

R.'s present study discusses the hermeneutical tensions that emerged in the post-conciliar decades. In the first instance, it describes the forceful dissent of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, a reluctant participant at the council, who afterward questioned its teachings (especially regarding both the reform of the liturgy and the ecumenical agenda) and set up a breakaway community known as the Society of Saint Pius X. Lefebvre was convinced that the council produced a rupture from the Church's earlier teachings regarding the Sacrifice of the Mass and the uniqueness of Catholicism vis-à-vis other churches.

Additional useful material about disagreements regarding the council is provided in chapter 6, "The Hermeneutic of Reform as a Task for Theology." Here R. discusses the lively debate between Giuseppe Alberigo (1926–2007), the late director of Bologna's Istituto per le scienze religiose, and two authors of controversial publications: Archbishop Agostino Marchetto, *Il Concilio ecumenico Vaticano II: Contrappunto per la sua storia* (2005); and Cardinal Camillo Ruini, *Nuovi segni dei tempi: Le sorti della fide nell'età dei mutamenti* (2005). Both authors voiced apprehension that Vatican II had introduced "changes" in the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. These hierarchs argued that every ecumenical council had to remain faithful to a hermeneutic of continuity, whereas they judged Alberigo's progressivist views as a hermeneutic of rupture. Pope Benedict XVI took an intermediate position by highlighting the council's hermeneutic of reform.

R. does not spell out a specific list of tasks that still remain to be accomplished in the wake of the council, but his final chapters recall the need for ongoing subsidiarity, collegiality, inculturation, respecting the hierarchy of truths, reading the signs of the times, ecumenical humility—in short, promoting an *ecclesia semper reformanda*. In chapter 10, R. urges the faithful to "remember the past in order to enrich the future" and "to carry within ourselves the legacy of Vatican II."

Given the nature of this collection of lectures, readers will find some repetition and overlapping of themes, but the comments bear repeating. The footnotes contain rich source material. Regrettably, R.'s extensive writings are not well known in English-speaking circles.

Michael A. Fahey, S.J.  
Fairfield University, CT

*Vatican II: Catholic Doctrines on Jews and Muslims.* By Gavin D'Costa. New York: Oxford University, 2014. Pp. xii + 252. \$99.

This clear and well-organized volume draws on an admirable amount of research in primary and secondary sources. While concentrating on the two documents from the Second Vatican Council that offer new teaching on Jews and Muslims, *Lumen gentium* and *Nostra aetate*, D'C. also attends to what can be gleaned from *Unitatis redintegratio*, *Ad gentes*, and *Gaudium et spes*. Furthermore, he rightly argues that, through what *Dei verbum* taught on the nature and history of God's saving self-revelation, the document also concerns the religious situation of Jews and Muslims.

Retrieving the traditional terminology of “theological notes,” D’C. summarizes Vatican II’s teaching on Jews and Muslims in propositions or *sententiae*. Whether others will want to follow D’C. in his precise way of classification remains unclear, but he valuably highlights the different grades of authority in official teaching.

When sorting out the appropriate “notes,” D’C. frequently introduces “the deposit of faith” (DF), a traditional term for all that God has revealed in Christ and through the Holy Spirit for our salvation, considered as a treasure entrusted to the church to be preserved, interpreted, lived, and proclaimed faithfully to all people until the end of time. Hence, when Vatican II cited Romans 11 for its teaching on the Jewish people, it was “recovering,” not the deposit of faith as such (122; see 143, 158), but rather an inspired witness to the DF. In general, it is not that the DF “testifies” to some truth (158; in this case that some Jews were involved in the death of Jesus), rather it is the inspired Gospels that testify to this truth in the DF.

D’C. repeatedly recognizes that the teaching of Vatican II on Jews and Muslims constituted “development,” “novelty,” and “reform,” but insists that this did not entail doctrinal “discontinuity.” Here he differs from Pope Benedict XVI, who said at the end of an address to the Roman Curia on December 22, 2005, “It is precisely [in a] combination of continuity and discontinuity at different levels that the very nature of reform consists.” Vatican II could not make various reforms in church teaching and practice without introducing some measure of discontinuity. Or to use D’C.’s term, there can be no “novelty” without some degree of discontinuity with what was previously taught and practiced.

Dealing with the anathema that the Council of Florence pronounced against “pagans, Jews, heretics, and schismatics,” as D’C. rightly notes, that council presumed that these four groups were all in bad faith and did not allow, as Vatican II did, for the possibility of their “invincible ignorance.” He then argues that, in its teaching on Jews and Muslims, Vatican II did not bring a “change of doctrine” but merely a “historical” change in the way official teachers of the church viewed the religious situation of these two groups. Hence what occurred was a change not in doctrine but only in the “perception” that motivated the new teaching of Vatican II (155). Is D’C. confusing the *motivation* for some teaching with the teaching itself?

D’C. is not cautious about stating his positions and mustering arguments. But at times readers will demur. Four examples bear this out. First, did Vatican II abstain from teaching that “the Jewish religion is a means of salvation” (159)? Surely the positive things that are taught about the Jewish people in *Lumen gentium* and *Nostra aetate* clearly imply that their religion was and remains, in some true sense, a means of salvation. Second, the same should be said in response to D’C. when he dismisses as a “misreading” the claim that, at least implicitly, Vatican II accepts that in some sense God uses other religions as means, albeit limited means, to salvation (80 n. 50). How could the council exclude that and yet agree that the beliefs and practices of other religions “often reflect a ray of that Truth that illuminates all human beings” (*Nostra aetate* no. 2; see John 1:9)? Third, surely Pope Paul VI was right in recognizing Hinduism as “theistic” (188). I remain unconvinced that *Lumen gentium* and *Nostra aetate* support D’C. in labeling both Hinduism and Buddhism as “non-theistic” (71). Fourth, having rightly described the *History of Vatican II*, edited by Giuseppe Alberigo,

as “an invaluable resource and a landmark of collective scholarship” (20), D’C. repeats some defamatory remarks about these five volumes. Rather than expressing “dry humour” (41), the remarks were ugly and inaccurate.

D’C. has a proper regard for what the authors of the conciliar texts intended to say and for all that was involved in the genesis of the documents, while correctly insisting on the primacy of the final text itself (22–23; see 139). He wisely warns his readers against presuming that the experts who helped draft those documents necessarily “have a privileged understanding of the final text” (83; see 203). What D’C. writes about historical, literary, and theological hermeneutics repays study. The volume could be improved with an editor who has a better eye for spelling.

Gerald O’Collins, S.J.  
University of Divinity, Melbourne

*The Second Vatican Council: Message and Meaning.* By Gerald O’Collins, S.J.  
Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2014. Pp. xiv + 219. \$24.95.

We are on the way to celebrating the 50th anniversary of Vatican II’s closure, this year on December 8. O’Collins’s book on Vatican II’s “message and meaning” gets us into the thick of the council—its sometimes-fierce debates, the major topics it tackled, and particularly the mosaic of its final texts. Few minds in the worldwide Catholic community of theologians could bring such a rich background of scholarship to such a study. Working with the original Latin texts and giving his own translations, O’C. has written on the Second Vatican Council for decades, and he brings his encyclopedic and synthesizing mind to bear here. One line in the preface prepares the reader for the riches this book offers: “For fifty years I have been studying Vatican II; yet the documents can still astonish me with the golden bits” (ix). Indeed, O’C.’s book is a treasure trove of those golden bits.

The book does not claim to be a total synthesis. It is deliberately selective in the themes it treats and the documents it draws on, mainly three constitutions (*Sacrosanctum concilium* on the liturgy, *Lumen gentium* on the church, and *Dei verbum* on divine revelation and its transmission), as well as the decree *Ad gentes* on the church’s missionary activity, and the declaration *Nostra aetate* on the church’s relation to other living faiths. Key themes brought to the fore include the central place of the liturgy in the life of the church and the central role that *Sacrosanctum concilium* came to play during the council; the supreme importance of *Dei verbum*’s teaching on divine revelation as above all a loving personal encounter with God; and the council’s revolutionary shift in attitude regarding other religions. Through O’C.’s artful selection of these themes and documents as his focusing lenses, we are provided with a clear picture of the fundamental vision of the Second Vatican Council. A particular strength of the book is the way it investigates a theme across all the documents, beyond its treatment within the specific document devoted to that theme—for example, “revelation” in *Dei verbum*.