A reflection on “to unite myself and to remain in society with the Brothers of the Christian Schools, who are associated to conduct, together and by association, schools for the service of the poor”

A 300-year-old formula

Since the origins of the Institute, we Brothers state in the second part of our formula of vows, in one form or another, our promise to live in Society. When we compare the formula of vows of one of our first Brothers to what we say today, similarities and differences appear immediately. We can draw a parallel between what Brother Pierre Narra says at his perpetual profession in 1699 and what we say since 1987, some three centuries later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula of Vows of Brother Pierre Narra</th>
<th>Formula of Vows of 1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, prostrate with the most profound respect before your infinite and adorable majesty, I <strong>consecrate myself entirely to you to procure your glory</strong> as far as I shall be able and as you will require of me.</td>
<td><strong>And for this purpose, I, Pierre Narra, promise you and vow to unite myself and to remain in Society with the Brothers who are associated together to keep together and by association gratuitous schools</strong>, in whatever place they might be, which I promise and vow to do even if in doing so I am obliged to beg and to live on bread alone, or to do in the said Society whatever I shall be employed to do whether by the body of the Society or by the Superiors who will be in charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>And for this purpose, I, Pierre Narra, promise you and vow to unite myself and to remain in Society with the Brothers who are associated together to keep together and by association gratuitous schools</strong>, in whatever place they might be, which I promise and vow to do even if in doing so I am obliged to beg and to live on bread alone, or to do in the said Society whatever I shall be employed to do whether by the body of the Society or by the Superiors who will be in charge.</td>
<td><strong>For this purpose I, ..., promise and vow to unite myself and to remain in society with the Brothers of the Christian Schools, who are associated to conduct, together and by association, schools for the service of the poor.</strong> I promise to go wherever I may be sent and to do whatever I may be assigned by the body of the Society or its superiors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wherefore</strong>, I promise and vow obedience both to the body of this Society and to the Superiors who shall be in charge of it, <strong>which vows of association as well as of stability in the said Society</strong>, and of obedience, I promise to keep inviolably all my life.</td>
<td><strong>Wherefore</strong>, I promise and vow chastity, poverty, obedience, <strong>association for the service of the poor through education</strong>, and stability in the Institute according to the <strong>Bull of Approbation</strong> and the <strong>Rule</strong> of the Institute. I promise to keep these vows faithfully all my life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In testimony thereof, I have signed; done at Paris, the fifth day of September, one thousand six hundred ninety-nine. Signed: Pierre Narra named Brother Paul³</td>
<td>In testimony thereof, I have signed. Done at ... on ... Signature ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brother Pierre Narra, born in 1677, is listed in 1689 in the community at rue Princesse, Paris (which had opened in March 1688). His home village is Charenton, a suburb of Paris. He completes the novitiate in 1695 and pronounces final vows in 1699. In 1717 Brother Pierre is listed in the Rheims community. He dies in 1751. I choose his formula of vows, among other reasons, not only because it is quite typical of what our first Brothers say prior to the Bull of Approbation in 1725 but also because it provides evidence of a certain number of significant choices made, whether by individual Brothers or by the “Society of the Christian Schools.”

*I consecrate myself entirely to you to procure your glory.*

Since the beginning, the initial paragraph of our vows has remained unchanged in content and in form:

Most Holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, prostrate with the most profound respect before your infinite and adorable majesty, I consecrate myself entirely to you to procure your glory as far as I shall be able and as you will require of me.

This text expresses for us the root of our consecration. We address ourselves to the “adored and contemplated” Holy Trinity, to whom we consecrate ourselves in a personal, individual action. In a way, the “divine association,” as Christians understand and speak of God, is the reference point for our approach to consecration.

An individual person addresses and speaks to the Trinity, someone who says, “I consecrate myself...” This consecration usually is expressed during the celebration of the Eucharist, but it is noteworthy that neither the *Rule* nor any other Institute text describes a particular ritual for pronouncing vows. The only requirements are that they be made in public and be received by the Superior General’s delegate. The presence of a representative of the Church’s hierarchy (a priest or a bishop) is not required; in any case, that person would not be involved in the pronouncing and the reception of these vows.

“I consecrate myself to you....” We note that in their heroic vow of 1691, John Baptist de La Salle and his two companions describe the scope of their commitment in detail: “... from now on and forever, until the last surviving one of us or unto the complete establishment of the said Society, make the vow of association and union to bring about and maintain the said establishment, without being able to withdraw from this obligation even if only we three remained in the said Society and if we were obliged to beg for alms and to live on bread alone.”

Here the entire gift of self is immediately affirmed: “totally yours.”

“To procure your glory....” The glory of God is a theme dear to John Baptist de La Salle. The glory of God signals God’s presence in the here and now; the glory of God proclaims that God is with us. The Bible surely tells us this: the glory of the Lord meets the Israelites at the altar and fills the tabernacle (*Exodus* 29:43, 40:34); it fills the house of the Lord (*1 Kings* 8:10ff); it leaves the Temple when the people are driven into exile (*Ezekiel* 9-11). God is revealed to be present with God’s people to sanctify, to lead, and to save them. The glory of God manifests God’s presence and signals that salvation is here, close at hand. This strong image allows us to understand the Lasallian approach: the glory of God is that all humans be saved – including,
therefore, the young – so that they arrive home with God. The glory of God is directly related to the mission of salvation among children of artisans and of poor people to which the Brother vows himself during his consecration to God. The glory of God is displayed in full view when salvation is accomplished. \( ^7 \) That glory is already visible when what students experience in the Christian School is the accomplishment of God’s design. \( \text{Thus the school is a place where God is present and can be experienced, known, and adored.} \)

“As far as I shall be able and as you will require of me.” One of the Brother’s specific tasks, to seek the will of God, highlights the importance of experiencing God, of conversing with God particularly in interior prayer to know and to follow God’s will. We say that we want to procure God’s glory “as far as I shall be able,” a statement with a realistic and ultimately healthy component. We commit ourselves to do whatever is possible. Claiming to want to do the impossible raises the specter of human pride and has no place in a consecration to God.

\( \text{For this purpose} \ldots \)

The era in which they create it profoundly marks the formula of vows of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, a time of reasoned discourse in which restrained, controlled thinking flows while striving to express itself in a clear and orderly form. The various articulations (\( \ldots \) for this purpose \( \ldots \) wherefore \( \ldots \) in testimony thereof \( \ldots \) ), so easy to spot in this formula and still in use today, demonstrate the style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula of Vows of Brother Pierre Narra</th>
<th>Formula of Vows of 1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{And for this purpose, I, Pierre Narra, promise you and vow to unite myself and to remain in Society with the Brothers who are associated together to keep together and by association gratuitous schools, in whatever place they might be, which I promise and vow to do even if in doing so I am obliged to beg and to live on bread alone, or to do in the said Society whatever I shall be employed to do whether by the body of the Society or by the Superiors who will be in charge.} )</td>
<td>( \text{For this purpose I, \ldots, promise and vow to unite myself and to remain in society with the Brothers of the Christian Schools, who are associated to conduct, together and by association, schools for the service of the poor. I promise to go wherever I may be sent and to do whatever I may be assigned by the body of the Society or its superiors.} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person who professes this vow includes how he is going to do what he globally envisages in the first part: how he specifically is going to procure the glory that he evokes in his consecration.

Differences are apparent between what Brother Pierre says and our current vows. Most obvious is the disappearance of “which I promise and vow to do even if in doing so I am obliged to beg and to live on bread alone....” The last Brother to employ this part of the formula, or at least the last one whose text is preserved, is Brother Michel Servin, who makes his vows on June 7, 1705. Brother Irénée (Claude François du Lac Montisambert) omits this passage in his formula of triennial vows, September 25, 1716, which he would not have done had this section of the formula still been in use, \( ^8 \) nor does he cite it in his handwritten “explanation” on the reverse side of his formula of perpetual vows, September 29, 1717.
The Rule of 1718 does not include this clause in its explanation of the vows, nor does the 1726 revision (after the Bull of Approbation). Nevertheless, the Collection of Various Short Treatises does mention it in various editions until 1886: “...not to leave the Society, if it happens that they come to lack everything in it, but to be resolved to ask for alms and to live on bread alone rather than to abandon the Society or the schools.”

Here we see one of the characteristics of our “religious” commitments. They are related to the mission with children and young people. Since the beginning and over the course of various famines and economic difficulties during the last third of Louis XIV’s reign, we know that Brothers put this commitment into practice, to say nothing of all the times in history when Brothers have lived in extreme poverty to continue serving young people in a country or in a city.

Furthermore, this perspective also supposes that the individual’s appropriation of the Institute’s mission includes both the intellectual and organizational elements of the Society and of its leaders and the personal life of those who associate, who are the very sustenance of that Society. This incorporation is connected with the explicit terms of the consecration, where the phrase occurs in part two after “And for this purpose, I promise and vow to unite myself and to remain in society ...” The commitment to live in association with Brothers in order to realize a singular project, conducting Christian Schools, has consequences in the individual’s life. Our present thinking about the vow of association ought to take this into account and, without doubt, to search for ways to make this dimension of our vows more distinct and explicit.

We can also note that our first Brothers, in this second part of the vow formula, continue their dialogue with the Trinity: “I, Pierre Narra, promise you....” Our current formulation, “For this purpose, I promise and vow to unite myself....” is more impersonal. It seems to be a public statement addressed to those who are present and not primarily to the Holy Trinity. It is almost an act of administrative ratification rather than a conversation with God.

Promise and vow or only promise?

There is an essential difference, in my opinion, between Brother Pierre Narra’s formulation and ours today with respect to the expression itself of the vow of association.

Brother Pierre Narra says, “I, Pierre Narra, promise you and vow to unite myself and to remain in Society with the Brothers....” This statement enables us to understand that in the third part of the vow formula, he returns to what he says earlier: “...which vows of association as well as of....” As for ourselves, we say, “I promise and vow to unite myself and to remain in society with the Brothers....” The vow of association is no longer truly at the heart of our formula of vows, because it is only in the third part with the list of vows that we find it explicitly stated: “Wherefore, I promise and vow chastity, poverty, obedience, association for the service of the poor through education, and stability....” The vow of association is now one vow among others and no longer the one vow that supports all the others.

The formulation is important, even essential in this genre of text, because for a Brother of the Christian Schools, it surely is his word exchanged with the Trinity that consecrates him to God,
not, as already noted, any liturgical rite or action by another person. It is, indeed, essential that what a Brother says at this central point in his life expresses his consecration to God.

Brother Pierre Narra and the other Brothers of his time also seem to be well aware at this point that they are at the heart of their consecration to God, because – a few lines later – they say for a second time, “which I promise and vow to do,” to introduce the idea of begging and of living on bread alone and to announce their loyalty and obedience to the Body of the Society and to its Superiors to do whatever they will be employed to do. This insistence could not be more significant.

What would the consequences be of returning to the original formula, “I promise you and vow to unite myself....”? Would it change the canonical status of the Institute of Brothers? Such considerations are beyond the competence of this author, but I firmly believe that our first Brothers, in saying what they say, are no less consecrated to God than we ourselves are. They demonstrate the position they occupy, or think they occupy, in God’s plan of salvation and in the People of God.

... to unite myself and to remain in society with the Brothers of the Christian Schools, who are associated to....

The vow formula of Brother Pierre Narra says the same thing (and he is not alone in doing so at the time): “...the Brothers who are associated together to keep together and by association gratuitous schools.”

In the third part of his formula, Brother Pierre will say, “...which vows of association as well as of stability in the said Society....,” thereby returning to the association that he already has described in the second part. That is why we must pause here for a moment, because this second part is, in fact, the description of the vow of association that our first Brothers are making. This text can clarify our understanding today.

*I promise (and vow) to unite myself and to remain in society....*

Association, first of all, is “to form a Society” with others. The notion of association includes unity and permanence (remaining). Uniting with someone means that one person agrees with another about the possibility of bringing to life a common project and of working together to make it succeed.

The next phrase designates who these people are: “with the Brothers of the Christian Schools,” a recognizable human group at the time with a particular lifestyle, uniform, and occupation. Evidently, the external signs of identity are more “legible” at that time for our first Brothers than they are in today’s complex and secularized societies.

“*Brothers who are associated together to keep together and by association gratuitous schools.*”

These persons – for me this is the essential point in defining “association” – are united, are “together,” to realize an educational project, “to keep gratuitous schools,” or as we say today, “to
conduct schools for the service of the poor.” Thus, it is a society that is recognized by its mission: to educate the children of artisans and poor families. In the 17th century, the term “gratuitous schools” has a specific meaning: schools, usually of the parish, that are opened for children from poor families. Moreover, the original Rule is not mistaken when it defines the existence of the Brothers, not by their “religious state” or individual ascetic sanctification, but by the response to the needs of artisan and poor families for the education of children and young people who are far from salvation. This is how God is speaking, calling, demonstrating to these certain people that salvation remains to be achieved and that their response is the way to holiness for these Brothers whom the Rule recognizes as being called and sent.

The Rule of 1987 offers the same perspective, not by describing the Brother’s response to God’s call as a state of Christian perfection, but by defining it as fidelity to a summons that he hears in the context of the need of young people – especially those who are poor – for human, Christian education. His listening and his response are the building blocks of the Brother’s life.

In John Baptist de La Salle’s time, association is the response in the form of an immediately available social structure: celibate men who live in community and choose as their ministry the elementary school to meet the most urgent need. Today, as we know, much has changed.

Our response as educators can no longer operate only in the context of The Conduct of the Christian Schools. In many countries the school has become a primary concern of the State or at least is dependent on the priorities of contemporary society. The curriculum has grown far more complex across all academic disciplines and requires content and cognitive skills beyond mastering basic reading, writing, and arithmetic. The dialogue between the “associated” and their environment plays out on many levels simultaneously, including youth at various stages, families, Society and its needs, State requirements, and school systems, not to mention evangelization, orientations of local Churches, history and tradition, societal groups, and religious denominations.

The people who are professionally engaged in education are also more diverse now. They include Brothers and Sisters and Laypeople, some of whom are not Catholic or not Christian. In some countries almost all the Brothers are retirees with no direct access to educating young people. The internationalization of the Lasallian presence worldwide also implies a wide range of outlooks and responses.

At this point in our reflection, we can assemble some characteristic traits of “Lasallian association.”

- unite oneself with other people.
- who form a society.
- which conducts a specific and characteristic educational project that favors poor people.
- remain in the society and in its project so that both succeed.

To form “society with the Brothers of the Christian Schools, who are associated together to...” returns us again to the founding document of June 6, 1694, when John Baptist de La Salle and twelve Brothers make a vow of association to select their Superior on the following day and to
give their Society a profoundly original form of existence in their current context. Laymen in the Church, a group from society’s working classes, they choose a lifestyle with no reference to sacred and established hierarchies, their primary consideration being their ministerial project and their intent to live together as a group capable of projecting itself into the future, of envisaging the “sequel” when the Founder has departed – “after the said Monsieur de La Salle, and forever in the future....”

This second part of our formula of vows comes to a close by recalling the role of the Body of the Society in the life of that Society and in relation to those who constitute it: “to do whatever I may be assigned by the body of the Society or its superiors.” To whom and to what are we referring when we say, “Body of the Society?”

The Collection of Various Short Treatises and Brother Irénée’s comments on the reverse side of his vow formula provide some indications, without saying everything on the matter.

In the Collection (1711), the vows oblige the Brothers “to obey ... third, the body of the Society, whether this body be represented by the superiors or by others assembled in its name....”

Brother Irénée (on the reverse side of his formula of perpetual vows, September 29, 1717) cites the text of the Collection, “by the vow of obedience, one commits himself to obey ... third, the body of the Society, whether this body be represented by the superiors or by others assembled in its name.”

The Rule of 1726 adds Chapter 18, “Obligations of the Vows,” a text that does not appear in the Rule of 1718. “By the vow of obedience, we are committed to obey ... third, the Body of the said Society, whether said Body be represented by several, whether a Director or others assembled in said name.”

The Letter of the “principal Brothers” of April 1, 1714, to John Baptist de La Salle also uses this reference to the body of the Society. “... we very humbly beseech you and command you in the name and on behalf of the body of this Society to which you have promised obedience....”

Blain, in describing a meeting of Brothers assembled in Paris (in 1713 or 1714) to support Brother Barthélemy when certain Brothers were confronting him and to discuss the revision of the Rule, refers to them as “principal Brothers.”

Thus, the Body of the Society appears to be “represented by a certain number of Brothers” who might be Superiors, Directors, or others “assembled in its name,” that is to say, having approved a formal act that identifies them and communicates the results of the meeting to the other Brothers. The Body of the Society requires an explicit process for it to manifest itself, one that envisages Chapters and Councils but also, in case of necessity, an assembly of Brothers whose authority all the others (or at least a majority) recognize.

These considerations still leave completely unanswered the question of who constitutes “the Body of the Society” today with respect to mission and to association as experienced by people who are not Brothers. Strictly speaking, a Chapter (whether General or District) is concerned
with the Institute of the Brothers, but nowadays it is no longer in a position to speak for the “real body,” the whole and entire Society consisting of Brothers, Sisters, and married and single Laypeople who are becoming more involved in varying degrees in the Lasallian Educational Mission. How can these diverse components of the body of the Society of the Christian Schools express themselves today? Without doubt this is one of the challenges we are facing now and in the future.

Finally, we must add another aspect of association, one that we tried to clarify previously: its mode of functioning in relation to people, spirituality, mission, and personal commitment. This topic leads to the question of internal organization: superior(s), councils, and methods of discernment, decision-making, and accompaniment. Here again, “Lasallian association” is reaching the point where it will have to respond, no doubt provisionally, while respecting contemporary attitudes and diversity in state in life, culture, and personal circumstances.

*Wherefore, I promise and vow ...*

Since the *Bull of Approbation* (1725) and the 1726 edition of the *Rule*, the third part of the vow formula begins by listing the three traditional vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience. In a certain sense, this is the “state of perfection,” the religious life as described and presented over the centuries. To this state of perfection, two specific vows came to be attached, oriented to the mission: *association for the service of the poor through education and stability.*

The vow formula of Brother Pierre Narra certainly includes a vow of obedience, although not exactly the same in nature as the one we currently make. In effect, the vow of obedience at the origins is a vow to ensure continuity and consistency in the Mission, so that the free schools will have teachers available. “Wherefore,” the third part of his profession, says in effect how to accomplish “keeping gratuitous schools.” The formulation of this vow comes after the reference to the body of the Society and to the Superiors who are guarantors of the fidelity of the association and of everyone associated in its mission.

Obviously, the three traditional vows provide the Brothers a well-defined place in the Church’s canonical structure. The consecrated life of chastity, poverty, and obedience has been and continues to be a path to holiness; but do these three vows say who a Brother of the Christian Schools is? It seems to me that the specific dimension of the Lasallian religious vocation is expressed by “I consecrate myself entirely to you,” at the beginning of the text, and by “to unite myself and to remain in society with the Brothers ... to conduct ... schools....” Is not our specific path to holiness the exercise of a profession to serve young people? This perspective enables us to travel along the way to God in company with women and men pursuing different personal vocations who consecrate themselves to the service of young people far from salvation.

However, we must not confuse our respective identities as Brothers and Laypeople who are associated. Brothers live their relationship with God in their ministry of serving young people while in the mode of religious life. Laypeople do so according to the mode of their own state in life, whether single or, more generally, married.
Brothers and Laypeople on their paths of association for the service of the poor through education

Several problems are now apparent. For over three hundred years, association for the mission has been the experience of celibate men, integrated with the religious life in a Community with a nearly total and detailed internal organization. Many Brothers and Laypeople are finding it difficult to break away from this model and to invent one adapted to the new times in which we are living. Too often, our thinking and our suggestions hark back to concepts and realities unique to the Brothers. Examples are the insistence on the District in the Acts of the last General Chapter\textsuperscript{15} and the role assigned to the Brother Visitor. This tendency is further reflected in the circumstances surrounding some commitment ceremonies of Laypeople as associates with the Brothers by promises made practically in the same liturgical and symbolic environment as in the profession of vows by Brothers. In actual practice, we are not sufficiently aware that symbols and gestures are sometimes as important as words and intentions and that they clearly say what we dare not express aloud.

Another difficulty arises when we try to separate “the community life of the Brothers” and “the mission.” This appears, for example, during Chapters (General or District) in which under certain arrangements Laypeople participate. Sometimes two meetings are juxtaposed, giving to one the work on internal issues of the life of the Brothers and to the other what concerns the mission, which is in total contradiction with the intuition of the Founder not to make any difference between the affairs of our state in life and those of our ministry.\textsuperscript{16}

How can we do right with this dual reality? The Lasallian mission is carried out overwhelmingly by Laypeople. Simultaneously, this same mission is substantially incorporated in the life of the Brothers because it is their way to holiness. Might the structure of the District, a kind of religious institution, be inadequate in the face of what we are experiencing in association today?

This real situation of people playing determining roles in the global Lasallian mission continues to pose questions to which a response is becoming increasingly difficult to delay. Among the educators worldwide who are active in this Lasallian mission, a significant number are believers but not Catholic or not Christian; others report being nonbelievers. It is evident that this situation must be respected absolutely.

Furthermore, a good number of these educators call themselves “Lasallian” and are recognized as such in their mission with young people. This being so, what place or what part can non-Christian or non-believing Lasallian educators have in defining and directing the Lasallian mission considered in its totality: to provide a human and Christian education to the young, especially to those who are poor? I am referring here to men and women in critical positions of leadership, formation, administration, accompaniment, and orientation throughout the “Lasallian world.” Not to mention the connection with the Church!

Finally, what are the present contours of this “Body of the Society” that I have promised and vowed to obey? Who determines, according to what criteria, membership in the “Body of the Society?” The answers to all these questions can only be reached in dialogue together among Brothers and Laypeople who associate, taking into account cultures and countries.
From association to communion

The structure of association cannot be pyramidal, as it has been in the Institute of the Brothers for so long. In particular, it ought not to be a mere decal of the way the Brothers live association. We must learn how to live in communion, that is to say, to journey together in continual dialogue, respectful of each person’s identity as we share the same ideal: following John Baptist de La Salle and bringing God’s salvation to children and young people, especially to those who are poor.

No doubt some will question the effectiveness of such a mode of operation. We must also consider the fact that some groups of men and women religious in our time have an organizational structure that is more defined than all the others, a model of sufficient force that appeals to the others. Most often, the District (or the Institute in Rome) initiates the meetings to develop relationships. This role as “motor” of association must not allow the Brothers to forget that they have to be, above all, the boatmen who carry their Lay Brothers and Sisters “to the other shore,” the place of their complete autonomy in charity, communion, and educational service.

Ultimately, beyond issues of animation and organization, effectiveness is the key, not implementing an operational model, in the Mission with children and young people, the place where God’s glory is revealed.

Endnotes

1. Brother Jean-Louis Schneider, who finalized this brief document about association in the Institute on April 21, 2005, is a member of the District of France. He has been a frequent presenter at the Centro Internazionale Lasalliano (CIL) in Rome and a regular presenter in Lasallian formation and education programs in his own District; and he was the Institute’s Director of Lasallian Studies in Rome from 2004 to 2009.


3. The author uses the birth name, Pierre Narra, throughout his text.


5. On November 21, 1691, the feast of the Presentation of Our Lady, John Baptist de La Salle, Nicolas Vuyart, and Gabriel Drolin profess this vow.


8. See the discussion on this point in Frère Maurice-Auguste, *op. cit.*, pages 44ff.


10. The last third of Louis XIV’s reign (1643–1715), approximately 1691–1715.


15. The 43rd General Chapter of 2000.

16. “Rules I Have Imposed on Myself” #3 in *Rule and Foundational Documents* (Landover, MD: Lasallian Publications, 2002), page 199. “It is a good rule of life to make no distinction at all between the work of our vocation in life and the work of our salvation and perfection.”