

Council Vatican II: Bibliographical overview 2007-2010

1. *The Background of the Debate in the Last Few Years*

In the debate about Vatican II the year 2005 marked a watershed, and was possibly as relevant as 1985, the year of the extraordinary Synod on the reception of the council.¹ A few facts have made the pontificate of Benedict XVI important for the development of the debate.² Months after the election of John Paul II's successor, Benedict XVI's speech of December 22, 2005 conveyed a clear message about the much-anticipated shift in the doctrinal policy about Vatican II of the former Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith: that speech celebrated the passage of Joseph Ratzinger's take on Vatican II from the level of an individual theologian, if not a powerful cardinal, to the level of the Roman pontiff's official interpretation of the council.³

¹ See previously M. Faggioli, *Concilio Vaticano II: bollettino bibliografico (2000-2002)*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 24 (2003)/2, 335-360; *Concilio Vaticano II: bollettino bibliografico (2002-2005)*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 26 (2005)/3, 743-767; *Council Vatican II: Bibliographical Overview 2005-2007*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 29 (2008)/2, 567-610. I thank my former colleagues at the Fondazione Giovanni XXIII in Bologna, and especially Dr. Enrico Galavotti and Dr. Federico Ruozzi for the valuable help they have given me with the bibliography.

² See also J. Wicks, *More Light on Vatican Council II*, in *The Catholic Historical Review* 93 (2008)/1, 75-101; J. Wicks, *Further Light on Vatican Council II*, in *The Catholic Historical Review* 95 (July 2009)/3, 546-569; G. Routhier, M. Quisinsky, *Recherches et publications récentes autour de Vatican II*, dans *Laval théologique et philosophique* 64 (2008), 783-824.

³ On the assessment of Vatican II given by Joseph Ratzinger as a theologian in the late 1960s and as Pope Benedict XVI since 2005, see L. Boeve, "La vraie récep-

But the ever-lasting political and institutional constraints of the “office of Peter” have clearly shown Benedict XVI the difficulty of turning back from the language and orientation of Vatican II, and the attempt to make of Vatican II a mausoleum.⁴ Not for the first time in history, the unintended consequences of a major historical event had an effect outside the boundaries of the institution as well, thus creating an external framework for the interpretation of Vatican II that is not less visible and tangible than the hermeneutical balance struck by the Church as a whole – popes, bishops, clergy, monks, theologians, families, lay men and women, pastoral ministers, missionaries. The debate about Vatican II undoubtedly feels outside pressure from that world to which Vatican II sent its message for the entire duration of Vatican II, from the *Message to the World* of October 20, 1962, to the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes* of December 7, 1965. The “incident” of January 2009 concerning Benedict XVI’s decision to lift the excommunication of the Lefebvrian bishops of the “Priestly Fraternity of St. Pius X” revealed how profoundly the culture of Vatican II has penetrated the modern world, and that the modern world is now begging the Church to be faithful to those teachings *ad extra*.⁵

The complexity of the debate has also to do with the fact that the history of the post-Vatican II Church intertwines with the growth in knowledge and awareness of Catholic theology about Vatican II. It is a remarkable fact that during the first decades of the debate about Vatican II the historical and theological research on the council has acquired information and developed approaches to the “thing” – Council Vatican II – that were only imaginable in the 1970s or 1980s. Scholars of very different theological affiliations now know

tion de Vatican II n’a pas encore commencé”. J. Ratzinger, Révélation et autorité de Vatican II, in Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 85 (2009)/4, 305-339. About the speech of December 2005 see F. Nault, Comment parler des textes conciliaires sans les avoir lus?, dans L’autorité et les autorités. L’herméneutique théologique de Vatican II, dir. Gilles Routhier et Guy Jobin, Paris 2010, 229-246.

⁴ See E. Galavotti, *Le beatificazioni di Benedetto XVI e il mausoleo del Vaticano II*, in *Il Margine* 30 (2002)/2, 22-33.

⁵ See M. Faggioli, *Il Vaticano II come “costituzione” e la “recezione politica” del concilio*, in *Rassegna di Teologia* 50 (2009) 107-122; Id., *Die kulturelle und politische Relevanz des II. Vatikanischen Konzils als konstitutiver Faktor der Interpretation*, in P. Hünermann (Hrsg.), *Exkommunikation oder Kommunikation? Der Weg der Kirche nach dem II. Vatikanum und die Pius-Brüder*, Freiburg i.B. 2009, 153-174; Id., *En torno al conflicto con los lefebvrianos. El Vaticano II y su recepción política*, en *Iglesia Viva* 238 (Junio 2009) 111-123; Id., *La réception politique de Vatican II*, dans *Spiritus* 196 (Septembre 2009) 263-269.

much more about Vatican II, both in its day-by-day unfolding and in its overall and epoch-making dimension: as an event of Church history, of the history of theology, of the history of ideas, and of political and social history. The Catholic Church now knows a significant amount of information about Vatican II, from different cultural approaches and geographical points of view. The amount of information about the change that happened at Vatican II is probably more than Catholic theology expected, and maybe more than the Church as an institution was ready to handle. But the communion of the Church is much better equipped to handle the rediscovery of its past than the intellectuals on the payroll of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, who when faced with the permanent, ideological manipulation of recent history were mocked with this popular Soviet-era joke: “We know exactly what the future will be. Our problem is with the past: that keeps changing”.

The past has not been changed by the lively historical and theological debate about Vatican II – a comforting sign of the vitality of the Church in a world where the so-called “militant atheism” takes pride in seeing faith and debate as opposite terms. The historicization of Vatican II starting in the late 1980s has clearly introduced a hermeneutical shift in the theology of Vatican II. Therefore it is not surprising that the abundance of information about Vatican II has not solved the issue of the need for a sole interpretation of the council documents. We may have the impression sometimes that knowing more about Vatican II has complicated the issue of its interpretation, but choosing to know less about the council is not a viable option.

Nevertheless, in the last few years the debate about the interpretation of the council has proved not less lively than before and has focused on the hermeneutical issue.

2. Recent Contributions

The period 2007-2010 saw a great number of studies published on Vatican II: especially reflections on the historiography of the council and the hermeneutics of Vatican II. The temperature of the polemics within the ecclesial communion about Vatican II is clearly reflected in the world of Catholic theology.

2.1. The Dichotomy “Continuity/Discontinuity”

The result of the first five years of Benedict XVI’s pontificate has seen a new wave of studies on Vatican II, but also a scaling back of the scope of many studies attempting to save the heritage and the reception of the council from the attacks of the willing supporters of an hermeneutic of a strict continuity.⁶ In particular, the narrow reception of Benedict XVI’s speech of December 2005 is evident, as well as the violent impact on the ecclesial debate of the sharp distinction between “continuity” and “discontinuity”⁷ – a distinction that, differently from the idea of “reform”⁸ – is foreign to a correct historical-theological understanding of Church history and of the history of the ecumenical councils.⁹

It is clear that there was an effort to consolidate the acquisitions of the historiographical work done between the mid-1980s and the late 1990s and to protect those results from the attempts to “revisit” in a way that is not respectful of a scholarly historical approach. The mainstream Catholic theology and historiography have long accepted the criteria for the hermeneutic of Vatican II proposed by Giuseppe Alberigo almost twenty years ago,¹⁰ but Benedict XVI’s contribution in

⁶ See J. Sweeney, *How Should We Remember Vatican II?*, in *New Blackfriars* 90 (1026) 251-260.

⁷ See N. Ormerod, *Vatican II – Continuity or Discontinuity? Toward an Ontology of Meaning*, in *Theological Studies* 71 (2010) 609-636; K. Schelkens, *Pte XII, précurseur du Concile Vatican II?*, dans *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 1 (66/2010) 177-182.

⁸ See C. Bellitto, *Councils and Reform. Challenging Misconceptions*, in *The Church, the Councils, & Reform: The Legacy of the Fifteenth Century*, eds. by G. Christianson, T.M. Izbicki, C.M. Bellitto, Washington DC 2008, 291-312; J. Rahner, *Öffnung nach außen – Reform nach innen: zur ökumenischen Hermeneutik des Konzils*, in *Una Sancta* 65 (2010) 137-154.

⁹ See F.X. Bischof, *Steinbruch Konzil? Zu Kontinuität und Diskontinuität kirchlicher Lehrentscheidungen*, in *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 59 (2008) 194-210; S. Mokry, “*Les conciles oecuméniques ne sont pas nécessaires à l’Église*”. *Erstes Vatikanum – einziges Vatikanum?*, in *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 58 (2007)/1, 58-68.

¹⁰ See now the collection of essays, G. Alberigo, *Transizione epocale. Studi sul concilio Vaticano II*, Bologna 2009, 895. For the impact of the 5-volume *History of Vatican II*, see Mathijs Lamberigts, *Alberigo and/on the History of Vatican II*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 29 (2008) 875-902; N. Lash, *Theology for Pilgrims*, Notre Dame, Ind., 2008; K. Maier, *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil (1962-1965) und dessen Bedeutung in der Geschichtsschreibung*, in *Weltoffen aus Treue. Studententag zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, Sankt Ottilien 2009, 21-38; G. Miccoli, *Una “transizione*

terms of “hermeneutics of reform vs. hermeneutics of rupture” have prompted the response of scholars, especially in Europe and North America. The authors of *Chi ha paura del Vaticano II?* (“Who’s Afraid of Vatican II?”) have recapitulated the main issues of the debate and in some cases nuanced their positions in a fruitful dialogue between different approaches to the texts of Vatican II.¹¹ In a more straightforward way (also because of the effects of the ongoing “talks” between the Roman Curia and the Lefebvrians and the major breakthrough of January 2009 with the lifting of the excommunications for the four bishops of the Society of Saint Pius X),¹² other authors have called for a defense of Vatican II and its effectiveness in contemporary Catholicism against revisionisms and reductionisms of any sort.¹³

epocale”. *Gli studi sul concilio Vaticano II di Giuseppe Alberigo*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 30 (2009)/3, 855-868; J.W. O’Malley, *Una “transizione epocale”*. *The Studies on the Second Vatican Council of Giuseppe Alberigo*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 30 (2009)/3, 869-874.

¹¹ *Chi ha paura del Vaticano II?*, a cura di A. Melloni, G. Ruggieri, Roma 2009, 151 (French translation: *Qui a peur de Vatican II*, Bruxelles 2010); G. Ruggieri, *Ricezione e interpretazioni del Vaticano II. Le ragioni di un dibattito*, 17-44; C. Theobald, *Nodi ermeneutici dei dibattiti sulla storia del Vaticano II*, 45-68; J.A. Komonchak, *Benedetto XVI e l’interpretazione del Vaticano II*, 69-84; P. Hünermann, *Il “testo”. Un complemento all’ermeneutica del Vaticano II*, 85-105; A. Melloni, *Breve guida ai giudizi sul Vaticano II*, 107-145. (For the essays by Hünermann, Komonchak, and Theobald in their original languages: P. Hünermann, *Der Text: Eine Ergänzung zur Hermeneutik des II. Vatikanischen Konzils*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 28 [2007] 339-358; Joseph A. Komonchak, *Benedict XVI and the Interpretation of Vatican II*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 28 [2007] 323-337; C. Theobald, *Enjeux herméneutique des débats sur l’histoire du concile Vatican II*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 28 [2007] 359-380).

¹² See M. Neri, *Fragile e inclusivo. La revoca della scomunica al lefebvriani è possibile solo nello spirito del Concilio*, in *Il Regno attualità* (2009)/6, 147-151; A. Schifferle, *Kirche als Weggemeinschaft - Identität durch Kontinuität: Eine Einladung zur Versöhnung in Verbindung mit Tradition und Konzil, in Weltoffen aus Treue. Studientag zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, Sankt Ottilien 2009, 209-249.

¹³ See A. Battlogg, *Ist das Zweite Vatikanum Verhandlungsmasse?*, in *Stimmen der Zeit* 10 (Oktober 2009) 649-650; W. Beinert, *Nur pastoral oder dogmatisch verpflichtend? Zur Verbindlichkeit des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils*, in *Stimmen der Zeit* (Januar 2010)/1, 3-15; W. Beinert, *Raccogliere il tempo. Il senso della storia e la terza epoca della chiesa*, in *Il Regno attualità* (2010)/4, 76-82; W. Beinert, *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil: Hintergründe - Gründe - Grundlage*, in *Una Sancta* 65 (2010) 57-71; N. Lash, *The Struggle for the Council: I. What Happened at Vatican II?*, in *Japan Mission Journal* 62 (2008)/3, 154-160; N. Lash, *The Struggle for the Council II: In the Spirit of Vatican II?*, in *Japan Mission Journal* 62 (2008)/4, 247-272.

Far from producing a new “conciliarism”,¹⁴ the debate has moved in uncharted territory, urging a clear response to those who claim that Vatican II is a “failed council”,¹⁵ and calling for a rediscovery of the term created by John XXIII of the council as a “new Pentecost” in order to argue not only for a pneumatological horizon of Vatican II, but also for its “fullness” and “completeness”.¹⁶ While the idea of Vatican II as a legitimate “authority” in the history of the Church is in danger, the idea of a “reception” of Vatican II is also in danger, in a way that could reset and diminish the role of the council in the Catholic tradition, and ultimately redefine the balance of authorities in postconciliar Catholic theology – at the expenses of Vatican II.¹⁷

A complete history of the reception of Vatican II in Catholic theology must still be written, but Christoph Theobald’s work represents a major achievement in the reconstruction of the irreversible impact

¹⁴ See H. Müller, *Konzilien des 15. Jahrhunderts und Zweites Vatikanisches Konzil. Historiker und Theologen als Wissenschaftler und Zeitgenossen*, in *Theologische Revue* 103 (2007) 1-18; H.-W. Reißner, *Konziliarismus redivivus?*, in *Theologie und Glaube* 98 (2008) 91-93.

¹⁵ See L. Oviedo, *Should We Say That the Second Vatican Council Has Failed?*, in *The Heythrop Journal* 49 (2008) 716-730. For the attempt to reflect on the ecclesiology of Vatican II as an “ecclesiology of communion” and “ecclesiology of friendship”, see J.D. Dadosky, *Towards a Fundamental Theological Re-Interpretation of Vatican II*, in *Heythrop Journal* 49 (2008) 742-763.

¹⁶ See T. Hughson, *Interpreting Vatican II: A New Pentecost*, in *Theological Studies* 69 (2008) 3-37.

¹⁷ About this, see G. Routhier, G. Jobin (éd.), *L'autorité et les autorités: L'herméneutique théologique de Vatican II*, Paris 2010, 248; G. Routhier, G. Jobin, *Introduction. L'interprétation et l'autorité* (7-9); L. Boeve, “La vraie réception de Vatican II n’a pas encore commencé”. J. Ratzinger, *Révélation et autorité de Vatican II* (13-50); K. Schelkens, *La réception de “Dei Verbum” entre théologie et histoire* (51-68); C.E. Clifford, *L'herméneutique d'un principe herméneutique* (69-91); J. Famerée, *La collegialité au synode extraordinaire de 1969. Un premier conflit d'interprétations de Vatican II* (95-123); P. De Mey, *La relecture de la pensée conciliaire sur la collegialité et la communion des Églises entre 1972 et 1983* (125-149); L. Villemin, *L'autorité des conférences épiscopales en matière de liturgie. Interprétations initiales et réinterprétations récentes* (151-165); G. Routhier, *Un “mandatum docendi” dénié. Comment on interprète un silence* (167-187); G. Jobin, *Quand “Gaudium et spes” fait (l’) autorité* (191-208); C. Fino, *L'autorité des pratiques chrétiennes de la charité en contexte de pluralisme. L'impulsion de Vatican II et le travail à poursuivre* (209-225); F. Nault, *Comment parler des textes conciliaires sans les avoir lus?* (229-246). By Routhier see also *Le concile Vatican II livré aux interprétations de générations successives*, dans *Science et Esprit* 61 (2009)/2-3, 237-255; G. Routhier, *Vatican II: Un concile à interpréter*, dans *Les Études* 406 (mai 2007)/5, 627-637.

of the council on the theological tradition of the Catholic Church in these last decades.¹⁸

2.2. The “Culture Wars” and The Debate on Vatican II

Richard John Neuhaus’s statement about Vatican II in 1987, “The contest over the interpretations of Vatican II constitutes a critical battlefield in our society’s continuing cultural wars”,¹⁹ must also be read in reverse: the substantial and undeniable ability of the Catholic Church to remain together in the Western hemisphere and in the rest of the world – despite the wars (cultural and otherwise) – owes much to Vatican II and its interpretations. Behind the very identity of the Church and its relationship with the modern world there is a specific (if sometimes unconscious or indirect) interpretation of Vatican II.²⁰

Some attempts to see Vatican II as a failed council are neither unconscious nor indirect, nor is the prevalent historical interpretation of Vatican II a distortion of the “true council” in perfect continuity with the past. These attempts come, significantly enough, from Europe and the United States. Throughout its history, until the 20th century, Christian theology had been mostly European with a North-Atlantic extension. Vatican II gave theology new birthplaces: not only Latin America, but also Africa and Asia. Thanks to the theology of Vatican II on the local Church and on non-Christian religions, the theology of “adaptation” and “inculturation” took the place of the traditional “theology of the *salus animarum*” (of the salvation of the souls) and of the purely missionary “theology of the *plantatio ecclesiae*” (the expansion of the Church and its structures). A key-passage in the history of the reception of Vatican II is the translation of a Catholic theology marked by its Greek, European, and Western cultural roots into a global culture.

The attempt to translate pope Benedict’s speech of December 2005 in the American context of a Catholic Church particularly polarized on the issue of Vatican II came from *Vatican II: Renewal*

¹⁸ See C. Theobald, «Dans les traces...» de la constitution «*Dei Verbum*» du concile Vatican II. *Bible, théologie et pratiques de lecture*, Paris 2009, 208, and especially *La Réception du Concile Vatican II, I: Accéder à la source*, Paris 2009, 944.

¹⁹ R.J. Neuhaus, *The Councils Called Vatican II*, in R.J. Neuhaus, *The Catholic Moment: The Paradox of the Church in the Postmodern World*, San Francisco 1987, 61.

²⁰ See also J.P. Chinnici, *An Historian’s Creed and the Emergence of Postconciliar Culture Wars*, in *The Catholic Historical Review* 94 (2008) 219-244.

within Tradition.²¹ The editors claim to be interpreting the Vatican II documents in “continuity”, as “renewal within tradition” of the Catholic Church, while they accuse the most-respected international historiography about Vatican II of producing a “distorting impact of the hermeneutics of discontinuity and rupture”. In brief, “the volume seeks to make a modest contribution to what Pope Benedict XVI calls a hermeneutics of reform in continuity with the two millennial traditions of Catholic thought and wisdom”.²² But the twenty-two articles of the volume in fact present a much more diverse set of interpretations of the documents of Vatican II. The commentaries on the Constitutions stress more than those on the Decrees and Declarations the continuity between the 19th and early 20th-century magisterial tradition and the texts of Vatican II. The late Cardinal Avery Dulles, for example, correctly describes as “false” a list of views

²¹ See *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition*, eds. by M.L. Lamb, M. Levering, New York 2008: Pope Benedict XVI, *A Proper Hermeneutic for the Second Vatican Council* (IX-XV); Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Levering, *Introduction* (3-22); Avery Dulles SJ, *Nature, Mission and Structure of the Church* (25-36); Benoît-Dominique de la Soujeule OP, *The Universal Call to Holiness* (37-53); Francis Martin, *Revelation and Its Transmission* (55-75); Denis Farkasfalvy O. Cist., *Inspiration and Interpretation* (77-100); Pamela E.J. Jackson, *Theology of the Liturgy* (101-128); Romanus Cessario OP, *The Sacraments of the Church* (129-146); J. Brian Benestad, *Doctrinal Perspectives on the Church in the Modern World* (147-164); Matthew Levering, *Doctrinal Perspectives on the Church in the Modern World* (165-183); Brian Ferme, *The Decree on the Bishops’ Pastoral Office in the Church, Christus Dominus* (187-204); Guy Mansini OSB and Lawrence J. Welch, *The Decree on Ministry and Life of Priests, Optatum Totius* (205-227); Anthony A. Akinwale OP, *The Decree on Priestly Formation, Optatum Totius* (229-250); M. Prudence Allen R.S.M. and M. Judith O’Brien R.S.M., *The Decree on the Appropriate Renewal of Religious Life, Perfectae Caritatis* (251-270); Robert W. Oliver BH, *The Decree on the Apostolate of Laity, Apostolicam Actuositatem* (271-286); Card. Francis George OMI, *The Decree on the Church’s Missionary Activity, Ad Gentes* (287-310); Charles Morerod OP, *The Decree on Ecumenism, Unitatis Redintegratio* (311-341); Khaled Anatolios, *The Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches, Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (343-349); Richard John Neuhaus, *The Decree on the Instruments of Social Communications, Inter Mirifica* (351-356); F. Russell Hittinger, *The Declaration on Religious Freedom, Dignitatis Humanae*, (359-382); Don J. Briel, *The Declaration on Christian Education, Gravissimum Educationis* (383-396); Arthur Kennedy, *The Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, Nostra Aetate* (397-409); Geoffrey Wainwright, *Anamnesis, Epiclesis, Prolepsis: Categories for Reading the Second Vatican Council as “Renewal within Tradition”* (411-437); Matthew L. Lamb, *The Challenges of Reform and Renewal within Catholic Tradition* (439-442).

²² M.L. Lamb, M. Levering, *Introduction*, in *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition*..., 7.

which he incorrectly attributes to some of the most appreciated interpretations of the Council's impact on ecclesiology (quoting John O'Malley, Gregory Baum, Richard P. McBrien, George Lindbeck, "together with many others who might be named").²³ Pamela E. Jackson, in her article about *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, stresses the continuity with the magisterium, lining up Augustine, the Council of Trent, Leo XIII, Pius X, the liturgical movement, Pius XI and Pius XII. Romanus Cessario in his essay about the liturgical constitution and the sacraments dismisses the achievement of the liturgical movement noting that it was moved by a "preferential option for the primitive".²⁴ But the landscape offered by other commentaries looks less polemical, more sound, and open to "renewal" as "development", such as, for example, the articles by Cardinal Francis George on *Ad gentes*, Guy Mansini and Lawrence J. Welch on *Presbyterorum ordinis*, M. Prudence Allen and M. Judith O'Brien on *Perfectae caritatis*, Khaled Anatolios on *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. Even the closing article by the Methodist Geoffrey Wainwright on criteria for an interpretation of Vatican II emphasizes renewal more than tradition. The volume provides an interesting contribution, but not fully in the direction of a hermeneutics of "reform in continuity" as declared by its editors. It is difficult to initiate a new interpretation of Vatican II while leaving unaddressed the main issues raised by the best contemporary, international and scholarly study of the Council, and it does not help when one draws inspiration from self-appointed *defensores concilii* who have not published anything scholarly about Vatican II. It is no surprise that some critics shows a woefully inadequate connection with the huge number of studies published every year on five continents (editions of new sources, historical studies, commentaries, books and articles based on work in the recently opened, huge collection of unpublished papers on Vatican II in the Vatican Secret Archives).

If the book edited by Lamb and Levering stays away from a Lefebvrian interpretation of the texts of Vatican II and blames only the interpreters of the council – thus following a tradition inaugurated a few years ago by Msgr. Agostino Marchetto with his collection of book reviews published in Italian in 2005²⁵ – a few other publications

²³ A. Dulles, *Nature, Mission and Structure of the Church*, in *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition...*, 25.

²⁴ R. Cessario, *The Sacraments of the Church*, in *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition...*, 133.

²⁵ See A. Marchetto, *El Concilio ecuménico Vaticano II. Contrapunto para su histo-*

seeking a *revanche* against the historians of Vatican II and propagating a view of Vatican II in its texts as clearly discontinuous from the tradition have gone far beyond the usual boundaries of the debate “texts vs. spirit of Vatican II”. Among these publications there are Roberto de Mattei and Brunero Gherardini, both based in the Roman milieu.²⁶ De Mattei especially, a reknowned apologist of ultra-traditionalist Catholicism and a biographer of the Brazilian revanchist Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, sees in Vatican II the triumph of modernism and the result of the infiltration of Communism and free masonry in Catholic theology at work at Vatican II. De Mattei’s hermeneutical effort provides interesting results in terms of archival discoveries from the ultra-traditionalist Lefebvrians, but it is most interesting (and disconcerting) in the attempt to present itself as the historiographical translation of the call of Benedict XVI for a renewed interpretation of Vatican II. In de Mattei’s work the rejection is not only of the “spirit” of Vatican II, but also of the very texts of the council, thus retrieving the conspiracy-driven Lefebvrian interpretation of Vatican II, and proving essentially useless for developing an hermeneutical approach to Vatican II.

3. *Hermeneutics of the Council and Reception of the “History of Vatican II”*

In the last decade, between the end of the historiographical work on the 5-volume *History of Vatican II* edited by Giuseppe Alberigo and the 50th anniversary of the opening of the council, research on Vatican II has produced significant work towards a better under-

ria, Valencia 2008; English translation: *The Second Vatican Ecumenical Council. A Counterpoint for the History of the Council*, transl. K.D. Whitehead (University of Scranton Press, 2010, 721). A shortened version in Russian: Агостино Маркетто. *II Ватиканский собор. Контрапункт к истории*. перевод с итальянского Олег Воскобойников, Москва, Духовная библиотека, 2009, 160 с. (A. Marchetto, *II Vatikanskij sobor. Kontrapunkt k istorii*, trans. Oleg Voskoboinikov, Moscow: Douhovnaja Biblioteka, 2009, 160).

²⁶ R. de Mattei, *Il Concilio Vaticano II. Una storia mai raccontata*, Torino 2010, 625; B. Gherardini, *Il Vaticano II sotto giudizio: “La grande guerra del Concilio”*, in *Divinitas* 51 (2008) 320-328; B. Gherardini, *Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II. Un discorso da fare*. Preface by Msgr. Albert Malcolm Ranjith (Secretary of the Vatican Congregation for Divine Worship), Frigento (AV) 2009, 264. See also G. Richi Alberti, *A propósito de la -hermenéutica de la continuidad-*. *Nota sobre la propuesta de B. Gherardini*, en *Scripta Theologica* 42 (2010) 63-81.

standing of what happened at Vatican II and how to receive it in the Church. After decades of studies on the council, its history and theology, and following the discovery of enormous archives of sources all over the world, the fact that nobody doubts any longer that “something happened” at Vatican II is not so obvious: the “narratives” may diverge, but the importance of the council for the actual state of contemporary Catholicism has become a bipartisan assumption. A series of different volumes and articles has stressed in the last few years the importance of the memory of Vatican II for the future of the Church and the unfinished work in the reception of the council.²⁷

Regarding the development of a set of hermeneutical principles, Ormond Rush has provided a significant contribution: he proposes two series of triads fundamental for the appreciation of the “history of the effects” of Vatican II. The first triad is taken from philosophical hermeneutics, and is formed by 1) understanding, 2) interpretation, and 3) application. The second triad concerns communicative events: 1) the original speaker or writer or author, 2) what is spoken or written or communicated, 3) the audience. Thus, Rush proposes a “reception hermeneutics”:

... the original event and the original authors, the documents themselves, and the people who after the event and the documents’ promulgation attempt to understand, interpret, and apply them from the context of diverse cultures and contexts down through history after the event: 1) a hermeneutics of the author, 2) a hermeneutics of the text, and 3) a hermeneutics of the receiver.²⁸

The role of the receiver in the process of the theological reception of Vatican II has been recently highlighted by Gilles Routhier, who connects the individuation of the “groups-subjects of the reception of the council” with the assumption of Vatican II as an “initial moment”

²⁷ See *Herausforderung Aggiornamento: zur Rezeption Vatikanischer Konzils*, ed. by A. Autiero, Altenberge 2000; *Unfinished Journey: The Church 40 Years After Vatican II, Essays for John Wilkins*, ed. by Austin Ivereigh, New York, NY 2003; *Zweites Vatikanum - vergessene Anstöße, gegenwärtige Fortschreibungen*, hrsg. von G. Wasilowsky, Freiburg i.B. 2004; *Zweites Vatikanisches Konzil - Ende oder Anfang?* hrsg. von A.E. Hierold, Münster 2004; *Vatican II: A Forgotten Future?*, in *Concilium* (2005)/4, eds. by A. Melloni, C. Theobald; *Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?*, ed. by D.G. Schultenover, New York-London 2007; *Chi ha paura del Vaticano II?*, a cura di A. Melloni, G. Ruggieri, Roma 2009.

²⁸ O. Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II. Some Hermeneutical Principles*, New York, NY-Mahwah, NJ 2004, XI.

for the reforms of the governance of the Catholic Church in the age of Vatican II. The author and director of a series of studies on the local reception of the council, Routhier stressed the concept of Vatican II as a “reform council” and the importance of a new phase of “regional and continental conciliarity” for the reception of the council. Routhier has stressed the nature of Vatican II as a council opening a transition towards a new era, and the need for the post-Vatican II Church to develop a practical ecclesiology which takes into account the collegial and synodal dimension expressed in the documents of Vatican II: “We probably do not need today a Council Vatican III, but we need to allow every level of the Catholic Church and the cultures they inhabit to give new life to the synodal life and to give new ways of expression to the conciliarity of the Church”.²⁹

In the last few years new contributions have enriched the debate. Ladislav Orsy, professor of canon law at Georgetown University, developed a similar approach to the interpretation of Vatican II, stressing the connection between the need for an institutional translation of the *communio* in the Church and for the reception of Vatican II as “a seminal council [...] a new course for the Church, a course that now causes turbulences but over the centuries will become an even flow”.³⁰ For Orsy the institutional and canonical translation of the new course of Vatican II must impact the role of the episcopal conferences, of the laity, and of canon law in the life of the Church, on the basis of the need to reform “the external structures and norms to express, to promote, and to sustain the internal bond of *communio*”.³¹

Looking at Vatican II as a reform council, the dogmatic theologian of Tübingen Peter Hünemann had underlined the feature of the *corpus* of conciliar texts as a “Constitution” for the Catholic Church:

If one looks for an analogy along the lines of a first approach to the outline of the text of council Vatican II, with the goal of characterizing the decisions of the council, what results is a certain similarity with constitutional texts as drawn up by representative constitutional assemblies. This similarity is expressed in a particular way in the texts of council Vatican II and appears in a form that is highly indirect and condensed as compared to the Council of Trent or the council Vatican I.³²

²⁹ G. Routhier, *Vatican II. Herméneutique et réception*, Montréal 2006, 211 and 421.

³⁰ L. Orsy, *Receiving the Council. Theological and Canonical Insights and Debates*, Collegeville, MN 2009, 4.

³¹ L. Orsy, *Receiving the Council...*, 5.

³² P. Hünemann, *Der Text: Werden – Gestalt – Bedeutung. Eine Hermeneutische Reflexion*, in *Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*,

Stressing the differences in the typology of Vatican II as a council with reference to the council of Trent and Vatican I, Hünemann employed a comparison with the *Rule* of St. Benedict to outline a correct understanding of the final documents of Vatican II. The identification of Vatican II as a “constitution” surely does not mean for Hünemann placing the council texts above the Gospel: “The legitimation of a council and its authority is essentially different from that of a constitutional assembly of a modern state ... [F]or this reason the conciliar text possesses an authority essentially different from that of a constitutional text”.³³ Hünemann precisely stated – in the carefully worded conclusion to his essay – a proposal to consider the texts of Vatican II as a “constitutional text for the faith”:

The corpus of texts of this council recalls a similarity with the texts of a constitution. At the same time, there are profound differences between the two beginning with the authority and specificity of the material of council texts. For this reason the text of council Vatican II can be prudently defined as a “constitutional text of faith”. If this preliminary idea of the text of council Vatican II is valid, then what follows is a whole series of problems and questions, criticisms, and also ways of interpreting Vatican II formulated without support, since they do not conform to the literary genre of the text.³⁴

In contrast, Christoph Theobald, professor of theology at the Centre Sèvres in Paris, has proposed a different approach centered on the specific hermeneutical value of the four constitutions of Vatican II, and especially of *Dei Verbum*, in a major two-volume work on the reception of Vatican II.³⁵ Theobald opens the first volume by saying that, despite the historiographical work done on Vatican II, the clash of the interpretations has at stake “the actual identity of the council,” and that at the beginning of the twenty-first century the simple act of referring to Vatican II is already an act of reception. The hypothesis is that the constitution *Dei Verbum* must be rediscovered, after having been set aside by post-conciliar theology, and newly appreciated together with the element of the signs of the times in *Gau-*

hrsg. von H.J. Hilberath, P. Hünemann, 5 vols., Freiburg i.B. 2004-2005, vol. 5, 5-101, especially 11-17 and 85-87, quotation on 12.

³³ P. Hünemann, *Der Text: Werden – Gestalt – Bedeutung...*, 15-16.

³⁴ P. Hünemann, *Der Text: Werden – Gestalt – Bedeutung...*, 17.

³⁵ C. Theobald, *La réception du concile Vatican II, I. Accéder à la source*, Paris 2009; Id. «Dans les traces...» de la constitution «*Dei Verbum*» du concile Vatican II. *Bible, théologie et pratiques de lecture*, Paris 2009.

dium et spes and with the idea of a relationship between council and history in the declaration on religious freedom *Dignitatis humanae*. The two-volume structure explains Theobald's reading of Vatican II through a two-fold, horizontal-vertical dimension of the council. The first volume (vertical axis) focuses on *Dei Verbum*, *Gaudium et spes*, and *Dignitatis humanae*, and the second volume (horizontal axis) on *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, *Lumen gentium*, and *Ad gentes*: "the vertical or theological axis of the revelation and its reception by faith, and the horizontal or 'social' axis of the communication between Church and the components of human societies".³⁶ Theobald acknowledges the "unfinished" character of the work of Vatican II and defines the contribution of Vatican II in an hermeneutic of *recadrage* ("reframing") – thus rejecting the idea of a "simple reference to organic development" for the understanding of Vatican II.³⁷

In this sense a set of hermeneutical principles proposed in the early 1990s by Giuseppe Alberigo has become, for the mainstream scholarship about Vatican II, a common rule for the interpretation of the documents of Vatican II.³⁸ Thanks to the fruits of this historiographical school, very few – save those who dream of a restorationist design on the Catholic Church – question the need to also use the category of "event" to fully understand the historical and theological significance of Vatican II.

The 5-volume *History of Vatican II* has become not only the standard for a complex and international history of an ecumenical council, but also for many of the symbols of the division around the narratives about Vatican II. Similar to the early seventeenth-century clash between Paolo Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent* and the apologetic history of Trent by Cardinal Pallavicino,³⁹ the *History of Vatican II* of the Bologna school has become the real target of the neo-conservative polemics on Vatican II in the effort to build an alternative

³⁶ *Ibid.* ..., 891.

³⁷ *Ibid.* ..., 893 and 896. On the hermeneutical balance between the four constitutions of Vatican II in the interpretation of the council, see *Le concile et la théologie. Perspectives pour le XXI^e siècle*, éd. par Bordeyne, L. Villemin, Paris 2006.

³⁸ See G. Alberigo, *Criteri ermeneutici per una storia del Vaticano II*, and *Fedeltà e creatività nella ricezione del Concilio Vaticano II. Criteri ermeneutici*, in G. Alberigo, *Transizione epocale: Studi sul Concilio Vaticano II*, Bologna 2009, 29-45 and 47-69.

³⁹ For an historiographical-ecclesiological appreciation of the *History of Vatican II* edited by G. Alberigo, see *Vatican II sous le regard des historiens*, ed. by C. Theobald, Paris 2006.

narrative about Vatican II, without the brilliancy and consistency of Pallavicino. In this regard John O'Malley's *What Happened at Vatican II* received and developed the insights of the Bologna school and opened the debate on one major issue – so far underdeveloped – concerning the language of Vatican II.⁴⁰ O'Malley tackled the conspicuous absence of serious studies on two major players, Paul VI and the so-called conciliar minority, in the historiography of Vatican II, and identified “the issues-under-the-issues”: the possibility of change in the Catholic Church, the relationship between center and periphery, and Vatican II as a language-event. According to O'Malley, the council deserves and needs to be read in its intertextual character and spirit. His judgment of the outcome of the debates on all of the issues-under-the-issues is sharper than the others that preceded him:

On the final outcome of the council the minority left more than a set of fingerprints, which means that it left its mark on the three issues-under-the-issues. On the center-periphery issue the minority never really lost control. It was in that regard so successful that with the aid of Paul VI the center not only held firm and steady but, as the decades subsequent to the council have irrefutably demonstrated, emerged even stronger.⁴¹

4. *The Inter-Textual Dynamic of the Council Documents*

4.1. “Letter” and “Spirit” of Vatican II

Most historians and theologians of the council have reached a mainstream consensus affirming that Vatican II is both a corpus of documents and an event, and that Vatican II should be known and understood in its letter and in its spirit. But the recent emphasis that polemics have given to the relationship between *letter* and *spirit* of Vatican II implies the need for research on Vatican II to take a step forward, from the history of Vatican II to a history of the post-Vatican II theology, that is, of the reception of Vatican II in post-conciliar theology. Reckoning with Vatican II and trying to understand the actual

⁴⁰ About O'Malley's book, see R.M. Curnow, *John O'Malley on Vatican II and Bernard Lonergan's realms of meaning*, in *The Irish Theological Quarterly* 75 (2010) 188-203.

⁴¹ See J.W. O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II*, Cambridge, MA 2008, 311 (Italian translation: *Cosa è successo al Vaticano II?*, Milan 2010). By J.W. O'Malley see also *Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?*, in *Theological Studies* 67 (2006) 3-33.

dynamics of the interactions between the texts of Vatican II assumes the ability to take the step from 1) purely commenting on the final texts of Vatican II (the first wave of research between the late 1960s and the early 1980s) to 2) the history of the composing of the texts of Vatican II (between the 1980s and the latest decade) and finally to 3) the history of their use in post-Vatican II theology.⁴²

In this sense, it seems clear that the emphasis of the early post-conciliar period on the ecclesiological statements of Vatican II (*Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* especially) seems to have made room now for a new balance in the approach to the corpus of the council. Between the end of Vatican II and the 1970s the hermeneutical approach of Karl Rahner had its center of gravity in the ecclesiological shift from the “*societas perfecta*” to a less juridical and more sacramental view of the Church. In 1966, Herbert Vorgrimler presented two of the most influential approaches to the documents of Vatican II in the preface to the authoritative *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*. The first approach followed the speech given by the then Cardinal archbishop of Milan Montini on December 5, 1962, who systematized the ecclesiological issue through a two-fold vision: the nature of the Church – the activity of the Church (*ecclesia ad intra – ecclesia ad extra*). Karl Rahner proposed the second approach, in three parts: “1. The Church’s fundamental understanding of itself in the dogmatic constitution on the Church *Lumen gentium*; 2. The inner life of the Church [documents *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, *Dei Verbum*, *Christus Dominus*, *Apostolicam Actuositatem*]; 3. The exterior commission of the Church [*Unitatis Redintegratio*, *Nostra aetate*, *Ad gentes*, *Gaudium et Spes*, *Dignitatis Humanae*].”⁴³

In this debate in the first years of the post-Vatican II period, the position of a particular theologian, the “Bolognese” Giuseppe Dossetti, who emphasized the role of the constitution on revelation *Dei Verbum* and of the liturgical constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* as “hermeneutical axis of the corpus of Vatican II,” was far from the mainstream interpretation of the “people of God” ecclesiology and from the emphasis on ecclesiology of Vatican II, but it was indicative

⁴² About this, see *L'Autorité et les Autorités. L'herméneutique théologique de Vatican II*, eds. by G. Routhier, G. Jobin, Paris 2010.

⁴³ See Herbert Vorgrimler, introduction to the *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1, VIII, trans. L. Adolphus, K. Smyth and R. Strachan, London-New York 1967-1969 (Original German: *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil. Konstitutionen, Dekrete und Erklärungen lateinisch und deutsch Kommentare - Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 3 vols., Freiburg i.B. 1966-1968).

of the debate around the issue of the trend in the approach to Vatican II during the first two decades.⁴⁴ The first twenty years of the post-Vatican II debate came to an end with the first turning point in the theological history of the post-conciliar period, in 1985, when the Extraordinary Synod of the Bishops stated: “The theological interpretation of the conciliar doctrine must consider all the documents both in themselves and in their close interrelationship, so that the integral meaning of the council’s affirmations – often very complex – might be understood and expressed”.⁴⁵ The Synod’s conclusions did not close the debate but, as it often happens, they acknowledged the work in progress and opened a door for development: it is a fact that in the last 25 years the theological debate has evolved towards a much more complex approach to the specificity of the final documents of Vatican II. The theological debate about Vatican II has accepted the idea of the literary genres of the documents of the council and their style as expressive of the style of the whole council.⁴⁶ At the same time, it has become even clearer than before, thanks to the now available and detailed studies on the history of the most important documents of the council, that there is a need to respect both the intratextuality and the intertextuality of these texts, together with a related need to avoid separating letter and spirit of Vatican II.⁴⁷ So the debate about the dynamics of the council texts in their use in Catholic theology has now three different but *not* incompatible approaches to this issue.

4.2. Theobald: Vatican II as Interpretive Act of the Tradition of the Gospel

The German-French Jesuit Christoph Theobald has recently made a major contribution to the theological understanding of Vatican II. Two points, among many others in this impressive volume, are worth mentioning.⁴⁸ On one side, Theobald sees Vatican II as an act of interpreting the Gospel in the theological economy of the “paradosis”. The *traditum* rises at Vatican II to a new level of importance,

⁴⁴ See G. Ruggieri, *Recezione e interpretazione del Vaticano II. Le ragioni di un dibattito*, in *Chi ha paura del Vaticano II?...*, 33-41.

⁴⁵ Synod of Bishops of 1985, “Final Report,” 22.

⁴⁶ See J.W. O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II...*, 43-48.

⁴⁷ O. Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II...*, 35-51.

⁴⁸ C. Theobald, *La réception du concile Vatican II...*

if we compare it with the role it had in previous ecumenical councils. Theobald observes a new situation in Vatican II, in which the radical challenge of pluralism in the church faces the cultural codes of the “tradition” and therefore Vatican II reinterprets the very institution of “council”:

The globalization of the Church, already perfectly perceptible during the preparatory phase of the council, its internal differentiation on the basis of the plurality of cultures, and the rise of the ecumenical debate, made it necessary that the ecclesiological aspect of the council as an institution be liberated from its juridical confinement and reoriented towards the Gospel. At the same time, these new elements required that the hermeneutical side of the circle between the apostolic tradition, as it is expressed in the inspired Scriptures, and its interpretive reception be open to a plurality of “authorized” interpreters. The issue of the theological identity of the council is at the intersection of these perspectives and it acquires today a new dimension, more radical than it has ever been.⁴⁹

For Theobald it is therefore clear that at Vatican II the “form” of the understanding of the Gospel had an impact on the “substance” of that understanding. At Vatican II we have a paradigm change that implied also a new perception of the meaning of the Revelation, in which we see what Theobald calls “radicalization of the theological identity of the council as an institution”.⁵⁰

On the other side, Theobald is advocating a “theological axis” in the interpretation of the corpus of Vatican II. In his interpretation of the council, the ecclesiological architecture of Vatican II was built around two dimensions, horizontal and vertical. The horizontal dimension of the Church (*ad intra* and *ad extra*) must be balanced with the vertical dimension by giving priority to the idea of revelation expressed in the constitution *Dei Verbum* (and in the declaration on religious liberty *Dignitatis humanae*). Theobald explained his approach to the corpus

⁴⁹ “La mondialisation de l’Église, déjà parfaitement perceptible pendant la phase préparatoire du Concile, sa différenciation interne, en raison du pluralisme culturel, et l’avancée du débat œcuménique nécessitent que le versant ecclésiologique de l’institution conciliaire soit libéré d’un certain enfermement canonique et décentré vers l’Évangile et que simultanément le versant herméneutique du cercle entre la tradition apostolique, telle qu’elle s’exprime dans les Écritures inspirées, et sa réception interprétative soit ouvert en direction de la pluralité des interprètes ‘autorisés’. La question de l’identité théologique du Concile se situe au croisement de ces deux perspectives et y acquiert aujourd’hui une ‘radicalité’ sans précédent”: *ibid.* ..., 264-265.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* ..., 265.

of Vatican II in his comments on the view of Vatican II as a “Constitution,” as proposed by the German dogmatician Peter Hünemann in 2005, and subsequently in his recent work, *The Reception of Vatican II*, an impressive and comprehensive contribution to the debate on the hermeneutic of Vatican II. Theobald proposed a dynamic hermeneutics of conciliar texts through a crossing of horizontal (*Lumen gentium*, *Unitatis redintegratio*, *Nostra aetate*, *Gaudium et spes*) and vertical (*Dei Verbum*, *Dignitatis humanae*, *Lumen gentium*, *Sacro-sanctum Concilium*) dimensions in the conciliar texts and a profound consideration of the historical nature of the texts:⁵¹

Is it possible to define the unity of the corpus of Vatican II without referring to the normative role of the Canon of the Scriptures? Is it possible to define this unity without showing how the corpus of Vatican II positions itself in its relationship with the Scriptures in their uniqueness – explicitly (in *Dei Verbum*) and implicitly (in the way Scriptures are quoted) – and at the same time in its relationship with the Tradition – explicitly and implicitly – that is, towards extratextual instances like the name of God and of Jesus and the work of the Holy Spirit?⁵²

For Theobald, the Church is the meeting point of the horizontal and vertical dimensions of the texts of Vatican II, and the unity of Vatican II is not given by its style or its literary genre, but by a systematic coherence in its theology around the horizontal-vertical scheme. In the intertextual dynamic of the documents of Vatican II, Theobald recently called for a new role of *Dei Verbum* as the text best equipped to handle the profound issues of reform and historicity in theology and in the Church:

Dei Verbum is really the great document of Vatican II that could not only articulate and unify theologically the different issues of the regulation (*dispositio*) – Scriptures, tradition, and magisterium – but also tried to honor the other two phases of the hermeneutical conscience of the Church, that is, the principle of reform (particularly decisive from an ecumenical point of view) and the historicity of the cultures of the receivers of the Gospel.⁵³

⁵¹ For the conception of the relations between conciliar texts and Vatican II as a whole see C. Théobald, *Introduction*, dans *Vatican II. L'intégralité. Édition bilingue révisée*, Paris 2002, I-XXXIV.

⁵² C. Theobald, *Mise en perspective*, dans *Vatican II sous le regard des historiens...*, 3-23, quotation at 12-13. See also C. Theobald, *Enjeux herméneutiques des débats sur l'histoire du concile Vatican II*, dans *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 28 (2007)/2, 359-380.

⁵³ C. Theobald, *La réception du concile Vatican II, I: Accéder à la source...*, 769.

In this approach, centered on the pivotal role of *Dei Verbum* for the theology of Vatican II, Theobald is not alone. The American Jesuit Jared Wicks, for example, recently emphasized the derivative and not original role of the ecclesiology of the council for the understanding of the council itself:

Some editions place *Lumen gentium* at the head of the Vatican II constitutions, but would not the conciliar ecclesiology be better contextualized if it were placed *after* the council text starting with “hearing the word of God reverently and proclaiming it confidently...” and ending with “the word of God ... stands forever,” as does *Dei Verbum*.⁵⁴

The role of *Dei Verbum* is directly connected to the issue of the hermeneutic of Vatican II as a whole, and a correct hermeneutical approach to the texts of Vatican II applies both the idea of *ressourcement* and the need to respect the hierarchy of truths in theology – two principles of a Catholic theology re-rooted in the Word of God via *Dei Verbum*.⁵⁵ In this sense, Ormond Rush’s hermeneutics of the council documents must be remembered, which distinguish between the hermeneutics of the authors, of the texts, and of the receivers. Rush has given a nuanced view of the central role of *Dei Verbum* in the context of the other documents:

According to the principle of the hierarchy of truths, *Dei Verbum* has a certain priority over the others, since one’s notion of church (*Lumen gentium*), its worship (*Sacrosanctum concilium*), and its relationship to the world (*Gaudium et spes*) should derive from the prior notion of how one conceives God’s revelation and its reception-transmission in history ... *Dei Verbum* therefore, although promulgating teaching regarding a ‘higher’ doctrine according to the hierarchy of truths, must be interpreted (re-interpreted) in the light of the other documents.⁵⁶

4.3. Hünemann: Vatican II as a “Constitutional Text”

Peter Hünemann has developed a different analysis in a long

⁵⁴ J. Wicks, *Vatican II on Revelation – From Behind the Scenes*, in *Theological Studies* 71 (2010) 637-650, quotation at 639. For the central role of *Dei Verbum* according to Wicks see also his latest book, *Doing Theology*, New York/Mahwah, NJ 2009.

⁵⁵ See Benedict XVI’s postsynodal apostolic exhortation *Verbum Domini* (September 30, 2010), especially par. 3, “From *Dei Verbum* to the Synod on the Word of God”.

⁵⁶ O. Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II...*, 42-43. For Rush’s view of the relationship between revelation and theology in terms of “*sensus ecclesiae*” and “*sensus fideium*”, see his most recent volume *The Eyes of Faith: The Sense of the Faithful & the Church’s Reception of Revelation*, Washington DC 2009.

and audaciously reasoned essay which underlines the feature of the corpus of conciliar texts as a “constitution” for the Catholic Church, thus emphasizing the idea of Vatican II as a whole in which the intertextual dynamic of the documents does not see the pre-eminence of a particular document or issue, since Vatican II is as a whole a “text” to be interpreted. The identification of Vatican II as a “constitution” surely does not mean for Hünemann placing council texts above the Gospel: “The legitimation of a council and its authority is essentially different from that of a constitutional assembly of a modern state ... [F]or this reason the conciliar text possesses an authority essentially different from that of a constitutional text”. But for Hünemann the texts of council Vatican II are to be considered a “constitutional text for the faith”:

The corpus of texts of this council recalls a similarity with the texts of a constitution. At the same time, there are profound differences between the two beginning with the authority and specificity of the material of council texts. For this reason the text of council Vatican II can be prudently defined “constitutional text of faith”.⁵⁷

The constitutional character of the texts of Vatican II can be seen in the hermeneutical and ecclesial consequences of this text: “The question now is how to transmit the knowledge of this corpus of texts of Vatican II to the people of God, to the different groups and states in the Church. It is not enough if only students of theology, future priests, seminarians, and pastoral ministers learn these texts. What we need at all levels of the life of the Church is an ongoing dialogue, an ongoing discussion and a reflection about this corpus”.⁵⁸

These different hermeneutical approaches share much and are not necessarily opposed to one another, because all presuppose and assume the historicization of Vatican II and the hermeneutical shift produced by the historical studies on the council. The Italian theologian Giuseppe Ruggieri called for a varied hermeneutic of Vatican II, viewing in the “theological axis” proposed by Theobald a view that is

⁵⁷ P. Hünemann, *Der Text: Werden – Gestalt – Bedeutung. Eine Hermeneutische Reflexion*, in *Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, hrsg. von H.J. Hilberath, P. Hünemann, 5 vols. (Freiburg i.B. 2004-2005): vol. 5, 5-101, esp. 11-17 and 85-87, quotations at 15-16 and 17. See also a more nuanced version of this view in Hünemann, *Der Text. Eine Ergänzung zur Hermeneutik des II. Vatikanischen Konzils*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 28 (2007)/2, 339-358.

⁵⁸ P. Hünemann, *Der Text: Werden – Gestalt – Bedeutung...*, 85.

respectful of the historical dimension of the documents of Vatican II. There is indeed a consensus among theologians about an hermeneutical approach to the council texts that takes into account the history of those documents and their literary forms and genre, thus comparing and differentiating between the hermeneutic of the council documents and the hermeneutic of the texts affirmed by *Dei Verbum* for the Bible: “In the debate taking place now nobody is challenging the need to interpret in a coherent and organic way the different documents approved by the council. But once we enunciate the principle of the unity of the corpus of Vatican II, we see time and again the difficulties concerning the biblical canon, with a fundamental difference, that is, the corpus of Vatican II does not enjoy divine inspiration like the Bible”.⁵⁹

4.4. O'Malley: Vatican II as a “Language Event”

A third approach to the corpus of Vatican II as a source for theology is more focused on the central role of the documents in their historical making, in their literary genre, and in their style. This alternate approach does not see in *Dei Verbum* the first step in the hermeneutic of Vatican II, given the intertextual dimension of every theological issue handled by the council, but favors a multilateral and intertextual approach to the council documents for the theological understanding of every issue. On this perspective, John O'Malley has emphasized in the last few years (also thanks to his studies on *The Four Cultures of the West*)⁶⁰ the need to understand the specificity of the genre and of the style of the documents of Vatican II in order to grasp their theological value and to overcome the entrenching of the “conservative/reactionary” and “progressive/liberal” positions. For O'Malley, the hermeneutic of Vatican II should pay more attention to new areas such as the council's language, as well as inter-documental history and other inter-documental issues of Vatican II. The acknowledgment of the specificity of the texts of Vatican II shows the “invitational” style of Vatican II: the fact that Vatican II was a “language event” needs to be taken seriously by its interpreters “in constructing a hermeneutic for interpreting the council”.⁶¹ For O'Malley, acknowledging the style of Vatican II makes it possible to recognize

⁵⁹ G. Ruggieri, *Recezione e interpretazione del Vaticano II...*, 41-42.

⁶⁰ See J.W. O'Malley, *Four Cultures of the West*, Cambridge MA 2004.

⁶¹ J.W. O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II...*, 310.

the spirit of the council as an expression of fundamental orientations that, based firmly on the documents, cut across the documents and is recoverable through an intertextual and intratextual approach: “the recognition of the intertextual character of the sixteen documents is therefore the first step in uncovering the paradigm and therefore an essential step in constructing a hermeneutic for interpreting the council [...] In that sense Vatican II conveyed a ‘spirit’”.⁶² For O’Malley the issue of style is crucial also in the attempt to move beyond the labels “conservative/reactionary and progressive/liberal”:

The council’s massive complexity and therefore the complexity of saying anything valid about it does not die the death of a thousand qualifications. Yet as this book has shown, it is possible to move beyond specific issues, to move beyond proof-texting techniques that lift sentences or paragraphs out of context, to move beyond loaded labels like conservative/reactionary and progressive/liberal, which are the ways the council has until now consistently been approached and interpreted.⁶³

With a similar approach, Gilles Routhier explained his view of the council documents in reference to the issue of style, affirming that proclaiming one document of Vatican II as primary could lead to a misunderstanding of the intertextual meaning of the council:

The renewed attention that we see today towards the hermeneutics of the documents of Vatican II is promising and dangerous at the same time. It is promising because, now that the experience of Vatican II becomes a distant memory, we have what the council left us with, that is, the texts. But this going back to the texts is dangerous if it is an excuse to make of the documents of Vatican II a stack of individual statements, autonomous from their literary context, independent from the act of their enunciation, detached from their background, truncated from the tradition that carries them, and independent from their style, so that these individual statements could be set in opposition one to the other.⁶⁴

5. *Edition of Sources and Memoirs*

Substantial work has been done on the publication of historical sources on the history of Vatican II and in the studies of the partici-

⁶² *Ibidem*.

⁶³ *Ibid.* ..., 312.

⁶⁴ G. Routhier, *Il Vaticano II come stile*, in *La Scuola Cattolica* 136 (2008) 5-32, quotation at 32.

pation of bishops and theologians at the council. Diaries continue to be an important source for the understanding of the intention of the council fathers, despite the warnings about the “risks” of the use of these sources.⁶⁵ The diaries of Msgr. Willebrands,⁶⁶ Schillebeeckx⁶⁷ and of Dom Helder Camara⁶⁸ are the most important result of these recent years, together with the edition of diaries of “minor” characters of Vatican II and the translation into other languages of already published diaries.⁶⁹ Of primary importance are the re-edition of Ratzinger’s *Theological Highlights of Vatican II* (first published in 1966) and a couple of other notable studies on the participation of the future Benedict XVI at the council, in which we can see the gap between Ratzinger’s interpretation of the council *concilio durante* and his reception of it a few years later.⁷⁰

The publication of memoirs has been less frequent than in the

⁶⁵ See F. Testaferri, *Diari del Concilio: Importanza e rischi. Due ermeneutiche a confronto*, in *Lateranum* 74 (2008) 369-382; H.-J. Sieben, *Konzilstagebücher: Eigenschaften, Entfaltung und Bestand einer Gattung*, in *Theologie und Philosophie* 83 (2008) 1-31.

⁶⁶ L. Declerck, *Les agendas conciliaires de Mgr. J. Willebrands, secrétaire du Secrétariat pour l’Unité des Chrétiens*, preface de T. Stransky (*Instrumenta theologica*, 31), Leuven 2009, XL-284; “*You Will Be Called Repairer of the Breach*”: *The Diary of J.G.M. Willebrands 1958-1961*, ed. by T. Salemnik, Leuven 2009, 450.

⁶⁷ See K. Schelkens (ed.), *The Council Notes of Edward Schillebeeckx 1962-1963* (*Instrumenta Theologica*, 34), Leuven 2011, XXX-77.

⁶⁸ H. Camara, *Circulares Interconciliares*, (Coleção Obras Completas de Dom Helder Camara), Recife 2008 (volume I in 3 tomes, org. Luiz Carlos Luz Marques e Roberto de Araújo Faria; volume II in 3 tomes, org. Zildo Rocha). In Italian: H. Camara, *Roma, due del mattino. Lettere dal Concilio Vaticano II*, a cura di S. Biondo, Cinisello Balsamo 2008, 497. In French: Dom H. Camara, *Lettres conciliaires, 1962-1965*, sous la direction de J. de Broucker, préface par le cardinal R. Etchegaray, postface par Étienne Fouilloux, 2 voll., Paris 2006.

⁶⁹ See J. Argaya, *Diario del Concilio*, eds. X. Basurko y J.M. Zunzunegui, Donostia-San Sebastián 2008, 624 pp.; Italian edition of H. de Lubac, *Quaderni del concilio*, a cura di E. Guerriero, 2 voll., Milano 2009, LXI-999; *Il sogno di una chiesa. Interventi al concilio di Giacomo Lercaro*, ed. by M. Donati, preface by Msgr. F. Lambiasi, introduction by P. Coda, Assisi 2010, 575; J. Mejía, *Una presencia en el Concilio: Crónicas y apuntes del Concilio Vaticano II*, Agape Libros, Buenos Aires 2009, 588.

⁷⁰ See J. Ratzinger, *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*, New York-Mahwah 2009, 288; K.-H. Menke, *Die christologisch begründete Einzigkeit der sichtbaren Kirche. Vier Dokumente, in denen Joseph Ratzinger/Benedikt XVI. das Konzil interpretiert*, in *Theologie und Glaube* 98 (2008) 242-260; J. Wicks, *Six Texts by Prof. Joseph Ratzinger as peritus before and during Vatican Council II*, in *Gregorianum* 89 (2008)/2, 233-311.

early years of post-Vatican II,⁷¹ but there is no end in sight for the flow of research on the participation of individuals, dioceses, and groups at the council. Yves Congar has been the subject of a new volume,⁷² together with a massive study on the Belgians and their network at Vatican II.⁷³ The contribution of the theological-ecclesiastical “milieus” (such as the Roman Curia)⁷⁴ is more and more important for

⁷¹ See O.H. Pesch, *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil und seine Rezeption. Bericht eines Zeitzeugen zweiter Ordnung*, in *Rottenburger Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte* 26 (2007) 279-285; K. Hillebrand, P.-W. Scheele, *Als Journalist beim Konzil. Erfahrungen und Erkenntnisse in der 3. Session*, Würzburg 2010, 175.

⁷² See Yves Congar, *maître en théologie* (proceedings of the conference of February 2006), with essays by Ph. Bordeyne, M. Quisinsky, J.-M. Vezin, G. Berceville, F. Bousquet, E. Durand, A. Nisus, F.-M. Humann, in *Revue de l'Institut catholique de Paris: Transversalités* 98 (2006) 1-181.

⁷³ *The Belgian Contribution to the Second Vatican Council*, International Research Conference at Mechelen Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve (September 12-16, 2005), eds. by D. Donnelly, J. Famerée, M. Lamberigts, K. Schelkens, (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 216), Leuven-Paris-Dudley MA 2008, 716; L. Kenis, *Diaries: Private Sources for a Study of the Second Vatican Council*, 29-53; M. Lamberigts, Leo Declerck, *The Role of Cardinal Léon-Joseph Suenens at Vatican II*, 61-217; G. Treffler, *Léon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens and Julius Cardinal Döpfner*, 219-231; C. Dirk, *Cardinal L.J. Suenens and G. Lercaro and the Second Vatican Council*, 233-253; G. Turbanti, *L.J. Suenens, G. Lercaro e G. Dossetti*, 255-283; L. Declerck, T. Osaer, *Les relations entre le Cardinal Montini/Paul VI (1897-1978) et le Cardinal Suenens (1904-1996) pendant le Concile Vatican II*, 285-323; G. Routhier, *Léger et Suenens: Les relations difficiles de deux princes de l'Église*, 325-357; E. Lanne, *Le rôle du monastère de Chevetogne au deuxième Concile du Vatican*, 361-388; P. De Mey, *Gustave Thils and Ecumenism at Vatican II*, 389-413; K. Schelkens, *Lucien Cerfaux and the Preparation of the Schema "De fontibus revelationis"*, 415-460; J. Wicks, *De Revelatione under Revision (March-April 1964): Contributions of C. Moeller and Other Belgian Theologians*, 461-494; C. Soetens, *La contribution de Charles Moeller au Concile Vatican II d'après ses papiers conciliaires*, 495-528; J. Grootaers, *Diversité des tendances à l'intérieur de la majorité conciliaire: Gérard Philips et Giuseppe Dossetti*, 529-562; J. Famerée, *Gustave Thils et le De Ecclesia. Un début d'enquête*, 563-584; Bordeyne, *La collaboration de Pierre Hautmann avec les experts belges*, 585-610; M. Lamberigts, *Msgr. Calewaert, Bishop of Ghent, and Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 611-632; S. Scatena, *Emiel Jozef De Smedt, John Courtney Murray and Religious Freedom*, 633-645; E. Louchez, *Évêques missionnaires belges au Concile Vatican II: Typologie et stratégie*, 647-684.

⁷⁴ See P. Chenaux, *La réception du Concile Vatican II dans la Curie romaine*, in *The Transformation of the Christian Churches in Western Europe 1945-2000. La transformation des églises chrétiennes en Europe occidentale*, eds. by J. Billiet, L. Kenis, P. Pasture, Louvain 2010, 255-266; U. Dell'Orto, *La recezione del Vaticano II nel Seminario di Milano: tre momenti emblematici*, in *La Scuola Cattolica* 138 (2010) 123-132; T. Eggenesperger, U. Engel (eds.), *"Mutig in die Zukunft". Dominikanische*

the reconstruction of the history of the event, not less than the contribution of “theological schools”,⁷⁵ of individual theologians,⁷⁶ and of local bishops.⁷⁷

Beiträge zum Vaticanum II, Leipzig 2007, 267; É. Fouilloux, *I teologi cattolici dal pre al postconcilio*, in *Tutto è grazia. In omaggio a Giuseppe Ruggieri*, ed. by A. Melloni, Milano 2010, 201-215; É. Fouilloux, *Le Concile Vatican II dans la “Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques”*, dans *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 92 (2008) 677-690.

⁷⁵ See J. Carola, *Pre-Conciliar Patristic Retrieval*, in *Augustinian Studies* 38 (2007) 381-405; M. Fourcade, *Thomisme et antithomisme à l’heure de Vatican II*, in *Revue Thomiste* 108 (2008) 301-325; J. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie - New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II*, London-New York 2010, 218.

⁷⁶ See T. Cabizzosu, *Prospetto sintetico interventi dei vescovi sardi al Concilio Vaticano II*, in *Theologica & Historica. Annali della Pontificia Facoltà Teologica della Sardegna*, XVIII (2009) 227-258; M. Faggioli, *Per un “centrismo conciliare”*. Albino Luciani e il Vaticano II, in *Albino Luciani dal Veneto al mondo*, a cura di G. Vian, Roma 2010, 355-383; D. Hercsik, *Henri de Lubac: Ein Zeuzeuge des Konzils*, in *Gregorianum* 89 (2008) 882-885; B.R. Hill, *Bernard Häring and the Second Vatican Council*, in *Horizons: The Journal of the College Theology Society* 33 (2006) 78-100; R. Levet, *Mgr Gérard Huyghe à Vatican II: un évêque particulièrement actif*, in *MSR* 64 (2007)/4, 49-60; S. Lösel, *Conciliar, Not Conciliatory. Hans Urs von Balthasar’s Ecclesiological Synthesis of Vatican II*, in *Modern Theology* 24 (2008) 23-49; S. Madrigal, *El Vaticano II en el “Diario” de Sebastian Tromp*, in *Razón y fe* 260 (2009) 265-282; S. Madrigal, *El Vaticano II en los cuadernos conciliares de G. Philips*, in *Razón y fe* 259 (2009) 259-284; J. Moingt, *Henri de Lubac au concile*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 29 (2008)/2, 537-546; B. Pottier, *L’apport du Père Congar à Vatican II*, in *Vatican II: la sacramentalité de l’Église et le Royaume*, eds. by A. Guggenheim, E. Michelin, Paris 2008, 23-46; M. Quisinsky, *Freiburger Konzilsväter auf dem II. Vatikanum. Konzilsbeteiligung und Konzils hermeneutik von Erzbischof Hermann Schäufele und Weihbischof Karl Gnädinger*, in *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv* 129 (2009) 181-289; G. Richi Alberti, *Karol Wojtyła: un estilo conciliar. Las intervenciones de K. Wojtyła en el Concilio Vaticano II*, Madrid 2010, 460; H.-J. Sieben, *Zwischen kurialistischem und säkularistischem Integrismus: Das Zweite Vatikanum in der Wahrnehmung des Tagesbuchschreibers Henri de Lubac*, in *Theologie und Philosophie* 83 (2008) 531-561; K. Unterburger, *Die Rezeption des II. Vatikanischen Konzils in der Diözese Rottenburg. Bischof Carl Joseph Leiprecht, Pfarrer Joseph Weiger und Pfarrer Hermann Breucha*, in *Rottenburger Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte* 26 (2007) 137-163; D. Vitali, *Nova et vetera. Mons. Luigi Carli al concilio Vaticano II*, in *Gregorianum* 91 (2010)/1, 91-123; B. Xibaut, *Mgr Léon-Arthur Elchinger. Un évêque français au Concile*, préface par Mgr J. Doré, Paris 2009, VI+486; G. Zamagni, *La “fine dell’era costantiniana” in F. Heer a M.-D. Chenu (1938-1963). In tre quadri e un epilogo al Concilio Vaticano II*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 29 (2008)/1, 113-138.

⁷⁷ See R. Gribble, *Vatican II and the Church in Uganda: The Contribution of Bishop Vincent J. McCauley, C.S.C.*, in *The Catholic Historical Review* 95 (October 2009)/4, 718-740; J.H. Kroeger, *Philippine Participation in the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council*, in *Philippiniana Sacra* XLII/42 (2007) 173-182.

6. Studies on the Final Texts of Vatican II

A long series of studies and essays has also been devoted to the analysis of the council documents and its effects on postconciliar theology and on the teachings of the Church.⁷⁸

Sacrosanctum Concilium

If a few studies on the liturgical constitution of Vatican II have been prompted by the *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* of Benedict XVI,⁷⁹ the interest for the liturgical constitution is one of the most frequented fields of research on the council. The destiny of the conciliar liturgical reform is front and center in the liturgical debate,⁸⁰ but recently the relationships between the liturgical

⁷⁸ For a comprehensive overview of the reception of Vatican II in theology see *Un nouvel âge de la théologie? 1965-1980*, eds. by D. Avon, M. Fourcade, Paris 2009, 432.

⁷⁹ See J. Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics*, Collegeville MN 2008; A. Grillo, *Dalla riforma necessaria alla riforma non sufficiente. Il movimento liturgico come 'effetto' del Concilio Vaticano II?*, in *Ecclesia Orans: Periodica de Scientiis Liturgicis* 23 (2006) 281-296; W.F. Rother, *Liturgische Gegenreform(ation)? Vom Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil zum Apostolischen Schreiben "Summorum Pontificum"*, in *Una-Voce-Korrespondenz* 38 (2008) 152-170. Very important also L. Villemain, *L'autorité des conférences épiscopales en matière de liturgie. Interprétations et réinterprétations récentes*, in *L'autorité et les autorités. L'herméneutique théologique de Vatican II*, dir. par G. Routhier et G. Jobin, Paris 2010, 151-165.

⁸⁰ See J. Baldovin, "Sacrosanctum Concilium" and the Reform of the Liturgy: Forty-five Years Later, in *Studia liturgica* 39 (2009) 145-157; P. De Clerck, *La réforme liturgique: ce qui reste à faire*, in *Questions liturgiques* 91 (2010) 64-75; P. De Clerck, *La liturgie a-t-elle besoin d'une réforme permanente?*, in *La Maison-Dieu* 260 (2009)/4, 211-226; P. De Clerck, *Pierre-Marie Gy: souvenirs et témoignage d'un liturgiste au temps de Vatican II. Souvenirs et témoignage collectés par Paul De Clerck*, in *La Maison-Dieu* 261 (2010)/3, 127-160; A. Join-Lambert, *Richesses de Vatican II à (re)découvrir*, in *Questions Liturgiques* 91 (2010) 42-63; J. de Kesel, *Vatican II, le renouveau liturgique et le renouveau de l'Église*, in *Questions Liturgiques* 91 (2010) 93-96; G. Midili, *La Sacrosanctum concilium, pietra miliare della riforma liturgica e ponte tra passato e futuro*, in *Ecclesia Orans: Periodica de Scientiis Liturgicis* 25 (2008) 7-32; K.F. Pecklers, *La liturgia en el Concilio Vaticano II y su futuro en la Iglesia*, in *ITER: Revista de Teología* 18 (2007)/42-43, 393-410; M. Probst, "All das aber geschieht in der Kraft des Heiligen Geistes" (SC 6). *Wie weit hat die nachkonziliare Liturgiereform diese Aussage eingeholt?*, in *Gott denken und bezeugen (FS Walter Kasper)*, Freiburg 2008, 459-478; G. Routhier, *La liturgie aux prises avec un monde et une église en mutation*, in *La Maison-Dieu*, 260 (2009)/4, 153-181; J.M. Sánchez Caro, *Reforma litúrgica y teología de los sacramentos. Influencia de*

constitution and the liturgical movement on one side⁸¹ and the ecclesiological content of Vatican II on the other side have been the subject of recent studies.⁸² The book by Scardilli in particular offers important insights into the ecclesiological content of the liturgical constitution, rightly noting a lack in the field: “i trattati di ecclesiologia postconciliare non hanno approfondito sufficientemente alcuni nuclei di grande spessore ecclesiologico contenuti nella costituzione sulla sacra liturgia”.⁸³

Ecclesiology (Lumen Gentium and Christus Dominus)

In the contributions on ecclesiology the most important is Daniele Gianotti's book on Patristic theology in the debate about *Lumen gentium*: the book not only traces the origins of the ressourcement in pre-Vatican II ecclesiology, but also shows the awareness of the council fathers about the relevance of the ressourcement, and highlights how Vatican II could strike a balance between a new faithfulness to the Fathers of the Church and the acknowledgment of their “otherness” in relationship to modernity.⁸⁴

la reforma litúrgica del Concilio Vaticano II en la actual teología sacramentaria, in *Salmanticensis* 55 (2008), 11-47; M. Stuflesser, *Das vergessene Sakrament. Liturgietheologische Anmerkungen zur Feier von Buße und Versöhnung im Gottesdienst der Kirche nach dem II. Vatikanischen Konzil*, in *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 57 (2007) 3-38; P. Tena, *La constitució Sacrosanctum Concilium en els quaranta anys del Concili Vaticà II*, in *Revista catalana de teologia* 32 (2007) 163-168; *Transforming Catholicism: Liturgical Change in the Vatican II Church*, eds. by D.R. Maines, M.J. McCallion, Lanham 2007. See also R.v. Bühren, *Kunst und Kirche im 20. Jahrhundert. Die Rezeption des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils*, Paderborn 2008, 940.

⁸¹ See A. Grillo, *Le mouvement liturgique et les tournants épistémologique du XXe siècle. Une petite considération inactuelle*, in *La Maison-Dieu* 260 (2009)/4, 123-152; P.-M. Gy, *Souvenirs et témoignage d'un liturgiste au temps de Vatican II*, in *La Maison-Dieu* 261 (2010)/1, 127-160; M. Klöckener, *La dynamique du mouvement liturgique et de la réforme liturgique. Points communs et différences théologiques et spirituelles*, in *La Maison-Dieu* 260 (2009)/4, 69-109.

⁸² See M. Faggioli, *Sacrosanctum Concilium and the Meaning of Vatican II*, in *Theological Studies* 71 (June 2010) 437-452; M. Faggioli, *Polis e liturgia nella chiesa conciliare*, in *Rivista di Pastorale Liturgica. La liturgia che verrà?* 277 (2009)/6, 19-24; P. Prétot, *Liturgie et ecclésiologie à une époque d'individualisation*, dans *La Maison-Dieu* 260 (2009)/4, 183-210; L. Villemain, *Ecclésiologie de la réforme liturgique de Vatican II*, in *Lumière et vie* 279 (2008) 71-79.

⁸³ See P.D. Scardilli, *I nuclei ecclesiologici nella costituzione liturgica del Vaticano II*, Roma 2007, 413, quotation at 30.

⁸⁴ See D. Gianotti, *I Padri della Chiesa al concilio Vaticano II. La teologia patristica nella Lumen gentium*, Bologna 2010, 530.

The Mariological debate received a new historiographical analysis,⁸⁵ but the issue episcopacy-clergy-laity is still one of the most studied,⁸⁶ together with the sacramental and missional character of the Church.⁸⁷ The hypothesis advanced a few years ago about an equivalence between “substitut in” and “est” in *Lumen gentium* 8 has produced a fair amount of reactions.⁸⁸ The issue of the synodal dimension of the Church of Vatican II seems to be in retreat,⁸⁹ or

⁸⁵ See C. Antonelli, *Il dibattito su Maria nel Concilio Vaticano II. Percorso redazionale sulla base di nuovi documenti di archivio*, Padova 2009, 612.

⁸⁶ See G. Bier, *Aufwertung der Bischöfe nach dem Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil?*, in *Rottenburger Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte* 26 (2007) 71-91; G. Caracciolo, *Spiritualità e laicato nel Vaticano II e nella teologia del tempo*, Milano 2008, 352; M. Fallert, *Mitarbeiter der Bischöfe. Das Zueinander des bischöflichen Amtes auf und nach dem Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, Würzburg 2007, xi-436; O. O'Brien, *The Theology of Lay Ministry. 'Developments' since Vatican II*, in *The Irish Theological Quarterly* 72 (2007) 88-95; H. Rikhof, *Das gemeinsame Priestertum der Gläubigen und das Priestertum des Dienstes. Wie liest man Lumen gentium 10?*, in *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift* 155 (2007) 79-89; R.W. Oliver, *Associations of the Faithful in the Antepreparatory and Preparatory Phases of Vatican II*, in *The Jurist* 70 (2010) 86-113; O. Rush, *The Eyes of Faith: The Sense of the Faithful and the Church's Reception of Revelation*. Washington DC 2009, 330; G.H. Tvard, *The Task of a Bishop in His Diocese. Christus Dominus 11-21*, in *The Jurist* 68 (2008) 361-381.

⁸⁷ See É. de Moulins-Beaufort, *La sacramentalité de l'Église selon le numéro 1 de Lumen gentium. Recherche sur la cohérence de la Constitution dogmatique*, in *Vatican II: la sacramentalité de l'Église et le Royaume*, éd. par A. Guggenheim, E. Michelin, Paris 2008, 63-70; N. Hausman, *Vie religieuse et sacramentalité de l'Église: l'apport du paragraphe 44 de Lumen gentium*, in *Vatican II: la sacramentalité de l'Église et le Royaume...*, 121-126; W. Insero, *La Chiesa è «missionaria per sua natura» (AG 2). Origine e contenuto dell'affermazione conciliare e la sua recezione nel dopo Concilio*, Roma 2007, 545; A. Guggenheim, *Église et Royaume. Une pierre d'angle du Concile Vatican II*, in *Vatican II: la sacramentalité de l'Église et le Royaume...*, 191-205; J.-M. Pasquier, *L'Église comme sacrement. Le développement de l'idée sacramentelle de l'Église de Moehler à Vatican II*, présenté par B.-D. de La Soujeole avec la collaboration de M. Fornerod, Fribourg 2008, 314.

⁸⁸ See H. Legrand, *Le statut pluridisciplinaire de l'ecclésiologie. Une requête de Lumen Gentium 8 'L'Église, réalité complexe, faite d'un double élément humain et divin'*, in *Science et Esprit* 59 (2007) 333-349; C. Malloy, “Subsistit in”: *Nonexclusive Identity or Full Identity?*, in *The Thomist* 72 (2008) 1-44; K. Schelkens, *Lumen gentium's "subsistit in" revisited: The Catholic Church and Christian Unity After Vatican II*, in *Theological Studies*, 69 (2008) 875-893; F.A. Sullivan, *The Meaning of "subsistit in" explained by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, in *Theological Studies* 69 (2008) 116-124; F.A. Sullivan, *Further thoughts on the meaning of "subsistit in"*, in *Theological Studies* 71 (2010) 133-147.

⁸⁹ See A. Indelicato, *Il Sinodo dei vescovi. La collegialità sospesa*, Bologna 2008, 401; H. Legrand, *Sinodalità al Vaticano II e dopo il Vaticano II. Un'indagine e una riflessione teologica e istituzionale*, in *Chiesa e sinodalità. Coscienza, forme, processi* (Forum ATII, 3),

not particularly evident, if compared to the great number of studies devoted to the ecclesiological constitution.⁹⁰

Gaudium et Spes

Michael Quisinsky has written an important work devoted to the pastoral constitution and to the issue of historicity, and has emphasized the contribution of the theological school of the Dominicans at Le Saulchoir – Chenu, Congar, and Féret – to the council, thus synthesized: “Die Kirche als zum Dienst an der Welt gesandte ist sowohl Teil des göttlichen Heilplans als auch der geschichtlichen Kontingenz unterworfen”.⁹¹ Many other studies have addressed the history of the drafting of *Gaudium et spes*,⁹² the problem of peace and politics,⁹³ and the role of science and anthropology in the pastoral constitution.⁹⁴

a cura di R. Battocchio, S. Noceti, Milano 2007, 67-108; G. Ziviani, *Una Chiesa di popolo. La parrocchia nel Vaticano II*, prefazione di mons. F.G. Brambilla, Bologna 2011, 312.

⁹⁰ See also Lakeland, *Lumen Gentium: The Unfinished Business*, in *New Blackfriars* 90 (2009)/1026 146-162; S. Pié-Ninot, *La Lumen gentium a quaranta anys del Concilii Vaticà II*, in *Rev. Cat. Teol.* 32 (2007) 177-190; F. Puig, *El uso de la categoría 'consagración' en vísperas del Concilio Vaticano II. Prolegómenos para un estudio de la consagración religiosa*, in *Annales Theologici: Rivista di teologia della Facoltà di Teologia del Pontificio Ateneo della Santa Croce* 22 (2008) 295-324; M. Vellankal, *Church: Communion of Individual Churches. Biblico-theological Perspectives on the Communion Ecclesiology of Vatican II*, Mumbai 2009, 349; K.D. Whitehead, *The Renewed Church: The Second Vatican Council's Enduring Teaching about the Church*, Ave Maria FL, 2009, 278; J. Wicks, *Questions et réponses au sujet des nouvelles Réponses de la Congrégation pour la Doctrine de la Foi*, dans *Irénikon* 80 (2007) 294-316; *Called to Holiness and Communion: Vatican II on the Church*, eds. by S. Boguslawski, R. Fastiggi, Scranton 2009, XIV+400.

⁹¹ M. Quisinsky, *Geschichtlicher Glaube in einer geschichtlichen Welt. Der Beitrag von M.-D. Chenu, Y. Congar und H.-M. Féret zum II. Vaticanum*, Berlin 2007, 576, quotation at 464.

⁹² See C. Aparicio Valls, *Il contributo dei laici nella prima tappa di elaborazione della Gaudium et spes*, in *Ricerche teologiche* 18 (2007)/2, 391-419; C. Böttigheimer, *Nicht von dieser Welt? Von der Kommunikationsfähigkeit der Kirche und der Bedeutung der Pastoralkonstitution "Gaudium et spes"*, in *Weltoffen aus Treue. Studientag zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, Sankt Ottilien 2009, 81-113.

⁹³ See J. Joblin, *L'Église et la construction de la paix. L'étape de Gaudium et Spes*, dans *Gregorianum* 91 (2010)/1, 137-153; M. Lamberigts, *Gaudium et spes: A Council in Dialogue with the World*, in *Scrutinizing the Signs of the Times in the Light of the Gospel*, ed. by Johan Verstraeten, Leuven-Dudley, MA 2007, 17-40; P.-Y. Materne, S. Maucq, *La question du politique depuis Vatican II*, in *Lumière et vie* 56 (2007)/273, 31-40.

⁹⁴ See S. Bullivant, *From "Main Tendue" to Vatican II: The Catholic Engagement with*

Dei Verbum

Last but not least, the constitution on the revelation has been the object of a few studies (including a new history of the document in its preparatory phase)⁹⁵ – but there have been fewer than anticipated, considering the celebration of the Bishops' Synod of 2008 on the Word of God.⁹⁶

Nostra Aetate

Except for a major contribution to the history of the declaration *Nostra aetate* and the role of Msgr. De Smedt,⁹⁷ most studies have focused on Jewish-Christian relations⁹⁸ and on the reception of the

Atheism 1936–1965, in *New Blackfriars* 90 (2009) 178-187; A. Melloni, *Galileo al Vaticano II. Storia d'una citazione e della sua ombra*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 31 (2010)/1, 131-164; R. Rybka, *Il giusto ordine sociale secondo la costituzione pastorale 'La Chiesa nel mondo contemporaneo'* *Gaudium et spes*, in *Angelicum* 84 (2007) 343-359; F. Scanziani, *L'antropologia sottesa a Gaudium et Spes. Invito alla lettura*, in *La Scuola Cattolica* 135 (2007) 625-652; J. Xavier, *Theological Anthropology of Gaudium et Spes and Fundamental theology*, in *Gregorianum* 91 (2010)/1, 124-13; I. Yung Park, *Il magistero cattolico e la sfida della non credenza. Una sintesi degli orientamenti a partire dal Concilio Vaticano II*, in *Annales Theologici: Rivista di teologia della Facoltà di Teologia del Pontificio Ateneo della Santa Croce* 21 (2007) 165-199.

⁹⁵ See K. Schelkens, *Catholic Theology of Revelation on the Eve of Vatican II: A Redaction History of the Schema De fontibus revelationis (1960-1962)*, Leiden-Boston 2010.

⁹⁶ See G. Deiana, *Bibbia e tradizione nelle Dei Verbum*, in *Euntes Docete* 61 (2008)/3, 179-210; A. Dupont, K. Schelkens, *Katholische Exegese vor dem Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil (1960-1961)*, in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 132 (2010)/1, 1-24; R. Gómez Fernández, *Revelación divina y comunión trinitaria: La relación entre trinidad económica y trinidad immanente en la constitución dogmática Dei Verbum del Concilio Vaticano II*, Madrid 2009, 634; S. Pié-Ninot, *Teología de la Palabra de Dios e Iglesia*, in *Gregorianum* 89 (2008) 348-367; A. Puig i Tàrrach, *La dei Verbum, quaranta anys després*, in *Rev. Cat. Teol.* 32 (2007) 169-175; F. Raurell, *Significat de la Bíblia en la Dei Verbum*, in *Revista catalana de teologia* 33 (2008) 213-229; M.D. Ruiz Pérez, *La Sagrada Escritura, alma de la teologia*, in *Isidorianum* 18 (2009)/35, 139-178; K. Schelkens, *Exegesis in the Wake of Vatican II. Lucien Cerfaux and the Origins of Dei Verbum*, in *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 25 (2008)/2, 169-201; J. Wicks, *Vatican II on Revelation – From Behind the Scenes*, in *Theological Studies* 71 (2010) 637-650.

⁹⁷ See L. Declerck, M. Lamberigts, *Mgr. E.J. De Smedt et le texte conciliaire sur la religion juive (Nostra aetate, n. 4)*, in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 85 (2009)/4, 341-384.

⁹⁸ See *Examining Nostra Aetate after 40 Years: Catholic-Jewish Relations in Our Time*,

declaration,⁹⁹ without providing groundbreaking new information on the drafting of the section on Islam and the other sections of the declaration.¹⁰⁰

Religious Liberty, Ecumenism, and Eastern Catholic Churches

The coming of age of Vatican II also means a new understanding of the declaration *ad extra*, such as the declaration on religious liberty, whose importance has been analyzed by a number of studies attempting not only to discover new chapters in the history of its drafting,¹⁰¹ but also to reinterpret it in light of the cultural and

ed. by A.J. Cernera, Fairfield, Conn. 2007, 224; E.I. Cardinal Cassidy, *Nostra Aetate Revisited*, 1-34; L.E. Frizzell, *The Teaching of the Second Vatican Council on Jews and Judaism*, 35-56; P.A. Cunningham, *Nostra aetate: A Catholic Act of Metanoia*, 160-175; J. Dujardin, *Dialogue avec le judaïsme et dialogue inter-religieux selon Nostra aetate*, dans *Vatican II: la sacramentalité de l'Église et le Royaume...*, 175-189; E. Mazzini, *Chiesa ed Ebrei al Vaticano II (secondo due riviste ebraiche italiane)*, in *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 43 (2007) 405-428; A. Melloni, *Nostra Aetate and the Discovery of the Sacrament of Otherness*, in *The Catholic Church and the Jewish people: Recent Reflections from Rome*, eds. by P.A. Cunningham, N.J. Hofmann, J. Sievers, New York 2007, 129-151; D.M. Neuhaus, *Achievements and Challenges in Jewish-Christian Dialogue. Forty Years after Nostra Aetate*, in *The Downside Review* 125 (2007) 111-130.

⁹⁹ See F. Gmainer-Pranzl, "...radius illius veritatis..." (NA 2). *Theologische Perspektiven im Horizont radikaler Entgrenzung*, in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 130 (2008) 298-322; W. Hünermann, *Jewish-Christian Relations: A Conciliar Discovery and Its Methodological Consequences for Dogmatics*, in *The Catholic Church and the Jewish people: Recent Reflections from Rome*, eds. by P.A. Cunningham, N.J. Hofmann, J. Sievers, New York 2007, 113-126; M. Ipgrave, *Understanding, Affirmation, Sharing: "Nostra aetate" and an Anglican Approach to Inter-faith Relations*, in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 43 (2008) 1-16; F. Kolffhaus, *Pastorale Lehrverkündigung - Grundmotiv des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils. Untersuchungen zu "Unitatis Redintegratio", "Dignitatis Humanae" und "Nostra Aetate"*, Berlin 2010, 256; J.T. Pawlikowski, *Nostra Aetate. Its Continuing Challenges*, in *Marianum: Ephemerides Mariologiae* 69 (2007), 387-415; D. Senior, "Nostra Aetate" and the Catholic Biblical Renewal: A New Understanding of Judaism and the Jewish Roots of Early Christianity, in "Perché stessero con Lui". *Scritti in onore di Klemens Stock SJ nel suo 75° compleanno*, a cura di L. De Santos e S. Grasso, Roma 2010, 27-41.

¹⁰⁰ See J. Ellul, *The Issue of Muslim-Christian Dialogue. Nostra Aetate Revisited*, in *Angelicum* 84 (2007) 361-381.

¹⁰¹ See R. Lafontaine, *Lonergan's Functional Specialties as a Model for Doctrinal Development. John Courtney Murray and the Second Vatican Council's Declaration on Religious Freedom*, in *Gregorianum* 88 (2007) 780-805; S. Scatena, *How Vatican II Debated Religious Freedom*, in *Japan Mission Journal* 62 (2008)/1, 7-14; P. Schmitz, *Dignitatis humanae. Eine Erinnerung an das Konzil*, in *Gregorianum*

political challenges of globalization.¹⁰² The studies on *Unitatis redintegratio* still lack a complete reconstruction of the contribution of the “ecumenical observers” at Vatican II,¹⁰³ while the studies on *Presbyterorum ordinis* have tried to cast a light on the actual situation of the clergy starting from the reception of the council document on the priesthood.¹⁰⁴ The studies on the relationship between Vatican II and feminist theology seem to be once again marginal,¹⁰⁵ after the steps

88 (2007) 821-838; C. Troisfontaines, *Mgr De Smedt et la Déclaration Dignitatis humanae*, in *Gregorianum* 88 (2007) 761-779.

¹⁰² See G.C. Pagazzi, *Teoria della coscienza e stile della Verità. Note a margine di Dignitatis Humanae*, in *Gregorianum* 88 (2007) 839-860; C.E. Clifford, *The Ecumenical Context of Dignitatis humanae Forty Years after Vatican II*, dans *Science et Esprit* 59 (2007) 387-403; G. Del Pozo Abejón, *La Iglesia y la libertad religiosa*, Madrid 2007, 270; M. Doak, *Resisting the Eclipse of Dignitatis Humanae*, in *Horizons: The Journal of the College Theology Society* 33 (2006) 33-53; M.J. Farrelly, *Religious Culture and Historical Change: Vatican II on Religious Freedom*, in *The Heythrop Journal* 49 (2008) 731-741; W. Linnig, *Le royaume de Dieu, l'Église et la morale*, dans *Vatican II: la sacramentalité de l'Église et le Royaume...*, 233-258; L. Mistò, *La Dignitatis humanae: un nuovo modello per la libertà religiosa*, in *La Scuola Cattolica* 136 (2008)/4, 601-620; A. Molinaro, *Riflessioni sulla Dignitatis humanae*, in *Gregorianum* 88 (2007)/4, 806-820.

¹⁰³ See A. Birmelé, *Réception du concile Vatican II. Un point de vue protestant*, in *The Transformation of the Christian Churches in Western Europe 1945-2000. La transformation des Églises chrétiennes en Europe occidentale*, eds. by J. Billiet, L. Kenis, P. Pasture, Louvain 2010, 281-295; N. Egender, *Cinquante ans de Vatican II. I. La voix des témoins*, in *Irénikon* 83 (2010)/1, 41-91; G. Flynn, *Vatican II and the World Council of Churches: A Vision for Receptive Ecumenism or a Clash of Paradigms?*, in *Louvain Studies* 33 (2008) 6-29; W. Henn, *At the Heart of Unitatis Redintegratio: Unity in Diversity*, in *Gregorianum* 88 (2007) 329-351; M. Monshau, *The Ecumenical Movement, Vatican II, and the Restoration of Liturgical Preaching for Catholic Worship*, in *Doctrine and Life* 57 (2007) 24-34; K. Schelkens, *L'«affaire de Rhodes» au jour le jour. La correspondance inédite entre J.M.G. Willebrands et Ch.-J. Dumont*, dans *Istina* 54 (2009)/3, 253-277; J. Wicks, *Cardinal Willbrands's Contributions to Catholic Ecumenical Theology*, in *Pro Ecclesia* 20 (2011)/1, 6-27; H. Witte, *Vatikanum II Revisited. Kontext und Entstehung der Aussage über die 'Hierarchie' der Wahrheiten*, in *Bijdragen* 68 (2007) 445-477. See E. Farrugia, *Re-Reading Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, in *Gregorianum* 88 (2007) 352-372.

¹⁰⁴ See M. Confoy, *Religious Life and Priesthood: Perfectae caritatis, Opatam totius, Presbyterorum ordinis*, New York 2008; G. Routhier, *L'écho de l'enseignement de Vatican II sur le presbytérat dans la situation actuelle*, in *Revue théologique de Louvain* 41 (2010) 86-112 et 41 (2010) 161-179; L. Villemin, *La théologie de Vatican II mise à l'épreuve. Presbyterorum ordinis et Pastores dabo vobis*, in *Prêtres diocésains* (2007) 125-140.

¹⁰⁵ See M. Radegundis Wespel, *Aus Schulschwestern werden Franziskanerinnen. Erinnerungen einer Ordensfrau an das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil*, in *Rottenburger Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte* 26 (2007) 299-300; P. Vanzan, *Le religiose 40 anni dopo il Concilio*, in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 159 (2008)/4, 41-49; P. Zagano, *Women and*

made by feminist theology beyond the “letter” of Vatican II between the 1970s and the 1980s.

7. *Receptions of Vatican II*

The studies on the reception of Vatican II have continued to develop, especially on the reception in Germany,¹⁰⁶ Italy,¹⁰⁷ France,¹⁰⁸ the United States,¹⁰⁹ Canada,¹¹⁰ Latin America,¹¹¹ and India and Southeast

the Church. Unfinished Business of Vatican II, in *Horizons: The Journal of the College Theology Society* 34 (2007) 205-221.

¹⁰⁶ See T. Giese, *Die Frankfurter katholische Studentengemeinde und das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil. Glaubenswissen und gesellschaftlicher Wandel*, in *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 61 (2009) 289-312; O.H. Pesch, *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil und seine Rezeption. Bericht eines “Zeitzeugen zweiter Ordnung”*, ..., 279-285; J. Pilvousek, *Die Rezeption des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils in der katholischen Kirche in der DDR*, 107-120; J. Pilvousek, *Die Rezeption des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils in der katholischen Kirche in der DDR*, in *Rottenburger Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte* 26 (2007) 107-120; S. Steger, *Die Liturgiereform im Bistum Würzburg nach dem Zweiten Vatikanum, Schlaglichter und Entwicklungslinien*, in *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 57 (2007) 266-288; W. Steck, *Der Beginn der Liturgiereform in der Erzdiözese München und Freising. Eine chronologische Spurensuche*, in *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 57 (2007) 135-151.

¹⁰⁷ See G. Alcamo, *La “sicura bussola” della Chiesa. La recezione del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II e i convegni ecclesiali nelle chiese siciliane*, Trapani 2008, 296 pp.; *A quarant’anni dal Concilio della speranza. L’attualità del Vaticano II*, a cura di D. Bonifazi, E. Bressan, Macerata 2008, 361; A. Giovagnoli, *Il Concilio Vaticano II e la società italiana*, 43-57; G. Ruggieri, *Cos’è stato il Vaticano II?*, 52-79; R. Morozzo della Rocca, *Il viaggio di Paolo VI all’ONU nel contesto del Concilio Vaticano II*, 81-96; E. Bressan, *La chiesa e le attese del mondo: la Gaudium et spes e l’insegnamento sociale della chiesa*, 97-115; A. Gasperoni, *La Bibbia, parola di speranza contro ogni speranza*, 131-148; A. Melloni, *Breve guida ai giudizi sul concilio*, 165-200; D. Saresella, *Alcune osservazioni sulla chiesa post-conciliare*, 317-336.

¹⁰⁸ See *L’Église de France après Vatican II*, éd. par J.-F. Galinier-Pallerola, A. Laffay, B. Minvielle, Paris 2011.

¹⁰⁹ See T. Kelly, *The Transformation of American Catholicism: The Pittsburgh Laity and the Second Vatican Council, 1950-1972*, Notre Dame 2009, 456.; M.S. Massa, *The American Catholic Revolution: How the Sixties Changed the Church Forever*, New York 2010, 224; D. Shanahan, *The History and Reception of the Divine Office in “Sacrosanctum concilium” Among the Laity in the United States*, in *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 43 (2008) 161-175; K.D. Whitehead (ed.), *After Forty Years: Vatican Council II’s Diverse Legacy. Proceedings from the 28th Annual Convention of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars (September 23-25, 2005, Charlotte, North Carolina)*, South Bend IN 2007, xv-285.

¹¹⁰ See *Vatican II: Experiences Canadiennes - Canadian Experiences*, eds. by M. Attridge, C.E. Clifford, G. Routhier, Ottawa 2011, 568.

¹¹¹ See M.I. Alguilar, *The Kairos of Medellín: Towards a Movement for Liberation and*

Asia.¹¹² The reception of Vatican II in the local Catholic Churches in Africa and in the Middle East seems to be still neglected or at least underestimated. On the other hand, the reception of the council in the religious orders can cast a light on the presence of Vatican II in former “mission countries”,¹¹³ and the relationship between Vatican II and the 1983 Code of Canon Law proves a fundamental moment for the understanding of the history of the reception of the council.¹¹⁴ Orsy defines Vatican II “a seminal council, probably more so than any other in history”, but, at the same time, he notes that “an increasing number of textbooks [of canon law] are slipping back into the comfortable position of never asking about a law’s link to theological values”.¹¹⁵

New Mission after Vatican II, in Moment or Movement? Assessing Liberation Theology Forty Years After Medellín, ed. by P. Claffey, J. Egan, Frankfurt 2009.

¹¹² See R. Mactal, *Mariological Development after the Second Vatican Council and the Impact of Marian Devotion in the Philippines*, in *Philippiniana Sacra* 42 (2007) 125, 249-300; P.C. Phan, *Living for the Reign of God: Liberation, Cultures, Religions. A Theology of Liberation for the Asian Churches*, in *Moment or Movement? Assessing Liberation Theology Forty Years After Medellín*, eds. by P. Claffey, J. Egan, Frankfurt a.M. 2009, 55-95; P.C. Phan, *Culture, Religions, and Mission in Asian Catholic Theologies*, in *Japan Mission Journal* 63 (2009)/1, 37-53; P. Pulikkan, *The Reception of the Second Vatican Council in the Indian Church and Areas of Further Realization*, in *Vidyajyoti Journal of Theological Reflection* 71 (2007) 208-219, 285-301.

¹¹³ See J. Schmiedl, *Reception and Implementation of the Second Vatican Council. Religious Institutes*, in *The Transformation of the Christian Churches in Western Europe 1945-2000. La transformation des églises chrétiennes en Europe occidentale*, ed. by J. Billiet, L. Kenis, P. Pasture, Louvain 2010, 296-311.

¹¹⁴ See P.J. Brown, *The 1983 Code and Vatican II Ecclesiology: The Principle of Subsidiarity*, in *The Jurist* 69 (2009) 583-614; B.J. Hilberath, *Der Codex Iuris Canonici als authentische Rezeption des Zweiten Vatikanums?*, in *Rottenburger Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte* 26 (2007) 36-39; N. Lüdecke, *Der Codex Iuris Canonici als authentische Rezeption des Zweiten Vatikanums. Statement aus kanonistischer Sicht*, in *Rottenburger Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte* 26 (2007) 47-69; M. Wijlens, *Das II. Vatikanum als Fundament für die Anwendung des Rechtes. Hermeneutische Reflexionen und praktische Konsequenzen*, in *Theologie der Gegenwart* 50 (2007) 2-14.

¹¹⁵ L. Orsy, *Receiving the Council. Theological and Canonical Insights and Debates*, Collegeville MN 2009, 161, quotation at 4 and 89. The most important part of the book (the part that most fully expresses the mind of the author) are chapters 8 and 9, *The Case of Definitive Doctrine and Definitive Doctrine and Ordinances Supporting It: Debating the Issues*. Orsy takes issue with the recent trend of the papal doctrinal policy (between the 1983 Code of Canon Law and the 1998 *motu proprio Apostolos Suos*) to affirm “definitive and non-infallible” teachings. Chapter 9 is especially useful for English-speaking readers, with the translation of the tense and fascinating exchange between Orsy and Cardinal Ratzinger that was published

8. Future Perspectives on the Research on Vatican II

The debate on Vatican II is far from over, and the theological focus of Benedict XVI's pontificate has undoubtedly showed that. But it would be profoundly misleading to assume the concentration of the debate in a few areas (or languages) of world Catholicism as an indication of the "regionalization" or sectorialization of this debate. In many areas of world Catholicism the debate on the council is not as lively as in the North-Atlantic hemisphere, but only because in those areas – countries and continents that have never been part of the historical experience of medieval Christendom – the epoch-making shift of Vatican II is taken for granted and ultimately works as a condition for the theological survival of the Church in a culturally and religiously diverse world.

The impact of Benedict XVI's pontificate on the reception of Vatican II will surely be a major part of future studies on the significance of the council for the Church and for theology. But the reflection on the relationship between Benedict XVI's pontificate and Vatican II does not need to be an isolated effort, and it must be put in the perspective of the history of the theological reception of Vatican II: in academic theology, in the magisterium, and in the *sensus fidelium*.¹¹⁶ There is no doubt that historians and theologians now teaching the historical and theological significance of Vatican II to new generations and to the public at large need not only to maintain the distinction between the history of Vatican II and the narrative of Vatican II in a period of clear "clash of narratives" about the council, they also must develop new tools for teaching the theology of an event that became the first televised council of the Church, whose first interpretation were also conveyed throughout the world by the mass media.¹¹⁷

The historicization of Vatican II starting in the late 1980s has clearly introduced a hermeneutical shift in the theology of Vatican II. In the 1980s especially, interpreters of the council applied to Vatican II the idea of a "paradigm shift," the definition given during the years of the council by Thomas S. Kuhn in his *The Structure of Scientific*

in two separate issues of the journal *Stimmen der Zeit* (216 and 217 of 1999) after the publication of the *motu proprio Ad tuendam fidem* (May 1998).

¹¹⁶ See O. Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II...*, 69-85.

¹¹⁷ See F. Ruozzi, *Rai, Luce e Concilio. Il Vaticano II nelle fonti cinetelevisive italiane*, PhD dissertation (dir. A. Melloni), University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, 2009.

Revolutions.¹¹⁸ But to understand the comparison between the history of science and the history of theology, one of the most important laws has been used much less: a major scientific advance is almost always overestimated in the short run for its consequences, and underestimated in the long run. Fifty years after the event of Vatican II we find ourselves in that crucial moment of passage between the short run and the long run: the clash of narratives about Vatican II encounters here the perennial law of the reception of the councils of the Church. Giuseppe Alberigo, recalling the worrisome memorandum sent between 1600 and 1612 by Robert Bellarmine to pope Clement VIII on the progress of the reforms decided by the council of Trent, had estimated that it took at least 50 years for the beginning of the real reception of Trent.¹¹⁹

Massimo Faggioli
University of St. Thomas
St. Paul, USA

Riassunto: *La rassegna analizza il dibattito storico e teologico attorno al Vaticano II negli ultimi anni, tra 2007 e 2010. In particolare, il saggio si concentra sugli effetti sul dibattito teologico sul concilio della polarizzazione tra "ermeneutica della continuità e della discontinuità", valuta il rapporto tra ermeneutica del concilio e ricezione/rigetto della storicizzazione del concilio, e tenta di offrire un quadro del dibattito in corso sulla dinamica inter-testuale dei documenti finali del Vaticano II.*

¹¹⁸T.S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago 1962.

¹¹⁹G. Alberigo, *La chiesa nella storia*, Brescia 1988, 218-239. About Trent and Vatican II, see P. Prodi, *Il paradigma tridentino. Un'epoca della storia della Chiesa*, Brescia 2010, esp. 205-220.