

thus far, leaving such issues aside in favor of a more homogeneous, often praxis-focused agenda” (83). This may be the most original contribution of the whole study and signals a necessary development in interreligious dialogue.

In the third and last part, “Some Questions and Issues,” P. explores a biblical basis for interreligious dialogue in which he singles out the ninth (or eighth) commandment, not to bear false witness against our neighbor (112), and the example of Jesus with the woman at the well (113). Misunderstanding other faiths, speaking disparagingly of them, says P., can amount to bearing false witness against them. Jesus’s dialogue with the Samaritan woman suggests an openness to the religious other. In the light of this biblical witness, P. suggests we need to be confident in “the God who precedes us, who is there before us” (126). P. has referred earlier to Origen’s notion of “seeds of the Word “that are germinating across creation. God is before and ahead of those who go out proclaiming the good news” (95).

There is much that is good and helpful in P’s work. His treatment of interreligious prayer based on actual experiments adds some welcome concreteness. A weakness might be an excessive multiplication of divisions and subdivisions of categories and models that can become bewildering. Perhaps a simplification of categories would allow room for some concrete examples from the author’s obviously rich experience in the area of interreligious dialogue.

Peter B. Ely, S.J.  
Seattle University

*A Council for the Global Church: Receiving Vatican II in History.* By Massimo Faggioli.  
Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015. Pp. ix + 349. \$44.

Few have proved as insightful in commenting on Vatican II and its reception than Faggioli. For over 50 years the controversy has been ongoing. Some have sought to implement its reforms, even seeing it as having a constitutional value for the life of the Church, a view rejected by Pope Benedict XVI, while others have continued to resist it. Under Popes John Paul II and Benedict XVI the debate over the council was shaped not by the academy but by the doctrinal policy of the Holy See, often at odds with the recent contributions on the history of the council, for example the works of Giuseppe Alberigo in Bologna and Peter Hünemann in Germany.

F. argues that the council must be seen from a historical perspective; “de-historicizing” it by submitting it to the ideology of “absolute continuity” can only lead to a re-Europeanization of a now global Catholicism (10). But for Pope Francis, ordained after the council concluded and the first pope from Latin America, the council is not to be reinterpreted or restricted, but implemented and expanded. F. traces how three master narratives, the traditionalist or ultratraditionalist (Lefebvrites), the ultraliberal (Hans Küng), and the neoconservative (Novak, Neuhaus, Weigel), struggle to control the recent past of the Church, at the risk of leaving the interpretation of the council in the hands of “theological pundits” and ideologues, weakening the understanding of Vatican II as a reform council. Much of the book is devoted to telling the story of its not always successful efforts at reform.

A proposal of some of the fathers for a permanent board of bishops, a *concilium episcoporum centrale*, to assist the pontiff (not unlike that created by Pope Francis) went nowhere, while Paul VI, whose “red pencil” was quite active in reviewing the conciliar documents, substituted his version of the synod of bishops for the one suggested by the conciliar debate. F. argues that the only real reform was that of *Sacrosanctum concilium* with its eucharistic ecclesiology, but liturgical reform was rejected by some as a way to reject the council itself. *Gaudium et spes* is central to two streams of interpretation of the council, the Augustinian and the Neo-Thomist, though the constitution was not so polarizing for the churches of Latin America, Africa, and Asia as it has proved to be for the American church. F. argues that the council as a theological event reentered the Church, moving beyond an inoffensive Catholicism in line with the cultural mainstream and pointing the way towards a Church closer to the world’s margins.

In spite of restoring the balance between the juridical and communal dimensions of the Church, the council ecclesiology *ad intra* is still a work in process, a “building site” (189), with the failed attempts to establish a central board of bishops to assist the pope, the rejection of a proposal for reforming the process of episcopal appointments, an ineffective synod of bishops rather than one envisioned by the bishops themselves, and restrictions on new forms of collegiality and synodality. The period between 1985 and 2000 was marked by steps backwards. But *ad extra*, the Church is simply different. Its stance towards non-Catholics, Jews, non-Christians, and modernity cannot be separated from what the Church believes and teaches about itself. One of the council’s significant accomplishments was to change the relations between the center and the periphery of the Church. F. explores this in terms of the role of episcopal conferences, noting that *Christus Dominus* remained somewhat vague and ambiguous about their legislative powers, while the 1983 Code and *Apostolos suos* (1998) limited their role, especially as the Church’s center of gravity shifted to Asia and Africa. That is changing under Pope Francis who has said that the juridical status of episcopal conferences has not yet been sufficiently elaborated, citing in his apostolic exhortation *Evangelii gaudium* those of Asia, Africa, Latin America, the United States, and France. For all its successes and failures, the council remains important for the Church today. Indeed, F. argues that many post conciliar features of the Church surpass the letter of the constitutional documents. He concludes that it marks the passage from a Eurocentric Catholicism looking inward to a global Catholicism.

Since most of the chapters in the book were previously published as articles or given as talks, the book is occasionally repetitive. It stands in need of more careful copy-editing; some sentences are awkward or difficult to decipher. Nonetheless it is a fascinating reflection on the council, deepened by the fact that F.’s perspective includes his experience as a scholar who has lived in both Europe and North America.

Thomas P. Rausch, S.J.  
Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles