



ELEPHANTS IN THE LIVING ROOM

Website: elephantsinthelivingroom.com



DR. RICHARD GAILLARDETZ
FRANCIS: POPE OF THE COUNCIL
ST. BLASÉ
STERLING HEIGHTS, MI
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2013

Introduction

Fr. Tom Lumpkin

I have the privilege of introducing Dr. Richard Gaillardetz. Sometimes, when people introduce speakers, they say our speaker really needs no introduction; and I think in some ways that is true of Richard. He's been here several times as a speaker, and in talking with some of you during lunch; a number of you are here today because you heard him speak before. He actually spoke at an Elephant's gathering three years ago. He spoke on the topic *Does Vatican II Theology of the Laity Have a Future?* And he said it certainly moved us beyond the way of thinking of the Church as two separate classes of clergy and laity; but we still aren't quite at a point yet where we see the Church as an ordered union and, more important, a communion of the baptized.

A little bio: He is presently the Joseph McCarthy head of Catholic Systematic Theology at Boston College and also the current president of the Catholic Theological Society of America. His topic today is: Francis: Pope of the Council. But I think we could also appreciate that this topic is being presented by Richard, theologian of the Council, not in the sense that he was one of the *periti* (theologians) of Vatican II, but in the sense that over the last years or so, I think he has been, at least for myself, and I think for a lot of you, a very significant person to help us understand the significance of Vatican II. He really helped us, as we have gone through this, to see just what it really means; and he will do that again today. I expect this will be a very helpful presentation, Francis: Pope of the Council; and it seems to me that we are very privileged to have him here; and it should be for all of us a very wonderful Advent afternoon. (Applause)

Francis: Pope of the Council

Dr. Richard Gaillardetz

Good afternoon. It's a pleasure to be here again. I have to say that I was just thinking, as President of the Catholic Theological Society of America, our presidential line meets with the Bishop's Conference Committee on Doctrine every November when they meet; and so about a month ago I had dinner with members of the Committee on Doctrine; and now as I stand in front of you, I have to say it's refreshing from being the most liberal person in the room to being the most conservative. (Laughter) It's a nice place to be, actually, at multiple levels. I am delighted to talk about Pope Francis, though I sort of feel a little bit like, you know, just jumping on the band wagon, because it seems to me everybody's coming out of the woodwork to offer their own interpretations of Francis; and I intend to do mine.

I became interested in this, in a particular way, about two weeks ago - obviously Bishop Gumbleton asked me to do this long before that - but I was at the American Academy of World Religions Convention; and we had, not one, but two different panels on Pope Francis. One was in the afternoon; and it had all the heavy hitters: Joan Chittister and Tom Reese and George Weigel; and then there was a smaller group of theologians that nobody knows, like me, and we did an evening thing; and after going to the afternoon panel I was so upset that, I ran back to my hotel room, and completely rewrote my talk to rebut what I had heard at the panel; and you're going to get the extended version of that rebuttal. Because what we got, and unfortunately, I sometimes think this is what cable television does, and I find it very unhelpful. You know, they want a heated debate; and so they get the most extreme person to the left, and the most extreme person to the right; and hopefully they will yell at each other; and everybody will be excited. And the first panel had a little bit of that; and so it was like two completely different popes were being talked about here, you know. But one of the talks had me particularly incensed - and it was not surprisingly

George Weigel's talk (Laughter) - because it emphasized, he kept talking about the absolutely seamless continuity from John Paul II to Benedict XVI to Pope Francis.

Continuity

And I actually think there is some continuity; and I want to start by talking about the continuity; but I also think that's too simplistic a read; and so I am going to try and offer you a little bit more comprehensive look at Pope Francis. Now I want to warn you in advance who you're hearing. I'm an ecclesiologist, really, by training; so I am a little bit more interested in what we are seeing in terms of Francis' vision of the Church, and what we are seeing in the papacy, and the way it's being changed. I'm not going to be focusing on something that is a worthwhile talk, in and of itself, namely some of the particulars of Pope Francis' teaching, particularly his social teaching, which, I think, is quite significant; but that's not going to be my focus right now. But it will be my entrée into this, because if we are going to talk about a continuity.

Well, first of all, I should mention the curiosity of the title, which I did intentionally, because of the four popes since Vatican II: Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, Benedict and Francis. Of those five Francis is the only Pope not to have been at the Council, which is kind of interesting, right? Obviously, Paul VI was an influential cardinal, John Paul II as well. John Paul I was a bishop of the Council. Pope Benedict XVI was a *peritus* - a theologian at the Council; but Bergoglio was nowhere near the Council; and yet, I am going to argue today that one of the areas of continuity between Benedict and his predecessors is in fact that they each of them in some way carried forward, or offered, a papal reception, of certain elements of Vatican II's teaching. I do believe all of them are in some way Popes of the Council. And one of the areas of continuity is that like his predecessors, he's dedicated to bringing forward the teachings of Vatican II.

The second area of continuity - and this is no small thing - is in the area of Catholic social teaching. I think there is a very significant continuous trajectory, if you follow papal teaching, papal social teaching, starting with Paul VI's *Populorum Progressio*, his *Octogesima Adveniens*; then you go to Pope John II and his three major social encyclicals: *Laborem Exercens*, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, and *Centesimus Annus*; and then, Pope Benedict's equally remarkable social encyclical: *Caritas in veritate*. When you look at all of those teachings and then you see what Pope Francis was saying in his recent apostolic exhortation, which we will be talking more about: *Evangelii Gaudium*, there is a tremendous continuity across all of those pontificates around the development of Catholic social teaching, around the need to critique an unfettered market based capitalism, which is not the same thing as critiquing capitalism in total, but particular forms of it, a critique that insists that the economy should serve the human person, and not the other way around, a critique of anything that assumes that profit is the only and highest motive in all economic activity. There is much, that in fact, in all of these, post conciliar popes share in common. So, I want to emphasize that, partly as a check against the tendency to too easily play up the differences, which I'm also going to talk about, between Pope Francis and some of his predecessors. So the two striking areas of continuity: Francis and his last four predecessors are all popes of the Council, each in their own way, furthered some aspect of the Council's teaching. All have been tireless champions for Catholic social teaching - very important elements of continuity.

Now, having said that, I think it's fair to say that Francis does bring something new to our Church that's obvious. Some people have played this out in terms of style versus substance. I think is an unhelpful framework. Some of you may have read I wrote a modest piece in NCR, in which I suggested the style substance distinction doesn't do justice to what Pope Francis is about. I think what's significant is that Francis has received, or carried forward, elements of Vatican II's teaching that tended to be neglected by his predecessors. In other words, they brought forward certain things that are quite significant. Francis, I think, has been bringing forward other elements of the Council's teaching that were not so significant. So one of the things I think that is so important is we have to think about the context in which each of these popes received the Council's teaching. So, for John Paul II, of course, the context was communist Poland; and his reception of Vatican II's teaching was very much mired in all of the political dynamics around countries behind the Iron Curtain, and religious freedom, and so on, and so forth. Benedict, of course, was receiving the Council's teaching from within the heart of Western Europe and the crises of faith that was going on, and is continuing to go on, in many parts of Western Europe. Francis' reception of the Council is quite distinctive, because it is marked by three characteristic features in his biography. First of all, he is a Latin American - even though he has Italian roots, he is a Latin American - and I think an important element of his reception of Vatican II's teaching is that he read the Council through the lens of

CELAM,¹⁷ the very influential Episcopal Conference for Latin America that gave us the Medellin documents and Puebla; and Aparecida, where he played a major role, helped shape, in decisive ways, how Pope Francis has thought about the teaching of Vatican II.

The second thing that is distinctive - and I'm not going to spend a lot of time on this - but the fact that he is a Jesuit. He has read the Council's teachings through the lens of a Jesuit's commitment to mission, and a Jesuit commitment to the Christo-Centrism of the gospel, and thirdly, a Jesuit commitment to discernment, a spirituality of discernment. And all of those have played an important role in how Francis thinks about the Council, and how we can bring the Council's teaching forward. And then, lastly, we should point out that of all the popes - you have to go back to Pope Pius X to find a pope who spent more time as bishop of a local church than Pope Francis - he spent 15 years as bishop of a local church before he was elected Pope. Now, by the way, Pope John Paul II comes close; he was 14 years as bishop. So, I think, when we are asking about Francis and the Council, he's carrying forward the Council, but through his particular biography, which is pastor, Jesuit, Latin American; and so it shouldn't surprise us that, because of that very distinctive background, he's brought forward other elements in the Council's teachings that weren't so prominent in those of his predecessors. Of all the things that he has brought forward, and really, this is, it seems to me, the hermeneutical key, at least at this point for understanding Francis' teaching, is that what we have is a missionary council that inspired a missionary pope to call for a missionary Church.

I. A Missionary Council Has Inspired A Missionary Pope to Create a Missionary Church.

It's interesting, if you were to go back and look at the corpus of Pope John Paul II's writings, the passage that John Paul II quoted more than any other was *Gaudium et Spes* §22, which is a christological text about how Jesus Christ comes to reveal humanity to itself. It's a beautiful passage. I suspect, and I'm guessing of course that when we get to the end of Francis' pontificate and people look back and say, "What passage from Vatican II what did Francis cite more often?" The early returns suggest that it will be *Ad Gentes* §2. Now *Ad Gentes* is the *Decree on the Missionary Life of the Church*. And for those of us in my ball game, it's the most profound ecclesiological text of the Council; and that's interesting, because my guess is, that while many of you are quite literate about Vatican II, that might not be a text with which you are tremendously familiar; but in our trade (ecclesiology), it is a very important document. And it was approved at the end of the Council; and so, in some ways, it takes in a lot of the Council's teaching. And *Ad Gentes* §2 makes a very bold statement. It says, "The Church is missionary by its very nature." And Francis has already quoted that on a number of occasions. Now that might seem to you to be a rather tame, or abstract, or even, in some ways, traditional statement, because, of course, we think of mission in terms of "The Missions." And many of us grew up as Catholics, supporting the missions, always prefaced by "The Foreign Missions." Mission work is what you do somewhere else. And it's largely about two things: winning souls to Christ; and what was called the *plantatio ecclesiae*, planting of new churches in unchurched countries.

But *Ad Gentes* §2 is recovering a much more profound biblical insight that perhaps, as Steven Bevens has put it, "It is not so accurate to say Christ founded the Church and gave it a mission; but rather, Christ called forth disciples, sent them in mission, and consented for there to be a Church in service of the mission." In other words, we're not first a Church, and then we decide what do we do? "I don't know, what do you want to do? I got an idea. Let's go out and talk to other people." That's one way. The other is we are sent in mission; and everything the Church does must serve being sent in mission. That is what *Ad Gentes* §2 is saying; and it goes on to develop that by suggesting its Trinitarian foundations. Why is the Church missionary by its nature?" because it proceeds from the Trinitarian missions of Word and Spirit. So the Church is the extension of God's expansive and inclusive love. It is to be a sacrament of God's saving love to the world. So, I believe, that if we're going to ask, "How Francis is related to the Council?" *Ad Gentes* §2 is the key. Almost everything that Francis says is about mission; but it is going to require us to tease out and broaden our own understandings of mission. Now, when I say that, it's not as if, for example, his predecessors were not interested in Church mission. John Paul II, for example, wrote a very profound encyclical on mission, *Redemptoris Missio*. But his emphasis on mission does sort of invite a certain contrast between him and his immediate predecessor, Pope Benedict XVI. Now I want to be very clear here. I'm not the kind of person that wants to put black hats on some people and white hats on others. So, if you're interested in somebody who's going to do a ten minute diatribe on how awful Benedict was, I'm not your guy.

A. Contrast with Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI

Benedict is who he is. He is a brilliant theologian who, frankly, didn't ever really want to be pope, and wasn't very good at it. And I'm saying that, I think that had a lot to do with his stepping down. I think, over time, he realized he really wanted to be a theologian. It's no coincidence that perhaps the most significant thing Benedict produced, while he was pope, was a trilogy of theological works, his *Jesus of Nazareth* series. I mean, that tells you a lot about his perspective. So Benedict and Francis are just different papal animals, as they were, right? Both of them are bringing forward the Council's teaching, but from a different point of view. And Pope Benedict, I think, is in fact more consistent than many people think in this. Very early, when he was a *peritus* of the Council, he was an engine for reform; but, because he wanted to bring forward a patristic theology of the Church, an exercise in *resourcement*, retrieving something from the early Church that had been neglected; and so he brought forward this very profound emphasis on a Eucharistic ecclesiology. - that the Church doesn't just receive Christ's body, it is Christ's body; and that the Eucharist transforms us into Christ's body; that Eucharist ecclesiology has always played a central role in Fr. Kasper, Cardinal Kasper, Pope Benedict.

So he always cared for that neo-Augustinian view of the Church. He also, as prefect for the CDF (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith) and, as pope, wanted to carry forward the Council's apostolate of the laity. Here, he was very much at peace with his predecessor, John Paul II, who wrote *Christifideles Laici*, a very important apostolic exhortation on the laity. But, for both of them, there was a particular strand; and this is what I talked about when I came last time three years ago - and, by the way, I was so impressed that the person introducing me (Fr. Tom Lumpkin) actually remembered what I talked about three years ago. (Laughter) As I heard it, I thought, "Yeh, that's good stuff." So what John Paul II and Benedict brought forward was the Council's teaching about the secular vocation of the laity. And this is a very positive teaching - that the laity are not suppose to be passive and pray, pay and obey, but we are to go out and transform the world. And that's been a very important part of John Paul II and Benedict's work; but note the emphasis is on the laity transforming the world.

Now that's there in the Vatican II documents. In fact the metaphor for leaven which is used in the documents of Vatican II, the Council uses the metaphor leaven six times. The first five times it uses the metaphor, it refers to the laity; and that's the part that I think John Paul II and Benedict picked up. The laity are to go out into the world. We're to be a leaven. We're to transform the world. Now there's some powerful stuff there; but note that there's a way of understanding that notion of Church mission in which the laity are sort of the Church's missionary infantry. We go out onto the battlefield; but who's staying back at headquarters? the hierarchy, right? And I think that's the shortcoming of that image. So, it's interesting, however, that in *Gaudium Es Spes*, the Pastoral Constitution on the Modern World, in §40, the Council speaks of the Church, not the laity, but the Church, the whole Church, as a leaven in the world. Does that follow? And that's the part that, I think, Pope Francis is picking up.

B. Pope Francis views Church as People of God - Calls for a Messier Church

Francis, actually, if you pay attention, hasn't talked a lot about laity. He doesn't use that word. He uses the preferred word of the Council: the faithful, the *Christifideles*, the Christian faithful. And so when Francis talks about mission, Francis, first of all, is not thinking of the Church exclusively in terms of a Eucharistic ecclesiology, which is Pope Benedict's tendency; and I'm a big fan of Eucharistic ecclesiology, so I'm not saying that's bad, but for Benedict, everything was Eucharistic ecclesiology; and that shaped how he looked at it. Francis tells us that his preferred image of the Church is the Church as People of God. Now, at this point, it is hard not to get into a kind of compare and contrast with Pope Benedict, because, of course, Pope Benedict was prefect of the CDF at the 1985 Extraordinary Synod, in which the synod tried to raise up a more Eucharistic theology of the Church and distance itself from People of God, which those at the synod thought, wrongly I believe, was an overly politicized way of thinking about Church.

Now the Council didn't use People of God in any political or even democratic way. People of God was a biblical image that emphasized our election, that we don't deserve anything, that we're God's people, not because we are better than anyone else, but simply because God has called us

to be a people. And that what we share in common is not rank or privilege, but Baptism, and that is why Francis is interested in recalling, not just the Council's theology of the laity, as good as that is, he wants to recall the idea that we are all God's people, that Baptism is the most important bond that establishes us. He's wanting to carry forward that wonderful passage that we find in sermon 340 of St. Augustine - it's quoted in *Lumen Gentium* - when Augustine gets exactly right the relationship between Baptism and Orders. Augustine's giving a sermon, and he says, "When I am frightened by who I am for you, a bishop, then I'm consoled by who I am with you, a Christian. The first is an office; the second is a grace. The first is fraught with danger, I might think I was better than you; in the second lies my salvation." Augustine understood that we are first of all baptized followers of Jesus before we are anything else; and Francis puts that on full display, which is why Francis' preferred language, interestingly, is not; he says it in a kind of perfunctory way to honor his predecessors, who emphasized the New Evangelization; but, in fact, his preferred language is not the New Evangelization. His preferred language is missionary discipleship.

C. Missionary Discipleship

And I can't emphasize enough the importance of that language, because we are all disciples. We are all disciples, the pope down to the infant baptized at Mass Sunday. All of us are called to be disciples of Jesus. All of us are called to be sent in mission; and this orients everything that Pope Francis does and thinks about the church. And so we have this wonderful passage, this is from *Evangelii Gaudium* his recent apostolic exhortation, which I strongly encourage you all to read, "The Church which goes forth is a community of missionary disciples ... An evangelizing community gets involved by word and deed in people's daily lives; it bridges distances; it is willing to abase itself, if necessary; and it embraces human life, touching the suffering flesh of Christ in others."^{2/}

Now let me stop a moment. There was a tendency - and I think this was a function of Pope Benedict's neo-Augustinianism - that he saw the contrast between Church and world a little more strikingly than Francis does. Francis' Ignatian roots prevent him from demonizing the world, frankly. Remember, Ignatius's great motto is, "To God in all things." So, Benedict tended to think of the Church as something like almost an oasis in a largely threatening world, governed by the dictatorship of relativism, and so on. So, he thought, that it may be inevitable in this kind of hostile world that what we are going to need to have is a smaller, purer, more orthodox Church that can be a counter sign to a fallen and broken world. Now, that's a powerful part of our tradition; and I don't want to dismiss it; but it's very different from the perspective of Pope Francis. For him the Church's mission isn't that we're going to step back, get our act together, make sure nobody in the Church disagrees with one another, make sure we have an absolutely uniform witness, and we're gonna demonstrate what that means to be Christian to the world out there. Francis' view is much more, if you will, extroverted. Mission isn't, "Let's get our act together, let's be the holiest people we can be, and witness that to the world." Mission, for Francis, is actually going out into the world; and it means, in a way, being messy. Evangelizers thus take on - and I love this metaphor, he's used it over and over again - "the smell of the sheep; and the sheep are willing to hear their voice."^{2/}

An evangelizing community is also supportive, standing by people at every step of the way, no matter how difficult or lengthy this may prove to be. So Francis emphasizes mission as going out into the world. He then says in this next passage, "I dream of a missionary option, that is a missionary impulse capable of transforming everything, so that the Church's customs, ways of doing things, times and schedules, language and structures, can be suitably channeled for the evangelization of today's world rather than for her self-preservation."^{3/} Now, here, Francis is picking up another element of the Council's teaching, an element frankly that didn't get a lot of attention from his predecessors, namely, *Unitatis Redintegratio* §6, which says, "Insofar as the Church is a human institution, it is always in need of reform and renewal;" not occasionally, like when we set the clock forward or back twice a year it is always in need of reform and renewal.

[A person from the audience asks a question and this is his response. I think what he is talking about here is a notion of self-preservation that is static, that is concerned with maintaining the

status quo, controlling as much as possible everything around us so that we're not threatened. I think Francis is committed to the idea that there's an authentic self-preservation of the Church that only comes when we stop being concerned with maintenance and control, and start giving ourselves over in vulnerability and service of the world. So he would agree with you completely that there ultimately isn't an alternative between these two.]

D. Church Must Be Reformed in Light of Mission

Now what I was trying to say was that - so he takes a particular spin on what Church reform needs to look like. So *Unitatis Redintegratio* §6 says, "Authentic reform will always consist in an increase of fidelity to what the Church is." That's what Vatican II said. How do you know whether reform is authentic or not? Authentic reform is going to make us more true to who we are. Everyone with me so far? Now, what does Francis think we are? A missionary Church. Therefore all reform has got to be concerned with one thing: how do we do mission better? How do we go out and meet people where they are?

And so when he speaks to the coordinating committee for CELEM, he says this: "The change of structures from the obsolete ones to new ones -and he takes for granted there are obsolete structures and they need to be reformed in service of new ones- will not be the result of reviewing an organizational flow chart."^{4/} He says, "We don't reform the Church just to make it more administratively efficient. In fact, one of my real concerns about the reform of the curia is there is going to be a mighty temptation on the part of the Council of Cardinals to think of reform precisely an organizational flow chart. I have a real concern that some of those reforms of the curia are going to be about efficiency, better communication, overcoming silos in the Vatican." Now those are all real concerns, but that's a different kind of reform; and, frankly, I don't think Francis, pardon the pun, is interested in that, because he says rather the reform he's interested in "will result from the very dynamics of mission. What makes obsolete structures pass away, what leads to a change of heart in Christians, is precisely missionary spirit."^{4/} And we're talking from the parish, to the diocese, to the universal Church needs to ask, "What's getting in the way of we're going out meeting people where they are?" We're going to have to take a look at those things: if it's law; if it's custom; if it's theology; frankly, even if it's doctrine. With all the qualifications that need to be made in that regard, Francis is saying, "This is what needs to govern authentic reform."

II. The Priority of Mercy.

A. Mercy and Forgiveness over Judgment

A second theme I want to raise up, because it is such an important emphasis, not that it was absent in his predecessors work at all, but Francis has mentioned, I think, in a particularly powerful way, the priority of mercy in the gospel message. And so in that Jesuit interview, he suggested that mercy and forgiveness are more important at the end of the day than judgment. He says, "The thing the Church needs most today is the ability" - I love this expression; it's from the Jesuit interview - "to heal wounds and to warm the hearts of the faithful. The Church needs nearness, proximity. I see the Church as a field hospital after battle."^{5/} This is very interesting. The significance here, by the way, is not "hospital." The significance is the word "field." Every pope has believed the Church should be a hospital, that it should administer the sacraments and heal the broken hearted. A field hospital pulls up out of the comfort of a nice secure institution and goes out onto the battle field, where the conditions are less than ideal, where you have less than ideal equipment, and you do the best you can, 'cause that's where the people are; and it's the field part that's so significant in Francis' vision, not the hospital part. Go out where they are. Minister to people where they are. Attend to the questions and concerns that they have.

I believe, by the way, I've often been asked about the conflict between the magisterium and the LCWR;^{6/} and some of you may have heard me talk about this. There was a suggestion - and I know you had Margaret Farley here recently - and I remember being asked the question recently. You know, "Does the Vatican just have a vendetta against women?" They've done the investigation of women religious communities; they're investigating the LCWR; they've taken on Elizabeth Johnson and Margaret Farley as theologians. There may be a couple other women theologians that are under the microscope right now. "Do they just have an axe to grind against women?" And my argument is, "Well, obviously, a certain kind of misogyny is part of the

ecclesiastical culture.” And I think it shapes almost anybody in Church leadership, to be honest; but I don’t think that’s the primary motivation. I think the primary motivation is this: women’s religious communities underwent, in the last fifty years, a tremendous shift and not just a demographic shift in numbers, a shift in resources. Many of them have maintained their allegiance to the hospitals and the schools that were so central to their apostolate. But you’ve also seen many women’s religious communities redirect their resources toward solidarity and presence with the poor, and the marginalized, and the broken in our society, whether they’re immigrants, whether they’re divorced, whether they’re gay and lesbian; but wherever people are on the margins, women’s religious communities have gravitated out there to be with them. And that’s changed the social location of the ministry of many women’s religious communities; and consequently, much of their voice has been focused on what they are encountering daily. They’re seeing the faces of broken people; and that’s the starting point for their pastoral and theological reflection.

Our bishops, by the way, by and large are not bad people at all. Like any large group, you know, you’ve got some that aren’t as nice as others; but most of them - and I deal with a lot of them - are good men who genuinely believe they are serving God and his Church. But, the fact of the matter is, most of these bishops spend their time in offices and meetings. They don’t daily look into the face of a gay person trying desperately to stay a part of this Church without being sentenced to a life of isolation and loneliness. So the difference is as much location as anything. You look at these issues differently when you look in the face of the broken daily; and Francis, I think, recognizes that. And he says a lot of things are gonna change if our pastoral leaders leave chanceries and go out to the margins, as many of the women’s religious communities have. Does that make sense? And I think that is what he is interested in. (Applause)

B. Eucharistic Hospitality:

And so that sense that we believe that the Church is a field hospital; we meet people where they are is important. Note here, this is what is interesting, because now Francis takes that missionary lens, and he goes back, and he meets up with his buddy, Pope Benedict, over coffee; and Benedict says, “You know, what about the Eucharist? The Church and the Eucharist is so important.” And I imagine Francis saying, “You’re absolutely right. If we’re a field hospital, the Eucharist is one of our most powerful instruments of medicine, a spiritual medicine. So we need to make sure the Eucharist is available to the broken. Thank you for that, Pope Benedict.” (Laughter) And so he says, “The Eucharist, although it is the fullness of sacramental life, is not a prize for the perfect, but a powerful medicine and nourishment for the weak. These convictions have pastoral consequences that we are called to consider with prudence and boldness.”⁷¹ Now if you can’t read between the lines there, meet me afterwards, all right?.

But, you see, he’s taking the same part of tradition that Pope Benedict held up: a beautiful Eucharist ecclesiology; but he’s now bringing it into the foreground an element of the Eucharist that hadn’t been in the foreground before. It’s precisely the broken that need the Eucharist. And if you are a field hospital, that’s the way you look at things. I love this frequently “we” - and I think he is talking about the clergy here - act as arbiters of grace: “You can have a little of this, and you can’t; and you’re quite not up to it, but maybe in a week or six weeks, we’ll let you in.” That’s what an arbiter of grace does. We are facilitators of it. We make grace possible through who we are as a Church in our ministry. “The Church is not a toll house; it is the house of the Father, where there is a place for everyone with all their problems.”⁷² (Applause) This is a powerful transformation!

III. The Recovery of Pastoral Ministry

A. Renounces “Spiritual Worldliness

The next thing that I would point out that Pope Francis is doing is that he is recovering the priority of pastoral ministry. Pastoral ministry doesn’t think of ministers, ordained and lay, as arbiters of grace, but as facilitators of it. That’s precisely what makes ministry pastoral. And so in the spirit of that, he is renounced, for example, what he calls “spiritual worldliness”. Now this is a term by the way that, I think, needs a little interpretation. This is a term he’s taken from the work of a

Jesuit theologian, Henri De Lubac, in his, the English title is *Splendor of the Church*, where De Lubac criticized “spiritual worldliness.” And what De Lubac means by that is a preoccupation with honor, privilege, status. Now we sometimes don’t think of it this way; and we’re more inclined to think “spiritual worldliness” would be a good thing; and understanding of the grace character of the world. That’s not what Francis means when he uses “spiritual worldliness;” he’s talking about clericalism. He’s talking about a focus on rank and privilege. This is why we are hearing in the Vatican rumblings that he is going to do away with the process of offering monsignorites to clerics. There’s no need to offer privileges to those who are called to serve God’s Church. (Applause) And we see this over and over in his ministry: a concern for a kind of neo-clericalism, that has clergy separating themselves from others.

B. Calls for a Ministry of Accompaniment

He calls for - and I think this is striking, because this is a term that took on a particular currency in Latin America - a ministry of accompaniment. One of the great privileges of my life was to do a series of interviews with the late Bishop of San Cristobal de Las Casas in Chiapas, Don Samuel Ruiz, who throughout his four decades of episcopal ministry continued to say, over and over, that his job as bishop was accompaniment, walking with the people. And I think that is an important theme that comes up in a lot of the CELAM¹⁷ documents; and Pope Francis has taken that forward. So we see when he addressed the Brazilian bishops last July he said, “Dear brothers (he was talking to the bishops), let us recover the calm to be able to walk at the same pace as our pilgrims, keeping alongside them, remaining close to them, enabling them to speak of the disappointments present in their hearts, and to let us address them.”⁸⁷ Important theme in his work!

IV. The Pastoral of Doctrine

This is a term he has not used. This is a term coined by a French theologian, Christoph Theobald, who claims he is one of the most important interpreters of the Second Vatican Council. Unfortunately almost none of his work is in English; so he’s not very well known here in the U. S. But he’s a major figure in Vatican II studies; and Theobald suggests - I think this is important - that one of the dangers that has happened since Vatican II. Theobald is arguing about the tendency we’ve seen particularly from some in the right in the Church that want to emphasize that Pope John thought of Vatican II, called for Vatican II, to be a pastoral council, which is true. But that’s been used to say, “Therefore, there’s no doctrinal significance to Vatican II. Vatican II is just about a new way of living out Church doctrine.” And Theobald rightly says, “No! It’s not that simple.” What John XXIII was talking about was a different way of engaging our doctrinal tradition; and Theobald calls this the principle of the “pastorality of doctrine,” that it is not doctrine here and pastoral life there; it’s doctrine, which first of all almost always emerged out of a particular pastoral setting. To study the history of doctrine is to recognize that almost every significant doctrinal commitment of ours emerged out of pastoral context, out of a concern about the sacramental life of the Church, the liturgical life of the Church, ordinary spirituality. And so John wants to recover the idea that doctrine is always embedded in the pastoral life of the Church; and it’s always interpreted in pastoral contexts.⁹¹ And so it’s interesting that when Francis refers to doctrine - and, by the way, I think this is interesting because many more conservative commentators have made a big deal about the fact that, “Oh liberals, you know, they’re turning Francis into their own image; and the truth is he doesn’t disagree with Benedict on any Church doctrine.” This is that style versus substance. “He’s a different style Pope; but in substance he’s no different than his predecessors.” But that is a very artificial understanding of doctrine. I mean, it’s true insofar as it goes by the way; but anybody who thinks tomorrow he is going to write an encyclical calling for the ordination of women is probably getting their hopes up for something that isn’t going to happen; but, I think, it is missing a larger point here. Francis doesn’t think of doctrine that’s over here, these principles that we genuflect to, and then sort of apply in a unilateral way, in a directional way from doctrine to every specific situation.

A. Pastoral Significance of the “Hierarchy of Truths”

Francis thinks that doctrine is always mediated in pastoral context. It’s not something kept in a hermetically sealed container and so he retrieves another theme from the Council and this is striking how neglected this theme is. In *Unitatis Redintegratio*, the Decree on Ecumenism, Vatican II §11, that document refers to a phrase that is shockingly ignored in the five decades after the Council in magisterial documents, mainly the “hierarchy of truths.” So the Decree on

Ecumenism says among all the truths of the faith there is a hierarchy, not all of them are equally foundational. This was an important teaching completely ignored as far as I can tell in magisterial documents until this Pope. I haven't done a word study of this; but it would be curious to see how often hierarchy of truths is mentioned in magisterial documents after Vatican II and before Pope Francis. What's more significant is that he applies it to the area of moral teaching. He says, "There is a hierarchy in the Church's moral teaching." And so we get this passage, "Pastoral ministry in a missionary style as opposed to whatever the other kind of pastoral ministry was, is not obsessed with the disjointed transmission of a multitude of doctrines to be insistently imposed."^{9/} See that model is: "Here's the doctrine; and my job as a pastor is to pick which doctrine to apply to your life in whatever situation you find yourself." You see?

And Francis is saying, "No, that's not how it works." "When we adopt a pastoral goal and a missionary style, which would actually reach everyone without exception or exclusion, the message has to concentrate on the essentials, on what is most beautiful, most grand, most appealing and at the same time most necessary."^{9/} The message is simplified, while losing none of its depth and truth, and thus becomes all the more forceful and convincing." This is after all; the title of this exhortation is *The Joy of the Gospel*. And he is saying, "We need to recover the joy of the gospel, the good news that should warm people's hearts that should not alienate them. It should be a medicine they welcome in the field hospital." And he says, "I don't think we're doing that."

He goes on "All revealed truths derive from the same divine source and are to be believed with the same faith."^{10/} Yeah, certainly it's true. We can take the catechism and say, "Look! We're suppose to accept all of these truths, the Nicene/Constantinople/Apostolan creed; we profess it every Sunday. He's saying, "I'm not telling you to pick and choose what you want to believe in the Nicene Creed. We should profess all of it; we should believe all of it; but in our pastoral life we're not necessarily applying it all in the same way." "Some of them are more important for giving a direct expression to the heart of the Gospel. In this basic core, what shines forth is the beauty of the saving love of God made manifest in Jesus Christ who died and rose from the dead. In this sense, the Second Vatican Council explained, 'In the Catholic doctrine there exists an order or a hierarchy of truths, since they vary in their relation to the foundation of the Christian faith'. This holds true as much for the dogmas of faith as for the whole corpus of the Church's teaching, including her moral teaching."^{10/}

And if you read between the lines here, you see what he said explicitly in the Jesuit interview: "Look, I am not about to challenge our Church's teaching on things like divorce and remarriage, or homosexual behavior, or abortion, or any of these things;" but, he says, "I am saying we become a little fixated on some of these." And you can read between the lines and hear what he's talking about here, that in the evangelical mission of the Church, should these be the first things we're talking about? And I think he is saying, "No, they shouldn't be the first thing that we're talking about."

V. A Listening Church

Francis is calling us to become a listening Church; and he does this by carrying forward the Ignatian commitment to discernment. There is a powerful spirituality of Ignatian discernment shot through - shot through - his language. He talks about the way he had to learn this as a superior. I thought one of the most remarkable things in the Jesuit interview is his admission that he was a bit of a horse's ass as a superior. And he uses a term only slightly more antiseptic than that. He was a jerk; and he had to learn a style of leadership that involved, first, listening to people.^{11/} This is, by the way, not a novel modern insight. St. Cyprian of Carthage in the third century wrote a letter to his clergy in which he reminded them, "It is sheer presumption for somebody to insist on teaching what they know rather than listening to the insight of others; for a teacher teaches best when he's first a patient learner." And Francis is taking that forward and he said we need to be a learning Church.

A. Calls for Consultative Structures

And so he calls for a revitalization of consultative structures. He says, he's talking now about the bishops. He says "In his mission of fostering a dynamic, open and missionary communion, the

bishop will have to encourage and develop means of participation proposed in the Code of Canon Law and other forms of pastoral dialogue”.^{11/}

Let me just stop and talk about that for a moment. What is he talking about here in the Code of Canon Law? Well, the Code of Canon Law, for example, because he’s talking here about a bishop, the Code of Canon Law encourages bishops to have diocesan synods, in which, by the way, lay people can be delegates. The Code of Canon Law encourages episcopal conferences, to have plenary synods; provinces to have provincial synods. The Code of Canon Law requires a bishop or his proxy to visit every parish in his diocese at least once every five years. Now, sadly, what the Code of Canon Law doesn’t say is what the bishop should do when he visits that parish; and so most bishops think, “Well, if they came to do Confirmation, check it off.” (Laughter) But I would argue the intent of that canon is: to go set up a microphone, and sit right there, and invite everybody in the parish to come and talk. That’s what Francis is talking about.

The Code has provisions for our bishops to listen. But we’re not doing it very well, out of a desire to listen to everyone, and not simply to those who would tell him what he would like to hear. This is also important. By the way, this is not just important for our bishops, this is important for all of us here in this room. I’ve never met a person in a leadership position who didn’t think they were consultative. I never met a pastor or a bishop who didn’t think he was consultative. I didn’t meet a liberal left wing Call to Action Catholic who didn’t think they were consultative. The question when we consult is, who. Who are you consulting? Are you only consulting people who are going to pat you on the shoulder, and tell you how incredibly prophetic and mature you are; (Laughter) or are you going to consult people who you know are absolutely going to disagree with you? And this is not just bishops, this is all of us in this room; if you’re only listening to the people who you know agree with you, you’re not listening the way Francis is talking about. Be very clear about this. This is true across the spectrum; if you’re not having the courage to engage in conversation people who you think are absolutely wrong, then you’re not listening, any more or less than the clergy are or are not listening.

B. Emphasizes *Sensus Fidei*

Francis is calling all of us to be a listening Church; and it demands conversion. It demands conversion for the bishops, because they have to emphasize there is another teaching of the Council shockingly neglected in the five decades since Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium* §12: “Every one of the baptized is given a supernatural instinct for the faith - Latin, *Sensus Fidei* - through which they receive God’s word. They penetrate its meaning more deeply; they apply it more profoundly in their lives.” Francis has mentioned *Sensus Fidei*, on at least three different occasions. He talked in his Jesuit interview shockingly not about the infallibility of the Pope, not about the infallibility of ecumenical councils, not about the infallibility of the ordinary universal magisterium, but of the infallibility of the *Church in credendo*, the believing Church. That’s the first time he ever mentioned the word infallibility. He talked about the infallibility of all God’s people listening to God’s word.^{12/}

C. Conversion of the Papacy

He wants a listening Church, and because he’s not a hypocrite, he recognizes that if he is going to call for a Church that listens, he needs to call for a pope that listens. And so he admits in *Evangelii Gaudium* the papacy has to undergo a conversion.^{13/} “Since I am called to put into practice what I ask of others, I too must think about a conversion of the papacy. We’ve made little progress in this regard.” I gotta tell you this, of all the things I like most about Pope Francis, this is it - this guy is a truth teller. He doesn’t know what spin is. (Laughter) And it’s been a long time since we’ve had Church leaders who don’t spin. He does not spin. He’s been refreshing in saying, “You know we’re not very good at this,” and particularly around consultation. He’s mentioned this in *Evangelii Gaudium*, but when he spoke to the coordinating committee in CELAM in July he said the same thing. He said, “We bishops have been lousy at listening to the faithful. The papacy and the central structures of the Universal Church also need to hear the call of pastoral conversion.”

Second Vatican Council stated that liked the ancient patriarchal churches, episcopal conferences are in a position to contribute in many and fruitful ways to the concrete realization of the collegial spirit. Now I got to tell you, because we are about to see one of the most remarkable things he does in this exhortation, “Yet, this desire has not been fully realized, what Vatican II has called us to do, hasn’t been fully realized, since a juridical status of episcopal conferences, which would see them as subjects of specific attributions, including genuine doctrinal authority has not yet been sufficiently elaborated.” Now to understand how shocking that statement is, there is a footnote in the text, and the footnote goes to the Apostolic Letter of John Paul II, *Apostolos Suos*, which denied bishops conferences a proper doctrinal teaching authority, except under very restrictive conditions. So, he’s just said we’ve not properly treated the doctrinal teaching authority of the episcopal conference; and he cites his predecessor as an example of where we haven’t done it well enough.

And that’s a remarkable thing that he’s done here; and then he goes on to talk about excessive centralization. Fr. Gerry (Bechard) asked me if I thought he might call a new ecumenical council. My suggestion is: no, he probably won’t. And the reason I don’t think he will is: I think he is more comfortable with a decentralized papacy Church authority. I think he would rather let the African bishops make more decisions on their own. The U. S. bishops, God help us, make more decisions on their own. (Laughter) - See I violated my own rule, that was a lack of charity and I’m serious that was not good. I’m trying to stop sort of making cheap shots like that. It doesn’t help our Church when any of us does that by the way. I feel that very strongly.

VI. The Flowering of a Persuasive Papacy

So the last thing I want to say - and boy I’m down now to about eight minutes for the really interesting thing I wanted to say - I think what we are seeing in this papacy is the flowering of a persuasive papacy. And, if you will, I am going to make three points quickly, and then maybe we can come back to it in the Q and A period. This section here is what I really tried to develop after hearing George Weigel’s speak of the seamless continuity between John Paul II, Benedict and Francis, because, I think, it’s more complicated.

We need to recognize, I think, in the last two centuries, two trajectories, kind of historical developments of the papacy that have been in a kind of conflict.

A. The Rise of an Ultramontane Papacy

So the first trajectory is what we will call the rise of an ultramontane papacy. Ultramontanism was a movement in the 19th century that emphasized papal authority. The word, really, *ultramontane*, if you think about *montane*, you think mountain; and that’s a reference to the Alps. So an ultramontane was somebody who thought you should look over the Alps to see what Rome thought about something before acting. So ultramontanism is: Rome has to approve everything. And that really started in the 19th century. A lot of people don’t realize the encyclical was really invented by Pope Benedict the XIV in the late 18th century, and was first used to sort of articulate doctrine by popes with Gregory the XVI in the first half of the 19th century. It’s only in the 19th century that we begin to have popes who regularly issue documents pronouncing on doctrine. Prior to the 19th century popes certainly did so, but it was the exception rather than the rule. Most frequently, if there was a doctrinal dispute in the medieval Church, the pope delegated the question to one of the theological faculties at the great medieval universities like Paris or Bologna, or Louvain, or Oxford; and the theologians would debate it.

In the late 16th - early 17th century there was - this is a shock I know - a huge acrimonious debate between Dominicans and Jesuits (Laughter) over the relationships between God’s grace and human freedom; and each side was condemning the other side as a heretic. So Pope Clement VIII calls for a commission to study the question. He sets up a commission of bishops. But the commission is going to investigate it by holding 18 public debates in which theologians are invited to get up and debate one another in front of the commission, so that all sides could be heard. And two popes later, because his predecessor only lives as pope for 30 days, Leo X,^{13/} I think it is, Pope Paul V convenes after 18 commissions; and you know what he says, “Dominicans, you’re allowed to preach your doctrine; Jesuits, you’re allowed to preach your doctrine; neither of you

gets to condemn the other guy. (Laughter) You need some humility. We're dealing with God here." What a wonderful exercise of papal teaching authority, a very different exercise. So, popes only rarely got involved in doctrinal disputes.

In the 19th century that begins to change. By the time we get to Pope Leo XIII, he issues over 80 encyclicals. Pope John Paul II wrote more pages of magisterial text than any other pope in history. So one trajectory that starts in the early 19th century comes to its term with John Paul II and Pope Benedict: the pope is the chief theologian; the pope is the chief expositor of Church doctrine. Does that make sense?

B. Pope John XXIII: The Tentative Beginning of the Persuasive Papacy

But here's where it gets complicated, because Pope John XXIII starts a different trajectory, the beginning of what I'm going to call a persuasive papacy; and it starts with *Gaudete Mater Ecclesia*, his remarkable opening address on October 11, 1962 in which he says in that address "In the past the Church saw fit to have recourse to the medicine of condemnation. Now it sees it best to use the medicine of mercy. In the past it was enough to vigorously condemn error. Now we must persuade people of the truth of the faith." All right? And Pope John's pontificate and the council that he begat was dedicated to a different style of communicating with the world: not condemnation and apodictic decrees, but persuasive conversation.

So here's where it gets complicated, because, remember that first trajectory: the pope is the expositor of doctrine, started in the 19th century. It kind of skips over John, and it continues haltingly with Paul VI - think of *Humanae Vitae*, a classic example of this - John Paul II's fifteen encyclicals, John Paul II and Benedict's rigorous sort of policing of dissident theologians. That represents, sort of, the culmination of the pope as expositor of doctrine trajectory. Everybody with me?

But it gets tricky, right? Because, while they're on the one hand continuing that older model, they're haltingly influenced by Pope John's model. Pope Paul VI, for the first time, creates the International Theological Commission to invite the Magisterium to consult with a diversity of theologians. He engages in a different style of papal leadership and teaching. Remember, Paul VI recognizes for the first time, and he only does it haltingly - it's going to get picked up afterwards - that sometimes we teach better when we don't issue a decree. Sometimes symbolic actions teach better than words.

And so what does he do while the Council is going on? He embraces the Ecumenical Patriarch of the Eastern Church, Athanagoras I; and they jointly rescind excommunications that had been in place for a thousand years. He goes and visits India; he goes on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; he comes to New York to address the United Nations. He begins to recognize that as a pope, there may be a different way of teaching, one that exercises symbolic gestures. Now, he only does this haltingly.

John Paul II, on the other hand, picks it up. You see, here is the ambiguity. On the one hand, John Paul II is heavy handed in policing orthodoxy, right? But, on the other hand, what's he doing? He's inviting world religious leaders to Assisi to pray; he's going and praying at the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem; he makes a point of going over 100 trips throughout the world, to almost every continent, and getting off the ground in an image we all remember, kissing the ground for the first time. His picture is plastered on the Time Magazine's cover in a bare cell praying with his would be assassin; and in the final months of his life, we see pictures of him struggling to continue his papacy.

Pope John Paul was the quintessential post-modern pope in his use of image to teach effectively. But you see the ambiguity, don't you? On the one hand, he's still trying to keep forward the pope as expositor and policer of doctrine; on the other hand, he's sympathetic to Pope John's persuasive papacy. There's an ambivalence there.

Pope Benedict continues the one; he fails miserably at the second. If Pope John Paul II was a master of the symbolic gesture, Pope Benedict was not. He thought an important symbolic gesture was to rescind the excommunication of four Lefebvrite bishops, but didn't bother to check that one of them was a holocaust denier, right? He didn't get how to use the papacy symbolically.

And indeed, this is part of my argument that I don't think Benedict was suited to the demands of a modern papacy, to be honest with you; and I think he wisely, at some point, stepped down so that he could do what his real passion was: theology, writing, teaching.

That, of course, brings us to Francis. Because Francis, I think, marks the culmination of this trajectory. So, where Paul VI, John Paul II and Benedict are caught between two worlds: sometimes they're the pope as policemen; sometimes they're the pope as the one encouraging persuasion and dialogue. Francis, I think, has largely put to bed the pope as policeman. I'm not saying he's not going to pronounce on Church doctrine, and he's certainly affirmed Church teaching, but there's none of the policeman's feel to it, all right? This is a pope who believes he teaches best by persuading.

Conclusion

I'll end my presentation with an anecdote. About two weeks after they published the remarkable interviews in the various Jesuit journals, I had a very pious Catholic journalist, who runs a pretty influential blog, contact me. And he said, "You know, I know" - I do some work on magisterial teaching authority and thing like that - and he says, "What the theological note, what's the official magisterial status of these encyclicals, I mean, of these interviews? What kind of degree of assent do we Catholics have to give to this teaching?" Now this is an interesting question. You see, Pope Benedict drew a distinction that goes all the way back to Robert Bellarmine in the 16th - 17th century, namely, that popes teach in their papal magisterium as pastors of the Universal Church. But Robert Bellarmine recognized that they could also be private doctors. So they could write as a private theologian. And, of course, Pope Benedict did that.

So, when he issued his Jesus of Nazareth volumes, he's very clear in the Preface, he's not issuing these as pope, he was issuing these as a private doctor. Does that make sense? But note what we're set up for. There are two ways a pope can teach: he can be the pope, and then he is going to issue magisterial documents, or he can take off his "pope hat," put on his "theologian hat," and write as a theologian.

But, may I suggest to you that the interviews Francis has been giving aren't either of those. He wasn't saying on the plane or with the Jesuits, "I'm taking off my pope's hat." He was teaching as pope, but in a different way. You see, we've become habituated to this model. We think the only way popes can teach is to issue formal magisterial documents. We're all of us habituated to that. And we ask ourselves, "Can we dissent or not dissent? Is that infallible or not infallible?" All of us, liberal or conservative, ask the same question. We give different answers to the question; but we all ask the same questions. (Laughter)

And Francis is trying to break our habits. He is trying to encourage us to see that, "I think I can teach by inviting conversation. I think I can teach by writing a letter to an Italian atheist journalist and submitting to an interview with him." Because, I think this guy has a spiritual instinct worth engaging and talking about. He talks about, not a culture of death, but a culture of encounter, a Church being vulnerable enough to go out and engage people in vulnerable conversation and dialogue. I think that is a very powerful model.

Now, I want to be very clear. I don't think that precludes a pope from teaching in his formal magisterial mode. I think Francis has already given us an encyclical that was a good part Pope Benedict's, all right? But, I think popes do occasionally need to address important controverted questions. But, I think Francis recognizes that perhaps that should be more of a last resort, that perhaps what we should be starting off with is dialogue and conversation; and then, recognizing sometimes we're going to have to put an end to certain questions, or we're going to have to give more definitive pronouncements.

I think Francis has internalized Cardinal John Henry Newman's felicitous phrase, "Truth is the daughter of time." But, sometimes the Church has to be patient in allowing truth to emerge. That doesn't mean we don't give authoritative pronouncements. I mean, that's why we have a non-infallible magisterium. Or the Church says, "We don't have absolute certitude on a question, but neither can we be silent." And so our

Church leaders will occasionally give authoritative and binding pronouncements with a lesser degree of authority, recognizing the truth is the daughter of time. We need to listen more!

My sense is that Pope Francis is very much an orthodox teacher of the faith. He is faithful to our doctrinal tradition. But he is reminding us to a whole series of neglected insights. The bishops, indeed all of us, are called to be teachers. And sometimes the bishops must teach in a normative doctrinal key. But, I think he wants us to remember Cyprian's dictum - Cyprian is better known for another dictum, but the one I'm interested in is: "You gotta be a learner before you can be a teacher." We have long been comfortable being a teaching Church; Pope Francis wants us first to be a humble listening Church.

Thank you. (Applause)

Transcribed by
Bev Parker
20131211

1. The Latin American Episcopal Council (Spanish: *Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano*), better known as CELAM, is a council of the Roman Catholic bishops of Latin America, created in 1955 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

2. *Evangelii Gaudium* §24 (Missionary Discipleship)

The church which goes forth is a community of missionary disciples . . . An evangelizing community gets involved by word and deed in people's daily lives; it bridges distances, it is willing to abase itself, if necessary, and it embraces human life, touching the suffering flesh of Christ in others. Evangelizers thus take on the "smell of the sheep" and the sheep are willing to hear their voice. An evangelizing community is also supportive, standing by people at every step of the way, no matter how difficult or lengthy this may prove to be.

3. *Evangelii Gaudium* §27 (Missionary Discipleship)

I dream of a "missionary option", that is, a missionary impulse capable of transforming everything, so that the Church's customs, ways of doing things, times and schedules, language and structures can be suitably channeled for the evangelization of today's world rather than for her self-preservation.

4. July 2013 Speech to CELAM Coordinating Committee: (Missionary Discipleship)

The "change of structures" (from obsolete ones to new ones) will not be the result of reviewing an organizational flow chart, which would lead to a static reorganization; rather it will result from the very dynamics of mission. What makes obsolete structures pass away, what leads to a change of heart in Christians, is precisely missionary spirit.

5. Pope Francis' Interview with Jesuit Journals: (Church as field hospital)

The thing the church needs most today is the ability to heal wounds and to warm the hearts of the faithful; it needs nearness, proximity. I see the Church as a field hospital after battle.

6. Leadership Council of Women Religious (LCWR) is a canonically approved membership organization which serves as a support system and voice for nuns and sisters (Catholic women religious) in the United States.

7. *Evangelii Gaudium*, §47 (Eucharistic Hospitality)

The Eucharist, although it is the fullness of sacramental life, is not a prize for the perfect, but a powerful medicine and nourishment for the weak. These convictions have pastoral consequences that we are called to consider with prudence and boldness. Frequently, we act as arbiters of grace rather than its facilitators. But the Church is not a tollhouse; it is the house of the Father, where there is a place for everyone, with all their problems.

8. Pope Francis' July, 2013 Address to Brazilian Bishops: (Recovery of Pastoral Ministry)

Dear brothers, let us recover the calm to be able to walk at the same pace as our pilgrims, keeping alongside them, remaining close to them, enabling them to speak of the disappointments present in their hearts and to let us address them.

9. *Evangelii Gaudium*, §35 (Recovery of Pastoral Ministry)

Pastoral ministry in a missionary style is not obsessed with the disjointed transmission of a multitude of doctrines to be insistently imposed. When we adopt a pastoral goal and a missionary style which would actually reach everyone without exception or exclusion, the message has to concentrate on the essentials, on what is most beautiful, most grand, most appealing and at the same time most necessary. The message is simplified, while losing none of its depth and truth, and thus becomes all the more forceful and convincing.

10. *Evangelii Gaudium*, §36 (Pastoral Ministry - Hierarchy of Truths)

All revealed truths derive from the same divine source and are to be believed with the same faith, yet some of them are more important for giving direct expression to the heart of the Gospel. In this basic core, what shines forth is the beauty of the saving love of God made manifest in Jesus Christ who died and rose from the dead. In this sense, the Second Vatican Council explained, "in Catholic doctrine there exists an order or a 'hierarchy' of truths, since they vary in their relation to the foundation of the Christian faith". This holds true as much for the dogmas of faith as for the whole corpus of the Church's teaching, including her moral teaching.

11. *Evangelii Gaudium*, §31 (Pastoral Ministry - (Listening to the Faithful)

In his mission of fostering a dynamic, open and missionary communion, he will have to encourage and develop the means of participation proposed in the Code of Canon Law and other forms of pastoral dialogue, out of a desire to listen to everyone and not simply to those who would tell him what he would like to hear. Yet the principal aim of these participatory processes should not be ecclesiastical organization but rather the missionary aspiration of reaching everyone.

12. *Evangelii Gaudium* §119 (Wisdom of the People of God)

In all the baptized, from first to last, the sanctifying power of the Spirit is at work, impelling us to evangelization. The People of God is holy thanks to this anointing, which makes it infallible in *credendo*. This means that it does not err in faith, even though it may not find words to explain that faith. The Spirit guides it in truth and leads it to salvation. As part of his mysterious love for humanity, God furnishes the totality of the faithful with an instinct of faith -*sensus fidei*- which helps them to discern what is truly of God. The presence of the Spirit gives Christians a certain connaturality with divine realities, and a wisdom which enables them to grasp those realities intuitively, even when they lack the wherewithal to give them precise expression.

13. Dr. Gaillardetz may have been referring to Pope Leo, XI, who reigned 26 days from April 1-27, 1605.