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Undoubtedly, Vatican Council II has brought about tremendous changes in the Church. Following the Council, the Church is perceived more as a servant and has become more open to the world. But some of the questions that emerge are: How come did the Church, whose originary experiences were the Exodus the Resurrection, forget its basic message? How come have the memory and history of the Church been partially distorted or deviated in the course of the last 2,000 years? How can we rediscover the Joy of the Gospels today? How do we reconcile the liberal and conservative elements of the Church in general and in their perception of Vatican II?

With these questions in mind, we first recall Paul Ricoeur’s contribution to memory, forgiveness and healing. Then we reflect on some of the profound changes brought about the Council, based primarily on one historian of the Council. Then we go on to see how Vatican Council II has made it emergence of a Jesuit Pope and his apostolic exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* (The Joy of the Gospel) possible!
1. History, Memory and Forgetting: The Dynamics of Social Organisation

Some general reflection on history, memory and forgetting may be useful for us to trace the historical significance of Vatican II. Throughout his career the contemporary philosopher Paul Ricoeur worked to make sense of the past and our ongoing involvement with it. Something about the past is undoubtedly no longer accessible to us. Nonetheless, traces of the past remain. Through them we try to represent the past in the present. We do so through memory and through the writing and reading of history. But memory is notoriously fallible and historical accounts, since they cannot represent the past just as it was, are at best only partial and therefore subject to the charge that they misrepresent, rather than represent, the past.¹)

Ricoeur consistently opposes any claim that historical knowledge can be or even rightly aspire to be definitive or absolute knowledge. He rejects, on the one hand, claims such as Hegel’s or Marx’s that there is one universal history in which all local histories are incorporated and made fully intelligible. On the other hand, he also resists the positivistic notion that there are bare, unchallengeable and uninterpreted facts waiting to be discovered that are accessible either to memory or to the historian. Nonetheless, he does hold that there can be objective historical knowledge that deserves to be called true.

Ricoeur’s *Memory, History, Forgetting*²) gives his fullest argument for this lifelong conviction. Its argument begins with an account of things purportedly remembered, for without memories there could be no history involving people. There is the individual’s memory of what he or she has encountered or done

---

or suffered. And analogously, there is a set of memories that individuals share with other members of their group. Through this ‘collective memory’, a group of people has access to past events and deeds that have been reconstructed and recounted to them. Indeed, from one perspective, this collective memory antedates individual memories. We are born into a ‘familial’ discourse replete with accounts of our group’s (family, locale, nation, etc.) past. Our individual memories take shape against the backdrop of this collective memory.3)

Nevertheless, collective memory presupposes someone’s report that he or she has witnessed something and recalled it accurately. This person in effect testifies: “I witnessed x occurring. If you don’t believe me, ask someone else who was there.” Testimony of this sort, given and received, underpins a group’s collective memory, its ‘common knowledge’. It also shows that there is a social bond among the group’s members that undergirds their trust in one another’s words.

Even though the historiographical operation is thoroughly interpretative, it is still possible to speak of the objectivity and truthfulness of the historian’s account. This operation has its point of departure in testimony. Even false testimony refers to a world in which something actually occurred, something objective. Furthermore, all testimony refers, at least implicitly, to some specific group and the social bond that supports the activity of giving and receiving testimony among its members.4) To the extent that historians perform the historiographical operation well they give a substitute representation of the past. A substitute is faithful to the available evidence and so deserves to be called true even though it is always amendable or reformable.

3) Dauenhauer - Pellauer, “Paul Ricoeur”.
4) Ibid.
Based on Ricoeur’s insights, we may affirm that creative and critical commitment to the Divine leads necessarily to healthy relationship with one another. So this section seeks to look at human relationships and the need for forgiveness enabling authenticity. Ricoeur’s theory of forgiveness and remembering is essentially mimetic in character; a movement from ideas to action and back again with the aim of gaining new insights and understandings to take the situation forward, a situation termed as the ‘mimetic arc of understanding’, by Ricoeur. The mimetic arc is an attempt to re-interpret reality with the help of imagination in order to capture ‘the essentials’ of situations, enabling us to ‘remake’ the world in light of its potential truths.5)

Our attempt in this article enables us to investigate the significance of history, memory, forgetfulness and forgiveness part of the dynamics of any social organization. Here we want to reflect on these dynamics specially on life of the Church with a view to understand the changes brought about by Vatican II. We need to realize that there are dynamics in our collective consciousness that makes forgetting of the basic charism rather easy and comfortable. It also tries to understand the hope that such rediscovery of our living deposit of faith provides. Such a reliving of the memory (re-membering of the Eucharist) is crucial for a faith society like that of the Church, based on the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

2. Profound Changes Brought about by Vatican II

These days, both liberals and conservatives in the Church tend to agree that the Vatican Council II was a failure. The left wing is saying the Council didn’t go far enough. The right wing is saying it went too far.

Robert Blair Kaiser, an American author and journalist, best known for his covering of Vatican Council II, in his 2012 Tablet Lecture holds that the Council was unambiguously a success. It has already changed the way we live - and think - as Catholics. He holds firmly that “the charter that was written at Vatican II is the only thing that will save the Church, the people-of-God Church, not the hierarchical Church.”

We shall take a historical route to understand the tremendous impact of the Council on today’s Church.

2.1 Aggiornamento and John XXIII

Kaiser admits that aggiornamento (‘updating’) was a pretty bold word for the pope John XXIII to use, in Roma aeterna, where nothing ever changed. How do you bring a Church that never changes ‘up to date’? The top cardinal in Rome, Alfredo Ottaviani, the pro-prefect of the Holy Office of the Inquisition, could not conceive of any of the changes that the word aggiornamento implied, and Kaiser soon found out from theologians like Yves Congar, Jean Danielou, Karl Rahner, and Edward Schillebeeckx (all of whom had been silenced before Vatican II for their ‘radical thinking’) that Ottaviani was doing almost everything he could to put roadblocks in the way of Council’s major change-projects. It’s perfectly understandable since coat of arms said it all: Semper Idem, Always the same.6)

The story has it that Pope John XXIII’s personal secretary strenuously attempted to dissuade the pope from convening the Second Vatican Council, fearing that the momentous initiative would prove disastrous and taint the pope’s legacy. The pope’s reply to his reluctant secretary reveals a profound mastery of discernment

as Ignatius understood it: “You’re still not detached enough from self. You’re still concerned with having a good reputation. Only when the ego has been trampled underfoot can one be fully and truly free.” Think of it this way: only when you are free to risk failure are you free to risk success.\textsuperscript{7)}

How would the Council bring the Church up to date? Right from the beginning, none was sure, not even perhaps to the Pope himself. Though a modest man, he had an intuition: that 2,500 bishops encouraged to speak freely in a kind of parliament of bishops would figure it out.

They did this very quickly. After a month-long debate on whether the Church should scrap its traditional Latin Mass for the vernacular, the Council Fathers voted 2,200 to 200 in favour of the language of the people. It was our first clue: that Vatican II was trying to re-create a people’s Church.\textsuperscript{8)}

Up to now, the bishops had been part of the ecclesia docens, the teaching Church, while the rest of us were the ecclesia discens, the learning Church. Here at the Council, the bishops all became part of the learning Church. Hobnobbing with theologians like Congar, Danielou, Chenu, Schillebeeckx, they began to start speaking of the Church in new ways, promising to create a new kind of Church, a people’s Church, not a Church that was making itself less and less relevant with its excessive clericalism, juridicism and triumphalism.\textsuperscript{9)} Some of the best Council speeches were now calling for a Church that believed God was at work in all men and women, in individuals as well as in humankind as a whole, a Church that wanted us to be all that we could be - in this life as well as in the next.


\textsuperscript{8)} Kaiser, “Don’t Let Anyone Tell You”.

\textsuperscript{9)} \textit{Ibid}. 

---
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2.2 Outward Looking Church

Soon after the Council began Kaiser was invited to write an elaborate book on it. And when the book came out in 1963, first in London and Dublin, it shot to number one on the bestseller list. The book is aptly titled *Pope, Council, and World; the Story of Vatican II.*

In the book, he used an extended metaphor, imagining the Church as the barque of Peter, a boat that had been in port for too many centuries, its bottom so encrusted with barnacles that it couldn’t even sail. Now, by calling a Council, I said that Pope John had figuratively launched that vessel out on to the seas of the world.

Pope Paul VI liked the image so much that he got one of his American monsignor friends who lived in Rome to ask Kaiser for permission to have his book translated into Italian and published for the benefit of the Italian bishops who didn’t quite understand the Council was trying to create a new kind of Church, one less concerned with its own power, one more at the service of humankind.

The barque-of-Peter image underlined what was different about Vatican II. For all the other twenty councils of history the Church turned inward on itself. This council was turned out to the world. But not everyone understood that right away. Pope John’s Curia didn’t get it—they may have never gotten it. The most curious among one might want to read Yves Congar’s *My Journal of the Council,* a daily diary of his exhaustive and exhausting work behind the scenes, battling with Cardinal Ottaviani and his friends. To get ready for the Council, they were crafting a compendium of the faith as enunciated by all the papal encyclicals written since Pius IX, doing everything they could to make Vatican II into another Council of Trent.

---

“This is all wrong.”, Congar asserted. “This is papalist nonsense. It is making the Council into a textbook manual that will not help bring about the aggiornamento Pope John XXIII is calling for a recreation of what the faith was in its primitive beginnings. To rediscover the beauty of that faith, we have to take a deeper look at Sacred Scripture, and study the Fathers of the Church. And only then will the Council speak to the world in language it can understand.”

Reading Congar’s accounts now, Kaiser realizes that his reports in *Time* and my book on the first session reflected only dimly what a fierce battle was going on. *The Observer* had a poster for his series that appeared in all the tube stations of London. It screamed out the headline “THE PLOT TO THWART POPE JOHN.” If we go through the history of the debate with Congar, we will see that headline was an understatement. That will make us understand why there have been attempts to in the coming year to dumb the Council down, of efforts to convince others that the Council didn’t change the Church very much. “I think it did, and after you recall what kind of Church we lived in before Vatican II, I think you will agree with me, and rejoice with me and be glad for what the Council did do, irreversibly, I hope.”, claims.11)

2.3 Radical Changes of the Council

The Council changed the way we thought about God, about ourselves, about our spouses, our Protestant cousins, Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims and Jews, even the way we thought about the Russians. When a handful of bishops kept pushing for conciliar condemnation of Communism, John XXIII kept insisting that that kind of talk would only blow up the world. Pope John and his Council made some preliminary moves that helped end the Cold
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War. Because of it the editors of *Time* made John XXIII the Man of the Year. Kaiser lists some of the significant changes that the Council brought about that affects the life of the Catholic Church.

The Council reversed the Church’s long-standing anti-Semitism and relations to the Jews. Until the Council, Catholics believed that, if Jews didn’t convert to Catholicism, there was something wrong with them. The Council Fathers took another look at that idea and decided that Jews were still living their ancient covenant with God. We decided there was nothing wrong with the Jews; they became our brothers and sisters.

Before the Council, we thought we were miserable sinners when we were being nothing but human. After the Council, we had a new view of ourselves. We learned to put a greater importance on finding and following Jesus as ‘the way’. It didn’t matter so much what we said. What mattered was what we did: helping to feed the hungry, clothe the naked and find shelter for the homeless. That’s what made us followers of Jesus.

Before the Council, we were told we were excommunicated if we set foot in a Protestant Church. After the Council (where Protestant observers were welcomed, given seats of honor, and spoken of no longer as Protestants, but as ‘separated brethren’), we stopped fighting the Methodists and the Presbyterians and joined them in the fight for justice and peace marches.12)

Before the Council, we thought only Protestants read the Bible. After the Council, we’ve seen a new Catholic appreciation of the Scriptures; they’ve been given a more prominent place at Mass. Also in many parishes, we have groups gathering every week for Bible study.

Before the Council, we took pride in knowing that we were the only people on earth who could expect salvation, according to the centuries-long

mantra, ‘There is no salvation outside the Church.’ After the Council, we began to see there was something good and something great in all religions. And we didn’t think we had all the answers. After Vatican II, we started thinking of ourselves not as ‘the one, true Church’. We were ‘a pilgrim people’. It was a phrase that summoned up an image of a band of humble travellers on a journey who, though we are subject to rain, snow, high wind, and hurricane, to thirst, starvation, pestilence, disease, and attack by leopards and locusts, keep on plodding ahead with a hope and a prayer that we will someone reach our destination. The image was calculated to counter an old self-concept that hadn’t stood up to scrutiny - of a triumphal Church that had all the answers, lording it over humankind.

Before the Council, we identified ‘salvation’ as ‘getting to heaven’. After the Council, we knew that we had a duty to bring justice and peace to the world in our own contemporary society, understanding in a new way the words that Jesus gave us when he taught us to pray, thy Kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven’. By the end, among the most influential figures at the Council, we encountered two humble souls, one a woman, Dorothy Day, the founder of the Catholic Worker movement, who wasn’t allowed to speak to the assembled bishops at Vatican II (no woman was), and a bird-like figure, Dom Helder Camara, the archbishop of Recife, in Brazil. Both of them went around Rome telling individual bishops and those who were putting together the Council’s crowning document, Gaudium et Spes: please don’t forget the poor.

The Council really did not forget the poor. The Church sides with the common people or the poor. So Gaudium et Spes affirms: “The joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted, these are the joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the followers of Christ.”
Before the Council, we were sin-obsessed. It was even a sin to eat a hamburger on Friday night after the game. After the Council, we had a new sense of sin. We didn’t hurt God when we sinned. We sinned when we hurt somebody else. Or ourselves. After the Council, we had a new holy hopeful view of ourselves, redefining holiness as the famous Trappist monk Thomas Merton did: to be holy is to be human.

Before the Council, we were told we were condemned to hell if we made love to our spouses without at the same time making babies. After the Council, we knew we had a duty (and the God-approved pleasure) to make love even if we could not afford to have another baby.

Before the Council, we thought God spoke directly to the Pope and that he passed the word down the ecclesiastical pyramid to the bishops, then to the priests, then the nuns, and, properly filtered, to us. “After the Council, we learned a new geometry. The Church wasn’t a pyramid. It was more like a circle, where we are all encouraged to have a voice.” We are the Church. We have a right and a duty to speak out about the kind of Church we want.

Kaiser reminds us that these changes did not come about because the Fathers of Vatican II revamped what we had already professed believing in the Apostles’ Creed. They didn’t change our faith; they didn’t come up with a new understanding of God. Still one God, two natures, three persons. Only in this sense can he agree with Pope Benedict XVI when he keeps insisting on something he calls ‘the hermeneutic of continuity’.

Our author Kaiser does agree that Council didn’t come up with anything new. “No, no new dogmas. And thank God for that. The last things modern, thinking Catholics want are dogmas of any kind. ‘Dogma’ and ‘dogmatic’ are words that we do not much resonate with,” he adds. When Jesus addressed the multitude on that hillside overlooking the lake, he did not enlighten their
minds by reading them the Ten Commandments. He enkindled their hearts by
telling what would make them happy.

The Council Fathers did not follow the example of the earlier Council of
Trent, but that of Jesus, claims Kaiser. They did not anathematize anyone or
anything. They set a new style of thinking about ourselves as followers of
the guy who told us how we could have life and have it more abundantly.

We make a mistake if we comb through the sixteen documents of Vatican
II and hope to find explicit warrants for the Church we want to see take
shape in the future.

We can only capture the real, revolutionary meaning of the Council by
looking at the new kind of language that permeated all those documents. It
was not the kind of legalistic language Cardinal Ottaviani loved. The
American Jesuit John W. O’Malley,13) the author of the most authoritative
work on the Council, *What Happened at Vatican II*, says the “Council’s
message was hidden in plain sight.” Fr. O’Malley describes it by contrasting
the old language with the old:

[...] at stake were almost two different visions of Catholicism: from commands
to invitations, from laws to ideals, from definition to mystery, from threats to
persuasion, from coercion to conscience, from monologue to dialogue, from ruling
to service, from withdrawn to integrated, from vertical to horizontal, from
exclusion to inclusion, from hostility to friendship, from rivalry to partnership,
from suspicion to trust, from static to ongoing, from passive acceptance to active
engagement, from fault finding to appreciation, from prescriptive to principled,
from behaviour modification to inner appropriation.14)

So Kaiser concludes optimistically: “the Council helped us all be more real,
more human and more loving. The Council helped us realize that the world

University Press, 2008).
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was a good place. It was good because God made it, and he made it because he loved us and loved the world, too. As should we.”

3. The Jesuit DNA

The above discussion on the changes brought about by Vatican helps us to appreciate the emergence of the person and message of the present pope. So in this section, I intend to show that the opening of Vatican II enabled Pope Francis, like John XXIII, to usher in an era of change, openness and optimism in the life of the Church. For this section, we base ourselves on a historical book of the earlier author Kaiser, Inside the Jesuits: How Pope Francis Is Changing the Church and the World. Our assumption in this section is that the Joy of the Gospel, which Pope Francis proclaimed is a continuation the Gospel message and the spirit of Vatican II.

Kaiser’s latest book carries the thesis: Pope Francis has Jesuit DNA, ‘a way of being’ that Jesuits learn during their formation and he was chosen to be a pope after Benedict’s unanticipated, history-shifting resignation (and the disaster of his papacy apparent in his unprecedented decision to resign, which was an admission of the defeat of his papal reign) precisely because he is a Jesuit. Francis was made as a pope because (in contrast to his predecessors) he’s ‘normal’ — and his normalcy is rooted in his Jesuit formation, which stresses a ‘head-and-heart take’ on faith as an antidote to

18) Kaiser, Inside the Jesuits, xii, cf. 31.
19) Ibid., 3.
20) Ibid., 7.
the poisonous gloom of the current age as exhibited in the two previous papacies.21)

Kaiser, who was himself a Jesuit for some years, notes that the Jesuit DNA is all about developing people engaged in ongoing discernment to ascertain what will work to the greater good of the people of God,22) and with its strong stress on discernment, Francis’ Jesuit DNA will work for the good of the entire church, since his Jesuit training will help him make right and courageous decisions for the church at this vexed, challenging point in its history.23)

It may be noted that the person of Pope Francis personifies the very changes that Vatican II has brought about, according to Kaiser. Moreover, the similarities between Pope John XXIII and Pope Francis cannot be missed!

Now we go to the Jesuit way of life or charism that has made Pope Francis so different and unique from other Popes.

3.1 The Jesuit Charism

For example, a central part of Jesuit formation bequeathed to the Society of Jesus by its founder Ignatius of Loyola is the *tantum quantum* rule, as pointed by Kaiser.24) This enables Jesuits to develop the ability to discern how to use the things of the world to the extent (*tantum*) that they help the follower of Jesus achieve her or his spiritual goals, while discerning the threat posed by the things of the world and learning to reject them to the extent (*quantum*) that they ensnare and impede spiritual progress. *Tantum quantum* thinking is, then, situational and pragmatic rather than absolutist and absolutist and

21) Ibid., 14.
22) Ibid., 32.
23) Ibid., 45.
24) Ibid.
doctrinaire. According to Kaiser, “Francis has been a _tantum quantum_ Jesuit at every turn: whatever works.”

Another key aspect of Jesuit spirituality encoded in the DNA of all Jesuits through their formation is the notion of _magis_ - the call always to do _more_, never to be satisfied with what has already been accomplished. In Kaiser’s view, Francis’ Jesuit DNA, with its emphasis on going for the _magis_, urges the church forward to the frontiers, as the _tantum quantum_ rule simultaneously calls on the church to shove aside everything that stands in the way of retrieving a spirituality focused on the joy of the gospel — a theme that is quickly becoming the leitmotiv of Francis’ papacy, which is setting a new joyful style for the entire church, Kaiser believes.

Pope Francis is, Kaiser thinks, _modeling_ these notions and this understanding of what is central to the Catholic enterprise (joy rather than gloom and condemnation) instead of talking about them: Francis has not been _telling_ us what the [Second Vatican] council means. He has been _showing_ us what it means by his actions.

In conclusion, Kaiser notes that, when Francis told the media soon after his election, “I think like a Jesuit,” what he intended to communicate is that he is (and as a pope, will remain) “constantly driven to rediscover, redefine, and reach out for better ways of doing things”: “His Jesuit DNA has driven him to rediscover, redefine, and set out on new frontiers and new boundaries with a holy boldness.” So he adds: “I see a Jesuit pope who,

26) Kaiser, _Inside the Jesuits_, 200.
27) Ibid., 65.
28) Kaiser, _Inside the Jesuits_, 83; Lindsey, “Bilgrimage: Robert Blair Kaiser’s Inside the Jesuits”.
29) Kaiser, _Inside the Jesuits_, 183.
30) Ibid., 194.
because of his Jesuit DNA, has hit on a new way of teaching, not by spouting off pieties or by preaching tirades against ‘the culture of death’ but by giving good examples of his own poverty of spirit.”

3.2 Research and Development

A key contribution of Francis’ Jesuit papacy will be, Kaiser believes, the reopening of theological discussions that his two predecessors ruthlessly suppressed, with dire effects for the whole church. As he notes, John Paul II and Benedict XVI all but shut down the ‘Church’s Research and Development Arm’.

Kaiser cites John A. Dick, an American theologian who spent much of his career teaching at Louvain University in Belgium. Dick maintains that Francis is moving the church away from harping on the ‘culture of death’ to talking about a ‘culture of encounter’ — a culture of the church’s joyful encounter with the secular realm as emphasized by Vatican II, in which it simultaneously learns from the world around it and communicates its core values to the world in respectful dialogical encounter. As Dick notes, the mapmakers for this project of developing a new ‘culture of encounter’ in Catholicism are the very people ‘slapped around for decades by Cardinal Ratzinger/Benedict XVI’ — that is, the theologians whose vocation is to help the church move always to the frontiers, to the magis, in its encounter with the world.

3.3 New Theological Directions

One of the most interesting and key contributions of Kaiser’s book is its expert quick survey of the kind of thinking-on-the-frontiers that Jesuit

31) Kaiser, Inside the Jesuits, 197; Lindsey, “Bilgrimage: Robert Blair Kaiser’s Inside the Jesuits”.
32) Kaiser, Inside the Jesuits, 11.
33) Kaiser, Inside the Jesuits, 13; Lindsey, “Bilgrimage: Robert Blair Kaiser’s Inside the Jesuits”.
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theologians (many of them were hounded and attacked by the two popes prior to Francis) have been doing for some time now — thinking that has clearly influenced the current pope, and will now begin to permeate the entire church through his new opening to theological discussion and, in particular, liberation theology.34)

For instance, Kaiser surveys the work of Sri Lankan Jesuit theologian Aloysius Pieris, an expert in the dialogue between Christianity and Buddhism, noting that “[f]or Pieris, liberation theology in Asia [is] more a process than a theology, ‘a primacy of praxis over theory […] the radical involvement with the poor and the oppressed. We know Jesus the truth by following Jesus the way’” — ideas that have brought Pieris scrutiny from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.35)

Then Samuel Rayan, an Indian Jesuit theologian, has written: “Jesus came to decolonize the religion and theology of the people, which had been occupied by royal, priestly, and wealthy settlers from the time of Solomon. Religion became priest-ridden and expensive, legalistic and burdensome. It had its outcastes and untouchables. It also had its ways of fleecing the poor. Jesus marginalized the temple and all priestly pretensions. The temple is destined to disappear. Worship shall be in spirit and truth. Mercy, not sacrifice. People, not Sabbath.”

The above reflections indicate that the long trajectory of the Council can lead to the person and message of Pope Francis. That itself is an achievement of the Council. Now from these historical perspectives, we are in a better situation to appreciate the Joy of the Gospel, which today’s world is open to!

34) Lindsey, “Bilgrimage: Robert Blair Kaiser’s Inside the Jesuits”.
35) Kaiser, Inside the Jesuits, 93.
4. Conclusion: *Evangelii Gaudium*

Our historical analysis of the Council and the Pope, it is hoped, will provide an adequate background to the basic Christian message that Jesus is the Light to the world and his message is a Joy for the world. This message is rediscovered in the teachings of Vatican II and personified in Pope Francis!

*Evangelii Gaudium* (The Joy of the Gospel) is the 2013 apostolic exhortation by Pope Francis on ‘the church’s primary mission of evangelization in the modern world’. It has been described as a ‘remarkable and radical document, one that ranges widely and challenges complacency at every level’, as well as ‘the manifesto of Francis’ and a ‘Magna Carta for church reform’.

The apostolic exhortation deals with many of the themes of Francis’ papacy, including obligations Christians have to the poor, and the duty to establish and maintain just economic, political, and legal orders. Francis says that the world ‘can no longer trust in the unseen forces and the invisible hand of the market’ and calls for action ‘beyond a simple welfare mentality’ that ‘attack[s] the structural causes of inequality’. Refocusing contemporary society’s lopsided priorities, he asks how ‘it is not a news item when an elderly homeless person dies of exposure, but it is news when the stock market loses two points’.

Calling for an ‘ecclesial renewal which cannot be deferred’, in this document Pope Francis is critical of the over-centralization of church bureaucracy, poor preaching, and excessive emphasis on doctrine. Additionally, it calls for more pastoral creativity and openness, and a ‘pastoral conversion’ in papal ministry.

In contrast to the writing style of previous popes, *Evangelii Gaudium* is not written in an academic style but ‘in language that is both easily understood and captivating’. In the 47,560 word document, Francis uses the
word ‘love’ 154 times, ‘joy’ 109 times, ‘the poor’ 91 times, ‘peace’ 58 times, ‘justice’ 37 times, and ‘common good’ 15 times (notes Wikipedia), something unheard of in normal academic documents. This indicates how pastoral minded the document and how joy, peace and love are central concerns to the document.

As such we need to reaffirm and rediscover the joy of being Christians. The Christian message and life is the remembering of the love God has for us, expressed in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. Unfortunately, we may forget it and interpret this experience differently. Holding on to the originary experience of the Christian community, we need to reaffirm our openness to the world and the joy of the Gospel. Precisely therein lies the hope for today’s Church and the world!
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본 논문은 특별히 교황 프란치스코의 인격과 가르침을 토대로 현 그리스도인의 삶에 있어 제2차 바타칸 공의회의 중요성에 초점을 두었다. 많은 사람들이 제2차 바타칸 공의회와 교회 안에서 입은 시간의 변화를 잊었지만, 사실은 당연한 것으로 여겨진다. 교회는 스스로 종으로서 인식하게 되었고 세상을 향해 개방하게 되었다. 그러나 과거의 몇 가지 일들이 남아있다. 이집트 탈출과 부활의 근원적 교훈을 소유한 교회가 어떻게 그 기본적인 메시지를 상실하게 되었는가? 오늘날 우리는 어떻게 복음의 기쁨을 재발견할 수 있었는가? 제2차 바타칸 공의회를 이해함에 있어 어떻게 우리는 일반적인 의미에서 교회의 진보적인 요소와 보수적인 요소를 서로 화해시킬 수 있을까?

이러한 질문들을 풀고, 우리는 먼저 기역, 용서, 치유에 대한 폴 릴레르의 공헌을 다시 고찰하고, 조직체로서의 가톨릭교회에 적용하려고 시도하였다. 이어서 공의회의 역사가인 로버트 블레이 카이저(Robert Blair Kaiser)의 입장에 근거해 공의회가 일으킨 중요한 변화들에 대해 고찰하였다. 또한, 바타칸 공의회가 어떻게 예수회 출신의 교황이 출현을 가능하게 했고 교황 사도교회인 『복음의 기쁨(Evangelii Gaudium)』을 반포하게 했는지 살펴보았다. 즉, 본 논문은 제2차 바타칸 공의회, 예수회 카리스마, 현 교황 프란치스코, 그의 사도적 권고인 복음의 기쁨을 역사적으로, 신학적으로 관찰하고자 하였다.

주제어: 로버트 블레이 카이저, 복음의 기쁨, 교황 프란치스코, 폴 릴레르, 기역, 역사, 망각, 예수회원 DNA, 아조르나멘토
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