

Lay and Religious States of Life: Their Distinction and Complementarity

by James D. O'Reilly

(first published in *Review for Religious* 27 [1968], 1027–1052, and republished in the Synthesis series, Franciscan Herald Press, 1971)

© 1968 James D. O'Reilly. All rights reserved.

I. Introductory Remarks

If we must have a fight, let us have a *good* fight: not shadow-boxing with peripheral questions but hand-to-hand engagement on basic issues, a battle of wits, not a conflict of emotions. Here in the Southland we find ourselves in the midst of a controversy over the subject of renewal of the religious life. Some view the controversy as a jurisdictional struggle between religious independence and episcopal authority. The charismatic is threatened by the institutional. Others discern here a clash between modernity and antiquity, between youth and age, between male and female, between classic and romantic. Others think that they detect a conflict between *Perfectae caritatis* and *Gaudium et spes*.

No doubt all of these elements are present in the chorus of debate, but only as screechy overtones to a fundamental note. They are present as coloring and obscuring that which is at the heart of the matter, namely, a just conception of the distinction between the lay and religious states of life, and, flowing from this, a question of the significance of religious presence in the professional world. If we are to have a *good* fight, this is what we must concentrate upon. We must come to grips more effec-

tively on this central ground instead of wasting our energies on local skirmishing.

As a first approximation to a final position, let me venture the statement that the distinction of lay and religious states arises out of the need to provide a system of checks and balances in the general effort of Christians to make an integral response to the human condition. Let me elaborate briefly. The human condition is described, at least, in the Christian world, as one of fallen creaturehood moving forward toward a saving consummation in Christ. That movement, however, is mysteriously two-sided: one of simultaneous ascent and descent, of evolution-devolution, of engagement and withdrawal. Man's approach to his salvation is both a making and a being made, a doing and a being done to, an accomplishment and a gift. Running through all our days from here to eternity is a counterpoint of nature and grace, of a lifting up and a letting down, an immanence and a transcendence, a winning and a losing, a living and a dying. It is in the effort of the Christian community to keep a just balance between these counter-elements that a distinction in the public order has come to be made between the two states of life, lay and religious. The distinction of states provides a system of checks and balances. Hence it is vitally necessary that we keep the distinction clear if we are to avoid either a Manichean gloom over descent, devolution, failing, limitation, and death, or a Pelagian exaltation over ascent, evolution, succeeding, accomplishment, and life. For we do not correct the first error by falling into the second.

With this as a first approximation to our final position we turn now to a detailed consideration of its separate elements. We consider in turn (1) the nature of the movement of man toward salvation, (2) the consequent ambivalence surrounding man's life in the world, (3) the resulting need for a public division of

states of life, and (4) the accompanying problem of integrating religious life into the world of professional work.

II. The “What” and the “How” of Salvation

There are two questions that need to be asked so as to come clear on the mystery of the process of salvation: (a) *what* is it that is to be saved; (b) *how* is the saving to be done. As to the “what” of salvation perhaps the point can be made most clearly by making a contrast — somewhat exaggerated — between the view of salvation in the Church yesterday and the view of salvation in the Church today. Yesterday the view was simply personal. Today, salvation is seen to be also cosmic and societal. Let me explain. I think that it is fair to say that if you had asked several years ago what it meant to say that Christ is Savior, the answer would have been confined mostly to persons considered individually before God. To say that Christ is Savior meant that He is the cause in several respects of bringing individual persons to final blessedness of body and soul with God in heaven. By His death Christ atones for sin; by His life, death, resurrection, and ascension He presents Himself as the exemplar of the saving process of every man; by His Pentecostal gift of the Spirit to His Church He transfigures men according to the pattern of His Sonship. By all means, whether meritorious, exemplary, or efficient, Christ brings each person to blessedness. Salvation means the saving of persons. Christ is our personal Savior.

If you had pressed a little more deeply and asked what about human society, I think that the answer would have been that if individuals come to blessedness with God, the group is automatically taken care of. What need is there, then, to ask a separate question about society’s salvation? Society, that is to say,

would have been equated with “sum of individuals,” and the saving of society would involve no new problem. If you had pressed more deeply still and asked about the salvation of the physical universe, I think the answer might have been that the question of its salvation does not arise since the universe is not a person. The universe is the dumb part of creation, good and necessary for producing and sustaining the life of persons now. But the universe is not “getting anywhere” in the scheme of salvation. It plays only a transient role in the life of man and is destined ultimately to fade from the picture. In fine, salvation would have been described as a process that has reference to persons taken individually. If organized society and the universe enter into the scope of salvation at all, it is simply insofar as they are needed to keep persons “going” in the present time. The smooth functioning of society and universe is a necessary accompaniment of the movement of individuals towards final happiness with God, but about their salvation no answer need be given because no question need be raised. They are not objects of the salvation process.

In recent years this view of the “what” of salvation has undergone some expansion. For one thing, society is now seen to be more than the sum of the individuals who compose it. Just as the properties of a molecule are more than the sum of the properties of the constituent atoms, as the living organism is a new entity over and above the cells of which it is composed, so too for society. Put persons together and by their interaction, though they do not cease to retain their personal identity, they constitute a body which is other than themselves. There is a corporate entity which is other than the somebodies. This corporate entity, too, needs to be brought to a fullness and a happiness with God which is more than the sum total of the beatitude of its members. It is spoken of as the Body of Christ. The view of salvation extends beyond individuals and embraces that more

elusive totality, the body of human society.

But that is not all. It is not just society that gets added to the salvation picture. The universe is included too, and for good reason. As society is the body *into* which we grow (always remaining fully ourselves), so the cosmos is the womb *out of* which we were drawn forth and *within* which we survive (not without the creative action of God). Now these cosmic roots of ours are not just a placental mass to be sloughed off upon our final emergence into God's presence. Our cosmic roots are the very body and womb that bore us and are no more to be left out of the compass of salvation than would a mother be left behind in the salvation of her children.

To sum up, the view of salvation which yesterday focused upon each individual before God, now widens to include society and the universe, because we have a stronger awareness of the corporate character of the first and of our genetic relationship with the second. A word of warning — this view is new as compared with our thinking yesterday in the Church, but it is not new as compared with our thinking the day before yesterday in the Church. One need only study ancient, medieval, renaissance, and modern writing on the subject of cosmic and corporate Christianity to see that the sun breaks through where it had shone before. But the view is sharper now than it was before because of the advances made in the physical and social sciences.

The effect of this change in view concerning the “what” of salvation can scarcely be exaggerated. The lay state in the Christian world is immediately put in a very different light. To put the matter vulgarly, the new view comes as a “shot in the arm” to all Christians whose lives, day in, day out, are devoted to those twin centers of modern endeavor, the control of our

cosmic environment, and the organization and management of human society. These are the two great foci of lay technological effort. One of them absorbs the skills of physicists, chemists, biologists. The other commands the attention of psychologists, sociologists, political scientists. Here the laity earn their daily bread. Abstracting from the abuses which mar these activities, as they do all human endeavor, the right uses of technology now take on a religious dimension. World-building and social engineering can no longer be set down as “merely” secular, altogether “this-worldly,” tinged with “vanity.” The objects upon which these sciences labor, the universe and society, are not ephemeral or evanescent. They are destined to come to a fullness and a lasting glory in the plans of God. The secular and the sacred remain distinct but they are no longer opposed. Prayer, self-discipline, and all the business of saving one's soul are no longer the sole activities in the struggle for salvation. Salvation is also hastened by all the efforts which men make to further cosmic development and societal organization. And not just because these activities exercise a man in virtue, but because they make an intrinsic contribution towards the future of some *thing* that is being saved for eternity. The new view of the “what” of salvation gives a distinct “edge” in the Church to youth, strength, modernity, progress, research, and development, to the whole secular world of business and government (always abstracting from their sinful abuse). What was heretofore in the shadows is now in the light. Away then with all sense of powerlessness, all feeling of inferiority, all talk of defeat and death, all enmity of science and religion, all Manichean pessimism, all non-functional asceticism — all distinction of sacred and secular? of natural and supernatural? of lay and religious? Or have we gone too far? Are we swinging from one extreme to another, from a Manichean pessimism to a Pelagian triumphalism?

We started out by saying that there are two questions that

need to be raised so as to come clear on the mystery of salvation. *What* is to be saved and *how* is it to be saved. We have answered the first. It is man, society, and the cosmos that are to be saved. We turn now to the second question, *how* is the saving to come about? Let us start with the salvation of the human person because here there is little misunderstanding of the saving process. The human person, embodied spirit, moves along a path of salvation whose steps carry him through stages of infancy, youth, maturity, old age, dissolution, death, and resurrection. The way of personal salvation is both wonderful and terrible, flattering to a man in that his efforts are called upon through life and are able to propel him through wonderful days of growth in body and spirit, yet humbling in that his very progress forward carries him into eclipse, darkness, and separation. The last act of a man is to lay himself down before God who saves. The human person does not arrive at his fulfillment of body-spirit by a uniformly victorious process of transformation. Transformation leads to a point of rupture at which all effort seems to have come to nothing. In fact, the effort of life has disposed the person to receive the fullness of life from God. In one way the final outcome of personal salvation can be described as man's achievement since he carried himself by his efforts (though not without assisting grace) to the point of rupture. But in another sense the final outcome is God's gift since nothing else will account for man's emergence into glory on the other side of the point of rupture. Here we have a peculiar blending of failure and triumph, of victory and defeat, of life through death. Christians have long been accustomed to see this as typified in the mystery of Christ and celebrated in the liturgy of the Eucharist. Entering into the spirit of this mystery with a clear head and a stout heart has long been a major part of a Christian's personal spiritual endeavor. He has always sought to integrate his personal death into the project of life, to live by a systole–diastole of sacrament-sacrifice.

That much being clear about the “how” of personal salvation, the question which I now wish to raise in all seriousness is whether the other two elements in the salvation picture, cosmos and society, are exempt from an analogous passage through darkness? Are they also destined to have their days of infancy, youth, maturity, age, feebleness, dissolution, death, and resurrection? Is their saving to come by way of transformation only, and not also by way of rupture? One reason for raising this question is that if it is the case that cosmic and societal salvation come by transformation leading to rupture, then the same ambivalence that characterizes a man's efforts to promote his advance to fullness of *personal* life will also characterize the parallel efforts of man to develop and control the *cosmos* and to organize the body of human *society*. These efforts, too, will succeed, but succeed by seeming to fail. Cosmic and societal salvation will also be typified in the mystery of the Lord of the Cosmos, the Head of the Body. They also will be celebrated in the liturgy of the Eucharist as a mystery of life through death.

A second reason for raising this question is to be found in the fact that so frequently today, in popular Catholic writing on the subject of life in the modern world, the possibility is not so much as raised, or is raised only to be dismissed with a smile. It is being assumed constantly, without any proof, that transformation is “in,” and that rupture is “out” as far as concerns the future of cosmos and human society. In the eagerness (eminently justifiable) to welcome society and cosmos into the “what” of salvation, there is a haste (altogether questionable) to exclude them from any “how” of salvation which would entail rupture. If we must endure the humbling fact of personal death, at least we can revel in the victory of unalloyed triumph over cosmos and society. So it runs. The effect of such an assumption is to intoxicate readers with the heady wine of undiluted transforma-

tion. It generates a mood of exaltation and triumph under the influence of which Christians are urged to seek a religion of only one kind, a religion of conquest, a religion that takes the dynamic and future-oriented form of building toward a supreme unification of the world *to be achieved by our efforts*. This view of the “how” of cosmic and societal salvation is sold under the label of “modern” or “twentieth century” or “post Vatican II” But the question we raise is whether the label should read “Poison.”

It is my contention that evidence exists and steadily accumulates in the sciences, social as well as physical, that all technique and process, whether spontaneous in nature or induced by man, whether exercised upon cosmos or society, is of such an inherent character that it cannot but generate devolution in the very act by which it also promotes evolution. The evidence is quite strong in the sciences which study cosmic processes, whether these are physico-chemical, biochemical, biological. Such processes while building up ordered systems operate within the framework of a law of degradation of energy sources. The evidence is not disturbed one whit by the airy dismissal of thermodynamics by writers whose acquaintance with the subject is less than elementary. This is not to deny the obvious fact of cosmic development. It is simply to draw attention to the price that must be paid.

In the social sciences we must obviously tread with a great deal of caution. There we have no easy quantitative criterion of evolution or devolution. But there, too, we must ask whether techniques of social development also exact a price which is ultimately lethal. Mind you, there is no question here of the destructive effects that have always been known to follow from the *abusive exercise of technique*. Dehumanization is a hoary theme. What is in question here is a diminution that is *inherent*

in technique at its best. The serious consideration of such a possibility by recent writers (for example, Jacques Ellul, *Presence of the Kingdom*, 1967), should at least, make writers pause before they carelessly assert that man is constantly creating, making the world — not just to pass the time until the parousia, but in order to *make the parousia come to pass*. That is true, but the writers pass over the “sticking-point” which is, whether we bring the parousia to pass with or without rupture. Our contention is that evidence for rupture is not absent. The “how” of salvation for cosmos and society may be as far from being “Hollywood” as is the way of salvation for the individual person. This would make it necessary to think less romantically about the Church and the modern world. It would also make it possible to bring a new precision to the meaning of religious life in the modern world. Its ancient witness may turn out to be surprisingly modern. We will come to that later. But first we must consider the way in which the how and what of salvation, personal, cosmic, and societal give a strange twosidedness to man’s movement through business enterprise, conjugal life, and societal organization, towards the kingdom to come.

III. The Ambivalence of Secular Activity

It must not be thought that whatever medication heals a wound will also provide a nourishing diet for the injured man. Yet this is the kind of mistake that appears to be made in relation to the problem of the renewal of religious life. Renewal of religious life poses two distinct problems — the elimination of abuses and distortions, and the restoration of its true meaning and place in the world of today. A correct approach to the solution of the first does not necessarily serve as a correct approach to the solving of the second. To overcome the Manichean distortions and abuses that disfigure the religious life one must redis-

cover the essential goodness of all secular activity. But to arrive at the truth of the religious life it is necessary to consider the limitations of secular activity. Too many writers on the subject of religious renewal seem to be deterred from doing the latter, perhaps by the fear that they will be accused of falling back into the Manichean error of damning the secular. In a laudable effort to offset the distortions of the religious life, they ring the changes on the goodness of secularity. But then they hasten to derive the meaning of the religious life from the same source as if the medication could also serve for nourishing diet. The removal of abuses may well start in the recognition of the goodness of secularity; but if we are to come to the meaning of the religious life, we must begin by facing the ambiguous character of that goodness.

In what follows we will focus attention on three areas of human secular activity so as to bring into view the element of ambiguity inherent in their very goodness. For convenient reference we will label these areas, “business,” “marriage,” and “government,” but we will use these terms in a broad sense. Under “business” we will include the entire field of research, development, production, distribution, exchange, and management by which men wrest support from and gain control over their cosmic environment. Under the term “government” we will include every exercise of social, political, and psychological technique that has to do with the building up in freedom of the body of society. “Marriage” we will take in its customary sense as the root source from which all activities of business or government take their point of departure and towards which they look back to find human meaning and personal significance. We choose business, marriage, and government because these are the centers of ongoing action in the secular life of man. The badge of the first is property, of the second is spouse, of the third is personal autonomy. The absence of these is a distin-

guishing mark, though only a negative one, of life in the redeemed world of the future. Furthermore, these are the goods which in some sense are relinquished by the vows which distinguish religious from lay life. It is clear that any attempt to penetrate the meaning of religious life in the world must start with an examination into these areas of life.

Take first the area of business. In the broad sense in which we are using the term, it is business which puts the world ahead and makes it fit for men to live in. Formerly confined to the terrestrial, business now begins to extend its activities into the planetary world. Nor need it stop there. All the riches of the universe may yet lie open to us. Distance and time are waiting to be bridged, energy to be harnessed, knowledge to be gained, and technique to be acquired. Business opens up the life of the present, and the badge of business is ownership and taking care. Areas must be divided and tasks distributed so that work may be pursued by men, dwelling in a cosmos, living in society, under God. Automation does not cause work to disappear. The forms of work may change from corporal to cerebral. But always we take on new and vaster cares. No world of total leisure lies around the corner. Inseparable from life in the present state of the world is the badge of ownership and the burden of taking care. About the goodness and dignity of both there need be no question. But we must ask, where is business taking us?

The few hints which we possess about life in the redeemed world point towards a very different state of affairs. In the kingdom to come, men will move more easily in a world. None need own anything because all will possess everything. Life in the kingdom will be marked by freedom from care. In a real sense the poor are nearer the kingdom insofar as their propertyless state more truly resembles the perfected state to come than does the condition of those who own and take care. Not that the un-

just and enforced character of their poverty is good but that the resemblance to the kingdom is clearer. In the same sense the rich are farther from the kingdom. Not that generous ownership is evil, but that the resemblance to the kingdom is fainter. That is the first anomaly in the life of business: It will end in its opposite.

A second anomaly must be noted — it is not business that takes us into the place where business is going. The entire effort of owning and caring, the exercise of the techniques of development, sustain the life of the present and put it ahead, but not without paying a price. All transmutations of energy into more available forms are accompanied by the simultaneous transformation of energy into less available forms. The net loss may be hidden by the vastness of the surroundings of our engines, but the trend towards depletion is not less real on that account. Business moves forward and upward, it is true. At the same time it pursues a path of diminution and exhaustion. It is an error, frequently repeated today, to say that the wastage of energy was banished from the physico-chemical universe by the appearance of living systems in the course of evolution or by the advent of man upon the cosmic scene. This is not so. Life forces act beyond, but not against, the physico-chemical laws, and though the human spirit directs cosmic process in ever more fantastic ways, it too operates beyond but not against the laws of process. The “radial” energy of Teilhardian hyperphysics is a convenient metaphor for describing the ascent of cosmic and human process but it has no effect on the arithmetic of the “tangential” accompaniment, any more than does the growth of a plant interfere with the mechanics of its eventual termination.

Such is the full ambiguity of the goodness of business in a world of ownership and taking care. Business carries us honorably upward and forward, but it brings us to this side of a point

of rupture leaving us still in possession but no longer rich, so that it is by God’s gift that we will be found on the other side of the point of rupture no longer possessing but rich beyond our dreams. The completion of our world is God’s gift, no less than its initiation. The task of business is to display both the power and the limitation of man in carrying the world forward and down to the moment of that completion.

Turning now to marriage, we observe a like ambiguity, frequently noted and much written about. Marriage as we know it now is a necessary part of man’s seeking after enlargement and fullness of life. Far deeper than the achievements of technology are the mysterious accomplishments of hearth and home — the love and striving of man and wife, the give and take between parents and children, the building up of the family of man. Not that all need therefore marry, but that even the unmarried are fulfilled by their contribution in labor and love to a world that would not exist at all if others were not marrying. But, as with business, we must ask, where is marriage taking us?

The few hints we have on the subject lead us to believe that in the redeemed world “they will no longer marry or give in marriage.” The family of man will have come to its completion. Life and love together will be held in perfect measure without pairing. In a real sense the unmarried are closer to the kingdom because their unpartnered state more closely resembles the perfected state of the new family of man. Not that enforced loneliness or unjust desertion is good but that the resemblance to the kingdom is clearer. In the same sense the married are farther from the kingdom. Not that chaste wedlock is evil but that the resemblance to the kingdom is fainter. That is the first anomaly in the life of marriage: It will terminate in its opposite.

A second anomaly must be noted. As with business in rela-

tion to the world, marriage, in the very act of perpetuating life and love, is simultaneously unable to rescue them from time and death. It is true and good that love is deepened and that children are nurtured into men. Yet always with those achievements goes the fading of life and love. The fact is evident, but far from trivial, that parents give life only to lose it themselves, and that love, though gained, never quite succeeds in bridging the inevitable otherness of one's partner. Total unity in which each becomes more himself as he succeeds in giving himself to the other remains the goal, but after the manner of a distant shore, viewed but not reached. The sexual act is undoubtedly the situation in which the ambivalence is most intensely expressed: *Post coitum, tristitia* [after lovemaking, sadness]. The insoluble dialectic of time and love, and the contradiction of life and death appear most intense in terms of sexuality. Only the kingdom will bring the riches of undying life and unfading love that marriage reaches towards but does not achieve. May we not see here an ambiguity that lies in the very goodness of marriage? It carries life and love honorably forward and upward, bringing the family of man to this side of a point of rupture in which we are still mated but in exile, so that it is by God's gift that we are found on the other side of the point of rupture, no longer mated, but home at last. The final perfecting of life together is the gift of God. The contribution of marriage is to display both the power and limits of man in carrying love and life forward and down to the point of completion.

We come finally to the third area of human secular activity — the government of human society. In the broad sense in which we use the term "government" we include every exercise of technique in human affairs that aims at the fullest measure of personal freedom in organized community, whether that be the domestic, the civil, or the industrial community. The great movements of our times in the field of human engineering are

directed towards organizing a fuller personal life in freedom for all men. We seek, in hope and love, a more just balance between the claims of person and community. Our avowed aim is to set men free to work together happily at the task of building the earth and finding life and love together in marriage. About the goodness of this effort towards sociogenesis not the slightest doubt may be raised, whatever the alleged tardiness of Christians to come alive to the fact in times past. No less than the cares of business or the concerns of marriage, the task of expanding freedom into the body social pertains to the heart of religion. About the dignity and worth of human government there can be no question. Nevertheless, we must ask, where is government taking us?

It may sound strange in our ears, but it is true to say that the kingdom towards which our present efforts direct us is not a kingdom of freedom. Heaven is captivation. All free pursuit of the good is conducted in the hope that we may end by being caught by it in a delirium of joy. If we struggle now for freedom and self-government, it is in order that we may be left open for that moment when we will be in bondage. In a sense the unfree, like the unpropertied and the unmarried are closer to the kingdom, because their freedomless state more closely resembles the perfected state of life to come than does the condition of those who are able to choose. Not that involuntary servitude is good, but that the resemblance to the kingdom is fainter. This is the first anomaly about the life of freedom in community — the goal of human government: It will end in its opposite.

A second anomaly must be noted. This is one, the very mention of which provokes instant opposition today. Speak of the inability of business to lead us straight into the world of non-business, or speak of the inability of marriage to lead us straight into the kingdom of non-marriage — speak of these and you

have some hope of being heard. But say one limiting word about the power of freedom to achieve the kingdom of heart's desire and you touch the tenderest nerve of creaturehood. All the Manichean skeletons of an authoritarian past are rattled, all the diabolic schemes to seize power and throttle freedom are brandished in one's face. It is usual for the inheritors of a great cultural break-through to be incapable of conceiving the world in any other terms. Freedom is our pet discovery today. Which makes it difficult to get the real point across. It is not that freedom in government is bad, nor that freedom in government should not be sought in increasing measure and furthered by every technique of consultation, participation, and communication. It is simply that freedom does not produce the kingdom. The organization of free men in a community of loving respect for person in the very act of liberating men from the inhuman condition of the oppressed, forges by its very technique a new web of planning, involvement, coordination, information. Freedom grows, yes. There is gain, of course. Yet not without a price being paid. Not that this is evil, any more than is the limited character of business or marriage, but it indicates the ambiguity of the goodness of government. It can only carry us to this side of a point of rupture where we are still free but enmeshed so that it is by the gift of God that we will be found on the other side of the point of rupture, captive but liberated.

Such, then, is the inescapable twosidedness of all secular human activity. At this point it may be well to repeat that in speaking of the limitation of all our creaturely efforts, we have in mind something other than those defeats that necessarily result from the sinful use of human freedom. Our task of building the earth, forming the self, and organizing the body of human society is forever encountering the neutralizing forces of greed, lust, and tyranny. This sin-born wastage is indefensible and inexcusable. But that is not what we have in mind. Neither, when

we speak of diminution and depletion, are we thinking of that sloughing off which is the accompaniment of every process and growth. The child must "die" so that the man may appear. That is the metaphorical "death" inherent in all transformation. What we have in mind here is the emergence of a real zero point on our way to completion, not by reason of any wickedness on our part but as inherent in any finite effort towards upbuilding and organization. We are asserting this limitation as a good, a salvific good. It is no tragedy. It is no excuse for taking up our bat and ball and going home. It is one of those deeply wonderful and terrible aspects of finiteness that in our foolishness we would rather pretend was not there.

All efforts to answer up truthfully to the condition of fallen creaturehood moving towards completion must give expression to a double truth. Everything is destined to be transformed, be it cosmic environment, or embodied spirit, or societal milieu. Hence all's well as touching our tasks of building the earth, achieving the self, organizing community. At the same time there is a distinct possibility that the transformation is not achieved without rupture. Hence all's well as touching the limitations attaching to every human effort to build the earth, achieve the self, organize community. On the one hand, the effective component in business, marriage, and government is aimed at a good, an omega point, that will not fail to be realized. On the other hand, the ineffectual component in business, marriage, and government is also pointed towards a good, but this time, a zero point that lays world, man, and society open before the saving God.

Man grows and matures by a progressive understanding of both sides of the full truth of his creaturehood. He must achieve a concern and assume a responsibility to contribute to the world seen as continuing creation. But he does not come of age unless

he also opens his eyes to the truth that the world as entering transformation is crucifixion. His full manhood is found through that unique creation that is crucifixion. Whoever separates these goods does violence to the meaning of Christian love for the world. He unmans himself by severing that part of courage which is expressed in activity from that part of courage which is expressed in passivity. He makes dying an enemy of living, failure an enemy of success, poverty an enemy of riches, passion an enemy of action. He fails to perceive the full reality of life, not just in the modern world, but in *any* world.

To return to our starting point, the medicine for a wound does not therefore provide nourishing diet for the wounded. The approach to the problem of the abuses and distortions of the religious life does not also serve as an approach to the problem of constituting the life in its truest meaning. The first problem calls for a rediscovery of the essential goodness of the worldly work of business, the sexual fulfillment of marriage, and the blessings of freedom. But when it comes to re-creating in the modern world a life which starts with a vowed surrender of property, of spouse, and of freedom, then it becomes clear that one must make the connection with the reality of creaturehood at those points which are least readily perceived by the modern world, which is to say, not at the goodness of business, marriage, and government, but at their limitation. Having seen the way in which the “what” and the “how” of salvation — cosmic, personal, and societal — give a strange twosidedness to man’s movement through business enterprise, conjugal life, and societal organization, towards the kingdom to come, we are now in a position to come to grips with the meaning of the religious life in today’s world. What is the word that is spoken, what is the meaning that is expressed by the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience? To this we now turn.

IV. The Distinction of States, Lay and Religious

The distinction between the religious state and the lay state arises naturally out of the ambivalent character of man’s life in the present phase of the world. Inasmuch as a necessity lies upon the Christian community to proclaim opposite but complementary truths about the process of world salvation it was to be expected that a distinction of states would emerge in the public order of Christendom. Truths of great consequence demand public articulation. On the one hand, work upon the world, love in marriage, and the search for personal autonomy in community are good. They lead us in the direction of the kingdom. On the other hand, these activities are unable to place us in the kingdom, and they will themselves be absent from the life of the kingdom. To relinquish them eventually is also a necessity for salvation. Thus the Christian community cannot assert the value of possessions, of marriage, of autonomy to the point where their opposites would seem worthless. Neither can the Christian community exalt poverty, celibacy, and obedience to the point where the goodness of possessions, of spouse, and of autonomy might seem to be denied. One of these is good in view of the journey, the other is good in view of the destination. One has roots in the present as leading to the future. The other has roots in the future as already upon us. As with so many other elements in the mystery of salvation, the prior enactment of the future before it comes has its proper place in the present. Proclamation of the twosided truth of man’s progress to the kingdom is a part of the public Christian good. Hence the need for a distinction of public states of life. Since the same voices cannot sing treble and bass at the same time, we need a choir in which the separate parts are blended in harmony. Our contention is that the lay and religious states of life combine in the public work of producing a harmony of life in two parts. When one

part falls silent, there is no harmony. When one part is sounded too loudly, there is dissonance. When parts are interchanged, there is confusion. There is harmony when each sings true.

In the light of this conception of the distinction and complementarity of lay and religious states we can now examine more clearly into the meaning of the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. First, the reason for making religious vows does not lie in any pessimistic belief that the life of business, marriage, and independence is in any way evil. It is not life in the world but a “worldly” life that is reprehensible. Hence, it is not true that life in the world must be set aside by those who would seek a truly “spiritual” life. Neither is that view of the vows correct which grants the goodness of these activities but asserts the danger inherent in them. In this view, life in the world, while not evil, is an obstruction on the path of salvation. Hence, the religious vows express a determination to spare no effort to achieve perfection. It is true that life in the world is not without its dangers. Possessions can lead to greed. Marital love can fall away into lust. The enjoyment of independence can lead to pride. But the proper conclusion to draw when, as here, the dangerous is also the good, is that those who pursue this good must do so with care. We cannot conclude merely on account of danger that it would be more virtuous to relinquish the pursuit of these goods. In any case, it is equally true that poverty, chastity, and obedience can become obstacles on the road to perfection. They too can be vitiated by abuse.

A third misconception avoids the two previous errors but falls into one of its own, namely, that though possessions, marital love and freedom are good, God is better. Those who would be perfect must give themselves more directly to God. The infinite must be preferred to the finite. The lesser must yield place to the greater. Religious vows are made by those who would

give an undivided heart to God. This is a view which rightly angers the good lay person. It puts him in a position of being a second class citizen, less generous. What is forgotten in this view is that it is *through* the finite that the infinite is to be sought. God indeed transcends the finite goods of the world, but He is also immanent in them, and in them He is to be found. But now it seems as if we have pulled the props from under the religious life altogether.

This brings us to the very heart of the matter. For if the infinite is to be sought through the finite, God through the world, how can there be any justification for a state other than the lay state? We answer that the infinite is to be sought through the finite, God through the world, by a double action, by a *living* of the present state of the world and by a *letting go* of it. One of these is not to be held in contradiction of the other. Both must be proclaimed as true and complementary by the Christian community. It is in community that men move towards the kingdom, and they go by a community effort of living and leaving. The necessity of doing so arises from the ambivalent nature of creaturely support. They die in living; and, by the gift of the Creator, it is in dying that they will be raised. The necessity calls for public expression.

To sum up, the meaning of the religious vows is not that life in the world is evil, not that it is good but dangerous, not that it is good but God is better, but that action in the world, though good, does not suffice to bring the world to completion. Passion in the world is also needed. A readiness to let go must also be expressed. We save the world by carrying it forward *and* by letting it go into the hands of God who saves. The coexistence of lay and religious states, each with its characteristic vows, ensures the full, public expression of the truth of life in the world.

An important consequence of this way of looking at the meaning of the religious life is that in relation to the crises of life in the world, the good religious and the good lay person will take up positions that are opposite but complementary. Their roles in relation to these crises will not be identical. One will *ease* the crisis along the line of *action*, the other will *sustain* the crisis along the line of *passion*. Let me illustrate. The crises of life are felt in those areas of life's action around which religious vows are centered: business, marriage, and liberty. Business can fail. Whether through mischance or injustice, men are forced into situations where their economic life is diminished. Men are forced out of business into poverty. Marriage can fail. Desertion, divorce, widowhood, or the simple failure to find a partner can push marital love into eclipse. Men are forced out of marriage into celibacy. Liberty can fail. Tyranny and oppression or the very necessities of organization can limit the choices and circumscribe the liberties of men. Men are forced into "obedience." In the face of these crises it is in fullest accord with Christian zest for life and Christian love for the world and society that men should seek to lift their burdens, open the snares, push back the barriers. Cold indifference to poverty, loneliness, and oppression have no place in Christian society. But having said that much — what we might call the lay half of the truth of man's life in the world — the obligation is still incumbent on Christian society to speak out with equal vigor the other half of the truth, the half which is cognate to the religious state. For in view of the nature of life in the kingdom, and because of the manner of our approach to it, these passivities, these diminutions, this being crushed, are not unmitigated evils. Even when produced and directed by the evil intent of men, these privations cannot be robbed of their reference to and their orientation towards the state of man in the kingdom. Thus while no humanism can be called Christian which neglects to answer the call to

social justice and world-building, neither can any humanism be called Christian which stops there.

The goodness of living life and the goodness of letting it go are essential components of an integral Christian humanism. In order that the two be kept in balance, it is necessary, most of all in moments of crisis, that lay action to overcome be integrated with religious passion to be overcome. By the side of the good layman who helps to lift up the poor, the lonely, the oppressed, there must stand the good religious who shows them how to endure. If the first should fail, the living of life is denied. If the second should fail, the leaving of life is dishonored. Should religious have been at Selma? That is hardly the question. The question is rather, what should they have been doing there. Did they not have a proper role of their own distinct from the lay role and complementary to it? — a role that their lay confreres would, we hope, understand. Or would they? Have religious themselves understood it? Or, afraid of seeming to deny the lay half of the truth of life, have they been led to obscure the religious half, the half which they are committed to uphold?

It may be that the problem of keeping roles distinct and the temptation to cross lines is related to the practical necessities of the past when religious communities carried the main burden of society's task of social welfare. Whenever the lay sector tended towards the neglect of the poor, the lonely, and the oppressed, religious communities moved in to fill the gap. Some were even founded specifically for the purpose of charitable works. In such circumstances, what began as a *substitutional* role took on the appearance of a *superior* role. The religious life was displayed as a shining example of the Christian love of fellow man, to be emulated by the laity. The religious vows presented the appearance of generous sacrifices made to further social projects. Lacking the massive support of organized government taxation,

how else could a community of Christians educate the poor, care for the widows and orphans, nurse the sick, and bury the dead except by letting go the impediments of income, marriage, and the freedom to come and go? The result is that in a later age when the lay forces of business and government begin to take more efficient care of society, the notion persists that lay and religious life are distinguished by greater and lesser degrees of the one Christian love for world and society, and the vows continue to be interpreted as means of liberating the religious for this greater dedication to world-building and social uplift. Religious asceticism is given a functional twist. Its determinant and its justification is apostolic action. If tomorrow the vows should get in the way of action, then, out they must go. But our whole point thus far has been that the lay and religious states are not distinguished by the *exercise* of different *degrees* of Christian *love* for the world and society, but by the *expression* of different *modes* of Christian *truth* about their salvation. Each mode of the truth leads to its own proper style of love. There is the love that abounds in action and there is the love that abounds in passion. There is the love that takes hold of creaturely power as good and the love that lets go of creaturely power as limited. This is true even when both are engaged in the same work, nursing, teaching, or whatever. Treble and bass both sing, but their pitch and quality are different. They speak the same melody but differently. The *meaning* of the religious life is one thing and the *needs* of the apostolate are another. One is not derived from the other. Religious life has its place in the apostolate, of course, but it is *defined* in terms of meaning rather than in terms of function.

The persistence of the notion that the lay and religious states are defined in terms of more and less perfect is illustrated further by the embarrassment occasioned by the comment that is sometimes made to the effect that many lay persons live more mortified lives than many religious. Underlying the comment is the

assumption that the religious life is supposed to display a higher standard of holiness, and, therefore, abound more in ascetical practices. The distinction is seen to be one of *degree* rather than *kind* of holiness, and the point of the vows get lost. There are, indeed, many lay people who are poor, who cannot buy what they need to have, simply out of sheer necessity. They do not have the wherewithal. This they regard as a misfortune to be borne as long as it cannot be overcome. The religious puts himself in the state of poverty by a deliberate choice. The money may be there, but it does not get used for certain things, and this is chosen as a good, not patiently borne as a misfortune. Granted that it is a scandal when the result is a too comfortable poverty, but the point of distinction of states is not which is the poorer, but which is a *publicly chosen* state. Likewise there are many lay persons who live unmarried simply because it turned out that way by some necessity. If the chance of marriage had been offered, they would have taken it. The religious lets marriage go by a deliberate choice. Religious celibacy is something embraced as a good, not something endured as a cross. There are many lay persons who lack liberty simply because circumstances hold them bound. The religious enters such a state by choice. So it is not poverty, celibacy, and obedience as “more” or “less” that distinguishes the states of life, but poverty, celibacy, and obedience as “vowed,” and publicly, in the Church. To have met these privately and along the road of life is one thing, but to have overtaken them from the start, and publicly, is another. That is deliberate act which speaks a public word about the goodness of letting go as a necessary part of the movement of world and society towards God. Since this is a task that is not often held in honor, there is, perhaps, a sense in which the religious life might be called a higher work, a harder task. But such terms are better avoided. The religious life is a state of perfection in the sense that in the public domain it more closely resembles the perfected state of the kingdom toward which we are

all called. The religious life is not a state of perfection in the sense that people within it are expected to do a better job of living *their* state than the laity are expected to do in living *theirs*. Comparisons between good members of one state and bad members of the other state are of little help in discerning the distinction of states. For that, we must compare them apart from their defects, and in the light of the full mystery of the world's salvation.

A final word about the problem of loss of identity in religious life. Whenever the total effort in any field is divided between social classes, it naturally happens that the seemingly weaker partner is tempted to doubt the worth of his role. Take the division of roles between men and women in the family. The man's role takes him more often out of the home, into the public and adult sector of the world. The woman's role, at least when the children are small, often confines her to the private and juvenile sector of the world. She seems to have the weaker part. She easily begins to doubt the significance of her role and seeks to gain status by taking over tasks more usually assigned to men. Or consider the diverse roles of science and philosophy in the academic family. They divide the labor of pushing back the frontiers of knowledge. On the surface, the contribution of the scientist is the stronger. Philosophy builds no bridges, has no applications in the visible domain. Hence it is philosophy that more easily suffers an identity crisis, and in an effort to regain status may even be guilty of remodeling itself along the lines of symbolic analysis. Always the seemingly weaker partner feels threatened.

Along the same line of argument consider the division of roles between the lay and religious states of life. Both styles of life are needed to express the full truth of the human condition of finite persons, together, in a world and moving towards a

completion with God. Yet who will deny that the lay contribution is the more impressive on the surface as compared with the religious. The propertyless, spouseless, powerless life of the vows seem pale by comparison with the world of business, of marriage, and of government. One seems aggressive and involved, while the other looks withdrawn and shy. One is easily exalted as positive and incarnational while the other is liable to be set down as negative and eschatological. So much is the lay mode of involvement in the world more showy than the religious anticipation of the life of the resurrection that the religious is troubled over the significance of his role. "Are we not out of place and irrelevant in the modern world?" is the cry. Many who are in the religious life are minded to leave it, and few who are outside it are anxious to join it. Admittedly, much of the "dropout" and vocation problem stems from abuses and distortions in the religious life. But quite apart from these, the state itself at its truest and best has a delicacy, a frailty, a remoteness from life that, so far from being a fault, is the inevitable handicap of a state that undertakes to give expression to the goodness of creaturely limitation. Religious vocation is always a source of wonder in the world. It is close to madness.

But if the religious life is defined, as we have contended, in terms of its meaning rather than its function, we must face the question of its use in the world. No state can be content with *being* something and *saying* something. It must be and say in the act of *doing* something. This is the question of coexistence of religious meaning and professional life.

V. The Religious State and Professional Life

We have been insisting that the religious life is defined in terms of the meaning which it expresses about the world rather

than in terms of what it does in the world. Yet it is in the act of doing something in the world that the religious life will speak its distinctive word. Doing what? That is the question which we must now ponder. The broadest answer would be, doing anything as long as it is not such as to obscure or contradict the meaning which the religious state is charged to uphold. That does little to narrow the field, and obviously the field is narrowed down in fact. What is excluded from the range of religious professional effort? Bank-robbing and the like are “out” for reasons that are evident. In addition, there may be some activities that inherently express the lay half of life’s meaning so strongly that they are not things that a religious might profitably do and still get the religious point across — tax-collecting or highway construction, for instance. Apart from such inherent “layness” there are few reasons why any occupation might not provide work in the world for a person in the religious state. But clearly there are some professions, for example, nursing and teaching, that have about them a peculiar aptitude to be exercised both by lay and religious. It is in respect of these that we can more profitably explore the distinctive character of religious involvement in professional life.

Consider the nursing profession and let us ask what is the special contribution of a nursing sister to the patient as compared with that of a “regular” nurse. Our answer will be that each one provides (in the ideal case) identical nursing care for the patient. Under nursing care we include everything that might be expected from a dedicated Christian nurse, spiritual as well as physical. On that score there can be no difference. But each will convey to the patient different but complementary halves of the truth about health, sickness, and death, and this simply by *reason of the sort of commitment which each is publicly known to have in relation to life in the world*. It is presence as lay or presence as religious that makes the difference to patient, not

any difference in nursing service. It is *what they stand for* that distinguishes the lay and religious nurse, not *what they do or how they do it*.

To clarify this position we must first ask how health and sickness fit into the total picture of life as understood in Christian thought. Recall what we said earlier about the salvation process. The entire creation is heading towards a completion in Christ by a process in which transformation may well lead into rupture and then resurrection. Is this how the hospital patient sees life? We might say of sickness what has been said of death in recent writing, that sickness is a “moment of truth.” Sickness is more than a bodily crisis threatening the patient’s life. It is a vital experience which directs the attention of the patient to that half of the ambivalent truth of life which all of us habitually neglect, namely, that life is completed by being emptied out as well as by being filled up. So intent are we on the living of life that we are little exercised in the letting go of it. Yet that is the other half of the business of life. The relinquishing of life by sickness, no more than the living of life by health, is the path that leads to its fullest recovery. Every sickness is a painful reminder that we have neglected this half of the truth, that we are strangers to the dying of things, that we are not practiced in the art of dealing positively with the negative element of our creaturely condition. To that extent every sickness is a reminder to us that we were only half living in what we were pleased to call the days of our health. The sick man is faced with two dangers. He may not recover and thus be deprived of a chance of making further progress in the positive business of living life upward and forward. On the other hand, in recovering, he may fall back into his neglect of the art of letting life go.

Since two dangers beset the sick person it is necessary that

he have two kinds of persons to minister to him at his bedside. On the one hand, he needs doctors and nurses skilled in the business of fighting disease and postponing death: people who in their personal lives too are dedicated to loving life by the living of it. On the other hand, the patient needs by his side others who though equally skilled in the arts of healing are dedicated in their personal lives to relinquishing those things which keep man's life in the world going — property, spouse, liberty — *while still loving and enjoying life*. In the mere presence of such a person ministering by his bed the sick man will see, as in the pages of a living book, the other half of the truth of his sickness, the half about which most of us tend to be negative.

The difference between the lay nurse and the nursing sister is not that the lay nurse can take care of the body and the nursing sister can take care of body and soul. It may be that many lay nurses are inept in the things of the soul and that nursing sisters are more at home with God, prayers, and so forth. But rather than throwing light on the distinction of lay and religious professional work, this fact points up a different truth about life in the world. The one, earning, married, and at liberty, speaks of the goodness of returning to health; the other, anticipating already the life of the kingdom, speaks of the goodness, in its own time, of letting health go. That time might be now or any moment. To convey this witness, the nursing sister must somehow be identifiable as such to the patient. She cannot just appear “like any other nurse.”

By no means is the difference between the good lay nurse and the good nursing sister to be identified as a difference in degree of devotion to patients, or to be described by saying that you can expect better service from one who has been set free by vows from the love and care of family. If the two kinds of nurses are not to be distinguished as more or less “religious,” as

above, neither are they to be distinguished as more and less dedicated. In fact, of course, one will often be more or less dedicated than the other, but this has nothing to do with the proper nature of the case. It is not that the nursing sister brings either religion or dedication into the world of sickness and medicine, for the good lay nurse does that too. It is that she bears witness to another half of the religious truth at a time and place in life where its absence is fatal to Christian culture. In a place where the battle against sickness and death is properly waged every hour of night and day, the nursing sister must be there to befriend sickness and death lest the effort to overcome them lead to the unconscious public assumption that they are enemies of mankind. Indeed, the more vigorously the battle of technology moves towards the conquest of disease and death, the louder must come the cry that they are our true friends in their own time and place. This is the other half of the Christian truth, the voicing of which constitutes the increasing relevance of the religious life in the modern world. It cries out on behalf of the limitations of technique so as to keep the world open to the gift character of ultimate completion.

A similar argument can be constructed to show the significance of religious presence in the teaching profession. The justification for the religious teacher is not that he or she knows more about religion and can do a better job of teaching the subject, or that the religious teacher teaches by her very life as well as by the book. Both of these are done by the good lay teacher. Nor is the justification for the religious teacher that he or she is more dedicated to the student by reason of being set free from the confining affections of home and family. The justification is that the religious teacher by his or her life project, rendered public and visible, expresses that half of the Christian truth about life in the world that is complementary to what is expressed by the life project of the lay teacher. It is vital that the young see

both sides of the truth expressed in harmony.

The persistence of other views of the significance of the religious teacher may be attributed to the accidents of history. It is a fact that in many places where schools had become irreligious or where education was denied to the poor, religious communities set up schools for Christian youth. But it was not because they were sisters in religion but because they were educated Christians that they could teach religion as well as secular subjects. And it was not because they wanted to make the project economically feasible that they took religious vows but because they had for other reasons taken religious vows that the project was economically feasible. The fact of religious presence in the teaching profession was often dictated by a defect on the part of Christian lay society. Either there was a dearth of Christians well educated in their faith, or there was an insufficiency of Christian lay funds. Because of lay defect of one sort or another, religious communities substituted heroically; but this obscures the fact that there would be a place for them in any case, and it leads to the persistence of the notion that the religious teacher is more dedicated, less “worldly” and therefore, more “religious.” In general, the notion persists that, other things being equal, the religious professional is to be preferred to the lay. The error is understandable in view of the accidents of history, but it is inexcusable today in view of our greater appreciation of the goodness and holiness of the lay state.

That much said about the error of exalting the religious teacher at the expense of the lay teacher, we must now regret the tendency to do the opposite. Much recent writing gives the impression that because of the vowed absence of the religious teacher from the “action-centers” of life, the religious teacher is ill prepared to guide the student into the modern world. At best the religious teacher is a substitute for the lay. The ideal thing

would be to have children taught by good Christian lay teachers. Not so, however. The point is again missed, as in the opposite error, that both lay and religious have a contribution to make to the teaching of youth — so that to be taught exclusively by the one or by the other is to be shut off from the lived integrity of Christian truth. The two should appear together by the desk of the student as the two should minister by the bed of the sick. And it is not so that one can provide religious knowledge and the other secular knowledge. It is that each may express by their personal life project distinct but complementary halves of the Christian truth about life. Nowhere more than in the modern world is there greater need for an expression of the truth expressed by the religious life project. The danger is great that in our new-found confidence in the power of man, our children may embrace a religion of undiluted conquest. They badly need to see the joy and goodness of being overcome.

It is not unimportant that the two kinds of teachers be visibly distinguishable. Public witness is not possible otherwise. Nor will it do to argue that it is not the dress but the manner that must distinguish the religious teacher from the lay. For that is to fall back into the error that the religious teacher is marked by greater holiness or greater virtue or greater love for mankind. But all along we have argued that what distinguishes the two is a *different* holiness, a *different* virtue, a *different* style of love: a holiness, a virtue, and a love that is pivoted around the mystery of the limited character of the goodness of property, of spouse, of liberty, in view of the manner of our approach to the kingdom, as distinct from holiness, a virtue, and a love that is pivoted around the mystery of the power and the goodness of business, marriage, and freedom that carry us towards the kingdom.

The attempt is often made to put the distinction between religious and lay professional in terms of a greater responsibility to-

wards the poor: "What should distinguish the religious from their lay counterparts is that they provide the same kind and degree of service, nursing, or teaching, *but for the poor.*"

Supposedly this is a reflection of a higher degree of Christian love that is to be expected from religious as compared with lay. Religious professional service is the same as lay but energized by greater love for the downtrodden. The view is plausible. After all, is not the religious life a state of "perfection"? Must not the performance be higher in some way? Perhaps there is danger here of a latent scorning of riches flowing from a misconception of the vow of poverty, analogous to a latent scorning of marriage that is sometimes associated with a misunderstanding of the vow of chastity? In any event, the fact that religious should often direct their skills and services to the poor rather than to the rich is a consequence of lay failure in the field rather than a property that flows uniquely from the nature of the religious life. Ideally both rich and poor should be served by both lay and religious nurses, teachers, scientists, philosophers, technicians, and so forth, because both rich and poor have need of the special contribution of each. The poor must hear the message of the religious so that they may be strong in enduring, and the message of the lay so that they may, hopefully, become strong in overcoming. Likewise, the rich need to hear the message of the religious so that they may perceive the goodness of letting go, and the message of the lay so that they may know the goodness of responsible power. For, to repeat, the distinction of the special contributions of lay and religious in professional life does not lie in any diversity of the service rendered, not in any superiority of the love with which it is offered, but in what is expressed in their diverse personal life projects concerning the power and the limits of all service in relation to the progress of man and world and society towards completion in the kingdom. Both rich and poor stand in need, though in opposite ways, of this double witness to the Christ-crossed truth of man in the

modern world, or in any world.

THE INFINITE IS TO BE SOUGHT THROUGH THE FINITE, GOD THROUGH THE WORLD, BY A DOUBLE ACTION, BY A LIVING OF THE PRESENT STATE OF THE WORLD AND BY A LETTING GO OF IT. ONE OF THESE IS NOT TO BE HELD IN CONTRADICTION OF THE OTHER. BOTH MUST BE PROCLAIMED AS TRUE AND COMPLEMENTARY BY THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY. IT IS IN COMMUNITY THAT MEN AND WOMEN MOVE TOWARDS THE KINGDOM, AND THEY GO BY A COMMUNITY EFFORT OF LIVING AND LEAVING. THE NECESSITY OF DOING SO ARISES FROM THE AMBIVALENT NATURE OF CREATURELY SUPPORT. THEY DIE IN LIVING; AND, BY THE GIFT OF THE CREATOR, IT IS IN DYING THAT THEY WILL BE RAISED.