

## 1. INTRODUCTION

By way of introduction, I would like to recall the intuitions of John XXIII in his opening speech *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*<sup>1</sup>. There is common agreement that this speech can be described as John's programme for the Council<sup>2</sup>. In this speech, the pope emphasized that it is important to take the challenges of the time seriously. He bluntly said no to all kinds of anxiety and distrust. He was of the opinion that people should be open for a future of the Church at the service of the world<sup>3</sup>. The speech was John's own work<sup>4</sup>, result of much reflection and many efforts<sup>5</sup>. The speech was important because of the then existing malaise. The first seven schemata were only sent to the fathers in the Summer of 1962 and the fathers did not have much time to study these texts<sup>6</sup>. In fact, several fathers, coming from the missionary countries, had already left their missions before the arrival of the schemata. Many, when arriving in Rome, had to ask for a copy. Moreover, most of the schemata met with critique, the schema on the liturgy being an exception. That people were disappointed about the schemata, is well known, as is made clear in the report of Edward Schillebeeckx at the request of Dutch (missionary) bishops, a report that was spread in Rome and was received very positively by most of the bishops<sup>7</sup>. That bishops' expectations were not very high, can also be read in the diary of Dom Helder Camara: "Je vois le Concile s'approcher. Mais jusqu'à ce jour, l'ordre du jour avec les schémas ne nous est même pas parvenu. Humainement, il n'y

---

<sup>1</sup> This part is based on M. LAMBERIGTS-L. DECLERCK, *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia. Johannes XXIII's openingsrede op het Tweede Vaticaans Concilie*, in *Collationes* (2012) 363-379.

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed study of this speech, see A. MELLONI, *Descrizione delle redazioni dell'allocuzione*, in *Sinossi critica dell'allocuzione di apertura del Concilio Vaticano II Gaudet Mater Ecclesia di Giovanni XXIII*, in G. ALBERIGO e.a., *Fede Tradizione Profezia. Studi su Giovanni XXIII e sul Vaticano II* (Testi e ricerche di Scienze religiose, 21), Brescia, 1984, pp. 223-283. The original text was written in Italian and then translated in Latin; cf. L.F. CAPOVILLA, *Nel cuore della gente papa Giovanni è già santo*, in *Jesus* 5 (1983) 64-72. This is not unimportant for there are clearly differences between the original Latin version (printed in the *Osservatore Romano*) and the official Latin text as published in the AAS; see the pertinent remarks in L. KAUFMANN-N. KLEIN, *Johannes XXIII. Prophetie im Vermächtnis*, Fribourg-Brig, 1990, pp. 108-109 (with further literature).

<sup>3</sup> See A. RICCARDI, *The Tumultuous Opening Days of the Council*, in G. ALBERIGO & J.A. KOMONCHAK (eds.), *History of Vatican II. Vol. II. The Formation of the Council's Identity. First Period and Intersession (October 1962-September 1963)*, Maryknoll-Leuven, 1997, pp. 14-18.

<sup>4</sup> See P. HEBBLETHWAITE, *John XXIII. Pope of the Council*, Londen, 1984, p. 430; RICCARDI, *The Tumultuous Opening Days of the Council*, pp. 14-15.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. MELLONI, *Sinossi critica dell'allocuzione di apertura del Concilio Vaticano II Gaudet Mater Ecclesia di Giovanni XXIII*.

<sup>6</sup> See the complaints of cardinal F. König in his book *Where is the Church Heading?*, Middlegreen, 1986, p. 24.

<sup>7</sup> See J.A. BROUWERS, *Vatican II. Derniers préparatifs et première session: activités conciliaires en coulisses*, in É. FOUILLOUX, *Vatican II commence... Approches Francophones* (Instrumenta Theologica, 12), Leuven, 1993, pp. 353-368. K. Rahner's critique about the schema *De fontibus* was outspoken: set the schema aside; cf. G. FOGHARTY, *The Council gets Underway*, in G. ALBERIGO & J.A. KOMONCHAK (eds.), *History of Vatican II. Vol. II. The Formation of the Council's Identity. First Period and Intersession (October 1962-September 1963)*, Maryknoll-Leuven, 1997, pp. 72-73. With regard to other critical remarks, see K. SCHELKENS, *Catholic Theology of Revelation on the Eve of Vatican II. A Redaction History of the Schema De fontibus revelationis (1960-1962)* (Brill's Series in Church History, 41), Leiden, 2010, pp. 265-269.

a guère à espérer ...”<sup>8</sup>

Already in the radio message of September 11, 1962, the pope had asked the Council participants to actively contribute to the *aggiornamento* he was longing for, a message that some people interpret today as an implicit dissociation from the prepared schemata<sup>9</sup>. In passing, it should be said that John XXIII himself also had contributed to the confusion by the publication of the Apostolic Constitution *Veterum Sapientia* (February 22, 1962), in which the pope had emphasized the importance of Latin for the teaching of theology, and this in a period that Latin was, also for many bishops in the missionary countries, no longer a language they were familiar with. In fact, several of these bishops had explicitly complained about the dominant role of Latin, experienced by their faithful as a sign of colonization<sup>10</sup>. In any case, the expectations were not very high, neither among the outsiders<sup>11</sup>, nor among many insiders<sup>12</sup>. I stress this point for it makes clear why people so enthusiastically reacted to the opening speech of the pope, a speech in which words such as *gaudere, laetitia*, or also *laetus* were used at least 6 times.

In his speech the pope emphasized that Christ is the centre of history and life, and that the problems humanity is confronted with today, are still the same as in Christ’s time<sup>13</sup>. The pope hoped that Vatican II should become a positive sign for Church and society; the Council should affirm the unity between Christ and the Church. The Council should direct people towards truth and goodness, and in doing so, people should be stimulated in taking their Christian faith seriously. He vehemently criticized those who were speaking of this time as a time of decline and misfortune, thus naively extolling a past that never existed<sup>14</sup>. John XXIII was a professional Church historian, something which is sometimes of help. The pope did not deny that this period in history was a challenging one, but was of the opinion that it is the Church’s duty to discover God’s active involvement in history by reading the signs of the

---

<sup>8</sup> Dom Helder Camara. *Lettres conciliaires (1962-1965). I. J’ai déjà un programme bien tracé*. Version française sous la direction de José de Broucker. Préface par le cardinal Roger Etchegaray. Postface par Étienne Fouilloux, Parijs, 2006, p. 23 (letter of Camara to Mgr. Manuel Larraín, bishop of Talca in Chili, August, 1962).

<sup>9</sup> BREDECK, *Das Zweite Vatikanum als Konzil des Aggiornamento*, pp. 308-310, with further literature. With regard to the parallels between the radio speech and the opening speech, see A. MELLONI, *Giovanni XXIII e l’avvio del Vaticano II*, p. 77, n. 12, in É. FOUILLOUX, *Vatican II commence ... Approches Francophones* (Instrumenta Theologica, 12), Leuven, 1993, pp. 75-104.

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., A. MELLONI, *Tensioni e timori alla vigilia del Vaticano II. La costituzione apostolica Veterum Sapientia di Giovanni XXIII (22 febbraio 1962)*, in *Cristianesimo nella storia* 11 (1990) 275-307.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. D.A. SEEBER, *Das Zweite Vatikanum. Konzil des Übergangs*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1966, p. 62; cf. also MELLONI, *Giovanni XXIII e l’avvio del Vaticano II*, pp. 82-83.

<sup>12</sup> See M. LAMBERIGTS-L. DECLERCK, *The Role of Cardinal Léon-Joseph Suenens at Vatican II*, in D. DONNELLY e.a., *The Belgian Contribution to the Second Vatican Council. International Research Conference at Mechelen, Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve (September 12-16, 2005)* (BETL, 216), Leuven-Parijs-Dudley, 2008, pp. 72-74.

<sup>13</sup> On a regular basis, the pope emphasized in his speech the central role of Christ in our salvation history. Not the Church but Christ is the centre, the *Lumen gentium*.

<sup>14</sup> HEBBLETHWAITE, *John XXIII. Pope of the Council*, p. 431 suggests the pope is thinking here of the Roman Curia.

times. He emphasized that the Church today enjoyed much more freedom and autonomy than often was the case in the past, including with regard to the organization of ecumenical councils. Pope John was less naive than sometimes suggested: he was very well aware of the complexity of political and economic problems.

The pope - and many who criticize today the results of Vatican II's implementation wholeheartedly refer to this – emphasized that the most important task of the Council was to guard and promote the Christian doctrine<sup>15</sup>, but this should be done while taking into account the current situation and the changed attitudes which request new approaches in the Catholic apostolate. The Christian doctrine thus needed a new translation and rephrasing, adapted to this period in history: this is what is meant with *aggiornamento*. This involves dialogue with the current time, and such dialogue is not possible when one simply condemns this *saeculum*<sup>16</sup>. I think one may say that for John XXIII Catholic doctrine and political, social, economic, and educational progress in history do not exclude each other. Respect for our common heritage is more than a nostalgic cherishing of a precious treasure definitely belonging to the past. Adaptation of the doctrine is needed if one wants to take seriously the pastoral challenges of today: the Church does not only read the signs of the times, but must search for words and formulae in order to give witness of its message in the current history<sup>17</sup>. The pope rejected a mysterious, transcendental esoteria, which is not related to human beings' life today. Doctrinal traditions only remain valuable when and if they are able to express themselves in a lifelike language<sup>18</sup>. This part of the speech will be quoted, not only by Council fathers during the debates in aula, but also twice by the pope himself in later speeches<sup>19</sup>.

One can describe the speech of the pope as a search for a new language and a rediscovery of God's presence in contemporary history, reason why the pope emphasized that the Church of today, spouse of Christ, will not condemn, but prefers mercy over severity<sup>20</sup>. Not power, but authority will be of help in pastoral work: authenticity has to do with testimony, not with condemnations. Dignity of the human person and strive for perfectness should be the two pillars of the Church as a loving, benevolent and patient<sup>21</sup>. The essence of being Church is the spread of Christian love. The challenge is to come to unity with the other denominations – and observers of these denominations were present at the Council, and, over the sessions, in growing number -, other religions and all people of good will.

---

<sup>15</sup> AAS, p. 790: “Praecipuum Concilii munus: doctrina tuenda ac promovenda”.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. AAS 54 (1962) 437-447.

<sup>17</sup> See BREDECK, *Das Zweite Vatikanum als Konzil des Aggiornamento*, pp. 319-320.

<sup>18</sup> The differences between the spoken (Italian) speech and its official (Latin), printed version AAS are evident; cf. also HEBBLETHWAITE, *John XXIII*, p. 432.

<sup>19</sup> BREDECK, *Das Zweite Vatikanum als Konzil des Aggiornamento*, p. 320.

<sup>20</sup> I want to mention explicitly that Vatican II is the first ecumenical Council that, finally, did not feel the need to formulate an *anathema*.

<sup>21</sup> In this regard, the Church wants to be a *Mater et magistra* (the title of the in 1961 published encyclical).

## 2. REACTIONS TO THE TEXT

The speech of the pope was well received, both in aula and in the press. People liked the pope's style. It is interesting to see what the media appreciated in the speech. *L'Osservatore Romano* emphasized that the pope had stated that the main purpose of the Council was the defense and promotion of the Catholic doctrine. The French newspaper *Le Monde* was of the opinion that the pope had approved the research methods as used in modern thought. According to *La Croix*, the speech should be read as the charter for Vatican II<sup>22</sup>. The journalist Henri Fesquet mentioned that the clarity of the pope's speech had impressed the Council fathers<sup>23</sup>. I think that all these interpretations are correct. However, the Council fathers mostly seemed to be impressed by the pope's plea for more openness towards the world, for a serious reading of the signs of the times, for a need to reinterpret the Christian message, and the like. The Belgian theologian, Mgr. Philips, wrote in his diary that the speech revealed a dramatic change in the highest authority's attitude: from condemnation to mercy and understanding; from closeness to openness; from power to love<sup>24</sup>. In any case, the pope offered the Council fathers a freedom to speak. He created a space for people like Cardinal Frings of Cologne to speak "offen und frei"<sup>25</sup>. The speech inspired the Dutch bishops to spread the critical remarks of Schillebeeckx among the Council fathers<sup>26</sup>. When the French bishops criticized the absence of a pastoral concern in the doctrinal schemata, they explicitly referred to the pope's speech<sup>27</sup>. The pope's opening address will play an important role in the rejection of the schema on the sources of revelation<sup>28</sup>, even although people attempted to make an artificial link between the schema and *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*<sup>29</sup>. Those who criticized this schema, introduced, referring to the pope's speech, elements such as the pastoral character of the Council<sup>30</sup>, the urgent need to offer the Christian message to people living in contemporary society, longing for a language that could be understood by all faithful<sup>31</sup>. Not without reason they referred to John's emphasis on the role of the Church as mother: a

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. RICCARDI, *The Tumultuous Opening Days of the Council*, p. 18.

<sup>23</sup> H. FESQUET, *Le journal du concile*, Le Jas du Revest-St.-Martin, Forcalquier, 1966, p. 27.

<sup>24</sup> *Carnets conciliaires de Mgr Gérard Philips, secrétaire adjoint de la commission doctrinale. Texte néerlandais avec traduction française et commentaires* par K. SCHELKENS. Avec une Introduction par L. DECLERCK (*Instrumenta Theologica*, 29), Leuven, 2006, p. 3.

<sup>25</sup> *Für die Menschen bestellt. Erinnerungen des Alterzbischofs von Köln Josef Kardinal Frings*, Keulen, 1973, p. 253.

<sup>26</sup> BROUWERS, *Vatican II. Derniers préparatifs et première session: activités conciliaires en coulisses*, p. 356.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. CONGAR, *Mon Journal du Concile*, p. 123.

<sup>28</sup> See G. RUGGIERI, *The First Doctrinal Clash*, in ALBERIGO & J.A. KOMONCHAK (eds.), *History of Vatican II. Vol. II. The Formation of the Council's Identity. First Period and Intersession (October 1962-September 1963)*, Maryknoll-Leuven, 1997, p. 234.236-237

<sup>29</sup> See RUGGIERI, *The First Doctrinal Clash*, p. 251. The voices of those who had complained about the absence of a pastoral concern in the documents had not really been heard during the discussions in the central preparatory commission. During the debates on the *De fontibus*, both the supporters and opponents of the scheme will refer to the pope's speech; see, e.g., MELLONI, *Giovanni XXIII e l'avvio del Vaticano II*, pp. 93-94.

<sup>30</sup> For the intervention of Maximos IV, AS I,3, p. 53.

<sup>31</sup> See the interventions of Guerry and Butler; AS I,3, p. 100 and p. 108.

mother shows mercy; a mother does not condemn, as had been the case in previous decades<sup>32</sup>. The good news must be preached and spread as a liberating message, not as a condemning document<sup>33</sup>. Several bishops mentioned the pope's ecumenical concern, a good example being the speech of bishop De Smedt of Bruges on November 19, 1962, who, on behalf of the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity<sup>34</sup>, bishop reminded his audience that ecumenical dialogue should be understood as a method and way to better understand each other. A blind defense of the own doctrine had not resulted into a real dialogue. De Smedt was of the opinion that a new approach was needed and mentioned the presence of the observers: their presence was regarded as a positive sign<sup>35</sup>. It is significant that in the discussion on the schema about ecumenism, "Ut omnes unum sint", quite a number of interveners explicitly mentioned *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*. Cardinal Bea, president of the Secretariat for the promotion of Christian Unity, mentioned the pope's distinction between the content of the *depositum fidei* and the way in which this content is articulated as an important key for the dialogue with the separated brethren<sup>36</sup>.

Several interveners, often considered to belong to the so-called minority – personally I do not like this concept, for one's belonging to the majority or minority can differ from dossier to dossier -, liked to refer to that part of the pope's speech where John had spoken about the preservation and promotion of the doctrine<sup>37</sup>. Indeed, one should be aware of the fact that John XXIII never had the ambition to change the content of the doctrine and he had said this explicitly in his introduction.

It goes without saying, that every Council participant could make use of the pope's speech for his own concerns. However, already at the end of the first session, it had become obvious that most fathers opted for these parts in the pope's speech where he had emphasized elements such as pastoral and ecumenical concern, willingness to dialogue with society, and the reading of the signs of the times.

### 3. SOME FINAL REFLECTIONS ON THE POPE'S TEXT

The pope offered in his opening speech a perspective, a kind of general guidelines. John did not offer a concrete and detailed program<sup>38</sup>. He only indicated the spirit in which the Council

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the intervention of Silva Henriquez, AS I,3, p. 81.

<sup>33</sup> RUGGIERI, *The First Doctrinal Clzsh*, pp. 254-255.

<sup>34</sup> See M. LAMBERIGTS, *Msgr Emiel-Jozef De Smedt, Bishop of Bruges, and the Second Vatican Council*, in M.T. FATTORI, A. MELLONI, *Experience, Organisations and Bodies at Vatican II* (Instrumenta Theologica, 20), Leuven, 1999, pp. 446-447.

<sup>35</sup> For an appreciation of this speech, see, e.g., CONGAR, *Mon Journal du Concile*, pp. 238-239.

<sup>36</sup> G. RUGGIERI, *Beyond and Ecclesiology of Polemics: The Debate on the Church*, in G. ALBERIGO & J.A. KOMONCHAK (eds.), *History of Vatican II. Vol. II. The Formation of the Council's Identity. First Period and Intersession (October 1962-September 1963)*, Maryknoll-Leuven, 1997, pp. 326-327.

<sup>37</sup> RUGGIERI, *The First Doctrinal Clzsh*, pp. 259-260.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. RICCARDI, *The Tumultuous Opening Days of the Council*, pp. 18.50.

fathers were expected to work<sup>39</sup>. The pope rejected doom-mongering. He invited to frankness and open-heartedness. In fact, the pope's vagueness when speaking about the Conciliar program created space for the Council fathers. They were enabled to realize the old adagium: *concilium episcoporum est*. I do not exaggerate when stating that the pope asked the bishops to take their responsibility, inviting them to think about the Church's future, to read the signs of the time and to take into account humanity's longing for everlasting happiness. John XXIII showed the direction the Council should go, but did not fill in how the Council should act. Many commentators have lamented about the rather difficult and hesitant start of the Council. They rightly do so. However, in opposition to previous Councils, the absence of a clear agenda created space for discussion and debate among bishops, religious superiors, and theologians, a surprise for all those who are familiar with the way in which Rome had treated people like Congar, Chenu, Rahner, De Lubac, Daniélou, only to mention a few, in the preconciliar period.

#### 4. VATICAN II AS A CASUS BELLI<sup>40</sup>

50 years after the opening of the Council, on different places and in different groups, a debate is going on about the correct interpretation of the Council. In several circles, Vatican II has become a *casus belli*. In this regard, people like to refer to the speech of Pope Benedict XVI on December 22, 2005. In this speech, the pope criticized those who like to speak about the Council in terms such as discontinuity. The pope also had problems with people who are of the opinion that the texts of the Council did not do justice to the spirit of the Council<sup>41</sup>.

The reproach that Vatican II was a rupture with the past of the Catholic tradition was already formulated by Mgr. Marcel Lefebvre at the end of the sixties, beginning of the seventies. Because of the post-conciliar developments, Mgr. Marcel Lefebvre stepped down as superior general of the Spiritans (1968). In 1970, Lefebvre started with a new seminary at Ecône (Switzerland), where he continued to use the so-called Tridentine liturgy, a liturgy, which, in all fairness, was not the result of decisions of the Council of Trent. The biggest problems Lefebvre had with the Council were not so much the liturgy but the Church's attitude towards ecumenism, religious liberty, and interreligious dialogue. In fact, during the pontificate of Pope John Paul II, Rome had shown a tolerant attitude towards those who wanted to follow the liturgical regulations as approved in 1962 (the mass of Pius V in his

---

<sup>39</sup> It is no coincidence that, at the end of his speech, the pope asked the fathers to follow the voice of the Spirit.

<sup>40</sup> This part is based on M. LAMBERIGTS-L. DECLERCK, *Vatican II. Some Retrospective Perspectives* (in print), and M. LAMBERIGTS-L. KENIS, *Het tweede Vaticaans concilie (1962-1965): een casus belli*, in M. LAMBERIGTS-L. KENIS (red.), *Vaticanum II: geschiedenis of inspiratie? Theologische opstellen over het tweede Vaticaans concilie*, Antwerp, 2013, pp. 9-30.

<sup>41</sup> For the pope's view on the Council, see L. BOEVE, *Interpreting the Second Vatican Council*, in L. BOEVE-G. MANNION (eds.), *The Ratzinger Reader*, New York, 2010, pp. 257-279.

latest version dates from that period)<sup>42</sup>. Mgr. Lefebvre and his followers were of the opinion that Vatican II was a *negative* rupture with the past<sup>43</sup> and up to today, people are rejecting the Council because of its ecumenical revolution. People consider Paul VI as the gravedigger of tradition, qualify Benedict XVI as a soft modernist, and speak of John Paul II as the apostle of a Universal religion<sup>44</sup>.

Other people speak about Vatican II as a *positive* rupture with the past, stating that the Council had said farewell to the droll pre-conciliar period. They consider Vatican II as the beginning of a new era. They like to refer what happened in the aftermath of the Council (especially 1968) and are longing for a new Council, Vatican II<sup>45</sup>. In a recent study, Vatican II was described as a Catholic revolution, in fact the greatest revolution since the reformation and this revolution is situated between 1968-1970, when the lower clergy and the laity, partly because of disappointments such as the one about the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, started their own reform project, held a plea in favor of freedom of conscience, thus creating a space where they could take their own moral decisions with regard to sexuality and authority<sup>46</sup>.

Already during the Council, people discussed the relation between the conciliar and the pre-conciliar period, or better, between the conciliar debates and decisions and the pre-conciliar currents in theology and Church life. Good examples are the debate about religious liberty<sup>47</sup>, and the text about the Jews<sup>48</sup>. The promoters of these texts made many efforts in order to explain why these texts, even although they seemed to suggest a rupture with the past, still were important for the Church's future. Indeed, these promoters suggested, after the Jewish drama during World War II, that the Church had to speak about the Jews and had to change her attitude. The same should be said with regard to religious liberty: recognition of religious liberty might become a stimulus for the ecumenical dialogue and a help for Churches, living under communist regimes.

---

<sup>42</sup> On this case, see, e.g; A. HENDERICKX-L. KENIS, *De zaak Lefebvre*, Leuven, 1979; Ph. LEVILLAIN, *Rome n'est plus dans Rome: Mgr. Lefebvre et son Église*, Parijs, 2010.

<sup>43</sup> See D. MENOZZI, *L'opposition au Concile (1966-1984)*, in G. ALBERIGO-J.-P. JOSSUA (éd.), *La réception de Vatican II* (Cogitatio fidei, 134), Parijs, 1985, pp. 429-457 ;

<sup>44</sup> Cf. D. BOURMAUD, *Cent ans de modernisme. Généalogie du concile Vatican II*, Étampes, 2003, especially part V : « Le modernisme triomphant ».

<sup>45</sup> Cf. G. ALBERIGO, *Vatican II et son héritage*, in M. LAMBERIGTS-L. KENIS, *Vatican II and its Legacy* (BETL, 166), Leuven-Dudley, 2002, pp. 9-10.

<sup>46</sup> A. GREELEY, *The Catholic Revolution. New Wine, Old Wineskins, Vatican Council*, Berkely-Los Angeles-London, 2004, p. 192. With regard to the impressive evolutions in the thinking of priests and laity, the numbers as offered on the pages pp. 36-40 are revealing.

<sup>47</sup> For the details, see SCATENA, *La fatica della libertà*.

<sup>48</sup> M. LAMBERIGTS-L. DECLERCK, *Vatican II on the Jews : A Historical Survey*, in M. MOYAERT-D. POLLEFEYT (eds.), *Never Revoked. Nostra Aetate as Ongoing Challenge for Jewish-Christian Dialogue*, Leuven-Grand Rapids/Cambridge, 2010, pp. 13-56.

The coordinator of the impressive *History of Vatican II*-project, Giuseppe Alberigo, preferred to speak of a transition Council<sup>49</sup>. He was of the opinion that a correct interpretation of the Council also should take into account its reception in, e.g., liturgy, synods, Medellín, ecumenical dialogue, interreligious dialogue and the like. Alberigo also emphasized the event-character of the Council: events influenced the results of the Council<sup>50</sup>. This is one of the reasons why the *History of Vatican II* paid so much attention to archival research. Due to this project, everywhere, but especially in Europe, much is done in order to collect and preserve archival material on the Council<sup>51</sup>.

A last direction that should be mentioned is the one that emphasizes the fundamental continuity between Vatican II and the preceding tradition. In two works<sup>52</sup>, consisting of shorter and/or longer reviews of work of others - Marchetto did not do research in archives – Marchetto constructed his own Council, not taking into account the results of historical-critical research, and affirmed, without any problem, that the Council is characterized by a perfect continuity with the past<sup>53</sup>. My problem with this type of readings is that research in archives is rather neglected<sup>54</sup>.

Needless to say, the Council itself is also responsible for these passions with regard to the correct interpretation: oppositions, possible dissensions, needed majority, they all resulted in compromises. This is normal: for about 4 years, more than 2000 bishops and a same number of theologians were involved in it. A Council is a search for the broadest possible unanimity, and the results of the final votes make evident that this ideal was realized. The Council succeeded in its search for unanimity, and, in opposition to Vatican I, all bishops remained together in Rome. Even better, bishops discovered that they were not only responsible for their own diocese, but, in a spirit of collegiality, for the whole Church and this both on a material and a spiritual level. They used a new style, a Biblical style<sup>55</sup>.

The Council showed its respect for the other Christian denominations: the reciprocal ban by both the Catholic and the Orthodox Church was, after 900 years, solemnly abolished. The other Christian heretics now became separated brethren with whom the Catholics started a

---

<sup>49</sup> G. ALBERIGO-J.-P. JOSSUA (éd.), *La réception de Vatican II* (Cogitatio fidei, 134), Parijs, 1985.

<sup>50</sup> Helpful in this regard is M.T. FATTORI-A. MELLONI, (ed.), *L'evento et le decisioni. Studi sulle dinamiche del concilio Vaticano II* (Testi e ricerche di scienze religiose. N.S. 20), Bologna, 2000.

<sup>51</sup> For an appreciation of Alberigo's work (and critical comments with regard to his evaluation of Paul VI), see M. LAMBERIGTS, *Alberigo and/on The History of Vatican II*, in *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 29 (2008) 875-902.

<sup>52</sup> A. MARCHETTO, *Il concilio ecumenico Vaticano II. Contrappunto per la sua storia*, Città del Vaticano, 2005; ID. *Il Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II. Per la sua corretta ermeneutica*, Città del Vaticano, 2012.

<sup>53</sup> For a well underpinned and destructive critique on Marchetto's position, see, e.g., G. RUGGIERI, *Réception et interprétations du concile Vatican II. Les raisons d'un débat*, in A. MELLONI-G. RUGGIERI (dirs.), *Qui a peur de Vatican II*, Brussel, 2010, pp. 16-17.

<sup>54</sup> See K. SCHELKENS, *Van dualisme naar veelheid. Pleidooi voor een katholieke lezing van het Tweede Vaticaans Concilie*, in *Collationes* 42 (2012) 381-401, p. 392.

<sup>55</sup> See J. FAMERÉE (éd.), *Vatican II comme style. L'herméneutique théologique du concilie*, Paris, 2012.

dialogue. The Council recognized that truth is present in other religions. There was the explicit recognition of religious freedom and the recognition and appreciation of variety in society<sup>56</sup>. Last but not least, the Council approved the attempts of so many movements and theologians, once suspected and condemned: theologians who once were put on the Index, whose careers were broken, at least for a while, now were asked as experts in order to help the Church in her search for a new future.

Respect for the past and concern for the future do not exclude each other. Our past is more than a relic; our future is more than a phantom, at least if we want to keep together past and future. One can only appreciate the richness of the past when one is also able to recognize the weaknesses of the past: reason why Paul VI asked for forgiveness; reason why an *aggiornamento* was needed.

In this regard, one has to mention the rediscovery of the Spirit. *Omnis comparatio claudicat*, but a comparison with Trent and Vatican I reveals that Vatican II mentions about 200 times the Holy Spirit, Trente 80 times, Vatican I 10 times. I suggest that the more one speaks about the Holy Spirit, the less one feels the need to condemn. I do not have to time to point out the many positive aspects of several, not all, of the Vatican II documents. Much could be said about the negative points, including *Inter mirifica*, the texts on the Oriental Churches or the declaration on Christian education (*Gravissimum educationis*), for I want to speak now about Vatican II's legacy.

Before doing this, I wish to make a last point. I do not understand that some people consider Vatican II as a second class for a pastoral Council. They suggest that Vatican II was not a doctrinal Council and therefore not an important Council<sup>57</sup>. If I am right, pastoral has to do with care for the faithful and this in its broadest sense of the word. Pastoral has to do with the life of the whole Church, referring to Christ, the only *lumen gentium* (cf. *Lumen Gentium* 1). The Church is called to make God visible in history (*Gaudium et Spes* 21) and this must be done through service to the world, an intuition clearly well understood and promoted by pope Francis. Vatican II is the first pastoral Council in history. The adjective pastoral is mentioned in the title of the document dealing with the bishops, *Christus Dominus*, and in the document about the Church in the world, *Gaudium et Spes*<sup>58</sup>. The word pastoral is used 34 times in the document on the bishops, 15 times in the one on the priestly formation, *Optatam Totius*, 19 times in *Ad Gentes* (on the missionary activities of the Church), and 16 times in the document on the priests<sup>59</sup>. I think that these numbers make clear what the

---

<sup>56</sup> *Gaudium et Spes* makes clear that the Council did see the problems in the world. Those suggesting that the document is too optimistic, should urgently read it.

<sup>57</sup> ALBERIGO, *Vatican II et son héritage*, p. 10; Alberigo refers to J. RATZINGER, *Entretien sur la foi*. Interview par V. Messori, Parijs, 1985.

<sup>58</sup> The document about the bishops, *Christus Dominus* is a *Decretum de pastoralis* *Episcoporum munere in Ecclesia*. *Gaudium et Spes* is qualified as *Constitutio pastoralis de Ecclesia in mundo huius temporis*.

<sup>59</sup> The adjective is mentioned 10 times in *Lumen Gentium*, 11 times *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

Council fathers had in mind. Similar exercises can be done with regard to the concept service, *servitium*, so often used in *Gaudium et Spes*. In sum, it is an urgent desideratum to return to Vatican II and its intuitions, at least if one is willing to prepare a future for the Church. But let us now deal with the Council's legacy.

## 5. *Vatican II's Legacy: Some Remarks*

### a. *The Liturgy: Source and High Point of Christian Life*

If my information is correct, the Anglo-Saxon world has invested much time and energy in the "re-translation" of the officially approved post-Vatican II translations of Latin liturgical texts into English, a re-translation that is described by the Irish theology professor Jim Corkery as a step back in time<sup>60</sup>. As an historian, I can only repeat what I stated elsewhere: experiments were allowed after the Council<sup>61</sup>. The African liturgies thus got the opportunity to develop their own liturgical celebrations, celebrations meeting the needs and wishes of their local communities with their own (justified) longing for a celebration of God's word in a language familiar to them. Ridiculous as these language controversies are in the view of a Belgian who lives in a country that has an expertise of more than 150 years in this type of disputes, I simply want to repeat that liturgical celebration of God's love for the world through the incarnation of his Son happened at that time in a language people understood. The language should be a medium at the service of the liturgical celebration of God's love for the world today and this necessarily involves adaptation to the current time and eventually to the future! But even if I do interpret things wrongly, I do want to repeat that liturgy is much more than language. Liturgy has to do with the building up of community life. The Eucharist is much more than just the commemoration of Christ's sacrifice, important as it might be. Indeed, we do not only celebrate the sacrifice as such but also come together as community in order to find inspiration, support and courage to concretize the message in our daily life and concrete actions. A Christian community gathers in prayer in order to commemorate the past in view of the future<sup>62</sup>. When the liturgical movement during half a century ago held a plea in favor of the use of the vernacular – people seem to forget that the introduction of the use of the vernacular already started in the beginning of the '40's, in India, not in Europe – it did so because its leading members, historians and philologists, had discovered that this had always been the way the church had followed. I consider it a great surprise that people today are willing to give up the rich variety of the Church in liturgics. In

---

<sup>60</sup> J. CORKERY, *The Promise of Vatican II: Reality or Illusion?*, in S. MULLIGAN (ed.), *Reaping the Harvest: Fifty Years after Vatican II*, Dublin, 2012, pp. 13-37, p. 20.

<sup>61</sup> See M. LAMBERIGTS, *Entwicklungen nach dem II. Vatikanum in den Niederlanden. Die liturgische Entwicklung als Fallstudie*, in P. HÜNERMANN (Hrsg.), *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil und die Zeichen der Zeit heute*, Freiburg, Basel & Wien, 2006, pp. 283-312.

<sup>62</sup> In this regard, CORKERY, *The Promise of Vatican II: Reality or Illusion?*, p. 36, insists on the fact that the liturgy belongs to us all, for it is the prayer of the Church and we are the Church. If Corkery is right, one might wonder how many lay faithful have been consulted on this matter.

any case, those promoting the use of the vernacular in liturgy – only four Council Fathers voted against the *Sacrosanctum Concilium*-constitution - , did so because they were of the opinion that liturgy requires an active participation of the community. Those who spent 1 minute of their precious time to the study of both the wishes of the bishops from Africa with regard to the Council and their interventions at the council do know how much the “Africans” were longing for their own liturgy. I am quite confident that the liturgical renewal as longed for during the preconciliar period is really implemented in Africa. Commentators rightly have observed that a great job still has to be done in Africa with regard to the reading of the Bible and the “dominant” role of the priest in the liturgy<sup>63</sup>, but all agree that thanks to Vatican II Africa finally has the liturgy it deserves. The same should be said with regard to Asia, where, long before the opening of the Council, liturgical enculturation had found its way, with Roman approval. In any case, one of the greatest gifts of the Council remains that it made the use of the vernacular possible and that it discovered the neglected role of liturgy in the building up of the local communities.

b. *The Rediscovery of the Bible as a Book of all Faithful.*

Gratefully celebrating God’s love for the world through Jesus Christ is essentially an ecclesiological act, id est, an act of a community. In this regard, I would like to remember the huge efforts made by the Bible movement. The Bible movement intended to re-open the richness of the Bible for the common people. Indeed, since Vatican II the Bible has become (again) the source and inspiration of authentic Christian life for all Christians. Vatican II’s texts sometimes read as a paraphrasing of Scripture. Scripture is recognized as the one and only source for Divine inspiration and truth. These days, one has the impression that the many Bible groups, founded as an implementation of Vatican II’s document *Dei Verbum*, are a bit tired. However, it remains an urgent need to return time and again to the source from which we live, Scripture, so successfully used by the former cardinal of Milan, Martini, when speaking with the youth of his diocese.

c. *New Centers of Theology*

I am well aware of the fact that with Vatican II rather young but quite powerful theologies suddenly disappeared. Some forms of Neo-Scholasticism were the result of the reaction against “Modernism” at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but certainly not an appropriate and correct presentation of Medieval theology as some of its adherents pretended. The Thomas Aquinas of that Neo-Scholastic theology disappeared. Thomas Aquinas was degraded to an interesting and thought provoking figure in Christianity’s history, a degradation which in fact can also be regarded as an upgrade: the Thomas of history seemed to be more interesting and challenging than the Thomas as presented in Neo-Scholasticism. The Thomas of history was clearly an out the box thinker, something one can hardly say of

---

<sup>63</sup> See the pertinent remarks of FAGGIOLI, *Vatican II*, p. 61.

the Thomas of Neo-Scholasticism. Vatican II is a beautiful example of a wrestling with the past, respect for the past, rediscovery of the past and hope for the future. Patristic literature will find its way in the documents<sup>64</sup>. Augustine receives more weight and authority than Thomas<sup>65</sup>. The participants are aware that Christianity has a history, are aware that they are not expected to invent a “new” Christianity, but have the duty to translate its content in another language and context. Vatican II was an attempt to respect the past and prepare a new future for the Church. The Roman Catholic Church is a Church which respects its tradition, and is aware of the fact that she is fundamentally characterized by historicity. We are unavoidably a historical religion, for Christ has become man, has entered history. This is true for every religion rooted in history. In the Bible, one will often find in the more recent book an interpretation of what is present in the older books<sup>66</sup>. *Aggiornamento* and *ressourcement* are not meant as ruptures with the past. It is rather the opposite: they must be described as respectful re-appreciations of the past in view of a new era.

With and because of Vatican II, bishops and theologians became more and more aware of the importance of local churches as valuable expressions of the multifaceted image the Church consists of. Bishops considered the diversity of theologies and theological approaches to be a richness, not a risk for the development of theology. Many missionary bishops had discovered the high moral and religious values as present in other world religions, a discovery which resulted in the respectful way of speaking about them in *Nostra aetate* 2, as already mentioned above. As a result, people were convinced that theology should develop in the direction of a theology of adaptation and enculturation. Theology should be more than an exercise in salvation of souls and expansion of the Roman Catholic Church, both approaches that sometimes were inspired by a rather colonial feeling of superiority. And let us be honest, theology was, up to the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, mostly European theology.

Within this context, new centers of theology developed, partly also as a result of the growing awareness that the Roman Catholic Church is a world Church, a Church being present all over the world, thus a Church being challenged, threatened and enriched by the diversity of the many cultures she is announcing the Gospel to. A theology nourished by the local life and experience of concrete Christians, will evidently have its own specific modes of

---

<sup>64</sup> See the impressive study of D. GIANOTTI, *I Padri della Chiesa al Concilio Vaticano II: la teologia patristica nella Lumen Gentium* (Biblioteca di teologia dell’evangelizzazione, 6), Bologna, 2010.

<sup>65</sup> See A. DUPONT, *The Authority of Augustine of Hippo at the Second Vatican Council. A Comparative Analysis of the Use of Augustine in the Preparatory and the Promulgated Documents*, in G. ROUTHIER, Ph. J. ROY & K. SCHELKENS (dir.), *La théologie catholique entre intransigeance et renouveau. La réception des mouvements préconciliaires à Vatican II* (BRHE, 95), Louvain-la-Neuve-Leuven, 2011, pp. 11-48, p. 13: “Augustine is the most quoted Father at the Council. Of the circa 330 quotes of *Patres* and *Doctores*, he was quoted 57 times, while Thomas Aquinas only 25 times.”

<sup>66</sup> The concept tradition is already present in the Bible. The New Testament regularly refers to the Old Testament, which is quoted both in agreement and in order to be criticized (cf. Mt. 4,1-11; 5,17-48). The evangelists do not hesitate to quote one text taken from the Old Testament in order to nuance another Old Testament text. Cf. Mt. 19,1-12.

appearance. At the same time, in dialogue with other local theologies, it will enrich and be enriched by them. Why should we fear diversity in theological approaches and ideas?<sup>67</sup>

African theology is a good example of how a continent can present itself as a valuable dialoguer in the rich diversity of the Church's multiform proclamation of the Good News. A continent that was thoroughly characterized by a Western view of theology, in fact Christianized in the context of Western colonization processes, found its own way. At the time of the Council, Africa – not only black Africa, as Algeria made clear – was on its way to independence. Decolonization with all its (positive and negative) effects was underway. African Christianity was certainly the result of a colonizing Christianity with all the ambiguities such characterization might mean: recent studies have shown that the Democratic Republic of Congo needs another 40 years in order to obtain the same welfare (in the fullest sense of that word) as it had in 1960. Of course, 40 years of history might be a detail, but in light of the Christian perspective of the individual's uniqueness as child of God, it is a disaster, a disaster both colonizers and colonized ones are responsible for. Both Western missionaries and African indigenous bishops were aware of the somewhat ambiguous situation at the time: pre-conciliar *vota*, conciliar interventions, they partially make clear that Africans and Europeans meet each other when talking about Africanisation of liturgy, enculturation of liturgy, and the like. Leading African theologians such as Tshibangu promoted the development of an African theology, id est, a theology that was inspired by the life in the local communities, a theology that took into account that local needs are challenges for the universal Church, but, at the same time, such theologians showed a great familiarity with the European theological history<sup>68</sup>. Bishops with a completely European background, with no familiarity about missionary countries such as John Corboy SJ, rector of Milltown Park in Dublin before being appointed bishop of the new diocese of Monze in Zambia 1962, discovered during the Council that being a bishop meant to work not just for others, but with them. He admitted that what he during 10 years had taught about the Church was rejected by the Council and he was very happy about that. He discovered that, I quote, "Everything was community (...) so that I couldn't just be going my own way"<sup>69</sup>.

In Latin America, new types of theology developed. They can be considered as a local implementation of Vatican II. For indeed, what else is liberation theology than a local reading of the signs of the times, a local plea in favor of social and political conversion, a local option for the poor. I am well aware of the fact that such reading of these Latin American signs of the times might be a biased one. But during the Council and in the decade

---

<sup>67</sup> See the pertinent remarks of J. CORKERY, *The Catholic Church in Ireland*, in *Studies* 100 (197) 193-205, esp. p. 195, where he rightly states that we are in the culture but the culture also in us. Theology is, or at least should be embedded in the culture theologians live in it.

<sup>68</sup> In this regard, Tshibangu's magister thesis on Cano is an excellent example.

<sup>69</sup> See P. CARBERRY, *Foreword*, in S. MULLIGAN (ed.), *Reaping the Harvest: Fifty Years after Vatican II*, Dublin, 2012, p. 7.

thereafter a series of military dictatorships took over the power in countries such as Brazil, Argentina, Chili, only to mention a few. These dictatorships were of the opinion that one should stop the communist conquer of the world. These dictatorships clearly searched for and (quite often) received the support from Catholic leaders, even although they neglected if not rejected the legitimate rights of the poor in their countries. In this regard one should remember the names of heroes such as the Brazilian bishop Dom Helder Camara and martyrs such as Archbishop Oscar Romero (El Salvador; doctor honoris causa of the K.U. Leuven). The Vatican II reading of the signs of the times was implemented by a series of Latin American bishops and theologians in favor of the poor, the have-nots, the excluded ones. In the theological reflections of these people the Exodus story played an important role. The official magisterium had quite a number of problems with regard to their economic underpinning, for it was suggested that these leftists were referring to communist principles. However, both Medellin and Puebla, the concrete interpretations of Vatican II in Latin-America, received the full support of Paul VI and John Paul II. Several of the suspected liberation theologians openly declared that they did and could not recognize themselves in the type of liberation theology as described and condemned in a 1985 document of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

Thanks to the Asian theologians we discovered on the one hand the richness of the other world religions – the spirituality of Hinduism and Buddhism – but at the same time we are still upset by the unacceptable idea that even Christians are considered to live their lives in their own “classes”, classes individuals cannot transcend. Indeed, one of the things I am still struggling with is the fact that Indian Christianity still accepts the structural difference between human beings because of their birth. Anyway, we can learn much from our Asian confreres. Asian theologians and theologians working in an Asian context taught us that sincere theology also has to do with dialogue, dialogue with other religions, with other Christian denominations. One of my doctoral students comes from India. He belongs to the Syro-Malabar Church, a Church that claims to be founded by the apostle Thomas. This Church, a Christian Church, a member of the Roman Catholic family, had, up to the coming of the Portuguese in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, no missionary tradition, but it lived, peacefully, together with other religions such as Hinduism. It is true, the Indian Church has become more and more a missionary Church, but it is equally true that it is a missionary Church in dialogue with the world. Indeed, believing in the uniqueness of Christ and his message does not exclude dialogue and openness to the richness of other religions. Nobody better understood *Nostra Aetate* 2! John Paul II once stated that interreligious dialogue is a serious matter: it might result in a conversion to another religion, but, according to the pope, it remains worth the risk.

Christianity will always be characterized by the tension between a Pauline courage if not recklessness *ad gentes* and a Petrine protection of our past realizations and certainties. Vatican II opted for the future, this is to say for a Pauline Church. This is clearly a difficult

choice, for a demanding one. It is the choice of a community living in a diaspora-context, but it needs much courage to recognize that you are living in a diaspora-context and even more courage that your own faith can learn much from what the context one lives in has to offer. The Early Church had no fear, no anxiety. It started the dialogue with a sometimes very hostile context, an enlightening example for all of us today.

In any case, and this is true for all continents, thanks to Vatican II and as part of its implementation, many faithful became engaged Christians, active in politics, hospitals, schools, social welfare and the like.

*d. Open Agenda points*

15 years ago, together with one of my students, I wrote an article entitled: *Concilium episcoporum est*. In this article we made clear that the courage of the bishops as member of the college of bishops resulted in a dramatic change of the Council agenda: while quite a number of the curial officers were of the opinion that the Council could be fixed in one week, eventually one month, bishops decided to develop their own, pastoral agenda's. Indeed, cardinals Frings and Liénart proposed to postpone the elections of the several council commissions. John XXIII accepted it, and, as a result, quite a number of the members of the preparatory commissions were not appointed into the council commissions. Theologians suspected during the '40's and the '50's became official periti of the Council.

In 1985, during a special synod of bishops<sup>70</sup>, celebrating the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the closing of Vatican II, the rich Vatican II-idea about the bishops as a collegium was reinterpreted in the direction of a relation between the pope and the individual bishops. During the Council, bishops were very much of the opinion that they could and should contribute to the government of the Church. As far as I can see, no bishop questioned the pope's supreme authority. Bishops wanted to be at the service, wanted to act as a college under the guidance of the supreme authority. However, the proposal did not really function, partly because the bishops wanted to serve the pope, not the curia, thus underestimating the power of the latter one<sup>71</sup>. Collegiality is far away these days, a fact already deplored by Joseph Ratzinger in his commentary on the *Nota praevia* to *Lumen Gentium*, some 50 years ago. At the time, Ratzinger also rightly observed that the pope's decision to create a forum for discussion with the bishops, the synods, was not received with enthusiasm for this forum

---

<sup>70</sup> One can hardly consider the organization of synods after Vatican II as a successful implementation of the Council aspirations. See part II in G. ROUTHIER-G. JOBIN (dir.), *L'Autorité et les Autorités. L'herméneutique théologique de Vatican II*, Paris, 2010, pp. 95-187.

<sup>71</sup> FAGGIOLI, *Vatican II*, p. 99.

was subordinated entirely to the authority of the bishop of Rome<sup>72</sup>. That the Post-Vatican II synods seldom become a success, is well known today<sup>73</sup>.

Also during the extraordinary synod of 1985, the 165 bishops representing the Episcopal conferences started to speak about the mystery of the Church, thus putting (partly) between brackets the idea of the Church as the people of God. Such changes reveal, at least in my view, that the Augustinians are gradually taking the lead. I have no problems with such option, as long as we are aware of it. Indeed: such interpretation in a sense disqualifies the intentions of the Conciliar majority (opting for a dialogue with the world) and results in a reduction of possible interpretations of the Conciliar documents<sup>74</sup>. Indeed, one cannot understand fairly the Conciliar documents without taking into account the Council as an event, as common experience of the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church, an overwhelming majority of them being convinced that the Church needed an *aggiornamento*<sup>75</sup>.

#### 6. To conclude

Students quite often ask me whether we need a Vatican III. I do hope that this lecture has made clear that we do not need a new council. What we need is an adequate and una voce implementation of what were the intuitions of the bishops at Vatican II. In such implementation process, the following issues will be of importance: Christianity and adequate evangelization (already in 1943, Godin published his famous book *France, Pays de Mission?*), Christianity and enculturation, Christianity and interreligious dialogue, Roman-Catholicism and ecumenism, Christian denominations and their role in society.

We are building up a post-Vatican II-Church. We do so because seldom in history so many bishops, present in Rome, were so willing to go for reform, change, and the like, for the pope, John XXIII wanted to go for that! In this regard, the famous German theologian, Karl Rahner, expert at the Council, might well be right when stating that the Council was simply “the beginning of the beginning” of the *aggiornamento*. Implementing much of the social concerns of the Council, Paul VI published documents such as *Populorum Progressio* and *Octogesima adveniens*, key texts of the Roman Catholic social teachings. John Paul II’s *Sollicitudo rei socialis* remains obliged literature for all social ethicists and social workers. In his testament, John Paul II said about this Council: “I am convinced that for a longtime yet new generations will drink from the source of riches that this Council of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has

---

<sup>72</sup> In this regard, see CORKERY, *The Promise of Vatican II: Reality or Illusion?*, pp. 23-24.

<sup>73</sup> See J. GROOTAERS, *Heurs et malheurs des synodes*, Leuven, 2012.

<sup>74</sup> See the pertinent remarks of G. ROUTHIER, *L’Assemblée extraordinaire de 1985 du synode des évêques: moment charnière de relecture de Vatican II dans l’Église catholique*, in Ph. BORDEYNE-L. VILLEMEN (éd.), *Le concile et la théologie. Perspectives pour le XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 2006, pp. 61-88.

<sup>75</sup> On this topic, see the excellent study of M. BREDECK, *Das Zweite Vatikanum als Konzil des Aggiornamento: zur hermeneutischen Grundlegung einer theologischen Konzilsinterpretation* (Paderborner theologische Studien, 48), Paderborn, 2007.

lavished on us.”<sup>76</sup> I do hope that you all will drink from this source of riches, for in a period of grief and anxiety, there is also much joy and hope as many prove in their daily life. And yes, the Church ad intra might be in crisis, but the Church ad extra is doing well: “Through its involvement in education, in healthcare, working with the poor, the homeless, and in defending those whose basic rights are being denied, the Church in the world has been (and I would argue continues to be) a light for the nations”<sup>77</sup>.

MATHIJS LAMBERIGTS (KU Leuven)

---

<sup>76</sup> For the quote, see FAGGIOLI, *Vatican II*, p. 96.

<sup>77</sup> See S. MULLIGAN, *The Church in the World: A Light for the Nations?*, in S. MULLIGAN (ed.), *Reaping the Harvest: Fifty Years after Vatican II*, Dublin, 2012, pp. 39-62, here p. 39.