

KS. GRZEGORZ BARTH

THE PERSONALIST *SHIFT* IN CHRISTOLOGY

THE PERSONALIST *SHIFT* IN CHRISTOLOGY

A b s t r a c t. The article deals with the issue of the personalistic placement of contemporary Christology. The character of this approach is described by a direct, existential attitude toward the personal phenomenon of Jesus Christ. The analysis in question stems from the reading of the integral and complete humanity of Christ (*verus et perfectus Homo*) thanks to the use of personalistic language. This take releases the traditional Christology from the burden of concepts that hinder the access to the personal mystery of the Saviour. Thus, the personalistic *shift* in Christology means that the “reality” under scrutiny is seen as an irreducible “point” of the existence of the God-Man who sets a radically new horizon of the acquisition of the truth that cannot be reduced to any concepts or formulae. This process is reflected by the principle of co-seemlines that is the modus of the personal covenant of the *humanum* and *divinum* that was literally and most fully realised in Christ, thereby giving an unparalleled perspective of speaking of God and of man. The profile of Christology directed existentially (the personalistic Christology) does not lose its scientific and methodological character or conceptual coherence, but it rather broadens the significance of these elements and puts them a radically new interpretative perspective.

Key words: Jesus Christ, Christology, personalism, person, R. Guardini.

In Christology – as in other areas of theology – we deal with the continuous development. It applies to new approaches and aspects of the truth about Christ, its references to other articles of faith, their profound comprehension and practical application. It evolves increasingly the methodological postulate of the integral linking of the biblical text and the Christological reflection, which explains it (in relation to the Tradition) and develops it (in the light of the experience of modernity). Consequently, Christology, based on the

Ks. dr hab. GRZEGORZ BARTH – adiunkt Katedry Chrystologii i Personalizmu Chrześcijańskiego KUL, członek zarządu Towarzystwa Teologów Dogmatyków; adres do korespondencji: e-mail: grzegorz.barth@kul.pl

Word of God, the Tradition and the experience are seen as a systematic substantiation of “the Christ event”, aimed to demonstrate that in his Person and mission, He is the absolute fulfillment of yearning and hope of all people who seek salvation¹. In the light of that sketched characteristics, an unusual suggestion emerged, that our experience with Jesus Christ indicates that human experience had reached its unparalleled fullness in Him and His history. In order to penetrate and understand the history of that Person, we at the same time reach the final dimension of the human experience, which we define as God². This Christology is based on the conviction that the only congruous object of our understanding and our reflection is our own subjective experience. The perspective presented above confronts us with a double difficulty: Do we know what is the human experience of being a person? And the second one: How does that experience, described as *personal*, allow us to comprehend and to interpret the mystery of Christ, expressed in the dogmatic formula? According to this, what meaning can we assign to personalistic reflection, when the truth about Christ is observed as *verus et perfectus homo*. A part of this conception is the Christological project designed to approach (the semantic distance “shortening”) the living and concrete person of Christ, who experiences the divine way of human destiny. It consists in situating Christological reflection in some original and fundamental context, where it is being thought “of” as a person rather than speaking “about” it. Then we deal with a “reality”, which is different than world and more real than he is³. When we meet Christ through apostolic preaching, we sense that this “reality” arises in every statement and constantly exceeds them. Thus, every respectable Christology must show this “original” majesty! It refers to the comprehension of a Personage, which was protected by Christianity *ab initio*. The cognition of Jesus is not the effect of historical or psychological research, but springs from the faith and love, when inner essence “touches” the being of God and tries to “perceive” His nature, involves in it and surrenders to Him the entire substance of human life. Then the procedure of Christology is placed in the vistas of reality, which covers the constituted connec-

¹ G.L. Müller, *Katholische Dogmatik. Für Studium und Praxis der Theologie*, Herder, Freiburg–Basel–Wien 2005, Auflage 6, p. 258.

² “In Christ, the Man, who is totally with God, not only human life isn’t destroyed, but even reaches its highest possibilities, which consists in crossing of oneself, towards the Absolute and reaching in his relations the fullness of God’s love”. J. R a t z i n g e r, *Znaczenie „osoby” w teologii*, „Personalizm” 8(2005), p. 46.

³ R. G u a r d i n i, *Bóg daleki, Bóg bliski*, trans. J. Koźbiał, Poznań 1991, p. 197.

tion of the essential meanings and values, which need further explanation. This approach determines the existential significance of Christological reflection, which outreaches the narrow circle of experts, and has its real reference to everything that is defined as *humanum*.

1. ON THE IMPORTANCE OF “A PERSON” IN THE HUMANITIES

In the modern humanities the consciousness of the personalistic reflection, the significance of understanding of man and his world (*Lebenswelt, life-world*) becomes more universal (this process is not systematic and even). It is about the recognition of a person as the superior and autonomous value in the relation to other values (technical, economic, scientific, social), which at the same time postulates its affirmation in that life spheres⁴. This point of view implies the full (ontologically and temporally) and comprehensive human development, to which all the particularistic values realized in the individual and social life should be subordinated. When we consider this issue from the point of view of the harmonized mainstream thought of modern personalism (which has certain rules of interpretation), it brings out and intensifies the range of possibilities of recovery of lost or still unperceived personal sense of *humanum*. Personalistic approach becomes a very important element in the mentioned studies, as well as meaningful concept within the politics, culture and art⁵.

An introductory description of personalistic thinking in the humanities not only persuades to new research, but can also raise some problems concerning the notion of “a person” and even about its role in the specific practical realization. This issue causes new questions and misinterpretations. It is impossible to describe here all the perplexing questions as it is not the subject

⁴ In accordance with the current systematization of areas, fields and disciplines (2011), I mean some disciplines in three areas of science (humanities, social sciences, theology), where the personalistic issue is the most common: philosophy, ethics, pedagogy, psychology, sociology and theology. One cannot ignore the fact that many humanists reject the concept of “a person”, considering it as unscientific, mystical, wishful, old-fashioned, and even as a form of Catholic utopia.

⁵ *Wörterbuch des Neuen Humanismus*, [<http://www.humanisten.ch/woerterbuch/wort.php?id=187>, 20.10.2014].

of this reflection, which is aimed to flag the difficulties and indicate some of their areas. What are the causes of these controversies? The most common reasons for them are the superficial approach to the matter of a person, the lack of thorough reflection on its essence, the existential meaning and the possibilities of application in real life. In this case an exclusive approach seems to be simpler, and consists in conceptual contradistinction to the notional realism of the reflection on a person, and brings everything into the shallow formulas without powers of designation. Those difficulties may also appear on the level of the practical application of the theory of a person, the conceptual system of which becomes incomprehensible to “layman”, even inconsistent with the reality, as the subject of its matter.

For many scientists, thinkers, culture creators, the phenomenon of the general crisis of intellectual, spiritual, moral, cultural, economic spheres of life is caused by the different tendencies of industrial society, where behavior is aimed at achieving temporary benefit, spreading of individualism, disintegrating of social ties, family, lack of educational systems are predominant; the representatives of the mentioned disciplines see “a person” as the only chance to solve many of these problems. Where does this capacity of „a person” originate?

A person is endowed with the shape, profundity and creative spirit. To be a person means to be integrated with oneself, to stick in oneself and to control oneself. It develops in the peculiarity of character, the inwardness of life, will, action, creating, but even all these elements still don't form a person. Therein lies its foible. All that only being in some “form of belonging to oneself” indicates a person⁶. A person possesses that complex meaning, which under the correct analysis can reduce the distance between the inner and outer world, between the most personal experiences and their external displays. A person, containing the theoretical and practical issues, shortens the distance between *logos* and *ethos*. Something practical is not just the effect or theory result. Thinking about a person *works* when it *thinks*. That distance is also reduced on subject-community, soul-body lines. In the discourse of the role of “a person” in the humanities, even the representatives of modern theology came to realize more vividly, that it speak about things, processes or ideas, but about the personal world. Therefore, they should creatively and consistently develop the idea of the phenomenon of a person. In the traditional theology prevailed the approach, which consisted in the

⁶ R. G u a r d i n i, *Świat i osoba*, trans. M. Turowicz, Kraków 1969, p. 176-181.

interpretation of the deeds of God, using the images and concepts derived from the observation of the physical world. As a result, theology, associated with church preaching the mysteries of faith, has become incomprehensible and distant towards everyday life. It must be remembered that it occurs always when the terminus a quo is not the specific reality, but more or less absorbed idea, system or method. All in all theology is about the mutual relationship of the human persons and divine Persons.

2. CHRISTOLOGICAL PRINCIPLE OF CO-SEEMLINES

Demonstrating that a person may be a principle of adequate theological thinking about God and man, demands *implicite* initial answer to the question: on what ontology should theology be based on? It is not (at least, it should not be) an abstract branch of human activity that would satisfy the intellectual and spiritual aspirations of the selected elite group, but as a science and wisdom, it touches the very core of every human existence, involved in a finite world of transience. Thus, as in the past, today theology faces the task of the creative involvement in the a-few-century-old stream of general human culture, which is (was) co-created with it and also owing to which it is (was) able to speak “adequately” to man of the epoch. Where does the power of its influence lie? It lies in a marvelous ability of the mutual mediation of the transcendence of faith and the immanence of human experience. Faith allows man to integrate his vague, variable, ambivalent and fragmentary range of experiences and see them in a new light. In the sphere of faith, human experience of being in the world is released from ambiguity, and at the same time reaches its comprehension in God with all its finiteness and limitations. On the other hand, faith must remain on the side of human experience, thanks to which is subjected to legitimacy and is “verified”, protecting itself from the escape to the gnostic irrationality. In the modern secularized context our initial question about the “foundation” of theology seems to become more intense and urgent. There is no doubt, that theology in order to re-open the access to the reality (!), which is more restricted today by the ideological confusion, its human discourse must root in the discourse of God. Only through this theological perspective, which restores the correct relationship between God and man, its human discourse is devoid of *secular* and *scientific*

autonomy⁷. A truly *theological* question always implicates the philosophical and scientific issue, because *ab initio* it's functionally dependent on its anthropological structures. The human subject introduces *a priori* the prospect and means of the cognition of God⁸. The existential and transcendental (personally subjected) prospect opens the way of the gradual "release" of human discourse about God from the calculated objectification and the interim appropriation. It plays a significant role in the recovery of the once lost senses and areas, as well as updates them to the present context. It gives the access to the possibly holistic view of the reality and explains its meaning to the age of superstitious beliefs in science and technological progress. It makes the justified objection, if the current way of talking about God and man, based on reistic and physical vision of reality is still feasible today?

The inner experience of man as a person is so poignant and filled with self-power it that points to a transcendent and personal basis of the reality. In that context K. Rahner's persuasive quote is even more pertinent: "Thus God is a person and only through the personal life, can we learn who He is. God can become a man, since man is a person, and because God is personal. On the other hand, it becomes clear what a person should be, only when God arises in a person. The boundaries of personal human existence are exceeded in it, and the elements, which are below the person, and which would like to penetrate and destroy it, are eliminated. The personal centre is rules over the entire man, since it is united with the personal centre of the God's life"⁹.

In light of the foregoing premises, the principle of *co-seemlines* is revealed and fully accomplished in the theological scenery, so that Divine persons can constitute the ultimate reference to the personal man. But also a man in one's personal creation and dignity makes a reference to God, who wanted him for Himself¹⁰. It is reminded by the principle of autoteleology, which says that a person cannot be a tool in goal achievement, but always makes a goal in itself¹¹.

⁷ J. M i l b a n k, *The Word Made Strange: Theology, Language, Culture*, Oxford 1997, p. 3.

⁸ K. R a h n e r, *Teologia a antropologia*, „Znak“ 21(1969), p. 1539.

⁹ K. R a h n e r, *Podstawowy wykład wiary*, trans. T. Mieszkowski. Warszawa 1987, p. 99.

¹⁰ *Gaudium et spes*, no. 24.

¹¹ In the similar way the principle of autoteleology was understood by St. Thomas Aquinas, I. Kant, W. Granat.

The maintenance of these two paradoxically extreme polar tendencies becomes possible within the same range of meaning, which makes the personal experience more accessible. It is done by means of observing the power of analogy (*ascensio*), which is based on the experience of the world and a man and recognition of the weakness of catalogry (*descensio*), which makes the revelation of God to man more accessible. These two united lines open the space of experience and cognition of a man as a person, which has no assumptions or conclusions in the philosophical or scientific branches. As a result of this move the weakness of power (*identity*) and the power of weakness (*difference*) appeared simultaneously in the process of cognition of a person. It contains something absolute (at least relatively). Otherwise, the Divine and a human nature are united with “a platform” of being a person, as something absolutely perfect, which joins two different directions: bottom-up and top-down¹².

The principle of *co-seemlines*, which is the modus of the personal covenant of *humanum* and *divinum*, was literally and fully realized in Christ, thereby defining the unprecedented prospect of speaking about God and a man. Since the Incarnation of the Son of God, everything that can be said about a man as a person irrevocably moves towards this crucial point, which patterns itself on Christ as God and Man united in one Person. Divinity, humanity and personality in Him comply with the relationally one experience in a unique and perfect way. Filial attitude of Jesus with its existential significance, theoretical and practical consequences move towards presenting “the principle of principles” that full of confidence and humility trust, truly shows the relationship, which unveils the truth of God and man as the *mutual*. “The fact that He, Jesus Christ, treats me so much as a spiritual person that he dies for my eternal life, dying he buries my condemnation, and rises me to be a person”¹³. His specific being, deeds, historical involvement in the fate of the world and humanity determine the meaning of Christianity¹⁴, and it

¹² In the above intuition is also presented in the words of J. Daniélou: “God and a soul belong to the same order of things. However, the absolute difference is that God is infinite in act, while the soul is infinite in becoming. Its divinity lies in the ability of transformation in God. So the progress is inherent in the nature of a soul, which is a kind of infinity in becoming”. *Platonisme et théologie mystique. Essai sur la doctrine spirituelle de saint Grégoire de Nysse*, Kolekcja “Théologie” 2, Paris, Aubier; nouvelle édition revue et augmentée 1954, p. 299.

¹³ H.U. von Balthasar, *Krisis*, in: *Spiritus Creator. Skizzen zur Theologie*, III, Einsiedeln 1967, p. 275.

¹⁴ G u a r d i n i, *Bóg daleki, Bóg bliski*, p. 180.

also creates certain consequences for Christology, which studies this phenomenon.

Then some questions about its original principle, internal structure and purpose should arise. Will it be able to bear a burden of divine-human drama, primarily adopted and expressed [personally] in Christ, suffering the existential tension between the once and for all historically authenticated in him revelation and the preaching and its implementing nowadays¹⁵? Will the significant *fides quaerens intellectum* be the faith which puts the questions about the world, where it exists? Will it resign to be a science of “abstract truth”, with a set of arid theoretical formulas, and become a living reflection with answers to the fundamental mysteries of life, which penetrates all the creatures rended between despair and confusion¹⁶? Will it be the cognition of “idea of God” or the cognition of “God Himself”, which denotes the cognition of Jesus Christ as He was and as He is¹⁷? Should the point of reference for Christological reflection be the creation of the concepts for itself, even those creative and original? Should it always be necessary to agree on something with something on the level of the next new theories or tangled thoughts? In Christology the basis is “given” (*die Sache*) only as a basis and therefore it cannot be, included along with everything what is based on it, in any common, existing and ordered system¹⁸. Divine knowledge has its own logic, which cannot be deductively derived from any human logic or metaphysics. Therefore it is hard not to agree with the observation of von Balthasar, that with the advent of Christ in the human mental outlook any kind of metaphysics was annihilated: “When Heidegger says that Christian metaphysics would be a wooden iron, because one who found God could no longer truly ask about the mystery of being; if Karl Barth says the same, because the philosophical prospecting hasn’t led to the cognition of one true, living God, replacing him with images of idols, thus it seems that the virtual condition has been confirmed from two opposite directions”¹⁹. Thus, returning to the initial question of our reflection about the ontological foundation of theology, we get very specific solution. It belongs to a personalis-

¹⁵ U. Z i l l e s, *Pluralizm w teologii*, in: *Podstawy wiary – teologia*, Kolekcja “Communio” 6(1991), p. 365.

¹⁶ J. Ż y c i ń s k i, *Teologia o ludzkim obliczu. Przedmowa*, in: J. S z y m i k, *Teologia. Rozmowa o Bogu i o człowieku*, Lublin 2008, p. 5.

¹⁷ M. B i e r d i a j e w, *O przeznaczeniu człowieka*, Kęty 2006, p. 18.

¹⁸ R a h n e r, *Podstawowy wykład wiary*, p. 64.

¹⁹ H.U. von B a l t h a s a r, *Krisis*, p. 269.

tic, Christological principle of *co-seemlines*, initiating the theological style of proceeding as difficult and constant process of recovery of Christ sense, filled with meaning and passion²⁰. It is also an attempt of gradual understanding of the conditions of ability of perception, analyzing and evaluating of human life from His perspective. It ably bonds the inner and outer world of a person, in order to open up his divine-human sense without any prejudice and simplifications!

The existentially oriented (personalistic) profile of Christology thus does not lose anything from its scientific, methodical, conceptual precision, but it rather broadens the significance of these elements in a radically new perspective of interpretation. To be more specific: it gradually departs from something what is “reasonable” for “understanding”. The significance of Christology as the intellectual activity comes of something that is concordant with the ethos of science. None of the creative researcher should doubt that the methodological purity and the creative imagination of a scientist are essential for science, as the substance of all researches depends more on the invention of new methods than using of the existing ones. One cannot blame the philosophical or theological reflection, claiming that it does not consider the goal of scientific research as end in itself (there appears some sense of megalomania among the academic theologians), but that it thematizes the conditions and the limits of science in the whole human life by its *reflexive* perspective. The perspective limitations, that entails the idea of the method is often hardly conspicuous. It always orients the researcher towards the reliability of the method, and as a result it turns away from the more important – the reflection²¹.

The principle of *co-seemlines* highlights the theological discourse about God and a man; thus it enhances the dialogical value and openness in the process of recovering of its own identity. Referring to *Soi-même comme un autre* by Ricoeur, it is a greatly original interpretative explanation of human, which goes through its core. In the literal translation of the title: “Being oneself, as something/someone else” the spiritual and dialogical point of view of the representative of French personalism becomes more vivid. The

²⁰ “If a philosopher – Bierdiajew writes – is a Christian and believes in Christ, so he should not agree his philosophy to Orthodox, Catholic or Protestant theology, can gain sense of Christ, making His philosophy different than the philosophy of a man who has no sense of Christ”. B i e r d i a j e w, *O przeznaczeniu człowieka*, p. 10.

²¹ H.G. G a d a m e r, *Prawa i metoda. Zarys hermeneutyki filozoficznej*, trans. B. Baran, Warszawa 2007, p. 720-724.

vision of a man in his substantial opportunity of opening up to something else/someone else, in a straight consequence conduces to something that can be called the “ontology of action”. Establishment of being oneself (*le soy*) mediated first of all by listening to God and flowing out that fact talking about God reaches the deepest level of human capability and capacity, this level is called “divinity capable of something” (*soi capable*)²².

3. SEVERAL POSTULATES AGAINST THE PERSONALISTIC CHRISTOLOGY

In the light of reflection made there can be formulated several specific postulates defining space of personalistically shifted Christology:

1. *Postulate of the meta-Christological character*

a) *In the direction of personalistic ontology*²³. Personalistic Christology growing out the experience of a concrete Person is not and cannot be *a priori* connected to any ontology, however, it is constantly laying new claims towards every ontology, which wants to clarify the mystery of Christ²⁴. The source, power of inspiration and direction of that claim is located in the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God, which is best systematized and explicated in the *Creed* of Chalcedon. It has to constitute some kind of „catalyst” of using every ontology (*principium hermeneuticum – omnis entis*)²⁵.

b) *In the direction of historicity of the cognition*. Personalistic Christology is about capturing the bond, which would be more original than relations between subject and object, in order to exit the idealistically conceived, closed in oneself, system of meanings in the direction of a lively and living person, which being a historical creature by now and forever owns certain *Lebenswelt* as its horizon. It locates the existence of Christ on the horizon of the whole history of a human, which for him is a history of looking for God. It cannot be an attempt of immersing and alloying Him with the race, envi-

²² P. Ricoeur, *Soi-même comme un autre*, Paris, Seuil 1990.

²³ Comp. Cz.S. Bartnik, *Studies in personalist System*, Lublin 2006, p. 53-64.

²⁴ See. G. Strzelczyk, *Chrystologiczne miejsce metafizyki*, in: *Metafizyka i teologia. Debata u podstaw*, ed. R. Woźniak, Kraków 2008, p. 268.

²⁵ Comp. Cz.S. Bartnik, *Jezus Chrystus jako hermeneuta rzeczywistości*, „Roczniki Teologiczne” 55(2008), vol. 2.

ronment, epoch, with humanity, in which He appeared. Such kind of intentions took place in history in the way of „portraying” of Christ. Authentically the Personalistic Christology must highlight the moment and the way of the Christ’s appearing in the history in all its dimensions and meanings. Showing the relations between the Person of Christ and the history, where the uniqueness of that Figure will not be an effect of the historical opposition, but will be an effort of perception the way in which in the history and through the history He is showing as a unique Person.

c) *Valuing the role of the word and language.* All our experience of the world is somehow developing from *inside* of language. A person experiences and catches clearly what was presented for it in language. As God reveals Himself in *one* Word only, *being* definitely reveals itself exactly in language. That Word which is from God from the beginning, and which is identified with God (John 1:14), and which comes from God in order to step into the history, constitutes the model of our language²⁶. It becomes a code for our speaking about Him. It embraces both, what is unchangeable and perfect, as well as, what is changeable and done for. As Son manifests the perfection of the eternal Logos, so the Incarnation manifests its historicity. By recognizing the fact, that both *That*, what is uttered, as well as *That*, what forms the statement, constitute a person, we recover (on the theological way) a forgotten horizon of language, which is a *being*, wherein we are as persons, Then the language is becoming a personal event, a living word not only describing reality, but also creating it.

2. *Christ as a starting point*

The deepest intuition of the Personalistic Christology is appearing in the dialogue between Jesus and Peter near Caesarea Philippi. Content of the above conversation show the internal trouble, struggle, which allow Peter to transcend the level of natural and widespread knowledge about Christ and by means of that to find space, in which the truth will be revealed for us: “You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God” (Matthew 16:16). Much more explaining to us is Jesus’ response about the necessity of the grace of the Revelation in order to be able to tell the truth about the One, who comes „from above”. It is not enough to have a look at Christ „from aside”, from

²⁶ Comp. A. W i e r c i ń s k i, *The Hermeneutic Retrieval of a Theological Insight: Verbum Interius*, in: *Between the Human and the Divine. Philosophical and Theological Hermeneutics*, ed. A. Wierciński, Toronto 2002, p. 1-23.

the perspective of the objective researcher. Every accepted Christological conception is also disappointing, so do even the dogmatic formulas, which are still vital for catching the truth, the aim of which is to embrace the “object” of Christology. Because it is about something incomparably deeper, about that irreducible starting point, which takes place in Christ Himself, not in an idea, but a living, particular person pointing out to a new horizon of the truth cognition, not bringing to any of mentioned conceptions or formulas. That is a person of Christ in its relation towards the two remaining Divine Persons – that creates an area of interpretation. The Personalistic Christology while regaining new ontological dimension of reflection about Christ, wants to give it freshness and clarity of vision. The return to the Figure means an attempt to find in our reflection an indisputable *point of existence* of Christ, which is called – the will of the Father and the obedience to it in the Holy Spirit²⁷.

3. *To grasp uniqueness of the Figure*

The more the person of Christ escapes every scientific systematization, world-view orientation, idea or vision (projection), the harder no one in the history of ideas wants to perceive and accept that inviolable horizon, which remains to be a defined “point” of the Christ’s existence. The longer we stay in spiritual and intellectual thought about It, even more mysterious, great, outstanding, incomprehensible it becomes for us, which does not mean abstract or inaccessible²⁸. It is a mystery of the new beginning in God personally, and as such – it is impenetrable. Because we are ready to confront the „reality”, which is bigger than us, and it invites us to a meeting even if we are not able to rise to this task.

4. *Postulate of integrity*

All attempts to show Christ can succeed when they do not go beyond the frames of the belief in a person of Christ, in order to show the way nume-

²⁷ “Starting point, from which He observed, judged and controlled a human being, rejoiced and suffered, is for sure inconceivably deeper than those taken from His surroundings. It is a point, which belongs to the world, particular place, which one can enter, power, upon which one can lean, love that one can trust. That all is a reality different from the world, more realistic than he is. G u a r d i n i, *Bóg daleki, Bóg bliski*, p. 197.

²⁸ Comp. P. S e e w a l d, *Jeżus Chrystus. Biografia*, trans. J. Jurczyński, Kraków 2011, p. 23.

rous streams of the tradition get together, penetrate, obtain various marked forms; the way that image grope to a central phenomenon in the multitude of prospects, which is necessary to save him from the direct access of a human. Perspectivity of the cognition plains and plasticity of the Figure going through it can increase while taking care of integrity of the Christ's Figure²⁹. All the evidence about Christ are intertwining in the inseparable way, and differences between them reflect the tension about the One, whom they are certifying. Attempts to smooth them make the Figure itself to be implausible. Tension in the very Truth demands it. It is about an approach, in which It is captured on the way of the believing cognition and exploring faith. In order to evoke credibility of the Figure, which will be evident and efficient as long as it is seen with eyes of the faith.

5. *Jesus' way of existence*

Analysis of Jesus' existence made on the basis of the biblical texts presents us a real and concrete person. It is not a kind of make-up, collection of mental meanings, spiritual strength, educational success. It means invention and understanding the structure of a unique personality of Jesus, especially its internal power. It is necessary to concentrate on Jesus' deeds, in which that independent factor makes itself felt. The most interesting is the way those deeds belong to a subject performing them. All of them depend and constitute the measure of the Performer's freedom. He can perform everything in such a scope, in which He is a person and his personality is fulfilled.

That Christology refers to a personal concrete [unusually inspiring psychologically], in the order the existential analysis accepted a transfer to a real ontology³⁰.

²⁹ Comp. H.U. von Balthasar, *Czy Jezus nas zna? Czy my znamy Jezusa?*, trans. E. Piotrowski, Kraków 1998, p. 47-51.

³⁰ See. R. Gardini, *The Humanity of Christ. Contributions to a Psychology of Jesus*, New York 1964.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- B a l t h a s a r H.U. von, *Krisis*, in: *Spiritus Creator. Skizzen zur Theologie*, III, Einsiedeln 1967.
- B a l t h a s a r H.U. von, Czy Jezus nas zna? Czy my znamy Jezusa?, trans. E. Piotrowski, Kraków 1998.
- B a r t n i k Cz.S., *Studies in personalist System*, Lublin 2006.
- B a r t n i k Cz.S., Jezus Chrystus jako hermeneuta rzeczywistości, „Roczniki Teologiczne” 55(2008), vol. 2.
- B i e r d i a j e w M., O przeznaczeniu człowieka, Kęty 2006.
- G a d a m e r H.G., Prawa i metoda. Zarys hermeneutyki filozoficznej, trans. B. Baran, Warszawa 2007.
- G u a r d i n i R., Świat i osoba, trans. M. Turowicz, Kraków 1969.
- G u a r d i n i R., Bóg daleki, Bóg bliski, trans. J. Koźbiał, Poznań 1991.
- G u a r d i n i R., *The Humanity of Christ. Contributions to a Psychology of Jesus*, New York 1964.
- M i l b a n k J., *The Word Made Strange: Theology, Language, Culture*, Oxford 1997.
- M ü l l e r G.L., *Katholische Dogmatik. Für Studium und Praxis der Theologie*, „Herder”, Freiburg–Basel–Wien 2005, Auflage 6, p. 258.
- R a h n e r K., Teologia a antropologia, „Znak” 21(1969).
- R a h n e r K., Podstawowy wykład wiary, trans. T. Mieszkowski. Warszawa 1987.
- R a t z i n g e r J., Znaczenie „osoby” w teologii, „Personalizm” 8(2005).
- R i c o e u r P., *Soi-même comme un autre*, Paris, Seuil 1990.
- S e e w a l d P., Jezus Chrystus. Biografia, trans. J. Jurczyński, Kraków 2011.
- S t r z e l c z y k G., Chrystologiczne miejsce metafizyki, in: *Metafizyka i teologia. Debata u podstaw*, ed. R. Woźniak, Kraków 2008.
- W i e r c i ń s k i A., *The Hermeneutic Retrieval of a Theological Insight: Verbum Interius*, in: *Between the Human and the Divine. Philosophical and Theological Hermeneutics*, ed. A. Wierciński, Toronto 2002, p. 1-23.
- Z i l l e s U., Pluralizm w teologii, in: *Podstawy wiary – teologia*, Kolekcja „Communio” 6(1991).
- Ż y c i ń s k i J., Teologia o ludzkim obliczu. Przedmowa, in: *J. S z y m i k, Teologia. Rozmowa o Bogu i o człowieku*, Lublin 2008, p. 5.

PERSONALISTYCZNE PRZESUNIĘCIE W CHRYSOLOGII

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

Artykuł podejmuje zagadnienie personalistycznego usytuowania współczesnej chrystologii. Charakter tego podejścia zostaje określony przez bezpośredni, egzystencjalny stosunek do fenomenu osobowego Jezusa Chrystusa. Analiza ta wyrasta z odczytania integralnego i pełnego człowieczeństwa Chrystusa (*verus et perfectus Homo*) dzięki zastosowaniu języka personalistycznego. Ujęcie to wyzwala tradycyjną chrystologię z obciążeń pojęciowych utrudniających zbliżenie się do misterium osobowego Zbawiciela. Personalistyczne „przesunięcie” w chrystologii oznacza zatem, że „rzeczywistość” badana zostaje wyznaczona nieredukowalnym „punktem” egzystencji Boga-Człowieka, który wytycza radykalnie nowy horyzont poznania prawdy, niesprowadzalny do żadnej z koncepcji czy formuł. Procesowi temu odpowiada zasada współodpowiedniości (*principle of co-seemlines*), będąca modusem osobowego przymierza *humanum* i *divinum*, które dosłownie i najpełniej zrealizowało się w Chrystusie, wyznaczając tym samym niespotykaną dotąd perspektywę mówienia o Bogu i o człowieku. Profil chrystologii ukierunkowanej egzystencjalnie (personalistycznej) nie traci tym samym nic ze swej naukowości, metodyczności, ścisłości pojęciowej, raczej poszerza znaczenie tych elementów i stawia w radykalnie nowej perspektywie interpretacyjnej.

Słowa kluczowe: Jezus Chrystus, chrystologia, personalizm, osoba, R. Guardini.