

THE EXISTENTIAL DIMENSION OF THE LIBERATION THEOLOGY
OF JUAN LUIS SEGUNDO

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford.

Matthew Aaron Tennant
Regent's Park College, Oxford
OSS ID number: 327543
Michaelmas Term 2014
Word count: 98,758

Acknowledgements

I truly appreciate the guidance and direction my supervisors Paul Fiddes, Philip Endean, and John Briggs provided. Paul Fiddes has been a patient and generous teacher, and he has guided my progress since my first days at Oxford in 2007. Philip Endean was my co-supervisor for my D.Phil. until he left Oxford for other opportunities. He offered exacting advice and warm encouragement. John Briggs was one of my supervisors during my M.St. and helped me formulate this D.Phil. project. His wisdom and direction proved indispensable to my progress.

In Montevideo, Uruguay, Elbio Medina, José Irureta, and Carolos del Castillo graciously hosted me, extended friendship, and helped me find resources in the Jesuit archives at Manresa Casa de Oración y Retiros. In particular, Elbio Medina graciously gave of his time as we discussed Segundo's ideas and welcomed me into his home for many late night conversations. José Irureta trusted me with the irreplaceable cassette tapes of Segundo leading his version of a base community (discussion group). I owe him my deepest gratitude for giving me such a resource. Carlos del Castillo freely gave of his time, driving me to and from the airport and offering his friendship.

Kenny Park and Denise DeVries were helpful as I was translating unpublished material from Spanish into English. I appreciate their assistance. The new material is presented in parallel Spanish/English in the Appendices.

I offer a heartfelt *thank you* to the members of Kilmarnock Baptist Church, Kilmarnock, Virginia, where I have had the privilege of serving as pastor since 2009.

My children Dean and Edison and my parents Robert and Joyce were a wonderful support to me during my graduate work. This project would not have been possible without the help, love and support of my wife Melanie.

Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Contents	3
Abbreviations.....	6
Short Abstract	8
Abstract.....	9
1 Introduction.....	13
1.1 Why this thesis?	17
1.1.1 Continuing existence of poverty and oppression.....	18
1.1.2 Continuing interest in liberation theology.....	19
1.1.3 Misunderstandings of various liberation theologies	20
1.1.4 The omission of existentialism	21
1.2 Christian Existentialism	25
1.2.1 Humani Generis	25
1.2.2 What must be rejected	27
1.2.3 What must be assimilated	31
1.2.4 The bad and good of existentialism.....	33
1.2.5 Rejection and acceptance	34
1.3 What kind of liberation theology?.....	38
1.4 Segundo's writings.....	44
1.4.1 Principal published sources cited.....	46
1.4.2 New material.....	47
1.4.3 Secondary material.....	48
1.5 Organization of this argument	49
2 Building an existential basis	51
2.1 Introduction	51
2.2 Metaphysical and psychological foundations	54
2.2.1 Two opposite experiences	55
2.2.2 Metaphysical foundations	56
2.2.3 Psychological foundations	60
2.3 The Philosophical Activity	61
2.3.1 Pure philosophy.....	62
2.3.2 Philosophy and existence.....	64
2.3.3 Existentialist philosophy.....	67
2.4 Existential activities and poetry.....	72
2.4.1 Pure existential activity.....	73
2.4.2 Art and existence	75
2.4.3 Pure poetry	78
2.4.4 Poetry and essence	80
2.5 Immanent art	82
3 The existential influence of Nicholas Berdyaev	85
3.1 Introduction	85
3.2 Primacy of Freedom	88
3.2.1 Primacy of Freedom in Berdyaev	89

3.2.2	Primacy of Freedom in Segundo.....	93
3.3	The Ambiguity of Freedom	98
3.3.1	Linear Freedom	99
3.3.2	Reciprocity	102
3.3.3	Pluralism and apparently irreconcilable positions	104
3.3.4	Pluralism and Dualism	108
3.4	Apophaticism and Freedom.....	113
3.4.1	Christological Controversies.....	114
3.4.2	Our First Thoughts about God	116
3.4.3	Neo-Platonists and German Mystics.....	118
3.4.4	Personal Liberty.....	119
3.4.5	The Challenge of Kant.....	120
3.4.6	Non-Negative Apophaticism in Freedom.....	121
3.5	Limits in the connection between freedom and existence	123
3.5.1	Limited Connection	123
3.5.2	Ecclesial Pluralism.....	125
3.5.3	Liberation Theology	126
3.5.4	The Role of Praxis	127
3.6	Conclusion	131
4	Libertad, Base Communities & Tape 24	132
4.1	Introduction	132
4.2	Segundo's Base Community	136
4.3	Tape 24--La Libertad	140
4.3.1	Freedom as a deception	141
4.3.2	The price of freedom	150
4.3.3	Barrier to freedom.....	162
4.3.4	Distractions from freedom.....	172
4.4	Conclusion	177
5	Heidegger and existential grammar.....	183
5.1	Heidegger entering Segundo's thought	183
5.2	Background--Segundo's published analysis of Heidegger	187
5.2.1	Justification for engagement.....	189
5.2.2	The purpose of engagement with Heidegger.....	193
5.3	La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología (manuscript).....	194
5.3.1	Defining phenomenology	200
5.3.2	Theology and experience	208
5.3.3	Revelation and existence.....	218
5.3.4	Scripture.....	226
5.3.5	Speech and existence.....	228
5.4	Mature argument in Dogma (1989)	232
6	Existentialism in <i>Liberación de la teología</i>	236
6.1	Dead corpse or living organism?	240
6.2	Methodological problems	245
6.2.1	Supposed Influence & Marx	247
6.2.2	Problems due to the 'end of history'	251
6.3	From pathways to long journey.....	258
6.3.1	Freedom and existence in relation to violence.....	261
6.3.2	Dogma does not capture the Absolute	266
6.4	Conclusion	271

7 Ideologies, Faith, and Freedom.....	277
7.1 What kind of ideology?.....	279
7.1.1 Other scholars & Segundo's ideology	280
7.1.2 Restating the problem	283
7.1.3 Marx/Marxism	287
7.1.4 Materialism and appearances.....	291
7.1.5 Transcendent data.....	294
7.2 Values in Language	297
7.2.1 Bécquer's Poem	298
7.2.2 Language analysis.....	302
7.3 Ideology and Existentialism.....	305
7.3.1 Consciousness-raising.....	308
7.3.2 Freedom's role	311
7.4 Conclusion	314
Overall Conclusion.....	316
Appendix I--"Existencialismo Cristiano"	320
Appendix II--<i>Sartre y Camus</i>	325
Appendix III--"La fenomenología"	347
Works Cited	428

Abbreviations

<i>Existencialismo</i>	<i>Existencialismo, Filosofía Y Poesía: Ensayo De Síntesis</i> . Buenos Aires: Espasa Calpe, 1948.
<i>Berdiaeff</i>	<i>Berdiaeff: Une Réflexion Chrétienne Sur La Personne</i> . Paris: Aubier, 1963.
<i>LT</i>	<i>Liberación De La Teología</i> . Buenos Aires: Carlos Lohlé, 1975. In English, <i>The Liberation of Theology</i> , trans. John Drury (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976).
"La Libertad--tape"	"24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus", in Segundo Tape Collection (Oxford, UK: Matthew Aaron Tennant's Private Collection, 1980).
<i>FI</i>	<i>El hombre de hoy ante Jesus de Nazaret, fe e ideología</i> . Vol. 1. Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1982. In English, <i>Faith and Ideologies</i> , trans. John Drury. Vol. I, Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1984.
<i>El hombre 2.1</i>	<i>El hombre de hoy ante Jesus de Nazaret, historia y actualidad: sinópticos y Pablo</i> . Vol. 2.1. Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1982. In English, <i>The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics</i> , trans. John Drury. Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today. Vol. II, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1985. <i>The Humanist Christology of Paul</i> , trans. John Drury. Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today. Vol. III, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986.
<i>El hombre 2.2</i>	<i>El hombre de hoy ante Jesús de Nazaret, historia y actualidad: las cristologías en la espiritualidad</i> . Vol. 2.2, Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982. In English, <i>The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises</i> , trans. John Drury. Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today. Vol. IV, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987. <i>An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth</i> , trans. John Drury. Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today. Vol. V, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988.
<i>Teología Abierta 1</i>	<i>Iglesia - Gracia</i> . Teología Abierta. Vol. 1, Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983. Originally publishes as <i>Esa comunidad llamada iglesia</i> . Teología abierta para el laico adulto. Vol. I, Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1968. <i>Gracia y condición humana</i> . Teología abierta para el laico adulto. Vol. II, Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1969. In English, <i>The Community Called Church</i> . Translated by John Drury. A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1973. <i>Grace and the Human Condition</i> . Translated by John Drury. A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1973.
<i>Teología Abierta 2</i>	<i>Dios - Sacramentos - Culpa</i> . Teología Abierta. Vol. 2, Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983. Originally publishes as <i>Nuestra Idea de Dios</i> . Teología Abierta para el Laico Adulto. Vol. III, Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1970. <i>Los sacramentos hoy</i> . Teología Abierta para el Laico Adulto. Vol. IV, Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1971. <i>Evolución y culpa</i> . Teología abierta para el laico adulto. Vol. V, Buenos

Aires: Lohle, 1972. In English, *Our Idea of God*. Translated by John Drury. A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1974. *The Sacraments Today*. Translated by John Drury. A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1974. *Evolution and Guilt*. Translated by John Drury. A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1974.

Reflexiones Críticas *Reflexiones Críticas*. Teología Abierta. Vol. 3, Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983.

Dogma *El dogma que libera: fe, revelación y magisterio dogmático*. Colección "Presencia Teológica". Santander, España: Sal Terrae, 1989. In English, *The Liberation of Dogma: Faith, Revelation, and Dogmatic Teaching Authority*, trans. Phillip Berryman. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1992.

"La fenomenología" "La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología", in Segundo Papers Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro de Espiritualidad Manresa.

EC "Existencialismo Cristiano" In Segundo Papers, 3 pages. Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro de Espiritualidad Manresa.

Short Abstract

Juan Luis Segundo (1925-1996) was a Uruguayan Jesuit priest who, I argue, had an existential dimension to his liberation theology. This thesis explores unknown and little-explored sources in Segundo's corpus. These sources support my thesis of his existential thought and are corroborated by his published works. The significance of this thesis is the widely overlooked connection between existentialism and liberation theology. My starting point is Segundo's 1948 book, in which he combines existentialism with personalism and develops a transcendental method grounded in love and inter-subjectivity. The following three chapters develop my argument through his engagement with four existentialist thinkers: Berdyaev, Sartre and Camus, and Heidegger. Chapter 3 demonstrates how Segundo follows Berdyaev's primacy of freedom, which allows for human creativity, but Segundo takes it as a 'quality of the will' and relates freedom to love. Chapter 4 shows how Sartre's and Camus' understanding of freedom and limits influenced Segundo's sense that a person's lived reality must be the starting point for theological reflection (e.g. through the hermeneutic circle). In chapter 5, I use an unpublished manuscript to show how Segundo uses the place of tradition in the Christian church and the role of speech in Heidegger's phenomenological analysis of Dasein in order to build his theology of 'liberative human seeking and divine revelation'. In the final two chapters, I draw the new sources together with two of Segundo's widely read books: *Liberación de la teología* (1975) in chapter 6 and *Fe e ideología* (1982) in chapter 7. In chapter 6, Segundo's existential liberation theology is evident in his hermeneutic circle, and in chapter 7, his understanding of the relationship between faith and ideology draws on the earlier chapters and leads into my conclusion.

Abstract

Juan Luis Segundo (1925-1996) was a liberation theologian who believed that theology should be transformative in human lives. The aim of this thesis is to demonstrate that a major dimension of Segundo's liberation theology is his understanding and use of existentialism, and in doing so the thesis also makes an original contribution to studies of Segundo by exploring unknown and unexploited sources in Segundo's work. Some of the sources are relatively unknown by scholars in Europe and North America, whereas others were completely unknown outside of a few people in Montevideo, Uruguay. Appendices to the thesis (not for examination) present key texts in Spanish and English translation.

For a theology to be transformative in human lives there must be a connection to existence (i.e. it must be existential), yet this apparently self-evident assumption has been widely overlooked in critical analysis of liberation theology. This *prima facie* connection to existence can be distinguished from 'existentialism' (a school of philosophy). Taking one of the main thinkers of Latin American liberation theology and analysing his indebtedness to and departure from existentialism as a school of philosophy, I will attempt to demonstrate that there is a significant existential dimension to his theology, and that perceiving this dimension makes a difference to an assessment of his work in such areas as freedom, analysis of society and the relation between faith and ideology.

Chapter 1 thus sets out the need for this thesis, roots the subject in Segundo's development as a theologian, and opens up some preliminary issues about the relation of liberation theology to existentialism through exploring an unpublished manuscript by Segundo, entitled "Existencialismo Cristiano" (probably written in the 1980s).

Segundo was a prolific writer, having published from 1948 to 1997. The first step (Chapter 2) to demonstrating the existential dimension of his thought is found in his 1948 work *Existencialismo, filosofía y poesía: ensayo de síntesis*. Few people have engaged with this short book at any length, but it provides deep insight into the early stages of his thought. Primarily, he combines existentialism with personalism and develops a transcendental method grounded in love and inter-subjectivity. This transcendence beyond the self is exemplified by the contrast and the relationship between the cognitive and the affective, or the philosophical and existential.

The next significant step (Chapter 3) in developing my idea comes from Segundo's 1963 thesis from Sorbonne, under the direction of Paul Ricoeur. In his thesis, he examines the Christian view of the person in the writings of the Russian philosopher Nicholas Berdyaev. From Segundo's analysis of Berdyaev, we first see the important role freedom plays in his thought and Berdyaev's significant influence in his intellectual development. I seek to demonstrate how Segundo follows Berdyaev's primacy of freedom, which allows for human creativity, and how this involves a cautious and modified approval of the existentialist maxim that 'existence precedes essence'. Segundo, however, takes freedom as a 'quality of the will' and relates freedom to love. He also has a place for the 'values of being' in establishing freedom which is missing in Berdyaev. The older thinker, nevertheless, influences Segundo's preference for a methodology yielding consistent growth rather than a systematic approach to theology.

Base communities form an integral part of liberation theology, and the influence of existential philosophers on Segundo's thought is evident in his interaction with his base community. His group in Montevideo is unlike many others across Latin America. Instead of consciousness-raising in the traditional sense (e.g.

literacy training or political action organizations, which he endorses), Segundo attempts consciousness-raising by leading his group to engage with existentialist philosophers (e.g. Sartre, Marcel, Camus, etc.). My research has yielded cassette recordings of Segundo leading discussions with his base community in Montevideo. I selected one tape and transcribed it to further illustrate the role existentialism plays in his liberation theology. The tape focuses on three works: *Caligula* by Camus, *The Flies* by Sartre, and *Nausea* also by Sartre. Each of these works explores the idea of freedom in different ways, thus building on the theme introduced in Segundo's work on Berdyaev. This research forms the basis of chapter 4.

My research has also uncovered an unpublished manuscript in which Segundo explores the place of tradition in the Christian church and the role of tradition in Heidegger's phenomenological analysis of Dasein. This leads Segundo to build his theology of 'liberative human seeking and divine revelation'. He explains why he finds Heidegger useful in his 1982 book *El Hombre de hoy ante Jesus de Nazaret*. Then, Segundo's manuscript introduces the role grammar plays in his theology, and by formally introducing grammar, he reiterates a theme from *Existencialismo*. This theme is the role played by freedom and existence as they are represented in poetry and literature, and it is repeated in other works. The arguments in the manuscript come to fruition in *El dogma que libera* (1989).

Having covered new material, I turn my attention to two of Segundo's most important published works in the final two chapters. In *Liberación de la teología* (1975), Segundo writes that theology is not 'dissecting a dead corpse but examining a living organism.' The argument of his most famous book brings together the various pieces of his thought I have already considered, answers some remaining questions, and puts forward some final implications from my research. (Chapter 6) A

key element here is the progression Segundo identifies first from ideology to a human and existentialist commitment to freedom, and then to a faith which is orientated in some way towards God's gift of freedom. The new sources add to a clearer understanding of *Liberación de la teología* and show his indebtedness to and departure from existentialism as a school of philosophy.

In *Fe e ideología* (1982), Segundo addresses further the need to work out the relationship between freedom and existence. (Chapter 7). He defines ideology narrowly as 'the systematization of my perception of the objective realm... i.e. non-valuational' and here makes a contrast between Marx's own social analysis (which Segundo can make use of) and Marxism. He shows how a purely materialist ideology is subject to the critique of the 'absurdity' of existence in existentialist writers, and then urges the Christian response to absurdity in finding 'transcendent data' in an analysis of existence. He thus returns to themes from *Existencialismo* in addressing materialism and personalism. His analysis of Bécquer's poem reveals the development of his thought and the way values and ideologies are represented in language.

My overall conclusion underlines the significance of finding an existential dimension in Segundo's liberation theology. When this dimension is uncovered, Segundo's status as a truly ecumenical theologian becomes apparent, reaching out beyond the Catholic Church to other Christian confessions and to the general human project of commitment to living in freedom.

1 Introduction

Liberation theology is a relevant twenty-first-century approach to Christian doctrine. Latin American liberation theology introduced a new way of approaching theology, beginning in the years immediately following Second Vatican Council (Vatican II) in the late 1960s. Generally, Latin American liberation theologians were led by social analysis to critically view traditional theological formulations. As this critique was most often within the Roman Catholic Church, it meant taking a critical attitude toward Church dogma and adopting practical positions that, in effect, appeared to others as ‘socialist’. However, in the half-century since its inception, liberation theology has taken many different forms, largely emphasizing “setting the captives free” (Luke 4:18, Isaiah 61:1).

Amongst Latin American liberation theologians, Juan Luis Segundo represents one of the most significant voices. He was a prolific writer who was referenced often in secondary works about liberation theology. His original approach prompted many student dissertations, which will be referenced within this text when they are relevant. Within the large body of primary and secondary literature on liberation theology, no substantial study has focused on the role existential philosophy plays within liberation theology. By isolating one set of influences on one particular liberation theologian, we will come to a richer understanding of the particular challenge that liberation theology represents for theology as a whole.

By and large, Latin American liberation theology is influenced by European and North American theology. That is, most prominent liberation theologians were educated in Europe. For example, Leonardo Boff (b. Concórdia, Brazil) studied in Munich, Germany. After studying engineering in St. Louis, Missouri, United States,

Jon Sobrino (b. Barcelona, Spain) studied theology in Frankfurt, Germany. Clodovis Boff (b. Concórdia, Brazil) and Gustavo Gutiérrez (b. Lima, Peru) studied in Leuven. Juan Luis Segundo (b. Montevideo, Uruguay) also studied in Leuven before completing his doctoral work in France at the Université Paris-Sorbonne. Before going back to Latin America and making their contribution to liberation theology, each of these thinkers became steeped in European and North American thought. While scholars have given much attention to the development and analysis of liberation theology and people have looked at the product and potential future of liberation theology, very little attention has been given to specific influences from outside Latin America on the development of liberation theology. Thus, I am going to focus on one theologian and the role of European existentialism in his thought.

Uruguayan Juan Luis Segundo was born on October 31, 1925. He attended the Jesuit-run Colegio del Sagrado Corazón in Montevideo for primary and secondary school. At sixteen years old, in 1941, he joined the Society of Jesus and began the first steps of his training in Córdoba, Argentina. He studied philosophy at San Miguel in Buenos Aires, Argentina and graduated in 1948 with his thesis *Existencialismo, filosofía, y poesía*, which was published in that same year in Madrid.¹ This short book is the primary source for chapter 2 below. In 1949, he returned to Colegio del Sagrado Corazón and taught philosophy and literature. A mimeographed copy of his lecture notes from 1953 is held in a private collection in Montevideo.²

In 1953, Segundo began studying theology with the Jesuits in Egenhoven, near Leuven, Belgium. While in Egenhoven, he took a course given by Léopold Malevez, whom Segundo references in an unpublished, undated document about

¹ Juan Luis Segundo, *Existencialismo, filosofía y poesía: ensayo de síntesis* (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1948).

² Juan Luis Segundo, "Orientaciones Literarias: Apuntes de clase," in *Elbio Medina Collection* (Montevideo: Private Archive, 1953).

Heidegger.³ José Irureta⁴ found the document amongst Segundo's papers after he died, and placed it in a box with Segundo's other papers at Manresa Retreat Centre, Montevideo, Uruguay. Other than Irureta, Segundo's closest colleagues were unaware of the existence of this document, and Irureta never read it.⁵ It is the primary source for Chapter 5 below.

In 1955, Segundo was ordained as a priest in the Society of Jesus. He graduated from Egenhoven in 1956 with the thesis "Christianity: A Utopia?" This thesis was later published in Spanish in Uruguay by a group Segundo organized called Cursos de Complementación Cristian (Courses for Christian Growth).⁶ In it, he writes, "From the approach that appears in the Second Council of Orange in 529, and later in the documents of Vatican II: God's grace is always implicit in human nature. Therefore, one should not compartmentalize the sacred and the secular".⁷ This thought is consistent with his later writings. For example, in *LT*, he writes about one grace throughout history, not two separate orders--i.e. a natural order within history (this life) and a supernatural order outside of history (the afterlife).⁸ As we shall see in the next chapter, this idea was also already present in his earlier 1948 work *Existencialismo* in what he calls *intermedios*. After his ordination, he returned to Uruguay.

In a 1994 interview, Segundo said that after teaching for six months in 1956 at the diocesan seminary in Montevideo, Uruguay, he felt he needed a state degree

³ Juan Luis Segundo, "La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología," in *Segundo Papers* (Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro de Espiritualidad Manresa), 25-26.

⁴ José Irureta, Uruguayan and a former Jesuit, was a friend and colleague of Juan Luis Segundo.

⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología". I found the document during my research in Montevideo, and when I asked people who knew Segundo very well about the document, they had never heard of it. José Irureta did not recall having ever seen it (Cf. Tennant, "Interview Notes," 2008, 3)

⁶ Juan Luis Segundo, *La Cristiandad, Una Utopía?* (Montevideo: CCC, 1964).

⁷ Elbio Medina et al., "Juan Luis Segundo Biografía," Montevideo, 1996, 1. Cf. Segundo, *La Cristiandad, Una Utopía?*

⁸ Juan Luis Segundo, *Liberación de la teología* (Buenos Aires: Carlos Lohlé, 1975), 8. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, trans. John Drury (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976), 3.

that would be recognized by the university in Uruguay, rather than a degree that is only recognized by the church. Accordingly, he moved to Paris to do further graduate work under the supervision of Maurice de Gandillac. He hoped to earn a state, or secular, degree in philosophy, but he started his work under the Institut Catholique, with de Gandillac supervising his work.⁹ Segundo wrote about the Russian philosopher Nicolas Berdyaev, and he described how de Gandillac had been personal friends with Berdyaev and helped him structure his dissertation proposal so that he would not need to learn Russian. Thus, he relied on French translations of Berdyaev.¹⁰ There is no evidence to indicate Segundo knew Russian.

When he submitted an early draft of his dissertation, De Gandillac suggested that he complete a state doctorate, so Segundo arranged a meeting with Paul Ricoeur in order to transfer to the secular faculty.¹¹ He submitted an early version of *Christianity, a Utopia?* to Ricoeur¹² and Ricoeur accepted him as a student. Segundo defended his dissertation in 1962 and published it one year later as *Berdiaeff: une réflexion Chrétienne sur la personne*.¹³

Upon his return to Uruguay, Segundo began leading seminars, teaching small groups, providing occasional lectures, and publishing articles, reviews, editorials, and books. He lived a quiet life, never held a university post, and was an introvert who preferred the company of books over people.¹⁴ This brief biographical sketch

⁹ Jesús Castillo Coronado, "Juan Luis Segundo in Conversation, An Interview with Jesús Castillo Coronado," *Louvain Studies* 22, no. 3 (1997): 266.

¹⁰ Coronado, "Interview," 267.

¹¹ Coronado, "Interview," 268.

¹² In 1994, Segundo said that the manuscript had not been published because of the Jesuit censors in France. As I stated above, it was later published in Spanish in Uruguay.

¹³ Juan Luis Segundo, *Berdiaeff: une réflexion Chrétienne sur la personne* (Paris: Aubier, 1963). This text will be the primary source for chapter 3 below.

¹⁴ This characterization is based on interviews with people who knew Segundo well, including Elbio Medina, José Irureta, and Armando Rollo.

describes the milieu of a man whose acumen continues to contribute to theological discourse.

1.1 Why this thesis?

There are four primary reasons for engaging with liberation theology, in general, and for writing this thesis, in particular: (1) the continuing existence of poverty and oppression; (2) continuing interest in liberation theology; (3) a misunderstanding of various liberation theologies; and (4) the omission of existentialism as a dimension of Segundo's liberation theology and in accounts of his thought.

The last point is the most significant. Segundo defines existentialism in *EC* as: "To know myself, then, as far as what I have that is opposite to all other objects, to know myself as I am for my fundamental sensibility, to know and describe my experiences inasmuch as they are mine, subjective, *this is existentialism*".¹⁵ His definition follows Sartre's "existence precedes essence",¹⁶ but deviates from Sartre's notion that all faith is *mauvaise foi*.¹⁷ Segundo's existentialism combines with Christian personalism, or an I-Thou relationship between humanity and God. Bryan Stone writes, "Segundo believes that Christianity provides the best form of existentialism",¹⁸ but Stone does not say exactly how. Teasing out Segundo's existentialism is one of the main foci of this project.

¹⁵ Juan Luis Segundo, "Existencialismo Cristiano," in *Segundo Papers* (Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro de Espiritualidad Manresa), 2, emphasis original.

¹⁶ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism and Humanism*, trans. Philip Mairet (London: Methuen, 2008), 22.

¹⁷ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness: An essay on phenomenological ontology*, trans. Hazel E. Barnes (London: Routledge Classics, 2008), Pt 1, Ch 2.

¹⁸ Bryan P Stone, *Effective Faith, A Critical Study of the Christology of Juan Luis Segundo* (New York: University Press of America, 1994), 67.

1.1.1 Continuing existence of poverty and oppression

Though the Bible records Jesus as saying that the poor will always be with his disciples (Mark 14:7), it contains far more examples of a theological call to end poverty and oppression.¹⁹ Liberation theology addresses the economic disparity between rich and poor people as a matter of structure. In 1989, Francis Fukuyama (and others²⁰ who proffer this kind of “ideological triumphalism”²¹) declared that humankind had reached “the end of history” with the apparent economic and political victory of Western capitalism over Soviet communism.²² Fukuyama clarified his argument in 1995. He writes, “The assertion that we have reached the ‘end of history’ is not a statement about the empirical end of the world, but a normative argument concerning the justice or adequacy of liberal democratic political institutions”.²³ However, such a sweeping assertion neglects the persistence of gross structural inequalities in wealth between the Northern and Southern hemisphere countries, and is also belied by the continuing attention given to liberation theology, by advocates and critics alike.²⁴

¹⁹ In *The Poverty & Justice Bible*, there are over two thousand verses identified as relating to poverty or justice. Cf. American Bible Society, *The Poverty & Justice Bible* (New York: American Bible Society, 1995).

²⁰ Cf. E.g. Fukuyama’s methodology is favourably used in Arthur Aughey, “Fukuyama, the End of History and the Irish Question,” *Irish Studies in International Affairs* 9(1998).

²¹ Cf. R. J. B. Bosworth, “Explaining ‘Auschwitz’ after the End of History: The Case of Italy,” *History and Theory* 38, no. 1 (1999).

²² Francis Fukuyama, “The End of History?,” *National Interest* 16 Summer(1989). Fukuyama draws his conclusion of the ‘end of history’ by interpreting the political events of the 1980s and the increasing number of articles in 1988-89 pointing to spreading peace, even if some of the conclusions were premature.

²³ Francis Fukuyama, “Reflections on the End of History, Five Years Later,” *History and Theory* 34, no. 2 (1995): 27.

²⁴ For example, see Goal 1 of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals Indicators is “Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger”. See <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg/Default.aspx>.

1.1.2 Continuing interest in liberation theology

Liberation theology was a significant topic in latter part of the twentieth century. Orbis Books published hundreds of books on the subject, and they were not alone. Jeffrey Klaiber refers to liberation theology's "considerable and creative influence on the entire Christian world".²⁵ His words are not cherry-picked to support my argument. Instead, they represent a virtual consensus among supporters and critics alike. Regardless of how one views liberation theology, very few people would suggest that it does not matter.

There continues to be interest in liberation theology not only as a cultural artefact of the 1960s and 1970s, but as a relevant twenty-first-century approach to Christian doctrine. There are many examples to support this assertion; here are three. (1) SCM Press began producing the Reclaiming Liberation Theology series in 2007. To date, there are eight titles in the series.²⁶ (2) The American Academy of Religion (AAR) has had an active Liberation Theology Consultation at their annual meeting between 2007 and 2010. At the 2011 Annual Meeting, the Consultation presented student research in an effort to stimulate further work in liberation theology. At the 2012 meeting, the Consultation changed to a Group, which is a higher status. (3) In a December 5, 2009 speech by Pope Benedict XVI, he addressed

²⁵ Jeffrey L. Klaiber, "Prophets and Populists: Liberation Theology, 1968-1988," *The Americas* 46, no. 1 (1989): 13.

²⁶ Jung Mo Sung, *Desire, Market, Religion*, ed. Marcella Althaus-Reid and Ivan Petrella, Reclaiming Liberation Theology (London: SCM Press, 2007). Luis Carlos Susin, Marcella Althaus-Reid, and Ivan Petrella, eds., *Another Possible World*, Reclaiming Liberation Theology (London: SCM Press, 2007). Alistair Kee, *Rise and Demise of Black Theology*, ed. Marcella Althaus-Reid and Ivan Petrella, Reclaiming Liberation Theology (London: SCM Press, 2008). Ivan Petrella, *Beyond Liberation Theology: A Polemic*, ed. Marcella Althaus-Reid and Ivan Petrella, Reclaiming Liberation Theology (London: SCM Press, 2008). Mario I. Aguilar, *Theology, Liberation and Genocide, A Theology of the Periphery*, ed. Marcella Althaus-Reid and Ivan Petrella, Reclaiming Liberation Theology (London: SCM Press, 2009). Marcella Althaus-Reid, ed. *Liberation Theology and Sexuality*, Reclaiming Liberation Theology (London: SCM Press, 2009). Nestor Miguez, Joerg Rieger, and Jung Mo Sung, *Beyond the Spirit of Empire*, ed. Marcella Althaus-Reid and Ivan Petrella, Reclaiming Liberation Theology (London: SCM Press, 2009). Enrique D. Dussel, *Politics of Liberation*, trans. Thia Cooper, Reclaiming Liberation Theology (London: SCM Press, 2010).

a group of Brazilian bishops and warned against the “consequence of some theologians adopting Marxist methods” in liberation theology.²⁷ His comments are not as significant as the fact that he is still addressing concerns about liberation theology.²⁸ These three examples highlight the variety of continued interest in the subject.

1.1.3 Misunderstandings of various liberation theologies

Liberation theology is a theology informed by structural analysis and ideology-critique, addressing not just the truth claims made by doctrinal statements, but also their social function. It opens up the possibility that a sentence which seems doctrinally unexceptionable (Christ is Lord of heaven and earth) may, in a particular social situation, have a social effect that, despite the piety, expresses a resistance to the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus. This theology exists in forms other than the Latin American one.²⁹ For example, there is black liberation theology,³⁰ South African theology,³¹ postcolonialism,³² lesbian/gay/bi-sexual/transgendered/queer

²⁷ Cindy Wooden, "Pope says Brazilian church still divided over liberation theology," *Catholic News Service*, December 7 2009.

²⁸ When Pope Benedict XVI (previously Cardinal Ratzinger) was head of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, he was the primary author and signatory of the 1984 document indicting liberation theology. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith Catholic Church, *Instruction on certain aspects of the "theology of liberation"* (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1984).

²⁹ This area is typified by the theologies written from a Latin American perspective. They are largely Catholic and often highlight the phrase “preferential option for the poor”. The phrase was first used by Fr. Pedro Arupe, S.J. in a 1968 letter to the Jesuits of Latin America. Gustavo Gutiérrez developed it in his seminal work: Gustavo Gutiérrez, *Teología de la Liberación*, Colección Verdad e Imagen (Salamanca: Sígueme, 1972/2004). Cf. Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*, trans. Sister Caridad Inda and John Eagleson (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1973/1993).

³⁰ This area of theology was born in the United States amongst people of African descent, and the main argument is liberation from oppression based on the colour of one’s skin. See James H. Cone, *The Spirituals and the Blues* (New York: Seabury, 1972). or James H. Cone, *God of the Oppressed* (New York: Seabury, 1975).

³¹ Similar to black liberation theology, South African theology was an egalitarian movement that helped the development of resistance to apartheid. The primary source is Basil Moore, ed. *Challenge of Black Theology in South Africa* (New York: Westminster John Knox, 1974).

³² In general, postcolonial studies analyse the impact of colonialism and its consequences. Postcolonial theory includes analysing the impact of colonialism and imperialism on religious

(LGBTQ) theologies,³³ or some other sub-category of contemporary theology.

Specialists often take time to define a specific sub-category (like Latin American liberation theology), but even when dealing exclusively with Latin American liberation theology, generalists might broadly combine the thought of different authors.³⁴

1.1.4 The omission of existentialism

Few of Segundo's readers have identified existentialism as a dimension of his liberation theology. Stanley Slade, for example, argues that Segundo's theology is based in the thought of Teilhard de Chardin.³⁵ Gerald Persha explores the particularity of the Roman Catholic Church and the universality of the Church's mission, and even though he treats Segundo insightfully, he largely ignores the influence of existentialism and misses one of the ways Segundo came to view the church as both particular and universal.³⁶ Segundo asserts that the church is particular for a time and place, but its mission is universally applicable to the human condition. Overlooking the influence of existentialism neglects an underlying

understanding, especially once the subjugated colony is independent. E.g. cf. Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979).

³³ Like the other theologies of liberation, LGBTQ theology seeks liberation for people who are oppressed based on sexual orientation. See Marcella Althaus-Reid, *Indecent Theology: Theological Perversions in Sex, Gender, and Politics* (Oxford: Routledge, 2000).

³⁴ E.g. In an article from a Polanyian perspective, Robert Osborn makes some good general points about liberation theology, but fails to adequately differentiate between liberation theologians. Using Sobrino, he focuses on a social-scientific approach to poverty (as Sobrino does) instead of engaging with the philosophical existential nature of being in poverty (as Segundo does). Robert T. Osborn, "Some Problems of Liberation Theology: A Polanyian Perspective," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 51, no. 1 (1983): 81.

³⁵ Stanley David Slade, "The Theological Method of Juan Luis Segundo" (Ph.D., Fuller Theological Seminary, School of Theology, 1979), 5.

³⁶ Gerald J. Persha, "Juan Luis Segundo: a study concerning the relationship between the particularity of the Church and the universality of her mission, 1963-1977" (Ph.D., University of Ottawa (Canada), 1978), 40ff. Persha lists the book as *Existencialismo, filosofía: ensayo de síntesis*. He is missing "y poesía". This could be a simple typing error or evidence that he had not seen Segundo's 1948 work.

tendency in Segundo's thought to emphasize the poetic or affective existence over the philosophical or cognitive essence.

In Schubert Ogden's *Faith and Freedom*, he interprets an existential approach to God as both "a liberated existence *in* freedom and a liberating existence *for* freedom...and the metaphysical being of God in itself as the ground of this existence of freedom, and God, therefore, as both the Redeemer and the Emancipator".³⁷ He identifies an existential dimension in liberation theology but criticizes liberation theologians for mistaking the nature of God as the basis of liberation. In other words, he sounds dismissive of theologians writing in less developed countries when he writes about himself and other North Atlantic thinkers as, "...those of us who are acquainted with certain other contemporary expressions..."³⁸ implying that others are unacquainted. He identifies Segundo as having developed a doctrine of God but then summarily rejects Segundo as "doomed to fail from the outset" for using too few sources.³⁹

In his 2004 book *The Future of Liberation Theology*, Ivan Petrella identifies the centrality of the relationship between faith and ideology in Segundo's thought and the influence it has on his project. He writes, "Juan Luis Segundo's understanding of the relation between faith and ideology can be seen as providing the closest historical analogy to the position developed in this book".⁴⁰ As I shall argue, especially in chapter 7 below, faith and ideology are born in Segundo's existentialism. His contemporary readers might misunderstand the distinction between faith and ideology without reference to his early works. In part, this is true

³⁷ Schubert M. Ogden, *Faith and Freedom: Toward a Theology of Liberation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1989), 81.

³⁸ Ogden, *Faith and Freedom*, 60.

³⁹ Ogden, *Faith and Freedom*, 60.

⁴⁰ Ivan Petrella, *The Future of Liberation Theology, An argument and manifesto* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 35.

because he returns to the existential question of his juvenilia. In *¿Qué mundo? ¿Qué hombre? ¿Qué Dios?* (1993), he calls upon the philosophical existentialism of Sartre, Camus, Marcel, Berdyaev, and Heidegger to provide a “modern way of setting out very old problems”.⁴¹ Additionally in *Dogma* (1989), Segundo writes, “In order to fully enter into this adventure [history of Christianity], God’s revelation has to again take on its proper experiential basis”.⁴² If readers of his later works, such as *¿Qué mundo?* or *Dogma*, do not understand the influence of existentialism on Segundo, they might miss his view of the usefulness of the philosophy of existentialism and the nuances of placing God’s revelation within experience.

According to Petrella, Latin American liberation theology promised to help liberate people from material deprivation. To do so, it had two parts: (1) “a re-reading of Christianity from the perspective of the oppressed” and (2) “the construction of historical projects”.⁴³ Each link is dependent on the previous step, and I suggest the very first is existentialist: (a) The existential dimension in Segundo’s theology leads him to (b) construct his understanding of faith and ideology, which (c) connects with constructing historical projects in liberation theology. Thus, (a) → (b) → (c). By historical projects, Petrella means “models of political and economic organization that would replace an unjust status quo”.⁴⁴

Petrella’s interpretation connects back with Segundo’s argument in *Dogma* that

⁴¹ Juan Luis Segundo, *¿Qué mundo? ¿Qué hombre? ¿Qué Dios?*, vol. 72, Colección "Presencia Teologica" (Santander, España: Sal Terrae, 1993), 99.

⁴² Juan Luis Segundo, *El dogma que libera: fe, revelación y magisterio dogmático*, Colección "Presencia Teologica" (Santander, España: Sal Terrae, 1989), 360-361. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma: Faith, Revelation, and Dogmatic Teaching Authority*, trans. Phillip Berryman (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1992), 235.

⁴³ Petrella, *The Future of Liberation Theology*, vii.

⁴⁴ Petrella, *The Future of Liberation Theology*, vii.

dogma should be a platform “from which the learning of new dimensions of meaning in human life ought to be launched in each generation”.⁴⁵

Not all of Segundo's readers missed the importance of existentialism. Mary Kaye Nealen in passing rightly identifies existentialism's influence on Segundo's thought in her 1989 thesis.⁴⁶ In her project, she seeks to answer the question *what do the poor mean to the church?* She seeks an ecclesiological answer for her primary question, even though Segundo does not really write a clear ecclesiology.⁴⁷ That is, although he never addresses church order, the role of bishops, or typical topics in ecclesiological works, he does wrestle with the role of the church,⁴⁸ and Nealen finds that Segundo's method is one of the most prominent elements of the church's response to the poor. She seeks to develop the ecclesial aspect of Segundo's theology and writes, “Segundo's method highlights the historical, dialectical character of God's action and human existence”.⁴⁹ Although “God's action and human existence” is not in itself supportive of the thesis of Segundo's existentialism, it suggests Segundo's high view of experience over essence when taken in conjunction with his other writings.⁵⁰

⁴⁵ Segundo, *Dogma*, 359. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 234.

⁴⁶ Mary Kaye Nealen, “The poor in the ecclesiology of Juan Luis Segundo” (Ph.D., The Catholic University of America, 1989), 13-14.

⁴⁷ The closest Segundo comes to writing a clear ecclesiology is in Juan Luis Segundo, *Función de la iglesia en la realidad rioplatense* (Montevideo: Barreiro y Ramos, 1962). Nealen does not reference this book in her thesis, which is unfortunate because this 81-page work basically supports her argument.

⁴⁸ E.g. Juan Luis Segundo, “La función de la Iglesia,” *Diálogo* 1(1965). Juan Luis Segundo, “La Iglesia, 'es necesaria?,'” *Diálogo* 7(1966). Juan Luis Segundo, “El diálogo Iglesia-Mundo: reflexión,” *Diálogo* 8(1966). Juan Luis Segundo, “The Church: a New Direction in Latin America,” *Catholic Mind* 65(1967).

⁴⁹ Nealen, “The poor in the ecclesiology of Juan Luis Segundo,” 140.

⁵⁰ E.g. Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 29.

1.2 *Christian Existentialism*

Segundo wrote a manuscript entitled “Existencialismo Cristiano”, in which he directly engages with existentialism as a philosophy.⁵¹ The manuscript was not published. My translation appears in parallel with the original text in Appendix I below. The manuscript presents Segundo directly engaging with existentialism in a primary source. There are no secondary sources in the following sub-sections analysing the manuscript because this is primary material not sourced before.

1.2.1 *Humani Generis*

Segundo begins by asking whether or not it is even possible to consider a “Christian existentialism”. He writes:

¿Es posible todavía hablar de “existencialismo cristiano” después de la Encíclica Humani Generis en que Pío XII condenó al existencialismo?	Is it still possible to speak of “Christian existentialism” after the Humani Generis Encyclical in which Pius XII condemned existentialism? ⁵²
---	---

Thus, the question is not simply about “Christian existentialism” as such. For Segundo, the question must be situated in relation to Vatican teachings. Specifically, he cites “Humani Generis”, a papal encyclical by Pope Pius XII. The purpose of the encyclical concerns “some false opinions threatening to undermine the foundations of Catholic doctrine” and generally suggests that any existentialism is forbidden by the Catholic Church.⁵³ Segundo sets his question within the parameters of such a critical encyclical in order to explain how he is using existentialism without violating

⁵¹ “Existencialismo Cristiano”. In *Segundo Papers*, 3 pages. Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro de Espiritualidad Manresa. The essay was likely written in the 1980s, but there is no date on the manuscript.

⁵² Segundo, “EC,” 1.

⁵³ Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, Papal Encyclical (Roman Catholic Church, 1950).

his professed Christian doctrine. He cites “*Humani Generis*” in order to use existentialism without being a heretic. He continues:

Es necesario tener en cuenta algo muy simple: el Sumo Pontífice no condena nombres, títulos, rótulos, sino hechos, opiniones. Si alguien se dice protestante por el solo hecho de protestar contra los impuestos, no por eso es heterodoxo, aunque el protestantismo esté condenado como herejía. Sartre dice que de la palabra existencialismo se abusa tanto que en la sociedad francesa se les llama existencialistas a las señoras que dejan escapar alguna palabra más gruesa que lo ordinario en la conversación.	We must keep one very simple thing in mind: the Supreme Pontiff does not condemn names, titles, or slogans, but rather actions and opinions. If someone is called “protestant” solely for protesting against taxes, this does not make him or her heterodox, though Protestantism is condemned as heresy. Sartre said that the word “existentialism” is so abused in French society that the term “existentialist” is used to describe women who allow a cruder than normal word to escape in conversation. ⁵⁴
---	---

Segundo asks the question “Is it still possible...” rhetorically. He distinguishes between “names, titles, or signs” and “actions and opinions”. In this way, he interprets “*Humani Generis*” to condemn certain heretical actions, not the word *existentialism*, which seems like a semantic distinction. However, this distinction will prove important because Segundo does not completely follow the Sartrean definition of existentialism, which reduces faith to *mauvaise foi*.⁵⁵ He would have approved to some extent of Sartre’s idea (cf. section 4.1). For Segundo, existence precedes essence, as in Sartre, but Segundo finds existence is the affective or poetic, whereas essence is cognitive or philosophical. In “*Humani Generis*”, he finds support for exploring existentialism:

Such fictitious tenets of evolution which repudiate all that is absolute, firm and immutable, have paved the way for the new erroneous philosophy which, rivalling idealism, immanentism and pragmatism, has assumed the name of existentialism, since it concerns itself only

⁵⁴ Segundo, “EC,” 1.

⁵⁵ Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, Pt 1, Ch 2. See my further discussion of *mauvaise foi* in chapter 2.4.2 below.

with existence of individual things and neglects all consideration of their immutable essences.⁵⁶

Segundo quotes part of the above section of “*Humani Generis*”:

Citemos las palabras de la Encíclica: “rechaza las esencias inmutables de las cosas y no se preocupa más que de la existencia de cada una de ellas”; “impugna el valor del raciocinio metafísico”.	Let us cite the words of the Encyclical: “rejects the immutable essences of things and is not concerned beyond the existence of each of them;” “impugns the value of metaphysical reasoning”. ⁵⁷
--	---

This is support through negation because Segundo does not wish to repudiate “all that is absolute, firm, and immutable”. In no way does he “concern [him]self only with existence of individual things”.⁵⁸ As we shall see in the next section 1.3, his liberation theology is a methodology in which theology is dynamic for the “signs of the times” (cf. Matthew 16:3)⁵⁹ and is applicable to the church and the world.⁶⁰ Later in the essay he fleshes out the collective application of his Christian existentialism and it is not exclusively concerned with “individual things”.

1.2.2 What must be rejected

Segundo answers whether or not there can be a Christian existentialism with two points: “what must be rejected and what must be assimilated”.⁶¹ I will treat the first in this subsection and the latter in the next subsection. He writes:

Encarando así el tema no hacemos más que seguir estrictamente las directivas pontificias: “...Los filósofos católicos no deben ignorar ni desatender	Addressing the theme in this way, we are doing no more than strictly following the pontifical directives: “... Catholic philosophers must neither
--	---

⁵⁶ Pius XII, *Humani Generis*.

⁵⁷ Segundo, “EC,” 1.

⁵⁸ Pius XII, *Humani Generis*.

⁵⁹ Juan Luis Segundo, “Revelación, fe y signos de los tiempos,” *Revista Latinoamericana de Teología* 14(1988). Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *Signs of the Times, Theological Reflections*, ed. Alfred T. Hennelly, trans. Robert R. Barr (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993), 128-148.

⁶⁰ Juan Luis Segundo, *Iglesia - Gracia*, Teología Abierta 1 (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983), 43. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *The Community Called Church*, trans. John Drury, A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1973), 7.

⁶¹ Segundo, “EC,” 1.

estas opiniones (erróneas)	<u>ignore nor neglect</u> these (erroneous) opinions ⁶²
----------------------------	--

Segundo quotes from “*Humani Generis*”:

Now Catholic theologians and philosophers, whose grave duty it is to defend natural and supernatural truth and instil it in the hearts of men [sic], cannot afford to ignore or neglect these more or less erroneous opinions. Rather they must come to understand these same theories well, both because diseases are not properly treated unless they are rightly diagnosed, and because sometimes even in these false theories a certain amount of truth is contained, and, finally, because these theories provoke more subtle discussion and evaluation of philosophical and theological truths.⁶³

If pathologists do not study diseases, they cannot find a cure. If doctors do not get close to sick people, they cannot treat them. Segundo draws on this logic by quoting the entire paragraph above, but he does not base his engagement on the negative side of the Pope’s case. Segundo picks up on the Pope’s more positive comments: “...they must come to understand these same theories well...because sometimes even in these false theories a certain amount of truth is contained”. Segundo positively advocates a version of existentialism that does not fall under the Pope’s description. He writes:

Hace, por lo mismo, mal según al Papa, el que, teniendo capacidad y estudios sobre la materia, no se preocupa de estas cosas, o niega a priori lo bueno que en ellas puede haber, o no saca de ellas un estímulo para ahondar y perfeccionar más su propio pensamiento ortodoxo.	It is, therefore, according to the Pope, wrong for someone who has skills and education on a matter not to be concerned about these things, or to reject <i>a priori</i> the good that there may be in them, or not to take from them a stimulus to deepen and perfect his or her own orthodox thinking. ⁶⁴
--	--

⁶² Segundo, “EC,” 1, underlining original.

⁶³ Segundo, “EC,” 1. Cf. Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, 9. The direct English translation is more readable than Latin to Spanish to English.

⁶⁴ Segundo, “EC,” 1.

Giftedness, for Segundo, is from God,⁶⁵ and he views his own skills and education as well-suited to engage with the philosophy of existentialism. When engaging with a school of thought, he argues against rejecting the potential good or benefit of that school out of hand. He uses *ideology* as almost tantamount to *school of thought*, e.g. turning existentialism into a philosophy would be an ideology.⁶⁶ While Segundo does not reject ideology in itself, as a matter of fact, for him, existentialism occupies the same realm as faith and subjectivity, as distinct from ideologies which complement faith.

In this manuscript, just as we shall see in chapter three below, Segundo identifies existentialism as a sequel to Kant. He writes:

El existencialismo es una secuela de Kant. Berdiaef, el existencialista ruso, explica muy bien, en una de sus obras (<i>Essai d'une métaphysique eschatologique</i>), el proceso que une esos dos extremos tan alejados al parecer: Kant-existencialismo. Kant cerró la puerta a puesto conocimiento racional de la realidad en sí. No podíamos conocer la realidad tal cual ella es en sí misma. Las características que nosotros creemos ser las características de los objetos reales, no son más que	Existentialism is a sequel of Kant. The Russian existentialist Berdyaev explains very well in one of his works, (<i>Essai d'une métaphysique eschatologique</i> – Essay on eschatological metaphysics)⁶⁷ the process that unites these two apparently distant extremes: Kant-existentialism. Kant closed the door on rational knowledge of reality <i>per se</i>. We could not know reality precisely as it is in itself.⁶⁸ The characteristics that we think are the characteristics of the real objects are no more than products of
--	--

⁶⁵ Segundo refers to gifts in the sense of *being gifted by God* in Juan Luis Segundo, *El hombre de hoy ante Jesús de Nazaret, historia y actualidad: las cristologías en la espiritualidad* (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982), 81. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, trans. John Drury, vol. V, *Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988), 73.

⁶⁶ Segundo defines an ideology as “the systematization of my perception of the objective realm...a vision of things that claim to be objective, i.e. non-valuational”. Juan Luis Segundo, *El hombre de hoy ante Jesús de Nazaret, fe e ideología* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1982), 31. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, trans. John Drury, *Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1984), 16.

⁶⁷ Nikolai Berdiaev, *Essai de métaphysique eschatologique*, trans. Maxime Herman, *Philosophie de l'esprit* (Paris: Aubier, 1946).

⁶⁸ Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, ed. Paul Guyer and Allen Wood, trans. Paul Guyer and Allen Wood, *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), e.g. 481.

productos de nuestro mismo conocer, productos del <u>sujeto</u> , y no del objeto.	our own knowledge, products of the subject, not of the object. ⁶⁹
--	--

Kant points out that when a person acts in accordance with that person's duty because it is that person's duty, that person is acting morally.⁷⁰ In line with Kant, Berdyaev argues moral duty is a choice made in freedom.⁷¹ Segundo points to not knowing things in themselves and the fact of moral freedom as the development of the philosophy of existentialism. Contemporary thought is dependent on what came before it, and Segundo rightly begins his assessment of twentieth-century existentialism with nineteenth-century Kantian thought. His engagement with Kant and Berdyaev suggests his awareness of technical contributions from various thinkers to the development of the philosophy of existentialism. However, at this point, he does not delve further into technical definitions. He summarizes Kant:

Así no podemos llegar jamás a conocer las esencias de las cosas, lo que las cosas verdaderamente son.	Thus we can never arrive at knowledge of the essence of things, of what things truly are. ⁷²
---	---

Segundo's summary is not unique,⁷³ but it allows him to follow "Humani Generis" and move ahead with what he finds useful in the philosophy of existentialism. The encyclical precisely opposed the view that it is impossible to

⁶⁹ Segundo, "EC," 2.

⁷⁰ Immanuel Kant, *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason, And Other Writings*, ed. Karl Ameriks and Desmond M. Clarke, trans. Allen Wood and George Di Giovanni, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

⁷¹ Nicolas Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, trans. R. M. French (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), 164.

⁷² Segundo, "EC," 2.

⁷³ For example, the same argument is present in Benedict Ashley, "The End of Philosophy and the End of Physics: A Dead End," in *Postmodernism and Christian Philosophy*, ed. Roman T. Ciapalo (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1997), 21. Also, the argument is here: Merold E. Westphal, *Transcendence and Self-Transcendence: On God and the Soul* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2004), 138.

know the essence of things. Segundo approves of what he defines as Kantian existentialism, viz. 'to know and describe my experiences inasmuch as they are mine is subjective',⁷⁴ while he disapproves of the route by which Kant has arrived at this point, by way of the theory that things cannot be known in themselves, including the self.

1.2.3 What must be assimilated

Segundo summarizes Kant as arguing that reason cannot use categories to allow a person to know a thing in itself (its essence or *noumenon*), whether this is an external object or the internal self. People can only know the phenomenon. He writes:

Si el conocimiento de los <u>objetos</u> no nos sirve de nada para acercarnos a ellos, pongamos nuestra atención en el conocimiento de nuestro propio yo, de nuestro <u>sujeto</u> . Pero, cómo conocernos a nosotros mismos? Si queremos conocer nuestras características objetivas, si queremos conocernos así <u>como</u> <u>conocemos a los demás objetos</u> , se nos vienen encima las mismas dificultades de antes, y nunca podríamos llegar a conocernos tales como somos.	If knowledge of <u>objects</u> does not help us to approach them, we focus our attention on the knowledge of our own "I," of our <u>subject</u> . But how can we know ourselves? If we want to know our objective characteristics, if we want to know ourselves <u>as we know other objects</u> , we are overcome by the same difficulties as before, and we will never manage to know ourselves exactly as we are. ⁷⁵
--	---

Kant's point is that if we want to know ourselves as we know other objects, we are faced by the same difficulty that we cannot know the essence of the thing observed. We can know the 'phenomena', such as experiences, feelings, and impressions. Segundo apparently approves of the value of 'knowing and describing

⁷⁴ Segundo, "EC," 2.

⁷⁵ Segundo, "EC," 2.

experiences' without ascribing to Kant's denial that we cannot know the essence of things.

This leads to the question, if "I" am both subject (observer) and object (thing observed), how can "I" (subject) observe or know "myself" (object)? To answer this dilemma, he focuses on the common characteristic of subjects when they are humans. Each person has experiences, and human experiences can be shared. Even though experiences can be shared, he writes, "They are not entirely the same things...for me subjectively, my experiences, my physical phenomena differ from all others; they are mine...they affect me directly".⁷⁶ Each person's experiences, though they can be shared, are unique; they are not exactly the same. He writes, as I quoted part of the following in section 1.1 above,

Conocerme, por lo tanto, a mí mismo en lo que tengo de opuesto a los demás objetos, conocerme tal como soy para mi sensibilidad fundamental, conocer y describir mis experiencias en cuanto que son mías, subjetivas, <u>tal es el existencialismo</u> .	To know myself, then, as far as what I have that is opposite to all other objects, to know myself as I am for my fundamental sensibility, to know and describe my experiences inasmuch as they are mine, subjective, <u>this is existentialism</u> . ⁷⁷
--	--

This is, perhaps, Segundo's most direct engagement with existentialism. He summarizes his understanding of existentialism in a succinct statement: "To know myself...to know and describe my experiences inasmuch as they are mine, subjective".⁷⁸ Connecting with his discussion of Kant, the experiences are an object of knowledge; they can be observed, known, and described. He does not agree with Kant that essences are not objects of knowledge. The one observing, knowing, and describing is the subjective person.

⁷⁶ Segundo, "EC," 2, underlining original.

⁷⁷ Segundo, "EC," 2.

⁷⁸ Segundo, "EC," 2.

Segundo does not proffer a more technical definition of the philosophy of existentialism, and to relate his engagement with Kantian epistemology might minimize his connection with Sartrean existentialism. In light of the “*Humani Generis*” framework of engagement, Segundo might accept this criticism. What he assimilates from the philosophy of existentialism could be Kantian, at least in a modified form,⁷⁹ more than Sartrean. However, he is discussing Christian existentialism and as it relates to his larger project of a liberation theology method, “to know and describe my experiences inasmuch as they are mine” is contextual. For example, the experience of the Salvadorian peasant who wishes to engage in political action for land reform will be different from the experience of the member of the oligarchy who wishes to maintain things exactly as they are.

Segundo’s definition of existentialism functions in both a secular and a sacred context. On a secular level, the peasant knows her experiences as they are hers, just as the member of the oligarchy knows her experiences as they are hers. Neither has an *a priori* precedence over the other. On a sacred level, knowing one’s experiences and relating them to God is where transformation begins in the gospel tradition. For example, in the Bible Jesus is recorded as having engaged with the woman at the well in her particular experiences as they were (John 4), not in doctrinal terms.

1.2.4 The bad and good of existentialism

Segundo explores the good and bad of existentialism and writes:

Para un existencialista tal como lo he dibujado, no es posible llegar a la esencia de la cosa tal cual ella es en la realidad. Sólo puedo conocerla tal cual ella es para	For existentialists as I have depicted them, it is not possible to arrive at the essence of the thing precisely as it is in reality. I can only know it as it is <u>for me</u> ,
---	--

⁷⁹ Cf. e.g. Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason*, trans. Mary Gregor, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 90ff.

mí, según mi subjetividad. De ahí el <u>relativismo</u> existencialista. De ahí que con sólo el existencialismo no se pueda llegar a conocer la esencia real de nada, y nada se pueda deducir, ya que la deducción, el raciocinio metafísico sólo es válido y posible con dos requisitos: el uso de la razón y la constatación de la existencia y esencia real de algo. La misma ciencia no tiene para el existencialismo un valor real, objetivo.	according to my subjectivity. This is the origin of existentialist <u>relativism</u>. Thus, with existentialism alone, it is impossible to know the real essence of anything, and nothing can be deduced, since deduction, metaphysical reasoning, is only valid and possible with two requirements: the use of reason and the verification of the real existence and essence of something. Science itself does not have for existentialism a real, objective value.⁸⁰
---	--

With the above quote, Segundo ventures into the interpretation of results. As an example, he holds up science, for science is often considered objective. Science can be somewhat objective when results are repeatable and verifiable, although even the questions asked by scientists, regardless of the field, betray an epistemological prejudice, e.g. Newtonian physics or quantum mechanics. Existentialism alone is not enough to know “the real essence of anything”. That is, existentialism as subjective knowing cannot be taken on its own; it has to be supplemented by what Segundo calls the “scientific”, objective knowledge. Arguing against Kant, he does think it is possible to know essences, but this conclusion does not invalidate the kind of knowledge of mental phenomena to which Kant ascribes. To do so requires reason and “verification of real existence and essence of something”.⁸¹ Segundo is arguing for complementarity between existence (that which is affective) and essence (that which is known).

1.2.5 Rejection and acceptance

In conclusion to the short essay, he begins a new section:

⁸⁰ Segundo, "EC," 2-3.

⁸¹ Segundo, "EC," 3.

El existencialismo no pueda ser nuestra filosofía por ser completamente relativa, irracional, y hasta profundamente inhumana, quitándole a nuestras facultades cognoscitivas y afectivas, quitándole a nuestra libertad misma toda razón de ser y justificando cualquier acto, cualquier tiranía, cualquier injusticia, cualquier indistinción entre el bien y el mal.	Existentialism cannot be our philosophy due to being completely relative, irrational, and even profoundly inhuman, removing our cognitive and affective faculties, removing from our freedom itself any reason for being and justifying any action, any tyranny, any justice, and any lack of distinction between good and evil. ⁸²
--	--

In the above quote, it would appear that Segundo rejects outright the philosophy of existentialism, yet he is very specific in what he rejects. A philosophy that is “relative, irrational, and...inhuman” has no use for him. He introduces (or re-introduces, depending on when he wrote this manuscript) the two aspects of how humans experience the world. These are “cognitive” and “affective” and they complement one another. He reacts against any philosophical system that can justify anything, like tyranny, injustice, and a “lack of distinction between good and evil”.⁸³

Rejecting the above aspects of the philosophy of existentialism, he turns to what he finds acceptable and writes:

Pero si se le saca al existencialismo su pretensión de abarcarlo todo, de ser el único conocimiento válido, de ser la única normal vital, y se lo reduce a su propio campo, entonces ciertamente responde a una necesidad real del pensamiento, tiene su verdad, debe ocupar su lugar en una filosofía cristiana y su nombre podría unirse a ese adjetivo cristiano que le hemos puesto en el título.	But if existentialism is stripped of its pretension of encompassing everything, of being the only valid knowledge, of being the only vital norm, and it is reduced to its own field, then it certainly responds to a real necessity of thought; it has its truth, it must occupy its place in a Christian philosophy and in its name can be united with this adjective of Christian that we put in the title. ⁸⁴
---	---

⁸² Segundo, "EC," 3.

⁸³ Segundo, "EC," 3.

⁸⁴ Segundo, "EC," 3.

Taking the above criticisms away, he finds an existentialism that is left with truth that fits within Christian philosophy. He affirms the title of the manuscript: Christian existentialism. It is important to note that the existentialism he finds useful is one that does not contain the “relative, irrational, and... inhuman”. But, what is left? He writes:

Es precisamente el campo de nuestra <u>subjetividad</u> . Si se admite, por otro lado, la posibilidad de un conocimiento objetivo de la realidad como tal, tampoco puede negarse que tenemos de la realidad un conocimiento subjetivo, y que esos dos conocimientos, el objetivo y el subjetivo, el racional y el afectivo, son juntamente los que determinan y empujan toda nuestra existencia.	It is precisely the field of our <u>subjectivity</u> . If, on the other hand, we admit the possibility of objective knowledge of reality as such, neither can it be denied that we have a subjective knowledge of reality, and that these two types of knowledge, rational and affective, are, together, those that determine and drive all of our existence. ⁸⁵
--	---

The objective/subjective come together in Segundo’s existentialism. As we shall see in the next chapter, he names this in-between *intermedios*.⁸⁶ A plural expression in Spanish connoting *in-betweens*. In chapter two, *intermedios* are in between the cognitive and affective tendencies, but it can function toward both. Whether or not he had in mind his earliest work when he wrote this essay is unknown, but the connection is fairly clear, though instead of using the cognitive/affective language, he uses subjective/objective.

He continues:

La filosofía, preocupada por lo objetivo y por lo universalmente válido, ha descuidado mucho este campo de nuestra <u>realidad</u> , debido, claro está, a la mayor dificultad que ofrece este campo a la razón teórica y a su menor importancia si se tiene en cuenta solamente lo universal, lo colectivo, las normas del conocer y del	Philosophy, concerned with the objective and the universally valid, has greatly neglected this field of our <u>reality</u> , due, of course, to the greater difficulty that this field offers to theoretical reason and its lower importance if considering only the universal, the collective, and the norms
---	---

⁸⁵ Segundo, "EC," 3.

⁸⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 32.

obrar más universales.	of knowledge and of more universal action. ⁸⁷
------------------------	--

There are limitations to what philosophy (or science) can accomplish. Segundo recognizes these limitations and is using what he finds beneficial in existentialism in order to navigate these in-betweens (*intermedios*). If the philosophy of existentialism remains exclusively seeking a universal answer, it will fail. If, according to Segundo, the philosophy of existentialism recognizes its limitations, it can enrich Christian theology. Hence, he has upheld the criticism of existentialism in “*Humani Generis*” while extracting what is useful to his theological project.

He concludes the manuscript:

Allí habita y habla Dios. Tratar de llevar la luz de nuestro conocimiento a esa región, es iluminar más para nuestro conocimiento, la realidad divina y acercarnos más a ella.	That is where God resides and speaks. Attempting to bring the light of our knowledge to this region is to further illuminate the divine reality for our knowledge and to come closer to it. ⁸⁸
--	---

Segundo’s conclusion points to the rest of his project, as well as the goals of this thesis. Though he did not draw in the *intermedios* language, when he writes “Allí habita y habla Dios”, he could be referring to the notion of *intermedios*. The relationship between existence and essence and the movement between them is part of his theological discourse. Existentialism, or his understanding of it, provides a framework for approaching ‘the region where God resides’ and offers a tool for approaching questions of faith. In addition, it applies to approaching humanity in

⁸⁷ Segundo, “EC,” 3.

⁸⁸ Segundo, “EC,” 3.

every way, whether human suffering, oppression at the hands of a despotic dictator, or personal transformation.

1.3 What kind of liberation theology?

Segundo's liberation theology can be summarized as a methodological approach rather than a doctrine or a set of precepts. Applied in the Latin American milieu, his theology addresses the specific concerns of that context. However, he does not enter theological discourse with a specific doctrine, as did Camilo Torres who argued that God is always on the side of the revolutionary.⁸⁹ On the other hand, Gustavo Gutiérrez is more systematic in his treatment of liberation theology.⁹⁰ Another example of a systematic approach is the edited volume by Jon Sobrino and Ignacio Ellacuría.⁹¹ In Segundo's response to the 'Instruction on Certain Aspects of the Theology of Liberation',⁹² he criticizes generalizing about all liberation theologians, as if "all cats are leopards".⁹³ Gutiérrez, for example, emphasizes class struggle and praxis.⁹⁴ Jon Sobrino focuses on searching for and presenting a new

⁸⁹ Camilo Torres, *Revolutionary Priest: The Complete Writings & Messages of Camilo Torres*, ed. John Gerassi, trans. June de Cipriano Alcantara, et al. (New York: Vintage Books, 1971), especially 466ff. This idea has been repeated by other Latin American liberation theologians. E.g. cf. Ann Mische, *Partisan Publics: Communication and Contention across Brazilian Youth Activist Networks* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 126.

⁹⁰ E.g. Gutiérrez, *Teología de la Liberación*. Cf. Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*.

⁹¹ Jon Sobrino and Ignacio Ellacuría, eds., *Systematic Theology: Perspectives from Liberation Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986).

⁹² Catholic Church, *Instruction on certain aspects of the "theology of liberation"*.

⁹³ Juan Luis Segundo, *Teología de la liberación: respuesta al Cardenal Ratzinger* (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1985), 12. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *Theology and the Church, A Response to Cardinal Ratzinger and a Warning to the Whole Church, Revised Edition*, trans. John W. Diercksmeier (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 2. In their polemical, non-scholarly condemnation of liberation theology, Gerard Berghoef and Lester DeKoster consider liberation theologians homogenous. Gerard Berghoef and Lester DeKoster, *Liberation Theology, The Church's Future Shock* (Grand Rapids, MI: Christian's Library Press, 1984), 11.

⁹⁴ Gutiérrez, *Teología de la Liberación*, 61ff. Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, 5ff.

historical Jesus whose focus is on poor people, and he generally identifies Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection with the struggles of poor people.⁹⁵

Segundo's methodological liberation theology is most clearly evident in *Teología de la liberación*, his response to the *Instruction*. In it, he responds to criticisms and engages other liberation theologians, especially Gutiérrez. Segundo directly addresses what he calls the "supposed influence of Rudolf Bultmann" but finds that one can adopt Bultmann's existentialist approach without being committed to the reductive conclusions often attributed to him.⁹⁶ Segundo then directly disavows Bultmann, writing, "There is nothing further from the [Latin American] context than the Bultmannian methodology".⁹⁷ His argument does not undermine the influence of existentialism in general or Bultmann in particular because he engages with Bultmann in more detail elsewhere.⁹⁸ As we shall see, Segundo engages with Berdyaev, Sartre, Heidegger, and Bultmann without agreeing with all of their conclusions.

Four examples serve to illustrate why I label Segundo's approach *methodological*:

⁹⁵ Jon Sobrino, *Cristología desde américa latina (esbozo a partir del seguimiento del Jesús histórico)* (Río Honda, México: Centro de Reflexión Teológica, 1976). Cf. Jon Sobrino, *Christology at the Crossroads, A Latin American Approach*, trans. John Drury (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1978).

⁹⁶ Segundo argues that since Latin American theologians were mostly educated in Europe, they are familiar with Bultmann. Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*, 14. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*, 3.

⁹⁷ Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*, 14. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*, 3.

⁹⁸ E.g. From this same period in his writing, Juan Luis Segundo, *El hombre de hoy ante Jesús de Nazaret, historia y actualidad: sinópticos y Pablo* (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982), 64ff. He engages Bultmann and Rahner and their Christologies as he develops his own. Their influence is evident, yet he neither affirms nor denies Bultmann's demythologization. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, trans. John Drury, vol. II, Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1985), 32ff. There are also examples of Bultmann from earlier and later in his career. E.g. From earlier: Juan Luis Segundo, *Nuestra Idea de Dios*, vol. III, *Teología Abierta para el Laico Adulto* (Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1970), 30-32. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, trans. John Drury, A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1974), 47-48. From later: Segundo, *Dogma*, 195. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 124.

(1) Segundo argues that salvation is a method rather than a doctrine in *Esa comunidad llamada iglesia*.⁹⁹ He views salvation as a method of living out divine love.¹⁰⁰ His approach is noteworthy because he does not clearly specify what salvation means in the sense of traditional church teaching, e.g. catechism, confirmation, or baptism. Instead, he views salvation as radically living out love and putting Christian doctrine into practice. He does not deny traditional practices, but expresses the Christ event as a lived process rather than a one-time event.

Putting doctrine into practice might require a more specific definition of doctrine. As a method, he writes about a Christian faith (or doctrine) that is lived out and specific to certain circumstances. Circumstances (or cultural milieu) lead to ideology, and faith is understood through one's present ideology. In Latin America under oppressive dictatorship, living out love might mean raising one's voice on behalf of the voiceless, yet, for Segundo, being the voice of the voiceless is not *ipso facto* Christian doctrine or the only way of living out the Christian faith. It is tied to a particular context. He does not present an ethical framework like Joseph Fletcher's "situational ethics".¹⁰¹ Instead, Segundo presents something similar to Paul Tillich's idea that "the law of love is the ultimate law".¹⁰²

(2) In *LT*, Segundo's hermeneutic circle represents faith in practice. The hermeneutic circle is a method. First, one experiences reality and this experience leads to ideological suspicion. Next, ideological suspicion can be applied to the entire ideological superstructure in general, and it can be applied to theology in particular.

⁹⁹ Juan Luis Segundo, *Esa comunidad llamada iglesia*, vol. I, Teología abierta para el laico adulto (Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1968). Re-issued Segundo, *Teología Abierta 1*. Cf. Segundo, *The Community Called Church*.

¹⁰⁰ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 1*, 97. Cf. Segundo, *The Community Called Church*, 52.

¹⁰¹ Joseph F. Fletcher, *Situation ethics: The New Morality* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966).

¹⁰² Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology, Volume 1: Reason and Revelation, Being and God* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951), 152.

Third, a new experience of theological reality can raise exegetical suspicion, with the new data providing a new way to approach the Bible. Finally, a new hermeneutic provides a new way of interpreting faith.¹⁰³ The method is unique because of the connection with the ideologies in the social situation, which connects the present with the past. Existential reflection fits in the circle because hermeneutics should, for example, try to find what in Jesus' "message should be attributed to the surrounding circumstances".¹⁰⁴

(3) Following a method is not restrictive and can cross boundaries between different areas of theology and from theology to other fields. In *FI*, Segundo contrasts his project with *A Marxist Looks at Jesus* by Milan Machoveč.¹⁰⁵ Machoveč uses the phrase "scientific method" where Segundo uses "ideology". The contradistinction between Segundo and Machoveč highlights one of Segundo's points in his response to the *Instruction*. He argues that liberation theology is not inherently Marxist and questions why it seems impossible to "accept certain valid elements in order to understand the mechanisms of social processes, separating them from the rest of the system that perhaps integrates them into an ideology".¹⁰⁶ In other words, one can accept Karl Marx's social commentary, like class conflict, without becoming a Marxist. Raymond McAfee Brown makes this point in explaining Latin American liberation theology to a North Atlantic audience. He writes, "Third world Christians do not need Karl Marx to realize that *a class struggle is going on*".¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ Segundo, *LT*, 14. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 14.

¹⁰⁴ Segundo, *LT*, 100. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 86.

¹⁰⁵ Segundo used Milan Machoveč, *Jesús para ateos*, trans. Alfonso Ortiz García (Salamanca: Sígueme, 1974). Cf. Milan Machoveč, *A Marxist Looks at Jesus*, trans. Kreuz Verlag Stuttgart (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976).

¹⁰⁶ Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*, 126. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*, 97.

¹⁰⁷ Robert McAfee Brown, *Unexpected News: Reading the Bible with Third World Eyes* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 40, emphasis original. N.B. The publication year is the same as the Vatican *Instruction*.

(4) We return to *Teología de la liberación*, his response to the *Instruction*, in which he suggests some flexibility in which method to use. He writes, “Reality never dictates what method is to be used to analyse it, and there is no method that does not emphasize certain aspects of reality, giving them privilege over others”.¹⁰⁸ In this section, he is responding to criticism in the *Instruction* about the use of Marxism by liberation theologians, but his response applies to whatever method is called for by a particular situation. As his argument unfolds, interpreting a biblical text might require a method like the hermeneutic circle, or responding to poor people suffering at the hands of rich people might require language borrowed from Marxist language of class struggle. For Segundo, a method is not mutually exclusive of another method.

Throughout Segundo’s writings, biblical interpretation and ecclesiology play important roles in addition to his methodology. For instance, his three-volume Christology largely follows the New Testament organization. He begins with *FI*,¹⁰⁹ which is his methodology for the subsequent volumes and will be the primary text for chapter seven below. Volume two explores Jesus as portrayed in the synoptic gospels and Romans,¹¹⁰ and volume three explores Jesus of the Ignatian Spiritual Exercises and the result of Segundo’s methodological Christology.¹¹¹ Although the place of scripture for Segundo is significant,¹¹² his method is influenced by his own participation in the Ignatian Exercises.

¹⁰⁸ Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*, 125. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*, 96-97.

¹⁰⁹ Segundo, *FI*. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*.

¹¹⁰ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*. Juan Luis Segundo, *The Humanist Christology of Paul*, trans. John Drury, vol. III, Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986).

¹¹¹ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, trans. John Drury, vol. IV, Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987). Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*.

¹¹² E.g. This thesis explores the role of scripture in liberation theology and credits Segundo with systematizing liberation theology. Steven Phillips, “The Use of Scripture in Liberation Theologies: an

The other important part of Segundo's liberation theology is his ecclesiology, yet his ecclesiology remains largely methodological. He neither presents his readers with a new ecclesiology, nor does he break significantly with traditional Catholic ecclesiology. Nowhere in his writings does he define the roles within the church, e.g. the role of a bishop or priest. Instead, in an almost Bonhoeffer-like manner, he views the church as the vehicle for theology and for liberation.¹¹³ This view comes through most clearly in *Esa comunidad llamada iglesia*. In the book, he argues that the church is peculiar. It started as an insignificant sect within a minority religion. He then takes his argument one step further. In contemporary culture, whether Christians are in the majority is a superficial matter according to Segundo, when taking active religious participation into consideration. He writes, "The church was born at a specific moment...therefore, a million years of human existence remain outside of her reach".¹¹⁴ This observation presents a question about how the church could be the only way to God, yet have not existed for so much of human history, but he argues that the church is peculiar in that it is unique and it is universal, using the Great Commission (Matthew 28:19-20) as a scriptural basis for the church's universality. He writes,

[Early Christians] who were practically contemporaries of the newly born church, already considered her to be universal--not because of the number of her adherents but because she embraced the dimension of humanity itself; because no reality or human being is outside of her frontiers; because she had always been present, even though her

examination of Juan Luis Segundo, James H. Cone, and Jürgen Moltmann" (Ph.D., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1978).

¹¹³ *Almost* must be emphasized because Bonhoeffer did not develop his theology from firsthand experience of poverty and oppression. However, Gutiérrez utilizes Bonhoeffer in Gustavo Gutiérrez, *The Power of the Poor in History* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1983), 233. There is a brief survey of Bonhoeffer in liberation theology in G. Clarke Chapman, "Bonhoeffer, Liberation Theology, and the 1990s," in *Reflections on Bonhoeffer: Essays in Honor of F. Burton Nelson*, ed. Geoffrey B. Kelly and C. John Weborg (Chicago: Covenant Press, 1999), 299-300.

¹¹⁴ Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 1, 12. Cf. Segundo, *The Community Called Church*, 5.

limitations as a particular historical reality seemed to indicate otherwise.¹¹⁵

For Segundo, the church can be uniquely God's, both as possession and instrument, but it is not the only instrument available to God. Segundo does not go much further in his description of the universality of the church or God's universality. He sets this assertion of universality as a precursor for the church as transformative. Viewing the church as transformative connects to a methodological liberation theology. In other words, it is applicable to different circumstances.

Segundo learned from what came before. He engaged widely with other sources as he developed his liberation theology. For example, in *LT*, he engaged with Harvey Cox, Karl Marx, Max Weber, and James Cone. By placing his hermeneutic circle alongside each of them, he demonstrates how his methodology works and places it in dialogue with established and familiar ideas. Each of these interlocutors precede Segundo's project, by many years in the cases of Marx and Weber, thus reinforcing the notion of his use of lessons from previous generations. He finds Cone's black liberation theology the best expression of his methodology because it is portable to other situations, e.g. it can be used for re-reading the signs of the times.¹¹⁶

1.4 Segundo's writings

Existencialismo marked the beginning of Segundo's prolific writing career. His intellectual life can be organized into four stages. Agustín Francisco Canessa identifies six stages in Segundo's works,¹¹⁷ but I find four stages to be a better

¹¹⁵ Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 1, 14. Cf. Segundo, *The Community Called Church*, 7.

¹¹⁶ Segundo, *LT*, Cap 1. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, Ch 1.

¹¹⁷ Agustín Francisco Canessa, "Etapas y Obras del Itinerario Histórico e Intelectual de Juan Luis Segundo," Montevideo, 2006.

description. The stages are marked by major works but also include articles and conference papers:

1. **1941-1962 is his early period and formative years.** The highlights in this stage are *Existencialismo* (1948) and *Berdiaeff* (1963). Arguably *Función de la iglesia en la realidad rioplatense* (1962) was also a major contribution in this period. The unpublished lecture notes "Orientaciones Literarias" (1953) show his intellectual development.
2. **1962-1975 was a productive period.** Segundo led the *Cursos de Complementación Christian* through 1964 and wrote a number of articles for *Mensaje*,¹¹⁸ *Diálogo*,¹¹⁹ and several other periodicals. He produced a five-volume set called *Teología abierta para el laico adulto*¹²⁰ (*Open Theology for Lay Adults*, published in English in five volumes as *A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity*)¹²¹
3. **1975-1984 was a tumultuous period.**¹²² Segundo's most famous work comes this period, *The Liberation of Theology* (1975),¹²³ published in English one year later.¹²⁴ During this period, he led reflection groups and continued writing.¹²⁵ He also wrote a three-

¹¹⁸ E.g. Juan Luis Segundo, "El círculo vicioso de la miseria: el universitario latinoamericano," *Mensaje* 113(1962). Juan Luis Segundo, "Diagnóstico político de América Latina," *Mensaje* 115(1962).

¹¹⁹ E.g. Segundo, "La Iglesia, 'es necesaria?'" Segundo, "El diálogo Iglesia-Mundo: reflexión".

¹²⁰ Segundo, *Esa comunidad llamada iglesia*. Juan Luis Segundo, *Gracia y condición humana*, vol. II, *Teología abierta para el laico adulto* (Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1969). Segundo, *Nuestra Idea de Dios*. Juan Luis Segundo, *Los sacramentos hoy*, vol. IV, *Teología Abierta para el Laico Adulto* (Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1971). Juan Luis Segundo, *Evolución y culpa*, vol. V, *Teología abierta para el laico adulto* (Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1972).

¹²¹ Segundo, *The Community Called Church*. Segundo, *Grace and the Human Condition*. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*. Segundo, *The Sacraments Today*. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*.

¹²² Liberation theology was both popular and under attack. At the end of this period, the Vatican "Instruction" was published and Segundo's response followed one year later. Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*.

¹²³ Segundo, *LT*.

¹²⁴ Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*.

¹²⁵ Coronado, "Interview," 275.

volume work called *El hombre de hoy ante Jesus de Nazaret*¹²⁶

published in 1982 (published in English as *Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today* in five volumes).¹²⁷ In 1983, he re-published his earlier five-volume work *Teología Abierta* in two volumes with a third volume of critical reflections.¹²⁸

4. **1985-1996 is Segundo's mature period, especially from 1989-1994.** He published four substantial books: *El Dogma que libera*,¹²⁹ *La historia perdida y recuperada de Jesús de Nazaret*,¹³⁰ *¿Qué mundo? ¿Qué hombre? ¿Qué Dios?*,¹³¹ and *El caso Mateo*.¹³²

These stages highlight the development of Segundo's thought. From the promising little book *Existencialismo* (1948) to the dense tomes of the early 1990s, he grew and continued to refine his thought throughout his life. Unlike other thinkers who experienced shifts in their thought (e.g. Heidegger or Berdyaev), Segundo remained consistent. Part of my approach outlined below will be to show this consistency by engaging with sources from different eras of his life.

1.4.1 Principal published sources cited

Due to the nature of this project, the best place to begin is with *Existencialismo*, which is the primary source in chapter 2. In chapter 3, I closely treat

¹²⁶ Segundo, *FI*. Segundo, *El hombre* 2.1. Segundo, *El hombre* 2.2.

¹²⁷ Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*. Segundo, *The Humanist Christology of Paul*. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*.

¹²⁸ Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 1. Juan Luis Segundo, *Dios - Sacramentos - Culpa*, *Teología Abierta* 2 (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983). Juan Luis Segundo, *Reflexiones Críticas*, *Teología Abierta* 3 (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983).

¹²⁹ Segundo, *Dogma*. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*.

¹³⁰ Juan Luis Segundo, *La Historia Perdida y Recuperada De Jesús De Nazaret*, vol. 65, Colección "Presencia Teologica" (Santander, España: Sal Terrae, 1991).

¹³¹ Segundo, *Qué mundo*.

¹³² Juan Luis Segundo, *El Caso Mateo: los comienzos de una ética judeocristiana*, vol. 74, Colección "Presencia Teologica" (Santander, España: Sal Terrae, 1994).

Segundo's thesis under the supervision of Paul Ricoeur, *Berdiaeff*. *LT* is the primary source for chapter 6, and *FI* is the primary source for chapter 7. While *LT* and *FI* have been extensively studied, *Existencialismo* and *Berdiaeff* have been largely overlooked by scholars treating Segundo. In addition to these books, I will occasionally reference one of Segundo's published articles. Most of these have been unavailable to English readers.

1.4.2 New material

At Jesuit Library at Manresa Casa de Oración y Retiros in Montevideo, Uruguay, there are over four thousand pages of articles and manuscripts by Segundo. Much of the material has been published. There are drafts of books, copies of published articles, and papers that he presented at conferences. Other than the books published by Orbis in English, much of these materials are unavailable outside of the Manresa Jesuit Library. Because of inaccessibility, much of it has been ignored or overlooked in other Segundo writings. In addition, there are unpublished manuscripts among his papers. Chapter 5 below makes use of one such paper as the primary source. The paper is undated and appears to be a rough draft of an article he was preparing. The title is "La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología".¹³³

Jose Irureta, a friend of Juan Luis Segundo, was in possession of eighty-eight cassettes containing audio recordings of reflection group meetings led by Segundo in the 1980s. Sr. Irureta entrusted me with the preservation of these recordings, and chapter 4 utilizes a cassette in which Segundo discusses freedom in light of fictional works: *Caligula* by Albert Camus, *The Flies* and *Nausea* both by Jean-Paul Sartre. The cassette is labelled 1980, two years before *FI* was published. In the recording, as we

¹³³ Segundo, "La fenomenología".

shall see, the seeds of the 1982 book were clearly germinating. The cassette supplements and adds insight to the book as a source.

1.4.3 Secondary material

There is a vast amount of secondary material written about Segundo's thoughts. Although he first published *Existencialismo* in 1948, others began referring to his works in the 1960s. For example, in 1967, Ivan Vallier included Segundo in a list of significant commentators on the relationship between the church and state.¹³⁴ Since then, people have written articles and over sixty master's and doctoral dissertations and monographs about, in response to, or inspired by the theology of Juan Luis Segundo. There are three major reasons for the high number of doctoral dissertations related to Segundo's theology. First, his extensive catalogue of publications has provided ready material for those seeking a research topic. Second, his books were widely translated. Latin American theologians who did not enjoy widespread translation have not received the attention Segundo has.¹³⁵ Third, during the 1980s, liberation theology enjoyed great popularity, so people at the places where one would expect to find Catholic theology being written (e.g. Fordham University or Boston College) were writing about liberation theology. However, graduate students were also writing about liberation theology in unexpected places (e.g. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and Fuller Theological Seminary). Because of the waning popularity of liberation theology in the 1990s, or because of his death in 1996, the number of Segundo dissertations has diminished to the

¹³⁴ Ivan Vallier, "Church "Development" in Latin America: A Five-Country Comparison," *The Journal of Developing Areas* 1, no. 4 (1967): 466.

¹³⁵ For example, João Batista Libanio has only one article translated into English, and there are very few people who have engaged with this insightful thinker. Cf. João Batista Libanio, "Hope, Utopia, Resurrection," in *Mysterium Liberationis: Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology*, ed. Ignacio Ellacuría and Jon Sobrino (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993).

current level of slightly less than one per year. When there is something in this extensive body of secondary material that adds to my argument or provides a valuable insight, I will make use of the source.

1.5 Organization of this argument

The primary goal of this project is to point to the prominent existential dimensions of Juan Luis Segundo's liberation theology and to present little known or previously unknown material to do so. Because existentialism is as varied as liberation theology, part of establishing Segundo's existential influence involves specifying the *kind* of existentialism that most heavily influenced his work. As shown in section 1.2 above and as we shall see in the following chapters, Segundo rejects some parts of the philosophy of existentialism and appropriates others.

Specifying the kind of existentialism that Segundo uses will also involve identifying key thinkers (e.g. Berdyaev, Bultmann, Camus, Heidegger, and Sartre) in his writing. Establishing this influence is dependent on Segundo's references. In one case, the endnotes of the unpublished manuscript *Heidegger* have been lost. Therefore, when using this source, I have attempted to reconstruct his citations. Due to the size of the body of Segundo's works, it is beyond the scope of this project to include a detailed exegesis or description of each of his books, articles, and papers. Therefore, I have selected the materials that I feel best illustrate the existential dimension of his liberation theology.

I compare works from different eras of Segundo's life in order to test the consistency in his argument. Chapters 2, 3, 6, and 7 use as a primary source *Existencialismo* (1948), *Berdiaeff* (1962), *LT* (1975), and *FI* (1982), respectively. Each comes from a different period and validates his consistency. For example,

compare *Acción pastoral latinoamericana* (1972) with *Dogma* (1989). In *Acción*, he writes, “The reflection of lay people does not start from theology, with which the priest is familiar, but from real everyday life and its problems”.¹³⁶ In *Dogma*, he writes,

In this book I have sought to show how all theology’s tools and aids have been converging toward a kind of dogma that constitutes a platform for liberative human seeking and divine revelation.¹³⁷

Segundo starts from the existential, not philosophical existentialism, but an observation of subjective phenomena. Despite seventeen years between the two quotes, he maintains a connection between existence and the way the people within a faith community understand God and their liturgical life. In this existence, there is human suffering and poverty. This connection does not, as he writes, “start from theology”. Instead, this connection incorporates theological tools to create a platform for “liberative human seeking and divine revelation”.¹³⁸

¹³⁶ Juan Luis Segundo, *Acción pastoral latinoamericana: sus motivos ocultos* (Buenos Aires: Búsqueda, 1972), 52. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *The Hidden Motives of Pastoral Action, Latin American Reflections*, trans. John Drury (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1978), 56.

¹³⁷ Segundo, *Dogma*, 397. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 263.

¹³⁸ Segundo, *Dogma*, 397. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 263.

2 Building an existential basis

2.1 Introduction

In his first published work *Existencialismo, filosofía y poesía: ensayo de síntesis* (1948), Juan Luis Segundo seeks to understand the meaning of human existence. He writes, "Whole books try to define philosophy," but he sets the question of defining philosophy aside and he continues, "Our analysis...comes from a human point of view".¹³⁹ The crux of his argument is the contradistinction between philosophical and existential limits. He suggests that humankind first encounters things and people in experience.¹⁴⁰ The first is only 'provisional', whereas the second is 'real and definitive'. The essential and existential contacts between people are human tendencies (i.e. a search for truth and goodness respectively). Expanding these two tendencies is one of the major themes of *Existencialismo*, and this book reveals an early existential leaning, which Segundo expands in his later works.

Segundo opens *Existencialismo* with this statement: "From the Middle Ages to today, humans have analyzed many things".¹⁴¹ He takes up this human task of analysis by offering an early attempt at synthesizing his understanding of existence, philosophy and poetry. Segundo's use of the word *existencialismo* could be translated from Spanish to English literally as *existentialism*, but his use of the term is not the same as in the area of modern philosophy called *existentialism*.¹⁴² As we

¹³⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 30.

¹⁴⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 34.

¹⁴¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 7.

¹⁴² Cf. "Existentialism," in *The Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy*, ed. Nicholas Bunnin and Jiyuan Yu (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

shall see in the following chapters, Segundo's *existencialismo* is both indebted to and differs from the existentialism of Sartre, Heidegger, Marcel, and Berdyaev.¹⁴³

He begins *Existencialismo* by contrasting his project with unnamed earlier thinkers stretching back to the Middle Ages. He suggests that these earlier thinkers have "abstracted, dissociated, and separated" the whole of existence into its parts, but his goal is to construct a synthesis.¹⁴⁴ At this point, he does not explain what he means by synthesis. He wants to find a new way of doing philosophy, combining it with experience in existence. In this early text, it is unclear whether he finds the answer in Scholastic theology or in a more contemporary idea like existential philosophy. As his thought develops, the answer comes out in subsequent works.

In the introduction, he proposes that this work is "one more grain of sand for the edification of that philosophical threshold through which human beings will be able to enter into their true home, which is life".¹⁴⁵ Odair Pedroso Mateus points out that Segundo is using Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's language here,¹⁴⁶ but Mateus' suggestion might be re-phrased as, "Segundo's language illustrates one similarity between his and Teilhard's thought". The reason for the suggested re-phrasing is that Teilhard's first published work was *The Phenomenon of Man* in 1955, seven years after *Existencialismo* first appeared. Segundo was influenced by Teilhard, but not until later.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴³ N.B. When the first letter is capitalized, as in *Existencialismo*, I am referring to Segundo's 1948 book. When the first letter is lower-case, as in *existencialismo*, I am referring to Segundo's existential philosophy, as distinguished from modern *existentialism*.

¹⁴⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 7.

¹⁴⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 7.

¹⁴⁶ Odair Pedroso Mateus, "At the Intersections of Poetry, Existential Philosophy and Theology: The Origins of Juan Luis Segundo's Thought," *Louvain Studies* 22, no. 3 (1997): 231.

¹⁴⁷ E.g. Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 2, 369ff.

Segundo introduces three conditions on which he feels his project depends. First, he wants to “return to common sense”.¹⁴⁸ He does not specify exactly what he means by “common sense,” but clearly he wants everyday experience to function as a point of departure rather than moving too quickly into abstract ideas. He writes, “We can no longer carry the burden of a philosophy that leaves us alone at dinner time or at the time for prayer”.¹⁴⁹ Second, the approach to philosophy that Segundo is proposing cannot be *parcial*. That is, this philosophy cannot be restricted to or give precedence to some *part* of human reality, whether that *part* is the intellect, the will, the material world or the realm of ideas. His condition is that this philosophy must speak to the whole of *existencia* and is therefore “existential”.¹⁵⁰ Third, the conclusions drawn from this philosophy must take into consideration “absolute existence”. Segundo writes, “Without a religious sense, without the experience of the sacred, without the experience of our existence, there is no vital synthesis possible in the universe”.¹⁵¹

As a preliminary note to treating *Existencialismo*, I would like to point out a caveat for contemporary readers. Segundo does not cite his sources in this book. Therefore, I have made every attempt to find his sources and cross-reference my citation of his work with his source or a translation thereof. Since he does not provide any references, it is impossible to definitively know his influences. Does the content come from his reading or from one of his seminary lecturers in San Miguel, Argentina? For example, when writing about two versions of the notion of time, he writes, “One affects us and the other does not, and this is because one brings with it

¹⁴⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 8.

¹⁴⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 8.

¹⁵⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 8.

¹⁵¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 9.

the sensation of presence and the other does not”.¹⁵² He does not mention Joseph Maréchal here, but “sensation of presence” is an idea Maréchal describes in *Etudes sur la psychologie des mystiques* in 1924,¹⁵³ and Segundo’s frequent reference to *psicología* suggests that he has had exposure to psychological thought. It would, however, be conjecture to suggest that Segundo read Maréchal. My project is to identify the drift of his thought in his early works in order to set up a structural parallel with his later, more mature works. This preliminary note is a caution against assuming that there is an historical connection when, in fact, there are only streams of similarity.

2.2 Metaphysical and psychological foundations

The first chapter sets the foundation for the book. Segundo opens it with a quote from Gabriel Marcel’s play *L’Horizon*.¹⁵⁴ He quotes a conversation between two characters, Germain and Bernard. The play is a case of mistaken identity; a medium predicts Germain’s death, but Bernard is the one who dies.¹⁵⁵ Germain discusses self-transcendence. The human movement of self-transcendence is a central idea in the first chapter of *Existencialismo*. This is the human desire to overcome limits and enter the dimension of the plenitude of being. For Segundo, the quote serves as a useful point of departure for the comparison he will set up between liberative and non-liberative religious knowledge, since Germain exhibits a desire to overcome limits, which, as we shall see below, Segundo suggests is a universal human trait.

¹⁵² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 15.

¹⁵³ Cf. Joseph Maréchal, *The Psychology of the Mystics* (Mineola, NY: Dover, 2004), 58.

¹⁵⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 11. Cf. Gabriel Marcel, *L’horizon: pièce en 4 actes suivie d’une postface* (Paris: Éditions aux étudiants de France, 1945), 86.

¹⁵⁵ Marcel, *L’horizon*.

2.2.1 Two opposite experiences

Two approaches to reality, that of philosophy and poetry, are exemplified by two approaches to time: Gustavo Adolfo Bécquer (poet) and Aristotle (philosopher).¹⁵⁶ Segundo quotes from Bécquer's poem "The dark swallows return"¹⁵⁷ and a line from Aristotle, "Time is the number of movements".¹⁵⁸ He suggests that this comparison will lead to a definition, but in *Existencialismo*, his idea of a definition appears somewhat imprecise. Instead, the contrast illustrates the impact of two different approaches to time: "one affects us and the other does not".¹⁵⁹ However, the distinction between Bécquer representing poetry (that which affects us) and Aristotle representing philosophy (that which does not) is the central point in Segundo's first section.

Segundo notes that the form of expression used by Bécquer and Aristotle is not the reason "one affects us and the other does not," for "the Aristotelian definition can also be put in verse".¹⁶⁰ He also notes that the theme the two thinkers consider is not what distinguishes one from the other because they both discuss time, and they could have discussed something else with the same result: Bécquer evokes a response and Aristotle does not. Segundo writes, "After listening to Bécquer, there might arise, on the other hand, this question: What is the *essence* of that change

¹⁵⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 13.

¹⁵⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 13-14. Cf. Gustavo Adolfo Bécquer, *Collected Poems: Rimas*, ed. Michael Smith and Luis Ingelmo, trans. Michael Smith (Exeter: Shearsman, 2007). In the second stanza of "Volverán las oscuras golondrinas..." For Segundo's more in-depth analysis of Bécquer's poem, see Section 7.2.1. below and Segundo, *FI*, 180ff. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 145ff.

¹⁵⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 14. Cf. Aristotle, *On the Heavens*, trans. J. L. Stocks (350 BCE), Book I, Part 9. Aristotle, *Physics*, trans. R. P. Hardie and R. K. Gaye (350 BCE), Book VIII.

¹⁵⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 15. This contrast again suggests Segundo's use of Maréchal's idea of "sensation of presence". Maréchal, *The Psychology of the Mystics*, 58.

¹⁶⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 14.

whose *existence* I experience?"¹⁶¹ He uses *essence* and *existence* in his own way. That is, *essence* relates to philosophy, with knowledge also being intermingled with essences, and poetry relates to *existence*. Poetry tends to bring us back to *seres*, which is literally *beings*.¹⁶² For Segundo, there are two ways of knowing a being: one is to know the essence and the other is to write a poem in which one knows the things that are beautiful, in an existential and affective way. In concluding the section, he writes, "We are faced with two fundamental tendencies of the human reality".¹⁶³ These tendencies are the intentional encounter with essence as found in philosophy and the affective encounter with existence, as found in poetry.

2.2.2 Metaphysical foundations

In the second section, Segundo writes, "We start from the experience that each of us has of our own limitation".¹⁶⁴ This is the universal notion of experience I referenced above, and this idea remains consistent with the three conditions he listed in the introduction. (1) Human experience is related to what he calls "common sense". That is, we begin from common experience, or something that is implicitly universal. (2) He is not referring to a *parcial* human reality; it is the total experience of limitation. (3) Experiencing "our own limitation" can be connected to "absolute existence" or "the experience of the sacred".¹⁶⁵ From human experience, he identifies the human movement of self-transcendence or desiring to overcome limitations and

¹⁶¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 15, emphasis added.

¹⁶² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 15.

¹⁶³ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 15.

¹⁶⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 16.

¹⁶⁵ The connection between "limitation" and something "absolute" is concomitant with the theology of Paul Tillich, which was developing concurrently. Cf. Paul Tillich, *The Courage to Be* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1952), 73-75.

enter the dimensions of the plenitude of being.¹⁶⁶ Humankind experiences limitations and then acts, regardless of whether the activities are functional and objective or material, “which is carrying us implacably towards full being, without ruptures”.¹⁶⁷ It is this plenitude of being that is without ruptures.

The movement beyond limitations toward perfection is mysterious in the material order, but Segundo writes, “It is even more mysterious in the spiritual order”.¹⁶⁸ Using the analogy of a vitamin moving from being in a plant to providing sustenance for a person, he distinguishes between the physicality of the vitamin and spiritual perfecting. The plant is destroyed in order to extract the nutrition contained within it, but a person cannot consume something in order to gain wisdom, kindness or beauty. Yet, spiritual characteristics have “the property to transmit themselves by multiplication...they propagate themselves by contact”.¹⁶⁹ In his example, vitamins extracted from plants equate directly to amount of nourishment they provide, whereas spiritual self-transcendence expands “by multiplication” and a person must abandon him/herself “in order to look for those perfections”.¹⁷⁰

According to Segundo, for one to go beyond oneself indicates both humility and a sense of greatness or nobility because the longing for infinite existence elevates a person over someone else who exists in submission to finite existence. However, he suggests that even those who long for infinite existence are “beggars of that existence,” which is similar to Berdyaev’s idea of humankind being a slave to

¹⁶⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 16.

¹⁶⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 16.

¹⁶⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 16.

¹⁶⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 17.

¹⁷⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 17.

freedom.¹⁷¹ Berdyaev's direct influence is further developed in chapter 3 below. At this point, Segundo references *homo viator*¹⁷² as a sense of movement within this existential journey. The process goes from what a person is to what a person desires to be. He quotes a line from Bernárdez's poem "La tierra," "Their eyes are like a king who sees his kingdom from the depths of a jail,"¹⁷³ and he writes, "Thus it requires this of us *to make ourselves one*, a transformation into the being whose perfection we desire".¹⁷⁴ That is, we cannot achieve self-transcendence or exceed our limits without other people.

Using a Scholastic metaphor, "to know is to become another, not really, but ideally,"¹⁷⁵ Segundo connects the idea of spiritual improvement (i.e. going beyond oneself) with other people. In other words, we cannot exceed our limits alone; other people must be involved. When encountering other people, the encounter leaves an impression, like the existence of an object reflected in a mirror. Following this idea of human encounter leaving an impression, Segundo asks if it is really possible to "go beyond ourselves, to really transform ourselves into *los seres* whose perfection we wish to acquire?"¹⁷⁶ For Segundo, the answer is *yes*, but knowledge is not enough for self-transcendence; self-transcendence requires love. Thus, in the transformation into *seres* (i.e. transformation into a true 'being'), love is a necessary component.

Segundo illustrates the idea of self-transcendence using a hypothetical example of two friends: one does not like the cinema, the other does. Once they are friends, they both go to the cinema. In Segundo's concept of love, or spiritual

¹⁷¹ Cf. Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 73ff.

¹⁷² This is possibly a reference to Gabriel Marcel, *Homo viator* (Paris: Aubier, 1945). However, the influence in the text is unclear because he does not stay with idea of the *human wayfarer*.

¹⁷³ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 18. Cf. Francisco Luis Bernárdez, "La tierra," in *Poemas elementales* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1942), Stanza 1, Line 10.

¹⁷⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 18, emphasis added.

¹⁷⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 18.

¹⁷⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 19-20.

improvement, there is a sense of change or process. Even though each of the friends remains their former self, they are something new. He writes, "Love is, then, what through the means of existential contact allows one to *project* oneself indefinitely, to construct oneself".¹⁷⁷ Exceeding limits is enabled by love. The spiritual improvement can continue *ad infinitum*. He summarizes, "If we now have the question posed to us: what is the existence of humankind? We must respond: it is a self-construction by love".¹⁷⁸

A "self-construction by love" is distinct from Sartre's idea that existence is self-construction.¹⁷⁹ In *Being and Nothingness*, in the section on being-for-itself, he writes, "Human reality is being in so far as within its being and for its being it is the unique foundation of nothingness at the heart of being".¹⁸⁰ Unlike Segundo's argument of love underlying existence, Sartre builds existence on "its being and for its being"; i.e. being-for-itself. This is, to some extent, antithetical to Segundo's self-construction by love.

Segundo ends the section by quoting Augustine, "Love and you do what you want,"¹⁸¹ and he relates Augustine's quote to following the love of God not only in words, but also in works. This is the image of self-transcendence or exceeding limitations. He distinguishes between law and morality. In legal matters, there is a difference between the legislator and the legislated one, but with transcendent love, the law is impossible and morality is spontaneous.¹⁸² A self-construction by love attempts to transcend human limitations.

¹⁷⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 21.

¹⁷⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 21.

¹⁷⁹ E.g. for more on self-construction, see "Patterns of Bad Faith" in Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 96ff.

¹⁸⁰ Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 103.

¹⁸¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 21. Segundo's quote, "*ama et fac quod vis*" is actually a misquote of "*dilige et quod vis fac*" taken from Augustine, *Homily 7 on 1 John 4:4-12*, Section 8.

¹⁸² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 22.

2.2.3 Psychological foundations

In the final section of the first chapter, Segundo turns his attention to the influence of *anthropological* principles on human mental activity.¹⁸³ He identifies two “fundamental natures” corresponding to the problem of human limitations.¹⁸⁴ He goes on to refer to these two natures as “mental directions” and “irreducible tendencies”.¹⁸⁵ Each of these labels is part of an attempt to elucidate the two different tendencies. He describes them as (1) intentional encounters with essence and (2) emotional/affective encounters with existence.¹⁸⁶ He refers to the intentional as natural, as in the desire for knowledge, and emotional/affective as unintentional, or free “like approaching beloved reality”.¹⁸⁷

Segundo identifies mental tendencies which he also calls “final acts,” and these lead to fruitive acts. A fruitive act implies an act that consists of or produces enjoyment, but he is unclear of the exact meaning. He writes, “The fruitive acts follow the final acts” and are consequential on the pleasure that follows “from all perceivable improvement”.¹⁸⁸ The fruitive acts follow terminal acts and form part of his view of transcendence. He notes that what he calls the “classic division” is inadequate. This “classic division” consists of cognitive acts (which are associated with understanding) and voluntary acts (which are associated with the will). He

¹⁸³ Segundo uses ‘metaphysical’ but, based on the context, he seems to mean ‘anthropological’. Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 22.

¹⁸⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 22.

¹⁸⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 22, 24.

¹⁸⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 22.

¹⁸⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 22.

¹⁸⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 23.

writes, “For me, understanding is the faculty of cognitive contact, whereas will is of existential contact”.¹⁸⁹

Segundo does not contradict the “classic division” or find these two tendencies in opposition to one another, “but rather a mutual interdependent necessity”.¹⁹⁰ There is a quest for both essence and existence of beings; the two tendencies are complementary, as in *existential philosophy*. In this sense, by using Segundo’s idea of *existencialismo* falling outside of philosophy, the two terms together illustrate the complementary relationship. He views human mental activity as a synthesis of acts, not simply one kind of act. He writes, “Neither frozen knowledge (pure image) nor a totally blind love (pure impulse) is possible for us”.¹⁹¹ In other words, neither one is possible by itself.

The complexity of the human condition makes it possible to comprehend these different directions, but “our integrating life energy prevents us from separating them”.¹⁹² There remains a difference between cognitive and affective tendencies; they are irreducible and complementary, yet remain different within the essence and existence. Humankind desires to overcome its limits, and this desire adopts the two tendencies, both the philosophical and the existential. These ideas will become foundational for the synthesis Segundo proposes in the following chapters.

2.3 The Philosophical Activity

Segundo begins chapter two with a quote from Xavier Zubiri (1898-1983). Zubiri was a Basque philosopher who mentored the prominent liberation theologian

¹⁸⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 23.

¹⁹⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 24.

¹⁹¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 24.

¹⁹² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 24.

Ignacio Ellacuría.¹⁹³ Ellacuría was one of the Jesuit priests who were assassinated in El Salvador in 1989. Zubiri writes, and Segundo quotes,

What characterizes and differentiates people from animals is not simply the things that are there, but everything seen. In other terms: what distinguishes the human from the animal is not the things one has, but what one proposes.¹⁹⁴

Zubiri's quote suggests that the human ability to construct proposals is the characteristic that distinguishes humankind from animals. Segundo uses this quote to continue his line of thought developed in chapter one on the human desire to overcome limits. This desire to overcome limits leads to the two tendencies: the philosophical and the existential, or seeking truth and goodness.

2.3.1 Pure philosophy

In his analysis of psychology, Segundo identifies two directions: "first, tending toward the truth by means of the intentional essential contact, and second tending toward the good by means of the existential affective contact".¹⁹⁵ He associates truth with essence and good with existence. The two directions are layers or parts of an evolutionary process and his point illustrates the depth of meaning and multiplicity of understanding the human condition. He suggests that there are people who orient their lives toward "one of these two aims with preference to the other".¹⁹⁶ Thus, someone who prefers or orients his or her life toward one direction will subordinate the other direction, but Segundo argues that this is only possible up

¹⁹³ Michael E. Lee, "Liberation Theology's Transcendent Moment: The Work of Xavier Zubiri and Ignacio Ellacuría as Noncontrastive Discourse," *The Journal of Religion* 83, no. 2 (2003): 228.

¹⁹⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 27. Cf. Xavier Zubiri, "Hegel y el problema metafísico," *Cruz y Raya* 1, no. 1 (1933): 237.

¹⁹⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 29.

¹⁹⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 29.

to a certain point. One cannot fully reach the truth or fully reach the good. These are tendencies.

As I stated at the opening of this chapter, Segundo has no desire to define philosophy. He seeks to define or understand human activity; this will be a key element of his liberation theology. At this point, his two directions are *tendencies*, not isolated poles, and a person can only tend toward one of the directions to a certain point. Connecting his two tendencies with “pure philosophy,” the title of this section in *Existencialismo*, he writes, “Therefore, there would be no difficulty in including a scientist in this definition of a philosopher”.¹⁹⁷ For Segundo, pure philosophy is the search for the truth or essence; it follows one of the two tendencies, unlike *existencialismo*, which is a synthesis between the philosophical and existential and so may be called ‘existential philosophy’.

In the final paragraph of the section, he introduces a “third series of acts which might be called intermediate (*intermedios*)”.¹⁹⁸ The *intermedios* do not necessarily relate to the philosophical (essence, intentional, and truth) or the existential (existence, affective, and goodness). The *intermedios* is in between these two tendencies, but it can function toward both. For example, Segundo suggests that one could approach an object to know it better (i.e. an existential act, not a philosophical act), but the attempt could lead to increasing cognitive (or philosophical) knowledge. The latter would be an ancillary outcome. For Segundo, the *intermedios* are very important, and this conclusion makes sense because both the philosophical and the existential are tendencies. As two tendencies, most acts in everyday human experience would be inclined to be *intermedios*.

¹⁹⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 30.

¹⁹⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 32.

2.3.2 Philosophy and existence

Perhaps the most fruitful exegesis of this section is Segundo's summary statement: "Philosophy is able...to utilize the existential order in its cognitive search".¹⁹⁹ He begins this section by asking, "What is the relationship between philosophy and existence?"²⁰⁰ He presents his answer in two parts: (1) an extrinsic relationship, and (2) the connection between the soul and love.

(1) By extrinsic relationship, he means the distinction between *finis operis* and *finis operantis*, or the purpose of the work and the purpose of the worker. There is a non-essential or inherent relationship between the two tendencies, and he suggests that *finis operis* is directed by *finis operantis*.²⁰¹ Segundo writes, "A strictly philosophical purpose must be subordinated or, otherwise, disappear before an existential purpose".²⁰² That is, a philosophical purpose does not exist for its own sake. It connects with an existential purpose.

Segundo argues that philosophy is insufficient to "overwhelm the existential aspiration of humankind".²⁰³ He relies on the etymology of philosophy, emphasizing the root of the word containing love, study, or pursuit of wisdom, truth, or knowledge. Within this etymology, there is nothing to overwhelm existence. Within the two tendencies, philosophy is subordinate to an existential purpose. He refers to his earlier argument when he writes,

Hemos hablado de dos puertas por las que el hombre espiritual y limitado sale, en cierta manera, de sí para lograr esa plenitud existencial que es su	We have spoken about two doors through which the spiritual and limited person leaves, to a certain extent, him/herself to achieve that existential
---	--

¹⁹⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 40.

²⁰⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 33.

²⁰¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 33.

²⁰² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 33.

²⁰³ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 34.

fundamental anhelo del que da testimonio con su mismo ser.	fullness that is his or her fundamental yearning which bears witness to his or her very being. ²⁰⁴
--	---

The person in his example is exposed to two points, from which that person figuratively *departs from* him/herself (i.e. through self-transcendence). This is manifested in personal transformation or exceeding limits. A person cannot leave his or her selfhood entirely (i.e. no *tabula rasa*), but the person can be existentially changed or become a New Being, borrowing Tillich's phrase.²⁰⁵ For Segundo, this transformation is of interest because we cannot compare what is apparent and provisionally seen with what is real and definitive because one is essential and the other existential.²⁰⁶

(2) The second part of his answer to the initial question is the connection between the soul and love. For Segundo, love is central to essence. He quotes a poem by José María Pemán (1897-1981), a Spanish journalist and poet. Pemán writes, "To live is to see...? No, my God! To see is to live!"²⁰⁷ Sight gives persons information about life; it provides data, and this is certainly 'living'. However, this information or data does not allow a person to see the essence of reality. According to Segundo, philosophy is concerned with essence, but essence is not the whole of life. In life, there is the opportunity to experience pleasure. This leads him to conclude that "knowledge is a functional activity...an activity that prepares a person for that person's definitive and objective activity, the existential activity".²⁰⁸ He finds there is

²⁰⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 34.

²⁰⁵ Paul Tillich, *The New Being* (London: SCM Press, 1956). Tillich, of course, takes the idea of the New Being from St. Paul (e.g. 2 Corinthians 5:17).

²⁰⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 34.

²⁰⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 35; Segundo, *Existencialismo*. Cf. José María Pemán, *Obras selectas, inéditas y vedadas: Poesía* (Madrid: Dopesa, 1971), 293. My translation.

²⁰⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 36.

pleasure in the cognitive life, which he suggests, is “not small,” but he writes “Only when one arrives at a true depth and one feels the forced limitation of knowledge and of accompanying pleasure...only then the philosopher feels the need of the existential at the end of his or her life”.²⁰⁹

Segundo continues drawing out the connection between the soul and love. He writes, “One needs to depend completely on philosophy...to feel the emptiness of a purely cognitive answer”.²¹⁰ He makes a cryptic, passing reference to politics “or any other end that is not the mere acquisition of truth”²¹¹ but then returns to the sense of emptiness in pure philosophy. However, existential acts “are not purely emotional acts without cognitive accompaniment”.²¹² Moving through the philosophical/cognitive tendency, he arrives at the profound and concrete love experienced between friends.

Philosophy turns toward existence and tries to “make the most of the truth of our existential experiences”.²¹³ Thus, for Segundo, any movement forward in discovering the depths of the truth cannot stop being philosophy. He writes, “The existential contact...is not philosophizing in the strictest sense of the word...the existential contact and the activity it produces are philosophizing in a wide sense”.²¹⁴ Thus, he arrives at his conclusion, “Philosophy is able, although oriented always in the direction of truth, to utilize the existential order in its cognitive search”.²¹⁵ ‘Pure philosophy’ is not a *synthesis* with the existential, in the same way that *existencialismo* is a synthesis, but it does *employ* to some extent the existential

²⁰⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 37.

²¹⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 37.

²¹¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 38.

²¹² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 39.

²¹³ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 39.

²¹⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 40.

²¹⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 40.

tendency. In this sense, *existencialismo* can mean both an 'existential tendency' and 'existential philosophy'.

2.3.3 Existentialist philosophy

Segundo clearly organizes the section of *Existencialismo* called "Existentialist philosophy". He begins by calling existentialist philosophy "that which employs...the existential encounter united to reason".²¹⁶ However, he prefers a definition based on a verb, not a noun. He writes, "It would be more correct to say: to philosophize existentially, since we try the activity and not the term".²¹⁷ Emphasizing the verb over the noun follows the two tendencies he described earlier in the book; i.e. tending toward the philosophical or the existential are activities, not objects.

Segundo provides four reasons for his definition. First, the field of existentialism is broad and includes diverse thinkers such as Heidegger, Jaspers, Sartre, and Marcel.²¹⁸ Second, the characteristics which make one philosophy distinct from another are its methods. Third, his definition omits the philosophical content of existentialism because he is more interested in human activity than defining philosophy. Fourth, existentialism runs into a mentality that is already formed in the philosophical method.²¹⁹

This final reason segues to a brief comparison of the apparent conflict between the old-style of approaching philosophy and *existencialismo*. For Segundo, *existencialismo* is required to justify itself in light of a contemporary context; i.e.

²¹⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 41.

²¹⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 41.

²¹⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 42. The same year, Copleston makes a similar point in his article on existentialism. He writes, "One can no more speak of the philosophy of Kierkegaard, Jaspers, Heidegger, Sartre, Marcel and Berdyaev, as though they maintained the same system, than one could speak of the philosophy of Plato, Berkeley and Hegel, as though one philosophy was common to the three thinkers". F. C. Copleston, "Existentialism," *Philosophy* 23, no. 84 (1948): 19.

²¹⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 43.

when he wrote *Existencialismo*, the context was the 1940s in Latin America. He suggests that some new characteristics “have collided with a concept that is too old to change suddenly” and that these new characteristics are deeply-rooted in the “fundamental act of *existencialismo*: the emotional existential contact”.²²⁰ He expands this idea, and writes, “Emotional contact implies a coexistence of the subject with the object”.²²¹ For Segundo, this means coexistence is pivotal in the human answer to the existential question, whereas “essential contact... leaves a real gap between the subject and the object”.²²² This happens in in-betweens (e.g. *intermedios*), not in existential or visual reality. In this way, “the essential contact [i.e. pure philosophy] saves and assures objectivity”.²²³ By contrast, “knowledge that causes us to co-exist with our objects originates in affection”.²²⁴ That is, knowledge given by a subject loses its objectivity but gains depth. For example, when asked for a testimony about the character of a friend, a person will respond, “I know her well...if she is my friend!”²²⁵

However, Segundo does not mean to renounce objectivity because doing so would destroy the philosophy he is trying to develop.²²⁶ Again, he follows the stream of thought of *intermedios*. Existential philosophy must partially sacrifice both objectivity and depth in order to unite them. Thus, through the principle of *intermedios* existential philosophy can mediate between objectivity and depth. That is, existential philosophy combines the two tendencies that Segundo has been elaborating--the philosophical and the affective, the search for truth and goodness.

²²⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 44.

²²¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 44.

²²² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 44.

²²³ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 44.

²²⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 45.

²²⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 46.

²²⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 46.

Segundo presents his readers with five characteristics of existential philosophy: universality, objectivity, testing by reason, bifurcation and poetry.

(1) Universality. No one can deny that Uruguay won the FIFA World Cup in 1930. Segundo writes, “Everyone understands the results of a sporting event in the same way because the reality and the objectivity of such a [sporting event] are evident...[But,] existential philosophy cannot aspire to such universality, since there is no full objectivity”.²²⁷ This is not an argument for giving up aspiring for universality, because without universality, “the exposition of [existential] philosophy would make no sense”.²²⁸ Universality comes from human experiences. Because people react in similar ways to similar circumstances, existential philosophy lends itself to universal application.²²⁹ For Segundo, striving for objectivity and universality makes existentialism more profound because it connects more closely to a person’s interior life.

(2) Objectivity. For Segundo, existential philosophy cannot be tested in one sense (e.g. whether or not Uruguay won the 1930 FIFA World Cup) but can be tested in people’s souls.²³⁰ Thus, the value of life, goodness, morals and beauty “are susceptible to testing...they are the fruit of reason and not pure existential experiences”.²³¹

(3) Testing by reason. According to Segundo, existentialism has been presented as a reaction against rationalism stemming from materialism, but he suggests that appearances can be deceiving and existentialism is not built on top of a

²²⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 48.

²²⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 48.

²²⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 48.

²³⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 49.

²³¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 49-50.

denial of reason.²³² Segundo's *existencialismo* does not oppose reason, but rationalist philosophies. This opposition evolved from previous schools of thought and takes existence into account in an original way. Because of the connection with previous philosophical approaches and because he frames his opposition as a philosophical quandary, Segundo points out that someone like Sartre fears making any logical contradictions.²³³ However, the existential philosopher has a new approach or "a quarry of new data: the existential experiences".²³⁴ For Segundo, existential philosophy is reasonable but not a rational system.

(4) Bifurcation. An existential philosopher cannot tell another person how to have an experience. The existential philosopher has an experience and tries to explain the experience. Segundo writes, "When an existential philosopher speaks to them of their sadness or anguish, they often think that they are in front of a poet. And, in a certain sense, they are right".²³⁵ There are two foci: explaining (i.e. object) and experiencing (i.e. subject). Thus, Segundo calls this characteristic of existential philosophy a bifurcation. He writes,

Si queremos ver <i>el ser</i> y dejamos pasar lo subjetivo, tampoco llegaremos a nada. Si reproducimos lo subjetivo para llegar <i>al ser</i> , entonces estamos en la clave del <i>existencialismo</i> .	If we want to see <i>being</i> and we leave behind the subjective, we will still not arrive at nothingness. If we reproduce the subjective to arrive at <i>being</i> , then we are in the key of <i>existencialismo</i> . ²³⁶
---	--

On the one hand, "seeing *el ser*" and departing from subjectivity leads to nothingness, whereas reproducing the subjective thing leads to *el ser*. This

²³² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 50.

²³³ Segundo does not offer his readers any context for this assertion in Sartre. However, context for such a statement could come from Chapter 2 and his discussion of bad faith in *Being and Nothingness*. He writes, "Bad faith apprehends evidence but it is resigned in advance to not being fulfilled by this evidence". Apprehending evidence and then ignoring it is a logical contradiction, and Sartre bases his argument on avoiding these types of contradictions. Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 91.

²³⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 51.

²³⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 51.

²³⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 52, emphasis added.

distinction is central to understanding Segundo's *existencialismo*. Humanity does not need to leave the subjective (i.e. existential), but use the subjective in order to reach being (*el ser*). Even though every human experience is unique, sharing existential aspects (existence, affective, goodness) leads to the philosophical (essence, intentional, truth).

(5) Poetry. For Segundo, bifurcation requires a poetic response; existentialist philosophers “do not need to explain their experience, but communicate it”.²³⁷ He writes,

Me decía un amigo, y con mucha razón, que el medio más propio para comunicar la filosofía existencialista sería la conversación, conversación sencilla y amigable, diálogo íntimo que vaya delineando esas vivencias según la subjetividad del que habla y del que escucha.	I told a friend, and quite rightly, that the best way to communicate my own existentialist philosophy would be the conversation--simple and friendly conversation--intimate dialogue that will delineate these experiences as the subjectivity of the speaker and listener. ²³⁸
---	--

Poetry allows for a more universal application for expressing *existencialismo*. To take it a step further than Segundo does, poetry offers the possibility of multiple layers of meaning. For example, in Bécquer's lines, “They will return, the dark swallows/to hang their nests on your balcony,”²³⁹ the swallows symbolize the end of a passionate relationship, but sometimes a swallow can simply be a migratory bird (Latin: *hirundo rustica erythrogaster*), like Freud's supposed remark, “Sometimes a cigar is simply a cigar”. In poetic dramas, “experience and reason, all have their place in that piece of life thrown into the scene,” and by identifying with the scene, “the

²³⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 52.

²³⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 52.

²³⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 13-14. Cf. Bécquer, *Poems*. In the second stanza of “Volverán las oscuras golondrinas.”..

spectator feels and thinks, prays and cries out his or her own problems and his or her own anguishes along with the protagonist”.²⁴⁰

Segundo finds his five characteristics present in the existential works of his time. In *Existencialismo*, he does not intend to provide an overview or survey of these works. Omitting examples could suggest a belief that his readers are already familiar with them, and if they are not, they could easily become familiar. The most interesting aspect of drawing out these five characteristics is demonstrating how “they are not accidental...and stem from the same essence of existential philosophy”.²⁴¹ This version of *existencialismo* demonstrates *intermedios*; i.e. human knowledge grasps the essence of things through an existential encounter.

2.4 *Existential activities and poetry*

Segundo begins chapter three, “Existentialist activities and poetry,” with a quote from the Italian philosopher Luigi Stefanini (1891-1956). Like all the quotes in *Existencialismo*, Segundo provides no clue as to which work he cites. Stefanini was a prolific writer; the Fondazione Luigi Stefanini lists forty-six major works, published between 1915 and 1960.²⁴² Based on the chapter title, the final lines, in which art provides for a deeper entry into the Spirit of God, are likely the most important part of the quote to Segundo. Stefanini’s words do not mention God, but *Spirito* is capitalized. The quote addresses sainthood and its call for excessive love, but along with love, art provides the opening to the “profound laws of the Spirit”.²⁴³ In an earlier book, Stefanini writes,

²⁴⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 53.

²⁴¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 53.

²⁴² <http://stefanini.altervista.org/>

²⁴³ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 55. Cf. Luigi Stefanini, *Gioberti* (Milano: Bocca, 1947).

Per diventare divino il poeta deve rinunciare ad essere se stesso. L'estro poetico non è solo oltre la ragione, ma anche oltre l'umanità.	To become divine a poet has to stop being himself. The poetic inspiration is not only beyond reason, but even beyond humanity. ²⁴⁴
---	---

Segundo seems to have found support in Stefanini for his idea of *intermedios*. This is a mid-way between philosophical enquiry and everyday knowledge. Stefanini suggests that the poet gives him or herself over to the craft of creating the poem, i.e. “stop[s] being himself”. However, there is no point at which Segundo follows Stefanini in describing a method to “become divine”. Perhaps Stefanini is suggesting spiritual growth, as in the passage quoted by Segundo, being open to the “profound laws of the Spirit”.

2.4.1 Pure existential activity

In this section, Segundo quotes an unidentified “old verse,”²⁴⁵ as well as from Coleridge,²⁴⁶ and Bernárdez. He turns from existential philosophy toward the “other face of the humanity, the real one, whose absolute value conditions to the first one”.²⁴⁷ That is, existential philosophy equates to philosophy understood as being concerned with existence, or existential activity. Segundo turns toward this ‘pure existential activity’ as distinct from ‘existential philosophy’. He writes, “The entire universe offers us its existential material at the expense of our own existence”.²⁴⁸ As an example, he turns to Coleridge’s *Dejection*: “O Lady! we receive but what we give”. For Segundo, this line is “in perfect proportion to what people ask from us and what

²⁴⁴ Luigi Stefanini, *Platone* (Padua: Cedam, 1932), 116.

²⁴⁵ This is an old fifteenth-century Spanish verse, and is attributable to Lope de Vega or Jerónimo Martin Caro.

²⁴⁶ Cf. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Dejection: An Ode* (1802), Stanza 4.

²⁴⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 57.

²⁴⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 57-58.

they give us”.²⁴⁹ Asking and giving is part of the reciprocation mutually represented in self-giving love.

Segundo identifies two ideas of being that are offered in love: (1) the love between a man and a woman, and (2) the love between humankind and God.

(1) In a relationship between two people, they offer each other part of their existence. The mutuality is self-giving. The man gives himself to the woman, and the woman gives herself to the man. Together, their love exists as a combination of the self-giving act, and their love exists in between the two unique identities of each individual. He writes, “It is the noblest existential act that may occur in the land of humanity and the only one that may deserve to be raised to the level of sacraments and the divine”. In this act of self-giving love, Segundo identifies participation in Absolute Being, which is “the existence of the unlimited and which is part of our existential experience in religious sentiment;” self-giving is not suicide, but availability.²⁵⁰

(2) The love between humankind and God is the second idea of being that is offered in love. The sense of availability is a simultaneous loss and recovery. As the self is given to another, the self is not lost because there is a new creation in the exchange of self with the other self. The exchange is “sublimated in our existential surrender to God, and is precisely the sense of religion”.²⁵¹ The love between humankind and God is mutual, but it begins with the human existential surrender. This second sense of being, for Segundo, is experienced in religion.

²⁴⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 58.

²⁵⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 59.

²⁵¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 60.

2.4.2 Art and existence

In life, there are intense experiences of love, and these experiences reveal a human inability to experience the fullness of existence. Segundo's reference to "embracing strangers in moments of intense joy"²⁵² is likely influenced by his enjoyment of *fútbol* and the impact Uruguay's victory in the 1930 FIFA World Cup had on him as a young child. In celebrating a major athletic victory, the "I" cannot experience the fullness of joy, so we look for another "I" who can receive the joy; hence two strangers embrace after their team wins an athletic event. If the other "I" does not exist, we can create it through art.

At its deepest level, Segundo believes art is "the impact of overabundant love".²⁵³ This idea avoids defining art in terms of a beauty which compensates for an existential emptiness. He suggests that art is unjustly dominated by aesthetics and he finds that rules replace a lack of inspiration. Thus, he believes in "educating the heart" as the best preparation for art; the concrete is "given" not "defined". This belief also leads him to conclude, "The artist is not a philosopher," and it is rare for a person to be able to do both art and philosophy.²⁵⁴ He acknowledges that his conclusions contradict some of his contemporary's beliefs --he might have had Sartre or Marcel in mind, but he does not identify anyone in particular.²⁵⁵ Segundo's conclusions are part of his overview of human existence, and he offers five

²⁵² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 61.

²⁵³ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 61.

²⁵⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 63.

²⁵⁵ Simone de Beauvoir describes Sartre as listing "artist, writer, or the philosopher" together. Simone de Beauvoir, *The Prime of Life* (Cleveland: World, 1962), 41. Stephen Priest makes the same argument in his introduction to Sartre writing about writing. Priest writes, "Literature is the art form in which Sartre expresses his own philosophy". Stephen Priest, ed. *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings* (London: Routledge, 2001), 258. Marcel makes the same argument about Sartre, although he could ostensibly be applying it to himself as well, referring to Sartre's work as art. Gabriel Marcel, *The Philosophy of Existentialism* (New York: Citadel, 1956), 89.

characteristics of creating art to justify his position. He asks readers to bear in mind the five characteristics of existential philosophy outlined above (Section 2.3.3).

(1) An artist tries to reproduce subjectivity affected by existential contact. Thus, an artist does not aspire toward objectivity in the same manner as the existential philosopher. Segundo suggests that artwork is “more perfect the better [an artist] reproduces his/her total ‘self,’ affected by existential contact”.²⁵⁶ In other words, art is an expression of the emotions and feelings of the artist, which suggests an aesthetic expression theory, but Segundo does not mention this theory even though he seems indebted to it to some degree.²⁵⁷ By perfectly reproducing the human condition, an artist could make something universal, but achieving a perfect reproduction seems unlikely to Segundo.

(2) Even though, as Segundo suggested, art is not objective, he conceives of the possibility of measuring how existential and affective it is; e.g. “the resonance it awakens in observers”.²⁵⁸ If art is trying to reproduce the artist’s subjectivity affected by existential contact, artwork can be criticized against this standard to measure whether or not it reaches “the deepest layers of human subjectivity”.²⁵⁹ His argument is “*finis operantis* can not dispense with *finis operis*”.²⁶⁰ As *finis operantis/finis operis* applies to every piece of artwork, this standard of existential evaluation could be universally applicable.

(3) Unlike the bifurcation Segundo presents in the five characteristics of existential philosophy, he does not find two separate foci in art, because art is not only objective. Segundo writes, “Art, located entirely in the existential, does not

²⁵⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 65.

²⁵⁷ Cf. “Expression theory,” in *The Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy*, ed. Nicholas Bunnin and Jiyuan Yu (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

²⁵⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 66.

²⁵⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 67.

²⁶⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 67.

intend any separation between the object and subject, but the purest and most complete coexistence”.²⁶¹ Explaining (i.e. object) and experiencing (i.e. subject) coexist in existential philosophy, and are combined in art.

(4) According to Segundo, when a person sees a work of art and interprets some meaning from the artwork, if the person agrees with the meaning, the person identifies the artwork as true. The reverse is also the case. When a person draws on the objective to form an opinion about the subjective, this discourse is existential philosophy, not art. He writes, “The artist has a perfect mastery of his/her work and can pretend”.²⁶² In *Existencialismo*, Segundo references another author’s work by title in only three places.²⁶³ One of these instances is Sartre’s *L’Existentialism est un Humanisme*. Although Segundo does not quote Sartre on the issue of “misrepresentation or bad faith,” he is likely referring to *mauvaise foi* or self-deception. Sartre writes,

One can judge a man by saying that he deceives himself. Since we have defined the situation of man as one of free choice, without excuse and without help, any man who takes refuge behind the excuse of his passions, or by inventing some deterministic doctrine, is a self-deceiver.²⁶⁴

Sartre’s idea of self-deception is relevant to Segundo’s artist who “can pretend” because “the artist obviously does not fool anyone; the objectivity of knowledge has no connection with the artist’s work”.²⁶⁵ The meaning someone finds in a work of art is susceptible to self-deception because of the connection between

²⁶¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 67-68.

²⁶² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 68-69.

²⁶³ Henri Bremond and Robert de Souza, *La poésie pure: avec un débat sur la poésie* (Paris: B. Grasset, 1926). Immanuel Kant, *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, trans. Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews, The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant in Translation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). And, Jean-Paul Sartre, *L’existentialisme est un humanisme*, Collection pensees (Paris: Nagel, 1948).

²⁶⁴ Sartre, *L’existentialisme est un humanisme*, 81. Cf. Sartre, *Existentialism and Humanism*, 60.

²⁶⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 69.

an objective articulation of the meaning and the subjective nature of the art. Again, *finis operantis/finis operis* applies to interpreting the artwork.

(5) For Segundo, artistic expression does not depend on rational or logical thought (reason), but artistic expression does not necessarily exclude reason either. He finds that reason facilitates expression but is not required in creating art. He writes, "The rational element facilitates the work of art even though not required".²⁶⁶ Both the act that is the source and the expression are existential, but the rational sense is both expressed in the art and facilitates the expression of the art.

2.4.3 Pure poetry

Segundo identifies a separation between dynamic and visual arts. Dynamic arts include poetry, music and dance, whereas visual arts consist of painting, sculpture, and architecture. He connects dynamic arts to "the celebration of religious events," and references the Scholastic idea of individuation, or defining what "makes some object the particular object that it is".²⁶⁷ He writes, "This individuation cannot be anything but different skills that every art assumes in humankind," and he suggests that the human instrument is used to express subjectivity.²⁶⁸ Within the dynamic arts, Segundo identifies three major studies in which the human spirit manifests itself: word, sound, and gesture.

²⁶⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 71.

²⁶⁷ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Public Domain, 1947), Treatise on the Sacraements, Q 77, Art. 2. Cf. Lawrence Brian Lombard, "Individuation," in *A Companion to Metaphysics*, ed. Jaegwon Kim and Ernest Sosa (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995).

²⁶⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 72.

Segundo does not dismiss the value of music in art, but he places more significance on words. He writes, “The word is something more. It is a special destiny of the signs; it is a kind of symbol”.²⁶⁹ To illustrate his point, he writes,

La percepción sensible del humo me habla del fuego, pero no del fuego en su contenido universal, sino de tal o cual fuego, encuadrado en circunstancias fijas de lugar y tiempo. La palabra fuego, en cambio, trae a mi mente un mensaje, aun cuando ninguna otra palabra la acompañe, y ese mensaje es universal, porque la convención humana le ha dado a ese sonido individual y concreto, un sentido lógico, intelectual.	The sense or perception of smoke reminds me of fire, but not of the fire in its universal content, but of such or which fire that is fixed in the circumstances of a place and time. The word fire, however, brings to mind a message, even if there is no other accompanying word, and that message is universal, because human convention has given this individual and concrete sound, a logical, intellectual sense. ²⁷⁰
---	---

When a person hears the word *fire*, the person does not need to stop and think about what a fire is. There are images and odours which automatically come to mind. Words offer meaning in varying degrees. For Segundo, this means that poetic words are more meaningful than other arts, just as music can be distinguished from pure sound and dance can be distinguished from gestures. Thus, he concludes, “As art, poetry does not have a necessary relationship with essential knowledge”.²⁷¹ Poetry represents something different from other art, such as music and dance, because words as signs indicate a meaning. However, poetry does not employ words in the same way as science and philosophy.

In the phrase “pure poetry,” Segundo refers to a book by Henri Bremond (1865-1933) about pure poetry. He does not tell his readers which of Bremond’s books, but he is likely referring to *La Poésie pure* (1926), written with Robert de

²⁶⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 73.

²⁷⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 73.

²⁷¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 74.

Souza.²⁷² Bremond was a French literary scholar, former Jesuit, and philosopher; he was also involved in the modernist controversy, and Segundo uses Bremond to underscore the importance of mystery in interpreting poetry. He agrees with Bremond that poetry cannot be reduced to logical analysis like a philosophical work. He writes, “Our life, our love, our poetry are in their same essence, a mystery”.²⁷³ Mystery is an important concept to Segundo. He suggests that it would be “insanity” to try and destroy the mystery, writing, “Immediately out of the creative vortex, existence, life, love, poetry, and art *are* in the most powerful and most humble participation of God, the *Absolute Existent*”.²⁷⁴ With the *Absolute Existent*, we can turn to the relationship between poetry and essence.

2.4.4 Poetry and essence

In opposition to Bremond, Segundo suggests that there is “no shortage of those” who find affective knowledge in poetry, but he argues against exclusively finding affective knowledge because his point is finding not just affective knowledge but cognitive knowledge too. He does not identify who *those people* are, but he calls poetry an “intellectual instrument” that lends itself to cognitive interpretation of an existential phenomenon. For Segundo, this “intellectual instrument” allows poetry to move beyond the existential realm and into essence. He writes, “Poets discover the secret relations of things”.²⁷⁵ Turning to Kant’s *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, Segundo identifies the mission of poetry is “to form us in the organic system of the

²⁷² Bremond and Souza, *La poésie pure*. However, he could be referring to Henri Bremond, *Prière et poésie* (Paris: B. Grasset, 1926). Cf. Henri Bremond, *Prayer & poetry: a contribution to poetical theory* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1927).

²⁷³ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 77.

²⁷⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 77.

²⁷⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 78.

phenomena of our universe...Poets are those who have fought to preserve the full sense of words".²⁷⁶ For example, in Kant, we read,

The art of poetry...claims the highest rank of all. It expands the mind by setting the imagination free and presenting...the one that connects its presentation with a fullness of thought to which no linguistic expression is fully adequate, and thus elevates itself aesthetically to the level of ideas.²⁷⁷

Kant does not reduce the value of poetry as an art, but he highlights the material aspect of a poem's existence. Segundo clarifies this point; he writes, "Poetry is an art, and art, as we have seen, comes from a source of existence".²⁷⁸ Thus, the impact of poetry is not accidental, and he attributes this to the instrument of poetry: the word. Segundo writes,

Tiene por la palabra una estrecha relación con la esencia de las Cosas que no es propia de otra ninguna entre las artes. La música, como actividad existencial es más pura que la poesía, lo cual, sin duda ninguna, no significa, por sí mismo una perfección mayor, dado que la pureza no es criterio de valor en el arte.	The word is closely related to the essence of things which is not typical of any other of the arts. Music, like existential activity, is more pure than poetry, which, no doubt, does not mean by itself a greater perfection, because purity is not the criterion of value in art. ²⁷⁹
--	--

In some ways, Segundo agrees with Kant, hence the direct reference. Segundo agrees with Kant that poetry causes the mind to conceive transcendental ideas, e.g. having unity and a purpose of the universe or conceiving of God and the existence of the self. However, there are some ways in which Segundo does not agree with Kant. In Kant, humankind cannot know these noumena or transcendental ideas. For Kant, art only appears to have an intrinsic purpose, yet as the quote above indicates, Segundo finds a deeper purpose in art. That is, the mission of poetry is "to form us in

²⁷⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 78. Cf. Kant, *Critique of Judgment*, 183ff.

²⁷⁷ Kant, *Critique of Judgment*, 203-204.

²⁷⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 79.

²⁷⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 79-80.

the organic system of the phenomena of our universe”.²⁸⁰ For Kant, art is “grounded in a moral judging”.²⁸¹ For Segundo, as we have seen above, art takes us into the area of loving interpersonal relations, although he inherits from Kant the perception that art cannot be reduced to concepts, e.g. “no linguistic expression is fully adequate”.²⁸²

For Segundo, there is a difference between poetry and existential philosophy, despite the fact that poetry (because of its dependence on words) leans toward the cognitive, or a quest for essence. Existential philosophy leans towards the existential/affective, a quest for existence. Like two notes in a musical chord, existentialist philosophy and poetry harmonize with one another. “They represent...a complex human response to the total needs of humanity in the fields of knowledge and overabundant love”.²⁸³ Existentialist philosophy and poetry have a complementary relationship. Without sharing this complementary meaning, both existentialist philosophy and poetry would be poorer.

2.5 Immanent art

In the conclusion to *Existencialismo*, Segundo returns to his original question about the meaning of human existence, and he concludes that human existence is ultimately oriented toward God by being grounded in God’s absolute existence. In her doctoral dissertation on Segundo, Teresa Lowe Ching writes, “Human existence is seen to be immersed in infinite Existence, in the superabundant love of the Absolute”.²⁸⁴ Segundo writes,

²⁸⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 78. Cf. Kant, *Critique of Judgment*, 183ff.

²⁸¹ Kant, *Critique of Judgment*, 228.

²⁸² Kant, *Critique of Judgment*, 203-204.

²⁸³ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 80-81.

²⁸⁴ Theresa Lowe Ching, *Efficacious Love, Its Meaning and Function in the Theology of Juan Luis Segundo* (New York: University Press of America, 1989), 31.

De El participamos en cada uno de nuestros amores, pues amamos algo suyo en cada plenitud existencial. Nuestro anhelo ¿no es una existencia sin límites? Y esa existencia sin límites ¿podrá ser una abstracción? Lo que amamos en realidad, si lo supiéramos expresar bien, es un Existente sin limites, una Persona existente por sí, un Tú Absoluto.	Through Thou, we participate in each one of our loves, since we love something of [God's] in every moment of existential plenitude. Is our desire not for existence without limits? And could this existence without limits be an abstraction? What we love in reality, if we knew to express it well, is an existence without limits, a Person existing in his/herself, in an Absolute Thou. ²⁸⁵
---	--

Ching writes, "In this way, human life is being gradually filled with the plenitude of God, the gift of his love, of his superabundance".²⁸⁶ For Segundo, human life is oriented toward God by a fullness of being and love. There is a sense in life of availability and permission of God; these two factors draw humankind to God. Segundo finds external art "too superficial...to hold that love".²⁸⁷ Immanent art is art that draws human existence to God.

Odair Pedroso Mateus points to this section to highlight the kind of theologian who will emerge and embrace a faith that affirms inter-personal categories when writing about God. In this way, Segundo combines existentialism with personalism. Mateus writes, "Segundo's formally 'secularized' theology will remain substantially mystical...God is present at the very mystery of life and the world...repeating again and again that all love loves God".²⁸⁸ During this same period, Tillich was combining existentialism with ontology.²⁸⁹ However, Segundo not only combines existentialism with ontology, but he also combines it with Christian personalism, or an I-Thou relationship between people and God.

²⁸⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 83.

²⁸⁶ Ching, *Efficacious Love*, 32.

²⁸⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 84.

²⁸⁸ Mateus, "Intersections," 242.

²⁸⁹ Tillich, *The Courage to Be*, 128-129.

The I-Thou relationship is what will become Segundo's transcendental method (e.g. the hermeneutic circle) grounded in love and inter-subjectivity. Although he has not developed his thought to the point of the hermeneutic circle yet, he is more focused on method rather than doctrine, and his method, even at this early stage, is characterized by the cognitive and the affective, the philosophical and the existential. In this early book, he already wishes to combine these two aspects (cf. the subtitle, *ensayo de síntesis*, or *attempt at synthesis*).

In final lines of the book, Segundo writes, "What is our existence?...God gives us the answer, the answer we want existentially presented as the end of our existence to fill our soul of its fullness".²⁹⁰ The simplicity of his expression shows the room for his future development, but it also expresses where he will go with his theology throughout the rest of his writings. His theology is based in love: love for humanity, love for God, and God's love for humankind. For Segundo, humankind participates in God through love. He concludes the book, "God is Alpha that begins the sense of our anguish and Omega that responds to us in the End".²⁹¹

Now, let us turn to Berdyaev's influence on Segundo's view of freedom and existentialism.

²⁹⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 85.

²⁹¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 85.

3 The existential influence of Nicholas Berdyaev

3.1 Introduction

While studying at the University of Paris, Segundo was influenced by his reading of Russian philosopher Nicolas Berdyaev. There, he wrote his first dissertation²⁹² on the topic of a Christian reflection on the concept of the person in Berdyaev's writing.²⁹³ It was published in 1964 as *Berdiaeff: Une Réflexion Chrétienne Sur La Personne* in Paris, but Berdyaev's influence on his work did not end with his dissertation, which was actually completed in 1962. The dissertation was published in French and never translated. Segundo did, however, write an expository article in Spanish about Berdyaev's thought for *Boletín de la Sociedad Uruguaya de Filosofía* in 1965.²⁹⁴

Segundo continued engaging with Berdyaev after his dissertation. The following two references show Segundo continuing to engage with Berdyaev, and both implicitly show a link between existentialism and liberation theology.

First, in *Teología Abierta 2*,²⁹⁵ he cites Berdyaev in the final section of his chapter on God and freedom. He is writing about the relationship between apophaticism and social domination. He writes, "Berdyaev perceived this intimate relationship" and quotes from *The Divine and the Human*.²⁹⁶ In Berdyaev's critique, there is a context of social domination in relation to apophaticism. This quote (1) supports my assertion that Segundo continued engaging with Berdyaev after *Berdiaeff* and (2) connects with both existentialism and liberation theology. It

²⁹² Segundo, *Berdiaeff*.

²⁹³ The second doctoral dissertation, also submitted to the University of Paris, is the two volume work published as Segundo, *La Cristiandad, Una Utopía?*

²⁹⁴ Juan Luis Segundo, "Exposición sobre Berdiaeff," *Boletín de la sociedad Uruguaya de filosofía* 1, no. 117 (1965). Since the dissertation goes into greater depth, I will focus my attention on it.

²⁹⁵ Originally published as Segundo, *Nuestra Idea de Dios*. Reissued as Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*. Cf. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*.

²⁹⁶ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 141. Cf. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, 114.

connects with existentialism because it places emphasis on experience through apophaticism. That is, one can say what something is not (negatively), as opposed to fully articulating what something is (positively). It also connects with liberation theology as it is a theological seed of freedom from social domination.

Second, in *FI* (1982), he writes about judging by actual values by which people live and cites Berdyaev.²⁹⁷ Instead of placing his emphasis on abstract values (essence) and then working backward to the way people live (existence), he begins with experience. This follows the mantra of the philosophy of existentialism (e.g. “existence precedes essence”). Berdyaev writes about transcendental anthropology in *The Destiny of Man*.²⁹⁸ In *FI*, Berdyaev’s influence is present and helps to support a link between liberation theology and existentialism. In this chapter, however, I will focus on *Berdiaeff* because it provides the clearest evidence of Berdyaev’s influence on Segundo. Therefore, a brief outline of *Berdiaeff* will be helpful before going further.

After his introduction, Segundo divides his work into two parts: “The religious experience of liberty”²⁹⁹ and “The philosophical interpretation of experience”.³⁰⁰ Both parts are subdivided into four chapters each. In part one, chapter one is about religion as the total direction of experience, and chapter two explores human liberty. Chapter three is an interpretation of Berdyaev’s apophatic knowledge of God, and chapter four is about the fall, sin, and eschatology. In part two, chapter one compares philosophy and phenomenology, a key part of this present argument. Chapter two explores philosophy as dialectic. Chapter three

²⁹⁷ Segundo, *FI*, 86. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 65.

²⁹⁸ Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, trans. Natalie Duddington (New York: Harper Torchbooks/The Cloister Library, 1960), 227.

²⁹⁹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 68-226.

³⁰⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 227-410.

discusses philosophy as transcendental thought, and chapter four regards philosophy as apophatic ontology. Segundo ends his work with a conclusion, in which he writes, "I believe Berdyaev particularly enriched the field of *existential phenomenology* in illuminating a whole sector of human experience...Catholic theology, in particular, can benefit from Berdyaev's thought".³⁰¹ This last quote, taken alongside *EC*³⁰² and *Existencialismo*³⁰³, strengthens my argument for an existential dimension to Segundo's liberation theology. The question becomes how to define it.

Berdyaev is an existential philosopher, and he writes about the origin of freedom.³⁰⁴ However, for Segundo, the origin of freedom is not as important as the impact or result of freedom as it already exists.³⁰⁵ In *Berdiaeff*, he primarily deals with freedom as an existential reality. Segundo does not ask about the origin of freedom for three reasons. First, he simply acknowledges its existence. He writes in *Teología Abierta 2*, "A person does not 'function', he or she decides".³⁰⁶ Second, other authors have dealt with the origin of freedom already.³⁰⁷ Third, Segundo stresses other questions in his writing. The origin of freedom is a philosophical question, whereas Segundo begins with an *a priori* emphasis on praxis.³⁰⁸ The role of praxis is very important in Segundo's theology, but it is not central to comprehending how Berdyaev's understanding of freedom influenced Segundo.

³⁰¹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 410, emphasis added.

³⁰² Segundo, "EC".

³⁰³ Segundo, *Existencialismo*.

³⁰⁴ Cf. Nicolas Berdyaev, "Jacob Boehme Etude I: Teaching on Ungrund and Freedom," *Journal Put'* 2007, no. November 20 (1930).

³⁰⁵ E.g. Segundo explores freedom as it exists within a social system. Juan Luis Segundo, "Teología y ciencias sociales," in *Fe cristiana y cambio social en América Latina* (Salamanca, Spain: Ediciones Sígueme, 1972), 289. Cf. Segundo, *Signs of the Times*, 10-11.

³⁰⁶ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 131. Cf. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, 106.

³⁰⁷ Cf. Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*.

³⁰⁸ Cf. The emphasis on praxis in the hermeneutic circle in Segundo, *LT*, chapter 1. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, chapter 1.

In order to identify the manner in which Berdyaev influences Segundo's existentialism, I will begin with freedom since it is central to Berdyaev's thought. First, I will explore the primacy of freedom in both authors' works in 3.2. Segundo suggests freedom represents a "radical ambiguity,"³⁰⁹ so I will unpack his notion of freedom as radical ambiguity in 3.3. Because apophatic theology is significant in Berdyaev's thought and Segundo devotes much attention in *Berdiaeff* to apophaticism, I will explore Segundo's understanding of Berdyaev's apophatic thought in 3.4. Throughout Segundo's writings, the church remains a constant instrument of change and action. Mary Kaye Nealen writes, "Segundo regards the community of faith as a direct result of Jesus' life and ministry. Jesus' followers extend his action on behalf of God's reign, and in so doing make the Christian community a sign of authentic love in the world".³¹⁰ However, freedom is not coterminous with the church. This will be the subject of 3.5. Altogether I intend to show how Segundo appropriates aspects of Berdyaev's view of freedom, which contribute to his existential liberation theology.

3.2 Primacy of Freedom

Freedom allows for human creativity, which is the way humankind can exert a creative influence, not only on other people, but on God and the world. Segundo sees the interplay between freedom and creativity as the source of reciprocity.³¹¹ He writes, "Reciprocity, apparently synonymous with mutual dependence, means, actually, almost the opposite. The other is not a means for me...but an end".³¹² There

³⁰⁹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 57.

³¹⁰ Mary Kaye Nealen, *The Poor in the Ecclesiology of Juan Luis Segundo*, vol. 113, American University Studies, Series VII Theology and Religion (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 101.

³¹¹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 126ff.

³¹² Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 127.

is a reciprocal relationship between the *other* and the one speaking, and because the reciprocal relationship includes God as the *other*, it is not mutually dependent. Even though humankind can exert creative influence on God, God is not dependent on receiving human influence. In this respect, influence goes back and forth, although Segundo later appears to revise his view when he writes, in the context of discussing Camus' play *Caligula*, "God has willed to have need of the creative liberty of the sons and daughters of God".³¹³ Perhaps his later view is a better way of conceiving of reciprocity, but, in *Berdiaeff*, he argues that human freedom has a connection with God in the sense that there is a finite number of ways in which humankind can connect with God. The connection is limited by finite humankind, and not by infinite God. However, even with the limitations, humankind enjoys the creativity that is available in freedom.³¹⁴ Both Berdyaev and Segundo give primacy to freedom.

3.2.1 Primacy of Freedom in Berdyaev

The primacy of freedom in Berdyaev is clearly evident throughout his works, but I will focus on freedom as evidenced in *The Destiny of Man*. Berdyaev's understanding of freedom is indebted to Jacob Boehme's Myth of the Ungrund,³¹⁵ but he diverges from Boehme, adding his own unique approach to God and freedom. The myth of the Ungrund is that God created the world out of meonic nothingness.³¹⁶ In Greek, there are two terms, both meaning *nothing*. *Ouk on*, is absolute nothing, as used by Plato as absolute nonbeing in *Parmenides*.³¹⁷ *Me on* is nothing which is

³¹³ Segundo, *Signs of the Times*, 167.

³¹⁴ Cf. Gerald J. Persha, *Juan Luis Segundo, A Study Concerning the Relationship Between the Particularity of the Church and the Universality of Her Mission (1963-1977)*, Probe Third World Studies (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1980), 85-98.

³¹⁵ Jacob Boehme, *Mysterium Magnum, Part 1, or An Exposition of the First Book of Moses Called Genesis* trans. John Sparrow (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2002).

³¹⁶ Berdyaev, "Jacob Boehme Etude".

³¹⁷ Plato, "Parmenides," <http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/parmenides.html>.

always relative to being, as opposed to being or in tension with it. That is, the myth of the Ungrund is that God created the world out of *relative nonbeing*, as opposed to *absolute nonbeing*. In Boehme, this non-being is a polar element of the divine being, but not in Berdyaev. Berdyaev's freedom-based theology suggests evil comes from the eternal freedom that co-existed with God in meonic nothingness and out of which humankind and nature can encounter pain and suffering. In this form, evil does not exist as an entity and has no power to create. Rather, evil derives from a freedom that is co-eternal *with* God, as opposed to being *from* God.

Berdyaev writes, "I believe that this primal drama and mystery of Christianity consists in the genesis of God in man and of man in God".³¹⁸ According to Berdyaev, human beings have the power to create things. Because of the rooting of human beings in primal freedom, there is mystery in the relationship between humankind and God, and there is a correlation between humankind's understanding of creation and God's work in the creative act. God is at work in both human creativity and all of creation. God is not dependent upon human creativity, but creates independently of creation. The creative act is rooted in mystery and is not dependent upon the creation. For example, a theologian like Schleiermacher articulates the temporal (among other) limitations to humankind's capacity to understand God when he writes, "The world is a work of which you survey only a part".³¹⁹ In other words, relating Schleiermacher's statement to Berdyaev, there is no means by which humankind can verify different theories of creation (or the eschaton) without having

³¹⁸ Nicolas Berdyaev, "Materialism Destroys the Eternal Spirit," <http://www.cjd.org/paper/roots/rmateri.html>.

³¹⁹ Friedrich Schleiermacher, *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers*, ed. Karl Ameriks and Desmond M. Clarke, trans. Richard Crouter, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 35.

witnessed the creation. The philosophies of creation and eternity in Berdyaev are dependent upon accepting the mystery of God; this is also present in *FI*.³²⁰

Freedom is central to Berdyaev's philosophy. Freedom is also seen as a positive attribute in Western cultures.³²¹ However, Berdyaev defined freedom as a "fatal gift which dooms man [sic] to perdition".³²² It is freedom that allows humankind to create and experience evil. Humankind is bound by the freedom that allows for an exploration of the origin of all that exists, and it is bound by the freedom that allows people to live in the world. Berdyaev's emphasis on freedom's role in creation and eschatology places freedom at the beginning and the end of all that exists. Freedom shapes his understanding of God and God's relationship with the world.

Berdyaev identifies three kinds of freedom: (1) primary irrational freedom or arbitrariness in freedom; (2) rational freedom or the fulfilment of moral duty; and (3) freedom permeated by the love of God, which is the freedom for which the majority of the population is unwilling to pay its price.³²³ The third is the most important freedom to Berdyaev, and the freedom out of which God and humankind creates. The Ungrund is an explanation of creation, which was a non-witnessed occasion, and it offers a means by which people can understand God as both good and yet remaining God, unlike playwright Archibald MacLeish's paradoxical definition: "If God is God He is not good, If God is good He is not God".³²⁴ Evil is included in Berdyaev's understanding of creation and the eschaton because

³²⁰ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 11. Cf. Segundo, *FI*, 86. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 65.

³²¹ There are many examples of the positive perception of freedom in Western thought. For example, see Conrad Black, *Franklin Delano Roosevelt: Champion of Freedom* (New York: Public Affairs, 2003). Or, for more titles illustrating the importance of freedom in Western culture, see the Champions of Freedom series from Morgan Reynolds Publishing.

³²² Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 24.

³²³ Nikolai Lossky, *History of Russian Philosophy* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1952), 233-235.

³²⁴ Archibald MacLeish, *J. B.: A Play in Verse* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1956), 14.

Berdyaev's thought is rooted in moral experience, which Segundo cites in *FI*.³²⁵ Freedom that comes out of the mystery of the Myth of the Ungrund is the basis for the origin of evil, and from the meonic nothingness of the Ungrund, God creates *and* humankind creates.

Berdyaev associates eschatological freedom with concrete ethical problems. He writes, "Eschatological fear connected with the final destiny of man and the world means substituting practical interested motives for the disinterested and transcendental terror".³²⁶ Humankind is afraid of the eschaton, and this fear is the motivation for the way people respond to ethical dilemmas. He connects eschatology with fear,³²⁷ but eschatological freedom is the liberation from this fear and the enslavement to false freedom. Liberation from enslavement which is an obstacle leads to humankind's ability to accept freedom permeated by the love of God. He explores this possibility through personality.

Berdyaev understands personality as the basis of slavery and freedom. "Personality is more primary than being...Being is a product of abstract thought".³²⁸ With personality, there is freedom from enslavement to being. Personalism recognizes the superiority of freedom over being.³²⁹ If Berdyaev's ontological perspective is rooted in evil distorting and compressing being, personality shapes humankind's relationship and understanding of freedom. The mystery is still part of freedom, but personality is the manner in which we are released from enslavement. Personality is the manifestation of freedom and the way humankind can also create. For Berdyaev, the eschaton is brought about by divine *and* human work.

³²⁵ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 13-15. Cf. Segundo, *FI*, 86. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 65.

³²⁶ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 177.

³²⁷ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 249-265.

³²⁸ Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 75.

³²⁹ Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 76.

3.2.2 Primacy of Freedom in Segundo

The primacy of freedom in Segundo's *Berdiaeff* according to Berdyaev is a "quality of the will" related to love.³³⁰ Freedom is the ability for humankind to freely make decisions and act creatively, fully realizing the decision and creativity in love. The significance of freedom runs throughout Segundo's works. As stated above, he does not directly address the origin of freedom in his writings, but he does address it as a question. By following the way he addresses freedom as it is, his view of freedom will be clearer.

In *Berdiaeff*, Segundo documents Berdyaev's exploration into the origin of freedom in Boehme's Myth of the Ungrund, but Segundo does not offer his own suggestion about the origin of freedom. He seems to place the origin in human existence, writing "Liberty is behind being".³³¹ This primacy of freedom is found in contemporary existentialism. For example, Sartre writes, "The freedom *makes itself exist* within the given by being its own prohibition against surpassing it".³³² Berdyaev reflects existentialism in the duality between freedom and nature, but rejects all notions of being. Segundo argues for primacy of freedom over being, but retains partnership between freedom and being.³³³ Acknowledging the existence of freedom is more important to him than tracing its origin. He agrees with Berdyaev that liberty precedes being, at least in human experience, but he does not argue that liberty preceding being is an eternal opposition. He develops a kind of Christian existential ontology, much as do Paul Tillich and John Macquarrie.

³³⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 44.

³³¹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 45.

³³² Jean-Paul Sartre, *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings*, ed. Stephen Priest (London: Routledge, 2002), 232.

³³³ See Table 1 below and Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 403.

Segundo's main critique of Berdyaev is that when he follows Boehme, he is not concrete enough in his understanding of freedom.³³⁴ Segundo does not imply that drawing more detail from Boehme's work would yield different results. He writes that Boehme embraces incipient dualism, placing "the Ungrund in opposition to divine being,"³³⁵ whereas he argues Berdyaev actually opposes this kind of dualism, which is a dualism in God, not between God and freedom.³³⁶ The Ungrund does not have a place in Segundo's theology, and the primacy of freedom in his thought is existential, not ontological. For Segundo, understanding freedom is a theological, not an ontological or existential dilemma, even though he uses the tools of both ontology and existentialism and identifies the nature of being with love. He thus takes Berdyaev's interpretation of Boehme's myth of the Ungrund and adapts it to Trinitarian theology. He writes:

Let us say that this is the same as in Trinitarian theology: the Father keeps a primacy of origin, remaining altogether as important, perfect, divine and necessary as the Son; in the same way, freedom keeps a certain primacy over its counterparts...³³⁷

His position sounds dualistic, but he uses the grammar of the Trinity and does not place freedom in opposition to God, as he accuses Boehme of doing with the Ungrund.³³⁸ Freedom is the way people act in relation to God, and it is the existential reality in which people act. For example, in *Nuestra Idea de Dios*, he writes, "God...sustains/nurtures freedoms that are meant to run the risk of adventure and creation".³³⁹ God and freedom are not dualistic in his thought because God nurtures freedom. For Segundo, freedom is not a coeternal existence, like it is in Berdyaev, but

³³⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 47.

³³⁵ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 47.

³³⁶ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 404.

³³⁷ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 49.

³³⁸ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 47.

³³⁹ Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 2, 159. Cf. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, 44.

the freedom God sustains has risks involved. If there was no risk, there would be no freedom. Humankind would have an automaton existence as subject to the divine will of God with no opportunity for adventure or creative activity.

In *Berdiaeff*, Segundo views freedom as an aspect of choice, and the choice is made with love.³⁴⁰ To understand how he views freedom, his readers must hence understand what he means by love. On the same page in *Berdiaeff*, Segundo connects creative activity to “elective love, with love choosing freely”.³⁴¹ He is influenced to make this connection by Ignatian spirituality, and this influence can be found in a more extended expression in his book *El hombre 2.2*.³⁴² Love is a choice and is evidenced by the manner in which a person chooses. Segundo goes on to call the creative activity “consistent in an elective, unverifiable love”.³⁴³ Again, it is a choice made with love, but the love is unverifiable because it is the motivation behind the choice. He describes the relationship between God and humankind in reciprocal terms, but the reciprocity does not denigrate God because it is a condition God imposes on God’s-self through worship and authentic love.³⁴⁴ God is in the reciprocal relationship with humankind because of authentic love, even if the authentic love is unverifiable. Segundo writes that true love gives of itself.³⁴⁵ The reciprocal relationship between God and humankind is self-giving. God gives humankind the freedom to choose. Humankind accepts the freedom, and with the love of the gift, humankind can choose to enter a relationship with God. These examples of Segundo’s explication of love in *Berdiaeff* illustrate the context in which he views the primacy of freedom.

³⁴⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 44.

³⁴¹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 44.

³⁴² Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*.

³⁴³ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 54.

³⁴⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 100. He writes, “God wills to have need...”

³⁴⁵ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 127.

One of the ways Segundo addresses freedom is in relation to theodicy, and he concludes that the freedom to choose releases humankind from an obligation. Love of God is not an obligation. He writes, “God cannot put an end to human pain, since there is no question of subjecting humankind to good by constraint, but to help humankind to free itself, because this freedom is the true good, and its lack the true evil”.³⁴⁶ Lack of restraint or coercion to love is not the same as lack of obligation, but Segundo’s argument that love gives of itself means the love relationship between God and humanity is free, not borne of coercion or obligation.³⁴⁷ He is summarizing Berdyaev, and apparently he agrees with him.³⁴⁸ In order to be efficacious, love requires the free choice to enter into a relationship, as in the way God freely chooses to love humankind, and humankind has the opportunity to freely choose to love God. In this way, the significance of freedom is theological, because it has an impact on the way in which humankind and God relate to one another. For Berdyaev, human freedom is to create new values with God, not just to obey God’s vision of values.³⁴⁹

Theresa Lowe Ching emphasizes the role of efficacious love in Segundo’s theology. She writes, “Efficacious love has, then, emerged as the fundamental value which underlies the structure of Segundo’s theology”.³⁵⁰ *Love that gives* brings into being different results than that which exists in a society that produces pain and suffering. For Segundo, love is the transformative aspect of Christianity and connected with action, but freedom provides the opportunity to experience transformative love through action. Segundo does not set up boundaries in which humankind has no choice but to love God. Humankind is free to act and free to act

³⁴⁶ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 115.

³⁴⁷ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 127.

³⁴⁸ This topic is in Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 23-44.

³⁴⁹ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 43-44.

³⁵⁰ Ching, *Efficacious Love*, 129.

with divine love. He understands freedom as a sign of the way humankind should relate to God, but an absence of freedom is true evil. For Segundo and Berdyaev, God is bound by freedom, so with the existence of freedom, God cannot end pain and suffering. Segundo argues that it is necessary for human creativity to engage with pain and suffering, and in this sense, action in freedom is the “true good, and its lack the true evil”.³⁵¹ In response to the question of evil, Segundo quotes Berdyaev:

The problem of theodicy is...only solved on the existential plane where God reveals Himself as freedom, love and sacrifice, where He suffers *with*³⁵² man and strives together with man against the falsity and wrong of the world, against the intolerable suffering of the world.³⁵³

Segundo uses Berdyaev’s emphasis on the Kingdom to situate his theodicy. The problem of evil is addressed as God is revealed in freedom. Berdyaev’s rejection of objectivization is connected with his emphasis on apophatic theology. He understands theodicy through experiencing God’s kenotic revelation, and Segundo appropriates Berdyaev’s Christian existentialism and associates freedom as the true good. That is, for Segundo, to be free is to be able to be in a relationship with God, and it is not necessary for human knowledge to constrain God by asserting an objective understanding of freedom as, for example, in Hegel. Even though Segundo does not explicitly trace the origin of freedom, he connects freedom to God and views it as the basis of human action and love. Freedom has primacy and is both a blessing and a curse for humankind.

³⁵¹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 115.

³⁵² Segundo quotes a French translation of *Slavery and Freedom* that uses *avec* or *with*, whereas R. M. French translates the Russian into “for” in English.

³⁵³ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 115. Cf. Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 89.

3.3 *The Ambiguity of Freedom*

For Segundo, freedom represents “radical ambiguity”.³⁵⁴ He argues that Berdyaev comes to Christianity through freedom, but, he asks, what kind of freedom is it? He answers that it is “this pure freedom, identified with creation, and from which we come to note its extremely ambiguous character”.³⁵⁵ For Segundo and Berdyaev “this pure freedom,” as we have already seen, is freedom that is able to create with love in partnership with God, compared with freedom in secular existentialism which places it within the individual and makes no association with the divine. Free human action is truly good when it relates to God. Freely choosing to relate to God is a revolutionary idea because it goes against the grain of freedom as action that does not include God. God nurtures freedom, but does not control the outcome.³⁵⁶ When humankind freely chooses to relate to God, it enters into a relationship with God, which is in opposition to objectivization and embraces God’s mystery.³⁵⁷ However, what is ambiguous about the freedom Segundo is describing? His understanding of freedom is paradoxical. That is, God gives/nurtures freedom, yet humankind can use the freedom to reject God.

What are the implications of this basic ambiguity? In this section, I will define three aspects of freedom that will unpack the ambiguity in Segundo’s understanding of freedom. They are (1) linear freedom; (2) reciprocity; and (3) pluralism. Exploring the ambiguity of freedom in this way will help elucidate the manner in which Berdyaev influences the notion of freedom in Segundo’s theology.

³⁵⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 57.

³⁵⁵ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 57.

³⁵⁶ Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 2, 159. Cf. Segundo, *The Community Called Church*, 104-105.

³⁵⁷ Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 89.

3.3.1 Linear Freedom

Segundo's view of ambiguity is characterized by rejection of linear freedom and is an adaptation of his treatment of entropy in Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's *The Phenomenon of Man*.³⁵⁸ He writes about this in *El hombre* 2.2 and suggests that Teilhard adopts a linear epistemological approach in which he moves too quickly from an ideal to its realization.³⁵⁹ Moving from one point to another in a straight line is close to the rational thought represented in objectivization, which Berdyaev criticized in *Slavery and Freedom* and Segundo quotes in *Berdiaeff*.³⁶⁰ Segundo prefers circular philosophical and theological movement, from praxis to theory to praxis.³⁶¹

Although Segundo does not cite Teilhard in *Berdiaeff*, he uses Teilhard as a frequent interlocutor in his other works,³⁶² and he has an on-going discussion of *entropy* and *negentropy* in other works.³⁶³ The idea of entropy is also present in Berdyaev's *The Destiny of Man*.³⁶⁴ However, Segundo only engages with Teilhard around the concept of entropy, not Berdyaev. It is Berdyaev's description of experience that influences Segundo's opposition to linear freedom. Segundo argues that experience is the "paradox of Revelation" and people experience Revelation in terms of original sin.³⁶⁵ For Teilhard, freedom grows from the natural order.³⁶⁶ For Berdyaev, freedom is part of existence. Teilhard traces the expansion of life, and his

³⁵⁸ Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man* trans. Bernard Wall (New York: Fontana 1970).

³⁵⁹ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.2, 942. Cf. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, 97.

³⁶⁰ Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 89. Cf. Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 115.

³⁶¹ Cf. The hermeneutic circle in Segundo, *LT*, chapter 1. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, chapter 1.

³⁶² Cf. esp. Juan Luis Segundo, *Teilhard de Chardin: una nueva concepción del metodo científico el aporte de la ciencia al cristianismo* (Montevideo: Parroquia Universitaria, 1975).

³⁶³ E.g. Segundo, *LT*, 248-250., Segundo, *FI*, 235-238., and Juan Luis Segundo, *Masas y Minorías en la Dialéctica Divina de la Liberación* (Buenos Aires: La Aurora, 1973), 29.

³⁶⁴ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 142-153.

³⁶⁵ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 203.

³⁶⁶ Teilhard de Chardin, *Phenomenon of Man*, 80.

language emphasizes scientific expression,³⁶⁷ yet Segundo is critical of Teilhard for calling his conclusion a scientific expression when he uses “transcendent data”.³⁶⁸ That is, Teilhard claims to structure his argument in scientific terms, but depends on data that is transcendent. His freedom builds in a linear manner, whereas Berdyaev and Segundo describe freedom as experience, and Segundo concludes that experiences change, shape and form in an ebb and flow, or circular fashion.

In *El hombre 2.2*, Segundo is critical of Teilhard’s placement of freedom on a linear spectrum.³⁶⁹ Segundo asserts that linear and circular evolutions of freedom do not necessarily require a choice. He makes a negative comparison in his conclusion that, according to Teilhard, human freedom does not necessitate a choice between good or evil.³⁷⁰ Ching writes, “Segundo argues against an either-or option and for the necessary complementary of entropy-negentropy”.³⁷¹ Negentropy is *negative entropy*, or *reverse entropy*, like a running down of a system. Segundo continues to insinuate that the origin of freedom is in existence, but he writes, “It is not *verifiable* that...human freedom exists... The most that can be verified is that all humans act *as if* they were free”.³⁷² That is, Segundo does not address freedom as a quantitatively verifiable theorem. His view of freedom is more ambiguous and does not conform to a linear structure, like Teilhard. He appears to be influenced by Kant when he argues that humankind acts “*as if*” it is free, and freedom is different for each unique person with an indeterminate manifestation. Ching connects Segundo’s use of entropy-

³⁶⁷ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 937. Segundo quotes Teilhard de Chardin, *Phenomenon of Man*, 39. Cf. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, 92.

³⁶⁸ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 938. Cf. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, 93.

³⁶⁹ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 942. Cf. Teilhard de Chardin, *Phenomenon of Man*, 65-6. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, 97.

³⁷⁰ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 968. Cf. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, 141 n.218. Segundo writes, “This is one of the weakest points in [Teilhard’s] thinking”.

³⁷¹ Ching, *Efficacious Love*, 62.

³⁷² Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 969. Cf. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, 141 n.219.

negentropy with “the struggle between the tendencies towards growth or disintegration that characterizes the entire physical world and human existence as located within that universe”.³⁷³

Segundo’s positive view of freedom is a departure also from Berdyaev. Berdyaev’s linear view of freedom places its origin in the myth of the Ungrund,³⁷⁴ although he defines freedom negatively when he writes, for example, “Freedom is a fatal gift which dooms man [sic] to perdition”.³⁷⁵ Freedom is paradoxical in both Berdyaev and Segundo. For both, freedom allows humankind to create evil. It is not created by God, but is freely created and chosen by humans.³⁷⁶ Humankind is bound by the freedom that allows for an exploration of the origin of all that exists, and it is bound by the freedom that allows people to live in the world. The difference is in the origin of freedom. For Berdyaev, the origin is in a linear sense in the myth of the Ungrund, and for Segundo, freedom is a gift from God.

Without freedom God is captive to God’s own predilection. It is possible for God to remain sovereign while coexisting with humankind’s freedom because God is not bound to freedom in the same way humankind is. Freedom is the means by which humankind is capable of creating, and Berdyaev sees no existence outside of freedom. Segundo’s approach is not reducible to linear freedom. Human freedom allows creativity with unique outputs. The multiple products of human output, like various schools of thought, represent various layers and illustrate the ambiguity in Segundo’s view of freedom. Neither Segundo nor Berdyaev, however, view freedom as having a determined output.

³⁷³ Ching, *Efficacious Love*, 62.

³⁷⁴ Berdyaev, “Jacob Boehme Etude”.

³⁷⁵ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 24.

³⁷⁶ Cf. Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 95-120.

Segundo and Berdyaev reconnect where freedom relates to the existence of evil. For Berdyaev, the root of evil is in *meonic* nothingness, which, for him but not for Segundo, includes *meonic* freedom, and he distinguishes meonic nothingness from *oukonik* nothingness, or absolute nonbeing.³⁷⁷ In *Berdiaeff*, Segundo examines human action in relation to evil, whose origin he agrees (following Augustine) is in meonic nothingness. Humans act “*as if*” they are free,³⁷⁸ but Segundo then faces the challenge of reconciling freedom, good/evil, and human action. He answers this challenge by quoting Berdyaev:

The question of the distinction between good and evil and of its origin cannot be solved apart from the prior question as to the relation between God and man, between the Divine and the human freedom...If there is a distinction between good and evil, and if evil exists, God must be justified, since the justification of God is the solution of the problem of evil...Putting it paradoxically it may be said that ethics judges not only man, but God also.³⁷⁹

3.3.2 Reciprocity

The above quote from Berdyaev highlights Segundo’s belief in the “reciprocity” between humankind and God. Berdyaev argues that God creates, but freedom stemming from *meonic* nothingness, or primordial nothingness, is co-eternally existent with God.³⁸⁰ Segundo disagrees with Berdyaev’s belief in the origin of freedom in *meonic* nothingness.³⁸¹ He draws the human ability to create out of Berdyaev’s assertion of freedom stemming from *meonic* nothingness, yet Segundo does not concede the origin of freedom to Berdyaev’s explanation. For Segundo, the origin of freedom remains almost irrelevant, but he acknowledges freedom as it exists from the will of God. If freedom is co-eternally existent with God, as Berdyaev

³⁷⁷ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 25.

³⁷⁸ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.2, 969. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, 141 n.219.

³⁷⁹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 100. Quoting: Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 23.

³⁸⁰ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 31.

³⁸¹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 45.

argues, Segundo argues that one can associate human creation and ethical judgment on humankind with the paradoxical notion that God is subject to ethical judgment too.

Segundo seems to enter this reciprocal relationship without agreeing with Berdyaev's *meonic* origin.³⁸² However, in his discussion of Berdyaev's argument for reciprocity, Segundo is unclear whether or not he concedes that God is subject to ethical judgment. He later writes, regarding God as the giver of grace, "From the start of human history, this 'grace' is given as such, is a revealed fact, and it does not act fortuitously, but *gratuitously*".³⁸³ The radical ambiguity of freedom allows human action to encompass both good and evil, but for Segundo, humankind experiences the radical ambiguity of freedom through grace given by God. While Segundo agrees with Berdyaev that God is subject to ethical judgement, this is not *in the same way* that humankind is.

By making human action responsible and subject to an ethical standard, Segundo can treat good/evil without surrendering freedom. In *Berdiaeff*, he defines ethics as "the independent value of being which is the origin of morality,"³⁸⁴ and freedom is within his definition of ethics. However, freedom does not equate to ethics on its own. He writes,

It is precisely because every free act is not good simply by the fact of being free that freedom enters into a rapport with ethics. There is no ethic if freedom on its own is sufficient to make any act good. It is the independent value of being which is at the origin of morality. This is why freedom can become sin.³⁸⁵

Segundo is using Berdyaev's own thought against him. Berdyaev rejects the notion of being as objectification. Just as God creates in freedom, humankind creates

³⁸² Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 100.

³⁸³ Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 2, 372. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 27.

³⁸⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 52.

³⁸⁵ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 52.

in freedom. Segundo borrows reciprocity from Berdyaev, but rejects the metaphysical underpinning in the Ungrund affirming instead the values of 'being'. People can produce either good or evil. Because each person is unique, one person's free action does not yield results identical to another person's free action. Segundo agrees with Berdyaev on this point, but the difference remains with values inherent in 'being' which is the creation of God. When Segundo talks about being here, he has in mind a created reality as distinct from the pure being or the uncreated being of God.

3.3.3 Pluralism and apparently irreconcilable positions

In *Función De La Iglesia En La Realidad Rioplatense*, Segundo describes two apparently irreconcilable positions and the church's response to conflict in the Plate River border region of Uruguay and Argentina. The two positions demonstrate incipient pluralism in an existent situation, and it is an opportunity for the church to function in reconciliation.³⁸⁶ The two positions cannot be simply synthesised into a third or common position. Just as in pluralism, where two or more ideas exist alongside one another, in these two positions, he presents the church as a collection of people functioning together and jointly making free decisions. In a Sartrean sense of existentialism, existence (in the form of the existent situation) precedes essence and demonstrates incipient pluralism in this situation. It also illustrates, in a broad sense, how pluralism functions in Segundo's theology. The people on each side of the river are free to act, but Segundo argues they do not need to act in opposition to one another. In this sense, freedom collides with evil, and human creativity yields a

³⁸⁶ Segundo, *Función*, 5-27.

plurality of responses. Lacking homogenous outcomes, freedom is a radically ambiguous reality.

Marilyn Sunderman argues that Segundo believes the Jesus of the Synoptic gospels is primarily concerned with people who are suffering.³⁸⁷ She bases her assertion on what he writes in *El Hombre 2.1*,³⁸⁸ but traces of his emphasis on the poor are evident in *Berdiaeff*, which was published five years before the final documents of the Medellín.³⁸⁹ He writes, “The need for love is a strange need, which does not tend to monopolize, but to give”.³⁹⁰ Although neither this quote nor the text of *Berdiaeff* deal directly with poor people or oppression in the same way as his later, more liberative works do, Segundo describes love as an efficacious reality. He argues that there must be an ethic alongside freedom, stemming from created being which reflects the absolute being of God and he identifies this with love.

Because freedom allows for human creativity, freedom yields the coexistence of two or more ideologies (i.e. pluralism), in addition to allowing humankind to choose true good or true evil. For Segundo, pluralism in the contemporary world is a natural reflection of human differences and human freedom. However, pluralism itself is not the value at the basis of morality. With an *a priori* assumption that humankind has the freedom to create, Segundo views human interaction with God as varied. Each person’s experience and understanding, inextricably connected to the freedom to create, is different. The different experiences are reflected in the various theological understandings people have of God. Regarding the various

³⁸⁷ Marilyn Ann Sunderman, "Humanization in the christology of Juan Luis Segundo" (Ph.D., Fordham University, 1995), 55ff.

³⁸⁸ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, esp. 160. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, esp. 107.

³⁸⁹ Medellín is widely viewed as the impetus of liberation theology. Segundo writes, “Medellín...stressed that the reception of the sacraments should be made conditional on a real comprehension and acceptance of what they authentically signify”. Segundo, *The Hidden Motives of Pastoral Action*, 54.

³⁹⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 127.

interpretations of the Law, Segundo writes, “It matters little what name one gives to the One who is truly the [religious] foundation”.³⁹¹ Although this quote from *Teología Abierta 2* sounds similar to Spinoza,³⁹² Segundo is placing the Law within a theological framework. That is, in Paul’s context, pagans and Jews receive equal judgment based on the same existential attitude which reflects values established by God. The judgment reflects the plurality of retrojecting the law of Christ into the Decalogue.

In *Berdiaeff*, Segundo connects pluralism with the primacy of freedom and the work of the Holy Spirit in eschatology. He writes:

The *Absolute* and the *One* separate at this place, and permanently, thanks to the primacy of freedom over being which is, of itself, one. And that is not done to the profit of dualism, since this One will disappear eschatologically, but to the profit of noumenal pluralism.³⁹³

Segundo argues that the primacy of freedom over being means that the Absolute does not have to be understood as the One (monism). That is, the Absolute multiplies into many personal instances in the noumenal realm. This assertion is more supportive of pluralism than dualism since--by Berdyaev’s own account-- the dualism of nature and freedom will be overcome in the eschatological Religion of God. Again, Segundo is arguing what he understands as the outcome of Berdyaev’s own thoughts, even if it is against Berdyaev. Segundo prefers pluralism to dualism, and he gives a place to being rather than the Ungrund.

Segundo appreciates the full implications of asserting human freedom, and he emphasizes the primacy of freedom in order to underscore ontological implications.

³⁹¹ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 393. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 44.

³⁹² Benedict de Spinoza, *The Chief Works of Benedict de Spinoza*, trans. R. H. M. Elwes, vol. 2 (New York: Dover, 1951). For example, Spinoza writes, “By God, I mean a being absolutely infinite--that is, a substance consisting in infinite attributes, of which each expresses eternal and infinite essentiality” (45).

³⁹³ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 404, italics original.

Being means being free. The Absolute or the One (unity of being) are two ways of describing God. Segundo borrows a table from Berdyaev to illustrate the oppositions:³⁹⁴

Primacy of freedom over being	Primacy of being over freedom
Primacy of the subjective existence over the objective world	Primacy of the objective world over subjective existence
Dualism	Monism
Voluntarism	Intellectualism
Dynamism	Statism
Activism	Passivism
Personalism	Impersonalism
Anthropology	Cosmology
Philosophy of the spirit	Naturalism

Table 1

Berdyaev's table illustrates how he placed each of these items in opposition to one another, and Segundo's use of the table implies he found it useful too. The primacy of freedom over ontology, though implying in Berdyaev a separation of the two concepts, is clearly evidenced in Segundo's work. Based on this, the pattern of priority is set for the table. The column on the left shows the item that has priority or primacy over the column on the right. Segundo's later emphasis on praxis is evident in an early form where he places primacy on voluntarism, dynamism, and activism over intellectualism, statism, and passivism. Freedom does not have

³⁹⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 403. Cf. Nicolas Berdyaev, *Cinq méditations sur l'existence* (Paris: Mouton, 1936), 30.

primacy over God,³⁹⁵ but freedom has primacy over non-freedom. However, he does take exception to the presence of dualism in the table as the polar opposite to monism, preferring pluralism.

3.3.4 Pluralism and Dualism

The phrase “not done to the profit of dualism”³⁹⁶ avoids being trapped in the idea of two opposing forces, and Segundo does not concede Berdyaev’s explanation of the primacy of freedom in dualism. Instead, he asserts that Berdyaev himself thinks that dualism of nature and freedom will disappear in the eschaton, and he finds the solution of multiple primacies in pluralism. The relationship between God and humankind continues through “noumenal pluralism”.³⁹⁷ Through pluralism Segundo reconciles the chasm created by free human choice of true good or true evil. Despite his assertion of the freedom of the Holy Spirit to interact with humankind anywhere,³⁹⁸ Segundo recognizes God at work in a unique way in the church, even where the church “takes a social form, as a church excluding all others from the truth”.³⁹⁹

In *From Theology to Social Theory*, Marsha Aileen Hewitt addresses Segundo’s pluralism. She writes, “What Segundo is trying to say is that faith is empty if it focuses upon a specific religious tradition, with its historically mediated truth claims, as its proper object, rather than a value”.⁴⁰⁰ She then quotes Segundo, “What

³⁹⁵ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 49.

³⁹⁶ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 404.

³⁹⁷ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 404.

³⁹⁸ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 404.

³⁹⁹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 75.

⁴⁰⁰ Marsha Aileen Hewitt, *From Theology to Social Theory: Juan Luis Segundo and the Theology of Liberation*, vol. 73, American University Studies, Series VII, Theology and Religion (New York: Peter Lang, 1990), 59.

is really chosen is a value, not one specific line of tradition among many others”.⁴⁰¹

However, he continues his discussion in a footnote at the end of the sentence she quoted, and she does not engage with his comments in this footnote. He writes:

For that reason, the previously mentioned book, Niebuhr’s *Radical Monotheism*, which did not contemplate faith and a possible pluralistic value system (or ideologies) as compatible, has provoked a book with a polemical, but ambiguous, title, *The New Polytheism* by David L. Miller. It is illustrative, for example, of the way Tillich talks about the *objective* criteria of the truth of faith: “The truth of faith must be considered from both sides. From the subjective side one must say that faith is true if it adequately expresses an ultimate concern”. We might expect that the objective side would provide us with criteria for choosing between different traditions of faith. But Tillich continues, “From the *objective* side one must say that faith is true if its content is *the really ultimate*...The other criterion of the truth of a symbol of faith is that it expresses the ultimate which is really ultimate. In other words, that it is not idolatrous. In the light of this criterion the history of faith as a whole stands under judgment...This is true of all types of faith”.⁴⁰²

This lengthy quote from Segundo’s footnote shows him defending Niebuhr and engaging with Tillich. Without referencing the footnote, Hewitt draws the conclusion: “The only way that one can ‘encounter’ God in the present historical situation is through pertinent ideologies,”⁴⁰³ and although Segundo does redefine and appropriate the notion of *ideology* for his own theological purpose (see chapter 7 below), the argument he continues in the footnote does not reduce Christianity to a “value”. Segundo emphasizes that human freedom allows the entire being to focus on an absolute value, that is, love and God as love.⁴⁰⁴ While he attributes explications of absolute faith to Reinhold Niebuhr, Richard Niebuhr, and Paul Tillich, he points to Tillich’s discussion of objective criteria for the truth of faith to reconcile pluralism.

⁴⁰¹ Hewitt, *From Theology to Social Theory*, 59. Quoting Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 178. Cf. Segundo, *LT*, 202.

⁴⁰² Segundo, *LT*, 202-203. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 181-182. H. Richard Niebuhr, *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970). Paul Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith* (New York: Harper, 1957), 110-112. Segundo translated the English edition of Tillich.

⁴⁰³ Hewitt, *From Theology to Social Theory*, 59.

⁴⁰⁴ Segundo, *LT*, 201. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 178.

However, for Tillich, this objectivity is limited; his belief in God as the ground of being forms the basis of his existential ontology. Segundo's existential ontology is based in God as absolute value, and so the values of being which emanates from God are created in a special way.

To underscore the elevation of Christianity beyond simply one value among others, Segundo quotes Tillich. Segundo's use of Tillich's "ultimate which is really ultimate" recognizes the efficacy of being ultimate, just as Segundo views love as being efficacious.⁴⁰⁵ God is ultimate, and, therefore, efficacious, but human action, taken in love, is also efficacious. Tillich provides Segundo with a criterion for judging elements in pluralism. That is, a faith or an ideology can be idolatrous or it can respect God as ultimate concern. Segundo similarly wishes to reconcile the radical ambiguity of freedom with God, or the "ultimate which is really ultimate". He does not wish to surrender God as an ultimate truth, but unlike Hewitt's reductionist examination of Segundo's theology as social theory, Segundo's pluralistic theology cannot itself be exalted to "a value".⁴⁰⁶

In *Berdiaeff*, Segundo argues that Berdyaev places both dualism and pluralism in opposition to monism.⁴⁰⁷ In Table 1, he uses Berdyaev's primacies to crystallize the relationship between various pairings that are in opposition to one another. Dualism, in opposition to monism on the chart, has primacy, but Segundo prefers to give pluralism primacy over monism because it is a more accurate reflection of God's relationship with humankind.⁴⁰⁸ There are three different senses of dualism in Segundo's analysis of Berdyaev: (1) Eternal opposition of principles (freedom and God); (2) Nature and freedom; and (3) two mutually exclusive spheres

⁴⁰⁵ Cf. Ching, *Efficacious Love*.

⁴⁰⁶ Hewitt, *From Theology to Social Theory*, 59.

⁴⁰⁷ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 404n.

⁴⁰⁸ Segundo, *El Caso Mateo*, 270.

of reality, as in Plato. According to Segundo, Berdyaev is arguing for (2) and implying (1), but not advocating (3).⁴⁰⁹ The first row on Table 1 places “primacy of freedom over being” in opposition to “primacy of being over freedom”. Segundo appropriates to a certain extent Berdyaev’s use of the dualism between nature and freedom, which aligns with the philosophy of existentialism, and he closely connects it with the “primacy of freedom over being”.⁴¹⁰ However, he points out that pluralism is a better contrast to “the One” since dualism will be reconciled eschatologically, and he rejects dualism, type (1) above.

Because he associates pluralism with “multiple denouements of personalism,”⁴¹¹ he places personalism in opposition to impersonalism as on the chart above. The “multiple denouements” (i.e. manifestations) amount to a criticism of anthropomorphic language about God. In his further discussion of the chart, Segundo places personalism in opposition to generalism,⁴¹² and generalism is a general statement or platitude about God that lacks Tillich’s “ultimate which is really ultimate”⁴¹³ or even Hewitt’s Christianity as a value. For Segundo, personalism depicts God as the supreme ‘person’ and reality is based in human interaction with this ‘person’, but he only appears to view God as the supreme person in the sense that God and humankind are both free and they enter into a relationship through mutual free choice, i.e. he does not regard God as ‘a’ supreme being.

Segundo traces the noumenal/phenomenal distinction past Berdyaev to Hegel, where he identifies “qualitative jumps” that Berdyaev found inexplicable in

⁴⁰⁹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 403ff.

⁴¹⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 46.

⁴¹¹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 404n.

⁴¹² Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 408.

⁴¹³ Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith*, 111.

the Hegelian system.⁴¹⁴ Segundo quotes Berdyaev: “Relativism was a danger which lay in wait for Hegel, but he understood the dynamic of spiritual and historical life better than other philosophers”.⁴¹⁵ The gaps in Hegel’s thoughts to which both Segundo and Berdyaev point are relative to Hegel’s overall project.⁴¹⁶ Both Segundo and Berdyaev appear to view the Hegelian dialectic with some ambivalent approval, but they both reject Hegel’s objectivization of freedom in social institutions within history. In this sense, Segundo and Berdyaev must be careful to avoid the same relativism Berdyaev identifies and Segundo references. If it is a potential danger for Hegel, it might be a potential danger for Segundo’s pluralism.

Segundo agrees with Berdyaev that dualism of nature and freedom will end in the eschaton⁴¹⁷ and he places his entire theological project within a lived reality (existence) with a backdrop of freedom, even if freedom is understood to include ambiguity.⁴¹⁸ Pure freedom, through which Berdyaev comes to Christianity, is identified with creation, or the act of creating, and Segundo notes that this freedom has an extremely ambiguous character. He argues freedom is able to create with love, and free human action is truly good when it relates to God. When people freely choose to relate to God, they enter into a relationship with God, which is in opposition to objectivization and embraces God’s mystery,⁴¹⁹ although Segundo does allow for a place for the objective in his ontology. However, describing this mysterious relationship is difficult if approached solely positively, or using only

⁴¹⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 307.

⁴¹⁵ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 306. Cf. Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Beginning & The End*, trans. R. M. French (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers 1947), 145.

⁴¹⁶ The “gaps” Segundo and Berdyaev identify are in Hegel’s ethics.

⁴¹⁷ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 404.

⁴¹⁸ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 57.

⁴¹⁹ Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 89; Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*.

cataphatic language. Segundo finds a solution to this dilemma by using Berdyaev's apophatic theology.

3.4 *Apophaticism and Freedom*

Berdyaev's view of freedom is related to the existentialism of the period, and Segundo both adapts and qualifies this in his own brand of Christian existentialism. Segundo's treatment of Berdyaev's apophatic knowledge of God in *Berdiaeff* demonstrates how he influenced Segundo's understanding of apophatic theology, which also has an existential dimension. Apophatic theology is a key element in Berdyaev's view of freedom and this in turn is grounded in human experience of existing. In Matthew Spinka's survey of Berdyaev, he labels Berdyaev's apophatic thought as the "ineffable, inexpressible, non-conceptual, intuitive apprehension of religious truth" and his cataphatic thought as the "logical, rationalized definitions of theology".⁴²⁰ Berdyaev extensively treats the distinction between apophatic and cataphatic thought in *The Beginning and the End*.⁴²¹ He writes, "Apophatic theology is of immense importance for the understanding of the problem of being,"⁴²² and he relates apophatic theology to the human potential for relating to God. For Berdyaev, apophatic theology allows humankind to speak about God "not as being, but as supra-being",⁴²³ by which he means *being beyond finite being*. Segundo does not use the same language to describe God, although the difference between him and Berdyaev relates more to their context and intended audience than disagreement over God as supra-being.

⁴²⁰ Matthew Spinka, *Nicolas Berdyaev: Captive of Freedom* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950), 106.

⁴²¹ Berdyaev, *The Beginning & The End*, 91-104.

⁴²² Berdyaev, *The Beginning & The End*, 99.

⁴²³ Berdyaev, *The Beginning & The End*, 97.

Spinka's succinct description distinguishes the pattern Berdyaev uses to emphasize mystery in apophatic thought, as opposed to cataphatic statements and creeds that limit God. For Berdyaev, cataphatic theology attempts to capture God in statements, and although ecclesial communities accept creeds such as the Apostles and Nicene, he resists confining God to such a positive statement. For Berdyaev, the apophatic predilection to mystery allows a greater possibility for speaking about God than cataphatic statements.

Segundo organizes his treatment of Berdyaev's apophatic thought into six sections: (1) Christological controversies, (2) our first thoughts about God, (3) Neo-Platonists and German mystics, (4) personal liberty, (5) the challenge of Kant and (6) an apophaticism in freedom which is "as little negative as possible".⁴²⁴ I will show Berdyaev's influence on Segundo by following Segundo's line of thought about Berdyaev's apophatic theology, using each of Segundo's sections as a point of departure.

3.4.1 Christological Controversies

What Segundo labels "Christological controversies" is really more about the Trinity. He argues that these controversies were concerned with the problem of freedom during the Reformation and he suggests "monism is identified with human slavery".⁴²⁵ For Segundo, monism does not allow for human freedom, whether it is a Reformation articulation or a monistic articulation at another point in ecclesiastical history. Humankind does not have a choice if there is not something, including freedom, outside of God. This is Segundo's preferred expression of Berdyaev's notion that freedom is coeternally existent with God; he describes this in the Myth of

⁴²⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 166.

⁴²⁵ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 131.

the Ungrund.⁴²⁶ However, Berdyaev's dualism is not the Platonic dualism, which he has been accused of propagating.⁴²⁷ Berdyaev modified Boehme's myth to explain problems in classical theodicy, and Berdyaev's view ascribes potency to freedom, but freedom on its own cannot bring the potency to actuality. In his explanation of freedom permeated by the love of God, he argues that God is still the master of freedom.⁴²⁸

Segundo suggests that Berdyaev finds it possible to "recognize in God an interior life, [that is] made of love and of suffering, although infinitely high and perfect".⁴²⁹ Suggesting that God has an "inner life" is anthropomorphic. However, Segundo argues that Berdyaev is not yielding to anthropomorphism and to support his claim, he quotes Berdyaev's *The Divine and the Human*, "Cataphatic theology is concerned with a God who has been objectified".⁴³⁰ In the same paragraph, Berdyaev writes, "We are not speaking of various Gods but of one and the same God Who hides Himself and reveals Himself in different degrees [sic]".⁴³¹ In other words, the god Berdyaev describes is not polytheistic or an anthropomorphism, but a monotheistic god, who relates to humankind through revelatory action. This action is beyond any cataphatic explanations (*apophasis*) but is reliant on both cataphatic and apophatic statements to narrow the infinite descriptive possibilities.

⁴²⁶ Berdyaev, "Jacob Boehme Etude".

⁴²⁷ Cf. Maurice Friedman, *To Deny Our Nothingness, Contemporary Images of Man* (New York: Delta, 1967), 272-4. Langdon Gilkey, *Reaping the Whirlwind, A Christian Interpretation of History* (New York: Seabury Press, 1976), 402.

⁴²⁸ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 31. However, on the same page, Berdyaev writes, "Three principles are active in the world". Identifying what he means by "principles" is key in labeling him a monist, dualist, semi-dualist, or even trio-ist. If by principles, he means ideas at work in the world, with "Providence" being supreme, he is still arguably a semi-dualist, and his dualism offers a potential answer for the problem of evil.

⁴²⁹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 132, italics original.

⁴³⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 133. Cf. Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Divine and the Human*, trans. R. M. French (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1949), 44.

⁴³¹ Berdyaev, *Divine and Human*, 44.

The problem of Christological controversies of the Patristic period was the result of cataphatic efforts, which Segundo called secular, to construct dogmatic explanations of the Trinity, Christology, and Grace and to remove the mystery of freedom.⁴³² Since the anthropomorphic idea of God's inner life did not solve the apophatic mystery, but instead raised new questions, Segundo continues his analysis and turns his attention to "first thoughts about God".⁴³³

3.4.2 Our First Thoughts about God

Segundo asks what are the first thoughts a person has about God. He pushes further by asking an epistemological question: how does humankind know God? He writes, "The contradiction apparently inherent in the Christian God proceeds from the contribution...of pre-Christian philosophies".⁴³⁴ This reference alludes to his later work in *Etapas Precristianas de la Fe*, in which he explores the pre-Christian development of understanding God.⁴³⁵ However, in *Berdiaeff*, he does not explicate pre-Christian philosophies as he does in *Etapas Precristianas de la Fe*. He shows how Berdyaev approves of Kant's attack on both the ontological argument and objectivization; i.e. Segundo deconstructs an ontological argument and an argument from objectivization. Segundo's own ontological argument is an argument from being as love, which is the key point: being is distinct from God as Supra-Being.⁴³⁶ In his ontological argument, Segundo juxtaposes Berdyaev and Kant, suggesting

⁴³² Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 138.

⁴³³ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 138.

⁴³⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 138.

⁴³⁵ Juan Luis Segundo, *Etapas Precristianas de la Fe: Evolución de la Idea de Dios en el Antiguo Testamento* (Montevideo: Cursos de Complementación Cristiana, 1964). My copy of *Etapas* was published in 1964, but Persha writes that *Etapas* was published in 1962, which would make it precede *Berdiaeff* (1963). Persha, *Juan Luis Segundo*, 301. However, Segundo stated in an interview, "In 1959, I returned to Uruguay because the theses were nearly finished". Coronado, "Interview," 268. Therefore, even if Persha is correct and *Etapas* was originally published in 1962, *Berdiaeff* was "nearly finished" in 1959.

⁴³⁶ Cf. In Barth, the being of God is 'the one who loves in freedom'.

Berdyaev's Kantian thought is a "corrected" Kant.⁴³⁷ In EC,⁴³⁸ he credits Berdyaev with explaining Kantian existentialism.⁴³⁹ In *Berdiaeff*, Segundo writes that for Kant, "The attribution of an objective reality to a supersensible idea is an illusion,"⁴⁴⁰ and he places Berdyaev in agreement with Kant regarding objective reality. As evidence for the agreement, he cites Berdyaev's *Freedom and the Spirit*. The difference between Kant and Berdyaev, according to Segundo, is that Kant places freedom at the end of the process of knowledge, whereas for Berdyaev, "freedom is the original moment of the experience".⁴⁴¹

Segundo argues for an objective reality of God, while being anxious not to reduce God to an object like other objects in the world, i.e. objectivization. He begins by asserting that Berdyaev does not have an *a priori* opposition to causal thought. However, despite this, Segundo quotes Berdyaev in *Slavery and Freedom*, "Christianity...knows only the people. *God did not create a world order...*"⁴⁴² and he asserts the quote represents the "profound unity of Berdyaev's thought".⁴⁴³ For Segundo, Berdyaev contrasts the God of philosophy with the God of Christianity by highlighting that "the road of causality leads to an absolute being that is not identical with the God of revelation".⁴⁴⁴ For Segundo, both the ontological argument and recognition of the objective reality of God do not resolve the need for mystery, which leads him back to the necessity of apophatic thought and exploring its relationship with Neo-Platonists and German mystics.

⁴³⁷ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 140.

⁴³⁸ For a discussion of EC, see chapter 1 above. For the manuscript, see Appendix I. Segundo, "EC".

⁴³⁹ Segundo, "EC," 2.

⁴⁴⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 140. Cf. Kant, *Critique of pure reason*, 112.

⁴⁴¹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 141.

⁴⁴² Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 142. Cf. Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 81.

⁴⁴³ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 142.

⁴⁴⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 144.

3.4.3 Neo-Platonists and German Mystics

In this section of *Berdiaeff*, Segundo outlines four stages of antinomy in apophatic thought which he finds in Berdyaev. The first stage begins with an increasing antinomy as rational thought seeks understanding of God using monism. Rational thought is dependent on reason, which he argues has freedom as its source because freedom presents an existential choice.⁴⁴⁵ The first stage is “represented by apophaticism itself, that of the Neo-Platonists and German mystics”.⁴⁴⁶ That is, the first stage includes the apophatic thought of the Neo-Platonists and German mystics, who understood apophaticism as the pseudo-Dionysian “limits of our intellectual capacity, our language, and our earthly horizon in the presence of God”,⁴⁴⁷ i.e., apophaticism as mere limit of reason.

Segundo questions the fruitfulness of the first stage, which leads him to the second stage: the antinomy between freedom and logic. He argues that God must be reached through freedom because the logical bonds prove to be impotent.⁴⁴⁸ If the pseudo-Dionysian apophaticism of Neo-Platonists and German mystics was too dependent on a reaction against reason, the existential choice stemming from freedom offers an alternative to reason or rational thought.

As argued above, reason leads to cataphatic statements of a causal relationship between God and humankind, instead of Segundo’s preferred apophatic statements that allow for a mysterious relationship between God and humankind grounded in typical human experiences of existence. Stating what God is not more accurately allows for infinite representations of God, as opposed to cataphatic

⁴⁴⁵ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 149.

⁴⁴⁶ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 148.

⁴⁴⁷ Andreas Andreopoulos, *Metamorphosis: The Transfiguration in Byzantine Theology and Iconography* (Yonkers, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2005), 220.

⁴⁴⁸ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 147.

statements that are bound to reason and causal relationships. For Segundo, the third stage is “the antinomy [which] postulated freedom not only negatively, but positively by forming a scheme of reality situated beyond being and occupied by a personal report of freedom”.⁴⁴⁹ Unlike pseudo-Dionysian thought, apophatic statements are not simply negative statements about God. They are a positive representation of God’s mystery, even if they are in the form of a negative statement.

Segundo’s fourth stage is the antinomy between apophaticism and positive truth about God. He writes, “One surpasses apophaticism in the affirmation of this freedom in God, as well as features required by freedom, which becomes positive truth about God”.⁴⁵⁰ The “affirmation of this freedom” references the freedom depicted in the third stage; that is, freedom is not only negative but positive. In stages two through four, freedom is existential. Through relating to existence a person can experience reaching God in freedom. Segundo explains the fourth stage by comparing Berdyaev with Kant. He writes, “Berdyaev introduced into his system Kantian discrepancies by enriching them without deforming them,”⁴⁵¹ which leads to his next section in *Berdiaeff* about Kant and personal liberty.

3.4.4 Personal Liberty

Instead of Kant’s notion of freedom as a mere ‘postulate’ of the practical reason, Segundo argues freedom is intrinsic and positive.⁴⁵² When he writes, “freedom is intrinsic,” he asserts freedom is situated within the person. Reason is a tool the person can use, but freedom is contained within the person and is a positive existential attribute of the person. Segundo argues that Berdyaev does not view

⁴⁴⁹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 147.

⁴⁵⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 147.

⁴⁵¹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 155.

⁴⁵² Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 155.

freedom as a kind of passive instrumentality to being.⁴⁵³ In that sense, freedom is not ontological; it is a positive aspect of human existence. The freedom that is intrinsic and positive in Berdyaev's apophaticism is existential, and Segundo uses Berdyaev's existential freedom to confront the antinomies listed in section 3.4.3 above.

For Segundo, the antinomies in the previous section are beneficial because they demonstrate how reason exhausts its possibilities. In other words, if a person takes too long to realize what is the absolute limit of rationalization, that person will put spiritual experience into rational categories.⁴⁵⁴ There is also danger in resorting to mystery too early because "the purpose of reason is to simplify problems and thus clearly release...the antinomy".⁴⁵⁵ Reason has a role, helping identify and solve problems and antinomies, but reason does not solve infinite problems. Reason is to be ranked below apophatic assertions because reason is only capable of framing a problem, not fully solving a problem. Apophaticism is required to speak about something that is infinite, like God.

3.4.5 The Challenge of Kant

Building on the antinomies identified by Berdyaev and outlined above, Segundo asks if Kant's own argument of a negative and extrinsic view of freedom exceeds what Berdyaev does in reflecting on him. He writes, "The answer to the question can only be *no*" because passing from the antinomies to freedom is different in Berdyaev from Kant.⁴⁵⁶ Kant regards reason as an end in itself, not a

⁴⁵³ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 164.

⁴⁵⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 156.

⁴⁵⁵ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 157.

⁴⁵⁶ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 161.

means to an end.⁴⁵⁷ Berdyaev views reason as a tool for elucidating antinomies, but reason is not the end. Mystery coming from freedom is the end. However, even in this respect Berdyaev is different from Kant because Berdyaev does not find a resolution, or an end, in the same way Kant does. Berdyaev views the apophatic assertions, seen positively through freedom, as the means by which humankind can describe the mystery of God. When considering Kant as possibly transcending Berdyaev's position, Berdyaev's apophatic theology leads Segundo to conclude "the answer to the question can only be *no*".⁴⁵⁸

3.4.6 Non-Negative Apophaticism in Freedom

In the final section in his chapter on apophaticism, Segundo concludes that when apophaticism is placed inside a framework dominated by freedom "it shows itself to be as little negative as possible".⁴⁵⁹ Segundo writes, "Apophatic theology is not negative any more if one gives it all the existential direction which it comprises".⁴⁶⁰ Segundo draws out of this kind of theological discourse that God reveals God-self to humankind in "history that requires--and requires only--spiritual resonance founded on an analogous interior experience".⁴⁶¹ Segundo identifies three ways Berdyaev thinks about God:

(1) He is good ...He is powerful... (2) He is not more good than he is not malicious; he is not more powerful than he is not impotent... (3) He created the heavens and the earth and incarnated himself in the time of human beings [sic].⁴⁶²

⁴⁵⁷ Cf. Kant, *Critique of pure reason*, 102.

⁴⁵⁸ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 161.

⁴⁵⁹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 166.

⁴⁶⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 167.

⁴⁶¹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 169.

⁴⁶² Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 170.

These three ways of thinking about God demonstrate the breadth of apophatic assertions. Berdyaev can make positive statements, as in his first and third statements in the above quote, but he also draws the idea of mystery into his language about God, e.g. his second way of thinking about God. “He is good” is a cataphatic statement, but, for Berdyaev and Segundo (as he quotes Berdyaev), God’s goodness only stands in apposition to the apophatic statement “He is not bad or malicious”. Segundo writes, “The third way [of speaking about God] speaks an altogether different language”.⁴⁶³ The “third way” refers to God as creator and incarnational (point 3 above). *Via negativa* or apophatic assertions can associate negative statements (e.g. point 2 above) with positive statements (e.g. points 1 and 3).

Segundo develops a concept of liberation theology which relies on an apophatic way of talking about God. Just as freedom is a recurring theme in his works, he often uses Berdyaev’s apophatic thought, even when he does not directly credit Berdyaev’s influence. An example from *Teología Abierta 2* will illustrate the influence of Berdyaev’s apophatic thought. Segundo explores the role of “No” in human knowledge of God. He writes, “What was called ‘negative theology’ or *apophatic* was based on the radical impossibility for finite, created reason to grasp anything divine”.⁴⁶⁴ Segundo uses apophaticism to answer the quest for human words “that best expressed the result of [God’s] revelation”.⁴⁶⁵

Talk about free human creativity is an apophatic way of talking about God. Segundo writes, “God is not ‘the depth of humankind’, but a personal reality who

⁴⁶³ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 170.

⁴⁶⁴ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 107. Cf. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, 86.

⁴⁶⁵ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 105. Cf. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, 85.

calls us to a dialogue where one freedom responds to another freedom”.⁴⁶⁶ For Segundo, God and humankind are in a dialogue, in which mutual freedom and creativity allows for a reciprocal response. Apophatic language allows finite humankind to talk about God, and because human language is creative (through freedom), humankind can provide God with unique responses, even though those responses are inherently limited. Structuring his argument around negation reflects the continuing influence of Berdyaev’s apophatic theology.

3.5 *Limits in the connection between freedom and existence*

The existential dimension of freedom in Berdyaev’s writing is all pervasive. The philosophy of existentialism is concerned with more than just existence in itself; it involves finding characteristic patterns in experience, and freedom for Berdyaev is pre-eminent here. This existential dimension of freedom in Berdyaev’s writing influences Segundo. In general terms, freedom is the central point of connection between humankind and God, when humankind and God relate to one another through mutual free choice. However, there are still limitations on the connection between freedom and existence, and these also illustrate Berdyaev’s influence on Segundo’s pluralistic understanding of freedom.

3.5.1 Limited Connection

The human experience is characterized by freedom. Existential freedom is distinct from political freedom as characterized by e.g. Thomas Paine when he writes, “...every man free to follow any occupation by which he can procure an

⁴⁶⁶ Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 2, 109. Cf. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, 87.

honest livelihood [sic]”.⁴⁶⁷ For Sartre existence precedes essence, and from this he draws the conclusion that “We can never explain our actions by reference to a given and immutable human nature...there is no determinism--man is free, man is freedom [sic]”.⁴⁶⁸ Existential freedom is thus possible as a matter of the will even when a person is not politically free. For Segundo, “Freedom is the true good” and “not only a quality of the will”,⁴⁶⁹ which is influenced by Berdyaev’s understanding of freedom as central to reality.⁴⁷⁰ “The true good” and freedom, in both Berdyaev and Segundo, are not simply identical. Freedom is only “the true good” in that it allows humankind to *experience* the true good, which he defines as relating to God through the experience of grace.⁴⁷¹ For Segundo, freedom is “not only a quality of the will”, because freedom exists whether or not humankind chooses to use it to relate to God.

“Freedom is the true good” when humankind uses its will to choose to enter a relationship with God.⁴⁷² Segundo’s sense of the direction of freedom towards God is different from secular existentialists of the period. A person becomes subject to Christian moral and ethical codes of conduct when that person freely chooses to enter a relationship with God. This notion of the potential through free human choice to enter submission to God leads Segundo to write paradoxically about the limitations of freedom in *FI*. He writes, “Freedom is lost upon using it”.⁴⁷³ In this way, a person’s freedom is limited or lost upon using it. This is similar to Berdyaev’s

⁴⁶⁷ Thomas Paine, *Rights of Man: Being an answer to Mr. Burke's attack on the French Revolution* (London: J. S. Jordan, 1791), 62.

⁴⁶⁸ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism is a Humanism*, trans. Carol Macomber (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), 29.

⁴⁶⁹ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 115, 44.

⁴⁷⁰ Nicolas Berdyaev, *Dream and reality : an essay in autobiography*, trans. Katharine Lampert (London: Bles, 1950), 99.

⁴⁷¹ This is a reoccurring theme in Segundo’s works. Cf. Segundo, *Teología Abierta 1*, 197-209.

⁴⁷² Cf. Segundo, *Etapas Precristianas de la Fe*.

⁴⁷³ Segundo, *FI*, 38. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 22.

understanding of entering a life of freedom. He writes, “In freedom life will be harder, more tragic and fuller of responsibility. The ethics of freedom is stern and demands heroism”.⁴⁷⁴

3.5.2 Ecclesial Pluralism

Segundo views creative action as part of freedom. He argues that even in the church there is pluralism. Comparing the biblical authors Paul and Matthew, Segundo writes, “The pluralism of the primitive church places us against the great alternatives of human existence”.⁴⁷⁵ What are the alternatives of human existence? If each person is, in fact, free to create, the resultant creation will necessarily be different, even if the resultant creations are only slightly different. In his example, Paul and Matthew write as free creators; therefore, their respective creations will be different. In order for their creations to become normative for orthodoxy, the differences would need to be reconciled, but Segundo argues that they do not need to be reconciled because their individual accounts of Jesus interacting with a community are an example of pluralism in the early church.

Human interaction with God does not need to reflect a single revelatory experience temporally based nearly twenty centuries ago. The divine-human relationship can reflect continued human experience without ignoring the Christian tradition. In Segundo’s description of freedom producing human creativity, he emphasizes the need to share love, not orthodox adherence.⁴⁷⁶ Bryan P. Stone identifies Segundo’s belief as an adamant connection between Christianity and freedom, in which “free human activity is created by God in order to provide God

⁴⁷⁴ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 158.

⁴⁷⁵ Segundo, *El Caso Mateo*, 270.

⁴⁷⁶ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 127.

with creative and novel responses, something absolutely new which even God cannot give to himself [sic]".⁴⁷⁷

3.5.3 Liberation Theology

Where institutional sin creates a situation of systemic oppression, freedom includes liberation from oppression caused by sin. Liberation theology incorporates emphasis on this aspect of freedom into the way God interacts with humankind. For Segundo, existential freedom established by this divine freedom is the means by which humankind can be liberated from oppression. Regarding the task of liberation theology, he writes:

The fundamental difference between an academic theologian and a liberation theologian is the latter feels compelled to open up the past with disciplines that help explain the present...Without liberation [or freedom]...it is destined to be reabsorbed by the more profound mechanisms of oppression.⁴⁷⁸

According to Segundo, the liberation theologian addresses present systems of oppression using any academic discipline that is available and grounds this work in praxis. By praxis, he means the practical application of theology, e.g. putting theology into practice. He writes, "[Liberation theologians] maintain that human beings, both as individuals and as political beings, are already building up the kingdom of God here and now in history".⁴⁷⁹ However, using academic tools to justify a practical call for an end to oppression is a vacuous activity if there are no means by which people can act. Segundo argues that liberation theology is not vacuous because there is a possibility for change, grounded in this existential freedom. While he does not get his understanding of praxis and the need for change

⁴⁷⁷ Stone, *Effective Faith*, 67.

⁴⁷⁸ Segundo, *LT*, 12. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 8.

⁴⁷⁹ Juan Luis Segundo, "Capitalism versus socialism : crux theologica," in *Frontiers of theology in Latin America* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1979), 247.

exclusively from Berdyaev, his understanding of how humankind can act in freedom is informed by his analysis of the place of freedom in human existence.

Writing about Marxist ideology in Russia, Segundo does not address political freedom because his emphasis is existential freedom:

To act in order to change the existing state of the things...comprises *an extreme simplification* of the system of evaluations. An evil has to be made of what is indifferent, it is necessary *to make a crime* of any hesitation, and a hesitation of the recognition of a value considered to be in opposition to the system.⁴⁸⁰

Segundo criticizes a Marxist-Leninist approach to changing society. He calls revolutionary action, as liberation theologians have been criticized for invoking,⁴⁸¹ “*an extreme simplification*”. Yet, he argues against inaction in the face of evil.

Berdyaev is arguing for a philosophy of action based on spiritual nature, but not political action--i.e. action is not trapped in the economic/material determinism of Marx. Segundo, likewise, does not call for a revolution.

3.5.4 The Role of Praxis

The role of praxis in forming this connection between existence and a limited freedom is fundamental, and in a wider sense, praxis is central to liberation theology. But, praxis is not the entire basis for a connection between existence and a limited freedom or for liberation theology. In *LT*, Segundo's starting point for the hermeneutic circle is praxis,⁴⁸² and in the Appendix to *Evolución y culpa*,⁴⁸³ he

⁴⁸⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 33, italics added.

⁴⁸¹ Dario Castrillón Hoyas, "An Attack on Liberation Theology," *Orange County Register*, 1 December 1985.

⁴⁸² Segundo, *LT*, 13. He writes, "I think the most progressive theology in Latin America is more interested in *being liberative* than in *talking about liberation*". Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 9.

⁴⁸³ N.B. The Appendix is not in the 1983 reissue of *Evolución y Culpa*.

writes, “We have the original situation, enslavement, and the final situation, creative liberty”.⁴⁸⁴ For Segundo, sin is complicity with oppression.

In *Teología Abierta 2*, Segundo outlines four “affirmations” of ways in which people can respond to structural sin: (1) “interior conversion, the liberation of the minorities, is the theoretical starting point for structural liberative praxis;” (2) “interior conversion is not the cause of structural change, [but] it collaborates... with change;” (3) in order to avoid new masters replacing the old, it must always liberate new minorities; and (4) “efficacy...varies with the *phases*”.⁴⁸⁵ Segundo uses these four affirmations as an indictment of human passivity, or a non-response to structural sin. There can be no liberation from structural sin if there is no interior conversion that collaborates with change, is efficacious, and does not create new masters who simply replace the old. In this way, for Segundo, humankind is called to freely respond to God by acting on behalf of the poor and oppressed.⁴⁸⁶

Horacio Bojorge is critical of Segundo’s dependency on social sciences in relation to the way he develops praxis. His assertion that Segundo is too dependent on social sciences might appear well founded at first because Segundo uses the tools of social sciences and engages with secular thinkers, e.g. Freud’s thought as a means of understanding guilt in *Evolución y Culpa*⁴⁸⁷ and Marx in *FI*.⁴⁸⁸ In both cases, however, Segundo does not take the position of his interlocutor; he uses it to better understand the human condition and then relates the human condition back to God. These and other interlocutors provide additional tools with which he can write about interactions between God and humankind. Bojorge criticizes Segundo for

⁴⁸⁴ Segundo, *Evolución y culpa*, 178. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 142.

⁴⁸⁵ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 418. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 69.

⁴⁸⁶ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 463ff. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 110ff.

⁴⁸⁷ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 376-381. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 31-35.

⁴⁸⁸ E.g. Segundo, *FI*, 367. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 300-301.

overemphasizing academics,⁴⁸⁹ but in *Berdiaeff*, Segundo places primacy on volunteerism over intellectualism, as shown in Table 1 above. For Segundo, academia and the tools developed in social sciences are ranked beneath God's relation to people, not the reverse.

Segundo argues that action is required when facing an evil system, such as institutional sin that creates a situation of systemic oppression.⁴⁹⁰ This argument is apparently a shift away from existential freedom toward political freedom, but his existential liberation theology is not based on a call for political freedom. Berdyaev too is clear about the evil of some systems and the need for action to reconstruct economics.⁴⁹¹ But in the face of systemic oppression, for Segundo interior conversion and existential freedom are an essential part of enacting change. This is a point where he differs from Berdyaev. Whereas Berdyaev views systemic change in economic terms, Segundo offers a theological context. He affirms that neither structural nor inner change is the simple cause of the other, that some structural changes can go on simultaneously to inner conversion, and that no systemic changes will be fruitful for social life without obtaining an inner freedom.⁴⁹²

He writes, "The continuing change in our interpretation of the Bible is a function of the continuing changes of our present reality, both individually and socially".⁴⁹³ For Segundo, the present reality reflects the way humankind understands the world, through the lenses of the social sciences. In order to respond

⁴⁸⁹ Horacio Bojorge, *Teologías deicidas: el pensamiento de Juan Luis Segundo en su contexto* (Madrid: Encuentro, 2000), 267.

⁴⁹⁰ Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 2, 418. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 69.

⁴⁹¹ Cf. Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Bourgeois Mind and other essays*, ed. Donald Attwater, trans. Countess Bennigsen and Donald Attwater (Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, Inc., 1934), 81ff.

⁴⁹² Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, "Derechos humanos, evangelización e ideología," in *Carter y la logica del imperialismo, tomo II*, ed. Hugo Assmann (San José, Costa Rica: Colección DEI, 1978), 339-353.

⁴⁹³ Segundo, *LT*, 12. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 8.

to that reality, Segundo argues humankind must revisit the Bible and reinterpret it in light of the present reality, including using social sciences.

When Segundo follows the hermeneutic circle from praxis to theory and engages with Marxist theories as a possible answer to oppression in capitalism,⁴⁹⁴ Bojorge argues Segundo is recommending and defending Marxism.⁴⁹⁵ However, Segundo uses Marxist theories to understand and explain human behavior, but he does not concede to Marxism. He writes, “A general theory about our perception of reality is called upon to be incorporated into theological methodology”.⁴⁹⁶ Segundo uses Marx’s ideas but distinguishes Marx from Marxists, and he clearly departs from Marx regarding praxis where Marx seeks a deterministic outcome, as he departs from Berdyaev where Berdyaev seeks to define the origin of freedom.

Praxis promulgates the necessity of a practical application to follow in the background of this theological exploration. Praxis gives humankind the opportunity to exercise freedom. In *Teología Abierta 2*, he writes, “In fact, the liberating truth is not theory but praxis,”⁴⁹⁷ but in “The Shift within Latin American Theology,” he identifies praxis as a part of liberation theology, but not the central argument.⁴⁹⁸ The central argument, according to Segundo, is humankind freely deciding to enter a relationship with God. Thus, he takes Berdyaev’s existential analysis of freedom as a reciprocal state between humanity and God, while disagreeing with his dualistic view of the origin of freedom. Praxis is always grounded in this existential/theological vision.

⁴⁹⁴ For a fuller discussion, see chapter 6. Segundo, *LT*, 19-25. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 15-20.

⁴⁹⁵ Bojorge, *Teologías deicidas*, 130-147.

⁴⁹⁶ Segundo, *LT*, 25. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 20.

⁴⁹⁷ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 399. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 52.

⁴⁹⁸ Juan Luis Segundo, “The shift within Latin American theology,” *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* (1985): 20. Jeffrey Klaiber writes about the change in liberation theology through the 1970s and points out that Segundo identifies this change, calling it the “two theologies of liberation” in this 1985 article. Klaiber, “Prophets and Populists: Liberation Theology, 1968-1988,” 7.

3.6 Conclusion

Freedom underpins the relationship between God and humankind. In order for a relationship to exist, there must be at least two willing participants to enter the relationship. Freedom is necessary for the relationship between God and humankind because without freedom people would function as mindless automatons filling a meaningless role in the relationship. With the existence of freedom, people can willingly enter into a relationship with God. In *Existencialismo*, Segundo connects artistic expression with existential human creativity,⁴⁹⁹ an argument connected with his understanding of free human creativity as expressed in *Berdiaeff*.⁵⁰⁰ In *Teología Abierta 1*, he contrasts freedom and determinism, concluding freedom functions within the realm of truth and truth comes from God.⁵⁰¹ In *LT*, Segundo argues that Christian faith exists within social structures, even as it is transcendent of those structures, e.g. Jesus words are connected to “ideological wrappings”.⁵⁰² These lead to tension between freedom and nature with its limits and conditions in both secular existential thought and in Berdyaev and Segundo. Segundo opposes Berdyaev’s dualistic approach to freedom and nature, and develops a more pluralistic approach. In *El Infierno*, Segundo compares eschatological and anthropological understandings of Hell; he writes about “the double language of freedom”.⁵⁰³ These four examples illustrate how Segundo continues using freedom throughout his writings. His theology was consistently influenced by Berdyaev’s intimate connection between existentialism and his view of freedom.

⁴⁹⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 70ff.

⁵⁰⁰ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 126-8.

⁵⁰¹ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 1*, 231ff. Cf. Segundo, *The Community Called Church*, 201.

⁵⁰² Segundo, *LT*, 100. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 86.

⁵⁰³ Juan Luis Segundo, *El infierno: un diálogo con Karl Rahner* (Buenos Aires: Lohlé, Lumen, 1998), 164ff.

4 Libertad, Base Communities & Tape 24

4.1 Introduction

"Theology is an art rather than a science..."⁵⁰⁴ These words appear as introductory comments in the margin of a speech Juan Luis Segundo delivered in Toronto in 1983. He uses *art* in the sense of a skill as the result of knowledge or practice, rather than *science* in the sense of a state or fact of knowing. Without overemphasizing marginalia, the comment suggests viewing theology as a practice or craft, perhaps gained through creatively doing theology in a specific situation. This comment connects with his other ideas, like primacy of freedom and freedom as the ability to create, which appear in his reflections on the human project in Sartre, as well as freedom within a person and as a positive attribute of the person.

Segundo's existentialism places freedom within boundaries. In the case of his comment above, the freedom to practice theology is within the boundaries of a particular context. For the purpose of developing the existential dimension of his liberation theology, his understanding of the boundaries on freedom are expanded and clarified through his engagement with two plays and a novel from Albert Camus and Jean-Paul Sartre. Segundo also finds, as we shall see, that it is futile for people to assert their freedom in denial of limits. In this way, he is opposing Sartre, although his relationship with Camus' thought is more complicated. Sartre and Camus influence Segundo in the following ways:

- 1) Segundo engaged with and cited both Sartre and Camus.⁵⁰⁵

⁵⁰⁴ Juan Luis Segundo, "The Shift Within Latin American Theology," in *Regis College of the Toronto School of Theology Public Lecture* (Toronto, Ontario, Canada 1983), Marginalia, emphasis original.

⁵⁰⁵ E.g. Segundo cites Sartre here: Segundo, *FI*, 18, 175, 218-19, 240-41, 285. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 28, 144, 178, 193, 199, 233, 244. He cites Camus here: Segundo, *FI*, 13-17, 97, 176-77. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 3-6, 21-22, 84-85, 140-44, 161.

2) Segundo read Sartre (and Berdyaev, Heidegger, and other philosophers) as early as his studies at San Miguel in Buenos Aires, Argentina in the late 1940s. An unpublished biography by the Jesuits of Uruguay states, "Authors who had major influence on his work were not all theologians. [Segundo says,] 'I owe much to Rahner in the first place. But, philosopher theologians like Berdyaev had a more profound influence on me, and in my early development, I would add Jean Paul Sartre and his plays treating the problem of freedom'".⁵⁰⁶ He lists Sartre amongst existential philosophers in *Existencialismo*⁵⁰⁷ and in his lecture notes from teaching in Montevideo in the early 1950s.⁵⁰⁸

3) Segundo led a discussion group and they discussed Sartre and Camus on at least one occasion. This is based on new material, a tape recording of Segundo leading the discussion group. In it he discusses the existentialism of Sartre and Camus through their creative writing. This tape will be treated in section 4.3 below.

4) Segundo's existentialism is different from Sartrean existentialism. The latter includes a project theory.⁵⁰⁹ This theory represents the way humanity realizes essence; this theory is required in Sartrean existentialism because Sartre denies transcendence. Segundo implicitly opposes this aspect of Sartrean existentialism. For example, in a passage in *FI* discussing Marx and Camus, although Segundo does not mention Sartre's rejection of transcendent data, he opposes Marx's explicit

⁵⁰⁶ Cf. ref. in Medina et al., "Juan Luis Segundo Biografía," Montevideo, 1996, 1. "Los autores que tuvieron mayor influencia en su obra no fueron todos teólogos. [Segundo says,] 'Debo mucho al primer Rahner, pero los que influyeron más profundamente en mí son autores tanto filósofos como teólogos, como por ejemplo N. Berdiaeff y me atrevería también a decir el Jean Paul Sartre de la primera época y de las primeras obras de teatro, tratando el problema de la libertad'".

⁵⁰⁷ He lists contradictory existentialist philosophers, "Heidegger, Jaspers, Sartre, Marcel". Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 42.

⁵⁰⁸ Segundo, "Orientaciones Literarias".

⁵⁰⁹ Sartre's project theory specifies the way in which being-for-itself understands itself and defines itself as this, rather than that. He writes, "The best way to conceive of the fundamental project of human reality is to say that man is the being whose project is to be God". Jean-Paul Sartre, *Essays in Existentialism* (New York: Citadel, 1963), 70.

rejection of transcendence. Thus, by implication, he opposes Sartre's rejection of transcendence. In the same passage, he opposes Camus' tacit acceptance of transcendence, which he finds unsatisfactory because Camus blames God for injustice whereas Segundo blames injustice on human freedom. Segundo views transcendent data as "unconsciously intermingled" in ideologies and methodologies more than people realize.⁵¹⁰

Sartre's significance in twentieth-century existentialism merits engagement when exploring Segundo's existential liberation theology.⁵¹¹ Segundo is both indebted to and departs from Sartre and Camus. Even though existentialism plays a significant role in Segundo's theology and it comes up in various places in his published works, he does not spend much time addressing or interpreting Sartre or Camus directly. Therefore, exploring a connection between Sartre and Camus and Segundo has been widely overlooked. For example, the following people discuss his existential connection with Bultmann but do not mention such a connection with Sartre or Camus: Theresa Lowe Ching,⁵¹² Eduardo Gross,⁵¹³ Mary Kay Nealen,⁵¹⁴ and Brian P. Stone.⁵¹⁵ Other commentators on Segundo, including Marilyn Ann Sunderman⁵¹⁶ and Anthony Joseph Tambasco⁵¹⁷, do not mention Sartre or Camus at all in their treatment of Segundo.

⁵¹⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 173-77. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 140-42.

⁵¹¹ In some cases, the connection between Sartre and other existential thought might be indirect or tangential. E.g. The American writer Richard Wright (1908-1960) met Sartre and Michael Fabre argues that he was influenced by French existentialists. This particular influence is indirect, at best, because Wright never directly cites Sartre. Michael Fabre, "Richard Wright and the French Existentialists," *MELUS* 5, no. 2 (1978).

⁵¹² Ching, *Efficacious Love*, 13. Ching writes, "Bultmann was the third major influence of that period. He provided Segundo with an existentialist interpretation of scripture which stresses the primacy of interpretation over narrative".

⁵¹³ Eduardo Gross, "A concepção de fé de Juan Luis Segundo" (Escola Superior de Teologia, 1997).

⁵¹⁴ Nealen, "The poor in the ecclesiology of Juan Luis Segundo," 88.

⁵¹⁵ Stone, *Effective Faith*, 79.

⁵¹⁶ Sunderman, "Humanization in the christology of Juan Luis Segundo".

⁵¹⁷ Anthony Joseph Tambasco, "The Contribution of Juan Luis Segundo to the Hermeneutical Question of the Relationship of the Bible to Christian Ethics" (Ph.D., Union Theological Seminary, 1981).

In his monograph, Horacio Bojorge mentions Sartre once. He writes, “This is also the reason why Sartre, following Nietzsche, may present faith in God as *bad faith*”.⁵¹⁸ The context of this quote is a dismissive summary of Segundo’s engagement with social science as wholly Marxist and heterodox, and Bojorge seems to miss Sartre’s technical concept of *mauvaise foi*. Sartre defines *bad faith* as societal pressure on people to accept false values and give up freedom to act creatively.⁵¹⁹ For Bojorge, Segundo’s concept of God is too indebted to social sciences. This leads Bojorge to conclude that Segundo is wrong about his understanding of God’s revelation and the hermeneutic circle. In fact it can be seen from our last chapter that Segundo would accept Sartre’s concept of bad faith, while affirming a ‘good faith’ in a God of creative freedom.⁵²⁰

The primary source for this chapter is an unpublished recording of Segundo leading a discussion group. I became custodian of this material in 2008, when José Irureta gave me eighty-eight tape recordings of Segundo leading small discussion groups in Montevideo.⁵²¹ Some of the tapes have a date and topic written on them, but others are undated. Based on this information, along with conversations with four discussion group members, I believe that the recordings were made between 1979 and 1986.

The tapes contain discussions about biblical passages, as well as theological and philosophical concepts. They also contain Segundo’s thought on ideas which he later published in *Reflexiones críticas* (1983), a follow-up to his five-volume *Teología*

⁵¹⁸ Bojorge, *Teologías deicidas*, 298.

⁵¹⁹ Sartre, *Essays in Existentialism*, 147-186.

⁵²⁰ Bojorge, *Teologías deicidas*, 71-90.

⁵²¹ I currently have the original tapes in my possession and have transferred eighty-six to digital format. Two were unintelligible. In order to make the recording used in this chapter more widely available, I have uploaded it to YouTube. The links are: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-os5aevEYKE> and <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kwj6gMs81SE>

abierta para el laico adulto (1967-72),⁵²² and his three-part *El hombre de hoy ante Jesus de Nazaret* (1982). Most important, in relation to my project, is the tape on which he discusses freedom in the existential-fictional works by Sartre and Camus. These tapes also reveal the kind of Christian base communities Segundo led.⁵²³ Let us now consider the context in which this recording was made: Segundo's CEB.

4.2 *Segundo's Base Community*

After the 1968 meeting of the Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano (CELAM) in Medellín, Colombia, *comunidad eclesial de base* (CEB) or *Christian base communities*, began to spread throughout Latin America.⁵²⁴ Tomas Bissonnette defines a CEB as "homogeneous groups of eight to forty Christians who share common interests, values, and objectives and who live an ecclesial experience in which primary interpersonal, on-going relationships predominate and who view themselves as an ecclesial unit".⁵²⁵ James Cavendish writes that CEBs advance democratization.⁵²⁶ Even though CEBs vary widely, especially in different countries and regions, they share some things in common: the members of each CEB have interests, values, and objectives in common.

As a theologian, Segundo lived within this context. Upon returning to Uruguay after his education in Europe, he was unable to find a teaching position, so he opened the Centro de investigación y acción social "Pedro Fabro" and he led

⁵²² Segundo, *Reflexiones Críticas*.

⁵²³ The transcript to this tape and my translation into English are available in Appendix II.

⁵²⁴ The CELAM meeting at Medellín encouraged CEBs. In document 10, the bishops write, "The Christian ought to find the living of the communion, to which he has been called, in his Base Community, that is to say, in a community, local or environmental, which corresponds to the reality of a homogeneous group and whose size allows for personal fraternal contact among its members". Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano, *Medellín Documents* (Bogotá: CELAM, 1968).

⁵²⁵ Tomas G. Bissonnette, "Comunidades de base: Some contemporary attempts to build ecclesial koinonia," *The Jurist* 36, no. 1/2 (1976): 24.

⁵²⁶ James C. Cavendish, "Christian Base Communities and the Building of Democracy: Brazil and Chile," *Sociology of Religion* 55, no. 2 (1994): 180.

various small discussion groups. These groups functioned as his CEB, but they were very different from the autonomous peasant communities led by Leonardo and Clodovis Boff (and others) in Brazil, various priests in El Salvador and throughout Latin America. Daniel Levine writes, "As a practical matter, base communities range in emphasis from highly pietistic and devotional to socially activist, in structure from authoritarian to democratic, and in status, from autonomous to utterly reliant on elites and institutions for guidance".⁵²⁷ Base communities are often associated with literacy training⁵²⁸ or lay-led hermeneutics, like those published in Ernesto Cardenal's *The Gospel in Solentiname*.⁵²⁹

Segundo describes the function of base communities:

It is assumed, for example, the functionality of the base communities is supposed to cover the gap between intensive and extensive pastoral ministry, between the maturity of faith and traditional Christianity. By not addressing the ideology present in whatever is social, we ignore the fundamental mechanism of the base communities: their rapid radicalization against the lie of an extensive pastoral ministry that constitutes one of the indirect but powerful basis of the *status quo*.⁵³⁰

He begins by addressing an assumed function of CEBs, but his focus is on ideological suspicion (cf. hermeneutic circle). For Segundo, there is a *prima facie* assumption of an ideology present. Every CEB (or whatever is social) will have an ideology already present, and the official pastoral ministry of the church often fails to understand the suspicions which the CEB harbour against it. However, his 'base community' is quite different from the rest of the phenomenon. In *Teología Abierta*

⁵²⁷ Daniel H. Levine, *Popular Voices in Latin American Catholicism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 13.

⁵²⁸ Cf. Conscience-raising in Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. Myra Bergman Ramos, 30th Anniversary ed. (New York: Continuum, 2009).

⁵²⁹ Ernesto Cardenal, *The Gospel in Solentiname, Volumes 1-4*, trans. Donald D. Walsh (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976-1982). Ernesto Cardenal, *The Gospel in Solentiname, Volume 2*, trans. Donald D. Walsh (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1978). Ernesto Cardenal, *The Gospel in Solentiname, Volume 3*, trans. Donald D. Walsh (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1979). Ernesto Cardenal, *The Gospel in Solentiname, Volume 4*, trans. Donald D. Walsh (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1982).

⁵³⁰ Segundo, "Teología y ciencias sociales," 287. Segundo, *Signs of the Times*, 9.

2, he writes, “A base community is composed of a restricted number of people who have relationships with each other”.⁵³¹ This is a wider and more flexible definition of a CEB, and it seems to more accurately reflect how he viewed such groups.

Given the wide variety of CEBs and the general agreement amongst the various types of communities, Segundo’s discussion group could be considered a certain kind of intellectual CEB. It was more autonomous, rather than dependent on institutions; it was democratic, rather than authoritarian. The group did not engage in the conscience-raising described by other liberation theologians, e.g. Paulo Freire.⁵³² Instead, Segundo’s CEB is comprised of more affluent, widely read, and intellectually oriented people than, say, Boff or Cardenal’s CEBs. As we shall see, Segundo’s listeners are familiar with Sartre and Camus, whereas Leonardo Boff, in an example below, engages with fairly poor, less intellectually oriented people.

In a speech given at Regis College of the Toronto School of Theology, Segundo cites a CEB visited by Leonardo Boff. He points out Boff’s struggle with articulating the theology expressed by members of a CEB that is comprised of many illiterate and impoverished people. Boff asked some of the people, “How did Jesus redeem us?” They responded: “Through his suffering”. Both Segundo and Boff found it interesting that the members of the CEB identified their salvific experience first with Jesus’ suffering, not with the Resurrection or Eucharist. Boff’s experience with this impoverished CEB leads Segundo to conclude:

No amount of subtle argument can conceal that the only relevant methodological feature of Latin American theology is, as a matter of fact, to start thinking not from a systematic listing of theological problems linked by an inner logic for the sake of an orthodox and credible answer to every problem, but instead, in the precise context I am describing, to start both from a commitment to think for the sake

⁵³¹ Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 2, 244. Cf. Segundo, *The Sacraments Today*, 32.

⁵³² E.g. see Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, chapter 3. Freire discusses “dialogics” which is the essence of education as the practice of freedom.

of poor and oppressed people, and from a consideration of their praxis every time we perceive that this praxis is linked, through theology, to the oppressive mechanisms of the whole culture.⁵³³

Segundo classifies two successive trends in liberation theology: (1) the identifying of middle-class intellectuals with the experience of poor people and their identifying oppressive ideologies *on behalf* of poor people, which might well include a critique of the attitudes of poor people, as in the example above. (2) Intellectuals and clergy attempt to learn from the actual faith and opinions of poor people, so that their praxis becomes the source of theology. These are two different appeals to praxis, and Segundo concludes that both have ultimately failed to achieve liberation for different reasons. From this lecture we may nevertheless conclude that he sees a limited place for middle-class intellectuals to reflect on the praxis of poor people.

According to this tape, Segundo's CEB must have been well-read and they were familiar with plays by Camus and Sartre. Other tapes reveal familiarity with other literary genres and authors (e.g. Péguy and Dostoyevsky). The group was also familiar with Catholic theology (e.g. there is a series labelled "Dogma" which reveals Segundo's ideas, later published as *Dogma*⁵³⁴). In addition, there are tapes on which Segundo discusses various biblical topics (e.g. John and Romans).

Generally CEBs emphasize experience over doctrine and form a response to particular circumstances.⁵³⁵ Segundo's discussion group was no different. His description of CEBs in *Teología Abierta 2* describes a group whose members are in relationship with each other.⁵³⁶ He views CEBs as a context for fresh hermeneutics,

⁵³³ Segundo, "The Shift Within Latin American Theology". N.B. The speech was written in English and published with only slight editorial modification in Segundo, *Signs of the Times*, 67-80, quote from p. 70.

⁵³⁴ Segundo, *Dogma*. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*.

⁵³⁵ E.g. Phillip Berryman, *Liberation Theology, essential facts about the revolutionary movement in Latin America and beyond* (Bloomington, IN: Meyer Stone, 1987), 64-68.

⁵³⁶ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 244. Cf. Segundo, *The Sacraments Today*, 32.

and he cites Jesus' exchange with the two men on the road to Emmaus in Luke 24:13-32 as an example of a CEB in miniature. He writes, "This little community was experiencing the bitter sorrow of a concrete situation, and it found no enlightenment in its faith...Hope had faded". But, when Jesus explained scripture in light of the situation in which they were living, he writes, "Little by little, a light dawned, and Scripture, which a moment earlier had nothing to say to them, would become a *present, efficacious, and operative word*".⁵³⁷ On this tape, when he talks about Camus or Sartre, he relates the theme of freedom in the stories with the situation in which he and his CEB lives, as a present, efficacious, and operative word about freedom.

4.3 Tape 24--*La Libertad*

In the collection of tape recordings of Segundo's CEB, one tape from 1980 is labelled "24 La Libertad" and the tape records Segundo discussing several fictional works by existentialists: *Caligula* by Albert Camus, *The Flies* by Jean-Paul Sartre, and *Nausea* also by Sartre. The tone of the tape is friendly. He is interrupted by laughter and the group seems to be familiar with the works he discusses. When Segundo makes a joke or points out an ironic twist in the story, the group is audibly engaged. He draws meaning from the story and uses the meaning as a vehicle for exploring freedom. For him, the story is present; it speaks to his context. Using this tape, it is possible to gain insight into both the way his CEB functions and how he sees the ideas of Sartre and Camus in relation to freedom and, in turn, his theology.

⁵³⁷ Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 2, 246. Cf. Segundo, *The Sacraments Today*, 33.

4.3.1 Freedom as a deception

In the play *Caligula* by Albert Camus, the protagonist is Caligula, the young Roman Emperor. On the surface level, he is a murderous, insane narcissist. A closer reading reveals Caligula to be an absurdist; he is a caricature of Camus' absurdism.⁵³⁸ Caligula carries out his own personal conflict with the meaninglessness of human existence and the struggle to realize true freedom. The play opens with Caligula mourning the death of Drusilla, his sister and lover. The action follows Caligula's quest to attain happiness by exercising his freedom, but freedom always remains a deception for him; he does not understand his freedom. Caligula begins systematic executions and lives out a major tenet of absurdism. This means that all attempts to find meaning are futile and humanity lives in a purposeless and chaotic universe. The action concludes with Caligula's death. Although he does not commit suicide, he engineers his assassination.

The tape opens with Segundo saying:

... Dice, "el Tesoro...el tesoro publico" dice, "es verdad, claro, el tesoro publico, pero es una cosa capital", y el tesorero, el ministro de finanzas de Roma, dice, "por supuesto, Cesar, es capital". Y Calígula se ríe y le pregunta a su mujer, su amante, Cesonia, "¿No es cierto, querida, que, es muy importante el tesoro publico?" y Cesonia, que ya conoce – ya conoce – a Calígula, le dice "no, Calígula, es una cuestión secundaria". Entonces Calígula dice, "lo que sucede, es que tu no sabés nada de esas cosas. El tesoro es un interés poderoso. Todo es importante, <i>todo</i> es importante: las finanzas, la moralidad pública, la política exterior, las provisiones del ejercito, las leyes agrarias. Todo es capital, te digo. Todo esta al	..., "the Treasury ... the public treasury," he says, "[it] is true, of course, the public treasury, is a capital thing," and the treasurer, the finance minister in Rome, said, "Of course, Cesar, it is capital". And Caligula laughs and asks his wife, his mistress, Caesonia, "Is it not true, dear, that the public treasury is very important?" and Caesonia, who already knows, says to Caligula, "No, Caligula, it is a secondary issue". Then Caligula says, "That's because you know nothing about those things. The treasure is a powerful interest. Everything matters: finance, public morality, foreign policy, the provisions of the army, the agrarian laws. Everything is capital, I say. Everything
--	---

⁵³⁸ For more on absurdism, see Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*, trans. Justin O'Brien (New York: Knopf, 1955), 3-118.

mismo nivel. Es decir, todo esta al mismo nivel, significa que nada tiene importancia. Como ha dicho “este mundo no tiene importancia. Entonces, de alguna manera, el dice, digamos, lo que dice el ministro de finanzas, pero lo dice con sorna, es decir, TODO es importante, todo tiene la misma importancia, no? Todo esta al mismo nivel; la grandeza de Roma, y tu crisis de artritis, todo esta al mismo nivel. Si uno no admite eso, nunca va a ser libre. Ese es un poco el precio que hay que pagar para la libertad.⁵³⁹	is at the same level. This means that nothing matters. As you said “this world is not important. Then, somehow, the finance minister says sarcastically, that is, EVERYTHING is important, everything is equally important, right? Everything is at the same level, the grandeur of Rome and your attack of arthritis. If you don’t admit this, you will never be free. That’s about the cost of freedom.
--	--

Segundo might have had the 1944 French edition during the gathering.⁵⁴⁰

However, this would require him to translate his quotes into Spanish as they went along, and why would he? In order for the community to have been familiar with the play, they would have either had to also be fluent in French or they had a Spanish translation. The former is possible, but the latter is more likely. Therefore, Segundo probably used Aurora Bernárdez’s Spanish edition of Camus’ *Calígula*.⁵⁴¹

In the above quote, Segundo focuses on what the character Calígula finds important, fundamental and logical. In the play, Camus uses Calígula’s diatribe as a setup for his absurdism. For Camus, absurdism is a conflict between two ideals, like Calígula’s conflict between what is important and the nature of freedom.

The above speech is from Act I and Calígula’s response to Drusilla’s death. He comes back to the palace after having spent three days roaming the countryside and

⁵³⁹ Juan Luis Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980, This quote and the others that follow are from my transcription and translation of this tape recording. For the complete transcript, see Appendix II.

⁵⁴⁰ Albert Camus, *Calígula, suivi de Le malentendu* (Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1944/1958). N.B. This is impossible to determine with certainty. Any conclusion is based, at least in part, on the memory of someone who was present at a specific, not extraordinary event over thirty years ago.

⁵⁴¹ Albert Camus, *El malentendido; Calígula*, trans. Aurora Bernárdez (Buenos Aires: Losada, 1947).

says, “Everything is important...everything is *equally* important”.⁵⁴² He, then, plans to enact a law in which everyone must leave everything they have to the state (to the “public treasury”), and Caligula believes he can do this because he is finally free--free of the constraints of life. For Caligula, the equal value of everything provides a basis for acting freely, understood as ‘as one likes’. Segundo comments on Caligula’s reasoning, “If, for some reason, a reason becomes a value then one appreciates that reason”.⁵⁴³ Caligula’s confidant and wife Caesonia is upset by his behaviour and tries to console him. “What’s wrong?” she asks. Segundo continues:

Ahora, esto es muy importante, digamos, para el punto de vista de la lógica de la libertad de Caligula, es lo fundamental. Entonces, prácticamente, la obra sigue esta lógica. No hay mayores variantes, los podíamos ver. ⁵⁴⁴	Now, this is very important, say, from Caligula’s point of view on the logic of freedom; it is fundamental. Then, practically, the work follows this logic. We could see no further variants.
---	---

The way Caligula understands freedom is a deception to himself and to those around him. He views everything as “important”; this can range from items on a macro level (the grandeur of Rome) to the ordinary, mundane items of everyday life (a crisis of arthritis). On one level, Caligula might have simply lost a sense of proportion. However, his ensuing madness as he seeks to live out this absolute freedom suggests his self-deception. He is subject to his own madness. To some extent, Caligula’s self deception regarding freedom parallels the argument of chapter 3 above, although for Berdyaev in *Slavery and Freedom*,⁵⁴⁵ a person is not subject to his or her madness; people are subject to their freedom. Camus presents Caligula as

⁵⁴² Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980, Emphasis in Segundo's spoken words. Cf. Albert Camus, *Caligula & Three Other Plays*, trans. Stuart Gilbert (New York: Vintage Books, 1958), 11.

⁵⁴³ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁵⁴⁴ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁵⁴⁵ Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*.

an absurdist character, and the story suggests that he is not necessarily free, but bound to his freedom.

Camus writes, "One can prove that the most ordinary person is already a monster of perversity and that, for example, we all more or less wish for the death of those we love".⁵⁴⁶ His character Caligula demonstrates this move from ordinary person to monster of perversity. Camus argues that freedom appears to be impossible because of human limits and finitude, but existentially, we know it is possible. He refers to this as "philosophical suicide" because for existentialists "negation is their God".⁵⁴⁷ He is critical of Sartre's argument for 'absolute freedom' because Sartre's characters have no use for their freedom. Camus writes, "In this universe man is free of the shackles of his prejudices, sometimes from his own nature... he is alone, enclosed in this liberty... His condition is absurd [sic]".⁵⁴⁸

In the play, Caligula decrees that all Roman citizens shall leave all their possessions to Rome (the State) and then they shall be executed. Thus, there is the additional factor: Caligula is a despot dictator, not unlike the concrete situation in many places in Latin America. For example, Pinochet was a dictator in Chile when this CEB was meeting. According to Madeleine Adriance, the Roman Catholic hierarchy voiced criticisms of the Pinochet regime, and in response, "The government retaliated with attacks on the bishops through the mass media".⁵⁴⁹ However, during this period, there were *desaparecidos* (or *the disappeared*) who were abducted by despot regimes, including in Chile⁵⁵⁰ and other countries in Latin

⁵⁴⁶ Albert Camus, *Lyrical and Critical Essays*, ed. Philip Thody (New York: Random House, 1970), 203.

⁵⁴⁷ Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*, 41.

⁵⁴⁸ Camus, *Lyrical and Critical Essays*, 205.

⁵⁴⁹ Madeleine Adriance, "The Paradox of Institutionalization: The Roman Catholic Church in Chile and Brazil," *Sociological Analysis* 53(1992): S59.

⁵⁵⁰ Hernan Vidal, *Dar la Vida por la Vida: La Agrupación Chilena de Familiares de Detenidos Desaparecidos* (Minneapolis: Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literature, 1982).

America.⁵⁵¹ If Caligula embodies absurdism in literature, these concrete examples, especially the *desaparecidos*, show absurdism demonstrated in real life.

In *LT*, Segundo addresses the situation in Chile in light of an anti-ideological stand within the Catholic Church. Citing Bonhoeffer in prison and Jesus' response to ideological crises in his day, Segundo asks, "Why cannot the Church choose sides? ... it cannot because in practice it would mean excluding from the Church that portion of Christians who had opted for the other side".⁵⁵² Taken in conjunction with his discussion of *Caligula*, it would imply that the Church cannot condemn the despot Caligula. For Caligula, his status as a dictator enables him to express the impossibility of freedom in tyrannical ways, like requiring everyone in Rome to leave all of their possessions to the public treasury. After this new mandatory system of bequests, Caligula begins widespread death sentences. His view of freedom is arbitrary; he does not care about the order of executions--they are all equally important to him.

Caligula hates poets because they attribute differing importance to things and it contradicts his ideal of absolute freedom.⁵⁵³ This statement picks up one of the earliest themes of Segundo's theology. In *Existencialismo*, Segundo finds poetry to be that which affects people in different ways, assigning differing importance to different things. Whereas, philosophy does not affect a person in the same way.⁵⁵⁴ In *LT*, he writes about this play, "The thesis underlying [*Caligula*] is that most human beings are never satisfied in life because they do not manage to attain the ideal they

⁵⁵¹ E.g. The following article examines the task of identifying human remains in Argentina. Eric Stover, "Scientists Aid Search for Argentina's "Desaparecidos"," *Science* 230, no. 4721 (1985).

⁵⁵² Segundo, *LT*, 148. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 131.

⁵⁵³ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980, Cf. Camus, *Caligula*, 14.

⁵⁵⁴ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 15.

had set for themselves”.⁵⁵⁵ In the play, people are caught in the process of trying to reach their ideal, but not achieving it; “hence they never feel real satisfaction in life, and death comes upon them in that state”.⁵⁵⁶ Freedom is the ideal that he is trying to reach. According to the tape, the problem with Caligula’s realization or awakening to freedom is that he is the same person--after wandering around the countryside and realizing that he is free, Caligula has not changed. He has not attained his ideal of freedom.

Segundo, then, turns his attention to the end of the play. At the end of Act IV, Scipio and Cherea kill Caligula. In the action of the play, everything comes together into a conflict (the people versus Caesar). As Caligula continues to carry out his murderous policy, his detractors grow in number and the Roman people hate Caligula. His death seems inevitable, even if Scipio and Cherea are reluctant to carry it out. Segundo points to this growing conflict:

Ahora...lo que aparece al final en la ... en el momento en que llega eso, es un monstruo, diríamos, ¿no? Roma abomina de ese monstruo que hace todas esas cosas. Es decir, y que hasta cierto punto su libertad en esa educación se ha ejercido y se ha perdido, ya ha elegido una cosa, y esa elección le trae la muerte, es decir, le acaba la vida. El esta como preparando una libertad, y no se da cuenta que su libertad ya se esta ejerciendo, y que por lo tanto ya el esta metido en una cosa sin quererlo, esta metido en una cosa sin quererlo, que va a hacer que el pueblo o lo ame o lo deteste, y si lo detesta, lo mate es decir, que termine con la libertad de el en el momento en que el la esta perfeccionando, y ya logrando llegar a elegir ese proyecto de el.⁵⁵⁷	Now...what appears at the end in the ... when this happens, he is a monster, we would say, right? Rome loathes the monster who does all those things. That is, to some extent his freedom in such education has been exercised and lost, [Caligula] has now chosen one thing, and that choice brings death, i.e. his life runs out. It is like he is preparing freedom, and does not realize that his freedom is already being pursued, and therefore he is involved in one thing unwittingly, which will make the people either love him or hate him, and if they hate him, to kill him, that is, end the freedom at the moment that it is being refined, and being able to choose his own project.
--	---

⁵⁵⁵ Segundo, *LT*, 118. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 103.

⁵⁵⁶ Segundo, *LT*, 118. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 103.

⁵⁵⁷ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

Caligula becomes the monster that Camus believes he already was⁵⁵⁸ because the freedom he has found is a disappointment. Caligula thought that he realized what true freedom looked like and returned to his palace to enact his warped view of freedom. Instead, he was disappointed by freedom because he is unable to escape himself. His madness accompanied his attempt to live out true freedom. In *Teología de la liberación*, Segundo, in responding to the Vatican *Instruction*,⁵⁵⁹ describes different kinds of ideologies. One ideology can use false arguments to prop up the *status quo*. There are others, but he writes that there are no ideology-free or impartial arguments.⁵⁶⁰ Caligula's ideology is an expression of his attempt to live out freedom. Segundo raises relevant questions about the relationship between finding freedom and losing oneself. Also, does freedom necessarily lead to death? Caligula proclaims: everyone dies and no one is happy. This is the limit that makes freedom 'impossible'. He continues:

Y entonces, unos instantes antes de la muerte, Calígula dice, ..."he conquistado la divina clarividencia del solitario". Solitario, porque lógicamente, la única educación para la libertad tiene que volver al hombre solitario, ¿no? En esa especie de [unintelligible] que iguala todas las cosas en una persona tienen que hacer de uno solitario. Vivo, mato, ejerzo el poder delirante del destructor. Eso es ser feliz, esa es la felicidad, esta insoportable liberación este universal desprecio, universal desprecio – es decir dar a todas las cosas el don de la igualdad, el don de la igualdad en la no importancia, ¿no? ⁵⁶¹	And then a few moments before death, Caligula says, ..."I have conquered the divine vision of the lonely". The solitary, because logically, the only education for freedom must return to the lonely person, right? This kind of crucible that equalizes all the things in a person must make one lonely. I live, I kill, I exercise the insane power of the destroyer. This is being happy, this is happiness, this unbearable release, this universal contempt, universal scorn - i.e. give all things the gift of equality, the gift of equality in lack of importance, right?
--	---

⁵⁵⁸ Cf. Camus, *Lyrical and Critical Essays*, 203.

⁵⁵⁹ Catholic Church, *Instruction on certain aspects of the "theology of liberation"*.

⁵⁶⁰ Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*, 25. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*, 36.

⁵⁶¹ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

Segundo views Caligula's freedom as a travesty, based on the abolition of any kind of discrimination. This is Caligula's attempt merely to assert his freedom in the face of its impossibility, but this kind of freedom is also a constraint because it cannot be avoided. Shortly before Scipio and Cherea kill Caligula, he says and Segundo quotes, "I have conquered the divine vision of the lonely".⁵⁶² This view expressed in the quote is Caligula's 'metaphysical rebellion', which is "the movement by which man protests against his condition and against the whole of creation [sic]".⁵⁶³ Caligula protests his lack of freedom but his misguided protestation leads to great suffering.

In *LT*, Segundo brings up this argument in light of *Caligula*. He summarizes his analysis of the play: "No human being can experience in advance whether life is worth the trouble of being lived and in what way it might be worth while".⁵⁶⁴ No one can sample life first and then decide whether or not life is worth the trouble of living. Segundo writes, "Real life for a human being presupposes a non-empirical choice of some ideal that one presumes will be satisfying".⁵⁶⁵ On the tape, he points to the way freedom is misunderstood. Caligula sees himself as free. The people of Rome, especially the conspirators, see themselves as attaining freedom by killing Caligula. Yet, in both cases, freedom is a deception, like Camus' 'metaphysical rebellion'. Human freedom, as Segundo suggests in *LT*, represents a paradox. He agrees with Camus: the problem is freedom. Acting in freedom and fulfilling their wishes, the people of Rome kill Caligula to solve one problem, but this solution does not bring an end to all problems. Part of Segundo's existentialism is the recognition of the

⁵⁶² Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980, Cf. Camus, *Caligula*, 72.

⁵⁶³ Albert Camus, *The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt* (New York: Random House, 2012), 23.

⁵⁶⁴ Segundo, *LT*, 118. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 103.

⁵⁶⁵ Segundo, *LT*, 118-119. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 104.

continuation of problems, like making choices without empirical evidence to support those choices.

Caligula represents ambiguity. He ignores the limits or constraints of freedom, somewhat like Sartre's early 'absolute freedom'⁵⁶⁶, yet he attains something in his solitariness. Segundo seems to agree with the first aspect, but disagrees with the second. Caligula thinks he is acting in freedom (e.g. "nothing matters" and "everything is equal importance"), but his actions are correlated to his despotic tendencies with all constraint removed. The question related to any particular context is: *what is the constraint?* In *Teología Abierta 2*, Segundo cites Eric Fromm's *The Sane Society*⁵⁶⁷ and relates Fromm's argument about freedom to human exploitation. Segundo writes, "No one is constrained by force to enter into a work contract".⁵⁶⁸ Freedom plays a role in human activity, but humanity acts with a certain set of constraints. In *LT* he writes, "[Freedom/faith] is always in the service of historical solutions to human problems, even though the latter solutions will always be provisional and incomplete".⁵⁶⁹ This provisional/incomplete sense is part of the problematic nature Segundo finds in freedom.

The emphasis on human suffering highlights one of the basic tenets of French existentialism. Humankind is in suffering or anguish, and humankind is condemned to 'absurdity', 'impossible freedom', or 'unbearable freedom'. Existential despair comes, at least for Caligula, from his realization about his fundamental alienation in a universe that does not care about him. In the end, other people (Scipio and Cherea)

⁵⁶⁶ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Notebooks for an Ethics*, trans. David Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 265.

⁵⁶⁷ Eric Fromm, *The Sane Society* (New York: Holt Rinehart, 1955), 87-88.

⁵⁶⁸ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 48. Cf. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, 35.

⁵⁶⁹ Segundo, *LT*, 126. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 110.

kill Caligula. The existential despair comes to fruition. Although this section has been about Camus' *Caligula*, Sartre expresses human choices in *Being and Nothingness*:

We are perpetually engaged in our choice and perpetually conscious of the fact that we ourselves can abruptly invert this choice and 'reverse steam'; for we project the future by our very being, but our existential freedom perpetually eats it away as we make known to ourselves what we are by means of the future but without getting a grip on this future which remains always possible without ever passing to the rank of the *real*. Thus we are perpetually *threatened* by nihilation of our actual choices and perpetually threatened with choosing ourselves--and consequently with becoming--other than we are.⁵⁷⁰

Caligula reflects Camus' suspicion about absolute freedom in the face of the threats Sartre describes. For Segundo, freedom is a paradox and a deception; it is limited. He finds *Caligula* to be a story that illustrates this paradox. In *Reflexiones Críticas*, although he does not mention Camus, he describes freedom as an "affiliation" between God and humanity, instead of a test of humanity by God. He writes, "The *final* value of freedom is explicitly left as an incomplete creation by God, to be well-placed in human hands".⁵⁷¹ Segundo reads Camus as a literary adaptation of the ongoing free creativity of God and humanity. In *Reflexiones Críticas*, he writes, "God ceases to participate in creation to make it critical to human freedom".⁵⁷² He contrasts human freedom between two poles: acting as a child of God and acting out of selfishness. Caligula demonstrates what freedom looks like when it is carried out in selfishness. Freedom has a price. We turn to that now.

4.3.2 The price of freedom

To transition from discussing Camus' *Caligula* to Sartre's *The Flies*, Segundo says, "I think it is important to relate another work...which also addresses the

⁵⁷⁰ Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 441.

⁵⁷¹ Segundo, *Reflexiones Críticas*, 265.

⁵⁷² Segundo, *Reflexiones Críticas*, 266.

problem of freedom".⁵⁷³ Thus, he turns his attention to the way in which freedom is portrayed in *The Flies*. Jean-Paul Sartre wrote *The Flies* in 1943.⁵⁷⁴ Camus' *Caligula* is an absurdist view of freedom, and Sartre's *The Flies* is an existential-humanist view of freedom. For example, in the introduction to *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre distinguishes between being-in-itself and being-for-itself. Being-in-itself is the mere being of things, whereas being-for-itself is intentionality. Being-in-itself, he writes, "does not refer to itself as self-consciousness does. It is this self".⁵⁷⁵ David Detmer summarizes: "Being-for-itself is purposive; being-in-itself isn't".⁵⁷⁶ Being-for-itself freely formulates projects. For Sartre, "Human freedom precedes essence in man and makes it possible; the essence of the human being is suspended in his freedom".⁵⁷⁷

Segundo's discussion group likely used Aurora Bernárdez's Spanish translation.⁵⁷⁸ He begins his discussion of *The Flies* by summarizing the plot and pointing out the nature of addressing a fundamental human problem. He says:

Ustedes saben que <i>Las Moscas</i> es una adaptación que hace Sartre, que como en todos estos casos, <i>Calígula</i> , y hasta cierto punto también <i>Las Antígonas</i> , es...son adaptaciones de cosas antiguas a los problemas, digamos, clásicos del hombre, los problemas fundamentales del hombre, ¿no? ⁵⁷⁹	You know that <i>The Flies</i> is Sartre's adaptation of <i>Caligula</i> , as in all these cases, and to some extent also in <i>Anubis</i> , <i>Antigone</i> is ... these are adaptations of old works to, the classical problems of humanity, the fundamental human problems. Right?
--	---

This introductory comment is informal, and it relates Sartre's indebtedness to philosophers of past generations. Segundo also brings to his listener's minds other

⁵⁷³ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁵⁷⁴ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Les mouches: drame en trois actes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1943).

⁵⁷⁵ Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, lxxv.

⁵⁷⁶ David Detmer, *Sartre Explained: From Bad Faith to Authenticity* (Chicago: Open Court, 2008), 64.

⁵⁷⁷ Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 25.

⁵⁷⁸ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Teatro*, trans. Aurora Bernárdez (Buenos Aires: Losada, 1948).

⁵⁷⁹ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

works (e.g. Sophocles *Antigone*). He refers to the way that the Greek dramatists treated themes of human existence: Antigone is a powerful example. *The Flies* is an adaptation of the Greek myth of Electra, of which Sophocles, Aeschylus and Euripides all wrote versions. Segundo is asking his discussion group to bear the lineage of the story or the themes of the story in mind as they discuss it. He says:

Entonces lo que es interesante es que Orestes aparece--aparece como un ser libre. Libre en el sentido de que para el todo es igual. Es un poco la...el caso de Calígula. Para el todo es igual. ¿Porque? Porque ha sido educado en el extranjero, porque no tiene nada; aparece allí en Argos, y no le interesa nada. Entonces conversa en la plaza de Argos con su pedagogo, con el que le ha enseñado, y precisamente se queja de esa libertad que no es la buena, que dijo Calígula que no es la buena, precisamente se queja, el tiene la sensación de que no tiene la verdadera libertad.⁵⁸⁰	So what's interesting is that Orestes appears as a free being. Free in the sense that for him everything is the same. It's kind of ... the case of Caligula. For him everything is the same. Why? Because he has been educated abroad, because he has nothing; he appears there in Argos, and is not interested in anything. Then he talks in the square of Argos with his teacher, with the person who taught him, and complains of this freedom that is not the good kind; he has the feeling that he has no true freedom.
---	---

The plot centres on Orestes. Segundo remarks that Orestes appears free. After the Trojan War, King Agamemnon returned to Argos and was killed by Aegisthus. Aegisthus married Agamemnon's wife Clytemnestra and treated Agamemnon's daughter Electra as a slave. Agamemnon's son Orestes was sent away. He was raised by a tutor and enjoyed a pleasant, comfortable life. At eighteen years old, he returns to Argos with his tutor and meets Zeus. This is where the story begins.

"Orestes appears as a free being". His use of the word 'appears' throws doubt on any notion that Segundo views freedom as an absolute state. In a 1985 article, Segundo points out his disagreement with Sartrean existentialism. He writes, "Sartre

⁵⁸⁰ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

has said, with evident exaggeration, that existence precedes essence".⁵⁸¹ Segundo restates Sartre's argument as "freedom is antecedent to nature".⁵⁸² This argument is false if it is dependent on a sequential order (birth, childhood, and so on) because nature is the first experience. Therefore, freedom cannot precede nature. On the other hand, if nature is about a person's entire life, especially including death, then "we shall have to admit that human beings are to a large extent what they have wished to be".⁵⁸³ This is similar to the way Berdyaev writes about transcendental anthropology in *The Destiny of Man*,⁵⁸⁴ and it is similar to my argument about freedom, existence and essence in chapter 3, which concludes that freedom underpins the relationship between God and humankind.

Segundo elsewhere offers another summary of Sartre's understanding of freedom and humanity, "Our nature is only a kind of negative framework, indicating what our options cannot transcend".⁵⁸⁵ To this, he offers an analogy: one would not want to marry a person solely with the knowledge that the person has a 'human nature'. He writes, "It is far more important to know, to be acquainted with, my spouse's concrete freedom. But concrete freedom is visible only, up to a point, in its historical traits or results. I only really know a human being when I know that being's history".⁵⁸⁶ In the article, he turns his attention to God, God's infinitude, and unlimited freedom. He describes God in language Sartre would not accept: "This means that God is *entirely* what God has chosen to be".⁵⁸⁷ However, Barth would

⁵⁸¹ Juan Luis Segundo, "Disquisición sobre el misterio absoluto," *Revista latinoamericana de teología* 2, no. 6 (1985): 218.

⁵⁸² Segundo, "Disquisición sobre el misterio absoluto," 218.

⁵⁸³ Segundo, "Disquisición sobre el misterio absoluto," 218.

⁵⁸⁴ Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, 227. See chapter 3 above.

⁵⁸⁵ Segundo, "Disquisición sobre el misterio absoluto," 219.

⁵⁸⁶ Segundo, "Disquisición sobre el misterio absoluto," 219.

⁵⁸⁷ Segundo, "Disquisición sobre el misterio absoluto," 219.

accept Segundo's description.⁵⁸⁸ For Segundo, this is absolute, transcendent freedom, or freedom without limits because, according to Segundo, "God cannot be limited in anything God chooses to be".⁵⁸⁹

On the tape, Caligula and Orestes do not have absolute freedom. Their freedom is not an absolute power to act, speak or think without any hindrances because all experiences form a manner of acting, speaking, and thinking. Segundo draws the connection between Orestes' education and his sense of freedom. Orestes has no connection with Argos; its property holds no appeal for him, so he is not bound to their customs. Their malaise is not his malaise. Therefore, it is not Orestes' education that gives him a sense of freedom, but it is his disassociation with life in Argos. In a discussion with his tutor, he concludes that freedom is not unambiguously good, just like Caligula. And, just like Caligula, Orestes feels that he has not found true freedom. Segundo picks up this argument:

Entonces el pedagogo, que lo ha educado, por supuesto, lo ha educado en la libertad, tipo así, hasta los dieciocho años, nada de valores, o sea, después hay que <i>elegir una libertad como tabula rasa</i> , le dice, "ahora sois joven, rico y hermoso, prudente como un anciano, libre de todas las servidumbres y de todas las creencias; sin familia, sin patria, sin religión, sin oficio, libre de todos los compromisos y sabedor de que no hay que comprometerse nunca". ⁵⁹⁰	Then the teacher, who brought him up, of course, educated him in freedom, and such, until he was eighteen, with no values, that is, later you have to choose, freedom as a tabula rasa, he says, "now you are young, rich and handsome, wise as an old man, free of all bonds and all beliefs, no family, no country, no religion, no job, free of all commitments and knowing that we must not ever commit."
---	---

⁵⁸⁸ Cf. God is "wholly other". Karl Barth, *The Humanity of God*, trans. Thomas Wieser and John Newton Thomas (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1960), 37-65.

⁵⁸⁹ Segundo, "Disquisición sobre el misterio absoluto," 219.

⁵⁹⁰ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

The teacher has tried to create a person who has a blank slate or *tabula rasa*. This is impossible, and Orestes' behaviour demonstrates this impossibility.⁵⁹¹ Orestes carries the history or memory of his father's death with him when he comes back to Argos. Everything a person knows is seen through the lenses of their previous experience, and Orestes is not exempt from this epistemological reciprocity. He is rich, young, and attractive, according to the narrative. Without a family, he is free of obligations. This sense of freedom is also a sense of isolation, which explains why he has come to Argos in the first place. He wishes to resolve the absence of isolation by researching what became of his family. The tutor's suggestion that he "never commit" is designed to maintain his freedom, but it will also continue his isolation. The tutor points to Orestes' freedom lying before him, and ends, "And yet you complain?" Segundo continues:

Y Orestes dice, "Pero no, no me quejo, no puedo quejarme. Me has dado la libertad de esos hilos que el viento arranca a las telas de araña y que flotan a diez pies del suelo. No peso mas que un hilo, y vivo en el aire". ⁵⁹²	And Orestes says, "But I'm not complaining, I cannot complain. You have given me the freedom of those threads that the wind pulls from the spider webs and float ten feet off the ground. I weigh no more than a thread, and I live in the air".
--	--

Orestes waxes poetic, *free as a piece of thread floating through the air*. But, is he really free? Or, does he demonstrate the constrained freedom emblematic in Segundo's other writing about this subject? What price is he willing to pay for his freedom? Will he be killed like Caligula? Or, will he have to kill Aegisthus in order to avenge his father Agamemnon?

⁵⁹¹ This concept of the *tabula rasa* was first described by Aristotle; he writes, "What it thinks must be in it just as characters may be said to be on a writing tablet on which as yet nothing actually stands written: this is exactly what happens with mind". Aristotle, *On the Soul*, trans. J. A. Smith (350 BCE), Book 3, Part 4.

⁵⁹² Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

In *Teología Abierta 2*, Segundo writes, “The liberating truth is not theoretical but practical”.⁵⁹³ For Segundo, this is proven by a person “coming to Christ”.⁵⁹⁴ In this he relates the individual decision (“coming to Christ”) to language in the Gospel of John about light and dark. E.g. a person comes to God in the light, and he cites John 3:21. In the play, Orestes goes back to Argos even though he has a comfortable life abroad with his tutor. He seeks to find meaning in his homeland. For Segundo, Orestes cannot experience freedom in a theoretical sense; he must go back to Argos. Upon arrival, he is greeted by an old man (Zeus in disguise) and great swarms of flies. He is seeking freedom through practical action.

The freedom of threads floating through the air but being unable to complain is no freedom at all. If Orestes were really free, he could engage in critical commentary about his situation or that of the residents of Argos. Instead, Orestes is not allowed to complain. He is both free and limited at the same time. This is the exact, limited freedom of Segundo’s theology, a perception he shares with Sartre and Camus. The question is how the self acts in face of the tension. Sartre asserts a freedom nevertheless.⁵⁹⁵ Camus urges finding oneself in an acknowledged situation of alienation, in a ‘metaphysical rebellion’. In *Teología Abierta 2*, Segundo addresses this type of tension in freedom. He places the tension within the question of how a person relates to God. In the language of the Gospel of John, the Word was in the world, but the world rejected the Word.⁵⁹⁶ He writes, “The fundamental sin, under consideration for the Evangelist, is not an individual infraction of the law, but

⁵⁹³ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 399. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 52.

⁵⁹⁴ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 399. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 52.

⁵⁹⁵ Sartre writes, “Freedom as the requisite condition for the nihilation of nothingness is not a property which belongs among others to the essence of the human being”. Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 25.

⁵⁹⁶ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 399. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 52. John 1:1-5.

political negation of history”.⁵⁹⁷ Segundo diverges from Sartre (who simply asserts freedom in the face of limits) and Camus (‘metaphysical rebellion’) and views freedom in tension and active in history.

While living in his exile, Orestes felt a sense of belonging to others. He did not yet know the name of those others, but they were the people of Argos. He proclaims, “But I am freed, thank god!” Segundo adds as an aside, “Oh the irony!”⁵⁹⁸ Then Segundo gives voice to Orestes, “I’m free! That pride of absence in my soul! That superb vacuum in my soul!”⁵⁹⁹ Freedom has left a void in his soul. For Segundo, freedom alone cannot fill the void. It is like his comment about philosophy from 1948, “We can no longer carry the burden of a philosophy that leaves us alone at dinner time or at the time for prayer”.⁶⁰⁰

In *El hombre 2.1*, he suggests that freedom from the Law is an irreversible fact for the Apostle Paul, even though it is not experienced that way in the Christian life. He writes, “On the one side, we have desires in general; on the other is the specific desire for security, or fear of insecurity (price of freedom)”.⁶⁰¹ Although the context of this quote is his discussion of Paul’s Christology, Segundo’s theme of limiting freedom continues. This is what he means by the “price of freedom”. It has limits, and for Orestes, he is on his path and the path he has chosen will lead to specific results. This is the price of freedom; time moves forward, and once one acts in freedom, the action is irreversible. Orestes experiences this *irreversibility* of freedom. He continues:

⁵⁹⁷ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 403. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*, 56.

⁵⁹⁸ Segundo, “24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus,” Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁵⁹⁹ Segundo, “24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus,” Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁰⁰ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 8. See chapter 2 above.

⁶⁰¹ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 467. Cf. Segundo, *The Humanist Christology of Paul*, 109.

Pero lo que viene aquí es importante, porque aquí aparece diríamos que para tener un camino propio, verdaderamente propio, es decir, que corresponda a la libertad, tiene que ser un camino inédito, y el camino inédito siempre es camino malo, diríamos, es un camino contra la ley.⁶⁰²	But what comes here is important, because here we would say it appears to have its own way, truly their own, i.e. corresponding to freedom, it has to be an unprecedented way and the road is a long, unprecedented bad road, we would say; it is a way against the law.
---	---

When Segundo begins to interpret the implications of Orestes sneaking into Argos, he describes it as a bad way of experiencing freedom. By “against the law”, he means expressing one’s freedom means acting out against the laws of Argos. In *Dogma*, the law takes on significance in relationship with *being* a Christian. In the chapter “New Peoples for the Faith”, he calls the early church the “learning church” and proposes they must ask “backward questions” because the first Christians were practising an enculturation of the Christian message (including Mosaic Law) with the Greek philosophy (especially Paul).⁶⁰³

On the tape, his discussion seems to be combining two elements. First, he is talking about Sartre’s *The Flies*. Second, he is talking about humanity falling short of divine law. This theme is common in his other writings.⁶⁰⁴ Although he does not cite any particular scripture passage, it sounds like the inner conflict described in Romans 7:14-25. This conflict is the subject of chapter 7 in *El hombre 2.1*.⁶⁰⁵ “For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate” (Rom 7:15b). He summarizes the passage: “Suppose we are dealing *simultaneously with a victory and a defeat, but on*

⁶⁰² Segundo, “24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus,” Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁰³ Segundo, *Dogma*, Ch 9, especially 266-270. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, Ch 9, especially 173-175.

⁶⁰⁴ E.g. Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 287-564. Segundo, *Dogma*, 185-198.

⁶⁰⁵ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 475-498. Cf. Segundo, *The Humanist Christology of Paul*, 113-125.

different levels".⁶⁰⁶ If Segundo is talking about both kinds of legal adherence, his discussion points toward the existential struggle with finding meaning in existence.

Entonces allí se le aparece Júpiter, es precisamente, es exactamente el dios de Santo Tomas, en <i>Suma Teológica</i> (laughter), exacto, lo conocen ustedes, perfectamente, profesor de filosofía, lo ha estudiado, etc, y entonces le da una lección sobre el uso de la libertad, y es muy importante lo que le dice, ¿no?. eh ... dice, solo el bien satisface, y el bien depende de mi. ⁶⁰⁷	Then at that point Jupiter appears; this is precisely, exactly the god of St Thomas, in <i>Summa Theologica</i> (laughter), exactly, you know him, well, a philosophy professor, he has studied [him], etc., and then gives him a lesson in the use of freedom, and what he says is very important, is it not?. eh ... he says, "only the good satisfies, and it depends on me".
--	--

This phrase, 'the good satisfied... depends on me' referring to God, has two implications: (a) that the good is what God determines it to be; (b) that what God creates is a perfection from which human beings can only decline, and to which they must return--i.e., a static view of created goodness.

On the first point, Segundo may be recalling Aquinas' critique of the classical presentation of the gods who are too human, in acting with arbitrary evil. In *Summa Theologica*, in Article 3, Objection 2 reads, "Sin is an act of some kind. But God cannot sin, nor 'deny Himself' as it is said in 2 Timothy 2:13. Therefore He is not omnipotent [sic]".⁶⁰⁸ In the response to this objection, Aquinas writes, "To sin is to fall short of a perfect action; hence to be able to sin is to be able to fall short in action, which is repugnant to omnipotence". As part of Aquinas' argument for God's omnipotence, God cannot sin. If one conceived of a real evil act being committed by God, the act that was previously considered evil would be good after God performed it. If this were the case, Aquinas' interlocutor would be speaking of gods "after the common manner of heathen, who thought that people became gods, like Jupiter or

⁶⁰⁶ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.1, 494. Cf. Segundo, *The Humanist Christology of Paul*, 122.

⁶⁰⁷ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁰⁸ Aquinas, *Summa*, First Part, Question 25, Article 3, Objection 2.

Mercury”.⁶⁰⁹ Sartre’s point is that such gods are limited by human freedom, implying that any concept of God is liable to the same critique. He writes:

Orestes: You are the king of gods, king of stones and stars, king of waves and sea. But you are not the king of humanity.

Zeus: Impudent spawn! So I am not your king? Who, then, made you?

Orestes: You. But you blundered; you should not have made me free.⁶¹⁰

Segundo thinks that this is true of the Greek gods, but not of the God of Jesus Christ. In *El hombre 2.1*, he adds to the idea that ‘the good depends on me’ from the tape. He writes:

The idea of a creation that is incomplete and for the moment condemned to uselessness, not good *in itself*, seems to be original with Paul, who is often alleged to be close to the Stoics. In the ‘Christian’ Middle Ages the prevalent idea was that creation or nature represents the good, that the possibility of evil lies only in the freedom of the human being. In *The Flies*, Jean-Paul Sartre offers us a Thomist image of God in Jupiter. After Orestes kills Clytemnestra and Aegistius, Jupiter speaks to him as follows: “...The world is good. I created it after my own will, and I am good. But you, you have done evil, and things accuse you with their petrified voices. Good is everywhere... in you, outside you... it is what permits the success of your evil undertaking... And the evil of which you are so proud, what is it but a reflection of being, a wrong turn, a deceitful image whose very existence is sustained by the good? ... *Return, my son...*”⁶¹¹

On the second implication of ‘the good depends on me’, i.e. a static view of created goodness, Segundo appears to be taking issue with Aquinas, from what he sees as an Ignatian standpoint. In both the above quote from *El hombre 2.1* and “Ignace de Loyola, ¿prueba o proyecto?”⁶¹² he is arguing, with reference to and in opposition to this speech of Jupiter, that the final perfection of the universe also

⁶⁰⁹ Aquinas, *Summa*, First Part, Question 25, Article 3, Response to Objection 2.

⁶¹⁰ Jean-Paul Sartre, *No Exit and Three Other Plays*, trans. Stuart Gilbert and Lionel Abel (New York: Vintage, 1989), 117.

⁶¹¹ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 520, n. 23. Cf. Segundo, *The Humanist Christology of Paul*, 215.

⁶¹² Juan Luis Segundo, “Ignace de Loyola: preuve ou projet?,” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 79, no. 5 (1991). Cf. Segundo, *Signs of the Times*, 149-175.

depends on human projects undertaken in cooperation with God.⁶¹³ The Thomistic image of God is the sole being whose existence is the same as God's essence, i.e. "what subsists in God is His essence [sic]".⁶¹⁴ This Thomistic God, juxtaposing good and evil, parallels the God envisaged in Sartre's *The Flies*. By contrast, for Segundo the universe is perfect only 'as a motive for love'--i.e. God intends it to be completed through human projects. He writes, "God is passionately interested in what human freedom can create in terms of love, justice and solidarity".⁶¹⁵ For Segundo, the universe is not a perfect object to which sinful humanity has to return, but life is the 'implementation of human creativity'. This Christian idea of the project, in contrast to Sartre's project, is fundamental to *El hombre 2.2*,⁶¹⁶ and in *Teología Abierta 2*, he contrasts it with mere progressivism, though without using the word 'project'.⁶¹⁷

In *El hombre 2.1* Segundo is more precise with his language and is able to more clearly spell out his point: there is tension between contemporary life and living as Christ; freedom has limits; it is a blessing and a restriction. The context of Segundo's citation of Sartre and Thomas is his discussion of Romans 8:1-39 and the defeat of death with Christ's victory. Thus, citing Sartre draws out Segundo's connection between *being* a Christian and *doing* something. He writes, "Being 'heir' does not mean inheriting something already acquired; it means inheriting something immensely worthwhile *to do*",⁶¹⁸ i.e. undertaking projects with God.

The first side of the tape ends.

⁶¹³ The same argument, first the Christological project and then the projects of Christians, is repeated in Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 734. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 91.

⁶¹⁴ Aquinas, *Summa*, Question 3, Article 4.

⁶¹⁵ Segundo, *Signs of the Times*, 167.

⁶¹⁶ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 733-748. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 90-103.

⁶¹⁷ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*. Cf. Segundo, *Evolution and Guilt*.

⁶¹⁸ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 520. Cf. Segundo, *The Humanist Christology of Paul*, 137.

4.3.3 Barrier to freedom

The second side of the tape opens with a brief discussion of the Apostle Paul and then Segundo turns his attention to *Nausea* by Jean-Paul Sartre.⁶¹⁹ He was probably using Aurora Bernárdez's Spanish translation of *Nausea*.⁶²⁰ He begins:

...veíamos en Pablo como el hombre tiene para poder comprender su existencia, que poder también realizar con su libertad un proyecto. Sartre se ha ocupado, sobre todo en 'La Náusea' de ese problema, de ver si el hombre es capaz de tener un proyecto, o lo que el llama mas bien una aventura. ⁶²¹	...we saw in Paul how people have to be able to understand their existence, in which a plan can also be performed with freedom. Sartre was involved in that issue, especially in 'Nausea,' to see if humanity is able to have a plan, or what he calls rather an adventure.
---	---

Sartre defines adventure in *Nausea*:

"What sort of adventures?" I asked him, astonished. "All sorts, Monsieur. Getting on the wrong train. Stopping in an unknown city. Losing your briefcase, being arrested by mistake, spending the night in prison. Monsieur, I believe the word adventure could be defined: events out of the ordinary without being necessarily extraordinary".⁶²²

The kinds of events Sartre describes in *Nausea* are the everyday, yet not mundane, events. Segundo touches on the importance of using *Nausea* and Sartre's idea of the *aventure*. He says, "Freedom and human existence would only have meaning if the adventure would be possible".⁶²³ For Segundo, this means, in part, that it must be possible to have the "events out of the ordinary without being necessarily extraordinary" described by Sartre.⁶²⁴ Being able to identify these little departures from the ordinary events of daily life is part of engaging in *aventure*. In quoting Roquentin, Segundo brings up the possibility of falling short of experiencing

⁶¹⁹ Jean-Paul Sartre, *La nausée* (Paris: Gallimard, 1938).

⁶²⁰ Jean-Paul Sartre, *La Náusea*, trans. Aurora Bernárdez (Buenos Aires: Losada, 1947). Cf. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Nausea*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: New Directions, 2007).

⁶²¹ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶²² Sartre, *Nausea*, 35-36.

⁶²³ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶²⁴ Sartre, *Nausea*, 35-36.

the adventure: “I had imagined that at some point, my life would take a rare and precious quality”.⁶²⁵ However, existence does not always lead to rare and precious qualities. Existence can be a series of fairly mundane events. When there is a slight break in the mundane, seeing the *aventure* in that moment gives meaning to freedom and human existence for Segundo. In *El hombre 2.2*, he writes about Ignatian spirituality, which he calls “spiritualities”, and, specifically, he relates it to Ignatius’ experience at Manresa as an adventure in the sense of a Sartrean *aventure*.⁶²⁶ The result of Ignatius’ *aventure* is the *Exercises*.⁶²⁷

Sartre has the notion of the human self as a ‘project’. He writes, “If, then, human reality itself is apprehended as temporal, and if the meaning of its transcendence is its temporality, we can not hope to elucidate the being of the for-itself until we have described and determined the significance of the Temporal”.⁶²⁸ In order to experience the *aventure*, the human self needs projects. These projects can be seen as facets of the basic human self’s project and this is caused by a longing to be within the human self. Segundo says:

El <u>rigor</u> , sobre todo del punto de vista del tiempo, esta caracterizado por la tensión entre un verdadero comienzo y un verdadero fin. Así como el proyecto es proyecto para el hombre cuando tiene un verdadero comienzo y un verdadero fin. Y el <u>rigor</u> precisamente consiste en esa tensión que se mantiene durante todo el tiempo desde el comienzo hasta el fin”. Así dice el protagonista de “La Náusea”, “hubiera sido necesario ante todo, que los comienzos fueran verdaderamente comienzos. Ah, veo tan bien ahora lo que he querido, verdaderos comienzos,	<u>Power</u> , especialmente from the perspective of time, is characterized by the tension between a true beginning and a real end, just as the plan is a plan for a person when it has a real beginning and end. And <u>power</u> is precisely this tension that is maintained from start to finish. So says the protagonist of “Nausea,” “it would have been necessary first of all, for the beginnings to truly be beginnings. Ah, now I clearly see what I wanted, true beginnings, appearing as a flourish of trumpets, as the first notes of jazz, abruptly cutting short the <u>tedium</u> ,
--	---

⁶²⁵ Segundo, “24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus,” Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶²⁶ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 755-756. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 104-105.

⁶²⁷ Ignatius of Loyola, *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, trans. Elder Mullan (New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1914).

⁶²⁸ Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 129.

apareciendo como un toque de trompetas, como las primeras notas de una música de jazz, bruscamente cortando en seco el <u>tedio</u> , consolidando la duración. Cortando en seco el <u>tedio</u> , es precisamente la existencia sin rigor, esa existencia donde todo se mezcla, donde no hay un proyecto. ⁶²⁹	establishing the duration. Cutting short the <u>tedium</u> , is precisely the existence without rigor, such an existence where everything is mixed, where there is no project". ⁶³⁰
---	--

Segundo says "*rigor*", which can mean either *extremely thorough* or *severity/strict*. I translated it as *power* (or *oomph*) because it is not simply *thoroughness* or *severity*. In Sartre, it represents something more, which is why I considered translating it as the onomatopoeia *oomph*. "Cutting short tedium (*tedio*)" or short-circuiting the sheer facticity of life makes existence less thorough, less rigorous. And, by "cutting short tedium", one might miss the *aventure* that gives meaning to freedom and to human existence. In this sense, Sartre's character complements Segundo's analysis in *El hombre 2.1*, described above.⁶³¹ He continues:

En realidad, el protagonista de "La Náusea" expresa muchas veces en esta novela, mas o menos filosófica que la aventura es el valor supremo de la vida, por encima de cualquier otro, puesto que todos los otros valen, en la medida en que forman una aventura, en que producen una aventura, en que colocados en proyecto producen una aventura. Por otra parte, esa misma exigencia absoluta de aventura, la vemos en cierto sentido en su negativa, cuando el protagonista de "La Náusea" confiesa que ha fracasado, y que ha fracasado "porque todo hombre fracasa" en la búsqueda de una aventura. Así dice al final de "La Náusea", "He fracasado, y se que todos fracasan, solo me queda sobrevivirme como un árbol,	In fact, the protagonist of "Nausea" often expressed in this more or less philosophical novel that adventure is the supreme value of life above anything else, since all the others have value, to the extent that they form an adventure, in which they produce an adventure, when placed in the project they produce an adventure. Moreover, in a sense we see in his refusal the same absolute requirement for adventure when the protagonist of "Nausea" confesses that he has failed and has failed "because everyone fails". In search of an adventure. As it says at the end of "Nausea," "I failed, and all fail, [so] it only remains to survive as a tree, like the red bench on the tram; eat,
--	---

⁶²⁹ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶³⁰ Sartre, *Nausea*, 37.

⁶³¹ Cf. Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 520, n. 23. Cf. Segundo, *The Humanist Christology of Paul*, 215.

como el banco rojo del tranvía; comer, dormir; dormir, comer”. ⁶³²	sleep; sleep, eat”.
---	---------------------

At the end of the above quote, Segundo abbreviates a quote from *Nausea*. It makes more sense in its context. Sartre writes,

At the same time, I learned that you always lose. Only the rascals think they win. Now I am going to be like Anny, I am going to outlive myself. Eat, sleep, sleep, eat. Exist slowly, softly, like these trees, like a puddle of water, like the red bench in the streetcar.⁶³³

For Sartre, winning seems to be a deception. Segundo precisely recognizes Sartre’s point in his paraphrasing: ‘I failed, all fail’ and skips to the philosophical, “Exist slowly, softly, like these trees...” Sartre identifies the supreme value Roquentin places on the *aventure*. Everything else is mundane and acknowledging the mundane leads to his sense of having lost. In this way, focusing too closely on the ‘out of the ordinary’ in the mundane at one point in time can serve as a barrier to freedom. He makes this point at the end of *El hombre 2.2* when he writes, “To focus on very short spans of time or very specific geographic locales--i.e. adopt a ‘pinpoint’ focus--the factor of freedom will tend to disrupt our knowledge of processes and hence be deceptive”.⁶³⁴ Roquentin loses his subjectivity when he loses a grasp on his project. Segundo continues with a question:

Pero, ¿Porqué esta imposibilidad de aventura del hombre, siendo que la aventura es lo que le da valor a la existencia humana? ⁶³⁵	But, why is there this impossibility of human adventure, since the adventure is what gives value to human existence?
--	--

⁶³² Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶³³ Sartre, *Nausea*, 157.

⁶³⁴ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 848. Cf. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, 37.

⁶³⁵ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

This rhetorical question sets the tone for his answer. The coordinate conjunction, *pero* or *but*, indicates a change in tone. Segundo is not continuing the previous line of thought. Instead, he is challenging the impossibility of humanity experiencing an *aventure*. The question is Segundo's belief in human existence having some value. It can be restated as such: *If human existence has value, which it does, then human aventure is possible.*

He gives two primary answers to his question:

En primer lugar, porque no existe un verdadero comienzo, y un comienzo es necesario para darle rigor al tiempo en que se vive la aventura, en que se lleva adelante el proyecto. ¿Que es lo que sucede? Según "La Náusea", según el protagonista de "La Náusea", que habla, los acontecimientos se producen en un sentido, y nosotros los contamos en un sentido inverso. Es decir, las aventuras solo existen cuando las contamos. Las aventuras solo existen en la literatura, no existen en la vida real.⁶³⁶	First, because there is no real beginning; a beginning is necessary to give power to the time in which you experience the adventure, in which the plan is carried out. What is happening? According to "Nausea," to the protagonist of "Nausea," who is speaking, events occur in one direction, and we count them in reverse. That is, adventures only exist when we count them. Adventures are only available in literature; they do not exist in real life.
---	---

Segundo's argument is that a person cannot know when he/she is going through an *aventure*. The reason is the *aventure* is an event. The person experiencing the *aventure* only knows about the present tense, not how the *aventure* or mundane will turn out. Only by looking back can a person see that there was a break in the merely mundane. However, this does not mean *aventures* do not happen; it means people do not wake up and say, "Today, I will experience 'events out of the ordinary without the events being necessarily extraordinary'⁶³⁷". Only in hindsight can a person say, "I had an *aventure*". Sartre's existentialism sounds nihilistic at this point in *Nausea*, but Segundo's existentialism breaks with the negativity and hopelessness.

⁶³⁶ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶³⁷ Sartre, *Nausea*, 35-36.

His second answer follows:

Precisamente porque en la literatura, el tiempo esta contado al revés, como lo va ahora a explicar Sartre: "Parece," dice el protagonista, "que empezamos por el comienzo: Era una bella tarde del otoño de mil novecientos veintidós, yo era pasante de notario en Marommes, y en realidad, hemos empezado por el fin, el esta allí, invisible y presente, es el lo que da a esas palabras la pompa y el valor de un comienzo. Me paseaba. Había salido sin darme cuenta del caserío, pensaba en mis dificultades económicas".⁶³⁸	This is precisely because in literature, time is told in reverse, as Sartre is now going to explain: "It seems," says the protagonist, "we must start at the beginning: It was a beautiful autumn afternoon in 1922; I was an intern notary in Marommes," and in fact we have started at the end. He is there, invisible and present, which is what gives the words the pomp and value of a beginning. "I was walking. I had inadvertently left the village, thinking of my financial difficulties".⁶³⁹
--	---

Segundo seems to have been reading out loud from *Nausea* at this point. My translation of his quote follows the English translation⁶⁴⁰ almost verbatim.⁶⁴¹ After the opening 'We must start at the beginning' each subsequent verb is in the past tense. It has meaning because the speaker has had time to reflect and note where there were mundane events and where there was a break from the merely mundane. At these breaks, the speaker experiences an *aventure*.

Segundo's view of the *aventure* is evident in *El hombre* 2.2. He describes experiencing the Christ of the Ignatian spiritual exercises as an adventure. He writes, "Let us consider the kind of adventure involved in living a *double 'cultural nature'* as we find it in the phenomena of acculturation".⁶⁴² Years earlier (1970), he wrote about acculturation as defined in the Medellín documents as "religion becomes a connatural part of a specific sociocultural world".⁶⁴³ He describes the two natures of

⁶³⁸ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶³⁹ Sartre, *Nausea*, 40.

⁶⁴⁰ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Nausea*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: New Directions, 2007).

⁶⁴¹ However, the French and Spanish translations still carry more weight for this analysis than the English.

⁶⁴² Segundo, *El hombre* 2.2, 662. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 35.

⁶⁴³ "Segunda Conferencia General del Episcopado Latinoamericano", (Medellín, 1968). Cf. Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 2, 100. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, 80.

Christ, but he notes the limitations of culture for experiencing the *aventure* of being in Christ, regardless of how sensitive or fluid a culture is.

Segundo takes the idea of *aventure* a step further than Sartre. For Sartre, *aventure* is limited to existence. For Segundo, Sartre's *aventure* can, in a divine sense, transcend existence and lead to an encounter with God. He continues:

"Era de noche, la calle estaba desierta". La frase ha sido lanzada negligentemente. Tiene un aspecto superfluo, pero no nos dejamos engañar y nos ponemos aparte. Es un dato cuyo valor lo comprenderemos por lo que sigue. Y tenemos la impresión de que el héroe ha vivido todos los detalles de esa noche como nuncios, como promesas o aun que vivía solamente aquellos que eran promesas, ciego y sordo para todo lo que no anunciaba la aventura. Nos olvidamos que el porvenir no estaba aún allí. El tipo se paseaba en una noche sin presagios, que le ofrecía confusamente riquezas monótonas y el no elegía. Así es en realidad nuestra vida.⁶⁴⁴	"It was night, the street was deserted". The phrase has been tossed out carelessly. It looks superfluous, but we don't allow ourselves to be deceived; we remain on the alert. This is a fact whose value we will understand from what follows. And we have the impression that the hero has experienced all the details of that night as harbingers, as promises, or even that he only lived those that were promises, blind and deaf to everything that did not herald adventure. We forget that the future had not arrived. The guy walked in a night without omens; it offered a confusion of monotonous wealth and he did not choose. Our life really is that way.
---	--

The opening of the above quote illustrates the simultaneous importance and insignificance of an existential statement. In setting up *aventure*, "It was night..." sets the scene, but its importance is only evident in what follows. If nothing happens or no *aventure* takes place, the statement is meaningless and insignificant. Segundo ends this quote by reading or reciting another section of *Nausea*. He says, "I wanted the moments of my life to follow and order themselves like those of a life remembered. You might as well try and catch time by the tail".⁶⁴⁵ As events move forward, the *aventure* unfolds but it only makes sense in hindsight, just like focusing

⁶⁴⁴ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁴⁵ Sartre, *Nausea*, 40.

on spans of time that are too short will allow freedom to “disrupt our knowledge of processes and hence be deceptive”.⁶⁴⁶ His point is that recognizing an *aventure* in real time is impossible. He continues:

Esta es una de las barreras que pone la existencia del hombre a la aventura. Pero existe otra, y es que en realidad el hombre no tiene su valor propio, precisamente aquello que el podría hacer, aquello que sería su aporte, aquello que sería su destino personal. “Así,” en “La Náusea” el protagonista dice, “tengo deseos de partir, de irme a cualquier parte donde sea verdaderamente mi lugar, donde yo encaje. Pero mi lugar no está en ninguna parte. Estoy demás. Ya veremos más adelante, en “Las Moscas” de Sartre, el desarrollo de esta experiencia, si se quiere, que hace el hombre de no tener una finalidad personal inscrita en su libertad a pesar de que la libertad parece habersele sido dada al hombre en función, precisamente, de ese destino personal.”⁶⁴⁷	This is one of the barriers that human existence puts before adventure. But there is another, and it is that in fact a person does not have his own value, precisely what he could do, what his contribution would be, what his destiny would be. “Thus,” the protagonist says in “Nausea,” “I have desires to leave, to go anywhere that is really my place, where I fit in. But my place is not anywhere. I’m redundant”. We shall see later, in “The Fly” by Sartre, the development of this experience, if you will, that forms a person who does not have a personal goal inscribed in his freedom, even though freedom seems to have been given to humanity precisely in function of that personal destiny.
---	--

When Segundo says, “a person does not have his own value”, that is, inherent value in oneself before one makes choices, he is speaking as Sartre would speak. He is not stating his own position. Segundo wrestles with the question of human value⁶⁴⁸ but concludes human potential has value. He writes that humanity was created *imago Dei* multiple times in multiple publications.⁶⁴⁹ Sartre suggests that only ‘fatal consequences’, i.e. definite and defined outcomes, provide the *aventure* with its value, which leads him to seek something significant in the universe.

Acknowledging Sartre’s view of reality as a mixture of freedom and limitations,

⁶⁴⁶ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.2, 848. Cf. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, 37.

⁶⁴⁷ Segundo, “24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus,” Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁴⁸ E.g. He argues for humanity’s responsibility in the world because of the profound potential of anthropogenic impact on the Earth. Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 1, 288ff. Segundo, *Grace and the Human Condition*, 82ff.

⁶⁴⁹ E.g. Segundo, *Teología Abierta* 2, 13ff. Cf. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, 3ff. See also Stone, *Effective Faith*, 191-193. Stone discusses *imago dei* in relation to his project on Segundo’s theology.

Segundo turns his attention back to *Nausea* and how Roquentin experienced the mixed reality. He says:

Nunca lo que hace el hombre tiene, como dice Sartre, consecuencias fatales. Las consecuencias de lo que hace el hombre son arrebatadas por contingencias, por otras intenciones, por otros proyectos, de tal manera que la masa del mundo, por decirlo así, no esta hecha por los proyectos del hombre.⁶⁵⁰	Nothing humanity has ever done, as Sartre says, has fatal consequences. The consequences of what humanity does are taken away by contingencies, other intentions, other plans, so that the mass of the world, so to speak, is not made by human plans.
--	---

Segundo quotes Sartre and looks at the outcome of human action. He partially agrees with Sartre about the barriers to freedom (“contingencies”). There is a break between what people do and future events--events that are possible but cannot be predicted with certainty. “Fatal consequences” sounds deterministic and such defined outcomes are not available. Because of the “contingencies”, individual “human projects” or *human action* do not impact the majority of the world. For Segundo, collective action does have widespread impact.

In *Acción pastoral latinoamericana*, Segundo explores the impact of the Church’s action in Latin America. He suggests an empathetic pastoral approach, connecting the work of the priest with the betterment of society. He also argues that theology and pastoral work should be connected instead of separate; he is addressing a situation in which he perceives theologians discuss issues whilst priests practice those issues, but he acknowledges the impracticality of his thesis when he writes, “What can we conclude...very little, if anything”.⁶⁵¹ However, he

⁶⁵⁰ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁵¹ Segundo, *Acción pastoral latinoamericana: sus motivos ocultos*, 119. Cf. Segundo, *The Hidden Motives of Pastoral Action*, 135.

connects the theology and priestly work with human action, that, when taken as a whole, can have an impact on society.⁶⁵²

When Segundo says above, “The consequences of what humanity does are taken away by contingencies”, he is summarizing Sartre in *Nausea*. For example, Sartre writes, “The essential thing is contingency. I mean that one cannot define existence as necessity. To exist is simply *to be there*; those who exist let themselves be encountered, but you can never deduce anything from them”.⁶⁵³ Segundo seems to be summarizing *Nausea* rather than expressing his own opinion. Perhaps Segundo agrees with Sartre about contingency and a denial of ‘fatal consequences’ while taking a more positive view of what human projects can achieve in the world, especially when corporate. He reinforces this notion by quoting Roquentin in the following:

“...me ahogaba en el fondo de ese inmenso tedio” ... Eso precisamente es lo opuesto a la libertad, lo opuesto al proyecto: el tedio. Eso de lo cual quiere desembarazarse el protagonista de “La Náusea” esa porquería pegajosa, que lo tiene agarrado, que fluye sin rigor, sin depender de la libertad del hombre, que le impone su proyecto, que le impone algo definitivo.⁶⁵⁴	“...I drowned in the depths of this immense boredom” ... That is precisely the opposite of freedom, the opposite of the project: tedium. The protagonist of “Nausea” wants to rid himself of that sticky mess in which he is mired, flowing without precision, without relying on human freedom, which imposes its project, which imposes something definitive.
---	--

Roquentin does not know he is not free. One of the main barriers to his freedom is boredom. Just as Caligula was a caricature of Camus’ absurdism, Roquentin serves as Sartre’s caricature of a person who misses experiencing freedom because he cannot overcome the barrier of himself or his ‘being’. His true self would be committed to the project. Segundo calls it a “sticky mess” and it has

⁶⁵² Segundo, *Acción pastoral latinoamericana: sus motivos ocultos*, 119-127. Cf. Segundo, *The Hidden Motives of Pastoral Action*, 135-141.

⁶⁵³ Sartre, *Nausea*, 131.

⁶⁵⁴ Segundo, “24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus,” Oxford, UK, 1980,

stuck to Roquentin. It would be easy to say that it caused him to miss experiencing freedom but that is a bit too deterministic for Segundo. Instead, recognizing it as a barrier makes more sense. This is why Roquentin can drown in the “depths of this immense boredom”. He is his own barrier to freedom.

4.3.4 Distractions from freedom

The entire discussion for the evening is about the nature of human existence, both the specific nature of the experience each person in the community has or is having and also the general nature of human experience on a macro level. Segundo's references to absurdity are about the experience of being caught between freedom and the limits imposed by being-in-itself. In Sartre's terms, this is the being of things, as opposed to being-for-itself which is intentionality. Caligula tried to exercise his freedom but only found it a deception. Orestes tried to find a sense of belonging and returned to the city of his birth, but found the price was incredibly high. In hindsight, would Orestes not have preferred a comfortable life with his tutor to killing his step-father Aegisthus? Possibly no. Like Roquentin, Orestes found an *aventure*, even though it came at a cost. Roquentin exemplifies the barriers to freedom in the mundane.

Segundo asks, “Is existence really so absurd that each person is opposed to the possible choices any other person can make (given each one's freedom), or are we to accept that there is no point where a person's freedom is lost”?⁶⁵⁵ For Sartre, an individual's freedom (being-for-itself) is inhibited by the demands of others on him or herself. This includes other people's perceptions of the individual. For the citizens of Rome, the answer is *yes, we are against Caligula exercising his freedom to*

⁶⁵⁵ Segundo, “24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus,” Oxford, UK, 1980,

require us to leave our belongings to the state and then murder us. In this case, existence is absurd, yet Segundo asks the question rhetorically. Neither he nor his listeners respond to it. He starts to make a reference to something else, “Las Piezas Negras”, but it gets a bit garbled and the tape drops out. When it comes back on, he has returned to Caligula and says:

En realidad ustedes saben que Calígula, el emperador loco, Camus lo toma para hacerle hacer, por decirlo así, la aventura de la libertad. ⁶⁵⁶	Actually you know Caligula, the mad emperor, Camus takes him to make him experience, so to speak, the <i>aventure</i> ⁶⁵⁷ of freedom.
--	--

If Caligula is the model of freedom, he is a distraction. Because he is such a monster to Rome, he cannot be considered an ethical or theological model of acting in freedom. Segundo attributes Caligula’s “*aventure* of freedom” to Camus. And, for Camus, Caligula experiences the Sartrean *aventure* of freedom. He tries to exercise his freedom, but it leads to disaster. His madness came with him into freedom; he did not find it there. Caligula has Sartre’s *aventure* of freedom ‘so to speak’, because Caligula’s *aventure* of freedom is one of terror and experiencing the deception of freedom as well as a lack of constraints. For this reason, Caligula’s *aventure* of freedom is a distraction. It does not elucidate freedom as such. It provides an example of an absurdist version of freedom. Segundo continues, “For Camus, it is absurd how freedom makes the human condition absurd”.⁶⁵⁸

En la obra, aparece que la insatisfacción de Calígula...y la constatación de que esa insatisfacción es general. Hablando con su amigo Helicón, dice, “las cosas tales como son no me parecen satisfactorias. Ahora lo se. Este mundo, tal como esta hecho, no es soportable. Por lo tanto yo tengo	In the play, it appears that Caligula’s dissatisfaction before starting his quest for freedom – Caligula’s dissatisfaction and the realization that of dissatisfaction is widespread. Talking to his friend Helicon, he says, “things as they are do not seem satisfactory. Now I
--	---

⁶⁵⁶ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁵⁷ I use Sartre’s *aventure* here because Segundo seems to be applying this Sartrean principle to Camus’ Caligula.

⁶⁵⁸ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

necesidad de la luna, o de la felicidad, o de la inmortalidad, o de algo que sea, tal vez, demente, pero que no sea de este mundo". Dato trascendente, es decir, la necesidad del hombre, de algo que no es lo empírico, lo que sea. ⁶⁵⁹	know. This world, as it was made, is not endurable. So I need the moon, or happiness, or immortality, or something that is perhaps insane, but not of this world". The transcendent fact, that is, human need, for something that is not empirical, whatever it is.
---	---

Segundo is pointing out that he wants something that transcends the empirical: this is a sign of human freedom, which for Camus cannot be met, while it can for Segundo, but not simply by affirming freedom. Caligula's unhappiness leads directly to "existential estrangement",⁶⁶⁰ using Paul Tillich's language. For Caligula (Caesar), this is unacceptable. The unavoidable and, up to this point, unmentioned part of the setting is Caligula's madness, or the unstated part of the setting could be his absurdist manifestation of the human condition. Either of these two pre-existing conditions, absurdist or madness, serves as a distraction to freedom. Segundo continues:

Entonces Calígula, después de un intervalo, afirma una verdad así con tono neutro: dice, "los hombres mueren, y no son felices". Es decir, esta es la situación, que el pretende remediar. Y pretende remediar llevando sus experiencias hasta sus ultimas consecuencias. ⁶⁶¹	Caligula then, after an interval, affirms the truth in a neutral tone, says, "People die, and are not happy". In other words, this is the situation that he intends to remedy. And he seeks to remedy it by taking his experiences to their ultimate consequences.
--	--

Caligula's words sound nihilistic. "People die and are not happy" is the message he acts out in the play, and he tries to get the people of Rome to see the truth of this message. Segundo points out that the result of a foray into freedom without boundaries in order to meet this situation leads to "ultimate consequences".

⁶⁵⁹ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁶⁰ Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology, Volume 2: Existence and the Christ* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), 59.

⁶⁶¹ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

Sartre's nihilistic freedom is characterized by the limits these consequences impose.

He continues:

Precisamente dice, "mi libertad no tendrá fronteras. Es precisamente porque el hombre pone fronteras a su libertad que no consigue ser feliz". ...No sigue su proyecto, que los hombres mueren y no son felices, al final de la vida experimentan que no han conseguido lo que han querido. Entonces él va a hacer una experiencia hasta sus últimas consecuencias. Y la formula así: "hoy, y en los tiempos venideros, mi libertad no tendrá fronteras". ⁶⁶²	He says precisely, "My freedom will have no borders. It is precisely because people put boundaries on their freedom that they fail to be happy". In other words, people are distracted from their freedom; one is not free, one does not follow one's plan. People die and are not happy; at the end of life they experience not having achieved what they wanted. Then they will take an experience to its ultimate consequences. And the formula is like this: "Today, and in the times ahead, my freedom will have no borders".
--	--

Segundo continues to dramatize the viewpoint of those who want to make freedom absolute. He says, "Humanity is distracted from its freedom; it is not free".⁶⁶³ This is a dramatization of those who wish to make freedom absolute; any admission of boundaries in their view means being 'distracted' from freedom--by looking for example at limits of death and lack of happiness. In *El hombre* 2.2, he writes about freedom in relation to Pauline theology: "Paul opposed Faith to any and all calculations based on the fulfilment of the Law (i.e. works); it was that Faith that would characterize the mature, adult human being... The problem was that one had to move beyond the concept of freedom as a *danger*".⁶⁶⁴ Freedom is not the absolute, but allows a person to live out faith in God. This departure from Camus' absurdist freedom and Sartre's nihilistic freedom is a significant characterization of Segundo's freedom.

⁶⁶² Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁶³ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁶⁴ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.2, 966. Cf. Segundo, *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*, 112.

People cannot act in whatever manner they like. Caligula demonstrates this. The proposition, *humanity is absolutely not free*, segues into ethics or, for that matter, liberation theology. This leads to Segundo's 'theology of project' as described in "Ignace de Loyola, ¿prueba o proyecto?".⁶⁶⁵ He portrays Jesus Christ as the eternal King who defines his salvific project as reconciling the whole world to himself. Segundo designates the 'project' as "a 'field of activity' rather a viable, actual project".⁶⁶⁶ The tape (1980) precedes his arguments in *El hombre* (1982) and "Ignace de Loyola" (1991). Thus, the similarities to Sartre's 'project' language are not just a coincidence. His direct engagement suggests a connection, even when he does not cite Sartre, as in the 'project' in "Ignace de Loyola".

He continues:

No precisamente para ser Todopoderoso, no es eso lo que le interesa, sino le interesa una vez que elija con su voluntad, lleve el razonamiento lógico de su libertad hasta el fin, pueda llevar realmente su proyecto hasta el final, que es lo que San Pablo dice que del hombre no es posible, que el hombre no logra hacer coincidir su proyecto con su realización. Esta sería, diríamos, la aventura de Calígula.⁶⁶⁷	Not necessarily to be all powerful; that's not what interests him, but he is interested that once you choose with your will, take the logical reasoning of your freedom until the end, you may actually take your plan to the end. What St. Paul says is that for humanity it is not possible, that people fail to match their projects to their completion. This would be, we would say, the adventure of Caligula.
---	---

Segundo suggests that Caligula does not necessarily want to be God, but he recognizes that once one chooses a path, in this case, one must follow this path to its logical conclusion. He refers to Paul, but does not say what passage. He could be referencing Romans 1 or Romans 7:15-19, and his point is humanity fails to reach its goals through its own will. He continues:

⁶⁶⁵ Segundo, "Ignace de Loyola: preuve ou projet?". Cf. Segundo, *Signs of the Times*, 149-175.

⁶⁶⁶ Segundo, "Ignace de Loyola: preuve ou projet?". Cf. Segundo, *Signs of the Times*, 161.

⁶⁶⁷ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

...Calígula tiene que comenzar aprendiendo, por decirlo así, a ser libre. Aprendiendo a ser libre siempre, es decir, aprendiendo a no desviarse del proyecto... Ahora, para que el hombre no se desvíe del proyecto en que se fija ya hay una condición a priori, que es precisamente la locura de Calígula... ⁶⁶⁸	...Caligula has to start learning, so to speak, to be free. Learning to be free forever, that is, learning not to deviate from the project... Now, for a person not to deviate from the plan that person has in mind, there is an a priori condition, which is precisely the madness of Caligula...
---	---

Due to the conversational tone of the tape, translating the transcription into intelligible English is continuously a challenge. Segundo is saying that it is a sign of madness to hold inflexibly to a project without being willing to modify it in the light of circumstances/limits. This is the sense in which he views humanity as complicit with God in co-creativity in history, yet he recognizes the contingency in this manner of living out one's freedom.

At the end of the discussion, Segundo brings up the madness perverting Caligula's understanding of freedom. The only way Caligula experiences the freedom without any borders is through his madness. He is not tied to things or items in the material world. By being unconnected from material things, his freedom is unconstrained. Caligula argues that the boundaries on freedom are what keep him from attaining happiness, but when he exercises his freedom in his madness without any boundaries, he does not experience any greater happiness. Instead, he sinks further in his madness and is eventually killed.

4.4 Conclusion

Segundo's freedom with limits is significant to the existential dimension of his liberation theology. He does not view freedom without its pitfalls. As his treatment of Sartre and Camus shows, there is the possibility of succumbing to

⁶⁶⁸ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

freedom as a deception. Like Orestes, it is possible to forge ahead with a belief in freedom, but forget the cost. There are barriers to freedom, and there are distractions from it. These pitfalls do not constitute sufficient reason to avoid freedom completely because freedom, for Segundo, is how humanity experiences faith in God, and God's project (e.g. the Kingdom of heaven) is carried forward in freedom. He seeks a path for pursuing freedom and the richness it can offer for theological discourse. He does not replace God with freedom, but he incorporates human action and initiative. Segundo's idea of freedom is a reaction to the freedom in Camus and Sartre--i.e. instead of Orestes, Roquentin, or Caligula, Segundo presents his version of existential freedom described above. Both Camus and Sartre recognize the polarity of freedom and limit in life: but they can only see the assertion of freedom as a way of coping with this tension – which in Camus takes an absurdist form and in Sartre a more nihilistic form of denying inherent values.

In *FI*, Segundo proposes that the problem is not a phenomenological approach to the individual, but a rejection of the social dimension of freedom due to a notion of freedom that is more 'authentic' the less 'conditioned' it is. He finds an ongoing fascination with the Cartesian subject in Sartre.⁶⁶⁹ In *El hombre 2.2*, although he refers to Bultmann rather than Sartre, he writes about Ignatius and affirms the 'existential preparation for authenticity'.⁶⁷⁰ In *FI*, he offers a critique of Camus' *Myth of Sisyphus* and absurdity. For Segundo, Camus illustrates and tentatively proposes that the rejection of all transcendent data leads to absurdism (see section 7.1.5 below).⁶⁷¹

⁶⁶⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 158-159. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 128.

⁶⁷⁰ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 721-723. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 78-79.

⁶⁷¹ Segundo, *FI*, 176-177. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 141-142.

Sartre and Camus have similarities and differences in their conception of freedom. For Sartre, humanity is condemned to freedom, and freedom means the ability to choose, i.e., “autonomy of choice”.⁶⁷² According to Ronald Santoni, Camus misunderstands Sartre’s definition of freedom, which leads to Camus’ criticism of it.⁶⁷³ For Camus, freedom is absurd and “has no meaning except in relation to its limited fate”.⁶⁷⁴ He opposes Sartre’s absolute freedom in favor of his understanding of absurd freedom, yet both Camus and Sartre reject the horizon of eternity and separate existential from ontological freedom. Segundo’s engagement with Camus and Sartre provides a backdrop for further theological investigation in the next chapter. In Tape 24, Segundo mentions God eight times. They are listed below in Table II.

Segundo’s notion of ‘adventure’ is a thoroughly existential idea that underlies his liberation theology. He says, “Freedom and human existence would only have meaning if the adventure would be possible”.⁶⁷⁵ Having an adventure is possible, in the Sartrean sense of “events out of the ordinary without being necessarily extraordinary”.⁶⁷⁶ Identifying these little departures, for Segundo, is part of engaging in *aventure*. As I wrote above, he compares Ignatius’ experience at Manresa to a Sartrean adventure.⁶⁷⁷ On the tape, he says, “...the adventure is what gives value to human existence”.⁶⁷⁸ His understanding of liberation theology is existential human action to improve negative conditions. Segundo’s notion of adventure follows Sartre and shapes his liberation theology.

⁶⁷² Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 483.

⁶⁷³ Ronald E. Santoni, "Camus on Sartre's 'Freedom': Another 'Misunderstanding'," *The Review of Metaphysics* 61, no. 4 (2008): 790.

⁶⁷⁴ Santoni, "Camus on Sartre's 'Freedom': Another 'Misunderstanding'," 796. Cf. Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*, 45.

⁶⁷⁵ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

⁶⁷⁶ Sartre, *Nausea*, 35-36.

⁶⁷⁷ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 755-756. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 104-105.

⁶⁷⁸ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

The following table is a collection of his references to God on the tape, and it is a useful tool for considering the theology of the tape.

	Original transcript	Translation	Description
1	¿Que corazón, que dios tendría para mi la profundidad de un lago, es decir, podría saciar mi sed?	What heart, what God would have for me the depth of a lake, i.e. could quench my thirst?	He is describing Caligula, early in the discussion group.
2	¿Que corazón, que persona, que dios , es decir, que valor podría ser suficiente como para saciar mi sed de felicidad?	What heart, what person, what God, that is, what value could be enough to quench my thirst for happiness?	Spoken in almost the same breath. Again, Segundo is describing Caligula's atrocities.
3	Pero yo, yo soy libre, ¡Gracias a dios ! (la ironía)	But I, I'm free, thank God! (the irony)	He is quoting Orestes.
4	Hoy ya no hay mas que uno, y Dios sabe adonde llega, pero este es MI camino, el camino de alguien que ha matado a su madre...	Today there is no more than one, and God knows its destination, but this is MY path, the way of someone who has killed his mother...	At the end of side one, he is describing Orestes' view of freedom.
5	Entonces allí se le aparece Júpiter, es precisamente, es exactamente el dios de Santo Tomas, en Suma Teológica (laughter), exacto, lo conocen ustedes, perfectamente, profesor de filosofía, lo ha estudiado, etc.	Then at that point Jupiter appears; this is precisely, exactly the God of St Thomas, in Summa Theologica (laughter), exactly, you know him, well, a philosophy professor, he has studied [him], etc.	Just after the previous quote, at the end of side one, this is the closest to a theological reference to God.
6	Dios es el bien, lo ha creado según su voluntad, por lo tanto, el mundo es bueno, las leyes que hay en el mundo son buenas, tiene que someterse a ellas.	God is good, he has created it according to His will; therefore, the world is good, the laws in the world are good, you have to submit to them.	This is connected to the previous two quotes, and is referring to God's nature.
7	No era el amor, Dios no, ni la gloria ni la riqueza	It was not love, God no, or glory or wealth	He is describing Roquentin in <i>Nausea</i> .
8	San Pablo llama la manifestación de la libertad de los hijos de Dios , de allí la nausea.	St. Paul calls it the manifestation of freedom of the children of God , hence the nausea.	Segundo is referring in the first place to the New Testament Jews.

Table II

Other than references five, six, and eight, his references to God are not primarily theological. By stating that they are not primarily theological, I mean that in this particular gathering, they were not discussing theology; they discussed three literary works. They did gather on other occasions discussed other topics: theology, philosophy, the Bible and Church dogma. In number eight on Table II, Segundo theologizes Sartre's experience of nausea by making a connection with Romans 8:21-22. The "growing in pain" (v. 22) refers to human hope that creation will obtain the freedom of the people of God and be set free from decay. That is, it is part of his discussion of the human project. For Segundo, God is ever-present, and listening to his discussion group and cross-referencing his points with his published works, shows how existential themes are a dimension of his thinking in his 'liberation theology'.

Segundo's belief in transcendence beyond the self is characterized by the cognitive and the affective. One can learn that absolute freedom corrupts, as in the case of Caligula, (a cognitive statement), but Camus' literature is affective and allows people to realize the limitations of freedom. Both aspects, the cognitive and affective, are combined in these readings. Segundo holds to a belief in the transformative nature of theology in human lives. He views human thinking about God as affective as well as cognitive. He combines existentialism with Christian personalism, including an I-Thou relation with other people and God. In order to better understand the way he combines existentialism with Christian personalism, Segundo engages with existential thinkers. The tape is fortunate for evidence of this engagement and for a continuing understanding of his theology.

5 Heidegger and existential grammar

There are two places in Segundo's works in which he directly and at length engages with Heidegger as his primary interlocutor. Both are in unpublished manuscripts which until now have not been commented upon: "La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología"⁶⁷⁹ and "El fundamento poético de toda metafísica según Heidegger".⁶⁸⁰ The former is the primary source for section 5.3 in this chapter, whereas the latter is fragmented. Both manuscripts are missing sections. In the first, Segundo's endnotes are missing. Therefore, for example, there is no indication of which translation of Heidegger's *Being and Time* Segundo cites.⁶⁸¹ The second of these manuscripts is, as the title suggests, about the poetic foundation of metaphysics according to Heidegger, and it focuses on Heidegger's analysis of Hölderlin. However, the document is missing enough of its substance to render it of limited use.

5.1 Heidegger entering Segundo's thought

Segundo mentions Heidegger in a list of people he identifies as existential philosophers in *Existencialismo* (1948).⁶⁸² This passing reference indicates Segundo's awareness of Heidegger at this very early stage of his development; Segundo was twenty-three years old when *Existencialismo* was published. He rightly identifies the works of Heidegger, Jaspers, Sartre, and Marcel as at least partially

⁶⁷⁹ Segundo, "La fenomenología".

⁶⁸⁰ Juan Luis Segundo, "El fundamento poético de toda metafísica según Heidegger," in *Segundo Papers* (Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro de Espiritualidad Manresa).

⁶⁸¹ Although, Segundo most likely used Martin Heidegger, *El Ser y el Tiempo*, trans. José Gaos (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1951).

⁶⁸² Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 42.

contradictory with one another.⁶⁸³ The reference, however, tells readers nothing about how Segundo reads Heidegger, e.g. whether or not he agrees with the German philosopher or finds him useful, or even whether or not Segundo read Heidegger at all or was simply quoting one of his lecturers. The reference simply provides evidence of Segundo's early awareness of, if not engagement with, Heidegger. Based on the nature of Jesuit education,⁶⁸⁴ the awareness might have come from a lecturer, not from Segundo's direct reading of Heidegger.⁶⁸⁵

In 1949, Segundo began lecturing at Colegio Sagrado Corazón in Montevideo. He taught philosophy and literature. He mimeographed his typed class notes in 1953; this is what he used when lecturing.⁶⁸⁶ In these notes, he makes a few references to Heidegger. These references are primarily related to the evolution of thought in general. For example, he quotes Heidegger's response to Descartes in *Being and Time*⁶⁸⁷ and then describes mathematical formulations as the only way to have universality, metaphysical fixity, and objectivity.⁶⁸⁸ Although they could reflect an epistemological influence on Segundo, as is suggested by his later thought,⁶⁸⁹ the nature and structure of his notes do not suggest original interpretation of

⁶⁸³ This assessment was shared with others. E.g. Swami Akhilananda, "Existentialism," *Journal of Bible and Religion* 17, no. 4 (1949): 236. On the other hand, Coates finds common ground between Heidegger and Sartre. J. B. Coates, "Existentialism," *Philosophy* 28, no. 106 (1953): 232.

⁶⁸⁴ At that time, Jesuit education followed, as it still does, *The Ratio studiorum: The official plan for Jesuit education*, trans. Claude Pavur (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005).

⁶⁸⁵ E.g. The Catholic Church, especially the Jesuits, dictated subjects and pedagogy in Latin American education in the 1920s, and the focus followed traditional post-Modernism and pre-Vatican II lines. Cf. Daniel C. Levy, *Higher Education and the State in Latin America: Private Challenges* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1986), esp. 120f. Fred P. Ellison, "The Writer," in *Continuity and Change in Latin America*, ed. John J. Johnson (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), 82.

⁶⁸⁶ Segundo, "Orientaciones Literarias".

⁶⁸⁷ Heidegger writes and Segundo quotes, "In criticizing the Cartesian point of departure, we must ask which kind of Being that belongs to Dasein we should fix upon as giving us an appropriate way of access to those entities with whose Being as *extension* Descartes equates to Being of the 'world'". Segundo, "Orientaciones Literarias," 19. Cf. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (New York: Harper Perennial, 2008), 128.

⁶⁸⁸ Segundo uses the following: *universalidad, fijeza metafísica, objetividad*. Segundo, "Orientaciones Literarias," 19.

⁶⁸⁹ Segundo, *Dogma*, 364ff. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 238ff.

Heidegger.⁶⁹⁰ Rather, they likely put forward another person's research. His students would have heard him say, "Everything we face in the world serves us as something we face on the way to something else...before one understands something's service...one uses it".⁶⁹¹ Here he seems to be referring to ¶ 15-16 of *Being and Time*, although he does not quote directly from Heidegger or cite the source. A direct quotation from ¶ 15 better illustrates the point Segundo is making, and it corresponds well with his earlier work in *Existencialismo*. Heidegger writes:

The Being of those entities which we encounter as closest to us can be exhibited phenomenologically if we take as our clue our everyday Being-in-the-world, which we also call our "*dealings*" in the world and with entities within-the-world. Such dealings have already dispersed themselves into manifold ways of concern. The kind of dealing which is closest to us is, as we have shown, not a bare perceptual cognition, but rather that kind of concern which manipulates things and puts them to use; and this has its own kind of 'knowledge'.⁶⁹²

The contradistinction between philosophical and existential⁶⁹³ dimensions Segundo made in *Existencialismo* is somewhat evident in the quote above, although he did not seem to get the idea from Heidegger when he wrote *Existencialismo*. The "*dealings*" are not simply "a bare perceptual cognition". There is a "concern which manipulates things and puts them to use,"⁶⁹⁴ unlike "a philosophy that leaves us alone at dinner time or at the time for prayer".⁶⁹⁵ In his class notes, Segundo uses Heidegger's example of a hammer.⁶⁹⁶ One uses a hammer before "we theoretically understand its essence as an instrument".⁶⁹⁷ In this way, existence (using the hammer) precedes essence (understanding the hammer's nature). The argument

⁶⁹⁰ E.g. William Barrett, *What is existentialism?* (New York: Partisan Review, 1947), Esp. 26 and 49.

⁶⁹¹ Segundo, "Orientaciones Literarias," 8.

⁶⁹² Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 95.

⁶⁹³ In English, *existential* equates to the German *existenzial* and Spanish *existenciario*. In English, *existentiell* equates to the German *existenziell* and Spanish *existencial*.

⁶⁹⁴ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 95.

⁶⁹⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 8.

⁶⁹⁶ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 197ff.

⁶⁹⁷ Segundo, "Orientaciones Literarias," 8.

seems to be about experience, and interaction leads a person to reach for a hammer when the person needs to put a nail into a piece of wood. There is no philosophical quandary about using a steel weight fashioned to a handle in order to thrust a nail into wood. One picks up a hammer for this task because of previous encounters with similar tasks. This is what Heidegger calls “its own kind of ‘knowledge’”.⁶⁹⁸

At this early stage of Segundo’s intellectual development, Heidegger’s influence thus appears to be present. While teaching at Colegio Sagrado Corazón, Segundo likely had access to José Gaos’ 1951 translation of *Being and Time*.⁶⁹⁹ In his class notes, he quotes from Gaos’ translation in a discussion of the Christian appearance of a classical ideal.⁷⁰⁰ Later, he certainly used Gaos’ translation when he wrote “La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología” because he did not read or speak German.⁷⁰¹

By the time his thesis on Berdyaev was published in 1963, the connection between Segundo and Heidegger was complete.⁷⁰² Initially, he includes Heidegger in a list of philosophers of significant esteem, e.g. he writes, “I put [Berdyaev] on the same level as... Heidegger”.⁷⁰³ Later, he puts Heidegger and Berdyaev into conversation about the nature of the “fallen state” of the world.⁷⁰⁴ The two men were contemporaries, with the Russian émigré living in Paris and Heidegger in Germany. After *Being and Time* was published (1927), Berdyaev referenced it in his writings, and his major works came after *Being and Time*.⁷⁰⁵ Therefore, it makes sense that Segundo would have read Heidegger as part of his project on Berdyaev,

⁶⁹⁸ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 95.

⁶⁹⁹ Cf. Heidegger, *El Ser y el Tiempo*.

⁷⁰⁰ Segundo, “Orientaciones Literarias,” 19. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 128.

⁷⁰¹ Interviews with Carlos Gutiérrez, José Irureta Goyena and Elbio Medina, in Montevideo, Uruguay (2009).

⁷⁰² Segundo, *Berdiaeff*.

⁷⁰³ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 11.

⁷⁰⁴ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 187.

⁷⁰⁵ E.g. Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 250.

and the evidence is clear in the first chapter ("Philosophy as Phenomenology") of the second part ("Philosophical Interpretation of Experience") of his study of Berdyaev.⁷⁰⁶ After the publication of *Berdiaeff* in 1963, Segundo returned to Heidegger occasionally in his published works, as we shall now see.

5.2 *Background--Segundo's published analysis of Heidegger*

In *El infierno* (1998), his posthumously published and final book, Segundo explores the notion of "Hell" within Karl Rahner's theology. In a subsection of chapter three called "Digression on Concupiscence in Rahner's Theology", Segundo distinguishes between early and later Rahner.⁷⁰⁷ He identifies the later Rahner with "transformational theology" and credits the shift with what he calls Rahner's "anthropological reading of Heidegger's ontology".⁷⁰⁸ Although Segundo is not treating Heidegger directly in this section, he draws Heidegger into his interpretation of Rahner. This is a natural connection, but Segundo might be missing the wider influence Heidegger had on Rahner. Carl Starkloff presents Segundo and Rahner as two contrasting views of ideology.⁷⁰⁹ Rahner, he argues, distances Christianity from ideologies because he views ideology in a Marxist sense. On the other hand, Segundo connects faith and ideologies, e.g. *FI*.

Rahner began his doctoral studies at Freiburg in 1934 and attended Heidegger's lectures. His doctoral thesis in philosophy was rejected because his supervisor Martin Honecker supposedly did not appreciate Rahner's bias for

⁷⁰⁶ Esp. Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 232-242.

⁷⁰⁷ Francis Schüssler Fiorenza describes the shift from Rahner's early philosophical writings to his later theological, pastoral and spiritual writings. Cf. Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, "Method in Theology," in *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Rahner*, ed. Declan Marmion (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 68-70.

⁷⁰⁸ Segundo, *Infierno*, 96.

⁷⁰⁹ Carl F. Starkloff, "Inculturation and Cultural Systems (Part 2)," *Theological Studies* 55.2(1994): 275-276.

Heidegger's thought.⁷¹⁰ Thus, the connection with Heidegger's thought was present for Rahner's entire career, and Segundo might be stretching things to suggest that this shift occurred in late Rahner. Furthermore, the connection between Rahner and Heidegger is common knowledge.⁷¹¹

The reason Heidegger enters this project is not because of what Segundo adds to Heideggerian studies, but because of what reading Heidegger adds to Segundo's thought. Specifically, this chapter will seek to show how Heidegger influenced Segundo's understanding of existentialism and how his analysis of Heidegger developed his liberation theology.

Unfortunately Segundo is answering a different question in the manuscript we shall be assessing. He is addressing the nature of Christian dogma, and for Segundo, it is an epistemological question, which, to answer, he turns to Heidegger. Beginning this chapter on Heidegger's influence with published references adds Heidegger-related material to the unpublished sources. If the unpublished sources were all that existed, they could easily be outliers of Segundo's thought--items that he never fully developed or intended to be taken on their own. However, the unpublished evidence is supported by the published. As we shall now see, he specifically proffers a justification for engaging with Heidegger in *El hombre 2.1*.

⁷¹⁰ Herbert Vorgrimler, *Understanding Karl Rahner: an introduction to his life and thought* (London: SCM Press, 1986), 62.

⁷¹¹ E.g. O'Meara writes, "Heidegger and Rahner have a similar point of departure: the one pursues Being, the other pursues divine grace in existential and historical dynamic, in a world and history that are partly mysteries". Thomas F. O'Meara, *God in the World: A Guide to Karl Rahner's Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007), 26.

5.2.1 Justification for engagement

In *El Hombre 2.1*,⁷¹² Segundo employs Bultmann's analysis of human 'pre-understanding' in his approach to Christology. Since Bultmann is dependent on Heidegger, he asks if it might not be more appropriate to go more directly to Heidegger himself.⁷¹³ Segundo's own method, i.e. an orthodox Catholic approach, and Heidegger's method can be juxtaposed in order to fruitfully uncover various aspects of both. He points to Protestant objections to natural theology, a typically Catholic theological approach, as a contrast with his own method.⁷¹⁴ Some Protestant objections to natural theology include the immediacy of human knowledge of God, the noetic effects of sin, and the questionable logic of theistic arguments.⁷¹⁵ However, *A Christian Natural Theology* by John B. Cobb, Jr.⁷¹⁶ is just one-example of a Protestant (United Methodist) theologian using natural theology positively.

Regarding Segundo's use of Heidegger, as we shall see in my exposition of his manuscript "La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología" below, Segundo finds he can use Heidegger's methodology without sacrificing his own theological convictions. This is similar to the conclusion in the unpublished manuscript "Existencialismo Cristiano" regarding the philosophy of existentialism in relation to the encyclical "Humani Generis".⁷¹⁷ In addition, he comes to the same conclusion regarding Heidegger in *El Hombre* by dismissing what does not contribute to his

⁷¹² Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*. Translated to English as Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*.

⁷¹³ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 55. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 33.

⁷¹⁴ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 55, n22. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 194, n13.

⁷¹⁵ See e.g. Michael Sudduth, *The Reformed Objection to Natural Theology* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009).

⁷¹⁶ Jr. John B. Cobb, *A Christian Natural Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2007).

⁷¹⁷ Segundo, "EC".

project and accepting what does. He asks his readers to “follow the thread of my methodological reflections with regard to Christology”.⁷¹⁸

Segundo indirectly justifies his engagement with Heidegger by widening the question and asks, “What solid objections can be raised against the use of a kind of existential grammar to better understand what I find appealing in Jesus of Nazareth?”⁷¹⁹ He skips providing an “in-depth study of the hermeneutic possibilities that might be afforded by phenomenology such as that elaborated in *Being and Time*”.⁷²⁰ He writes this elsewhere.⁷²¹ Instead, he provides three reasons supporting the theological usefulness of existential grammar. These reasons, in turn, justify his use of Heidegger’s methodology.⁷²²

- 1) Renouncing Heidegger does not remove a barrier between Jesus and modern humanity.
- 2) When dealing with a divine revelation *understanding* can NOT pass judgment on *preunderstanding*.
- 3) Although the *preunderstanding* is inextricably connected with a number of human elements and interests, it is primarily connected to human freedom.

I will now address each reason individually.

Heidegger is no barrier to Jesus

In the first case, Segundo’s justification could be restated positively. *Heidegger is not necessarily a barrier between Jesus and modern humanity*. Likewise, the same could be said of other thinkers or approaches, e.g. *Barth or Derrida is not a barrier between Jesus and modern humanity*. A methodology, like Heidegger’s

⁷¹⁸ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.1, 56. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 34.

⁷¹⁹ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.1, 56. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 34.

⁷²⁰ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.1, 56. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 34.

⁷²¹ E.g. Segundo, “La fenomenología”.

⁷²² Segundo, *El hombre* 2.1, 56. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 34.

phenomenology or existentialism, provides an approach (or method) for theological discourse. Therefore, by setting Heidegger aside, people who seek a better understanding of theology set aside Heidegger's potential usefulness, especially as a hermeneutical tool.

Relationship between understanding and pre-understanding

Segundo's second point touches the usefulness of using existential grammar to better understand Jesus of Nazareth. When dealing with divine revelation, he argues that there is a progressive relationship from *pre-understanding* to *understanding*. In other words, *understanding* cannot regress or return to a state of *pre-understanding* and *understanding* cannot make a judgment on *pre-understanding*. Because understanding Jesus as the Christ is an engagement between finite human ability and something that is infinite and/or divine, it is necessary to take a kind of *pre-understanding* into consideration (for this see further below), but this does not mean *pre-understanding* is subject to *understanding*. Segundo writes,

It is precisely because we understand those events, persons, and documents from one particular stance rather than another (signs of the times) that we come to have (anthropological) faith in them; only on that basis do we come to regard them as an appeal made to us from the Absolute.⁷²³

A person cannot understand something from a perspective other than that person's own perspective. The way a person learns is dependent on current *understanding*, and this is indicative of the progressive relationship from *pre-understanding* to *understanding*. A person interprets 'the signs of the times' through his or her own experience, which implies an understanding which precedes conceptual understanding. Here Segundo affirms Bultmann's concept of pre-

⁷²³ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 56. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 34.

understanding as conditioning for revelation, which is a theological adaptation of Heidegger's notion of pre-understanding. Nyström and Dahlberg write about Heidegger's own view of pre-understanding: "When Martin Heidegger tried to analyse the being that understands its own being, he found that interpretation is the foundation of all human understanding".⁷²⁴ For Heidegger, pre-understanding in terms of human moods is seen as preparation for the disclosure of Being. Susann Lavery explains, "This pre-understanding is the meanings or organization of a culture that are present before we understand and become part of our historicity of background".⁷²⁵ Pre-understanding shapes understanding of events.

Pre-understanding and freedom

Segundo's third reason for using existential grammar and engaging with Heidegger is the most in-depth. He writes, "Jesus always perceived with crystal clarity that reception, rejection, and comprehension of his words depended on the attitudes *already* existing in the hearts of his listeners with regard to the terms in which he expressed himself".⁷²⁶ *Pre-understanding* seems to be bound up with a number of human elements and interests, but when it encounters the divine, it is primarily connected to freedom. People pick and choose what they want from, for example, the Bible on the basis of *pre-understanding*. This is why God "stands at the door and knocks" (Revelation 3:20), and Segundo argues that this is "the price that God has chosen to pay for our liberty".⁷²⁷

⁷²⁴ Maria Nyström and Karen Dahlberg, "Pre-understanding and openness – a relationship without hope?," *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences* 15, no. 4 (2001): 340.

⁷²⁵ Susann M. Lavery, "Hermeneutic Phenomenology and Phenomenology: A Comparison of Historical and Methodological Considerations," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 2, no. 3 (2003): 24.

⁷²⁶ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.1, 57. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 35.

⁷²⁷ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.1, 57. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 35.

5.2.2 The purpose of engagement with Heidegger

The three reasons from *El Hombre* 2.1 presented above demonstrate how Segundo uses Heidegger in the development of his methodology. They represent a fuller development of his methodology. *LT*, which was published ten years earlier, shows the seeds of the later methodology of *El Hombre*. Segundo does not shift away from a method of doing liberation theology in order to focus on something else, like defining doctrine or approaching liberation theology systematically. Thus, the three reasons presented above follow as if they are rules for engagement and could be applied to various situations. Segundo's liberation theology need not be exclusively applied to one milieu.

In *FI*, Segundo addresses John Macquarrie's book *God-Talk*. Segundo is critical of Macquarrie's interpretation of the poetic medium on the grounds that he undermines the aesthetic by too closely following Heidegger's ontology.⁷²⁸ According to Segundo, this causes Macquarrie to miss the affective nature of poetry.⁷²⁹ Segundo's justification for studying the philosophy of existentialism included a call for people with the skills to study a philosophy in order to better understand it and use it to enrich Christian theology.⁷³⁰ The same application works for studying Heidegger. He engages with Heidegger in order to better understand what Heidegger can add to his thought, but also in order to understand where Heidegger diverges and leads others astray, as his example from Macquarrie's analysis of poetry shows.

⁷²⁸ Cf. John Macquarrie, *God-Talk: An Examination of the Language and Logic of Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), esp. ch. 7.

⁷²⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 186. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 168.

⁷³⁰ Segundo, "EC," 1.

5.3 *La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología (manuscript)*

The primary source for understanding Segundo's reading of Heidegger is a thirty-two page, unpublished manuscript called "La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología".⁷³¹ The manuscript, which is possibly an early draft of a project he was developing, is in the Jesuit Library at Manresa Casa de Oración y Retiros in Montevideo, Uruguay. As I wrote above, Segundo's endnotes are lost. Thus, I need to provide a similar caveat as in Chapter 2 regarding *Existencialismo*--I have made every attempt to find his sources and cross-reference my citations of his work with his source or a translation thereof. Unlike *Existencialismo* which has almost no references to his sources, he seems to have had a quite thorough list of references in "La fenomenología".⁷³²

In the introduction, Segundo outlines three points that he finds in Heidegger's *Being and Time*.⁷³³ Let us consider each, in turn.

Phenomenology does not exclude theology.

To support his claim that phenomenology does not exclude theology, Segundo cites three passages from *Being and Time*. I will focus on the second one, from ¶ 49:

⁷³¹ Segundo, "La fenomenología". All quotations in English are my translation. Cross-reference sources are my best guess based on the clues in the text. Hereafter to be referred to as "La fenomenología". The manuscript cannot be precisely dated. There are some clues in the sources he cites. For example, he references Henri Birault around thirteen times (several references could be from Birault, but might not be). He wrote sometime after 1978 if he is citing Henri Birault's 1978 book *Heidegger et l'expérience de la pensée* (Paris: Gallimard, 1978).

⁷³² There are 94 superscript endnotes in the text. Segundo most likely used José Gaos' 1951 translation of Heidegger, *El Ser y el Tiempo*. He did not have access to Martin Heidegger, *Ser y Tiempo*, trans. Jorge Eduardo Rivera (Santiago, Chile: Editorial Universitaria, 1997). It was published after he died. When cross-referencing Segundo's citations from *Being and Time* in English, I will reference John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson's 1962 translation of Heidegger, *Being and Time*.

⁷³³ Interestingly, Segundo references four points, but only provides three. Segundo, "La fenomenología," 1. This oversight can be forgiven because Segundo never published the manuscript.

In the ontological analysis of Being-towards-the-end there is no anticipation of our taking any existential stand toward death. If “death” is defined as the ‘end’ of Dasein--that is to say, of Being-in-the-world--this does not imply any ontical decision whether ‘after death’ still another Being is possible, either higher or lower, or whether Dasein ‘lives on’ or even ‘outlasts’ itself and is ‘immortal’.⁷³⁴

This passage in Heidegger’s work has been cited by a number of commentators on his thought. John Hick, Herman Philipse, and Hubert L. Dreyfus each add a different perspective to reading this passage. For example, when quoting this same passage, John Hick suggests that Heidegger’s analysis of death is psychological and independent of “the question whether men [sic] in fact have a further existence beyond the frontier of death”.⁷³⁵ Hick’s insight points toward Heidegger’s existential thought, and although his perspective is not unique, it corroborates the most obvious reading of this passage--i.e. Heidegger has an ambiguous view of anything after death. This reading is basically in accord with Segundo’s own point.

Herman Philipse, however, finds almost the opposite to Hick (and Segundo) in this same quotation. He points out that Heidegger’s “analysis of death is fundamental in relation to a biology, psychology, theodicy, or theology of death...according to which the existential analysis discovers a priori conditions for the possibility of all factual existents, and with the phenomenologico-hermeneutical theme, which claims that a regional ontology of Dasein is the foundation of all sciences of man [sic]”.⁷³⁶ Philipse concludes with the prediction that Heidegger will “deny the legitimacy of all doctrines of survival after death”.⁷³⁷ Instead of finding Heidegger’s view of something after death as ambiguous, Philipse reads Heidegger

⁷³⁴ Segundo, “La fenomenología,” 1. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 292.

⁷³⁵ John Hick, *Death and Eternal Life* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 101.

⁷³⁶ Herman Philipse, *Heidegger's philosophy of being, a critical interpretation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 370.

⁷³⁷ Philipse, *Heidegger's philosophy of being, a critical interpretation* 370.

as making a definite denial of survival after death.⁷³⁸ He draws a comparison between ¶ 49 and ¶ 53 (in which Heidegger argues against life after death, e.g. “Dasein never comports itself authentically towards its end”⁷³⁹).

Similarly to Hick and Segundo, but perhaps not to Philipse, Michael Inwood uses this quote from ¶ 49 to suggest that anyone could agree with Heidegger’s account of death, regardless of whether or not they believe in immortality, because Heidegger’s view is not determined, i.e. that there would be *definitely* something after death.⁷⁴⁰

Hubert L. Dreyfus writes in implicit agreement with Segundo but adds the observation that Heidegger does not proffer the possibility that his existential-ontology gives humanity any binding guidance. Again, he uses this quote from ¶ 49 of *Being and Time* as each of the previous commentators have. In the Forward to *Time and Death*, Dreyfus writes, “Heidegger is therefore not going to give us advice as to how to live our lives in the face of the *inevitability* of the terminal collapse of our being-in-the-world”.⁷⁴¹ Dreyfus points out the missing moral-ethical dimension of this passage, but he does not suggest Heidegger can be read as concluding *there is* or *there is not* something after Being-in-the-world.

Another commentator on this same passage from ¶ 49, Taylor Carman, suggests that Heidegger was not talking about what happens after death at all. Carman writes, “Questions about survival or immortality will remain ontologically obscure if we have not already understood death in its immanent existential

⁷³⁸ Philipse, *Heidegger's philosophy of being, a critical interpretation* 370.

⁷³⁹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 304.

⁷⁴⁰ Michael Inwood, *Heidegger: a very short introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 74.

⁷⁴¹ Hubert L. Dreyfus, “Forward,” in *Time and death: Heidegger's analysis of finitude*, ed. Carol J. White and Mark Ralkowski (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), xxxv-xxxvi.

significance".⁷⁴² For Segundo, the primary argument he develops from this quote is that the relationship between phenomenology and theology is not, by definition, mutually exclusive.

Simply the number of people who have engaged with this one quote from Heidegger is interesting. These other commentators all wrote after Segundo died, so he is not copying from them. Likewise, they could not have known about his manuscript because it was never published. Where Segundo is influenced by another person's thought, he is careful to cite his influence, e.g. "Henri Birault...writes".⁷⁴³ The sheer number of endnote references in the text suggest fastidious attention to detail in citing his sources. It is unfortunate that the notes themselves did not survive with the manuscript. The fact that so many others cite this one passage from *Being and Time* suggests that Segundo was reading Heidegger with a sense of what is significant. He gives this example to illustrate Heidegger's point that an ontological account of 'being towards death' does not tell us anything about the ontic/factual reality of whether there is life beyond death, but his larger purpose is to deny any incompatibility between the phenomenal and theological methods.

Opposition between phenomenology and theology

Segundo's a second point of introduction builds on his first. He finds that even though the relationship between phenomenology and theology is not mutually exclusive, there is a certain opposition between them. This opposition relates to the difference between ontic and ontological, between what is founded and its foundation, and opposition is to be found in the ontological dimension. Ontic relates

⁷⁴² Taylor Carman, *Heidegger's Analytic: interpretation, discourse, and authenticity in Being and Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 284.

⁷⁴³ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 13.

to what is given 'factually' and ontological relates to the foundation of being, i.e. the deep structure of the factual. Segundo points to Adam as an example and argues that the ontic suggests the manifestation of Adam's sin in human decline, whereas ontology "does not show in what sense humanity might be in a decaying state".⁷⁴⁴ Here, he is viewing ontology through phenomenology as 'allowing what is real to show itself', which Heidegger understands as a method of enquiry for two kinds of 'real', the ontic and the ontological.

Segundo cites Heidegger, "Only when death is conceived in its full ontological essence can we have any methodological assurance in even *asking* what *may be after death*".⁷⁴⁵ He then quotes one of Heidegger's notes: "Theology can find in Being-guilty, as existentially defined, an ontological condition for the factual possibility".⁷⁴⁶ The "factual possibility" is Heidegger-speak for "thrown-ness" or *sense in which humanity is thrown into the world*.⁷⁴⁷ Segundo argues that theology should be discussing what the ontic is (i.e. ontologically) or what is given beyond mere 'facts'. He goes on to write, "The opposition between ontic and ontological is reduced to an opposition between what is founded and its foundation".⁷⁴⁸ He writes, "This text seems to admit...an adaptation of the phenomenological method to the theological content".⁷⁴⁹ Phenomenology when interpreted by ontology is opposed to any theology which makes certain claims about the nature of human and divine existence 'in fact', as a 'science of the ontic'. This leads back to what Segundo finds useful in existential phenomenology.

⁷⁴⁴ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 2.

⁷⁴⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 2. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 292.

⁷⁴⁶ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 2. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 496 n. ii.

⁷⁴⁷ George Steiner, *Martin Heidegger* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 87.

⁷⁴⁸ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 2.

⁷⁴⁹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 3, underlining original.

Segundo himself does not stop with Heidegger's ambiguity towards something after death. Dealing with life after death in *Teología Abierta 1*,⁷⁵⁰ he writes,

Grace enables us to journey forward as human beings--without interruption but through the effect of an essential gift--from the natural human condition to the creative liberty of the sons of God...this also transforms the idea we must entertain about the goal toward which God's gift elevates us: *eternal life*.⁷⁵¹

In *Teología Abierta 1*, Segundo places an "ontological interpretation of death"⁷⁵² within his explication of grace. Unlike Heidegger's ambiguity, Segundo views life as a journey in or under God's grace, and the journey leads to eternal life, which he views as a gift from God. However, his point in "La fenomenología" is not about the reality of the afterlife. He gives Heidegger's view of death as an example of the difference between phenomenology and theology.

Closer than they appear

Returning to "La fenomenología", Segundo finds his third reason for engaging with Heidegger in a long quote from *Being and Time*.⁷⁵³ He suggests that within *Being and Time* there is a closer unity between phenomenology and theology than might at first meet the eye. Phenomenology is different from theology in that theology designates the object of its study (God) within the etymology of the word. However, "phenomenology neither designates the object of its researches, nor characterizes the subject-matter thus comprised".⁷⁵⁴ According to Segundo, Heidegger is comparing the theological (concerned with the object) with the phenomenological

⁷⁵⁰ Originally published as Segundo, *Gracia*. Cf. Segundo, *Grace and the Human Condition*. However, in this project, I quote from Segundo, *Teología Abierta 1*.

⁷⁵¹ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 1*, 274. Cf. Segundo, *Grace and the Human Condition*, 70.

⁷⁵² Segundo, "La fenomenología," 2. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 292.

⁷⁵³ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 59.

⁷⁵⁴ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 2. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 59.

(concerned with the method), and this leads Segundo to draw the conclusion it is possible to adapt the phenomenological method to studying the content of theology. Before teasing out this comparison, he turns his attention to defining phenomenology.

5.3.1 Defining phenomenology

Segundo begins his definition of Heidegger's phenomenology by quoting, what he calls a motto, from *Being and Time*: "[i.e. attention] to things themselves".⁷⁵⁵ The motto seems to be about drawing out the meaning of things that are apparent, so that things themselves do need phenomenological enquiry, or attention to them as phenomena. To find or draw out the meaning requires, however, acknowledging a type of concealment beneath a phenomenon. Heidegger writes, "Concealment is the opposite concept of phenomenon," but only a few pages later, he adds that a phenomenon is also "something that proximally and for the most part does *not* show itself at all".⁷⁵⁶ The phenomenological method, for Heidegger, can thus be used in the area of both the ontic and the ontological. Segundo follows Heidegger's definition of phenomenology: "A phenomenon must be displayable, something that is already there... just as an economy is behind the value of money".⁷⁵⁷

Segundo summarizes his account of Heidegger: "Dasein is ontically 'closest' to itself and ontologically farthest; but pre-ontologically it is surely not a stranger to itself".⁷⁵⁸ Dasein is Heidegger's vocabulary for 'being-there' as distinct from *Sein*, which is 'Being'; Dasein is notably the human being. In the first part of the quote, Dasein relates closely to what is factual, or ontic, as 'a being'; in the second part,

⁷⁵⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 3. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 50.

⁷⁵⁶ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 51-55, 59.

⁷⁵⁷ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 3.

⁷⁵⁸ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 4. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 37.

Dasein is furthest from itself when it relates to the study of the nature of 'Being' itself, i.e. what is ontological. Heidegger is pointing out the "peculiar difficulties grounded in the kind of Being which belongs to the object taken as our theme and to the very behaviour of so taking it".⁷⁵⁹ Phenomenology for Heidegger thus means paying attention to things as they appear in order finally to notice Being which does not immediately appear.

In this article Segundo has a specific reason for appealing to Heidegger's phenomenological method in this way. He is going to focus on Heidegger's phenomenological exegesis of speech in order to draw a comparison with the phenomenon of *Christian* speech in both its circumstantial statements of faith and dogmatic formulations. This in turn will lead him to consider the relation between revelation, scripture and tradition.

When phenomenology is applied to exegesis of speech, Segundo argues that "what is immediately revealed in speech (once phenomenologically verified), is the ontic, which belongs to the being, especially the being we are, i.e. the existentiell"⁷⁶⁰ However, what is revealed in speech is not exclusively the ontic. The ontological also shows itself on further enquiry, as Segundo goes on to argue from Heidegger.

The first job of phenomenology is to reach material truth, but according to Segundo, "phenomenology...is not identified with any particular science".⁷⁶¹ It relates differently in different places, but, he acknowledges, it has always been seen as a typical philosophical method. This leads to the question of whether or not phenomenology has an intrinsic relationship with philosophy alone. In other words, could it not be partnered with theology? Segundo turns to Heidegger, who writes,

⁷⁵⁹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 37.

⁷⁶⁰ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 5.

⁷⁶¹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 5.

"Theology...has its own attestation, which remains closed off in principle from any philosophical experience".⁷⁶² In the same endnote, however, Heidegger places the action of bearing theological witness within "existential analysis", which Segundo equates to phenomenological analysis.

Segundo does not ignore Heidegger's separation of phenomenology from theology. Instead, Segundo focuses on Heidegger's phenomenology as a method. This complements his own predilection for method over doctrine, and he applies phenomenology as a method in a different way than Heidegger did in *Being and Time*. In phenomenology, Segundo finds a vibrant approach for understanding *logos* and *alétheia*. A focus on exegesis of speech requires Segundo to deal with the typically Heideggerian distinction between the German words *existenzial* and *existenziell*. Segundo's Spanish translation is *existenciario* and *existencial* and Macquarrie's English translation is *existential* and *existentiell*, respectively. Segundo's use of *existentiell* (Spanish *existencial* or German *existenziell*) is consistent with his earlier works. It is the affective and beautiful, e.g. knowing a being through writing a poem. He equates *existentiell* with the ontic, what is given 'in fact'. The *existential* (Spanish *existenciario* or German *existenzial*) relates to the ontological. In my following discussion I will use Macquarrie's version of the terms in his translation of Heidegger.

In order to truly grasp phenomenology, humanity must engage with the exegesis of being itself, not simply exegesis of speech. The *existentiell* is commonly understood as the sphere of ontic understanding of beings in the world. For Segundo, this finally means engaging with "the fear that is at the root of all fears".⁷⁶³

⁷⁶² Segundo, "La fenomenología," 5. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 496, n. ii.

⁷⁶³ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 5.

He gets to this point only through first describing ontic fear and relates it as what follows from 'various forms of fear' but it exceeds these forms as a basic mood of fear. The "fear at the root of all fears" is, he says, "no longer existentiell but existential," no longer ontic but ontological. That is, particular fears are ontic,⁷⁶⁴ but he adds, "Phenomenology is not opposed, as we saw, only to empty or falsified concepts, but also to 'constructions in the air' and 'accidental discoveries' i.e. to everything does not exceed the level of the ontic, of the existentiell seeking this existential-ontological foundation"⁷⁶⁵ This leads him to concede to Heidegger a disruption between theology when it is existentiell (i.e. when it is exercised as an ontic science) and phenomenology (when it is applied ontologically) as existential. Summarizing Heidegger, Segundo notes that "phenomenology leads us from the ontic to the ontological".⁷⁶⁶

Before Segundo can fully concede a break between theology and phenomenology, he reminds his readers with a quote from Heidegger: phenomenology "neither designates the object of its researches, nor characterizes the subject-matter thus comprised".⁷⁶⁷ Heidegger provides the opening for phenomenological method to be applied to an object other than a fact that is observed to exist (i.e. phenomena), like theology. Segundo takes this opening and compares phenomenology's material content and formal content. Material content is existentiell and relates to the ontic, whereas formal content is more closely related to the existential-ontological. He writes, "Phenomenology does not have a defined

⁷⁶⁴ Magda King writes, "A distinction must be sharply drawn between fear of the ontic, biological 'end of life' (decease), and dread as the basic mood which discloses that Da-sein as a thrown being exists to his end". Magda King, *A Guide to Heidegger's Being and Time*, ed. John Llewelyn (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001), 153. King's argument highlights the complexity of describing Heidegger's distinction between ontic/ontological and existentiell/existential.

⁷⁶⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 5.

⁷⁶⁶ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 6.

⁷⁶⁷ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 6. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 59.

material content, but it has a formal content".⁷⁶⁸ The phenomenological method is finally to find the essence of beings in an ontological sense. His argument, about applying phenomenology to theology, depends on taking a wider definition of phenomenology, including the ontic, but not to be confined to it.

Before he moves on to develop the application of Heidegger's phenomenological method to theology, he tells his readers that he must finish dealing with some issues raised in phenomenology. Using a quote from Pierre Thévenaz, Segundo identifies the significance of language in phenomenology:

Even before man [sic.] thinks or speaks, Being speaks to man and renders language, logic, and thought possible. But we see to what an extent the method and ambition of phenomenology has been attenuated.⁷⁶⁹

Segundo calls Thévenaz's text "remarkable" but he suggests that Thévenaz does not understand the most profound sense of phenomenology in Heidegger. That is, in later Heidegger himself, Segundo finds phenomenology expressed most fully in the sense of exegesis of speech, while philosophy (or logic in the Greek sense) does not last.⁷⁷⁰ He writes, "The existential is what disappears," since "the ontic is already simply being".⁷⁷¹ Thus, Segundo perceives that with phenomenology of speech the boundaries between the ontic and the ontological begin to collapse. Segundo is not completely critical of Thévenaz, however. He finds implicit agreement in Thévenaz's text when he quotes, "The philosopher, in the current sense of the term, should keep silent; it is the poet and the 'thinker' who will replace him [sic]".⁷⁷²

⁷⁶⁸ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 6.

⁷⁶⁹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 7. Cf. Pierre Thévenaz, *What is Phenomenology? and other essays*, trans. James M. Edie, Charles Courtney, and Paul Brockelman (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1962), 62.

⁷⁷⁰ Segundo does not identify where he finds phenomenology expressed most fully in the sense of exegesis of speech. Perhaps he is referring to Martin Heidegger, *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry*, trans. Keith Hoeller (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2000). It was originally published in 1944, seventeen years after *Being and Time*.

⁷⁷¹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 7.

⁷⁷² Segundo, "La fenomenología," 7. Cf. Thévenaz, *What is Phenomenology*, 62.

The introduction of poetry appears to be a *eureka*-moment for Segundo when he reads Thévenaz. According to his reading of Heidegger, the German philosopher did not develop from one stage to another, but experienced a break between his early and later writings.⁷⁷³ Phenomenology becomes the exegesis of speech (origination and foundation), and Segundo suggests that anyone who misses this characteristic of phenomenology misses one of the most fundamental and original characteristics of *Being and Time*. He argues that this exegesis of speech is expressed in poetry. We shall return to this idea in the next chapter but before moving to an analysis of Heidegger's influence on the way Segundo reads poetry, which he does in another manuscript,⁷⁷⁴ Segundo turns to speech through time.

Segundo writes, "All speech transmitted throughout time is tradition".⁷⁷⁵ Citing a lengthy quote from Heidegger about Dasein falling back into the world, Segundo argues that speech over time leads to or becomes tradition, which is bound with the sense of being fallen. He does not directly define what he means by *fallen*, but it seems to be analogous to being in the world as opposed to being with God. For Heidegger, being 'thrown'/fallen into the world leads to a forgetting of being in giving attention only to beings. In the introduction, he references Adam and humankind's indebtedness to Adam in the form of sin.⁷⁷⁶ However, the idea of being fallen seems to be more metaphorical than literal for Segundo. He writes, "Any phenomenology is definitive in history".⁷⁷⁷ He draws this conclusion based on the following progression: (1) Phenomenology is exegesis of speech → (2) Speech over

⁷⁷³ This could also be Segundo's misreading of Heidegger because there broader development in Heidegger's thought between *Being and Time* (1927) and *Hölderlin's Hymne "Der Ister"* (1942). The latter title Segundo treated in "El fundamento poético de toda metafísica según Heidegger" and is likely the comparison he uses to draw his conclusion about a break in Heidegger.

⁷⁷⁴ Segundo, "El fundamento poético de toda metafísica según Heidegger".

⁷⁷⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 7, underlining original.

⁷⁷⁶ This is similar to Augustine's reference to the "damnation originally forged by Adam" in Augustine, *Handbook on Faith, Hope, and Love*, trans. Albert C. Outler (Public Domain, 420/1999), Ch 25.

⁷⁷⁷ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 8.

time changes → (3) Speech from the past becomes tradition → (4) A particular phenomenology is definitive in history.

As speech changes over time (in hindsight it is a tradition), the phenomenology associated with that speech at a given time remains associated with that particular speech. Segundo finds Heidegger's method unique from other phenomenologies in this respect. He writes, "The event or situation of the 'fall' means that the precarious character of every phenomenological formulation requires continuously renewing the application of the method",⁷⁷⁸ which he will go on to apply to phenomenology of speech in ecclesial tradition. In order to better understand the uniqueness of Heidegger's method, Segundo examines how his method is applied to ontology. He quotes Heidegger,

Because Dasein has falling as its kind of Being, the way Dasein gets interpreted is for the most part *inauthentically* 'oriented' and does not reach the 'essence' ...But whenever we see something wrongly, some injunctions as to the primordial 'idea' of the phenomenon is revealed along with it.⁷⁷⁹

Segundo focuses on Heidegger's assertion of the need for exegesis, on the one hand, and the "fall" as an inauthentic tendency or orientation, on the other. The 'essence' is Being rather than beings, the ontological. Heidegger explains 'essence' as "the primordially appropriate ontological way of formulating questions".⁷⁸⁰ That is, we must go deeper than the factual/ontic into the essence, or Being itself. Segundo interprets Heidegger's concept of exegesis as a treatment of moral conscience that is fundamentally about everyday speech, which is the factual individual voice. Then, he asks, "Where does that voice come from, who has [it], what does [it] say, and to whom does [it] address?" The answer is human experience-- "The 'voice' of

⁷⁷⁸ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 8.

⁷⁷⁹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 9. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 326.

⁷⁸⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 326.

conscience is not the more profound, radical and 'essential' reality, because, if it were so, it would always be present".⁷⁸¹ However, experience cannot be accepted as it is. Again, he quotes Heidegger, "But must the ontological Interpretation agree with the ordinary interpretation at all? Should not the latter be, in principle, ontologically suspect?"⁷⁸² This leads to a vicious circle, in which exegesis is associated with everyday speech, and this speech comes from human experience but this experience cannot be accepted as it is. For example, he writes, "To feel called and to not feel called are equally real".⁷⁸³ One cannot validate or invalidate another person's experience (or, in the case of his example, one's sense of being called). One can only comment or possibly interpret speech about experience.

Segundo goes on to parallel the relation between the ontic and the ontological with the relation between everyday speech and revelation. He writes, "All of *Being and Time* can be summarized by the following quote: 'Dasein is ontically 'closest' to itself and ontologically farthest; but pre-ontologically it is surely not a stranger'".⁷⁸⁴ He interprets this to mean that the *fall* is not complete. Rough but valid interpretations of a phenomenon still exist. Even though some things are normally hidden, "something of the self emerges"; what Segundo calls a *pre-ontology* or "passivity of the entity with respect to being, just as there is always a passivity of speech regarding its meaning".⁷⁸⁵ This leads to pure experience, "a kind of photographic machine that is reduced to taking a photograph of being" and he

⁷⁸¹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 9.

⁷⁸² Segundo, "La fenomenología," 9. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 335.

⁷⁸³ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 10.

⁷⁸⁴ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 10. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 37.

⁷⁸⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 10.

agrees with De Waelhens' conclusion that phenomenology is the basis of all existentialism that follows it.⁷⁸⁶

The section concludes with Segundo's summation of phenomenology: "it is not pure and simple experience" but it "reaches the limits of being"; he adds, "Ultimately there is always the 'phenomenon,' that is, the reality that shows itself".⁷⁸⁷ This reality is not only ontic but ontological. Philosophical existentialists are experimental and base their conclusions on contingent facts, the ontic. He ends by writing, "In this sense, there is a phenomenological, philosophical, and ontological basis for other sciences".⁷⁸⁸ This quote is consistent with Segundo's existential ontology. In *LT*, he emphasizes that human freedom allows the entire being to focus on an absolute value, that is, love and God as love.⁷⁸⁹ Segundo's existential ontology is based in God as absolute value. This *basis* is where he begins the next section, relating theology with experience.

5.3.2 Theology and experience

The second section takes the definition of phenomenology that Segundo developed in the first section and relates it to theology, especially as theology is practiced as Church dogma. This section presents his most original contribution in the manuscript. By relating his definition of phenomenology (or, the way he understands Heidegger's phenomenology) to theology, he comes back to the meta-theme of his writings: how people relate to one another and to God and the role of freedom in the human experience.

⁷⁸⁶ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 10. Cf. Alphonse de Waelhens, *La Philosophie de Martin Heidegger* (Louvain: L'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1942).

⁷⁸⁷ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 11.

⁷⁸⁸ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 11.

⁷⁸⁹ Segundo, *LT*, 201. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 178.

In this section, Segundo uses the place of tradition in Heidegger's phenomenological analysis of Dasein to better understand the place of tradition in Christianity. This follows his previous assertion that phenomenology is a method that can be applied to theology. He tests the theory, and when he applies Heidegger's phenomenological method to theology, he finds God as both an ontic (what is given as existence and truth) and ontological reality (the foundation of existence and truth). For Christians, living in God means daily life is pre-ontological because one can only see what is given (ontic) and not its foundation (ontological), but there is still a dependence on the gift of what is ontological. As we shall see, he returns to his concept of *intermedios* first introduced in *Existencialismo*, which allows people to agree on a description of reality even though they do not all see reality in the same way. He writes:

La teología está toda ella edificada sobre el habla. No sólo en cuanto ciencia ("-logía", en su primer sentido), sino en cuanto a su contenido y a su método. Ya cuando decimos teología, nos referimos aquí a la teología católica. La transposición de nuestros resultados a otras teologías, aunque no sea automático, será, no obstante, fácil.	Theology is built entirely on speech. Not only as a science ("-logy" in its first sense), but in terms of content and method. And when we say theology, we refer here to Catholic theology. The transposition of our results to other theologies, although not automatic, will, however, be easy. ⁷⁹⁰
---	--

Segundo's readers can infer different meanings from his assertion about the relationship between theology/speech. He could be following along the lines of his former dissertation supervisor Paul Ricoeur with the primacy of speech/language over social reality, especially as Ricoeur argued in *The Rule of Metaphor*,⁷⁹¹ or he could simply be referring to the words of the Bible as the basis of Christian

⁷⁹⁰ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 11.

⁷⁹¹ E.g. Paul Ricoeur, *La métaphore vive* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1975). Cf. Paul Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language*, trans. Robert Czerny (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), esp. Study 8 pp. 322-329.

theology.⁷⁹² Whether he is making a complex argument with a nod to another thinker like his mentor, or he is simply stating the obvious, the etymology of *theology* relies on the Greek *logos*. This, as may seem clear, means that theology has as its basis both *words* (dynamic equivalent of *logos*) and science (implicit in the contemporary use of *-ology*).⁷⁹³ In other words, theology is based on speech (words spoken) and contains speech (mechanism for the transmission of meaning). In the sense of both/and/*intermedios*, he can use Ricoeur's primacy of speech/language over social reality and he can follow the Bible as the basis of Christian theology.

The latter half of the above quote specifies what type of theology Segundo addresses: Catholic theology. However, by his own admission, his method is not exclusively applicable to Catholicism. He argues that his method is applicable to other contexts or what he calls "other theologies".⁷⁹⁴ Words can be affective (poetic) or cognitive (philosophical), existentiell (ontic) or existential (indicating the ontological). As he argued in *Existencialismo* (see chapter 2), language can be affective,⁷⁹⁵ and poetry is more affective than philosophical language. In "La fenomenología", he writes:

En la fórmula de Cristo hay una cierta poesía implícita, en el sentido de que no puede dársele a sus palabras, sin más ni más, un contenido especulativo universal.	There is a certain poetry implied in the words of Christ in the sense that a strictly universal speculative content cannot be given to his words. ⁷⁹⁶
---	--

The "words of Christ" imply poetry, Segundo argues, not the other way around, i.e. *poetry implies the word of Christ*. By suggesting that the "words of Christ"

⁷⁹² E.g. Stephen's speech in Acts 7 which led to his martyrdom.

⁷⁹³ The contemporary use of *-ology* includes many nonce words.

⁷⁹⁴ There are countless book titles available about Catholic-Protestant dialogue. E.g. Robert McAfee Brown, *The Ecumenical Revolution: An Interpretation of the Catholic-Protestant Dialogue* (London: Burns & Oates, 1969), esp 82ff. Brown presents ecumenism as a source for purification, rather than conversion.

⁷⁹⁵ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 29.

⁷⁹⁶ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 12.

are implicitly poetic, he raises them from philosophical content, that is, cognitive, to affective language. For Segundo, the comparison is not perfectly linear, with affective to one side and cognitive on other, or existentiell (ontic or what is given) language at one point and existential language (pointing to ontological or foundational reality) at another point. He moves toward the middle, just as he did in *Existencialismo*, when he identified an in-between or *intermedios*.⁷⁹⁷

Intermedios does not exactly relate to the existentiell or existential. In his earlier exploration, he compared the philosophical and existentiell. He defined “existentialism”⁷⁹⁸ positively in EC as useful to theology when it is stripped of the pretension of encompassing everything.⁷⁹⁹ In *Existencialismo*, he argued that *intermedios* is not simply a correlation of the philosophical (concerned with essence, intentional, and focussing on truth) or the ‘existential’ (concerned with human existence, affective, and focussing on goodness). Instead, it is in-between these two tendencies, yet can simultaneously move toward both. For example, Segundo suggests that one could go up to an object in order to know it better, i.e. an existential act, more closely to what Heidegger calls an ‘existenziell’ (existentiell) act, and not a philosophical act turning the ‘existenzial’ (existential) into a system, but the attempt could lead to increasing cognitive (or philosophical) knowledge. In this example, one could explore what is given in an existentiell sense (ontic) and, in turn, learn more about the foundation of what is given in an existential sense (indicating the ontological), and this latter knowledge would be an ancillary outcome. For Segundo, *intermedios* is an important concept, and as two tendencies, most acts would have a propensity to be *intermedios*.

⁷⁹⁷ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 32.

⁷⁹⁸ N.B. Segundo did not use either Spanish word *existencial* or *existenciario* in EC.

⁷⁹⁹ Segundo, “EC,” 3.

Segundo describes theology as “speech that tells us the content of faith, which tries to make us aware of what we implicitly believe”.⁸⁰⁰ He then quotes St. Anselm, *fides quaerens intellectum*,⁸⁰¹ which he refers to as “an old saying of the Scholastics”,⁸⁰² but he restates Anselm’s quote as “faith seeking to become aware of what we believe implicitly,” and he equates his restatement of Anselm with Heidegger’s phrase, “conceptual self-interpretation of Christian existence”.⁸⁰³ According to Segundo, people express faith in formulas because it is easier than fully expressing one’s beliefs in one’s own words. Restated: Church dogma provides a mechanism for expressing faith. To support this claim, he quotes from Karl Rahner:

The effort of theology and the Magisterium in search of divinely revealed reality and truth always ends in an exact formulation. This is natural and necessary.⁸⁰⁴

Rahner’s reference to the Magisterium or authority of the Catholic Church points toward a higher purpose, the “search for divinely revealed reality”. For Rahner this results in a formula, not the ‘end’ of the search though. In his book *Foundations of Christian Faith*, he concludes by proffering possible alternate creeds as the natural outcome for describing new ground in theology. He writes about the need for “new basic creeds in which the Christian profession of faith is expressed in a way which corresponds to our present cultural situation”.⁸⁰⁵ Segundo does not

⁸⁰⁰ Segundo, “La fenomenología,” 13.

⁸⁰¹ Anselm, *Proslogion, With the Replies of Gaunilo and Anselm*, trans. Thomas Williams (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing, 2001), 2.

⁸⁰² Segundo, “La fenomenología,” 13.

⁸⁰³ Segundo, “La fenomenología,” 13. He could be citing Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 74. “The anthropology of Christian theology...arrives at an interpretation of that entity which we call ‘man’”. Or, he could be citing Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 494, n. vi. “In its Interpretation of ‘life’, the anthropology worked out in Christian theology...has always kept death in view”. Neither quote fits perfectly, so it is possible Segundo is quoting from another place or misquoting Heidegger.

⁸⁰⁴ Most likely from Karl Rahner’s essay “Chalcedon: End or Beginning?” redacted as “Current Problems in Christology” in *Theological Investigations Vol. 1*, p. 149.

⁸⁰⁵ Karl Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith, an introduction to the idea of Christianity*, trans. William V. Dych (New York: Crossroad, 1978), 448ff.

reference Rahner's new creeds, but these new creeds do seem to connect with Segundo's "speech that tells us the content of faith".⁸⁰⁶

Segundo references Henri Birault (1918-1990), a French philosopher who studied Heidegger. Segundo cites Birault thirteen times. Birault contributed to a book on phenomenology in 1953⁸⁰⁷ and contributed to a book about the existence of God in 1961.⁸⁰⁸ In 1978, he wrote a seminal work on Heidegger, *Heidegger et l'expérience de la pensée*.⁸⁰⁹ Returning to the theme of theology and experience, Segundo quotes Henri Birault:

The true end of Theology is the elaboration of the belief itself, not the edification of a set of theoretical proposals floating above belief and the validity of which could subsist outside belief.⁸¹⁰

This above quote from Birault connects back to Segundo's reinterpretation of Anselm's *fides quaerens intellectum* as "faith which tries to make us aware of what we implicitly believe,"⁸¹¹ or Heidegger's "conceptual self-interpretation of Christian existence".⁸¹² Birault sets forth a contradistinction between "the elaboration of belief" and "theoretical proposals floating above belief",⁸¹³ which Segundo may well associate with the contrast he draws between the ontic and the ontological, and which Heidegger draws between the existentiell and existential. The 'elaborations of belief' result from attention to the ontic or factual experience of believing, which in turn point to an ontological reality through receptivity to revelation. 'Theoretical proposals' are, by contrast, attempts to construct a philosophy of ontology.

According to Segundo, the theological theme of belief is promoting faith. The type of

⁸⁰⁶ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 13.

⁸⁰⁷ Henri Birault et al., *Phénoménologie, existence* (Paris: Colin, 1953).

⁸⁰⁸ Henri Birault, Henri Bouillard, and Stanislas Breton, *L'Existence de Dieu* (Paris: Casterman, 1961).

⁸⁰⁹ Henri Birault, *Heidegger et l'expérience de la pensée* (Paris: Gallimard, 1978).

⁸¹⁰ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 13. Cf. Birault, *Heidegger et l'expérience de la pensée*, 30.

⁸¹¹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 13.

⁸¹² Segundo, "La fenomenología," 13. Cf. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 74 and 494, n. vi.

⁸¹³ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 13. Cf. Birault, *Heidegger et l'expérience de la pensée*, 30.

faith is one that clarifies itself. Quoting Birault, he writes, "Belief is not the business of theology," but promoting faith.⁸¹⁴

According to Segundo, "Theology is rooted in the everyday religious life".⁸¹⁵ He turns his attention to the blessing brought about by heresies. Segundo does not cite Augustine, but seems to be echoing Augustine's argument:

For we can see that many matters of importance to the Catholic faith are canvassed by the feverish restlessness of heretics, and the result is that they are more carefully examined... and thus an argument aroused by an adversary turns out to be an opportunity for instruction.⁸¹⁶

As for Segundo, he writes, "The errors that have determined the most famous dogmatic formulations...have not been the only source from which they spring".⁸¹⁷ He argues that practising the Christian life means growing, what Segundo calls "tending always towards a greater perfection".⁸¹⁸ This tendency allows the possibility of two opposing views because (1) the dogmatic formulations respond to something (often a heresy) and, thus, are on going, and (2) move toward greater perfection, instead of achieving it.

At this point, he references an approach to "two opposing views", which walks "the line between truth and error",⁸¹⁹ i.e. phenomenology/existentialism give occasions for walking this line. Any and each new field of thought can be approached in such a way that two opposing views do not stand in contrast or opposition with one another, but offer complementary insights. Again, he quotes Rahner:

⁸¹⁴ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 13.

⁸¹⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 13.

⁸¹⁶ Augustine, *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*, trans. Henry Bettenson (New York: Penguin, 410/1984), 650 (Book XVI, Ch 2).

⁸¹⁷ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 13.

⁸¹⁸ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 13.

⁸¹⁹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 14.

Only in this, do historical theology and history of dogma have a real job, irreplaceable and necessary to perform in theology as such, i.e. in the dogmatic.⁸²⁰

Rahner writes, and Segundo quotes, about the idea of the roles historical theology and dogmatic theology play in the development of dogma. Neither comes from a vacuum. What has come before (i.e. historical theology) shapes present responses (Church dogma) to current problems.

By developing his argument based on historical thought, he provides evidence to refute the accusation that liberation theology learned nothing from what came before it. He also provides a key to reading his liberation theology. In his own words, he writes, "Theology, as with ontology, is practically given to us through *tradition*".⁸²¹ His theology does not make dogma foundational in itself, but allows for a phenomenological method in developing it. He writes, "We, in our present historical situation, need to ask tradition and choose according to its response".⁸²² He is arguing for applying phenomenological method to essentially historical speech, and he suggests that the phenomenological method can be used for the clarification of the Christian tradition as it is expressed in dogmatic formulas.⁸²³

In Catholic dogma, which Segundo identifies as "current theological speech", he finds two parts: (1) "the outwardly faithful repetition of an transmitted dogmatic formula", and (2) "a practical way to understand it".⁸²⁴ These are two sides of the same coin, and he does suggest that they are part of every dogmatic formulation. He finds the themes present *de término medio* (English: *in-between*).⁸²⁵ In other words,

⁸²⁰ Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations, Man in the Church*, trans. Karl Kruger, vol. 2 (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963), 151-152. Cf. Segundo, "La fenomenología," 14.

⁸²¹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 14.

⁸²² Segundo, "La fenomenología," 15.

⁸²³ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 15.

⁸²⁴ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 16.

⁸²⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 16.

both are typically present in contemporary theology. Dogma is given through tradition, but it does not stand alone. Dogma is reinterpreted anew in every generation. Segundo's argument moves toward liberation theology; it is an expression of the dogma that has come before, but the practical way of understanding it in the poverty-stricken less developed parts of the world requires a new interpretation.

Segundo continues drawing out the connection between historical theology and Church dogma. He writes, "A tradition is never totally incomprehensible, totally hidden. It is an understanding of the 'in between'".⁸²⁶ That is, if a dogmatic formulation is truly based on tradition, it will be comprehensible. If language or speech is made clear by experiences, the difference between historical dogma and contemporary theology is clearer. He writes,

Aquí surge una dificultad importante. El lenguaje teológico nos da una respuesta. Ahora bien, nosotros no tenemos, al parecer, experiencia más que de la pregunta. La fenomenología nos lleva, por el lenguaje, a la realidad experimental. Pero en este campo, la fórmula dogmática no nos lleva a la experiencia de su contenido.	Here arises an important difficulty. Theological language gives us an answer. However, we apparently do not have any experience other than the question. Phenomenology takes us, through language, to the experimental reality. But in this area, the dogmatic formula does not lead us to experience its content.⁸²⁷
--	---

The terms of phenomenology do not transfer directly to theology. Therefore, Segundo needs to make this conversion. He connects God, whom he calls "supernatural being", with existence and truth, and argues that ontology is at the same time cognitive and philosophical (existential). In order to connect his argument in this section back to theology, Segundo suggests that Christian life on a daily basis is "pre-ontological" with respect to God.

⁸²⁶ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 16.

⁸²⁷ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 17.

Heidegger writes, “Dasein has a pre-ontological Being as its ontically constitutive state”.⁸²⁸ Other commentators on Heidegger have explored his notion of pre-ontology. In *The Environment and International Politics*, Hakan Seckinelgin argues that understanding nature is dependent on transcendental ontology, or “the pre-ontological constitution of the subject in order to think in terms of metaphysics of beings”.⁸²⁹ When pre-ontology is applied in this way, it is a pre-foundational setup of the subject. For Segundo, the Christian life exists and is practiced before the participant understands God. William J. Richards writes, “When this ontological knowing is possessed but not adverted to, it is called pre-ontological”.⁸³⁰

Ontological knowledge is foundational or existential. According to Segundo, when Christians share a certain understanding of being that is between human I-Thou relations, their existential knowledge is something shared with all humanity; it is not exclusively for Christians. He suggests that when Christians share with others some understanding of supernatural being (God) that is “in between”, it allows Christians and non-Christians to implicitly agree on the content of the Christian faith in a practical way. His conclusion to the section on theology and experience is not as clear as one would hope, but it points to the universal application he seems to be trying to make. His main argument is for the existentiell Christian life and practice (before understanding God) as a theological application of Heidegger’s pre-ontology. Freedom is a pre-ontological dimension of human existence.

⁸²⁸ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 39.

⁸²⁹ Hakan Seckinelgin, *The Environment and International Politics: International fisheries, Heidegger and social method* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), 103.

⁸³⁰ William J. Richardson, *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2003), 343.

5.3.3 Revelation and existence

Segundo begins the third section by assessing the possibility of a theology based on the phenomenology of dogmatic speech. In our current situation, we are, he writes, “to ask of dogma the meaning of our concrete existence and to choose according to it”..⁸³¹ From that answer, he suggests that one can imagine the experience that made history provoke a dogmatic response. He seems to be implying Augustine’s blessing of heresy.⁸³² As time goes forward, Segundo writes, “The truth of the response was then *discovered* since the response is modeled on the specific question”..⁸³³ The questions that provoke dogmatic answers are relevant to concrete situations and are not imagined for the sake of inventing dogma. These can only unfold as time goes on; they cannot be ascertained once and forever.

Segundo’s reference to *discovering* a new truth is reminiscent of his argument in his 1978 book chapter, “Derechos humanos, evangelización e ideología”. In it, he points to the changing understanding of human rights over time as an example of variable interpretations within scriptural tradition, such as accepting slavery in one period and then denouncing it in another.⁸³⁴ Even though in the article he was addressing the way hermeneutics change over time, in this manuscript, he is making the same case for dogmatic formulations. He writes,

Pero la fenomenología que usa la filosofía, lleva a la existencia del hombre en cuanto <u>interrogador</u> del ser, mientras que aquella que usa la teología lleva a la existencia del hombre en cuanto <u>creyente</u> en el Ser.	But phenomenology that uses philosophy leads to human existence as an <u>interrogator</u> of Being, while that using theology leads to human existence as a <u>believer</u> in Being. ⁸³⁵
--	--

⁸³¹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 20.

⁸³² Augustine, *City of God*, 650 (Book XVI, Ch 2).

⁸³³ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 20.

⁸³⁴ "Puesto que solo cuando fue económicamente viable una sociedad sin esclavos fue que se descubrió la relación el Evangelio y la abolición de la esclavitud". Segundo, "Derechos," 345.

⁸³⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 20, emphasis original.

Comparing *believer* (theology) with *interrogator* (philosophy) goes along with Segundo's earlier contradistinction between existence as the poetic/affective and essence as the philosophical/cognitive in *Existencialismo*. If the only approach is philosophical, he finds that it "leaves us alone at dinner time or at the time for prayer".⁸³⁶ If it is accurate to say that Segundo tends to view philosophy negatively when taken separately from theology, as his writings (both published and unpublished) appear to suggest, his philosophy must be read in conjunction with theology. Further, for Segundo, even existential philosophy, like any philosophy, separated from theology is not useful.⁸³⁷ As he writes in *Existencialismo*, apart from faith it is has no use and leaves one cold.⁸³⁸ Theology, Christian faith, or, in this particular part of this manuscript, Church Dogma proffers a transcendent presence that does not leave one alone at dinner time, according to Segundo.

As a way of understanding his theology, the comparison of *believer* (theology) with *interrogator* (philosophy) illustrates the combination of the secular and the sacred, and the secular does not add value to human understanding of existence when used apart from the sacred. His manuscript is both a criticism of the secular as it is and an appropriation of the secular for use by the sacred. Liberation theology was criticized for misunderstanding political economics and misusing social sciences at the expense of theology,⁸³⁹ but Segundo seeks to combine theology with social sciences, philosophy and/or other fields without sacrificing dogma. Instead, he seeks to use philosophy, in this case Heidegger's phenomenology, to better understand theology (dogma).

⁸³⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 8.

⁸³⁷ This is his argument in Segundo, "EC," 3.

⁸³⁸ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 8.

⁸³⁹ E.g. A criticism of the political economics of liberation theology is Michael Novak, *Will It Liberate?: Questions About Liberation Theology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1986). A criticism of the theology of liberation theology is Berghoef and DeKoster, *Liberation Theology, The Church's Future Shock*.

Segundo writes, “For Heidegger, both philosophy and theology present a question: they query”.⁸⁴⁰ In Heidegger this act of questioning [i.e. interrogation] is the shared point of departure for theology and philosophy. In *Starting with Heidegger*, Tom Greaves writes, “Theology is significant insofar as it contains and leads one towards philosophy, but philosophy itself is not bound to theology or the life of faith”.⁸⁴¹ In other words, Greaves argues that in Heidegger theology contributes to philosophy, but is not necessary. Segundo would disagree. He would turn the phrase around: *philosophy contributes to theology, but is not necessary*. This is because for Segundo, Theology ‘believes’ in Being, while Philosophy remains with an ‘interrogation’ of Being.

Greaves and others⁸⁴² point out that for Heidegger all Western metaphysics is onto-theology, which Heidegger borrows from Kant.⁸⁴³ By onto-theology, Heidegger means conceiving of the transcendent in terms suitable only for the ontic. Segundo appropriates Heidegger’s use of grammar in order to make sense of reinterpretations of historical dogmas and evolution in dogmatic formulations. In other words, the dogma is relevant only insofar as it is still speaking to the current experience. Segundo’s argument implies future reinterpretations of dogma. He writes:

Por eso la teología es una ciencia “positiva,” y no una “ontología,” una ciencia que “supone” algo que no se discute, y no una ciencia “ontológica” que busca el “logos,” la razón de ser de todo lo que contiene.	That is why theology is a “positive” science, and not an “ontology,” a science that “supposes” something that is not discussed, and not an “ontological” science seeking the “logos,” the reason for being of everything in it. ⁸⁴⁴
--	--

⁸⁴⁰ Segundo, “La fenomenología,” 20.

⁸⁴¹ Tom Greaves, *Starting with Heidegger* (New York: Continuum, 2010), 121.

⁸⁴² E.g. Iain D. Thompson, *Heidegger on Ontotheology: Technology and the Politics of Education* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2005), esp. Ch 1.

⁸⁴³ Kant, *Critique of pure reason*, 584.

⁸⁴⁴ Segundo, “La fenomenología,” 20.

Segundo departs from Heidegger because he disagrees with Heidegger's critique of onto-theology. Segundo finds that philosophical ontology interrogates being, is in search of the 'logos', while theology begins from revelation. The distinction between ontic (what is given in experience) and ontological (foundation) returns here in the sense of contrasting ontology and theology as disciplines of knowledge (sciences); theology deals with both ontological and ontic realities, but its 'scientific' method is not to attempt to construct an ontological theory. Just as theology relates to faith in Being, not an interrogation of Being, Segundo follows the on-going process of reinterpretation, using a method instead of using a particular dogmatic formulation that is good once and for all time. This is the reason he calls theology a *positive* science; it is concerned with particularities not universal theories, and moves forward and over time reinterprets itself. He writes, "If a theological statement seems to answer a philosophical question, either one or the other has not been properly understood".⁸⁴⁵ In other words, "If a person asks God in theology about the meaning of his or her existence and how to grasp it, and if God has already answered this question by Revelation, theology will have the following three characteristics".⁸⁴⁶ He then returns to Birault, whom he seems to be quoting:

1. "Faith is an existential mode of human and historical existence, a way in which and through which a story reveals itself to us which we become participants".⁸⁴⁷
2. "The real purpose of theology is the development of belief itself, and not the edification of a set of theoretic proposals floating above belief and the validity of which may exist outside of belief".⁸⁴⁸

⁸⁴⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 21.

⁸⁴⁶ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 21.

⁸⁴⁷ Henri Birault quoted in Segundo, "La fenomenología," 21.

3. "Belief in itself is that new life, granted by the grace of God, participation, in and through faith, in this story of Revelation that can never be grasped outside of faith".⁸⁴⁹

On the first point, "faith is an existential mode of human existence...", each person's life is a story. Thus, experience connotes a narrative in which revelation plays a part, but the person analysing the story cannot step outside of it in order to comment on what is happening. The story continues, and if life is a story, commenting on the story becomes part of the story. In logic, the previous sentence sounds a bit like a Wittgensteinian tautology,⁸⁵⁰ Segundo's point is that humanity constantly and unavoidably participates in experience and revelation.

Segundo summarizes the second point: "You can only capture the whole truth of a dogmatic formula from its involvement with existence".⁸⁵¹ His emphasis of "elaboration" over "edification of a set of theoretical proposals floating above belief"⁸⁵² reinforces his argument for methodology over doctrine. Theology engages with existence and elaborates on it. It does not educate about static doctrines.

The third point, relating belief to revelation, connects both to the life of faith. He makes the point that neither belief nor revelation can truly be understood or appreciated apart from faith. According to Segundo, to the person who is outside the Church (or outside a life of faith), the speculative nature of revelation or belief would not necessarily make sense. He writes, "Therefore, in Revelation there is a constant and fundamental reference to natural and simple human existence".⁸⁵³ That is,

⁸⁴⁸ Henri Birault quoted in Segundo, "La fenomenología," 21.

⁸⁴⁹ Henri Birault quoted in Segundo, "La fenomenología," 21.

⁸⁵⁰ Cf. e.g. Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus* (New York: Harcourt, 1922), 99.

⁸⁵¹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 21.

⁸⁵² Henri Birault quoted in Segundo, "La fenomenología," 21.

⁸⁵³ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 23.

echoing Matthew 7:7, "...seek and you shall find," he argues that revelation is part of human existence.

Segundo clarifies how he distinguishes between his negative-sounding view of philosophy and how philosophy can be useful. He writes, "Phenomenology is a cognitive operation like feeling or deduction. Existentiell analysis is not something one can affirm or deny depending whether one belongs to realism, idealism or materialism".⁸⁵⁴ For Segundo, phenomenology is properly understood as existentiell analysis, not a philosophical system. His statement reiterates his argument in *Existencialismo* about the contradistinction between what is poetic and what is philosophical. Existentiell analysis is affective. His examples (realism, idealism and materialism) are philosophical or part of social science and represent something closer to Sartre's account of essence. He equates Heidegger's phenomenology with existentiell analysis and suggests that the methodological categories of Heidegger's phenomenology and the fundamental results of this method be accepted in theology. He writes, "But nobody ever thought, even Bultmann, of taking everything Heidegger says at face value", and he adds, "Phenomenology is a field of discovery, not a set of propositions".⁸⁵⁵

Segundo alludes to Heidegger unduly emphasizing something to the point that "no one recognizes him" and then points to "Jaspers' criticism" that Heidegger's "desperate awareness" is not a universal experience but only the way some people experience the human condition.⁸⁵⁶ In *General Psychopathology*, Jaspers was critical of Heidegger for failing to clarify his methodology or achieve what is promised in

⁸⁵⁴ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 24.

⁸⁵⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 25.

⁸⁵⁶ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 25.

it.⁸⁵⁷ To respond to the objection from Jaspers, Segundo quotes Léopold Malevez, who was one of his teachers at Egenhoven:

Without doubt, this objection is well founded, we believe (i.e. not everything is recognized in the analysis of Heideggerian existence), but it is not against the application of an indefinite existential interpretation (the phenomenology described by Heidegger, but not performed by him); even if it turns out that Bultmann erred in relying on the power of an existential interpretation of the message [kerygma], on the Heideggerian analytic. There is still, after that, a question of whether or not it was allowed to require the assistance of an existential analytic; moreover, in a universally valid principle, the conclusions disown Heideggerian nihilism.⁸⁵⁸

Heidegger's emphasis on elements of anxiety has, according to Malevez, led him to a philosophy that Christians cannot adopt, but Malevez and Segundo agree with the application (i.e. of method) of Heidegger's phenomenology, which Segundo equates to *existentiell* (*existencial*) analysis. However, both Malevez and Segundo do not see Heidegger as having achieved this analysis. In fact, they both seem to agree with Jaspers' criticism in *General Psychopathology*. The process (*existentiell* analysis, according to Segundo, and phenomenology, for Heidegger) can be applied to theology and, for Segundo, the process adds to theological discourse. For someone like Segundo, who favours methodology (or process) over static doctrine, Malevez's reading of Heidegger would resonate with his wider goal.

In *Teología de la liberación* (1985), Segundo attributes his liberation theology to the influence of Malevez. He writes, "On the intellectual and theological level, what I have always understood as my own 'theology of liberation' began with [Malevez]--a theology that spoke once again when I returned to Latin America".⁸⁵⁹ Malevez taught

⁸⁵⁷ Karl Jaspers, *General Psychopathology*, trans. J. Hoenig and Marian W. Hamilton (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1997), 778.

⁸⁵⁸ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 25, underlining original. Cf. Léopold Malevez, *The Christian Message and Myth: The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann*, trans. Olive Wyon (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1958), 43.

⁸⁵⁹ Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*, 99. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*, 75.

Segundo about the role of the second Council of Orange (529) in the conflict between Augustine and Pelagius. Segundo attributes Malevez with using historical reasons to argue that “the ‘preparation of faith’ was not reduced to the situation in which a person begins to feel attracted by faith and acts accordingly...gradually learning about Christianity”.⁸⁶⁰ Segundo writes that Malevez anticipated Karl Rahner’s idea of the ‘supernatural existential’, although Segundo provides a caveat about Rahner not accepting Malevez’s “preparation of faith” at that time.⁸⁶¹

In “La fenomenología”, Segundo cites Malevez to support his argument about the usefulness of engaging with Heidegger. Returning to Jaspers’ objection that Heidegger’s “desperate awareness” is not a universal experience but only the way some people experience the human condition, Segundo clarifies what he means and what he understands Malevez to be supporting. He writes that Christian philosophy implies a “transcendental philosophy, a system that goes beyond experience, to establish God or a path leading to God”.⁸⁶² To an imagined interlocutor who concludes: *phenomenology is not a system of Christian philosophy*, Segundo responds, “Well of course not! Nor is it math or geography”.⁸⁶³ For him, phenomenology can enter Christian philosophy as an analytical tool.

In this section of the manuscript, Segundo attempts to show how phenomenology applies to theology, connecting the existential with the existentiell. He intends the connection to not simply be an historical exegesis of Catholic dogmatic theology, but as a fundamental ontology, or phenomenology as the foundation for theology. He refers to this as the “contents of faith, as communicating the truth of the supernatural” and this puts humanity into a relationship with

⁸⁶⁰ Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*, 99. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*, 76.

⁸⁶¹ Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*, 100, n. 34. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*, 166 n. 28.

⁸⁶² Segundo, “La fenomenología,” 26.

⁸⁶³ Segundo, “La fenomenología,” 26.

natural existence; he writes, "Philosophical phenomenology, addressing natural human existence formed the basis for understanding the revealed message sent".⁸⁶⁴ The message sent is, as he concludes, the basis of truth (*alétheia*) and effectively transmits the substance of faith in which God is revealed.

The last part of the "Revelation and Existence" section of "La fenomenología" is concerned with objections to using Bultmann's account of Christ, on the basis that he has employed Heidegger's phenomenology.⁸⁶⁵ This is close to Segundo's argument in *El hombre 2.1*.⁸⁶⁶ In *El hombre 2.1*, he compares Heidegger's results with the parallel existentiell analysis ("análisis existenciales") of Sartre and Jaspers.⁸⁶⁷ He also includes the difference between Heidegger's *existenzial* or "existential categories" (Spanish: "*categorías existenciales*") and *existenziell* or *existentiell* (Spanish: *existencial*) analysis of experience.⁸⁶⁸ In the manuscript "La fenomenología", Segundo treats Heidegger more in his own right than merely as a source for Bultmann.

5.3.4 Scripture

The penultimate section in the manuscript is the shortest. This section concerns the final point he had proposed to deal with when he had suggested distinguishing dogmatic theology from its source, revelation. That is, he focuses on God's revelation as evident (or revealed) through scripture, and recall that he views phenomenology as a tool of exegesis, specifically exegesis of speech. Echoing a

⁸⁶⁴ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 26.

⁸⁶⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 24-26.

⁸⁶⁶ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 54-58. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 32-36.

⁸⁶⁷ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 58. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 36.

⁸⁶⁸ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 62. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 38.

Barthian view of scripture,⁸⁶⁹ Segundo views the Bible as not mere writing but God's revelation, and he sees it as continuing to speak to the problems and issues arising in each new generation. The phenomenological approach is a tool for addressing the problems in each new generation.

In this section of the manuscript, Segundo carries his argument forward using scripture as a test case. He writes, "Revelation is the same as Inspiration".⁸⁷⁰ Then, he argues that God's revelation cannot be viewed as primarily directed to the writer(s) of scripture, but to the community of faith. The Bible's authors then recorded revelation as experienced by the community of faith. For Segundo, the sequence of God speaking to humanity goes from revelation (first) to inspiration (second), even though he already wrote that they are the same in terms of being equally important, not equivalent. Occurring in sequence (revelation then inspiration) does not prioritize one over the other. He identifies revelation as *su fieri* (*to become*).⁸⁷¹ That is, revelation *becomes* inspiration. From inspiration, he turns to the infallibility of the Church. He writes:

La medida en que diversos elementos que componen la Iglesia participan de esa infalibilidad, es la medida en que pueden de una manera real, "ontológica," <u>representar</u> la Iglesia. O sea en la medida en que están unidos más o menos indefectiblemente a esa fe viviente en la comunidad.	The extent to which various elements of the Church share in that infallibility is the extent to which they can in a real way, "ontologically," <u>represent</u> the Church. So, to that extent, they are united more or less inevitably to that faith living in the community. ⁸⁷²
--	---

The Church is represented by the way it embodies inspiration as a product of revelation. Segundo sees the Church "illuminated by the truth that is its life" and,

⁸⁶⁹ E.g. Karl Barth, *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, ed. G. W. Bromiley and Thomas F. Torrance, trans. G. W. Bromiley, vol. I/2, Church Dogmatics (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2010), 671. Barth writes, "Scripture is not mere writing but in its written character is Spirit and life".

⁸⁷⁰ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 27.

⁸⁷¹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 27.

⁸⁷² Segundo, "La fenomenología," 28.

“Thus, the Pope, who represents the whole Church by a special charism of God, has his own infallibility”.⁸⁷³ However, he does not connect infallibility with omniscience and is critical of literal views of scripture, calling them “something like a class in which the Lord dictates his doctrine”.⁸⁷⁴ Literal readings view scripture as making the essence of understanding God apparent, but he views scripture as a narrative in which, he writes, “The story itself is the vehicle of truth”.⁸⁷⁵ Thus, the story can reflect human experience and point toward the essence.

As Segundo has already argued, the progression goes from God to the community of faith and the writers within the community who bear witness to revelation from God. He writes, “Inspiration is not a sporadic activity of God that illuminates humanity here and there to make them tell the truth. It is a movement, a journey, an education that God gives to his people and the stages of which are written in ‘inspired’ books as a testimony of that faith”.⁸⁷⁶ Scripture points to revelation.

5.3.5 Speech and existence

In the final section, Segundo borrows and appropriates from Heidegger, but adds little to what he has already written. He writes:

La Escritura toda entera es un <u>habla</u> , <u>destinada a la fe</u> , cuya <u>verdad absoluta</u> está garantida por Dios. En este sentido, ella es <u>totalmente</u> verdadera, en sus detalles como en sus grandes líneas, cualquiera que sea el tema que trate, porque toda ella está destinada a la fe. Imposible dividir en ella lo esencial como verdadero y lo accidental como	The Scripture in its entirety is <u>speech</u> , <u>destined to faith</u> , whose <u>absolute truth</u> is guaranteed by God. In this sense, it is <u>absolutely</u> true in its details and in broad lines, whatever the subject matter, because it is all destined for faith. It is impossible to divide the essential as true and the accidental as indifferent. The entire Bible is the
--	---

⁸⁷³ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 28.

⁸⁷⁴ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 28.

⁸⁷⁵ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 29.

⁸⁷⁶ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 29.

indiferente. Toda la Biblia es el testimonio de la fe, y esa fe es verdad, y verdad absoluta.	witness of faith and that faith is truth, absolute truth. ⁸⁷⁷
---	--

In the above quote, Segundo combines a fundamental truth of scripture with his argument about revelation, inspiration and interpretation. Breaking the pieces apart is not only fruitless, it is impossible. He writes, "The truth...is not presented to us in an absolute state, but through speech".⁸⁷⁸ Thus, he returns to the beginning in the manuscript--i.e. existential analysis of speech. All of the time he spent writing about inspiration and story relates back to grammar and speech. Within speech, there is meaning that is hidden and must be discovered. Discovering this meaning is the task of hermeneutics, but separating meaning from within speech is impossible because speech and meaning are so closely intertwined.

When put within a particular context, whether a biblical scene or contemporary systemic oppression, there is a person or a community. Within the community, people communicate using inherited phrases and sentences. In *El Hombre 2.1*, he writes, "Knowledge of a given language serves as a vehicle for a certain way of seeing things, of perceiving reality".⁸⁷⁹ The kind of analysis of communication he describes in "La fenomenología" leads to two truths: *quae* and *qua*. The first, as in *fide quae*, is belief in the message itself. The second, *fides qua*, is the faith as it is exercised. Segundo writes, "The two truths are expressed by the same means: phrases, sentences, assertions".⁸⁸⁰ He goes on to distinguish between the forms of faith, but adds little to his argument or a wider understanding of faith. He writes:

⁸⁷⁷ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 29.

⁸⁷⁸ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 30.

⁸⁷⁹ Segundo, *El hombre 2.1*, 55. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 33.

⁸⁸⁰ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 30.

Esto nos lleva a la conclusión siguiente: cuanto mejor conozco yo el pasado y el presente del interlocutor, tanto mejor puedo comprender el contenido del mensaje que se le hace. Si ese conocimiento llegara a la identificación, y comprendería como él, es decir de la mejor manera posible.	This leads to the following conclusion: the better I know the past and present of the interlocutor, the better I can understand the content of his or her message. If this knowledge were to be identified and understood as itself; i.e. the best way possible. ⁸⁸¹
---	---

According to Segundo, revelation in the Bible is only possible by understanding the present and past of the community that receives the message. In order to understand *what is given* (in the ontic sphere of life) as revelation from God, one must understand the past and present of the particular community to which this revelation has been given. By suggesting a “best way possible”, he is also invoking his earlier idea of “in-between”. In other words, moving closer to getting to know the ontological (the existential) requires engagement with the past and present of a community and exploration of the ontic (existentiell).

Segundo then summarizes his entire argument:

a) <u>toda frase, afirmación, juicio, forma parte de un mensaje totalmente verdadero, da testimonio de una verdad inmutable y absoluta.</u> b) <u>ninguna</u> frase, afirmación o juicio, tomado <u>a parte del conjunto, pasado, presente y futuro</u> de esa revelación homogénea en su desarrollo histórico c) esta identificación sólo es posible teniendo en cuenta todo <u>el pasado, presente y futuro</u> de esa revelación homogénea en su desarrollo histórico d) esto explica cómo <u>la mere escritura, sin la tradición</u> que continúa desde el interior esa evolución homogénea del mensaje, no podría constituir ningún criterio capaz de hacernos reconocer la verdad absoluta en nuestro presente	a) <u>Any sentence, statement, or opinion is part of an entirely true message bearing witness to an immutable and absolute truth.</u> b) <u>No</u> sentence, statement or opinion [is] made <u>aside from the whole, past, present and future</u> of this homogenous revelation in its historical development c) This identification is only possible taking into account all <u>past, present and future</u> of that homogenous revelation in its historical development d) This explains how <u>mere writing, without the tradition</u> that continues this homogenous evolution of the message from <u>within</u> , could not establish any criteria that can make us acknowledge the truth in our present ⁸⁸²
---	---

⁸⁸¹ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 30-31.

⁸⁸² Segundo, "La fenomenología," 31, underlining original.

This summary builds on several principles. First, he views the message as true. Second, the message is homogenous, in which the present message relies upon a tradition of Christian experience. Third, it is timeless. And, fourth, the writing does not supersede the message. Segundo affirms that God is still speaking and continuing to work in the world. He writes, "When we say that Revelation ends with Christ, we mean that any further development... shall be made explicit... a new plan of knowledge of absolute truth".⁸⁸³ He affirms the New Testament as the New Covenant and concludes the manuscript with the following:

Al decir que el depósito de la Revelación se cierra con los testigos que presenciaron la vida, muerte y resurrección de Cristo, no se quiere establecer un abismo entre la edad apostólica y la siguiente, sino una diferencia con respecto al Antiguo Testamento, a la Antigua Alianza, cuyo destino era 231efiniti el acontecimiento. La Alianza 231efinitive no prepara nada: ella es el coronamiento, la consagración en la verdad.	Saying that the deposit of Revelation ends with eyewitnesses to the life, death and resurrection of Christ is not to establish a gap between one apostolic age and the next, but a difference from the Old Testament, the Old Covenant, whose destiny was to prepare for the event. The final Covenant does not prepare anything definitive: it is the coronation, the consecration in truth. ⁸⁸⁴
---	--

Returning to his basis for engaging with Heidegger, Segundo has satisfactorily demonstrated that his definition and use of Heidegger's phenomenology does not exclude theology. When phenomenology excludes anything transcendent, it stands in opposition to theology, but if used as a method, it can be applied to theology. Heidegger compares the theological (concerned with the object) with the phenomenological (concerned with the method), and this is where Segundo takes the argument and applies it as a method for use in theology. His own application of this method is evident in *El hombre 2.1* and *2.1*. in the way he interprets scripture.

⁸⁸³ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 31-32.

⁸⁸⁴ Segundo, "La fenomenología," 32.

Segundo can then conclude that it is possible to adapt the phenomenological method to studying the empirical material of experience from which theology constructs a content.

5.4 *Mature argument in Dogma (1989)*

In *Dogma* (1989), Segundo addresses the same questions of the manuscript: *How does God speak? Or, rather, how does humanity understand God?* His conclusion in *Dogma* emphasizes method or process over dogma or data to be learned. He writes, “Divine revelation is not a deposit of true information, but *true pedagogy*”.⁸⁸⁵ He identifies liberation theology as having an attachment to faith, but faith occurs in between revelation and reading the signs of the times.⁸⁸⁶ Taking the argument Segundo builds in the manuscript using Heidegger’s phenomenology, the published thoughts of *Dogma* demonstrate that the manuscript does not represent an outlier to Segundo’s thought, and it shows one of the major influences in developing this dimension of his liberation theology. Instead of basing it in social analysis, Segundo has an existential dimension that is, at least from the manuscript, informed by Heidegger.⁸⁸⁷ And, taken in conjunction with his engagement with Berdyaev, Sartre, and Camus, Segundo reads Heidegger as an existentialist, even though he relates to Heidegger’s phenomenology, which he calls “*existentiell analysis*”.⁸⁸⁸

Dogma is the first book of Segundo’s mature period of writing, dating from its publication until his death in 1996. This period is marked by longer, denser books than the shorter books in his multi-volume series, although his earlier works could

⁸⁸⁵ Segundo, *Dogma*, 373. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 245.

⁸⁸⁶ Segundo, *Dogma*, 364. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 238.

⁸⁸⁷ Daniel Shipani credits Segundo with integrating sociological analysis into liberation theology. Daniel S. Shipani, *Freedom and Discipleship: Liberation Theology in an Anabaptist Perspective* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1989), 39.

⁸⁸⁸ Segundo, “La fenomenología,” 5, 25.

hardly be called consistently short or light.⁸⁸⁹ However, it is not the length that marks his mature period, but the development of his thought. Liberation theology concurrently experienced maturation. Books like *Dogma* explore foundational questions of Christian faith. Perhaps because it is less polemical (i.e. no explicit attack on rich nations), readers who were receptive to liberation theology missed Segundo's point: exploring the nature of Church dogma and how it comes to be.

Revelation for Segundo is communication from God, and he explores the nature of revelation in both the manuscript "La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología" and *Dogma*. In the latter, he writes, "God has determined to communicate certain truths concerning God and the human being. And always *all the time and both at once*".⁸⁹⁰ If so, one might ask, *how does God communicate?* Segundo revisits the ideas of divine communication from the manuscript and suggests that the "word of God" in revelation must be given in a language of human beings. This leads him to place two logical conditions on divine communications.

(1) Using Gregory Bateson's language,⁸⁹¹ Segundo suggests that what is communicated must convey a "difference that makes a difference".⁸⁹²

(2) "If the transmitted difference of revelation does not make any difference in the recipient, nothing has been communicated".⁸⁹³

Segundo points to the thermostat as an example. When the temperature changes, i.e. revelation happens, no revelation is communicated until the thermostat "understands" what has been transmitted and turns on the furnace. "Only then is

⁸⁸⁹ E.g. Segundo, *Berdiaeff*. His published thesis is over 400 pages.

⁸⁹⁰ Segundo, *Dogma*, 365. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 239.

⁸⁹¹ Segundo cites Gregory Bateson, *Pasos hacia una ecología de la mente* (Buenos Aires: Carlos Lohlé, 1972), 487ff. Cf. Gregory Bateson, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 315ff.

⁸⁹² Segundo, *Dogma*, 365. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 239.

⁸⁹³ Segundo, *Dogma*, 365. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 239.

there true ‘communication’: when there is a difference that makes or produces a difference”.⁸⁹⁴ He goes on to return to the contradistinction between the cognitive and the affective. Life, he argues, is a “wager” because no one knows the outcome of a choice (e.g. career, marriage, etc.), but people make choices (enter the wager) based on the affective, not necessarily the cognitive. Likewise, it might seem that “God reveals, and we, faced with this revelation...decide whether or not to accept it,” but the reverse is the case. He writes, “Human beings *understand only what affects them*...Faith is an *active*, indispensable part of revelation itself”.⁸⁹⁵

As Segundo connects faith to community (Church and its reading of the signs of the times), he returns to questions about the Bible. For example, if the New Testament endorses monogamy, but the Old Testament allows for polygamy, which one is right? Segundo suggests that people cannot keep thinking of revelation as a list of questions and answers that provide a timeless Christian doctrine. He writes, “God seems concerned not that the divine ‘revelation’ be true in itself...but that it ‘becomes’ true in the humanization of the human being... God speaks only to those who seek, and gives them no recipes, but rather guides them in their searching”.⁸⁹⁶ He is invoking Matthew 7:7 as part of this process.

For Segundo, God’s revelation is not a “deposit of information, but a *true pedagogy*”.⁸⁹⁷ The existential grammar he picks up from Heidegger is a tool that allows the Christian to learn to learn and emphasizes method over dogma, but the method is significant in itself. For Segundo, the difference between meaning and usage of a biblical text is clear in variable biblical interpretations over time, such as, as mentioned above, accepting slavery in one century and then denouncing it in

⁸⁹⁴ Segundo, *Dogma*, 367. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 240.

⁸⁹⁵ Segundo, *Dogma*, 370. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 242.

⁸⁹⁶ Segundo, *Dogma*, 373. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 245.

⁸⁹⁷ Segundo, *Dogma*, 373. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 245.

another.⁸⁹⁸ His understanding of method is what allows for interpretation to progress, what he finds to be closer to God's will for humanity. The example of denouncing slavery is a concrete manifestation of contemporary liberation theology (i.e. a person who was captive is set free or liberated).

As Segundo wrote in *Existencialismo*, "The word has a close relationship with the essence of things".⁸⁹⁹ Words connote meaning and lean toward the cognitive, unlike existential method that leans toward the existential/affective. In Heidegger, Segundo finds a method for drawing a richer meaning from words in relation to a particular context by noticing what does not immediately appear through close attention to what does appear. It adds to his pedagogy argument in *Dogma*. In the example of slavery above, liberation theology is dependent on relating words to existence and context, e.g. a particular time and place, and when words are understood, they can be better used toward a liberating end, like setting the captives free (Exodus 5:1, Luke 4:18, and so on). In this manner, Segundo continues developing the existential and affective themes first introduced in his 1948 work.

⁸⁹⁸ Segundo, "Derechos," 345.

⁸⁹⁹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 79-80.

6 Existentialism in *Liberación de la teología*

Up to this point, my project has had two primary foci. First, I have highlighted the significant existential dimension of Juan Luis Segundo's liberation theology, and the influences behind it. Second, I have presented several previously unknown or little used sources, using these sources alongside his better-known works to emphasize the first point. In this chapter, I turn my attention to Segundo's most significant work: *Liberación de la teología* (1975), translated into English as *The Liberation of Theology* (1976).⁹⁰⁰ The book is based on a course he taught at Harvard Divinity School in the spring of 1974, and he is best known for *LT*.⁹⁰¹ Because of its popularity and wider importance for theology in general, any investigation into Segundo's thought would be incomplete without addressing this book. Therefore, *LT* will be the primary source for this chapter and supports the earlier two foci. While continuing to highlight the existential dimension of Segundo's theology, it will also situate his theology firmly within the wider topic of liberation theology. Segundo's liberation theology is theology done in the consciousness that it is always inseparably connected with ideologies in the social situation.

The basic premise of *LT* is the way people *do theology*. Segundo argues that theology needs to be liberated, and he presents his case for the liberation of theology and an approach for achieving his vision of liberation. His approach involves a method--the hermeneutic circle--and a context. The way he approaches a context is one of the reasons his theology is considered liberation theology and it is based on the premise that the world should not be the way it is.⁹⁰² His argument can be

⁹⁰⁰ Segundo, *LT*. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*.

⁹⁰¹ This claim is based on the number of citations of *LT* in sources, including JSTOR and ProQuest.

⁹⁰² Summarized in Robert McAfee Brown, *Gustavo Gutiérrez, An Introduction to Liberation Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1990), 51. This theme is present throughout Segundo's works. E.g. Segundo, *Nuestra Idea de Dios*, 35. Cf. Segundo, *Our Idea of God*, 27. Juan Luis Segundo, "Conversión y

summarized as follows: Jesus was concerned with human liberation, the Church can liberate people, grace is both supernatural and natural, and there is a connection between the past and present.⁹⁰³

Paul Ricoeur, Segundo's dissertation supervisor, summarizes Rudolph Bultmann's original idea of a hermeneutic circle: "To understand, it is necessary to believe; to believe, it is necessary to understand".⁹⁰⁴ Segundo follows Ricoeur and adapts Bultmann's idea to his own hermeneutic circle with four steps:

- (1) ideological suspicion
- (2) the application of our ideological suspicion to the whole ideological superstructure in general and to theology in particular
- (3) new way of experiencing theological reality leading to exegetical suspicion
- (4) new hermeneutic.⁹⁰⁵

Segundo's hermeneutic circle is unique because of the connection with the ideologies in the social situation, which connects the present with the past. His hermeneutic circle is an illustrative example from *LT* of his tacit connection to existentialism. He suggests that ideologies precede commitment. That is, the kind of commitment--to the future, to human change, to the word of God--that Bultmann is talking about is always in the context of a pre-existing ideology. This ideology is itself actually a commitment to certain forms of human existence.

reconciliación en la perspectiva moderna de la teología de la liberación," *Cristianismo y Sociedad* 13(1975). Cf. Segundo, *Signs of the Times*, 37-52.

⁹⁰³ Segundo, *LT*, 7, 12. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 3, 8.

⁹⁰⁴ Paul Ricoeur, *Conflict of Interpretations* (London: Continuum, 2004), 385.

⁹⁰⁵ Segundo, *LT*, ch. 1. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, ch. 1.

As we shall see, later in this chapter, I shall propose that both ideology and commitment precede theology or understanding. He writes, “To understand the word of God addressed to human beings, Bultmann feels one must begin by understanding one’s own existence”.⁹⁰⁶ Bultmann is a proponent of interpreting the New Testament in existentialist terms,⁹⁰⁷ and he is often discussed in existentialist terms.⁹⁰⁸ Segundo’s appeal to Bultmann fits into his discussion of ideology because interpreting culture in existential terms highlights a continuing connection between the past and the present. The present kerygma is connected to a past (first-century) understanding of Christian existence,⁹⁰⁹ and ideology is always produced by something that comes before.

Segundo borrowed existential grammar from Heidegger.⁹¹⁰ He acknowledges his own use of Heideggerian grammar in *LT*,⁹¹¹ but goes beyond Bultmann and Heidegger. He takes existential themes and applies them to theology in order to liberate theology from some of the constraints that developed within positions of power and authority, i.e. academia within developed countries. His goal, as stated in the introduction, is to examine the method of liberation theology, not the content itself. By taking a critical look at its method, thus Segundo contributes to the maturation of liberation theology in *LT*.

⁹⁰⁶ Segundo, *LT*, 112. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 98.

⁹⁰⁷ Rudolf Bultmann, *New Testament and Mythology and Other Basic Writings*, trans. Schubert M. Ogden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 1-44, esp. 14-15.

⁹⁰⁸ E.g. John Macquarrie lists Bultmann as an existentialist interpreter of the Bible in Bultmann, *New Testament and Mythology*, 1-44, esp. 14-15. More explicit claims about Bultmann’s existentialism can be found in John Macquarrie, *Existentialism* (New York: Penguin, 1972), esp. ch. 2. Norman Perrin, *The New Testament, An Introduction: Proclamation and Parenthesis, Myth and History* (New York: Harcourt, 1974), 22. Nels Frederick Solomon Ferré, *Searchlights on Contemporary Theology* (New York: Harper, 1961), 106. However, some authors do not mention Bultmann when discussing existentialism in general. E.g. There is no mention of Bultmann in Barrett, *What is existentialism?*

⁹⁰⁹ Bultmann, *New Testament and Mythology*, 45-68, esp. 62.

⁹¹⁰ Discussed in chapter 5 above, using Segundo, “La fenomenología”.

⁹¹¹ Segundo writes, “In order to attain the existential authenticity and profundity required to gain an ever deeper understanding of the word of God, Bultmann proposed to base his methodology on the existential analysis of Heidegger”. Segundo, *LT*, 112. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 98.

Although scholars have widely engaged with *LT*, they mostly focus on the methodology of liberation theology or a capitalism versus socialism debate. The latter is usually couched in either/or terms and misses Segundo's somewhat unique definitions. For example, Dennis McCann recognizes the significance of Segundo's self-examination in *LT*, but he misses key elements, especially the role of faith and ideology.⁹¹² James Olthuis appreciates Segundo's approach as "one of the most sophisticated accounts of a liberationist way of doing theology",⁹¹³ whereas George Hunsinger sees it as the "inflation of the human deed" and misinterprets Segundo's broad definition of ideology.⁹¹⁴ He commends Richard Neuhaus for noting a disturbing trend in liberation theology,⁹¹⁵ although he does not condemn *LT*.⁹¹⁶ The reviewers often have widely varying assessments.⁹¹⁷ Some reviewers speak well of liberation theology and Segundo, like Olthuis, whereas others are highly critical of it.⁹¹⁸

The most extensive commentary on Segundo's thought is by Alfred Hennelly.⁹¹⁹ He focuses an entire chapter on *LT*, in which he treats Segundo's hermeneutic circle as a dynamic theological process and considers the challenge it poses to traditional theology. Hennelly writes, "The partiality of a commitment to

⁹¹² Dennis P. McCann, "Review of 'The Liberation of Theology'," *Religious Studies Review* 3, no. 2 (1977): 98, 100.

⁹¹³ James H. Olthuis, "Evolutionary dialectics and Segundo's Liberation of theology," *Calvin Theological Journal* 21(1986): 80.

⁹¹⁴ George Hunsinger, *Disruptive Grace: Studies in the Theology of Karl Barth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 56.

⁹¹⁵ E.g. Neuhaus credits the influence of liberation theology in North America with the publishing effort of Orbis Books. Richard John Neuhaus, *The Catholic Moment: The Paradox of the Church in the Postmodern World* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 172.

⁹¹⁶ Hunsinger, *Disruptive Grace*, 56.

⁹¹⁷ One extreme is harsh: Berghoef and DeKoster, *Liberation Theology, The Church's Future Shock*. E.g. The other end of the spectrum is receptive: E.g. Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, ed. David N. Freedman, The Anchor Bible Reference Library (New York: Doubleday, 1997).

⁹¹⁸ E.g. Michael Novak reads Segundo as presenting an either/or option between capitalism and socialism in Novak, *Will It Liberate?*, 16-32, esp. 26. To support his argument, Novak cites Juan Luis Segundo, "Capitalismo - socialismo: crux teológica," *Concilium* 96(1974).

⁹¹⁹ Alfred T. Hennelly, *Theologies in Conflict: the challenge of Juan Luis Segundo* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1979).

the oppressed functions as a 'social preunderstanding' for the interrogation of biblical texts, thus achieving a much broader perspective than Bultmann's existential preunderstanding had attained previously".⁹²⁰ However, even though Hennelly adds good insight to Segundo-studies, he does not identify the influence of Bultmann's existentialism or the existential dimension of Segundo's liberation theology. In the two places he mentions existentialism, he juxtaposes it with Marxism,⁹²¹ which Segundo does not do.

LT moves from a first step (commitment to an ideology) to a second step (theology), which has political connotations, and Segundo connects faith and ideology because faith is required in order to accept a system of ideas. In other words, a person cannot consider all options and then make a decision. People make non-empirical choices with the presumption that these choices will lead to happiness or satisfaction. *LT* applies the faith/ideology connection to theology and the way people talk about God in specific situations.

6.1 *Dead corpse or living organism?*

Theology, for Segundo, is dynamic. It is alive and continues to form. In the conclusion of *LT*, he does not wrap up his argument in a demonstrative way. Instead, in an almost timorous tone, he titles the one-page section "General Conclusions?" in which he deliberately includes a question mark. He writes, "My aim in this volume has not been to dissect a dead corpse but to examine a living organism known as theology".⁹²² This contradistinction between a dead and living organism represents the living, flexible, and ever-adapting nature of theology for Segundo. He does not

⁹²⁰ Alfred T. Hennelly, "The Challenge of Juan Luis Segundo," *Theological Studies* 38 (1977).

⁹²¹ Hennelly, *Theologies in Conflict*, 61, 63.

⁹²² Segundo, *LT*, 267. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 241.

look at theological conclusions, even the conclusion to his own book, as complete. They are still in-progress and open to change and adapt to future circumstances.

In the first pages of *LT*, Segundo points out that liberation theology is a point of no return for Latin Americans. The reason it is a point of no return is the development of a new hermeneutic in its methodology. Liberation theology presents a new way of approaching God, and once the laity and clergy begin to understand God in a new way (e.g. through reading or applying scripture in a new way), it is impossible to go back to an earlier method because there is no way to forget the idea of human liberation, especially when it relates to the existential situation in a particular time and place. Segundo writes, "Liberation theology is an irreversible thrust in the Christian process of creating a new consciousness and maturity in our faith".⁹²³ He presents liberation theology as a viable and appropriate step in theological development and sees it as a process that is varied and will continue to develop. As a step, liberation theology challenges theological discourse. Even one of his critics, Richard Neuhaus, brings Segundo's argument into conversation with Reinhold Niebuhr's Christian realism.⁹²⁴ Although Neuhaus would disagree with Segundo's conclusions, he would agree with Segundo that that as a process liberation theology has changed and adapted over time.⁹²⁵

In *LT*, Segundo identifies four characteristics that he understands to be shared throughout liberation theology: (1) Jesus was concerned with an integral human liberation, not just individual salvation. (2) The Church contains liberating

⁹²³ Segundo, *LT*, 7. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 3.

⁹²⁴ Neuhaus, *The Catholic Moment*, 225.

⁹²⁵ Compare the feminist approach of Ruether with Marc Ellis' Jewish liberation theology: Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Liberation Theology: Human Hope Confronts Christian History and American Power* (New York: Paulist Press, 1972). Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1983). Marc H. Ellis, *Toward a Jewish Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987). Interestingly, Ruether provides a supportive blurb on the back cover of Ellis' book.

features in its faith and liturgy, not salvific magic. (3) There is one grace and order throughout history. Grace operates in both supernatural and natural spheres, and it gives humanity the means by which they can experience grace and rise to a supernatural level.⁹²⁶ (4) Liberation theology is characterized by theology done in consciousness that is always connected to ideologies in the social situation and, thus, forming a “connection between the past and present”.⁹²⁷

There remains a dilemma between basic, shared characteristics of liberation theology and recognizing the uniqueness of various so-called liberation theologians. Although various liberation theologies *do* share some characteristics, there are differences between liberation theologians. Sometimes these differences are quite large.⁹²⁸ Instead of arguing for *either* shared characteristics *or* distinctions amongst liberation theologians, we should observe that there are *both* shared characteristics *and* distinctions amongst all liberation theologians.⁹²⁹

Segundo's first characteristic, Jesus is concerned with human liberation, is widely shared by liberation theologians. For example, James Cone,⁹³⁰ Leonardo Boff,⁹³¹ Choan-Seng Song,⁹³² and John Sobrino⁹³³ write about Jesus' relationship with human liberation in similar ways. The exceptions are somewhat minor.⁹³⁴

Concerning Segundo's second characteristic, which focuses on the liberating features

⁹²⁶ Segundo, *LT*, 7. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 3.

⁹²⁷ Segundo, *LT*, 12. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 8.

⁹²⁸ E.g. See the comparison of Ruether and Ellis above.

⁹²⁹ Another examples comes from Hamid Dabashi, *Islamic Liberation Theology: Resisting the Empire* (New York: Routledge, 2008). Dabashi does not engage with Jesus Christ. Therefore, the argument in his book does share Segundo's characteristics, especially his first one. However, Dabashi labels his project 'liberation theology', although it is not Christian liberation theology; it is Muslim liberation theology.

⁹³⁰ E.g. Cone, *God of the Oppressed*, 138ff.

⁹³¹ Leonardo Boff, *Church: Charism and Power, Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*, trans. John W. Diercksmeier (New York: Crossroad, 1985), 59ff.

⁹³² Choan-Seng Song, *Jesus and the Reign of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 285.

⁹³³ Sobrino, *Christology at the Crossroads*, 195.

⁹³⁴ E.g. Segundo does not spiritualize suffering in the same way as Sobrino.

within the Church, The Latin American Bishops Conference (CELAM) has been an active voice in Latin American liberation theology.⁹³⁵ In addition, this characteristic is shared amongst liberation theologians, e.g. Gustavo Gutiérrez,⁹³⁶ Hugo Assmann,⁹³⁷ and Alfred Hennelly.⁹³⁸ Segundo expands Gutiérrez's idea of liberation as springing out of pastoral action that takes place within the church.⁹³⁹

For non-Catholics, Segundo's view of "The Church" might appear overly indebted to the Roman Catholic Church. Despite the places where he eludes to a potential universal salvation⁹⁴⁰ or ecumenism,⁹⁴¹ he writes from a Roman Catholic context. His perspective, as Charles Van Engen points out, is similar to Augustine's universal community, implying both universal salvation and ecumenism.⁹⁴² Segundo writes about the church as both universal and particular,⁹⁴³ whereas Mary Kaye Nealen situates Segundo's ecclesiology within the Roman Catholic Church.⁹⁴⁴ She uses the word "ecumenical" once in a list of topics addressed by Vatican II.⁹⁴⁵ Although his second characteristic might sound Roman Catholic, Segundo's theology is *catholic*, and for him, the universal church contains liberating features.

⁹³⁵ Paul E. Sigmund, *Liberation Theology at the Crossroads: Democracy or Revolution?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 37.

⁹³⁶ Gutiérrez, *Teología de la Liberación*, 67-69. Cf. Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, 9-10.

⁹³⁷ Hugo Assmann, *Teología desde la praxis de la liberación: Ensayo teológico desde la América dependiente* (Salamanca, Spain: Ediciones Sígueme, 1973). Cf. Hugo Assmann, *Theology for a Nomad Church*, trans. Paul Burns (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976).

⁹³⁸ Alfred T. Hennelly, *Theology for a Liberating Church: The New Praxis of Freedom* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1989), especially 86ff.

⁹³⁹ Segundo, *Acción pastoral latinoamericana: sus motivos ocultos*. Cf. Segundo, *The Hidden Motives of Pastoral Action*.

⁹⁴⁰ E.g. Segundo describes Hell in metaphorical terms; it is "behind us with respect to freedom". Segundo, *Teología Abierta 1*, 250. Cf. Segundo, *Grace and the Human Condition*, 46. However, he clearly includes hell in his eschatology when he writes, "Belief in an eternal hell belongs to the faith of the Church and even the practice of the sacraments". Segundo, *Infierno*, 65.

⁹⁴¹ Segundo writes about ecumenism in Segundo, *Dogma*, see chapter 10. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, chapter 10.

⁹⁴² Charles E. Van Engen, "The Global Church: Locality and Catholicity in a Globalizing World," in *Globalizing Theology: Belief and Practice in an Era of World Christianity*, ed. Craig Ott and Harold Netland (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2006), 168.

⁹⁴³ Segundo, *Esa comunidad llamada iglesia*, chapter 1. Cf. Segundo, *The Community Called Church*, chapter 1.

⁹⁴⁴ Nealen, *The Poor in the Ecclesiology of Juan Luis Segundo*, throughout, esp. chapter 1-2.

⁹⁴⁵ Nealen, *The Poor in the Ecclesiology of Juan Luis Segundo*, 7.

Segundo's third characteristic is one order in history, not two separate ones-- i.e. as if there were a natural order within history (this life) and a supernatural order outside of history (the afterlife). He writes, "One and the same grace raises every human being to a supernatural level and gives them the means [they need in order to] fulfil, in love, their true destiny within the only history".⁹⁴⁶ This idea pushes forward the existential aspect of his theology; it is an existential ontology in which God as true Being appears in and through existence, though not in immediate form. Sartre's maxim "existence comes before essence"⁹⁴⁷ represents for Sartre himself a secular existential philosophy and denies a divine otherness⁹⁴⁸ (e.g. God or the eschaton or Barth's "wholly other"⁹⁴⁹). Segundo echoes Sartre in giving priority to existential analysis over development of statements about essence,⁹⁵⁰ but for Segundo existential freedom is always rooted in essence.⁹⁵¹ For Segundo, the present reality is God's reality, i.e. God's grace is in the present reality and at work in history. This is what he means by one grace in the present and God at work within historical processes.⁹⁵²

The third characteristic seems to be a response to the way Catholic priests under the Conquistadors of the sixteenth century evangelized Latin America. In colonial theology, priests espoused two separate orders: a natural order, wherein

⁹⁴⁶ "...una misma gracia alza a un nivel sobrenatural a todo ser humano y le da los medios necesarios para cumplir, en el amor, ese destino en la única historia". Segundo, *LT*, 8. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 3.

⁹⁴⁷ Sartre, *Existentialism and Humanism*, 27.

⁹⁴⁸ Sartre's concept of "bad faith" denies anything divine. Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 70ff.

⁹⁴⁹ Karl Barth, *The Doctrine of Reconciliation*, ed. G. W. Bromiley and Thomas F. Torrance, trans. G. W. Bromiley, vol. 4.3.1, Church Dogmatics (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1961), 146.

⁹⁵⁰ Cf. chapter 5. Segundo, "La fenomenología".

⁹⁵¹ Segundo points to Sartre's use of essence as a concept in Segundo, *Teología Abierta 1*, 235. Cf. Segundo, *Grace and the Human Condition*, 31. This concept is outlined in Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 95ff.

⁹⁵² Ivan Petrella borrows this concept from Segundo, and suggests that the future of liberation theology is dependent on reinventing historical projects. Petrella, *The Future of Liberation Theology*, 35.

suffering should be tolerated, and a supernatural order outside of history (afterlife) that awaits the faithful.⁹⁵³ Instead of these two orders, Segundo's wider theology is summarized in this idea of "one shared grace". In the fourth characteristic, there is a connection between the past and the present. The past sets up the ideology for the present, and theology is always connected to the prevailing ideology. Robert McAfee Brown provides a more general summary of all liberation theology, and he claims Segundo as the source. He summarizes liberation theology as the belief that the world should not be the way it is.⁹⁵⁴ However, the four characteristics set out in *LT* provide a better starting point for Segundo's liberation theology than Brown's summary.

6.2 Methodological problems

When a theology is closely connected to a methodology, its method comes under great scrutiny. For example, William Cosgrave connects liberation theology with a methodology, instead of considering it a doctrine, and he outlines various shared aspects of the method.⁹⁵⁵ If Segundo's methodology is too indebted to a philosophy (e.g. existentialism), his theology is, consequently, simply a restatement of a philosophy, albeit in theological terms. Arguing for a strong existential dimension presents Segundo as susceptible to methodological problems. Therefore, although his theology contains an existential dimension, God remains the centrepiece (*theo-logos*) for Segundo.

⁹⁵³ For an excellent explanation of this evangelization process, see David Tombs, *Latin American Liberation Theology*, ed. Henri Gooren, Religion in the Americas (Leiden: Brill, 2002), chapter 1.

⁹⁵⁴ Brown, *Gustavo Gutiérrez, An Introduction to Liberation Theology*, 51.

⁹⁵⁵ William Cosgrave, "The Theology of Liberation," *The Furrow* 37, no. 8 (1986): 508-511. He provides seven characteristics of liberation theology: (1) an option for the poor, (2) an indelible connection between praxis and theory, (3) the goal of a new humanity, (4) liberation as a central theme, (5) social analysis, (6) engagement with politics, and (7) scripture.

The connection between liberation theology and its political context tends to be problematic for the methodology of theology. During the period which gave birth to liberation theology, the Cold War and the nascent conflict between communism and capitalism occupied politics. Many authors have observed the significant role of politics in liberation theology.⁹⁵⁶ If liberation theology is simply a Latin American subcategory of political theology, it should be treated as such. On the other hand, if liberation theology has an original contribution to the field of theology, the connection to politics should not be overemphasized. Likewise, if liberation theology is, in fact, *theo-logos*, the connection to philosophy should not be overemphasized.

The methodology of Segundo's liberation theology is to ask theological questions in light of his four general characteristics within the basic method of liberation theologies in general, which is reflection on praxis. For example in Segundo's method, how does the Trinity function in relation to Jesus' concern with integral human liberation? Answering a basic theology question (function of the Trinity) in light of Jesus' concern for integral human liberation is a product of liberation theology's methodology. Another example, taken from Segundo's second characteristic, relates to ecclesiology: What are the liberating features in the liturgy of the Church? This second question is the basis of Ernesto Cardenal's four volume *The Gospel in Solentiname*.⁹⁵⁷ This example connects the methodology of liberation theology with biblical theology. By changing the traditional approach of theology and introducing elements from outside of the academy, liberation theology provides a new way of doing theology. In this section, I analyse Segundo's methodology in

⁹⁵⁶ E.g. Berryman, *Liberation Theology, essential facts about the revolutionary movement in Latin America and beyond*, chapter 8.

⁹⁵⁷ Cardenal, *Solentiname*.

light of Marx's influence and juxtapose Segundo's view of the 'end of history' with other views.

6.2.1 Supposed Influence & Marx

In the opening pages of *LT*, Segundo uses Harvey Cox, Karl Marx, Max Weber, and James Cone as interlocutors.⁹⁵⁸ Each one demonstrates part of Segundo's hermeneutic circle. For example, according to Segundo, Cox does not move beyond the first step (ideological suspicion) because he does not accept the existential dimension of the circle. Segundo writes, "Cox never really accepted pragmatic man as he is nor the consumer society as it is [*sic.*]"⁹⁵⁹ The existential dimension of Segundo's liberation theology involves a commitment to each step of his hermeneutic circle, yet he finds Cox stopping on the first step. However, this engagement does not necessarily imply indebtedness to these thinkers. He could be positively influenced by and borrowing from one of the aforementioned thinkers, or he could reject their thought and react to it.

In *Teología de la liberación* (1985), Segundo responds to an article⁹⁶⁰ written by Joseph Ratzinger prior to the publication of the 'Instruction on Certain Aspects of the "Theology of Liberation"' in 1984.⁹⁶¹ Ratzinger characterizes liberation theology as being overly influenced by Bultmann. This specific reference is helpful because Bultmann is characterized as an existential theologian,⁹⁶² and it relates to the existential dimension in Segundo's thought. Segundo replies to Ratzinger's characterization:

⁹⁵⁸ Segundo, *LT*, 14-45. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 10-34.

⁹⁵⁹ Segundo, *LT*, 17. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 13.

⁹⁶⁰ Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, "Liberation Theology," *Christendom-Awake.org* (1984).

⁹⁶¹ Catholic Church, *Instruction on certain aspects of the "theology of liberation"*.

⁹⁶² See chapter 1, section 3 "What kind of liberation theology?" above.

Cardinal Ratzinger's article seemed to come from a European who reads European phenomena and tendencies into a non-European context. As an example, he speaks of the *supposed influence* of Rudolf Bultmann on liberation theology. Of course, one cannot presume that the Latin American liberation theologians, having been educated in Europe, would be unfamiliar with Bultmann or even that they may be more immune than any European theologian to the impact of one of the most influential theologians of this century.⁹⁶³

Segundo points out that it is not surprising for there to be some influence of Bultmann on liberation theologians, given their European education. However, note Segundo's word choice: *supuesta influencia*. *Supuesta* means *alleged, so-called*, or something that might be misleading. If there is positive influence (e.g. liberation theologians borrowed something from Bultmann), it is not universally shared amongst liberation theologians. Segundo is influenced by Bultmann; he acknowledges the influence, but casts some doubt with *supuesta*; for instance, he himself does not go as far as Bultmann's demythologization. The same nature of influence could be applied to his use of Sartre, Marcel, Berdyaev, Heidegger, or others.

Karl Marx is one of Segundo's interlocutors in *LT*, which contributes to liberation theology's association with Marxism. Segundo follows Marx's method to some extent (i.e. society develops from one level to the next), but rejects Marx's conclusion (i.e. humanity achieves something without anything divine). Association with Marxism has long dogged liberation theology and reflects the milieu out of which liberation theology grew. The Soviet Union and the United States/Western Europe fought for control of the southern hemisphere; the development of theologies in Latin America reflected the Cold War struggle. In this struggle, neither the Marxists nor the capitalists profited.

⁹⁶³ Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*, 13, emphasis added. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*, 3.

Segundo does not always delineate clearly where he positively utilizes Marx's method and where he criticizes Marx's conclusions. This makes Segundo susceptible to critiques such as political scientist David McLellan's. He criticizes various currents of religious thought, including Segundo, for the "use of apparently Marxist categories to achieve critical self-renewal".⁹⁶⁴ He presents three ways in which liberation theology is indebted to Marxism:

- (1) Its criticism of "the involvement of the Latin American Church in the social and political structures that have compounded the domination and oppression of the mass of the people"
- (2) Its rereading of the Old and New Testaments, with an emphasis on "earthly realism" and "political liberation" of the Exodus narrative and the political dimension of Jesus' ministry
- (3) Its attribution of "social and political dimensions to traditional Christian concepts"⁹⁶⁵

When the Church is complicit in oppression, Segundo would agree with McLellan's first point. The second point emphasizes the existential nature of liberation. The "earthly realism" is the lived experience that is pervasive in so much liberation theology. The third point seems to be a misunderstanding of traditional Christian concepts; i.e. Segundo's three-part series *El hombre de hoy ante Jesus de Nazaret* explores the historical Jesus as a liberative figure, but is not indebted to Marxism. Peter Scott uses McLellan's argument, emphasizing the same points, but specifically summarizing chapters 2 and 3 of *LT*, he writes "If Marx was consistent about his method, Segundo argues, he would not have been able to reject religion in

⁹⁶⁴ David McLellan, *Marxism and Religion: a description and assessment of the Marxist critique of Christianity* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 148.

⁹⁶⁵ McLellan, *Marxism and Religion*, 153-154. Op. cit. Peter Scott, *Theology, Ideology and Liberation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 21-22.

the way he did”.⁹⁶⁶ Scott better understands Segundo’s theological argument in *LT* than McLellan, but illustrates how overly simplistic it can be to argue that Segundo or liberation theology is overly indebted to Bultmann or Marx. The criticism that liberation theology is too heavily influenced by Marx comes up again and again.⁹⁶⁷

Segundo does not promote Marxist revolutionary ideology. Instead, he argues against the snares of ideology and writes that Jesus must be divested from “ideological wrappings” and released from his “specific historical context”. Terms like heaven and hell, for example, are bound to Jesus’ milieu. Thus, even if we have a verbatim account of Jesus’ words, Segundo follows Bultmann to argue that hermeneutics should still “try to find out what elements in [Jesus’] message should be attributed to the surrounding circumstances”.⁹⁶⁸ He writes that, similarly, “A real, effective option on behalf of the oppressed can de-ideologize our minds and free our thinking for the gospel message. Theology is the second step”.⁹⁶⁹

Despite Segundo outlining and naming ideologies, including his definition of ideology, to which we shall return in the next chapter, critics like Daniel Bell continue to broadly place all liberation theologians “within the tradition of Marxist socialism, a tradition that in its various manifestations has understood politics as statecraft”.⁹⁷⁰ In an endnote Bell softens his position somewhat; i.e., “The Marxist tradition is not monolithic...the tradition has been marked by a consistent adherence

⁹⁶⁶ Scott, *Theology, Ideology and Liberation*, 22.

⁹⁶⁷ E.g. Tom Moylan writes, “Revolutionary action informed by Marxist theory came to be accepted as a legitimate means toward a better life for people of the non-Western world”. Tom Moylan, “Denunciation/Annunciation: The Radical Methodology of Liberation Theology,” *Cultural Critique*, no. 20 (1992): 36. Moylan cites Matthew Lamb for support of this position. Cf. Matthew Lamb, *Solidarity with Victims: Toward a Theology of Social Transformation* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 128.

⁹⁶⁸ Segundo, *LT*, 100. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 86.

⁹⁶⁹ Segundo, *LT*, 101. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 87.

⁹⁷⁰ Daniel M. Bell, Jr., *Liberation Theology After the End of History: The refusal to cease suffering*, ed. John Milbank, Catherine Pickstock, and Graham Ward, *Radical Orthodoxy* (London: Routledge, 2001), 65.

to a conception of politics as statecraft".⁹⁷¹ Segundo recognizes the diversity of Marxist thought; he writes, "There are a thousand different ways of conceiving and interpreting 'Marxist' thought".⁹⁷² He counters an accusation, like Bell's, of being indebted to Marx. He urges engagement with the world and does not advocate for suffering idly while others make political decisions. However, he does not advocate for a specific political system. Instead, he points out the flaws in each system. However, he reserves his greatest criticisms for academic theology because he sees it as pretending to have answers when it does not. As we shall see in 7.1.3, he distinguishes between Marx's thought and Marxism.

6.2.2 Problems due to the 'end of history'

What is the future of liberation theology? This is a question Segundo asks in *LT* and it is the subject of books and articles by other authors.⁹⁷³ Political scientist Francis Fukuyama boldly declared the "end of history" with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dismantling of the Soviet Union,⁹⁷⁴ and the timing of his claim coincided with a drop in the popularity of liberation theology.⁹⁷⁵ Daniel Bell uses Fukuyama's claim in the title of his book *Liberation Theology After the End of History*, and Bell's entire approach looks back on liberation theology as a past event, not seriously taking into consideration its present relevance and future development.⁹⁷⁶ The end of the dialectical struggle and the apparent triumph of capitalism did not, I suggest, end human suffering or the need for liberation. Segundo does not approach the

⁹⁷¹ Bell, *Liberation Theology After the End of History*, 81 n.103.

⁹⁷² Segundo, *LT*, 19 n10. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 35 n10.

⁹⁷³ E.g. Petrella, *The Future of Liberation Theology*. See also, Daniel H. Levine, "Assessing the Impacts of Liberation Theology in Latin America," *The Review of Politics* 50, no. 2 (1988).

⁹⁷⁴ Fukuyama, "The End of History?"

⁹⁷⁵ Evidenced by a decline in the number of books published on the subject.

⁹⁷⁶ As is evident in his title, Bell, *Liberation Theology After the End of History*.

future in light of the struggle between Marxism and capitalism in the development of Latin America. Even when he used the phrase *fin de la historia* (end of history) in the post-Soviet era, he used it in conjunction with eschatology.⁹⁷⁷ In fact, Segundo's approach to eschatology throws interesting light on any claim to have reached a final point or consummation in history.

The belief in the end of the world in some form or another is present in ancient culture. For example, in the Bible, Matthew 25:31-46 credits Jesus with describing a future with eternal judgment, which is what Segundo views as Jesus' "ideological wrappings".⁹⁷⁸ In other words, even if the speech were a verbatim transcript of Jesus' words, it is connected to his cultural ideology. Origen is another ancient example, writing in a sermon about Deborah's song in Judges 5, "We understand all these mysteries to be those things which in the last times and at the end of the age are accomplished through the Church".⁹⁷⁹ This eschatological reference shows a belief in and engagement with the coming of the Kingdom of God. Eschatology developed over time. Augustine was influenced by Origen.⁹⁸⁰ The theological notion of the coming Kingdom continues to evolve.

Hegel traced the progress of 'the Idea' or Absolute Spirit/Reason diversifying itself through relative ideas in the human consciousness. Hegel presents the notion of ideas evolving toward an end within what we now call the Hegelian dialectic: thesis-antithesis-synthesis. The synthesis becomes the basis of the thesis in the next stage and then a new antithesis forms, and so on. Each thesis has an internal contradiction, which could be viewed in a similar way to Segundo's ideological

⁹⁷⁷ Segundo, *Qué mundo*, 245.

⁹⁷⁸ Segundo, *LT*, 100. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 86.

⁹⁷⁹ Origen, *Homilies on Judges*, trans. Elizabeth Ann Dively Lauro (Washington, DC: CUA Press, 2010), 84.

⁹⁸⁰ E.g. György Heidl, *Origen's Influence on the Young Augustine: A Chapter of the History of Origenism* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2003).

suspicion. The internal contradiction leads to the struggle and forward progress. They move toward a future final end and Hegel calls the realization of the Absolute Spirit (Geist).⁹⁸¹ In his *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*, Hegel writes, “World history is the record of the spirit’s efforts to attain knowledge of what it is in itself”.⁹⁸²

Marx used Hegel’s argument about history as the basis for his materialism. He teases out his criticism in *Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right* (1844).⁹⁸³ He writes, “What Hegel presents as the end, the determining factor, the *prima causa*, of primogeniture is, instead, an effect, a consequence of it, the power of abstract private property over the political state...”⁹⁸⁴ For Marx, the development of a future end is the triumph of communist socialism. Fukuyama makes the ironic claim that ‘end of history’ has come to an end because the Marxist struggle has been overtaken by the triumph of capitalism, but those events were not, in fact, the end of history, nor were they the end of liberation theology or human suffering.

The social and political processes were changing in the late 1980s. The context out of which liberation theology had been born was rapidly changing. Military dictatorships ended in Argentina (1983), Uruguay (1984), Brazil (1985), Panama (1989), and Chile (1990). The civil war in El Salvador ended in January 1992, and the civil war in Guatemala ended in 1996. Coming out of a context of such turmoil, liberation theology evolved to reflect a contextual theology in a changing

⁹⁸¹ Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004). Above is a traditional metaphysical view of Hegel’s philosophy.

⁹⁸² Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*, trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 54.

⁹⁸³ Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right*, trans. Joseph O’Malley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1844).

⁹⁸⁴ Marx, *Critique of Hegel*, 100.

world, yet the basic tenets of liberation theology would remain relevant. Poverty and oppression continue beyond Fukuyama's 'end of history'.

Segundo would not have noted an end to history in a Hegelian or Marxist sense because he viewed a future end in eschatological terms. Neither would he have viewed the fall of Soviet-style communism as an end to history because nowhere does he argue for Western capitalism as a just economic system. He is not a Marxist, but neither is he a proponent of laissez faire capitalism. This is part of his phenomenological approach, to give attention to the phenomenon of a dialectical struggle in history without the materialistic denial of transcendent being. His view of economics combines a recognition for the necessity of monetary exchange for goods and services (capitalism) with justice and God's coming Kingdom. He does not endorse unfettered accumulation of wealth. The following three examples illustrate this point.

(1) In *El hombre 2.2* (1982), Segundo makes reference to the "end of history when divine judgement takes place" and the context is an assessment of Ignatius of Loyola's Christology.⁹⁸⁵ In this particular chapter, Segundo explains why Ignatius should be read as a product of his own age in a similar way to how he argues Jesus' words are connected to "ideological wrappings".⁹⁸⁶ However, Segundo's focus remains in the present tense on experienced reality, i.e. what Ignatius calls "making a choice as a way of life".⁹⁸⁷ Segundo does not dispute an end of history, but addressing it is not his point either. In this set of books, he writes about how Jesus applies to every day life in every age and the emphasis is on human existence or

⁹⁸⁵ Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 682-683. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 50.

⁹⁸⁶ Segundo, *LT*, 100. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 86.

⁹⁸⁷ Ignatius of Loyola, *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: Based on Studies in the Language of the Autograph*, trans. Louis J. Puhl (Chicago: Loyola Press, 2010), 169ff.

existential reality, not a future end in the eschaton. The reference to the end of history is more of an acknowledgement than part of his argument.

(2) In *Teología de la liberación* (1985), Segundo again refers to the end of history in eschatological terms. He writes,

Moving from a period where action was the key to the religious life of Israel and [action] was also an *essential experience*, we were reminded of the eschatological promise according to which, at the end of history, God himself will abundantly communicate his Spirit and renew the human heart.⁹⁸⁸

Here he does not use the phrase “end of history” in a Hegelian, Marxist, capitalist, or ‘Fukuyaman’ sense. Instead, Segundo’s exegetical focus is on existential reality with the eschaton serving as a reminder of the coming Kingdom and promise of God’s future; the eschaton is not just a reminder and a promise, but also an incentive for activity in the present. The emphasis remains on human transformation in daily life. In other words, his focus in *Teología de la liberación*, besides responding to the Vatican’s *Instruction on Certain Aspects of the “theology of liberation”*, is arguing for the Church to be God’s vehicle for improving human conditions.

(3) In *Dogma* (1989), published the same year as Fukuyama’s article, Segundo references the “end of history”, but his meaning again relates to an eschatological end and makes no reference to the political changes throughout Latin America or the fall of Soviet-style communism.⁹⁸⁹ He addresses realized eschatology, and his treatment of this connects back to Hegel’s progression toward an end of history because, Segundo argues, the realized eschatology represented in the New Testament is a progression. He views church dogma as a development of realized eschatology, but it is not a static, once and for all times development. Dogma changes

⁹⁸⁸ Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*, 71, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*, 52.

⁹⁸⁹ Segundo, *Dogma*, 186. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*, 118.

over time and represents an evolution of ideas. This leads to human liberation, but he does not make the direct connection with a Hegelian, Marxist, capitalist, or 'Fukuyaman' end of history.

Thus, an end of history does not make liberation theology unnecessary because such a theology represents a continuing step in the evolution of ideas. Liberation theology addresses a certain milieu (mid-twentieth-century Latin American oppression), and as that milieu changes his four characteristics of liberation theology still apply to the world. These characteristics evolve to reflect changing needs but both Hegel and Marx's evolution of ideas toward an end of history are not actually fulfilled in an *end*, per se. The world continues, and Segundo's idea of evolving ideas continues. As long as suffering and oppression continue, there continues to be a need for liberation. Segundo's appropriation of a realized eschatology, which drives dogma to continue reflecting the world, means a Christian *future* eschatology on its own lacks power to transform the present. His realized eschatology is influenced by existentialism, especially the Christian existentialism of Bultmann.

In *LT*, Segundo refers to the "end of history" and argues that if the emphasis is on a future eschaton, two separate planes emerge, the natural and supernatural.⁹⁹⁰ This distinction between two planes corresponds to the oppression associated with evangelisation of indigenous people by colonial missionaries.⁹⁹¹ He argues against allowing this emphasis on the eschaton to turn "faith and hope into something

⁹⁹⁰ Segundo, *LT*, 168. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 147.

⁹⁹¹ Tombs, *Latin American Liberation Theology*, chapter 1.

metahistorical and alienation and disgust toward history".⁹⁹² In other words, the two separate planes function as a perversion of God's intent for humanity.⁹⁹³

Continuing this same point in *LT*, Segundo dissects a quote from Richard Shaull, "The kingdom of God always stands over against every social and political order, thus exposing its dehumanizing elements and *judging* it. At the same time, the Kingdom is a *dynamic* reality; it is 'coming' through the work of him who is restoring the nations".⁹⁹⁴ Segundo views Shaull's quote as an affront to Latin American liberation theology because it seems to relativize historical realities and place the entire burden for action with God. Humanity is left with nothing to do because action is up to God. Introducing another quote from Shaull,⁹⁹⁵ Segundo finds some of the same criticisms with Shaull's argument and, by implication, Moltmann, which he summarizes as "*hope* for a new future and *freedom* to expect and *serve* the things that are to come".⁹⁹⁶ For Moltmann, a new creation creates a *permanent revolution* in the present through de-stabilizing the status quo. For Segundo, this does not lead to a revolution, "unless it is a very strange sort of revolution".⁹⁹⁷ This last point contradicts the accusation of liberation theology's indebtedness to Marxism, especially Marx's eleventh thesis on Feuerbach.⁹⁹⁸ Segundo neither agrees with Marxist calls for revolution toward the end of history, nor does he agree with

⁹⁹² Segundo, *LT*, 168. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 147.

⁹⁹³ Segundo writes against ideas such as those presented in Rubem Alves, *A Theology of Human Hope* (New York: Corpus, 1969), 65-67. Alves separates humanistic messianism from messianic humanism, and he is influenced by Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope, On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*, trans. James W. Leitch (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).

⁹⁹⁴ Segundo, *LT*, 168. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 147. Richard Shaull, "Revolutionary change in theological perspective," in *Christian social ethics in a changing world: an ecumenical theological inquiry*, ed. John C. Bennett (New York: Association Press, 1966), 36.

⁹⁹⁵ Segundo, *LT*, 169. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 148. Richard Shaull, "Christian Faith as Scandal in a Technocratic World," in *New Theology*, ed. Dean Peerman and Martin Marty (New York: Macmillan, 1966), 130.

⁹⁹⁶ Segundo, *LT*, 170. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 149.

⁹⁹⁷ Segundo, *LT*, 170. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 149.

⁹⁹⁸ Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels, *The German Ideology, including Theses on Feuerbach* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 1998), 571.

Shaul's assertion that change or improvement in the human condition is exclusively up to God. Segundo argues for transformation as history continues to unfold.

6.3 *From pathways to long journey*

In *LT*, Segundo writes, "The new pathway [of Vatican II] was based on the assumption that faith has as its function the task of guiding the human mind towards more fully human solutions in history".⁹⁹⁹ The way he focuses on the *human* mind and *human* solutions illustrate both his lack of focus on future eschatological elements discussed in the previous section and the existential dimension of his theology. His theology continues to emphasize God; it is not a humanistic theory. For Segundo, God is present, but working through humanity. Thus, Vatican II represents the acknowledgement of God's presence in human existence and compatible, for Segundo, with a kind of ontological existentialism.

Early in *LT*, Segundo writes, "If the pathway of theology is so technical and torturous, readers might well feel that it is not worth trying to plod over its trackless wastes".¹⁰⁰⁰ However, he does not allow theology to remain a pathway. Instead, he tries to draw his readers into viewing theology as a journey. A pathway is a way or route that can be seen as more singular in focus and is reflected in static dogmas that do not change over time. This latter view can make theology seem colder and more philosophical, unlike an affective, poetic feeling. For Segundo, theology as a journey is a more flexible approach that allows his methodology to be applied differently in various circumstances (e.g. poetry and literature, or a new hermeneutic). In order to

⁹⁹⁹ Segundo, *LT*, 143. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 126.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Segundo, *LT*, 47. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 39.

begin this shift, he outlines the first chapter of *LT* in four straightforward approaches. He writes:

- 1) "A theology worthy of the attention of a whole human being...stems from a pre-theological human commitment to change and improve the world".
- 2) Taking the word of God and converting it from a vague outline into a clearly worked out message requires an understanding and appreciation of the ideological mechanisms of established society.
- 3) Theology must be turned into a tool for orthopraxis or else it will be in danger of being dissolved into universal and ahistorical concepts.
- 4) "We have to rescue the sovereign freedom of God's word, to say in every situation what is creatively liberating in that situation".¹⁰⁰¹

Within the above statements, there is a movement from a monochromatic approach to a liberative and methodological approach. In Segundo's first approach to the journey of theology, God speaks, someone records or represents God's speech as dogma, and people receive God's speech. However, theology comes from a pre-theological desire and 'human commitment' to change the world. Even before God's speech, the recipient wishes to change the world. This is close to the eleventh thesis on Feuerbach, in which Marx writes, "Philosophers have hitherto only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point is to change it".¹⁰⁰²

In the second approach, words about God (*theo-logos*) are inextricably connected to society and the ideologies within. Again, this is reminiscent of Jesus' "ideological wrappings".¹⁰⁰³ Segundo's reference to "ideological mechanisms" is a significant point in *FI*, which will be further addressed in the next chapter. His use of ideologies to explain the development of theology began long before *FI*. Ideology, commitment and theology are related in the following: the expression of theology is a product of a person's commitment to understand God (or the divine), and the

¹⁰⁰¹ Segundo, *LT*, 47-48. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 39.

¹⁰⁰² Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*, 571, emphasis original.

¹⁰⁰³ Segundo, *LT*, 100. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 86.

person's ideology is present in the way that person is capable of understanding and expressing something meaningful about God (i.e. ideology precedes commitment, first to truly human aims and then to God's purposes). He writes of the need for liberation, "Otherwise theology will become and remain the unwitting spokesman of the experiences and ideas of the ruling factions and classes".¹⁰⁰⁴ Theology is wedded to ideological mechanisms, which gives disproportionate ideological influence to people with power. This suggests the existence of different ideologies amongst different social/economic classes, and it infers a need to liberate theology from this disproportionate connection.

The third approach relates to the future of theology, not just liberation theology, but Segundo questions the efficacy of some theologies. Unless theology is turned into a liberative, "serviceable tool for orthopraxis", it is at risk of being mollified into universal and ahistorical concepts.¹⁰⁰⁵ The point rests on his belief in the potential for theology to be a tool. Although, as I stated above, his summary sounds similar to Marx's eleventh thesis on Feuerbach, he is not arguing for revolution, but transformation. For Segundo, by serviceable tool, he means making theology affective, like poetry, instead of conceptual or cognitive.

Going back to Segundo's first published work, hints of these approaches are apparent in *Existencialismo*. In it, he contrasts the different qualities of philosophical and existential limits. According to his argument, people 'provisionally' encounter things while seeking their essence. Then, in a 'real and definitive' way, they encounter things existentially.¹⁰⁰⁶ As he questions the future of theology, he identifies a problem if the encounter is a philosophical or universal concept instead

¹⁰⁰⁴ Segundo, *LT*, 47. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 39.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Segundo, *LT*, 47-48. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 39.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 34.

of an existential or affective encounter. However, there is also a problem when existentialism itself becomes a philosophical system.

Segundo highlights biblical freedom and the difficulty of keeping that freedom. By keeping or rescuing biblical freedom, he writes, "We have...to say in every situation what is creatively liberating in that situation".¹⁰⁰⁷ This point is reminiscent of his argument in *Berdiaeff*, in which he argues freedom is intrinsic and positive,¹⁰⁰⁸ but his point in *LT* emphasizes the risk to freedom. People who have something to lose seek to protect what they have. He views people in positions of power and authority as having something to lose if people without power or authority are freed from oppression. Thus, liberating people from oppression carries a risk with it, and liberation varies from situation to situation. Depending on the circumstances, one kind of liberation can look very different from another kind of liberation. Therefore, liberation requires creativity.

6.3.1 Freedom and existence in relation to violence

Violence has been a contested issue for liberation theology since its inception.¹⁰⁰⁹ Gustavo Gutiérrez writes, explaining why he never addressed violence in detail, "Theological reflection on the subject of violence...has not made substantial advances since St. Thomas Aquinas".¹⁰¹⁰ José Miguel Bonino considers that the use of

¹⁰⁰⁷ Segundo, *LT*, 47-48. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 39.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Segundo, *Berdiaeff*, 155.

¹⁰⁰⁹ E.g. David Turner refers to a supposed "theology of violence, used by some liberation theologians". J. David Turner, *An Introduction to Liberation Theology* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1994), 85. E.g. He cites J. Michael Jendrzeczyk as a liberation theologian who advocates for the possible use of violence. However, Jendrzeczyk is neither a theologian nor an academic; he was an activist for Human Rights Watch and died in 2003. Elizabeth Becker, "Michael Jendrzeczyk, 53, Advocate for Asians, Dies," *New York Times*, May 4 2003.

¹⁰¹⁰ Gustavo Gutiérrez, "Teología y ciencias sociales," *Páginas* 63-64, no. 9 (1984): 15. Translated as Appendix II in Sigmund, *Liberation Theology at the Crossroads*, 243.

violence cannot be ruled out in the last resort of resistance/revolution.¹⁰¹¹ Arthur McGovern dismisses violence in liberation theology.¹⁰¹² On the other hand, Camilo Torres justifies the use of violence with a *prima facie* expectation of impending revolution.¹⁰¹³ However, Torres seems to be somewhat of an outlier from mainstream liberation theology. Instead of a violent uprising, most liberation theologians are concerned with improving conditions for the majority of people, and violence does not improve conditions for poor people because they carry out fighting on behalf of rich people.

Violence exists in the world, and in Latin America during the time in which liberation theology came into existence, violence was part of the population's reality. Segundo asks the question in *LT*, "When and where does violence begin?" Then, he answers his own question, "Any phenomenological study of violence and its relationship to love must begin by discarding the terrible superficiality that surrounds many analyses of this issue".¹⁰¹⁴ He wishes to go beyond shallow or trivial analysis and get to the heart of the matter. By approaching it systematically, he hopes to avoid banal generalizations, like *liberation theology promotes violence*. He writes,

*Violence is an intrinsic dimension of any and all concrete love in history just as it clearly is an intrinsic dimension of any and all concrete egotism. The efficacy of our love must be worked out within the context of the laws that govern the economy of energy. Of course we must do all we can to narrow down the proportions of the violence required to maintain the efficacy. But, in general, we can say that any attempt to choose between love and violence makes no sense at all.*¹⁰¹⁵

¹⁰¹¹ José Míguez Bonino, *Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age* (London: SPCK, 1975), 125-128.

¹⁰¹² McGovern writes, "I have yet to find any statement by a liberation theologian calling for violent revolution or declaring it necessary for bringing about social change in Latin America". Arthur F. McGovern, *Liberation Theology and Its Critics: Toward an Assessment* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1989), 186.

¹⁰¹³ Torres, *Revolutionary Priest*, 361.

¹⁰¹⁴ Segundo, *LT*, 177. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 156.

¹⁰¹⁵ Segundo, *LT*, 183, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 161.

Segundo recognizes the existence of violence but argues for less of it. He sees violence as existent in history but it is also a product of “concrete egotism”. He can make this argument because love represents passionate feelings about a person or object, and passionate feelings can lead to physical actions. Although they do not *necessarily* result in violence, physical actions born out of passion or love *can* lead to violence. Thus, his conclusion is for violence to be kept in check. This is what he means by “narrow down the proportions”, but he does not see a choice between violence or love. In fact, according to this quote, an either/or choice between love or violence is nonsensical; he argues, unequivocally, against the exacerbation of violence.¹⁰¹⁶

Segundo summarizes his response to violence: (1) The same instruments apply to both love and egotism, and they can be used in either direction. (2) He accepts the proposition in entropy of limited energy and, therefore, acknowledges the necessity of “a prudent distribution of energy” that “entails painful options very much akin in appearance to those of egotism”. (3) The options include danger and ambiguity, and pain is universal, but not necessarily personal. (4) “Such a reduction in our thinking and acting is real violence, and it involves both an internal and external expression of violence”.¹⁰¹⁷ (5) “The basic structure of violence is not opposed to love”.¹⁰¹⁸

In the first point above, the same instruments apply to both love and egotism. Segundo expands the definition of armament to include what he calls “mental

¹⁰¹⁶ Segundo, *LT*, 184. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 162.

¹⁰¹⁷ On this point, John Drury’s English translation misses Segundo’s emphasis. He writes, “(4) Tal reducción necesaria en nuestra manera de pensar y de actuar es, desde el primer momento y desde su nivel más sutil, verdadera violencia, dado que opone a la libre expresión personal de otros seres una fuerza impersonal interna o externa o, por mejor decir, interna y externa”. Segundo, *LT*, 184. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 161-162.

¹⁰¹⁸ Segundo, *LT*, 183-184. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 161-162.

tendencies” which is essentially psychological violence. He views these mental tendencies as efficacious in causing death and destruction. For example, citing extreme physical violence, he writes, “Let us grant that the nuclear weapons [physical violence]...might *eventually* destroy our planet, but the fact is that human egotism is *already* destroying our planet”.¹⁰¹⁹ Recognizing the existent destructiveness of egotism, he places it alongside physical danger, like potential nuclear war, in extremis. Love and egotism have a mental component, and this mental or psychological component is the instrument that both use and can cause real harm or real good. In other words, violence shares some of its efficaciousness with love.

The second point is about nuances. Segundo rejects the idea of an absolute right and an absolute wrong. To make his point, he brings up the proposition in entropy of limited energy and the need to evenly distribute it. This even distribution potentially leads to “painful options very much akin in appearance to those of egotism”.¹⁰²⁰ In other words, people might act out of love, but it is not a pure action nor does it completely leave out the possibility for their action to include something negative. By bringing in the idea of entropy, Segundo invokes physics, which includes Newton’s third law of motion; “To any action, there is always a contrary, equal reaction”.¹⁰²¹ When someone acts in love in one place, the reaction elsewhere could yield violence.

Segundo offers an example to make his point. Suppose someone has broken into your house and you surprise the burglar. There are two possible lines of action: treat the burglar as an object or a human. In other words, to stop the burglar using

¹⁰¹⁹ Segundo, *LT*, 179, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 157.

¹⁰²⁰ Segundo, *LT*, 183. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 161.

¹⁰²¹ Isaac Newton, *The Mathematical Papers of Isaac Newton*, vol. 6, 1684-1691 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 99.

whatever force is necessary does not take into consideration the social and psychological forces leading to a life of crime. Using force or violence does not empathize and consider the burglar's perspective. Even if we are reluctant to use violence to stop the burglar, we can use institutional, sanctioned violence and call the police. Segundo, then, highlights how overly simplistic his example is. He writes, "We already have prior commitments of love...to many people. They depend on us and may be living in the same house, so we are inexorably forced to calculate our store of energy vis-à-vis two possible directions of love".¹⁰²² Even though love might lead to compassion toward the burglar, the love associated with other commitments might require violence, either by calling the police or personal action, in order to fulfil these commitments.¹⁰²³

In the third point, Segundo brings up the potential for danger that accompanies any violence. To return to his example of a burglar, the homeowner faces the possibility of the burglar reacting violently. In acts of love, compassion, or mercy, there is potential danger. Segundo suggests that there are unwitting uses of acts of love in the service of egotism. Thus, the danger is not intentional, as in violent reactions. By way of an explanation, he writes, "The mechanism at work in them entails subjecting real people to the law that regulates our relations with impersonal things and impersonal functions".¹⁰²⁴ The mechanism is ontic; people encounter this first. The law is ontological and derived from cognition; it is impersonal in the encounter.

On the fourth point, for Segundo, violence is *both* internal *and* external. The way people approach the subject of violence needs to be collapsed from two distinct

¹⁰²² Segundo, *LT*, 183. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 161.

¹⁰²³ This point is similar to Bonino's argument in José Míguez Bonino, *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975).

¹⁰²⁴ Segundo, *LT*, 183. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 161.

categories into one, from separate categories of internal violence *or* external violence to one category of violence. This one category includes both internal and external violence. He is careful to distinguish between violence as a by-product of individual self-expression and violence as an impersonal force.

On the fifth point, he writes, “The basic structure of violence is not opposed to love”.¹⁰²⁵ In fact, he takes this point one step further when he writes, “It is an essential and intrinsic dimension of any and all effective love within the context of the human condition”.¹⁰²⁶ However, he adds, the nature of love tends to reduce violence. Although “violence is not opposed to love”, it is not necessary for love; violence is not required for love. As love becomes more efficacious, the dynamic of love reduces the amount of violence. These changes are evolutionary and take place over time. They are part of what he calls the long journey.

In the issue of violence of love, Segundo uses a phenomenological/existential method. In the fourth point above, violence is *both* internal *and* external. By paying careful attention to what appears, what does not appear immediately is revealed. For example, the love of God does not appear immediately in a tragedy, but by paying careful attention to what is apparent, the love of God does appear. This is an ontological existentialism.

6.3.2 Dogma does not capture the Absolute

In chapter six of *LT*, Segundo associates ideologies with relativity, placing them in relation to one another. Ideologies are relative to the time and place in which they arise, e.g. Segundo’s example about Jesus’ words--they are a product of

¹⁰²⁵ Segundo, *LT*, 184. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 162.

¹⁰²⁶ Segundo, *LT*, 184. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 162.

the ideologies of his age. Dogma is a human invention used to describe God and it is bound to the prevailing ideology of the age. Therefore, as ideologies evolve over time, dogmas evolve to reflect ideological changes. In the final section of chapter six, Segundo argues that Roman Catholic dogma is not a *paréntesis* of God, whom he calls “the Absolute” at this point.¹⁰²⁷ *Paréntesis* strictly translated is *parenthesis*, but his use of the word implies *to capture* or *summarize*. In other words, dogma does not *capture* or *summarize* God.

The idea that dogma is not a summary of God resonates with one aspect of liberation theology. That is, it places God beyond the limitations of dogma; God is liberated from the potential constraints of being contained with theology or dogmatic definitions.¹⁰²⁸ Segundo emphasizes this multifaceted definition of liberation theology.¹⁰²⁹ Thus, religious systems that perpetuate oppression cannot be ordained as the one true path to the Absolute.¹⁰³⁰ According to Segundo, God cannot be captured by dogma because history precedes Christianity. Humanity existed for thousands of years before faith, and “it would be impossible to imagine any divine plan of universal salvation if the absence of faith had such [negative]

¹⁰²⁷ Segundo, *LT*, 199. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 175.

¹⁰²⁸ Walter Altmann supports Segundo’s claim when he described the dynamic nature of liberation theology in a World Council of Churches press release. Walter Altmann, “Liberation theology is alive and well,” World Council of Churches, <http://www.oikoumene.org/en/press-centre/news/liberation-theology-is-alive-and-well>. Jordan Ballor cites Altmann and echoes his argument. However, Ballor adds his criticism that all liberation theology maintains a core belief in a “neo-Marxist critique of economic markets”. Jordan Ballor, *Ecumenical Babel: Confusing Economic Ideology and the Church's Social Witness* (Grand Rapids, MI: Christian's Library Press, 2010), 89.

¹⁰²⁹ E.g. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, “Is Liberation a Bad Word? The Relevance of the Vatican Instruction for Theology Today,” in *Regis College Toronto Public Lecture* (Elliott MacGuigan Hall, Toronoto1985). In this lecture, Segundo takes a traditional approach to liberation theology, focusing on liberating people from suffering, but as he does in *LT*, he argues for liberation of traditional theological approaches to God.

¹⁰³⁰ E.g. According to Glenn Bucher, those outside the liberation movements can develop a liberation theology which will affect their theological and human renewal and complement their quest for liberation and a connection with God. Glenn R. Bucher, “Toward a Liberation Theology for the “Oppressor”,” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 44, no. 3 (1976).

consequences”.¹⁰³¹ Segundo also makes an argument from the perspective of moral behaviour. Some people behave morally even if they are not adherents to Christianity, which he suggests undermines a Christian claim to moral authority.¹⁰³² In other words, Christianity is not required for moral behaviour.

Segundo argues that faith is absolute because it is a truth revealed by God. Thus, he calls faith an absolute element. On the other hand, he suggests that ideologies are relative to the historical circumstances that produce them.¹⁰³³ He situates the relative element with ideologies and the absolute element with faith, and then he asks, “What is left after we strip away ideologies? What is faith? What is its content?”¹⁰³⁴ In other words, he is asking whether this is too simple a polarity because faith could also be relative. To answer these questions, he gives three responses.

First, for Segundo, dogma is made by people out of their freedom to do so. He writes, “Our freedom is precisely the capacity to absolutize what nature and history always present to us as something relative”.¹⁰³⁵ In the way he connects freedom to the ability to make absolutes, his argument sounds like Berdyaev’s position in *Slavery and Freedom*, especially when Berdyaev writes, “Man is a slave of various sorts of idols, but they are idols which he has himself created [sic.]”.¹⁰³⁶ However, Segundo does not cite Berdyaev. Instead he references Mannheim’s use of the word “relationism” as a way of avoiding pejorative connotations of “relativism”. Segundo does not provide a reference to the specific place where Mannheim writes about relationism. However, one example is from *Ideology and Utopia*. In it, Mannheim

¹⁰³¹ Segundo, *LT*, 199. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 175.

¹⁰³² Segundo, *LT*, 199-200. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 176.

¹⁰³³ Segundo, *LT*, 175. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 154.

¹⁰³⁴ Segundo, *LT*, 200. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 176.

¹⁰³⁵ Segundo, *LT*, 200. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 176.

¹⁰³⁶ Cf. Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 130-131.

writes, "Relationism signifies merely that all of the elements of meaning in a given situation have reference to one another and derive their significance from this reciprocal interrelationship in a given frame of thought".¹⁰³⁷

Segundo, however, disagrees with Mannheim's need to avoid relativism. To support his positive use of relativism, Segundo cites H. Richard Niebuhr's *The Meaning of Revelation*. Segundo quotes Niebuhr, "Relativism does not imply *subjectivism and scepticism*".¹⁰³⁸ The quote goes on to describe how belief can be both historically mediated and mediated by history. Niebuhr argues for an on-going historical process in which experience is formative for each person, and a person's experience is relative to other people's experience and historical experience. Segundo sees relativism as the first step in answering his questions.

The second response is "*subjective* absolutization" which Segundo defines as "an act of trust and surrender that logically deserves to be called 'faith' even though it may not entail belief in God or a specific religious tradition," and it is a commitment to liberation apart from whether or not liberation is achieved.¹⁰³⁹ He cites Tillich, both of the Niebuhr brothers, and Protestant theology in the United States for supporting analysis of faith common to both Christians and non-Christians.¹⁰⁴⁰ He points out the consistency in portraying an absolute faith that is always relative, which with something as intangible as faith is readily observable. Marsha Hewitt writes about this passage, "One could say that the '*subjective* absolutization' one gives to a values-structure constitutes a transcendent datum of

¹⁰³⁷ Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia: And Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Routledge, 1936), 76.

¹⁰³⁸ Segundo, *LT*, 200. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 176. Cf. H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation* (New York: Macmillan, 1941), 10. Emphasis added by Segundo.

¹⁰³⁹ Segundo, *LT*, 201, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 177.

¹⁰⁴⁰ For support, Segundo cites Niebuhr, *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture*.

that person's faith".¹⁰⁴¹ Thus, faith can only be absolute in the sense of "a particular value that is freely placed by the individual human subject, above all others".¹⁰⁴² This is the *commitment* that follows ideology and precedes theology and is the *decision to be human* in existential thinking.¹⁰⁴³

The third response involves a human faith which adds to its existential commitment some kind of specific orientation towards God. This is what Segundo ascribes to Tillich, and describes as "the faith professed by a Christian who has stripped away the veil of illusion and has come to realize that this is the process whereby a Christian value such as love becomes something in the midst of relative realities".¹⁰⁴⁴ Segundo highlights one particular value, what he calls "*human faith*", but it is not a choice among different religious traditions but a pluralistic amalgamation. He cites Tillich's *Dynamics of Faith*, quoting, "The other criterion of the truth of a symbol of faith is that it expresses the ultimate which is really ultimate".¹⁰⁴⁵ However, John R. Pottenger emphasizes Segundo's reference to an "educational *process*". Pottenger writes, "It is the process of learning itself that alone transcends historical situations and thus can alone claim ontological status as abstraction, although it manifests its quality conditionally".¹⁰⁴⁶ Pottenger might be overemphasizing Segundo's point because Segundo adds, "The problem for Catholic theology begins when one tries to define the precise content of this revelatory process".¹⁰⁴⁷

¹⁰⁴¹ Hewitt, *From Theology to Social Theory*, 54.

¹⁰⁴² Hewitt, *From Theology to Social Theory*, 73.

¹⁰⁴³ E.g. Sartre describes an impending human existential "decision" in Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 78-81.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Segundo, *LT*, 202, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 178.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Segundo, *LT*, 203. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 182. Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith*, 111.

¹⁰⁴⁶ John R. Pottenger, *The Political Theory of Liberation Theology: Toward a Reconvergence of Social Values and Social Sciences* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1989), 137.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Segundo, *LT*, 204. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 179.

Segundo gives three interpretations of this content. First, God is the content of revelation. Second, the Bible is the poetic process of revelation. Third, divine revelation is a “*deutero-learning* process”.¹⁰⁴⁸ In the first two points, he echoes the Barthian explanation of revelation.¹⁰⁴⁹ In other words, the Bible is not revelation itself; God is the content. The Bible is the poetic process. The third part is Segundo’s original contribution, in which he views God’s revelation as a “*deutero-learning* process” or learning to learn. Existential experience is the basis of how people learn to learn and is the subject of chapter four in *LT*.¹⁰⁵⁰ The relationship between ideology and commitment/faith includes an acknowledgement of existing ideologies (step one in the hermeneutic circle). By appealing to existential experience, faith relates to lived reality but is also transcendent in the potential for changing the human condition. Education helps understand the Absolute, but it does not capture it. Education is a secondary step in understanding God.

6.4 Conclusion

Segundo’s theological approach in *LT* emphasizes the existence of the individual person as a free, sentient being who is responsible for determining his or her future in this life, i.e. before death. The individual acts in communion and/or tension with other individuals and God. For Segundo, theology is a living organism and is capable of changing to reflect an ever-evolving understanding of God. Church dogma is not static; it changes over time. The fact that it changes points back to the human limitations in understanding God. Since Christian doctrine is an

¹⁰⁴⁸ Segundo, *LT*, 204-205. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 179-180.

¹⁰⁴⁹ E.g. Barth, *Church Dogmatics I/2*, 514f.

¹⁰⁵⁰ See especially Segundo, *LT*, 203. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 178.

approximation of who God is, it must change over time as human understanding increases and improves.

Because dogma changes over time, there are nascent methodological problems. For example, if old authority rests in one place and that place does not accept an improvement in human understanding, authority must be wrested away and replaced with a new authority. The changes in dogma are not smooth, systematic or planned out. They can happen in fits and bursts. For liberation theologians, like Segundo, they were susceptible to accusation of having ulterior motives when they wrote about changes needed in Church dogma. Segundo and others had to defend themselves against accusations of putting forward a Marxist theology. As politics evolved in the late twentieth century, liberation theologians also had to defend themselves against the false promises of capitalism. Defending against accusations became part of liberation theology. *LT* addresses some accusations, but since it arrived so early in the development of liberation theology, *LT*, in some respects, elicited some criticisms and accusations of Segundo's use of Marxism with a *prima facie* rejection of the philosophy.

In exploring *LT*, the existential dimension of Segundo's thought is latent. When he introduces the hermeneutic circle, he emphasizes the existence of the individual as a free being who is capable of interpreting scripture. When he presents a "search for sociology", he highlights, above all else, methodology, which requires the existence of free-thinking people to carry it out.¹⁰⁵¹ When he looks at the church in relation to ideology and eschatology, he acknowledges the role of humanity. People write church dogma and people change church dogma. His theology incorporates divine interaction as part of the existential reality, but the human

¹⁰⁵¹ Segundo, *LT*, chapter 2. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, chapter 2.

commitment that underlies the commitment of faith is also a strong existential element. He underscores his theology with humanity acting as free agents who can determine their own intellectual development through human action, e.g. *deutero-learning*.

The secondary material relating to *LT* is abundant. Thus, in this project, we move from virtually unknown sources, like his dissertation *Berdiaeff* or an unpublished manuscript *Heidegger*, to his most widely read book *LT*. By turning to this better known work, my argument for an existential dimension to his theology relates directly to what is already familiar in Segundo's thought.

Because *LT* is essentially about how people *do theology*, Segundo's argument is for the liberation of theology from the people who have traditionally been doing it. His approach involves a method, the hermeneutic circle, and the particular context of Latin America in the 1960s and 70s. His method and context are one of the main reasons his theology is considered liberation theology. As I stated in the introduction above, he believes that the world is not the way it should be and that Jesus was concerned with human liberation. His theology goes on to include the Church in creating human liberation, and he views God's grace as both supernatural and natural.

At the beginning of this chapter, I cited as an example of Segundo's existentialism his use of Bultmann in *LT*. To carry the example further, let us return to Segundo's engagement with Bultmann. In *El hombre 2.2*, he explores Bultmann's demythologization and juxtaposes demythologization with his own hermeneutic circle from *LT*. He writes,

Bultmann proposes a concrete procedure or methodology for *authenticating* our existential reflection and thus preparing ourselves to better hear and more profoundly understand the word that God is

addressing to us when we interpret supposedly mythical events. That procedure is, of course, Heidegger's analysis of the differences between an authentic existence and an inauthentic existence, which is to be found in his well-known work, *Being and Time*.¹⁰⁵²

Beginning with Bultmann's "methodology for *authenticating* our existential reflection," Segundo moves to Heidegger, pointing out his influence in Bultmann's methodology--this is an example of human commitments preceding theology. For Heidegger, authentic and inauthentic existence are "characterized with regard to those modes of the temporalizing of temporality;" e.g. a person in an inauthentic existence will "lose *himself* in the object of his concern, he *loses his time* in it too".¹⁰⁵³ Heidegger's 'authentic' and 'inauthentic existence' are not abstract concepts. Segundo finds these two types of existence to be appropriate for theological discourse. He argues that they can help a person "better hear and more profoundly understand the word that God is addressing to us when we interpret supposedly mythical events".¹⁰⁵⁴ In this way, he finds Heidegger a useful interlocutor who can provide language for a more developed understanding of God interacting with the world.¹⁰⁵⁵

Segundo's overall project in the three volumes of *El hombre* (FI, 2.1 and 2.2) is the development of a Christology. In this particular portion of his project, he is exploring the notion of Christ within the Ignatian spiritual exercises. In the spiritual exercises, there is a significant amount of time spent praying and reflecting. Segundo traces the spirituality of these exercises through four chapters, but in chapter five, "Demythologization and Discernment of Spirits," he turns his attention to Bultmann (and, in turn, Heidegger) in order to answer his own existential doubts about some

¹⁰⁵² Segundo, *El hombre* 2.2, 721. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 78.

¹⁰⁵³ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 463.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.2, 721. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 78.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Cf. Chapter 5, for a more detailed treatment of this.

of the spiritual aspects of the exercises. He expands his understanding of Heidegger's influence on Bultmann and what he finds most useful in Heidegger's analysis. He writes:

Heidegger had an ontological intention that Bultmann rejected. Bultmann felt we should not look to Heidegger for the results of an abstract (*existenzial*) phenomenology of human existence, but rather should look to him for a concrete 'existentialist' (*existenziell*) analysis.¹⁰⁵⁶

Heidegger calls the way that one could approach an object in order to know it better an *existenziell* ('existentiell') act, as opposed to a philosophical one which is 'existenzial' ('existential') or using "existential categories". Segundo agrees that the *existenzial* can appear where it does not immediately appear, i.e. the ontological foundation. In both the *existenziell* and the *existenzial*, Segundo finds a methodology that complements his own project in *LT*. He suggests that Heidegger gives his readers a deeper and improved existential understanding of the human condition. Reading Heidegger in this way, Segundo finds a "spiritual pathway or course of 'exercises' that will help us to reach or get closer to an authentic existence".¹⁰⁵⁷ Segundo agrees with Bultmann's application of this reading of Heidegger to the events of Christ's life, but Segundo does not take Heidegger's ontological intention simply as an alternative to Bultmann's rejection of ontology. Instead, he reaches Heidegger through Bultmann and accepts Bultmann's suggestion that Christians "should look to [Heidegger] for a concrete 'existentialist' (*existenziell*) analysis", while also asserting the usefulness of the *existenzial*. In this way, Segundo finds "a methodological analysis" in *Being and Time* that will help Christians "deepen and

¹⁰⁵⁶ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.2, 721-722. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 78. In my discussion until now I have been using the form 'existentiell', as in the translation of Heidegger by John Macquarrie. In the following discussion I use 'existenziell' since it is the German form used by Segundo in *El Hombre*.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Segundo, *El hombre* 2.2, 721-722. Cf. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 78.

perfect [their] own level of existential understanding". He uses the methodological analysis he finds in *Being and Time* to explicate the concrete side of the spiritual experience in, for example, the Ignatian Exercises. The existenzial can appear in the midst of life in Segundo's view of liberation theology--i.e. the unveiling or revelation of the loving and free God who liberates--grace and nature are not two orders.

Segundo returned to this distinction between the *existenzial* and *existenziell* in his final book *El Infierno*, published posthumously in 1998. He suggests that *existenziell* (or 'existentiell') is "a substantive adjective expressing a 'transcendental' condition of existence".¹⁰⁵⁸ He finds the *existenzial* to be more useful as a theoretical and ontological approach, and he applies this approach to theology. It is part of the existential grammar he borrowed from Heidegger as evident in both *Heidegger* and *LT*.¹⁰⁵⁹ The terms function along a linear path from the ontological or foundational (*existenzial*) to the ontic or what is founded (*existenziell*). By finding the true foundation of liberation, Segundo's work in *LT* can found a new methodology, the hermeneutic circle, which is bound to its cultural identity and ideologies just as is every other thought or idea. In *LT*, he takes existential themes and applies them to theology in order to liberate theology from some of the constraints that developed within positions of power and authority. In face of the dominant ideologies that influenced twentieth-century theology, Segundo takes existentialism and appropriates it for his project of liberating the methodology of theology.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Segundo, *Infierno*, 120 n15.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Segundo writes, "In order to attain the existential authenticity and profundity required to gain an ever deeper understanding of the word of God, Bultmann proposed to base his methodology on the existential analysis of Heidegger". Segundo, *LT*, 112. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 98.

7 Ideologies, Faith, and Freedom

Juan Luis Segundo defines an ideology as “the systematization of my perception of the objective realm...a vision of things that claims to be objective, i.e. non-valuational”.¹⁰⁶⁰ His definition is consistent with the way other scholars use the word *ideology*. For example, Michael Hunt relates it to political historiography and defines it as, “an interrelated set of convictions or assumptions that reduces the complexities of a particular slice of reality to easily comprehensible terms and suggests appropriate ways of dealing with that reality”.¹⁰⁶¹ Another example is Emile Durkheim, who compares societal influences to an ideology.¹⁰⁶² Herman Schmid describes Louis Althusser’s view of ideology as “surprisingly parallel” to Durkheim’s.¹⁰⁶³ Whether it is a “systematization of my perception”, “an interrelated set of convictions” or “societal influences”, the central part of Segundo’s definition is ideology is “non-valuational”, distinguishing ideology from faith. His definition departs from other’s usage when he argues that ideology becomes oppressive when it is confused with faith.

For Segundo, an ideology both stands in distinction from faith and functions alongside it. In *FI*, he acknowledges borrowing from James 2:17 and writes, “...a faith without ideologies is, in reality, dead”.¹⁰⁶⁴ He views ideology as informing and shaping faith, and he recognizes that a person’s ideology is helpful in seeing the need for a change or shift of one’s perception. In the Latin American liberation theology milieu of 1970-90, this could mean that The Church must cease complicity with the state. Segundo’s definition and usage is different from Marx, who viewed “ideology

¹⁰⁶⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 31. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 16.

¹⁰⁶¹ Michael H. Hunt, “Ideology,” *The Journal of American History* 77, no. 1 (1990): 108.

¹⁰⁶² Émile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, ed. Steven Lukes, trans. W. D. Halls (New York: The Free Press, 1982), 86.

¹⁰⁶³ Herman Schmid, “On the Origin of Ideology,” *Acta Sociologica* 24, no. 1/2 (1981): 60.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 156, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 126.

as an instrument of social reproduction".¹⁰⁶⁵ For Marx, ideology perpetuates an oppressive system of perceiving reality.¹⁰⁶⁶ Whereas, for Segundo, ideology is a system of *naming* reality; it does not perpetuate the system in and of itself, and so sanction the continuing of exploitation. In fact, for Segundo, faith and ideologies together can be an instrument of change.

Antoine Destutt de Tracy first used the term *ideology* to describe a "science of ideas" in 1796.¹⁰⁶⁷ William Taylor references Tracy's use in *The Monthly Review*.¹⁰⁶⁸ Marx and Engels wrote about ideology in *The German Ideology* around 1846, but it was not published until 1932.¹⁰⁶⁹ Throughout the twentieth century, the word *ideology* appeared more and more frequently. From Philip Converse's description of ideology as "thoroughly muddled by diverse uses" in 1964¹⁰⁷⁰ to the late 1990s, the usage of ideology grew. Kathleen Knight charts its particular scholarly usage in the journal *The American Political Science Review*, and she shows in a chart that by the 1970s about half of all articles the journal published engaged the concept of ideology. According to the Google Ngram viewer,¹⁰⁷¹ the frequency of the word "ideology" peaked in 1994. Segundo's "non-valuational" ideology complements his

¹⁰⁶⁵ Caroline K. Kaltefleiter and Anthony J. Nocella, "Anarchy in the Academy: Staying True to Anarchism as an Academic-Activist," in *Anarchist Pedagogies: Collective Actions, Theories, and Critical Reflections on Education*, ed. Robert H. Haworth (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012), 203.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*, 29.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Antoine L. Destutt de Tracy, *Eléments d'idéologie* (Paris: Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1977).

¹⁰⁶⁸ William Taylor, "Paris during the Year 1796," *The Monthly Review* 20(1796): 569.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*, vii.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Philip Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics," in *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. David E. Apter (New York: The Free Press, 1964), 207. Cited in Kathleen Knight, "Transformations of the Concept of Ideology in the Twentieth Century," *The American Political Science Review* 100, no. 4 (2006): 619.

¹⁰⁷¹ An n-gram is a contiguous sequence of n items from a given sequence of text or speech. The Google Ngram viewer was developed by Jon Orwant and Will Brockman and charts the yearly count of selected n-grams [n] or words and phrases, as found in over 5.2 million books digitized by Google Inc.

theological project because he does not connect it with a particular doctrine; it is a way of describing existence.¹⁰⁷²

In this chapter, by focussing on the relation between ideology and faith I will attempt to bring together the pieces from the earlier chapters and present a summation of the argument in my project. The original sources add to Segundo's published works. Both the new material and published volumes inform my view that the existential dimension of Segundo's liberation theology is significant, and it has previously been absent in the corpus of secondary material on his thought. Using his treatment of faith and ideologies, my goal is to rectify this omission.

7.1 What kind of ideology?

I quoted Segundo's definition of ideology above, but this simple definition does not completely answer the question: *what kind of ideology complements his theological project and connects to the existential dimension of his thought?* In *FI*, the source of the definition above, he builds on his earlier work and the existential dimension of his liberation theology becomes clearer. He distinguishes between "the realm (or structure) of *meaning* or values and the realm of *efficacy*".¹⁰⁷³ He sees both terms, *meaning* and *efficacy*, as tangible, and thus, they provide a guide for his discussion of faith and ideology. He also suggests that most people have some understanding of *faith* and can confirm this understanding using their own experience. However, he sees a change when using a word like *ideology* because he is "using *abstract* and therefore much more arbitrary language".¹⁰⁷⁴ He resolves this shift by returning to concrete experience to connect ideology with efficacy.

¹⁰⁷² Segundo, *FI*, 31. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 16.

¹⁰⁷³ Segundo, *FI*, 142. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 109.

¹⁰⁷⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 141. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 109.

Segundo understands the problems associated with defining a word like *ideology*, so he rhetorically asks, “Why do I not use a term for the realm of efficacy that is as concrete as the term ‘faith’ used for the realm of meaning?” He answers “Because there is no such term”.¹⁰⁷⁵ In *FI*, he explains his reasons for rejecting the following words: foreseeing, knowing, knowledge, science, and wisdom. He writes, “Despite its abstract character, the word ‘ideology’ can designate any system of ‘ideas’ about the connection between events when viewed as objective: i.e., independent as *facts* from the values on which they depend for their purpose or finality”.¹⁰⁷⁶ Although ideology remains a somewhat loaded term,¹⁰⁷⁷ he resolves that it best describes his meaning but asks readers to pay careful attention to his definition and usage.¹⁰⁷⁸

7.1.1 Other scholars & Segundo’s ideology

Throughout his writings, Segundo often uses the word *ideology*; this has not escaped scholars’ attention. In addition to the two doctoral theses cited above, Peter Scott quotes Segundo’s *FI*, “I shall use the term ‘ideology’ for all systems of means, be they natural or artificial, that are used to attain some end or goal”.¹⁰⁷⁹ He suggests that Segundo uses ideology in a general sense, but does not go on to explain how Segundo’s engagement with ideology is peculiarly his, or that it is critical of Marx’s view of the creation of religion as an oppressive ideology, as I do. Segundo is critical

¹⁰⁷⁵ Segundo, *FI*, 141. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 109.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 142. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 109.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Much has been written about the nature of ideology. E.g. Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*. Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia: And Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. Segundo scholars have explored his understanding of ideology. E.g. Kevin Lee Forrester, “An analysis and critique of the relationship between faith and ideologies in the work of Juan Luis Segundo” (Ph.D., The Catholic University of America, 1992). Marsha Hewitt, “An analysis of the notion of ideology in the critical theology of Juan Luis Segundo” (Ph.D., Concordia University (Canada), 1987).

¹⁰⁷⁸ Segundo, *FI*, 142. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 110.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Scott, *Theology, Ideology and Liberation*, 24. Cf. Segundo, *FI*, 30. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 16.

of Marx in *FI*¹⁰⁸⁰ and I shall present a further perspective on Segundo's engagement with Marx in 7.1.3 below.

There are other examples of scholars engaging with Segundo's definition of ideology. In *Black Theology and Ideology* (2002), Harry H. Singleton juxtaposes Segundo and James Cone, suggesting Cone uses Segundo's method to remove the ideology of white supremacy and "uses that new hermeneutic as a way of reinterpreting theology for the purpose of black liberation".¹⁰⁸¹ In a 1982 article, Charles Strain calls Segundo "the theologian who has gone the furthest in working out the possibilities of faith and ideology".¹⁰⁸² Ivan Petrella writes, "Juan Luis Segundo's understanding of the relation between faith and ideology can be seen as providing the closest historical analogy to the position developed in this book," referring to his own project.¹⁰⁸³ These are examples of scholars engaging with Segundo, in general, and as such, they show interest in Segundo's thought. They also bring to light the significance of his use of ideology. Different scholars interpret his use and definition of ideology differently, but there appears to be agreement that it is noteworthy.

At the end of *FI*, Segundo describes three kinds of ideology: neutral, negative or one-sided, and positive. He identifies one-sided ideology with Marxism, writing, "Marxism and liberalism are one-sided ideologies insofar as they disregard their own flaws, the complexity of reality, and the possibility of their claims being

¹⁰⁸⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 367-368. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 300-301.

¹⁰⁸¹ Harry H. Singleton, *Black Theology and Ideology: Deideological Dimensions in the Theology of James H. Cone* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002), 91, see also 92-111. The book is a revised version of Singleton's thesis: Harry H. Singleton, "Dimensions of deideologization in the works of James H. Cone" (Ph.D., Graduate Theological Union, 1998).

¹⁰⁸² Charles Strain, "Liberation Theology: North American Perspective," *Religious Studies Review* (1982): 284.

¹⁰⁸³ Petrella, *The Future of Liberation Theology*, 35.

compatible with anthropological faith, indeed with a specific faith".¹⁰⁸⁴ He focuses his attention on the destructiveness of one-sided ideologies and does not expand much on neutral or positive ideologies. He ends the section by asking if the objective is to have "better" ideologies.¹⁰⁸⁵ *Better* is an interesting choice of words because it implies judgment, as in the assertion that one ideology is preferable to another.

Segundo believes the answer is 'yes' and argues this point in the final two chapters.

He writes:

My intention in this work is not to propose concrete solutions to problems which vary from place to place and from group to group on our continent. The reader can only hope that in this new methodological approach there are general lines of orientation for the task that we cannot postpone: i.e., laying foundations for a culture that is truly our own, hence flexible as well.¹⁰⁸⁶

Again, Segundo refers to methodology and hopes to present a "new methodological approach", which is consistent throughout his works. His project in *FI* is not to produce in finished form a new system or a positive ideology (e.g. a doctrine of liberation theology). Instead, he hopes to build on the earlier method of projects, like *Existencialismo*, *Heidegger*, and *LT*. For example, he presents poetry as affective in *Existencialismo* and grammar as indicative of meaning in *Heidegger*. *LT* is focused on the hermeneutic of liberation. Evidence of Segundo's evolution is evident in the cassette recording *La Libertad*. In this chapter, we shall see his steps toward a positive ideology, based in faith, although distinct from it, and his continued use of existentialism complementing his liberation theology.

Part of the existential process in Segundo's liberation theology is working out various issues. This *existential process* is his engagement with concrete situations in order to uncover new answers to old questions. In *FI*, he engages with freedom as he

¹⁰⁸⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 367. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 300-301.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Segundo, *FI*, 367. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 301.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 388. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 320.

did in *Berdiaeff*, both as an ideology and as a manifestation of the human capacity to accept God's grace and extend it to others. This engagement was present in *Berdiaeff* in the way Segundo takes over an existential view of freedom from Berdyaev. This existential process was also present in the literary works of Sartre and Camus treated in the cassette tape *La Libertad*. Both illustrate fictitious concrete situations as archetypes for human freedom. In *FI*, Segundo is more technical in his analysis of freedom and he draws in existential language similar to the way he defined freedom in *Heidegger*.

Throughout the remainder of section 7.1, ideology will remain in the background as I focus on bringing together various pieces of this project, especially as they relate to Marx and Marxism. Segundo restates questions about human experience and Marx/Marxism in *FI*. This reflects his existential dimension and consistent concern for liberation, and the manner in which he restates questions is the subject of subsection 7.1.2. In 7.1.3, I treat Segundo's distinction between Marx and Marxism; he sees them as different from one another. Then, in 7.1.4, we shall see how Segundo engages with Marx's view of materialism. In 7.1.5, we shall see how transcendent data of Jesus' message conflicts with an idea like Camus's absurdism.

7.1.2 Restating the problem

Segundo begins *FI* by acknowledging what he calls a "popular view" in which "a radical division is set up between people who have 'faith' and those who structure their lives around some 'ideology'".¹⁰⁸⁷ These two terms, faith and ideology, are distinct from one another, but rather than defining and distinguishing between them, he begins with a phenomenological analysis in order to restate the problem

¹⁰⁸⁷ Segundo, *FI*, 13. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 3.

and look for a solution. In this analysis, he explores what the senses or mind notices in *Caligula* by Camus, what Segundo calls an anthropological dimension. Thus, one of his aims in *FI* is to provide further development to the method he set out in *LT*.

An example of the potential for Segundo's method comes from Rollan McCleary, who uses Segundo's methodology of liberation theology and the way he restates problems in order to find unique solutions. For McCleary, this is the key to applying liberation theology to "gay theology".¹⁰⁸⁸ McCleary cites Guy M  nard as first applying Segundo's hermeneutic circle to queer theology.¹⁰⁸⁹ By restating the problem and setting out a methodology, rather than a doctrine, Segundo sets up liberation theology to be applied to other areas of theology. The way M  nard and McCleary use Segundo's methodology illustrates this point, but based on his writings, Segundo would not likely share McCleary and M  nard's conclusions.

Returning to *FI*, Segundo uses what he calls "two anthropological dimensions" to "restate the problem". The problem, according to Segundo, is that "people assume... faith and ideologies... oppose and exclude each other".¹⁰⁹⁰ The two anthropological dimensions are *Caligula* by Albert Camus and a comparison of value, meaning and faith. In *Caligula*, Camus tells the story of the Roman emperor who seeks to exercise absolute freedom.¹⁰⁹¹ In a tape recording of Segundo discussing *Caligula*, he describes the perverse way Caligula tries to experience freedom, but his happiness and the way he expresses freedom as murder leads to his death.¹⁰⁹² In *FI*, he uses a specific definition of happiness as his point of departure: "*the basic*,

¹⁰⁸⁸ Rollan McCleary, *A Special Illumination: Authority, Inspiration And Heresy In Gay Spirituality* (London: Equinox, 2004).

¹⁰⁸⁹ McCleary, *A Special Illumination*, 60. Cf. Guy M  nard, *De Sodome    l'Exode: jalons pour une th  ologie de la lib  ration gaie* (Montreal: L'Aurore/Univers, 1980).

¹⁰⁹⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 13. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 3.

¹⁰⁹¹ Camus, *Caligula, suivi de Le malentendu*. Camus, *Caligula*.

¹⁰⁹² This is addressed above in chapter 4. Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

undeniable fact that every human being is moved by a quest for *satisfaction*".¹⁰⁹³ He deliberately does not include a concrete definition because his point is the universal quest for something good and satisfying.

In his remarks at the end of the chapter, Segundo identifies two surprises in *Caligula*. First, Caligula's adventure of being free tends to close off adventures rather than open him to new possibilities.¹⁰⁹⁴ This is identical to his summary comments on the tape recording.¹⁰⁹⁵ The second surprise is related to human limitations. He writes, "It is impossible for the individual to explore the possibilities of existence ahead of time in an empirical way".¹⁰⁹⁶ He provides the example of a person who chooses to be a doctor. After the person makes this choice, the person can no longer experience with direct, empirical knowledge, another choice, like being an engineer, for example.¹⁰⁹⁷

Elaborating on his doctor/engineer example, Segundo quotes André Gide, "The large quantity of this remainder would always be preferable to any one unit".¹⁰⁹⁸ Segundo writes, "There is no system by which we can choose the remainder".¹⁰⁹⁹ In his remarks, he adds what he calls a "decisive fact", "Freedom is gradually and steadily lost as we use it".¹¹⁰⁰ Berdyaev makes a complementary argument in *Slavery and Freedom*, in which he writes, "Man seeks freedom...has a drive toward freedom, and yet not only does he easily fall into slavery, but he even loves slavery [sic]".¹¹⁰¹ Segundo does not go as far as Berdyaev in labelling the loss

¹⁰⁹³ Segundo, *FI*, 37, italics original. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 21.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 37. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 22.

¹⁰⁹⁵ Segundo, "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus," Oxford, UK, 1980,

¹⁰⁹⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 38. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 22.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Segundo, *FI*, 15. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 5.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Segundo, *FI*, 15. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 5. André Gide, *Les nourritures terrestres* (Paris: Société du Mercure de France, 1897), 78.

¹⁰⁹⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 16. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 5.

¹¹⁰⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 38. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 22.

¹¹⁰¹ Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, 59.

of freedom as slavery, but from chapter 3 above, we can at least acknowledge Berdyaev's influence in shaping Segundo's view of freedom. Thus, when Segundo points to the loss of freedom, the imprint of Berdyaev's influence is evident. In addition, the loss of freedom or calling the quest for freedom a "fall into slavery" echoes Gide's literary analogy of longing for something else after having made a choice. There is freedom to make a choice, but once a person makes a choice, another choice is no longer available. Freedom is lost because it is used, and the person is bound or a slave to the choice.

Segundo introduces a second "decisive fact": "*the impossibility* faced by every human being *of experientially exploring* the limits of human possibilities insofar as satisfactions are concerned".¹¹⁰² This second "fact" builds upon the first, but he introduces a new example: "genital sexual love". He cites Freud's concept of culture with the following quote as an explanation: "man's discovery that sexual (genital) love afforded him the strongest experience of satisfaction, and in fact provided him with the prototype of all happiness..."¹¹⁰³ The problem, according to Segundo, is the lack of a comparison. "Strongest experience" compared to what? He also points out that sexual intimacy "is not an act; it is a *process*, a trip".¹¹⁰⁴ No one can both experience sexual intimacy and *not* experience it. In a long quote from Freud, Segundo emphasizes the subjectivity of "strongest" or best experience.¹¹⁰⁵

Segundo is exploring the limitations of a purely existential approach. These "decisive facts" are illustrative of his belief that existential analysis itself tells us that we are always operating with transcendent data. Transcendent data exceeds

¹¹⁰² Segundo, *FI*, 38, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 22.

¹¹⁰³ Segundo, *FI*, 17. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 23. Sigmund Freud, "El malestar de la cultura," in *Obras completas* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1968), 30. Sigmund Freud, *Civilization And Its Discontents*, trans. James Strachey (New York: W. W. Norton, 1962), 89.

¹¹⁰⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 17, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 23.

¹¹⁰⁵ Segundo, *FI*, 18. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 24.

verifiable limits of human possibilities (cf. sub-section 7.1.5 below). For Segundo, experience is within a social structure. In the above example of sexual intimacy, he points out how cultural expectations shape anticipation of a “strongest experience” and how achieving sexual intimacy is not an immediate, isolated act; it takes time. He writes, “It presupposes decisive mediations if the resultant satisfaction...is to be intense and gratifying”.¹¹⁰⁶ A person cannot experience *better*; a person can only have an experience, and within the restrictive framework of existential analysis whether it is a good or bad experience, in the sense of being more or less satisfying and worthwhile, is subjective.

7.1.3 Marx/Marxism

Karl Marx the person and Marxism as a school of thought are not the same. Segundo distinguished between the two, finding some of Marx’s ideas useful but considering Marxism itself as an overreaching one-sided ideology. In *LT*, he writes, “Those who identify themselves with Marx and his thinking have a thousand different ways of conceiving and interpreting ‘Marxist’ thought”.¹¹⁰⁷ Segundo maintains that Marx himself has a kind of anthropological faith, when understood existentially. Segundo finds that Marx is wrong in regarding all ideology as oppressive, and his thought is itself an ideology.

The variations of school of thought with Marx-studies are numerous; Segundo might not be using hyperbole when he refers to “a thousand different ways of conceiving and interpreting ‘Marist’ thought”. Ironically Marxists have developed an ideology which liberation theology can discard in finding what is of value in

¹¹⁰⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 17. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 23.

¹¹⁰⁷ Segundo, *LT*, 19. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 35.

Marx's thought. Identifying the variations in Marx's schools of thought contributes to constructing the existential dimension of Segundo's liberation theology. Segundo uses Marx's ideas in an existential way to apply to the human condition. He argues that Marxists have confused ideology with faith.

Horacio Bojorge is critical of Segundo's use of Marx in general,¹¹⁰⁸ and Peter Scott sees Segundo as too uncritical of Marx.¹¹⁰⁹ Both miss Segundo's distinction between Marx and Marxism. He sounds sympathetic to Marx when he writes, "The division of labour was not an evil in itself...The division of labour became a source of bondage when it took on its own institutional life independently of human beings and over them".¹¹¹⁰ However, in that quote, he is using Marx to contrast Adam Smith's "invisible hand".¹¹¹¹ Both capitalism and Marxism/communism can be functional and dysfunctional systems. In Segundo's comparison, he writes that basic needs are both met and ignored in both types of economies. Both systems place "faith in their system against the *ideology* of the other system".¹¹¹² In this sense, Segundo is critical of Marx and Marxism, whilst, at the same time, he is critical of the pitfalls of capitalism.

Mary Kaye Nealen notes Segundo's classification of Sartre in *LT*, as an "independent Marxist".¹¹¹³ In his words, Segundo suggests that Sartre is "excessively ironic in his treatment of present-day Marxist sociology",¹¹¹⁴ and he quotes Sartre:

They cannot step out of themselves. They *reject* the enemy phrase (out of fear or hatred or laziness) at the very moment they are pretending

¹¹⁰⁸ Bojorge, *Teologías deicidas*, 133ff.

¹¹⁰⁹ Scott, *Theology, Ideology and Liberation*, 24.

¹¹¹⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 308. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 253.

¹¹¹¹ Adam Smith, *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*, ed. Edwin Cannan and Max Lerner (New York: Modern library, 1937), book 4, ch. 2. Cf. Segundo, *FI*, 308. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 252.

¹¹¹² Segundo, *FI*, 305, italics original. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 251.

¹¹¹³ Nealen, *The Poor in the Ecclesiology of Juan Luis Segundo*, 37. Cf. Segundo, *LT*, 73. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 61.

¹¹¹⁴ Segundo, *LT*, 73. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 61.

to open up to it. This contradiction blocks them up. They literally do not understand a word they are reading. And I am not attacking this incomprehension in the name of any bourgeois objective but rather in the name of Marxism itself. Their rejections and condemnations will be all the fiercer, their refutations all the more successful, the more they really know what they are refuting and condemning".¹¹¹⁵

Sartre's reference to "present-day Marxist sociology" implies that there was a previous Marxist sociology. For the Marxists contemporary with Sartre, he sounds dismissive and points out a seeming contradiction between acceptance and rejection of opposing or differing thought. Sartre's criticism of "present-day Marxists" is "in the name of Marxism itself". In other words, he points to another, earlier, perhaps purer form of Marxism--one that is closer to Marx's original thought. Segundo's view of Marx and Marxism is very close to Sartre's description in the above quote because Segundo also sees an earlier version of Marx's thought, which Segundo sees as separate from Marxism.

According to Segundo, theologians frequently identify with Sartre's criticism of "present-day Marxists". Segundo supports this assertion by citing an August 5, 1890 letter from Engels to Conrad Schmidt. In the letter, Engels describes how the word 'materialistic' has taken on a broad meaning for many young writers in which "anything and everything is labelled *without further study*; they stick the label on it and then think the question disposed of". Engels continues, "Our conception of history is above all a guide to study, not a lever for construction after the manner of the Hegelian. All history must be studied afresh".¹¹¹⁶ The use of the phrase "guide to study" echoes Segundo's emphasis on method over dogma, and the last part of the

¹¹¹⁵ Segundo, *LT*, 73. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 67. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Critique de la raison dialectique* (Paris: N. R. F., 1960), 35.

¹¹¹⁶ Segundo, *LT*, 73. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 68. Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels, *Collected Works*, vol. 49 (New York: International Publishers, 1975), 8.

quote, “studied afresh”, is reminiscent of ‘new wineskins for new wine’ (Mark 2:21-22), although Engels was not likely invoking a scriptural idiom.

Segundo’s distinction between Marx and Marxism seems clear in both *LT* and *FI*, yet some thinkers continue to collapse the two together. For example, Michael Zweig correctly interprets the wider tension between Marxism and liberation theology, but does not distinguish between Marx and Marxism in Segundo’s thought. Zweig writes, “The partnership between Marxism and religion is an uneasy one”.¹¹¹⁷ Then, he quotes Segundo from *LT*, “In Marx’s view, philosophy can *make* errors...religion *is* an error”.¹¹¹⁸ Zweig concludes, “Indeed, Marxists have been overwhelmingly dismissive of religion and suspicious of religiously motivated action”.¹¹¹⁹ Zweig misses Segundo’s distinction between Marx and Marxism. He moves from writing about “Marxism” to quoting Segundo, in which Segundo addresses Marx, not Marxism. Then, Zweig concludes with the categorical label “Marxists”. According to this approach, for Zweig, Marx, Marxism, and Marxists are all equivalent terms, but for Segundo, they are distinguishable. Contemporary liberation theology, in general, tends to be sympathetic to Marxism or socialism, yet Segundo follows Sartre and argues that there is a difference between “present-day Marxists” and Marx. In missing this distinction, Zweig fails to note how Segundo observes that Marx’s view of religion differs at different points in his career.

As we shall see in the next section, in Marx’s early writings, religion is a protest against suffering, but in later Marx, Segundo quotes his writing, “The

¹¹¹⁷ Michael Zweig, “Economics and Liberation Theology,” in *Religion and Economic Justice*, ed. Michael Zweig (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991), 39.

¹¹¹⁸ Zweig, “Economics and Liberation Theology,” 39. Cf. Segundo, *LT*, 70. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 59.

¹¹¹⁹ Zweig, “Economics and Liberation Theology,” 39.

happiness of the people calls for the suppression of religion”.¹¹²⁰ Segundo draws a contradistinction within Marx’s thought and separates these differences from Marxism, which describes one particular view of religion and appears more monolithic in nature than the variances found within Marx’s writings. Likewise, this tendency toward a homogenous school of Marxist thought is at the centre of Sartre’s criticism of “present-day Marxists”.

7.1.4 Materialism and appearances

Materialism views physical matter as the only reality, and everything, including thought, feeling, mind, and will, can be explained in terms of matter and physical phenomena. When combined with the philosophy of existentialism, in which existence precedes or holds a higher meaning than essence or transcendence, materialism complements existential analysis and gives the dictum ‘existence precedes essence’ a certain flavour. For Marx, social institutions and ideologies produce hierarchical structures. Stanley Aronowitz identifies that Segundo objects to Marx’s hierarchy, an objection which Segundo formulates by using Marx’s own early writings.¹¹²¹ For instance, Segundo uses the following quote from Marx in *El hombre 2.2*:

Religious suffering is, at one and the same time, the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people.¹¹²²

¹¹²⁰ Segundo, *LT*, 70. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 59. Marx, *Critique of Hegel*, 131.

¹¹²¹ Stanley Aronowitz, *The Crisis in Historical Materialism: Class, Politics, and Culture in Marxist Theory* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1990), 169-170. Cf. Segundo, *LT*, 27 n23. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 36 n23.

¹¹²² Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels, *Collected Works*, vol. 3 (New York: International Publishers, 1975), 5. Cf. E.g. Segundo, *El hombre 2.2*, 648 n22. Segundo, *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*, 129 n33.

If Marx were consistent in his appraisal of religious suffering as an expression of real suffering and expressive of the desire to liberate people from suffering, he would be presenting the basic premise of liberation theology. However, he does not make this argument and goes on to identify religion as “the opium of the people”, soothing but not solving problems. For Segundo, the failure of historical materialism undercuts Marx’s denigration of religion. Segundo points to Engel’s critique of econometric historical materialism after 1890 by citing a letter he wrote to Joseph Bloch on 21-22 September 1890. He writes that neither he nor Marx have ever argued that in historical materialism “the determining element in history is *ultimately* the production and reproduction in real life”.¹¹²³ Aronowitz concludes from Segundo’s argument in *LT*, “The theoretical basis for Marxist opposition to religion--as distinct from opposition to the Church--is arbitrary, even under socialism”.¹¹²⁴ The other side of Aronowitz’s conclusion provides a viable role for religion in human liberation.

John R. Pottenger makes a similar argument to Aronowitz.¹¹²⁵ Marx’s thought was a response to the materialism of the Industrial Revolution, but Pottenger adds, “It is not clear to what extent Marx was in fact bound to materialist explanations of history and social change”.¹¹²⁶ Dialectical materialism is Marx’s way of understanding reality; it is his method for unravelling the meaning of the world. For Segundo’s overall project, there is a consistent tendency to view scripture, theologians and philosophers, and schools of thought as having something to add to his theological method, without coming completely under the influence of one

¹¹²³ Marx and Engels, *Works*, 33, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *LT*, 27 n23. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, 36 n23.

¹¹²⁴ Aronowitz, *The Crisis in Historical Materialism*, 170.

¹¹²⁵ Pottenger, *The Political Theory of Liberation Theology*, 88-91.

¹¹²⁶ Pottenger, *The Political Theory of Liberation Theology*, 90.

project or another. In that sense, liberation theology simply contributes to his hermeneutic circle and method of existential theology, yet a reductionist conclusion limiting how much he is a liberation theologian misses the primary thrust of his theological method. Instead, it would be more accurate to say, Marx contributes to Segundo's understanding of materialism. Additionally, Marx's thought simultaneously by a negative argument contributes to Segundo's sense of the role of religion, i.e. religion is *not* the opiate of the people but offers both material and spiritual transformation. Material transformation is the result of involvement in society and politics.

Segundo writes, "The term 'mode of production' is much less *materialist* than is often assumed by both its advocates and its opponents".¹¹²⁷ Returning to the idea presented in the above quote from Engel's letter to Bloch, Segundo focuses on the "human relations generated by the type of production".¹¹²⁸ Instead of materialism, he focuses on that which is affective, not the cognitive. He writes, "This necessary and determining relationship is not immediate. It is operative in the last instance or ultimately, and hence it is open to a relative autonomy".¹¹²⁹ Separating the faith of a movement from the ideology of the organization is challenging (e.g. the Pharisees in Matthew 23:27). For Segundo, Marxists include people who grow impatient with the revolution and stress the ideological superstructure in a deterministic way.¹¹³⁰ Instead, Segundo takes on change as an evolutionary process and it is more affectively based in faith than a cognitive ideology.

In *Existencialismo*, Segundo presents five characteristics of existential philosophy. These characteristics are described in greater detail in chapter 2.3.3

¹¹²⁷ Segundo, *FI*, 221. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 180.

¹¹²⁸ Segundo, *FI*, 222. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 180.

¹¹²⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 222. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 181.

¹¹³⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 222. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 181.

above, but the third characteristic involves testing an idea against reason. According to Segundo, the philosophy of existentialism has been viewed as a reaction against rational thought stemming from materialism.¹¹³¹ He denies this view of existentialism as a rejection of reason. His *existencialismo* (defined in chapter 2, above) does not oppose reason but rationalist philosophies, and presents existence in an original way. Juxtaposing *Existencialismo* with *FI*, we can see how the contradistinction between faith and ideology parallels his treatment of poetry and philosophy, to which we shall return in section 7.2 below. Before turning to values in language, exploring Segundo's treatment of transcendent data offers an evaluation of dialectical materialism.

7.1.5 Transcendent data

Segundo defines transcendent data as something that exceeds the verifiable limits of human possibilities.¹¹³² Transcendent data are the basis of forming values. Segundo writes, "Values are not chosen or preferred unless some non-instrumental conception is part of that decision".¹¹³³ In other words, in order to choose some value (e.g. *this* is good; *that* is not), a non-instrumental concept must be involved. A non-instrumental concept is not concrete or physical. Thus, Segundo concludes, every value includes some transcendent datum. He points out that using transcendent data is not scientific; it is not independently verifiable.

In *FI*, Segundo turns to Camus's *The Myth of Sisyphus* to illustrate that the rejection of all transcendent data leads to absurdism.¹¹³⁴ For Camus, absurdism is to

¹¹³¹ Segundo, *Existencialismo*, 50.

¹¹³² Segundo, *FI*, 96-97. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 72-73.

¹¹³³ Segundo, *FI*, 97. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 73.

¹¹³⁴ Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*.

be embraced.¹¹³⁵ Segundo rejects absurdism and compares immanent and transcendent data. The immanent data is everything that exists or operates within existential reality. It is scientific or verifiable. Segundo asks, "What about the possibility of *transcendent* data that could do away with absurdity?"¹¹³⁶ Camus rejects that possibility because transcendence leads to a super human and there is no logical certainty or experimental probability. He writes, "I want to know whether I can live *with what I know* and with that alone".¹¹³⁷

Camus's conclusion in absurdism leads Segundo to ask, "How can a person ground anything on the absurd?" He quotes Camus's answer: "It's a question of meaning and life will be lived all the better if it has meaning".¹¹³⁸ That is, meaning is found in embracing the absurd paradox between freedom and limit. The answer for Segundo is *a person cannot ground anything in the absurd*, and Camus's attempt to do so is "word play". Using 1 John 4:11-20 as an example, Segundo writes, "The fact that God is love makes certain things rather than others *worthwhile*".¹¹³⁹ He cites two additional biblical examples, but his point rests in Jesus' preaching and the assumption that people are more inclined to change their behaviour if they believe in transcendent data (e.g. the kingdom of God). For Segundo, humanity has the freedom to decide and the answer is not in absurdism, but in reasonable transcendent data. Returning to his understanding of existentialism, Segundo views

¹¹³⁵ Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*, 121-123. Segundo quotes from 30-31, but his point is better made later in Camus's book. Cf. Segundo, *FI*, 97. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 84.

¹¹³⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 97. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 84.

¹¹³⁷ Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*, 40, Segundo's italics. Cf. Segundo, *FI*, 97. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 84.

¹¹³⁸ Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*, 53, Segundo's italics. Cf. Segundo, *FI*, 97. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 85.

¹¹³⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 96. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 73.

Jesus as providing a reason for a different meaning-structure to replace the existing one in his listeners' minds.¹¹⁴⁰

The appeal to transcendent data fits into Segundo's distinction between Marx and Marxists and his engagement with materialism. He has shown that a purely materialistic approach such as Marxism falls under Camus' diagnosis of the absurdity of existence. He thus uses the existentialists against Marxists, and then shows that the ensuing problem of the absurd can only be met by a transcendent perspective. The idea of 'transcendent data' also carries forward the procedure throughout *FI* of carefully setting out questions and is part of his process for each person working out his or her own freedom. In this way, his liberation theology is somewhat individualistic, but he never separates it from the church. For Segundo, an individual's relationship with God is through the church, even though working out this relationship is individualized for each person; it does not look the same for everyone.

The nature of his argument in *FI* builds on his earlier work. For example, he quotes Berdyaev to support his argument for transcendence. Berdyaev writes about a "transcendental human being",¹¹⁴¹ and the way Segundo uses the quote, it supports his argument for something more than Camus's immanent data. Berdyaev writes, "Philosophy is anthropological...the whole problem resides in *elevating the quality* of that anthropologism to the point where it brings out what I would call the transcendental human being".¹¹⁴² For Segundo, philosophy is held in contrast to poetry and that which affects people. We turn to that now.

¹¹⁴⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 96. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 73.

¹¹⁴¹ Howard Slaatté points this out in his 1997 thesis about Berdyaev's ethics. Howard Alexander Slaatté, *Personality, spirit, and ethics: the ethics of Nicholas Berdyaev* (New York: P. Lang, 1997), 69.

¹¹⁴² Berdyaev, *Cinq méditations sur l'existence*, 35, Segundo's italics. Cf. Segundo, *FI*, 277. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 227.

For Segundo, people make decisions while operating with transcendent data, i.e. “data relating to things which he or she cannot personally experience and which, in that sense, are beyond him or her”.¹¹⁴³ He was not necessarily referring to things that transcend the world, e.g. God, but the sum-total of all experiences that go beyond what a person can comprehend. He writes, “When I refer to ‘transcendent data’, I am talking about something which is relevant for human beings precisely because the latter are operating continually in a ‘limit-situation’ ... it is a question of responding to human beings who notice the real-life limits of their existence”.¹¹⁴⁴ Segundo concludes that transcendent data for these “limit-situation” applies to secular, as well as sacred, language.

7.2 *Values in Language*

Liberation theology addresses the meaning of words and the thought behind the words people choose. For example, in *The Gospel of Solentiname* (1976), Ernesto Cardenal addresses the story of Mary and Martha in Luke 10:38-42. He quotes a man named William who summarizes the story, “One was a revolutionary and the other wasn’t”.¹¹⁴⁵ This interpretation places a certain weight on the roles represented by the characters Mary and Martha and puts a value on the gospel language not seen by many interpreters. This is not to say that William’s summary is wrong; it is simply an illustration of the way language can represent value structure. Finding revolutionary language seems significant to William. Thus, he finds it in this gospel pericope.

¹¹⁴³ Segundo, *FI*, 38. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 23.

¹¹⁴⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 192. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 169.

¹¹⁴⁵ Cardenal, *Solentiname*, Vol. 3, 111.

Segundo focuses chapter 6 in part one of *FI* on how values are represented in language.¹¹⁴⁶ He sees value in language as part of the meaning-structure of being human. In the chapter, he engages with Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus* (1922)¹¹⁴⁷ and John Macquarrie's *God-Talk* (1967)¹¹⁴⁸ in order to set up his argument. I will return to his use of these two sources in 7.2.2 below. In the introduction Segundo gives an example of two people who both speak the same language but find it difficult to understand one another. He cites a husband and wife, who presumably speak the same language and know each other well, but still the husband misunderstands the wife and vice versa. He also refers to what is often called the "generation gap" when parents find it difficult to understand the meaning of their children's language.¹¹⁴⁹ To better understand how language possesses value, we can turn to Segundo's analysis of Bécquer's poem "Rima 53" in *FI*.

7.2.1 Bécquer's Poem

Segundo writes that "Rima 53" is perhaps Bécquer's "most famous poem"¹¹⁵⁰. Bécquer is an integral part of secondary language education in the Spanish-speaking world, especially in the twentieth century.¹¹⁵¹ Using this verse from his audience's common frame of reference, Segundo hopes to illustrate how poetry is not only affective, but is successful in producing his intended result of communicating meaning. Behind meaning, values become apparent.

¹¹⁴⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 179-216. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 145-174.

¹¹⁴⁷ Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus*.

¹¹⁴⁸ Macquarrie, *God-Talk: An Examination of the Language and Logic of Theology*.

¹¹⁴⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 179. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 145.

¹¹⁵⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 179. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 146.

¹¹⁵¹ Cf. e.g. Mario A. Blanc, *Las rimas de Bécquer: su modernidad* (Madrid: Pliegos, 1988). In addition, a secondary school textbook lists Bécquer as "the other most important poet". José María Echazarreta Arzac, *Lengua Castellana y Literatura* (Madrid: Editex, 2008), 16.

Segundo quotes three stanzas. Each one begins with some things that repeat, e.g. “They will return, the dark swallows”, “They will return, the thick honeysuckles”, “They will return, the ardent words”.¹¹⁵² In the middle of the stanza, “*Pero*” or “*But*” signifies things that, in the actual experiences connected with the returning things, do not repeat. He writes, “Words are like swallows and honeysuckle flowers; they are all the same. They are universal and hence the uniqueness of the personal necessarily escapes the words”¹¹⁵³ Because words are universal, they cannot express the unrepeatable things which carry value. What are unrepeatable are “the same repeatable things insofar as they are related to concrete persons”.¹¹⁵⁴ For Segundo, even though experiences may be universal, they have an unrepeatable aspect in a similar way to Heidegger’s “the now”. In *Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit*, Heidegger describes consciousness and the dialectical movement. He writes, “The now is something simple that remains what it is in its being other. The now is what is absolutely many nows--it is universal”.¹¹⁵⁵

Although Heidegger’s “the now” and Segundo’s universal experience do not form an exact parallel, their approach in this area is consistent with one another. Segundo engages Bécquer’s poem to illustrate universal experience and to show that while words can express the universal, they cannot express or denote the unrepeatable within the universal. He writes, “The poet rejects a world of values depending on universal qualities”.¹¹⁵⁶ Words used poetically can contest their own universality and suggest a world of values (which inhere in particular things and persons). Heidegger interprets Hegel’s phenomenology to do the same thing. This

¹¹⁵² Segundo, *FI*, 180. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 146.

¹¹⁵³ Segundo, *FI*, 180. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 146.

¹¹⁵⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 183. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 149.

¹¹⁵⁵ Martin Heidegger, *Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994), 71.

¹¹⁵⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 183. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 149.

consistency is evident in the way Heidegger views poetry. In *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry*, Heidegger focuses on Hölderlin not because he “realizes the universal essence of poetry, but rather because Hölderlin’s poetry is sustained by his whole poetic mission... [he is] *the poet’s poet*”.¹¹⁵⁷ Bécquer’s “Rima 53” holds a similar place for Segundo.¹¹⁵⁸

Across boundaries of culture, geography and time, human experience is certainly consistent. Heidegger suggests that the German milieu is captured by Hölderlin. Segundo views Bécquer similarly for Latin American culture. In both cases, the poet writes about one topic, and the poem can be interpreted to apply to universal experience. But although words are universal, they create different meanings in different contexts, which witnesses to the uniqueness of the personal realm--and it is here that “transcendent data” have a place. Words used poetically can “break through the general nature of language in some way”.¹¹⁵⁹ No matter how much a person wishes to describe a unique, personal experience, the words used in the description can be used in other circumstances to carry a different meaning. Segundo interprets Bécquer’s poem to mean the speaker in the poem’s words is unable to uniquely describe his/her own love. Words cannot denote this world of value, this world of the unrepeatable, but may witness to it.

In his review of *FI*, Cornel West writes about Segundo’s treatment of Bécquer’s poem. He calls the way Segundo highlights human “access through the medium of language, to the vast, structured realm of meaning and values” neo-Kantian vocabulary; for West, this is “highly suspect”.¹¹⁶⁰ He is critical of the weight Segundo gives to language, suggesting that the later Wittgenstein used by Segundo

¹¹⁵⁷ Heidegger, *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry*, 52, emphasis original.

¹¹⁵⁸ Segundo, *FI*, 179. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 146.

¹¹⁵⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 183. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 150.

¹¹⁶⁰ Cornel West, "Review of Juan Luis Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*," *Commonweal* 111(1984): 56.

precludes such an “expressivist view of language”.¹¹⁶¹ West points to Ernst Cassirer and Susanne K. Langer, to both of which we will turn now.

In *Language and Myth* (1925), Cassirer writes, “Whatever appears important for our wishing and willing...that and only that receives the stamp of verbal ‘meaning’”.¹¹⁶² And, Langer writes in *Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling* (1972), “The awakened dreamer cannot recollect the events of the dream, but they color the remembered image and make it exciting on every recall, for they belong to its nature as intimately as its form and literal meaning”.¹¹⁶³ West makes an interesting connection between Segundo’s interpretation of affective value in language, especially the language of poetry, and Cassirer and Langer. Cassirer mediated between analytic and continental philosophy, and Langer, who translated *Language and Myth* from German to English, describes the feeling after a dream in similar terms to Segundo’s description of affective poetry. Segundo would not necessarily be uncomfortable with the comparison. However, West describes Segundo’s view of language as expressivist in a way that is precluded by the later Wittgenstein and suggests that Segundo’s view of value in language leads to “philosophical confusion”.¹¹⁶⁴

Even if one were to accept West’s idea that Segundo’s vocabulary is similar to that of Cassirer and Langer, this affinity does not work. Segundo does not cite Cassirer or Langer in any work, published or unpublished. Thus, neither person can be counted as an influence on Segundo. In addition, Cassirer was involved in a debate with Heidegger in 1929 in which Cassirer defended Kant’s symbolic forms

¹¹⁶¹ West, "Review of Juan Luis Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*," 56.

¹¹⁶² Ernst Cassirer, *Language and Myth*, trans. Susanne K. Langer (New York: Harper, 1946), 37.

¹¹⁶³ Susanne K. Langer, *Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling*, vol. 2 (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1972), 279.

¹¹⁶⁴ West, "Review of Juan Luis Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*," 56.

against Heidegger's existential analysis of Dasein.¹¹⁶⁵ As I have already written in chapter 5 above, Segundo was influenced by Heidegger and his existential grammar, which includes his existential analysis of Dasein, and not Cassirer's counterpoint.

In *FI*, Segundo does not argue for full explanations within poetry. Instead, poetry provides affective, existential testimony to experience and does not try to fully explain experience in cognitive, philosophical terms. He writes, "If we focus on the preferences of the poet, it seems that we can say little except that he values unrepeatable experiences which are conveyed in and through deep personal relationships".¹¹⁶⁶ The poem reveals the experience of the poet, and in the poem, readers can see, according to Segundo, the poet's total personal commitment, i.e. "His love is absorbed...impervious to all other sensations or considerations".¹¹⁶⁷ Because the poet's experience is total commitment and exclusive to the poet, this experience, even though it is universal, is unrepeatable. For Segundo, Bécquer's poem highlights these different aspects of the kind of value that is suggested by language. This is an insight which might be called 'existential' rather than 'expressivist'.

7.2.2 Language analysis

In *FI*, Segundo engages with the section in John Macquarrie's *God-Talk* (1967) in which Macquarrie addresses poetry. Segundo writes about it, "I believe, however, this detour is very inadequate".¹¹⁶⁸ He does not think Macquarrie has solid anthropological footing from which to construct God-language through using ordinary language. His criticism is that Macquarrie begins from an ontology--God as

¹¹⁶⁵ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, § 10.

¹¹⁶⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 184. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 149.

¹¹⁶⁷ Segundo, *FI*, 185. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 149.

¹¹⁶⁸ Segundo, *FI*, 186. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 168.

Holy Being--rather than from ordinary language.¹¹⁶⁹ Segundo suggests that Macquarrie “follows Heidegger’s ontological interpretation of poetics”.¹¹⁷⁰ If poetry is detached from both everyday experience and ethical considerations, it becomes a special preserve of human “playfulness”, and human “rationality” is exhausted of poetry and relegated to positivist reason and science.

For classifications, Segundo turns to Wittgenstein’s *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (1922), from which he borrows the labels: *denoted* things and *connoted* things. *Denoted* things are facts that are objectively verifiable through experience, whereas *connoted* things have “expressed acceptance through subjective impressions which could not possibly be verified”.¹¹⁷¹ Segundo provides an example of a cat. A statement might denote that the cat is on the doormat whilst connoting that the speaker does not like the cat. If another person corrects the speaker to say that the cat is on the windowsill instead of the doormat, the speaker might say: “What do I care if the cat is here or there? What I mean is that I have had enough of that cat!”¹¹⁷²

These classifications allow him to ask about the connoted aspects of Bécquer’s poem. The birds flying are denotable facts, independently verifiable, but the motivation of the birds is like the motivation of Bécquer’s lover or religious statements, e.g. “God exists” or “God does not exist”. Segundo writes, “The poet is not purporting merely to *connote* the... sensations aroused by the events he describes or *denotes*; he is purporting to offer a certain type of *reasoning* in which there are premises and conclusions”.¹¹⁷³ Empirical verification is a part of language, but

¹¹⁶⁹ Cf. Macquarrie, *God-Talk: An Examination of the Language and Logic of Theology*, 99-101, 194-195.

¹¹⁷⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 186. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 168.

¹¹⁷¹ Segundo, *FI*, 186. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 150.

¹¹⁷² Segundo, *FI*, 187. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 151.

¹¹⁷³ Segundo, *FI*, 187. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 151.

meaning and motivation (the reasoning behind language) is also present. In his existential theology, Segundo connects the commentary poetry provides for everyday events that affect people with meaning of those events. He writes, “We are confronted with values, thanks to which some things are sad and others pleasant”.¹¹⁷⁴ This type of analysis provides a means to value different things.

Before leaving language analysis, Segundo goes a step further. Poetry does not simply touch things that are affective and contain a system of valuation; in poetry he finds a special type of verifiability. There is in poetry, according to Segundo, an explanation of some physical phenomenon, a sense of self-validation, and traces of transcendent data. He writes, “We try different premises until we find the one which experience forces upon us as the most ‘economical’ explanation of phenomena”.¹¹⁷⁵ Perhaps he is placing too much weight on the meaning in poetry, but his argument is based on experience and correcting these premises within a set of alternatives. This follows Gregory Bateson’s Level 1 category of learning.

Segundo references Gregory Bateson with “self-validating” information, but he does not provide a citation at this point.¹¹⁷⁶ Bateson writes about “self-validating” information in his essay “The Logical Categories of Learning and Communication”. There are three levels of learning: Level 1 is linear and based on trial and error (Bateson uses the example of Pavlov’s dog). Level 2 is more complex and involves corrective change, or “learning to learn” (also called deutero-learning). Level 3 is “difficult and rare even in human beings” (changing the way of learning).¹¹⁷⁷ He writes, “This self-validating characteristic of the content of Learning 2 has the effect

¹¹⁷⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 189. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 152.

¹¹⁷⁵ Segundo, *FI*, 191. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 154.

¹¹⁷⁶ However, Segundo devotes a section of Part 1, Chapter 4 to Bateson’s “self-validating principles”. Segundo, *FI*, 116ff. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 91ff.

¹¹⁷⁷ Bateson, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, 279ff.

that such learning is almost ineradicable. It follows that Learning 2 acquired in infancy is likely to persist through life”.¹¹⁷⁸ This ‘self-validation’ is evident in Segundo’s following statement about the values of the poet: “*To some extent, then, every values-structure is necessarily grounded on the ultimate satisfaction one expects to get from the conjunction of reality with the practice of some value or set of values*”.¹¹⁷⁹ Some information is self-validating because it is based in “the *ultimate* satisfaction”. In other words, it is transcendent data.

7.3 *Ideology and Existentialism*

FI has an undercurrent of existentialism throughout the book. For example, Segundo analyses Camus’s *Caligula*.¹¹⁸⁰ In his discussion of tradition, he emphasizes Jesus’ context, “a long series of referential witnesses to certain values, a process involving defeats, victories, and retreats”.¹¹⁸¹ In his comparison of faith and works in Paul and James, he associates Paul’s emphasis on faith as a reaction to turning religion into an ideology, and he writes, “Paul attacks the same problem at its existential roots”.¹¹⁸² In other words, he draws meaning from Paul’s emphasis on faith but adds an existential dimension to this very faith. This undercurrent is a summation of a theological project that carries an existential dimension, as has been, hopefully, made evident by the previous chapters highlighting both Segundo’s engagement with existential thinkers (e.g. Berdyaev, Sartre, Camus, Bultmann, and Heidegger) and his use of existential ideas (e.g. the relationship between essence and existence).

¹¹⁷⁸ Bateson, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, 301.

¹¹⁷⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 192. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 154.

¹¹⁸⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 13-14. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 4, 21-22.

¹¹⁸¹ Segundo, *FI*, 100. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 75.

¹¹⁸² Segundo, *FI*, 152. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 123.

In *FI*, Segundo finds in mutual human dependence that the “social dimension of human experiences of freedom has not been elaborated by the major proponents of existential or phenomenological analysis”.¹¹⁸³ He sees a void and tries to fill that void with *FI*. His argument is against an individualistic view of existence, and he sees early Sartre as trying to break free from the social dimension of existentialism. He writes of Sartre, “He seems to imagine that a human being would be all the more human insofar as it could derive its most original options from itself alone, as if it were the first human individual”.¹¹⁸⁴ Segundo attributes Sartre’s emphasis on the individual as a shortcoming due to Sartre’s indebtedness to Descartes’ *cogito*. Segundo’s departure from the prevailing existentialism is evident in his understanding of the social dimension of human experiences. He has a social dimension to the way he uses the word *ideology*, i.e. “to ignore the social dimension of existential problems is to suffer a terrible impoverishment”.¹¹⁸⁵ In this way, both his existentialism and his use of the word *ideology* are unique, but he does not depart so far as to be unrelated to the philosophers with which he engages. Traces of Sartre’s *mauvaise foi* are present in Segundo’s definition, for example, of ideology, i.e. “the difficulty of realizing certain ideals leads us unwittingly to change them... due to *mauvaise foi*”.¹¹⁸⁶

In his thesis on Segundo’s Christology, Bryan Stone writes that the relationship between faith and ideologies dominantly “impresses itself upon the character and complexity of the christological [sic.] question” and “manifests itself in the structure of Segundo’s own unique method for interpreting the significance of

¹¹⁸³ Segundo, *FI*, 16-17. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 6, 28 n. 3.

¹¹⁸⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 17 n. 4. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 28-29, n. 3.

¹¹⁸⁵ Segundo, *FI*, 136. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 105.

¹¹⁸⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 17. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 28.

Jesus”.¹¹⁸⁷ For Stone’s project exploring Segundo’s Christology, his assessment of the dominant role faith and ideology plays in Segundo’s thought is accurate. A summary of Stone’s elements of faith and ideology in Christology are “freedom [in Christ] *from* fear, anxiety, and legalism” and “freedom [in Christ] *for* creatively loving others”.¹¹⁸⁸ In addition, I find the role of existentialism present in Jesus as calling attention to transcendent data and in poetic expression of his person and resurrection. Stone emphasizes the role of praxis in Segundo’s Christology, and whilst praxis and existentialism are not synonyms, they do both point toward something experienced. Praxis is to be distinguished from theory, and Segundo’s *existencialismo* includes essence and existence as two complementary tendencies. They can be seen in the way poetry is affective, whereas philosophy is not.

Segundo points out how real *aletheia* is impossible for humanity, and he looks at how it relates to ideology. On the one hand, he writes, “Truth, then, insofar as that is possible for human beings, would lie, [i.e. if ideology means a system of thought that hallows exploitation, as in the Marxist use of the term], not in having a ‘good’ ideology but in having no ideology at all, in descending from something that can be manipulated and sticking to what is inseparable from reality”.¹¹⁸⁹ In the negative sense of ideology as exploitative, there is no such thing as a ‘good’ ideology. Karl Mannheim, whom Segundo uses as an interlocutor in *FI*, writes, “It is nothing less than shocking to discover that those persons who claim to have discovered an absolute are usually the same people who pretend to be superior to the rest”.¹¹⁹⁰ It is in this sense that Segundo views the notion of a ‘good’ ideology. Instead, he argues, the existential goal is to have no ideology.

¹¹⁸⁷ Stone, *Effective Faith*, 69.

¹¹⁸⁸ Stone, *Effective Faith*, 188.

¹¹⁸⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 125. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 97.

¹¹⁹⁰ Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia: And Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*, 77.

On the other hand, Segundo recognizes that ideology exists. He describes two established uses of the term *ideology*. One is neutral and the other is exploitative. He writes, “The more *neutral* sense refers to everything that lies outside the precision of the sciences, to the suprascientific or the superstructural realm”.¹¹⁹¹ Though Segundo finds a ‘neutral’ sense of ideology useful, indeed essential, he is being critical of this particular view of the *neutral* sense of ideology and he wants to include an element of science within it if people are to be freed from a false consciousness.¹¹⁹² Segundo finds in consciousness-raising in Latin America an awareness of a “systematic lie” through developing ideologies.¹¹⁹³

In the following subsection, we will go further by looking at the liberation theology concept of consciousness-raising. Segundo addresses this idea in *FI*, and it continues to bring together the existential dimension of his theology and the various pieces in this project. Then, we will explore the role of freedom with ideology, and in the final subsection, we shall see how Segundo’s ideology and existentialism relates to his liberation theology more broadly.

7.3.1 Consciousness-raising

In *FI*, Segundo focuses the existential application of his project on Latin America. It is the milieu with which he is most familiar. He calls it a “very different situation” from developed countries and refers to it as “their human adventure”,¹¹⁹⁴ harkening to Sartrean language of *aventure* (cf. chapter 4). Sartre writes, “For the most banal even to become an adventure, you must (and this is enough) begin to

¹¹⁹¹ Segundo, *FI*, 125. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 97.

¹¹⁹² Segundo, *FI*, 127-130. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 98-100.

¹¹⁹³ Segundo, *FI*, 336-343. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 277-82.

¹¹⁹⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 335. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 276.

recount it”.¹¹⁹⁵ The Latin American situation is hardly banal, but Segundo explores the existential situation in Latin America and the despair and lack of hope in a negative situation. This despair is what he calls a ‘partially self-validating epistemological premise’¹¹⁹⁶ He points out that this is the opposite of “personal experiencing of an ‘instrumental reward’,” what Bateson calls almost rote learning.¹¹⁹⁷ Bateson writes, “This is characterized by the predominant conditioned stimulus being an act of the subject”.¹¹⁹⁸ The subjective act commended by Segundo, as a ‘learning to learn’, is ‘consciousness raising’.

In Cornel West’s review of *FI*, he sounds dismissive of Segundo’s engagement with consciousness-raising. He writes, “After brief generalizations of the periods of consciousness-raising... Segundo tries to go beyond mere economic and political analysis... calling for the creation of ‘an effective cultural tradition’”.¹¹⁹⁹ However, perhaps West misses the anthropological point Segundo raises with the notion of consciousness-raising because he does not take the time to peruse the wider role consciousness-raising plays in liberation theology, including in Segundo’s other writings. In *FI*, Segundo does not blame injustice for poverty in Latin America, but what he calls “the lie”, i.e. “magical formulas for development were running up against the *structural, systemic* character of that injustice”.¹²⁰⁰ Consciousness-raising is not a passing generalization, as West suggests, but part of Segundo’s understanding and presentation of the relationship between faith and ideologies, as in “a growing *emotional dissociation of means and ends*”.¹²⁰¹

¹¹⁹⁵ Sartre, *Nausea*, 39.

¹¹⁹⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 336. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 277.

¹¹⁹⁷ Segundo, *FI*, 336. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 277.

¹¹⁹⁸ Bateson, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, 172.

¹¹⁹⁹ West, "Review of Juan Luis Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*," 57.

¹²⁰⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 337, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 278.

¹²⁰¹ Segundo, *FI*, 342, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 282.

For Segundo, consciousness-raising takes on a sacramental tone. Roger Haight insightfully identifies efficacious role of sacraments in liberation theology.¹²⁰² He finds in liberation theology a high value on faith, as something more than mere belief, and he cites Segundo and consciousness-raising as what appears to be an existential example of the efficacy of the sacraments. He quotes *Teología Abierta 2* (in English, *The Sacraments Today*), comparing the sacraments to a consciousness-raising activity.¹²⁰³ Alfred Hennelly also notes the connection between Segundo's consciousness-raising and the sacraments, although Hennelly juxtaposes Segundo and Paulo Freire's literacy training in *Teología Abierta 2*.¹²⁰⁴ Hennelly adds a citation of the first part of *Teología Abierta 2* (in English, *Our Idea of God*). Hennelly presents Segundo's view of consciousness-raising as "problem-posing" and not "deposit-making" and sacraments should connect with the "present, concrete, existential situation".¹²⁰⁵ The response, he argues, is both intellectual awareness and human action for improved conditions.

For Segundo, increasing intellectual awareness naturally connects to human action. This is part of the existential application for his theological project. In *FI*, he addresses some of the issues with so-called "third way" economic approaches, e.g. "orthodox capitalism",¹²⁰⁶ but he refrains from getting too far from theology. If he were to devote more attention to economic analysis, his work would suffer from a lack of focus. Instead, he returns to the relationship between faith and ideologies.

¹²⁰² Roger Haight, *An Alternative Vision, An Interpretation of Liberation Theology* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985), 189.

¹²⁰³ Haight, *An Alternative Vision*, 330. Cf. Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*. Cf. Segundo, *Teología Abierta 2*, 269-277. Segundo, *The Sacraments Today*, 53-59.

¹²⁰⁴ Hennelly, *Theology for a Liberating Church*, 73-74.

¹²⁰⁵ Hennelly, *Theology for a Liberating Church*, 74.

¹²⁰⁶ Segundo, *FI*, 338-340. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 278-280.

7.3.2 Freedom's role

In the final pages of *FI*, Segundo turns to what the Apostle Paul calls “Christian liberty”. This is the way freedom re-enters his existential liberation theology. He identifies a tension between the freedom that is associated with the biblical tradition and the desire to return to the bondage of the law.¹²⁰⁷ He writes, “The new ‘freedom’ forced them to think about things for which they had previously had prefabricated answers”.¹²⁰⁸ He references 1 Thessalonians 5:20, but a rather significant translation issue potentially could lead readers away from Segundo’s meaning. He quotes, “*Probadlo todo y retened lo bueno*”,¹²⁰⁹ which John Drury translates as “Think before you do anything--hold to what is good”.¹²¹⁰ However, the Spanish verb *probar* can mean *taste, try, check, test, or demonstrate*--and *test* suits the Greek here. 1 Thessalonians 5:21 (Segundo actually wrongly cites 5:20) says, “Test everything; hold fast to what is good”. Segundo writes, “Note that the same reaction would occur today among those who regard themselves as Christians from their cultural heritage”.¹²¹¹ He connects the human condition to freedom in Christ. That is, Segundo is calling for a “testing” of received traditions, and a holding fast to what rings true about the actual human condition.

Segundo references Galatians 5:2, “...Christ will be of no benefit to you”. He is emphasizing this dichotomy between living in bondage to the law and freedom in Christ. For Segundo, this means connecting with the existential situation of being human. There are human dilemmas, and the issue is whether the church seeks to represent people or serve them. The Christian tradition can be, for Segundo,

¹²⁰⁷ Segundo, *FI*, 411. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 337.

¹²⁰⁸ Segundo, *FI*, 411. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 337.

¹²⁰⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 411.

¹²¹⁰ Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 337.

¹²¹¹ Segundo, *FI*, 411-412. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 337.

“simultaneously normative and liberative” because the tradition teaches a “process of *learning to learn*” instead of proffering ready made answers for any situation.¹²¹²

Glenn Bucher cites Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and argues that oppressors have an inability to work out their own freedom. He writes, “Only the oppressed can initiate their own, and their oppressor’s, liberation”.¹²¹³ Segundo also references Freire, as cited above, but Bucher’s point highlights the complexity of Paul’s Christian liberty because the oppressor needs the oppressed in order to work out his or her own liberation. Freedom does not arrive en masse. The one who is being freed cannot, like Caligula, go off to explore his or her freedom and return with an outlandish portrayal of freedom. When the oppressed are freed, they are still in a relationship with the oppressor. This was Segundo’s point. He writes, “Each bit of transcendent data which comes into play here serves as a launching pad: the more solid it is, the deeper and further the problems we may explore”.¹²¹⁴

Throughout *Teología Abierta 1*, Segundo presents the church as a minority, even when it claims majority status.¹²¹⁵ The church is a minority, according to Segundo, because most people live outside of the existential transformation of encountering God. In a 1980 review of *Teología Abierta 1*, John Sweeney describes Segundo’s thesis as (a) the church is more qualitative than quantitative, (b) the church does not exist to benefit its members, but to serve them, and (c) “the church is not necessarily the best place of salvation for everyone”.¹²¹⁶

Sweeney’s first point connects with Segundo’s transformative Christian freedom. As Paul writes, people are free in Christ and no longer slaves to the law.

¹²¹² Segundo, *FI*, 412. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 338.

¹²¹³ Bucher, "Toward a Liberation Theology for the "Oppressor"," 522.

¹²¹⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 412. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 338.

¹²¹⁵ Segundo, *Teología Abierta 1*.

¹²¹⁶ John Sweeney, "For the Builders of a New Ireland: The Theology of Juan Luis Segundo," *The Furrow* 31, no. 12 (1980): 785.

The law is quantitative, whereas Christian freedom is qualitative and reflects Segundo's "process of *learning to learn*" as opposed to quantitative ready made answers.¹²¹⁷ Sweeney's second point connects with Segundo's point in *FI* about the church as representative or servant of people. Although *FI* was published two years after Sweeney's article, it is consistent with the five-volume set on which Sweeney is commenting, i.e. *Teología Abierta*. In both cases, the church is to be a servant, not a benefactor or representative.

In Sweeney's final point, "the church is not ...best place of salvation",¹²¹⁸ *FI* is again consistent with *Teología Abierta*. Segundo writes, "Alienated from an uncritical, tradition-bound Church, aware of other exigencies and possibilities for Christianity, these Christians move towards the 'philosophical' end of our spectrum".¹²¹⁹ Freedom allows Christians to move in this direction, but it is a direction Segundo would oppose. Alienation from tradition might lead people toward philosophy, but it is a move away from transcendent data and other affective elements of faith. Segundo wants to base the "faith" element in liberation theology, the commitment to freedom intended by God, in ordinary human experience of faith-commitments and transcendent data. He argues that Marx himself has an anthropological faith. West, however, criticizes this attempt as a Christian philosophical anthropology.

For Segundo, there must be a balance between freedom in Christ and adherence to tradition. On the one hand, suspicion and asking questions are an integral step in his hermeneutic circle.¹²²⁰ Nowhere in his writings does he support blind adherence to church dogma. In fact, one of his later books, *Dogma*, directly

¹²¹⁷ Segundo, *FI*, 412. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 338.

¹²¹⁸ Sweeney, "For the Builders of a New Ireland: The Theology of Juan Luis Segundo," 785.

¹²¹⁹ Segundo, *FI*, 412. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 338.

¹²²⁰ Segundo, *LT*, ch 1. Cf. Segundo, *Liberation of Theology*, ch 1.

addresses questioning and freedom in dogma.¹²²¹ On the other hand, throughout his writings, Segundo continuously engages with church dogma. He never separates from the church and always writes from within it, including his response to the Vatican's *Instruction on certain aspects of the "theology of liberation"*.¹²²² He concludes the section in *FI* on freedom in Christ, emphasizing balance and flexibility--two hallmarks of his existential theology. He writes, "Christianity, as a factor of human and cultural *flexibility*, really requires a delicate balance".¹²²³

7.4 Conclusion

Segundo summarizes *FI*: "The relationship between *faith* and *ideology* is not one of identity or mutual exclusion; it is one of complementarity. There is a necessary complementarity between the realm of meaning and values on the one hand and (scientific) systems of efficacy on the other".¹²²⁴

For Segundo, liberation theology involves both faith and ideology. Faith is commitment to values, ends and meanings, expressed in poetic language. Faith means reaching out to transcendent data from ordinary human language and experience. There is a *faith* that can be discerned in all human experiences, especially in limit-situations--this is the existential dimension. *Ideology* is in its proper sense not an excuse for exploitation as in Marx's critique, but (a) provides a social context for faith; (b) is an essential element in consciousness-raising--i.e. a "scientific", non-evaluative understanding of the situation; and (c) indicates an

¹²²¹ Segundo, *Dogma*. Cf. Segundo, *The Liberation of Dogma*.

¹²²² Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*. Catholic Church, *Instruction on certain aspects of the "theology of liberation"*.

¹²²³ Segundo, *FI*, 413, emphasis original. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 338.

¹²²⁴ Segundo, *FI*, 300. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 241.

efficacious means of achieving what the ultimate ends of faith demand. Both denotation and connotation are necessary for achieving human freedom.

Overall Conclusion

This thesis began with the assertion that liberation theology is a relevant twenty-first-century approach to Christian doctrine, with Latin American liberation theology introducing a new way of approaching theology. Latin American liberation theologians generally followed social analysis in order to critically view traditional theological formulations. My focus has been on the unexplored existential dimension of Juan Luis Segundo's liberation theology, while introducing previously unpublished and under-utilized works.

In the final chapter (chapter 7), I explored the way that the existential dimension of liberation theology in Segundo's writing connects with his reflections on faith and ideology. *FI* is an ambitious project. Cornel West accurately describes it as a "full-blown philosophical anthropology" and insinuates that parts of *FI* are "half-baked" and yield "philosophical confusion".¹²²⁵ At times, Segundo fails to adequately distinguish *between* faith and ideology. This is the confusion West notes, although his main critique is against any attempt to root religious faith in a general anthropology. Despite West's criticism, *FI* has been widely cited.¹²²⁶ Instead of something too big to make sense, the book is about Segundo's distinction between religious and anthropological faith and continuity between them. The faith element in liberation theology has its starting point in an existential faith commitment.

The relation between religious and anthropological faith connects to the basic problems of liberation theology because it relates to the world as it is. If the world were perfect, Segundo would not need to embark on such a project, but he

¹²²⁵ West, "Review of Juan Luis Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*," 56.

¹²²⁶ E.g. The following two sources rely on *FI* in their treatment of liberation theology or Segundo, but have not previously contributed to my argument, nor have I previously cited them. James C. Livingston et al., *Modern Christian Thought, The Twentieth Century*, vol. 2 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 295. Thomas Louis Schubeck, *Liberation Ethics: Sources, Models, and Norms* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 65.

warns against the allure of becoming religious and forming faith into a damaging ideology. This is the danger of ideology--a structure of thought that sanctions exploitation, but ideology also plays, in a neutral sense, a key part in liberation and promoting change. Segundo sees something concrete at stake in the world, but writes, "I make no pretence of offering clear solutions to specific problems".¹²²⁷ Even though his project continually relates back to the basic questions of liberation theology, Segundo writes from a theoretical perspective.

Authors like Segundo are necessary for the entire project of liberation theology because they develop its concepts and push the theoretical framework forward. Daniel Levine writes in the conclusion to an article on liberation theology that its impact is still "not well understood in deductive terms".¹²²⁸ He could have had Segundo in mind when he wrote: "Liberation theology's most enduring impacts are likely to come through the development of new structures, mediating agents, and new styles of leaders drawn from hereto oppressed and quiescent social strata".¹²²⁹ This is what Segundo attempts to do, although he does it in a pastoral framework instead of as an activist. He presents a valuable theoretical approach to liberation theology, though his complex argument is embedded in pastoral concerns.

Segundo's pastoral approach is clearer in earlier works, like *Teología Abierta*, but other works, like *Berdiaeff* or *LT*, are more technical. Segundo's intent in *FI* is to write in accessible language, so that anyone can read it and judge his ideas for him/herself, regardless of whether or not they have religious beliefs.¹²³⁰ This is indicative of his intent, yet his use of academic sources make it inaccessible to non-experts.

¹²²⁷ Segundo, *FI*, 413. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 338.

¹²²⁸ Levine, "Assessing the Impacts of Liberation Theology in Latin America," 256.

¹²²⁹ Levine, "Assessing the Impacts of Liberation Theology in Latin America," 256.

¹²³⁰ Segundo, *FI*, 413. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 339.

In 1977, Richard Roach assessed liberation theology based on a few writings by Gutiérrez and Segundo. Roach is critical of the apparent dependence on Marx, but he credits Segundo with pointing out the need for humane conditions in economic production and the problem with maintaining the common good when there are “destructive goals set by the selfish interests of individuals and small groups”.¹²³¹ Despite the fact that Roach was writing five years before *FI* was published, his assessment connects with Segundo’s argument and the major thesis of my project.

Segundo writes against destructive goals, but he does it at a macro level of human activity. Instead of addressing one particular case, like economic development in a particular country, he writes about things that affect all human beings. The application is universal. That which is good transcends boundaries, i.e. national, social, and religious. As I argue above, Segundo does not adopt Marxism, but finds Marx’s social commentary helpful to understand what affects humanity, and he argues that the world could be better than it is.

James Burtchaell asks whether or not liberation theology is authentically Christian. He cites Segundo’s interpretation of Jesus’ preference for poor and oppressed people in the gospels.¹²³² Burtchaell concludes on a cautionary note encouraging liberation theologians to do justice to the story of Jesus.¹²³³ Hardly a page written by Segundo does not include something explicitly Christian. Even when he takes issue with a Catholic Church teaching, like the Vatican’s *Instruction on Certain Aspects of the “Theology of Liberation”*,¹²³⁴ his response seeks to reconcile the

¹²³¹ Richard R. Roach, “A New Sense of Faith,” *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 5, no. 1 (1977): 150.

¹²³² James Tunstead Burtchaell, “How Authentically Christian Is Liberation Theology?,” *The Review of Politics* 50, no. 2 (1988): 268. Cf. Segundo, *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*, 91. Original source: Segundo, *El hombre* 2.1, 150.

¹²³³ Burtchaell, “How Authentically Christian Is Liberation Theology?,” 280.

¹²³⁴ Catholic Church, *Instruction on certain aspects of the “theology of liberation”*.

difference without resorting to heterodoxy.¹²³⁵ Therefore, according to Segundo's liberation theology, it is authentically Christian. Even the existential dimension of Segundo's liberation theology functions within The Church, and his use of existential sources explains the human condition, but does not supersede Church teachings, historical Christian orthodoxy, or the Bible.

In this thesis, I have introduced new sources and argued for an existential dimension to Segundo's liberation theology. When this existential dimension is uncovered, Segundo's status as a truly ecumenical theologian becomes apparent, reaching out beyond the Catholic Church to other Christian confessions, other faiths and to the general human project of commitment to living in freedom. Discerning the existential dimension also clarifies his often-criticized relation to Marxism, and his original contribution to the relation between faith and ideology.

One Segundo scholar, Mary Kay Nealen, summarizes Segundo's general method with what she calls "his greatest strength" when she writes, "Through the faith-ideology analysis he has provided a tool which can assist in the creation of systems that empower the poor and manifest the love for which the church exists".¹²³⁶ Segundo tries to make the tools he creates in his books available to people who hold religious beliefs and those who do not. He feels that "both groups are essentially the same" and he seeks to provide tools to help both unlock "the meaning of human existence and possible ways to address this basic challenge".¹²³⁷ Throughout his prolific writing career, various themes repeat themselves, and in this project, I have sought to highlight and exegete the persistent existential dimension of his liberation theology.

¹²³⁵ Segundo, *Teología de la liberación*. Cf. Segundo, *Theology and the Church*.

¹²³⁶ Nealen, *The Poor in the Ecclesiology of Juan Luis Segundo*, 142.

¹²³⁷ Segundo, *FI*, 413. Cf. Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*, 339.

Appendix I--“Existencialismo Cristiano”

Following is my translation of “Existencialismo Cristiano”, with the original Spanish text and pagination in the left column and my translation in the right column.

<u>Existencialismo Cristiano</u> Una observación previa sobre el título. Es necesario deslindar los términos y evitar equívocos. ¿Es posible todavía hablar de “existencialismo cristiano” después de la Encíclica Humani Generis en que Pío XII condenó al existencialismo? Es necesario tener en cuenta algo muy simple: el Sumo Pontífice no condena nombres, títulos, rótulos, sino hechos, opiniones. Si alguien se dice protestante por el solo hecho de protestar contra los impuestos, no por eso es heterodoxo, aunque el protestantismo esté condenado como herejía. Sartre dice que de la palabra existencialismo se abusa tanto que en la sociedad francesa se les llama existencialistas a las señoras que dejan escapar alguna palabra más gruesa que lo ordinario en la conversación. ¿Cuál es, por lo tanto, aquella opinión concreta, aquella afirmación que el Sumo Pontífice condenó en el existencialismo? Citemos las palabras de la Encíclica: “rechaza las esencias inmutables de las cosas y no se preocupa más que de la existencia de cada una de ellas”; “impugna el valor del raciocinio metafísico”. Comprender bien el alcance de estas dos afirmaciones, de las cuales la segunda es consecuencia lógica de la primera, nos alejará de todo equívoco en cuanto a nuestro título y a la pregunta tácita que él encierra: ¿es posible un uso cristiano del existencialismo despojado de su error fundamental?	<u>Christian Existentialism</u> First, a note about the title. It is necessary to define terms to avoid errors. Is it still possible to speak of “Christian existentialism” after the Humani Generis Encyclical in which Pius XII condemned existentialism? We must keep one very simple thing in mind: the Supreme Pontiff does not condemn names, titles, or slogans, but rather actions and opinions. If someone is called “protestant” solely for protesting against taxes, this does not make him or her heterodox, although Protestantism is condemned as heresy. Sartre said that the word “existentialism” is so abused in French society that the term “existentialist” is used to describe women who allow a cruder than normal word to escape in conversation. What, then, is that specific opinion, that affirmation, that the Supreme Pontiff condemned in existentialism? Let us cite the words of the Encyclical: “rejects the immutable essences of things and is not concerned beyond the existence of each of them;” “impugns the value of metaphysical reasoning”. Having a good understanding of the value of these two affirmations, the second of which is a logical consequence of the first, will help us avoid any error with regard to our title and the tacit question surrounding it: is a Christian use of existentialism possible if freed from its fundamental error?
---	--

Trataremos, por lo tanto, de examinar muy brevemente esto dos puntos: 1) lo que se debe rechazar; 2) lo que se puede y se debe asimilar.

Encarando así el tema no hacemos más que seguir estrictamente las directivas pontificias: "...Los filósofos católicos no deben ignorar ni desatender estas opiniones (erróneas) ... Más aún, es necesario que las conozcan bien, pues no se pueden curar las enfermedades que antes suficientemente no se conocen; además en las mismas falsas afirmaciones se oculta a veces un poco de verdad; y, por último, esas falsas opiniones incitan la mente a investigar y ponderar con más diligencia algunas verdades filosóficas o teológicas".

Hace, por lo mismo, mal según al Papa, el que, teniendo capacidad y estudios sobre la materia, no se preocupa de estas cosas, o niega a priori lo bueno que en ellas puede haber, o no saca de ellas un estímulo para ahondar y perfeccionar más su propio pensamiento ortodoxo.

Página 2

El existencialismo es una secuela de Kant. Berdiaef, el existencialista ruso, explica muy bien, en una de sus obras (*Essai d'une métaphysique eschatologique*), el proceso que une esos dos extremos tan alejados al parecer: Kant-existencialismo.

Kant cerró la puerta a puesto conocimiento racional de la realidad en sí. No podíamos conocer la realidad tal cual ella es en sí misma. Las características que nosotros creemos ser las características de los objetos reales, no son más que productos de nuestro mismo conocer, productos del sujeto, y no del objeto.

Así no podemos llegar jamás a

We will therefore attempt to very briefly examine these two points: 1) what must be rejected; 2) what must be assimilated.

Addressing the theme in this way, we are doing no more than strictly following the pontifical directives: "... Catholic philosophers must neither ignore nor neglect these (erroneous) opinions ... Even more, it is necessary to know them well, since illnesses cannot be cured without being sufficiently known in advance; furthermore, in the same false affirmations at times a bit of truth may be hidden; and finally, these false opinions incite the mind to investigate and ponder more diligently some philosophical or theological truths".

It is, therefore, according to the Pope, wrong for someone who has skills and education on a matter not to be concerned about these things, or to reject *a priori* the good that there may be in them, or not to take from them a stimulus to deepen and perfect his or her own orthodox thinking.

Page 2

Existentialism is a sequela of Kant. The Russian existentialist Berdaief explains very well in one of his works, (*Essai d'une métaphysique eschatologique* – Essay on eschatological metaphysics) the process that unites these two apparently distant extremes: Kant-existentialism.

Kant closed the door on rational knowledge of reality *per se*. We could not know reality precisely as it is in itself. The characteristics that we think are the characteristics of the real objects are no more than products of our own knowledge, products of the subject, not of the object.

Thus we can never arrive at

conocer las esencias de las cosas, lo que las cosas verdaderamente son.

Si el conocimiento de los objetos no nos sirve de nada para acercarnos a ellos, pongamos nuestra atención en el conocimiento de nuestro propio yo, de nuestro sujeto. Pero, cómo conocernos a nosotros mismos? Si queremos conocer nuestras características objetivas, si queremos conocernos así como conocemos a los demás objetos, se nos vienen encima las mismas dificultades de antes, y nunca podríamos llegar a conocernos tales como somos.

No podemos, por lo tanto, aplicar al conocimiento de nuestro yo, de nuestro sujeto, la razón con que creemos conocer todos los objetos y con la cual, en realidad, no conocemos nada tal como es.

Y ¿qué es eso que yo no tengo de común con los demás objetos? Mis vivencias personales, mis sentimientos, mis impresiones, mis fenómenos psíquicos personales. Pero, --se me dirá-- todas las demás personas tienen esas mismas cosas. No enteramente esas mismas cosas. Si las mira la razón, parecen exactamente de igual género: pero para mi sensibilidad, para mí, subjetivamente, mis vivencias, mis fenómenos psíquicos difieren de todos los demás, son míos, me intereso personalmente en ellos, me afectan directamente.

Conocerme, por lo tanto, a mí mismo en lo que tengo de opuesto a los demás objetos, conocerme tal como soy para mi sensibilidad fundamental, conocer y describir mis experiencias en cuanto que son mías, subjetivas, tal es el existencialismo.

De esta síntesis que ha de resultar forzosamente demasiado concisa, demasiado escolar, pero que los más entendidos podrán quizás reducir a sus exactos términos científicos, se

knowledge of the essence of things, of what things truly are.

If knowledge of objects does not help us to approach them, we focus our attention on the knowledge of our own "I," of our subject. But how can we know ourselves? If we want to know our objective characteristics, if we want to know ourselves as we know other objects, we are overcome by the same difficulties as before, and we will never manage to know ourselves exactly as we are.

We cannot thus apply to the knowledge of our "I," of our subject, the reason with which we think we know all objects and with which, in reality, we know nothing as it is.

And what is it that I do not have in common with other objects? My personal experiences, my feelings, my impressions, my personal physical phenomena. But, -- you will say -- all other people have these same things. Not entirely these same things. As seen by reason, they appear to be exactly of the same kind: but for my sensibility, for me, subjectively, my experiences, my physical phenomena differ from all others; they are mine, I am personally interested in them, and they affect me directly.

To know myself, then, as far as what I have that is opposite to all other objects, to know myself as I am for my fundamental sensibility, to know and describe my experiences inasmuch as they are mine, subjective, this is existentialism.

From this synthesis, which must necessarily prove to be too concise, too scholarly, but which those with more understanding may perhaps reduce to its exact scientific terms,

siguen lo malo y lo bueno del existencialismo.

Para un existencialista tal como lo he dibujado, no es posible llegar a la esencia de la cosa tal cual ella es en la realidad. Sólo puedo conocerla tal cual ella es para mí, según mi subjetividad. De ahí el relativismo existencialista. De ahí que con sólo el existencialismo no se pueda llegar a conocer la esencia real de nada, y nada se pueda deducir, ya que la deducción, el raciocinio metafísico sólo es válido y posible con dos **Página 3** requisitos: el uso de la razón y la constatación de la existencia y esencia real de algo. La misma ciencia no tiene para el existencialismo un valor real, objetivo.

El existencialismo no pueda ser nuestra filosofía por ser completamente relativa, irracional, y hasta profundamente inhumana, quitándole a nuestras facultades cognoscitivas y afectivas, quitándole a nuestra libertad misma toda razón de ser y justificando cualquier acto, cualquier tiranía, cualquier injusticia, cualquier indistinción entre el bien y el mal.

Pero si se le saca al existencialismo su pretensión de abarcarlo todo, de ser el único conocimiento válido, de ser la única normal vital, y se lo reduce a su propio campo, entonces ciertamente responde a una necesidad real del pensamiento, tiene su verdad, debe ocupar su lugar en una filosofía cristiana y su nombre podría unirse a ese adjetivo cristiano que le hemos puesto en el título.

¿Cuál es ese campo? Es precisamente el campo de nuestra subjetividad. Si se admite, por otro lado, la posibilidad de un conocimiento objetivo de la realidad como tal, tampoco puede negarse que

follow the bad and the good of existencialism.

For existentialists as I have depicted them, it is not possible to arrive at the essence of the thing precisely as it is in reality. I can only know it as it is for me, according to my subjectivity. This is the origin of existentialist relativism. Thus, with existentialism alone, it is impossible to know the real essence of anything, and nothing can be deduced, since deduction, metaphysical reasoning, is only valid and possible with two **Page 3** requirements: the use of reason and the verification of the real existence and essence of something. Science itself does not have for existentialism a real, objective value.

Existentialism cannot be our philosophy due to being completely relative, irrational, and even profoundly inhuman, removing our cognitive and affective faculties, removing from our freedom itself any reason for being and justifying any action, any tyranny, any justice, and any lack of distinction between good and evil.

But if existentialism is stripped of its pretension of encompassing everything, of being the only valid knowledge, of being the only vital norm, and it is reduced to its own field, then it certainly responds to a real necessity of thought; it has its truth, it must occupy its place in a Christian philosophy and in its name can be united with this adjective of Christian that we put in the title.

What is the field? It is precisely the field of our subjectivity. If, on the other hand, we admit the possibility of objective knowledge of reality as such, neither can it be denied that we have a subjective knowledge of

tenemos de la realidad un conocimiento subjetivo, y que esos dos conocimientos, el objetivo y el subjetivo, el racional y el afectivo, son juntamente los que determinan y empujan toda nuestra existencia. La filosofía, preocupada por lo objetivo y por lo universalmente válido, ha descuidado mucho este campo de nuestra <u>realidad</u>, debido, claro está, a la mayor dificultad que ofrece este campo a la razón teórica y a su menor importancia si se tiene en cuenta solamente lo universal, lo colectivo, las normas del conocer y del obrar más universales. Sin embargo, no hay una sola de las decisiones o de los actos más decisivos de la vida que no tengan parte de su explicación en esa región más misteriosa pero real en que la razón no puede totalmente penetrar. Para no inducir a error en esto, hay que tener presente que nuestra subjetividad no es mera relatividad y variación. Nuestra subjetividad forma parte de nuestro ser racional, y la influencia de la razón obra también en ella indirectamente. A medida que se profundiza, a medida que nos desprendemos de la sensibilidad barata, de la subjetividad desequilibrada, vamos llegando a una región más universal, que no por eso deja de ser subjetiva: la región donde tienen lugar nuestros encuentros más totales con el Unum Necessarium, con Dios. Allí habita y habla Dios. Tratar de llevar la luz de nuestro conocimiento a esa región, es iluminar más para nuestro conocimiento, la realidad divina y acercarnos más a ella.	reality, and that these two types of knowledge, rational and affective, are, together, those that determine and drive all of our existence. Philosophy, concerned with the objective and the universally valid, has greatly neglected this field of our <u>reality</u>, due, of course, to the greater difficulty that this field offers to theoretical reason and its lower importance if considering only the universal, the collective, and the norms of knowledge and of more universal action. However, there is not a single one of the most decisive actions of life that is not part of its explanation in this most mysterious but real region, in which reason cannot totally penetrate. In order not to lead to error in this, we must keep in mind that our subjectivity is not merely relativity and variation. Our subjectivity is part of our rational being, and the influence of reason also acts on it indirectly. To the extent that it is deepened, to the extent that we detach ourselves from cheap sensibility and imbalanced subjectivity, we begin to arrive at a more universal region that still remains subjective: the region where our most total encounters take place with the Unum Necessarium, with God. That is where God resides and speaks. Attempting to bring the light of our knowledge to this region is to further illuminate the divine reality for our knowledge and to come closer to it.
---	--

Appendix II--Sartre y Camus

Following is my transcript and translation of the cassette tape labelled “24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus”. This cassette was originally recorded by José Irureta in Montevideo, Uruguay in 1980. A longer description is contained in chapter four above. The Spanish transcript is in the left column and my translation is in the right column.

Casete 24--La Libertad Gray highlighting indicates redundant phrases and these are omitted from English. ... Dice, “el Tesoro...el tesoro publico” dice, “es verdad, claro, el tesoro publico, pero es una cosa capital”, y el tesorero, el ministro de finanzas de Roma, dice, “por supuesto, Cesar, es capital”. Y Calígula se ríe y le pregunta a su mujer, su amante, Caesonia, “¿No es cierto, querida, que, es muy importante el tesoro publico?” y Caesonia, que ya conoce – ya conoce – a Calígula, le dice “no, Calígula, es una cuestión secundaria”. Entonces Calígula dice, “lo que sucede, es que tu no sabés nada de esas cosas. El tesoro es un interés poderoso. Todo es importante, <i>todo es importante</i>: las finanzas, la moralidad pública, la política exterior, las provisiones del ejercito, las leyes agrarias. Todo es capital, te digo. Todo esta al mismo nivel. Es decir, <i>todo esta al mismo nivel</i>, significa que nada tiene importancia. Como ha dicho “este mundo no tiene importancia. Entonces, de alguna manera, <i>el dice, digamos, lo que dice</i> el ministro de finanzas, pero lo dice con sorna, es decir, TODO es importante, todo tiene la misma importancia, no? Todo esta al mismo nivel; la grandeza de Roma, y tu crisis de artritis, todo esta al mismo nivel. Si uno no admite eso,	Cassette 24--Freedom Audio available here: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=os5aevEYKE ..., “the Treasury ... the public treasury,” he says, “[it] is true, of course, the public treasury, is a capital thing,” and the treasurer, the finance minister in Rome, said, “Of course, Cesar, it is capital”. And Caligula laughs and asks his wife, his mistress, Caesonia, “Is it not true, dear, that the public treasury is very important?” and Caesonia, who already knows, says to Caligula, “No, Caligula, it is a secondary issue”. Then Caligula says, “That’s because you know nothing about those things. The treasure is a powerful interest. Everything matters: finance, public morality, foreign policy, the provisions of the army, the agrarian laws. Everything is capital, I say. Everything is at the same level. This means that nothing matters. As you said “this world is not important. Then, somehow, the finance minister says sarcastically, that is, EVERYTHING is important, everything is equally important, right? Everything is at the same level, the grandeur of Rome and your attack of arthritis. If you don’t admit this, you will never be free. That’s about the cost of freedom.
---	--

nunca va a ser libre. Ese es un poco el precio que hay que pagar para la libertad. Ah, voy a ocuparme de todo eso. Escúchame, tesorero. El Tesorero le dice que escucha, y le propone un plan económico que se va a seguir en Roma, célebre. Escúchame bien, le dice al tesorero. El primer tiempo, o la primera etapa del plan económico: todos los Patricios, todas las personas del imperio que dispongan de alguna fortuna, pequeña o grande, es exactamente lo mismo, deben, desheredar a sus hijos y hacer testamento inmediatamente a favor del estado. El tesorero dice, “pero, Cesar, ...” Caligula dice, “todavía no te he dado la palabra. En la medida de nuestras necesidades, haremos morir a esos personajes que han hecho testamento a favor del estado (risas), según el orden de una lista establecida arbitrariamente. Arbitrariamente, eso es muy importante, porque si es por alguna razón, esa razón se convierte en valor. Entonces, uno aprecia esa razón. Tenemos el orden en que se los hace morir <i>tiene</i> que ser arbitrario. Si no, uno se esta apegando ya a una cosa”. Dice, “Ocasionalmente, podremos modificar ese orden, pero siempre arbitrariamente (mas risas), y heredaremos”. Cesonia esta molesta, y le dice, “Pero, ¿que te pasa, que te ha dado?” Le dice a Calígula, y Calígula, imperturbable, dice, “el orden de las ejecuciones, no tiene en efecto, ninguna importancia. O, por mejor decir, esas ejecuciones tienen una importancia igual, lo que significa que no tienen ninguna. Ahora, esto es muy importante, digamos, para el punto de vista de la	Ah, I will take care of all that. Listen, treasurer. The treasurer says he’s listening, and he proposes a famous economic plan to be followed in Rome. Listen well, he says to the treasurer. The first time, or the first stage of the economic plan, all patricians, all people of the empire who have some wealth, large or small, are exactly the same; they must disinherit their children and immediately leave everything to the state. The treasurer says, “but Caesar..”. Caligula says, “I have not yet given you the floor. According to our needs, we will kill those characters who have made a will in favor of the state (laughs), in the order of a list drawn arbitrarily. Arbitrarily, this is very important because if it is for some reason, that reason becomes value. Then, one appreciates that reason. The order in which they are made to die has to be arbitrary. If not, we’re already becoming attached to something”. He says, “Occasionally, we may modify that order, but always arbitrarily (more laughter), and we’ll inherit”. Caesonia is upset, and says, “But what’s wrong with you?” to Caligula, and Caligula, imperturbable, says, “the order of executions is in fact irrelevant. Or, rather, these executions have equal importance, which means that they have none. Now, this is very important, say, from Caligula’s point of view on the logic of
--	---

lógica de la libertad de Calígula, es lo fundamental. Entonces, prácticamente, la obra sigue esta lógica. No hay mayores variantes, los podríamos ver. Calígula, por ejemplo, odia a los poetas. ¿Porque? Porque, “la poesía”, dice, “da importancia a los seres y a las cosas. Hace sentir atractivos, comunica importancia y valor a los seres y a las cosas,” entonces el no quiere que hayan poetas en Roma. Pero además, para que todas estas cosas sean verdaderamente equivalentes para el, que el orden en el que hace matar a la gente sea arbitrario, supone que también sus amigos entran dentro de ese orden, etc., todo esto supone una educación en la arbitrariedad, en la igualdad de todas las cosas, etc., porque como le dice uno de los personajes, “existe lo bueno y lo malo, la grande y lo bajo, lo justo y lo injusto, le aseguro que todo esto no cambiará”. Le dice Cesonia, precisamente a Calígula. Calígula le contesta, “pues, mi voluntad es cambiarlo. Que no exista esa diferencia previa, diríamos, a la libertad, que es lo que hace que el hombre no asuma su libertad totalmente en ninguno de sus proyectos. Ya se que es un poco la ley. Es una ley como del exterior. Existe ya. Existe lo bueno y lo malo, lo justo y lo injusto, lo bajo y lo noble, etc., ¿no?, pues, Calígula dice “no, para mi no existe. Daré a este siglo el don de la igualdad”. Es decir, el don de la libertad, que es lo mismo. Cesonia, que representa precisamente, el amor de Calígula, dice, “no podrás negar el amor”. Pero precisamente Calígula se educa a si mismo, diríamos, hasta poder negar el amor. Y entonces mata, por ejemplo, a sus mayores amigos. La amistad, es	freedom; it is fundamental. Then, practically, the work follows this logic. We could see no further variants. Caligula, for example, hates poets. Why? Because, “poetry,” he says, “gives importance to beings and things. It makes them feel attractive, communicates importance and value to beings and things”. So he does not want to have poets in Rome. But in addition, for all these things to be truly equivalent for him, for the order in which to kill people to be arbitrary, also his friends fall into that order, etc. This represents an education in the arbitrary [or teaches the meaning of “arbitrary”], the equality of all things, etc., because as he tells one character, “there is good and bad, large and low, right and wrong; I assure you this will not change”. Caesonia tells Caligula precisely this. Caligula replies, “So it is my will to change this. No such previous difference should exist, let’s say, to freedom, which is what makes a person not entirely assume liberty in any of his plans. I know it is a kind of law. It is a law and foreign. It already exists. There is good and bad, right and wrong, the low and the noble, etc., right? As Caligula says “no, for me it does not exist. I will give this world the gift of equality”. In other words, the gift of freedom, which is the same. Caesonia, who precisely represents the love of Caligula, says, “you can not deny love”. But Caligula educates himself, we would say, even to deny love. And then to kill, for example, his best friends. Friendship, i.e., he gets rid of friendship. He kills his friends,
--	--

decir, se deshace de la amistad. Mata a sus amigos, o destierra a sus amigos, y termina matando a Cesonia, que es su amante, que es su amor. Precisamente como para extinguir ese último obstáculo que hay ante su libertad, que es el amor, precisamente, el amor de las personas. Que hace que el hombre no siga sus proyectos, para respetar a las personas, a las que ama, o para ayudar, o para amar técnicamente (¿?) a las personas.

Ahora, lo que ocurre, es, diríamos, lo que aparece al final en la ... en el momento en que llega eso, es un monstruo, diríamos, ¿no? Roma abomina de ese monstruo que hace todas esas cosas. Es decir, y que hasta cierto punto su libertad en esa educación se ha ejercido y se ha perdido, ya ha elegido una cosa, y esa elección le trae la muerte, es decir, le acaba la vida. El está como preparando una libertad, y no se da cuenta que su libertad ya se está ejerciendo, y que por lo tanto ya él está metido en una cosa sin quererlo, está metido en una cosa sin quererlo, que va a hacer que el pueblo o lo ame o lo deteste, y si lo detesta, lo mate, es decir, que termine con la libertad de él en el momento en que él la está perfeccionando, y ya logrando llegar a elegir ese proyecto de él.

Y entonces, unos instantes antes de la muerte, Calígula dice, ¿no?, "he conquistado la divina clarividencia del solitario". Solitario, porque lógicamente, la única educación para la libertad tiene que volver al hombre solitario, ¿no? En esa especie de brasero que iguala todas las cosas en una persona tienen que hacer de uno solitario. Vivo, mato, ejerzo el poder delirante del destructor. Eso es ser feliz, esa es la felicidad, esta insoportable liberación este universal

or banishes his friends and ends up killing Caesonia, who is his lover, who is his love, precisely to extinguish the last obstacle to his freedom, which is love, precisely, love of people. What makes a person not follow his plans, to respect people, those he loves, or to help, or to technically love persons?

Now, what happens is, shall we say, what appears at the end in the ... when this happens, he is a monster, we would say, right? Rome loathes the monster does all those things. That is, to some extent his freedom in such education has been exercised and lost, [Caligula] has now chosen one thing, and that choice brings death, i.e. his life runs out. It is like he is preparing freedom, and does not realize that his freedom is already being pursued, and therefore he is involved in one thing unwittingly, which will make the people either love him or hate him, and if they hate him, to kill him, that is, end the freedom at the moment that it is being refined, and being able to choose his own project.

And then a few moments before death, Caligula says, --right?--, "I have conquered the divine vision of the lonely". The solitary, because logically, the only education for freedom must return to the lonely person, right? This kind of crucible that equalizes all the things in a person must make one lonely. I live, I kill, I exercise the insane power of the destroyer. This is being happy, this is happiness, this unbearable release, this universal contempt, universal

desprecio, universal desprecio – es decir dar a todas las cosas el don de la igualdad, el don de la igualdad en la no importancia, ¿no?

La sangre, el odio a mi alrededor, este aislamiento sin igual del hombre que tiene su vida bajo la mirada, bajo su poder, si esta preparado para elegir. Pero precisamente ya no puede elegir, no puede elegir en primer lugar porque se vació a si mismo de ideales, al igualar las cosas, y en segundo lugar, porque lo matan ya afuera. Es decir, en parte porque ya elegido, y en parte porque ya es precisamente lo que ha elegido hace que lo maten. Entonces el dice, “pero, ¿dónde apagar esta sed?” La sed que tiene el hombre de la felicidad, recién esta en el comienzo, Calígula. Lo que ha hecho hasta ahora es previo a la aventura de la libertad. ¿Dónde apagar esta sed? ¿Que corazón, que dios tendría para mi la profundidad de un lago, es decir, podría saciar mi sed?, ¿que corazón, que persona, que dios, es decir, que valor podría ser suficiente como para saciar mi sed de felicidad? Es decir, ahora, ahora está para elegir, diríamos, ¿no? Pero ciertamente no encuentra nada que elegir, ¿no? Nada en este mundo ni en el otro que esté a mi altura, nada. Es decir, no le llama la atención nada, es decir, precisamente, ha matado, al igualar las cosas, ha matado todas las posibilidades del proyecto. No tomé el camino verdadero. No tomé el camino verdadero. Es una de las afirmaciones así, importantes de la obra. No llego a nada. Mi libertad no es la buena.

Si son declaraciones todas seguidas, diríamos, de que su aventura no la consiguió porque Calígula es una figura un poco ambigua. Parece hasta cierto punto como un triunfador, en su muerte. Sin embargo, el mismo en

scorn - i.e. give all things the gift of equality, the gift of equality in lack of importance, right?

Blood, hatred around me, this matchless isolation of the person who has his life under his eye, under his power, if he is ready for choosing. But precisely now he has no choice, no choice in the first place because he emptied himself of ideals by equalizing things, and secondly, because they are already killing him outside. That is, in part because already chosen, and partly because it is what he has chosen that causes them to kill him. Then he says, “but where can I slake this thirst?” This thirst people have for happiness, Caligula is only beginning. What he has done so far was before the adventure of freedom. Where to quench this thirst? What heart, what God would have for me the depth of a lake, i.e. could quench my thirst? What heart, what person, what God, that is, what value could be enough to quench my thirst for happiness? That is, now there is something to choose from, we would say, right? But certainly no choice is found, right? Nothing in this world or the other that is within my reach, nothing. Nothing is striking; precisely, he has killed, by making all things equal, all the possibilities of the plan. I did not take the true project. It is one of the important claims of work. It came to nothing. My freedom is not the good kind.

If all these statements follow one another, we would say that Caligula did not get his adventure because he is a somewhat ambiguous figure. He seems to some extent triumphant in his death. However, he, by

quedar que descalifica su aventura, “mi libertad no es la buena”. Nada. Siempre nada. Ah, como pesa esta noche. Esta noche pesa como el dolor humano”, como el dolor humano porque, precisamente, él lo ha hecho para que no existiera el dolor humano. Es, diríamos darle fuerza a la libertad, y sin embargo, el dolor humano lo espera el final de esa aventura que el ha hecho, preparando su libertad, ¿no? O sea que, el dolor humano estaba antes, diríamos, el lo ha querido solucionar, y encuentra otra vez el dolor humano, y precisamente en ese momento es cuando lo ... vienen, entran a matarlo. No aparece la muerte de el en la escena, sino que entran simplemente a matar a Calígula. Yo creo que es importante relacionar con esto, por lo menos comenzar a relacionar con esto otra obra, que son “Las Moscas” de Sartre, que también tratan el problema de la libertad. Ustedes saben que “Las Moscas” es una adaptación que hace Sartre, que como en todos estos casos, Calígula, y hasta cierto punto también Las Antígonas en Anubis, es ... son adaptaciones de cosas antiguas a los problemas, digamos, clásicos del hombre, los problemas fundamentales del hombre, ¿no? En este caso, “Las Moscas” es una adaptación de la trilogía de Sófocles, la Orestíada, es decir, cuando Agamenón que ha estado en la guerra de Troya, vuelve de la guerra de Troya vencedor, su esposa Clitemnestra, que es amante de Egísto, digamos, planea con su amante la muerte de Agamenón, el asesinato de Agamenón. Y entonces asesina a Agamenón; y de Agamenón y de Clitemnestra quedan dos hijos: Orestes y Electra. Orestes,	disqualifying his adventure, “my freedom is not good”. Nothing. Always nothing. Ah, how heavy is the night. Tonight weighs like human pain, as human pain because, precisely, he made it so no human pain would exist. It is, we would say, to give strength to freedom, and yet human pain awaits him at the end of the adventure he has experienced, preparing his freedom, right? That is, human suffering existed before, we would say, he wanted to solve it, and again he finds human pain, and just at that moment is when... they come, they enter to kill him. His death does not appear in the scene, but they simply come in to kill Caligula. I think it is important to at least begin to relate to this another work, “The Flies” by Sartre, which also addresses the problem of freedom. You know that “The Flies” is Sartre’s adaptation of Caligula, as in all these cases, and to some extent also in Anubis, Antigone is ... these are adaptations of old works to, the classical problems of humanity, the fundamental human problems. In this case, “The Flies” is an adaptation of Sophocles’ trilogy, the Oresteia, i.e., when Agamemnon, having been in the Trojan War, has returned in triumph from Troy, his wife Clytemnestra, who is the lover of Aegisthus, plans with her lover Agamemnon’s death, the murder of Agamemnon. And then she murders Agamemnon. Clytemnestra and Agamemnon have two children, Orestes and Electra. Orestes, who
--	---

que parte para el extranjero, que prácticamente no ha estado en el momento del asesinato de su padre, o que es muy, muy pequeño. Lo cierto es que se va al extranjero. Y Electra, que sigue viviendo con su madre Clitemnestra y con su padrastro Egísto, que en realidad son los asesinos de su padre. Entonces, Electra es la que, digamos, sueña con vengarse, y Orestes, según diríamos, la misma trilogía, y según Sartre, que le interesa todavía mas, es un ser indiferente. El no ha vivido todo lo que ha vivido su hermana allí, porque el ha estado fuera.	leaves for abroad, who practically was not there at the time of his father's murder, or was very, very young [at the time.] What is certain is that they go abroad. And Electra still lives with her mother Clytemnestra and her stepfather Aegisthus, who actually are her father's murderers. So Electra is the one who dreams of revenge, and Orestes, as it were, in the same trilogy, according to Sartre, which is of even more interest, is indifferent. He has not experienced everything his sister lived through there, because he has been away.
Entonces, prácticamente su hermana lo lleva poco a poco a que él sea el vengador. Ella no puede vengarse, en cambio, el tiene que matar a Egísto y a su madre, sobre todo, Clitemnestra, para vengar el asesinato de su padre, ¿no?, y este es el, diríamos, es el argumento tanto de La Orestíada en Esquilo como de Las Moscas en Sartre.	Then, practically his sister gradually leads him to be the avenger. She can not retaliate; however, he has to kill Aegisthus and especially his mother Clytemnestra, to avenge the murder of his father, and this is the plot of <i>The Oresteia</i> in both <i>Aeschylus</i> and Sartre's <i>Flies</i>.
Entonces lo que es interesante es que Orestes aparece, aparece como un ser libre. Libre en el sentido de que para el todo es igual. Es un poco la ... el caso de Calígula. Para el todo es igual. ¿Porque? Porque ha sido educado en el extranjero, porque no tiene nada; aparece allí en Argos, y no le interesa nada. Entonces conversa en la plaza de Argos con su pedagogo, con el que le ha enseñado, y precisamente se queja de esa libertad que no es la buena, que dijo Calígula que no es la buena, precisamente se queja, el tiene la sensación de que no tiene la verdadera libertad.	So what's interesting is that Orestes appears as a free being. Free in the sense that for him everything is the same. It's kind of ... the case of Caligula. For him everything is the same. Why? Because he has been educated abroad, because he has nothing; he appears there in Argos, and not interested in anything. Then he talks in the square of Argos with his teacher, with the person who taught him, and complains of this freedom that is not the good kind; he has the feeling that he has no true freedom.
Y dice Orestes, "Ah, un perro, un viejo perro que se calienta acostado al lado del hogar, y se incorpora un poco a la entrada de su amo, gimiendo	And Orestes says, "Ah, a dog, an old dog warming himself lying by the fireplace, and recovering a bit on the entrance of his master, moaning softly

suavemente para saludarlo, un perro tiene mas memoria que yo”. Reconoce a su amo, tiene algo propio, diríamos, ¿no? Su amo, el perro, ¿no? Su amo, y, ¿que es mío?, ¿que es mío? Entonces el pedagogo, que lo ha educado, por supuesto, lo ha educado en la libertad, tipo así, hasta los dieciocho años, nada de valores, o sea, después hay que elegir, una libertad como tabla rasa, le dice, “ahora sois joven, rico y hermoso, prudente como un anciano, libre de todas las servidumbres y de todas las creencias; sin familia, sin patria, sin religión, sin oficio, libre de todos los compromisos y sabedor de que no hay que comprometerse nunca”. “No hay que comprometerse nunca,” es la norma de Jean, diríamos, el ser libre por lo menos tiene toda su libertad el frente a sí, ¿no? “¿y todavía os quejáis?”, le dice el pedagogo. Y Orestes dice, “Pero no, no me quejo, no puedo quejarme. Me has dado la libertad de esos hilos que el viento arranca a las telas de araña y que flotan a diez pies del suelo. No peso mas que un hilo, y vivo en el aire”. Esto es precisamente el desarrollo de la obra va a ser el paso de esa libertad a diríamos, a pesar como hombre a tener un peso como hombre. El quiere tener sus propias cosas, y por lo tanto, su proyecto, hacer algo con su libertad. Dice, “Yo sabia ya a los siete años que estaba exiliado. Dejaba deslizar a lo largo de mi cuerpo, dejaba caer a mi alrededor los olores y los sonidos, sabia que pertenecían a los demás, y que nunca podría convertirlos en mis recuerdos. Porque eran de otros.	to greet him, a dog has more memory than me”. He recognizes his master; he has something of his own, we would say, right? His master, the dog’s, right? His master, and, what is mine?, What is mine? Then the teacher, who brought him up, of course, educated him in freedom, and such, until he was eighteen, with no values, that is, later you have to choose, freedom as a tabula rasa, he says, “now you are young, rich and handsome, wise as an old man, free of all bonds and all beliefs, no family, no country, no religion, no job, free of all commitments and knowing that we must not ever commit. “Never make a commitment,” is Jean’s rule; those who are free at least have all their freedom in front of them, right? “And yet you complain?” teacher asks. And Orestes says, “But I’m not complaining, I cannot complain. You have given me the freedom of those threads that the wind pulls from the spider webs and float ten feet off the ground. I weigh no more than a thread, and I live in the air”. This is the development of the work; it will be the step of this freedom, we would say, to begin as a man to have the weight of a person. He wants to have his own things, and therefore, his plan, to do something with his freedom. He says, “I knew already at the age of seven that I was in exile. I let smells and sounds slip along my body, drop around me; I knew they belonged to the others, and I could never convert them into my memories. Because they belonged to others. Because
---	---

Porque los recuerdos son manjares
 succulentos para los que poseen las
 casas, los animales, los criados, y los
 cantos. Pero yo, yo soy libre, ¡Gracias
 a dios! (la ironía) Ah! Que Libre Soy!
 ¡Que soberbia ausencia mi alma! ¡Que
 soberbio vacío hay en mi alma!

Entonces allí es precisamente donde
 empieza a tentar a Orestes su
 hermana Electra con el crimen, el
 tiene que vengar la muerte de su
 padre. Y Orestes empieza a tentarse.
 ¿Porque? Porque dice, “Ah, si hubiera
 un acto, un acto, mira, un acto que me
 diera derecho de ciudadanía entre
 ellos,” es decir, “entrar en Argos y ser
 alguien, ser alguien de Argos, tener
 algo propio”. La necesidad de hacer
 con la libertad algo, de ser alguien, de
 tener, de ser un ciudadano de Argos,
 con todas las servidumbres, etc., y
 también con todas las cosas propias,
 lo que tienen las personas –
 pertenecer, ¿no? – “si hubiera un acto,
 mira, un acto que me diera derecho a
 ciudadanía entre ellos, si pudiera
 apoderarme aun a costa de un crimen,
 de sus memorias, de las memorias
 que tiene Argos, de su terror y de sus
 esperanzas, para colmar el vacío de
 mi corazón! ¡Ah, Aunque tuviera que
 matar a mi propia madre!” Es una
 cosa hipotética, no, o sea, el crimen es
 algo que le interesa porque es algo
 que lo pondría en Argos, le daría peso,
 la daría consistencia humana. Y en
 realidad lo hace, lo hace. Llega a
 hacerlo después de todo el desarrollo
 del drama, llega a matar a Egisto, y
 llega a matar a Clitemnestra, que es su
 madre.

Y entonces, hasta cierto punto, en
 principio triunfa, ¿no? Dice, todavía
 ayer andaba al azar sobre la tierra, y
 millares de caminos huían bajo mis
 pies, bajo mis pasos. Es decir, tenía
 todavía delante de mi millares de

memories are succulent nectar for
 those who own houses, animals,
 servants, and songs. But I, I’m free,
 thank god! (The irony) Oh! I’m so
 Free! Let pride desert my soul! What a
 superb emptiness there is in my soul!

Then this is precisely where Orestes’
 sister Electra begins to tempt him
 with the crime; he must avenge his
 father’s death. And Orestes begins to
 be tempted. Why? He says, “Ah, if
 there were an act to give me right of
 citizenship among them,” i.e., “go into
 Argos and be someone, be someone
 from Argos, have something of my
 own”. The need freedom to do
 something, be somebody, to have, to
 be a citizen of Argos, with all bonds,
 etc., and all the things themselves,
 what people have – to belong, right? -
 “If there were an act, look, an act that
 would give me the right to citizenship
 among them, if I could gain power at
 the cost of a crime, of their memories,
 of the memories that Argos has, their
 terror and their hopes, to fill the
 emptiness in my heart! Ah, even if I
 had to kill my own mother! “It’s a
 hypothetical thing, the crime is
 something that interests you because
 it’s something that would place us in
 Argos, that would give weight, would
 give human consistency. And indeed
 he does it. It does so after all the
 drama unfolds; he kills Aegisthus and
 he kills Clytemnestra, who is his
 mother.

And then, to some extent, in principle
 he prevails, right? He says, still
 walking at random on earth, and
 thousands of roads fled beneath my
 feet, under my feet. That is, I had still
 ahead of me thousands of ways; they

caminos, pues pertenecían a otros. Hoy, ya no hay mas que uno, este es el precio de la libertad. Hoy ya tengo MI camino. O sea, en señalado, pero estoy contento, porque tengo <i>mi</i> camino, el camino que corresponde a mi proyecto. Hoy ya no hay mas que uno, y Dios sabe adonde llega, pero este es MI camino, el camino de alguien que ha matado a su madre, el camino de alguien que, bueno, ya tiene que hacer una serie de cosas, esta metido hasta el fondo, ¿no?, este, en Argos, en la vida de Argos, en ... con su crimen, etc. Pero lo que viene aquí es importante, porque aquí aparece diríamos que para tener un camino propio, verdaderamente propio, es decir, que corresponda a la libertad, tiene que ser un camino inédito, y el camino inédito siempre es camino malo, diríamos, es un camino contra la ley. Es decir, el no ha podido entrar en Argos en esa manera, si no es precisamente tomando en Argos una posición en contra de la ley, es decir, no se puede ... no se puede entrar como persona en Argos, como persona y al mismo tiempo libremente, para someterse a todo, porque entonces uno se vuelve una cosa, dentro de Argos. Para meterse dentro de Argos tuvo que meterse rompiendo una ley, haciendo algo propio de él. Su camino es su camino propio porque es un crimen, en realidad. Si no, estaría perdido entre la muchedumbre de Argos. Entonces allí se le aparece Júpiter, es precisamente, es exactamente el dios de Santo Tomas, en Suma Teológica (laughter), exacto, lo conocen ustedes, perfectamente, profesor de filosofía, lo ha estudiado, etc, y entonces le da una lección sobre el uso de la libertad, y es muy importante lo que le dice, ¿no?. eh ... dice, "solo el bien satisface, y el bien depende de mi. (repeats) Por el crimen te has apartado de mi. Si no	belonged to others. Today, there is no more than one; this is the price of freedom. Today I have MY path. Or, as indicated, however, I'm happy because I have <i>my</i> path, the way that applies to my plan. Today there is no more than one, and God knows its destination, but this is MY path, the way of someone who has killed his mother, the path of someone who, well, who has to do a number of things, this put all the way, is not it, this, in Argos, in the life of Argos... with his crime, etc. But what comes here is important, because here we would say it appears to have one's own way, truly one's own, i.e. corresponding to freedom, has to be an unprecedented way, and the road is a long, unprecedented bad road, we would say; it is a way against the law. That is, he was not able to enter Argos in that way, except by taking a stand in Argos against the law, i.e. one cannot ... cannot enter as a person in Argos, as a person and at the same time free, to submit to everything, because then you become a thing in Argos. To get into Argos he had to do so by breaking a law, making something of his own from of it. His way is his own way because in reality it is a crime. If not, he would be lost in the crowd of Argos. Then at that point Jupiter appears; this is precisely, exactly the god of St Thomas, in Summa Theologica (laughter), exactly, you know him, well, a philosophy professor, he has studied [him], etc., and then gives him a lesson in the use of freedom, and what he says is very important, is it not?. eh ... he says, "only the good satisfies, and it depends on me. (Repeats) For the crime you've been away from me. If you do not return to me for repentance, you can never be satisfied. "In other words, the good satisfaction of the good, and good
--	--

vuelves a mi por el arrepentimiento, no podrás satisfacerte nunca". Es decir, la satisfacción bien del bien, y el bien viene del cumplimiento de la ley, es lo bueno, precisamente. Dice, "El mundo es bueno, lo he creado según mi voluntad, y yo soy el bien". Dios es el bien, lo ha creado según su voluntad, por lo tanto, el mundo es bueno, las leyes que hay en el mundo son buenas, tiene que someterse a ellas. "Pero tu, tu has hecho el mal. Y las cosas te acusan, con sus voces petrificadas, el bien esta en todas partes. Tu cuerpo mismo te traiciona, pues se acomoda a mis prescripciones ..." (End of first side) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kwj6gMs81SE (Mostly to himself) ... No estamos bien, porque yo no tengo mucho recuerdo de como funciona este aparato ... y no sé si estará bien o estará mal ...alo, alo alo alo ... veíamos en Pablo como el hombre tiene para [??] poder comprender su existencia, que poder también realizar con su libertad un proyecto. Sartre se ha ocupado, sobre todo en 'La Náusea' de ese problema, de ver si el hombre es capaz de tener un proyecto, o lo que el llama mas bien una aventura. Precisamente el describe la aventura en términos de un tiempo cualitativamente diferente, que vamos a ver, es el que corresponde realmente a aquel que tiene un proyecto y que está siguiendo su construcción. Según el, la libertad y la existencia del hombre solo tendrían sentido si la aventura seria posible, es decir, si ese proyecto que el hombre reconoce como tal fuera posible. En "La Náusea" escribe el protagonista	comes from law enforcement is good, exactly. He says, "The world is good, I've created it by my will, and I am the good". God is good, he has created it according to His will; therefore, the world is good, the laws in the world are good, you have to submit to them. "But you, you've done wrong. And things accuse you, with their petrified voices, the good is everywhere. Your own body betrays you, since it adapts to my laws ... " (End of first side) Audio for side 2 available here: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kwj6gMs81SE We are not doing well, because I don't remember much how this unit works ... I don't know if it will be good or bad ... hello, hello, hello, hello ... we saw in Paul how people have to be able to understand his existence, in which a plan can also be performed with freedom. Sartre was involved in that issue, especially in 'Nausea,' to see if humanity is able to have a plan, or what he calls rather an adventure. He precisely describes the adventure in terms of a qualitatively different time, which we will see, is what really belongs to him who has a project that is following its construction. According to him, freedom and human existence would only have meaning if the venture would be possible, i.e. if this project that the person recognized as such were possible. In "Nausea" writes the protagonist Roquentin, "Something
--	--

Roquentin, "Hay algo que tenía para mí una importancia mas grande que todo lo demás, sin darme cuenta de ello. No era el amor, Dios no, ni la gloria ni la riqueza ... era ... en fin, me había imaginado que en cierto momento, mi vida podría tomar una cualidad rara y preciosa. No eran necesarias circunstancias extraordinarias, pedía nada mas que un poco de rigor – rigor es precisamente lo propio de un actuar de un proyecto. Rigor es lo que hace que una cosa influya verdaderamente en la siguiente, y así sucesivamente. Que las cosas no aparezcan y desaparezcan por otras razones que se entremezclan y hacen que no exista rigor.

El rigor, sobre todo del punto de vista del tiempo, esta caracterizado por la tensión entre un verdadero comienzo y un verdadero fin. Así como el proyecto es proyecto para el hombre cuando tiene un verdadero comienzo y un verdadero fin. Y el rigor precisamente consiste en esa tensión que se mantiene **durante todo el tiempo desde el comienzo hasta el fin**". Así dice el protagonista de "La Náusea", "hubiera sido necesario ante todo, que los comienzos fueran verdaderamente comienzos. Ah, veo tan bien ahora lo que he querido, verdaderos comienzos, apareciendo como un toque de trompetas, como las primeras notas de una música de jazz, bruscamente cortando en seco el tedio, consolidando la duración. Cortando en seco el tedio, es precisamente la existencia sin rigor, esa existencia donde todo se mezcla, donde no hay un proyecto. Pero con respecto a los comienzos, esos verdaderos comienzos, dice el protagonista de "La Náusea", "Pero ese pequeño acontecimiento no es parecido a los demás," (Esta

that to me had greater importance than anything else, without realizing it. It was not love, God no, or glory or wealth ... it was ... well, I had imagined that at some point, my life would take a rare and precious quality. No extraordinary circumstances were needed, I asked nothing more than a bit of rigor - accuracy is precisely the characteristic of activating a project. Rigor is what makes one thing truly influence the next, and so on. Things do not appear and disappear for other reasons than that they are intertwined and cause a lack of rigor.

Rigor, especially from the perspective of the time, is characterized by the tension between a true beginning and a real end, just as the plan is a plan for a person when it has a real beginning and end. And the rigor is precisely this tension that is maintained from start to finish. So says the protagonist of "Nausea," "it would have been necessary first of all, for the beginnings to truly be beginnings. Ah, now I clearly see what I wanted, true beginnings, appearing as a flourish of trumpets, as the first notes of jazz, abruptly cutting short the tedium, establishing the duration. Cutting short the tedium, is precisely the existence without rigor, such an existence where everything is mixed, where there is no project. But with respect to the beginning, these true beginning, says the star of "Nausea," "But that little event is not like others," (This describes what should be a start), "one sees immediately that in the presence of a great way to get lost in the fog, and one also said, "something is starting. Something starts then stops. The adventure is not

describiendo lo que debe ser un comienzo) “uno ve inmediatamente que esta en la presencia de una gran forma que se pierde en la bruma, y uno también se dice, ‘algo esta empezando. Algo empieza para luego acabar. La aventura no es algo que se continúa, no tiene sentido sino por su muerte. Así esa muerte, si es la mía, soy arrastrado sin retorno. Cada instante aparece para conducir a los que los siguen. Me aplico a cada instante con todo mi corazón, se que es único, irremplazable, y con todo, no haría un solo gesto para impedir que se extinguiera. Me inclino sobre cada segundo y trato de agotarlo. Este es el ideal de la aventura, ese ideal de la aventura que tiene un comienzo, y que tiene un fin como acaba de decirnos Sartre en “La Náusea”.	something that continues; it makes no sense except by his death. So that death, if it is mine, pulls me in with no return. Every moment appears to lead to those that follow. I apply myself to every moment with all my heart; I know it is unique, irreplaceable, and would not make a single gesture to prevent its extinction. I lean on every second and try to exhaust it. This is the ideal of an adventure that has a beginning, and has an end as Sartre has just told us in “Nausea”.
En realidad, el protagonista de “La Náusea” expresa muchas veces en esta novela, mas o menos filosófica que la aventura es el valor supremo de la vida, por encima de cualquier otro, puesto que todos los otros valen, en la medida en que forman una aventura, en que producen una aventura, en que colocados en proyecto producen una aventura. Por otra parte, esa misma exigencia absoluta de aventura, la vemos en cierto sentido en su negativa, cuando el protagonista de “La Náusea” confiesa que ha fracasado, y que ha fracasado “porque todo hombre fracasa”. En la búsqueda de una aventura. Así dice al final de “La Náusea”, “He fracasado, y se que todos fracasan, solo me queda sobrevivirme como un árbol, como el banco rojo del tranvía; comer, dormir; dormir, comer.	In fact, the protagonist of “Nausea” often expressed in this more or less philosophical novel that adventure is the supreme value of life above anything else, since all the others have value, to the extent that they form an adventure, in which they produce an adventure, when placed in the project they produce an adventure. Moreover, in a sense we see in his refusal the same absolute requirement for adventure when the protagonist of “Nausea” confesses that he has failed and has failed “because everyone fails”. In search of an adventure. As it says at the end of “Nausea,” “I failed, and all fail, it only remains to survive as a tree, like the Red Bank tram; eat, sleep; sleep, eat.
Pero, ¿Porque esta imposibilidad de aventura del hombre, siendo que la	But, why is there this impossibility of human adventure, since adventure is

aventura es lo que le da valor a la existencia humana? En primer lugar, porque no existe un verdadero comienzo, y un comienzo es necesario para darle rigor al tiempo en que se vive la aventura, en que se lleva adelante el proyecto. ¿Que es lo que sucede? Según “La Náusea”, según el protagonista de “La Náusea”, que habla, los acontecimientos se producen en un sentido, y nosotros los contamos en un sentido inverso. Es decir, las aventuras solo existen cuando las contamos. Las aventuras solo existen en la literatura, no existen en la vida real. Precisamente porque en la literatura, el tiempo esta contado al revés, como lo va ahora a explicar Sartre: “Parece,” dice el protagonista, “que empezamos por el comienzo: Era una bella tarde del otoño de mil novecientos veintidós, yo era pasante de notario en Marommes, y en realidad, hemos empezado por el fin, el esta allí, invisible y presente, es el lo que da a esas palabras la pompa y el valor de un comienzo. “Me paseaba. Había salido sin darme cuenta del caserío, pensaba en mis dificultades económicas”. Esta frase, tomada simplemente en lo que ella es, quiere decir que el tipo estaba absorbido, moroso, así en leguas de una aventura, precisamente en ese genero de humor en que se dejan pasar los acontecimientos sin verlos. ¿Que es lo que hace entonces, que yo pueda decir esas palabras, y que el lector de la obra entienda que esta delante de una aventura? Es que en realidad, yo, que hago literatura, conozco ya el fin, y eso es lo que	what gives value to human existence? First, because there is no real beginning; a beginning is necessary to give rigor to the time in which you experience the adventure, in which the plan is carried out. What is happening? According to “Nausea,” to the protagonist of “Nausea,” who is speaking, events occur in one direction, and we count them in reverse. That is, adventures only exist when we count them. Adventures are only available in literature; they do not exist in real life. This is precisely because in literature, time is told in reverse, as Sartre is now going to explain: “It seems,” says the protagonist, “we must start at the beginning: It was a beautiful autumn afternoon in 1922; I was an intern notary in Marommes,¹²³⁸ and in fact we have started at the end. He is there, invisible and present, which is what gives the words the pomp and value of a beginning. “I was walking. I had inadvertently left the village, thinking of my financial difficulties. “ This phrase, taken just as it is, tells us the guy was absorbed, morose, and leagues away from an adventure, exactly in that type of mood in which events are allowed to pass unseen. What then makes me able to say those words, and for the readers of the work to understand they are facing an adventure? It’s just that in reality, I, who make literature, already know the end, and that’s what the star of “Nausea” goes on to say, but there is
--	--

¹²³⁸ Sartre, *Nausea*, 39-40.

continúa diciendo el protagonista de “La Náusea”, pero allí está el fin que transforma a todo. Para nosotros, lectores, el tipo ya es el héroe de la aventura; su morosidad, sus preocupaciones económicas son mucho más preciosas que las nuestras. Están todas doradas por la luz de las pasiones futuras. Y la narración prosigue al revés. Los instantes han cesado de apilarse sin sentido los unos sobre los otros. Son engullidos por el fin de la historia que los atrae, y cada uno de ellos atrae a su vez el instante que lo precede. Es decir, estamos en una aventura, pero esa aventura es solo literaria.

“Era de noche, la calle estaba desierta”. La frase ha sido lanzada negligentemente. Tiene un aspecto superfluo, pero no nos dejamos engañar y nos ponemos aparte. Es un dato cuyo valor lo comprenderemos por lo que sigue. Y tenemos la impresión de que el héroe ha vivido todos los detalles de esa noche como nuncios, como promesas o aun que vivía solamente aquellos que eran promesas, ciego y sordo para todo lo que no anunciaba la aventura. Nos olvidamos que el porvenir no estaba aún allí. El tipo se paseaba en una noche sin presagios, que le ofrecía confusamente riquezas monótonas y él no elegía. Así es en realidad nuestra vida. Por eso, carece de aventuras en la misma medida en que carece de comienzos. Carece de esos momentos que abren la puerta a un proyecto y donde el hombre se lanza precisamente a la ejecución de ese proyecto. “Por eso,” el protagonista de “La Náusea” continúa, “he querido que los momentos de mi vida se sigan y se ordenen como los de una vida de la cual uno se acuerda. Es decir, como los momentos de la vida que uno cuenta, literariamente. Lo mismo

the end that transforms everything. For us readers, the guy is already the hero of the adventure; his melancholy, his financial worries are much more precious than ours. They are all gilded by the light of future passions. And the narration proceeds backwards. The instants have stopped piling nonsensically upon each other. They are engulfed by the end of the story that draws them and each in turn attracts the moment that precedes it. That is, we are on an adventure, but this adventure is just literary.

“It was night, the street was deserted”. The phrase has been tossed out carelessly. It looks superfluous, but we don’t allow ourselves to be deceived; we remain reserved. This is a fact whose value we will understand from what follows. And we have the impression that the hero has experienced all the details of that night as harbingers, as promises, or even that he only lived those that were promises, blind and deaf to everything that did not herald adventure. We forget that the future had not arrived. The guy walked in a night without omens; it offered a confusion of monotonous wealth and he did not choose. Our life really is that way. So they lack adventures to the same extent that they lack beginnings. Those moments are missing that open the door to a project and where a person launches himself precisely to the implementation of this plan. “Thus,” the protagonist of “Nausea” continues, “I wished that the moments of my life would continue and be ordered like those of a life that one remembers. That is, like the moments of life that one tells literarily. This would be

equivaldría a querer atrapar al tiempo por la cola”.

Esta es una de las barreras que pone la existencia del hombre a la aventura. Pero existe otra, y es que en realidad el hombre no tiene su valor propio, precisamente aquello que el podría hacer, aquello que sería su aporte, aquello que sería su destino personal. “Así,” en “La Náusea” el protagonista dice, “tengo deseos de partir, de irme a cualquier parte donde sea verdaderamente mi lugar, donde yo encaje. Pero mi lugar no está en ninguna parte. Estoy demás. Ya veremos más adelante, en “Las Moscas” de Sartre, el desarrollo de esta experiencia, si se quiere, que hace el hombre de no tener una finalidad personal inscrita en su libertad a pesar de que la libertad parece habersele sido dada al hombre en función, precisamente, de ese destino personal.

Falta, por lo tanto, para la acción, esa especie de causalidad final, que daría rigor, que daría sentido, que daría fuerza a cada momento donde se está eligiendo. Esto es lo que Roquentín le dice a su mujer: “Y bien, tu no piensas las mismas cosas que yo. Tu te quejas porque las cosas no se disponen en derredor tuyo como un ramo de flores, sin que tu te des la pena de hacer nada, pero yo nunca he pedido tanto. Yo quería obrar. Sabes que cuando jugábamos de niños al aventurero y a la aventurera, tu eras aquel al quien le suceden aventuras, yo era aquel que las hacía llegar. Yo decía, soy un hombre de acción, ¿te acuerdas? Y bien, ahora digo, no se puede ser un hombre de acción. Por ejemplo, hubiera sido necesario que yo pudiera decirme en el mismo momento que obraba, que lo que yo hacía tendría consecuencias fatales,

equivalent of trying to catch time by the tail”.

This is one of the barriers that human existence puts before adventure. But there is another, and it is that in fact a person does not have his own value, precisely what he could do, what his contribution would be, what his destiny would be. “Thus,” the protagonist says in “Nausea,” “I have desires to leave, to go anywhere that is really my place, where I fit in. But my place is not anywhere. I’m redundant”. We shall see later, in “The Fly” by Sartre, the development of this experience, if you will, that makes a person who does not have a personal goal inscribed in his freedom, even though freedom seems to have been given to humanity precisely in function of that personal destiny.

Failure, therefore, for action, is a kind of final causality, which would provide rigor, which could make sense, which would give strength to each moment you’re choosing. This is what Roquentin tells his wife: “Well, you do not think the same things as me. You complain because things don’t arrange themselves around you like a bouquet of flowers, without you making the effort of doing anything, but I’ve never asked for so much. I wanted to act. You know that when we were children playing adventurer and adventuress, you were the one to whom adventures happened; I was the one who made them come. I said, I am a man of action, remember? Well, now I say, no one can be a man of action. For example, I would have to be able to tell myself at the same moment that I was acting, what I was doing would have fatal consequences.

consecuencias fatales. Con esto quiere decir Sartre lo que precisamente da valor a la aventura, consecuencias definitivas, que lo que yo hacia se escribiría en el universo. Se iría a escribir en el universo como algo definitivo, como algo que llevaría mi marca, mi sello, que sería mi destino. Pero, eso es imposible. En la existencia del hombre las cosas no tienen ese orden. Parece imposible que el hombre ponga su sello en una realidad que no tiene sentido, en una realidad que esta demás, en una realidad que sobra, en una realidad mezclada. Por eso el nombre de “La Náusea”. La náusea es la sensación que experimenta Roquantín, el protagonista, cuando tiene la sensación de que contempla esa realidad, que es la existencia, y la ve así, sin nada definitivo, sin nada que realmente sea una finalidad. Con todas las cosas que se suceden, con todas las cosas que evolucionan, con todas las cosas que se mezclan, con todo eso que no es el destino personal, algo definitivo que ha dejado un ser humano. Y así dice el protagonista, “no estaba sorprendido, sabia bien que eso era el mundo; el mundo enteramente desnudo que se manifestaba de golpe, y me ahogaba de cólera contra ese enorme ser absurdo. Es decir, el mundo sin significación, porque el hombre no le ha puesto significación a ese mundo ni le puede poner significación a ese mundo. Nunca lo que hace el hombre tiene, como dice Sartre, consecuencias fatales. Las consecuencias de lo que hace el hombre son arrebatadas por contingencias, por otras intenciones, por otros proyectos, de tal manera	By this Sartre means precisely what gives value to the adventure, final consequences, that what I was doing would be written in the universe. It would start being written in the universe as something definite, something that would bear my brand, my seal; it would be my destiny. But this is impossible. In human existence things don't have that order. It seems impossible for someone to put his stamp on a reality that does not make sense, on an excessive, redundant reality, a mixed reality. Hence the name of “Nausea”. Nausea is the sensation Roquantín, the protagonist experienced when he had the feeling that contemplating the reality that is existence, and seeing it this way, without anything definitive, nothing really being a goal. With all the things that happen, all the things that evolve, all the things that are mixed, with everything that is not personal fate, something definitive a human being has left. So says the protagonist, “I was not surprised, I knew well that the world was like this; the world is suddenly revealed completely naked, and I was choking with rage against this huge absurd being. That is, the world has no meaning, because humanity has not given this world significance and is incapable of giving it meaning. Nothing humanity has ever done, as Sartre says, has fatal consequences. The consequences of what humanity does are taken away by contingencies, other intentions, other plans, so that the mass of the world, so to speak, is
---	--

que la masa del mundo, por decirlo así, no esta hecha por los proyectos del hombre. Continúa el protagonista: “Ni siquiera podía preguntar de donde saldría eso, todo eso, y como sucedía que existiera en el mundo mas bien que la nada. Eso no tenia sentido. El mundo estaba presente en todas partes, delante, detrás. Nada hubo antes que el, nada. No hubo momento en que pudiera no existir, eso era lo que me irritaba. Seguramente no había ninguna razón para que existiera eso, esa larva que fluía. Yo gritaba ‘¡que porquería, que porquería!’ me sacudía para desembarazarme de esa porquería pegajosa, pero me tenia bien agarrado, y habían tantos toneles y toneles de existencia indefinidamente, me ahogaba en el fondo de ese inmenso tedio”. Eso precisamente es lo opuesto a la libertad, lo opuesto al proyecto: el tedio. Eso de lo cual quiere desembarazarse el protagonista de “La Náusea” esa porquería pegajosa, que lo tiene agarrado, que fluye sin rigor, sin depender de la libertad del hombre, que le impone su proyecto, que le impone algo definitivo. Se ve así en “La Náusea”, como Sartre afronta por primera vez, o en forma literaria, este tema de la libertad, que va a ser un tema muy frecuente en sus obras, que va a aparecer en “Manos Sucias”, que va a aparecer en “Las Moscas”, que va a aparecer en muchas obras literarias de el, y que por supuesto, aparece en el serie “La Nada”, que es la obra filosófica que escribe también por esta época. Pero nos referimos a las obras estrictamente literarias, que son las que estamos viendo aquí.	not made by human plans. The protagonist continues: “I could not even ask where it would all come out, and how it happened that in this world there exists more or less nothing. That made no sense. The world was present everywhere, in front and behind. Nothing was before it, nothing. There was no time it might not exist; that was what irritated me. Surely there was no reason for it to exist, this flowing larva. I shouted ‘that shit, that sucks!’ I shook myself to get rid of that sticky mess, but it had a tight grip on me, and had so many casks and barrels of indefinite existence, I drowned in the depths of this immense tedium”. That is precisely the opposite of freedom, the opposite of the project: tedium. The protagonist of “Nausea” wants to rid himself of that sticky mess in which he is mired, flowing without precision, without relying on human freedom, which imposes its project, which imposes something definitive. It is thus seen in “Nausea,” as Sartre addressed this issue of freedom for the first time, or in literary form, which would be a very frequent theme in his works, which would appear in “Dirty Hands”, “The Fly”, in many of his literary works, and of course, in the “Nothingness” series, which is the philosophical work he also wrote at this time. But we refer to strictly literary works, which are what we are seeing here.
--	---

Lo que nos interesa, entonces, en este momento, es señalar como para Sartre, no existe ese dato trascendente, que haga posible la aventura, que haga posible el proyecto del hombre. El hombre no entiende lo que hace, no entiende para que tiene libertad, si no puede realizar con su libertad, ningún proyecto. El poder realizar un proyecto sería ese dato trascendente que necesitaría Sartre para que la aventura fuese posible, pero el se niega a aceptar, o simplemente no conoce ese dato trascendente que es precisamente el, que San Pablo llama la manifestación de la libertad de los hijos de Dios, de allí la nausea. Es decir, de allí la actitud que corresponde que para Sartre es la existencia del hombre.	What interests us, then, at this point is to indicate that to Sartre, this transcendent data does not exist, which enables the adventure, which makes possible the human project. People do not understand what they are doing; or why they are free, if they cannot do any project with their freedom. Being able to make a plan would be this transcendent data that Sartre would need to make the adventure possible, but he refuses to accept or simply does not know that transcendent fact, which is precisely what St. Paul calls the manifestation of freedom of the children of God, hence the nausea. That is, hence the corresponding attitude that for Sartre is the human existence.
Esta existencia es absurda en el sentido en que pone al hombre frente a la alternativa de pedir todo lo que debería hacer el hombre, dado que tiene libertad, o aceptar esa existencia que no tiene sentido donde su libertad se pierde. Y ese es, precisamente, el tema de la obra de Jean Anouilh, en "Las Piezas Negras", y especialmente en "Antígona", como luego veremos ...	This existence is absurd in the sense that it puts people against the alternative of asking for everything that people should do, given their freedom, or accept this existence that has no point, where their freedom is lost. And that is precisely the theme of the work by Jean Anouilh, in "The Black Plays," and especially in "Antigone," as we shall see ...
[Recording interrupted, sound of switching back on, and speaker states:] ... si ... ahora, simplemente queda dicho que ésta segunda parte del cassette viene después del otro cassette sobre Anouilh, (background speaker: "ya terminamos Anouilh" y Le Mensa, de Sartre, que vimos la otra vez. Entonces, yo creo que tal vez lo que podríamos ver ahora es algo que ya hemos visto varias veces, pero que yo creo que voy a tener interés siempre en el mismo planteo del problema, y es Calígula, la de ... de Camus. La ...	[Recording interrupted, sound of switching back on, and speaker status] ... if ... now, it just must be said that this second part of the cassette tape comes after the other on Anouilh (background speaker "we already finished Anouilh " and Mensa, by Sartre, which we saw before. So I think maybe what we might see now is something we have already seen several times, but I think I'll always be interested in the same approach to the problem, and it's Caligula, by Camus.... The ...

En realidad ustedes saben que Calígula, el emperador loco, Camus lo toma para hacerle hacer, por decirlo así, la aventura de la libertad. De alguna manera para mostrar lo absurdo de la condición humana de que ya hemos hablado, para el es absurda la manera que la libertad hace que la condición del hombre sea absurda. En la obra, aparece que la insatisfacción de Calígula antes de comenzar su aventura de la libertad – la insatisfacción de Calígula y la constatación de que esa insatisfacción es general. Hablando con su amigo Helicón, dice, “las cosas tales como son no me parecen satisfactorias. Ahora lo se. Este mundo, tal como esta hecho, no es soportable. Por lo tanto yo tengo necesidad de la luna, o de la felicidad, o de la inmortalidad, o de algo que sea, tal vez, demente, pero que no sea de este mundo”. Dato trascendente, es decir, la necesidad del hombre, de algo que no es lo empírico, lo que sea. Y Helicón dice, “si, es un razonamiento valido, pero en general, no se lo puede llevar hasta el fin, ese razonamiento”. Calígula dice, “no sabes nada de eso. Es precisamente porque no se lo lleva hasta el fin, por lo que no se obtiene nada”. Es decir, la ... no se lleva el razonamiento de la libertad hasta el fin, por lo que no se obtiene nada. Hay una falta de lógica, diríamos, en el uso de la libertad, que hace que no se obtenga nada. “pero tal vez baste permanecer lógico hasta el fin”. Entonces Calígula, después de un intervalo, afirma una verdad así con tono neutro: dice, “los hombres mueren, y no son felices”. Es decir, esta es la situación, que el pretende remediar. Y pretende remediar	Actually you know that Caligula, the mad emperor, Camus takes him to make him experience, so to speak, the adventure of freedom. In some way to show the absurdity of the human condition of which we have already, for him it is absurd how freedom makes human condition absurd. In the play, it appears that Caligula’s dissatisfaction before starting his quest for freedom – Caligula’s dissatisfaction and the realization that of dissatisfaction is widespread. Talking to his friend Helicon, he says, “things as they are do not seem satisfactory. Now I know. This world, as it was made, is not endurable. So I need the moon, or happiness, or immortality, or something that is perhaps insane, but not of this world”. The transcendent fact, that is, human need, for something that is not empirical, whatever it is. And Helicon says, “yes, it is a valid argument, but in general, one cannot follow through on such reasoning”. Caligula says, “you know nothing about that. It is precisely because it does not lead to the end, so nothing is obtained”. That is, the ... the argument of freedom does not follow to the end, so nothing is obtained. There is a lack of logic, we would say, in the use of freedom so that nothing is obtained. “But perhaps it is enough to remain logical until the end”. Caligula then, after an interval, affirms the truth in a neutral tone, says, “Men die, and are not happy”. In other words, this is the situation that he intends to remedy. And he seeks to remedy it by taking his experiences to their ultimate consequences.
--	--

llevando sus experiencias hasta sus ultimas consecuencias. Precisamente dice, “mi libertad no tendrá fronteras. Es precisamente porque el hombre pone fronteras a su libertad que no consigue ser feliz”. Es decir, el hombre se distrae de su libertad, no es libre, no sigue su proyecto, que los hombres mueren y no son felices, al final de la vida experimentan que no han conseguido lo que han querido. Entonces el va a hacer una experiencia hasta sus últimas consecuencias. Y la formula así: “hoy, y en los tiempos venideros, mi libertad no tendrá fronteras”. No precisamente para ser todopoderoso, no es eso lo que le interesa, sino le interesa una vez que elija con su voluntad, lleve el razonamiento lógico de su libertad hasta el fin, pueda llevar realmente su proyecto hasta el final, que es lo que San Pablo dice que del hombre no es posible, que el hombre no logra hacer coincidir su proyecto con su realización. Esta sería, diríamos, la aventura de Calígula. Entonces, para llevar adelante esto, Calígula tiene que comenzar aprendiendo, por decirlo así, a ser libre. Aprendiendo a ser libre siempre, es decir, aprendiendo a no desviarse del proyecto que se fija. Ahora, para que el hombre no se desvíe del proyecto en que se fija ya hay una condición a priori, que es precisamente la locura de Calígula, que está apareciendo en toda la obra, es precisamente no atarse a las cosas, cuando uno se ata a las cosas es cuando la libertad empieza a desviarse, y entonces lógicamente, no se obtiene nunca lo que se ha buscado. Por lo tanto, dice, como va a obtener ese fin de una libertad sin fronteras. “este mundo no tiene	He says precisely, “My freedom will have no borders. It is precisely because people put boundaries on their freedom that they fail to be happy”. In other words, people are distracted from their freedom; one is not free, one does not follow one’s plan. People die and are not happy; at the end of life they experience not having achieved what they wanted. Then he will take an experience to its ultimate consequences. And the formula is like this: “Today, and in the times ahead, my freedom will have no borders”. Not necessarily to be all powerful; that’s not what interests him, but he is interested that once you choose with your will, take the logical reasoning of your freedom until the end, you may actually take your plan to the end. What St. Paul says is that for humanity it is not possible, that people fail to match their projects to their completion. This would, we would say, the adventure of Caligula. Then, to pursue this, Caligula has to start learning, so to speak, to be free. Learning to be free forever, that is, learning not to deviate from the plan to be fixed. Now, for a person not to deviate from the plan that person has in mind, there is an a priori condition, which is precisely the madness of Caligula, which is appearing throughout the work, is precisely not to be tied to things; when one is tied to things is when freedom starts to wander, and then logically, one does not always gets what one is looking for. Therefore, he says, how can one get that to that freedom without borders. “This world has no importance. Things do not matter. The thing about people is that they
--	---

importancia. Si las cosas no tienen importancia. Lo que ocurre con los hombres es que le dan importancia a las cosas, independientemente del proyecto que tienen. Le dan importancia a las personas, le dan importancia alguien [que] quiere ser un médico famoso, y sin embargo le da importancia a las leyes del tráfico, le da importancia a sus amigos, le da importancia a su familia, le da importancia a una serie de cosas y al final todo eso va cuartando su proyecto, y al final es un médico mediocre, porque su familia le sacó tiempo, o porque su amistad le sacó tiempo, o las leyes del tráfico le impidieron hacer lo que el quería, en fin, cualquiera de esas cosas que se suponen importantes ...	give importance to things, independent of their plans. They give importance to people, someone who wants to be a famous doctor, and yet gives importance to traffic laws, his friends, his family, to a number of things and in the end all that is cutting into his plan, and finally he ends up a mediocre doctor because his family took time, or because his friend took his time, or traffic laws prevented him from doing what he wanted, in short, any of those things that are considered important ...
(recording dropped out)	(recording dropped out)
Entonces lo importante es no darle ninguna importancia a las cosas que no vengan del proyecto. Y esta es la educación de Calígula. Eso es el preproyecto de Calígula, porque el va a tener después su proyecto pero primero tiene que educarse dentro de esa libertad. Y eso es lo que hace digamos, la locura de Calígula. Por ejemplo, le vienen a avisar que hay (esta es una de las partes tal vez mas interesantes...	So the important thing is not to give any importance to the things that do not come from the plan. And this is the education of Caligula. That is the preliminary plan of Caligula, because he will begin the project afterward but first must educate himself within that freedom. And that's what we call the madness of Caligula. For example, they have come to notice that there is (this is perhaps one of the, most interesting parts...
(Recording ends)	(Recording ends)

Appendix III--“La fenomenología”

Following is my translation of the unpublished manuscript “La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología”. The original manuscript is located, along with Segundo’s other papers, in the Jesuit archives at the Centro de Espiritualidad Manresa, Montevideo, Uruguay. A detail treatment of this text is in chapter five above. The original Spanish text and pagination is in the left column and my translation is in the right column.

La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología Índice general: Tema 21 Carpeta: N. 10 E pp. 1-32 [Manresa: carpeta III-23] Página 1 <u>La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología</u> Las posibilidades de la filosofía de Heidegger con respecto a lo religioso se suelen buscar del lado de un rompimiento del positivismo que parecería secuela necesaria de su fenomenología. Desde ese punto de vista se ha hablado y se habla de dos Heidegger, el de “Sein und Zeit”, y el de los últimos escritos raramente divulgado fuera de un núcleo de amigos y discípulos. Pero ese problema interesa más bien la filosofía cristiana, mientras que nosotros nos ocuparemos aquí únicamente de las relaciones posibles entre la fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología. A primera vista, el problema anterior parecería proponerse también aquí antes de hablar de toda relación posible con la “teología” que, como su nombre lo indica, trata precisamente de un “ser” que difícilmente puede decirse experimentable.	[Manresa: folder III-23] Page 1 <u>The Phenomenology of Heidegger and Theology</u> The potential of Heidegger’s philosophy with respect to religion will often seek a break with positivism that would seem like a necessary sequel to his phenomenology. From this point of view, it has been said and is said there are two Heideggers, e.g. that of <i>Being and Time</i> and that of recent writings rarely disseminated outside a core of friends and disciples. But that problem better concerns Christian philosophy, whereas here we deal only with the possible relationships between the phenomenology of Heidegger and theology. At first glance, the previous problem also seems to be proposed here before talking about any possible link with “theology” which, as its name implies, is precisely about a “being” that can hardly be said to be experienced.
---	---

Sin embargo, ello no es así, y Heidegger mismo, en su período más “cerrado” a todo lo que no sea fenomenología, es decir, en “<i>Sein und Zeit</i>,” habla de tales relaciones en cuatro textos capitales. En primer lugar, esas relaciones no son contradictorias en el sentido en que fenomenología excluiría positivamente la teología. El dato teológico sería, en ese caso, falso, por el sólo hecho de aplicarle el análisis fenomenológico a cualquier contenido de la teología. Pero ello no es así, según Heidegger: Hay que distinguir el “ser deudor” originalmente inherente a la constitución del “ser ahí” por respecto al <u>status corruptionis</u> teológicamente entendido. La teología puede encontrar en el “ser deudor” existencialmente definido una condición ontológica de su posibilidad fáctica...El análisis existencial del “ser deudor” no prueba nada ni en pro <u>ni en contra de la posibilidad del pecado</u>. (1) La misma constatación con respecto a la muerte y al más allá: El análisis ontológico del “ser relativamente al fin” <u>no prejuzga</u>, por otra parte, ninguna <u>posición existencial ante la muerte</u>. El hecho de definir la muerte como “fin” del “ser ahí”, es decir, del “ser en el mundo”, no hace recaer	However, this is not so; and Heidegger, in a period more “closed” to anything other than phenomenology, i.e., in <i>Being and Time</i>, he speaks of such relations in four pieces of capital. <u>First</u>, these relations are not contradictory in the sense that phenomenology positively excludes theology. The theological fact, in this case, would be false by simply applying phenomenological analysis to any content of theology. But this is not the case, according to Heidegger: The Being-guilty which belongs primordially to Dasein’s state of Being, must be distinguished from the <i>status corruptionis</i> as understood in theology. Theology can find in Being-guilty, as existentially defined, an ontological condition for the factual possibility of such a <i>status</i>...The existencial analysis of “Being-guilty” proves nothing either <i>for</i> or <i>against</i> the possibility of sin.¹²³⁹ The same is found with respect to death and beyond: The ontological analysis of “Being-towards-the-end” does not predetermine <u>any existentiell stand toward death</u>. If “death” is defined as the ‘end’ of Dasein—that is to say, of Being-in-the-world—this does not imply any
--	--

¹²³⁹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 496 n. ii.

ninguna decisión óntica sobre la cuestión de si es posible “después de la muerte” otro ser, superior o inferior, de si el “ser ahí” “sobrevive” o incluso, “perdurando”, es “inmortal”. (2) Y lo mismo finalmente con respecto a la “caída” del hombre en una situación inferior debido al pecado: La exégesis ontológico-existencial tampoco hace, por ende, afirmaciones ónticas sobre la “corrupción de la naturaleza humana”; <u>no porque falten los indispensables medios demostrativos</u>, sino porque sus problemas son anteriores a toda afirmación sobre corrupción o inocencia. La caída es el concepto ontológico de un movimiento. <u>No se decide ónticamente</u> si el hombre es “sumido en el pecado”, en el <u>status corruptionis</u>, si peregrina en el <u>status integritatis</u> o se encuentra en un estado intermedio, el <u>status gratiae</u>. (3) En segundo lugar, es evidente con todo que esos textos señalan una cierta oposición entre fenomenología (por lo menos en cuanto unida a la ontología filosófica) y teología. Cuando Heidegger dice que “la ontología del ser...en cuanto indagación filosófica, no “sabe” fundamentalmente nada del pecado” (4), ese término de	ontical decision whether ‘after death’ still another Being is possible, either higher or lower, or whether Dasein ‘lives on’ or even ‘enduring’ is ‘immortal’.¹²⁴⁰ And finally the same is true with respect to the “fall” of humanity into an inferior situation because of sin: Our existentially-ontological interpretation makes no ontical assertion about the ‘corruption of human nature,’ <u>not because the necessary evidence is lacking</u>, but because the problematic of this interpretation is <i>prior</i> to any assertion about corruption or incorruption. The fall is conceived ontologically as a kind of motion. <u>It is not decided ontically</u> if man is ‘drunk with sin’ and in the <u>status corruptionis</u>, whether he walks in the <u>status integritatis</u>, or he finds himself in an intermediate stage, the <u>status gratiae</u>.¹²⁴¹ <u>Second</u>, it is evident with all these texts that they indicate a certain opposition between phenomenology (at least as united with philosophical ontology) and theology. When Heidegger says that “the ontology of being...in philosophical inquiry, ‘knows’ essentially nothing of sin,”¹²⁴² the term “essentially” means that
---	---

¹²⁴⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 292.

¹²⁴¹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 224.

¹²⁴² Unknown

“fundamentalmente” quiere decir que la ignorancia no es accidental sino esencial al método fenomenológico de la filosofía.

Página 2

En qué consiste esa oposición? Los tres textos que acabamos de leer nos lo dicen claramente por medio de esos dos términos que se oponen en ellos continuamente: óntico y ontológicos. A la teología pertenece hablar sobre lo óntico, o, como dice Heidegger en otros textos, sobre lo que se da “de hecho”, sobre lo “fáctico”. A la ontología pertenece en cambio el descubrir lo “ontológico”, esto es, el sentido, el fundamento de lo óntico. La teología no dirá, por ejemplo, que Adán pecó y que todos los hombres contrayeron [?] en él una deuda que se manifiesta en un estado de decadencia de hombre. La ontología, por medio de la fenomenología, no mostraré en qué sentido el hombre puede estar en un estado decadente.

La oposición entre óntico y ontológico se reduce a una oposición entre lo fundado y su fundamento. Y ésta es, precisamente la relación de oposición que existe entre teología y ontología fenomenológica, según Heidegger. Por eso decía en el primer texto citado:

La teología puede encontrar en el “ser deudor” existencialmente definido una condición ontológica de su posibilidad fáctica. (5)

Y con respecto a la muerte:

Con sentido y razón no cabe ni siquiera preguntar en forma metódicamente segura por lo que será después

ignorance is not accidental but fundamental to the method of phenomenological philosophy.

Page 2

Of what does that opposition consist? The three texts that we have just read speak clearly to us through these two continuously opposing terms: ontic and ontological. Talk about the ontic or, as Heidegger says in other texts, about what is given “in fact” over the “facts” belongs to theology. To ontology belongs instead the discovery of the “ontological,” that is, the sense, the foundation of ontic. Theology does not say, for example, that Adam sinned and all humanity contracted a debt with him that is manifested in a state of human decline. Ontology, through phenomenology, does not show in what sense humanity can be in a state of decline.

The opposition between ontic and ontological is reduced to an opposition between what is founded and its foundation. And this is precisely the opposition between theology and phenomenological ontology, as in Heidegger. This is why he said in the first passage quoted:

Theology can find in Being-guilty, as existentially defined, an ontological condition for the factual possibility.¹²⁴³

And with regard to death:

Only when death is conceived in its full ontological essence can we have any methodological

¹²⁴³ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 496 n. ii.

de la muerte sino <u>tan sólo una vez concebida ésta en su plena esencia ontológica...</u> La exégesis ontológica de la muerte dentro del más acá es <u>anterior</u> a toda especulación óptica sobre el más allá (6) Y Heidegger puede citar en este sentido a San Pablo (7). Finalmente, una afirmación todavía más explícita a propósito del estado de “caída”: La exégesis ontológico-existencial tampoco hace, afirmaciones ónticas sobre la “corrupción de la naturaleza humana”; no porque falten los indispensables medios demostrativos, sino porque <u>sus problemas son anteriores</u> a toda afirmación sobre corrupción o inocencia...Pero la fe y la “idea del mundo”, al hacer tales o semejantes afirmaciones...tienen que recurrir a las estructuras existenciales puestas de manifiesto, <u>supuesto que sus afirmaciones aspiren al par a ser objeto de una comprensión conceptual.</u> (8) Finalmente, en tercer lugar, existe también un texto que indica, a nuestro parecer, una unidad más estrecha posible entre fenomenología y teología. En efecto, podemos concebir, por lo menos hipotéticamente, el empleo, por parte	assurance in even <i>asking what may be after death...</i>The this-worldly ontological Interpretation of death takes precedence over any ontical other-worldly speculation.¹²⁴⁴ And Heidegger can cite Saint Paul in this sense.¹²⁴⁵ Finally, there is an even more explicit statement about the state of the “fall:” Our existentially-ontological Interpretation makes no ontical assertion about the ‘corruption of human Nature,’ not because the necessary evidence is lacking, but because <u>the problematic of this Interpretation is prior</u> to any assertion about corruption or incorruption...But in so far as any faith or ‘world view’, makes any such assertions...it must refer back to the existentially structures which we have set forth, <u>provided that its assertions are to make a claim to conceptual understanding.</u>¹²⁴⁶ Finally, third, there is also a text that indicates, in my view, a closer unity between phenomenology and theology. Indeed, we can conceive, at least hypothetically, the employment by theology of the phenomenological method itself. In this case,
--	---

¹²⁴⁴ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 292.

¹²⁴⁵ Possibly: Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 494.

¹²⁴⁶ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 224.

de la teología, del propio método fenomenológico. En este caso, la fenomenología sería separable de la filosofía (que no “entra” en la teología, sino que se limita a ser su “fundamento” en el sentido ya estudiado) y aplicable a una ciencia como la teológica. Y vemos que Heidegger no se opone a una tal hipótesis. Describiendo precisamente el método fenomenológico, dice así: El nombre de fenomenología es por su sentido, según esto, un nombre distinto de las denominaciones <u>como teología y demás semejantes</u>. Estas <u>designan los objetos</u> de la ciencia correspondiente en su respectivo contenido material. “Fenomenología” ni designa el objeto de sus investigaciones, ni es un término que caracterice el contenido material de este objeto. La palabra se limita a indicar <u>cómo</u> mostrar y tratar <u>lo que</u> debe tratarse en esa ciencia. (9) Ahora bien, es evidente que si Heidegger toma precisamente para la comparación los términos de teología y de fenomenología, uno para designar el objeto material de una ciencia, y otro para designar su método, podemos deducir que esos términos no son irruductibles. De otro [Pagina 3] modo, la comparación estaría mal elegida, cosa que es difícil de pensar cuando se trata de Heidegger. Este texto parece pues admitir, por lo menos en principio, una adaptación del <u>método</u> fenomenológico al	phenomenology would not be separable from philosophy (not to “enter” in theology, but merely to be its “foundation” in the sense already studied) and it is applicable to a science such as theology. And we see that Heidegger does not oppose such a hypothesis. Describing precisely the phenomenological method, he writes: Thus the term “phenomenology” is quite different in its meaning from expressions <u>such as “theology” and the like</u>. <u>Those terms designate the objects</u> of their respective sciences according to their subject matter. ‘Phenomenology’ neither designates the object of its research, nor characterizes the subject matter thus comprised. The word merely informs us <u>how</u> to demonstrate and handle <u>what</u> is to be addressed in this science.¹²⁴⁷ It is evident that if Heidegger directly compares theological and phenomenological terms, one to designate a physical object of a science, and the other to designate the method, we can deduce that these terms are not irreducible. Otherwise, [Page 3] the comparison would be badly chosen, which is hard to think when it comes to Heidegger. This text seems to admit, at least in principle, an adaptation of the phenomenological <u>method</u> to the theological <u>content</u>.
--	--

¹²⁴⁷ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 59.

contenido teológico.

Estos son los datos explícitos e inmediatos que nos proporciona el mismo "Sein und Zeit" sobre el problema de las relaciones entre fenomenología y teología. En realidad, casi no hemos hecho otra cosa hasta aquí, que enredarnos en nuevos problemas y acumular dificultades. ¿En efecto, qué es fenomenología? ¿Cuáles son sus relaciones con la filosofía y la ontología? ¿Qué es teología? ¿Qué relación existe entre teología y ontología?

He ahí otros tantos problemas que es necesario elucidar, aunque no sea más que brevemente antes de poder contestar a la pregunta que hemos hecho en esta introducción.

I

La fenomenología según Heidegger, como según Husserl, puede definirse por este lema: "a las cosas mismas" (10). Ahora bien, hay cosas que están ya patentes. La casa que tengo frente a mi ventana no ha menester de ninguna fenomenología. En efecto, fenómeno está en oposición a "encubierto". "Encubrimiento es el concepto contrario de fenómeno" (11) dice Heidegger.

Si hacemos, pues, un método de ese ir a las cosas mismas, se trata evidentemente de descubrir lo encubierto:

Qué es lo que debe llamarse 'fenómeno' en un señalado sentido? Qué es lo que es por esencia tema necesario de un mostrar expresamente? Con evidencia aquello que inmediata y regularmente justo no

These are the explicit and immediate pieces of information that *Being and Time* itself provides us about the problem of relations between phenomenology and theology. Actually, we have done nothing so far except to entangle ourselves in new problems and to accumulate difficulties. Indeed, what is phenomenology? What are relations with philosophy and ontology? What is theology? What is the relationship between theology and ontology?

There are many problems that need to be elucidated, if only briefly, before being able to answer the question I asked in this introduction.

I

Heidegger's phenomenology, according to Husserl, can be defined by this motto: "to the things themselves".¹²⁴⁸ Well now, there are things that are already apparent. The house that I have outside my window has no need for phenomenology. In effect, phenomenon is the opposite of "concealed". Heidegger says, "Concealment is the opposite concept of phenomenon".¹²⁴⁹

If we, therefore, make this a method of going to the things themselves, this is obviously to discover the concealed:

What must a 'phenomenon' be called in a specific sense? What is it that by its very essence is *necessarily* the theme necessary to be *explicitly* demonstrated? With evidence, that immediately and

¹²⁴⁸ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 50.

¹²⁴⁹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 51-55.

se muestra, aquello que, al contrario de lo que inmediata y regularmente se muestra, está oculto, pero al par es algo que pertenece por esencia a lo que inmediata y regularmente se muestra, de tal suerte que constituye su sentido y fundamento (12). Es decir que fenomenología supone necesariamente un ocultamiento de algo. Pero también un ocultamiento <u>especial</u>. No todo lo oculto puede ser objeto de la fenomenología, sino lo que está oculto en aquello mismo que debería mostrarlo. Esto es lo que quiere decir Heidegger al añadir “es algo que pertenece por esencia a lo que inmediata y regularmente se muestra”. Esto quiere decir que las cosas que por su esencia misma están separadas de lo que naturalmente se muestra, no son objeto de la fenomenología. El fenómeno debe ser algo “mostrable,” algo que está ya allí, en la muestra, sin que por ello se muestre regularmente. Como detrás de un negocio está el valor del dinero. “Justo porque los fenómenos no están dados inmediata y regularmente, dice Heidegger, es menester de la fenomenología” (13). Y precisamente fenómeno es lo que, como hemos dicho, “<u>debería</u>” mostrarse en lo que está oculto. Pues bien, ese “debería” que no se realiza nos pone sobre la pista de una noción que ejerce una gran influencia en la fenomenología y que la fundamenta. La condición del hombre obligado a hacer	<u>normally does not show itself</u>, it is something that lies <i>hidden</i>, in contrast to that which immediately and normally does show itself; but at the same time it is something that so essentially belongs to what thus shows itself as to constitute its meaning and its ground.¹²⁵⁰ This means that phenomenology necessarily involves hiding something. But it is also a <u>special</u> concealment. Not everything hidden can be the object of phenomenology, except that which is hidden in the very things that should show it. This is what Heidegger means by adding “it is something that belongs to what thus shows itself”. This means that things that by their very nature are separated from what is naturally shown are not the object of phenomenology. The phenomenon must be something “demonstrable,” something that is already there, in the showing, without necessarily being shown regularly, as behind a business is the value of money. Heidegger writes, “Just because phenomena do not occur immediately and regularly, it is a necessity of phenomenology”.¹²⁵¹ And, phenomenon is precisely what, as I said, “<u>should</u>” show what is hidden. Well then, this “should” that is not realized puts us on the trail of a notion that has a major influence on phenomenology and on which it is based. The condition of humanity forced to perform “phenomenology,”
---	--

¹²⁵⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 59.

¹²⁵¹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 53.

“fenomenología,” es un estado de “caída”. A ello se refiere Heidegger al describir la fenomenología por estas palabras:

Pero lo que en un señalado sentido (explicado más arriba) permanece oculto, o vuelve a quedar encubierto, o sólo se muestra ‘desfigurado,’ no es tal o cual ente, sino, como han mostrado las consideraciones anteriores, el ser de los entes (14). **Página 4**

Ahora bien, esas “consideraciones anteriores” pueden resumirse en este texto típicamente heideggeriano y que tendrá no poca importancia para la consideración de la teología:

El ‘ser ahí’ es ónticamente lo más cercano a el mismo (porque ‘de hecho’ se identifica con él), ontológicamente lo más lejano (porque debido a su estado de ‘caído’, el ser que él es le permanece ‘encubierto’), pero, sin embargo, preontológicamente no extraño (es decir, que el ser está ‘dispuesto’ a mostrarse, puesto que está en lo mismo que se muestra, como fundamento y significación) (15).

Al “ser ahí”, pues, en su estado de “caído”, le es encubierto su ser. Heidegger explica, en efecto, al hablar

is a state of “the fall”. In this respect, Heidegger describes phenomenology in these words:

Yet that which remains *hidden* in a specific sense (explained above), or which relapses and gets *covered up* again, or which shows itself only ‘*in disguise*’, is not just this entity or that, but rather the *Being* of entities, as our previous observations have shown.¹²⁵² **Page 4**

Well then, these “previous considerations” can be summed up in this typically Heideggerian text and it will have much importance for the consideration of theology:

Dasein is ontically the closest thing to itself (because ‘actually’ it is identified with it), ontologically it is most distant (because of its state as ‘fallen’, the being that it is remains ‘hidden’). However, pre-ontologically not strange (i.e., to be ‘ready’ to show itself, since it is the same as that shown as the basis and significance).¹²⁵³

Since its state is “fallen,” Dasein disguised its being. Heidegger explains, in effect, speaking of

¹²⁵² Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 59.

¹²⁵³ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 37.

de fenomenología, el sentido de ese “logos” que figura etimológicamente en el vocablo. “Logos” significa primeramente <u>habla</u>, y en segundo lugar fundamento, <u>razón de ser</u>. Estas dos significaciones, como veremos, no son separables totalmente, y se pasa insensiblemente de una a otra. Porque, en efecto, en primer lugar, el “ser ahí” refleja su estado de caído en el habla. El hombre, tal como lo conocemos, tiene tendencia a utilizar la significación en un sentido no auténtico, a perder el contenido exacto y pleno de los signos que usa. No nos detendremos aquí a estudiar el porqué y la naturaleza de este hecho, fácilmente comprobable. Vengamos inmediatamente a sus consecuencias. Si la fenomenología debe “apofainesthai ta fainómena: permitir ver lo que se muestra efectivamente por sí mismo, tal como se muestra” (16), ha de comenzar necesariamente por devolver al habla, sea interior o exterior, su transparencia [¿transparencia?] y su plenitud, su originalidad. De ahí que se presente siempre contra “<u>la adopción de conceptos sólo aparentemente rigurosos</u>,” y contra la consecuencia de esta adopción, es decir “<u>las cuestiones aparentes</u> que se extienden con frecuencia a través de generaciones como problemas” (17). Heidegger, lo mismo que Husserl, comenzará el trabajo filosófico por esta pregunta tipo: “Qué entendemos por...” (Was meinen wir?) (18). O sea que la fenomenología comienza por ser una exégesis del habla. Con respecto precisamente a ese “logos” de la fenomenología, en el sentido de “habla,” muestra Heidegger cómo el concepto mismo de verdad antes de ser correspondencia del	phenomenology, the meaning of the <i>logos</i> that is contained in the word etymologically. <i>Logos</i> first means <u>speech</u> and, second, <u>reason for being</u>. These two meanings, as we shall see, are not entirely separable, and they pass insensibly from one to another. This is because, in fact, first, Dasein reflects its fallen status in speech. Humankind, as we know, has a tendency to use meaning in an inauthentic sense, to lose the exact content and fullness of signs in use. I will not stop here to study the reasons and the nature of this fact, which is easily verifiable. I will move immediately to its consequences. If phenomenology says “the observational data: let us see what actually shows itself, as shown”,¹²⁵⁴ we must necessarily begin to return to speech, either internal or external, to its transparency [transparencia?] fullness, and originality. Hence, if this is presented against “<u>the adoption of concepts only apparently harsh</u>,” and against the result of this adoption, then it is “<u>apparent that the issues often extend across generations and problems</u>”.¹²⁵⁵ Heidegger, like Husserl, will begin this philosophical work with questions such as: “What we mean by ..”. (Was meinen wir?).¹²⁵⁶ Thus, phenomenology begins by being an exegesis of speech. With regard to exactly this <i>logos</i> of phenomenology, meaning “speech,” Heidegger shows how the very concept of truth before being aware of the correspondence with
--	--

¹²⁵⁴ Unknown

¹²⁵⁵ Unknown

¹²⁵⁶ Unknown

conocimiento con la realidad, es “*aletheis*”, esto es transparencia del habla, alusión al hecho de que la significación no encubre sino descubre lo significado:

Porque el ‘logos es un permitir ver, por ello puede ser verdadero o falso. Todo se reduce también a librarse de un artificial concepto de la verdad en el sentido de una ‘concordancia’. Esta idea no es en ningún caso la primaria en el concepto de ‘*alétheia*’. El ‘ser verdad’ del ‘logos’ como ‘*letheúiein*’ quiere decir: en el ‘legein’ como ‘apofáinesthai, sacar de su ocultamiento al ente de que se habla y permitir verlo, descubrirlo como no-oculto (*alethés*) ‘(19)...’ Cuando, como hoy se ha vuelto de todo punto usual, se define la verdad como aquello que conviene ‘propiamente’ al juicio, y encima se apela a favor de esta tesis a Aristóteles, se trata tanto de una apelación injustificada cuanto, y ante todo, de una mala inteligencia del concepto griego de verdad (20).

En realidad, antes de que el habla sea verdadera en lo que dice materialmente, es necesario que sea ‘verdadera’ en cuanto habla, es decir es menester que deje mostrarse por sí misma a la realidad que ella pretende

reality, *aletheis*, i.e. transparent speech, of an allusion to the fact that the significance does not conceal but reveals the meaning:

Because the *logos* is a definite mode of letting something be seen; thus it may be true or false. Everything is also reduced to releasing itself from an artificial concept of the truth in the sense of ‘correspondence.’ This idea is not in any case the primary in the concept of ‘*alétheia*.’ The ‘being true’ of *logos* as ‘*letheúiein*’ means: in the ‘legein’ as ‘apofáinesthai, bring out of its hiding place the entity to which is referred and be allowed to see it, to discover it as not hidden (*alethes*)¹²⁵⁷ ... When, as today is done with all usual points, the truth is defined as what is ‘precisely’ appropriate for judgment, and if one then invokes the support of Aristotle with this thesis, not only is this unjustified, but, above all, the Greek conception of truth has been misunderstood.¹²⁵⁸

In fact, before the speech is materially true, it must be ‘true’ in spoken words; i.e. it is necessary to stop showing itself to the reality it intends to signify. And this is the first job of phenomenology. **Page 5**

¹²⁵⁷ Unknown.

¹²⁵⁸ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 57.

significar. Y este es el oficio primero de la fenomenología. **Página 5**

La primera consecuencia de lo que acabamos de ver es que la fenomenología, así entendida, no se identifica con ninguna ciencia particular. Dondequiera que el habla, debido a la caída, esté sumida en lo impreciso, en lo in esencial, una análisis fenomenológico se impone.

Y, sin embargo, la fenomenología ha sido siempre un método típicamente filosófico. Es lógico, pues, que nos preguntemos si no tiene una relación más intrínseca con la filosofía que el de ser simplemente una exégesis del habla.

Precisamente para distinguir a la filosofía de la teología, Heidegger nos dice que ésta última “es atestiguada en una forma peculiar, que permanece fundamentalmente cerrada para toda experiencia filosófica” (21).

Nos es menester, pues, tratar de descubrir cuál es la forma de atestiguar propia de la filosofía. Según Heidegger, este testimonio se da en el “análisis existencial” (22) que, como se sabe, no es otra cosa que un análisis fenomenológico. Resulta, pues, que la forma de atestiguar propia de la filosofía, es la forma misma del atestiguar fenomenológico. Y, a su vez, cuál es este última? Heidegger nos lo dice en el texto y citado:

Fenomenología quiere, pues, decir: *apofainestai ta fainómena*: permitir ver lo que se muestra efectivamente por sí mismo, tal como se muestra por sí mismo (23).

Estas palabras nos muestran explícitamente a la experiencia como

The first consequence of what we have seen is that phenomenology, thus understood, is not identified with any particular science. Wherever speech, due to the fall, is mired in imprecision, as in essence, a phenomenological analysis is necessary.

Yet, phenomenology has always been a typical philosophical method. It is therefore logical to ask ourselves if it has no intrinsic relationship with philosophy other than simply being an exegesis of speech.

Precisely to distinguish philosophy from theology, Heidegger tells us that the latter “is testified to in a special way, which remains closed off in principle from any philosophical experience”.¹²⁵⁹

We must therefore try to describe the form of witnessing of philosophy itself. According to Heidegger, this testimony is given in “existential analysis,”¹²⁶⁰ which, as everyone knows, is nothing more than a phenomenological analysis. Therefore, the way to bear witness to philosophy itself is the manner of phenomenological testimony. And, in turn, what is this latter? Heidegger tells us in the text and cites:

“Phenomenology” means *apofainestai ta fainómena*--to let that which shows itself to be seen for itself as it is shown for itself.¹²⁶¹

These words point us explicitly to experience as the way of witnessing

¹²⁵⁹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 496 n. ii.

¹²⁶⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 496 n. ii.

¹²⁶¹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 58.

la forma de atestiguar propia de la fenomenología y, por ende, de la filosofía. Dejar que se muestre lo que se muestra, dejar ver lo que se muestra tal como se muestra, todas éstas son expresiones sinónimas de experiencia. Ahora bien, puesto que ya hemos visto que la fenomenología consistía, ante todo, en una exégesis del habla que le devolvía su transparencia primitiva, hay que concluir que <u>lo que él habla</u>, así descubierta, nos dice, es la realidad que la filosofía tratar de sacar a luz? En otras palabras, la experiencia que corresponde al lenguaje “verdadero” (como <i>alétheia</i>), es la experiencia filosófica, aquello de que da “testimonio” la filosofía? A estas preguntas tenemos que responder, con Heidegger, por la negativa. A la fenomenología le incumbe una segunda tarea, continuación de la primera, y sólo al cabo de ella surge en la experiencia el fenómeno propiamente filosófico. En efecto, lo que se revela en el habla inmediatamente (una vez verificada fenomenológicamente), es lo óntico, lo que pertenece al ente, y en especial, al ente que somos nosotros, es decir, lo existencial. La fenomenología de la palabra “temor”, nos lleva al temor existencial es decir, a la descripción viva, real, de <u>un</u> temor, el que está más al alcance de nuestra experiencia, entre las diversas formas de temer que <u>pueden</u> existir y quizás ya han existido en nosotros. Hay que volver, pues, a empuñar la fenomenología, para hacer la exégesis, no ya del habla, sino del ente mismo. Tenemos que interpretar ese “temor” particular descubierto, hasta que él nos libre su secreto: el temor que está en la base de todos los temores, <u>la estructura que permite al hombre temer</u>, el temor, no ya	of phenomenology itself, and thus, of philosophy. Allowing what is shown to be shown, allowing what is seen to be seen as it is shown; all these are synonymous expressions for experience. Well then, as we have already seen that phenomenology consisted, above all, of an exegesis of speech that returned it to its original transparency, must we conclude that <u>that which it speaks</u>, thus revealed, is the reality that philosophy tries to bring to light? In other words, the experience that corresponds to “real” language (as <i>alétheia</i>) is the philosophical experience, which gives philosophical “testimony?” To these questions we must answer, with Heidegger, in the negative. A second task is incumbent on Phenomenology, a continuation of the first, and only after completing it, the philosophical phenomenon itself emerges in experience. In effect, what is immediately revealed in speech (once phenomenologically verified), is the ontic, which belongs to the being, especially the being we are, i.e. the existentiell. The phenomenology of the word “fear” leads us to the existentiell fear; that is, to the vivid description, real, of <u>one</u> fear, which is closer to our experience, among the various forms of fear that <u>may</u> exist and may have already existed in us. We must return, then, to grasp phenomenology, to perform exegesis, not of speech, but of the being itself. We have to interpret this particular “fear” until it releases its secret to us: the fear that is at the root of all fears, <u>the structure that allows man to fear</u>, fear that is no longer existentiell, but existentielle.
---	---

existencial, sino existenciario.

De ahí que, según Heidegger, la fenomenología no se oponga solamente, como vimos, a los conceptos vacíos o falseados, sino también a (24) “las construcciones en el aire” y a “los descubrimientos casuales”, es decir a todo lo que no rebasa el plano de lo óntico, de lo existencial en busca de su fundamento ontológico-existenciario.

Ya lo dijimos antes: “logos” es, primero, habla; pero también “razón de ser” (25) **Página 6**

Ahora bien, si esta fenomenología nos conduce de lo óntico a lo ontológico, tendremos evidentemente que admitir la identificación de ontología y fenomenología? La consecuencia se impone, y Heidegger lo enseña explícitamente:

Tomada por su contenido es la fenomenología la ciencia del ser de los entes--ontología (26).

Y en este sentido, fácil es de ver el rompimiento inevitable que se sigue entre teología, ciencia óptica, y fenomenología, ciencia ontológica.

Sin embargo, cómo puede decir Heidegger que la fenomenología, “tomada por su contenido”, es esto o lo otro, después de habernos dicho que fenomenología “ni designa el objeto de sus investigaciones, ni es un término que caracterice el contenido material de este objeto” (27)? A nuestro parecer, hay que establecer aquí una distinción entre contenido material (*sachhaltigkeit*) y contenido formal. La fenomenología no tiene un contenido material definido, pero tiene un

Hence, according to Heidegger, phenomenology is not opposed, as we saw, only to empty or falsified concepts, but also¹²⁶² to “constructions in the air” and “accidental discoveries” i.e. to everything does not exceed the level of the ontic, of the existentiell seeking this existentielle-ontological foundation.

We have already said before: *logos* is first speech, but also a “reason for existence”.¹²⁶³ **Page 6**

Well now, if this phenomenology of the ontic leads to the ontological, do we obviously have to admit the identification of ontology and phenomenology? The consequence is implied, and Heidegger explicitly teaches:

Phenomenology is the science of the Being of entities--ontology.¹²⁶⁴

And in this sense, it is easy to see the inevitable rupture between theology, optic science, and phenomenology, an ontological science.

However, how can Heidegger says that his phenomenology, “taken by its contents,” is this or that, after having said that phenomenology “neither designates the object of its researches, nor characterizes the subject matter thus comprised”?¹²⁶⁵ In my opinion, I must establish a distinction here between material content (*sachhaltigkeit* [BT, p. 59]) and formal content. Phenomenology does not have a defined material content, but has a formal content, a

¹²⁶² Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 224.

¹²⁶³ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 55.

¹²⁶⁴ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 61.

¹²⁶⁵ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 59.

contenido formal, un contenido que está en su misma noción de método. Puesto que su método consiste en descubrir el ser de los entes, el ser será siempre su contenido formal y en ese sentido se identificará con la ontología. Pero esto trae como inmediata consecuencia el sacar a la ontología e al lado de las demás ciencias, y aun de las ciencias filosóficas, y esto no por tener un contenido material más extenso, sino en razón de que mienta un método y no un contenido. Y así es, en efecto, para Heidegger, y esto puede ser una prueba de que la interpretación que acabamos de hacer corresponde a su pensamiento: Con el uso del término de ontología tampoco se habla en favor de <u>una disciplina filosófica determinada que esté en relación con las restantes</u> (28). Y continúa con estas palabras que ilustran aún más lo que vamos diciendo, mostrándonos cómo la ontología es más bien un método impuesto por las cosas mismas, que una ciencia de contenido material: No se trata en absoluto del problema de una disciplina previamente dada (por la determinación de su contenido material, evidentemente), sino a la inversa; es de la <u>necesidad objetiva de determinadas cuestiones y de la forma de tratarlas requerida por las cosas mismas</u>, de	content that is in its very notion of method. Since his method is to discover the essence of beings, the being will always be its formal content will always be and in that sense be identified with ontology. But this brings the immediate consequence to ontology and then to the other sciences, and even to philosophical sciences, not by having a larger material content, but because it mentions a method and not a content. And so, in fact, and this may be proof that the interpretation just given corresponds with his thinking, Heidegger writes: When we use the term ‘ontology’, we are not talking about a definite <u>philosophical discipline standing in interconnection with the others</u>.¹²⁶⁶ It continues with these words that further illustrate what we are saying, showing how ontology is rather a method imposed by the things themselves than a science of material content: This is absolutely not the problem of a discipline that has been presented beforehand (for the determination of its material content, evidently); on the contrary, it is the from <u>objective necessity of specific questions and the kind of treatment which the ‘things themselves’ require,</u>
---	---

¹²⁶⁶ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 49.

donde puede salir si acaso una disciplina (29). De donde vemos una vez más que no existe ese divorcio entre teología y ontología ni entre teología y fenomenología. La teología para Heidegger, es una ciencia óntica. Pero qué impide pensar el <u>que esas realidades</u> señaladas por la teología, exijan “determinadas cuestiones” y “una forma de tratarlas” determinada y específicamente ontológica y fenomenológica? Pero antes de entrar propiamente al estudio de la teología, tenemos que completar nuestro estudio sobre la fenomenología poniéndonos frente a algunos problemas que ella suscita. Hemos insistido en nuestra exposición en el hecho innegable pero poco señalado y puesto en valor, de que, para Heidegger, la fenomenología es una exégesis del habla. Precisamente éste es el punto que permite comprender el paso del primer Heidegger al segundo, como lo deja ver implícitamente este texto de P. Thévenaz: L’accent que était sur le souci de l’être passe maintenant sur le langage, centre nouveau de la relation Etre-homme...En constatant cette importance du langage, nous pourrions être Pagina 7 enclins á penser que Heidegger se trouve dans la ligne de l’inspiration phénoménologique: la recherche des significations conduisait en effet la phénoménologie au	that can one develop such a discipline.¹²⁶⁷ Here we see once again that there is no such divorce between theology and ontology or between theology and phenomenology. Theology, to Heidegger, is an ontic science. But what prevents us from thinking <u>that these realities</u> identified by theology, require “specific issues” and particular and specifically ontological and phenomenological “ways of dealing with them?” But before entering the study of theology itself, we must complete our study of phenomenology by addressing some issues it raises. In our discussion we have stressed a little recognized and valued, but undeniable, fact as noted, that, for Heidegger, phenomenology is an exegesis of speech. This is precisely the point that allows understanding the transition from the first Heidegger to the second, as implicitly revealed in this text by P. Thévenaz: The accent which was on the concern for being now passes to language, the new center of the Being-man relationship...In observing this importance given to language, we might be Page 7 inclined to think that Heidegger is in the line of phenomenological inspiration. Inquiry into significations led phenomenology in fact to the heart of the
---	--

¹²⁶⁷ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 49.

coeur du problème du langage...Dés "Sein und Zeit" déjà, Heidegger fait un sorte de phénoménologie de mots; il essaie par la manipulation des étymologies, en "réduisant" le sens quotidien des mots, en les faisant éclater, de dévoiler les significations implicites ou ensevelies, de reprendre le langage humain a sa source significative. Mais si maintenant les significations qui se dévoilent elles-memes comme des realites objectives sont des mots recharges d'une plenitude de sens perdu, c'est dire que le langage n'est plus l'instrument dont l'homme se sert pour s'exprimer, mais la revelation meme de l'Etre. "Le langage n'est pas quel que chose que l'homme, entre autres facultes ou instrumentes, possede aussi, mais ce qui possede l'homme". Avant meme que l'homme parle ou pense, l'Etre parle a l'homme et rend possible le langage, la logique et la pensee. Mais on voit bien comment la methode et l'ambition phenomenologique s'extenuent (30). Pues bien, este texto notable	problem of language...In return, since <i>Sein und Zeit</i> Heidegger has made a sort of phenomenology of words. By manipulating etymologies, "reducing" the everyday meaning of words, by exploding them, he tries to disclose their implicit or buried meanings, to recover human language at its meaningful source. But if the meanings which reveal themselves now as objective realities are words recharged from a fullness of lost meaning, that is to say that language is no longer the instrument that man uses to express himself, but the very revelation of Being. "Language is not something that man, among other faculties or instruments, <i>also possesses</i>, but <i>that which possesses man</i>". Even before man thinks or speaks, Being speaks to man and renders language, logic, and thought possible. But we see to what extent the method and ambition of phenomenology has been attenuated.¹²⁶⁸ This remarkable text as
---	---

¹²⁶⁸ Thévenaz, *What is Phenomenology*, 61-62.

como interpretación de la evolución de Heidegger, no comprende el verdadero y más profundo sentido de la fenomenología. Porque precisamente lo que perdura en la segunda etapa de Heidegger es la fenomenología, en el sentido de exégesis del habla. Lo que no perdura es la filosofía, es la parte “lógica”, en sentido griego, la búsqueda de “la razón de ser” de lo existencial. Para el segundo Heidegger, lo óntico es ya el ser, simplemente. Lo existencial es lo que desaparece. El mismo Thévenaz lo dice implícitamente cuando continúa en esta forma:

Le philosophe, au sens courant du terme, devra se taire, et c’est le poète et le penseur qui le relayeront (31).

Eso es, precisamente. El filósofo, el que busca activamente el fundamento necesario y universal, la estructura básica de la realidad, enmudece, y el poeta y el pensador lo relevan, y lo relevan justamente continuando con la fenomenología, en el primero de los sentidos que ella tiene: exégesis descubridora del habla y, en ella, de la realidad que está en su origen y que es su fundamento. El no haber notado este carácter original de la fenomenología (quizás a causa de la proximidad husserliana) es la causa de que el cambio sobrevenido en el pensamiento de Heidegger aparezca como una ruptura, y no como una evolución y un enriquecimiento.

Si se pierde de vista este carácter de la fenomenología, no se comprende tampoco uno de los caracteres más fundamentales y originales de “*Sein und Zeit*”, latente a todo lo largo de la obra: lo que Heidegger mismo llama “una

interpretation of the evolution of Heidegger does not include the true and more profound sense of phenomenology. Because precisely what lingers in the second phase of Heidegger is phenomenology, in the sense of exegesis of speech. What does not last is philosophy; it is the “logical” part in the Greek sense, the search for the existentiell “reason for being”. For the later [second] Heidegger, the ontic is already simply being. The existentielle is what disappears. Thévenaz himself says it implicitly when he continues in this way:

The philosopher, in the current sense of the term, should keep silent; it is the poet and the “thinker” who will replace him.¹²⁶⁹

This is precisely it. The philosopher, who is actively seeking the necessary and universal foundation, the basic structure of reality, is mute, and the poet and thinker reveal it precisely by continuing with phenomenology, in the first of its senses: the revealing exegesis of speech, and in it, the reality is in its origin and that is its foundation. The failure to note this characteristic of phenomenology (perhaps because of the proximity of Husserl) is the reason for the changes in Heidegger’s thinking. It appears as a rupture, and not as a development or enrichment.

If we lose sight of this nature of phenomenology, we will not have uncovered even one of the most fundamental and original characteristics of *Being and Time*, one that is latent throughout the book: what Heidegger himself calls “a

¹²⁶⁹ Thévenaz, *What is Phenomenology*, 62.

destrucción de la historia de la ontología". Ya hemos visto, en efecto, que el habla se presenta regularmente, como todo lo humano, en un estado de "caída" que la hace inauténtica. Esto puede decirse independientemente del tiempo. Pero cuando esta condición se estudia dentro de la temporalidad, la fenomenología adquiere una dirección especial, que corresponde a la manera también especial de presentarse la caída en el tiempo. Y así dice Heidegger:

Esta elemental historicidad del "ser ahí" puede permanecerle oculta a éste mismo. Pero también puede descubrirse de cierto modo y experimentar un peculiar cultivo. El "ser ahí" puede descubrir la tradición, conservarla y seguirla expresamente (32).

En efecto, toda habla transmitida en el tiempo es tradición. Y el hombre puede tomar una postura frente a esa tradición. Pero antes de examinar cuál puede ser esa postura, notemos una característica esencial de toda tradición: **Página 8**

Pero la exégesis preparatoria de las estructuras fundamentales del "ser ahí" tomado en su forma de ser inmediata y "de término medio," que es también aquella en que es inmediatamente histórico, hará patente lo siguiente: el "ser ahí" no tiene sólo la propensión a "caer" en su mundo, en el cual es, e interpretarse

destruction of the history of ontology". We have already seen, in fact, that speech presents itself regularly, like everything human, in a state of "fallenness" that makes it inauthentic. This is true regardless of the time. But when this condition is studied within time, phenomenology acquires a special direction, which also corresponds to the special way the fall is presented in time. And so Heidegger says:

This elemental historicity of Dasein may remain hidden from Dasein itself. But there is also a way by which it can be discovered and given proper attention. Dasein can discover tradition, preserve it, and follow it explicitly.¹²⁷⁰

In effect, all speech transmitted throughout time is tradition. And humankind can take a stand against this tradition. But before considering what this attitude may be, we notice an essential feature of any tradition: **Page 8**

Our preparatory interpretation of the fundamental structures of Dasein taken in its immediate and "in between" form (a kind of Being in which it is immediately historical as well), will make manifest not only that Dasein is inclined to fall back upon its world (the world in which it exists) and to interpret itself in terms of that world by

¹²⁷⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 41.

reflejamente desde él; <u>el “ser ahí” “cae”, a una con ello, en su tradición...</u>Esta le quita la dirección de sí mismo, el preguntar y elegir...La tradición que así viene a imperar, <u>hace inmediata y regularmente lo que “tramite” tan poco accesible que más bien lo encubre.</u> Considera lo tradicional como comprensible de suyo y obstruye el acceso a las “fuentes” originales de que se bebieron, por modo genuino en parte, <u>los conceptos y categorías transmitidos.</u> La tradición llega a hacer olvidar totalmente tal origen. Desarrolla el sentimiento de que no se ha menester ni siquiera de comprender la necesidad de semejante regreso (33). En este texto notable, Heidegger nos muestra la incidencia de la caída sobre la historicidad del hombre. La tradición, forma concreta de esta historicidad, sufre, en cuanto habla, un encubrimiento tanto más peligroso cuanto más inconciente. Y, a causa de ese encubrimiento, ella a su vez encubre al hombre sus posibilidades de preguntar y de elegir. Destruir la tradición no significa pues, en el lenguaje de Heidegger, una destrucción puramente negativa sino, como él mismo lo dice, el descubrimiento “de las condiciones	its reflected light, but also that <u>Dasein simultaneously falls prey to its own tradition...</u>This takes away its own direction, being able to question and choose... The tradition that it has thus begun to rule, <u>makes what it ‘transmits’ is made so inaccessible, immediately and regularly, that, instead it conceals it.</u> The traditional is considered as comprehensible in itself; it blocks our access to those primordial ‘sources’ from which the <u>categories and concepts handed down</u> to us have been in part quite genuinely drawn. Indeed, tradition makes us totally forget that origin, giving us the feeling that it is not even necessary to understand the need for such a return.¹²⁷¹ In this notable text, Heidegger shows us the impact of the fall on the historicity of humanity. Tradition, a concrete form of historicity, suffers, when spoken, from a cover-up that is more dangerous the more unconscious it is. And, because of that cover-up, it conceals from humanity the opportunity to ask questions and make choices. In Heidegger’s language, to destroy tradition is not meant as a purely negative destruction but, as he himself says, the discovery “of the most elementary and unique conditions that enable a fruitful return
--	--

¹²⁷¹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 42-43.

más elementales y únicas que hacen posible un regreso fecundo al pasado en el sentido de una creadora apropiación de él (34). “No tiene nada que ver con una mala relativización del punto de vista ontológico” (35).

La tradición no se vuelve “falsa” en el sentido de una no-concordancia con la realidad. Si se la puede llamar “falsa”, es únicamente en el sentido de es un habla que ya no descubre ni deja mostrarse lo que en ella se debería mostrar. “Es menester ablandar (no suprimir o reemplazar) la tradición endurecida y disolver las capas encubridoras producidas por ella” (36).

Más aún, la fenomenología misma, una vez realizada, ha menester continuamente de repetidos intentos fenomenológicos para no recaer en su estado de “habla cerrada” a donde la conduce su inclinación natural.

La posibilidad de que se petrifique o que se vuelva tal que no haya quien empuñe lo originalmente “empuñable” está en las entrañas mismas del trabajo concreto de la fenomenología. Y la dificultad de estas disciplina consiste justamente en hacer que sea crítica en un sentido positivo consigo misma (37).

Según esto, ninguna fenomenología es definitiva, en la historia. Y éste es un carácter sumamente importante que no se tiene tampoco suficientemente en cuenta al estudiar el método de Heidegger, esencialmente distinto, en

to the past in the sense of its creative appropriation”.¹²⁷² “It has nothing to do with a vicious relativizing from the ontological perspective”.¹²⁷³

Tradition does not become “false” in the sense of inconsistency with reality. If it can be called “false,” it is only in the sense of speech no longer revealing nor allowing to be revealed what should be shown in it. “It is necessary to soften (not suppress or replace) the hardened tradition and dissolve the obscuring layers it has produced”.¹²⁷⁴

Moreover, once phenomenology itself is made, it must continually repeat phenomenological attempts to avoid falling into the status of “closed speech” to which its natural inclination leads.

The possibility of it becoming petrified or becoming such that no one can impugn what originally could be impugned, is the real “guts” of concrete phenomenological work. And the difficulty of these disciplines consist precisely in making it critical in a positive sense, with itself.¹²⁷⁵

Accordingly, any phenomenology is definitive in history. And this extremely important characteristic is not taken sufficiently into account when considering Heidegger’s method, which is essentially different, in this point,

¹²⁷² Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 43.

¹²⁷³ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 44.

¹²⁷⁴ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 44.

¹²⁷⁵ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 61.

este punto, de otras fenomenologías. El hecho o la situación de la “caída” da a toda formulación fenomenológica un carácter de precariedad que exige un continuo renovar la aplicación del método.

Pasemos ahora a otro problema en donde se nos va a revelar el elemento opuesto al que acabamos de ver, y que constituye su necesario complemento.

Tratemos de acercarnos más, y de examinar más exactamente en qué consiste prácticamente el método fenomenológico aplicado a la ontología. Heidegger, en un pasaje perdido, nos da un resumen sumamente conciso del proceso fenomenológico. Lo hace hablando de la “deuda” como estructura del “ser ahí”, y dice lo siguiente:

Todas las investigaciones ontológicas de fenómenos como deuda, conciencia, muerte, tiene que partir de aquello que la interpretación cotidiana del “ser ahí” “dice” sobre ellos. En la **Página 9** forma de ser del “ser ahí” que es la caída está implícito al par el que su interpretación tenga regularmente una “orientación impropia y no dé en la “esencia,” por serle extraño el planteamiento ontológico originalmente adecuado de las cuestiones...Pero en todo ver errado hay desembozadas también indicaciones acerca de la “idea” original del

from other phenomenologies. The event or situation of the “fall” gives every phenomenological formulation a precarious nature that requires continuously renewing the application of the method.

Now to another problem that will reveal to us the element opposed to what we have just seen, and which is its necessary complement.

Let us try to get closer and examine more precisely of what the phenomenological method applied to ontology practically consists. Heidegger, in a lost passage, gives us a very concise summary of the phenomenological process. He does so by talking about “debt” as a structure of Dasein, as follows:

All ontological investigations of such phenomena as guilt, conscience, and death, must start with what the everyday interpretation of Dasein ‘says’ about them. **Page 9** Because the way of being of Dasein is the fall, it is implicit along with its interpretation regularly being *inappropriately* ‘oriented’ and does not reach the ‘essence’ since the originally appropriate ontological way of formulating questions remains alien to it. But in every incorrect vision are revealed some indications of the primordial ‘idea’ of the phenomenon.¹²⁷⁶

¹²⁷⁶ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 326.

fenómeno (38). Tres elementos saltan a la vista en la descripción que acabamos de transcribir. El segundo es el fundamento de la necesidad de esa exégesis, y de una exégesis ulterior, o sea la “caída” como tendencia a lo inauténtico. El tercero es <u>el fundamento</u> no ya de necesidad, sino <u>de la posibilidad de esa exégesis ulterior</u>. Veámoslo prácticamente en un ejemplo tomado de “Sein und Zeit”. Tratando de la conciencia moral, Heidegger hace ante todo la exégesis del “habla” cotidiana con respeto a ella. Pues bien, puesto que el habla cotidiana dice de la conciencia que es una “voz”, cabe preguntarse de dónde viene esa voz, quién tiene esa voz, qué dice esa voz, a quién se dirige esa voz. He aquí otras tantas preguntas obvias que hay que dirigir al habla para que ella nos libre su secreto óntico. Y el habla nos contesta por la experiencia. Porque, en efecto, a ella se dirigía la pregunta o las preguntas. No es ninguna deducción la que ha de responder. Las preguntas pues, equivaldrían a éstas otras: de dónde <u>experimentamos</u> que viene esa voz...etc. Ahora bien, contestadas esas preguntas (omitimos aquí la respuesta puesto que sólo tratamos de mostrar un ejemplo), vemos que estamos en presencia de un contenido de conciencia que se repite <u>esporádicamente</u>. La voz de la conciencia no es la realidad en la que vivimos siempre. Frente al hecho de la “vacación” de la conciencia, se presenta también, el hecho de la “no-vocación”, de la tranquilidad de conciencia. Frente a este hecho, tenemos forzosamente que constatar que la “voz” de la conciencia no es la realidad más profunda, radical y “esencial”, pues, de ser así, estaría siempre	Three elements stand out in the description we have just transcribed. The second is the foundation of the need for this exegesis and a further exegesis; i.e. the “fall” as a tendency toward the inauthentic. The third is the <u>foundation</u>, not only of the necessity, but of <u>the possibility of further exegesis</u>. Let’s take a practical example from <i>Being and Time</i>. Addressing moral conscience, Heidegger’s exegesis is foremost about everyday “speech”. Since the everyday speech of conscience says it is a “voice,” one wonders where that voice comes from, who has that voice, what that voice says, and whom does this voice address. Here are so many other obvious questions to be directed to speech for it to release to us its ontic secret. And speech answers us from experience. Because, in effect, the question or questions were addressed to speech itself. There is no deduction of who must respond. These questions are equivalent to these others: from whence we <u>experience</u> that voice coming ...etc. Having answered these questions (we omit the answer here since we are only trying to show an example), we see that we are dealing with the content of consciousness that is repeated <u>sporadically</u>. The voice of conscience is not the reality in which we always live. Facing the fact of “vacation” of consciousness, is also present the fact of “non-vocation,” peace of mind. Given this fact, we are bound to find that the “voice” of conscience is not the most profound, radical and “essential” reality, because, if so, it would always be present and would
---	---

presente y no daría lugar a su contrario. Si me he de basar en la experiencia, no puedo decir que la “voz” de la conciencia sea una estructura del ‘ser ahí’ humano, porque, como dice Heidegger, acaso “puede tener valor probatorio una interpretación de la conciencia que tanto se aleja de la experiencia natural?” (39). En efecto, la experiencia natural me dice que la conciencia aparece esporádicamente para “reprender” o “poner en guardia” contra cosas bien determinadas y no muy frecuentes quizás.

Pero por otro lado, está el problema inverso. El habla no pone en contacto con un hombre que está ya en la situación de la “caída”. Lo vulgar y lo inauténtico no comienza por deformar el habla, sino el conocimiento mismo de donde el habla parte. De ahí que la realidad que la experiencia nos trasmite no pueda aceptarse sin más ni más. De ahí que Heidegger se pregunte expresamente:

Necesita la exégesis ontológica concordar con la interpretación vulgar? No es ésta fundamentalmente sospechosa desde el punto de vista ontológico? (40).

Estamos, pues, frente a un aparente círculo vicioso que Heidegger expone de la manera siguiente:

De aquí se siguen dos cosas: la interpretación cotidiana de la conciencia no puede, por una parte, pasar por criterio último de la “objetividad” de un análisis ontológico. Este

not give rise to its opposite. If I must base [my opinion] on experience, I cannot say that the “voice” of conscience is a structure of human Dasein, because, as Heidegger says, perhaps “an interpretation of the conscience can have probative value as far it removes itself from ‘natural experience’”.¹²⁷⁷ In fact, natural experience tells me that consciousness appears sporadically to “reprimand” or “warn” against very specific and perhaps infrequent things.

On the other hand, there is the reverse problem. Speech is not put in contact with a person who is already in the situation of the “fall”. The vulgar and inauthentic does not begin to deform speech, but rather the very knowledge of the place from which speech begins. Hence, the reality that experience transmits to us cannot be accepted as it is. Thus, Heidegger expressly asks himself:

But must the ontological Interpretation agree with the ordinary interpretation at all? Is it not fundamentally, ontologically suspect?¹²⁷⁸

We thus face an apparent vicious cycle that Heidegger states as follows:

Two things follow from this: the everyday interpretation of conscience cannot, on one hand, be accepted as the final criterion for the ‘Objectivity’ of an ontological analysis.

¹²⁷⁷ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 323-324.

¹²⁷⁸ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 335.

no tiene, por otra parte, <u>derecho alguno a no hacer caso de la comprensión cotidiana de la consciencia</u> (41). <u>Página 10</u> Veamos primero cómo sale prácticamente Heidegger de este círculo vicioso, y luego trataremos de formular el principio que le permite esa salida. En el ejemplo que tomamos, Heidegger trataba de la conciencia moral como de una voz que se presenta esporádicamente. Pues bien, este hecho de la presencia esporádica y no continua, nos pone necesariamente frente a una cierta equivalencia dentro de la existencia humana de la “voz” y de la “no-voz”. Sentirse llamado y no sentirse llamado son igualmente reales. El ser del hombre tiene que ser el fundamento tanto del uno como del otro, puesto que los dos son posibilidades “fácticas” del “ser ahí”. Esta reducción de lo óntico a su condición de algo fáctico, esta comprensión de lo óntico como óntico, nos abre la posibilidad de ir más a fondo, de encontrar el “fundamento”, lo ontológico. En el caso de la conciencia moral, Heidegger encuentra ese fundamento en el ser comprendido y experimentado como “deuda”. El “ser deudor” es el fundamento de la voz de la conciencia (“ser deudor” que atiende a su deuda) y de la tranquilidad de conciencia (“ser deudor” que no atiende a su deuda). Ello será lo que constituye el fenómeno último que se revela tanto en la conciencia como en su falta, la estructura ontológica fundamental el existenciario de la conciencia. Ahora bien, este descubrimiento hubiera sido imposible si la condición normal y	<u>This does not have, on the other hand, the right to disregard the everyday understanding of conscience.</u>¹²⁷⁹ <u>Page 10</u> Let us first see how Heidegger exits from this vicious circle practically, and then we will try to formulate the principle that allows this exit. In the example we take, Heidegger addressed moral conscience as a voice that presents itself sporadically. Because of sporadic and non- continuous presence, we are necessarily facing a certain equivalence within human existence, of the “voice” and “non-voice”. To feel called and to not feel called are equally real. Humankind’s being must be the basis of both the former and the latter, since both are “factual” possibilities of “being”. This reduction of the ontic to its status as a something factual, this understanding of the ontic as ontic, opens for us the possibility to go deeper, to find the “foundation,” the ontological. In the case of moral consciousness, Heidegger finds this foundation in the being understood and experienced as “debt”. “Being the debtor” is the foundation of the voice of conscience (“being the debtor” served his debt) and peace of mind (“being the debtor” is not serving his debt). This will be what constitutes the last phenomenon that is revealed both the conscience and in its absence, the fundamental ontological structure, the existentials of conscience. This discovery would have been impossible if the normal and regular condition of humankind had
---	--

¹²⁷⁹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 336.

regular del hombre no tuviera nunca una relación con su ser auténtico. Si el hombre no fuera a veces “llamado” por la conciencia, no hubiera podido ponerse de manifiesto fenomenológicamente el “ser deudor” que es su fundamento, así como el de la tranquilidad de conciencia, que es su posibilidad inauténtica. Porque “fenómeno” es lo que se muestra por sí mismo. No sería posible ninguna ontología si el hombre cotidiano no estuviera ya en contacto con el ser auténtico, por lo menos en forma esporádica e irregular. Esto es lo que dice Heidegger precisamente a propósito de nuestro caso:

Es necesario que también la experiencia vulgar de la conciencia alcance el fenómeno de alguna manera - preontológicamente (42).

Y así el texto clave de la fenomenología aplicada a la tarea ontológica se nos presenta en esta frase que, desde un punto de vista, resume todo “Sein und Zeit”:

El ‘ser ahí’ es ónticamente lo más cercano o él mismo, antológicamente lo más lejano, pero, sin embargo, preontológicamente no extraño (43).

En efecto, la “caída” no es total. La interpretación vulgar de un fenómeno, y, en general, del fenómeno del ser, no puedo encubrirlo totalmente. Porque precisamente tiene su ser del fenómeno. El ente vive en el ser, vive del ser. Por más que normalmente lo oculte, siempre hay

never had a relationship with its authentic self. If humanity were not sometimes “called” by conscience, “being the debtor” could not be demonstrated phenomenologically as its foundation, along with peace of mind, which is its inauthentic possibility. Because “phenomenon” is what shows itself. No ontology would be possible if humanity were no longer in daily contact with the authentic being, at least in a sporadic and irregular form. This is precisely what Heidegger says about our case:

The ordinary experience of conscience must also somehow--pre-ontologically--reach this phenomenon.¹²⁸⁰

And so the key text of phenomenology applied to the ontological task is presented to us in this sentence that from one point of view, summarizes all of *Being and Time*:

Dasein is ontically the ‘closest’ or itself ontologically farthest; but pre-ontologically it is surely not a stranger.¹²⁸¹

Indeed, the “fall” is not total. The ordinary interpretation of a phenomenon, and in general, the phenomenon of being, cannot entirely be disguised. Precisely because it has its being from the phenomenon. The entity lives within being, lives from being. No matter how much it

¹²⁸⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 336.

¹²⁸¹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 37.

algo del ser que emerge, una “preantología”, una pasividad del ente con respecto al ser, así como existe siempre también una pasividad del habla con respecto a su significado. Es menester abrirse a esa pasividad.

Y esa abertura no es la pura experiencia, una especie de máquina fotográfica que se reduce a fotografiar al ser. Ya hemos visto cómo era siempre menester de una dialéctica que procede por negación y por reincorporación. Por eso De Waeh lens puede decir, hablando de la fenomenología que está en la base de todo existencialismo lo siguiente:

Tout acte ou attitude humains, quel qu’il sois, est de soi instauratif d’un sens et, en vertu du principe que l’existence humaine est par définition capable d’autocompréhension, ce sense peut etre saisi...Si donc il est vrai que toute attitude humaine s’épuise á concrétiser une des possibilites dont la structure générale de l’etre de l’existence **Pagina 11** humaine fournit le dessin, on admettre aussi que cette attitude peut etre comprise, et qu’elle le sera, lorsque d’implication en implication, on l’aura ramenée a la possibilité structurelle dont elle veut entreprendre la manifestation concrete (44).

normally hides it, there is always something of the self that emerges, a “pre-anthology,” a passivity of the entity with respect to being, just as there is always a passivity of speech regarding its meaning. It is essential to be open to this passivity.

And that opening is not pure experience, a kind of photographic machine that is reduced to taking a photograph of being. We have seen how a dialectic that proceeds by denial and recovery is always necessary. Thus, De Waeh lens can say the following, speaking of the phenomenology that is at the basis of all existentialism:

Any human act or attitude, whatever it may be, is in itself establishing a meaning and, under the principle that human existence is inherently capable of self-understanding, this meaning can be captured ... So, if it is true that all human behavior is exhausted to realize one of the possibilities of which the general structure of the being of human existence **Pagina 11** provides the design, we admit that this attitude can be understood, and it will be, when implication by implication, it is led to the structural possibility from which it wants to undertake a concrete manifestation.¹²⁸²

¹²⁸² Probably from Alphonse De Waelhens. *La Philosophie de Martin Heidegger*, Louvain, Éditions de l’Institut supérieur de philosophie, 1942. I do not have access to this book, so I am unable to verify this source.

Y la palabra “dialéctica” aparece explícitamente en un artículo posterior sobre la fenomenología en general, que se refiere directamente a Husserl pero que, en esto, puede aplicarse igualmente a Heidegger: Egalement naïve s’avère une conception de la description phénoménologique pour laquelle cette description serait en quelque sorte <u>dictée</u> par la chose elle-même, vis-à-vis de laquelle l’esprit n’aurait qu’un rôle d’enregistrement... On pose le vrai problème de la <u>dialectique</u> (45). No nos interesa aquí el estudio de la naturaleza de esa dialéctica, sino sus relaciones con la experiencia. Lo que acabamos de demostrar es que la sola experiencia no es capaz, sin una dialéctica interior, de poseer simplemente el fenómeno. En el fondo la experiencia es dirigida por los principios básicos de la actividad racional. Pero <u>ella conserva, a todo lo largo de ese proceso, el cargo exclusivo de control</u>. La dialéctica, en la fenomenología, no será nunca concebida como garantía de verdad. Esto no significa que la verdad termine donde termina la experiencia, sino que allí termina la fenomenología. Heidegger mismo dice expresamente que una afirmación que niegue la verdad de un dato no controlable por la experiencia, no puede fundarse en la fenomenología, sino que es el producto de una posición tomada de antemano Con esto no se adscribe este tratado ni a una “<u>posición</u>,” ni a una “<u>dirección</u>,” porque la	And the word “dialectic” appears explicitly in a later article on phenomenology in general, which refers directly to Husserl, but in this, can also apply to Heidegger: A conception of the phenomenological description would also be considered naïve if this description is <u>dictated</u> in some way by the thing itself, vis-a-vis which the mind would only have a recording role ... This poses the real problem of the <u>dialectic</u> ¹²⁸³ We are not interested here in studying the nature of this dialectic, but its relationship with experience. What we have just shown is that without an internal dialectic, experience alone is not able to simply possess the phenomenon. In the end, experience is directed by the basic principles of rational activity. But <u>it retains, throughout this process, the unique burden of control</u>. The dialectic in phenomenology will never be conceived as a guarantee of truth. This does not mean that truth ends where experience ends, but that phenomenology ends there. Heidegger says explicitly that an assertion that denies the truth of a fact that cannot be assessed by experience cannot be founded in phenomenology, but rather is the product of a position taken beforehand Thus our treatise does not subscribe to a ‘<u>standpoint</u>’ or represent any special
--	--

¹²⁸³ Unknown-- De Waelhens again?

fenomenología no es ninguna de las dos cosas, <u>ni puede llegar a serlo nunca, mientras se comprenda a sí misma</u> (46). Tenemos pues que la fenomenología, aunque no es pura y simple experiencia, llega hasta los límites de ésta. Es una búsqueda “dialéctica” a través del campo de la experiencia. En último término siempre estará el “fenómeno,” es decir la realidad que se muestra por sí misma. La “estructura” de un existenciario será siempre, al mismo tiempo, algo experimental y el término de una dialéctica que partiendo de lo “fáctico” contingente, desemboca en lo “necesario” (47). Por eso podía decir Heidegger que la fenomenología se oponía a los “descubrimientos casuales,” es decir no “fundados,” no basados en una “condición existenciaría de posibilidad del ‘poder ser’ tácticamente en cada caso” (48). Y también en este sentido la fenomenología filosófica, la ontología se diré “fundamento” de otra ciencia. II La teología está toda ella edificada sobre el habla. No sólo en cuanto ciencia (“-logía”, en su primer sentido), sino en cuanto a su contenido y a su método. Ya cuando decimos teología, nos referimos aquí a la teología católica. La transposición de nuestros resultados a otras teologías, aunque no sea automático, será, no obstante, fácil. Si se considera el objeto de la teología, encontramos ante todo un comentario científico de los enunciados del magisterio eclesiástico. El magisterio es, pues, en habla. Y, a su	‘direction’; for phenomenology is nothing of either sort, nor can it become so as <u>long as it understands itself</u>.¹²⁸⁴ We hold therefore that phenomenology, although it is not pure and simple experience, reaches its limits. It is a “dialectic” search through the field of experience. Ultimately there is always the “phenomenon;” that is, the reality that shows itself. The “structure” of an existentialist will always be, at the same time, something experimental and the term of a dialectic that begins from the “factual” contingent and ends up as “necessary”.¹²⁸⁵ This is why Heidegger could say that phenomenology was opposed to “chance discoveries,” i.e., not “founded,” not based on an “existentiale condition of possibility of the ‘being able to be’[or probable] tactically in each case”.¹²⁸⁶ And in this sense, the philosophical phenomenology, or ontology would be called the “basis” of another science. II Theology is built entirely on speech. Not only as a science (“-logy” in its first sense), but in terms of content and method. And when we say theology, we refer here to Catholic theology. The transposition of our results to other theologies, although not automatic, will, however, be easy. If we consider the object of theology, we find first and foremost a scientific review of the statements of ecclesiastical rule. Teaching is, therefore, in speaking. And, in turn,
--	--

¹²⁸⁴ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 50.

¹²⁸⁵ Unknown

¹²⁸⁶ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 402.

vez, el magisterio eclesiástico se presenta como interpretación, como comentario autorizado de la tradición eclesiástica, es decir, de lo que la tradición ha transmitido por medio del habla. Finalmente la misma tradición eclesiástica nos trasmite un habla, el habla primitiva que es la Revelación de Dios a los hombres. **Página 12** Y su método no consiste en otra cosa sino en hacer “hablar” a esas hablas, en hacerles manifestar lo que en ellas está presente, aunque normalmente oculto o encubierto.

Evidentemente, todas esas hablas a las que nos referíamos, no están separadas por ningún abismo. La Revelación misma nos presenta ya una decisión del magisterio eclesiástico, a raíz del llamado primer Concilio de Jerusalén. San Pablo no sólo trasmite un mensaje oído de otros, sino que construye sobre ese mensaje una verdadera teología. A su vez, el teólogo de hoy debe interrogar directamente la Escritura (aunque no puede hacer caso omiso, en su interpretación teológica, de la tradición eclesiástica), o la traición misma.

Pero todo esto no impide el que, desde el punto de vista práctico, notemos inmediatamente una diferencia dentro de estas hablas. Dos tipos de ellas solicitan nuestra atención. Por un lado tenemos La Revelación misma. No encontramos en ella fórmulas dogmáticas, es decir, enunciado de valor lógico, universal, que pretenden escapar a las circunstancias concretas en que han sido hechos. “Bienaventurados los pobres de espíritu, porque de ellos es el reino de los cielos” no tiene ninguna diferencia esencial con respecto a una fórmula dogmática del Concilio de Trento, por ejemplo. Ello no impide, sin embargo, el que no podamos concretamente hacer sobre uno y otro

the Church’s teaching is presented as an interpretation, as an authoritative commentary of ecclesiastical tradition; i.e. of what tradition has been transmitted through speech. Finally, the same ecclesiastical tradition transmits to us a speech, the primitive speech which is Revelation of God to humanity. **Page 12** And its method is to do nothing but to make those speeches “speak,” to make them declare what is present in them, although it is usually hidden or disguised.

Evidently, all these speeches to which we refer are not separated by any gap. Revelation presents us an ecclesiastical decision, based on the so-called First Council of Jerusalem. Saint Paul not only conveys a message heard from others, but builds on this message a true theology. In turn, the theologian today must directly examine scripture (although without ignoring ecclesiastical tradition in its theological interpretation or), or the betrayal itself.

But all this does not prevent, from a practical standpoint, our noticing a difference within these speeches. Two types seek our attention. On one hand, we have the Revelation itself. We did not find dogmatic formulas in it, i.e. universal, logical statement, seeking to escape the circumstances in which they were made. For example, “Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven” has no essential difference with respect to a dogmatic formula of the Council of Trent. However, this does not prevent us from specifically studying about one or the other text. There is a certain poetry implied in the words of Christ in the sense that a strictly universal speculative content

texto el mismo estudio. En la fórmula de Cristo hay una cierta poesía implícita, en el sentido de que no puede dársele a sus palabras, sin más ni más, un contenido especulativo universal. Basta pensar en otra frase, perfectamente equivalente: “Si tu ojo te escandaliza, córtalo y arrójalo de ti”. Esto equivale a decir que para captar las palabras de la Revelación misma, es menester estar siempre atentos a recuperar el contexto concreto en que fueron dichas. Y si no podemos encontrarlo, el sentido de las palabras, desde el punto de vista teológico, quedará oscuro. Como no podemos saber con seguridad qué tono empleó Cristo para decir a su madre aquellas palabras: “Mujer, qué nos va a mí y a ti?”, los teólogos no han sacado de esas palabras ninguna conclusión, siendo así que desde el punto de vista meramente especulativo, la frase equivale a “qué relación hay entre tu y yo?”, y esta frase, fuera de todo contexto, está llena de implicaciones lógicas. Una cosa semejante ocurre con la tradición patrística (aunque la preocupación dogmática está presente en muchas de sus obras), y actualmente con todo lo que podríamos llamar la “teología extraescolar”, como son los escritos espirituales y místicos, por ejemplo, o el sentir religioso que guía a los cristianos corrientes en su vida diaria. Del otro lado están las fórmulas dogmáticas empleadas por el magisterio de la Iglesia y por la teología llamada precisamente “dogmática”. Esas formulaciones, en forma de dogmas o tesis, equivalen ciertamente a las fórmulas de la Revelación y de la Tradición, puesto que se presentan, y son en realidad, como una expresión de ellas. Pero esa expresión tiene un carácter propio, que las ha hecho precisamente	cannot be given to his words. Just think of another phrase, perfectly equivalent: “If your eye offends you, cut it out and cast it away from you”. This means to say that to capture the words of Revelation itself, we must always be alert to retrieve the specific context in which these words were spoken. And if we cannot find it, the meaning of words, from a theological point of view, will remain obscure. Since we cannot know for sure what tone Christ used to tell his mother those words: “Woman, what is this to me and to you?,” theologians have not drawn any conclusion from those words, since from a purely speculative point of view, the sentence amounts to saying, “What is the relationship between you and me?” and, out of context, this sentence is full of logical implications. A similar thing happens with the patristic tradition (although the dogmatic concern is present in many of its works), and now with what we might call “extracurricular theology,” such as spiritual and mystical writings, for example, or the religious feeling that guides current Christians in their daily lives. On the other hand, there are dogmatic formulas used by the Magisterium of the Church and theology precisely called “dogmatic”. Such formulations, as dogmas or theses, are certainly equivalent to formulas of Revelation and Tradition, since they are presented as, and really are, an expression of them. But that expression has its own character, which has made them precisely necessary. Otherwise, Revelation and
--	--

necesarias. De lo contrario, la Revelación y la Tradición hubieran bastado. Una diferencia existe pues en el orden práctico. Las fórmulas dogmáticas han nacido de una necesidad concreta y llevan su sello. Esa necesidad consistía precisamente en definir, en asegurar, en universalizar. Circunstancias determinadas de la vida eclesiástica, no sólo errores o, herejías, piden que una tendencia espiritual, en sí misma ambivalente (de lo contrario la necesidad no hubiera existido, sea precisada. Por ejemplo, la veneración a María, exigida por la Revelación y la Tradición, llevaba en sí una ambivalencia hasta que se definiera la causa de esa veneración: Madre de Dios? Madre de Jesús asumido por Dios? La fórmula dogmática comienza por ser una <u>definición</u>. "María es Madre de Dios". Pero precisamente la insuficiencia práctica de la Revelación y de la Tradición tal como eran conocidos hasta ese momento, consistía, como ya lo hemos visto, en ser susceptible de diferentes Página 13 interpretaciones. Es, pues, oficio de la fórmula dogmática <u>asegurar</u> una interpretación. Este asegurar se logrará por el empleo de tales términos y de tales precisiones que, aquellos que tienen la interpretación opuesta se vean obligados a reconocer que su interpretación no es la adoptada por la Iglesia. Es decir, que no puedan hacer suya la nueva formulación sin cambiar al mismo tiempo de opinión. A su vez, esta exigencia conduce a una tercera. Para ser exacto en este sentido, es menester emplear términos <u>universales</u>, términos que para todos y en todas las circunstancias signifiquen lo mismo. De lo contrario no se asegura la definición. Concebido esto así, es innegable que hay una diferencia	Tradition would have sufficed. A difference exists in the practical order. Dogmatic formulas are born of a specific need and carry the seal [associated with the specific need]. That need consisted precisely of defining, assuring, and universalizing. Specific circumstances of church life, not just errors or heresies, call for spiritual trend, ambivalent in itself (otherwise there would not have a need) to be specified. For example, the veneration of Mary, as required by the Revelation and Tradition, carried with it an ambivalence until the cause of such veneration was defined: Mother of God? Mother of Jesus made God? The dogmatic formula begins by being a <u>definition</u>. "Mary is the Mother of God". But precisely the practical failure of the Revelation and Tradition as they were known until that time, was, as we have seen, in being susceptible to different interpretations Page 13. Therefore, it is the business of the dogmatic formula to ensure an interpretation. This assurance will be achieved through the use of such terms and such details that those who have the opposite interpretation are forced to admit that their interpretation is not the one adopted by the Church. That is, they cannot take possession of the new wording without changing their opinion at the same time. In turn, this requirement leads to a third [requirement]. To be precise in this regard, it is necessary to employ <u>universal</u> terms, terms that for everyone and in all circumstances mean the same thing. Otherwise the definition is not assured. Considered this way, it is undeniable that there is a difference
---	---

entre la formulación religiosa tal como se la encuentra generalmente en la Escritura, por ejemplo, y tal como se la encuentra en el Concilio de Trento. A esto se puede oponer, que toda fórmula comienza por ser concreta, inmediata, a la manera de Nuestro Señor, y que luego se vuelve ambivalente a fuerza de ser repetida o de enfrentar nuevas circunstancias y problemas. Prescindimos, por el momento, de tratar esta cuestión. Pero aún dando por supuesto eso, queremos aquí referirnos a esos dos momentos distintos: un momento en que la fórmula es captada en todo su sentido y fuerza decisiva, y otro momento en que una ambivalencia práctica obliga a precisarle en dogma. Si ese dogma, a su vez, realiza el mismo movimiento, ello no nos interesa actualmente. Basta que se dé prácticamente esa diferencia. Ello justifica el que comencemos por tratar de la teología “dogmática” para pasar luego al estudio de la teología en su fuente misma: la Revelación. La teología es, pues, un habla que nos dice el contenido de la fe, que trata de hacernos concientes de aquello en lo que creemos implícitamente. “<i>Fides quaerens intellectum</i>,” como decían los antiguos escolásticos. O, como dice Heidegger: “autointerpretación conceptual de la existencia creyente” (49). Al salir así a la conciencia, la fe se vierte en fórmulas. Karl Rahner, al examinar precisamente el valor de las fórmulas dogmáticas en su estudio sobre el Concilio de Calcedonia, dice así: El esfuerzo de la teología y del magisterio en busca de la realidad y	between religious formulation as it is usually found in Scripture, for example, and that found in the Council of Trent. This can be countered by saying that any formula starts by being concrete, immediate, in the manner of our Lord, and then becomes a ambivalent by being repeated or facing new circumstances and problems. We will avoid, for now, addressing this issue. But even assuming this to be true, here we refer to these two different moments: one when the formula is captured in its full meaning and decisive force, and another moment in which practical ambivalence requires it to be specified as dogma. If that dogma, in turn, performs the same motion, this does not interest us now. It is enough that this slight difference exists. This justifies us beginning to address “dogmatic” theology and then move on to study theology at its very source: Revelation. Theology is thus speech that tells us the content of faith, which tries to make us aware of what we implicitly believe. <i>Fides quaerens intellectum</i>, as in the old saying of the Scholastics. Or, as Heidegger says: “conceptual self-interpretation of existence as a believer”.¹²⁸⁷ To leave to the conscience, faith is poured into formulas. Karl Rahner, to examine precisely the value of dogmatic formulas in his study of the Council of Chalcedon, writes: The effort of theology and the Magisterium in search of divinely
---	--

¹²⁸⁷ Segundo could be citing Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 74. ““The anthropology of Christian theology...arrives at an interpretation of that entity which we call ‘man’.” Or, he could be citing Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 494, n. vi. ““In its Interpretation of ‘life’, the anthropology worked out in Christian theology...has always kept death in view.” Neither quote fits perfectly, so it is possible Segundo is quoting from another place or misquoting Heidegger.

de la verdad reveladas por Dios, termina siempre en una formulación exacta. Ello es natural y necesario (50). En efecto, no se trata de un mero pasatiempo, puesto de moda por cristianos demasiado especulativos. Henri Birault, comentando a Heidegger en relación con el punto que tratamos, dice así: La fin véritable de la Theologie, c'est l'elaboration de la croyance elle-meme, et non pas l'edification d'un ensemble de propositions théorétique flottant au-dessus de la croyance et dont la validité pourrait subister hors de la croyance. Cette <u>thématisation théologique de la croyance n'est pas le fair de la theologie, car elle est originellement réclamée par la croyance elle-meme</u>: elle constitue donc comme <u>une promotion de la foi qui cherche en quelque sorte a se mettre au clair avec elle-meme</u> (51). La teología está enraizada en la vida religiosa cotidiana. Los errores que han determinado las formulaciones dogmáticas más célebres, además de no ser errores puramente especulativos, no han sido los únicos resortes de donde éstas brotan. Especialmente si se tienen en cuenta, no sólo las definiciones	revealed reality and truth always ends in an exact formulation. This is natural and necessary.¹²⁸⁸ Indeed, this is not a mere hobby made fashionable by too-speculative Christians. Henri Birault, commenting on Heidegger in relation to this point, writes: The true end of Theology is the elaboration of the belief itself, not the edification of a set of theoretical proposals floating above belief and the validity of which could subsist outside belief. This <u>theological theme of belief is not the business of theology, since it was originally claimed by belief itself</u>: it is therefore a <u>promotion of faith</u> that seeks somehow <u>to clarify itself</u>.¹²⁸⁹ Theology is rooted in everyday religious life. The errors that have determined the most famous dogmatic formulations, besides not being purely speculative errors, have not been the only source from which they spring. Especially if one takes into account not only the conciliar definitions, but the teaching of the Roman Pontiffs and the
--	--

¹²⁸⁸ Most likely from Karl Rahner's essay "'Chalcedon: End or Beginning?'" redacted as "'Current Problems in Christology'" in *Theological Investigations Vol. 1*, pp. 149-200. N.B. Verify this source.

¹²⁸⁹ Likely from Henri Birault, *Heidegger et l'expérience de la pensée* (Gallimard, 1978)

conciliares, sino el magisterio de los Romanos Pontífices y el esfuerzo teológico. La vida cristiana, tendiendo siempre hacia una perfección mayor, se propone siempre también problemas de “orientación” teórico-práctica que exigen una explicitación de lo revelado. Las ambivalencias de que antes hablábamos no se reducen simplemente a la posibilidad de sostener dos tesis opuestas. Así el problema práctico del matrimonio entre cristianos, obliga a San Pablo a explicitar los elementos contenidos en la religión capaces de iluminarlo. La Página 14 teología se preocupará siempre de tomar conciencia de la línea que separa la verdad y el error en cada nuevo campo que se ofrece a su decisión “de tal suerte que esa línea fronteriza se guarde en la cotidianidad de la práctica religiosa” (52). Ahora bien, esa habla que es la teología, por más que tienda a defender <u>de una vez para siempre</u> la verde poseída por la fórmula, <u>sufre</u> la historia, y, con ella, una crisis de verdad, no en el sentido de la verdad como conformidad con la realidad (que está asegurada definitivamente), sino en el sentido más original de “alétheia”. La fórmula, que continúa siendo verdadera, es decir adecuada a la realidad, se vuelve, con todo, oscura como habla a causa del proceso histórico. En efecto, la historia va transformando insensiblemente el sentido de los términos representativos. Frente a esa transformación, como dice Rahner, ...no hay que estar tan seguro de que alguien la ha comprendido (la fórmula en cuestión) si no puede hacer otra cosa que repetirla monótonamente	theological effort. The Christian life, always tending towards a greater perfection, also always offers problems of “orienting” theory and practice that require an explication of what is revealed. The ambivalence to which we referred is not simply reduced to the possibility of holding two opposing views. So the practical problem of marriage between Christians forces St. Paul to explain the elements contained in religion that are able to illuminate this. Page 14 Theology is always concerned with becoming aware of the line between truth and error in each new field offered for its consideration “in such a way that the borderline is guarded in everyday religious practice”.¹²⁹⁰ However, this speech, which is theology, no matter how much it tends to <u>defend once and for all</u> the truth possessed by the formula, <u>suffers</u> history, and with it, a crisis of truth, not in the sense of truth as conformity with reality (which is definitely assured), but in the more original sense of <i>alétheia</i> [Gk: truth]. The formula, which continues to remain true; i.e., adequate to reality, however, becomes obscure as speech because of the historical process. Indeed, history imperceptibly transforms the meaning of representative terms. Faced with that transformation, Rahner writes, ...one must not be so sure anyone has understood (the formula in question) if one cannot do anything but repeat it monotonously with a
---	--

¹²⁹⁰ Unknown

adornada de un par de fórmulas explicativas (53). La teología es, hasta cierto punto, “historia,” puesto que se trata siempre de remontar la corriente histórica para volver a encontrar la verdad en cerrada en la fórmula dogmática. Sólo en eso, dice también Rahner, la teología histórica y la historia de los dogmas tienen una tarea real, insubstituible y necesaria que realizar <u>en la teología como tal</u>, es decir en la dogmática (54). Y esa historia teológica que remonta al pasado, qué otra cosa es sino el equivalente de la “destrucción de la historia de la ontología”? La teología, como la ontología, se dan prácticamente a nosotros a través de una “tradición”. Dios ha querido que esa tradición esté compuesta de elementos humanos y siga las leyes humanas. Si él le ha asegurado sobrenaturalmente un éxito (del cual hablaremos más adelante), ello no impide que la naturaleza humana desarrolle en ella su propia actividad. Más aún, esto es exigido por el plan divino. De ahí que la “tradición” en sentido eclesiástico, participe de todos los caracteres de la “tradición” ontológica. Una mirada atrás, a lo que Heidegger decía de ella, puede mostrarnos esto sin lugar a dudas: El “ser ahí” puede descubrir la tradición, conservarla y seguir la expresamente...Pero la exégesis preparatoria de las estructuras fundamentales del “ser ahí” tomado en su forma de ser inmediata y “de	few explanatory embellishments.¹²⁹¹ Theology is, to some extent, “history,” since it is always trying to trace the historical trend to return to find the truth enclosed in dogmatic formula. Only in this, says Rahner, do historical theology and history of dogmas have a real job, irreplaceable and necessary to perform <u>in theology as such</u>, i.e., in the dogmatic.¹²⁹² And, what else is that theological history going back to the past but the equivalent to the “destruction of the history of ontology”? Theology, as with ontology, is practically given to us through “tradition”. God has willed this tradition to be composed of human elements and follow human laws. If God supernaturally assured success (which we’ll discuss later), this does not prevent human nature from developing its own activity within it. Moreover, this is demanded by the divine plan. Hence the “tradition,” in the ecclesiastical sense, participates in all the characters of the ontological “tradition”. A look back at what Heidegger said about it can show this without a doubt: Dasein can discover, preserve and expressly follow the tradition ...but the preparatory exegesis of the fundamental structure of Dasein, if taken in its immediate and “in between” way of being, which is also
--	--

¹²⁹¹ Possibly Karl Rahner’s essay.

¹²⁹² Possibly Karl Rahner’s essay.

término medio”, que es también aquella en que es inmediatamente histórico, hará patente lo siguiente: el “ser ahí” no tiene sólo la propensión a “caer” en su mundo, en el cual es, e interpretarse reflejamente desde él; el “ser ahí” “cae,” a una con ello, en su tradición más o menos expresamente tomada. Esta le quita la dirección de sí mismo, el preguntar y elegir...La tradición que así viene a imperar, hace inmediata y regularmente lo que “transmite” tan poco accesible que más bien lo encubre. Considera lo tradicional como comprensible de suyo y obstruye el acceso a las “fuentes” originales de que se bebieron, por modo genuino en parte, los conceptos y categorías transmitidos. La tradición llega a hacer olvidar totalmente tal origen. Desarrolla el sentimiento de que no se ha menester ni siguiera de comprender la necesidad de semejante regreso...El “ser ahí” ya no comprende las condiciones más elementales y únicas que hacen posible un regreso fecundo al pasado en el sentido de una creador apropiación de él (55). **Página 15**

Este texto, si se lo comprende bien, puede aplicarse a la teología en sus relaciones con la “tradición”. Porque, en efecto, no se trata de un liberarse de la tradición, sino, por el contrario, de un caer en la cuenta de que, con el mero repetirla, no la poseemos ya en su riqueza creadora. Esa repetición superficial que supone todo perfectamente comprendido, no hace sino impedirnos hacerle a la tradición las preguntas necesarias para encauzar según ella la vida religiosa de hoy Y si la “tradición,” en su riqueza original, nunca fue ni será totalmente olvidada, nunca fue ni será totalmente “encubridora” de su contenido (tampoco lo es para

where it is immediately historical, will clearly make the following suggestion: Dasein not only has the propensity to “fall” in its world, in which it is, and interpret itself as reflected in it, Dasein “falls,” one with itself, in its tradition more or less expressly taken as it is. This removes its self – direction, questioning and choosing ... The tradition that thus comes to prevail makes immediately and regularly what it “transmits” so little accessible that, rather, it hides it. It considers the traditional as understandable in itself and it obstructs access to the original “sources” from which the transmitted concepts and categories drank, genuinely in part. The tradition comes to make one completely forget this origin. It develops the feeling of not having the need to even understand the necessity of such a return... Dasein no longer understands the most fundamental and unique conditions that make possible a fruitful return to the past in a sense of creatively owning it.¹²⁹³ **Page 15**

This text, if it is well understood, can be applied to theology in its relationship with the “tradition”. Because, in effect, it is not a freedom from tradition, but on the contrary, a realization that, with mere repetition, we do not possess it [tradition] in its creative wealth. That superficial repetition that assumes all is perfectly understood, rather prevents us from asking tradition the necessary questions to guide the religious life of today AND if “tradition,” in its original richness, never was or will be totally forgotten, never was or will complete “conceal” its content (nor is it for Heidegger, since by it [tradition] one can always

¹²⁹³ Unknown

Heidegger, puesto que por ella se puede pasar siempre a su ser propio), ello se debe a que la Iglesia está cimentada en el ser sobrenatural que es su vida y, al mismo tiempo, su verdad. Pero ello no impide que, como dice Rahner,

La historia de la teología no sea simplemente la historia del progreso de los dogmas, sino también una historia de su olvido (56).

La primera conclusión es, pues, que la historicidad propia del ser humano, en su condición actual de “caída,” de a la tradición una característica importante. Según ella, la simple repetición de una fórmula dogmática no basta para poseer la verdad en ella contenida de una vez para siempre. Por eso podemos decir con Rahner:

Quien toma en serio la “historicidad” (no la relatividad) de la verdad humana (en la cual se ha encarnado también la verdad de Dios a través de su Revelación) comprende que, a partir de ella, ni el sobrepasar una fórmula suprimiéndola, ni el conservarla fosilizada hacen justicia al conocimiento humano... Esta conservación que capta un auténtico “de-una-vez-para-siempre” es una conservación histórica solamente si la historia progresa y el movimiento del pensamiento sale de las formulas obtenidas,

pass on to its own being); this is because the Church is grounded in the supernatural being that is its life and, at the same time, its truth. But the fact remains that, says Rahner,

The history of theology is not simply the story of the progress of dogmas, but also a history of its neglect.¹²⁹⁴

Therefore, the first conclusion is that the historicity of the human being, in its present “fallen” condition, gives tradition an important feature. According to this, the simple repetition of a dogmatic formula is not enough to possess the truth contained in it once and for all. We can say with Rahner:

Whoever takes seriously the “historicity” (not relativity) of human truth (in which is also embodied the truth of God through his revelation) understands that, from it, neither exceeding a formula nor suppressing it, nor preserving as fossilized serves human knowledge... This preservation that captures an authentic “once-and-for-all” is a historic conservation only if the story progresses and the movement of thought comes out of the formulas obtained, to find them again, on their

¹²⁹⁴ Possibly Karl Rahner’s essay.

para volverlas a <u>encontrar</u>, a ellas mismas, a las antiguas (57). Nosotros, en nuestra situación histórica actual, necesitamos <u>preguntar</u> a la tradición, y <u>elegir</u> según su respuesta. Ahora bien, la tradición encubierta en la repetición inauténtica, como veíamos en el texto de Heidegger, “le quita (al hombre) el preguntar y el elegir”. No podemos “sacar conclusiones” auténticas del pasado sin “una creadora apropiación de él”. Por eso dice Rahner de la teología que lo presentado históricamente y hecho siempre de nuevo presente no forma <u>en primer término</u> un material de premisas <u>del cual podemos sacar conclusiones</u> desconocidas hasta ahora, sino que es el objeto que --conservado siempre-- <u>debe ser continuamente adquirido de nuevo</u> por nosotros (58). Solamente después de este que Heidegger llama “regreso fecundo al pasado,” es posible pasar adelante y responder de una manera auténticamente entroncada en el pasado, a las nuevas situaciones históricas. Hemos visto pues hasta aquí cómo el método fenomenológico aplicado a un habla esencialmente histórica, ha de ser empleado en el esclarecimiento de la Tradición, en cuanto ésta es transmisión de fórmulas dogmáticas. Vamos a ver ahora la aplicación	own, in the former [formulas].¹²⁹⁵ We, in our present historical situation, need to <u>ask</u> tradition and <u>choose</u> according to its response. Tradition disguised in inauthentic repetition, as we saw in Heidegger’s text, “takes away from (the person) the asking and the choice”. We cannot “draw authentic conclusions” from the past without “creative appropriation of it”. So says the theology of Rahner: what is presented historically and continually demonstrated again does not form in <u>primary terms</u> a material assumption <u>from which we can draw conclusions</u> unknown up to now; rather, it is the object--always maintained--that <u>must be continually reacquired</u> by us.¹²⁹⁶ It is only after this, which Heidegger refers to as a “fruitful return to the past,” that it is possible to move forward and respond in an authentic manner rooted in the past to new historical situations. We have seen thus far how the phenomenological method, applied to an essentially historical speech, can be used in the clarification of Tradition, as it is a transmission of dogmatic formulas. We will now see the
--	--

¹²⁹⁵ Possibly Karl Rahner’s essay.

¹²⁹⁶ Possibly Karl Rahner’s essay.

de dos caracteres más del método fenomenológico, en su aplicación a la teología dogmática. El primero se refiere al punto de partida de la investigación que acabamos de precisar.

La fenomenología, decíamos en el párrafo pasado, toma el habla tal como ésta se encuentra en el uso cotidiano. Aplicando esto mismo a nuestro asunto, hemos de decir con Rahner que, también en nuestro caso

Página 16

el punto de partida sólo puede ser la comprensión “de término medio” (59) actual de la teología, tal como nos es dada en los manuales, en la manera “de término medio” que tienen de comprenderla todos y cada uno, en cuanto a lo que está realmente claro en la conciencia teológica corriente (60).

Ahora bien, esta habla teológica corriente, “de término medio,” contiene dos cosas, y es importante el señalarlo: la repetición exteriormente fiel de una fórmula dogmática transmitida, y una manera práctica de comprenderla. Esto es lo que indica precisamente el término empleado por Heidegger y Rahner “de término medio”. En efecto, esta expresión está tomada del razonamiento y, en especial del silogismo. Dos cosas iguales a una tercera son iguales entre sí. Esa “tercera cosa” cuya identidad con las dos primeras permite pasar de una a otra, tiene que ser la misma en las dos identidades. Tener pues, de una noción, una comprensión “de

implementation of two more characteristics of the phenomenological method, as applied to dogmatic theology. The first concerns the starting point of investigation that we have just detailed.

Phenomenology, as I said in the last paragraph, takes speech as it is found in everyday use. Applying this to our case, we say with Rahner, also in our case:

Page 16

The point of departure can only be the “in between” understanding ¹²⁹⁷ of each of them in the current theology, as we are given in the manuals, in terms what is really clear in the current theological consciousness.¹²⁹⁸

This current “in between” theological speech, contains two things, and it is important to point this out: the outwardly faithful repetition of an transmitted dogmatic formula, and a practical way to understand it. This is precisely what Heidegger and Rahner’s term indicates by “in between”. Indeed, this expression is taken from reasoning, and especially from the syllogism. Two things equal to a third are equal to each other. This “third thing,” whose identification with the first two allows moving from one to the other, must be the same in the two identities. Having a notion, an understanding of the “in between,” simply means having enough

¹²⁹⁷ Possibly Karl Rahner’s essay.

¹²⁹⁸ Possibly Karl Rahner’s essay.

término medio” significa tener de ella un conocimiento suficiente como para no confundir dos empleos de la misma palabra: ni más ni menos. Así, usar de una verdad teológica en un razonamiento, supone que tenemos de esa verdad un cierto conocimiento, que somos capaces de servirnos de ella sin equivocarnos, aunque no sea con una propiedad original.

Una tradición nunca es totalmente incomprensible, totalmente encubierta. Existe de ella una comprensión “de término medio,” si se trata verdaderamente de una tradición (y no de un mero documento indescifrable que no puede llamarse propiamente una tradición).

Una fenomenología que se ataque a la tradición histórica del dogma, tendrá, pues, que comenzar por preguntarle a la “comprensión de término medio” de la teología de hoy, la pregunta clave: “Qué entendemos por...” En otras palabras, tendrá que librar lo contenido en el habla teológica cotidiana, por medio de un recurso a la experiencia.

A una doble experiencia. Esto está notablemente bien expresado por Heidegger, al hablar de la “destrucción de la historia de la ontología,” trabajo equivalente, como ya lo hemos visto, al que la teología realiza con su propia historia. Dice así:

La destrucción del contenido tradicional de la ontología antigua (es) llevada a cabo siguiendo el hilo conductor de la pregunta que interroga por el ser, en busca de las experiencias originales en que se ganaron las primeras determinaciones del ser, directivas en adelante

knowledge so as not to confuse two uses of the same word. Thus, use of a theological truth in an argument means that we have some knowledge of that truth; we are capable of using it without error, although not in a proprietary sense.

A tradition is never totally incomprehensible, totally hidden. There is an “in between,” understanding of it if it is truly a tradition (and not merely an indecipherable document that cannot be properly called a tradition).

A phenomenology that will attack the historic tradition of dogma must, therefore, begin by asking the key question of an “in between understanding” of the theology of today; that is, “What do we mean by...” In other words, we will have to release the theological content of everyday speech, through recourse to experience.

This is a double experience, as remarkably well expressed by Heidegger, speaking of the “destruction of the history of ontology,” equivalent work, as we have seen, to that which theology performs on its own history. He says:

The destruction of the traditional content of the former ontology (is) carried out by following the guideline of a question asking about being, seeking original experiences in which the first determinations of existence were gained, forward directives.¹²⁹⁹

¹²⁹⁹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 46-47. This doesn’t match up well, but it seems fairly close.

(61). Como se ve una vez más, se trata de enraizarnos en la tradición de una manera viva que asegure su verdad. Pues bien, ello se hará por un recurso a una doble experiencia. La primera es la de <u>la pregunta misma</u> nuestra, actual, real, “situada”. La segunda es la de <u>la pregunta histórica</u> que ocasionó la fórmula que aún hoy, y para siempre, sigue vigente y verdadera. Este mismo camino está señalado por Rahner en sus páginas ya ampliamente citadas. Comencemos por citar completo un texto ya presentado parcialmente: Lo presentado históricamente y hecho siempre de nuevo presente no forma en primer término un material de premisas del cual podamos sacar conclusiones desconocidas hasta ahora, sino que es el objeto que--conservado siempre--debe ser continuamente adquirido de nuevo por nosotros, <u>que somos nosotros como nadie puede serlo en la historia fuera de nosotros mismos</u> (62). Se preguntará quizás aquí: por qué comenzar por nosotros mismos, cuando se trata, en el fondo, de resucitar una experiencia histórica? La respuesta es sumamente clara en fenomenología. En efecto, ya hemos Página 17 visto que, debido a la “caída,” el habla pierde su verdad, en el soádo[?], no de adecuación con la realidad, sino de “alétheia,” de	As can be seen again, we must be rooted in tradition in a lively way that ensures its truth. This will be done by using a dual experience. The first is <u>our same question</u>, current, real, “situated”. The second is <u>the historical question</u> that led to the formula that even today, and forever, is still valid and true. This same path is marked by Rahner on his pages and is widely cited. Let us begin by quoting a text already partially presented: What is historically presented and always newly present is not first a material assumption from which we can draw conclusions hitherto unknown, but it is rather the object--preserved forever-- that must be continually re-acquired by us, <u>we who are ourselves as no one can be in history outside ourselves</u>.¹³⁰⁰ We may ask here: why start with ourselves, when it is a matter, in essence, of reviving a historical experience? The answer is very clear in phenomenology. Indeed, we have already seen that Page 17 due to the “fall” speech loses truth, in [????], not adapting to reality, but <i>alétheia</i> [Gk. <i>Truth</i>], of openings. Well then, this “fall” is precisely the loss of Dasein in
---	--

¹³⁰⁰ Possibly Karl Rahner’s essay.

abertu[?]. Pues bien, esa “caída” es precisamente la pérdida del “ser ahí” en lo anónimo, en lo universal, en lo “ante los ojos”. La fenomenología no permite precisamente la vuelta a la realidad propia y auténtica a trae vés de un habla que se abre y deja que se muestre lo que en ella se muestra. Ahora bien, nuestra pregunta auténtica, la pregunta que interesa nuestro ser y que nos permite ver la realidad formulada por el dogma, no es ciertamente la misma que se dio históricamente en otra época. Esto es cierto, pero también es cierto que es inútil tratar de acercarnos a aquella experiencia de la historia con un lenguaje impropio, vacío. Solamente si el lenguaje está ya abierto por nuestra experiencia actual, podremos comprender la diferencia con la experiencia histórica. No la asimilaremos a la nuestra, pero la nuestra nos dará el instrumento apropiado para reconstruirla. Dicho en otras palabras, sólo un dogma vivido actualmente puede permitirnos la comprensión auténticas de las formulas actuales y de las fórmulas pasadas. No se trata de una cualidad de lo moderno en cuanto tal. Se trata de ser “nosotros” auténticamente frente al dogma, para que la verdad contenida en su fórmula se abra paso hasta nosotros. Y Rahner hace a este propósito esta justísimo observación: Con esto no se quiere decir que sea particularmente útil a la teología en general tomar como punto de partida...cualquier particularidad de la realidad que nos rodea, captada de un modo “reflejo” ...Es mejor ver los hechos mismos (teológicos)...Eso sí, <u>con</u>	the anonymous, in the universal, in the “before our eyes”. Phenomenology cannot exactly turn back to actual and authentic reality and through speech that opens and lets it show what it shows. Our real question, the question that concerns our being and permits us to see reality formulated by dogma is certainly not the same as it was historically in a different era. This is true, but it is also true that it is futile to try to approach this experience of history with inappropriate, empty language. Only if the language is already opened by our present experience can we understand the difference from historical experience. We do not assimilate it to our own, but ours will give us the appropriate tool for rebuilding it. In other words, only a dogma lived now can afford the genuine understanding of the current and past formulas. This is not an attribute of modernity as such. It is about being authentically “we” before the dogma, so that the truth contained in its formula opens a way for us. And Rahner makes, in this regard, this very just observation: This does not mean it is particularly helpful to theology in general to take as a starting point...any feature of the reality around us, captured in a “reflexive” way...It is better to see the facts themselves (theological)... <u>To have the courage to ask, not to be satisfied with just</u>
--	--

tal de tener el valor de <u>preguntar</u>, de no satisfacerse con cualquier cosa, <u>de pensar con el corazón que uno tiene</u> y no con el que le dicen que debería tener...No tiene sentido querer ser moderno a todo trance. Lo único que se puede hacer aquí es <u>no pensar en renegar de lo que uno es</u> (por angustia, desconfianza u ortodoxia mal entendida), sino dejarse expresar y confiar en que Dios puede dar su gracia a nuestro tiempo como por otra parte la da a los pecadores (63). Sólo así, llevando a la historia nuestra pregunta por el ser sobrenatural que es nuestro dogma, podemos encontrar la pregunta que otros hombres, antes que nosotros, han hecho, y, por medio de esa pregunta, hallar la verdad de la respuesta, hallar la verdad de la fórmula dogmática con que la tradición respondía a aquella pregunta entonces y responde aún ahora. Aquí surge una dificultad importante. El lenguaje teológico nos da una respuesta. Ahora bien, nosotros no tenemos, al parecer, experiencia más que de la pregunta. La fenomenología nos lleva, por el lenguaje, a la realidad experimental. Pero en este campo, la fórmula dogmática no nos lleva a la experiencia de su contenido. Decir, por ejemplo, que Cristo tiene naturaleza divina y humana, pero constituye una sola persona, el Verbo, todo eso no corresponde a una	anything, <u>to think with your heart that you have</u> and not the one people say you should have...It makes no sense to want to be modern at any cost. All you can do here is <u>not to think of denying what you are</u> (through anxiety, lack of trust or misunderstood orthodoxy), but rather allow yourself to be articulate and trust that God can give grace to our time, as otherwise is given to sinners.¹³⁰¹ Only thus, leading to our historical question about the supernatural being, which is our dogma, we can find the question that others before us have asked, and, through that question, find the truth of the answer, find the truth of the dogmatic formula with which tradition answered the question then and answers it even now. Here arises an important difficulty. Theological language gives us an answer. However, we apparently do not have any experience other than the question. Phenomenology takes us, through language, to the experimental reality. But in this area, the dogmatic formula does not lead us to experience its content. Saying, for example, that Christ has divine and human nature, but he is a single person, the Word-- does not correspond to an experience. Phenomenology, in the theological
---	--

¹³⁰¹ Possibly Karl Rahner's essay.

experiencia. La fenomenología, en el dominio teológico, parecería que sólo es capaz de hacernos experimentar nuestras propias inquietudes, nuestras propias aspiraciones, en otras palabras, nuestras preguntas al dogma, no el dogma mismo. Pedimos permiso a nuestros lectores para dejar este problema fundamental para el párrafo siguiente, y para substituirle otro más inmediato que es, en parte, su introducción. En efecto, sea que la experiencia corresponsal [o corresponda] sólo a la pregunta, sea que corresponda también a la respuesta, vuelve a presentarse aquí el problema de toda fenomenología en relación con el estado de “caída”. Si la fenomenología ha de poner de manifiesto lo que se muestra (experimentalmente) y, a su vez, Página 18 lo que se muestra no es lo auténtico, cómo es posible que lo auténtico se muestre (experimentalmente)? Cómo controlar la autenticidad si la experiencia no nos da sino realidades correspondientes a la caída? La respuesta es exactamente la misma aquí como allí, porque la dificultad es exactamente la misma. Veamos primero esto último en un texto expresivo de Rahner que se refiere a esa teología de término medio fenómeno típico de la “caída,” por la que hay que comenzar nuestra investigación teológica. Con respecto a lo que piensa, (esa teología “de término medio”) puede, si es atacada (de superficial) y se defiende, sobrepasarse siempre a sí misma...Precisamente en la teología, donde todo está estrechamente ligado (como en la ontología, pues en	domain, only seems only be able to make us experience our own concerns, our own aspirations. In other words, we experience our questions to the dogma, but not the dogma itself. We ask our readers for permission to leave this fundamental problem for the next paragraph, and to replace it with something more immediate; that is, in part, its introduction. Indeed, whether the experience is correspondent [or corresponds] only to the question, whether it also corresponds to the response, the problem of all of phenomenology presents itself in relation to the status of the “fall”. If phenomenology is to reveal what is shown (experimentally) and, in turn, what is Page 18 shown is not true, how is it possible for the authentic to show itself (experimentally)? How can we check the authenticity if experience gives us nothing but realities corresponding to the fall? The answer is exactly the same here as there, because the difficulty is exactly the same. Let us first see the latter in an expressive text in which Rahner refers to that theology of in between phenomena, typical of the “fall,” from which we must begin our theological research. With regard to what is thought, (that theology “in between”) may, if attacked (superficially) and defended, always surpass itself...It is in theology, where everything is closely linked (as in ontology, which is actually supernatural ontology), that it always happens
---	--

realidad es la ontología sobrenatural), sucede siempre que quien es sensible al reproche de no haber pensado, investigado y solucionado suficientemente esto o aquello, puede reaccionar con impaciencia y de buena fe diciendo que él supo siempre eso <u>que le preguntaban y que, “en el fondo,” él también era capaz de decirlo y de esclarecerlo</u>. Se le podría preguntar entonces por qué habló tan poco y tan superficialmente de una cosa que, sin embargo, merecía una exposición más exacta y detallada; y si no habrá olvidad también en otras cosas, aquí o allá, lo que dice saber “evidentemente”; y si eso no demuestra quizás que, a pesar de todo, ese conocimiento “evidente” y ese “lo-sabía-claramente-desde-hace-tiempo” no tienen tanto valor (64). Nótese cómo esta descripción de la caída en el campo teológico, corresponde a esta descripción de la misma en el campo filosófico hecha por Heidegger, y que presenta además observaciones dignas de tenerse en cuenta en teología: La forma en que los fenómenos pueden estar encubiertos es variada. En primer término	that one who is sensitive to criticism of not having sufficiently thought, investigated and solved this or that, may react with impatience and in good faith, saying he (or she) always knew <u>what he was asked and, that “deep down,” he also was able to state and clarify it</u>. You might ask then why he spoke so little and so superficially about a thing that, however, deserved a more accurate and detailed exposition; and if he might have also forgotten something else, here or there, what he claims to know “obviously” and if this does not prove that maybe, despite everything, that this “obvious” knowledge and that “I-have-known-it-clearly-for-some-time” does not have much value.¹³⁰² Note how this description of the fall in the theological field corresponds to Heidegger’s description of it in the field of philosophy, and that also presents reliable observations that are worthy of being taken into account in theology: There are various ways in which phenomena can be covered up. In the first place, a
--	---

¹³⁰² Possibly Karl Rahner’s essay.

puede estar encubierto un fenómeno en el sentido de estar todavía <u>no descubierto</u>. No hay noción ni conocimiento de su estar ahí. Un fenómeno puede además estar <u>enterrado</u>. Esto implica: estaba ya descubierto, pero volvió a quedar encubierto. Este encubrimiento puede llegar a ser total, o bien, y es la regla, lo ya descubierto es aún visible, pero sólo en la forma del “parecer ser...” ...Este estar encubierto en el sentido de estar “desfigurado” es el más frecuente y más peligroso, porque aquí son especialmente tenaces las posibilidades de engaño y extravío. Las estructuras del ser de que ya se dispone, <u>aunque permaneciendo encubierta [en] la tierra de que son autóctonas</u>, y los conceptos correspondientes, quizá <u>reivindican sus derechos dentro de un “sistema”</u>. En razón de la <u>inserción artificial en un sistema, pretenden pasar por algo que no ha menester de mayor justificación y es “claro,”</u> y que por ende puede servir de punto de <u>partida a una deducción progresiva”</u> (65).	phenomenon can be covered up in the sense that it is still quite <u>undiscovered</u>. There is no notion of its knowledge or existence. Moreover, a phenomenon can be <u>buried over</u>. This means that it was already discovered but became covered up again. This covering-up can become complete; or rather-- and as a rule--what has been discovered earlier may still be visible, though only as a “semblance” ...This covering-up in the sense of being ‘disguised’ is both the most frequent and the most dangerous, for here the possibilities of deceiving and misleading are especially stubborn. The available structures of Being and their corresponding concepts, <u>although remaining covered in their native earth,</u> perhaps <u>may claim their rights within a “system”</u>. Due to their artificial insertion into a system, <u>they present themselves as something ‘clear’, requiring no further justification,</u> and thus can serve as the <u>point of departure for a progressive deduction.</u>¹³⁰³
--	--

¹³⁰³ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 60.

Como decíamos, la solución es también la misma, y Rahner la indica suficientemente en la primera parte del texto citado. Recordemos una vez más el texto clave de Heidegger para la ontología:

El “ser ahí” es ónticamente lo más cercano a él mismo, antológicamente lo más lejano, pero, sin embargo, preontológicamente no extraño (66).

El hombre, decíamos, es un habitante en el seno del ser, y del ser auténtico. La autenticidad no le es absolutamente extraña e **Pagina 19** inaccesible. Separando, por medio de una dialéctica cuyo funcionamiento hemos también estudiado, aunque muy a la ligera, la acumulación de lo inauténtico, no sólo llega al ser, sino que lo experimenta, porque viva en él y por él. Pues bien, convirtiendo estos términos al ser propio de la teología, al ser sobrenatural que, como el de la ontología es, al mismo tiempo, existencia y verdad, podemos decir que el cristiano, viviente en el seno de ese ser sobrenatural, está en su vida cotidiana, en una situación “pre-ontológica” con respecto a él. El cristiano, así como comparte con todos los hombres una cierta comprensión del ser “de término medio” que le permite ponerse de acuerdo con ellos sobre lo que “es”; de la misma manera comparte con los demás cristiano una cierta comprensión del ser sobrenatural “de término medio” que le permite ponerse de acuerdo con ellos en cuanto al contenido de su fe, de una manera práctica, implícita y no refleja (en el sentido que tiene la palabra de Heidegger “pre-ontológico,” que puede

As mentioned, the solution is also the same, and Rahner indicated it sufficiently in the first part of the quoted text. Let us remember once again the key text for Heidegger’s ontology:

Dasein is ontologically the closest to itself, anthologically the farthest; however, pre-ontologically not extraneous.¹³⁰⁴

We said humanity is a resident within the heart of being, and of the authentic being. Authenticity is not completely strange and **Page 19** inaccessible. Separating, through a dialectic whose function we have also studied, although very quickly, the accumulation of the inauthentic, not only arrives at the being, but experiences it, because it lives in him and for him. Converting these terms to the specific being of theology, the supernatural being that, like that of ontology is, at the same time, existence and truth, we can say that the Christian living in the heart of this supernatural being is, in his or her daily life, in a “pre-ontological” state with respect to it [this supernatural being]. Christians, sharing with all humanity a certain understanding of the being “in between” that allows them to agree with them on what “is”; in the same way share with other Christians some understanding of the supernatural being “in between” which allows them to agree implicitly with them regarding the content of their faith in a practical way, implicit and not reflexive (in the Heideggerian sense of the word “pre-ontological,” that can be applied even to an entire ontology).

¹³⁰⁴ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 244.

aplicarse aún a toda una ontología).

Se ha insistido demasiado poco, a nuestro parecer, en la pasividad con respecto al ser que caracteriza a la fenomenología ontológica de Heidegger. Y sin embargo, es un hecho que su ontología sólo es posible, en el fondo, como pasividad. La misma comprensión del término del fenomenología nos habla ya de esto. Lo mismo sucede en lo teológico. La fe, como virtud teológico infusa, nos da esa situación “preontológica” con respecto a la verdad sobrenatural. La verdad, finalmente, se muestra por sí misma, y el hombre la recibe siempre en una pasividad que la teología traduce con el término de “gracia”. Por eso Rahner terminaba el párrafo referente a esa entrada en lo auténtico, refiriéndose a la gracia:

Lo único que se puede hacer aquí es no pensar en renegar de lo que uno es, sino dejarse expresar y confiar en que Dios puede dar su gracia a nuestro tiempo como por otra parte la da a los pecadores (67).

Gracia, aquí, es el ser sobrenatural que se da como verdad, que “se muestra por sí mismo”.

Y con esto penetramos en el estudio directo de la Revelación.

III

Hemos visto hasta aquí las posibilidades de una teología basada en la fenomenología del habla dogmática. Hemos notado que el contenido de la teología está constituido primeramente por fórmulas dogmáticas “tramitadas”. Esa tradición tiene todas las características de la “historicidad humana”. Verdadera de una vez para

Too little emphasis has been placed, in my view, on the passivity with respect to the being that characterizes Heidegger’s ontological phenomenology. And yet, it is a fact that his ontology is only possible, deep down, as passivity. The same understanding of the term of phenomenology already speaks to us of this. The same is true in theology. Faith, as an infused theological virtue, gives us this “pre-ontological” situation with respect to supernatural truth. The truth finally shows itself on its own and humanity always receives it with a passivity that theology translates with the term “grace”. Thus, Rahner ended the paragraph concerning that entry into the authentic, referring to grace

All you can do here is not to deny what you are, but rather allow yourself to be articulate and trust that God can give grace to our time just as otherwise it is given to sinners.¹³⁰⁵

Grace, here, is the supernatural being presenting itself as truth, which “shows itself on its own”.

And with that, we enter into the direct study of Revelation.

III

We have seen so far the possibilities of a theology based on the phenomenology of dogmatic speech. We note that the content of theology is formed primarily by “processed” dogmatic formulas. That tradition has all the characteristics of “human historicity”. A dogmatic formula is true once and for all (as guaranteed by God) and absolutely adapted to reality,

¹³⁰⁵ Possibly Karl Rahner’s essay.

siempre (en cuanto garantida por Dios) y absolutamente como adecuación con la realidad, una fórmula dogmática puede no estar “abierta” para nosotros, debido a la “caída” de la tradición en una repetición más o menos vacía. La verdad de una tradición permanece la misma en la caída (en cuanto conformidad con la realidad objetiva), y es útil hasta cierto punto, pues nos permite ponernos de acuerdo sobre verdades “de término medio” referentes a nuestra religión: pero otro lado, pierde su verdad en sentido pleno, su “alétheia,” por cuanto nosotros nos hacemos incapaces de captar las implicaciones reales, verdaderamente religiosas de esa verdad (cuya esencia es, no obstante, lo religioso). Sacada de su contenido de religión vivida, una fórmula dogmática conserva su verdad objetiva que podrá ser captada por un científico ateo, pero no es ya la verdad sobrenatural identificada a la gracia e inseparable de ella, que se da **Página 20** al hombre como atracción y respuesta, y única fuente de progreso teológico.

Para volver a recobrar esa verdad de la “tradición” es menester un doble paso. Implicarnos nosotros, en nuestra situación actual y total, en el contenido de ella: preguntar al dogma el sentido de nuestra existencia concreta y elegir según él. Y, en segundo lugar, desde esta implicación, tratar de revivir la experiencia que, formulada históricamente como pregunta, provocó la respuesta dogmática. La verdad de la respuesta estaba entonces “descubierta” puesto que la respuesta se calcaba sobre la pregunta concreta. Así lo será también para nosotros si aseguremos, al mismo tiempo, la continuidad y la implicación.

Ahora bien, esta fenomenología

and it may not be “open” for us because of the “fall” of the tradition into more or less empty repetition. The truth of a tradition remains the same in the fall (in accordance with objective reality), and it is useful to some extent, as it enables us to agree on facts “in between” referring to our religion. On the other hand, it also loses its truth in a full sense, its “*alétheia*,” because we have become unable to grasp the real and truly religious implications (the essence of which is, however, the religious). Taken outside of the context of lived religion, a dogmatic formula retains its objective truth that can be captured by an atheistic scientist, but it is no longer supernatural truth identified with grace and inseparable from it, which is **Page 20** given to humankind as an attraction and response, and the only source of theological progress.

Returning to recover the truth of “tradition” requires a double step. Involving ourselves in our current and total situation, in its content: to ask of dogma the meaning of our concrete existence and to choose according to it. And, second, from this implication, to try to relive the experience that, formulated historically as a question, provoked the dogmatic response. The truth of the response was then “discovered” since the response is modeled on the specific question. This is also true for us if we ensure, at the same time, continuity and ownership.

This phenomenology so far is

es, hasta ahora, idéntica a la del filósofo, en cuanto éste atiende a la tradición filosófica. La misma situación, el mismo fin, el mismo método. La fenomenología, como método de exégesis aplicable a toda habla transmitida, puede ser, como Heidegger mismo lo indica, el método de cualquier ciencia que presente tales condiciones.

Pero la fenomenología que usa la filosofía, lleva a la existencia del hombre en cuanto interrogador del ser, mientras que aquella que usa la teología lleva a la existencia del hombre en cuanto creyente en el Ser.

Esta es una diferencia fundamental, según Heidegger, y él extrae de ella numerosas conclusiones, sobre todo en una conferencia contemporánea a "Sein und Zeit" sobre "Teología y filosofía," y en la "Introducción a la Metafísica" de 1953.

Henri Birault tratando de nuestro tema, expone así estas diferencias existentes para Heidegger entre filosofía y teología (o, si se quiere, entre fenomenología filosófica y fenomenología teológica):

Le philosophe est l'homme qui est tout entier livré à la puissance de l'interrogation. Cela signifie deux choses, qu'il oppose l'interrogation jusqu'à ses plus extrêmes limites et que, pour venir à bout de l'interrogation, il n'attend pas d'autre secours que de l'interrogation même (68). Il n'y a pas de

identical to that of the philosopher, as it attends to the philosophical tradition--the same situation, the same purpose, and the same method. Phenomenology as a method of exegesis applicable to all transmitted speech, can be, as Heidegger himself indicates, the method of any science that presents such conditions.

But phenomenology that uses philosophy leads to human existence as an interrogator of being, while that using theology leads to human existence as a believer in Being.

This is a fundamental difference, according to Heidegger, and he draws many conclusions from it, especially in a contemporary conference of *Being and Time* on "Theology and Philosophy," and in "Introduction to Metaphysics" in 1953.

Addressing our subject, Henri Birault expresses this difference existing between Heidegger's philosophy and theology (or, if you will, between philosophical phenomenology and theological phenomenology) as follows:

The philosopher is the person who is completely led by the power of inquiry. This means two things: he or she opposes question to its most extreme limits and to come to the end [nutshell] of the question, the person expects no other rescue than the questioning itself.¹³⁰⁶ There is no common measure, there is no continuity or possible passage

¹³⁰⁶ Henri Birault

commune mesure, il n'y a pas de continuité ou de passage possibles entre l'interrogation par laquelle se définit la métaphysique et la croyance qui est le fondement de la théologie (69). En efecto, para Heidegger, tanto la filosofía como la teología presentan una pregunta, interrogan. Pero ahí termina su semejanza. La filosofía soluciona esa pregunta atendiendo únicamente a lo que en la pregunta se revela. Así como un alumno inteligente se reconoce, no sólo en la respuesta, sino en la manera de preguntar, así, en la filosofía, el ser se revela, no respondiendo desde afuera a la pregunta, sino a través de lo que la misma pregunta supone. En efecto, el preguntar por el ser supone ya una relación al ser, una estructura de ser que la fenomenología debe descubrir a través de la pregunta misma. En cambio la teología pregunta y espera la contestación para "saber". Espero otra cosa que la pregunta misma, o, si se quiere, otra persona en la cual se cree. La teología "supone" algo indiscutible, infundable, inaccesible, que es la respuesta, es decir, lo que Dios revela. Sobre ese <i>positum</i>, la teología elabora sus preguntas y sus categorías, porque ese "positum" modifica la existencia, y la teología era precisamente la "auto-interpretación conceptual de la existencia creyente" (70). Por eso la teología es una ciencia "positiva," y no una "ontología," una ciencia que "supone" algo que no se discute, y no una ciencia "ontológica" que busca el "logos," la razón de ser de todo lo que contiene. Así dice Página	<u>between the question defining metaphysics and the belief that is the foundation of theology.</u>¹³⁰⁷ Indeed, for Heidegger, both philosophy and theology present a question: they query. But the similarity ends there. Philosophy resolves this question by attending solely to what is revealed in the question. Just as an intelligent student recognizes himself not only in the answer but in the way of asking, so, in philosophy, the self is revealed, not responding to a question from the outside, but through what the same question means. In effect, questioning by being already supposes a relationship to being, a structure of being that phenomenology must discover by the question itself. On the other hand, theology asks and waits for the answer to "know". I expect something other than the question itself, or, if you will, another person in whom one believes. Theology "means" something indisputable, unfounded, inaccessible, which is the answer; that is, what God reveals. On this <i>positum</i>, theology creates its questions and categories, because that "<i>positum</i>" modifies existence and theology was the precisely "conceptual self-interpretation of believers' existence".¹³⁰⁸ That is why theology is a "positive" science, and not an "ontology," a science that "supposes" something that is not discussed, and not an "ontological" science seeking the "logos," the reason for being of
--	--

¹³⁰⁷ Henri Birault

¹³⁰⁸ Unknown

21 muy bien Birault, y nosotros lo habíamos indicado ya en el primer párrafo:

Tels sont les reportes de la theologie et de la philosophie d'après Heidegger a l'époque de "Sein und Zeit". La communauté limitée mais certaine qui s'institue ici entre ces deux sciences est manifestement tributaire d'une double définition: de la philosophie comme science ontologique ou transcendante, de la theologie comme science ontique ou positive (71)...Par là on comprend que le croyant ne puisse pas être opposé au philosophe comme celui qui a déjà trouvé à celui qui cherche encore (72).

Si un enunciado teológico parece responder a una pregunta filosófica, es que no se ha comprendido bien el uno o la otra. En efecto, y para atenernos únicamente a la comprensión de la teología, si el hombre pregunta a Dios en la teología acerca del sentido de su existencia y de la manera de empuñarla, y si a esta pregunta Dios ha contestado ya por la Revelación, la teología tendrá los tres caracteres siguientes que Birault comenta siguiendo a Heidegger:

Cet enracinement de la theologie dans la foi permet de "deduire" les caracteres essentiels de cette science ontique. La

everything in it. Birault said it Page 21 very well, and we had already indicated it in the first paragraph:

Such are the reports of theology and philosophy according to Heidegger, in the era of *Being and Time*. The somewhat limited community that instituted it here between these two sciences is obviously dependent on a dual definition: philosophy as an ontological or transcendental science, and theology as a science or positive ontic¹³⁰⁹ ... By this it is understood that the believer cannot be opposed to the philosopher as one who has already found what the other is still seeking.¹³¹⁰

If a theological statement seems to answer a philosophical question, either one or the other has not been properly understood. Indeed, to adhere only to the understanding of theology, if a person asks God in theology about the meaning of his or her existence and how to grasp it, and if God has already answered this question by Revelation, theology will have the following three characters that Birault points out following Heidegger:

This grounding of theology in the faith allows "deducing" the essential ontic characters of this

¹³⁰⁹ Henri Birault

¹³¹⁰ Henri Birault

foi est un mode existentiel de notre existante humaine et historique, mod dans lequel et par lequel une histoire se decouvre a nous dont nous devenona (?) les participante. C'est pourquoi (Daher) la theologie en tant que science de la croyance comme mode d'etre en lui-meme <u>historique</u> (als einer in sich geschichtlichen Seinaweise) est elle-meme, dans sa substance la plus intime, une science <u>historique</u> (eine historisch Wissenschaft); et conformement a l'historicite (Geschichtlichkeit) specifique qui est incluse dans la croyance, elle est, en verite, une science historique d'une nature particuliere (73). Ya hemos insistido suficientemente en la explicación de este primer carácter de la teología, y así pasamos inmediatamente al segundo, descrito así por Birault: De la meme facon que la theologie est un science specifiquement historique par essence meme et non pas seulement dans tel ou tel de ses aspects particuliers, de meme, elle est toujours aussi science <u>pratique</u>. La fin veritable de la theologie, c'est l'elaboration de la	science. Faith is an existential mode of human and historical existence, a way in which and through which a story reveals itself to us which we become participants. Therefore (<i>Daher</i>) theology as a science of belief as a way of being historical in itself (<i>als einer in sich geschichtlichen Seinaweise</i>) is itself, in its most intimate essence, a <u>historical</u> science (<i>eine historisch Wissenschaft</i>), and consistent with the specific historicity (<i>Geschichtlichkeit</i>) included in belief, it is, in truth, a historical science of a particular nature.¹³¹¹ We have already sufficiently explained this first character of theology, and so we pass immediately to the second, thus described by Birault: In the same way that theology is a specifically historic science in its own essence and not just in one or another of its aspects, likewise, it is still <u>practical</u> science. The real purpose of theology is the development of belief itself, and not the edification of a set of
---	---

¹³¹¹ Henri Birault

croyance elle-meme et non pas l'edification d'un ensemble de propositions theoretiques flottant au-dessus de la croyance et dont la validite pourrait subsister hors de la croyance...La theologie sera donc science de la croyance <u>comme telle</u> ou de <u>l'existence</u> croyante. En ce sens (qui est le sens donne au mot existante después Kant et Kierkegaard – l'exister comme agir, comme praxis) elle est science pratique et cela independamment de tous "application" pratique (74). También hemos hablado de este carácter de la teología al insistir en el hecho de que sólo es posible captar la verdad total de una fórmula dogmática por la implicación de la existencia en ella. Nos queda pues, el tercer carácter: Cette double détermination de la théolgoie comme science historique est science pratique n'exclut pas, mais implique plutot, la reconnaissance de son caractere profondement <u>systematique</u>. Ici encore, la theologie est systematique par essence meme, et en dehors de la forme systematique qu'elle peut etre tentee de revetire...Elle n'est pas systematique parce	theoretic proposals floating above belief and the validity of which may exist outside of belief ... theology is therefore the science of belief <u>as such</u> or the believing <u>existence</u>. In this sense (which is that given to the word existing after Kant and Kierkegaard--existing as the action, as praxis) it is practical science independent of any practical "application".¹³¹² We have also discussed this nature of theology by insisting that you can only capture the whole truth of a dogmatic formula by the involvement of the existence in it. This, therefore, leaves us the third character: This double determination of theology as a historical science is practical science does not exclude but rather implies the recognition of its deeply <u>systematic</u> nature. Again, theology is systematic in its own essence, and apart from the systematic form it can be tempted to assume [??] ... It is not systematic because it leads to a system but because it comes from the original systematic
--	--

¹³¹² Henri Birault

qu'elle aboutit a un systeme mais parce qu'elle procede du sistema original de Pagina 22 la croyance. Ce qu'elle se propose, en effect, d'amener á la lumiere, c'est le corps non demembre de la croyance. Or la croyance...est en elle-meme cette vie nouvelle, octroyee par la grace de Dieu, participation, dans la foi et par la foi, a cette histoire de la Revelation qui ne peut jamais etre saisie en dehors de la foi. La theologie est donc indissolublement <u>systematique pratique</u> et <u>historique</u> et elle ne peut posseder un de ces caracteres sans avoir necessairement aussi les deux autres (75). Volvemos a encontrar aquí las afirmaciones que hacíamos al finalizar el párrafo pasado. El cristiano, por la gracia, es un habitante del ser sobrenatural. La fe le da acceso a su conocimiento. Pero la fe se perfecciona tomando conciencia de sí misma, es decir de ese ser sobrenatural que es su ser. La fe, hecha existencia, busca ser conciente de sí misma para que su existencia sea no impropia e imperfecta, sino auténtica y perfecta. Una vez más, "la teología es la autointerpretación conceptual de la existencia creyent," el "fidem quarena intellectum" de los antiguos. La Revelación es el ser sobrenatural que se nos muestra para que vivamos más auténtica y	Page 22 belief. What it [theology] proposes, in effect, to bring to light, is the body not disconnected from belief... belief in itself is that new life, granted by the grace of God, participation, in and through faith, in this story of Revelation that can never be grasped outside of faith. Theology is thus inextricably <u>systematic, practical and historical</u> and cannot possess one of these characters without necessarily also having the other two.¹³¹³ We again find the statements we made at the end of the last paragraph. The Christian, by grace, is an inhabitant of the supernatural being. Faith gives you access to its knowledge [of the supernatural being]. But faith is perfected by its awareness of itself, i.e. that supernatural being that is its being. Faith, made existence, seeks to be conscious of itself so that its existence is not improper and imperfect, but authentic and perfect. Once again, "theology is the conceptual self-interpretation of Christian existence," the <i>fidem quarena intellectum</i> [<i>fides quaerens intellectum</i> = faith seeking understanding] of the ancients. Revelation is the supernatural being ... for us to live most authentically and perfectly this new
--	--

¹³¹³ Henri Birault

perfectamente esa nueva vida de fe. Dios podía habernos dado sin Revelación la participación a su vida divina, pero no lo ha hecho así. Dios podía habernos enseñado verdades teóricas para que hiciéramos teoremas con ellas, pero no lo ha hecho así. Dios ha querido que conociéramos nuestra nueva existencia, y que viviéramos ese conocimiento.

La Revelación se encarna así en nuestra existencia, como la gracia que llamamos habitual. Transforma nuestro ser natural infundiéndose en él, no creando una existencia aparte. Dios nos ha hablado en términos propios de nuestra existencia natural, de cosas en las que está implicada nuestra existencia natural. Y esa habla es, sin embargo, sobrenatural, no sólo en su objeto, sino en su ser mismo de habla, puesto que no es más que el ser sobrenatural que se deja ver. De ahí que no se podrá jamás decir que aquél que ha comprendido especulativamente el sentido de los términos de una afirmación revelada, esté en posesión de la verdad revelada. Esa fórmula es, en sí, verdadera y lo sigue siendo aun comprendida por un ateo, pero la verdad que encierra no la posee el ateo sin la gracia de la fe, porque esa verdad es sobrenatural.

El aspecto opuesto es también importante, y en él nos detendremos por el momento. Dios nos ha revelado la verdad sobrenatural en términos de nuestra existencia natural e implicando nuestra existencia natural. Por ahí podemos comprender el trabajo de la teología y sus relaciones no sólo con la fenomenología como habla, sino como ontología. Así dice Birault:

Les concepts Essentiels
de la théologie ne
doivent-ils pas entre

life of faith. God could have given us participation in divine life without revelation but did not. God could have taught us to make theoretical truths for us to make theories with them, but has not done so. God wanted us to know our new existence, and for us to live that knowledge.

Revelation is thus embodied in our existence, like the grace we call common. It transforms our natural being, infused itself into it, not creating a separate existence. God has spoken to us in terms of our own natural existence, of things in which our natural existence is involved. However, that speech is supernatural, not only in its object but in its very being as speech, since it is no more than the supernatural being that allows itself to be seen. Hence you can never say that one who has speculatively understood the meaning of the terms of a revelatory affirmation is in possession of revealed truth. That formula is, in itself, true and it is still understood even by an atheist, but the truth it encompasses is not possessed by the atheist without the grace of faith, because this truth is supernatural.

The opposite aspect is also important, and we will stay here for now. God has revealed the supernatural truth to us in terms of our natural existence and involving our natural existence. From here we can understand the work of theology and its relationship not only with phenomenology as speech, but as ontology. Birault writes:

Should the essential
concepts of theology not
be exempted from any

soustraits á toute investigation philosophique ou ontologique, <u>s'ils veulent demeurer dans leur élément propre</u> qui est celui de la croyance? Pour qu'il en soit ainsi, <u>il faudrait d'une part que l'existence croyante consitue une totalite fermee sur soi</u> radicalement étrangère á l'existence non-croyante, d'autre part <u>que la science postive ou ontique de cette croyance (comme toute autre science d'ailleurs) put jamais se Developper independamment de toute ontologie (76).</u> Ahora bien, puesto que la Revelación nos habla en términos de nuestra existencia, acerca de nuestra existencia, ninguna de las dos posibilidades se realiza. Y así dice muy bien Birault: Par la foi, l'existence non-croyante est surmontée en meme temps que découverte dans sa vérité qui est le péché. C'est dire que Page 23 cette existante n'est pas purement et simplement abandonnée mais conservée en meme temps que dépassée. L'existence croyante ne cesse pas de dépasser l'existence non-croyante, elle en est le dépassement meme,	investigation or ontological philosophy, <u>if they wish to remain in their own element</u>, which is belief? To be this way, <u>it should be first that the believing existence constitutes a totality closed on itself</u> is radically alien to the unbelieving existence; second, <u>that the positive or ontic science of this belief (as any other science for that matter) could never develop independently of any ontology.</u>¹³¹⁴ Since Revelation speaks to us in terms of our existence, about our existence, neither of the two possibilities takes place. As Birault says very well: By faith, the unbelieving existence is crowned at the same time as it is discovered in its truth, which is sin. This means Page 23 that this existence is not simply abandoned but kept at the same time as exceeded. The life of faith [believing existence] does not cease to exceed non-believing existence; it is this surpassing itself, yet it cannot, it must <u>never have exceeded it.</u>¹³¹⁵
--	---

¹³¹⁴ Henri Birault

¹³¹⁵ Henri Birault

mais pourtant elle ne peut, elle ne doit jamais l'avoir dépassée (77). En la Revelación hay, pues, una referencia constante y fundamental a la existencia humana natural simplemente. La consecuencia es clara, y Birault la saca siguiendo enteramente a Heidegger: Tous les concepts theologiques comporteront donc nécessairement <u>s'ils son pris dans la plénitude de leur signification</u>, une référence essentielle à l'existence non-croyante et devront ainsi etre qualifiés d'ambivalents puisqu'ils devront toujours "valoir" et pour la croyance et pour la non-croyance (78). Y esto explica la ilusión de poseer la verdad teológica sin la gracia de la fe. Birault prosigue: La théologie <u>véhicule donc toujours nécessairement une certaine compréhension de l'être de l'homme en general: savoir ontologique ou philosophique qui n'est nullement l'objet propre de la Théologie mais qui n'en contribue pas moins á déterminer la signification de ses notions essentielles.</u> Ainsi la theologie ne se fonde pas sur la philosophie, mais d'une certaine maniere elle est	Therefore, in Revelation there is a constant and fundamental reference simply to natural human existence. The implication is clear, and Birault takes the following entirely from Heidegger: All theological concepts necessarily behave as if they have necessarily <u>captured in the fullness of their meaning</u> an essential reference to the unbelieving existence and they must thus be qualified as ambivalent since they will always "claim" and the belief for non-belief.¹³¹⁶ This explains the illusion of possessing the theological truth without the grace of faith. Birault continues: Theology <u>necessarily always carries a certain comprehension of the human being in general: ontological or philosophical knowledge that is is not the progress subject of theology, but nevertheless it contributes to determining the significance of its essential notions.</u> Thus, theology is not based on philosophy, but in a way it is nevertheless founded upon
--	--

¹³¹⁶ Henri Birault

pourtant fondee sur elle en tant qu'elle est science (79). Y esto es, al mismo tiempo, un hecho histórico y una necesidad lógica, como lo dice muy bien Birault en otro lugar: Que la theologie, en tant que science ontique, ne puisse pas entre independante d'une certaine ontologie de la nature humaine, ce n'est pas seulement ce que l'histoire meme de la theologie pourrait effectivement révéler, mais ce qui découle d'une "necessite d'essence" concernant la structure de toute science ontique en general (80). Todo esto no es más que la explicitación de las palabras con que Heidegger mismo nos decía esto en uno de los textos citados en la introducción de este trabajo: La fe y la "idea del mundo" al hacer tales o semejantes afirmaciones (teológicas)...tienen que recurrir a las estructuras existenciales puestas de manifiesto, supuesto que sus afirmaciones aspiren al par a ser objeto de una comprensión conceptual (81). Por eso, cuando a raíz de la controversia provocada por las doctrinas de R. Bultmann (muy discutibles por otra parte en otros	philosophy as much as it is on science.¹³¹⁷ And this is both a historical fact and a logical necessity, as Birault said elsewhere: Theology, as an ontic science, is not independent from a certain ontology of human nature; it is not only what the history of theology might indeed reveal, but what arises from a "necessity of essence" concerning the structure of any ontic science in general.¹³¹⁸ All this is only the explanation of the same words Heidegger used and we cited in the introduction to this work: But in so far as any faith or 'world view', makes any such assertions...it must come back to the existentielle structures set forth, provided that its assertions aspire to being the object of <i>conceptual</i> understanding.¹³¹⁹ Thus, when, following the controversy provoked by the doctrines of Rudolf Bultmann (on the other hand, they are very questionable
---	---

¹³¹⁷ Henri Birault

¹³¹⁸ Henri Birault

¹³¹⁹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 224.

puntos), se le acusó de hacer depender la teología de la “filosofía de la desesperación” heideggeriana, se cometieron dos confusiones que un estudio más directo de Heidegger hubiera quizás evitado.

“Bultmann subordina el mensaje cristiano a una filosofía” (82), dice la primera objeción. Grave error, o, mejor dicho, errores, porque casi cada palabra es un error. El primer error es el de creer que la teología no está subordinada a nada. Lo que Dios nos dice es verdad incondicionalmente, pero para que nosotros conozcamos lo que Dios nos dice es menester de una cantidad de condiciones. Por ejemplo, de conocimientos históricos. Un católico ignorante de la historia creería estar en la verdad diciendo que “el alma es la forma del cuerpo,” siendo así que, de acuerdo con el lenguaje de nuestro tiempo, “forma” significa el contorno material de un cuerpo. Quién puede negar entonces que la **Página 24** teología, y el mismo mensaje cristiano esté subordinado a la historia, a la gramática, a la filología, a la fenomenología...? Alguno podría quizás objetar (aunque de hecho no lo hemos visto hacer) las palabras mismas de Heidegger que habla de la ontología (fenomenológica) como de una “función correctiva” (83). Ello sería también un grave error, porque basta leer a Heidegger para comprender que esa “corrección” no se aplica al contenido mismo del mensaje teológica, sino a su expresión cuando ésta, a fuerza de repetirse históricamente, pierde su sentido profundo. Es el mismo ejemplo que antes poníamos con respecto a la palabra “forma” aplicada al alma. A la

in other points), Bultmann is accused of depending theology that is dependent on a Heideggerian “philosophy of despair,” two confusions took place that could have been avoided in a more direct study of Heidegger.

“Bultmann subordinates the Christian message to a philosophy,”¹³²⁰ said the first objection. This is a serious error, or, rather, errors, because almost every word is wrong. The first mistake is to believe that theology is not subordinate to anything. What God says is true unconditionally, but for us to know what God says, a number of conditions are necessary. For example, knowledge of history. A Catholic who is ignorant of history would believe it is true to say that “the soul is the shape of the body,” even though, according to the contemporary language, “shape” means the outline of a material body. Who can deny then that **Page 24** theology and the Christian message itself are subordinated to history, grammar, philology, phenomenology...? Perhaps one might object (though in fact we have not seen it done) to Heidegger’s very words speaking about (phenomenological) ontology as a “corrective function”.¹³²¹ This would be a serious mistake, because it is enough to read Heidegger to understand that this “correction” does not apply to the content of the theological message, but its expression when it, by virtue of historical repetition, loses its deeper. This is the same as in the example above with regard to the word “shape,” applied to the soul. History has the duty to “correct,” not the message, but the error in

¹³²⁰ Karl Barth’s pamphlet “Rudolf Bultmann: Ein Versuch, ihn zu verstehen (An attempt to understand him)”?

¹³²¹ Unknown

historia le compete el deber de “corregir,” no el mensaje, sino el error de interpretación que habría en dar a la palabra “forma” empleada hace siglos, el mismo contenido que tiene actualmente.

Otro error latente en la objeción es el de considerar la fenomenología como una filosofía. Porque, evidentemente, todos estarían de acuerdo en subordinar prácticamente la teología (en cuanto a su expresión se refiere) a las disciplinas históricas o filológicas, pues qué otra cosa hace de hecho el dogma y la exégesis bíblica? Pero subordinarla a una filosofía, eso sí que no. Filosofía se dice sistema hipotético de explicación del universo (puede ser que no sea ésta la definición de filosofía, pero todo el mundo piensa en eso al usar del término, sobre todo en relación con la teología). Por qué, pues, el dogma estaría subordinada a una hipótesis? Nuevo error, que ignora profundamente a Heidegger y su interpretación de la fenomenología. Precisamente hubiera bastado leer las páginas de Heidegger sobre la fenomenología para ver cómo no es ella una hipótesis. La fenomenología es una operación cognoscitiva como la sensación o la deducción. El análisis existencial no es algo que se pueda afirmar o negar según pertenezca uno al realismo, al idealismo o al materialismo. Lo mismo que los primeros principios de la filosofía aristotélico-tomista (no la filosofía aristotélico-tomista con los primeros principios) son perennes, no porque sea una filosofía superior a las otras, sino porque no son una filosofía, sino el mecanismo mismo de la razón. Podrán usarse de una manera positiva, idealista, relativista, pero de esos principios es imposible deshacerse. Podrán aplicarse a la materia, o a las ideas, o no aplicarse; pero no dejarán

interpretation in giving the word “shape” as used for centuries, the same content as it has today.

Another latent error in the objection is to consider phenomenology as a philosophy. Because, obviously, if everyone would agree to subordinate theology practically (in terms of how its expression is concerned) to historical or philological disciplines, what else is there for dogma and biblical exegesis to do? Subordinate to a philosophy? Definitely not. Philosophy speaks is said to be a hypothetical system of explaining the universe (perhaps this may not be the definition of philosophy, but everyone thinks of this when using the term, especially in relation to theology). Why, then, would the dogma be subject to a hypothesis? This new error, which profoundly ignores Heidegger and his interpretation of phenomenology. It would have been sufficient to read the pages of Heidegger’s phenomenology to see how it is not a hypothesis. Phenomenology is a cognitive operation like feeling or deduction. Existentiell analysis is not something one can affirm or deny depending whether one belongs to realism, idealism or materialism. As the first principles of the Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy (not the Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy with the first principles) are perennial, not because it is a better philosophy than the others, but because it is not a philosophy but they are actual mechanisms of reason. They may be used in a positive, idealistic, relativistic manner, but these principles cannot be undone. It may apply to matter or ideas, or it may not

por eso de ser los principios de todo funcionamiento racional. Y la teología está necesariamente “subordinada” a ellos en el sentido dicho. El segundo punto en que Bultmann sufre las críticas de los teólogos está íntimamente relacionado con esto último; pero la objeción es aquí más fundada, por lo menos aparentemente. Según ella, la ontología fenomenológica de Heidegger <u>llevaría a conclusiones</u> inaceptables para un creyente, y, por ende, inaprovechables para una teología. La filosofía de Heidegger sería una filosofía de la desesperación y del ateísmo. En esta objeción se confunden cosas más difíciles de separar, pero la confusión no es menos grave. En primer lugar, la “filosofía” de Heidegger no lleva a tales conclusiones. Más aún, no lleva a ninguna conclusión. La fenomenología como tal no hace sino ponernos frente a nuestra misma realidad constatable y experimental. Si contiene una dialéctica, ella es de la más evidente simplicidad y no afirma nada que no pueda constatarse directamente. Primer error, pues: la fenomenología no lleva a conclusiones, si se la comprende a la manera de Heidegger (84). No seamos demasiado lógicos, dirán los adversarios de Bultmann, y convengamos en que el resultado de esa fenomenología a la Heidegger no puede ser admitido por un cristiano. Nuevo error, pero aparentemente fundado en una verdad: “La conciencia desesperada” que se atribuye a la filosofía de Heidegger. Así dirá Jaspers mismo: La conscience désespérée n’est	be applied; but this will not stop them from being the principles of all rational function. And, in that sense, theology is necessarily “subordinate” to them. The second point at which Bultmann suffers criticism from theologians is closely related to this latter; but the objection here is more justified, at least apparently. According to it, Heidegger’s phenomenological ontology <u>leads to unacceptable conclusions</u> for a believer, and therefore, is unusable for a theology. Heidegger’s philosophy would be a philosophy of despair and atheism. This objection confuses things that are more difficult to separate, but the confusion is no less serious. First, Heidegger’s “philosophy” does not lead to such conclusions. More importantly, it does not lead to any conclusion. Phenomenology as such only places us in front of our own observable and experimental reality. If it contains a dialectic, it is of the most evident simplicity and does not assert anything that cannot be directly verified. This is the first error; phenomenology does not lead to conclusions, if it is understood the way Heidegger understands it.¹³²² Bultmann’s opponents may say not to be too logical, so let us agree that the outcome of Heidegger’s phenomenology cannot be accepted by a Christian. It’s a new error, but apparently it is based on a truth: “The desperate awareness” that is attributed to Heidegger’s philosophy. Jaspers says it well: Consciousness is in no desperate truth of
---	--

¹³²² Unknown

aucunement la vérité de l'homme Pagina 25 en général; elle est simplement une manière dans laquelle certains hommes, e meme beaucoup d'hommes, mais non pas tous se reconnaissent (85). Es extraño que esta objeción venga de Jaspers. Porque ella puede tener dos sentidos: uno verdadero, pero que no ataca a Bultmann, y otro que ataca a Bultmann pero que no es verdadero. El primer sentido sería el siguiente: Heidegger acentúa excesivamente algunas experiencias de la existencia humana, y no pone de manifiesto otras que las complementan o las corrigen. En particular, para decirlo con las palabras del P. Malevez: La philosophie de "Sein und Zeit" (telle du moins que Bultmann, avec beaucoup d'autres, la comprenait) accentuait, dans le Dasein, les traits qui soulignent sa chute et sa détresse (85). Sería largo verificar esta afirmación, pero podemos darla por verdadera. Ahora bien, acaso Bultmann, al tratar de aplicar al contenido de la fe la fenomenología de Heidegger (=análisis existencial), pensaba tener como verdaderas todas y cada una de las frases de Sein und Zeit? Evidentemente, lo que se toma en la teología son las categorías generales de método, y los resultados más fundamentales de ese método.	man Page 25 in general it is simply a way in which some people-- even many people, but not all--recognize it.¹³²³ It is strange that this objection comes from Jaspers because it can have two meanings: one that is true but does not attack Bultmann, and another attacks Bultmann but is not true. The first meaning would be the following: Heidegger over-emphasizes some experiences of human existence and does not show others that complement or correct them. In particular, to use the words of Léopold Malevez: The philosophy of <i>Being and Time</i> (at least as far as Bultmann, along with many others, understood it) accentuated in Dasein the features that highlight its downfall and distress.¹³²⁴ It would take too long to verify this claim, but we could consider it to be true. But perhaps Bultmann, in trying to implement the content of faith in Heidegger's phenomenology (= existentiell analysis), thought of holding all of the phrases of <i>Being and Time</i> as true? Evidently, what are taken in theology are the broad methodological categories and the most fundamental results of this method. But nobody ever thought,
---	---

¹³²³ Karl Jaspers

¹³²⁴ Probably from *Le message chrétien et le mythe: la théologie de Rudolf Bultmann* (Translated to English as *The Christian message and myth: the theology of Rudolf Bultmann*) by Léopold Malevez (1954 in French & 1958 in English).

Pero nadie pensó jamás, ni siquiera Bultmann, en dar por dinero con tanto y sonante todo lo que dice Heidegger. Heidegger mismo no lo hubiera hecho. La fenomenología es un campo de descubrimientos, no un conjunto de proposiciones. Si Heidegger acentúa un punto indebidamente, de tal modo que “no todos se reconocen en él,” pues el mismo método de Heidegger pide que eso se corrija. Este sentido, supuesto verdadero, de la crítica de Jaspers, se revela, por ende totalmente inoperante como crítica de principio de la tentativa de Bultmann.

El otro sentido es, aparentemente por lo menos, más profundo, y puede verse en esta frase del P. Malevez en la que éste ataca la objeción de Jaspers:

Sans doute, cette protestation est bien fondée, croyons-nous (es decir, que no todos se reconocen en el análisis de la existencia heideggeriana) ; mais elle ne porte pas contre la requête d'une interprétation existentielle indéterminée (la fenomenología descrita por Heidegger, pero no la realizada por Heidegger) ; même s'il s'avère que Bultmann a fait erreur en s'appuyant, pour l'interprétation existentielle de message, sur l'analytique déterminement heideggerienne, il reste encore, après cela, à demander s'il n'est pas autorisé à exiger l'aide d'une analytique existentialiste, d'ailleurs

even Bultmann, of taking everything Heidegger says at face value. Heidegger himself would not have done that. Phenomenology is a field of discovery, not a set of propositions. If Heidegger unduly emphasizes a point, so that “not everyone recognizes himself or herself in it,” then Heidegger's same method calls for it to be corrected. This sense, of course, is true; Jaspers' criticism is revealed; therefore it is totally irrelevant as a critique of what Bultmann attempted.

The other sense is, apparently at least, deeper, and can be seen in this sentence by Léopold Malevez, in which he attacks Jaspers' objection:

Without a doubt, this objection is well founded, we believe (i.e. not everything is recognized in the analysis of Heideggerian existence), but it is not against the request for an indefinite existential interpretation (the phenomenology described by Heidegger, but not that performed by him); even if it turns out that Bultmann erred in relying, for the existential interpretation of the message, on the Heideggerian analytic. There is still, after that, a question of whether or not it was allowed to require the assistance of an existential analytic; moreover, in a universally valid principle, the conclusions of which

<u>en principe universellement valable, dont les conclusions desavoueraient le nihilisme heideggerien (87).</u> Esta última frase nos revela una confusión última que podría ser el sentido de la objeción de Jaspers: confusión entre filosofía cristiana y Teología. En realidad se espera de una filosofía el que sea “cristiana” antes de que pueda afirmarse que la teología podrá expresarse a través de ella. Por filosofía cristiana se entiende corrientemente (a pesar de las controversias teóricas) una filosofía trascendente, un sistema que vaya más allá de la experiencia, que establezca a Dios o un camino que lleve hacia él. Así por ejemplo el P. Malevez cita estas palabras de Heidegger: La pensee se tient attentive a la voix de l’etre et au-dela, aux resonances qui emanent de cette voix, et qui interpellent l’homme dans son essence, afin qu’il aprenne a experimenter l’Etre dans le neant (88). Pagina 26 Y la pregunta que se hace es clara: Maintenant, quelques interpretes (Welte, J. B. Lotz) ont paru identifier cet etre ainsi experimente avec Dieu, «le Dieu chretien de la revelation » (89). Y después de examinar esta posibilidad, el P. Malevez resume: S’il était ainsi, si le	<u>disown Heideggerian nihilism.¹³²⁵</u> This last sentence reveals a past that might be confusing the meaning of Jaspers’ objection: confusion between Christian philosophy and theology. In reality, we expect from Christian philosophy, before it can be argued that theology can be expressed in through it. Christian philosophy is commonly understood (in spite of the theoretical controversies) as a transcendental philosophy, a system that goes beyond experience, to establish God or a path leading to God. Thus, Malevez quoted these words of Heidegger: Thought stands attentive to the voice of being and beyond, the resonances which emanate from that voice, and that challenge the human in his or her essence, in order to learn to experiment with Being in nothingness.¹³²⁶ Page 26 And the question being asked is clear: Now some interpreters (Welte, JB Lotz) appeared to identify this much-experienced being with God, “the Christian God of revelation”¹³²⁷ And after examining this possibility, Malevez summarizes: If so, whether or not
--	---

¹³²⁵ Léopold Malevez

¹³²⁶ Léopold Malevez

¹³²⁷ Léopold Malevez

Dasein heideggerien <u>était susceptible de ce prolongement vers l'authentique transcendance</u>, en ce cas, la philosophie de Heidegger nous préparerait aussi bien a la christologie traditionnelle qu'a la revelation du vrai Dieu (90). Ahí está precisamente la confusión. La fenomenología de Heidegger es tan nihilista como una geometría. Y toda fenomenología del mismo tipo lo será, por más que no acentúe exageradamente la parte de caída de la condición humana. Se comprende mal la fenomenología cuando se espera de ella una “prolongación” hacia la trascendencia. A priori ya se puede saber que ella no dirá nada ni en pro ni en contra de Dios, ni en pro ni en contra de la existencia del pecado original, ni en pro ni en contra de la existencia en el más allá (91). Qué se puede deducir de allí? Que la fenomenología no es un “sistema de filosofía cristiana”? Pues claro está que no"! Como tampoco las matemáticas ni la geografía. La fenomenología puede entrar en un sistema filosófico cristiano, o en un sistema filosófico materialista. Pero no “prepara” ni a la una ni a la otra, ni a otra alguna posición filosófica (92). Podríamos transcribir otra vez los textos de Heidegger, pero preferimos enviar al lector al primer párrafo que consistía en la descripción del método fenomenológico heideggeriano (93). Así pues, hemos de concluir que el pretendido nihilismo de Heidegger, o bien es un efecto de	Heidegger's <u>Dasein was capable of such extension to authentic transcendence</u>, in this case, Heidegger's philosophy would prepare for us both the traditional Christology and the revelation of the true God.¹³²⁸ That is precisely the confusion. Heidegger's phenomenology is as nihilistic as geometry. And all phenomenology of similar types will be so, as long as they do not overly exaggerate the part of the fall in the human condition. Phenomenology is poorly understood when an “extension” to the transcendent is expected from it. It is already a priori knowledge that it cannot say anything either for or against God, nor for nor against the existence of original sin, and neither for nor against the existence in the afterlife.¹³²⁹ What can be deduced from this? That phenomenology is not a “system of Christian philosophy”? Well of course not! Neither are math or geography. Phenomenology can enter a Christian philosophical system or a materialist philosophical system. But it does not “prepare” for one or the other, or any other philosophical position.¹³³⁰ We could again transcribe others of Heidegger's texts, but I prefer to send the reader to the first paragraph that was the description of Heidegger's phenomenological method.¹³³¹ Thus, we conclude that the alleged nihilism of Heidegger either is an effect of accidentally “accentuating”
--	--

¹³²⁸ Léopold Malevez

¹³²⁹ Unknown

¹³³⁰ Unknown

¹³³¹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 59.

“acentuación” accidental de cierto aspecto de la experiencia, y que habría que corregir dentro de las perspectivas mismas de su método; o bien no es más que la apariencia engañadora que pretende hacer de la fenomenología un sistema cerrado de verdad filosófica, lo que es, al mismo tiempo, contrario a la lógica y a la historia. Podemos, pues, concluir este párrafo. En resumen, hemos tratado de mostrar cómo la fenomenología es aplicable a la teología, no sólo en cuanto exégesis histórica de la tradición dogmática (objeto del párrafo anterior), sino en cuanto ontología fundamental, ya que el contenido de la fe, en cuanto comunicación de la verdad sobrenatural, se nos da en relación con nuestra existencia natural. La fenomenología filosófica, ocupándose de la existencia humana natural, forma así el fundamento de la comprensión del mensaje revelado. Es, pues, fundamento de su verdad en cuanto “alétheia,” en cuanto transmisión efectiva, no al fundamento de su verdad substancial y objetiva, que es Dios mismo en cuanto se revela. IV Pasamos ahora al último punto que nos habíamos propuesto tocar, cuando dividimos prácticamente la teología dogmática de su fuente, es decir de la Revelación misma, tal como se nos manifiesta en la Escritura principalmente. Porque, en efecto, desde el punto de vista práctico, tanto en la Escritura, como en muchos de los escritos espirituales de la Tradición patristica, no encontramos la intención de formular, de la manera más universal posible, una verdad dogmática. La formulación de la verdad propia de la Escritura, por ejemplo, es mucho más	a certain aspect of experience, and which should be corrected within the same perspectives as his method. Or, it is simply a misleading appearance that seeks to make phenomenology a closed system of philosophical truth, which is, at the same time, contrary to logic and history. We can therefore conclude this section. In summary, I have tried to show how phenomenology applies to theology, not only as historical exegesis of the dogmatic tradition (the subject of the preceding paragraph), but as fundamental ontology, since the contents of faith, as communication of the supernatural truth, comes to us in relationship to our natural existence. Philosophical phenomenology, addressing human existence, thus naturally forms the basis for understanding the revealed message. It is, therefore, the basis of its truth as <i>alétheia</i>, as an effective transmission, not the foundation of its substantial and objective truth, which is God himself as revealed. IV We turn now to the last point that we had proposed to address when we practically divided dogmatic theology from its source, i.e. from Revelation itself, as revealed to us primarily in Scripture. Because, in fact, from a practical point of view, both in Scripture and in many of the spiritual writings of the patristic tradition, we find no intent to formulate, in as universal a way as possible, a dogmatic truth. The formulation of the truth of Scripture itself, for example, is much more detailed and specific, more rooted in the relativity Page 27 of time and human space.
--	---

circunstanciada y concreta, más enraizada en la relatividad del **Página 27** tiempo y del espacio humanos.

Evidentemente, todo lo que hemos dicho hasta aquí se aplica a este nuevo campo, en la medida en que se trata igualmente de la posición del hombre frente a la verdad sobrenatural que se le entrega en el habla histórica. Pero el problema de la Escritura, de su inspiración y de su inerrancia presenta características suficientemente especiales como para justificar un párrafo aparte.

El principio general en esta materia, nos parece ser el siguiente: “El ‘terminus ad quem’ de la Revelación es el mismo que el de la Inspiración”.

El “terminus ad quem” de la Revelación no es otro que la comunidad de la fe. Desde este punto de vista es quizás interesante notar cómo el “Logos” de San Juan, no es una palabra, una doctrina en el aire, sin término correlativo. El Logos es palabra en diálogo, en un sentido fundamental: palabra que se dirige a los hombres, que debe ser recibida en el “auditus” de la fe. Todo el Prólogo de San Juan no es más que un ir y venir entre lo que la Palabra es en sí misma y su recepción de la parte de aquellos a quienes se dirige. Y ese Logos es Revelación, al mismo tiempo que persona.

Por eso la Revelación no puede concebirse como dirigida primeramente al escritor, sino como dirigida a la comunidad de los que ya creen o han de creer, a la comunidad de la fe. La fe es el término correlativo de la Revelación, y no directamente la Escritura.

Ahora bien, la Inspiración, decíamos, sigue a la Revelación, es la misma revelación considerada en su fieri, en su modo de realizarse. En la

Obviously, everything we have said so far applies to this new field, to the extent that it is also the human position with regard to the supernatural truth that is given in historic speech. But the problem of Scripture, its inspiration and inerrancy, presents enough special features to warrant a separate section.

The general principle in this matter, to me, seems to be the following: “The *terminus ad quem* [Latin: *goal* or *finishing point*] of Revelation is the same as Inspiration”.

The *terminus ad quem* of Revelation is none other than the community of faith. From this point of view, it is perhaps interesting to note how the “Logos” of St. John is not a word, a doctrine in the air without a corresponding term. The Logos is a word in dialogue, in a fundamental sense: A word that is addressed to humanity, which must be received in the *auditus* [Lat. hearing, listening] of faith. The entire Prologue of St. John is no more than a back and forth between the Word in itself and its reception on the part of those to whom it is addressed. And that Logos is Revelation and, at the same time, a person.

Therefore, Revelation cannot be conceived as primarily directed to the writer, but also directed to the community of those who already believe or will believe, the community of faith. Faith is the correlative term of Revelation, and it is not directly Scripture.

Inspiration, as we said, follows Revelation. Revelation is considered in *su fieri* [Latin *to become*] in the way it is carried out. In St. Paul’s first letter

primera carta de San Pablo a los Tesalonicenses, se nos describe ese inspiración fundamental, que es la penetración de la verdad en el alma de los creyentes: “en *dynamei*, kai en *pneumati agio*, kai en *pleroforia polle*” (1,5).

De esa comunidad así “inspirada,” brota la fe que luego, a través del escritor sagrado, tomará forma escrita. La Revelación pasa, por la inspiración, de la comunidad a aquel de sus representantes que tiene además, el carisma de la expresión. Pero ello no quita que el término primero, inmediato y fundamental de la Revelación como de la inspiración sea la comunidad de la fe.

Sólo los que vienen después, los que toman contacto no con la comunidad misma, sino con los monumentos que ella dejó, creen estar en presencia de los factores que han formado a la comunidad, surgidos aquí y allí sin más causa que el arbitrio divino, siendo así que es lo contrario. Los Evangelios, por ejemplo, que nosotros tomamos cándidamente, desde nuestra ignorancia histórica, como el factor que formara a la comunidad cristiana primitiva, han sido, por el contrario, formados por ella.

Todo esto se halla perfectamente bien formulado en unas frases del P. Benoit O.P. que me permito citar extensamente:

L’inspiration est un charisme très riche et de portée analogique...L’inspiration scripturaire est un cas particulier de ce charisme et ce n’est pas le plus élevé. A côté d’ell, et sans doute au-dessus d’elle, il y a l’inspiration

to the Thessalonians, he describes to us this fundamental inspiration, which is the penetration of truth in the soul of believers: “*en dynamei*, kai en *pneumati agio*, kai en *pleroforia polle*” In power and in the Holy Spirit and with full conviction” (1:5).

From that “inspired” community, faith flows through the sacred writer and takes a written form. Revelation happens through the inspiration of the community to that of their representatives, who also have a charismatic expression. But this does not affect the first, immediate, and fundamental terms of Revelation as in the inspiration of the community of faith.

Only those who come after, those who made contact not with the community itself, but with the monuments it left, believe they are in the presence of the factors that shaped the community, emerging here and there with no more than a divine judgment, although that is the opposite. For example, we take the Gospels candidly from our historical ignorance as a factor of the formation of the early Christian community, and were, in contrast, formed by it.

All this is perfectly expressed in a quote from Fr. Benoit O.P. that I cite at length:

Inspiration is very rich and analogical charisma... Scriptural inspiration is a special case of this charisma and this is not the highest. Beside it, and probably above it, there is prophetic inspiration, apostolic inspiration, etc. charismas that were

prophetique, l'inspiration apostolique etc., charismes qui n'étaient pas <u>directement</u> ordonnées à ce résultat final qu'est la mise par écrit de la Revelation, mais bien plutôt au <u>jaillissement</u> <u>même de cette</u> révélation dans toute la richesse de sa première formulation orale et à son développement multiforme dans la communauté vivante choisie par Dieu pour <u>recevoir, élaborer et</u> <u>transmettre la Parole.</u> Action de l'Esprit infiniment souple et variée dans tout un milieu humain où il opère, d'abord dans <u>le</u> <u>peuple de l'Ancien</u> <u>Testament</u>, puis de <u>la</u> <u>Communauté</u> <u>Apostolique</u> que est <u>Página 28</u> l'Eglise naissante ; action qui, pour s'exercer surtout par certaines personnalités plus saillantes telles que les Prophètes et les Apôtres, n'est pas moins à l'œuvre dans les nombreux anonymes qui concourent de façons diverses à concevoir et formuler le message...En fin, on osera peut-être parler d'une <u>continuation de</u> <u>l'inspiration</u> dans l'Eglise. De même que l'Esprit agissait dans	not <u>directly</u> bearing on this final result that is putting the Revelation in writing, but rather the <u>outpouring of that</u> <u>same</u> revelation in all its rich first oral formulation and its multifaceted development living in the community chosen by God to <u>receive,</u> <u>prepare and transmit</u> the Word. The action of the Spirit is infinitely flexible and varied across the entire human environment where it operates, first <u>in the</u> <u>people of the Old</u> <u>Testament</u> and then the Apostolic Community Church that is Page 28 emerging; this action, especially to be practiced by some more prominent personalities such as the Prophets and the Apostle, is no less at work in the many anonymous individuals who contribute in different ways to design and formulate the message...In the end, we dare perhaps to speak of a <u>continuation of</u> <u>inspiration</u> in the Church. Just as the Spirit acted in the ancient people chosen by a sort of collective inspiration, so it provided its action in the new Israel.¹³³²
---	---

¹³³² Benoit.

l'ancien peuple élu par une sorte d'inspiration collective, de même il fournit son action dans le nouvel Israël (94). La inerrancia que es la consecuencia inmediata de la inspiración, sigue el mismo camino. Es, ante todo, una cualidad querida por Dios para la comunidad, es una cualidad que la comunidad de la fe debe tener. Es un don de Dios a ella. El Cuerpo Místico de Cristo no se ilumina con la verdad de Cristo por partes que se pasan sucesivamente la luz unas a otras, empezando por las de más elevada jerarquía. Todo el cuerpo unánimemente, primeramente, inmediatamente es iluminado por la verdad que es su vida. No hay varias infalibilidades, una de las cuales pertenece a la Iglesia discente y otra a la docente. Primeramente, inmediatamente, está <u>la</u> Iglesia infalible, que es toda la Iglesia que vive de Cristo y, por lo tanto, de la Verdad. La medida en que diversos elementos que componen la Iglesia participan de esa infalibilidad, es la medida en que pueden de una manera real, "ontológica," <u>representar</u> la Iglesia. O sea en la medida en que están unidos más o menos indefectiblemente a esa fe viviente en la comunidad. Así el Sumo Pontífice, que representa por un carisma especial de Dios, la Iglesia toda entera, tiene por sí mismo toda su infalibilidad. Pero esa infalibilidad no hay que concebirla como una especie de ciencia especial por la cual él sabe más que los cristianos lo que hay que creer, sino porque tiene una gracia especial de <u>estar de acuerdo</u> con lo que todos los cristianos creen, es decir de estar de acuerdo con la Verdad que es la vida misma de la Iglesia total. Los cristianos, en el sentido más	Inerrancy, which is the direct result of inspiration, follows the same path. It is, above all, a quality desired by God for the community. It is a quality that the community of faith should have. It is God's gift to the community of faith. The Mystical Body of Christ is not illuminated with the truth of Christ in parts that successively pass the for light from one part to another, beginning with those of higher rank. First, the whole body is unanimously and immediately illuminated by the truth that is its life. There are not various infallibilities, one of which belongs to the Church learner and another to a teacher. First, immediately, it is <u>the</u> infallible Church, which is the whole living Church of Christ and, therefore, of truth. The extent to which various elements of the Church share in that infallibility is the extent to which they can in a real way, "ontologically," <u>represent</u> the Church. So, to that extent, they are united more or less inevitably to that faith living in the community. Thus, the Pope, who represents the whole Church by a special Charism of God, has his own infallibility. But this infallibility should not be viewed as a special kind of science by which he knows what to believe more than the Christians, but rather because he has a special grace to <u>agree</u> with what all Christians believe, to agree with the Truth that is the very life of the whole Church. Christians, in the most fundamental sense of the term, are not infallible because they think the same as the Pope, but he is infallible
---	---

fundamental de la expresión, no son infalibles porque piensan lo mismo que el Papa, sino que éste es infalible porque necesariamente piensa lo que todos los cristianos piensan. Cada cristiano no es infalible porque puede separarse de esa verdad que es la vida de la Iglesia. El Papa, en cambio, no lo puede, como Cristo mismo no lo puede. Cada obispo lo puede, porque aunque representa “ontológicamente” una parte de la Iglesia, no la representa toda. Pero todos los obispos, reunidos en Concilio, son infalibles de la infalibilidad de la Iglesia total que representan entonces totalmente.

Lo mismo ocurre en la tradición. No se trata de que ciertas personas, llamada Santos Padres hayan tenido una luz especial, una ciencia superlativa o milagrosa. Su infalibilidad no es otra que la representación real que tienen de la Iglesia total en una época cualquiera.

Pensemos ahora en el pueblos elegido, en el Israel del Antiguo Testamento. Esos pueblos, desde que aparece frente a nosotros a través de la páginas de la Escritura, es poseedor de una fe: Yahvé único Dios salvador y absoluto legislador moral.

Esta fe, desde el punto de vista de la verdad, encuentra su expresión en una escena del Exodo (34, 7). Yahvé mismo se presenta en una teofanía Moisés sobre el Sinaí, y una voz, que no se sabe bien si pertenece a Yahvé o a Moisés (poco importa, por otro lado en cuanto a la autoridad de su contenido) grita:

Yahvé, Yahvé! Dios misericordioso y compasivo, lento en encolerizarse, rico en bondad y en fidelidad, que conserva su gracia durante mil generaciones, que

because he necessarily thinks like all Christians think. Every Christian is not infallible because they can be separated from that truth that is the life of the Church. The Pope, however, cannot, like Christ himself cannot. Each bishop can, because although he represents “ontologically” part of the Church, he does not represent the whole Church. But all the bishops gathered in Council, are infallible with the infallibility of the whole Church which they then fully represent.

The same is true for tradition. It is not that some people called Holy Fathers have a special light, a superlative or miraculous science. Their infallibility is nothing other than the actual representation they have of the whole Church at any time.

Consider now the chosen people in Old Testament Israel. The people, appearing to us through the pages of Scripture, possess one faith: Yahweh only saving God and absolute moral law.

This faith, from the standpoint of the truth, finds its expression in a scene from Exodus 34:7. Yahweh appears in a theophany to Moses on Sinai, and a voice, it is not known whether it belongs to Yahweh or Moses (it's of little importance, on the other hand, regarding the authority of its content) screams:

Yahweh, Yahweh, a merciful and gracious God, slow to anger, abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast grace for the thousandth generation, forgiving

perdona la iniquidad, la rebelión y el pecado; pero que no los deja sin castigo, visitando la iniquidad de los padres en los hijos y en los hijos de los hijos hasta la tercera y la cuarta generación. **Página 29**

Vemos en ese texto, aplicadas a Yahvé, las dos grandes cualidades o atributos que San Juan dará a la Palabra de Dios, al Verbo que es al mismo tiempo Persona y Revelación: “lleno de gracia y de verdad”. En efecto, la “fidelidad” que aparece en nuestra traducción del hebreo, es para los Setenta, sinónimo de “verdad” (*alethinos*) o mejor aún de “veracidad”. Y esta traducción de los Setenta, en cuanto atesta una interpretación de la fe más aún que como traducción exacta desde el punto de vista filológico, tiene una gran importancia. Elle nos muestra cómo esa “fidelidad” de Yahvé en salvar, viene a significar también una salvación del error, una conducción por la verdad hacia la verdad. No se trata ciertamente de una verdad o de un error abstracto. Pero se trata, como en el texto estudiando del Nuevo Testamento, de la cualidad de la palabra de Yahvé por la cual merece que se confíe en El, que se tenga fe en lo que El dice.

Y es de notar, en segundo término, cómo esa veracidad no se concibe como el fruto de un magisterio especial, algo así como una clase en que Yahvé dicta su doctrina. La misma providencia que Yahvé tiene de su pueblo, es su verdad. El pueblo de Yahvé, conducido por Yahvé, y en cuanto se deja conducir por Él, está en la verdad. Por eso fidelidad, justicia, verdad son sinónimos en el Antiguo

iniquity and transgression and sin; but not leaving them unpunished, but visiting the iniquity of the parents upon their children and the children's children unto the third and fourth generation. **Page 29**

We see in this text, when applied to Yahweh, the two main qualities or attributes that St. John gives God's Word, the Word who is both a Person and Revelation: “full of grace and truth”. In fact, the “fidelity,” in my translation of the Hebrew, is for the Seventy, a synonym for “truth” (*alethinos*), or better yet “truthfulness”. And this translation of the Septuagint, as attested by an interpretation of the faith even more than as an exact translation from the philological point of view, is very important. It shows us how this “loyalty” of Yahweh to save, will also mean a saving from error, directing from the truth to truth. It is certainly not an abstract truth or error. But this is, as in studying the text of the New Testament, the quality of the word of Yahweh by which trust in Him is deserved; one can have faith in what He says.

And note, secondly, how that truthfulness is not conceived as the result of special instruction, something like a class in which the Lord dictates his doctrine. The same Providence that Yahweh has for his people, is his truth. The people of Yahweh, led by the Lord, and as far as they allow themselves to be led by him, are in truth. That's why loyalty, justice and truth are synonymous in

Testamento. Se trata siempre de la conducción del pueblo escogido a través de la historia por Yahvé. La historia misma es el vehículo de su verdad.

Y así vemos, por lo tanto, cómo para el Antiguo Testamento, lo mismo que para el Nuevo, Revelación, inspiración e inerrancia van juntas, de Dios a la comunidad de la fe, y de ella a los escritores y a los escritos que dan testimonio de esa fe. La inspiración no es una actividad esporádica de Dios que ilumina aquí y allí a un hombre para hacerle decir una verdad. Es un movimiento, un camino, una educación que Dios da a su pueblo, y cuyas etapas quedan fijas por escrito en los libros “inspirados,” testimonios de esa fe. La verdad revelada es inmutable y absoluta, porque Dios es “fiel,” es decir, “veraz”; pero esa verdad se trasmite y llega hasta nosotros dentro de una evolución histórica, la revelación progresiva del Antiguo Testamento a la Comunidad de Israel, y la Revelación definitiva, pero no menos progresiva en su manifestación, hecha a la Comunidad cristiana.

V

Estamos pues en presencia de todos los elementos que nos permitirán sacar las últimas conclusiones. Estas conclusiones podrían resumirse como sigue.

La Escritura toda entera es un habla, destinada a la fe, cuya verdad absoluta está garantida por Dios. En este sentido, ella es totalmente verdadera, en sus detalles como en sus grandes líneas, cualquiera que sea el tema que trate, porque toda ella está destinada a la fe. Imposible dividir en ella lo esencial como verdadero y lo accidental como indiferente. Toda la Biblia es el testimonio de la fe, y esa fe es verdad, y verdad absoluta.

the Old Testament. It is still a matter of Yahweh leading the chosen people throughout history. History itself is the vehicle of truth.

And so we see, therefore, how in the Old Testament, as in the New, Revelation, inspiration and inerrancy go together, from God to the community of faith, and from it to the writers and writings that bear witness to that faith. Inspiration is not a sporadic activity of God that illuminates humanity here and there to make them tell the truth. It is a movement, a journey, an education that God gives to his people and the stages of which are written in “inspired” books as a testimony of that faith. The revealed truth is absolute and unchangeable because God is “faithful;” i.e., “truthful,” but that truth is transmitted and reaches us in a historical development, the progressive revelation of the Old Testament to the Community of Israel, and the final Revelation, but no less progressive in its expressions made to the Christian community.

V

We are therefore in the presence of all the elements that will allow us to draw the final conclusions. These conclusions could be summarized as follows.

The Scripture in its entirety is speech, destined to faith, whose absolute truth is guaranteed by God. In this sense, it is absolutely true in its details and in broad lines, whatever the subject matter, because it is all destined for faith. It is impossible to divide the essential as true and the accidental as indifferent. The entire Bible is the witness of faith and that faith is truth, absolute truth.

Pero el problema se propone cuando se habla de la verdad de una cualquiera de sus partes, tomada separadamente. Es verdad, por ejemplo, que “non est Deus”? Es verdad que “...nec mortui laudant Te”?... Para solucionar este problema no basta decir que hay que poner la frase en su contexto, porque una vez que lo hemos hecho con la segunda, v. gr., descubrimos que, efectivamente, los judíos, hasta el fin del A.T. no creían en una supervivencia verdaderamente tal. Qué debemos concluir entonces?

Lo que dijimos en los párrafos anteriores nos permitirá solucionar uno de los aspectos de este problema. **Página 30** La verdad, decíamos, de un mensaje, no se nos presenta en su estado absoluto, sino a través de un habla. Se nos presenta, pues, como “fenómeno,” es decir, como aquello que está normalmente oculto en lo que debía revelarlo. La Revelación es un fenómeno en el habla. Ahora bien, cuando se trata de desprender ese fenómeno, ese mensaje, del habla, uno se da cuenta de que los dos elementos están tan íntimamente trabados que es prácticamente posible el separarlos. Toda habla, en efecto, es un contacto con una persona o con una comunidad viva, individual. El que esa persona comprenda el mensaje en su verdad, no depende solamente de la verdad del mensaje, sino de una comunidad personal previa que se establece por los mismos medios con que se expresa el mensaje, es decir, por medio de frases, juicios y afirmaciones. Así por ejemplo, un mensaje puede estar concebido en esta forma: “El sol marcha rápido desde un punto al otro del horizonte. De la misma manera será rápida la vida del pecador”. Desde el punto de vista gramatical, nada permite atribuirle la verdad a una de las frases en detrimento de la otra. Las

But the problem is suggested when speaking of the truth of any of its parts, taken separately. Is it true, for example, *non est Deus* [*there is no God*]? Is it true that *...nec mortui laudant Te* [*...and not dead laudable You*]? To solve this problem it is not enough to say that we should put the phrase in context, because once we have done that with the second, v. gr. we discovered that, indeed, the Jews, until the end of the OT did not believe in true survival as such. What shall we conclude then?

What we said in the previous sections allows me to solve one aspect of this problem. **Page 30** The truth, I said, of a message, is not presented to us in its absolute state, but through speech. It is presented to us as a “phenomenon;” that is, as what is normally hidden in what should disclose it. Revelation is a phenomenon in speech. Well now, when it comes to releasing this phenomenon, this message or speech, one realizes that the two elements are so intimately linked that it is practically impossible to separate them. All speech is, in fact, individual contact with a person or a living community. What the person understands of the message in its truth is not only dependent on the truth of the message, but a previous personal community that is established by the same means used to express the message, i.e., by phrases, sentences and statements. For example, a message can be conceived in this way: “The sun goes rapidly from one point to another on the horizon. In the same way, a sinner’s life will be fast”. From the grammatical point of view, there is nothing to attribute truth to one of the sentences in detriment to the other. The two are equivalent. The message,

dos se equivalen. El mensaje, por otro lado, es totalmente verdadero. Pero si tomamos la primera de las afirmaciones <u>por sí misma</u>, la afirmación es falsa. No se diga que hay que poner la frase en su contexto, porque ello puede significar dos cosas: o bien que las otras frases no hacen ver que la hemos entendido mal, o bien que esa frase sólo es verdadera según el uso que de ella se haga y para qué se la emplee. Lo primero no es cierto, porque la segunda frase no explica la primera, sino que es totalmente independiente, y la verdad de la primera tiene por lo tanto que estar contenida en sus mismos términos. Lo segundo es también erróneo, porque ello implicaría un puro relativismo: lo que sirve para probar o explicar la verdad es verdadero. No basta tampoco con decir que el género literario hace de una cosa falsa científicamente una cosa verdadera literariamente. Es cierto que el género literario empleado no es el científico, pero ello no hace la frase verdadera. Por otra parte, ningún género literario puede impedir la certidumbre de que los judíos no creían en una recompensa ultraterrena... La explicación, desde el punto de vista filosófico, es, que un habla, como ya lo hemos mostrado, consta de dos verdades: una la verdad que llamaríamos “<i>quae</i>,” y otra “<i>qua</i>”. Una que se identifica con el mensaje mismo; otra que se identifica con esa comunidad previa que es condición <i>sine que non</i> para la transmisión del mensaje. Las dos verdades se expresan por los mismos medios: frases, juicios, afirmaciones. Así, de las dos frases citadas anteriormente, la primera tiene una verdad funcional, una verdad de habla, mientras que la segunda tiene la verdad transmitida, el	on the other hand, is absolutely true. But if we take the first of the assertions <u>by itself</u>, the assertion is false. Do not say you must put the phrase in context, because it can mean two things: either that the other phrases do not make us see that we have misunderstood, or that the phrase is true just in the way it is used and how it is used. The first thing is not true, because the second does not explain the first sentence, but it is totally independent, and the truth of the first has therefore to be contained in its own terms. The second is also wrong, because it would imply a pure relativism: it serves to prove or explain that truth is true. Nor is it enough to say that a literary genre makes of a scientifically false thing one that is literally true. It is certain that the literary genre employed is not scientific, but this does not make the sentence true. Moreover, no literary genre may prevent the Jews’ certainty in not believing in an afterlife... The explanation, from a philosophical point of view, is that speech, as we have shown, consists of two truths: one is the truth we would call <i>quae</i> and the other is <i>qua</i>. One that identifies with the message itself; one that identifies with the previous community that is a <i>sine qua non</i> for the transmission of the message. The two truths are expressed by the same means: phrases, sentences, assertions. Thus, in the two sentences above, the former has a functional truth, a truth-speaking, while the second has the truth conveyed by the message. The first is false, because there is no
--	---

mensaje. La primera no es falsa, porque no se da preciamamente como mensaje, porque no se presenta como adecuación con la realidad, sino como adecuación entre dos individuos que se hablan. Así, es imposible desprender la verdad, el mensaje, por el solo hecho de poner a un lado los juicios y afirmaciones, y en otro montón todo lo que es adorno, afectos y otras cosas semejantes. Pero ello no significa que no nos sea posible desprender el mensaje absoluto de su envoltura relativa, a condición de conocer al oyente y su pregunta. Por el conocimiento de lo que es el oyente, yo puedo comprender lo que no es mensaje en el habla, lo que es simplemente elección de un medio de comunicación vital con él. Conociendo su <u>pregunta</u>, yo puedo comprender cuál es precisamente el mensaje que viene a solucionarla, y separar ese mensaje de todo lo demás que no responde a esa pregunta. Esto nos lleva a la conclusión siguiente: cuanto mejor conozco yo el pasado y el presente del interlocutor, tanto mejor puedo comprender el contenido del mensaje que se le hace. Si ese conocimiento llegara a la identificación, y comprendería como él, es decir de la mejor Página 31 manera posible. En el caso de la Escritura, desprender el contenido de la Revelación de su forma relativa, sólo es posible por un conocimiento del presente y del pasado de esa comunidad que recibe el mensaje. Ello equivale prácticamente a decir que ninguna frase o afirmación, por más universal y clara que parezca se ha de identificar sin más con el mensaje, sino en la medida en que toda la Escritura anterior desemboca en ella, en la medida en que un desarrollo	precision in the message, because it is presented as an adaptation to reality, but as a match between two individuals who speak to each other. Thus, it is impossible to detach the truth, the message, by the mere act of putting aside judgments and claims, and make another pile of all that is ornamental, affectionate, and so forth. But that does not mean that we can remove an absolute message from it relative packaging, a condition of knowing the listener and his question. For the knowledge of what the listener is, I can understand what is not a message in speech, which is simply choosing a vital means of communication with it. Knowing its <u>question</u>, I can understand what exactly is the message that comes as the solution, and separate that message from anything else that does not answer that question. This leads to the following conclusion: the better I know the past and present of the interlocutor, the better I can understand the content of his or her message. If this knowledge were to be identified and understood as itself; i.e. the Page 31 best way possible. In the case of Scripture, releasing the contents of Revelation from its relative form, it is only possible by understanding the present and past of the community that receives the message. This is practically equivalent to saying that almost any phrase or statement, however universal and clear it appears, only has to identify with the message, to the extent that all previous Scripture leads to it. This applies to the extent that a
--	--

homogéneo de la comunidad de la fe atraviesa esa frase y la certifica. Ello es ya evidente en el plano natural e histórico. Pero supongamos ahora que tenemos--sobrenaturalmente--la garantía de que el futuro continúa ese desarrollo homogéneo. De que el futuro no es una desviación, ni una interrupción de esa corriente, sino su auténtica continuación. Por el mismo hecho, también el futuro, y sobre todo él, nos permitirá distinguir entre el mensaje absoluto y su forma relativa. Evidentemente, si el futuro es homogéneo en cuanto al mensaje, lo que no pasa a él, lo que no se incorpora en él, no es más que forma, que necesidad de expresión, envoltura relativa del mensaje (aunque gramaticalmente sea tan afirmación como las fórmulas más abstractas del mensaje mismo, y aunque, desde el punto de vista de la extensión, sea una frase, diez frase o un capítulo...) Así, si tomamos todo el conjunto del A.T. o del Nuevo, podemos sostener estas cuatro proposiciones en cuanto a su exégesis: a) <u>toda frase, afirmación, juicio, forma parte de un mensaje totalmente verdadero, da testimonio de una verdad inmutable y absoluta.</u> b) <u>ninguna frase, afirmación o juicio, tomado a parte del conjunto, pasado, presente y futuro de esa revelación homogénea en su desarrollo histórico</u> esta identificación sólo es posible teniendo en cuenta - c)	homogeneous development of the community of faith crosses this phrase and certifies it. This is already evident in the natural and historical plan. But suppose now that we have--supernaturally--the guarantee that the future continues developing uniformly. This is not a deviation of the future, or an interruption of the flow, but it is an authentic continuation. By the same fact, also the future, and especially it, will allow us to distinguish between the absolute message and its relative form. Clearly, if the future is homogeneous in terms of the message, what does not happen to it or is not incorporated into it, is nothing other than form, just a need for expression, a surrounding for the message (although grammatically it is as much an assertion as the more abstract formulas of the message itself, although, from the standpoint of extension, is a word, ten words or a chapter ...) Thus, if we take the whole of the O.T. or the New, we can sustain these four propositions as to its exegesis: a) <u>Any sentence, statement, or opinion is part of an entirely true message bears witness to an immutable and absolute truth.</u> b) <u>No sentence, statement or opinion made aside from the whole, past, present and future of this homogenous revelation in its historical development</u> c) This identification is only possible taking into account all <u>past, present</u>
---	---

d) todo el <u>pasado</u>, <u>presente y futuro</u> de esa revelación homogénea en su desarrollo histórico esto explica cómo <u>la mere escritura, sin la tradición</u> que continúa desde el <u>interior</u> esa evolución homogénea del mensaje, no podría constituir ningún criterio capaz de hacernos reconocer la verdad absoluta en nuestro presente Si insistimos al hablar de un desarrollo <u>homogéneo</u> de la comunidad de la fe, ello se debe al hecho de que, como ya lo hemos mostrado, esa comunidad viviente de la fe va, a medida que el tiempo avanza, tomando, bajo la conducción divina, una conciencia cada vez más profunda de lo que hay de implícito en su fe. Así puede decirse que todo el Antiguo Testamento está implícito en la primera página de la Biblia, como todo el Nuevo está implícito en la primera página del Evangelio. Saber que Dios es uno, salvador y legislador absoluto, llevará al pueblo de Israel a la creencia en la vida futura, en la providencia universal, en el mesianismo escatológico. Saber que Jesús es el Cristo, Verbo de Dios y Redentor de los hombres, que ha enviado a su Espíritu para dar vida a su Iglesia, es tener el germen del que todas las verdades cristianas son una explicitación. Pero, en cambio, no se puede decir que el Nuevo Testamento sea una pura y simple continuación homogénea del Antiguo. Es, ciertamente, en muchos aspectos su continuación, pero entre los dos existe un hecho histórico, un acontecimiento	and <u>future</u> of that homogenous revelation in its historical development d) This explains how <u>mere writing, without the tradition</u> that continues this homogenous evolution of the message from <u>within</u>, could not establish any criteria that can make us acknowledge the truth in our present If we insist on speaking of a <u>homogeneous</u> development of the community of faith, this is due to the fact that, as we have shown, the living community of faith is, as time goes on, taking under God's guidance an ever deepening awareness of what is implicit in their faith. So we can say that the entire Old Testament is implicit in the first page of the Bible, as the entire New Testament is implicit in the first page of the Gospel. Knowing that God is one, absolute savior and legislator, will lead the people of Israel to belief in future life, in the universal order, in the eschatological Messianism. Knowing that Jesus is the Christ, the Word of God and Redeemer of humankind, who has sent his Spirit to give life to his Church, is to have the germ of all Christian truths in one explanation. But instead, we cannot say that the New Testament is a pure and simple homogenous continuation of the Old. It is, certainly, in many aspects its continuation, but between the two is a historical fact, a divine event that is introduced historically in
---	--

divino que se introduce históricamente en nuestro tiempo y que hace en él un corte vertical. Por eso tenemos que decir que la Revelación no se termina con el Antiguo Testamento, no porque vengan después otros libros inspirados, sino porque los libros inspirados que siguen al Antiguo Testamento dependen de un hecho que no es la pura y simple explicitación de la Revelación hecha a Israel. Y cuando decimos que la Revelación se termina con Cristo, queremos decir que todo el desarrollo ulterior de la Iglesia en el Página 32 conocimiento de la verdad revelada, se hará por explicitación, por desarrollo homogéneo, sin que ningún otro hecho divino venga a interrumpir y a inaugurar una nueva época, un nuevo plan de conocimiento de la verdad absoluta. El Nuevo Testamento es la Alianza Nueva y definitiva, en la verdad como en todo lo demás. Al decir que el depósito de la Revelación se cierra con los testigos que presenciaron la vida, muerte y resurrección de Cristo, no se quiere establecer un abismo entre la edad apostólica y la siguiente, sino una diferencia con respecto al Antiguo Testamento, a la Antigua Alianza, cuyo destino era preparar el acontecimiento. La Alianza definitiva no prepara nada: ella es el coronamiento, la consagración en la verdad.	our time and it makes a vertical cut in it. So we have to say that Revelation does not end with the Old Testament, not because other inspired books came after, but because the inspired books that follow the Old Testament still depend on a fact that is not a pure and simple explanation of the revelation made to Israel. And when we say that Revelation ends with Christ, we mean that any further development of the Church in the knowledge Page 32 of revealed truth shall be made explicit, for homogenous development without any divine fact coming to interrupt and inaugurate a new era, a new plan of knowledge of absolute truth. The New Testament is the New and final Covenant, in the truth as in everything else. Saying that the deposit of Revelation ends with eyewitnesses to the life, death and resurrection of Christ is not to establish a gap between one apostolic age and the next, but a difference from the Old Testament, the Old Covenant, whose destiny was to prepare for the event. The final Covenant does not prepare anything definitive: it is the coronation, the consecration in truth.
--	--

Works Cited

- Adrianne, Madeleine. "The Paradox of Institutionalization: The Roman Catholic Church in Chile and Brazil". *Sociological Analysis* 53 (1992): S51-S62.
- Aguilar, Mario I. *Theology, Liberation and Genocide, A Theology of the Periphery*. Reclaiming Liberation Theology. edited by Marcella Althaus-Reid and Ivan Petrella London: SCM Press, 2009.
- Akhilananda, Swami. "Existentialism". *Journal of Bible and Religion* 17, no. 4 (Oct. 1949 1949): 236-239.
- Althaus-Reid, Marcella. *Indecent Theology: Theological Perversions in Sex, Gender, and Politics*. Oxford: Routledge, 2000.
- Althaus-Reid, Marcella, ed. *Liberation Theology and Sexuality*, Reclaiming Liberation Theology. London: SCM Press, 2009.
- Altmann, Walter. "Liberation theology is alive and well". World Council of Churches, <http://www.oikoumene.org/en/press-centre/news/liberation-theology-is-alive-and-well>.
- Alves, Rubem. *A Theology of Human Hope*. New York: Corpus, 1969.
- American Bible Society. *The Poverty & Justice Bible*. New York: American Bible Society, 1995.
- Andreopoulos, Andreas *Metamorphosis: The Transfiguration in Byzantine Theology and Iconography*. Yonkers, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2005.
- Anselm. *Proslogion, With the Replies of Gaunilo and Anselm*. Translated by Thomas Williams. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing, 2001.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Public Domain, 1947.
- Aristotle. *On the Heavens*. Translated by J. L. Stocks. 350 BCE.
- Aristotle. *On the Soul*. Translated by J. A. Smith. 350 BCE.
- Aristotle. *Physics*. Translated by R. P. Hardie and R. K. Gaye. 350 BCE.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. *The Crisis in Historical Materialism: Class, Politics, and Culture in Marxist Theory*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.
- Arzac, José María Echazarreta. *Lengua Castellana y Literatura*. Madrid: Editex, 2008.
- Ashley, Benedict. "The End of Philosophy and the End of Physics: A Dead End". In *Postmodernism and Christian Philosophy*, edited by Roman T. Ciapalo. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1997.
- Assmann, Hugo. *Teología desde la praxis de la liberación: Ensayo teológico desde la América dependiente*. Salamanca, Spain: Ediciones Sígueme, 1973.
- Assmann, Hugo. *Theology for a Nomad Church*. Translated by Paul Burns. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976.
- Aughey, Arthur. "Fukuyama, the End of History and the Irish Question". *Irish Studies in International Affairs* 9 (1998): 85-92.
- Augustine. *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*. Translated by Henry Bettenson. New York: Penguin, 410/1984.
- Augustine. *Handbook on Faith, Hope, and Love*. Translated by Albert C. Outler. Public Domain, 420/1999.
- Augustine. *Homily 7 on 1 John 4:4-12*.
- Ballor, Jordan. *Ecumenical Babel: Confusing Economic Ideology and the Church's Social Witness*. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian's Library Press, 2010.
- Barrett, William. *What is existentialism?* New York: Partisan Review, 1947.

- Barth, Karl. *The Doctrine of Reconciliation*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Church Dogmatics edited by G. W. Bromiley and Thomas F. Torrance. Vol. 4.3.1, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1961.
- Barth, Karl. *The Doctrine of the Word of God*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Church Dogmatics edited by G. W. Bromiley and Thomas F. Torrance. Vol. I/2, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Barth, Karl. *The Doctrine of the Word of God §19-21*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Church Dogmatics edited by G. W. Bromiley and Thomas F. Torrance. Vol. I/2, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Barth, Karl. *The Humanity of God*. Translated by Thomas Wieser and John Newton Thomas. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1960.
- Bateson, Gregory. *Pasos hacia una ecología de la mente*. Buenos Aires: Carlos Lohlé, 1972.
- Bateson, Gregory. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Prime of Life*. Cleveland: World, 1962.
- Becker, Elizabeth. "Michael Jendrzeczyk, 53, Advocate for Asians, Dies". *New York Times*, May 4 2003.
- Bécquer, Gustavo Adolfo. *Collected Poems: Rimass*. Translated by Michael Smith. edited by Michael Smith and Luis Ingelmo Exeter: Shearsman, 2007.
- Bell, Daniel M., Jr. *Liberation Theology After the End of History: The refusal to cease suffering*. Radical Orthodoxy. edited by John Milbank, Catherine Pickstock and Graham Ward London: Routledge, 2001.
- Berdiaev, Nikolai. *Essai de métaphysique eschatologique*. Translated by Maxime Herman. Philosophie de l'esprit. Paris: Aubier, 1946.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. *The Beginning & The End*. Translated by R. M. French. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers 1947.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. *The Bourgeois Mind and other essays*. Translated by Countess Bennigsen and Donald Attwater. edited by Donald Attwater Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, Inc., 1934.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. *Cinq méditations sur l'existence*. Paris: Montaigne, 1936.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. *The Destiny of Man*. Translated by Natalie Duddington. New York: Harper Torchbooks/The Cloister Library, 1960.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. *The Divine and the Human*. Translated by R. M. French. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1949.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. *Dream and reality : an essay in autobiography*. Translated by Katharine Lampert. London: Bles, 1950.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. "Jacob Boehme Etude I: Teaching on Ungrund and Freedom". *Journal Put'* 2007, no. November 20 (1930): 47-79.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. "Materialism Destroys the Eternal Spirit". <http://www.cjd.org/paper/roots/rmateri.html>.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. *Slavery and Freedom*. Translated by R. M. French. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944.
- Berghoef, Gerard, and Lester DeKoster. *Liberation Theology, The Church's Future Shock*. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian's Library Press, 1984.
- Bernárdez, Francisco Luis. "La tierra". In *Poemas elementales*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1942.
- Berryman, Phillip. *Liberation Theology, essential facts about the revolutionary movement in Latin America and beyond*. Bloomington, IN: Meyer Stone, 1987.

- Birault, Henri. *Heidegger et l'expérience de la pensée*. Paris: Gallimard, 1978.
- Birault, Henri, Henri Bouillard, and Stanislas Breton. *L'Existence de Dieu*. Paris: Casterman, 1961.
- Birault, Henri, Jean Wahl, Paul Ricoeur, Emmanuel Levinas, Aron Gurwitsch, and H. L. Van Breda. *Phénoménologie, existence*. Paris: Colin, 1953.
- Bissonnette, Tomas G. "Comunidades de base: Some contemporary attempts to build ecclesial koinonia". *The Jurist* 36, no. 1/2 (1976): 24-58.
- Black, Conrad. *Franklin Delano Roosevelt: Champion of Freedom* New York: Public Affairs, 2003.
- Blanc, Mario A. *Las rimas de Bécquer: su modernidad*. Madrid: Pliegos, 1988.
- Boehme, Jacob. *Mysterium Magnum, Part 1, or An Exposition of the First Book of Moses Called Genesis* Translated by John Sparrow. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2002.
- Boff, Leonardo. *Church: Charism and Power, Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*. Translated by John W. Diercksmeier. New York: Crossroad, 1985.
- Bojorge, Horacio. *Teologías deicidas: el pensamiento de Juan Luis Segundo en su contexto*. Madrid: Encuentro, 2000.
- Bonino, José Míguez. *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Bonino, José Míguez. *Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age*. London: SPCK, 1975.
- Bosworth, R. J. B. "Explaining 'Auschwitz' after the End of History: The Case of Italy". *History and Theory* 38, no. 1 (Feb 1999): 84-99.
- Bremond, Henri. *Prayer & poetry: a contribution to poetical theory*. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1927.
- Bremond, Henri. *Prière et poésie*. Paris: B. Grasset, 1926.
- Bremond, Henri, and Robert de Souza. *La poésie pure: avec un débat sur la poésie*. Paris: B. Grasset, 1926.
- Brown, Raymond E. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. edited by David N. Freedman New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Brown, Robert McAfee. *The Ecumenical Revolution: An Interpretation of the Catholic-Protestant Dialogue*. London: Burns & Oates, 1969.
- Brown, Robert McAfee. *Gustavo Gutiérrez, An Introduction to Liberation Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1990.
- Brown, Robert McAfee. *Unexpected News: Reading the Bible with Third World Eyes*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984.
- Bucher, Glenn R. "Toward a Liberation Theology for the 'Oppressor'". *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 44, no. 3 (Sept. 1976): 517-534.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *New Testament and Mythology and Other Basic Writings*. Translated by Schubert M. Ogden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Burtchaell, James Tunstead. "How Authentically Christian Is Liberation Theology?". *The Review of Politics* 50, no. 2 (1988): 264-281.
- Camus, Albert. *Caligula & Three Other Plays*. Translated by Stuart Gilbert. New York: Vintage Books, 1958.
- Camus, Albert. *Caligula, suivi de Le malentendu*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1944/1958.
- Camus, Albert. *El malentendido; Caligula*. Translated by Aurora Bernárdez. Buenos Aires: Losada, 1947.
- Camus, Albert. *Lyrical and Critical Essays*. edited by Philip Thody New York: Random House, 1970.
- Camus, Albert. *The Myth of Sisyphus*. Translated by Justin O'Brien. New York: Knopf, 1955.

- Camus, Albert. *The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt*. New York: Random House, 2012.
- Canessa, Agustín Francisco "Etapas y Obras del Itinerario Histórico e Intelectual de Juan Luis Segundo". 12. Montevideo, 2006.
- Cardenal, Ernesto. *The Gospel in Solentiname, Volume 2*. Translated by Donald D. Walsh. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1978.
- Cardenal, Ernesto. *The Gospel in Solentiname, Volume 3*. Translated by Donald D. Walsh. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1979.
- Cardenal, Ernesto. *The Gospel in Solentiname, Volume 4*. Translated by Donald D. Walsh. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1982.
- Cardenal, Ernesto. *The Gospel in Solentiname, Volumes 1-4*. Translated by Donald D. Walsh. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976-1982.
- Carman, Taylor. *Heidegger's Analytic: interpretation, discourse, and authenticity in Being and Time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Cassirer, Ernst. *Language and Myth*. Translated by Susanne K. Langer. New York: Harper, 1946.
- Catholic Church, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. *Instruction on certain aspects of the "theology of liberation"*. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1984.
- Cavendish, James C. "Christian Base Communities and the Building of Democracy: Brazil and Chile". *Sociology of Religion* 55, no. 2 (Summer 1994 1994): 179-195.
- Chapman, G. Clarke. "Bonhoeffer, Liberation Theology, and the 1990s". In *Reflections on Bonhoeffer: Essays in Honor of F. Burton Nelson*, edited by Geoffrey B. Kelly and C. John Weborg. Chicago: Covenant Press, 1999.
- Ching, Theresa Lowe. *Efficacious Love, Its Meaning and Function in the Theology of Juan Luis Segundo*. New York: University Press of America, 1989.
- Coates, J. B. "Existentialism". *Philosophy* 28, no. 106 (1953): 229-238.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Dejection: An Ode*. 1802.
- Cone, James H. *God of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury, 1975.
- Cone, James H. *The Spirituals and the Blues*. New York: Seabury, 1972.
- Converse, Philip. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics". In *Ideology and Discontent*, edited by David E. Apter. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- Copleston, F. C. "Existentialism". *Philosophy* 23, no. 84 (Jan 1948 1948): 19-37.
- Coronado, Jesús Castillo. "Juan Luis Segundo in Conversation, An Interview with Jesús Castillo Coronado". *Louvain Studies* 22, no. 3 (1997): 263-307.
- Cosgrave, William. "The Theology of Liberation". *The Furrow* 37, no. 8 (August 1986): 506-516.
- Dabashi, Hamid. *Islamic Liberation Theology: Resisting the Empire*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- de Waelhens, Alphonse *La Philosophie de Martin Heidegger*. Louvain: L'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1942.
- Destutt de Tracy, Antoine L. *Eléments d'idéologie*. Paris: Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt : Frommann-Holzboog, 1977.
- Detmer, David. *Sartre Explained: From Bad Faith to Authenticity*. Chicago: Open Court, 2008.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L. "Forward". In *Time and death: Heidegger's analysis of finitude*, edited by Carol J. White and Mark Ralkowski. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Durkheim, Émile. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. Translated by W. D. Halls. edited by Steven Lukes New York: The Free Press, 1982.

- Dussel, Enrique D. *Politics of Liberation*. Translated by Thia Cooper. Reclaiming Liberation Theology. London: SCM Press, 2010.
- Ellis, Marc H. *Toward a Jewish Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987.
- Ellison, Fred P. "The Writer". In *Continuity and Change in Latin America*, edited by John J. Johnson. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- "Existentialism". In *The Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy*, edited by Nicholas Bunnin and Jiyuan Yu. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- "Expression theory". In *The Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy*, edited by Nicholas Bunnin and Jiyuan Yu. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Fabre, Michael. "Richard Wright and the French Existentialists". *MELUS* 5, no. 2 (1978): 39-51.
- Ferré, Nels Frederick Solomon. *Searchlights on Contemporary Theology*. New York: Harper, 1961.
- Fiorenza, Francis Schüssler. "Method in Theology". In *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Rahner*, edited by Declan Marmion. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Fletcher, Joseph F. *Situation ethics: The New Morality*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.
- Forrester, Kevin Lee. "An analysis and critique of the relationship between faith and ideologies in the work of Juan Luis Segundo". Ph.D., The Catholic University of America, 1992.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. 30th Anniversary ed. New York: Continuum, 2009.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization And Its Discontents*. Translated by James Strachey. New York: W. W. Norton, 1962.
- Freud, Sigmund. "El malestar de la cultura". In *Obras completas*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1968.
- Friedman, Maurice. *To Deny Our Nothingness, Contemporary Images of Man*. New York: Delta, 1967.
- Fromm, Eric. *The Sane Society*. New York: Holt Rinehart, 1955.
- Fukuyama, Francis. "The End of History?". *National Interest* 16 Summer (1989): 3-18.
- Fukuyama, Francis. "Reflections on the End of History, Five Years Later". *History and Theory* 34, no. 2 (May 1995): 27-43.
- Gide, André. *Les nourritures terrestres*. Paris: Société du Mercure de France, 1897.
- Gilkey, Langdon. *Reaping the Whirlwind, A Christian Interpretation of History*. New York: Seabury Press, 1976.
- Greaves, Tom. *Starting with Heidegger*. New York: Continuum, 2010.
- Gross, Eduardo. "A concepção de fé de Juan Luis Segundo". Escola Superior de Teologia, 1997.
- Gutiérrez, Gustavo. *The Power of the Poor in History*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1983.
- Gutiérrez, Gustavo. *Teología de la Liberación*. Colección Verdad e Imagen. Salamanca: Sígueme, 1972/2004.
- Gutiérrez, Gustavo. "Teología y ciencias sociales". *Páginas* 63-64, no. 9 (1984): 4-15.
- Gutiérrez, Gustavo. *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*. Translated by Sister Caridad Inda and John Eagleson. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1973/1993.
- Haight, Roger. *An Alternative Vision, An Interpretation of Liberation Theology*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*. Translated by H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A. V. Miller. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper Perennial, 2008.
- Heidegger, Martin. *El Ser y el Tiempo*. Translated by José Gaos. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1951.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry*. Translated by Keith Hoeller. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2000.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Ser y Tiempo*. Translated by Jorge Eduardo Rivera. Santiago, Chile: Editorial Universitaria, 1997.
- Heidl, György. *Origen's Influence on the Young Augustine: A Chapter of the History of Origenism*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2003.
- Hennelly, Alfred T. "The Challenge of Juan Luis Segundo". *Theological Studies* 38 (Mr 1977): 125-135.
- Hennelly, Alfred T. *Theologies in Conflict: the challenge of Juan Luis Segundo*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1979.
- Hennelly, Alfred T. *Theology for a Liberating Church: The New Praxis of Freedom*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1989.
- Hewitt, Marsha. "An analysis of the notion of ideology in the critical theology of Juan Luis Segundo". Ph.D., Concordia University (Canada), 1987.
- Hewitt, Marsha Aileen. *From Theology to Social Theory: Juan Luis Segundo and the Theology of Liberation*. American University Studies, Series VII, Theology and Religion. Vol. 73, New York: Peter Lang, 1990.
- Hick, John. *Death and Eternal Life*. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Hoyas, Dario Castrillón "An Attack on Liberation Theology". *Orange County Register*, 1 December 1985, A10.
- Hunsinger, George. *Disruptive Grace: Studies in the Theology of Karl Barth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Hunt, Michael H. "Ideology". *The Journal of American History* 77, no. 1 (1990): 108-115.
- Ignatius of Loyola. *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*. Translated by Elder Mullan. New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1914.
- Ignatius of Loyola. *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: Based on Studies in the Language of the Autograph*. Translated by Louis J. Puhl. Chicago: Loyola Press, 2010.
- Inwood, Michael. *Heidegger: a very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Jaspers, Karl. *General Psychopathology*. Translated by J. Hoenig and Marian W. Hamilton. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- John B. Cobb, Jr. *A Christian Natural Theology*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2007.
- Kaltefleiter, Caroline K., and Anthony J. Nocella. "Anarchy in the Academy: Staying True to Anarchism as an Academic-Activist". In *Anarchist Pedagogies: Collective Actions, Theories, and Critical Reflections on Education*, edited by Robert H. Haworth. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Practical Reason*. Translated by Mary Gregor. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Paul Guyer and Allen Wood. The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant. edited by Paul Guyer and Allen Wood Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Translated by Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews. The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant in Translation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason, And Other Writings*. Translated by Allen Wood and George Di Giovanni. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. edited by Karl Ameriks and Desmond M. Clarke Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Kee, Alistair. *Rise and Demise of Black Theology*. Reclaiming Liberation Theology. edited by Marcella Althaus-Reid and Ivan Petrella London: SCM Press, 2008.
- King, Magda. *A Guide to Heidegger's Being and Time*. edited by John Llewelyn Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.
- Klaiber, Jeffrey L. "Prophets and Populists: Liberation Theology, 1968-1988". *The Americas* 46, no. 1 (1989): 1-15.
- Knight, Kathleen. "Transformations of the Concept of Ideology in the Twentieth Century". *The American Political Science Review* 100, no. 4 (Nov 2006): 619-626.
- Lamb, Matthew. *Solidarity with Victims: Toward a Theology of Social Transformation*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Langer, Susanne K. *Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling*. Vol. 2, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1972.
- Latinoamericano, Consejo Episcopal. *Medellín Documents*. Bogotá: CELAM, 1968.
- Laverty, Susann M. "Hermeneutic Phenomenology and Phenomenology: A Comparison of Historical and Methodological Considerations". *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 2, no. 3 (2003): 21-35.
- Lee, Michael E. "Liberation Theology's Transcendent Moment: The Work of Xavier Zubiri and Ignacio Ellacuría as Noncontrastive Discourse". *The Journal of Religion* 83, no. 2 (April 2003): 226-243.
- Levine, Daniel H. "Assessing the Impacts of Liberation Theology in Latin America". *The Review of Politics* 50, no. 2 (Spring 1988): 241-263.
- Levine, Daniel H. *Popular Voices in Latin American Catholicism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Levy, Daniel C. *Higher Education and the State in Latin America: Private Challenges*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1986.
- Libânio, João Batista. "Hope, Utopia, Resurrection". Translated by Dinah Livingstone. In *Mysterium Liberationis: Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology*, edited by Ignacio Ellacuría and Jon Sobrino. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993.
- Livingston, James C., Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, Sarah Coakley, and James H. Evans. *Modern Christian Thought, The Twentieth Century*. Vol. 2, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Lombard, Lawrence Brian. "Individuation". In *A Companion to Metaphysics*, edited by Jaegwon Kim and Ernest Sosa. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
- Lossky, Nikolai. *History of Russian Philosophy*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1952.
- Machoveč, Milan. *Jesús para ateos*. Translated by Alfonso Ortiz García. Salamanca: Sígueme, 1974.
- Machoveč, Milan. *A Marxist Looks at Jesus*. Translated by Kreuz Verlag Stuttgart. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976.
- MacLeish, Archibald. *J. B.: A Play in Verse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1956.

- Macquarrie, John. *Existentialism*. New York: Penguin, 1972.
- Macquarrie, John. *God-Talk: An Examination of the Language and Logic of Theology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Malevez, Léopold. *The Christian Message and Myth: The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann*. Translated by Olive Wyon. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1958.
- Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia: And Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Routledge, 1936.
- Marcel, Gabriel. *Homo viator*. Paris: Aubier, 1945.
- Marcel, Gabriel. *L'horizon: pièce en 4 actes suivie d'une postface*. Paris: Éditions aux étudiants de France, 1945.
- Marcel, Gabriel. *The Philosophy of Existentialism*. New York: Citadel, 1956.
- Maréchal, Joseph. *The Psychology of the Mystics*. Mineola, NY: Dover, 2004.
- Marx, Karl. *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Translated by Joseph O'Malley. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1844.
- Marx, Karl, and Fredrick Engels. *Collected Works*. Vol. 49, New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- Marx, Karl, and Fredrick Engels. *Collected Works*. Vol. 3, New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- Marx, Karl, and Fredrick Engels. *The German Ideology, including Theses on Feuerbach*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 1998.
- Mateus, Odair Pedroso. "At the Intersections of Poetry, Existential Philosophy and Theology: The Origins of Juan Luis Segundo's Thought". *Louvain Studies* 22, no. 3 (1997): 229-244.
- McCann, Dennis P. "Review of 'The Liberation of Theology'". *Religious Studies Review* 3, no. 2 (April 1977): 98-105.
- McCleary, Rollan. *A Special Illumination: Authority, Inspiration And Heresy In Gay Spirituality*. London: Equinox, 2004.
- McGovern, Arthur F. *Liberation Theology and Its Critics: Toward an Assessment*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1989.
- McLellan, David. *Marxism and Religion: a description and assessment of the Marxist critique of Christianity*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Medina, Elbio, Ivonne Clerc, Carlos Gutiérrez, and José Irureta. "Juan Luis Segundo Biografía". 4. Montevideo: Jesuitas de Uruguay, 1996.
- Ménard, Guy. *De Sodome à l'Exode: jalons pour une théologie de la libération gaie*. Montreal: L'Aurore/Univers, 1980.
- Miguez, Nestor, Joerg Rieger, and Jung Mo Sung. *Beyond the Spirit of Empire. Reclaiming Liberation Theology*. edited by Marcella Althaus-Reid and Ivan Petrella London: SCM Press, 2009.
- Mische, Ann. *Partisan Publics: Communication and Contention across Brazilian Youth Activist Networks*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. *Theology of Hope, On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*. Translated by James W. Leitch. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Moore, Basil, ed. *Challenge of Black Theology in South Africa*. New York: Westminster John Knox, 1974.
- Moylan, Tom. "Denunciation/Annunciation: The Radical Methodology of Liberation Theology". *Cultural Critique*, no. 20 (Winter, 1991-1992 1992): 33-64.
- Nealen, Mary Kaye. *The Poor in the Ecclesiology of Juan Luis Segundo*. American University Studies, Series VII Theology and Religion. Vol. 113, New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

- Nealen, Mary Kaye. "The poor in the ecclesiology of Juan Luis Segundo". Ph.D., The Catholic University of America, 1989.
- Neuhaus, Richard John. *The Catholic Moment: The Paradox of the Church in the Postmodern World*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Newton, Isaac. *The Mathematical Papers of Isaac Newton*. Vol. 6, 1684-1691, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. *The Meaning of Revelation*. New York: Macmillan, 1941.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Novak, Michael. *Will It Liberate?: Questions About Liberation Theology*. New York: Paulist Press, 1986.
- Nyström, Maria, and Karen Dahlberg. "Pre-understanding and openness – a relationship without hope?". *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences* 15, no. 4 (2001): 339-346.
- O'Meara, Thomas F. *God in the World: A Guide to Karl Rahner's Theology*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007.
- Ogden, Schubert M. *Faith and Freedom: Toward a Theology of Liberation*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1989.
- Olthuis, James H. "Evolutionary dialectics and Segundo's Liberation of theology". *Calvin Theological Journal* 21 (Ap 1986): 79-93.
- Origen. *Homilies on Judges*. Translated by Elizabeth Ann Dively Lauro. Washington, DC: CUA Press, 2010.
- Osborn, Robert T. "Some Problems of Liberation Theology: A Polanyian Perspective". *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 51, no. 1 (March 1983): 79-95.
- Paine, Thomas. *Rights of Man: Being an answer to Mr. Burke's attack on the French Revolution*. London: J. S. Jordan, 1791.
- Pemán, José María. *Obras selectas, inéditas y vedadas: Poesía*. Madrid: Dopesa, 1971.
- Perrin, Norman. *The New Testament, An Introduction: Proclamation and Parenthesis, Myth and History*. New York: Harcourt, 1974.
- Persha, Gerald J. *Juan Luis Segundo, A Study Concerning the Relationship Between the Particularity of the Church and the Universality of Her Mission (1963-1977)*. Probe Third World Studies. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1980.
- Persha, Gerald J. "Juan Luis Segundo: a study concerning the relationship between the particularity of the Church and the universality of her mission, 1963-1977". Ph.D., University of Ottawa (Canada), 1978.
- Petrella, Ivan. *Beyond Liberation Theology: A Polemic*. Reclaiming Liberation Theology. edited by Marcella Althaus-Reid and Ivan Petrella London: SCM Press, 2008.
- Petrella, Ivan. *The Future of Liberation Theology, An argument and manifesto*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Philipse, Herman. *Heidegger's philosophy of being, a critical interpretation* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Phillips, Steven. "The Use of Scripture in Liberation Theologies: an examination of Juan Luis Segundo, James H. Cone, and Jürgen Moltmann". Ph.D., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1978.
- Pius XII. *Humani Generis*. Papal Encyclical. Roman Catholic Church, 1950.
- Plato. "Parmenides". <http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/parmenides.html>.
- Pottenger, John R. *The Political Theory of Liberation Theology: Toward a Reconvergence of Social Values and Social Sciences*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1989.
- Priest, Stephen, ed. *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings*. London: Routledge, 2001.

- Rahner, Karl. *Foundations of Christian Faith, an introduction to the idea of Christianity*. Translated by William V. Dych. New York: Crossroad, 1978.
- Rahner, Karl. *Theological Investigations, Man in the Church*. Translated by Karl Kruger. Vol. 2, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963.
- The Ratio studiorum: The official plan for Jesuit education*. Translated by Claude Pavur. St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005.
- Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. "Liberation Theology". *Christendom-Awake.org* (1984).
- Richardson, William J. *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2003.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Conflict of Interpretations*. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *La métaphore vive*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1975.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language*. Translated by Robert Czerny. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- Roach, Richard R. "A New Sense of Faith". *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 5, no. 1 (1977): 135-154.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Liberation Theology: Human Hope Confronts Christian History and American Power*. New York: Paulist Press, 1972.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1983.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- Santoni, Ronald E. "Camus on Sartre's 'Freedom': Another 'Misunderstanding'". *The Review of Metaphysics* 61, no. 4 (Jun. 2008): 785-813.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness: An essay on phenomenological ontology*. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes. London: Routledge Classics, 2008.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Critique de la raison dialectique*. Paris: N. R. F., 1960.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Essays in Existentialism*. New York: Citadel, 1963.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Existentialism and Humanism*. Translated by Philip Mairet. London: Methuen, 2008.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Existentialism is a Humanism*. Translated by Carol Macomber. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings*. edited by Stephen Priest London: Routledge, 2002.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'existentialisme est un humanisme*. Collection pensees. Paris: Nagel, 1948.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *La Náusea*. Translated by Aurora Bernárdez. Buenos Aires: Losada, 1947.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *La nausée*. Paris: Gallimard, 1938.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Les mouches: drame en trois actes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1943.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Nausea*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: New Directions, 2007.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *No Exit and Three Other Plays*. Translated by Stuart Gilbert and Lionel Abel. New York: Vintage, 1989.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Notebooks for an Ethics*. Translated by David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Teatro*. Translated by Aurora Bernárdez. Buenos Aires: Losada, 1948.
- Schipani, Daniel S. *Freedom and Discipleship: Liberation Theology in an Anabaptist Perspective*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1989.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers*. Translated by Richard Crouter. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. edited by Karl Ameriks and Desmond M. Clarke Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- Schmid, Herman. "On the Origin of Ideology". *Acta Sociologica* 24, no. 1/2 (1981): 57-73.
- Schubeck, Thomas Louis. *Liberation Ethics: Sources, Models, and Norms*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Scott, Peter. *Theology, Ideology and Liberation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Seckinelgin, Hakan. *The Environment and International Politics: International fisheries, Heidegger and social method*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.
- "Segunda Conferencia General del Episcopado Latinoamericano". Medellín, 1968.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "24 La Libertad de Sartre y Camus". In *Segundo Tape Collection*. Oxford, UK: Matthew Aaron Tennant's Private Collection, 1980.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Acción pastoral latinoamericana: sus motivos ocultos*. Buenos Aires: Búsqueda, 1972.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Berdiaeff: une réflexion Chrétienne sur la personne*. Paris: Aubier, 1963.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Capitalism versus socialism : crux theologica". Translated by John Drury. In *Frontiers of theology in Latin America*, 240-259. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1979.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Capitalismo - socialismo: crux teológica". *Concilium* 96 (1974).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *The Christ of the Ignatian Exercises*. Translated by John Drury. Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today. Vol. IV, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "The Church: a New Direction in Latin America". *Catholic Mind* 65 (1967).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *The Community Called Church*. Translated by John Drury. A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1973.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Conversión y reconciliación en la perspectiva moderna de la teología de la liberación". *Cristianismo y Sociedad* 13 (1975).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Derechos humanos, evangelización e ideología". In *Carter y la logica del imperialismo, tomo II*, edited by Hugo Assmann, 339-353. San José, Costa Rica: Colección DEI, 1978.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Diagnóstico político de América Latina". *Mensaje* 115 (1962).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Dios - Sacramentos - Culpa*. Teología Abierta 2. Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Disquisición sobre el misterio absoluto". *Revista latinoamericana de teología* 2, no. 6 (1985): 209-227.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *El Caso Mateo: los comienzos de una ética judeocristiana*. Colección "Presencia Teologica". Vol. 74, Santander, España: Sal Terrae, 1994.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "El círculo vicioso de la miseria: el universitario latinoamericano". *Mensaje* 113 (1962).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "El diálogo Iglesia-Mundo: reflexión". *Diálogo* 8 (1966).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *El dogma que libera: fe, revelación y magisterio dogmático*. Colección "Presencia Teologica". Santander, España: Sal Terrae, 1989.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "El fundamento poético de toda metafísica según Heidegger". In *Segundo Papers*, 33 pages (missing pp. 5-24). Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro de Espiritualidad Manresa
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *El hombre de hoy ante Jesus de Nazaret, fe e ideología*. Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1982.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *El hombre de hoy ante Jesús de Nazaret, historia y actualidad: las cristologías en la espiritualidad*. Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982.

- Segundo, Juan Luis. *El hombre de hoy ante Jesús de Nazaret, historia y actualidad: sinópticos y Pablo*. Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *El infierno: un diálogo con Karl Rahner*. Buenos Aires: Lohlé, Lumen, 1998.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Esa comunidad llamada iglesia*. Teología abierta para el laico adulto. Vol. I, Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1968.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Etapas Precristianas de la Fe: Evolución de la Idea de Dios en el Antiguo Testamento*. Montevideo: Cursos de Complementación Cristiana, 1964.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Evolución y culpa*. Teología abierta para el laico adulto. Vol. V, Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1972.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Evolution and Guilt*. Translated by John Drury. A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1974.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *An Evolutionary Approach to Jesus of Nazareth*. Translated by John Drury. Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today. Vol. V, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Existencialismo Cristiano". In *Segundo Papers*, 3 pages. Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro de Espiritualidad Manresa.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Existencialismo, filosofía y poesía: ensayo de síntesis*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1948.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Exposición sobre Berdiaeff". *Boletín de la sociedad Uruguaya de filosofía* 1, no. 117 (1965).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Faith and Ideologies*. Translated by John Drury. Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today. London: Sheed and Ward, 1984.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Función de la iglesia en la realidad rioplatense*. Montevideo: Barreiro y Ramos, 1962.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Grace and the Human Condition*. Translated by John Drury. A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1973.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Gracia y condición humana*. Teología abierta para el laico adulto. Vol. II, Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1969.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *The Hidden Motives of Pastoral Action, Latin American Reflections*. Translated by John Drury. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1978.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics*. Translated by John Drury. Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today. Vol. II, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1985.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *The Humanist Christology of Paul*. Translated by John Drury. Jesus of Nazareth Yesterday and Today. Vol. III, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Iglesia - Gracia*. Teología Abierta 1. Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Ignace de Loyola: preuve ou projet?". *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 79, no. 5 (1991).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Is Liberation a Bad Word? The Relevance of the Vatican Instruction for Theology Today". In *Regis College Toronto Public Lecture*. Elliott MacGuigan Hall, Toronoto, 1985.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *La Cristiandad, Una Utopía?* Montevideo: CCC, 1964.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "La fenomenología de Heidegger y la teología". In *Segundo Papers*, 32 pages. Montevideo, Uruguay: Centro de Espiritualidad Manresa.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "La función de la Iglesia". *Diálogo* 1 (1965).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *La Historia Perdida y Recuperada De Jesús De Nazaret*. Colección "Presencia Teologica". Vol. 65, Santander, España: Sal Terrae, 1991.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "La Iglesia, 'es necesaria?'"'. *Diálogo* 7 (1966).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Liberación de la teología*. Buenos Aires: Carlos Lohlé, 1975.

- Segundo, Juan Luis. *The Liberation of Dogma: Faith, Revelation, and Dogmatic Teaching Authority*. Translated by Phillip Berryman. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1992.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Liberation of Theology*. Translated by John Drury. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Los sacramentos hoy*. Teología Abierta para el Laico Adulto. Vol. IV, Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1971.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Masas y Minorías en la Dialéctica Divina de la Liberación*. Buenos Aires: La Aurora, 1973.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Nuestra Idea de Dios*. Teología Abierta para el Laico Adulto. Vol. III, Buenos Aires: Lohle, 1970.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Orientaciones Literarias: Apuntes de clase". In *Elbio Medina Collection*, 183. Montevideo: Private Archive, 1953.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Our Idea of God*. Translated by John Drury. A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1974.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *¿Qué mundo? ¿Qué hombre? ¿Qué Dios?* Colección "Presencia Teologica". Vol. 72, Santander, España: Sal Terrae, 1993.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Reflexiones Críticas*. Teología Abierta 3. Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Revelación, fe y signos de los tiempos". *Revista Latinoamericana de Teología* 14 (1988).
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *The Sacraments Today*. Translated by John Drury. A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1974.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "The shift within Latin American theology". *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* (S 1985): 17-29.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "The Shift Within Latin American Theology". In *Regis College of the Toronto School of Theology Public Lecture*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 1983.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Signs of the Times, Theological Reflections*. Translated by Robert R. Barr. edited by Alfred T. Hennelly Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Teilhard de Chardin: una nueva concepción del metodo científico el aporte de la ciencia al cristianismo*. Montevideo: Parroquia Universitaria, 1975.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Teología de la liberación: respuesta al Cardenal Ratzinger*. Madrid: Cristiandad, 1985.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. "Teología y ciencias sociales". In *Fe cristiana y cambio social en América Latina*, 285-295. Salamanca, Spain: Ediciones Sígueme, 1972.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. *Theology and the Church, A Response to Cardinal Ratzinger and a Warning to the Whole Church, Revised Edition*. Translated by John W. Diercksmeier. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Shaul, Richard. "Christian Faith as Scandal in a Technocratic World". In *New Theology*, edited by Dean Peerman and Martin Marty, 123-134. New York: Macmillan, 1966.
- Shaul, Richard. "Revolutionary change in theological perspective". In *Christian social ethics in a changing world: an ecumenical theological inquiry*, edited by John C. Bennett. New York: Association Press, 1966.
- Sigmund, Paul E. *Liberation Theology at the Crossroads: Democracy or Revolution?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Singleton, Harry H. *Black Theology and Ideology: Deideological Dimensions in the Theology of James H. Cone*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002.
- Singleton, Harry H. "Dimensions of deideologization in the works of James H. Cone". Ph.D., Graduate Theological Union, 1998.

- Slaatté, Howard Alexander. *Personality, spirit, and ethics: the ethics of Nicholas Berdyaev*. New York: P. Lang, 1997.
- Slade, Stanley David. "The Theological Method of Juan Luis Segundo". Ph.D., Fuller Theological Seminary, School of Theology, 1979.
- Smith, Adam. *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. edited by Edwin Cannan and Max Lerner New York: Modern library, 1937.
- Sobrinho, Jon. *Christology at the Crossroads, A Latin American Approach*. Translated by John Drury. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1978.
- Sobrinho, Jon. *Cristología desde américa latina (esbozo a partir del seguimiento del Jesús histórico)*. Río Honda, México: Centro de Reflexión Teológica, 1976.
- Sobrinho, Jon, and Ignacio Ellacuría, eds. *Systematic Theology: Perspectives from Liberation Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1986.
- Song, Choan-Seng. *Jesus and the Reign of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Spinka, Matthew. *Nicolas Berdyaev: Captive of Freedom*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950.
- Spinoza, Benedict de. *The Chief Works of Benedict de Spinoza*. Translated by R. H. M. Elwes. Vol. 2, New York: Dover, 1951.
- Starkloff, Carl F. "Inculturation and Cultural Systems (Part 2)". *Theological Studies* 55.2 (1994): 274-294.
- Stefanini, Luigi. *Gioberti*. Milano: Bocca, 1947.
- Stefanini, Luigi. *Platone*. Padua: Cedam, 1932.
- Steiner, George. *Martin Heidegger*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Stone, Bryan P. *Effective Faith, A Critical Study of the Christology of Juan Luis Segundo*. New York: University Press of America, 1994.
- Stover, Eric. "Scientists Aid Search for Argentina's "Desaparecidos"". *Science* 230, no. 4721 (1985): 56-57.
- Strain, Charles. "Liberation Theology: North American Perspective". *Religious Studies Review* (July 1982).
- Sudduth, Michael. *The Reformed Objection to Natural Theology*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009.
- Sunderman, Marilyn Ann. "Humanization in the christology of Juan Luis Segundo". Ph.D., Fordham University, 1995.
- Sung, Jung Mo. *Desire, Market, Religion*. Reclaiming Liberation Theology. edited by Marcella Althaus-Reid and Ivan Petrella London: SCM Press, 2007.
- Susin, Luis Carlos, Marcella Althaus-Reid, and Ivan Petrella, eds. *Another Possible World, Reclaiming Liberation Theology*. London: SCM Press, 2007.
- Sweeney, John. "For the Builders of a New Ireland: The Theology of Juan Luis Segundo". *The Furrow* 31, no. 12 (1980): 783-789.
- Tambasco, Anthony Joseph. "The Contribution of Juan Luis Segundo to the Hermeneutical Question of the Relationship of the Bible to Christian Ethics". Ph.D., Union Theological Seminary, 1981.
- Taylor, William. "Paris during the Year 1796". *The Monthly Review* 20 (1796): 569.
- Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre. *The Phenomenon of Man* Translated by Bernard Wall. New York: Fontana 1970.
- Thévenaz, Pierre. *What is Phenomenology? and other essays*. Translated by James M. Edie, Charles Courtney and Paul Brockelman. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1962.
- Thompson, Iain D. *Heidegger on Ontotheology: Technology and the Politics of Education*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2005.
- Tillich, Paul. *The Courage to Be*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1952.
- Tillich, Paul. *Dynamics of Faith*. New York: Harper, 1957.

- Tillich, Paul. *The New Being*. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Tillich, Paul. *Systematic Theology, Volume 1: Reason and Revelation, Being and God*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Tillich, Paul. *Systematic Theology, Volume 2: Existence and the Christ*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Tombs, David. *Latin American Liberation Theology*. Religion in the Americas. edited by Henri Gooren Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Torres, Camilo. *Revolutionary Priest: The Complete Writings & Messages of Camilo Torres*. Translated by June de Cipriano Alcantara, Angela Boyer, Robert Olsen, Linda Day, John D. Ring and Juan Tito. edited by John Gerassi New York: Vintage Books, 1971.
- Turner, J. David. *An Introduction to Liberation Theology*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1994.
- Vallier, Ivan. "Church "Development" in Latin America: A Five-Country Comparison". *The Journal of Developing Areas* 1, no. 4 (1967): 461-476.
- Van Engen, Charles E. "The Glocal Church: Locality and Catholicity in a Globalizing World". In *Globalizing Theology: Belief and Practice in an Era of World Christianity*, edited by Craig Ott and Harold Netland. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2006.
- Vidal, Hernan. *Dar la Vida por la Vida: La Agrupación Chilena de Familiares de Detenidos Desaparecidos*. Minneapolis: Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literature, 1982.
- Vorgrimler, Herbert. *Understanding Karl Rahner: an introduction to his life and thought*. London: SCM Press, 1986.
- West, Cornel. "Review of Juan Luis Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies*". *Commonweal* 111 (1984): 53-57.
- Westphal, Merold E. *Transcendence and Self-Transcendence: On God and the Soul*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2004.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus*. New York: Harcourt, 1922.
- Wooden, Cindy. "Pope says Brazilian church still divided over liberation theology". *Catholic News Service*, December 7 2009.
- Zubiri, Xavier. "Hegel y el problema metafísico". *Cruz y Raya* 1, no. 1 (1933): 223-240.
- Zweig, Michael. "Economics and Liberation Theology". In *Religion and Economic Justice*, edited by Michael Zweig. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.