

REMIGIUSZ KRÓL

**A PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE UPON RELIGIOUS
ANTHROPOLOGY**

The history of modern philosophy of religion concentrates currently on the anthropological dimension of a man in the context of religion.¹ Let us have a look (in this thought) at the whole complexity included in the peculiarity of this religious phenomena which bothers a modern man. What I mean here is the ultimate sources and their explanations as well as the role of religion in comprehending what is called saint, in grasping that which is in the pure state, in understanding that which has not yet been desecrated by the existential dimension of a man anchored in the history of time, the history from which he grows out. And such characteristic moment, which gives the beginning to everything, from which everything has got its *arche* (beginning), is, undeniably, a man in its complexity. A man, who appears here as an unusual being, privileged in its behaviour, becomes at the same time a particular joint of the ontological diversity of our world. Human consciousness comes first here and helps to express one's identity as something that is "mine" together with "all that is around" as the subject details or as his working. Far from it, a human being is not the only subject to philosophizing, or the deepest explanation of the reality, since he/she is a component of

¹ See Z. Zdybicka, *Religia i religioznawstwo*, Lublin, 1988; A. Bronk, *Nauka wobec religii*, Lublin, 1996; P. Moskal, *Spór o racje religii*, Lublin, 2000.

the whole universe. In connection to this, we do need other theories about some different types of existence to that of a human being, as well as a general theory of existence, in order to explain all that exists in a full and ultimate manner, since such determinants as experience, self-education, getting to know oneself, experiencing things, and many, many more, are not capable of exhausting human cognition and behaviour,² human complexity. Each attempt to comprehend a man should necessarily take into the account the process of the whole development, its stage of religious behaviours. Even hypothetically speaking, if religion, together with its diverse forms in which it updates, is only a joke or mockery, where one gets the impression that he or she sees something that does not actually exist, where one has to deal with the distorted vision or wrong interpretation of a thing or phenomena, with a subjective evaluation of a situation or events which are just to happen and which appear to be an evident illusion or fantasy, or the consciousness as a passive reflection of the features of the reality, or, in a wider, derivative sense, where we are to deal with a secondary phenomenon, accompanying some basic, primary phenomena, but such that they do not have any impact on the previously mentioned, then there still exists a relationship between God and a believer, which relationship or link, becomes an unprecedented, obvious fact. It is in that sense that we may speak about the subject of the anthropological religion, which relies on a conceptual disaffiliation of the features, parts or elements of the religious phenomenon, its subject matter; it consists of studying its features, elements and the relations taking place in the correspondence between a man and God.

A human being and his/her place in the world becomes explained by the inner existing structure of a man's reality and the existence in general. The philosophical anthropology deals with analyzing human actions and behaviours and his creations, as long as the previously mentioned point out his ontological structure, which means, to what extent do they refer to the existence and the existential position among other creations and use the results of the philosophical knowledge which touches upon the aspects of physicality and sensuality hidden in a human being.³ Nevertheless, it has little to do with the lack of integrated and full response of detailed science in giving an answer to the question: Who is a man? And in what relation a man stays towards other being. I mean here the whole human kind, whole society, nature and culture. In the hustle and bustle of everyday living one may notice a commonly appearing responsibility of the human kind as for the reality which a man co-creates, in which he spends his everyday life and one may even make out an intensification of science and technology, which is allowed to speak in the human existential dimension. Regardless of that, the life difficulties which arise here and are connected with the dimension of the contemporary civilization, are not diminishing at all. A man gets closer and closer to the mystery of nature, strives for noble aims, explores the truth in all its dimensions, becomes an author of new ideas including the whole world of culture, but one may also notice the fact that that man is being crafted and refined, raised to the state of perfection by the entirety of the spiritual and material output created in the general historical development. That man shows in many ways his freedom, and at the same time he is so determined in his

² See B. Suchodolski, *Rozwój nowożytnej filozofii człowieka*, Warsaw, 1967; S. Kamiński, *Antropologia filozoficzna a inne działy poznania*, in *O Bogu i człowieku*, ed. B. Bejze, Vol. 1-2, Warsaw, 1968-69, pp. 149-164.

³ See M. Jędraszewski, *Antropologia filozoficzna. Wybór tekstów*. Poznań, 1991.

boundaries, possibilities and in describing, in his abilities to make a firm and unquestionable decisions, and that man is limited in the span of comprehending by enriching the content in the causal moderation, his resolutions and decisions. Such things happen because that man is an element of the world which transcends, existing in the inside and outside at the same time, beyond something, in particular; that man is a subject for recognition beyond a recognizing mind, going beyond the content and the subject of recognition which refers to considering aprioritic forms of cognition as those being ahead and conditioning experience. Nonetheless, a man tries to understand the world and himself but he still finds many mysteries in himself and the surrounding reality. Those mysteries become a problem which he cannot always manage to cope with. That man appears in his actions, in the diversity and is bothered by many different contradictions which leads him to conflicts and unusual degenerations; despite that fact, he can still be brave, not losing the feeling of a monolithic personality.⁴

Therefore, taking part in an attempt to explain the ontological structure of a man and his existential position in the whole existential order, where a capture of the analytical discourse of a man in his religious anthropology and his relations towards what saint is takes place, we become witnesses who bring those relations closer to comprehension, thanks to which it comes to examination of what people believe in and what they confess about their faith and express in their religious practices. Only that person who explores this phenomenon does hit the heart of the matter in their religion. On the basis of such experience, where a man manages to find himself in the core of his faith, situating himself as if in the score of a believer, in the heart of the act of faith, in the place of a man who is accompanied by comprehension, it is Anselm's *fides querens intellectum* that a man becomes enlightened by the glow of the One who exists, meaning God, alive and true. A man, a child of time and various cultural transformations, possesses scientific aspirations which religious anthropology requests here, have to muster up his courage of a permanent link with the fact of being dependent on the cognizing subject conditioned by the features of that subject, which involves the subjectivity of him getting closer to the subject of the study, objective explanations encompassing the religious fact in general, trying to distinguish the sheer sense. There appear understatements and ambiguities in this synthetic analysis. There also emerges a question as for understanding of what has occurred in reality; that is the question about an event, phenomenon, symptom, act or the given state of condition, about that religious fact which can be specified only by the observational ability to accept the "otherness" of perceiving this or that man, all in order to be able to gain what he believes in and how this fact influences on his own life and the live of that person who lives nearby.

It is also worth wondering: perhaps there exists any peril of arranging a project, a plan, losing in thought about the future of oneself, staying that person who I am when it comes to colliding with somebody else, the danger of bringing him in the consequence to

⁴ The philosophers such as: Thomas of Aquinea, Swieżawski, Klaubertanz, Moler or Krąpiec do explain it all ultimately by distinguishing the ontological structure of a man and his existential position in the whole existential order. It does not have to mean that before one gets to the deepest rights, he or she does not have to analyse the abundance of features which are human personality in the cultural and natural environment. See Thomas of Akwin, *Traktat o człowieku*, prepared by S. Swieżawski, Poznań, 1956; G. Klubertanz, *Philosophy of human nature*, Ney York, 1953; J. Moler, *Człowiek w świecie. Zarys antropologii filozoficznej*, Paris, 1969, and M.A. Krąpiec, *Ja- Człowiek*, Lublin, 1991.

his own, subjective imagination. Or in other words: do we really manage, in order to fully comprehend other people, to go beyond our own "limitness," beyond our intellectuality, in order to, as a consequence of that, accept our credibility in the sense of accepting this holy text called The Bible, in which text God discloses Himself as a subject, as a hidden creature, but who is not subordinated to empirical experience, who allows a man, however, to get to know Him by using human's inborn empirical abilities, by conclusions based on signs of the surrounding world, that living and non-living one, based on the natural phenomena such as the visible goods, fire, water, air, stars, stormy water and the blue lights, and so on. Those things we are discussing here are a cosmic revelation. God reveals Himself directly, too, according to the Second Vatican Council, by: a favourable, personal, and beneficial link with a man in created by a direct dialogue; He does it so as to allow a man, in our contemporary world, to learn about God and His saving will, with a strong feeling of certainty and faultlessly and that happens due to the supernatural revelation. The aim of the descending of the Eternal Wisdom is the man's participation in God's nature by the divine grace given to a man free of charge, but under the condition that a man accepts God's instructions with faith, love and gives a positive response to His speech, as well as to the cultural symbols or the peculiar rituals. Briefly put, I mean here the acceptance of that mediation of the religious tradition in which that other man is included, other in his peculiarity of thinking or expression. It stays within the sphere of dreams to explain and, consequently, to comprehend, together with the consciousness, where a sense of what has already been said emphasizes, so where the consciousness together with the feeling of experiencing things, with the existence or happening of something that there cannot be found any explanation not based on the wider comprehension.⁵

Being open to the other man

Such intended plan of acting, such project needs, of course, openness to the other man.

Since the times of the explanation, exploration, recognition, and making oneself aware of the science of human beings till the contemporary times, a man appears as a subject of those sciences. That is why we have to deal here with the protest, a kind of hold up even, which exists between science and theology. Surely, theology is the integrity of Christian cognition, as well as communication shaped and organized as for science, the integrity which is ambiguous in its triple sense, meaning: 1. a research activity of competent people who create social knowledge; 2. in its common meaning-learning, gaining knowledge; 3. in its basic meaning- persistently modified creation of a human social activity which is strengthened in special languages by special statements, which statements reflect, let us say, adequately under certain conditions, those chosen

⁵ See A. B. Stępień, *W poszukiwaniu istoty człowieka*, in: *O człowieku dziś*, ed. B. Bejze, Warsaw, 1974, pp. 64-94, and *Wstęp do filozofii*, Lublin, 1955, pp. 114-115; and A. Połtawski, *Świat – spostrzeżenie-świadomość*, Warsaw, 1973.

fragments of reality which a man experience or to which he postulates.⁶ Theology, thus, is a man's speech on the subject of God, and that speech tries to find the answers to all the questions which bother a contemporary man. The paradox of that situation is included in human language, in the language which is the language of the specific epoch and culture. We are preoccupied by the issue of what kind of discussion is taking place in our civilization where a man is given a chance to learn about himself by an analytical immersing into the process of an everyday language. The language of theology is included in the culture of the definite time and is announced in that definite time, it does not incorporate the direct continuity between positive sciences which have many meaning, even if it refers to the specific cognition, where it may mean the elements of formal cognition, cognition itself and cognition as a branch of culture⁷ together with theology, but there exists, at least in a part of it, an inevitable distinctness between those two. When it comes to practice, the analysis of those two subjects presents their co-operation which, in consequence, does not long for conformity, neither for their joining. There can be found certain similarities in the everyday events, where that which is marked by religion, always gets through to a man by the cultural heritage. We do find the confirmation of that phenomenon in the histories of those huge and small religions. In this sense, the every dimension of theology is in its initiation of a cultural collection (*ansambl*), formed by the history and expressed by faith thanks to the experience, and it faces the 'directness' of the dimension in order to introduce it, later on, into the history of its creative individuality and the whole community in which a man is to live. We do approach here a level of difficulty of religious anthropology, since the subject of it is a man (*homme*), his *humanistas*-humanity (*or humanness, humanite*), his dignity connected with his personal nature which explains the moral order of treating everyone as a target of his actions, and not only as a means. To cut the long story short, we are strictly interested in a man and his humanity and all his relations with that which belongs to God, a man who becomes a knowledge-owner and its explorer. In such a sense, there emerges a question: is that man, that subject of my interests, different to me, different to my 'myself,' because I am trying to search for the truth about him, consider him in the variety, let us say, to 'penetrate' him, all that in order to comprehend him. So how, then, that other man, the 'public eye' in confrontation with me, all my humanity, my *Menscheit*, meaning the overall of all the people's common features, together with the mental lives, animality and other, and together with the whole of the features constituting the choice differences, looks like? How does this man appear in my cultural appearance? Are not my investigations determined by the cultural heritage of the epoch I grow in? Has not my whole religious experience, which I want to understand by using the peculiarity of different forms and conventional norms in the alphabet of the existential transcription of my cultural tradition which I am a beneficiary of, been

⁶ See K. Rahner, *Theologiae*, in: *Sacramentum Mundi. Theologisches Lexicon fur die Praxis*, ed. K. Rahner, A. Darlapp, Freiburg im Briesgau, 1969, Vol.4, pp. 860-874; A. Grabner-Heider, *Theorie der Theologie als Wssenschaft*, Munich, 1974; and S.C. Napiórkowski, *Jak uprawiać teologię?* Wrocław, 1991.

⁷ See *Nauka w świetle współczesnej filozofii*, prepared by E. Pakszys, J. Such, J. Wiśniewski, Warsaw, 1992; and A. Chalmers, *Czym jest to, co zwiemy nauką?* Wrocław, 1993; W. Tatarkiewicz, *Cywilizacja a kultura*, in *Parerga*, Warsaw, 1978, pp.74- 92; and H. Levrier, *La culture et l'homme*, Paris, 1980.

modified too much? Irrespective of the meaning of this fundamental question, applying an analytical process to some religion by concentrating on the discourse of the external factors become a scientific experience, *Wiissenschaft*, where we are to deal with an organized learning process which serves to construct theories, that is to science in a topical sense. It goes together with a set of ready, in a sense, but still hypothetical theories which refer to a defined discipline of reality, and those theories fulfill the methodological conditions as for specifying the concepts and justifying the statements.⁸ We take, in such a process, into consideration the following factors: observation, measurements, conclusions, definitions, and others, in order to get to the heart of the matter and grasp the essence (*ousia*; *to ti estin*), that is, in order to be now what something used to be in the past. An attempt of a usual comparing of many religions leads us to the fact that the historical regularities, together with the forms in which their empirical facts, which are the starting point for the scientific researches of that religious phenomena, manifest themselves, the regularities fit some patterns, or groups of all human beings and they accept certain structures, displaying the fact of being identical and constant, firm in all the religious experiences we already dealt with in the history of a human kind. It is the firmness(constans) that emerges despite the differences in the details which are the outcome (consequence)of the historical development, general evolution, the processes of getting through to more complex states or, in some sense, to more perfect states. It also authorizes us, unprecedented, to take the religious phenomena away from the repercussion of the processes in time, away from this phenomenon being un-contemporary and from grouping it in the way so as it would be possible to come up with a comparative specification in an analytical process which is beyond strictly historical determinants. We do then experience the phenomenology that is not only a method for describing the religious facts of that *phainomeon*, that is what shows up and appears together with the word and science, *Wiissenschaft*, according to a structural key which postulates a structural analysis of the studied subjects, where a world and its domains, culture in particular, are not disordered groups of elements, but are systems making up a clear unity whose structure is not only a sum, an arrangement of elements, but a new quality, and all changes within it may be caused by some immanent reasons, and where description of a structure cannot be reduced to description of its elements, to knowledge about a structure, according to which only those elements are easily comprehensible and allow to be characterized.⁹ That phenomenological manner in the structural dimension becomes something indispensable, one could even say necessary, essential to be in touch with somebody (*etre en contact avec quelqu'un*), in the tangled empirical data of the history, in order to express, clarify and order it. That empirical material is necessary to adequate the whole comprehension so as to find oneself in that answer reaching how and whys of various religious experiences which set strong

⁸ See A. Motycka, *Główny problem epistemologiczny filozofii nauki*, Wrocław, 1990; S. Kamiński, *Nauka i metoda. Pojęcie nauki i klasyfikacja nauk*, Lublin, 1992; and J. Życiński, *Elementy filozofii nauki*, Tamów, 1996.

⁹ Such people as C. Levy- Strauss, R. Bearthès, L.Althusser, M. Foucault, J. Lucan, J. Piaget, J.-B. Fagas do wrote about the analysis of the structural subjects very extensively. See J. Kmita, *Strukturalizm jako koncepcja metodologiczna*, in *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 12(1968), nr 2, pp. 45-62, and S. Kamiński, *O strukturalizmie syntetycznym*, in *Filozofia i metoda. Studia z dziejów metod filozofowania*, Lublin, 1993, pp. 167-176.

foundations to the anthropological initiation. In this way, for the first time in that whole researching operation, we could start it all again from a man who has become matrix, material, contribution situating him in the inscription of God's thought and act, a man whom God adores and in whom we find happy *Hallelujah*.

That fascination of the fact that a man is a religious creature, does not tell us anything, neither it explains. It happens because of a simple reason: we do affirm only quasi- generality, commonness, and massiveness of religious experiences in religions. In order to clarify all the premises of this phenomenon, it would be proper to initiate the analysis of a man's articulation and the analysis of a position he does have in this world, according to that man. One would have to ask a question: aren't these presentation the aftermath of the strictly economic motives of religious and theological specificity, or more or less obvious in its clarity, comprehension by *homo sapiens* his own form in a conditional distance which separates him from the divine creatures and from potentiality which is given to him after the departure of those creatures, and establishing a peculiar intimacy which is in consequence: a communion of people, dialogue and a harmonious bond.

The first task for anthropological religion is then analyzing that concrete phenomenon of the experienced reality by a concrete man, so as to get closer to the cultural autonomy of a believer. Such plan may only exist under the condition that it takes into consideration religious facts as cultural facts, which are expressed in the context which occurs in a relationship with all other elements with which that believer co-exists and where the score of the religious phenomenon is developed. The exemplification we deal with in the religious language referring to *sacrum*, is instructive for us, as it is comprehensible in all its message only among the community of the believers, which community becomes at the same time a participant of an interpretation based on hermeneutical tradition, meaning the art of interpreting which sets the rules for interpretation texts and symbols of all kinds, especially those old ones,¹⁰ since it has been initiated and created by a definite group of people and done for the sake of that definite group. The researcher has to take into the account, then, the whole tradition of man's works(text, culture), and indirectly-a man himself, basically all that is a part of the sacral language, if of course he has a noble purpose which is the comprehension of religious experience described by that language in the history and culture of a man and the surrounding world, and the activities of understanding the rules and their theories.

Interpreting religious texts

There have always been the interpretation of texts which explained the origins from the times of *kerygma*, meaning from the times since we deal with the 'redeeming address' which had been passed to Jews and pagans as a missionary expedition

¹⁰ We do mean here the ability to interpret, comprehend and avoid misunderstandings. See K. Rosner, *Hermeneutyka jako krytyka kultury. Heidegger, Gadamer, Ricorur*. Warsaw, 1991; and G. Sowiński, (ed.), *Wokół rozumienia. Studia i szkice z hermeneutyki*. Kraków, 1993.

commissioned by the appearing God. For example, in The New Testament the address is emphasized by such terms as: the Gospel(e.g. St. Matthew 26,13; Galatians 2,2); the arrival of God's Kingdom and the Messiah together with the summons for internal transformation(e.g. St. Matthew 3,2; 4,17); the testimony of the person and mission of Jesus- the Messiah(e.g. St. John 1,9-15.19-27; II Corinthians 1,19; Philippians 1,15), the testimony of God's Son (e.g. The Acts 9,20), Lord(e.g. II Corinthians 4,5) and most of all, prophesying the torture, death and the Resurrection of crucified Jesus (e.g. I Corinthians 1,23; II Corinthians 5,15.21; The Acts 2, 14-36; 3,12-26; 10,34-43) and His comeback(e.g. II Timothy 4,1; II Peter 1,16).

The whole case connected with the hermeneutics has undergone a change during the history. Slowly, consciousness that the part of The New Testament is an interpretation, explanation and a commentary of the Christian life, has arisen, and Saint Paul's prophecies, on the other hand, aim at discovering the truth that a Christian's life should be experienced in torture, death and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Since the times of the Fathers of Church, that is since first five centuries, where we are to deal with patristics, a chronologically ordered systematization was developed, where logical points of the Bible has been specified. The 19th century brought us a critical reading showing that The New Testament is already a commentary and making of choices, so it is a text which should be interpreted, similarly to all that cultural and religious motives which should be extracted from The Old Testament heritage. There emerges a peculiar relationship in the confrontation of that which is humane with that which is divine. That relationship announces itself in the previously planned distance as for the event the text advocates. We do have here two paths for interpretation. These are: the path of the Scripture, which passes to spiritual experience which arose here, according to the critical- historical analysis; the other path of interpretation is theology, which commences its travel to a specific text, to a present existence in which our time passes by. We do have, thus, two paths, namely: the philosophical and the historical one, which denies certain actualization of the Scripture, where the content is assigned to that person in the historical context whose aim is to explore and understand the message within. A systematization is taking place here, whose task is a modernization explored in a deep reverence as for the holy text we do deal with here. In this way we get closer to the language of mysticism(*misticos*), which is a mysterious cognition reserved for the initiated. The experience of the presence of God, more than natural, easy and direct, caused by the Holy Ghost and a theological reflection on mystical experience¹¹ should be thoroughly scrutinized in the very beginning in the context of the living environment of the surrounding culture. The description of this phenomenon, which is the personal experience of a unity with God, is difficult to explain in a literal way, even more- it cannot be conveyed, elucidated, as one cannot ever disjoin it from a mystic's personal spiritual relationship and the way in which we deal with a mystical experience accompanied by a passive refinement of the senses and the spirit, and a mystical unification with God we encounter as a result of purification. Saint John who had helped Jesus to carry the cross during His last moments will tell us about the passing through

¹¹ See H. Urs von Balthazar (ed.), *Grundfragen der Mystik*, Einsiedeln, 1974; J. Sudbrack (ed.), *Das Mysterium und die Mystik*, Würzburg, 1975; and *Mistyka w życiu człowieka*, W. Słomka (ed.), Lublin, 1980.

the Night which became to him a jolly and lofty happiness. It was because of the destruction and annihilation of powers, desires, passions and his feelings, thanks to which a clumsy impression and tasting of God, a man of mysticism left his way of human acting and association, and followed a God's way of acting. That dark night, which Saint John tells us about, became a God's influence on his soul, which impact purifies the soul from the unconsciousness and habitual, natural and spiritual imperfections. This influence is known as poured contemplation or mystical theology. In this contemplation we do cope with God's admonishing a soul using the hidden manner and training it in more perfect love, while it does not do anything and does not understand the way that contemplation is being poured. That contemplation is a loving God's Wisdom which gives beneficial results, where by the soul's purification and enlightenment it becomes ready for love unification with God. Despite the fact that each mystical experience is a very personal one, it may express itself only in the context and through a language in which we figure culturally, the language which is a tool of our interpersonal communication. A word which is thrived by a mystic in his/her experience is a statement of what has been the subject of his/her personal incident, experience and what he/she wants to share with now with other people, irrespective of whether we deal here with an order of God Himself or a spiritual master, such as Saint Ignacy Loyola, Saint Franciszek Ksawery, Saint Magdalena Zofia Barat, the establishers of Sacre Coeur convent, cardinal Mercier- a Belgian statesman, theologian and philosopher, a professor at the University of Leuven or Saint Vincent a Paolo, or the most common superior in the Church. The message included here is derived from the necessity of a language comprehensible for all contemporary mystics with whom our everyday life passes by, and that happens regardless of the will of purifying the language, which should necessarily be mentioned here. We do know now, from *Theology of an internal life*, called *Ascetic* that the embodiment of an experience event, contemporarily speaking, becomes to a mystic a subject of various sufferings which should be experienced, however. We do have such examples of ascetics, for instance a great stigmatist Anna Katherine Emmerich, Saint Father Pio, saint John Vianney, Saint Theresa- a doctor of the Church, who all experienced mysticism and stigmata. We do know Jacob's battle with an angel he fought with a human word which appeared to be too humane to say what cannot be said, which is cannot be named, which has no equivalent in human language. To say that there is a necessity for integration with cultural dimension we do deal when it comes to describe the mystical language is not enough, as what causes a problem here has already been said in a very adequate way, without any damage to the whole case. The case itself is not so straightforward in its obviousness, as we deal here with the experience of the primeval existence, unconditional, untied, unlimited, independent in every sense, perfect Absolute possessing the reasons of its existence and its qualifications which may be understood as a personal or non-personal existence.¹² Mystical experience, thus, goes beyond the geometry of time and space and is simply a-temporal. We do not know, however, how it could be connected to culture which belongs only to humans and is limited and relative in its opportunities. There also arises

¹² See J. N. Findlay, *Akcent to the Absolute*, London, 1970; P. Rossano, *Dio o l'Assoluto nelle religioni*, Fossano, 1970; Z. J. Zdybicka, *Partycypacja bytu. Próba wyjaśnienia relacji między światem i Bogiem*, Lublin, 1972.

a question as for the role of culture of a mystic himself and its task in reflecting the experience included in the expression of the mystical description and its phenomenon as for the behaviour of the whole score of the sense and the threads within. Don't we encounter here an escape from determination in the experienced limit and a trap in it, all in order to fall into a representation of the whole of symbols used in this domain and not in the described pictures or in the similarities of things, situations, different processes, transmitting the statements about one object onto the other, on the basis of analogies taking place between them thanks to the usage of the present day, by transmitting the relation occurring between two forms onto some other pair of forms? It is here that basic problems of a contemporary mystic reside in; that person in the moment of speaking, naturally positions himself in a defined historical time, in a concrete dimension of his culture and irrespective of whether his speech concerns what goes beyond the imperative of time and is above his perspective. I do think that it is not only the religious language, but also traditions are concrete facts of culture which he should take into consideration, which he should take into account. What belongs to the phenomena of religious episode does not stand out with its natural autonomy and it does not depend on its essence. The religious fact, even if possible to capture in its timing, cannot be treated just as a simple historical fact. It is not determined, in its essence, by the contemporary circumstances of the economic, political or cultural nature. The environment from which the religious phenomenon emerges cannot always be treated as a heuristic key thanks to which a proper interpretation is found and discovered¹³ by using analogy, presumption, generalizations, thought experiments, associations, experimental models, hypothesis, as their character does not runs out in an event and its substantial manifestation.

The appeal to sciences about a human being

It is the appeal to specific sciences referring to a human being that helps in explaining all what goes beyond the event which is not able, however, to discover and exhaust the complexity, the substance of a religious fact. It is the reaching to science that becomes, these days, one of the most characteristic episodes of the current days in discovering the dignity of cultural facts. That can be noticed not only in the evolving thought of our culture from the east and west, south and north, but the fear of the fact that also in our peculiarity of perceiving things and opinions we form on the subject of many types of experiences, procedures based on distinguishing methods of models, those real and ideal ones, but possessing distinct and common features in the span of some group of items, and on concentrating the rest of items on those models or in the arrangements of the mentioned types of languages. This attempt itself has a justification, irrespective of the fact whether it is capable of becoming a beneficiary of that religious potential, or not. By this way and in this manner, thanks to a precise study of structural myths we express in a vivid and dramatized form some real or postulated fact and an event which is

¹³ See Z. Pietrusiński, *Myślenie twórcze*, Warsaw, 1970; W. Marciszewski, *Analiza semantyczna pytań jako podstawa reguł heurystycznych*, in *Studia semiotyczne*, 5 (1974), pp. 133-146.

a primeval, non-critical way of explaining the natural and social world which reflects spirituality, knowledge and an organization of a given group of people.¹⁴ We do deal here, in this sense, with a myth which is a creation of a collective consciousness, which searches for truth and belongs to the ancient religion as well as to traditional societies presented as a systematic material for reading. Nevertheless, it is not able to exhaust the experienced meaning of those myths in all the cultural contexts of poetic forms which refer to imagination, some idea or doctrine, which, in consequence, is to help with the realization, neither is it able to exhaust the experienced phenomenon by referring to contemporary societies which are the creation of collective consciousness, different to objective reality, but inspiring to a concrete action or by referring to a depiction manifesting mental processes taking place in the collective unconsciousness, as we are dealing here with unveiled consciousness of a contemporary recipient of those myths occurring in a diverse game of various relations of a given language system. As a reminder, let us say about one more issue: great theories of cognition, which deal with authenticity and legal validity of human cognition¹⁵, supported themselves in searching for the truth about philosophical sciences, causing too much systematization of religious experience which explored the secrets of science, with all the baggage of complexity, and wanted to penetrate like an X-ray, in order to bring them out later on. Facing such an interest of sciences and a lack of concrete answers to the questions of all that issues assimilated by faith and the whole of people's socio- historical and material activities in progress of reshaping by them and adjustment to the demands of natural and social reality, in the face of experience acquired in religious acting, sciences dealing with the issue of a man appeared to supply an outwardly proper answer. The effectiveness of those sciences created a kind of certainty, a feeling that we deal with a way of explaining all the signs encountered in religious experiences of a person who uses those signs, who expresses his/her thoughts and emotions thanks to those signs, explaining, at the same time, the vagueness which accompanies the meeting of a man with that which is divine and finding answers to all the questions which boosted adrenaline of modern "mindeness". We do encounter in all religions a kind of a system which is generated as a result of a long-term reflection over basic problems of a man. I do mean here such determinants such as life and death, good and evil, and love - a bond of all perfection. From the pedagogical point of view, every religion is formed as a kind of a system of beliefs and myths and rituals connected with them, prospering in a strictly defined manner and encompassing traits of a configuration linked with a cultural-historical context in which it appeared, grew up and still exists. It would be an advantage to mention one more level of specification which is a sort of interpretation, explanation and a commentary on every religion given by their believers, or by a person who takes up interpreting. In this context, we do encounter a question of what should be done in order to comprehend the sense of religious experience included in tangle of various symbols, pictures and dogma, meaning opinions, legal decree of the doctrine which is infallible

¹⁴ See L. Kołakowski, *Obecność mitu*, Poznań, 1972; I.G. Garbour, *Mity- modele- paradygmaty*, Kraków, 1984; K.Rahner, *Demitologizacja*, in: *Mały słownik teologiczny*, Warsaw, 1987, pp.76-78, 243; and D.F. Mclean (ed.), *Myth and Philosophy*, Warsaw, 1971.

¹⁵ See A.J. Ayer, *Problem poznania*, Warsaw, 1965; R. Ingarden, *U podstaw teorii poznania*, Vol.1, Warsaw, 1971; R. Nozick, *Philosophical Explanation*, Oxford, 1981; R.M. Chisholm, *Teoria poznania*, Lublin, 1994.

science entailed in God's Revelation given to us by Church Teacher's Committee in primary education, and announced in a Vatican Council or by the pope in the form of dogmatic definition¹⁶ which may also be a subject to further investigation or constant development. There is also one more thing to discuss, namely how to distinguish individual interpretation of this relation from religious practices of a particular parish community? We do come across a certain difficulty caused by wide development of the studies of a man and all the cognitive tools in the science about science(meta-science), namely the theory of scientific cognition dealing with science in general, or with particular types of science considered as cognition from the formal side, or as textual cognition.¹⁷ The above mentioned sciences are supposed to narrow down all the conclusions drawn from the analysis, they help us in understanding and in readiness for precision in discovering the psychological and socio-cultural factors, which have impact on our religious perception, imagination and subordination of their general theory of believers' moral systems. The answer we get on the basis of the previously mentioned scientific tools is more of a technical nature in the sense of a specific level, psychological, social or economical state of things. That technical answer we get, acquires the traits of truth as we are dealing here with a result we get after an analysis which is connected with the examined coefficients with the usage of the wide range of scientific equipment. There occurs yet another question; what kind of truth are we dealing here with, as every time we do get different answers? Let us say at this moment that if, every other time, we introduced different perspective, then we were given different results of the research. Every interpretation we encounter here may find what is actually searched for. What is being searched for, thus, is interpretation, which is a way of reductive comprehension based on fixing reasons to the results perceived as real, psychological, sociological or political. The variety of the answers given by science to the question of a man threatens by a clash of all the aspirations of the competing hermeneutic sciences, that is the abilities to interpret, comprehend and avoid misunderstandings. Basically speaking, we do mean here understanding the human creations, and indirectly, understanding a man himself. However, we cannot fail to mention the fact that between the most important aspects of cultural transformations which occur and function in some aspect, a crisis of contemporary religion comes about. This combination, which takes place between sciences dealing with the issue of a man and the explanation of truths, plays an essential role here. This comparison puts the conflict in the position of interpretation of the religious phenomenon as sometimes it is heading for disintegration of the whole unity, loosening the process in which the elements of some structural wholeness stop creating it, at least under some conditions in the subject of the research. Irrespective of our reliable attitude towards the case of religious presenting the characteristics of men's religious activities and disassembling the unity into heterogenous elements, aiming at distinguishing those primeval elements, discovering constructive or conditioning factors, indicating the reasons, rules, and laws, the answer to our *pourquoi, warum, why*, will still not be found. Here we have the end

¹⁶ See W. Nieke, *Dogmatismus, Historisches Woerterbuch der Philosophie*, ed. J. Ritter, K. Grunder, Vol.2, 1972, Basel, pp. 277-279; K. Kondydyk, *Verification ana Dogmatism, international Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, 8, (1977), pp.1-17.

¹⁷ See B. J. Gawecki, *Przygotowanie do filozofii*, Warsaw, 1964, pp. 132-136; S. Kamiński, *Nauka i metoda. Pojęcie nauki i klasyfikacja nauk*, Lublin, 1992, pp.32-36.

of all intellectual honour, meaning all that which is essential, necessary and impossible in the face of a sense of a structure of something, and only a multi-directional move, that is a religious discourse, which is: a conversation, discussion, dissertation, contemplation and a way of thinking based on the activity of our brain, is able to face the cognitive target by indirect thinking operations and is able to express the reigning norm.

The functions and the course of relationships linking a man with God

We should do everything in order to protect the nature of the religious experience from faking it, by articulating the functions and the course of the relationships linking a man with God and His powers, which appear to a man as those mostly dignified in comparison to cultural forms and significant existential structures, encompassing those more potential features, common for a few genres of this relationships. The occurring case of man's connections with that which is divine is as old as history. God has always been an object of passion and delight to a man. People of all generations has tried to find various theories of a practical activity of a collection of statements enclosing axioms and their consequences explaining this relation, all in order to be in the range of the discipline, more and more independent from metaphysics¹⁸, meaning independent from the basic department of philosophy, understood in many ways, and in order to be independent from theologians.

The anthropological way of perceiving the religious phenomenon relies on interpretation which is actually a scientific opportunity, as it accepted all the aspects of culture and community, where specific religious aspects came to being. It would be good then to make out that cultural boundary, as the sheer understanding is possible in the internal part of human life complexity, of the shared life. Such solutions of those internal relationships occurring between the particular religious phenomena and cultural events, seems to be the most important task for religious anthropology. At any rate, we do deal here with religious phenomenon and its experience which men were allowed to discover, explore and learn, as well as be a part of this learning sequence of their history. We deal then with human recording of what already exists according to some rule and is real in comparison to what seems to exist but is a creation of our imagination and is opposite to what ideal is, both in the objective and subjective sense of a particular reality which stays in hiding itself. That which is saint is in the relational connection. Even if religion and its various aspects in which its internal life discourse happens is only fiction or consciousness as a passive reflection of the features of the reality, where a secondary phenomenon takes place, not having any impact on the it, according to some socio-analytical and sociological theories, then we do deal here with something which comes about between God and a believer and that something cannot be explained piece by piece. Only that person who believes in the power far more better than human kind, then all that transcendentalism is not fake. One more thing should be mentioned here, namely

¹⁸ See J. Owens, *An Elementary Christian Metaphysics of Authentic Existentialism*, Englewood Cliffs, 1965; E. Coreth, *Metaphysik*, Innsbryck, 1981; M.A. Krapiec, *Metafizyka. Zarys teorii bytu*, Lublin, 1995.

what a man gets in reality which goes beyond his human possibilities and his physical strength, starting from an expression reflecting spiritual record of a reality which a man experiences in a way remaining the inside of the immanence which does not go beyond a specific item. What is expressed in the religious experience does not belong to easy descriptions of what is divine, of what appears as something external, but it is a true relationship of a link between a man and God, who thanks to what divine is, forms and changes the believer's attitude, He brings a man to a breakthrough, where a transition from living in sin to living in friendship with God takes place, turning round from the inappropriate path and a change of life and behaviour.

Using analytical parsing in reference to a religious fact we do deal with here, as the only explaining discourse would not be the pure case, as giving it less significance would have to start from such religious anthropology which shows in its action a unity of a believer. It does not claim, however, that such anthropology should be understood as a way of encompassing the whole meta-philosophy, where we are given the result of our researches and achievements. This anthropology is an integral expression of basic premises, thanks to which we are able to grasp and comprehend what saint is in human experience. We do also have here relationships taking place between each object and the object itself, namely a relation between an identified identity with oneself, with my "I" and a group which notices the social bond in the greatness of forms, a man's relation included in a cosmic dimension of time and a manner in which he becomes a carrier summarizing the universe and finding his place in the universe, having the ability to place himself in it. It happens because a man understands himself in what he says about his personal religious experience. He also discovers a vocation to become a saint. This evangelical "be saint" becomes to a man a conscious discourse about his own existence.

The interest of religious anthropology is then all that people believe in, what they experience, what they feel, and what they call *sacrum*. There is no sheer curiosity, neither the will to comparison, which could often become relative degeneration. On the contrary, all religious experiences are taken into consideration here, and religious anthropology is open to distinctness in its spiritual heritage. All anthropological ration is encompasses here, too, it is open in its discourse to a live spirit together with the worries applied on the path of understanding all that cultural diversity and the deep peculiarity of diverse human behaviours.