

FROM CONCILIAR TEST TO MORAL CONTEXTS THE METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGE OF *GAUDIUM ET SPES*

Raphael Gallagher CSsR.
Alphonsian Academy
rgallagher@alfonsiana.edu

Abstract

This paper is based on the presupposition that *Gaudium et spes* is the decisive text of Vatican 2 for the methodological structure of moral theology. The presumption is examined, in the main, from a textual angle. The author believes that theologians have not paid enough attention to the textual reconstruction of *Gaudium et spes* that is now available. He constructs his argument in a number of simple steps (a) general hermeneutical criteria for interpreting the text, (b) the implications of the first footnote to the text for understanding the whole text, (c) the confirmation of what this footnote tells us by an examination of the Preface and Introduction. and (d) an effort to explain the substance of this analysis by examining a paragraph from each of the first four chapters of the conciliar text (articles 21, 30, 34 and 43)). The implications of the conciliar text for moral theology conclude the article in a schematic and summary way,

Introduction

There is a strengthening view that *Gaudium et spes* is the decisive conciliar *locus* for theological reflection on moral issues in the light of the texts of Vatican 11.¹ Normally the reference text is *Optatam totius 16*: this is not to be ignored, but the reform of theological studies dealt with in that document concerns priestly formation.² To ensure that the view of moral theology with which we operate is a decisive break with the manual tradition, given all its presuppositions, it is more likely that *Gaudium et spes* will provide a richer textual source. Implied in this view is that we should conceive moral theology more in terms of the practical theology of the Christian life, taken in its widest sense.³ If this is the formal object of our study it means that the textual sources we use will be different from the traditional ones favoured by the manuals. Unexamined, to a large extent, is the methodological issue of how one moves from a text like *Gaudium et spes* (which is not specifically written for moral theology) to a theological consideration of moral problems that arise in different social and economic contexts. That is the question I wish to pursue.

On reading the text of Gaudium et Spes

The schema offered by Alberigo is a useful starting point for the criteria of our textual interpretation.⁴ The Council, generally speaking, is best seen as an event, that is, something that changed the way of thinking prevalent before the occurrence of the event. Behind the event one can see traces of the intention of Pope John 23rd in his convocation of the Council on January 25th 1959, an inspirational idea that is formulated more precisely in the Bull of Convocation *Humanae salutis* of December 25th 1961.⁵ To be noted is the quasi-inspirational tone of the Pope's words, clearly linking his concept of the Council to the work of the Holy Spirit: this view is confirmed by entries into his well-known diary *The Journal of a Soul*.

These initial criteria of interpretation can be substantiated by further ones, mainly based on the texts of the Council. Without entering the separate issue of various type of conciliar documents (Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations) one can note an underlying concern: the Council should be 'pastoral'. At this initial stage of the argument of this paper I am taking 'pastoral' to suggest that the Council intended to offer a testimony to the *faith lived in practice*. This immediately differentiates the Council from previous councils, which tended to concentrate on statements and affirmations of faith *expressed in formulae*. Obviously, Vatican 11 does not negate this previous tradition, but it tries to place its own statements and affirmation in a dialectical relationship with the exigencies of faith in the actual living of that faith. The reason for this choice is linked to the project of *aggiornamento*, a word that gained worldwide prominence after the discourse of Pope John 23rd at the opening of the Council on October 11th 1962, *Gaudet mater ecclesiae*.⁶ In this text one can note how the Pope links the inspiration to convoke the Council to the challenge of making the Spirit present in our day and age: *aggiornamento* is, implicitly, more than a matter of external adaptation. This background criterion for the interpretation of the texts of the Council can be confirmed by the important lexical study co-ordinated by Paul Tombeur which allows us to compare the linguistic structure of Vatican 11 compared to previous Councils.⁷ The presence, or absence, of various words (*accomodatio, anathema, cum, haeres, rennovatio, veritas*) in Vatican 11 confirms a 'new' tone in the Council

The Council produced 'texts', certainly, and one can refer to the 'spirit' of the Council. Keeping a key speech of Paul 6th in mind⁸ may help us see the sense in which the idea of the Council-as-event can operate as a broad hermeneutical key. The intuition offered by the Pope is that the Council was a moment of sowing the seed that would, with patience, produce new fruit. It is in this sense that I am using the idea of the Council-as-event. It is important to avoid a literalist interpretation of texts, as it is important to avoid a vague reference to a spirit that may not be verifiable. This caution, which urges us towards a comprehensive interpretation of the texts, is particularly important for our specific text *Gaudium et spes* for a simple reason: if the broad sense of being 'pastoral' is at the centre of understanding the event of the Council it is proper to conclude that this may have particular relevance to a Constitution which is denoted as a Pastoral one. There is a pre-history to the Council, as there is obviously now a post-history (the period of reception). I am not of the view that it is particularly useful, however, to judge everything in terms of being 'pre-conciliar' or 'post-conciliar': the lines of demarcation are not that clear. That is why the sense in which I am using the term 'event' (linked to Pope Paul 6th's idea of sowing the seed) seems more inclusive as a frame of reference. We need to pay attention to the texts of the Council, and for our purposes here the text of *Gaudium et spes*: that is the premise on which I proceed. But, equally, the texts alone (that is, taken as isolated literary excerpts) are likely to give reductionist views of the Council. That such was not the intent of the Council can be deduced from the final message of the Council itself (December 8th 1965), especially those sections addressed to artists and young people: the texts of the Council are meant to give new life, perhaps in ways not imagined by the texts themselves.⁹

On reading the Text of Gaudium et spes as a Conciliar Text

Interpreting *Gaudium et spes* inevitably brings us back to an even more essential question: the interpretation of any magisterial text. I think it is worth summarizing one classic position.¹⁰ The greater the authority invested in a text, the greater the importance of that text: the wider the group of people addressed by a text, the more significant is its import; the closer a text comes to the core of matters of faith or doctrine, the more importance it has for the life of the Church: the more authoritative the sources used in the text (for example, Scripture, tradition), the more intense should be our acceptance: the more solemn the form of the text (for example, a decree, an encyclical or a conciliar constitution) the more importance it has. On the basis of these criteria it is obvious that

Gaudium et spes, as a text, enjoys the higher ranking among magisterial texts and, thus, has a *prima facie* plausibility as being of importance for moral theology.

Though to be read as a conciliar text, in the sense indicated in the previous paragraph, it is legitimate to add some comments given what I have said earlier about the particular purpose of Vatican 11, taken as a whole. The texts of the Council are to be taken as a *totality*: thus, *Gaudium et spes* should be inter-linked, for interpretative purposes, with other documents of the Council. The spirit and text of the Council documents should be understood as a *unity*: thus, *Gaudium et spes* needs to be interpreted in the light of the best available textual re-constructions as well as in view of the way it has been received in the Church since its promulgation. This total unity should be understood within the broad *tradition of the Church*: thus, while *Gaudium et spes* represents a novelty in terms of conciliar texts and is a rejection of the original schemata prepared for the Council, it should not be seen as a break with the more radical (that is, biblical and patristic) tradition of the Church. This coherence with tradition should be seen in the context of *the needs of the Church now*: thus, *Gaudium et spes*, by the tone and tenor of its content, is best understood as being for ‘the contemporary world’, just as the title indicates.¹¹

Keeping these broad criteria in mind, we can proceed to the more precise task of seeing how the text of *Gaudium et spes* might be translated into different contexts.

An Initial Clue: The First Footnote

A first approximation may be gleaned from the footnote to the title of our document. Such a footnote is unique in the history of conciliar texts. If the title needs a footnote, it implies possible confusion in the understanding of the total document. This is the case with the first footnote, which was presented as an official explanation of how the full text of *Gaudium et spes* is to be interpreted. This is the justification for paying attention to the note.¹² I can find no linear development behind the footnote which was written in November 1965, that is three weeks before the promulgation of *Gaudium et spes*.¹³ My presumption is that the footnote was considered essential at this late stage to clarify something in a text that was in danger of not being accepted by the Council Fathers. Though near the end of the Council, there were still 541 Council Fathers (that is, nearly one quarter of the total) who were unhappy with calling the text a *Constitutio*. The story is complex, but I think it is a reasonable conclusion that the note helped to clear the passage of *Gaudium et spes* as a Pastoral Constitution. Referring back to what I have said about the grade of importance to be given to such a conciliar statement, this is no small matter in establishing the importance of our text.¹⁴

Three elements in this note should be underlined: church, world, and doctrine. *Gaudium et spes* is an ecclesiological document of Vatican 11, and this clearly links its interpretation closely to *Lumen gentium*: what is affirmed in that text should be presumed to be affirmed in *Gaudium et spes*, and what is rejected in the Dogmatic Constitution should be presumed as rejected in the Pastoral Constitution. This is a result of the criteria mentioned in the last paragraph regarding the need to see the texts of the Council as a ‘totality’. To be particularly excluded are the ideas of the Church as a perfect society, merely hierarchical and of unequal membership. Care is obviously needed on this point, lest we fall into a reductionist ecclesiology. Once the positive view of the Church is understood, however, we can better understand what the footnote implies as regards the meaning of the world. The world, in *Gaudium et spes*, is best understood as an anthropological term: it is the place where the drama of human existence is worked out. The clarification of these first two terms in the footnote (church and world) leaves us in a better position to understand the third term: doctrine. Implicitly excluded is an identification of ‘doctrine’ with ‘dogma’ as traditionally understood.

The importance of this footnote is that it is offered as an aspect of interpreting the full text of *Gaudium et spes*. It is clear that the Council Fathers, by wishing to avoid a false doctrine-pastoral juxtaposition, sought to indicate the precise sense in which the Pastoral Constitution is ‘pastoral’. What is novel about *Gaudium et spes* is its aim to express the truths of salvation in a way that is accessible to people today, taking into account their difficulties and responding to their questions as they have formulated them. What is affirmed in the text can, with confidence, be applied to different contexts. If *Gaudium et spes* offers a particular view of key ideas (namely: Church, world, doctrine) in the text itself it is legitimate, given the authoritative importance of this Pastoral Constitution, to apply these meanings in analogous theological contexts.

A Confirmation of this initial Clue

I believe that confirmation of this textual interpretation of the first footnote can be confirmed by an analysis of the Preface and Introduction to our text (articles 1-10). The preface and Introduction encapsulate the haste with which parts *Gaudium et spes* were written.¹⁵ My research indicates three broad moments, chronologically and methodologically, in the composition of this part of our text, and which correspond to different drafts of the document.¹⁶ These moments are: dialogue, solidarity and the multi-layered historical situation of the human person in the world. We will take these in turn.

The first substantial draft, after the rejection of the prepared pre-conciliar *schemata*, was the Malines text completed in September 1963. Here the effort was to establish criteria by which the Church could dialogue with the world. Though it did not receive a very positive response when presented to the Council Fathers, it did start the substantial debate, within the Council, on what ‘dialogue’ might actually mean. Different in tone is the Zurich Text (February 1964): the approach is more sociological than strictly theological. The text succeeds in expanding the concept of dialogue to show that it should include ‘solidarity’ with the world. Again, the reactions of the Council Fathers to this new draft were not entirely favourable.¹⁷ The third decisive draft, for our purposes here, was that prepared at Ariccia in February 1965. Here the important arguments revolve around two axes: a preference for biblical language and a rejection of a two-tiered approach that divided, in a false way, the natural and supernatural destiny of the human person. It is in this sense that I believe *Gaudium et spes* considers the human person in the context of actual complex situations. It was the Ariccia text, despite some opposition, which became the basis of the final draft of *Gaudium et spes*.

If we look at the headings of articles 1 through 10 we can see more clearly the emergence of the sense in which the text of *Gaudium et spes* could be applied in analogous contexts. . Examples are: hope and anguish (4), deep-seated changes (5), changes in the social order (6), changes in attitudes, morals and religion (7) and imbalances in the world (8). It is the drama of the human condition that is at the centre of the concern of the text at this point.¹⁸ Important to note, however, are the explanations given in the final two articles of the introduction. Only a non-utilitarian and ethical analysis will truly *change* the world. Development is possible only on a moral basis: we can note the importance of human dignity in a community context as explained in article 9. We are taken to the heart of the matter in the following article 10. Change is never something that can be analysed externally: the external changes, mentioned in the previous paragraphs, have implications for the internal life of the human person: the text clearly points to criteria of a religious and ethical nature. Interesting I believe, is the implication that there is a need to apply these criteria (for instance, sin) to all people, and not just to Christians. There is, of course, a nuance to the way the criteria of evaluation would be applied: but the difference is to be found at this level of application and not in the fact that Christians, *per se*, are automatically more moral than others. Typically for *Gaudium et spes* the section ends with a christological reflection. To be noted, however, is the way in which the

text arrives at this reflection: it is through the *mysterium hominis* that we come to understand the *mysterium Christi*. One can note different hands at work in this part of our text, but the juxtaposition is fortuitous. P. Pavan (close to Pope John 23rd and a principal redactor of *Pacem in terris*) had vigorously argued for an introduction that would be a sincere description of the world as it actually is. G. Phillips (a significant theological figure in the drafting commissions) counter-argued that such an approach risked a conciliar text that would be too tied to contingent facts. What is remarkable in the final text is the persistence of both views. The world is a *theatrum* (article 2) where change is *magis dynamica* (article 6) and is indeed marked by the process of *socializatio* (article 6): these recall the ideas of Pavan. But these changes are more than sociological phenomena, as indicated: the crisis is about the *bona* of life (article 7) which involve a *perturbatio normis* (also article 7) which involves us in a struggle for *dignitas* (article 8): here one can see more clearly the ideas of Phillips.

The first ten articles are a summary of what we find in the rest of the text. There is a sense of upheaval in the world, and this is disturbing the human equilibrium at the level of our deepest desires. This is firstly a sort of sociological fact: one can see the changes and take note of them. What is interesting in the construction of our text is the way this level opens out to a second level: the moral significance of these changes. The text then invites us to consider a third level of significance: the changes raise questions of an ultimate nature. It is, of course, affirmed by *Gaudium et spes* that the light of Christ, present in the world through the Church, will illuminate our path from the first (sociological) level to an appreciation of proper ethical and religious solutions. But the close reading of the text allows us to see deeper into this affirmation that, of itself, is hardly a surprising one. It is through the experience of radical contingency and change that we come to a fuller realisation of the non-contingent and unchanging truth offered in Christ.

This is the paradigmatic way of interpreting the remainder of the conciliar text. It is a bipolar interpretation (the inevitability of change – the necessity of non-change) that is characteristic of *Gaudium et spes*. This paradigmatic bipolarity is verifiable in the text, and it can be observed as factual in the world since the Council. By analogy, therefore, it is the method that I believe is best suited to the moral theological analysis of social, economic and political questions today. The text itself reveals the way in which new contexts can be addressed.

The Substance of this Methodological Change

It is not sufficient to affirm that *Gaudium et spes* proposes a particular methodology, or simply to assert on the basis of this affirmation that it has analogical possibilities for the moral theological consideration of contemporary problems. The substantial content of the methodological shift needs to be explained. The core content is to be found in the four chapters of part one of *Gaudium et spes* and are well known: *the dignity of the human person, the community of people, human activity in the world, the mission of the Church in the world*. I propose to take an article from each of these four chapters to illustrate how the methodological shift in *Gaudium et spes* operates. The choice of the articles is not arbitrary: I have chosen, from each of the first four chapters, those articles that seem best suited to give substance to the argument of this paper, that is: within the text of *Gaudium et spes* there are implicit methodological positions that have a clear relevance for analogous moral contexts now.

(a) *The dignity of the human person*. Article 21, part of the section on atheism, is the first illustration. The Church must say no to atheism as a formal thesis, but at the same time the Church must allow itself to be addressed by the question of atheism. This is a novelty. Two forms of atheism were discussed in the previous article 20, postulatory atheism and Marxist atheism. What is interesting about both forms is that they have their origin in that

part of the world (Europe) where the presence of the Church was presumed to be strongest. This point was not lost on some of the Council Fathers, and it helps to explain the tone of the discussion on atheism. The word *damnat* is avoided in favour of *reprobat*.¹⁹ The confidence implied in the article was not shared by all the Council Fathers, nor by some Protestant Observers who were worried about too great a trust in human reason.²⁰ Close reading shows that the openness of the text is well founded in reality. The guiding line is the *humanum* which is a *quaestio insoluta*.²¹ It is the proposal of how the Church should respond to this unresolved question that illustrates the particular content of human dignity in our text. The Church must have a *nuntium*²² which is capable of being understood even by those formally rejecting the Church. This is not to claim that only the Church has the answers to human problems. The emphasis, rather, is on how the human yearning for inner peace can be disturbed by wrong answers. It is clearly shown that atheism is a wrong answer to the deepest desires of the human heart: the Church offers a better answer, without condemnation of other views. In this sense the true dignity of each person receives a particular affirmation. Atheism is, clearly, a problem about (the absence of) God in a person's life. But, in the analysis of *Gaudium et spes*, this turns out to be a problem about dignity, or its absence, in a person's life.²³

(b) *The community of people*. It is in article 30 that we can see a good example of how the methodology of *Gaudium et spes* works for this topic. In the previous articles of this chapter (23 to 29) the base lines are set in place: the social nature of the individual has a theological basis (article 24), this social nature is inherent to the person and not an outside adjunct (article 25) and this is best understood in a particular view of the common good (article 26). These steps imply a novel way of confronting the problem of the isolated individual in contemporary society (article 29) With article 30 we can note the repetition of these different stages in the argument. An overly individualistic theory of salvation is first refuted: then with the idea of *iustitiae et caritatis officium* the horizon of salvation is expanded.²⁴ If it is only through the promotion of social institutions that the individual can be formed, therefore it is only in this context that the person can be saved. The text is prudent with regard to socialism and capitalism, noting the reductionist tendencies in both ideologies. The wording is marked by the times in which it was written, though there are interesting possibilities even for our global age: to be noted in this article are the words *quo mundus magis unitur*.²⁵ We can see in this article the three-fold stage of social engagement: the construction of society is the task of the community and can only be realised by virtuous people. What is novel about the presentation of the argument is that the individual is taken seriously, both as a member of society and as one destined for salvation, but the conception of the individual is not that of an 'isolated atom' but of one who is constitutively social. This has obvious implications for any discourse about the sources of morality: these are to be located within the human person, but understood as a person-in-community.²⁶

(c) *Human activity in the world*. It is in article 34 that we can best see the guiding principles for this topic: one is linked to origin of creation (note 57) and one to the finality of creation (note 58). Human work, therefore, is not an end in itself: the aim is to give glory to God. Thus, though work involves us in a very immanent world, we are not thereby alienated from a transcendent God: the use of the words *opus Creatoris evolvere*²⁷ are indicative of this. There is a recovery here of an idea much esteemed by the Churches of the Reform: worldly vocation is a proper way in which to encounter the living God. There is a recovery, too, of the unity of human life: we do not have two lives to lead, but only one which, though rooted in this world, opens by its own nature to the eternal. The text notes that work is

indeed a *human* concern: when we affirm, for instance, that the human person is more than *homo oeconomicus* (a standard affirmation within catholic theology) we need to be able to accept the legitimate autonomy of the human world. This is possible because to be a ‘worker’ is, in fact, to be a co-partner with God in the creation of a better world. Work is salvific precisely because it enables us to become more human. The import for the world of today, where work is often reduced to a material mode of improving one’s position in life, is obvious.²⁸

(d) *The mission of the Church in the world.* From this rather brief chapter I have chosen one of the longer articles, 43, to illustrate my argument. The opening lines show that we should not separate our religious lives from our temporal responsibilities, giving a biblical foundation in footnotes 93 through 96. This shows why lay people have a particular role to play, and this conditions the ministry of the pastors. On social questions it is not to be expected that pastors have an answer to every question.²⁹ Differences, therefore, will emerge but these should be solved in a spirit of dialogue conducted in a *colloquio sincero*.³⁰ It is admitted that this may not always be the case, given that the Church is made up of members *qui Spiritui Dei infideles sunt*³¹. This brings us back to what *Lumen gentium* had earlier said (*LG*, article 8) about the Holy Church of God being always in need of purification. Article 43 is important, in the context of the whole of Chapter 4, because it explains why a *contemptus mundi* approach is not appropriate for the Church’s mission in the world. This article links the theological and christological bases of such a mission.³² Already stated, in article 41, is that Christ is the One who progressively reveals the truth to us: it is stated, later in the chapter at article 45, that Christ is the Lord of History. Thus, the article we are examining here (article 43) is a good example of the general methodology of *Gaudium et spes*: the argument begins from points that are less clear to arrive at conclusions that are more clear. This is not simply an ‘inductive’ method, as it is sometimes called. More precisely, it is an acceptance of the argument that it is only by examining what it means to be human that we can arrive at the light (that is, in Christ) which will ultimately reveal the human to itself.

The substance of the arguments in the first part of *Gaudium et spes*, illustrated through selected paragraphs, is a confirmation of what we saw earlier in the analysis of the footnote to the title, the Preface and the Introduction. The core concern of our text is a consideration of the human person, analysed from a particular perspective in historical circumstances: this consideration is always in an ecclesiological framework that ultimately leads to the Person of Christ as the Word and Light for humanity. That is the methodology which, I believe, can be proven from a textual analysis of *Gaudium et spes*. Because the arguments treated in the first part of the Pastoral Constitution (the dignity of the human person, the community of people, human activity in the world and the mission of the Church in the world) are, in a self-evident manner, the arguments that are central to the new contexts of moral concern for the Church, we can conclude that the methodological shift that characterises *Gaudium et spes* has analogical implications for the theological consideration of morality today.

Implications

This move from a conciliar text to new moral contexts is obviously difficult. I have taken care to examine some of the texts of *Gaudium et spes*, not as an end in itself, but as an indication that the Pastoral Constitution is fertile ground for those who wish to construct a moral theology of the type mentioned in the opening paragraph. By way of conclusion, and in a synthetic way, I offer the

following schema as the agenda for such a moral theology, with references to how *Gaudium et spes* may nourish a response.

- (i) Change is inevitable. The key motor for change is power, and this inevitably involves a revisiting of our ideas of liberty, community and equality.³³
- (ii) The changes that occur have consequences, also, for our mode of thinking and knowing. Instrumental reason, and the therapeutic sciences, are not necessarily the full answer.³⁴
- (iii) Further, these changes oblige us to consider new forms of social relations, largely as a result of the deregulation of ideas in our world.³⁵
- (iv) From this it is evident that change has consequences for morality and religion (the sense of what is good in life, the clash between various goods, the growth of utilitarianism etc.)³⁶
- (v) In fact, the changes may be so profound that they provoke questions about the meaning of human life itself.³⁷
- (vi) If, therefore, we are in doubt as to what the ‘human person’ means today we need to return to the originating vision, in Christ, which is clearly to be found within a consideration of the person as an image of God.³⁸
- (vii) The text of *Gaudium et spes* thus offers us, by analogy, an indication of the theological method to be followed in addressing the great social, economic and political questions of the day.³⁹

It is not my contention that *Gaudium et spes*, on its own, is a sufficient source for the type of moral theology I have proposed. But it is a central *fons*. My concern is that, while using the conciliar text in a different moral context, we respect the methodological implications of the original text. To respect the text, we need to use the critical studies of the various drafts of our text that are gradually becoming available. This will not be a limiting of our vision to a literal method. On the contrary, it will open our eyes to exciting possibilities, and justify the opinion expressed at the start of this presentation: *Gaudium et spes* is the privileged text of Vatican 11 for those concerned with the theological consideration of moral concerns.

¹ Confer M. Lamberigts and L. Kenis (eds.), *Vatican 11 and its Legacy*, Leuven University Press, Louvain 2002. Of special interest are the chapters by J. Selling (145-162) and M. Elsbernd (187-201).

² This has been little noted by scholars. I do not intend to sideline the importance of *Optatam totius* but, as a document intended for the formation of priests, this finality has to be taken into account in interpreting its various parts.

³ I find myself close to the view of moral theology as presented by N. Rigali, “From ‘Moral Theology’ to the ‘Theology of the Christian Life’: An Overview”, in *Origins* 34 (2004) 6 (June 24th) 85–91.

⁴ G. Alberigo, *Treue und Kreativität bei der Rezeption des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils*, LIT Verlag, Münster 1999.

⁵ Text in *Enchiridion Vaticanum 1: Documenti del Concilio Vaticano 11 (1962-1965)* EDB, Bologna, 1993, 18^o ed., 2-19. Hereafter *EV 1*.

⁶ *EV 1*, 33-55.

⁷ P. Tombeur (ed.) *Thesaurus Conciliorum Oecumenicorum et Generalium Ecclesiae Catholicae*, Louvain 1996.

⁸ The text of the *Allocutio*, delivered on November 18th 1965 (that is, during the last session and just three weeks before the closure of the Council) is in *EV 1* 272-287.

⁹ “Nuntii quibusdam hominum ordinibus dati”. *EV 1* 316-341.

¹⁰ H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum* (Edizione bilingue a cura di Peter Hünermann), EDB, Bologna 1995, LV-LX.

¹¹ The formulation of this paragraph is my own, though one will note similarities with more notable writers on these topics, for instance: W. Kasper, *Theology and Church*, Crossroad, New York 1989; F. A. Sullivan, *Creative Fidelity: Weighing and Interpreting Documents of the Magisterium*, Gill and Macmillan, Dublin 1996; R. Gaillardetz, *Teaching with Authority: A Theology of the Magisterium in the Church*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville (MN) 1997.

¹² The Commission presenting the note was quite explicit: “‘Titulo ‘Constitutio Pastoralis De ecclesia in mondo huius temporis’ servato, addatur in corpore Constitutionis nota natuam propriam Schematis explicans et proinde regulam ad eius rectam interpretationem enuntians”. The use of ‘regula’ is to be underlined for the purposes of my arguments.

¹³ The most authoritative re-construction of our text (G. Turbanti, *Un Concilio per il mondo moderno: la redazione della costituzione 'Gaudium et spes' del Vaticano 11*, Il Mulino, Bologna 2000) gives indirect clues but, of itself, is not a proof-text of what I am proposing here.

¹⁴ I have treated this question at greater length, though from a slightly different perspective, in R. Gallagher, "The Significance of a Note: The Implications of *Gaudium et spes* for fundamental moral theology", in *Studia Moralia* 41 (2004) 2 451-463.

¹⁵ Apart from the work of Turbanti (mentioned in note xii) the story of the text is well chronicled in G. Alberigo, *Storia del Concilio Vaticano 11* (5 Vols.), Il Mulino, Bologna 1994 ff. Of particular interest is Volume 5, pages 371-491.

¹⁶ Confer R. Gallagher, "Change and Continuity in the Human Condition: the implications of GS pars. 4-10 for moral theology", in *Studia Moralia* 35 (1997) 1, 49-69.

¹⁷ There are many reasons for this but among them, I believe, is the fact that the text was associated with B. Häring who was, at this stage of the Council, not well regarded by important Council figures.

¹⁸ Though concerned with more than the preface and introduction, this view is confirmed by a recent study of importance for understanding our text: P. Bordeyne, *L'homme et son angoisse. La théologie morale de « Gaudium et spes »*, Cerf, Paris 2004.

¹⁹ GS Art. 21, par. I.

²⁰ Confer H. Vorgrimler (ed.), *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican 11*, Vol. 5, Herder and Herder, New York 1969, 143-163.

²¹ GS Art. 21, pars. 3 and 4.

²² GS Art. 21, par. 7.

²³ The reversal of the question of atheism, from a focus on 'God' to a focus on 'inadequate conceptions of human dignity' is the novelty of our text: a theological analysis of the shift of emphasis can be found in H. de Lubac, *Le drame de l'humanisme athée*, Cerf, Paris 1983.

²⁴ GS Art. 30, par. 1.

²⁵ GS Art. 30, par. 2.

²⁶ This implication is of particular importance. The 'turn to the subject', characteristic of much philosophical discussion since the Enlightenment, is generally not well received in catholic circles, for obvious reasons. The legitimate fear is that such a turn eliminates the theonomous role of God by reducing the individual to an autonomous self. The nuances of this article of *Gaudium et spes* seem, in my view, well formulated to answer the type of moral problem indicated by philosophers such as C. Taylor, *Sources of the Self*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass.) 1989. The theological possibilities are indicated by another important philosopher: J. Dunne, *Back to the Rough Ground*, Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame (IN) 1993.

²⁷ GS Art. 34, par. 2.

²⁸ I suspect the influence of M-D. Chenu is important in this article, especially his *Theology of Work* (London 1956). One can note traces, also, of the views of K. Rahner: confer *Theological Investigations*, Vol. 6, Burns and Oates, London 1974.

²⁹ GS Art. 43, par. 2.

³⁰ GS Art. 43, par. 3.

³¹ GS, Art. 43, par. 6.

³² The ideas of Y. Congar are not far removed from these expressions of the Council. Confer his *The Mystery of the Church*, Helicon, Baltimore 1990 and, especially, *Le Concile de Vatican 11. Son Eglise, Peuple de Dieu et Corps du Christ*, Cerf, Paris 1984.

³³ GS Art. 5 and 6.

³⁴ GS Art. 7 and 8.

³⁵ GS Art. 23 – 32.

³⁶ GS Art. 14 – 18.

³⁷ GS Art. 10, 33-38.

³⁸ GS Art. 12, 22, 32, 39.

³⁹ This would bring us into a consideration of the second part of our text, *De quibusdam problematibus urgentioribus*, Art 46 – 93, which would necessitate a separate study.