

## What the 20th Century Papacy Tells Us about the Papacy of the Future

Russell Hittinger

Rome, Jan. 31, 1999

I have entitled this talk: “What the 20th Century Papacy Tells Us about the Papacy of the Future.” It will give us an opportunity this New Year’s Eve to look forward by looking backward.

So, let’s imagine ourselves pilgrims in Rome one hundred years ago, at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. We would have noticed that there was not much activity out here in the vicinity of the Castel Gandolfo. From 1870 until 1929 the popes refused to use the villa in protest against the Italian government’s seizure of papal properties. It would remain unused by the popes until 1934.

In Rome, however, we would find ourselves in a city full of pilgrims, for 1900 was a Holy Year. It was a greatly anticipated Jubilee. The Jubilee Years of 1800 and 1850 were cancelled altogether because of civil unrest and revolution, and the preceding Jubilee of 1875 was reduced in scope after Pius IX declared himself a “prisoner in the Vatican.” The pope in 1900, of course, was Leo XIII. Elected in 1878 — exactly a century before the election of John Paul II — Leo, too, considered himself a “prisoner in the Vatican.” During his 25 year pontificate, he never put foot outside Vatican property. (Which, perhaps, is why he had the time to write some 85 encyclicals).

At St. Peter’s, Pope Leo XIII began the Jubilee celebration by dedicating the entire human race to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. While expressing gladness at the piety of the pilgrims, he admitted that his pontificate had been “difficult and

full of anxiety.”<sup>1</sup> In an encyclical written for the occasion, the ninety year old pope said, “The world has heard enough about the so-called rights of man. Let it hear something of the rights of God.”

Leo recalled the Emperor Constantine’s victory, under the sign of the cross, at the Milvian Bridge in 312:

When the Church, in the days immediately succeeding her institution, was oppressed beneath the yoke of the Caesars, a young Emperor saw in the heavens a cross, which became at once the happy omen and cause of the glorious victory that soon followed. And now, today, behold another blessed and heavenly token is offered to our sight - the most Sacred Heart of Jesus, with a cross rising from it and shining forth with dazzling splendor amidst flames of love.<sup>2</sup>

Was Leo, a “prisoner in the Vatican,” hoping that the Lord would raise up another Constantine to deliver the papacy? Or, was he saying that the age of Constantine is over, and that the Church must rely upon the rule of Christ symbolized by the Sacred Heart? I am not sure we know the answer to this question.

Born in 1810, Leo had witnessed the most turbulent century of the papal office since the Avignon captivity of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. The century began with the death of Pius VI who died in captivity in France after being kidnapped by the French revolutionary armies. The French Directory declared him to be “the last Pope.” (CP1 482). His humiliation did not end in death. The local Constitutional clergy refused his body a Christian burial (D203); a Parisian newspaper boasted:

---

<sup>1</sup> Tametsi futura prospicientibus (Nov. 1, 1900), §2.

“The death of Pius VI has, as it were, placed a seal on the glory of philosophy in modern times.” (MS 212).

During his lifetime, Leo XIII had seen yet another a pope kidnapped, three archbishops of Paris murdered,<sup>3</sup> and half of the Prussian hierarchy imprisoned by Bismark for refusing to cooperate in state control over the Church. Priests, monks, and nuns, by the tens of thousands throughout Europe, were expelled from their countries. Just one year after the Jubilee, the French government would pass a law that closed 2500 Catholic schools.

The tenor of these times can be found in little facts. For example, St. Therese of Lisieux received the Carmelite habit in 1889 (she died just before the Jubilee). But her superior would not permit the traditional ceremony of cutting the novice’s hair, for the nuns had to be ready to flee, *incognito*, on a moment’s notice.” Just a few years earlier, at Solesmes, the Benedictines were dragged out of their choir stalls by civil authorities.

Above all, Leo was painfully aware that he was the first pope since the 8<sup>th</sup> century to inherit no papal lands. The last papal warship, the *Immaculate Conception*, anchored at Toulon in the south of France was sold for lack of a papal harbor. The pope not only lacked firepower, but had no effective political constituency in Italy. The 1868 papal decree *Non Expedit* forbade Italian Catholics from participating in parliamentary elections. In Rome, the new Italian

---

<sup>2</sup> Annum Sacrum (May 25, 1899), §12.

<sup>3</sup> In Paris, Denis-Auguste Affre, +Bp of Paris killed on the street baricade in late June 1848. In 1857 Marie Dominique Auguste Sibour assassinated over Immaculate Conception by an insane priest (Sibour a liberal of sorts, friend of Lacordaire). Georges Darboy who wore his predecessors pectoral cross and ring, executed by the Commune 24 May 1871, along with two Jesuits and three others.

government confiscated monastic and religious properties, deconsecrated the Coliseum, and made clergy subject to military conscription.

At his election in 1878, the civil authorities would not provide security, so he was unable to give the traditional *Urbi et Orbi* address from the balcony of St. Peter. (No *Urbi et Orbi* address would be given from the loggia of St. Peter's until 1922). In fact, the government let it be known that it would not guarantee security for his coronation in St. Peter's itself, so the ceremony had to be moved to the Sistine Chapel. (Incidentally, after his coronation, Leo abolished the Sistine Chapel's castrati choir, which I like to think was the beginning of the Thomistic revival). Three times (1881, 1889, 1891) he discussed with foreign ambassadors his need to take flight from Rome. One of those occasions was the funeral of Pius IX, whose funeral cortege was attacked by a mob wishing to throw the corpse into the Tiber. They managed to get the corpse into San Lorenzo's "outside the walls" (the burial place of St. Lawrence, who, by tradition, was said to have been roasted to death in the Roman Forum). But even in death, Pio Nono was a magnet for the disapproval of the gentiles: San Lorenzo was the only Roman church directly hit by bombs during WWII.

Since the French Revolution there have been 14 popes — if we factor out the very brief pontificate of John Paul I, we have 13. Very few of them were secure from physical threat. Pius VI and Pius VII were kidnapped; Pius VIII was imprisoned for 6 years as a bishop before being elected pope; Gregory XVI made plans to flee to Venice after the 1831 revolution; Pius IX fled Rome for several months after the 1848 revolution; as I mentioned, Leo XIII three times planned

escape from Rome;<sup>4</sup> and as we learned after WWII, the Germans engineered a plot to kidnap Pius XII in 1943.

This evening we will celebrate with Pope John Paul II an unprecedented period of prosperity and prestige for the Catholic Church and the See of St. Peter. The *Te Deum* can be sung tonight with unusual conviction and gratitude. For the first time, not just in modern times, but for more than a millennium, the Church will enter a new century not only at peace with the nations, but more importantly with its freedom intact. And it all came to pass without another Constantine.

Permit me to say a few words about the liberty of the Church at the close of the millennium, before I conclude with a thought or two on Leo XIII's remark to the pilgrims here in Rome a century ago about the rights of man.

Over the years our seminars have consisted largely of Poles and Americans. That's obvious enough. But perhaps it is not quite so obvious that Poland and America, for quite different reasons, are historical exceptions to the rule of church-state relations that prevailed elsewhere over the past millennium.

The United States government never established a church. In 1783, the Apostolic Nuncio in France asked the Second Continental Congress for permission to establish a Vicar apostolate and to reorganize dioceses in America. Congress wrote back a letter basically saying, thanks for asking, but we have no jurisdiction over such matters. From the very outset, the Church could be about its mission without asking leave of the state.

---

<sup>4</sup> In 1881 at funeral of Pius IX; controversy over Giordano Brunos statute in 1889; and French pilgrimage of 1891.

In Poland, after King Boleslaw the Bold murdered St. Stanislaw in 1079, the Polish Church could trace itself back to a confessor-bishop. Kings were required to do ritual penance at that site following their coronation. The liberty and even the superiority of the Church stands at the very beginning of your national consciousness. Such was not true everywhere else in Christendom, where the Church more often than not was a feudal vassal.

And as the Poles understand all too well, modern states had no intention of doing ritual penance in honor of a martyred bishop. After the partitions of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, Russia, Austria, and Prussia imposed upon the Polish Church regalistic doctrines alien to Poland. The old claims of kings in Christendom had been revamped to express the power of the modern state. The state claimed *potestas jurisdictionis* (power to legislate), *potestas ordinis* (guardian of order), *potestas docendi* (arbiter of knowledge).

My point, though, is that these doctrines were not alien to the rest of Europe.

At the time of the partitions, Joseph II of Austria issued some 600 edicts regulating religion in the Empire. The Czar treated the Polish Church the way he treated his own Church, as personal property. For its part, Prussia didn't hesitate to assert the superiority of state over church. In 1838 the Archbishop of Posen was thrown in jail for ordering his clergy to conform to laws of the church rather than the state. During *Kulturkampf*, under Bismark, things would only get worse for the liberty of the Church in Prussia and in western Poland. How could there be recourse to the "rights of man," when Bismark believed that his minister of cults was "doing the work of Bethlehem"?

We should never lose sight of the fact that democratic revolutions did not bring religious liberty, but rather gave to Europe refurbished doctrines and policies of state supremacy. In Italy it went by the name of Riccism, in Germany Febronianism, in France Gallicanism, in England Anglicanism. Toleration usually was a euphemism for state control of the Church. The Austrian Toleration Edict of 1781, for example, asserted Imperial control of the Church and suppression of contemplative orders. The new Piedmontese Republic in Italy asserted the principle of “a free church in a free state,” but the government immediately moved in 1855 to confiscate the property of monasteries. With the exception of Belgium, the example was repeated everywhere. In fact, the Vatican thought it had won a great diplomatic victory in 1855 when it persuaded Austria to allow the pope to freely send written communications to the bishops in the Austrian Empire. As late as the papal conclave of 1903, three states asserted the right to veto papal elections. Indeed, at that conclave, Franz Josef of Austria, via Cardinal Puzyna, Bishop of Krakow, exercised the veto to prevent the election of Cardinal Rampolla.

Imagine ... the Church entered this century vetoed in its most solemn political act! The 1903 conclave elected Pius X, who immediately threatened excommunication of anyone in the future who would try to veto the proceedings of a papal conclave. Well into this century, however, states continued to insist upon ancient rights of the *placet* and *exequator* regarding the nomination or approval of bishops.<sup>5</sup> As George Weigel points out in his biography of John Paul

---

<sup>5</sup> Placet = it pleases us; exequator = let it be done; State order to publish or requiring obedience to church acts: publish and insist on bull, brief, encyclical.

II, the Communists claimed similar rights. When the Archbishop of Krakow died in 1962, the Polish government vetoed seven candidates before agreeing to Wojtyla — and they got just what they deserved.

The Second Vatican Council put an end to this meddling. Its decree on bishops, *Christus Dominus* (28 Oct. 1965) asserted: “Since the apostolic office of bishops was instituted by Christ the Lord and pursues a spiritual and supernatural purpose, this sacred ecumenical synod declares that the right of nominating and appointing bishops belongs properly, peculiarly, and per se exclusively to the competent ecclesiastical authority.” (§20)<sup>6</sup> The Church’s liberation from Caesar was made complete in the 1983 Code of Canon Law. Buried deep within that tome we find Canon 377§5, which asserts: “For the future, no rights or privileges of election, appointment, presentation or designation of Bishops are conceded to civil authorities.”

By looking backward, then, we see that one of the biggest stories of the century — and since we are permitted to exaggerate, but only slightly, one of the biggest stories of the past millennium — is that the Church is free. It is an unprecedented chapter in the history of the Church.

I have emphasized this part of the story because, as children of modernity, it is easy to for us imagine the march of liberty exclusively through the lens of individual rights. Here, though, we must appreciate the *liberty of an institution*, one that was won only through the most difficult trials. We are able to be here

---

<sup>6</sup> Then, rather politely, the Council addressed civil authorities, who “are most kindly requested voluntarily to renounce the above-mentioned rights and privileges which they presently enjoy by reason of a treaty or custom, after discussing the matter with the Apostolic See.”

today because of our civil rights — rights to travel, to obtain a passport, and a right to worship according to what we understand to be the truth about God. We should be grateful that modern governments have guaranteed protection of these civil rights. But we are here as Catholics, rather than as members of a multitude of national churches, because the Church fought for its liberty and unity.

This liberty was won, in large part, by the pre-Vatican II Church. Catholics of my generation sometimes are embarrassed by the thought of how long it took the popes to appreciate modern liberty. It took modern states a long time, too, to appreciate modern liberty. I think it is fair to say that, in 1900, the states wanted to be churches far more than the Church wanted to be a state. For all their intransigence against modernity, the pre-Vatican II popes refused to hand over the Church, piece by piece, to the modern states. When the Second Federal Law of the Prussian *Kulterkampf* closed Catholic educational institutions, Pius IX wrote a letter to Willhelm I, dated 7 August 1873. “Everyone who has been baptized,” Pius, asserted “belongs in some way to the pope.”

And we shouldn’t overlook the importance of Vatican Council I. By declaring first that the pope’s authority was derived from Christ rather than from an ecclesiastical plebiscite, and second that he was given an episcopal authority over the whole Church, the Council preserved the unity of the Church just one generation before Europe committed suicide in the trenches of Verdun.

Today we are accustomed to the idea that the papacy has an international mission of unity and of teaching. The papacy no longer rules the gentiles; it teaches them. In his mind’s eye, Leo XIII understood that this would be the future course of the papacy. A century later — as it turned out, exactly a century

after Leo's election, Pope John Paul II began to accomplish what Leo could only see from afar. It is a century that began with the sale of the last papal battleship, the *Immaculate Conception*, and ends with *Shepherd One*. The pope as a "prisoner in the Vatican" to a pope, who, as George Weigel suggests as the beginning of Witness to Hope, is "the most visible man in history."

My point is that this remarkable flowering of the papal *missio docendi* depended upon the Church deciding, once and for all, in 1870, not to take the episcopalian turn. Vatican II rightly re-emphasized the idea of episcopal collegiality; but again, that was possible only because the bishops at Vatican I refused to purchase their local liberties at the expense of unity with the See of Peter.<sup>7</sup> The temptation to do so was great. Almost all of the European governments adopted the policy of divide-and-conquer. Threatening their local bishops with reprisals, including cancellation of concordats, the ruling powers made it clear that if the bishops chose unity with Rome they would lose unity with their flocks.

The British were by far the most cunning.<sup>8</sup> Foreign Secretary Clarendon, along with the British envoy in Rome, Lord Russell, secretly encouraged the vote for Roman jurisdiction, so convinced were they that the result would lead to ridicule and schism.<sup>9</sup> When the bishops and the Catholic people rallied to Pastor aeternus, the House of Commons was so surprised and appalled that one

---

<sup>7</sup> Imagine, too, what would have happened after Vatican II. We would have had as many versions of Catholicism as there were national churches.

<sup>8</sup> It was not Lord Acton's finest moment. As Chadwick reports, it was believed that Acton could use his friendship with the British Prime Minister Gladstone to persuade the French to pull their troops out of Rome, creating anarchy, and thus ending the Council. Chadwick, A History of the Popes, 1830-1914 (1998), 202.

member of that august body proposed a white paper on the noxious social effects (in England) of the doctrine of transubstantiation.<sup>10</sup> The Austrian government promptly cancelled their concordat with Rome, claiming that the papacy after 19 July 1870 was not the same government with which they had negotiated. In Prussia immediately after the Council, the bishops suffered persecution that approximated what the Polish Church had to endure under the Communists.

This brings me back to Leo XIII's grumpy remark on the occasion of the Jubilee of 1900: "The world has heard enough about the so-called rights of man. Let it hear something of the rights of God." The main issue of that time was the liberty of the Church, including liberty in such seemingly little things as the ability to send written communications across national boundaries without asking leave of the State.

But that issue is settled. For the first time since Constantine, at least in the West, the two powers are free. Between the two, there is no zero-sum game on the issue of liberty.

In the waning decades of our century, a new problem has come into view. We might call it the problem of disillusioned sovereignty.

Last October, at the conclusion of the Synod of European bishops, Archbishop Franc Rode of Slovenia made an interesting observation. Not so long ago, he said, the Church had to face ideological systems which proclaimed the

---

<sup>9</sup> Chadwick, 194.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. 265f.

sovereignty of man. Today, however, “**nothing reigns**... [it is] a void to which the Church responds with the new evangelization.”<sup>11</sup>

By saying that “nothing reigns,” the Slovenian bishop put his finger on the problem. Modern man asserted that, in human things, man should reign. The crown jewels of the new City of Man were twofold: first, that individuals should govern themselves; second, that they should govern each other on the basis of constitutional democracy.

Throughout the modern age, the Church countered assertion that man must reign with “**Yes...but.**” In fact, in the 1900 Holy Year encyclical Leo XIII wrote: “Man may indeed be king [*imperat quidem homo*] ...but only on condition that he...diligently seek his rule of life in God’s law.”<sup>12</sup> What men heard, however, was: “**Yes...but...the Church must rule.**”

But as modernity passes into post-modernity, it is not the Church but the City of Man that is in question. With respect to individual autonomy, men today are quite unsure whether it amounts to anything — not just in the moral sense of the term, but even at the psychological level. With regard to the second crown jewel, the modern state, we see states ceding authority to markets in which no one reigns. For lack of a better term, I call it *disillusioned sovereignty*.

As John Paul II constantly reminds us, the problem is one of anthropology. Man in our time takes flight from his modern liberties to rule himself and to democratically rule others because he takes flight from himself. Unlike

---

<sup>11</sup> CHURCH RESPONDS TO EUROPE'S CONSUMER VOID WITH GOSPEL ...  
Cardinals and Bishops Comment on Synod's Final Message. VATICAN CITY, OCT 24  
(ZENIT) ZE99102207

revolutionaries of the old days, the “hidden man” abstains from setting forth a human agenda. He is not sure that there is a *humanum* that bears the rights of self-rule.

To the question *quid sit homo*, “What is man?”

The late-moderns answer in a tautology: Man is he who has rights.

What, then, are these rights by which we can know who man is?

Answer: whatever the claimant asserts.

So, it seems that we can conclude that  $X = X$ . Answer: Yes; that is precisely what it means to be the bearer of rights.

Thus, the tautology of the “hidden man.”<sup>13</sup> What are you? From the burning bush of late modernity, he says  $X = X$ . What’s that? Silence. He is, shall we say, a kind of de-frocked Meister Eckhart.

The modern anthropological turn kept turning: first, into anthropocentrism, and then to an emptying-out of the *anthropos*. The abortion right summarizes the second turn: An indefinable bearer of rights has a license to kill or to accept an indefinable piece of flesh.  $X = X$ . Everyone here is familiar with the famous effort by the American Supreme Court to define this right. “At the heart of liberty is the right to define one’s own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life. Beliefs about these matters could not define the attributes of personhood were they formed under compulsion of the State.”  $X = X$ .

---

<sup>12</sup> *Tametsi futura prospicientibus* (On Jesus Christ the Redeemer). Nov. 1, 1900. §7.

And this is why it will do no good today to speak, as did Leo a century ago, so critically of the rights of man. There is no point in trying to negate an empty tautology. In 1864 Pius IX published the infamous Syllabus of Errors, condemning some 80 propositions. More than half of the erroneous propositions concerned neo-regalist doctrines that the State is superior to the Church. In the West today, we would be hard pressed to find anyone who would defend the idea that the State has *any* competence in *any* matters touching upon religion.

Several other propositions concern the superiority of reason to revelation. For example: “reason is the ultimate standard by which man can and ought to arrive at knowledge of all truths of every kind.” (#4) This proposition, which seemed impudent at the time, assumes not only that reason is a standard, and that there is an ultimate standard, but also that human reason is likely to arrive at truth. Consider one more proposition condemned in 1864: “[that] human reason...by its natural strength and principles, [can] attain to the true science of even the most abstruse dogmas, provided only that such dogmas be proposed to reason itself as its object.” (#9). Imagine the kind of work we would have to do today to bring someone up to the level of being capable of assenting to this erroneous proposition!

My intention, of course, is not to mock the Syllabus of Errors. Once upon a time, these propositions were, as William James might have put it, “live options” of belief and anti-belief. They represented a civilizational battle over who shall rule. Modern man was confident that he had posed the right question and that he knew the right answer. The mastery of State over Church, and the

---

<sup>13</sup> Pierre Manent, The City of Man (Princeton: 1998), 135.

mastery of reason over revelation, seemed to stand or fall together. Today, neither are left standing.

From one point of view, John Paul's pontificate brings the modern papacy to a fitting conclusion. The collapse of the "Evil Empire" in 1989 brings the post-1789 political monster to an end. But from another point of view, his pontificate is the beginning of something new.<sup>14</sup>

Spin the reel of history ahead to the papal encyclical Fides et Ratio (1998). John Paul includes a little syllabus of errors. He mentions eclecticism, scientism, and pragmatism. The next one marks the *novum*:

... the currents of thought which claim to be postmodern merit appropriate attention. According to some of them, the time of certainties is irrevocably past, and the human being must now learn to live in a horizon of total absence of meaning, where everything is provisional and ephemeral... This nihilism has been justified in a sense by the terrible experience of evil which has marked our age. Such a dramatic experience has ensured the collapse of rationalist optimism, which viewed history as the triumphant progress of reason, the source of all happiness and freedom; and now, at the end of this century, one of our greatest threats is the temptation to despair. §91

In the encyclical Redemptoris missio (1990) the pope discusses what this *novum* might mean for the mission of the Church.

---

<sup>14</sup> We can believe that divine providence gives us the kind of popes we need. For the age of the Garibaldi's and Bismark's, we got Pius IX and Leo XIII. For the age of the "hidden man" we got John Paul II. Thus making good on St. Augustine's words: "For on whatever place one has fallen, on that place he must find support that he may rise again De vera religione, XXIV.

But what moves me even more strongly to proclaim the urgency of missionary evangelization is the fact that it is the primary service which the Church can render to every individual and to all humanity in the modern world, a world which has experienced marvelous achievements but which seems to have lost its sense of ultimate realities and of existence itself. “Christ the Redeemer,” I wrote in my first encyclical, “fully reveals man to himself...”

“God is opening before the Church,” he concludes, “the horizons of a humanity more fully prepared for the sowing of the Gospel.”

How can he say that God is showing us a “humanity *more* fully prepared for the sowing of the Gospel”?

Perhaps what the pope is trying to help us to see is that, in the twilight of modernity, in which, as the Slovenian bishop said, *nothing reigns*, mankind has an unexpected propinquity to a great treasure: His royalty and dignity hidden in the mystery of Christ.<sup>15</sup>

Modern man first took flight from God, and then from himself; finally, it was not clear that anyone should rule. Not as a *person* would rule. Once upon a time the nations raged, “We have no king but Caesar.” But the rule of Caesar was the rule of a person. The Church has seen the Caesars come and go — ancient emperors, tribal chieftans, Christian princes, absolute monarchs, revolutionary leaders and prophets, even the democratic rule of *vox populi vox dei*

---

<sup>15</sup> As the French philosopher, Pierre Manent, points out, the tables are turned. Whereas in early modernity the Church enjoyed political authority but dialectical disadvantage against the questions of the *philosophes*, the Church today has no political rule but dialectical advantage. For the Church not only has an answer, but still knows how to ask the question: *quid sit homo?* Pierre Manent, “Christianity and Democracy,” Modern Liberty and its Discontents (Rowan and Littlefield: 1998), 115.

— but in every case it was a reign of a human person or persons.<sup>16</sup> Today, the nations rage: “We have no rule but genetic imperatives at the physical level, and market forces for society.”

This is the world in which the Gospel is sown today. The mission *ad gentes*, at the turn of the millennium, is to raise up the “hidden man” who has taken flight from himself, and who sees no possibility that either God or Man should reign.<sup>17</sup> Pascal wrote: “Outside Jesus Christ we do not know what is our life, or our death — God or ourselves.”<sup>18</sup> Pascal’s little epigram conveys an ancient truth — without the revelation of the God-Man, humanity is genuinely ambivalent whether man is made for man or made for God. In post-modernity men are disillusioned with either option. Compared to a century ago, there is a quiet at the center.

In that quiet, we might hear the Introit for the Sunday after Epiphany: *In excelso throno vidi sedere virum...* “Upon the highest throne I saw a Man sitting...”

---

<sup>16</sup> Moreover, human rule in the temporal city was always regarded as a kind of divine vicariate. The modern states were slow to abandon this idea. See David Nicholls, *Deity and Domination: Images of God and the State in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Routledge: 1989). In the West, the papacy is the last vicariate.

<sup>17</sup> The journey of believers towards the Third Millennium is in no way weighed down by the weariness which the burden of two thousand years of history could bring with it. Rather, Christians feel invigorated, in the knowledge that they bring to the world the true light, Christ the Lord. Proclaiming Jesus of Nazareth, true God and perfect Man, the Church opens to all people the prospect of being “divinized” and thus of becoming more human.” *Incarnationis Mysterium*. Bull of Indiction for the Holy Year. 29 November 1998. §2. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et spes*, 41.

<sup>18</sup> John Paul II, Address to the Italian Military, OR March 12, 1979. Quoting *Pensées*, 417. See, Weigel 273.