

# The Religious Sense and Faith

Luigi Giussani

## Introduction

**Giussani:** Has Coki ever spoken to you about personal responsibility?

*Yes, often.*

**Giussani:** But does the method, the practical method by which the house lives foster this personal responsibility or not? Who knows! Let's go on.

*Today we are doing "The 'Power' of the Layperson, that is, the Christian": it's beautiful!*

## The Equivocation<sup>a</sup> between Faith and Religious Sense

*Questioner: I would like to ask a question about the relationship between faith and the religious sense. When you were asked: "But doesn't your pedagogical proposal use man's religious sense as a lever" you replied: "The core of our proposal is more the announcing of an event that happened, that took men by surprise in the same way that, 2,000 years ago, the news heralded by the angels in Bethlehem took the poor shepherds by surprise. An event that happens independently of any other consideration to the religious and non-religious man"<sup>1</sup>. And further on to the question of what is "the educational itinerary proposed to those who encounter your movement", you replied: "First of all - let's say it again - the grace of an encounter... Secondly, the stirring of the experience of identity, of correspondence between the content of this encounter and the religious sense"<sup>2</sup>. I wanted to ask if the religious sense is reinforced by the encounter, though we have always said that what defends you from power lies in the religious sense, that we should safeguard the religious sense.*

**Giussani:** You are mixing up two problems. First of all, you have focused on the most important point of the interview because all the dramatic dialectics at the level of religious sense, or of religious experience in the modern world rest on this very fact: since every man is governed by the heart, which is to say the religious sense, many things might happen, so many things might be intuited and there might be so many constructions, and they are all good - as the second School of Community book says<sup>3</sup> - because the religious sense is the value of a man. The religious sense is in all men but every man, every human being develops his own consciousness of this religious sentiment according to his temperament, according to his background, according to his character, according to the circumstances that befall him. So many fables may be construed about the religious sentiment but they are not so different that the value ultimately inherent in all these fables is taken away, which is the religious sense proper. In all these fables the value of religious sentiment is affirmed.

Ecumenism as it is understood today entirely rests on this point, even in the pseudo-Catholic translations pervasively given by so many theologians of the Second Vatican Council and, above all, the theology after the Council. In the "Catholic version" this - how should I put it? - pantheon of fables

---

<sup>a</sup> Fr. Giussani. is using the word in the following sense: "To resemble so closely as to occasion mistake." - which is a meaning of equivocate that is rarely used today.

construed about religious sentiment – remember the plain and all the people building the bridge?<sup>4</sup> – this pantheon of constructions on top of religious sentiment also implies the event of Christ at a certain point or, better, Christ's self-revealing. This was even the interpretation given of "Christ, Centre of the Cosmos and of History": Christ, if he is the center of the cosmos and of history, is inside everything and so, it was said, everything is beneficial, all is good because Christ is inside everywhere and all the positions that man assumes are good, because Christ is inside everywhere. Thus with this false interpretation was confirmed the babble of all the fables that went before: this is the typical position that Karl Rahner proposed with his equivocal interpretation, the generator of all the post-Conciliar equivocations. Cardinal König, who seems to have changed his mind recently<sup>5</sup>, inaugurated the Second Vatican II with a "Christocentric" discourse, that is, Christ the center of the cosmos and of history, but "fallaciously" center: center in the sense of identification of the content of the religious sense with God made flesh. An identification so that God made flesh, if he is identified with the religious sense, is inside every man and all his expressions.

The question was: "Do you ground your educating in religious sentiment?" If I were to ground my educating in religious sentiment, I would be able to develop my educational fable in any way, I would be able to give it any form, and all of it would be Christian. Any form at all, even the most contradictory, would be Christian because all expressions of the religious sense are good or, better, they are Christian: all religions are Christian!

That's a little hard to grasp, isn't it?

*Questioner: No, it's clear.*

*Questioner: Not for me. I haven't understood it very well.*

## **Starting from the encounter, not from the Religious Sense**

**Giussani:** The question I was asked in the interview is: "In educating, do you start off from the religious sense?" I said: "No". Why not? (And yet we did start from the religious sense in the first book<sup>6</sup>. I would even say that if we had any characteristic at all it was to have entered into contemporary culture - which is also Christian and also Catholic - with our discourse on the religious sense. I'll tell you later how you have superimposed two problems).

I don't start from the religious sense because if I did start from the religious sense I would have to admit that the constructions made on top of the religious sense would all be good, all of them authentic. If then the news, true or fabled, that God became flesh - he was born, became a man, born of a woman's womb and is the center of the cosmos and of history and is therefore inside every human heart - were to enter into the world in some way, then this Christ would coincide with the religious sense: this religious sense, this general religious sense inside all men coincides with Jesus Christ, is called Jesus Christ. And so everything that is construed taking its point from Christ - all gnosticism, the so-called gnosticism is founded on this, is it not? - would then a true thing, good, just because the religious sense is always good, original by man's very nature. The religious sense is always good and all that is constructed on top of it is all good; different, but good. If this religious sense is Christ, whatever expression man gives to his religious sentiment is Christian. It is the elimination proper of Christ as historic fact, unrepeatable and incomparable, without precedent, with no possibility of antecedents, not the consequence of factors that went before, as the text of "Il cammino"<sup>7</sup> (On the Way) says.

## **Christ as historical fact...**

But we construct our education on the following precise point: in saying that the religious sense would be fragile - nor can it even be seen, and it is totally dark, it is totally shrouded in mist, and it is a great mixture: the result is a babble of constructions, it is expressed in a great cloud of dust - if God, the Mystery, had not become a man and in that great square of the world<sup>8</sup> he had not cried: "I am the way to destiny because I am destiny", if this man had not come and had not claimed to identify - this man who ate, drank, slept, stayed awake and was killed and rose again - with the divine, with the destiny of man, with the true object of the religious sense.

## **... reveals and clarifies the Religious Sense**

The object of the religious sense is ultimately the unfathomable Mystery; therefore, it is understandable that man ponders this in such a way that he has a thousand thoughts about it. But there is only one truth. It's just that it is beyond the reach of man. So the Mystery became a human fact, became a man, a man who had legs and walked, who had a mouth and ate, who had eyes and wept, who died: this is the true object of the religious sense. So, in discovering this fact of Christ the religious sense is also revealed to me, clarified for me in a spectacular way.

Why was it that it was us who turned out the book on the religious sense and why couldn't a Protestant have done it or a Buddhist? Why? Because we encountered Jesus and, in contemplating Him and sensing Him, we understood what was inside us: "Whoever knows You, knows himself", Saint Augustine used to say<sup>9</sup>.

First answer. Now for the second. You say to me: "Why start by denying the religious sense as the first thing when our whole education came to be on the strength of the religious sense?". Why, in order to come to know the religious sense and to develop the religious sense did we have to encounter someone: in the absence of this teacher we would not have understood each other. Therefore I can say to Christ: "You really are me". "You are me", is what I really can say to him because, in sensing Him I understood myself. Whereas, whoever tries to understand himself by reflecting on himself gets lost in a maze of trails, in a maze of notions, in a maze of images.

But if someone says: "So Christ is everything in all things", the answer to him is the one you give on page 41<sup>10</sup>, when you say that the power of the Risen One is manifest according to the Father's plans and, for now, we are called to foresee that moment when we pray "Come, Lord Jesus".

"Christ everything in all things"<sup>11</sup> is a way of indicating the variety of means by which the mystery of the Father lets man come to know who Christ is. Many will know Him at the end, they will have to wait until the end. And it cannot be taken for granted that more know Him today than in the past. Remember how Solov'ëv describes the end of the world: the Anti-Christ is about to kill the last Christians, but Christ runs ahead and defeats him<sup>12</sup>. That's the very point of difference between us and the theology dominant today.

In short, Zaccheus might well have been an inveterate atheist, a cynic. He climbed up into the tree to see him out of curiosity. When he heard say "Zaccheus"<sup>13</sup>, he heard the name "Zaccheus" called in such a way that he "crumpled". At that point he began to understand who he himself really was, understand? It's an encounter.

It's also true that the Christian encounter brings to the surface what should be the primary truth about the world. The first encounter, in itself, should be the world: if you were to have been born with the awareness of a 20-year-old, the wonder of this reality would be the encounter with being. Annamaria, did you read the paragon<sup>14</sup>? Imagine emerging from your mother's womb with the awareness of a 20-year-old: as soon as you open your eyes, you are amazed by what is called being,

reality. This is an encounter, the first encounter. Everyone lives without the wonder of this first encounter, as if it were something obvious; and so they enjoy nature less, they enjoy time less and space, they enjoy reality less.

*Questioner: I have a question on what you were saying last week. Remember when you said that the companionship must be created by the "I" and that it's not primarily the place of the relationship between me and Christ...<sup>15</sup>? It's not all that pertinent but it is tied in with something you are saying here.*

**Giussani:** Given that there are so many things that are pertinent, let's not introduce the less pertinent things, don't you agree? Otherwise, someone else might say to me: "Excuse me but that fig branch there has a hump on top: where does Jesus come in with that top hump?!". Let's go on.

*Questioner: I wanted to ask something. At our retreat, you said that in many cases vocation for us was still not a new way to relate with reality, meaning, it is still not being involved in all that is human in Christ<sup>16</sup>. This came to mind when in the interview to the question "What do you think has given rise to the insistence on a power that demands the 'democratization' of the Church ...?" you replied: "The fact, to my mind, of having lost and mislaid on a global scale the newness of the Christian event"<sup>17</sup>. Does the fact of having lost the newness of the event have anything to do with not living our utmost vocation I wondered?*

**Giussani:** Certainly. Anyone who sets out to judge the Christian experience in terms of the scope of power it gives - in one way or another: ecclesiastic or political, above and below, no matter how - who sets out by appraising the Christian fact in terms of the power it gives, has consideration for power not the Christian fact. Power is the consideration there. So he would be better off joining the parliametary majority, or De Gaulle, or England's Masonic Lodges: the perfidious Albion ... (sorry, Mandy!).

*Questioner: I was born in America!*

**Giussani:** Well! Mandy, you're the exact opposite of perfidious! Power is their consideration and not the Christian fact whereas the Christian fact is revealed in its fullness and in its truth in the precise thing we call vocation. In the vocation the Christian fact demonstrates its power, the power it has over the world: the power it has over the world is that of revealing Christ, of bearing witness to Christ. The greatest force there is in the world is to anticipate the end of the world, don't you agree? The end of the world and the total unveiling of the glory of Christ. Living the glory of Christ in the here and now, unveiling the glory of Christ in the here and now, bearing witness to Christ now: this is the power we have over the time of now, this is the force of now, this is the greatness of now.

But it is remarkable that 40 years after the foundation of our Movement ... I used these same words, mind, in my first weeks of teaching. Indeed, when I was in the university I taught the first lesson every year in these terms. I used to say: "The most important thing in man is the religious sense because it is reason; it is on the basis of this that man judges all things and through this he may become master of all things. But why is it that I call "religious sense" reason? For reasons I will now explain. How come I was able to grasp these things? I explain the religious sense to you as I see it, and I see it as Christ made me see it. Therefore, if I had not first encountered Christ, I would not teach these things". So the important thing on which to build, on which we are built is not the religious sense but the encounter with Christ. All of today's ecumenism, that rests its case on the fact that all religious are similar, that all religious expressions are equivalents, that all the affirmations of the human heart have the same value has simply

forgotten that God was born a child, was born a man and that it is by following this man that we understand what the heart is, what the religious sense is, what reason is, what destiny is, what everything is.

But the remarkable thing is that, after 40 years, even some of the leaders of our groups don't understand these things. They are so far from understanding them that in having to govern or order the mass of people constituting the community, they ordain according to their own thinking and, above all, according to their sentiments and above all according to their preferences in the basest sense of the word; and so they unnerve and undo the energy that was spent at such cost by those who went before them five years ago, ten years ago (those who bore the brunt of them!)<sup>18</sup>. We have to be implacable with these people, with whomever replaces the project they say they encountered, the Christian project in whose name they act, with a project of their own. We have to be intransigent, not letting any equivocation pass.

*Questioner: I was very happy this week to read the interview: every day I thought of what you say at the beginning: "What is Christianity if not the advent of a new man who by his very nature becomes a new protagonist on the world scene?"<sup>19</sup>. It's as if I had understood for the first time that the only thing that counts in my life is that I be this new man.*

**Giussani:** Of course.

### **To bear witness to Christ.**

The only value in life is to be this protagonist, is to become this protagonist, being protagonists of the new world, meaning, being protagonists of a world where God is recognized to have become a man and who, if we follow Him, saves us. Where it is understood who the man is, that more distance can be run and that, if we go wrong, we are forgiven (which are three great things!).

*Questioner: I also wanted to ask you what will sustain me in my asking?*

**Giussani:** Certainly not going for meals with leaders of the Movement or organizing great dinners like they used to do and still do! It's a rebellion, almost, against formality, a rebellion against being formal that we need; we can't afford it. Three things are indispensable for avoiding being formal in response to the call to be protagonists in the world: first, that God became flesh; second, that to affirm, to liberate man – to liberate man: to make him capable of true knowledge and love, to make him true man (true!) – He died, died on the cross (the sacrifice, the nail); thirdly, that he rose again. He did not rise again in the afterlife, he rose again in this life; therefore, the resurrection changes one's way of seeing and experiencing, the way of the human experience so that it is happier. In this adventure of man as creature, the resurrection of Christ is evidenced in a body which makes him present in a visible, useable way. And the gladness - as one of the answers to the 74th question in *Litterae Communionis*<sup>20</sup> said – is the foretaste of happiness.

But I haven't answered you. Sorry, what was the question?

*Questioner: I asked what will sustain me so that I may understand that the advent of a new man does not depend on my own capacity.*

## **Christ's Companionship in your Life**

**Giussani:** That is a capital observation: the primary characteristic of the new man is that it becomes evident to him that he does nothing on his own, it is not him who empowers himself, not him who has the courage, not him who has the energy, not him who has the clear head: all of this is given to him. How is it given to him? By the companion close to him sharing his road.

This companion sharing the road is the same one whom John and Andrew<sup>21</sup> contemplated and who becomes clear throughout the passage of time - because he is with us until the end of the centuries<sup>22</sup> - in the companionship of others who recognize him as I do, to whom he makes himself recognizable as he made himself recognizable to me. Therefore, this companion becomes companionship.

And this, Cecca, is not in contradiction of what we were saying last time. For this companionship really does spread the presence of Christ as companion of your life, think of all the overcoming you have to do within yourself of the things that happen to you in the immediate term, of the things you see. The things you see are faces, more ephemeral and impotent than yours, maybe, irritating: you can't trust them or you can trust them only to a point! But think of all the energy you need to produce, meaning, the type of faith you need to adhere to the fact that these people from familiar addresses are people who are close to you not because they chose you, not because you are from the same familiar address but because you represent, that is, you are the sign, you are the sign and symbol of that person who is accompanying you and who assumes the form of these your companions. Think of the effort you have to make to translate this companionship into sign of Christ!

And this is a responsibility which cannot be borne by anyone else: there might be only one of you here who recognizes this while the others do not and for this one person you all represent, truly, remember, you are the presence of Christ; not for the others, no. Because you recognize him in these people does not mean that they all recognize him. Indeed, let me ask you: does anyone recognize him? You need more inner strength to recognize him.

When I went into the first class at the Berchet high school, none of those people there supposed that anyone sitting at the desks around them might have been the sign of Christ's real presence. Christ was present, he was present to Pigi<sup>23</sup> who was there at the second desk in that class and who is still in Brazil. Christ was present to him through me and all his companions: it was the last thing he was thinking of. Then at the end of the year, one, two, three, four began to see. To see? They began to see!

## **The Eye of the Faith**

But if the whole group had been made up of people who were conscious of this...To be conscious of this, it is not necessary to suspend life's other activities, replacing them with this thought. Rather, this thought is the way to live all life's relationships. "Christ everything in all things": Not that your hair now has to disappear, or your nose, your teeth, your ears and your eyes. None of this must disappear. "Christ everything in all things" is a meaning, a value of the reality of the next person which the strength of your faith sees: it's as if you were to pass through the person and discover what was sustaining everything.

Therefore, to respond definitively to Cristina's question: we must ask to be sustained. For thousands of years people have been asking this: the Jews are the only nation in the world who, for thousands of years, asked the Mystery to make the promise come true and, when the promise happened, they didn't realize it. Do you see? You have to ask for it. Today Anna - there has never been a time that she hasn't shared an exceptional thought with me, never - told me what we are saying now in a more drastic, much shorter way: "The boundary locks us out [this could only be Teresa], while the eye penetrates it and sees beyond [Teresa is not a pretext for something different, but the truth of Teresa is something different]". So one can see how come a person is so inspiring and attractive; and one can see the origin

of the attraction, the origin of the security, the security of confidence. The origin lies "beyond": it is the eye that sees, the eye of the faith, *les yeux de la foi*<sup>24</sup>. But this penetration must be paid by the cross, by the nail.

*Questioner: Why do you say "nail", today?*

**Giussani:** Nail!

*Questioner: Do you like it?*

**Giussani:** Like it? It's a question of nails, is it not?

*Questioner: Yes.*

**Giussani:** The word renunciation is equivocal, nail is not: nail regards a fact, renunciation is a theory. So you don't lose...: the fantastic thing is that you find - in the end - not only that you have lost nothing but that the thing has become bigger, greater.

If you lived as other girls do in a normal apartment, think how very inhibiting your way of looking, your way of feeling would be. I am complaining when I speak about the absence of responsibility because this way of seeing, of feeling is less than it should be.

But it is a promise that we are following, not a chastisement. Both promise and chastisement imply that something is lacking: promise means that something is missing, chastisement means that...something is cut off, something has been removed.

Only that promise is mercy and chastisement destruction. In promise, one is "heading towards" something, meaning, it is a certainty that makes one increasingly happy; in chastisement we are increasingly benumbed until the last blow, the knock-out, hurls us to the ground.

*Questioner: May I ask a question about this?*

**Giussani:** About the knock-out?!

*Questioner: No, about the sacrifice.*

**Giussani:** Yes.

### **God is the mystery of the "more"**

*Questioner: Today I told someone: "Maybe in your relationship with that person you should make a sacrifice". She answered: "But I hate the thought of making that sacrifice". You were saying just now how inhibiting it would be because of my temperament and my nature to adapt to a way of living unsuitable for me! Does that mean that adhering to the sacrifice is not just a matter of prudence but necessary to be increasingly oneself?*

**Giussani:** Always! Otherwise it would be unjust. It would be the contradictory image of being: being exists that we might “be” more and more; being is expressed as promise.

It’s as if something else must prevail and not something that should be taken away.

As if what you want be true, be increasingly truer (not taken away!). That it be true and not anything else because God is the mystery of the “more”.

Sorry but I have to have a clear understanding of this. You say that the sacrifice has to be made so that whatever you want may become true. But...become truer.

### **But what I desire is Christ.**

What you desire is the fulfillment of the relationship between what you want - circumstantially, temporarily, as if you were in transit - between what you want as transit and the ultimate destiny of the journeying, in which what you want as transit grows greater the more it helps you. And when you reach the end, you are embraced and, embraced; you cast yourselves into the ultimate point, into the infinite sea.

For this reason, there is no distinction whatever: the love of a man for a woman is not split into marriage and virginity (marriage: fulfillment; virginity: negation); There is absolutely no love of man for woman who are married unless it is virginity, and it is not virginity unless it is love for the living reality. Only that, for this to be so - it’s identical in the first case and in the second case - there has to be crucifixion. Crucifying the object of one’s desire which is right in itself is like being on the verge of grasping it but being unable to.

In short, there is nothing more anti-Christian than conceiving “Christ everything in all things” as elimination of everything because Christ reigns. Christ reigns by allowing everything to become true! For, the Word Incarnate is the truth. And Christ reigns by making things become true if we follow Him on the cross. Love something and you have the urge to...the whole impetus is pushing you to grasp it: if you grasp it, you lose it; if you grasp it, you make it smaller, you crush it. But if you could grasp it and do not, it becomes great, great, great so that you kneel before it. You kneel because you foresee: it lets you glimpse the substance of which it is made.

At the beginning of the interview, you say: “Faced with this cultural state of affairs, the Christian finds himself having to fight to vindicate his right to exist and to affirm the historic ‘utility’ of his presence in a context that considers his claim to be absolutely irrelevant, insignificant”<sup>25</sup>. As I read, I thought that this was not just the case of the Christian today: every man perceives of himself as living in a reality which considers his claim to exist to be irrelevant and insignificant. And I realized that the temptation to be formal was real but that it was in order to live that one gave in in connivance. And you said that in order not to give in to the formal these three things were indispensable: God made man, who died and rose again. Does this mean that I, in order not to yield to formalism, must repeat these three things, carry them with me forever?

But these three things are the content of the faith! The content of the faith is but the content of the meaning of things. You go and stand in front of a plant or go down stairs: you can’t do that as a human being unless you are aware of the purpose. And all purposes are linked one to the other, they have an ultimate perspective. Of course you carry them with you! You don’t have to carry them with you always, you carry them with you always.

### **Education in the Faith**

In fact, educational development is not to make you remember the birth, the death, the resurrection of Christ but to let you know Jesus. The more you know Jesus the more you know that he had been a



child, that he then died on the cross, that he rose again. It is from inside Jesus that his whole story unfolds. His story comes from inside Him, you don't study and learn by heart the details of the story and then join them together to form an identikit of Jesus: this is a common error in education in the faith, as if the faith were the result of an inventory of detailed observations!

This is why it is distracting to preach moral values not starting off from the fact of Christ: this drives man towards something of which he is incapable because he is incapable of applying all these values. Indeed, he is incapable of applying even one of them since they are all linked. This is my famous paragon<sup>26</sup> of the boy who was a troublemaker, a delinquent, a good-for-nothing who believed all the girls in the town belonged to him and all the mothers say to the girls: "Watch out for that one! Watch out for that one!", and they all flee him. But at a certain point, he falls in love with someone, he really falls in love. Every time he approaches her she runs away because she knows his type but he says to her: "Don't, this time it's different: I really love you". And the girl doesn't believe him at first...Let's say six months pass: for six months she runs away and he follows her. In those six months, he changes. At the end of this time, his mother meets the girl's mother and says: "My son is changed, he's unrecognizable!". In following the girl and what she wanted, he changed: he learned everything and he hadn't studied and learned by heart the catechism of values! That's how Christianity enters the world. This is the value of the companionship; for this reason for the Adult Group, vocation is living more and more profoundly the life of the house, the companionship of the house. But it must be the companionship of the house, not the companionship we mentioned before<sup>27</sup>!

*Questioner: In what sense?*

**Giussani:** It mustn't be the more general conception of companionship: a convenient companionship, one of convenience, pleasurable: "We get along well together". No, not that! It has to be something else!

Let's get along together by all means but, if someone hurts you, you must forgive. The eyes you train on her are different eyes, the eyes of forgiveness. It's different. You get along well when you sing together; but when there are duties to fulfill, responsibilities to own, cars to park thoughtfully so that the others coming home later won't have problems ...

*Questioner: Teresa has drawn up plans for parking in the courtyard so many times!*

**Giussani:** Really? But plans aren't lifesavers. Especially if there is no sense of personal responsibility! What's the difference? Plans aren't lifesavers but life is saved by love. If people were to love other people and, in parking their cars, were to think of others...It's the anger I feel whenever I find a car parked leaving a huge space and the one in front just as much: there would be space for three cars instead of just two and even them with difficulty! This is because there is no love for man. But this love in regard to the car is exactly the same love one has for one's father, mother and brother.

I can tell you haven't many questions to ask!

*Questioner: Porzia has.*

**Giussani:** Another time, that's enough. Let's go now! However, the first question this evening was the central one.

## Thinking of a Question

**Giussani:** But you will have to take the trouble to think of a few questions! Even if you don't manage to ask it, you have to think of questions. If you think of a question or you are being too silly and so you think of any question at all, or...but one can't think of any question at all: whether little or large, think of a question on something that strikes you and learn, therefore, take the risk of learning something more.

I wanted to ask you if the whole question lay in the fact of having the courage to follow the correspondence with the heart to the end.

The whole problem lies in the courage to apply the relationship with Christ when you discover the correspondence with the heart: the courage to invest all your relationships with this memory, with this consciousness, as if one had the face of a beloved person in mind. Gardini says in that phrase of his which is the loveliest in the world! "In the experience of a great love all that happens becomes an event in its orbit"<sup>28</sup>.

Ah, that's the hard part. You perceive the correspondence in an instant, you sense the correspondence immediately. It is not "hard to apply the correspondence" but it is hard to apply the relationship that corresponds to you (the relationship with something, with a reality that corresponds to the heart). That Jesus corresponded to the heart of the widow of Nain was evident as soon as He touched her on the shoulder and said to her: "Woman do not cry"<sup>29</sup>: that is enough. The hard part for her would have come later had she had to challenge the scribes and the Pharisees and had she followed Him: it's the relationship with that which made us feel the correspondence with the heart.

They're coming for me at 8.45.

Well, aren't you giving me something to eat?

*Questioner: Yes!*

**Giussani:** Is there any soup?

*Questioner: I don't know.*

**Giussani:** Milk, then, milk!

### Notes

\* Tischrede 92 June 17, 1993. Text of reference: L. Giussani, "The 'Power' of the Layperson, that is, the Christian", in *Un avvenimento di vita, cioè una storia*, Edit - Il Sabato, Roma 1993, pages 31-66.

1. Giussani, "The 'Power' of the Layperson, that is, the Christian", in *Un avvenimento di vita ...*, op. cit., page 38.
2. Ibidem, pages 38-39.
3. Cf Giussani, *At the Origin of the Christian Claim*, Jaca Book, 1988, page 25.
4. Ibidem, pages 44-45.
5. F. König, "It wasn't enough to open up to the world", interview by A. Tornielli, in *30DAYS*, No. 10, 1992, pages 10-15.
6. Cf Giussani, *The Religious Sense*, Rizzoli, Milano 1997.
7. Cf Giussani, "Along the Way", in *Un avvenimento di vita ...*, op. cit., page 478.
8. Cf Giussani, *At the Origin ...*, op. cit., pages 44-45.
9. Saint Augustine, *Soliloquia* 2, 1, 1.
10. "The power of the Risen One to whom the Father placed everything in submission is manifest according to the Father's plans. We are not called to envisage the hour and the day. All we know is that at the end, the power of the Risen One will be visible in every person and every thing. The Christian is the man who knows how to live the present anticipating in certainty and hope the moment of the final fullness. And whoever lets explode in the present the powerful invocation of Scripture: "Come, Lord Jesus"; thus beginning to transform the world according to a dawning authentically analogous with that which shall be the last of the days". (Giussani, "The 'Power' of the Layperson, that is, the Christian", in *Un avvenimento di vita ...*, op. cit., page 41).
11. Colossians 3, 11.

12. Cf V. S. Solov'ëv, *I tre dialoghi e il racconto dell'Anticristo*, Vita e Pensiero, Milano 1995, pages 177-221 (The Three Dialogues and the Story of the Anti-Christ).
13. Luke 19, 5.
14. Giussani, *The Religious Sense*, op. cit., pages 139-140.
15. Reference to the Tischrede 91, June 8 1993, pro manuscripto.
16. Cf Pentecostal Retreat of "Memores Domini", May 7-9 1993, pro manuscripto, pages 25 and to follow.
17. Giussani, "The 'Power' of the Layperson, that is, the Christian", in *Un avvenimento di vita ...*, op. cit., page 47.
18. Reference to acts of violence directed at some university exponents of the Movement in the 1970s.
19. Giussani, "The 'Power' of the Layperson, that is, the Christian", in *Un avvenimento di vita ...*, op. cit., page 33.
20. "Joy is like a brief and partial foretaste of happiness; gladness is a state of the mind, tendentially permanent, generated by the hope of happiness" (Giussani, 74 questions and answers, supplement to *Litterae Communionis - Tracce*, No. 6, June 1993, page 3; now published in Giussani, "Happiness Pain, God's Choice, the Companionship", in *Realtà e giovinezza. La sfida*, Sei, Torino 1995, page 199, Reality and Youth. The Challenge).
21. Cf John 1, 37-39.
22. Cf Matthew 28, 20.
23. Pigi Bernareggi was one of Father Giussani's first pupils at Milan's Berchet highschool and of the CL Movement's first missionaries (then *Gioventù studentesca*, Student Youth) to leave for Brazil.
24. Cf P. Rousselot, *Les Yeux de la foi*, Jaca Book, Milano 1977.
25. Giussani, "The 'Power' of the Layperson, that is, the Christian", in *Un avvenimento di vita...*, op. cit., page 35.
26. Cf Giussani, *Vivendo nella carne*, Bur, Milano 1998, pages 127-128 note 28 (Living in the Flesh).
27. Cf Tischrede 91, June 8 1993, pro manuscripto.
28. R. Guardini, *L'essenza del cristianesimo*, Morcelliana, Brescia 1980, page 12.
29. Luke 7, 11-17.