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Abstract: What follows is a fuller version of a public lecture given at the Pontifical College Josephinum on October 16, 2013. It surveys developments during Period II of the Second Vatican Council, in meetings and commission work extending from September 29 to December 4, 1963. The Introduction describes the five sections to come. The 1963 Period began three months after the election of Pope Paul VI, whose opening discourse will provide a memorable passage cited below. The Period saw notable advances on two schemas which became, a year later, the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Lumen gentium, and the Decree on Ecumenism, Unitatis redintegratio. A vote was taken by which, by a slight majority, the Council members decided not to have a separate constitution on the Blessed Virgin Mary, but to place the prepared Marian schema in De ecclesia as its concluding Chapter. Two shorter texts, appended to the schema on ecumenism, on the Church’s relation to the Jewish people and on the civil right to religious liberty, came onto the agenda but immediately sparked controversy, which will continue for nearly two years before the promulgation in 1965 of Vatican II’s Declarations on these subjects. During Period II the Council’s text on liturgical renewal took its final form through the fine tuning of many particular passages to become the Constitution Sacrosanctum Concilium, which Pope Paul VI solemnly promulgated on December 4, 1963, as a first major outcome of Vatican Council II.

Introduction

This presentation of Vatican II’s Second Period in 1963 will move through five topics, in some walking at a more deliberate pace, but for others moving more briskly. First is a visit to the Council at work exactly fifty years ago. Second, in contrast to that one day’s particulars – I offer a global scheme of the Council’s dynamics and dramas. In the third place comes an appreciative introduction to Vatican II’s new leader in 1963, Pope Paul VI. Fourth, I will review briskly the topics of the
title, ecclesiology and ecumenism. Finally, I will take note of the Council’s advance in November 1963 to complete its first document, the Liturgy Constitution, but that event occurred, with a fateful coincidence, on the same day with another event far from Rome.

A Day’s Work at the Council Fifty Years Ago

Fifty years ago, on October 16, 1963, the 2,200 members of the Second Vatican Council assembled in St. Peter’s Basilica at 9 AM. It was the forty-ninth general meeting of the Council and the thirteenth assembly for work in 1963. The bishops first looked on as a bishop of the Coptic Catholic Church of Egypt celebrated mass with melodic Coptic chants which most all did not understand. After the hour-long mass, a deacon with two acolytes came to the altar to place there a 15th century manuscript volume of the four Gospels. That Gospel book lay open – in view of all – during every assembly of the Council to express Christ’s transcendent presidency over the Council.1

Then in this October 16th meeting, nine speakers gave their evaluations of the “schema” (draft text) De ecclesia, which had been sent to the members in mid-summer. They spoke about Chapter II, concerning Church’s hierarchical structure, which was mostly about the episcopate, but with a paragraph on priests and deacons.2 A year later, in November 1964, a revised form of the whole text was Chapter III of the solemnly approved Vatican II Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, which begins, “Lumen gentium cum sit Christus.”

Interventions by the council Fathers on this episcopate chapter had begun on October 4 and 109 Council members had already spoken on it. On the day before our meeting, on October 15th, the General Secretary asked the Fathers to vote on ending interventions on the Chapter, so they could move on to the next chapter, on the People of God especially the laity, in the Church. Those in favor of closing discussion were asked to stand up. The seminarian-assistants for each section of the banks of seats began counting those standing. But this ended quickly, since clearly a large majority favored ending discussion on the chapter.3

But as our session began on Oct. 16th, the General Secretary announced that among those cut off from speaking by yesterday’s vote, nine bishops were designated spokesmen for groups of bishops. These included a speaker for a group of Polish bishops, one for the Melkite bishops of Lebanon, and another for the episcopal con-

1. During Vatican II’s third period, the Council members received a volume in different languages on the history, going back to the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), and on the significance of “enthroning” the open Gospel book, that is, to show that Christ was presiding at the Council. Romeo De Maio, Le livre des évangiles dans les conciles œcuméniques (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1963). Henri de Lubac read De Maio’s volume and once noted that Le Monde, amid its ample reporting on the Council, never mentioned the important fact of the enthroned gospels. Henri de Lubac, Carnets du Concile, ed. Loïc Figoureux, 2 vols. (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 2007), 2, 310f and 405.


ference of Venezuela. The Rules prescribed that such members could speak, even after a vote to close discussion. These nine got to speak on Oct. 16, which added complexity to the discussion of the Chapter. Regarding the passage on the diaconate, two of the nine spoke for restoring the permanent diaconate, but the Polish bishops were contrary, since the atheistic government of 1960s Poland would try to plant “moles” in this new part of the clergy.\(^4\) The Melkite spokesman found the draft chapter on the episcopate excessively concerned to repeat statements on papal primacy as Vatican I defined this in 1870. The present text should affirm the primacy quite strongly, but just once, and then calmly treat the foundation of the episcopate, the bishops’ collegial unity, and their ministries of teaching, sanctifying, and governing. The Venezuelan bishops wanted another part of the text to say very clearly that it is by episcopal sacramental *ordination* that a bishop has the episcopal powers, while for exercising the powers in a particular place a *missio* has to come from the Pope. This is important, the Venezuelans argued, to show that the fundamental structure of the church is sacramental and not juridical by its ordering of authorities established by God’s will and specified by law.\(^5\)

After the nine bishops spoke, the October 16 debate moved on to the next draft chapter treating the People of God, especially the laity, with interventions by four cardinals. But the published record of this part of Vatican II gives, after the speeches on Chapter II, no less than 150 comments on the same chapter by bishops and episcopal conferences which did not ask to speak, but did hand in written comments on the chapter.\(^6\) Their comments went together with the texts of the 115 speakers to make up a sizeable packet of 887 pages, all on chapter II of *De ecclesia*. These pages were duplicated by mimeograph for the Council’s Doctrinal Commission. That Commission then set up three teams of its member-bishops to work through the proposals on Chapter II given by the Council’s Doctrinal Commission. The teams included as well designated expert assistants (*periti*) of the Commission. For example, both Karl Rahner and Joseph Ratzinger were among the twenty-seven *periti* assigned to help on revising the chapter. From combing through all the interventions, points of convergence were identified, many of which confirmed the previous draft while others were critical of it. The study identified some new and enlightening amendments to this text and the other chapters. The revision process lasted into 1964, when the Doctrinal Commission produced a further schema *De ecclesia*, which was mailed to the Council members, so they could prepare to vote on it during the Council’s Period III in 1964.\(^7\)

For the evening of October 16, 1963, Yves Congar recorded in his Council diary that he went with Karl Rahner and other *periti* to a meeting with some

---

4. *Acta Synodalia*, II/1, 608–09 (bishops of Thailand and Laos for the diaconate), 623–24 (also the episcopal conference of Equador), and 624–26 (Polish bishops contrary).
5. *Acta Synodalia*, II/1, 615–17 (the Melkite intervention) and 610–13 (Venezuelan bishops).
7. Pope Paul VI approved the revised schema for sending to the Fathers on July 3, 1964. It is published in *Acta Synodalia*, III/1, 158–373. The paragraphs of the new text were printed beside those of the prior text of 1963. An accompanying *Relatio* gave reasons for each of the changed passages, often by indicating an oral or written intervention by a Council Father as the source of the modification in the newly revised text.
Spanish bishops and their *periti* to discuss the next chapter of *De ecclesia* on the People of God. A Spanish theologian proposed basing the chapter in definitions of a “rational sociology,” but this made no impression. Instead, “Rahner, as always, monopolized the dialogue. He is marvelous, but he does not realize that where he is there is no room left for anything else.” The Spaniards hoped to move out of their isolation, for example, by circulating a statement with a history of salvation framework, but the visitors could not take on this work, since they are fully occupied in helping their own bishops and the Council commissions.\(^8\)

This description of Vatican II at work on one day fifty years ago can suggest something of the huge ecclesial event that the Council was, and it can introduce several parts of the complex itinerary along which schemas travelled before they became the sixteen final Vatican II documents. Great care was taken to hear what the bishops of the Church brought to the event. The Commission work was taxing. Much effort went into the renewal of Catholic teaching and the rejuvenation of Catholic life that Pope John XXIII had envisioned when he convened Vatican II.

### A Global View and Interpretation of Vatican Council II

When people ask me “what happened at Vatican II,” I regularly arrange my answer around two major conciliar dramas. The first drama was the surprising but quite decisive leaving behind, early in the Council, of most, but not all, of the texts produced by the commissions that worked for two years before Vatican II formally opened. This first drama focuses on Period I (1962) of the Council. It unfolded through the gradual awakening of the bishops to dissatisfaction with many of the prepared schemas as not being right in tone and emphasis for the Council’s work. I treated this development in a 2012 lecture, now published, with attention to Pope John XXIII’s several statements of his Council aims and objectives.\(^9\) His aims gradually “took hold” in the minds and hearts of a majority of members to become guidelines for what the Council should be doing. John XXIII gave criteria for revising, or even setting aside, schemas not advancing these aims. As Period I ended in December 1962, Pope John issued directives on thoroughgoing revisions of the existing texts to make them conform more closely with his and the Fathers’ goals of church-wide spiritual and doctrinal renewal, along with turning in a welcoming way to other Christians and to the modern world.\(^10\)

This first drama had a long third act, which was Vatican II’s “second preparation” during 1963, by the Council’s commissions, to revise some prepared texts, set others aside, and to assemble some new schemas.\(^11\) The Council majority then wel-

---


comed most of the new texts and put its own stamp on them by amendments before approving them as the Vatican II documents to be promulgated by Pope Paul VI.

Why did the revised texts of the second preparation fit with and promote the Council’s aims? I find a main reason in the way the revised texts included results of a great “harvest” of twentieth-century pre-conciliar renewal movements. The revised schemas made use of work by the Catholic pioneers – of 1930 to 1960 – of biblical, liturgical, patristic, and ecumenical thought. These movements were the effective preparation for Vatican II, which however many of the appointed preparatory commissions of 1960–62 had neglected. But the “movements” left many marks on the new and revised texts of the second preparation.

For a satisfactory total account of Vatican II, however, one has to add the second major drama, about which Joseph Komonchak has written. This broke out in 1964, during Period III, when several divisions emerged between parts of the Council majority about what to feature in the revised schemas then moving toward approval. I hope more emphasis will fall on this second drama in the coming years of 2014–15, to show the marks it left on the documents and especially how the divisions had their post-conciliar continuations. But what follows about Period II (1963) concerns the first great drama of the Council.

The New Vatican II Leadership of Pope Paul VI

Blessed Pope John XXIII died on June 3, 1963, and on June 21 the Archbishop of Milan, Cardinal Giovanni Battista Montini, was elected Pope, taking the name Paul VI. Someone once said it must have been hard for Paul VI to become Pope while a general Council was underway – something like climbing into the engine as engineer of an already fast-moving train. But the image is wrong. Cardinal Montini was very much “on the train” from the beginning and he had his ideas about the journey and the destination. Paul VI knew the inner workings of Vatican II, because he served in 1961–62 on the Central Preparatory Commission and during Period I on the Council’s Secretariat for Extraordinary Council Affairs.

In weekly meetings of the Secretariat during Period I of Vatican II, a group of eight cardinals took up numerous issues concerning the Council’s procedures, beginning with a far-reaching proposal by Cardinal Augustin Bea, President of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, on the aims of Vatican II. A Secretariat

12. In the midst of these pre-Vatican II renewal movements, the Louvain church historian Roger Aubert described their fermentsonly in La théologie catholique au milieu du XX° siècle (Tournai & Paris: Casterman, 1954). John W. O’Malley tells of the movements in What Happened at Vatican II (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), pp. 71–80 (liturgical and patristic movements; new currents in philosophy) and 84–86 (Pius XII’s biblical and liturgical encyclicals).

member, Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens, expounded to them his plan for organizing the Council topics. Shortly after the Council opened, Montini – the future Paul VI – submitted a three-stage plan of movement through the Council topics of (1) the mystery of the Church itself; (2) the activities of the Church ad intra in teaching, worship, and pastoral care; and (3) the relation of the Church to the world around it, whether near (other Christians) or further away (culture, economics, other religions, enemies of the Church).¹⁴

Cardinal Montini also gave a programmatic address in the closing days of Period I, on December 5, 1962, highlighting the task of issuing a comprehensive portrayal of the Church itself. This would show how the Church is rooted in our Lord Jesus Christ, from whom she receives all her being and her calling as the instrument by which He, the Lord, actively works to teach and sanctify. The episcopate needs treatment to complement what Vatican I, ninety years before, taught on papal primacy. But we should show the sacramental foundation of episcopal ministry. In preparing a new schema on the church, the Doctrinal Commission should collaborate with the Secretariat for Promoting the Unity of Christians.¹⁵ So, when Paul VI began leading the Council, he was well-informed and deeply engaged in Vatican II.

Furthermore, our existing Vatican II histories did not tell about Paul VI’s consultations on the future course of the Council. Just nine days after his election, Paul VI asked Cardinal Julius Döpfner, Archbishop of Munich and a member of both the Secretariat for Extraordinary Affairs and of the Council’s Coordinating Commission, to suggest ways of making good progress in the Council. Döpfner’s response went by letter to Pope Paul and has recently been published.¹⁶ Döpfner proposed, first, that the existing schemas be examined with a view to setting aside texts giving little promise of fostering the Council’s main goals. The central goal is the Church’s pastoral renewal, while grounding this theologically. An ecumenical concern must mark every document. Work toward the pastoral goal unfolds within a universal horizon in which topics are taken up which have significance for all peoples. For Period II, ecclesiology should unify the work, by treating five schemas, namely, those on the Church, the Blessed Virgin Mary, Ecumenism, Bishops, and the Lay Apostolate.¹⁷ Döpfner addressed Paul VI frankly about some schemas being problematic. Few impulses for Church renewal appear in the existing drafts

¹⁴ Bea’s proposal is in Acta Synodalía, VI/1, 200–04, with Montini’s following on pp. 206–08. Suenens’s plan given to the Secretariat is not in Acta Synodalía, but is treated by Mathijs Lamberigts and Leo Declerck in “The Role of Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens at Vatican II,” in The Belgian Contribution, 61–217, at 75–78.
¹⁷ These five were in fact discussed during Period II. But soon after Döpfner’s letter to Pope Paul, Cardinal Bea sent to the Coordinating Commission two Annexes to the Ecumenism schema, on the Jews and Religious Liberty, which became new topics and in time distinct schemas which unleashed heated discussion at the Council. See Döpfner Konzilstage-
on Priests, Seminaries, Religious Life, and Schools, while the texts on Sacraments, with the exception of one on mixed marriages, should be relegated to the revision of Canon Law. Döpfner's passion was to give Vatican II a sharp focus. But, most importantly, his letter documents Paul VI's early gathering of expert opinion, as he prepared for Vatican II's Period II, which was to open on September 29, 1963.

On that day, Pope Paul VI delivered an hour-long discourse, which was the second inaugural discourse of Vatican II and which deserves our careful attention.\textsuperscript{18} That address contains the new Pope's striking declaration of faith in Christ the Lord, which I cite here.

The starting point and the goal [of the Council] is that here and at this very hour we should proclaim Christ to ourselves and to the world around us: Christ our beginning, Christ our life and our guide, Christ our hope and our end.

O let this council have the full awareness of this relationship between ourselves and the blessed Jesus – a relationship which is at once multiple and unique, fixed and stimulating, mysterious and crystal clear, binding and beatifying – between this holy Church which we constitute and Christ from whom we come, by whom we live, and toward whom we strive.

Let no other light be shed on this council, but Christ the light of the world! Let no other truth be of interest to our minds, but the words of our Lord, our only master! Let no other aspiration guide us, but the desire to be absolutely faithful to Him! Let no other hope sustain us, but the one that, through the mediation of His word, strengthens our pitiful weakness: “And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world” (Mt. 28:20)…

This council should have as its starting point this vision, or mystical celebration, which acknowledges Him, our Lord Jesus Christ, to be the Incarnate Word, the Son of God and the Son of Man, the Redeemer of the world, the Hope of humanity and its Supreme Master, the Good Shepherd, the Bread of Life, the High Priest and our Victim, the sole Mediator between God and men, the Savior of the world, the eternal King of ages; and which declares that we are His chosen ones, His disciples, His apostles, His witnesses, His ministers, His representa-

tives, and His living members together with the whole company of the faithful.

From this profound confession, Pope Paul passed on to explain four objectives of the Council’s work. It intends to bring about: (1) the enunciation of a fairly precise definition of the Church itself; (2) the renewal of the Church, that is, pruning and correcting herself in conformity with the model given in Christ; (3) the promotion of unity among all Christians (with Paul’s heartfelt word of regret and forgiveness addressed to other Christians, and he turned to the non-Catholic Council observers at this point) and (4) taking up dialogue with the world, solicitous for the poor and afflicted, while showing respect for promoters of culture, learning, science, and art, and for leaders of nations.¹⁹

A very practical change, as Period II opened, came with Paul VI’s appointment of four Cardinal “Moderators,” who rotated in presiding over the assemblies and with whom the Pope had regular contact and through them watched carefully Council developments. They were Cardinals Agagianian (Prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith), Döpfner (Archbishop of Munich), Lecaro (Archbishop of Bologna), and Suenens (Archbishop of Malines, Belgium).

Period II’s Work on Ecclesiology, Bishops, and Ecumenism

From what the first section above presented about the Council fifty years ago, we know that the first major deliberation in 1963 was on the schema of a Dogmatic Constitution on the Church itself, which aimed to fulfill Paul VI’s first Council objective.

Historically, this doctrinal self-presentation of the church was needed. It was, first, taking up unfinished business left from the First Vatican Council of 1870. There a complete draft De ecclesia had been prepared, but when France and Prussia began moving toward war, only a part of the draft, on the primacy and infallibility of the Pope, was discussed, emended, and promulgated before Vatican I suspended its work. Second, what Vatican I defined on the papacy left a one-sided account of the Catholic hierarchy. When the bishops of the world were canvassed in 1959–60 on topics needing treatment at Vatican II, many said the new Council had to complement Vatican I with teaching on the episcopate and the episcopal college. Third, in the decades before the convocation of Vatican II, ecclesiology was a topic of intensive theological reflection, which already affected the encyclical of Pope Pius XII, The Mystical Body of Christ (1943).²⁰

¹⁹. A parallel statement of Council objectives is no. 1 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy: “The sacred Council has set out to impart an ever-increasing vigor to the Christian lives of the faithful; to adapt more closely to the needs of our age those institutions which are subject to change; to encourage whatever can promote the union of all who believe in Christ; to strengthen whatever serves to call all of humanity into the church’s fold.” Cited from Austin Flannery, gen. ed., Vatican Council II. Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations (Northport, NY: Costello Publications, 1996), 117.

²⁰. Examples of this reflection are Romano Guardini, The Catholic and the Church (London: Sheed & Ward, 1935; originally 1922); Émile Mersch, The Whole Christ (Milwaukee: Bruce,
A first Vatican II draft *De ecclesia* had been handled very critically in the final days of Period I in 1962. The Doctrinal Commission had to thoroughly revise it, under the scrutiny of a Commission on Coordinating the Council’s Work established by Pope John XXIII.\(^{21}\) For the Council Fathers, even before they returned to Rome for Period II, it was clear though that the Council’s commissions had been working. The bishops had received fourteen schemas, among which was a new four-chapter *De ecclesia* which came up first in Period II.

After Pope Paul VI’s opening discourse, the Fathers spent two days giving their general evaluations of the 1963 revised *De ecclesia*.\(^{22}\) Most spoke very positively about the depth and biblical freshness of the text. It showed the Church deriving from the plan of God the Father, from the mission and saving action of the Son, and from the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit. It features historical process, with the Church being on pilgrimage, not yet at its destination. Catholics fully belong to the Church by the threefold bond of faith, the sacraments, and union with the rightful pastors. But baptized Christians of other churches and confessions pertain fundamentally to the church, not so much by their sincerity and good will, as by objective realities, called the *elementa* constituting the Church, that is, Baptism, the proclaimed and biblical word of God, the creedal confession of Christ, and sharing in the life-giving Spirit. The *Commentary* given the Fathers on this passage says it indicates the “theological principle of ecumenism,” namely, that those who are connected by sharing in saving realities are now dedicating themselves to overcome their separation and estrangement by dialogue and cooperation.\(^{23}\)

*De ecclesia’s* chapter on the episcopate clarified the “collegial” relation between Pope and bishops – of which the Council was a notable experience. It also moved toward a doctrinal clarification of the roles of the episcopal conferences, in which the bishops were gathering during and between the periods of the Council. Chapter III on the people of God, especially the laity, pleased the bishops by sketching a doctrine not yet treated officially in the Catholic Church. Chapter IV was on the call to holiness in the Church, both of all and of consecrated persons in religious life. – So, on the second day of discussing the new schema, the Fathers voted to adopt the schema as their basis of further work, with 2301 favorable to it and only 43 against basically accepting the draft.\(^{24}\)

But when the Fathers began their detailed examination of the schema’s Chapter II on the hierarchy, especially the episcopate, the initial unity seemed to

---

\(^{21}\) The Coordinating Commission sent quite exigent specifications for revising *De ecclesia* to the Doctrinal Commission in late January 1963. The text is given in *Acta Synodalia*, V/1, 185-88.


\(^{23}\) *Acta Synodalia*, II/1, 231.

\(^{24}\) *Acta Synodalia*, II/1, 391, on the vote taken toward the end of the meeting of October 1, 1963.
fragment, as difficulties were raised, especially about the coherence of the new text on the episcopate with the settled doctrine from Vatican I on the unique and supreme powers of the Pope governing the universal Church. Controversy was just beneath the surface in the interventions of October 16 that we recalled in our first section. Central in the schema is the point that bishops exercise a proper power. They are shepherds, for pasturing, that is, teaching, sanctifying, and governing—but not as delegates of the Pope.

With 115 oral interventions over nine days, during which the stack of further written comments grew, it was difficult to perceive the “mind of the assembly” on the episcopate. To obtain clarity, the Moderators introduced an orientation vote on five questions. The votes would, they hoped, give clear directives to the Doctrinal Commission which was going revise the text in the light of all that had been said. The vote was on October 30, 1963, which was a crucial event of the whole Council. The innovations of the draft schema were upheld by large majorities of the Fathers. The reality of collegiality in the episcopal college would now become Catholic doctrine in a Dogmatic Constitution. But just how to formulate this teaching is going to need much discussion. From this day on, an opposing minority fused together and began working against innovations. After all, on two of the October 30 questions about the powers of the episcopal college, the non placet votes came from over 15% and over 19% of the Council members. Such a level of dissent had to be reduced if the Council was to speak with the needed moral unanimity in enunciating Catholic doctrine.

In October 1963, before the votes on the five questions, the Fathers took up Chapter III, on the People of God, especially the laity. But a re-structuring of the schema had been proposed and decided, namely, to move passages treating the whole People of God, with their charisms and share in Christ’s priestly role, to a position before the Chapter on the hierarchy. This was done and remains in Chapter II of Lumen gentium.

Just before the October 30 vote, speakers evaluated the schema's Chapter IV, on holiness in the Church. One paragraph of the chapters spoke of a “universal call” to holiness, before treating the consecrated life of vowed religious. Again, a restructuring found favor, so as to develop what became the inspiring Chapter V of

25. The questions and results were as follows. (1) Episcopal consecration is the highest grade of the Sacrament of Orders: 2123 placet—98.4%. (2) Bishops in the Catholic communion are members of a Body or college of Bishops: 2154 placet – 95%. (3) This College succeeds the College of the Apostles and, in communion with the Pope, has supreme power over the universal Church: 2148 placet – 84.2%. (4) This power of the College comes from God [not by papal delegation]: 2138 placet – 80.3%; (5) It is opportune to consider making the diaconate a permanent grade of ordained ministry: 2120 placet – 75%. The questions are given at Acta Synodalia, II/3, 573–75, and the results of the voting on p. 670.

26. The first public request for this came on Sept. 30, at the end of the first day of discussion of the new ecclesiology schema as a whole. The bishop of Bolzano, Italy, Joseph Gargitter proposed it, with reasons for it, in his intervention given in Acta Synodalia, II/1, 359–62, on p. 360. On October 9, a booklet was distributed giving proposed emendations mailed in by the Fathers on Chapters III and IV. At the beginning, the booklet gave an account of the reordering of the chapters proposed by Cardinal Suenens, which the Coordinating Commission had accepted. Acta Synodalia, II/1, 324–29.
the Constitution on the Church, “The Universal Call to Holiness.” Chapter V typifies Vatican II’s way of addressing us in idealistic terms which compliment us on our dignity and potential, while calling us to raise our standards of life and service, much in the way of the late Pauline letters to the Ephesians and Colossians. This is the much discussed “style of Vatican II,” in texts which, while teaching doctrine and laying out roles of service, depict ideals in an attractive and encouraging manner and so gives a valuable model for preaching.\footnote{27}

The time needed to give a full hearing to the members’ comments on \textit{De ecclesia} led to curtailing the agenda. Concerning a prepared schema on Mary, Period II saw only one question treated, namely, whether Vatican II would issue a distinct doctrinal text on the Blessed Virgin or whether such a text would become the final, crowning chapter of the Constitution on the Church. On October 29\textsuperscript{th} a slight majority opted for incorporation into \textit{De ecclesia}, by only a forty-vote margin, so that we have Vatican II’s Marian doctrine in Chapter VIII of \textit{Lumen gentium}.\footnote{28}

The schema on the Bishops’ Pastoral Governance of Dioceses was treated rather critically in November 1963, especially since it omitted the theme of collegiality expressed in \textit{De ecclesia} and accepted in the votes of October 30. Cardinal Valerian Gracias of Bombay faulted the schema for giving no clear definition of a diocese as the setting of a bishop’s ministry.\footnote{29} Others complained over the schema’s neglect of episcopal conferences. Bishop Correa Leon, from Colombia, a member of the Commission on Bishops, revealed that the members of the commission had not been called together to discuss the draft and approve its text for presentation to the assembly. The Commission president, Cardinal Marella, had convoked a small group based in Rome to revise an earlier draft, but without taking into account the doctrine of the episcopate and its collegiality given in the dogmatic schema \textit{De ecclesia}.\footnote{30} Naturally this text went back to the Commission along with a sizeable packet of observations to serve in creating a thoroughly revised schema, which was a notable extension of the “second preparation” into 1964.

In the final days of the 1963 Period II, the assembly gave a warm welcome to a draft in three chapters on Catholic principles of ecumenical understanding and on fields and norms of ecumenical engagement. On November 21, 96\% of the Fathers voted to make the three chapters the basis of a Council decree – naturally after amendments and voting in the next Council period.\footnote{31}

But the text on ecumenism also had two added chapters over which controversy broke out, with the result that no votes took place on them. These were, first, a short text on Christian relations with the Jews, which was a topic that Pope John had added to the Council agenda and on which Cardinal Bea gave an impassioned introduction on November 18, in one of the major addresses of

\footnotetext[27]{John W. O’Malley highlights this dimension of the Vatican II documents in \textit{What Happened at Vatican II}, 43–52, a section on “Genre, Form, Content, Values: ‘The Spirit of the Council.’”}

\footnotetext[28]{Before the vote, on October 24 Cardinal Santos of Manila gave reasons in favor of a distinct Constitution (\textit{Acta Synodalia}, II/3, 338–42) and Cardinal König of Vienna laid out reasons for incorporation into \textit{De ecclesia} (\textit{Acta Synodalia}, II/3, 342–45).}

\footnotetext[29]{\textit{Acta Synodalia}, II/4, 447–50, at 448.}

\footnotetext[30]{\textit{Acta Synodalia}, II/4, 462–64, at 462.}

\footnotetext[31]{\textit{Acta Synodalia}, II/4, 690.}
Vatican II. \textsuperscript{32} The second added text expounded the civil right of religious liberty, which the Secretariat took up as a required presupposition to ecumenical engagement with the major confessional families of Western Christianity. These will be central parts of that further drama which will grow in intensity and difficulty of resolution in 1964–65.

**Completing the Liturgy Constitution, with a Fateful Coincidence**

During Period II, the Fathers of Vatican II had to practice multi-tasking, because while they discussed ecclesiology, bishops, and ecumenism, they also refined the text of the draft Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.

Already a year before, in 1962, they had discussed each part of the schema, but in Period I they completed a definitive text of only the Introduction and Chapter I, on the nature of the liturgy and the general principles to guide the renewal and fostering of Catholic liturgical worship (\textit{Sacrosanctum Concilium}, nos. 1–46). This already completed part was rich in doctrine on Christ’s redemptive work and his ongoing presence when the Church gathers for worship, when Christ associates his body with himself in glorifying the Father (no. 7). Here a central component of ecclesiology was already proposed and accepted. Worship is “the high point towards which ecclesial activity is directed; it is, at the same time, the source from which all the Church’s power flows out” (10). General principles are then given for the “general reform” (\textit{instauratio}) of the Church’s liturgy, so that all may easily understand the liturgical texts and actions and so enter into them in a celebration “which is full, active, and the community’s own.” (21)

In Period II, the Fathers’ worked through the liturgy schema’s Chapters II to VII, which set forth reforms in accord with the principles stated in Chapter I, regarding Eucharistic celebration, other sacraments, the liturgy of the hours, the liturgical year, sacred music, and sacred art and furnishings. On Oct. 4, just six days into Period II, the Fathers received a booklet explaining the how and why of the Liturgy Commission’s revision of Chapter II, on Eucharistic celebration. The revised portions depended on the oral and written comments that the Fathers had made on this Chapter a year before. On October 8, 1963, while speakers were treating \textit{De ecclesia} on the episcopate, the Fathers began also voting \textit{placet} or \textit{non placet}, on each revised paragraph (SC 47–58), resulting in huge or large majorities favorable to all revised formulations. \textsuperscript{33}

But for the summary vote on the whole chapter on Eucharistic worship, the Council members could also vote \textit{placet juxta modum}, that is, acceptance but with a reservation on one or more points for which the member offered an amendment. \textsuperscript{34}


\textsuperscript{33} For example, that the \textit{Ordo Missae} should be reformed (SC 50): 2249 \textit{placet} / 31 \textit{non placet}; that the vernacular should be introduced at mass where pastorally helpful (SC 54): 2139 \textit{placet} / 67 \textit{non placet}.

\textsuperscript{34} Votes simply \textit{placet} totaled 1417, which was not quite two-thirds (1495) of those voting that day, as was needed for the chapter to gain approval. The votes \textit{placet iuxta modum} were 781 in number.
This brought complications, since many Council members submitted precise amendments on points they felt could still be better formulated. Thus, the Commission had more work, to review the amendments submitted and accept as many of them that improved the chapter, but without going against matters already approved by large majorities. This also happened on Chapter III, on the other sacraments, on which many very specific amendments came in. Large majorities voted simply placet on the further chapters, and the Commission brought back Chapters II and III, with some changes in view of the amendments offered, which proved satisfactory to a large majority.

Thus, a final vote, approving the whole amended draft Constitution was taken on November 22, with the outcome of 2158 placet votes and only 19 votes of non placet, which gave all the Council members a sense of deep satisfaction over completing what they saw as a major text for the life of the Church. At the Period's concluding public session of December 4, 1963, after a ceremonial final vote and Pope Paul VI's solemn approval, he acted una cum patribus to promulgate Sacrosanctum Concilium on a wide-ranging reform of Catholic worship.

But the day of the Fathers' initial final vote was November 22, 1963. Later that day, when it was late morning in the American Central time zone, Lee Harvey Oswald assassinated President John F. Kennedy. The shots in Dallas ushered in the raucous social turmoil of the mid- and later 1960s. This powerful and upsetting wave came to include other assassinations, inner-city riots in black ghettoes, and huge outbursts of student protest against existing authorities in academe, police forces, and government at all levels. Social turmoil, strife, and conflict abounded and had its disturbing impact on the Church life of Catholics, which was to be the very place where the elegant and idealistic final documents of Vatican II were destined to enter, to be received, and to be lived. It belongs to the complete history of the Second Vatican Council that this reception did not occur in placid and peaceful times, but in a cultural and ecclesial ambience fraught with difficulties. So, beyond the unfolding of Vatican II's dramatic developments, there will be a history of the first conciliar reception, which will occur amid turmoil and from this beginning will extend into the lives of those who are now re-receiving Vatican II and who have read these pages.

35. Votes placet iuxta modum on Ch. III totaled 1045, which was well more than one-third of those voting. Reiner Kaczynski, describes the work of the Liturgy Commission on the modi submitted with the placet iuxta modum votes, which brought a clarification of the method by which commissions should treat the submitted amendments with votes placet iuxta modum. History of Vatican II, 3, 202–13. The procedures followed in this process were then followed at this stage in the genesis of all the other Vatican II documents.

36. After announcement of the outcome of the vote, the Dean of the College of Council Presidents, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, intervened with words of gratitude and congratulations addressed to the conciliar Liturgical Commission for their labors in shepherding the schema, soon to be a Vatican II Constitution, through the complex iter of its successive revisions. Tisserant's address was several times interrupted by lengthy rounds of applause. Acta Synodalia, II/5, 767–68.