

# Pavol Dancák

---

## Christian Thinking in Secular Context

---

Philosophy and Canon Law 2, 9-19

---

2016

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

**Pavol Dancák**

University of Prešov, Slovak Republic

## Christian Thinking in Secular Context

**Abstract:** The revival of religious thinking does not amount to a simple reproduction of what preceded secularism. It rather constitutes a reference to an authentic reflection on what caused the lay movements in society. We can say it is time to try anew. In this manner, we can treat it as an opportunity, although admittedly in a very unstable situation.

**Keywords:** human being, Christianity, secularism, the image of God

It is impossible to imagine Europe without Christianity, churches, Christian crosses scattered along the roads, hospitals, human rights, solidarity, and care for the weakest among us. It is evident that civilization and culture have been inspired by transcendence towards the divine. Despite that, Europe witnessed the process of secularization, which started in the mid-twentieth century and worked towards pushing God and Christianity out of all areas of human life in all ways possible. This process strived for atheist secularism, which involves a complete and utter exclusion of God and the natural moral order from all areas of human life. Christian religion has been continually and with even greater vigor and subtlety restricted to the private lives of individuals. Such tendencies can be seen in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, whose creators, irregardless of historical reality, avoided any reference to God or religion.

Many people did not theoretically justify their secular stance, but they lived as if there were no God. Some people openly rejected Christianity and others, in larger numbers, practiced their faith in God only formally. The concept of God was distorted in so many different ways, oftentimes by Christians themselves. In some instances, we have to agree with those who criticized Christians for creating God in their own human image. Oftentimes, God was presented not as a loving father and a healer of body and soul, but as a strict judge or

even as an avenger. People sometimes used the concept of God to fill the gaps of knowledge or considered God an instigator of the motion in the world. Selfish satisfying of the shadow needs resulted in a modern man gladly accepting the pagan image of God as a guarantor of some secure blessedness. To secure this, it should be sufficient to pray and offer some kind of sacrifice. God should be bound by such favor and provided he keeps his account books, he should sooner or later return the favor. The pagan division of reality into sacred and secular grew stronger in everyday life and people somehow ignored the fact that *in God we live and move and have our being* and that only *in God's grace we are who we are*. People did not recognize God at the market as the one *to be worshiped in spirit and truth*. And so we cannot marvel at the famous fool playing requiem for the dead God.

Distorted image of God has become most evident in our perception of freedom as an unlimited wilfulness. Historical experience, however, teaches us that the modern times' motto *equality, fraternity, and liberty* involved exclusion from the brotherhood, deprivation of freedom or even life to all who were not equal in the right sense of the word. History, and sadly the most current history of the twentieth century, too, prove that secularization poses a threat. Revelation of the New Testament rejected whatever sublime business figures of egocentrism and appealed to the human persons to surrender themselves and do good deeds because God is love.

Modern man, as many times before, refused to admit his/her responsibility before God. What is more, man also claimed the right to determine what is good and what is evil. Such claim, however, goes beyond the essential purpose of man, who, on the one hand, can learn about good and evil, who can, and also must, distinguish between good and evil, who can and should do what is good, but who can also do what is evil. Still, modern man cannot say that from now on good will be evil and evil will be good. Man naively assumes that it is possible to abandon his/her essentially given place and tries to turn the world upside down. But to every action there is always a reaction. If I am cutting my own throat, I should anticipate consequences. Instead of God, man placed him/herself in the center of his/her activity, yet s(he) did not succeed in creating Heaven on earth. Just the contrary, man created totalitarian regimes which, by rejecting God, brutally destroyed the dignity of man in the hellish conditions in the concentration camps and gulags. This is the main reason why we consider the times we live in as the times of the spiritual crisis, the times of breaking the established societal and cultural structures, the times to which a mood of doom and a concealed fear of the upcoming future are ascribed. This concealed fear seems to be peculiar in character. It is the fear that man feels of him/herself. There is a real danger that people would be able to turn their own creations against themselves. In current state of technology that would mean to commit a collective suicide. This rather bleak picture of the postmodern situation raises

a question: Is there anything that can protect man from such danger? A question asked in such a way directs human thinking into the realm associated with matters of God. A man of today, as a matter of fact as s(he) has always been is a searcher. In order for the search to be the strength and support for a human being, it is important to subject it to a rational reflection. Otherwise, the whole gamut of pseudoreligions comes into existence.<sup>1</sup> Nobody has ever seen God and therefore we can only speak of God in an anthropomorphic manner, which implies speaking of God on the basis of human experience, and, what is more, by means of analogy and metaphor.<sup>2</sup> We have to be wary not to remove what is substantially divine from the concept of God.

Postsecular philosophy has its place in a current philosophical thinking that arose from the crisis and criticism. In its wider context, it can be described as postmodern philosophy dealing with the issue of religion and secularization. Postsecular philosophy has been developed on the revelation of wrong assumption that there are irreconcilable differences between the scientific and technological progress of modern civilization and religion. And it does not concern only the United States and the Arab countries. The revival of religion is evident in Europe, too.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, secularization takes place and it “compels to a radical reinterpretation of the nature of Christian mission in social structures,”<sup>4</sup> while a theological origin of secular ideas is taken into account. Issues associated with a universal distribution of human rights, the idea of a person, autonomy of reason, freedom and solidarity, as well as an essential possibility of societal and technological progress are all parts of an original Greek, Roman, Hebrew, and Christian theological legacy. Not only was secularized European thinking tradition built on that legacy, but so were explicitly antireligious systems (the Enlightenment, Fascism, and Communism). György Geréby points out to many perils that the postsecular thinking about religion holds in itself.<sup>5</sup> The concept of religion does not represent some common essence of all religions, since the concept of God in the respective religions is not formulated in the same way. Jürgen Habermas, too, openly agrees with this claim in “religious unmusicality.” In postsecular thinking, the concept of

<sup>1</sup> Jozef Pauer, “Náboženstvo alebo zápas o obnovu strateného,” in *Hodina filozofie filozofie (Úvod do filozofie stredne pokročilých)* ed. František Novosád et al. 71–90 (Bratislava: Iris 2004).

<sup>2</sup> Marek Rembierz, “Tropy transcendencji... Współczesne myślenie religijne wobec pluralizmu światopoglądowego i relacji międzykulturowych,” *Świat i Słowo* vol. 2, no. 23 (2014): 17–50.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Danièle Hervieu-Léger, “The Role of Religion in Establishing Social Cohesion,” in *Religion in the New Europe*, ed. Krzysztof Michalski (Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2006), 45–62.

<sup>4</sup> Martin Vašek, *Kapitoly zo súčasnej filozofie náboženstva* (Bratislava: IRIS, 2012), 16.

<sup>5</sup> György Geréby, “Triezvo opojná idea,” in *OS Fórum občianskej spoločnosti* (Bratislava: Kaligram, 3–4/2006), 108–118.

religion alone is inaccurate from the methodological perspective and we have to be wary of its naive simplicism.

The apparent revival of religious thinking has its base in the acceptance of the fact that the crucial role in religion is played by *sensus numinis*, in other words, the sense of the divine. The numinous is a mysterious and incognizable power that inspires awe and terrifies man, but at the same time, it allures and captivates him/her.<sup>6</sup> It is *mysterium tremendum et fascinatorum*. Just because the numinous is both terrifying and fascinating at the same time, it is partly cognizable. This numinous is “holy”; it is “other” and “otherworldly.” It is something mysterious, yet revealing, something unknown, yet profoundly intimate. Religion as a specific human phenomenon must be grounded in the essence of man, that is, in what makes a man a man and what distinguishes him/her from all others.<sup>7</sup> And thus, pondering upon the phenomenon of religion we come to issues related to knowledge and freedom, and to issues related to limited knowledge and limited freedom.

Every object of knowledge can be known in even more detail and therefore all knowledge is to some extent just the notion. The pathway to knowledge never ends.<sup>8</sup> The objects of knowledge are placed before us over and over again. Especially it pertains to our knowledge of God. We are constantly on our way to him, because the facts we speak about him are taken from the world of our own experience and therefore they are limited and pertaining more to the limited than to the infinite. As a matter of fact, we would have to speak about him all that is finite. He is both *omninominabile* and *unum*. Explaining the approach to knowledge of God, Nicolas Cusanus, therefore, does not limit himself only to affirmative theology, but he also seeks the help of negative theology so that, looking through the beryl,<sup>9</sup> he can attain coincidence of opposites. *Ignorantia docta* is a result of it. Knowledge of God for Cusanus is learned ignorance. It is not just any methodical aid, but it is the state of our knowledge of God. After all, all our knowledge, which always maintains its approximative character, leads to God.<sup>10</sup> Gianni Vattimo claims that the postsecularist thinking is dominated by

<sup>6</sup> Ján Komorovský, “Mircea Eliade a jeho Morfológia posvätná,” in Mircea Eliade, *Dejiny náboženských predstáv a ideí / I* (Bratislava: Agora, 1995), 18.

<sup>7</sup> Emerich Coreth, *Možnosti človeka* (Banská Bystrica–Badín: RKCMBF UK, TI, 1997), 17.

<sup>8</sup> “The intellect, which is not truth, never comprehends truth so precisely that truth cannot be comprehended infinitely more precisely. For the intellect is to truth as the polygon is to the circle. The more angles the inscribed polygon has, the more similar it is to the circle. However, even if the number of its angles is increased *ad infinitum*, the polygon never becomes equal [to the circle] unless it is resolved into an identity with the circle.” Mikuláš Kuzánsky, *O učenej nevedomosti*, trans. Augustín Valentovič (Bratislava: Pravda 1979), 37.

<sup>9</sup> Nicholas of Cusa wrote the book “De beryllo” [On the Beryl], a brief epistemological treatise using a beryl or transparent stone as the crucial analogy.

<sup>10</sup> “It is clear, therefore, that all we know about the truth is that the absolute truth, such as it is, is beyond our reach. The truth, which can be neither more not less than it is, is the most

negative theology emphasizing inaccessibility, void, and otherness, as it is very difficult to determine positive predicates.<sup>11</sup>

Faith as a natural part of human knowledge has once again become a topic of discussion and as such represents the crucial attitude to the divine, since for us God stays radically inaccessible. It is a basic and “universal” fact which paradoxically accompanies every experience with God which is understood in the broadest sense of the word.<sup>12</sup> The affirmation of God’s radical inaccessibility is rooted not only in God being invisible, but also in his transcendence with respect to our possibilities of knowledge. This assumption is nothing new and it represents the oldest part of philosophical and theological thinking about God. The confirmation of it can be found in the Holy Scripture in the Gospel of John: “No one has ever seen God” (Jn 1:18); as well as in the experience of mystics in all religions. However, it does not mean that God is unattainable in any sense, otherwise it would not be possible to create a concept of God at all, we would not know his name and atheism would be a necessity. It also means that regardless of the level and quality of our intellectual capacities and profundity of our experience, we are not capable of proving God’s existence or understanding who he is. We can only “assume” in some way that the world and we alone are dependant on some powerful transcendence. But for what we “know” about him, God is somebody radically other to all that we are able to see and think of literally.

If we were able to discern him using our cognitive skills—in broader sense—by some tools, it would mean that God is equal to other facts cognizable using these tools. It would, in the end, mean idolatry.<sup>13</sup>

In postsecular philosophy, God is a mystery and affirmation of God has always a character of faith as an affirmation of what is divine despite the inadequacy of our cognitive and ascetic efforts. The inadequacy does not mean that the faith is something irrational. Just the contrary; it appears rational because in itself the faith is the affirmation of the truth that makes the reality of the world more comprehensible, more “illuminated.” This is why the faith itself and its content demand understanding in an essential and not an accidental manner. It is

---

absolute necessity, while in contrast with it, our intellect is possibility. Therefore the quiddity of things, which is the ontological truth and which has been sought by all philosophers and has been discovered by none of them is unattainable in its purity. And the more profoundly we learn this lesson of ignorance, the closer we approach the truth itself.” Kuzánsky, *O učenej nevedomosti*, 37.

<sup>11</sup> Martin Vašek, *Kapitoly zo súčasnej filozofie náboženstva* (Bratislava: Iris, 2012), 18.

<sup>12</sup> “He would not be apprehended in this world where we are led by reason and opinion and doctrine through the more known to the unknown in symbols. Here only where persuasions end and faith enters is he apprehended. Through faith we are ravished in simplicity so that, beyond all reason and understanding we contemplate Him [...]” Kuzánsky, *O učenej nevedomosti*, 169.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Tomáš Tatranský, “Výzvy post-sekulárni filozofie,” in *Teologické texty*, 1 (2008): 23–25.

still *ides quaerens intellectum*. In Christian thinking, the essential characteristic of numinous lies in God revealing himself in a form of a loving being, as love completing the meaning of our existence. Appeal to holiness, as stipulated in the Old Testament, becomes even more pressing in the New Testament when Jesus Christ invites us to: “Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect” (Mt 5:48). The faithful in Christ are hallowed by the love they experienced in Christ.<sup>14</sup> “Follow God’s example, as dearly loved children and walk in the way of love, just as Christ loved us [...]” (Ef 5:1).

Understanding of the numinous in Christianity is greatly influenced by the fact that “Christianity is not the teaching of return such is Gnosticism and Neoplatonism, but the teaching of creation.”<sup>15</sup> The account of man’s creation in the Book of Genesis refers to essential relationship of man to God. Adam is not an overthrown god, nor is he a particle of spirit that fell to a body from heaven. He is a free being in a constant and vital relationship to God. His origin refers to that, too. He comes from the earth, but he does not limit himself to the earth. God breathed into him the breath of life and his existence depends on it. He became a living soul, both a personal being and a being dependent on God. Religion does not step in to supplement man’s human nature that would already be complete. Religion is integrated into his structure from the beginning. It would not make sense to talk about man without placing him into the relationship with God.<sup>16</sup>

Man is bonded with God, his Creator. Man’s relationship to God is one of the original and vital dependence manifesting itself in freedom in a form of obedience. He needs the obedience as his own complement that allows him to understand that he is not God, but he depends on God for he gave him life—a breath that makes him alive, but which he is not conscious of. He holds the law of obedience deep in his heart and in his conscience. Genuine obedience is possible only in freedom and it makes a man an autonomous being. Talents were dealt, the Lord has left, but he shall return. The concept of autonomy embraces within itself opinions of Stoicism, Enlightenment, and Atheism, but most of all it embraces the profound truth about freedom. The word autonomy derives from words *autos* and *nomos*, meaning to create laws for oneself. It then implies that freedom is related to law. Autonomy does not necessarily mean anarchy. It rather points to something that limits it.<sup>17</sup> What we have in mind is a law inscribed in the hearts and conscience of man and through which the living God speaks to those created by him. God places man into a beautiful and

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Werner Jaeger, *Wczesne chrześcijaństwo i grecka paidei*, trans. Krzysztof Bielawski (Bydgoszcz: Homini, 1997), 103.

<sup>15</sup> Mircea Eliade, *Dejiny náboženských predstáv a ideí / II.* trans. Eubica Vychovalá (Bratislava: Agora, 1997), 299.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Xavier Léon-Dufour, *Slovník biblickej teológie*, 169.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Karol Tarnowski, *Wiara i myślenie* (Kraków: Znak, 1999), 36.

good world created for man by God to cultivate and govern. The obligation to work does not replace the obligation to obey God, but it is directed to it.

After all, man in his/her nature is a social being. The principal distinction between the sexes is both example and source of life in society which is not based on power but love. God sees this relationship as a mutual help. This principal relationship sets an ideal for every relationship with a fellowman, so God, too, expresses the concluded contract with his people in a form of an engagement.<sup>18</sup>

Man has been created in God's image. Priest's interpretation summarizes Jahvist claims and points out to the fact that the creation of the universe was crowned by the creation of man. At the same time, it keeps records of God's intention: "Let us make mankind in our image [...] Procreate [...] Let them conquer the earth and rule over all the animals" (Gn 1:26 ff). Man is created in God's image and s(he) can establish a dialog with God. Man is not God; s(he) lives in dependence on God, in a relationship which is analogous to the relationship between the father and son (cf. Gn 5:3). There is one difference though; the image cannot exist independently of the one who is depicted in the image. The expression *breath* in the account of creation refers to just that. Man fulfills his role of an image by performing two main roles: as an image of God's fatherhood, he must procreate and fill the earth and as an image of God's domination he must conquer the earth under his rule. Man is the master of the world, the God's presence on earth. That is how the God's plan looks like. It was fully accomplished, however, only in Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Adam too was created to God's image, but only Jesus Christ is "the image of God" (2Kor 4:4). Paul the Apostle explains it: "He is an image of invisible God, the firstborn over all creation. For in Him all things were created, things in heaven and on earth [...]. All things were created through *Him* and for Him. He is before all things and in Him all things hold together. And He is the head of the body, the church" (Col 1:15–18). He is not only a visible image of an invisible God, but he is forever a son joined to his Father (cf. Jn 5:18, n. 30). Jesus perfectly realizes what Adam should have been—a being in everlasting relationship of son's dependence on God. Man works, and thus does God's will. Jesus Christ does the work of his Father: "To this very day my father is at His work, and I too am working now" (Jn 5:17). All things were created through him and for him and so he rules over all creations.

Biblical message brings to every man living in history a message of salvation and in this history man shall spread the message about the world beyond history to which he belongs.<sup>19</sup> Christian faith belongs to the realm of free and personal events unfolding between man and God as the history of salvation. Christian

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Léon-Dufour, *Slovník biblickej teológie*, 170.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Jacques Maritain, *Křesťanský humanismus*, trans. Vojtěch Gaja (Praha: Universum, 1947), 254.



understanding presents a strong belief that the world does not originate in general and unavoidable necessity and it is not necessarily eternal either. The world did not emanate from some divine principle, it is not a cosmic catastrophe, but it originates in a free decision of God. Man him/herself has his/her origin in a free decision: “Let us make mankind in our image, in our likeness” (Gen 1:26). For Christian culture it is important to know that evil in the world is not rooted in metaphysical and thus imperative paraprinciple. Evil has its roots in free and personal decision of a man who rejected the command of God. Although the human history has been marked by the curse of sin from the beginning of times, it has also been full of impact of loving God who shows mercy to man. Creation, incarnation, and redemption are not rooted in the necessity but in the God’s free decision. God’s Son becomes a man in order to perform “free self-revelation of God, bring a message of salvation and in the end to freely accept the redemptive death on the Cross,”<sup>20</sup> and all of that in a personal contact with another man and a community of people.

Jesus Christ, after all, is the leader, the head of the body. Having said that, life is given by Him—“the last Adam” (1Kor 15:45), the heavenly Adam whose image we should bear (15:49). He is the head of the family, the Church—the perfect human society; or rather he is the unifying principle of the society comprised of people (cf. Ef 1:10). Adam finds the meaning of his being and his existence only in Jesus Christ, the Son of God who became a man for all of us to become sons of God (Gal 4:4a).

By calling Jesus Christ “the Last Adam,” Paul the Apostle argues that the Christian faith believes is Jesus as an exemplary man.<sup>21</sup> Jesus as an example representing that a degree of man’s upbringing goes beyond the limits of the human being and only in this transcendence is s(he) the genuine exemplary man. The more man becomes him/herself, the more s(he) is with another. S(he) comes to him/herself only by distancing from him/herself. S(he) comes to him/herself only through others. Man is aimed at others—better said the Other—God. The more s(he) is him/herself, the more s(he) is with the Other—God. Man comes to him/herself only when s(he) leaves him/herself. Man is an image of God. In reality, this image is just an image as it only represents God. In only reflects its ideal’s main features and as a result of original sin is deformed, too. Such situation causes God’s activity to be, first of all, aimed at purging and healing a man and then at leading him/her to best likeness to his/her ideal as possible. This takes place in the course of long years of upbringing in which God reflects freedom and creates man.

Openness to the whole, to the infinite makes the human person a human person. Therefore, he/she is what he/she should be by transcending him/herself infi-

<sup>20</sup> Emerich Coreth, *Co je člověk?*, trans. Bohuslav Vik (Praha: Zvon, 1994), 26.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Joseph Ratzinger, *Úvod do křesťanství* (Řím: Křesťanská akademie, 1982), 153.

nately. It implies that the more human he/she is, the less withdrawn, “restricted” he/she becomes. In this way, a real human being is the one who is detached the most, who not only touches infinity—the Infinite—but who is one with God. And such is Jesus Christ. In Jesus the incarnation met its destination—the New Adam.<sup>22</sup> The cardinal idea of the Christian education is the deification of man. God became man for man to become God. This, by no means, can be taken literally. Deification is understood as unspecified “share” in God’s nature (Western thinking refers to it as to compassion). This daring formulation confirms the presence of man’s infinite desire to be satisfied only by God who is an ultimate aim of the whole inner dynamism of man.<sup>23</sup> Deification represents moving towards the numinous, but, at the same time, it does not mean the destruction of man. It is his/her own realization. In doing so, man becomes man in the most ideal way. That is not through identification with God, but through getting closer to him in the greatest possible way given to the human person. The human person becomes the human person through the deepest fellowship.<sup>24</sup>

Man is directed to another man and he/she finds him/herself only through another.<sup>25</sup> In giving him/herself up, man realizes his/her own being. The metaphysical basis of this fundamental structure is given by the essence of the finite spirit that realizes itself in an unconditioned and unlimited horizon of the being, truth, and good, that is, in the essential orientation towards the absolute.<sup>26</sup> Man as the finite spirit in the world does not have absolute being of God as his, immediate goal to which s(he) would direct his/her action. The absolute is not given imminently as an object of knowing, wanting, and loving. It is always mediated by the world. The world represents an immediate object area of our spiritual self-realization. In our world we should realize our being as well as essentially transcendent relationship with the absolute divine being. Therefore, in the world itself, it must be possible to realize our inner attitudes which are, in line with the transcendent nature of man, aimed at the world, and which reach their full meaning and last goal in the absolute. In our sensual world, however,

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Ratzinger, *Úvod do křesťanství*, 155.

<sup>23</sup> “[...] and this craving for more will never stop: it will be stretching out to something not yet grasped: the subject of this deficiency will always be demanding a supply, always altering into the grander nature, and yet will never touch perfection, because it cannot find a goal to grasp, and cease its impulse upward. The First Good is in its nature infinite, and so it follows the necessity that the participation in the enjoyment of it will also be infinite, for more will always be grasped, and yet something beyond that which has been grasped will always be discovered, and this search will never overtake its Object, because its fund is as inexhaustible as the growth of that which participates in it is ceaseless.” *Řehoř z Nyssy: Contra Eunomium I*, 290–91 /GNO I, 112, 9–20, in Lenka Karfíková, *Řehoř z Nyssy* (Praha: Oikoymenth, 1999), 194–95.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Dariusz Oko, *Łaska i wolność* (Kraków: WAM, 1997), 86–87.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Edward Sienkiewicz, *Koncepcja „rewolucji wspólnotowej” w polskiej teologii uczestnictwa* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo naukowe UAM, 2003), 305.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Edward Stólarik, *Filozofia náboženstva* (Košice: RCMBF UK), 54.

we encounter other personal beings towards which we can, or even must adopt certain evaluating attitude—acceptance, warm-heartedness, unselfish devotion. These are the attitudes which aim at the infinite personal value of God.

“God is love. Whoever lives in love lives in God, and God in them” (1Jn, 4:16). Love as a bond of perfection and fulfillment of law determines all means of sanctification, portrays them and brings them to the goal (LG 42). The Church in all its life confesses God as the Saint and Majestic; and especially does so in the holy liturgy to “thank to God for his indescribable gift” in Jesus Christ (2Cor 9:15), to praise his glory (Ef 1:12), with the power of the Holy Spirit (Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, No. 6). In the Eucharistic Liturgy, the Church addresses God as: “Holy, Holy, Holy [...]” In the Eastern Liturgy, a priest says: “Holy to the Holy.” Participating in the God’s holiness, a believer unifies with Jesus Christ by receiving the Body of Christ.

The revival of religious thinking does not amount to a simple reproduction of what preceded secularism. It rather constitutes a reference to an authentic reflection on what caused the lay movements in society. We can perhaps say that now it is the time to try anew. And thus we can see it as an opportunity, although admittedly in a very unstable situation.

## Bibliography

- Coreth, Emerich. *Co je člověk?* Translated by Bohuslav Vik. Praha: Zvon, 1994.
- Coreth, Emerich. *Možnosti člověka.* Translated by Peter Volek. Bystrica–Badín: RKCMBF UK, TI, 1997.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Dejiny náboženských představ a ideí, vol. II.* Translated by Lubica Vychovalá. Bratislava: Agora, 1997.
- Geréby, György. “Triežvo opojná idea.” In *OS Fórum občianskej spoločnosti*. Bratislava: Kali-gram, 3–4 (2006): 108–118.
- Hervieu-Léger, Danièle. “The Role of Religion in Establishing Social Cohesion.” In *Religion in the New Europe*, edited by Krzysztof Michalski, 45–62. Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2006.
- Jaeger, Werner. *Wczesne chrześcijaństwo i grecka paidei.* Translated by Krzysztof Bielawski. Bydgoszcz: Homini, 1997.
- Karfíková, Lenka. *Řehoř z Nyssy.* Praha: Oikoymenh, 1999.
- Komorovský, Ján. “Mircea Eliade a jeho Morfológia posvätna.” In Mircea Eliade, *Dejiny náboženských představ a ideí, vol. I.* Bratislava: Agora, 1995.
- Kuzánsky, Mikuláš. *O učenej nevedomosti.* Translated by Augustín Valentovič. Bratislava: Pravda, 1979.
- Léon-Dufour, Xavier. *Slovník biblickej teológie.* Translated by Emil Krapka, Vojtech Mikula, Ján Dieška, and Alojz Litva. Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2003.
- Maritain, Jacques. *Křesťanský humanismus.* Translated by Vojtěch Gaja. Praha: Universum, 1947.

- Oko, Dariusz. *Łaska i wolność*. Kraków: WAM, 1997.
- Pauer, Jozef. "Náboženstvo alebo zápas o obnovu strateného," *Hodina filozofie (Úvod do filozofie stredne pokročilých)*, edited by František Novosád et al. (eds.), 71–90. Bratislava: Ikar, 2004.
- Ratzinger, Joseph. *Úvod do křesťanství*. Řím: Křesťanská akademie, 1982.
- Rembierz, Marek. "Tropy transcendencji... Współczesne myślenie religijne wobec pluralizmu światopoglądowego i relacji międzykulturowych" *Świat i Słowo*, vol. 2, no. 23 (2014): 17–50.
- Sienkiewicz, Edward. *Koncepcja „rewolucji wspólnotowej” w polskiej teologii uczestnictwa*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2003.
- Stolárik, Stanislav. *Filozofia náboženstva*. Košice: RCMBF UK, 2005
- Tarnowski, Karol. *Wiara i myślenie*. Kraków: Znak, 1999.
- Tatranský, Tomáš. "Výzvy post-sekulární filosofie." *Teologické texty*, 1 (2008): 23–25.
- Vašek, Martin. *Kapitoly zo súčasnej filozofie náboženstva*. Bratislava: Iris, 2012.

Pavol Dancák

## La pensée chrétienne dans le contexte laïque

### Résumé

La renaissance de la pensée religieuse n'est pas une simple reproduction de ce qui précédait la sécularité. C'est plutôt le recours à une réflexion authentique sur les facteurs qui ont provoqué les mouvements laïques dans la société. Nous pouvons dire qu'il est venu le temps d'essayer encore une fois. Ainsi peut-on le traiter comme une sorte de chance, bien que cela se passe dans une situation très incertaine.

Mots clés : homme, Christianisme, laïcité, image de Dieu

Pavol Dancák

## Il pensiero cristiano nel contesto laico

### Sommario

La rinascita del pensiero religioso non è una semplice riproduzione di ciò che precedette il secolarismo. È piuttosto un richiamo ad una riflessione autentica su ciò che causò i movimenti laici nella società. Possiamo dire che è arrivato il momento di provare nuovamente. In tal modo possiamo trattare ciò come un'opportunità anche se in una situazione molto incerta.

Parole chiave: uomo, Cristianesimo, secolarismo, immagine di Dio