

# Understanding the Shift in *Gaudium et Spes*: From Theology of History to Christian Anthropology

Theological Studies  
2017, Vol. 78(3) 634–658  
© Theological Studies, Inc. 2017  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/0040563917714620  
journals.sagepub.com/home/tsj



**Dries Bosschaert**

Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium

## Abstract

This contribution reconsiders the rejected but often overlooked “Malines text” (September 1963) as the missing link in the redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes* and as a key witness to the document’s Christian anthropology. Applying the three hermeneutical principles of content, style, and “pastorality” (*pastoralité*) to this text and its redaction history, a basis is laid for a reading of Vatican II that respects its embrace of diversity.

## Keywords

Christian anthropology, conciliar hermeneutics, *Gaudium et Spes*, humanistic style, Malines text, pastorality, Second Vatican Council

In September 1963 a select group of theologians met in all urgency. The location of their meeting was significant: it was the same room where representatives of the Roman Catholic and the Anglican Communion had held the famous Malines Conversations (1921–1927).<sup>1</sup> Forty years later the ecumenical spirit of these

- 
1. While the Malines Conversations are beyond the scope of this contribution, reference must be made to the excellent study by Adelbert Denaux, ed., *From Malines to ARCIC: The Malines Conversations Commemorated*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 130 (Leuven: Leuven University, 1997).

---

## Corresponding author:

Dries Bosschaert, Catholic University of Leuven, Sint-Michielsstraat 6 - box 3000, Leuven, Belgium.  
Email: dries.bosschaert@kuleuven.be

pioneering conversations would receive a central stage in the Catholic Church's Second Vatican Council (1962–1965). Moreover, it was Cardinal Suenens, Archbishop of Malines-Brussels, who stood on the barricades at Vatican II, urging his fellow bishops in full assembly to go as a council *ad extra* and to meet the expectations of the world. Not surprisingly, he was entrusted with responsibility over the one conciliar schema that would answer this call. This September meeting in 1963 probably represents his most fundamental attempt to define the schema's content. At that moment, a group of European theologians assembled in his archdiocesan palace and redacted the Malines text,<sup>2</sup> intending the redacted text to serve as a draft for *Gaudium et Spes*. While the redacted text was ultimately rejected, its drafting represents a crucial phase in the redaction history of the Pastoral Constitution.

It is the focus on Christian anthropology in recent interpretations of *Gaudium et Spes* that calls for a reconsideration of the rejected draft. Walter Kasper even considers Christian anthropology “the Archimedean point of the Pastoral Constitution, the basis for a dialogue with the world of today.”<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, Christian anthropology has become one of the main hermeneutical keys for interpreting conciliar documents, the council as a whole, and the council's reception.<sup>4</sup> In contrast, the general anthropological turn in twentieth-century theology has often been overlooked, certainly when preconciliar and conciliar history are linked. A partial explanation for overlooking the importance of the anthropological turn at large for the council may be that the Malines text itself has been overlooked. In Gil Hellín's *Gaudium et Spes* synopsis, for example, this text was not taken into account at all, despite Hellín's recognition that it constituted the start of the redaction process.<sup>5</sup> Likewise, Kasper

- 
2. This contribution will refer to “the Malines text.” Other designations include: Text of Louvain, Schema of Malines, Belgian Draft, etc. Sometimes also the Dutch name “Mechelen” of the city is used.
  3. Walter Kasper, “The Theological Anthropology of *Gaudium et Spes*,” *Communio* 23 (1996): 129–40 at 135.
  4. Consider for instance these studies: Philippe Bordeyne, *L'homme et son angoisse: la théologie morale de “Gaudium et spes”*, Cogitatio Fidei 240 (Paris: Cerf, 2004); Philippe Bordeyne, “Signs of the Times and Moral Anthropology in *Gaudium et spes*,” in *Revisiting Vatican II: 50 Years of Renewal*, ed. George Kochuthara (Bangalore: Dharmaram, 2014), 266–80; Luis Ladaria, “L'homme à la lumière du Christ dans Vatican II,” in *Vatican II: bilan et perspectives: vingt-cinq ans après 1962–1987*, ed. René Latourelle, Recherches (Montréal: Bellarmin, 1988), 409–22; Francesco Scanziani, “La Chiesa nel mondo: Aspetti teologici e antropologici in *Gaudium et spes*,” in *40 anni dalla “Gaudium et spes”*: *Una eredità da onorare*, ed. Giovanni Turbanti, Francesco Scanziani, and Dionigi Tettamanzi (Milano: In Dialogo, 2005), 57–94; Paul-Werner Scheel, *Was ist der Mensch? Die Antwort des II. Vatikanischen Konzils* (Würzburg: Echter, 2015); Thomas Gertler, *Jesus Christus: Die Antwort der Kirche auf die Frage nach dem Menschsein: eine Untersuchung zu Funktion und Inhalt der Christologie im ersten Teil der Pastoralconstitution “Gaudium et Spes” des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils*, Erfurter Theologische Studien 52 (Leipzig: Benno, 1986).
  5. While he refers to the “schema of Lovania” as the first schema presented, he presents in fact the schema *De Ecclesia in mundo huius temporis*, which is known as the Zürich text. In fact, he should have introduced the text *De active praesentia ecclesiae in mundo*

situated the conciliar discovery of Christian anthropology in the Zürich text, another key draft document. This account of the discovery seems strange, however, given that the meeting in Malines gathered such a unique group of theologians, highly respected for their work on Christian anthropology in preconiliar years. The purpose of the present contribution, then, is to show how the Malines text can be understood as a locus of a balanced Christian anthropology amidst conciliar tensions and theological cultures. This intermediate role of the Malines text was already noted by the French church historian Etienne Fouilloux in 2009:

The synthesis drafted at Malines in September 1963, under the auspices of Cardinal Suenens, did not long withstand the opposing tensions. On the one side were the French-speaking experts, quite often of a Thomist ancestry, who proposed a positive “horizontal” or “sociological” reading of the surrounding world, to which the Council was supposed to address a message of hope; on the other side were the German-speaking theologians, but not only them, of a more patristic extraction, according to whom this reading gave away the congenital ambiguity of the world wounded by sin and thus of its need for redemption through the cross.<sup>6</sup>

To describe the role of the Malines text in the redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes* as well as its significance for the interpretation of that document, I develop here a threefold argument corresponding to three hermeneutical principles. First, I place the Christian anthropology of the Malines text in its historical theological context, analyzing the contributions of the principal authors according to two clusters of thought borrowed from the preconiliar “theology of history” debate. I argue that the redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes*, and the Malines text in particular, still bear the marks of this theological current of thought from the 1940s and 1950s. The Malines text itself and its eventual rejection can only be understood in light of the theological tensions stemming from the post-war and Cold War context. Second, I apply the hermeneutical principle of style,

---

*aedificando* (cf. Fonds Philips 0878, *Adumbratio Schematis XVII: De activa praesentia Ecclesiae in mundo aedificando*, Gerard Philips, lat., 22.9.1963, Centre for the Study of the Second Vatican Council, Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, KU Leuven, Belgium), hereafter referred to as Fonds Philips. Similarly, see Fonds Congar 1307, *Adumbratio schematis XVII De activa praesentia ecclesiae in mundo aedificando* (manuscripta: Malines, Textus correctus, 22/09/1963, Fonds Congar, Archives de la province dominicaine de France, Bibliothèque du Saulchoir [Paris]).

6. “La synthèse esquissée à Malines en septembre 1963, autour du cardinal Suenens, n’a pas résisté longtemps à des tensions opposées. D’un côté des experts de langue française, et d’ascendance thomiste assez souvent, qui proposent une lecture positive, ‘horizontale’ ou ‘sociologique’ du monde ambiant, auquel le concile se doit d’apporter un message d’espoir; de l’autre des théologiens de langue allemande, mais pas seulement, et plutôt de filiation patristique, selon lesquels cette lecture fait bon marché de l’ambiguïté congénitale d’un monde blessé par le péché, et donc de sa nécessaire rédemption par la croix.” Etienne Fouilloux, “Les théologiens catholiques de l’avant à l’après-concile: 1962–1969,” in *Un nouvel âge de la théologie? 1965–1980: Colloque de Montpellier*, ed. Dominique Avon and Michel Fourcade (Paris: Karthala, 2009), 19–36 at 32.

proposed by John O'Malley, to the redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes*, situating the Malines text between the preceding Roman text and the succeeding Zürich text. This section serves as a basis for understanding the text's Christian anthropology in light of the conciliar shift in style. Third, I apply the principle of "pastorality" (cf. Christoph Theobald) to the complex redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes*, simultaneously showing the principle's normativity for the reception of the Pastoral Constitution. Finally, in the conclusion, these three hermeneutical principles describe the major insights the Malines text has to offer for understanding Christian anthropology and *Gaudium et Spes*.

## Content: A Mixed Text of Malines?

The history of the Second Vatican Council's turn towards modernity,<sup>7</sup> and of its Pastoral Constitution, have been extensively documented.<sup>8</sup> According to that history,

- 
7. This paradigm shift has been described at length by Stephen Schloesser, "Reproach vs. Rapprochement: Historical Preconditions of a Paradigm Shift in the Reform of Vatican II," in *50 Years On: Probing the Riches of Vatican II*, ed. David G. Schultenover (Collegeville: Liturgical, 2015), xi–xlix. It was also discussed in Joseph A. Komonchak, "Vatican II and the Encounter of Catholicism and Liberalism," in *Catholicism and Liberalism: Contributions to American Public Philosophy*, ed. Robert B. Douglass and David Hollenbach (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2002), 76–99.
  8. Given the complex redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes*, a brief review of the major moments in this process may be of some use to the reader. The relation of the church and the world was originally not on the conciliar agenda. It was only after the acceptance of Suenens's plan for the council that the schema was taken up as seventeenth in the list of conciliar schemas (January 27, 1963), hence its original name Schema XVII. A Mixed Commission of members of the Doctrinal Commission and the Commission of the Apostolate of the Laity became responsible for Schema XVII. During the 1963 intersession, a first draft was written on the basis of preparatory schemas. This draft, known as the Roman text, was considered insufficient by the Coordinating Commission (July 4, 1963). Next, the Malines text was drafted under the responsibility of Cardinal Suenens in September 1963. This text, the Malines text, was rejected at the following meeting of the Mixed Commission (November 29, 1963). A new redaction was undertaken in the intersession of 1964; the result of this round of redaction is known as the Zürich text. This text was sent to the Council Fathers at the beginning of July 1964. This time it was listed in thirteenth place (Schema XIII) on the conciliar agenda. It was the Zürich text that was discussed for the first time during the third conciliar period. In the third intersession a central redaction committee oversaw the revisions made by the different subcommissions. The most important meeting of the Mixed Commission (including the members of these different subcommissions) was in Ariccia, where the text was thoroughly revised. After further redactions, the text was approved by the Coordinating Commission and Pope Paul VI (May 1965). It was then again sent to the Council Fathers. They discussed the text during the fourth conciliar period. The text was approved on December 7, 1965 with an overwhelming vote: 2,309 Council Fathers voted *placet*, 75 *non placet*, and 7 abstained. For the most extensive account of the redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes*, see Giovanni Turbanti, *Un concilio per il mondo moderno: la redazione della costituzione pastorale Gaudium et spes del Vaticano II*, Istituto per le scienze religiose di Bologna: Testi e ricerche di scienze religiose. NS (Bologna: Mulino, 2000).

the role of Cardinal Suenens in articulating the Constitution's anthropological emphasis is uncontested. In his address to the Council Fathers on December 4, 1962 he clearly expressed his wish to influence Schema XVII in this sense. A first draft with a first chapter on the human vocation was written in Rome.<sup>9</sup> This Roman text, partly written by the French Jesuit theologian Jean Daniélou, was quickly rejected by Suenens. As the relator of the schema, Suenens argued against this Roman text, reasoning that the document had not sufficiently laid down the principles concerning the church, the world, and their mutual vocation. His words struck a sympathetic note with fellow members of the Coordinating Commission. They decided that it was only right to give Suenens the responsibility to redact a new first chapter. He gladly accepted the opportunity and invited a number of trusted theologians to Malines to draft a conciliar vision of Christian anthropology.<sup>10</sup>

The meetings at Malines seemed to the participants to be a unique opportunity to develop the theological foundations of the church's relationship with the world. Over the course of four days, eleven theologians met in Malines. Their work was divided into three days of redaction (September 6–8, 1963) and one day of revisions (September 17, 1963).<sup>11</sup> Unfortunately, their efforts have often been overlooked as insignificant and unrepresentative. On the one hand, it is often argued that the text is insignificant, since only eleven redactors participated. This argument neglects the fact that a significant part of the group's participants were key players in the pre-Vatican II debate on the relationship between theology and the world. Moreover, the participants were all

9. Intervention by Cardinal Leo Joseph Suenens (December 4, 1962), in *Acta Synodalia* 1, no. 4 (1971): 222–27 (hereafter cited in text as *AS*); Leo Joseph Suenens, *Relatio "De praesentia efficaci ecclesiae in mundo hodierno"* (Commissio de Concilii Laboribus Coordinandis: July 4, 1963), in *AS* 5, no. 1 (1980): 630–33.

10. In a preparatory note, Suenens explained that the participants had to draft a conciliar chapter that would introduce some more practical, sociologically oriented chapters on the urgent problems the world faced at the time. Only this text would be voted on by the Council Fathers and thus become a conciliar document. The other chapters—later known as the “annexes”—could even be drafted after the council by theologians and experts in the field. Concerning the content and style, Suenens stated that the text had to have an ecclesiological focus and include a Christian anthropology. Inspiration could be found in the Roman text. Suenens insisted on the christological focus of this anthropology, emphasizing the universal kingship of Christ and a Christian transformation of the world. In sum, Suenens envisaged a doctrinal text that would include a Christ-centered anthropology. *Note sur le schéma 17 à élaborer*, Fonds conciliaire Suenens 1296. The Fonds conciliaire Suenens is available for consultation at the Archives of the Archdiocese of Mechelen-Brussels (Mechelen, BE). It is interesting to note that while Suenens stated that the text would become the conciliar part of the schema, he was in fact only granted the responsibility to draft a proposal with some main orientations. See *Commissione di Coordinamento: Verbali*, ASV-ACVII 1198.497, at the Archives of the Second Vatican Council, consultable at the *Archivum Secretum Vaticanum* (Vatican City).

11. At the meetings the following persons were present: Albert Prignon, Gerard Philips, Gustave Thils, Charles Moeller, Lucien Cerfaux, Philippe Delhaye, Bêda Rigaux, Albert Dondeyne, Yves Congar, Karl Rahner, and Roberto Tucci.

well acquainted with one another and had a history of intense academic collaboration in international organizations and study groups (e.g. COPECIAL).<sup>12</sup> All factors were thus present to facilitate collaboration and the production of a well-founded theological schema.

On the other hand, the redaction is often dismissed as parochial, that is, too Belgian. This argument, first of all, neglects the significance of the Belgian Catholic Church, its university, and its theology for defining the content of this conciliar text. Although the Belgians were marked by the legacy of Cardinal Désiré-Joseph Mercier and his promotion of Neo-Thomism, after World War II they had to rethink their understanding of Christianity and humanity to cope with the horrors of the German occupation, to reconcile the factions it had created, to deal with the tensions among language communities in Belgium, and to dialogue in a context of strong sociopolitical polarization.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, in the midst of the Cold War, they had understood the effects of both globalization and decolonization.<sup>14</sup> Second, depicting the text as too Belgian neglects the way the “*squadra belga*” successfully defined the agenda during the council. This group of bishops and theologians, with the Belgian College as its center, knew how to work together for the common goal of a conciliar *aggiornamento*.<sup>15</sup> Finally, with the participation of Yves Congar, Karl Rahner, and Roberto Tucci, some of the most representative and authoritative West European theologians contributed to this “Belgian” text. In short, the Malines meetings were a unique collaboration of Belgian and international theologians with a clear theological perspective on the world and a well-established Christian anthropology.

- 
12. Comitato Permanente dei Congressi Internazionali per l’Apostolato dei Laici. A history of this committee can be found in Bernard Minvielle, *L’apostolat des laïcs à la veille du concile (1949–1959): Histoire des congrès mondiaux de 1951 et 1957*. Studia Friburgensia: Series Historica (Fribourg: Ed. universitaires, 2001).
  13. It should for instance be noted that Suenens, who was vice-rector of the Catholic University during the Second World War, had conflicts with the German occupying forces over the use of the university’s enrollment lists. Moreover, the Mechelen transit camp located in the Archdiocese deported over 25,000 Jews and others from Nazi-occupied Belgium to Auschwitz-Birkenau. One of the early examples of a project in which theologians wished to reconsider humanity as such in this postwar period can be found in Fernand Van Steenberghen, *L’homme nouveau: examen de quelques aspects du problème de l’humanisme chrétien au lendemain de la guerre* (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1947).
  14. Recall, for example, that Belgium hosted the first postwar World Fair *Expo ’58* (1958), which focused on human freedom and progress. Belgium also witnessed in the same years the independence of its former colony, Congo (1960).
  15. One cannot for instance neglect the importance of the Belgian theologian Gerard Philips in the drafting of *Lumen Gentium*, but also in *Gaudium et Spes*. For a description of the role of the “*squadra belga*” at the council, see Mathijs Lamberigts and Leo Declerck, “La contribution de la ‘squadra belga’ au Concile Vatican II,” *Anuario de Historia de la Iglesia* 21 (2012): 157–83, <https://www.unav.edu/publicaciones/revistas/index.php/anuario-de-historia-iglesia/article/view/2306>. The importance of other Belgians can be found in Doris Donnelly et al., eds., *The Belgian Contribution to the Second Vatican Council: International Research Conference at Mechelen, Leuven, and Louvain-la-Neuve (September 12–16, 2005)*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 216 (Leuven: Peeters, 2008).

### “Theology of History” as Hermeneutical Principle

When the participants met to draft Suenens’s text, an intellectual distinction concerning Christian anthropology arose among them. A study of the Malines text and its importance for the theme of Christian anthropology should therefore first of all investigate the content of that discussion. It is possible to do this by starting from the many tensions underlying *Gaudium et Spes* that were recently presented by Ormond Rush.<sup>16</sup> Rush shows that it is difficult to point to a single, clear Christian anthropology in the Pastoral Constitution. Most scholars explain the tensions by appealing to the document’s redaction history. In this regard, the hermeneutical model of Joseph A. Komonchak, which describes a Thomist and an Augustinian tendency, has been popular among scholars, but this approach was put under pressure recently, not least by Komonchak himself.<sup>17</sup> A new conceptual model for the interpretation and evaluation of conciliar Christian anthropology thus seems necessary. The building blocks of such a model are found in the preconciliar “theology of history”<sup>18</sup> current of thought. Reconsidering this current facilitates a distinction between two clusters of theological emphasis: eschatology/transcendence and incarnation/immanence. The decision to use these two clusters has a double advantage. On the one hand, it takes into account the long term (*longue durée*): because theologians involved in drafting *Gaudium et Spes* were often involved in this preconciliar theological movement, their conciliar contributions must be understood in light of their preconciliar activities. On the other hand, this framework avoids hermeneutical concepts that are affected by post-conciliar debates about the reception of *Gaudium et Spes* in the present-day reading of its redaction history.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, distinguishing between these two clusters of theological emphasis makes clear that the underlying objective continues to be the same search for a

16. Especially Ormond Rush, “Unresolved Tensions within *Gaudium et Spes*: Agenda for a Contemporary Christian Anthropology,” in *Being Human: Groundwork for a Theological Anthropology*, ed. David G. Kirchhoffer (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2013), 35–46.

17. A comparison of the two following articles is in this regard highly revealing: Joseph A. Komonchak, “Augustine, Aquinas, or the Gospel *sine glossa*? Divisions over *Gaudium et spes*,” in *Unfinished Journey: The Church 40 Years after Vatican II*, ed. Austen Ivereigh (London: Continuum, 2003), 102–18; Joseph A. Komonchak, “A Postmodern Augustinian Thomism,” in *Augustine and Postmodern Thought: A New Alliance against Modernity?*, ed. Lieven Boeve, Mathijs Lamberigts, and Maarten Wisse (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 123–46.

18. See Roger Aubert, “Discussions récentes autour de la théologie de l’histoire,” *Collectanea Mechliniensia* 33 (1948): 129–49.

19. One of the examples of an interpretation-key that became charged with meaning is the distinction Joseph Ratzinger made in his commentary of the first chapter of *Gaudium et Spes* in the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, a distinction between theistic-oriented anthropologies and creation-centered anthropologies. See Joseph Ratzinger, “The Dignity of the Human Person,” in *Commentary of the Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 115–62. The reception of this distinction can be seen in David L. Schindler, “Christology and the Imago Dei: Interpreting *Gaudium et Spes*,” *Communio* 23 (1996): 156–84.

valid Christian anthropology. Consequently, elements of both clusters were often present in every theology of history. This was also the conclusion in the theology of history debate formulated by Gustave Thils: “To the question raised at the beginning of this book: Transcendence or incarnation? one may answer, it seems, transcendence *and* incarnation. It is both and, not either or. True Christianity, the unique Christianity of Christ and the Spirit, of God and the Bible, is comprised of both movements, both attitudes, both ideas.”<sup>20</sup> In what follows, this debate will be examined more closely, with a particular attention to the two clusters, eschatology/transcendence and incarnation/immanence. For each cluster I present three participants, with a focus on their theological stance and their contribution to the meetings.

### *Eschatology and Divine Transcendence*

In this early phase of the redaction of the Malines text, it is helpful to study the interplay between Yves Congar and Gerard Philips. The former had made a name for himself in preconiliar years with his ecclesiology and his theology of the laity, especially in his book *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat*,<sup>21</sup> where he developed a new understanding of the existence of the laity within the church and the world. He brought both emphases to the redaction of the Malines text. By submitting two proposals in preparation for the Malines meeting, the French Dominican clearly showed himself the most enterprising participant. These proposals,<sup>22</sup> forwarded to the other group members in advance, featured a plea for a new document that would incorporate an anthropology wherein all human beings are defined by their christological vocation. This definition would supply the foundation for a subsequent ecclesiological definition of the church’s mission, relying on the central adage of *consecratio mundi*. In order to accomplish this ideal of a consecrated world, the whole of humanity had to be transformed according to its christological vocation. In other words, humanity had to be formed in the image of Christ, since Christ was considered the true human being.<sup>23</sup> Congar aligned with Suenens’s ecclesiological focus, but stressed the need for a genuine christological anthropology even more than Suenens did.

- 
20. “A la question posée au début de ce livre: *Transcendance ou incarnation?* On peut répondre, semble-t-il, *Transcendance et incarnation*. L’un et l’autre. Pas l’un ou l’autre. Le vrai christianisme,—l’unique christianisme du Christ et de l’Esprit, de la Bible et de l’Eglise,—comporte les deux mouvements, les deux comportements, les deux idéaux.” Gustave Thils, *Transcendance ou incarnation? Essai sur la conception du christianisme* (Louvain: Nova et Vetera, 1950) 97.
  21. Yves Congar, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat*, Unam Sanctam (Paris: Cerf, 1953). ET: Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity, trans. Donald Attwater (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1965).
  22. Yves Congar, *Animadversiones generales super Schemate “De praesentia et actione Ecclesiae in mundo hodierno”*, Fonds Philips 861; See also Letter of Yves Congar to Gerard Philips (September 18, 1963), Fonds Philips 876.
  23. The ultimate success of this transformation depended on the church, which was called in its mission to the threefold task of forming community (*koinōnia*), serving humanity (*diakonia*), and witnessing the Gospel truth (*martyria*).



Congar's orientation was more or less shared by Gerard Philips,<sup>24</sup> one of the main Belgian *periti*. This does not come as a surprise, since in preconiliar years Philips had followed a research path similar to that of Congar, with a strong ecclesiological focus. Philips's *De leek in de Kerk* even preceded Congar's *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat* by one year. The first however, placed more emphasis on Christianity's transcendence of the world. This difference was probably caused by their respective educations. While Congar was trained in "historically conscious Neo-Thomist theology," promoted at the Dominican school, Le Saulchoir, Philips tended towards the Augustinian thought of the Jesuits' Gregorian. Despite this difference, the two took the lead in the Malines meeting and wished to draft a sound doctrinal text. Consequently, on the first day of the meeting, Philips proposed, referring to Congar's preparatory work, to develop a text in four paragraphs, dealing with the mission of the church, the world itself, the dogmatic principles underlying the relation of the church and the world, and the mission of the church in the world. It is important to note that right from the start Philips also insisted that the text had to contain a sound anthropology as well. Philips emphasized that their text had to include the whole of humanity, since it ultimately found its end in God and was created in the image of God. Humanity was, however, deformed by sin; it had to be reformed and perfected by Christ.<sup>25</sup>

The contribution of Charles Moeller displayed a similar concern for eschatology. This theologian was known for his *Humanisme des Béatitudes*,<sup>26</sup> but he would become perhaps the most unjustly forgotten Louvain theologian. His theology was mostly based on classic and contemporaneous literary works, causing him to be frequently labeled a literary critic instead of a theologian. This literary basis, however, always served as a prelude to the Christian perspective. Since his humanism was rooted in the Christian message of salvation, it developed and completed the more secular and existentialist humanisms of his contemporaries.<sup>27</sup> On the one hand, then, his use of humanism offered the possibility to engage in a dialogue with other groups in society that claimed to be based on a similar humanist ideal, including atheists. This idea of humanism could form the common foundation on which they could together construct a better world. On the other hand, Moeller's use of a Christian humanism also brought to the fore the importance of the eschatological perspective.<sup>28</sup> Indeed, the war had indicated the incompleteness of human

24. Gerard Philips, *De Heilige Kerk* (Mechelen: Het Kompas, 1935); Gerard Philips, *De leek in de Kerk* (Leuven: Davidsfonds, 1952); Gerard Philips, *Le rôle du laïcat dans l'Eglise*, Cahiers de l'actualité religieuse (Tournai: Casterman, 1954); Gerard Philips, *The Role of the Laity in the Church* (Cork: Mercier Press, 1956); Gerard Philips, *Naar een volwassen Christendom*, Davidsfonds Keurreeks (Leuven: Davidsfonds, 1961); Gerard Philips, *Pour un christianisme adulte*, Cahiers de l'actualité religieuse (Tournai: Casterman, 1962).

25. Fonds conciliaire Suenens 863.

26. *Humanisme des Béatitudes* was a book that was announced several times as forthcoming, but was never actually published. However, Moeller expressed his ideas concerning his specific understanding of Christian humanism in several of his other publications, referring to it as a *Humanisme des Béatitudes*.

27. Charles Moeller, *Humanisme et sainteté: témoignages de la littérature occidentale*, UCL Bibliothèque de l'Institut Supérieur des Sciences Religieuses (Tournai: Casterman, 1946); Charles Moeller, *Sagesse grecque et paradoxe chrétien: témoignages littéraires*, UCL Bibliothèque de l'Institut Supérieur des Sciences Religieuses (Tournai: Casterman, 1948).

action and the delusional futility of believing that humans could autonomously complete the world's history. At the same time the limits of traditional neo-Thomism to successfully render the Christian message understandable to society had been exposed as illusory. Moeller had gained these insights by teaching the postwar generation of students in secondary school. The anthropology presented in Moeller's works in this new literary language, with its focus on the openness of the human being towards God's mysterious and hidden presence, was likewise developed by the Malines participants as a way to engage the postwar generation. Therefore not only should Moeller's *Humanisme des Béatitudes* be considered a theological contribution, but also as the presentation of an existential option for an eschatological holiness.

### *Incarnation and Divine Immanence*

Other perspectives, focusing on divine immanence and the incarnation, were present at the Malines meetings as well. In this respect, Gustave Thils was perhaps the most notable participant. He had been a very active player in the ecumenical movement, but in this context he was included because of his pioneering work in developing a theology of earthly realities. His work is often considered the first systematic and methodological theology addressing contemporary reality, history, and society.<sup>29</sup> His theology proposed a creation-centered reading of reality that aimed to provide his contemporaries with the tools to comprehend the intrinsic meaning and development of every-day reality. As such, his work was an answer to the observation that, at least within the working class, many were turning away from the Christian faith because of its perceived detachment from their daily lives.

A similar belief in human responsibility for the development of the human community and the modern world can be read in some of Karl Rahner's early works, such as *Geist im Welt* and *Hörer des Wortes*.<sup>30</sup> There Rahner tried "to articulate a vision of concrete Christian and human existence in the world as embraced by God the Holy Mystery—not as an impersonal force, but as personal presence."<sup>31</sup> This quest for an all-encompassing vision of existence later became the driving force behind his

28. See for the sociopolitical role of humanism in postwar France Edward Baring, "Humanist Pretensions: Catholics, Communists, and Sartre's Struggle for Existentialism in Post-War France," *Modern Intellectual History* 7 (2010): 581–609, <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1479244310000247>.

29. Gustave Thils, *Théologie des réalités terrestres: Préludes* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1946); Gustave Thils, *Théologie des réalités terrestres: Théologie de l'histoire* (Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1949); Gustave Thils, *Théologie et réalité sociale* (Tournai: Casterman, 1952).

30. Karl Rahner, *Geist in Welt: zur Metaphysik der endlichen Erkenntnis bei Thomas Aquin* (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1939); Karl Rahner, *Hörer des Wortes: zur Grundlegung einer Religionsphilosophie* (München: Kösel-Pustet, 1941).

31. Joseph Augustine Di Noia, "Karl Rahner," in *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology in the Twentieth Century*, ed. David F. Ford (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989) 183–204 at 183. See also Anton Losinger, *The Anthropological Turn: The Human Orientation of Karl Rahner*, Moral Philosophy and Moral Theology (New York: Fordham University, 2000).

transcendental anthropology. Interestingly enough, in the process of drafting the Malines Text, it was precisely these two men, Rahner and Thils, who were made responsible for the section on the mission of church. Thils wrote the paragraph on humans as the image of Christ, while Rahner wrote the rest of the section.

While these two worked rather deductively, others preferred an inductive approach to develop their anthropology. That was certainly the case for the Louvain philosopher Albert Dondeyne, a strong proponent of a Christian humanism that would do justice to the development of the world and culture. This humanism was strongly linked to his role as mentor of *Universitas*, a student movement for Catholic Action. The involvement of members of *Universitas* in the resistance and their support of the working class during World War II continued in their involvement with the postwar Catholic left and the search for a globalization based on social justice. Moreover, Dondeyne pointed out the necessity for Christian humanism to seek inspiration in contemporary currents of thought, such as existentialism. This openness to an integration of existentialist elements into Catholic theology had made his ideas widely popular. The international interest in his three-part article “Les problèmes philosophiques soulevés dans l’Encyclique *Humani Generis*”<sup>32</sup> must be understood in this sense. Nevertheless, his thoughts were best synthesized in a monograph entitled *Faith and World*.<sup>33</sup> This work offered an anthropology that focused mainly on the eventual positive effects of a Christian humanist formation. Well-formed Christian humanists would contribute to the full elaboration of culture and the world. Thus, they would align with universal progress towards a unified and more humane society. This global transformation of the world and culture was what interested Dondeyne the most. The Christian aspect of Dondeyne’s anthropology sometimes even seemed accessory. Yet it was a fore-drawn conclusion that in the September meetings Dondeyne would receive responsibility for the section on “the world in full development.” In his contribution he clearly introduced his positive appreciation of the human person and its abilities. Moreover, it is interesting to see how Dondeyne also tried to influence the general outcome of the schema even apart from the section assigned to him. When Philips was making the final revisions, Dondeyne asked him to redirect the ecclesiology of the document towards an understanding of the church as *mysterium*. Finally, Dondeyne emphasized the importance of human conscience and Christian responsibility in constructing the new culture. This was also linked with the emerging acceptance of the notion of (religious) tolerance in the Catholic Church.

Dondeyne shared these emphases with the Italian Jesuit Roberto Tucci. Dondeyne and the director of La Civiltà Cattolica were constantly concerned with describing humanity in its present-day context. Thus, they tried to include a truthful description

32. Albert Dondeyne, “Les problèmes philosophiques soulevés dans l’Encyclique ‘*Humani Generis*,’” pts. 1–3, *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 49, no. 21 (1951): 5–56, <https://doi.org/10.3406/phlou.1951.4326>; 49, no. 22 (1951): 141–88, <https://doi.org/10.3406/phlou.1951.4338>; 49, no. 23 (1951): 293–356, <https://doi.org/10.3406/phlou.1951.4351>.

33. Albert Dondeyne, *Geloof en Wereld* (Antwerpen: Patmos, 1961), translated as Albert Dondeyne, *Faith and the World* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University, 1963).

of this present world (cf. the “signs of the times”). Crucial elements for them were the development of a renewed culture, the process of universalization, and the transformation of the world in a more humane direction.

### *Malines Text*

The Malines text was completed September 22, 1963. It was structured in three main sections: (i) “On the Mission of the Church,” (ii) “On the Present World,” and (iii) “On the Task of the Church in the World.” In general a doctrinal style was applied and the cluster transcendence/eschatology seemed to predominate. These aspects were expressed most clearly in the paragraphs “The Human Being as Image of Christ,” “Human Dignity,” and “The Doctrine of the Supreme Vocation of the Human Person,” where, in a doctrinal style, human beings are presented in a non-historical way and described as created in the image of God. Created goodness is described as affected by sin through human actions and through human influence on creation. The image of God can only be restored in Christ, who will eschatologically transform everything and everyone. This path to redemption is clearly framed within salvation history. It is striking that in this presentation the authors chose to refer to the Epistle to the Colossians, a clear effort to include aspects of a theology of the cross. This is noteworthy, since the main author of this section, Gustave Thils, had been reproached by Jean Daniélou for proposing “a somewhat excessive optimism” in his theology of reality.<sup>34</sup> The Malines text thus dealt with preconciliar tensions and aimed to offer a balanced theology acceptable to all conciliar participants.

It is, however, too simplistic to state that only the transcendence/eschatology cluster was present in the text. In the second instance, this emphasis was balanced by an immanence/incarnation approach. Especially, the sections “Human Dignity” and “The Doctrine of the Supreme Vocation of the Human Person” start from a very positive anthropology, wherein humans are able to understand through reason alone the deeper meaning of reality. By listening to divine revelation they are invited to share in the divine nature and to contribute to creation. Thus, the Malines text presented an anthropology with elements of both clusters. On the one hand, it focused on divine transcendence with human beings described in an eschatological framework. On the other hand, it offered an anthropology that started from a theology of creation with a positive view of reality and its completion. In short, the redactors developed a single text on the mission of the church in the world, with anthropology as one of its main threads, showing marks of both tendencies in the “theology of history” current of thought.

After being distributed to the members of the Mixed Commission during the council’s second period, the Malines text was rejected. It is nonetheless striking that this

---

34. Jean Daniélou, review of *Théologie des réalités terrestres: I.: Préludes*, by Gustave Thils, *Etudes* 255 (1947): 134–35 at 135.

rejection apparently was not mostly related to content. From a theological viewpoint the members of the Mixed Commission agreed that the schema was an improvement over the Roman text. They appreciated in particular that the text transcended the one-sided focus on the human being as the image of God. Nevertheless, the style was considered too abstract and too doctrinal. Bishop Ménager formulated it as follows: “This reads like a class in the *théologie des réalités terrestres*, exclusively seen from the ecclesial point of view and not from the point of view of people and their expectations.”<sup>35</sup> A new text was to be drafted that would be different in style, more in line with the recent encyclicals.<sup>36</sup> Yet could this remark have implied that the Malines text did in fact succeed in proposing a new anthropology with regard to content, but not with regard to style?

### Style: The ‘Missing Link’ between Rome and Zürich

The rejection of the Malines text on the basis of style underlines the importance of the hermeneutical principle of style. This principle was developed most exhaustively by John W. O’Malley.<sup>37</sup> He argued that the conciliar style adopted at Vatican II intended to address contemporaries in a persuasive and understandable language that would do justice to their historical consciousness and global experience. O’Malley linked this language with the epideictic genre, which he described as “a form of the art of persuasion and thus of reconciliation. While it raises appreciation, it creates or fosters among those it addresses a realization that they all share the same ideals and need to work together to achieve them.”<sup>38</sup> The conciliar use of the epideictic genre was unique to Vatican II and an expression of the council’s humanistic style. According to O’Malley one could even consider the acceptance of this humanistic style and culture as one of the major shifts undertaken by the Second

35. “Cela apparaît comme une leçon de théologie des réalités terrestres vues du point exclusif de l’Église et pas du point de vue des hommes et de ce qu’ils attendent” (Jacques Ménager, “*Remarques sur la ligne générale à adopter pour le schéma 17* (December 15, 1963), Fonds Hautmann 846. The Fonds Hautmann is consultable at the *Archives de l’Institut Catholique de Paris* (Paris, FR). Cf. Letter of Simon Hoa Nguyễn-van Hien to Jacques Ménager (December 16, 1963), Fonds Moeller 1578. The Fonds Moeller is consultable at the *Université Catholique de Louvain Centre Lumen Gentium* (Louvain-la-Neuve, BE).

36. Cf. Letter of Alfred Ancel to Emiliano Guano (December 19, 1963), Fonds Hautmann 1230.

37. Esp. John W. O’Malley, “Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?” *Theological Studies* 67 (2006): 3–33, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390606700101>. Republished in John W. O’Malley, “Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?” in *Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?* ed. David G. Schultenover (New York: Continuum, 2008), 52–91. Hereafter reference is made to the latter publication.

38. O’Malley, “Vatican II,” 76.

Vatican Council. Thus culture came to replace the juridical-legislative genre that was an expression of scholastic culture.<sup>39</sup> As such, the humanistic style of the Second Vatican Council represented a departure from neo-Scholastic theology.

### *The Hermeneutics of “Style”*

The council’s humanistic style is the second principle applied to the development of the council’s Christian anthropology. This second principle not only enriches the study of certain notions related to the *longue durée*, but also illumines the redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes* up to the final document. Finding the right balance between a doctrinal and a humanistic style seemed to be a constant concern of the Council Fathers and theologians.

The importance of style is not only indicated by the rejection of the Malines text, but also by the role stylistic considerations played in the redaction process. When we consider the redactors from the point of view of style, it is already notable that stylistic preferences forged different alliances than considerations of content alone would dictate. First, Dondeyne and Moeller, who were juxtaposed as to content, were both proponents of a Christian humanist theology, one that took into account the *Zeitgeist* of its contemporaries and that would do justice to the experience of the faithful. They relied on existential thought as well as biblical language. Second, this attention to the human experience also implied an inductive approach to reality, which in its turn distinguished Dondeyne from Thils. The latter’s work was based upon the premise that realities had to be explained deductively out of Christian revelation and tradition. Dondeyne, in contrast, preferred the inductive method, which began with the experience of reality before drawing theological conclusions. With regard to content, however, they both represented the incarnation/immanence cluster. Third, the stylistic preferences of the representatives of the eschatology/transcendence cluster were not very uniform. Both Philips and Congar envisaged a doctrinal style explaining the role of the church in the world. Moeller, in contrast, preferred a language understandable to people of good will. These three examples suggest that the tensions underlying the text not only concerned content but also style. The importance of stylistic considerations is further clarified when the Malines text is situated in the broader redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes*. Precisely in light of the “stylistic shift” described by O’Malley, the function of the Malines text in the redaction history of the final document becomes clear.

---

39. This contribution refers to the humanistic style as it was explained in John W. O’Malley, *Four Cultures of the West* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2004). I prefer the designation “humanistic style” over “pastoral style” to avoid confusion with Theobald’s principle of “pastorality” (see n. 52). Moreover, the designation “humanistic style” also takes into account O’Malley’s reflections on the pastoral cliché. See: John W. O’Malley, “A Pastoral Vision: a Cliché, a Council, and, Finally, Pope Francis,” *America*, July 18–25, 2016, <http://www.americamagazine.org/issue/pastoral-vision>.

## The Role of Style in the Development of a Christian Anthropology

To understand the “stylistic shift” in the Christian anthropology of the Malines text we first have to return to the Roman text, the first draft. This text intended to address the theme of Christian anthropology by including a first, key chapter on the human vocation, which focused on human participation in divine life and in the eschatological kingdom of God. It was largely written by Daniélou. His theology was strongly influenced by his preconiliar contribution to the *ressourcement* movement, his eschatologically oriented theology of history, and his connection with the *nouvelle théologie*. His contribution especially reflects his doxological humanism.<sup>40</sup> The text met with a three-phased opposition, each phase of which raised stylistic concerns.

First, Moeller assessed the Roman text. He indicated that the style could have been better:

Schema XVII is the schema that, above all others, will be read by non-believers. In its current state [...] it does not seem of a nature to respond to their legitimate expectations. It will appall the separated Christians, and at the same time it will disappoint Catholics. It vacillates between revealed, biblical doctrine on these questions and a natural philosophy. [...] but is a Council held to declare philosophical theses?<sup>41</sup>

Moeller pled for the retention of references to revealed truths about humanity as the image of God. Nevertheless, he wanted these references to be integrated into modern humanism. To this end they had to be linked with themes such as the renewed consciousness of human freedom and the incarnation of humanity in concrete conditions. This contextualization would at the same time give a theological value to the humanism Moeller espoused.<sup>42</sup> This approach is also in line with Moeller’s later remarks on the chapter on culture, where he stated that the text lacked a theological style. Moreover, he thought that the document required a better foundation, both christologically and eschatologically.<sup>43</sup>

40. See Marc C. Nicholas, *Jean Daniélou’s Doxological Humanism: Trinitarian Contemplation and Humanity’s True Vocation* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012); Guillaume Derville, *Histoire, mystère, sacrements: L’initiation chrétienne dans l’oeuvre de Jean Daniélou* (Perpignan: Desclée de Brouwer, 2014).

41. “Le schéma XVII est celui qui, avant tous les autres, sera lu par les non-croyants. Tel qu’il est, sauf les chapitres V, VI, il ne semble pas de nature à répondre à leur attente légitime; il révélera les chrétiens séparés: et décevra les catholiques un peu au courant. En effet: On hésite entre la doctrine révélée, biblique, sur ces questions, et une philosophie naturelle. Ceci surtout sensible dans le chapitre I, n° 1–13, chapitre III. Si l’on veut donner ici de la philosophie, qu’on le dise, et qu’on choisisse. Mais un concile est-il fait pour déclarer des thèses philosophiques?” Charles Moeller, “*Schéma XVII*” (March, 1963), Fonds Moeller 898.

42. See esp. the intermediate remarks of Charles Moeller, “*Schéma XVII. Remarques générales sur le proemium et le chapitre I*” (May 21, 1963), Fonds Moeller 912.

43. “Je répète que, à usage interne, le schéma peut servir. Mais, comme tel il y a peu de souffle, et pas de théologie” Charles Moeller, “*Remarques sur le schéma De cultura et progressio technico*” (May 12, 1963), Fonds Moeller 946.

Second, a group of theologians<sup>44</sup> met in May 1963 at the Belgian College. At this meeting they formulated their views on the Roman text. Reflecting on Congar's *Animadversiones*<sup>45</sup> on this text, they agreed that the style was philosophically too abstract and the content a non-organic recital of the preconiliar schemas. Congar in particular pointed out the need to revise the text thoroughly and stated that it needed to offer a message of hope. Third, these independently developed critiques merged at the end of May when Moeller and Congar were both asked by Suenens to prepare his *relatio*<sup>46</sup> for the Coordination Commission. Suenens also appealed to his preferred theologian, Philips. The latter's contribution to this *relatio* marked the start of his involvement in the redaction history of Schema XVII. This *relatio* led to the rejection of the Roman text by the Coordination Commission and to the appointment of Suenens to supervise the new theological introduction.

This process shows that the redactors of the Malines text intended to write a well-founded theological text, but they opted in favor of a doctrinal approach. It was no longer the abstract neo-Scholastic style of the manuals and the conciliar minority, but rather one that addressed the world. While the style of the Malines text can be correctly described as an "ecclesiological systematization,"<sup>47</sup> this description should not lead to neglecting the text's genuine effort to develop a theologically based anthropology (cf. Kasper). Moreover, one of the main aims of the redactors had indeed been the successful integration of this anthropology into the text. Unfortunately, the redactors were overtaken by time, since in light of developments it was felt that the doctrinal style was no longer satisfactory. This feeling was increased by the enthusiastic reception of the encyclical *Pacem in Terris*.<sup>48</sup> However well-founded the theology of the Malines text might have been, it could never have satisfied the expectations of an audience ready for an appeal to their humanity. This explains its rejection and its fate as a forgotten stage in accounts of the redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes*.

The subsequent process to draft the Zürich text underpins this stylistic observation. Among the core team of theologians involved in the further redaction, only Moeller and Tucci worked on the Roman, Malines, and Zürich texts, thus contributing to the stylistic shift. It is noteworthy that apart from their theology, the first was known for his literary work, the latter for his editorial work. In the end, the Zürich text also received harsh judgments. One of the recurring observations was that it was too "journalistic" in nature.<sup>49</sup> The question remains, however, if this critique was aimed at its

44. At this meeting the following people were present: André-Marie Charue, Albert Prignon, Yves Congar, and Henri De Riedmatten.

45. Yves Congar, "*Animadversiones generales super Schemate 'De praesentia et actione Ecclesiae in mundo hodierno'*" (May 17, 1963), Fonds Philips 861.

46. Gerard Philips, Yves Congar, and Charles Moeller, "*Nota de Schemate XVII ad usum Em.mi Card. Suenens*" (May 28, 1963), Fonds Philips 853; *idem*, Fonds Suenens 1274.

47. Kasper, "The Theological Anthropology of *Gaudium et Spes*," 134.

48. Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris* (April 11, 1963), [http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_j-xxiii\\_enc\\_11041963\\_pacem.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem.html).

49. In his notes during the meeting of the mixed commission between 9 and 12 March 1964, Pierre Hauptmann noted that Cardinal Ermenegildo Florit (1901–85) remarked that the



style or at its theology. In this perspective Moeller's observations on the schema are insightful. While he was the strongest proponent among the Belgians of a new style, he criticized its theology. He repeatedly called for a more exact use of theological principles, since only this approach would bring the envisaged balance between style and content. He described that balance in the following terms: "I think that the balance between a perspective of 'presence in the world' and a perspective of 'eschatological rupture' must be sought, not in an abstract academic combination, but rather in the theological principles themselves."<sup>50</sup> These inspirational principles were, according to Moeller, the world as created by the *Logos*, man as the image of God, the value of hope, Christ as universal Lord of the Mount, and the kingdom of God.<sup>51</sup>

The limited number of votes cast in favor of including other members of the Malines group in subsequent phases of the redaction indicated, however, that the Mixed Commission wished to distance itself from the Malines group.<sup>52</sup> Not until the summer of 1964, after the failure of the Zürich text, could members of the Malines group return to the scene with any intensity. The renewed involvement of the Malines participants could not have been possible, however, without the appointment of the French canon Pierre Hauptmann as the new coordinator of the schema. He understood the importance of establishing a diverse group of collaborators, including those involved in the previous redaction. Moeller, for example, was invited to join his work with the following laudatory note:

As you undoubtedly know, when allowed a glimpse of my task in Rome, I was discretely asked for names of *periti* whom I would wish to have as possible collaborators. I admit that I did not hesitate a second to suggest your name together with those of RR.PP. Hirschmann and Tucci. I am convinced that we will form a strong team, and I think that the success of Schema XIII partly depends on it.<sup>53</sup>

This communication suggests that in addition to content and style, a more personal-procedural factor should be taken into account. Hauptmann's remarks may even

---

text was too journalistic in style. Pierre Hauptmann, "*Notes prises en cours de reunion Commission mixte du Schéma XVII*" (March, 9-12, 1964), Fonds Hauptmann 914.

50. "Je pense que le principe d'équilibre entre le point de vue 'présence au monde' et le point de vue rupture eschatologique, doit être cherché, non pas dans un dosage académique abstrait, mais dans les principes théologiques eux-mêmes." Letter of Charles Moeller to Emiliano Guano (April 15, 1964), Fonds Moeller 1022.

51. As listed in Letter of Charles Moeller to Bernard Häring (April 15, 1964), Fonds Moeller 1020.

52. See Turbanti, *Un concilio per il mondo moderno*, 302.

53. "Comme vous le savez sans doute, en me laissant entrevoir à Rome quelle serait ma charge, on m'avait discrètement demandé les noms des 'periti' que je souhaiterais avoir comme collaborateurs éventuels. J'avoue n'avoir pas hésité un seul instant à indiquer votre nom ainsi que ceux des RR.PP. Hirschmann et Tucci. Je suis persuadé que nous formerons ensemble une équipe soudée, et je crois que le succès du schéma XIII en dépend pour une part." Letter of Pierre Hauptmann to Charles Moeller (December 23, 1964), Fonds Hauptmann 1427.

indicate that previous failures of the text could be partly attributed to failures in the way the work proceeded. This factor might also explain why the input of certain theologians was only possible after the conciliar minds of others had matured.

## The Principle of *Pastoralité* in the Redaction Process

These observations lead us to introduce a third hermeneutical principle, namely, the principle of “pastorality” (*la pastoralité*). This notion was introduced by Christoph Theobald as an alternative to a merely “constitutional” hermeneutics that draws primarily on the conciliar corpus to interpret Vatican II. Instead, Theobald argues that the normative role of history should have a place in conciliar hermeneutics. It is only through history that the value of the conciliar documents, often compromise texts, can be understood. In this history, Theobald gives much weight to the “vast process of collective learning” that happened during the council.<sup>54</sup> Moreover, for the council participants this learning experience not only took place at an intellectual level; it also involved the acquisition of a *modus agendi*, a way to proceed as a group striving for a common goal. Theobald further defines the principle as “the intimate *connection* between this inscribing of an evangelical way of listening to each other in deliberation, on the one side, and [on the other] what has been said of the *pastoral and ecumenical criterium* with its two implications, the experience of self-reform and the respect for the historical and contextual rootedness of the interlocutor.”<sup>55</sup>

Four interconnected aspects can be extracted from Theobald’s notion of pastorality. These aspects provide insight to the historical process of the council itself. First, Theobald proposes the primacy of the Word of God. The council was experienced by the participants as a careful listening to the Word of God in the sources of revelation

---

54. Summarizing, he states that “*history alone* enables us to understand [the historical nature of the council corpus] as the trace of a vast process of collective learning.” See Christoph Theobald, “The Reception of the Second Vatican Council: Drawing up a Criteriology,” in *The Contested Legacy of Vatican II: Lessons and Prospects*, ed. Lieven Boeve, Mathijs Lamberigts, and Terrence Merrigan (Leuven: Peeters, 2015), 65–104 at 92. The same theme was also elaborated in Christoph Theobald, “Le style pastoral de Vatican II et sa réception postconciliaire: élaboration d’une critériologie et quelques exemples significatifs,” in *Vatican II comme style: L’herméneutique théologique du Concile*, ed. Joseph Famerée (Paris: Cerf, 2012): 265–86. Moreover, in a three-year project Theobald and some colleagues successfully recreated this process of pastoral deliberation with around two hundred theologians; see Mathijs Lamberigts et al., eds., *50 Years after the Vatican II Council: Theologians from All Over the World Deliberate* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2015).

55. “Le *lien* intime entre cette inscription d’une manière évangélique de *s’entendre dans la délibération*, d’un côté, et ce qui a été dit du *principe pastoral et oecuménique* avec ses deux implications, l’expérience d’auto-réforme et le respect de l’enracinement historique et contextuel de l’interlocuteur.” Christoph Theobald, *Le Concile Vatican II. Quel avenir?* (Paris: Cerf, 2015), 71. Emphasis original. The word “*principe*” is translated above as “*criterium*” in order to avoid unnecessary confusion with the three principles central to this study.

and in discerning the signs of the times. Second, the council participants did not enter into the conciliar process individually, but as a collective body, seeking common agreement through deliberation. Dialogical notions, such as listening and argumentation, were crucial. This same dialogical attitude also came to the fore in the pastoral and ecumenical criteria. The pastoral criterion, Theobald's third aspect, points to the classic comprehension and experience of Vatican II as a pastoral council open to ecclesial reform in light of the exigencies of the times. The ecumenical criterion, the fourth aspect, can be understood as the search for a way to comprehend and deal with the "other." During the council this was exemplified at best through the relations with other Christian churches, practitioners of other religions, or atheists. A genuine relationship with each of these groups required approaching them with respect for their thought and sociohistorical contexts. The redactors of *Gaudium et Spes* were continually confronted with these four aspects of pastorality. The document's originality in the history of the councils required the redactors to appeal to the sources of revelation, to their own experiences, and to the world *ad extra*.

Theobald's notion of pastorality also holds a value for the present reception of the Pastoral Constitution. Attending to these different aspects in the complex redaction process and its multifaceted effect on the conciliar documents facilitates an openness to receiving the council's teaching. In Theobald's view, the principle of *pastoralité* is inevitably linked with the future, leaving "a structural, indeed normative openness, implicit in the very principle of 'pastorality,'" to receiving the council's teaching.<sup>56</sup>

### *Pastorality and the Anthropology of Gaudium et Spes*

Having established the meaning of *pastoralité*, it remains to be shown how attending to this principle helps us to understand the group behind the Malines text, their role in the redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes*, and the principle's importance for the reception of that document. This approach also provides insight in to the personal experiences of the participants and the effect of those experiences on the anthropology of the text itself. The principle of pastorality thus influences our understanding of the redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes* and nuances certain postconciliar interpretations of the same document. Theobald's notion of pastorality thus offers a third principle by which to study the Christian anthropology of the Pastoral Constitution. The utility of this principle in the present case can only be illustrated by returning to the work of the Malines group and linking it with the four aspects of Theobald's notion of pastorality.

First, influenced as they were by the biblical *ressourcement* movement,<sup>57</sup> the redactors of the Malines text wished to give clear primacy to the Gospel message, both in the content and the style of their anthropology. Consequently they supplied scriptural

56. Theobald, "The Reception," 91.

57. For the impact on and role of theologians in this movement, see esp. *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*, ed. Gabriel Flynn and Paul D. Murray (Oxford: Oxford University, 2012).

references that were later considered usable elements in the subsequent redaction of *Gaudium et Spes*.<sup>58</sup> Moreover, the Malines group's adherence to the Word of God helps explain some apparent "modernisms" in the anthropology they helped introduce. For example, Dondeyne's view of human development through a person's actions in the world was often understood as the position of a philosopher who specialized in phenomenology. The integration of this idea into the *Gaudium et Spes* chapter on culture was judged similarly. On the other hand, Dondeyne's anthropological position could also be considered as the result of a truthful listening to the Gospel. Studying the redaction history in fact highlights Dondeyne's repeated call to be loyal to the Gospel message and, thus, to refer not only to Genesis 1:31 to explain a person's activity in the world, but to complete the explanation with Genesis 1:28.<sup>59</sup> This completion would constitute a shift from a mere passive gratitude for earthly realities on the part of the created individual to an active involvement with those realities through labor. This interest in emphasizing the theological value of labor as an intrinsic element of the human condition was the result not only of a preconciliar "discerning of the signs of the times" (i.e., the social question), but also of reading this phenomenon "in light of the gospel." Indeed, theologians such as Thils had developed theologies of labor which highlighted the link between this topic and the sources of revelation.<sup>60</sup>

Second, considering the redaction history from the perspective of a deliberative act further illustrates the balanced anthropology that lay behind the Malines text. First of all, this approach helps to explain the apparently unexpected rejection of the "excellent" Malines text.<sup>61</sup> Reasons of content and style were put forward, but underlying these reasons was also a feeling that the project procedurally contradicted the deliberative process started the months before. The text was presented just prior to the meeting of the Mixed Commission, strengthening the commission members' feelings that a unilaterally appointed group had usurped their responsibilities. The anthropology of the Malines group was likewise dismissed by the commission as unilaterally formulated. In his conciliar recollections, Suenens still laid the responsibility for the text's failure at the feet of Daniélou, who was upset over his exclusion from the redaction process. Suenens thus overlooked the importance of the council's deliberative process. In his recollections, he also overlooked Daniélou's importance in establishing the

58. Letter of Alfred Ancel to Emiliano Guano (December 19, 1963), Fonds Haubtmann 1230.

59. E.g. Albert Dondeyne, "Schema de Ecclesia in mundo huius temporis" (April 29, 1964), ASV-ACVII 1193.271. Interestingly enough, in the final version of the chapter on culture, only the reference to Gen 1:28 was kept to indicate that the human being "should subdue the earth, perfect creation and develop himself." *Gaudium et Spes* (December 7, 1965), 57 (hereafter cited in text as *GS*), [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_const\\_19651207\\_gaudium-et-spes\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html).

60. Thils, *Théologie des réalités terrestres: Préludes*, 186–94. Thils can thus be considered a pioneer in the development of a "theology of labor." It was only ten years later that the most fundamental work on that topic was published: i.e., Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Pour une théologie du travail* (Paris: Seuil, 1955).

61. Letter of Alfred Ancel to Emiliano Guano (December 19, 1963), Fonds Haubtmann 1230.

anthropology of the Roman text, which the Malines group had largely neglected.<sup>62</sup> Next, Philips's newly increased theological influence in the summer of 1964 came at the cost of the influence of Häring and his Zürich text. Yet the Zürich redaction was also an important moment in the deliberative process. Philips was personally conflicted about taking over the role of his friend Häring, who, Philips admitted, lacked the necessary leadership to bring the project to a good end.<sup>63</sup> The return of Philips gave impetus to the French bishops to advance Hauptmann in order to counterbalance a new dominance of the Malines group.<sup>64</sup> Hence, a new equilibrium was sought to develop an anthropology that reflected the concerns of both the Malines and Zürich groups. A first attempt at this anthropology was given in Philips's text *De integra hominis vocatione*.<sup>65</sup>

In subsequent interpretations of the council, the tension between the incarnational and eschatological emphases has often been used to dismiss *Gaudium et Spes* as belonging to the first emphasis and representing a naïve modern optimism. Scholars often refer to the German criticisms of the schema, especially those of Rahner and Ratzinger.<sup>66</sup> In an effort to avoid a worldwide disillusionment caused by the rejection of Schema XIII in a final stage of deliberations, a rejection that was mostly due to the opposition of German bishops and theologians, Philips had ensured in September 1965 that in the ten subcommissions dealing with the text, representatives of the main theological tendencies were present. Only in this way, he explained, could the text be written as the church's profession of faith addressed to all of humanity. The anthropology included was thus the result of this deliberative act and at the same time still open to a diversified reception.

Third, the pastoral aspect can also function as a key to understanding the renewed presence of Philips in a different sense. It might indeed seem strange that this theologian was reintegrated into the redactional process. He was generally considered to be

62. "At the first meeting of the [Mixed] Commission, one has torpedoed the text, in part, I think, under influence of Father Daniélou who was very displeased to not have been among the theologians. I have not had him invited, however, at the request of the other theologians." Werner Van Laer, ed. *L.J. cardinal Suenens: memoires sur le Concile Vatican II*, Instrumenta theologica (Leuven: Peeters, 2015), 33.

63. See Philips's notes on November 17, 1964, in *Carnets conciliaires de Mgr Gerard Philips: Secrétaire adjoint de la Commission Doctrinale; Texte néerlandais avec traduction française et commentaires*, ed. Karim Schelkens, Instrumenta theologica (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 62.

64. Philippe Bordeyne, "La collaboration de Pierre Hauptmann avec les experts Belges," in *The Belgian Contribution to the Second Vatican Council*, 594–96.

65. Gerard Philips, *Caput I. De integra hominis vocatione*, 26.09.1964, in Fonds Philips 2047.

66. A discussion of these critiques can be found in Lieven Boeve, "Gaudium et Spes and the Crisis of Modernity: The End of the Dialogue with the World?" in *Vatican II and its Legacy*, ed. Mathijs Lamberigts and Leo Kenis (Leuven: Leuven University, 2002), 83–94. These critiques were already made during the council, see e.g. Brandon Peterson, "Critical Voices: The Reactions of Rahner and Ratzinger to 'Schema XIII' (*Gaudium et Spes*)," *Modern Theology* 31 (2015): 1–26, <https://doi.org/10.1111/moth.12109>.

a strongly dogmatic theologian, not someone capable of using the style preferred by this pastoral council. Yet if we take into account the notion of self-reform, we will recognize that Philips understood that a pastoral document was needed, a document that would appeal to contemporary readers. Philips even pointed to the Anglican Bishop Robinson's *Honest to God* as an exemplary work.<sup>67</sup> Most of all, Philips recognized that he could coordinate the work, but that he would never be able to apply the desired style. He admitted he needed others to complete this part of the task.<sup>68</sup> In sum, almost one year after writing the Malines text, Philips knew that the council and the world wished for a new text and not a second Malines text. He had experienced first-hand the reform that had occurred in the church, and he understood that now a conversion of theologians was needed as well.

Fourth, the ecumenical principle and its emphasis on the historical and contextual rootedness of the interlocutor strongly influenced the anthropology of the Pastoral Constitution and the outcome of the council as a whole. Increasing ecumenical awareness explains the growing importance of Lukas Vischer's observations. As a World Council of Churches observer at Vatican II, he was first contacted in April 1963 for his views on the schema. He was consulted increasingly in the following years, repeating his call to do justice to the "eschatological character of the Gospel."<sup>69</sup> He also promoted balancing the incarnational and eschatological tendencies in *Gaudium et Spes* for ecumenical reasons. The influence of this particular interlocutor explains the inclusion of the threefold mission (*koinōnia, diakonia, martyria*) in the Malines text. It was around these same three principles that the New Delhi Assembly of World Council of Churches (1961) had constructed its document, *Jesus Christ: The Light of the World*. This ecumenical sensitivity of the Malines redactors was a legacy of their ecumenical experiences during and after World War II. Many of the Malines group had been influenced by their experiences with the *Journées œcuménique de Chevotogne*, which had been a platform where they could meet in all openness with other Christians. At Chevotogne in 1947 they had already reflected in an ecumenical spirit on theological themes that would reemerge during the council, including Christian anthropology.<sup>70</sup> The Cold War had also stimulated theologians to engage with another group of interlocutors, namely atheists, though engagement with this group was considerably less

67. Pierre Hautmann, *Notes*, 10–11.09.1964, Fonds Hautmann 1159; Charles Moeller, *Notes d'une réunion sur le SXXIII*, 10–13.9.1964, Fonds Moeller 1092.

68. See esp. Yves Congar, *Mon journal du concile* (Paris: Cerf, 2002), 2:274–76; *Carnets conciliaires de Mgr Gerard Philips*, 62.

69. Letter of Lukas Vischer to Emiliano Guano (April 18, 1963), Fonds Moeller 893; Letter of Lukas Vischer to Charles Moeller (May 29, 1964), Fonds Moeller 1062: here cited: "[das Schema nimmt] im Ansatz den eschatologischen Charakter des Evangeliums nicht ernst genug."

70. The importance of the network established by these study days in preparation for the Second Vatican Council is discussed in Emmanuel Lanne, "Le rôle du Monastère de Chevotogne au Deuxième Concile du Vatican," in *The Belgian Contribution to the Second Vatican Council*, 361–88.

developed. As early as the 1950s, for example, Moeller had been pleading to develop a language that would do justice to their thought and experience.<sup>71</sup> This would be possible by reading their works, as Moeller had exemplified, but more importantly by engaging in dialogue with this group.<sup>72</sup> The success of such a new attitude resulted in, among other things, a shift from numerous preparatory *vota* pleading for a condemnation of atheism to the establishment of a Secretariat for the Non-Believers in 1964,<sup>73</sup> and finally to an attempt to understand the atheistic worldview and take account of it in *Gaudium et Spes*. The redactors' engagement with both groups of interlocutors not only explains the anthropology contained in the Pastoral Constitution, but also highlights the openness and dialogical value of the Constitution to its future reception.

## Conclusions

This essay has investigated the redaction history of the Malines text as a window to understanding the theology and anthropology that underlie *Gaudium et Spes*. Its main findings can be structured logically according to the three principles central to this study.

First, the application of the two clusters to the content of the Malines text proves illuminating, particularly by situating the redactors with respect to one of the two tendencies: toward eschatology and divine transcendence, or toward incarnation and divine immanence. This approach also helps explain some of the alliances that emerged in this phase of the redaction. Nevertheless, when one applies this hermeneutical tool, it should be remembered that the two tendencies are not mutually exclusive. The theologians active in the redaction process often represented aspects of both tendencies. It should also be remembered that the interpretation presented here is just one way to understand the different positions encoded in *Gaudium et Spes*. As noted in the introduction, many other tensions have already been identified in order to explain the content of *Gaudium et Spes*. The present model complements rather than excludes other

---

71. Charles Moeller, *Mentalité moderne et évangélisation: Dieu, Jésus-Christ, Marie, l'Eglise* (Brussels: Lumen Vitae, 1955); Charles Moeller, *L'homme moderne devant le salut* (Paris: Ouvrières, 1965).

72. In this regard it is interesting to note how Dom Hélder Câmara proposed to Moeller in December 1963 that he organize a meeting with prominent atheists during the council. Moeller, who had been a strong promotor of such a dialogue, was apparently quite enthusiastic. Even more, given the fact that Câmara was going to present the same idea to De Lubac in the evening, he noted, "je veux voir s'il vibre comme Moeller." See Hélder Câmara, *Lettres conciliaires (1962–1965) de Dom Hélder Câmara*, 2 vols. (Paris: Cerf, 2006), 1:392.

73. See esp. Pope Paul VI, *Allocution on the day of Pentecost* (May 17, 1964), *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964) 433, [http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/it/homilies/1964/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_hom\\_19640517\\_pentecoste.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/it/homilies/1964/documents/hf_p-vi_hom_19640517_pentecoste.html); Pope Paul VI, *Allocution to the Cardinals* (June 23, 1964), *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964) 584, [http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/it/speeches/1964/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_spe\\_19640623\\_sacro-collegio.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/it/speeches/1964/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19640623_sacro-collegio.html).

approaches. Bringing in aspects of the “theology of history” current of thought highlights once again how important is Vatican II’s prehistory for understanding the event itself and the content of its documents.<sup>74</sup>

Second, this essay has related the redaction history of the Malines text to the principle of style. As has become clear, an approach focused solely on the document’s content is insufficient. It is interesting to note that the redactors held different opinions concerning style. Some preferred a doctrinal style and wished to present the dogmatic principles on anthropology in the clearest way. Others pleaded in favor of a more pastoral and more biblical style. They were convinced that only by developing a new style could the church appeal to humanity again. Representatives of both styles remained active during the whole redaction process of *Gaudium et Spes*. Moreover, while at certain moments some perspectives were excluded, in the end the contributions of both groups were utilized. This observation leads to the conclusion that the diversity of positions described in the content-focused approach is also applicable in the realm of style. During the redaction of *Gaudium et Spes* many perspectives on style were operative; these perspectives should be taken into account when assessing the document’s redaction history. Style is an equally important consideration for interpreting the promulgated version of the Pastoral Constitution. While the diversity of tensions concerning content is recognized broadly, I argue in favor of acknowledging the presence of different styles as well. My purpose is not to degrade the document, but to illustrate its theological diversity. For it is clear that each of the different styles aimed to represent a valid theology.

Finally, the whole history of the Malines text and of *Gaudium et Spes* exemplifies the importance of Theobald’s principle of pastorality. The work of the redactors described in this contribution points to their concern to be truthful to the Gospel not only in the result of the council but also in its process of deliberation. In this process, the participants wished to remain loyal to the theological principles they espoused, but also felt the need to express those principles in a satisfactory way. In doing so wanted to deepen magisterial teaching on the position of the church in the world, while appealing to the day-to-day experience of their addressees. This *modus agendi* described by Theobald is probably most fully realized in the redaction of *Gaudium et Spes*, for this document in particular was truly “the result of the Council as such.”<sup>75</sup> Indeed, since the redactors were unable to appeal to previous councils in their deliberations, they relied more strongly on their own preconiliar studies, and on their experiences during the council. This made the redaction history of *Gaudium et Spes*, more than any other

---

74. The importance of studying the council’s pre-history was already presented in Gilles Routhier, Philippe Roy-Lysencourt, and Karim Schelkens, eds., *La théologie catholique entre intransigence et renouveau: La réception des mouvements préconciliaires à Vatican II*, Bibliothèque de la Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique (Louvain-la-Neuve: Collège Erasme, 2011).

75. Mathijs Lamberigts, “*Gaudium et Spes*: A Council in Dialogue with the World,” in *Scrutinizing the Signs of the Times in the Light of the Gospel*, ed. Johan Verstraeten, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Lovaniensium (Leuven: Leuven University, 2007), 17–40 at 26.



document, a process of presenting one's own perspective, while recognizing its relative value. At the same time these individuals wished to transcend their individual perspectives to attain a truly conciliar document.

The Malines text is thus a prime example of a pastoral document in Theobald's terms. Thanks to their familiarity with each other, the redactors knew how to work together and set aside their sense of self-importance. This collaborative humility resulted in an ability to integrate different viewpoints into one document. The document's Christian anthropology was likewise the result of an act of collective learning and balance in which listening to the Word of God in a deliberative context is paired with a pastoral and ecumenical sensitivity. It might be true that the redactors did not succeed completely in eliminating traces of these different perspectives in the Malines text, or even in *Gaudium et Spes* itself. Nevertheless, Theobald's notion of pastorality enables us to view the different positions contained in the final document as a strength, not a weakness. As Philips seems to suggest in his diary, the redaction history itself can therefore be an inspiring model for the reception of *Gaudium et Spes* as an unprecedentedly open conciliar document:

May the Holy Spirit show us the right path. The Council should not conduct actual theological work, but rather give direction without needlessly closing off alternatives; it should guarantee legitimate freedom, and teach every believer to take up one's personal responsibility before God. Nobody may try to use, or rather misuse, the Council to further his own personal views, which would not agree with the intellectual humility and trust that are proper to faith. We are in the light as well as the shadow of faith. Victory through faith comes from God not from our intellectual capacity. This is all a painful, yet salutary purification of faith. But faith never doubts from afar.<sup>76</sup>

### Author biography

Dries Bosschaert received his PhD and STD from the Catholic University of Leuven. He is Secretary of the Leuven Centre for the Study of the Second Vatican Council. His research focuses on contemporary church history in general, and on mid-twentieth century theological renewal and Vatican II in particular.

---

76. "De H. Geest moge ons de juiste weg wijzen. Het Concilie moet geen eigenlijk theologisch werk verrichten, maar richting aangeven, niet nodeloos uitwegen afsnijden, de rechtmatige vrijheid waarborgen, en aan ieder gelovige zijn persoonlijke verantwoordelijkheid—voor God—leren opnemen. Niemand mag, voor zijn persoonlijke opvattingen, het Concilie trachten te gebruiken, t.t.z. misbruiken. Dat komt niet overeen met de intellectuele deemoed en het vertrouwen van het geloof. Wij zijn in het licht, en ook in de schaduw van het geloof. De overwinning door het geloof is uit God, niet uit onze intellectuele kracht. Dit alles is een pijnlijke, maar heilzame uitzuivering van het geloof. Maar het geloof "ver-twijfelt" nooit." Philips on August 10, 1964, in *Carnets conciliaires de Mgr Gerard Philips*, 126.