

ANDREW N. WOŹNICKI  
USA

THEANTROPY:  
THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE  
OF HUMAN AND DIVINE DIMENSIONS IN MAN

In his consciousness man experiences a mysterious call which permeates his whole human reality and which, at the same time, urges man to transcend his given nature, thus transforming his actual existence through the realization of a specific assigned destiny, unique to each and every human person. In general, this inner tension of human existence consists in a polarity in man between his being and his becoming<sup>1</sup>, specifically, between his being human and his becoming divine. St. Augustine's „animam et Deum scire cupio” expresses this inner structure of human desire for self-realization and ultimate self-perfection according to a specific divine design, which can be defined as theantropy.

The purpose of this paper is to reflect on the religiousness of man in his various forms of theantropic 'self-realization', thus manifesting different modes of the divine image according to a twofold motion of the ascendancy and descendancy of the human and the divine nature in man, as it has been developed by the different religious orientations in Western civilization.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Del p, *Weltgeschichte und Heilsgeschichte*, „Stimmen der Zeit”, 138(1940-1941), p. 247; „The first law our human state is the law of finite becoming: man is always oriented toward the complete and perfect expression of himself and of all being” (quoted in: B. Harring, *The Law of Christ*, I, Westminster: The Newman Press, 1961, p. 87).

## I

Western civilization is basically grounded on two divergent and disparate traditions of understanding the ultimate destiny of man, thus establishing either an immanent or a transcendent order of human existence. On the one hand, the Orphic tradition on the polarity of all natural things, by emphasizing the immanency of the human composition of body and soul, discloses a paradoxical condition of man as living in a constant tension between his materiality and his spirituality, thus leaving man at the mercy of the fatalistic powers of the World (Nietzschean *amor fati*). But, on the other hand, the Jewish doctrine on the creation of all things by God, by stressing the transcendentality of man's origin, invokes in human consciousness an absolute distance between God the Creator and man the creature, thus evoking in man a sense of the subordination of his human element to his divine image (*Ruah*).

Now, under the influence of the Orphic religion, the Greeks developed a cosmic view of the union of the human and the divine components of man, because human existence is conceived by them as the ultimate outcome of the breath of the Whole and the final expression of the progressive movement of Time/*Chronos*, thus delineating a horizontal theantropy. On the other hand, under the influence of the Judaic religious belief that everything has its origin and beginning in and from God, the union of the human and the divine elements in man was understood to result from a gradual and historical development, through which human existence is constantly progressing in a creative way of self-becoming under the constant presence of God Himself, thus outlining a vertical theantropy.

The horizontal theantropy of the Greeks – which was mystical in nature and fatalistic in character<sup>2</sup> – and the vertical theantropy of the Jews – which was theocentric in nature and legalistic in character<sup>3</sup> – presented Christianity with a paradoxical picture of man with respect to his temporality and eternity, his finiteness and infinitude – in short, his natural conditions and supernatural destiny. St. John's Incarnated *Logos* revealed the sacral character of human life (J. 1, 14. 16), but man, newly „sacralized” by the divine *Logos* is still „groaning inwardly while awaiting for the redemption of our bodies” (Rom. 8, 23). St. Paul admits that he experiences a perplexity of his nature between the law of God and the law of the flesh (Rom. 7, 25); he

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. Parandowski, *Mitologia*, Warszawa: „Czytelnik”, 1972, p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. F. Koneczny, *Cywilizacja żydowska*, London: Wydawnictwa Towarzystwa Imienia Romana Dmowskiego, 1974, p. 168-177.

is subjected to an inner tension between the *charismatic* nature of the divine and the *hamartiocentric* inclination of the human. The Christians, then, although they enjoy a real divine life by virtue of the *Incarnated Logos*, must nevertheless establish a new relationship to God, which will consist in a disposition/*diatheke* of divine grace and human nature wounded by the original sin, thus creating a new form of theantropy in both the vertical charistocentric order of salvation and the horizontal hamartiocentric order of redemption.

To better understand the dichotomy between the hamartiocentric and charistocentric dimensions of Christian belief, we must consider Greek views concerning the theantropic nature of man.

## II

The influence of Orphic teaching was not limited to philosophy alone, but exerted an impact upon all the spheres of spiritual life in Western civilization<sup>4</sup>. One of the contributors to the „Meander” Encyclopaedia writes in this respect:

„The Orphics were the first in Greece to introduce the notion of paradise and hell, of judgement after death and reward or punishment for the sins committed on earth. The Orphic religion shares many common elements with the Dionysian religion, but there are many significant differences between them as well. In the Orphic religion the eternal liturgy is not sufficient; a high degree of spiritual intensity is also imperative. Moreover, the insiders (*mistai*) are obliged to observe certain ritualistic regulations and participate in mysteries permeated with an atmosphere of reconciliation and mortification. Orphic theology unites man with the deity. Orphic writings propagated a religion in which metaphysics constitutes the foundation and support for ethics”<sup>5</sup>.

In fact the Orphic metaphysical religion is nothing but „a mystical monotheism according to which the mythical gods are merely external forms of a single divine being” (J. Parandowski). In order to understand this mystical monotheism of the Orphics and their teaching on the metaphysical and ethical

---

<sup>4</sup> For the impact of Orphism on the contemporary artists in all media, see: D. M. K o s i n s k i, *Orpheus in Nineteenth-century Symbolism*, Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1989.

<sup>5</sup> *Mała Encyklopedia Kultury Antycznej*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1983, p. 550.

principles of the union of man with the gods, it is necessary to reconstruct the Orphic paradigm and outline its essential tenets and principles with regard to theogony and cosmogony.

In the very beginning there was *Chronos*/Time, which the Orphics considered to be the first principle of all things. From *Chronos* emanated *Aether* and *Chaos*. The first born god from *Aether* and *Chaos* was *Phanes* (Light), considered to be the originator of the whole world<sup>6</sup>. Greek mythology in general, and Orphic doctrine in particular, identified *Phanes* with several deities known under various names; *Phanes* eventually became a prototype for *Eros*<sup>7</sup>.

In Orphic theogony *Eros* is recognized as the most universal and organizational principle of all reality both in its unity and in its plurality. In words of Proclus: „Pherecydes used to say that Zeus changed into Eros when he was about to create, because, having composed the world from opposites, he led it into harmony and peace and sowed sameness in all things, and a unity that interpenetrates the universe”<sup>8</sup>. However, when *Phanes*-Light created its opposite Night at origin of *Gaia* and *Ouranos*, the principle of Hate introduces an evil power of separation and brought about an antagonistic and hostile opposition among all the natural forces of the Whole (Empedocles)<sup>9</sup>.

Distinguishing between the previous reign of Kronos, when celestial daemons ruled over men, and the present reign of Zeus, when the beneficial spirits of men are constrained and left to manage their own affairs<sup>10</sup>, the Orphics describe the present condition of human life as a consequence of a primal sin committed by the Titans, who ate the divine child Dionysius. Now, when Zeus killed them in revenge, man was composed from their ashes – from the remains of both the Dionysian soul/*psyche* and the Titanic body/*soma*. The former is good and divine, but the latter is evil and adverse to the spirituality of the human soul. The duality of human nature is incompatible with man's original destiny, which is supposed to remain divine. Man, therefore, must re-establish the original unity of the human and the divine in his nature by mystical theantropy.

The Orphic tradition, then, connects man's destiny with his spirituality and strives to liberate the human soul from its embodiment by certain religious

---

<sup>6</sup> H. D i e l s, W. K r a n z, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, I, Zürich: Weidmann, 1989, B 12: p. 11.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. G. S. K i r k, J. E. R a v e n, *The Presocratic Philosophers*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1962, p. 41, 45.

<sup>8</sup> *In Tim.*, II, p. 54 – quoted in: K i r k, R a v e n, op. cit., p. 61.

<sup>9</sup> B 17. 6-8, in: D i e l s, K r a n z, op. cit., p. 316.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. P l a t o, *Laws*, 713c-e; i d e m, *Statesman*, 269c-274e.

practices and ceremonies. If a man's soul is still impure when he dies, it must transmigrate into another body for further punishment. But, if a man leads an ascetic life and purifies himself from the evil inclinations of his body, his soul will return to its original divine life and will enjoy an eternal, blissful happiness after his death. But, betwixt and between death and eternal life, the soul must journey through the underworld. At that moment the soul undergoes the last test and trial, namely, it must choose to drink water either from the spring of *Lethe* (the water of forgetfulness) or the spring of *Mnemosis* (the water of memory)<sup>11</sup>.

In the Orphic tradition man's soul and body constitute a specific dialectical tension between activity and passivity; that is, the soul sleeps while the body is active, but awakens when the body sleeps. While asleep, man's soul manifests itself in the form of dreams and trances. Here, for the first time, we find the theory which identifies the simultaneous state of consciousness and sub-consciousness. Orphism presents this tension between the soul and the body in the form of a mystical union between *Thymos* (the human power of instinctive drives and feelings) and *Nous* (the divine power of the spiritual faculties of knowing and willing). As a result of this dialectical tension between the human and the divine powers, man undergoes many traumatic experiences, which can be overcome by both moral behavior and religious practices<sup>12</sup>. Consequently, the mystical theantropy of the Orphics will lead to a fatalistic interpretation of human destiny<sup>13</sup>, and *logos* will become a principle of the perpetuation of successive palingenesis<sup>14</sup>.

For the ancient Greek, then, the whole of reality is divine: „This is how it is with Nature and Harmony: the Being of things is eternal, and nature itself

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. W. K. C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, London, Methuen & Co., 1952; ch. 4; W. Jaeger, *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*, Oxford: University Press, 1947, p. 61 ff.; M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, München, 1955, p. 698.

<sup>12</sup> *Religie święta*, Warszawa: „Pax”, 1957, p. 245 ff.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. V. Cioffari, *Fortune, Fate and Chance*, in: *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, II, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973, p. 226: „Among the Orphics Fate was viewed as the law which controls the conditions of our birth, death, and successive reincarnations. The belief in the process of a constant, monotonous, and unavoidable return to the point of departure came to be symbolically represented in the revolution of a wheel. The wheel of Fate was considered as regulating the course of humanity through the process of birth, death and reincarnation. Plato gathered myths and beliefs concerning Fate, and reshaped them in a certain order which was to be adhered to closely by subsequent thinkers. In his works, therefore, we can establish the stage and the implications which had been reached concerning Fate and its relation to Fortune”. On the influence of Orphism on Plato, see: A. Krokiewicz, *Studia orfickie*, Warszawa: Trzaska, Evert i Michalski, 1947, p. 90.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Laws*, 904e-905 ff.

requires the divine”<sup>15</sup>. However, the diathetical structure of nature/*physis* requires divinity only under the condition that there is some underlying organizational principle of all reality, a principle through which all natural things are intelligible in regard to both their being and their becoming. Now, from the time of Heraclitus the Greek thinkers perceived this underlying organizational principle of reality in *logos*. *Logos* also reveals human nature in its totality as living in the presence of divinity<sup>16</sup>, and by the same token, as having the possibility of realizing both its material and its spiritual dimension. Living in the constant presence of divinity, *logos* as a principle of the ‘self-disposition’ of human nature, dispenses not only natural but also supranatural powers, thus subordinating man to God. Philosophical investigations into Greek mythology led Plato to conclude that „not man but God is the measure of all things”:

„Now God ought to be to us the measure of all things, and not man, as men commonly say (Protagoras): the words are far more true of Him. And he who would be dear to God must, as far as is possible, be like Him and such as He is. Wherefore the temperate man is the friend of God, for he is like Him; and the intemperate or unjust man is unlike Him, and different from Him. And the same applies to other things; and this is also the noblest and truest of all sayings, – that for the good man to offer sacrifice to the Gods, and hold converse with them by means of prayers and offerings and every kind of service, is the noblest and best of all things, and also the most conducive to a happy life, and very fit and meet”<sup>17</sup>.

But, since there is an ontological „difference between the human and the divine nature”<sup>18</sup>, there must be a disparity between the human and the divine *logos*. This disparity between the human and divine *logos* causes man and God to enter into a unique order of ‘dis-position’ either in cosmic or in historical form. In Greek religious experience, the disparity between the human and the divine *logos* constitutes an inner tension between two opposite laws: *tesmos* and *nomos*, a tension between unwritten and written law, the particular and general law, natural and civil law. Referring to the social consciousness of the ancient Greeks, Glotz writes:

„On the one hand the ancient *themis* of the *genos* was introduced into the *dike* of the city by transforming the most venerable *themistes* into what were

<sup>15</sup> P h i l o l a o s, fr. 6, in: D i e l s, K r a n z, op. cit., p. 408.

<sup>16</sup> W. F. O t t o, *Die Götter Griechenlands*, Frankfurt a. M.: Verlag G. Schulte-Bulmke, 1947, writes: „What characterizes a Greek is his constant vivid awareness of the proximity of the divine”.

<sup>17</sup> *Laws*, IV, 716c-d.

<sup>18</sup> *Timaeus*, 68d.

called *thesmoi*. Such was the word which signified in the oldest days the fundamental rules of public law. They did not distinguish as yet between the temporal and the spiritual [...] What was their origin? No one knew, or at least no one knew its date, but they did not doubt that they had been *established* (*thesmos=tithemi*) for eternity by the gods. The gods worshipped in the families and the city, but above all the great the deity of the city, had in the dim past revealed them to men; and the most venerable of them, those which sprang from the soil at the same moment as the first ear of corn, [...] On the other hand there existed a law which owed nothing to revelation, the *nomos*. Here everything was man – made. Its essential characteristic was that it was written [...]”<sup>19</sup>.

The tension existing between *thesmos* and *nomos* was perhaps best expressed by Sophocles, when he ordered Antigone to disobey the tyrannic decree as contrary to the spirit of *thesmos*.

The spirit of the universalistic *thesmos* and the particularistic *nomos* of the religious experience of the Greeks created in their consciousness fatalistic feelings about human existence. The reason for the fatalism of Greek religious consciousness is the absolute dependence of men on the gods, and human *logos* turns out to be nothing but a blind response to the divine force of *moira*/fate, *tyche*/chance, and *ananke*/necessity. This threefold fatalistic power of Greek religious consciousness was pursued by the ancient bards and epic writers. All man's ambitious strivings and attempts for self-determination are finally overpowered by divine intervention. As a matter of fact, man's incentives and inducements are triggered to release some very disastrous consequences, e.g., Laius' disregard of Apollo's oracle.

This fatalistic power of supradivine reality(ies), which is an impersonal and unpredictable force in reality, was challenged by the Greek philosophers, who saw in those devastating powers not the determining factors of human or divine beings, but principles of nature, which cannot be completely understood in its total regularity. In other words, instead of basing the relationship between the human and the divine *w i t h i n* nature, as proposed by the earlier mythologists, the philosophical sages suggested that the kinship between man and God has a free and direct character, thus „de-cosmologizing” religious beliefs and endowing them with historical dimensions.

Although Plato regarded *Moira* as a determining factor of human morality („virtue is neither natural nor imparted by teaching, but an instinct given by God <*theia moira*> to those to whom it is given”)<sup>20</sup>, he also maintained that

<sup>19</sup> *The Greek City and Its Institutions*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930, p. 135 f.

<sup>20</sup> *Meno*, 99e.

each man chooses the kind of life he wants to realize. In his myth of Err, Plato argues that the Fates are not responsible for the human condition, because each individual man ultimately determines his actions and moral conduct: „Your genius will not be allotted to you, but you will choose your genius; and let him who draws the first lot have the first choice, and the life which he chooses shall be his destiny. Virtue is free, and as a man honors or dishonors her he will have more or less of her; the responsibility is with the chooser – God is not responsible”<sup>21</sup>.

Greek religious experience advanced two forms of theantropy: mythical and philosophical. The former is based on the necessity of the natural order, and the latter on human freedom. The Stoics, in opposition to the materialistic conception of cultural development advocated by Democritus and Epicurus, concluded that „all the progress made by man is not simply brought about through pressure of external necessity, but it has its origin in the spontaneity of the human *logos*, and it was individuals who used the natural freedom of the spirit to strike out new paths”<sup>22</sup>.

The philosophical freedom of the Greeks, however, was conceived only as a negative power liberating man from the external necessity of the natural order by acknowledging man's „exemption from the slavery of certain mental attitudes and habits”<sup>23</sup>, thus, invoking in his consciousness a feeling of ‘self-possession’ with the ability to exercise his own nature. The theantropic principle of human perfection is arrived at, according to Epictetus, only „by examining the purposes of God and his governance of the world [...] <so> that what God wills, <man> may will too, and what God wills not, he may not will either”<sup>24</sup>. The philosophical *logos* of the Greeks, then, ‘dis-poses’ human freedom to the divine by establishing a unilateral relationship between man and God. Consequently, while being liberated from the fatalistic forces of mythical supradivine determinations, the philosophical theantropy of the Greeks was unable to establish a mutual union of the human and the divine in the sense of a relationship of man to God and God to man.

---

<sup>21</sup> *Republic*, X, 617e.

<sup>22</sup> *Seneca*, *Ep.* 90.

<sup>23</sup> M. J. Adler, *Freedom: A Study of the Development of the Concept in the English and American Traditions of Philosophy*, Albany, N. Y.: Magi Books, Inc., 1968, p. 13.

<sup>24</sup> *Discourses*, IV, 1.



## III

Christianity challenged not only the Jewish legalistic theantropy of the *Torah*, but also the Hellenistic sophist theantropy of the divine *logos* conceived as an all-pervasive principle of reality. From its very beginning, Christianity tried to transcend both the Mosaic expectation, held by the Jews, of worldly liberation by the promised Messiah and the Greek polytheistic religions by various mysteries, rituals and ceremonial rites, thus transforming their divine *nous* into the Incarnated *Logos* of the Resurrected *Christos*. Admitting the „complete absurdity of the message of the cross” for human reason, St. Paul ironically addresses himself to both the legalistic Jewish scribe and the sophisticated Greek philosopher, and says:

„Where is the wise man to be found? Where the scribe? Where is the master of wordily argument? Has not God turned the wisdom of this world into folly? Since in God's wisdom the world did not come to know him through 'wisdom', it pleased God to save those who believe through the absurdity of the preaching of the gospel. Yes, the Jews demand 'signs' and Greeks look for 'wisdom', but we preach Christ crucified – a stumbling block to Jews, and absurdity to Gentiles; but to those who are called, Jews and Greeks alike, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For God's folly is wiser than men and his weakness more powerful than men” (I Cor. 1, 20-25).

First and foremost, the Christian doctrine on creation and redemption seems to be irreconcilable with the Orphic teaching on the fatalistic origin of man. In general, in keeping with their presupposition that the whole of reality constitutes some universal duality, the Orphics viewed man as having originated from the composition of two opposite and hostile elements, soul and body, thus leaving human destiny at the mercy of extreme fatalistic forces. Although in their dualistic view of reality the Orphics did, in fact, proclaim the priority of spirit over matter, they nevertheless – according to Plato – regarded all reality as nothing but „the combined work of necessity and mind”<sup>25</sup>, thus establishing an ontological order of good and evil ruled by *ananke*.

Secondly, the Orphic theory of reincarnation is contrary to the Christian belief that in man there is an essential unity of body and soul. Now, this psycho-physical unity in man demands that not only man's soul will survive but his body as well. St. Thomas argues:

„For the human soul is immortal, and continues after its separation from the body. Yet union with body is essential to it, for by its very nature the soul is

---

<sup>25</sup> *Timaeus*, 48a.

the form of the body. Without the body it is an unnatural condition; and what is unnatural cannot go on for ever. Therefore the soul, which is perpetual, is not forever apart from the body, but will be reunited with it. The soul's immortality, therefore, seems to demand the eventual resurrection of the body"<sup>26</sup>.

Moreover, Orphic metempsychosis requires the circularity of time, which is the 'sorrowful weary wheel' of all existing things, whereas the Christian conception of creation regards time as the purposeful unfolding of the „revelation of the sons of God” and „redemption of our bodies” (Rom. 8, 19. 23).

Finally, the Christian teaching on the original and personal sin of man as the consequence of human freedom, and the necessity for personal liberation from evil by divine grace merited by Christ on the Cross, is entirely opposed to the Orphic theantropic renewal of wounded human nature by *katharmos*<sup>27</sup>. Moreover, the Christian understanding of the theantropic resolution of the unity of the human and the divine in man does not consist merely in a simple cosmic power of the Orphic *Eros*, but in a supernatural force of God's grace, which has the redemptive power to transform human nature and which can lead to a mutual reconciliation between God and man. In general, the Christian transcendental theantropy consists in *metanoia*, which St. Paul derives from *Agape* (I Cor. 13; Gal. 5, 6).

Now, notwithstanding the essential doctrinal differences between the development of Christian theological doctrine as such, there is some affinity between the Christian view and the mystical theantropy of the Orphics, especially, on the issue of the Christian understanding of the mode of self-realization of the union of the human and the divine in man's religious consciousness<sup>28</sup>. In the first attempt to Christianize Greek pantheistic theantropy, St. Paul – referring to the Christian teaching on the Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ – reinterprets the Graeco-Hellenistic conception of God from its pure immanent understanding to a transcendental one. In his discourse with „Epicurean and Stoic philosophers” in the Areopagus, St. Paul referring to the inscription on an altar „to the Unknown God”, says: „Now, what you are thus worshiping in ignorance I intend to make known to you. For the God who made the world and all that is in it, the Lord of heaven and earth, does not

<sup>26</sup> *Contra Gentiles*, 4, 79, 4135.

<sup>27</sup> On the meaning of 'katharmos', see: W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, I, Cambridge University Press, 1965, p. 244 f.

<sup>28</sup> Some students of Orphism suggest, on the contrary, that there is not only a close relationship between the Orphic religion and Christianity, but a certain essential doctrinal similarity; cf. R. Eisler, *Orpheus*, Leipzig–Berlin, 1925; V. D. Macchiolo, *From Orpheus to Paul*, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1930. On the resemblances and differences between Christianity and Orphism, see: Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, p. 267-271.

dwell in sanctuaries made by human hands; nor does he receive man's service as if he were in need of it. Rather, it is he who gives to all life and breath and everything else" (Acts 17, 24-25).

In view of the immanency of the union between the human and the divine, on the one hand, and the transcendency of the relationship between man and God, on the other hand, St. Paul outlines the Christian understanding of thean-tropy not only as an essential but also specifically as an existential disposi-tion/*diathesis* of God to man. First of all, God as the Creator of all things is the ultimate principle of everything that exists, i.e., the Maker of „the world and all that is in it, the Lord of heaven and earth". Secondly, God as the Creator of everything that exists is by the same token also the very origin of inspiration, i.e. „the breath" of all reality. And, finally, God as the Maker of everything that exists is the ultimate destiny of all reality. Now, pointing to the transcendentalty of God's activity and His absolute dominion over the whole world, St. Paul concludes that in God „we live and move and have our being" (Acts 17, 28).

\*

In his speech in the Areopagus, St. Paul not only synthesizes the whole of Greek wisdom with respect to God, but proclaims a new thean-tropy, which is theological in nature and philosophical in character. St. Paul, in his thean-tropy not only predicates a horizontal union of the human and the divine in man, but he also aspires to establish a vertical kinship between God and man. This kin-ship with God, in turn, perfects the human/divine reality of man both from within – in the immanent order – through the self-realization of man's „innate" nature and from without – in the transcendent order – through the self-transfor-mation of man by God's grace. Although St. Paul was unsuccessful in conver-ting his Areopagus' audience, his speech on the „Ignoto Deo" became itself a paradigm for future proselytizing on Christian thean-tropy in its threefold form<sup>29</sup>: 1. m y s t i c a l – „in Eo vivimus"; 2. m e t a p h y s i c a l – „in Eo movemur"; 3. p h e n o m e n o l o g i c a l – „in Eo sumus".

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. K. M i c h a l s k i, *Nieznanemu Bogu*, Warszawa: Naukowy Instytut Katolicki, 1936, p. 9-12.

TEANTROPIA:  
RELIGIJNE DOŚWIADCZENIE LUDZKIEGO I BOSKIEGO WYMIARU W CZŁOWIEKU

S t r e s z c z e n i e

W swojej świadomości egzystencjalnej człowiek doświadcza kruchości swego istnienia i uświadamia sobie, że jego ludzka rzeczywistość jest w swej naturze przypadkowa, a w swym charakterze skończona. Ontologiczna kondycja przypadkowości i skończoności egzystencji ludzkiej wywołuje w świadomości człowieka pragnienie stałości jego wewnętrznej i naturalnej dyspozycji (*diathesis*), aby jego „być” było trwalsze od jego „nie być”. Ta świadomość istnienia możliwości „bycia” lub „niebycia” jest odwiecznym faktem związanym z ludzką egzystencją i jako taka stanowi początek i główne źródło niepokoju, który człowiek wyraża w wierzeniach religijnych i w refleksji metafizycznej.

Celem niniejszego artykułu jest refleksja nad religijnością ludzką w różnych formach „samo-realizacji” teantropijnej każdego pojedynczego człowieka, będących przejawami różnych obrazów Boga zgodnie z dwojakim kierunkiem – wznoszenia i opadania ludzkiej i boskiej natury w człowieku, tak jak obrazy te zostały rozwinięte w wierzeniach religijnych cywilizacji zachodniej.

*Tłumaczył Tadeusz Karłowicz*