

‘Catholic’ In Vatican II: Implications for a Contemporary Ecclesiology In India

Thomas Kuriacose, S.J.
De Nobili College, Pune 411014, India

Abstract: The two key words ‘catholic’ and ‘catholicity’ in the documents of Vatican II deserves a closer look. Among the important reasons for this is the fact the Church is qualified as ‘catholic’, and ‘catholicity’ is an essential dimension in ecclesiology. Therefore, it is an imperative that we make a deeper study of this word in the documents of Vatican II. A very large portion of this article is devoted to a study of the usage of ‘catholic’ and ‘catholicity’ in Vatican II, and then drawing out their implications for a contemporary ecclesiology in India.

The Catholicity of the Church is indicated by the acceptance and fostering of genuine diversity and plurality. This has important lessons and consequences for the local churches in India, as also for the contribution of the local churches of India to local churches outside India. One of the important applications of *Lumen Gentium* has been in the field of inculturation. True ecclesial catholicity demands that attempts be made to inculturate at deeper levels. This would require serious study, in-depth dialogue with knowledgeable people, great generosity, humility, courage, and most of all, total openness to the Holy Spirit.

Keywords: catholic, Catholicity, Vatican II, Ecclesiology, inculturation, *Lumen Gentium*

Introduction

The words 'catholic' (in its adjectival form) and 'catholicity' (in its noun form) in the documents of Vatican II merit a closer look.¹ Among the important reasons for this is the fact the Church is qualified as 'catholic', and 'catholicity' is an essential dimension in ecclesiology. Therefore, it becomes almost an imperative to make a deeper study of this word in the documents of Vatican II, because Vatican II is so very important for attempting to formulate a contemporary ecclesiology, be it for India or for anywhere else in the world. For this reason, a very large portion of this article is devoted to a study of the usage of 'catholic' and 'catholicity' in Vatican II, and then drawing implications for a contemporary ecclesiology for India.

General Remarks on Vatican II And Catholicity

A few general remarks are in order here (some of which are very commonly known and accepted, but which are worth repeating here). This is the first time in the history of the Church, that the Church defines and describes itself in solemn Council.² Every Council (like everything else!) is linked and marked by its epoch, and its teaching is best understood in this light, and especially in the perspective of its purposes. At Vatican II, the Council Fathers wanted, as far as ecclesiology is concerned, to free the conception of the Church from overly juridical or hierarchical constraints, to one where all members of the Church would find their eminent dignity and rightful role in the life of the Church.³

In a such a big assembly, where Council Fathers came from all over the world, representing different needs of the Church, diverse theological viewpoints, there cannot be unanimity on a number of issues. The Second Vatican Council therefore has tried to give place to various currents of thought, putting stress on a particular position in a given context.⁴ For this reason, Vatican II does not provide a uniform usage of certain words (that is, in different contexts the meaning or stress of the same word may vary, or diverse words are used to convey the same thing), nor does it propose a synthesis of the various ideas expressed.⁵ This is very true for the *catholicity* of

the Church. In the question of catholicity, this is not a drawback, but one of the riches of Vatican II! It would be helpful here to make three remarks in this connection. One, this is quite fitting, for we are in front of a mystery that is very rich, and cannot be defined fully or adequately. Two, the purpose of Vatican II is not to close a debate, or confine within limits the catholicity of the Church, but rather, to stress the opening out and flowering that has to take place.⁶ Three, the variations in stress, according to the context, clearly indicate that different aspects have different importance according to varying circumstances.

A final general remark is concerning the limits being set to the study made in this article because of considerations of the length of the article. It is obvious that one cannot treat of all the aspects of catholicity in Vatican II. Therefore the stress is on what is given in *Lumen gentium*, the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, primarily because it is on the Church. There will therefore be only restrictive mention or reference to other documents.

The Word “Catholicity” in Vatican II

The word “catholicity” (“catholicitas”, in the official Latin text, and its inflections) is used eight times in the documents of the Second Vatican Council.⁷ It is used twice in *Ad Gentes*: in AG 1, it comes at the very start of the decree, providing the very basis of mission; in AG 4, talking of Pentecost, speaks of the union of people in the catholicity of faith. It comes twice in *Lumen gentium*: in LG 13, where the gifts of the parts are shared among themselves and with the whole Church; in LG 23, where the diversity of the local churches, by the convergence of their unity, shows the catholicity of the undivided Church. We find it four times in *Unitatis redintegratio*: in UR 17, where it is said that the spiritual and other heritages belong fully to the catholicity and apostolicity of the Church; and *thrice* in UR 4 itself, once, to talk of the exercise of the liberty each one has in liturgical rites, even theological formulations, and that in charity, and preserving unity, the catholicity and apostolicity of the Church have to be manifested. For the second and third usages, where it occurs twice in the *same* paragraph, we give the paragraph

concerned, for it is very remarkable indeed, in the context of ecumenism! So, from UR 4:⁸

Nevertheless, the divisions among Christians prevent the Church from effecting the fullness of catholicity proper to her in those of her sons who, though joined to her by baptism, are yet separated from full communion with her. Furthermore, the Church herself finds it more difficult to express in actual life her full catholicity in all its aspects.

In addition to *catholicitas*, there are 180 uses of “catholicus” and its inflections, of which 146 times it is used as an adjective, and 34 times as a noun.⁹ Obviously, for our present purpose, it is not necessary to go into the details of these usages, so just a few general remarks are sufficient. Most of the time, the word, in its adjectival usage, is used to stand for the attribute of the Church (in the sense of the creedal “catholic Church”), and as a noun it stands for members of the Church (the “Catholics”). The word has also been used as a synonym for universality. As for the contexts of its use, it has been used to show the legitimacy of local churches to be “catholic”, in the context of ecumenism, for example. As was remarked in the introduction to this section on Vatican II, this variation of use, far from showing an imprecision on the part of the Council Fathers, indicates rather the richness of the term, thus letting shine forth different facets of a multi-dimensional concept. All these uses help to deepen and widen the understanding of the catholicity of the Church.

Before moving on to the theological consideration of catholicity with special reference to *Lumen Gentium*, it would be useful to say a word about this Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. On hearing the words “Dogmatic Constitution” one would normally expect to see something very legal, technical, speculative or abstract; or something that would define in strict and narrow terms, and tend to underline the static elements present. This is not the case with *Lumen gentium*. It stresses the aspect of Mystery, the active relationship with God and among members of equal dignity, and its orientation is one of openness and dynamism.¹⁰

Catholicity: Theological Considerations

As an introductory résumé of *Lumen Gentium* on catholicity, it is worth quoting the words of the ecclesiologist Francis Sullivan:¹¹ “*Lumen Gentium* treats the property of catholicity most fully in the last five articles (nos. 13-17) of chapter Two: ‘The People of God’. In the first of these articles, the council provides a brief theology of catholicity, of which the principal headings are: (1) the Trinitarian source of catholicity, (2) catholicity as universality of races, nations and cultures, (3) catholicity as unity in rich diversity, and (4) catholicity as relationship with all humanity.”

It can be noted right away that the word “catholicity” appears only in LG 13 (of these five articles mentioned by Sullivan). LG 14 to LG 16 show the link and relation of all people to the Church of God; and LG 17 speaks of the mission of the Church to go to “the ends of the earth”. What is worth underlining is the setting of these texts that treat of catholicity. It is the *second* chapter of the Constitution, which is on the *People of God*, which begins with the words, “At all times and among every people, God has given welcome to whosoever fears Him and does what is right (cf. Acts 10:35).”¹² (cf., LG 9). The fact, yes the fact, not the mere *possibility*, of welcome by God, at *all times* and to *every people* (LG 9 mentions certain conditions for this welcome, upon which no comment needs to be made, because the present investigation does not enter into the question of those who purposefully reject God) is of capital importance. It can be deduced that this opening sentence does three things: it sets the background (and is therefore constantly “present” or “visible” even if we move elsewhere), it presents the basis (that is, it provides the foundation, the support), and it gives the dynamic orientation (thus to keep on moving forward, and serves as a reminder that we cannot “turn back” or go in an opposite direction), to the catholicity of the Church.

It is useful here to quote the text of *Lumen gentium* 13 that talks specifically of catholicity:¹³

It follows that among all the nations of earth there is but one People of God, which takes its citizens from every race, making them citizens of a kingdom which is of a heavenly and not an earthly na-

ture. For all the faithful scattered throughout the world are in communion with each other in the Holy Spirit, so that 'he who occupies the See of Rome knows the people of India are his members.' Since the kingdom of Christ is not of this world (cf. Jn. 18:36), the Church or People of God takes nothing away from the temporal welfare of any people by establishing that kingdom. Rather does she foster and take to herself, insofar as they are good, the ability, resources, and customs of each people. Taking them to herself she purifies, strengthens, and ennobles them. The Church in this is mindful that she must harvest with that King to whom the nations were given for an inheritance (cf. Ps. 2:8) and into whose city they bring gifts and presents (cf. Ps. 71[72]:10; Is. 60:4-7; Apoc.21:24). This characteristic of universality which adorns the People of God is a gift from the Lord Himself. By reason of it, the Catholic Church strives energetically and constantly to bring all humanity with all its riches back to Christ its Head in the unity of His Spirit.

In virtue of this catholicity each individual part of the Church contributes through its special gifts to the good of the other parts and of the whole Church. Thus through the common sharing of gifts and through the common effort to attain fullness in unity, the whole and each of the parts receive increase.

First, it is worth looking at the comments of a competent theologian, Aloys Grillmeier,¹⁴ who commenting on this text says that diversity, in the life of unity of people, is from Christ, in the one Spirit, for the universal situation in the world; and that catholicity flows from this. "The nature of this catholicity is determined by the tension between the call to unity and unicity, and the divine command to embrace all men and ages in this unity." This catholicity is first envisaged geographically, with the one People of God dwelling among all the nations of the earth, remaining in fellowship, in *communio*, with each other, with all the Spirit-given fullness which is proper to the People of God. "Thus catholicity as understood by the Constitution is a union of opposites. The people of God represents one pole [...] The other pole is formed by the multiplicity of the

peoples of the earth, with their various customs, talents and energies, which are to be preserved for them insofar as they are genuine values”; we see some of these elements, which form the ‘opposites’, as Grillmeier continues, “The full catholicity of the Church only comes about when this combination of natural and supernatural goods in the local and regional Churches has been fused in mutual communion in the universal Church.” Grillmeier says that one of the achievements of the Council was “the re-discovery of the universal Church in the local church”, and he notes: “The local Churches enrich each other and also the universal Church.” Further, the “task of the Church is to continue in all ages and places the redemptive work of Christ for all creation, by its missionary preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments, which are the instruments for bringing the cosmos into the realm of the grace of Christ.”¹⁵

Among the aspects of catholicity that LG 13 draws attention to, Grillmeier notes the “fullness in unity”.¹⁶ The communion of the local churches “contributing thereto its full ecclesial reality, for the good of the whole and of each part.” Another aspect of catholicity is “variety in unity.” There are various levels among the members of the People of God, which Grillmeier calls “the catholicity of structure in the Church” and he remarks that the following chapters of the Constitution discuss this at length. Grillmeier notes that “the right of the local church to its own proper existence is preserved. It has the right to live by its own traditions and to maintain its own spiritual features” provided it embodies fully the general structures of the Church, the full preaching of the Word, the administration of the sacraments, and the unity of government.

Joseph Komonchak draws our attention to some important points of this text of LG 13. To give here his own words:¹⁷ “The catholicity of the Church thus does not refer merely to the universal geographical spread of a single uniform Church”, and Komonchak then quotes a portion of LG 13 (the last part of the quote that is given above). After which he continues: “In other words, the Church is not an abstract but a *concrete* universal, one not in spite of but precisely in and because of the variety of the local churches. And this unity in concrete catholicity is something to be achieved every day, through

an interchange in which all the churches are active and responsible subjects and recipients.” The points wished to be reaffirmed strongly are: the catholicity of the Universal Church is expressed concretely in and through local churches; that diversity is not a concession given to local churches, but something essential to the Universal Church; the necessity of continually achieving this catholicity; the activeness and responsibility of each local church; and the mutual exchange that must take place between local churches. Komonchak goes on to note: “This view of the Church represents, as a number of commentators have pointed out, something like a Copernican revolution in ecclesiology. Historically, it represents at least a counterweight to, if not a reversal of, a centuries-long process of withdrawal and administrative centralization and uniformity in almost all areas of Church life.”¹⁸

Speaking in the context of the catholicity of local churches, Hervé Legrand notes that the catholicity of the Universal Church is enriched by the catholicity of the local churches.¹⁹ Having in mind a wider context (than the text of LG 13 that has been quoted above), Francis Sullivan underlines the fact that *Lumen gentium* stresses the role of the Spirit, for example, in LG 4 and LG 13, where the Spirit is shown as acting in the Body of Christ, as the source of the rich diversity of gifts endowed to the Church.²⁰

What deserves to be highlighted in the Council’s statements that are quoted above, from LG 13, is that the (“good”) diversities of the local churches are “gifts and presents” “from the Lord Himself”. LG 13 shows that the universality of the Church leads to an openness to the *world* (and in AG 4, to cultures): to its problems and questions. We note as well that the Council talks of “the ability, resources, and customs of each people”. Do these “resources” include religious insights that come from other faiths? Can the Spirit be considered the giver of these gifts too? The Council most probably did not have such a question in mind, for the context seems to indicate only cultural riches.

It is proper now take up a very important statement found in LG 23.²¹ It is useful to note first the sentence which precedes this statement: “The individual bishop, however, is the visible principle and foundation of unity in his particular church, fashioned after the

model of the universal Church.” And then comes this remarkable statement: “In and from such individual churches there comes into being the one and only Catholic Church.” It is appropriate to take the original words in Latin for the title of the next sub-section: “in quibus et ex quibus”.

LG 23: “In quibus et ex quibus”

The Council text itself refers to St. Cyprian (*Epist.* 55,24) who talks of the One Church spread all over the world in a multitude of members. It is worth looking at the words of Mgr. Philips who explains this text of LG 23.²²

The thought which is most remarkable, and which goes back to the most ancient conceptions, we find in the following sentence of the Constitution: particular churches are formed in the image of the universal Church, and it is in them and through them that the one and unique universal Church exists. This vision merits our full attention. Particular churches are not parts which by addition or federation constitute the universal Church. Each particular church is the Church of Christ present in a fixed place and She has all the means of salvation, given by the Lord, to His People.

As Hervé Legrand notes, in comparison with the ecclesiology till then, which was dominated by the conception of seeing the local churches as parts of and subordinated to the Universal Church, this new conception²³ represented a Copernican revolution.²⁴ It has also been considered as being the most important ecclesiological formulation of Vatican II.²⁵ From here, it was quite natural for theologians to take the next step, and see this text as being absolutely decisive for understanding the structure of the *communion* of churches in the Catholic Church. In fact, the Extraordinary Synod of 1985 and Pope John Paul II have confirmed the centrality of the communion of churches in the teaching of Vatican II.²⁶

Henri de Lubac, on the relation and conception of the Universal Church vis-à-vis the local churches, has this apothegmatic sentence, which has become famous: “A prior universal Church, supposedly

existing in herself, outside of particular churches, is but a being of imagination.”²⁷ After referring to this, Hervé Legrand has the important observation to make that it is a false problem to talk of “priority” of one over the other, while considering the relation of local churches and the Universal Church.²⁸

Seeing the model of the mystery of the Trinity, of unity in diversity, Adelbert Denaux finds a relation of immanence, as the principle of communion, between the universal dimension and the particular dimension of the one and unique Church of Christ.²⁹ Karl Rahner finds it of fundamental importance that the diocese is not merely an administrative region of the ‘perfect society’ of the Church, but is itself a church “in which” (*in quibus*) the Church exists. He also comments that this is a biblical way of speaking.³⁰

In addition to all the insights various authors (some of whom have been quoted above) offer us, it would be very useful to highlight the *dynamics* that LG 23 proposes. This becomes more clear when contrasted to the understanding behind the statement of CD 11, which states, “A diocese is that portion of God’s people which is entrusted to a bishop [...] this portion constitutes a particular church in which the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church of Christ is truly present and operative.”³¹ In CD 11, it is the universal Church that is present and active in the local church. Here the dynamics is of a “pre-existing” Universal Church, which manifests itself by its presence and action in the local church. Whereas in LG 23, the dynamics is the opposite: the universal Church is manifested *from* (*ex quibus*) the local churches. The purpose here is in no way to “oppose” these two views; rather to highlight an essential, and very important, insight of Vatican II. The universal and the local are seen in very close, mutual and *essential* relationship; where there is no contradiction or conflict, but rather mutual enrichment and correction in case of overstress of one element over the other.

From a further consideration of *ex quibus* we can see how there is importance given to the local church as an acting *subject* made up of members who also are subjects (this is the “theology of People of God” in action). Another aspect of this could be the valorisation of local and regional institutions, like Episcopal Conferences.

Vatican II: Further Comments

In the context of ecumenism, as Dulles remarks, “Vatican II’s concept of catholicity may therefore be called cautiously ecumenical rather than narrowly confessional.”³² Vatican II is also quite clear that the fullness of catholicity is possible only in communion with Rome, as the See of the successor of Peter (cf., UR 4). At the same time, Vatican II shows its openness when it says that the heritage of the Orthodox Churches also belongs to the catholic character of the Church (cf., UR 17). Further, in the missionary context too, as Dulles remarks, “Missionary activity is therefore seen both as an expression and as an intensification of the Church’s catholicity.”³³ What is more, Vatican II is realistic and humble enough to accept that the catholicity that the Church manifests is a limited catholicity, for reasons like the failure of missionary activity to reach all; the dividedness of Christianity, etc.³⁴

Vatican II’s openness, as Gustave Martelet so pointedly shows,³⁵ is characterized by its effort to unite together things that might seem contrary to one another; but the deeper reason for this is the love for all people that the Church bears, in its efforts to interpret the “Signs of the time”, and to present the mystery of the Church. Further, Vatican II was very conscious of its responsibility³⁶ to respond to the contemporary world, and the existential needs of the men and women of today. We find this of capital importance to the question of catholicity, in the context of our present inquiry.

Conclusion to Vatican II and Catholicity

As a conclusion to this section on Vatican II and catholicity, I repeat the summary which Avery Dulles makes, for it expresses very well what I too would like to say:³⁷

In summary, Vatican II presents catholicity not as a monotonous repetition of identical elements but rather as reconciled diversity. It is a unity among individuals and groups who retain their distinctive characteristics, who enjoy different spiritual gifts, and are by that very diversity better equipped to serve one another and thus advance the common

good. Individual Christians and local churches are bound to one another in mutual service and mutual receptivity. This relationship is founded not upon domination but on a free exchange of trust and respect. Thanks to Christ's faithfulness to his promise to be with his people, catholicity is never lacking to the Church. But it is dynamic and expansive; it continually presses forward to a fullness and inclusiveness not yet attained. It is a ferment at work in the Catholic Church and in every authentic Christian community. Even beyond the borders of explicit Christianity, the grace of Christ, working in the hearts of all who are open to it, brings individuals and groups into a saving relationship with the Church catholic, the God-given sign and sacrament of the ultimate unity to which the entire human race is called. Thus the Catholic Church is, according to the teaching of Vatican II, 'a lasting and sure seed of unity, hope, and salvation for the whole human race' (*LG* 9). [...] Although securely rooted in the tradition, the council's teaching on catholicity is attuned to the new situation that became evident after World War II. It takes cognizance of the plurality of cultures, the other Christian churches, the non-Christian religions, and atheism. Optimistic without being overweening, modest without being abject, this treatment of catholicity is serene and attractive. In comparison with papal teaching of the nineteenth century, Vatican II shows a remarkable respect for freedom and diversity, both within the Church and in the larger sphere of human relations.

After this brief study of catholicity in Vatican II, I now turn to its implications for an ecclesiology for contemporary India.

Implications for an Indian Ecclesiology

Some of the comments made, and the quotes given, while presenting the highlights of catholicity in Vatican II, already offer implications for an Indian ecclesiology. Apart from those obvious

implications, some which are not so obvious, or which need greater spelling out, are given below.

Previously the local churches of India looked to 'western' churches for monetary assistance, missionary help, theological guidance and various forms of leadership. To anyone who studied the relationship of the local churches in India to local churches in financially more developed countries, it was obvious that the relationship was not of equal partners. It was more of 'one-way only' dependence. Vatican II, especially through LG 13, reminds us that in the one Catholic Church all local churches are of equal dignity, and can and must mutually enrich one another. Therefore it is time that the local churches of India behave as equal partners with local churches outside India, and also be seen and treated as such, especially by those who had, in the past, treated them as 'merely dependent' churches. There may yet be differences in monetary terms, and money may need to flow in one direction still. However, money is only one among many important items. There must be mutuality and sharing in personnel, theological insights and the processes of decision-making.

Flowing from the discussion given above on "in quibus et ex quibus" (LG 23) the role of the Indian Church vis-à-vis the Universal Church, in the context of globalization and the coming-to-be of a new world order, becomes very significant indeed. Within the Universal Church, there can be no monopoly of leadership of a permanently fixed group of local churches. Particular historical contexts led to some local churches taking leadership in some areas of Church life. There is a new historical context now, and it is time that Indian local churches take leadership in some of the areas that were previously taken by others. An example of one such area could be what has been termed as 'New Evangelization'. The vibrancy of the Catholic faith (even in the face of grave difficulties) in some of India's local churches is a glowing example for those local churches whose Catholic faith has dwindled and is even dying out. India's local churches can show many other local churches how to adapt and respond to changing circumstances, especially in a globalizing world. Further, speaking in general terms, with regard to the Universal Church (as represented by the Church officials at the

Vatican) and the Indian Church, this statement by LG 23, calls for tremendous reflection and study as to how there can be a mutual give-and-take in deeper understanding, better formulation and greater expression of the Catholic faith in the changed circumstances of the contemporary world.

The Catholicity of the Church is indicated by the acceptance and fostering of genuine diversity and plurality (LG 13). This has important lessons and consequences for the local churches within India, as also for the contribution of the local churches of India to local churches outside India. One of the important applications of this text of *Lumen Gentium* has been in the field of inculturation. However, the inculturation one normally sees is on a superficial level, like in the adopting of some outward cultural traits. The initial attempts which received much publicity were the attempts at 'sanskritization'. It is very creditable on the part of those who attempt to inculturate according to the needs of their context, for example in Tribal areas, or Dalit-dominant regions. True ecclesial catholicity demands that attempts be made to inculturate at deeper levels. This would require much study, in-depth dialogue with knowledgeable people, great generosity, humility, courage, and most of all, total openness to the Holy Spirit. The remarks of LG 13 have great potential, both for the manner of governance by the local church authorities, as also for a much greater participatory role for all members of the local churches. Further, among the local churches of India themselves, LG 13 calls for greater sharing and interaction in various fields and at different levels. Then, this is to be extended to local churches outside India.

Conclusion

This article is but a brief study of the words 'catholic' and 'catholicity' in the documents of Vatican II, with a special concentration on the usages of these words in *Lumen Gentium*. There are many more riches to be unlocked and made use of from these two words alone. This great task beckons us as we search for better ways to respond to the challenges before us in the contemporary period and the future ahead.

Notes

1. These are topics very dear to Professor Kurien Kunnumpuram, since he has been teaching ecclesiology and is a specialist on Vatican II [Editor's addition].
2. CONGAR, Yves M.-J. (OP), "En guise de conclusion", in *L'Eglise de Vatican II. Vatican II, textes et commentaires des décrets conciliaires. La Constitution dogmatique sur l'Eglise Tome III (Unam Sanctam 51c)*, Edited by Guilherme BARAUNA (OFM), Paris : Cerf, 1966. pp.1365-1373. p.1365.
3. DENAUX, Adelbert, "L'Eglise comme communion", in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 110/1 (1988), pp.16-37; 110/2 (1988), pp.161-180. p.16.
4. Some have called Vatican II a "Pastoral Council" because of its pastoral orientation. Hermann Pottmeyer sees it most characterized as a "Council of Transition". Pottmeyer also notes the imprecision of Vatican II concerning exact definitions. Cf., POTTMEYER, Hermann J., "Vers une nouvelle phase de réception de Vatican II. Vingt ans d'herméneutique du Concile", Translated from German by Henri Rochais, in *La Réception de Vatican II (Cogitatio Fidei 134)*, Edited by G. ALBERIGO and J.-P. JOSSUA, Paris : Cerf, 1985. pp.43-64. On pages 43-44 Pottmeyere talks of this Council being a Council of transition.
5. The following book served as a helpful reference for a better understanding of Vatican II: *Le deuxième concile du Vatican (1959-1965). Actes du colloque organisé par l'Ecole française de Rome en collaboration avec l'Università de Roma-La Sapienza (Rome 28-30 mai 1986) (Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome, 113)*, Rome : Ecole française de Rome / Palais Farnèse (Diffusion : Paris, E. de Boccard - Padova, La Bottega d'Erasmo), 1989.
6. In a slightly different vein, cf., CONGAR, Yves, "En guise de conclusion", 1966. p.1365. Congar highlights that an important Council touches the Church in its depth and has repercussions for several generations, even centuries. Congar attributes this to the presence and action of the Holy Spirit.
7. Cf., *Concilium Vaticanum II. Concordance, Index, Listes de fréquences, Tables comparatives (Collection : Informatique et étude de textes)*, by Philippe DELHAYE, Michel GUERET, and Paul TOMBEUR, Louvain : CETEDOC, Université Catholique de Louvain, 1974. p.84. For those who may find it useful, given here are the phrases in Latin, in which catholicitas or its inflections occur. (1) AG 1 : "Ad Gentes divinitus missa ut sit 'universale salutis sacramentum' Ecclesia ex intimis propriae catholicitatis exigentiis, mandato sui Fundatoris oboediens"; (2) AG 4 : "et tandem praesignata est unio populorum in fidei catholicitate, per Novi Foederis Ecclesiam"; (3) LG 13 : "Vi huius catholicitatis, singulae partes propria

dona ceteris partibus et toti Ecclesiae afferunt”; (4) LG 23 : “Quae Ecclesiarum localium in unum conspirans varietas indivisae Ecclesiae catholicitatem luculentius demonstrat.”; (5) UR 4 : “Hac enim agendi ratione ipsi veri nominis catholicitatem simul et apostolicitatem Ecclesiae in dies plenius manifestabunt.”; (6) UR 4 : “Attamen divisiones Christianorum impedimento Ecclesiae sunt quominus ipsa ad effectum deducat plenitudinem catholicitatis sibi propriam in iis filiis”; (7) UR 4 : “Immo et pro ipsa Ecclesia difficilius fit plenitudinem catholicitatis sub omni respectu in ipsa vitae realitate exprimere.”; (8) UR 17 : “totum hoc patrimonium spirituale ac liturgicum, disciplinare ac theologicum in diversis suis traditionibus ad plenam catholicitatem et apostolicitatem Ecclesiae pertinere.”

8. The Documents of Vatican II, Edited by Walter M. ABBOTT (SJ), New York : Guild Press, America Press, Association Press, 1966. p.349. From here on, this book will be referred to as The Documents of Vatican II, 1966.
9. Cf., Concilium Vaticanum II. Concordance, Index..., 1974. pp.84-86.
10. Cf., The Documents of Vatican II, 1966. p.13. “The greatest merit of the Constitution is that, far from canonizing the past, or even consecrating the present, it prepares for the future.” Here, in these words, Dulles is quoting G. DEJAIFVE (SJ), “La ‘Magna Charta’ de Vatican II”, in Nouvelle Rev. Théologique 87 (janvier 1965), p.21. And that this Constitution “is a stepping-stone and not a final accomplishment.” This second is a quote from Dom Christopher BUTLER, in the foreword to the Paulist Press edition of The Constitution on the Church, New York : Deus Books, 1965, pp.8-9.
11. SULLIVAN, Francis A. (SJ), The Church We Believe In: One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, Dublin : Gill and Macmillan, 1988. p.87.
12. The Documents of Vatican II, 1966. p.24.
13. The Documents of Vatican II, 1966. p.31.
14. Cf., GRILLMEIER, Aloys (SJ), “Chapter II. The Mystery of the Church”, Translated by Kevin Smyth, in Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II. Vol.I., General Editor : Herbert VORGRIMLER, Translated from the German by Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth and Richard Strachan, New York : Herder and Herder; London : Burns and Oates; 1967, pp.138-185. p.167. This whole paragraph is taken from this commentary of Grillmeier.
15. GRILLMEIER, Aloys, “Chapter II. The Mystery of the Church”, 1967. p.167. Grillmeier, in a footnote (No.23, started on p.167, and continued on p.168) notes that “catholicity of time” is briefly alluded to by the Constitution, when LG 13 talks of the expansion of the people of God “through all ages”. Grillmeier notes that this doctrine must be completed by reference to the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.

16. Cf., GRILLMEIER, Aloys, "Chapter II. The Mystery of the Church", 1967. p.168. The quotes in this paragraph are taken from the same place.
17. Joseph A. KOMONCHAK, "The Local Realisation of the Church," in *The Reception of Vatican II*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell, Edited by G. Alberigo, J.P. Jossua and Joseph A. Komonchak, Catholic University of America Press, 1987, p.78.
18. Joseph A. KOMONCHAK, "The Local Realisation of the Church," in *The Reception of Vatican II*, 1987, p.78. Or, in the original French edition, KOMONCHAK, Joseph, "La réalisation de l'Eglise en un lieu", 1985. p.109. Komonchak, on the comment of a "copernican revolution" gives reference to E. LANNE, "L'Eglise locale et l'Eglise universelle : Actualité et portée du thème", in *Irénikon* 43 (1970), pp.481-511; and to L. BOUYER, *L'Eglise de Dieu : Corps du Christ et Temple de l'Esprit*, Paris : Cerf, 1970, pp.333-343.
19. Cf., LEGRAND, Hervé, "La réalisation de l'Eglise en un lieu", in *Initiation à la pratique de la théologie Tome III : Dogmatique 2*, edited by Bernard LAURET et François REFOULE, Paris : Cerf, 1983. p.154.
20. SULLIVAN, Francis, *The Church We Believe In...*, 1988. p.92.
21. *The Documents of Vatican II*, 1966. p.44.
22. PHILIPS, Gérard, *L'Eglise et son mystère au deuxième Concile du Vatican. Histoire, texte et commentaire de la Constitution Lumen Gentium Tome I*, Paris : Desclée, 1967. pp.307-308. Yves Congar's remark on Mgr. Philips' role in the redaction of *Lumen gentium*, may be worth noting. CONGAR, Yves, "En guise de conclusion", 1966, on page 1370 states that the role of the principal editor of this text, that is, Mgr. Philips, cannot be minimized.
23. Avery Dulles too notes this "new development", and remarks to what this is attributed. It is the deeper reflection on the oneness of the Eucharist, the role of the Bishop, etc., which led to this realization. We shall be quoting Hervé Legrand on this, a little later as he (LeGrand) demonstrates this very pointedly. Cf., DULLES, Avery, *The Catholicity of the Church*, Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1985. p.23: "A new development in Vatican II, in comparison with previous official Catholic teaching, is the doctrine that the whole Catholic Church is present and operative in the local church. This dynamic presence is variously attributed to the [p.24] bishop, the gospel, and especially to the Eucharist, as the sacrament of unity in which Christ himself is truly present with his grace (LG 26, CD 11)."
24. Cf., LEGRAND, Hervé, "La réalisation de l'Eglise en un lieu", 1983. p.152.
25. Cf., LEGRAND, Hervé, "Une éventuelle relance de l'uniatisme pourrait-elle s'appuyer sur Vatican II?", in *Irénikon* 66/1 (1993). p.18.
26. Cf., LEGRAND, Hervé, "Une éventuelle relance de l'uniatisme...", 1993. p.18. Reference is made to Pope John Paul II's *Christifideles laïci*, n.19.

27. DE LUBAC, Henri, *Les églises particulières dans l'Eglise universelle*, Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1971. p.54. The translation from the French is of the present author.
28. Cf., LEGRAND, Hervé, "Une éventuelle relance de l'uniatisme...", 1993. p.19.
29. Cf., DENAUX, Adelbert, "L'Eglise comme communion", 1988. p.166.
30. Cf., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II. Vol.I.*, General Editor : Herbert VORGRIMLER, Translated from the German by Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth and Richard Strachan, New York : Herder and Herder; London : Burns and Oates; 1967. p.205.
31. *The Documents of Vatican II*, 1966. p.403.
32. DULLES, Avery, *The Catholicity of the Church*, 1985. p.21.
33. DULLES, Avery, *The Catholicity of the Church*, 1985. p.22.
34. Cf., DULLES, Avery, *The Catholicity of the Church*, 1985. p.22. "At various points in its documents, Vatican II acknowledged that the catholicity of the Church is in fact limited." And Dulles mentions the reasons that we too mention.
35. Cf., MARTELET, Gustave (SJ), *Les idées maîtresses de Vatican II. Initiation à l'esprit du Concile*, Paris : Cerf, 1985 (2nd Edition. 1st edition : Desclée de Brouwer, 1966). In the chapter titled "Catholicité de l'Eglise et union christologique à ses contraires" (pp.103-130), the theme that runs through it, is the idea of catholicity as the universality of salvation — to the unbeliever as to those of other religions, as for all Christians — marked by an openness that unites together what might seem contrary. p.130.

To the above can be added another article by Gustave Martelet: MARTELET, Gustave (SJ), "L'Eglise et le temporel. Vers une nouvelle conception", in *L'Eglise de Vatican II. Vatican II, textes et commentaires des décrets conciliaires. La Constitution dogmatique sur l'Eglise Tome II (Unam Sanctam 51b)*, Edited by Guilherme BARAUNA (OFM), Paris : Cerf, 1966. pp.517-539. Especially the section titled "Catholicité complète et récapitulation spirituelle du monde", pp.535-539.

36. Joseph Komonchak draws our attention to some very important points in this connection. Cf., KOMONCHAK, Joseph A., "Ministry and the Local Church", in *Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Annual Convention*, June 10-13, 1981 Vol.36, Cincinnati (Ohio) : The Catholic Theological Society of America, 1982, pp.56-82. For example, p.63: Komonchak is talking of the factors that led to development in Vatican II's themes. In this, Komonchak sees the contribution of modern critical history. "Applied to the Scriptures and to the monuments of tradition, historical studies revealed to what a degree the founding and decisive moments in the Church's history were also human decisions: *ius divinum* inescapably also *ius humanum*. With

this came the realization how greatly the Church's historical self-realization were bound to historical, social, and cultural conditions" ... And the responsibility of each generation ... for GS 55 says of the 'new humanism', "for which man is defined above all by his responsibility for his brothers and for history".

A few other allusions to important points, that Komonchak draws our attention to, e.g., p.64: Refers to Karl Rahner's Selbstvollzug (= 'historical subject', is one possible translation), which is central to his 'existential ecclesiology' [reference to K. Rahner, "Ekklesiologische Grundlegung", in Handbuch der Pastoraltheologie: Praktische Theologie der Kirche in Ihrer Gegenwart Vol.I, edited by F.X. ARNOLD and others, Freiburg : Herder, 1964, pp.117-118.] Reference also to Bernard LONERGAN, Method in Theology, New York : Herder and Herder, 1972, pp.361-367, where Lonergan uses this term for his definition of the Church as 'a process of self-construction'. ... "The Selbstvollzug of the Church, then, is its coming-to-be, its becoming. The term clearly points to the event-character of the Church's existence, but it also includes the other notion of which I have already made use, that the Church is made to come to be and that it itself is the active historical subject of its coming-to-be. I am not convinced that the ideas carried by the term Selbstvollzug are yet adequately integrated into ecclesiology."

Also, Komonchak says (p.65) that using the terms 'People of God', 'the Body of Christ', 'Temple of the Spirit', and then saying the Church is also a "process of self-constitution", may sound odd. But these terms demand the latter expression. My personal comment in this connection is that these terms do not express mere unilateral action by God; the human element is contained in them.

37. Cf., DULLES, Avery, The Catholicity of the Church, 1985. pp.24-25.

Continued from p. 36.

56. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "Laity and Creative Ministries", 174.
57. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "The Church of My Dreams", 417-418.
58. Cf. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "The Church of My Dreams", 418.
59. The expression, the Church of God, signifies a Church that is rooted in the experience of God. Thus she should open herself to the incomprehensible mystery of God. She does not trust merely in what she can foresee, plan, control and manipulate (cf. K. KUNNUMPURAM, The Indian Church of the Future, 30).
60. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "The Crisis of Values in the Church", 68. The mission Jesus declared was to bring the fullness of life to every man (Jn.10:10).

The 'good news' he proclaimed was centered on human beings. He wanted to convince human beings that God loves them (cf. Lk. 12:32). The basic human response to God's offer of love is not the return of love to God but what Jesus stressed in love for one's fellow human beings (cf. Mt. 19:16-19). And Jesus meant the Church to be a contemporary realization of the values which he cherished and for which he gave his life (cf. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "Jesus and Man", 182-186, 188).

61. Cf. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "Laity and Creative Ministries", 175.
62. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "Crisis of Values in the Catholic Church", 73. In this context it's worth quoting R. Latourelle, "the Church is loyal to the past but not its slave; it shows an equal and unyielding will to remain loyal to the unique message of the faith, and simultaneously to the realization of that message, in order to answer the questions of each age." (R. LATOURELLE, "Church III. Motive of Credibility", 157-158).
63. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "The Church of My Dreams", 406; cf. Id., "Towards a New Ecclesiology in the Light of Vatican II", 6.
64. Cf. K. KUNNUMPURAM, Towards a New Humanity, 6.
65. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "Laity and Creative Ministries", 166.
66. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "The Church at the Service of the People of India", 155.
67. Cf. J. RATZINGER, "Commentary on Chapter 1. of *Gadium et Spes*", 118.
68. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "Reflections of Christian Spirituality", 217.
69. For instance Kunnumpuram quotes the THIRD SYNOD OF BISHOPS, Justice in the World, 6; EN 29; RM 58; Sollicito Rei Socialis, 47, 48. But not without an exception, as he highlights that CDF, Instruction on Christian Freedom and Liberation seems to betray signs of dichotomous thinking when it speaks of 'of the unity and distinction between evangelization and human promotion'(64). If such a position is adopted in order to point out that the Church's mission cannot be reduced to a merely this- worldly project of socio-economic and political liberation, then it is quite right to do so. But if it is meant to signify that in addition to her proper religious mission of promoting the supernatural salvation of individuals, the Church has also the task of working for human liberation, then it reveals a dichotomous and a non-holistic approach to the Church's mission. (K. KUNNUMPURAM, "Freedom and Liberation. Reflection on a New Document from Rome", 206).
70. See S. PIÉ NINOT, Teologia Fundamentale, 466ff.
71. Cf. K. KUNNUMPURAM, "Towards a Theology of Ministries", 28-29.
72. J. KAVUNKAL, "Vatican II and the Mission of the Church in India", 44.