A CRISIS OF RECEPTION:

THE CONSTITUTION ON THE SACRED LITURGY AND THE

DEBATE OVER THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE

ROMAN MISSAL

A thesis by **J. Peter Nixon**

presented to The Faculty of the Graduate Theological Union

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Berkeley, California

April 2008

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

On March 16, 2002, the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments rejected a proposed English translation of the Roman Missal. The translation—almost twenty years in the making—had been prepared by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) and approved by eleven national episcopal conferences. The rejection of the translation marked a low point in relations between the Congregation, ICEL, and the episcopal conferences, relations which had deteriorated markedly over the previous decade. In the latter years of the 1990s, the Congregation had rejected a number of liturgical texts approved by the episcopal conferences, including a 1997 rejection of ICEL's Rite of Ordination. One year prior to its rejection of the English Missal (known as "the Sacramentary"), the Congregation issued a new instruction, titled *Liturgiam authenticam*, that required a much more literal approach to translation than had been the case previously. That same year, the Congregation demanded a restructuring of ICEL that would give it more control over the commission's internal operations.

The actions of the Congregation produced a strong reaction among many who had been involved in the translation process. Writing in *America* magazine, Bishop Donald Trautman, former chairman of the Committee on Liturgy of the U.S. bishops, wrote that *Liturgiam authenticam* "points away from the liturgical and biblical renewal of Vatican II."[1] Christopher Walsh, the chair of the ICEL Advisory Committee, delivered a lecture in 2000 where he suggested that the Holy See was attempting to "restrict the prerogatives of bishops and Bishops' Conferences" laid out in Vatican II's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in an

---

[1] Donald Trautman, "The Quest for Authentic Liturgy," *America*, October 22, 2001, 7-12.

effort to "slow down or halt altogether the process of adaptation and inculturation."[2]

These critics have suggested, implicitly or explicitly, that the Congregation's actions contradict the intent of Vatican II's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. That document granted significant authority to the national episcopal conferences to extend the use of the vernacular and to prepare and approve the necessary translations of the liturgical books. They argue that the actions of ICEL have been guided by the Constitution's desire to promote the "full, conscious and active participation of the faithful." The Congregation, by contrast, argues that the Constitution required that translations be "approved, that is confirmed" by the Holy See and that this approval process is not a mere formality.[3] The Congregation has further argued that, on some of the substantive issues in dispute, ICEL went beyond a reasonable construal of the Constitution and its implementing documents.[4]

The purpose of this thesis is to "re-read" the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in light of this conflict. I will argue that a useful way of approaching this dispute is to understand it as a *crisis of reception*. As Hermann Pottmeyer and others have observed, the documents of Vatican II are characterized by juxtapositions of theses that are in tension with each other.[5] While those who worked to implement the Constitution attempted to do so in ways that were faithful to these tensions, certain concepts within the document received more emphasis than others. In the process of revising the Missal translation, there was

---

[2] Christopher Walsh, "Minding Our Language: Issues of Liturgical Language Arising in Revision" (lecture, Ceiliúradh, June 20, 2000, http://www.cccdub.ie/conference/2000-ceiluradh [accessed December 14, 2006].

[3] See Article 80 of *Liturgiam authenticam*.

[4] Jorge Cardinal Medina Estévez to President of the Conference of Bishops of the United States, March 16, 2002, http://www.adoremus.org/CDW-ICELtrans.html [accessed May 9, 2006].

[5] Hermann J. Pottmeyer, "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II: Twenty Years of Interpretation of the Council," in *The Reception of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, et. al., translated by Matthew J. O'Connell (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1987), 39.

an effort by many of those involved in the process to recover some of these latter concepts. For a variety of reasons, this effort provoked a crisis for which both sides in the dispute must share some responsibility.

To say that responsibility is shared, however, does not mean it is equally apportioned. I will also argue that the preponderance of evidence favors the positions taken by ICEL and its member episcopal conferences. The authors of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy clearly intended to give substantial deference to the judgments of the national episcopal conferences regarding the details of translation. With respect to the approach to translation, I will argue that the Constitution's norms favor an approach that is more flexible than the one enunciated in *Liturgiam authenticam*. Nevertheless, I will also suggest that there are aspects of ICEL's approach to translating the Missal that are difficult to defend. In my conclusion, I will recommend the creation of an international body, similar to the Pontifical Biblical Commission, which could advise the Holy See and the episcopal conferences on broad theoretical questions related to the liturgy in general, and translation and inculturation in particular. The existence of such a body could reduce the future likelihood of these sorts of conflicts.

Chapter 2 of the thesis will lay out my method of proceeding. I will make use of an approach to the conciliar texts developed by the theologian Ormond Rush. Rush argues that the understanding of any communicative event requires an understanding of the communicator, the communication, and the recipient of the communication. Thus in analyzing the texts of the Second Vatican Council, we require a "hermeneutics of the authors," a "hermeneutic of the text," and a "hermeneutic of the receivers." Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of the thesis will apply this method to the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. More details about how this will be done will be presented in Chapter 2, which will also provide a brief overview of differing approaches to interpreting the Council. The final chapter will summarize and organize the evidence in support of the argument laid out above.

Before we "put out into the deep" (Lk 5:4), I want to offer a brief word about terminology. The Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments will, for understandable reasons, be abbreviated as the "Congregation for Divine Worship," the "Congregation," or merely the "CDW." The International Commission on English in the Liturgy will be abbreviated as "ICEL" or the "Commission." I will use the term "Holy See" to refer collectively, when necessary, to the papal office and the various institutions of papal executive governance that are associated with it. I will also follow a reference convention common to works of Catholic theology in referencing major ecclesial documents by the letters corresponding to their Latin titles. The reference "LA 20", for example, would indicate the 20th article of *Liturgiam authenticam*. While I will generally refer to the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy by its English title (and occasionally abbreviate it as "the Constitution"), I will, for reference purposes, use the letters corresponding to its Latin title of *Sacrosanctum concilium*, i.e. SC.

CHAPTER TWO: Methodological Considerations

Faced with the deep divisions over the translation of the Roman Missal, it is tempting to think that we can simply go back to the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, read what it says on the matter, and easily decide who is right and who is wrong. If it were really that easy, however, it is unlikely that the argument would have emerged in the first place. Texts—and the texts of Vatican II are no exception—are rarely so unambiguous.

One of the insights of the philosophical discipline of hermeneutics is that a text does not exist in isolation. It has a history, which includes a history of its interpretation. One should approach a text with an understanding of this history. One can also bring new questions to a text that has a long history of interpretation. A close examination of the text in light of these questions may yield new insights, which then become part of the text's history. One can discern a continued movement from text to context and back again, in a circular or spiral movement that results each time in deeper understanding. This process is often referred to as the "hermeneutic circle."[6]

In this chapter, I want to make use of this insight in developing an interpretive approach to the Constitution on the Liturgy. In interpreting the document, we cannot simply begin *de novo*, as if it had never been interpreted before. Both the Constitution and the Council as a whole have a history of interpretation and reception. Before we begin the process of interpretation anew, we need to have an understanding of this history and its implications for our work.

Accordingly, the first section of this chapter will address the contested history of the Council's interpretation. It will examine two broad traditions of interpretation that have emerged over the past forty years. I term the first

---

[6] Ormond Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II* (New York: Paulist, 2004), xi-xii.

approach the "historical-critical" tradition because of its self-conscious effort to apply the tools and techniques of biblical historical criticism to the Council's texts. I term the second approach the "hermeneutics of reform," using a phase coined by Pope Benedict XVI to designate those who strive to highlight the continuities between Vatican II and the historical tradition of the Church. I will argue that while there are certainly differences in emphasis between these two traditions, there is also significant common ground. Any attempt to interpret the Council's documents must incorporate insights from both.

The second section of this chapter will attempt to develop an interpretative approach to the Constitution using a framework developed by the theologian Ormond Rush. Rush argues that every communicative event must include three elements: the author, the text, and the receiver. Any effort to interpret a particular text must pay attention to all three of these elements.

Interpreting the Council: Two Traditions

Most observers of the Council and its reception agree that one can discern two broad approaches to its interpretation. These approaches are often described with terms like "liberal" or "progressive" versus "conservative" or "traditional. [7] My own preference is to use terms that are slightly more descriptive and less loaded with ideological weight. I will term the first approach "historical-critical" because its dominant feature is that it applies tools and techniques that are similar to those used by modern biblical scholars. I will term the second approach a "hermeneutic of reform," using a term coined by Pope Benedict, because its key characteristic is that it tries to emphasize the continuities between Vatican II and the Church's earlier tradition.[8]

---

[7] Avery Dulles, S.J., "Catholic Ecclesiology since Vatican II," in *Synod 1985: An Evaluation*, eds. Giuseppe Alberigo and James Provost (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 3-13

[8] Pope Benedict XVI, "Address of His Holiness Benedict XVI to the Roman Curia Offering Them Christmas Greetings," December 22, 2005, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/ speeches/2005/december/documents/ hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia_en.html [accessed February 10, 2008].

Without minimizing the real differences between these two traditions, I want to suggest that these differences are not as great as is often supposed. In what follows, I will highlight some of the key concerns of each approach. As we shall see, there are a number of points of agreement that suggest that some interpretative common ground can be found

A "Historical-Critical" Approach to the Council

If there is an overriding concern for interpreters working in this tradition, it is that the meaning of Vatican II not be reduced to a narrow reading of its texts. In the same way that modern biblical criticism attempts to place a particular passage from scripture in its broader historical, cultural, and redactional context, historical-critical approaches to Vatican II insist the same tools should be applied to the Council's texts. Without this context, disputes over the meaning of the Council tend to fall back into various forms of proof-texting.

The Jesuit historian John O'Malley, for example, has argued that the documents of the Council must be read in light of the many ways that Vatican II marked a break with the past practice of the Church. He suggests that the wide range of new approaches and changes embraced by the Council add up to something more than a set of reforms. The Council used rhetoric that exhorted rather than threatened. It sought to redistribute power within the Church by affirming episcopal collegiality. It embraced positions on religious liberty and the relationship between Church and State that had been historically anathematized. The comprehensiveness of these changes "suggests that we are dealing here with something more than a 'reform.'"[9]

O'Malley suggests that one of the great weaknesses of Catholic thought is that it refuses to recognize the discontinuities in history. Historically, the Church

---

[9] John O'Malley, S.J., "Developments, Reforms and Two Great Reformations: Towards a Historical Assessment of Vatican II," in *Tradition and Transition: Historical Perspectives on Vatican II*, ed. John W. O'Malley (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989), 109-112.

has tended to embrace forms of "substantialism" that sees the Church moving through history, but unaffected by it. In this view, reform can only be through retrieval or organic development. It discounts the possibility of true transformation.[10]

Another historian of the Council, Joseph Komonchak, has suggested that the meaning of Vatican II must be understood using the categories of "event," "experience," and "final documents." The latter two concepts are the easiest to understand. The "experience" of Vatican II is, according to Komonchak, the intentions, motives, decisions and actions of those who participated in the Council in various ways. The final documents are the product of that experience, the record of what the participants of the Council finally did say. They are legitimately invoked as a fixed expression of their intentions.[11]

While we need to understand both the experience of the Council and its final texts, Komonchak suggests that an additional category is needed, that of "event." An event is not merely a simple occurrence, but one that has consequences. Events generally mark a rupture, a break with routine. Several elements of Vatican II—its summoning by John XIII, the rejection of the prepared schemas, and the drama of the actual debates—fall into this category. The historical discernment of an "event" requires a long-term point of view. Komonchak cites Bernard Lonergan's point that "the outcome of a battle fixes the perspective in which the successive stages of the battle are viewed."[12] The subsequent reception of the Council, therefore, becomes a hermeneutic key in determining whether it marked something truly discontinuous in the life of the Church

---

[10] John O'Malley, S.J., "Reform, Historical Consciousness and Vatican II's Aggiornamento," in *Tradition and Transition: Historical Perspectives on Vatican II*, ed. John O'Malley (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989), 44-81.

[11] Joseph Komonchak, "Vatican II as an 'Event," *Theological Digest*, 46:4 (Winter 1999), 337-352.
[12] Ibid., 347.

In a similar vein to O'Malley and Komonchak, the German theologian Hermann Pottmeyer argues against reducing Vatican II to its documents. The Council "was not only a body that turned out decisions; it was an event, a movement in the course of which the Church elaborated a new interpretation of itself."[13] Each of the texts has "a pre-conciliar history, a history within the Council, and, since that time, a post-conciliar history or history of influence exercised."[14]

In approaching the texts themselves, Pottmeyer argues that the interpreter must pay special attention to the juxtaposition of theses in tension with each other. For example, in *Lumen Gentium*, the statements reaffirming Vatican I's teaching on the primacy of the pope are placed side by side with statements affirming the supreme authority of the episcopal college. Pottmeyer suggests that it would be a mistake to see the use of juxtapostion as merely as the result of political compromises within the Council. It reflects, rather, a desire to hold in tension the twin goals of renewal of the Church and the preservation of continuity. The Council was not able to go beyond juxtaposition to a new synthesis. "But even juxtaposition is progress," writes Pottmeyer, "because by being complemented the older thesis is relativized as one-sided and bearings are given for further development in understanding the faith."[15]

O'Malley, Komonchak, and Pottmeyer are all clearly representative of the "historical-critical" approach to interpreting the Council. They are strongly concerned that the texts of the Council not be read in isolation, apart from their historical and redactional context. Pottmeyer in particular is concerned that a failure to use this approach will render the reader unable to make sense of the tensions in the documents, where apparently contradictory theses are juxtaposed

---

[13] Hermann J. Pottmeyer, 30.

[14] Ibid., 39.

[15] Ibid., 38-39.

together. The result will be one-sided readings of the documents, whether of the liberal or conservative variety.

<u>Viewing the Council though a "Hermeneutic of Reform"</u>

The second tradition of interpretation—what I am calling a "hermeneutic of reform"—emerged later than the first and was to some extent a reaction to it. If there is an overriding concern of interpreters working within this second tradition, it is that the meaning of Vatican II not be *separated* from the Council's texts. As we will see, this does not imply that those who espouse a "hermeneutic of reform" are textual fundamentalists. Theologically, however, those associated with this approach take as their starting point Pope John XXIII's statement that his purpose in calling the Council was to "transmit [Catholic] doctrine, pure and integral, without any attenuation or distortion."[16]

The theologian who has been most critical of approaches to the Council which emphasize its discontinuity with the pre-conciliar tradition is the man who currently holds the chair of Peter, Benedict XVI. During his tenure as prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the faith, Joseph Ratzinger severely criticized those who saw Vatican II as a significant rupture in the history of the Church. "There is no break in continuity," Ratzinger stated in 1985. "In no wise did the Council seek to introduce a temporal dichotomy into the Church."[17]

In a Christmas address to the Roman Curia in 2005, Pope Benedict expanded on this position. He contrasted a "hermeneutic of discontinuity" with a "hermeneutic of reform." The former, he argues, asserts that the texts of the Council do not represent the true spirit of the Council because they contain statements which were inserted at the behest of the minority in order to reach

---

[16] Pope John XXIII, *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*, October 11, 1962, http://www.saint-mike.org/ Library/ Papal_Library/JohnXXIII/Opening_Speech_VaticanII.html [accessed February 10, 2008].

[17] Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger with Vittorio Messori, *The Ratzinger Report: An Exclusive Interview on the State of the Church* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1985), 35.

unanimity. The true spirit of the Council is to be found in its innovations. Benedict contrasts this position with a "hermeneutic of reform," which accepts that it was the intention of the Council fathers to express the unchanging doctrine of the Church in a new form.[18]

Cardinal Walter Kasper has expressed a similar concern with an approach to the Council that focuses on its "spirit" at the expense of the actual texts. Kasper agrees with Benedict that it would be absurd to distinguish between the pre-conciliar Church and the post-conciliar church in such a way as to suggest that the post-conciliar church is a new church. The Council must be understood within the wider tradition of the Church. Kasper suggests that an appropriate motto should be "*only* the Council, but the *whole* Council." Having said this, Kasper also argues strongly that the meaning of the Council texts cannot be obtained through a narrow literalism. "The spirit of the whole, and hence the meaning of an individual text, can only be discovered by pursuing the textual history in detail."[19]

Some of the ideas put forward by Kasper are also evident in the work of the 1985 Extraordinary Synod of Bishops. Convened to mark the 20th anniversary of Vatican II, the Synod reflected many of the divisions within the Church over the interpretation of the Council.[20] Nevertheless, the bishops were able to achieve consensus on a set of interpretive principles that continue to prove influential.

> The theological interpretation of the conciliar doctrine must show attention to all the documents, in themselves and in their close inter-relationship, in such a way that the integral meaning of the Council's affirmations-often very complex-might be understood and expressed. Special attention must be paid to the four major Constitutions of the Council, which contain the

---

[18] Pope Benedict XVI, 6.

[19] Walter Kasper, *Theology and Church* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 172.

[20] Avery Dulles, "The Reception of Vatican II at the Extraordinary Synod of 1985," in *The Reception of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, et. al., translated by Matthew J. O'Connell (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1987), 349-363.

interpretative key for the other Decrees and Declarations. It is not licit to separate the pastoral character from the doctrinal vigor of the documents. In the same way, it is not legitimate to separate the spirit and the letter of the Council. Moreover, the Council must be understood in continuity with the great tradition of the Church, and at the same time we must receive light from the Council's own doctrine for today's Church and the men of our time. The Church is one and the same throughout all the councils.[21]

We can see here the clear emphasis on continuity in the statement "the Church is one and the same throughout all the councils" and in the injunction not to separate the spirit and the letter of the Council. At the same time, there is a strong affirmation that the texts of the Council cannot be read in isolation but must be interpreted in light of their relation to one another and to those of previous councils.

Pope Benedict, Cardinal Kasper and the Fathers of the 1985 Synod can be reasonably seen as representative of the approach that I have termed a "hermeneutic of reform." They are concerned about any tendency to separate the "spirit" of the Council from its actual texts and privilege the former over the latter. They are committed to the idea that the changes introduced by the Council, even if theologically and sociologically significant, do not disrupt the underlying continuity of the faith.

Lessons for a Hermeneutic of the Council

As this brief overview of two approaches to the Council's interpretation has made clear, serious and substantive disagreements exist over how best to interpret the Council. Nevertheless, these two traditions of interpretation are not tangential to one another and there are significant areas of agreement.

First of all, it is clear that both traditions rule out a simplistic form of textual literalism. Kasper states that the redactional history of the texts must be considered a key to their interpretation. Both O'Malley and 1985 Synod fathers

---

[21] Extraordinary Synod of Bishops, "Final Report of the 1985 Extraordinary Synod," http://www.saint-mike.org /Library/Synod_Bishops/Final_Report1985.html [accessed: February 10, 2008]

highlight the importance of inter- and intra-textuality, i.e. the relationship of the documents within themselves and to each other.

There is also agreement that the historical context of the documents is key to their understanding. While this is obviously the position of O'Malley and Komonchak, Pope Benedict's speech to the Curia also suggests that the Council must be seen as a response to questions posed by the historical and theological developments of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Finally, both sets of authors agree that one of the key challenges in interpreting Vatican II is discerning the continuity of the great tradition among the historical and sociological discontinuities that were so obvious in the wake of the Council. O'Malley, who makes the strongest arguments for seeing Vatican II as a "paradigm shift," nevertheless concedes that for believing Christians, "a total shift of paradigm is by definition impossible."[22] Pope Benedict concedes that discerning the lines of continuity is not always easy.[23]

Towards a Hermeneutic of Vatican II

In this section, I want to develop an interpretive approach to the Constitution on the Liturgy that takes into account the conclusions of the previous section. Such an approach must pay close attention to the text itself. It must also attend to the redactional history of the text, the conciliar debates that produced it, and the broader historical forces that influenced those who engaged in those debates. Finally, it must appropriate Komonchak's insight that the significance of a discrete event can often only be truly appreciated in light of the subsequent history of which it is a part. For this reason, we need to examine how the Constitution was interpreted and applied, particularly in the context of the issue that is the focus of this study.

---

[22] O'Malley, "Two Great Reformations," 88.

[23] Pope Benedict XVI, 8.

Ormond Rush, an Australian theologian, has developed an approach to interpreting the Council that integrates many of these insights. In 2004, Rush summarized his approach in a short work titled *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermenutical Principles*. Any communicative event, notes Rush, must include three elements: 1) the original speaker or author; 2) what is spoken, written or communicated; and 3) the addressee, the person who is spoken to, or who reads or receives the communication. For purposes of simplicity, Rush refers to these three elements as *author*, *text*, and *receiver*.[24]

Interpreting the documents of Vatican II requires a hermeneutics of each of these three elements. A hermeneutics of the *authors*—which attempts to reconstruct the intention of the author of a text—would need to pay attention to the pre-conciliar and conciliar proceedings. Rush suggests that a fruitful way to understand Vatican II is as an "event of reception," where the great tradition was received and interpreted in light of new questions raised by the Church's encounter with modernity.[25]

Rush identifies a number of movements of reception associated with the Council. There was the reception of historical-critical theological scholarship, which marked a shift away from classical modes of thinking and an embrace of historical consciousness. Secondly, there was the reception of scripture and other elements of the tradition. Thirdly, there was the reception of modernity, as illustrated by the Church's new openness to modern ways of thinking after a century and a half of deep suspicion. Finally, there was an ecumenical reception, as symbolized by John XIII's decision to invite observers from Christian communities that were not in communion with Rome.[26]

---

[24] Ormond Rush, x-xi.

[25] Ibid., 1-12.

[26] Ibid., 8-22.

Rush's second interpretive element, a hermeneutics of the *texts*, takes the text more or less "as is," and is less concerned with the history that came before it. To take the text "as is," however, means more than merely understanding the denotative meaning of the words used by the author. John O'Malley, for example, has argued that conciliar exegetes have paid insufficient attention to the genre and style of the Council's documents. Rather than issuing condemnations, as many previous councils had done, Vatican II used language that exhorted and inspired.[27] A hermeneutic of the text must also pay attention to issues of structure—such as the ordering of propositions within a document—the relationship of elements within a text (intra-textuality) and between one text and another (inter-textuality).

The final interpretive element, a hermeneutic of the *receivers*, examines how a particular text has been read, interpreted, and applied. Rush agrees with Pottmeyer that a major feature of the Council texts is the juxtaposition of theses that are in tension with one another. We cannot arrive at an adequate interpretation of the texts simply by choosing sides in the Council's debates. We need to pay attention to how the global Church has received these texts and tried to resolve these tensions in actual practice.[28]

Towards a Hermeneutic of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy

The remainder of this study will be an attempt to use Rush's hermeneutic principles to interpret the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in light of the dispute over the translation of the Roman Missal into English. Chapter 3 will, following Rush's approach, develop a hermeneutic of the authors. In addition to looking at the Council debates, I will also discuss the historical role of the liturgical movement in shaping those debates. Because the focus of this study

---

[27] John O'Malley, S.J. "Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?" *Theological Studies* 67 (2006), 23.

[28] Ormond Rush, 60-65.

deals with the translation of liturgical texts into the vernacular, I will pay particular attention to how that issue was addressed during the Council.

Chapter 4 will develop a "hermeneutic of the text" by looking at the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy itself. Part I of this chapter will focus on the Constitution as a whole in an attempt to understand its underlying principles. In keeping with Pottmeyer's observation that the Council documents are characterized by theses in tension with one another, I will pay particular attention to identifying important points of tension within the document. Part II of the chapter will focus specifically on the sections of the Constitution dealing with the use of the vernacular and the roles of the episcopal conferences and the Holy See in preparing and approving translations.

The point of Chapter Five will be to develop what Rush terms a "hermeneutic of the receivers." In this chapter, my interpretive lens will become progressively narrower as I focus specifically on the issue of the translation of the reformed Missal from Latin into English. I will begin with a discussion of how the Holy See implemented the Constitution with respect to the use of the vernacular. From there, my lens will shift to the episcopal conferences and ICEL, where I will review how the principles and norms of the Constitution were applied during the preparation of the first and second English translations of the Roman Missal. The latter part of this chapter will focus on the controversies of the late 1990s and the events that led up to the Holy See's rejection of the revised translation in 2002.

My hope is that by the end of Chapters 3, 4 and 5, the reader will have a better understanding of how each side in the Missal dispute read and applied the Constitution. We will then be in a better position to engage in the work of the final chapter, which will be an assessment of the extent to which each side in this dispute was faithful to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution.