

Henri de Lubac

Vatican Council Notebooks

volume one

Ignatius

VATICAN COUNCIL NOTEBOOKS

I

HENRI CARDINAL DE LUBAC

VATICAN COUNCIL
NOTEBOOKS

I

Introduced and annotated by
LOÏC FIGOUREUX

Foreword by
FRANÇOIS-XAVIER DUMORTIER, S.J.
and JACQUES DE LAROSIÈRE

Preface by JACQUES PRÉVOTAT

Translated by Andrew Stefanelli
and Anne Englund Nash

IGNATIUS PRESS SAN FRANCISCO

Original French edition:
Carnets du concile I
© 2007 by Éditions du Cerf, Paris

Unless otherwise noted, Scripture quotations have been taken from the Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible, Second Catholic Edition, © 2006. The Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible: the Old Testament, © 1952, 2006; the Apocrypha, © 1957, 2006; the New Testament, © 1946, 2006; the Catholic Edition of the Old Testament, incorporating the Apocrypha, © 1966, 2006; the Catholic Edition of the New Testament, © 1965, 2006 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. All rights reserved.

Cover designed by Roxanne Mei Lum

© 2015 by Ignatius Press, San Francisco
All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-58617-305-0

Library of Congress Control Number 2014912894

Printed in the United States of America ©

CONTENTS

Foreword by François-Xavier Dumortier, S.J., and Jacques de Larosière	7
Preface by Jacques Prévotat	9
Introduction by Loïc Figoureux	15
List of Abbreviations	45
Note on the Text by Loïc Figoureux	47
Six “Council Notebooks” (from July 25, 1960, to September 2, 1963)	51
Index of Personal Names	533

FOREWORD

The publication of Father Henri de Lubac's *Council Notebooks* has been long and carefully considered. In fact, although we have a typewritten text corrected by Father de Lubac, the original manuscripts of the *Council Notebooks* seem now to have disappeared. The reasons for this have been the subject of conjecture, all the more complex given the fact that the opinion of Father de Lubac regarding the publication of these *Notebooks* seems to have changed over the course of the years and led him to write one day, in his own hand, in an undated text: "These pages must not be published." He justified this wish by the limitations of his notes, "simple reference points for my own use, noted in the day-to-day course of events and copied out cleanly"; he indicated these same limitations in a second series of preliminary notes in which he places greater emphasis on the evolution of the conciliar situation, of which he was not able to take account, and on the partial nature of his information. These notes come from an author who, in thinking about what he has written, sees their limitations. That is the explicit reason for the wish expressed in this regard by Cardinal de Lubac. So the desire to publish this typewritten text cannot be attributed to Cardinal de Lubac himself.

Because these *Council Notebooks* were known to exist and quotations from them had been published and because they could contribute to a better understanding of the work of the council, it seemed to the Cardinal de Lubac International Association and to the French provincial of the Society of Jesus that the publication of this text of the *Council Notebooks* should be authorized, while at the same time drawing the reader's attention to what was expressed by Cardinal de Lubac while alive.

Father François-Xavoer Dumortier,
French Provincial of the Society
of Jesus Internationale

Jacques de Larosière,
President of the Association
Cardinal Henri de Lubac

PREFACE

In the rich historiography associated with the Second Vatican Council, there has been no lack of syntheses and local studies or of testimony from participants, bishops, experts, observers, and witnesses from all over the world. The French actors in this drama have not been outdone. The *Notes quotidiennes au Concile* (Daily notes from the council) by Father Chenu (1995) were followed by *Mon Journal du Concile* (*My Journal of the Council*) by Father Congar (2002), who had wished his work to be published, on the condition that the publication be delayed until after the year 2000. Now at last we have Henri de Lubac's *Council Notebooks* (*Carnets du Concile*), long awaited and also an indispensable source for understanding this event.

Apart from *Entretien autour de Vatican II* (Conversation about Vatican II), an interview given to Angelo Scola that appeared in the Italian magazine *30 Giorni* (June 1985) and was reprinted in July 1985 by the publishing house Éditions du Cerf,¹ Henri de Lubac kept a low profile. Was this due to a reluctance to open up, to the painful memory of what he suffered during the 1950s, or to the desire to preserve the discretion and distance of one closely involved in the council's work? Or to the fear of exploitation by the media of remarks intended to remain on the plane of the sole competence he acknowledged: that of a theologian? So many factors explain the reserve shown, up until his final years, by one of the principal thinkers and inspirers of the council about consenting to make public these *Notebooks*, written day by day in the course of the sessions and subsequently recopied and amended with that care and precision, that scrupulous regard for accuracy and for the *mot juste* so characteristic of what he conceived to be the manner and requirements of his task as an expert at the council.

From the time of his nomination as a consultor to the Preparatory Theological Commission in July 1960, then as an expert on the

¹ Henri Cardinal de Lubac, *Entretien autour de Vatican II* (France catholique-Éd. du Cerf, September 25, 1985).

Doctrinal Commission, Father de Lubac was an active participant in or a witness to all the diverse aspects of the council: the general congregations, the Doctrinal Commission (which met in the afternoons during the sessions but continued its work during the intersessions as well), meetings of the French bishops, private encounters between French and foreign bishops on the fundamental questions, various conversations, preparation and clarification of interventions at the council at the request of numerous bishops, lectures in front of audiences of bishops or of seminarians studying in Rome. Father de Lubac was always present, except for a brief interruption due to illness at the beginning of the second session.

All aspects of the council are recalled; first of all, the slow and laborious fine-tuning of the definitive texts, in the course of interventions in Latin by the council Fathers in the *aula*, scrupulously reproduced from day to day and punctuated with commentaries, at times sharp and vivid; next, the numerous opportunities for encounters encouraged by the extraordinary theological and cultural ferment that prevailed in Rome during the council. Notable among these were encounters with observers from other confessions, such as Cullmann or Boegner, who were constantly present. Other aspects not without interest included discussions in bars, where friendships were formed and rare exchanges took place, as well as behind-the-scene maneuvers fomented by one group or another, by which he was not fooled. Nor did Henri de Lubac overlook minor, everyday incidental details, like the deafening racket made in the basilica when heavy carts loaded with printed amendments to be distributed to the Fathers would enter from behind Bernini's baldachino!

European influence was still dominant, but there were personalities from outside Europe that were able to make their presence felt, for example the Melchite patriarch Maximos IV, advocate of a sister Church founded by the apostles, warm defender of ecumenism, fervent opponent of the Holy Office, whose remarks were hardly ever repeated, or Helder Câmara, presented with a lively sympathy though not without reservations. The presence of other Churches, particularly the African Church, united around her leaders – Gantin, Rugambwa, Sangaré, Zoa – and very much alive, brought out in a striking manner the universality of the Church, her catholicity.

On the essential points, the theologian did not give way: wherever the opportunity was presented to him – and the occasions were not

lacking – he firmly defended his ideas, particularly one on which he insisted: the orthodoxy of the Catholic faith of Father Teilhard de Chardin. The struggle was severe, and the moments of leisure few. Nevertheless, strolls in Rome or the surrounding country stirred up secret memories and reflections that remind one how much the author of the *Drame de l'humanisme athée* (*The Drama of Atheistic Humanism*) remained a humanist and true poet.

Besides information about the numerous aspects of the conciliar assembly, what makes the testimony of these notebooks so captivating is the strongly rendered presence of men and their psychology. The author excels in sketching the portrait of the actors with only a few words. Thus, the masters of the Holy Office, confident of possessing the truth – Ottaviani, Browne, Parente, Tromp – who made the painful discovery that they were not the masters of the council, are depicted with a sense of nuance and an understanding that help to recreate the relationship between the forces and to grasp why the majority were reluctant to put forward their views. On the side of the majority, hostile to the schemas prepared by the Curia, were the cardinals from various countries, particularly of central Europe – Döpfner, Frings, König, Léger (from Montreal) – supported by Bea, who finally in the course of the first session proved to be the dominant figure. The clarity of their remarks, their calm aptitude for going back to and clarifying what was essential, conferred on them an authority in the assembly that was (with some exceptions) not enjoyed to the same degree by the French episcopate, which was an insufficiently consistent group. De Lubac has the gift of spotting nascent talent. In the course of the elaboration, rich in new developments, of the constitution *De Ecclesia*, he deepened his acquaintance with “Dr.” Joseph Ratzinger, whom he describes as a “theologian as peaceable and kindly as he is competent”. In the same way, during the long discussion over the drafting of the constitution *Gaudium et spes*, he observed the assertiveness of Archbishop Wojtyła, whose interventions struck him because of the seriousness, the rigor, and the solidity of his faith and created in him a lively flow of fellow feeling, which was reciprocated.

The criteria he uses in his judgments and assessments are quite naturally those of a theologian, hence his almost constant distrust of journalists. The contamination of theological questions by political ideology or propaganda never ceased to trouble him. De Lubac does not conceal his opinions. That makes this document valuable. The judgments he makes

concerning the remarks of some seemingly well-qualified religious figures are sometimes surprising. For example, in the course of the discussion about *De revelatione* (the constitution *Dei Verbum*), he observes: "I note, in all these discussions, the nearly equal ignorance of the theologians and the exegetes, bishops or not, of the traditional doctrine on Scripture. Some excellent formulae, completely traditional, are set aside without being understood."

If we had to define the principal axis of this consistency in high spiritual standards and theological rigor, we would need to come back to the central conception of his religious thought: the close link between the natural and the supernatural. Loïc Figoureux quite rightly points out the importance of this idea at the beginning of his introduction. One could cite numerous examples that reveal, in the judgments as well as in the doctrinal choices of Father de Lubac, the fundamental character of this criterion. Thus, to give one example, dated November 1964, during the third session, observe in what terms he defines his method to some close associates: "I try to bring the problems back to their most simple expression and in terms of faith. I also seek to show how much the questions we are debating today need to be fundamentally clarified by a coherent doctrine of nature and the supernatural." Again, during the discussion of schema 13 (*Gaudium et spes*), he recalls (September 25, 1964): "If we are not convinced a priori, through the view of faith, that there is a certain preestablished harmony between the revelation of Christ, grasped in its fullness, and the secret expectation planted by God in the depths of men of all times, we will lack the apostolic daring that alone has a chance of reaching the men of our time." Making due allowances and distinguishing between levels, is there not also a connection here between this criterion and his explicit reservations about the abandonment by the CFTC [Confédération française des travailleurs chrétiens, a French trade union] of its Christian label? But, above all, is this not the profound reason that caused him to second the remarks of Bishop Volk and Archbishop Wojtyła during the discussion of *Gaudium et spes*? We should continue this line of questioning and ask ourselves if the importance that he attached to the question of collegiality and of the famous *Nota explicativa praevia*, relative to the discussion of chapter 3 of the constitution *De Ecclesia*, an importance greater than Father Congar, no less vigilant himself on this topic, seems to have granted it, is not a product of these same deep reasons. Nor has it been ruled out (the question remains unresolved) that a certain theological

and ecclesiological proximity to Don Dossetti might be due to similar considerations.²

These *Notebooks* bear witness to the difficulties Father de Lubac experienced in the years following the publication of *Surnaturel* (*Supernatural*, 1946), very much in evidence within the Theological Commission, in the preparatory period (1961–1962) during which the theologian, just recently named to the commission by John XXIII, was confronted with future conciliar schemas prepared by his adversaries. Nevertheless, it was his theology that prevailed in *Lumen gentium* as also in *Dei Verbum*. The approval that Étienne Gilson showed him, shortly before the last session of the council (June 24, 1965), delighted him. All in all, a major turning point had occurred, with tremendous consequences.³

This monumental work could not have been accomplished without the conjunction of fortunate circumstances: the new edition of the *Œuvres complètes* (*Complete Works*) of Henri de Lubac on the initiative of the Association Internationale Cardinal Henri de Lubac and the publisher Éditions du Cerf; then the opportunity that was offered, in order to complete the difficult task of editing and annotating this work, to benefit from the aid of Loïc Figoureux, a young professor of history who, in addition to his talents as a researcher and skills as a historian, has the rare capacity to seek, wherever it might be found, the information and expertise available. How can one not pay tribute to the judicious choice he made in having recourse to Father Leo Declerck, the author of numerous works on the council, an internationally recognized expert, whose experience, discreet knowledge, and competence offered on a daily basis contributed to the remarkable work of the young historian.

JACQUES PRÉVOTAT,
Professor of modern history, University of Lille-III

² Guillaume Cuchet, “À propos de quelques parutions récentes sur le concile Vatican II”, *Revue d’histoire de l’Église de France*, vol. 88, no. 221 (July–December 2002), p. 465, no. 4.

³ For developments in the area of missions, see Ilaria Morali, *La salvezza dei non cristiani: L’influsso di Henri de Lubac sulla dottrina del Vaticano II* (Editrice missionaria italiana, 1999). The author emphasizes the influence of Father de Lubac on no. 16 of the constitution *Lumen gentium*.

INTRODUCTION

It was on the chance reading of a newspaper,¹ in July 1960, that Father Henri de Lubac² learned that he had been called to participate in the preparation of Vatican Council II. His *Notebooks* take their beginning from this point. These retrace, over the course of five and a half years, his participation in the preparation and then in the four sessions of the council. However, his nomination as a consultant to the Preparatory Theological Commission, in the summer of 1960, was hardly expected, and Father de Lubac even appears astonished by it. How does one explain this reaction? What importance would it have for the journal he was then beginning? Can one, finally, attempt a first approach toward answering the question of what Father de Lubac's role was at the council?

An “Astonishing Piece of News”³

These few words, recorded by Father de Lubac in his *Notebooks* at the announcement of his official nomination as consultant to the Preparatory

¹ Henri de Lubac, *Mémoire sur l'occasion de mes écrits* (1st ed., Namur: Culture et vérité, 1989; 2nd ed., 1992), in *Œuvres complètes*, vol. 33 (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 2006), 117; trans. by Anne Elizabeth Englund as *At the Service of the Church: Henri de Lubac Reflects on the Circumstances That Occasioned His Writings* [ASC] (Communio Books; San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 116.

² Henri Sonier de Lubac was born on February 20, 1896, in Cambrai. Soon thereafter, the de Lubacs returned to Lyon, after a few years spent in Bourg-en-Bresse. He entered the Society of Jesus in October 1913, but his formation was interrupted by World War I, during which he experienced, as did so many others, the horror of the trenches. As a result of having been wounded in 1917, at Ville-sur-Tourbe (Marne), he suffered, from 1922 on, from violent headaches that permitted him to do hardly any sort of work other than reading during these attacks. He was ordained a priest on August 22, 1927, and he was named a professor of theology at the Catholic Faculties of Lyon in October 1929. He taught fundamental theology there and, from 1930 on, the history of religion. In 1938, his first important book, *Catholicisme*, was published. When the Second World War broke out, he got involved in the spiritual resistance and the *Cahiers du Témoignage chrétien* (Notebooks of Christian witness). Forced to leave Fourvière in 1950, he returned there in 1960. He was named as a consultant to the Preparatory Theological Commission in 1960 and a council expert (*peritus*) in 1962. Father de Lubac was created cardinal on February 2, 1983, and died on September 4, 1991.

³ *Notebooks*, July 25, 1960.

Theological Commission, say a great deal about the suspicion in which he was held, principally after the Second World War, by one group within the Society of Jesus, the “Roman” theologians, but also, sometimes, by the pope himself.⁴ In fact, one cannot understand Father de Lubac’s astonishment without going back to the theological controversy of the late 1940s, from which he suffered grave consequences. Without going into all the details of a study already thoroughly carried out elsewhere,⁵ it is advisable to recall this background, the echoes of which will be found in the *Notebooks*.

There were sharp tensions within French Catholicism in the period after the war. They were rooted, but only in part, in the differences that emerged in the course of the black years.⁶ In Thomist circles, the climate was troubled principally because of several Jesuit initiatives that seemed to call scholastic theology into question, whereas this theology represented for the Thomists “the truly scientific state of Christian thought”.⁷ Two book series symbolize the initiatives of the priests of the Society of Jesus: “Sources chrétiennes”⁸ (Christian sources), a series of patristic texts whose first volumes had appeared in 1942, and “Théologie”, sponsored by the faculty of theology at Fourvière,⁹ the first volume of which, *Conversion et grâce chez saint Thomas d’Aquin* (Conversion and grace in Saint Thomas Aquinas, 1944), by Father Henri Bouillard, S.J., was vigorously debated.¹⁰ When an article by Father Daniélou devoted to the “Orientations présentes de la pensée religieuse” (Current directions in

⁴In a letter to his superior André Ravier on March 30, 1957, published in the November 2006 *Bulletin* of the Association Internationale Cardinal Henri de Lubac, Father de Lubac, recounting the “Fourvière affair”, wrote: “In an audience in the course of which Cardinal Gerlier wanted to plead my cause, the Holy Father [Pius XII] said to him: ‘But with this priest, what is alarming is that one never knows if he says what he thinks.’” Let us note, however, that in 1958 Father de Lubac received the confidence of the same Pius XII through his confessor, A. Bea.

⁵We are following here the work of É. Fouilloux, “Dialogue théologique? (1946–1948)”, in *Saint Thomas au XX^e siècle* (Paris: Éd. Saint-Paul, 1994), 153–95.

⁶On this phase of the [Nazi] occupation and the Vichy regime in France, besides the essay by Fouilloux, 166–67, see H. de Lubac, *Entretien autour de Vatican II* (Paris: France catholique–Éd. du Cerf, 1985), 15. Also see the Fouilloux’s work *Une Église en quête de liberté: La Pensée catholique française entre modernisme et Vatican II, 1914–1962* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1998), esp. chap. 7.

⁷M. M. Labourdette, “La Théologie et ses sources”, *Revue thomiste* 46 (1946): 353–71.

⁸A series founded by Fathers de Lubac, Daniélou, and Mondésert, from a project of Father Fontoynt. See É. Fouilloux, *La Collection “Sources chrétiennes”: Éditer les Pères de l’Église au XX^e siècle* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1995).

⁹This refers to the Jesuit Scholasticate, located on Fourvière Hill in Lyon.

¹⁰We note that the book had been approved by Father Charles Boyer.

religious thought) appeared in the French Jesuit magazine *Études* in April 1946, the fears of the Thomists were confirmed, helped by the sharpness of Father Daniélou's expressions. He did in fact condemn "a progressive desiccation of theology" and judged that "Neo-Thomism still stresses theological rationalism." He recalled "categories that are those of contemporary thought and that scholastic theology had lost". The article was regarded as an attack and provoked the reaction, in measured terms, of the Dominican Labourdette in the journal *Revue thomiste*,¹¹ which he edited. In his eyes, the disparagement of scholasticism presented the risk of an abandonment of the claim to universal truth, in short, a risk of relativism. The Jesuit response, composed by Father de Lubac, appeared in a journal of the Society, *Recherches de science religieuse*, in February 1947.¹² The article was interpreted as a "point blank rejection".¹³ The publication, in the fall of 1946, of *Surnaturel: Études historiques*¹⁴ (*Supernatural: Historical Studies*) only reinforced the mistrust felt for what some were calling the "Fourvière school", from the name of the hill in Lyon that sheltered the Jesuit scholasticate where Father de Lubac resided but where he did very little teaching. His questioning in this work of scholastic teaching since the sixteenth century on the question of the relationship between nature and the supernatural was the subject of keen debate. Father de Lubac intended in particular to dispute the notion of pure nature, which resulted, in his view, in an extremely harmful dualism: if there exist two "strata" in man, nature and the supernatural, each foreign to the other, there would seem to be a great risk of seeing them studied separately, by philosophy and theology respectively, as if the latter had nothing to say about the whole, living man. If the work was hailed by several journals as a particularly important study on the supernatural,¹⁵ critics were no less numerous, reproaching him especially for calling into question the gratuitous character of the supernatural: if there exists in human nature a desire to see God, is man then not able to demand to see God and thus compel him? Henri de Lubac believed that he had been misunderstood. Indeed, he did not intend to question the

¹¹ Labourdette, "Théologie et ses sources", 353–71.

¹² October–December 1946 issue, 385–401.

¹³ Letter from Marie-Dominique Philippe, O.P., to Labourdette, February 7, 1947, quoted by Fouilloux, "Dialogue théologique?", 174.

¹⁴ H. de Lubac, *Surnaturel: Études historiques* (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1946).

¹⁵ In ASC 203–23, Father de Lubac reproduces several reviews that, while sometimes mentioning a few reservations, recognize the importance of his book.

gratuity of the supernatural. To insist on the profound unity of man, in opposition to dualism, did not imply that man could attain to the knowledge of God by himself.¹⁶ Nevertheless, “critics abounded everywhere. ‘Refutations’ of *Surnaturel* increased. The most sinister news, apostasy included, circulated. Every country brought its own contribution to the campaign. Some *Semaines religieuses* warned the faithful against the ‘wolves in sheep’s clothing’.”¹⁷

In Rome, concerns about these French affairs were coming to light. Father Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., a professor of theology at the Angelicum and a major figure in Roman Thomism, published a violent attack in the journal *Angelicum*,¹⁸ “La nouvelle théologie où va-t-elle?” (Where is the new theology going?), in which he judged that the latter “amounted to modernism”. Henri de Lubac, who obviously could not accept such an accusation, also rejected the label of new theology used by his Dominican opponent. In part, because it grouped together under a single heading theologians who, in his opinion, in no way formed one school of thought; and also because he judged that his theology was in no respect a novelty but was, on the contrary, a return to the sources, he who recalled that “it is necessary to go back to the farthest past – which will reveal itself to be the nearest present.”¹⁹ Thus, in the controversy surrounding *Surnaturel*, Father de Lubac reckoned that he had returned to the sources of Thomism and was more of a Thomist than some of its defenders, who were proving to be more faithful to the commentators on Saint Thomas, Cajetan in particular, than to the

¹⁶For a succinct presentation by Father de Lubac himself, refer to *Entretien autour de Vatican II*, 28–32.

¹⁷ASC 62. Among the criticisms, Father de Lubac mentions most particularly the article by Father Garrigou-Lagrange, “La Nouvelle Théologie où va-t-elle?”, *Angelicum*, October–December 1946, 126–45, that of Father Boyer, “Nature pure et surnaturel dans le ‘Surnaturel’ du P. de Lubac”, *Gregorianum* 28 (1947): 379–95, that of Father Jacques de Blic in *Mélanges de science religieuse* 1947, and the relevant pages of Father de Broglie’s *De Fine ultimo humanae vitae* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1948). See ASC 272–73, the letter to the Father Provincial of March 16, 1948.

¹⁸“Nouvelle Théologie où va-t-elle?” However, the article was not made public until the beginning of 1947. We should note that there was no coordination between the French Dominicans and Father Garrigou-Lagrange, as Fouilloux points out. The *Revue thomiste* had even refused to publish the latter’s article, judging it too violent.

¹⁹H. de Lubac, *Paradoxes*, 1946, republished in *Œuvres complètes*, vol. 31 (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1999), 11; trans. Paul Simon and Sadie Kreilkamp as *Paradoxes* and included in *Paradoxes of Faith* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987), 20. We note, however, that Fouilloux, in his book *Une Église en quête de liberté*, judged, without trying to be controversial, that the appellation “new theology” was well deserved. See chap. 6.

Angelic Doctor himself. Among the Jesuits, the attitude of the Superior General, Jean-Baptiste Janssens, elected in 1946, changed.²⁰ At first he had shown confidence in Father de Lubac, entrusting to him the editorship of the journal *Recherches de science religieuse*.²¹ Rather quickly, however, when the controversy swelled, he took a cautious approach: so in March 1948 he asked that Father de Lubac's responses to the objections made against him be submitted not only to the censor of his province, which was normal, but also to the Jesuit censor in Rome.²² It would, however, be going too far to speak of a repudiation, although Father de Lubac wrote to his provincial: "The exceptional rule to which it [the double censorship] submits me (and which does not apply to any of my detractors) shows me clearly, despite the paternal assurances you have given me, that I am considered suspect."²³ But the attacks against *Summae* did not cease, even from within the Society of Jesus: "The main charge was drawn up by Father Guy de Broglie.²⁴ It was spread throughout the world, thanks to the relations of the Gregorian with all countries. The fact that Father Charles Boyer (and, no doubt, a few others) is in Rome allows him to reach and disturb the most influential members of the Church's government."²⁵ The confidence of the Superior General weakened as a consequence: "In 1950, on receipt of an outrageous dossier, full of calumnies as incredible as they were appalling, Father General, badly advised by Father Dhanis,²⁶ who had no fear at the time of playing the role of false witness, virtually signed off on that dossier without making the least beginning of an inquiry."²⁷

The consequences of this were very serious. At the beginning of 1950, Father de Lubac received a secret letter²⁸ from the Superior General of the Jesuits. He informed him that he would have to cease teaching at the faculty of theology, from that summer onward, and that he would have to

²⁰We are relying here on Father de Lubac's documents, without having been able to consult the archives of the Holy See or those of the General Curia of the Society of Jesus, still closed for this period.

²¹Father de Lubac learned of this decision on January 22, 1947: see ASC 62, n. 6.

²²ASC 274.

²³Letter from H. de Lubac to his provincial, March 25, 1948, quoted in ASC 274.

²⁴In his book *De Fine ultimo humanae vitae* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1948).

²⁵Letter from H. de Lubac to his provincial, André Ravier, March 30, 1957, in the November 2006 *Bulletin* of the Association Internationale Cardinal Henri de Lubac.

²⁶The latter had been the apostolic visitor in France in 1949.

²⁷Letter from H. de Lubac to his provincial, André Ravier, March 30, 1957.

²⁸ASC 64.

step down from his post as editor of *Recherches de science religieuse*. Official notification, again from the Superior General, was not slow in coming. Several professors who resided at Fourvière were relieved of their duties: Fathers Émile Delaye, Henri Bouillard, Alexandre Durand, Pierre Ganne, and Henri de Lubac, for “pernicious errors on essential points of dogma”.²⁹ Furthermore, they had to leave Fourvière for new accommodations. For Father de Lubac, these were in Paris, on Rue de Sèvres. According to his testimony, it was, moreover, on the very day of his arrival in Paris that Pius XII’s encyclical *Humani generis* was published in the newspaper *La Croix*. The encyclical was understood to be a condemnation of the “new theology”, although Henri de Lubac always insisted on the fact that he found nothing in the document that could affect him doctrinally. Not in the sense that no passage in the encyclical was directed at him, but in the sense that his doctrine, clearly understood, was not in contradiction with it.³⁰ Even so, his works *Surnaturel*, *Corpus mysticum*, *De la connaissance de Dieu* (*The Discovery of God*), and his article in *Recherches de science religieuse* on “Le mystère du surnaturel”³¹ (The mystery of the supernatural) were withdrawn from all Jesuit houses of formation the world over, on the decision of the Superior General dated October 25, 1950. From this time forward he was forbidden to publish any works of theology.

“From 1955–1956 on, a certain relaxation in official severity began to manifest itself.”³² Already in 1953, however, his work *Méditation sur l’Église* (*The Splendor of the Church*) was able to appear in print, but that was, in the opinion of the Superior General himself, “quite by chance”.³³ In 1956, as a sign of détente, Father de Lubac was able to publish *Sur les chemins de Dieu* (*On God’s Paths*), a much enlarged version of the second

²⁹ ASC 68.

³⁰ He wrote as follows on September 22, 1960, in his notebooks regarding the “Fourvière affair”: “I reread some passages of the encyclical *Humani generis* that chanced to fall beneath my eyes. I am sickened by the stupidity and baseness of the calumnies that resulted in certain paragraphs of this text. How can so much meanness be possible in the center of Catholicity? And such an absence of discernment? What is most cruel is that this comes from the Society of Jesus itself, from false reports made by brothers and solemnly ratified by Father [General], and, more than ten years later, despite the evidence, still maintained in full.”

³¹ H. de Lubac, *Corpus mysticum: L’Eucharistie et l’Église au Moyen Âge, étude historique*, Théologie (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1944; 2nd ed., 1949), and *De la connaissance de Dieu* (Paris: Éd. du Témoignage chrétien, 1945; 2nd ed., 1948), trans. by Alexander Dru as *The Discovery of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996). “Le Mystère du surnaturel”, *Recherches de science religieuse* 36 (1949): 80–121. The article had been approved by the Jesuit superior general.

³² ASC 80.

³³ ASC 75.

edition of *De la connaissance de Dieu*, and, in November 1959, after an interruption of nine years during which time he had been supported by Cardinal Gerlier, he was able to resume teaching at the Catholic Faculties in Lyon. This background is indispensable for a proper understanding of the *Notebooks*, but the fundamental question remains. Why, despite all these signs of abatement, did Henri de Lubac in fact regard the news of his nomination as consultor to the Preparatory Theological Commission to be “astonishing”? Did this not seem to be in line with the rehabilitation that had been in progress since the mid-1950s? In reality, Father de Lubac judged, with good reason, moreover, as will be seen in these *Notebooks*, that not all opposition was extinguished. The Superior General had not entirely recovered from his mistrust toward him and had never acknowledged the least error of judgment in the measures taken with regard to the priests of Fourvière. In May 1959, Father de Lubac wrote the following in a report prepared for an interview with his provincial:³⁴ “Even just recently, Father General opposed with all his power the steps he knew would be successful in assuring the regular resumption of my teaching duties; it was only a few days ago that he caused me to understand once more that he would not authorize any doctrinal publication from me.” Although testimonies of friendship and esteem were not lacking, Father de Lubac considered the accusations of 1950 to have discredited in part what he said. This is what he explained to the provincial, Blaise Arminjon, in January 1960, that is, only a few months before his nomination as consultor: “The less-than-mediocre men who are the supreme authorities in the view of our Father General are blind – and, what is more, moved by passions that are infinitely petty. Until my death I will be regarded as being at least among the suspect. And this is what compels me to keep quiet. For more than twelve years, I have been present, in silence (as far as essential matters go), at the Tragedy of the Faith that is playing out in our time. The lies solemnly ratified by Father General in 1950 have killed me.”³⁵ The words of this letter and of the report are obviously very harsh, but they must be understood in the same sense as the letter to Father Ravier in 1957:³⁶ in

³⁴ Archives of the Jesuit Province of France, Henri de Lubac, dossier 28, report dated May 23, 1959.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, dossier 29, 1960, folder, letter from H. de Lubac to Father Arminjon, dated January 21, 1960.

³⁶ One can refer for this to the presentation of this letter by Father Georges Chantraine, in the November 2006 *Bulletin* of the Association Internationale Cardinal Henri de Lubac.

these excerpts, Father de Lubac speaks openly to his superior, as, for that matter, the functioning of the Society of Jesus expects. He does not conceal from him what he judges to be dishonest tactics. Father de Lubac cannot accept the substance of the accusations, because they appear to him simply false, without that calling into question the obedience and respect owed to his superiors. It should be noted that these clarifications, implacable as they may be, are limited to the relation between the Jesuit and his superior, and an excerpt from the letter to Father Ravier is significant in this regard: "I will never say anything outside; but every time this matter comes up between my superiors and me, I will say to them again: in the accusation brought against me there is not a single atom of truth."³⁷

So Father de Lubac's astonishment is explained by the harshness endured and the persistent distrust. His nomination thus appeared to be a sign of appeasement. Gaston Fessard, moreover, wrote to him on August 1, 1960: "I have learned of your nomination as theological "consultor" to the future council . . . beside Congar, Labourdette, and others. Hearty congratulations. It is a small and late reparation."³⁸ Father de Lubac likewise saw in this a change in the climate, since he answered his confrere: "They wanted to give a symbolic reassurance to the two religious orders³⁹ that were shaken up in France under the former regime."⁴⁰ Moreover, this interpretation was not limited only to the man concerned or to the circle of his friends, since the *Informations catholiques internationales* wrote in the issue for January 1, 1961, dedicated to the council: "One point merits being raised. John XXIII has called upon the expertise of two theologians deeply controversial among some in Rome, isolated for a time from the debates, and who thus are making a conspicuous comeback: Fathers Congar and de Lubac."⁴¹ However, the doubts concerning his orthodoxy were not limited to a few Jesuits surrounding the Superior General and, especially, had not suddenly disappeared at the announcement of his nomination. The council, announced by John XXIII on January 25, 1959,

³⁷ Letter to Father Ravier of March 30, 1957.

³⁸ Fessard-de Lubac correspondence, consulted in its typewritten version at the Henri de Lubac Center in Namur.

³⁹ The Jesuits and the Dominicans. This was still Father de Lubac's interpretation in his *Entretien autour de Vatican II*, 16.

⁴⁰ Letter to Gaston Fessard, August 4, 1960.

⁴¹ Page 11.

had begun with a phase termed “antepreparatory” (from May 17, 1959, to May 30, 1960), intended for the collection, perusal, and classification of the *vota*⁴² of the future council Fathers, as well as those from the faculties of theology and canon law. Now the *vota* issuing from the Lateran, the Gregorian, and the Angelicum⁴³ carried the trace of past quarrels. The one from the theology faculty of the Lateran, composed by A. Piolanti, named the incriminated theologians, quoting extracts from their works in order to illustrate and underline their errors. Henri de Lubac was cited three times, at the head of the authors criticized. Some names already seen above, such as that of Henri Bouillard, are also found there. The works from which the quotes were drawn included, of course, *Surnaturel* and *Corpus mysticum*, to which must be added the article that appeared in the journal *Recherches de science religieuse*.⁴⁴ Once again, it was a question of defending against any form of relativism, which the writings of Henri de Lubac were said to imply, particularly on the question of dogmatic and theological progress. Father Dhanis, S.J., had been given the task of drafting the *votum* of the theology faculty of the Gregorian, and, even at the time of the preparatory phase of the council, Father de Lubac saw in it serious attacks aimed at himself.⁴⁵ Ten years after *Humani generis* and at the dawn of the council, the controversy surrounding the “new theology” was not yet extinguished.

A Journal of the Council

It was in this somewhat tense context that Father de Lubac arrived in Rome and took part in the preparation for the council. His *Notebooks* allow us to follow him during this preparatory phase, then throughout the four sessions (from 1962 to 1965). Before wondering what interest these notes might have for the contemporary reader, let us listen to Father de Lubac himself:

These pages must not be published. They are personal recollections, simple reference points for my own use, jotted down from day to day and then written up. Sometimes they repeat mere gossip or jokes. Various

⁴² Wishes regarding the subjects to be treated at the council.

⁴³ This refers to the pontifical universities or the Roman ecclesiastical faculties. The Dominicans run the Angelicum, and the Jesuits the Gregorian.

⁴⁴ “Le Mystère du surnaturel”, 80–121.

⁴⁵ See especially the entry dated September 28, 1961, in the *Notebooks*.

names are misspelled. I have often noted, not what was most important, but what I was able to hear, whether in the general congregations in Saint Peter's or in the meetings of the Doctrinal Commission or in various chance conversations. The days when I had the most work were also the days when I lacked the time to take notes. And many papers were lost before everything could be gathered together and put in order.

a. On various points, in the course of these six years (1960–1965), my opinions have sometimes changed, either because certain situations evolved or because I found myself better informed about the men or circumstances by subsequent events.

b. There is obviously no question here of a report that intends to be complete and always balanced. It is a series of notes taken from day to day according to what I was able to see and hear from my window. Even when I was a direct witness, many things escaped me, and many elements were lacking for me to form a judgment. When, for example, I talk about a general congregation in Saint Peter's, I only mean that part of it which I heard or understood from my seat, according to my capacity to pay attention at any given moment.⁴⁶

The Redaction of the "Notebooks"

Father de Lubac indicates that his *Notebooks* were written up from notes taken on the spot that are no longer available to us. A question arises for the historian: How much time passed between the events and their new transcription in the *Notebooks*? Beneath this question, which might appear somewhat trifling, resides a subtle problem: Did the delay between taking the notes on the spot and their final rewriting lead Father de Lubac to correct his first impressions? We can only suggest some partial answers. The final version of the *Notebooks* was at times composed at least several months after the fact. This is certain for the first session. In fact, in the entry for October 4, 1962, that is, just before his departure for the council, Father de Lubac wrote: "This morning, in Marseilles, I kissed mama for the last time." Since Gabrielle de Lubac did

⁴⁶This undated document is part of a dossier entitled "Cahiers du Concile" (council notebooks) consulted at Namur, at the Henri de Lubac Center, itself part of the Molette collection. It is possible, however, that this note dates from the 1980s, for it is certain that H. de Lubac reread his *Notebooks* for his book *Entretien autour de Vatican II*, as p. 34 of that work attests: "According to a note I made on September 19, 1964, on that date, Paul VI had already agreed with the four 'moderators' to make the decision." One will observe that this note does indeed appear under that date in the *Notebooks*.

not die until March 15, 1963, it is evident that all the pages dedicated to this first session were put in final form after March 15, 1963.⁴⁷ That does not necessarily imply, however, that Father de Lubac corrected his first impressions in the final version.

To detect such amendment of the notes taken on the spot is made rather difficult by the absence of those notes from the archives. Nevertheless, we have been able to avail ourselves of Father de Lubac's correspondence, which gives us a snapshot of his immediate reactions. After consulting several sizable collections of letters, we have found only one obvious discrepancy, concerning the black week during the third session of the council, between his impressions at the time and their transcription in the *Notebooks*. The black week was characterized by a great deal of emotion in the council *aula* due to three events: the addition to the schema *De Ecclesia* of the *Nota praevia*, which explained, on the pope's initiative, the doctrine of collegiality and responded to the concerns of the minority at the council; the postponement of the vote on religious liberty, even though the vote was eagerly expected; the addition of *modi* to the decree on ecumenism "in a sense that was felt as a blow to ecumenical amity".⁴⁸ On all these points, the level-headedness of Father de Lubac in his *Notebooks* is remarkable. He endeavors to gather the reactions of various people, seeks to inform himself accurately, but he is scarcely moved, or, rather, he does not allow it to show. He only notes that he confided his sorrow to Carlo Colombo, a close friend of Paul VI, and wished that a little light might be shed on all these decisions, since the lack of information was giving rise to comments of every sort.⁴⁹ A close comparison of his correspondence with the *Notebooks* is illuminating here, for it reveals the evolution of Father de Lubac's thought. In a letter to Father Bernard de Guibert on November 23, 1963, he writes:

⁴⁷The theory according to which the words "for the last time" could have been added later does not hold, for it is the only private note in the *Notebooks*, which is justified only by its exceptional character. One can discover another sign of this chronological gap between the time the events occurred and the time they were recorded: twice during the first session (on November 29 and December 7, 1962), Father de Lubac speaks of Jean Villot as Cardinal Villot, although he was not created a cardinal until February 1965. That would lead one to think that the definitive composition of the manuscript version took place only after that date and, without doubt, after the council, but one ought to be cautious, given the rarity of these clues, even if an error on this point at the time of the events related seems surprising, for Archbishop Villot, Coadjutor Archbishop of Lyon, was not unknown to Father de Lubac.

⁴⁸R. Laurentin, *Bilan du concile* (Paris: Éd. du Seuil, 1966), 19.

⁴⁹*Notebooks*, November 19 and 20, 1964.

November 19, 20, and 21 will remain for a long time, I fear, days of mourning for the Church. It no longer does any good to get indignant over what must well be called a “robbery”;⁵⁰ the wrong has been done, with incalculable consequences. One could see in Saint Peter’s a cardinal, one of the most solid members of the council, shedding tears. And I would not dare to report the reflections of certain observers. A few men (a handful), knowing exactly what they were doing, have set out to ruin any sort of *aggiornamento*, to abolish any chance for ecumenism, to send the bishops of the entire world back to the condition of valets, and everything was accomplished in three days. The Holy Father, without yielding to them in everything (far from it!), has yielded sufficiently to put the bishops now in a false position, reduced to impotence. The incidents of decadence are going to gather pace, and perhaps in reaction anarchic revolts will spring up. Catholicity has been completely mocked. One had to have been present at the tragedy from the inside to understand its significance. Let us pray.

The contrast with the *Notebooks* is striking. In fact, on the subject of the *Nota praevia* one reads: “Moreover, the most reasonable people must see very well that the insertion of the *Nota praevia* changes nothing essential and that this document retains its character whether it is put into the section or not”, and this is noted under the date of November 19. On November 20, regarding the decree on ecumenism:

The majority of these corrections are in fact insignificant. But one or two of them were the subject of caustic criticism this morning. In particular, the next-to-last one. Some saw it as offensive to Protestants. The text of the decree says: “In ipsis Sacris Scripturis Deum inquirunt et inveniunt sibi loquentem.”⁵¹ The new text has: “... Deum inquirunt quasi sibi loquentem.”⁵² So, one asks, has a Christian never been able to find God by meditating on Scripture? So the good that he believes he has found in his reading has never been more than an illusion (*quasi*)? So the intention is to instruct the bishops either to utter this insult or to reject *De œcumenismo*? ... However, a question begins to arise, well suited to restore calm, at least in this area of ecumenism: Would one go to war over a word taken in the wrong sense?

Finally, on the text devoted to religious liberty: “No one, however, seems to allude to the actual fact that the text of *De libertate* presented

⁵⁰ An allusion to the “Robber Council of Ephesus”, a name given to the Second Council of Ephesus (449).

⁵¹ In Holy Scripture, they seek and find God, who speaks to them.

⁵² They seek God as the one who speaks to them.

by Bishop De Smedt is really a revised text, a point that gave a reason (for some, a pretext) to call for a postponement”, in the note for November 21.

This discrepancy between the correspondence and the *Notebooks* is easily explained, not by any hypothesis of double speak, Father de Lubac being far too attached to the truth for that, but by the period of time that elapsed between the notes taken on the spot and their final, rewritten form. Here again, we do not know how much later the definitive version was composed, but a few days were sufficient, in this case of the black week, for Father de Lubac, better informed, to recover his serenity. In fact, in his letter of December 28, 1964, to the same Father de Guibert, the tone is quite different:

Yes, it is true, the last few days of this conciliar year have been painful, and there is some risk of “trauma” remaining as a result. But, as regards what is basic, that has not brought about any notable change. On the subject of ecumenism, there are two regrettable modifications – but these are only details in a text of which all the substance remains. . . . And we have to be very glad that, in the end, Paul VI has approved this Note [the *Nota praevia*] in the form that the Theological Commission had finalized it in the last redaction after a great deal of back and forth discussion and many necessary modifications.

Thus the *Notebooks* do not always provide a snapshot of reactions taken from real life but, rather, constitute a text that has sometimes been reworked and amended according to what Father de Lubac later learned.

Finally, these *Notebooks* have been the object of several stages of redaction. As we have said, the first was the taking of notes on the spot, in Saint Peter’s during the general congregations or in committee or subcommittee, from which six notebooks were drafted. This manuscript was then typed up at an unknown date. Comparison of the manuscript and typewritten versions reveals some small changes, essentially in the form of short additions intended to clarify Father de Lubac’s thought. The fact that the author declared to Philippe Levillain, when he gave him the manuscript version of his *Notebooks* for the latter’s thesis⁵³ in 1972, that he had never reread them permits us to think that these modifications were made after this date, and doubtless even after 1975, the year that Levillain’s thesis was published. Indeed, Father de Lubac was

⁵³ *La Mécanique politique de Vatican II: La Majorité et l’unanimité dans un concile* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1975).

alarmed to read some of the judgments⁵⁴ he had made; perhaps that was what prompted him to take up his *Notebooks* again. Finally, a third version consists of additions, sometimes voluminous, especially concerning the preparatory phase, and based on the typewritten version. In this case, too, we have no date.⁵⁵ It is certain, however, that Father de Lubac referred to his *Notebooks* at the beginning of the 1980s for his book *Entretien autour de Vatican II* (1985), as the work itself and the archives of the French Province of the Society of Jesus at Vanves⁵⁶ prove. We cannot deduce from this, however, that all the additions date from the same period.

Might these different versions and the difference in tone observed between the *Notebooks* and the letters not also reveal a difference in the nature of the sources? Let us note immediately that here we are entering the realm of hypothesis. If the *Notebooks* were purely for private use, why not retranscribe the evolution of his thinking on the subject of the black week, an evolution, moreover, that would be completely understandable (the total absence of information allowed one to imagine secret machinations of the worst kind aimed at sabotaging the council, since very few knew what had really happened). Perhaps it was because Father de Lubac thought his *Notebooks* might be used,⁵⁷ and he did not wish to inflate incidents and aggravate disagreements that turned out, after more was learned, to be unfounded or at least exaggerated, whereas the letters were written in the grip of emotion. So, in what concerns himself at least – for he notes clearly and accurately the reactions of those around him – Father de Lubac did not wish, on every occasion, to retranscribe the different stages of his reactions but preferred, at least for this episode, to come directly to the conclusions he reached, conclusions that were restrained and better founded, out of concern for the truth but also for appeasement. Father de Lubac was not doing the work of a historian, and one can well believe that transcribing his transient emotions mattered much less to him than showing the debates at issue and their importance for the faith.

⁵⁴The author's correspondence with Philippe Levillain, August 2006. Levillain used the *Notebooks* in his thesis, without however mentioning them explicitly (he spoke of unpublished documents), in conformity with Father de Lubac's wishes when he gave them to him.

⁵⁵All these additions, deletions, and modifications have been indicated in the notes.

⁵⁶In fact, in box 7 of the Henri de Lubac collection, there is a sort of table of contents of the *Notebooks*, written in Father de Lubac's hand, on the back of printed leaves mentioning among others a book published in 1983.

⁵⁷It is, moreover, significant that some of the corrections are minor ones, matters of pure style: What is the point of that in a purely private document?

The Journal's Interest

In the note quoted at the beginning of this section, Father de Lubac insists, as he often does, on the caution with which his work must be considered. Who would be surprised that these *Notebooks* ought not to be taken as an official, exhaustive, and absolutely sure source of information? Henri de Lubac, qualified as he might be to understand what is going on at the council, is nevertheless only a man, with moments of fatigue, inattention, difficulty in understanding because of static interference or various accents. If this note must not be ignored, insofar as it puts Father de Lubac's text into historical and theological perspective, it remains no less true that the *Notebooks* offer us a particularly interesting account of a fundamental event of the Church. Father de Lubac's research had since the 1930s helped to prepare this *aggiornamento* of the Church that was Vatican II. His *Notebooks* thus prove to be invaluable for those who wish to grasp the crux of the problems under discussion, the issues in the debates, all the more so since Father de Lubac shows himself to be most often remarkably accurate in quoting the speakers and sometimes accompanying their interventions with short comments or more developed passages that permit the reader to share his analyses. The *Notebooks* thus allow one to grasp, in the course of the debates but also in Father de Lubac's informal meetings, correspondence, and readings, the intellectual climate that surrounded him: that of the Roman theologians during the preparatory phase,⁵⁸ for whose work he had little esteem, then the abandonment of this theology (even if it retained some supporters), judged too juridical, too inclined toward definitions to the point of stifling the mystery. Finally, even if they never made him lose confidence in the council, Father de Lubac recorded his fears, which were more frequent starting with the third session, about tendencies and expressions he judged to be rash⁵⁹ and about a spirit he considered too little concerned with the respect owed to doctrine, tradition, and superiors.⁶⁰ In short, the reader is invited to immerse himself in the theological ferment that was the council, in the company of a guide capable of pointing out the principal issues. Obviously, this journal is not sufficient on its own; it must be compared with and completed by others, but it constitutes an invaluable source for understanding the council and the history of Catholicism.

⁵⁸ *Notebooks*, September 19 and 20, 1961.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, November 11, 1964, for example.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, July 28, 1964.

These *Notebooks* also permit us to become better acquainted with Father de Lubac himself. To be sure, this is not an intimate journal, and the note of October 4, 1962, already mentioned, stating that he kissed his mother for the last time, is the only really private one in the *Notebooks*. But his analyses, his sympathies, his agreements, and his disapprovals teach us a great deal about the manner in which he experienced the council. The *Notebooks* also put into writing the life of an expert at Rome, made up of numerous meetings, encounters with bishops and priests from all over the world, discussions about the schemas or about unverifiable rumors, advice given to the council Fathers, conferences, study of texts. Besides this work, which was that of every expert, much of Father de Lubac's time and energy was taken up with defending his own orthodoxy, principally during the preparatory phase, and, during the whole council, that of his colleague Teilhard de Chardin, who holds a noteworthy place in this journal. Thus, these *Notebooks* constitute a particularly interesting witness for anyone who wishes to be better acquainted with the council, the history of Catholicism, and Father de Lubac himself. The author shows prudence, is concerned above all with the truth, and introduces us with remarkable precision into debates that are sometimes still current.

Henri de Lubac and the Council

We do not claim to be carrying out an in-depth study here but simply wish to give a few points of reference.

During the preparatory phase, in the course of which, let us remember, he was named a consultor to the Preparatory Theological Commission, Father de Lubac found himself in a delicate situation, to say the least. Even at the time of his nomination, moreover, he showed caution: "You will have learned that I am now a 'consultor' to the Theological Commission of the council! I received a fine piece of paper to that effect, signed Tardini. It occurs to me that these 'consultors' are hardly ever consulted; and besides, you will have seen the other names . . ." ⁶¹ Father de Lubac was in fact going to be seated beside men who had played a part in the rigors he had experienced for the last ten years or who had even drafted *vota* aimed at having his theses condemned by the council (one thinks here of É. Dhanis and A. Piolanti). To be

⁶¹ Letter to Henri Bouillard of July 28, 1960, in the archives of the Jesuit Province of France.

sure, the commission included many other men, members and consultants (such as Yves Congar), who were in no way hostile to Father de Lubac or who were scarcely familiar with the facts of the whole controversy. It is no less true, though, that throughout the preparatory phase, Father de Lubac had to struggle to defend his orthodoxy, which he judged to be directly, although anonymously, called into question by the texts of the commission to which he belonged. Constrained by the secrecy demanded of the members and consultants, and so unable to reveal anything to those outside, neither could he hope for an effective clarification in committee, since the consultants could only intervene at the invitation of a member. The position seemed so hopelessly entangled that at one point he thought of resigning from the commission.⁶² Dominated as it was by the Holy Office and the “Roman” theologians, the commission was still marked by the climate of suspicion that prevailed in the 1940s and 1950s toward Father de Lubac and others, including his confrere Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. This explains why the Jesuit from Lyon could afterward consider himself to have been something of a hostage, even a defendant.⁶³ To be sure, he sometimes intervened during the meetings, and he drafted a memorandum on the knowledge of God, but the impact of such interventions was minor, and he was very severe regarding the result of the commission’s work. In fact, the schemas prepared seemed to him far too little concerned to present the Church to the world, to return to the sources of Christianity, to show its power and importance for the present world, overly preoccupied as they were with pursuing error and reducing the faith to formulae that were ever more precise but, in Father de Lubac’s view, ever more foreign to its very essence.⁶⁴ Hence the question that comes almost as the conclusion of this period in the *Notebooks*: “What will this council be?”⁶⁵

Father de Lubac was not, at first, certain of attending the council. Since no French bishop had called on him to serve as an adviser during the sessions, the provincial, who wished his presence in Rome, looked for a bishop likely to accept him as a theologian. He found one in Bishop Gilbert Ramanantoanina, S.J., a Madagascan bishop from Fianarantsoa. This precaution, however, proved unnecessary, since Father de Lubac

⁶² *Notebooks*, September 28, 1961.

⁶³ ASC 117.

⁶⁴ *Notebooks*, September 29, 1961, for example.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, March 12, 1962.

was named an expert (*peritus*) of the council.⁶⁶ In October 1962, he was able to embark for Rome. The first session of the council is, by far, the one to which he devotes the most pages, like many Fathers and experts who kept a journal during the council. No doubt the effect of novelty played some part in this: while everyone experienced this extraordinary event with enthusiasm, some time was undoubtedly needed to prioritize, to distinguish what was important from what was secondary, and to give up transcribing everything. For the reader, it is also the opportunity to observe the profound disagreements between the majority of the Fathers and the spirit that had presided over the drafting of most of the preparatory schemas. The meticulousness of Father de Lubac's transcription of the interventions of this period thus permits one to have a clear picture of the debates at that time and the issues of the *aggiornamento* desired by John XXIII. In fact, on the liturgy, revelation, or the Church, the reader is able to grasp the diversity of theological positions at a time when it became apparent that the Holy Office did not represent the majority of the council Fathers. But Father de Lubac was not content to attend the general congregations in Saint Peter's, during which these debates were held. Admittedly, during this first session, he did not participate in any conciliar commission, a fact that necessarily limited the possible impact of his actions, for it was in the commissions that the texts were drawn up, proposed corrections were examined and amended, and so on. This is not very surprising, moreover, since only the Liturgical Commission did any important work during the first session. Father de Lubac's activity was nonetheless intense: following the general congregations in the morning were numerous visits, lunches, meetings, conferences on Teilhard but also on the schemas under discussion or to come, dinners at the various houses that welcomed the council Fathers and the experts, personal study of the conciliar texts, and so on. The dogmatic schemas left him deeply unsatisfied, and he was anxious to contribute to their replacement by participating in meetings,⁶⁷ by disseminating his own remarks (or those of his confrere Father Martelet), by means of writing or during the conferences, like the one on October 27, during which he responded to questions from 150 bishops, priests, and seminarians.

⁶⁶The rules of the council make clear that the experts (*periti*), named by the pope, attend the general congregations but do not speak there unless they are questioned. At the request of the presidents of the conciliar commissions (doctrinal, of the liturgy, and so on) they work on the drafting and amendment of the schemas.

⁶⁷*Carnets*, November 18, 1962.

A letter addressed to Father Henri Bouillard bears witness to his activity: "I cannot find a single moment to write or, of course, to work or to read – and sometimes even to sleep. I am caught up in an immense whirlwind, with long sessions of four hours running in Saint Peter's, almost every morning. Anyway, all that is not without interest; one more or less gets caught up in what is going on, and one is fascinated by what is at issue."⁶⁸

Nevertheless, we would do well to keep a measured tone: we do not see, in fact, Father de Lubac forging steady working relationships, throughout the session, in a structured group with the task of proposing a replacement text or a modification of a conciliar document, which makes difficult any direct influence on the work of the council. His relations with the French episcopate remained rather loose⁶⁹ (that would be a cause of complaint for Father de Lubac throughout the council), in spite of some meetings and lectures, sometimes before an important audience. Thus it is amusing to note that when Cardinal Liénart met Father de Lubac at the end of the first session, he asked him what he was doing in Rome!⁷⁰

In December 1962, when the first session of the council ended, a session marked in particular by the rejection of the schema on the sources of revelation and, so, foreshadowing the refusal to allow a takeover of the council by the Holy Office and the "Roman" theologians,⁷¹ Father de Lubac displayed a cautious optimism, founded on a twofold experience: that of the catholicity of the Church, experienced during the general congregations and in the numerous encounters made possible by the council, and that of the action of the Spirit.⁷² A letter addressed to Msgr. Bruno de Solages bears witness to this: "Yes, I believe that something

⁶⁸ Letter of November 1, 1962, in the archives of the Henri de Lubac Center, Namur, where all the correspondence referred to on the following pages was consulted.

⁶⁹ Among the French episcopate were some who were not Father de Lubac's supporters. Even during the fourth session of the council, on October 25, 1965, he wrote: "Bishop Gouyon recently told me that he had proposed to have me invited by the French bishops for a conference on Teilhard, but he had come up against a veto from some of them." The opposition of certain bishops to Teilhard could also account in part for this veto.

⁷⁰ *Notebooks*, December 4, 1962.

⁷¹ Although these men did not form a united group on every occasion. Thus, we see that, after the council, Archbishop P. Parente, assessor of the Holy Office, was in favor of collegiality.

⁷² Father Michel Sales, who knew Father de Lubac well and who had numerous very specific conversations with him regarding the council, especially between 1968 and 1971 and between 1974 and 1986, insisted on this aspect relative to the final text, voted on and promulgated, of *Lumen gentium*, during an interview with the author.

extraordinary has taken place during these first two months of the council. It would be too much to say a 'revolution', since nothing has yet been accomplished. . . . However, an evangelical breath has passed over the council, the breath of the Spirit of Christ."⁷³

It was during the first intersession that Cardinal Ottaviani, as president of the Doctrinal Commission, invited Henri de Lubac to Rome to participate in its work. The latter, however, believing himself to be too tired,⁷⁴ had himself excused. Moreover, one month later, he was hospitalized for a double operation, for appendicitis and prostate problems. Although far from Rome, he did not lose interest in the council. The intersession allowed him, in fact, to work on the schemas dedicated to revelation and to the Church and to meet with bishops. Even in the hospital, his interest did not flag, as Henri Rondet, S.J., attests in a letter to Msgr. de Solages, in which he brings up Father de Lubac's state of health: "Yesterday, on the contrary, he spoke a great deal and told me that he could not manage to refrain from doing so; he was even surprised that he was able to give a long discourse in Latin relating to the council!"⁷⁵ So it was starting from the second conciliar session that Father de Lubac participated in the work of the Doctrinal Commission, and this change is very important for the *Notebooks*. In fact, that very circumstance introduces us to the immense work of redrafting the texts made necessary by the rejection of the preparatory schemas. These passages are invaluable, for, unlike the debates held in the general congregations, those of the commissions and subcommissions have not been made the subject of official publications. For the Doctrinal Commission, we have at our disposal the *Relatio*⁷⁶ of Father Tromp, the secretary of the commission, and some private accounts, including this one, which thus assume great importance for understanding the council.

During this session, the *Notebooks* carry the trace of Father de Lubac's recent hospitalization. In fact, he was only able to come to Rome at the end of October 1963, thus one month after the beginning of the session,

⁷³ Letter of December 20, 1962.

⁷⁴ Letter to Gaston Fessard, May 12, 1963.

⁷⁵ Letter of June 23, 1963. However, Father de Lubac thought at the time that he would not return to the council, as a letter to Father Fessard, dated August 11, 1963, attests: "There is no longer any question of Rome or the council. Moreover, there is such a campaign organized against me among the integrist clans (a campaign in part clear-sighted, in part originating from the ridiculous legend forged in 1950), that I would be much too uncomfortable there."

⁷⁶ This can be consulted at Louvain (Belgium), in the archives of Monsignor Gérard Philips, among other places.

since his two operations necessitated a lengthy convalescence, which he continued in Rome. Thus, his conciliar activity was less intense than during the first session, and, if we take his word for it, he was almost a tourist visiting the council:

During this time, I set out for Rome at the wish of our superiors; everything was settled in a few hours, and I left. And it has been twenty days already that I have been here, convalescing under the beautiful Roman sky, installed at the Holy See's expense in a hotel where I find a level of comfort that no house of the Society could offer me. But as soon as I want to get a bit closer to the council, I quickly become exhausted, and my correspondence suffers. . . . In any case, I am happy to be attending some memorable sessions, and I am gathering information on a great many things.⁷⁷

A passage like this will not surprise those who are accustomed to read the Jesuit from Lyon, always inclined to downplay the importance of the work he was able to conduct. The reader of the *Notebooks* will qualify this statement slightly, since Father de Lubac carried on many meetings, was consulted, and attended the sessions of the Doctrinal Commission. Nevertheless, it is certain that his activity was much less feverish than it had been in 1962,⁷⁸ even in writing his *Notebooks*, which are much less extensive for this session. While no fewer than 270 pages are devoted to the first session (in the typewritten version), the second is treated in only thirty-five pages!⁷⁹

The *Notebooks* resume a greater fullness beginning with the second intersession. Father de Lubac attended very important meetings of the Doctrinal Commission, from the first week of June 1964 on, and offers us a detailed report. In fact, he devotes almost as many pages to this week alone as he did to the whole of the second session. Even if these few days represent only a part of the work carried on during the intersession,⁸⁰ this testimony proves very interesting, for it introduces us into the work of

⁷⁷ Letter to Gaston Fessard, November 18, 1963.

⁷⁸ Father de Lubac is thus not mentioned among the experts of the seven subcommittees constituted to review *De Ecclesia*. See G. Alberigo, *Histoire du concile Vatican II* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 2000), 3:131.

⁷⁹ One could certainly argue against this deduction the words of Father de Lubac himself: "The days when there was the most work were also the days when I had no time to take notes", but his correspondence confirms a less important activity during this session.

⁸⁰ Father de Lubac does not provide us with a complete survey of the work of the Doctrinal Committee during this period, since he was not present at the meetings in January-February, then in March 1964, devoted to *De Ecclesia*, or at those in April on *De revelatione*.

the commission on *De Beata* (a chapter of the text *De Ecclesia*) and on *De revelatione* and also relates the episode of the thirteen suggestions of Paul VI concerning collegiality. With a great deal of precision, especially on the thirteen suggestions, which were the subject of intense discussions, well transcribed here, Father de Lubac plunges us into the heart of the commissions' work, permitting us to understand another side of conciliar activity, those debates turning on one word, one phrase, behind which there are often a whole theology and conception of the faith being expressed. This testimony also allows the reader to see the conciliar texts as the products of history, of long discussions and necessary compromises, in short, it allows us to be introduced to a greater understanding of what the council and its texts were. Finally, the inter-session was also the occasion for Father de Lubac to participate in a new task, that of revising schema 13, devoted to the Church in the modern world, by a mixed committee (the Doctrinal Commission and the Commission for the Lay Apostolate). If his direct influence remained weak, Father de Lubac occasionally advised one or another council Father: Bishop Ancel, auxiliary bishop of Lyon, or Bishop McGrath, auxiliary bishop of Panama City until March 1964, then bishop of Santiago de Veraguas, whom he had met during the first session.

Henri de Lubac takes up once again during the third session (170 pages in the typed version) a much more sustained activity. Added to his personal work on the texts were his explanations of them and advice to various council Fathers. In particular, Father de Lubac addressed a group of bishops, mainly African, at the hotel *Giotto*, where he resided with Father Martelet (for example, he gave a talk on the first two chapters of *De revelatione*),⁸¹ without this, of course, hindering him from working with others, including Bishop Muñoz-Vega, with whom he held a work meeting devoted to the study of *De revelatione* and to the chapter of *De Ecclesia* on collegiality, and the Melchite Élie Nijmé, who asked him for a note after an intervention by Archbishop Marty "that compromises the transcendence of revelation".⁸²

In the counsel he gave and in his interventions, Father de Lubac shows himself to be anxious for a clear affirmation of Christian doctrine, especially in the work on schema 13 and the work of the Secretariat for Non-Christians, created by Paul VI on Pentecost 1964 and to which he

⁸¹ *Notebooks*, September 28, 1964.

⁸² *Ibid.*, September 19, 1964, and October 2, 1964.

had been called. He recalls the necessity, in his view, of speaking to men as a Christian, and thus he is opposed to a tendency, which he regarded as dangerous, to dissociate Catholicism and “real life”, as if the former had nothing to say to the latter, a tendency he found, for example, in an article by Henri Fesquet.⁸³ Certainly, Father de Lubac’s concerns about the religious situation of his time are not new (as early as February 1961, he had a conversation with Father de Peretti concerning “the decline of the spirit of faith and of prayer among the French clergy, secular and regular”),⁸⁴ but they become more frequent from this session on; satisfaction and concern mingle. He himself wrote, in September 1964, that he had observed since the winter of 1963–1964 a “growing anarchy”.⁸⁵ Thus he looked unfavorably on the direction taken by the journal *Concilium*,⁸⁶ on whose directorial committee he sat, primarily on account of an article by E. Schillebeeckx.

It is nonetheless true that the council always seemed to him to bring a healthy renewal. A letter to Father Bouillard shows us this: “On the council, impressions vary from day to day. As a whole, it is a marvelous adventure, a real thaw. There are shadows, of course, and there are dangers. But what a difference from what we have known, even just yesterday!”⁸⁷ Even more, Henri de Lubac hoped that the council would permit a way out of a religious situation that troubled him: “It is very true, in any case, that the current religious situation worries me, and, as you know, has for a long time. . . . We find ourselves caught between two factions to which the council (misunderstood by both) has given the opportunity to aggravate each other. . . . But I am very hopeful, all the same, that once the council is over, the main lines will be brought out, which will allow us to rally people of goodwill.”⁸⁸ So the importance he places on the explanation of the council, his major concern, is understandable. His warnings against false interpretations (he confided this, for example, to Cardinal Léger, to whom he addressed a letter on this subject and who expressed a desire to use it for a coming intervention)⁸⁹ led Archbishop Marty to call him, maliciously, “the guardian angel of the council”.⁹⁰

⁸³ *Ibid.*, November 11, 1964.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, February 11, 1961.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, September 10, 1964.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, November 17, 1964.

⁸⁷ Letter of October 4, 1964.

⁸⁸ Letter to Father Ravier, December 18, 1964.

⁸⁹ *Notebooks*, October 17 and 19, 1964.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, October 28, 1964.

During the third intersession, Father de Lubac went to Rome twice, for the mixed commission charged with the preparation of schema 13 and for the Secretariat for Non-Christians. If, during the intersession, Father de Lubac did not take part in the meetings of the mixed commission that were organized in February 1965 at Ariccia, for the purpose of drafting a new schema 13 (the ancestor of *Gaudium et spes*), he was certainly in Rome for those that took place from the end of March to the first week in April. It was there that he was in close contact with Archbishop Wojtyła, who made a strong impression on him and with whom he felt a profound common understanding. Moreover, the impression was mutual: it was Father de Lubac who wrote the preface to the French edition of *Amour et responsabilité* (*Love and Responsibility*), which the archbishop of Kraków brought out in 1965. During this intersession, Father de Lubac, who was lodging with the Fathers of the Holy Cross on via Aurelia Antica, was, at the same time, a part of an informal work group around Bishop McGrath. This little group attended the sessions of the mixed commission for the revision of the schema on the Church in the modern world and also organized work meetings intended to improve the schema under discussion, which Father de Lubac judged too superficial and not authentically Christian enough. The debates, not grasping the problems they addressed sufficiently to satisfy the Jesuit from Lyon, are transcribed here, moreover, with less precision than is customary with him, a sign no doubt of a lesser interest in debates judged disappointing, despite the interventions he found valuable, those of Bishop Volk of Mainz and Archbishop Wojtyła.

During the last session (sixty-four pages in the typed version), Father de Lubac continued to attend the sessions of the Doctrinal Commission, of the mixed commission for the revision of schema 13, of the Secretariat for Non-Christians, but also of the Secretariat for Non-Believers.⁹¹ The worries that had become more acute during the preceding session were confirmed. Thus Father de Lubac was troubled to see the work of the council poorly understood, through faulty liturgical translations or through the agitation (something he called the “paracouncil”) kept up by various journals and priests more anxious, so it seemed to him, to set parties at odds and to stir up controversy than to inform themselves calmly and accurately. Consequently, he called on the bishops to guide the faithful, and he himself went to great lengths to do so by means of

⁹¹ These last two were not conciliar organs.

various conferences. In his mind, it was a matter of carefully distinguishing between true and false *aggiornamento* and of speaking to the men of his times while remaining faithful to tradition.⁹² His concern with regard to secularizing tendencies was just as marked: he insisted, a number of times, notably on the occasion of the text on atheism, a theme that particularly preoccupied him, on the need for clear doctrinal reminders.⁹³ He himself surprised some of his listeners, during a conference at the Belgian college, when he declared that atheism was an evil and that it had to be combated,⁹⁴ convinced as he was that “the ‘understanding’ of atheists and their atheism that was being sought and preached risked developing an inferiority complex among the faithful – and encouraging a worldly progressivism that made everything turn to the disparagement of believers.”⁹⁵

The context had at that time changed significantly. If Father de Lubac could feel like an accused person during the preparatory phase, if there were rumors circulating during the first session about his eviction from the council, during the last one he received the honor of concelebrating with the pope,⁹⁶ and it was then that another rumor began to circulate, one that he went to great lengths to deny: that he would soon be made a cardinal!⁹⁷ Even so, it would be wrong to oversimplify and make of the council the period of Father de Lubac’s sudden rehabilitation, passing from the state of an exile to that of a respected “great theologian”.

⁹² The testimony of Bishop Léonard of Namur, is revealing: “We welcomed Father de Lubac to the Belgian college for a conference. We were all on fire about the idea that it was necessary to translate the Christian faith into a new language. We had to find an innovative way in which to address the world. . . . But Cardinal de Lubac, equipped with a formidable knowledge of history told us: ‘One does not invent a language that way: one must draw inspiration from tradition, from Scripture, from the Fathers of the Church. One can be creative, but on the condition that one remains truly faithful to the sources. The use of a new language is not something that can be decided on in an office.’ In short, he tempered our ardor” (*Monseigneur Léonard: Entretiens avec Louis Mathoux* [Paris: Parole et silence; Brussels: Mols, 2006], p. 109).

⁹³ *Notebooks*, September 23, 1965, for example.

⁹⁴ Note 241 of the *Journal* of Albert Prignon, rector of the Belgian college, edited by L. Declerck and A. Haquin, p. 95.

⁹⁵ *Notebooks*, September 21, 1965.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, November 18, 1965.

⁹⁷ Let us recall that H. de Lubac was indeed created a cardinal . . . but by John Paul II, in 1983, eight years before his death. On this rumor, see, for example, the letter to H. de Lubac from Father Fessard on December 4, 1965. Father de Lubac vigorously denied this rumor. However, according to the testimony of René Brouillet, French ambassador to the Holy See, referring to the words of Cardinal Villot, secretary of state, Paul VI had hesitated for a long time between Father de Lubac and Father Daniélou for the Consistory of 1969 (testimony of René Brouillet received by Philippe Levillain).

First of all, because the suspicions of which he was the object involved only a few men, sufficiently influential nonetheless to constrain him to silence for a time, while many others showed him esteem. Next, because all hostility toward him had not suddenly disappeared. The *Notebooks* give several examples of this, coming principally from the “Roman” milieu. Thus the publication of an article favorable to Father de Lubac⁹⁸ in a small Assisi journal, *Rocca*, elicited a letter of protest from Cardinal Ottaviani, asking the bishop of Assisi that the magazine be subject to an ecclesiastical censor from that time on. But Father de Lubac judged that he was also the object of another hostility, coming from within the Society of Jesus itself: “The Roman milieu always hostile and impenetrable (despite the pope), the French episcopate keeping away from me (for four years, for example, I was constantly in the same room as Archbishop Garrone, on the Theological Commission, and he never spoke a single word to me about the council), and violently rejected by the so-called progressive wing of the Society, today in favor.”⁹⁹ Father de Lubac is seen here caught between what he called the “two integrisms”.¹⁰⁰ On one side, the integrisms of certain Romans, already mentioned; on the other, a secularizing way of thinking that poorly misunderstood, according to Father de Lubac, the dialogue with the world, in whose train it seemed to want to find a place, reinterpreting revelation and tradition in a not very traditional sense. He saw in this the danger of a dualist conception of man, one that totally separated nature and the supernatural. Indeed, it is not without interest that Father de Lubac published in 1965 *Le Mystère du surnaturel* (*The Mystery of the Supernatural*), which, in a sign of change, was well received. In the preface he wrote:

Though the dualist – or, perhaps better, separatist – thesis has finished its course, it may be only just beginning to bear its bitterest fruit. As fast as professional theology moves away from it, it becomes so much more widespread in the sphere of practical action. While wishing to protect the supernatural from any contamination, people had in fact exiled it altogether – both from intellectual and from social life – leaving the field free to be taken over by secularism. Today that secularism, following its course, is beginning to enter the minds even of Christians. They too seek to find a harmony with all things based upon an idea of nature which might be acceptable to a deist or an atheist: everything that comes from Christ, everything that should lead to him, is pushed so far into the

⁹⁸ “Incontri all’ ora del Concilio Henri de Lubac”, *Rocca* 23 (May 15, 1964).

⁹⁹ Letter to Father Ravier, November 8, 1965.

¹⁰⁰ *Notebooks*, October 3, 1965.

background as to look like disappearing for good. The last word in Christian progress and the entry into adulthood would then appear to consist in a total secularization which would expel God not merely from the life of society, but from culture and even from personal relationships.¹⁰¹

At the end of the council, what balance sheet can be drawn up? In what concerns his conciliar activity, let us listen to Father de Lubac himself: “This will be the end of a large parenthesis, within which I have led a life less active than usual: no real work, comings and goings, visits, impromptu meetings, lunches in restaurants, and then, long sessions of the general congregations, and especially of the subcommissions and commissions.”¹⁰² Readers of the *Notebooks* will be in a position to qualify this judgment. It is certainly true that we would be hard pressed to draw up a list comparable to the one made by Yves Congar, enumerating the conciliar texts that were from his pen or that were based on one of his texts,¹⁰³ and it is obvious that Father de Lubac did not have the same level of activity as the Dominican, to take the example of a man who was in a similar situation to his at the opening of the council. But we should appreciate the true value of Father de Lubac’s activity: through the advice he lavished on numerous Fathers, through the many meetings that he attended, through the defense of his fellow Jesuit Teilhard de Chardin (the growing success of which seemed to him potentially dangerous since it distorted his thought), he put a great deal of effort into the work of the council. If his direct influence, that is, the influence he was able to exert directly on the drafting of the conciliar texts, was slight, that should not make us forget the importance of a more diffuse influence. Many had read his works on the Church, on exegesis, on the supernatural, on Teilhard; their impact is admittedly difficult to measure precisely,¹⁰⁴ but it is important, since Father de Lubac, along with others, of course, has contributed so much to the theological renewal of the twentieth century.

¹⁰¹ *Le Mystère du surnaturel* (Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 1965); republished in *Œuvres complètes*, vol. 12 (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 2000), 15; trans. Rosemary Sheed as *The Mystery of the Supernatural* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), xi–xii.

¹⁰² Letter to Father Bouillard of November 24, 1965.

¹⁰³ See Y. Congar, *Mon Journal du concile* (Paris, Éd. du Cerf, 2002), 2:511; trans. Mary John Ronayne, O.P., and Mary Cecily Boulding, O.P., as *My Journal of the Council* (Hindmarsh: ATF Press, 2012), 919–28.

¹⁰⁴ Jean-François Chiron shows in “La Naissance eucharistique de l’Église”, in *La Rencontre au cœur de l’Église* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 2006), pp. 133–47, that *Lumen gentium* 26 follows *Méditation sur l’Église*, where Father de Lubac speaks of the Eucharist that makes the Church. In this connection one can also quote Father de Lubac himself, who, in the foreword to the fifth edition of *Méditation*

It must be remembered that Father de Lubac was not a council Father, and his role as expert was really to advise the Fathers, not to impose on them (something, moreover, of which Congar was equally convinced). He also felt the limits of his action in a conciliar mechanism that consisted, for an expert, of slipping a brief note to a bishop or an influential secretary in the hope of modifying a word, a sentence, without any expectation of a complete revision. Father Martelet, who associated a great deal with Father de Lubac during the council, emphasizes this point. According to him, in fact, Father de Lubac was a “fish out of water”,¹⁰⁵ a writer and not a teacher, not well suited to stepping into the conciliar mechanism. Although Father de Lubac felt close to certain Fathers, he did not have continuous links to a formally constituted work group. No doubt, too, the persistent suspicions about his orthodoxy did not encourage him to intervene. However, it would be wrong to think of Father de Lubac as a timid man,¹⁰⁶ and several times we see him providing advice to a bishop, encouraging a speaker (and especially Karol Wojtyła during the revision of schema 13) whose intervention seemed to him particularly important, which is another kind of possible influence. He judged, not without pain, that the religious situation of the time presented a good number of dangers and that it was necessary to face that fact. Thus we see him concerned after Archbishop Marty’s speech *in aula* on atheism, during the fourth session,¹⁰⁷ and anxious to explain to him the implications of his intervention.

sur l’Église (1968), wrote the following: “Since [this book] was written, an ecumenical council has been held, a dogmatic constitution on the Church has been promulgated. If nothing in it shows any disagreement with the work of the council, *if it even is found to have anticipated it in more than one regard*, it nevertheless requires a few adjustments to correspond better to the aim of *Lumen Gentium*” (italics not in the original). As for his book *Surnaturel*, one can cite an excerpt from *Entretien autour de Vatican II*, 27–28. Father de Lubac, in response to the question: “Does the orientation of the council not owe something all the same to a certain theologian of the ‘Supernatural’?”, judged that he, along with many others, might have had a very general influence and added: “What I grant you is that I feel very comfortable with the orientations of the council that are able to find a foundation in the traditional position: that of Saint Thomas, among others, which I had tried to revive. . . . One can say without exaggeration that the council put an end to extrinsicism.” Finally, there can be no doubt that Father de Lubac’s influence can be seen on chapter 1 of *Gaudium et spes*.

¹⁰⁵ Interview, August 2005.

¹⁰⁶ One thinks especially of his intervention of October 11, 1965, on the sidelines of the council, to defend his confrere Teilhard de Chardin, harshly attacked by Henri Rambaud. One will observe on that occasion that Father de Lubac did not put himself forward in his *Notebooks*, simply writing: “In the end, I asked to speak. In a few sentences, I reestablished the truth.” His correspondence bears witness in a more vivid manner to the spirited nature of Father de Lubac’s opposition to Rambaud. In fact, he wrote, in a letter to Father Ravier on October 21, 1965: “I took the floor and demolished him in eight minutes.”

¹⁰⁷ *Notebooks*, September 28, 1965.

At the conclusion of the council, Father de Lubac's general assessment was divided between satisfaction with the work carried out at the council (with some reservations with regard to schema 13) and with the first acts of Paul VI, whom he never ceased to defend, and a growing concern in the face of secularizing tendencies. This is what is sometimes presented as a "stiffening" of Father de Lubac's views, while others preferred to see in it a fidelity that a shifting context made to appear as a more conservative tendency. He explained his state of mind in a letter to Bernard de Guibert: "Although happy on the whole, I am unable to refrain from some melancholy thoughts. Will all these conciliar texts be strong enough to resist an interpretation of the Christian faith that is weakening and secularizing? Too many people, as you know, are inclined in that direction today, and they have had an opportunity, in the atmosphere created by the council, to push their point of view. Will the desired renewal happen? Are we ready to preach it? I have seen Father Arrupe, a very likeable man. With him, with Paul VI, Providence has provided us with good guides."¹⁰⁸ So he called on the bishops to devote themselves right from the time of the council to an accurate, straightforward explanation of the conciliar texts. This seemed to him to have priority, at which task, moreover, he himself would work by means of several publications.¹⁰⁹

LOÏC FIGOUREUX

Professor of History, Université Lille-III

¹⁰⁸ Letter of November 3, 1965.

¹⁰⁹ One can only indicate a few benchmarks here, without aiming to be exhaustive. In the period immediately after the council, Father de Lubac, in spite of the concerns already set forth, manifested a certain serenity and set to work on the explication of the council. The characteristic texts from this point of view are found in *Paradoxe et mystère de l'Église* (Paris: Aubier, 1967), trans. James R. Dunne as *The Church: Paradox and Mystery* (New York: Ecclesia Press, 1969), *La Révélation divine* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1968, where there is a commentary on the *Prooemium* and chapter 1 of *Dei Verbum*), and *Athéisme et sens de l'homme: Une double requête de "Gaudium et spes"* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1968); the last two works have been reprinted by Éd. du Cerf, *Révélation divine, Affrontements mystiques, Athéisme et sens de l'homme*, in *Œuvres complètes*, vol. 4 (Paris, 2006). Father de Lubac later became more and more troubled by trends of growing importance that interpreted the Second Vatican Council as a transformation, and he published *L'Église dans la crise actuelle* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1969) and *Les Églises particulières dans l'Église universelle* (Paris: Aubier, 1971), trans. by Sr. Sergia Englund, O.C.D., as "Particular Churches in the Universal Church", in *The Motherhood of the Church* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1982), in order to fight against what seemed to him to be false interpretations of the council. Finally, always in this desire to be faithful to *aggiornamento*, he published *Entretien autour de Vatican II*, on the occasion of the synod of 1985, and gave a talk at the plenary session of the Sacred College: "Sur la collégialité épiscopale et la primauté du successeur de Pierre" (On episcopal collegiality and the primacy of the successor of Peter), published in Michel Sales, *Le Corps de l'Église: Études sur l'Église une, sainte, catholique et apostolique* (Paris: Fayard, 1989), 229–30.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Religious Orders

A.A.	Assumptionist
B.A.	Basilian Alepian
B.S.	Basilian Salvatorian
C.I.C.M.	Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary
C.M.	Lazarist
C.M.F.	Claretian
C.PP.S.	Missionary of the Precious Blood
C.S.C.	Holy Cross Father
C.S.Sp.	Spiritan
C.Ss.R.	Redemptorist
M.E.P.	Foreign Missions of Paris
M.S.	Missionary of La Salette
M.S.C.	Missionary of the Sacred Heart
M.S.F.	Missionary of the Holy Family
M.S.F.S.	Missionary of Saint Francis de Sales
O.C.D.	Discalced Carmelite
O.C.S.O.	Cistercian of the Strict Observance (Trappist)
O.F.M.	Franciscan
O.F.M.Cap.	Capuchin
O.F.M.Conv.	Friar Minor Conventual
O.M.I.	Oblate of Mary Immaculate
O.P.	Dominican
O.S.B.	Benedictine
O.S.B.M.	Basilian of Saint Josaphat
O.S.A.	Augustinian
O.S.M.	Servant of Mary (Servant Friar)
O.S.U.	Ursuline
P.B.	White Father
P.S.S.	Sulpician
S.D.B.	Salesian of Don Bosco

S.J.	Jesuit
S.M.	Marist or Marianist
S.M.M.	Montfort Missionary
S.V.D.	Divine Word Missionary (Verbite)

Other Abbreviations

AAS	<i>Acta Apostolice Sedis</i>
ACA	Assembly of Cardinal and Archbishops
ACO	Action catholique ouvrière
AS	<i>Acta synodalia sacrosancti concilii oecumenici Vaticani II</i>
B.I.	Biblical Institute
Card.	Cardinal
CELAM	Latin American Episcopal Conference
CFTC	Confédération française des travailleurs chrétiens
Msgr.	Monsignor
DH	Heinrich Denzinger, <i>Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matter of Faith and Morals</i> , ed. Peter Hünemann, 43rd ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012)

NOTE ON THE TEXT

The version of Father de Lubac's *Notebooks* published here is the result of different stages of redaction. The text taken as a reference for this edition is the manuscript text produced from notes taken day to day at Saint Peter's or in committee. We are familiar with this text thanks to photocopies of the six original notebooks made as documentation by Philippe Levillain, with the assent of Father de Lubac, for the former's thesis *La Mécanique politique de Vatican II: La Majorité et l'unanimité dans un concile* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1975). The notebooks themselves have been lost. This text was then typed out, but it is not known precisely when¹ or by whom. It is nevertheless possible that it was the work of Brother Mouton, S.J., given the fact that he had done typing for Father de Lubac on other occasions. Whatever the case, this typewritten version presents some slight modifications in relation to the manuscript version. Most often this involves brief pieces of information or judgments on some particular intervention or Father or expert. We have indicated these additions or changes in a note, preceded by an asterisk. An asterisk also marks its place in the body of the text. Finally, we have found, at Namur and at Vanves, a third stage of redaction. In fact, in the Molette collection then on deposit at the Henri de Lubac Archives Center, there is the typewritten version augmented, for the preparatory period only, with important additions, undated, in Father de Lubac's own hand and with the title changed from *Cahiers* to *Carnets*.² These sometimes involve simple, very short details, but Father de Lubac also produces the text of letters to which he refers, following a procedure not unlike the voluminous notes of his *Mémoire sur l'occasion de mes écrits* (*At the Service of the Church*). In a few rare cases, some passages are deleted. Here also, we have kept the manuscript text as our basis and have indicated the additions or deletions in a note with an asterisk. At Vanves rare additions were found to

¹ See the introduction for theories about this.

² The words are synonymous, and both are translated here as "notebooks". – TRANS.

the typewritten version, this time concerning the conciliar period itself and appearing here in the notes.

The numerous people cited by Father de Lubac are almost all the subject of a short biographical note where they are first mentioned. These notes are confined to the conciliar period, except when the people in question later occupied positions of particular importance. Mistakes in proper names have been corrected, without indicating the error in a note, if there was no doubt about the identity of the person in question. On the other hand, we have chosen to keep the incorrect name in the body of the text when it departs significantly from the true name, or what we suppose to be the true name, with a note indicating this.

Other notes attempt to explain allusions, help in the comprehension of the operation of the council, and sometimes correct errors, due in particular to a lack of distance.

The appendices are intended to provide various aids to a better understanding of this conciliar journal. Thus we have indicated the subject of the paragraphs under discussion during the council sessions or intersessions, of which Father de Lubac sometimes mentions only the number. One should take particular care, when consulting these references, to check the date of discussion of the texts, since these sometimes underwent very important modifications in the course of the sessions and intersessions. A list of members of the Preparatory Theological Commission and of the conciliar commissions, a presentation of the different governing bodies of the council and of the course followed by a conciliar text, a glossary, and some chronological benchmarks try to make the consultation easier.

We could not have accomplished this work alone, and we would like to thank all those who contributed to the present publication. First of all, this book would not have been possible without Father Dumortier, S.J., provincial of France and beneficiary of Father de Lubac, and Father Nicolas-Jean Sèd, O.P., managing director of Éditions du Cerf. Numerous archivists willingly answered our questions, notably Father Robert Bonfils, S.J., archivist of the French Province, and Madame Gosset, archivist of the Province of Southern Belgium. We have also been able to count on the warm encouragement, wise advice, and answers of Jacques Prévotat, professor of modern history at the University of Lille-III, of Father Georges Chantraine, S.J., and of Father Michel Sales, S.J. Anne showed great patience when it was necessary to compare the typed

and manuscript versions. Éric Mahieu, whose work on Congar³ was a valuable resource, graciously reread a part of this work. Finally, last but not least, we would like very particularly to thank Father Leo Declerck, fine connoisseur of the council, whose help was as constant as it was indispensable. It goes without saying that we are solely responsible for any errors or inaccuracies that might be found in this edition.

Loïc FIGOUREUX

³ Yves Congar, *Mon Journal du Concile*, ed. Éric Mahieu, 2 vols. (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 2002), trans. Mary John Ronayne, O.P., and Mary Cecily Boulding, O.P., as *My Journal of the Council* (Hindmarsh: ATF Press, 2012).

SIX "COUNCIL NOTEBOOKS"

July 25, 1960. – At Fourvière, where I settled in again a few days ago,¹ I received an official notice, signed: Tardini,² that names me as a consultant for the Preparatory Theological Commission³ at the council. I had heard about this some time earlier, through an issue of *La Croix*, read in the parlor of a convent, but I wondered if this astonishing piece of news could be correct.

August 6, 1960. – I received a letter from Cardinal Ottaviani,¹ explaining the role of the consultants on this commission and enjoining me to secrecy from now on.

November 11, 1960. – Arrived in Rome. I am lodging at the Biblical Institute, where I saw Frs. Haulotte,¹ Lyonnet,² des Places,³ and Philip⁴ (who had come from the Gregorian).⁵ In the afternoon, Dom

July 25

¹ This refers to the Jesuit scholasticate in Lyon from which H. de Lubac had been removed back in 1950. Since 1954, however, he had divided his time between rue Sala, in Lyon, and Paris.

² Domenico Tardini (1888–1961), Italian, ordained in 1912. Pro-secretary of state for Pius XII from 1952, he became secretary of state for John XXIII in December 1958, a position he occupied until his death on July 30, 1961.

³ This was one of the eleven commissions that, together with the three secretariats, were at work during the preparatory phase of the council, opened by John XXIII on June 5, 1960. They prepared the texts that were to be submitted to the council Fathers. These commissions and the secretariats were headed by a Central Preparatory Commission.

August 6

¹ Alfredo Ottaviani (1890–1979), Italian, ordained in 1916. Assessor of the Holy Office in 1935, he was created cardinal in 1953, then named secretary of the Holy Office in 1959. He presided over the Preparatory Theological Commission, then over the Doctrinal Commission. In 1966, he became pro-prefect of the new Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

November 11

¹ Edgar Haulotte, S.J. (1920–1989), French. Professor of exegesis.

² Stanislas Lyonnet, S.J. (1902–1986), French, ordained in 1934. He taught Sacred Scripture at Fourvière beginning in 1938. Then he was professor of exegesis and theology at the Biblical Institute. He had to cease teaching, however, at the request of the Holy Office, at the end of the academic year 1961–1962, until July 1964.

³ Édouard Barbou des Places, S.J. (1900–2000), French, ordained in 1931. A specialist in Greek studies, from 1948 on he taught Greek religion and philosophy in their relation to the New Testament at the Biblical Institute.

⁴ Octave Philip, S.J. (1893–1971), French, ordained in 1922. Bursar at the Gregorian from 1955 to 1967.

⁵ The Pontifical Gregorian University was founded by Ignatius of Loyola and Francis Borgia in 1553. Pius XI in 1928 associated it with the Biblical Institute, founded by Pius X on May 7, 1909. Both were entrusted to the Jesuits.

Jean Leclercq⁶ brought me to the house of the Cistercians of the Common Observance, on the Aventine; young monks from every country are assembled there: Cistercians, Trappists, Benedictines; conversed first of all with a small group of thesis students, then with the whole group (around thirty).

November 12. — This morning saw Fr. Donatien Mollat,¹ Fr. Pin,² Fr. Évode Beaucamp, O.F.M.³ Fr. Lyonnet showed me his mimeographed response to an attack that appeared in May in *Divinitas*, the journal of the Lateran.⁴ Fr. Leclercq told me about the death of Erik Peterson,⁵ a few days ago; since our first meeting in 1953, in the church of St. Louis des Français, and our common prayer at Saint-Eustache, I greatly loved the man. In the afternoon, visited Fr. Philippe de la Trinité⁶ (whom I knew long ago as a student of philosophy at Mongré,⁷ in 1923–1924) at San Pancrazio; his Spanish confreres have persuaded him of the authenticity of Canticle B of St. John of the Cross. In my free moments, read in the

⁶Dom Jean Leclercq, French Benedictine (1911–1993) of St. Maurice Abbey in Clervaux (Luxembourg). A specialist in the monastic history and spirituality of the Middle Ages, author of, in particular, *L'Amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1957); trans. Catharine Misrahi as *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (New York: Fordham Univ. Press, 1961).

November 12

¹Donatien Mollat, S.J. (1904–1977), French, ordained in 1935. Exegete, professor of Sacred Scripture at Fourvière, then at the Gregorian from 1959 on, he was a specialist in the Johannine writings.

²Émile Pin, S.J., born in 1921, French. Professor of general and religious sociology at the Gregorian.

³Évode Beaucamp, O.F.M. (1917–1997), French. Professor of Sacred Scripture at the Lateran University.

⁴Quarterly journal, published since 1957, of the Lateran University. The origin of the university goes back to 1773, when Clement XIV entrusted the faculty of philosophy and theology of the Roman college to the clergy of Rome. It became a pontifical university by decision of John XXIII, in May 1959.

⁵Erik Peterson (1890–1960), German, converted to Catholicism in 1930. A friend of Karl Barth, theologian and historian of religions, he was hostile to Nazism and took refuge in Rome in 1933. He is famous for his book *Le Monothéisme comme problème politique* (Leipzig: Jakob Hegner, 1935). He died on October 26.

⁶Philippe de la Trinité (Jean Rambaud), O.C.D. (1908–1977), French, ordained in 1934. He entered the Holy Office in 1952, and, starting the next year, he also presided over the Roman theology faculty of the order [Discalced Carmelites]. He ceased teaching, however, in 1960.

⁷Notre Dame de Mongré, an establishment run by the Jesuits, at Villefranche-sur-Saône, that H. de Lubac attended as a student from 1909–1911. In 1923–1924 he spent the regency period of his Jesuit formation there, between his years of philosophy and theology, and became an aide to the prefect of studies of the college.

library of the B.I.:⁸ Farrar,⁹ on the history of exegesis; Buteonus,¹⁰ on Noah's Ark, etc.

November 13. – At the Abbey of St. Jerome.¹ High Mass. Conversation with Father Grégoire,² a Belgian, who is preparing a thesis on St. Bruno of Segni; conversed also with Frs. Leclercq, Gribomont,³ Thibaut,⁴ etc. After lunch, recreation in the living room of the abbot, Dom Salmon;⁵ made the acquaintance of Msgr. Jacqueline,⁶ chaplain of the Chateaubriand school, who is finishing a thesis on Saint Bernard and Roman pontifical law;⁷ and of Leonardi,⁸ scriptor at the Vatican and a member of the Italian Historical Institute for the Middle Ages. At the

⁸ Biblical Institute.

⁹ Frederic W. Farrar (1831–1903), British. A well-known writer and Anglican preacher, he wrote several works of fiction as well as important philological and theological studies, including *History of Interpretation* (1884) and *The Life of Christ* (1884).

¹⁰ Pseudonym of Jean Borrel, author of the *Opera geometrica*, published at Lyon in 1554. In this work he studies many subjects, among them the construction of Noah's ark.

November 13

¹ Benedictine abbey in Rome, instituted in 1933 by Pius XI for the revision of the Vulgate.

² Réginald Grégoire, O.S.B., born in 1935, Belgian. He worked in the service of the Holy See from 1957 to 1983, collaborating on the critical edition of the Vulgate. His thesis, *Bruno de Segni: Exégète médiéval et théologien monastique* (Spoleto, Centro di studi sull'alto medioevo), was published in 1965.

³ Jean Gribomont, O.S.B. (1920–1986), Belgian, a monk of Clervaux (Luxemburg). Editor of the critical edition of the Vulgate. Specialist in patristics, he was also open to ecumenical questions.

⁴ Michel Thibaut, O.S.B. (1877–1962), Belgian, ordained in 1902, with the name Raymond in religion. A monk of the Benedictine abbey of Saint-Benoît de Maredsous (Belgium). Former editor of the *Revue bénédictine* from 1905 to 1914. He was the disciple of Dom Columba Marmion, abbot of Maredsous from 1900 to 1923 and spiritual master.

⁵ Pierre Salmon, O.S.B. (1896–1982), French, ordained in 1924. Abbot of Saint-Jérôme, expert at the council during the first two sessions, he was named titular bishop in June 1964.

⁶ Bernard Jacqueline (1918–2007), French, ordained in 1944, *minutante* [a kind of secretary] for the Congregation of Propaganda and chaplain of the Chateaubriand school in Rome, a school created at the beginning of the twentieth century at the instigation of the French ambassador to the Holy See to permit French or foreign children in Rome to receive their education in French.

⁷ Bernard Jacqueline had already defended, in 1949, a thesis on "Pontifical Law according to Saint Bernard of Clairvaux: An Essay on Ecclesiastical Law in the Middle Ages", at the Institut catholique in Paris, but he was continuing his research on "Episcopate and Papacy in Saint Bernard of Clairvaux", a thesis that he defended at Paris-IV in 1971.

⁸ Claudio Leonardi, born in 1926, Italian. Scientific secretary at the Istituto storico italiano per il medioevo (Italian Historical Institute for the Middle Ages); founded in 1883 to "unify the publication of national historical sources", it became the Istituto storico italiano per il medioevo in 1934; scriptor (a member of the scientific body of the Vatican Library charged with the production of catalogues, inventories, and bibliographic instruments) for the Latin manuscripts in the Vatican Library.

end of the afternoon, reception at the Villa Buonaparte⁹ (the embassy close to the Vatican); there I saw again Archbishop Perrin¹⁰ (Carthage)*¹¹ and Archbishop Veillot (Angers).¹² Saw Bishop Mercier (Sahara).¹³ Msgr. Girard,¹⁴ superior general of the Sulpicians, introduced me to his friend and former student*¹⁵ Father Gagnebet, O.P.¹⁶ – The Assistant¹⁷ (de Gorostarzu)¹⁸ caught sight of me (I was sitting); he came up to me, flanked by two tall men whose arms he was holding: “Ah, hello! I want to present these two journalists to you, they are very dear friends of mine”, and then he went away, leaving me with L’Hopital, from *Le Monde*, and a correspondent from *Paris-Soir*.¹⁹

November 14. – Ceremony at Saint Peter’s, where I was driven by Father Georges Jarlot,^{1,*2} in the right-hand gallery in the apse. The pope arrived to the chanting of the Credo. On the throne, underneath the chair of Bernini, he read his speech, with an appearance as tranquil as a nice old grandfather reading his newspaper after dinner. A chant. And

⁹Since 1950, the French embassy to the Holy See has been located in this building, erected in 1750 by Cardinal Silvio Valenti Gonzaga, secretary of state for Benedict XIV.

¹⁰Paul Marie Perrin (1904–1994), French, ordained in 1936. Auxiliary bishop, then archbishop of Carthage from 1947 to 1964, he was named apostolic delegate to Iraq in July 1964, then archbishop of Baghdad in August 1965. Member of the Commission for the Missions.

¹¹* “Who had given me such a kind reception in Tunis at the time of Archbishop Gounot.”

¹²Pierre Veillot (1913–1968), French, ordained in 1939. Bishop of Angers since 1959, he was named coadjutor of the archbishop of Paris in July 1961. He became archbishop of Paris in 1966 and remained so until his death. He was created cardinal in 1967. Member of the Commission for Bishops and the Government of Dioceses.

¹³Georges Mercier, P.B. [Père Blanc, a member of the White Fathers] (1902–1991), French, ordained in 1928. Bishop of Laghouat (Algeria) from 1955 to 1968.

¹⁴Pierre Girard, P.S.S. [a Sulpician] (1892–1974), French. Superior of the university seminary in Lyon from 1934 to 1945, then of the Seminary of Saint Irenaeus from 1945 to 1952, he was superior general of the Society of Saint Sulpice from 1952 to 1966. Expert at the council beginning with the second session.

¹⁵* “Seminary of Clermont-Ferrand”.

¹⁶Rosaire Gagnebet, O.P. (1904–1983), French, taught theology at the Angelicum. He was a qualifier, then, in 1964, consultant to the Congregation of the Holy Office. Member of the Preparatory Theological Commission, he was named an expert in 1962.

¹⁷Adviser to the Jesuit superior general for an Assistancy (a country or group of countries of the Society).

¹⁸Bernard de Gorostarzu, S.J. (1890–1970), French. Assistant for France from 1944 to 1963.

¹⁹There must be confusion here with *France-Soir*, whose correspondent was Jean Neuvecelle.

November 14

¹Georges Jarlot, S.J. (1894–1980), French, ordained in 1925. Professor of social doctrine at the Gregorian from 1950 to 1974, he is the author of *Doctrine pontificale et histoire*, 2 vols. (1964 and 1973), on social teaching from Leo XIII to Benedict XV and on Pius XI. He was a member of the Preparatory Commission for the Lay Apostolate.

²* “An old friend from the Jersey novitiate”.

John XXIII,³ after having shaken the hands of all the cardinals, departed on the Sedia, hailed by applause. A banal and empty ceremony. I did not understand the speech, in Italian; I was told it contained nothing very particular.

Saw Fr. Leloir,⁴ from St. Jerome, again, who had come to work at the Biblical Institute; he gave me some details about the mixed committee (Jesuits and Benedictines) charged with correcting the new Psalter; the directives given by Cardinal Bea,⁵ the president, were: 1/ the new text is to be taken as the base; 2/ return to the language of Augustine and Jerome; 3/ consider the chant; 4/ consider its liturgical usage. It does not seem like the committee is going to be very active.

Saw Fr. Dumeige⁶ and Fr. Alfaro⁷ at the Gregorian; the latter has little respect for his compatriot Fr. Alonso, C.M.F. [a Claretian], as a theologian.

Met Father Salaverri,⁸ accompanied by a young Spanish priest, under the cloister of the Biblico [the Pontifical Biblical Institute]. After greeting him, I told him that he had been mistaken, or rather that he had been misled, in the campaign he made against Fourvière in 1949–1951. Then I congratulated him on the fine collection that he had just brought out and that had appeared very recently in the publications of Comillas. We are to see each other again tomorrow morning at the Holy Office.

November 15. — At 8:45 A.M., I entered the Holy Office.¹ (I had come there once before, in September 1946, to visit Msgr. Ottaviani, to

³ Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli (1881–1963), Italian, ordained in 1904. Nuncio in France from 1944 to 1953, he was created cardinal in 1953 and became patriarch of Venice. Elected pope on October 28, 1958, he was beatified in September 2000.

⁴ Dom Louis Leloir, O.S.B. (1911–1992), Belgian, from the abbey of Clervaux (Luxembourg), ordained in 1935. He was working at the time on a doctorate in theology.

⁵ Augustin Bea, S.J. (1881–1968), German, ordained in 1912. Confessor of Pius XII, rector of the Biblical Institute from 1930–1949. He was created cardinal in 1959. President of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity in June 1960.

⁶ Gervais Dumeige, S.J. (1913–1996), French, ordained in 1946. Professor of ecclesiastical history and prefect of studies for the theologates at Enghien (Belgium) and at Chantilly, he taught at the Gregorian from 1960 on.

⁷ Juan Alfaro, S.J. (1914–1993), Spanish. Professor of dogmatics at the Gregorian, where he was general prefect of studies from 1964 on.

⁸ Joaquín Salaverri, S.J. (1892–1979), Spanish, professor of theology at the Pontifical University of Comillas (Spain). Consultor to the Preparatory Theological Commission, then named council expert in 1962.

November 15

¹ Roman congregation, descended from the Inquisition and charged with examining doctrinal questions. The prefect of the congregation was the pope himself. Also called *Suprema Congregatio*, it became the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 1965.

whom I had offered the last two volumes that had then been published of *Sources Chrétiennes*,² and who had given me in return his treatise on the Public Law of the Church,³ with a beautiful inscription). In the little waiting room, where I was the second to arrive, I found myself face to face with Father Labourdette, O.P.,⁴ who had arrived first.*⁵ At 9 A.M., opening meeting of the commission. Cardinal Ottaviani told me that he remembered my visit in 1946. Some explanations in Latin were given in turn by the cardinal president⁶ and Father Sébastien Tromp, S.J.,⁷ the secretary. I greeted Fr. Van den Eynde, O.F.M.,⁸ Msgr. Schmaus⁹ (Munich), etc. Don Carlo Colombo,¹⁰ superior of the seminary in Milan, has a friendly, smiling face. I was driven back to the Biblical Institute by Father Philippe, O.P.,¹¹ who also took along his confreres Labourdette and Gagnebet.

I swore an oath on the Gospel¹² that Cardinal Ottaviani held on his knees.

² A series of patristic texts, started by Fathers Claude Mondésert, S.J., Daniélou, S.J., and de Lubac, S.J., the first volumes of which appeared in 1942. On this subject, reference can be made to the book by É. Fouilloux, *La Collection "Sources chrétiennes": Éditer les Pères de l'Église au XX^e siècle* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1995).

³ A. Ottaviani, *Institutiones juris publici ecclesiastici* (Rome: TPV, 1947–1948).

⁴ Michel Labourdette, O.P. (1908–1990), French. Professor of moral theology at the Dominican *studium* in Toulouse. Consultor to the Preparatory Theological Commission, then named as an expert to the council in 1962. Member of the Pontifical Commission for the Study of Population, the Family, and Birth. According to H. de Lubac, this was their first meeting. Father Labourdette had been at the origin of a theological controversy with the Jesuits, particularly on the subject of the place of Scholasticism, in 1946.

⁵ * "Brief exchange, cordial".

⁶ This was Alfredo Ottaviani.

⁷ Sebastiaan Tromp, S.J. (1889–1975), Dutch, professor of theology at the Gregorian from 1929 to 1967. Secretary of the Preparatory Theological Commission, then of the Doctrinal Commission. He was also a consultor to the Congregation of the Holy Office. Expert at the council.

⁸ Damien Van den Eynde, O.F.M. (1902–1969), Belgian. Rector of the Antonianum, member of the Preparatory Theological Commission, named an expert to the council in 1962. He contributed in particular to the drafting of the preparatory schema *De fontibus revelationis* and to the liturgical constitution *Sacrosanctum concilium*.

⁹ Michael Schmaus (1897–1993), Austrian. Professor of theology at the University of Munich until 1966. Member of the Preparatory Theological Commission, he was named an expert in 1962.

¹⁰ Carlo Colombo (1909–1991), Italian, ordained in 1931. Professor of dogmatic theology at the Seminary of Milan. Member of the Preparatory Theological Commission, expert at the council during the first two sessions. He was also Giovanni Battista Montini's private expert. He became auxiliary bishop of Milan, a position he held from 1964 to 1985.

¹¹ Paul Philippe, O.P. (1905–1984), French, ordained in 1932. Commissioner of the Holy Office from 1955 to 1959, then secretary of the Congregation for Religious. He was a member of the antepreparatory commission. He became titular bishop in August 1962 and was named a member of the Commission for Religious at the time of the first session. Created cardinal in 1973, he was prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches from 1973 to 1980.

¹² He is referring to the oath of secrecy regarding the work undertaken by the Preparatory Theological Commission.

At the Gregorian, I saw Frs. Philip, Blet,¹³ Lonergan.¹⁴ Saw at the Biblical Institute several young priests and old Father Alberto Vaccari,¹⁵ happy to tell me his memories of Beirut.

Visited Cardinal Paolo Marella,¹⁶ *¹⁷ on via della Conciliazione; he showed me in detail his beautiful library of Far-Eastern religions, as well as, in a large alcove, a library made up exclusively of Japanese works: many were ancient, magnificently illustrated, laid out in rolls or in sheets, the latter in boxes. We were admiring them at full speed when someone came to announce Archbishop Guerry¹⁸ of Cambrai; the cardinal made him wait so that he could finish showing me his treasures.

November 16. – This morning once again at the Holy Office. I saw Fr. Leclercq,¹ Oblate of M.I., a very likeable man. He is Fr. Tromp's secretary for the Theological Commission, at the same time as he is working at the Holy Office. We talked about Teilhard,² etc. Then he led me into the library, where I was welcomed by Fr. Hendrix,³ one of the German

¹³ Pierre Blet, S.J., born in 1918, French, ordained in 1950. Professor of modern history at the Gregorian from 1959 on, he revived in particular the history of pontifical diplomacy. He was one of the group of four Jesuits to whom Paul VI opened the Vatican's secret archives to permit them to study the actions of the Catholic Church during the Second World War and to publish the volumes of the *Actes et documents du Saint-Siège relatifs à la Seconde Guerre mondiale*, 11 vols. (1965–1981).

¹⁴ Bernard Lonergan, S.J. (1904–1984), Canadian, ordained in 1936. Theologian, philosopher, he was professor of theology at the Gregorian from 1953 to 1965. An expert at the council beginning with the third session.

¹⁵ Alberto Vaccari, S.J. (1875–1965), Italian, ordained in 1905. Professor of Old Testament exegesis at the Biblical Institute from 1912 to 1959, he was also a professor at Saint Joseph University in Beirut. Member of the Preparatory Theological Commission, expert at the council.

¹⁶ Paolo Marella (1895–1984), Italian, ordained in 1918. Apostolic nuncio to France from 1953 until February 1960. He was president of the preparatory commission, then of the conciliar Commission for Bishops and the Government of Dioceses. A member of the Secretariat for Unity from 1963 on. President of the Secretariat for Non-Christians. For a long time he was apostolic delegate to Tokyo (1933–1948), which enabled him to build up this rich library on Far-Eastern religions.

¹⁷ * "Former nuncio in Paris, who had been very good to me there".

¹⁸ Émile Guerry (1891–1969), French, ordained in 1923. Archbishop of Cambrai from 1952 to 1966. Member of the Commission for Bishops and the Government of Dioceses.

November 16

¹ Michel Leclercq, O.M.I., born in 1926, French, ordained in 1951. From 1959 until 1962, he was a *scrittore* at the Holy Office for work in the French language. *Minutante* [a kind of secretary] for the Preparatory Theological Commission.

² Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, S.J. (1881–1955), French, ordained in 1911. Intensely interested in the sciences, he thought that the Christian tradition did not contradict them but that the two could be combined in a harmonious synthesis. In particular, he believed that Christian faith and evolution were compatible. The Holy Office, however, was disturbed by his positions and his influence, and the majority of his non-scientific writings were not published during his lifetime.

³ He is actually referring to Wilhelm Hentrich, S.J. (1887–1972), German, ordained in 1917. Private librarian of Pius XII from 1942 until his death. A consultor to the Holy Office from 1955 on. (Information communicated by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith).

Jesuits on familiar terms with Pius XII.⁴ It was on the ground floor; the window looks out on the courtyard of the Inquisition; in the prison, they tell me, they now store potatoes. I can guess the clever secrecy in the lay-out of the chambers.

At noon, at the Ursuline Sisters' on via Nomentana, I had lunch with Fr. Stanislas Lyonnet. A certain number of Mothers passed by. Chatted with the elderly Mother Saint-Jean,⁵ who seems more robust than ever.*⁶

In the afternoon, a visit with the mother abbess of Rabat,⁷ a woman from Lyon, spiritual daughter of Father Monchanin.⁸ She founded a religious community at Nazareth. With the support of Msgr. Baron⁹ in Rome, she, along with her entire monastery of Poor Clares in Rabat, went over to the Eastern rite. Cardinal Bea drove me to his house, on via Aurelia (the Brazilian College); a good and simple man, he spoke to me about Taizé, etc. His secretariat for Christian unity doubles as a secretariat for the Jews.¹⁰

November 17. – This morning, at the Gregorian, consulted some journals. Spoke with Fr. Gathier,¹ who has just been named a consultor to the Commission for Studies; he gave me his recent book on Hindu thought.*² Also saw the Rev. Fr. René Arnou,³ who is making at this

⁴Eugenio Pacelli (1876–1958), Italian, ordained in 1899. Secretary of the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs from 1914 to 1917, then nuncio to Germany, he was created cardinal in 1929 and became secretary of state in 1930. He was elected pope on March 2, 1939.

⁵Marie de Saint-Jean Martin, O.S.U. (1876–1965), French. Prioress General of her order from 1926 to 1959.

*⁶“She had taken me in with great courtesy and care in 1953.”

⁷Mother Véronique of the Holy Face (Clotilde Vacheron) (1909–1981), French. Superior of the Poor Clares of Rabat in 1936. In 1958, she founded the first Poor Clare monastery in the Greek Melchite Church, at Nazareth. She had been profoundly affected by Father de Lubac's book *Catholicism*.

⁸Jules Monchanin (1895–1957), French, ordained in 1922. He was strongly interested in the ecumenical, scientific, and philosophical activities of his time. In 1939, he left for India, where he founded a small contemplative hermitage with Father Le Saux. After the council, Henri de Lubac wrote *Images de l'abbé Monchanin* (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1967). Also see the works of François Jacquin, especially *Jules Monchanin, prêtre: 1895–1957* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1996).

⁹André Baron (1893–1981), French, ordained in 1930. Rector of Saint-Louis-des-Français from 1949 to 1962. In 1960 named a consultor to the Preparatory Commission for Religious.

¹⁰The Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, created on June 5, 1960, by John XXIII, was charged with strengthening relations with non-Catholic Christians but also with Judaism.

November 17

¹Émile Gathier, S.J. (1892–1963), French. Professor of Hindu philosophy at the Gregorian. He was the author of *La Pensée hindoue: Étude suivie d'un choix de textes* (Paris: Éd. du Seuil, 1960).

*²“He knew Abbot Monchanin well in India.”

³René Arnou, S.J. (1884–1972), French, ordained in 1915. Professor of philosophy from 1926, then of dogmatic theology from 1932 on, at the Gregorian. In 1958, he became major superior of the interprovincial Jesuit houses in Rome up until 1964.

time a visitation at the Gregorian. He strongly desires an internationalization of the Curia. Like me, he had noticed the pope's speech *in Italian*, Monday, at St. Peter's.

Had lunch at the embassy, invited by Mr. de la Tournelle.⁴ Cardinals Liénart⁵ and Bea were also present. Saw Count d'Harcourt,⁶ nephew of the one I used to know. Mr. de Sayve,⁷ adviser to the ambassador, exhorted me to prepare a "revolutionary" council; I asked him what he meant by that. At the table, I sat beside Fr. Delos, O.P.,⁸ ecclesiastical adviser;^{*9} we talked about Fr. Fessard's¹⁰ last book (which he did not accept – although he was moderate in his remarks). Chatted also with Msgr. Girard^{*11} and with two young priests from Lille,¹² who were preparing their theses and living at St.-Louis des Français.

At 4 P.M., at the Reformed Cistercians'. I first of all admired, in the hollow of the small valley, the beautiful church of Three Fountains, which dates from the origins of the Order. Nearby, on the hill, a new monastery houses the abbot general of the Trappists (Dom Sortais)¹³ and the students. Chatted a moment with Bishop Suhr¹⁴ of Copenhagen, a Benedictine, former prior of Saint-Jérôme; he spoke to me about

⁴ Guy Le Roy de la Tournelle (1898–1982), French diplomat. French ambassador to the Holy See from 1959 to 1964.

⁵ Achille Liénart (1884–1973), French, ordained in 1907. Bishop of Lille from 1928 to 1968, created cardinal in 1930, president of the ACA [Assembly of Cardinals and Archbishops] in 1949. He was a member of the Central Preparatory Commission, then, during the council, a member of the Board of Presidency and the Coordinating Commission.

⁶ Bernard d'Harcourt (1905–1966), representative of the French Association of the Order of Malta to the Grand Master of the Order of Malta in Rome. He was the nephew of Robert d'Harcourt (1881–1965), French, former professor of German language and literature, member of the Académie française, and himself the nephew of Albert de Mun.

⁷ Olivier de Sayve, adviser to the French Embassy to the Holy See from 1958 to 1961.

⁸ Thomas Delos, O.P. (1891–1975), French, ordained in 1922. Adviser of the French Embassy to the Holy See and professor of public law at the Angelicum.

⁹ * "In contact with Bruno de Solages: social studies groups in Fribourg".

¹⁰ Gaston Fessard, S.J. (1897–1978), French, ordained in 1928. Philosopher, editor of the journal *Études*, in 1941 he wrote *France, prends garde de perdre ton âme*, the first installment of *Témoignage chrétien*, then *France, prends garde de perdre ta liberté* in 1945, faced with the rise of Marxism. He was the "philosopher of human liberty created by God and called forth by him". His last book was *De l'actualité historique* (Paris: Desclée, 1960).

¹¹ * "Who had so often received me at Lyon long ago, the superior of the university seminary".

¹² One of them was Gérard Nottebaere, born in 1932, French, ordained in 1956. He had been studying at Rome since 1957.

¹³ Gabriel Sortais, O.C.S.O. (1902–1963), French. Abbot of Bellefontaine from 1936 to 1951, he became general of the Trappists in 1951 and remained so until his death.

¹⁴ Johannes Theodor Suhr, O.S.B. (1896–1997), Danish, ordained in 1933. Bishop of Copenhagen from 1953 to 1964. Member of the Central Preparatory Commission.

Father Roos, S.J.,¹⁵ whom I know; he was not happy about being summoned to Rome for no other reason, he told me, than to hear a speech from the pope; there had not been a single meeting of his commission (Central Commission?). I gave a talk in front of about thirty young monks. Interventions from Dom Jean Leclercq and from Dom Olivier Rousseau¹⁶ (from the Benedictine priory of Chevetogne).¹⁷ The atmosphere was fervent, very pleasant. As we were beginning to speak about the study of the Church Fathers, an American, no doubt a student at the Angelicum,¹⁸ stood up and said to me: "But the Church tells us to study the doctrine of Saint Thomas!" Clarifications from Dom Leclercq, Dom Rousseau, and myself. Next we went to Vespers, in the new church, which resembles the one at Sept-Fons in its present state.

November 18. – This morning, worked. (I am noting down nothing that relates to the Theological Commission.) Saw Fr. Donatien Mollat again. Father R. Araud,¹ who is at the Bellarmino,² came to see me; he had asked Father Boyer,³ the rector, to invite me, but his suggestion was not accepted. After lunch, meeting in my room with some professors of the Biblical Institute, who were wondering about the doctrinal and pastoral repercussions of their science. In the afternoon, caught sight of Fr. Labourdette, who had come to see Fr. Lyonnet, to speak with him about original sin in Scripture and in St. Thomas.

¹⁵Heinrich Roos, S.J. (1904–1977), Danish. Professor of philosophy at the University of Copenhagen.

¹⁶Olivier Rousseau, O.S.B. (1898–1984), Belgian. Monk of Chevetogne, editor of the journal *Irenikon*, his particular interests were liturgy, ecumenism, and monastic life.

¹⁷It was founded at the end of 1925 by Dom Lambert Beauduin (1873–1960), who wished to found a monastery dedicated to Christian unity. Installed first at Amay-sur-Meuse, the community moved to Chevetogne (in the diocese of Namur) in 1939. The priory was raised to the rank of abbey in 1990.

¹⁸Saint Thomas Aquinas College, held by the Dominicans, which received pontifical title in 1906 and became a pontifical university in March 1963.

November 18

¹Régis Araud, S.J. (1925–1993), French, ordained in 1957. At the time he was completing a two-year program in moral theology in Rome and in 1962 became professor of moral theology at Fourvière.

²Jesuit college in Rome, where, among others, Jesuits studying in the various Roman universities reside.

³Charles Boyer, S.J. (1884–1980), French, ordained in 1916. Professor of theology at the Gregorian until 1962, he was the founder of the *Unitas* center and of the journal of the same name, created in 1946, official bodies of the Vatican's unionism. Also rector of the Bellarmino from 1955 to 1961, he organized many Thomist conferences in Rome. He was named a member of the Secretariat for Unity in 1960, then an expert to the council in 1962.

At 6 P.M. I gave a lecture in the great hall of the Biblical Institute on “the study of the Bible in the twelfth century”. Numerous students from just about everywhere. At the end, I exchanged views with some of those present.

November 19. – This morning, for the first time during this stay, I ventured into Rome. The Church of Saint Pudentiana and Saint Mary Major. At the Oriental Institute,¹ visited with Frs. Hausherr² and Goubert;³ at the Russicum,⁴ visited Fr. Tyszkiewicz.⁵ Fr. Hausherr had me read a recent article by Fr. Louis Bouyer,⁶ published in *Contacts*,⁷ a French Orthodox journal. He promised me that he would very shortly write the chapter that I had asked from him for the collective work being edited by Fr. Ravier.⁸ He spoke to me very highly of J. A. Cattat.⁹

At the end of the morning, saw Fr. Magrassi, O.S.B.,¹⁰ from the abbey in Genoa, presently in Rome, vice-rector of the Maronite college.¹¹ He

November 19

¹ Institute founded by Benedict XV on September 15, 1917, and incorporated into the Gregorian University by Pius XI in September 1928.

² Irénée Hausherr, S.J. (1891–1978), French, ordained in 1923. Philologist and theologian, he taught at the Oriental Institute of Rome from 1927. In 1934, he occupied the chair of spiritual theology.

³ Paul Goubert, S.J. (1901–1967), French. Specialist in Byzantine history, he was a professor at the Institut catholique of Lyon.

⁴ Pontifical college of Rome, entrusted to the Jesuits, founded in 1929 by Pius XI for the formation of clergy destined for Russia.

⁵ Stanisław Tyszkiewicz, S.J. (1887–1962), Ukrainian, belonging to the Austrian Province, ordained in 1915. He had been teaching at the Russicum since 1931, dealing especially with young ecclesiastics of the Byzantine rite.

⁶ Louis Bouyer (1913–2004), French. Theologian, Lutheran pastor until the Second World War, he became a priest of the Oratory in 1944 and taught at the Institut catholique of Paris until 1963, then in England, Spain, and the United States. Consultor to the Preparatory Commission for Studies and Seminaries at Vatican II, he was a consultor for the liturgy, the Congregation for Worship, and the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. He was one of the figures of the biblical and liturgical movements and a co-founder of the journal *Communio*.

⁷ *Contacts: Revue française de l'orthodoxie*, founded in 1949 by Jean Balzon; a journal of theology and spirituality.

⁸ André Ravier, S.J. (1905–1999), French, ordained in 1937. Superior of the Jesuit Province of Lyon from 1951 to 1957, he was then editor of *Études* and dedicated himself especially to works on spirituality (on Francis de Sales in particular). The collective work that he edited was *La Mystique et les Mystiques* (Paris and Tournai: Desclée De Brouwer, 1965). In this book, Father Hausherr wrote the chapter “Les Premières générations chrétiennes”.

⁹ Jacques Albert Cattat (1909–1989), Swiss, diplomat and orientalist, he was a specialist in the study of religions.

¹⁰ Andrea Magrassi, O.S.B. (1930–2004), Italian, ordained in 1953.

¹¹ College founded by Gregory XIII in 1584. It is one of the many colleges of Rome for the formation of clerics.

is the author of a thesis on Rupert de Deutz¹² which should soon be translated (adapted) into French. He is going to hasten the completion of the first volume on Rupert to appear in our *Sources*.

Lunched at the Gregorian. In the cafe, with Fr. Arnou (delegato)¹³ and the rector (Muñoz-Vega).¹⁴ After the break, Fr. Henri Vignon¹⁵ showed me, with a good deal of commentary, the Gregorian's *Vota*¹⁶ for the council. It was insane. These good Fathers would each like to canonize in solemn fashion their own little obsessions. Sectarianism and puerility. Fr. Édouard Dhanis¹⁷ composed in particular a *votum* on revelation and the formulae of dogma. No sense of the simple grandeur of the Church's faith that is to be proclaimed. A strange diminishment (to say nothing more) of faith in Christ. Another *votum* would like to see condemned those who hope that God might have an ordinary means of saving infants who have died without baptism, etc. These are the kinds of things that are going round and round in many*¹⁸ Roman heads since the announcement of the council!

Msgr. Piolanti,¹⁹ rector of the Lateran, gave a vehement speech yesterday in the great hall of his university. It was the final meeting of a week of conferences on the councils. He is supposed to have declared that the council will condemn all modern errors, in particular those

¹²Rupert of Deutz (circa 1075–1129). Benedictine monk, born in Liège, he accomplished a monumental work. Abbot of Deutz, near Cologne, and a theologian, he was, in H. de Lubac's view, "a giant on the threshold of the twelfth century". The first volume of Rupert to appear in the series *Sources chrétiennes* was *Les Œuvres du Saint Esprit*, *Sources chrétiennes* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1967).

¹³The Delegato is the delegate of the superior general for the houses in Rome that depend directly on him.

¹⁴Pablo Muñoz Vega, S.J. (1903–1994), Ecuadorian, ordained in 1933. He was rector of the Gregorian from 1958 to 1963 and named an expert to the council in 1962. Named coadjutor bishop of Quito in February 1964, he attended the last sessions of the council as a council Father. He was created cardinal in 1969.

¹⁵Henri Vignon, S.J. (1894–1963), French. Professor of theology at the Gregorian.

¹⁶This refers to the wishes of the conciliar Fathers and of the faculties of canon law and theology, collected during the period prior to the preparatory phase (May 17, 1959–May 30, 1960), regarding the subjects to be treated at the council.

¹⁷Édouard Dhanis, S.J. (1902–1978), Belgian, ordained in 1929. In 1949, he was charged by Father Janssens with visiting the Jesuit houses of higher learning in France. Professor of fundamental theology at the Gregorian, where he was prefect of studies, then rector from 1963 to 1964. That same year, he also became a consultant to the Holy Office. Member of the Preparatory Theological Commission, he was named an expert in 1962.

¹⁸* Father de Lubac changed "many" to "some" and added this sentence: "Besides, it seems that these *Vota* do not really represent the opinion of the competent teachers at the Gregorian."

¹⁹Antonio Piolanti (1901–2001), Italian. Rector of the Lateran and consultant to the Holy Office. Member of the Preparatory Theological Commission, he was named an expert in 1962.

mentioned in *Humani generis*²⁰ and most especially the “new theology”²¹ (according to Fr. Paul Goubert, who was there and who judged that this week at the Lateran was a success). At the opening session, Archbishop Parente,²² assessor of the Holy Office,²³ had made a similar speech; he had gone back as far as Descartes, Kant, and Hegel in his condemnations. (According to Dom Jean Leclercq, who attended the session and who heard that he had been awarded the title of professor at the Pontifical Lateran University, without having heard anything about it beforehand.)

In the afternoon, a visit from Fr. Balducci²⁴ from Florence (*Testimonianze*), currently in Rome, and also Msgr. Baron, rector of St.-Louis des Français. He spoke to me about his recent trip to Israel, about Maritain,²⁵ etc.; I spoke to him about Msgr. Journet²⁶ with regard to Teilhard.

At 6 P.M., Fr. Leclercq came to get me, to take me to the scholasticate of his brother Oblates of Mary Immaculate. Warm reception. I gave nearly the same lecture as yesterday, in front of more than a hundred theology students. Dined with the small community of future professors, who are preparing their theses. The rectors of the two communities were very friendly. Father Bélanger²⁷ was there, having come from Ottawa for the preparation of the council; he would like, it seems to me, to push

²⁰Encyclical of Pius XII of August 12, 1950, “Concerning some false opinions threatening to undermine the foundations of Catholic doctrine”. Henri de Lubac’s adversaries thought that the encyclical had condemned his positions on the supernatural, although he always denied that.

²¹This expression was popularized especially by Father Garrigou-Lagrange in an article in 1946, “La Théologie nouvelle, où va-t-elle?” *Angelicum*, October-December 1946, 126-45. De Lubac objected to this expression applied to the “Fourvière group”, another just as mythical entity, in his view.

²²Pietro Parente (1891-1986), Italian, ordained in 1916. Assessor of the Holy Office from 1959, then secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith from 1965 to 1967. He was created cardinal in 1967. Member of the Doctrinal Commission.

²³The person who has the second highest rank after the secretary in the Holy Office. His functions correspond more or less to those of the secretary of the other congregations. In 1965, when the Holy Office became the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, the assessor became secretary.

²⁴Ernesto Balducci (1922-1992), Italian priest, he founded, in 1958, *Testimonianze*, a journal that, along with some others in Italy, wished to initiate a theological, spiritual, and ecclesial renewal.

²⁵Jacques Maritain (1882-1973), French. A philosopher, he contributed to the renewal of Thomist studies by showing the modernity of St. Thomas Aquinas’ philosophy.

²⁶Charles Journet (1891-1975), Swiss, ordained in 1917. Professor at the Seminary of Fribourg, friend of Jacques Maritain, he edited the journal *Nova et vetera* that he founded with François Charrière. In February 1965, he was created cardinal. He opposed Teilhard in the name of the defense of Thomism.

²⁷Marcel Bélanger, O.M.I., Canadian, vice-rector of the Catholic University of Ottawa. Consultant to the Preparatory Theological Commission, he was named as an expert to the council.

for a definition concerning the Virgin Mary; he is preparing, with Fr. Balić, O.F.M.,²⁸ the international Marian congress in Ottawa for 1962 (certain Mariologists seem to be placing their hope in this congress to put pressure on the council). After dinner, more cordial conversation; the thesis students asked me all kinds of questions. I had the opportunity to speak for rather a long time about Fr. Teilhard.

Sunday, November 20. — Last day in Rome. I said yesterday to our secretary, Fr. Leclercq,¹ that several people were surprised at the absence of Fr. Karl Rahner² from the commission; he answered that there had been a roadblock. Chatted with Father Moran³ about the two Testaments, the preparation for the council, etc. Said goodbye to the rector of the Biblical Institute,⁴ who is defending his Institute to the best of his ability in the face of certain critics; spoke with him about the work of Miss Jaubert on the date of the Last Supper.⁵ A walk in the Forum, accompanied by Fr. Haulotte, saw the Crucifixion fresco in the church of Santa Maria Antica and the mosaic at Saints Cosmas and Damian. In the evening, the manuscript for Fr. Lyonnet's next article, for *Biblica*. Saw Frs. Jarlot, Philip, and Mollat again. Fr. Haulotte accompanied me to the station. Left at 10 P.M.*⁶

²⁸ Carlo Balić, O.F.M. (1899–1977), Yugoslavian. Theologian, Mariologist, professor of dogmatic and Marian theology at the Antonianum and, from 1959, at the Lateran. He was a consultor to the Congregation of the Holy Office and founding president of the Pontifical International Marian Academy. Member of the Preparatory Theological Commission, he was named as an expert in 1962.

November 20

¹ Michel Leclercq, O.M.I.

² Karl Rahner, S.J. (1904–1984), German, ordained in 1932. A theologian, he exerted a very great influence on Catholic thought. Consultor to the Preparatory Commission for the Discipline of the Sacraments, he was named an expert in 1962. He was one of the founders of the journal *Concilium* in 1965.

³ William L. Moran, S.J. (1921–2000), American. Specialist in Assyriology and professor of exegesis of the Pentateuch at the Biblical Institute from 1958 to 1966.

⁴ Ernst Vogt, S.J. (1903–1984), Swiss, ordained in 1933. Rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute from 1949 to 1963. He was named as a consultor to the Preparatory Theological Commission at the beginning of 1961.

⁵ Annie Jaubert, *La Date de la Cène: Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1957).

⁶* At this point there are several inserted additions. First of all, a handwritten letter from Father de Lubac, dated November 19, 1960: "Very dear friend [unidentified]. Our letters crossed in the mail; yours reached me this morning; I have passed on to Father Philip that which was for him. My stay in Rome is over; I leave tomorrow evening and will be in Lyon Monday at 1:00 P.M. I hope that next Thursday the result will be satisfactory. Let us know immediately at Lyon. Here, everything went smoothly. But, and this will not surprise you, I will not leave very comforted. The state

of mind of all the personnel in charge as far as theology is concerned is always the same. No understanding, a great deal of pettiness, ignorance of the world to which the Gospel must be preached, lack of spiritual life, a cast of mind that is incurably polemical and negative. At the Lateran, the rector (Monsignor Piolanti) and the Master of the Sacred Palace (an Italian Dominican) gave a speech at the beginning of the new term. Their great objective, according to what I was told (I was not there): to have the "new theology" condemned and to strengthen the encyclical *Humani generis*. I will relate to you some other matters (among those that are not *sub secreto!*). Today I had lunch at the Gregorian, where I saw some Frenchmen. Here, yesterday, a lecture: on the Bible in the twelfth century. It did not go badly. The atmosphere of the Biblical Institute is friendly. Goodbye! *Frater in Christo*." Next comes a typewritten sheet: "On my return to Lyon, reread some passages from the great 'Letter' of Father General to the Assistancy of France [cf. the note on this letter dated September 23, 1961], which threatens to become news again in the preparation for the council. There are some truly appalling passages in it: the expressions of the authors that one wants to condemn are broken up, mixed together, deformed, changed from the meaning that the context makes clear, in order to make error come forth. By means of procedures like these, one could just as well cause exactly the opposite error to emerge. For in these matters, everything rests on a delicate balance. This determined will to make their own children appear heterodox or even gravely culpable would be incredible, if one were to suppose that the person who signed this letter knew what it contained. One would not find a single other example in our history. And this still persists; it is impossible to explain anything about it to Father General, who would himself be alarmed if he saw it."

January 16, 1961. Sent to Father Tromp in Rome the essay he had asked for from me on the natural knowledge of God.

January 20. Read the "*Philosophie de l'histoire des conciles tenus en France*" by Abbot Cacheux (1884, Paris). Some excerpts, chosen at random: "The search that the council of Aix conducted into the Empress Judith cleared her of any suspicion of adultery." "In order to refresh the lawns of discipline with a sheet of flowing water in these scorching days, the meeting took place at Attigny." "Amoléon gave a sweetness to the idealism of the Christian philosophy." "The councils were struck with sadness to see the terrain of virtue littered with debris." "As the majestic figure of Christianity advanced on the road of time, she made the forces of history shine." "The torrents of disorder were dried up at the council of Auch" . . . , etc.

January 26. Wrote to Father Séb. Tromp to thank him for his volumes 2 and 3 on the *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia* that he recently sent me (I had sent him the first two volumes of *Exégèse médiévale*). "Propter reformationem universalis Ecclesiae", "pro universali Ecclesia reformanda": formulae of Innocent III, sermon to the Lateran Council [For the reform of the universal Church, for the universal Church to be reformed].