

JEAN DANIELÉLOU'S
DOXOLOGICAL HUMANISM

Trinitarian Contemplation and
Humanity's True Vocation

MARC NICHOLAS



Jean Daniélou's
Doxological Humanism

Jean Daniélou's
Doxological Humanism
Trinitarian Contemplation and
Humanity's True Vocation

Marc C. Nicholas



James Clarke & Co

James Clarke & Co

P.O. Box 60

Cambridge

CB1 2NT

United Kingdom

www.jamesclarke.co

publishing@jamesclarke.co

ISBN: 978 0 227 17404 3

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A record is available from the British Library

First published by James Clarke & Co, 2013

Copyright © Marc C. Nicholas, 2012

Published by arrangement

with Pickwick Publications

All rights reserved. No part of this edition may be reproduced, stored electronically or in any retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the Publisher (permissions@jamesclarke.co).

Contents

ONE	The Split between Theology and Spirituality	1
TWO	History and Prayer	10
THREE	Prayer, Trinity, and Mission	45
FOUR	Prayer and the Spiritual Life	93
FIVE	The Crisis of Interiority and the Truly Human City	124
SIX	Daniélou's Doxological Humanism	146
	<i>Bibliography</i>	163

ONE

The Split between Theology and Spirituality

HANS URS VON BALTHASAR begins his important essay “Theology and Sanctity” with the observation that “in the whole of Catholic theology there is hardly anything that is less noticed, yet more deserving of notice, than the fact that, since the great period of Scholasticism, there have been few theologians who were saints.”¹ In this remark is summed up the history of the divide between theology and spirituality that reached its acme with the Neo-Scholasticism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Though this neo-Scholasticism waned after the middle of the twentieth century, it seems to be attempting to extend its influence again at the turn of the twentieth century.² Von Balthasar’s entire theological project centered on the deconstruction of such a dichotomy. In the essay, he notes the pre-Scholastic naiveté concerning such a divide, the perpetuation of the divergence until the middle of the twentieth century, and the attempt to overcome the split that was commensurate with the overthrow of Neo-Scholastic theology prior to Vatican II.

Pre-Scholastic Theology and Spirituality

When one looks at the great personages of the early church, one is struck by the fact that most of them were both pastors and theologians. Their lives were models of the unity of the Christian life and the elucidation of

1. Von Balthasar, “Theology and Sanctity,” 181.

2. Candler, “New Scholasticism,” forthcoming.

Christian truth: a testament to a complete understanding of truth that "consist[ed] precisely in this living exposition of theory in practice and of knowledge carried into action."³ Von Balthasar notes the New Testament teaching concerning the office of teachers and pastors. Both Ephesians 4:11 and I Corinthians 12:29 attest to the distinctiveness of the roles of pastor and teacher. However, one need not maintain the possibility of distinct roles to the detriment of seeing both offices in a single individual. Not all pastors are teachers, and not all teachers are pastors, but one should not be surprised to see the two offices coincident in a single individual since they are so closely related by Paul in his epistles. Therefore, it should be no surprise to see that the greatest Christians of the early centuries of the Church are both pastors and teachers: Irenaeus, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and many others.⁴ This unity of spirituality and truth is seen in a number of Johannine passages. The author of I John maintains: "Whoever says, 'I know him,' but does not keep his commandments is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (I Jn 2:4); and, later on in the letter, "Whoever is without love does not know God" (I Jn 4:8). "There is simply no real truth" von Balthasar contends, "which does not have to be incarnated in an act or in some action, so that the incarnation of Christ is the criterion of all real truth . . . , and 'walking in the truth' is the way the believer possesses the truth."⁵ Indeed the New Testament and the early Fathers consistently exhibit a complete naïveté concerning such a divide. Instead, the writers of the New Testament and the early Fathers were "complete personalities," who were unable to envisage the separation of theology and spirituality. Even a cursory perusal of New Testament and Patristic sources would indicate the fact. Von Balthasar notes that it "would not only be idle but contrary to the very conception of the Fathers to attempt to divide their works into those dealing with doctrine and those dealing with the Christian life (spirituality)."⁶ Perhaps Origen is the clearest indication of this fact. Origen left the Church an enormous amount of literature. Though it has been attempted by some modern interpreters, to divide his works into the speculative, polemical, spiritual, and hermeneutical would be artificial and

3. Ibid.

4. Von Balthasar notes that even those who were not both pastors and teachers in the monastic and mystical traditions "bring out still more clearly the union of doctrine and life." Ibid., 182.

5. Ibid., 181–82.

6. Ibid., 183.

detrimental to Origen's thought and to one's understanding of the work he bequeathed to the Church. Though some of his works may have been more or less practical or speculative or pastoral, each of his works has the primary aim of "expounding the word of God, which is as much a word of life as a word of truth."⁷

Von Balthasar maintains that this original unity was maintained for centuries. He contends that it was not until scholastic methodology gained prominence that such a division was made possible: "The early medieval thinkers in the West, under the aegis of Augustine, did not depart from this basic concept. Anselm, himself abbot, bishop and doctor of the Church, knew no other canon of truth than the unity of knowledge and life. The same may be said of Bede, Bernard and Peter Damian. But as theology increasingly took on a 'scholastic' form, and Aristotelianism burst in like an elemental force, the naïve unity hitherto accepted was gravely shaken."⁸

The Rise of Scholastic Theology

The rise of the Scholastic method within theological discourse radically transformed the way theology was envisioned from its bases and method to its purpose and sources. This change had a far-reaching effect on theology which would contribute to theology's own self-understanding. Whereas theology was initially more of a meditation on and exposition of God's self-disclosure in the Word, in the new style of theological discourse practiced by the schoolmen, theology increasingly became the methodical parsing of abstract truth which was dissociated from the concrete realities of an embodied Christianity. It must be noted that medieval Scholasticism made enormous contributions to the development of the Church's own self-understanding. Thinkers such as Thomas, Bonaventure and Albert were able to maintain a balance between theology and spirituality. However, it appears that it took such singular minds to keep the method from overtaking the aim.

Von Balthasar maintained that the progress attained by scholasticism primarily lay in the philosophical realm. Though of great importance, this method placed theology alongside philosophy as a coordinating system (sometimes as a competing system) for the exposition of truth.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid., 184.

Jean Danielou's Doxological Humanism

Von Balthasar writes of the advances of philosophical methodology of scholasticism:

The booty in this case, however, was primarily philosophical, and only indirectly theological. Philosophy began to emerge as a special discipline alongside theology, with its own concept of philosophical truth, which was perfectly correct in its own sphere, and could lay no claim to superior content of revealed truth. *Adequatio intellectus ad rem* [conformity of the mind to reality]: this definition envisaged, primarily, only the theoretical side of truth. The intimate connection was seen, and indeed emphasized, between the true and the good as the transcendental properties of the one being, but it was looked at more from the human standpoint, in the mutual presupposition of intellect and will . . . , than in their objective mutual inclusion, or real identity. Philosophy, as a doctrine of natural being and excluding revelation, could not know that the highest mode of interpreting that philosophical definition of truth must be a trinitarian one.⁹

The scholastic method, left in inadequate hands, would provide disastrous results. The problem was that most practitioners were not equipped to maintain the balance between method and the integrity of theology and spirituality.

M. D. Chenu gives Abelard as a prime example of a practitioner of the scholastic method who was unable to balance the method and theology as practiced prior to Scholasticism. "In the west, the classic case of this failing is that of Abelard. This champion of dialectic was the first whose genius promulgated the laws of conceptual thinking in their application to theological knowledge. He is called, not without cause, the founder of scholastic theology. But in the intoxication of his discovery he could not maintain the proper spiritual attitude towards the awful silence of the mystery."¹⁰ Chenu consistently commends individuals such as Abelard for the substantial contribution they were able to make, while at the same time chastising them for their inability to retain the proper spiritual balance. "It is in prayer and

9. Ibid., 185.

10. Chenu, *La Théologie est-elle une Science?*, 41; ET: *Is Theology a Science?*, 40. "Les cas classique e cette défaillance, en Occident. Est celui d'Abélard. Le chevalier de la dialectique, qui le premier eut le genie d'annoncer les lois du langage conceptuel dans l'elaboration du savoir théologique, et qu'on appelle à cause de cela, non sans raison, le fondateur de la théologie scholastique, ne sut pas, dans l'ivresse de se découverte , conserver a juste sensibilité spirituelle au respect, au silence du mystère." All subsequent English translations of this text will be Armytage's translation unless noted otherwise.

devotion, and in the profoundest sense of the devotion, that theology, the understanding of the Word of God, is born and lives. ‘This sacred science,’ reads the office of Albert the Great, ‘is acquired through prayer and devotion rather than through study’—words not to be taken as an epigram but as a structural necessity. A theology that could be true without being devout would be a sort of monster.”¹¹

Furthermore, the Aristotelianism of the thirteenth century also opened up the space for the development of the concept of natural science, which would in turn give birth to a general secularism. Within this arena, the greatest of the practitioners of Scholasticism were able to transpose the concepts and methodology of Aristotelianism and the secular sciences into the field of Christian theology. This transposition had the effect of raising the method of the secular sciences to the “plane of the sacred, and so to import to [them] a real Christian ethos.”¹² As a result, post-scholastic theology became a rational exposition of traditional theology (Von Balthasar uses the terms “biblical theology”), turning theology on its head. As the work of theology proceeded after scholasticism, the rational framework that had been attached to theology became more rigid with each succeeding generation. As a result of this process, the philosophical bases of theology usurped the position of tradition and scripture and became the arbiter of the faith, exercising authority over the entire theological process.¹³

The Effects of the Split between Theology and Spirituality

Von Balthasar concisely sums up the main effect of the split between theology and spirituality opened by the over-reliance on scholastic method. The period following the advent of scholastic theology “saw the disappearance of the ‘complete’ theologian . . . , the theologian who is also a saint. In fact, spiritual men were turned away from a theology which was overlaid and overloaded with secular philosophy—with the result that alongside dogmatic theology, meaning always the central science which consists in the

11. Ibid., 41–42. “C’est dans la prière, dans l’adoration, dans la devotion, au sens profond du mot, que naît et vit la théologie, l’intelligence de la Parole de Dieu. «Cette science sacrée, est-il dit dans l’office du maître Albert le Grand, s’acquiert par l’oraison et la devotion plus que par l’étude». Ne prenons pas cela comme une bon parole, mais comme une exigence structural. Une théologie qui pourrait être vraie sans être pieuse, serait en quelque sorte monstrueuse.”

12. Von Balthasar, “Theology and Sanctity,” 186.

13. Ibid.

exposition of revealed truth, there came into being a new science of the 'Christian life,' one derived from the mysticism of the Middle Ages and achieving independence in the *devotio moderna*.¹⁴ The culpability need not fall solely on the introduction of scholastic method and the subsequent exacerbation by the neo-scholasticism of later centuries. Von Balthasar clearly notes that the "saints" were as culpable for the division as any other. While scholasticism pushed the practitioners of the spiritual life to the side, the "spirituals" all too readily retreated from the schools to widen the gap between theology and spirituality to an even greater degree.¹⁵ "The saints, intimidated by the conceptual entanglements drawn round the gospel truth, no longer dare to collaborate in the necessary work of the exposition of doctrine, or think themselves qualified to do so. They leave dogma to the prosaic work of the School, and become—lyrical poets."¹⁶

This situation ends in a number of exacerbating results. There developed among the spirituals a concern to describe and delineate the affective states of ascetical and mystical theology.¹⁷ Though this phenomenon can be seen earlier—particularly in the Spanish mysticism of the sixteenth century—it is in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which demonstrate the most concrete instantiation of this fact. In the manuals of such thinkers as Adolphe Tanquerey, the Jesuit Joseph de Guibert and the immensely important Dominican Reginald Garrigou-Lagarange, an elaborate "technology of the self"—to use Mark McIntosh's language—fused the scholastic manualistic style with an extreme concern with delineating the progress of the soul to perfection through the stages of ascetical theology and mystical theology.¹⁸

14. Ibid., 187.

15. Ibid., 188–93.

16. Ibid., 192.

17. The terms ascetical theology and mystical theology came to have very specific and distinct meanings. *Ascetical theology* concerned the "form and progress of the Christian life up to the beginnings of passive contemplation," whereas, *mystical theology* "analyzed further stages up to mystical union." Sheldrake, *Spirituality & History*, 52.

18. McIntosh, *Mystical Theology*, 8. The fusion of the concern for affective mysticism and neo-scholastic method is laid out in Sheldrake, *Spirituality and History*, 52–55.

Prospects for Reintegration

In Mark McIntosh's contribution to Blackwell's "Challenges in Contemporary Theology" series, he, like von Balthasar, notes that theology, when it separates itself from mystical experience (or as McIntosh and Bernard McGinn prefer, "mystical consciousness"), it "becomes ever more methodically refined but unable to know or to speak of the very mysteries at the heart of Christianity."¹⁹ Likewise, mysticism, when it isolates itself from speculative theology, "becomes rootless, easily hijacked by individualistic consumerism." But, unlike William Johnston, who holds little hope for the reintegration of theology and spirituality (believing that theologians remain "unregenerate"), McIntosh believes that there are identifiable avenues in the study of theology and spirituality which may in fact lead to such a reintegration.²⁰

Even more basic to the discussion than ways in which academic theology can reacquaint itself with spirituality, it appears that McIntosh's implicit, and more profound, solution to the problem of the split between theology and spirituality entails a view of the human person that disallows any division between one's articulation of Christianity and one's own lived "spiritual stance" concerning concrete events and situations. More important than whether or not one speaks of the encounter with God by means of "divine grounding language" or by means of "union language," more important than whether one describes the mystical encounter with God in terms of "mystical consciousness" or in terms of "mystical experience," McIntosh holds up the example of those individuals who exhibit an understanding of the encounter of divine presence by the manner in which they articulate that encounter and how they live their lives in light of their own understanding of the encounter with God. Here McIntosh gives the example of Edith Stein, who, on the night of her arrest by two German SS officers, demonstrated that her "theological understanding of what she saw as the self-sacrificing pattern of divine life grew increasingly more incarnate in her own spiritual stance. She repeatedly articulated her belief that a spirituality of compassion and responsibility for others enabled one to contribute in some limited personal way to the unlimited self-giving that she understood to be constitutive of God's existence—a self-giving embodied for her in the history of Jesus."²¹

19. McIntosh, *Mystical Theology*, 10.

20. Johnston, *Inner Eye of Love*, 195–96.

21. McIntosh, *Mystical Theology*, 4.

This picture of an individual who embodies the unity of the spiritual and theological indicates in a clear manner that the split between spirituality and theology is only entirely mitigated by integrated personalities. For Edith Stein, McIntosh tells us, "her work as an interpreter of major theologians such as Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Thomas Aquinas, and John of the Cross was all of a piece with her spirituality."²² It is in such personalities that we are able to identify a "pattern for the re-weaving of spirituality and theology," a pattern found in "complete personalities"—to use von Balthasar's parlance—who are examples of an integrated anthropology.

McIntosh rightly points out that at its very roots the split between theology and spirituality seems to be a bifurcation of the individual person and represents a defective view of the human person—what would be described in theological short-hand as a defective anthropology. The answer to the gap between the disciplines is not bridged through methodological or academic orientation, but rather is achieved by realizing who we are. In a brief essay for *L'Osservatore Romano*, Jean Daniélou notes that investigation into the arena of who we are as human beings typically falls short because it fails to assess the human person in its entirety. The material sciences fail in their account of the *humanum*—as do the psychological sciences—in that they fail to see what is human in its totality and in turn omit what is most essential to humanity. Therefore, Daniélou reflects, "We must ask ourselves what these . . . types of inquiry lack. What they lack is, essentially, that they do not lead to the [essential] dimension of man at the core of his existence: the relationship with a God by whom he was begotten and for whom he was created."²³ Indeed, Daniélou maintains that "the idea that there is in our life two poles which are opposed—a human pole and a divine pole—by no means corresponds to the true Biblical conception of humanity."²⁴ The human person must be seen in its entirety which entails accounting for that which makes humanity truly human. This essential quality of the human person is found in humanity's participation in divine life without which humanity is a mutilated form of its true identity. As Daniélou notes, "There is in the relationship with God a relationship that constitutes the very being of man."²⁵

22. McIntosh, *Mystical Theology*, 3.

23. Daniélou, "Man in Search of Himself," 10.

24. Daniélou, "La Vérité de l'Homme," 4.

25. Daniélou, "Man in Search of Himself," 10.

Conclusion

Daniélou believes that a proper understanding of humanity must entail an assessment of it as a unity. To propose that the material aspect of humanity and the spiritual aspect of humanity can be partitioned from each other is to “fall victim to the most detestable form of idealism which separates spiritual existence from its material and sociological substratum. *It is our profound belief that man is a unity; that is to say, that there is a fundamental connection between the problems of the body and those of the soul.*”²⁶ Thus, any true humanism is an integral humanism which views humanity in its totality.

Secondly, an essential aspect of this unified view of the human person is its doxological nature. For Daniélou, “prayer is an absolutely universal human vocation.”²⁷ Therefore, he concludes, prayer is in itself “a fundamental part of all humanism.”²⁸ To fulfill a basic quality of one’s fullest expression of his humanity is to participate in the adoration, worship and contemplation involved in the life of prayer.

26. Daniélou, *L'Oraison Problème Politique*, 27; ET: *Prayer as Political Problem*, 27. “Le méconnaître serait pécher par cet idéalisme que nous détestons par-dessus tout, car il sépare l'existence spirituelle de son substrat matériel et sociologique. Or nous croyons profondément que l'homme est un, c'est-à-dire qu'il y a une relation fondamentale entre les problèmes du corps et ceux de l'âme.” All subsequent English translations of this text will be Kirwan's translation unless noted otherwise. See also Daniélou, “L'Oraison comme problème politique,” 62–73.

27. Ibid., 28–29. “L'oraison est . . . en élément constitutif de la vie humaine.”

28. Ibid., 24. “Prière est . . . une dimension fondamentale de tout humanisme.”

TWO

History and Prayer

ONE MIGHT WONDER WHY an exposition of Daniélou's ideas concerning prayer should begin with his theology of history. Indeed, most books on prayer have little to say about history and many times elide it altogether.¹ Contrariwise, Daniélou makes it a point to consider history in *Contemplation: Croissance de l'Eglise* with roughly a quarter of the small volume occupying itself with the relationship of prayer and history.² Prior to a full exposition of Daniélou's understanding of history, it is important to note how he relates the two areas in *Contemplation*.

Daniélou notes that to enter into prayer is—among many things—to rediscover God through a wonderment at the *magnalia Dei* (“wonders of God”), through one's recognition of one's own relationship to God as one of his children and a coheir with Christ, and finally as an entering into God's guiding of the story of history. It is this last point that is of importance to us here. Daniélou writes, “prayer is an entering into the ways of God an acceptance of the divine plan that God carries out in the world. It means becoming aware of the God who is coming, and not simply of the God who is. If we were only aware of the God who is, we might have the feeling that prayer withdraws us from the movement of life, and that there is an opposition between the contemplative life and the movement of history. But this is quite false. The God who is, is also the God who is coming, and the entire world is the accomplishment of the plan that comes from God and

1. It is important to note that a major critique of late neo-scholasticism by *ressourcement* thinkers is that it had no historical sense.

2. Daniélou, *Contemplation: Croissance de L'Eglise*.

is moving toward God.”³ This passage contains some important elements of Daniélou’s theology of history which will be more fully discussed later but should be noted here. The vocabulary of *venir* and *être* points to the concept of advent (*adventus/venir*; coming-advent) which plays a vital role in Daniélou’s coordination of prayer and history and to which he devoted an entire study.⁴ Related to the idea of advent is that of a divine plan which God is executing through the events of human history. History is not a series of singular, unrelated events. Daniélou’s typological reading of history does not allow for such a radical individualization of the events that make up history. Instead, “advent . . . appears as a pedagogy of the faith. Faith does not consist in the belief that God exists, but that God intervenes in history. This is what seems unreasonable to humans: that at the heart of the framework of ordinary events, in the midst of the determinism of physics and the chains of sociological facts, there are irruptions of God—a properly divine activity—in which God creates, visits, and saves.”⁵ And, indeed, Daniélou contends, this concern for history is seen in the paradigmatic prayer of the *Our Father*. Daniélou notes, “In the *Our Father* we pray for the fulfillment of God’s plan for all humanity; we enter in a certain way into God’s own intentions when we ask that his will be done.”⁶

3. Ibid., 17–18. “Prier, c’est enfin entrer dans les voies de Dieu, dans l’acceptation de dessein divin qui s’accomplit dans le monde; c’est être sensible au Dieu qui vient et pas simplement au Dieu qui est. Si nous n’étions sensible qu’au Dieu qui est, nous pourrions avoir le sentiment que la prière nous retire du mouvement de la vie, et qu’il y a une opposition entre la vie contemplative et le mouvement de l’histoire. Ce serait très faux, car le monde entier est l’accomplissement d’un dessein qui vient de Dieu et qui va vers Dieu.” ET: *Prayer: The Mission of the Church*. All subsequent English translations of this text will be Schindler’s unless noted otherwise.

4. Daniélou, *Le Mystère de l’Avent*; ET: *Advent and The Advent of Salvation*. All subsequent English translations of this text will be Sheed’s unless noted otherwise.

5. Daniélou, *Contemplation*, 56–57 “L’Avent apparaît ainsi comme une pédagogie de la foi. La foi ne consiste pas à croire que Dieu existe, mais que Dieu intervient dans l’histoire. Et c’est cela qui apparaît invraisemblable à l’homme. Qu’au cœur de la trame des événements ordinaires, au milieu des déterminismes des faits physiques, de l’enchaînement des faits sociologiques, il y ait des irruptions de Dieu, des actions proprement divines, où Dieu crée, visite, sauve.”

6. Ibid., 42. “Dans le *Notre Père* nous demandons le succès du dessein de Dieu en tous les hommes; nous entrons en quelque sorte dans l’intention même de Dieu quand nous demandons que son œuvre soit accomplie.”

History in Twentieth-Century Catholicism

There is a certain sense in which there was a great deal of accord concerning history within twentieth century Catholic theology. Paul Henry notes that “despite their disagreements,” those concerned with the idea of history within the context of Christian theology were “unanimous in their admission that Christianity alone has given and can give meaning to history, and that outside Judeo-Christian revelation or Islam (which is to some degree a Christian heresy) there is no philosophy of history.”⁷ This accord is commensurate with an understanding of the historical nature of Christianity as a “biblical revelation, which is not a metaphysic but essentially a history.”⁸ However, the “unanimous” accord must be said to end there, as a great deal of controversy arose around the relationship of history and doctrine.

Of the major thrusts of the renewal in twentieth century Catholicism, foremost within this context, was the sense that “theology should take seriously the concrete historicity of the Church’s life and faith.”⁹ This mandate was thought to be a factor in the revitalization of the Church’s increasingly desiccated spirituality. Proponents of renewal under the rubric of *nouvelle théologie* contended that “a theology grounded in historical understanding [would bear] the fruit of authentic spirituality.”¹⁰ This spiritual deficit and lack of historical sensibility no doubt was at least in part due to the education of theologians through the neo-scholastic manuals of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (often pejoratively labeled “Denzinger theology”). Aidan Nichols notes that while this sort of theological formation gave the seminarians of the time a more robust grasp of the faith than their successors, “the drawback was that so crystalline an intellectual structure . . . could not easily be turned into a preaching and catechesis that moved souls.”¹¹ While some Dominicans charged that the *nouvelle théologie* was infected with a historical relativism reminiscent of early twentieth century

7. Henry, “Christian Philosophy of History,” 421. Daniélou writes, “Il n’est pas nécessaire d’être judéo-chrétien pour croire en l’existence d’un Dieu. Ceci se retrouve dans toutes les religions et constitue la religion comme telle. Mais il est nécessaire d’être judéo-chrétien pour croire dans l’intervention de Dieu, dans l’histoire humaine.” *Approches du Christ*, 83.

8. Henry, “Christian Philosophy of History,” 425.

9. Mayeski, “Quaestio Disputata: Catholic Theology and the History of Exegesis,” 142.

10. *Ibid.*, 149.

11. Nichols, *Catholic Thought Since the Enlightenment*, 131.

Catholic modernism, the Jesuits of Lyons-Fourvière rejoined that “a certain Scholastic theology possesses the contrary vice in its own thorough insensitivity to history.”¹² As de Lubac bitinglly retorted to the charge, “si les mauvais jours du modernism sont, grace à Dieu, maintenant loin de nous, les mauvais jours de l’intégrisme ne fussent sur le point de revinir” (If the evil days of Modernism are now, thank God, far from us, the evil days of integralism may be coming back).¹³

In response to the overly abstracted theses of Denzinger theology, there arose, in Germany and Austria, what is today called the Innsbrück school. Rather than heaping thesis upon thesis concerning every imaginable topic, the Innsbrück school represented a “slimline theology” which demonstrated that not all Catholic doctrine carried equal weight.¹⁴ While no less intellectually respectable, the Innsbrück school prioritized its core presentation of the gospel in order to lighten the overly cumbersome apol-

12. Nichols, “Thomism and the Nouvelle Théologie,” 10.

13. *La Théologie et ses sources*, 95; quoted in Fouilloux, “Dialogue théologique?”, 174 and quoted in Nichols, “Thomism and the Nouvelle Théologie,” 10. See also “Integralism” and Modernism,” in *Sacramentum Mundi*, v. 3, 151–52; v. 4, 99–104. For a distinction between *integralism* and *integrist*, see Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory*, 206–7. Milbank writes, “One’s starting point should be the seemingly obscure claim made by the most important of the Latin American ‘liberation theologians’ . . . that the new theology of grace espoused by the second Vatican Council is what has made liberation theology possible: such, indeed, that liberation theology alone, is to be considered the authentic outworking of post-conciliar Catholic thought. What is alluded to here is the embracing by the council of what one can term the ‘integralist revolution.’ This means the view that in the concrete, historical humanity there is no such thing as a state of ‘pure nature’: rather, every person has always already been worked upon by divine grace, with the consequence that one cannot analytically separate ‘natural’ and ‘supernatural’ contributions to this integral unity.

“The liberation theologians contend, quite cogently, that the social and political implications of this ‘integralism’ were not properly realized by the council. Although this was precisely because the council was rightly concerned to repudiate earlier ‘integrist’ politics. The ‘integrist’ viewpoint has insisted upon a clerical and hierarchic dominance over all the affairs of secular life, founded upon a ‘totalizing’ theology which presents a complete system, whose details cannot be questioned without compromising the whole. (This difference between ‘integralism’ and ‘integrist’ should be carefully noted).”

Speaking of Yves Congar’s *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l’Église*, Fergus Kerr remarks that “this sectarian tendency to maximize whatever is settled by authority slips into condemning all openness, research, and questioning of received ideas. A Catholic’s orthodoxy becomes measurable by the degree of hatred that he shows for those he suspects of heterodoxy. The problem with *intégrisme* is . . . that it has too little confidence in the truth, insufficient love of the truth.” *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians*, 41.

14. Nichols, *Catholic Thought since the Enlightenment*, 130–33.

ogetic thrust of the manuals.¹⁵ Contrary to manual theology, the Innsbrück school emphasized the traditional theological center of Catholicism in the doctrines of the incarnation and salvation through the person of Christ. While the Innsbrück school had effectively reoriented Catholic thought to a degree, its force was cut short because the “inhibitions on Church activity imposed by the National Socialists overtook Austrian Catholicism with the *Anschluss* of 1938.”¹⁶ Even so, while the Innsbrück school somewhat effectively undermined the abstract, dehistoricized propositions of high neo-scholasticism, it did not provide cogent answers to the relationship between dogma and history raised in the previous century in the modernist controversy. It fell to *la nouvelle théologie* to answer this demand.

Much of the debate over history and theology is encapsulated in the episode between Dominicans of Saint-Maximin and Toulouse and the Jesuits of Lyons, especially Daniélou, de Lubac, Bouillard, and others. In the early 1940's, two important series were begun under the guidance of Daniélou and his confreres, *Sources Chrétiennes* and *Théologie*, which immediately came under the suspicion of the prominent Dominicans Marie-Michel Labourdette and, more importantly, Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange.¹⁷ Daniélou gives the purpose for beginning *Sources Chrétiennes* succinctly: “For the latter [the earlier work of Hemmer and Lejay], it was entirely a matter of publishing historical documents, the testimonial artifacts of the faith of the ancients. The new idea is that there is more to ask the Fathers. On this view, the Fathers are not only the veritable witnesses of a bygone state

15. The Innsbrück school of theology was a group of theologians who “were decidedly missionary or ‘kerygmatic’ in orientation. [They] looked for a truly evangelical theology which would identify the central core of the gospel, God in Christ with his good new, and relate all else to that. At Innsbrück a school of kerygmatic theology arose concerned to produce an articulation of the original proclamation in compelling language.” Nichols, *Shape of Catholic Theology*, 336–37. Representative of this group is the well-known catecheticist and liturgist Josef Jungmann. Jungmann sought to draw on Scripture and the Liturgy in order to “suggest what was really paramount in Christian faith, the one thing necessary that might get lost in too abundant a plethora of doctrines,” Nicholas, *Catholic Thought since the Enlightenment*, 132. See Pierce and Downey, *Source and Summit* for a select but useful bibliography.

16. Nichols, *Catholic Thought since the Enlightenment*, 133.

17. The most recent work on Garrigou-Lagrange is Peddicord, *Sacred Monster of Thomism*, which seeks to present “a more balanced account of his personality and his achievements” (Candler, “The New Scholasticism,” forthcoming). For his part, Candler believes that this attempt at a reassessment marks an attempted “resuscitation of [the] errors” committed by Garrigou-Lagrange and his associates. See also Jürgen Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie New Theology*, 15–29.

of affairs, they yet provide the most enduring and ‘contemporary’ nourishment for men of our own day. Indeed, we find in the Fathers categories of thought congenial to the questions being posed in the intellectual dialogues of contemporary thought, categories which scholastic theology unwittingly lost.”¹⁸ *Théologie* was chartered with the two-fold aim of a return to the

18. Daniélou, “Les Orientations Présentes de la Pensée Religieuse”, 10. “Pour cette dernière, il s’agissait avant tout de publier des documents historiques, témoins de la foi des anciens. La nouvelle pense qu’il y a plus à deander aux Pères. Ils ne sont seulement témoins véritable d’un état de chose révolu; ils sont encore la nourriture la plus actuelle pour des hommes d’aujourd’hui, parce que nous y retrouvons précisément un certain nombre de catégories qui sont celles de la pensée contemporaine et que la théologie scolastique avait perdues.” Translated by Peter M. Candler Jr. and Aaron Riches, “Current Trends in Religious Thought,” *Communio* (forthcoming), fn. 24. Labourdette notes that this same sentiment is echoed in the introduction to Daniélou’s *La Vie Moïse*, “La Théologie et ses sources,” 25 n. 1. John Courtney Murray surmises the aim of *Sources Chrétiennes*: “And we know, too, that in the patristic climate of opinion the uninitiated rather tends to gasp for breath. It is to this problem and its solution that the recently inaugurated series of patristic texts . . . directly addresses itself, with altogether remarkable success” (Murray, “Current Theology: *Sources Chrétiennes*,” 251; which provides reviews of the first 19 volumes of *Sources Chrétiennes*). “Though familiarity with the cultural and religious milieu and facility of encounter with the Fathers was certainly a goal of de Lubac and Daniélou, it seems that Labourdette had understood the more subtle and underlying aim of the series. It is rather the choice of texts which indicated the theological agenda which lay at the heart of the series. The inaugural volume, Gregory of Nyssa’s *Vie de Moïse*, indicated the trajectory of the series. Instead of an Aquinas or a Bonaventure, Gregory of Nyssa established a mystical rather than a scholastic penchant (and concordantly a Greek rather than a Latin tone).” As A. N. Williams notes, “the broader purposes of the series of which it was the inaugural volume (*Théologie*), and the agenda of the first volumes of *Sources chrétiennes* series launched earlier by Daniélou and de Lubac; in all of these, Labourdette claimed to see a devaluation of Thomism. Although the all-sufficiency and unsurpassability of Thomism is no longer an issue, the debate over Bouillard’s work and *Sources Chrétiennes* devolved on the underlying questions of the exhaustability of older theology and the relation of epochs of the Christian theological past to one another, and these remain pertinent. . . . If the theology of one era can simply render earlier ones obsolete, and if definitive readings of any theology can be . . . already arrived at, then there is scant reason to continue studying any of them: not only they, but also their contemporary significance, have already been plumbed.

“The most immediate challenge of the *nouvelle théologie* was simply that it stirred up interest in the Christian past by making the rich array of older theology available, notably through the inauguration of *Sources chrétiennes*. One significance of the latter was the way in which its editorial decisions constituted a tacit rejection of certain scholarly orthodoxies. By including texts of lesser-known medievals . . . , or by rejecting the decisions of earlier editors, *Sources chrétiennes* queried the regnant wisdom about which authors were worth attending and how they should be interpreted. Moreover, in publishing both patristic and medieval texts side by side, the scope of the series implicitly queried the notion of a vast and fundamental divide between the theological landscape of the Fathers