

OPUS DEI: PRAYER OR LABOR?

di
JAMES BERNARD MURPHY

The paper critically discusses the charism of Saint Benedict spirituality and its motto ora et labora or sometimes orare et laborare. In particular, the author notes the common practice of misquoting this motto to say: "laborare est orare", in relation of Opus Dei spirituality. The paper underlynes that the Latin motto cannot be found in the writings of Escriva, but the idea captured in "Laborare est Orare" is the basis for the spirituality of Opus Dei. The paper then arguments how Sts. Benedict and Escriva represent the fundamental alternative charisms of work. In Benedict, work the necessary precondition for the spiritual freedom of prayer while for Escriva work is itself offered up as a form of prayer. In the first, we encounter God through the spiritual exercise of prayer, in the second, through the exertion of our daily occupation.

One Latin Letter: The Charism of Work in St Benedict and in St Josemaría Escrivá

Sometimes simple errors can lead us to important truths. The motto of the world-wide Benedictine Confederation is *ora et labora* (prayer and work). This motto is often attributed to St Benedict himself but cannot be found in his *Rule*. Many Benedictines believe that their motto accurately captures the spirit of the *Rule* (RB, chapter 48), which describes the monk's day as alternating among the Divine Office of the Hours, manual labor, spiritually-uplifting reading[1]. What is most amusing and illuminating, however, is the common practice of misquoting this motto to say: *laborare est orare*. For one of infinite examples, see this article in Time Magazine: ' "*Laborare est orare*" said St Benedict (work is prayer)[2].' So deep is this modern misreading, that some writers even mistranslate the Benedictine motto to fit it: 'Thus, his (Benedict's) motto - *Ora et Labora* (to work is to pray) - became a standard of the Rule[3].' I have traced this very creative and suggestive error back to that great charismatic prophet of the Victorian work ethic, Thomas Carlyle: 'The old Monks had a proverb "*Laborare est Orare*," to work is to pray[4].' Such pervasive misunderstanding, misattribution, misreading, and mistranslation, reflects more than mere bad scholarship: these are the errors, not of individuals, but of an age. No matter what Benedict may have said, we moderns cannot help but hear that 'work is prayer'.

The modern spiritualization of work is nowhere more influential than in the doctrine of St Josemaría Escrivá and his Opus Dei. I have not found the Latin motto in the writings of Escrivá, but the idea captured in *Laborare est Orare* is the basis for the spirituality of Opus Dei: 'Let us work. Let us work a lot and work well, without forgetting that prayer is our best weapon. That is why I will never tire of repeating that we have to be contemplative souls in the middle of the world, who try to convert their work into prayer[5].' St Escrivá invites every Catholic layman to identify his own work with the *operatio Dei*. To measure the chasm between Benedict and Escrivá, we need only consider the contrasting ways in which they understand 'the work of God'. For Benedict, the *Opus Dei* means only the divine office, the liturgy of the hours[6]. The divine office is the only activity of the monk

1) The standard edition of the *Rule of St. Benedict*, in Latin and English, is *RB 1980* (hereafter RB), (ed.) Timothy Fry OSB (Collegeville, USA: Liturgical Press, 1981).
2) www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,891459-9,00.html#ixzz0dGjHPYpi
3) Quentin Skrabec, *St. Benedict's Rule for Business Success* (West Lafayette, USA: Purdue University Press, 2003), 30.
4) http://carlyleletters.dukejournals.org/cgi/content/full/15/1/lt-18421008-TC-JO-01?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&fulltext=laborare+est+orare&searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=0&resourcetype=HWCIT
5) *Furrow*, 15. All of Escrivá's works can be found at www.Escrivaworks.org. All quotes of Escrivá are from this website, identified by the name of the book and the chapter. See 'Those who are pious, with a piety devoid of affectation, carry out their professional duty perfectly, since they know that their work is a prayer raised to God.' *The Forge*, 9.
6) Thus, Dom Cuthbert Butler says: 'by "Work of God" (*opus Dei, opus divinum*) St Benedict means precisely the public recital of the office, and nothing else…' *Benedictine Monachism* (London: Longman Green, and Co., 1924), 30.

whose sole object is God himself. Indeed, the divine office is the work of God not only in the sense that it is an activity only for God, but also in the sense that the words recited are themselves the work of God in the Scripture. But for Escrivá, *Opus Dei* refers to our daily labor in whatever occupation we pursue. Because of the immensely successful and pervasive influence of Escrivá's movement, many Catholics now think of their own occupations in terms of The Work of God: by our daily labors we participate in the God's work of creation and redemption. So the meaning of *Opus Dei* has evolved from the liturgy of the hours to the ordinary daily occupations of lay Catholics, raised up as an offering to God.

Is there one iota of difference between *laborare et orare* and *laborare est orare*? Does it matter whether we think of the Work of God as the divine office or as our daily chores? Yes, I think that the contrast between Benedictine and Escriván spirituality will illuminate our understanding of what we mean by prayer and by work. These two saints express fundamental alternatives in any spirituality of work: either work is a necessary precondition for prayer or work is itself raised up as prayer. Benedict's sources, both classical philosophy and the Bible, both Athens and Jerusalem, teach the subordination of work to prayer. In Genesis, work is described as a punishment for the disobedience of the Fall. In Plato and Aristotle, work belongs to the realm of necessity: work is a necessary precondition for the spiritual freedom to be found in thought and contemplation. Both of these themes are evident in St Benedict, who describes work (in chapter 48) as both a remedy for the evil of idleness and as a necessity of life[7]. Work is undoubtedly subordinated to prayer: work belongs to the body (*opus corporis*) and to this world while prayer belongs to the spirit and to God. Although both Athens and Jerusalem subordinate the realm of work to the realm of prayer, they do so for different reasons. There is no doubt that Benedict, following St Paul, values manual labor much more than does any ancient philosopher. For Plato and Aristotle, manual labor is for slaves or metics; the only 'work' that might be worthy of a philosopher would be statesmanship. But, after all, Jesus was a carpenter and St Paul prided himself on his tent-making, so Jerusalem esteems manual work much more than does Athens. Still, both Athens and Jerusalem, in different ways, agree that we divinize ourselves primarily through activities of the mind, especially the contemplation of God. Neither Jesus nor St Paul ever confused their labor for their prayers, or doubted the spiritual superiority of prayer. In short, Benedict's elevation of verbal prayer over manual labor still belongs to the ancient hierarchies of soul over body, freedom over necessary, spirit over matter.

Charles Taylor identifies 'the affirmation of ordinary life' as a central strand of modern thought[8]. Indeed, in Thomas Carlyle, work becomes the highest good and the highest calling of man. 'All true work is sacred.' For Carlyle, truly *laborare est orare*. The charism of work in Escrivá follows closely in the path blazed by Carlyle.

7) 'Idleness is the enemy of the soul. Therefore, the brothers should have specified periods for manual labor … to do whatever work is necessary … if poverty should force them to do the harvesting themselves' (RB 48.1, 6, 7).

8) Taylor, *Sources of the Self* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), ch. 13.

To begin with, Escrivá champions the example of the early Christians, who, before monasticism, lived out their Christian vocations through their ordinary occupations. Escrivá embraces a characteristically modern 'affirmation of everyday life' as he calls Christian laymen and women to embrace their worldly occupations as the primary vehicle of sanctification. Escrivá denies that Genesis presents work as a form of punishment: he claims that God made man for work in the Garden even before the Fall. We can also see a modern democratic impulse in this sanctification of work, since only a few men can hope to follow the ancient path toward sanctification through the cloister or through philosophy. St Escrivá develops this spirituality of work into a doctrine he calls 'Christian materialism': an incarnational theology of divinizing ourselves through our immersion in worldly occupations. Here all the ancient hierarchies are inverted, as material work is elevated to the realm of the spiritual.

1. Work and Prayer in the Benedictine Tradition

In the fifteen centuries of Benedictine monasticism, there have been many different understandings of the relation of work to prayer. This is not surprising, given the immense temporal and geographical diversity of Benedictine life. In any living tradition, we must expect constant change, and the Benedictine tradition has seen many waves of decline, reform, and renewal. True, the *Rule of St Benedict*, like any written code or grammar, does reduce the scope of change, compared to any purely oral tradition. But Benedict's *Rule* is notoriously terse and incomplete: far from specifying all important aspects of life in a monastery, it neglects even some fundamental activities. Modern readers are often surprised that the *Rule* makes no explicit provision for either the celebration of the Eucharist or for private prayer; yet it would be foolish to conclude that Benedict or the Benedictines ever neglected either the Mass or silent prayer. Conversely, Benedict provides a very detailed schedule of punishments for infractions of his Rule, a schedule almost totally ignored in modern monasticism. So the living tradition of Benedictines is essential for understanding and interpreting the *Rule of St Benedict*. It is no accident that all of the important scholars of the *Rule* have been monks. Only someone who has lived and practiced Benedictine monasticism can understand its rules, because all rules are parasitic on the practices they regulate. As the philosopher Michael Oakeshott said, 'rules are like birds: they must live before they can be stuffed.' The *Rule of St Benedict* did not create monasticism but aimed to reform and regulate an ongoing tradition; apart from that lived tradition, the rules are incomprehensible.

So it is not possible to recover a pure and original Benedictine spirituality, untouched and uncontaminated by the subsequent fifteen centuries of lived monasticism. Nonetheless, historical research has persuasively shown that modern Benedictine ideas are often quite different from those of the founder. In the case of work, in particular, we see powerful forces of historical anachronism that lead many writers, both Benedictine and lay, to read Benedict's *Rule* in term of a modern spirituality of work. Although we cannot avoid interpreting the past in the light of the present (our very focus on work reflects our modern concerns), still we

must attempt to uncover Benedict's own understanding if we are to learn from him. Although the Benedictine tradition of commentary is an invaluable guide to the meaning of Benedict's Rule, it is not infallible. Our understanding of Benedict's own intentions has been hugely improved by comparing his *Rule* with the *Rule of the Master*, an anonymous code of monastic life that dates from the beginning of the sixth century. By noting what Benedict borrows and what he ignores in the *Rule of the Master*, we get a better sense of what he wanted for his community[19]. We should want Benedict's *Rule* to be not merely a mirror but also a challenge for our own ideas. If we want a genuine conversation between ancients and moderns, then we have to respect their differences. I will try to show that Benedict's understanding of work and prayer differ quite strikingly from his modern admirers. But my interest is not primarily historical but philosophical: I want to argue, further, that Benedict's implicit philosophy of work and prayer has important lessons for moderns. What does Benedict mean by work and prayer and how did he rank them?

The first thing to note is that work occupies, both in theory and in practice, a much larger place in modern life than in Benedict's world. Depending upon the season, Benedict's monks are supposed to work 4 to 6 hours a day, excluding Sunday. By contrast, according to Terrence Kardong OSB, today's American monks work 10 to 12 hours a day. He says that the work ethic is undermining monastic life: 'I consider work the most pressing issue for American Benedictines, I contend it is killing us[11].' Nor is this merely an American problem. De Vogüé also notes that whereas Benedict needed to encourage his monks to work, today 'there is less need to arouse monks to it than to keep them from being completely absorbed in it[11].' Similarly, Benedict devotes only a few verses to the topic of work, whereas he devotes thirteen entire chapters (8 to 20) and many other scattered verses to the topic of prayer. Yet a huge proportion of modern commentary on the Benedictine tradition focuses on work.

It is obvious to almost everyone that 'work is prayer' is not genuinely Benedictine; indeed, Kardong argues that the converse 'prayer is work' is closer to Benedict. Kardong reminds us that even the official Benedictine motto (emblazoned on the refectory napkins) *ora et labora* is not originally Benedictine and arose only in the nineteenth century[12]. What does Benedict actually teach about work and prayer? Benedict divides up the monastic day into three essential activities: the *Opus Dei* (divine office), productive labor, and biblical study (*lectio divina*). Depending both

9) The standard edition of the *Rule of the Master* is Adalbert de Vogüé OSB, *La Règle du maître*, 3 vols (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1964); De Vogüé's authoritative edition of Benedict's Rule is then based on a close study of the relation between these two Rules, see '*La Règle de Saint Benoît,* 7 vols (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1972).
10) *Assumption Abbey Newsletter* (Richardton, ND 58652), Vol. 23, no. 4 (October 1995); also at: www.osb.org/gen/topics/work/kard1.html.
11) Aldalbert de Vogüé, *The Rule of St. Benedict: A Doctrinal and Spiritual Commentary*, tr. John Baptist Hasbrouck OSB (Kalamazoo, USA: Cistercian Publications, 1983), 247.
12) Kardong, *Assumption Abbey Newsletter*, cites the research of M.D. Meeuws 'Ora et Labora', *Collectanea Cisterciensia* 54 (1992), 193-214.

upon the season and the liturgical calendar, work takes 4-6 hours, liturgy about 3 hours, and biblical study about 2-3 hours. What is striking about these three primary activities in the *Rule* is that none of them corresponds to what we normally think of as Christian prayer. Jesus warned against the public prayer of the Pharisees and told his disciples to pray privately and in secret (Mt 6:6). The opus Dei, however, is public worship, not private prayer. True, Benedict permits monks who wish to pray alone to remain in the oratory after the divine office (RB 52), but he does not require any private prayer nor set aside specific times for it.

According to Adelbert de Vogüé, before Benedict, the divine office originally alternated recited psalms with silence for private prayer; but, over time, this silent void was filled with recited antiphons. He says that reciting the psalms was not originally described as prayer; instead, the prayer followed the recitation. But he concedes that for Benedict, the psalmody was prayer[13]. Some Benedictines see the *Opus Dei* as the required public homage due in justice to the divine king; while others see it as merely a convenient way to organize the personal obligation of each monk to pray[14]. What about the *lectio divina*? Was that prayer? Reading the Scriptures was certainly regarded as propaedeutic to prayer. If we think of prayer as a conversation with God, then we must first listen to God's holy word and then, in response to that word, offer a prayer. In the divine office, as in the *lectio divina*, the monk listens to and meditates upon the word of God, preparing him to respond in prayer. The study of the Bible and of biblical commentary was thought to be a first rung of a ladder of ascent: *lectio, cogitatio, stadium, meditatio, oratio, contemplatio*. For this reason, many Benedictines say that the *lectio divina* essentially is prayer[15].

Despite our modern tendency to see work as a vehicle for personal fulfillment and even as a spiritual vocation, Benedict was much more prosaic about manual work (*opus manuum*). First, he saw work as a duty of justice: monks ought to earn their own keep and not be a burden on others (RB 48.8). Second, work was a necessary evil: monks must do 'whatever work is necessary' and they should not complain even if 'their poverty should force them to do the harvesting themselves' (RB 6, 7). Third, work helped the monk escape the dangers of what parents today call 'unstructured time': 'idleness is the enemy of the soul' (RB 48.1). Here Benedict sounds a specifically Christian note, since his word for 'idleness' (*otiositas*) comes from the classical Latin *otium* meaning leisure. For the pagan Greeks and Romans, leisure was a great good, making possible the supreme enjoyments of politics

13) Aldalbert de Vogüé, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 139, 142 and 148.
14) 'The central figure of the society (of the monastery) was the divine King. The monastery was a palace, a court, and the divine office was the daily service and formal homage rendered to the divine Majesty. This, the opus Dei, was the crown of the whole structure of the monastic edifice.' Butler, *Benedictine Monachism*, 31. 'The monk is not a member of the Church specially assigned to public praise. He is simply a disciple of Christ who seeks to put into action, alone or with others, the command "Pray without ceasing".' De Vogüé, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 139.
15) Dom Paul Delatte, *The Rule of St. Benedict: A Commentary* (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1921), 305 and 306.

and philosophy. Benedict's *Rule* makes no provision for any unstructured leisure or recreation, though, of course, meals and siestas afforded opportunities for recreation. Why the fear of idleness? Benedict does not say, but one of his sources, the *Rule of the Master*, said that 'the idle man is a prey to his desires'; and much later Thomas Merton warned about the dangers of daydreaming[16]. Benedict was less worried about idleness than the Master, who attempted to fill every spare moment of the monk's life[17].

Benedict does not tell us whether he thinks that work reflects the goodness of God's creation or is merely a punishment for sin: Did Adam and Eve work in Paradise or only after the Fall?[18] His commentators agree that Benedict does not emphasize the ascetic dimension of work and that he is at pains not to impose undue burdens of labor on his monks (RB 48.9)[19]. Benedict also doesn't specify what kind of manual labor monks may be required to perform: workshop or field, skilled or unskilled? His commentators point out that any kind of labor is acceptable as a school of obedience: 'It doesn't matter what we do, so long as we've got to do it[20].' When he discusses the skilled work of the artisans (RB 57), Benedict does not wax poetic about how skilled work actualizes and develops our latent powers or how fulfilling we find it to transform natural materials into useful and beautiful artifacts. Instead, he warns against the danger of pride lurking in the mastery of an art: 'If any one of them becomes puffed up by his skillfulness in his craft … he is to be removed from practicing his craft …' (RB 57.2,3). Nonetheless, Benedict does welcome artisans, if they 'practice their craft with all humility' (RB 57.1). Benedictine commentators do not agree about the value of even skilled manual labor. Delatte says that manual work 'has no efficacy of itself for the formation of an intelligent nature and less still for the development of the supernatural life[21].' But Thomas Merton and Dom Sighard Kleiner insist that 'even humble skills are gifts of God and enable men to participate in some measure in the creative activity of God[22].'

16) De Vogüé, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 239; Thomas Merton, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, (ed.) Patrick F. O'Connell (Collegeville, MN, USA: Liturgical Press, 2009), 131.
17) See Terrence Kardong, *Benedict's Rule: A Translation and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN, USA: Liturgical Press, 1996), 48.1.
18) Benedict's commentators do not agree about the divine origin of labor. Dom Sighard Kleiner says: 'As soon as he left paradise, Adam received this law.' Kleiner, *Serving God First*, tr. James Schavinger (Kalamazoo MI: Cistercian Publications, 1985), 174. But Delatte claims that work is 'anterior to sin' in *Rule of St. Benedict*, 304.
19) 'Manual work is imposed on the monks as an economic necessity and as an exercise of ascesis and a religious duty.' De Vogüé, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 133. 'The utilitarian predominates over the ascetical or aesthetical when it comes to work.' Kardong, *Benedict's Rule*, 48.6. 'So manual labor is a process of mortification' yet 'work is not simply a penalty and a punishment; it is a divine law anterior to sin, of universal validity.' Delatte, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 305 and 304.
20) Butler, *Benedictine Monachism*, 374. Butler may be recalling the traditional maxim of the English school master: 'It doesn't matter what the boys study, so long as they don't like it.'
21) Delatte, *The Rule of St. Benedict,* 305.
22) Merton, *The Rule of St. Benedict,*, 136; Kleiner uses the same language in *Serving God First*, 179.

The history of Benedictine monasticism casts some doubt upon whether Benedict was right that manual labor (*opus manuum*) is a necessary part of the monastic life. Terrence Kardong observes that the Benedictine tradition combines frequent praise of manual work with the frequent desire to avoid it in practice[23]. Kardong argues that manual labor is not a necessary part of the monastic vocation but Thomas Merton, reflecting the Cistercian tradition, disagrees: 'manual labor is an integral part of the life of a monk….[24]'

At first glance, the three essential daily activities of the monk, liturgy, biblical study, and manual labor all seem unique and incommensurable. They don't seem to have much in common, beyond requiring attention and effort - though very different kinds of attention and effort. One cannot be really substituted for another and they have no obvious common measure. If I miss the liturgy of the hours can I read the Bible instead? Or can I skip Bible study to take in the harvest? Yet beginning with Benedict and continuing down to the present, writers have attempted to show that these are not unique and incommensurable activities but are somehow just different expressions of the same activity. By means of analogies and metaphors, we can compare anything to anything else: work is like prayer in that both can be offered up to God; work is like prayer because both involve effort. As Romeo said, Juliet is like the moon because both are always changing; but Juliet is not literally the moon and work is not literally prayer. In Benedictine discussions of *lectio divina*, *opus manuum*, and opus Dei, however, writers tend to forget the distinction between analogical and univocal speech. These writers do not claim that work can be likened to prayer, but that work literally is prayer. So all three activities are described sometimes as work and sometimes as prayer. I think this tendency to insist upon a common denominator among these disparate activities stems from a deep-seated but unstated conviction that the life of a monk must have a special unity and integrity so that all of his essential activities are really just one activity.

Benedict himself unifies the three activities through various rhetorical devices. Consider, for example, his metaphors for the monastery itself. He famously states in the Prologue: 'Therefore we intend to establish a school for the Lord's service' (RB Prol. 45). Now a *schola* (from the Greek word for leisure) is place free from the pressure of work. So if the monastery is a school, then all of its activities are leisurely and freely pursued without any economic necessity. If the monastery is a school, then work is a form of study or prayer. But the monastery is not literally a school because Benedict later describes the monastery as a workshop (*officina*) whose tools are prayer and study (RB 4.78, 75). In this sense, all the monk's activities are kinds of work, the work he calls a 'spiritual craft' (*ars spiritalis*). Indeed, just by call-

23) Kardong, *The Benedictines*, 166-7. 'Although manual labor cannot be said to be intrinsic to the monastic vocation, and soon became unknown for choir monks in early medieval Europe, the Cistercian reform recognized it as one of the components of an integral life of simplicity and contemplation.' Kardong, *Benedict's Rule*, 48.8.

24) 'To say that any kind of labor - clerical, apostolic, etc - fits the bill is to distort the meaning of the Rule…' Merton, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 132.

ing the liturgy of the hours the *Opus Dei* and calling work *opus manuum* or *opus laboris*, Benedict is comparing labor and liturgy[25]. Of course, at a deeper level, Benedict does not treat liturgy, study, and work as the same activity. He assumes, in fact, that they are mutually exclusive, which is why they must be performed at separate times; nor are monks permitted to substitute one for the other. The abbot, however, is permitted to require a monk to work if he unwilling or unable to study, on the theory that both work and study protect us from the danger of idleness (RB 48.23). That work and *lectio divina* can thus occasionally be interchanged has led some Benedictines to argue that *lectio divina* is actually a kind of work[26]. But Kardong observes that Benedict often says (RB 48) that his monks are 'free' (vacare) for reading (lectio) - free, that is, from the necessity of work, meaning that reading, like prayer, is 'holy leisure, time spent only for God and with God.' Kardong contrasts activities enjoyed for their own sake, like biblical study, from those that are meant to serve other purposes, like work[27]. For these reasons, most Benedictines treat biblical study as prayer. So if the life of the monk is to be divided between prayer and labor (ora et labora), and if work is labor and the divine office is prayer, then where do we put biblical study? Benedict himself treats the *lectio divina* sometimes as work and sometimes as prayer, as do his commentators.

But some Benedictines and others want even more unity to the monk's day. This leads them either to describe all the monk's activities as work or to describe them all as prayer. According to Kleiner, 'St Benedict considers all our occupations work: the opus Dei, the *opus manuum*, the *lectio divina*….' Indeed, Kleiner insists that the liturgy is 'real work' and 'useful employment' - on the assumption, presumably, that we honor any activity by calling it 'work'[28]. But by calling all our activities work, we efface the important distinction between those activities we enjoy purely for their own sake and those we use as instruments for other purposes. Are monks really essentially worker bees? Perhaps liturgy, study, and work are all labors of love, three kinds of service to God?[29] I would explain these kinds of service in terms of the three-fold law of love: liturgy is service to God himself, which is why it comes first; work is service to our neighbor, as an image of God; and biblical study is service to the image of God within ourselves.

A more common strategy for unifying the activities of the monk is to describe them all as prayer, as in the modern mantra that 'to work is to pray.' This doctrine of implicit prayer goes back to Origen, who articulated an influential ideal of a life wholly given over to prayer: 'the entire life of the Christian, taken as a whole, is a

26) 'this last [*lectio divina*] is also considered a work because anyone who cannot apply himself to it is to be given some manual work (48.23).' Dom Sighard Kleiner, *Serving God First,* 174.
27) Kardong, *Benedict's Rule* 48.4 and 48D.
28) 'To consider the *opus Dei* in any other way than as real work would be to adopt positivistic and Marxist views…. But, we do not expect that today's society will consider the opus Dei a useful employment, and still less, that it would pay for it.' Kleiner, *Serving God First*, 175-6.
29) Butler says that since the monastery is a 'school of the service of God' then study, prayer and work are the three main kinds of service. *Benedictine Monachism*, 29.

single great prayer, and what we normally call prayer is only a part of this.' Origen was famous for his allegories, and he offers an allegory of human life in which everything we do is offered up as prayer to God: 'to act well is to pray[30].' This notion of implicit prayer was never the dominant strand of thought or practice in the history of monasticism, but it never disappeared. With the rise of the modern work ethic, Origen's idea came roaring back in the form of 'to work is to pray'. We find this doctrine even in Thomas Merton: 'Work with the hands, the exercise of a skill, is truly a prayer…. But we must know how to work, peacefully, silently, humbly, and for the glory of God.' Merton even says that we should not use machines to finish the work quickly so that we have time for prayer, since work itself, done properly, is prayer[31]. The danger of this doctrine of implicit prayer is that it seems to undermine the requirement for both formal, public, prayer and for informal, private, prayer. If everything we do is prayer, then what is the need for actual liturgy or personal conversation with God?

Still, the ideal of a life wholly devoted to prayer was a powerful one. Among the Greek Fathers of monasticism, the expression 'opus Dei' (*ergon tou Theou*) referred, not to the liturgy but to the whole of the monastic life[32]. Yet in Benedict, as we have seen, the 'opus Dei' refers only to the liturgy of the hours. Far from seeing work as prayer, Benedict insists that every activity cease when the monk hears the call to the divine office: 'Therefore nothing is to be preferred to the Work of God' (RB 43.3). This famous maxim is often cited to prove that the *Opus Dei* is the most important activity of the monk, but in context it seems to mean only 'when the bell for office rings, nothing is to be put ahead of the Office[33].' The fact that the office takes priority over other activities at its appointed hours does not prove that the office is absolutely prior to all other activities. One might say that Benedict values work above all because he devotes the greatest number of hours to it or that Benedict values biblical study above all because he devotes the best hours of the day to it. What makes the *Opus Dei* the most important activity of the monk is that it is the only activity of the monastic community directed wholly to God. If the monastery is a school of service to God, then the *Opus Dei* is the unique service offered by the whole school to God. Thus, most Benedictines agree with Dom Butler: 'the divine office is the soul of the monastic life[34].' A monastery might cease doing every other activity, but if it ceased the office of the hours, it would cease being a monastery[35].

30) Origen, cited in Korneel Vermeiren OCSO, *Praying with Benedict*, tr. Richard Yeo OSB (Kalamazoo, USA: Cistercian Publications, 1999), 20; and in De Vogüé, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 152.
31) Merton, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 136.
32) Korneel Vermeiren, *Praying with Benedict,* 44-5.
33) Kardong, *Benedict's Rule*, 43.3.
34) 'This means that the essence of a Benedictine vocation is the celebration of the liturgy.' Butler, *Benedictine Monachism*, 32 and 30. Merton agrees: 'the principal core of the monastic family is the common praise of God in the Opus Dei.' *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 14.
35) To see the monastic origins of the modern university, consider what Alan Ryan, the Warden of New College, Oxford told me: 'By the terms of the endowment of this College, I am permitted to discharge the entire faculty and all the students. But I cannot touch the choir, which must recite evensong every day until Kingdom come.'

The New Testament commands every Christian to 'pray constantly' as well as to 'work, or you shall not eat.' Ever since the time of the Desert Fathers, some Christians have sought to devote their lives wholly to prayer; but other Christians saw this as an unfair attempt to shirk the common duty of work. But how can we pray constantly if we must devote so much of our time to work? Must we then divide our days and our lives between sacred prayer and profane work? Is there someway to combine these commands, so that prayer is compatible with work or work becomes a prayer? According to some Benedictine scholars, the Greek Monastic Fathers developed strategies for unifying the monk's life and for overcoming any division between profane and sacred activities. For example, the Desert Fathers often picked very simple forms of work, such as making rope, so that their minds were free for reciting memorized psalms and for being constantly aware of God's presence. Basil the Great (died 370), for example, offered this example of how monks can unify prayer and work: 'While our hands are occupied, we can with our tongue praise God with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs … we can thank God who has endowed our hands with the capacity to work … finally, shall ask God that the work of our hands may be guided toward their object, in order that they may be acceptable to God[36].' According to De Vogüé, this oral or mental recital of memorized texts from the Scripture was known as meditation. In this original ideal 'the monk was doing the same thing at work as at the office; in both the time flowed by in the continual recitation of Scripture, and especially of the psalms. Prayer was the response, both at work and at office, to this incessant hearing of the word of God.' Biblical study also fit harmoniously with this integrated vision of a monk's day. 'The purpose of these studies is to furnish the memory with inspired texts to recite continually, either at the office or at work[37].'

Compared to this vision of a harmoniously integrated life, in which work, liturgy, and study are all unified by the activity of continual meditation on God's word, the *Rule of St Benedict* seems to create a life fundamentally divided between sacred and profane activities. Benedict divided the monk's day into distinct and mutually exclusive activities, work, biblical study, and the divine office. Although he often makes analogies between them, he never talks about the prayer and meditation that might hold them together as a coherent whole. He does not tell monks to pray privately during the office, during biblical study or during work. The Benedictine monastery is even physically divided between the sacred space of the oratory, which he says, is only for prayer (RB 52), and the profane workshops. Of course, just because Benedict's *Rule* makes no mention of private prayer during work does not mean that monks did not actually pray frequently during work, as well as during the office and during their reading. But, as monastic work became less manual and more clerical (in both senses of that word), it became much harder to combine work and prayer. De Vogüé argues that the Benedictine ideal is not *ora et labora* nor even *ora, labora, lege but ora, labora, lege, meditare*, for it is the mindfulness

36) Basil, cited in Vermeiren, *Praying with Benedict,* 15. Augustine also said about his monks: 'A person can very well sing the divine songs while working manually.' Cited in De Vogüé, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 154.
37) De Vogüé, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, 135.

of meditation, the constant awareness of God, that holds the disparate activities of the monk together and in harmony[38]. But whether Benedict himself saw such a unity to the monk's day is doubtful.

2. St Escrivá: Opus Dei as Daily Labor

What we find in Escrivá's sanctification of work is in part a return to the ancient ideal of continual prayer and in part modern affirmation of the moral and spiritual value of ordinary work. Although Escrivá often claims that he is returning to the earliest traditions of lay Christianity, before the rise of monasticism or clerical orders, his spirituality of work is closer to early Greek monasticism than to anything we find in the Book of Acts. True, the earliest Christians usually did normally keep their worldly occupations; but there is no evidence that they treated those occupations as modes of sanctification or as forms of implicit prayer. Like Paul, these first Christians worked so as not to be a burden to others and to provide alms to the poor: they seem to have interpreted their work as a duty of justice, not as mode of sanctification. But, as we have noted, the Desert Fathers articulated a vision of the unity of life in which prayer permeates every activity, including work; and Origen developed a doctrine of work and works as implicit prayer. Escrivá is opening up the path of the Desert Fathers to every Christian layman.

Benedict interpreted the command to pray constantly to mean, at a minimum, to pray the office seven times a day and at midnight (RB 16, 3, 4) but blessed Epiphanius, Bishop of Cyprus, a Greek monk objected to this rule by saying: 'Evidently you are neglecting the other hours of the day when you are not praying. The true monk should be ceaselessly praying and saying psalms in his heart[39].'
Here Epiphanius articulates Escrivá's critique of Catholic spirituality and his ideal of the unity of life. Escrivá sees Catholic life as hopelessly divided between clerical and lay, between the spiritual and the profane, the church and the world. He offers a vision of what he calls 'Christian materialism' which promises a unity of life that transcends all of these divisions. His doctrine of sanctifying work is just a means to his larger vision of life as continual prayer: 'we will be able to turn our whole day into a continuous praise of God[40]'. Escrivá's *Opus Dei* is often described as a democratizing of the spiritual life, in which 'being a saint is not just the province of a few spiritual athletes, but is the universal destiny of very Christian[41].' But actually, Escrivá's ideal of continual prayer amidst work is a much more demanding ideal, in many ways, than Benedict's. St Benedict was fairly realistic about the human capacity for sustained attention on God or anything else, which is why he rotates his monks through a wide variety of tasks every day. He assumes that few people could stand the psychological pressure of attempting to focus on God

38) Ibid., 242.
39) Epiphanius, cited in Vermeiren, *Praying with Benedict*, 25.
40) Christ is Passing By, 119.
41) John Allen, Opus Dei (London: Penguin, 2005), 16-17.

every minute of the waking day. Escrivá's ideal of the unity of life affords no respite whatever from the duty to pray incessantly; indeed, according to him 'even our sleep should be a prayer[42].' The life of his Numeraries, in particular, has proven in practice to be very demanding indeed[43]. Much easier, in many ways, to be a Benedictine monk than an *Opus Dei* layman.

Vittorio Messori, an Italian journalist and friend of Opus Dei, compares Escrivá's ideal to that of Benedict: '… the celebrated precept of Saint Benedict for his monks could be turned on its head: rather than *ora et labora* … one should *labora et ora*, so that the office, the factory, the street, the home become themselves a church, a place of prayer…[44]'As we have seen, *ora et labora* is not a precept of St Benedict and, as we shall see, Escrivá's implicit precept is not *labora et ora* but *labora est ora*: one Latin letter makes a huge difference in meaning. Still, Messori is right in one respect: when it comes to the meaning of Opus Dei, Escrivá does turn Benedict on his head. For Benedict the *Opus Dei* refers only to the liturgy while for Escrivá the *Opus Dei* refers mainly, if not solely, to daily labor. So Escrivá elevates work to the primacy that Benedict accords to the liturgy.

Escrivá's theology is radically incarnational and opposed to any sharp division between spirit and matter: 'Authentic Christianity, which professes the resurrection of all flesh, has always quite logically opposed 'dis-incarnation', without fear of being judged materialistic. We can, therefore, rightly speak of a 'Christian materialism', which is boldly opposed to that materialism which is blind to the spirit[45].' Instead of seeking to rise above our material circumstances or to retreat from the world, Escrivá advocates 'making heroic verse out of the prose of each day' for heaven meets earth, he says 'when you sanctify your everyday lives[46].' Whereas we saw that Benedictines are divided on the question of whether work constitutes divine punishment for sin, Escrivá has no doubt: 'work is not a curse; nor is it a punishment for sin. Genesis had already spoken about the fact of work before ever Adam rebelled against God[47].'

What makes Escrivá so modern is his identification of the world with the world of work. The informal motto of his *Opus Dei* defines the threefold vocation of the laity as: 'To sanctify work, to sanctify themselves in work, and to sanctify others through work[48].' Let us consider what each of these three kinds of sanctification means. How does one sanctify work? By performing it perfectly, both with 'human perfec-

42) Christ is Passing By, 119.
43) Allen interviewed many Numeraries and found lots of complaints of 'inhuman expectations' and of being 'exhausted and drained'; as one said: 'This is not for the faint of heart.' See Opus Dei, 87.
44) Vittorio Messori, Opus Dei, tr. Gerald Malsbary (Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, 1997), 99.
45) Passionately Loving the World, 115.
46) Ibid., 116.
47) *Friends of God*, 81.
48) *Freedom and Pluralism in the People of God*, 10.

tion (professional competence) and with Christian perfection (for love of God's Will and as a service to mankind) …' When work is performed as perfectly as humanly possible, 'it is sanctified and becomes God's work, *Operatio Dei, opus Dei*[49].' Escrivá likes to quote the Castilian poet who said: 'Write slowly and with a careful hand, for doing things well is more important than doing them[50].' Jesus said that we should 'be perfect, as your Heavenly Father is perfect' and Escrivá interprets this counsel of perfection to apply mainly to occupational diligence. As Giuseppe Romano says: 'Work is well done because we cannot offer God a shabby gift: God deserves better. It is also done well, because it renders service to others…[51]'. What are we to make of his call to perfectionism? Is perfectionism really a way to make our work holy? It seems hard to generalize: some kinds of conscientiousness are certainly morally required while other kinds can become merely scrupulous and neurotic. Sheer attention to detail can sometimes undermine the larger moral purpose of our work, as when workers stall production by 'work to rule'. As for Escrivá's 'doing things well is more important than doing them,' Chesterton famously offered this equally valid riposte: 'Anything worth doing is worth doing badly.'

In Escrivá's doctrine of sanctifying work through careful performance we can certainly see a democratizing impulse. Escrivá follows the maxim of the early modern poet that 'God loveth adverbs': it doesn't matter what we do (consistent with divine law), but how we do it. God does not care about what kind of work we do, just that we do it perfectly, lovingly, and humbly. Escrivá claims to reject the ancient hierarchy of occupations in which the liberal arts were regarded as intrinsically superior to the servile, mechanical arts. At the same time, however, Escrivá's *Opus Dei* has made recruitment of intellectuals a priority. Commenting on the words of Jesus 'I will make you fishers of men,' Escrivá comments 'men - like fish - have to be caught by the head[52].' So, in practice, Escrivá does create a certain hierarchy of callings.

How do we sanctify ourselves in our work? By making our work into prayer: 'any honorable work can be a prayer[53].' What is falsely attributed to Benedict is truly attributed to Escrivá: *Laborare est orare*. But how can work become prayer? Unfortunately, Escrivá does not distinguish literal prayer from implicit or metaphorical prayer. Sometimes he clearly implies a doctrine of work as implicit prayer. In this sense, to work is in and of itself to pray. Escrivá speaks of 'your continual hard work, which you will have learned to turn into prayer, because you will have started it and finished it in the presence of God…[54]' Note that in this passage he does not say that work is prayer when we do it while being aware of the presence of God; the sheer ubiquity of God suffices for our work to be in the presence of God.

49) Ibid.
50) *Passionately Loving the World*, 116.
51) Romano, cited in Messori, *Opus Dei*, 163.
52) *The Way*, 978. On Escrivá's emphasis on the evangelization of the intelligentsia, see Messori, *Opus Dei*, 110-13.
53) *Christ is Passing By,* 10.
54) *Friends of God*, 66.

But in other places he talks about combining work and prayer: 'prayer and work can easily go together[55].' Unfortunately, Escrivá doesn't offer many specifics, but the practice of his followers can help us to interpret these cryptic words. Members of *Opus Dei* say that they sanctify themselves in work by 1) offering their work explicitly to God or to some good cause, such as peace or justice; 2) intending to seek to serve God in their work by treating those they encounter in work with kindness and generosity; 3) spontaneous interjections of prayer amidst work[56]. Indeed, Escrivá does explicitly endorse this last strategy for combining work and prayer: 'Ejaculatory prayers do not hinder your work, just as the beating of your heart does not impede the movements of the body[57].' Like the Desert Fathers, Escrivá here imagines simple manual labor in which the mouth and mind are free to praise God. Escrivá quotes a lathe-worker who found that he could sing God's praise while operating his lathe[58]. In one place, Escrivá does acknowledge the possibility that work might even interfere with prayer: 'Work tires you out and leaves you unable to pray[59].'

What are we to make of these strategies for turning work into prayer? First, we should note that the doctrine of work as implicit prayer seems to undermine our motivations to try to mix our work with actual prayers. If to work is inherently to pray, then what need have we of other kinds of prayer? Further, if to work is to pray, then does it follow that anyone who works is also praying? What makes Christians special? Second, not all kinds of work can be mixed with actual prayers. We don't want our surgeon or barber to burst into spontaneous praise of God, not even mentally. Some kinds of work demand a focused attention that is not compatible with frequent prayer. John Allen reports the amusing example (not amusing to him) of an *Opus Dei* truck driver praying the rosary while they drove at full speed[60]. Still, these kinds of work can certainly be 'offered up' to God when we commence the work day, as Escrivá suggests for intellectually demanding work[61]. Third, Escrivá's imperative of seeking perfection at work seems in tension with some of these strategies for mixing work and prayer. Cognitive psychologists remind us what a scarce resource is our attention: human beings cannot divide their active attention on both work and prayer. Finally, mixing work and prayer may not be consistent with prayer if, as Simone Weil says, 'absolutely unmixed attention is prayer.'

What does it mean to sanctify others through work? The first ecclesiastical decree approving *Opus Dei* in 1950 said: 'The members of *Opus Dei* exercise the annunciation of the Gospel to their fellows above all through means of example which they give to their neighbors, their colleagues and companions at work, in their

55) *Furrow*, 471.
56) See Allen, *Opus Dei,* 79-91.
57) *Furrow*, 516.
58) Ibid., 517.
59) Escrivá consoles the fatigued worker with this comment: 'You are always in the presence of your Father. If you can't speak to him, look at him every now and then like a little child … and he'll smile at you.' In *The Way,* 895.
60) Allen, *Opus Dei*, 91.
61) *Furrow*, 522.

family, social, and professional lives, striving always and everywhere to be better[62].' Escrivá believes that the most important example that Christians can set for others is to excel at their work: 'To attract and to help others, I need the influence of my professional reputation, and that is what God wants[63].' We must strive always to be leaders in our professions, so that our prestige will attract others to our Christian ideals: our 'professional prestige' is our 'bait' as fishers of men[64]. According to *Opus Dei* member Dominique Le Tourneau: 'To win over others, a person must take to heart his need to carry out his duties as well as the best of his companions, and if possible better than the best[65].' Escrivá calls 'our professional prestige' the 'cathedra from which others are taught to sanctify their labor and to conform their lives to the demands of the Christian life[66].'

Here the contrast with Benedict is quite sharp: Benedict expressed grave concern for the spiritual pride associated with professional prestige (RB 57). Escrivá and his followers are aware of the dangers of this emphasis on the duty to strive for professional reputation. We can make an idol of what William James called 'the bitch-goddess, Success.' Although Escrivá says in scores of places that we should pursue our careers and professional success relentlessly, in a couple places he does warn of the danger: 'An impatient and disordered anxiousness to climb up the professional ladder can mask self-love under the appearances of "serving souls"[67].' According to Escrivá, we sanctify others by the example we set in our professionalism and in our professional prestige. How does this work? My co-workers, he says, will be drawn to me because of my success and they will learn that I use my professional success to glorify God. My reputation at work is a kind of magnet that draws colleagues into friendship, who will see that my productivity stems from 'being a collaborator with God in the creation and recreation of the world[68].' Perhaps there are those who think that Christians are losers or that Christianity is incompatible with worldly success? I can remove this obstacle for others if I witness my faith amidst my professional accomplishments.

One shortcoming of this strategy of witnessing to the Gospel through professional success is that many actual saints have been regarded as failures by worldly standards. From Cervantes' Don Quixote to Graham Greene's 'whisky priest,' many fictional saints have also been notorious losers. Escrivá frequently invites us to identify with the 'hidden years' of Jesus' life[69], when he worked as a carpenter. But did Jesus draw anyone to the Father because of his success at the workbench? Did any of his apostles win converts by way of professional expertise? Isn't our professional success just as likely to alienate our colleagues, due to envy or rivalry, as to attract them? Are people drawn to us because of our success or despite it? Moreover, what people most ad-

62) Cited in Messori, *Opus Dei*, 102.
63) *Furrow*, 781.
64) *The Way*, 372.
65) Le Tourneau, cited in Allen, *Opus Dei*, 89.
66) Le Tourneau, citing Escrivá, in Messori, *Opus Dei*, 162.
68) *Furrow*, 701.
69) Giuseppe Romano, cited in Messori, *Opus Dei*, 163.

mire in their co-workers are not the qualities mentioned by Escrivá, such as prestige, perfection, and reputation, but rather dedication and love of the work itself. Escrivá is certainly right that the example we set to others is very important. As St Francis said, 'preach the Gospel incessantly, and, only when necessary, use words.' But Escrivá seems unduly focused on work as the locus of this kind of Christian witness: 'We too, with a holy pride, have to prove with deeds that we are workers, men and women who really work[70].' But isn't it just as likely that we announce the Gospel by the example we set as friends, as spouses, as parents, as siblings, as neighbors, as citizens?

It is instructive to contrast the daily schedule of an *Opus Dei* member with the schedule of Benedict's Rule. Recall that Benedict required, 4-6 hours of work, 3 hours of liturgy, and 2-3 hours of biblical study. The Norms of *Opus Dei* call for daily Mass, at least one hour of private prayer, and at least 15 minutes of spiritually-uplifting reading (including the Bible)[71]. As for work, there is no upper limit: Escrivá demands work and more work. 'Work without rest,' he says, because your models are the leaders of your professions, who 'devote many hours of the day, and even of the night, to their jobs[72].' Nothing is more modern about Escrivá than his devotion to the Gospel of Work and even modern Benedictines are working almost twice the hours set by Benedict himself.
Just as Benedict has nothing good to say about idleness (*otiositas*), so Escrivá constantly seeks to arouse us from our sinful torpor. 'You must fight against the tendency to be too lenient with yourselves…. Sometimes we worry too much about our health, or about getting enough rest[73].' What Escrivá misses completely are the costs of his ideal of relentless work to other equally valuable goods, such as play, the enjoyment of art, friendship, parenting, marriage. All of these goods require leisure, but a word search of his collected writings finds only two mentions of leisure and one of them condemns it[74]. Similarly when Escrivá is not condemning rest and recreation, he defines them merely as opportunities to regain strength for work: 'Rest means recuperation: to gain strength … it means a change of occupation, so that you can come back later with a new impetus to your daily job[75].' So when we are not working we should be preparing ourselves for work: 'He who pledges himself to work for Christ should never have a free moment[76].' Are Escrivá's fellow Spaniards so irredeemably indolent?

At the beginning of the nineteenth century Gospel of Work, John Keats wrote his famous 'Ode to Indolence', which begins with a quote from Jesus: 'They toil not; neither do they spin' (Luke 12:27). Jesus praised the lilies of the field, which in their sheer idleness surpass the beauty of all the human effort devoted to Solomon's

70) *Furrow*, 701.
71) *Friends of God*, 62.
72) For the Norms of Opus Dei, see Allen, *Opus Dei*, 30-31.
73) *The Forge*, 65; *Friends of God*, 60.
74) *Friends of God*, 62.
75) *See The Way*, 530 (negative) and *Christ is Passing By*, 166 (positive).
76) *Furrow*, 514. Cf. 'Certainly it is necessary to rest, because we have to tackle our work each day with renewed vigour.' *Friends of God*, 62.

finery. If Jesus were preaching the Gospel of Work, why would he heap such praise on the lilies? Christians must learn, not only how to actively serve God, but also how to passively receive his gifts. Ultimately, our active efforts pale in comparison with the infinite and unmerited bounty God bestows on us. The deepest and hardest lesson that Jesus taught his disciples was the one saved for the end: by washing their feet, Jesus attempted to teach his disciples the lesson of how to receive love, of how to accept gifts. In an eschatological perspective, to be a Christian is more about receiving than about giving, more about waiting than about working.

Escrivá's spirituality of work is often attacked for being Calvinist, in the sense that the predestined Calvinist seeks in worldly success the sign of his election[78]. And it is true, as we have seen, that Escrivá places a lot of emphasis on the importance of professional success, as a way to attract and to sanctify others. Moreover, Max Weber famously describes Calvinism as a 'worldly asceticism', in the sense that Calvin's followers brought the frugality, regularity, and self-denial of the monastery into the management of business enterprises. Escrivá's *Opus Dei* can indeed be rightly characterized as a 'worldly asceticism'. But Calvin's overwhelming emphasis on God's unmerited grace is far from the spirit of Escrivá. A true Calvinist is in no danger of thinking that he can earn salvation by any effort of personal sanctification. Escrivá's upbeat optimism is much closer to the spirit of Pelagius than to the grim spirit of Calvin. Escrivá's unrelenting focus on sanctification through work can easily create the hope that we might earn our own salvation. In the words of an *Opus Dei* teacher: 'What the idea of sanctification of work helps me to see is that I can get into heaven by doing this job[79].'

There is an irresistible appeal to the ideal of incessant prayer, as first articulated by the Desert Fathers and now developed by Saint Escrivá. If all of our activities could become forms of prayer, then our entire lives could be offered to God. In the light of this heroic ideal, the *Rule of St Benedict* appears as a pretty sorry compromise, since Benedict does not require or even endorse constant prayer. Benedict's monks alternate between sacred and profane activities, reflecting his deep concession to the limits of the human condition. By contrast, Escrivá hoped to overcome this divide between the sacred and the profane; he hoped that work itself could become a form of prayer. But he never showed how work could function as implicit prayer and his preferred kinds of professional work are usually not compatible with constant explicit prayer. Benedict's monks can work without praying because they have the time to pray without working. By endorsing the modern tendency to let work fill all available hours, Escrivá's followers, who seek a life of incessant prayer, may well end up finding instead a life of incessant work.

JAMES BERNARD MURPHY
Professor of Government, Department of Government, Dartmouth College, Hanover NH 03755
jamesbernardmurphy@gmail.com

77) *The Way*, 357.
78) See the discussion of Calvinism and Opus Dei in Allen, *Opus Dei*, 87-9.
79) See Allen, *Opus Dei*, 83.