's literary output	214
b) <i>Peritus</i> at the Second Vatican Council	218
c) The dynamic and prophetic nature of Congar's theology	232

Chapter Five

CONGAR ON NEWMAN'S CONTRIBUTION TO CATHOLIC THEOLOGY	239
--	-----

V.1. OVERVIEW	243
Historical, cultural and philosophical context	250
V.2. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE	254
V.3. PERSONAL SANCTITY AND THE TRIPLE OFFICE	260
V.4. TRADITION AND TRADITIONS	268
a) Tradition and traditions I: historical essay	269
b) Tradition and traditions II: theological essay	284
V.5. OTHER CONGARIAN THEMES/WORKS	298
a) True and false reform	298
b) Theology of the laity	312
c) Christians in dialogue	314

INDEX OF THE THESIS

Preliminary Conclusion	317
Newman	317
Congar and Newman	318
Congar at Vatican II	318
Congar on Newman	319
PART IV	
Introduction	323
Chapter Six	
THE PRESENCE OF NEWMAN IN HENRI DE LUBAC & JEAN DANIELÉLOU	325
VI.1. OVERVIEW	325
a) Review of Newman and Congar	325
b) The significance of <i>Pensées sur l'Église</i>	332
VI.2. HENRI DE LUBAC	336
a) De Lubac and Newman: a comparison of profiles	336
b) Ecclesiology	342
c) Interpretation of Scripture	364
d) Natural religion and supernatural religion	382
e) Autobiographical	394
VI.3. JEAN DANIELÉLOU	401
a) His writings	404
b) Relationship with Jean Honoré	411
PART V	
Introduction	415
Chapter Seven	
NEWMAN AND THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL	417
VII.1 DIRECT CITATIONS BY COUNCIL FATHERS	421
a) Development of doctrine	423
b) Rationality of the faith	429
VII.2 NEWMAN AND THE COUNCIL PERITI	440
a) Yves-Marie Congar	440
b) Henri de Lubac	445
VII.3 PARALLELS BETWEEN NEWMANIAN AND CONCILIAR TEACHING	453
a) Ecclesiology	456
b) Interpretation of Scripture	463
c) Personalism	464
d) Conscience	466
VII.4. A POSTCONCILIAR RETROSPECTIVE	468

FINAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	483
PART I	483
Newman's chief works: <i>Apologia pro vita sua</i> , <i>Essay on development</i> and <i>Grammar of assent</i>	483
PART II	487
Precedents of mid-20th-century Francophone interest in Newman's writings	487
PART III	491
Presence of Newman in Congar	491
PART IV	494
Congar, de Lubac and Daniélou	494
Presence of Newman in de Lubac	495
Presence of Newman in Daniélou	503
PART V	505
Newman and the Second Vatican Council	505
Newman and the Council fathers	507
Newman and the Council periti	509
Parallels between Newmanian and conciliar teachings	512
A postconciliar retrospective	513
 SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	 517
 APPENDIX I: CARDINAL NEWMAN'S WORKS	 527
1. Sermons	527
2. Treatises	527
3. Essays	527
4. Historical	528
5. Theological	528
6. Polemical	528
7. Literary	529

Bibliography of the Thesis

NEWMAN

Primary sources

- Addresses to Cardinal Newman with His Replies, etc.: 1879-1881* (ed. by W. Neville), Longmans, London, 1905.
- Apologia pro vita sua*, Longmans, London, 1908.
- Arians of the Fourth Century*, Longmans, London, 1908.
- Callista: a tale of the third century*, Longmans, London, 1901.
- Difficulties of Anglicans*, II, Longmans, London, 1900.
- Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, Longmans, London, 1906.
- Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects*, Longmans, London, 1907.
- Mr Kingsley and Dr Newman: a correspondence on the question whether Dr Newman teaches that truth is no virtue?*, Longmans, London, 1864.
- Essay on the development of Christian doctrine*, Longmans, London, 1909.
- Fifteen Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford*, Longmans, London, 1909.
- Grammar of Assent*, Longmans, London, 1903.
- Historical Sketches*, II, Longmans, London, 1906.
- Historical Sketches*, III, Longmans, 1909.
- Idea of a University*, Longmans, London, 1907.
- Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman during his Life in the English Church* (ed. by A. Mozley), II, Longmans, London, 1903.
- Letters and Diaries** (critical edition), Oxford, 1961.
- «On consulting the faithful in matters of doctrine», *The Rambler*, July 1859, 198-230.
- Parochial and Plain Sermons (in eight volumes)*, Longmans, London, 1907-1908.
- Preface to the Via Media of the Anglican Church*, I, Longmans, London, 1901.
- «Prospects for the Anglican Church», in *Essays Critical and Historical*, I, Longmans, London, 1907.
- Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day*, Longmans, London, 1902.

* Of all of the works listed, this is the only one not available on the web at <<http://www.newmanreader.org/works>>.

Secondary sources

- BIEMER, G., *Überlieferung und Offenbarung. Die Lehre von der Tradition nach John Henry Newman*, Freiburg, 1961.
- BUCKLEY, J., «Newman's autobiography», in I. KER and A. HILL (eds.), *Newman after a hundred years*, Oxford, 1990, 93-110.
- CHADWICK, O., *Newman*, Oxford, 1983.
- CHURCH, R. W., *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years, 1833-1845*, 3rd ed., Macmillan, London, 1892, 129-130.
- COULSON, J. and A. ALLCHIN (eds.), *The Rediscovery of Newman: an Oxford symposium*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1967.
- DAVIS, H., «Le rôle et l'apostolat de la hiérarchie et du laïcité dans la théologie de l'Église chez Newman», in *L'Éclésiologie au XIXe siècle*, Paris, 1960, 329-349.
- DULLES, A., «Authority in the Church», in I. KER and T. MERRIGAN (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, Cambridge, 2009, 170-188.
- *John Henry Newman*, London, Continuum, 2009.
- «Newman: the anatomy of a conversion», in I. KER (ed.), *Newman and Conversion*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1997, 21-36.
- «The threefold office in Newman's ecclesiology», in I. KER and A. HILL (eds.), *Newman after a hundred years*, Oxford, 1990, 375-399.
- GAUTHIER, P., *Newman et Blondel: tradition et développement du dogme*, Cerf, Paris, 1988.
- GRIFFIN, P., «Some Admonitions of John Henry Newman regarding the Correct Use of Scripture in the Quest for Revealed Truth», *Annales Theologici* 5 (1991), 301-325.
- GUITTON, J., *La notion de développement*, Paris, 1933.
- HONORÉ, J., *Itinéraire spirituel de Newman*, Seuil, Paris, 1963.
- «Newman et Saint Augustin», *Revista Augustiniana* 31 (96), 1990, 821-838.
- *Fais paraître ton jour. Newman poète et prophète de l'au-delà*, Cerf, Paris, 2000.
- *John Henry Newman. Un homme de Dieu*, Cerf, Paris, 2003.
- KELLY, E., «Newman's Reputation and the Biographical Tradition», *Faith and Reason*, Winter 1989.
- KER, I., *John Henry Newman: a biography*, Oxford, 1988.
- *The achievement of John Henry Newman*, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1990.
- (ed.), *Newman and Conversion*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1997.
- «The Church as Communion», in I. KER and T. MERRIGAN (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, Cambridge, 2009, 146-147.
- KER, I. and MERRIGAN, T. (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, Cambridge, 2009.
- LANGA, P., «El Vaticano II, Concilio del Cardenal Newman», *Revista Agustiniiana*, 96-XXXI (1990), 781-819.
- LASH, N., «Tides and twilight: Newman since Vatican II», in I. KER and A. HILL (eds.), *Newman after a hundred years*, Oxford, 1990, 447-464.
- LORDA, J., Review of J. MORALES, *Newman (1801-1890)*, Madrid, 1990, in *Scripta Theologica* 23 (1991), 324-326.

- MERRIGAN, T., «The Anthropology of Conversion: Newman and the contemporary theology of religions», in I. KER (ed.), *Newman and Conversion*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1997, 117-144.
- MIGUEL MAUTI, R., «La recepción de Newman en la teología del siglo XX», *Revista Teología* 42 (2005), 417-462.
- MORALES, J., *Introducción a la teología*, Eunsa, Pamplona (2ª ed.) 2004.
- «La figura del teólogo a lo largo de la historia», *Scripta Theologica* 33 (2001) 665-696.
- *Newman (1801-1890)*, Rialp, Madrid, 1990 (*nueva edición*, 2010).
- «Newman's ideal of holiness in the world», in G. BIEMER AND H. FRIES (eds.) *Christliche Heiligkeit als Lehre und Praxis nach John Henry Newman: Newman's teaching on Christian holiness*. Glock und Lutz: Sigmaringendorf, 1988, 148-159.
- *Teología, experiencia, educación: estudios newmanianos*, Eunsa, Pamplona 1999.
- NÉDONCELLE, M., *La philosophie religieuse de John Henry Newman*, Sostrilib, Strasbourg, 1946.
- NICHOLS, A., *From Newman to Congar*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1990
- PELLITERO, R., «Verdad, vida, caridad: comunión y acción de la Iglesia», in *Teocomunicação* (Brazil) 33 (2003), 789-813.
- STORK, R., Review of I. KER, *John Henry Newman: a biography*, Oxford, 1988, in *Annales Theologici* 4 (1990), 489-493.
- SULLIVAN, F., «Newman on infallibility», in I. KER and A. HILL (eds), *Newman...*, 419-446.
- TRISTRAM, H., «J.A. Möhler et J.H. Newman», *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, Paris, 1938, n° 2.
- (ed.), *John H. Newman: centenary essays*, Burns and Oates, London, 1945.
- TRISTRAM, H. and BACCHUS, F., «Newman», in DTC 11 (1931), 327-398.
- VAISS, P., *Newman et le Mouvement d'Oxford: un réexamen critique*, Lang, Berne, 2006.
- WALGRAVE, J., *Newman. Le développement du dogme*, Casterman, 1957.
- WARD, W., *The Life of J.H. Newman, based on his Private Journals and Correspondence*, 2 vols, Longmans, London, 1912.

CONGAR

Primary sources

- Chrétiens désunis. Principes d'un «oecumenisme» catholique*, Cerf, Paris, 1937.
- Jalons pour une théologie du laïc (1953)*, trans. D. Attwater as *Lay People in the Church* (revised with additions by the author), Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1985.
- Journal d'un théologien (1946-1956)*, edited and annotated by É. FOUILLOUX, Cerf, Paris, 2000.
- La Foi et la Théologie*, Desclée, Tournai, 1962.
- La Tradition et les traditions*, I, Fayard, Paris, 1960.
- La Tradition et les traditions*, II, Fayard, Paris, 1963.
- L'Église de Saint Augustin à l'époque moderne. Histoire des dogmes*, III, 3, Paris, 1970.
- Mon Journal du Concile*, I-II (ed. with introd. by E. Mahieu), Cerf, Paris, 2002.
- Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Église* (2e édition revue et corrigée), Cerf, Paris, 1968.

Secondary sources

- DULLES, A., Preface to G. FLYNN (ed.) *Yves Congar: theologian of the Church*, Peeters, Louvain, 2005, 27-29.
- FAMERÉE, J., «Formation et ecclésiologie du «premier» Congar», in A. VAUCHEZ (ed.) *Cardinal Yves Congar*. Cerf, Paris, 1999, 51-70.
- PELLITERO, R., «El Padre Congar: génesis de un pensamiento (chronicle of a colloquium in Toulouse 23-24 April 2004)», *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia*, 14 (2005), 454-457.
- «Congar's developing understanding of the laity and their mission», in *The Thomist* 65 (2001), 327-359.
- *La teología del laicado en la obra de Yves Congar*, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, 1996.
- PUYO, J., *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar: une vie pour la vérité*, Centurion, Paris, 1975.
- SCARISBRICK, J., «An historian's reflections on Yves Congar's *Mon Journal du Concile*», in G. FLYNN (ed.) *Yves Congar...*, 249-275.

DE LUBAC

Primary sources

- Carnets du Concile* (ed. with introd. by L. Figoureaux), I-II, Cerf, Paris, 2007.
- Catholicisme: les aspects sociaux du dogme*, 5th ed., revised and extended, Cerf, Paris, 1952.
- Le drame de l'humanisme athée*, Paris, 1944.
- Corpus mysticum*, Montaigne, Paris, 1949.
- La foi chrétienne: essai sur la structure du Symbole des Apôtres*, 2^e édition revue et augmentée, Aubier, Paris, 1970.
- Memoire sur l'occasion de mes écrits*, ed. by Georges Chantaine, Cerf, Paris, 2006.
- Méditation sur l'Église*, 6th ed., Cerf, Paris, 2003.
- Le mystère du surnaturel*, Cerf, Paris, 2000.
- Histoire et Esprit: l'intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène*, Cerf, Paris, 2002.
- La rencontre du bouddhisme et de l'Occident*, Cerf, Paris, 2000.
- La pensée religieuse du père Pierre Teilhard de Chardin*, Cerf, Paris, 2002.
- Paradoxes*, Cerf, Paris, 1999.
- Theology in History* (trans. by A. Nash), Ignatius, San Francisco, 1996.

Secondary sources

- DE BERRANGER, O., «Des Paradoxes au Mystère chez J.H. Newman y H. de Lubac», *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 78 (1994/1): 45-79.
- DULLES, A., *Henri de Lubac: In appreciation* (1991), retrieved 1 February 2010 from http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article_id=10726.

DANIÉLOU

Primary sources

- Le signe du Temple ou de la présence de Dieu*, 21st ed., Gallimard, 1942.
Le mystère du salut des nations, Seuil, Paris, 1946.
Sacramentum futuri: études sur les origines de la typologie biblique, Beauchesne, 1950.
Bible et liturgie: la théologie biblique des sacraments et des fêtes d'après les Pères de l'Église, Cerf, Paris, 1951.
Les anges et leur mission: d'après les Pères d'Église, 2nd ed., Chevetogne, 1953.
Essai sur le mystère de l'histoire, Seuil, 1953.
 «Compte rendu de: Jaak Seynaeve, *Cardinal Newman's doctrine of Scripture*, Louvain, 1953», *Dieu Vivant* 26 (1954), 155-157.
Dieu et nous, Grasset, Paris, 1956.
L'avenir de la religion, Fayard, Paris, 1968.
Et qui est mon prochain?: Mémoires, Stock, 1974.
L'Église des premiers temps: des origines à la fin du IIIe siècle, Seuil, 1985.
Carnets Spirituels (ed. by Marie-Josèph Rondeau), Cerf, Paris, 1993.

Secondary sources

- HONORÉ, J., *La grâce d'être né. Mémoires*, Renaissance, 2006
 OLSON, C., «Jean Daniélou's Master Key», CatholicExchange.com, 2002 <<http://catholiceducation.org/articles/religion/re0514.html>>.
 PETIT, B., in «Jean Daniélou 1905-1974», *AXES Recherches pour un dialogue entre christianisme et religions*, 7, 1-2 (1974-1975), 148-150.

ON THE RECEPTION OF NEWMAN IN FRANCE

- AUBERT, R., *Le problème de l'acte de foi: données traditionnelles et résultats des controverses récentes* (troisième édition), Louvain, 1958.
 BAUDIN, E., «La philosophie de la foi chez Newman», *Revue de Philosophie* 8 (1906) 571-598; 9 (1906) 20-55, 253-286, 373-391.
 BREMOND, H., *Newman: Essai de biographie psychologique*, Paris, 1905.
 — *La Pensée chrétienne: Le développement du dogme, La vie chrétienne and La psychologie de la foi*, Paris, 1906.
 — communication in response to J. LEBRETON, «Le primat de la conscience d'après Newman», *Revue pratique de l'apologétique* 3 (1906-1907), 676-677.
 — «Apologie pour les newmanistes français», *RPA* 3 655-666.
 DARBOY, G., «Comment y a-t-il progrès dans le catholicisme?», *Correspondant* 23 (1848), 281-293.

- DE GRANDMAISON, L., «Newman considéré comme maître», *Études* 109 (1906) 721-750; 110 (1907) 39-69.
- DIMNET, E., communication in reply to J. LEBRETON, «Autour de Newman», *RPA* 3 (1906-1907) 616-619.
- DUPUY, B., «Newman's influence in France», in J. COULSON and A. ALLCHIN (eds), *The Rediscovery of Newman: an Oxford symposium*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1967, 148ff.
- GONDON, J., *Notice biographique du R.P. Newman*, Paris, 1853.
- LEBRETON, J., «Le primat de la conscience d'après Newman», *Revue pratique de l'apologétique* 3 (1906-1907) 667-675; 678.
- «Autour de Newman», *RPA* 3 (1906-1907) 488-504; 619-620.
- MIGUEL MAUTI, R., «La recepción de Newman en la teología del siglo XX», *Revista Teología* 42 (2005), 417-462.
- NÉDONCELLE, M., «L'influence de Newman sur les yeux de la foi de Rousselot», *Revue des sciences religieuses* 27 (1953) 321-332.
- ROUSSELOT, P., «Remarques sur l'histoire de la notion de foi naturelle», *Recherches de science religieuse* 4 (1913), 26ff; IDEM, *The Eyes of Faith*, trans. by J. Donceel, Fordham, New York, 1990.
- THUREAU-DANGIN, P., *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIXe siècle*, 3 vol., Paris, 1899-1906.
- TRISTRAM, H. (ed.), «Cardinal Newman's Theses de Fide and his Proposed Introduction to the French Translation of the University Sermons», *Gregorianum* 18 (1937), 219-260.
- (ed.), *John H. Newman: centenary essays*, Burns and Oates, London, 1945.
- TRISTRAM, H. and BACCHUS, F., «Newman», in *DTC* 11 (1931), 327-398.
- VAISS, P., *Newman et le Mouvement d'Oxford: un réexamen critique*, Lang, Berne, 2006.
- WALGRAVE, J., *Newman. Le développement du dogme*, Casterman, 1957.
- WARD, W. «Newman and Sabatier», *Fortnightly Review* 69 (1901), 808-822.
- *Last Lectures by Wilfrid Ward: being the Lowell lectures (1914) and three lectures delivered at the Royal Institution (1915)*, New York, 1967.

SOME EARLY FRENCH TRANSLATIONS OF NEWMAN'S WORKS*

- BOYELDIEU D'AUVIGNY, L., *Essai sur le développement de la doctrine chrétienne*, Paris, 1847.
- BREMOND, H., *La Pensée chrétienne: Le développement du dogme, La vie chrétienne and La psychologie de la foi*, Paris, 1906.
- DU PRÉ DE SAINT-MAUR, G., *Du culte de la sainte Vierge dans l'Église catholique (Letter to Dr Pusey from Difficulties of Anglicans, II)*, Paris, 1865.
- *Histoire de mes opinions religieuses*, Douniol, Paris, 1866.

* For a more complete list, see M. NÉDONCELLE, *La philosophie religieuse de John Henry Newman*, Sostralib, Strasbourg, 1946, 315-319.

- GASTON, MME, *An essay in aid of a grammar of assent*, Paris, 1907.
- GONDON, J., *Histoire de développement de la doctrine chrétienne*, Paris, 1848.
- *Le catholicisme travesti par ses ennemis*, a translation of *Present Position of Catholics in England* (1851), Paris, undated.
- *Conférences prêchées à l'Oratoire de Londres* (1851), a translation of volume one of the English original *Lectures on certain difficulties felt by Anglicans in submitting to the Catholic Church*.
- *Conférences adressées aux protestants et aux catholiques* (translation of *Discourses addressed to mixed congregations*), Paris, 1853.
- MICHELIN-DELIMOGES, L., *Apologia pro vita sua*, Paris, 1939.
- ROUCOU-BARTHÉLÉMY, A., *Pensées sur l'Église* (Unam Sanctam, 30), Cerf, Paris, 1956.

GERMAN NEWMANISTS AND TRANSLATIONS OF NEWMAN'S WORKS

- AUBERT, R., *Le problème de l'acte de foi: données traditionnelles et résultats des controverses récentes* (troisième édition), Louvain, 1958.
- BECKER, W., «Newman's influence in Germany», in J. COULSON and A. ALLCHIN (eds), *The Rediscovery of Newman: an Oxford symposium*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1967.
- GLADEN, K., *Die Erkenntnisphilosophie J.H. Kardinal Newmans im Lichte der thomistischen Erkenntnislehre beurteilt*, Paderborn, 1933.
- «Die Glaubensphilosophie Kardinal Newmans», *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 48 (1935), 419-442.
- HAECKER, T., trans. of *Grammar of Assent (Philosophie des Glaubens)*, München, 1921.
- trans. of *Essay on Development*, München, 1922.
- KARL, A., *Die Glaubensphilosophie Newmans. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Methodologie der modernen Glaubensbegründung*, Bonn, 1941.
- KARRER, O., *Gebetbuch / J.H. Kardinal Newman. Aus seinen Schriften gesammelt*, München 1928.
- *Die Kirche*, 2 Bde., Einsiedeln / Köln 1945/1946.
- LAROS, M., *Der Glaubensproblem bei Pascal*, Düsseldorf, 1918.
- trans. of *Apologia (Die Geschichte meiner religiösen Psyche)*, Sarrelouis, 1913.
- trans. of *Meditations and Devotions (Gott und die Seele)*, Mayence, 1919.
- *J.H. Newman. Religiöse Erzieher der katholischen Kirche*, Leipzig, 1920.
- *Kardinal Newman*, Mayence, 1920.
- article on Newman, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 7 (1935), 531-534.
- MIGUEL MAUTI, R., «La recepción de Newman en la teología del siglo XX», *Revista Teología* 42 (2005), 417-462.
- PRZYWARA, E., *Religionsbegründung. Max Scheler. J.H. Newman*, Fribourg, 1922.
- *Einführung in Newmans Wesen und Werk (J.H. Newman. Christentum. Ein Aufbau*, fasc. 4), Fribourg, 1922.
- *A Newman Synthesis*, London, 1930.

- SIMON, P., «Newman and German Catholicism», *Dublin Review* 219, July 1946, 82, cited in W. BECKER, «Newman's influence in Germany».
- STEIN, E. and E. PRZYWARA (trans.) *Briefe und Tagebücher bis zum Übertritt zur Kirche 1801-1845*, München, 1928.
- TRISTRAM, H. and BACCHUS, F., «Newman», in *DTC* 11 (1931), 327-398.
- TRISTRAM, H., «J.A. Möhler et J.H. Newman», *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, Paris, 1938, n° 2.

MAGISTERIUM

Benedict XVI

Address to the Roman Curia, 22 December 2005.

(Discourses as cardinal)

- RATZINGER, J., «Conscience and Truth», 10th Workshop for Bishops, February 1991, Dallas, Texas, USA.
- «John Henry Newman belongs to the great teachers of the Church», *L'Osservatore Romano* (English edition) 22 (01.06.2005) 9, translation of a talk given in 1990.

John Paul II

- Encyclical letter *Fides et Ratio*, 1998.
- Encyclical letter *Veritatis splendor*, 1993.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1992.
- Apostolic exhortation *Christifideles laici*, 1988.
- Letter on the occasion of the second centenary of the birth of Cardinal John Henry Newman, 27 February 2001.
- Address to participants in the academic symposium to commemorate the centenary of the death of Cardinal John Henry Newman, 27 April 1990.
- Letter to the Archbishop of Birmingham for the centenary of the elevation to the Cardinalate of John Henry Newman, 7 April 1979.

Paul VI

- Address to the Luxembourg Newman Association, *L'Osservatore Romano* (English edition), 17 April 1975 (368).
- «The Wealth of Cardinal Newman's Thought», *L'Osservatore Romano* (English edition), 4 June 1970 (114).
- Address at the ceremony for the beatification of Blessed Dominic Barberi, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, vol. 55, 1963.

John XXIII

Ad Petri Cathedram, AAS (51) 1959, 497-531.

Discourse pronounced by John XXIII, 11.X.1962, reproduced under the title «El Principal Objetivo del Concilio», in *Concilio Vaticano II. Constituciones, Decretos, Declaraciones, Legislación posconciliar*, 3ª ed., BAC, Madrid, 1966, 945-952.

Leo XIII

Apostolicae curae, 13 September 1896.

Conciliar documents

Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II, Typis Polyglotis Vaticanis, 1970- (abbrev.: ACTA)

Apostolicam actuositatem

Christus Dominus

Dei Verbum

Dignitatis humanae

Gaudium et spes

Lumen gentium

Optatam totius

Presbiterorum ordinis

Unitatis redintegratio

Other documents of the Holy See

COMISIÓN TEOLÓGICA INTERNACIONAL, *Documentos 1969-1996*, Madrid 1998.

OTHER SOURCES

BASTERO, J., *Mary, Mother of the Redeemer*, Four Courts, Dublin, 2006.

BLANCO, P., «Joseph Ratzinger, perito del Concilio Vaticano II (1962-1965)», *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia* 15 (2006) 43-66.

BYRNE, A., «Crossing the Tiber», <www.mercatornet.com> [22 October 2009].

ESCRIVÁ, J., *The Way* (annotated ed.), Scepter, London, 2001.

LORDA, J., *Antropología cristiana: del Concilio Vaticano II a Juan Pablo II*, 3rd ed., revised and updated, Palabra, Madrid, 2004.

— *La Gracia de Dios*, Palabra, Madrid, 2004.

STEENSON, J., «Seeking the Pearl of Great Price», <www.mercatornet.com> [23 October 2009].

VILLAR, J., «Identidad eclesial», *ABC* (21 October 2009).

The presence of J. H. Newman in Y. M. Congar, H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou

I. YVES-MARIE CONGAR

1.1. *Newman and Congar: prophet and peritus of the Second Vatican Council*

Both Newman (1801-1890) and Congar (1904-1995) lived lengthy lives. Both were Europeans, dedicated patristic scholars, historians, teachers, theologians, promoters of renewal, men of the Church. Both were censured for a time by ecclesiastical superiors, both were obedient and patient, and both were rewarded in later life by being named cardinals¹.

But on many points they differ too. Newman was English and insular, Congar French and «continental». The former an Evangelical-leaning Anglican who in mid-life embraced Catholicism, the latter a cradle Catholic who in his youth befriended Protestants and Jews. Newman was a contemporary of J. A. Möhler (1796-1836), Congar an heir of many of the German theologian's seminal ideas. The one declined numerous invitations to participate in the First Vatican Council, the other played an active role as *peritus* in the Second.

Perhaps what unites these two great Christian gentlemen the most is their strong sense of divine vocation, of God's calling them to follow a provident spiritual itinerary in obedient service of the Church Universal (Catholic) wherever that might lead and at whatever personal cost. Newman –as university man, religious thinker, convert, counsellor of converts, spiritual diarist and Christian apologist in the face of rising nineteenth-century secularization– unconsciously becomes the model of modern twentieth-century theologians in dialogue with fellow believers, culture and the world. Rationalist criticisms and theological inertia prompt men like Möhler and Newman² to return to the sources, so as to better determine, among other things, the true nature of the Church. Congar is acutely aware of the legacy of renewed biblical and patristic scholarship bequeathed by his nineteenth-century predeces-

sors. His own Catholic upbringing, his childhood friendships with people of other confessions and faiths, his encounters with Protestants and Anglicans during wartime captivity at Colditz, his penchant for history, and, above all, his theological training at *Le Saulchoir* feature among the key influences that prepare the way for his vocation, at once ecclesiological and ecumenical³.

Although prudent, ever-conscious of history and a resolute defender of the patrimony of tradition, Congar was also a pioneering theologian. He was fully aware of this, as is clear from a diary entry in 1946 in which he gives his reasons for not wishing to stand in as administrator (*régent*) of *Le Saulchoir*, following the removal of its head, Father Chenu. In the diary he questions his own capacity for administration, but more importantly he emphasizes the importance of his ecclesiological and prophetic work (*mon travail 'prophétique'*), as well as his participation in the ecumenical movement, and the need to have the time and the freedom to dedicate himself to these delicate areas, which because of their novelty might arouse suspicion or censure, which he does not wish to bring upon the College a second time⁴.

Almost ten years earlier he had provided an equally explicit testimony to his work on the frontiers of theology. Aware that his ecumenical thinking might ruffle the brows of some in the Church not yet familiar with this ecclesiology, Congar wrote in a preface to his 1937 work *Chrétiens désunis*:

We disavow in advance that which, within this book, might become disavowed by our Church... Perhaps certain parts might appear hard to certain persons. Many of the things, within the book, have seemed hard at first to ourselves. But having, after an effort which at times was a struggle, recognized them as true, we can no longer hush them up. Obedience to the truth has ever been a law for us⁵.

In many ways his thinking presaged the teaching of the Council. One area of particular interest was the pastoral reality and structure of the Church. As early as the 1930s, Pellitero writes, «in his search for answers to the pastoral challenges of the time... Congar figured among the driving forces in the re-evaluation of the role of the laity, within the context of the French Catholic Action movement»⁶. The University of Navarra professor attributes to the Frenchman the introduction «into France [of] the great ecclesiology of Tübingen, centered in the works of Johann Adam Möhler, in which the Church appears as a living organism extending herself through history under the impetus of the Holy Spirit»⁷.

The outbreak of the Second World War was a catalyst for new experiences, among them, a sharpening of «awareness of the necessity of a renewal of

the apostolate». Popular devotions and pilgrimages increased, as well as «the desire to reach the most difficult environments, especially the working masses». The result was «a profound reconsideration of the Church's mission and, within that mission, of the role of the laity. Congar, in his encounters with the laity (and within the context of the Catholic Action movement), spoke of the personal spiritual life and the Christian transformation of society»⁸. These are themes that would later attain particular prominence in the Council's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*.

During the 1930s and 1940s, continues Pellitero, «[i]n order to provide a foundation for the ecclesial vision of the laity, he turned to the theology of the Mystical Body, then at the height of its popularity, and to the vision of the common priesthood of the faithful»⁹. In 1953 he published *Jalons pour une théologie du laïc*. Immediately after the Council he reconsidered a number of his positions, for example, «with regard to the so-called 'theology of ministries'»¹⁰. The dynamic nature of his innovative thought has ensured that «Congar's was not a straight linear evolution but rather a process of pathbreaking, travelling at times along previously unexplored trails, which involves great effort and requires corrections en route»¹¹.

Caution is in order, nonetheless, when speaking of a first or second Congar prior to and following the Council. Famerée maintains that one can speak of a «first Congar» in the sense where, in accordance with the Second Vatican Council, his ecclesiological reflection undergoes adjustments, but not of a «first Congar» in the sense where his preconciliar self would be radically opposed to a postconciliar «second Congar». The progressive continuity (*continuité évolutive*) observable in his thought is elaborated consciously in the same vein as the original (*en fidélité avec la veine originelle*)¹². The link between the two Congars, so to speak –and the wellspring from which both he and Newman drew– is the continual return to the roots of the most authentic Christian tradition. It was, in fact, this *modus operandi* which led him to anticipate many aspects of the Council's theology¹³.

In a summary of Congar's theological work –masterly in its concision– Dulles explains how his passion for ecumenism led him into other areas where he also made a considerable impact: «His understanding of Scripture and Tradition had a manifest influence on the Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Verbum*. His theology of the Holy Spirit has been helpful for Catholic renewal and has facilitated mutual comprehension between the churches of East and West»¹⁴.

The French theologian's «ecumenical ecclesiology permeates the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium* and the Decree on Ecumenism *Unitatis Redintegratio*», he says. The American Cardinal argues that «[v]iewing the Church as a people called together in the Holy Spirit, Congar anticipated what is called a 'spirituality of communion'». He attributes to Congar, amongst other pioneering ecumenists, the insight that «non-Catholic churches and communions could possess important elements of the true Church». Dulles underlines the French Dominican's belief «that Catholicism should take on different forms in different cultures, and that the catholicity of the Church would be enriched if the Greeks and Russians, Scandinavians and British, were in full communion with Roman Catholics»¹⁵.

The Jesuit theologian concludes his profile of Congar –made in the context of an ecumenical setting commemorating the Frenchman's theological work– with the following remarks: «Congar emphasized the dialectic between structure and life in the Church. He held that lay persons, even without holding any office could enjoy the gifts of the Holy Spirit and participate in the prophetic, priestly, and regal ministries of Christ. Reacting against the centralism of the previous centuries, he resuscitated the concept of the local Church and envisaged the universal Church as a communion of particular churches –themes with which Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox could resonate–. Together with several colleagues in France and Belgium, he retrieved the ancient idea of collegiality among bishops. In his great work on True and False Reform he laid down principles for authentic Catholic reform, carefully distinguishing it from revolutionary proposals that are sometimes marketed under the banner of reform. Open though he was to new research, he firmly adhered to the dogmas and divinely given structures of the Church... Like his contemporary Henri de Lubac, he possessed an almost incredible mastery of the patristic and medieval sources. He could always find reputable predecessors to support his proposals»¹⁶.

With a long life dedicated to the theological task behind him, Congar would remark retrospectively that:

My publications respond to calls that I have felt and that were linked to occurrences (*conjunctures*). I have attempted to serve theologically the People of God, «this Church that I love», in its historical life¹⁷.

This succinct comment provides rich insights into the man and his vocation. His writings were inspired by a continual response to his divine calling in different moments and contexts. His view of the theologian's function was

one of service to the Church, understood in its broad, historico-salvific and ecumenically oriented sense of the People of God, here and now in this «time of the Church», or, as he puts it, «in its historical life».

Congar was graced with a strong sense of God's plan of salvation both for all of creation and for him personally in every concrete moment of his life. Within that global plan, he believed, everyone has his place, be it great or small. We see this conviction expressed very clearly in a detailed interview that he gave in the seventies¹⁸. Commenting on the history of the people of God in general, the French theologian highlights the equality of all the baptised before God. Yet within such vocational unity, he draws attention to the fact that some are called upon to play an historically more weighty role than others:

Obviously, some have an historical place: Newman, Thérèse de l'Enfant Jésus, de Foucauld, Paul VI... have a considerable historical role, just like statesmen, geniuses...¹⁹.

Although it is no more than a passing reference, it is significant that, of those whom Congar lists as occupying what he calls a «historical place» (*une place historique*) in this global plan, Newman should be named first. Moreover, it seems remarkable that the English convert to Catholicism should precede two French saints²⁰ and the Pope whose task it was to close the last ecumenical council²¹, not to mention other great historical figures. The prominence of Newman in the French historian's mind seems to us to be unquestionable. His observation is too logically ordered –three modern figures renowned for their holiness followed by a modern Pope– to be a slip of the tongue or a mere throwaway remark, and many of his works are peppered by other similar comments regarding the Englishman's stature.

Let us return to the text of the interview, for it sheds light also on how Congar perceived his own, not inconsiderable, role in recent Church history, in spite of what he regards as his comparatively limited personal value. The Frenchman sees his calling as at once divine and situated in time. In marvelously lucid fashion, he contrasts the paradox of the deep mystery of vocation and its apparent day-to-day imperceptibility; the insignificance of its recipient and the disproportionate nature of its effects:

The drama, is that each one, caught up in his own history, rarely perceives that unique vocation... I myself, having received my vocation as priest, religious, servant of theology, have had a role within the Church which greatly exceeds my

personal value, it's undeniable; I've had the chance to be involved in that renewal of the Church which has led to the Council; in the end, I've been fulfilled since I have always sought to situate myself exactly in line with God's plan²².

One detects in this text a blend of modest self-appraisal combined with complete confidence in his place in God's plan, and of its far-reaching significance and capacity to fulfil. Similar sentiments are expressed in some earlier comments –in this case on his ecumenical vocation– in which he again defers to Newman:

My work... will be to «influence the tone of thought», not only of my country, but of all countries, nay of the world, «with a view to a distant time when I shall be no longer here». Although, puny (*chétif*) as I may be compared to Newman, the world is so full of communications and interchanges (*échanges*), now, that my tiny contribution really has an impact everywhere (*mon infime apport a réellement un retentissement partout*). I am read and understood in Boston and in New Delhi...²³.

Congar regards the ecumenical task to be beyond his modest natural capacities, but at the same time he knows that he is not alone, and that the enterprise does not depend on his efforts solely. Besides, Congar does not set his hopes on Christian unity's being achieved in his own lifetime, but rather aims to play his modest historical part in the process of achieving it, in God's own good time.

One modern «reputable predecessor» whom Congar frequently invoked in support of some of his principal theological opinions –in the areas of fundamental theology, development of doctrine, historical theology, tradition, the laity and ecumenism– was John Henry Newman. In our study we shall attempt to examine more closely his intellectual debt to the Englishman. Besides focusing on direct citations by Congar of Newman, we shall also look for possible indirect –what one might call «prophetic»– influences of the latter on the former, culminating in the eventual incorporation of many Newmanian ideas into the «new» ecclesiology of Vatican II, which the French *peritus* had a proximate role in shaping²⁴.

1.2. *Development of doctrine*

In relation to *Essay on Development*, one of Newman's most seminal works, Congar remarks, that, had it not been for his personal and English temperament and had the nature of the themes selected not made Newman adopt an

essay style, he could have played the role of a kind of new «*Logique*» for the treatment of Christian doctrines²⁵.

In *La Foi et la Théologie* we see a certain influence of the English theologian in the French Dominican's elaboration of the foundation and nature of development, and more specifically in his remarks about how the temporality of the Church –a pilgrim community– is affected by the human condition. Commenting on the progress of the Church in the understanding of the faith, Congar states that the living reception of the faith on the part:

of the faithful and of the Church follows the conditions of the human spirit. The solidity of Newman's *Essay* comes from his dual capacity as historian and psychologist. Newman rests his views on the analysis, made more or less throughout his work, of the psychological structure of human knowledge. Man compensates for the weakness of his perceptions by elaborating them through a series of judgements and reasonings²⁶.

While Saint Thomas saw this conditioning in the need for discourse (*discours*), today, argues Congar, we are more sensible to its aspect of temporality (*temporalité*) or of historicity²⁷.

Yet, individual human interpretation, although an essential part of personal assent to revealed truths of faith, is not above Revelation but rather depends on it, nor is it hermeneutically autonomous. The human spirit depends on the Holy Spirit, and particular discernments shall always be subject to the general grace of discernment entrusted to the hierarchy, before being accepted as authoritative explicitations of the single sacred deposit of the faith.

Regarding the homogeneity of development, or preservation of the identity of sense (*sens*), or of meaning, Congar proposes that:

It is the sense of the Faith, prompted (*suscité*) and guided by the Holy Spirit moving the universal Church to believe as it ought, and likewise the bishops to teach as they ought, which is the adequate power, apt to judge correctly the authentic and homogeneous explicitation of the revealed given (*donné révélé*)²⁸.

Having proposed this thesis, the French theologian goes on to say that one can verify such homogeneity a) by way of reasoning, b) by means of historical documentation, c) by reference to the consciousness of the Church and to the magisterium. The Church uses these three means concurrently, since only their combined use furnishes an adequate justification²⁹.

Development is truly historical, Congar argues, but the methods of the human sciences, while useful, are limited and incapable of effecting a complete synthesis. Hence, he continues:

There exists a certain distance between human means, which the Church ought to use and uses to assure itself of its fidelity to the revealed deposit, and the divine absolute that constitutes the deposit. The latter is not measured by the former, but by the assistance of the Holy Spirit... The most ancient Fathers of the Church argued from apostolic tradition. But the fact that, after them, that tradition has been lived (*a été vécue*) [means that] there is developed within the Church an understanding of the faith guided by the same Spirit who has spoken through the prophets. Thus is constituted a new «locus» (*lieu*), that of the *sense* which the Church has recognised and developed, *sensus Ecclesiae*. One can neither reduce it to its ancient expressions, nor separate it from the documents capable of witnessing to its fidelity³⁰.

The French Dominican concludes the exposition of his thesis affirming that such a view of things corresponds 1) to the historical reality of development, in particular that of recent Marian dogmas; 2) to criteria admitted by dogmatic formulation and to the explanations of numerous theologians; and 3) to patristic pronouncements and declarations of the magisterium.

We feel that it would be a forced interpretation, based on the evidence presented above, to extrapolate a significant dependence of Congar on Newman, with respect to his understanding of development. The French theologian, in fact, invokes many other theologians (with their own *nuances*) such as Marin Sola, Dhanis, Blondel, Möhler, de Grandmaison, Gardeil and de Lubac, in support of his views.

Nevertheless, Congar does give Newman a separate treatment from the rest, as if to acknowledge the historical importance of the Oratorian's contribution on this doctrine. Moreover, a close reading of the text reveals many parallels between both theologians' arguments, although Newman, argues as always from his characteristically Newmanian empirico-philosophical perspective, and consequently his arguments have to be understood within the context of his peculiar mode of thought, as it is reflected in his writings as a whole.

Thus, in Congar's words, the Englishman proposes less a theory of development than a criteriological outline for the preservation of identity or for remaining faithful to a primitive type through changes³¹.

Here we see both Newman's originality and his deference to the magisterium. Congar then turns to the need to situate the *Essay* in the context of the

rest of the British Oratorian's writings, and draws attention to a sociological or pastoral phenomenon which he himself met with in early twentieth-century France, namely, that of modern atheism:

Newman's *Essay* gains a lot in force when placed in relation... with the whole of his thought: on the one hand, with his analysis of the natural workings and psychological structures of the human spirit, on the other hand, with his analysis of the development of the religious man's and the rationalist man's thinking. Witnessing the beginnings of modern unbelief as a collective historical fact, Newman has, in effect, retrieved, although applying it to a thinking extended in time, a kind of Pascalian analysis of the submissive spirit and the rebellious spirit³².

Thus, whether applied to studying the development of doctrine through time or more fundamentally to the act of faith itself, a docile openness to the truth disposes one to accept as certain the cumulative and convergent value of indices rendered, for example by the illative (or inferential) sense in the case of the act of faith, whereas a rebellious disposition results in a progressive blinding of the intellect.

1.3. *Tradition and traditions*

In this major Congarian work, presented in two volumes, the French theologian seeks to sketch, in the first of these, a history of the problem of tradition (*la problématique de la tradition*). The question of tradition, such as it is posed today in ecumenical circles, he argues, is largely determined by the heritage of the preceding twenty centuries during the course of which the manner of approaching it has varied and has progressively acquired greater precision. In this first essay, Congar's main concern is to outline this history, yet he does not wish to limit himself to a mere investigation of the documentary evidence, preferring rather to lay the historical-cum-theological groundwork for a deeper analysis in the second, properly speaking, theological essay³³.

a) *Tradition and traditions I: historical essay*

The former disciple of the *Le Saulchoir* historico-theological school, makes reference to Newman in both essays. Not surprisingly, his first reference to the English theologian appears in the context of the Fathers' biblical sense of the mystery of revelation³⁴.

Thus Congar distinguishes between the broad sapiential exegesis of the Fathers and the narrow literal exegesis of the sixteenth-century Reformers. Moreover, he does so, not without betraying some influence from Newman, for he goes on to conclude this chapter on the Fathers of the Ancient Church with a supporting quote from the Englishman while he was still an Anglican:

We lay greater stress than they [the Early Church Fathers] on proofs from definite verses of Scripture, or what are familiarly called texts, and we build up a system upon them; they rather recognized a certain truth lying hid under the tenor of the sacred text as a whole, and showing itself more or less in this verse or that as it might be. We look on the letter of Scripture more as a foundation, they as an organ of the truth³⁵.

Congar ends the chapter by recommending a balance between the contemporary preoccupation with the historical genesis of Scripture and the Church, and the Fathers' sensibility to the heavenly origins of the mystery of revelation and to its present actualization in the time of the Church by the Holy Spirit³⁶.

Why should it be necessary to explain to the modern historical mentality how the Early Church Fathers thought? Why does there appear to be such a chasm between contemporary and classical early Christian perspectives?

According to Congar, from the sixteenth century on, Catholic apologetics becomes dominated by the controversy of Protestantism. Thereafter apologists are anxious to fasten to the apostolic deposit all that Protestants attack and that, by contrast, the Church regards as a sacred good, possessed from time immemorial. They have no more than an imperfect consciousness of historical intelligibility, and an excessively logical conception of dogmatic development³⁷. Yet the pressing apologetic necessity stimulates them to seek in the early patristic writings justifications for current liturgical and ecclesial practice. So much so that the decree of the Council of Trent on traditions was written in such a way as to allow it to hold the position of the Fathers. It remains the position of numerous and important Catholic theologians, maintains the Frenchman, as he goes on to cite various authors, including Newman, whom he quotes as follows:

Nor am I aware that later Post-tridentine writers deny that the whole Catholic faith may be proved from Scripture, though they would certainly maintain that it is not to be found on the surface of it, nor in such sense that it may be gained from Scripture without the aid of Tradition³⁸.

In the same text, although not quoted in this instance by Congar, the Englishman asserts that:

The divines of the Church are in every age engaged in regulating themselves by Scripture, appealing to Scripture in proof of their conclusions, and exhorting and teaching in the thoughts and language of Scripture. Scripture may be said to be the medium in which the mind of the Church has energized and developed³⁹.

As the British theologian argues, the practice reflects:

a certain law of Christian teaching, which is this –a reference to Scripture throughout, and especially in its mystical sense–⁴⁰.

In the third chapter of *La Tradition et les traditions I*, Congar passes on to consider the history of the Middle Ages. In an excursus appended to the chapter, the French theologian once again invokes the authority of Newman, in support of his position that Scripture contains, at least implicitly or in principle, the whole treasure of truths that it is necessary to believe in order to be saved. This, he adds, is not the principle of *Scriptura sola* of the Protestant Reformers, who, reacting against what they considered to be undue papal ecclesiastical authority, sought to underline the sovereignty of God by affirming the sufficiency of Scripture formally as well as materially. Not only did they maintain that all that was given to be believed was contained in Scripture, but furthermore they asserted that the Christian benefiting from the interior witness of the Holy Spirit could find it there.

Congar maintains that the Fathers and mediaeval theologians that he has cited admit the material sufficiency of Scripture, while also stating that it is insufficient in itself to yield its true sense and is understood correctly only within the Church and within its tradition. This declaration of the sufficiency of Scripture on the part of the Fathers and mediaevals, he goes on to say, has often been expressed in an occasional manner and in a particular context.

Then, as a fitting way to conclude his argument on the material sufficiency but formal insufficiency of Scripture, he proceeds to transcribe a long quote from a letter by Newman to his Anglican friend Edward Pusey, which strikes the French ecumenist as being so irenic and catholic in tone⁴¹.

In the final chapter –chapter six– containing a survey of tradition and the magisterium of the Council of Trent up to the middle of the twentieth

century, Congar cites Newman several times. Referring to the latter's *Apologia pro vita sua*, he states that the English theologian explained the growth in interventions of the doctrinal authority of the Church, for the most part by the Pope, as being due to the need to confront the increasingly widespread and violent evil of rationalism. The observation, the French Dominican maintains, is valuable⁴².

He notes in passing the influence of Newman on Giovanni Perrone (1794-1876) –professor of dogmatic theology in the Jesuit Roman College– regarding the change in the latter's understanding of the subject of tradition. After having had contact with the Englishman, Perrone expanded the concept to include the ordinary lay faithful, albeit reserving the teaching function to the hierarchy alone. Congar explains the historical background:

Newman had complained that in his *Praelectiones* of 1842, Perrone did not mention the *consensus fidelium* among the theological places. In his *De immaculato B. Mariae Virg. Conceptu*, Rome, 1847, Perrone insists, by contrast, on the role of the whole body of the faithful in keeping tradition⁴³.

The Frenchman goes on to conclude somewhat wryly:

The mariological developments have, a century later, obliged theologians not to neglect this point⁴⁴.

Congar classifies Newman and Matthias Scheeben (1835-1892) together as authors of great syntheses (*grandes synthèses*). However, while acknowledging Scheeben's remarkable knowledge of the Fathers and of the ancient theologians, the German theologian, he says, had neither the historical formation nor turn of mind of the Englishman⁴⁵.

The Frenchman views Newman's contribution to the clarifying of the notion of tradition in the context of the Englishman's search for a solution to a problem of theological history which he had encountered in his patristic studies⁴⁶.

Then Congar makes the following key affirmation of the significance of the former Oxford tutor's investigations:

With Newman –not that he had been alone, but he has been, and remains unto this day, the main classic [al author] on the question– the notion of development became an internal dimension of tradition. Newman had brought a decisive contribution to the problem of the relationship between magisterium and history in tradition⁴⁷.

The French historian goes on to highlight Newman's role in clarifying the respective functions of hierarchy and ordinary faithful, in together expressing the unique infallibility of the whole Church:

... The teaching Church is not always the most active instrument of the grace of infallibility: this has been seen, says Newman, in the Arian crisis. The Church is a hierarchically structured organism, but the whole of it lives (*mais tout entier vivant*). The ideal is a *conspiratio pastorum et fidelium*...⁴⁸.

Nevertheless, Newman ever defended the role of authority in religion, as the following passage from *Essay on Development* shows:

Moreover, it must be borne in mind that, as the essence of all religion is authority and obedience, so the distinction between natural religion and revealed lies in this, that the one has a subjective authority, and the other an objective... Thus, what conscience is in the system of nature, such is the voice of Scripture, or of the Church, or of the Holy See, as we may determine it, in the system of Revelation⁴⁹.

Congar glosses the above by saying that Newman then pursues the parallelism: just as it is always morally good to follow conscience, even if it might be sometimes erroneous, likewise is it prudent to follow always the magisterium even in cases where it is doubtful that it would be infallible⁵⁰.

In the final pages of his historical essay, the French theologian summarizes what he has presented up to now: how, on the one hand, the natural movement of theological development, on the other hand, the necessity to oppose the Reform, have led to the insistence on the role of the living magisterium as a decisive or formal element, to the point where, in certain declarations, the infallibility of the Church and of its magisterium appear as if an autonomous, sufficient value, dispensing with any reference to an explicit attestation at the level of the documentarily attested Given (*au niveau du Donné documentairement attesté*). Further clarification was obviously needed to avoid fideistic excesses. Nineteenth-century critical historians reacted by asserting their autonomy from theology. But by

[a]pplying their method in a manner independent of the domain of Revelation, of the ancient history of Christianity, of dogmas and institutions, they risked reconstituting an image of the Christian given that deviated from the dogmatic affirmations of the Church⁵¹.

One of the consequences of the modernist crisis that ensued is the greater awareness of the added value (*plus-value*) that the faith of the Church admits in relation to that which the purely human textual studies allow in their historical and critical reading. Congar attributes to Newman, along with Möhler, the insight that the Church cannot be understood except from within. History, he insists, is incapable of critically justifying developed beliefs⁵².

b) *Tradition and traditions II: theological essay*

Many of the Newmanian ideas invoked in the first essay reappear in the second: the idea of Tradition as teacher, the citing of Scripture as proof; Möhler and Newman and the *sensus fidei*; Newman and Perrone and the dogma of the Immaculate Conception; the material sufficiency of Scripture; the necessity of Apostolic writings; and the rediscovery of Tradition by Möhler, Newman and others.

But there are some fresh accents such as the invocation of Newman's image of Mary as the pattern of faith, in both the reception and the study of divine truth. There are the explicitations of Tradition as «the consciousness (*conscience*) of the Church»; of «real possession» referring to unformulated yet definite convictions. In the context of a discussion of the liturgy as a theological place, we are presented with Newman's lauding of the eloquence of demonstrative liturgical rituals and gestures. We are treated to an analysis of the somewhat divergent views of implicit knowledge held by Newman and Blondel. In discussing education as presence or person-to-person communication, we see Max Scheler's understanding of tradition as vital communication of values by example, compared to Newman's observations about the living voice of oral Tradition.

In any case, I propose to consider briefly each of the Newmanian ideas in turn, both those that are reiterated by Congar from the first essay and those that are newly introduced in the second, in order of their appearance in the latter.

In the preface to the theological essay written in January 1963, the author outlines the difficulties of tackling a topic that has attracted so much research and magisterial attention⁵³. The essay had been written prior to the first session of the Second Vatican Council which dealt with precisely the question of Tradition and its relation with Scripture in the communication of Revelation. Moreover, prior to publication, there had appeared various studies of interest such as those of Holstein, Geiselman, Kasper and Biemer⁵⁴, to mention but a

few, as well as several articles relevant to the theme, all of which he tries to incorporate in some way into his work. It is in this context that Congar attempts to explain the value of his second volume on Tradition. He suggests that all of these studies as a whole serve to broaden perspectives, in the new atmosphere of ecumenical dialogue, which requires going beyond the narrow context of the controversies of the sixteenth century and demands that Catholics themselves broaden their minds⁵⁵.

The first chapter Congar dedicates to providing an analysis and synthesis of the idea of tradition. In a subsection entitled «that which is transmitted is received by a living, [and] therefore active, subject», the French theologian observes that the New Testament presents Mary as the perfect model of a Christian believer. She accepts the Word, and thus she becomes the Mother of God. She keeps the Word in her heart (Lk 2: 19-51). He quotes Newman's last university sermon, in which the latter comments on the words of St Luke, «Mary kept all these things in her heart», and presents the Mother of God as

our pattern of Faith, both in the reception and in the study of Divine Truth. She does not think it enough to accept, she dwells upon it; not enough to possess, she uses it; not enough to assent, she develops it; not enough to submit the Reason, she reasons upon it; not indeed reasoning first, and believing afterwards, with Zacharias, yet first believing without reasoning, next from love and reverence, reasoning after believing. And thus she symbolizes to us, not only the faith of the unlearned, but of the doctors of the Church also, who have to investigate, and weigh, and define, as well as to profess the Gospel; to draw the line between truth and heresy; to anticipate or remedy the various aberrations of wrong reason; to combat pride and recklessness with their own arms; and thus to triumph over the sophist and the innovator⁵⁶.

The Frenchman, argues that the fidelity in question is not merely rational but vital⁵⁷. Further on in the same chapter Congar credits Newman with recovering the patristic idea of using Scripture as a means of proving the truth of oral teaching or of Tradition. Yet, eager to highlight the proper dignity of Scripture as a written text, while acknowledging that the Fathers used it to combat heresy, he adds that they cherished it all the more as the source of all saving knowledge⁵⁸.

A short intervening chapter entitled «an essay of clarification of the notion of tradition» follows. It precedes the next chapter of particular interest to our study –chapter three– which is dedicated to the subject of tradition.

Turning to Möhler's understanding of the *sensus fidei*, the Frenchman explains that in the latter's *Symbolik*, he compares tradition to the spirit of the people, the link between past and present, which becomes objective in national laws and institutions, but he adds:

[i]t is not a creation of the community or simply a result of its life: Möhler ties this common spirit to the transcendent reality of the Holy Spirit as to its operating cause, and to that of Christ as its content of truth-life. He ties it to the positive fact of Pentecost. This spirit or this sense that lives in the community is inseparable from the objective content of the Tradition which it conserves, understands and interprets⁵⁹.

Congar then notes that it has been said that the *sensus fidei* of the Church is the same as what Newman calls the illative or inferential sense. He draws a subtle distinction between the two, however:

We say that these are realities of the same order, faculties of perception, but viewed at different levels and in a different role. The *illative sense* is the faculty of anticipating the outcomes, which responds to the pre-conviction stage in the process of grasping the truth. The *sensus fidei* of the Church is a faculty of understanding the implications, not yet elucidated of a reality *already possessed*⁶⁰.

Both Newman and Möhler –and other nineteenth-century authors as well as contemporary ones too– often speak of *sensus fidei Ecclesiae* in terms of «consciousness» (*conscience*). Although the French ecclesiologist is favourable to the idea, he wishes to clarify it a little, and he does so, invoking the aid of Newman's concept of real possession⁶¹.

Thus Congar explains the basic expressions of the consciousness of the Church, which, he goes on to say, do not exhaust its content. Moreover, keen to avert the danger of conveying the notion of a single absolute monolithic consciousness, he distinguishes between it and the theological concept of communion, adding the following qualification:

We do not imagine a single conscience of which the personal conscience of Christians and of heads of the Church would be manifestations or moments. Conscience belongs to persons, who cannot be merged into a higher unity. The unity of persons in the Church is not a type of 'fusion', but a type of 'communion'...⁶².

Taking up the issue of the role of the laity, the Frenchman is attracted by the importance accorded by Newman to the ordinary Christian faithful in

transmitting the faith, a view which may have resulted in Newman's influencing indirectly –via Perrone– the dogma of the Immaculate Conception⁶³.

Asserting an active role for the laity in exercising «the spiritual maternity of the Church», Congar goes on to affirm that the faithful as corporate subject of tradition are for the most part occupied with keeping it and transmitting it. They keep it through their fidelity in thought and action; they transmit it through scientific and catechetical education and through their witness or profession of the faith. Thus, he says, it is Christian parents who make Christian children. Furthermore, as active subjects of Tradition, the laity constitute a «theological place» (*lieu théologique*) and thus form part of the assembly of witnesses, signs or monuments of Tradition⁶⁴.

Turning his attention in the fourth chapter to tradition and ecclesial life, the Dominican theologian describes «the teaching style» (*le style de l'enseignement*) of the liturgy in its confession of the faith as simply proceeding, with the assurance of life, to the affirmation of what it does and of the content it yields in being celebrated⁶⁵. De Maistre, writes Congar, has expressed this in his passionate and polemical prose, but Newman did so in his completely irenic and penetrating manner⁶⁶.

Already in our introductory remarks to this section on the second volume of *La Tradition et les traditions*, we alluded to the somewhat divergent views of implicit knowledge held by Newman and Blondel. The French Dominican cites Möhler and Franzelin among precursors of the latter's notion of the «implicit lived» (*implicite vécu*) before highlighting the significance of the role of Newman:

Newman above all had, in his study of the implicit, given a place to those ideas or determinations that we bear within us, already defined, but without having brought them to a clear intellectual consciousness. So we can act already in accordance with them before formally expressing them and, should the collision with a contrary force furnish the occasion, the orientation already formed will express itself in conscious thought⁶⁷.

He then goes on to remark that the analysis of the Englishman was perhaps more satisfactory than the more developed one of the French philosopher, in that Newman's manifested better the already intellectual nature of the implicit⁶⁸.

Another idea already mentioned above briefly in our introductory remarks to this section was Max Scheler's understanding of tradition as vital communication of values by example. The idea resembles Newman's ob-

servations about the living voice of oral Tradition. Congar draws on both authors to support his premise that:

The law of education is presence, the communication from person to person. In this respect, the educational activities themselves are secondary or ancillary⁶⁹.

He quotes Scheler at some length, citing Newman in a related footnote. There he invokes the English educationalist's view that the great instrument of a university, or rather its organ

has ever been that which nature prescribes in all education, the personal presence of a teacher, or, in theological language, Oral Tradition. It is the living voice, the breathing form, the expressive countenance, which preaches, which catechises. Truth, a subtle, invisible, manifold spirit, is poured into the mind of the scholar by his eyes and ears, through his affections, imagination, and reason⁷⁰.

There is a fleeting reference to the rediscovery of Tradition in the nineteenth century in the next chapter on Scripture and Tradition. The achievement is attributed to Möhler and the Tübingen School, together with Pasaglia, Franzelin and Scheeben, as well as Newman⁷¹.

Newman is named in passing in the same chapter among several scholars who, based on extensive historical data, have maintained the mutual interdependence of Scripture and Tradition. Congar asserts in this regard that Scripture and Tradition are not two independent sources but rather two witnesses to the same Revelation, differing only in their modality⁷².

A little further on, the French theologian again invokes the Englishman on the relationship between Bible and Tradition. Having cited St Irenaeus and St Augustine as stating that many men keep the faith without knowing the Scriptures, Congar observes nevertheless that:

It has not been in vain that the apostolic Scriptures have been providentially given us. As Newman loves to underline, they are necessary to the Church for *justifying* its preaching⁷³.

1.4. *The significance of Pensées sur l'Église*

Avery Dulles argues that Newman's principal –and late– ecclesiological work *Preface to the Via Media* «does not seem to have significantly influenced the developments that led from Vatican I to Vatican II», because Catholic ec-

clesiologists focused on other works by Newman. The *Preface* «was almost totally ignored by Catholics outside the English-speaking world until after Vatican II», maintains the North American theologian. Moreover, even after the Council continental European historical investigations neglected Newman's work. Dulles expresses his surprise «that two major post-Vatican II studies of the history of the theology of the threefold office both omit to make any mention of Newman's Preface»⁷⁴.

Perhaps the American theologian overstates his case, for the *Preface* was not ignored by the editors of *Pensées sur l'Église*⁷⁵. Moreover, this collection of Newman's ecclesiological writings must have been read by many other Francophone theologians⁷⁶. Whether this means they latched on to the idea of the triple office as taught by Newman⁷⁷ and then developed it further is another question. Suffice it to say that Newman's ecclesiological ideas were available in French some years prior to the Second Vatican Council and had already been made accessible to a German-reading theological public in the 1940s⁷⁸.

II. HENRI DE LUBAC

2.1. *De Lubac and Newman: a comparison of profiles*

De Lubac (1896-1991) was born six years after the death of Newman (†1890) and was introduced to the former Oxonian's thought by his Jesuit masters Léonce de Grandmaison and Jules Lebreton⁷⁹. The contrasts and similarities between him and the Englishman, for the most part, mirror those we outlined above between Congar and Newman. We feel that this is no coincidence, but owes much to the largely homogeneous climate in which French theology was elaborated in the first half of the twentieth century.

Though Congar (a Dominican) and de Lubac (a Jesuit) have their own distinctive theological style and particular interests, and were trained in different theological schools, nevertheless they share much in common. Take, for example, their Thomistic formation, their veneration for the Fathers, their ample scholarship and their active engagement in theological debate via journal articles and seminal theological works. Perhaps the contribution for which both will best be remembered is their shared commitment to the development of an ecclesiology that would define clearly the Church's mission in relation to the modern world.

It is noteworthy that de Lubac should publish his first book, *Catholicisme* (1938), after having been invited to do so by Congar. The latter had read some of the Jesuit's writings on the subject, and, being in the process of launching the ecclesiological collection *Unam Sanctam*, suggested to him the idea of uniting various articles in one volume⁸⁰.

We shall analyze different works of de Lubac under four main headings: *ecclesiology, interpretation of Scripture, natural religion and supernatural religion, and autobiographical*⁸¹.

Broadly speaking, the first two headings are tied to the principle of the development of doctrine and the last two to the principle of the rationality of the faith. These are the two fundamental ideas present in Newman from which, we are arguing, all others, in one way or another, can be derived. They are far from being perfectly discrete categories, and indeed the two principles often appear side by side –or intertwined– in the Englishman's writings.

2.2. *Ecclesiology*

a) *Catholicisme*

Two titles spring immediately to mind in discussing de Lubac's ecclesiology: *Catholicisme* (1938) and *Méditation sur l'Église* (1953)⁸². Like much of his work, rather than constituting systematic treatises on the Church, they are a collection of studies, reflections and meditations on aspects of the mystery of the Church.

Catholicisme is a work rich in patristic and a myriad of other ancient and mediaeval references. Steeped in tradition, it attempts to apply that tradition to modern circumstances. The Christian is not alone, nor can he be saved without being part of the great and broad communion of the Catholic Church, without participating in her sacraments and without actively nurturing his interior life. Belonging to the Church demands engaging in her saving mission to all peoples. Apart from defending the truth of Catholicism and proclaiming it to all nations, every baptized faithful is obliged to respect in other cultures what is compatible with Christianity, what is catholic, universal, desired by God from the moment of creation. Moreover, Church membership involves a commitment to solidarity and to working together with non-Catholics towards achieving a just society. But, says de Lubac: «Humanism is not spontaneously Christian. Christian humanism must be a

converted humanism»⁸³. The ultimate goal is eschatological unity in Christ, so that Christ may be all in all.

Hence, as Avery Dulles puts it so succinctly, the book «was intended to bring out the singular unitive power of Catholic Christianity and its capacity to transcend all human divisions»⁸⁴. In stark contrast to the unitive power of Catholicism, the interior rupture caused by sin leads to a social rupture.

The latter point is reinforced by a citation of the fifth volume of Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons* –which, de Lubac notes, is summarized in Nédoncelle's *La philosophie religieuse de Newman*–. The citation follows a quote from St Maximus the Confessor: «The devil, seducer of man from the beginning, separated him from God in his will, separated men from each other»⁸⁵. This patristic reference is related to Newman via a footnote to his sermon on «Christian Sympathy»⁸⁶.

The testimony of Newman is invoked again when de Lubac cites his sermon «Connexion between personal and public improvement». The French theologian quotes Pascal⁸⁷, who –he contends– sums up unanimous tradition by stating «*tout ce qui arrive à l'Église arrive aussi à chaque chrétien en particulier*»... *c'est l'anima in Ecclesia* (St Jerome)»⁸⁸. Newman echoes this sentiment when he says:

Thus the heart of every Christian ought to represent in miniature the Catholic Church, since one Spirit makes both the whole Church and every member of it to be His Temple. As He makes the Church one, which, left to itself, would separate into many parts; so He makes the soul one, in spite of its various affections and faculties, and its contradictory aims. As He gives peace to the multitude of nations, who are naturally in discord one with another, so does He give an orderly government to the soul, and set reason and conscience as sovereigns over the inferior parts of our nature⁸⁹.

Unity of life in individual Christians, argues the famous former Oxonian, is essential to achieving unity in the Church; disunity within the Church hampers the attainment of societal peace:

while Christians do not seek after inward unity and peace in their own breasts, the Church itself will never be at unity and peace in the world around them –and in somewhat the same manner, while the Church throughout the world is in that lamentable state of disorder which we see, no particular country, which is but a part of it, but must be in great religious confusion too, within its own limits–⁹⁰.

In what follows, one cannot help but see Newman's Catholic heart bursting forth under the constraints of his then membership (1843) of the estranged Anglican Communion:

... We cannot hope for the recovery of dissenting bodies, while we are ourselves alienated from the great body of Christendom. We cannot hope for unity of faith, if we at our own private will make a faith for ourselves in this our small corner of the earth... Break unity in one point, and the fault runs through the whole body... Surely we have abundant evidence on all sides of us, that the division of Churches is the corruption of hearts⁹¹.

Further on de Lubac describes catholicity as a force and perpetual demand that moves the Church to propagate the Kingdom of Christ worldwide in order to make all men participate in her saving redemption. To renounce it «would be to deny her own essence, what Newman had called her 'idea'»⁹².

In a chapter on «Person and Society», the French Jesuit is at pains to make clear that «personal religion and interior life are not in any way synonyms of individualism or of religious subjectivism. 'True religion is a hidden life in the heart', but it has nothing to do with egoistic introversion (*repliement égotiste*)»⁹³.

Beyond citations in footnotes and passing references in the main body of the text, the single most impressive quote from Newman comes closer to the final page. An extract from the Englishman's writings features among the 55 texts⁹⁴ included as appendices at the end. The Newmanian work selected –entitled «Catholic fulness» (*La plénitude catholique*)– is a powerful commentary from *Essays Critical and Historical*, II, on Milman's View of Christianity. We quote it here in part:

Now, the phenomenon, admitted on all hands, is this: –that great portion of what is generally received as Christian truth, is in its rudiments or in its separate parts to be found in heathen philosophies and religions... Mr. Milman argues from it– «These things are in heathenism, therefore they are not Christian»: we, on the contrary, prefer to say, «these things are in Christianity, therefore they are not heathen.» That is, we prefer to say, and we think that Scripture bears us out in saying, that from the beginning the Moral Governor of the world has scattered the seeds of truth far and wide over its extent; ... even after His coming, the Church has been a treasure-house, giving forth things old and new, casting the gold of fresh tributaries into her refiner's fire, or stamping upon her own, as time required it, a deeper impress of her Master's image.

... Divine teaching has been in fact, what the analogy of nature would lead us to expect, «at sundry times and in divers manners», various, complex, progressive, and supplemental of itself. We consider the Christian doctrine, when analyzed, to appear, like the human frame, «fearfully and wonderfully made»; but they think it some one tenet or certain principles given out at one time in their fulness, without gradual enlargement before Christ's coming or elucidation afterwards. They cast off all that they also find in Pharisee or heathen; we conceive that the Church, like Aaron's rod, devours the serpents of the magicians. They are ever hunting for a fabulous primitive simplicity; we repose in Catholic fulness⁹⁵.

The text shows Newman's principle of the development of doctrine at work, not in the sense of a continuous revelation, but rather as an ongoing fathoming of the full –Catholic– sense of revelation already given. What is more, such a conclusion is reasonable to expect, since thus the process of comprehending supernatural revelation mirrors that of the grasping of nature's own secrets. In other words, both nature and revelation have their origin in the same Divine Creator who, within the established order of creation, reveals⁹⁶ to man, in accordance with man's nature, «at sundry times and in diverse manners». Moreover, «after Christ's coming», God «elucidates» this revelation by means of the Catholic Church, to which nature and the revelation to the Jews partially point the way.

b) *Méditation sur l'Église*

We turn now to the second «ecclesiological» work of de Lubac's that we shall consider here, namely, *Méditation sur l'Église*⁹⁷. As we shall see, it is replete with Newmanian references⁹⁸.

De Lubac is keen to place in relief the unity of the Christian faith, and hence the organic unity of its individual dogmas, inseparable from each other because inseparable from the One Mystery at faith's core. Just as the faith is one in its formal principle, so the Christian Mystery, which forms the object or content of the faith, is in itself equally one. The Christian Mystery being one, «under the manifold formulas which have grown over the centuries, is proposed to our adhesion always as a complete reality, which the formulas 'encircle from all sides, without ever being able to exhaust or even less to divide it'»⁹⁹.

The observation seems to evoke, albeit indirectly, an idea expressed in a passage from Newman's last university sermon which highlights the difficul-

ties of the human mind's efforts to express the One God's attributes in so many formulas¹⁰⁰.

It is to this sermon that de Lubac explicitly refers, as he marvels at the process of the development and ripening of doctrine under God's unfailing guidance, citing Newman as follows:

Wonderful it is, to see with what effort, hesitation, suspense, interruption –with how many sways to the right and to the left– with how many reverses, yet with what certainty of advance, with what precision in its march, and with what ultimate completeness, it has been evolved¹⁰¹.

In commenting on the unity of the people of God, the Frenchman fuses citations from St Augustine and Newman: «The Christians of every age and of every country, of every race and of every culture form a unique people, united by the love of Christ... To lack the love of Christ is not only an illness, it is death (St Augustine). All of them find in that love 'a bloom of grace and youth'»¹⁰².

The paradox present in both de Lubac and Newman of the visible and the invisible¹⁰³ surfaces in a citation from *Apologia* that contrasts the Mystery of the Church on earth and her complete manifestation in heaven:

The visible world still remains without its divine interpretation; Holy Church in her sacraments and her hierarchical appointments, will remain, even to the end of the world, after all but a symbol of those heavenly facts which fill eternity. Her mysteries are but the expressions in human language of truths to which the human mind is unequal¹⁰⁴.

It is a theme to which the Frenchman will return time and again¹⁰⁵, citing for support the early Church Fathers. In sketching the profile of the *vir ecclesiasticus*¹⁰⁶, de Lubac evokes «the enthusiasm of a still Anglican Newman when he discovered the true Church in discovering 'the Church of the Fathers' and that, through a kind of Platonic reminiscence or rather through an illumination of the Spirit, there he recognized his Mother!»¹⁰⁷.

The Jesuit theologian cites the fifth chapter of *Apologia* four more times¹⁰⁸. It really is a key reference for him. And the reason, we may venture to say, is that Newman's spiritual and theological journey provoked him to write a defence of the fundamentals of the Catholic faith in an entirely new fashion.

In our view, his arguments are fresh for three main reasons. *First*, because the circumstances in which he is defending the faith –the modern rationalistic

world— are relatively new and he adapts his language and efforts at persuasion appropriately. *Secondly*, because he skips centuries of narrow neoscholasticism¹⁰⁹ to go directly to the writings of primitive Christianity, a hitherto forgotten treasure-house of biblical and theological wisdom. *Finally*, because his own experience of «the difficulties of Religion» are so strongly felt, so intimately shared, and so beautifully and convincingly dispelled.

De Lubac speaks of Newman's refined sensitivity to the challenges of belief, and at the same time of his unwavering conviction in traditional theological doctrine:

Many persons are very sensitive of the difficulties of Religion; I am as sensitive of them as any one; but... I feel no temptation at all to break in pieces the great legacy of thought thus committed to us for these latter days¹¹⁰.

In affirming that the true man of the Church «wishes never to forget... that he ought not to expect to reap himself what he has perhaps sown»¹¹¹, the French theologian brings to mind Yves Congar's own counsel of patience with respect to demands for Church reform¹¹². The latter's citation of *Apologia* in *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Église* overlaps with that made by de Lubac in *Méditation*¹¹³.

The final quote from *Apologia* arises in the context of de Lubac's warning against false intransigence that identifies the faith with the primitive past alone, according to a *sui generis* hermeneutic that prohibits any rational reflection on its content and thus prevents the Church from revealing the actuality of the eternal here and now¹¹⁴. He recommends following the example of Newman: «instead of establishing ourselves in the Church as in our domain and possession, instead of confusing her more or less with ourselves, let us apply ourselves on the contrary, without expecting personal triumph, to merge ourselves with the Church»¹¹⁵.

Newman's *Letter to Dr Pusey* is cited no less than nine times in *Méditation*, one of which we have already alluded to above¹¹⁶.

Regarding the second citation, de Lubac writes: «Newman observes that the Fathers 'do not speak of the Blessed Virgin merely as the physical instrument of our Lord's taking flesh, but as an intelligent, responsible cause of it'»¹¹⁷.

The Frenchman notes Newman's linking of fidelity in the faith to Marian devotion¹¹⁸. He is aware that the Englishman invokes the patristic doctrine

of «Mary as the Second Eve» and that he locates «the doctrine of our Lady's present exaltation in Scripture (*Apocalypse* 12)»¹¹⁹.

The French theologian's close familiarity with Newman is underlined by the variety of the latter's writings that he employs. We shall see this as we examine in *Méditation* the remaining citations of the English convert.

To emphasize the need for patience in the face of a divergence of opinion in the Church, de Lubac cites Newman's correspondence with W. G. Ward, who regretted so much that his former master did not share all of his theological views¹²⁰.

On obedience to Church leaders despite their defects, the French theologian asserts that the true man of the Church: «knows that whereas obedience can never oblige one to do evil, it may lead to an interruption or omission of a good one was doing or that one wished to do... Even if this is in a certain case a hard truth, it is for him above all a 'marvellous truth'»¹²¹. In support of his view, he cites a prayer of Newman taken from Bouyer's biography¹²².

Several more counsels follow, on respect for the ancient tradition of the Church, on the danger of judging her «according to superficial 'modern' criteria», on the necessity of seeing her with eyes of faith. All point to the example of Newman, who knew how to overcome these temptations against the Church, which appears to men who do not live by faith

but, as it were, a body of humiliation, almost provoking insult and profaneness¹²³.

Indeed one might say that the most powerful invocation of Newman in *Méditation* occurs in this chapter dedicated to temptations against the Church. The English convert is seen as a model and proof of the necessity of grace to penetrate the apparent ordinariness of Catholicism and of the Church, so as to see its supernatural essence.

In de Lubac's own words: «Only a miracle of grace can make us understand these things¹²⁴. Without it the most beautiful sentiments and the spiritual faculties are but an obstacle. They make man like a Cedar of Lebanon which still has not been broken by the Lord (*n'a point encore été brisé par le Seigneur*). They nourish pride and spoil charity (*ferment à la charité*). Even within the Church, they can, we have said, become a temptation. If there should be such a day for us, it would benefit us to recall, in evoking the concrete circumstances of their action, the example of those men who have heroically surmounted it»¹²⁵.

Then he proceeds to recount Newman's conversion in what can only be described as sheer awe in the face of the power of God's grace and of the firm fidelity of the Englishman to his conscience, at the cost of losing friends, social position and professional stability¹²⁶.

He was not attracted by Catholics, «but» –concludes the French theologian, almost triumphally– «for his faithful soul, such a step was a necessity and never afterwards did he regret it for an instant»¹²⁷.

2.3. *Interpretation of Scripture*

The most important work focused on Scripture that links Newman and de Lubac is the latter's *Histoire et esprit: l'intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène*, first published in 1950. Not surprisingly, most of the citations of the Englishman by the Frenchman that feature in this section will be drawn from it¹²⁸. The two theologians are united by their common veneration for the Greek exegete and this shall become more evident as we consider the comments of each on Origen.

However, while inspired by Newman's devotion to Origen, de Lubac does not find the Englishman's theory on the inspiration of Scripture entirely satisfactory¹²⁹. His view is influenced by Seynaeve, whom he cites with relative frequency¹³⁰.

The question of the inspiration of Scripture is one that occupied Newman late in life. But his work of exegesis is much broader. Seynaeve says that three concerns seemed to have guided him in elaborating this work: «First, he tried to show the importance... [of] constant and religious reading of the Bible for ordinary faithful (*simples fidèles*) as well as for theologians –this is nothing other than a return to what in the Middle Ages was called *lectio divina*–. Secondly, he wished to establish on solid grounds the harmony between the two Testaments so as to preserve more securely the Old Testament books. Finally, he believed that one ought to recognize in numerous passages in the Bible, above all with respect to the Old Testament, the existence of a mystical and spiritual sense, which corresponds in practice to what today is called the *sensus plenior*»¹³¹.

A noteworthy feature of Newman's «exegesis» is the manner in which he favours the allegorical method of the Alexandrian school to that of the more literal interpretation espoused by the school of Antioch. Without ever rejecting the literal method, the Englishman preferred to it the use of the «mystical

sense», as is clear from the following passage in *Arians*, which de Lubac quotes in part in his masterful historical study, *Exégèse Médiévale*:

In all ages of the Church, her teachers have shown a disinclination to confine themselves to the mere literal interpretation of Scripture... It may almost be laid down as an historical fact that the mystical interpretation and orthodoxy will stand or fall together¹³².

The Frenchman is of like mind. In *Histoire et esprit*, the French theologian cites Möhler on the importance of the mystical interpretation of the Scriptures in the primitive Church and then goes on to say that his testimony is echoed shortly afterwards by Newman:

The use of Scripture then, especially its spiritual or second sense, as a medium of thought and deduction, is a characteristic principle of doctrinal teaching in the Church¹³³.

In an essay appearing at the end of this same Cerf edition –entitled *La querelle du salut d'Origène aux temps modernes* (1982)– the Jesuit theologian supports wholeheartedly Newman's refusal to accept that «so great a soul [as Origen's] was lost»¹³⁴.

Elsewhere, he says that the Englishman was quite right to trace two of the main principles of his thought to the Alexandrine Fathers. First, the sacramental or mystical principle; secondly, the «doctrine that Probability is the guide of life» taken from Butler's *Analogy*, an eighteenth-century work that commences with a quote from Origen¹³⁵.

No reader of Scripture, irrespective of his erudition, can claim to have mastered every doctrine that it contains, argues Newman¹³⁶. Not even the sacred authors themselves could fathom all that the Divine Author wished to reveal through them. Thus, one risks confusion in accepting that the whole meaning of Scripture is reduced to what the sacred author could have perceived explicitly. Newman –states de Lubac, citing Seynaeve– thought that the sacred authors had not always known nor even suspected the spiritual and profound sense of what they wrote¹³⁷.

In considering whether to return to the traditional term 'spiritual sense' or 'spiritual understanding' (*intelligence spirituelle*), the French theologian recalls how Newman insisted on the literal and not only the spiritual fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies¹³⁸. Indeed the unity of the two testaments

impresses both scholars –a marvellous synthesis of the faith, of all Christian thought and spirituality contained in the doctrine of the «fourth sense»–¹³⁹ grasped in its springing forth, or as Newman remarks:

the Old Testament... is delivered to us on the same authority, under the seal of canonicity impressed upon it by Christ Himself. There is something beautiful in this appointment. Christ is the great Prophet of the Church, and His teaching is as truly her law, as His death and intercession are her life. In that teaching the whole canon centres, as for its proof, so for its harmonious adjustment. Christ recognizes the Law and the Prophets, and commissions the Apostles¹⁴⁰.

The best way to grasp Newman's reading of Scripture is through examples¹⁴¹. De Lubac offers several.

First he cites a comment from Bouyer that God's leading the Israelite smoothly (*sans heurt*) from a primitive religion to one vivified by prophetic revelation prepared the way for a second transition (*transposition*) from Old Testament to New¹⁴². Then he refers to analogous remarks from Newman in a sermon that bring out the latter's capacity to go beyond the literal –without by any means ignoring it–. The former Oxonian draws out a really far-sighted interpretation of the Old Covenant, viewed with reference to the New Covenant in Christ:

it may be asked, whether it is possible to consider the Christian Church, which is so different from the Jewish, a continuation of it; ... I answer... its change when Christ came, from a local into a Catholic form, was not abrupt but gradual. What was first a dispersion, became a diffusion; during the last centuries of Judaism, the Church was in great measure Catholic already¹⁴³.

A concrete example of how Old Testament figures are interpreted by Newman as types of New Testament ones is illustrated masterfully in a discussion of the case of Elisha:

... it does seem likely that Elisha is meant to represent some person or persons in the times of the Gospel, as Elijah is the type of St. John... What is the lesson for Christian times deducible from Elisha's history?... as Elijah represents the Baptist, Christ's forerunner, so Elisha prefigures Christ's successors, His servants which come after Him and inherit His gifts...¹⁴⁴.

De Lubac agrees with the view (de Ghellinck) that the mystical exegesis of the ancients and mediaevals «clashes with modern interpretation (*heurte le*

lecteur moderne)». He laments the fact that few modern exegetes have followed the path traced by Newman and other select nineteenth-century scholars who, like the Fathers, were alert to discerning a spiritual sense in Scripture¹⁴⁵.

Moreover, although the Fathers lacked modern methods of textual criticism, they had certain significant advantages over later biblical exegetes. They enjoyed «a kind of connaturality with Scripture which our faith does not recover without effort», or as Newman puts it:

Again, this age is a practical age: the age of the Fathers was more contemplative; their theology, consequently, had a deeper, more mystical, more subtle character about it, than we with our present habits of thought can readily enter into. We lay greater stress than they on proofs from definite verses of Scripture, or what are familiarly called texts, and we build up a system upon them; they rather recognized a certain truth lying hid under the tenor of the sacred text as a whole, and showing itself more or less in this verse or that as it might be. We look on the letter of Scripture more as a foundation, they as an organ of the truth...¹⁴⁶.

Attempting to emulate the Fathers –and Origen especially– is by no means a risk-free undertaking. Hence, de Lubac, invoking Newman once again, warns against an «excessive enthusiasm that would lead us to copy their methods»¹⁴⁷.

Nevertheless, the Frenchman suggests that we may learn from them how to improve our understanding of Scripture: «if we take a closer look at the eternal significance of the great Bible stories, always in the light of the Christian Mystery, we may learn ‘to better understand the eternal youth of an old text’»¹⁴⁸. He then goes on to remark on how Newman «in his profound naivety» could see aspects of the story of the patriarch Jacob still being fulfilled within us today¹⁴⁹:

... We feel Jacob to be more like ourselves than Abraham was.... Well were it for us, if we had the character of mind instanced in Jacob, and enjoined on his descendants; the temper of dependence upon God’s providence, and thankfulness under it, and careful memory of all He has done for us. It would be well if we were in the habit of looking at all we have as God’s gift, undeservedly given, and day by day continued to us solely by His mercy. He gave; He may take away¹⁵⁰.

By way of concluding this section on the *interpretation of Scripture* and by way of introducing the next on *natural religion and supernatural religion*, it seems appropriate to highlight one other point.

De Lubac first selects a quotation from Origen's *Commentary on St John* in which the Eastern exegete urges his readers to discern traces of the divine *Logos* both in nature and in the Law. He then applies an Augustinian interpretation of same which completes Origen's doctrine by specifying that the first book, nature (creation), has to be understood by reading the second book, the Bible (re-creation), grasped not through carnal senses but through faith.

The French theologian concludes: «Crede ut intelligas, that is to say, believe in 'prophecy', accept the Word of God manifested in history, and the whole divine work will again be clear to you and will lead you to God»¹⁵¹. These ideas, says de Lubac, have often been recovered by biblical scholars such as Newman¹⁵².

2.4. *Natural religion and supernatural religion*

A devoted disciple of St Thomas Aquinas, de Lubac «preferred to contemplate [him] in continuity with his predecessors rather than as interpreted by his successors», asserts Dulles. The American cardinal continues: «In de Lubac's eyes, a serious failure occurred in early modern times, and indeed to some extent in the late middle ages. This was the breakdown of the Catholic whole into separate parts and supposedly autonomous disciplines»¹⁵³.

Part of «this process of fragmentation, for de Lubac, was the erection of an order of 'pure nature' in the scholasticism of the Counter Reformation»¹⁵⁴. Contrary to Cajetan and Suarez' view that human nature could exist with a purely natural finality, «[f]or de Lubac, the paradox of a natural desire for the supernatural was built into the very concept of the human»¹⁵⁵.

In *Le mystère du surnaturel* (1946) the French theologian illustrates the contrast between rationalist philosophy's view of the self-sufficient being intent on being happy without God in and through himself, and the very different conception of 'natural religion' as explained by Newman, within the order of Providence¹⁵⁶. The Englishman had written, for example, that

as Revealed Religion enforces doctrine, so Natural Religion recommends it. It is hardly necessary to observe, that the whole revealed scheme rests on nature for the validity of its evidence... There is, perhaps, no greater satisfaction to the Christian than that which arises from his perceiving that the Revealed system is rooted deep in the natural course of things, of which it is merely the result and completion; that his Saviour has interpreted for him the faint

or broken accents of Nature; and that in them, so interpreted, he has, as if in some old prophecy, at once the evidence and the lasting memorial of the truths of the Gospel¹⁵⁷.

One might well say, writes the French theologian, that by supernatural revelation a superior order of truth comes to be added to truths which arise from natural reason, but this is no more than, at most, an abstract outline, and in reality things are never so simple¹⁵⁸.

De Lubac is responding to what he feels are neoscholastic excesses¹⁵⁹. By contrast, the main object of Newman's critiques were nineteenth-century rationalists and utilitarians.

Notwithstanding these very different contextual circumstances, in support of his own position de Lubac cites Newman's *Idea of a University*¹⁶⁰, which we shall quote here. The English educationalist-cum-theologian begins a severe attack on the educational philosophy of his day by declaring:

When I am told, then, by the partisans of Universities without Theological teaching, that human science leads to belief in a Supreme Being, without denying the fact, nay, as a Catholic, with full conviction of it, nevertheless I am obliged to ask what the statement means in their mouths, what they, the speakers, understand by the word «God.» Let me not be thought offensive, if I question, whether it means the same thing on the two sides of the controversy. With us Catholics, as with the first race of Protestants, as with Mahometans, and all Theists, the word contains, as I have already said, a theology in itself¹⁶¹.

He proceeds to specify the monotheist view of God: Then, with devastating effect, he goes on to redirect the withering critical tools of rationalist scepticism on its own highly inadequate conception of God, or rather of the «Supreme Being»:

... I cannot take it for granted, I must have it brought home to me by tangible evidence, that the spirit of the age means by the Supreme Being what Catholics mean... If His [the Supreme Being's] Essence is just as high and deep and broad and long as the universe, and no more; if this be the fact, then will I confess that there is no specific science about God, that theology is but a name, and a protest in its behalf an hypocrisy¹⁶².

Key to Newman's reflections on the relationship between natural and supernatural religion is the clarity and certainty of Christian doctrine as com-

pared to the tentative conclusions of natural philosophy. Whereas the philosopher aspires towards a *divine principle*, the Christian aspires towards a *divine agent*¹⁶³.

Yet not all philosophical minds need grope for the truth in vain. In support of the human mind's natural capacity to know God, de Lubac—in another of his works, *Sur les chemins de Dieu*—cites alternately Newman's *Apologia* and his novel *Callista*¹⁶⁴.

In the second chapter, entitled «the affirmation of God», he argues that a certain customary awareness of God (*habitude de Dieu*) in the mind preexists any conscious act of identifying him as such. De Lubac quotes the Englishman as follows:

Of all points of faith, the being of a God is, to my own apprehension, encompassed with most difficulty, and yet borne in upon our minds with most power¹⁶⁵.

In the next chapter on «the proof of God», he cites—at considerable length—a dialogue from *Callista* that contains a typical Newmanian anthropological argument for God's existence, based on religious conscience:

... So you see, Polemo, I believe in what is more than a mere 'something.' I believe in what is more real to me than sun, moon, stars, and the fair earth, and the voice of friends. You will say, Who is He? Has He ever told you anything about Himself? Alas! no!—the more's the pity! But I will not give up what I have, because I have not more. An echo implies a voice; a voice a speaker. That speaker I love and I fear»¹⁶⁶.

In order to differentiate clearly between mere moral uprightness and religion, Newman's analysis of conscience is once again invoked. Citing autobiographical writings of the latter, de Lubac writes, «Newman says that he recalls that in his adolescence he desired to be virtuous, but not religious»¹⁶⁷. Looking back over the years, he confesses that although he had the firm habit of referring everything to the will of God, often his actions proceeded rather from a certain consciousness that prevented him from doing otherwise, through a sense of rectitude, through a perception of what was convenient for him, so that, in acting, he had been faithful to himself rather than having acted through faith and charity¹⁶⁸.

He wanted to be virtuous without being religious, in other words, without loving God¹⁶⁹. What did Newman mean by saying this? De Lubac provides the following explanation:

«The purely moral notions of good and evil, of duty, are one thing, quite another the same notions taken up in a religious context. Without losing the first character they acquire a second. Many stop at the first; others, like Newman, have perceived as well the new dimension that the second confers on them: ‘Conscience is most certainly a moral sense, but it is more’. It is the voice of God. Duty is the obligation of obeying his commandment and moral evil, guilt (*colpa*), is already sin. With subtlety, Newman will explain that ‘the ordinary sin of the Intellect’ consists in making ‘the command of duty a kind of taste; sin is not an offence against God, but against human nature’; in those who so think ‘conscience has become a mere self-respect... When they do wrong, they feel, not contrition, of which God is the object, but remorse, and a sense of degradation. They call themselves fools, not sinners’»¹⁷⁰.

Just as doing good in order to be faithful to one’s own human nature differs from so doing in order to obey the Father’s will –remarks the Frenchman– so there is an essential difference between the simple moral guilt (*colpa*) that causes a degradation of man, and sin considered as an offence against God that causes a separation from him, even if it so happens that both things are designated by the same word¹⁷¹.

2.5. *Autobiographical*

José Morales has observed that the twentieth century saw the publication by various Catholic theologians of autobiographical accounts¹⁷². Their broad purpose was to reflect on their own personal history and to stimulate a more widely received theology.

It seems reasonable to suppose that many were inspired by the example of Newman, who dedicated his life to elaborating a living theology, cogniscent of religious experience, yet firmly grounded in Scripture and in patristic teachings. Rooted in a simple and robust faith, this fresh way of exposing Christian doctrine contributed to a «spiritual awakening of spiritual wants» and transformed the conception of theology as an anti-heretical tool into a vital science that provided nourishment for Catholic minds and souls.

Henri de Lubac is situated very clearly in the centre of this new current of theology, and it should not surprise us that his writings would feature

frequent references to Newman's spiritual and theological itinerary, as in fact they do.

Although de Lubac's memoir (*Mémoire sur l'occasion de mes écrits*), is not, in his view, an apology or a book of memoirs, nevertheless it features numerous allusions to Newman's *Apologia*¹⁷³. Remarking that he was reluctant to write it in the first place, he quotes Newman's account of his own antipathy towards personal disclosures:

It may easily be conceived how great a trial it is to me to write the following history of myself; but I must not shrink from the task. The words, '*Secretum meum mihi*,' keep ringing in my ears; but as men draw towards their end, they care less for disclosures...¹⁷⁴

Following suspicions aroused in certain Roman circles –in the wake of the publication of *Surnaturel* (1946)– about «a supposedly modernistic 'new theology' [being developed in France], the Jesuit General... removed de Lubac and several colleagues from their teaching positions and required them to submit their writings to a special process of censorship»¹⁷⁵. A cloud remained over de Lubac for several years, but without his being able to dispel it, in part because no direct accusation was made against him to which he might respond in his defence¹⁷⁶.

In May 1951 he was moved to copy down in a notebook the following explanatory comment made by the author of *Apologia* in response to defamatory remarks published about him by a Cambridge historian:

[M]y present subject is my Accuser; what I insist upon here is this unmanly attempt of his, in his concluding pages, to cut the ground from under my feet –to poison by anticipation the public mind against me, John Henry Newman, and to infuse into the imaginations of my readers, suspicion and mistrust of everything that I may say in reply to him. This I call *poisoning the wells*–¹⁷⁷.

But, the Frenchman laments, that, unlike Newman, he could not make a public protest¹⁷⁸.

It is evident from his writings that he often contemplated Newman's trials in the Anglican Church. Commenting on a passage about the Church as mother cited in *Méditation* (1954), and, referring to Newman's last sermon at Oxford, de Lubac writes:

«Anyone in the Church... could not but recognize in that passage [of *Méditation*] an allusion, however roundabout, to that celebrated peroration of the

sermon of St Mary's, in which Newman bid a sad farewell to the Anglican Church. Everyone, in any case, could easily discern in these words... my humble and confident supplication to my Mother, who had declared me her secret enemy (*qui m'a déclaré son ennemi secret*), and of which I proclaim with assurance that she'll not persist in her judgement. But no one, among those who in practice, for me, represented her, had given me the least sign that he had been sensible to that appeal...»¹⁷⁹.

A year later, the Jesuit theologian published *Nouveaux paradoxes* (1955). Again he found consolation in the uncanny parallels between his own difficulties and those which Newman had experienced a century earlier¹⁸⁰. There is little doubt but that his faith was fortified by the Englishman's capacity –when he looked back over his life– to see Divine Providence there at work¹⁸¹.

«Beginning in 1962, de Lubac published a series of theological works on Teilhard and edited several volumes of Teilhard's correspondence»¹⁸². De Lubac was not Teilhardian by nature¹⁸³, but he was a loyal friend, and in his writings about Teilhard and his thought, he seems to have identified with Teilhard's strong early sympathies with Newman¹⁸⁴.

But the importance of de Lubac's remarks about Teilhard lies in the evidence they provide of the intellectual milieu that prevailed in early twentieth-century France amongst young theologians and the interest shown by many teachers and students in the Englishman and in his thought. It was in this environment that de Lubac learned theology. Moreover, it is clear from all the material that we have presented in this chapter –and analyzed under the four main headings: *ecclesiology*, *interpretation of Scripture*, *natural religion and supernatural religion*, and *autobiographical*¹⁸⁵– that Newman's influence on the Frenchman was quite considerable indeed.

III. JEAN DANIELOU

3.1. *Daniélou and Newman: a comparison of profiles*

The philologist-cum-theologian Jean Daniélou (1905-1974) –writes Olson– «was a professor at the *Institut Catholique* in Paris and a vital member of the controversial 'New Theology' movement. His first works were scholarly studies of the theologies of St. Gregory of Nyssa, Origen, and the Jewish thinker Philo. His *History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea* is considered a classic in patristic scholarship»¹⁸⁶.

Together with de Lubac he founded *Sources Chrétiennes*, «a collection of patristic texts translated into French, which were first published in the 1940s and have since reached four hundred in number. The series sought to recover the riches of the patristic tradition, especially in the areas of Biblical interpretation and spirituality. The first volume published was Daniélou's translation of St. Gregory of Nyssa's spiritual classic, *The Life of Moses*»¹⁸⁷.

Daniélou's «emphasis on the personal, relational nature of the Christian Faith» was a perspective shared by «de Lubac, von Balthasar, Karl Adam, Romano Guardini, and Yves Congar and had an obvious influence on the documents of the Second Vatican Council», asserts the Oregon-based catechetics director¹⁸⁸.

In his capacity as *peritus* at the Second Vatican Council, Daniélou collaborated with Karol Wojtyła, the future Pope John Paul II, in the drafting of *Gaudium et Spes*, the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. In 1969 Daniélou was made a cardinal by Pope Paul VI.

The methodology that we have employed up to now in the case of Congar and de Lubac we shall also apply to a brief study of Daniélou, but with some modifications.

The reason is that, unlike in the writings of the other two French theologians, the presence of Newman in the works of Daniélou is very sparse indeed. This may be due to Daniélou's more popular style of writing. He cites few authors in general, and his books are largely intended for a broad public, specialists and non-specialists alike.

In any case, it seems probable that Daniélou more often read Newman indirectly—through other authors who were familiar with the Englishman and his thought—than directly.

Be that as it may, it is of less significance how Daniélou came to know of the figure of John Henry Newman than that he had a certain measure of familiarity with him, his way of thinking and his importance for modern twentieth-century theology.

It is interesting to note, for example, their common interest in the Fathers and the primitive Church, as well as biblical theology and angelology. Both were dedicated pastors of souls, men of the Church, who devoted themselves to the formation of youth and to making theology a living thing¹⁸⁹. Both were made cardinals late in life.

Daniélou, like Newman, suffered for his defence of the faith in the face of doctrinal deviations. Writing not long after his death in 1974, his Jesuit

colleague and close friend Henri de Lubac described Cardinal Daniélou as «the man, in France, who had carried out the most intense action in today's terrible spiritual combat». Men who considered themselves progressive «and who seem no longer to understand either the Gospel or the Church have made his life hard. He himself, however, was a generous and peaceful heart, open to all»¹⁹⁰.

In what follows we shall first examine a few examples of references to Newman in Daniélou's works and writings. Then we shall look at the relationship between him and one of his «disciples», another Frenchman, Jean Honoré, who later published several books on the English cardinal.

3.2. *Daniélou's writings*

The few references to Newman in Daniélou's writings tend to bear a strong Patristic component and/or allusions to angels.

The first quote from Newman that we have come across is in the short yet profound work *Le signe du Temple* (1942)¹⁹¹. In a chapter on the Ecclesial Temple, Daniélou emphasizes that the Temple of God is no longer the distant hope of the Jewish diaspora; rather it is ever-present. All we need do, he says, is to look within us to find ourselves in the Communion of Saints¹⁹². Then he quotes a homily by Newman on the Church:

our Lord Jesus Christ, after... ascending on high, left not the world as He found it, but left a blessing behind Him. He left in the world what before was not in it – a secret home, for faith and love to enjoy, wherever found, in spite of the world around us... – This is the Church of God, which is our true home of God's providing, His own heavenly court, where He dwells with Saints and Angels... Though thou art in a body of flesh, a member of this world, thou hast but to kneel down reverently in prayer, and thou art at once in the society of Saints and Angels¹⁹³.

In the introduction to *Les anges et leur mission: d'après les Pères d'Église*, Daniélou takes up a concern expressed by the encyclical *Humani generis* about the denial of some of the personal character of angels¹⁹⁴. In response to the demythologizing tendencies of rationalists and the theosophizing tendencies of spiritualists, he opts for a Christological approach. Following the Fathers Daniélou's predominant interest is to reflect on the role of the angels in the economy of salvation.

But, most significantly from the point of view of our study, is how the Frenchman justifies the opportuneness of his study. He does so, at least in part, by invoking the theological importance given them by St Thomas Aquinas and the close intimacy with angels enjoyed by the greatest of the saints and men of the Church, among whom he includes St Augustine and John Henry Newman¹⁹⁵.

The third example is from a review of Seynaeve's study at Louvain of Newman's doctrine of Scripture, which Daniélou penned in 1954¹⁹⁶. It is the most important of the four instances of the Frenchman's referring to Newman which we shall present here. This is because, in that article, not only does Daniélou summarize the Belgian theologian's study, but he also offers his own critical appraisal of the significance of the figure of Newman in the history of biblical interpretation.

Formed in the school of the Fathers of the Church, Newman –writes Daniélou– «discovers the great principle of biblical hermeneutics which is the relationship between the two Testaments, what he calls the sacramental principle. He assimilates this method perfectly, thanks to his own doctrine of analogy, of which the correlation (*correspondance*) between the different stages of design is a distinguished (*éminent*) application»¹⁹⁷.

Thus, asserts Daniélou, «He is situated then in the great tradition of biblical typology, of which he represents a link (*chaînon*)».

Daniélou proceeds to illustrate with broad brush-strokes the main characteristics of Newman's thinking and observes that they are the same as those of the Fathers of the Church. In a simple yet beautifully apposite phrase, the French theologian describes Newman as having a «naturally patristic understanding (*une intelligence naturellement patristique*)».

The Bible is a religious book. It tells us of the great mysterious works of God, and of the history of salvation. Newman's exegesis is Christological, yet it is the Holy Spirit –the Oxonian says– who under the veil of the literal sense, with the eyes of faith, reveals to us the profound truths hidden beneath. He grasps the correlation between the history of Israel and that of the New Israel. In Newman typology is at once traditional and alive. He rediscovers Patristic homiletics.

In contrast –to a certain degree– with de Lubac¹⁹⁸, but in agreement with Seynaeve, Daniélou expresses reservations about the allegorism which moderns call *sens plénier*. Although he says that Newman was right to recognize the existence of the *sensus plenior* in the Fathers, Daniélou insists that their use of it justifies his own reservations about its legitimacy.

The French theologian concludes his review of Synaevé's book, affirming that in it «the importance of Newman in the history of the interpretation of the Bible appears in full light. He was a great initiator who rediscovered the tradition of patristic exegesis and who renewed it in its expression, while remaining completely faithful to its principles. At the same time he understood the importance of biblical criticism and of all it could contribute to the understanding of the literal sense. Certainly he did not see clearly how to balance these two complementary aspects. The biblical criticism which he knew was still rudimentary and extreme (*outrancière*). This explains why part of his work is not of interest, whereas the remainder is valid (*valable*). But at least he held firmly to both ends of the chain. And it is in this regard that he is an astonishing precursor, whose great example we now understand after a century of searching (*Et il est à cet égard un étonnant précurseur, dont nous comprenons maintenant le grand exemple après un siècle de tâtonnement*).

In a series of interviews published posthumously under the title *Et qui est mon prochain?*, Daniélou provides an interesting self-portrait, which includes some perhaps, at first sight, surprising comparisons with Cardinal Newman.

The French cardinal sees himself as a spontaneous man with a horror of social and hierarchical obligations, more at home with the rank and file than with social or intellectual elites. On becoming a cardinal he continued as before, organizing his life and activities without any personal collaborator. In that regard, he says, he was like Newman, who after being made a cardinal, «remained an intellectual beyond repair (*irréparable*), kept a total simplicity and never came to take himself too seriously»¹⁹⁹.

Daniélou dedicated his life to intellectual work and apostolate with youth, yet did not keep company with intellectuals, preferring that of simple folk and young people²⁰⁰.

Here he draws another comparison with Newman: «I think there again of Newman who accepted the epithet of 'egotist', in vogue in the nineteenth century, since he said, 'There is God and myself, and afterwards the rest (*il y a Dieu et moi, et puis il y a le reste*)»²⁰¹. I feel very close to him. I do not feel dependent on anyone, except for God, and therefore, I do not feel any need to protest, either for the bourgeoisie or for the Church»²⁰².

Although Daniélou himself admits to being spontaneous and uncomplicated, his comparison with Newman is neither arbitrary nor superficial. As a cardinal who stoutly defended Tradition and the magisterium in a hostile postconciliar climate, he was open to the –clearly unjust– charge of being a

stooge of the hierarchy or an apologist for a perceived ecclesiastical or intellectual elite. He was of course neither. Before other men he was his own man; before God he was a dependent.

Newman, in a different era, had suffered similar criticisms in a different ecclesiastical and social context²⁰³. Yet the English cardinal possessed not only a singular independence of mind, but also a profound consciousness of the divine presence. Daniélou also enjoyed a solid interior life and did not fear to speak his mind. It was only natural that the French cardinal should identify with his English predecessor.

3.3. *Relationship with Jean Honoré*

Cardinal Jean Honoré (1920-) is the author of several books and articles on the life, thought and work of John Henry Newman²⁰⁴.

The nature of the account which we shall present of the history of his relationship with Daniélou and Newman, as well as other personalities such as Bouyer and Blanchet, is largely anecdotal. Nevertheless, we feel that it is also invaluable because of the historical context and insights it provides into the dynamic atmosphere in which Newman was studied and assimilated in a well-known centre of Francophone theological formation in the middle of the twentieth century.

Honoré first came across the «great Oxford convert» in about 1938 when as a seminarian at the diocesan seminary in Rennes he stumbled upon a book about the nineteenth-century English Catholic Revival²⁰⁵. In late 1942 he was enrolled at the Carmelite seminary with a view to obtaining a licenciate in theology.

Students at the Carmelite seminary traditionally attended classes given by professors from the Catholic Institute of Paris²⁰⁶. It was the custom of the faculty to have Jesuits occupy chairs of theology and to perform the function of dean. Some of the most prestigious Jesuit professors such as Jules Lebreton, Guy de Broglie and Yves de Montcheuil taught there. Honoré detected, in de Montcheuil's teaching, «certain intuitions of Newman in the access to the faith and the role of personal conscience»²⁰⁷.

At the end of his studies at the theology faculty (1944-1945), Honoré immersed himself in a systematic reading of Newman's works for his doctoral thesis. Daniélou had been recently nominated to the chair of patrology that had previously been occupied by Lebreton. This fact brings us to a point of

particular significance for our study, namely, that Honoré asked Daniélou to be his thesis director²⁰⁸.

On his return from a research trip to England in 1946, the French Newman scholar had the opportunity to meet Daniélou (who was staying at the Jesuit house there) and appraise him of progress on his thesis. Daniélou told him of the appointment of Louis Bouyer to the theology faculty and recommended that Honoré ask him to assist him²⁰⁹. Bouyer willingly agreed to succeed Daniélou as Honoré's thesis director, but more by way of guiding him with a view to his thesis defence²¹⁰.

Honoré defended his thesis on the spiritual itinerary of Newman in April 1949 at the *Institut Catholique* of Paris:

«The tribunal, presided by the rector, Mgr Blanchet, comprised, along with many other professors of the faculty, Fr Daniélou and Fr Bouyer, my thesis director. Paradoxically, it is the latter who made the most incisive critique [of my work]: he noted that my *Itinéraire*, in presenting but the subjective aspect, the successive states of the soul of the convert, had ignored his evolution at the level of thought. In contrast to Fr Daniélou, who retained my work as it was in view of publication, Fr Bouyer, who besides had never made the least remark to me when I consulted him, made me understand that some delay would still be necessary. I understood better his reserve when I learnt that he himself had long been preparing a biography of Newman for publication!»²¹¹.

Honoré's account of his thesis defence is especially interesting because of the personalities it brings together. Thus we may observe: first, that Blanchet was a Council father at Vatican II, where he cites Newman; secondly, that Bouyer and Honoré go on to feature among Newman's best-known spiritual biographers; and, finally, that Bouyer and Daniélou –granted, enjoying a varying degree of familiarity with Newman (Bouyer much more than Daniélou)– were involved as consultors at the Second Vatican Council.

IV. NEWMAN AND THE COUNCIL PERITI

4.1. *Yves-Marie Congar*

There are some who regard the Second Vatican Council as «Congar's council»²¹². Newman was a great believer in «individual reason», but he circumscribed it within the context of the dynamic yet strictly hierarchical relationship between conciliar fathers and their theological advisers²¹³.

Nevertheless, we feel that there is a danger in attributing the results of the Council to any one individual or particular group of persons, given the broad participation of an unprecedented number of bishops, along with, in an indirect way, their various consultors and advisers. Within this diversity of theological and ecclesial opinions, undoubtedly some individuals were called upon to play a more visibly influential role. However, the value of the perhaps less visible contributions of bishops, for example, from mission territories in Asia, Africa and America –who by their very presence alone created a certain ecumenical aura– as well as the prayer of the whole Church worldwide, is inestimable. In short, the key protagonist was the Holy Spirit working through the Episcopal College *cum et sub Petro*.

That said, given the complexity and range of issues addressed by the Second Vatican Council, those who played the role of conciliar fathers at its meetings depended, perhaps more than in any previous ecumenical council, on individual *periti*. Between the first and second Vatican councils the Church had grown enormously in breadth and extent, theology had developed greatly, and new pastoral and ecumenical concerns had multiplied to an unprecedented degree. In their day-to-day preparations –of speeches, proposed amendments, translations of documents, summaries of other fathers' contributions, expositions of dogma and tradition, etc.– many of the council fathers relied heavily on the expert help that only accomplished theologians such as Congar, de Lubac, Daniélou, Ratzinger, etc. could provide.

Turning our attention now to the first of these, we shall examine in chronological order Congar's references to Newman in his diary of the Council, *Journal du Concile*.

The first allusion to the Englishman features in a diary entry dated 21 October 1962. The Dominican reflects on the Council's early proceedings as follows: «I am struck, after so many days, by the role that the theologians play. At the First Vatican Council, they scarcely played any role. Those who could have done so either had not been invited or had not come: Döllinger, Newman (even Scheeben!)»²¹⁴. Those days are over, he says, or almost.

Congar continues: «It is true that many of the bishops did their own theology. This time, the bishops are much more pastors. They are less theologians. Besides, there exists in the Church a large group of living theologians who do not limit themselves to the ready-made chapters of the theology of the school, but strive to think and shed light on the facts of the Church. These theologians are quite numerous. They are far from being all

in Rome, but only here (*mais rien qu'ici*) I saw: Chenu, Colson, Chavasse, Ratzinger, Rahner, Semmelroth, Lubac, Rondet, Daniélou, Schillebeeckx, etc., etc. These theologians carry out a genuine teaching (*exercent un véritable magistère*)»²¹⁵.

Three months later (6 December) the French Dominican praises highly a speech on the role of conscience –by the superior of the Marists, Joseph Buckley– which reminds him of Newman²¹⁶.

In October of the following year (1963), Congar summarizes some comments by Cardinal Gracias of Bombay on the schema *De Ecclesia*: «The Church exists in herself, but not for herself: she is a minority at the service of the majority (cites Newman, cites Paul VI)...»²¹⁷.

Newman arises again in the Frenchman's journal in March 1964. The entry of the fourteenth of that month provides some very interesting insights into Congar's own reading of the dynamics of the Council's workings. He admires the Belgian theologians and bishops for their cohesion and efficacy²¹⁸. The Belgians, he observes, are daring, united and concrete in their interventions. He reveals an acute sense of his own perceived isolation, describing himself as a man under surveillance who is still «suspected, sanctioned, judged, discriminated»²¹⁹. In contrast with the Belgians' cohesion, the French bishops, although full of pastoral charity and piety, do not work with the experts. Among the Belgians, bishops and experts work on equal terms (*ex aequo*), as befits former students of Louvain. Among the French, the greater part of the experts are religious; the Belgian experts are secular. All of these factors make the Belgians more effective²²⁰.

These remarks form the background to Congar's invoking Newman and that other well-known English liberal-thinking Catholic, Lord Acton: «I think of the idea so fitting (*si juste*) of Lord Acton and of Newman on the role played, in the nineteenth century, by the suppression of the Universities outside of Rome and the place taken by the Roman colleges²²¹. We have at the moment a kind of reverse of the situation. The whole movement of the council, in its Theological Commission, has been to switch from the Roman colleges to theological centres outside of Rome. But, of these universities, Louvain is the only one that has been effective». He laments what he feels is the absence of any comparable contribution on the part of the French bishops who have been trained in the theology faculties of the Catholic institutes in France²²².

The final reference to Newman is recorded in a journal entry dated 17 September 1965. It alludes to the discourse of Cardinal Heenan on religious freedom. Congar writes: «It appears that the session has been very interesting; six interventions by cardinals, among them Heenan who quoted Newman, ‘Conscience first, then the Pope’»²²³.

4.2. *Henri de Lubac*

De Lubac was taken by surprise by his nomination as consultor of the preparatory Theological Commission in July 1960. Later he was named expert of the Doctrinal Commission. He has been described as an «actor or witness of the Council in the diversity of its aspects: general congregations, Doctrinal Commission (which functions in the afternoon during the sessions, but continues its work during the intersessions), meetings of French bishops, private encounters between French and foreign bishops about questions in depth (*sur questions de fond*), various discussions, preparation and adjustment of Council interventions, at the request of many bishops, conferences before audiences of bishops or of seminarians studying at Rome»²²⁴.

The French Jesuit first mentions Newman in his Council notes while recalling a visit he made on 7 December 1962 to the English College in Rome. Writing about it the next day, he says: «Yesterday evening, at the English College, the rector showed me a portrait gallery of English cardinals; a quite beautiful portrait of Newman, which I do not believe ever to have seen reproduced». Shortly afterwards he is shown a portrait of Mgr George Talbot, a Rome-based English ecclesiastic with whom Newman did not see eye to eye. De Lubac reminds the rector of Talbot’s words on learning of the publication of *Apologia*: «We had managed to silence him and here he is starting over again»²²⁵.

A year later in a tense debate of the Doctrinal Commission on *De libertate religiosa*, he notes a citation of Newman on conscience by the German commission expert Bernard Häring²²⁶.

In a moment of disillusionment –in early June 1964– with what he calls the «petty intrigues» at the conciliar proceedings on the part of those small few «who seek to monopolize the faith and wish to impose themselves dictatorially», de Lubac invokes Newman’s *Essay on Development*:

the mind is below truth, not above it, and is bound, not to descant upon it, but to venerate it²²⁷.

This small group which thinks it represents tradition obliges many of the bishops to oppose it, thus compromising the peace of the Church and provoking false interpretations²²⁸.

Later that same month –24 June 1964– he records that he has just finished reading the *Itinéraire spirituel de Newman* by Jean Honoré, who had then been named rector of the Catholic University of Angers²²⁹. The book sets him thinking that a study of the Oxford Movement is necessary «as a model, ‘mutatis mutandis’, of the aggiornamento which is currently sought in the Church; to show there (*en montrer*) above all the interior side, the serious depth before God, the ascetical and spiritual roots»²³⁰. He then goes on to quote a letter by Newman written almost a century earlier and cited in Honoré’s book:

... my apprehensions are not new, but above 50 years standing. I have all that time thought that a time of wide-spread infidelity was coming, and through all those years the waters have in fact been rising as a deluge. I look for the time, after my life, when only the tops of the mountains will be seen like islands in the waste of waters²³¹.

Honoré adds that Newman, on seeing an intelligent and reflective young man, shuddered with anxiety and fear in thinking about the future. Newman wondered how could the young man resist the growing deluge of reason against Christianity. And de Lubac observes: «This great fact Newman glimpsed, and it is what ought to principally concern the Council»²³².

The final reference to Newman that appears in de Lubac’s Council notes is dated 27 March 1965. That evening the French theologian was due to return to Rome after having spent a number of days in Lyons attending to matters various. While there, he reviewed a copy of the thesis of John Stern on the *Bible and Tradition for Newman the Anglican*. The thesis had been prepared under the direction of de Lubac and was defended in May 1965 at the theology faculty of Lyons²³³.

4.3. *Overall evaluation of the Council periti*

At first sight, the data yielded by the diaries are hardly astounding. Each of the two French theologians considered refers to Newman five times in his «Council diary». Nevertheless, on closer examination, they do seem to indicate that the Englishman was never far from their thoughts. For every time they mention him explicitly, how many times did the memory of this great

protagonist of Church history impact on the mind and imagination of each of them implicitly? Can we not assume that they were in fact much more often conscious of Newman's towering historical figure during this time of the Council than their conciliar diaries explicitly reveal?

I think we can. The main reason is that their theological writings, as we have already seen, show a constant recourse to Newman's thought and example to support their own opinions and interpretations. Moreover, in serious interviews both have referred to Newman's historic contributions. Congar in 1975²³⁴, de Lubac in 1985 in the context of a discussion of *Lumen gentium* and doctrinal development²³⁵.

More interesting than the quantity of references is the quality or profundity of the reflections which each one is stirred to make during the course of the Council. Parallels between the circumstances surrounding Vatican I and II almost inevitably prompt a consideration of Newman's penetrating historical and psychological analysis (Congar) or of the deep ascetical and spiritual life that underpinned his theology (de Lubac). The one is busy writing his historical and theological essays on Tradition as the Council progresses; the other is reading an account of Newman's spiritual itinerary and directing a thesis on Bible and Tradition in Newman at the same time. It is surely no coincidence that Tradition is one of the principal themes dealt with at the Second Vatican Council.

Of course, Congar and de Lubac are not the only experts present at the Council. There were many many others. Daniélou, as we have already noted, played a key role in drafting *Gaudium et spes*. He too was familiar with Newman. Present too were Louis Bouyer²³⁶ about whom we have already spoken in the previous chapter, and the Swiss Francophone theologian Charles Journet²³⁷. Then there were the German *periti*, among whom was Joseph Ratzinger²³⁸. Moreover, Christopher Butler of England and numerous consultants from the U.S. –for example, John Courtney Murray²³⁹– would at the very least have been conversant with Newman.

It would be pointless to continue listing off names and personalities familiar with Newman. Nor is it to our purpose in this study to speculate as to whether they formed a majority or sizeable minority among the Council's theological consultants. Suffice it to say that we have shown in some detail how two key French *periti* commonly acknowledged to have wielded much influence at Vatican II clearly had Newman present in their minds and work during the Council²⁴⁰. Moreover, it can be assumed that there were numerous

others who would have been familiar with his doctrines, for example, on development, the rationality of faith, the laity and conscience.

Although it may seem like quoting Newman to prove Newman, we feel that his role at the Second Vatican Council can best be explained by his own distinction between real apprehension and notional apprehension. Not all present at the Council were conscious notionally of Newman's life and work during it; yet a great many indeed had, nevertheless, a real apprehension of his principal ideas. They had not mastered the whole Newmanian grammar, but they had acquired –either by reading his works or more often by hearing his ideas explained by *periti* such as Congar and de Lubac– a working knowledge of Newman's lexicon.

Newmanian concepts permeated Council debates and intersessional discussions. Council fathers invoked them, touched on them or indeed at times collided with them without necessarily being able to articulate them fully or attribute them directly to their originator. The ideas of development of doctrine and the rationality of the faith were in the air. Two popes of the Council had alluded to both principles²⁴¹. Sixteen conciliar fathers were recorded as referring to the Englishman in the official Council documents. Newman, the <invisible *peritus*>, was really present at Vatican II, albeit in the subtlest of ways.

Notes

1. Newman was elevated to the College of Cardinals at the age of 78, Congar a year before his death. While an Anglican, the English theologian was condemned for his Catholic interpretation (*Tract 90*) of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England by several Anglican bishops, cfr. A. NICHOLS, *From Newman to Congar*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1990, 20-21. His writings as a Catholic were feared by some ecclesiastical figures to be excessively innovative. The initiative to «rehabilitate Newman completely» began as a petition in 1878 to Pope Leo XIII by the Duke of Norfolk (via Cardinal Manning) to make Newman a cardinal, which he readily did, cfr. J. MORALES, *Newman (1801-1890)*, Rialp, Madrid, 1990, 323-330. Congar was censured for early writings on ecumenism and on the «priest-worker» movement, cfr. A. NICHOLS, *Yves Congar*, Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1989, 7-8, and J. PUYO, *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar: une vie pour la vérité*, Centurion, Paris, 1975, 99ff. With the passing of years, the principles of ecumenism received a better reception within Catholic theology. John XXIII named the French theologian a theological consultant to the preparatory commission of the Second Vatican Council, Paul VI made him a member of the official Catholic-Lutheran commission of dialogue as well as of the then newly founded Pontifical International Theological Commission, and John Paul II raised him to Cardinal in 1994.
2. On Newman and Möhler, see: O. CHADWICK, *From Bossuet to Newman*, 111-119; N. LASH, *Newman on Development*, 90-94 (both citations are from R. WILLIAMS, «Newman's Arians», in I. KER and A. HILL [eds.], *Newman...*, 275, n.73.); H. TRISTRAM, «J.A. Möhler et J.H. Newman», *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 2, Paris (1938) 184.
3. Cfr. J. FAMERÉE, «Formation et ecclésiologie du «premier» Congar», in A. VAUCHEZ (ed.) *Cardinal Yves Congar*, Cerf, Paris, 1999, 52ff.
4. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *Journal d'un théologien (1946-1956)*, edited and annotated by É. FOUILLOUX, Cerf, Paris, 2000, 71-72.
5. Y. CONGAR, *Chrétiens désunis. Principes d'un «oecumenisme» catholique*, Cerf, Paris, 1937, XVI. He also exhibited exemplary fidelity in never publishing anything without first obtaining a *nihil obstat*, cfr. J. PUYO, *Jean Puyo interroge...*, 107.
6. R. PELLITERO, «Congar's developing understanding of the laity and their mission», *The Thomist* 65 (2001), 328-329. See also his extensive study about the theology of the laity in Congar; ID., *La teología del laicado en la obra de Yves Congar*, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, 1996.
7. *Ibid.*, 329.
8. *Ibidem*.
9. *Ibidem*.
10. *Ibid.*, 330.
11. *Ibidem*.
12. Cfr. J. FAMERÉE, «Formation et ecclésiologie...», 52.
13. Cfr. *ibid.*

14. A. DULLES, Preface to G. FLYNN (ed.), *Yves Congar: theologian of the Church*, Peeters, Louvain, 2005, 28.
15. *Ibidem*.
16. *Ibid.*, 28-29. Further on we shall have reason to discuss Congar's writings on the triple office at somewhat greater length in the context of an analysis of the modern theological origins of the fresh Christological focus of postconciliar ecclesiology prompted by Vatican II's teachings.
17. Y. CONGAR, Preface to R BEAUCHESNE, *Laity and Ministry in Yves-M.-J. Congar, O.P.: Evolution, evaluation and ecumenical perspectives*, Boston, 1975, vii (English translation by R. Beauchesne), cited in J. FAMERÉE, «Formation et ecclésiologie...», 59-60, n.4.
18. J. PUYO, *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar: une vie pour la vérité*, Centurion, Paris, 1975, 164ff.
19. *Ibid.*, 166. On Newman's historical importance and historical sensibility, see also Y. CONGAR, *L'Eglise de saint Augustin à l'époque moderne. Histoire des dogmes*, III, 3, Paris, 1970, 435-437; IDEM, *Journal d'un théologien...*, 70.
20. Saint Thérèse of the Child Jesus was canonized by Pope Pius XI on 17 May 1925. The same Pope proclaimed her Universal Patron of the Missions, alongside Saint Francis Xavier, on 14 December 1927.
She was proclaimed a Doctor of the Universal Church on World Mission Sunday, 19 October 1997, by John Paul II. The Strasbourg-born Charles de Foucauld, from whom «the spiritual family of Charles de Foucauld» takes its name, was beatified by the same Pope on 13 November 2005.
21. Congar met Paul VI three times in private audience, the last time in November 1973. Every time they met, he was hugely impressed by the Pope's extraordinary attentiveness, delicacy and capacity to listen; so much so that the French theologian felt that he would have been as relaxed in his company as if with a friend, were it not for his acute awareness of his being in the presence of the Holy Father, who is like no other person on earth. «... Je pourrais me croire avec un ami, si je n'avais parfaitement conscience d'être en présence du Saint-Père, et qu'il est unique au monde», J. PUYO, *Jean Puyo interroge...*, 118. In the same interview, he describes the Pope as a man of great courage and of perfect intellectual probity: «un homme très courageux... Une autre qualité de Paul VI, sa parfaite probité intellectuelle...», *ibid.*, 119.
22. J. PUYO, *Jean Puyo interroge...*, 166-167.
23. The comments are from an article published just prior to the Second Vatican Council, entitled «Simple reflections on the originality of the ecumenical enterprise». See Y. CONGAR, «Simple réflexions sur l'originalité de l'entreprise oecuménique», in IDEM, *Chrétiens en dialogue: contributions catholiques à l'Oecuménisme*, Cerf, 1964, 107-121. The embedded quotations are from a letter by Newman to Mr Wetherell, 1 November 1864, cited in WILFRID WARD, *The Life of J.H. Newman, based on his Private Journals and Correspondence*, II, Longmans, London, 1912, 56.
24. For example, clearly influenced by Newman, Congar argues that patience and respect for delays is essential in the task of reform, citing as a reference –though not quoting– a passage from the Englishman, which he says deserves to become a classic «There is a time for every thing, and many a man desires a reformation of an abuse, or the fuller development of a doctrine, or the adoption of a particular policy, but forgets to ask himself whether the right time for it is come...», *Apologia pro vita sua*, Longmans, London, 1865, 259; cfr. Y. CONGAR, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Eglise* (2^e édition revue et corrigée), Cerf, Paris, 1968, 277, n.138. As we shall see further on, the same passage is also cited in H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation sur l'Eglise*, Cerf, Paris, 2003, 222, n.64.
25. Y. CONGAR, *La Foi et la Théologie...*, 267. A prophetic observation, given that at the end of the twentieth century no lesser authority than the International Theological Commission should invoke Newman's *An Essay on the development of Christian doctrine* (1845, 3^a ed. 1878) as the basic source on the interpretation of dogmas. The criteria they recommend are non other than the seven notes of a true development as elaborated by Newman in his *Essay*, namely: preservation

- of its type, continuity of its principles, its power of assimilation, its logical sequence, anticipation of its future, conservative action upon its past and its chronic vigour, cfr. COMISIÓN TEOLÓGICA INTERNACIONAL, *Documentos 1969-1996*, Madrid 1998, 417-453, cited in J. MORALES, *Teología, experiencia, educación: estudios newmanianos*, Eunsa, Pamplona 1999, 17.
26. Y. CONGAR, *La Foi et la Théologie*, Desclée, Tournai, 1962, 104-105.
 27. *Ibid.*, 105.
 28. *Ibid.*, 112.
 29. Cfr. *ibid.*, 112-113.
 30. *Ibid.*, 118.
 31. *Ibid.*, 119.
 32. *Ibid.*, 119-120.
 33. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition et les traditions*, I, Fayard, Paris, 1960, 8.
 34. *Ibid.*, 77-78.
 35. «Prospects for the Anglican Church», in *Essays Critical and Historical*, I, VII, British Critic, April 1839, 286, cited in cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, I, 90, 120, see <<http://www.newmanreader.org/works/essays/volume1/prospects.html>>.
 36. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, I, 91-92.
 37. Cfr. *ibid.*, 73.
 38. *Essay on Development*, Longmans, London, 1909, 342, accessed 15 April 2005 at <<http://www.newmanreader.org/works/development/chapter7.html#return15>>; cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, I, 75 and 112, n.62.
 39. *Essay on Development*, 339.
 40. *Ibid.*, 339.
 41. *Difficulties of Anglicans*, II, Longmans, London, 1900, 11-13 accessed 15 April 2005 at <<http://www.newmanreader.org/works/anglicans/volume2/pusey/index.html>>. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, I, 148-150.
 42. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, I, 237. «... L'idée est, croyons-nous, valable»; cfr. *Apologia*, French trans. by L. Michelin-Delimosges, Paris, 1939, 279, 286ff, 295-296.
 43. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, I, 286, n.68.
 44. *Ibid.*, 286, n.68.
 45. Cfr. *ibid.*, 261.
 46. Cfr. *ibid.*, 260-261.
 47. *Ibid.*, 261.
 48. *Ibid.*, 261.
 49. *Essay on Development*, 86. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, I, 293, n.124.
 50. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, I, 293, n.124.
 51. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, I, 263.
 52. Cfr. *ibid.*, 267.
 53. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition et les traditions*, II, Fayard, Paris, 1963, 7-10.
 54. Significantly for our topic, Biemer had just published a study on the doctrine of tradition according to Newman, G. BIEMER, *Überlieferung und Offenbarung. Die Lehre von der Tradition nach John Henry Newman*, Freiburg, 1961. See also J. GEISELMANN, *Die Heilige Schrift und die Tradition. Zu den neueren Kontroversen über das Verhältnis der heiligen Schrift zu den nichtgeschriebenen Traditionen (Quaestiones Disputatae, 18)*, Freiburg, 1962; H. HOLSTEIN, *La Tradition dans l'Église*, Paris, 1960; W. KASPER, *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der Römische Schule (Giovanni Perrone, Carlo Passaglia, Clemens Schradler)*, Freiburg, 1962. Hanson had also just published a volume on tradition which cited and critiqued Congar's historical essay, but which came to his attention too late to be incorporated into the second essay, R. HANSON, *Tradition in the Early Church*, London, 1962.
 55. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, II, 9-10.

56. *University Sermons*, XV, 313-314, accessed 17 April 2009 at <<http://www.newmanreader.org/works/oxford/index.html>>.
57. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, II, 29.
58. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, II, 63.
59. *Ibid.*, 83.
60. *Ibid.*, 84-85.
61. Cfr. *ibid.*, 85.
62. Cfr. *ibid.*, 85-86.
63. Cfr. *ibid.*, 91.
64. Cfr. *ibid.*, 91-92. On the importance of the laity, see also Y. CONGAR, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcité (1953)*, trans. D. Attwater as *Lay People in the Church* (revised with additions by the author), Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1985, xix and 285-286.
65. *Ibid.*, 118. «... la liturgie procède simplement, avec l'assurance de la vie, à l'affirmation de ce qu'elle fait et du contenu de ce qu'elle livre en le célébrant.»
66. Letter 4 June 1837 to Mrs J. Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence*, II, 208-209 accessed 30 April 2009 at <<http://www.newmanreader.org/biography/mozley/volume2/file8.html>>. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, II, 119.
67. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, II, 127.
68. Cfr. *ibid.*.
69. *Ibid.*, 132.
70. *Historical Sketches*, III, I, Longmans, 1909, 14. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, II, 307, n. 63.
71. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, II, 151.
72. Cfr. *ibid.*, 166, 169.
73. *Ibid.*, 172.
74. A. DULLES, «The threefold office in Newman's ecclesiology», in I. KER and A. HILL (eds.), *Newman after a hundred years*, Oxford, 1990, 397. The studies he refers to are that by L. SCHICK, *Das dreifache Amt Christi und der Kirche: zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der Trilogien*, Frankfurt, 1982, and the more detailed study by A. FERNÁNDEZ, *Munera Christi et Munera Ecclesiae: historia de una teoría*, Pamplona, 1982.
75. Cfr. *Pensées sur l'Église*, Unam Sanctam, 30, trad. A. Roucou-Barthélémy, Cerf, Paris, 1956, 306-307ff. There the editors reproduce pages xxxvi-xciv of the Preface to the Third Edition (1877) of *The Prophetic Office of the Church*, first published in 1837 by the then Anglican Newman.
76. Henri de Lubac, for example, cites the translation by A. Roucou-Barthélemy of the Preface of 1877, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Exégèse Médiévale: les quatre sens de l'Écriture*, II, Aubier, Paris, 1964, 154, n.4. Although the particular quote that he employs has to do with the interpretation of Scripture, one may infer that de Lubac—a meticulous and thorough scholar—had read it entirely.
77. See, for example, Preface to the Third Edition, *Via Media*, I, Longmans, London, 1901, xxxix-xl; cfr. *Pensées sur l'Église...*, 309-310. Besides its elaboration in Preface, the idea also appears in a much earlier work originally published in 1843: «all His followers in some sense bear all three offices, as Scripture is not slow to declare. In one place it is said, that Christ has «made us kings and priests unto God and His Father»; in another, «Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.» [Rev 1, 6; 1 John 2, 20], «The Three Offices of Christ», in *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day*, Longmans, London, 1902, 55-56.
78. Theologians such as Congar and the Belgian Roger Aubert had sufficient command of German to assimilate the results of developments of Newmanian studies in that language.
79. Cfr. O. DE BERRANGER, «Des Paradoxes au Mystère chez J.H. Newman y H. de Lubac», *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 78 (1994/1) 46.
80. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Mémoire sur l'occasion de mes écrits*, Cerf, Paris, 2006, 25-26.

81. Although some of the Frenchman's works have a clear overall guiding theme, others tackle various topics together, so that a degree of theme overlap is inevitable.
82. *Corpus mysticum* (1944), although an «important study of mediaeval ecclesiology» (Dulles), does not concern us here, cfr. A. DULLES, *Henri de Lubac: In appreciation (1991)*. It does contain, however –in a note at the end entitled «Une illusion de l'histoire de la théologie»– one striking quote from Newman taken from his essay on Benedictine Schools, cfr. *Historical Sketches*, II, Longmans, London, 1906, 475; H. DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 2d edn., Aubier, Paris, 1949, 366, n. 1.
83. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme: les aspects sociaux du dogme*, 5th edition, revised and enlarged, Cerf, Paris, 1952, 323.
84. A. DULLES, *Henri de Lubac...*
85. Cited in H. DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme...*, 12.
86. Cfr. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, V, 9, 122-123.
87. In whom so many commentators see parallels with the Englishman, e.g. Y. Congar, M. Laros.
88. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme...*, 169.
89. *Sermons bearing upon subjects of the day*, Longmans, London, 1902, 10, 132.
90. *Ibidem*.
91. *Ibid.*, 133.
92. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme...*, 190.
93. *Ibid.*, 301. The Newman quote is from «Christ hidden to the world», *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, IV, 16, 243.
94. Of Fathers of the Church and other authors venerated by de Lubac.
95. *Essays Critical and Historical*, II, 231-233, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme...*, 393-395. The same text is referred to briefly at p. 253, where de Lubac affirms that the Church knows that all races, all ages, all sources of culture (*tous les foyers de culture*) have to furnish their part: *ex toto mundo totus mundus eligitur* (Prosper).
96. His plan of salvation, it is understood.
97. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation sur l'Église*, 6th ed., Cerf, Paris, 2003. Cardinal Avery Dulles describes it as «a popular work on the church constructed out of talks given at days of recollection before the [Second World] war», cfr. A. DULLES, *Henri de Lubac...*
98. De Lubac generally quotes the Englishman directly from well-known translations –such as those by L. Michelin-Delimosges, H. Bremond, P. Leyris and J. Gondon– but he also relies on material drawn from French commentators such as Louis Bouyer and Maurice Nédoncelle.
99. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 16. The nested quote is from L. BOUYER, *Newman: sa vie, sa spiritualité*, 1952, 239. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Theology in History*, trad. by A. Englund Nash, San Francisco, Ignatius, 1996, 339.
100. *Fifteen Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford*, Longmans, London, 1909, 350-351, hereafter referred to as *University Sermons*.
101. *Ibid.*, 317. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 17. In an article published in 1948 on the development of dogma, de Lubac states: «I situated myself in the line of Newman», H. DE LUBAC, *Mémoire sur l'occasion de mes écrits*, 65. It appeared in *Recherches de science religieuse*, of which de Lubac was made editor on 22 January 1947. It's a theme he returns to relatively frequently. For example: «C'est Newman qui nous en avertit, 'de par la nature de l'esprit humain, pour maîtriser une idée neuve, il faut du temps'. Et cela encore est très Teilhardien», cited in IDEM, *La pensée religieuse du père Teilhard de Chardin*, 293; cfr. IDEM, *Theology in History*, trad. by A. Englund Nash, Ignatius, San Francisco, 1996, 555.
102. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, VII, 134; cfr. *Callista*, 171, «textes cités et commentés dans le beau Newman d'Henri Bremond, pp.243-245». Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 46-47.
103. Cfr. O. DE BERRANGER, «Des Paradoxes au Mystère chez J.H. Newman y H. de Lubac»...

104. *Apologia*, 27. «Ce sont les expressions du grand Newman», says the French theologian, H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 63.
105. See, for example, H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit: l'intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène*, Cerf, Paris, 2002, 251.
106. A man of the Church, not so much recognizable by external garb, but rather by a loyalty to her that springs from within him, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 209.
107. *Ibid.*, 213. The accompanying footnote cites the fifth chapter of *Apologia*, with cross-references to *Historical Sketches* and *Letter to Dr Pusey*, cfr. *ibid.*, 213, n.26. See also H. DE LUBAC, *Las Iglesias particulares en la Iglesia Universal*, Salamanca, 1974, 175.
108. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*: 215 (twice); 222, n. 64; 245.
109. By no means does he dismiss scholasticism out of hand, cfr. *University Sermons*, 349-350.
110. *Apologia*, 238-239, 251. The first reference encompasses the following Newmanian aphorism: «Ten thousand difficulties do not make one doubt, as I understand the subject; difficulty and doubt are incommensurate», *ibid.*, 239.
111. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 222. The text continues: «In short, he resists simplistic solutions which, even without directly harming the faith, compromise in some way the fulness, the equilibrium and the depth of the Catholic heritage», *ibid.*
112. *Apologia...*, 259-260. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *Vraie et fausse réforme...*, 287, n.159.
113. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 222, n.64. Elsewhere de Lubac has written in a similar vein, see IDEM, *Theology in History*, trad. by A. Englund Nash, Ignatius, San Francisco, 1996, 336.
114. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 244-245.
115. *Ibid.*, 245. The comment is accompanied by the nigh inevitable reference to Chapter five of *Apologia*.
116. *Ibid.*, 213, n.26. The other instances are to be found in *ibid.*: 213, n. 27; 273, n.1; 274, n. 4; 275, n.10; 277, n.22; 290, n.76; 291, n.81; 326, n.4. Most of the citations are made in a chapter entitled «L'Église et la Vierge Marie» (The Church and the Virgin Mary).
117. At the same time he remarks that Hurrell Froude, an Oxford colleague and intimate friend, had inculcated in Newman both love of the Virgin and admiration for the Catholic Church, *ibid.*, 273, n.1; cfr. *Letter to Dr Pusey*, which appears in *Difficulties of Anglicans*, II, Longmans, London, 1900, 35.
118. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 274, n.4. «Just those nations and countries have lost their faith in the divinity of Christ, who have given up devotion to His Mother», *Letter to Dr Pusey*, 92.
119. *Ibid.*, 44, 53ff. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 275, n. 10; 277, n. 22.
120. Letter to Ward, 18 February 1866, *Letters and Diaries*, XXII, 157; cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 218-219. The Frenchman also cites Newman's «portrait of the 'narrow mind' (*l'esprit étroit*)», *ibid.*, 219b.
121. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 226.
122. Cited in WILFRID WARD, *The Life of J.H. Newman, based on his Private Journals and Correspondence*, Longmans, London, 1912, II, 365. Cfr. L. BOUYER, *Newman...*, 428; H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 226, n.81.
123. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, IV, 16, 250; cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 264-265, 253, 266 and 268-269.
124. These remarks are preceded by the following scriptural references: «God has chosen what is foolish in the world to confound the wise» (1 Cor: 1, 26-29, cfr. Matt, 11, 25).
125. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 268.
126. See *Present Position of Catholics*, IX, Longmans, London, 1908, 395-398. This series of discourses were first made in 1851, six years after his conversion. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 268-269; *Le catholicisme travesti par ses ennemis*, 9th conference (trad. J. GONDON), 469.

127. H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation...*, 269. Cfr. Letters to Coleridge (16 nov. 1844), to Keble (21 nov.) and to his sister Jemima (15 mars 1845), *Letters and Diaries*, X, 416-417, 424-427, 595-598. Cfr. L. BOUYER, *Newman...*, 298-314.
128. We shall also refer to his later historical study of ancient and mediaeval scriptural commentators, *Exégèse Médiévale* (two volumes, 1959 and 1964).
129. Yet as we shall see there is a great deal more that unites the two theologians than separates them, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit: l'intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène*, Paris, Cerf, 2002, 303, n.54. Newman's writings on inspiration have been collected and annotated by J. HOLMES AND R. MURRAY (eds), *On the Inspiration of Scripture*, Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1967.
130. J. SEYNAEVE, *La doctrine de Newman sur l'inspiration*, in *Ephem. Theol. Lovan.*, 1949, 377.
131. IDEM, «Newman: doctrine scripturaire du cardinal», in *Dictionnaire de la Bible (Supplément)*, 6 (1960) 469.
132. *Arians of the Fourth Century*, Longmans, London, 1908, 404-405; cfr. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 343-344; H. DE LUBAC, *Exégèse Médiévale: les quatre sens de l'Écriture*, I, Aubier, Paris, 1959, 387, n.2; A. DULLES, *John Henry Newman...*, 68-69. De Lubac also cites *Arians* in the second volume of his Mediaeval Exegesis, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Exégèse Médiévale: les quatre sens de l'Écriture*, II, Aubier, Paris, 1964, 131, n.7.
133. *Essay on Development*, 346. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 38, 104-105; IDEM, *Catholicisme...*, xii.
134. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 519.; cfr. *Apologia*, 259. The same essay –Dispute about the Salvation of Origen– is reproduced in H. DE LUBAC, *Theology in History*, trad. by A. Englund Nash, San Francisco, Ignatius, 1996, 110-111.
135. Cfr. *Apologia*, 26-28, 10-11; H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 251. «Newman avait donc bien raison lorsqu'il déclarait unir à la suite des Pères alexandrins les deux points de vue dans sa pensée». See also IDEM, *Méditation sur l'Église*, 63. Butler's *Analogy* undoubtedly is influenced by Origen, but the argument about probability's being the guide of life surely owes more to Bishop Butler's response to the empirical arguments of the «Evidential School» (John Locke, etc.) than it does to the philosophy of the Alexandrine School.
136. Cfr. *Development of Christian Doctrine*, 71; cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 329, n.218.
137. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 387, n.30; J. SEYNAEVE, *La doctrine de Newman sur l'inspiration*, dans *Ephem. Theol. Lovan.*, 1949, 366».
138. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 388, n.36. «C'est contre la prétention d'un christianisme tout 'spirituel' (c'est-à-dire faussement spirituel) que Newman prononçait à Littlemore ses deux sermons: «The Christian Church a Continuation of the Jewish» et «The Principle of Continuity between the Jewish and Christian Churches», recueillis dans *Sermons bearing on subjects of the day...* Il y insiste sur l'accomplissement littéral, et non pas seulement 'spirituel' des prophéties».
139. The *anagogical* sense, that which points towards heavenly realities. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Exégèse Médiévale...*, I, Aubier, Paris, 110-118. «*Nam in divino eloquio agitur de giro quadruplicem; quia, sicut dicit prima Glossa super Genesis: Quatuor sunt sacrae Scripturae regulae sive sensus, id est, historia..., allegoria..., tropologia..., anagogia... His quatuor rotis, tota divina Scriptura volvitur*», mediaeval text cited by de Lubac in *ibid.*, 117.
140. Prophetic Office, *Via Media*, I, 308; cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Mémoire...*, 84. See also O. DE BERANGER, «Des Paradoxes...», 53; H. DE LUBAC, «Sur un vieux distique: la doctrine du 'quadruple sens'», *Théologies d'occasion*, 117-136, cited in *ibid.*
141. Philip Griffin provides a useful and relatively brief summary of criteria Newman recommended for reading Scripture correctly, see P. GRIFFIN, «Some Admonitions of John Henry Newman regarding the Correct Use of Scripture in the Quest for Revealed Truth», *Annales Theologici*, 5 (1991) 301-325.
142. L. BOUYER, «Liturgie et exégèse spirituelle», in *La Maison-Dieu*, n°7, 1946, 35, cited in H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 402, n.90.

143. *Sermons bearing on subjects of the day*, 189-191; cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 402, n. 90. Newman's comments clearly have significance for ecumenical and interreligious dialogue. Elsewhere, de Lubac is careful to point out that if Christianity is a completed Judaism (*judaisme accompli*), it is because it is a transfigured Judaism (*judaisme transfiguré*), cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Exégèse Médiévale...*, II, 147, n.4, where he cites Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, 437.
144. *Sermons bearing on subjects of the day*, 166-170, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 429, n.193.
145. Cfr. *ibid.*, 427-428.
146. «Prospects of the Anglican Church», *Essays Critical and Historical*, I, 286-287; cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 430-431. Elsewhere, he quotes another text from the same Newmanian essay, which is also invoked by Congar, ECH, I, 286, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Exégèse Médiévale...*, II, 76; Y. CONGAR, *La Tradition...*, I, 90, 120.
147. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 430-431.
148. «Peut-être aussi verrons-nous porter un regard plus attentif sur la signification éternelle des grands épisodes bibliques, toujours à la lumière du Mystère chrétien et nous apprendrons de la sorte 'à mieux connaître la jeunesse éternelle du vieux texte'», *ibid.*, 433.
149. «Et c'est Newman qui disait, dans sa naïveté profonde: 'N'est-il pas singulièrement touchant de lire dans l'histoire du patriarche (Jacob) le récit de ces mêmes choses qui, aujourd'hui encore, s'accomplissent au dedans de nous?'», *ibid.*, 433, n.207 and n.209.
150. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, V, 6, 76-83. Although the citation by de Lubac –via Bremond's *Newman*– refers to sermon 24, his comments seem rather to correspond to sermon 6, which we have quoted here.
151. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Histoire et esprit...*, 351-352; also IDEM, *Exégèse Médiévale...*, II, 174.
152. «Ces idées, souvent reprises, se retrouveront dans Hamann, *Méditations bibliques*, et dans Newman, *Apologia*, dernier chapitre», *ibid.*, 352, n.81.
153. A. DULLES, *Henri de Lubac...*
154. *Ibidem.*
155. *Ibidem.*
156. H. DE LUBAC, *Le mystère du surnaturel*, Paris, Cerf, 72, n.3; cfr. IDEM, *Mémoire...*, 82, n.3.
157. *Oxford University Sermons*, 30-31, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *La pensée religieuse du père Pierre Teilhard de Chardin*, Cerf, Paris, 2002, 336, n.1.
158. H. DE LUBAC, *Le mystère...*, 275.
159. Commenting on what he calls «de Lubac's most famous work», Dulles says that «*Surnaturel* (1946) maintains that the debate between the Baianists and the scholastics in the 17th century rested on misinterpretations both of Augustine and of Thomas Aquinas... Contemporary neoscholastics, especially in Southern France and Rome, taking offense at de Lubac's attack on their methodology and their doctrine, interceded with the Holy See for a condemnation. When Pius XII published the encyclical *Humani generis* (1950), many believed that it contained a condemnation of de Lubac's position, but de Lubac was relieved to find that the only sentence in the encyclical referring to the supernatural reproduced exactly what he himself had said in an article published two years before», A. DULLES, *Henri de Lubac...* For a fuller explanation of the controversy, see J. LORDA, *La Gracia de Dios*, Palabra, Madrid, 2004, 344-350.
160. 'Il est bien de parler de Dieu', remarquait Newman, 'mais ce mot contient toute une théologie, et il faut préciser de quel Dieu l'on parle', H. DE LUBAC, *Le mystère...*, 275., cfr. *Idea of a University*, Longmans, London, 1907, 35-36. Cfr. M. NÉDONCELLE, *La philosophie religieuse de Newman*, 277.
161. *Idea of a University*, Longmans, London, 1907, 35-36.
162. *Ibid.*, 37-38.
163. *Ibid.*, 27-28.
164. *Callista*, a novel –begun in 1848– in which «the heroine is a beautiful and virtuous pagan girl who comes to realize the inadequacy of paganism and converts to Christianity in North Africa in time to be martyred in the Decian persecution. The mobs who call for the death of

NOTES

- Christians are moved by anti-Catholic prejudices reminiscent of those Newman witnessed in England when the Catholic hierarchy was reestablished in 1850», A. DULLES, *John Henry Newman*, Continuum, 2009, 9-10.
165. *Apologia*, 238-239, cfr. H. de Lubac, *Sur les chemins de Dieu*, Aubier, Montaigne, 1966, 70 and 285, n. 32. «Avant d'y être 'identifiée' par aucun acte conscient, il doit exister dans l'esprit une certaine 'habitude de Dieu'». The book first appeared under the title *De la connaissance de Dieu*.
166. *Callista: a tale of the third century*, Longmans, London, 1901, 314-315; cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Sur les chemins...*, 92-93.
167. H. DE LUBAC, *Mistica e mistero cristiano*, Milano, Jaca, 1979, 48.
168. Cfr. *ibid.*, 48-49; L. BOUYER, *Newman...*, 347. Bouyer provides a translation in French of the notes written by Newman in Latin during a retreat made in April 1847 at San Eusebio's, Rome, cfr. *ibid.*, 345.
169. See *Letters and Correspondence*, I, 22.
170. H. DE LUBAC, *Mistica e mistero...*, 48-49; cfr. Also «Newman et la conscience», in *Sermons universitaires*, 1955, 72, 28 and 38 (notes by M. Nédoncelle), 379, notes 11 and 12; cfr. *Idea of a University*, VIII, 200, 191-192. Those who thus assume philosophy as their religion and good taste as their moral criterion, continues Newman, fail to see the remedy which Catholics find so natural: «They are angry and impatient, not humble. They shut themselves up in themselves... As to confession, which is so natural to the Catholic, to them it is impossible; unless indeed, in cases where they have been guilty, an apology is due to their own character, is expected of them, and will be satisfactory to look back upon. They are victims of an intense self-contemplation».
171. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Mistica e mistero...*, 49-50. These are far from being the last words of either author on grace and virtue, see also H. DE LUBAC, *Theology in History*, 163; IDEM, *Mistica e mistero...*, 156-157; *Oxford University Sermons*, 3, 6 March 1831.
172. For example, Y. Congar, R. Guardini, H. de Lubac, J. Daniélou and J. Ratzinger, cfr. J. MORALES, «La figura del teólogo a lo largo de la historia», *Scripta Theologica*, 33 (2001) 693.
173. See de L.'s avant-propos (1981), H. DE LUBAC, *Mémoire...*, 9-10; cfr. editor's (G. Chantraine, SJ) footnote distinguishing between Newman's *Apologia* and de Lubac's memoir, *ibid.*, 422, n.5. What it is fair to say is that the Frenchman's «two memoirs are written in the presence of God», G. Chantraine, in introduction to *ibid.*, iii-iv.
174. Cfr. *ibid.*, 10; *Apologia*, 1.
175. A. DULLES, *Henri de Lubac...*
176. See his statement that «no authority (*aucune autorité*)» either of the Society of Jesus or of the Church had ever questioned him, *ex officio*, about his doctrine, H. DE LUBAC, *Mémoire...*, 399.
177. *Apologia*, xv-xvi; cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Mémoire...*, 296 (Annex IV). «Le 14 mai 1951, je copiais dans un cahier ce texte de Newman dans son *Apologia* (xv-xvi)....»
178. *Ibid.*, «Mais je ne pouvais pas, comme Newman, faire une protestation publique».
179. *Ibid.*, 308 (Annex IV). De Lubac's continued filial devotion to the Church was ultimately rewarded on his being named a cardinal by John Paul II in 1983. See interview after being made a cardinal, *ibid.*, 465ff.
180. See chapter entitled Spiritual life, *Paradoxes*, Cerf, Paris, 1999, 154.
181. Cfr. *ibid.*, 160.
182. A. DULLES, *Henri de Lubac...*
183. De Lubac includes among those who influenced his thought Rousselot, Newman (well understood), Laberthonnière, Maréchal, Valensin, de Montcheuil, de Grandmaison and Teilhard de Chardin (although he did not consider himself Teilhardian, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Mémoire...*, 473-474).
184. Cfr. *ibid.*, 174.

185. As we mentioned at the outset of this chapter, broadly speaking, the first two headings are tied to the principle of the development of doctrine and the last two to the principle of the rationality of the faith. These are the two fundamental ideas present in Newman to which, we are arguing, all others, in one way or another, can be related.
186. C. OLSON, «Jean Daniélou's Master Key», CatholicExchange.com, 2002, accessed 31 March 2010 at <<http://catholiceducation.org/articles/religion/re0514.html>>.
187. *Ibidem*.
188. *Ibidem*.
189. In the words of one former student of the former Dean and Professor of Patristics at the *Institut Catholique*, Paris, Daniélou taught them that «theology is not only an object of study..., but it is the source of understanding and of discernment for the life of the Church, today as yesterday», B. PETIT, in «Jean Daniélou 1905-1974», *AXES Recherches pour un dialogue entre christianisme et religions*, 7, 1-2, 1974-1975, 149.
190. H. DE LUBAC, Lettre à un ami d'Amérique, 22 May 1974, *Bulletin des amis du Cardinal Daniélou*, 10 (1984) 67.
191. J. DANIELOU, *Le signe du Temple ou de la présence de Dieu*, 21st ed., Gallimard, 1942.
192. *Ibid.*, 32.
193. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, IV, 190, 198.
194. J. DANIELOU, *Les anges et leur mission: d'après les Pères d'Église*, 2nd ed., Chevetogne, 1953.
195. «C'est pourquoi parler des anges ne sera pas inopportun... voyons-nous que les plus grands d'entre les saints et les hommes de Dieu ont vécu dans leur familiarité, de Saint Augustin à John Henry Newman», *ibid.*, 5ff.
196. IDEM, «Compte rendu de: Jaak Seynaeve, *Cardinal Newman's doctrine of Scripture*, Louvain, 1953», *Dieu Vivant*, 26 (1954) 155-157.
197. *Ibid.*, 155.
198. See preceding subsection above on de Lubac and the interpretation of Scripture. There we noted, among other things, de Lubac's admiration for Newman's use of the mystical interpretation of the Bible, which he says is lacking in modern exegetes. However, attempting to emulate the Fathers –and Origen especially– is by no means easy; invoking Newman once again, De Lubac warns against an «excessive enthusiasm that would lead us to copy their methods». On the subtle differences between Daniélou and de Lubac over the «spiritual sense», cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Mémoire sur l'occasion de mes écrits*, 283.
199. J. DANIELOU, *Et qui est mon prochain?: Mémoires*, Stock, 1974, 13, 12-14.
200. Cfr. *ibid.*, 14.
201. *Ibid.*, 14. The quote seems to correspond to that of *Apologia*, 4.
202. J. DANIELOU, *Et qui est...*, 14.
203. See, for example, *Apologia*, 246.
204. J. HONORÉ, *Itinéraire spirituel de Newman*, Seuil, Paris, 1963; IDEM, *Fais paraître ton jour: Newman poète et prophète de l'au-delà*, Cerf, Paris, 2000; IDEM, *John Henry Newman. Un homme de Dieu*, Cerf, Paris, 2003. He taught at St Vincent's College in Rennes and in Saint-Malo, and lectured in dogmatic theology at the major seminary. For six years he worked at the National Religious Education Centre (CNEC). He later served as rector of the Catholic University of Angers (1964-1972). He served as bishop of Evreux from 1972 to 1981, after which he was appointed archbishop of Tours until his retirement in 1997. Following the 1985 Synod of Bishops he was asked by the future Pope Benedict XVI to be one of the bishops responsible for overseeing the preparation of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. He was proclaimed cardinal by John Paul II in February 2001, see <<http://www.catholicnewsagency.com/resource.php?n=122>> [accessed 15 October 2009].
205. Cfr. J. HONORÉ, *La grâce d'être né. Mémoires*, Renaissance, 2006, 52. The book was probably Thureau-Dangin's classic historical study, P. THUREAU-DANGIN, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIXe siècle*, 3 vol., Paris, 1899-1906.

206. When a candidate for the priesthood entered the Carmelite seminary, he then automatically entered into the programme of university studies of the *Institut Catholique*, cfr. B. PETIT, in «Jean Daniélou 1905-1974»..., 148.
207. Cfr. J. HONORÉ, *La grâce d'être né...*, 61-62.
208. Cfr. *ibid.*, 86.
209. Honoré describes his first encounter with Louis Bouyer, «a former Lutheran pastor, recently converted to the Catholic Church», whom he first knew as a brilliant second-year student of the faculty, cfr. *ibid.*, 60.
210. Cfr. *ibid.*, 88-91.
211. Cfr. *ibid.*, 101-102. In the event Honoré emerged from his thesis defence with honours. He finally published his thesis in revised form in 1962 (right in the middle of Vatican II), cfr. *ibid.*, 159-160. Ironically it is precisely Cardinal Jean Honoré who has penned the preface to the latest edition of the French Oratorian's classic, i.e., L. BOUYER, *Newman. Sa vie, sa spiritualité*, Cerf, Paris, 2009.
212. Dulles goes so far as to say that the Sedanese scholar «was able to play so great a part at Vatican II that it could almost be called Congar's council», A. DULLES, Preface to G. FLYNN (ed.) *Yves Congar: theologian of the Church*, Peeters, Louvain, 2005, 27. The view is shared by Scarisbrick, cfr. J. SCARISBRICK, «An historian's reflections on Yves Congar's *Mon Journal du Concile*», in G. FLYNN (ed.) *Yves Congar...*, 265-266.
213. Cfr. *Apologia*, 265-266.
214. Y. CONGAR, *Mon Journal du Concile*, I (ed. with introd. by E. MAHIEU), Cerf, Paris, 2002, 136.
215. *Ibid.*, 136-137.
216. «J'entends seulement quelques passages de la très belle intervention du supérieur des Maristes. Il ne faut pas, dit-il, partir de l'autorité, mais de la personne libre et de la conscience (ô Newman!)», Y. CONGAR, *Mon Journal...*, I, 306, cfr. n.5; cfr. ACTA, I, 4, 353-355.
217. Cfr. Y. CONGAR, *Mon Journal...*, I, 420-421.
218. Of Gerard Philips, he says: «Sans aucun doute, c'est Mgr Philips l'artisan n° 1 de l'oeuvre théologique du concile», IDEM, *Mon Journal du Concile*, II (ed. with introd. by E. MAHIEU), Cerf, Paris, 2002, 56.
219. *Ibidem*.
220. Cfr. *ibid.*, 56-57. In an interview years later, Congar explains that the French bishops used the experts very little, «at least at the beginning». He then cites an instance when they did. In March 1963 Daniélou –who had been the theologian chosen by the archbishop of Toulouse Gabriel-Marie Garrone (member of the Doctrinal Commission)– asked Congar to replace him, as he (Daniélou) was already tied up with work on various other commissions. In this way, Congar ended up being engaged in a direct way in the elaboration of *De Ecclesia*. The Dominican proceeded to take up residence at the Belgian College, which he regarded as the centre of operations on the schema, cfr. J. PUYO, *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar: une vie pour la vérité*, Centurion, Paris, 1975, 138-139. He mentions also having dedicated long days of work, collaborating in particular with Daniélou, to early drafts of the document which eventually became known as *Gaudium et spes*, cfr. *ibid.*, 143.
221. Four years earlier Congar had published a paper in which he commented on this very issue, see Y. CONGAR, «L'Écclésiologie de la Révolution française au Concile du Vatican, sous le signe de l'affirmation de l'autorité», in M. NÉDONCELLE (ed.), *L'Écclésiologie au XIXe siècle*, Cerf, Paris, 1960, 98-99.
222. Y. CONGAR, *Mon Journal...*, II, 57.
223. *Ibid.*, 394.
224. Jacques PRÉVOTAT in Preface to H. DE LUBAC, *Carnets du Concile* (ed. with introd. by L. FIGOUREUX), I, Cerf, Paris, 2007, x.
225. H. DE LUBAC, *Carnets...*, I, Cerf, Paris, 2007, 519-520.

226. See entry dated 11 November 1963, IDEM, *Carnets du Concile* (ed. with introd. by L. FIGOUREUX), II, Cerf, Paris, 2007, 23. On background to this text, see *ibid.*, 13, n.2.
227. *Essay on Development*, 357; cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Carnets ...*, II, 70.
228. De Lubac seems to write these strong –although at the same time measured and carefully chosen– words in a moment of considerable irritation. He goes so far as to declare that these would-be defenders of orthodoxy pose more of a threat to the faith than atheists or dissidents (*nos réformists*) in the Church, cfr. *ibid.*
229. See subsection above on the French Newmanist and disciple of Daniélou.
230. H. DE LUBAC, *Carnets...*, II, 109.
231. Letter to Mrs Maskell, 6 January 1877, cited in WILFRID WARD, *The Life of J.H. Newman*, II, Longmans, London, 1912, 416.
232. H. DE LUBAC, *Carnets...*, II, 109. «Ce grand fait qu’apercevait Newman, voilà ce qui devrait au premier chef occuper le Concile». Cfr. J. HONORÉ, *Itinéraire spirituel de Newman*, Seuil, Paris, 1964, 207.
233. It was published two years later: J. STERN, *Bible et tradition chez Newman: aux origines de la théorie du développement*, Paris, 1967. Cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Carnets...*, II, 344, n.2.
234. J. PUYO, *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar: une vie pour la vérité*, Centurion, Paris, 1975, 166.
235. H. DE LUBAC, *Entretien autour de Vatican II*, Cerf, Paris, 1985, 44. «Ce qu’on appelle développement du dogme n’est jamais qu’on progrès relatif... Vous savez sans doute comment le grand Newman a exposé et justifié la chose, à la suite des Pères de l’Église. On l’a quelquefois trahi, en lui faisant parler d’une ‘évolution’ du dogme». On the key role of de Lubac in the drafting of *Lumen gentium* and the similarity between parts of it and certain passages from *Méditation sur l’Église*, see O. DE BERRANGER, «Des Paradoxes au Mystère chez J.H. Newman y H. de Lubac», *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 78 (1994/1) 68-69.
236. Consultant on liturgy and on Christian unity, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Carnets...*, I, 20, n.6.
237. Member of the preparatory Theological commission. About his familiarity with Newman see R. MIGUEL MAUTI, «La recepción de Newman en la teología del siglo XX», *Revista Teología*, 42 (2005) 439-441.
238. See P. BLANCO, «Joseph Ratzinger, perito del Concilio Vaticano II (1962-1965)», *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia*, 15 (2006) 43-66. On the influence of Newman on Ratzinger and on other German theologians, cfr. R. MIGUEL MAUTI, «La recepción de Newman...», 431-438. For a personal account of same by the later Pope Benedict, see J. RATZINGER, «Conscience and Truth», 10th Workshop for Bishops, February 1991, Dallas, Texas, USA. «In January 1946, when I began my study of theology in the Seminary in Freising..., an older student was assigned as prefect to our group, who had begun to work on a dissertation on [1] Newman’s theology of conscience even before the beginning of the war... Alfred Läßle –the above mentioned prefect named– published his dissertation in 1952 with the title: *Der Einzelne in der Kirche (The Individual in the Church)*. For us at that time, Newman’s teaching on conscience became an important foundation for theological personalism, which was drawing us all in its sway. Our image of the human being as well as our image of the Church was permeated by this point of departure...». Ratzinger goes on to mention the influence of two other theologians whose teachings on Newman had a big impact on him, namely, Gottlieb Söhngen and Heinrich Fries: «When I continued my studies in Munich in 1947, I found a well-read and enthusiastic follower of Newman in the Fundamental Theologian, Gottlieb Söhngen, who was my true teacher in theology. He opened up the *Grammar of Assent* to us and in doing so, [2] the special manner and form of certainty in religious knowledge. Even deeper for me was the contribution which Heinrich Fries published in connection with the Jubilee of Chalcedon. Here I found access to [3] Newman’s teaching on the development of doctrine, which I regard along with his doctrine on conscience as his decisive contribution to the renewal of theology».

NOTES

239. Private expert of Cardinal Spellman and named expert at the Council from the second session onward, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Carnets...*, I, 545, n.1.
240. On Congar's role, Scarisbrick affirms that while bishops informed themselves of course, nevertheless, «the single most important factor which transformed the Council and resulted in the rank-and-file voting overwhelmingly for, say, collegiality, ecumenism, religious liberty, were those sessions when Congar and others were able to inform, explain and answer questions», J. SCARISBRICK, «An historian's reflections on Yves Congar's *Mon Journal du Concile*», in G. FLYNN (ed.) *Yves Congar: theologian of the Church*, Peeters, Louvain, 2005, 264. It is difficult to imagine Congar give a conference on any of these issues without referring at some point to Newman. Nor would de Lubac fail to cite him or his ideas and/or example. Among those who consulted him –for instance, on collegiality– was Émile Blanchet, Rector of the *Institut Catholique* at Paris, cfr. H. DE LUBAC, *Carnets...*, II, 18 and 27.
241. See, for example, *Ad Petri Cathedram*, AAS (51) 1959, 497-531: 513; also comments of conciliar father Archbishop Shehan of Baltimore, ACTA III, 5, 350 (*De Ecclesia in mundo huius temporis*). «*Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, in quo invenitur sententia, variis modis repetita: 'a power of development is a proof of life' –potestas crescendi signum vitae est–. Eadem veritas... diversis locis et diversimode... adumbratur... in Litteris Encyclicis *Ecclesiam suam*, Pauli Papae VI, praesertim... ubi dicitur 'Ecclesia... magis magisque proficiet in conscientia muneris sui, suae arcanae naturae, suae doctrinae...' ... haec sententia enucleari debet ut constituat... partem schematis de quo agitur».

Index of Excerptum

PRESENTATION	7
INDEX OF THE THESIS	11
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE THESIS	15
THE PRESENCE OF J. H. NEWMAN IN Y. M. CONGAR, H. DE LUBAC AND J. DANIELÉLOU	25
I. YVES-MARIE CONGAR	25
1.1. Newman and Congar: prophet and peritus of the Second Vatican Council	25
1.2. Development of doctrine	30
1.3. Tradition and traditions	33
1.4. The significance of <i>Pensées sur l'Église</i>	42
II. HENRI DE LUBAC	43
2.1. De Lubac and Newman: a comparison of profiles	43
2.2. Ecclesiology	44
2.3. Interpretation of Scripture	51
2.4. Natural religion and supernatural religion	55
2.5. Autobiographical	58
III. JEAN DANIELÉLOU	60
3.1. Daniélou and Newman: a comparison of profiles	60
3.2. Daniélou's writings	62
3.3. Relationship with Jean Honoré	65
IV. NEWMAN AND THE COUNCIL PERITI	66
4.1. Yves-Marie Congar	66
4.2. Henri de Lubac	69
4.3. Overall evaluation of the Council <i>periti</i>	70
NOTES	73
INDEX OF EXCERPTUM	87