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PREFACE

When people learn that a Lithuanian Baptist missionary is writing a thesis on the French Catholic theologian Yves Congar they look puzzled. I have had to explain why many times. But it was clearer as the project continued that the answer had to do partially with my personal experience. I became a Christian when studying drama in the Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre and in the process of writing a play from the Book of Revelation. Raised in Soviet times in a nominally Catholic country I had been drawn to the Bible’s apocalyptic tones when Lithuania gained independence. A student of acting cannot remain satisfied with merely external knowledge of biblical or any other vision but has to interiorize it. Eventually during this process, I realized that the tables had turned and I myself was already involved in the bigger picture, as if pre-empted by it. In this picture, the risen Christ with visible marks of crucifixion, myself, and the surrounding world, were caught into the movement in which I and the creation were living and with wounds being healed. What was special and new in this experience was the fact that in this encounter neither the freedom, agency or creativity of myself as human being nor the complexity of the world were annulled, but were satisfied. There was no demand to withdraw from or denigrate the natural, social and cultural. This was the beginning of my personal journey of faith to experience this meaningful and reciprocal connection between all these “actors.” The particular impression of the risen Christ as radiating in and bringing together myself, the world and God has remained ever since; furthermore, this presence was through living waters, which permeated these realities without negating them.

This experience resurfaced when I was later reflecting on Christian mission as a Baptist missionary. I was wondering how one addresses society and culture, and acts meaningfully in the world, and experiences growing intimacy with God. I sensed that some way of addressing and connecting these issues in a theological way was necessary. When discussing with supervisors possible ways my doctoral studies could proceed and bringing these concerns to them, the name of Yves Congar came forth. We agreed that I would do my initial research and read some of his books. Congar’s life spanned almost the whole twentieth century (1905 – 1995), but I began my acquaintance with him from his last works on the theology of the Holy Spirit, and especially his tri-volume I Believe in the Holy Spirit. The subtitle of the first volume of the book was “Revelation and the Experience of the Spirit,” and addressed experience; the role of the risen Christ and his Spirit in human being, the church and the world was a constant theme. His work provided a theological way to look at their interconnection which resonated with my experience, and allowed me to embrace this experience and see its implications. On the other hand, this validating encounter with tradition challenged me, a Baptist missionary, with the theology of tradition. This connection with God was not merely the experience of immediacy, but there was a continuing pattern of “touch” tied with the belief in incarnation. But what impressed me at the same time was Congar’s intent and ability
to present these issues in a way which put the relation of God and the world at the centre. This ability to turn to the mystery of the relation of God to the creation in the light of contemporary challenges, or getting deeper to be able to act creatively in the present has pre-occupied me ever since.

My doctoral studies, challenging and humbling as they were, were also an exciting and stimulating experience. This was thanks to the people and institutions which supported. I am grateful to them. My supervisors, Dr. Tim Noble and Prof. Dr. Ivana Noble had helped to connect my spiritual aspirations with relevant theological sources and introduced me to the work of Yves Congar. Tim especially have helped to overcome numerous barriers on the way, but I was enriched and blessed by the friendship of both. My third supervisor, Prof. Dr. Kees van der Kooi, joined later and brought his distinct dynamic and challenging input. International Baptist Theological Study Centre in Amsterdam has provided a space of continued communal discernment and support. Then there were short, but significant highlights. I want to to thank Prof. Dr. Peter De Mey of KU Leuven, who has made my short visit to Leuven productive, introduced me to the trove of archival information and a helped to orient myself in it. I also want to thank to Father Hervé Legrand for his help, comments and friendship during my study visit to Bibliothèque du Saulchoir in Paris. I want to thank Langham Scholars for financially enabling my studies through Langham scholarship. Their sensitivity and support on the way encouraging and kept me going. Dr. Ian Shaw, was a constant and reliable help. I also want to thank John Jeackocke for his help in the finishing stages of working with the manuscript. I am grateful to Douwe and Tineke Visser for Dutch translation of the summary of my thesis. I want to thank my extended family in Vilnius, my parents, Henrikas and Ona, and my sister, Ieva. They supported and encouraged my aspirations, even when it was not clear where this journey heads. Finally, I am deeply grateful to my wife Gilija who was the first to believe in and encourage my theological studies, and then was constantly there and kept faith, shared ministry burdens. She, and our children, Ieva Marija, Henrikas Jokūbas and Jonas Paulius, daily bore the burden of a part-time doctoral student at their side and I appreciate their long-suffering.

A technical note: all translation from French is mine unless otherwise noted. Since the research took several years, I have used some Polish, Russian or other sources translations before English translations were available. All this is reflected in the footnotes and bibliography.
INTRODUCTION

Yves Congar (1904 – 1995) was a French Dominican priest and is widely regarded as one of the most important Catholic theologians of the twentieth century. His working life spanned the bigger part of a century marked by wars and ecclesial turbulence. His work initially focused on the theology of the church in a world more and more conscious of its autonomy from religious influence. The church he served has experienced several crises in his life-time. In the end of his life he wrote on theology of the Holy Spirit, embracing sources from the theological West and East in seeking to articulate a common faith. This crowned a theological life marked by relevance to the issues of a day, where the resources to bear upon contemporary issues were drawn from theological sources of old by a theologian embedded in a community of faith. And this proposes an intrigue – how does his journey as a whole help to reflect on a life of faith in contemporary world? Congar’s role in the Second Vatican Council might be a good example. He left his input in its major constitutions and participated first-hand in this ecclesial event, where the Catholic church reflected on what it is in this constantly changing world. In his major work from this period on theology of tradition, Congar does not separate theology and practice, spirituality and knowledge, faithfulness to the past and present creativity. This focus on the struggles of Christian faith in the changing world should make Congar interesting to other Christian confessions. Furthermore, the rationale behind his response – the theological view of the world as engaged by the divine activity, should be interesting to those who ask what Christian faith can propose for a contemporary world.

In needs to be said at the outset that Congar may be best known for his work in ecclesiology. But I think it cannot be disputed that his reflection on the church was always linked to the church’s presence and engagement in the world. Throughout the course of his work Congar was aware of and addressed the causes of unbelief in the contemporary world. In thinking how to do this effectively, he did not rely on some external, merely rational, or coercive way. It was rather by invoking over and over again the vision in which God, the world and humanity intimately interrelate. The church, then, would engage with unbelief by embodying this vision. So, this intimate interrelation, where God, world and humanity mutually interweave, allows me to ask if the way he sought to address the world in the early work and later theology of the Holy Spirit are mutually related. My research question, consequently, is – how does the emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit affect the understanding of the participation of God in the world and the world in God in the theology of Yves Congar? To answer this question, it is necessary to bring forth Congar’s awareness of the role of the Spirit in this twofold movement deeper to the sources of faith and outward in engaging the world. A reflection on the relation of the world’s participation in God and God’s engagement with the world ensues. In this reflection, the church as human-divine community plays a crucial role, but the participation and engagement cannot be exhausted or limited by this role.
A question of how the awareness of the activity of the Spirit affects mutual participation of God in the world and the world in God already presupposes several things. First, set in the background of addressing the unbelief of the world it implies that this is an engaged study, underlied by a practical communal life. This means life of the world and life in the world is already implicated, since the church is world transformed, that is engaged by the divine activity. Thus, even when viewing Congar as an ecclesiologist, the relation to the world is there and is brought to the fore. Even if Congar does not reflect on this, the question about the activity of the Spirit brings the world to the fore. This engaged and practical, one could say embodied, character of Congar’s approach should not be attributed only to his early but also to his later work. Second, this question about the activity of the Spirit proposes a reciprocity – that there is not only participation of God in the world, but also that of the world in God. While there is sufficient backing for such a hypothesis in Congar’s early work, his use of the pattern of descent-ascent in particular, this second aspect mostly emerges in Congar’s later work. This, then, raises the question if there is no violence done to the theologian by implying a framework, which was supposedly there from the beginning. This question is especially relevant, because as it will be shown, Congar did not have a theology of the world which was as developed as his Pneumatology. Yet, on the other hand, the occasional nature of Congar’s writing and his development vis-à-vis contemporary challenges has a particular affinity with the reflection on the role of the Spirit. This would mean that the occasional and developing nature of Congar’s theology is in fact a prelude of reflection on the Spirit, since in it the matter, the Spirit, is inseparable from the medium, the ecclesial reflection on the go. This also points to the incipient theology of the world, since such reflection is necessarily aware of it being conditioned historically and culturally.

I have organized my research around three roughly chronological focal points.1 The first was True and False Reform in the Church,2 preceded by Divided Christendom3 and followed by Lay People in the Church,4 second, there was Tradition and Traditions,5 and finally, there was I Believe in the Holy Spirit.6 I was attracted by continuity and accumulation, but also rifts and progression between these points. This inspired me to look for the correlation between these changes and Congar’s willingness to address the complexity of the situation of the world. Congar’s later turn to Pneumatology needs not be associated with some developed cultural or political analysis of the world, but, it will be shown, is accompanied by his reflections on

---

1 See Appendix for timeline of main events in Congar’s life and his major works, which were most important for my thesis.
the theology of liberation, the Charismatic renewal, Orthodox critique concerning lack of Pneumatology. In looking at this accumulation and maturation in his reflection, the close connection between the three issues Congar focused upon in these different periods, namely “reform,” “tradition” and “the Holy Spirit” is key. It allows us to see what happens with Congar’s earlier themes and the concern for engagement of embodied presence in the world – his sensitivities about the role of the human subject and the world. If they are not abandoned, but rather affirmed and receive more space with a developed Pneumatology, then, even if Congar does not sufficiently develop them, the case can be made that they are key for its structure. This look at Congar’s early and later work together would allow to formulate a hypothesis, that thanks to his theology of the Holy Spirit human free and creative activity in the world can be at the same time the activity of God. This brings the development of theology of the Spirit in line with early theology of engagement in the world and participation in God and his desire to engage and address the causes of unbelief of the world.

To test the hypothesis neither the later nor the early work alone are sufficient. Furthermore, I am able to embark on such a project only thanks to the significant work which has been done on Yves Congar. Elizabeth Groppe in *Yves Congar’s Theology of the Holy Spirit* makes a significant case for Congar as a theologian of the Holy Spirit and not only an ecclesiologist. She shows the Trinitarian foundations of his Pneumatology and argues for the indivisibility of pneumatological anthropology and pneumatological ecclesiology. For comprehensive analytical studies, she points to Joseph Famerée, *L’Ecclésiologie d’Yves Congar avant Vatican II: Histoire et Église. Analyse et reprise critique,* and the diachronic study of Cornelis van Vliet, *Communio sacramentalis: Das Kirchenverständis von Yves Congar—genetisch und systematisch betrachtet.* Groppe used van Vliet’s framework to present the trajectory of Congar’s development. But these studies did not point out the role of the world both as a theme and as a shaping influence. Famerée’s analysis of Congar’s ecclesiology pointed to the relation church-world, but he did not look at the theological framework of participation, which undergirded this relation. Furthermore, he focused on Congar’s early work and the Pneumatological implications for the relation God-world were not addressed. The same could be said about Charles Macdonald, *Church and World in the Plan of God: Aspects of History and Eschatology in the Thought of Père Yves Congar.* Furthermore, another thing these studies have in common is the predominately systematic approach to a theologian. This could have missed his theology’s occasional character, which would have necessarily implied the shaping role of the world. Furthermore, the systematic approach presumes a kind of

---

continuity in the work, which might be insensitive to some rifts and discontinuities and their reasons.

These challenges might, certainly, apply to my work as well. Partially the issue is how Congar’s later Pneumatological work is presented. Famerée’s analysis, which incorporated the theme of the world, also pointed to a qualitative difference in Congar’s later Pneumatological work. This kind of qualitative difference was noted by other ecclesiologists, such as Alain Nisus, L’Église comme communion et comme institution: une lecture de l’ecclésiologie du cardinal Congar à partir de la tradition des Églises de professants and Rémi Chéno, L’Esprit-Saint et l’Eglise: Institutionnalité et pneumatologie. Vers un dépassement des antagonismes ecclésiologiques. As to the systematic approach and the imposed continuity I have sought to address the issues of both continuing framework and continuing theological concern. This kind of approach to Congar’s work is similar to Gabriel Flynn, Yves Congar’s Vision of the Church in a World of Unbelief. Flynn not only identifies the central role of the world in Congar’s work, but also points to what I also see as his continuing motivation. However, Flynn does not show the importance of Congar’s Pneumatology within this trajectory as he focuses on Congar’s vision of the church. Nevertheless, this facilitates setting Congar’s work in the context of the contemporary world. This is also partially addressed by Aidan Nichols, Yves Congar, and more recently Andrew Meszaros, The Prophetic Church: History and Doctrinal Development in John Henry Newman and Yves Congar. The latter work is important for its attention to the notion of history in Congar.

This brings an important, but quite unexplored terrain of the milieu which engendered Congar’s creativity, planted the seeds and even were conclusive in his embrace of Pneumatology. The Second Vatican Council and the discussions with ecumenical observers played such a role. Research has been carried out on the role of observers at Vatican II and

11 See also Joseph Famerée and Gilles Routhier. Yves Congar. (Paris: Cerf, 2008).
15 Aidan Nichols, Yves Congar (Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow, 1989).
on its Pneumatology. But to explore this milieu some wider patterns of Congar’s theology have to be discerned to notice shifts therein. The studies mentioned earlier presume a continuity and shift in Congar’s work, which revolves around his rapprochement with the East and his background in Thomas Aquinas. So, William Henn in The Hierarchy of Truths According to Yves Congar, 19 delves into Congar’s methodology, epistemology and theological understanding. But it is necessary to discern Congar’s wider approach to theology of participation, central to his discussion of East and West in the issue of the relation between uncreated and created. The works on Ressourcement highlight both the importance of Congar’s role at the beginning of this movement and the relation nature/grace, which is key in it. However, they do not reflect much on the input Congar’s later Pneumatology provides.

In this respect the work on Congar’s Pneumatological Christology shows the implications of this Pneumatological turn; the theology of “two missions” is the way Congar explicates the relation God-world. These studies point to the effect of this Pneumatological shift for anthropology, ecclesiology and sacramental theology, but do not reflect on the relation God-world itself. Those, who are familiar with Congar’s work, however, can raise several questions as to the topic and methodology of my approach. First, about the issue of the world. How does one interrogate Congar on the issue, on which he himself did not reflect explicitly and directly? This might seem a far cry from what is arguably Congar’s main contribution – renewing theological issues by looking at them historically. Furthermore, as Congar was not primarily known for his system-building, how can one present a case for the relation of the Spirit and the world as present as a seed in his early work, and then continuing throughout?

However, a closer look at Congar’s place in the *Ressourcement* merits such a line of inquiry. These studies pave the way for a further theological study. Identifying how Congar approaches Thomas Aquinas plays a significant role for such a study. His view on this topic is accessible. Congar distanced himself from a theological approach to Aquinas, which viewed faith as adhesion to transcendent metaphysical affirmations with a rigid separation of nature and grace. However, he maintained the formal distinction between nature and grace, which affirmed the role of the world and the humanity within a particular approach of Congar. This helps to locate the relation nature/grace in Congar’s look at the practical life of the church. But it also extends to the relation of the church and the world, the role of history and human subjectivity. In these already in his early work the activity of the Spirit is noted. The interaction is already there. Congar’s ecclesial milieu of reflection, his method of historical investigation of theology and the theological themes of incarnation and the Holy Spirit interweave. This, then, allows me to launch an inquiry right from the heart of Congar’s concern. The renewal of theological themes by looking at them historically, furthermore, implies both the presence of the world and the role of the Spirit in such renewal. This invites the question how the practical and historical developments bring about his theology of the Spirit, and, in turn, what does this theology contribute to the issue of nature/grace. In other words, it permits me to show how the issues of history, human subjectivity and communion, related to the rise of theology of the Spirit, profit from this development? Lastly, Congar’s early approach to theology as wisdom and his central theological themes of the two divine missions have a central and continuing role in using history as the matter of theology. Identifying this theological picture averts an impressionistic reading, but it also brings its

---


24 *ibid.,* 161.

metaphysical assumptions. In imagining how Congar’s approach might be extended and in assessing his Pneumatology, these will have to be addressed as well.

This theological picture revolves around the issue of participation. This issue has received more and more prominence recently. A.N. Williams juxtaposed Eastern and Western traditions around the issue of participation. I would include in this line of inquiry the work of Paul Fiddes on wisdom theology and some other works on mystical theology. The issue at stake is the immediacy and directness of the participation of God in the world and the world in God. Congar’s early work is attentive to the mystery of God vis-à-vis the contemporary challenges and seeks to intimately reconnect faith and life. But how his later insights fall along similar lines has not been explored. There is then a need of a study, in my view, which would focus immanently on Congar’s work, taking into account his early and later writings. If Congar was consistently concerned to address the causes of unbelief in the world, then it is possible to measure his later developments in the light of his early concerns. This is especially the case if the trajectory between the two was held intact by a theological vision of the living God, which united God, world and humanity. This spiritual vision, furthermore, would show that engagement in the world and participation in the triune God were linked. If, thanks to the role of the Spirit, there is an enacted vision in which God, humanity and world are intimately related, this would satisfy his concerns. Yet, it has to be said at the outset that Congar’s use of language of participation is quite complex. While embracing the imagery of descent-ascent associated with the issue, Congar distinguishes the Western and Eastern traditions by referring to the differences between Aristotle and Plato. Yet this issue extends

---


beyond the reality of human participation in God as Congar is also alert to the historical nature of human and ecclesial existence. It is also a participation in the ecclesial body and thus is a sharing in Christ which is worldly and historical. The overtones of the immediacy and directness of spiritual experience in the biblical literature and spiritual practice are not to be missed out as well. The issue of participation gives a way to analyse Congar’s approach to the relation of God, humanity and the world, especially when he insists that they relate intimately, that is immediately or directly, and freely.

Before proceeding a few more issues connected with the issue of participation require attention. My intent is to show that Congar’s Pneumatological reassessment of the relation of the triune God and the world affirms the creation’s (including human) own free and creative activity. It would allow us to see how the authentic creative work of humanity and the world is at the same time the work of God. That is, through the activity of the Spirit, human and worldly activity would then intimately participate in God as they lead the world to the fullness of divine presence. In this tripartite dialogue God-world-humanity, I will sometimes refer to the human being, sometimes to human person and sometimes to humanity. They are partly interchangeable. It will be shown that Congar distinguishes between human nature and human person, where the latter is viewed as freedom to create oneself. Humanity is in the making for Congar. In his dynamic view of things, they are generally interrelated and thus in my usage all the three aspects will be embraced. What about the world? In his earlier work, partially due to his preoccupation of the role of the church in the world, the word refers to human, social, cultural and political reality. Yet, already in his early work the divine presence is viewed in all the created reality, as the church is situated in the return of the whole creation to God. Here the human being is a microcosm, and in humanity the destiny of the whole cosmos is implicated in the divine plan, where God becomes all in all. Furthermore, Congar’s incarnational sacramental theology implies a divine transformation not only of a human being but also the elements of cosmos and nature. Congar’s interlocutors might give an insight into his view of the world as he shares in this general intellectual milieu. The names of Teilhard de Chardin, Henri Bergson, Charles Péguy constantly appear in his work, but his engagement with them is quite superficial.30 On the other hand, there are Orthodox thinkers, like Vladimir Soloviev or Alexis Khomiakov who are also mentioned in reflecting on the notion of the world, which exceeds human creation.31


31 See Congar, Lay People, 94 and Congar, Dialogue, 240, 241. Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900) was a Russian philosopher, theologian, poet and literary critic, a significant figure in the development of Russian philosophy of the end of 19th century. When Congar thought of philosophical analogues of ecumenism in reflecting on the divine plan for creation, Soloviev’s idea of “transition from unity to unity by way of multiplicity” was at the background. Congar, Dialogue, 65, 67. Soloviev is also associated with Sophiolog, a stream of thought of the end of 19th and beginning of 20th century, which focused on Sophia-Wisdom. See Paul Gavrilyuk, “The reception of Dionysius in twentieth-century Eastern Orthodoxy.” Modern Theology 24.4 (2008): 707-723., 709. Congar is
Congar generally appreciates their affirmation of the world and they, significantly, might be seen as helping, some directly, some not, in developing a theology of the Spirit.

These interlocutors lead to the last issue in Congar’s unique way to theology of the Spirit, which needs to be mentioned beforehand. It is the questioning of the Christian institutions prevalent in contemporary culture. The vision of intimacy between God-world-humanity proposed to the unbelief of the world has to reflect on the mediation of Christian faith and the role the institution plays in it. The ability to justify one’s claims for the Christian church by a mere reference to the authority or historical and cultural presence of the church is according to Congar not to be taken for granted. And this is where the churches of other confessions might look to a theologian of tradition like Congar for a way to make the case for Christian faith’s historical and institutional claims. Congar’s approach, which focuses on the mystery of the divine activity in the world and in the church, and builds on the intimacy of the spiritual experience, points to the possibilities of a different kind of engagement. While set in a climate which presumes a pervading ecclesial presence, it, however, precipitates a different future. There is an interrelation between Congar’s approach, his message and the ecclesial medium of this message to be explored. How is the way he renewed theological problems by looking at them historically when viewed in the light of his concerns fruitful? Congar’s desire to immediately and spiritually connect to the sources of faith, when set vis-à-vis the desire to address the challenges of life in the world, brings to the fore a practical matrix in which the turn to a theology of the Spirit happens.\(^{32}\) If these are inseparable, then a claim for a Christian way of life including its institutions drives its force from the reality of the work of the Spirit, as the One who is acting both in the church and in the world and leading towards the fullness of divine presence. This focus on the activity of the Holy Spirit, then, would allow to surpass

\(^{32}\) I begin from Congar’s own definition of Pneumatology. For him it should “describe the impact, in the context of a vision of the Church, of the fact that the Spirit distributes his gifts as he wills and in this way builds up the Church.” It “goes beyond simply making present the structures set up by Christ; it is the actuality of what the glorified Lord and his Spirit do in the life of the Church, in all the variety of forms that this activity has assumed in time and space.” Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 1, 156, 157. In it “theory is to a great extent dependent on praxis.” ibid., 172. The Spirit’s activity in the history of the world, however, is also referred to. (Ibid.) But was Congar involved in what maybe called constructive theology? The middle stage of his work suggests that he did and that his Pneumatology in particular realizes what he associated with “constructed” in theology. It was not the theology for its own sake, it was drawing from what is received in tradition and re-constructing it for contemporary times. See Yves Congar, *Situation et tâches presentes de la theologie*. (Paris: Cerf, 1975). This reconstruction is to reassess the relation between the contemporary situation of the world and the supernatural gift of the salvation. Here Congar points to Teilhard de Chardin; see ibid., 62. This has effects on the level of “given” (71) and “constructed.” (73) Under the “constructed” the proposal to address the situation by developing the between the link between God-world-humanity is viewed. (77-79) A brief reflection on Thomas Aquinas (80-81) reiterates the framework. This allows placing his *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* in continuity and maturation of these thoughts.
the focus on the church and ask instead about the theology of human-divine activity in the world.

In my reading of Congar, what he calls a “sapiential” approach in the middle stage of his work is central. In Congar’s view this is how Fathers and theologians of the Middle Ages viewed divine activity, penetrated by a wisdom in which the books of creation, the Scriptures and the human soul were understood “each through each.” But even the embrace of this approach could have been conditioned by conversations with Protestant theology and Congar’s early exposure to Orthodox theology, as was noted concerning his use of the world. This approach seems to provide a way to assess the relation between the immediacy of experience with God and immersion and engagement in the world. It also brings into focus the issue of mediation between created and uncreated, which centres on the role of Jesus Christ and human-divine activity in the relation God-world. Once the emphasis on the salvation history in the work of Congar becomes prominent, the themes of “mediation” and “immediacy” in the relation God-world bring forth respective emphases on Christology and Pneumatology. And yet, why bother with these complex analyses? My motivation is the realism with which Congar connects the immediate experience of God and one’s immersion in the world, visible in his early use of the image of “touch”. This engaged view of participation is not only individual and communal, but also eschatologically oriented to penetrate, or touch the whole creation. Thus, with the help of a theology of two divine missions, it paves the way to see how theology can engage as creative and prophetic, and contribute to the actual healing of the world. Thus some abstractions and metaphysics of the sapiential approach will be reviewed in the light of contemporary theological tools more tuned to reflect on the activity of the Spirit also associated with the sapiential. I will look at the unexplored potential of the theology of the Holy Spirit. It will bring forth a view of theological reflection which is necessarily conditioned and immersed in the world. It will also underscore a reciprocal relation between beginning from one’s life and seeing the world as engaged by divine activity in the Spirit. Such an approach to theological creativity, if explicitly accepted, may prove Congar’s viability in the contemporary scene and contribute to the current Pneumatological debate.

I will make several key steps in exploring the hypothesis that through the activity of the Spirit, human creative and free activity in the world and the world’s developments might be at the same time the activity of God. First, the relation God-world in Congar’s early ecclesiological work will have to be brought forth. Once the human-divine activity he proposes is set in this vision, I point to a re-vision in the middle stage of his theology. The “unveiling” of the living Lord, connecting God-world-humanity, which is to address unbelief, reaffirms the dialogue with the world as the deciding factor, but surpasses the focus on the church alone. And, finally, his theology of the Spirit will be located in this revision and will allow to imaginatively
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33 Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 65.
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shed light on the whole course of his work. To avert a superficial reading, an attentive reading of Congar will be presented, beginning from historical situation, and proceeding to his theology. Since those aspect were interwoven, this passage from historical to theological is warranted and even key in assessing Congar. So, Congar will be viewed in the light of the ecclesial, but also intellectual developments of his time. But also some key elements of his theological system, which persists through all the stages of his work will have to be discerned. The sources that Congar brings forth in reflecting on the contemporary scene to bear on it, Congar’s own influences, setting and major interlocutors will be presented. To bring out his own thought I will focus on the ones he himself directly engaged with, or which help clarify his position. For this, I will present a synchronic picture. But as time went by and Congar’s theology began to change, a certain continuing structure could be identified. This diachronic view allows noticing what changes appear in this structure and asking why. This interplay of synchronic and diachronic approach will allow to sharpen the issue of the direct relation between the immediate experience of God and one’s involvement in the world. It allows us to see how they reciprocate and leads to theological analysis. The earlier mentioned issue of participation will allow me to combine several key concerns: it is crucial for addressing unbelief, it is related to the experience of immediacy with God, and it also explains the relation between created and uncreated.

My thesis will not have a biographical chapter, but I will use biographical and contextual data to interpret the evolving Pneumatology of Congar. Main dates and works pertaining to my research will be referred to in an Appendix. In the first chapter I look at how the contemporary ecclesial challenges revealed the need and prepared a space for theology of the Holy Spirit in the work of Congar. I situate Congar’s turn to Pneumatology already in his early insights on the causes of unbelief. The chapter consists of two parts. In the first part I show how Congar interacted with the contemporary scene. The intent to affirm the input of the world and the uniqueness of grace, while better realized in the later work on the Spirit, is already present in the early work. In the second part I turn to the sources of Congar’s theology of the Holy Spirit. The interaction with the theology of the church of Thomas Aquinas and theology of Johann Adam Möhler will help introduce the central role of the image of incarnation. However, the relation of this image to the catholicity of faith, or its tendency to universality, will open a space to inquire into the role of the Spirit in incorporating creation into the divine life. This chapter will introduce Congar’s view of participation in the relation God-world and a discernible connection between the two movements: deeper into the mystery and outward into the world.

The second chapter turns to Congar’s work after World War II and will particularly focus on Congar’s notion of synergy. What this notion contributes to the account of participation will become clear by looking primarily at Congar’s work on reform in the church. Congar’s attention to ecclesial movements, the spiritual life of the human person and one’s engagement in culture will help to inquire into how this synergy is a collective reality. But my main concern will be on how these developments correlate with the attention to the proper
role of the Spirit. What would the developments of the theology of the Spirit contribute to
the relation of created-uncreated which were presented as clearly distinct? This question will
be addressed by turning to the issue of mediation, Congar’s Christology and its ontological
presuppositions in his account of the human-divine relation in the church. This chapter will
establish the insufficiency of mere invocation of the role of the Spirit and the necessity of
proper Pneumatology in the light of Congar’s prevalent metaphysical approach to Christology.
Through the traditional image of sacramental connection or touch of God and the world, it
will point to a possible solution – Pneumatological Christology.

While these first chapters build on the implied intimate relations between God, world and
humanity, the world’s role becomes explicit only in Congar’s theology of laity, the subject of
the third chapter. Following Congar’s attention to the ecclesial involvement in the world in
ecclesial movements it is necessary to address how his view of the world develops. But even
more interesting is how this affects his understanding of participation of God in the world and
the world in God. The view of participation which is not merely abstract, but is played out in
one’s engagement in the world, has to affect Congar’s appropriation of Aquinas’s idea of
participation and its interpretations. I will look at Congar’s use of the then prevalent idea of
participation with its clear distinction of nature and grace as “planes” in the light of
developments in biblical theology and ecumenism. A developing view of the economy of
salvation and Christology with a more pronounced role of the Spirit will be presented through
the image of divine-human temple. This will show that the role of the Spirit is directly relevant
to the perceived loss of immediacy and interrelation between nature and grace in some
earlier accounts of the followers of Thomas Aquinas. But it will point to a different possibility
of reading Thomas. This chapter will show the key role of two divine missions in Congar’s
attempt to present the relation God-world and the role of the Spirit in achieving the
immediacy in this relation. The need to reassess the notion of mediation will be discussed.

The fourth chapter begins where the third left off and explores the role of the Holy Spirit in
presenting the intimate relations between God, the world and humanity. I explore how an
emphasis on the proper role of the Spirit emerges and what contributes to this
Pneumatological development. Besides Congar’s reflection on the relation between history
of salvation and on God in eternity, this brings to his reflections on the issue of person. The
potential and limitations of this reflection will be addressed. This will bring forth the vision of
intimacy of communion in the relations God-world-humanity, and the aspect of personal
becoming in Congar’s anthropology. But how does it help to see how the world is
incorporated into God? Pneumatological development necessarily embraces one’s life in the
world, and points to eschatological fulfilment of communion. This implies the role of the Spirit
in creation, but does it allow to maintain its integrity and otherness? This chapter will
contribute to the account of participation as it will present it as encounter with God in the
world, and connect intimacy with God to the engagement in the world. But it will sharpen the
tension with his view of mediation, with the question of the world at the forefront. While the
world is essential to one’s experience of God, Congar’s view of mediation does not
acknowledge that it is itself conditioned or mediated by society and culture. As this view is linked to Congar’s Christology, this leads to the analysis of how Congar’s developing Pneumatology might contribute to his view of the world and the divine activity (grace).

Chapter five follows Congar into a period of his work which both accumulates what came before and presents a rift. Consistent with Congar’s early approach – response to the world by looking deeper into the mystery of the relation God-world – his theology of living tradition takes a central role. It presents the participation of God-world-humanity as human-divine activity in the world. But I will also show that this theology rests on a sapiential vision. Congar presents this vision as a Patristic and Scholastic approach, where the books of creation, human soul and the Scriptures interpret one another. In Congar’s turn to the issue of revelation a ground is laid to address the world. The unveiling of the living God shows the world as already engaged and surpasses the introverted focus on the church. With the role of the Spirit as transcendent subject of tradition the theology of two divine missions becomes the organizing principle of the relation God-world. But what is the role of the world and its particularity in this tripartite dialogue God-world-humanity? Is it adequately addressed? Further analysis will comprise two lines of Congar’s Pneumatological developments. First it will look at Congar’s work on the church as sacrament of salvation of the world, which builds on his work on tradition. Second, it will look at how Congar addresses a challenge from Orthodox theology as to the articulation of reality of participation of the world in God. The fifth chapter goes beyond the need of mere demonstration of the interrelations between God, world and humanity, to show the world has to be viewed already engaged.

Chapter six will explore if the role of the Spirit spreading through anthropology, ecclesiology and sacramental theology prefigures a major Pneumatological re-visioning of the relation God-world. It begins from showing that the focus on the “historical” life of the community through its emphasis of the reality of life in the world brings forth Pneumatology as such. But then, the re-visioning also surpasses the view of the church, even when viewed as the human-divine realm of the activity of the eschatological Spirit. This will invite a reassessment of the account of the relation of the triune God and the world and the issue of participation. Two issues will be important. First, is the engagement and participation in the world in its own right sufficiently incorporated? Second, does the presentation of intimate relation with God account for real participation in God? This will allow an analysis of what a more developed Pneumatology contributes to Congar’s Trinitarian view of the return of creation to God. The centrality of “filial” imagery in the world’s participation in the Son and the Spirit and in the view of the immanent presence of the transcendent God will emerge. Both the potential and limits of this re-visioning will be assessed. While it contributes to the interplay between the human being, the church and the world, is it genuinely open to appropriating the world’s autonomy, development in its otherness? This chapter will finish up with the possibility, necessity and potential of extending and developing Congar’s view of participation to the relation Spirit—world.
CHAPTER ONE. CONGAR’S EARLY WORK: THE NEED AND SOURCES OF THEOLOGY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Yves Congar was born on April 13, 1904, in Sedan, France, into a middle-class Christian family. After the war years and occupation of Sedan 1914 – 1918, Congar studied in a small seminary in Reims 1919 – 1921 and then in the Catholic University of Paris 1921 - 1924.¹ He was ordained on 25 July, 1930, in Saulchoir, Belgium. In 1932, he began his teaching career. I begin my study of Congar with a deep and shattering personal experience that Yves Congar had as a young theologian soon after his theological work began. Congar felt the church was partly to blame for the rise of unbelief. Congar gave a theological reading of this rise, which reflects the challenges of French Catholicism at the beginning of the twentieth century. He also pointed out the need of a theological response to the growth of unbelief in the Western world. In introducing this experience, I will suggest that it will resurface in a similar fashion in other significant moments of Congar’s work. His theological career spanned most of the twentieth century. This experience will help me in introducing what I consider his engaged response to the world. Crucial for this response is how he envisions divine presence in the world. My underlying question is whether this tension gives a continuity for all his theology, beginning with his concern for reform in the church and culminating in his work on the Holy Spirit. The first chapter begins by looking at the initial vision of the relation God-world and asking what its promises and shortcomings are.

Congar’s concerned reflection on the ecclesial situation resulted in what might be viewed as the contours of his theological programme. In it he wanted to adopt some of the insights of the culture and in its light review what the church really is. I will follow him as he reflects theologically on what the church is in the divine plan, its relation with the incarnation of Christ and the work of the Spirit. What will be of particular interest is how this turn to the central mysteries is related to the engagement with the world. Next, I will look at what sources were at hand when as Congar wanted to reflect on the contemporary challenges and how the theology of the Holy Spirit was activated. How a Dominican theologian appropriates the theology of Thomas Aquinas and more recent theologians, Möhler in particular will be of interest. I will ask what already precipitates his theology of the Holy Spirit and also what hinders discerning the role of the Spirit in this early ecclesiological stage.

EARLY CONTOURS OF CONGAR’S THEOLOGICAL PROGRAMME

Two early articles of Yves Congar, written in 1934, well set the scene for his whole theological journey and show his character. One was published in the French Catholic newspaper Sept, the other in the Dominican periodical La vie intellectuelle. In them Congar confronted the crisis of the Roman Catholic Church of the early 20th century. The first article reflected on the fact that the increasingly atheistic and humanistic society proposed happiness outside the realm of faith. On the other hand, theology, predominantly a specialist technical activity reserved for the clergy, left the church focused on itself, defensive and moralizing. The second article looked at the reasons of unbelief, and laid part of the blame on the church and theology. The analyses left a heavy imprint on the consciousness of the young theologian. Congar felt a demand for a positive response from the church. The concerns give insight into the character of Congar. They also show that he took it to heart to theologically address the situation of the church in the world.

SETTING THE SCENE: THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

Congar’s point of view in his theological assessment is made clear in the first of the two articles, ‘Déficit de la théologie.’ The deficit for him is the deficit of developments in theology, which would keep in step with developments in culture. Thus the medieval synthesis of theology was for Congar a good example of theology properly done. Congar was not fixed on the past. His reading of the contemporary situation is as follows. The modern world, which emerged in the wake of the synthesis of Medieval Christendom, constituted itself into the secular State. Congar looks at his peculiar French situation, which thinks and develops on its
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6 For extracts from the article and analysis, see Jürgen Mettepenningen, Nouvelle Théologie, 43-45.
7 This is what Congar called “The Golden Age of Scholasticism” – what he calls the “third ‘entry’” of Aristotle’s philosophy highlighted theology’s scientific character. Yves Congar, History of Theology, (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968), 85. What pertains to my point is what Congar calls the “clash between Aristotelianism and Augustinianism.” ibid. Congar contends that in Thomas, as divine science, theology reproduces the order in which divine wisdom orders “all things.” ibid., 95. The key difference is that in Thomas things have their nature “in themselves” and it does not consist in their reference to God. Furthermore, this nature (for example, human nature) remains the same under different states (even Fall). 105. The sciences, then, could develop speculative knowledge of things and represented “a genuine knowledge of the world and of the nature of things.” 106, 107. This affirmed a certain autonomy of the world. Congar does not dismiss secularity altogether. Concerning
own, without reference to God. However, this does not mean for him that the spiritual dimension evaporated. Rather if previously there was a united spiritual whole of church and culture, now it had been divided into two. One was, according to Congar, the spiritual realm of the modern world, with the remnants of the Christian habits and traditions in some of its institutions. The other was the self-proclaimed spiritual realm of clerics and theologians. For Congar they deal with problems irrelevant to living faith in a dead language. The only way this “world” of clerics was related to life of the world was the apologetics against other (non-Catholic) churches and moralism in relation to the world.

Congar is not happy with the situation, but his solution seems to be largely dictated by an early, medieval, synthesis. This is visible in the scope of Congar’s concern. While reflecting about the church, his use of “spiritual” alludes to the relation of God and the world. There is spirituality in the modern world and also the residue of the earlier unified spiritual realm. The human, social and cultural world is theologically approachable and readable. This is partly a merit of the medieval synthesis, which serves as an example for Congar. Due to it he cannot accept the opposition and separation between the world (society) and the church. His proposal was theology as wisdom, where theology establishes a living connection to human knowledge and activity. This leads Congar to avoid the separation. Following Aquinas in understanding theology as the human science of what pertains to faith, Congar asserts that as human it welcomes diverse manifestations of knowledge and different social movements. As science of faith, it goes deeper than mere fashions and reveals the significance, direction and fulfilment of new cultural developments. In such a way, the important human realities were to be won back to Christ and the modern world re-conquered.

Congar’s solution, however, is only partially satisfying. Even if he implies that there is a spiritual dimension to the world, i.e. the world participates in God, this is not in any way clarified. Congar argues that as human science theology appropriates cultural developments. However, as the spiritual dimension of the world is not clarified, does not this appropriation look like an “external,” formal and domineering appropriation of the “other” realm? Furthermore, does Congar challenge the separation of realms? He is firmly situated in the realm of the church, and assumes that the secular and clerical worlds are separate. The
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8 For a wide historical overview of this era in French intellectual life, see Étienne Fouilloux, Une Église en quête de liberté: la pensée catholique française entre modernism et Vatican II. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1998).
9 Jürgen Mettepenningen, Nouvelle Théologie, 45.
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11 On Congar’s understanding of theology as wisdom, which follows Aquinas, see Congar, History of Theology, 207. See also Jürgen Mettepenningen, Nouvelle Théologie, 78-79.
12 Mettepenningen, Nouvelle Théologie, 45.
priority of faith is self-assumed and its commandeering position comes with a terminology of conquest. The world is not seen as having something significant to contribute. But surely this cannot be his intent, which seems actually affirming of culture. This indicates already in his early work a tension, when one seeks to affirm the freedom and the contribution of the world and the freedom of divine grace. I suggest that Congar’s early work did not have a solution to this tension and eventually demanded a deeper re-assessment. I will not spell it now, but some brief note of anticipation is in order, just to show continuity in Congar.

Congar’s later turn to the role of the Spirit and the view of the world as historic/dynamic has to deal with the same tension. It re-assessed the relation of the world and God: the world was a mixed state (no separate realms) - God acted in it by grace, but sin was also present. This later insight is in continuity with his early concerns, but also indicates a progress. This suggests that there was more space both for the activity of God and the contribution of the world when the role of the Spirit comes to the fore. With this question in mind I turn to Congar’s second article, which gives a glimpse of the theological vision behind a response.

CONTours OF A RESPONSE TO THE HUMAN WORLD: PARTICIPATION IN GOD

The main weight of Congar’s response to the challenges of the church is on theology – he responds by asking what the church is in the divine plan. This is important, because it connects the “outward” emphasis towards the world with an “inner” or “deeper” emphasis on what divine activity establishes the church, i.e. who is behind the church. At this stage of his work, the two emphases are connected by the image of “incarnation.” Thus, according to him, in a world which has its own spirituality, a humanism, the church had to live out, or incarnate the Christian Creed. It was an intense incarnated faith and love, which could engage society and assimilate new human and cultural developments. The image of “incarnation” resonates with the incarnation of Christ, but there is more. What inspires Congar in his response is the mission, the movement indeed, of lay people.
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13 Congar later directly criticized the influential nineteenth century Catholic theologian Matthias Joseph Scheeben for adopting the word “supernatural” as a noun, rather than adjective. This, according to Congar, hardened the distinction between the two main orders and implied the idea of a second nature, above the first, but with similar ontological consistency. Even if Congar would not agree with this, it would be his theological milieu. Instead later Congar proposed that the Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit put nature into new relation with God, accomplishing its supernatural aim. In this later stage, nature is dynamically viewed as historic and cosmic creation. This shows Congar’s consistency. It also indicates that turning to the world led Congar to turn to theology of the Holy Spirit. See Yves Congar, “Église et monde,” Esprit 33 (1965), 340.
14 Congar, “Une conclusion.”
15 ibid., 215.
the church had to understand the laws of the newly emerging world, and those who were working in this world understood them. As I will later show in greater detail, the activity of the Spirit in the church as the people of God, and not only hierarchy, is the hallmark of Congar’s mature Pneumatology. Focusing his hopes on a movement of lay people and on the church as people of God suggests the quest for the underlying role of the Spirit. But does this address unbelief and how?

At the core of Congar’s response is the vision of the relation of God and the world, i.e. participation of the world and human being in God. First, it is not unbelief as such that Congar addresses, but unbelief’s collective causes, thus his concern for the role of the church. But this role concerns primarily the “laity,” since it addresses the rift between faith and the whole human life, including activity in the world. Congar does not want faith relegated to the private sphere. On the other hand, he is aware that human beings, whom the church addresses view themselves and their activity as autonomous, i.e. independent from God. So, Congar presents an argument, which runs as follows. Faith relates the human soul to God as Absolute Good. Since all humans have a general love of good, he continues, all humans are oriented to Absolute Good. For him this means that God is not only a goal, but also behind the process of the human return to God. God inspires and brings the whole of human life, personal and worldly, into unity. Congar locates faith within this profound dynamism. The proposal of a self-revealing God, grace, resonates with the general human desire for good. As the divine power carries human aspirations towards belief, human existence is fulfilled though faith in Jesus Christ. Faith gives meaning and forms human life after the image of God. Thus, faith is not peripheral, extra or foreign to human nature, but essential for realization of both human personality and humanity. This embraces the activity in the world, where faith acts as a vision (seeing like God sees) in shaping the world.

Congar made a case for how faith counts in the world, but how did he fare in responding to contemporary insistence on human self-sufficiency? His proposal acknowledges that human activities aspire for good, thus tend towards God. He also made a case that in this pursuit faith is not something additional or foreign to human aspirations. However, even if his account is open to human existential experience, it surely does not begin from it. He presents a view in
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23 219. On Congar’s view of faith influenced by Aquinas, see Congar, History of Theology, 204. See Thomas Aquinas, Contra Gentiles, (New York: Hanover House, 1955-57), Book I, Chapters 1-4, 8, accessed online at http://dhpriory.org/thomas/ContraGentiles1.htm on November 8, 2017. And Aquinas, ST, I, Q 12, A 12. I will also discuss it below and then later in the chapter.
which human existence is predetermined towards God. Does it allow human activity to set its terms and see its value in itself? Would this account be attractive to those who insist on human autonomy? On the other hand, does it really challenge the insufficiency of humanism from the perspective of faith? It might be argued that Congar’s intent, due to his ecclesial situation, is to show lay Christians that faith has to engage in the world. In any case, the proposal’s intent on unity and divine causality does allot space to human agency and exercise of freedom. Consequently, there is no way to postulate how the human being acts in freedom in a synergy with the divine Spirit, as Congar’s later work contends. This emphasis on the Spirit comes with an emphasis that it is indeed humans who act in their freedom. Nevertheless, this view presents the human situation abstractly and does not regard its complexity – Congar begins from a predetermined framework. Yet this view of participation is fruitful in other respects.

Having begun with human participation in God, Congar proceeds to the role of the church in the relation of God and the human and historical world. This beginning point already anticipates that for Congar thinking about the church and thinking about the human being are interwoven. So faith, oriented to activity, according to Congar, organizes and transforms all human material to reflect the face of God, which makes this material a part of the mystical Body. Thus faith cannot be restricted to the private sphere, but makes itself visible in the personal and communal way of life and culture. Thus, as human activities and culture wrap themselves around faith as its garment (when faith appropriates them), human cultural and social life is restored. However, for Congar this is not merely the issue of restoration of culture. This culture becomes the image of faith; it expresses and even completes faith. For Congar this boils down to God’s interaction with the world as descent - God’s reign in a precarious way comes into souls and bodies, into the material universe. While the trajectory of this movement will be in Congar’s view consummated eschatologically, this descent even now makes the cultural milieu significant. God is invested in it - culture nourishes and realizes faith and the human being. This shows the implications of the image of divine incarnation, but how does this visibility address specifically unbelief? For Congar the visibility does not mean that one can see mystery, but its believability. The mystery of divine presence is paradoxically both hidden in and shining in the magnificence of visible humanity. Thus, as the

24 So, later commenting on theology of the Holy Spirit of Thomas Aquinas, Congar wrote “God alone is the beginning and the end. God’s life is divine and is communicated by grace, which is the characteristic of the Holy Spirit.” Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1, 118. “We are led by another, who does not act without us or violently.” ibid., 120.

25 Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 135 “God is the sovereign Subject and we are really subjects of a life and actions that are our own.”

26 See Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 130. “... the Church is an institution, but it is also and even primarily the ‘we’ of Christians.”

27 Congar, “Une conclusion,” 220.

28 ibid., 221.

29 222.
world is sanctified and transformed by the Spirit (by becoming the mystical Body of Christ), this invites belief and its rejection matters.\textsuperscript{30}

Congar suggests the vision of eschatological transformation of the world by the Spirit, which may resonate with the desire of those yearning for a better world. He also helpfully situates the church within this movement of the world, which implies that the church is not important for its own sake. How does this line of inquiry help dealing with the problems of self-focus and opacity, which Congar perceives in the church? He also suggests that culture completes the faith, gives it an expression, thus contributes. However, does this amount to the view that the pursuits of culture are worthy as such? Congar presents an image that human activities and culture wrap around faith. Does not this suggest that \textit{faith} makes them meaningful? Is faith itself unaffected by the culture in which it is situated and are they external to one another? Congar’s only reference to the Holy Spirit holds a promise, I suggest. Congar looks at the causes of unbelief from a perspective that God, human being and the world are related. The all-embracing character of faith suggests that to be humanly acceptable, faith has to be intimately linked with life. This extends to the world. To be able to transfigure everything human, it must appear so attractive and beautiful that it would be impossible and fatal to refuse.\textsuperscript{31} What is attributed to the Spirit intimately relates, almost interweaves, the personal, social and cultural aspects of human existence. This resonates with his later claim that intimate connections between human, world and God (implying the role of the Spirit) are crucial in addressing the unbelief of the world.\textsuperscript{32} The image of incarnation is crucial in understanding of how this works.

\textbf{THE INCARNATION AND THE CATHOLICITY AS DIVINE INTERACTION WITH THE HUMAN WORLD}

Congar seems to assume a certain continuity between the church and incarnation of the Word. A key influence on the relation of faith and visibility is the notion of signs of faith in Thomas Aquinas.\textsuperscript{33} Aquinas articulated the notion in the chapter “On the necessity of sacraments,” where he linked the sacraments with the incarnate Word. According to Thomas, the Word was accessible to human senses, and affirmed the role of the senses in the human grasp of spiritual and intelligible reality, and the sacraments continued in this logic. So, there is a logic of incarnation for Congar, whereby through the signs and gestures God was to be accessed. However, Congar continues, due to the rise of purely human spirituality, faith was

\textsuperscript{30} ibid.
\textsuperscript{31} 223, 224.
\textsuperscript{32} This emphasis on the intimate connections of human being, cosmos and God resurfaces in the later work, which focuses on the activity of the living God. I will point out in due time that this leads to Pneumatology. See Yves Congar, \textit{Dialogue Between Christians}, 24.
relegated to the private sphere.\textsuperscript{34} This meant a culture where all human gestures and realities were placed outside the church.\textsuperscript{35} So how faith can live without this educative cultural milieu is an issue.

This is a difficult struggle for Congar because he is torn by two apparently conflicting drives. He wants to maintain the integrity of creation, thus culture and its development, but he also wishes to affirm the uniqueness of divine grace. While he liked the contemporary view of the human being as a concrete creature living in the world, the view of humanity as self-sufficient was for him reductive. He thought this made the uniqueness of the supernatural aspect of the grace and love of God, which was more than the world, obsolete.\textsuperscript{36} On the other hand, he saw that emphasis on the supernatural nature of faith degenerated into the regime of “dogmatism, authority, submission, conservativism” of the church.\textsuperscript{37} Congar’s challenge seems to be how to maintain both the divine uniqueness of grace and authentic human quest. It is in the juncture of the intimate relations between the general human quest and God that the (implicit) theology of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit is situated.

The incarnation and catholicity form a theological basis for Congar’s programmatic proposal for the church.\textsuperscript{38} Congar suggested that there was a deficit of incarnation and Catholicity in the church:

to every growth of humanity, to every bit of progress, to every extension of the human in any one of the domains of creation—whether of knowledge or action—there should correspond a growth of the Church, an incorporation of the faith, an incarnation of grace, a humanization of God! That is the Church. That is Catholicity ... The church is the world insofar as it believes in Christ, or ... it is Christ dwelling in the world and saving it by our faith. The Church is religious humanity. What am I saying? It is the universe as transfigured by grace to the image of God.\textsuperscript{39}

He argues that in trying to maintain the purity, transcendent nature and uniqueness of faith the church became self-focused, defensive and isolated. Thus, many spheres of human life were untouched by faith and not filled by the Spirit and the need of the supernatural to be humanized and embodied was not satisfied. This was counter to the image of incarnation, which for Congar showed that all human things require divine completion and presence. In

\textsuperscript{34} Congar, “Une conclusion,” 224. Congar identified this new spirituality with what he calls “the new revelation,” living by means of interior light of reason, “spirituality of the conscience.” See Ibid., 236.

\textsuperscript{35} 227.

\textsuperscript{36} 235. This desire to affirm the uniqueness of grace directly leads to theology of the Spirit as the emphasis on “filial life.” See in the discussion of dualism after the Vatican II, Yves Congar, \textit{Un peuple messianique. L’Eglise, sacrement du salut. Salut et liberation} Cogitatio fidei 85, (Paris: Cerf, 1975), 181.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 238.

\textsuperscript{38} Mettepenningen, \textit{Nouvelle Théologie}, 45.

\textsuperscript{39} Congar, “Une conclusion,” 247, as quoted from Jossua, \textit{Yves Congar}, 25.
receiving the communication of the Spirit of Christ they would become his Body and glorify 
God.\textsuperscript{40} Faith could not stand being disincarnated as pure interiority of the spirit. It had to be 
inspiring and radiating through the whole of life as in sacred art, in the virtuous life, and in a 
culture.\textsuperscript{41}

Catholicity, which for Congar in this article was the desire to fulfil the whole of human life and 
reality in the light of Christ, was also partial.\textsuperscript{42} This fulfilment, achieved in the Spirit, was 
connected with incarnation. The church lost the visibility, which, and he refers to Thomas 
Aquinas, acted as a sign, allowing one to see what to believe.\textsuperscript{43} In addition to miracles and 
prophecies (the signs for Thomas), which were rare, Congar presented the ordinary Christian 
way of life, and the mass as signs.\textsuperscript{44} In these God presented humans with a human face; this 
human visibility consoled those who approach God. In this way, everything truly human was 
transfigured and assumed into Christ. However, the milieu (“the cosmic, institutional, 
psychological and social realities” for Congar) has changed. It was no longer favourable to 
faith, i.e. it neither induced faith nor allowed it to breathe and thrive. So, Congar argues for 
the necessity of a “politics of presence,” meaning the (public) presence in the culture of signs 
of faith, which point to Christ,\textsuperscript{45} and manifest God’s desire for the all-embracing fullness of 
human existence. Congar called for the re-creation of a milieu, which is favourable to faith 
and ultimately to human existence. Congar is not clear on what the “politics of presence” 
means, but its scope can extend from lay participation in the activities of the world to the role 
of liturgy. Furthermore, this would expand the implications of incarnation for non-human 
creation. It is not necessary to rule any possibilities out for the time being.

But let us turn to the references on the roles of Christ and the Spirit in Congar’s theological 
sketch, or rather their interchangeability. In his response to the unbelieving world, the role of 
the church is key. It is not a merely theoretical proposal, but embedded in ecclesial life. As 
such, it seeks to look deeper at the church, and this is where the roles of Christ and the Spirit 
and God’s participation in the world come forth. The role of the Spirit is not immediately 
evident, but important. It is closely tied to the work of Christ. To show this I turn by way of 
anticipation to some later writings. In these he referred to the tradition of the church as the 
milieu of the Spirit, which nourishes and induces faith.\textsuperscript{46} In a still later work he mentions that 
the liturgy plays the role of the setting, where the activities of Christ and the Spirit intersect.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{40} Congar, “Une conclusion,” 241.  
\textsuperscript{41} ibid., 243.  
\textsuperscript{42} 245.  
Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Online Edition Copyright © 2008 by Kevin Knight, accessed online in 
\textsuperscript{44} Congar, “Une conclusion,” 246.  
\textsuperscript{45} Congar, “Une conclusion,” 248.  
\textsuperscript{46} ibid., on tradition as the milieu of the Spirit, see Yves Congar, \textit{Tradition and Traditions: A historical and 
In his later work he also presents a justification of Christian personal and communal experience of the Spirit vis-à-vis a sceptical world. Congar also writes about the “testimonies” of the Spirit in human lives, traversing the familiar territory of miracles, prophecy and visible signs. This shows that within a consistent emphasis on visibility in his work, the role of the Spirit became more prominent. Thus, I believe it is fair to suggest that the roles of Christ and the Spirit are the basis of Congar’s response to the unbelief. However, this does not mean that only Congar’s later work has to contribute to the discussion of the engagement in the world and the participation in God.

I would like to return to the “politics of presence” - what might it mean? Congar was almost certainly not arguing for a clericalisation of culture, and his notion of “milieu” was evidently wider than the church. Keeping in mind the later emphasis on the Spirit, does not it suggest the role of the Spirit in the culture, in making signs and creating milieus outside ecclesial activities? The activity of the Spirit can be seen underlying the “politics of presence” in appropriating and working with signs of culture and work out their relation with faith in a way which is permeating, rather than “external?” This leads me to suggest that Congar’s early work has an important contribution, which has to be viewed together with later emphasis on the role of the Spirit. Marie-Dominique Chenu noted that Congar’s approach to the Incarnation and Catholicity is the “starting point for a contemporary history of the term ‘incarnation.’” Congar, on the other hand, builds on the work of Chenu, his mentor in Saulchoir and develops the ecclesial and Pneumatological implications of focus on incarnation.

---


50 Marie-Dominique Chenu was a rector of Saulchoir, the house of studies of Dominican order in Kain, Belgium, where Congar in 1931 defended his doctorate. The school later moved to France. See Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie*, 41 and Meszaros, *The Prophetic Church*, 43. Mettepenningen writes that Chenu was not only rector of Saulchoir when Congar later served as a professor, but also was “instrumental in transforming the philosophical and theological formation ... into fully fledged ecclesial faculties during his ten-year tenure, thereby acquiring the approval of the Church authorities.” Mettepenningen, Ibid., 47.

51 As pointed out in Christophe F. Potworowski, *Contemplation and Incarnation: The Theology of Marie-Dominique Chenu* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001), n. 13, 124. Chenu refers to Teilhard de Chardin’s “progressive humanization and the laws of ‘social becoming’” and a call “to embrace this new object of human adoration,” as the world is converted to “a kind of natural Religion of the Universe.” Teilhard calls “to convert this conversion to an even higher degree, by showing through our whole lives that only Christ, *in quo Omnia constant*, is capable of animating and leading the newly perceived progress of the Universe.” See Christophe F. Potworowski, *Contemplation*, 121. Congar writes: “what Father Chardin perceived for the entire cosmos and all of its history, Father Chenu perceived for the historical and social dimension of human life” quoted in Potworowsky, *Contemplation*, n. 8, 121. Congar’s emphasis, then, is ecclesial and Pneumatological.

52 Congar lauds Chenu for the “incarnational” spirituality of young workers in lay movements, Congar thinks Chenu has saved the theme of “continuation of the incarnation” from ambiguity by interpreting it “in terms of a realism of grace and Word.” Yves Congar, "My Path-findings in the Theology of Laity and Ministries." *Jurist* 32 (1972): 169.
This programmatic nature of Congar’s early response might set a tone of how to approach his work as a whole. Several researchers see Une conclusion, and especially its third part, as programmatic for the whole movement of renewal in French Catholicism, nouvelle théologie. This umbrella term points to theologians (including Congar), who left a significant imprint in the documents of Vatican II. Thus some see the early, ecclesiological, work of Congar, which influenced the Vatican II, as his major contribution. But this presents a problem of how to approach his work on the Spirit. For example Richard P. McBrien concludes that Congar’s “pneumatology is, in the end, a function of his ecclesiology.” On the other hand, in his work on the theology of the Spirit, Congar sought to establish the contrary – he presented the role of the Spirit as sovereign, which meant the Spirit institutes and does not merely ratify the institution of the church. I will look more closely at the rifts and discontinuities in Congar’s work later, but as we go towards the more detailed analysis, it is necessary to keep a wide picture of the whole. A view of his work as theological response to the changing situation of the church in the world allows an appreciation of his work as a whole.

Thus, I partially agree with Gabriel Flynn that with his vision of the church Congar responded to the challenge of unbelief. Flynn rightly points out the formative influence of the situation of the world in Congar’s theology. However, he does not view Congar’s turn to theology of the Holy Spirit within the same trajectory. It is important for my argument that later, in 1966, Congar suggested to go further than the theology of the church within the same logic of answering unbelief. He argued that the times demanded an even more radical attempt than renewal of the church and turned to the idea of the revelation of the living God. This idea was “the indissoluble link in Judaeo-Christian revelation between theology, anthropology and cosmology, the living God, man and the world.” This maintains his early emphasis that the realities were intimately connected. It was the lack of the theological vision and

53 Faméreé and Routhier, Yves Congar, 23, n. 3 quoted by Mettepenningen, Nouvelle Théologie, 45. Mettepenningen supports the view that it is programmatic for Nouvelle Théologie.
56 Yves Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 46. Congar refers to Walter Kasper, An Introduction to Christian Faith (London/New York: Burns & Oates/Paulist Press, 1980), 138 – 139. Kasper argues that “ecclesiology is a function of pneumatology” to counter the assumption that “the Spirit has become the guarantor of the Church as an institution and pneumatology has become the ideological superstructure on top of ecclesiology.”
58 Congar, Dialogue between Christians, 23.
demonstration of this connection, which was the obstacle to belief. The presentation of the relation between human person, creation and the kingdom of God, was also the turn to God as living. This turn was fulfilled in “The Holy Spirit in the ‘Economy,’” “He is Lord and Giver of Life” and “The River of the Water of life (Rev 22: 1) flows in the East and in the West.” The cosmological scope of Congar’s theological proposal, if consistently present, will suggest that his Pneumatology goes beyond the integration of spiritual anthropology and spiritual ecclesiology, as proposed by Elizabeth Groppe.

But it might be asked at the outset: how are the response to the world and the participation of God in the world related? Is the focus on the world really essential? I have already suggested and this will carry more weight as I continue, that Congar’s way of response, which might be viewed as an “outward” move, is by getting “deeper.” So, it is not merely thoughts on the church, but rather what is the basis of the church in the divine activity. The ultimate “deeper” for Congar is the relationship of the world and God. So, I suggest, by reflecting on going outward, Congar goes deeper into God’s participation in the world; and by reflecting on the world’s participation in God, Congar finds himself necessarily going outwards. I will give one example from his later work on ecumenism, which was a move “outward” for the Catholic theologian. The different constructions of a theology of the Trinity in the East and the West, according to Congar, were the result of different approaches to the relationship between nature and the supernatural and the different anthropological understandings of the image and likeness of God.

I intend to read Congar’s work on the church in the light of this wider perspective of the relation of God and the world, taken as predominately human, social, cultural and political reality. The unity of the church for him was the unity of supernatural reality with tangible forms of a specific church. Such a reading suggests that Congar entertains the possibility of a theological vision. This vision, it could be argued, is of a credible demonstration of how God, the world and humanity were intimately connected to address world’s unbelief?

However, the view of Congar’s work at this stage as programmatic faces several challenges. First, the vision was not outlined. This is partly due to the fact that Congar was not a system builder. Furthermore, Congar embarked on several important themes – the church, tradition and the Holy Spirit. While related, they are not reducible to one or the other. However, there is an attitude or an instinct which is related to each of these themes and which persists. It combines historical and prophetic on the one hand, and spiritual experience and apostolic engagement on the other. Second, the presence of the “world” in Congar’s theology is

59 These are the names of the three volumes of Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit. (italics mine)
61 This also includes the practical life of the church as the milieu of theological reflection. See Michael Quisinsky, “The ‘Interference’ between Nouvelle Théologie and Catholic Practice in Church and Society.” Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 90.1 (2014): 71-98
ambiguous. The “world” is a major interlocutor of Congar, but it is not a theme of his work. It is an echo, a reflex, not something he reflects upon. His later work elaborates, but the analysis is limited to its role in the positive plan of God. I will look at it more closely later, but in terms of role of the Spirit in the relation God-world, such schematic presentation does not yield much. What presents possibilities of seeing the role of the Spirit is not spelled out by Congar. As Charles MacDonald put it, for Congar “the world is history which is continually moving towards the goals of reconciliation and integrity.”\(^6\) This dynamic and progressive view stays behind the scenes at this stage of his career.

Congar’s intent to reconnect with the “world,” is understandable, and he begins by viewing the cultural world as having something to contribute. But it is not merely a favourable view of the world. If the world’s autonomous and immanent life is not open to the transcendent, it has to be challenged. The church, on the other hand, is connected with the transcendent God and needs embodiment in culture. The world, however, is an interlocutor and a recipient, but remains invisible and passive. Such a view has several pitfalls. There is no way to critically reflect on the way the the world affects the church. For example, is not such a view of transcendent and immanent itself a product of the particular culture? Besides, it may be too presumptive about divine presence in the world and, consequently, optimistic about the meaningfulness of the world. Furthermore, while seeking the contrary, it might be seen as limiting Congar’s intent to address the otherness of the world in its complexity, realism and influence. Congar’s work is programmatic, then, in the sense that his subject matter, approach and individual situation interweave. The enquiry, too, is programmatic, where return to the sources of faith and engagement in the world interrelate. This undergirding framework, however, is enough to ask about what the developing theology of the Spirit contributes to the relation God-world.

**PROGRAMME DEVELOPS: Divided Christendom**

From this more general and sketchy view I proceed to see how Congar developed his theology with an eye on what role is played by the Holy Spirit. In line with the parameters set earlier, I will look at this role in the light of the relation God-world. I will be particularly interested in its relation with the role the incarnation of Christ plays. I intend to show in this section that, as Congar looks at the concrete life of the church and invokes Trinitarian imagery, this opens a space for developing the theology of the Spirit. My reading of Congar’s argument is as follows. The need to theologically affirm the diversity of human reality required linking it with the Trinity and the general purpose of human existence. The Trinitarian scope of the human return to God emphasised the virtues of faith and love attributed to the work of the Spirit,

---

\(^6\) MacDonald, *Church and World in the Plan of God*, 100.
but this affirmed the work of the Spirit only in human beings. However, Congar also points out that this return has social and ecclesial dimensions, which he views as the Christological shape of this return. I want to show that when juxtaposed with the reality – the time, life and mission of the church – this Trinitarian focus eventually led him to appreciate the reality of the Spirit not only in individuals, but also in the life of the church. Thus, the challenges of the church in the world called for a theology of the Spirit.

I will begin by setting the scene. Congar’s approach in Divided Christendom, his first book, helps us to understand what he means as a properly theological perspective. This means he distances himself from confessional apologetics and looks at how the issue is related to the central mysteries of faith. This approach was conscious. After Congar passed his lectorate in theology on June 7, 1931 he was asked to prepare a course on apologetics at Saulchoir. Then he spent a year in Paris. Congar attended courses in rational sociology in the Institut Catholique and courses in Hautes-Études, by Gabriel Le Bras, historian of canon law and the founder of applied sociology of religion in France, and by the philosopher Étienne Gilson. He also went to some courses at the Protestant Faculty of Theology. He closely followed the French Protestant turn to the Reformers and the influence of Karl Barth. Paris also offered the Franco-Russian circle, a meeting-place for Orthodox, Catholics and Protestants. Congar attended together with Nicolas Berdyaev and Jacques Maritain. In teaching at Saulchoir, De Ecclesia, a treatise on the Church, was included in the apologetics program. This must mean that as Congar’s theological framework was being formed, he was conscious of the problems of inter-confessional apologetics. But he did not believe in rational demonstration in apologetics, and Divided Christendom was an attempt to draw apologetics (and the theology of the church) out of its defensiveness and towards fundamental theology.

In line with these concerns, Divided Christendom places the church in a general setting of divine and human interaction. This meant that human and historical aspects were important. These were the emphases of his school, Saulchoir, open to new cultural developments and insisting on the historicity of human existence. The anthropological and cultural diversity and human development were affirmed as important in themselves and to an extent

68 ibid.
69 The apologetic course later appeared as *History of Theology* and had the first methodological outlines of Congar’s theology.
70 Jossua, *Yves Congar*, 22.
autonomous. On the other hand, Congar felt the need to maintain the emphasis on the supernatural nature of faith and the exclusive role of the church. To balance both, he turned to the theology of Thomas Aquinas. The focus on the oneness of God and human diversity (and division) provides him with the tools to discuss the unity - “oneness” and “catholicity” - of the church. Congar’s vision emphasises unity and this is reflected in how he presents the roles of Christ and the Spirit.

Within the vision of unity of the body of Christ, the role of the Spirit is predominately viewed as the soul of the one body of Christ. This role was crucial, because the Spirit unified the whole. Congar turns to the Fathers to show that the unity of the church comes from the oneness of God. But there is also a link between the church as a Society and the divine Societas. To explain this human incorporation into the life of God, Congar presents the whole of the biblical story of the creation being drawn into divine life and uses the image of the temple. As the temple implies indwelling, the role of the Spirit comes forth. So, the Holy Spirit draws humanity to participate in the one divine life. The image which Congar uses to define this role of the Spirit is “the Soul of the Church.” Primarily this means that the Spirit communicates the intra-divine life of faith and love to individuals. The social expression of this communication is the body of Christ. Humanity can return to God and returns to God in Christ, due to the mediation of Christ. This happens in the body of Christ, in which humanity contacts Christ through sacraments; in them the human and the divine meet. As this is the body of Christ, its construction follows the imagery of incarnation, divine (supernatural life) and human (human historicity) laws come together in the organic reality of one (hierarchical) society. The imagery of incarnation allows Congar to affirm both human historicity and the supernatural nature of faith. But is this sufficient?

Congar definitely wants to avoid the juridical and hegemonic implications of one hierarchical society and thus emphasises that the law of incarnation means that the divine aspect assumes the limitations of humanity. However, he also uses the image of a relation between body and soul, which views the body as an instrument of the soul and suggests an almost organic and automatic continuity of incarnation in the church. The role of the Spirit would preclude

---

72 Congar attempts to take the subject in the widest sense and “attempts to interpret the actual divisions of Christendom on the theological plane,” inquiring “why and how as a matter of theology” communities remain divided and attempts at reunion do not succeed. Congar, Divided Christendom, 39, 40.
74 “The Church is not merely a Society, but the divine Societas itself, the life of the Godhead reaching out to humanity and taking up humanity into itself.” Congar, Divided Christendom, 48.
75 Congar, Divided Christendom, 52.
76 ibid.
77 ibid., 61.
78 ibid., 83. “this supernatural life is acquired through the social and visible organism of the church.”
79 ibid., 69.
80 ibid., 65.
81 Congar’s primary reference is Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on Colossians, Chapter 1, Lecture 5, accessed online at https://aquinas.cc/225/226/162 on 26 October, 2017.
this, but it has to be more than mere validation of what the church does as institution. Thus, bringing forth the role of the Spirit is a good step. The overall imagery suggests the following summary. The soul animates the body and the body localizes the soul as its instrument; thus, the Spirit animates the church and the church manifests the Kingdom of God in time and space as the instrument of the life of Christ. The language of causality and instrumentality, however, seems to suggest that the role of the Spirit is merely validating. There is also the danger of looking at the human line as subservient to the divine, and to regard it as a mere receptacle. However, the role of the Spirit comes to the fore as Congar connects the two lines in one concrete reality of the church in discussing the catholicity.

When discussing catholicity, the role of the Spirit is even more pronounced. Here the unity of divine and human extends into time, space and all human development. The incarnation extends into this universality, that is catholicity. Thus, in the church, catholicity is not only geographical and juridical, but also qualitative. It is the universality of truth, redemption, and divine gifts. Congar articulates this with the help of a theology of the grace of Christ, which plays a prominent part in later Pneumatology. In this theology Christ is the principle of salvation of the world. The church, his body, is pleroma, fullness, and the meeting place. The emphasis here is not on incarnation as descent, but on the re-ascent. This return to God is the domain of the Spirit. Christ descended and re-asced to fulfil all things. His incarnation functioned like a principle - the divine life came into every human reality to realize it. The next step was return, which assumed this reality into God. What is not incorporated in God, does not give God the glory. These were prominent features of the theology of Saulchoir to which I will turn next. The theologians in this school reflected how in Christ God intended to indwell all the spheres of human life - Christ was both a child and a worker. The dynamic universality of the church followed and adapted to all human reality, but maintained

82 Congar, Divided Christendom, 81, 82.
83 Congar’s later work states that the Spirit makes the church one, but the emphasis that “the Holy Spirit is the principle of Catholicity,” from Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 24, is already present as I will show later in the chapter.
84 Congar, Divided Christendom, 95.
86 Thomas Aquinas, De Veritate, q. 29; ST, III, Q 7 and 8. Congar’s later work shows that the headship, or eminence of Christ in regard to the body in Thomas Aquinas is to be viewed together with his insistence on the Holy Spirit as “the heart of the Church.” Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 61. Christ is the instrument of communication of the grace of God, but this is the grace with which he himself is filled, the Holy Spirit. Christ acts through the Holy Spirit and the Spirit acts through Christ, Ibid, 62.
87 Congar later criticized the Christology of Thomas: “he [Thomas] gave more attention to the aspect of descent, ... incarnation of the Word, than to the aspect of re-ascent, in which the action of the Holy Spirit is involved.” ibid, 86.
88 Congar, Divided Christendom 97, 98.
89 See Congar on Chenu in Yves Congar, ”My Path-findsings,” 169.
an unchangeable social form of unity. Divine in essence, the church followed human diversity, respected and fulfilled, but also simplified and assimilated it.

There is an aptitude in Congar’s proposal, but the lack of the articulated role of the Spirit has its downside. The community in his account is preceded by the means which procure the community, that is the hierarchical institution. Joseph Famerée sees the danger of conceiving the church in a dualist way, a heavenly church, representing the divine aspect (institution) and the earthly church as receptacle (communion). This would make the church as community in history subservient to the institution, and thus secondary. The incorporation of creation into the divine life, consequently, takes from the fullness of reality of the creaturely life instead of fulfilling it. Congar’s way of addressing this difficulty correlates with the turn to the Spirit. With the development of Pneumatology, there was a shift in approaching unity and diversity, which had implications for an approach towards human realities and divine life. This emphasis safeguarded the integrity and historicity of the creature.

Jean-Pierre Jossua sees in Congar a shift from catholicity as universal capacity for unity to diversity or pluralism, as “an internal value in unity.” This means that the later Congar does not subject diversity to unity. Jossua aligns this shift with Pneumatology, in which Congar better appreciates both the “ever inaccessible and never possessed” divine mystery and human historicity. The desire to affirm both human and divine in fellowship remained. However, in early Congar divine logic focused on the uniqueness of Christ and human logic needed unified structures. This ran the risk of identifying the church as mystery and church as society (Roman Catholic Church). In his later work, according to Jossua, Congar defined the church mystically and less abstractly. It was the “communion of persons and of Churches,” and the Spirit meant the “harmonious diversity, liberty, the unforeseen.” The anthropological dimension was rooted in historicity. There was continuity in Congar’s emphasis on the incorporation of the divine and human. But it also shows that the creaturely integrity, the communal and historical reality of human existence was safeguarded with the development of Pneumatology.

When viewed from the perspective of the relation God-world, some facets of the emphasis on incarnation need to be maintained. The issue of participation stands out. As the Spirit communicates divine life to human being, and they form a social body, this means an eschatological presence in the creation, expressed and effected by Eucharist. Viewed in light of the ecclesial engagement in the world, this is a political presence and an intimate relation.

---

90 Congar, Divided Christendom, 101, 102.
91 ibid., 108 – 111.
92 Famerée L’eclésiologie d’Yves Congar avant Vatican II, 54.
94 ibid.
95 ibid.
with God and an intimate relation with God. It is indeed a realistic human contact with divine, which has implications for the whole dynamic creation and not merely a human one. This is even more visible in that it is oriented to the future. The tendency to universality points not only to the past, but also to the future Christ. It implies human-divine cooperation in returning the creation to God as images of “Christ as Alpha and Omega” and “Pleroma Christi” suggest. Such embodied presence of the eschatological in the world and also human involvement with the divine in and together with the whole creation need not be dissolved. In fact, one should look intently how it unravels when viewed from the perspective of participation of God in the world and the world in God. What does such a perspective entail?

ACTIVITY AND HISTORY: WHAT KIND OF THOMISM?

This question brings to the particular kind of Thomism Congar espoused. Where did Congar get the emphases on history, living tradition and human activity? To see how the contours of Pneumatology developed, it is necessary to look at what was particular about the house of studies, Saulchoir, at Kain-la-Tombe in Belgium. It had a “factory-like spirit” and “a schedule more narrow and inflexible than a corporation’s.” Saulchoir initially found Congar already a Thomist, but not of the kind of Saulchoir. The difference hinged upon the interpretation of Thomas Aquinas’s work. One contemporary author points out the distinction - is Thomas to be viewed as a “father of post-Tridentine Catholicism,” “post Vatican I natural theology,” “a prolegomenon to modern Catholic apologetics, the quarry for arguments for the existence of God” or “a compendium of traditional theology, Latin and Greek: taking the sapiental-ontological way, ... not building one’s theology from the historical event of the incarnation, redemption and so on; beginning rather from the end, from the communion in divine beatitude promised to the saints, anticipated in the moral and sacramental realities of faith, hope and charity”? Saulchoir focused on the reality of faith as lived and this meant a focus on history. Marie-Dominique Chenu secured a place for an historical method in the school. The school focused on Thomism, pursued studies in biblical and patristic sources, Greek philosophy, Medieval studies, and situated Thomas in his period. The emphasis on the Spirit resonated with an emphasis on historicity, but there was more.

The school was open to contemporary challenges, which required a living approach to tradition. The apologetic concerns of the school opened up to a broad historical context and understanding of problems in the science of religions. Chenu opened for Congar “major

---

96 See MacDonald, Church and World, 75, 76 for Congar’s use of the terms.
97 Jossua, Yves Congar, 15.
98 When I refer to Congar as Thomist here, I do refer to the importance of Thomas Aquinas in his theological thinking, rather than Congar being the proponent of a rigid system built by successors of Thomas.
100 Jossua, Yves Congar, 16.
human and intellectual options” and brought in the awareness of history. The turn to tradition made diverse past resources of the church present. Congar had only one year in philosophy, because of earlier encounters with philosophy through Maritain and Garrigou-Lagrange. However, in the four-year theology cycle the ecclesiological and ecumenical sensitivities emerged. The apostolic commitments of Saulchoir in Norway and Russia, in relation to Protestantism and Orthodoxy, were always present. Congar’s Dominican lectorate thesis, directed by Chenu, in summer of 1928 was “Unity of the Church.” It focused on the unity of the church in the thought of Möhler, whose Pneumatology, as I will soon point out, left an imprint in Congar.

Thus, when Congar moved the issue of ecumenism to properly theological ground, this was in line with the bigger theological programme of his school. The community of co-workers in Saulchoir, especially Yves Congar, Marie-Dominique Chenu and Henri-Marie Féret, held conversations on essential options, like liquidating “baroque theology” and returning to the (Patristic and Scholastic) sources. Already in 1932 they set on this course undergirding their attempts “by an unchallenged fortress - the work of St. Thomas Aquinas.” This was the way of openness in several aspects. It acknowledged development; Chenu influenced the theological methodology of Congar on the development of dogma. The openness did not conceal the positive contribution of faith (and church). Chenu accepted the emphasis of Ambrose Gardeil of God’s donné (gift) - God’s revelation “as manifest in the testimonies of Scripture, liturgy and tradition.” This openness to development was also openness to the world. Already in 1929, the life of Saulchoir was open to the chaplains of Jeunesse Ouvrière Catholiques (Young Catholic Workers) and Catholic Action. They were “received, listened to, and assisted” by Chenu and Congar, getting an understanding of what they were doing in their ministries and in return provided the theologians with awareness that theology is engaged and participated in apostolic activity.

The military connotations of the “unchallenged fortress” of Thomas Aquinas were not exaggerated. Congar needed this fortress since he was attentive to the demands and problems posed by Catholic Modernists and sought to identify their positive contributions. This meant applying their critical techniques to the Christian deposit and the incorporation of
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the point of view of human as the personal subject. The “unchallenged fortress” was to provide a way to incorporate new developments, while maintaining the uniqueness of faith and integrity of theology. Thus, no wonder that interpretation of Thomas Aquinas was at the centre of theological debates. The particular input of Congar is an ecclesiological emphasis on theology and anthropology, which bore fruit in the work of the Spirit. Congar was aware that ecclesiology developed in the juridical disputes of the fourteenth century. But was the essence of the Church to be conceived along juridical or along Scriptural, Patristic lines? Congar sought to surpass merely rational application of scholastic method of analysis of society to the church as supernatural society. To do this he focused on the “treatise on the Son of God in his social dimensions.” This look at the church as mystery is a sensitive response to the challenges of the surrounding culture; it connects with inquiry into political presence of the church. This is a setting from which the participation of God in the world and the world in God is approached.

**Sources of Congar’s theology of the Holy Spirit**

The “treatise on the Son of God in his social dimensions” provides an opportunity to turn to the sources of Congar’s Pneumatology in the relation God-world. I will show that when Congar looks at the social dimension of the treatise on the Son of God, it already presupposes the work of the Spirit. The question I ask is why did the theology of the Spirit have to develop? I will begin by identifying Pneumatological emphasis in Congar’s reading of Aquinas theology of the church. I will show that this emphasis is present when Congar explores the ecclesial dimensions of the central mysteries of the faith, the Trinity and Christology. These ecclesial dimensions also presuppose the world, since the concrete church lives in history. So my argument runs this way – focus on the reality of grace in the church (the activity of God in the church), if the church is viewed in history, requires articulating the role of the Spirit. To make this point I begin with Congar’s understanding of the idea of the church in Thomas Aquinas.

**Thomas Aquinas on the Church: Church, Human Being and Trinity**
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Congar’s turns to the church in Aquinas to articulate the church as a mystery, and not merely a juridical and sociological reality. He begins from the exposition by Thomas of “the holy catholic Church” from the Apostles’ Creed. According to Congar, Thomas presents the church as an organic and almost biological body, governed by the Spirit as Soul. But the emphasis on the Spirit is more pronounced than in earlier work. This is being done in order to preclude confusing human life and divine life and also shows that due to the activity of the Spirit the unity of the church is deeper than sociological. Yet Congar has to assemble his picture of this activity from the theology of the Trinity and anthropology, since Thomas did not write an ecclesiology. So, Congar argues that the members form a unity in the church because the Trinity (by the work which is attributed to the Holy Spirit) indwells in them; the Holy Spirit places in them tendencies to achieve that unity in the form of the virtues of faith, love and hope. Thus the church as living body is one, because indwelled by one soul. This makes unity inward, since the soul quickens inwardly as divine life present in human beings. Congar thus makes a case from Thomas that the church is not a mere sociological reality, not only a society, but also mystery, and the role of the Spirit is key for his doing this.

This role of the Spirit is based on Thomas’ anthropology, Congar shows, and eventually points to and depends on the account of human participation in God. Thus, it shows the issue of participation is central for his view of the relation God-world. The theological virtues (faith, love and hope) show how a human being participates in divine life without confusion with God. Through them the divine life is tuned to the human mode. They provide a human being with the finality and through them humanity participates in God by participating in God’s knowledge and love of Godself. One lives divine life through faith, i.e. one sees as God sees; and through love, i.e. one loves as God loves. Humanity in the church is oriented towards God as the object of faith and love; and the virtues form into the likeness of God.

118 Congar, The Mystery of the Church, 56.

119 The key issue here is to guard the radical otherness of God, but at the same time show that human beings indeed participate in God. Cavanaugh summarizes that God for Aquinas is “sheer actuality” and God is Being itself and not another finite being in the world. Thus as “God’s essence is existence, he (Thomas) remarks ‘that which has existence but is not existence, is a being by participation.’” Cavanaugh, “A Joint Declaration?”, 269, quoting Thomas Aquinas, ST I, Q 3, A 4.

120 This is because according to Aquinas God sees all things other than Godself “in Himself,” as referred to Him, i.e. “‘God knows and loves other things by knowing and loving Himself as creator.” Cavanaugh, Ibid., 267.

121 Thus, since it is really God, whom human beings know and love, according to Aquinas, God is really present in their lives as the one they know and love: “there is one special mode belonging to the rational nature wherein God is said to be present as the object known is in the knower, and the beloved in the lover. And since the rational creature by its operation of knowledge and love attains to God Himself, according to this special mode God is said not only to exist in the rational creature, but also to dwell therein as in His own temple” (ST I. Q 43, A3) quoted in Cavanaugh, 272. Cavanaugh continues, that since in Aquinas knowledge is the form of participation, i.e. to know means to be conformed, to immaterially possess the form in the mind, and since will...
Ecclesiology, thus, is linked with human pursuit after God. Congar consequently presents the whole *Secunda Pars* of Summa, the part concerning the human return to God, as ecclesiological.\(^\text{122}\) As only God can return us to God, the principle which moves and directs humans to the divine end has to be divine. This means that the whole supernatural life of humanity, i.e. the return, is attributed to the Holy Spirit. This emphasis on the Holy Spirit also means that the human act really proceeds from human being, and is free, and at the same time has efficacy from God.\(^\text{123}\) The same extends to the sacraments and ministries, which in Thomas get their efficacy from the Spirit. The Holy Spirit, thus, acts in human beings and in the church and the picture is that of the world participating in God.

**Personal, ecclesial and cultural implications of Thomist influence**

The other contribution of the emphasis on the Holy Spirit and Thomist descent/re-ascent, was that it did not separate theology and spirituality. The sequence – descent/return - was not mere speculation about human participation in God, but was a way to fulfil the relation of reason and faith, and theology and contemplation. This way of reflection was self-involving, pursued in life and, for Congar, meant involvement in the ecclesial life. Congar follows Marie-Dominique Chenu, who saw the system of Thomas as a means to provide theological – contemplative coherence. Chenu insisted that Aquinas has to be first of all read as a theologian in his historical context rather than as a philosopher.\(^\text{124}\) Chenu viewed theological systems as expressions of spirituality: “a theology worthy of the name is a spirituality, which finds the rational instruments adequate to its religious experience.”\(^\text{125}\) Consequently, he
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\(^{123}\) This is achieved by what is called “created grace.” On created grace as *habitus*, “accidental form,” the divine element which elevates and penetrates human being to divinize, a state impossible to reach by human efforts, see Henri de Lubac, *A Brief Catechesis on Nature and Grace*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1984), 41. The point is to affirm that Holy Spirit doesn’t remain external to human person, but rather leaves the mark without comingling with human nature, “a connaturalilty” established between human being and God. (42) De Lubac also pointed to Maurice Blondel, who wrote that this was not something extra, an extrinsic point, “but an adoption, an assimilation, an incorporation, a consortium, a transformation which, through the bond of charity, insures both the union and the distinction between distinction of two incommensurables.” Supernatural for him was not a distinct being, robbing humans of their nature, but intended to be in humans, but not coming from them. Maurice Blondel, *Exigences philosophiques du christianisme* (Paris: P. U. F., 1950), 58 and 162 quoted in de Lubac, 48. He also quoted Teilhard de Chardin, that “the supernatural is a ferment, a soul, not a complete organism; it comes to transform ‘nature.’” Teilhard de Chardin, *Le Milieu divin*, (Paris: Seuil, 1957), 199, quoted in de Lubac, 49.


claimed that the *Summa Theologica* had to be approached as a religious text, as Fergus Kerr points out.\(^{126}\) The plan of *Summa*, then, “results from an option characteristic of Latin theology, which implies a spiritual itinerary towards the God of revelation.” \(^{127}\) Chenu proposed to read Thomas in the light of Augustine and the Neo-Platonic tradition.\(^{128}\) Thus, Thomas appealed to the Platonic theme of emanation and return and found in it “a splendid source of intelligibility.” \(^{129}\) Kerr writes about Chenu that for him “faith does not short-circuit intelligence; on the contrary, it incarnates the divine truth in the very substance of our minds.”\(^{130}\) Congar provided it with a Pneumatological emphasis.

Besides being related to human spirituality, Congar’s reading of Thomas is related to human activity in the world as reflections on the mystical body of Christ show. Congar draws a parallel between God’s relation to the world and Christ’s relation to the church. This parallel revolves around the emphasis that in the relation of God and the world, what one side gains does not mean that the other side loses.\(^{131}\) The insight is important as such for the relation of human activity and God. However, Congar extends it further. He looks at how Thomas presents the return of creation as accomplished in *Christ*. The church is (included) in Christ and Christ is immanent to the church. The church was in Christ due to the fact that when God became incarnate, also the humanity of Christ became the head of all creation.\(^{132}\) In this new state of things, Christ was the principle, containing in himself all the effects of grace to be spread in the church. Thus Christ and the church were not more than Christ alone. Congar suggests there is an analogy between the relation of Christ and the church and the relation of God and creation. In Thomas, he pointed out, God plus the world does not mean more than God alone, since the world, which emanates from God “is a multiple reflection of what is one and simple in him.”\(^{133}\) The world is what it is only by participating in God, receiving from God, but adding

\(^{126}\) Kerr, 28.
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\(^{129}\) Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Toward Understanding Saint Thomas* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1964), 304. On the plan of *Summa*, see 304-305. He describes the role of the three parts of the Summa as follows: “*Ia Pars* – emanation from God-the-principle; *Ila Pars* – return to God-the-end; and because, *de facto*, by God’s free and utterly gratuitous design (sacred history reveals this to us) this return is effected through Christ-the-man-God, a *illa Pars* will study the “Christian” conditions of this return.” Thus discussion of history may be introduced precisely in the Third part, 305. On *exitus* and *reditus*, see 306. Chenu emphasizes its ontological and cosmic meaningfulness was masked by psychological and moral emphases of Augustine. He views neo-Platonic *exitus* and *reditus* as “progression and conversion: this two-sided law of production” which when confronted with Christian economy of creation and salvation was purged from “cosmic determinism and the idealistic dialectics.” 306.
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nothing to God. The church is humanity turned to God and “is what it is only by participation in Christ, receiving from him, yet adding nothing.” This sets the church and the world on one plane as one realm, i.e. the creation, but also underscores the activity of God.

NECESSITY OF THE TWO DIVINE MISSIONS

Congar’s early view of this divine activity centres on Christology and the role of the Spirit is generally implied. He points out that the return of humanity to God in Christ in Thomas is twofold. First there is the incarnation, where human nature was united to God in Christ. This was the beginning of the return to God, since creation was concentrated and recapitulated in human nature. Second, there was a “harvest” of incarnation. In this harvest, what was achieved in Christ unfolded in the mission of the church, through which the riches of humanity were returned to their source. As to the implied role of the Spirit, I would like once again to turn to Congar’s mentor, Chenu. According to Kerr, Chenu linked God and creation, the divine mystery and the world by the “missions” of Son and the Spirit. He also showed that the neo-Platonic schema of emanation and return was responsive to history (and human creative freedom). The sacred history with all its dependency on God and human free will could be located in this circuit. This emphasis on the two missions and especially the role of the Spirit implies the engagement with culture and emphasis on human creative activity in history. Furthermore, this suggests that human creative activity is at the same time a divine activity, whereby creation is returned to God. But what would this emphasis on “two missions” change? This would sharpen the question of the proper role of the Spirit vis-à-vis the emphasis on the incarnation of Christ. It appears to me that the logic of the life of the church and its mission leads the way forward and demands an articulated role of the Spirit.

HIDDEN ROLE OF THE SPIRIT

To show this I return to Congar’s reading of ecclesiology in Thomas Aquinas with an eye to the question of the participation of humanity in God. Congar looks at how Christ was in the church, or the immanence of Christ to the church. As in Thomas there was nothing in the church which did not come from Christ; the return of human beings to God was the life of Christ in them. Congar’s argument depends on the structure of the Summa. In its first part Thomas views the human as the one who has and grows into the image of God. This image tends towards the object one is likened to and is fulfilled in action. This action and the
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movement are more effective in proportion, i.e. the more true and perfect they are. And so, there are degrees of process of growth and reflection of the image of God: in potency, imperfectly and perfectly. These three degrees, Congar shows, have their counterparts in the third part of the Summa concerning the return of humanity to God and Christ as its head. Congar concludes that degrees in the growth of the image of God are correlative to degrees of incorporation into Christ and assimilation of Christ. The whole process also depends on the works of Christ in the flesh, since in the prologue of Tertia Pars Christ’s life is called “redemptive, meritorious and efficacious” and exemplary. But the terrain of the “return” of humanity is, as I have already shown, also that of the Spirit.

If the life of Christ, human life and the church connect in the terrain (activity) of the Spirit, why is Congar (and Thomas) silent on this role? While there is clearly an incipient Pneumatological Christology in Thomas (and Congar), the theologies of Christ and the Spirit are not on equal footing. Congar follows Thomas and affirms that all that exists in the return to God has to spring up from God, so all graces come from God as “first and proper cause and the Holy Ghost by appropriation.” This “appropriation” and the fact that the Spirit does not have a proper and particular causality stand in contrast with the proper causality of Christ. Since his humanity is in persona joined to divinity, his causality is particular and true, though instrumental. The goal of the whole process is that human beings were assimilated to the Trinity. However, there is a difference of attribution - the return is ecclesial and the church is called the body of Christ and not the Spirit. Does this mean that the Pneumatological aspect of return is suppressed? Furthermore, the focus on the Christological shape of return assumes almost continuity between Christ and the church. Does not this result in a picture of the return where the world as such was missing? To get some insight I have to turn to the later Congar. Congar makes the problem visible as he takes on the charge of “Christomonism.”

In the first of the articles which initiated the turn to Pneumatology (almost forty years later), Congar voiced the reproach of ecumenical observers of the Second Vatican Council (Orthodox in particular) that the schemas of Lumen Gentium and Dei Verbum lacked Pneumatology. “Christomonism,” as opposed to the “ecclesiological pneumatology” of the East, meant that in the Latin Church the Spirit was viewed as a simple function of Christ as the one who merely personalized his salvation. The Spirit made the work of Christ effective in the church, harmonized ecclesial life in its development and assured fidelity to origins by personal and institutional charisms. This, they reasoned, disregarded the plainly personal character of the mission of the Spirit in Pentecost, the Spirit’s proper work in constituting the church both after and together with the work of Christ. The personal or proper action of the third
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hypostasis in the historical life of the church was not appreciated. The action of the Spirit was dependent on the Son as “simple function of realization of his work.” Thus, in Scholasticism everything, which is gift and grace in the divine causality is appropriated to the Spirit, but there is no proper and autonomous operation of the Holy Spirit. This doctrine, when viewed in the light of Scripture, was dissatisfying. These later articles, however, did not even raise questions about the Spirit’s role outside the realm where Christ was known.

The Limits of Thomist Influence

This perspective from later work shows that even if he marked out the terrain of the Spirit already in his early work, the framework he used did not allow him to show it. With the help of Thomas Aquinas Congar made a case that the church was a mystery; he placed it in the matrix of human participation in God. He presented the church as belonging to the Christian mystery itself: “the very mystery - Christian, trinitarian, human-centred, Christ-centred and sacramental,” and consequently a subject of theology and not only narrow apologetics. The contemporary approach to Aquinas allowed him to approach the church as a theological place. It began with the focus on incarnation, which required developing the ecclesiastical implications of the central doctrines, in other words, showing how these doctrines are embodied and lived out. As these doctrines were lived out, only ecclesial life could preserve “the full, large and undefiled Catholic tradition, the inspiration of the Fathers.” This life already assumes that tradition is the place where Christ, the Spirit and human activity connect. Congar concludes that such an approach to tradition would be both Pneumatological: “the Church is contemplated as a Spirit-centred reality, as the Body whose soul and principle is the Holy Ghost,” and Christological: “the Church is contemplated in Christ, as Christ is contemplated in the Church,” the church is visible and embodied. Where did this notion of tradition come from and how does it affects the view of the relation God-world?

Towards a Proper Role of the Spirit: Life of the Church as Theological Locus

Congar’s theology of the Holy Spirit develops vis-à-vis to what freshly occurs in the world and his reflection on the catholicity of the church is key in pointing this connection out. As catholic, the church tends towards universal – the world. Congar later commented on the issue of catholicity in his early work and directly connected it to the role of the Spirit. The Spirit is
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experienced “on the go,” in life as lived.\textsuperscript{149} This means that development of faith belongs to the \textit{essence} of the church, which was not essentially a reality out of time and space. This growth of faith is the development of its unity in time and consciousness, which is guided by the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{150} This faith, which the church carries, is wider than the consciousness people have of it. It is a reality, lived out by the church, which is prior to and explains the texts. The life of the church thus becomes a significant “site,” it is reality as lived out in human response to divine grace and has a proper role alongside inspired texts. This also means that besides looking to the past, the church is in the present and is oriented towards the future. Aware of its past, in this more \textit{traditional} understanding of tradition (according to Congar), the life of the church brings forth the implications of its faith.

It is the Spirit who combines human development and divine activity in the church as a mystery, “a living organism, animated and governed by the Holy Spirit, one which contains, vitally, its law within itself.”\textsuperscript{151} While this role of the Spirit is subservient to the institution, it puts the \textit{life} of the church in the world at the centre. The catholicity of faith is not something prescribed in advance, but comes about only in concrete life when people from diverse walks of life receive faith. These potentialities are brought forth in their being actualized in the (missionary) events, wherein the self-understanding of the church expands. This process extends into the future.\textsuperscript{152} So it is in the \textit{practice} of the church that one grows in awareness of the faith the church holds.\textsuperscript{153} He even suggests that some dogmas are given like institutions, “not only objects of faith, but as something to be done, effected, practiced.”\textsuperscript{154} This means that the church learns what these dogmas mean in the process of doing what it is commanded.\textsuperscript{155} The context makes it clear that practices include teaching, governing and the sacramental life of the church. However, Congar is quite sure that living developments cannot slip in anything heterogeneous.\textsuperscript{156} He views it as having an interior law like a living thing,

\textsuperscript{149} Yves Congar, \textit{The Mystery of the Church}, it is a collection of essays; I will focus on the early pre-war ones, some from 1937.
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\textsuperscript{155} ibid. Congar gives as an example Father Sertillanges, who thought about authority, which “teaches itself by its own decisions, as an intelligent grain of wheat might learn by watching itself grow, only dimly aware of what it bore within itself,” and applies this to dogmatic instruction of the church.
\textsuperscript{156} Here Congar refers to the way Thomas Aquinas uses the term ‘locus’ in his theology of sacraments. Thomas Aquinas, \textit{ST}, II, Q 75 and 76, accessed online, \url{http://www.logicmuseum.com/authors/aquinas/summa/Summa-III-73-79.htm} on 28 April 2015. There is an influence of Chenu and Saulchoir here. “For Chenu, liturgy is a privileged area where the Church fulfills itself as a mystery in act.” In understanding cultic activity praxis rather than doctrine is light. See Potworowski, \textit{Contemplation and Incarnation}, 185. Potworowski traces this back to the early work of Chenu, where he urged the need to ‘remain “present to the datum revealed in the present life of the Church and the current experience of Christendom.”’ See Potworowski, 185, n. 68. He refers to Chenu, \textit{Le Saulchoir}, 66, 67. Potworowski further argues that the ruling principle is once again incarnation – various forms
which animated by the Spirit, develops in a particular way, just as (my example) an orange cannot develop into an apple.\textsuperscript{157}

This image of faith being unpacked in and with the world in the life of the church is further expanded with the later and wider exposition of \textit{locus theologicus}. Congar’s later work on the Holy Spirit departs from these organic and institutional metaphors. It expands this \textit{locus theologicus} by adding inner inspirations in the intense spiritual life of saints, the church’s way of acting (especially in sacraments) and the sense of faith in the faithful as theological \textit{loci}.\textsuperscript{158} These are linked to the Spirit, who speaks through the prophets, and anointing, which takes place in history.\textsuperscript{159} This is also reiterated in Congar’s theology of tradition. The liturgy was for him a \textit{locus theologicus} in that the whole faith of the church was invested in its prayer, and liturgy “contains, offers, expresses” the Christian mystery in its own way as the channel of revelation.\textsuperscript{160} While both stages rightly assume ecclesial presence in the world, which is also (Christological and sacramental) participation in God, something crucial is missing. If viewed from the perspective of the relation God-world, the world contributes to this development of faith, but not directly. Its presence is merely implied (or reflexive) as the Spirit is viewed only in the response of the church. Furthermore, the focus on this sacramental participation sees the role of the Spirit as merely validating, not initiating. On the other hand, if the world contributes to the development of faith, it must be thanks to the activity of the Spirit in it and behind the whole process. This is a necessary implication of Congar’s emphasis on universality; his way towards such development is to sort out the roles of the Spirit and Christ in the church.

\textbf{The influence of Johann Adam Möhler}

Johann Adam Möhler gave Congar theological tools to look at the difference between Spirit- and Christ-centred ecclesiology.\textsuperscript{161} The nineteenth-century theologian of the Tübingen School objected to eighteenth-century Scholastic “naturalistic” ecclesiology, which viewed the church along the lines of a secular organization. According to this view the church consisted in a juridical order of hierarchy, and this order was sufficient. There was no felt need of a continuous vivifying action of God – “God created the hierarchy, and so provided more than
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adequately for the needs of the Church right to the end of the world.” Möhler, on the other hand, in his early work proposed a spiritual and charismatic church in an ecclesiology centred on the Spirit. The Spirit of love, who is embodied in the church, essentially formed the church from within. The institution, while willed by God, was only the expression rather than the cause of unity. In his later work, however, he corrected himself with a Christological ecclesiology. It emphasised the institution, which caused and structured the communion in faith and love and assured its spirit. There is a union of love in the church, but this union comes from the principle of incarnation continuing in the church as the outward means of bringing about the unity.

However, how do these ecclesiological discussions and theology of Möhler bear upon the relation God-world? Congar views the renewal of Catholic theology in the nineteenth-century as an achievement in which human existence, culture and faith came once again in a synthesis. He sees continuity within a great theological tradition, which peaked in Thomas Aquinas. It thus followed the years of “theology penetrated by the miasma of philosophism” and characterized by the “inability to associate Christianity with things of the human spirit.” Romanticism brought together theological contemplation on the faith and speculation. It contributed the sense of development and history. The faith of the church had regained “a sense of connections and a viewpoint of living organism.” In such a context, the emphasis on the Holy Spirit, which Congar learns from Möhler, arises in the complex cultural and spiritual landscape, but also responds to it. The role and prominence of the theology of the Spirit is not accidental to this response. As Rosato pointed out, “in Die Einheit Möhler had made a radical departure from previous ecclesiological treatises by stressing the invisible and hidden action of the Spirit penetrating through the visible facts of church history so as to incorporate mankind into an ongoing Pentecost, a gifted yet free entrance into Christ’s legacy of grace and salvation.” Möhler and the Tübingen School impress Congar with a vision of theological whole, in the line of the Fathers and great Scholastic thinkers.
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169 See Philip Rosato, “Between christocentrism and pneumatocentrism: An interpretation of Johann Adam Möhler’s ecclesiology.” The Heythrop Journal 19.1 (1978): 46-70. He shows how Möhler was influenced by Johann Gottlieb Fichte and Friedrich Schlegel (58), and Friedrich Schleiermacher and Georg Hegel (60, 61), but also diverged from them. Rosato shows that Möhler presented “a dialectical method poised between the historical person and mission of Jesus Christ and the fulfillment of his person and mission in the work of his Spirit.” (70)
Consequently, Congar’s turn towards theology of the Holy Spirit and his view of the world shares some of the philosophical presuppositions of this era. More importantly it connected human consciousness and historical human community, which bore Christ’s salvation, by means of the presence of the Spirit as “its continuous life-giving principle.” Rosato points out that for Möhler the Spirit acted in history to incorporate creation into the Body of Christ.

Möhler’s influence thus points to Congar’s emphasis on the perennial role of the church in the human return to God. Ecclesiology was not primarily a treatise on authority, which regulated and assured belief. It points to the communion of persons, real religious subjects, made by the Spirit as subject. Ecclesiology is set within Christian mystery. The divine persons receive absolute priority (rather than mere dignity) in the operation of the church. In this way Möhler’s view on the work of the Spirit restored the “radical primacy” of the supernatural ontology (living reality of grace) over the structures. With this primacy of the reality of grace, Möhler retrieved and Congar accepted the inspiration of early Augustinian ecclesiology, the attention to res more than sacramentum, to the interior reality of life of grace than to the mediations and external structures, which were the means to achieve it.

Second, Möhler’s view of the church further contributed in recovering, according to Congar, the idea that the real understanding of Christ and Christian faith was self-involving. This led Congar towards a theology of tradition. Christianity was not an idea or formula, but “life that proves itself by being lived.” As the life of faith was the interior work of the Spirit of love and community, right faith “supposes the participation in the experience which those who love Christ have of him. The tradition is the consciousness which the church has of its faith.”

BEYOND MÖHLER

While Congar acknowledged the diversity of the Romanticism, he found its climate “relatively homogenous,” which affected Möhler’s theology of the Spirit. The church was for him a
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171 Rosato pointed out Schleiermacher’s notion of consciousness as influence on Möhler’s consciousness of the church, which Congar uses (Rosato, Ibid., 56, 57). He also shows Möhler departed from overt dependence “on the immanental exagerations of Schleiermacher and Hegel,” where the notion of spirit bordered on pantheism towards objective ground for ecclesiology, where “Christ meets man in a tangible way in his visible church.” (61) Thus, Möhler adopted Hegel’s theory of objective mind, but rejected his idealism as threatening human freedom. The transcendence of the Spirit, consequently, guaranteed human freedom (62). According to Rosato Möhler’s Christocentrism has to be viewed in the confluence of Hegel’s insistence on objective mind, joined to Anselm’s insistence for “tangible reality as complement to innate knowledge” and Athanasian “stress on the transcendence of the Spirit of Christ.” (Ibid.)
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collective subject, an organic totality enclosing the members. So later Congar contends that Möhler’s Pneumatology was functional. According to him, Möhler did not reflect on the person of the Spirit but rather on the Spirit’s function in the church. In the church as a living organic totality and the mystical Body as a social organism, the Spirit, “soul of the church” was “absolute guarantee” of hierarchical acts. But does Congar himself evades this critique? Möhler’s dialectical relation of the roles of the Christ and the Spirit still shaped his work. In this his approach differs from Heribert Mühlen, who also reacted against the juridical-social implications of the ecclesiology of Bellarmine. The latter emphasized the visibility of the church over against the perceived error of invisible spiritualist ecclesiology. Mühlen was dissatisfied with Möhler’s view of continuing incarnation, since it led to ecclesial monophysitism (that there is only a divine element in the church) or mysticism. Mühlen’s proposal was Pneumatological, i.e. he turned instead to the Spirit as “One Person in multiple persons (in Christ and in us).” Congar, on the other hand, maintained the emphasis on incarnation. So, what was his way of overcoming merely functional approach to the theology of the Spirit, while maintaining emphasis on incarnation?

Famerée pointed out a risk in using physical and biological metaphors in presenting the union with Christ as continual incarnation. This subjected the work of the Spirit to a prolongation of continual incarnation of Christ, viewed in juridical terms and taken for granted. This muted the genuine newness, which the resurrection of Christ brought, and masked the “irreducible alterity between Christ and us.” Möhler could not help with this, as Christomonism extended to ecclesiology, anthropology and sacramental theology. Congar sees the way out is in the new researches of the relations of the church and world, theology of history and this history as Revelation. There is an underlying logic in these concerns. It points to a theological pre-occupation with the role of the church in the relation God-world, which is reductive. It does not merely stifle Pneumatology, but also reduces Christology to the incarnation and what has been instituted. Congar’s later sensitivity to the challenge of Christomonism vis-à-vis Orthodox theology, consequently, calls not only for the Pneumatology. It also requires reviewing of Christology, and what continues from the work of Christ. Thus, ecclesial presence in culture, the view of human activity and sacramental theology all have to be reviewed through the lens of relation God-world. It would be consistent with the instincts of the theologian, who responds to the challenges in the world by reflecting on the mysteries of faith.

CONCLUDING REMARKS TO CHAPTER ONE

179 ibid., 50.
181 ibid., 30.
182 Famerée, L’ecclésiologie d’Yves Congar, 78, 79.
184 ibid.
In this chapter I showed the Pneumatological potential in Congar’s vision of how God is related to the world and how human and the church participate. His work on divisions in Christianity proposed a twofold pattern of the relation of human and divine, which prepares the space for the role of the Spirit alongside Christ. Congar’s proposed view of the theology of the church in Thomas Aquinas already implied the church as Pneumatological mystery. This brought forth the image of the Spirit as the soul of the body of Christ and the source of unity. The theology of Johann Adam Möhler allowed assessing how the Spirit incorporates creation into divine life, dynamically, in and through the life of the church. As to the role of the Spirit in the relation God-world this early period of Congar presents a claim: the church, and thus human involvement, play a crucial and necessary part in the relation of God and the world, which follows from the incarnation of Christ. This claim distinguishes and intends to reconcile two lines: historical and cultural human life and divine activity. But it was not evident that in Congar’s early proposal the integrity of the creation and the freedom of divine activity were fully preserved or interwoven. In the second chapter I will look at how the situation unfolds and how the development of the proper role of the Spirit affects human participation in divine activity.
CHAPTER TWO: REFORM, THE SPIRIT AND THE DIVINE HUMAN SYNERGY

The development of Congar’s theology of reform in the church was prompted by the renewal in the life of people of faith after World War II. Here it will be investigated how this renewal relates to Congar’s emphasis on the role of the Spirit as presiding over the movement of the church in history. To do this it is necessary to be sensitive to concrete and historical realities. Here the notion of “synergy,” which simultaneously emphasizes the proper role of the Spirit and divine-human co-operation, is key. Does this “pneumatic” view of humanity participating in divine activity makes a link between ecclesial movements and the Holy Spirit? This will lead to the fact that the Holy Spirit plays the central role in Congar’s account of how the church of fallible human beings, acting in their freedom, is made holy. But in terms of the relation God-world in Congar this will point to a tension.

Congar exclusively presents the “synergy” in the context of the church. This is due to his Christology, while the reform in the world points to the work of the Spirit. There is potentially a danger in Congar’s account that it becomes reductive in presenting the relation God-world. In other words, it is necessary to ask if the metaphysical underpinnings of Congar’s Christology go far enough in affirming human (and worldly) participation in God? It might be that the emphasis on the role of the Spirit and the theological response to the situation allowed and required more. This emphasis rightly brought forth the central role of the divine human activity in the relation God-world and humanity’s participation in God. But was Congar’s Christology, which always implied the relation God-world, right in limiting this participation to the church and thus constraining interaction with the world? This chapter intends to show that an adequate vision of divine human (and worldly) cooperation should embrace the Spirit’s action in the world and this requires modifying Congar’s Christology.

WAR AND AFTER WAR YEARS: RENEWAL AS RETURN TO SOURCES

What was the impact of World War II on the life of Yves Congar and his theological journey? His theological work was halted, but the shattering experience of war went beyond that. To get an insight into the direct effect of this experience is difficult. But there are several clues. When the war began, Congar was mobilised and soon imprisoned for five years. He viewed the experience of captivity as grace, which taught the importance of courage and the friendships with courageous individuals, “with whom one can associate and keep faith.”1 The
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friendship with those involved in the Resistance was refreshing, and he later used the image of resistance as the image of the church, as the underground movement of the world. This was the image of courageous prophetic individuals and the resisting community in the world, where stable institutions crumble and evil institutions prevail. The all-pervading experience of war and peace reiterated the necessity that “love ... dominate and penetrate everything.”

The connection between the destinies of the world and the church is made clearer by the developments on the ecclesial scene.

In 1942, while in captivity in Silesia, Congar learned that Roman authorities had condemned Chenu’s book, Une ecole de theologie: le Saulchoir. Congar’s mentor was deemed theologically suspicious. Because of his captivity Congar’s own work survived virtually unscathed, but the pre-war confidence and enthusiasm in the province of the Dominican order was shattered. On the other hand, the mid-forties were years of intense theological fermentation in France. The renewal of the interest in the Scholastic and Patristic sources of Christian theology sought to bring forth their contemporary relevance. In 1942 the translations of several Greek Fathers, notably Origen, were published. In 1944 Conversion et grâce chez saint Thomas d’Aquinois Henri Bouillard saw the light of day. In 1944 Henri de Lubac published Corpus Mysticum and in 1946 Surnaturel. Thus the war, the major upheaval, Congar perceived, interlinked the futures of the church and the world. Clergy yearned for a “theology illuminating the most authentic researches of the apostolate.” Congar described French Catholicism in 1946 - 47 as “one of the most beautiful moments in the life of the
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church,” with developments like “the renewal of biblical studies, the liturgical movement, the priest-worker movement, a new sense of Christian community and a more pastorally grounded theology.”¹⁰ The call “to return to the sources” though deemed dangerous,¹¹ was associated with renewal in the ecclesial life in its interaction with the culture.¹²

Congar was eager to serve the cause and proposed a distinct approach to reform through return to the sources, combining inward and outward trajectories. In Vraie et fausse réforme dans l’Eglise, according to Chenu, Congar “gave of himself more than he did in any other work.”¹³ On the one hand, 1945 – 1947, saw a marked missionary engagement.¹⁴ In 1947 Esprit offered a sociological critique of external forms of the Church, voicing the pastoral concerns and problems.¹⁵ The congress of the Union des Œuvres in 1946 had as its theme “Parish: Christendom as Community and Mission.”¹⁶ On the other hand, Congar pointed out, this was the first of all contemporary reforming movements inspired by the liturgical movement.¹⁷ This movement itself was concerned with the pastoral situation and the whole structure of the Church.¹⁸ In 1943 the Centre de la Pastorale Liturgique was established, which focused not on the clerical, but communal, pastoral and intellectual aspects of the ecclesial life. Together with the return to the sources - the Bible and Fathers of the Church - it strove after the renewal of preaching, teaching and pastoral care in the parishes.¹⁹ The move towards the culture and towards the sources, inwardly into the mystery of the church, are complementary. But how does it relate to the theology of the Holy Spirit?

**RETURN TO THE SOURCES AS THE RESPONSE TO THE WORLD**

To discern this, one has to see how the “return to the sources” interplays with the engagement with the world viewed as human, social and cultural reality. Engagement meant being sensitive to the contemporary emphasis on the human subject and the philosophy which emphasised this role.²⁰ In 1950 Vraie et fausse réforme dans l’Eglise Congar began
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describing the contemporary religious consciousness as the consciousness of lay people involved in mission. The reform and involvement in the world were interwoven and thus Congar’s insight from 1937, that the movement for lay apostolate (mission) was the desire for reform, gained flesh. The theme of lay apostolate was developed in Jalons pour une Theologie du Laicat. This book completed the trajectory of the work on reform in focusing on the relation of the church and the world in relation to the kingdom of God. It was a timely attempt to “awaken concern and awareness in the ecclesiastical consciousness.” Eventually, the return to the sources, or Ressourcement, culminated in the reforms of the Second Vatican Council. But is there a reference to the role of the Spirit?

The issue of relevance in the return to sources is closely knitted to an implicit attempt to discern the role of the Spirit, I suggest. As Flynn showed, Congar’s understanding of Ressourcement is complex. It embraces the liturgical return to the sources and renewal of interest in biblical and patristic sources. Flynn points to the influence of French poet and social critic, Charles Péguy (1873–1914). He quotes Congar: “What would a little later be called ‘ressourcement’ was then at the heart of our efforts. It was not a matter either of mechanically replacing some theses by other theses or of creating a ‘revolution’ but of appealing, as Péguy did, from one tradition less profound to another more profound.” The liturgical changes by Pope Pius X (pope from 1903 – 1914), Flynn shows, reiterated Congar’s appreciation for Möhler’s approach to the Fathers. This, as I have earlier shown, was a Pneumatological approach, whereby the tradition was approached in its spirit, i.e. from within. Flynn quotes Congar: “But Möhler does not use the Fathers in order to prove conclusions; he seeks to live and, by communion with their spirit, to find as perfect as possible a communion with their thought and with their life.” The Fathers were not invoked from outside, as a means, but their “company” was “a spiritual milieu, the milieu of the normal life of the theologian.” So, the relation of movements “deeper” and “outward,” appear to imply
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the work of the Spirit. Flynn is right to suggest that Congar was stimulated by questions of Modernism\textsuperscript{31} in maintaining historic faith and using historical methods.\textsuperscript{32} However, he is not helpful in showing the intimate connection between living and engaging in the world and the role of the Spirit.

A. N. Williams helps to see how the return to sources looking for their contemporary relevance may be linked with the theological centers of Christian faith. She suggests that the return to sources was not the end, but rather the beginning of the dialogue with contemporary issues. The dialogue consequently meant, “pressing systematic implications of the position [of the diverse tradition] in relation to contemporary concerns” (italics added).\textsuperscript{33} This insight helps me initiate the analysis of the theological character of Congar’s response. Flynn has pointed out that Congar’s return to the sources had a centre: it was a “return to the essential, to Jesus Christ, especially in the central mystery of Easter.”\textsuperscript{34} This Christological emphasis, however, has to be situated within the wider list of Congar’s concerns. Congar sought to throw theological light on the issues of the times, but it has to be kept in mind that this was dangerous. As O’Malley notes - “much of the burden of Vraie et fausse réforme consists in Congar’s attempt to justify the method and thus anticipate potential critics.”\textsuperscript{35} This helps in seeing what Congar emphasized and why. Without denying the Christological emphasis in Congar’s work on reform, this openness will help in discerning how the role of the Spirit emerges in theological response to contemporary challenges. How does one discern this role?

I proceed to show that ecclesial challenges in post-war France contribute to Congar’s emphasis on the role of the Spirit. But, to reiterate, the look at different movements is crucial to my argument. There were implicit Pneumatological emphases in the pre-war period, as I have shown, but it seems that the post-war world of crumbled structures required more. Since for Congar the destinies of the church and the world were linked, his analysis of the church may be viewed from the perspective of the relation God-world. For early Congar the church was a Pneumatological reality, which his work on the reform as I will soon show, will reiterate even more strongly. The awareness of the sin of the church points to the source of life and holiness of the church, the Holy Spirit. This would mean that in the world marred by human sin and evil, this source reverberates on and enlivens the human and ecclesial life. Once this, ecclesial, role of the Spirit, is viewed from the perspective of the relation of God and the world, this would give a clue of how to theologically interpret different movements, linked to Ressourcement. Such perspective would allow making a direct connection between these movements and the personal role of the Holy Spirit. This Pneumatological development
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would help extend Congar’s trajectory and view participation in the movements in the world as participation in God’s activities in the world. A look at how the emphasis on the Spirit emerged in Congar leads me in this direction.

THE DEMAND FOR TRUTHFULNESS AND THE TURN TO THE SPIRIT

What were the concrete challenges, which called him to theologically focus on the Spirit? The situation of the Catholic Church in France gave rise to the express need of the activity of the Spirit to renew the face of the church. There were surveys of Young Christian Workers of what was the feeling of the “masses.”

The book *La France, pays de mission?* by two priests, Frs. Godin and Yvan, challenged the face the church presents to the world. Congar’s diagnosis was as follows. “The world constructs itself in religious indifference” was the feeling. The church, on the other hand, maintained anachronistic forms of worship, a non-communal structure of parish life, analytic and abstract catechetic forms. Thus, only the activity of the Holy Spirit could adapt and revitalise external forms of pastoral structures, make missionary action effective and restore the church to evangelical ideal. With the “Christian world” disappearing, this call for the activity of the Spirit comes together with an insistence on the authenticity of the church as sign.

This emphasis on authentic sign is in Congar’s thinking a demand for personal and ecclesial truthfulness, linked to the work of the Holy Spirit in human life. The church needed to be the church - the apostolic spirit and external forms of life were related in authentic gestures. This attempt of the church to be fully the church of Christ was for Congar the work of the Holy Spirit.
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Spirit and one of the signs of the times. This quest for authenticity embraced individuals and was also communal, i.e. ecclesial - for Congar the truthfulness of gestures in ecclesial life was reciprocated in the individual virtues of honesty and authenticity. There was an erosion of trust in the authorities of office and structure. The objective truth and structures needed a lively connection with the authentic expression of a particular individual. Consequently, the church had to be viewed as also built from below, through personal initiatives, inspired by the Spirit. According to Congar, in the war and post-war experiences, the notion of “good” expanded to embrace true values, which could not be owned by any group. So, as questionable authorities, subsisting in stable times, vanished, the demand of the society to structurally reform arose and the church had to respond. The truthfulness which was demanded could only come from the activity of the Spirit.

Consequently, this emphasis on the Holy Spirit binds together the spirituality of the human person and the emphasis on life as truthfully lived in the world. This emphasis comes together with a change of emphasis from the “church” to the “church-world.” The wider perspective makes this clear. Congar points out that the theological and pastoral research of 1947 – 1950 (his work on reform) sought to adapt and adjust the traditional realities of the church to the new situation. In the later preface to True and False Reform in the Church, in 1967, Congar places a bigger emphasis on the influence of the culture. He wrote that theological work was being carried “on the basis of and within the framework of a solid Catholic structure, today we are intellectually and culturally torn out of a Catholic framework, perhaps even out of a religious framework, and thrown into a world which, by its vitality and its innovation, imposes its problems upon us.” This relation between the church and the social-cultural world was for Congar intimate and reciprocal. How one understands the church depended on how one understood the world and how one understands the relationship between the church and the world. But this later re-view has to do with Congar’s eventual realization, that adaption and transparency of the church was not enough. He suggests turning from the focus on the church to God, who unveils Godself through the activity, which intimately connects human, cosmos and God, i.e. to the living God. What binds the two stages is that this intimate connection depends on the role of the Holy Spirit, who brings together human activity and divine activity.

Theological response: the synergy and the proper role of the Spirit
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This brings me to Congar’s theological proposal. Congar approaches the issue of reform cautiously and nuances it with theological tools which were recognizable and acceptable to possible opponents.\(^{49}\) He treasures the unity of theology which Thomist synthesis provided. This synthesis provided a way to distinguish and relate a binary of “nature” and “grace.” So, Congar sought to embrace the historical experience of believers and the church - Möhler and Newman helped by invoking a historical experience; but Thomas Aquinas was to provide the framework.\(^{50}\) Congar made a distinction: he felt he needed to ground reflection on life on a solid theological structure and base theology of the communion on the theology of the unity (of the church). His study of reform had to be based on solid ecclesiology, which meant that reflecting on life he wished to reaffirm the uniqueness and distinctiveness of grace. Yet, the two were distinguished only for the sake of reflection. Congar affirmed the permeation of “nature” and “grace:” this mystery had to shine through its human canvases, which made its presence known through human history and action.\(^{51}\) The classical theology was to be bound with the lights of history and experience, the traditional and contemporary had to blend. To analyse if this was a satisfactory solution, I will identify Christological and Pneumatological aspects of his proposal.

Congar’s initial proposal, quite consistently, was Christological, since he looks for the way to interrelate human frailty and divine power in the church. This was meant to affirm both human and divine aspects, but made its human aspect subservient. This is how this worked. Congar did not want to ignore either the purity or reality of sin in the church, which included “delays, lack of comprehension of the culture, or narrowness.”\(^{52}\) Congar began from the nature of the church and distinguished its formal and material principles. The church was infallible, he contended, insofar as it is from God, “according to the aspect that it comes from God, and to the degree that it is of God,”\(^{53}\) which means “in its formal principles (given by God).”\(^{54}\) But in its material principle, “as a people made up of human beings, the church is fallible.”\(^{55}\) This emphasis on structural principles meant the church as mystery and institution preceded the church as communion. The community, it appears, made the institution actual, and was secondary, as Famerée has shown.\(^{56}\) This was because the mystery and institution were primarily Christological - the mystery was first in God’s plan of predestination, second in incarnation.\(^{57}\) The institution derives from Christ, because the sacraments of faith and apostolic ministry institute the church.\(^{58}\) The Holy Spirit merely acts to make these
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efficacious. Consequently, the communion aspect and the role of the Spirit seem to be subservient.

But Congar’s inquiry does not stop here. He also seeks to articulate how the real, concrete church works, and here the role of the Spirit emerges. So, he presented four meanings of the “church,” – (a) “church as the elements of the institution,” (b) “church made up of human beings,” (c) church as hierarchy and faithful, and (d) church as conjunction of divine and human, which united “the divine formal principle with the human material principle.” The last is synthetic and included other meanings. The church consists of hierarchy and faithful, and possesses a concrete social – institutional reality, one church. This synthetic view of the church embraced actual human reality inseparably into divine human communion. Congar explains this as the dialectic of “gift and task,” where the church and the Holy Spirit are both involved. The “gift-task” views the relation between divine and human (in the context of discussion of the evil in the church) as “synergy of a gratuitous divine gift … and a human activity that is characterized by human freedom, limitations, and natural fallibility.” Thus discussing the concrete church, Pneumatological emphasis emerges. Furthermore, Congar uses the term “synergy,” which returns to the image of participation of God in the world and the world in God. I will look at what they contribute one by one.

This argument concerning holiness of the church brings forth the proper role of the Spirit, which is not merely making the action of Christ efficacious. Congar opposes Calvin’s “I believe the holy church” with the quote from Thomas Aquinas “I believe in the Holy Spirit sanctifying and uniting the church.” According to Congar, one should view the holiness these passages are concerned with as coming from God through the divine action of the Spirit. By believing in the Holy Spirit, one sees the church as mystery. Consequently this “holiness can only be affirmed by faith in the Holy Spirit, whose proper activity it is” (italics mine). This proper role of the Spirit surpasses the earlier distinctions of the divine as what is instituted and the human as what is the material of the church. This brings into focus the concrete reality of the church, which as the earlier section of this chapter made clear, is related to the world. This relation to the world points to embodied presence, which in the first chapter was a consequence of incarnation. Is there anything this Pneumatological emphasis contributes? Thanks to the earlier mentioned permeation of “nature” and “grace,” it affirms the embodied nature...
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presence is radiant, as the divine shines through the human. Furthermore, the human aspect is realistic, taking into account human sin. But are both human and divine affirmed adequately?

Congar’s did not reflect on synergy systematically, but some facets stand out in relating human and divine. First, it does not look at individuals. The dialectic “gift-task” is about what in the church is given by God, its structural elements, and what comes from human history and activity. Keeping in mind the relation God-world, this points to the way of communal being in the world, which is engaging. It is a way to show the world how it can be transformed and constructed by the divine activity when in relation with God. Second, Congar’s idea of synergy (not the term) might be brought alongside and interconnect with the notion of participation, thus relevant to the relation God-world. In his later work Congar reflects on the term “the Communion of Saints” from the Apostle’s Creed and returns to the discussion begun in his work on reform. In the early work he wrote that “the communion of saints is in the area of the sancta (holy things) – the objective gifts of God,” meaning living saints, mysteries and sacraments. This is the “gift” part of the synergy, which, in the concrete life of the church, connects with present and historic human activity in Congar’s synthesis. The human and divine lines met in the church around the image of a kind of continuing incarnation. What are the implications for the relation God-world more generally?

In his later work the concept of “synergy” is absent, yet the notion remains. It shows a development which is relevant to the discussion of the relation of intimate participation in God and the engagement in the world. He looks on participation in “the good things” (or holy things) of the “community of salvation” together with others and the principle of this participation. This divine principle of participation is love and this allows elaborating the notion of synergy. Love belongs to human participants (thus their own), but is also divine, and this can only be thanks to the Holy Spirit. In this way God can be in humanity and when God receives human beings “as his sons, he receives himself, having given himself to us and having dwelt in us.” This has implications for the world as well, since for Congar (following Aquinas) the one who lives in love participates in “all the good that is done in the earth.”

This notion of synergy suggests a reflexivity in God whereby creation is returned to God

---

65 Congar’s later work clarifies that this is where Congar aims. “… the Holy Spirit … causes this radiation of holiness,” he writes. Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 58. The section is called “The Struggles of the Holy Church of Sinners” and points to eschatological presence in which not only individuals, but also church struggles “because it is so carnal.” ibid., 57. The Spirit furthers the cause of the Gospel, responds in the life of the church to the appeal of history vis-à-vis the fulfilment in the kingdom of God. ibid.

66 Congar, Ibid., 59.
67 Congar, True and False, 90, 91.
69 This connects with the “radiation” part as “saints reveal the Spirit … they reveal God as gift, love, communication and communion.” ibid., 58.
70 ibid., 60.
71 ibid. Referring to Aquinas, Collationes de ‘Credo in Deum’, Lent 1273, art. X (Opera, Parma ed.), 149.
together with its own integrity and its own activity. This is thanks to the role of the Holy Spirit, but is the world’s presence anything more than accidental? The notion of participation expands, but it is still viewed in an ecclesial context. There is a backdrop of history, but the human and historic matter only so far. Is “the world” adequately incorporated in its realism and “otherness” of its contribution? Furthermore, is this question relevant at all?

EARLY VIEW OF SYNERGY

To address these questions, I will analyse Congar’s notion of synergy in greater detail. Congar’s earlier work presents the synergy under the being of the church “in Christ.”72 How does “in Christ” relate to the Spirit? Congar does not view the new covenant between God and humanity inaugurated by Jesus Christ as merely historical or legal.73 It is a spiritual regime, individual and collective, inaugurated by the pouring of the Spirit on the Messiah and God’s people.74 How is it linked with Christ? This new kind of inheritance and regime (of God’s people) extends into the present. The sacraments are the signs of the covenant, which connect past, present and future, and Christ, according to Congar, inaugurates them.75 True, the sacraments achieve this, when celebrated in the way which suggests the role of the Spirit, but this role is not spelled out. Congar views this regime as the return of the world to God - the church is the world brought back under the authority of Christ.76 This shows Congar is after the incorporation of the world. How does this work?

The church “in Christ” is the church as “theandric reality” and is almost a single entity with Christ. “In Christ” means the influence, life and movement and actions of Christ in Christians.77 Christ dwells as the interior principle of their actions, which form the body of Christ, when under Christ’s impulse and in his name. To express this unity, Congar heavily employs the Augustinian image of soul and body.78 The church is then Christophany; it expresses Christ, who animates it, as the “visible body of his Spirit.”79 Thus a synergy is “the theandric reality of the church:” the church as the body of Christ is both gift, i.e. what is “already fulfilled” and manifests Christ (the visible church) and task.80 The latter is the Christ to be fulfilled – building his community body, when what is of value in the world is incorporated into God, and thus fulfils Christ. The gift and task are in dialectic in the earlier work and they are

72 I will look at the chapter “The church and its unity” from the Mystery of the Church.
73 Congar, Mystery of the Church, 15, 16.
74 ibid. 17, 18
75 20.
76 21.
77 26, 27.
78 See Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1, 80, about the Spirit as the principle of church, where the Spirit “performs in the Church that function that is carried out in the body by the soul.” Augustine, Tractates on the Gospel of John, Tractate 26, section 13, accessed online at http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1701026.htm on 20 October 2015
79 Congar, Mystery, 27.
80 ibid.
presented as synergy in the post-war work. While human aspect plays a part in this vision, emphasis on Christ, as earlier noted, made human communion and the role of the Spirit subservient. If communion is subservient, this cannot mean that what really happens in history is adequately affirmed. But how is the role of the Spirit related to this?

Congar’s early view of the church “in Christ” is consistent with this critique, as his emphasis on the apostolic ministry and sacraments shows. So, for him, the sacraments continue a theandric, that is to say divine human reality of Christ in the church - they are the “gift,” the church, which comes down from God as a structure. “Gift” is what establishes the church and ensures its unity and distinctiveness in the world. Sacramental actions constitute the “inmost fibre of the Mystical Body,” as they build the mystical body by joining humanity to Christ and nourishing it with divine fellowship and life.81 What is the role of the Spirit? Congar does not mention the Spirit with capital “S.” According to Congar, when celebrated in “modality of the spirit,” they (sacraments) establish a contact with the Lord and make the redeeming mystery of Christ present.82 There is no proper name, just modality. What has been said of sacraments extends to apostolic ministry: beside the sacraments as “inanimate, tangible means,” there are the “living means,” the “sacramental persons,” that is the apostolic ministry.83 While Congar seems to suggest the role of the Spirit, the perpetuation of the mystical Body by the sacraments and ministry (of the Roman Catholic Church) suggests that “theandric” is reserved to this church and happens in it organically, or automatically. This affirms human-divine contact, but takes the grace of God and divine activity in the church for granted.84

Such a view is not merely closed to the concrete experience of the community, but also presents the relation God-world, in which the social and cultural world is mere recipient. However, the emphasis on the Spirit brings in different logic. Famerée pointed out that such limiting of the work of the eschatological Spirit to the spiritual life suggested a dualism. The inner work of the Spirit and the outward work of the sacraments and apostolic ministry, “in Christ,” meant the latter were effective as such.85 Congar corrected himself later with a view of the Spirit working in the institution and in the faithful.86 This also points to a Christological weakness in Congar. Famerée rightly pointed that the physical and biological metaphors were on the side of continuity (and not “otherness”) between Christ and the church.87 Thus, the focus on incarnation risked clouding the new creation which the resurrection of Christ

81 ibid., 32, 33.
82 34.
83 35 – 36.
84 Congar in his later work himself wrote that speaking of grace (without a developed theology of the Spirit) Catholic theologians risked objectivizing grace and “separating it from the activity of the Spirit.” Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 69.
85 Famerée, L’Ecclésiologie, 153.
86 Congar in his later work writes that the Spirit “co-institutes” the church together with Christ and not only validates what he instituted. See Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 7.
87 Famerée, L’Ecclésiologie, 78, 79.
brings.\textsuperscript{88} The relation God-world did not reflect on Christ in his sufferings and resurrection, or the role of the Spirit in incorporating creation into Christ. On the other hand, Congar made a case of how the church engaged the world, to which the metaphors of incarnation contributed. Being “in Christ” emphasised its distinction in the political world, offering a different source and view of “power” or authority as pastoral, priestly and prophetic power.\textsuperscript{89} The church was not only “corpus politicum,” but also “corpus organicum or biologicum,” thus a different kind of body.\textsuperscript{90} But without an articulated role of the glorified Christ and the Spirit, this embodied presence relied too much on juridical and institutional, thus merely external, appeal. Such approach reduces the implications of incarnational imagery as well. By focusing on juridical and institutional, it precludes the development of the tangible aspect to include non-human world.

**The Corrective Pneumatological Aspect of Synergy**

In terms of the relation God-world and in light of Congar’s concern to address unbelief, such a view of incorporation of the world could not be satisfactory. With a more pronounced role of the Holy Spirit the whole picture of how God incorporates the world might change, even if Congar limits this to social-cultural reality. As I have already pointed out the Augustinian image of the church as a body and the Spirit as a soul of this body dominated Congar’s early presentation. However, the exposure to the ecclesial situation in the world eventually prompted him to revisit the use of the Augustinian image. It was, he contended, misused and reductive: in ecclesiology, the concept was basically used to validate the righteousness of the institution, its magisterium, dogmatic pronouncements and sacraments.\textsuperscript{91} The misuse in Congar’s view also extended to anthropology. The overstated juridical factor emphasised personal indwelling and did not have much to do with the life of the church. This was visible in that charisms were viewed as private vocation rather than service for the sake of the body.\textsuperscript{92} However, for Augustine, according to Congar, the Spirit “intervenes outside of and above” the institution and sacraments to produce saving efficacy in the unity of love.\textsuperscript{93} Congar connects this re-emergence of the role of the Spirit with the renewed understanding of the church as community with active persons engaged in the world.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{88} Famerée, ibid.
\textsuperscript{89} See Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, for participation of the church in the threefold office of Christ.
\textsuperscript{91} Yves Congar, *Called to Life*, (Slough: St Paul Publications, 1987), 63.
\textsuperscript{92} ibid.
\textsuperscript{94} ibid., 64. The dialogue between Catholic and Orthodox influenced this development. Congar quoted the Orthodox observers from the Vatican II: “If we were to prepare a treatise De Ecclesia, we would draft a chapter
The resulting view of the synergy of the human and divine is mirrored in the understanding of the church, spirituality and the world. According to Jossua, at the center of this re-emergence is Congar’s turn to the Patristic vision, in which ecclesiology is the ecclesiology of the Christian human being; that is, it encompasses anthropology, the “we” of Christians. This link of anthropology with Pneumatology was an antidote to an abstract theology of the church which focused exclusively “on the societal, juridical, and organized aspect of the Church.”

Jossua points out that Congar viewed the emphasis of the Catholic Church on the visibility of the church and its powers in the Catholic Church as a reaction against the secular encroachment on the papal power. Thus, Congar turned to the relation between God and the human being. To add to the Western theological anthropology, which reflected on the human as the image of God, “starting from the spirit of man,” he summoned the Eastern view of humanity as “a collaborator in creation.” The key concern was that there was no opposition between “the glory of God, which is the ultimate end of everything, and the happiness of man or the completion of the world.”

The reemergence of the role of the Spirit, and thus synergy, is connected with and responds to the ecclesial situation in the world. This presumes a relation with the world, which approaches it as more than an abstract entity and recipient, and also reaches beyond its socio-cultural aspect. What is this relation in Congar’s early work?

THEOLOGY OF REFORM AND THE CHURCH AS THE REALM OF THE SPIRIT’S ACTIVITY IN THE WORLD

This question invites looking deeper into Congar’s theology of reform. As in his work on divisions in Christianity, Congar situates reform in the divine plan of incorporating creation into divine life. He views the divine plan as a progressive movement whereby God realizes the intention to indwell the whole creation. This is a movement from divine promise to its realization, from particular (Abraham, Israel) to universal (the whole world).

Furthermore, this is a particular kind of progress. Congar applies the Teilhardian concept of “interiority” to the divine plan, thus its implications are wide-ranging, even if Congar at this moment looks predominately at the human world. This means the divine economy is realised as if from within, not by being externally imposed. God becomes “all in all” by filling creation and
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Congar, True and False Reform, 117.

fulfilling the freedom of the creature and overcoming alienation and conflict. Ultimately, this plan is realised in human lives by the Spirit. Thus the overall plan embraces the whole creation and is implicitly Pneumatological. But human participation in the divine plan is inscribed within this plan due to the role of Jesus Christ, through the (sacramental) participation in the sacrifice of Christ. Thus, following Congar’s thoughts on synergy, we return to the concept of participation. But what changes in the approach to participation and what does his theology of the Spirit contribute?

Congar’s synergy of gift and task presented the divine in terms of structure for the church. This was quite a static take on the divine movement in incarnation, which in a sense continued in the church. The emphasis on the Spirit, however, brought forth a more dynamic picture as it emphasised human historic activity, that is task. It was also more realist as it embraced human frailty and evil. As a result, participation is to be seen as human-divine activity in the world, which is the locus of the Spirit, and which is centred around the mystery of human-divine reality – a sacramental touch. This may be concluded in that for Congar the time and activity of the church are at the centre of this divine movement. This is its time in-between, an “already reality of the new and definite covenant,” where the church takes from the gifts of God (structure, sacraments, given by God), and has the task to return creation to God and is oriented to the future fullness. In this divine-human cooperation the time of the church is the time of the sacrament. The church continues the mission of Christ both as a sign of his presence and means for humans to enter and be in communion with God. God enters the flow of time to incorporate into Christ human beings made in the divine image. What proceeds from the Trinity and what proceeds from humanity meet in Christo. This Christological account of human participation, however, in due time will be challenged as “Christomonism.” The question I have, then, is how the event of the Spirit presents a dialectic of form and life of the church. This will give an insight into how the roles of Christ and the Spirit relate and what the emphasis on the Spirit brings to the relation God-world.

From the perspective of the relation God-world, however, such an account of the Spirit implies the distinctively creative and forward-looking aspect of this reform. It is first evoked by the philosophical milieu, to which Congar refers, and then reiterated by the reference to

101 Congar, Called to Life, 141-144. Interiority is the opposite of separation and isolation, conflict and disorder, which characterized the world. Loving God communicated Godself and sought to exist in the creation, thus the end was creation full with God’s presence. Since all would then possess God, there would be no separation and conflict. The interior presence of God meant the freedom of creation, since it enables creation acting from within itself realise itself without external constraints. Congar identified it with the “glorious liberty of the children of God” in the words of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans.

102 Congar, Called to Life, 146.

103 Congar, True and False Reform, 123.

104 ibid., 124, 125.

105 ibid., 127, 128.

106 On the two theological approaches to sacrament as “sign” of the presence of grace definitely given in Christ, and “instrument,” extending the humanity of Christ, see Famerée, L’Ecclésiologie, 314.

107 Congar, True and False Reform, 129.
“prophecy.” Reform for Congar is the activity of transcendent impulse, the intervention by the Spirit in the life of the church. As the church plays a part in incorporating creation, its visible and instrumental role means unique temptations, those of “Pharisaism” and the “Synagogue.” Both of them discuss the attitude to the tension between life and the forms that life takes. In “Pharisaism” the forms of the emerging life and the means to produce life become ends in themselves. In the “Synagogue,” the forms, which expressed the living experience, become fixed in time and space. Thus, as the divine plan tends towards the interior (like the law written on tablets over against the law written in hearts), there should be a constant concern to maintain a spiritual truth and meaning of things rather than their forms. Then, as a spirit always expresses itself or is embodied in particular forms, real faithfulness refuses allegiance to any stage prior to the perfect form. There has to be a fidelity to development, which seeks to find God’s intent in the movement of time and culture, through which God provokes the church to change. The church thus not only develops as a human and historical organism, but there is a “transcendent impulse of the Holy Spirit.”

This transcendent impulse, consonant with ecclesial movements, is presented vis-à-vis the structure, derived from in Christo.

The role of the Spirit comes forth when Congar reflects on the reality of prophecy in the life of the church, which has effects on Christology, and is open to the world. Reform for him is an “act” and he does not identify it with a gradual self-realization of the church; it is an “event” in the whole of its life. What I think is particularly important is that this “event” falls on the church in its historical life. This suggests that the world (or God through it) impresses it upon the church. And this implies an event of creativity in the tradition, which links this with the previous paragraph. But Congar contemplates the issue theologically,

108 ibid., 133.
109 See Congar, True and False Reform, 135. The idea is that life, as it emerges, is fixed in its expressions, “habits, memories, and institution.” In the end these become a system, and an end in itself. Congar relies on the way Péguy adopted the category élan vital (life-force) of Henri Bergson in Charles Péguy, et al. Le mystère des saints innocents; Note sur M. Bergson; Note conjointe sur M. Descartes, (Paris: Gallimard, 1935). Henri Bergson (1859-1941) was a French philosopher and one of the first proponents of process philosophy. The notion élan vital (life-force or continually developing vital impetus, which produces new forms) is found in his book Henri Bergson, Creative Evolution, (New York: Modern Library, 1944), 94-109.
110 Jossua explains this is as a move from the juridical aspect and cult to a personal and human aspect, see Jossua, Yves Congar, 114.
111 ibid., 115.
112 Congar, True and False Reform in the Church, 134.
113 ibid.
114 The creative aspect can be understood through the recognition of the conceptuality of Péguy in the term of “event” and prophecy as well as distinction of form and life. Henning Schmidgen has pointed how Péguy differentiated between history and tradition. If historical accounts compared to “a long railway line that runs along the coastline at a certain distance from it which allows one to stop at any station one wishes; tradition, the collective memory, in this metaphor is the coast itself, with its marshes, people, fishes, estuaries of rivers and streams, the life on land and the life on the sea.” Henning Schmidgen, “The materiality of things? Bruno Latour, Charles Péguy, and the history of science,” History of the Human Sciences published online 8 October 2012., 7. This refers to Charles Péguy, “Clio: Dialogue de l’histoire et de l’âme païenne” [Clio: Dialogue between History and the Pagan Soul], in C. Péguy, Œuvres en prose, 1909–1914 [Works in Prose, 1909–1914]. (Paris:
that is, as the activity of God through the world upon the church. Reform implies that the Spirit acts to maintain the dynamic truth of things with an aim to present the world with the true face of Christ. Counter to what appeared earlier, this means the continuity in the divine work is not automatic, but depends on the Spirit. The spiritual and charismatic reality of prophecy, in which humans participate, maintains it. The prophecy springs from the Holy Spirit, but reaches through individuals, who are non-conformist, because of their “second sense of fidelity.” This new sense of fidelity is the “launch of a new departure towards the goal,” whereby the individual arouses the church to become closer to Christ and revise the “style of Christ’s presence” vis-à-vis the world. Famerée, however, pointed out the limits of the focus on individuals due to the lack of Pneumatology. Congar’s attention to the life of the church in the world calls to develop the Pneumatological aspect, but what are the implications for Christological aspect?

CHRISTOLOGICAL PNEUMATOLOGICAL TENSION

The Christological aspect is no longer a static emphasis on structure, initiated by the incarnation. Let me look more closely at what Congar calls the Augustinian “dialectic of conversion.” In it the emphasis on sacraments is spelled out with reform in mind. There is an on-going dialectical movement between the exterior and interior, oriented at attaining genuine reality through external means. Congar reiterates Augustine’s distinction between sacramentum, “the external sacramental sign” and res, “interior reality of grace,” the objective of the sacrament. This means that there is a movement towards the goal, wherein the church of “means,” communio sacramentorum – sacraments, hierarchical ministry – is oriented to realise the church as – “the union of love in the body of Christ.”

Gallimard, 1959-1961), 268. Schmidgen pointed to Gilles Deleuze’s work on repetition and event in Péguy’s philosophy of history. In it tradition was understood not from “a particular end-point of a series of events,” but “from the unique event that is the reason for the process of passing something on in the first place, which sets the process in motion and continues it.” Schmidgen, Ibid., 9. See also Gilles Deleuze, Difference and Repetition, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994). In such understanding of tradition, “True reading persuades a text to start over again, and makes it into an event, which comes to the reader in the present moment from far away.” Schmidgen, Ibid., 10. This would apply both to the event of incarnation and to the new beginning of reform.

115 Jossua, Yves Congar, 111.
116 Congar, True and False Reform in the Church, 169, 171.
117 Jossua, 112.
118 The lack of a theology of the Holy Spirit precluded Congar from developing a comprehensive vision of the church as prophetic. Famerée pointed out the problems of a focus on the “prophetic” individual and restricting the prophetic role in teaching to the hierarchic ministry. Thus the prophetic role was monopolised by the magisterium, with other “prophets” relegated to the sphere of private revelations, and the faithful confined to the margins. Famerée, L’Ecclesiologie, 117, 118.
119 Congar, True and False Reform, 192
This goal is achieved in the actual life of the church, in worship, sacrifice and priesthood, which in the process achieves fullness and authenticity. Thus, Congar works within primarily Christological imagery. However, the turn to the concrete life of the church requires the role of the Spirit to be more pronounced. So, it seems to me, there is an impulse from the living church to adapt the theology behind the church’s structure.

This impulse is Pneumatological as it presents the church as the realm of the activity of the Spirit in the world. I turn to Congar’s “the conditions for authentic reform without schism,” to support my claim. Congar begins from the living and vibrant reality of the church (rather than the metaphysical concepts). Second, it emphasises that the reality of initiatives is ambivalent; when one starts from the concrete reality there is a mix. Congar describes this ambivalence using the Möhler’s concepts of Gegensatz (contrast) and Widerspruch (contradiction). This means that the healthy life of the communion has contrasts (antitheses) and the unity of the church is the ultimate test of the ideas: the contradiction is when contrast might rip out the unity of the church, become self-sufficient and create schism, a wrong “one-sidedness.” So, Congar embraces the church as a living and dynamic reality, “the organism given life by the Holy Spirit,” who harmonizes diversities. The faith, then, is the faith lived out: the “integrity of faith does not consist in the sum of all the truths but in the living exchange, within the church, of doctrinal truths which manifest in different ways the one reality lived in faith in charity.” The life of the church, under the activity of the Spirit, is what maintains the integrity of faith. Thus, through the account of reform, one sees the picture of the church, which is Pneumatological. But in what way does this matter in the relation God-world?

To discern these implications, I turn to how Congar explains which reform is true. This will show how this Pneumatological picture deals with the life of the church in the world. First, Congar contends that one has to begin from the concrete life of the church, rather than an abstract theological system. The reform is authentic if love and real concrete life and not the intellectuality of the (theological) system are primary. Congar’s point in making a distinction is not so much to distinguish theory and practice, but to criticize the conceptions of theory which are beyond time and space. Thus, life is wider than the intellectual system and it tests the systems, not vice versa. Second, the truth is found in and together with the
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communion of the church. This re-iterates the important activity of the Holy Spirit, who enlivens and actualizes the whole Body of Christ.\textsuperscript{129} This does not mean that the church can explicitly and fully give an account of the truth it carries, but that it learns on the go. Because of this “prophetic” aspect, the thoughts and activities are justified or validated by the ecclesial community, which is both norm and boundary line.\textsuperscript{130} Third, this requires “patience with delays.”\textsuperscript{131} The intellectual and dialectical viewpoints aim at purity and strain life through their sieves and tend to separate. The painful path towards fullness requires patience,\textsuperscript{132} when the community tests the ideas and activities through its own life until “novelty is assimilated into unity.”\textsuperscript{133} Lastly, the novelty is not introduced forcefully, since genuine renewal comes through tradition.\textsuperscript{134} Thus the life of the church develops by contemplative, spiritual adapting, “a new intensification of love of God and of people,” coming from the paschal mystery.\textsuperscript{135} Thus, this account shows ecclesial life in the world is key, but how the world as such contributes is not immediately clear. Such contribution would have to imply the Spirit’s work in extra-ecclesial world.

If the ecclesial life in the world is essential, what is the nature of such an omission? This Pneumatological account of human-divine activity comes along the image of participation of humanity in God, centred around the mystery of Christ. But is this account of human-divine activity inviting, or responsive towards an unbelieving and suffering world? Perhaps a deeper look at Congar’s Christology will give an answer. Congar’s ecclesiology gives a hint in this direction. He reflects on the institutional church (primarily the Roman Catholic) as the realm of the work of the Spirit in the world. If the role of the Spirit is merely to validate the institution, this presents the world with a challenge to accept this institutional and juridical reality. But Congar’s intent is different. He wants to present the church as human-divine mystery. The distinction hinges on Congar’s Christology, which undergirds his view of mediation, i.e. the role the church plays in mediating divine action, to which I turn next. This discussion requires looking at the participation of humanity in divine activity and the role of the Holy Spirit in Christology, i.e. how they interact. I will ask what kind of logic would support Congar’s apparent assertion of priority of the divine institution over the human life (community) of the church. Other authors have convincingly argued, and later Congar would agree, that life (community) is as basic as structure (hierarchical institution).\textsuperscript{136} I address this issue because my primary concern is not ecclesiological, but rather how the changes in thinking concerning the roles of Christ and the Spirit affect the view of human-divine

\textsuperscript{129} ibid., 229.
\textsuperscript{130} 232.
\textsuperscript{131} 265 – 274.
\textsuperscript{132} For contrast of Catholic “fullness” and Protestant “purity,” see Congar, \textit{Tradition and Traditions}, 152.
\textsuperscript{133} Congar, \textit{True and False}, 282.
\textsuperscript{134} ibid., 291.
\textsuperscript{135} 298.
\textsuperscript{136} Famerée, “True or False Reform,” 7, 17. On Congar’s evolution, see Congar, “My Path-findings,” 169. He presents the church as community with the structure, a structured community, without separating structure and life.
cooperation. Thus, the look at human-divine synergy leads to the issue of participation of humanity in God.

CHRIST AND HUMAN DIVINE COOPERATION

I have earlier shown that Congar assesses the human participation in the divine activity as primarily ecclesial, coming from the relation of Christ and the church, his mystical body. This discussion has led to the issue of “mediation,” a Christological emphasis on the institution and structure of the church and the effect it had for Pneumatological emphasis on community. Now I will look at how and why Congar moves towards a more pronounced role of the Holy Spirit and how his evolving understanding of the world’s participation in God serves that move.

ANALOGY OF CHRIST AND THE CHURCH: THE EMPHASIS ON HUMANITY

It is necessary to show first that for Congar humanity has a role to play in the divine activity and affirms the role of humanity in synergy. Congar insists on the link between Christology, ecclesiology and Mariology, i.e. the question of the “scope and extent of creaturely cooperation with the Creator.”137 The Christological basis of this cooperation leads to the role humanity plays in the church. For Congar humanity participates in Christ’s mediation. So, he presents a horizontal (historical, institutional) continuity of Christ’s work in the church, over against Karl Barth’s ecclesiology based on vertical event, i.e. intervention of the Spirit, the immediate divine act without human mediation.138 According to Congar, this difference boils down to the fact that the role the humanity of Christ plays is not sufficiently acknowledged. The reasons are Christological. Congar claims that when Martin Luther opposed Scholastic “theologia gloriae” with “theologia crucis,” he approached God solely in the drama of salvation, in which God is as it were substituted for the human being. Consequently, there was no view of human-divine co-operation, the communication of intrinsic human divine properties in Jesus Christ. Salvation was the sole act of God.139 Congar, on the other hand, looks at the part the humanity of Christ plays in causing salvation, which brings humanity back

138 Even if as Kimlyn Bender argues there is in later Barth “a truly incarnational ecclesiology” uniting divine activity and human society in the church in time and space, in the early work Congar is dealing with, the church “was predominately portrayed as invisible and ahistorical.” Especially note that the image of “communio sanctorum is an event and has its history in many events,” which does not amount to the continuity Congar proposes. See Kimlyn J. Bender, Karl Barth’s Christological Ecclesiology. (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2013.), 168, 166.
Congar contends for the unreduced role humanity plays in human divine participation, which is important for my argument.

On the other hand, at this stage Congar avoids the image of the church as the continuity of incarnation and presents human and divine in the church as bound by covenant. Thus, two natures with proper operations (inconfusable) are indivisibly linked in one person in Christ, but this cannot apply to the ontology of the church. So looking at the role of the incarnation, he also looks at the limits of the analogy between the church and Christ. He asks what the role of the divine nature and person in the church would play even if the church strictly speaking does not have these. Congar’s intent is to show that the image of “continued incarnation,” when applied to the church, has its limits. It is beneficial when it presents the church at once visible and invisible, having a theandric (human-divine) and kenotic structure. This means the divine law of incarnation guides the church as “the law of Incarnation.” Misconceptions of the union of God and the human in Jesus Christ also apply to the church— it is an error to exclude the human side, identify the church with the kingdom of God and dismiss the essentially historic nature of the church. The parallelism, however, is that of structure and functional dependence. The church is conjoined to God by means of the covenant and not being, i.e. functionally, and this cooperation is reserved for certain operations. Thus, he concludes, in the church, divine and human are more inconfusable than indivisible.

EMPHASIS ON HUMANITY AND THE ROLE OF THE SPIRIT

Congar’s emphasis on humanity together with the limits of the image of incarnation requires looking at the role of the Spirit in Jesus Christ. Ecclesiology gives a clue. Central to Congar’s affirmation of the humanity in the church is the role the humanity of Jesus Christ plays in salvation. United to divinity without confusion and division, it is also the humanity of Jesus, which becomes the instrument of salvation. As such it is the basis of human participation in the continuing mediation of Christ through the church. Congar uses several images in his argument against Barth. This participation is illustrated with the image of the lake - if the church is a lake, it is fed from Christ as a distant source by a human, external and visible conduit. It is an “external action” together with the operation of the Spirit, acting from

---

140 Congar, Ibid., 29.
142 Ibid., 71.
143 73.
144 Ibid.
146 Ibid., 32. This is not the only image of human-divine interaction for Congar. The two other images are the immediate, vertical “event” of rain, like the proposal of Barth (35) and the image of fullness (which fills the church as “internal spring”) and is reserved for eschatology (ibid.). Congar’s “eirenic,” ecumenical proposal is the merge of vertical and horizontal. (See 37.)
within. Congar views the apostolic ministry as the conduit which mediates grace and links historical and eschatological aspects. How does he substantiate his view? He draws from Irenaeus, that for humans to be truly united with God, Christ had to be God, and thus, in him humanity was truly united with God. But then Congar looks at what is after the incarnation – the time of the church – as also extending human participation in God. He substantiates the claim for the apostolicity of the church through the Irenaean affirmation of the historicity of the incarnation. The doctrine of succession as “formulated by Irenaeus” is for him “like that of the historic Incarnation, of unique importance in the part it plays in bringing about our union with God himself.” But is this reference enough?

What does this presentation of “external action” as conduit and the role of the Spirit as merely animating what was established and determined suggest? Does not it suggest that in addressing the unbelieving world it is not the intimate relations between God-world and humanity, but rather the “external” institution that comes first? Does not this present a danger of presenting human mediation as autonomous and sufficient in itself? Once looked at from the perspective of the unbelieving world, which Congar sought to address, a need of a Pneumatological aspect is clear. Furthermore, this is a need of a full-fledged Pneumatology, where the Spirit not merely validates, but participates in constituting, and also has an eschatological – cosmological – scope. Drawing from Congar’s arguments so far, I would like to present the following claim: in order to show that the human being plays a role in divine activity fully, one has to fully acknowledge the role of the Spirit. But this claim makes sense even when reading the analogy of the church and Christ.

ROLES OF CHRIST AND THE SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH

When Congar looks at the divine operations in the church, there is the link between the human and the Spirit. It extends to the institutional reality of the church and to its members. Congar argues that properly divine actions in the church, (the proper principle of which cannot be a creature), its “powers” and “institution” do not have being apart from God.

147 55. On the criticism of the dualist relegation of the Spirit as acting merely “within,” see Famerée, L’Écclésiologie, 151. This shows the Pneumatological weakness of this stage - the eschatology seems to have nothing new to offer. The Spirit merely accompanies and does not co-institute the ministry and sacraments.
148 Congar, ibid., 34.
149 ibid.
150 This is remedied in Congar’s later work with a more elaborate reference to Irenaeus. Congar returns to the view of apostolicity in the context of the image of “two hands” of God in bringing creation back to God. He presents the role of the apostles in founding the church in that they communicated the Spirit. Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 9, referring to Irenaeus, The Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching, paragraph 41, accessed online at http://www.ccel.org/ccel/irenaeus/demonstr.iv.html on 28 October 2015.
151 Congar, Sainte Eglise, 78, 79.
They continually need the intervention of God.\textsuperscript{152} This precludes any self-sufficiency or automatism of the action of the church as institution. On the personal level, this divine-human operation of the church implies the virtues of faith, hope and love, and the spiritual gifts.\textsuperscript{153} The human church embraces persons with their human and historical freedom. They are efficacious because they participate in the work of God, but are also free.\textsuperscript{154} So returning to the Chalcedonian framework, it is the Holy Spirit who makes, “two operations, two wills in the church, relevant to two natures” work in the church.\textsuperscript{155} Like true humanity, the church is in development, realising itself in human history and honouring the liberty of human wills. The church is a divine mystery: God brings it about and acts in it through Christ, with the sacraments as means. But this church also encompasses the persons, their consciences, who are subjects of freedom and action, and this is where the Spirit acts.\textsuperscript{156}

Thus, there is for Congar a distinction between Jesus Christ and the church (not so visible in the earlier work) as the church does not have a divine nature. The church participates in divine acts. How? His answer seeks to combine the roles of Christ and the Spirit. So, God has entered human history in incarnation and instituted the “visible relay” of operations, sacramental means, which create community when God makes them effective.\textsuperscript{157} These sacramental means generate the community of believers, who know, love and commune with God. But this community is not only outward but presupposes that grace creates in the them certain dispositions, which Congar calls “supernatural habitus.”\textsuperscript{158} What was initiated in the incarnation of Christ together with the work of the Spirit correspond to divine nature in the church, according to Congar. Thus Christ and the Spirit are behind “supernatural operations in the faithful and the institution as such,” as their immediate principle, while these are also human activities.\textsuperscript{159} They are not pure acts of God, but also real acts of the church and its

\textsuperscript{152} Here it is not visible, but Congar’s later work explicitly refers to the role of the Spirit: “the Spirit must actively intervene in the case of any activity that is related to the sacramental or ‘hierarchical’ institution.” Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, vol. 2, 45.

\textsuperscript{153} Congar, \textit{Sainte Eglise}, Ibid.

\textsuperscript{154} ibid., 79. For Congar a theology of spiritual gifts was one of the ways theology of the Holy Spirit was present in Western theology and developed in Scholasticism, even if clouded by Christology., see Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, Vol. 1, 117-120.

\textsuperscript{155} Congar, \textit{Sainte Eglise}, 81.

\textsuperscript{156} ibid., 82.

\textsuperscript{157} 85.

\textsuperscript{158} ibid. Here Congar refers to Thomas’s “\textit{habitus} or ‘haviors,’” which come from God. Thomas Aquinas, \textit{Summa Theologica}, Ia Ilae, q. 68, a. 3, ad 2. These interrelate free human activity and the divine action “for he is so acted upon, by the Holy Ghost, that he also acts himself, in so far as he has a free-will. Therefore he needs a habit.” Accessed online at \url{http://www.newadvent.org/summa/2068.htm#article3}, 29 October 2015. Congar translates “habit” by “haviour,” see Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, Vol. 1, p. 124, note 18. The idea is that as human seeks to attain divine life, only God can make human act divinely, but it has to be humans, who act. Thomas, Congar shows, achieves this through “theological virtues and especially charity,” whereby human goes beyond human mode and achieve God, while at the same time given by God as “haviours.” Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, Vol. 2, 135.

\textsuperscript{159} Congar, \textit{Sainte Eglise}, 85.
members. These Pneumatological accents comply with Congar’s experiential approach to life in the community, his participation in movements and the role of prophetic individuals.

These developments, however, require a pronounced role of the person of the Spirit. The church as communion means the subjects in Jesus Christ are real subjects, who act according to the grace given by the Holy Spirit, as if that was their nature.\textsuperscript{160} The institution is also viewed as an instrumental relay of faith – handing on of what is received – which needs the intervention of the Holy Spirit, and is not autonomous. Consequently, the mysticism of the church is that of the communion, not union (as in Christ). In it the grace and spiritual gifts in the lives of individuals are like a divine nature.\textsuperscript{161} There was openness to the movement of the Spirit, but the presentation of the role of the Spirit cannot be viewed as sufficient. Congar responded to “organicist … biologico-organic … romantic” presentations of the mystery of the church, which insisted on “continued Incarnation.”\textsuperscript{162} The theology of the Spirit, while present, does not, in my view, go far enough. Congar still views the community as the fruit of, and thus subservient to, the institution of the church. This points to a problem of a better conceptualization of the relation of Jesus Christ and the Spirit, where their relation is more reciprocal.\textsuperscript{163} Consequently, in the divine human cooperation the human, historical and concrete worldly aspect was still subjected to the institution. Theology of the Spirit also appears as a function of ecclesiology, due to its subjection to Christology. So, is there a space for manoeuvre in Congar’s Christology?

**THE ROLE OF HUMANITY OF CHRIST AND SACRAMENTAL CONTACT**

There is in Congar a Christological tension, which falls along the lines of the beginning point of Christology – is it metaphysics or salvation history? The previous lines of inquiry of the relation of human and divine (synergy in the world) all lead to the person of Christ and the role of the Spirit in Jesus Christ. I now take a closer look at Congar’s discussion on the person and natures of Christ. Following the analogy between the church and Christ, the look at the “person” and “nature” in Jesus Christ might throw some light on the relation of structure and

\begin{footnotes}
\item[160] ibid., 86.
\item[161] 87. Spiritual gifts are distinct from the virtues in the theology of Thomas in that they enable to act beyond human means due to the movement by superior principle. They are not mere gifts, but rather “spirits,” pointing to inspiration. They point to the leading by the Holy Spirit. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, Vol. 1, 119. They are “‘inspirations’ that are generously listened to in generously given freedom.” This means for Congar that in Thomas institution always presupposes and calls for event of the Spirit. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, Vol. 2, 135.
\item[162] ibid., 96.
\item[163] 97. I think Congar’s turn to the Spirit at this moment is still primarily within classic western Augustinian and Aquinas’s view of the Spirit. Eventually he will re-work it with an eye to Orthodox theology. It is helpful to anticipate at this stage, that as Work suggested, “Vladimir Lossky and many other Orthodox theologians regularly alleged that Western Scholasticism depersonified the Holy Spirit by misconstruing his relation as the Father’s and Son’s shared nature, and reasserted the classic Eastern doctrine of the Spirit’s single procession from the Father.” Telford Work, “Pneumatology” in Kelly M. Kapic and Bruce L. McCormack. *Mapping Modern Theology: a Thematic and Historical Introduction*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2012), 231.
\end{footnotes}
community. Congar begins from a metaphysical perspective, so person for him is not the moral and psychological individual conscience.\textsuperscript{164} This would be metaphysical nature or the type of the thing. The metaphysical person means for him an original and incommunicable existence that is what distinguishes this individual from another.\textsuperscript{165} Christ’s human nature, according to Congar, exists as incommunicable (individual) from his conception by virtue of a metaphysical principle of being, the divine person, the Son of God. And the Word is the metaphysical principle of this “created and incommunicable existence,” the “I,” who plays the role of an “actually existing human personality.”\textsuperscript{166} Congar’s reflection of the church leads to the heart of Christological debate, which led to Chalcedon.\textsuperscript{167} If the “I” of Jesus Christ is the eternal Word and not a human person, then, this would explain why this takes from the emphasis on community, when the analogy is extended to the church.

But there is a different line of argument in Congar, which does not begin from metaphysical language, but which also bears on the humanity of Christ and better expresses his intent. When he emphasises the humanity of Christ, instead of looking at ontology (how humanity and divinity are metaphysically related), he turns to the economy, that is the history of salvation. This leads him to propose that through since incarnation, God governs the creation also through the humanity of Christ. This humanity is “spiritual, free and independent in a human sense … it is supremely and integrally holy in itself … [it is the] sacred Humanity of Jesus … in itself and as humanity, raised to an admirable dignity and filled with power and holiness.”\textsuperscript{168} This affirmation of free and intelligent humanity comes with the implications of the sanctifying role of the Spirit.\textsuperscript{169} This emphasis on the humanity of Christ is not only a hint towards the role of the Holy Spirit in Christ, but also has implications for the relation God-world. This comes forth in his argument for horizontal, historical continuity in the church. Congar discusses the “sacred humanity of Jesus,” but this time his emphasis is not on Christ as Head, principle of salvation and sanctification of the church.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{164} Congar, \textit{Christ, Our Lady and the Church}, 47. Nature - “the principle that determines existence to a certain type in the scale of perfection and activity ... a thing’s type [italics mine.]... its qualifications, faculties and structure of activity.” Person – “a sheeply existential principle by which the individual is so real that it exists in its own proper being, wholly original, incommunicable, incapable of fusion with another.” [italics mine.]
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{165} On the theological sources of this discussion, see how Congar presents the views of Boethius, Richard of Saint-Victor and Thomas Aquinas in \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, vol. 3, 104, 118. Metaphysical as distinct from psychological and moral personality, determines “an individual nature to an existence incommunicable and wholly its own.” Congar, \textit{Christ, Our Lady and the Church}, 50.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{166} ibid., 50, 51.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{168} ibid., 52, 53.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{169} As the link with the later work makes clear, see Congar, \textit{The Word and the Spirit}, 91, 92. “In the West, the Fathers expressed this consecration of Christ by the Spirit in terms of the grace of Christ as the Head, which made him the principle of salvation and sanctification for his body.” Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, vol. 1, 21.
\end{flushleft}
It is rather the humanity that links the life of God via the incarnation of Christ and the present church. Congar contrasts it with the Protestant image of the church, which is vertical, in that the continuity is not in time and space, but rather “in the invisible sphere of our risen Lord.” In this view the faithful are connected with the cross not through a historical and visible link, but by a direct act of God, “invisible and unforeseeable” event and response of faith. As both traditions affirm the formula of Chalcedon, Congar suggests this should imply faith in the “sacred Humanity of Christ, the instrument of divinity.” So how in this view did Christ in the flesh reach into the present? It is, for Congar, not a mere moral influence or pledge of the grace. It is rather that salvation means a contact and redemptive action has a direct, one could say physical, effect. Physical means that it effectively causes salvation, the contact with Christ continuing through the historical realities issued by him. This contact penetrates the world and history. Furthermore, this contact points to the divine action, but also requires an action from below. “God’s gift in each sacrament must enter into a movement of devotion which goes out from us to God.” Congar seeks to evade any spiritualist presentations of the church while making a case for the visible and even “political” presence of the divine activity in the world. The role of incarnation is key in this attempt and thus has to be maintained. Furthermore, the implications of such view of incarnation can be extended to non-human creation and thus maybe further developed. This “power,” though, is not to be associated merely with institution and the juridical aspect of the church. This “power” should point to the Holy Spirit and engage the unbelieving world. How is this possible?

Thus, according to Congar, the church as human-divine does not have divine nature, but participates in divine activity. This comes about through divine movement in incarnation, reflected in the deposit of faith and transmission of three apostolic powers of priesthood, spiritual governance and teaching magisterium. But this also comes about through participation of persons in God through faith and love, and spiritual gifts, thanks to the activity of the Spirit, who forms spiritual communion. Thus, the church does not have divine personality (that is metaphysical personality) as the body of Christ. However, Christ and humanity, thanks to his being a human being, form “like” one person, in which the Holy Spirit

170 Yves Congar, *Christ, Our Lady and the Church*, 35. Even in the later work Barth wrote “communio sanctorum is an event and has its history in many events.” This would still allow Congar’s metaphor to hold. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of Reconciliation IV*. 2 (London, New York: T&T Clark, 2010), p. 652, quoted in Bender, *Karl Barth’s Christological Ecclesiology*, p. 166
171 Yves Congar, *Christ, Our Lady and the Church*, 36.
172 *ibid.*, 39. Congar takes the formula from Thomas Aquinas, whose approach, according to Congar is that of Cyril of Alexandria and John Damascene, see *ibid*, note 52. Especially note Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, III, Q 7, A 1, ad 3.
173 Congar, *ibid.*, 40.
174 63.
175 Congar, *Sainte Eglise*, 85.
176 *ibid.*, 86-87.
177 88-90.
acts. Here he refers to his holy humanity, which acts as an instrument, thanks to the activity of the Holy Spirit, who imparts divine life and forms into Christ. This leads him to the economy of salvation – Congar refers here to two acts of “espousal” of human nature by Christ, in incarnation and in baptism. This is a dynamic kind of unity, which is a covenant, not a substantial unity. So, referring once again to the Creed, Congar contends that when Fathers and Scholastics explain “I believe in the Holy Spirit, the Holy Catholic Church ... they say: I believe in the Holy Spirit, not simply in himself, but in the Church, making it One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic.” Thus human element in the church is “akin to content of Christ’s humanity, which passes beyond what is purely human and proclaims divine presence.” This, consequently, “as a sign, a parable or a sacrament, has the power to draw” human minds towards God revealed through sensible realities, that is the visible church.

Congar’s account makes a case for a political presence of the church, which is also a participation in God. However, its Christology is ambiguous. He affirms divine movement in incarnation as in a sense continuing in the structure of the church. It is distinct from the activity of the Spirit. Thus, it cannot avoid presenting the church as primarily institution simply because Congar does not show how the Spirit acts in the life of Christ. On the other hand, this focus on embodied divine presence in the world shows a way forward: it points to salvation history, where there is the relation between humanity of Christ and the Spirit. How the mission of the Holy Spirit fulfils this emphasis on the humanity of the Son will have to be examined later. But what does this discussion contribute to the relation God-world? When looking from the perspective of the embodied presence in the world, the account of participation is nourished by several Pneumatological aspects. There is the work of the Spirit in human persons, then there is the activity of the Spirit in Christ as the head of humanity and the church, and third, there is an implied activity of the Spirit in the sacrament. This third aspect pointed to the necessary movement from below to complement divine activity and also to the healing of the world. The latter issue indicates that Congar’s view of incarnation, which primarily focuses on that which was instituted is reductive. Thus the turn to the Spirit does need not to oppose incarnationalist understanding of the church, but rather expand and deepen it. The non-human world is present in the church and participates in its task of bringing all creation into divine presence, as sacramental celebrations show. Thus, together with the other two they not only imply the activity of the Spirit, but also acknowledge the complex ecclesial, human and cosmic reality in this return to God.

Concluding remarks to Chapter Two

178 ibid., 90.  
179 93.  
180 Yves Congar, Christ, Our Lady and the Church, 68.  
181 ibid.  
182 ibid.  
183 I owe this point to my supervisor Ivana Noble.
In this chapter I began with an observation that different ecclesial movements after the Second World War correlate with Congar’s emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit. Congar did not make a connection, but his pneumatic view of synergy, approached from the perspective of the relation God-world, suggests it. So, I looked at this notion of synergy, which presented church as human-divine cooperation and brought together an intimate experience of God and involvement in the world. I concluded that Congar rightly began from the concrete life, which required articulating a theology of the Spirit, and then offered a critique of his account of cooperation.

I think it was rightly criticized as reductive and shown to imply that the role of the Spirit is subservient to that of Christ. So I explored if the criticism does not apply to Congar’s Christology, which also regulated his view of how humanity (the world) and God relate, which is my primary interest. While the focus on incarnation affirmed ecclesial presence and incorporation of the world into divine life, it lacked emphasis on the risen Christ and the novelty the Spirit brings. This must have also constrained the view of interaction with the world. Next I identified in Congar’s work an ambiguity as to his Christology, more in tune with Congar’s account of synergy. It emphasized the sacred humanity of Christ and began not from the metaphysics, but from economy of salvation.

This chapter helped present a Pneumatological view of the church as human-divine synergy – in its life and practice in the world. But it also showed that the adequate vision of divine-human (and worldly) cooperation requires developing the personal role of the Spirit. As to the relation of the Spirit and the world, this chapter presented the world as interlocutor of the church and the church as the realm of the Spirit’s activity in the world. As it pointed to the embodied divine presence in the world and the synergy, it drew attention to the wider presence of this eschatological Spirit. The Spirit was present in human persons and in the activity in the church, and the activity of the Spirit was implied in the sacraments. Thus, the return to God implicated the world. But the presence of the world as such was merely reflective. The reflection on the role of the Spirit, however, seems to require a more complex and nuanced view of the world. In this way, the second chapter has initiated an argument that through the activity of the Spirit a creative human and worldly work is at the same time the work of God.
Chapter Three. The Laity and Participation in God through the World

Chapter three concludes the presentation of Yves Congar’s initial vision by showing its “outward” trajectory in the theology of laity. This will give a view of how Congar’s vision of the world’s participation in God extended when he sought to relate a person’s spiritual experience and engagement in the world. I will begin by situating this vision in the theological struggles of his time, which was to transcend the focus on the church and open it up to the changed situation of the world. After looking at reform in the church, in chapter three I follow Congar as he reassesses the role of the church in the world. Continuing from Chapter two, I will show that this ecclesial move “outward” completes the move “inward,” i.e. return to the sources, and that the role of the Spirit is behind both. This will lead to his theological vision itself.

In the analysis, I will suggest that the vision of the world’s (taken in both a narrow sense as socio-cultural and a wider sense of all creation) participation in God and divine activity in the world requires turning to the role of the Holy Spirit. The relation of Christ and the Spirit, pointed out earlier, now will revolve around the role the mediation of Christ plays in this world. This focus will give a different angle to view the synergy – as the activity of the world and God (and not only the church). I will look more closely at what the notions of participation and mediation imply. Is this a real and direct participation in God? And, on the other hand, is it truly an engagement in the world? Are both directly linked and exactly what role does the theology of the Spirit play in this? These questions are pivotal to my thesis that the authentic creative work of human beings and cosmos is at the same time the work of God through the role of the Spirit.

Situating Congar’s Theology of Laity: The Relation Church – Socio-Cultural World

The interaction of church and society in the Catholic Church in France became a matter of growing intense contention around the summer of 1953. Later, in September of that year the question of the “worker-priests” was considered, Congar’s colleagues from Saulchoir were summoned to Rome and the surveillance became closer.1 So, the issue of “worker-priests” put the relation of church and society in focus, as O’Meara pointed out: “the object of ceaseless publicity was one experiment aimed at drawing the church into contact with ordinary life: the priest worker.”2 Priests as “brothers and theological commentators” took
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1 Congar, Dialogue, 42.
jobs in factories and joined the political struggle for the welfare of workers. Rome stopped the experiment. Congar, unlike Chenu, was not directly involved, but identified with the movement thanks to which “the Church was again heard by the poor, and perhaps the most important thing yet, the poor were again heard in the Church.” However, for him this was only a fragment in the period from 1947 to the end of 1956. Congar wrote about this time as “nothing but an uninterrupted sequence of denunciations, warnings, restrictive or discriminatory measures, suspicious interventions.” He was exiled from Saulchoir, all of his writings were subjected to central censorship. Congar and others (Chenu, de Lubac, Feret) responded with fidelity, submission and evangelical serenity, which eventually “triumphed over every hope of the system which was stifling them.” Why was this issue important?

It seems that in this practical issue the theology of relation of the world and grace was affected. Thus this was not the drama of individuals, but of the school of thought, which reviewed how theology interacts with life. Congar wrote: “the French Dominicans have been persecuted and reduced to silence because they have been the only ones who have had a certain freedom of thought, initiative and expression.” So, the school’s notion of development of faith in interaction with life, represented by Möhler’s notion of living and developing tradition, was an object of concern. However, introduced into the French-speaking world, this theology later entered into the discussions and texts of Vatican II. Then, this interaction with life meant the theology of Saulchoir brought into the interplay the awareness of society, philosophical tools and the living sap of the Gospel. O’Meara writes about Pierre Chaillet that “the active interplay of nature and grace in Aquinas and Möhler’s theology of the church living through the Spirit in history” led him to work out a theology of engagement and enabling action. It seems that “prophetic” in the church came to the fore in this creative vitality.

The theologians were later rehabilitated, attended and worked on the Constitutions of Vatican II, bringing their ideas into its documents. However, they interpreted their difficulties differently. According to O’Meara, Chenu and Congar interpreted it as “historical development of ecclesiial forms and the struggle of each age for its proper and creative theology.” This lays an emphasis on evolution. O’Meara himself, however, together with Feret sees in it the conflict of individuals vs. system, and a need to relate the spirit of the Gospel with the issues of justice and human rights. Here the emphasis is more on the rift of
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3 ibid.
4 Congar, Dialogue, 33.
5 ibid., 32.
6 33.
7 ibid.
9 ibid., 16.
10 O’Meara, Ibid., 13.
11 ibid., 16.
the dominant attitudes of the past and realignment with some more pertinent cultural issues. The influence of theologians extended to the council of the whole (Catholic) church in Vatican II, and, according to O’Meara, transformed the face of the church. The movements and theologies of 1950’s “drawn from a perspective of grace active in a hopeful world … were soon accepted at Vatican II.”

It is necessary in my view to discern the spirit of their efforts. Richard McBrien suggested that this difficult period, if forgotten, might lead to justifying some pre-Vatican II ideas by appealing to the name of Congar and portions of his theology. However, Congar’s notion of evolution is not to be viewed as less “prophetic.” It is rather the focus on the divine-human cooperation in the life of the church: “firstly … God is in charge and accomplishes His gracious design through us” and this activity is also a suffering, patience: “secondly that, in all great things, delay is necessary for their maturation.” This points to the patience of the sower, wherein the suffering of the cross necessarily plays a part. The result is genuineness, depth and power, right to be heard and respected. This chapter will look at how Congar expanded his view of cooperation beyond earlier concern for reform in his theology of lay people.

THEOLOGY OF LAITY AS A BRIDGE

Theology of laity in my view significantly contributes to the picture of God and humanity acting together and implies a wider notion of the world than merely human world. This theology springs from a spiritual experience (of the lay people), which also comes forth as engaged in the world. Thus it builds a bridge between an eternal God and a transitory world, which in my view requires the theology of the Holy Spirit. To show this necessary role of the Spirit, I will focus on two major tensions in Congar’s account of participation, which he seeks to address. The first is Congar’s attempt to reconcile two theses, what he calls “the eschatological and evolutionist-incarnationist theses.” The evolutionary thesis asserts the continuity between the work of cosmic process, secular history and the eschatological kingdom. Thus it affirms the activity, creativity and freedom of the world – in it earthly realities are progressively spiritualized. The “dualist-eschatological” is not so optimistic about worldly reality: the eschatological kingdom is transcendent to the earthly historical progress and a process of preparation to the kingdom. Thus it affirms the direct activity of God. As Congar attempts to reconcile them, he seeks to affirm the process of evolution of the creation, the activity of human being and the activity of God at the same time. My primary interest lies in the theological basis of Congar’s optimism, which is, in my view, due to his

12 ibid.
14 Dialogue, 45.
15 Ibid.
16 Congar, Lay People, 103.
17 ibid., 85 and 86.
accent on the two divine Persons, the Son and the Spirit in articulating the divine participation in the world.

But how does Congar reconcile these theses? His theology of laity comes forth, as this divine participation in the world revolves around human participation in God as it is lived out in the world. So it is in life, in the practical realm, where both inter-permeate. This leads to a second tension. The theology of laity spotlights the question of human participation in God while also in the world. But for Congar this raises the issue of the directness of access to God in secular engagement. Congar follows Gauthier in distinguishing between immediate adherence to God by those who renounced the world (monks and nuns) and “lay spirituality,” which seeks God “not immediately,” but through humanity and the world.\(^\text{18}\) This is meant to affirm the autonomy and value of created things in the plan of God and lay grounds for a spirituality in the world. While direct and exclusive work for the kingdom is identified with monasticism,\(^\text{19}\) for lay people the life of the world is not a mere setting (as for monks). The co-operation in the work of creation is key, i.e. consonant to their sanctification, “their co-operation in the Kingdom of God.”\(^\text{20}\) This significantly expands the view of participation in the relation God-world (taken in a more comprehensive way). If one participates in God through the world, the world essentially belongs to this relation. But it also raises some questions. Does it imply that there is a direct and immediate relation with God unmediated by the world? Does it imply that mediated participation in God cannot be direct?

His proposal shows the issue of participation (in God) also implies taking part (participating) in the world and taking part in the church. It is necessary to discern his intent, which has to take into account that it is key for him to show that laity participates in the priestly, prophetic and kingly energies of Christ. So, what is at stake in affirming the directness and immediacy? They are to be understood in terms of participation of God in the world and the world in God. For Congar, the laity are participating in God through engagement with the world. Cavanaugh, however, argued that Catholic Action (a lay movement in the Catholic Church to which Congar referred) was primarily concerned with salvation of souls.\(^\text{21}\) Its emphasis on interiority, while dealing with social problems, emphasizes “personal formation of the individual for action in the world.”\(^\text{22}\) Its values are applied to the world existing out-there, “outside the church” and the church is not “meant to be a body in any way analogous to other social bodies.”\(^\text{23}\) This would raise an issue of genuineness and comprehensiveness of ecclesial involvement or taking-part (participation) in the world. It also seriously invalidates the attempt to incorporate the cosmic and historic process, as it appears as mere backdrop for individual salvation. On the other hand, Congar himself raised questions as to the directness of laity’s participation in


\(^{19}\) Congar, ibid., 423
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\(^{21}\) Cavanaugh, *Torture and Eucharist*, 141.
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God, as already indicated. Thus, while Congar rightly puts the issue of laity up-front as participation in God and engagement in the world, the delineation church-world runs the risk of invalidating it.

This is the same delineation which asserts directness/indirectness of participation in God and this allows probing its theological basis. A later theological turn to the Holy Spirit exposes this theological issue. A decade later Congar wrote about the vision of the living Lord as intimately related with the world and human being, which contrasts with his work on laity. This intimacy suggests immediacy and interiority in the relation God-world. Furthermore, both his earlier and later work suggest that the real presence of the Holy Spirit in the church and in believers forms a real community which lives in the world. Thus, the role of the Holy Spirit breathes the air of directness, synergy and community into the account of engagement. Thus, my hypothesis – genuine engagement and direct participation demands the personal role of the Spirit. To test this hypothesis, I have to turn to the issue of mediation, which is, I argue, responsible for the aforementioned definitions. This brings us to the role of Jesus Christ, his mediation and the way the church participates in it. But this time I will address this role in the context of the relation church – world. It was earlier viewed as a kind of continued incarnation, so at this stage a kind of rift appears in this continuity, when the eschatological aspect is developed. And yet Congar refers primarily to socio-cultural world. The full embrace of participation in the world has to have an eye for the role of the Spirit in the whole of cosmos. Only this would address the relation between the evolutionary and eschatological aspects. But for now I will look how are these aspects linked with the roles of Christ and the Spirit? In seeking to answer these question, one is drawn to Congar’s view of the theology of two divine persons, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

THE WORLD, ITS EVOLUTION AND THE INCARNATION

In this wider picture of the tension between evolutionary and eschatological, Congar’s view of evolution is quite reductive. He indeed views it positively, thanks to his view of incarnation and Christology generally, but seems to limit his view to the progress of human history. He develops his earlier Christological line that God was open to everything authentically human. For him this is the Judeo-Christian assertion of the unity of humankind from beginning to end.

---

24 He wrote later: “there is a pressing need for a clear vision and demonstration of the intimate connection which these realities [kingdom of God, human being and creation] have with one another as the most effective answer to the reasons of modern unbelief.” Congar, Dialogue, 23.

25 The Spirit was the uncreated soul of the church and “the complex of gifts of grace” was the created soul of the church. See Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 19. This relationship between created realities in the church and the uncreated reality of the Spirit was in its sacramental and ecclesial life, i.e. community, and not only in believing and loving souls. See Congar, The Mystery of the Church, xi. As the Holy Spirit “logically and causally” preceded created grace in the Western theology, see Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 84, this suggests the realism and directness of divine human participation. (ibid.)
in the divine plan. Congar’s logic is as follows. There is a singularity and multiplicity in this plan: the person is always one, but human nature is shared by many, it is a multiplicity. This multiplicity is in development as each individual contributes to human nature. Thus humanity is in the making and only as history will unfold “and all peoples and races have become one in Christ, will it be possible to say “Man is made.”” Thus Congar views the history and the world (using these terms almost interchangeably) as a progress because of this Christology. Through incarnation Jesus Christ has contributed as individual to human nature. But there is also the future and a development, wherein human diversity also has “a Christian and providential value.” For him Christ is not, in a sense, restricted to his incarnation, but opened-ended, as is humanity. This is for Congar a basis for the openness of the church to every human development in culture, which did not need the tutelage of the church.

Theology of the laity is set in this tension between history and eschatology. The earlier stiff pattern of ecclesial treatises merely regulating the participation of laity did not suffice. Congar marks out the crucial role of the liturgical movement, which revolved around the issue of participation in Christ. The church of liturgy was the “generous, vital, religious” Body of Christ, inspired by his life. The two developments, liturgical and engagement in the world were interrelated. The period 1930 – 1935, when the image of the church as Mystical Body of Christ was widely used, was also the time when Catholic Action blossomed. This was a “re-centering on Christ and the Christian mystery;” the liturgical movement fed the ecclesiological renewal advocating “‘active participation’ of the faithful in the liturgical act.” This is behind Congar’s drive for participation and partially explains his view of “directness” – it follows the pattern of liturgical participation, and concerns the priesthood of the laity.

However, for Congar spirituality and engagement also connected, and this had implications for his view of priesthood. Experience with young Catholic workers (from 1933) showed that the theology of the mystical Body fused with their experiences into “incarnational” spirituality. The life of a worker continued the life of Christ the worker. Behind there is a clear trajectory – the secular world could be successfully confronted only with an adequate
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27 ibid., 14.
28 15.
29 For Congar’s view of the “fullness of Christ” or pleroma Christi, and the tension between protology and eschatology, see Charles MacDonald, Church and World in the Plan of God: Aspects of History and Eschatology in the Thought of Père Yves Congar o.p. (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1982), 75 - 80.
31 Yves Congar, “My Path-findings,” 170.
32 ibid., 171. Saint Pius X and his successors used the expression “active participation,” Congar notes. They grounded this participation in the very nature of the liturgy as worship of the whole mystical Body, but the faithful were meant “to let themselves be guided and so follow their pastors in docility.”
33 172. Congar mentions the particular influence of the work of his friend and collaborator M. D. Chenu.
Theology of the laity, a “total ecclesiology.” This theology combines openness to a dynamic human world and desire to penetrate the depths of the mystery of Christ. For Congar, as Jossua noted, “to an awakening of the world there corresponds an awakening of the laity in the Church.” This openness was in contrast to medieval Christianity, which did not see the positive reality of the world. The faithful for Congar participated in the everyday process of creation of the human being. Jossua quoted a conversation with Congar: “they make man, humanity.” This creation unfolds in history, but on the other hand, the faithful are the Mystical Body of Christ. Their personal sacrifices, their lives and deeds are integrated (participate) into the sacrifice of Christ. Because the church as the Body of Christ for Congar brings about the mystery of Christ, sacrifices are necessarily linked with liturgy.

While the language is Christological throughout, there are significant tilts towards a theology of the Spirit. It comes alongside the formerly mentioned eschatological aspect and liturgical participation and emphasizes the tangible divine presence in the world in its widest sense, even if Congar is not explicit about this. The faithful (“laity”) through their lives and action are at the centre of bringing creation, in its freedom and history, back to God. Through Christians the actions and energy of Christ are exerted in the history and cosmos more generally, as they are a space inbetween the church and world. Not a mere aspect of the church; they are the church in the context of what humanity and the cosmos are. Congar wrote that “a complete theology of laity will be a total ecclesiology: it will also be an anthropology, and even a theology of the creation in its relation to Christology.” This implies the role of the Spirit, as I will show next. Congar connects ecclesiology and anthropology; he views the church as the “we,” which presumes that the Spirit not only works in individuals, but also in the community. This ecclesiology is also a theology of creation — as the church is the world turned to God. The church is also the church primarily in mission. Congar sees the church throwing itself open to lay activity — a great reservoir of energies, as “the Holy Spirit moves the world towards an ideal of fullness … a new spring, a vigil of Pentecost.” Congar sees the dynamism of lay activity as a particular movement of the Holy Spirit. I suggest it points to the free activity of the Spirit in the movement “outward” (in theology of laity), as it pointed in the movement

35 Jossua, Yves Congar, 117.
36 Writing about the possibility of the secular liturgy Congar perceives a reverse movement to the one which characterized the previous 1500 years of Christianity. If the former stressed the differences and segregated specific and special liturgical settings from everyday use of things, he witnessed (in 1973) the opposite process. See Congar, Called to Life, 127 – 128.
37 Jossua, 125
38 Congar, Called to Life, 127.
39 Congar, Lay People, xvii.
40 Congar, Lay People, xix. Note also that while he does not develop “total ecclesiology,” the “full pneumatology” for Congar is not “internal mission” of the Spirit in individuals plus the validation of the infallibility of magisterium, but rather actuality of what the risen Christ and his Spirit do in historical community (not only hierarchy) in various forms in history. See Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1., 156-157.
“deeper” (in reform). Congar’s theological view of the world may look reductive vis-à-vis contemporary view of cultural studies, biological-ecological debate, but there is a potential in his theology of priesthood and liturgy if it is supplemented by theology of the activity of the Spirit in the creation.

ESCHATOLOGICAL (AND PNEUMATOLOGICAL) CORRECTIVE

Now I will look to theological developments which contributed to making the role of the Spirit more explicit. In his theology of laity Congar presents their participation in Christ through the theology of Christ as priest, king and prophet. However, he is primarily interested in the mission (not ontology) of Christ to achieve God’s “all in all” – eschatological indwelling of all creation. These three offices show how Christ mediates the grace of God to anointed people (thus the differences in directness between clergy and lay). There are several key developments, which contribute to making the role of the Spirit explicit. First, Congar points to the rule of the risen Christ. Thus, the kingship, that is the lordship, is Christ’s sovereignty over the church and creation. The church, the world and the kingdom of God are linked and point to “recapitulation” of the world or its restoration under Christ’s authority, “putting under a new head.” Second, there is a priestly image of the temple in the making. It suggests the kingship is an eschatological state, but also developmental. Congar suggests Christ’s kingship is priestly, thus, according to him, it is not coercive (sacrifice is far from coercive). Thus, the question should arise – how does it take hold? In my view, this leads directly to the role of the Spirit.

This line of argument allows situating Congar’s attempts to reconcile the synthesis of Aquinas’s view of the relation between nature and grace and the economy of salvation. In this reconciliation, however, he presents the kingship as perfect dominance of “Pneuma.” This invocation of Pneuma is to guard the integrity of creation and reconcile the orders of nature and grace. In Pneuma nature achieves perfection (Congar follows Aquinas on the relation of nature and grace) since nature realizes itself not by and in itself, but through the

41 Congar, Lay People, 61. Congar accepts the influence of Protestant theology in recovering the theme of three offices of Christ in 16th century. However, he points out that the theme of anointing, which is implied in three offices, is traditional and appears in liturgy. Its Pneumatological connotations, however, he does not develop either at this moment, or later.

42 Ibid. Congar accepts the input of biblical studies and Protestant theologians, Oscar Cullmann in particular, pointing to economy of salvation, which progressively concentrates from multitude to one and then from one to the multitude: see reference to Oscar Cullmann, La royauté du Christ et l’Eglise dans le Nouveau Testament. (Paris: Foi et vie, 1941).

43 Congar, Lay People, 64. Together with Cullmann and others, see note 1.

44 His major inspiration is Aquinas interpretation of times of economy of salvation in its three successive stages of “internal worship.” See Thomas Aquinas, ST, I-II, Q 103, A 3.

45 Congar sees the resurrection as the “first achievement” of triumph of Pneuma over nature. Congar, Lay People in the Church, 66.

46 Already in his early work Congar used a generalized contrast between followers of Thomas and Augustinians in the binary relation nature/grace. Here is how he presents it: Thomas (and Albert) affirmed the value of things
influence of a higher principle – grace. This higher principle refers to the activity of the Holy Spirit. While Pneuma plays a crucial role, this role among “orders” does not resemble the dynamic account of the activity of the Spirit as found in the Scriptures. So, secondly, and more importantly, Congar looks at the economy of salvation, the triumph of the Spirit in resurrecting Jesus. This restores in the world and humanity “the integrity of the vestiges or the image of God, which are in them.” This emphasis on the risen Christ in the economy of salvation marks a significant turning point.

Congar’s eschatological emphases were forged because of encounters with Protestant theology and his interests in biblical studies, but his continuing close connections with Orthodox theology are also significant. These gave him the opportunity to point out the proper value of the time of the church in the cooperation of people with Christ. Now he can situate them in a “space between” between the ascension of Christ and his return, and not only refer to incarnation as earlier. Thus Congar’s theology finds a place for human doing, which bears upon eternity. The Christian mystery means for him that the Second Adam is fulfilled in the substance of the First. The two for him are, basically, conjoined; time enters into eternity and free persons are drawn into divine life. This development fits into Congar’s early neo-Platonic view - “the return” happens on the basis of “down-coming and of the gift of agape.” To grow into the fullness of Christ and the temple of God, free historical actions, which draw their strength from the gift of God in Christ’s Pasch have to be brought as sacrifices. The return, in the grace of the Spirit, draws its strength from the gift, the movement of descent, which accordingly maintains the “once for all” status of salvation in Jesus. This bearing of human doing upon eternity comes due to the emphasis on the
glorified Christ, on eschatological orientation, and implies the work of the Spirit. Furthermore, this human doing is clearly set in context of the movement of the whole cosmos, even if Congar does not capitalize on it in reconciling evolutionary and eschatological. If only the eschatological Spirit would be seen in the evolutionary aspect (which embraces the whole creation), the case for reconciliation would be stronger.

The implications of the eschatological corrective reverberate over the theology of laity, which is Congar’s primary concern here, but they also have a wider significance. The eschatological comes beside the historical and suggests an “otherness” between Christ and his Body, as the image of the church as spouse of Christ shows. With it comes a major turn from looking at the nature of the church to its mission. First seen in Congar’s proposal for Vatican II, it is later drafted and grafted into its constitution on the church. His proposal suggests that the church has to work “as if under the eyes” of the world and other Christians. Congar proposes that the schemas of the council beside the church as mystical body of Christ (consistent with his early work), also embrace the values of the “people of God” and communion (consistent with a view of church in mission). Thus, the eschatological point of view establishes the missionary aspect of the church at the centre of the notion of the church. The eschatological point of view allows properly locating the relationship of the church and world amid questions raised by the ecumenical movement and Protestants. The church and the kingdom of God here are distinguished (“otherness”) and the church looks not only back “to the work of the Incarnate Word in the days of His flesh,” but also to “the eschatological Fullness to be prepared.” Congar concluded that once the definition of the church and its eschatological perspective are settled, this would situate the theology of laity.

RAPPROCHEMENT AND ITS APORIAS POINT TO THE SPIRIT

Having identified a theological tension between the evolutionary and eschatological, I am now in the position to look at his proposal. I will return to my hypothesis that full theology of participation of God in the world (which now maybe viewed also in widest sense) and the world in God (Congar’s concern) requires theology of the Spirit. But in looking at Congar’s theology of laity, Congar’s narrower focus is evident. However, it is significant that he situates himself in between two theses, that of “total discontinuity” and “incarnational theology.”

---
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The first, where he puts Martin Luther, Karl Barth and the Catholic theologian Louis Bouyer, is pessimistic towards the world (taken as socio-cultural reality primarily). The Kingdom is transcendent to history and progress, and foreign to the process of development. The other group, according to Congar, looks positively at the human effort and the progress of human history. It presents continuity between the cosmic process, personal and cultural effort and the kingdom of God. While the achievement depends on the intervention of God, there is a preparation, ascending steps, where human effort plays a part. Thus Christianity progressively spiritualizes earthly realities, since the cosmos is one and is subjected to redemption by Christ. Realities of the world do have a value in themselves and anticipate the final fulfillment through the Spirit. History (not only the church) mediates Christ’s saving way, though the church quickens the historical process and shows the historical process its role and meaning. The way the issue was formulated framed the discussion in Vatican II and to some extent is relevant to this day.

The reality of the lay people in the church pressed Congar for a theological solution between the two. He does not challenge the progressive, evolutionary view of history, which he himself to an extent espouses, but rather points to its ambivalence. It is probable, that Congar saw that it is necessary to theologically address the wider notion of the world this view embraced. For him the temporal world is the world of grace and sin and the different aspects of liberation were consequently ambivalent and open to misunderstanding. So, the world is a mixed state of grace and sin. As he assesses this ambivalent state, however, he begins not from its ambivalence, but rather from metaphysical presuppositions, in which they are clearly distinguishable. So, when he looks at history as the intermediary of Christ, for him

61 On the role of this Catholic theologian see Jake C. Yap, “Louis Bouyer and the Unity of Theology,” in Flynn and Murray (eds.), Ressourcement, 289-304. His overarching interest was in the relation of God and creation extending from individual through church to the material cosmos, and the “the result of divine intervention in human history is divine adoption.” Yap, 293; for probable influence of Karl Barth, see Yap, 296.

62 Congar, Lay People, 86. Congar points to Teilhard de Chardin. Alister McGrath cites the paper of Teilhard de Chardin ‘What I Believe’ – “1. I believe that the universe is in evolution. 2. I believe that evolution proceeds toward the spiritual. 3. I believe that the spiritual is fully realized in a form of personality. 4. I believe that the supremely personal is the universal Christ.” Alister E. McGrath, Science and Religion: an Introduction, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 224.


66 Beside Congar’s own affirmation, this is also explored by Charles MacDonald. He situates Congar’s position as intermediate between “eschatological humanism” of Louis Bouyer and “inaugurated eschatology” of Gustav Thils, see see MacDonald, Church and World, 89, 91, 94.

67 According to MacDonald, “in the conclusion that each one reaches, G. Thils and Y. Congar appear to have much more in common with each other than either has with L. Bouyer.” ibid., 115. In using world and history as synonyms, Congar follows Maurice Montuclard.

68 Congar, Lay People, 87.
this means that the orders of cosmos and grace are not distinguished, but rather equated. So, the metaphysical view of “orders” of grace and nature as distinct is his beginning point - Congar agrees that the world will attain its end in the kingdom of God – “grace” is the fulfillment of “nature.” This will be articulated in the account of divine activity, which guards the integrity of the world’s contribution (and also its progress). As to the world’s contribution, his view is consistent with the “eschatologist” view that the world has to pass through death to be fulfilled by divine gift. And yet it seems that his effort of reconciling the two approaches suffers from, firstly, a lack of a more nuanced and comprehensive view of the created reality and, second, from a lack of the appreciation of the activity of the eschatological Spirit in creation.

This requires to address some of Congar’s presuppositions. His argument against the evolutionary view of history is that it has to acknowledge the ambiguity as to the relation of nature and grace. This ambiguity in the context of his work on laity also refers to the directness of participation of the world and through the world in God. However, Congar’s embrace of this ambiguity cannot be regarded as consistent, as he does not address his own presuppositions. His beginning point is the abstract distinction of orders which falls along the same lines as direct participation in God and realms of church and world. Congar’s theological intent is to affirm a distinctive and separate autonomy of the world and it is to be affirmed. But the world, which is thereby affirmed, is the world as abstraction, as the binary nature/grace implies Congar’s view of realms of direct/indirect participation (church/world) in God strengthen this perception. Possibly, this, but also the evolutionist approach precludes him from a more comprehensive and thus adequate look at the situation of the world, including its history. His view of divine activity in the world does not take into account the evils, which twentieth century and Congar himself witnessed. The experience of the absence of God and the meaninglessness of history also evades him. He also does not reflect on the divine activity in the creation more generally. On the other hand, as he argues for the development of potentialities of the world, he makes a case that the world’s activity does contribute to the kingdom of God. Does this impede the gratuity of the kingdom and impede the continuity between the church and the kingdom as MacDonald argued?

**JE\*US CHRIST AND THE SPIRIT IN THE ACCOUNT OF PARTICIPATION**

With these questions in the background I turn next to Congar’s theology of two divine missions. It may be that the theology of the Spirit, which allowed Congar to begin his ecclesiology with concrete life, will have a similar effect in the relation God-world. I showed that the move “outwards” – to the world – in Congar’s theology of laity shows the whole
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created world plays a part in the divine plan. I now want to identify the theological core of his view. For this I look at the real divine involvement in the world and real participation of the world in God. Congar achieves this by pointing to the role of two divine missions – the participation of the world in God is the work of Jesus Christ and the Spirit. How does this work? Congar shows the unity of the divine plan revolves around human existence. The world is linked with humanity either in the fall or hope as “a single subject of divine intervention.”

Humanity and the world have a common Christological end. Human beings grow to resemble Christ, through whom all things are and exist. Christ restores and fulfills what he has given as seed and vocation to creation; this links the work of salvation with creation, as the latter’s fulfillment. This is where the Spirit’s role comes into play. According to Congar, as human being becomes the temple of the Spirit, this restores the integrity of the created nature and creation. The resulting cosmic praise realizes the unity of cosmos and the redeemed. Thus divine presence in creation and the creation’s return to the presence of God in worship is achieved by the activities of the Son and the Spirit.

This account of the relation God-world significantly departs from the earlier one, which rested on incarnation (church as continuing incarnation) and the role of the Spirit is significant. Thus it is not a mere continuity and progress. At the heart of continuity between the world and the kingdom is the identity (sameness) of the suffering and glorified body of Jesus. This is a transformation which then extends to creation by the work of the Holy Spirit, “the agent proper to the second creation.” (Italics mine.) This means a rupture under the proper activity of the Person of the Trinity. But this transformation is also an eschatological presence in the world. Congar points out it already works in human bodies and in human culture.

However, at this stage, it seems, Congar points out the transformation in individuals, relying on a following account of the human role in cosmos. Congar sums up the relation of nature and grace in Aquinas and Albert the Great in the following way. For them, the things (of the world) have their own energies, which are participations in God’s goodness, since God bestowed them as forces making the world.

Their aggregate is the cosmos. Beside these forces of participation, there is a highest form of participation in God which is not a force of the creature and is not the nature by which a creature lives. This participation, “grace,” unites the creature made in God’s image with God and establishes a relationship like a family relationship, a communion. While this relationship does not change things physically, it

73 Congar, Lay People, 88.
74 Congar, Lay People, Ibid.
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76 Ibid., 90. He points both to the experiences of healing and the influence of Christians in the society, the nature is thereby healed by grace, even if primary focus of Congar is on human civilization.
77 Congar, Lay People, 91.
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79 Congar as yet does not call this the “spirit of sonship,” as in his later work. See Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 79 – 99, the chapter called “God Has Sent the Spirit of His Son Into Our Hearts,” or Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 101. To compare: in The Word and the Spirit, he writes: “The Spirit carries out God’s plan or purpose, which is to finish the task of (re-)making man in his image and making him a son.” (Ibid.) He bases it
creates a new relationship of human with the world, gives new energies. Thus, he concludes, the gifts of grace are able to change and influence cosmos.  

THE ANDRERIC TEMPLE: PRESENCE AND THE SPIRIT

While the latter presentation points to a transforming role of the Spirit, its use for engagement in the world is limited to individuals. While the element of communion is visible, the engagement of community as such in the world is not worked out. To demonstrate the shift, I compare Congar’s account of participation from 1953 with the account of participation from 1962. Both accounts fall into roughly the same period (post-war and prior to Vatican II). I will also focus primarily on how Congar uses the account of participation of Thomas Aquinas and the role of the Spirit in the account of participation. In the later work Congar maintained the picture of relation of nature and grace described in previous paragraph. However, this time the discussion is located not at the beginning, but at the end of the book, which looks at the divine plan of indwelling creation. Congar significantly begins from salvation history – gives an overview of how God draws creation into divine fellowship (participation). In the end of the book, Congar returns to Thomas to identify three modes of divine presence in the cosmos, linked by their increasingly deeper involvement with the creation.

The image of the temple is a way for Congar to combine the Scriptural economy of indwelling with the Thomas’s account of participation. This helps to identify what the prominence of the Spirit brings to the theology of participation. Congar takes a cue from Thomas and suggests God is present in creatures as their cause and in that the creatures reflect divine perfections. Second, as in his earlier work, he asserts that God is present by grace (the filial life, as in the earlier paragraph) by being genuinely present to believers as the one who is known and loved and is present in the life of the lover. Congar is after genuine or real (and even direct) participation. This is not only a presence, but also indwelling. He makes this emphasis thanks on ontological reality – “the Spirit is therefore the Spirit of the Son because he has entered the Son’s life as a son in a way that is effective in fulfilling the Promise. That functional reality clearly presupposes an ontological reality in order to provide a foundation for its existence and its truth.” (ibid.)

80 Congar, Lay People, 92.
82 Ibid., 238, 239. Congar once again refers to the structure of Summa, where first part of Summa refers to divine presence according to creative power and similitude, second – to presence by grace and third – to divine presence according to hypostatic union. See also Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on the Letter of Saint Paul to the Colossians, Chapter 2, Lecture 2, accessed online at https://aquinas.cc/224/226/303 on 10 October 2017.
83 This is because, according to Congar, the life with God, in which human being possesses a beloved person (God), “is only an image, but nevertheless a genuine image of that presence of God in the soul.” However, the divine power of grace at work enables establishes human contact with God: “touch and possess him, not something that is like him, but his own living Substance.” Congar, The Mystery of the Temple, 239.
to the role of the Spirit, not visible at this moment, thus still leaving an ambiguity. The third is the ontological indwelling. This is a corporeal presence of God in the world through the mystery of incarnation, which is *theandric*, that is human-divine mystery. The human body becomes the temple and for Congar this inaugurates the manner of the existence derived from Christ. This manner of existence, significantly, is that of the Spirit. According to Congar, in Christ “a human body truly becomes the temple of God.” This comes from incarnation, as a fundamental law of divine activity – full divine presence, to be real, must be embodied. It also connects the incarnation of Christ and the existence of the church. But it is the Spirit, who realizes or fulfills this divine plan.

The Spirit’s role thus brings directness, cooperation and intimacy, between the world and God, which was not visible earlier. Thus for Congar the world is the divine temple, first, in that God is present in it as creator and creation comes from and resembles God. Second, the world is the spiritual temple by God’s presence (indwelling) in believers, as in his work on laity. But it is the third mode of presence which is genuinely fresh as it brings Thomas, the economy of salvation and the Gospels together. This is visible from the question Congar raises – does this divine human reality of Christ as the temple bear upon the world? Is the world, that is all creation, also “a theandric temple through the corporal presence of the Incarnate Word?”

This image of theandric temple, which is also pneumatic, is a step forward in Congar’s account of the relation God-world (all creation). But what does it mean? According to Congar, the world indeed is a theandric temple because the reality of the body of Christ not only embraces his earthly and risen body, but also the Eucharist and the community of believers. Thus, “through the combined action of the Spirit and of the sacrament containing its own essential mystery,” the holy humanity of Jesus “takes to itself ... a ‘whole’ body of which it is the...”
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84 This is more than being present as cause or similitude, but being there substantially and personally, thus it merits the term “Indwelling.” 240. On the relation of indwelling to the Spirit, see Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 2, 79 – 99.
85 “In Jesus Christ ... God unites himself in the field of existence to a human nature which becomes the human nature of the Word. The immanence, the indwelling, is total, ontological.” Congar, *The Mystery of the Temple*. 240
86 241. Earlier in the book Congar looks at the Gospel texts and looks at the attitude of Jesus to the Temple to make a point, that Jesus transcended the temple as in him (in distinction to the prophets), it is not only a message from God, but “a personal and substantial coming into the world of the Word, of God himself.” ibid., 112. Thus he as the temple and the worship are the final reality, “the regime of the messianic era, which is characterized by the outpouring of the Spirit promised by God. It is a spiritual regime (“pneumatic”) and its worship is in Spirit and in truth.” ibid.
87 ibid.
88 ibid., 242.
89 243. Here he sees that contemporary exegesis and tradition “agree regarding the order in which these three realities, that in a sense are one, combine with one another.” 242. See Henri de Lubac’s *Corpus mysticum: the Eucharist and the church in the Middle Ages: historical survey*. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006).
90 Meaning that sacrament is necessary as such due to its physicality, which characterized Christ’s incarnation, more on this in the chapter 4.
91 For Congar, made holy by the Spirit, as I have shown in chapter 2.
head and we are the members.⁹² The theandric reality is built on this relation of the body and the Spirit, embraces Christ’s body, community and the Eucharist and extends to the whole creation. This already addresses the earlier challenge that the church affects the world through individuals taking part in its struggles. It is the worshipping community, which lives and is in the world. As a political presence of earlier chapters, it is also engaged in the struggles of creation, while also directly participating in God, evidently thanks to theology of the Spirit.

The relation with the creation is even more explicit in that theandric presence relates to other modes of presence, and thus escapes the merely ecclesial realm. The account of the temple points to an intimacy and participation in God, which assumes into itself and concludes other modes of presence.⁹³ So, as the presence of God in Christ assumes and fulfills the cosmic presence and the presence by grace, so the theandric temple “includes and completes the spiritual and the cosmic temples.”⁹⁴ I see a genuine development for the role of the Spirit in the relation between “spiritual” and “theandric” temples. According to Congar the theandric temple presupposes the spiritual one and completes it by conferring “an unexpected dignity.”⁹⁵ This dignity is the Son’s own grace, “a filial grace, a grace of the Word Incarnate, the grace of a holy human nature, whose principle of existence is the very Person of the Word.”⁹⁶ When this dignity is conferred to human beings, they do not become members of the Word (God), but members of Jesus Christ. Since the “personal principle of his existence is the very Person of the Word,” (i.e. what makes him an individual, irreducible to others), the grace which makes Christians spiritual temples is “Christly.”⁹⁷ This leaves us with a question – what is this “unexpected dignity” and especially how this matters to earlier identified aporias in the relation God-world (creation)?

These distinctions seem to reiterate the pattern of Congar’s earlier, incarnational Christology, and raise questions as to reality of creation’s participation in God. Congar’s later Pneumatology will address the Orthodox reproach that Western theology does not express “true deification” more directly.⁹⁹ The Neo-Scholastic vision with its interest in things themselves and their ontology was challenged. Eastern theology, Congar points out,
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⁹² Congar, The Mystery of the Temple, 243.
⁹³ Congar refers to Thomas Aquinas, Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, I D 37, Q 1, A 2. (Translated by John Laumakis) A creature is united to God in three ways: first, “according to likeness only,” second, “attains God himself by operation” through faith and love, and third, “not only according to operation, but also according to being” as an act of hypostasis. Later Thomas writes that the three ways “accompany every creature and they are also presupposed in other ways. For in what God is by union, he is also by grace, and in what he is by grace, he is in by essence, presence, and power.” Accessed online at http://www4.desales.edu/~philtheo/loughlin/ATP/Sententiae/ISentd37q1a2.html on 10 June 2015.
⁹⁴ Congar, The Mystery of the Temple, 243.
⁹⁵ ibid., 244
⁹⁶ ibid.
⁹⁷ ibid.
⁹⁸ Congar, The Mystery of the Temple, 244.
distinguished the orders of nature and grace, but articulated a more intimate relationship between nature (including cosmic) to be transfigured, and grace. The Catholic position is important for Congar as it asserts: “the creational order has nonetheless its own existence, its own goodness and along with them, a fundamental aptitude to return to God once the way is opened and given to it by the eternal Wisdom through whom all things subsist.” If one looks at this earlier stage with Pneumatological focus, one sees a Pneumatological Christology. It is visible in that the filial worship is Christ’s own worship in the Gospels, and now exists in his body the church, and restores human nature. Through this human nature, it is then communicated to the cosmic temple, as the human being is “the microcosm,” linking all creation to “the sacred humanity of Jesus Christ.” This is an emphasis on the sacred humanity of Jesus Christ, as I pointed out in Chapter Two. But the other question (beside the world’s participation in God) is how does this articulate the realism of engagement in the world? Is the reality of creation sufficiently affirmed?

THE ANDRIC TEMPLE AND THE APORIAS OF MEDIATION

There is for Congar a continuity between the world and the world to come: “the temple of the world to come will also be the temple of the cosmos in the fullest sense.” For Congar the biblical story testifies this – it begins and ends with the divine temple (creation as sacred world and whole world as temple). The image of temple includes priesthood: Adam (the First Adam of Genesis and the New Adam, Jesus Christ) in its midst as priest. Thus Christ’s royal priesthood is at the centre, but it is a pneumatic priesthood. Priesthood, according to Congar, unites “the visible and invisible, the things below and the things on high, nature and grace, under sovereign ascendency of the Spirit.” So, Christ as mediator unites nature and grace, but this depends on the activity of the Spirit. How does it work? According to Congar, Jesus Christ is the “(re)consecration of the world” as he returns the world to “the sacred sphere of grace.” So, Congar envisions two spheres, which resemble “orders” between which Jesus mediates, “above,” “the sacred sphere of grace” and “below.” In the “below” the “duality of the Church and World remains,” but the church is more with the “above,” since in it Jesus Christ is recognized. This sets the two necessary roles of Christ and the Spirit, but also uses the language of mediation between two spheres. Is this language the same that limited the directness of participation?

100 Yves Congar, Jesus Christ, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), 178.
101 Congar, The Mystery of the Temple, 244. The idea is this: the whole world is involved in the spiritual destiny of humanity and transformed by Christ’s incarnation and resurrection. see ibid. Also Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 124.
102 Congar, Mystery of the Temple, 245.
103 ibid. Congar explicitly links Paradise of the first Adam with new heavens and new earth of New Adam with the imagery of the temple.
104 ibid. Congar refers to the third chapter of Lay People, 59 – 121. I will soon turn to it.
105 Congar, Mystery of the Temple, 246.
106 ibid.
Before turning to the language of “spheres” or “realms” I would like to finally show the crucial and novel role of the image of the theandric temple. When viewed in terms of incorporation of creation into God, it makes visible the Spirit. According to Congar, after Christ’s incarnation, there is a body of Christ in the world. This “theandric temple” builds upon (and surpasses) the “spiritual temple,” which now appears as the temple of souls, i.e. individuals. What does the theandric temple bring to this spiritual temple? It seems from Congar’s account that this is an emphasis on the communal body. To give souls, which form the spiritual temple “their true being and a higher dignity,” the “theandric temple” unites the “spiritual temple … to itself in a mystical or community (“communionnel”) body.”

So, the image of communal body seems to distinguish one from another. This development, of course, necessarily implies the presence and activity of God in the world – society, art, etc. The relation of nature and grace, and incorporation of the world into God, is also explained through the image of sacraments. Besides suggesting that “theandric” temple is an embodied communal reality, not only a spiritual-individual one, Congar points out that this community is achieved, i.e. effected, “by means of sacraments.” This use of “theandric” language presents the world in terms of ontology and cosmology. Is it helpful, then, in addressing the social causes of world’s unbelief, which was Congar’s concern already in his early work? Is it, in other words, able to relate to the world in its tragedy and estrangement?

It might be remembered from Congar’s early work on the church that “theandric” language came together with a view of divine work as kenotic and the imagery of continuing incarnation. The intent was to affirm the integrity of creation, but also not to shun from the reality of the human sin in its individual and social dimensions. There is no reason, why this should not be implied in this account as well. But certain problems arise if these realities are not explicitly addressed. Perhaps if incarnation is viewed together with Christ’s death and resurrection and furthermore with glorified Christ, radiant with the glory of the Spirit, this would better address the complex and frequently tragic realities of creation? Then, the Eucharist gives even more clarity concerning the “theandric temple.” It nourishes the souls (“spiritual temple”) with grace, but it is also the sign of “the community-body of Christ,” in that it fosters unity in the body of the community. But it is even more than that. It is the promise of resurrection and has a cosmic value: the elements of created world and human labour (bread and wine) are like the first-fruits of creation “brought to the community of Christ’s body” and consecrated. Thus the image “theandric temple” for Congar is first of all the connection of spirit and body. As the “spiritual temple” required the body of the community, now body, the matter of the world is consecrated in the Eucharist. This is more
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107 ibid.
108 ibid.
109 More on the relation of the Eucharist, the unity of the community, and the role of the Spirit in the sacrament, see Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 3, 258
110 ibid. They assume natural elements human labor - bread and wine of Eucharist. The Eucharist is the thanksgiving of the created world. See Congar, Lay People, 210, 211, 214, 410.
evident from Congar’s example of cathedrals, which for Congar are “the sign and the promise that all will be made one, the visible and invisible, the corporeal and the spiritual, in the one temple of God and of the Lamb.”\textsuperscript{111} This means the corporeal, earthly, political is really taken by God as body, through the activity of the Spirit and through the contact with what comes from incarnation – sacrament and community. In this sense, it develops the imagery of radiating body introduced in earlier chapters in engaging the unbelieving world. But does it sufficiently address the earlier focus on the external institution which engages the world or the duality still remains?

The “theandric temple” brings in the novelty, but the Spirit’s role in community, in sacraments, and for that matter in creation, is not yet developed.\textsuperscript{112} There is a potential, associated with the role of the Spirit, to link participation in God and engagement in the world in a direct and intimate way. But what about the language of “orders,” which seemed to impede the directness? For Congar there is a movement from below where the whole creation cries for “the world of the spirit” and also a movement from above as “the world of the spirit” cries for the “world of Man-God.”\textsuperscript{113} The two realms are set as distinct. It is clear that the Christological perspective sets the rules of engagement between the two – they come together and at the centre of this juncture is Jesus Christ. I will proceed to discuss the distinction in the next section. Here I would like to look at what their connection brings. Jesus Christ as “theandric temple” points not only to Jesus Christ. Through him, all humanity mediates, and the “theandric temple” means the return of the whole creation to God in the Spirit. The cosmos, according to Congar, needs human mediation and interpretation in this return.\textsuperscript{114} The merging of the two movements comes with an implied role of the Spirit: this mediation is achieved only in filial religion, “the only true relationship between the creature and its God,” which comes from Jesus Christ, the only true temple.\textsuperscript{115} In this vision of the temple in Christ, the roles of Jesus Christ and the Spirit interact. As its building goes beyond Christ’s coming in the flesh, humanity participates in it.

The mediation of Christ, consequently, is key, but also implies the language of “orders,” which separates. The promise for a more direct account of participation is with the emphasis on the holy humanity of Jesus Christ and Pneumatological Christology. This shows an ambiguity. Congar hesitates between two approaches. The earlier approach begins from abstract notions.

\textsuperscript{111} Congar, \textit{Mystery of the Temple}, 247.

\textsuperscript{112} This is the subject of the \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, volumes 2 and 3.

\textsuperscript{113} ibid.

\textsuperscript{114} Congar quotes the seventeenth century French bishop Jacques-Benigne Bossuet: “The inanimate creatures ... glorify the Heavenly Father although imperfectly and in their own way. Yet man is to be their mediator, so that their adoration may be made perfect. ... he is a macrocosm in a microcosm, because, although his body encloses him within the world, he has a mind and heart greater than the world. And this, so that, contemplating the whole universe and gathering it into himself, he may offer it, sanctify it, consecrate it to the living God.” ibid., quote from Columba Marmion, \textit{Le Christ, idéal du moine}, (Maredsous: Éditions de Maredsous, 1947), 436 – 437.

\textsuperscript{115} Congar, \textit{Mystery of the Temple}, 248.
and sets binaries: the distinction of nature and grace and emphasis on ontology in Christ. The second looks at the economy of salvation, and is more Pneumatological. At the same time Congar employs the insight of Aquinas that the three ways of divine presence inter-permeate, which overcomes distinctions. However, it seems to me that the lack of the more pronounced role of the Spirit in Thomas and in Congar’s own (early) Christology precludes this. In Thomas the three ways of divine presence “accompany every creature and they are also presupposed in other ways. For in what God is by union, he is also by grace, and in what he is by grace, he is in by essence, presence, and power.” 116 This would suggest that “Christly” temple would embrace into itself both nature and grace. But at the same time Congar wishes to keep the nature and grace separate to maintain a pre-occupation with ontology and affirm the integrity and autonomy of the world. At the same time he asserts that the world is, in a limited way, a “theandric temple.” Furthermore, the inter-permeation of the modes of presence and the cosmic scope of picture would be enhanced by seeing the work of the Spirit in creation. This would challenge or expand a focus on theandric temple where the creation looks as a mere recipient. In the earlier work Congar suggested that his rapprochement of “eschatological and evolutionist-incarnationist theses” was “disadvantageous to neither.” 117 With an eye to Congar’s later work I proceed to see if this is really the case.

RAPPROCHEMENT REVISITED

Several authors have viewed Congar’s rapprochement as lacking. Famerée praised Congar’s distinction between the historic church and the Kingdom. 118 It indeed defused the focus of the church ad intra and opened a way for the world to contribute (take part) in the kingdom. However, he also pointed out a problem with this cooperation of the world. Famerée rightly asks if Congar’s notion of “theandric temple” does not assume “pure and simple identity between eschatological mystery and paschal mystery?” 119 Because of this identity is there something in the end (parousia), which was not there in the beginning (incarnation), i.e. has the life of the world anything to contribute? Famerée puts it like this: does God “take the alterity (otherness) of the human and cosmic history seriously?” 120 If God enters history in incarnation, does not history, transfigured, enter into God in reciprocity? 121 According to Famerée this should happen in “modo divino ... but really, in the sovereign Liberty of Love for his Creation.” 122 For me this question points to the activity of the Holy Spirit.

117 Congar, Lay People, 103.
118 Famerée, L’Ecclésiologie, 320.
119 ibid. (italics his) Congar writes about “the decisive mystery of the identity of the Alpha and the Omega, of the identity of the mysteries of Easter and the Parousia.” Congar, Mystery of the Temple, 223.
120 Famerée, L’Ecclésiologie, 321.
121 ibid.
122 ibid.
It seems that Congar’s later work on the Spirit suggests a more reflexive and direct account of participation of God in creation and creation in God. Pointing once again to Thomas Aquinas, Congar shows that in human love, God really received Godself.\textsuperscript{123} This is due to the grace, i.e. the activity of the Spirit, however, it is primarily restricted to the communion body of Christ.\textsuperscript{124} In his meditation on the Holy Spirit, however, he writes “God, as it were, outside himself is God in us – God in his creatures ... in his activity and the movement by which he directs and inspires history.”\textsuperscript{125} This is based on his view that the Spirit “makes the divine communion open to what is not divine ... He is God’s ‘ecstasy’ directed towards his ‘other,’ the creature.”\textsuperscript{126} Thus in Congar’s work the theology of the Holy Spirit connects the movements of “deeper” into participation in divine life and “outward” to incorporate the world. Congar’s account makes clear that his later theology of the Spirit is the way to embrace both the otherness of the creature, and its participation in the divine life. It suggests a better reconciliation, or \textit{rapprochement}. Nevertheless, the view of creation would have to be more complex to respond to evolutionary/eschatological tension and show how the Spirit is active in creation.

Since the mediation of Christ played a central role, a version of the Spirit Christology might help review the relation God – world in Congar’s account of participation. I agree with the way James Hanvey reads Congar’s work on the temple, that is as “a version of Spirit Christology.”\textsuperscript{127} Congar surpasses the earlier notion of the Spirit merely animating the church and subordinate to Christ, he points out. For Hanvey this appreciation of the role of the Spirit, as I have shown from Congar’s later work, comes with appreciation of the socio-cultural \textit{world}. So, Hanvey continues, Congar proposes that the history of the world cannot be separated from the history of God with Jesus Christ as “the inner principle” of the movement of history, where the movement is “an action of the Holy Spirit.”\textsuperscript{128} Thus the unfolding of divine presence leads to “ever greater personalization and humanness,” according to Hanvey; this presence is fulfilled not in Christ, but in humanity as a whole, in the new community, where Christ dwells.\textsuperscript{129} Hanvey rightly points out the relation of Congar’s Spirit Christology to the fulfillment of divine presence in humanity as a whole.

\textbf{TWO ORDERS AND PARTICIPATION}

\textsuperscript{123} See Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, vol. 2, 60. “By receiving us as his sons, he [God] receives himself, having given himself to us and having dwelt in us.”
\textsuperscript{124} “This gift, with its radical principle, the Holy Spirit, is present in all the members of the communicational Body of Christ.” ibid.
\textsuperscript{125} Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, vol. 3, 150.
\textsuperscript{128} ibid., 388.
\textsuperscript{129} 390.
But how does this affect the relation of human and worldly activity and divine activity? How are eschatological novelty and “otherness” of creation both to be taken seriously? Congar basically insists on two issues. First, the eternal temple, “New Jerusalem,” is the gift “from above.” This means the divine gift is totally gratuitous and unique. Second, this “New Jerusalem” is built from humanity, affirms and takes in the whole human journey, its struggles and creativity. As the temple is to be absolutely pure, this requires that what is valuable “in the unlimited evolution of the energies of the First Adam” is purified in recapitulation. The language of “orders” plays a central role in this synergy of divine gift and human effort as Congar distinguishes the roles of the church and the world. What are these “orders?”

The kingdom of God is the order of integrity and peace, which translates into secular categories (also “order”) of “integrity and reconciliation.” Congar’s intent seems to be to bring forth the contribution of the world. So, he presents the state of the world as that of deep ontological oppositions resulting from the “otherness:” human vs. nature, one person vs. the other. The world of the human as if by its own energies moves to overcome them and achieve life and fellowship. These are the energies of creation, since what drives the process is that all humanity is made in the image of God, “which is perfectly one in many and many in one.” Congar uses the word of the Orthodox thinker, Solovyev, “uniplurality,” to describe the goal, meaning a whole, where each thing is respected for its own sake. For Congar this means that in its own integral way the world moves towards what reflects the kingdom. What is then the role of the church? The church and world are oriented to the same end, but remain distinct; their immediate ends, the means to achieve them, show they are on different “planes” and have their own “constitutions.” The church participates in God “directly,” – “the Church co-operates directly in the constitution of the Kingdom,” while the world (or history) participates with defects. This replicates the “direct” or “indirect” participation in access to God by clergy vs. laity. What are the implications of this distinction?

In John Milbank’s view Congar “defines a ‘distinction of planes’ between ecclesial-clerical and lay-secular action, without regard for the incongruity between this dualism and the integralist revolution.” This critique points to the lack of intimate relations between God-world, the
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130 Congar, Mystery of the Temple, 220.
131 ibid., 221.
132 Congar, Lay People, 94.
133 ibid.
135 Congar, Lay People in the Church, 95.
136 ibid., 95 and 99.
137 John Milbank, Theology and social theory: Beyond secular reason. (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2008), 229. Milbank points out that Congar takes the distinction from the Thomist view of Jacques Maritain and preserves the latter’s reading of Thomas about autonomous order of the world. However,
concern of Congar as well. What does he mean by integralism? According to Milbank, for Maurice Blondel “integralism” was “the supernaturalizing of the natural,” i.e. that in the society “there can be no true justice without charity, and no true social order without transformation by the supernatural society which is the church.”

In the relation God-world Blondel’s approach, Milbank continues, would oppose the model of medieval Christendom and any suggestion of coercive power. It was rather an “‘integral’ transformation of society by grace, affecting all its beliefs, assumptions and practices.” So it was achieved by the influence of Christians in the social and political. Thus Milbank brings into the view two interlocutors of Congar - Blondel, and Jacques Maritain. In his view, while Blondel still believed in the “Christian society,” the latter emphasised (due to his reading of Thomas), the autonomy of the order of the world having its own fixed law. But this did not mean, according to Milbank, “purely natural” humanity, but “natural” political power was “subordinate to supernatural judgement.”

There are repercussions of this position in the language Congar uses and this critique has to be partly accepted. Milbank rightly pointed out that what appears as a dualism is incongruous with the integralist revolution. But as I showed earlier and will continue to show, Congar sought to articulate intimate relations between God, world and humanity. Milbank’s critique does not adequately address Congar’s intents and dynamism in this direction. Milbank states that the church lives in protected “‘meta-history,’ with its events ... essentially untouched by social processes.” In claiming this he does not take into account the historical approach Congar took as he tackled almost all the significant issues of his life-work. On the other hand, I earlier noted that the relation to the world and world’s role is not adequately addressed in Congar’s theology. Furthermore, Milbank rightly showed that Congar argued for the world’s “intrinsic spiritual significance,” elaborated in Christological language, with the church and the world viewed under the authority of Christ. So, his critique applies to the framework Congar used. So, while Congar had collectivist concerns, it delineated the distinction between
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Milbank continues Congar does not sufficiently stress “the ‘integral information’ of the temporal by the spiritual.” (ibid.)


139 Milbank, Ibid.

140 ibid., 226.


142 Milbank, Ibid. He points to Henri de Lubac, who strongly emphasized the historical and social dimensions of salvation, but tended “to prescind from the political, and to insulate the Church from wider social processes.” (ibid., 228) So, while arguing that the church is also a society, Milbank argues, de Lubac makes a contrast of “Church/secular society in terms of the contrast individual/social,” thus implying “that there is a realm which is merely ‘social’ and which the individual might stand outside,” which reiterates the view of the world as autonomous. Consequently, the church does not interfere, except “where social actions impinge on the ethical and religious sphere, which now appears especially ‘individual.’” (ibid., 229) Milbank refers to Henri de Lubac, Catholicism, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988), 145 – 208.

143 Milbank, ibid.
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the secular and spiritual by contrasting social and individual, as Cavanaugh earlier pointed out. Thus, direct ecclesial “engagement” was not fulfilled. Milbank concludes (pointing to Latin American context): “hence the ‘distinction of planes’ was abandoned by the liberation theologians” to work out integralism, which includes also a political dimension.145

TWO “PLANES” AND SYNERGY

This leads to the question if the contours of the Spirit Christology in Congar’s “theandric temple” are applicable in addressing the directness of engagement in the socio-cultural world. In his later work Congar contended that the whole people of God – the messianic (or anointed) people – is the sacrament of salvation of the world, a fact that Milbank does not take into account.146 This would indicate the dualisms are surpassed as the role of the Spirit is worked out in the life of the church and in sacraments, beside that of Christ.147 The community is prior to the distinction of hierarchy-laity and it lives and directly engages the world as also a political community in which the Spirit acts. Milbank and Cavanaugh do not refer to Congar’s Pneumatology. Congar, sadly, did not have the opportunity to work out the implications to the relation God-world and substantially revisit his earlier work in the light of light of Pneumatology. If he had done so and the relation Spirit-world had been articulated, perhaps the issue of “orders” and its distinctions of directness or immediacy would have been addressed. They, as my further chapters will show, still linger, though are not so explicit.

The role of the Spirit, then, embraces the engagement in the socio-cultural world and the access to God, as the directness of engagement concerns also the directness of participation in God. Boersma’s critique of Chenu is helpful. For Boersma both Chenu and Congar belong to the group of authors who sought to restore what he calls “a sacramental mindset that regards the created order as symbolic in character, so that it makes the supernatural reality present to the world of time and space.”148 But both looked at Incarnation as not only celebrating “the historical and material character of the created order,” but also insisted on its autonomy, accepted its cultural shifts and had a view that “the Incarnation continued in the Church, and through the Church throughout society.”149 Boersma suggests that such acceptance of and even (Chenu’s) “advocacy of desacralized universe made it difficult for him to sustain the incarnational or sacramental ontology that he was intent on recovering.”150 As

145 The lay activity, remained intra-ecclesial, whereas pastoral activity was embroiled in the political struggles. ibid. So, Gustavo Gutierrez argues that there was “gradual forsaking of such expressions as supernatural end, supernatural vocation, and supernatural order and in the ever-increasing use of the term integral … which tend to stress the unity of the call to salvation.” Consequently, “the frontiers between the life of faith and temporal works, between Church and world, become more fluid.” Gustavo Gutierrez, A Theology of Liberation: History, politics, and salvation. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004), 39 – 47.
146 Congar, Un Peuple Messianique, 98.
147 ibid., 87.
149 ibid., 45.
150 ibid.
noted in Chapter One, Congar’s early emphasis on incarnation was a characteristic of a stream of thought in which Chenu was a major figure. But his later work with developed role of the Spirit may provide a way to argue both for engagement in the world (and in a way its autonomy) and intimacy with God. It may lay a groundwork for theology of engagement in the complex and suffering world with an eye to and in cooperation with divine activity, thanks to the role of the Spirit.

To make this case let me briefly look at the interaction of two “orders.” Both of them interrelate around the issue of participation. Congar proposes that the church directly cooperates with God, because it has in itself the causes, which will renew the world. They (the causes) constitute the church: in prayer the church cooperates with God, the Spirit is actively present through the Spirit’s gifts, and there are three messianic offices, priesthood, prophecy and kingship. Consequently, the apostolic church brings the cosmos to God by participating in what resembles the two missions. The world, on the other hand, does not have such direct participation, largely as the realm of ambiguity and ambivalence. The attempts of human culture to overcome what haunts human existence (in pursuing the state which resembles God’s kingdom) are marred by defects. Ambivalence means that hope is mixed with pessimism, good with bad; there is no guarantee of pure development of good. Congar asserts that the secular culture neglects the transcendent and trusts in the immanent forces of the world. Importantly, it constructs its own eschatology, neglects the intervention from above, ignores the wisdom of the cross and relies on the instinct of survival.

His proposal, however, does not leave those separated, but suggests a synergy. To achieve its goals, according to Congar, the culture has to realize the gift of God and its insufficiency, which brings in the role of the church. Congar’s rapprochement affirms the continuity between human effort and divine gift. This means that in discussing the relation God-world in Congar there is not only the ecclesial synergy discussed in chapter two (“deeper”). There is also a synergy of the work of the world (meaning the whole creation) and divine activity (exemplified in the move “outward”), which brings together human effort and divine gift. But how do the two synergies relate? First, for Congar the latter synergy revolves around the human being: he proposes that human effort, which strives after integrity and unity, prepares

---

151 Congar, Lay People, Ibid. Congar presents the participation of the church in Christ’s offices in terms of the “causality of grace.” Christ as the anointed, causes the ecclesial institution to be a divine organ, and in such way the church participates. This comes together with the Spirit and gifts, who indwells the church and is “already present and active in the Church” as the Principle “which will calm the world’s groaning and dry our tears; which brooded over creation at its beginnings … and always has been and is the quickening of the second creation.” (ibid.)

152 See also Famerée, L’Ecclésiologie, 205.

153 Congar, Lay People, 99.

154 Ibid., 99 – 102.

155 102.

156 This, according to Congar, in the history of salvation means that “by an exercise of pure grace God in Heaven brings the happy outcome which an effort begun here below, itself not without the help of grace, could not reach by itself.”, 103.
earthly material for the kingdom as it humanizes the world. The things in the world have to be transformed in such a way as to contribute to human existence.\textsuperscript{157} Second, the world has to (autonomously, it appears) realize its fullest potential, which is then to be taken into Christ.\textsuperscript{158} Thus for him the “liberation” of the creation means allowing it to live out its truth, if the world wants to arrive at the kingdom (and offer itself to the Spirit’s embrace) “in a state of full development and activity.”\textsuperscript{159} Culturally and socially undeveloped and immature, the world, in Congar’s view, will be lacking when the kingdom comes. But what if there would be a way to perceive the Spirit acting in the world, in the “liberation” of creation and in its autonomy? Is there a way the theology of the Spirit helps this second synergy and rapprochement in general?

\textbf{THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE LAITY AND THE SPIRIT}

To show the possibility of affirming both real engagement in the world and real participation in God I turn to Congar’s theology of priesthood. In it there is a link between creation and eschatology, crucial for the aforementioned mutuality, and at its centre is a theology of sacrifice. The latter implies and binds Christological and Pneumatological aspects crucial both for immediacy with God and realism of engagement. In his theology of priesthood, Congar’s instinct or spirit to show intimate relation with God while immersed in the world and thus through the world shows up. It seeks to draw nearer towards sources of faith while keeping with its historical and cultural relevance. The issue of priesthood brings together the Christ of the past (Alpha) and the future Christ (Omega), but also the church and the world in divine and human activity.\textsuperscript{160} It overcomes some of earlier abstract separations. Congar’s notion of priesthood, Jossua noted, comes from the idea of sacrifice rather than of mediation or consecration.\textsuperscript{161} Thus it has a potential to challenge the abstract and juridical language of realms and orders. This idea revolves around the biblical synthesis extracted from the \textit{City of God} of Augustine.\textsuperscript{162} Augustine’s sacrifice, Congar notes, tends to its completion in the final fruit. For him “true sacrifice is every work done with the aim of uniting us with God in a holy fellowship, that is to say, every work that is referred as its end to the good which can make

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{157}{ibid.}
\footnote{158}{\textsuperscript{104}}
\footnote{159}{\textsuperscript{105}. This development is contrary to the development of Christendom, were there was no world outside the church: “From that time [Constantine], seeing that all people, including emperors, were with few exceptions Catholic, I feel that I have written the history not of two cities but as it were of one, the Church,” Otto of Freising, \textit{Chronicon}, as quoted by E. Gilson, \textit{Dante et la philosophie}, 203, in Congar, \textit{Lay People}, 105, note 1.}
\footnote{161}{Jossua, \textit{Yves Congar}, 105.}
\footnote{162}{Congar, \textit{Lay People}, 122 – 127. He summons the biblical imagery in Augustine, \textit{City of God}, book 10, chapters 5, 6, 16 accessed online at \url{http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/120110.htm} on 2 December 2015 and Irenaeus, \textit{AH}, book 4, chapter 17, 4.}
\end{footnotes}
us truly blessed.” The final fruit is the city of God, which saints constitute through their sacrifices, deeds done in a Godward movement; the total sacrifice is the total city of God, for which Christ sacrificed himself. Augustine’s understanding of sacrifice and the eschatological goal allows bringing to view that the relation God-world is key here.

This turn to Augustine and later reference to Thomas suggest that the following discussion is to be viewed in the light of a “sapiential eschatology,” which both share. Congar’s point of interest is the particular role of Christian religion in this and embodied presence in the world. So, he affirms Augustine’s view that Christ’s body is fulfilled in its three dimensions: the community and the body of Incarnation are dynamically linked through the sacramental body. However, he finds that the ecclesiological implications of Augustine’s theology of sacrifice points to the ambiguity. This is an ambiguity as to the positive role of “instituted” Christian worship. The concern with the personal spiritual reality of priesthood (and not the means to it) meant that believers were members of Christ, sharing in a life of faith, grace and love. This was not sufficient, according to Congar. On the other hand, Augustine associated priesthood with baptism in an “ecclesiology of res and ecclesiology of sacramentum.” Congar resolved the ambiguity with the help of Thomas Aquinas’ theology of the “sacramental characters as participations in the priesthood of Christ.”

163 Congar, Lay People, 127, a quote from Augustine, City of God, 10, 6.
164 Augustine, City of God, 10, 6: “Augustine, City of God, 10, 6. “… it follows that the whole redeemed city, that is to say, the congregation or community of the saints, is offered to God as our sacrifice through the great High Priest, who offered Himself to God in His passion for us, that we might be members of this glorious head, according to the form of a servant. For it was this form He offered, in this He was offered, because it is according to it He is Mediator, in this He is our Priest, in this the Sacrifice … And this also is the sacrifice which the Church continually celebrates in the sacrament of the altar, known to the faithful, in which she teaches that she herself is offered in the offering she makes to God.”
165 I came upon this term in Elizabeth Phillips, “Eschatology and Apocalyptic,” in Craig Hovey and Elizabeth Phillips. The Cambridge Companion to Political Theology. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 279. Phillips spells it “sapiential,” as do I. She takes it from Matthew L. Lamb, “Wisdom Eschatology in Augustine and Aquinas,” in Aquinas the Augustinian, ed. Michael Dauphinais, Barry David and Matthew Levering (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 259. This “’sapiential eschatology overcomes tendencies toward instrumentalizing both nature and divine revelation,’ as it recognizes that ‘the revelation of eschatology in Holy Scripture supernaturally fulfils the finality of the created universe rather than simply destroying and negating it in a final conflagration, as if that were all.’” Phillips, Ibid., quoting from Lamb, Ibid., 265.
166 In dynamically linking Eucharistic and Ecclesial the states of Christ’s body, Congar depends on the work of Henri de Lubac, Corpus Mysticum.
167 Congar, Lay People, 140. Thus, priesthood would be identical with life of grace and would add nothing to being drawn into divine life. It would imply, Congar continues “a spiritual priesthood for the heathen who are justified by good faith.”
168 ibid., 141. This emphasized the necessity of institutional means to participate in the spiritual reality.
169 ibid., Thomas Aquinas, ST, III, Q 63, on “outward sign – character” A 1: “… whenever anyone is deputed to some definite purpose he is wont to receive some outward sign thereof. … by the sacraments … the faithful receive a certain spiritual character.” A 2: “… the sacraments of the New Law produce a character … as by them we are deputed to the worship of God according to the rite of the Christian religion. … Now the worship of God consists either in receiving Divine gifts, or in bestowing them on others. And for both these purposes some power is needed … Consequently, a character signifies a certain spiritual power ordained unto things pertaining to the Divine worship.” On this as participations in Christ’s priesthood - A 3: “Now the whole rite of the Christian religion is derived from Christ’s priesthood. Consequently, it is clear that the sacramental character is specially
necessity of the positive—meaning instituted the way of worship, but what did this mean for the presence of the church in the world? Does not this reiterate that the contemporary world is faced with its institutional and juridical claims rather than invited into the mystery of human-divine interaction? On the other hand, “sapiential eschatology” allows situating this concern of Aquinas in the relation between creation and eschatology. The presence of Christian worship is both to fulfil the creation, and to engage it in the light of God’s ultimate justice and peace.

Congar’s picture of divine-human interaction affirms both the properly Christomorphic shape of return and Pneumatological emphasis. But this abstract distinction is confounded by the mystery, which Congar expounds. Since the idea of Summa is human return to God, Thomas, Congar shows, viewed Christ (in all he did and suffered) as the way through which humanity returns to God. By offering himself as sacrifice, Jesus Christ initiated Christian return and worship, “a positive, social, institutional religion,” with himself as the one and only true priest.¹⁷⁰ He is the auctor (he fulfils and is ultimately responsible) as head of the priestly body. An organized and social worship is that of Christ in and through the church. Christ is the principle of the whole Christian existence as “exemplary causality and efficient causality.”¹⁷¹ On the other hand, Congar also asserts that the virtue of sacraments is attributed to the Holy Spirit. However, Scholastic theologians subjected this to impulse of Christ, grace of Christ as head.¹⁷² Moreover, all Christian sacrifices can really attain to God because the Holy Spirit puts them into motion. The Holy Spirit works in line with the “absolute, unique and universal” priesthood of Christ.¹⁷³ This Pneumatological aspect was even more pronounced in Congar’s later work, as I will show later. It will suffice to note now that Congar argued that the loss of the experience of immediacy of experience of Christ was to the loss of the Pneumatological aspect. The unity and dynamism of sacramental process it provided was clouded by the Scholastic penchant for transcendent causes and mediations. He especially referred to the earlier mentioned theology of sacrament as character.¹⁷⁴


¹⁷⁰ Congar, Lay People, 143.
¹⁷¹ ibid., 143-144.
¹⁷² ibid.
¹⁷³ Congar, Lay People, 158.
¹⁷⁴ If in Augustine and Fathers one could pass immediately from the ecclesial body of Christ to sacramental body in the “dynamism and truth of unique mystery,” with the theology of character a more personalized, individualized way of celebration comes forth. Yves Congar, L’Église: de saint Augustin à l’époque moderne. Vol. 20. (Paris: Cerf, 1996), 167. With “created grace,” where there is no more “great Christ” (in us), but “his gifts of grace, personally received,” thus the distance. The “true body” (of Christ) earlier applied to the church (with the sacramental body realizing its mystery) now is attributed to Eucharist, the reality of the presence of Christ in the sacrament. ibid., 168.
This immediacy of participation in God is later reciprocated with the view of the church as the sacrament of salvation of the world, thus real communal presence (and engagement) in the world. But Congar’s theology of laity shows theology of sacrifice at the heart of both. The sacrifice of Christ is a priesthood in action, a reality to take part in, uniting the sacrifices of humanity and God. This is because the sacrifice of Christ is his self-sacrificing life in the Spirit (his spirit of sonship) and his deeds, culminating in the Pasch.\(^\text{175}\) This reference to Christ is however, not only oriented to the past. This allows inferring a proper role to the Spirit. Christ is Alpha (what Christ has done for humanity) and Omega (Christ being with humanity), which unfolds all powers of the sacrifice. He identifies them as “the same mystery,” Alpha as principle, Omega as result.\(^\text{176}\) The image of Eucharist (and priesthood) gathers the “threads of Christian economy of priesthood.”\(^\text{177}\) The Eucharist gives a glimpse to the situation in between Pasch and Parousia.\(^\text{178}\) This means that thanks to the Spirit, the church participates in Christ, - Christ as the reality of the filial life of the church, and Christ as the (sacramental) means of realising this life, structure.\(^\text{179}\) There is still a duality in Congar’s account, since the time of the church is that of the action of the Spirit and ecclesial institution, presented as one alongside the other, without permeation. These distinctions, which thwart immediacy with God and presence in the world, will be partially addressed in his later work, as I will show. But I do not want this to cloud the implications of Congar’s theology of priesthood for the relation God-world.

In oscillating between earlier and later work I want to show that the immediacy of relation with God of his later work applies to the relation God-world in the early. In his theology of laity Congar presents public worship as tending towards eschatological Omega and drawing from “the first and the Second Adam."\(^\text{180}\) This must mean there is a cooperation – the activity of creation and the divine activity – come together. This, according to Congar, is expressed in a “give-and take, a sort of mutual complementing, between these two parts of the Church’s worship,” meaning from above (hierarchical) and from below (communal).\(^\text{181}\) Congar’s intent is not separating, since he continues that “together they form one single liturgy.”\(^\text{182}\) In this return to God, human worship is perfected as the Holy Spirit appropriates divine gift. Furthermore, what holds this vision intact needs to be brought into view. Congar finds this co-operation “illustrated by what we have said before ... about the meaning of history in relation to the kingdom of God ... and by the Catholic theology of grace.”\(^\text{183}\) This means Congar

\(^{175}\) Congar, *Lay People*, 159 – 162.  
\(^{176}\) ibid., 163.  
\(^{177}\) 165.  
\(^{178}\) On this identification of “eucharistic body and of the fellowship body,” see de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum*, 177-182.  
\(^{179}\) Congar, *Lay People*, 167.  
\(^{180}\) ibid., 208, 209.  
\(^{181}\) 211.  
\(^{182}\) ibid.  
\(^{183}\) 212.
views it in the wider human-divine and even cosmic-divine interaction. Human movement, divine gift and human use of this gift are for him linked “organically.” What is the theological basis for that? For Congar the participation of the church in Christ’s three offices is based on the fact that “the sacrifice of the Cross belongs to the entire universe.” This means it goes further than “properly sacramental celebration,” embraces the whole world and even goes beyond that as it “offers to God all things that are his – space, time and inanimate nature itself.” It is clear, that the view of creation sustained by two divine missions is behind this assertion.

Already at this stage the intimacy and reciprocity in human-divine-cosmic relation is implied thanks to the role of the Spirit. But does this amount to real creative engagement in the world? The liturgy for Congar is truly cosmic – “in the Eucharistic sacrifice the offering of the world and of time is integrally and efficaciously taken up by the only One.” But on the other hand, neither the contribution of creation, nor that of eschatology, are fully affirmed. There is no focus in the words of Phillips on “the equality, community, and freedom in and for which human sociality was created and towards which earthly powers must be pointed in light of the ultimate justice of the Kingdom of God.” Phillips has rightly argued for grounding eschatology in the understanding of creation as ongoing creating and sustaining activity of God. This comes along with my insistence on the necessity of showing the role of the Spirit in the world. On the other hand, Congar showed how divine movement towards the world in incarnation, cross and resurrection engages it and returns it to God by its own movement. But this centrality of sacrifice and the participation of Christians in Christ’s priesthood has to be viewed in the light of the engagement in the world. It seems that its Pneumatological dimension is consonant and requires aligning the understanding of sacrifice and priesthood with the “dangerous memory of Jesus Christ.” This leaves the question as to what Congar’s theology of laity contributes to the role of the Spirit in the relation God-world.
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184 ibid.
185 ibid., 201.
186 ibid., with references to Paul Claudel and to St. Maximus the Confessor and a quote from Jacques Bossuet’s sermon on the Annunciation. This is based on seeing human being as “microcosm,” see also Henri de Lubac, *The Drama of Atheist Humanism*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995), 20, 21.
187 Congar, *Lay People*, 221.
189 ibid.
190 According to Johann Baptist Metz, “… the Church must understand and justify itself as the public witness and bearer of the tradition of a dangerous memory of freedom in the ‘systems’ of our emancipative society.” This is “memoria Jesu Christi.” Johann Baptist Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, (London: Burns & Oates, 1980), 89, 90. But my primary reference here is Michael Kirwan, “Eucharist and Sacrifice.” *New Blackfriars* 88.1014 (2007): 213-227., 214. Here he refers to Bruce Morrill for the Eucharist dimension of Johann Baptist Metz’s political theology, Bruce Morrill, *Anamnesis as dangerous memory: Political and liturgical theology in Dialogue*. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000), 30. Kirwan points to the Johannine notion of “filiation” as that which allows to see Eucharist as dangerous memory. With the help of Chauvet, he looks at the Eucharist as that which is to be lived, not in servile, but filial way (as brothers and sisters). This view of will not “allow us to abdicate our
TOWARDS THE PNEUMATOLOGICAL CORRECTIVE

This theology comprises two movements – the movement “deeper” (into divine mystery) and “outward” (God’s incorporation of the world) – into one. The emerging role of the Spirit is able to bring the two moves together. It would address the criticism of Congar’s early proposal and show the implications of his later theology of the Spirit. I agree with Charles MacDonald that Congar’s account has more in common with the “incarnational – evolutionist” view (G. Thils) than both have with the “eschatologist” (L. Bouyer). MacDonald rightly points out the theological focus of Congar on divine mystery as God communicates divine life to creation. MacDonald agrees with Congar’s view of the distinctiveness and autonomy of the world, but thinks that these encroach on the gratuity of the divine gift, when these become a “‘necessary condition’ with respect to God’s kingdom.” From the opposite angle Famerée has suggested the world in Congar appears as mere object of the ecclesial mission, that is the world itself cannot teach or bring anything to the church. The theological focus supports my insistence on the emphasis on the Spirit, as Famerée also points out – “the Spirit works and addresses the Church, that the Kingdom comes also outside the influence of historic Church.” However, this also points to the personal role of the Spirit in the world and not only the church, which Congar does not develop.

Congar viewed the contemporary situation of the world as ambivalent and ambiguous, but did his theological assessment of the world go far enough? Did he assess and accept the world into his theology? What would such acceptance imply? Eberhard Jüngel pointed to Dietrich Bonhoeffer who “took modern atheism as an opportunity to investigate anew a Christian concept of God in critical interaction with the theological tradition.” This investigation, Jüngel points out, suggested God could not be thought of “without simultaneously considering the world and its historical situation,” and challenged theology to think God in the historical situation of the world, which thinks itself as without God. Congar does not seem to reflect on the historical situation of the world, but rather begins from metaphysical presuppositions. On the other hand, the salvation history emphasis of Congar’s theology (and latent Pneumatology) is, in my view, in line with Bonhoeffer’s “not thinking God without the world,” as Jüngel puts it. Furthermore, Jüngel summarizes Bonhoeffer’s proposal as

human responsibility ... by leaving everything up to a falsely transcendent and non-incarnate God.” Kirwan, Ibid., 225.

191 MacDonald, Ibid., 117
192 ibid., 116, 117
193 Famerée, L’Ecclesiologie, 207. Ibid.
194 Ibid.
195 Eberhard Jüngel, God as the Mystery of the World: On the Foundation of the Theology of the Crucified One in the Dispute between Theism and Atheism, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans 1983), 57.
196 Ibid.
thinking God as “the one who lets himself be pushed out of the world and thus the one who relates himself to the world.” 198 This resonates with Congar’s reflections on the divine presence as activity of two divine missions, the Son and the Spirit. The ambiguous, ambivalent, and yes, atheist, situation would give the Pneumatological perspective an edge.

Furthermore, such a Pneumatological approach would be more in tune with the critique of “progressivist conceptions of history.”199 The issue at stake is not whether the world is to be viewed as fundamentally evil or fundamentally good, but rather how to adequately address the pains, sufferings and evil humanity faced in 20th century. At the same time when the divine activity in creation is not limited to socio-cultural world, the approach to progress is also more nuanced. Such theological approach, better tuned to the ambiguity and complexity, would require to focus on what happens in the history, rather than its finality, and provide a critical distance necessary to engage any ideological leanings. The cue may be taken from Congar’s approach to the history of the church and its role in the world. In it the clarity and the directness that the language of “orders” suggests gives way to ambivalence and ambiguity. However, due to the personal role (presence and activity) of the Spirit this does not lead into discouragement or scepticism. The inspiration comes from the earlier sacramental view, while formulating the participation in God as the engagement in the contemporary world.

Graham Ward expressed this view of creation: “God spoke the world into being and therefore the world was made by his Word and sustained by his Spirit.”200 This view meant that in the “sacramental space” which ensued one could understand the world and its activities: “The world itself was discursive, words and things were interrelated.”201 Congar shared a view (which Ward finds in Michel de Certeau) that this view has collapsed,202 but he turned to the role of the Spirit to reinterpret the vision for contemporary times.

Thus, Congar sought to affirm the “temporal” and distance himself from the juridical focus on the church as society towards understanding it as mystery.203 In line with earlier images, this view of the church is not merely where the divine radiates through the human, but points to the political presence of the church – it is a radiant communal body. Furthermore, it is a human-divine mystery where the world’s (creation’s) movement meets divine movement.

---

198 Jüngel, God as Mystery of the World, 61.
201 ibid.
202 ibid. “the unitary and also ternary architecture of the universe collapsed, ushering different conceptions of time, presence, and space.”
203 Yves Congar, “Église et monde,” 338. This is “ecclesiology as the chapter on public law.”
This coincides with his later attempt to surpass the distinction of two orders. The role of the Spirit is key: the Spirit and the Spirit’s gifts of grace put the world into a new relation with God, because the Spirit effectively ordains nature (the world) to accomplish its profound and supernatural aim. At the centre of this revision is for Congar the Judeo-Christian idea of Revelation, uniting God, the human and the world. Together with this development Congar does not begin from metaphysical presuppositions, but from the ambivalence of the world. Before coming to this revision, it is worth noting that this role of the Spirit still lacks personal traits. The movements “deeper” and “outward” resonate with Congar’s later Pneumatology – the Spirit is there the Person who draws into the intimacy of the divine life and incorporates the “other” into the divine communion. This leads me to see how the appreciation of the contemporary situation of the world and the development of the personal role of the Spirit are related.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS TO CHAPTER THREE**

In this third chapter my attention turned to another significant contribution of Congar – his theology of the laity. This theology expanded the account of participation in God – this participation was also an engagement in the socio-cultural world and the creation’s own progress. The role of the Spirit in the church, a movement “deeper” into the relation with God was thus comprised of the role in the movement “outward” – into the world and incorporating the world’s own movement. These developments, however, showed that Congar’s understanding of divine presence in the world and its participation in God is complex. Some participated more directly, but not others. The analysis has led us to distinguish two major approaches – one, which began from metaphysical presuppositions and the other, relying on the economy of salvation. Both focused on the mediation of Christ. I found that the latter, as exemplified by Congar’s “theandric temple,” was both more pneumatological and suggested a more direct and immediate relation between God and the world. However, a better articulation of this relation required both a development of the
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204 M. J. Scheeben’s view of “supernatural,” as a noun rather than adjective, hardened the distinction between the two main orders, according to Congar. It implied a second nature, above the first, but with similar ontological consistency. Congar, Ibid., 340. See also Matthias Joseph Scheeben, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, Scheeben, Matthias Joseph, and Cyril O. Volland. *The Mysteries of Christianity*. (St. Louis, Mo. London: B. Herder Book Co., 1946), 737. Congar used the image of “embracing” or “enveloping:” “If the world and history are enveloping the Church, Christ and the Church are enveloping the world.” The world and history are enveloping the church, because humanity in history and historical life of the church, what Congar calls “material cause” of the church, shapes and conditions the church. On the other hand, while “the Church is in the world and in history, the world and history are in a supernatural order.” Jesus Christ creates the church through revelation and realizes it as his mystical body. (352)

205 341.

206 So the Spirit is “the communion between the Father and the Son, but he is first of all the Breath of God, ... a going out, an impulse an ‘ecstasy’.” Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, 149. See the chapter “Theme of the Holy Spirit as the mutual love of the Father and the Son,” in Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 1, 85. This Augustinian theme sees the Spirit as “the end and the seal of intra-divine fertility, who communicates that fertility to us and is also the principle of our return to the Father through the Son.” (Ibid., 81).
personal role of the Spirit and the ambiguous situation of the world as the beginning point of theology.
In this fourth chapter I look at the middle point of Congar’s work, which is the pivotal point in my thesis looking at the role of the Holy Spirit in the relation God-world. So, I will explore, firstly, how at this stage the role of the Spirit finally becomes important in its own right in Congar’s work. Then, secondly, I will show how it is related to an emphasis on personhood, and the resulting spiritual vision, which links the human person, the world (the creation) and God. I will show how this surpassed the earlier ad-intra view and proposed an in-depth theological engagement with the contemporary situation. Viewed in the light of Congar’s earlier work, this will require showing that the Spirit plays a crucial role in engaging and drawing the world into the divine life. I will also ask why this particular role was important and what shifts it brought to the relation God-world in the contemporary situation. This chapter will establish that when Congar appropriates a more comprehensive – dynamic and historic view of the world, he does so with the help of a theology of the Holy Spirit. My argument will be that faith’s vision of participation in God is directly and creatively engaging the world only as the personal role of the Spirit is brought forth. The potential and limits of Congar’s insights concerning the role of the Spirit continue in the line of earlier emphases on the synergy and Spirit Christology. As Congar does not yet reflect on the personhood of the Spirit, some of the earlier hindrances await the full-fledged Pneumatology.

The situation of the turn to the living God

In the period before, during and after Second Vatican, the language of the Spirit is more overt. This comes along with rapid changes in the ecclesial situation. It started to change with the pontificate of John XXIII, which began on 28 October 1958. This change brought a reinstatement for Congar, which relieved censures. There were unexpected opportunities of service, and new publications. The major event, one of the four “moments of grace” in Congar’s life, was the Second Vatican Council.¹ The intention to hold the Second Vatican Council was announced on 25 January 1959. Congar was soon named a consultant for the preparatory commission, then official expert of the theological commission of the Council. Though distrust was still lurking in some quarters, Popes John XXIII and especially Paul VI showed trust in Congar, and invitations and requests for collaboration multiplied.² The experience of serving the council was transforming for Congar. It surpassed earlier expectations and opened new horizons. He viewed the council as living tradition in action, a
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¹ Flynn, Yves Congar’s Vision, 4.
² Jossua, Yves Congar, 34.
“great density of fidelity and wisdom coming from the entire church ... an event of Pentecostal type ... a visit of the Holy Spirit.”

How did this event reverberate within the ecclesial life?

For Congar the council was the event in which a real change or shift happened. The role of the Spirit, which came to the centre, was inseparable from the matrix in which it emerged. In his case the personal, theological and ecclesial aspects overlapped. When Congar arrived on 15 November 1960 for the first gathering of the Preparatory Theological Commission, he was still suspect, an attitude to which he had been accustomed since 1938. Vatican II, for Congar, was marked by the intense struggle for the Constitutions, especially to do with ecclesiology and tradition. J. J. Scarisbrick reads Congar’s account to show that the battles around the documents in Commissions and sub-Commissions challenged the predominant theological attitudes of the Roman curia. The collision was between Roman curial theology rooted in the manuals of the 19th century and patristic, biblical theology critical of curial authoritarianism. Alberto Melloni sees in Congar’s diaries the struggle of the system against truth. Melloni identifies several aspects of the system’s conspiracy against truth – theological attitude towards tradition and “unlimited devotion to Mary,” anthropological contempt for the human subject, disregard of experience and history, and ecclesiological insensitivity to human needs and ecumenical appeal. The change of attitudes and the atmosphere cannot be separated from what Congar thought about the council as a Pentecostal event. By the year 1965 Congar’s paranoia and pessimism had been largely dispelled.

The role of the Spirit, thus recovered, was not to be limited to the event. Sometime in 1963 Congar sees that the people who held control are losing it. In 1962 his diaries read, “Pius IX still reigns. Boniface VIII still reigns,” but in 1965 the entry of the pope is the “entry of a bishop, pastor and priest, not prince.” For him this is a change in the spirit of the council, which has to be maintained: “the danger is that one will not seek any more ... It would be a betrayal of the aggiornamento if we thought it could be fixed once and for all in the texts of Vatican II.” Vatican II for him is not a warehouse to be exploited, but would need to “explicate its contributions and riches ... to follow its dynamism.” Vatican II challenged theologians to serve the increasingly complex reality which has developed since, and the role of the Spirit was crucial. Congar refers to Pope Paul VI’s call during a general audience of 6 June 1973 for
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developments in Christology and ecclesiology to be followed by the new chapter on the Holy Spirit “as an indispensable supplement” of the council. This change of equilibrium of diverse theological elements, i.e. Vatican II, was for Congar the release of creative energies. Against this backdrop we can ask what Congar meant when he considered, according to Groppe, that the Council “had done very good work, but in numerous regards it had gone only half-way.”

The shifts can be gleaned from Congar’s publications. In the period prior to and during Vatican II he published works which were begun and matured during the time of suspicion and exile. His ecclesiological research matured and reassessed earlier themes. In 1960, the historical part of the study on tradition, *Tradition and Traditions*, was published; in 1962, *Sacerdoce et laïcat* supplements the work of Lay People in the Church; in 1963, *Pour une Eglise servante et pauvre* and *Sainte Eglise*, gathering thirty years of ecclesiological writing. The 1964 work *Chrétiens en dialogue* is an answer to the earlier work *Chrétiens desunis*. The shift is visible in the role of the work, *Tradition and Traditions*. According to Jossua, in it “Congar intentionally and definitively moves the question of tradition from the field of apologetics to a field that is strictly theological.” Already in the beginning of his teaching, Congar believed that the mission of his generation was to “bring together in the Church all that was good in the demands and problems posed by modernists.” (italics added) This meant a move from doing theology as inter-confessional apologetics towards true fundamental theology as a discipline. The focus on the church, however, gives way to the focus on the Spirit. Groppe writes that between the years 1967 and 1985, Congar published “more than fifteen articles on the theology of the Holy Spirit, the three-volume *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* (1979-1980), and the monographs *Esprit de l’homme, Esprit de Dieu* (1983), and *The Word and the Spirit* (1984).” Where does this shift come from?

The shift built upon earlier work but also reassessed it as Congar, in my view, sought to articulate faith with an eye to the developing cultural situation. So, in 1964 Congar affirmed that an even more radical way forward than ecclesiology was needed in addressing unbelief. This more radical way had to concern “the very notion of faith and the correlative idea of revelation.” This initiates a turn to the subject of tradition, which I examine in the next chapter. But Congar’s concern throughout is theological, not merely apologetic, which means
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it looks at the fundamental relation of God and humanity. Thus Congar is concerned with the relation God-world. He turns to the vision, which links “theology, anthropology and cosmology, the living God, man and the world!” To address modern unbelief effectively, Congar thought one should have demonstrated how the human being, cosmos and God are intimately connected. What constitutes this intimate relation? It will be suggested in this chapter that for relations to be intimate, they have to be personal, thus the issue of “personhood” will be addressed. The issue of “personhood” is also the issue of freedom, it will be shown. Then, there is an experience implied in the intimate relation which highlights the necessary role of the world, as it is in concrete life that intimate relation happens. But does this point to the role of the Spirit? Before addressing this role, let me provide an example of how concretely the issues interrelate.

To delineate Congar’s approach to the issue I will outline Congar’s involvement in drafting the Declaration on Religious Liberty of Vatican II. The issue of human freedom in human-divine cooperation was discussed when the relations of the church and world were shifting. Nazism, then communism and secularism, on the one hand, and the freedom of individual conscience, on the other, brought unique challenges. This new situation was addressed with principles taken from ecumenical dialogue. But the relation of the church and the world was also reviewed in a more dynamic vision, “the church is in the world and the world is in the plan of God.” Their finality pointed to the final consummation in the kingdom of God and eschatology. The anthropological component of the freedom of conscience revolved around the issue of human personhood. In this the affirmations about God could not be separated from affirmations about human existence: “theology could not discover God without discovering the human and the destiny of the world together with God.” For Congar this meant the presence of the church which relied not on the “legal” or “political” authority, but on the law of the Gospel, Christian life. Congar sees it expressed in the ideas Koinonia, Diakonia, Marturia: Fellowship, Service and Witness of the World Council of Churches. The church is present in the world as Christian communion. This “poor” presence raises the question of how then one is drawn in freedom to God.
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Congar’s French theological proposal was distinct from the Anglo-Italian, which eventually prevailed and which focused on the political-juridical. It sought to deconstruct an existing pact of theology and politics, provide a common ground for rival approaches and positively outline a biblical view of freedom. This view intended to show “salvation history as the way of liberation and the way of teaching humanity freedom;” the juridical section followed. The interference of the pope, according to Alberigo, guarded the freedom of the church – the religious freedom as a free act of faith and freedom of the magisterium. It also sought to confront religious indifferentism, distinguished between tolerance in political realm and in the church; as it appropriated the concept of tolerance from the civil perspective, it doomed Congar’s biblical and historical sections. The pope’s point of concern was that the biblical and salvation history section would be interpreted as a charter of freedom in the Church. Congar saw Maritain’s distinction of freedom in civil society and in religious community behind the pope’s position. But this distinction could not effectively address indifferentism, according to Congar. It follows that he, on the other hand, saw freedom as the centre of the way of salvation, interpreted as education in freedom. His theological proposal sought to be an effective response to indifferentism through a theological horizon relating the humans, cosmos and God. This sketch sets a background to appreciate the role of the Spirit, which will come into the view in addressing similar concerns.

TOWARDS PERSONAL ROLE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE RELATION GOD-WORLD

My task in this chapter is to show how the personal role of the Spirit emerges in the relation God-world. Even if earlier quotes suggest a wider scope, Congar’s view of the world focuses primarily on human creation. To achieve this goal I will have to look at what Congar’s notion of personhood implies. At the same time, as the period and theological landscape change, I keep on identifying what stays on: his openness to the developments in the world and penetrating deeper into the mystery of the triune God. What does this notion of person bring? For the purposes of my argument it is important firstly because it shows what intimacy means – personal relations are intimate relations. Secondly, it shows what the vision of faith means for Congar – it is like an experience, where one’s personal life in the world makes sense through a relation with God. So, the notion of the person signals a shift in the account of human participation in God as it does not begin with metaphysical presuppositions, but rather with the encounter with God in the world, the experience. So, thirdly, it urges to reflect on
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the relation on human person and divine persons, and the interpersonal relations, pressing to consider intra-Trinitarian life. And, fourthly, it has a continuing significance of affirming human self in the light of contemporary ideologies. All of them combined with Congar’s focus on the mystery of the triune God point towards a picture of the role of the Spirit in the relation God-world.

“LIVING GOD” AND ASCENT TO COMPLEMENT DESCENT IN SALVATION ECONOMY

I will begin by showing this role of the Spirit in a theological account of divine relation to the creation. Congar’s account of participation of the world in God evolves. At this stage he presents God as involved with creation in two clear moments; they provide a bridge between God in eternity and in salvation history and point to two divine persons. There is a passage from “theology” (God in Godself) to “economy” (God acting in creation), and there will finally be “a kind of re-absorption of ‘economy’ into ‘theology.’” This “descent” and “re-ascent” point to distinct roles of Jesus Christ and the Spirit. Thus the incarnation already suggests the role of the Spirit. This is because the ecclesial and cosmic implications of “re-ascent” come from “descent.” In situating incarnation in the recapitulation of all things in Christ Congar relies on the studies of liturgy of St. Gregory Nazianzen and catechetical homilies and anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia. This view of incarnation in salvation history is connected with the coming of the Holy Spirit – Christmas is realized in the Pasch, which in turn is linked with the birth of human beings from the Spirit. Congar points to the traditional maxim: “nothing in man has been saved but that which was assumed by the Son of God in His incarnation.” But traditional sources also link the birth according to grace with the birth of Christ according to flesh.

This brings forth the role of the Spirit - as incarnation aims at human divinization, the “admirabile commercium” of incarnation is totally ordered to that of ascension and that of Pentecost. Human nature was saved through the condescension and filial obedience of

40 This concern together with the latter, that is the personhood as being in relation, is reiterated in recent times by Paul Fiddes: “it is hard to conceive of a responsible self and to withstand totalitarianism without some concept of a human subject.” Paul Fiddes, “The Late-modern Reversal of Spirit and Letter: Derrida, Augustine and Film.” in The Spirit and the Letter: A Tradition and a Reversal. Ed. Paul S. Fiddes and Günter Bader. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013. 105–130., 127.
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Jesus Christ, because he was also a human being. But there is a crucial link between human filial life (life as children of God) and the birth of Christ, and this link is the Holy Spirit. Christ became the life-giving spirit by resurrection according to the Spirit. This soteriological insight has two implications for the relation church-world, according to Congar. First, the church is not made for itself, but for apostolic service to the world. Second, the theology of created or earthly realities has to be paschal and eschatological (and not only “incarnational”). This challenges the duality of realms, because it shows the world is to be viewed as both fallen and in Christ. The two moments show both divine transcendence and also an intimate involvement in the perishable world, transcendence and immanence. This is visible in what he calls the divine “philanthropy.” This philanthropy shows that the relation of God and the world follows the pattern of the mission of the Son and that of the Spirit.

The Trinitarian pattern remains. First, the philanthropy means that a certain kinship between God and humanity is fulfilled in Jesus Christ. The argument is this: if God addresses humans and imparts the Spirit, there should be between God and humanity a fundamental, divinely realized, kinship. It is realized divinely, thus there is a distance between the transcendent God and humanity. However, if what humans say about God is based on what God communicated, there has to be a possibility of analogy. This possibility rests on the assertion that God is Jesus Christ; that is, there must be something in God, which permits him to “stoop so low” and become human. But, second, this divine involvement with humanity in salvation also has an eschatological aspect. According to Congar, God not merely is (“aseity”), nor merely was: but is to come. This means God is for, towards, and with humanity and opening
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the way of life and accompanying them, as God who makes to be and to live, the living God.\textsuperscript{52}
This eschatological aspect points to the role of the Spirit.

This emphasis on God as living, in my view, implies the activity of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{53} As this activity acquires more and more attention and importance, theological reflection has to catch up. This follows from the fact that for Congar the economy, that is history of salvation, is insufficient, but requires ontology. Thus eschatological focus with an eye to the divine eternity points to the role of the Spirit. This is how it works. The goal (of return of creation to eternal God) is the eschatological: “God (is) everything to everyone;” how is this return reflected in the distinction between God’s eternal being and God’s acts in the world? This is the challenge of relating free and gracious divine acts (from the incarnation to our divinization) and the necessary (eternal) mystery of God.\textsuperscript{54} To relate the two Congar claims that these acts imply and reveal something of God’s eternal nature; they are theophanic. They do this by showing that the Absolute is not only for and in itself, but is the Love-Gift.\textsuperscript{55} As for Congar economy involves questions of ontology, thus he speaks of an ontology of love, suggesting all creation is oriented towards the absolute (Love). This orientation means nature requires saving and is to be saved by grace. Congar expresses this with Blondel’s distinction between simple and “full,” intense existence, realizing true relationship with Being.\textsuperscript{56} This relationship will be perfectly and truly realized eschatologically.\textsuperscript{57} But where is the Spirit?

The ontological account of how the beings are both distinct from Being, and also free, points to the role of the Spirit. The problem is this: the (absolute) Being is self-referring (all is saved by reference to it) and it posits the beings outside of itself; as this Being is Absolute, does this mean that the beings are referred and reduced back to it?\textsuperscript{58} How are creation and God distinct and in fellowship without reducing the creature? Congar reasons: God’s act of letting beings be, “Let the world be,” must be referred to “God is everything to everyone” of the end.\textsuperscript{59} Being refers (orders) beings to itself and by this act communicates to them a life of happiness. But how can one let creatures be and at the same time affirm that God is everything to everyone? This is due to the fact that “the absolute is Love, and Love is Gift, communication.
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The absolute is Generosity.\textsuperscript{60} How did God do this? According to Congar, Jesus manifested this descent of the Absolute Love into the relative, and the Holy into a world of sin to bring creatures to God. This restored the relation between creatures and Creator and revealed some of God’s eternal being, which is more than the descent. This revealed God as “communion … love, tenderness, effusion of himself, infinite kindness towards others, affection, subordination.”\textsuperscript{61} These are the themes of Love and Gift in the relation God – (broken, sinful) world, which are fulfilled with Congar’s theology of the Holy Spirit. Thus to affirm both God and the world, the person of the Spirit is key.\textsuperscript{62}

\textbf{THE LIVING GOD AND THE PERSON OF THE HOLY SPIRIT}

To summarize: as the relation church – world was changing, Congar turned to the soteriological aspect of the relation God-world and this implies the personal role of the Spirit. This affects the account of the participation of God in the world and the world in God. While focusing primarily on socio-cultural aspect of the world, Congar’s analysis can be extended beyond. And the role of the Spirit plays a crucial role. To argue for the integrity and the importance of the world in this relation with God, Congar turned to a theology of the living God, and more specifically to the Holy Spirit. But is not the reference of the Spirit too vague and inconclusive? Congar’s work on the church dispels any doubts. In it the theology of the living God shows a space for the mission of the Spirit beside that of the Son. Due to the robust link between God’s work in the history of salvation and God’s eternal being, this presents contours of the theology of the Spirit. In his article “The Church and Pentecost” Congar presents the feast of Passover as the fruit of Pasch. Both are actually one mystery, since Christ has passed through death to life according to the Spirit and merited the gift of the Spirit.\textsuperscript{63} This is a dynamic view of God as living, – “economy” for him revolves around “a dynamism coming from God for men through Christ.”\textsuperscript{64} For Congar the Spirit concludes and consummates the movement, in which the church is born. In this way the “economy” of God drawing creatures into divine life is related with immanent relations of the Trinity. How is this relevant to my discussion of participation?

The development of the proper role of the Spirit suggests the reciprocity between Christ and the Spirit, which directly affects the way humanity participates in divine life. The image of communion becomes central. So, the Father, \textit{Agape}, “the Principle, who has no principle” initiates the communion, which “is ignited by the Son who is sent by the Father, and
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consummated by the Holy Spirit who is sent by the Father and the Son.” The immanent relations of the triune God are clearly and directly linked with the church for Congar. The Spirit completes what Christ established, thus one reality, made of two moments. From this moment Congar’s binary structure is explicitly and directly referred to the two divine missions. First, there is a form, “structured and made available,” then, “life infused into it, the form is set in motion,” and living fruit produced. This duality, linked to the immanent life of God, gives rise to different binaries in Congar’s work: baptism and confirmation, the Scripture and Tradition, the way of mediated religion and religious movements with immediate experience of God.

I think the interaction of two missions with human participation is important to retain, but Congar’s way of putting it was rightly criticized. Famerée has criticized the lack of real reciprocity of Christ and the Spirit in these suggestions: if the work of Christ provided empty form (“structure”) for the Spirit to fill (infuse with life), this is deficient. He rightly argues that if the Spirit actualizes and interiorizes the historic and positive work of Christ, the Spirit is relative to Christ. The authentic, reciprocal, duality would have to show Jesus Christ as relative to the Spirit as well. He rightly calls for a Christological Pneumatology, which would view the whole life, death and resurrection of Jesus as lived in the power of the Spirit. But how does it affect human participation in divine life? If as Famerée suggests the role of the Spirit in the life of Jesus prior and after the Pasch are proposed, this links the pre-paschal and post-paschal times of Christ. The structure of the church is what is derived from incarnation, and the church in a sense continues in this mediation. Christological Pneumatology should show how the Spirit plays a part in establishing the structure. On the other hand “life,” which the Spirit brings into the world, is not to be separated from Christ; it is Christomorphic. The Spirit was behind the (shape of) life Jesus Christ lived in the world.

Such reciprocity, however, suggests the personhood of the Spirit has to be affirmed. In emphasising God as living, Congar situates the church within the flow of divine life. The personal characteristics of the Spirit are displayed as he concludes from the event of Pentecost, that the Spirit is the “communion” and “communication” (of the divine life), the one who consummates the communication of the life of the Trinity (theology) and God’s communication to human beings (economy.) The Spirit is the “source of communion in unity,” the openness to diversity and also a freedom since communion is not imposed. So, Congar looks at what he calls the physiology and morphology of the church. The physiology means the church is both the community and hierarchy, which come together in genuine
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This is due to inner morphology, God giving Godself through the Holy Spirit to be the soul of the body as “life-giving soul” and as “indwelling soul” in the church. So the Spirit brings together the communication of the divine life, which the Spirit fulfils, and communion. This Pneumatological development, pointing to the personhood, is not developed in Congar, as juxtaposition with Nikos Nissiotis, his Orthodox interlocutor, shows.

Nissiotis makes it clear what the role of the Spirit brings to human participation in God. In terms similar to Congar’s, Nissiotis suggests that the communion of the divine Persons in triune life is the mystery of all creation and revelation. It is the activity of the Spirit of God, which reveals the deep secret of creation, — sharing the same life (a communion). What is behind this emphasis on communion? Nissiotis presents the God of revelation as personal, not one person, but a plurality in reciprocal movement, “caused and animated by a mysterious essence, which is love.” He argues that this is a Patristic vision and it resembles Congar’s line of argument about the persons of the Trinity. Thus for Nissiotis (similarly to Congar) the Spirit operates in the personal communion of the Father and the Son, and in the salvation history “ordains and ‘actualizes’ divine work with humanity.” A personal God establishes interpersonal communion with the world. This emphasis on “personal” is directly linked to the role of the person (and freedom) of the Spirit and the vision of the relation God-world, which Congar lacks. How is this emphasis significant for the relation God-world?

It shows the Spirit fulfills (and is key to) the intimate and free participation of the world in God. According to Nissiotis, the communion of the triune life of God shows that the freedom (of divine Persons) is not alienation or emancipation, but the reciprocity in the relation of love. This extends to divine activity in creation: “God acts freely in creation and the Spirit blows where the Spirit wills, because they are personal,” i.e. to create communion. In the relation God-world the Son and the Spirit have their proper roles. The proper mission of the Son is to be “born in eternity,” his birth in time and the incarnation follows from this. The Spirit eternally proceeds from the Father; the (proper) mission in the history through the Son follows from this. Such direct procession (which challenged the Catholic view of Filioque)
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alone ensures that the Spirit is not subjected to the Son – is free. Consequently, for Nissiotis, Pentecost was the culminating point of history as the “moment, in which Christ's work is fulfilled in time and in human being.” So, humanity and the world take part in Christ’s work and divine life through the Spirit. This view of Trinity shows that human beings “establish communion with the Holy Spirit, the grace of the Son and the love of God the Father.” Congar’s later work affirms as much, so Nissiotis provides a way to assess what Congar lacks – the personal role of the Spirit in the relation God-world – and points to the challenge he sought to address.

This emphasis on the Spirit amid the discussion of “person” introduces the larger context. A look at the two divine missions re-viewed the church as primarily in mission. There was also a corresponding need for a theology of the world, viewed from the perspective of the Pasch and eschatology. In this light the role of the Spirit, if it is not confined to the church, opens a wider horizon. Congar’s view, however, is confined. True, the communication of the divine life means for Congar that at Pentecost the church is also apostolic. True, it is to bear upon the world as the Spirit “laid the foundation of the Church’s universality.” Famerée pointed out that this view of “bearing” is problematic – it suggests the church and the divine history are as it were in “competition” with the history of the world. Thus the role of the Spirit outside the people of God and the positive contribution of “profane” times is neglected, he notes. Cannot this critique be extended further to the role of the Spirit in the creation in its widest sense? The theology of the Spirit suggests a turn to the relation God–world but when the Spirit is confined to the church, this does not help. Is the theological discussion of personhood helpful in overcoming these concerns? Does the reflection on the personal role of the Spirit help in affirming the value of non-human creation? This requires a closer look at what is the potential of Congar’s view of the role of the Spirit in bringing the human being and the creation to participate in God at this stage.

**Living God, Person and the Intimate Relations of God-Human-World**

The role of the Spirit in linking God, human beings and the world (creation) allows a return to my thesis – how the world participates in God and God in the world. At this stage Congar attempts to incorporate the contemporary, dynamic view of the world, which suggests the part the world plays. There is an affinity with the earlier emphasis on the personal God, in that the human being and the world are linked through discussion of personhood. This is how
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it goes. For Congar the church is the Christian community face to face with the vastness and variety of the world. For Congar the church is the Christian community face to face with the vastness and variety of the world. It is the first fruits of the divine plan which embraces both the church and the cosmos. Congar employs Teilhard de Chardin’s evolutionary understanding of the world of Teilhard de Chardin to engage a contemporary view of the world. While Congar’s use of Teilhard is not consistent, as I will later show, my key point is to show that the issue of “personhood” in it links God, the human and the world. Teilhard argues that the world has a new consciousness of the whole, which links the importance of the human person and the world as an interconnected whole. This new consciousness, then, views the human person as a unique whole and the world as a whole “held together by an aggregate of interactions, attractions and compenetrations.” This explains Congar’s insistence on intimate relations, but how is this personhood related to the divine presence in the world, which should be understood in its entirety, not only as a social reality?

I would like to point out two aspects. First, Congar brings into the debate Teilhard’s faith in the personal God, which is to be viewed in the light of the social and philosophical determinisms of a contemporary era. Theologically, the figure of Jesus Christ is the point of convergence of the evolution of the world and human person. So, for Teilhard, according to de Lubac, the figure of Christ was “the most perfect approximation yet achieved of a final object toward which the universal effort of mankind may tend without effort and deformation.” Congar agrees: in Jesus Christ, the “whole,” which comprises person and the dynamic world, becomes meaningful. Second, there is “an anthropological turn,” best represented by Karl Rahner. Rahner’s view of the human being as a spiritual being and thus open to God for Congar agrees with the theology of Thomas Aquinas. As a human being surpasses the limits of determined existence, the argument goes, it is necessary to reject the separation of the human life in the world and the grace of God. The “person,” that is each concrete individual, is enveloped by grace, “the grace of God is offered in every truly personal
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activity and is accepted or rejected by each man or woman.”\textsuperscript{92} (italics added) The issue of personhood connects God and the world, nature and grace, but it is primarily Christological.

This discussion of personhood, however, in the general scope of my research has to take several issues into account. First, Congar’s reference to Teilhard’s use of person has to be viewed in the light of the latter’s view of hyperpersonal and point Omega. In Teilhard’s view consciousness was inherent in all matter, as “within,” and the process of evolution as an “ascent to toward consciousness ... should culminate forwards in some sort of supreme consciousness.”\textsuperscript{93} This fulfilment of the universe, what Teilhard calls the point Omega, coincides for him with the final vision of Christian dogma. In it God fulfils and purifies the world by “uniting it organically with himself” through Christ.\textsuperscript{94} This account cannot be reduced to human world and its eschatological orientation, which brings to a second source of Congar’s inspiration, Orthodox theology.\textsuperscript{95} Congar is certainly sympathetic to its vision of “transfiguration of creation” and “cosmic aspects of Christianity,” even if himself is more focused on the human activity in bringing it about than mere contemplation.\textsuperscript{96} His eschatological vision, then, is centred around the communion of persons focusing primarily on humanity. But it does not mean that Congar’s theology is closed to a different kind of reading. He is not particularly committed to some rigid theology of personhood. Likewise the generalizations of the view of Orthodox theology have to be avoided. The person vocabulary is criticized in that it is used in anthropomorphic way when referring to “the Trinity as a communion of three divine Persons.”\textsuperscript{97} These issues help to approach personal role of the Spirit in a more sensitive way, which might help to address how the whole creation participates in God.\textsuperscript{98}
The issue of personhood points to the bigger picture of how the relation God-world is postulated and this relation is presented with Christ at the centre. While this picture looks primarily at the social world, it is gradually clear that the relation with the whole created reality is implied. In this Congar still retains some of the theological structure of his earlier work. There is for him a clear continuity in the choices that the human being makes. But there is also a change of perspective. He perceives a continuity in a “progressive unfolding” of the human attitude towards self, life and Absolute within the stages of attaining faith. But there is also ambivalence - this encounter with God in the world begins from an ambiguity. This contributes a new aspect to the relation God-world. Earlier accounts described how the created participated in the uncreated with “metaphysical” clarity, but did not affirm human experience. How does Congar articulate the “metaphysical” clarity and ambiguity of experience at the same time?

Congar continues the sapiential line, shown in earlier chapters. Now he refers to Augustine, Pascal and Newman. First, there is a struggle between “self-love” and “love of God,” two forces within the cosmos, taken from Augustine’s City of God. Pascal points to the “weakness” of Jesus coming, - to maintain the freedom of human response Jesus comes not in divinely manifest way, but is recognizable only by seekers. With the help of John Henry Newman he applies these attitudes not only to individuals, but also to human groups. So one arrives at faith in Jesus Christ by being open to what resembles faith and love in the ambiguous world. This pre-faith and pre-love are socially mediated for Congar; thus he presents the idea of “pre-church,” nourishing the attitudes of pre-faith and pre-love. The virtues of faith and love, by which a person participates in God, are attained in the world.
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However, he is also optimistic about this continuity of creation and grace. What is the theological reason for such a clear perception of continuity?

The reasons for continuity rest on divine participation in creation through Jesus Christ – they are Christological. For Congar God presents Godself in a veiled way in the world. One might love or reject God without recognizing God. The encounter with God in the world is possible, according to Congar, because creation is iconic and the human being is made in divine image. This means God searches for the human being and the human being is oriented (even if unknowingly) to God. Thus everything is “an occasion for an encounter with God, - a place for a possible visit.” This “iconic” value of everything is because Jesus Christ is the ultimate Sign. Because of him the universe and history “can become sacraments of the active presence of God” in the mutual approach of God and the human being. Thus the attitude of openness is key, since the truth (in the words of Le Roy) comes towards human beings even if its “incarnation in an explicit idea has not yet been effected.” Incarnation is behind Congar’s view of continuity between creation and redemption in a human divine dialogue. The creation retains within itself “a kind of iconic power and possibility of turning it into an “epiphany” of God.” This is the sapiential approach in which Congar presents the relation of God, world and humanity in Jesus Christ in a series of artistic metaphors. The human being can participate in reading the book of creation together with Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the poet who has revealed the poetics of God in the world and in human beings. By playing with these as with a “lyre,” Jesus Christ “leads us to the threshold of the things of God.” And lastly, Jesus Christ makes the world readable and the place to encounter God.

These artistic metaphors suggest the creative interaction of all involved. But how far does Congar go in affirming the contribution and creativity of the human being and the world. Do they have anything to contribute? The mediation of Jesus Christ, thus, comes with a strong and optimistic sense of continuity between “nature” and “grace” in the account of divine presence in the ambiguous world. This continuity comes from Thomas Aquinas. So, Congar asserts that in coming to faith, the future attitudes are from the outset “in the basic dispositions which determine the initial response of exclusion.” As a follower of Thomas Aquinas he maintains that the end (faith) must be anticipated in antecedent stages (pre-faith). Congar consequently distinguishes between full and supernatural faith and a kind of attitude of pre-faith, the presence of grace before the experience of grace in salvation, and openness.
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to discipleship.\textsuperscript{114} This means that faith does not come as something strange to the human being, but is related to the significance of human life – “the total meaning we give to the whole fact of our existence.”\textsuperscript{115} This means that salvation brings full significance of life; it lies in the human relationship to God as the human end.\textsuperscript{116} This continuity also indicates that a metaphysical scaffolding remains. It necessarily rests on the doctrine of analogy, which, as Chauvet argues, postulates the relation between the creature and God in terms of the cause and principle of existence.\textsuperscript{117} Does this affirm the creativity of the creature itself? Consequently, is this continuity a good response to the unbelieving world and does it resonate with the experience of faith in the contemporary world?

In terms of response to the contemporary situation, I agree with Jüngel that such a view of analogy should be avoided. Chauvet showed that for Jüngel such a (Thomist) view of analogy presents “a divine ens supremum as a capstone of the arch and absolute foundation for the totality of entities.”\textsuperscript{118} This kind of “onto-theology” presupposes the “ontological priority of thought to language.”\textsuperscript{119} Chauvet agrees with him that human beings are unable to get totally outside “language, culture and desire,” and this should be thought “before all else.”\textsuperscript{120} Theology, then, is to be located in this mediation. So, it is not the mediation of Christ that poses a problem, but rather its unreflected metaphysical presuppositions, when one does not see that they are culturally mediated. However, it is not to be inferred that these mediations are not related. The key issue is that of causality in the relation God-world. The discussion of whether movements for liberation and other religions mediate salvation showed that Congar accepts that persons in these can seek God in and through them, but they do not mediate salvation.\textsuperscript{121} So, from the view of the human person, only the church can mediate, that is serve as the instrument of salvation, as the body of Christ in the exclusive relation God-world. So, the mediation of Christ, it might appear, profits from this \textit{a priori} causal picture. If the reversal mentioned before were possible, it would not only show the reciprocity – that the church is formed and shaped by the world, but the mediation of Christ can be reviewed.
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\textsuperscript{116} Congar relies on Thomas Aquinas: “When a man arrives (morally) at the age of reason, the first thing to which his mind must turn is to deliberate about himself. And if he directs himself towards the true end, grace is given him and original sin is remitted.” See the discussion in Thomas Aquinas, \textit{ST}, I-II, Q 89, A 6., “Can venial sin be in a man with original sin alone?” accessed online at \url{http://www.newadvent.org/summa/2089.htm#article6} on 12 November 2015.
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\textsuperscript{121} This point was highlighted by Jacques Dupuis: “Congar does not accept a salvific value or mediation of salvation in the religious traditions as such, objectively considered, while admitting that these may exercise a de facto mediation for persons who in good faith seek God in and through them. He thus distinguishes between religions in themselves and as they are lived by concrete persons.” Jacques Dupuis, \textit{Towards a Christian Theology of Religious Pluralism}, (Maryknoll, New York: 1997), 147, n. 15.
It seems that a Pneumatological Christology, which is consonant with the emphasis on the holy humanity of Jesus Christ offers a clue. The metaphysical presuppositions behind the aforementioned use of analogy had implications for the relation of divine activity and creation. Chauvet further showed it resulted in presenting grace as a “thing” in the productionist scheme of causality.\textsuperscript{122} This has to be viewed together with Congar’s later contention that grace was viewed as a thing in Western theology due to the lack of Pneumatology.\textsuperscript{123} Once this productionist picture is viewed as itself conditioned by history and culture, one can truly begin from ambiguity.\textsuperscript{124} This could pave the way to discern the activity of the Spirit in the reality of the complex world. This allows to juxtapose Jüngel and Congar. Jüngel also looks at the parables of Jesus Christ and the Gospel and understands “the man Jesus as the parable of God.”\textsuperscript{125} But he revisits the Thomist view of the mystery of God, for him defined “solely (!) through the limits of human knowledge,”\textsuperscript{126} with a view of faith, which “knows God as the ultimate and authentic mystery of the world.”\textsuperscript{127} Congar and Jüngel are thus comparable.\textsuperscript{128} This concept of mystery is to be presented positively, as something graspable and distinct from riddle.\textsuperscript{129} Such a view presents life in the world as bearing, that is mediating, the knowledge of God and avoids the centrality of the metaphor of causality, which suppresses the creativity of the world.

Such a view both gives a better footing if one wants to treat one’s situation in the world adequately, and, significantly, points to the role of the Spirit. Jüngel retains analogy, but points to its eschatological aspect. The analogy is like the new day and rising sun; the dove, the Holy Spirit, replaces the owl of Minerva.\textsuperscript{130} The analogy has God as one of its members, based on the fact that God is related to the world.\textsuperscript{131} Because of this relation, the world, which might give no reference to God in itself, begins speaking of God. This speech does not speak of God as the world’s cause or principle, but, because of new and eschatological light, it speaks of something “more obvious” and “completely new.”\textsuperscript{132} Jüngel also points to the parables of Jesus (as does Congar) but points to their eschatological potential, thus diverging from Congar. Through being spoken, God enters into language and for Jüngel, this is about
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125 Jüngel, God as the Mystery of the World, 289.
126 ibid., 245.
127 ibid., 246.
129 Jüngel, God as the Mystery of the World, 250.
130 ibid., 285.
131 “God himself relates in this relationship, relates to himself and at the same time to the world.” 283.
132 Ibid., 285.
the relation of the kingdom of God to the world. Consequently “the parable, although it
speaks the language of the world, speaks at the same time in truth and speaks genuinely of
God.” This juxtaposition does not only firmly root the encounter with God in the world, but
links this rooting with the view of divine activity in the world. However, this account of the
relation of God and creation is primarily Christological. What is the potential of developing
the personal role of the Spirit in the world?

PERSONHOOD AND THE TRINITARIAN SHAPE OF RETURN TO GOD IN THE WORLD

This role begins to emerge when social and cultural immersion of human knowledge (and thus
faith) is affirmed. This view also suggests that human beings are not passive recipients of
grace as a “thing” in the causal scheme and it implies human-divine synergy. Consequently,
such an approach would allow to embrace one’s experience of the faith in the world even
more. The participation of the world in God, then, is not some general account of how things
are in divine ontology. It is rather the reflection on the experience of faith, in which the
human, the world and God are intimately involved. Congar’s view of conversion shows this.
Conversion for him is a “complex human reality, moral, social, historical and perhaps even
genetic,” these aspects alone cannot explain it. To comprehend it one has to acknowledge
“the divine action as a factor.” Conversion is a participation: an entry “into the inexhaustible history of charity, and the return of creation to God by means of light, freedom, the cross, and love.” It happens in the world, where the human being is engaged by the
presence of truth: approached by the “other,” it is called to respond in love. This love
becomes “the principle for a new synthesis, capable of modeling and unifying our entire
personality.” Congar thus reiterates from Aquinas that the human being is “auto-creative
liberty,” i.e. creating oneself, by “virtuous acts and the habitus.” Personhood is this
“supreme realization of created being.” One is in the world through one’s body (Congar
points to Maurice Merleau-Ponty). Through the Spirit one has an “internal freedom” – real
authenticity brought about by “the divine communication, which we call the Spirit of God.”
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The role of the Spirit is even more clear, when the concern for intimacy presents the notion of “person” as the one in relation. Congar affirmed that Christianity and divine revelation are primarily a history and not metaphysics. The goal of revelation is salvation: divine presence and self-communication is to be viewed as the history of salvation, that is economy. The economy has a social shape - the constitution of the people of God, the church and divine self-communication happens in events. The living and personal God acts towards the world as God of the covenant. The view of humanity is consequently relational in two combined aspects: the horizontal, interpersonal on the human level, and vertical, interpersonal on the human-divine level – and they are one. But this theological view is also consonant with the prevalent cultural climate: while Aquinas thinks person as the highest form of being, he reflects about the general ontology of things. But “person” has an existential aspect, and Congar views Aquinas in the light of contemporary existential concerns. Theologically it all rests on the personal triune God. The encounter with God in the world centers on the issue of person because God is personal. So, the encounter with person shows an attitude towards God, as the person is related to the image of God and consequently a kind of “prolongation of God.” Person for Congar is, then, sacramental.

This means the person is the exceptional mediation in the whole creation: person and hospitality to the other person are mysteries. Congar writes about “the mystery of encounter,” where encounter entails people, circumstances and events, and the mystery entails a two-fold meaning as a religious term. It denotes what is beyond human grasp and also “a deep reality having a meaning and effect beyond what we are capable of spontaneously perceiving.” This latter meaning, and also as an adjective “mystical,” was used interchangeably with “sacrament.” It thus connected that to which it was applied (“sacrament”) to the plan of God, which unfolds in human history and will be fulfilled in eschatology. The “mystery of encounter,” then, presents a vision of life on earth as penetrated by the presence of God. This is at the heart of human participation in God, which Congar views in the scheme of the descent – ascent of the triune God vis-à-vis the world. The return to God, according to Congar, passes through the love of the neighbor, which is the
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“locus,” the place for the love of God in the world. The incarnation of Christ, descent, and the solidarity of God and humanity in Jesus Christ means return to God is inseparable from “from love and service” to the human. The ascent is through the Holy Spirit, who pours out this love in human hearts; the mission of the Spirit concludes the plan of the love of God the Father. While the issue of person plays an important part in Congar’s vision, how his lack of reflection on the issue of personhood should be read? The discussion about person points to the Spirit’s silent presence, but there is no developed theology of the Spirit, this personal role is not developed. On the other hand, Congar appreciated that Orthodox theology had “a very lively sense of the originality of the person,” which marks the discussion of his Pneumatology. These issues will come into focus once again in my last chapter. The exposition so far has shown the Spirit’s activity in making the person and in interpersonal activity in the world, but is this all there is to this activity?

The initial intuitions of the relation of the world and the Spirit

I will next look at the cosmological contours of the activity of the Spirit. As earlier noted Congar thought an effective answer to contemporary unbelief is to demonstrate how the human being, the world and the living God are intimately connected. I have also suggested that intimacy, effect and interpenetration point to the role of the Holy Spirit. But so far, this role has been limited to the activity in human persons and in the communion. So, now I want to look at how these two aspects are related. How is it a response to unbelief to see the personal role of the Spirit bringing together the world, the human being and God in unity? I have shown in the first chapter that in addressing unbelief the notion of visibility was central. The visibility meant the unbelieving world was presented with and thus engaged by the world sanctified and transformed by the Spirit, which was the mystical Body of Christ, the church. Engaged meant it was appealed to – shown what it could and should become, thus the rejection would matter. Congar’s intent thus did not change, but the development of the role of the Spirit would allow it to be re-assessed.

The role of the Spirit emerges in this reciprocal relation of the church and world in their relation to the kingdom of God. For Congar both present the church as a juncture, in which the “holiness,” or uniqueness which derives from Christ and cosmic “all-embracingness” meet. Their relation is reciprocal: “the Church means salvation for the world, but the world
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means health for the church.”

This is because both have the same goal, thus salvation is the restoration of fullness of meaning and the intensity of life for the human being. Heaven is the pattern of the world, restored by grace from its lost state, wherein “that which all earthly history strives after is received as a gift from above.” As Congar guards the synergy of integrity and freedom of the world and the gratuity of divine gift the role of the Spirit comes into view. The key issue is to show that the gift of God is not imposed externally, but also not a development of creation’s immanent forces. Congar consequently suggests that the kingdom of God works from “within,” an argument to which I turn in the next paragraph. As he relates this to divine self-revelation and self-communication, this clearly implies the gift is the Spirit and to keep the mentioned issues intact requires a development of Pneumatology. But how is this gift related to historic and worldly efforts to bring back integrity to humanity and to conquer death?

Congar’s position hesitates between the references to Orthodox theology and Teilhard’s notion of “interiority.” It seems to me that Teilhard’s position appealed to Congar because of its broad scope of showing that God, the world and the human being work together. To understand the “within” one has to acknowledge their common insistence on mediation. Both Teilhard and Congar distinguished the “within” from outward means, though Teilhard also viewed the development of culture and society as means (not only the church). Ian Barbour shows that for Teilhard every entity has simultaneously “within” and “without,” subjective and objective aspects. So, according to Barbour, Teilhard presents a continuing creation and unification towards a “creative union” against a disunity of the “many.”

Congar follows Teilhard only in part: he adopts the thought of Teilhard on the goal, but does not follow him fully on evolution. Congar stresses eschatological intervention by the Spirit. For Teilhard the world and the multiple will be unified not by “identification (God becoming
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all) but by differentiating and communicating action of love (God all in everyone).” So, Congar’s view of incarnation does not have the cosmic scope of Teilhard’s thought. However, Congar adapts some aspects of Teilhard’s thought in his Pneumatology without an important insight concerning human collaboration. In Teilhard the image of the cosmic Christ connects the incarnation, the resurrection of Christ and human collaboration with God. According to Barbour, this ultimate reality for Teilhard is the “supreme person” (rather than “undifferentiated unity” or “impersonal structure”) and the final convergence is guaranteed by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Teilhard, as Barbour shows, “seems to believe that the ‘within’ is a more effective vehicle of divine influence than the ‘without.’” This would suggest that to fulfill the account of human collaboration and evolution, the role of the Holy Spirit in them would be necessary. At least this is a conclusion Congar draws. He agrees with Teilhard as to the final state: there “God is all in all,” and the freedom is the victory of inwardness over externality, shining manifestation of Source. Furthermore this “within” clearly points to the Holy Spirit. However, Congar’s Pneumatological aspect does not bring forth with it a sufficiently articulated image of the world. Teilhard, on the other hand, contends that “God is entirely self-sufficient, and nevertheless creation brings to him something vitally necessary,” thus God “consummates himself only in uniting.” This presents a problem, to which I come next.

The relation of the Spirit to the world is problematic at this stage of Congar’s work. It affirms the freedom and creativity of history and the human being but at the same time guards the uniqueness of the divine activity and the church. As such it views the activity of the world in the light of faith, wherein belief in incarnation affirms that the world is taken as it is and affirmed. But the role of the Spirit is restricted to interiority, and in Congar’s case, to the church. No vision of collaboration of creation and the Spirit ensues. Moreover, this vision of
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the role of the Spirit completes a spiritual vision and experience of faith. It reflects on the experience of intimacy between God, the human being and the world. There is a clear link and engagement of the world by the Spirit, but this comes primarily through the church (Congar) and refers to the final state. This makes the experience of the direct relation God-human-world at the present state secondary. However, how might such a vision address and engage the unbelief of the contemporary world? I proceed to show that a closer look at the personal role of the Spirit suggests the contours of such an engagement.

**THE PERSON OF THE SPIRIT ENGAGING THE WORLD**

The traditional dynamic theological picture of two divine missions suggests this: the world is already in God, engaged by and participating in divine activities. It shows God intimately involved, but also prior to and transcendent. This relativizes the underlying metaphysical picture of participation modelled around the image of causality, but does not sublate it. The traditional image of two missions, with which I began this chapter, of the risen Christ and his Spirit, consequently, is not directly linked to the desires and pains of the broken world. However, this sets initial contours of a developing dynamic view of how the divine missions and the world’s (and human) activities interplay. Congar’s early concerns point to the personal role of the Spirit. When he sought to effectively address unbelief, he made it clear that it was not the unbelief as such, but rather its collective, worldly, causes, which he addressed.\(^{176}\) The church, consequently, played a prominent role in engaging society and culture. If this view of engagement as embodied remains, then it is valid to ask what would the personal role of the Spirit bring to it. The vision of participation of the world in God, I have shown, should be viewed as a vision (or experience) of faith. This vision of faith is embodied, it is not merely an abstract, but is a vision, which is lived-out personally and communally. Then, the mere theoretical demonstration is not enough, one has to begin with one’s experience in the world and challenge and be challenged with diverse ways of life in this world.

The personal role of the Spirit, then, comes together with this emphasis on the dynamical engagement set in the history of the world. As such it is set and conditioned in the world. But this posed a challenge to the vision of participation, centred on causality, which was at the heart of one strand of Christology, which Congar inherited. Thus, Congar’s suggestion of theological vision as demonstration of the relations between God, human being and the world does not go far enough. This is especially a case if this demonstration is of merely causal relations. If the discernment of the role of the Spirit comes with this view of human-divine activity, which is set and conditioned by the world, this cannot be a mere demonstration. It is rather a lens to view the world through the activity of Jesus Christ and the Spirit, of the person who is already engaged by these activities. It also shows, that in engagement revelation is

\(^{176}\) Congar, “Une conclusion,” 215.
necessary as that which unveils how God is engaging the world, which will be addressed in the next chapter. This would begin not from initial certainty, but rather from complexities and existential uncertainties of human life in the world. This view would embrace the activity of God, but also would not limit the world’s freedom.

**THE WORD AND THE SPIRIT: HISTORY AND ESCHATOLOGY**

In the remaining sections of the chapter, I will outline that such a possibility comes in Congar’s later work with the personal role of the Spirit in the relation God-world. The world in this account is primarily social and cultural. Already in his early work Congar showed that the unity of the divine plan (creation and salvation) relied on the unity of the agent, but he focused on the Word. This stage of Congar’s thought constitutes a turning point, which is clear from Congar’s later work. In an article from 1971 Congar looks at the Holy Spirit as the “transcendent Agent,” who works in history for God.\(^{177}\) So God realizes his design not only by the mission of the Word become flesh, but also by the second mission of the Spirit. This does not mean, however, a separate economy. To ensure this he summons the image of Hans Urs von Balthasar of the Spirit as “Unknown Beyond the Word.”\(^{178}\) This means that in Christ humanity enters into the regime of the new alliance and the eschatological work of the Spirit, the promise, follows.\(^{179}\) The Spirit accomplishes in time and space the universal work of Christ. The Spirit “universalizes it, ... rends its universal value effective and actual.”\(^{180}\) The Spirit, the unique and transcendent person, “perfectly immanent in everything,” unites past, present and future in the “sacramental time” of the church.\(^{181}\)

Congar’s use of von Balthasar’s “unknown beyond the Word” is an attempt to outline the personal role of the Spirit. For von Balthasar the Spirit is within the Trinitarian communion of love into which creation is drawn. This means the Spirit proceeds simultaneously from the Father and the Son in their mutual turning to one another in love. But the Spirit is also the opening of God, the Father, through the Son to the creation in love.\(^{182}\) This procession is distinct from the relation of the Father and the Son. As the Word comes from the Father and returns to the Father, the Spirit confirms this reunion of the Father and the Word and also
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179 Congar, “Pneumatologie et théologie de l’histoire,” 63.
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comes forth as the promise of the Father. The personal role of the Spirit comes through self-renouncing of the temporal Word. The temporal Word comes into silence and the “liberated Spirit of love” comes forth to endlessly expose the mystery of Father and the Son – “Silence and Word” – to creation. The person of the Spirit can unite the human being, the world and God in love, because love is the common nature in the Creator God and the personal property of the Spirit. But the role of the Spirit is mysterious, unknown: the “unknown God who makes God known to us,” comprehensible in efficacious actions, “demonstration of the Spirit and power.” The Spirit never leaves the Word behind, but “beyond the Word, he is the Spirit of the one Word and therein all words.” Balthasar’s image, then, allows Congar to maintain his early emphasis on the Word and carve a space for the Spirit in the relation God-world.

However, Congar’s use of von Balthasar is already engaged: he uses it while presenting the prophetic role of the church. So, “Unknown beyond the Word” means for Congar that the Spirit acts in mystery and freedom, “forwards, in a time and space that has been made open by the Word.” I agree with Coakley that Congar goes further than reflecting on the Spirit as either the bond between the Father and the Son or the One who completes revelation. His primary concern is that the Holy Spirit completes creation by drawing it into divine life. The symbols of the Spirit are the symbols of movement towards this goal, “power of new beginnings, freedom and openness to recognizing the other.” Congar draws from Duquoc the image of the Absolute as ecstatic, rather than closed-in. The Spirit breaks “the self-sufficiency of the ‘face to face,’” exorcizes the spell of the past and projects towards a new future. Congar also embraces the Eastern emphasis on the eschatological destiny of the whole creation. The Spirit, as the Spirit of truth and freedom, enables Christ’s “once for all”
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192 Congar gives a long quote from the address of Ignatius IV (Hazim) then the Orthodox Metropolitan of Latakia, at the WCC Fourth Assembly, Uppsala, August 1968, published in Irenikon 42 (1968), 344 – 54 In it Ignatius claimed that the future rather than the past explains “the newness of creation” in a prophetic and creative act, in which “God ‘comes’ into the world as though he were coming to meet it.” Human beings participate in the paschal event through the Spirit, who brought it about in the first place and who will fulfill it. Without the Spirit human action is slavish, whereas in the Spirit, “and in indissoluble combined activity, the cosmos is raised up and groans giving birth to the kingdom.” The Holy Spirit “gives birth ... speaks through the prophets ... introduces a new dynamism into our horizontal world.” This required a “prophetic” theology, the aspect which Congar sought to address, see Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 62-72.
to take root and bear fruit in humanity. The encompassing image is that of incorporation of creation in the power of Christ and the Spirit.

How is this significant for the discussion of personhood and the encounter of God in the world as developed in the current chapter? First, it points to the Spirit as “unknown,” thus to a kind of kenosis of the person of the Spirit. Second, this points to what kind of spiritual experience one aims at while in this world – it is the experience of transparency of all things by seeking God to be all in all. This allows to inquire into the person of the Spirit by reflecting on the activity, which for Congar referred to interpersonal (intimate) relations between God and humanity, but also in creation generally. But this also points to an insufficiency. While this section allows asking about the person in terms of the finality of this activity and the value of communion, kenosis of the Spirit comes with a silence concerning the creation in its most wide sense. In the chapter called “Heaven, the world’s burning bush,” this finality points to “a certain state of being” in which “God himself [is] shining like the ideal Sun, ... the finite totally penetrated and irradiated by the infinite.” It is God, who is totally immanent while being transcendent, which spells full freedom of creation, wherein it acts from within itself thanks to presence of God. It is thanks to the person of the Spirit, who is the source of communion, because the Spirit “transcends space and time,” inhabits and “makes us transparently open,” that is present to one another. The “unknown,” then, is known as the one who acts in interrelations and makes things transparent. This means the wounded world is re-integrated and fulfilled by being filled by God; it maintains its own life, but also surpasses its own limits thanks to the Spirit. And yet without the view of how the Spirit acts in the whole creation, this assertion is quite weak. However, the relation of creation to eschatology raises some questions as I will soon show.

THE INCORPORATION OF THE WHOLE CREATION AND THE SPIRIT AS GIFT

I perceive a change in the theological picture of the relation God-world, which comes with a more developed theology of the Spirit. It is the vision of the living God, who engages the world, acts in it and with it and draws it into fellowship. A look at the use of Aquinas in Congar’s Pneumatology shows that. Congar follows Thomas (and Augustine) in viewing the Spirit as the uncreated, hypostatic Love and Gift, who proceeds (from the Father) by mode of will and love (thus distinct from the Son, whose procession is associated with knowledge).
This makes the Spirit the principle of what God “freely produces outside himself as a participation of his goodness.” So, Congar takes from Aquinas, that when Christians confess the Holy Spirit as God, they imply that all things have the divine goodness as the end they are ordered to. This means the Spirit as the giver of life gives movement to all things – as the soul gives life to the body, so God animates the world. Since God governs the world in God’s goodness, and the Holy Spirit proceeds by love, this government of the world is attributed to the Spirit. This results in effects, and this is where the role of the church shows. This governance results in supernatural, divinely produced knowledge, that is faith – the church is then the gathering of faithful. The grace communicated means the “communion of saints,” and its effect is the remission of sins. So, when Congar focuses on the Spirit, the world is drawn into the vision of faith, which is sustained by the community of faith; it participates in God.

Cosmological scope of the work of the Spirit recasts the emphasis on human participation in divine activity, which is more dynamic and suggests interplay. The central image is friendship, in which the role of the Spirit is central through indwelling. God draws the creature into divine life by means of a life of friendship between God and humanity, which maintains the freedom of the creature. But crucial for this relation and freedom is that this life is also a filial life, one is made God’s lover by the Holy Spirit – the one, who is led by the Spirit is the child of God. It is within this context that Congar situates the Thomist view of Christian action as a “supernatural form of human activity,” which is sustained by divine law (exterior) and grace (the Spirit, interior) and thus operates like a law of freedom (by the creature’s own movement). This is the filial life of friendship with the Trinity, when the virtues (faith, hope and love) are practiced with openness to the inspiration of the Spirit (“spiritual gifts”). This life, while personal, is not individual, since the church is a communion – “unified, sanctified

201 ibid., Congar extensively quotes from Thomas Aquinas, Compendium theologiae, Part I, 147, accessed online http://dhspriory.org/thomas/Compendium.htm#147 on 30 October 2015
202 ibid.
203 The main source is Thomas Aquinas, Summa Contra Gentiles, Book 4, Chapters 20 – 22, accessed online at http://dhspriory.org/thomas/english/ContraGentiles4.htm#20 on 30 October 2015
204 Ibid. “… this is the proper mark of friendship: that one reveal his secrets to his friend … by the Holy Spirit we are established as friends of God … by the Holy Spirit that men are said to receive the revelation of the divine mysteries. (21. 5) … to get a man to the beatitude of divine enjoyment which is proper to God in His own nature, these are necessary: first, that by spiritual perfections he be likened to God; then, that he operate with these perfections; and thus, lastly, achieve that beatitude we mentioned … And thus by the Holy Spirit we are configured to God and through Him we are made ready for good operation. And by the same Spirit the road to beatitude is opened to us.” (21. 8) In the question “how through the Holy Spirit we are moved to God” (22. 1) Thomas answers: “this appears to be especially proper to friendship” meaning to converse, delight in the presence, consent to the friend, the filial life means “driven not as slaves, but as free men.” (22. 2 – 5).
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and animated by the Holy Spirit.” This communion is the effect of Jesus Christ and the Spirit acting, engaging and drawing creation into the divine life. This intimacy and interiority directly challenges the world’s exteriority and “strangeness:” divine presence is “the source and principle of total communion.” Thus with the theology of the Spirit the interplay and communion of humanity and God characterize the relation God-world. But is this interplay sufficient in accepting world’s otherness, creativity and realism?

The discussion so far brought important suggestions. This activity as noted earlier, is to be viewed and oriented to the transformation of the whole creation. Furthermore, it was situated in the evolutionary process process of the whole. What does this juxtaposition imply? First, if there was a view of the role of the Spirit in creation, this would supplement the interior vision of the work of the Spirit in friendship with the vision of the Spirit’s work in the creation. Second, thanks to this there would be a vision of reciprocal relations of the creation and the church and the more comprehensive Pneumatological picture of the relation of God and the creation would emerge.

THE PRESENCE OF GOD NOW: CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY AS THE SACRAMENT OF SALVATION

My main concern is how due to the role of the Spirit one’s direct engagement, or activity in the world, is also one’s intimate participation in God. The image of the indwelling of the Spirit in human hearts and in the communion of saints moves in this direction. It means that the human person and communion (thus creation) are indwelled by God’s own love, “on which heaven rests.” This makes the believers its priests, able to interpret the groans and desires of creation. However, for Congar this tangible world is the “assigned setting” of human advance towards fulfilment in the view of “heaven and earth.” These are two states of the same human life, which enlighten one another in continuity and reciprocity. Congar’s view of this setting, in my opinion, reiterates that there is metaphysical scaffold, which is prior to one’s situation of being embedded in the world. On the other hand the role of the Spirit comes with an emphasis on experience of the eternal God in the world. “Heaven and earth” reciprocally affect one another, because the Holy Spirit, who transcends time and space, indwells creation: the Spirit brings creation into community (the church), and eventually into the unity of divine life.

208 Congar, Called to life, 145.
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Does the prior metaphysical framework affect the role of the Spirit in relation God-world? I think it does. Congar’s opinion about the possibility of encounter with God through the secular movements suggests this. This openness seems limited by the view of analogy, which I reviewed earlier. Congar suggests that if movements have something of the absolute value, like “Duty, Peace, Justice,” they inspire a spark of love and a desire to transcend oneself. Thus the movements become encounters with God, if they reflect the face of God and resist self-sufficiency by being open to the transcendent. Human participation in these movements is like anticipation of (the virtue of) love, as a kind of pre-love. They have to resemble their fulfillment – faith and love in the Christian sense. The communal aspect of mediation, consequently, is totally reserved to the church. This has to be because of the causal view of participation. But does this position, which is consistent with the view of the world as “setting,” adequately deal with the reality of the world? It seems to me that Congar’s traditional emphasis on two missions follows a different logic than this metaphysical account. In it he presents a divine movement, in which God “aims at corporeity.” The idea is that beginning with incarnation (and descent), God establishes community, wherein Christ touches people physically and spiritually, as a ladder for people to reach the divine (ascent). This resonates with Congar’s view, analysed earlier, of the holy humanity of Jesus Christ and incipient Pneumatological Christology. But how does this affect the relation with the non-human world?

Brief reference is sufficient to his how Congar reasons. He begins from the view that liturgy and sacraments of the church do not merely announce, but “realize in mysterio, secretly inchoativelly, dynamically, as through first-fruits, the incorporation of all things in Christ.” This is because as the liturgy removes the influence of the devil from what it intends to use, the resulting sacramental worship is an act of “thanksgiving for the creation and the redemption, incorporating the world’s praise into the praise of Jesus Christ.” This view implicates the non-human world also and a kind of engagement as well. What kind of engagement does it suggest? It shows the community is drawn into divine movements and at the same time directly engaged in the world. The church, according to Congar, continues in the divine movement, it is engaging the world as the prophets and Jesus Christ did. Its goal is for God to be acknowledged as God in the on-going cosmic struggle against “powers.”

213 Congar, Wide World, 121, 124.
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217 Congar, Jesus Christ, 211, 212.
218 ibid., with references to Nicolaus Cabasilas and S. Broussaleux (trans.) La vie en Jésus-Christ. Prieuré d’Amay-sur-Meuse (Belgium), 1931. 144. Congar also points to the use or ornamentation and architecture.
219 Congar, Wide World My Parish, 133. These are forces (“personal and collective, superior and immanent to the great realities of the world or of history”), which divert creation from the full monotheism. See also, Congar, Jesus Christ, 185 – 186. The theology of “powers” has been developing since. See Walter Wink, Powers,
this view the existence of the church resonates with the world’s implicit desire for the mystical Body (divine fellowship) while involved in the struggle. Through the extrapolations from faith in incarnation the world is tangibly implicated, but does this sufficiently address its complexity? What could a more developed Pneumatology, using the resources used so far, propose for the relation of God and creation in this wider sense?

Wolfhart Pannenberg invites to revisit the thought of Teilhard in his attempt to overcome subjectivistic biases of the language of the spirit in traditional Christian thought and worship by understanding the spirit “on the basis of his function in creation.” Pannenberg appreciates Teilhard’s view of the spirit, which permeates, activates material processes, urging to surpass and converge “towards a centre of perfect unity.” Created spirit, then, participates in the one spirit, which animates the whole process, maintaining their distinction, and here Pannenberg proposes a modification. “If Teilhard had conceived of energy in terms of a field, this would have been in perfect concordance with his idea of a transcendent spirit whose creative power dominates the entire process of evolution.” What changes with this? This, according to Pannenberg resolves ambiguity of how point Omega is viewed: whether it is a mere “extrapolation of tendencies inherent in the evolutionary process” or a true “creative origin of evolution.” With Pannenberg’s help the latter case would predominate and evolution would be the work of the spirit, which transcends individuals and is identical with “God Omega, who creatively and progressively unifies” the world. This does not negate Teilhard’s use of “within” but adds up the view of universal energy field in assessing the activity of the Spirit, in which entities participate by the way of ecstasy. This is meant, according to Panneberg to apply and view Christian spirituality in line with the basic reality even of organic life.

Such approach to the activity of the Spirit allows relating Teilhard’s view of cosmos and evolution with a work of eschatological Spirit in Jesus Christ and salvation history more generally. Several contemporary studies seem to lean in this direction. Some have looked at
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Cappadocian Fathers, to which Congar drew closer in his later work.\textsuperscript{227} Sure, they expose Congar’s Pneumatological lack: that there is no vision in his work of the activity of the Spirit in creation and in social movements. Cornelis van der Kooi draws attention to Bergmann’s reading of Gregory Nazianzus, where the Spirit is the “principle of the self-movement of God” presenting God as “the agent of human movement, guidance and fulfilment.”\textsuperscript{228} This supplants a static view of the relation God-world, as “movement” is introduced as “a positive element into the ontology of God and the creation.”\textsuperscript{229} When divine movement in the creation is appreciated, the free interplay of God and creation ensues. The participation of creation in God profits: “the triune God – Spirit, Son, and Father – moves in qualitatively different but integrated and complementary ways in, through, and with creation.”\textsuperscript{230} This synergy embraces diverse movements in, but also maintains theological contours of, incorporation of creation into God, important for Congar.

What would such a position imply? It hints at a possibility that one’s activity in the world, and the creation as well (even without reference to the church) can also be intimately (or directly) involved in God through the Spirit. This intimate involvement resonates with Congar’s contention that the Spirit incorporates the world into God. Such a position reiterates that God acted in history and affected the body of the world through the incarnation, which in a sense continued in sacramental signs and the Christian. This position points to the activity of the eschatological Spirit, who works in and through these to draw the world into divine life. This is not only activity in persons or interpersonal relations, but also in the creation. It is in the world that the Spirit forms the body of Christ by struggling against the powers to keep alive the spirit of the prophets and Christ. The Spirit’s goal is the participation of the world in God. Such a view of participation suggests the interplay of creation and the two divine missions. One might begin by seeing oneself and the world as already engaged by the activity of the divine missions. Beginning from one’s life in the world is consistent also with an emphasis on the risen living Christ (and not only incarnation), present and acting in the world.\textsuperscript{231} So, it suggests an experience (or vision) of participation in God, which sees oneself as intimately involved in the world, its movements and history. How might one participate in God and at the same time be intimately involved in the world? This leads me to Congar’s theology of tradition, which looks at the interplaying of creation with two divine missions in a greater detail.

\textsuperscript{227} See Sigurd Bergmann, “Trinitarian Cosmology in God’s Liberating Movement: Exploring some Signature Tunes in the Opera of Ecologic Salvation.” \textit{Worldviews: Global Religions, Culture, and Ecology} 14.2 (2010): 185-205. Bergmann points out that in Gregory Nazianzene “the analogy between God and the world was not ontologically but soteriologically envisioned.” (198) He opposes this with “a Whiteheadian process or an Teilhardian teleological evolution.” (195)
\textsuperscript{229} Bergmann, “Trinitarian Cosmology in God’s Liberating Movement,” 197.
\textsuperscript{230} ibid., 203
\textsuperscript{231} Congar, \textit{Jesus Christ}, 197.
Before proceeding I would like to identify several issues which are critical in assessing the relation God-world in Congar’s work and which this chapter has brought out. The first one is the role of creation. Fameréée has criticised Congar’s notion of “pre-church” as it already oriented and assimilated human beings “into a latent presence or into the pre-existence of the Church.”

His key contention is that the church is not only for, but actually needs the world, which is not a mere setting. If the human search for good and Christian revelation (grace) present a robust continuity (as Fameréée sees in Congar and Rahner), this risks the novelty of revelation and the reality of creation. He suggests the relation nature-grace is dialectical and not dialogical: the world offers the diversity and the church “the christic profoundness of its created reality.”

The new creation is the “correlation of two specific truths, that of Revelation and that of creation.” Fameréée’s argument rightly warns against presenting grace as domineering towards human pursuits of truth and creation’s strivings, it does not help to see how the Spirit already works in a human being and how the world is already a place of the Spirit’s work. In my view, this strengthens an argument for Pneumatology in the relation God-world, as it is the Spirit’s role which helps avoiding such domineering attitude.

Second, there is an issue of what role the socio-cultural milieu plays in mediating human participation in God. Together with Stephen Fields I would situate Congar in the middle between the “optimistic and broad” inclusivism of Karl Rahner and the “negative and strict” exclusivism of Karl Barth. Fields discerns Congar’s trajectory towards “crediting of culture as an essential mediation of God’s universal saving will.” Key to his argument is that when Congar refers to non-Christian religions as “habitually” “a canal of grace,” he is aware that for Thomas “habitual grace” is “sanctifying grace.” Fields sees here Congar’s shift from the focus on a single consciousness to the theological anthropology of *Gaudium et Spes*, where the socio-cultural milieu and persons reciprocally affect one another. Thomas F. O’Meara helps out by pointing to Pneumatological potential. According to him Congar’s “incognitos
of God,” like “Duty, Peace, Justice, Fraternity, Humanity,” mediate grace in the secular realm.\(^\text{240}\) As fundamentally oriented towards grace, they have to have the Holy Spirit, who dominates time and space, as principle of their spiritual existence.\(^\text{241}\) However, it is necessary to point out that while for Congar there is action of the Holy Spirit in the world, “but he is not given himself, in person.”\(^\text{242}\) His view is still dominated by his Christology, which, as it was shown, rested on the view of analogy, which viewed the world as recipient.

Third, the two former questions are important vis-à-vis the mediation of Christ and its relation to the role of the Spirit. O’Meara contends that the salvation (through the incognitos) is personal and this moves away from tying it to the church. So, for Congar, O’Meara argues, the person can sacrifice themselves consciously only with the help of God, that is the human conscience has to be elevated in a way, which resembles a revelation.\(^\text{243}\) So, Congar’s “person” points away from the equality of religions or movements to the church, and does not identify the experience of grace with membership in the church.\(^\text{244}\) This points to the importance of the role of the Spirit vis-à-vis Christ. Terrence Merrigan has pointed out that “mediation” for Congar is a Catholic concern. Catholicism is “a ‘sacramental’ system” of mediated presence, wherein for the saving presence of Christ the visible and tangible means are essential.\(^\text{245}\) So, while Congar acknowledges that the whole creation moves towards the eschatological Kingdom, the church serves for him as an “active sign.”\(^\text{246}\) The sacramental character of the church comes from the union with Christ, and separating from Christ would “rob it of its ‘essential’ significance as instrument of his salvific will.”\(^\text{247}\) However, for the later Congar this focus on “mediation” in experiencing grace does not work without the “immediacy” of the eschatological Spirit, who draws the creation into the divine life.\(^\text{248}\)

**CONCLUDING REMARKS TO CHAPTER FOUR**

This chapter has helped to introduce and outline the contours of the later work of Yves Congar. It showed that the particular emphasis on the Holy Spirit comes into view with a

\(^{240}\) ibid., 373, 374. O’Meara uses Francis Sullivan’s term, to refer to what Congar terms “the very wide field of encounter with God through means (mediations) which are not those of positive history of salvation,” Congar, *Wide World My Parish*, 120 and 124.

\(^{241}\) O’Meara, Ibid., 377. See also Congar, *Wide World My Parish*, 112.

\(^{242}\) It is only in the church that “divine sonship, real incorporation in Christ, the Holy Spirit dwelling in us” is given. ibid., 111.

\(^{243}\) “… salvation is possible on the basis of an obedience to what conscience presents to us as absolute.” Yves Congar, “Non-Christians Religions and Christianity,” *Evangelization, Dialogue and Development* (Rome: Gregoriana, 1972), 133, quoted in O’Meara, “Yves Congar,” 384.

\(^{244}\) The religions were “but as aspects of people,” and the individual grace was distinct from communal religion. O’Meara, “Yves Congar,” 385, 387.


\(^{246}\) ibid., 456.

\(^{247}\) ibid., 457.

review of the relation church-world and with a vision of faith, where the human being, the world and God were linked. This has brought forth a problem – while the issue of “person” played an important role, it was not reflected upon. This correlated with the lack of developed theology of the Spirit. This correlation is important for the relation of God and creation – both in terms of the issue of personhood, its anthromorphic usage, and as it relates to non-human creation. Will Congar’s later work provide clues of how to address this issue? This question will be in the background as we move into Chapter Six. Assessing this vision in the light of Congar’s early work, I proposed that the role of the Spirit goes beyond merely being in the picture. Rather than mere demonstration, the emphasis on the Spirit requires looking at the world as engaged by the divine activities. This engagement meant that the experience of faith comes as embodied in the world in the community of faith. This community was creation transformed by the work of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. However, I also found that such engagement was restricted by the metaphysical underpinnings of Congar’s theology, related to the role of Jesus Christ (mediation). They restricted the role the world plays and affected the view of human being. Thus the remaining two chapters turn to these restrictions. I hope to show next that with the personal role of the Spirit, one can simultaneously acknowledge the creativity and dynamism of the world and direct participation in God.
CHAPTER FIVE. PNEUMATIC TRADITION AND THE LOGIC OF TOUCH

Taking my cue from the previous chapter I move to the next phase of Congar’s work – his theology of tradition and the church as sacrament. This phase allows me to present how Congar’s mature thought interrelates God, the socio-cultural world and human being. What does it contribute to the picture of the relation God-world? To show this I begin from Congar’s notion of living tradition, which sought to respond to culture through deeper reflection on the mystery of the triune God. This will show that the theology of tradition continues in line with Congar’s early concern. But it will also allow to discern a rift as earlier themes of mediation and synergy are reviewed in the context of bringing the whole creation back to God. I will analyze the role played by the notion of pneumatic tradition which presents a clear personal role the Spirit. I will show that this primarily presents tradition as action, human-divine activity in the world. But I will also look at what implications this has for Congar’s earlier emphases. I will point to the fact that this means his interest surpasses the focus on the church in two directions: towards Pneumatology and towards the relation God-world-humanity. The closer look at this continuing human-divine interplay vis-à-vis the creation, which uses the image of touch, will lead to Congar’s take on the church as the sacrament of salvation of the world. I will propose that his concern for the world’s part in the vision of the church is related to the demand for the role of the Spirit in the sacraments and in the community. In this way tradition also engages (touches) the world in its most comprehensive sense as mission due to the personal role of the Spirit. This will initiate the last part of my argument which analyzes how the roles of Jesus Christ and the Spirit interact with the freedom and creativity of the creation.

LIVING TRADITION

The next phase of Congar’s developing picture of how and in what sense the world participates in God is theology of tradition. He presents the issue which “once irritated” reformers, but does not view it apologetically, rather in terms of “religious and theological contemplation.”¹ So, it is about human-divine relation. But this is not something merely interior. Tradition is also the struggle for the fullness of public truth, the “interior” struggle of the church “exteriorly,” when engaged in a contesting social world.² This signals a major revision. Congar worked on theology of tradition right before and during the Second Vatican Council; the apostolic face of the church was at stake.³ This theology was key to

¹ Congar, Situation et tâches, 39.
² ibid.
“aggiornamento” - bringing up to date of the Roman Catholic Church face to face with the developing world. The turn to its living tradition was also a turn towards the culture. Theology of tradition, then, is a meeting place of Congar’s early and later work. Theology of tradition is significant as it allows me to see how different strands of Congar’s thought come together in his mature work. I will look at how the theology of tradition with the person of the Spirit as its transcendent subject articulates the relation between humanity and God.

THEOLOGY BEHIND THE TRADITION AS ACTIVE AND LIVED

Congar’s theology of tradition presents tradition as a flow of human-divine life. This is clear from the imagery of the river and source which he uses. The imagery of the source and communication of life puts the Gospel at the centre of Congar’s understanding of tradition. He unambiguously contends that the source of the Gospel is Jesus Christ and the “Gospel is present when Christ is present and actively communicating his life.” Emphasis on life means its saving efficacy, which is to be not merely known, but rather experienced. Congar uses images of a river and spring, applied to the Gospel, used with baptismal typology. He reasons: to produce an effect, the Gospel not only reveals, but is also an exercise in saving power which engages life. The Word gives knowledge and also produces an effect; the Word is an act of God. Congar builds on the view of the Council of Trent of faith as knowledge, and the awareness from the First Vatican Council that “faith entails both an aspect of knowledge and a principle of justification and eternal life.” As the power, the Gospel embraces knowledge and life; its transmission comprises noetic and dynamic aspects. Continuity of life is crucial for continuity of faith.

Such continuing lived dynamic reality was theologically grounded in the Trinity and is sustained by the personal role of the Spirit. According to Congar God (the Father) is the auctor
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5 Congar maintained, “that the saving Gospel is contained entirely in Scriptures, as it is also contained entirely in Tradition.” Yves Congar, The Meaning of Tradition. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2004), 43. This was a position, he argued, of older theologians J. H. Newman, M. Scheeben and contemporaries J. Ratzinger, K. Rahner and H. de Lubac among others. The point of contention was whether the Gospel revealed by Jesus Christ was handed down “partly in the Holy Scriptures, and partly in unwritten tradition.” ibid. In this case the Scriptures would need to be completed.
6 Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 272.
7 ibid., 274.
8 ibid., 280. The Word of God is an act of God. Aidan Nichols suggests Karl Barth’s influence. Nichols, Yves Congar, 14. Congar himself, however, points to Origen, rather than Barth, since it is important for him, that while the text of Scriptures is the result of God’s revelatory action, the text is not the operation of God now. Thus reference to Henri de Lubac, Histoire et Esprit, beginning with 336. The written and preached Word of God has for Congar a sacramental structure, which means it is effective beyond the written text, and there is “real presence” of the Word, where the “institution,” or text, calls for “event” of the Holy Spirit. Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 25.
9 Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 282.
10 ibid., 283.
of mission and tradition, its ultimate subject; the subjects of tradition are many and they comprise *Ecclesia*. With Jesus Christ these form a single subject, because of a twofold cause of unity, the external cause – mission, and the inner principle of unity, the Holy Spirit. This means that for Congar the Holy Spirit is the transcendent Subject of tradition. This role assures homogeneity “between the Church’s actual teaching and the apostolic deposit.” This role of the Spirit means tradition has the “identity of principle,” which is present in all the moments of history of the church. The Spirit according to Congar actualizes and interiorizes faith in time and space. The Spirit does this in persons without forcing them through interventions and events in their consciousness. This points to the proper activity of the Spirit, which is not independent from Christ’s work, as in each consciousness “historical transmission of the pattern of belief,” which comes from the incarnation, and “spiritual ‘event’” combine. This raises the question if the Christological “once for all” has its full critical sway over ecclesial life and also if the Spirit has a free and truly personal role. In other words, does not the homogeneity domesticate the freedom of the divine and human activity?

Congar’s notion of tradition intends to take these issues into account, and this depends on the developed role of the Spirit. The trajectory initiated here is consummated in his later work. The role of the Spirit allows him to stress not only the continuity but also new emergences and the possibility of fault. He seems reticent on domesticating the work of the Spirit by the notion of identity or homogeneity. For Webster the *ressourcement* approach of Congar emphasized ecclesial visibility and overlooked other ways of conceiving ecclesiology; he was too much on the side of homogeneity. But Webster is reserved as to the full historicity of divine gift and the intimacy of human-divine relation in the church. Congar’s reference to liturgy would be the response. It accommodates the idea that in relation to the Word, the

---

11 ibid., 311 – 313. John Webster, however, finds Congar’s Christology oddly muted, probably because he does not want to emphasize the Protestant “once for all.” See, John Webster, “Purity and Plenitude: Evangelical Reflections on Congar’s *Tradition and Traditions*” Flynn, ed. Yves Congar, 54.


13 See also Yves Congar, *Un Peuple Messianique*, 8.


15 ibid., 343.


17 John Webster, “Purity and Plenitude,” 59. Webster criticizes the remnants of “continued Incarnation” in Congar by arguing that the “the incarnate Word” enjoys sovereign freedom in his relations ad extra and in the ecclesiology prefers to focus on the distinction of Christ and his body. Webster, ibid, 62. For Webster covenant emphasizes “differentiation and drastic inequality … the astonishing *unitio* of God and the fallen creature, not ontological *unio*.” (ibid.) I think Congar’s earlier work showed he is in agreement with this view, but he cannot accept that the relation of Christ and the church is “purely extrinsic.” This would mean the history of the church is a “merely human story,” and does not reflect that “the Christ and the Church are in one another and that one and the same “mystery” includes them both.” Congar, *Tradition and Traditions*, 491, 492.

18 Webster also argues that the transcendence of the Holy Spirit is not to be compromised in association with tradition, as its transcendent subject. For him God’s promises are more about “eschatological security” and “the inexhaustibility and infinite reliability” of the divine grace, than its availability as historical reality, as for Congar. Thus he is reluctant to go all the way to embrace the complete historicity of divine gift, as Congar did. Webster, ibid., 63. Webster also thinks that as Congar folds the Scripture into the life of the church, the Scripture cannot function as prophetic witness, since it is not “an alien element.” (ibid.)
church is in a relation of confrontation as well as identity. Congar’s proposal rests on the necessary development of the personal (and intervening) role of the Spirit in the act of transmission. Congar’s insistence on the full historicity of the divine gift in tradition is significant for the full participation of the world in God. Before turning to the significance of this reference to liturgy, I would like to return briefly to my research question. How does the theological emphasis on the Holy Spirit affect the understanding of the participation of God in the world and the world in God in Congar’s theology? This helps to see what are the implications of Congar’s turn to the unveiling of living God for this participation.

It actually achieves two things. First, Congar turns to the issue of revelation. But in light of earlier emphasis on the embodied presence of the church this turn to revelation is a turn to embodied revelation - tradition. Nevertheless, tradition, as Congar approaches it, is as if made transparent to the Gospel; he does not view it as autonomous and in fact goes beyond a sole focus on it by referring to its source, which is the living Gospel. So, the intimate and historical human-divine relation is affirmed, but it is also made transparent, that is, its kenotic nature is underlined. In this Congar goes beyond a focus on the idea of the church to focus on “even more radical idea … [that is] the very notion of faith and the correlative idea of revelation … the idea of God as the living God which is the indissoluble link … between theology, anthropology and cosmology.” Second, as embodied and in the world, this turn to revelation has a clear theological rationale, which accumulates Congar’s earlier work but also moves a step forward. It is the emphasis on the proper activity of the Spirit, which is not independent from Christ’s work. It goes along the earlier mentioned trajectory of surpassing, as Congar’s later thoughts on what constitutes Pneumatology suggest: “a full pneumatology … goes beyond simply making present the structures set up by Christ; it is the actuality of what the glorified Lord and his Spirit do in the life of the Church, in all the variety of forms this activity has assumed in time and space.” In addressing the world, Congar proposes human-divine activity, which is both embodied and kenotic in what comes from Christ and affirming the activity of the Spirit. This allows returning to the issue of liturgy, since it is for Congar “the one place where Christology and pneumatology are [undoubtedly] united.” This issue, as earlier indicated, is to be connected with the way eschatological Spirit already acts in creation.

TRADITION AS SELF-ENTRUSTING DIVINE — HUMAN ACTION

---

20 Congar’s later work views the church as a liturgical whole (ministry within community) and argues that what is derived from historical institution requires the action of the Spirit. The Spirit intervenes and the continuity is in the action of the Spirit, which makes the work of Christ present in the time of the church and makes liturgy the place of eternal life. Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 35.
21 Congar, Dialogue, 23.
22 Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1, 156.
For Congar the liturgy embodies tradition as a unique means of communication, which transmits and entrusts in a unique manner.\textsuperscript{24} It is still the Gospel which is at stake. Tradition entrusts or passes on the Gospel in a different way than writing, since in it life and communion, not mere knowledge, are entrusted. So, as Jesus Christ was in communion, he was touched, this “touch” of life goes on.\textsuperscript{25} Its ultimate basis is that God has handed over Jesus and he has given himself, he is reality, and everything else is “a preparation, communication, sign and sacrament of this Reality.”\textsuperscript{26} Thus tradition is “the very principle of the whole economy of salvation.”\textsuperscript{27} This reality has priority over words, and it is to this reality that the testimonies, or the monuments of tradition, point, the church possesses this reality and knows its meaning.\textsuperscript{28} The liturgy, the active celebration of the Christian mystery, is the \textit{locus theologicus} of this reality. This means the whole faith of the church is invested in its prayer and liturgy, and “contains, offers, expresses” the Christian mystery in its own way as the channel of revelation.\textsuperscript{29} Congar affirms that “two breads” or “two tables,” the preaching and the Eucharist, complete one another.\textsuperscript{30} The one employs conceptual signs and formulas and passes on knowledge, the second, in signs, communicating the substance of reality itself.\textsuperscript{31} Tradition, then, binds the divine life and human life in a particular way.

This tradition is also a presence in the socio-cultural world, where world and God interact and thus expresses the relation God-world. The view of tradition as action suggests this. Since the reality of tradition surpasses the intellect, the liturgy “teaches” in and through action, which establishes the conditions for life and communicates life itself.\textsuperscript{32} Liturgy acts as \textit{didascalia}, the teaching by being the “spiritual matrix” which forms life thus engaging the world.\textsuperscript{33} It contains the reality and celebrates it by being open to the intervention of divine activity through prayer and openness to the Spirit. Thus it is interior to the life of the church, but at same time it is open for the transcendent.\textsuperscript{34} As not primarily oral, it uniquely passes on by a different logic, by being embodied and communal. This gives a glimpse on how it continues in the world – it passes “by fertilizing contact,” in continuity with incarnation, but effective through the intervention of the Spirit.\textsuperscript{35} The two divine persons come together in this. Contents, performers, context interpenetrate; words and actions, spirit and form come together. This

\textsuperscript{24} Congar, \textit{Tradition and Traditions}, 349.
\textsuperscript{25} ibid.
\textsuperscript{26} ibid., 350.
\textsuperscript{27} Congar, \textit{The Meaning of Tradition}, 15.
\textsuperscript{28} Congar, \textit{Tradition and Traditions}, 350, 352.
\textsuperscript{29} ibid., 355. On the tradition as \textit{locus theologicus}, see references in 354, note 3. Congar accepts the original sense “lex orandi, lex credenda,” his point is that faith is contained in the prayer in a more full way, which theological formulas “unpack.”
\textsuperscript{31} Congar, \textit{Tradition and Traditions}, 356
\textsuperscript{32} ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} ibid., 358.
\textsuperscript{34} ibid., 359.
\textsuperscript{35} ibid., 360, 361.
is the celebration by Christ the High Priest and the coming of the Holy Spirit, institution by Christ and constitution of event by the Spirit.\textsuperscript{36} In this way the living tradition implies direct human participation in divine activity. But the embodied and tangible logic necessarily implies the whole creation. So, what role does the world play in this?

Tradition as action implies a limited part for the world, mainly socio-cultural and focused on the past. Tradition contains Christian reality as lived and conveys truths in its own way.\textsuperscript{37} First present in the lived reality, these truths then come to knowledge and formulas.\textsuperscript{38} This move from “implicit in life” to the “expressly known” is from Maurice Blondel,\textsuperscript{39} who discusses identity of the historical Jesus and the Christ of the church. Blondel intends to take both history and faith seriously.\textsuperscript{40} The current period matters: Alpha will be fully understood, when one comes to Omega.\textsuperscript{41} On the one hand, Congar insists that tradition inaugurates nothing—it “anticipates the future and prepares itself to clarify that future by the selfsame effort that it makes to remain true to the past.”\textsuperscript{42} But, on the other hand, the tradition as action is necessarily in the world and affects thought. The tradition as “implicitly held” is the “faithful activity” accompanied by thought; the thought clarifies practice, but is affected by action and tied to it.\textsuperscript{43} Tradition as action has “clarity and completeness” even under an implicit regime which relates dogmatic knowledge to life.\textsuperscript{44} Blondel’s “implicitly held” tradition itself “resides” and is carried in the acts of fidelity in this world.\textsuperscript{45} For Congar this resonates with the biblical view of truth, focusing on integrity of life; and insistence that the fullness of truth will come in eschatology.\textsuperscript{46} But does such a view of human-divine activity sufficiently address the human and worldly aspect?

\textbf{Critical Reflections on Congar’s Tradition as Action}

\textsuperscript{36} Congar, \textit{The Word and the Spirit}, 117.
\textsuperscript{37} See Congar, \textit{The Meaning of Tradition}, 29 and especially 43.
\textsuperscript{38} Congar, \textit{Tradition and Traditions}, 359. They become “by means of magisterium, objects of knowledge and formulas of faith.”
\textsuperscript{40} Congar, \textit{Tradition and Traditions}, 362. Blondel views religious claim as dependent on, but not measured by, historical evidence, and draws from the experience of the reality of faith, thus tradition. For him it is not the case that history “had never entered,” i.e. was extrinsic. See \textit{The Letter on Apologetics and History and Dogma.}, 225 on his argument against “extrinsicism,” a form of apologetics of his day. Blondel rather proposes a tradition as synthesis, which utilizes “speculative, ethical and historical” powers of Christianity. Congar, \textit{Tradition and Traditions}, 363.
\textsuperscript{41} ibid, 366. Quote from Blondel, \textit{Histoire et Dogme}, 214.
\textsuperscript{42} ibid., 364 quote from Blondel, \textit{Histoire et Dogme}, 204-205.
\textsuperscript{43} Congar, \textit{Tradition and Traditions}, 364.
\textsuperscript{44} ibid., 365.
\textsuperscript{45} ibid.
\textsuperscript{46} ibid., 366.
Congar’s critical reflections show the intent of his use of Blondel. He appreciates Blondel’s acceptance of both history and theology, and even goes further. According to Aidan Nichols, Congar’s tradition “re-creates” that of Blondel, even if better equipped theologically and exegetically.\(^\text{47}\) But Congar is more attentive to the role of history. Vis-à-vis Blondel he argued that the declarations of the magisterium are not creative, but depend on evidence and are to be interpreted in their historical setting.\(^\text{48}\) Congar also affirmed that what is entrusted to the church is not just a lived reality, but also a deposit of revelation.\(^\text{49}\) So, there is a constitutive revelation, which has an authoritative and critical role over subsequent developments. Congar due to his critical-theological reading of tradition also understood the dynamism of the relation between the magisterium and community.\(^\text{50}\) This shows that Congar’s approach to tradition comprises the two trajectories identified in earlier chapters. It is an openness to the world or history in their complexity and at the same time an inquiry into the mystery of the triune God. Congar views tradition as history and as a human-divine relation, but this carries several risks.

David Coffey points to the inconsistency in Congar’s critique of Blondel, that his tradition was not objective enough and has a dogmatic character. If it does, according to Coffey, it cannot be also the “inexhaustible fund that all three, Moehler, Blondel and Congar, want it to be.”\(^\text{51}\) Only Blondel’s view could guarantee this due to his notion of action.\(^\text{52}\) But this presents a problem. Flynn points to Blondel’s influence on Congar and through him into the documents of Vatican II.\(^\text{53}\) But together with Jonathan Robinson he regrets that the innovative understanding of the dynamic nature of tradition has clouded its role as “fixed legacy of Revelation.”\(^\text{54}\) For Robinson Congar’s understanding of tradition could not sustain a view of Christianity which Congar practiced.\(^\text{55}\) Coffey rightly points out that the theological basis of tradition is in the fact that God has “handed over” Jesus Christ, who has “given” himself.\(^\text{56}\)

\(^{47}\) Nichols, *Yves Congar*, 36, 38.


\(^{49}\) ibid., 367.

\(^{50}\) ibid.


\(^{52}\) Coffey thinks Möthler’s early, Pneumatological work, was superior to his later Christology, which Congar nevertheless follows in making Tradition more objective. ibid., 53, 54.

\(^{53}\) Flynn, *Yves Congar’s Vision*, 202: “it is thanks to Congar that Blondel’s personalistic theory of tradition gained entry to the teachings of Vatican II.”


\(^{55}\) Jonathan Robinson, “Congar on Tradition” in Flynn, ed. *Yves Congar*, 329, 350, 355. So, when introducing historical thinking into ontology reiterated by followers of Thomas Aquinas, Congar did not erect a “bulwark against historicism.” (335) If not primarily the content, the tradition was at risk “of becoming a self-propelling activity which generates its own content.” (343) If tradition is essentially “activity,” the church was not confined to visible and hierarchical church, the monuments of tradition were not binding on the work of the Spirit, and revelation as the activity of God was prior to language in which the church receives the word of God.

\(^{56}\) Coffey, Ibid., 57, referring to Congar, *The Tradition and Traditions*, 350.
But to address the criticism it is necessary to complement this basis. Coffey points out what is missing in this divine self-communication — emphasis on the Holy Spirit as gift and the risen Christ. This resonates with Congar’s later appreciation of the relation of the glorified Christ and the Spirit. Coffey suggests that what is handed on is not the body of doctrine, nor “Christian life,” but the entire Christian mystery. For Coffey, this mystery is “essentially ... the risen Christ himself, who is never found on his own but always in union with the Church.” This points to the novelty of divine and eschatological life and goes beyond mere continuity.

This applies to the approach to liturgy. Webster shows the active notion of tradition allowed Congar to distinguish between Tradition and its monuments. The resulting sacramental and Pneumatological understanding of Tradition countered a juridical and historicist identification of the action of God and these monuments. But perhaps for Webster there is still too much of the identification, making Congar’s account of the distinction only partially successful. The liturgy was for Congar an “efficacious representation” of tradition. There was a unity between tradition and the traditions; but traditions were also witnesses of Tradition, so they were distinct. This “efficacious representation” for Webster “tugs in rather different direction from the basic idea of traditions as witness.” The emphasis on the risen Christ and his Spirit can better balance this continuity and distinction. But discussing the role of tradition as active human-divine reality, it is necessary to remember the setting of Congar’s theology of tradition. Blondel viewed the history of Christianity as the supernatural reality of divine self-communication; this self-communication (as tradition) constitutes the church; the action of the faithful embodies the meaning of Christianity. But this action has to be a fully human action.

This draws attention to some aspects of Blondel’s philosophy of action, which are also relevant to Congar’s use of his philosophy. Congar surely should have appreciated Blondel’s concerns. According to Baum, for Blondel the philosopher, one encounters the transcendent in the finite human experience and reflection. For him this implies the necessity of revelation as Milbank showed: the logic of action demands a “divine human mediator” and human action “requires a revelation ... dogmatic tradition.” Milbank argues this is an inconsistency. For Blondel, for the human being to be fulfilled required the
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57 Coffey, Ibid., 54, 57.
59 Coffey, Ibid., 54.
60 John Webster, “Purity and Plenitude,” 55.
61 ibid.
63 See Maurice Blondel, Action: Essay on a Critique of Life and a Science of Practice (1893), trans. by Oliva Blanchette. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1984). For Blondel “in voluntary [human] action a secret nuptial takes place between the human will and the divine will” (342) and “action is a synthesis of man and God: neither God alone, nor man alone can change it, produce it, or annihilate it.” (343) Positive reference to Blondel in relating natural-supernatural, Un Peuple messianique, 159.
64 ibid., 15.
65 Milbank, Theology and social theory, 217.
supernatural and even for the precise contours of this supernatural to be shown – the Incarnation and the Trinity.\textsuperscript{66} Milbank argues that in the contemporary context Blondel’s philosophy has to be “re-understood as theology.”\textsuperscript{67} Such proposal can hardly be reconciled with Blondel’s explicit intent to approach the issue of the supernatural from a philosophical perspective. However, there is a point to Milbank’s critique that without allegiance to (Christian) tradition, the action might be also “violence and risk” and not “action as love.”\textsuperscript{68} Furthermore, Blondel too easily dismisses the possibility of nihilism and indifference.\textsuperscript{69} Paul Ricoeur criticizes Blondel’s method of immanence as the method of innocence along similar lines.\textsuperscript{70} Such optimism rests on the sapiential insight as to the intimate relation of the life of the world and God, but this insight is not argued out. This impedes adequate assessment of the human situation in the world. When applied to Congar’s theology of tradition this criticism asks if it is open to accept the reality of evil and suffering in the human life and in the world into the relation God-world. Furthermore, this leaves the reference to the non-human world out. This requires that one looks more closely at the relation God-world, which is implied.

TRADITION, WHICH BINDS GOD, HUMANITY AND THE WORLD AS BOOKS

I now turn to see how theology of tradition relates God, human being and the world. I do this because my primary concern is how it contributes to the participation of God in the world and the world in God. The notion of the world is quite ambiguous here. In the economy as the self-communication of God, the Father is the source of all created things but also the source of divinity of the Son and the Spirit, as they proceed from the Father. Thus, the Father delivers the Son for the life of humanity and then delivers the Spirit to the church, which becomes an extension of divine communion. The divine transmission continues in the human transmission.\textsuperscript{71} Thus Congar’s theology of tradition may be viewed as the relationship God-world. Tradition is what brings God, human being and creation together due to the missions

\textsuperscript{66} ibid., 218.
\textsuperscript{67} ibid., 219.
\textsuperscript{68} ibid.
\textsuperscript{69} ibid., 213. “The response of indifference to this or that (nihilism) or of a secret and tragic withholding of assent to the ceaseless additions our actions make (stoicism) – the two reactions which Blondel considers the very essence of sin – may appear to be the best resort of the sensitive person.”
\textsuperscript{70} Paul Ricoeur, \textit{Freedom and nature: The voluntary and the involuntary}. vol. 1. (Evanston: Northwestern University Press), 1966, 31. “...perhaps after all the work of Maurice Blondel is not only a method of immanence, but also a method of innocence ... it may be that Maurice Blondel underestimates the difficulties of the method of immanence, in particular those which proceed from the accident of the fault. Guilty freedom, broken between a powerless ethical inspiration and the strange effectiveness of the nothing at the heart of all its works, blocks the access to its own surpassing. Furthermore, the use of the method of immanence is inseparable from a deliverance of freedom by a Transcendence, which becomes immanent to the extent to which the will purifies itself in becoming actively associated with its own liberation. ... there runs the search for an onerous assurance which, to Blondel, is already given. . . .”
\textsuperscript{71} Yves Congar, \textit{The Meaning of Tradition}. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2004.), 15.
of God, those of the Son and the Spirit. The creation is certainly wider than a human and historical world, even if Congar’s approach is limited to the latter notion.

The “world,” consequently, is not meant to be a mere backdrop of Congar’s work, but is knit into the theology of tradition. Searching for a theological basis for his understanding of tradition, Congar turns to the Scriptural–patristic approach to the Scriptures as “sapiential,” which embraces the three books of human soul, creation and Scriptures. This approach is based on the two convictions, that “everything is the work of Word,” and that God communicates not in words alone. First, this means that the reading of the Bible assumes that the books (human soul, world, Scriptures) interpret one another. Second, the words of God are interpreted and make sense as one lives the life which God gives. Thus, tradition embraces the human, the world and the Scriptures and it is understood in life as a dynamic and not merely noetic reality. Two consequences follow.

First, the sapiential approach plays an important role as it affirms the importance of history and the world. It posits the relation between creation and the gift of God. This “initial proportion” allows Congar to argue that “historical and earthly existence of the supernatural” is possible (italics added). Christ’s rule extended over the creation and history; the redemption was inserted in history through the incarnation of Christ. Thus the divine human covenant assumed historical shape and had to guarantee historical continuity of what Christ has instituted. The divine salvation, which God wrought in Jesus Christ, becomes the source of the life of the church in its history by means of the efficacious work of the Holy Spirit. Thus two divine missions link God and the world. Consequently, the time of the church is not purely human, but the continuous life of grace in history.

72 Congar uses the Scholastic theme of “divine missions” as a link between theology of God in Godself and theology of divine activity in the world – creating the world outside of God and returning the humanity back to God. Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 8.

73 “The Bible is, for the Fathers and for all the Middle Ages, a total wisdom ... it contains the secret of creation itself, since it expresses the thought of God, not of a man. The Fathers’ point of is sapiential.” Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 65 He outlines this “synthesis” in a footnote, packed with references. “Synthesis” embraces several theses: a. God created an orderly universe. (Congar sees this in the Scriptures, Augustine, Bernard, Bonaventure and Henri de Lubac) b. Nature and human soul are as a book where human being discerns divine presence. (Basil, Origen, Augustine, Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas and E. Gilson, Chenu and de Lubac are primarily in his mind) c. In case of human being the resemblance to God was lost by sin. (Origen, Augustine, Hugh of Saint-Victor) d. Thus Bible is necessary to understand the book of the world, but the books of the world and human soul allow fully and deeply penetrating the Scriptures. (In Congar’s note one finds the names of Augustine, Cassiodorus, Isidore, the monastic movement and the Victorines.) For detailed references see Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 65, 66 note 2. This approach to wisdom is multi-layered, but one has also to keep in mind that such approach is inspired by close interaction with Orthodox theology and modern debate as Chapter Six will show.


75 Congar. Tradition and Traditions, 148 – 149.

76 ibid., 148

77 ibid.
Second, the sapiential approach affirms that this relation is not only noetic, but is also embodied in human life in all its complexity. This is clear from Congar’s argument against “sola Scriptura.” The church views the world as “re-created” in the Son, thus appropriating knowledge which does not come from Scripture. So, one reads the Scripture by living in the church and in the tradition, and this life must play a role in the reading. The sapiential synthesis of Congar rests upon the coherence of the work of God, as it reflects the face of God and constitutes the presence of the Wisdom of God. Human beings discern this presence in the “two books of nature and the soul or through experience,” where the world is iconic (Origen) and the human is microcosm (St. Basil). The image of God (and thus theological view of things) is lost by sin, thus Jesus Christ, the content and meaning of the Scriptures, reveals the divine meaning of the books. Congar refers to Origen and Augustine and concludes that the Scriptures are necessary to understand the world and human self, but the books of nature and soul allow understanding the Scripture in all its detail. This embodied nature of tradition would certainly profit if the world in its more comprehensive sense is affirmed. This kind of development might follow the logic of Congar’s attempt to adopt a more historical view of tradition.

The role of the Spirit comes forth when Congar does not stop at static and ahistorical presentation. The meaning of the Scriptures centres on the covenant in Jesus Christ, which means that the people of God share in his death and exaltation. The covenant is realized in the life of Jesus Christ and in the church. The events of history realize the “Word that is all dynamic” and they are oriented to eschatology. This happens through the Holy Spirit, who connects the life of Christ and the church. The history of salvation is, indeed, historical, which means that humans and the Spirit make it together: “a history which is made by men and the Holy Spirit, together.” Human participation requires articulating the role of the prophetic Spirit, which inspires and binds the history of salvation, the Scripture and human lives. The Fathers had a consciousness of tradition as “a living transmission of lived realities,” but also “a certain exemplarist, and even essentialist spirit.” The Spirit was for them “the principle of all progress beyond time, space, the multiplicity and differentiation of spirits,” as in Thomas. Congar, however, is set to develop not only the progress beyond time and space,
but also in time and space. This suggests Congar’s view of the Spirit in his theology of tradition, to be relevant and properly address the world, requires a theology of creation.

To identify this gap, it is necessary to point to one major source of inspiration in this “sapiential” thinking which Congar does not mention here, but references to which are elsewhere in his work. This is the sophiology of Vladimir Soloviev. Congar had a hope that one would write a thesis “on the theme of the natural or philosophical analogues of ecumenism,” 88 which indicates a kind of relation or even implicit rationale behind an ecumenical discussion, which undergirds it in the wider divine plan for creation. As to his idea of what that might be, he pointed to Soloviev’s idea of “transition from unity to unity by way of multiplicity.” 89 Congar is clearly sympathetic to Soloviev’s vision of interrelating the human being, cosmos and God. 90 However, as I mentioned earlier, he does not explicitly acknowledge and engage this line of inquiry. To see how this might be done I turn to Paul Fiddes. Fiddes turns to “sapiential” or wisdom theology for a rapprochement with contemporary Western thought and in includes Sophiology into the discussion. 91 This was a sentiment of Congar in his work. Fiddes looks at biblical wisdom as practical (like Congar) but also as wisdom, which expresses God’s own creativity. Both aspects interrelate for him in a theology of creation, which Congar did not develop, but resonates with Congar’s living tradition as human-divine reality. The common emphasis on wisdom is a good starting point. Paul Fiddes presents wisdom as daily and practical, but also as wisdom of participation in God. The latter is the knowledge of the divine, concerned with contemplative and creative human participation in God’s own creativity. 92 Fiddes presents a theology of creation rooted in participation in the Trinity. 93 Congar also seeks to relate human involvement and the presence of the self-revealing God. Emphasis on human freedom goes together with the
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88 Congar, Dialogue, 65.
89 ibid., 67. On this notion of “all-unity” and Sophiology, see Gavrilyuk, “The reception of Dionysius in twentieth-century eastern orthodoxy,” 709.
90 See Congar, Dialogue, 221, 241 and Congar, Jésus-Christ, 194.
91 Fiddes, Seeing the World, 381-387.
92 Fiddes, Seeing the World, 11.
93 ibid., 13.
emphasis on the Holy Spirit in Congar’s work. But I suggest that this freedom lacks the ingredient of creativity of creation, which is present in the work of Paul Fiddes.

**PAUL FIDDES AND THE MISSING “BOOK OF THE WORLD”**

This juxtaposition of Congar and Fiddes is proposed to highlight some presuppositions which underlie Congar’s account of the participation of the creature in God. First, Fiddes differs from Congar in that he presents the human being as primarily immersed in the world. He seeks to transcend the view of the self as mere thinking subject, which is consonant for him with a purpose to control the world. Such critique might be addressed to Congar’s earlier and more abstract presentation of the human return to God. So, what does this critique entail? Fiddes begins from “embodiment, connectedness, and participation” of creatures, living with and participating in the life of others. Second, the Scriptural view of wisdom allows Fiddes to formulate how this being in the world is a participation in God. To do this he distinguishes in it two dimensions of “wisdom:” first, that which is called “wisdom of observation,” the wisdom engaged in the world, observing things and exercising judgment. The second dimension expresses “God’s own creativity,” wisdom, which was there in the beginning of the world. This he calls the “wisdom of participation.” This wisdom resonates with Congar’s early account of participation. But for Fiddes, however, the two dimensions interweave as both are necessary for the theology of creation. This theology is “rooted in participation in a God, who exists in triune relations, and who relates to what is created in all its diversity.”

What would the account of Fiddes contribute to the view of participation, which Congar produced?

The answer revolves around the part the world plays in theology. Congar affirmed contemplative participation in divine knowledge, but what about the participation and immersion in the world? Congar uses the imagery of the “three books.” Like Congar, Fiddes also refers to Origen and Augustine. But Fiddes goes further in showing what the book of the world contributes as he juxtaposes early Christian theology and the contemporary philosophy of signs, semiotics. In this philosophy, the world is a network, wherein persons and objects form the network of signs within the sign-bearing world. Signs point to other signs in the world of time and space and are established by their difference from one another. But the juxtaposition with Christian tradition presents a problem, Fiddes points out. In semiotics signs refer to other signs within the immediate network of relations and the thought of creator-origin beyond the signs is problematic. The world is viewed as a system closed upon
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itself and cannot declare anything about God, as Christian tradition asserts.\(^{100}\) This draws attention to the theological-philosophical problem, which might point to what suppresses the role the world plays.

Fiddes exposes Augustine’s account of the book of the world and the book of Scriptures to the critique of French philosopher Jacques Derrida. If these two books witness to the eternal book, the word of God, which has become flesh in the incarnation, this is open to the criticism of “logocentrism.”\(^{101}\) This is how this works: the unified form of the book presumes a totality, in which writing’s multiple signifiers are held “in a ‘transcendental signifier’ … immune to the particularities of time and space.”\(^{102}\) The problem is in identifying God and metaphysics, when viewing that the signifiers are “validated by the ideality of the transcendent signified,” God.\(^{103}\) This presumes that there are timeless ideas, which have a structural unity, without particularities of time and space, and these ideas are contained in the mind of the conscious subject.\(^{104}\) God is then presented as “transcendental signified,” existing outside time and space, independent of signs and sanctioning a hierarchy of being. Since being is understood as presence, the more being one has, the more presence the one imposes on the others, and this becomes a “hierarchy of domination.”\(^{105}\) This image reinforces my concern with the imagery of causality in the relation God-world in the analysis of Congar’s use of analogy. Furthermore, this would explain why the world’s presence is merely reflective and receptive.

But in a way this complies with a different strand in Congar’s work. Fiddes looks at what would be the different way of relating God and the world through this world of signs. I have shown

\(^{100}\) Fiddes, *Seeing the World*, 271.

\(^{101}\) Fiddes, “The Late-modern Reversal of Spirit and Letter,” 108. “Logocentrism” is a belief, an “underlying ideal of Western culture,” that the meaning is “perfectly self-present” in speech, as there is no temporal or spatial distance, because “speaker, speech and the listener” are in simultaneous moment. This is opposed to the written word. Barbara Johnson, “Translator’s introduction,” ix, in Jacques Derrida, *Dissemination* (Chicago: University Press, 1981). Fiddes points to the relation of the transcendent subject and the transcendent text in Augustine. The latter is “the ‘system of signified truth’” a kind of “eternal book, the word of God to which the two books of scripture and the natural world … bear witness.” (ibid.)

\(^{102}\) Fiddes, “The Late-modern Reversal of Spirit and Letter,” 108. Derrida questions everything that has a “centre,” as a guiding concept, Paul Fry notes. The problem is in thinking about the center as which brought the structure into existence as its cause. So, “Derrida describes the history of metaphysics as a history of successive appeals to a center: to some generic impulse from which everything derives.” Paul Fry, *Theory of Literature*. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2012), 132. The problem with metaphysics is that “the center ... constituted that very thing within the structure ... while escaping structurality ... within the structure and outside it” at the same time. Jacques Derrida, “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences,” in David Richter, ed. *The critical tradition: Classic texts and contemporary trends*. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2007), 915. Thus metaphysics structured the thought systems but created the impression that it is outside history and culture.

\(^{103}\) Fiddes, Ibid. According to Derrida, “the whole history of the concept of structure ... must be thought of as a series of substitutions of center for center, as a linked chain of determinations of the center,” the matrix of which “is the determination of being as presence,” wherein the center was called “eidos, arché, telos, energeia, ousia (essence, existence, substance, subject) aletheia, transcendality, consciousness, or conscience, God, man, and so forth.” Derrida, Ibid., 916.

\(^{104}\) Fiddes, “The Late-modern Reversal of Spirit and Letter,” 106.

\(^{105}\) Ibid.
in the previous chapter that this was also Congar’s intent, and he even referred to Jesus Christ as ultimate Sign. Fiddes asserts the importance of the human world of signs, which is both ambiguous and creative. Fiddes looks at the interaction of signs in Derrida, where the final meaning of the text is always postponed. The chain of signifying is never-ending the “signifier having done its work becomes itself something to be signified.” The concept of the différence plays a key role, since it points to the “primordial condition for all signs,” which is the movement of distinguishing (one sign from the other) and deferral (of meaning). This is possible, Fiddes points out, since for Derrida the relation between the signifier and the signified in the text is not decidable. Such a view not only acknowledges the creativity of the world, but also addresses the issue of mediation by showing it is itself mediated. The text is thus the medium, but never “becomes a mere mediation: it outwits and undoes all ontologies.” This challenges the relation God-world expressed in the language of two planes or realms and the need of mediator between them. Derrida, according to Fiddes, presents the world around us as a system of signs, a text, “the structures called ‘real,’ ‘economic,’ ‘historical,’ ‘socio-institutional’, in short: all possible referents.” Human beings are immersed into this world as text, which is prior to them. The view of human beings as immersed in the world as text is an important corrective to Congar, which allows adequately assessing the “book of the world.” What the account of Fiddes does not propose is the activity of the Spirit in creation, thus account of creation is still predominately socio-cultural.

Congar’s look at the theology of the Scholastic period raises a criticism similar to Fiddes. In the Middle Ages, he states, the Scripture was read in light of two other books, and brought
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106 Fiddes, Seeing the World, 272. For Derrida the “rupture” in the substitutions comes about when language invades the universal problematics, i.e. when “everything became discourse … everything became a system where central signified, the original or transcendental signified, is never absolutely present outside a system of differences.” Derrida, Ibid. The world becomes linguistic, but this does not mean that Derrida “denies the existence of any reality outside a text. In Of Grammatology, Derrida notoriously said “there is nothing outside the text.” What he meant by that is that there’s nothing but text.” Paul Fry, Theory of Literature, 142.


109 Derrida, “The double session,” 215 quoted in Fiddes, 272. Paul Fry points to this important feature of Derrida’s deconstruction, where the “basic move in theory … looks like an inversion of priority in a binary pair, but it’s not so much that as a reminder that they cannot exist apart from each other,” in other words that you can not have one binary without the other. Fry, Theory of literature, 139. Binaries of presence/absence, nature/culture, mediation/immediacy, and so forth, see Derrida, “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences,” 924. See also Fry, Ibid., 133 – 135.

out fully their significance. There was indeed a “whole” of human being, world, salvation and communion of saints, the work of Wisdom, with regulating Scripture as summit. The concept of auctoritas was key, meaning function and status of entity in its relation to source. The value of a thing was considered not in terms of historical, temporal genesis, but by a place in the hierarchy of the world “in virtue of its function or status.” God was auctor, the ultimate cause; auctoritas extended to that which has been given by God – the gift of being true, expressing truth and divine will. The human-divine was subordinated to God as personally responsible auctor, cooperation “benefits from the absolute guarantee attached to the first Truth.” The books of creation and soul revealed full meaning in relation to Scriptures. Scriptures revealed full significance in the church. Scholastics attributed true and holy determinations of the life of the church to the “revelatio, inspiratio, suggestio of the Holy Spirit.” But the focus upon the transcendent real cause of truth overshadowed the historical dimension of the existence and the work of the Spirit.

Furthermore, there is an explicit tendency in Congar’s notion of living tradition to overcome some of the dualities characterising his early work. Theologically this is possible thanks to the role of the Holy Spirit. Inspired by Romanticism, tradition was indeed “the continuous and living totality, as the ever increasing stock of the expressions of the Christian genius.” But it also brought together several opposing binaries and began from one’s being immersed in the life of believing community. First, it brought together the inside, inward sense of faith, “genius,” and the “structure”, hierarchy, in the theology of communion. Second, the living tradition proposed an account of objective and subjective aspects of living with authoritative texts. Their cumulative witness overwhelmingly suggested that the subject of tradition was the whole body of the faithful and not only hierarchy. Third, living tradition showed community and hierarchy cooperated in carrying the living faith, relating authority and the life of community. Congar refers to “the great syntheses of Newman and Scheeben.”

111 Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 86.
112 ibid., 90.
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114 ibid., 91.
115 ibid., 92.
116 ibid., 94–97.
117 Traditions express the genius of communities, which carried them. Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 192.
118 ibid., 193. On the early work of Möhler and its influence on theological renewal in twentieth century, see Boersma, Nouvelle Théologie, 42.
119 Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 194.
120 ibid., 193, 194. Written texts expressed living tradition and were necessary for “the historical verification of continuity” and “concrete awareness of communion.” ibid., 195. Möhler distinguished subjective and objective aspects of tradition, but J. B. Franzelin distinguished tradition in objective and in active sense, the latter pointing to the acts of transmission. ibid., 197. See Möhler, Unity in the Church, paragraphs 12, 16 and 28, Joannes Baptista Franzelin, De Divina Traditio et Scriptura, (Roma: Taurini, 1870).
122 ibid., 209. John Henry Newman’s tradition was not a mere historical witness of the past - the church had living authority, magisterium. (210, 211) The homogeneity is open to critique - due to sensus fidelium, the “Christian”
a living tradition gives a view of faith, which related the “inside” of faith to the “outside” of the world. Blondel proposed tradition, “in which history and dogma are united by a live current passing in both directions - from the facts to dogma, and from the dogma to the facts.”\footnote{ibid., 216.} On the other hand this meant, that “the Church cannot be understood except from within,”\footnote{ibid., 218.} as the church also reads dogmatic tradition in its human history.

This shows the tension in Congar’s work. On the one hand tradition continues as human-divine mystery, which extends from Jesus Christ to the church and confronts the world.\footnote{ibid., 216.} This brings human-divine relation to the fore. God is presented as transcending all that mediates his presence. This both affirms the human means of knowing God and also relativizes them and makes them transparent. This allows presenting God as immediate in and through those means by the activity of the Spirit. On the other hand, Congar still prioritizes a perspective, which he calls “inward” and thereby reiterates a distinction inward/outward. This reiterates the criticism, that theological assessment of the world is lacking. Congar was conscious of this. According to him, medieval Christianity lived without active reference to and consciousness of the “world” as beyond the church or facing it.\footnote{ibid., 216.} Its homogenous environment was totally different from the questions which Vatican II had to address. In this the contribution of Fiddes is helpful. When conscious subjects used the signs as means of control, he argued, this did not respect genuine ‘otherness’ of the world and people.\footnote{ibid., 216.} The openness of the responsible subject to the “‘freeplay’ or ‘game’ of ‘undecidability’”\footnote{Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, 147 in Fiddes, Seeing the World, 142.} of the text of the world was constrained. Fiddes opposes this “game” to the domineering imposition of presence through “thought,” a metaphysical system. This view of the subject as primarily immersed in the world is closer to Biblical wisdom literature.\footnote{Fiddes, Ibid., 145.}

**MEDICATION AS “LOGIC OF INCARNATION” AND IMMEDIACY OF THE SPIRIT**

Now I will look more closely at Congar’s sapiential theology, which underlies the relation God-world. While Congar’s primary concern is socio-cultural world, its implications should not be thus restricted. This relation revolves around the two divine missions in which the world takes

\footnote{127} Like the church and Jesus it conceals divine reality in the human frame. ibid., 220, 221.
\footnote{128} Congar, Un peuple messianique, 58.
\footnote{129} \textbf{Derrida, Speech and Phenomena}, 147 in Fiddes, Seeing the World, 142.
\footnote{123} ibid., 216.\footnote{124} ibid., 218. The history could not justify the form of belief; tradition could not be reduced to or emancipated from its records.
\footnote{125} Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 211. Scheeben distinguished the conservation-transmission of tradition, the task of the whole people of God, and the definition of its content, which is under authority “by whose act a truth becomes a dogma or a law,” which is hierarchy. ibid., 213.}
part. Central to this theology is the redemptive value of incarnation of Christ; the realities, which come from it, are “the body of God’s gift.” Thus, the life of the church and liturgy is fully embodied, worldly and historical contact with and participation in God, based on the two divine missions. The church, consequently, is a pursuit of unity of two moments in the meeting of “two supernaturals.” The first is the “transmitted supernatural” (historical institution of the church, sacraments). It is derived from Christ and is mediated by the church. The second is the “promised personal supernatural” (the Spirit of Christ), which makes unique revelation and salvation “a real objective presence” in the church. Congar, consequently, affirms both mediation (Christ-church) and immediacy (the Spirit-experience) in the relation God-world. The sapiental approach is based on the conviction that there is a resonance between creation, history, and divine gift, Jesus Christ. Congar assumes that the creation sympathetically vibrates towards Jesus Christ. Christ is both the Lord of the world and Redeemer.

This means Christ’s entry into history had to reverberate in history, which is a case for historic continuity in the church. This continuity rests on the fact that Christ instituted the church within the covenant established by God. It exists, according to Congar, in sacraments, apostolic ministry and Tradition. The history of the church, consequently, is not purely human history. The Holy Spirit as its efficacious principle is the source of life, salvation and revelation in the history of the church. Congar consequently criticizes the Reformation that it equated the whole cosmic, historical, earthly, “terrestrial moment of the supernatural” with Scripture. It restricted the action of God to his Word, and contact with God to that which was appropriated into consciousness by faith thus limiting the bodily presence of the supernatural on earth. The relation of nature and grace, the link of Incarnation of Christ and the Spirit, their sympathetic vibrations are key in relating human life and participation in God. Congar centres it around two missions, of the Son and of the Spirit. This relation forms the basis of the church. This embodied and Pneumatic view of divine presence would be consonant with what has been earlier said about the creativity of the world. As this theological approach begins from being embedded in the world, this might also suggest what would be Congar’s response to the emphasis on causality.

Consequently, for Congar, the work of God in creation and redemption is one work. It is not broken by distinction between the natural and supernatural or dislocated by sin. The world,

130 Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 146.
131 ibid., 147.
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133 On the later view of the “way of mediation” and the “way of immediacy” see Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 52.
134 Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 147, 148.
135 ibid., 148.
136 For appreciative and insightful Protestant critique of Congar’s work on tradition see John Webster, “Purity and Plenitude,” 43.
137 Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 149.
human nature and reason are the “work of the same Wisdom as the redemptive incarnation and our adoption in grace.” Revelation is not the only knowledge - **analogia entis** combines with **analogia fidei**. The latter presupposes the first, includes and then confirms and completes it. This comment suggests a metaphysics of causality, which I criticized earlier as suppressing the book of the world and one’s view of engagement in it. Nevertheless Congar presents a wider picture. Scripture is a gift of God and the means to reach God through the knowledge of “the reality of God’s grace and gift.” The reality is transmitted, in a comprehensive and rich way, which goes beyond Scripture. The real relationship with God is a reality to be possessed and not only notionally understood, it is a real communion with actually present gifts of God. There is no opposition between purity of witness (the Protestant view) and fullness of heritage, i.e. between “purity and plenitude.” Congar affirms both a normative model of the written Word, and the Word as the self-gift of God entering history, establishing “a logic of incarnation, of life, of assimilation.” This signals that one’s theological reasoning begins in history, a beginning which conditions one’s metaphysics.

The role of the Spirit in relating God and the world furthers this interpenetration. Theology of tradition occupies the pivotal role in that it charts the development of Pneumatology. Congar relates the time of the Church to the time of incarnation and the overall historicity of God’s gift. This means the relation between Christ and church cannot be viewed as merely extrinsic (merely in its relation to the “once for all” of the Pasch), and the history of the church cannot be viewed as merely human. But for Congar this complete historicity of God’s gift in the story of the church is achieved with the emphasis on the role of the Spirit: in Pentecost the fruit of Christ’s earthly journey “entered into time and became part of history.” Thus, due to the divine activity, viewed with eyes of faith, the question of tradition is not merely the question of history, though it is full history. The question of tradition is also the question of the mystery of the church as the mystical Body of Christ, where Jesus Christ and the church are “in one another and the same ‘mystery’ includes them both.” This position, forged in the contemporary discussions with Protestants and Orthodox led Congar to conclude a possible way forward. A more adequate theology of tradition would require “the elaboration of a more
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139 Congar’s juxtaposition of these analogies maybe extended with other possible analogies, like “analogy of love,” or “analogy of relations” but one must address metaphysical presuppositions. The key point is that metaphysics should not “denigrate the body in its particularities of time and space in favour of some realm of universals.” Paul Fiddes, “Concept, Image and Story in Systematic Theology.” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 11.1 (2009): 3-23., 11, 9.
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141 ibid., 153. This “plenitude” is for Congar a principle of discernment. In his later work he applies it to discerning the movements of the church. “The Church is not simply the [Charismatic] Renewal, nor is it simply liberation theology. The Church is fullness.” Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 2, 169. 23.
143 ibid., 492.
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satisfactory doctrine of the Spirit’s activity in the Church as such.” This shows how theology of tradition gave impetus to his theology of the Spirit, which focused on the actual, historical life of the church. But how is this a participation in God?

**SACRAMENTAL TIME**

The role of the Spirit vis-à-vis the notion of sacrament points to the dynamic interactive participation of the world in God. It affirms the role of the history. So, in tradition human and historical continuity (horizontal) and divine intervention (vertical) unite. This comes in what he calls a sacred history. This history embraces the act of faith, a personal event, wherein human consciousness is affected vertically by the presence of God, and the horizontal plane by tradition, as “transmission of an historical or social type.” According to Congar, God has set in the world a structure of relationships and each historical moment that the human enters into a relationship and appropriates saving truth and power is “constituted by the Holy Spirit as a properly divine history.” Such union with God means that the time of the church is sacramental. The unique and free Holy Spirit is for Congar the principle of “sacramental time:” through the Spirit what is past is present and what is to come is already here. Thus the ontology of sacred history is built around the ontology of sacrament. The sacrament is like a memorial, which brings together humanity and God, in the past, future and present.

This kind of unity is thanks to participation in the two divine missions. It affirms the role the humanity of Jesus Christ played and looks at how it extends and embraces human activity in the world. That which Christ has done for humanity (marked by the biblical expression “together with Christ”), is the principle of new creation brought about by the Holy Spirit. This emphasis on humanity is important. Congar’s logic is as follows: the works Jesus Christ
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149 Congar, “Pneumatologie Dogmatique,” 499.
150 This means Christ’s redemptive acts are present as cause, present and active in sacraments to have an effect in human lives. The “unique and eternal” Spirit, effects communication and brings into communion the past, present and future believers; present “in one single instant and without temporary extension,” the Spirit brings into the hearts the kingdom of God. Congar, *Tradition and Traditions*, 259, 261.
151 The time of the history of salvation and the time of the church implies a relation and communion of successive generations with a unique historically dated and remote fact, which is “not only a reference of memory and thought, but the presence and action of the mystery of salvation.” Congar, “Pneumatologie Dogmatique,” ibid.
153 François-Marie Humann shows that Congar’s view of Christ and the Spirit focuses on the relation between God and humanity. Humann, *La relation de l’Esprit-Saint au Christ*, 15. Congar’s approach is important to the world marked by historicity and the contingency of human existence, as the readability of mysteries of faith depends on restoration of unity between anthropology and theology, “by rendering human the identity and theologal [based on supernatural virtues of faith and love] vocation, thanks to theology of Trinitarian plan of God in the history.” ibid., 238.
did in his life on earth belong to the past. Christ did them as also a human being.\footnote{Congar, Tradition and Traditions, 260, note 2.} This has implications for present divine saving action, which operates through the Word made flesh—it is “not only through the consciousness and will of the glorified Christ ... but through the saving \textit{acta et passa}, accomplished once and for all, in history, and including at the same time all their future applications.”\footnote{ibid.} This divine movement in incarnation extends into the future and embraces further developments, which take part in it.

But this is fulfilled by the activity of the Spirit. Congar’s point is to assert the power of the first Eucharist for the present Eucharistic celebration and the way to achieve this is through the emphasis on the Spirit. In the Eucharist, the acts of Christ on earth receive from the Holy Spirit “a wholly transcendent character.”\footnote{ibid.} This sacramental view, furthermore, extends to the sacramental time of the church, as a communion which embraces past, present and future. When the Spirit, according to Congar, acts in the church, the activity of the church is in history, but also goes beyond history; the Spirit inserts events into “another sphere of existence, the eschatological order.”\footnote{ibid.} Congar still operates in a two-layer picture of the metaphysics of causality, but his intent is to affirm human freedom in this sacred history.

So, the sacred history provides “a context for human freedom.”\footnote{ibid.} This is a ascent to God, thus a participation, which is based on the act of God and maintains Trinitarian shape. God evokes it and it has to come from “the sacred humanity of Christ, our Head.”\footnote{ibid.} This is also the work of the Spirit, which is based on the glorified humanity of Jesus Christ. Thus, through the Spirit, the human historic act in the world is truly human and divine and enters eternity. The City of God is built, by power coming out from Jesus Christ as ‘‘conjoined animated instrument’’ (freely and consciously) in all the actions God brings about in this world.”\footnote{ibid.} This looks like a synergy of his early work.\footnote{See Congar, True and False Reform, 92 – 95.} The divine “visitations,” “missions,” “comings” from above give birth to the church, but the building blocks of human response are from below. However, Congar views the response as both to God and to one’s time. Thus one’s culture and history has a role in human-divine interaction.\footnote{ibid., 261, 262.} Christian responses draw from the \textit{depositum fidei} as objective source, and from themselves, “living subjective principle, by a
movement that comes from God.” In this the time of the Church, the time of the Spirit, and the time of tradition coincide.

Tradition is not only the structure for successive transmissions of its deposit, coming from the incarnate Word. It is also a “continual renewal and fertility within this given structure, which is guaranteed by a living and unchanging principle of identity.” The Holy Spirit and Christ come together for this task, but the role of the Spirit is relative to Christ. This human-divine interaction, which unfolds in secular history, comes together with the eschatological role of the Spirit. But is the role that history plays and the fullness of what can be understood by the world adequately addressed? There is a hesitation in Congar’s account between the assertion of human historicity and the Pneumatological picture and the framework of causality and the language of “orders.” However, one might note an evolution where an emphasis on human historical engagement in the world comes with the personal role of the Spirit more pronounced. The notion of sacramental time interweaves past, present and future. This resonates with the personal role of the Spirit, which is to bring the cosmos into the unity of divine life. This means a more developed role of the Spirit in the relation God-world, where the world is taken in its fullest sense. But the subservience of the role of the Spirit to that of historical incarnation risks fossilizing the past, suppressing present creativity and eschatological novelty. This also is reductive in that does not take into account the role of the Spirit in the creation.

THE INCORPORATION OF THE DYNAMIC WORLD AND THE NEED OF PNEUMATOLOGY

There were some significant shifts in Congar’s theology after Vatican II. His view of the world changed and he assessed it as a dynamic, even if primarily socio-cultural totality; the view of the church changed as well. It was not ontologically superior to the world, but was in the movement of history. The goal of the church was the unity of humanity with God in Christ. This meant the church was sacrament, as the “sign” of and “means” (instrument) to human-divine union. “The sign” marked an epiphanic role. Here Congar embraced Karl
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Rahner’s theology of symbol, sign and sacrament, which rested on the theology of God’s eternal Word as reflecting the Father. But Congar also affirms that as God inserts the alliance of grace into the creation and history, God chooses sensible realities communicating Godself. This meant that the sacraments not only show, but also effect the human-divine relation. As glorified, Christ becomes the principle of the physical reality of bread and wine; the invisible reality of grace is not only signified, but also caused. This issue of causality raises some questions, which are related to the role of the Spirit.

I have referred in previous chapter to Chauvet’s critique of the Thomist language of instrumentality in talking about grace. He criticized the “onto-theological presuppositions of classical sacramental theology.” Congar was also aware that when grace is separated from the activity of the Spirit, this runs the risk of objectivizing grace. Chauvet reinforces the position of Fiddes and Derrida and seeks to avert the metaphysical framework of causality. Human beings (and their thinking) are enveloped by language (culture and history). This attitude is subversive as “an attitude of ‘folly’:

we must accept the death of the illusion everything in us desperately wants to believe, that is, the illusion that we can somehow pull ourselves out of the necessary mediation of symbols, situate ourselves outside of discourse, and apprehend reality directly, without passing through cultural tradition or the history of our own desire – in short, that we can take our ‘That’s self-evident,’” our “It goes without saying” as reality. It is precisely these judgments, seemingly so “reasonable,” that never cease to delude us.

This leads to a hypothesis that a more Pneumatological view of grace also addresses the framework of causality by allowing human-divine activity to be presented as also mediated by history and culture.

LOGIC OF TOUCH: THE MISSIONS OF THE SON AND THE SPIRIT COME TOGETHER

There is a resonance between a turn to a more Pneumatological account of human-divine activity and openness to incorporate the world. At this stage of his work, Congar goes beyond an introvert focus on the church, but still affirms a continuity in human-divine relation. I see this expressed in Congar’s contention that in presenting the relation of Christ and the church, Jesus Christ is the primary sacrament: the church is the sacrament of Christ and there is no autonomy and self-sufficiency to the church. This is a development in which the church has
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172 Congar, Un peuple messianique, 24.
174 Chauvet, Symbol and Sacrament, 7.
176 Chauvet, Ibid, 55. “Humans do not possess language, they are possessed by it.”
177 ibid., 82 (italics in original)
178 Congar, Ibid., 32. The idea that Jesus Christ is the sacrament of God and the church is the sacrament of Christ is from Henri de Lubac, Catholicisme: les aspects sociaux du dogme, (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1938)
to accept a dependence on divine activity and point to it in a kind of kenosis. This means *sacramentum incarnationis* is the foundation of sacraments. But Congar contends there is no autonomy (of sacraments) from Christ and Spirit - all sacramentality comes from divine activity. This does not view grace as a thing, but rather as divine activity. However, there is for Congar a prolongation of the incarnation by an embodied touch of faith, which establishes contact between God and humanity in and by sacrament. This tangible touching nature of faith necessarily implicates the socio-cultural world – the divine presence is encountered and touched in the world. But this tangibility and presence, as earlier shown, implies a wider notion of the world. The touching nature of faith affirms a necessary role of the world, which is thereby engaged, being healed and invited into the divine life. Furthermore, it argues for a necessity of an embodied sign or practice from the fact of incarnation. Through these signs the world is presented with an image of creation as already transformed by the divine presence.

What is new in this stage is that this depends on the activity of the Spirit. It is in this mutual activity of Jesus Christ and the Spirit that the (primarily socio-cultural) world and humanity participates. This is because the embodied touch of faith continues from Jesus as the ultimate sign, who used parables and miracles in drawing people to himself, and implies the role of the Spirit. Extended to the church the sign applies to its signs, practices and the life of the community, which accompanies and explains the Word (preaching). “The word completes the sign … Word and sign go together in the Gospel. The sign has its full value only when it is illuminated by the word.” By engendering faith these signs imply the activity of the Spirit. For Congar in the sacrament, words and faith meet and actuate one another and this “actuation entails an effective participation by God himself.” This constitutes a touch through the activity of the Spirit, as Congar’s later work clarifies. He shows from Aquinas that the sacramental communion of believer and God is taken up by the movement
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179 Congar, *Un peuple messianique*, 33.
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182 Congar draws the idea of the contact from Paul’s prefix syn, as in crucified, resurrected, reigning together with Christ. For him this signals a realistic communion with the mystery of Christ. Thus acts once for all accomplished by Christ also encompass the believers. Congar shows that in Thomas faith establishes continuity, as it connects (the believer) through the sign with the mystery of Christ. (Congar, *Un peuple messianique*, 50, 51) The words “copulare, continuari, continuatio” indicate this contact in Aquinas. Without faith the sacramental elements would have no relation to Jesus Christ. “Faith touches and causes to be touched.” Congar, *The Word and the Spirit*, 12. “In the sacraments, it is mainly faith which takes effect, by means of which the sacraments are to some extent united with their first cause and also with the recipient.” Thomas Aquinas, *In IV Sent*. D 1, Q 1, A 4, Q 3, sol. et ad. 3; D 4, Q 3, A 2, sol. 1 quoted in Congar, ibid., 13.
184 ibid., 82.
(intervention) of the Spirit. When invoked, the Spirit opens in the believer a channel for the Spirit and brings about (“invests”) the presence of Jesus.\textsuperscript{187} This communion, due to the intervention of the Spirit, is cleaving to Jesus Christ, but this also implies the aspect of incorporation of the world through mission.\textsuperscript{188}

This discussion shows what faith in incarnation implies. This is the view of faith, which is connected with signs, and rests on the sapiential conviction. God is invested in embodiment in renewing creation. But this embodiment is not self-enclosed, it requires overcoming the present boundaries and journey into the “otherness” of the world. Furthermore, if one takes into the account the eschatological role of the Spirit, this openness to “otherness” is an openness to the encounter with the Spirit. It is the Spirit, who “fills the universe [and] gathers everything that exists in it for the glory of the Father.”\textsuperscript{189} This view of faith as touching and embodied brings eschatological and sapiential aspects together. Faith is indeed creation mysteriously touching God with an eschatological goal in mind. It points to the necessary interplay of spiritual experience and engagement with “otherness.” This continuing “touch” which engenders and is effective by faith, also presumes a necessary role of the world, which “touches.” True, it is faith, which establishes contact in sacramental signs, which are not efficacious without faith. But their efficacy is not that of faith for Congar: it is not pure \textit{verbum visibile}, it is the other type of contact.\textsuperscript{190} As this touch is an enactment, it is an action of the world, the specific value of which is under corporeal logic. This means it is also a touch, which the world as such makes, it is an action of the world. This different, corporeal logic is indeed the logic which affirms the “otherness” of the world, and the world’s sacramental nature as openness to the activity of the Spirit to radiate in it and fulfil it. And yet this corporeal logic is not fully developed. Is not this due to the fact that Congar’s account does not have the view of the Spirit’s activity in creation, of for that matter in social world and culture? He predominately focuses on the signs of the church and its activities are in engagement with culture, as faith is embodied and radiates in the corporeality. But this presents a radical possibility of how the whole world and body might be in the interaction with the activity of the two divine missions. But it is also has to be a direct engagement, where the eschatological Spirit engages the corporeal world to transform it. This corporeal logic necessitates an “outward,” or incorporating, view of sacrament in the world.

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{187} ibid., 263. Even in Thomas Aquinas, according to Congar, “the effect to which sacrament points,” is not produced by sacramental act alone, but requires the intervention of another energy, the breath, fire and dynamism of the Spirit. 264.
\item\textsuperscript{188} For Congar liturgy is not separate from mission, rather “the whole law of liturgy” embraces binaries: faith-baptism, word-sacrament. Congar, \textit{Priest and Layman}, 121. Proclamation and liturgy are “two successive stages in Church’s apostolic action, … two simultaneous components,” of the activity of God and the church for the humanity. 122. They correspond to the constitution of the human being, who accomplishes divine call in the physical, without being limited and imply two divine missions. 125.
\item\textsuperscript{189} Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, vol. 2, 218.
\item\textsuperscript{190} Congar, \textit{Un peuple messianique}, 72.
\end{footnotes}
What has been said about Eucharistic communion surely applies to the relation God-creation, because the Eucharist “follows the structure of the economy of salvation.” A similar analogy was present in the work on tradition, but this time the greater emphasis is on the role of eschatological Spirit. What does it contribute to the relation God-world (taken in comprehensive sense)? For sacrament to function the Spirit as “the author of charity” intervenes. Coming from Pasch, this charity acts in the world and leads it to the kingdom of God. The Spirit sanctified and anointed Jesus and penetrated him in his glorified state, then invests with this presence in Eucharist. Through the Spirit the three realities of body (Jesus Christ, community and Eucharist) come together – “dynamically linked to each other through the dynamism of the Spirit.” In the early work Congar wrote that the hand of God in Jesus Christ is “the very dwelling-place of his grace, in his Son made flesh, terminating, as it were in fingers, in the mission and gift of the Holy Spirit, Digitus Dei.” Now due to the activity of the Spirit in these realities it is possible to postulate how God touches, engages and draws the world into the divine life, but this requires a view of Christology to which the work of the Spirit is indispensable.

PNEUMATOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE CHURCH AS SACRAMENT OF SALVATION OF THE WORLD

Congar’s work on the church as the sacrament of salvation of the world supplements the view of human-divine life, presented in his theology of tradition. The “of the world” aspect while present throughout the history of the church was suppressed. A similar obscurity had befallen the Pneumatological reality of sacraments, which was due to Christology. Are these deficiencies related? Congar argues that Augustine’s view of sacrament as sign separated the revealed content of the sacrament from the practical aspect of its realization. This has led to attention on the rites, which clouded the vision of the total communication of salvation. As the sacrament operated without the ecclesiology of the local community, it focused on the individual, who was served by ministry. Christendom lived without consciousness of being in the world, and thus instead of understanding itself as sacrament, it

192 The life of the church contains memory and founding event, the “prophetic sign of absolute future” and present grace. ibid., 271.
193 ibid., 263.
194 ibid.
195 Congar, Priest and Layman, 110.
196 Congar, Un peuple messianique, 59.
199 ibid.
200 ibid.
turned to individual sacraments. Congar’s critique implies there was a vision in which the developed role of the Spirit addresses these issues, relating God and the world.

Congar’s view of the activity of the Spirit is via the Trinitarian balance in ecclesiology from the third to fourth centuries. The vision gradually emerges when Congar addressed the critique of the Lutheran Rudolph Sohm. It centres around the shift in how the church was viewed in the Middle Ages. Earlier, it was the church created by divine actuality, the community. Later, it was the church, once founded with the emphasis on its essential organs, that is potestas (power of priesthood and papacy). The juridical developments were for Congar inescapable. But he agrees with Sohm’s perception that eventually this has led to the loss of “actualism of God;” in the Counter-Reform the operation of the Holy Spirit was “insufficiently perceived, developed and affirmed.” So, the vision comprises two divine missions. For Congar the church as community, necessarily “takes the form of politeia.” While Sohm “admits that the charismatic or “sacramental” action of God generates the order of communion,” Congar asserts that for Sohm it is not juridical. This spiritual idea of the church without societal form is for him a kind of “ecclesiological Appolinarianism.” Congar does note that the view of God intervening from glory would depreciate the incarnate Word and his work publicly “inscribed in history.” On the other hand, this “law,” has sacramental foundation; it is based on the ontology of grace. This presumes the activity of the Spirit.

Congar’s historical vision is actually oriented to the present; it is constructive. Thus, he appreciates that Vatican II appropriated the sacramental theology of Aquinas, in which “the sacraments make the Church.” In this way the sacraments were linked directly with incarnation, which is divine activity. The order should not be reversed – it is not that the church makes the sacraments. This presented the relation of the sacraments and the church

203 Congar, L’Église, 151 - 155.
204 ibid., 153.
205 ibid.
207 ibid., 277, with reference to Friedrich Pilgram (Physiologie der Kirche) (Mainz 1860).
208 ibid., Congar, “Rudolph Sohm nous interroge encore,” 277.
209 ibid. Congar argues that God’s activity with humans in their human reality, which cannot be without structure expressed in law, comes from faith in the humanity of Christ and the historicity of his work, whereas Sohm looks only at Christ as God, acting though the Spirit. See Ibid., 278.
210 ibid.
211 ibid., 282. “As the assumed nature inseparably united to Him, serves the divine Word as a living organ of salvation, so, in a similar way, does the visible social structure of the Church serve the Spirit of Christ, who vivifies it, in the building up of the body.” See references to Dogmatic Constitution on the Church Lumen Gentium, 8 and 21, paragraph 2, accessed online at http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html on 7 December 2015.
212 Congar, “Rudolph Sohm nous interroge encore,” 284.
in the way where the church was their place and milieu. In the design of God both visible and spiritual, Christ and the church were one historical and public mystery. Congar’s trajectory in his reflection on the sacraments reciprocates the trajectory in his work on tradition. There is a turn to affirming the importance of the immediacy of the presence of Christ: “we have before us the fact that Christ is substantially present in our Eucharist and in our communion.” He points to the danger to neglect this “real presence of Christ sacrificed and glorified” even in focusing on the body of community. There is a contact, which continues in the movement of God towards humanity. But this is a contact with the Christ, who is risen through the Spirit. This makes the human contact both indispensable, but also transparent and affirms its kenotic nature.

This development provides a basis for a visible church, which engages the whole created world through its life, but also presents it as a human-divine mystery. In this light I propose that the view of the church as the sacrament of salvation of the world has to go hand in hand with a recovery of Pneumatology. This question also implies a deeper question of how God engages the world (in human-divine activity) through divine missions. This issue drives straight to the relation of Christology and Pneumatology in this crucial historical period. According to Congar the demise of the role of the Spirit was due to the Scholastic theology of the grace of Christ as the head, that is Christology. Before it, the Holy Spirit made one the member of the church, as in Augustine’s view of efficient headship as Christ as source of gifts. The rise of a theology of “created grace” suggested Christ possessed this grace in full. He then spread this grace in his body, making it “the domain or fruit of the grace of Christ.”

The role of the Spirit as uncreated grace became obscure; the analytical took the place of the synthetic, the dynamic view and human-divine immediacy was at risk. In Augustine and the Fathers one could pass immediately from the ecclesial body of Christ to the sacramental body in the “dynamism and truth of unique mystery.” This emphasized one’s unity with the church and community. But a “new” and more individualized way of celebration focused on the priest’s power to consecrate; distinctions risked separating “the moments of sacramental process and of mystery.” These developments risked the immediacy in human-divine relation.
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222 With “created grace,” where there is no more “great Christ” (in us), but “his gifts of grace, personally received,” suggesting distance between Christ and believers. The “true body” (of Christ) earlier applied to the church (with sacramental body realizing its mystery) is now attributed to the reality of the presence of Christ in
This loss of immediacy and dynamism connects the growing obscurity of the role of the Spirit to the developments in Scholastic theology. The issue of the “real presence” of Christ in Eucharist, according to Congar, clouded the role of the Spirit. This development has to be juxtaposed with the change in the use of the word “mystical.” Earlier the term “mystical body of Christ” referred to Eucharistic elements, and the “true body of Christ” had “had been realized in the celebration of the Eucharist that culminated in communion in the mystical/sacramental body.”

In the course of the twelfth century “the mystical body of Christ” began referring to the church and the consecrated bread and the celebration of the Eucharist “becomes the rite by which the priest effects the miracle of the true body of Christ, which then exists quasi-independently.”

Congar seeks to return to the earlier sense, which would be problematic without articulating theology of the Holy Spirit, who effects real presence of Christ in the church. The Spirit played a role in consecration (of elements), but the grace, to which Eucharist aimed, was attributed to the “active presence of Christ.”

This emphasis on Christ, however, came with the concern for transcendent causes and study of mediations of Scholasticism, fragmenting the reality of sacraments. The focus on the structure of things and not the action of God meant an efficiency of sacrament itself. The move from the church as sacrament to the church of sacraments pointed to the distinctions between the parts of God and ministers. The dynamic plan of God moved to the background. There was also the shift in the notion of truth. The dynamic and biblical notion of truth, signifying “plenitude of being viewed in a dynamic process” gives way to “truth, consisting in the being of the thing in itself.”
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Eucharist. ibid., 168. The communal body is not anymore a true mystical body (which is now Eucharist), when mystical is applied to it, it is not an adjective, but a proper name, analogous to “holy Church.”


Louth, Ibid.

I owe this conclusion to the supervisor of my thesis Timothy Noble.

Congar, “Pneumatologie ou christomonisme,” 400, 401. This effect of grace was due to the Eucharist in its Christological reality, “rather than the Holy Spirit, which operates this effect of grace.”

ibid., 402.

Congar, L’Église, 169. Congar argues that Isidorian (“operation of God mysteriously performed under visible appearances”) and Dionysian (“reflection of heavenly reality from which it emanates”) notions of symbol were replaced with an Augustinian definition of the sign.

ibid., 169, 170 The concept of “character” in sacramental theology as “invisible and permanent mark” in the transmitted grace, became ecclesiological principle distinguishing believers, unbelievers and hierarchy. The latter had sacramental power “independent of insertion into ecclesial community,” effectually ending “Augustinian ecclesiology of ecclesia.”

ibid., 171. The priesthood was viewed as a reality for itself instead of “the service to (and thus in) community in edifying the Body of Christ”), which was defined by “personally possessed power (character) to consecrate Eucharist.” (173)

ibid., 175, reference to de Lubac, Corpus Mysticum, ch. 9 as applied to the discussion of true body of Christ (community-body, Eucharist-body and risen-body.)
and personalist” (act of God) to a more static and reified view (“certain supernatural ontology in us”).

This shows that Congar’s focus on the role of the Spirit is set to restore a dynamic and immediate vision of human-divine relation in the world. In its own way, it addresses the metaphysics of causality and resonates with an attempt to see the social world and human being as creative and participating in God. What comes from incarnation is to be assessed together with the activity of the Spirit. This affirms genuine political presence, which is also an intimate relation with God. It evades merely external and coercive authority of the church vis-à-vis the world, associated with the discourse of causality. Congar proposes to understand the church as the *communication* of divine gift and the task of living in *communion*, a kind of synergy of divine gift and human task. This goes beyond the role of the Spirit in individual souls and is public. Congar calls to develop the role of the Spirit in sacraments and in how the church constructs and realizes itself. Such a developed role of the Spirit would present the church as structured and the anointed messianic people as the sacrament of salvation of the social world. The church not only “shows” what the world is meant to be, but also effects the change. The view of sacrament as “instrument,” while rightly criticized, also refers to a real presence and activity of Christ in the church, in which faithful participate.

But this discussion also implies more in terms of the relation the Spirit-world. It shows the theology of the Spirit and theology of the world are interrelated thematically but also that their relation is more intimate. There is a Pneumatological potential present in Congar’s work, but it becomes evident what his work lacks – namely the relation of the whole world and of the Spirit. Its development would need a more robust presentation of participation in the relation God-world, but also present a dilemma. Ivana Noble has pointed to this dilemma in her article on sacramentality in Alexander Schmemann and Louis-Marie Chauvet. She commended Schmemann’s cosmology, which included all creation into celebrating
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237 This eschatological potential is present already in Congar’s early work, in which he addressed the problem of dechristianisation of society, as MacDonald points out. “The locus of anticipation of the eschaton is the sacramental life and the life of theological virtues,” but, according to MacDonald, this is more extensive. “It also touches the cosmic universe and material creation, although Congar does not elaborate on this aspect of this eschatological presence.” Congar uses it “in his theological reflections on Christian involvement in the world” through the “correlation between the quality of the social and cultural structures and the quality of Christian belief.” MacDonald, *Church and World*, 47.
participation in divine life, but pointed out that it lacked a stronger emphasis on history and human engagement in the world.\textsuperscript{239} Chauvet’s language of appropriation, on the other hand, weakened human bonds with the world as it was created (unlike the language of participation), but strengthened active work in the world.\textsuperscript{240} These two approaches, however, can be viewed in “a non-synthetic dialectics.”\textsuperscript{241} This way of looking, which invokes the Trinitarian term \textit{perichoresis}, would resonate with Congar’s later emphases in the relation God-world to which I turn in the final chapter. However, there are strands of Congar’s Pneumatological thought consistent with the view of the world as sacrament.\textsuperscript{242}

\textbf{Way forward}

At this stage of Congar’s work there are several important developments in the relation God-world-humanity, which already point to a shape of his Pneumatology. All of them imply the dynamic role of the socio-cultural world, even if they do not overtly address it. Significantly, as Congar responds to this dynamism, he turns to the intimate relation between God and world, which brings the Pneumatology to the fore.

First, it is theology of human action. Congar shows in Thomas Aquinas the link of human action with the role of the Holy Spirit within the movement by which creatures return to God or move to their end (purpose).\textsuperscript{243} In this movement, the principles of the operation wholly belong to the creature, but they are also from God. This shows what Thomas thinks is the experience of Christians, which Paul calls the leading of the Holy Spirit. The gifts of the Spirit means that only God can “make us act divinely,” leading to God’s own sphere, but these are

\textsuperscript{239} ibid., 199.
\textsuperscript{240} 198.
\textsuperscript{242} This primarily reminds on his work on the world as “theandric” temple in my third chapter with mediating or priestly view of human being as microcosm. It is comparable to Schmemann’s view. See Mathai Kadavil, \textit{The world as sacrament: sacramentality of creation from the perspectives of Leonardo Boff, Alexander Schmemann and Saint Ephrem}, (Leuven: Peeters, 2005) and Alexander Schmemann, \textit{For the life of the world: sacraments and orthodoxy}. (New York: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1973). However, Congar’s approach is closer to Chauvet’s, but with Pneumatological emphasis. He looks at the role of the life of the church “as one long epiclesis” and sacraments progressively incorporate “into the glorified Body of Christ, towards eschatological fulfilment” through the activity of eschatological Spirit. Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, vol. 3, 267.
the Christians who act. Thomas emphasizes the term “spiritus or ‘breath’ as a dynamic and motivating reality.” Thus within the confines of rigidly established laws of nature, Thomas indeed “made room for event of the Spirit.” Thomas, according to Congar, is not fixist, but recognizes the historicity of human nature in “natural law,” by demanding the event of the Spirit: “his ethical cosmos is the cosmos of saving and sanctifying will of God, according to the measures, which surpass all rationality, supernaturally.” This does not do violence to human nature: nothing without it, but everything beyond it. The moral life is not lived within the structures of nature, but rather moral institution calls for the event of the Spirit. While this account does look at human being in concrete way as being shaped by culture, social life, it can be extended in this way thanks to theology of the Spirit.

Second, Congar turns to history as such by specifying that the Holy Spirit is the “transcendent Agent,” who works in history for God. So God’s plan is realized not only by the mission of the Word become flesh, but also by the second mission of the Spirit. By summoning Hans Urs von Balthasar’s image of the Spirit as the “Unknown Beyond the Word” he makes sure it is not a separate economy. This means that while Congar’s vision begins from the historic, it has a cosmic and eschatological scope. In the church, incarnate Word constitutes the structure, means of grace and ministry. The Spirit, on the other hand, acts in the persons, is known through activities and accomplishes in time and space the universal work of Christ. The Spirit “universalizes it, ... rends its universal value effective and actual.” The time of the church then, connects human and divine, history and eschatology in the present. The Spirit, the unique and transcendent Person, “perfectly immanent in everything,” unites past, present and future in the “sacramental time” of the church. Congar’s brief article on the theology of history, however, does not address the complexities of history or of the world, but also could be extended in this direction.

Third, these reflections on the Spirit’s presence in the life of human being and in history, converge with the divine activity, through which God engages the world and heals it. There is an activity already present in the world. Congar turns to Geiseilmann’s reading of Isidore, where Eucharistic pneumatology corresponds with soteriological pneumatology. The
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sancifying value of the sacrament, “hidden operation of the virtus divina … is attached to sacrament celebrated in the Church, because the Holy Spirit, who dwells in it, operates in it secretly to this effect.”254 Not a mere attribution or appropriation, this effect “by and beyond the Eucharistic elements,” is the proper operation of the Holy Spirit, who dwells in the church.255 This means that epiclesis belongs to theology generally, he argues, not merely to sacramental theology, but to the whole saving economy.256 This is because in the Fathers the Eucharist and the Symbol of Faith have a Trinitarian structure. Thus, in the economy, nothing is completed without the grace of the Spirit. This, as I have already shown, has to be viewed in the context of the real world being saved.

Fourth, in looking at the historical life of the church in the world in its connection with past divine activity and in the light of future, Congar delves deeper in the “filial” imagery of Pneumatic Christology. It is also thanks to an already incipient Pneumatology, the activity of the Spirit in Christ. The Spirit as Third Person, “anointed, consecrated and sanctified” Christ in incarnation and baptism, and also made Christ’s body and words living, or “divinizing.”257 This extends to what has come from the incarnation: the theology of the Eucharist was linked with the “glorified body of Christ;” the epiclesis extended to reading of the Scriptures: “the letter, the body,” derived from the incarnation, were made vivifying and sanctifying by the Spirit.258 Congar points to the activity of the Spirit in the distinction in theology of Eucharist between “res contenta” (the “real presence,” provided immediately) and res non contenta (“unity of the Church or the mystical Body,” not given immediately). The latter is realized in “the living and free subject exterior to sacrament, and demands the spiritual act of this subject.”259 This links Pneumatology in Christ with the theology of community.

Key to this link is the theology of Christ as Head. Thomas Aquinas, who for Congar is the epitome of this Western Tradition, integrated the spiritual vision and analytical instruments. So, his theology of participation of created in uncreated presented the church as “divinizing communion with God” in its profoundest sense.260 Christ, the incarnate Word, and what Christ brought - “faith, sacraments, institutions.”261 This is the gift. The church, in return,
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“encompasses the whole return to God.” This is a task. But in a human-divine synergy, it is the Spirit who makes the church the Body of Christ, starting with the humanity of Christ. While the role of the Holy Spirit was not developed due to the theology of “created grace,” Thomas introduced “the idea of the instrumental causality of Christ’s humanity into the theology of de Christo capite,” which presented the church in its life and in dependence on Christ as its head. According to Congar, Thomas views the relation between “humanity and divinity in the Christ” in line with Greek Fathers, where “the divinization was brought in humanity of Christ, in whom it was united with Logos and filled with the Spirit.” Thus the gathering into “one body, ... exercise of royal priesthood, is attributed to the action not only of sacraments, but the Spirit,” and this pointed to a “veritable ecclesiological pneumatology.”

This Pneumatological turn is the way to articulate participation of the world in divine persons. The “grace makes us true participants in the life of divine Persons: grace comes from these Persons and is appropriated to the Holy Spirit, who is the gift of God, the communication itself.” But this participation revolves around “two missions” and embraces two registers: the Pneumatological – the register of absolute divine causality, which is final, exemplary and efficient and the register of incarnation, which is equally efficient and exemplary. The relation of the roles of Christ and the Spirit, consequently, determine how the participation of the world in God is articulated. At this stage, Congar thinks in terms of causality, which I have addressed earlier.

These points show that the turn to the theology of the Spirit is about the participation of creation in the two divine persons. When the Spirit’s role is developed, it has to have repercussions to the participation of the world in God and Christology. “Filial” imagery is at the centre. It looks at the vertical relations with God, but also implies drawing the world into this divine life. Thus, Congar presents the ecclesial human-divine activity alongside other aspects, like personal, sacramental and cosmic. While Congar builds on his notion of tradition as living human-divine activity, this notion presumes and interweaves these other aspects as well, being open to them. His reflection on the Spirit is key in this trajectory. True, Congar does not present a systematic account, but if his reflex is to be discerned, it could be

---

262 234.
263 ibid. “God and by appropriation the Holy Spirit inhabits, fills and animates all the saints, starting with Christ’s humanity,” acts in the Church and completes it as the body of Christ, “identically the same in all.” “Ita etiam omnia membra corporis mystici habent pro ultimo complemento spiritum sanctum, qui est unus numero in omnibus” in Thomas Aquinas, Super Primo Libro Sententiarum, lib. 3 d. 13 q. 2 a. 2 qc. 2 ad 1, accessed online at http://www.corpusthomisticum.org/snp3013.html on 7 December 2015.
264 Congar, L’Église, 235. “his theology of grace as created habitus brings and considers above all Christ as communicant of grace.” This was overturned with Pneumatological Christology, focused on historical and soteriological rather than ontological aspect of Christology, see Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 86.
265 Congar, L’Église, 235.
266 Congar, “Pneumatologie ou christomonisme,” 406.
267 ibid., 407.
268 ibid., 409.
269 ibid.
presented in the following way: in looking at the world’s challenges, the look at the divine mystery focuses one’s eyes to the role of the Spirit in the world. While the church plays a part, it does not exhaust this relation God-world.

CONCLUDING REMARKS TO CHAPTER FIVE

This period of Congar’s work was groundbreaking in terms of my concern, the role of the Spirit in the relation God-world. His notion of living tradition and the church as sacrament of salvation showed how the Spirit connects human and divine activity. Furthermore, it has led to the conclusion that the development of Pneumatology and appreciation of the role the world plays are related. However, the analysis revealed some important weaknesses. When reviewing how humanity, the world and God act together, it showed the part the world plays was implied, but not developed. This trend continued from Congar’s earlier work, as Congar was still focused on the church, the activity in the ecclesial realm, a vision from “within.” However, as the role of the Spirit was developed and the principle of tradition was viewed in the light of the relation God-world, this “within” was necessarily bound with the “without.” I have followed this development in the notion of the church as the sacrament of salvation. It required articulating the role of the Spirit not only in individuals, but also in sacraments and the historical community. This approach suggests that a theology of the Spirit presents a dynamic vision, which interconnects sacrament, prophetic life and individual faith. When seeking for human-divine interaction, this complements the theology of the true mystical body of Christ in the world. This leads to the next chapter. It will give me an opportunity to ask how one’s engagement in the world, if it is to be participation in God, re-assesses the theology of the two divine missions.
In this last chapter I look at Congar’s theology of the Holy Spirit and ask what it implies and what changes as it was developed. I will begin with the notion of living prophecy, which takes its cue from the living tradition and the sacrament of salvation. Then I will ask what this notion means. I will show that it suggests a re-entry or re-view or re-vision in Congar’s theology, which is as if discussion is entered into through a different door, that of the Spirit. This will lead to reassessment – that is, what does this revision change in Congar’s account of the world’s participation in God, and human participation or involvement in the world. This will require addressing the question of mediation, which will consequently allow addressing the emphasis on the role of the world through the relation Spirit-creation. Connected to this revision will be the connection of mediation with the role Christology plays in Congar’s theology. I will suggest that this developed theology of the Spirit allows reviewing ecclesial human-divine activity, but that it also calls for more. To better incorporate the world and its activity, what Congar initiated in his Pneumatological Christology should be extended to the Spirit-world relation. Once this relation is developed, one can present human-divine action, which transforms the world from within its free and creative life.

LIVING PROPHECY

My reading of this last stage of Congar’s work builds on the line charted in earlier chapters. According to Groppe, Congar considered that the Second Vatican Council “had done very good work, but in numerous regards it had gone only half-way.” 1 It appears that Congar sensed new opportunities arising due to the focus on the role of the Holy Spirit. But how did this focus emerge? Congar points to the developments in the theology of the Catholic church. After the First World War it experienced a renewal of spirituality, which “displayed a Trinitarian tendency.” 2 Then, several factors contributed: “the logic of reality itself, the patristic renewal, a desire for solid theological foundations, and the ecumenical dialogue, in particular with our Orthodox brethren.” 3 But Congar does not restrict the renewal of Pneumatology to a religious framework. Beside ecumenism, Second Vatican Council and the

3 ibid. It has to be noted, that Congar’s ecumenical endeavours and the attitude to dialogue imply the openness to the “other,” which encompasses the whole humanity and is in conversation with contemporary philosophical developments. Congar, Dialogue Between Christians, 65–68. Furthermore, being involved in an ecumenical movement meant reflecting on the go – it was the milieu of encountering the guidance of the Spirit, carefully avoiding “facile concordism or syncretism.” ibid., 51. This suggests the role of the ecumenical movement might be even more significant.
charismatic movement, he writes about “the forces of reality and life.” What does he mean? Congar wrote in 1967 about his work: “today we are intellectually and culturally torn out of a Catholic framework, perhaps even out of a religious framework, and thrown into a world which, by its vitality and its innovation, imposes its problems upon us.” In 1972, he wrote that rapid cultural developments call “for a revision of ‘traditional’ forms [of the historical church] which goes beyond the level of adaptation or aggiornamento and which could be instead a new creation.” What does Congar mean when he suggests going beyond the level of adaptation?

It indicates an openness to the future and to the novelty associated with the role of the Spirit. This draws attention to how Congar’s reflection on “the prophetic” builds on theology of tradition, but also goes a step further. The prophetic is a realm of openness and dynamism which he discusses under the heading of “autonomy of the Spirit.” If his early work presented the activity of the Holy Spirit alongside that which was instituted by Christ, later Congar is able to surpass this dualism. What remains is his wish to affirm a “free sector in which the Spirit alone was active.” In this later development he overcomes a dualism by affirming the unity between the activity of the Spirit and the glorified Christ; this activity was “the source of a new element in history.” This shows that a distinct role of the Holy Spirit is linked to novelty. This novelty, as also his theology of tradition, presents the human-divine activity as worldly, political, engaging and radiant presence. It focuses not only on a “within,” but is also a testimony and a sign of the work of the Spirit in the socio-cultural world: the Spirit is the One who speaks through the prophets. This connection of the Spirit and prophets distinguishes the Spirit from the Word; the Spirit is not the Word, but rather the Breath, “that brings out the word and carries it forward.”

THE CHRIST AND THE SPIRIT: THE PATTERN OF DEVELOPMENT AND DISCERNMENT

With developing emphasis on the activity of the Spirit, there is a shift in Congar’s presentation of human-divine activity. It does not violate the earlier emphasis on continuity, built on the sapiential view of the relation God-world taken in its most general sense, but reaffirms the intimate links of God-world and humanity. The church, according to him, inwardly “lives and
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7 Congar, *Word and Spirit*, 48. The prophetic is distinguished from tradition, which is discussed under “The Word and the Spirit do God’s work together,” Ibid., 32.
9 ibid., 12.
10 Tradition is this testimony to the activity of the Spirit together with prophecy and parrhesia (apostolic freedom and boldness). Congar, “Pneumatologie Dogmatique,” 485, 487. See also Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 2, 129.
11 ibid., 488.
breathes” by the active charism of prophecy. Thus both Christ and the Spirit establish “a continuity between the constitutive period of revelation and the time of the church.” There is no “autonomy of the Spirit” from Christ; the Spirit ensures the church’s continuity with the Gospel through a “ministry of living faithfulness.” But this continuity is more than mere external reference to the name of Jesus Christ, Scriptures or tradition. That the Spirit “blows where he wills” means that the communities of believers do not have exclusive rights to prophecy and “that Jesus’ words come to them nowadays by ways that they cannot prepare or discern in advance.” This means the prophetic Spirit can be seen in the way of life and the “mode of existence” in line with Jesus as prophetic.

Congar recognizes the tension with the positive revelation (Scripture, tradition), but he cannot evade this reality as this is the reality of the eschatological Spirit in the church. He points to charism of prophecy in the times of the Fathers, which reappeared in the times of “revolutionary social change or historical crisis.” The Spirit opened the church to the future, but this activity was frequently mired by the interpretations of history supporting “certain national, dynastic, popular, pontifical or spiritual claims.” He also sees a “prophetic tradition” as distinct from “episcopal tradition” in the thought of John Henry Newman. This prophetic tradition allows transposing the faith in the times of revolutionary change without losing the substance. Thus, the prophetic gift, which keeps the church in the truth of God’s revelation, subsists in the church, which means that the whole body is prophetic.

---

14 For Congar, if the autonomy is attributed to the Holy Spirit (not to be mixed with proper activity of the Spirit), this leads to “pneumatocentrism,” Congar, *Pneumatologie Dogmatique*, 502.
18 ibid., 67.
21 ibid. Congar refers to the Constitution “Lumen Gentium” of Vatican II, which reads “Christ, the great Prophet, who proclaimed the Kingdom of His Father both by the testimony of His life and the power of His words, continually fulfills His prophetic office … not only through the hierarchy … but also through the laity.” accessed online at http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html on 7 August 2015.
authority is enveloped within a community and is in its service. This eschatological role of the Spirit, however, with its reference to Joachim of Fiore, extends wider than the church.

Congar, as also Henri de Lubac, reflected on the significance of Joachim for contemporary culture. But there is a difference between the two. Philip Rosato points to de Lubac’s Christocentrism. De Lubac called for “renewal of Christocentrism, the unambiguous confession that the Christ who has come and has already sent His Spirit is the medium metaphysicum of Christian theology and not the Holy Spirit who some day is to come.” Rosato points to its lack of Pneumatology. In his view the Spirit’s “present efficacy in the world” would supplement necessary ecclesiological and eschatological aspects. Furthermore, he asks if de Lubac could not view Joachim as “the first uncompromising promoter of the Church’s Spirit-guided efforts at the renewal of society.” Congar, on the other hand, criticizes Joachim by referring to Aquinas’ “new law.” The regime of the New Testament, consequently, is that of Christ and the Spirit together, rather than one surpassing the other. His proposal, consequently, is not Christocentrism, but presents the relation between God and the social world presented as two divine missions. Congar agrees with de Lubac that the eschatological sense of Fiore was secularized in the philosophies of Schelling and Hegel, which then spread into theology. This means his theological proposal is to engage the contemporary scene.

According to Congar, the juxtaposition of the history of liberation and the history of God (implicitly, in line with “Joachimism”) has developed into Rahner’s axiom identifying the economical and immanent Trinity. But Congar does not look at the changeability of God or theology of suffering of Christ and this line of inquiry suggests. He instead points to the image of the transfiguration of Christ, which is that of the Radiating Christ. He points to a
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22 This implies the theology of magisterium, resembling Orthodox idea of sobornost, that is community embracing the hierarchy. Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 69.
23 Henri de Lubac, S.J., La Postérité Spirituelle de Joachim de Flore, (Paris: Éditions Lethielleux, 1979). Congar’s reading is along the similar lines – Joachim introduced into the history of the world (history of the church for Joachim) “an eschatology that has characterized by a great novelty of a rule of inner life and of freedom.” Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1, 128. This development could result in social protest or philosophies of reason and progress. The resulting expressions, according to Congar “have often been forms of secularization of the Spirit.” ibid., 130.
25 Rosato, Ibid., 394.
26 ibid., 395.
28 In it the signs and rules required by the logic of incarnation were affirmed, albeit as secondary and at the service of the grace of the Spirit. Congar, Ibid., 128, referring to Thomas Aquinas, ST, I-II, Q 108, A 1, accessed online at http://www.newadvent.org/summa/2108.htm#article1 on 15 December 2015.
30 Yves Congar, Esprit de l’homme, esprit de Dieu, 18, 19.
31 ibid., 18.
Pneumatological Christology. This means the relation God and the whole creation requires reassessing the Scholastic theology of “missions of God.” This allows building on the view of human-divine activity presented in earlier chapters by asking how loyalty to God relates to one’s engagement in the social, cultural and political world. The Spirit “who has spoken through the prophets” makes possible a loyalty to the church, on the one hand, and taking sides with all those “in revolt, all the disappointed, all the unheard, all the damned in this world,” on the other. This allows the juxtaposition of the immediacy of the participation in God and the engagement in the world. The newness of the Spirit “comes from the fullness that was given once for all by God in Christ.” Congar’s response is Pneumatological Christology: “the Word may be permeated with the Spirit, but the Spirit is also permeated with the Word.” The theology of the missions of the Son and the Spirit connects the economic and immanent Trinity and presents the relation of God and world. But it need not at the same time be limited to the human creation, as was noted in earlier chapters. This invites to look if affirmation of the Spirit contributes a qualitative difference?

ENTRANCE THROUGH THE DOOR OF THE COMMUNITY AND THE SPIRIT

I agree with several researchers who have pointed to the underlying significant shift in Congar’s later, Pneumatological, theology. His ecclesiology gives a clue. In it a focus on community comes with the more pronounced role of the Spirit and means a departure from Congar’s earlier, Thomist, account. This earlier account depended on the philosophy of four causes of Thomas and the result was the church built by hierarchical ministry, made by Christ. This linear scheme, according to Congar, violated God’s actuating power, Pneumatology, theology of charisms and ministry. And so Congar in his later writings argues for a different entrance “door,” or starting point of assessing the relation of created and uncreated in human and divine aspects of the church. If one enters by the door of community,
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32 It undoubtedly fulfills in the image of “spiritualized and glorified body” of Christ’s glorification through the Spirit, see Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 90, 92.
33 Congar, Esprit de l’homme, esprit de Dieu, 19.
35 Ibid.
36 Ibid., 72. Congar relies on theology of Christ as Head of Thomas Aquinas, in which God is the author of grace, “but Christ is the instrument of this communication, not an inert or mechanical instrument, but one that is intelligent, free and joined as an organ, in such a way that he acts through the Holy Spirit or that the Holy Spirit acts through him.” Ibid., 62.
37 On the “divine missions” as the link between God in Godself (Trinitarian processions) and God placing creation outside God and returning it back to Godself, see Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1, 7-8.
39 Congar, “Path-findings,” 174, 175.
40 Ibid., 175.
41 Ibid., 176.
then there is no linear scheme.\textsuperscript{42} This later account thus resolves a duality of the church “from above” and “from below” present in his early work. Now “the community appears as the enveloping reality \textit{within which} the ministries, even the instituted sacramental ministries, are placed as \textit{modes of service} of what the community is called to be and do.”\textsuperscript{43} This is because Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit act “both on the instituted ministries and on the community so that a reciprocity of action holds good between the ministers on the community and the community on the ministers.”\textsuperscript{44} This quotation explicates what the Spirit as “‘co-instituting principle” means for Congar.\textsuperscript{45}

The Spirit not only animates what is determined, but also initiates a reciprocity and comes together with a view of the church as community as an enveloping reality. Congar seeks to avert the view of the church in the Counter-Reformation, which emphasized legislative aspects and was focused on what was founded by Christ during the days in the flesh. But the pyramidal image of the church coincided with the fact that Pneumatology was replaced by the theology of the “created grace” of Christ, as noted in the earlier chapter.\textsuperscript{46} So, the reversal presents a Pneumatological Christology, which allows re-envisioning human-divine activity. Christ’s humanity, hypostatically united to the eternal Son, is seen as penetrated by the Spirit and enabled to communicate the Spirit.\textsuperscript{47} The result is the view of the church as primarily communion rather than society,\textsuperscript{48} the church as mystery sustained by the Trinitarian mystery.\textsuperscript{49} The Spirit is behind the unity of the church – the principle of communion, whereby the faithful participate in the goods given by God and in divine life itself.\textsuperscript{50} The person of the Spirit connects and brings into communion the vertical relation with God and the horizontal relation with fellow-believers. Because of the particular role of the person of the Spirit, the unity of this community is both intimate (the Spirit works in the hearts) and is not coercive (the Spirit of communion penetrates without enforcing).\textsuperscript{51} But is this relevant only to the ecclesial realm?

\textbf{The re-visioning and the personal role of the Spirit}

\textsuperscript{42} ibid., 177.
\textsuperscript{43} ibid., 178.
\textsuperscript{44} ibid.
\textsuperscript{46} Congar, “Pneumatologie Dogmatique,” 495.
\textsuperscript{47} ibid., 496.
\textsuperscript{48} Congar re-appropriates Friedrich Pilgram’s notion of the church as communion, which organizes itself into the society. ibid., 500. This communion took the shape of the society with public law, thus “communion, which organizes itself into the society.” Congar quotes Friedrich Pilgram, \textit{Physiologie der Kirche}. (Mainz, 1860), 125.
\textsuperscript{49} For Congar this change of attitude and entry point is an achievement of Second Vatican Council. On the theme of the connection of the Mystical Body and “sanctification as a participation in Christ’s anointing by the Spirit,” see Congar, \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit}, vol. 1, 168, on the connection of the missions of the Son and the Spirit and the church as community, see ibid, 168 – 169.
\textsuperscript{50} Congar, “Pneumatologie Dogmatique,” 497.
\textsuperscript{51} ibid., 498, 499.
Congar’s Pneumatology brings a significant extension to his presentation of human-divine activity, but it itself comes into the view only when he looks at this activity in history. This activity in history combines two important lines. Congar emphasized the *kenotic* nature of the church, then tradition. Now he speaks about kenotic “conditions of God’s self-revelation and self-communication.” 52 This means, first, that this self-communication takes place in accordance with divine “condescendence,” and a distance between intra-trinitarian life and divine activity in creation. 53 But, second, this distance does not preclude creation’s participation in divine life. What is revealed expresses what God is and does for the creation. 54 Beside this continuity, Congar also insists (as in his earlier work) on the human-divine touch, which continues after incarnation in the historical church. 55 This shows a human-divine activity relies on or participates in the two divine missions.

Such a view of the participation in the two divine missions comes from Congar’s major conversation partners – Irenaeus, the Cappadocians and Augustine. In Irenaeus, the church and the Spirit condition each other as “two different but interdependent points of entry.” 56 This presents a dialectical tension of two necessary aspects: the church, that is, structured Christian community, which contains and hands down apostolic faith, and the Spirit, who continually renews it. 57 Athanasius, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen showed Congar that reflection on the experience of human-divine relation required demonstrating the personal

53 ibid., 15.
54 5.
55 Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, x. For Congar personal activity of the Spirit is known through what is brought about in humanity, but not “in himself.” ibid., viii. This is a perception of the presence of God, acting in humanity, creating fellowship with God. (ibid., xvii) This experience also embraces ordinary life – experience of divine activity in prayer, sacraments of faith, life of the church and labor of love. (ibid., xviii) There is an intimacy and mutuality in this experience – “we find ourselves in finding God” and its certainty comes from practical assurance of the experience in consonance with the “cloud of witnesses.” (ibid.)
56 ibid., 68. Congar quotes Irenaeus: “where the Spirit is there is also the Church, but also where the Church is there is also the Spirit.” St. Irenaeus, Against Heresies, Book III, chapter 24, 1, accessed online at http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0103324.htm on 21 September 2016.
57 See Congar, Ibid., 71, note 30.
Congar appropriates Augustine’s image of the person of the Spirit as Gift. This image is ecclesial – it shows that what comes from the institution (thus from the Incarnate Word) in human-divine activity demands the event of the Spirit. But Congar also shows that there is in Augustine the idea of “regressus,” which is “the return of the soul to its source.” Thus the Spirit is “intra-divine fertility” and communicates this fertility to human beings and becomes the principle of human return to God. This idea of descent and re-ascent allows Congar to turn to the theology of participation of Aquinas. For the latter only Augustine’s analogy derived from the structure of the human spirit had sufficient force to organize a theology of Trinity. In its reflection on intra-trinitarian self-communication if, in the human nature, intellect and love can be distinguished, the same is not the case in God. But this also implied a participation of creation, as Cavanaugh argued. According to Cavanaugh, such an account of divine simplicity suggests the human and divine do not relate at the expense of one or the


59 Congar, Ibid., 79. Augustine, Congar argues, does not use the divine essence as the beginning point in approaching divine persons, but since he insists on the unity of substance and equality in this substance, it is difficult for him to make a transition from essential to notional (personal). ibid., 78.

60 For Augustine the essential and personal meaning overlap in the images of Love and the Spirit, which apply to the first two Persons of the Trinity (the Father and the Son). Thus in presenting the procession of the Spirit, a distinction with the procession of the Son is necessary. To solve this issue Augustine insists on continuity between “economy” and “theology,” which makes the Filioque, or procession of the Spirit from the Father through the Son, a necessity. ibid., 79. On Congar’s argument for suppressing Filioque in the creed, see Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 3, 204 – 207.


62 ibid., 80. On the Spirit as the Soul in the Body of Christ, see references to Augustine in Chapter Two.

63 ibid., 81. He refers mainly to Augustine, Ibid., B XV, Ch 21, S 41.

64 Congar, Ibid., 81. Thomas, according to Congar, later built his synthesis on the “idea of egressus and reeditus.”

65 ibid., 88. The theme of “mutual love” had poetic value, but has led to anthropomorphisms, Congar refers to the work of Hyacinthe-François Dondaine, S. Thomas d’ Aquin, Somme Théologique. La Trinité, II (Paris: Desclée, 1946), 387 – 409.

66 “In God … being, knowing and loving are one … God existing in his own natural being, God existing in his intellect and God existing in his love are only one, each of the three being one subsisting reality.” Thomas Aquinas, Compendium Theologiae, 50, from Dondaine, Ibid, 406. quoted in Congar, Ibid., 88.

67 Cavanaugh, “A Joint Declaration?,” 266.
other – they do not compete. Thus, he continues, Aquinas’ doctrine of the Trinity actually asserts that human beings are drawn into “God’s own circle of knowing and loving.” Since God’s essence is existence, those who have existence, but are not existence itself, have being by participating. The emphasis on the person of the Spirit resonates with the emphasis on the human return to God, or sanctification.

But, significantly, neither ecclesiology nor anthropology suffices in presenting Pneumatology. Genuine Pneumatology in Congar’s view does not merely look at the role of the Spirit in individuals nor is it there to guarantee the institution. “It is the actuality of what the glorified Lord and his Spirit do in the life of the Church in all the variety of forms that this activity has assumed in time and space.” It is only in history and in focus on real life that Pneumatology comes to the fore. “Pneumatology, like ecclesiology and theology as a whole, can only develop fully on the basis of what is experienced and realized in the life of the Church. In this sphere, theory is to a great extent dependent on praxis.” On the one hand this section showed the life of the world is essential to Congar’s Pneumatology. On the other hand, it showed that that Trinitarian account of divine persons is crucial for the presentation of the participation of world in God. I next proceed to show how Congar’s Trinitarian account combines these two aspects.

Re-assessing the Trinitarian account of the creation’s participation in God

The image of “indwelling” is central to Congar’s Pneumatology and his main intent is to underline that this is a real divine presence. This seeks to establish that one directly participates in God vis-à-vis the question of Orthodox theology to Western theology: is this a real participation? Congar proceeds to articulate this intimacy and realism through the role of the Spirit in indwelling. This role helps him to maintain the divine transcendence of God, the integrity and freedom of the creature and also the substantial and deifying divine presence in the creature. The creature meant is primarily a human being and creation – a socio-cultural one. Congar shows the affinity between Thomas Aquinas and the Greek Fathers.

68 “God simply is the same as his essence, there can be no accidents in God,” means God knows and loves other things by loving and knowing Himself, as otherwise this would mean a mutability in God. Ibid., 267.
69 Ibid.
70 “Because God is Being, everything else that is participates in God … that which has existence but is not existence, is a being by participation.” Ibid., 269.
71 Cavanaugh might be also read along the lines of divine descent and humanity’s return to God. “In the Incarnation God breaches the boundaries between heaven and earth. The Holy Spirit continues this work of drawing all things to God in love.” Ibid., 271.
73 Ibid., 172
75 Congar’s concern seems to be the claim of Orthodox theologians that Western theology does not express “true deification.” See I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 3, 151.
in affirming that the gift of the Holy Spirit “logically and causally” preceded created grace, which recreated humans according to God. True, this role of the Holy Spirit is also eschatological and concerns the whole world, that is the whole creation, cosmos, but this is reserved to the future. This final divine presence is “intimate, radiant, total and sovereign,” but does not consume the creature – this divine self-communication may be viewed as the soul’s own act. The present world remains in the background, as in his earlier work.

INDWELLING AND “APPROPRIATION”

But Congar’s Pneumatology carves the space for the Spirit, which fulfils the aspirations of his earlier chapters on the interpersonal and intimate communion. He follows the lines of critique of ecumenical observers of the Second Vatican Council (Orthodox in particular) that the Spirit was a function of Christ and merely personalized his salvation. Congar sought to respond to this critique while pointing to the resources within Western theology. So, he commended the work of Heribert Mühlen who insisted that the issue of the proper or merely appropriated role of the Spirit determined how one views the grace of God and theology of the church. Mühlen, according to Congar, attributed to the Holy Spirit the “proper fruit of indwelling and sanctification,” and freed the Spirit from being merely the function of Christ. Mühlen’s view of the Spirit as intra-Trinitarian “We in person,” “Us” within Trinity, allowed spiration to be seen as an act, performed by the Son and the Father, “Wir-Act.” This developed Pneumatology within Western theology. Congar also appreciated the emphasis on the personal aspect, but argues that when “We in person” is applied to the Spirit it attributes to the Spirit what was “common to both the Father and the Son.” Thus, while appreciating his

77 ibid.
78 ibid.
79 The action of the Spirit was dependent on the Son as “simple function of realization of his work.” Congar, “Pneumatologie ou christomonisme,” 395.
80 Heribert Mühlen, “¿Actúan las Personas Divinas Como Tales en el Ámbito de lo Creado?” translation of “Person und Appropriation. Zum Verständniss des Axioms: In Deo omnia sunt unum, ubi non obviat relationis oppositio,” Münchener theologische Zeitschrift, 16 (1965) 37-57., accessed online at http://www.seleccionesdeteologia.net/selecciones/lib/vol16/62/062_muhlen.pdf on 7 October 2015. Mühlen viewed the “appropriation” as an attempt to maintain the identity of the philosophical idea of God, which made the unity of divine essence its departure point. Saving economy as present in Revelation, Scriptures, was merely to substantiate that idea.
81 Yves Congar “Pneumatologie ou christomonisme,” 415.
82 Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 109. This emphasizes the procession from the Son and not only the Father. Congar viewed the filioque as necessary in the Western formulation of the mystery of the Trinity since it preserved the distinction of hypostases of the Son and the Spirit, because in the Western view the persons were distinguished “only by an opposition of relation, and that exists only though processions.” But this clause also preserved the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, as the Son “has everything in common, apart from being the Father.” Congar, Diversity and Communion, 101.
83 Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 109. Congar thus likes the beginning of Mühlen’s theology, but thinks he failed to show that the spiration is the act of two persons. Congar follows Thomas in shaping his Pneumatology around the analogy of the spirit.
Pneumatology and its resonance with biblical language, he finds Mühlen’s Trinitarian theology lacking in presenting a sufficient distinction.

These distinctions are not important for their own sake, but concern the relation God-world, seek to affirm divine transcendence, but also affirm the direct and active participation of creation. What is the shape of his Trinitarian proposal? Congar does not do away with “appropriation,” as both in East and West the work of the divinity outside the Trinity was thought of as the work of all three persons. In the West, however, divine activity in the creatures was appropriated to one divine person. The properties common to three are appropriated to one when that activity resembled the personal characteristic property. So, where did this leave the role of the Spirit? Congar was sympathetic to, but could not accept the position of Matthias Scheeben. Scheeben follows the order of how God gives Godself to humans - from the Father through the Son in the Spirit, who becomes the primary gift. Through the Spirit, given to humanity, the life of the Father and the Son are given as well. But for Congar this sounded almost identical to the physical union of the humanity of Jesus and the Person of the Son. Such parallelism and almost identification with the humanity of the Son of God has led to the view of the Church as “a kind of Incarnation of the Holy Spirit.” But Congar agreed with the sentiment that the doctrine of appropriation distances the Holy Spirit and did not reflect the intimacy and directness of the presence of God.

Congar’s Trinitarian proposal takes shape in dialogue with Eastern theology. In it God’s coming to humanity forms the basis of return: it is in the Spirit, through the Son to the Father. The divine nature in this view was not a common stock prior to persons, but was rather situated “only in the mutual communication of the processions and being of the Persons.” The three come as one, but operation is not threefold, but “according to the order and characteristics of their hypostatic being.” His own option thus follows the order of return to God, where the Spirit through quasi-formal causality assimilates human beings to the Son. In this order of exemplarity, the Spirit as gift has logical priority and thus some of the “proper” role. This realizes the image of the Trinity in a soul in a more profound way, as it conforms it to the Trinity. Due to the Pneumatological re-visioning, the soul relates to the three divine persons, whom it knows and loves, and this happens in human experience. This special connection with each divine person is to be fulfilled in the beatific vision, which means eschatologically. Congar’s Trinitarian proposal seeks to establish the realism and intimacy of

---

84 ibid., 85.
85 Congar, “Pneumatologie Dogmatique,” 494.
87 Ibid.
88 Ibid.
89 ibid.
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personal relation with God. The “appropriation” was an impediment since it clouded the relation between persons. How does he address this?

**INDWELLING AND “AD EXTRA”**

Congar untangles the issue of “appropriation” by looking at the “ad extra” principle, but his aim is to articulate human-divine intimacy. Congar agrees with the Scholastic vision that all works *ad extra* were common. But this affected the vision of the grace of adoption; it was without the reference of human relation to the persons of the Trinity, thus not personalized enough. Thus, the appreciation of the Trinity had consequences for the immediacy of relation with God. As “created grace,” it was “accidental” reality produced in humans. Due to this view, Congar continues, even in the incarnation Aquinas distinguished between Christ as “Son of the Father” through divine begetting and Christ as Son “as a creature and through created grace.” This suppressed the role of the Spirit in Jesus Christ. The way out for Congar is to provide a more personalized account, where the role of each person is pronounced. But Congar sees an even stronger and more positive connection between human created adoption and the uncreated sonship of Christ in the Greek Fathers. He in particular marks out that for them Christ assumed human nature, which was more than the “*individual humanity of Jesus*” but was in fact, human nature (the nature, which each human being hypostatizes individually). Thus, the nature was re-conformed. Congar appreciates their result. He envisions this as an equally Catholic view that human beings really become the children of God, underlining the reality of participation, which is achieved by bringing forth the role of the Spirit. But the reality of deification implies a whole return of the creation and in this case of creature to God. This leaves open a further need to show the significance of the proposed role of the Spirit for the relation God and whole created reality.

**INDWELLING AND INCORPORATION**

---


93 ibid., 90.

94 ibid.

95 On how the theology of “created grace” impeded the appreciation of the role of the Spirit in the Christology of Thomas Aquinas, see Yves Congar, *The Word and the Spirit*, 84.

96 Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 2, 91. So, also in Aquinas, “Our Father” is addressing the Trinity, but the reality produced (grace in humans), assimilates to the Son, and “possibly the divine nature ... insofar as that is hypostasized in the Son.” Augustine opened the way to speak about unity with Christ in his Body, “a single total Christ, one Son with him and in him.” This unity was not a natural unity hypostatically united to the Son, but was based on the free decision of grace. ibid., 92.

97 ibid.
Congar’s view of the relation God-world revolves around the image of the “filial” relation between God and humanity. It shows how each divine person participates, how the world is engaged and presumes ecclesial human-divine activity in this return of the cosmos. Furthermore, it emphasizes the role of the Spirit in returning creation to God and begins from this activity. Congar presents the Spirit as the principle which realizes Christian mystery. This is the mystery of the Son of God who became human and enables humans to become the children of God. Grace, consequently, is not a thing to possess but presumes the activity of the Spirit. The cooperation and synergy follow – this is the work of human freedom together with God, who alone can make humans holy through the incarnate Son and the Spirit. In the wider plan of God, this means that God, who is Love, creates beings, capable of love, who participate in divine love and give themselves freely. God gives them the desire, an echo of divine desire, and the movement to return to God. Congar has two ways to conceptualize this. First, the French school of spirituality gives Congar a way to view the role of the Spirit in the return of creation to God. According to this view, the Spirit does not have “intra-divine fruitfulness of his own,” but is the end (or term) of processions from the Father and Son being “made fruitful outside of God,” in the incarnation of Christ and the sanctification of humans. The other way was the Cappadocian view of the Spirit as the eschatological, fulfilling Gift, “all action comes from God, progresses through the Son and is fulfilled by the Spirit.”

But is the verticality in this relation, (I take a cue from Congar’s ecclesiology as earlier indicated) reciprocated by the sufficient horizontality – the relations in the world? “Filial” relations are also brotherly-sisterly relations and have to be oriented to the whole socio-cultural world. Congar acknowledges that the possibility to learn theologically and intimately of the Spirit comes from the “economy,” that is life and salvation as experienced. This is because being created in the image of God, means a human openness to “supra-mundane and supra-historical transcendence.” Congar reiterates this human aspiration as the desire after integrity and reconciliation, persistent throughout human history. But he uses the language of orders - of the “life of God” and something like human order, to which

99 ibid., 69.
100 ibid., 67 - 68.
101 Congar, “Pneumatologie dogmatique,” 514 presents two ways of presenting the Spirit as eschatological Gift, one the Cappadocian linear scheme “From the Father through the Son in the Spirit” the other from French school of spirituality, see the next note.
103 Yves Congar, “Pneumatologie Dogmatique,” 514.
105 Congar, “Pneumatologie Dogmatique,” 511.
106 ibid.
redemption, achieved by Jesus Christ, responds. The Spirit then consummates and realizes this achievement. The Spirit does this by not only making efficacious the mediations of grace (Scriptures, sacraments, ministry), but also by awakening and returning to God the desire and the groans of creation, which yearns after the liberty of the children of God. But this reiterates the effects of the language of orders of the directness of participation in God and engagement in the world.

Congar’s use of the language of orders was due to his indebtedness to Western tradition. But there is a shift going on. Sarah Coakley has situated Congar’s Trinitarian theology closer to a Cappadocian rather than an Augustinian approach. Coakley speaks about “distinctly ‘linear’ tinges” in Congar’s “‘incorporative’ pneumatology.” This rightly shows his Pneumatology as “incorporative,” speaking about the world. And the horizontalit y it implies is wider than socio-cultural world. This linearity meant one entered divine life by experiencing the activity of the Spirit and then re-ascended the “divine hierarchy, via the Son to the Father.” But Coakley also shows the imprint of “linearity” on the human-divine activity. This activity is “less subtle and reflexive” than the one seen in the writings of the apostle Paul, she argues. In Paul’s account, “Sonship’ is progressively expanded within the creative space of the Spirit’s unimpeded answering to the Father.” Coakley does not restrict the “Sonship” either to the earthly Jesus, or to the risen person of Christ individualistically conceived. It is rather the “transformed divine life,” to which the whole creation tends and into which it is transformed. As I have earlier pointed out, Congar also might be read along similar lines, though with some reservations. But what about the effect of “linearity” on the human-divine activity?

In his interaction with Orthodox theology Congar commended its “lively sense of originality of the person” and appreciated the relation between the Spirit and the Word as a “whole

---

107 Ibid., 512.
108 Ibid.
109 Coakley, “Why Three?” 39. This is correct if the role of the Spirit is viewed in Augustine’s image of “the bond of love” between the Father and the Son. See ibid., 34. Augustine was important to Congar, but he followed a different line of Augustinian thought, conceptualizing the Spirit not around the concept of “nexus,” (bond), but rather the analogy of the spirit, as understood by Thomas Aquinas. See Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1, 88.
110 Ibid.
111 Ibid. As I have earlier noted, Congar embraced the neo-Platonic theme of descent – re-ascent from Thomas Aquinas. See Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1, 81.
112 Ibid.
113 Ibid.
114 Ibid., 37.
115 See Congar on the “Christ in the future,” in Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 71. But Congar does not reflect much on this, but rather reasserts that this Christ is “still Christ,” the divine fullness given once for all has not been “totally revealed or totally fulfilled in Christ according to the flesh.” But when looking at this fulfillment, Congar sees the fulfillment in the revelation of the Spirit and this is where the role of the historical church comes forth. See Ibid.
116 Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 105. This is a reference to the work of Vladimir Lossky, so this should be viewed as general appreciation Orthodox theology. Congar did not reflect, as earlier noted, on the notion of
network of relationships … [whereby] a purely linear way pattern of dependence is avoided.”¹¹⁷ This comes together with the incorporative role of the Spirit, which Coakley rightly identified. She points to Congar’s constructive Pneumatological attempt. The Spirit, Coakley shows from Congar, plays a role in “an opening to communion between God and man.”¹¹⁸ This subtle and reflexive divine life spreads into creation based on the “co-operative action of the praying Christian with energizing promptings of the ‘indwelling’ Holy Spirit.”¹¹⁹ Congar was indeed open to affirm (in the words of Christian Duquoc) that “the creative and dynamic role [of the Spirit] gives rise to other differences. He makes the divine communion open to what is not divine.”¹²⁰ This is then applicable to the relation God-world, human and non-human. It is necessary to underline that human-divine activity is in the context of creation, which is being transformed. But without the activity of the Holy Spirit in creation, the latter aspect risks being left out. Here the “filial” imagery shows its limits. It presents the world as drawn into filial life and presents an interplay between God, world and humanity. This imagery shows the central role of the Son of God, but what would be the implications of a more pronounced role of the Spirit for this relation?

Congar’s Pneumatology combined the presence of the Spirit in persons, the presence of the Spirit in the church community and in human-divine activity in history. But this turn to the whole world and history also lays its demands – the human-divine activity is to be reviewed in the light of the presence of the “other.” This “otherness” might refer to transcendent activity of the prophetic Word, the eschatological Spirit in the world’s developments, but also to free human creativity and world’s developments. How does this resonate with the “filial” imagery? As earlier noted, it highlights different aspects of this imagery. This filial life serves as an example, but it is also a realization of the intimacy with God intended for the whole creation. It is not only the participation of creation in the activity of the divine persons, drawing it closer into the divine life, a “vertical” (transcendent) dimension. It also points to a “horizontal” (immanent) intimacy of the realities among themselves. Besides, the two are interwoven. Nevertheless, the “vertical” line predominates and its implications for “filiation” is evident – it restricts the human-divine to the ecclesial. What are the possible reasons?

The earlier discussion of linearity helps as it allows to connect Congar’s vertical and linear “filial” view with the Western view of procession of the Spirit through the Son. This implies, on the other hand, that if the linear pattern is avoided, it might extend the issue of

¹¹⁷ ibid., 106.
¹¹⁹ Coakley, 37.
participation further than the personal and ecclesial dimensions. This is not to suggest that “filiation” and for that matter the relation between economic and immanent Trinities, which underscores the *Filioque* is to be avoided to achieve this.\(^{121}\) Nevertheless, David Bentley Hart proceeds to argue against the *Filioque* clause as failing to account for the Spirit’s work in the economy of salvation.\(^{122}\) I will soon show that Congar was open to this insight, but focuses on the ecclesial dimension of this issue as his reflections on the theology of Mühlen shows.\(^{123}\) The implications of this insight have to go further and underscore the “from below” and “horizontal” aspects of the relation God-world.\(^{124}\) So, for Kizhakkeparampil this distinction and interpenetration of the missions of the Son and the Spirit, would allow linking Christian religion with other religions.\(^{125}\) This sets the scene to explore the limits of Congar’s account of tripartite dialogue and interaction God-world-humanity. The sapiential imagery of his theology points to the “horizontal” dimension and suggests dynamic intimacy, permeation and ecstasy of created realities. His Pneumatology, while consistent with these insights, stops

---

\(^{121}\) Orthodox theologian David Bentley Hart writes, “all truth and goodness in creation is a participation in the eternal truth and goodness of God’s Trinitarian act of knowledge and love of his own essence, and were any aspect of created reality – especially economy of salvation – anything but a disclosure of this order of divine reality, it would be neither true nor good (nor, for that matter, real).” David B. Hart, “The Bright Morning of the Soul: John of the Cross on Theosis.” *Pro Ecclesia* 12.3 (2003): 324-344., 325. Hart opposes the division of “ordinates of the economic and immanent Trinities from one another” in the theology of Vladimir Lossky as implying “some species of theological voluntarism,” which would present God with a freedom as “arbitrary” choice, preserving in divine being “some quantity of unrealized voluntative potential,” and relating to creation not in self-disclosing revelation, but merely in power. Ibid. Congar, for that matter, also noted this distance between immanent and economic Trinities in Gregory Palamas and Lossky and also pointed to the work of the sophiologists in addressing this. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, 62.

\(^{122}\) Hart, Ibid. He points to the role of the Spirit in begettering the Son, and the incarnation, anointing and mission as the works of the Spirit.

\(^{123}\) Congar appropriates Mühlen’s theology of anointing of Christ because it agrees with the concrete and historical way the Scripture speaks. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 1, 23, 24. But Congar asserts both divine missions are necessary as his polemics against “pneumatocentrism” suggests. So, he indicates that Mühlen has failed to stress the real connection between the church and incarnation. (24) Thus, in Jesus Christ the quality of the Son of God evokes the fullness of the Spirit. However, Congar wishes to extend this order to the church, wherein sanctification should follow institution of the church.

\(^{124}\) Isaac Kizhakkeparampil pointed out the ambiguity in Congar’s theology. Congar perceived the need to base epiclesis “on the pneumatological or ascending Christology of the Synoptics … which would combine the uniqueness and the incomparability of Jesus with the universality of his claim and his Kingdom,” and yet emphasized descending Christology. “His writings accentuate the ontological status of Jesus as the Word made flesh more than his messianic status of being the unique bearer of God’s Spirit.” Isaac Kizhakkeparampil, *Invocation of the Holy Spirit as Constitutive of the Sacraments according to Cardinal Yves Congar* (Roma: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1995), 148. Kizhakkeparampil argued that if descended would have been complemented with ascending, “the dominance of the kenotic sacrifice of Jesus in his thought would have been attenuated by his equal concern for the eschatological liberation of the Spirit which fully directed and permeated it.” (151).

\(^{125}\) To present this insight Kizhakkeparampil points to the role of the divine *Pneuma* before the ministry of Jesus Christ. “Although the eschatological effusion of the Holy Spirit as the *Spiritus Filii* has added an essentially new component to evolving economy of salvation, the divine *Pneuma* has always been acting as the creative and vivifying power of God the Father, the *Spiritus Patris*. His closeness has been experienced from the very beginning of human history, and it still enlivens the entire cosmos, inducing human beings to invoke the Creator to transform all things.” (158) This is “inclusive christocentrism... characterized by confession of the universal presence of the *Spiritus Patris et Filii.*” ibid.
short of these cosmic implications. Nevertheless, his Pneumatology continues the “sapiential” line of his early work. Yet it is necessary to see how the Spirit acts in salvation history keeping in mind that this history is played out in creation. This brings to the issue of how the Spirit is related to Jesus Christ and, thus, Pneumatological Christology. How does it help to articulate this relation of God and creation?

**THE SPIRIT AND THE NOTION OF MEDIATION IN THE RELATION GOD-CREATION**

Congar’s Christology shaped his view of the relation God-world; now Pneumatological Christology helps re-visioning the relation of creation and God. How does the view of participation it proposes accept the realism of human existence and articulate the realism of participation in God? Piet Schoonenberg argued that Logos Christology is in “permanent danger of neglecting or diminishing his [Jesus Christ’s] humanity, especially his human personhood.” Congar’s early work had marks of Logos Christology. For Schoonenberg the starting point is the “true and unabridged humanity of Jesus,” meaning Jesus Christ “also is [italics his], psychologically and ontologically, a human person, a human ego, a human subject of conscious and free acts, a subject of human decision and history.” In his later work Congar still thinks of the “I” of Jesus Christ as that of the eternal Son, but the relation Father-Son is realised in the human and historical condition of kenosis and this points to the activity of the Spirit. The Spirit bridges the gap between eternal and “economic” sonship of Jesus Christ. For Congar not only Jesus Christ is God, but also God is Jesus Christ, as the Word was eternally conceived “to be made flesh, crucified and glorified.” This can only be achieved, Congar contends, if “the Word proceeds a Patre Spirituque, from Father and the Spirit, since the latter intervenes in all the acts and moments in the history of the Word incarnate.” So, for Congar it is the Spirit’s role which allows affirmation of the historicity of Christ’s (and our) humanity fully.

---

126 Piet Schoonenberg, “Spirit christology and Logos christology.” *Bijdragen* 38.4 (1977): 350-375., 361. The distinction of Logos and Spirit Christology, centers around the issue of the pre-existence of the Son of God. It centers on the prologue of John’s Gospel, and revolves around the issues of incarnation, or descent of Logos, and his elevation, thus ascending Spirit Christology, Ibid., 350. Congar’s thinking in both stages of his work shows the mark of both, which I will carefully distinguish.


130 ibid.

131 Congar’s logic is as follows – if the Word was eternally conceived to be made flesh, crucified, glorified and to be the head of the children of God, then, since the Spirit intervenes in all these moments, the Word has to eternally proceed from the Father and the Spirit. That is, to keep the economy intact, it has to be traced to eternity. “If all the *acta et passa* of the divine economy are traced back to the eternal begetting of the Word,
Before looking how these two are related, I want to show the underlying basis for such a conclusion. Congar asserted that “the true and full meaning of the economy can only be preserved if we also include the theology.”\(^{132}\) This is the logic, which Schoonenberg shares. Schoonenberg has followed Rahner’s insight, identifying the free mystery of economy with the necessary mystery of Tri-unity.\(^{133}\) Congar understood Schoonenberg’s intent and acknowledged that speaking of pre-existent Person might risk damaging “the reality of human personality.”\(^{134}\) He identifies with the need to begin from revelation, but does not agree with building the ontology of divine being in eternity from this knowledge.\(^{135}\) There are other ways to preserve the reality of humanity, maintaining Congar’s line of inquiry and turning to Pneumatological Christology, like that of David Coffey.\(^{136}\) Coffey intends to understand Christ as “unified subject at once divine and human, as the Gospels present him,” and for that, he argues, Chalcedonian dogma needs to be interpreted by adopting and adapting the concept of *enhypostasia*.\(^{137}\) It is not to be confused with Piet Schoonenberg’s proposal.\(^{138}\) Nevertheless, they share a common insight – the humanity of Christ is fully affirmed with a more pronounced role of the Spirit. Nevertheless, this is not meant to be applied only to the

\(^{132}\) ibid., 93. As Jesus Christ was ontologically God and a human being from conception, Congar seeks to fully embrace history and humanity by pointing to the activity of the Spirit in all the aspects of the economy. But is it sufficient to avert the ontological and metaphysical effects of this Christology? To fully assert the Spirit (and what is associated with the theology of the Spirit), Congar reasons, we need to place the Spirit in eternal procession. But does not this itself reiterate the separation between the two, the immanent and the economic, making the historical subservient at the end in spite of all the efforts?\(^{133}\) ibid., 95. This is a conclusion he draws from the discussion in “Cappadocians, Constantinople, John Damascene” in *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, 29 – 43. The intent is to formulate the relation of created and uncreated by maintaining the integrity of both as also their intimacy. See also Congar, *Duch*, 38 -43.\(^{134}\) Congar assessed both of them in *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, 13 – 17.\(^{135}\) ibid., 14.\(^{136}\) ibid. Schoonenberg affirms with Rahner, that not only the “economic Trinity” (Trinity in the work of salvation) is the “immanent Trinity” (Trinity in God’s eternity), but also vice versa. True, Schoonenberg professes an “apophatism, … the impossibility of affirming or denying anything” as to intra-divine and this saves his orthodoxy, according to Congar. (ibid.) But Congar sees in Rahner that “this threefold way of being given is … forever given in God, belonging therefore necessarily and “essentially” to him.” Karl Rahner, *Trinity*, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970), 74, quoted in Congar, ibid.\(^{137}\) According to Ralph del Colle for David Coffey “the Holy Spirit creates, sanctifies, and then unites the humanity of Jesus to the divine Son.” When “viewed “from below,” from the perspective of an ascending Christology, the hypostatic union is an anointing or bestowal by the Father of the Holy Spirit on the humanity of Jesus – i.e. his habitual grace – with the grace of headship to demonstrate that grace experienced by believers is rooted intrinsically in the person of Christ as its source.” Ralph Del Colle, *Christ and the Spirit: Spirit-Christology in Trinitarian Perspective*. (Oxford University Press on Demand, 1994),124.\(^{138}\) ibid., 418 “It is primarily not the human nature which is enhypostatic in the divine person, but the divine nature in the human person.”
humanity of Christ – it is extended to human-divine activity in the world and is to incorporate the world.

The notion of Christ’s “holy humanity” as a conjoined animated instrument of divinity, which Congar takes from Thomas Aquinas, is key in this.\textsuperscript{139} It emphasises the human as an organ of divinity. It also comes with an emphasis on the role of the Spirit.\textsuperscript{140} This notion appears in Congar’s theology of sacraments, which, as earlier noted, are the mutual touch of God and creation. But is the mutuality of this touch sufficient? Congar would agree with Chauvet that Thomas insufficiently emphasizes “the ascendant and ethical aspects of the sacraments,” and his presentation “is too heavily weighted in favor of the “Christological-descending” aspect.”\textsuperscript{141} Congar asserts that the humanity of Christ has its integrity and its own, human, holiness even apart from the acts in which it is the instrument of divine.\textsuperscript{142} How does Congar’s Pneumatological Christology address this issue? For Congar it was more than God acting in Christ. Rather by virtue of union with divinity in the person of Christ, the humanity was raised to dignity and filled with power.\textsuperscript{143} Congar in his later work affirms that the Spirit “actuates” Jesus as Messiah and Lord in two stages, in the form of servant and in glory.\textsuperscript{144} This second stage means that Jesus not only became a spiritual body, but that he became a “life-giving spirit” (1 Corinthians 15: 45). Jesus received “a spiritualized and glorified body, which was the source of life.”\textsuperscript{145} This has to be viewed in the light of incorporating the world. But how does this Pneumatological aspect bear upon this incorporation?

Congar’s reflection on the holy humanity of Christ as an instrument, as earlier indicated, relies on Thomas Aquinas. For Thomas, according to Chauvet, “the sacraments remain the sacraments of the incarnate Word ... as prolongations of the sanctified humanity of Christ.”\textsuperscript{146} However, Chauvet points to the effects of categories of causality and instrumentality, when applied to the humanity of Christ.\textsuperscript{147} I share Chauvet’s concern that “unconscious (and uncriticised) onto-theological presuppositions” meant the language was “technical or

\textsuperscript{139} Congar points out that the theology of Thomas is dependent on the Greek Fathers and especially John Damascene. See references in Yves Congar “Pneumatologie ou christomonisme,” 405. I use “holy humanity” instead of “sacred humanity,” used in Chapter Two, to avoid allusions of “sacred” as taken apart.

\textsuperscript{140} ibid.

\textsuperscript{141} Chauvet, \textit{Symbol and Sacrament}, 11.

\textsuperscript{142} “... the humanity of Christ is sanctified and sanctifying in the whole of its being, it is supremely and integrally holy in itself.” Congar, \textit{Christ, Our Lady and the Church}, 52.

\textsuperscript{143} Congar, \textit{Christ, Our Lady and the Church}, 52, 53.


\textsuperscript{145} Congar, \textit{The Word and the Spirit}, 90.

\textsuperscript{146} Chauvet, ibid., 20, 21

\textsuperscript{147} When applied to the role of the holy humanity of Christ, Chauvet distinguishes that in Thomas, it is not “disposing causality,” but “instrumental efficient causality.” This means that in it “the principal cause moves; the instrumental cause, being moved, moves,” meaning the humanity of Christ also moves, rather than “the giver of the form effects; the preparer of the matter disposes.” (ibid., 18)
productionist.” Chauvet’s main concern is that Thomas Aquinas (and other Scholastics) privileged the category of “cause” as they sought to comprehend the divine grace in the mystery of divine-human relation. According to Chauvet grace cannot be considered a “thing” or “value,” it is “a non-object, non-value.” This category of causality comes with images of production or augmentation with “a model in which the idea of ‘instrumentality’ plays a pivotal role.” Chauvet is reluctant to necessarily accept the “instrumental and productivist language of causality” and goes beyond the discussion of sacraments to question the assumptions of the existence of such an “onto-theology,” of such “metaphysics.” While good thinkers, he continues, never thought that metaphysics could explain the totality of being, it is necessary to take the critical approach to metaphysics “as a point of departure and as a framework.” I have looked in chapter five at the effect of such metaphysics on the “otherness” of the world. Now the Pneumatological aspect allows returning to the issue.

Chauvet’s argument complies with the intent of Congar’s turn to theology of the Spirit and shows its potential in addressing the contemporary scene. When Congar spoke of grace, this meant the activity of the Spirit, and not a thing or entity. The focus on the role of the Spirit in the life of Jesus Christ allows him to adopt the perspective of the history of salvation, which is a step towards better affirming the role of history and culture. Congar sought to remedy the lack of Pneumatology in the Christology of Aquinas and addressed the concept of “created grace.” This concept, Congar argues, prevented Thomas Aquinas from developing a more complete understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of Jesus. So, Congar is caught in between the discussion in terms of the salvation history and the terms of the ontology of Jesus Christ. The latter reflects on the fact of incarnation but lacks emphasis on

148 ibid., 22. With this as I have earlier noted Congar would have agreed, though he contended that grace was viewed as a thing due to the lack of Pneumatology, see Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 69.
149 Chauvet, Ibid., 7.
150 ibid.
151 ibid.
152 ibid.
154 According to Congar a theology of created grace prevented Aquinas from “developing a more complete understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit.” It was a consequence of the union and expressed the ontology of Christ. But in terms of salvation history, it emphasized descent, rather than re-ascent and the role of the Holy Spirit in Christ. Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 85, 86.
155 This “created grace” looked at grace as if adapted to humanity in Christ (and in humans). In Thomas, according to Congar, Christ was “Son of the Father” through divine begetting and Christ as Son “as a creature and through created grace.” Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1, 90.
156 Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 84. So, (Congar summarizes Thomas) the created grace, which presupposed uncreated grace (the Holy Spirit), was necessary for Christ to act holy as a human being.
157 ibid., Created grace was also a necessary consequence of “grace of the union,” i.e. Chalcedonian hypostatic union, and, according to Thomas, Congar points out, together with spiritual gifts were in Christ in fullness from conception.
the role of the Spirit and the salvation history. The role of the Spirit, consequently, allows him to assert that creation indeed participates in God by showing the relation with the Son’s participation. And it also allows him to reiterate that participation in God does not take away from one’s participation in the world.

Congar navigates through the dangers of Monophysitism and Adoptionism. Once again, the juxtaposition with Schoonenberg is instructive. For the latter, theology of the Spirit addresses the danger of Monophysitism. The same (though differently) would apply to Congar. He presents the work of Christ as primarily for humans (i.e. begins from economy, not eternity and metaphysics). Congar justifies this by arguing that the Holy Spirit constitutes Jesus as the Son of God in a new way - “not from the point of view of his hypostatic quality” or ontology, but of salvation history. As Christ was the Firstborn for the others, Congar continues, the role of the Spirit is crucial to conform to him by making them the children of God, which happens in history. To avoid Adoptionism, Congar still maintains that Jesus was ontologically the Son of God because of hypostatic union from the moment of conception. This union, then, made him the temple of the Spirit and holy by the Spirit in his humanity. But does this imply that Jesus was not holy in any different way?

Congar’s approach strengthens the humanity and the vision of what it is to be human and affirms the relation between the “filial” relationship of Jesus Christ with the Father and human participation in God. This allows turning to the issue of realism of participation in God. But does not this diminish an affirmation of the divinity of Jesus? Not necessarily, according to Schoonenberg’s proposal. While Congar’s Spirit Christology does not have this reciprocity, it can profit from Schoonenberg’s account. This can be extended to Congar’s notion of human-divine activity, which continues as touch in incorporating the world. This activity relies on the “two actuating moments” of virtus or effectiveness of the Spirit, where Jesus Christ was constituted and not merely proclaimed as Lord. The economy and eternity

---

158 This Christology was pre-occupied, Congar argues, with the aspect of incarnation, “than to aspect of reascent, in which the action of the Holy Spirit is involved.” (ibid.) This is related with a lack of “full recognition of the historical character of economy of salvation.” (87)

159 Piet Schoonenberg, “Spirit christology and Logos Christology,” 361. This is because Spirit Christology seeks to affirm the full human personality of Jesus (against Monophysitism), but it has to guard itself against Adoptionism.


161 ibid.

162 Schoonenberg starts his “christology ‘from below’ starting from (but not finishing at) Jesus as man.” Thus divine presence in Jesus is “supreme and final or ... messianic and eschatological.” Schoonenberg, ibid. This means that the holiness of Jesus while can be termed as gradual, its measure is unique. “It is the difference of partial sanctity from the fullness.” ibid. Schoonenberg can argue in this way because for him there is a reciprocity inherent in this divine presence. “God, being present in whatever of his creatures, is in no way enclosed in it ... on the contrary ... being immanent, also transcends the creature ... God, therefore, is present in, or to, the creature, entering into it and pervading it, but also embracing it, containing and sustaining it, indeed grounding it.” (ibid.) Thus, he speaks of “a reciprocal enthypostasis.” (ibid.)

163 Congar’s use of terms constituted and virtus are important: the Spirit co-institutes the church with Christ (Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, Vol. 2, p. 7). This complies with the holy humanity of Jesus Christ, as virtus,
are linked for Congar, as the Son is conceived eternally to become incarnate and First-born.\textsuperscript{164} This emphasizes the continuing and incorporating filial relation played out in the world. Now this returns to the question if the horizontal dimension in this relation is underscored enough. Congar’s relation of economy and eternity, then, is a crux of the problem of the participation of created in uncreated. The relation of economy and eternity for Congar is incomprehensible to the human mind and he refers to the transcendence of God. However, the juxtaposition with Schoonenberg shows that once the filial language is supplemented with Pneumatological, the tension might be alleviated.

What does this reference mean? First, Congar is cautious with the second part of Rahner’s axiom (i.e. that the immanent Trinity is also the economic Trinity). I have earlier noted that Congar pointed to Schoonenberg’s “apophatism,” that is that one cannot derive the ontology of God (intra-divine life) from the economy and that “apophatism” “leaves the author’s orthodoxy intact.”\textsuperscript{165} Second, he argues (together with Rahner’s emphasis on salvation history) that God’s full self-communication, as Father, Son and Holy Spirit is full only in the beatific vision, thus in heaven.\textsuperscript{166} The transcendence means that in this communication “there is no participation [of the creature] in the aseity … or what makes God God.”\textsuperscript{167} Since this self-communication is in salvation history, it suggests a certain hiddenness and distance between revealed and eternal Trinity. Referring to Luther, Congar points out “God reveals himself by hiding himself;” while economy does not conceal ontology, there is a limit as to how far it reveals.\textsuperscript{168} So, for Congar a passage from reflections on the revelation to the eternity of God is a hallmark of Western theology.\textsuperscript{169} But for him the essential mystery of Trinity and the free mystery of grace, while identical in God, are distinct for human reflection and incomprehensible.\textsuperscript{170} While interesting in and of itself the issue of the Spirit Christology of Congar has to be left here.\textsuperscript{171} This research has shown how in Congar’s work it is interwoven and affects the practical-ecclesial life in the world – ecclesial, personal and sacramental. Furthermore, it is situated in a major Pneumatological re-visioning of the relation God-world. This allows it to be viewed in the wider context of interrelating the Spirit and the world, yet also presents some issues to deal with.

\textsuperscript{165} ibid., 15.
\textsuperscript{166} ibid., 16.
\textsuperscript{167} ibid., 16.
\textsuperscript{168} ibid., 16.
\textsuperscript{169} “The identification of the order of eternal existence of the hypostases with the order of economy is fundamental to the Latin position.” 17.
\textsuperscript{171} There are several dissertations on this issue, see Introduction.
Congar’s solution is not without its problems, as the critique of Paul Fiddes in relation to both Thomas Aquinas and Gregory Palamas suggests. Fiddes argues that if one maintains that “there remains an unknowable essence of God back beyond revelation,” this “seems to limit the participation of the creature in God.” Fiddes is probably concerned that if essence is postulated as unknowable and beyond revelation, then creation cannot participate in it. This argument complies with my concern to articulate not only how God participates in creation, but that creation also participates in God through the Spirit. Fiddes follows Karl Barth and Hans Urs von Balthasar and views the “mystery of God should be understood ... as the unknowable depths of what is made known, not something which is totally unknown.” However, Congar was aware of the beatific vision of Aquinas “as a vision without created species, that is God himself as the most objective form of our understanding.” He also pointed to the Orthodox distinction of divine essence (unknowable) and “energies,” which can be communicated. Both were valid, but different ways: one was participation in a “likeness of God’s perfections ... realized in existence by the efficient causality,” the other the participation “entitatively and ontologically.” While these observations challenge the reading of Fiddes, his point remains. Both interlocutors still view created and uncreated as “two orders of being” excluded from one another and requiring “another principle to mediate between them,” which does not do full justice to the human and worldly aspect. Is that really so?

“NARRATIVE OF MEDIATION”

Paul Fiddes approaches the issue of participation in God from a theology of creation. This helps me to ask how creation might be fully incorporated into the discussion of the relation God-world. Human-divine wisdom, he proposes, connects wisdom as life in the world and participation in God. This articulates the immediacy in the relation God-world from a different angle. According to him the Scholastic account of participation was lacking if compared to biblical wisdom literature. He reasons thus: if God perceives the essences of created things directly, he does not see the world as mortals do. Then the immediate communion between the wise and wisdom, as described in wisdom literature, is

---

174 Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 3, 15. According to Steven Payne, in Thomistic theory of knowledge, “…the cognitive act in which an object is apprehended by means of its substantial rather than its accidental form ... may be described as knowledge of a thing’s “essence” or “quiddity.” Key to this theory of knowledge is that “the subjects somehow “participate” in the objects of their cognition, that the mind in its own way becomes whatever it knows.” Payne, John of the Cross and the Cognitive Value of Mysticism, 25, 26.
175 Congar, Ibid.
176 ibid., 65, 66.
177 Fiddes, Ibid., 383.
178 Fiddes, Seeing the World and Knowing God, 204.
impossible.\(^{179}\) Besides, if the direct vision of God is merely eschatological as Scholastic literature suggests, human beings participate in God only through analogy, by reflecting God and by being caused by God. For more direct participation the obvious and direct connection between “God’s participation in God’s own life in Trinity, and human participation in God” was necessary.\(^{180}\) But a parallel with Scholastic view, which Fiddes proposes, is useful. Fiddes draws from it that it maybe used to show that God intimately participates in how a human being knows, more precisely, that in how concepts are formed. This can be further extended to the role of the Spirit in human loving and willing.\(^{181}\) It seems that for Fiddes analogy is not direct and intimate enough for an account of participation. But it is questionable if Congar’s reading of Thomas would agree with Fiddes’ reading.

Actually, the approach of Fiddes is not far removed from Congar’s reading. Fiddes appropriates the Trinitarian notions of activity and person in Thomas – they help him present how humanity participates in God. This has shaped Congar’s account as well. The point of Fiddes is to underscore the “dynamic nature of the being of God” and present God as “event of relations,” and the human being as participant, rather than spectator, in the network of relations.\(^{182}\) Congar viewed everything active in God as done by the divine persons; his notion of divine person was, consequently, relationship in the mode of substance, in which humanity participated.\(^{183}\) So, Congar’s reading of Thomas seems to anticipate much of the critique of Fiddes, including the Eastern critique of the identity of the relations with one essence of God in Aquinas.\(^{184}\) Congar addressed the issue of difference between East and West as “a profession of the same central dogmatic core and a mutual recognition of two different, but not contradictory theologoumena.”\(^{185}\) However, what still stands in the way of dynamic

\(^{179}\) ibid., 205.

\(^{180}\) ibid. Aquinas, according to Fiddes, did come close as for Aquinas the mind was the aspect of humanity which resembled God. So, when the Father generates the Son with intent to create the world and human mind “generates the word and ‘illuminates’ the world in order to know God,” these are alike. However, they do not merge into one activity, and the directness of the participation as the one seen in wisdom literature is not achieved. ibid., 206.

\(^{181}\) So, Congar followed Augustine’s analogy of the structure of the spirit as it presents itself in Thomas Aquinas. Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1, 88. Furthermore, this metaphysical picture of triune God is in line with Augustine’s concern for spiritual experience: “the soul is more God’s image when, because of the knowledge that the Word communicates to it and the love that the Spirit places in it, it makes present the resemblance to the one of whom it is the image.” Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 3, 84.

\(^{182}\) Fiddes understands that this presents relations in God as “real and ‘beingful’” as this presents “a dynamic concept of being based on relation.” Fiddes, Participating in the Trinity, 381.

\(^{183}\) “Everything active in God was ... done by Persons. The essential knowledge and love of self exist only as hypostasized in personal subjects, which can be distinguished by the opposition in the relationships which constitute them. These relationships are established in the divine substance ... they make Persons according to the divine substance, the first ... under the aspect of knowledge ... and second ... under the aspect of will or love.” Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 1, 89.

\(^{184}\) Fiddes, Ibid., 382.

interplay and intimate participation is the view of divine presence as merely by causation and analogy.

Congar would recognize the approach to participation which Fiddes proposes. Fiddes refers to Gregory Palamas, who presents that “finite beings can participate in, or see, God only insofar as he actively manifests himself to creatures, in his triune ‘energies.’” Already in the middle stage of his work Congar pointed to two different sources of inspiration, Platonist and Aristotelian, behind Eastern and Western theology. The East underscored a continuity and not a distinction between nature and grace. Thus, if there was a focus on “ontology” and “being” in the East, there was “activity” and “operation” in the West; in the view of human existence this revolved around “deification-similitude” (East) and “beatitude-operation” (West). The Eastern view, consequently, viewed Christ’s work as “regeneration, a recreation and re-spiritualization of human nature;” the incarnation and the Eucharist, which continued the human presence of Christ in the world, had “cosmic and ontological importance.” It was shown earlier in this chapter that in the Pneumatological revision of the account of participation, Congar drew closer to such a view of Christ’s work. Eucharist in the West, according to Congar, “above all confers a greater intimacy with Christ,” but he also mentions this is “in spite of our theology and liturgy which are more realistic.” These parallels allow us to interpret what resources Congar turned to as he reflected in how to address contemporary theological challenges.

Congar’s view of the concept of knowledge in the East gives an insight into how one’s participation in the world and intimacy with God can be more intimately linked. He saw that this knowledge was pursued not by analysis, but by “ontological spiritual deepening” whereby it is by “becoming deeper that one acquires a better understanding of the inner meaning of things, if not of their external relationships.” This approach is clearly in line with Congar’s pursuit of intimacy between God, world and humanity, but also presents a line of argument he did not explore. This is where the proposal of Fiddes fits. The latter criticizes the limits put on the participation of the creature in God not only in Aquinas, but also in Palamas. Congar’s sapiential background, which draws from Aquinas and Augustine, already presupposed that knowledge in God is not separated from the world. In his article, Fiddes also shows that the view of self and the world of Thomas Aquinas allows the latter to see how

---

186 Fiddes, *Participating in the Trinity*, 378. The creatures shared in “energies of God,” thanks to “Palamite image of the persons of the Trinity as ‘energies’ of God.”
187 So, in the Eastern view of participation in God in which “things are shared likenesses and the world is an expression of God and grace” whereas the West viewed the “world as made up of natures, causes, powers and influences,” and focused on “efficient causality and ... genesis ... coming of existence.” Congar, *Dialogue Between Christians*, 223, 224.
188 ibid., 225.
189 227.
190 ibid.
192 Fiddes, ibid., 378.
participation in the Trinity results in greater participation in others. His conclusion is fitting: “we can see how the participation in God to which Aquinas points can be made more direct and immediate, though experienced in the world.” But I have shown throughout my work that even if a sapiential line is present in Congar, it is not developed. On the other hand developing the role of the Spirit in creation would significantly help Congar’s attempt. How could it be extended?

Perhaps Congar’s rapprochement with Orthodox theology can extend his earlier sapiential insights. Andrew Louth pointed to Bulgakov’s sophiology, which intimately links human knowledge and activity in the world and participation in God. This signals the immediacy and directness of the participation of creation in God, which Fiddes marked out in biblical sources. Interestingly, Congar positively mentions Bulgakov and sophiology in his *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. He does not discuss sophiology as such, but as I will soon show, would have appreciated the inner dynamism in God it presented. Furthermore, he employs the notion of the kenosis of the Spirit in his Pneumatology. Cannot this point the way to a fuller picture of human-divine activity in the world? Paul Gavrilyuk showed that for Bulgakov the Spirit’s kenosis was ultimately fulfilled in Pentecost, but “began with creation and would end in the eschaton, when God would be all in all … The Holy Spirit sanctifies and transforms

193 He reasons along the lines of participation resembling the account I have presented a bit earlier in Thomistic theory of knowledge. “When the mind sees an object, it knows it because object exists in some way in the observing mind. The mind turns towards the image and form of the thing it holds in itself.” Fiddes, “Participating in the Trinity,” 390, 391. This Fiddes applies to the knowledge of the world, which “from its own existence radiates into the space of owner.” Reading Aquinas through von Balthasar, Fiddes concludes that “… all knowledge is at the same mystery. The light that breaks forth from the particular beauty of object, awakening the intellect, is the glory of God which is sustaining the world.” Fiddes, Ibid., referring to Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Logic. Theological Theory*, vol. I., *Truth of the World* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 61-71. In Balthasar mind does not “extract a universal essence from the object,” but the object and mind are in “a mutual self-opening and self-revealing” communion in their particularity.

194 Fiddes, Ibid., 391.


196 Bulgakov’s theology “invites the human spirit on a fascinating quest after the nature of things, but it is rooted in the simple turning of the creature toward God in joy and gratitude.” Louth, Ibid. In a different article Louth formulates the fundamental intuition of sophiology “the gulf between the uncreated God and creation, brought into being out of nothing, does not put creation in opposition to God, rather Wisdom constitutes a kind of μετατόπισις (between), between God and us/ creation, for Wisdom is that through which God created the universe, and it is equally through wisdom that the human quest for God finds fulfilment.” Andrew Louth, “Sergii Bulgakov and the Task of Theology.” *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 74 (2009), 243 – 257, 255.

197 He commends Bulgakov’s attempt to go beyond the debate of East and West as to origin of divine persons. According to Congar, Bulgakov set to work out a theology of Trinity on different foundations and analyze “the inner dynamism of God … and the correlation between the three hypostases who are situated within that absolute and living Subject … who reveals himself in Wisdom identified with his ousia (this is sophiology, the object of discussion in its own right).” Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, 76, note 1. Congar commends this insight of sophiology vis-à-vis Vladimir Lossky’s rejection of Bulgakov’s attempts and points to Paul Evdokimov, who was more open to the insights of Bulgakov. See also Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press), 69.


205
creation without destroying its creaturely integrity.” 199 The theology of the Spirit, consequently, suggests an interplay of God, human being and the world, which might incorporate the world as a participant in its own right. But Congar’s theology of the Spirit does not look at the Spirit’s activity in creation as such.

Congar’s sapiential reading of Thomas would not be foreign to such attempt. When Congar writes about participation in “eschatological knowledge,” it is also a present participation in God’s own life. It is divine knowledge, which is communicated, though imperfectly, and results in faith possessing the (divine) reality beyond signs. Furthermore, this resonates with an innate desire of creation. This desire is essential for the human being as created in the divine image but without interior capacity to realize union with God.200 The created and inherent dynamism of creation is restored by the supernatural actions and gifts in the movement from the law (Old Testament) to grace (New Testament) to glory (Parousia).201 This eschatological character also means that the spirituality is not a mere addition, but “interior and essential to the epistemological structure of theological knowledge.”202 This theological sapiential “theologia gloriae” means that the faith is, as revealed in the New Testament, the intimate knowledge of God’s own life. Theology of the Holy Spirit means that “God not only sent his gifts, he has come, he is himself engaged,” it comprises the knowledge of who God is, real participation, through indwelling.203 Congar, even as he begins with creation in knowing God, follows Aquinas. This is Congar’s pattern to underscore the God is God vis-à-vis creation, while at the same time showing God as intimately involved in it. This transcendence in Thomas, to reiterate, is connected with immanence.204

In this Congar retains Aquinas’s view that God is transcendent as the First Truth (as in earlier hierarchical Auctoritas), but he presents this First Truth as the living God. This allows him to construct a sapiential vision, which incorporates a dynamism of creation. Congar attributes the absence of reflection on history in Thomas to his vision that God knows primarily Godself as the essential object of knowledge. The creatures are known only secondarily and in relation

---

199 Paul L. Gavrilyuk. “The kenotic theology of Sergius Bulgakov.” Scottish Journal of Theology, vol. 58 (2005), 251-269, 259. This builds on theology of the relation God-creation, in which realism of creation is better incorporated. “The Father limits himself by becoming utterly transcendent … the Son … descends to the level of humanity [and] the Holy Spirit … accommodating his power to the state of individual creatures … limits his power by allowing the sinful revolt of creatures against God.” ibid.

200 For Congar, in Thomas the reality of the world is coherent – nature desires God, but does not have power to procure divinization. Congar, “Le moment,” 175.

201 ibid., 176.

202 ibid.

203 ibid.

204 According to Cavanaugh, in Thomas “precisely because God is entirely transcendent to creaturely being, because God is not another being in competition with finite being, God is the only agent who acts immediately – that is, through no medium – in all things.” Cavanaugh, “Joint Declaration,” 270.
to God; the creation, incarnation, history of salvation are accidents. However, this relation of the facts of history to the First Truth is more intimate, because God engages with these facts. Congar sees in the plan of *Summa Theologica* a passage from the essential (intra-Trinitarian) to the free mystery (economy); creation and its return to God is to be viewed only in terms of the “intimate Generosity of the Divinity,” which is “the whole Trinitarian mystery.” The Father is the principle and secret source of divine generosity *ad extra* and the created world already participates in God’s goodness. Creation has its first origin in this uncreated generosity, the same, “which in God produces Trinitarian life.” The salvation is then a new participation in the uncreated generosity of Trinitarian life as God comes in person (“mission of Word and the mission of the Spirit”). The dynamic historic reality is then based on the fact that God is *living* and thus, Congar quotes Seckler, “his eternity is not static, but dynamic.” Congar views the theology of Thomas as primarily realism: “le thomisme, c’est le réalisme!” This helps Congar show how God is both simple and engaged in the complexity of life, eternal and unchanging, and involved in history. But is this sufficient to incorporate creation in its own right?

This leads to the most pertinent aspect of the critique of Fiddes, which addresses the distinction of orders of nature and grace and the notion of mediation. According to Fiddes, when Aquinas begins with the self-knowledge and self-love of God, in which creatures participate, he does not begin with creation as active and creative. This brings us to what Fiddes calls “the narrative of mediation,” which assumes the ontological gap between the material world of human persons and the transcendent world of the divine, and proposes an intermediate principle. In the case of early Christianity, this was the figure of Christ, “reconfigured as a cosmic mediator,” bridging the gap between two ontological spheres of “unchanging, intellectual Being” and “transient, material Becoming.” This figure of Christ came close to the idea of Logos—Soul contemplating eternal ideas, “thoughts in the mind of a Supreme God.” While this development did not neglect that Logos became “a human

---

205 Congar, “Le moment,” 171. According to Congar, when Thomas uses Aristotle’s epistemological categories, temporal as the object of faith “is accidental for the Faith itself: the facts interest only by the reason of their relation to the First Truth.”

206 Ibid.
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being in Jesus of Nazareth,” the Son of God was “a mediator bridging an abyss between two worlds of reality.”

Does this critique apply to Congar? The Pneumatological corrective begun by Congar in the series of articles, overviewed at the end of chapter 5, would preclude a definite answer. In reflecting on human action, the sacraments, and on the church as the sacrament of salvation of the world, Congar approaches mediation as embodied and in history. Significantly, this comes with the theology of the Holy Spirit in a picture of the participation in the divine missions, inspired by Thomas Aquinas.

Fiddes does not wish to do away with the rich concept of “mediatorship,” but rather a reductive version of it – the one “bridging a gap between two worlds.” This reduction, according to him, denigrated the world of physical matter, lost interest in particular details, separated two orders of reality and was a narrative of domination. Fiddes takes this conclusion from Colin Gunton. Gunton points to the image of the “two hands” of God by Irenaeus. It is here, according to Gunton, that classic Christian ontology is formulated. This is the idea that God created by two hands, and that, unlike in paganism or neo-Platonism, there are no intermediate beings. Thus, the Son and the Spirit “mediate between the divine and created.” But, according to Fiddes, even Gunton’s continued use of the paradigm of mediation “means that he has still not escaped from the trap of separating two orders of reality.” On the one hand, this critique of Fiddes may be rightly applied to some of the aspects of Congar’s thought. It brings to the fore the philosophical-theological reasons behind the lack of immediacy between one’s participation in the world and participation in God. On the other hand, the proposal of Fiddes himself has raised questions if it adequately addresses God as transcendent “other” and “creatio ex nihilo.” Congar embraces the language of mediation and would not attract such criticism, as his reliance on Thomas shows. In this tension between “being” and “becoming” Congar attempts to find a balance by making a “being” aspect more dynamic. But his earlier work’s Pneumatological insights employed the language of process and becoming. Does a developed Pneumatological approach to mediation help appropriating creation in a more comprehensive way. Does Congar’s

216 ibid.
220 Gunton, Ibid.
221 Fiddes, Ibid.
revisioning present that the creation indeed participates in God, and not only God in creation, as the activity of the higher principle in the lower.\textsuperscript{224}

THE SPIRIT AND THE RELATION GOD-WORLD

To begin with, one has to appreciate that for Congar this is indeed a re-visioning: “a theological emphasis on the Trinity and on Christology seen in the light of pneumatology.”\textsuperscript{225} Congar’s revision abounds with dynamic imagery of the flow. So, God (the Father) is fontal deity, Father as “the absolute Source of divinity.”\textsuperscript{226} This divine reality flows into the cosmos. The Spirit as the eschatological Gift consumates the movement. Congar also presents a Pneumatological Christology.\textsuperscript{227} This is his presentation of the immanent presence of the transcendent God.\textsuperscript{228} What does the language of the Spirit contribute to the understanding of the role of the divine person of the Holy Spirit in the relation God-world? While Congar was open to the wisdom or sapiential imagery in the relation God-world-humanity, the role of the Spirit is not presented in this imagery.\textsuperscript{229} The work of Fiddes gives a clue of how this could be done. Reflecting on the notion of Wisdom in Wisdom literature, Fiddes argues that it should not be absorbed “into either Logos or Spirit.”\textsuperscript{230} He identifies in Wisdom a “two-fold quality” of standing “over against” the world in a way which underscores both its transcendence and immanence.\textsuperscript{231} This angle is comparable with Congar’s reflection on the reality of the living God, “a source... not seen; all that is seen is the river that flows from it.”\textsuperscript{232} But it also points to the transcendent role of the Spirit in the world. In line with Congar’s work, this need not be with adopting the language of Wisdom, but could be possible if the Spirit role in creation would be affirmed with the view of the creation in the field of force of the Spirit. This would build on his reading and supplement it with a suggestion of Pannenberg, as proposed in Chapter Four. The result would be similar to that suggested by Fiddes, but without a danger of presenting Sophia as a kind of fourth member of the Trinity.

The relation of transcendence and immanence allows us to return to Congar’s view of the relation between participation in God and engagement in the world. Congar addresses the

\textsuperscript{224} On the peculiar use of “participation” as not a mere synonym for “communion” and philosophical-theological discussions surrounding it, see Paul S. Fiddes, “Participating in the Trinity,” 375 – 378.


\textsuperscript{226} Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 3, 133. Congar starts from Augustinian principaliter, which expresses “the idea of the first and absolute source, attributing procession of the Spirit to the Father as source.” This then is reaffirmed in Albert the Great and especially Bonaventure, where the theology of the Father as absolute source, in\textit{nascibilis}, meaning the Father as first and thus has “a propensity to communicate himself.” (134, 135) Congar’s view is like Bonaventure’s, looking at the reality of the \textit{living} God. (137)

\textsuperscript{227} Congar, Ibid., 128 – 165.

\textsuperscript{228} “God ... as transcendent and as immanent, both as beyond and above everything and as with and for us.”137.

\textsuperscript{229} Congar, Ibid., vol. 1, 11.

\textsuperscript{230} Paul Fiddes, “Wisdom And The Spirit,” 151.

\textsuperscript{231} ibid., 152, 153 Thus the image of the sun, from which nothing is hidden (transcendence) and the quality of Wisdom to be available and close to human being (immanence.)

\textsuperscript{232} Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 3, 139.
challenge of the philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty that “the Christian was a bad conservative and an uncertain revolutionary.” According to Congar “the truth and the grace of the Holy Spirit” unites both immanence and transcendence: “there is no fatherhood without brotherhood. God is not paternalistic. Transcendence and immanence go together.” But a closer look at how this is applied to human liberations allows assessment of Congar’s attempt. Congar rightly presented the divine plan as transcendent to human liberations. There was a proportion between the two – the divine plan embraced liberations, but there was no identity between them. But what, then, about immanence? This points to the role of the Spirit, which was to interiorise, radicalize and in this way fulfill the exigencies of temporal liberations. While filial imagery is invoked, this is primarily realised in the church. The relation church-world, like in his earlier work, would remain essentially one-sided and limit the view of human-divine activity to the church. The dualist pattern of Chrictic form and the Spirit as (its interior) life remains. This view reiterates the reductive vision of mediation between God and the world. Thus, Congar’s argument that the transcendent (spiritually immediate) and immanent (socially engaged) come together thanks to the role of the Spirit is on a shaky ground. There is a lack of reciprocity in the contribution of the world. Yet if the view of the Spirit’s activity in creation is affirmed, such view of human-divine activity would be in reciprocal relation with what the Spirit does there. If one remembers Congar’s early desire to confront the unbelief of the world, one finds it reiterated in his Pneumatological re-visioning. The Spirit indeed acts in the unbelieving world. But here the focus is on the Spirit’s work in the human being, and its intimate relations with the work in the church and in the world in its widest sense, somewhat thwarting his aspirations.

On the other hand, the image of the return of the creation to God suggests the Spirit brings freedom and integrity, which is personal, communal, but also cosmic. Thus, a more comprehensive view of the mediation of the two divine missions has to encompass the work of the transcendent Spirit in the world. Fiddes shows from Wisdom literature that the


234 Congar, Ibid., 139.

235 Congar, Un Peuple Messianique, 167 – 171. In looking at the movements in the world (for example liberation movements), Congar calls for their openness to transcendence. In the spiritual immediacy with transcendent God (for example, charismatic) he calls for historical engagement or incarnation. Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 2, 165-169.

236 Such a view would be supported by the sections “The Holy Spirit and our Prayer” and “The Spirit and the Struggle against the Flesh, the Spirit and Freedom” in the second volume of I Believe in the Holy Spirit, 112-118 and 119-133.

237 See, however, how effortlessly Congar passes from talking about the as the source of the individual freedom to the Spirit as the principle of freedom in the church, as if both are intimately interrelated, Ibid. 126, 127. This freedom is for Congar a direct result “of the two missions of the Word and the Spirit,” as the Spirit compels the church “to go beyond itself.” So, as spiritual anthropology completes spiritual ecclesiology, the same can be extended further.

238 As Charles MacDonald noted: “the locus of the anticipation of the eschaton is the sacramental life and the life of the theological virtues. It is, however, more extensive than this. It also touches the cosmic universe and material creation.” MacDonald, Church and World, 47.
transcendent and immanent work of Wisdom means that God is over against the world as supreme observer and within the world as what makes it cohere. The latter aspect, which participates in the world and invites into divine life, is depicted “as permeating all as well as observing all,” associating the Spirit with permeation. The work of Fiddes supplements Congar’s account of the permeation of the two divine missions by situating it in creation. When the Spirit is associated with Wisdom, Fiddes shows, this allows articulating the immanence of the transcendent God better. This helps in appreciating the diversity and complexity of the world. This emanation of Wisdom from God is in the Hebrew (but not Greek) tradition of “personifications of attributes of Yahweh,” as “extensions of the divine personality” such as Word, Spirit and Wisdom. Thus emanation is not to be associated with the image of mediator, who bridges a gap, but at the same time it complies with and extends Congar’s Pneumatological imagery. Wisdom as spirit is identical in both “standing over against” and “within,” flowing from God, so that human beings could participate in divine life. Fiddes also points to the Christological reversal in this imagery and its recovery by Jacob Boehme and the Russian Sophiologists.

Congar’s Christological view of human divine activity presented it in filial terms. This human-divine activity continued a human-divine touch from the Gospels and was set to incorporate the world. It invited participation. The “filial” imagery combined a relation with the transcendent God, who was also immanent. This “filial” imagery necessarily implied a vertical dimension – the relations between human beings and the relations of the world. The fact that it was inviting and resonant with the world meant that there is a prior intimacy between God and creation, which is necessary to maintain, as is the transcendence of God. This intimacy is necessary in addressing unbelief as it shows the creation something which is crucial to its

239 Fiddes, “Wisdom and The Spirit,” 154. This “permeation” belongs to the Spirit’s pervading aspect, but it is counter to Stoic “world-soul” because it is “who is ‘with God’ and can be sent ‘from God.’” “... the Spirit is the Holy Spirit of Yahweh as well as the Spirit in the world. Spirit, like Wisdom, is both transcendent and immanent.” Thus Wisdom as Spirit both retains the idea of Wisdom as over against the world and also as “a means of coherence, “permeating all spirits.”

240 Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 71. “The Word may be permeated with the Spirit, but the Spirit is also permeated with the Word.”


243 Fiddes, Ibid., 159.

244 ibid., 161. Augustine who, according to Fiddes, completed the move when he identified “wisdom (sapientia) as the higher or male part of the mind and sense-knowledge (scientia) as the female, lower part of the mind.” 162.

245 ibid., 163. If for Boehme the Wisdom “is the “mirror” in which God, the Primal Abyss ..., reflects the divine self and becomes self-conscious, creating self-difference and giving rise to the “manifold” beings of creation,” for Russian Sophiologists wisdom was the “world” of the Trinity and body of God.
existence as creation. While this insight is not foreign to Congar, it is not adequately addressed. His Pneumatological re-visioning restricts this intimacy to its fulfilment in the realm of the church and looks at even the Christological aspect in terms of “form,” which presents it as an external relation. But his Pneumatological line of inquiry wades into the intimacy of the relation God-world already present and needs be only extended and specified. As his presentation of relation God-world relies on some metaphysical assumptions, for the success of this Pneumatological inquiry, these have to be lastly addressed.

THE WORD AND THE NOTION OF SIGN

This reiterates an early question: is it possible to intimately participate in God while also being engaged in the world, which is being transformed, or does the critique of earlier dualism still apply? Congar’s discussion of sign, when applied to the role of the word, is instructive. It points to interpersonal relations through the system of signs. For Congar, the signifier depends on the signified, and this applies to the signs through which God manifests and acts outside Godself, which must mean that God acts to validate the communication. So, by means of word, God in divine generosity leaves Godself as an “inner and external word,” postulates beings outside and distinct from God and acts in cosmos. The Word links divine manifestation in creation, in Jesus Christ and in human hearts. The Spirit, then, effectively realizes this plan of God. The Word links the realities through a kind of continuation of divine movement of incarnation in what has been inaugurated by it, that is Scripture, the church. But this human-divine touch also implies the role of the Spirit: the word is effective in and by faith because of intervention of the “inner master,” the Holy Spirit. This, however, presents this role as still limited to the “interior.”

But, as I have already showed Congar’s Pneumatological Christology and Pneumatology implied more. Nevertheless, Congar’s account of sign has to attend to the critique of Fiddes as to a dualist view of reality. The mediator (in this account) bridges between two worlds. This fails, according to Fiddes, to do justice to the Trinitarian view, since complex (intra-Trinitarian) conversation is reduced to extrapolation of the Logos as “spoken and speaking word.” Even if the Logos means an entrance into divine communion, the relation between creation and
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248 ibid., 10.
251 ibid., 12. Faith attaches, connects “sacramental signs to what they signify, which is the Passion of Christ, the principle of their effectiveness. Faith touches and causes to be touched.” Thus “the form of the sacraments is like a continuation of incarnation.”
the world depends on “a single speech agent.” Congar also would be familiar with this as a challenge of Christomonism, which he addressed. In line with a re-visioning of Congar, Fiddes also proposes to view the world in the “context of the whole Trinitarian event of God as Spirit.” This is a shared intuition. The proposal of Fiddes, however, goes further. He does not want to dispense with the idea of the voice and re-voicing the text of the world as suggested by Augustine. He rather wants to enrich the picture of the relation God-world by invoking the language of spirit, which is not separate from letter. Perhaps this would help affirming the “otherness” and input of developing world? To achieve this, he suggests applying Derrida’s *différance* to God as Spirit.

This reading of Fiddes resonates with Congar’s Pneumatology and allows showing how the “otherness” of creation can be appropriated. Fiddes shows how, in Derrida, the Hegelian return is transformed into journey. This openness to what is to come resists assimilation to ideology. Central is the view of the spirit through the symbol of the fire, meaning “coming, which is always to come.” This signals an openness. Furthermore, the self does not impose its presence, because the self is what gives space for spirit, which always comes as fire. Before looking more closely as to what the language of spirit means, let me show the affinity of the language with the one Congar uses. Spirit also spreads: “catches and gives fire” – it is “moving out of the self towards the other and a receiving from the other.” In Fiddes’s view of spirit, this “auto-affective spontaneity” does not need anything exterior to be enflamed or enflame, passes “ecstatically outside itself; it gives itself Being outside itself ... it displaces.”
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258 Fiddes, Ibid. quote from Derrida. The image of fire allows Derrida to recognize in its indecision “dividing path ... to pass between a Greek or Christian – even onto-theological – determination of *pneuma* or *spiritus*, and a thinking of [Heidegger’s] *Geist* which would be other and more originary.” Derrida, *Of Spirit*, 82.

259 ibid.

260 Fiddes, ibid, a quote from Derrida, *Of Spirit*, 33.
For Congar the Spirit is eschatological Gift, who is to “come,” indeed the “Gift par excellence” within the dynamism of the Trinity. God is also the Third, which means going beyond the static attitude of the Father face to face with the Son. “Divine communion” is open “to what is not divine … love … ‘ecstasy’ directed towards his ‘other’, the creature.” The view of the Holy Spirit as impulse, ecstasy, sets things into motion and links what is most intimate in God to what is most external in unity, which is not imposing.

Furthermore, Fiddes affirms the mutual necessity of spirit and letter, which resonates with Congar’s view of the mutual relation of the Word and the Spirit. This is in line with Congar’s view of tradition as human-divine touch, but brings forth the notions of creativity and non-coercion implied in the account of the spirit. Derrida’s notion of “promise” might be juxtaposed with Congar’s Gift “to come.” But, first it needs be underlined that Derrida’s (and Fiddes’s) view challenges Congar’s view of the function of language (or signs). It begins with a view of human life and reasoning as embedded in language, rather than a metaphysical view of “word” in the communication between God and world. When embedded in language, the inflaming movement of the spirit is as always-coming promise, which cannot be confined. According to Derrida, “language always … comes down to the promise. This would be the promise of spirit.” This approach provides a space for the creativity in the world and which arises from its developments. The potential of the spirit as “promise” is even more clear when Fiddes places it alongside Derrida’s concepts “différance and khora.” All these concepts, and thus the spirit, indicate “otherness,” which “disturbs all attempts to establish either full presence or full absence.” The language of the spirit implies “constantly breaking open boundaries and upsetting rigid ideas as to what is ‘inside’ or ‘outside’ the reality established by language.” How would this affect the view of tradition as human-divine touch in the wider context of the relation God-world?

Like in Congar, this closer look at the Spirit spreads into other theological themes. Fiddes uses it to distinguish between God as spirit and the person of the Holy Spirit. In this “spirit” signifies
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261 Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 3, 144. There are no references to the work of French philosopher Emmanuel Levinas, even if it sounds as if his thoughts maybe at the background.
262 Ibid., Congar quotes from Duquoc, Dieu différent, 121 – 122.
263 Ibid., 149, quote from Walter Kasper, Kirche, Ort des Geistes, (Freiburg: Herder, 1976), 34.
264 Fiddes, ibid., reference to Derrida, Of Spirit, 94. This promise means “a ‘yes’ which lies behind all signs in the world and all signifiers of language … an open-ended desire that cannot be confined within the network of linguistic signs … this is not … a subject, self-presence or voice, but an ‘event,’ a coming of the event … which we must think in order to approach the spiritual.” Fiddes, Ibid. This is in striking resemblance with Congar’s proposal of “way of mediation” and “the way of immediacy,” see Congar, The Word and the Spirit, 52. What is also important is to notice that in this language and spirit are linked in an originary state, bound together at the beginning.
265 Fiddes, Ibid., 124. The “wholly other” through these terms is both inside and outside of language, Fiddes points out that Derrida’s “khora” follows the use of Heidegger and comes from Plato’s ὑμηθα, as “the ‘space’ which is neither being nor non-being, but a kind of ‘interval’ between.” See Jacques Derrida, Khôra, (Paris: Galilée, 1993). See also Plato, Timaeus, (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 2000), lix-lixiv. There it is rendered χώρα.
266 Fiddes, “The Late-modern Reversal,” 124.
267 Ibid.
“the whole dynamic being of God ... indicating dynamic movement.”

This corresponds not to the oppositions spirit/letter but points to the fluidity of embodied life. This “flow” has an aspect of “promise or opening up of relations to a new depth and a new future,” which points to the role of the Holy Spirit in deepening relation of God and humanity. This kind of imagery would not be foreign to Congar. Writing about heaven as symbol of transcendence he objects to substituting the image “on high” with “inside.” He writes: “the reality is something more profound and integral: the ‘on high’ becomes ‘within.’ Heaven, which is God in his transcendence, is wholly immanent, “God all in all’. The first man Adam became a living being; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit.” Congar recognized the eschatological role of the Spirit, but this view of Fiddes allows presenting this role as engaging the world. On the other hand, Congar asserts the eschatological presence of the Spirit in the world in the life of human person, in ecclesial human-divine activity and with the elements of cosmos in the Eucharist.

From Fiddes it is to be asserted that the world and one’s involvement in its struggles, “flows,” as a complex and interwoven process, and world’s participation in God has to incorporate this “flow.” This language of the spirit helps by placing God inside and outside the text of the world and thus views the voice as but one metaphor for “God’s action of self-giving and self-expression in a created world.” This view of Fiddes complies with and is reinforced by Chauvet’s critique of the instrumental approach to language in Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. He criticizes the view “as a purely instrumental intermediary” and not “the meeting place where being and humankind mutually stepped forward toward one another.” This allows combining the fact that one is already embedded and shaped by history and culture, and that this world is already intimately engaged by God. And yet the limits of textual imagery suggested by Derrida and Fiddes become apparent if the Spirit’s role in the creation is to be assessed. The discussion in this section wanted to underscore the dynamic aspect, yet it was still revolving around text. This does not do full justice to Congar’s thinking. In his theology of
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270 Congar, Called to Life, 143.
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273 Chauvet, Symbol and Sacrament, 32, 33. This, according to Chauvet, has not only resented the “necessity of a mediation through language,” but was suspicious “of the very corporality and historicity of humankind.” ibid., 34. The resulting view of human divine relation, governed by the metaphor of principle and cause, presupposed the relation of analogy between God and creature even before the mediation of “language, culture and desire.” This presupposed “ontological priority of thought to language,’ overlooking the fact that every thought is ‘always already language.’” ibid., 40 quotes from Eberhard Jüngel, Dieu mystère du monde, 2: 47.
tradition it was not only word, but also act and touch. In his later work, there is not only word, but also breath. Does not this suggest to supplement textual and structural imagery with an energetic, like a force-field?

It would seem that without focusing on the proper role of the Spirit and the Spirit’s activity in creation, the danger of drifting and centering and reducing everything to textuality is very strong. Furthermore, Congar asserts: “no Christology without pneumatology and no pneumatology without Christology.” Viewed in the context of the relation God-creation, would not this mean that the activity Spirit, viewed with the help of aforementioned imagery provides a space and engenders Christlike activities and expressions in and through the material and textual fabric of creation? Here this section brings together what has been reflected on the Pneumatological Christology and the Spirit in creation. The reciprocity of the Spirit and the Word, then, should extend to the divine activity in the creation, human being and in their mutual interrelations. This suggests how Congar’s reflections on the role of the Spirit, which interweaves human person, the world and divine self-communication may be enriched. While not presenting some rational system, this implies intimate relations between the realities, which Congar thought are essential in addressing the unbelieving world. This also complies with his theological instinct. Thanks to the role of the Spirit, one’s deepening participation in God is at the same time a more engaged participation in the world and allows acknowledging diversity and fullness of creation. Such interaction with the Word and the Spirit brings immediacy with God and engagement in the world to fruition.

This development allows closing the trajectory discerned in earlier chapters, where engagement in the world and participation in God were presented in layers. Thanks to the role of the Spirit the direct and immediate presence – the participation in God – can be achieved through the participation in the ambiguous (and complex) world. The binaries, which characterized Congar’s work, that is natural/supernatural, church/world, transcendence/immanence, are not abolished. They rather necessarily imply and require one another, and are in reciprocal relation. In Congar’s Christology the notion of kenosis already gave a space to the human and historic dimension. This development requires more – the contribution of world has a constitutive part. The view that the world and one’s life are already engaged and porous to divine activity accepts the complexity of the world (kenosis) and the immediacy of relation with God (surpassing and transcendent role of the Spirit in the creation). However, as God’s self-communication looks forward for the completion in the eschatological era, this notion of kenosis implies a possibility to view the whole creation without excluding the tragedy and evil. The distance between eternal and revealed Trinity,
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276 Congar is open to the insight of Walter Kasper that as the salvation history unravels in creation, its Christological and Pneumatological fullness is present “here and now … and fulfilled by the Spirit in our history. This is accomplished by the Spirit because he first filled Christ and found in him total openness to the gift of God.” See also Walter Kasper, Jesus Christ, (London, New York: Burns & Oates; Paulist Press, 1976), 267-268.
espoused by Congar, affirms that divine self-communication is in accordance with the rule of “condescendence,” even the theology of the cross, or by “means of opposites.” Furthermore, the church, consequently, is a sign and structure in the historic world of signs and structures and powers which it engages. Jesus Christ, however, radiates in the world bringing it to divine fullness by his living Spirit, not only in the church. This vision of the living Spirit, the living waters, seems particularly suited to address such complex experiences. The divine activity is transcendent and immanent, connecting the human person, the world, and God’s revelation. The world is interwoven and creatively participates as it is also being healed, by being accepted into the inner relation, permeation of the relation God-world-humanity.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS TO CHAPTER SIX**

In this chapter I finalized Congar’s trajectory with his theology of the Holy Spirit. To show what it has contributed I began with his notion of prophecy. It has helped to demonstrate that there is a re-entry in his theology of the church through the door of community. I have suggested that this is more than an ecclesiological development, but rather a review of human-divine activity through a theology of the Spirit. This has led to the re-assessment of Congar’s Trinitarian account of participation, centred on the image of indwelling. While this image allowed a better expressing of the intimacy of the human-divine interpersonal relation, I have queried whether it sufficiently presents human life as life in the world. This question has led to a look at Congar’s view of mediation, which is closely related to his Christology. I used two ideas from Paul Fiddes: the critique of the notion of mediation and the notion of spirit developed in dialogue with contemporary philosophy. It allowed a better incorporation of the world’s role into the theological account of participation and also demanded re-viewing human-divine activity. The resulting account supplemented Congar’s theology of tradition as action and re-connected God, the human being and the world in a more satisfying way.

---

CONCLUSION

I will briefly recap the development of my argument to draw my final conclusion and point to some areas of possible further development. My thesis has looked at how the emphasis on the role of the Spirit affects the understanding of God’s participation in the world and the world in God in the theology of Yves Congar. I began by showing that the first marks of the theology of the Holy Spirit were already present in Congar’s early work. In his work on the causes of unbelief in society, he turned to the relation between created and uncreated in Thomas Aquinas. This meant maintaining the consistency of the primarily but not exclusively socio-cultural creation (thus its freedom) and the transcendence of God and thus outlined the width of Congar’s theological programme. I also showed that the issue of participation was for him concrete, as I have shown from his work on divided Christendom. It reaffirmed that theology and spirituality went together, but also comprised a theology of the church, thus engagement in the world. This set the stage for the important appearance of the role of the Holy Spirit as relevant for the interconnection of these issues.

The intimate relation between God and the world, however, was presented in two Christological images. First was the image of a kind of incarnation, which continues in the church, whereby faith is incarnated in new human contexts. The second was the image of catholicity, which showed that faith (and God) tends to universality, which is to engage culture. It is in this second aspect, which came from the incarnation, that I saw the Pneumatological potential for the account of participation in God and divine activity in the world. Congar’s view was that the social cause of unbelief was the retreat of faith to privacy and disengagement from culture. Thus, in addressing unbelief, Congar went further than the spiritual experience of intimacy with God to communal and worldly participation – the church. Through the Spirit, it was a dynamic reality incorporating the whole creation into the divine life. This chapter showed that for Congar a theology of incarnation linked the mediation of Christ and the church as in a way continuing. It affirmed the historical and cultural diversity to be incarnated, but potential limits of this approach showed. Seeking to affirm creation’s own role in this ascent to God, the philosophical framework which was used did not allow going far enough and the incipient Pneumatology promised more. Likewise, the implications for the whole creation were not addressed.

This paved the way to discerning the Spirit’s role in human-divine activity, to which I turned in the second chapter. Congar’s notion of synergy, which emerged as Congar addressed a vibrant post-war theological scene, is at the centre. Equipped with a contemplative view of theology, he at the same time sought to reconnect with the movements in society which required a creative approach to tradition. The liturgical, missionary and biblical renewals pressed him to reflect on reform in the church and to reflect on the participation of the created in the uncreated in a new way. This notion of synergy emphasized human historical activity and cooperation with God. Thus, themes of intimate participation in God and
engagement in the world came with an emphasis on the proper role played by the Holy Spirit. This raised some tensions with Congar’s inherited Christology and the issue of mediation mentioned earlier. If the synergy looked at the concrete relation of human and divine in the historical church community, the image of continuing incarnation began from the language of causes. This helped to articulate a distinction of created-uncreated, as the formal cause of the church was divine institution and the material cause human community. But it made the role of the Spirit subservient to that of Jesus Christ. The view of metaphysics behind his Christology was in tension with this notion of synergy, in which divine and human interweaved and led to a closer look at the history of salvation. This chapter established the central role of the historical human-divine activity as the milieu of the Spirit in Congar’s theology. Furthermore, Congar’s contemplated human-divine activity, whereby God effectively touches the world, invoked a kind of Pneumatological Christology. This indicated that the concern for immediacy with God and engagement in the world might be connected. But this required reassessing what contribution the creation brings. The role of the whole creation could have been presumed together with the activity of the Spirit, but it was not yet developed.

This has brought me to the third chapter, which dealt with the trajectory of the early work of Congar by outlining his view of theology of the world. It was significant that this came about in his theology of laity, the fruit of Congar’s reflections on participating in the different movements. This more pronounced role of the world required a more pronounced role of the economy of salvation, thus also the role of the Holy Spirit. The theology of laity comprised the striving after immediate participation in God and one’s engagement in the world in Congar’s concrete approach to participation. It ranged from participation in Christ’s threefold office to engagement (and participation) in secular activities to make society better. Yet this issue boiled down to the view of the relation God-world and what the world has to contribute to God’s kingdom. Congar’s approach to the issue of mediation determined how the integrity of creation and the transcendence of God were maintained and how human-divine activity was presented. However, this raised questions as to the intimate relations between the realities. The intimacy of the relations was crucial in addressing the unbelief of the socio-cultural world, and yet the mediation enforced the distinctions clergy-laity, church-world. The relation of evolution of the creation and the intervention of divine activity (grace) indicates a tension Congar deals with. It seemed that to affirm creative role of humanity in the history, and the role of creation in most comprehensive sense, the language of “orders,” created and uncreated, was not helpful. On the other hand, the emerging Pneumatological approach was open to viewing the world engaged by the two divine missions of the Son and the Spirit. It was better suited to articulate the intimacy between God and the world. The image of the world as “theandric temple” was Pneumatological and went beyond the earlier distinctions and pointed to the intimacy of God-world-humanity and had implication to non-human creation as well. However, due to the lack of a more pronounced personal role of the Spirit, inconsistencies remained, mainly due to Congar’s view of mediation. However, this chapter
established that there are significant grounds to look for the inter-permeation with the developed role of the Spirit.

The fourth chapter follows Congar through the period in the Catholic church in which the established theological balance in the relation church-world begins crumbling. He became convinced that ecclesial renewal was not enough and sought for ways to theologically reflect on the situation of the world. I showed that this is when the theology of the person of the Holy Spirit begins emerging. Congar explicitly embraced the pattern of two divine missions in the relation God-world. The ascent of the creation through the Holy Spirit is clearly set beside the descent of the Son of God into creation, which dominated his earlier work. While this pattern was set in the context of human-divine (ecclesial) activity, the person of the Spirit was behind the communion and communication of divine life to the whole creation. I positioned this emphasis on the Spirit as person within the wider context of Congar’s thinking about “person.” Congar’s reflection on personhood of Christ and human being interrelated the world and human being and their evolution. It underscored freedom and creativity. The theology of the Spirit was emerging as this intimate interrelation of God-world-humanity was being articulated. Moreover, this emphasis on the role of the Spirit affirmed intimacy with God at the same time as freedom and creativity of human person acting in the world. This signaled a revision of Congar’s framework. It began not from metaphysical presuppositions but from life in the world. The issue of participation was viewed as encounter with God in the world and intimacy with God was connected with engagement in the world. This account of inter-permeation came along with the theology of the Spirit and presumed the Spirit’s activity in the whole creation. The latter, however, was not articulated, but possible ways of doing this was proposed building on Congar’s work from this period. Beside viewing metaphysical presuppositions as themselves mediated by the world, they would propose the view how of the Spirit acts in cosmos.

Chapter five takes its cue in the major turning point of Congar’s theological career and looks at his work around the major event of his life – Vatican II. In this chapter I finally show that return to the sources of faith and intimacy of human-divine relation combines with attention to the world. This reversal once again reiterates Congar’s early desire to address unbelief by showing God intimately involved with creation and humanity. But this time the proposed renewal goes further: the unveiling of the living God goes beyond a focus on the church. In its place, there emerges a theology of living tradition, which is human-divine activity. It appropriated the role of the world – such unveiling is communally embodied and lived in the world - and appropriated historical acts into the divine life. This averted an introverted focus on the church. It was not spiritualist but focused on divine work in history. It was not institutional but belonged to the mystery of the economy of divine self-communication. Significantly, this came with a pronounced role of the Spirit as the transcendent subject of tradition. The relation God-world-humanity was at its core. But was the freedom and creativity of humanity and the contribution of creation sufficiently and adequately addressed? Congar’s view of the missions of the Word and the Spirit, while potent, remained
ambiguous and dualistic. While leaning towards a Pneumatological view there was no interpenetration of the Word with Spirit. The view of tradition was more focused on continuity than inbreaking of the creative novelty. This muted the necessarily disruptive role of either prophetic Word or the developments of the world. However, Congar’s view of tradition already implied the necessary intervention of the Spirit and called for Pneumatology. This required reassessing the approach to mediation, where Christology would be merged with Pneumatology and shown to be itself mediated by the world. This suggested that the issues of freedom and development of the whole creation and the theology of the Spirit were related. It looked at historical developments whereby the emerging metaphysical framework accounted for loss of immediacy and eschatological dimension in the relation God-world-humanity. Developments in Christology and ecclesiology supplanted the theology of the Spirit and forgot the theology of the world. Congar implied a Pneumatological vision would reintegrate God-world-humanity.

The sixth chapter comprised the analysis of Congar’s development and signaled a kind of Pneumatological revision of the aforementioned issues. The mediation is not viewed here without the immediacy of the Spirit. The revision of the church as the people of God, a structured community, signaled a re-entry. But it was also important that Congar’s re-visioning went further than the church towards a full-fledged Pneumatology. This was indicated by Congar’s embrace of the issues of prophetic and other movements, like charismatic, ecumenical and the issues of liberation. This has helped to address two concerns. First, was the engagement and participation in the world, the world’s movements and its creative evolution sufficiently addressed? Second, how was this related to the participation in God? Was this intimacy “real?” The overall framework of Congar’s work provided a way to look at how these concerns interrelate and the sixth chapter showed re-entry from the perspective of the Spirit addressed both questions. It began from being situated in the world, that is, from the experience of the Spirit, which was immediate experience of the transcendent God in the world. Thus theology of the Spirit contributed to the engagement in the world as the immediacy in God. Congar’s Trinitarian view contributed the immediacy to the relation God-world as the roles of the three divine persons in returning creation were affirmed. This implied and built on the relation God-world-humanity as a look to the movements in the world showed Congar combined earlier Christological concern in Pneumatological Christology. This suggested two developments. First, it reviewed human-divine activity. It presented the person, the church and the world in interplay, which was made possible and continued the work of Jesus Christ together with his Spirit. But was it genuinely open to and appropriating the creative contribution of the world and its movements, its “autonomy” or otherness? So, secondly, Congar’s review points to the ecstatic role of the eschatological Spirit, which should be extended to the relation Spirit-world. This ecstatic role allows returning and completes the inter-permeation of God-world-humanity present in Congar’s earlier work. However, Congar’s work stops precisely at this point.
So, looking at Congar’s work as a whole, one can see that the emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit affects the understanding of the relation God-world. Congar’s Pneumatological review affirms the creativity of the world and human person in their return to God, thanks to the role of the Spirit. However, he views this human-divine activity primarily within the context of the church. The work of the Spirit in the world, even if implied, is not shown to directly bear upon this human divine activity and needs further attention. Congar does not show how history and culture condition one’s metaphysical framework, though he is open to the idea generally, he does not reflect on the role of the Holy Spirit in creation in its most comprehensive sense. Thus, otherness or creative developments of the world and human person indeed contribute in their freedom and this is thanks to the activity of the Spirit. But this contribution, while it is essential for Congar’s view, is not addressed explicitly, which hampers the tripartite dialogue and interpenetration of God-world-humanity. So, thanks to the activity of the Spirit, human creative and free activity in the world might be at the same time the activity of God. Such development of the theology of the Spirit is in line with his early concern for engagement in the world and participation in God. It might, then, be viewed as addressing and engaging the causes of unbelief of the world in line with Congar’s early intents of the relation God-world. Yet, without a pronounced and affirmed view of the Spirit’s activity in the world, this view is not sufficient to address the contemporary world even on Congar’s own terms.

There are significant steps made towards such engagement by applying Congar’s own theological approach to his Pneumatology. This allows a focus on the potential of what his view of the activity of the Spirit in Christology, anthropology, sacramental theology and ecclesiology contributes to the relation God-world. Thanks to the developed role of the Spirit, human and earthly realities are acknowledged and interwoven more intimately and dynamically with the divine activity. This comes together with a view of grace as not a thing, but as the activity of the Spirit. Yet for this potential to be realized, one has to begin from the historical, contingent and conditioned human situation in the world and embrace it. Congar’s Pneumatology shows the viability of such an approach, and it needs to be embraced and extended. The potential of the view of the Spirit as the Gift would need to be developed in approach to two divine missions and the three books. Would it interweave those elements better by beginning unequivocally from the situation of contingency and prove the viability of such approach in the ongoing mission of the church? Congar’s theology maintains a necessary tension between immanent and transcendent. It engages the world’s unbelief in intertwining the intimate participation in God and direct engagement in the world and works in the whole creation to bring it to the fullness of divine presence. Congar views the Spirit as the Gift, that is “Love and Grace are hypostatized in the Spirit.”¹ This emphasis extends his view of divine self-communication in the conditions of kenosis as for Congar “grace even makes God prefer what is wretched to what is sublime.”² So, even if the work of the Spirit is

² ibid.
hidden, this preference should embrace in its scope the reality of evil and sin in its most intimate, but also widest and most complex dimensions.

CONTOURS OF POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT: IMMEDIACY WITH GOD AND ENGAGEMENT IN THE WORLD

This conclusion opens up a further line of inquiry, which might enrich the relation of the participation in God and engagement in the world. This line might attend more closely to the question left open by Congar’s theology of tradition. In it tradition was a part of the world and its history, but also engendered and nourished faith. But could this kenotic view of the church and tradition also incorporate the other as really contributing anything of value? My account showed the direct relation of the ecclesial awareness to the world and the rise of emphasis on the specific role of the Spirit. Does not this suggest that a direct relation of the specific role of the Spirit in bringing creation to God would even better be affirmed through the world’s otherness? This may be implied from Congar’s work, but the relation has to be made explicit. Congar used kenosis of the Spirit and reference to the Spirit’s eschatological activity to interpret the divine activity in the world. The ecstatic work of the eschatological Spirit in the later work consummated this trajectory, which began with emphases on “catholicity” and “fullness” in his early work. Congar was open to seeing the work of the Spirit behind the novelties in the world, which bring the future in.

This would avoid a reduction of Congar’s Pneumatology. When Congar presented the divine plan as transcendent to human liberations, it claimed a proportion between the two. The divine plan embraced liberations, but there was no identity between them. The role of the Spirit was, consequently, to interiorise. This meant that in the relation with the movements the influence was one-sided and limited the engagement to the church. This was the effect of a dualist view of Christic form and merely interiorising role of the Spirit. On the other hand, Congar also argued that the transcendent or spiritually immediate and immanent or socially engaged aspects come together thanks to the role of the Spirit. This presents an ambiguity which Congar does not resolve. But we are left with some possible solutions. In looking at the movements in the world (for example liberation movements), Congar calls for their openness to transcendence. In the spiritual immediacy with the transcendent God (for example, charismatic) he calls for historical engagement or incarnation. Furthermore, the image of the return of the creation to God suggests the Spirit brings freedom and integrity, which is personal, communal and cosmic. Coming “from within” it was not imposed from without as if by form. This must be a divinising role of the eschatological Spirit in the world. In his eschatological vision, the world is penetrated by the Spirit and transparent to God. The immediacy of divine presence heals relations in creation and restores its integrity. The Spirit brings unity, wholeness, immediacy and communion.
These trajectories have an important common ground, which reiterates both the participation in God and engagement in the world. They show that what comes from Christ and from the Spirit brings creation into divine life. There is a more intricate question behind: how one interrelates the account of participation in God (“theology”) with activity which happens in history (“economy”). The Christological contribution looked at what the church effects in the world’s ascent to God (Congar’s earlier “Christofinalization”) as an instrument and used the image of causality. It presupposed the picture of participation, which was in line with “incarnational” engagement as prophetic, priestly and kingly. The activity of the eschatological role of the Spirit in history built upon this, but theological image is of the divine self-love or reflexive Gift, open to the other. The two activities come together in restoring and fulfilling the life of creation in a way which is integral to creation. Thus, for Congar, eschatology was built on a sapiential view of the relation God-world. This important common ground suggests the divinising role of the Spirit is as important as the Word’s. Furthermore, this role argues that “surpassing” comes from within the world’s own movement, and not as if imposed by the form from without. If the divinising role of the Spirit in creation is not affirmed, the integrity is at stake, and externalism of form prevails.

So, the relation of Congar’s Pneumatological Christology with the specific mission of the Spirit in creation is key. Congar’s theology of the risen Christ already points in this direction. It shows the divine presence is extended to the whole creation thanks to the triumph of the activity of the Spirit in pneumatizing the humanity of the Son of God. Congar’s account of divine presence, following Aquinas, held that the “presences” implied one another, suggesting interrelations between nature and grace. This resonated with the specific role of the Spirit, on the other hand, which showed God as ecstatic in embracing the “otherness” of the creation into the divine life, and creation surpassing itself. The figure of the risen, who was crucified, then, affirmed both the sapiential fulfilment of creation, and was eschatology acting in the history. Thanks to the Spirit, the “natural” was permeated and interwoven with the “supernatural.” What would be the implications of a direct, intimate and reciprocal relation of Pneumatological Christology to the divinising activity of the Spirit in creation?

It would allow us to affirm that there is a human-historical “touch” of God “from below.” This would extend Congar’s trajectory of the sapiential and eschatological to the contemporary context with its changed ecclesial political presence. Congar’s turn from focus on the church could be prophetic. The unveiling of the living God combined a fundamental relation between God and humanity with engagement in the world. This surpassed the introvert focus with an ecstatic move. The engagement in the world and participation in God came together in human-divine activity, which continued in the economy of divine self-giving. This account of human divine activity was built on the vision of the activity of the living God, whereby the Scriptures, the world and the human being come together and interrelate. This appreciated the work of the divine missions in history. The sacramental “touch,” a kind of continuing incarnation, might connect a move “from above” and “from below.” When the kenotic role of Christ and eschatological role of the Spirit are distinguished, and complement one another,
this makes sacraments relevant to other human activities and aspirations. There is in this practice an openness to eschatological in-breaking and an event of surpassing, where human touch and divine touch connect.

**Contours of Possible Development: Socio-cultural Sphere**

The development of such a line of inquiry points to some further areas to be explored. Étienne Fouilloux suggested Congar was the figure who might be a bridge between Vatican II and the developments which followed. Congar referred to this as a long process of reception of the council. But Fouilloux also pointed to Congar’s perplexity at the thought of the younger generation of French Catholic theologians, Michel de Certeau, Georges Morel, Jacques Pohier. This points to the challenges of relating Congar to the contemporary situation. A question of Aidan Nichols is in place: “in an age marked by philosophical, and especially epistemological sophistication in the academy, and by ideological competition in the market place, can Congar’s consciously naïve reliance on the language of the Fathers suffice to ground the Trinitarian vision of a world moving, as the Church, to its eschatological completion?” On the other hand, Congar’s theology is different than Henri de Lubac’s in addressing and incorporating the novelty and prophetic as it arises. Congar’s attention to the human-divine reality of tradition puts him into a place to mediate between tradition and “dislocation,” to use Michel de Certeau as an example. De Certeau’s work is pessimistic over the ability of Christian institutions to respond to developments of modernity. Both thinkers reflect on this action as a human-divine activity with reference to the activity of Jesus Christ and the Spirit in an interplay of the world and God. Bauerschmidt pointed out for Henri de Lubac the rupture between the work of Jesus and his followers put de Certeau in line with Joachim of Fiore.

Congar’s claim that the fresh and new in history and culture that the Spirit displays comes from the fullness once for all given in Christ is conciliatory. Brenna Moore thinks de Lubac
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4 *ibid.*, 84.
5 Aidan Nichols, *Yves Congar*, 189.
6 Congar confided in a 1975 interview: “For each person, it is important to know where he lives. Me, I live in the church … I see others, laypeople, young friars who frankly live in today’s culture. They sympathize with the questioning of scholastic culture by the sciences, sociology, psychology, and the quest for a more just society.” Puyo and Yves Marie-Joseph Congar. *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar*, 221-222 as quoted in Fouilloux “Friar Yves Cardinal Congar,” 86. Michel de Certeau looked at the challenge of the question “where are you speaking from?” from the perspective of the question: “on what authority are you speaking?” Michel de Certeau, “The weakness of believing: From the body to writing, a Christian transit” in Graham Ward, *The Certeau Reader* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2000), 216.
and ressourcement looked at the texts of the past in order to interiorize and live them. But to de Certeau the texts exhibited a “form of experience I could not deny was ‘Christian,’ yet could not recognize as my own.” This suggests a view on “otherness” as a reluctance to domesticate the past and inability of secular modernity to inhabit the past world. Thus, it calls for creative praxis, or re-enactment. Congar’s juxtaposition of Joachim of Fiore and the Pneumatology of Thomas Aquinas, and his Pneumatological Christology indicates a theological rationale to incorporate these contemporary ways of thought. But a more complex look at history and the world than Congar’s would be necessary, perhaps a dialogue with social sciences. The socio-cultural world and history already play a role in Congar’s work. De Certeau shares a beginning point with Congar – de Lubac’s ternary view of the true body of Christ. For de Certeau, both the sacrament and the church are joined with the historical body of Jesus in a contemporary performance, which is liturgy. But de Certeau shows the importance of the cultural shifts in the conceptions of “time and presence,” due to which the ternary became binary. Graham Ward notes that “this new metaphysics and linguistics announced ‘a lack of trust in discourse and the God affirming assurance that the spoken word cannot be lacking.’” This undermines a former view of the creation, where the world was spoken by God into being, made by the Word and sustained by the Spirit, and which opened a “sacramental space in which the world and all its activities could be understood and read.” Congar’s Pneumatology builds from these reflections, so a vision of creation, penetrated by the activity of two divine missions, might ensue.

This kind of development would confirm together with Cavanaugh that the mystical Body embodies “in history the true social body of Christ.” A political reading of the Eucharist, where the kingdom of God interrupts historical time, ensues and points to the political implications of the liberating role of the Spirit. This would be in line with Congar’s project, where the developments in theology of sacrament are reinforced by developments in the anthropology, ecclesiology and theology of the world. Furthermore, this will also provide a space to incorporate a theology of the Spirit’s activity in creation. On the other hand, the scope of such work would be unrealistic. But Congar’s work provides a pattern, which may

---

12 Moore, “How to Awaken the Dead,” 175, 177.
14 ibid., 84.
16 Ward, Ibid.
18 Cavanaugh, Ibid., 220
sum up his theological instinct: one’s life in the world and one’s participation in God are linked. The pattern of this interrelation and interaction is the theology of two divine missions. Thanks to the interweaving presence of the Spirit, the depth and immediacy of one’s relation with God is intimately interwoven with penetrating deeper into the mystery of the world and into one’s own being. It allows these “books” to interpret each other.

This suggests a Pneumatology, which begins from ambiguity and promise, characterizing one’s life in the world and presenting a framework of openness and incorporation. It accepts the world as complex, dynamic and creative but shows it already engaged and sustained by the activity of the living God. This activity is in the world, viewed as text, and shines through it without negating its freedom. It also creatively-prophetically pushes it forward. The world is being drawn into the two divine missions as a dialectic between evolutionary and eschatological. This Pneumatology revolves around unveiled (and discerned) presence of the risen Jesus Christ in the world. The risen Jesus Christ and his Spirit are transcendent as they draw the world into the divine life without negating its creativity. The world’s life is engaged. It is faced with radiating human-divine presence, which shows a distinct pattern of embodied and political life. The world is challenged to be open to transcendent other. Yet this openness to otherness is not only the openness to the transcendent God, but also to the other in the world, a challenge to the church. On the other hand, this transcendence comes with a need for unity of all in God which is inscribed immanently, in the ontology of things. This approach would build on the relation between the sapiential and eschatological in Congar’s view of tradition. But this would show tradition as ongoing and incorporating human-divine activity, which is also a mission. Tradition witnesses and engages, but is reciprocally engaged and re-created in the tripartite dialogue of God-world-humanity. The two divine missions draw the world into closer intimacy with God; this does not negate worldly and created realities, but they are brought into closer intimacy between themselves.

CONTOURS OF POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT: DIVINE PATTERNS OF INTIMACY, DELIGHT AND ACTION

If one considers the participation of God in creation and creation in God several important strands of Congar’s work need to be drawn together and call for further development. This need is even more pressing if one maintains his concern in experiencing intimacy with God while also acting in and with the whole creation. Some of Congar’s interlocutors, it was noted, had a more comprehensive view of creation than Congar has used. But their ideas, as it was shown, were seldom a constitutive part in his turn towards theology of the Spirit. This points to a potential. First, this would suggest that the socio-cultural and political aspects of the world (which interested Congar) have to be supplemented. The space has to be allocated for evolution of cosmos and with an eye to the transformation of the whole creation. Second,

---

the direct relation between the world taken in its whole complexity and the theology of the Spirit, which is presupposed, maybe be outlined. The better account of intimacy between the world in its complexity and God, could be brought forth. The image of the radiant body of Jesus Christ, used only marginally by Congar, would have implications for the whole body of creation. What has been reflected about the role of the Spirit in creation so far could show a way forward. I mean the view of the Spirit as a field of force sustaining all creative reality, the kenosis of the person of the Spirit and the hyper-personal view of point Omega. This Pneumatological approach would further affirm the created realities acting in their own dynamism and help penetrating and healing their sometimes painful inter-relations. The theology of the Spirit would consequently comprise the diversity of the actions of the Spirit in complexity of the world.

The activity together, bringing the activity of the creation and activity of God, requires an extension of the notion of participation. Pneumatological imagery, especially, the image of powerfield, which embraces the whole created reality in its own dynamism, has a potential for such development. With its help, the Spirit might be viewed as making creation transparent and glowing, bringing intimacy, joy and unity. Thanks to this image there is a potential openness to the Spirit in everything. This image also may affect how Congar’s Christology maybe developed. It is not sufficient to supplement the images of voice, text and structure with the images of breath, action and energy. Rather, they have to be presented in necessarily reciprocal relations and mutuality which would avert the dominance or primacy of the textual and structural. The relation of “economy” and “theology,” used by Congar, would enable drawing out necessary implications of one to the other in mutual oscillation to the practice. This reciprocity would affect the notion of participation, in both what Congar terms “descent” and “ascent.” This applies to the role of the Holy Spirit aced in creation before and in the divine “descent,” and the Christic shape of the “ascent” of creation. But Congar’s approach inspires to develop of how this extends into contemporary life.

Such extension might use and develop the sapiential approach which he employed. The view of the world as existing in the power-field of the Spirit would mean that the text (!) of the three books (creation, soul and Scriptures) is the milieu of the activity of the Spirit. Thus, socio-cultural and also non-human world, all that shapes and makes human being, is shown to be transparent to the divine activity and, consequently, maybe be drawn into the divine presence. The view that Holy Spirit sustains and acts in the creation and wants to unite all things under the authority of Christ, does not surpass, but completes the focus on incarnation. But such an approach would also challenge the verticality of Congar’s imagery. It is not enough to see how humanity and all created reality are drawn into God and become transparent to the Spirit and how Christ radiates through them. One is oriented to the primacy and importance of horizontal and “temporal” relations between realities involved as where cosmic-divine drama unfolds. This might be visible in Congar’s own work, where the vertical pattern of “descent” and “ascent” is seen in a temporal view of tradition, which brings together the creation, human person and God. The horizontal and temporal envelops the
vertical imagery. What are the possible implications of this inter-permeation of realities and a view of their immediacy in reflecting on how the engagement in the world and the intimate experience of the activity of God are related?

Firstly, it gives a way of how to further reflect on Christian engagement. The Christian practice, as a way of living striving from incarnation, can be assessed simultaneously as deification and as political engagement. This expands how the sacramental “touch” or practice is viewed. Thanks to the developed role of the Spirit, the creation would have to be also viewed as a mystery, or sacramental, and taking part in deification. This is because it enables communion with God by not merely revealing God, but also by being constitutive to the “touch” itself. If creation is part of the mystery, this suggests a human-divine-cosmic interaction, in which human and worldly is penetrated and drawn into a synergy with divine patterns of intimacy, delight and action. These divine patterns, the two missions of the Son and the Spirit, draw together the historical, thanks to the role of Jesus Christ in history, but also the eschatological, as the Spirit works towards divine fullness. This view is embodied and embedded in the body of the creation, but also open to be permeated and fulfilled by the Spirit. This kind of development of sacramental language is further required by Congar’s language of the three books. If, as I have shown, the human person is a sacrament for him, the Scriptures are sacramental and the church is sacrament of salvation of the world, then what about the third book? Since the creation is knit into the interrelation and is constitutive to encounter with God, it has to be sacramental. Once the activity of the Spirit in creation is affirmed, the case for such sacramental role is strong.

Such development, secondly, would re-situate the theology of tradition. The view of the Spirit acting in creation, focuses one’s eyes to the unfolding divine, human and cosmic drama. Congar approached the tradition and liturgy as action. In the context of creation, tradition might be seen as signifying or even tangibly engendering this cosmic drama. But the drama cannot be limited to tradition. This would limit the activity of two divine missions and the role of three books. Theology of tradition was built on the image of three books and the two divine missions, now these images need to be kept intact and their interaction fulfilled. This suggests the vision of tradition has to be supplemented with a view of cosmos as sacrament and its activity as part of the dramatic and even tragic action. This points to the importance of human activity, passion and efforts, and also the developments and movements of the creation in its most comprehensive sense. The tradition, consequently, signifies and sharpens, incorporates and engages the creation, but also has to be viewed as porous and open-ended. What kind of development does this affirmation of the mystery of human actions, of movements and creation more generally, require? The imagery of three books and two divine missions suggests contours of possible development. The liturgy has to embrace the whole world in a kind of liturgy of the world. This liturgy-action, then, encompasses three realities – God, cosmos and humanity in a slightly different way. The realities interweave thanks to the interweaving of two divine missions. Thereby the participation of God in creation and creation in God mutually interplay in the life of the world in a synergetic dialectic of cosmic effort and
the divine Gift. This drama involves and is open-ended to all the creation and its developments. It does not lose its practical and embodied aspect, visible when human being appropriates Christ and is appropriated in Christ. But the goal of this drama is the divine indwelling and permeation of the whole creation.

Thirdly, such development points to a necessary and fulfilling link between human activity and developments in the world, and the history of salvation, which needs to be further developed. In light of suggested Pneumatological revisioning, any human activity in the world has a potential to be sacramental – to participate in God and touch the world in the healing way. This is thanks to the activity of the Spirit, who is free and unrestricted, and can bring immediacy with God in and through any situation. The Spirit also desires the freedom of creation and fullness of its life in every concrete detail – the Gift fulfilling the activities of the world in their freedom and playfulness. So, there is the possibility of synergy and intimacy of encounter with God in and through every activity in the world. Such liberation of creation and makes its processes transparent to divine activity. It is here that the tradition is necessary as a model of how human and worldly developments are tested and develop through interplay with divine missions. In tradition the different socio-cultural movements and developments come into contact with divine signs and are tested through the communal life. In it material elements of creation and its processes are drawn into the divine drama and into the healing touch. It shows words embraced by life, the intellectual processes inseparable from the social-cultural life they shape and are shaped by. This helps to approach the Spirit’s activity and human activities (or socio-cultural movements and processes in creation) as not some kind of inscrutinable transcendent other. There are ambiguities, misuse, wrong “fire,” cunning creativity. The Spirit’s activity is to be seen as working out in the struggles and events of life. The continuing Pneumatological “touch” of Jesus Christ and the Scriptures is necessary for prophetic sharpness and priestly health.

The instinct behind Congar’s theological approach needs to be maintained. His vision of cosmos, humanity and God, and two missions penetrating them and helping them interweave needs to be developed. It allows going deeper into relationship with God which is a way of fullness for the created realities, while looking forward to new developments of history and the better knowledge of creation. It is practically engaged and allows to address the world and its history tangibly, while immersed and shaped by it. This is a healing touch, which leads towards the world becoming a temple of God, a burning bush.
Appendix - Timeline of Congar’s life and main works

1890 - 1914 Modernist crisis

1904
April 13, 1904 born in Sedan, France
April 13, 1904 born in Sedan, France
1919 - 1921 Seminary studies in Reims
1921 - 1924 studies in Catholic University of Paris
1925 joined Dominican Order
July 25, 1930 ordained a priest

1925
1931 - 1971 Professor of theology in Saulchoir,
1932 begins teaching introductory course in theology (later turned into article “Théologie”) and ecclesiology, which at the time was included in inter-confessional apologetics program, developing the latter to the status of fundamental theology.
1932 Sabbatical semester in Paris, contact with young intellectuals of Russian emigration who revolved around Nicolas Berdiaev. Contact with problems posed by Modernist crisis.
1934 organized a meeting with Karl Barth, after being introduced to his thought.

1934
1940 - 1945 captivity during WWII

1940
1946 - 1957 crisis of the nouvelle théologie
1947 - 1956 Congar’s writing subject to censorship

1947
1890 - 1914 Modernist crisis

1950
1952
1953
1955
1956
1958
1959
1960 and 1963 volumes 1 and 2 of Tradition and Traditions

1960
1965

1965
1970
1971
1974
1975
1977
1979-1980
1982
1983
1984

1970 L’Eglise de saint Augustin à l’époque moderne
1970 “Pneumatologie ou christomonisme dans la tradition latine?.”
1971 “Pneumatologie et théologie de l’histoire.”
1974 “Le Saint Esprit dans la théologie thomiste de l’agir morale.”
1982 Diversities and communion. (Diversity and Communion)
1984 La Parole et le souffle. (The Word and the Spirit)

1977
1979
1982
1983
1984

1994
November 26, 1994 appointed to the College of Cardinals by Pope John Paul II.

1995
June 22, 1995, dies in Paris
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SAMENVATTING


Zijn toewijding aan de theologische taak van de kerk in turbulente tijden vormt de continuïteit tussen de twee perioden en nodigt uit tot het analyseren van zijn ontwikkeling, de rijping van zijn werk en de breuklijnen daarin. Het proefschrift is gebaseerd op de waarneming dat de onderwerpen waarmee hij in vroegere jaren bezig was, zijn aandacht bleven houden en dat dit uiteindelijk uitmondde in een theologie van de Heilige Geest. Deze ontwikkeling werd tot nu toe niet onderzocht. De studie biedt een manier om het werk van Congar als geheel te waarderen in het licht van zijn vroege interessen. Daarmee wordt opnieuw duidelijk dat zijn visie op de theologie, die de levende God, de wereld en de mensheid verbindt tegenover de ongelovige wereld, ook nu nog relevant is.

Zo’n analyse stuitte echter op een aantal uitdagingen. De rol van de Heilige Geest in de relatie van God - wereld, vooral als de ‘wereld’ wordt gezien als buiten de kerk, is niet vanzelfsprekend in het werk van Congar. Hij is vooral bekend als iemand die zich specifiek bewoog op het terrein van de ecclesiologie. Maar waarom heeft hij dan uiteindelijk een pneumatologie geschreven en geen ecclesiologie? Bovendien was de theoloog Congar niet in de eerste plaats bekend als systematicus, maar eerder als theoloog van de traditie die theologische thema’s zocht te vernieuwen door ze historisch te benaderen. Om deze uitdagingen het hoofd te bieden moest het werk van Congar nauwkeurig gelezen worden, met als uitgangspunt het voornaamste voorwerp van zijn theologische aandacht. Dat was de behoefte om de waargenomen kloof tussen de spiritualiteit en de theologie aan de orde te stellen, en dit alles vanwege het verlangen de ongelovige cultuur te betrekken op de kerkelijke praktijken. Zodoende kwam de impliciete relatie tussen de theologie van de Geest en de realiteit van de wereld centraal te staan in zijn denken als theoloog van de traditie. De analyse van de veranderende kerkelijke situatie en een blik op theologische problemen in hun historische ontwikkeling en in het licht van de menselijke subjectiviteit veronderstellen alle de realiteit van de wereld. De focus op de vernieuwing in de kerk veronderstelt bijna als
vanzelf aandacht voor de rol van de Geest, en dit in het bijzonder bij een theoloog die zich hartstochtelijk betrokken wist op het leven van de kerk in de wereld.

Dit vereiste een nauwkeurige historisch-theologische lezing van Congars werk. Historisch lezen was belangrijk omdat volgens Congar theologie in de geschiedenis gelokaliseerd moet worden. Echter, om de rol van de Heilige Geest in de relatie God-wereld naar voren te brengen was dit niet voldoende, maar wees het wel de richting. In de benadering van Congar zijn de omgeving, dat is het kerkelijk leven, de methode, dat is de theologie van de traditie en theologische thema's zoals incarnatie en de Heilige Geest met elkaar vervlochten. Dat inzicht helpt om aan te tonen dat, wanneer Congar hedendaagse kwesties aan de orde stelde door terug te keren naar de theologische bronnen, dit ook een terugkeer was naar de Bron van het geloof. Op die manier speelden fundamentele theologische thema's zoals christologie en pneumatologie al een bepalende rol in zijn vroege werk. Dat, en Congars benadering van theologie als wijsheid, maakte het mogelijk een samenhangend beeld te vormen waarin God, wereld en mensheid verbonden zijn. Deze theologische visie, die God, wereld en mensheid verbindt door middel van de theologie van twee zendingen (Zoon en Geest), maakte het mogelijk waar te nemen hoe theologie van de Geest zich naast die van de Zoon ontwikkelde. De groeiende waardering voor de rol van de Heilige Geest maakte het mogelijk de tripartite samenspraak God-wereld-mensheid beter te begrijpen, daar ruimte aan te bieden en wereld en mensheid te verweven

Om de spanningen tussen ontwikkeling en continuïteit te ontdekken in de poging van Congar om de ongelovige wereld te betrekken bij een visie op de intieme relatie tussen God en wereld, spelen enkele concepten een cruciale rol. In zijn beeld van participatie wordt de goddelijke activiteit bemiddeld door de Incarnatie en de gevolgen daarvan; de rechtstreekse relatie en de verheffing van de schepping tot God wordt geassocieerd met de rol van de Geest. Toch benadert Congar de twee goddelijke zendingen van Zoon en Geest allereerst in en vanuit de concrete kerkelijke menselijk-goddelijke activiteit. Dit nodigde uit tot het onderzoeken van het metafysisch kader dat Congar gebruikt, in het licht van zijn verlangen naar een meer rechtstreekse en onmiddellijke betrokkenheid van God op de wereld en van de wereld op God. Door aan te sluiten bij dit verlangen om de ongelovige wereld aan te spreken, wordt het mogelijk om Congar met gebruiking van zijn eigen opvattingen te beoordelen en te bedenken hoe zijn Geest zich uitspreidt over de wereld.

Het proefschrift is opgebouwd uit zes hoofdstukken. Het eerste hoofdstuk begint met Congars ongerustheid dat het geloof uit de cultuur verdwenen is en dat de theologie gescheiden van spiritualiteit bestaat. Het onderzoekt hoe hij deze situatie aan de orde stelt door een beroep te doen op de begrippen menswording en katholiciteit. Zo wordt Congars visie op participatie
van God en wereld gerelateerd aan Thomas van Aquino. Terwijl daarmee de continuïteit van het kerkelijk onderwijs in het oog wordt gehouden, geeft die visie ook de mogelijkheid in dat onderwijs ontwikkeling en menselijke subjectiviteit een plaats te geven. Dit laatste heeft een duidelijke pneumatologische onderbouwing: het is de realiteit van de Geest in de kerk, een lijn van denken die Congar vond bij Johann Adam Möhler.

Het tweede hoofdstuk volgt Congar in de kerkelijke vernieuwing van de naoorlogse jaren en focust op het thema verandering en de menselijk-goddelijke synergie. Het beschrijft hoe Congar de dynamische visie op de concrete werkelijkheid van de kerk probeert te benaderen, daarbij de structuur van Aquino opnieuw overdenkend. De christologische nadruk op voortdurende menswording wordt gecombineerd met aandacht voor de concrete werkelijkheid van de kerk en een duidelijke nadruk op een eigen rol van de Heilige Geest. Daarin ontwaren we al een hint naar de pneumatische christologie.

Het derde hoofdstuk rondt de aandacht voor zijn vroege werk af met een blik op zijn lekentheologie. De realiteit van de wereld krijgt de haar passende aandacht in de relatie God-wereld naast een realiteit van de kerk. Zo ligt de bal voor een aandeel in Gods werk duidelijk bij de wereld. Congars poging tot herwaardering van de ontwikkeling van de wereld en van de eschatologie door middel van de twee goddelijke zendingen wordt geschetst. De pneumatologische kracht van Congars beeld van de wereld als een tempel waarin God en mens samenwerken – en de grenzen daarvan – wordt aan de orde gesteld en geanalyseerd.

Het vierde hoofdstuk signaleert een belangrijke verandering in Congars denken. Het onderwerp wereld groeit uit tot zelfstandig thema met een duidelijke eigen bijdrage van die wereld, en Congar beweegt naar de theologie van een levende God om de ongelovige wereld te betrekken. Beschreven wordt hoe in deze ontwikkelingen de theologie van twee goddelijke zendingen naar voren komt en hoe Congar zich in het gesprek met Orthodoxe theologen gaat richten op theologie van de Heilige Geest. In de relatie God-wereld groeit de wereld uit tot domein van het werk van de Geest.

Het vijfde hoofdstuk volgt uit het vierde omdat Congars focus verschuift van kerk naar traditie. Congars pneumatische begrip van traditie wordt gepresenteerd als een goddelijk plan van zelfcommunicatie (zelfopenbaring) met daarin drie vervlochten ‘boeken’: de Schriften en de boeken van de wereld en de menselijke ziel. Maar wordt de integriteit en vrijheid van het boek van de wereld volledig gehandhaafd en is het volledig verweven?
Congars visie op de kerk als het sacrament van verlossing voor de wereld en de reikwijdte van Congars pneumatologische herwaardering zien er in dit opzicht veelbelovend uit.

In het zesde hoofdstuk worden de implicaties van deze pneumatologische heroriëntatie geanalyseerd. Opgemerkt wordt dat Congar met de ontwikkelde theologie van de Geest heel de kerkelijke situatie opnieuw belicht. Op die manier wordt wat eerder aan de Incarnatie werd toegeschreven nu doordrenkt van de Geest, waarmee hij een pneumatologische Christologie presenteerde met een focus op de menselijk-goddelijke interactie. Sterker nog, er wordt aangetoond dat met de gegroeide rol van de Geest in de trinitarische theologie, de rol van de mensheid en de wereld beter geïntegreerd is en verweven met de goddelijke activiteit. En toch zijn ook de grenzen duidelijk vanwege Congars gebruik van een metafysisch kader, en wordt aangetoond hoe die verdere nabijheid en directheid zouden kunnen uitsluiten.

Dit heeft geleid tot de conclusie dat dankzij de activiteit van de Geest, menselijke en vrije actie in de wereld tegelijkertijd zouden kunnen worden gezien als actie van God. Maar zonder een uitgesproken en gegronde visie op het werk van de Geest, aanwezig in de wereld als zodanig, is deze theologie ontuigend. En toch, de richting die Congar wijst om meer vertrouwelijkheid en integriteit te bereiken, en God en de wereld opnieuw en meer intiem met elkaar te verbinden en zich aan elkaar toe te wijden tegenover de ongelovige wereld, verdient navolging. Het is noodzakelijk om hem op zijn eigen merites te beoordelen en na te gaan hoe zijn visie kan worden uitgebreid tot in de huidige tijd. Een dynamisch beeld van God en wereld, waar de theologie van de Geest een centrale plaats inneemt, heeft niet alleen effect op wat van Christus afkomstig is, maar biedt ruimte om het bestaan van onze wereld in God te bevestigen.
SUMMARY

This thesis analyses the development of the theology of the Holy Spirit in the work of 20th century French Catholic theologian Yves Congar focusing on the relation God-world. Yves Congar’s life-work, both in his early and later years, has left a significant mark in the discussions he participated in. This thesis brings his early and later work together. His early work addressed the rifts between Christian spirituality, theology and practice; theological view of divisions in Christianity, reform, laity and tradition were its highlights. His life-work concluded with the theology of the Holy Spirit. His engaged life of theological service to the church in turbulent times brings a continuity between the two periods and invites to analyze the development, maturation of his work, and rifts in it. The thesis builds on the initial observation that his early concerns remained throughout and were given adequate space and achieved maturity with the theology of the Holy Spirit. Such development has not been hereto researched by Congar’s scholars and presents a way to appreciate Congar’s work as a whole in the light of his early concerns. This it reiterates his vision of the theology, which binds together living God-world-humanity vis-à-vis the unbelieving world which is still relevant now.

Such analysis, however, had to overcome several challenges. The role of the Holy Spirit in the relation God-world, especially if the “world” is viewed as extra-ecclesial, is not obvious in Congar’s work. He is most known as an ecclesiologist. But why did he eventually produce a Pneumatology and not an ecclesiology? Furthermore, as a theologian Congar was not primarily known as a system-builder, rather a theologian of tradition, who sought to renew theological themes by looking at them historically. To address these challenges a close reading of Congar’s work was provided, settings his predominant theological concern as a starting point. This was the need to address the perceived rift between the spirituality and the theology, with a desire to engage an unbelieving culture with a focus on the ecclesial practices. In this way the implicit relation of theology of the Spirit and the reality of the world was situated precisely in his being a theologian of tradition. The analysis of the changing ecclesial situation, a look at theological problems in their historical development and in the light of human subjectivity, all presuppose the reality of the world. Then, a focus on renewal in the church presumes the role of the Spirit when invoked by a theologian who was on-the-go engaged in the life of the church in the world.

This required an attentive historical-theological reading of Congar’s work. Historical reading was important, as the history was where theology for Congar was located. Yet to bring forth the role of the Holy Spirit in the relation God-world this was not sufficient, but it showed the way. In Congar’s approach, the milieu, that is the ecclesial life, the method, that is the theology of tradition, and theological themes, like incarnation and the Holy Spirit interweaved. This has helped to show that when Congar addressed contemporary issues by theologically returning to the sources, this was also a return to the Source of faith. In this way, fundamental theological themes, like Christology and Pneumatology played an organizing
role already in his early work. This, and Congar’s approach to theology as wisdom, allowed to discern an abiding picture, connecting God-world-humanity. This theological vision, binding God-world-humanity by means of the theology of two divine missions, allowed discerning how theology of the Spirit developed alongside that of the Son. The growing appreciation of the role of the Holy Spirit allowed to better understand, give space and interweave the world and humanity in the tripartite dialogue God-world-humanity.

To discern the tensions between development and continuity in Congar’s attempt to engage the unbelieving world by a vision of intimate relation God-world, certain concepts play a crucial role. In his view of participation, the divine activity is mediated through Incarnation and its effects, the immediacy and ascent of creation to God was associated with the role of the Spirit. And yet Congar primarily views the two divine missions of the Son and of the Spirit in and through concrete ecclesial human-divine activity. This invited to assess the metaphysical framework Congar uses in the light of his desire for a more direct and immediate participation of God in the world and the world in God. Identifying with this desire to address the unbelieving world, this sets a way to evaluate Congar on his own terms and imagine how to extend his spirit to contemporary scene.

Thesis develops in six chapters. The first chapter begins from Congar’s anxiety that faith is disincarnate in the culture, and that theology is separate from spirituality. It looks at how he addresses the situation by invoking concepts of Incarnation and Catholicity. This situates the view of participation of God in the world by Thomas Aquinas, which Congar uses. While it guards the continuity of the ecclesial teaching, it also allows to incorporate a development and human subjectivity. The latter has a clear Pneumatological rationale, looking at the reality of the Spirit in the church, and is inspired by Johann Adam Möhler.

The second chapter follows Congar into the different movements of ecclesial renewal of after-war years and focuses on the issue of reform and human-divine synergy. It looks at how Congar seeks to address the dynamic view of the concrete reality of the church, while reiterating the structure of Aquinas. The Christological emphasis on continuing Incarnation is juxtaposed with attention to concrete reality of the church and a clear emphasis on the proper role of the Holy Spirit. A hint towards Pneumatological Christology ensues.

The third chapter concludes his early programme with the look at his theology of laity. The reality of the world gets its proper treatment in the relation God-world beside a reality of the church. This sets the issue of the participation clearly in the world. Congar’s attempt of rapprochement between the evolution of the world and eschatology by means of two divine missions is presented. The Pneumatological potential of Congar’s view of the world as a theandric temple and its limits are presented and analyzed.

The fourth chapter signals a major revisioning. The issue of the world emerges as a theme in its own right with a distinct contribution of the world, and Congar turns to the theology of a living God to engage the unbelieving world. It is noted how in these developments the
Theology of two divine missions comes to light and how in conversation with Orthodox theologians Congar begins focusing of theology of the Holy Spirit. In the relation God-world, the world emerges as the domain of the Spirit’s work.

The fifth chapter follows from the fourth as Congar’s focus moves from the church to tradition. Congar’s pneumatic notion of tradition is presented in the divine plan of self-communication, as interweaving the three books, the Scriptures, the books of the world and human soul. But is the integrity and freedom of the book of the world fully maintained and is it fully interwoven? Congar’s view of the church as the sacrament of salvation of the world and the scope of Congar’s Pneumatological re-assessment look promising in this respect.

In the sixth chapter the implications of this Pneumatological revisioning are analyzed. It is noted that Congar re-enters the ecclesial situation with the developed theology of the Spirit. Thus, what was earlier attributed to Incarnation is permeated by the Spirit, presenting Pneumatological Christology with a focus on human-divine interaction. Furthermore, it is shown that with the developed role of the Spirit in the Trinitarian theology, the role of humanity and the world is better integrated and interwoven with the divine activity. And yet the limits due to Congar’s use of metaphysical framework are also identified, and it is shown how they might preclude further intimacy and directness.

This has led to a conclusion, that thanks to the activity of the Spirit, human and free activity in the world might be viewed at the same time as the activity of God. But without a pronounced and affirmed view of the Spirit’s activity in the world as such, while present, this theology is insufficient. However, Congar’s lead to achieve greater intimacy and integrity, and more intimately reconnect God and the world vis-à-vis the unbelieving world and to engage it, has to be followed. It is necessary to assess him on his own terms and ask how that could be further extended into contemporary times. For this some dominating metaphysical assumptions have to be addressed by explicitly beginning one’s theological reflection from contingent and worldly historical situation. This dynamic picture, to which the theology of the Spirit is better attuned, not only permeates what derives from Christ, but gives a way to affirm the incorporation of the world into God. This would allow to further extend the engagement while going deeper to the sources, addressing socio-cultural world and focusing on how to draw creation more immediately into the divine life.