

Three Pathways into the Theological Mind of Pope Francis

KEITH LEMNA
St. Meinrad Seminary
St. Meinrad, IN

DAVID H. DELANEY
San Antonio, TX

THE YOUNG papacy of Pope Francis has excited many Catholics and non-Catholics throughout the world. The best evidence of this perhaps was the outpouring of enthusiasm demonstrated by throngs of people at World Youth Day 2013 in Brazil, many of whose participants were especially eager to catch a glimpse of and hear from the new pope from Latin America who had already won their loyalty. This massive gathering of Catholics and others showed the world that in Pope Francis the Church has a formidable leader, at least inasmuch as he has captivated the attention of many millions of people, drawing even the fascination of hardened detractors of the Church. Indeed, Pope Francis has become a hallowed figure among classes of people who have generally held the Church in open scorn for the past several decades. Pope Francis, in contrast to the previous two popes, is seen by them (however accurately or inaccurately) to be an eminently sympathetic figure, a builder of bridges, who understands what is truly in the hearts of modern and post-modern men and women and who desires to conform the Church to their needs and expectations.

Nevertheless, it seems clear that Pope Francis has not yet been understood, at least in the English-speaking world, on a theological level. He has most certainly not been understood in terms of how his magisterium reflects his theological sources. His ideas warrant a much more serious discussion by theologians than has so far been produced. We hope in this article to take a step or two toward understanding Pope Francis in a

systematic manner, to see him in light of his theological background so that we may provide some clues for a richer interpretive context for his papacy, one that is a little less liable to journalistic misconstruing.

At the outset, it is particularly important to note that Pope Francis is first and foremost not a professional theologian by training or vocational background but a Jesuit pastor. He has brought his Jesuit spirituality, with all of its Ignatian practicality (even pragmatism), simplicity, and sense of order to the papacy. His philosophical and theological interests are largely of a practical nature, ordered to the service of his flock. He has a pedagogical background in pastoral theology and even in Spanish literature but not in systematic theology or philosophy. He never finished a proposed doctoral dissertation in Munich on the theology of Romano Guardini, whose non-Hegelian and non-Marxist theology of dialectic was attractive to him. It is likely that one would search in vain to locate any particular school of theological or philosophical thought to which he might be said to subscribe fully. He is known to have been trained by reputable Thomists in Argentina and to have read widely in the Church Fathers and in the Church's spiritual tradition, but some of those in the Jesuit order who have known him are quick to point out that he has developed his own personal views—and always very pastorally oriented—regarding Catholic theology and philosophy.¹

With all of this said, his mind, like that of any other pastor in the Church, cannot be understood in utter detachment from the specifics of his theological formation. Thus, it is important, in interpreting him, to explore his Argentinian theological background. As a first step, then, in developing a plausible, interpretive theological context for Pope Francis,

¹ Conversations that we have had with Jesuits who know his thought and its formational influences confirm that his thought cannot be identified with any particular stream of thought. He seems to have developed his own personal theological vision, which he takes from many sources. His use of terminology also exhibits this characteristic; it does not fit exactly with any particular school but tends to be analogous usage of terms in order to highlight some specific characteristic. At the same time, as we shall see, there is strong evidence that an Argentinian *teología del pueblo* (theology of the people) is a very strong influence for him. This sense of Francis's individuality is supported by various brother Argentinian Jesuits in a recently published book of interviews; see Alejandro Bermúdez, *Pope Francis: Our Brother, Our Friend: Personal Recollections about the Man Who Became Pope* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2013). Other common themes Bermúdez's book brings out are Francis's firm Ignatian spirituality and practicality, his priority of pastoral application even over against theological inquiry, and his astute intellect in knowing how best to get things done. Regarding his dissertation idea, see *ibid.*, 68, where it is discussed by Juan Carlos Scannone, S.J., whom we will discuss in some detail below.

we shall explore briefly Argentinian liberation theology, which is at the vanguard of Argentinian theology and with which, we shall demonstrate, Pope Francis is almost certainly at home. This type of liberation theology has distinguishing characteristics that make it, in contrast to some other varieties of the general type, amenable to the Church's doctrinal tradition. In Argentina, liberation theology takes the direction of a specific sort of "theology of the people" (*teología del pueblo*) that refuses to pit classes of people against one another or against the Church in an inevitable situation of conflict. It takes its starting point in a cultural-historical analysis of the present situation of human communities in the light of faith and not in the light or darkness of Marxist categories.

Access to the Holy Father's mind can also be gained by looking at his pre-papal writings, a task that was seemingly much more easily accomplished in the case of the previous two pontiffs, who had each written voluminously in areas pertaining to Catholic theology and philosophy prior to being elected pope. This might at first appear not to be so in the case of Pope Francis. Yet, this appearance is deceiving. It rests on ignorance of the significance for him of the massive and theologically rich Aparecida document, the joint declaration of the bishops of Latin America and the Caribbean (CELAM) from their Fifth General Conference in 2007, held in Aparecida, Brazil, whose editorial commission he headed. Since the time of his election as Bishop of Rome, Pope Francis has spoken of the decisive importance of this document for the future of Latin American Catholicism. His role in the document's outcome was crucial. Indeed, he was in charge of the writing of the final document. The content of this document surely tells us much about how Pope Francis understands the situation of the global Church—and not only the Church in Latin America—in the face of the challenge of contemporary and future evangelization.² Even more, it is not too much to say that it gives us access to his theological mind in the manner of a personal writing.

² See Sandro Magister, "When Bergoglio Defeated the Liberation Theologians," *Chiesa* (October 1, 2013); available at: chiesa.espresso.repubblica.it/articolo/1350613?eng=y; accessed on 1 Oct 2013. In this article, Filippo Santoro, Archbishop of Taranto, Italy, who worked with Bergoglio on the document, is quoted as saying: "Of course, Aparecida made a significant contribution and marked a change of position that is valid not only for Latin America, but for the whole Church." Indeed, the recent release of the Post Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, *Evangelii Gaudium* (EG) on 26 November 2013 would seem to confirm Aparecida's now universal significance (available at the Vatican website). In this first of Francis's magisterial writings that is not left over from Benedict XVI's pontificate we can see more clearly Francis's plan. *Evangelii Gaudium* cites Aparecida and its associated documents no fewer than sixteen times.

In this essay, then, we would like to explore briefly, in turn, the aforementioned two pathways into the mind Pope Francis: first, Argentinian liberation theology, and, second, the Aparecida document. We shall dedicate a section to each pathway. In a third section, we shall suggest how these pathways are integrated in his thinking in the light of a third important pathway into his thought: the writings of Luigi Giussani, the founder of the ecclesial movement *Communion and Liberation*. We shall suggest in this section that Pope Francis is moved in his thinking by the desire to kindle the fire of new evangelization and that all of the pathways into his thought that we will have explored coalesce around his desire for the Church to become more fully missionary, and his recognition that mission should proceed by awakening the religious heart of man with the attraction of the Cross of Christ humbly made present to the world through the personal witness of the Church. By clarifying the three pathways that we have marked out, we hope to catch a glimpse of the sort of theological reasoning that underlies the Holy Father's evangelical strategy, evident for instance in the recently released *Evangelii Gaudium*, and to spur future theological inquiry into his exercise of the papal office.

I

We shall begin by expounding Argentinian liberation theology. It is necessary at the outset of this task to provide at least a cursory historical sketch of the experience of Catholicism in Latin America and in particular in Argentina.³ The advent of liberation theology is, after all, deeply conditioned by this history.

One might plausibly say that the early experience of Catholicism among the various peoples of Latin America is to a large degree a shared one, even if the resulting regional particularities are relatively unique cultural expressions of this experience. Catholicism came to the southern continent of present day Latin America in the early sixteenth century through the evangelistic efforts of Spanish and Portuguese missionaries accompanying the colonists. In 1508, Pope Julius II gave authority to King Ferdinand of Spain to appoint bishops in the Spanish colonies in the New World, subject to papal approval. The resulting system has been called *real patronado* (or *padronato real*, which translates to "royal patronage"). In many ways, the consequences of this system are still felt today in the sense of alienation of the average Catholic from the hierarchical

³ Cf. John Frederick Schwaller, *The History of the Catholic Church in Latin America: From Conquest to Revolution and Beyond* (New York: New York University Press, 2011); John Lynch, *New Worlds: A Religious History of Latin America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012).

Church, a situation that an ecclesial figure with the heightened pastoral sensitivity of Pope Francis would want naturally to redress.

At the risk of overgeneralizing, one of these consequences has been an all-too-often misplaced loyalty on the part of the bishops first to Spain and later to the ruling powers. The bishops were generally chosen from the elite classes even after the Spanish were expelled. The majority of the priests, on the other hand, were solicitous to the average, poor Catholic whom they served, which would eventually lead to a sense of alienation of many priests from their bishops and subsequently toward the hierarchical aspect of the Church. By the twentieth century, the average Latin American Catholic and many priests would come to equate the hierarchical Church with privilege, elitism, and the injustices of particular political regimes. Priests would in various ways be exempted in public sentiment from association with Church hierarchy. When liberal and masonic thought entered Latin America in the nineteenth century, this alienation turned into an anti-clericalism that now carried over to animosity toward priests as well in many minds, a situation that has left a lasting memory.⁴

The colonial experience of the indigenous peoples was of course often deplorable, and this generally caused most tribes that did not need the Spanish for protection to resist Spanish culture, including the Catholic faith. Although the various missionary orders—the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and later, but primarily in the rural areas, the Jesuits and their *reducciones* (“reductions” or rural settlements aimed at “reducing” those aboriginal ways of life that were in contradiction with the Gospel)—were relatively beneficent toward the indigenous peoples, the secular Spanish often exploited them out of the motivation of greed.⁵ Spanish landowners were always looking for cheap labor; subjugation and

⁴ The term “liberal” is a technical term still commonly used in Latin America to refer to Enlightenment-influenced thinking which gave rise to the American and French revolutions and to the many revolts against Spanish rule in nineteenth-century Latin America. However, Latin American liberal thinking came directly from Europe, spreading there with the European revolutions that swept through Europe in 1848. Masonic influence, primarily with its anti-Catholic, anti-clerical emphases, was also felt throughout Latin America, though perhaps Mexican Catholics suffered most from it in the Cristero wars of the early twentieth century. This cultural memory explains Francis’s continued concern with freemasonry mentioned in his plane interview returning from World Youth Day 2013; transcript available here: www.vatican.va/holy_father/francesco/speeches/2013/july/documents/papa-francesco_20130728_gmg-conferenza-stampa_en.html. In this interview, Pope Francis refers explicitly to “lobbies” of Masons.

⁵ Cf. Jorge Mario Bergoglio and Abraham Skorka, *Heaven on Earth: Pope Francis on Faith, Family, and the Church in the Twenty-first Century*, trans. Alejandro Bermúdez and Howard Goodman (New York: Image, 2013), 199–201. Here, Pope Francis

enslavement of the indigenous peoples provided their primary source of such labor. This pattern established what would become a class system based upon skin color, with those of pure Spanish origin becoming members of the elite class and the poor indigenous and *mestizos* (of mixed Spanish and indigenous and/or Black African blood) forming the under-class and often being exploited for their cheap labor.

The Spanish colonial era in Latin America approached its end with Napoleon's incarceration of the Bourbon king, Ferdinand VII of Spain, in 1807. This led to wars of independence throughout Latin American territories. In Argentina, the May Revolution of 1810 led to the ouster of the Spanish Viceroy, and the colony declared independence in 1816, though fighting with Spanish royalists would continue until 1824. Like almost every other newly independent country, Argentina quickly fell into a long civil war, a struggle between two different factions with differing views of how the country should be governed. It finally approved its current Constitution in 1853, though, like its neighbors, it continued to experience a somewhat tumultuous history progressing through liberal governments, dictatorships, radical governments, coups followed by military dictatorships, wars with neighboring states, and reforming governments.

In many ways the experience of Argentina is similar to that of the rest of Latin America, but in many other ways it is different. Argentina's indigenous population quickly declined, almost to disappearance, primarily due to nineteenth-century European immigration; today the population is about 97 percent white.⁶ Thus the class system based upon skin color experienced in other Latin American countries was not as great a factor in Argentinian social structures. The elite were usually the landowners. Argentina has had as well an unusually large middle class for much of its history, though one economic collapse in the 1980s and a second one at the beginning of the new millennium reduced its size to the present day. Even so, Argentina has throughout its history been one of the most prosperous countries in Latin America. Nevertheless, it has also had and continues to have a large poor class, with poverty of a kind not seen in the United States.⁷ Although the common experience in most Latin Ameri-

(then Jorge Bergoglio) stresses the beneficial presence of the religious orders in the colonies of Latin America.

⁶ This figure comes from: www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ar.html; accessed on August 9, 2013.

⁷ Overall, by the mid 1990s, poverty in which basic human needs were not met was at about 15 percent; however, in rural areas this rate was as high as 40 percent. This was down from an average closer to one quarter of the population in the later Perón and post-Perón years; acquired from go.worldbank.org/TIDQRMGIS0.

can countries of the great wealth divide (the few rich and the majority in extreme poverty) was not as pronounced in Argentina, most Argentinians were still aware of this acute poverty from experiences in certain areas of the cities and from visits to rural areas and neighboring countries.

Argentina differs from many other Latin American countries in another important respect: Marxist socialism has never seemed to gain a foothold there. Perhaps this was due to Juan Perón, who rose to power during World War II, achieving the presidency in 1946. Perón has been described as more of a fascist or a national socialist than an outright Marxist. He was at once populist and authoritarian. His economic policies were initially successful but soon began to fail, and Argentina lost its once stable, flourishing economy. Peronian nationalist collectivism, which redistributed wealth to the poor, seems to have inoculated Argentina to some degree against Marxist success in achieving governance and, as we shall see, in gaining a foothold in theology. As with the rest of Latin America, the country is predominantly Catholic (somewhere between 77 and 92 percent),⁸ but the percentage who practice their faith is much lower (around 20 percent).⁹

With this as background, let us now turn to explore the special character of liberation theology in Argentina, enlisting especially the aid of Juan Carlos Scannone, S.J. (b. 1931), the greatest living Argentinian Jesuit philosopher, who has been at once a mentor to Pope Francis (then Jorge Bergoglio) and a spiritual advisee of his.¹⁰ Scannone taught Greek and literature to the young Bergoglio in the seminary.¹¹ Later, while Bergoglio was rector of the seminary at which Scannone taught, he would consult with Scannone on theological and philosophical matters and Scannone with him on spiritual matters.¹² This mutual mentoring went on for some ten years. This lends credibility to Scannone's assertion, made in an interview with the French

⁸ These figures come, respectively, from features.pewforum.org/global-christianity/total-population-percentage.php (August 9, 2013) and www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ar.html (August 9, 2013).

⁹ This figure comes from the second source in note 8 above.

¹⁰ Our primary reference for this discussion is taken from the article by Juan Carlos Scannone, S.J. "Perspectivas Eclesiológicas de la 'Teología del Pueblo' en Argentina," in *Ecclesia Tertii Millennii Advenientis: Omaggio al P. Angel Anton, Professore di Ecclesiologia alla Pontificia Università Gregoriana nel suo 70° Compleanno*, ed. F. Chica, S. Panizzolo, and H. Wagner (Casale Monferrato: PIEME, 1997), 686–704.

¹¹ *La Stampa*, "Fr. Scannone: 'Meet my Pupil, Bergoglio,'" March 3, 2013; accessed from: vaticaninsider.lastampa.it/en/world-news/detail/articolo/francesco-francisco-23770/ on August 9, 2013. See also Bermúdez, *Our Brother*, 62.

¹² *Ibid.* Scannone also reports that he lived together with Bergoglio at the Colegio Máximo de San José in San Miguel, in the province of Buenos Aires for as many as 17 years. On this, see Bermúdez, *Our Brother*, 62–63.

daily journal *La Croix* shortly after Bergoglio's election to the papacy, that Francis is a product of the Argentinian school of liberation theology, for which Scannone is himself a foremost advocate.¹³

Fr. Scannone is a particularly interesting figure, the study of whose work would greatly enhance the North American understanding of Latin American theology and philosophy. He is Professor Emeritus, Theology Director at the Institute for Research in Philosophy at the University of the Savior–San Miguel in Buenos Aires, Argentina. He was educated as a philosopher, gaining his Ph.D. in philosophy in 1967 from the University of Munich, where he wrote his dissertation on the French philosopher Maurice Blondel, although he was most profoundly affected later by the thought of the French phenomenologist Emmanuel Lévinas, particularly his 1961 work *Totality and Infinity*.¹⁴ Although Scannone was schooled in phenomenology and some of his work is still in the field of phenomenology (he has recently shown interest in the work of Jean-Luc Marion), he is also a liberation theologian/philosopher. One might say that he is a liberation theologian who informs his work with insights from phenomenology. He was involved in liberation theology from its beginning (1968), but, perhaps because of Peronism in Argentina, he and his Argentinian confreres never considered Marxist metaphysics a possible foundation for their work.¹⁵ Nevertheless, they did see value in a liberationist hermeneutic for developing an inculturated theology for the Latin American—and particularly the Argentinian—context, but not one that would be a provincial and segregated specimen of theology. Scannone suggests that for any inculturated theology to be legitimate it must also be a universal theology. This is a tricky balance to accomplish, and one would doubtless have to see his work in light of his appropriation of Lévinas's concept of alterity to understand how he might suggest pulling it off. It is beyond our goals at present to do so, but it is interesting to ponder that the present papacy might inspire some North American theologians to think about what it means for contemporary French phenomenology to inform a Latin American *teología del pueblo* and vice versa. At any rate, Scannone seems to be indebted at least as much to

¹³ *La Croix*, “Le pape François et ‘l’école argentine de la théologie de la libération,’” March 17, 2013; accessed from: www.la-croix.com/Religion/Actualite/Le-pape-Francois-et-l-ecole-argentine-de-la-theologie-de-la-liberation-_NP_-2013-03-17-921907 on August 13, 2013. For more information on their relationship, see Bermúdez, “Father Juan Carlos Scannone, S.J.” in *Our Brother*, 61–75.

¹⁴ Carlos Beorlegui, “La Influencia de E. Levinas en le Filosofía de la Liberación de J. C. Scannone y de E. Dussel (1a Parte),” *Revista Realidad* 57 (May–June 1997): 245.

¹⁵ Scannone, “*Perspectivas*.”

French theology as to German theology, the latter of which is the source of most forms of liberation theology.

The Argentinian school of liberation theology is, like all other forms of this theology, deeply wedded to the preferential option for the poor. However, as Scannone has expounded the matter, it contextualizes the preferential option in a wider theology of the people (*teología del pueblo*) that takes its starting point not in Marxism but in the ecclesial documents *Gaudium et Spes* (GS) and *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (EN). The category of the People of God is decisive here. Though there was interchange between the Argentinians and some elements of the Marxist liberation theological schools (not all of whose representatives accepted the Argentinian school as a legitimate branch of liberation theology), the Argentinian school would use the latter's terminology, but in a manner that is quite congruent with Church tradition. It would stress a preferential option for the poor that is ecclesially integrated. That is, Argentinian liberation theology sees the poor within the heart of the People of God, in the light of an ecclesiology of communion where all have a share in the Church. It does not dismiss the importance of hierarchical institution but affirms that ecclesial authority exists to serve the people. Scannone distinguishes four currents in liberation theology, and his schematization was taken up by Cardinal Antonio Quarracino (who preceded Bergoglio as Archbishop of Buenos Aires) in the Cardinal's presentation of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith's *Instruction on Certain Aspects of the Theology of Liberation* (1984) in *L'Osservatore Romano*. Gustavo Gutiérrez has himself confirmed that there is a distinctive Argentinian current of liberation theology.¹⁶

In order to distinguish more precisely the particular characteristics of the Argentinian school, we will follow Scannone in highlighting some of its differences from Latin American Marxist currents of liberation theology. Perhaps the most important differentiating characteristic of the Argentinian *teología del pueblo* is that it emphasizes what Scannone calls an "integral liberation," by which he means a theocentric, vertical liberation that makes possible horizontal, political liberations. Liberation comes first from God, in this view, in contrast to the Marxist idea that liberation is first and foremost a human political achievement. Following *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, the *teología del pueblo* understands that while human liberation from oppression

¹⁶ Cf. Bermúdez, *Our Brother*, 64. Quarracino's years are 1923–98. Scannone's original article identifies the four currents as: 1) theology from the pastoral praxis of the Church, 2) theology from the praxis of revolutionary groups, 3) theology from historical praxis, and 4) theology from the praxis of the Latin-American Peoples (see Juan Carlos Scannone, "La teología de la liberación. Caracterización, corrientes, etapas," *Stromata* 18 [1982]: 3–40).

is linked to the Gospel message of salvation, it is not—as Marxist liberation theology might have contended—the only liberation, nor should it be the first concern for theology (see *EN* 35–39). Clearly, a theology of personal sin would be crucial in this perspective. One could not, in this school, reduce the reality of sin to its presence in social structures.

Another important distinguishing characteristic of the Argentinian school is that it rejects the primacy of the Marxist category of conflict. Scannone indicates that the *teología del pueblo* presupposes that unity has an ontological primacy; conflict arising in human affairs comes only later. Scannone holds that one is better able from this perspective to analyze conflict arising from injustice and oppression and so to resolve it. In this way, the term “people” is understood differently than in the Marxist schools, which reduce the category “people” to those who are oppressed, in a natural state of conflict with the oppressors. In the Argentinian school, the oppressors are also “people” who must be reconciled with those whom they oppress. Thus, a great part of the project of the Argentinian school is to look at the relationship between all of the “people” from a particular historico-cultural context and from that of the People of God. Marxist sociological analysis is not the determining factor here.¹⁷ The category “people” also includes, as intimated above, the hierarchical structure of the Church, which the Argentinian school recognizes as necessary if the Church is to be a servant Church. It is a special challenge in many Latin American contexts to affirm the hierarchical Church, for the reasons pointed out in our exposition above.

Besides the category of “people,” and the attendant emphasis on a preferential option for the poor, the *teología del pueblo* prizes as a primary category “popular religiosity.” As we have seen so far in his papacy, popular religiosity is very important to Pope Francis. This is also an important theme in *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, and it has found a place in *Evangelii Gaudium* as well.¹⁸ As Scannone understands it, this concept presupposes that at the center of a culture is the organization of a society around the ultimate

¹⁷ Cf. Bermúdez, “Father Juan Carlos Scannone, S.J.” in *Our Brother*, 64.

¹⁸ *Evangelii Nuntiandi* §48, emphasizing the importance of popular religiosity, instructs that one which is well oriented is able to be purified of distortions and superstitions, which if not dealt with can result in the development of sects and do damage to true ecclesial community. However, if pastors guide it through a “pedagogy of evangelization” then its richness in values which manifest an implicit thirst for God and the unique spiritual expression of those who experience poverty and simplicity, become apparent. *Evangelii Nuntiandi* says that popular religiosity often brings people to generosity and sacrifice, it highlights profound attributes of God such as fatherhood, providence, and a sense of His loving omnipresence, and it engenders in those who practice it patience, a daily

meaning of life—that is, how individuals and the society should relate to one another and to God as demanded by Him. For Scannone, this takes the form in Argentina of popular piety. Liberation theologians of the Marxist variety often differ from the *teología del pueblo* very strongly on this point. One might take Juan Luis Segundo's theology of liberation as a counterexample, which has been plausibly accused of Gnosticism and elitism.¹⁹ Segundo's representative Marxist position seems—or so critics have argued—to privilege saving gnosis for an elite few, eschewing the Catholic piety of the common folk, those whom Segundo refers to as “the common Christian.” In a Marxist analysis, “popular piety” might be perceived as an opiate given to the people by those from the oppressor classes, or at least encouraged by them, in order to keep the people from seeking a social justice that would undo the stratification of society. This is not Scannone's view; he nevertheless thinks that one must not take popular piety in a completely uncritical way, absent any theological and moral analysis of it.²⁰

A final distinguishing mark that we would like to highlight is the Argentinian school's unique aspiration to evangelize culture and cultures. Inspired by *Gaudium et Spes* and *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, the *teología del pueblo* takes the Church's mission of evangelization with the utmost sense of urgency. Scannone himself argues that the evangelization of cultures is necessary through a so-called “marvelous exchange” between the People of God and “the peoples,” especially through popular religiosity. We cannot draw out the specifics of this proposal here, but it is quite different from Marxist versions of liberation theology, which do not follow the Magisterium on evangelization with the seriousness that Scannone's Argentinian school does.

All of the concerns of the Argentinian school of liberation theology that we have briefly expounded are expressed in a summary of liberation theology given in an interview of Cardinal Jorge Bergoglio by Francesca Ambrogetti and Sergio Rubin in 2010, prior to his election to the papacy.²¹ In this interview, Cardinal Bergoglio characterizes the Church's

awareness of the Cross, detachment, openness to others and devotion. While Scannone does not explicate these, they are implicit in his treatment of the *teología del pueblo* and its dependence upon *Evangelii Nuntiandi* for its theology of popular religiosity. See also *Evangelii Gaudium* §§90 and 122–26.

¹⁹ See Horacio Bojorge, S.J., *Teologías Deicidas: El Pensamiento de Juan Luis Segundo en su Contexto: Reexamen, Informe Crítico, Evaluación*, 2d ed. (Montevideo: Centro Cultural Católico “Fe y Razón,” 2011), 293–311.

²⁰ *Evangelii Gaudium* reflects this approach. Cf. §§69 and 70.

²¹ *Pope Francis: His Life in His Own Words*, interviews with Francesca Ambrogetti and Sergio Rubin, trans. Laura Dail Literary Agency (New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons, 2013), 92–95. This is the translation and publication of the 2010 interview book referenced here.

stance on liberation theology—a theological movement which he sees as an “interpretive consequence of the Second Vatican Council”²²—as quite broad. He stresses that the Church has not made a mass condemnation of it. He recognizes the ideological missteps of liberation theology, particularly its use of Marxist categories to analyze reality, but he stresses as well the importance of its emphasis on a preferential option for the poor and on popular religiosity—the latter being, as we have just seen, a prevalent concern in the type of liberation theology he likely knows best, namely, the Argentinian variety. He commends those many men and women who have been inspired by liberation theology to live in greater service to the Church.

An Argentinian interpretive lens seems very much present in the summary of liberation theology given in this interview. Pope Francis/Cardinal Bergoglio asserts that the emphasis that emerged after the Council toward a preferential option for the poor was of the utmost importance for evangelization, but that it had the potential—which was, of course, realized—to be co-opted by ideologies in the turbulent time of the 1960s. He suggests that the taint of ideology was lessened, however, by a growing awareness among theologians and pastors of the treasure of the popular religion of the people. Francis has the highest praise here for Paul VI’s *Evangelii Nuntiandi*. He particularly commends that apostolic exhortation for its treatment of popular religion, which is, he says, “the greatest thing written” about it and which, he tells us, is repeated in the Aparecida document in what he considers to be that document’s greatest part.²³ We see, then, that Francis has a glowing assessment of the concerns of the Argentinian school of liberation theology that we have expounded: a preferential option for the poor (which the Aparecida document places, in line with the Argentinian school, in the context of a rich theology of the People of God), evangelism, and popular religiosity. All of these concerns are found expressly in the Aparecida document, to which we now turn.

II

There is, it should be said to start with, much debate about the meaning of the Aparecida document, which as we noted above resulted from CELAM’s Fifth General Conference in 2007. In the Second General Conference of CELAM, held in 1968 at Medellín, Colombia, the Latin American bishops adopted an expression of their common concerns which was very much influenced by Marxist liberation theologies; it

²² Ibid., 92.

²³ Ibid., 94. It is no surprise then, that Francis cites *Evangelii Nuntiandi* no fewer than thirteen times in *Evangelii Gaudium*.

explicitly approved certain aspects of the liberation program such as base communities. However, beginning with the Third General Conference, held in Puebla, Mexico in 1979, we begin to see a softening of this connection, although most agree that Puebla reaffirmed everything from Medellín. John Paul II directed CELAM to hold its Fourth General Conference in 1992 to celebrate the 500th anniversary of Columbus's founding of the new world. This conference was held in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic. John Paul II greatly influenced the Latin American bishops to center their concerns on his call for a new evangelization, and this is what one finds in the Santo Domingo document. This caused Salvadoran liberation theologian Jon Sobrino to characterize "Medellín as a 'leap forward' and Puebla as a 'dainty step forward,'" while he characterized the conference in Santo Domingo "as a 'shaky step into the future.'" ²⁴ Although Aparecida still contains some positive reference to ecclesial realities derived from liberation theology that were found in Medellín, such as base communities, it is clear that those which it considers to have been successful are those in communion with the Church and obedient to the Magisterium. ²⁵ Even Cardinal Bergoglio, in 2012, seems to have admitted that the document was a break from the CELAM documents of the past. ²⁶

The Aparecida document is a well-thought-out document (or rather, a coherent series of documents) that is thoroughly Trinitarian in theology (see especially paragraph 14, put there through a "decisive intervention" by then-Cardinal Bergoglio) ²⁷ and exhibits a *communio*-influenced ecclesiology. Its primary focus is on missionary evangelization, and every concern it presents is discussed in this context. ²⁸ Moreover, unlike some of its predecessor documents, it addresses pastoral priorities in an order reflecting an authentic missionary focus. The Aparecida document seems to correspond with the tenets of the *teología del pueblo* outlined above, which makes sense since the latter arose from reflection on *Evangelii*

²⁴ Anna L. Peterson, "Santo Domingo and Beyond: Documents & Commentaries from the Historic Meeting of the Latin American Bishops' Conference by Alfred T. Hennelly," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 63, no. 4 (Winter, 1995): 863.

²⁵ See CELAM, Aparecida document (AD) (2007), par. 99e; available at: www.celam.org/aparecida/Ingles.pdf.

²⁶ See George Weigel, "Light from the South," *On the Square*, June 13, 2012; accessed from www.firstthings.com/onthesquare/2012/06/light-from-the-south on August 13, 2013.

²⁷ Reported by Archbishop Santoro, in "When Bergoglio Defeated the Liberation Theologians." Others at the conference had not wanted to lay the foundation for the document, as paragraph 14 does, in the theology of the Trinity.

²⁸ There are more than 150 mentions of mission or evangelization.

Nuntiandi and *Gaudium et Spes*, ecclesial texts which likewise form a basis for Aparecida.²⁹ The document opens with a focus on creating missionary disciples and on the Church's primary mission to evangelize, obviously reflecting the primary concerns of the new evangelization. It also discusses the great dangers facing Latin America, including threats to marriage, family, and life, and it highlights the need to recover the sense of the dignity of women in many Latin American cultures. It highlights the perennial challenges that Latin America has faced in the social and economic disparity that leads to widespread, abject poverty. However, we now see all these concerns placed into their proper relationship to the Gospel message. Social teaching no longer appears to be presented as the entirety of the Gospel itself.

Like the concerns of the Argentinian school, the Aparecida document strongly emphasizes a preferential option for the poor, integral liberation (or authentic Christian liberation), and popular religiosity. In close connection with these themes is the concept of "encounter," which is a theme of great importance to Pope Francis, as we shall see in the third section of this essay. The document's treatment of the preferential option for the poor integrates it as an essential aspect of evangelization. Every authentic disciple, it tells us, is a missionary, and every authentic missionary loves Jesus Christ and so sees Him in the "least of His brothers" (citing Mt 25:40). Jesus made Himself poor (here it cites Heb 2:11–12 and 2 Cor 8:9). Love for his poor brothers manifests itself first in the disciple's concern for the unity of the poor with Christ, but inseparable from this is his concern for promotion of the poor man's integral (material and spiritual) human development. Francis, both before and since his election, has emphasized that integral liberation demands that we not lose sight of our obligation to care for the "suffering flesh of Christ."³⁰

Moreover, evangelizers must put on Christ, becoming poor as He did, though we do so because Christ is all we have to give of redeeming value. All of this is encompassed in the term "authentic Christian liberation," which refers to the primary importance of salvation from sin but with necessary fruits being manifested in the work of believers toward the liberation of the least of their brothers from poverty and oppression.

²⁹ The Aparecida document cites *Evangelii Nuntiandi* nine times.

³⁰ Jorge Bergoglio, "Bringing the Nearness of Christ to a Disillusioned World: Homily at the Closing Mass of the National Congress on the Social Doctrine of the Church," 8 May 2011; in Pope Francis, *Encountering Christ: Homilies, Letters and Addresses of Cardinal Jorge Bergoglio* (New Rochelle, NY: Scepter, 2013), 155. For example, see his interventions at Assisi available at Vatican Radio website (en.radiovaticana.va).

This harkens to a theme that we have already encountered with Scannone and the distinguishing characteristics of Argentinian theology vis-à-vis the Marxists. Interestingly, in the context of youth ministry, the Aparecida document states that missionaries must embrace a “preferential and evangelical option for the poor and needy” (AD 393e).³¹ This phrase “evangelical option” seems simply to link the preferential option with the Church’s essential mission of integral liberation, though no explanation is given. While there is an emphasis on the preferential option, Aparecida clarifies that it is not an “exclusive or excluding” option (AD 392), though it does not clarify how it is not exclusive. One might presume that this means that the Church is meant to reach everyone with the mercy of Christ and not just the poor. Emphasis on the poor is an unmistakable hallmark of Pope Francis’s pontificate to date, punctuated by its receiving approximately eighty mentions in the Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium*.³² The Aparecida document mentions another important theme that we have heard from Pope Francis, that of the obligation of the Church to go out to the peripheries of society.³³ The Church must be especially solicitous of those most unlikely to hear the Gospel because of their poverty.

The preferential and evangelical options for the poor are the interpretive keys for understanding what Francis means when he says he wants “a poor Church for the poor.” Since his election to the papacy, he has clarified what is meant in speaking of a poor Church.³⁴ He has explained that a poor Church is one that realizes it has nothing of its own, that everything that it has is from Christ, upon Whom it is completely and

³¹ The preferential option for the poor has the corollary of the evangelical option for the poor (see also AD 446) which seems to be a reflection of the Old Testament preferential option for first bringing the good news to the *anawim* that scholars see fulfilled in the sequence of the epiphanies of the Messiah, beginning with Mary and Joseph and then to the shepherds (cf. Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: a Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, New Updated Edition [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993], 497–99).

³² While there are certainly clusters of focus, it is notable that this theme of the poor and the option for them is found throughout the Exhortation (see EG §§21, 48, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 70, 76, 80, 97, 123, 125, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 204, 205, 207, 212, 218, 236, 265). The careful observer will see that this concern permeates the entirety of Pope Francis’s thought; he sees it in its manifold meanings as the key for the New Evangelization and for the renewal of Church and society.

³³ We see this point repeated in *Evangelii Gaudium* (see EG §20).

³⁴ Address of Pope Francis to the Participants in the Plenary Assembly of the International Union of Superiors General, 8 May 2013; available on the Vatican website.

totally dependent. He says that it is not sufficient to know a theoretical poverty; one must experience it, one must touch the flesh of the poor Christ in order to learn humility, solidarity, sharing, and love.³⁵

Francis is firm in his commitment to the importance of popular religiosity and is responsible for its emphasis in the Aparecida document.³⁶ The document follows *Evangelii Nuntiandi* quite closely, as then-Cardinal Bergoglio said to interviewers in 2010.³⁷ However, like the *teología del pueblo*, it more explicitly ties popular religiosity to the relationship of all the people with the People of God. It cites as particular expressions of popular piety in Latin America “patronal saint celebrations, novenas, rosaries, the Way of the Cross, processions, dances and songs of religious folklore, affection for the saints and angels, solemn promises, and family prayer” (AD 258).³⁸ It highlights pilgrimages especially as a manifestation of the People of God in their earthly pilgrimage of faith. We see in this especially the simultaneous intimate solidarity of pilgrims with God and one another. The Aparecida document emphasizes that popular religiosity is not “mass spirituality.” Rather, it is at once a personal encounter with the Lord and a response to felt concrete, human spiritual needs. The document, like *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, emphasizes the importance of pastors taking popular religiosity seriously if they are to help guide it to maturity and so deepen the faith of its practitioners. Here Aparecida has in

³⁵ While the context of this discussion is the evangelical counsels, he clearly includes the entire Church in his words on poverty.

³⁶ Scannone often discusses Francis’s emphasis on popular religiosity and says it is directly derived from the Argentinian School. One example Scannone points to is Francis’s emphasis on the clergy’s need to engage with and foster the simple faith of the people. Scannone also confirms that it was due to Cardinal Bergoglio that popular religiosity achieved the emphasis it has in AD (cf. Bermúdez, “Father Juan Carlos Scannone, S.J.” in *Our Brother*, 71). Likewise, Msgr. Fazio, regional vicar of Opus Dei in Argentina and close friend to then-Cardinal Bergoglio, affirms that understanding the Pope’s thought means understanding his emphasis on popular piety (cf. Mario Fazio, *Pope Francis: Keys to His Thought* [New Rochelle, NY: Scepter, 2013], 40–48). We find this emphasis on popular religiosity articulated in his pre-papal interventions as well. For example, Bergoglio writes: “Popular piety has a deep sense of transcendence and, at the same time, is a real experience of the nearness of God, possesses the capacity to express the faith in a full language that overcomes rationalisms with contemplative features that define one’s relationship with nature and other men . . .” (Jorge Bergoglio, “Religiosidad popular como inculturación de la fe en el espíritu de Aparecida,” in *A la luz de Aparecida*, Archdiocese of Buenos Aires, 2009, 25; cited in Fazio, *Keys*, 42). Popular piety also receives prominent mention in *Evangelii Gaudium* (see EG 90, 122–26).

³⁷ Cf. *His Life*, 94.

³⁸ Msgr. Mario Fazio identifies the major elements of Cardinal Bergoglio’s popular piety as: shrines, pilgrimages, feasts, and Marian devotions; see Fazio, *Keys*, 40–48.

mind a more direct contact with Scripture, greater participation in the sacraments, devotion to the Sunday Eucharist, and a greater expression of love of and service to others. For Aparecida, popular religiosity in Latin America is Marian in spirit (43). It has traditionally been and continues to be a means of dialogue and inculturation with indigenous cultures (see all of 2.1.5).

Encounter, as we have said, is another primary category found in the Aparecida document. Of course, the context is a personalistic faith to which one comes through an encounter with Jesus Christ. The first encounter anyone has with Christ is that which is manifested in His missionaries (that is, all believers). This personal encounter must be a permanent attitude manifested in a spirit of brotherly and sisterly solidarity for service, including the defense of life and the protection of the most vulnerable and excluded (AD 394).³⁹

Pope Francis provides us with insight into his major themes of concern from Aparecida in his address to the leadership of CELAM given at a general coordination meeting in Rio de Janeiro for 2013 World Youth Day.⁴⁰ The first point we might note is that his introduction indicates his belief that Aparecida differed from the previous four General Conferences in some important ways. This is consistent with his comments in an interview in 2012, which we referenced above.⁴¹ He first mentions that the bishops did not begin by discussing the *Instrumentum Laboris*, the mandate for discussion which had been developed by the experts of the preparatory committee. Rather, the bishops first prayed in the Marian shrine, accompanied by the People of God, where they could hear the pilgrims' prayers and hymns. This public interpretive focus by Pope Francis corresponds to all that we have seen from him in regard to his Marian devotion, his prayer-based spirituality, and his having been influenced by the *teología del pueblo*. The bishops then proceeded to discuss their mutual concerns in order to outline their major priorities before making reference to the *Instrumentum*. In this way, the agenda was set by the concerns of the entire body, in the midst of prayer, rather than by the preparatory committee.

The major concern Francis highlights, alluding to the words of his two previous successors, is the bishops' mission of helping to guide the universal Church in preparing for a new Pentecost. This preparation begins with forming and preparing missionary disciples. In the same way that mission

³⁹ See Samuel Gregg, "Pope Francis on the True Meaning of Poverty," *Crisis Magazine* (June 5, 2013).

⁴⁰ Available on the Vatican website.

⁴¹ See note 26, above.

and evangelization form the core of the Aparecida document, they constitute Francis's summary of it. He identifies as his first concern Aparecida's call for a "pastoral conversion." This is interesting because Aparecida covers pastoral conversion in the middle of the document, but it dedicates to it only about a page and a half out of about 150 pages. His intervention at Rio suggests it has a much higher priority in his mind.⁴² Among the elements of pastoral concern he highlights is the need for pastors to examine their activities to ensure that they are predominantly pastoral rather than administrative. He wants them to become less patronizing of the laity; rather, the bishops and clergy should recognize that the laity must be given the freedom to mature in discipleship in order to live the Gospel more effectively and so become fruitful collaborators with their pastors. In saying this, he suggests that the history of the involvement of the bishops with their flock is one of manipulation and "infantilization." Here we believe we can see an understanding of the clergy as responsible for spiritual leadership in service of the laity, but that both together share the responsibility, if in different ways, for mission and evangelization.

In what could be the key to understanding Francis's pastoral priority, he cites the first line of *Gaudium et Spes*, a document upon which the *teología del pueblo* and Aparecida rely. Pope Benedict XVI had chosen this exact passage for his opening address to the 2007 Aparecida General Conference. The passage declares that the same hopes, joys, grief, and anguish are shared by the people of the world and the followers of Christ (GS 1). This linking of "the peoples" with the People of God is a central theme of the *teología del pueblo*, as we have seen, and its influence would in part explain Francis's sensitivity to this particular passage and this particular approach to mission. Of this passage, Francis declares what we think might be the hermeneutical key for interpreting his entire pontificate to date: "Here we find the basis for our dialogue with the contemporary world." We will investigate, in more detail below, his approach to this dialogue and his rationale for it. However, here we might note that he goes on to say that he believes the world, especially the world's young, to be in some manner attentive to the existential concerns about which the Gospel, the Magisterium, and the Church's social teaching have much to say. Therefore through these three a fruitful exchange "must" take place.⁴³

⁴² Pope Francis affirms this in *Evangelii Gaudium*, emphasizing the urgency for ecclesial renewal and the central place pastoral conversion must take in it (see EG §§27–33).

⁴³ The official Vatican English translation uses the term "change" for the Spanish *cambio*. While this is the primary meaning of the term, and one might otherwise expect "intercambio" meaning "exchange;" *cambio* can also mean exchange. In this

In other words, it is not optional for the Church to engage in this continuing dialogue with modernity. The Church's social teaching and its implications appear to be what he considers the most fruitful place for this dialogue. Francis indicates that the first step in this dialogue is listening, and thereby engaging with today's people in every scenario and "areopagi" (a term employed by the *Aparecida* document for a place of encounter with the nations) in every language, culture, and reality in order to proclaim Christ to them. This one statement would appear to explain what we have seen of Francis's actions, his words, and his priorities thus far. He appears to be working to gain the attention of the world through actions and words, in order to engage the people of the world first in issues of mutual concerns (if perhaps unthematized concerns) in order to reveal to them the radical nature of the Gospel's response.

Lastly, we might mention that he highlights his concern over the danger posed by various proposals for contemporary missionary evangelization but which he says are simply parodies of, and so stumbling blocks to, authentic missionary discipleship. Among these he includes the substitution of various ideologies, including politico-economic ideologies such as market liberalism and Marxism, for the Gospel. He mentions also the reduction of the Gospel to a psychological enterprise, which he calls an elitist hermeneutic that turns the person inward through spirituality courses and spiritual retreats and has nothing to do with the authentic Gospel, which is self-transcending. He also rejects proposals grounded in Enlightenment ideology he characterizes as Gnostic, in which "enlightened Catholics" offer a higher spirituality which ends up being disincarnate, focused sterily on *quaestiones disputatae*. We agree with Thomas Reese, who suggests the Holy Father is speaking of such *quaestiones disputatae* as birth control and women priests.⁴⁴ He rejects restorationism as a form of Pelagianism by which doctrine and discipline themselves replace the Gospel. His frequent criticisms of the legalism or Pelagianism of "Catholic Traditionalism" as he understands it, and his preference for mysticism, expressed in a recent interview,⁴⁵ evoke the ancient distinction between Christian ascetical theology (represented in the extreme by

context, it seems to us that he did mean an exchange in the form of dialogue. If "change" is the correct meaning, this would seem to indicate an urgency for effecting social change.

⁴⁴ Thomas Reese, "Pope Francis and the Three Temptations of the Church," *National Catholic Register*, August 13, 2013; available online at the NCR website.

⁴⁵ Cf. Antonio Spadaro, S.J., "A Big Heart Open to God: The Exclusive Interview with Pope Francis," *America* (September 30, 2013); available at the Vatican website under "speeches."

Pelagius) and Christian Platonism (represented by Saint Augustine); the former lauds the human capacity to pursue virtue on its own by obedience to external command, and the latter emphasizes the need for interior transformation of the passions by grace. He rejects functionalism, in which ecclesial programs are created and assessed according to quantifiable results and statistics; from the beginning of his papacy he has expressed his concern that functionalism turns the Church into an NGO. Finally, he condemns clericalism. He says that in the majority of cases clericalism is manifested in what we might consider a reverse fashion, that we have seen since the 1980s. Here the clergy attempts to clericalize the laity, allowing them to take roles proper to the clergy, often in response to their requests. He says that clericalism is largely responsible for the lack of freedom and maturity seen in Latin American (and in this context we would argue, North American) laity, although it is clear from his teaching in other contexts that he is strongly opposed to any form of clericalism, even when that word is understood in its most usual meaning, that is, that the clergy often abuse their authority and use their office in order to be served rather than to serve.⁴⁶

III

We believe that our third pathway into the theological mind of Pope Francis clarifies and integrates much that we have expounded in this essay and brings his evangelical spirit into full relief. The writings of Luigi Giussani, the third pathway that we have marked out (in addition to the *teología del pueblo* and the Aparecida document), have been of great importance to Pope Francis. He has said so himself in public presentations of two of Giussani's books that he gave when he was Archbishop of Buenos Aires and in the published versions of these presentations. In 1999, he presented the Spanish edition of Giussani's *The Religious Sense* at a public lecture. In the revised publication of this lecture he said that he did so to express the gratitude that he owed Giussani. "For many years now," Archbishop Bergoglio said, "his writings have inspired me to reflect and have helped me to pray." "They have," he continued, "taught me to be a better Christian, and I spoke at the presentation to bear witness to this."⁴⁷ In 2001, Bergoglio presented the Spanish version of Giussani's *The Attraction of Jesus Christ* and said that he agreed to do so for two

⁴⁶ It must be admitted that what the Holy Father said at World Youth Day would seem to be at odds with *Evangelii Gaudium* in which he says that excessive clericalism has kept laity away from roles in decision making (see EG §§102).

⁴⁷ Jorge Bergoglio, "For Man," in *Generative Thought: An Introduction to the Works of Luigi Giussani*, ed. Elisa Buzzi (McGill: Queens University Press, 2003), 79.

reasons: “The first and more personal one is the good that this man has done me, in my life as a priest, through the reading of his books and articles. The second reason is that I am convinced that his thought is profoundly human and reaches man’s innermost longings.”⁴⁸

Pope Francis’s words about evangelization spoken on the 2013 Feast Day of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux—which coincided with his initial meeting with the consultative group of eight cardinals that he established to help him in his governance of the Church—are indicative of the direction in which he would like to take the universal Church. He spoke directly in reference to the Saint of the Child Jesus, but we think that his talk was just as much evocative of essential points in Giussani’s apologetics:

Another spirit comes, that of that charity that suffers all, pardons all, that does not boast, that is humble, that doesn’t seek itself. Someone could say—and there are some philosophers that think this way—that this is a humiliation of the majesty of man, of the greatness of man. This is sterile! The Church has wisely made this saint, humble, small, trusting in God, meek: she has made her the Patron of Missions . . . The Church, Benedict XVI told us, does not grow through proselytism, it grows through attraction, through witness. And when the people see this witness of humility, of meekness, of mildness, they feel the need that the Prophet Zachariah spoke of: ‘We want to come with you.’ The people feel that need in the face of the witness of charity, of this humble charity, without bullying, not sufficient, humble. Worship and serve! . . . Today, here in the Vatican, begins the meeting with the Cardinal consulters, who are concelebrating the Mass. Let us ask the Lord that our work today will make us all more humble, more meek, more patient, more trusting in God, so that the Church can give a beautiful witness to the people, and seeing the People of God, seeing the Church, they might feel the desire to come with us.⁴⁹

It is significant that in his presentation of Giussani’s *The Attraction of Jesus* he compared some of Giussani’s statements to those of Saint Thérèse. Both see Christian mission in the terms just quoted: of personal encounter, of humble servitude, of meek witness through which the divine mercy of Christ is made known to humanity. Obviously strongly drawn to this understanding of mission, Bergoglio said, “I dare to say that the privileged encounter is the caress of the mercy of Christ on my sin. . . . In front of

⁴⁸ Silvina Premat, “The Attraction of the Cardinal,” *Traces: Communion and Liberation International Magazine*, available at: www.traces-cl.com/Giu2001/argent.htm; accessed on 1 October 2013.

⁴⁹ Vatican Radio, “Pope Concelebrates Mass with Council of Cardinals,” available at Vatican Radio website (en.radiovaticana.va).

this merciful embrace—and I continue along the lines of Giussani's thought—we feel a real desire to respond, to change, to correspond.”⁵⁰ The Christian him- or herself must model Christ's exemplary mercy in his or her own life. The Christian life must become, on this traditional but newly articulated view, attractive, that is, beautiful with the glory of the Cross. Christ draws those who suffer into his Church through the witness of his followers, in their taking up of his own path of redemptive love. Conversion—religious, doctrinal, aesthetic, and moral—would follow from an initial longing elicited or awakened in the heart of those who encounter the mercy of God demonstrated in his People. An entailment of this position is that failure to follow this witness among the People of God makes the Church ugly—for all its merely apparent and external beauty—and causes many sheep to leave the sheepfold.⁵¹

The Giussanian approach described here and openly advocated by Pope Francis even prior to his being elected pope is, of course, redolent of Saint Augustine, but also and perhaps especially of the logic of Hans Urs von Balthasar's *Love Alone Is Credible*.⁵² A typically patristic concern with Christ's manifestation or revelation is revived in this aesthetic theology.⁵³ Both Giussani and Pope Francis are strongly centered in an explicitly articulated Christic faith; they proclaim the mercy of God by openly speaking of Jesus Christ and His salvific mission. They tell us of the power of His gaze to move our hearts.⁵⁴ Obviously, not every episcopal leader or theologian thinks in these Christocentric terms, with such personalist and aesthetic focus. One might wonder where Pope Francis was inspired to do so. There is no evidence that we have been able to find that he read Balthasar directly or with profit. His own admission that he has read Giussani's books *and* articles and that they have been very important to him seems to be a strong indication that the founder of *Communion and Liberation* has been quite influential on him in this respect.

⁵⁰ Premat, “Attraction.”

⁵¹ The continuing central importance of the theme of the attractiveness of Christ and His disciples for evangelization for Pope Francis can be verified in *Evangelii Gaudium* (see EG §§15, 34, 39, 44, 73, 99, 100, 107, 113, 131, 141, 153, 157, 159, 167, 168, 261).

⁵² Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Love Alone Is Credible*, trans. David Schindler (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2004).

⁵³ Cf. Robert Sokolowski, *Eucharistic Presence: A Study in the Theology of Disclosure* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994), 205–8. In this study, Sokolowski connects Balthasar, phenomenology, and the concern of the Church Fathers with the manifestation of God in Christ.

⁵⁴ Cf. Giussani, *At the Origin of the Christian Claim*, 53. In his daily homilies, Pope Francis has often called on us to be open to Christ's (and even Mary's) gaze.

There is, however, another level of approach in Giussani: he leaves space for a dialogical encounter that does not require explicit reference to the person of Christ. In presenting *The Religious Sense* to the Argentinian public, Archbishop Bergoglio validated this level of evangelical approach, which may tell us something about his overall pastoral strategy even as Bishop of Rome. In consideration of this, it is well to recall the structure of presentation in Giussani's great trilogy of apologetics.⁵⁵ He follows a classically modern tri-partite division in this regard: first, in *The Religious Sense*, he discusses religion in general and focuses on the religious dimension of human self-questioning or the restless heart that Saint Augustine so profoundly thematized; next, in *At the Origin of the Christian Claim*, he explores the irreducible uniqueness of the Gospel, evoking G. K. Chesterton's *The Everlasting Man* to show how radical and singular are the claims of Christ regarding his authority over history and the cosmos; finally, in *Why the Church?* he establishes the unique dignity and destiny of the Catholic Church.⁵⁶ The logic of the structuring of the apologetics manuals invoked in Giussani's own trilogy is doubtlessly incapable of being evaded, given the perennial nature of the human soul in its movement toward Christ, and Giussani clearly sees the lasting validity of this structure. However, he infuses it with a pastoral content and does not seek to demonstrate the Christian claim according to the canons of modern critical reason, as so many manuals tried to do.⁵⁷

Pope Francis has understood the benefit of the Giussanian method of personal encounter (rather than that of textbook, rational demonstration) in a pastoral setting where mission is lived out in the day-to-day lives of the people. In presenting *The Religious Sense*, he affirms with Giussani that on a first level of encounter one needs to clarify the essential question of what it is to be human. It is fruitless to speak the name of Jesus Christ with its full doctrinal accompaniment to someone who has not first become a religious question to himself. One is reminded of Cardinal Newman's statements at the

⁵⁵ Luigi Giussani, *The Religious Sense*, trans. John Zucchi (Montreal: McGill Queens University Press, 1997); *At the Origin of the Christian Claim*, trans. Viviane Hewitt (Montreal: McGill Queens University Press, 1998); *Why the Church?* trans. Viviane Hewitt (Montreal: McGill Queens University Press, 2001).

⁵⁶ Cf. Avery Dulles, *A History of Apologetics* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999), 202–5. In these pages, Dulles discusses the tri-partite structure of classical Catholic apologetics in the eighteenth century, which was followed by the manualist tradition well into the twentieth century. He discusses Giussani's more pastoral approach to this tri-partite division on pp. 341–42.

⁵⁷ Cf. Avery Dulles, *The Craft of Theology* (New York: Crossroad, 2001), 3–14. Dulles discusses here the different approaches to apologetics historically taken by theologians in the face of modern criticism.

end of *A Grammar of Assent*, where he says that it is his goal primarily to reach religious man with the Gospel and not what one might call the “overly-civilized” and a-religious men and women of the day; the task of evangelizing these he would leave to the likes of a Christian mind presumably more at home in engineering than religion, such as that of William Paley.⁵⁸

Certainly, Pope Francis wants to reach everyone, including the “overly-civilized,” but in line with Newman’s insight into the difficulty of communicating the Gospel to the irreligious, he commends, in presenting *The Religious Sense*, the strategy of first bringing people to see their religious essence. Bergoglio quotes Reinhold Niebuhr (on whom Giussani did his doctoral dissertation): “Nothing is so incredible as an answer to an unasked question.”⁵⁹ The claims of Christ can be seen as credible only to one who has first asked the right questions, the very questions to which Christ alone is the answer. Bergoglio insists that the most important question of all in this regard is not, as in most presentations of natural theology, whether or not God exists or if we can know Him, but whether or not we can find in ourselves “the mark that God has made, so as to be able to meet with Him.”⁶⁰

This passage calls to mind the early Christian Platonism that we briefly mentioned above, represented for instance in Saint Gregory of Nyssa’s *Sermon on the Sixth Beatitude*, wherein the great Cappadocian theologian argues that man should go in search for God by looking within, to the image of God in the soul that is now covered over with passions but that can be washed clean by following the beatitudes. God can be found more fully within the soul, Gregory insists, than outside of it by deducing His existence as the cause of physical nature or as the Orderer of the cosmos. Augustine himself would of course be the greatest Western champion of this “Christian Platonist” approach to the interior search for God. This in fact deeply scriptural understanding of humanity has, properly understood, always given the Church a universal anthropology of mission centered on the image of God found in each soul, testifying that each human soul has equal ontological dignity in the sight of God. The Christian is moved by this anthropological focus to realize that he or she must meet all people with the Gospel as brothers or sisters, since all equally contain the image of God within themselves.

⁵⁸ John Henry Newman, *A Grammar of Assent* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1979), 328–32.

⁵⁹ Bergoglio, “For Man,” 79. Giussani himself often made reference to this quote. The quote comes from Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol. 2, *Human Destiny* (New York: Nisbet, 1943), 6.

⁶⁰ Bergoglio, “For Man,” 80.

Bergoglio says that it is paradoxical that Giussani would say so little in *The Religious Sense* about God but so much about human beings and their religious search, but this, he insists, aligns with the most important challenge of the culture of our day, that is, the challenge of human meaning. Humankind has, he asserts, lost a proper sense of itself, and it can only come to find itself again by giving reason its full scope in asking about life's meaning. Humankind has the need to come to see itself again in the light of the totality of reality's factors—to rediscover its religious sense—if it is truly to flourish. The human heart, understood in terms of the unity of reason, will, and affect, has to be drawn to be open to the whole of reality in order for the claims of God in Christ to be at all credible to it. All of this is to say that it has to be willing to let reality measure it, to open itself up to all of experience, rather than to make of itself the measure of reality. Such self-opening would entail openness to all the “big questions” that help us make our way through the thicket of diversion, self-deception, or sloth that keeps us from encountering the divine image within us in the light of Christ: “Why is there pain, why death, why evil? Why is life worth living? What is the ultimate meaning of reality, of existence? What sense does it make to work, love, become involved in the world? Who am I? Where did I come from? Where am I going?”⁶¹

Bergoglio insists with Giussani that only by means of personal encounter (as we have seen, a decisive theme in the Aparecida document) and companionship can the human heart verify the meaning of its experience, to see the validity of its questioning, and to find a concretely satisfying answer to this questioning. The certainty that one arrives at through Christian faith in response to the religious search can be attained only “in the harmony of all the human faculties,”⁶² and this can come about only through the personal dialogue that one encounters in living community. Otherwise, the religious or Christian claim would come off as abstract or even absurd speculation. Living Christian personal witness and encounter is absolutely essential for evangelizing the unbeliever, in order that he may verify the claims of Christ; they even allow one to raise the preliminary religious questions at an appropriate pitch, that he might understand that these questions bring into human consciousness the totality of existence and that Christ alone is the total response to them.⁶³

⁶¹ Ibid., 82.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Pope Francis's estimation of the importance of the theme of encounter for the New Evangelization is confirmed in reading *Evangelii Gaudium* (see EG §§1, 3, 7, 8, 44, 78, 87, 88, 91, 128, 167, 171, 257, 264, 272).

We think that the signs of Giussanian influence have been quite discernible in aspects of Pope Francis's magisterium thus far. This is so not only in regard to his practical focus on a type of evangelical aesthetics of the Cross but also in regard to his obvious desire to reach out to all of humanity in its search for meaning. His two famous interviews (as of the time of this writing) have made this clear.⁶⁴ Yet, we would not want to go too far in equating Pope Francis's approach with that of Giussani. There is this difference between them which can be seen by considering a criticism, however unjustly leveled, that has often been made of *Communion and Liberation*, namely, that it does not seek cultural mediation for the Christian faith.⁶⁵ One reason for this criticism is evidently the fact that Giussani at times spoke in very critical language regarding culture outside of the Church. In *At the Origin of the Christian Claim*, for instance, he stresses emphatically that the revelation of Christ "overturns the religious method," which could be taken to entail an overturning even of "naturally religious" cultures. Moreover, the ecclesial movement that he founded is resistant to letting secular culture determine the movement's way of life (like Giussani himself, they take the need for prudential judgment in this regard with the utmost seriousness), a fact that has led to a great deal of annoyance in some quarters. The Giussanian method strictly applied has an eschatological, Niebuhrian, Barthian, or Balthasarian edge to it that one does not so readily encounter in Pope Francis's teachings.

Indeed, Pope Francis seems at times to have more of a correlationist or adaptationist tonality to his teaching, one that might evoke the *aggiornamento* of John XXIII more than the oftentimes critical approach of Giussani or of the previous two popes or that might call to mind the post-conciliar strategy to inculturate the Gospel to modern tastes that was adopted by so many of his Jesuit confreres after the Second Vatican Council. Thus, he has been applauded by many of those in the Church who think that it is time for the Church to seek a mediatory pact with contemporary secular culture. Certainly, he has wanted to search for commonalities among believers, across religions, and among all of humanity and to set aside differences as much as possible. As he said in his book interview from 2010, the Church has one sheep left in the fold and needs to go in search of the ninety-nine who have left.⁶⁶ He has

⁶⁴ Cf. Spadaro, "A Big Heart," and Eugenio Scalfari, "The Pope: how the Church will change," *Repubblica* (1 October 2013), available at www.repubblica.it.

⁶⁵ Giorgio Sarco, "What Kind of Life Gives Birth to Communion and Liberation: An Interview with Luigi Giussani," *Traces: Communion and Liberation International Magazine* (May 1979): 6ff.

⁶⁶ *Pope Francis: His Life in His Own Words*, 80–81.

repeated this since his election to the papacy. He seems to hold most firmly that dialogue, friendship, and at least a partial bracketing of contentious social disputes that appear to be peculiarly Christian concerns form an indispensable first stage in the journey to reach the lost ninety-nine (and this means, of course, all of humanity). Scannone, in interpreting his theological protégé, has gone so far as to suggest that Pope Francis wants to make the Church more austere—this is evident in his desire to create “a poor Church for the poor”—so that it would be easier for it to adapt itself to modern culture.⁶⁷ However true that may be, Pope Francis clearly has stressed that the Church must meet humanity where it is in the respective brokenness of the Church and of contemporary human communities. The Church must, he thinks, lose its fear of personal encounter with men and women of all walks of life and all existential or metaphysical proclivities. We think that, for at least two reasons, Pope Francis’s emphasis on universal dialogue should not—as in fact it has—cause consternation among some in the Church.

First, the approach to evangelization that stresses a non-combative, dialogical method in search of common ground is not simply—as some may suspect—a strategy of the failed ecclesial programs of the 1970s. It has ancient roots in Catholic thought, a fact that Hans Urs von Balthasar himself acknowledged as he was trying to defeat the accommodationist method of evangelization of the post-conciliar age with his radically Stauro-centric aesthetics.⁶⁸ Saint Peter Faber, for one, one of the first companions of Saint Ignatius of Loyola and one of Pope Francis’s heroes in the Society of Jesus, was famously “non-combative” and “dialogical.”⁶⁹ Faber was known to hold that the Church must take special care to meet people outside of it as friends and not as enemies. This position corresponds as well to that held by some of the Jesuit missionaries in Asia, such as Saint Francis Xavier and Matteo Ricci, both of whom are known to be much beloved by the present pope. According to the method of these great early modern Jesuit missionaries, the Church must be willing to set

⁶⁷ Cf. Mauro Castagnaro, “La teologia di Francesco. Intervista a Juan Carlos Scannone” *Il Regno* (May 2013): 128; available at: www.ilregno.it/php/view_pdf.php?md5=551d2a89d33b8cf6be7d72459d0d1cb1; accessed on Oct 21, 2013. If the instrumentalist premises that underlie this claim hold true for Pope Francis as for Scannone, Francis’s approach would still have the benefit of forcing theologians with a richer, deeper, expressivist understanding of the Gospel in relation to culture to think about the theology of mission with greater urgency.

⁶⁸ We refer to Balthasar’s perhaps somewhat unfair treatment of the “cosmological reduction” and the “anthropological reduction” in *Love Alone Is Credible*, especially at 15–50.

⁶⁹ Cf. Spadaro, “A Big Heart.”

aside, for the purpose of common human endeavor, the differences that divide it from cultures in particular times and places in order to show that it can be trusted but also in order to work together with ambient cultures in the pursuit of the good of all people. It should be noted that for Faber and the other Jesuit missionaries just mentioned this was clearly an evangelical strategy and not simply a matter of giving in to worldly ideologies for the sake of a false peace.

Nevertheless, it can be said that it is in the spirit of Peter Faber that Pope Francis has focused on issues of common social concern such as unemployment, care for the elderly, and the effects of “savage capitalism” (this last expression being rather non-divisive in many parts of the world). Pope Francis can provide the very important lesson to the universal Church that evangelization requires a spirit of friendship that can reach out to all people, that does not exclude in practice the Gospel imperative to extend God’s salvific mercy to everyone, and that does not fall into despair in a world that in much of Europe and North America has become progressively de-Christianized.

At the same time, if we see Pope Francis’s teachings as a whole, there is no reason to think that he is not in fact in closer agreement with Giussani himself on the matter of cultural engagement than might appear at first sight. Explaining what “openness to the world” really means for the Church of the Second Vatican Council, Giussani once said:

Many protagonists of the *aggiornamento* in Italy were convinced that the Council had opened the Catholic Church to a system of thought borrowed from certain philosophical or sociological trends. We [meaning *Communion and Liberation*], on the other hand, while respecting all the human sciences within their own contexts, were convinced that the starting point that the Council was pointing us toward was the imitation of the mindset, the method, that Christ had used in His life. Opening up to the world does not mean accepting (and certainly not uncritically) the world’s ideologies; it means finding the desire for truth that moves mankind.⁷⁰

This goes back to the first level of Giussanian apologetics, and one might presume, given his presentation of *The Religious Sense*, that Pope Francis would agree with this statement. Certainly, these words align with Pope Francis’s warning to the Church at World Youth Day to avoid reducing the faith to worldly ideology—whether of the “left” or the “right.”

And this brings us to our second point, namely, that one must not forget that there has been another side to Pope Francis’s magisterium that

⁷⁰ Sarco, “What Kind of Life,” 17.

is not often commented on, one that is hardly bereft of admonitions to the faithful to follow the Way of the Cross and to avoid worldliness, spiritual or otherwise.⁷¹ After all, as we have said, Francis has made it clear that the beauty of Christian witness is a participation in the glorious Cross of Christ. He has said himself that the peace to which a Christian life truly lived leads is not a “saccharine peace.”⁷² He has affirmed that the Way of the Cross is singular and unworldly—hardly a message conducive to a simplistic correlationism as practiced, particularly by many Jesuits, in the 1970s. A balanced interpretation of Pope Francis must acknowledge that he does have his moments where he wants us to remember that Christ, to speak in the terms of Giussani, “overturns the religious method.” Nor should one forget elements of the doctrinal tradition that he has firmly upheld and taught about. He has been very explicit in his Marian devotion, in recognizing the reality of spiritual warfare, and in affirming the prospect of personal sin with the need for the sacrament of confession in order that the sinner may be reconciled with God. We do not often hear about the Virgin Mary (whose virginity Francis clearly takes literally) or about angels and demons (whose real, and not simply metaphorical, existence Francis has affirmed in the past) from people who take a stance for a watered-down Gospel of a purely correlationist or adaptationist variety.⁷³ Again, he has emphasized the unity of the faith and that Catholics must accept it whole, even warning young people not to “liquefy” their faith.⁷⁴

⁷¹ On “spiritual worldliness,” see *Evangelii Gaudium* §§93–97. “Spiritual worldliness,” this document teaches us, seeks, behind a mask of religious piety, earthly glory rather than the Lord’s glory.

⁷² See Vatican Radio, “Papal Mass Draws Thousands in Assisi,” available at the Vatican Radio website (en.radiovaticana.va). Further evidence that Pope Francis does not lack an eschatological edge to his evangelical approach can be found in the daily Mass homily he gave on November 18th, 2013, where he condemned as “adolescent progressivism” an uncritical accommodation to worldly practices. In doing so, he cited the 1907 apocalyptic novel, *Lord of the World*, by Msgr. Robert Hugh Benson, Anglican convert to Catholicism. This novel depicted a mass apostasy before the Second Coming brought about by a “spirit of worldliness,” as the Pope called it (available on *L’Osservatore Romano* website).

⁷³ On his devotion to the Blessed Virgin see e.g. his homily on the Solemnity of the Assumption, accessible on the Vatican website; for an analysis on Francis’s belief in the reality of the devil and spiritual warfare and its relationship to his Ignatian spirituality, see e.g. nrconline.org/news/vatican/battle-devil-pope-francis-frames-fight-jesuit-terms. Regarding the devil, Bergoglio stated the matter quite plainly in an interview: “I believe that the Devil exists.” In *Pope Francis: On Heaven and Earth*, 8.

⁷⁴ See for example his address to the Argentinian youth at the 2013 World Youth Day www.zenit.org/en/articles/pope-s-address-to-argentinian-youth. The Official Vatican translation chose to interpret the Spanish *licuar*, as “water down” rather than

Pope Francis's thought is formed by a number of diverse influences, which we certainly do not intend to reduce naively to one idea. Yet, there does seem to be an integrating *ratio* that unifies the three theological pathways we have reviewed in this essay. This *ratio* is his commitment to the goodness of man who is created for God, who is unceasingly called by God, but who must be helped to see that his interior desire is sated only through a profound, intimate union with Christ; only by imitating Him can man's sublime vocation be fulfilled (cf. *Gaudium et Spes* 22). This is in perfect accord with his emphasis, influenced by liberation theology, on the need to care for the suffering flesh of Christ—that is, the poor and oppressed who have a special place in this calling. Pope Francis clearly wants the Church to become more fully a missionary Church—led by a servant hierarchy whose representatives are pastorally converted to go out to the “existential peripheries” of humanity, even at the risk of injuring the Church. His frequent talk of the need for Christians to risk injury to the Church for the sake of mission may be taken to mean, we think, that the followers of Christ, forming together with the Lord His Mystical Body, must be willing to “fill up [in themselves] those things that are wanting in the sufferings of Christ” (Col. 1:24). After all, how else can mission proceed? Bergoglio's preferred method of evangelization is dialogical encounter with the other, in which the Christian manifests Christ's mercy as he has experienced it in his own encounter with the Lord, especially with the other who suffers (through poverty, for instance) or who is truly open to the religious dimension of human nature (through popular religiosity, for instance). He seems to sense an acute urgency to remind us that this can be quite a dangerous procedure, and perhaps especially to the Christian's own sense of self-security or even self-certainty. Yet, he insists, it is absolutely necessary if we are to be a truly missionary Church concerned for the salvific good of all people.

“liquefy” as in the Zenit translation. Thus, it reads Francis asking the Argentinian youth: “please don't water down your faith.” This is a legitimate interpretation as well. *Licuar* can mean “to blend” or to “liquefy.” The reason Francis makes reference to orange, apple, and banana milk shakes (in the Zenit translation) or juice (in the official translation) in this context is that in using the term *licuado* which means “blended” or “liquefied” he is referring to a popular Argentinian drink. In Latin America, *licuado* is used to refer to a drink that blends some sort of fruit together with milk, blending or liquefying the fruit. Thus, the reference could suggest a number of things, something foreign added (the milk), something diluted, or inasmuch as he says the faith should be taken whole, we think it means taking just a drink and so part of the faith (which would be the fruit), something along the lines of what is sometimes called “cafeteria Catholicism.”

In the end, we think that it is a personal sense of the interplay of the universal religious sense present in all souls and the need to proclaim the irreducible and unique Gospel of Christ that moves any concrete pastoral strategy. Every pastor of the Church balances these factors differently. It should not be surprising that bishops of Rome would themselves differ in this balancing act or that Pope Francis would have a different measure of things than, say, Pope Benedict XVI—even while there remains an essential continuity between them, as between all popes. Clearly, Pope Francis's experiences of crushing poverty and of the ubiquitous presence of popular religion in Latin America have shaped his perception of the postmodern world differently than John Paul II's or Benedict XVI's European experiences of the effects of emergent wealth on native religiosity, and so one might especially expect a different balance of these factors between Francis and his immediate predecessors. He has lived directly amongst masses of impoverished yet "naturally religious" people who maintain a concomitant natural humility. Pope John Paul II and Benedict XVI, on the other hand, were immediately ensconced in a world of growing and even tyrannical consumerism and irreligion, truly a "culture of death" presided over by a "dictatorship of relativism," whose effects are oftentimes experienced in Latin America merely as an unwelcome colonialist European exportation. These different experiences might easily lead to different senses of how the Church should engage the world: one, perhaps, focused on calling Europe back to its Christian roots, the other, perhaps, focused on seeking a Christian religiosity that is not eurocentric and is, if anything, more sympathetic to the state of contemporary culture, which cannot be reduced to its European or North American expressions.

We think that with the help of Giussani's appropriation of the classical stages of apologetics, the Argentinian liberation theology, and the Aparecida document we are able to get a better understanding of Pope Francis's own personal balancing act, manifest, for instance, in *Evangelii Gaudium*. His theological mind emerges a bit more clearly through a consideration of these sources. He is obviously an advocate of personal encounter and dialogue through a preferential option for the poor and respect for popular religiosity in order to proclaim an integral liberation, through which he would have the Church connect to the universal aspirations of the human heart in the contemporary period. He is, as we have demonstrated, far from blind to the irreducible uniqueness of the beautiful form of Christ on the Cross, a concern of Christian proclamation that he has likely drawn at least to some extent from Giussani and made an essential part of his day-to-day teaching. He seems to de-emphasize cultural conflict as

much as possible, but, one might surmise, this is all (as was true of Faber) for the good of proclaiming the Gospel universally, so that it can reach all people, even those who have seemingly turned the most fiercely away from it—doubtlessly in many cases because of the very failure of Christians to be true to the example of Christ's own witness. **N·V**