

4. Indigenous spirituality: expanding the view

Philip Gibbs

Introduction

Taking Indigenous spirituality in Papua New Guinea as the starting point, my intention in this paper is to outline briefly the way such spiritualities have been understood in Melanesia using a "biocosmic" principle for interpreting symbols, and then to consider how Raimon Panikkar's *cosmotheandric* principle might expand the view. In particular I am interested in how we might develop our understanding of *anthropos* in relation to *bios* and *cosmos*. A further question emerges as to how one might include the manifestation of "Christ" in a dialogue of Christian theology with Indigenous spirituality in our contemporary situation.

1. Indigenous Spirituality in Papua New Guinea

Papua New Guinea is a nation comprising hundreds of cultures. Despite the plurality of beliefs and practices, there are themes such as Melanesian spirituality that can be identified as common throughout the region. Melanesian spirituality has been defined as a search for, maintenance of, and celebration of life. The primary concern is for growth, fertility, health, wealth and success. Traditional Melanesian spirituality is non-theistic. In a few cases where there is a high god, it is at best a *deus otiosus* – a "retired god". The main practical concern is to keep channels of life open, which means maintaining and strengthening relationships with people and other elements of the cosmos. This is accomplished through rituals, often in the form of exchange. Such cosmic spirituality is not concerned with an intellectual quest, but rather a quest for life involving survival and wellbeing.

Some have labelled traditional Melanesian spirituality as magical and superstitious. This is because it is not concerned so much with the ultimate source of life-giving power in a transcendent God, but rather with the availability and immediate use of power to bring about life and wellbeing, found in healers, sorcerers and ancestral spirits.

2. The "Biocosmic" explanation of Melanesian Spirituality

Scholars investigating Melanesian spirituality often use a "biocosmic" explanation for the use of non-theistic symbols representing sacred reality in Melanesian religion. Ennio Mantovani of the Melanesian Institute has

developed this approach,¹ and many writers, including myself have found the explanation useful. The *biocosmic* religious experience does not refer to an ultimate called God (*theos*), but to an ultimate experience as *bios* (life). It is characterised by the experience of "something" which is absolutely necessary for existence; of "something" in which everything participates. Mantovani says that this "something" is *bios* or life. The more a reality participates in that life, the stronger, healthier, richer and more important that reality becomes. If life ebbs away, then sickness and eventually death follows. Life in this context is material, biological and spiritual.

The term *cosmic* is used in the understanding that everything participates in cosmic life in various degrees and everything is bound together by it. Animals and plants may be distinguished from humans, but are still linked together into a *cosmos*. Everything that exists shares in the same "life" – hence the term "biocosmic." The symbolism of the *biocosmic* experience is not vertical as the experience with *theos* tends to be, but horizontal, with a stress on blood, the womb, the tomb, the phallus.

According to Mantovani, Christianity was not totally unbiased as it grew out of Israel which, in order to survive as an ethnic group, had to fight against the agrarian *biocosmic* religions of Canaan. The fight for survival did not allow Israel to dialogue with the *biocosmic* religious experience and its symbols.² Christianity followed suit and it was God as *theos* who was introduced to Papua New Guinea by the Christian missionaries – with seemingly little concern for Melanesian *biocosmic* issues of gardens, growth, and fertility in all its forms. Christianity had to introduce sin, as the cause of the lack of true life and as the reason for the death of Jesus. Theoretically, the *biocosmic* religious experience of Melanesian spirituality could focus on life-giving love without needing human sinfulness as a motive for that love to appear.

For Mantovani this *biocosmic* experience is part of God's revelation to the people of Melanesia going back thousands of years prior to the coming of Christianity. He claims that today Christianity does not need an ethnic identity, as was the case with Israel. Christianity subsists in a plurality of

¹ Ennio Mantovani, "Discussion: Is there a Biocosmic Religion?" A Reply to Dr Garland, *Catalyst* 16/4 (1986): 352-366. Ennio Mantovani, *Divine Revelation and the Religions of PNG: A Missiological Manual* (Goroka: Melanesian Institute, 2000).

² Mantovani, *Divine Revelation and the Religions of PNG*, 85.

local churches and is thus free to dialogue with different forms of religious experience.³ Mantovani's explanation is somewhat akin to other explanations of how cosmic religions are concerned with sacred, womanly, earthly matters. They represent the basic posture that *homo religiosus* adopts towards the mysteries of life.⁴

3. A Broader Perspective

Mantovani's insights based on his experience in the field and on comparative religion and phenomenology are valuable; however I am left with remaining questions. Is the life of the human person simply *bios*? Could more attention be given to the value of the human person (*anthropos*) in relation to *bios* and *cosmos*? Secondly, how does one do "theo-logy" without a *theos*? Thirdly, in Christian theology, how can one best include Christ in dialogue with Indigenous spiritualities, particularly in the context of changing contemporary realities? I could refer back to discussion on such issues within literature originating in Papua New Guinea, principally that from the Melanesian Institute. However, in this presentation I am seeking a broader philosophical and theological perspective, drawing on the work of Raimon Panikkar, particularly his books *The Cosmotheandric Experience*,⁵ *Christophany*,⁶ and his recently

³ Mantovani, *Divine Revelation and the Religions of PNG*, 98.

⁴ Aloysius Pieris, *An Asian Theology of Liberation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 71. Mantovani's work has not been without controversy. In 1986, Christopher Garland published an article, "Is Traditional Religion in PNG Theistic?" in which he argues that Mantovani's *biocosmism* is merely a stress upon one element within theism rather than a separate form of religion. He suggests that "Mantovani has given a one-sided view of theism in order to make his non-theistic alternative seem all the more attractive." Christopher Garland, "Is Traditional Religion in PNG Theistic?" *Catalyst* 16/2 (1986): 128. Garland argues that traditional religion in PNG has room for personal relationships, and thus is really a form of theism. Mantovani replied that treating Melanesian religions as a form of theism means treating them as distorted or inferior. Using the analogy of Melanesian Pidgin he argues that to call all Melanesian religions theistic is like saying that Pidgin is an inferior brand of English [Mantovani, "Discussion," *Catalyst* (1986): 357]. He insists that the "ultimate" for Melanesian religions is "life" and not love.

⁵ Raimon Panikkar, *The Cosmotheandric Experience* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis books, 1993), 93.

⁶ Raymond Panikkar, *Christophany: The Fullness of Man* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004 [Italian Jaca Books, 1999]).

published book, *Rhythm of Being*.⁷ Panikkar reflects on many themes common to those of the *biocosmic* principle, particularly the primacy of life (*anima mundi*).⁸

4. Panikkar and the Cosmotheandric Vision

Raimon Panikkar draws on his comprehensive knowledge of Christianity, Hinduism and Buddhism, but seldom refers explicitly to primal religions except in reference to the "nonhistorical consciousness" of "so-called prehistoric man".⁹ For those with a nonhistorical consciousness time is the rhythm of nature measured by the seasons of the earth. The passage of time is measured by the sun or the moon; not the clock. In such a world, the divine permeates the *cosmos* and the world is "full of gods". For Panikkar polytheism is still understood within the framework of theism, and he is seeking an alternative to the theistic *mythos*.

The alternative is a *cosmotheandric* vision of reality: a Trinity of cosmic, human and divine, that Panikkar considers irreducible cross-cultural dimensions constituting reality.¹⁰ A stone is more than just "matter". *Anthropos* is more than a rational animal. *Theos* here is used to capture the 'more' that pervades the cosmic and the human, yet is not reducible to either. The "rhythm" of these dimensions of reality exists in relation to each another as a form of *perichoresis*, dwelling within one another (literally: dancing around each other) in a continuing creation (*creatio continua*).

5. Anthropos in the cosmotheandric model of the divine mystery

Panikkar explains why he uses the term "Man" as the English term for *anthropos* – a word "which males have unjustly monopolized". He feels that the alternative term "human being" is dehumanizing – making each individual a member of a class of beings. "Man ... is not a species of a genus 'animal'."¹¹ He notes that if we want to be called "beings" at all, we are

⁷ Raymond Panikkar, *The Rhythm of Being* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010).

⁸ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 269.

⁹ Panikkar, *Cosmotheandric Experience*, 93.

¹⁰ Panikkar considers the term *theanthropocosmic*, but decides to use *cosmotheandric* because it is "more euphonic." Panikkar, *Cosmotheandric Experience*, 54f.

¹¹ Panikkar, *Christophany*, 16.

humane beings, beings in which the *humanum* is not a class, but the essence of very being.¹²

Unlike animals, Man has the capacity to relate to the Divine because of body, soul and spirit, as found in the Jewish and early Christian traditions. It is a mistake to omit the spirit or simply merge it with soul as western culture tends to do today because the spirit makes us divinizable in a way that is different from all other beings. Without the spirit, theology is reduced to anthropological dualism with the human *logos* about the *theos* rather than the *logos* of the *theos* to which we listen.¹³ *Logos* reduced to *ratio* even dares to prove God's existence.¹⁴

Panikkar refers to "*anthropophany*" as distinguished from anthropology. *Anthropophany* is not the *anthropos* studied by the *logos* (anthropology), but *anthropos* including the spirit disclosing to us what we are. As part of the Trinity of cosmic-human-divine we share in the divine dimension and play a part in the transformation of the *cosmos*.

Despite the metaphysical level of discussion I think this notion of *anthropophany* and the understanding of *anthropos* in relation to matter and spirit is useful in dialogue associated with Indigenous spirituality. Until now in Melanesia the discussion has been mostly dualistic. It compares cosmic spirituality and its concern for the earth, nature, wellbeing and exchange, with their equivalents in *metacosmic* spirituality: heaven, transcendence, salvation and grace. I have noted how Melanesian Christians may acknowledge the *metacosmic* beliefs of Christianity, while cosmic spirituality continues as part of the deep underlying religious dimension of a person's faith.¹⁵ Panikkar helps support endeavours to think beyond dualism in terms of "as-well-as" rather than "either-or."

Panikkar's view of *anthropos* in relationship to matter and divine is also useful in the Indigenous worldview that naturally understands the

¹² Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 296.

¹³ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 189.

¹⁴ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 303.

¹⁵ Philip Gibbs, "It's in the Blood," *South Pacific Journal of Mission Studies* 31 (Dec. 2004): 22-27. Reprinted in *Catalyst* 34/2 (2004): 129-139; *Verbum SVD* 46/2 (2005): 151-161; *Sedos Bulletin* (2005): 117-121, 131.

person as self conscious within a web of relationships.¹⁶ The Melanesian person develops independence of character within a socio-centric rather than an individualistic environment. Broadening the context beyond the social to the cosmic and the divine could surely enrich our understanding of the person as not just socio-centric but at the crossroads (not the center) of the threefold horizon of being.¹⁷

6. "Theos" and theo-logy

Panikkar is critical of attempts to deal with the divine in "terrestrial" categories. Theism represents a particular mode of thinking, which has produced a certain type of worldview and developed its own specific variety of theology. He maintains that true religion is not bound by "theisms" – monotheism, pantheism, atheism or any other theism. He notes how theisms seem to have lost their convincing power today, perhaps because *anthropos* feels that the *theos* always wants to dominate heteronomically – as the transcendent wholly other.¹⁸ He says that we don't need to hypostasize the qualities of the divine into a single, transcendent, separate, supreme being. We have to liberate the divine from the burden of being "God." God is not a cultural universal, unlike the divine mystery, which is a constitutive dimension of reality. The experience of the Divine is not an experience of an isolated aspect of reality, but is an experience of an entire reality in one of its dimensions. By listening lovingly – in silence to each being we discover its divine dimension.

Panikkar retains *theos* as part of the divine-human-cosmic triad – but here *theos* refers to the Divine purified of the limitations imposed by religion. Monotheism imposes a personal character on the godhead and Asian religions propose an impersonal idea. In his view, too often both suffer from intellectual idolatry. Throughout history, human cultures have formulated different responses to the wonder of existence. The *cosmotheandric* vision is an expression of the radical relativity of the whole of reality, referring to the reality lying behind those various formulations, not the formulations themselves such as God, or Supreme Being. Thus

¹⁶ Marilyn Strathern uses the term '*dividual*' in contrast to the Western "individual" to reflect how a person in Melanesia is frequently constructed as the plural and composite site of the relationships that produce them. Marilyn Strathern, *The Gender of the Gift* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 13.

¹⁷ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 304.

¹⁸ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 358.

theos in the *cosmotheandric* vision can be a symbol for the mystery about which we are aware through our openness to the infinite unknown – which is faith. The basic response in the *cosmotheandric* vision is thankfulness for the gift of Being – or Life.

Panikkar concludes that theo-logy or the human science of God all too often seeks to entrap God in our human categories. The only way to redeem theo-logy is to treat it as a subjective genitive; that is, as the word of God to which we may listen.

Indigenous spiritualities such as those from Papua New Guinea appear not to use theistic symbolism. Nor do they entertain accounts of *theos* entering into human history. The Indigenous *mythos* is about the search for life. The source of life may at times be symbolised in a *Dema* figure who dies and is buried – the symbol of life emerging from the *Dema* figure's grave. Yet the origin of that life is a cosmic energy, not a personal one. If one leaves theistic notions aside and considers Divine mystery as the ultimate source of life and being, then there is room for viewing this as a *locus theologicus* for Indigenous theology. Indigenous spirituality can be considered theology when it enables us to become aware of where the different symbols of the *theos* find a common arena in response to the wonder of existence and the gift of life.¹⁹

7. The Manifestations of Christ within Indigenous Spiritualities

Can insights that seek a different *mythos* from that of orthodox monotheism assist in the dialogue between Christian theology and Indigenous spiritualities? Panikkar is wary of Christologies being a Western product bound by the history of culture and the monotheism inherited from Abrahamic tradition.²⁰ He introduces the concept of "christophany" as the manifestation of Christ to human consciousness including both the mystical experience of Christ as being one with the Father and a critical reflection on that experience.²¹ He does not want to reduce the reflection on Christ to a doctrinal or intellectual method proper to Christology, but seeks to go beyond that aided by what he calls the "third eye." The first eye is that of

¹⁹ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 206.

²⁰ Panikkar, *Christophany*, 4, 7.

²¹ Panikkar, *Christophany*, 10.

the senses, the second – that of the intellect; the third is the mystical vision facilitated by the spirit.

For the "third eye" of mystical vision Panikkar draws upon the Indic notion of *Advaita* – a non-dualistic conception of reality as interrelatedness. (It is not limited to Indic notions, since he notes that the polytheism of African religions is *advaitic*).²² *Advaita* does not say "either-or" but "as well as." The focus is not on two poles of a dialectic, but rather on an awareness of the relationship that exists. For example, "nothingness" is the dialectical negation of "being." In contrast, "absence" (Spanish - *nada*) is not negation but the awareness of emptiness surrounding being. The awareness of an absence only makes sense together with the presence of whose absence we are aware. There is not the one without the other.²³ This is *Advaita*.

Reason alone cannot grasp Christophany, but the third eye of mystical intuition can. The "third eye" of the mystical intellect does not depend on us seeing or knowing, but comes into being when we are conscious that we are seen or known. A stone may be felt; it may be known; but it may also be a symbol of the temple and the temple may be a symbol of the Divinity for those able to participate in the *mythos* that provides a horizon of intelligibility for the symbol. Too often rationalism blinds us to the wisdom of the "third eye" of mystical intuition. With the aid of the third eye it is possible to view Jesus Christ as one of the most powerful symbols "encompassing (not to say incarnating) in himself corporeality (matter), humanity (consciousness), and divinity (infinite)."²⁴

It is relevant here to note how Panikkar also utilizes the term *incarnatio continua*. Christianity is a historical religion. But Christ is more than historical reality. "Christ has appeared as king, soldier, knight, pacifist, friend of the poor, rebel and madman."²⁵ The incarnation takes place in a specific cultural milieu and so in effect is already an inculturation. At the same time it transforms the culture that receives it. Authentic Christians are unique participants in the *incarnatio continua* as persons who have experienced the reality of Christ. Christ is not an "other"; I am not Christ;

²² Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 164.

²³ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 314.

²⁴ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 304.

²⁵ Panikkar, *Christophany*, 174.

we are neither one nor two. This is the non-dual relation of the person in the experience of *Advaita*.²⁶

8. Dialogue with Indigenous spiritualities

Panikkar distinguishes three moments of consciousness: nonhistorical, historical – which includes the rational-scientific, and transhistorical consciousness that amounts to experiencing the sacredness of the secular and includes the *cosmotheandric* experience.²⁷ As noted in section 4 above, traditional Melanesian spirituality would be considered nonhistorical. Panikkar observes correctly that the elites of pre-industrial societies are trying to change the mode of consciousness of their people in order to introduce the historical consciousness “which is a prerequisite for industrialization or revolution.”²⁸ Unfortunately, if they have not done so already, they will find that they are exchanging a transcendent heaven for the few in the “next life” for a fulfillment in the future that turns out to be not very bright in either the historical or the vertical dimensions. The fact is that a substantial proportion of humanity has not reached the minimal level of the *humanum*.

Panikkar’s insight into the Divine mystery and transhistorical consciousness helps provide an opportunity to move beyond a prehistorical *biocosmic* understanding to a position where humankind takes on a unique position in relation to the cosmic, while at the same time the Divine is revealed through sacred secularity in symbols of life.

From a *biocosmic* worldview the human person has no special dignity and no particular insight other than their contribution to the cycle of *bios* (life) in the *cosmos* (world). Is it not preferable to view humanity in relation to both the world and the divine in the triadic relationship pointed out by Panikkar? *Bios* risks remaining just that if considered alone, but seeing it in relation to the divine opens an opportunity for *bios* to move in the direction of *zoe* – life that is “*tempeternal*.”²⁹

²⁶ Panikkar, *Christophany*, 77.

²⁷ Panikkar, *Cosmotheandric Experience*, 121.

²⁸ Panikkar, *Cosmotheandric Experience*, 126.

²⁹ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 271.

Arguments for the uniqueness of Christ aside, Indigenous spirituality becomes Christian theology with the introduction of Jesus Christ as the primary symbol of life who came to reveal *zoe* in its fullness, not just *bios*. This is not about incarnation in the traditional sense or fulfilment of pre-existent revelation. Jesus Christ represents a special image of the Divine allowing one to have a personal relationship within the Divine Mystery. As *anthropos*, we humans are at a meeting point of the three dimensions (spiritual, intellectual and material) and we see this represented in a special way in Christ.

In order for this to happen we need a “new *mythos*” because the myths of progress, science, technology, history, democracy and similar stories to which many of our contemporaries cling are no longer held to be true by an increasing number of responsible thinkers.³⁰ An alternative is still on the horizon; however Panikkar claims that we will find it in the *advaitic* myth of the *cosmotheandric* trinity: *cosmos-anthropos-theos*.³¹

9. Indigenous Spiritualities in a globalised technological world

Indigenous spiritualities exist today alongside a multiplicity of ideologies and beliefs, including the secular *mythos* of the modern industrialised world. Papua New Guinea is facing a boom in multinational mining and natural gas projects that strain the physical, human, moral and spiritual resources to the limit. People are competing to acquire a share of the spoils. For example, with regards to land, there appears to be little concern for the sacredness of land in the midst of the skirmish for monetary compensation.

Panikkar views modern technology in negative terms – calling it technocracy because it reduces life to the sensible and rational, forgetful of the mystical. He thinks that the only possibility for the future entails “a creative transformation of human culture, taking into account the human experience of the last six millennia in its positive and negative aspects”.³² In proposing a *cosmotheandric* attitude he wants to rescue the Divine from being considered a separate entity floating somewhere above and beyond the rest of reality.

³⁰ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 374.

³¹ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 404.

³² Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 319.

Pannikar presents three aspects of *cosmotheandric* spirituality as it relates to the contemporary world. Firstly, *cosmotheandric* spirituality seeks to transform the *cosmos*. Humanity is not simply a part of the *cosmos*, but a part of the very destiny of reality. Humankind is not passive, but can affect the whole adventure of being. "Man is an unfinished 'product' of the hands of the Creator because the human task is to achieve the unfinished portions by bringing to fulfilment both oneself and the surrounding world."³³ We cooperate with the divine and share in the divine dimension.

Secondly, *cosmotheandric* spirituality is aware of our ecological responsibility in the *oikos* or household. The *oikos* is suffering from an *oikonomia* out of control. Our life on earth is not an accident and we have the responsibility to bring the *oikonomia* under control for the sake of the human household and the *cosmos* as a whole.

Only if the Godhead, the natural World, and Man are seen to belong intrinsically together in a Trinitarian reality will our attitude to the earth cease to be domineering, and become one of real partnering – a partnership with something we ourselves *are*.³⁴

Our being does not end at the tips of our fingernails. The earth is more than our spaceship for travelling somewhere else. The earth is not a resource. We and the earth are together and it is our home.

Thirdly, *cosmotheandric* spirituality includes political involvement. By politics is meant the human concern about the well being of the *polis*, taken as a symbol for the fullness of human life as a community. If the ultimate ideals of humanity, which are what we call religious questions, are not incarnated in the spatio-temporal structures of sociological life — what we call political problems; both remain sterile. The specific problem is "whether the System *as such* — the projects of civilization we support, the technocratic mentality we share — is conducive to human fulfilment on all levels."³⁵ It is not a matter of changing structures but rather changing the underlying assumption that the motivation for action is victory and not love.

³³ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 350.

³⁴ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 353.

³⁵ Panikkar, *Rhythm of Being*, 358.

These three practical applications of *cosmotheandric* spirituality help balance theory with praxis to indicate a direction for our theological reflection. Indigenous spirituality cannot hide in the bush or the desert. It must find a place in the Rhythm of Being as it exists today where mystery is shunned.

10. Conclusion

In one of his few references to Oceania, Panikkar notes how faith or initiation is necessary for an authentic study of Christ.³⁶ Faith is the human dimension that corresponds to myth. It is always mediated through symbolic expressions and specific beliefs that embody faith in a particular tradition. Here is where Panikkar could perhaps have appreciated more as a dialogue partner the spirituality emerging from what he calls "nonhistorical" consciousness and not only the historical human experience of the last six millennia. The nonhistorical consciousness represented today in Indigenous spiritualities has a natural appreciation for the mystical and the relational. Admittedly such spiritualities are influenced by contemporary scientific developments. Yet, they have much to teach us about initiation, the "third eye" and about faith in the broad sense of the existential openness to Mystery.

Panikkar says that dialogue is possible if one can share in the symbolic world of the other – experiencing and thinking different symbols together. Unfortunately, too often Indigenous people are confronted with Euro-ecclesial neocolonial Christ or an otherworldly *metacosmic* Christ and there seems little room or freedom for discovering the presence of the Divine expressed in forms that are quite new – but not really new – a Christ associated with the sexual, the earthly, and the mysterious.³⁷

Though most Christians in Papua New Guinea adopt new beliefs and cease to practice many traditional rituals, there remains an underlying spirituality, which has its roots in cosmic spirituality. This spirituality becomes more apparent when facing life and death realities, for the focus of traditional religion in Papua New Guinea is the struggle for life in the face of death. Primal religion remains as an underlying dimension of human life.

³⁶ Panikkar, *Christophany*, 84.

³⁷ I have tried to engage in such dialogue over the past 37 years as anthropologist and priest in Papua New Guinea. For example, see: Philip Gibbs, "It's in the Blood," *South Pacific Journal of Mission Studies*, 22-27.

It's in the blood. If people can come to understand that different forms of religion are not necessarily opposed, then a way is opened for dialogue, which must start with an inner dialogue of faith within the individual.

I am optimistic that dialogue can occur if we can take a sympathetic view of the salvific significance of core cultural values, often values associated with life and wellbeing. Certainly we can learn from Panikkar about the importance to be given to *anthropos* in the triad of reality. Also, Indigenous spiritualities could contribute a richly human experiential dimension to the philosophical and metaphysical discourse. Cosmic spirituality is very much a search for life. But it is life in the face of death. It is a spirituality of both womb and tomb. I think that in dialogical dialogue with Panikkar's insights, Indigenous spiritualities can contribute an ecologically relevant life-giving opportunity for *anthropos* to see the divine in the *cosmos* and in a Christic *incarnatio continua* face those situations where life is threatened.