

THE FIRST SESSION AND AFTER, OCTOBER 1962–SEPTEMBER 1963

Commentary: October–December 1962 – the first period of the Council

Sacrosanctum Concilium

The first document that emerged from the Council, in December 1963, was *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Constitution on Sacred Liturgy) and it set the tone for the rest of the Council's work. The initial document still insisted on the primacy of Latin in the liturgy and the priest continuing to turn his back to the worshippers.

Some bishops began to question how people could be involved if the priest had his back to them and said Mass in Latin. Maximos IV Saigh, the Melchite Patriarch of Antioch (Syria) and leader of the Melchite bishops at the Council (who was known for his outspoken comments, delivered in French), reminded his brothers at the Council that Latin was a language of the Roman rite and not of the Universal Church. Christ had spoken the language of his contemporaries.

The final constitution left it to the Episcopal conferences in different parts of the world to propose to the Holy See the degree and modes to which the vernacular language could be admitted into the liturgy. According to John O'Malley, the Council 'set in motion a programmatic reshaping of virtually every aspect of Roman Catholic liturgy unlike anything that had ever been attempted before'.¹

Lumen Gentium

The first draft of *De Ecclesia* (the later *Lumen Gentium*, Dogmatic Constitution of the Church) was rejected as it was considered to be triumphalistic, clerical, and too judicial, referring to its members as 'subjects'. Among the most notable emphases in the Constitution was that the Church was conceived as being the People of God, an earthy, tangible image as opposed to the spiritual image that had been dominant, the Mystical Body of Christ. The longest chapter of *Lumen Gentium* (chapter three), focused on the hierarchy, in particular the

¹John O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2008), p. 139.

episcopate, but was preceded by an elaboration of the meaning of the Church as the People of God in chapter two.

The main issue that was under discussion in the document was the relationship between Vatican I and Vatican II, specifically the relationship between the Pope and the bishops. It explained how the doctrine of papal infallibility functioned alongside the increased emphasis on collegiality among the bishops. The theme of collegiality, which was introduced by Cardinal Suenens, became *the* diversifying subject of the Council. The Belgian Cardinal-Archbishop encouraged the Council to view collegiality both within the Church and in regard to its relations to other churches.

The document also clarified that the realm of political and social change was the domain of the laity: ‘the laity, by their vocation, seek the kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs and ordering them [. . .] [I]t is therefore his [the layman’s] special task to illumine and organise these affairs [. . .] according to Christ’s mind.’

Some critics have pointed out that, while bishops were authorized to meet at national levels, there were no clear mechanisms for broad episcopal influence on the Vatican. While the national councils approved local modifications of the liturgy, the changes still had to be approved by the Roman Curia.

Dei Verbum

The *Dei Verbum* (Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation) essentially addressed the roles in the Church of scripture, tradition, and the *Magisterium* (the teaching authority) and of their relationship to each other. The original document, which spoke of two sources of revelation – tradition and scripture – was rejected and had to be revised. Initially tradition was considered to be more important than scripture, a notion which was met with immediate opposition. The Council of Trent had spoken of the Gospel of Christ as the one source to which both scripture and tradition gave witness; the *periti* were strongly opposed to the initial document and Bishop De Smedt and others vehemently criticized the lack of ecumenical awareness. Although 60% voted against the text, the Doctrinal Commission managed to find a technical loophole which said that a two-thirds majority was needed in order to approve/reject a document and that the same text should be used as basis for discussion. The Pope intervened and declared that a two-thirds majority was only needed for acceptance not rejection; the document was therefore to be re-assessed by both the Doctrinal Commission and the Secretariat for Christian Unity. It is ironic that papal overruling was

accepted in the same session where collegiality had been so fervently discussed.

Report No 49.

15th October, 1962

THESE REPORTS

I am continuing to send reports in this same form until further notice. The Observers have had a preliminary consultation as to what form their reporting should take. So far we have had no instructions from Lambeth. [...]

Whatever form we decide upon will have to take account of the fact that Dr. Grant and I will be the only permanent members of the team. I have suggested that Dr. Grant be asked to submit reports on theological issues as they arise and that I continue my series, concentrating on matters of Roman Catholic organisation etc. The Bishop of Ripon would in that case add a chairman's summary and comments from time to time. This system is in force until we get guidance from Lambeth.

THE OBSERVERS

This extraordinary body has now assembled. We are a motley crew and are not a good representation of non-Roman Christendom. The Orthodox, to begin with, are not properly represented, as you know. Two very fine-looking, intelligent Russians appeared a day late and strode straight into the limelight. One is an Archimandrite, speaking (or saying he speaks) no language other than Russian – it is difficult to see what use he can be. The other is an Archpriest from Leningrad, whose name I have not yet learnt. Syrian and Armenian and Ethiopian Orthodox as well as representatives of the 'Russian Church outside Russia'. These last have been speaking amicably to the representatives of the Patriarchate of Moscow.

There are Copts, Old Catholics, Lutherans (Skydsgaard and Lindbeck), Reformed (French Reformed, Shaw the Scots Presbyterian and Nichols a divinity professor from U.S.A.), Schlink representing German Evangelical Churches, Disciples of Christ, Quakers, Congregational (Norton and Caird), Methodist (an American Methodist Bishop and Dr. Harold Roberts), Lukas Vischer, representing W.C.C. and two Unitarians (!). As guests there are two brothers of Taizé, Oscar Cullmann, Archpriest Schmemmann of an

Orthodox seminary in New York. Hildebrandt (the one who used to be in England) is in as an alternate. Dr. Jackson, the Southern Baptist chief, has turned up, and has been received as a guest.²

The main objection to the Observers is that they are nearly all German, British and American. The almost total non-representation of Africa and Asia is lamentable. The Secretariat have commented favourably on the Archbishop of Canterbury's action in appointing de Soysa. This leads me to wonder whether it wouldn't be a good thing to appoint an African alternate to de Soysa if one can possibly be found.

TELEVISION

On the eve of the Council I took part in a performance of *Panorama*, an evening television programme. The two dramatic personae were Cardinal Gilroy of Sydney³ and myself, and we spoke from the nave of S. Peter's. They had of course intended to have the Bishop of Ripon had he arrived in time. The main point I made, in answer to the usual questions, was that the Council had certainly achieved a good deal before it started. A few years ago it would have been unthinkable that an Anglican could be televised in the nave of S. Peter's discussing these issues amicably with a Roman Cardinal.

OPENING CEREMONY

You will have seen full reports in the press and perhaps on television. We had most advantageous seats, on special chairs put in front of the diplomatic corps. It is said that the Pope, touring the basilica the previous evening to see that all was in order, saw that the observers were high in a remote gallery. He ordered this to be changed. [. . .]

OBSERVERS' FIRST MEETINGS

Dr. Schlink and I, as the 'oldest inhabitants' called a first meeting of the Observers, at the American Church. It was a social occasion.

²One of the most eminent observers was George Lindbeck (1923–), American Lutheran theologian, professor at Yale Divinity School, and from 1968 to 1987 member of the Joint Commission between the Vatican and the Lutheran World Federation. He became widely acknowledged as one of the leading lights in the development of a 'post-liberal' theology in the United States.

³Norman Thomas Gilroy (1896–1977), nominated as Bishop of Port Augusta in South Australia, 1934, despite little pastoral experience; Archbishop of Sydney, 1940–1971; created Cardinal, 1946. At the Council Gilroy was appointed to the Council of Presidency.

The Secretariat called us together on Friday 12th for a briefing. There will be regular meetings at which themes will be explained and question can be asked. The Associated Press, we are told, circulated a news item to the effect that ‘a secret meeting, behind closed doors has been held between Anglicans and Roman Catholics to begin negotiations’. This again is totally untrue and we hope that Col. Hornby⁴ will trace it to its source and deny it. There is no doubt that there are considerable sections of the press who are out to cause trouble, and if possible, even where no difficulties exist, to invent them maliciously.

AUDIENCE WITH THE POPE

On Saturday 13th, the Secretariat suddenly announced that the Pope would receive the observers at 11 a.m. the following day, Sunday 14th. The Anglican delegation immediately said firmly but politely that they regretted they could not attend, as they would be observing the Lord’s Day in a Catholic manner. All the Protestants agreed and the time of the audience was rearranged.

The audience was held in the Sala del Concistorio. Two features of it were notable. There is a magnificent raised throne in this hall, but the Pope had ordered an ordinary chair to be set on the floor level. Also, he made the whole of the Secretariat of State’s department and the Papal Household turn out for the event, which is the usual protocol for royal visits.

1ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY

This was held in the Basilica of S. Peter’s on Saturday October 13th. After the Mass the first business was the election of the departmental commissions. The Bishops had been provided with three documents, a list of all the ‘Fathers of the Council’, a blank voting paper and a list of those who had formed the preparatory commissions. Had the elections happened that first day it is likely that the bishops would have had to elect more or less the same people who had formed the preparatory commissions, having no alternative. This is what the conservatives thought that they would do.

Cardinal Liénart (of Lille) and Frings (of Cologne) immediately suggested a postponement until Tuesday so that in the meanwhile they could meet and decide who were the most suitable candidates.

⁴See p. 35, n. 3.

This was carried with acclamation.⁵ During the weekend nominations have been prepared by national or regional councils of bishops. This can be regarded as an initial triumph for the liberals.

CARDINAL BEA'S RECEPTION

The Cardinal received the delegated observers (and wives!) on Monday Oct. 15th. Practically all the members of the Secretariat were present. In his speech the Cardinal addressed the observers as 'My brothers in Christ' and spoke of the grace of Baptism which had established bonds that are indestructible, stronger than all the divisions. These bonds had prompted the Pope to create the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the presence of the observers at the Council. The Cardinal referred to the painful fact that a 'good number of venerable Orthodox churches of the East' were not represented, and the necessity to continue to pray for the removal of obstacles which prevented closer relationship. He offered to the observers as much help as they cared to ask for, from himself and members of the Secretariat and asked for positive criticism. He regarded the occasion as a family gathering, a spiritual feast, a kind of 'agape' in the One Lord.

Professor Schlink replied on behalf of the observers.

2ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

This took place on Tuesday October 16th. Cardinals Ottaviani and Roberti moved that the elections take place without further delay and that the procedure be by 'relative majority', as distinct from 'absolute majority'. This would shorten the campaign considerably. The argument was fortified by the fact that this was the method recommended in the Standing Orders. The motion was carried, and although this represents a slight triumph for the 'old guard', the postponement even for three days was a very important development.

We were given a new place this day, in one of the tribunes, facing the confessional. It was announced that the first meeting for 'disputations' would be on Monday 22nd. The first subject to be dealt with will be the Liturgy. This is regarded as a good piece of news, representing a determination to get down to practical matters first and making theology take its place in the queue, and perhaps even take its shape according to the needs of liturgy.

⁵This was at once regarded as a crucial action to gain some control over the proceedings by the men of the liberal majority.

We have been provided with a first volume of ‘Schemata’ or motions for debate. I was very pleased to find that I can follow the Latin of the debates very much better than I had feared. But in any case the members of the Secretariat sit with us and interpret liberally. Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, who seems to fulfil a role in the Council rather parallel to that of the last Bishop of London in the Church Assembly,⁶ asked the group of Anglicans afterwards: ‘Say, can any of you guys tell me what language that was they were talking in this morning?’ And also ‘See if you can find out who the two guys are who are sitting on either side of me. I suppose they’re cardinals from some place, but I daren’t ask them who they are after all this time.’
[...]

Report No 50.

29th October, 1962

GENERAL

Life here is really rather exhausting at the moment. We quite often have a service somewhere before breakfast (often involving travelling, e.g. to All Saints’ or to some place where the Observers meet for prayer), long sessions listening in Latin till 12.30. Then there is correspondence, business, interviews in the afternoon and quite often official junketings at noon and at night, to say nothing of our own entertainment here. In addition there are meetings called by the Secretariat. There is no meeting of the Council on Thursdays, but even then we have social functions.
[...]

THE FIRST THREE SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL

These were concerned with elections, and the general issues are referred to in the last report. The main result is, I think, good for us, though time must show. Most of the names are unknown to us: but there is a welcome absence of Irish and Italians, and those who are otherwise our friends seem to be very satisfied with the results.

COUNCIL SESSIONS IN GENERAL

These begin at 9 a.m. with a Mass. There is then the solemn ‘enthronement’ of the Bible at the altar, which is I think a pleasant surprise to the Protestants. The session is presided over by a council

⁶Presumably Henry Montgomery Campbell (1887–1970), Bishop of London, 1956–1961.

of 10 cardinals, taking it in turn to be the Chairman. We sit in a very advantageous position right opposite the cardinals. The loud speaker system is excellent and we have the help of translators as required.

4TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL

On Monday October 22nd, as previously announced, the Fathers of the Council began their discussion of the agenda according to the prepared 'Schemata', with the section dealing with the Liturgy. Owing to the difficulties of speaking in Latin, the proceedings could not possibly be considered to constitute a debate as we understand it, as in the Convocation or even in Parliament, and consisted of a series of carefully prepared written speeches.

For the most part, the suggestions in the 'Schemata' for bringing up-to-date the Liturgy of the Roman Church are eminently reasonable and acceptable by us. As the Bishop of Ripon remarked, 'If they go on like this, they'll find they've invented the Church of England.' We often comment that the general principles are similar to those of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer.

[. . .]

Cardinal Montini, Archbishop of Milan suggested that the questions at issue be put to international commissions of bishops who have their finger on the pastoral points. On the matter of the use of the vernacular, he thought that Latin should be retained for countries where Latin was spoken, but that other languages should be permitted elsewhere. Liturgy was made for man, not man for liturgy. He advocated the avoidance of long ceremonies with meaningless repetitions, but that monastic peculiarities should be allowed.

Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York was cautious. He would like to see careful experiments before anything new was adopted. He was not anxious to see independent action and said that the unity of the Church must be evident, especially in worship. He defended the use of Latin generally, with some exceptions as in the case of Marriage.

Cardinal Döpfner, Archbishop of Munich wished for the deliberations of the Preparatory Central Commission to be duplicated and distributed. He also asked for a Commission to be set up after the Council for the revision of service books. The language of the Liturgy should be the vernacular as far as possible. *Salus populi*⁷ always the rule. Regional Commissions should discuss these questions.

[. . .]

⁷'The health of the people'.

Cardinal Silva Henríquez, Archbishop of Santiago said that the participation of the faithful was most important, especially among some of his illiterate.

[...]

Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi, Apostolic Delegate of the U.S. was very reactionary and asked the Fathers not to renew too much and keep an eye on 'Mediator Dei'. The 'Schemata' he felt, went as far as they ought to go.

[...]

An Italian Bishop made an unusually strong protest, for an old man, against spurious relics which in his opinion should all be collected and burned!

Bishop Kempf of Limburg near Cologne made the point that actions and gestures in the Liturgy should conform to present social conventions. He stressed the need to take the ecumenical view and watch parallel developments in other confessions.

Cardinal Rugambwa of Bukoba spoke on behalf of the African bishops and said they accepted the Schemata with joy.

A (to me) unknown Italian bishop said that if the vernacular were used it would make it easier for the Protestants to 'come over'!

THE ENGLISH HIERARCHY

We were entertained at lunch by the English College and found ourselves in the presence of the whole English hierarchy, including the Cardinal. The Bishop of Ripon and I sat on either side of Cardinal Godfrey at lunch. He spent most of the time asking me about the organisation of our cathedrals. Archbishop Heenan reckoned not to be disturbed by press misrepresentations.

MEETING FOR OBSERVERS

These are organised weekly: the first one started with an explanation of the Liturgical Schemata by a Swiss Jesuit from the Gregorianum, Fr. Schmidt. He gave a very objective account of the background. The Roman Church and the Protestant bodies had much to learn from one another in this matter. During discussion *Cullmann* asked if there was going to be any further explanation of the relation of the Mass to the sacrifice once-for-all on Calvary. The speaker said they hoped to work on the meanings of the word 'representative'. He admitted

that there were differences in the Roman Catholic Church in the relationship.

Professor Berkouwer (Holland) asked what was to be the starting-point of discussion if we reject the dispute between ‘symbolic’ and ‘realistic’. Schmidt said that they were not yet certain of the distinction between repetition and representation as applied to the sacrifice. The Orientals had the key to the theory of representation.

Max Thurian, Prior of Taizé,⁸ said that they would like to see a more Trinitarian approach to the whole schemata on the Liturgy, though they were pleased it was so Christological. He wanted more mention especially of the Holy Spirit. I asked about the phrase in the prooemium that ‘Liturgia, per quam, maxime in suo centro, opus Redemptionis exercetur . . .’.⁹ We were a liturgical church and understood the meaning of this. Surely some indication ought to be given, for the sake of the Protestant brethren, that the work of redemption is accomplished by other means as well. The speaker accepted this comment.

In these meetings we find ourselves sometimes in embarrassing company. Two speakers at this meeting spoke of ‘the Protestant Church’. We questioned this conception and it seemed to be agreed that there was no such thing. Am I right in thinking that there is a ‘World Council of Churches’ mentality growing up round the illusion that ‘Protestants’ are already a homogeneous body?

There is no doubt that most of the other delegates think of the future in terms of ‘discussions’ primarily, there being too large a proportion of academics among them.

Report No 51.

2 November 1962

PRIVATE MEETING OF OBSERVERS

At a private meeting presided over by Schlink two points were mentioned which the assembly thought should be handed on to the Secretariat. One was the matter of freedom of conscientious objection to war, which was severely limited in Roman Catholic countries. The

⁸Max Thurian (1921–1996), Sub-prior of the ecumenical monastic Taizé community in France. Invited as a non-Catholic observer to the Second Vatican Council. He converted to Roman Catholicism in 1988 and was ordained a priest.

⁹‘For the liturgy, through which our redemption is accomplished, most of all in its centre’.

other was the hope that the observers would be able to meet groups of Bishops, not treat always through the Secretariat.

I said that although we were quite in agreement with the suggestions we must be aware of trying to function as a bloc of observers. Where that came naturally there was not necessarily any objection to it. But our prime duty was to represent our own confessions only; and any communiques to the Secretariat should normally be in that form. There was no objection to, and much to be said for, communal discussion of themes. Confessional groups should then decide separately to send, or not to send, representations to the Secretariat.

[...]

RECEPTIONS

These happen thick and fast. I have been to eight during the week ending Sat 27th Oct. and we have given two dinner parties ourselves. The Bishop of Ripon and I join as hosts in the handsome rooms in the American Church House and we share the expenses.

[...]

5TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OCTOBER 23RD

Discussions in the Council began on the section of the Schemata which deals with the subject of the Liturgy, and was in general terms.

Cardinal Ottaviani said that the text should be revised by theologians. He did not think it was right to say baldly that 'the redeeming work of Christ is fulfilled in the Liturgy'. A fuller statement was needed.

Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis, expressed a desire to draw a distinction between what is laid down by Christ and what is not. There was a necessity for reformation in the second century. There was a particular need to distinguish between modern man and 16th century man. The pastoral needs were paramount. A union between faith and liturgy must always be kept.

Bishop Hermann Volk of Mainz, urged a spirit of simplification. He wanted to cut out all features which come from human vanities, such as pomp and circumstances. Especially in pontificabibus.¹⁰ Exaggerations there are intolerable. This should be made to appeal to the separate brethren, and apply to vestments, music, art, everything. The liturgy

¹⁰Matters relating to the pontificate of the Pope.

is often the only opportunity the faithful have of coming into contact with the Divine. Mass must try to avoid legalism.

A missionary bishop said that the tension between tradition and revision should be solved by adopting a *via media*!¹¹

[. . .]

Cardinal Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo, spoke against the points made by Cardinal Ottaviani and said that this was not a theological dissertation, but a liturgical textbook. It was evident to many who had pastoral instinct that Latin was not enough. The vernacular was essential for the participation of the faithful; also the proclamation of the word with dialogue among the people. Exceptions should be made for solemn occasions, priests' conventions etc., when Latin only could be used. Translations should, of course, be approved. In his opinion people could not attend, let alone take part in, the Divine Office, because of Latin.

Cardinal McIntyre, Archbishop of Los Angeles, spoke in defence of the use of Latin whose retention in these days was especially urgent.

Cardinal Léger, Archbishop of Montreal, strongly approved of the Schemata. He wished to press for an immediate sub-Concilium to revise the liturgical books, not to wait for the end of the Council, and stressed some paragraphs as being of primary importance, as most countries are missionary countries.

Cardinal Godfrey, gave general approval to the Schemata. He could see the usefulness of the vernacular in the mission field etc., but Latin in the Mass should not be touched. There was a danger of confusion in neighbouring districts. And he would rather have tranquillity after the Council than confusion. The fact that a ceremony was introduced in the twelfth century was no argument against it. All ceremonies should be scrutinised according to their present usefulness, not as if they were archaeological pieces in a museum, in which only the antique had value.

[. . .]

Patriarch Maximos IV, Saigh of Antioch for the Melchites, said that the Roman Church used Greek until the 4th century, and Latin was introduced because it was the vernacular language of the people of Rome. It was not until the middle ages that the Latin language became the universal language of the Church. In the East all languages were

¹¹The basis, in Pawley's understanding, of the Church of England as a church both catholic and reformed.

potentially liturgical languages. He favoured regional conferences of bishops [...]

6TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 24TH OCTOBER

The discussion again centred round the Prooemium¹² and the first chapter of the Schemata on the Liturgy.

Cardinal Gracias, Archbishop of Bombay, urged a very great increase of discretion for Episcopal Conferences in missionary countries. Some of the minor sacraments must be entirely in the vernacular. The liturgy was in part instruction. It was the *Verbum Dei* in action and therefore must at all costs be made clear. The greater part of his faithful were illiterate. They heard, but did not read. There is no longer East or West as these terms used to be thought of, but a new church of the Gentiles. The vernacular is also necessary to put an end to ‘all this bickering about the meaning of documents.’

It would be wiser to make Russian the language of the Church than Latin! He asked for simplification of episcopal vestments. At Vatican I Manning¹³ joked that the bishops coming out among the crowds looked like a dramatization of the parable of Dives and Lazarus.

Cardinal Bea said that the Council should leave open the possibility of entirely new rites. The Ecumenical Movement had opened great new possibilities in this field and no door should be shut to developments.

Cardinal Bacci, (the Latin expert)¹⁴ maintained that the participation of the people should be brought about by other means than the introduction of national languages. Epistles, Gospels etc. in vernacular tongues were no better understood by the people. It was possible for them to be embarrassed as e.g. by the story of Susannah. (general expressions of derision in S. Peter’s). He even spoke against the indiscriminate use of vernacular testaments. Episcopal conferences would lead, he thought, to diversities hurtful to the Church. This whole speech was very badly received.

[...]

¹²Preface or introduction.

¹³Henry Edward Manning (1808–1902), Archbishop of Westminster, 1865–1892; created Cardinal 1875.

¹⁴Antonio Bacci (1885–1971), Cardinal-Deacon of Sant’Eugenio, 1960–1971; Titular Archbishop of Colonia in Cappadocia, 1962. He was strongly opposed to the use of the vernacular in the Mass. In what was known as the ‘Ottaviani Intervention’, he and Ottaviani sent to Pope Paul VI, with a short covering letter from themselves, a study by a group of theologians under the direction of Archbishop Lefebvre criticizing the draft Order of Mass of the revision of the Roman Missal.

Bishop Van Lierde, Vicar General for the Pope of the Vatican City, urged for greater clarity in the relations between the Liturgy and the spiritual life. The suggestion in the text that the Liturgy was the *only* means of redemption was dangerous. Doubtful relics should be scrutinised by a special commission. He also wanted a common attempt to introduce the greater Christian feasts into public life: Advent, Christmas, Ascension, even Corpus Christi.

[. . .]

Archbishop Šeper of Zagreb asked for a modification and clarification of a section which was better expressed in *Mediator Dei*,¹⁵ concerning the relation of the sacrifice of the altar to the salvation achieved upon the Cross. Account should be taken of Protestant insights in this matter.

Report No 52.

9 November 1962

7TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, OCT. 26TH

Discussion continued on the Liturgy [. . .]

Cardinal Siri, Archbishop of Genoa, said that they should have in mind the receptivity of the minds of the laity. Exaggerations would only confuse them. He advocated a mixed communion on the liturgy and the Discipline of the Sacraments to deal with details.

Bishop Bekkers of the Hertogenbosch, Holland, spoke on behalf of the Dutch episcopate and said that all agreed with the Prooemium and Chapter I. Their theological objections were small; in all things pastoral considerations were to prevail. Someone must consider, he went on, whether the Holy See ought to be leaded [*sic*] with the responsibility of deciding all the questions which might be referred to it. Unless regional conferences of bishops were give a wide margin this was what would be likely to happen.

[. . .]

Bishop Luigi Carli of Segni, Italy, was of the opinion that the place of the Liturgy in the life of the Seminarist was exaggerated. Good Liturgy grew naturally out of holy lives. There should be a central expert international commission of appeal in liturgical matters. He also made

¹⁵Encyclical issued by Pope Pius XII in 1947 regarding the participation of the faithful in the liturgy.

a very strong attack on the dangers of regional episcopal conferences, as lending to excessive variety.

Abbot Christopher Butler of Downside, who subjected us to a great flow of Oxford Latin, said that any doctrinal consequences of changes opposed in the constitution should be made clear. You could go a long way in custom without affecting doctrine at all. Where there was no such change proposed, this should be made clear.

Bishop Demetric Mansilla Reoyo, Auxiliary of Burgos, Spain, asked that a list be made of these extra-liturgical devotions which were (a) permitted and (b) commended. There was much regional variety before Trent, which Trent usified to the good of the Church. (Our minds thought of Cranmer, and the rites of Sarum, York and Hereford).¹⁶
[. . .]

Abbot Benedict Reetz, Abbot General of the Benedictine Congregation of Beuren, Germany, complained about an opening sentence which was too bald. 'Latina lingua in Liturgia servetur'.¹⁷ What was to happen to Gregorian chant, however, he asked, if the vernacular be used. (Let the Church of England answer that one).¹⁸ He wanted the vernacular to be used up to the Offertory, then Latin for the canon. On the whole a surprising and unconvincing defence of Latin coming from one of the Benedictine abbeys which has been a spearhead of liturgical reform.
[. . .]

Bishop Le Cordier, Auxiliary of Paris, said that he worked in an 'urban agglomeration' with youth etc. who were 'post-Christians', but he had good lay witnesses at work in factories, prepared to suffer for their faith. A Church which was truly a *Mater et Magister*¹⁹ would talk to her children in their own language.

Bishop Rau of Mar del Plata, Argentina, spoke for Latin America, asked for not only a wider use of the vernacular, but for a reconsideration of any and every gesture and notion. The Liturgical Movement had already shown itself to be a direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Latin was not understood, especially in 'Latin' countries! Liturgical participation of the people was only possible if they were fully understanding what was

¹⁶In the Book of Common Prayer, of which Cranmer was the substantial author, these early rites were drawn together and given a new and distinctive form as the voice of a Reformed church.

¹⁷'Latin [should be] preserved in the liturgy'.

¹⁸In the Church of England, while the Psalms are often sung to Anglican psalm chants, both Psalms and canticles may still be sung to Gregorian chants, for example at Compline.

¹⁹*Mater et Magister* (Mother and Teacher), 1961 encyclical issued by Pope John XXIII.

going on. No commentary could take the place of understanding the text. No valid historical case existed against the use of the vernacular. [...]

Bishop Stanislaus Lokuang of Tainan, China, said that regional conferences should not make the changes, but should make suggestions to a central international committee. It was wrong to say that Liturgy, as such, was the gift of God, but the gift was grace, of which the Liturgy is a fruit.

Bishop Clemente Isnard of Nova Friburgo, Brazil, speaking on behalf of all the hierarchy of Brazil, argued that it was no good quoting Canon Law to the Council as something binding. The Council was above Canon Law and should change it where necessary. What was the point of granting 'permission to suggest' to bishops – even laity could do that!

One of the most amusing features of these discussions is to note the difference between the actual substance of the speeches, and the report on the day's deliberations as published in the following *Osservatore Romano*. On the above discussion the report read: 'The Council Fathers' discussion on these points was done with mutual exchange of each one's learning and experience. It is not a matter of opposing positions, but of a common and fraternal research through the free expression of different points of view, of liturgical practice always more suited for the realisation, on the catechetical and pastoral planes, of the very end which the Church sets for itself in carrying out its divine mission: the salvation of souls.'

9TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OCTOBER 29TH

Discussion on the Liturgy was resumed, still on the Prooemium and Cap. I.

Bishop Santin of Trieste said that 'adaption' was not necessary for old churches, but rather a deeper piety and more active participation, much of which could be achieved without a single change in the liturgy. Adaption in ritual, however, was possible and necessary. Bishops should go away from the Council and think this out, then report findings to regional conferences.

Bishop Battaglia of Faenza, Italy, reported that there was no mention of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the whole schema. He appealed for some insertion with the phrase 'in opera nostrae salvationis'.²⁰ He also made a frantic appeal for the retention of the Latin language.

²⁰'In works of our salvation'.

Archbishop Melendro of Anking, China, (in exile), was anxious that the pendulum be not allowed to swing too far.

Report No 53.

7 November 1962

10TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OCTOBER 30TH

Discussion was resumed on the 2nd Chapter on the Liturgy.

Cardinal Godfrey spoke first on certain difficulties which arose in his parishes: (i) masses tended to succeed one another every half an hour and therefore a homilia in every mass was not practicable, nor public prayers. (ii) the place for the vernacular was in the private prayers of the faithful, not in the public prayers of the priest. (iii) Communion in both kinds. Doctrinal difficulties had been raised by Protestants against the practices of one kind as used in the Roman Church; the general adaption of two kinds would therefore be constructed as an admission of doctrinal error. There were hygienic reasons against it: lipstick on the chalice (would the women use liturgical colours?) (a heavy-handed effort at a joke). There was also the case of alcoholics. (iv) Concelebration was all right, e.g. on Holy Thursday when all the priests stood around the bishop. Conditions otherwise should be very carefully stated in the schema.

Cardinal Gracias, Archbishop of Bombay, urged that unless the great questions (the use of the vernacular, adaptations of rite, and episcopal conferences), were clearly settled in the first chapter, it was going to be very difficult to consider the subsequent chapters. He stood against communion in both kinds in India for special reasons. He made an impassioned appeal for prayers for India and said that the 72 Indian bishops were having to consider whether to return to their country because of the grave military situation.²¹

[...]

Cardinal Alfrink, Archbishop of Utrecht, said that nothing was clearer in sacred scripture than that Christ instituted the sacrifices of the Mass under two kinds. It was agreed that it was difficult to carry this out at every Mass, but opportunities ought to be more frequent than the occasions mentioned in the chapter. Every congregation ought to be familiar with the practice, which must be worked out by the episcopal conferences.

²¹ On 20 October 1962, Chinese forces had attacked India in the Himalayan border regions. After an intensive conflict a cease-fire was agreed on 20 November.

Cardinal Ottaviani [...] The reform of the Mass was a very awesome thing [...] Communion in both kinds was quite impracticable. The Scriptural arguments were not conclusive in this matter of detail. Christ was not trying to write rubrics. (He was ‘gonged’ into silence after 15 minutes!)

Cardinal Bea said that the word ‘convivium’ in the Preface should be substituted by ‘sacrificium’. To ‘sacrificium laudis’ add ‘et propitiationis’.²² These two emendations come from Trent. The Homilia was already prescribed by canon law at which the faithful were present on Sundays and feast days. The question of communion in both kinds was disciplinary, not dogmatic. Pius IV allowed the chalice to certain areas of Germany two years after Trent. The Cardinal quoted several other instances of papal permissions for this privilege.

[...]

Archbishop Ermenegildo Florit of Florence [...] wanted homilia only at the more solemn masses. This should be strongly encouraged. (None of the speakers so far seemed conscious of the desire of the Liturgical Reformers that the Sacrament and the Word should almost never be separated, and that if necessary the number of masses on a given Sunday should be reduced. c.f the Book of Common Prayer – where there is a sermon the faithful should not communicate without having heard it.)]

[...]

Bishop Bernhard Stein, Auxiliary of Trier, said that there must be a determined effort to make the word of God really understood in the celebration of the Mass. The whole conception of the Verbum Dei must be restored to its proper place.

[...]

11TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OCTOBER 31ST.

Discussion centred on [...] the Schemata on the Liturgy.

A notice was given out forbidding the fathers to ‘circulate’ one another without the permission of the presidents.

[...]

Cardinal Caggiano of Buenos Aires approved of concelebration especially at ordinations and Maundy Thursday. It could be extended to sick priests.

[...]

²²‘The sacrifice of praise’ ‘and atonement’.

Bishop Iglesias Navarri of Urgel, Spain, was against communion in both kinds. This was rendered quite unnecessary by decisions of private councils. Concelebration, he thought, only for the ordination of priests.

Bishop Nueir, Auxiliary of Tebe-Luxor for the Copts, pleaded for liberty to use leavened or unleavened bread because of difficulty of getting the necessary type in certain circumstances.

[...]

Bishop Devoto of Goya, Argentina, thought that there had been too much detail so far in the Council. He asked that the priest be allowed to face the people, and that considerable streamlining of ceremonial in the Mass should take place. A priest's intentions must not be able to be bought, or, if they were for individuals, to be for others than those present in public masses.

Bishop Nagae of Urawa, Japan, felt that lections and hymns at least should be in the vernacular. Perhaps in countries of the Latin language, they might wish to retain this language, but there was no question that it was possible in missionary lands. The people of Japan would never be able to say even the Lord's Prayer in Latin.

[...]

Bishop Da Cunha Marelim of Caxias do Maranhão, Brazil, was against communion in both kinds because of infectious diseases. The westward position for the mass should be reserved for special cases under permission of the ordinary. Otherwise the faithful would be more inclined to watch the face of the celebrant than to contemplate the face of Christ.

Archbishop Weber of Strasbourg, said that a large number of French bishops were in favour of communion in both kinds. The schema left discretion to bishops, which was as it should be.

Bishop Elchinger, Assistant Bishop of Strasbourg, wished for a more clear exposition of one section, that any changes were by way of evolution of a new liturgical understanding. Conservatism must be resisted for the sake of youth, who could not 'take' formalism and pomposity. They must have a rite that conveyed the mystery of the Incarnation without the unnecessary mystification of unknown ceremonies. If young people did not find communion with the divine within the Church they would go and find it elsewhere.

[...]

Archbishop Neofito Edelby, Titular of Edessa of Osroene. After a very clear advocacy of communion in both kinds, he accused the Council of being under a psychological prohibition lest it should seem to be

under pressure from the ‘separated brethren’, and less there should be any ‘loss of face’. In any case intinction should solve the problem if there was any practical difficulty. The eastern churches, he said, had kept to the ‘catholic order’ through the centuries. Nevertheless there should not be sudden abandon, but gradual experiment, in the west.

Bishop Peter Pao-Źin-Tou of Hsinchu, Formosa, said there should be clear division between the three parts of the Mass. The use of the vernacular in the Mass of the catechumens would be immediately welcome in China. He thought that the post communion part of the mass was too short and the faithful had scarcely time enough to return adequate thanks before leaving the church. Why not therefore transfer the Gloria to the end of the service? Anglicans exchanged grins.²³

[. . .]

Bishop Jan van Cauwelaert of Inongo, Congo, said that the bishops of Africa, Madagascar ‘and the other islands’ were very much in favour of the extension of concelebration. In fact 260 bishops supported the proposals of Cardinal L ger that the matter be left in the hands of individual diocesan bishops. This bishop made a very moving appeal for a new spirit in legislation which was loudly applauded. (Applause is officially not permitted in the Council).

Bishop Boillon, Coadjutor of Verdun, France, made the point that the sick can often only receive liquid. In that case communion must be administered in the second kind.

[. . .]

Report No 54.

12 November 1962

12TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 5TH

There were no meetings of the General Assembly on November 1st, 2nd and 3rd, as S. Peter’s was being prepared for the celebrations of the 4th anniversary of the Pope’s coronation on Sunday November 4th. Discussions on Cap I of the Schemata on the Liturgy were resumed on Monday Nov, 5th.

Cardinal Confalonieri of the Curia made an attempt to suggest that discussion be limited as far as possible to the actual text of the Schemata. This suggestion was not well received.

²³This is the format as set down in the Book of Common Prayer.

Cardinal McIntyre of Los Angeles said that the mass was intelligibly and reasonably performed in the U.S.A. The Epistle and Gospel were read in English and then explained. This was quite enough. There was no need to interrupt the Latin. Sufficient manoeuvre was already allowed by existing formularies.

Bishop Duschak, Vicar Apostolic of Calapan, Philippines, said that there had already been dozens of changes in the *ordo missae*.²⁴ All changes should be as far as possible returns to the original forms and simplicities of the Liturgy as far as they were made clearer by advancing liturgical studies. We should not, he said, be hesitant to adopt radical changes provided they help to restore the original commemoration, in its simplest form, to the affection of the people. Christ sat in the middle of the people using the language of the times [. . .]. Then let a totally reconstituted and renovated Liturgy draw all together again, separated brethren and all. This would then indeed be a Concilium Unionis.

The substance of this speech was relayed to my wife on the telephone by the B.B.C. correspondent in Rome, before it was delivered in S. Peter's. Later the bishop concerned held a press conference at which he expounded his points once more. So much for the 'secrecy' of the Council's deliberations!

[. . .]

Bishop Bandira de Mello of Palma, Brazil, said that the Roman rite had evolved spontaneously from the first century and no doubt S. Peter himself had a hand in it. It was therefore a sacred trust which would be tampered with only at peril.

Bishop Cousineau of Cap Haitien, Haiti, hoped that the Council would not hesitate to institute and introduce new prayers into the canon itself if it felt that God's truth was more clearly expressed by so doing. There must be no unchangeable sanctity about the forms of words [. . .]

[. . .]

Bishop Seitz of Kontum, Viet Nam, asked for the significance of the offertory to be more clearly expressed in words and ceremony. Let the people both eat and drink the Body of Christ without limitation. The use of Latin at any point was nothing but a hindrance in the Far East.

[. . .]

²⁴*Ordo Missae* (Order of Mass) is the set text of the Roman Rite Mass. In 1969 Paul VI promulgated the *Novus Ordo Missae* (New Order of the Mass or the New Ordinary of the Mass, not the official name). The *Novus Ordo Missae* is the ordinary form of the Roman Rite; the Traditional Latin Mass is the extraordinary form. Both are equally valid, and any qualified priest can celebrate either.

Discussion continued on Cap II

Bishop Pildáin y Zapáin of the Canary Islands, Spain, said that a more fluid form of prayers in the Mass should exist for topical needs, particular biddings, etc. The homeless, the unemployed etc. should find that their needs had a recognisable place in the Liturgy itself.

MOTIONS FOR CLOSURE

After a few speeches it was announced that ‘the Sovereign Pontiff had given to the Committee of Presidents the right to call for a vote for the closure of a debate when, in their judgement, the subject had been sufficiently treated and there were still Fathers down to speak’. This kind of notice is always repeated in the five languages French, Spanish, English, German and Arabic, which is no doubt evidence that not all the bishops can be assumed to understand Latin.

A vote for closure was taken, which was almost unanimous:

‘Surgant qui consentitunt cession sessionis’

‘Surgat qui nelant’²⁵

Laughter and clapping when no one stood for the ‘Noes’.

Discussion then turned to Cap III which deals with the Sacraments and Sacramentals.

Cardinal Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo, asked that there should be a clearer distinction between the two. The former were instituted by Christ and were effective *ex opera operato*, the latter were instituted by the Church and were effective *ex opere operantis*.²⁶ Therefore let there be no change in the former, but perhaps in the latter.

[. . .]

Bishop Franz Hengsbach of Essen, said that:

1. The Sacraments in general are also discussed under other headings as well (Commission on Sacraments for example). He therefore called for a rearrangement of the material by a commission.

²⁵Would those who consent to this session’s closure stand?; ‘Would those who don’t, stand’.

²⁶‘*Ex opere operato*’ – ‘by the work done’, i.e. sacraments confer grace when the sign is validly effected. ‘*Ex opera operantis*’ – ‘from the work of the worker’, i.e. a term mainly applied to the good dispositions with which a sacrament is received, to distinguish them from the ‘*ex opere operato*’.

2. Confirmation concerns the Laity. This should be discussed also with them.
3. The sections on Baptism of Adults and Confirmation should be run together. No one should be baptised as an adult without proceeding at once to Confirmation. A unified rite of Christian Initiation should therefore be worked out. This all sounded very Anglican.

[. . .]

Archbishop Capozzi of Taiyuan, China, made a very strong appeal for a lively interpretation of all Sacraments and sacramentals by the celebrating priests, and the avoidance at all costs of formalism. The privilege of the cardinals of hearing confessions everywhere should be extended to every bishop.

Archbishop Kozłowiecki of Lusaka, Northern Rhodesia, drew attention to the shortage of priests and suggested that very much more use should be made of the laity e.g. for catechism. Priests in the mission field must be liberated as much as possible from administrative matters, and even from spiritual ones which could be accomplished by the laity.

[. . .]

Bishop Lebrín of Valencia, Venezuela, suggested that the privilege of baptism by laity should be extended because of the shortage of priests and difficulties of travelling.

Archbishop Salazar of Medellín, Colombia, speaking on behalf of all the bishops of Colombia, said that there should be two separate orders of confirmation, one for infants, one for adults. The regulations and canons about penances were too complicated. A form of interrogatory confession for those who were in articulo mortis²⁷ should be compiled. There should also be more liberty for provincial bishops. A uniform burial rite should exist for all classes, rich and poor! [. . .]

Bishop Cabrera Cruz of San Luis Potosí, Mexico, said that the shortage of priests made the practice of nuptial masses almost impossible in busy parishes. The married should therefore be encouraged to go to communion as soon afterwards as possible (c.f. Book of Common Prayer). Mexican accent very difficult to hear.

[. . .]

²⁷'At the moment of death, or a moment before death'. The phrase applies especially to any significant statement that a person consciously makes, such as an admission of guilt or a sudden act of contrition, just as he or she is about to enter eternity.

14TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 7TH

Discussion was resumed on the Liturgy [. . .]

Bishop Pierre Rougé, Coadjutor of Nîmes, said that the proposals concerning the rite of Unction had perhaps been thought to be contrary to the findings of the Council of Trent. This was not so if reference were made to the theological sections of a sacrament previously ordained by Christ. The prayers in the ritual had always asked for the recovery and good health of the recipient. How could that be if the sacrament were always only intended for those in articulo mortis.²⁸

Bishop Angelini, titular of Messene, said that one of the results of the practice of waiting for a person to be in articulo mortis was that the ministration was lost altogether. Much better, therefore, for it to be used in general sickness. In primitive peoples, under the present conditions, far from healing, it kills from fright. The rite needs to be very much simplified, e.g. by the provision that it could be performed on the forehead only.

Bishop Kempf of Limbourg was of the opinion that even if the scope of this sacrament were broadened, they should not lose sight of the fact that it was *also* a sacrament of death, the anointing of the body for the passage out of this life into the life of resurrection.

Bishop Isnard of Nova Friburgo, Brazil, made a plea for the use of confirmation after the age of full reason. The change of the times, universal education etc. demands this.

Bishop Sansierra of San Juan de Cuyo, Argentina, said that the promises of baptism were such as were administered to a child per sponsos. By the time a child was ready for confirmation he should be adult and the promises should be more extensive, containing promises to Christ and the Church. The ritual and the rite of marriage should be amplified to give the pair much more to say and to do. Let the blackness of funerals gradually be exchanged for something better corresponding to the real theology of the matter.

[. . .]

Bishop Sibomana of Ruhengeri, Ruanda, said that on behalf of some of his own neighbours, they welcomed the provision in par. 49 that there might be incorporated into the rite of Baptism such local customs as might be edifying. There were in some parts of Africa certain initiatory

²⁸See p. 155, n. 27.

rites which could easily be so incorporated. Many people in his part of the world took baptism very seriously and found the present ceremony rather short and unimpressive.

[...]

Bishop Wojtyła, Vicar Capitular of Cracow,²⁹ said that the pastoral aspect of the sacraments should certainly be kept on top. Christian initiation should not be thought of just as consisting of Baptism, but also of all Christian instruction and catechetical preparation for confirmation, leading up to first communion and this ought to be the order of the rites. (How Anglican can you get?) I made a mental note that we might send in a memorandum to the effect that this was very much the mind also of the Anglican Communion, and that the following out of the ideas had been found to be pastorally very profitable.

[...]

Bishop Malula of Leopoldville, Congo, asked that the bishops of the Catholic Church should unite in approving once more the ancient principle of *diversitas in unitas*; but then, like the Magi, offer each one what was their own, in union with their fellows. Let there be in effect national churches united by a common allegiance.

[...]

Cardinal Frings, Archbishop of Cologne, spoke of proposals for a further reform of the psalter, not in accordance with classical Latin, but of patristic. Let the Vulgate stay where it can; if not let it be compared with the Hebrew version of Jerome. There should be liberty left to episcopal conferences to allow certain people to be dispensed from the breviary in Latin. Many ordinands came these days from schools where there was no Latin. They were therefore a special case.

Cardinal Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo, asked that the imprecatory psalms from the Breviary be left out; likewise psalms which used a non-Christian view of the after-life.

[...]

Cardinal Léger, of Montreal, made some totally radical suggestions for the clergy in parishes, as to the recitation of lauds, vespers and 'lectio divina'. The busy parish priest was sanctifying all the hours of the day by his work. The universal imposition of the same rule of prayer on religious and on parish priests was useless [...]. The bishops had a solemn obligation for the clergy in this matter. The disobedience which the present rule forced upon the parish clergy was most destructive of a good spirit. He, further, made an appeal for the vernacular in the Divine office in certain regions, and under

²⁹Karol Józef Wojtyła (1920–2005), Pope John Paul II, 1978–2005.

necessary circumstances. Great dangers of formalism existed if these suggestions were not implemented.

15TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 9TH

Discussion continued on Cap IV concerning the Divine Office.

Cardinal Cerejeira, Patriarch of Lisbon, spoke first and said that care must be taken to avoid the dangers of 'activism' and 'Americanism' and not to let the spiritual office of the Church be swamped by daily necessities. The life of prayer must be preserved. Nevertheless the 7 hour offices, as at present constituted, were not convincingly arranged, and should be reconsidered.

Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, said that when innovations were made they must not be allowed to be just antiquarian and academic. The vernacular would be quite permissible for private recitation, though it should be borne in mind that the priest even in private recitation was offering the public prayer of the Church.

[. . .]

Cardinal Godfrey, Archbishop of Westminster, said that exaggeration had been made of the need for removing the 'burden' from the shoulders of the clergy. He had never heard a priest complain of the difficulties. There was always a danger of 'activism'. He appealed for the keeping of the old traditions, and insisted that the Breviary must continue in Latin; otherwise they would seriously undermine the possibility of Latin. There should be no further abbreviations. [. . .]

Cardinal Bacci of the Roman Curia, said that $\frac{4}{5}$ of the Breviary was from the Old Testament. This should certainly be revived. At least $\frac{1}{3}$ of the Psalms were unsuitable for recitation in the Christian Breviary. Historical lections should be improved and brought up to date, particularly the history of the Saints. A Commission to carry on this work after the Council would be desirable.

Cardinal Bea said it was not necessary for the Council to decree that a revision should take place. It had begun and was already going on and would continue under the papal decrees. What the Council should do is to lay down clearly the general rules which should govern the revisions; concerning the respective obligations of the religious and the secular; concerning the relation of choir offices to private recitation, and particularly concerning the participation of the laity in the Office from time to time. He made an appeal that the above measures would save a lot of time.

[. . .]

Bishop Weber of Strasbourg on behalf of most of the bishops of France, said that priests who were actively engaged in the apostolate could not possibly fulfil all the obligations of the canon law. The Council should lay down the obligation of reciting the office as far as possible. There should then be a thorough revision with the needs of the parish priest in mind, if he was to fulfil his duties.

Bishop Franić of Split, speaking with the consent of all the Yugoslav bishops, said that in their circumstances, with few priests, they were overwhelmed with the obligations. A certain telescoping of the obligations (e.g. meditation into the office etc.) should be undertaken. [...]

Bishop Reh of Charleston, South Carolina, said that the whole breviary was designed for choral recitation. How could it therefore be well conceived for the harassed parish priest. The prayers, for one thing, were often responsory. There should therefore be a totally different type of private prayer evolved for the use of the individual priest saying the Breviary alone.

[...]

Report No 56.

14 November 1962

16TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 10TH

Cardinal Ruffini, the reactionary Archbishop of Palermo, was in the chair for this Session and he announced at the beginning that there was to be no more applause. Discussion [...] on the Divine Office continued.

Bishop García, titular of Sululos (Spanish), said that there was too much of the Old Testament in the Breviary. This should be rectified with the greatest care by the substitution of the New Testament and patristic passages.

[...]

Bishop Levan, Auxiliary of San Antonio, Texas, was of the opinion that the more extensive use of the vernacular in the offices, especially in public recitation, would be a help not only to the faithful of the Roman Catholic Church but also to the separated brethren.

[...]

Archbishop Plaza of La Plata, Argentina, made a speech against those who too easily threw down the cult of images. He wanted to restore Our Lady of Ransom and Our Lady of Mount Carmel to the calendar. (They were expunged at the last revision).

Bishop Čule of Mostar, Yugoslavia, asked that there should be a distinction between the saints of the 1st class, whose lives were of universal importance and those who were of only local concern. A strong plea for greater recognition of S. Joseph was then made. There were too many members of small religious orders being canonised. This man was stopped by the President.

Archbishop Melendro of Anking, China, (in exile), made a plea for the cultus of Mary who was the best of all introductions to the person of Christ. This speech got so sermonical that the President eventually said:

Omnes episcopi praedicatores sunt; praedicatoribus non praedicatur.³⁰

17TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 12TH

[. . .] Discussion was then resumed on the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th Chapters of the Schemata on the liturgy. The fifth chapter dealt with the liturgical year, the sixth was on the liturgical vestments and instruments, the seventh chapter concerned sacred music and the eight and last on the sacred art.

Cardinal Camara, Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro, urged the greater competence of clergy in sacred music, starting at the Seminaries; particularly in the matter of Gregorian chant.

Cardinal Feltin, Archbishop of Paris, wanted a fixed Easter on the first Sunday of April.

Cardinal Rugambwa, Bishop of Bukoba, Tanganyika, wanted a permanent Commission of music experts to be able to encourage the development of native music especially in the new countries.

[. . .]

Archbishop Melendro of Anking, China, (in exile [. . .]) thought that modern art had gone too far in banishing pictures. The Council should lay down that in all churches there should be at least a picture of Our Lord and Our Lady, preferably on the altar.

[. . .]

Archbishop Khoury of Tyr, Lebanon, wanted a redefinition of a liturgical day. There was a general practice for a liturgical day to run from vespers to vespers. He would prefer midnight to midnight. He spoke

³⁰‘[While] all bishops are preachers preaching should not be undertaken for the sake of preachers.’

for greater caution in the mitigation of fasts. There was a tendency to give in too easily to the laity of the modern world.

[. . .]

19TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 13TH NOVEMBER

Cardinal Ottaviani returned to the Assembly today. His absence had been much commented upon in the Press and elsewhere and the fact that he had not been present since having been ‘gonged’ by the chairman (followed by applause) was in some quarters interpreted as pique. He chose, however, to return when the same chairman (Cardinal Alfrink) was presiding.

A ruling was made that amendments could be read out but not discussed at length.

Discussion continued on the [. . .] Liturgy.

Bishop D’Amato, Abbot of S. Paul Outside the Walls, made a plea for the universality of plainchant. Students from all nations in Rome, especially Africans and Asians said how easily they picked it up, starting from their own musical traditions. Gregorian chant did not, he said, go easily into any other language than Latin.

Bishop Almarcha Hernandez of León, Spain, asked that use be made of the treasures of music which existed already. Why hanker after more where there was this inexhaustible feast! A forlorn cry for traditionalism. Much Gothic architecture was destroyed at the Reformation, and there was now much danger that modern styles would obscure the value of what had gone before.

[. . .]

CULT OF S. JOSEPH

Cardinal Cicognani intervened at this juncture with a message from the Pope. He announced that the Holy Father had decreed that the name of S. Joseph should be inserted in the Canon.

This announcement was regarded by our friends in the Council at first sight with unconcealed dismay, lest its publication should seem to be the puny first-fruits of the great deliberations:

Parturiunt montes,
Nascetur ridiculus mus.³¹

³¹‘Mountains will go into labour, and a silly little mouse will be born.’ Horace, *Ars Poetica*, line 139.

Some said that perhaps the Pope by deciding to take it on his own shoulders as a *Motu Proprio*³² had avoided this very possibility. Others said that we must bear in mind that the Pope was under continual pressure from the ‘Integrists’. In making them this petty concession perhaps he was hoping to put himself in a position in which he would later be able to say to them ‘You’ve had what you asked for – now be reasonable and let the others have a turn.’

The discussions continued on the subject of the Liturgy.

[. . .]

Bishop Kowalski of Culma, Poland, wanted all *jus liturgicum*³³ kept in Rome. It had been one of the surprises (to me at any rate) to find how the Poles seemed to be conservative to a man. One supposed that sovietisation might have chastened them. But they were previously very reactionary. The Polish National Catholic Church in America, I imagine, represents the skimming off most of the reforming cream.

Bishop Taguchi of Osaka, Japan, appealed for simplification of the appearance of churches and of bishops! The Cappa Magna was not a thing which appealed to the Japanese, nor was the taking on and off of mitres during Mass.

Bishop Volk of Mainz, said he was authorised by the Secretariat for Unity to move an amendment to the effect that all parts of the Mass which could be sung by choir or people should be able to be sung in the vernacular, whether to Gregorian chants or not.

This completed the discussion on that part of the Schemata which concerns the Liturgy.

Report No 57.

16 November 1962

19TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 14TH NOVEMBER VOTE ON THE LITURGY

Before proceeding to the new project on the Sources of Revelation, the Secretary General read (followed by translations in five languages) a communication in the name of the President, Cardinal Tisserant:

[‘]With the completion of the discussion of the project “De Sacra Liturgia” it is proposed to proceed to a vote on the following Order of the day:

³²A document issued by the Pope on his own initiative and under his own name.

³³Liturgical jurisdiction.

1. The II Vatican Ecumenical Council, having seen the project “De Sacra Liturgia”, approves its directive criteria which are intended to render, with prudence and comprehension, the various parts of the liturgy itself more vital and formative of the faithful, in accordance with present pastoral requirements.
2. The amendments proposed in the conciliar discussion as soon as they are examined and compiled in due form by the Council Commission on Liturgical Matters, should be submitted without delay to the vote of the General Congregation, so that its votes may serve for a final rendition of the text.³⁴

This was eventually voted on and carried with only about 50 votes against, some 2,200 voting. The general principles of the Schema had thus been approved. This was regarded by one and all as a great gain.

Cardinal Ottaviani opened the discussion on the Sources of Revelation [. . .]

He then made a general declaration on the functions of a Council in relation to doctrine, which was to bring about *incrementum*, not *renovationem*, of the faith.³⁴

Cardinal Liénart, *Bishop of Lille*, said that the Schema was a completely inadequate presentation of the situation. There was but one source of revelation, from which the two here mentioned flowed. Even Trent said that. The word of God incarnate was the original fount, which he allowed to flow on through the Apostles. The Holy Ghost was speaking through the Apostles before the New Testament was written. The style of the Schema was cold and scholastic. One could not speak so of God’s previous gifts.

The Cardinal went on to say that they should have the sense to begin this Schema (in the presence of the observers!) with a clear declaration of their trust in the Word of God. This would have been a better thing to do than to correct errors. Their faith, he said, must not be founded on scholastic disputations, but on the whole word of God. The whole Schema should be rewritten.

Cardinal Frings, *Archbishop of Cologne*, referred to the speech of Cardinal Ottaviani, and that the Cardinal had said that the first duty of the pastor was to preach the truth. But there were two ways of preaching the truth: one which pleased and one which repelled. In this Schema

³⁴‘Growth’, not ‘renewal’.

they did not have the Church speaking as *Mater et Magistra*,³⁵ but like a strict schoolmarm! He backed up Liénart in saying that this habit of speaking of the two founts was not really patristic, but dated from the 19th century historicism.

[. . .]

Cardinal Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo, then came to the rescue. This had all been prepared with great care etc. Why throw it out without giving it a hearing? If they were to have another Schema, they should have to consult all the fathers again and so on ad infinitum.

Cardinal Siri, Archbishop of Genoa, agreed that the Schema was not perfect, but should be used as far as possible. ‘Modernism’ was still alive and had in fact grown since Vatican I and constituted a real danger. The Bishops of Italy yesterday had decided:

- a. There was not an equal proportion between Scripture and Tradition,
- b. it should be made clearer that Tradition needed to be interpreted almost entirely by Scripture.

Cardinal Quiroga y Palacios, Archbishop of Santiago de Compostela, maintained that it would not be right to reject any schema at this stage. If necessary it could be amended. The Church must obviously take into account the result of modern scholarship. Expressions and terminology should be as intelligible as possible.

Cardinal Léger, Archbishop of Montreal, wanted a revision of the whole thing in such a way as to show recognition of the great fruits of modern biblical scholarship. The present scheme:

1. had too much dogmatic certitude about things which were not yet decided,
2. the whole tone of the Schema should be made positive,
3. the mentality of the Schema should show confidence in the Holy Spirit without fears of errors; let then the doors be open to all the fruits of modern biblical scholarship.

[. . .]

Cardinal Alfrink, Archbishop of Utrecht, thought that there had been no real attempt to improve upon the doctrine of Trent, even though so much in the biblical field has happened in the meanwhile. The Schema missed great opportunities of removing misunderstandings which offended the separated brethren.

³⁵Mother and Teacher.

[. . .]

Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis, suggested that the whole Schema be thrown out and that a new start be made. It was in no sense adapted to the needs of the present day, less clear even than Trent [. . .]

Cardinal Bea did not think that the Schema corresponded with the Holy Father's intentions for the Council which was that doctrines should be brought up to date. The Schema was completely lacking in pastoral sagacity. The whole affair lacked also any idea of the ecumenical problems. All this with an overtone which was most moving.

Patriarch Maximos IV Saigh of Antioch of the Melchites, spoke again in French without apology. This was no time for definitions about the relation of Tradition and Scripture, but about the relation of both to the needs of the modern world. This Schema just represented the formulars of previous years. He renewed his appeal to get down as soon as possible to the Schema De Ecclesia, which was at the back of it all, without which all must remain confused.

Archbishop Soejijapranata of Semarang, Indonesia, spoke in the name of all his bishops. This Schema would be a hindrance to unity because it did not face up to any of the problems. It would make the whole world think that the Church was not abreast of the problems of the present day. Attention should be paid to the relation of revelation to the magisterium of the Church.

Report No 58.

20 November 1962

20TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 16TH

[. . .]

Cardinal Tisserant spoke first and said that the Pope was well aware of the difficulties of modern biblical scholars. He was carrying on the work of Pius XII, who always tried to help them.

Patriarch Cerejeira of Lisbon thought that it would not be fair to the observers to let them suppose they could compromise with the truth in order to oblige. The situation of the world demanded that they should say what they had to say, without respect of person.

[. . .]

Cardinal McIntyre, Archbishop of Los Angeles, gave general approval to the Schema. There was in fact much freedom in the seminaries. Any other line of teaching than that of the Schemata would confuse the laity. It would be wrong to set aside what so many experts,

teachers, and even Popes, had handed down to them as a sacred treasure.

Cardinal Caggiano, Archbishop of Buenos Aires, said that they had all had a hand in the preparations of the Council. The Schema was drawn up by a most carefully organised network of experts, leading up the Pope himself. [. . .] It was their main duty to carry on the main lines of tradition. What could be done to take into account modern knowledge should be gladly accepted. It would not help the separated brethren to pretend that Catholic doctrine was other than it was. The Pope's intentions were that they should express things in a pastoral way, not that they should minimise doctrine. This, in his judgement, had been done.

[. . .]

Cardinal Urbani, Patriarch of Venice, liked the Schema. Recent biblical developments had done harm in seminaries. Admittedly the expression was in some places too scholastic. Exegetes must be allowed to do their work, but they must be warned that their studies could easily bring about much damage. But on the whole they should be encouraged [. . .]

[. . .]

Archbishop Bengsch of Berlin, did not think that the Schema tallied with the minds of the fathers, especially in the spirit which dealt with the hard labours of those who were trying to explain the Bible to people. It shut doors which not even Trent or Vatican I had shut. Everybody was under the threat of modernism, whether in East Germany or elsewhere. What was needed were clear words concerning the content of the Scriptures. The Schema went out of its way to make difficulties for the separated brethren, especially the heading of *magisterium ecclesiae*. He could not, he said, go back and give his young confessors a stone instead of bread.

[. . .]

Archbishop Florit of Florence, said that the scholastic method of presenting doctrine was not well adapted to the modern mind. Biblical studies in particular needed a different approach and every effort should be made to make an opening for the new techniques.

Dom Christopher Butler, Abbot of Downside, was against the Schema. It did not fulfil the intentions of the Holy Father. There was no reason why the domestic quarrels of the Catholic Church should be broadcast to the world. Many questions were spoken about dogmatically which were not settled even by the scholars who were investigating them. Some had said that this Schema would do as a basis for discussion. It had already shown itself to be a source of real divisions. It was therefore unsuitable. There should therefore be a meeting between

the champions of both sides to see if there could be a basis for a new constitution.

21ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 17TH

[...]

Discussion on the Sources of Revelation then continued.

Cardinal Döpfner, Archbishop of Munich, spoke for an immediate vote and for the writing of a new Schema. He said that the Schema had had a very sticky passage through the various committees. Much of what had been said in the session had already been said in the Central Commission and had been ignored.

Cardinal Ottaviani, President of the Theological Commission, denied that the Schema had been arrived at by anything but the most democratic methods.

Bishop Parente, Assessor at the Holy Office, said he spoke not as an assessor of the Holy Office, but as a pastoral bishop. (He has no effective diocese at all). This was greeted with derision.

Archbishop Zoa of Yaoundé, Cameroons, said that the thing should be entirely rejected. He spoke on behalf of a very large group of African bishops. They approved of what Abbot Butler had said.

Bishop Pourchet of St. Flour, rose to support Abbot Butler's proposition.

Bishop Hakim, of Akka of the Melchites, Israel, also wanted the Schema rejected. He spoke in French, without apology. Ignoring the whole witness of the Eastern Church, and the entire tradition of the Eastern fathers, the theologians of the Roman Curia had succeeded in putting forward a theology of the word of God which was narrow and local instead of catholic.

Report No 59.

24 November 1962

22ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY 19TH NOVEMBER, 1962

Discussion was resumed on the Schema on the Sources of Revelation.

[...]

Cardinal Gracias, Archbishop of Bombay, said that the Schema had had so much opposition that in amending it, it would become unrecognisable. There were not enough representatives of the mission countries on the committee. Let there be another and new Schema.

Cardinal Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago, spoke for the rejection of the Schema because it could not possibly be a basis for unanimity.

[. . .]

Bishop Martin, Vicar Apostolic of New Caledonia, said that there should be nothing in the Schema which would even suggest the possibility that tradition is ever anything but interpretation of Scripture.

Bishop Henríquez, Auxiliary of Caracas, Venezuela, spoke for all the bishops of Venezuela. He asked for the whole Schema to be rejected and for another to be written in close contact with the Biblical Institute.

Bishop Griffiths, Auxiliary of New York, quoted ‘Lord, we have toiled all the night and taken nothing. Nevertheless at thy word we will let down the net.’ He suggested making the best of the Schema and asked to hear the experts on both sides.

Bishop De Smedt, Bishop of Bruges, spoke for the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. He said that the Schema failed in this matter of unity. Hitherto one of the hindrances to unity had been the fact that each side had expressed its interpretation of the depositum fidei³⁶ in language and terminology which was unfamiliar to the other. Care should be taken to see that this was brought to an end by this Council. There must be an entirely new method, free from any suggestion of opposition or urge for conversions. To restate the Schema in these terms would not be easy. There was no need to minimise Catholic truth for the sake of friendliness. Yet they must at least know what the Orthodox and Protestants said about these things.

The Secretariat for Unity was set up by the Pope to help other commissions. It offered to help the theological commission in this matter. They declined. He went on to say that there was a noticeable difference between the ‘Ecumenicity’ of those who lived side by side with the separated brethren.

He finished with a most moving peroration (which I had to admit moved me nearly to tears) saying that the whole Schema was actually a retrograde step at the very point where progress really could be made – not in union but in the possibility of dialogue – now and in the future. This Schema as it stood would close the doors for a long time and the 2nd Vatican Council would be responsible for a very great mistake.

³⁶‘Deposit of faith’. The apostles entrusted the ‘sacred deposit’ of the faith, contained in sacred scripture and tradition, to the whole of the Church.

This was received with applause, in spite of previous prohibition. Ottaviani left the Aula during the speech! (The speech was afterwards seen to be of the greatest importance in the Council and undoubtedly influenced the voting).

24TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 20TH

Discussion on the Sources of Revelation continued.

After about half an hour of speeches, it was announced that a vote would be taken on the proposal of the Council President on the question *whether* the discussion should be stopped on the whole Schema and a new one prepared *or* whether the Council should proceed to a discussion of the detailed chapters. This was intended, and treated, as a trial of strength. The result of the voting was:

For abandoning the Schema	about 1300
" continuing "	about 800

which was received with a gasp of surprise by all; nobody, not even the most sanguine, having expected the 'liberals' to be so strong. All our friends, from Cardinal Bea downwards, were very pleasantly surprised. Incidentally although a record of a vote having been taken was published in the *Osservatore Romano* the next day, no figures appeared. They were, however, published in the big national daily the *Messaggero*.³⁷

It was, however, immediately announced that for a resolution on a doctrinal matter of this character to be effective, a majority of 2/3 was necessary, which this was not. The decision was therefore set aside and the Schema was proceeded with. This seemed at first sight to be a clever manoeuvre by the integrists of the form in which the question was put i.e. if it had been put the other way round the 2/3 majority would not have been necessary. It was later agreed that this was not the case and that the procedure, though unfortunate, was regular. The majority were encouraged by their win, but said that it just fell short of the necessary 2/3.

24TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 21ST

The following morning, however, it was announced that the Pope had decided that it would not be practicable to discuss a Schema against which more than half the Council had voted. He therefore

³⁷Italian daily newspaper published since the late 1870s.

ordered that discussion on it should cease and that a new Commission, representing both the Theological Commission and the Unity Secretariat, should sit and draw up a new one.

This was greeted with applause. The privileges of the autocratic papacy were thus invoked to save the democratic council from the consequences of its own rules. Almost everybody regarded this as a very wise move. It should perhaps be interpreted as the Pope acting as a good pastor rather than as a theological liberal. The communication from the Pope ended with the statement that the fundamental doctrines of the Church on these matters had already been laid down at Trent and Vatican I.

There were desultory speeches on the same theme during the morning of which the only notable one was that of:

Dom Christopher Butler, O. S. B., Abbot of Downside who hoped they would exclude from the Schema everything which hampered the liberty of scholars on things which were not as yet defined. Nothing should be put in which favoured one school of thought at the expense of another. There had been unworthy things said in the assembly the day before which really impugned the honesty at the Pontifical Biblical School and such scholars. This should not be done.

OBSERVERS' MEETING

The usual Tuesday evening meeting for the Observers was called by the Secretariat for Unity on November 20th, and the subject was that of the Sources of Revelation, the current one on in the Council. We were addressed first by Fr. Yves Congar, O. P. Members of the Secretariat for Unity were also present.

He began by commenting on the remark of Bishop Guerry (of Cambrai) in the Assembly where he said that there was no necessary opposition between doctrine and pastoral needs. Those in favour of the Schema, in the opinion of Fr. Congar, were too intellectualist. There were, he thought, two concepts of ecumenism:

Doctrinal. The partisans of the Schema saw tradition only in doctrinal form. For them ecumenism consisted merely in being polite to one another.

Realistic. The belief that there was a real dialogue which was able actually to mould the tradition in such a way as to make it more potent as a vehicle of ecumenism:

Fr. Congar went on to say there were two streams of tradition:

- a. The written word,
- b. The oral tradition which consisted not only of the spoken word, but also of a whole instinctive spirit in the Church.

The texts in Holy Scripture about the Eucharist were few and not very informative from the point of view of one wishing to celebrate the Eucharist. The real spirit was handed on by the instinctive tradition, c.f. the difference between instruction and education.

A second example was the ordination of priests. The actual tradition sacerdotii was accomplished by the laying of hands by the presbytery without a word spoken.

There were *three tensions in the Council*.

1. *Sociological*. The opponents of the Schema were German, Dutch, French, French African, Indonesian etc. Then there was the Irish group, (especially N. America); then the Italo-Spanish. One could not push differences so far as to cause rupture between the groups. Catholic unity was too valuable to sacrifice.
2. *Academic*. The difference between l'église 're-sourcée' and l'église non-re-sourcée* The return to sources, biblical or patristic had already made a great division. The other side had learnt all their theology from manuals. The 're-sourcées' went back to the Greek fathers as well as the others.

*He meant a church which has or has not had in effect a biblical and patristic reformation.

3. *Between the Holy Office and the rest of the Church*. The various commissions were chosen widely, except for the Theological Commission.

In the latter the consultors were not able to speak, as in the other Commissions. The Theological Commission was very conservative: it would have no relations with any other commissions, let alone the Secretariat for Unity.

Professor Cullmann said that the problem brings up the question of the norm. For Protestants the norm was Scripture, for Catholics otherwise. Is that so? If so what was the Catholic norm?

Congar said that tradition must itself find its norm in the magisterium because it had had to decide what Scripture was. A norm must be *living*. The Scripture was fixed. He added that he would like to introduce into

Catholic theology the word ‘indefectible’ as well as infallible. The latter was applied only to acts; the former to a whole activity. Indefectible admits the possibility of occasional error while guaranteeing the whole process.

Archbishop Heenan, who was present at all this session, then said that as there were bishops present he felt it his duty to say that he, probably they, disagreed very strongly with what had been said, especially the last section. He did not want the observers to get a false impression.

The meeting was then electrified by the principal Russian observer *Borovoj*, who, with many dramatic gestures, then got up and said that for the Orthodox the relations between Scripture and Tradition presented no problem. They had always had an ‘orthodox’ doctrine.

Then, with accelerating gestures and with great force of declamation, he turned towards where Cullmann and Schlink were sitting and said: ‘I wish you Protestant theologians would realise the harm you are doing in picking the Bible to pieces, with your *Formgeschichte*,³⁸ without giving people positive doctrines to put in its place. You make mistakes in publishing your immature conclusions. The atheists among whom we have to live use your confusions to demonstrate that all Bible teaching is discredited. You manufacture a weapon with which they can beat our backs. Have you no more sense?’

At this point the meeting broke up.

Report No. 60

25th November, 1962

25TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 23RD

Discussion began on the Schema on Communications Media, press, radio, cinema, and television. The Secretary General announced that following this, the Council will discuss the decree on the Unity of the Church, which is called *Ut unum sint*, which will be followed by a project for a constitution concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary, called ‘De Beata Maria Virgine’. This project was distributed to the fathers on this date, together with a project on the Church, ‘De Ecclesia’, which are in a single volume.

[. . .]

³⁸ *Formgeschichte* (form criticism – classification of Biblical texts according to literary form) was introduced by the German Old Testament scholar H. Gunkel (1862–1932), and applied to New Testament studies.

26TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Discussion on the Communications Media continued. It was announced that the special commission for the revision of the project on the Sources of Revelation had been constituted. Cardinal Ottaviani and Cardinal Bea are to be joint presidents(!) Other members are: Cardinale Liénart, Frings, Ruffini, Meyer, Lefèbvre, and Michael Browne. Members of the Theological Commission and the Secretariat for Unity are also said to be taking part. These discussions should be interesting!

[...]

Report No. 61

1st December, 1962

27TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 26TH

It was announced that as soon as the discussion on the project concerning *Communications Media* was finished, the Council would move to examine the Schema on the *Unity of the Church* prepared by the Commission for the Oriental Churches. There would also be separate treatment on the same subject based on the project prepared by the Theological Commission and the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. Reservations for speaking time on the discussion of the Schema on the *Church* were also now being accepted. This would immediately follow up *Ut unum sint*. The Project *De Beata Virginis* would be considered with 'De Ecclesia' of which it formed a part.

After an hour's further debate on the *Communications Media*, it was decided to cease the discussion, and a start was made on the Schema *Ut unum sint* which was introduced by:

Cardinal Amleto Cicognani as President of the Preparatory Commission for the Oriental Churches. He said that this Schema was mainly concerned with the churches of the ancient East. There were difficulties in the way of union. This document was intended to explain the doctrine of the Church in such a way as to make the path of union easier [...]

Father Athanasius Welykyi of the Order of St. Basil the Great, who was the Secretary of the Commission for the Oriental Churches, to read the report on the project. Although, he said, this was only concerned with the Eastern churches, the principles were of course universal. They were not concerned primarily with theological unity. That was not in

question. An attempt had been made to use terms familiar to Oriental ears, rather than scholastic language.

The situation of the East, he continued, was not just a schism, but a separation. *Fratres separati* was therefore a term of endearment, not of hostility. The first step towards unity must be psychological. It must be the declaration by a council that all easterns who come to find unity with the One Church would be able to preserve their own rites.

Cardinal Liénart, Bishop of Lille, said that the tone of the Schema was all wrong. It spoke in a too authoritative way of the duty of others to return to unity with them. It was too pleased with itself. It was clearly not able to be of much pastoral use.

It was no use talking about the East alone, as if the East were one Church – this was a great psychological mistake. And one could not treat the East apart from the West. They should be speaking at the same time of the Protestants and Anglicans who were baptised Christians. This should be referred to the Secretariat for Unity.

Cardinal Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo, thought that this Schema should be put together with the one ‘*De Ecclesia*.’ It was dangerous, when talking of unity, to use language which gave the impression that the Church was nothing else than a vehicle for bringing about the union of Christians.

[. . .]

28TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY NOVEMBER 27TH

[. . .]

Discussion on the Schema on the Unity of the Church was then resumed.

Report No. 62

4th December, 1962

30TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY – 30TH NOVEMBER

[. . .]

Discussion on the Schema on the *Unity of the Church* then continued.

Cardinal Wyszyński, Archbishop of Warsaw, said that the urgency of these days, especially as seen by those who were suffering oppression, was compelling to unity. The doctrine of the Eastern fathers led all towards the same goal.

Cardinal Bea. This Schema was not compiled as an isolated doctrinal exercise but as an opportunity of expressing the Latin churches' admiration and friendliness towards the Oriental Church.

Many things overlapped with those prepared by the Secretariat for Union. They should therefore be run together if possible, after they had done Chapter II (*de ecumenismo*) in the Schema *De Ecclesiae*.

Provision should be made for combined liturgical prayer. There must be a distinction between doctrine itself and the way in which it was expressed. It was in this latter that much improvement was possible.

Unidentified – probably *Archbishop Harmaniuk of Winnipeg, for the Ukrainians*, wanted a mixed theological commission consisting of Catholics, Orthodox, Anglicans and Protestants to work out a unified basis of total reunion. It was no good attacking the problem piecemeal.

[...]

Bishop Franić of Spalato, Yugoslavia, said that this must be considered not 'ex libris' but 'ex vitae'. Before the war thousands of their people went over to the Orthodox for 'opportunist' reasons. They would not now be won back by aggressive ecumenism. It should be more clearly stated that this was a schism between two churches through the faults of both and as two churches they should make entirely mutual approaches again. He proposed certain 'penetential' [*sic*] emendations expressing the acknowledgement by Catholics of their faults.

Archbishop Hayek of Aleppo of the Syrians, thought that the Eastern question must at all costs be kept separate. There must be talk of Oriental churches, for there were so many. There was also need to speak of the Latin and Eastern churches as parallel, and never of return of the latter to the former.

Archbishop Heenan, of Liverpool, thought that it had been a pity to start this with the Eastern churches. The nearer they were the harder it was to find unity. To Protestants they could easily say that they could not love Christ unless they also loved the Blessed Virgin Mary. In the case of the East the greatest reasons of schism were envy and jealousy. He regretted the absence of observers from Constantinople and Athens, and from the total Orthodox world with the notable exception of the Russians. He was thankful that the Archbishop of Canterbury had so readily responded to the Pope's invitation. There was among Anglicans and Protestants a much more ready understanding of the problems at issue, and a greater willingness to try and solve them.

I saw Archbishop Heenan after the Council and thanked him for his kind references to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Anglicans in

general. Heenan purred with pleasure and said he hoped that I would pass the news on to Canterbury, which I hereby do. I refrained from observing that our keenness to be represented in Rome was partly inspired by the prospect of discussing the issues in a climate more favourable than that provided by the R.C. hierarchy in England.

I ventured to question his assessment of the Eastern affairs. My information was that the Orthodox as a whole had been double-crossed by the Russians, who were themselves probably acting in answer to political dictates in order to embarrass the Romans. [...] Heenan said he was not sure if my intelligence was right. I said that Athenagoras was certainly disposed to cooperate personally though, like the Pope, he was surrounded by some backward-looking reactionaries. We both laughed ecumenically and went our ways.

It was announced that on the following day discussion would open on the Schema *‘De Ecclesia’*. This represented the failure of Ottaviani to postpone this debate until the following session.

31ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY 1ST DECEMBER

[...]

Cardinal Ottaviani in typical vein (he is very humorous, and a consummate spontaneous orator in Latin) said that no doubt the ‘opposition’ had already prepared another Schema, so he would confine himself to saying that the Schema was neither unecumenical, scholasticus, non-pastoralis, or any of the other usual things. ‘Tolle, lege; non substituitur’.³⁹

Bishop Franić, of Spalato, Yugoslavia of the Holy Office, was put up as official ‘relator’. The Schema was the result of much labour. It represented the simple doctrine of the Church received from the past, unalterable etc. as one, indefectible, infallible etc. It should also be noted that a great effort had also been made to make it agreeable to modern biblical scholarship.

[...]

Cardinal Alfrink, Archbishop of Utrecht [...] There was, he thought, too much insistence on the rights of the Church. There should be much more talk about the liberties of other people which is [*sic*] to be preserved by the Church. The Schema about the Blessed Virgin Mary should be joined on this.

³⁹“Take up and read; there is no ‘alternative’”. The first part of the quotation stems from St Augustine’s *Confessions*, book VIII, chapter 12.

Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis, said that the bishops were not the whole of the Church, and more should be said about the other orders. There should also be more about the liberty of Christians in general rather than about the rights of the Church.

Bishop Bernacki, Auxiliary of Gniezno, Poland, remarked that there was no chapter about the Pope. They owed this also to the separated brethren.

Bishop De Smedt of Bruges said that the Schema took some account of modern theology, but has many defects.

1. Too much ‘triumphalism’, pompous, romantic, as in *Osservatore Romano*. This was far from the humble language of Scripture; from the solid style of the Eastern Church.

2. Clericalism. The whole was like a pyramid, with the Pope at the top and the people at the bottom, *ecclesia docet et discernit*.⁴⁰ Much use should be made of the place of the laity, especially of their part in the life of the Church. There was also too much episcopopatris.

3. Iuridicism, legalism. All validly baptised Christians were members of the Church. The language concerning the separated brethren was arrogant.

Bishop van Cauwelaert, of Inongo, Congo, thought that there was too much legalism about the whole Schema, and not enough of the joyful news of the new redeemed community in which all men can find the home they need, and all the graces. The social work of the first apostolic community was itself an impulse for the growth of the Church. It would help if the Church were more liable to learn from the world around it what it has to teach. Let us talk, he said, less about asking the Protestants having to submit [*sic*] to an authoritative power they don’t understand, but rather let us invite them to cooperate in the work of Christ. The whole thing should be radically revised.

The general feeling among the observers was that this had been a disappointing start to the discussion, being too ‘conformist’.

Our friends among the Romans said that they were being very careful not to allow a climate of sympathy to build up around Ottaviani. The debate would probably ‘hot-up’ later.

⁴⁰‘The teaching and learning Church’.

32ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY 3RD DECEMBER.

Discussion of the Schema on the Church continued.

Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, gave a warning against too high ideas about the place of the laity in the Church. There were great opportunities of services already open to them which had not been taken up, without opening up new ones.

[. . .]

Cardinal Gracias, Archbishop of Bombay, thought that the Schema had great faults but could be adopted by a special commission [. . .]. The attitude of the Catholic missions to non-Christian races and nations must be more modest, or they would invite persecutions. They should show knowledge of all different modes of thought of Asian philosophers concerning the Christian community.

Cardinal Léger, Archbishop of Montreal, wanted a permanent sub-council to be set up for carrying out in detail the will for renewal so clearly shown already. There should be clear voting and decisions now about the Liturgical Schema so that they could go home with clear ideas and begin work at least in that department.

[. . .]

Archbishop Kominek, titular of Eucaita (Polish), preached a short homily on the birth of the Church at the foot of the Cross (Our Lady being the first member), which started a notable movement towards the coffee bars.

Archbishop Marty of Rheims said that the Church was essentially a mystery. The Schema made too much of it as an institution. Some people could even make a juridical institution of the Holy Trinity! The same was true of the treatment of the hierarchy. The relation of the laity to the hierarchy was too much like that of troops to a commanding officer. The Mission of the Church was inadequately expressed. It was not to bring salvation to men – this was done by Christ alone. The office of the Church was to announce the grace of Christ available.

Bishop Huyghe of Arras thought that the Schema [was] too inward-looking. It lacked evangelical spirit. It was subject to all the objections brought against the ‘two fontibus’;⁴¹ too pompous, too scholastic,

⁴¹Two sources.

out-of-date, too juridical. It should be totally re-written by people who came straight from a reading of the gospels.

Bishop Hurley of Durban spoke for the total re-writing of the Schema according to the new principles of unity. Much has been written, he said, of a new conception of the Church, which had been entirely ignored.

Bishop Rupp of Monaco made a very strong appeal for the decentralisation of the Church and the ending of the 'baroque' age of church government.

33RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY DECEMBER 4TH

The discussion on the Schema on the Church was resumed.

Cardinal Frings, Archbishop of Cologne, said there was nothing in the Schema of the Greek tradition about the Church. [. . .] He asked for the doctrine of the Church to be rather scientific, catholic, ecumenical, than juridical. The whole thing, he thought, was unworthy of an ecumenical council. It should be sent back for thorough revision.

Cardinal Godfrey, Archbishop of Westminster, was generally in favour of the Schema. He found it difficult to know in his nation what people actually believed. Now the 'state Church' since the Reformation, called itself the 'catholic' Church. They were called the 'Romans' while there were others who called themselves 'Anglo-catholics'. Let no one think that the non-Catholics were close to them in the faith, and no one should come to England thinking that the problem was easy. They must be charitable, but that does not involve them in making concessions in doctrine or morals; that would be very stupid. It would be no help to the separated brothers, but an obstacle. He spoke frankly lest after the Council it should be thought that they should in any way have changed everything. *Caritas sine scientia errat.*⁴²

Cardinal Suenens, Archbishop of Brussels-Malines, asked what was the main thought of the Council? There should be a coordinating theme. Vatican I was a council de primatu pontificis. Vatican II should have *ecclesia Christi gentium*.⁴³ If this theme, which came from the Pope, were acceptable, then they should reconsider the Schema.

The general subject was the Church; what it was, what its job was. He proposed a whole re-arrangement of the Schema in detail. There was

⁴²'Love without knowledge is mistaken'.

⁴³Vatican I was about the primacy of the Pope. Vatican II should be about the Church of Christ for the nations.

not time or space to talk about the rights and privileges of the Church, but rather of its world. The doctrine of the Church would be clarified in the vigorous prosecution of this programme. As the successor of Cardinal Mercier, he prayed that the work of the Secretariat for Unity would be a pattern for all.

Cardinal Bea said that the present doctrines of the Church began to take their shape at Trent, when the world was so troubled that no one could think clearly. Vatican I was interrupted by wars. Now all separated brethren and they had been thinking about the Church afresh. It was, therefore, up to them to make a real contribution to its clarification.

There were, he felt, certain things to the Schema which were missing. The evangelical commission of the Church must come earlier and be more prominent. And what about the question of who were members of the Church. This was not the time to put out a definition of this, for it was under discussion by scholars.

There should be much more reference to the Scriptural origins of the collegium episcoporum. Then let the office of the papacy be fitted naturally into this. Let all the questions come from the most reputable and ancient sources. A lot of the doctrine under this head is obscure, and should be clarified [. . .]

The root trouble was that the Schema did not correspond to the intentions of the Holy Father, which were that the doctrine of the Church should speak clearly out of its pages and not only to theologians and priests and Catholic faithful but to all Christians, and even to the world.

Cardinal Bacci thought that they should speak of fratres seiuncti,⁴⁴ not separate. The former was less offensive, as not involving them in the guilt of a deliberate act of separation. They must be careful to give the separated no suggestion that there were divisions as to doctrine. [. . .]

Archbishop Guerry of Cambrai objected to the suggestion in one of the chapters that the authority of the bishops derived from the Pope. Also the totally juridical treatment of the relation of the Pope to the bishops. This relationship was never mentioned except as juridical. The main idea should be that of a father of a family. [. . .]

⁴⁴'Separated brethren'.

34TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 5TH DECEMBER

[. . .]

Cardinal Ruffini spoke first and said he was generally in favour of the Schema.

Cardinal Montini, Archbishop of Milan [. . .] They had heard many theories of the episcopate put before them in the past. But there was no coherent theory of the episcopate here. What was its real job in the Church? What was the place of the Papacy in the Church? What was the real function of the college of the bishops?

[. . .]

Patriarch Maximos IV, Saigh, of Antioch of the Melchites, said that the Schema did not correspond to the Pope's ecumenical intentions.

1. The use of the metaphor of an army ready for battle was not good for these days. There was a spirit of triumphalism which was to be deplored.
2. Ecumenism was conceived too much in the way of submission.
3. Titular bishops were not given full treatment. Were they real bishops or not?
4. The language concerning the Pope was terribly exaggerated. Was the Pope the only successor of Christ?

A certain theological school⁴⁵ was continually forcing its theories on the notice of the Council. Let the Council have a mind of its own.

The Primacy of the Pope was not in the succession of the Caesars, but of Christ. Christ always associated authority and love. There were those who exalted the Papacy to divinity. He read some terrible extravagances from an Italian church magazine. Let the world see that this was a primary of service, not of power.

[. . .]

35TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 6TH DECEMBER

Discussion on the Schema on the Church continued.

[. . .]

This was a singularly uninteresting morning's debate [. . .]

⁴⁵Presumably meaning Thomism, but possibly Scholasticism.

[. . .]

Discussion on the Schema on the Church was resumed.

Cardinal König, Archbishop of Vienna, said that there should be certain improvements. In particular the missionary function of the Church should be clearer.

Cardinal Lefebvre, Archbishop of Bourges commented on the total lack of mention of the *Caritas Christi*,⁴⁶ which should be the chief motive of the mission of the Church. Under this inspiration the whole nature of the various orders of the Church, bishops, priests, deacons and laity would take on a different character, the clergy more humble, the laity more active.

Bishop Ghattas, of Thebes, Egypt, said that the tradition of the East always spoke of ‘the churches’, taking account of the collegiality of the episcopate. It was therefore arrogant to speak dogmatically of the necessity of union with the see of Peter. It should be held up as a rallying point that Rome should be a centre, Baptism should be the unifying factor among all the Christians.

Bishop Ancel, Auxiliary of Lyons, said that the juridical organisation of the hierarchy should not conflict with the evangelical aims of the Church, and in so far as it does it should be radically reformed.

[. . .]

Bishop Volk of Mainz thought that the Church should be conceived of not so much as the means of grace, but as the fruit of grace. The Schema should be more clearly seen to come out of Scripture. [. . .]

Dom Christopher Butler, Abbot of Downside, hoped that they would not define any new doctrine. There had been many objections to the Schema, and there should certainly be a very radical rewriting.

There had been very much new thought about the nature of the Church since they had thought of it as exclusively the company of those in communion with Rome only. They should define the limits of speculation and then encourage the theologians to go ahead within those limits.

The ‘doctrinal mission’ of the Church must be to open up the word of God for people’s edification.

⁴⁶God’s love.

THE INTERIM

There were of course many reviews in a variety of newspapers about the first session of the Council and speculations about the second. All the papers which I have read agree in thinking that the first session has been successful; that the party of reform showed itself to be much stronger than it was expected to be; that much acceleration of business will be necessary in the next session and that nobody should be too sure in their prophecies about the second session.

Our friends in Rome were pleased with the progress, some of which astonished even them. In particular they rejoiced at the recognition accorded to Cardinal Bea and his Secretariat.

There were some who advised caution. They said that Ottaviani is a very powerful man and that of course machination will be going on in the interim to ensure that not too much ground is gained by the liberals in the next session.

THE BUSINESS COMMISSION

Soon after the last sessions the Pope appointed a septemvirate to review all the Schemata which had not yet been dealt with, to streamline them and where necessary to revise them 'in the light of experience gained in the first sessions', i. e. to see that the Holy Office do not have it all their own way and that the point of view of the liberals finds free expression; also to remove language and expressions which might be offensive to non-Catholics. The seven were Cardinals

- | | |
|--------------|---------|
| Cicognani | Döpfner |
| Confalonieri | Suenens |
| Spellman | Alfrink |
| Urbani | |

The three on the left are conservatives, those on the right liberals, and the seventh I do not know about. He is the Pope's successor at Venice. [...]

ARRIVAL. I returned here on May 3rd, and propose to stay until June 19th [...]

THE AMERICANS I came out here via Berchtesgaden, where I had been asked to address an assembly of the American chaplains in Europe, the American Forces chaplains in Europe, and a holiday conference of their lay people, about 250 people in all. They were very interested in the theme (Unity and the Vatican Council), very enthusiastic about the improvement in relationships and seemed aware that there is a struggle going on in the R.C. Church in the States to minimise the hardness of the (mainly Irish) diehards.

[. . .]

ARCHBISHOP HEENAN

You will know that the Archbishop has had a motor accident, which has prevented him coming to Rome for the present sessions of the Union Secretariat. Willebrands thinks that Mgr. Heenan must be out of the running from Westminster, or else the announcement would have been made by now [. . .]

THE COORDINATING COMMISSIONS

These are said to have done their work pretty drastically, both in spirit and in letter, i.e. they have rewritten and shortened schemata 'in the spirit of the debate of the first part of the Council'.

[. . .]

Report No. 69.

22nd May, 1963

THE POPE'S HEALTH

I have been trying to refrain from unnecessary alarmist reports about the above, partly because even the reliable sources of information seemed uncertain about it. But I have just been with Cardinal Tisserant, the Dean of the Sacred College, who puts the matter beyond doubt. The Pope, according to him, is gravely ill and 'can not last long'. In answer to my question whether he will live to the next session of the Council he said 'most probably not'. On return from the visit I hear that the Pope has missed his usual Wednesday audience, for the first time. We must therefore presumably expect his end during the next months.

I wonder if you have any official information as to what would be the correct procedure in the event of the Archbishop needing to send a message of condolence in the event of the public announcement of his sickness or in the case of his death. There is obviously here a slight urge on the part of the unity Secretariat to get everything concerning the 'separated brethren' to reach the Vatican via them. The Secretariat of State, on the other hand, do not want to renounce any privileges. My feeling is that we should be careful to reserve our rights as a Church to continue direct access to the Pope by whatever means have hitherto been used [. . .]. I am told that in the event of the death of a Pope the Secretary of State goes out of office immediately and that correspondence for the Sacred College is addressed to His Eminence the Cardinal Camerlengo, who is the temporary post-box for the College.
[. . .]

Report No. 70

27th May 1963.

THE POPE'S HEALTH

This now seems to be expiring and his death may have occurred before you get this. In any case it is time to consider what you would do in the way of sending a delegation to the funeral. I am proposing to be here until June 19th, though if the Pope were to live that long I could stay longer [. . .]

A NEW ELECTION

To judge by precedents a Conclave would be held about a fortnight after the decease [. . .] At least that is what the Secretariat told me this morning. My memory was that the election took much longer.

I must now attempt to prophesy as follows. The continuation of the Council is obviously the major feature in the election of the new Pope. You will no doubt know that the decision to continue or not to continue rests entirely with the new Pope, who can either erase the Council as though it had never been, or can in five minutes validate all its previous proceedings.

All my sources of information without exception say that it is unthinkable that the cardinals should elect a man who would not carry on the Council, and I think the same. The dominant influence

being Italian there are three currents which determine this, one that the bishops would so obviously want it to continue and the Cardinals would wish to satisfy them. Second that a decision to discontinue would clearly be interpreted by the whole world as an act of great impiety against the memory of such a beloved figure as the present Pope, and the concepts of 'bella figura' and 'bruta figura' loom large in these quarters.⁴⁷ Thirdly, I imagine that even die-hards want to continue the Council in order to clean up the 'heresies' that are abroad.

It is therefore possible that they may elect a Pope just for the purpose of bringing the Council to a safe conclusion. In that case it might be an old man, such as Cardinal CICOGNANI, the Secretary of State. There are more people who seem to favour this than I should like to think. He would be a colourless chairman, and it is said of him that he has been scrupulously fair in chairing the Oriental Commission even when it went against his own ideas. But he was responsible for the bad text of the Schema on the Oriental churches and reunion which has had a severe mauling at the Council. He is at heart a reactionary, though mild. And he is 81! I think there is no possibility of the election of Cardinal BEA, though some speak of it.

The favourite is undoubtedly MONTINI of Milan. By that I mean that the bishops would elect him in, and the Italian population. Though with the Conclave you can never be sure. It is a proverb that he who goes into the Conclave Pope comes out a Cardinal. Pius XII was an exception to this. Montini's left-wing sympathies are said by some to tell against him. Assuming that it has to be an Italian, he would suit us best. I was among the group who stayed with him in 1956.

Among younger Italian cardinals there is CONFALONIERI, who is a canonist and administrator, colourless and safe. The extreme right, from whom God preserve us, is SIRI of Genoa.

If the Pope dies in the course of the Council that will make the ensuing Conclave different from most in that the College of Cardinals will know one another fairly intimately. I think this would tell in favour of Montini. On the other hand it could make the possibility of a non-Italian Pope much greater than it otherwise would be. There are too many unknown factors for it to be possible to prophesy on that issue. If it were a non-Italian the most likely name among those I have heard is that of Suenens of Malines-Brussels. He has expounded some revolutionary new ideas at the Council, and been loudly applauded,

⁴⁷The 'beautiful figure' and the 'ugly figure' (i.e. making a bad figure, or presenting a bad image).

(on the Laity, on the reform of the religious orders, on the Liturgy and Ecumenism). But he has a very conservative side as well, as you might expect from Belgium, and he is a great devotee of the cults of the B.V.M. A strange mixture.

In the event of the Pope dying within a week or so, would you wish me to extend my stay here to cover the period of the Conclave, Declaration, Coronation etc? I am inclined to believe the Romans would think it odd if I went home in the middle of it all.

In the event of the death, election etc. being before the end of July it is thought here that that would not affect the date of the reopening of the Council.

Report No. 71

31st May 1963

[. . .]

THE POPE'S LIFE

I think that by this time you receive this the Pope will have died, in spite of totally unfounded rumours and even reports (e.g. in the *Times*) that he has revived. The strange drama has been enacted here of the *Osservatore Romano* continuing to put out entirely falsely optimistic reports while the secular papers are speaking of 'the transparent lies' of the Vatican press. The power of rumour in this town is quite terrifying. I was told at 5 p.m. today by Fr. Boyer in the Biblical Institute that the Pope was dead. Even I was disposed to believe that he was right. But it was an unfounded rumour. It is said in the secular press with an obvious double-entendre that 'they will believe anything in this city'.

The Pope has had cancer of the stomach and of the prostate gland. The Vatican papers have persisted in calling it a 'tumorous Growth'. One can not help thinking that this strange behaviour dates from the days when every effort was made to hide the death of the Pope because of the possibility of violent attempts to impose a new Pope on the Conclave.

THE FUNERAL

I am informed by the Minister to the Holy See that in past cases the 'entombment' has happened on the fourth day after the

death. This has been semi-private, i.e. nobody more remote than diplomatic representatives has been present. The Requiem is on the ninth day, unless that is a Sunday. It is to that that presumably representatives of other churches will be invited. Incidentally, will our representative represent the C. of E. or the Anglican Communion? Or the Archbishop of Canterbury?

[...]

THE CONCLAVE

I think I ought to say that the best informed people here do not attempt to prophesy, and I am sure you will not expect me to do so. Nobody does any more than make a list of the possibilities, and this I have already done. To my previous list I think I would now add that of Cardinal de Jairo, a moderate conservative. But we must bear in mind that John XXIII wasn't on anybody's long list [...]

I hear from reliable sources that the Pope held a Consistory on his death-bed and made some new cardinals. The Pope has delivered a testament to the Cardinal Secretary of State asking that the Council should continue. This confirms my previous belief that the Conclave will elect a man who will fulfil this pious wish.

[...]

'THE WOOLWICH SCANDAL' (I use the Archbishop's own description)⁴⁸

I am afraid that this has now reached the English theological colleges here, the Gregorian University, Cardinal Bea and members of the English and American congregations and has done us much harm. I have asked the English book-shop to stock the Archbishop's pamphlet. I am presenting Cardinal Bea with a copy of the Archbishop's pamphlet and of the speech at Louvain which I hope will act as an antidote. The book has also caused wide distress in America. When Professor Schlink was here a week or two ago he commented upon it unfavourably. I have done my best to explain the motives of the book, though not to hide the fact that it is a tactical mistake. Incidentally, I gather from both R.C. and Episcopal Americans

⁴⁸The rumpus caused by the publication earlier that year of the polemic *Honest to God* by the Bishop of Woolwich, John Robinson. The book, which appeared to challenge a variety of conventional doctrines, not least about the nature of God, appropriated and popularized certain phrases adopted by Dietrich Bonhoeffer, but very much on its own terms. It was an almost immediate bestseller, and very much a phenomenon of the day. Archbishop Ramsey wrote a riposte which was not widely regarded as his most successful work.

here that Tillich's⁴⁹ stock is pretty low in America. He is called the cocktail party theologian and judged to be incomprehensible. Someone said 'the best known and least read theologian in the States.'

CARDINAL BEA

I had a long session with the Cardinal last week. He had enjoyed his time in America and seemed to think that there was a better spirit there now. He said that Küng had overstepped the mark there a bit, and this seems now to be a fairly common verdict. He was apparently misunderstood in Britain in one or two instances. I think he would now do well to lie low. The Cardinal had attended a meeting in Geneva with the W.C.C. on mixed marriages. He said it was difficult to deal with the Protestants because they differed among themselves as to the theological nature of marriage. I said that this did not apply to the Anglicans, and he agreed. He asked me to send his greetings to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which I hereby do.

[...]

Report No. 72

6 June, 1963

THE OBSEQUIES OF POPE JOHN XXIII

The date of the official public Requiem has been changed from Saturday June 15th to Monday June 17th. I have heard from the Bishop of Ripon that he is expecting to come, and I think I look forward to seeing him again.

THE CONCLAVE AND CORONATION

The Italian newspapers carry the suggestion that the cardinals will want to have the election over in time to crown the new Pope on the feast of S. Peter and S. Paul, June 29th. I should have thought that this was for them an irresistible temptation to make the best propagandist use of the moment.

⁴⁹Paul Tillich (1886–1965), German theologian by then living in the United States; in the eyes of the broad reading public perhaps most notably author of *The Shaking of the Foundations* (London, 1949).

ITALIAN PRESS COMMENTS

The late Pope has had an exceedingly good writing-up, as might have been expected, even when making allowance for habitual Italian exaggerations. The main achievement with which he is credited is that of having flouted the wishes of his Curia and given free rein to the liberal aspirations of the Church in other parts of the world than Italy. The only word of criticism (and this is always very gently put) is that he did not realise what would be the effect in Italy of his 'leftist' political utterances. It seems to be universally assumed that these were the cause of the swing in the Italian elections. It is said even in moderate circles that this might give the Italian cardinals an excuse for 'ganging-up' against the progressiveness in the forthcoming election which they would not otherwise have. It would be sad if that proved to be true.

[. . .]

FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONCLAVE ETC.

The Requiem on the 17th will be in fact a novemdiale, counting from and including the day of the entombment and then excluding the two Sundays and Corpus Christ, which are not counted.

The Conclave will begin at 6. p.m. on the 19th, though the elections will not start until the following day. President Kennedy, who had planned to arrive in Rome on the 20th at the end of a tour in Europe has decided not to cancel his appointment.

The reviews in the newspapers about the election of the Pope are very confusing. I suppose they have to prophesy to please their public but their assessments are often based on misinformation and are contradictory.

Two matters seem to be fairly well agreed upon, and both are disappointing. One is that the election must take into account the political situation in Italy. The Christian Democrats were returned at the recent election with a very much reduced majority and rely on cooperation from the Socialists. Their government is thus very tenuous. The last Pope having caused a swing to the left, the reviews say, the new one must surely correct the tendency.

The other thing on which the reviews seem agreed is that Montini's chances have grown much less in the past two years. He has become cautious and diplomatic and has even involved himself in palpable contradictions. But they may be wrong about this too, though I have heard it in other circles.

The reviews give a larger chance than I should have thought to Lercaro of Bologna. Taking advantage of those I have read the colourless Confalonieri is the favourite.

Report No. 73

17th June 1963

[...]

THE ELECTION

The press notices here grow more and more like those for the last week before the 'Grand National' in England.⁵⁰ You could almost have a daily call-over and shorten or lengthen odds accordingly. At the time of writing the candidature of Cardinal Montini continues to be played down and that of Cardinal Lercaro of Bologna played up in his place. There is no doubt in my mind that in the general public opinion Confalonieri is the favourite. Urbani of Venice and Costaldo of Naples have been increasingly canvassed and there is no doubt that they must be put on the 'long list'. I imagine that the former is the more progressive of those two, and that we might do much worse than to have him. He has at least a lot of experience behind him, and was chosen by the last Pope to be his successor of Venice. It becomes evident that in this method of election and under this present state of tension (there is not usually a dominating issue in an election) almost nobody will get the candidate they really want and they will have to agree on a 'third man'.

I am sorry to see that the newspapers include among the papabili the name of Antoniutti, one of the more recent creations. I had understood that he was 'kicked upstairs' for having made a really bad job of being Nuncio in Spain. He is of the extreme right wing and is a personal friend, it is said, of Franco.

THE U.S.S.R. AND THE REQUIEM

A shudder has been caused in Rome by the announcement that the Soviet Union are sending as their representatives two excommunicated Lithuanian R.C. priests. These men are excommunicated *latae sententiae*⁵¹ for being 'Quisling' administrators

⁵⁰A famous horse race and something of a national event which attracts a great deal of betting on favourites of one kind or another.

⁵¹'Sentence already passed'.

under the regime of 2 dioceses whose bishops are in prison. The photograph in the press shows them arriving in Fiumicino airport in lay dress accompanied by a member of the Soviet police. The last I heard of it was that the cardinals were to meet to decide whether or not to receive the delegation.

It seems to me, and to everybody, that this is both a calculated insult and a deliberate embarrassment. It will enable the conservatives in the Curia to say to the rest ‘You see what Pope John’s overtures to the left have led to’, and so favour the election of a right-wing pope.

[*Added by hand*] P. S. *This is misinformation. See next report*

THE NEXT SESSION OF THE COUNCIL

Cardinal Léger of Montreal recently said that shortly before he died the Pope sent and offered to the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople that if he wished to attend the next session he could have the use of Castel Gandolfo. It is not known if it was accepted.

It occurs to me that there is every possibility that a reforming pope, if he were to be elected, might want to postpone the next session of the Council, so that we must not necessarily be disappointed if that happens. The revised abbreviated agendas were to have been sent out at the beginning of June to the bishops. Any Cardinal elected pope would not necessarily have studied them in detail, unless it was Tisserant or Confalonieri. A reforming Pope might therefore feel that he should study at length after he has got his breath and then sent them off at leisure.

[. . .]

THE POPE’S SARCOPHAGUS

I am sorry to see that part of the inscription on the above, recording the achievements of the late Pontiff, includes the (to us) unacceptable claim that he worked hard.

‘UT OMNES FRATRES CHRISTIANOS SEPARATOS
IN UNUM OVILE REDUCERET’

‘Ecclesiam’ might have done, but not ‘ovile’.⁵²

⁵²The Pope worked hard ‘to bring back all separated Christian brothers into one sheep fold’; ‘church’ might have done, but not ‘sheep fold’.

THE ELECTION

The cardinals are being walled up this afternoon and it is expected that the election will be completed on Friday or Saturday. I hope to be spared the humiliation of hearing that the Pope is somebody whose name I have not even mentioned in these reports, but I give due notice that that is not impossible. The latest developments here are that we hear much more of the candidature of Antoniutti from civilian sources than we should like to hear. I have already made reference to him and he is very right wing. The Legation here fancy Marella, with Confalonieri as second. The Unity Secretariat, on the other hand, think Antoniutti quite impossible and still have Montini or Lercaro at the top of their lists. I hope it isn't wishful thinking on their part. Some sides, and indeed all sources that I have seen or heard, think it impossible that the new Pope should not want to continue the Council.

I have tried out my idea that even a 'liberal' pope might want a postponement of the Council and this seems to be generally admitted. So we must not be disappointed if that is what happens – it could be a good thing in the long run.

THE REQUIEM

The Bishop of Gibraltar and I attended this on Monday the 17th. Although it was celebrated by the French Cardinal Tisserant there was no trace of liturgical reform. The Earl of Perth,⁵³ as you know, represented Her Majesty, and we had the honour of dining with him on the evening of the previous night.

We were surprised that there were not more representatives of churches. The Russian Observers were there as usual, pushing themselves to the fore and making sure that they were photographed every few yards. There was also a delegation from the Russian émigré Church in Europe, Schlink from Heidelberg, Vischer from Geneva and a representative from the Methodists.

THE ENTHRONEMENT AND CORONATION

There is a very strong current of opinion that in spite of the short interval involved June 29th (the feast of SS Peter and Paul) will be

⁵³John David Drummond, eighth/seventeenth Earl of Perth (1907–2002), minister of state for colonial affairs in Harold Macmillan's Conservative government, 1957–1962.

the date. In fact a very reliable source, coming straight from Cardinal Tisserant, said that arrangements were being made prior for that day, and that it would be up to the new Pope to cancel them if he wishes. Invitations will not be sent out to other churches though, if they send them, their delegations will be welcome.

I was surprised and disappointed to find that both Schlink and Vischer think it would be wrong for them to be represented at a coronation, because there is a complex of dogmas concentrated upon this occasion to which they have objection. I argued that the position did not seem to me to be materially different from that of the Observers at a Vatican Council. I added that in my view it was most important that as many as possible of the Observers should be sent as delegates to the enthronement and coronation. If it were an acceptable Pope it would signify our encouragement; if it were an unacceptable one it would be a demonstration in support of our friends to show that our desire for better relations did not change with the change of the papacy.

It is important in this connection to remember that the main ceremony involved is that of the Enthronement of the Bishop of the diocese of Rome. All that takes place inside the Basilica is the enthronement. The Pope is enthroned by the Dean of the Sacred College. It is at this that delegates would occupy seats of honour and I do not see that any delegation would be in any way compromised by being present at it. The assembly inside the Basilica then moves out in casual disorder to S. Peter's Square, where the Pope appears on the balcony and is crowned with the tiara. Nobody is officially present at this ceremony except the small party on the balcony. The origin of the ceremony is that of investiture with the sovereignty of the Vatican kingdom. The Pope is only crowned by the senior cardinal deacon. Our friends in the Vatican will get additional delight if they have to see Montini crowned by his enemy Ottaviani. In the processions the mitre is always carried before a tiara. Both ceremonies are formal public recognitions, comparable to the enthronement of a bishop in an English diocese. They have no legal or sacramental significance. Cases have occurred in which cardinals who were only in priest[']s orders have been elected Pope. The last case was that of Gregory XVI in the middle of the last century. Such a man became Pope immediately on acceptance of election. Cardinal Tisserant will enthrone the new Pope as Bishop of Rome. I am inclined to think that you would be wise to refer to the whole ceremony in any public statement as the 'Enthronement and Coronation of XXXX as Bishop of Rome and Pope'.

[. . .]

THE U.S.S.R. DELEGATION TO THE REQUIEM

My item on the above was based on misinformation contained in the newspapers. The men who represented the U.S.S.R. were not excommunicate; they were in fact vicars capitular duly elected by the Chapters of the dioceses whose bishops were in prison, to act as Ordinaries during the bishops' inhibition. This is in full accord with canon law. It is interesting to note how the Vatican are dealing with the situation in the countries east of the iron curtain, where bishops are under civil censure. A member of the cathedral chapter is elected to be the legal Ordinary of the diocese and a priest in the diocese is then consecrated bishop to a titular see to perform the episcopal functions. He does not have full canonical jurisdiction, which resides legally in the Ordinary.

THE SECRETARIAT AND THE FUTURE

All the staff seem to be optimistic. Willebrands today said that an unprogressive Pope might hold up the work of the Secretariat in certain respects only for a period, but there was no possibility of its being closed down. He said that there had been critics of the late Pope's attitude to politics, to ecclesiastical administration, and his attempts at theology, but nobody had dared gainsay his attitude to ecumenism. The Unity Secretariat regarded as symptomatic that although most of the caretaker cardinals are reactionaries nobody has dismissed Capovilla the late Pope's chief chaplain, who is being allowed to stay on to see if the next Pope wishes to continue him in the service. In the last interregnum there was a thorough and immediate clear-out of all Pius XII's staff.

Report No. 75

21st June, 1963

A CORRECTION

In a previous report (No. 72) I referred to Cardinal ROBERTI as a liberal. This was mistaken. He is a Curia Cardinal and a canonist. He is spoken of by some as being, because of his neutrality and legislative experience, a good man to bring the Council to a conclusion and to implement its deliberations. He is most unimpressive to look at.

[...]

THE CONCLAVE

The cardinals were walled up on the 19th and there were four votings yesterday the 20th. The smoke is put up the chimney after every second vote if they are negative. All four votes yesterday have been negative. Apparently the method of voting is straight, with no proposition of candidates. The cardinals adjust their votes each time according to the 'form' of the previous voting. The first vote of all is a 'homage' vote from which an election is not usually made.

The appearance on the balcony is said to be generally about half an hour after the acceptance of the Papacy.

THE CONCLAVE ORATION

This was preached before the cardinals on the evening of the 19th before they were enclosed. It was preached by Mgr. Amleto Tondini, the Latin expert of the department of 'letters to heads of state.' It was heavily dosed with the 'rightest' sentiments, and was obviously 'inspired' by some of the influences in the Vatican unfavourable to us.

The oration was as nearly critical of Pope John as it dared to be. After lengthy eulogies of him it said that he had left a difficult task for his successor. The people recognised in him goodness and a desire for peace, but were those yearnings the only needs of mankind which it was the Church's duty to satisfy! A more important task of the new Pope would be to safeguard the Catholic faith against the dangers of modernism and relativism. The Pope's aim in calling the Council had been to safeguard the Catholic faith by demonstrating its adaptability to the needs of the present day. He also had invited the separated brethren 'being desirous to provide more securely for their eternal salvation, to return to the Church of Christ'!!! (One is conscious here of a deliberate, arrogant return to the offensive type of pre-Roncalli).

As if the foregoing weren't enough the orator went on to say that the new Pope would certainly have to bring the Council to a conclusion at some time or other, but he would have to consider very carefully whether the present was the best time to do so. He said that the Catholic Church must beware of toying with communism or with any other set of erroneous ideas which were deceiving mankind at the present moment. The proper course for the new Pontiff to adopt was to show the world that the Catholic Church was not to be blown away by every blast of strange doctrine, but that its dogmas were unchangeable. He should steer the ship of Peter for the advantage of all, but particularly of the Catholics.

This oration, which was obviously inspired by the extreme right of the Curia, caused a wave of irritation to sweep over the city of Rome. There was however a credible source of information, stemming from members of the Sacred College itself (who were not as yet enclosed) that such a speech would probably have the effect, if it had any effect at all, of encouraging the 'left' and perhaps even of moving to the left some of the waverers in the centre, who would thus have had a gratuitous demonstration of what they might be in for if they had a Pope of the right. The Secretariat for Unity say we are to disregard it.

Report No. 76

21st June, 1963

POPE PAUL VI

Cardinal Montini was elected this morning after the first count of the day and in a comparatively short conclave. I was present in S. Peter's Square, having hurried down there after seeing the white smoke on the television. The timing made Montini's chances very high and there was general expectation in the square that it would be him. I met the Unity Secretariat men there and enjoyed their company throughout. The Cardinal Deacon (Ottaviani) had to announce the election and he did it with gusto considering how unacceptable it must have been to him. He will also have to perform the coronation.

All the Secretariat staff and several other people I met think it quite possible that the reactionary oration (which was summarised in the last report) at the Conclave might have had an effect contrary to what was intended.

There is considerable pleasure that the new Pope has taken the title of the Apostle of the Gentiles and it is hoped that this is significant. The idea of Paul at the helm of the ship of Peter is a suggestive one.

The Pope eventually appeared on the balcony and gave a blessing. The applause in the Square was most moving. I must admit that I was very moved at the announcement. I was naturally thinking of the thrilling time we had at Milan in 1955 [*sic*] with Montini and of how he had said that we should live to see considerable change in Christian relations in our lifetime.

I went back to the Secretariat afterwards and asked if I could procure a bottle of champagne and bring it in, which I did. We then all toasted the new Pope and the cause of Christian union. Willebrands made a neat little speech in which he said that this was certainly a great day

for them, and he was sure it would be also for the Church of England. He said that the spontaneous response of the Church of England to the policy of John XXIII had certainly been appreciated in Roman circles, and who was to say that it was not without influence in the course of events which had led to this happy moment.

This has been an exciting day and I will refrain from attempting any further evaluation of the new Pope except to say that in my opinion Pope John's surprising overture, which was endorsed by the bishops in Council more strongly than we could have hoped, has now penetrated right into the Vatican itself to be a certain sign that God's hand is guiding our brethren of the Roman Church to better things. Nobody should suppose that Paul VI, or any other Pope, can undo the tangled skein of 400 years separation in a generation. But his election is certainly further confirmation that it is worth our while pursuing the path we have begun and that there is real ground to hope and pray for the eventual reunion of Christendom.

Report No. 77

26th June, 1963

POPE PAOLO VI

It still seems too good to be true that Cardinal Montini was elected Pope, and everybody here is very happy about it. There can now be no doubt that the papers were deliberately trying to play down Montini's candidature for political reasons. I hope it is realised what 'being Political' amounts to in Italy. Any Pope or Bishop who dares to say (what is evident to the eyes) that there is a gross maldistribution of wealth in Italy, is being 'political' and is guilty of 'leftist' tendencies. Anyone who says that atheistic communism is a danger to the liberties of man tends to be called a 'rightist' or 'neo-fascist'. Very often what is called 'political interferences' is a necessary and reasonable application of the second Commandment in cases where to be silent would be to betray the gospel and the priestly office. Similarly, to be known to have views about the reform of the Curia is to be 'political'. In all these senses Montini is a 'political' Pope, and long may he continue to be so.

There have of course been many speculations as to how the election came about. It was accomplished quickly, and with no bones broken. It is said that he was elected on the first day and asked the cardinals to 'sleep on it'. Two of his protagonists are said in all the papers to have been decisive. The flamboyant Cushing of Boston is said to have

swayed all the South American cardinals and even to have stampeded Spellman of New York. But it was apparently Micara, one of the old curia cardinals, who persuaded his curia brethren that they stood no chance, and also that there must be no bargaining. In some previous appointments there have been instances of mild simony when a Pope has been elected after promising to have someone of the opposite faction as Secretary of State. Montini evidently did not do this, as he immediately confirmed Cicognani, John XXIII's nominee, in his office. Incidentally, the newspapers have taken to referring to the 'rightest' or 'integrist' cardinals also as the 'dogmatists'.

THE ESTABLISHMENT AND THE ITALIAN PRESS

I have recently written five letters to editors of Italian magazines and newspapers correcting the continual suggestion that the Queen is hierarchical head of the Anglican Church and that the establishment is more onerous than it is in fact. It may interest you to hear that the article by Alberto Spada of the *Europeo* was headed 'Pope and Queen'. It carries a photograph of the Queen 'as Head of the Anglican Church consecrating Guildford Cathedral'. This is really intolerable, and I am taking some cuttings to Cardinal Bea. In my mind one of the strongest arguments for disestablishment (for which I am not a fanatical enthusiast) is the false impression it gives of the whole Anglican Communion. I had to explain to the Abbot General of the Benedictines that the Queen had no relationship to PECUSA – it is a bad as that. Fortunately the articles always all call her the 'Head of the Anglican Church' which one can deny outright. It is surprising how few people realise that such connections as there are obtain only in the two English provinces, not even in Wales or Scotland.
[...]

THE SECOND SESSION OF THE COUNCIL

I have just been told by the British Minister that the Council will re-assemble on September 29th. It is interesting to note, that for the first time, the Council is to have as its opening (or closing) date, a day which is not a feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

COMMUNICATION WITH THE POPE.

I have written a personal letter to the Pope on the strength of my personal association and hope this will reach him. I wish it had been possible to have an audience before we come away next Monday, but it would not be reasonable to ask, though I have given him notice that I intend to ask for one next time. It might be possible to exploit

this situation so that we have a really trustworthy straight ‘private line’ to His Holiness. I have just been with Cardinal Tisserant who, without my mentioning the matter said ‘You should use your previous acquaintance with the Pope to see that he has *direct* information about what is in your minds.’

CONTINUATION OF THE COUNCIL

Cardinal Tisserant told me today that he thought the Council must almost certainly have a third session, in the Spring or Summer of 1964.

Report No. 78

1st July, 1963

CARDINAL BEA

I had a farewell interview with the Cardinal last Friday 28th June. He asked me to convey his greetings to the Archbishop of Canterbury. He is hoping to have at least a month’s rest during the summer.

Concerning the conclave he confirmed what had been rumoured in the papers, that the ‘right’ hadn’t really a candidate who stood a chance. Cardinal Micara, one of the Curia cardinals, therefore suggested that the ‘right’ should own themselves defeated and support the ‘left’ which they meekly did. He was supported by Cardinals Testa, Cento and Confalonieri.

THE COUNCIL

Everybody now seems to think it is likely that there will be a third session of the Council, perhaps after Easter 1964.

[. . .]

R.C. ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER

The Apostolic Delegate⁵⁴ was in Rome on Friday last and had an audience with the Pope, presumably for this purpose. Cardinal Bea is against Heenan’s nomination and in favour of Holland of Portsmouth, though he would welcome Abbot Butler providing he has the necessary administrative capacity about which he is not certain.

⁵⁴Gerald O’Hara (1895–1963) was the Apostolic Delegate to Great Britain from 1954 until his sudden death on 16 July 1963.

THE POPE

I had intended to return, as you know, on Monday July 1st. According to the usual pattern of events out here I learnt at 10.30 p.m. the previous evening that the new Pope wished to see us the following day at noon. Accordingly I rearranged my passage and was able to be at the audience, at which His Holiness received the two Russian observers, Bishop Kotliarov and Archpriest Borovoj, the Bishop of Ripon and myself, Brother André of Taizé and the Rector of the American Episcopal Church in Rome.

This was the first private audience of the new Pope's reign other than those normally given to Heads of State and their representatives and to Roman Catholic prelates.

His Holiness received us in the Library most cordially. He spoke specially warmly to the Bishop of Ripon and to me as 'old friends'. He spoke of our meetings at Milan and of his being our guest at the American Church House. We were all very moved by the occasion not least the Pope himself. He said he had pledged himself to work for Christian unity, and we should find him true to his word.

As the Russian observers were present, we made no speech in return (I will explain this in private), but made it abundantly evident that we were very pleased at his election and that we would pray and work for the unity we all desired.

I was able to renew my contact with Don Pasquale Macchi,⁵⁵ who was the Pope's chaplain at Milan in 1955 [*sic*], who has come with him to the Vatican, and who is to remain in the same post. I asked him whether we could use him as a channel of direct communication with the H.H.⁵⁶ and he said we could. If therefore there is ever anything of a very confidential kind which we wish to communicate, this would be a reliable channel.

THE CORONATION

This happened outside S. Peter's on Sunday evening June 30th. You will have seen accounts and pictures of the ceremonial. We had exceedingly prominent places behind the cardinals. The whole scene was splendid in the extreme. It cried out loud for large doses of

⁵⁵Dom Pasquale Maachi (1923–2006), private secretary to Paul VI; made a bishop by John Paul II in 1989.

⁵⁶Presumably His Holiness, i.e. the Pope.

liturgical reform, though the main principle was good, and the Pope's mass was a dialogue, with hearty participation by French, Belgian, German (and Anglican contingents). The Pope in his address said how wonderful it was that the epistle and gospel were repeated in Greek. He should have said that it would have been better if only they had been repeated in Italian for the benefit of the 150,000 on foot for the service.

The papal allocution was very good. It was delivered in Latin, Italian, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Polish and Russian (i.e. sections of the oration in each). It was again Christocentric, and the only time Our lady was mentioned it was in the words of the Magnificat. There was a considerable exhortation to the Uniate churches to respect the authority of the Holy See!

THE RUSSIAN OBSERVERS

These two, Bishop Kotliarov and Archpriest Borovoj continue to be an embarrassment (perhaps deliberately?) to the Secretariat and to us. They informed the World Council of Churches that they had no intention of coming to the Coronation, and then came. Kotliarov has continuously said he did not speak English. Today I started to speak to him in French, and he asked me to speak in English because he did not understand French. I was able to reply that in December he asked me to speak to him in French because he did not understand English etc. There are those who suggest that his elevation to episcopal rank since the last session of the Council is a subtle political move.

The Americans frequently 'get at' me about Kotliarov, saying that they have him on every black list in the White House. I have answered that as Anglican observers we could do nothing about this, but suggested that if it were true the American Embassy could reasonably protest to the Vatican.

The two of them embarrass us all by continually forcing themselves into the front row of everything which happens. I managed to engineer today that the two bishops, i.e. Kotliarov and Ripon were presented to the Pope first. There is evidence that Borovoj is straightforward and is being watched by Kotliarov. The former warned Willebrands secretly not to communicate with anyone on his journey back from Moscow by train, and Willebrands is aware of having been followed several days after his return via Vienna.

This is one of the many reasons why it is so desirable that the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople should send a representative, who should be a bishop, who could then be accepted

by all observers as their leader. Can Lambeth suggest this to Constantinople?

[...]

THE CORONATION (FURTHER)

I omitted to mention above the matter of the tiara. This was put upon the head of the Pope (to the amusement of many) by Cardinal Ottaviani; with a formula which ought soon to be forgotten. Phrases like 'princeps principum'⁵⁷ etc. came over the air.

The interesting and (we hope) significant thing was the shape of the new tiara. Instead of the old baroque shape (like that of a guardsman's bearskin) the artificers of Milan had made him a new tiara in bright metal (burnished steel? aluminium?) of the same shape as the old Byzantine mitre, rather like a beehive. Was this a deliberate reversion to the forms of the Popes of the undivided Church?

Montini behaved very humbly through it all. He is a man who could not 'put on airs', no matter how high one exalted him. His chaplain told me he spent the whole night awake in prayer between the first vote which elected him and the second which he accepted immediately.

[...]

Report No. 79

20th September, 1963

ARRIVAL

I arrived here on Sept. 18th. and hope to stay to the end of the next session of the Council, until about Dec. 10th. The Council ends on the 4th December.

[...]

THE COUNCIL – THIRD SESSION

It now seems to be taken for granted that there will be a third session of the Council, probably May – July next year.

[...]

THE INTERIM.

The coordinating commissions of the Council have been hard at work and have been trying to carry out the late Pope's directive to shorten,

⁵⁷'The first of the firsts'.

conflate, and where necessary rewrite, the Schemata of the last session. I am informed that 20 Schemata have been reduced to 17, and that the present Pope thinks even they are too long. The new Schemata (four of them at least) are in our hands: they are much shorter than their predecessors. These schemata have been out to the bishops and have been digested by them. The new Pope has not altered any of them so far, and they have come out over the seal of John XXIII.

THE NEW POPE, PAUL VI

The Pope continues to run true to form. Mgr. Willebrands told me today that the Pope sent for him last week and asked about the work of the Secretariat at length. This is more than his predecessor did. He told W. that he had said unity would be a preoccupation of his pontificate and that he meant what he said.

The *Osservatore Romano* has twice shown pictures of the Pope saying Mass in a plain long 'gothic' chasuble. I append one of them. This must be the first time a Pope has been seen in this garb since the Reformation. He is obviously establishing himself in the affections of all his staff here as a most devout industrious and learned Pope with a very wide view. It is fair to say that whereas they loved Pope John they admire Paul VI. That does not mean to imply that Paul is cold. He takes longer to know and is less spontaneous; he will certainly be a great Pope. Everyone is agreed in saying that the two men are providential. Paul could not have made the 'breakthrough' which John has accomplished, and John could not have steered the outcome as judiciously as Paul will do.

ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER

There is no doubt that the nomination of Mgr. Heenan was a surprise out here, as well as at home. The long delay had been interpreted as meaning they were trying to find someone else at all costs. I find that my guesses from England correspond to what is supposed out here, viz. Heenan was appointed because of the unity angle. It is recognised that the English episcopate didn't want him for reasons that are not difficult to guess. But he has talked so much about unity that he will have to attempt to implement the decisions of the Council.

This is a confidential report. I don't think readers will need informing that Archbishop Heenan will want careful watching. He is concerned with unity but is at the same time a very zealous Roman Catholic and a very forceful and persuasive prelate. Perhaps he has been raised up to encourage zeal in the Church of England. I think our friends in the religious orders will have been disappointed, though the hierarchy

will rather have had Heenan than any religious at all. It was amusing to notice that Dom Christopher Butler's assessment of Heenan in the *Sunday Times* said that 'Dr Heenan has had a very thorough theological formation'; and formation is of course to be distinguished from, in fact contrasted with, education, in Roman parlance.

My own view is that Heenan is the best we could have expected unless we could have had Holland of Portsmouth (assuming of course it could not be a religious). But he is not a man of wide vision and I'm afraid he is not a man whom people really trust. Even ordinary people sense this very much.

UNITY IN ENGLAND

Having been bold in the last paragraph may I stick my neck out further and express the hope that the C. of E. will quickly evolve machinery to deal with the new situation which I should say is already created by Heenan's appointment, and which will in any wise come about after the Council – i.e. the situation whereby the Roman Church in England will start using the new 'unity' situation as a means of further propagation of the faith? And they of course will be highly organised and will have a programme controlled by the hierarchy. Has the C.F.R. given thought to this, or does it reckon to deal with this situation? [...] We need to have a centre to which all Anglicans (and others?) can address questions about Roman relations, which shall ensure that trained speakers are available in all areas, shall weigh reports of Roman misbehaviour and (where advisable) pass them on to Heenan's committee, and a thousand other things. Is John Kelly's committee able to do this? [...]

REPRESENTATION IN ROME

I wonder if any thought is being given to the future of this assignment? It is evident to me that when the Council is over there will be scope and opportunity, if not an actual request, for an Anglican officer in Rome, and an Anglican centre. I would gladly write at length on suggestions about this if asked to do so. If this is to come into being in a year or eighteenth months' time surely now is the time to be planning the finances. As we have our men at Geneva and back that whole enterprise to some thousands per annum I hope there would be a case for this too. No doubt in the future it will have to have an Anglican Communion angle and sustentation?) etc. That will not be for me to decide, but I do recommend strongly that it be kept in mind. The chief reason for it is that the Romans would welcome it: they are very flattering about us sometimes and speak very generously of what we have to contribute.

THE POPE'S VISIT TO THE ENGLISH COLLEGE

On the 22nd of August the Pope went to the summer residence of the College during his stay at Castel Gandolfo. In the course of this visit the Rector said:-

the 'vocation' of the students of the English College will be to work in England for the salvation of the souls and for the conversion of many brethren separated from the Holy See. The alienation of our country from the Catholic faith was a most sad event, but now the darkness seems slowly to be dispersing, and we continually pray that the Lord may hasten the great day when finally England may again be called The Dowry of Mary.

Responding to the Rector, the Pope expressed:

'sympathy, affection, admiration for what English Catholics are doing and for what they represent in the Church of God', adding that 'they constitute one of the strategic points, it may be said, in the life of the Church'. The Pope then hoped that the action of English Catholics might attain 'the most joyous and', that is that it might be possible 'in very truth to greet England once more as the Dowry of Madonna, and that its inhabitants, with all others who share their nationality, may all become sons of the same Church, of the same faith, with the confidence in their hearts of Christian salvation.'

It seems only fair to quote this kind of lapse on the part of the Pope. But what else could he say to the English College? The Rector of the College is a rather unprepossessing Irishman of the hard school called Mgr. Tickle (!); friendly to speak to, but with no vision.

[. . .]

THE POPE AND THE CURIA

The Pope has announced the general terms of his intentions of reform for the Roman Curia. This is no surprise, for he himself has often adumbrated it, notably in what was regarded as his 'pre-election' speech in Milan. The reform is of course long overdue and is strongly desired by everybody except the Curia itself. The main intention is to internationalise it, to streamline it and to think out its fundamental significance in relation to the Papacy and the episcopate. The general complaint has been that the Curia has been able actually to interfere with the running of dioceses. I imagine that this is a long-term project,

though the Pope made it clear that he is going to do it largely on his own.

[. . .]

WILLEBRANDS AND THE SCHEMATA

I had a long talk on arrival with Willebrands and expressed my view that the Schemata represent an immense advance on their predecessors, on which we congratulated the Secretariat. We hoped of course that more ground would be won in the second session. Willebrands said we must be prepared for the *integristi* to fight back hard and there was always the possibility of their regaining some ground, though he hoped not. The part of the Schemata de Ecclesia of the papacy was very disappointing and in my view represented a worsening of the position at Vatican I. Willebrands said that they were not satisfied with it but I could not pin him down to saying how it could now be improved upon. The ‘Explanations’ are very bad and merely demolish ‘straw arguments’. Whoever thought that infallibility meant that the Pope could predict next week’s weather?

In my view the two main points won were the recognition that all the baptised were members of the Church (on whatever footing) and the implied admission (in de Ecumenismo) that there was schism within the Church (i.e. in recognising the Orthodox as *Ecclesiae Orientales*). I asked whether that did mean giving up some of the position of Trent and Vatican I by which actual communion with the successor of Peter was an essential condition of membership of the Church. He said that he hoped we shouldn’t call it that but a ‘clarification of an idea’. That seemed to me to be a pregnant remark and perhaps a momentous discussion. In countless conversations I have never yet heard anybody of Willebrands’ authority say so plainly how they intended to get round this kind of difficulty.

I asked him how the R.C. envisaged the development of their present approaches to the Orthodox. The Pope had said that he wasn’t thinking in terms of ‘submission’: but what I said [was] that it was surely already obvious that neither the Orthodox nor we could make unity in any form on the basis of the infallibility per se of the Pope.

[. . .]

I asked if the differences between the Roman and Anglican doctrines about the Eucharist could be regarded as a *diversitas espressionis*,⁵⁸

⁵⁸‘Difference of expression’.

and he said he thought not. But I am not sure how really conversant Willebrands is with our theology.

[. . .]

Report No. 81

30th September, 1963

CARDINAL BEA

I had an introductory interview with the Cardinal who seemed to be in very good health. He agreed that the new Schemata were a great advance on the old ones. I said that the 'Explanations' offered in de Ecclesia about the nature of the infallibility of the Pope were disappointing and were not in fact explanations of our difficulties at all. He said we should wait and see what came out of the Council. I asked if he thought that the 'Liberals' should gain further ground at this session, and he said he thought it was possible.

He repeated that it was now quite certain that the Secretariat would continue after the Council. There would be a third session of the Council, and the Cardinal thought this more likely to begin soon after Easter than in the autumn.

[. . .]

ARCHBISHOP HEENAN'S ENTHRONEMENT

The press men who are here for the opening of the Council have obviously been given a good impression of Heenan and seem to think that he is bound to live up to his professions of friendliness. I am amused by his conception of 'building a bridge to Lambeth', and hope it will be made wide enough for two-way traffic.

[. . .]

LIGHT RELIEF

The reassembly of all the personalities of the Council has brought its crop of stories. One of the most attractive is that the conservatories [*sic*] in their confessions now habitually say 'Bea culpa, Bea culpa, Bea maxima culpa'.