

the enormous consequences of that event" (157). Thus Faggioli helpfully draws our attention to the significance of the postconciliar period. To those who would dismiss this period as a departure or deviation from the council itself—and thus “out of bounds” for understanding Vatican II—Faggioli points to that other great reforming council of the modern period, Trent. So much of what today can be legitimately considered “Tridentine,” Faggioli argues, cannot be found in the published decrees of the Council of Trent. The Tridentine church—with all its institutional and juridical structures, its centralized and universalist ecclesiology, its liturgy, rites, and catechism—all of these elements owe more to the reception of the council than to the corpus of its documents. If our assessment of Trent is not limited to commenting on its texts, why should we feel so constrained when it comes to Vatican II? Drawing a line from the sixteenth century to the present, Faggioli concludes, “refuting the theological value of the reception of Vatican II” is to freeze Vatican II “in a sort of theological monolith—assigning it a fate that had not even been the one of the Council of Trent” (256).

If the “spirit” of a council is shorthand for the way in which it is received and implemented (260), then an appeal to the “spirit of Vatican II” is not a flight into abstraction or subjectivity. Rather, to speak of the spirit of Vatican II is to locate the conciliar event squarely within the concrete realities of history. In fact, if we are worried about abstract and ideological interpretations, then it may very well be that citing an ahistorical “letter” of the council poses the greater risk.

Without a doubt the reception of Vatican II is historically significant. But Faggioli makes a further claim, and so issues a further challenge: the history of reception has *theological* importance. This is a challenge for the theologian to imagine the event of the council itself within a broader understanding of revelation, magisterium, and the *sensus fidelium*. It is a challenge to attend not only to what Vatican II said, but also to what it *did*, and to what God may yet be doing through it.

EDWARD P. HAHNENBERG  
*John Carroll University*

*A Church with Open Doors: Catholic Ecclesiology for the Third Millennium.*  
Edited by Richard R. Gaillardetz and Edward P. Hahnenberg. Collegeville,  
MN: Liturgical Press, 2015. xvi + 220 pages. \$24.95 (paper).  
doi: 10.1017/hor.2016.74

The nine essays on ecclesiology found in this volume in honor of Fr. Thomas F. O'Meara, OP, were first presented during a symposium in

September 2014. That meeting was marked both by its high level of theological conversation regarding the past and future of Roman Catholic ecclesiology, and by its deep sense of gratitude to O'Meara for his intellectual service to the academy, to the Christian churches, and to many of the scholars there gathered. The editors, Richard Gaillardetz and Edward Hahnenberg, and the two other organizers of that gathering, Stephen Bevans and Vincent Miller, are to be commended for bringing these scholars together, both in 2014 and now in this collection of essays.

The essays are organized in three parts. Part 1, "A Church of Missionary Disciples," includes essays by Stephen Bevans, SVD, on the missionary nature of the church and a "missionary ecclesiology"; and by Paul Lakeland, on demography, apostolicity, and the possibilities of a kenotic ecclesiology. Two strong essays comprise part 2, "Church and Culture." The first is Natalia Imperatori-Lee's challenging essay on Latino/a theology and the future of the church in the United States and beyond; its central location in the volume conveniently exemplifies her argument that Latino/a reality must be as central to contextual US ecclesiology as it has always been, whether noticed or not, to the history of the Catholic Church in this country. Vincent Miller's essay relates the history of Catholic treatments of "culture" in *Gaudium et Spes* and the postconciliar period. In today's new "media ecology," he argues, the challenge for the church in relation to culture is not homogenization of culture, as feared in the 1960s, but fragmentation of culture, "in which sectarianism is the default stance" (80).

Part 3, "Ecclesiological Openings," is the longest section of the book, comprised of five chapters: Richard Gaillardetz writes on power, authority, and the exercise of authoritative teaching; Mary Ann Hinsdale, IHM, discusses gender complementarity as "the issue under the issues" in postconciliar ecclesiology; Susan Wood, SCL, provides a liturgical ecclesiology rooted in a liturgical theology of the assembled community; Edward Hahnenberg points to ministerial anomalies as a key for understanding future forms of ministry; and Michael Fahey, SJ, gives a masterful survey of the history of ecumenism and points to its future in forms of receptive ecumenism.

As might be expected with such a collection of accomplished, thorough scholars, each of these essays stands alone as an important contribution to future ecclesiological discourse. The book as a whole would make an excellent source for an upper-level undergraduate or graduate course in ecclesiology, as well as for the educated lay reader. It meets and exceeds one standard for evaluation of a collected volume, therefore—there are no weak essays, no "duds," but nine examples of creative, substantive scholarship.

It is more difficult to trace the unifying thread of the volume as a whole. The editors are correct in noting that the unity of the volume is "the shared

conviction that Catholic ecclesiology cannot remain closed in on itself" (xv), and in that sense the "church with open doors" of the book's title may be all the work needs. But one also gets the impression that the authors have opened doors in a number of different directions at the same time; rather than ecclesiology *en conjunto*, a method of Latino/a theology highlighted by Imperatori-Lee, this is more ecclesiology *en paralelo*. In that sense one can see the limitations of the genre of the collected volume. While contemporary ecclesiology may, thankfully, have moved beyond the model of the single volume *De ecclesia* written from the limited viewpoint of a single theologian, we have not yet found the forms for a successful collaborative ecclesiology. Nevertheless, these essays, and the conference from which they arose, provide an excellent foundation for further development of such an ecclesiology, and perhaps it will be in the classroom use of the essays and of the work as a whole that a dialogical Catholic ecclesiology for the third millennium will continue to take shape.

BRIAN P. FLANAGAN  
*Marymount University*

*Did the Saviour See the Father? Christ, Salvation, and the Vision of God.* By Simon Francis Gainé, OP. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. viii + 232 pages. \$120.00  
 doi: 10.1017/hor.2016.75

In this new contribution to a classic debate, Simon Francis Gainé makes the case for the human Jesus experiencing the beatific vision (the sight of God enjoyed by the blessed in heaven) from the first moment of his earthly existence. To advance this position, famously endorsed by Thomas Aquinas, Gainé systematically tackles objections that have been voiced by its contemporary opponents, many of whom are Thomists themselves. These include a lack of biblical and patristic support, as well as theological objections concerning Jesus' faith, knowledge, freedom, and passibility. While the table of contents might not indicate it, this work is frequently quite technical. The primary intended audience seems to be other Catholic theologians, and by the end of his argumentation, Gainé declares, "For the Catholic theologian, the earthly Christ's possession of the beatific vision should be a moral certainty" (200).

Gainé's work will find a warmer reception among some theologians than others. The author indicates his own method and commitments in the first chapter, telling the story of this now-unpopular theory's predominance from Thomas' day up to the mid-twentieth century, and then calling for its