Landas 18:1 (2004) 59-93

INCULTURATION AND THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

Patricia G. Panganiban

I. Introduction

A. Main Problem and Objectives

The overwhelming amount of recent literature on inculturation, contextual and local theologies, the local church, and similar topics is evidence that serious rethinking is underway in the areas of missiology, ecclesiology and theological method on the relationships between the Christian faith on the one hand, and culture on the other.[1] The crucial issues often identified in the literature belong to two inseparable levels—the theoretical level, involving how to conceive of the two aforementioned "poles," and the practical level, involving how to go about "inculturating the faith." Many theories and models have emerged in the last few decades, and presumably much more will surface until a satisfactory amount of consensus and clarity is reached in the language of inculturation.

One way to contribute to this on-going search is by looking at how this new direction took shape in the first place. It is widely acknowledged that the Second Vatican Council—in its organization

and manner of proceeding, its worldwide scope, and most of all, in the theological thrusts of its documents—is the decisive event in according inculturation the priority it now enjoys. The documents *Lumen Gentium*, *Ad Gentes,* and *Gaudium et Spes* are particularly seen as expressive of a renewed ecclesiology that implicitly recognizes the need for inculturation. Rahner's interpretation of the Council as "the beginning of a tentative approach by the Church to the discovery and official recognition of itself as world-church"[2] is a widely accepted and often-quoted statement that pinpoints the connection between the Council on the one hand, and inculturation on the other.

Granted that this post-conciliar period is "marked largely by a continuation of the tensions experienced at the Council,"[3] could we find connections between the present questions in inculturation and issues uncovered, perhaps left unresolved at the Council? And are some current difficulties not traceable to the Council at all? In simpler terms, this paper attempts to answer the question, "How can looking back at Vatican II help us better understand the problems we now face in inculturation?" The immediate aim of this work is thus to arrive at greater clarity as to what issues are involved in inculturation by going back to its conceptual roots in Vatican II. It is hoped that this attempt will offer some leads in addressing the challenges faced by this world-Church.

B. Limits and Method

Some methodological concerns need to be identified and addressed in any attempt at giving an evaluation and interpretation of Vatican II. One of the first considerations must be to clarify what is meant by the term "Vatican II." Komonchak cites three uses of the term Vatican II—as *event, experience,* and *final documents.*[4] The terms *experience* and *final documents* are relatively straightforward terms. The notion of *event* on the other hand needs further unpacking.

Sewell defines an event as "a sequence of occurrences that result in the transformation of structures,"[5] which—according to Veyne—"has meaning only within a series. . . (whose) number is indefinite."[6] If Vatican II is an event in these senses, then those who study and write on the Council must consider what place they give to the Council in the series of episodes in the plot of their histories and interpretations.

In this paper, select aspects of the *experience* and *final documents* will be examined in view of how Vatican II as an event is construed. Unlike many studies that consider the Council as climactic, and thus consider new thrusts such as inculturation as the *denoument;* in this work, the Council will be viewed more as an opening event—the beginning of the story. As such, the current problems and developments in inculturation appear to constitute a rising action—a series of conflicts in search of some future resolution. These aspects of the Council that promise to shed most light on the concern of this study lie in the documents *Lumen Gentium, Ad Gentes, and Gaudium et Spes,* as well as in the reconstruction and analysis of the experiences out of which these texts were born. By this I refer to key debates, reactions to drafts and the like throughout the preparatory and conciliar periods.

II. Problems in Inculturation

A. Inculturation Defined

1. Origins of the term

The term *en*culturation is supposed to have crossed over from the field of cultural anthropology to missiology through the work of Pierre Charles, but *in*culturation appeared for the first time in the work of Joseph Masson, S.J. in 1962, when he coined the phrase *Catholicisme Inculturé*, or "inculturated Catholicism."[7] As of 1974, the Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences (FABC) spoke of "a church indigenous and inculturated."[8] On the tenth anniversary of *Ad Gentes'* promulgation, Paul VI already expressed the idea of inculturation,

but without still using the term.[9] In 1977, Father General Pedro Arrupe, S.J. is said to have introduced the term to the Synod on catechesis in Rome, but another source attributes the use of the term at the same synod to Cardinal Sin of Manila.[10] Contrary to both, Congar states that the term was coined in Japan as a variant of the term *acculturation.*[11] Yet another account of the term's origin is that of Chupungco, who says the word was coined in 1973 by G.L. Barney, a Protestant missionary.[12]

In any case, John Paul's *Catechesi Tradendae* (1979) which followed the synod in Rome, marked the first appearance of the term in a papal document.[13] On the twenty-fifth anniversary of the promulgation of *Ad Gentes,* the same Pope promulgated *Redemptoris Missio* (1990), the document that is considered the *magnum opus* on inculturation.[14]

In this encyclical, inculturation is defined as "the intimate transformation of authentic cultural values through their insertion in Christianity and the insertion of Christianity in the various human cultures."[15] It is very similar to Fr. Arrupe's definition which is also widely quoted in the literature:

> the incarnation of Christian life and of the Christian mes sage in a particular cultural context, in such a way that this experience not only finds expression through elements proper to the culture in question (this alone would be no more than a superficial adaptation) but becomes a principle that ani mates, directs, and unifies the culture, transforming it and remaking it so as to bring about a 'new creation.'[16]

2. Related terms

Enculturation in cultural anthropology refers to an individual's insertion into his or her own culture. Crollius states that the idea has been analogously applied in missiology in the sense of the Church's "insertion" into a given culture—this is the process that the term inculturation refers to. The main difference between the two terms is that in enculturation, the individual is assumed to not yet have a culture and only by means of this process does one acquire it. With regard to the Church however, "though it (Church) is not bound to any particular culture, (it) does not enter into a given culture unless already linked with elements of another culture."[17]

Acculturation, a term also borrowed from cultural anthropology, refers to "the encounter between cultures."[18] This term's close relative, *interculturation,* was coined to highlight the two-way process involved when the Christian message, which is already embedded within a culture, interacts with another culture. The idea is that the gospel and culture mutually transform of each other.

That inculturation has emerged as the widely-used term in the Roman Catholic Church could partly be explained by the fact that alternative terms have been found to be inadequate. For example, Schineller finds the terms *imposition, translation,* and *adaptation* to lack the proper nuances in describing the relationships between faith and culture. [19] He considers other terms more suitable such as *indigenization, contextualization, incarnation,* and *inculturation.*[20] Still, the term indigenization has a negative connotation in some languages which was basis for its rejection in Catholic circles.[21]

In a more comprehensive work, Bevans classifies current approaches to relating faith and culture into the following models, (a) translation, (b) anthropological, (c) praxis, (d) synthetic, (e) semiotic, (f) transcendental, (g) counter-cultural.[22] One of the main

strengths of this attempt at schematizing existing approaches is that it clarifies for us what methodological issues are at stake in the process of developing an approach to inculturation.

The debates on terminology are far from over, and as of today, different terms are preferred by different groups and scholars. For example, *indigenization* and *contextualization* which appear in the texts of the World Council of Churches seem to be the preferred Protestant term, whereas *adaptation* and *incarnation,* terms found in the texts of the Second Vatican Council are variably defined, sometimes viewed negatively, and at other times, considered synonymous with inculturation.[23] While emphasizing different aspects of the inculturation process, these terms all describe ways of understanding the relationships between faith and culture.[24] This brings up a second question in understanding inculturation, the question of *what* are being related in the first place.

3. Faith, gospel, or Church? Culture, cultures, context, or world?

Papal documents often use *gospel* more than *faith* to emphasize the content or message of Christianity. However, others argue that *faith* connotes both the message (objective) and the subjective assent dimensions of Christianity as well. When we speak of *Church,* or *church,* for that matter, the emphasis is usually on distinguishing a particular group of people from the rest. But with the idea of the Church as People of God, more ambiguities arise. In any case, Schreiter states that "no one has been able to make a totally compelling case for the use of one term or the other. The nuance one is seeking...has generally been the most determinative feature."[25]

On the other hand, the use of *Culture* brings to mind what Lonergan calls a classicist notion of culture which considered a particular culture to be normative universal hence, was "the one and

only culture for all time."[26] This idea of culture eventually gave way to the modern concept of culture which he considers to be empirical, dynamic, and pluralist—though he does not use this last term. Hence *cultures* in the plural is more reflective of the latter concept. But once the term "world" is used, ambiguities once more arise. The term *context* is usually understood to be broader than culture, but again, the various ways of using either term often obscure their distinctions.

This brief sketch of the problem of terminology is the mere tip of the iceberg, so to speak. Other difficulties involved in inculturation come to light more readily after a consideration of this first obstacle. The subsequent section thus exposes a few more key issues in inculturation's theory and practice.

B. Difficulties in Inculturation

In 1978, Crollius considered inculturation a neologism, whose definition had not yet been standardized by repeated use.[27] Today, twenty-five years since his landmark article was published, the term can hardly be called new anymore. However, that the language and terminology are still fluid and changing can be attributed in part to the relative novelty of the area of study, and to the divergences among scholars and their contexts.

To a great extent, these divergences lie in the understanding of culture on the one hand, and of faith on the other. Like any other interdisciplinary field, the study of inculturation suffers from the ambiguities in the disciplines it involves—anthropology on the one hand, and theology and its subfields on the other. In the area of missiology in particular, Schreiter repeatedly asserts the need for a theology of culture and cultures. He identifies the following points as the main issues in the development of such a theology, hence in the understanding and practice of inculturation today:

> Where does one start—culture or gospel? To what extent is the gospel supra-cultural, and to what extent embedded in a culture? What is an appropriate model for the analysis of culture? To what extent should it emphasize cultural identity and to what extent social change? Is there a dialogical model that can hold all the elements in tensions? Is there a privileged model? (Semiotic?) Is there some philosophical high ground from which this can all be adjudicated? Or are we caught up in a welter of pluralism that erodes into relativism?[28]

He then pinpoints some obstacles to inculturation of the faith in many cultures; (1) a lack of methodologies and tools; (2) reluctance of church officials to permit legitimate experiments in inculturation; (3) the association, even identification of cultural embeddedness with contingency, and related to this; (4) the general issue of how conceptually deal with pluralism.[29]

Contrary to Schreiter's assessment, missiologist Richard Cote states that there is no need to assume that either faith or culture has to play a dominant role in the process.[30] Having to choose to emphasize faith or culture is itself a roadblock, and so is the whole "models" approach. Instead, he proposes using the metaphor of marriage in understanding inculturation to get beyond what he thinks is too much dichotomy.

More specific questions that fall under one or two of Schreiter's questions deal with how to understand the subjects of inculturation. While it is affirmed that it is the local church which "does" the inculturating, in reality, are experts dominating the scene? Further questions arise from this statement—what understanding of the local church is operative in our efforts at inculturation? How are we to understand the roles and relationships of the laity, of the church leaders, and of experts in inculturation? Certainly not to be neglected is the question of the role of the Holy Spirit in the process.

Furthermore, there is also the question of how to determine what we mean by an adequate level of inculturation. What criteria do we have for judging the inculturation of the faith in any given place and culture?

In other words, the problems are both theological and practical, and it is one of the challenges facing us to distinguish the two, and to understand their inter-relatedness. What light does a discussion of some aspects of Vatican II shed on both kinds of problems? In order to answer this question, we must first see in general, how inculturation as a new direction in ecclesiology and missiology is related to the Second Vatican Council.

III. The Second Vatican Council and the Emerging Notion of Inculturation

A. Introduction

First, there is a need to reassert the fact that inculturation has been occurring since the beginning of Christianity, prior to the creation of the term. Culture as a locus of revelation has always been a latent idea in the Church's life. Second, it can however be argued that the Council is largely responsible for bringing this notion more clearly to the fore, in spite or the term's absence in the Council documents. One of the first theologians to articulate an argument along these lines was Karl Rahner in an essay entitled, "A Basic Theological Interpretation of the Council."[31] His basic claim is that the Council was "the beginning of a tentative approach by the Church to the discovery and official recognition of itself as world-church."[32] In light of this, the emergence of the idea of inculturation can be understood as one of the manifestations of the Church's formal acceptance of its character as world-church.[33]

Rahner nuances his claim by first stating that the Church has always been, *in potentia,* a world-church; and that many precedents have manifested the Church's recognition of this identity. However, he argues that "the Council was for the first time in a formal way a Council of the world-Church as such."[34] The great theologian cites the following bases for this thesis: first, this was the first time that loc ' bishops attended an ecumenical council and the first time that native episcopates were represented. Second, with regard to the final documents produced by the Council, the following texts represent an articulation of this emerging self-identity: the triumph of the use of the vernacular in liturgy in *Sacrosanctum Concilium,* the awareness of the responsibility of the Church for the history of mankind in *Gaudium et Spes,* the avoidance of the linguistic style of neoscholastic theology in *Lumen Gentium* and *Dei Verbum,* the positive appraisal of the great world religions in *Nostra Aetate,* the strong belief in the effectiveness of the universal salvific will of God in *Lumen Gentium, Ad Gentes,* and *Gaudium et Spes,* and finally, the renunciation of "the use of any powers in proclaiming its message that are not implied in the power of the gospel itself" in *Dignitatis Humanae.*[35]

Other theologians have given similar interpretations. Bernard Lonergan uses Vatican II as a reference point in his explanation of the breakdown of a classicist notion of culture ("Culture" with a capital C) to the emergence of a modern notion of culture.[36] Scherer and Bevans have considered the positive view of culture expressed in *Gaudium et Spes* to be a crucial turning point in the shaping of the thrust toward inculturation.[37] Komonchak attributes the development of this positive attitude toward culture to the entire council itself, which he interprets to be "the acceptance of the Church of historical consciousness, its need for critical history, cultural and historical diversity, and a greater sense of individual and collective responsibility for the future of humanity."[38] The Council was, in this sense, "a long-overdue effort by the Catholic Church to deal seriously and discriminatingly with the culture created in the West by the Enlight-

enment, the economic and political revolutions of the last two centuries, the development of the natural and human sciences and the secularization and pluralization of society."[39]

In this light, the holding of the Council was itself a moment of inculturation, one in which the Church positively engaged in the prevailing culture by shifting away from a negative, combative attitude toward anything and anyone that seemed to put its authority to question. From this point of view, the Council thus represented a turning away from a particular "incarnation" of the Church—that is, its sociological form that developed in reaction to modernity, which was largely patterned after an idealized medieval Christendom.[40]

If the Church turned away from this, what exactly did it turn to? My contention is that one concrete direction pursued was inculturation, notions of which can be gleaned from the documents of the Council on the Church and its mission, various redactions of these documents, and sources that recount the Council's history.[41]

B. Tentative Notions of Inculturation in the Documents on the Church and Its Mission:

Lumen Gentium, Gaudium et Spes, Ad Gentes

The notions of Church and its mission will serve as the backdrop for uncovering notions of inculturation in these documents. Each section in this part will therefore be structured in the following manner: first, some background will be given about the document; second, key assertions directly related to the relationship between faith/Church and culture will be exposed; and third, broader themes that relate to issues in inculturation will be studied.

1. *Lumen Gentium*

a) Background

The draft *De Ecclesia* was debated during the Council's first and second sessions, and was approved at the third session. In its earliest form, it followed a structure not unlike those present in neoscholastic manuals,[42] and was criticized by the Council Fathers primarily for "its general approach and spirit,"[43] which according to Philips, was among other things, not pastoral enough for them, and did not seem to correspond to what Pope John XXIII had in mind. As the suggestions and criticisms came pouring in, what became evident was a desire to move farther away from the emphases of the ecclesiologies of Bellarmine, Vatican I and *Mystici Corporis.* For example, there was a suggestion of emphasizing the nature of the church as community more than as a society, the criticism of a too-close identification of the Roman church with the mystical body of Christ, too little biblical and patristic influence, the absence of the Church Fathers of the East in the list of authorities, the warning to avoid triumphalism, clericalism, and juridicalism, and remember the role of suffering, the goals of solidarity and unity.[44] Bouyer considers the draft deficient from an ecumenical perspective, for defining a Church "member" too rigidly; and from the missiological perspective, for having too little on the mission of the Church.[45]

The rejection of the preparatory schema thus allowed for a more radical shift in emphasis. At the first session, the new schema involved the following four-fold division, (1) the mystery of the Church, (2) the hierarchical constitution of the Church and the episcopate, (3) the people of God and the laity, (4) the call to holiness in the Church. More changes were made to this draft, and what emerged as the "hot potato" in the discussions was the notion of the college of bishops, and the fear that its adoption would lead to a diminishment of the primacy of the papacy. The chapter on the people of God was moved earlier on in the document, a decisive turning point, according to Bouyer, and reflective of perhaps the most important change in emphasis. Thus, by the second session, the structure of the schema

was very close to the final one approved at the third session (1) the mystery of the Church, (2) the People of God, (3) the Church hierarchical, (4) the Laity, (5) the call to holiness, (6) the religious, (7) the pilgrim church, (8) Our Lady. Finally, an explanatory note on the issue of collegiality was added on to the end of this document.

The relationship between faith/Church and culture did not emerge as a major issue; however, by implication one could say that the ambiguities in the discussions on how to understand authority, specially that of the local bishops already hint at later questions and issues.

b) Texts pertaining to inculturation

It is in the second and third chapters that glimmers of the notion of inculturation, and its ecclesiological foundations begin to appear in the document.

> The one People of God is accordingly present in all the na tions of the earth. . . . All the faithful are in communion with the Holy Spirit so that 'he who dwells in Rome knows those in most distant parts to be his members'. . . .[S]he fosters and takes to herself in so far as they are good, the abilities, resources and customs of peoples. In so taking them to herself she purifies, strengthens, and elevates them. . . .
>
> In virtue of this catholicity, each part contributes its own gifts to other parts and to the whole Church, so that the whole and each of the parts are strengthened. . . . Holding a rightful place in the communion of the Church there are also particular Churches that retain their own traditions, without preju dice to the Chair of Peter. . . .[46]

This text takes up the theme of the catholicity of the Church and emphasizes the following points—first, that the Holy Spirit is the principle for unity amidst diversity; second, that the communion of particular/local churches make up the universal Church and that local churches with their traditions, customs, etc. enrich each other and the universal Church.[47] This theme of reciprocity is likewise mentioned by Rahner in conceiving the relationship between local and universal Church. According to the FABC, Article 13 "sees the relationship of the Church to cultures and traditions in the horizon of the unity of the whole of the human race (of which the Church is a sacrament), and of the universality of the Church in which each individual part with its different culture, heritage and riches is in communion with one another."[48]

Another text, while focused on the bishops' relationship with their particular churches and the universal Church, mentions "it is in these (particular Churches) and formed out of them that the one and unique Catholic Church exists."[49] Three paragraphs later, the Council recognizes that "the Church of Christ is really present in all legitimately organized local groups of the faithful, which in so far as they are united to their pastors, are also quite appropriately called Churches in the New Testament."[50]

These texts directly indicate the move toward decentralization by emphasizing the mutual relationship between local churches on the one hand and the universal Church on the other. It is made clear by the text that local churches make up the universal Church, at the same time, the universal Church is realized in local churches. The problem arises when leadership is discussed, specifically with regard to the understanding of collegiality of the bishops and how in turn to keep from diminishing the primacy of the Pope.

c. *Lumen Gentium* and issues in inculturation

First, the whole thrust of the document, specially the place it gives to the idea of the Church as the People of God, and the local church, provided official impetus to do more reflection on the local church and by implication, the processes of inculturation. It is primarily in this document as a whole that we can find the foundations for understanding the Church as present only in local situations. Second, the way that *Lumen Gentium* is structured—i.e., understanding the Church primarily as mystery, then as People of God, after which chapters are devoted to the hierarchy and laity—has direct bearing on our understanding of who does the inculturating, and how it takes place. Third, the more central place given to mission, and grounding the Church's mission in the divine *Missio*, provides a Trinitarian basis for understanding inculturation as an aspect of mission.[51]

Fourth, the broad problem of keeping the balance and tension between the universal and particular churches, specially when it comes to leadership, manifests itself in two concrete extremes. On the one hand, Schreiter considers a major problem the hesitance of church authorities to allow legitimate experimentation in inculturation; on the other hand, there also abound real aberrations in inculturation experiments, whether in catechesis, liturgy, and other fields. I suppose that when it comes to practical problems involving unpredictable outcomes, the motivation of fear of failure ought to be balanced with a healthy boldness and optimism.

After this discussion on the basis for the emphasis on the local church, more specific statements on the necessity of looking into local cultures will be seen in the next document on the mission of the Church.

2. Ad Gentes Divinitus

a) Background

The Preparatory Commission for the Missions was headed by Cardinal Agagianian, and comprised of twenty-two members and thirty-two consultors. Of this entire group, forty-one were from Europe—an unsatisfactory selection, but at least all continents were represented.[52] The draft prepared by this commission had the following seven sections: *(1) De regimine Missionum, (2) De disciplina cleri, (3) De religiosis, (4) De sacramentis et de S. Liturgia, (5) De disciplina populi christiani, (6) De studiis clericorum, (7) De cooperatione missionali.* [53] Since some of these sections overlapped with the other drafts, only the first and last sections were kept for the next meeting. At this early stage, some Council fathers felt that a separate missionary document could be unnecessary since the Constitution on the Church could already include the topic.

This draft was not tackled at all during the first session, and since the preparatory schemata on the Church and Revelation were both rejected, a new draft schema for mission was begun at the end of the first session. At the second session, two more outlines were drafted and disapproved, until a third schema entitled *De Missionibus* was deemed sufficient. On April 23, 1964, the announcement came that the Commission on Mission ought to compress their material into few proposals and guiding principles and they did so, under the new title *De activate missionali.*

For majority of the missionary bishops, the scant six pages of thirteen propositions comprising the document on mission increasingly brought to light their marginal position. In a key intervention, Cardinal Frings stated that the problem of missions was so essential for the Church and for these times, that a few guiding principles would not suffice.[54] Another bishop said it was nothing but the "dry bones"

in Ezekiel's prophecy.[55] A final draft was created and finally approved during the last session, but again, not without revisions.

This last text was a product that took into account the suggestions to "express more clearly the basis of the missions, the connection with *Lumen Gentium*, the missionary mandate of the Pope and the universal episcopate in corporate responsibility activity, the irnportance of local churches, and their role as agents not merely recipients of the proclamation of the gospel."[56]

Throughout the discussions, earlier and broader conflicts in the realm of missiology were played out. One of these divergences was between two schools of mission—one that put emphasis on individual conversion as the primary aim of mission, espoused by J. Schmidlin, of the University of Munster; and another that emphasized *plantatio ecclesiae*, held by P. Charles and T. Gentrup of Louvain. In the 1920s, the latter pair criticized Schmidlin's theory which had been the prevailing notion in the early 1900s. In 1943, Daniel and Godin's famous article, *La France, Pays de Mission?* came out, further putting to question the geographic view of mission.[57] Hence the major criticism of the various early schemata on mission was that they were limited to the juridical notion of mission as set forth in canon law, that is, "missions are the activities of the church in territories under the Propaganda."[58] This view had been dramatically changed by the time of the *Ad Gentes'* approval.

From this brief study of the background of the document on mission, two key issues emerge as crucial (1) the role and place of mission in the Church's life, and (2) how to understand the Church's mission. In the following section, some texts of *Ad Gentes* that bring up notions of inculturation will be discussed.

b) Texts directly pertaining to inculturation

The first chapter focuses on the theological bases of mission in the singular, then moves on to distinguishing this from specific *missions.* The latter term is defined as "particular undertakings by which heralds of the gospel are sent out by the Church and go forth into the whole world to carry out the task of preaching the gospel and planting the Church among peoples or groups who do not yet believe in Christ."[59] There was this felt need to distinguish missionary work *ad gentes,* as it were, from the pastoral care and dialogue that other contexts required. The second chapter which is divided into three sections,[60] focuses on missionary work itself. Some points of emphasis are on the primary place of Christian witness and dialogue, the necessity of solidarity, and the key missionary activities of preaching the gospel and gathering the People of God. Article 15 is worthy of note because in its tackling of the formation and building up of local Christian communities, it speaks of them as "endowed with cultural riches of their own nation."[61] Article 16 which deals with the role of priests in missionary work, stresses the need for priestly training that "faces up to the particular nation's own way of thinking and acting. . . so that they will better understand and appreciate the culture of their own people; . . . they should examine the relationship between the traditions and religion of their homeland and Christianity. . . ."[62]

The third chapter entitled Particular Churches is perhaps the most relevant section to this study on inculturation. When the document speaks of the work of building up Christian communities, there is a keen sensitivity and priority accorded to taking into account local cultures and contexts.[63] There is also new focus on the laity as missionaries who carry out Christian witness precisely within their own societies and cultures. Hence, stress is put on the need for familiarity with their own culture, and their task of guarding and purifying it.[64] In fact in his commentary, Brechter indicates that in these articles, "adaptation is emphasized to satiety."[65] Significantly, he adds

that a concern that might be more important than adaptation, is only marginally considered in the text, namely, the challenges posed by "urbanization, migration, and religious indifferentism."[66] To cite Brechter once more, this section ends "with an ideal and grandiose vision of the future when the treasures of the nations in customs and tradition...are brought into the young churches, and men's religious diversity are brought into the catholic unity of the universal Church."[67] The next chapter which is on missionaries, also lays great stress on the local culture in the process of formation of missionaries.

In the end, these sections of *Ad Gentes* testify to the fact that once cultural pluralism became accepted, a more dialectical view of "adaptation"—which I think is what inculturation refers to—came to be considered a necessary element of mission.

d) Ad Gentes and issues in inculturation

In the foregoing exposition on the Church's mission and its various aspects, the following themes are found to be pertinent to the present-day issues in inculturation. First, the Council's relative success at understanding mission more broadly, and giving it a more central place, contributed to a more dynamic and outward-looking ecclesiology that is necessary for inculturation to take place. Second, the Council's effort to harmonize the notions of mission as proclamation, and mission as *plantatio ecclesiae* sheds much light on the difficulties involved in keeping the balance between the structural/"visible" elements and the invisible elements of being a Church, as well as the journey/pilgrim notions of faith and Church. Inculturation's processual nature has likewise to be kept in mind in conception of theories or in actual experiments.

Third, the foregoing discussion can raise questions and shed light on the question of formulating the criteria for inculturation. That ongoing proclamation and building up of Christian communities were emphasized in *Ad Gentes* shows that work toward inculturation does not stop when, for instance, parishes are established, or a native episcopate begins to appear. On the other hand, we can point to concrete norms for determining the level of faith's inculturation. These could be (1) the level and vibrancy of scholarship in local theology, catechesis, and liturgy, being done in seminaries and various places of formation, (2) the quality of inculturated liturgical celebrations, of catechesis, and the like, (3) the extent of the knowledge and appreciation for local church history, just to name a few.

Finally, the fact that no directives were specified as to how to go about the programme of "adaptation" shows that this task was really left to post-conciliar generations. Hence, forty something years after the Council, a wealth of scholarship and activity pertaining to inculturation has emerged, albeit plagued by problems of methodology, application, and the like. Brechter's observation that there is very little mentioned on social change is only slowly being accounted for today. Bevans shows us, for example, that it is only the most recent models for inculturation (Schreiter's semiotic model, for example) that consider this element.

3. *Gaudium et Spes*

a) Background

The Theological Commission and the Apostolate for the Laity were the sub-commissions in charge of preparing documents pertaining to the social order. The draft on the Christian moral order and a section of the schema on the Apostolate of the Laity were the two texts that originally dealt with the "Church and world" relationship. The document *Gaudium et Spes,* which throughout the latter discus-

sions was called Schema 13, is probably the only document that originated from two separate texts.[68]

It was only after the First Session that the Council Fathers decided to create a single, separate document devoted to this topic. The "decisive impulse," as Moeller puts it, to produce such a draft can be traced back to Dom Helder Camara of Rio de Janeiro who constantly argued against strictly focusing on internal Church troubles while problems of hunger, under development, and the like were afflicting the world.[69] It was finally Cardinal Suenens who suggested dividing the various schemata into the categories of *Ecclesia ad intra* and *Ecdesia ad extra* by the end of the First Session.

Throughout the Council, a total of five sets of drafts were created before arriving at the final document.[70] It would be beyond the scope of this paper to provide a detailed narration of the genesis and transformations of the documents; but based largely on Moeller's work, some idea of recurring conflicts can be sketched. First of all, the problem of defining culture arose in the early stages of the deliberations. The Council Fathers thus resorted to expanded description of culture rather than creating a definition by the second text's preparation.[71] Second, the question of how to describe the state of the world today, that is, "without descending to platitudes" was an issue that arose at Malines in 1963, and later again during the Third Session.[72] The synthesis arrived at involved a double tension that was summed up in the following manner:

> On the one hand, Christians need not accept the world as it is. On the contrary they should build it up in the light of the principles of their faith, for example, in accordance with the command to fill the earth and subdue it (K. Rahner). On the other hand, it is not necessary to reduce the role of humanity to that of a lay brother in a monastery (Congar). A type of presence of the Church in the world must be achieved which is not one of power and domination but of service.[73]

Third, in spite of this early position, the usages of the terms Church and world would emerge as problematic, and among present-day redactors of *Gaudium et Spes,* this ambiguity is often pointed out.

Fourth, in a significant intervention at the Third Session, Cardinal Lercaro stated that the discussions on culture ought to form the core of the entire schema. He said that "culture is a 'fundamental medium' a 'form' involved in. . .the content expressed in words, symbol, ritual, or any other means."[74] Fifth, at the Fourth Session emerged the related question of keeping in tension the distinct yet inseparable poles of the document's concern, namely, "to speak of faith as applied to the problems of actual life."[75] In other words, the whole idea and possibility of being pastoral on a worldwide scale was being put into question.

What did other *periti* say about *Gaudium et Spes*? First of all, among those involved in the preparation of this text, there was a sense of it being the most difficult yet one of the most significant documents of the council. Second, the document received quite opposite reactions from "opposite" theological strands from within the majority.[76] For example, Chenu gave the document much praise for its "Christian anthropology which relates grace to a knowledge of human nature that goes beyond the psychological to include the social and the historical,"[77] whereas Rahner criticized its lack of "a sufficient theological gnoseology that would explain how it arrived at its analysis of contemporary culture, a profound theology of sin, and of eschatology."[78] Ratzinger pointed out two main concerns, those of a "dubious use of the term 'People of God' and a Teilhardian tendency of identifying Christian hope with modern confidence in progress."[79] Dossetti, spoke strongly against the document by calling them a bunch of common-sense assertions[80] marked by insipid optimism and lacking real universalism.[81]

These points probably tell us more about inculturation than a casual reading of the final texts do. Nuances such as these are not easily found without some background on the history of the document. Let us now turn to some select passages from *Gaudium et Spes*, results of the foregoing discussions and much compromise among the groups.

b) Texts directly pertaining to inculturation

The entire document is divided into an introduction followed by two main parts, and many pertinent texts can be found in both.[82] Two articles from the first half of the text echo *Lumen Gentium* in asserting the following: that the Church is universal, thereby not committed to any one culture,[83] but also that it profits from the riches hidden in various cultures. . . and must foster vital contact and exchange between the Church and different cultures.[84]

In Part Two, the chapter entitled "The Proper Development of Culture" is a crucial section or any discussion on inculturation. In Article 53, perhaps for the first time in a conciliar document, it is stated that the human person achieves "true and full humanity only by means of culture," and that culture refers to "all those things which go to the refining and developing of man's diverse mental and physical endowments." [85] The text is significant for a second reason, that is, for explicitly acknowledging cultural pluralism in a conciliar document. Moeller considers these points as deserving merit for going beyond "a purely aristocratic conception of culture, by clearly rejecting the idea of 'uncivilized' nations,"[86] a point that has been formulated in many ways, as already shown in previous sections of this paper.

The notion that culture is a human product appears, and is followed by statements that stress the positive ends to which culture must be aimed and used.[87] This is also a significant development that

brings to light the Council's emphasis on responsibility for, and solidarity with humanity in general.

c) *Gaudium et Spes* and issues in inculturation

Perhaps the most important connection that can be drawn between the text, its history and inculturation today is the persistence of the divide between approaches to understanding the relationship between the Church/faith and the world/culture. Schreiter states that the question of starting point and method is a key issue in inculturation. This is confirmed by Bevans, who in his classification of approaches to inculturation, shows precisely what is gained and lost in each approach. In his sketch can be found similar traces of theological approaches presumed by the opposing groups of redactors of *Gaudium et Spes.* For example, Bevans speaks of the *translation* model that involves "knowing the culture so as to effectively insert the gospel" and the *anthropological* model that involves "knowing the culture to pull the gospel out of it." He also speaks of a *praxis* model that focuses on approaching culture with some suspicion, since it involves emphasizing the need for social change.[88]

Two more related points are worth emphasizing here. They are Schreiter's call for (1) developing a theology of culture, which needs to be (2) more cognizant of culture as constructed by the "powerful" and hybridized by globalization—notions that were not yet explicit or emphasized in the world as described by Vatican II. The first point seems to be a continuation of the Council fathers' question on how to make assessments of culture—or as Rahner calls it, the need to develop a gnoseology. The second point brings us to a realization of the limitation of the document *Gaudium et Spes*; namely, it sought to engage primarily the challenges of modernity, and not yet those of globalization. This being said, the document is nevertheless broad enough to include different conceptions of culture, which may or may not include globalization. Schreiter, who shares Dossetti's criticism that the document did not account for many other

cultural situations, puts forth the idea that the Roman Catholic Church could have been seeing itself at the Council, as providing a kind of hybrid culture, a "third culture" as it is better known today.[89]

What Komonchak said about the post-conciliar reactions of the opposing groups of redactors is also a promising question to pursue in light of inculturation. If indeed the more "Augustinian" group had more unbalanced, and generally negative reactions to the Council, and the more "Thomistic" group had more nuanced assessments of the Council's effect, then I wonder 1) what reasons are behind this assertion, and (2) what impact the explanation has on evaluating approaches to inculturation. Also, given this dualistic vision, one may well ask if Cote is indeed right about needing to avoid the divide with the use of "marriage" as a metaphor for inculturation.

Perhaps this proposal that metaphor be used for conceiving of inculturation, or Schreiter's idea that considers the Roman Catholic Church (in *Gaudium et Spes),* as attempting to provide a mediating "third culture," are today's efforts at continuing what *Gaudium et Spes* began. Certainly, the Council's struggle to deal with pluralism, new conceptions of culture, faith, revelation, Church and liturgy is a reference point in examining problems that have arisen after the Council.

C. Participation and Processes at Vatican II: Relevance for Inculturation

First of all, roughly two-thousand five hundred bishops participated at the Council, and even more were consulted in order to come up with an initial agenda. This is itself expressive of a new way of envisioning an ecumenical council. Also, the majority of Council fathers were a heterogeneous group, even if the mainstays among them were all Central Europeans, educated before the Second World War.[90] The marked presence, albeit limited influence of

African, Latin American, and Asian bishops who acted as supporters of these mainstays is of great importance, for "the experience of these bishops at the Council was the basis for the role that they and their churches are now playing in the final decades of the twentieth century."[91] It is no wonder then that for example, the former "mission countries" of Latin America and Asia, are now doing significant work in the areas of contextual theologies and inculturation through CELAM and the FABC. This fact should remind us of the occurrence of the *coup d'Eglise* when the preparatory schemata was rejected, and the Council was later dominated by those who were at first in a marginal position. Relative to inculturation, this should remind us of the importance of the prophetic elements found both in culture and faith.

Second, the attitudes with which the Council was later viewed and understood as espousing—whether naive optimism or excessive pessimism-are also something we need to be aware of, specially in light of the risky business of practicing inculturation. It seems that today more than ever, a balanced, *Christian* realism—perhaps grounded in spirituality is very much needed among agents of inculturation.

Third, the debates surrounding the nature of the Council as pastoral, and the question of how to relate doctrine and its communication reminds us to be aware of criteria we hold in assessing the success of efforts to hand on the faith in various cultures. In principle, what we have seen in the Council's work is that we cannot be faithful to the deposit of faith without being equally faithful to the human community receiving the faith.

IV. Conclusion

This paper has attempted to find in the history and key texts of the Council, a broader and deeper understanding of the issues confronting inculturation today. We have seen that at the Council, the following elements emerged, and they prepared for, and hastened the development of the notion of inculturation: (1) the growth of interest in the local church, (2) the adoption of a more empirically-oriented concept of culture, (3) the emergence of a more dialectical notion of the relationship between faith/gospel/Church on the one hand, and culture/context/world on the other. Contributing to these three elements were the participation of bishops from all over the world, and the quite novel processes undertaken at the Council. These have been explained in order to provide a partial historical and theological understanding of the problems in inculturation.

Some new avenues of study have opened up as this reflection was carried out. For example, in the area of history and theology, a closer look at the work of the Sub-commission for the Signs of Times might yield valuable insights into how the process of inculturation could be conceived. Second, an inventory of theological approaches and their implied "theologies of culture" are also worth a look. Third, the ongoing work of episcopal bodies on building up the local church through inculturation represents a storehouse of material that have yet to be analyzed by scholars of inculturation.

With regard to other disciplines, communications theory and cultural studies—which are incidentally often considered "marginal disciplines" in universities—promise to provide useful tools in constructing theories of inculturation. Schreiter seems to be one of the foremost scholars going in this direction, as can be seen in his engaging the literature on globalization in his ongoing construction of a semiotic theory of inculturation. The new and much needed insights after all, are often discovered by those who can be comfortable in the midst of uncertainty and liminality, as the example of John XXIII and the Council's eventual majority showed.

NOTES

[1]For simplicity's sake, this paper will use the terms "faith" and "culture" to identify the two poles being inter-related in the process of inculturation. There is a whole debate as to what terms are appropriate to use—faith, gospel, Church, on the one hand, and culture, cultures, context, and world—which will be tackled briefly in pages 7-8 of this paper.

[2]Karl Rahner, "Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council," in *Theological Investigations* vol. 20 *Concern for the Church*,(NY: Crossroad, 1986),77-89.

[3]Giuseppe Alberigo, "The Christian Situation after Vatican II," in *The Reception of Vatican II,* eds. Giuseppe Alberigo, Jean Pierre Jossua, and Joseph A. Komonchak, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Washington, D.C.: CUA Press, 1987), 8.

[4]Joseph A. Komonchak, "Vatican II as an 'Event'," *Theology Digest* 46 no. 4 (Winter 1999): 338. According to Komonchak's text, these three terms came from the program of a symposium on the Council in Bologna, December 1996. *Experience* means "the contemporary intentions, motives, encounters, decisions, and actions during the council," and *final* documents refer to the "product of that experience."

[5]Ibid., 339.

[6]Ibid., 345.

[7] David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission,* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1991), 447. Fr. Masson was a professor at the Gregorian University in Rome. According to Aylward Shorter, Fr. Masson wrote the following in 1962: "Today there is a more urgent need for a Catholicism that is inculturated in a variety of forms." See Shorter, *Toward a Theology of Inculturation,* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988), 10.

[8] James A. Scherer and Stephen B. Bevans, "New Directions in Mission and Evangelization" vol. 3 *Faith and Culture,* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1999), 2.

[9]Ary A. Roest Crollius, S.J., "What is so new about inculturation?: A Concept and Its Implications," *Gregorianum* 59 (1978): 722.

[10]It is said that the Pope "wavered between embracing and rejecting the inculturation idea" but in the end chose in favor of it. See Bosch, 452. The famous quote from the Paul VI's encyclical reads, "Evangelization is to be achieved, not from without as

though by adding a veneer, but in depth, going to the very center and roots of life." (EN #20)

[11]Peter Schineller, S.J., *A Handbook on Inculturation,* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1990), 21.

[12] Crollius, 722.

[13] Anscar J. Chupungco, *Liturgical Inculturation: Sacramentals, Religiosity and Catechesis,* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 25.

[14] Cf. CT # 53 "'The term 'acculturation' or 'inculturation' may be a neologism, but it expresses very well one factor of the great mystery of the Incarnation.' We can say of catechesis, as well as evangelization in general, that it is called to bring the power of the Gospel into the very heart of culture and cultures. For this purpose, catechesis will seek to know these cultures and their essential components. . . ."

[15] It has been suggested by Fr. Berard Marthaler and Sr. Catherine Dooley that the theme of inculturation had emerged during the International Catechetical Study Weeks that stretched from 1960 to 1968. This link in the history of the emergence ot inculturation has yet to be studied more closely, and as such, is beyond the scope of this paper.

[16] *Redemptoris Missio*, 52.

[17]Arrupe, quoted in Shorter, 11.

[18] Crollius, 726.

[19] Shorter, 7. Also found in Crollius, 723.

[20] Schineller, 14-17.

[21] Ibid., 18-24.

[22]Crollius, 723.

[23]Stephen B. Bevans, *Models of Contextual Theology,* rev. ed. Faith and Culture Series, (MaryknoIl, NY: Orhis, 1992), 37-137.

[24] The term *adaptation is* generally considered inadequate by the previously quoted authors since it allegedly connotes a superficial interaction between faith and culture. However, it has been argued well by Chupungco that the use of the term in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* refers to "the general program of Church renewal or updating," and that its neutral, non-anthropological connotation is actually the reason for its continued use in liturgics. See Anscar J. Chupungco Liturgical Inculturation: *Sacramentals, Religiosity and Catechesis,* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992),24.

[25] For definitions and comparisons of these terms, see Robert Schreiter, "Faith and Cultures: Challenges to a World Church," *Theological Studies* 50 (989): 746-48; Schineller, 14-27; Shorter, 3-16.

[26]Ibid., 746. Schreiter deals only with the terms *faith* and *gospel*; the comment on *Church* was my addition.

[27]Bernard Lonergan, "Belief: Today's Issue," in *A Second Collection*, eds. William F.I. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrell (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974),92-93.

[28] Crollius, 721.

[29] Schreiter, "Faith and Cultures," 757-58.

[30] Ibid., 757.

[31] Richard G. Cote, *Revisioning Mission: the Catholic Church and Culture in Postmodern America*, (Mahwah, N.J.): Paulist Press, 1996),42.

[32] Cf. Footnote # 1.

[33]Ibid., 78.

[34] Other aspects of this paradigm shift are liberation, ecumenism, and inter-religious dialogue. While it is not the concern of this paper to tackle these "siblings" of inculturation, it is important to note that the development of all three ideas, while not without precedent, was hastened by the Second Vatican Council.

[35]Ibid., 80.

[36] Ibid., 82.

[37] Bernard Lonergan, "Belief: Today's Issue," 93. Of Catholics, Lonergan says, "up to Vatican II they were sheltered against the modern world and since Vatican II they have been exposed more and more to the chill winds of modernity."

[38] Scherer and Bevans, *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization* vol 3, 6.

[39] Joseph A. Komonchak, "The Local Realization of the Church," in *The Reception of Vatican II*, eds. Giuseppe Alberigo, Jean-Pierre Jossua, and Joseph A. Komonchak, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Washington, DC: CUA Press, 1987), 87.

[40]Ibid., 79.

[41]Joseph A. Komonchak, "Modernity and the Construction of Roman Catholicism," *Cristianesimo Nella Storia* 18 (1997): 353-85.

[42] Another excellent discussion of the Council's understanding of culture is to be found in Herve Carrier, S.J., "The Contribution of the Council to Culture," in *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives: Twenty-five Years After* (1962-1987) vol. 3, ed. Rene Latourelle (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1989), 442-65.

[43]According to Philips, the chapters of the first draft had the following chapter titles: (1) the nature of the church militant, (2) the members of the Church and the necessity of the Church for salvation, (3) the episcopate as the highest grade of the sacrament of orders, the priesthood, (4) residential bishops, (5) the states of evangelical perfection, (6) the laity, (7) the teaching office, (8) authority and obedience in the Church, (9) relationships between Church and State and Religious tolerance, (10) the necessity of proclaiming the gospel to all peoples and in the whole world, (11) ecumenism. At the very end was an appendix on the Virgin Mary, Mother of God and Mother of Men. See Gerard Philips, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: History of the Constitution," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* vol I, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler (NY: Herder and Herder, 1967), 106.

[44]Ibid., 107.

[45]Ibid., 107-110.

[46]Louis Bouyer, *The Church of God, Body of Christ and Temple of the Spirit,* trans. Charles Underhill Quinn (Chicago; Franciscan Herald Press, 1982), 165.

[47]LG #13.

[48] Aloys Grillmeier, "Chapter II: The People of God," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* vol. I, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler (NY: Herder and Herder, 1967), 168.
[49] See Thesis 5.3 of the Theological Advisory Commission of the FABC, "Theses on Inculturation," in *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization* vol. 3, 92.

[50]LG #23.

[51]LG #26. The theme that the universal Church is realized in and through local churches in articles 23 and 26 of *Lumen Gentium* also appears in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* #42 and *Christus Dominus* # 11.

[52]The Incarnation is usually cited as the key doctrinal basis for inculturation. The Paschal Mystery is also often brought up to emphasize the aspects of "cross/death" and resurrection in the process of inculturation. Some have emphasized the necessity of adding Pentecost in the development of the doctrinal bases for inculturation. See for example, the Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines, "Pastoral Exhortation on Philippine Culture," in *Landas* 13 no. 1(1999): 7.36.

[53]See Joseph A. Komonchak, "The Struggle for the Council During the Preparation of Vatican II (1960-1962)," *in History of Vatican II* vol. 1 *Announcing and Preparing Vatican Council II Toward a New Era in Catholicism,* gen. ed., Giuseppe Alberigo, English ed., Joseph A. Komonchak (Leuven: Peeters and Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995), 192; and Suso Brechter, "Decree on the Church's Missonary Activity: Origin and History of the Decree," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* vol. 4, ed., Herbert Vorgrimler (NY: Herder and Herder, 1969), 87.

[54]Brechter, 90.

[55]Ibid., 99.

[56]Ibid., 98. Also see Donal Lamont, O.Carm., *"Ad Gentes*: A Missionary Bishop Remembers," in *Vatican II Revisited by those who were there*, ed. Alberic Stacpool (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1986), 270-82.

[57]Brechter, 106.

[58] W. Richey Hogg, "Some Background Considerationsfor *Ad Gentes*," *International Review of Missions* 56 (July 1967): 282-84. Also see Komonchak, 'The Struggle for the Council," 193-94. This geographic view of mission was said to be based on the ideal of medieval Christendom which needed to be expanded.

[59] Ibid., 290.

[60]Brechter, "Preface and Chapter 1: Doctrinal Principles," 117.

[61]Ibid., 125. Section 1: Christian Witness (Articles 11 and 12), Section 2: Preaching the Gospel and Gathering God's People Together (Articles 13 and 14), and Section 3: Forming the Christian Community (Articles 15-18).

[62]AG #15.

[63]AG #16.

[64]AG #19. For example, "The faith should be imparted by means of a well-adapted catechesis and celebrated in a liturgy that is in harmony with the character of the people; it should also be embodied by suitable canonical legislation in the healthy institutions and Customs of the locality."

[65]AG #21.

[66]Brechter, 146.

[67]Ibid., 147. One wonders in what sense Brechter interpreted the Council's use of the "adaptation" term. At present, there can be seen an increasing attempt to account for social change in various theories of inculturation.

[68]Ibid., 150.

[69]Charles Moeller, "Pastoral Constitution in the Modern World: History of the Constitution," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* vol. 5, ed., Herbert Vorgrimler (NY: Herder and Herder, 1969), 4. It is also relevant to mention that Moeller points out that the presence of some tension arising from approaching the same theme from various sides. This is a theme that recurs throughout the stages of Schema 13.

[70]Moeller, 10-11.

[71]These texts were the following: (1) The" originating" texts from the Theological Commission and Apostolate of the Laity were *De ordine morali christiano and De ordine sociali, and De apostolatu laicorum in actione sociali;* (2) Schema 17 (Jan-May 1963); this was followed by Interim text A (Malines, September 1963) and Interim Text B (Zurich, February 1964); (3) Second Zurich Text-later called Schema 13 (Third Session, Feb-Nov 196); (4) Ariccia text (Jan-Sep 1965); (5) Final text.

[72]Ibid., 16. This question was raised in the preparation of the second text.

[73]Ibid., 21 and 35. The phrase "signs of the times"which first appears in *Pacem in Terris* is used in this draft. That a Subcommission for the Signs of the Times was created at the Third Session shows how seriously the formulation of the state of the world was taken.

[74]Ibid., 22.

[75]Ibid., 43.

[76]Ibid., 60.

[77]Joseph A. Komonchak, "The Redaction and Reception of *Gaudium et Spes:* Tensions within the Majority at Vatican II," Photocopy from course packet, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.. This point was also developed in Joseph A. Komonchak, "Dealing with Diversity and Disagreement; Vatican II and Beyond," Fifth Annual Lecture of the Catholic Common Ground Initiative held at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 27 June 2003.

[78]Komonchak, "The Redaction and Reception of *Gaudium et Spes,"* 5.

[79]Ibid., 2-4

[80]Ibid., 7-8.

[81]Ibid., 16.

[82]Ibid., 15.

[83]These texts are Articles 42 and 44 of Part One, Chapter IV "Role of the Church in the Modern World;" and Articles 53, 55, 56, 58, 59 in Part Two, Chapter II "The Proper Development of Culture."

[84]GS #42.

[85]GS #44. The rest of this text states, "the Church learned early in its history to express the Christian message in the concepts and language of different peoples...." The term adaptation also makes one of its few appearances in the Council's documents in this text.

[86]Ibid.

[87]Moeller, 256.

[88]GS #55. Articles 56 to 59 elaborate the implications of culture as a human creation.

[89]The models are summed up in Bevans, "Models of Contextual Theology," 141 ff.

[90]Robert J. Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and Local,* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997), 77.

[91]Alberigo, "The Christian Situation after Vatican II," 11.

[92]Ibid. See his footnote #33.