

KATOLÍCKA UNIVERZITA V RUŽOMBERKU
TEOLOGICKÁ FAKULTA KOŠICE



RODINA A FARNOSŤ
perspektívy novej evanjelizácie

Zborník z vedeckej konferencie s medzinárodnou účasťou
Košice, 20. september 2013



2014

Rodina a farnosť: perspektívy novej evanjelizácie

Zborník z konferencie s medzinárodnou účasťou,
20. september 2013, Hlavná 89, Košice.

© Teologická fakulta Košice

Editor

Mgr. Bc. Richard Kucharčík, M.A. PhD.

Recenzenti

ThDr. Štefan Novotný, PhD.

ThDr. Juraj Pigula, PhD.

ThDr. Lucia Pečovská, PhD.

© Michal Vaško – Vydavateľstvo, Prešov 2014

Vydanie prvé

Zborník je výstupom riešenia grantového projektu KEGA 043KU-4/2012
Komentovaná bibliografická online príručka náuky o rodine.

Zborník neprešiel odbornou jazykovou korekciou. Autori príspevkov v plnom rozsahu zodpovedajú za obsah svojich príspevkov, ich pôvodnosť, štylistiku, gramatiku, ako aj techniku a etiku citovania.

ISBN 978-80-7165-940-2

OBSAH

| | |
|---|----|
| ÚVOD..... | 5 |
| ZAČIATOK A KONIEC SKUTKOV APOŠTOLOV V DOME THE BEGINNING AND THE END OF THE ACTS IN THE HOUSE..... | 7 |
| <i>Juraj Feník</i> | |
| THE HOUSEHOLD OF GOD: THE FAMILY AND CHRISTIANIZATION IN THE EARLY CHURCH BOŽIA DOMÁCNOSŤ: RODINA A CHRISTIANIZÁCIA V PRVOTNEJ CIRKVI..... | 21 |
| <i>David Hunter</i> | |
| „IF YOU SEE CHARITY, YOU SEE THE TRINITY” – THE FAMILY AND THE WAY OF LOVE „AK VIDÍŠ LÁSKU, VIDÍŠ TROJICU” – RODINA A CESTA LÁSKY .. | 45 |
| <i>Stephan Kampowski</i> | |
| KÁNONICKO-PRÁVNE ASPEKTY NOVEJ EVANJELIZÁCIE CANONICAL AND JURIDICAL ASPECTS OF THE NEW EVANGELIZATION | 61 |
| <i>Miroslav Konštanc Adam, O.P.</i> | |
| ODBORNÉ PROFILY AUTOROV | 75 |

ÚVOD

*„Budúcnosť evanjelizácie závisí v značnej miere od domácej cirkvi.“
(FC 52)*

Slová „pápeža rodiny“, ktoré odzneli ešte v roku 1979 v Pueble, naberajú na váhe a aktuálnosti uprostred dvoch dôležitých okamihov života Cirkvi - po biskupskej synode o novej evanjelizácii, ktorá novú evanjelizáciu kladie na zodpovednosť práve rodinám a pred mimoriadnou biskupskou synodou o rodine, ktorej zámerom je uvažovať o nových pastoračných výzvach pre pastoraáciu rodín.

Uprostred týchto dvoch okamihov sa v rámci riešenia projektu KEGA 043KU-4/2012 uskutočnila i vedecká konferencia s medzinárodnou účasťou *Rodina a farnosť: perspektívy novej evanjelizácie*, ktorej cieľom bolo hľadať prieniky rodiny a farnosti v kontexte novej evanjelizácie. V tomto zborníku ponúkame príspevky, ktoré tieto prieniky reflektujú z biblického, patristického, antropologického, teologického, pastoračného i kánonického pohľadu, čo umožňuje komplexný pohľad pre uvažovanie nad miestom rodiny vo farnosti.

Pri tomto uvažovaní je zrejmé, že rodina nemôže zostať len pasívnym objektom pastoraácie, ale mala by sa stať dôležitým a aktívnym subjektom pastoraácie vo farnosti. Táto jej zodpovednosť a misia vyplýva zo sviatosti krstu a sviatosti manželstva.

Sviatosť kňazstva a sviatosť manželstva je v hierarchii sviatostí zaradená do spoločnej kategórie sviatostí služby spoločenstvu, obe sviatosti sú teda dvoma piliermi, na ktorých je treba stavať pastoračnú činnosť vo farnosti.

Predkladaný zborník je príležitosťou vytiahnuť z pokladnice múdrych hospodárov veci staré i nové (Porov. Mt 13, 52) a za krátky čas načerpať kúsok z toho, k čomu sa jednotliví hospodári dostávali pomalými a trpezlivými krokmi.

Editor

ZAČIATOK A KONIEC SKUTKOV APOŠTOLOV V DOME

THE BEGINNING AND THE END OF THE ACTS IN THE HOUSE

Juraj Feník

Abstrakt

Článok ponúka exegetickú štúdiu textov zmieňujúcich sa o dome v Skutkoch apoštolov s partikulárnym zameraním na začiatok a koniec rozprávania, v ktorých priestor domu figuruje prominentne. Poukazuje na ľahko prehliadnuteľný fakt, že prvé (Sk 1–2) a posledné epizódy (Sk 28:17-31) v tomto diele sú situované v dome, takže je evidentné, že Lukáš tak zámerne situuje opisované Božie konanie do domu. Záver článku ponúka aktualizačnú úvahu vo svetle vykonanej exegézy o funkcii domu v živote Cirkvi dnes.

Kľúčové slová: Skutky apoštolov. Božie konanie. Pavol. Dom.

Abstract

This exegetical essay investigates the texts in the Acts of the Apostles featuring houses. It highlights the oft-unnoticed fact that the narrative of the Acts begins (Acts 1–2) and ends (Acts 28) in a house. Such observation leads to the conclusion that Luke as the author of the Acts purposefully situates God's action described in these narratives in a house. The final part of the essay offers an exegetically based reflection on the function of the house in the Church nowadays.

Key words: Acts of the Apostles. God's activity. Paul. House.

ÚVOD

Čitateľ Lukášovho evanjelia spozoruje, že dej tohto spisu sa začína a končí v Jeruzalemskom chráme. Prvá perikopa (1:5-25) predstavuje starého kňaza Zachariáša ako vo svätyni chrámu vykonáva svoju

kňazskú službu, počas ktorej mu Gabriel zvestuje narodenie syna Jána. Lukáš výslovne spomína Zachariášov vstup do chrámu (1:9 εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κυρίου) a jeho omeškanie sa v chráme z dôvodu anjelovho zjavenia ako príčinu netrpezlivosti modliaceho sa zástupu (1:21 ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτόν). Posledná perikopa evanjelia (24:52-53) sa takisto odohráva v chráme. Ježišovo vyvedenie učeníkov k Betánii a vzatie do neba predchádza návratu učeníkov do Jeruzalema (24:52 ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ) a ich trvalému zostávaniu v chráme (24:53 καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντός ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ). Začiatku evanjelia v chráme korešponduje jeho koniec v chráme a tak lokalita chrámu tvorí makroinklúziu v rámci celého Lukášovho prvého spisu.

Podobnú literárnu procedúru môže čitateľ Nového zákona objaviť v druhom zväzku Lukášovho diela, v Skutkoch apoštolov. V prípade tohto spisu inklúziu vytvára priestor domu, ktorý jasne figuruje na začiatku a na konci Skutkov. Podľa správy Skutkov sa učenici po Ježišovom nanebovstúpení vracajú späť do Jeruzalema a po vstupe do mesta vystupujú do hornej miestnosti (1:13 εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον ἀνέβησαν), kde so ženami trávia čas v modlitbe (1:12-14). V tomto priestore potom dôjde k známej Turíčnej udalosti: Duch naplní dom, v ktorom je táto komunita zhromaždená (2:2 ἐπλήρωσεν ὄλον τὸν οἶκον). Dej Skutkov sa teda začína v dome v Jeruzaleme. Aj posledná scéna alebo v skutočnosti posledné scény tohto diela sú situované v dome. Po príchode do Ríma Pavol prebýva v prenajatom dome/byte, ktorý slúži ako základňa pre jeho hlásanie a výmeny so židmi (28:23 ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ξενίαν; 28:30 ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι). Čitateľ Lukášovho dvojdiela teda bez námahy postrehne ohraničenie každého z týchto dvoch zväzkov cez prostriedok inklúzie a uvedomí si, že tak ako sa evanjelium začína a končí v chráme, tak sa Skutki začínajú a končia v dome. Špecifikovanie konkrétneho priestoru, do ktorého je situovaný dej, môže byť tak vnímané ako špecifická črta začiatku a konca oboch Lukášových zväzkov.

Pri obrátení pohľadu špecificky na Skutki si čitateľ všimne frekvenciu, s akou sa Lukáš v tomto diele zmieňuje o dome a koľko udalostí tým pádom umiestňuje do domu. Samotný výskyt termínu je pomerne vysoký. Označenie domu maskulínom οἶκος sa vyskytuje v Skutkoch 25 krát a feminínom οἰκία 12 krát. Bez zámeru podať vyčerpávajúcu

štatistiku tématiky domu stačí zbežne pripomenúť niekoľko udalostí a postáv v Skutkoch, ktoré sú úzko späté s prostredím domu. Hlavná postava druhej časti Skutkov, Pavol, často vystupuje v priestore domu. Po stretnutí so vzkrieseným Kristom (Sk 9) je Pavol privedený do Damasku, kde prebýva v dome istého Júdu. Tam je k nemu poslaný učeník menom Ananiáš, ktorému Pán vo videní prikazuje ísť na ulicu zvanú Rovná a vyhľadať v dome Júdu modliaceho sa Šavla (9:11 ζήτησον ἐν οἰκίᾳ Ἰούδα Σαῦλον ὀνόματι Ταρσέα). Ananiáš poslúcha Pánov príkaz a vchádza do domu, v ktorom je Pavol hosťom (9:17 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν). V tomto dome sa potom odohrávajú ďalšie udalosti: Ananiáš vkladá na Pavla ruky a Pavol je pokrstený (9:17-18). Pavlov krst sa odohráva v dome v Damasku. Pri následnom opise Pavlových ciest Lukáš opäť predstavuje Pavla ako toho, ktorý operoval v domoch. Skutki ukazujú ako je Pavol hosťom v dome Lýdie vo Filipách (16:15), žalárnik v jeho dome v rovnakej lokalite (16:34), v dome Jasona v Solúne (17:5), v dome Títia Justa v Korinte (18:7), v dome v Troade (20:7-8), v dome Filipa v Cézarei (21:8), v dome Mnasona v Jeruzaleme (21:16). V súvislosti s Pavlovou činnosťou v domoch vyvstáva z textu Skutkov istá irónia, pretože Pavlova aktivita pred stretnutím s Kristom spočíva v prenasledovaní cirkvi po domoch a jeho aktivita počas misijných ciest vo vyučovaní po domoch. V 8:3 je Pavol predstavený ako zúrivý prenasledovateľ cirkvi, ktorý po Jeruzaleme vchádza do domov a násilím z nich vyťahuje mužov a ženy, ktorých vrhá do väzenia (ἐλνυμαίνετο τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους). Vo svojej rozlúčkovej reči v Miléte, na druhej strane, Pavol pred odchodom do Jeruzalema sumarizuje svoju činnosť ako vyučovanie na verejnosti a po domoch (20:20 διδάξει ὑμᾶς δημοσίᾳ καὶ κατ' οἴκους). Pavlovo hlásanie po domoch je evidentným protipólom jeho prenasledovania po domoch. Pavol má ďalej v Skutkoch kľúčovú funkciu pri obrátení celých domácností: Lýdie vo Filipách (16:14-15), žalárnik vo Filipách (16:30-34) a Krispa v Korinte (18:1-11). Spolu s obrátením domácnosti stotníka Kornélia v Cézarei (10:1-11:18), pri ktorom rozhodujúca úloha pripadá Petrovi, tvoria tieto rozprávania blok tzv. obrátení domácnosti a určite patria k dobre známym statiam Skutkov apoštolov.

Formulované síce iba štatisticky, predošlé riadky slúžia ako náčrt významu domu v Skutkoch, bez podania detailného predstavenia témy

domu. Táto téma nepatrí medzi tie, ktoré zostávajú bez povšimnutia a analýzy¹. Tento článok, pôvodne prednáška na Teologickej fakulte v Košiciach 20. septembra 2013 v rámci konferencie Rodina a farnosť: perspektívy novej evanjelizácie, sa nepokúsi ďalej kompaktne predstaviť celú problematiku domu, ale sústreďí sa na analýzu priestoru domu na začiatku a na konci Lukášovho druhého zväzku. Konkrétne, ako už bolo naznačené, ponúka exegeticko-teologickú analýzu textov zo začiatku a konca Skutkov, v ktorých hrá rolu dom a tak sa zameria na už spomenutú inklúziu vytvorenú práve cez tento priestor. Článok poukazuje na to, že dej Skutkov apoštolov sa začína a končí v dome a v závere ponúka krátku aktualizáciu úvahu o význame domu v Skutkoch a dnes.

1 DOM NA ZAČIATKU (Sk 1:13; 2:2)

Dom je jedna z prvých topografických zmienok v Skutkoch apoštolov. Na začiatku rozprávania podáva Lukáš sumár svojho prvého zväzku, ktorý opisoval Ježišovo konanie a učenie až do dňa nanebovzatia (1:1-2). Nasledujúca krátka perikopa (1:3-8) opisuje konverzáciu vzkrieseného Krista s apoštolmi a ďalšia jeho nanebovzatie v prítomnosti prizerajúcich sa učeníkov (1:9-11). Následná časť sa zmieňuje o návrate učeníkov do Jeruzalema a o ich prebývaní na modlitbách v hornej miestnosti (1:12-14). Keďže pre tieto perikopy je možné identifikovať paralely v závere

1 Porov. John H. Elliott, "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (ed. Jerome H. Neyrey; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991) 211-240; Roger W. Gehring, *House Church and Mission: The Importance of Household Structures in Early Christianity* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004) 62-225; David Lertis Matson, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts: Pattern and Interpretation* (JSNTSup123; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1994) 86-200; Jerome H. Neyrey, "Teaching You in Public and from House to House (Acts 20.20): Unpacking a Cultural Stereotype," *JSNT* 26 (2003) 69-102; Markus Öhler, "Das ganze Haus: Antike Alltagsreligiosität und die Apostelgeschichte," *ZNW* 102 (2011) 201-234.

Lukášovho evanjelia (Lk 24:13-53), De Jonge ich považuje za úvodnú sekciu Skutkov, s 1:15 predstavujúcim začiatok novej sekcie².

Bez špecifikovania lokality, v ktorej sa Ježiš učeníkom zjavoval, v rámci opisu Ježišových zjavení po vzkriesení Lukáš uvádza Ježišov príkaz nevzdalovať sa z Jeruzalema (1:4 ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι), ale tam očakávať prísľub Ducha. Po prijatí sily Ducha majú byť učeníci svedkami Ježiša po Judei a Samárii a až po koniec zeme, začínajúc v Jeruzaleme. Návrat učeníkov do Jeruzalema z Olivovej hory, ktorým sa začína perikopa obsahujúca zmienku o dome (1:12-14), predstavuje uposlúchnutie Ježišovho príkazu (1:4 ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι → 1:12 τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ). Text sa tak na začiatku sústreďuje na dva topografické, návzajom prepojené údaje: učeníci sa vrátili do Jeruzalema z Olivovej hory, ktorá je blízko Jeruzalema, vo vzdialenosti povolenej vykonať v sobotu. Tento spôsob uvádzania vzdialenosti sa u Lukáša používa aj v Lk 24:13 (dedina Emauzy vzdialená 60 stadií od Jeruzalema), pričom v oboch prípadoch chce evanjelista zdôrazniť blízkosť danej lokality k Jeruzalemu a tým centrálnosť Jeruzalema pre opisovaný dej³.

Po spomenutí návratu učeníkov z Olivovej hory do Jeruzalema, v 1:13a Lukáš špecifikuje miesto návratu ako hornú izbu, do ktorej vystúpili (εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶν ἀνέβησαν), a udáva zoznam osôb a ich aktivitu v tomto priestore (1:13b-14). Obraz prvej komunity, ktorý tu Lukáš kreslí, vyzerá ako spoločné modlitbové zhromaždenie jedenástich, žien, Ježišovej matky a jeho bratov v hornej izbe domu v Jeruzaleme. Lokalita tohto zhromaždenia je udaná termínom ὑπερῶν a na tomto mieste sa s veľkou pravdepodobnosťou odohrávajú aj nasledujúce perikopy Skutkov. S uvedeným termínom sa stretávame viackrát v Septuaginte. Kniha Daniel obsahuje zmienku o Danielovi modliacom sa v hornej izbe svojho domu (6:11 θυρίδας ἦνοιξεν ἐν τῷ ὑπερῶν αὐτοῦ κατέναντι Ἱερουσαλημ καὶ ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ τρίς τῆς ἡμέρας καθὼς ἐποίει ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ἔδειτο). Prvá kniha Kráľov hovorí

2 Henk Jan de Jonge, "The Chronology of the Ascension Stories in Luke and Acts," *NTS* 59 (2013) 151-171, tu 160.

3 Porov. Richard J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24* (AnBib 82; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978) 86.

o prorokovi Eliášovi bývajúcom v hornej izbe domu u vdovy a táto horná izba je priestorom, v ktorom Eliáš oživuje mŕtveho syna vdovy (1 Kr 17:19 ἀνήνεγκεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον ἐν ᾧ αὐτὸς ἐκάθητο; 17:23 καὶ κατήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπερώου εἰς τὸν οἶκον καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ). Druhá kniha Kráľov spomína proroka Elizea ako hosťa bývajúceho v hornej izbe u zámožného manželského páru v Suname (2 Kr 4:10 ποιήσωμεν δὴ αὐτῷ ὑπερῶον; 4:11 ἐξέκλινεν εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον καὶ ἐκοιμήθη ἐκεῖ). Pri pohľade do NZ, samotné Skutky obsahujú ďalšie miesta spomínajúce hornú izbu. Pri návšteve Jopy je Peter vyvedený do hornej izby (9:39 ὃν παραγενόμενον ἀνήγαγον εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον), do ktorej bola uložená zomrelá učenička Tabita (9:37 ἔθηκαν αὐτὴν ἐν ὑπερώῳ). Túto ženu potom Peter v hornej miestnosti privádza späť k životu (9:40). Horná izba je nakoniec priestorom v Troade, kde Pavol láme chlieb (20:8 ἐν τῷ ὑπερώῳ οὗ ἦμεν συνηγμένοι). Na viacerých miestach SZ a NZ sa stretávame s termínom ὑπερῶον, ktorý označuje izbu na poschodí alebo streche domu. Podľa názoru Gehringa, takáto izba bola najlepšie vybavenou a ventilovanou miestnosťou v dome, slúžiaca predovšetkým ako hosťovská izba pre relaxáciu a odpočinok, neskôr aj ako študovňa a modlitebňa⁴. Bez špecifikovania jej veľkosti, skúmaný text ďalej napovedá, že sa muselo jednať o pomerne veľkú miestnosť (porov. 1:15).

Použitím určitého člena τό, ktorý kvalifikuje ὑπερῶον, Lukáš prezrádza, že má na mysli konkrétnu a adresátom dobre známu hornú miestnosť v Jeruzaleme. Text implikuje, že čitateľ sa so zmienkou o tejto miestnosti už stretol. Ako reprezentant rozšírenejšieho názoru, Fitzmyer identifikuje túto miestnosť s hornou izbou, v ktorej Ježiš podľa Lukášovej správy slávil večeru pred svojou smrťou a premenil chlieb a víno na svoje telo a krv⁵. Aj keď sa v evanjeliu pre označenie tejto miestnosti používa odlišný termín ἀνάγειον (Lk 22:12) a “[t]he narrative therefore avoids making any obvious firstspace equation of these two locations,”⁶ identifikácia tejto izby s tou, do ktorej sa apoštoli

4 Gehring, *House Church and Mission*, 65.

5 Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998) 213.

6 Matthew Sleeman, *Geography and the Ascension Narrative in Acts* (SNTSMS 146; Cambridge: University Press, 2009) 83.

vrátili po nanebovzatí, “seems most natural,”⁷ ako uvádza Parsons. Podporou pre tento návrh môže byť aj adjektívum μέγα, ktorým Lukáš v evanjeliu upresňuje veľkosť hornej izby (22:12 ἀνάγειον μέγα ἑστρωμένον): išlo o veľkú miestnosť, čo je presne obraz, ktorý človek získava z čítania prvých perikop v Skutkoch. Po Ježišovom nanebovzatí sa učeníci teda vracajú do tej istej miestnosti, kde boli zhromaždení počas poslednej večere a tam sa venujú modlitbe v spoločenstve žien a Ježišovej matky. Po opise Ježišovho nanebovstúpenia (1:9-11) sa dej Skutkov začína v hornej miestnosti v Jeruzaleme (1:12-14), ktorá predstavovala jednu z posledných zastávok Ježišovho života pred smrťou. Vo vnútri tohto domu je zhromaždené jadro Ježišových nasledovníkov. Dalo by sa povedať, že Ježišova činnosť pred smrťou a vzkriesením sa končí poslednou večerou v dome a jeho činnosť po vzkriesení a vystúpení do neba sa začína zhromaždením učeníkov a vyliatím Ducha v rovnakej lokalite. Možno by bol obhájitelný aj návrh, ktorý by hovoril o kristologickom rozmere tohto domu: Kristus, ktorý tento dom použil pred smrťou, ho používa aj po nanebovzatí, keďže do tohto domu a ľudí v ňom vlieva svojho Ducha. Svoju aktivitu na konci evanjelia a na začiatku Skutkov sústreďuje Ježiš do domu: jeho telo z chleba vzniká v dome a v dome sa prejavuje jeho Duch, ktorého zosiela z neba.

Horeuvedené tvrdenie dokumentuje epizóda Turíc (2:1-13), ktorá situuje vstup Ducha do priestoru domu, v ktorom boli učeníci so ženami zhromaždení. Rozdelenie textu na dve časti prezrádza, že jeho prvá časť (2:1-4) sa odohráva v dome a druhá časť (2:5-13) v priestore pri dome na verejnosti v Jeruzaleme, pretože opisuje zhromaždenie zástupu pri mieste, na ktorom sa nachádzajú učeníci. V tejto lokalite potom Peter prednáša svoju Turíčnu reč (2:14-36), ktorou nechápavému zástupu vysvetľuje zmysel udalosti, ktorá sa práve odohrala. Začiatok perikopy (2:1) zdôrazňuje prítomnosť zhromaždenej skupiny učeníkov a žien na tom istom mieste (v dome) v deň Turíc. Príchod Ducha je opísaný ako zostúpenie hluku pripomínajúceho prúdenie silného vetra, ktorý naplnil celý dom, v ktorom malo zhromaždenie svoje miesto (2:2 ἦχος

7 Mikeal C. Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 21; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1987) 197.

ὡσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν ὄλον τὸν οἶκον οὗ ἦσαν καθήμενοι). Následné verše (2:3-4) potom opisujú objavenie sa ohnivých jazykov a naplnenie všetkých Duchom. Lukáš špecifikuje, že hluk naplnil celý dom, v ktorom boli učenici usadení a nič v perikope a jej kontexte nenaznačuje, že by malo ísť o odlišný dom od toho, do ktorého hornej izby učenici vystúpili v 1:13. Ako pozoruje Kremer, text vyjadruje myšlienku, že nielen horná miestnosť, ale celý dom bol naplnený hlukom, ktorý zostúpil z neba⁸.

Dom v Jeruzaleme ako miesto zhromaždenia a modlitby predstavuje predovšetkým priestor, do ktorého vstúpil Duch zostúpivší z neba. Petrova Turíčna reč slúži v tomto kontexte ako klarifikácia fenoménov, ktorým zástup zhromaždený pri dome nerozumie (2:5-13). Tým, ktorí si myslia, že apoštoli sú opití vínom (2:13), musí Peter vysvetliť, že sú v skutočnosti naplnení Duchom. V Petrovej reči je neskôr príchod Ducha prisúdený Ježišovi, ktorý po svojom zasadnutí po Otcovej pravici vylial Ducha na učeníkov, ako môžu svedkovia vidieť a počuť (2:33). Podľa Petrovej reči, Kristus bol ten, ktorý prijal Ducha od Otca po svojom povýšení po Otcovej pravici a následne ho vylial na učeníkov. Kristovo autorstvo udalosti Turíc ponúka možnosť vnímať dom ako priestor stretnutia medzi Kristom a učeníkmi. V predchádzajúcich scénach Skutkov sa dá pozorovať istá realita bipolárnej separácie Ježiša od učeníkov a učeníkov od Ježiša. Konkrétne, pri udalosti nanebovzatia došlo k oddeleniu Ježiša od učeníkov: po posledných inštrukciách bol Ježiš zdvihnutý (1:9 ἐπήρθη) a oblak ho vzal učeníkom pred oči. Lukáš v tomto kontexte viackrát zdôrazňuje Ježišovu cestu do neba (1:10-11 [2x sloveso πορεύομαι]). Element separácie je v texte silno prítomný. Následný text však opisuje aj vzdialenie sa učeníkov od Olivovej hory, od miesta Ježišovho nanebovstúpenia a tak nepriamo od Ježiša. Učenici sa vracajú do Jeruzalema (1:12). Dá sa teda hovoriť o dvojitej separácii. Táto je však následne v určitom zmysle prekonaná udalosťou Turíc, pretože Duch pochádzajúci od Ježiša (a z neba, kam bol Ježiš vzatý) je zoslaný do domu, kde prebývajú učenici. Dom ponúka priestor pre stretnutie medzi učeníkmi a Ježišom a jeho Duchom. V tomto dome

8 Jacob Kremer, *Pfingstbericht und Pfingstgeschehen: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Apg 2,1-13* (SBS 63/64; Stuttgart: KBW, 1973) 104.

sa začínajú vlastné udalosti, ktoré chce Lukáš opísať v svojom druhom zväzku. Dej Skutkov vychádza z domu. Vlastne sa Skutki začínajú hore v nebi, odkiaľ pochádza Ježišov Duch a dole v dome, kam tento Duch zostupuje.

2 DOM NA KONCI (Sk 28:23,30)

Posledné perikopy rozprávania Skutkov sa odohrávajú v Pavlovom prenajatom byte v Ríme, takže sa dej tématicky vracia do priestoru, v ktorom sa otvoril: do domu. Dve záverečné kapitoly Skutkov predstavujú, ako navrhuje Alexander, naratívny epilóg knihy, ktorý kulminuje Pavlovou prítomnosťou v Ríme⁹. Po rozhodnutí v Cézarei vypraviť Pavla do Ríma (27:1) predposledná kapitola Skutkov opisuje namáhavú plavbu Stredozemným morom, búrku a nakoniec stroskotanie na Malte. Po trojmesačnom neplánovanom pobyte na Malte (28:1-10) sa Pavol nakoniec dostáva do Ríma, čo Lukáš slávnostne oznamuje známou vetou καὶ οὕτως εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἦλθαμεν (28:14). Pavlov vstup do Ríma sa odohráva v sprievode bratov, ktorí mu z mesta vyšli v ústrety k Tres Tabernae a Appi Forum (28:15-16) a následnou scénou je povolenie pre Pavla rezidovať osamote s vojakom, ktorý ho strážil (28:16 ἐπετράπη τῷ Παύλῳ μένειν καθ' ἑαυτὸν σὺν τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ)¹⁰. V tomto bode však Lukáš ešte explicitne neuvádza priestor Pavlovho pobytu.

Posledné tri scény Skutkov sa skladajú z dvoch stretnutí Pavla so židmi (28:17-22 a 28:23-28) a záverečného zhrnutia Pavlovej aktivity v Ríme (28:30-31). Aj keď v prípade prvej scény Lukáš neudáva jasne Pavlovu lokalitu (28:17-22), následná scéna spomína byt alebo hosťovskú izbu ako priestor, do ktorého prišli židia za Pavlom po tom,

9 Loveday Alexander, “Reading Luke-Acts from Back to Front,” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: University Press, 1999) 419-446, tu 424.

10 Pre detailnú historickú, právnickú a exegetickú analýzu Pavlovej situácie domáceho väzenia v Ríme pozri Michael Labahn, “Paulus – ein *homo honestus et iustus*: Das lukanische Paulusportrait von Act 27–28 im Lichte ausgewählter antiker Parallelen,” in *Das Ende des Paulus: Historische, theologische und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte* (ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Horn; BZNW 106; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001) 75-106.

čo mu určili konkrétny deň na stretnutie (28:23 ἤλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ξενίαν). Takisto posledná scéna lokalizuje Pavlovu aktivitu do domu, konkrétne do prenajatého bytu (28:30 ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι). Na základe špecifikácie Pavlovej lokality v posledných dvoch scénach je možné usudzovať, že aj prvá scéna, opisujúca Pavlovo zvolanie židov po príchode do Ríma, sa odohráva v jeho byte. Pavlov byt je tak zo strany Lukáša zámerne zdôraznenou lokalitou pre Pavlovu činnosť v Ríme na konci Skutkov. Dej sa končí v Pavlovom “privatquartier”¹¹ v Ríme.

Lukáš v týchto textoch používa dva termíny pre opis Pavlovho bytu. Tým prvým je ξενία, termín pre hostovskú izbu, ktorý spomína aj Pavol vo Flm 22 pri ohlásení svojej návštevy u Filemona. Druhým termínom je μίσθωμα, prenajatý priestor/byt. Cadbury poukazuje na nezvyčajnosť použitia týchto termínov pre označenie bývania¹². Zvláštnosť termínov si všíma aj Mealand, avšak na báze pozornej štúdie termínu μίσθωμα navrhuje, že termín môže znamenať prenájom za byt¹³ a tak by bol Pavol vykreslený ako skutočne prebývajúcí v prenajatom byte v Ríme počas dvoch rokov¹⁴. Pre ciele tohto príspevku je podstatné vyzdvihnúť obsah a význam posledných scén v Skutkoch odohrávajúcich sa v Pavlovom byte. Prvá scéna (28:17-22) prebieha tri dni po Pavlovom príchode do Ríma. Pavol ako väzeň nezačína svoju činnosť na novom mieste hlásaním v synagóge ako bolo doteraz jeho zvykom, ale, “fait unique et étonant,”¹⁵ zvoláva popredných židov k sebe do svojho rímskeho bytu. V predchádzajúcich epizódach Skutkov to bol Pavol, ktorý po príchode do mesta vyhľadal synagógu a v nej presviedčal židov o mesiášovi, na

-
- 11 Gerhard Schneider, *Apostelgeschichte. Zweiter Teil: Einleitung, Kommentar zu Kap. 9,1–28,31* (HThKNT; Freiburg: Herder, 1982) 408.
 - 12 Henry J. Cadbury, “Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts. III: Luke’s Interest in Lodging,” *JBL* 45 (1926) 305-325, tu 319-322.
 - 13 David L. Mealand, “The Close of Acts and its Hellenistic Vocabulary,” *NTS* 36 (1990) 583-597, tu 584-587.
 - 14 Pozri ďalej Hermann J. Hauser, *Strukturen der Abschlusserzählung der Apostelgeschichte (Apg 28,16-31)* (AnBib 86; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979) 153-157.
 - 15 Albert Vanhoye, “Les Juifs selon les Actes des Apôtres et les Épîtres du Nouveau Testament,” *Bib* 72 (1991) 70-89, tu 76.

konci Skutkov sú to židia, ktorí prichádzajú k Pavlovi do bytu na základe jeho autoritatívneho повелу (28:17 συγκαλέω). Pavlova reč k židom (28:17b-20) má charakter osobnej apológie s koncentráciou na Pavlovu konformitu so židovským spôsobom života a jeho loyálnosť voči židovskému národu, čo podčiarkuje použitie zámen a sloviess v prvej osobe singularu v týchto veršoch. Pavlov byt v Ríme je teda priestorom, v ktorom sa posledný krát Pavol obraňuje pred židmi. Odpoveď židov potvrdzuje Pavlovu nevinnosť (28:21) a vyjadruje túžbu počuť od neho viac o kresťanskej sekte, ktorá všade naráža na odpor (28:22). Táto požiadavka vedie k ďalšiemu stretnutiu medzi Pavlom a židmi, opäť v jeho byte, v deň stanovený židmi.

Druhá scéna (28:23-28) opisuje príchod ešte väčšieho počtu židov k Pavlovi do bytu (28:23a) a Pavlovo ohlasovanie Božieho kráľovstva a presvedčanie o Ježišovi od skorého rána do večera (28:23b). Pavlova reč vedie k rozštiepeniu poslucháčov (28:24-25 οἱ μὲν ἐπέθοντο/οἱ δὲ ἠπίσταν) a Pavlovmu ohodnoteniu postoja odmietnutia citáciou známeho textu z Izaiáša (28:26-27). Posledná časť jeho výpovede slávnostne oznamuje, že spása je definitívne poslaná pohanom, ktorí budú počúvať (28:28). V tejto scéne tak "wird das letzte Mal in der Erzählung das Muster der Verkündigungstätigkeit der paulinischen Mission aufgerufen: Paulus geht zuerst zu den Judaioid, erfährt dort geteilte Resonanz und wendet sich dann den Ethnae zu."¹⁶ V Pavlovom byte v Ríme sa teda odohráva Pavlovo posledné ohlasovanie špecificky židom a z jeho bytu zaznieva ponuka spásy pre pohanov.

Aj tretia scéna tejto sekcie a zároveň vrcholná scéna celej knihy je situovaná do Pavlovho bytu (28:30-31)¹⁷. Verše majú charakter zhrnutia Pavlovej činnosti v Ríme. Zároveň, ako píše Marguerat, "[t]he summary has a biographical goal to close the activity of the hero of

16 Ute E. Eisen, *Die Poetik der Apostelgeschichte: Eine narratologische Studie* (NTOA 58; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006) 204.

17 Nedá sa vylúčiť, že zmenou slovníka (28:23 ξενία → 28:30 μίσθωμα) naráža Pavol na zmenu scenérie. Záverečný sumár by už nepredstavoval Pavla ako väzňa, ale ako slobodného hlásateľa, ktorý vo vlastnom prenajatom dome neobmedzene hlása všetkým, ktorí k nemu prichádzajú. Pre zámer tohto príspevku je dôležité vyzdvihnúť, že sa naďalej a špecificky jedná o priestor domu.

Acts.”¹⁸ Pavol zostáva počas dvoch rokov vo vlastnom prenajatom byte a prijíma všetkých, ktorí k nemu prichádzajú (ἀπεδέχτο πάντας τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους πρὸς αὐτόν). Skupina prichádzajúcich označená ako πάντας pravdepodobne zahŕňa židov aj pohanov a vyjadruje univerzálnosť Pavlovho hlásania. Pavlov byt je priestorom, do ktorého môže vstúpiť ktokoľvek; byt nezostáva pre nikoho uzavretý. Obsah Pavlovej činnosti spočíva v hlásaní Božieho kráľovstva a vyučovaní o Ježišovi Kristovi. Posledné slová knihy vyjadrujú modalitu Pavlovho vyučovania: s úplnou otvorenosťou (μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας) a bez obštrukcií (ἀκωλύτως). Význam tejto perikopy sumarizuje Prieur nasledovne: “Trotz der Gefangenschaft des Paulus und viele Widerstände schreitet die Verkündigung des Evangeliums voran und kann nicht gehindert werden. Das ist der Ton, den der Auctor ad Theophilum mit ἀκωλύτως, dem letzten Wort der Apostelgeschichte, anstimmt.”¹⁹ Pavlov byt v Ríme na konci knihy poskytuje priestor, do ktorého nemá nikto zamedzený prístup a v ktorom má svoje miesto Pavlovo ničím neobmedzené hlásanie a vyučovanie, najprv adresované židom, potom všetkým. Naratívny oblúk Skutkov vytvorený cez zmienky o dome tak zhrňa Eisen nasledovne: “So nehmen nach der Erhöhung des Auferstandenen und der Rückkehr der JüngerInnen nach Jerusalem von einem Obergemach die weiteren Ereignisse ihren Ausgang und sie enden in einer Mietwohnung in Rom (Act 28,30).”²⁰

3 PRIESTOR DOMU V SKUTKOCH A DNES

Rozprávanie Skutkov vykazuje zámernú cirkularitu umiestnením prvých a posledných epizód do priestoru domu, okrem ďalších početných scén vo vnútri príbehu takisto situovaných v dome. Tak na začiatku ako aj na konci je dom v určitom zmysle centrom diania.

18 Daniel Marguerat, “The Enigma of the Silent Closing of Acts (28:16-31),” in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke’s Narrative Claim upon Israel’s Prophecy* (ed. David P. Moessner; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999) 284-304, tu 302.

19 Alexander Prieur, *Die Verkündigung der Gottesherrschaft: Exegetische Studien zum lukanischen Verständnis von βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* (WUNT 2/89; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) 82.

20 Eisen, *Die Poetik*, 158.

Do domu sa vracajú učenci z Olivovej hory po Ježišovom vystúpení do neba a do tohto domu je z neba zoslaný Ježišov Duch. Do domu zvoláva Pavol popredných židov v Ríme a do neho prijíma všetkých, ktorí chcú k nemu prísť počuť jeho hlásanie o Božom kráľovstve a o Ježišovi. Postavy na začiatku a konci Skutkov sú tak doslova vtiahnuté do domu. Tým pádom sa dom stáva miestom zhromaždenia, a následne aj modlitby, vyučovania, ohlasovania, presvedčania, dialógu, prijatia. Povedané trochu zospiritualizovaným jazykom, dom je priestor, v ktorom uprostred ľudí a cez ľudí koná Boh. Dom predstavuje Božie prijatie ľudských podmienok a materiálnosti a tak sa dá vnímať ako obraz inkarnácie: ľudský príbytok sa mení na Boží príbytok. V známej Štefanovej obrannej reči v Jeruzaleme (Sk 7) tento diakon v ostrej kritike na chrám síce židom hádže pred oči, že Najvyšší nebýva v domoch zhotovených ľudskou rukou (7:48 οὐχ ὁ ὑψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ), zvyšok Skutkov, a najmä ich úvod a záver v dome, však demonštruje, že predsa len Najvyšší prebýva aj v domoch zhotovených ľudskou rukou. Najvyššieho povýšený Syn zoslal svojho Ducha na zhromaždených v dome a spása pochádzajúca od Najvyššieho bola Pavlom ponúkaná všetkým prichádzajúcim do jeho bytu v Ríme. Všeobecne povedané, ako to formuluje pero dogmatika, “Boh si vybral svet ako priestor spásy.”²¹ Konkretizáciou tohto Božieho rozhodnutia podľa konceptuálnej a naratívnej stratégie Skutkov je Božie prebývanie v špecifických domoch.

Popri neupierateľnom a potrebnom význame kostola ako miesta verejného liturgického zhromaždenia Cirkvi, dom stále predstavoval vhodné miesto pre zhromažďovanie kresťanov na malej škále. Skúsenosti kresťanov v štátoch, v ktorých Cirkev bola a je prenasledovaná (Čína, štáty komunistického bloku na európskej pôde), potvrdzujú úplnú nevyhnutnosť malého privátneho priestoru pre stretnutie veriacich. Zhromažďovanie Cirkvi po domoch nebolo ničím nezvyčajným a bez využívania domov by v niektorých periódach bola Cirkev priam nefunkčná. Priestor domu poskytoval dostatočnú ochranu a uzavretosť pred potencionálnym nebezpečenstvom zvonka. Podporoval ducha

21 Vladimír Juhás, “Johann Baptist Metz a konkrétna dejinnosť spásy,” *Verba Theologica* 1 (2012) 75-85, tu 75.

solidarity a spoločenskej rovnosti medzi zhromaždenými. Cirkev často vo svojej histórii prežívala v domoch a zaiste sa nepomýlime, ak navrhujeme, že Skutki poskytujú dostatok textových dát pre hľadanie koreňov tohto fenoménu aj v tomto texte.

Poukazujúc na viaceré riziká, ktoré v sebe skrýva priestor domu pre fungovanie Cirkvi na rôznych stupňoch, Gehring napriek tomu vníma, že model domu by nemal “be overlooked today as a viable option for church growth.”²² Vo svete ovládanom masmédiami, ktoré podporujú viac izoláciu ako medziludské spojenie, môže priestor domu poskytnúť dostatok tepla a prijatia aj pre kresťanské spoločenstvo schádzajúce sa za účelom modlitby, čítania Písma, zdieľania. Dom a funkčná rodina operujúca v ňom môže byť vitálnym priestorom pre rozvíjanie rodinnej, v dome sústredenej spirituality, a tak hlavným uzlom pre odovzdávanie viery ďalšej generácii. Pastieri Cirkvi oprávnené zdôrazňujú účasť na nedeľných bohoslužbách vo verejných liturgických priestoroch Cirkvi, ale rovnako intenzívne povzbudenie by mohlo byť adresované k rozvíjaniu domácej, cez-týždňovej spirituality. Ako na začiatku Skutkov sú modlitby v dome doprevádzané prítomnosťou Ducha. Ako Pavol v Ríme, kresťanskí rodičia môžu v dome hlásať Božie kráľovstvo a učiť o Ježišovi Kristovi všetky ich deti prichádzajúce na tento svet a do ich domu. Dom má byť aj dnes miestom kresťanského kultu, lebo v ňom naďalej prebýva Najvyšší a tí, ktorí v neho uverili. A takíto ľudia spolu s celou svojou domácnosťou, ako píše Öhler, “bilden so die Grundstruktur eines dauerhaften Christentums.”²³

ÚDAJE O AUTOROVI

Juraj Feník, S.T.D.

Katolícka univerzita v Ružomberku

Teologická fakulta Košice

Katedra systematickej teológie

Hlavná 89, 041 21 Košice

e-mail: juraj.fenik@ku.sk

22 Gehring, *House Church and Mission*, 309.

23 Öhler, “Das ganze Haus,” 232.

THE HOUSEHOLD OF GOD: THE FAMILY AND CHRISTIANIZATION IN THE EARLY CHURCH

BOŽIA DOMÁCNOSŤ: RODINA A CHRISTIANIZÁCIA V PRVOTNEJ CIRKVI

David Hunter

Abstrakt

V tejto eseji sa zaoberám troma rôznymi súbormi textov z troch rôznych období ranej histórie Cirkvi. Každý z nich je zvláštnym spôsobom prepojený s rodinným životom. Jedná sa o deutero-Pavlovské listy a pastorálne epištoly, spisy Klementa z Alexandrie a spisy Jána Zlatoústeho. Všetky tri súbory textov reagujú na extrémny asketizmus – potvrdzujúc, na jednej strane, tradičné štruktúry spoločnosti, ktorými sú napr. grécko-rímske domácnosti, a, na strane druhej, ponúkajú nový pohľad na tie isté štruktúry vo svetle evanjeliových hodnôt. Všetci traja autori predstavili možnú transformáciu alebo „christianizáciu“ tradičnej domácnosti, a teda aj „christianizáciu“ spoločnosti založenej na domácnosti. Preto sa v prvej časti tohto článku v krátkosti zaoberám úlohou domácnosti v rímskej spoločnosti a skúmam niektoré z rôznych postojov, ktoré k nej zaujala kresťanská literatúra z konca prvého a zo začiatku druhého storočia. Potom sa v druhej a v tretej časti obraciam na Klementa a Jána Zlatoústeho, ktorí s osobitnou jasnosťou rozčlenili/ usporiadali ciele a hodnoty kresťanskej domácnosti a urobili tak v priamej závislosti od neskorších Pavlových spisov.

Kľúčové slová: Grécko-rímska domácnosť. Christianizácia. Prvotná cirkev. Klement Alexandrijský. Ján Zlatoústý.

Abstract

In this essay I discuss three distinct sets of texts from three different moments in early church history, each concerned in a special way with family life. These are the deutero-Pauline and Pastoral Epistles, the writings of Clement of Alexandria and the writings of John Chrysostom. All three sets of texts react against extreme asceticism, on the one hand, by affirming the traditional structures of society, such as the Greco-Roman household, and, on the other hand, by re-conceiving these structures in the light of Gospel values. All of these writers envisioned the possible transformation or “Christianization” of the traditional household, and, thereby, the “Christianization” of the society based upon the household. Therefore, in the first of this article, I briefly discuss the role of the household in Roman society and examine some of the different attitudes we find toward it in the Christian literature of the late first and early second centuries. Then, in the second and third parts, I turn to Clement and John Chrysostom who articulated with particular clarity the goals and values of the Christian household and did so in direct dependence on the later Pauline writings.

Key words: Greco-Roman household. Christianization. The Early Church. Clement of Alexandria. John Chrysostom.

1 INTRODUCTION

This lecture begins with a paradox¹. An honest look at the earliest Christian literature reveals disparate, even contradictory, views on family and household life. Some sayings of Jesus preserved in the Synoptic gospels suggest that the spread of the Christian message might entail profound divisions within families. For example: “I have come to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and one’s foes will

1 After its delivery at the INTAMS conference in Leuven, Candida Moss and Meghan Henning generously read and offered comments on this lecture. It has benefitted much from their contributions.

be members of one's own household" (Mt 10,35-36)². Similarly, the apostle Paul showed little interest in fostering the structures of family life or marriage. Because he expected the imminent second coming of Jesus, Paul thought it best that everyone should remain in the state in which they received the faith (1 Cor 7,26-28); the additional responsibilities of marriage and family life were seen as a source of anxiety and distraction from "the affairs of the Lord" (1 Cor 7,32-34). In later centuries, even after eschatological expectations had ebbed, texts such as these supported ascetical ideals and practices and gave short shrift to marriage, family, and household³.

But there is another side to the story. From the very beginning the spread of the gospel required not only itinerant preachers, but also married householders to provide them with lodging and material support⁴. Paul himself, although he was no enthusiast for marriage, encouraged Christians to remain married to non-Christians and even hoped that such a union might lead to the conversion of the unbeliever (1 Cor 7,12-16); he also cited Jesus' prohibition of divorce and remarriage, as did all three of the Synoptic gospels⁵. Moreover, Paul explicitly mentioned the Christian communities that met and worshipped in the homes of Prisca and Aquila, as well as the household of Stephanas (1 Cor 16,15), "the people of Chloe" (1 Cor 1,11), and the church that met in the household of Philemon. By the early years of the second century the author of First Timothy could speak of the church

2 See also Mt 10,37-38 with parallels in Lk 14,26 and Mk 10,29. See also *Gospel of Thomas*, logia 55 and 101. The Lukan variant of this verse even urges Jesus' disciples to "hate" (*misei*) their families.

3 See, e.g., the discussion in ELIZABETH A. CLARK, *Antifamilial Tendencies in Ancient Christianity*, in *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5 (1995) 356-380. On the impact of 1 Cor 7 on development of Christian asceticism, see D.G. HUNTER, *The Reception and Interpretation of Paul in Late Antiquity: 1 Corinthians 7 and the Ascetic Debates*, in L. DI TOMMASO AND L. TURESCU (eds.), *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity*, Leiden and Boston, E.J. Brill of Leiden, 2008, pp. 163-191.

4 See especially the work of GERD THEISSEN, *Social Reality and the Early Christians*, tr. M. KOHL, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress Press, 1992.

5 1 Cor 7,10-11, apparently alluding to the sayings preserved in Mk 10,2-9.

as the “household of God” (3,15) and characterize the ideal Christian leader (the *episkopos* or “overseer”) as the man who had managed his own household well and raised his children properly (3,4-5). Clearly, the household could not be dispensed with so easily.

These contrasting perspectives on family and household will provide the framework of my talk today. I will discuss three distinct sets of texts from three different moments in early church history, each concerned in a special way with family life. These are the deutero-Pauline and Pastoral Epistles from the late first or early second century; the writings of Clement of Alexandria from the late second century; and the writings of John Chrysostom from the late fourth century. In each instance the author in question was reacting against certain forms of ascetic extremism, although the precise character of the ascetic parties varied in each case. As we will see, all three sets of texts react against extreme asceticism, on the one hand, by affirming the traditional structures of society, such as the Greco-Roman household, and, on the other hand, by re-conceiving these structures in the light of Gospel values. All of these writers envisioned the possible transformation or “Christianization” of the traditional household, and, thereby, the “Christianization” of the society based upon the household. The household played such a critical role in this process, at least partly because of the special place it occupied in the religious and political imagination of Greco-Romans. Therefore, in the first part of this essay, I will briefly discuss the role of the household in Roman society and examine some of the different attitudes we find toward it in the Christian literature of the late first and early second centuries. Then, in the second and third parts, I will turn to Clement and John Chrysostom who articulated with particular clarity the goals and values of the Christian household and did so in direct dependence on the later Pauline writings.

2 THE ROMAN HOUSEHOLD AND THE CHRISTIAN HOUSEHOLD

First, then, the *domus*. The Roman household lay at a unique juncture between two social and cultural worlds in antiquity. On the one hand, it was the locus of all private activity; it was the realm of women, children, and slaves, in contrast to the forum or city, which

was the proper arena for the activity of the freeborn male citizen. On the other hand, the household was an intrinsic part of the broader religious and political economy of the ancient world, and it was the male head of the household who was the connecting link between these two domains. In theory at least, the *paterfamilias* was the undisputed master or *dominus*, whose word was law and whose “fatherly power” (*patria potestas*) extended even to matters of life and death. Moreover, the life of the household itself was viewed as a fundamental building block of society, the foundation of a well-ordered city, state, and cosmos⁶. Pagans and Christians alike acknowledged the essentially political character of the household and the human bond of marriage that was its necessary precondition. Cicero, for example, succinctly stated the common conception in his treatise *On Duties* when he wrote: “The origin of society is in the joining (*coniugium*) of man and woman, next in children, then in the household (*domus*), all things held in common; this is the foundation of the city and, so to speak, the seed-bed of the state” (*seminarium rei publicae*)⁷.

In addition to this political dimension, the household also had specifically religious features. Commenting on this aspect of domestic piety, John Barclay has observed⁸:

Roman households...honoured the hearth (*Vesta*) and the *Penates*, the deities who watched over the store-house and

6 The reverse was also the case: a disordered household was viewed as a danger to civic order and a tear in the social fabric. Hence Christians, such as the author of 1 Tim 3,4-7, endorsed the role of Christian leaders who managed their children and households well and were well regarded by outsiders.

7 *De officiis* 1.17.54, cited in CAROL HARRISON, *The Silent Majority: The Family in Patristic Thought*, in STEPHEN C. BARTON (ed.), *The Family in Theological Perspective*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1996, 87-105, p. 89, n. 3. Augustine stated similar sentiments in the opening pages of *De bono coniugali* 1.1.

8 JOHN M.G. BARCLAY, *The Family as the Bearer of Religion in Judaism and Early Christianity*, in HALVOR MOXNES (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, London and New York, Routledge, 1997, 66-80, p. 67.

guaranteed the food supply. In addition, they worshipped gods of the household known as the *Lares* (probably deified spirits of dead ancestors), who were often represented by small statues or paintings.... Roman habit often associated these gods with the figure of Fortuna and the Genius of the family—specifically the Genius of the *paterfamilias*—so that the domestic cult was intimately linked with the honour and prosperity of the head of the household.

Given this strong identification of the Roman household with the religious and political life of the empire, it is not surprising that some early Christians articulated their distinctive identity by repudiating that crucial bearer of religious and political identity: the *paterfamilias* and the household he represented⁹.

We see this anti-familial response most vividly in the second and third-century Apocryphal Acts, whose heroines, such as the virgin Thecla or the matron Mygdonia, expressed their Christian faith precisely by rejecting husbands, marriage, and household. We see it in heroes, such as the apostle Judas Thomas, who persuaded young couples to renounce sex on their wedding night. Commenting on the spirituality behind these sexual and cultural renunciations in the Apocryphal Acts, Peter Brown has written: “Married intercourse was treated as the linchpin of the towering structure of the ‘present age.’ To break the spell of the bed was to break the spell of the world. This was a world whose social structures stood condemned”¹⁰. It would be easy

9 In some early Christian texts the disciple of Jesus is called upon to abandon the family in order to acquire a new one in the Christian community and in the kingdom of God. See, e.g., Mk 10,29-30: “Jesus said, ‘Truly I tell you, there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields, for my sake and for the sake of the good news, who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age—houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields with persecutions—and in the age to come eternal life.’” I thank Candida Moss for reminding me of this text and its notion of an alternative family.

10 PETER BROWN, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1988, p. 98.

to dismiss such stories simply as pious legends, promoted by ascetic extremists (which, to a great extent, they were), but that would be to overlook the widespread popularity of Thecla's cult and the Thomas legend both in the East and in the West throughout late antiquity¹¹. The figure of Thecla, for example, was constantly cited as a model of the virgin's renunciation in ascetical texts from the early church. These stories of radical renunciation continued to inspire (and to entertain) Christians who seemed to enjoy the spectacle of humbled patriarchs spurned by their wives and fiancées¹². One suspects that it was precisely this inversion of power relationships that accounts for the popularity of the Apocryphal scriptures then as now. Most Christians, however, seem to have inclined to more moderate views. If the Pastoral Epistles and the Deutero-Pauline epistles in the New Testament are representative of an emerging consensus in the opening years of the second century, then it appears that marriage and household life had come to be seen as a potential bearer of Christian values¹³. This is especially the case with the so-called "household codes" found in Colossians and Ephesians, as well as in 1 Peter and several of the Apostolic Fathers¹⁴. These texts are famous (or infamous) for their explicit affirmation of the hierarchical

-
- 11 See the excellent study of STEPHEN J. DAVIS, *The Cult of Saint Thecla: A Tradition of Women's Piety in Late Antiquity*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2001.
- 12 The diary of the pilgrim Egeria (22-23) speaks of her visit to the shrine of St. Thecla in Isauria, where the *Acts of Thecla* were read in their entirety in a liturgical context. I am grateful to Meghan Henning for this reference.
- 13 In the case of the Pastoral Epistles the vision of the church as the "household of God" (1 Tim 3,15) may have been directed specifically against the kind of household subversion encouraged by the Apocryphal Acts. See DENNIS McDONALD, *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon*, Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1983, who suggests that stories about Thecla may lie behind the polemics of the Pastoral Epistles. This theory has recently been endorsed by DAVIS, *The Cult of Saint Thecla*, pp. 8-18.
- 14 Col 3,18-4,1; Eph 5,21-33; 1 Pet 2,18-3,12; 1 Tim 2,8-15; 6,1-10; Titus 2,1-10; *1 Clem.* 3.21.6-8; Ignatius, *Pol.* 4.1-5.3; Polycarp, *Phil.* 4.1-3. Space does not permit a full examination of all these household codes. I have focused only on a representative sample of them.

relations embedded in the Roman (and now Christian) household. Based on ancient traditions regarding “household management” (*oikonomia*), these tables of ethical guidelines fully endorse the position of the *paterfamilias* as *dominus* or master of his wife, children, and slaves. One sees this very clearly in the code of Colossians 3,18–4,1:

Wives, be subject to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and do not be harsh with them. Children, obey your parents in everything, for this pleases the Lord. Fathers, do not provoke your children, lest they become discouraged. Slaves, obey in everything those who are your earthly masters, not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord.... Masters, treat your slaves justly and fairly, knowing that you also have a Master in heaven (RSV).

One could hardly find a clearer statement of the Christian appropriation of the structures of the Roman household, even the inherently brutal institution of slavery¹⁵.

Nevertheless, even within the Colossians code, I would argue, there is a subtle critique and realignment of familial relationships. Mutual responsibilities are outlined: wives are told to submit, but husbands are told to love; children are told to obey, but fathers are told not to provoke; slaves are told to obey and serve, but masters are told to treat their slaves justly. While one might question the extent to which Christianity actually altered domestic institutions such as slavery, the example of Paul’s admonition to Philemon may give reason for optimism. Even though a runaway slave could be punished with torture, mutilation, or death, Paul sent Onesimus back to his Christian master with the admonition that Philemon should accept his slave, “no longer as a slave but more than a slave, a beloved brother...both in the flesh and in the Lord” (Phlm 1,16). Unless Paul’s confidence

15 On the matter of slavery, however, one should note that 1 Pet 2,18-21 goes further than Colossians or Ephesians by urging slaves to endure suffering at the hands of unjust masters and thereby to follow the model set by Christ.

in Philemon was tragically misplaced, the case of Onesimus suggests that Christian convictions sometimes did force a reconsideration of traditional domestic relationships.

My argument, however, does not depend on an immediate and wholesale transformation of Roman society, something that it would be unrealistic to expect. My point is simply that by the late first or early second century, some Christians began to see the household as a place that could be permeated with a spirit of love and forgiveness, that is, as a place that could be “Christianized”¹⁶. This perspective is especially clear in the Letter to the Ephesians, which seems to be dependent on Colossians, but which presents significant developments beyond that text. Here the husband-wife relationship is re-configured both in terms of the marriage between Christ and the Church and in terms of the relationship between head and body:

Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ. Wives, be subject to your husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior. As the church is subject to Christ, so let wives also be subject in everything to their husbands. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her, that he might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such

16 It is significant, for example, that just a few lines before the household code in Colossians we find the following words: “Put on then, as God’s chosen ones, holy and beloved, compassion, kindness, lowliness, meekness, and patience, forbearing one another and, if one has a complaint against another, forgiving each other, as the Lord has forgiven you. And above all these put on love, which binds everything together in perfect harmony” (Col 3,12-14). The author of Colossians seems to have envisioned domestic relationships within the Christian household as a primary context within which to exercise these specifically Christian virtues. In other words, the household was deemed capable of genuine Christianization.

thing, that she might be holy and without blemish (Eph 5,21-27; RSV).

In Ephesians we see a critical development beyond Colossians: here the male head of the household, specifically in his role as husband, is likened to Christ as husband and head of the Church. On the one hand, of course, it is possible to see this identification as deeply problematic. It grants a kind of sacred legitimacy to male authority by the analogy with Christ: the authority of the heavenly Lord thereby underwrites that of the earthly lord. But from another perspective one can read the Ephesians code as both a critique and a subversion of a household structure based on coercive power. The Lord who is presented as the model husband is the one who loved and gave himself up for the Church. The model of the “Christian patriarch,” therefore, is one who has attained his position precisely by repudiating earthly power and emptying himself. In Ephesians, I would argue, we see a dialectical movement involved in the Christianization of the household: on the one hand, there is an appropriation of the dominant cultural models of family; on the other hand, we see a significant revision or critique of these models of domestic relationships.

This interpenetration of church and household was so profound that by the early years of the second century, as I noted above, the author of the Pastoral Epistles could speak of the church as the “household of God” and characterize the ideal Christian leaders as men who had married, raised children, and succeeded in the time-honored task of household management. The author of these letters—almost certainly not the apostle Paul—expected similar exemplary conduct of women who managed households, especially widows. Older women were expected to “train the young women to love their husbands and children, to be sensible, chaste, devoted to the home, kind, and submissive to their husbands, that the word of God may not be discredited” (Titus 2,4-5). Women who wished to be formally enrolled as widows in the Church had to demonstrate their worthiness by means of their domestic duties: “She must be well attested for her good works, as one who has brought up children, shown hospitality, washed the saints’ feet, helped the afflicted, and devoted herself to doing good in every way” (1 Tim 5,10). In the context of discussing the support to be given to

widows, First Timothy even declares: “If any one does not provide for his relatives, and especially for his own family, he has disowned the faith and is worse than an unbeliever” (5,8). All of this is a far cry from the “hatred” of family enjoined in some of the gospel texts¹⁷.

From the point of view of the history of the Christian household it is significant not only that these texts were preserved and transmitted, but also that they were eventually accepted into the New Testament canon as writings composed by the apostle Paul. The process of canonization, then, which was well underway by the late second century, contributed to the Christianization of the household by presenting the Pastoral and deutero-Pauline writings as the proper lens through which to view the more radical Paul. In other words, the acceptance of these later writings represented a judgment by the church that a particular interpretation of Paul (namely the pro-familial one I have described) was to be normative for the orthodox church. The encratite Paul of the apocryphal acts was tacitly displaced by a more domesticated version of the apostle. As a result, in subsequent centuries letters such as Colossians, Ephesians, and First Timothy were to serve as a guide for Christian thinkers who had a special concern for familial matters and some reservations about ascetical piety.

I would like now to look more closely at two Christian writers who developed their understandings of the Christian household in direct dependence upon the New Testament household codes and the Pastoral Epistles: Clement of Alexandria and John Chrysostom. Clement was a lay teacher in late second-century Alexandria who addressed himself to a complex urban audience with competing interests and values. On the one hand, he was dealing with educated, cultivated city-dwellers (both pagan and Christian), to whom he wished to demonstrate that the Christian life was compatible with that of an urbane Alexandrian citizen. On the other hand, he was faced with radical Gnostic, Marcionite, and Encratite teachers, who thoroughly repudiated the possibility of a truly Christian marriage and household. To both audiences he argued that

17 Cf. BARCLAY, *Family as Bearer of Religion*, p. 77: “We have traveled a long way here from when Jesus’ disciples left the dead to bury their own dead!”

the life of a married householder could be infused with authentically Christian virtue. Clement thus did more than anyone else in the pre-Constantinian Church to portray the Christian household as “the household of God,” that is, as a community within which commonly accepted social roles and social structures were both assumed and revised in the light of Christian convictions¹⁸.

3 CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA AND THE CHRISTIAN HOUSEHOLD

It seems that the household and its potential for Christianization were never far from Clement’s mind. His treatise, *Paidagogos*, portrayed Christ, the divine Logos, in the thoroughly domestic role of the *paidagogos*, the tutor or guardian (usually a trustworthy slave) charged with the duty of supervising the life and morals of boys belonging to the upper classes¹⁹. In the opening pages of the work, Clement even described the saving action of the Logos as one of *oikonomia*, a word that conjured up both the notion of “household management” and the “dispensation” or “economy” of salvation²⁰. This book dealt with a wide range of moral issues, almost all of them situated in the domestic setting: how to conduct oneself at dinner parties, how to engage in sex with one’s wife in a discrete and self-controlled manner, whether men should practice depilation or the removal of their bodily hair (Clement’s answer to the last question was “no”). As Blake Leyerle has observed (borrowing the language of Pierre Bourdieu), Clement’s aim was to

18 For a more extended discussion of the origins of “Encratism” (both as a tradition of Christian thought and an anti-heretical label) and Clement’s response to it, see D.G. HUNTER, *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovinianist Controversy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007, 101-113.

19 On the social role of the *paidagogos*, see NORMAN H. YOUNG, *PAIDAGOGOS: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor*, in *Novum Testamentum* 9 (1987) 150-76; *The Figure of the Paidagōgos in Art and Literature*, in *The Biblical Archaeologist* 53 (1990) 80-86.

20 *Paed.* 1.3.3; text in H.-I. Marrou and M. Harl (eds.), *Clément d’Alexandria: Le Pédagogue* (Sources Chrétiennes 70), Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1960, p. 112.

“extort what is essential while seeming to demand the insignificant”²¹. In the household under the tutelage of Christ, no behavior could be seen as random or ill considered; all must be *kata logon*, “in accord with reason.” It is also worth noting that in Clement’s vision of divine pedagogy all members of the household—including the adults—remain children under the guidance of the Logos.

A somewhat different agenda is present in Clement’s “Miscellanies” (*Stromateis*), especially the third book, which is devoted to a defense of marriage and household against the assault of radicals, such as Marcion and Tatian. Clement spent a good portion of this treatise responding to interpretations of the sayings of Jesus and Paul that Tatian and others had taken in a radically ascetical direction. Noting that both Jesus (in Mt 19,4-6) and Paul (in Eph 5,31) had cited Genesis 2,4 (“Therefore a man leaves his mother and father and is joined to his wife, and the two become one flesh”), Clement argued that Encratites were wrong to hold that marriage belonged only to the time before the coming of Christ²²:

How then can marriage be a state only intended for ancient times and an invention of the law, and marriage on Christian principles of a different nature, if we hold that the Old and the New Testaments proclaim the same God? “For what God has joined together no one may ever put asunder” for any good reason; if the Father commanded this, so much the more also will the Son keep it. If the author of the law and the gospel is the same, he never contradicts himself.

For Clement, the integrity of the Christian household was an essential aspect of his argument against radical ascetics who despaired of any “Christianization” of sex, marriage, or family. As Clement saw it,

-
- 21 BLAKE LEYERLE, *Clement of Alexandria on the Importance of Table Etiquette*, in *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3 (1995) 123-141, p. 140, citing PIERRE BOURDIEU, *The Logic of Practice*, tr. RICHARD NICE, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 1990, p. 69.
- 22 *Str.* 3.12.83 (GCS 52/2, 234; ed. O. STÄHLIN and L. FRÜCHTEL); tr. HENRY CHADWICK and J.E.L. OULTON, *Alexandrian Christianity: Selected Translations of Clement and Origen* (Library of Christian Classics), London, SCM Press, 1954, p. 79, slightly altered.

it must be possible for members of the Christian household to embody the highest Christian virtues; if not, then the radicals have won.

We see this argument most explicitly in Clement's extensive use of the Pastoral Epistles, which he found most helpful in responding to the radicals' appeal to 1 Corinthians 7. Clement had a particular interest in 1 Timothy 3, where the author indicated that household management was the ideal preparation for ministry in the church. It is noteworthy that Clement characterized the work of the married householder in the language of "public service" (*leitourgia*) and "ministry" (*diakonia*). This suggests that he viewed marriage and household management not simply as a preparation *for* ministry, but as an essential type *of* ministry²³:

Both celibacy and marriage have their own different forms of service and ministry to the Lord; I have in mind the caring for one's wife and children. For it seems that the particular characteristic of the married state is that it gives the man who desires a perfect marriage an opportunity to take responsibility for everything in the home which he shares with his wife. The apostle says that one should appoint bishops who by their oversight over their own house have learned to be in charge of the whole church. Let each man therefore fulfill his ministry by the work in which he was called, that he may be free in Christ and receive the proper reward of his ministry.

For Clement, the practice of *oikonomia* was a form of ecclesiastical ministry, a reflection and an extension of God's own providential activity into the world.

In another section of the *Stromateis*, where he described the characteristics of the true Christian sage or "Gnostic", Clement could even claim that the married householder was superior to the celibate, if he remained inseparable from the love of God in the midst of his active concern for the household. Although his personal salvation may be less secure, Clement argued, in his commitment to the household he

23 Str. 3.12.79 (GCS 52/2, 231-232; ed. O. STÄHLIN and L. FRÜCHTEL); tr. CHADWICK and OULTON, *Alexandrian Christianity*, 76-77.

“actually preserves a faint image of the true Providence”²⁴. Clement’s view derives partly from his conviction that even the act of procreation is “cooperation with the work of creation” and a participation in the divine image, a point that Clement also made in the *Paedagogos*²⁵. But it also comes from his sense that the household can be a genuine locus of the divine presence. For example, Clement could interpret Mt 18,20 (“Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them”) as referring to the husband, wife, and child. “Through his Son,” Clement wrote, “God is present with those who are soberly married and have children. And in the same manner the same God is also with the man who exercises continence in accord with reason”²⁶. For Clement, the Christian family is itself a church in miniature, capable of embodying and reflecting the divine presence in the world.

Before moving on to my final author, John Chrysostom, I would like to point to one further writing of Clement that deserves attention for its teaching on the Christian household, “Who is the Rich Man Who Can be Saved?” (*Quis dives salvetur*). This little work, which is something like a lengthy sermon, is well known as the first Christian writing to discuss in a comprehensive way the problem of the possession of wealth. Taking as his starting point the story in Mark’s Gospel of the rich young man whom Jesus sent away sorrowful because he had great possessions (10,17-31), Clement offered the view (which eventually became standard in Christian tradition) that the rich man’s problem was his excessive attachment to wealth. Borrowing Stoic terminology he argued that possessions are “a matter of indifference” (*adiaphora*); the ethically relevant factor is not the external wealth, but the internal passions that keep one attached to them. The most important feature of Clement’s argument, however, was not his full embrace of the household

24 Str. 7.12.70: τῷ δὲ αἰοικῶ τὰ πολλὰ εἶναι συμβέβηκεν ἀπειράστω. μόνου γοῦν ἑαυτοῦ κηδόμενος ἡττάται πρὸς τοῦ ἀπολειπομένου μὲν κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίαν, περιττεύοντος δὲ ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸν βίον οἰκονομία, εἰκόνα ἀτεχνῶς σφύζοντος ὀλίγην τῆς τῇ ἀληθείᾳ προνοίας; tr. CHADWICK and OULTON, *Alexandrian Christianity*, p. 138.

25 *Paed.* 2.20.83 (SC 108, 164).

26 Str. 3.10.68; tr. CHADWICK and OULTON, *Alexandrian Christianity*, p. 71, slightly altered.

or his use of philosophical concepts to justify this, but rather the extent to which specifically Christian considerations shape his discussion of the problem²⁷.

For example, Clement saw the possession of material goods as necessary in order to carry out many of the precepts of Jesus, such as feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and welcoming the homeless. Wealth is justified, but only for the purpose of sharing (*koinonia*)²⁸. Citing some of the harsh sayings of Jesus regarding “hatred” of family, Clement argues that they mean Christians should not let relatives become an obstacle to the faith; after all, if Christians are required to love their enemies, they must certainly love their nearest of kin²⁹. For Clement, the guiding principle in the Christian use of household goods was the two-fold command of love of God and love of neighbor, and this love has been dramatically displayed, he argued, in the Gospel parable of the Good Samaritan³⁰.

Clement’s insistence on love as the motivating power behind the Christian use of wealth was so strong that it led him actually to reconceive the divine nature in terms of a familial image, but a decidedly non-patriarchal one in which the mutual love of father, mother, and child expressed the divine gift that inspires human giving³¹:

Behold the mysteries of love, and then you will have a vision of the bosom of the Father, whom the only-begotten God alone declared. God in God’s very self is love, and for love’s sake He became visible to us. And while the unspeakable

27 Cf. ERIC OSBORN, *Ethical Patterns in Early Christian Thought*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1976, p. 73: “Stoic self-sufficiency and freedom is modified by Clement so that it is no longer acceptance of the inevitable but is creative discipleship ... Christian freedom looks to the future of God’s kingdom and differs as sharply from Gnostic libertinism as it does from Stoic indifference”.

28 Q. *div.* 13.

29 Q. *div.* 22.

30 Q. *div.* 28.

31 Q. *div.* 37; tr. G.W. BUTTERWORTH, *Clement of Alexandria* (Loeb Classical Library) Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1960, p. 347, slightly altered.

part of Him is Father, the part that has sympathy with us is Mother. By His loving the Father became of woman's nature, a great proof of which is [the Son] whom He begat from Himself; and the fruit that is born of love is love. This is why the Son Himself came to earth, this is why He put on human nature, this is why He willingly endured the human condition, so that, having been measured to the weakness of us whom He loved, He might in return measure us to His own power.... On behalf of each of us He laid down the life that is equal in value to the whole world. In return He demands this sacrifice from us on behalf of one another.

Clement's point goes well beyond the immediate question of whether Christians should make use of possessions. He suggested that the Christian understanding of God, and specifically the Christian belief in how God was manifested in Jesus, has fundamentally changed the terms in which one answers the question. Marriage, children, household, family, possessions—all have their place in Clement's deeply incarnational theology, but their use has been radically re-defined in terms of the absolute gift of love that Clement sees in the Incarnation. These human realities are fully embraced, but profoundly re-evaluated; they can no longer be absolute values, but they are to serve as instruments for the expression of divine love.

4 JOHN CHRYSOSTOM AND THE CHRISTIAN HOUSEHOLD

Clement's emphasis on the possibility of a genuinely Christianized family life was echoed two centuries later by Saint John Chrysostom. Like Clement, John was deeply concerned about the lives of Christians in the city. Also like Clement, John explicitly affirmed the value of household management as a preparation for ministry in the Church, directly following the teaching of the Pastoral Epistles. For example, in one of his homilies on First Timothy (3:5), he wrote:

Even pagans acknowledge that the man who has ruled his household is well prepared to govern the city. For the Church is, as it were, a large household, and just as in a household there are children, a wife, and servants, and the

man exercises rule over them, so too in the Church there are children, wives, and servants. And if the man who presides over the Church has partners in his rule, so too the man has a partner in his wife³².

But times had changed, and John Chrysostom at Antioch faced a rather different problem than Clement had encountered in Alexandria. For Clement, as we have seen, the primary problem was the radical ascetics, and he had to argue that traditional marriage and family life could be construed as authentically Christian. John Chrysostom, by contrast, lived after the Constantinian and Theodosian revolutions, at a time when Christians were increasingly assimilated to secular culture. The task of “Christianization” involved not so much demonstrating the compatibility of Christianity and society, but rather demanding that Christians live a distinctively Christian way of life in a society that was nominally Christian but still largely pagan or secular in its values and moral orientation. What Clement and John shared, however, was the conviction that the household could be transformed and made the setting for an authentically Christian life.

For John Chrysostom such a perspective did not come easily or all at once. In his earliest writings he showed himself partial to the monastic life, which by the end of the fourth century had come to be seen by many as the ideal form of the Christian life. John, of course, had spent several years living an ascetical life in the hills near Antioch (372-378), eventually returning to the city and to life in the clergy only after he had damaged his health by excessive fasting³³. Sometime during this monastic period, or perhaps shortly after returning to the city, John wrote a three-book treatise, “Against the Opponents of the Monastic

32 Hom. 10 on 1 Tim 3:5 (PG 62: 549): Τοῦτο καὶ οἱ ἔξωθέν φασι, ὅτι ὁ οἰκονομικός καὶ πολιτικός ἂν γένοιτο ταχέως. Καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἡ Ἐκκλησία, ὡσαυτὴ μικρὰ οἰκία· καὶ ὡσπερ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰσι παιδία, γυνή, οἰκέται, καὶ πάντων ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀνήρηται τὴν ἀρχήν· οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐδὲν ἄλλο, ἢ τοῦτο ἐστὶ, παιδία, γυναῖκες, οἰκέται. Εἰ δὲ κοινωνοὺς ἔχει τῆς ἀρχῆς ὁ τῆς Ἐκκλησίαςπροεστῶς, ἀλλ’ ἔχει κάκεῖ ὁ ἀνὴρ κοινωνὸν τὴν γυναῖκα.

33 Palladius, *Dialogue on the Life of John Chrysostom* 5.

Life³⁴.” In this early work, which contains books addressed separately to pagan and to Christian parents, John claimed that a large and prosperous city like Antioch was no place to raise a child, at least not if one wanted to produce a *Christian* child. The false values imbibed from the surrounding culture, especially the love of money and lust for status, put the young person’s soul in jeopardy. Sadly, John complained, the parents themselves inculcate all the wrong values by preferring that their sons acquire a classical education and pursue profitable careers instead of attending to their moral formation. The only real solution, John argued, was to take the young men out of the city and entrust them to monks in the nearby hills. After a period of moral formation, removed from the temptations and distraction of urban life—ten or twenty years would not be too long, John suggests—the youth could return to the city with their virtue solidly established and ready to take up their positions as active Christian citizens³⁵.

It is difficult to know what to make of this odd proposal for monastic schools, or even whether Chrysostom himself expected to be taken seriously. The work appears to be a highly rhetorical apology for the ascetical life and it would have been recognized as such by his rhetorically trained audience³⁶. Moreover, as I have argued elsewhere, John may have been responding to contemporary pagans, such as the late emperor Julian and the sophist Libanius, who had been touting the moral benefits of Hellenic culture. John’s response would have been that it is Christianity—especially in its scriptures, and in the example of its holy men and women—that provides the resources needed for a Christian moral formation. For the purposes of my lecture today, however, the most significant feature of the book, “Against the Opponents of the Monastic Life,” is that John soon abandoned this

34 For a discussion of the date, see J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom: Clerics between Desert and Empire*, 138-139, 141-142, who argues for the monastic period. But see my discussion in *A Comparison between a King and a Monk/Against the Opponents of the Monastic Life: Two Treatises by John Chrysostom*, where I suggest a date after his return to the city in 378.

35 *Oppugn.* 3.18.

36 See the comments of Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom*, 147.

proposal for monastic education. Within a few years (most likely while still a presbyter in Antioch)³⁷, he wrote the little treatise, “On Vain Glory and the Right Way for Parents to Bring Up Their Children.” This book is the first and, as far as I know, the only patristic treatise devoted exclusively to the topic of childrearing. As such, it is especially germane to our discussion of the “Christianization” of the family, as Chrysostom envisioned it.

First, it is highly significant that in the later treatise, “On Vain Glory,” John explicitly repudiates his earlier stance on monastic education. Referring back to the earlier treatise, John writes:

Raise up an athlete for Christ! I do not mean by this, hold him back from marriage and send him to desert regions and prepare him to assume the monastic life. It is not this that I mean. I wish for this and used to pray that all might embrace it; but as it seems to be too heavy a burden, I do not insist upon it. Raise up an athlete for Christ and teach him though he is living in the world to be reverent from his earliest youth³⁸.

John’s new perspective is significant because he has explicitly tempered his earlier enthusiasm for monasticism, at least for the monastic life as a locus of moral education. In his new discussion he no longer insists on flight from the city, but he explicitly acknowledges that it is possible to achieve the highest degree of virtue within the city. But the most important new development is his argument that Christian parents should play the primary role in shaping the lives of their children in a specifically Christian manner. The task of “Christianization” belongs first in the household, not in the monastery.

It is possible that John’s shift of focus away from the monastery and toward the Christian family and city might reflect some deeper reservations about the role of the monastic life within the church. Although he continued throughout his life to present monks as models

37 For a discussion of the date of *De inani gloria*, see Anne-Marie Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome: Sur le vaine gloire et l’éducation des enfants* (SC 188; Paris: Cerf, 1972), 41-47, who places it at the end of 393 or the beginning of 394.

38 *De inani gloria* 19 (SC 128, 102-104).

of virtue, he also occasionally criticized them for failing to engage sufficiently in the life of the Christian community. For example, in another work written shortly after his own return to the city, the two books *On Compunction*, addressed to the monks Demetrius and Stelechius, John faulted certain monks for showing excessive concern for their own personal solitude and for refusing to accept a role of leadership in the church (again, the word is *oikonomia*)³⁹. Somewhat later, in his treatise *On the Priesthood*, John even compared the monk unfavorably to the bishop whose life was dedicated to the service of the community:

We need not, then, give lavish or excessive admiration to the monk because, by keeping himself to himself, he avoids agitation and does not commit many serious sins; for he has nothing to goad and excite his soul. But if a man has devoted himself to the whole community and has been forced to endure the sins of all, and still remains firm and unwavering...he is the one who deserves everyone's applause and admiration, for he has given proof enough of his prowess⁴⁰.

John's turn to the Christian family or household as the primary locus of moral formation seems to have been part of this broader shift away from extraordinary expressions of Christian piety, as evident in the monastic life especially in the Syrian context, towards a more ecclesially-centered spirituality, firmly rooted in the city and in the urban households that comprised it. This shift in John's attention, of course, mirrored his own personal transition from monastic life to an active ministry in the church at Antioch, first as deacon and then as presbyter.

But there is another factor that I think has to be given equal consideration in this matter. From his earliest to his latest writings, John was deeply sensitive to the perceptions of Christian behavior

39 *De compunctione* 1.6 (PG 47: 403-404).

40 *De sacerdotio* 6.5; translated by G. Neville, *St. John Chrysostom: Six Books of the Priesthood* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984), 144.

in the eyes of pagan critics. He frequently complains, especially in sermons, that Christians fail to live in ways that show any distinctively Christian values and that Christian moral failings cause even pagans to question the value of the Christian religion. A particularly poignant presentation of this argument is found near the end of the twenty-sixth homily on Romans, where John describes an imaginary interchange between a pagan and a Christian. The pagan says to the Christian: “How do I know that God’s commands are possible? You were born and raised in this wonderful religion, and you don’t do anything of the sort.” John interjects and says to the Christian: “I know exactly what you will say; you will say, ‘I know other people who do so, the monks who live in the desert.’” Then John continues: “Aren’t you ashamed to confess that you are a Christian, but then to point to other people because you can’t show any Christian conduct yourself?” At this point the pagan chimes in again: “Why should I have to go to the mountains and search out the deserts? If it’s not possible for someone who is living in the middle of cities to live the philosophical life, then this is a sad commentary on this way of life, if we have to leave the cities and flee to the desert. But show me a man who has a wife and children and a house and who lives the philosophical life.” John then takes up argument again reminding the Christian that Jesus said, “Let your light shine before human beings,” not before mountains and deserts and out-of-the-way places. John insists he’s not criticizing those who have fled to the desert, but rather rebuking those Christians in the city who have failed to live a virtuous life.

John’s point is clear. If Christianity is a true religion, its beliefs must be capable of shaping persons who live lives of notable virtue. It is not enough for faithful Christianity to be practiced only by an elite few. There is certainly a place, in John’s thinking, for outstanding exemplars, such as the monks. But if Christianity cannot produce persons of extraordinary character in the ordinary circumstances of life, he would argue, then it has failed in one of its chief purposes. Such a perspective helps to explain John’s turn to the Christian household, and particularly to the moral responsibilities of Christian parents, in his treatise “On Vain Glory.” The shift from monastery to household as the locus of moral education signaled John’s

recognition that the work of “Christianization” had to begin at the source, namely with the primary relationships that formed the child. Only when deeply rooted in the household could the Christian faith then extend into the city and begin the “Christianization” of society.

5 CONCLUSION

A brief word of conclusion. In this lecture I have tried to describe the way in which some early Christians adopted the traditional structures of the Roman household and yet reconceived their roles within that household. From the time of Jesus to that of John Chrysostom, we see an increasing cultural assimilation, if you will, but also increasing reflection on the limits of that assimilation. There were a number of reasons for this development. Christians usually met in family homes, a fact which surely must have encouraged them both to assume the value of the traditional household and to think about it in Christian terms. The ascetic critique of family life surely led more moderate Christians, such as the author of the Pastoral Epistles and Clement, to look for ways in which the household could become a genuine locus of Christian life. John Chrysostom likewise, though in a different context, sought to make the Christian family a vital source of Christianization.

I would suggest that there may have been something deeper going on in the simultaneous Christian assimilation and critique that I have described, something deeper, that is, than merely a response to social conditions. As a religion born of the conviction that God had become human in the person of Jesus Christ, the Christian faith had an implicit commitment to redeeming all that was human, all that was “worldly”. The household was the place where much of human life was lived: the place where people were born and died, where they ate and drank and slept and made love; it was the place where the basic social relationships were modeled and internalized. The impulses we have seen in the letters to the Colossians, Ephesians, and Timothy, and in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and John Chrysostom—the impulse to realign hierarchical relationships, the impulse to re-imagine domination as forgiveness, service, and self-emptying, and to re-describe household duties in terms of Christian charity—these are the impulses that animated the Christian embrace of the Roman family. The early

Christian household was the place where the most mundane of human relationships could be transfigured by the love of God made present in Christ. The writers I have considered here, each in his own way, sought to make the household—like the Church itself—a “household of God,” that is, an extension of the Incarnation into the world.

ÚDAJE O AUTOROVI

David G. Hunter, BA, M.A. PhD.
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506, U.S.A
david.hunter@uky.edu

„IF YOU SEE CHARITY, YOU SEE THE TRINITY” – THE FAMILY AND THE WAY OF LOVE

„AK VIDÍŠ LÁSKU, VIDÍŠ TROJICU” – RODINA A CESTA LÁSKY

Stephan Kampowski

Abstrakt

Príspevok poukazuje na rodinu, ktorá je sama o sebe dobrou novinou, „Evanjeliom“, zviditeľňujúcou Božiu lásku vo svete. „Cesta lásky“ je ponúknutá ako „dôkaz“ existencie Boha, ktorý je oveľa presvedčivejší než akékoľvek abstraktné logické argumentácie, a ktorý je preto pri hlásaní evanjelia najdôležitejší. Je ale rodina naozaj dobrou novinou? Miestom, kde sa žije láska? Niet pochýb o existencii rôznych foriem rodinného egoizmu, domáceho násillia a útlaku vo vnútri rodinných vzťahov a štruktúr. A keď nám Cirkev predkladá rodinu ako dobrú novinu, nemá pred týmito faktami zatvorené oči. Cirkev neobhajaie ani jednoduchý návrat k tomu, čo nazývame „tradičná rodina“, lebo táto nie je ničím iným než buržoáznou rodinou. Naopak. Evanjelium rodinu volá k obnove a premene mocou Ducha Svätého, vyzýva ju, aby sa stala miestom, kde sluby, odpustenie a plodnosť, ktoré korešpondujú s najhlbšími túžbami ľudského srdca, nepominú. Napokon – príspevok odkazuje na štatistické zistenia, ktoré naznačujú, že rodinný život má tendenciu robiť ľudí nábožnejšími, čo potvrdzuje pôvodnú hypotézu, prvý krát vyjadrenú svätým Augustínom a znova zdôraznenú Benediktom XVI. v encyklike Deus Caritas Est, že totiž: „Ak vidíš lásku, vidíš Trojicu.“

Kľúčové slová: Rodina. Láska. Nová evanjelizácia. Odpustenie. Plodnosť. „Navždy“. Dôkazy Božej existencie.

Abstract

The article argues that the family is itself a good news that makes God's love visible in the world. The “way of love” is proposed

as a “proof” for the existence of God that is much more convincing than any abstract logical argumentation and that is hence the highroad for the proclamation of the Gospel. But is the family truly a good news, a place where love is encountered? No doubt there are forms of family egoism, domestic violence, and oppressive power structures. When the Church proposes the family as a good news, she does not close her eyes to these facts. She does not advocate a simple return to what is called “the traditional family”, which is nothing other than the bourgeois family. Rather, the Gospel calls the family to be renewed and transformed by the power of the Holy Spirit so as to become the place of lasting promises, forgiveness, and fruitfulness, corresponding to the deepest desires of the human heart. Finally, reference is made to statistical findings that suggest that family life tends to make people more religious, confirming the initial hypothesis first expressed by Saint Augustine and recalled by Benedict XVI in *Deus Caritas Est*: “If you see charity, you see the Trinity.”

Key words: Family. Love. New evangelization. Forgiveness. Fruitfulness. “The forever“. Proofs for God’s existence.

1 THE TRADITIONAL PROOFS OF GOD’S EXISTENCE AND THE WAY OF LOVE

Does God exist? In confrontation with this question, St. Thomas formulated his famous Five Ways, starting from our experience of the material world and concluding to a Being that is the first mover, the first cause, the necessary ground, the highest perfection and the ultimate end of all contingent being.¹ These so-called cosmological proofs are extremely convincing, and nonetheless over the centuries people have known to resist their logical appeal. In 1941 the Austrian mathematician Kurt Gödel elaborated a proof for God’s existence very similar in nature to that already proposed by St. Anselm of Canterbury in the 11th century, which begins with the idea of a perfect being, to whose perfections it must belong to exist.² Gödel’s version of this

1 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I, 2, 3.

2 Cf. Kurt Gödel, “Ontological Proof,” in *Collected Works: Unpublished Essays & Lectures, Volume III*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1995,

so-called ontological argument has been declared logically valid by contemporary scientists.³ Still, few people have become believers on account of it. The fact is that, although Christianity contains doctrines and ideas, it is not primarily a doctrine. As Benedict XVI says in his encyclical letter *Deus Caritas Est*, the Christian faith is about the encounter with an event: with the person of Christ.⁴ Here, the question of course is how this event is communicated. It is our contention in this essay that the privileged “argument,” for God’s existence – an existential argument that *communicates* the encounter with the person of Jesus Christ – is “the way of love”, i.e., the testimony of human beings united in love and the experience of being loved, affirmed, and wanted for one’s own sake.⁵ We will argue that this testimony is given and that this experience is made in a very privileged way in and through the family.

2 THE FAMILY IN SACRED SCRIPTURE

But was Jesus not critical of the family? Wasn’t his the rather harsh message meant for those who would prefer their family to him: “He who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me” (*Mt* 10:37)? When Jesus’ own mother and his relatives were looking for him, they had to hear him ask, “Who is my mother, and who are my

pp. 403–404; Anselm of Canterbury, *Proslogium*, chapter 2, in: *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson, The Arthur J. Banning Press, Minneapolis 2000, pp. 93-94.

- 3 Cf. Christoph Benzmüller and Bruno Woltzenlogel Paleo, “Formalization, Mechanization and Automation of Gödel’s Proof of God’s Existence,” submission to arXiv e-print service of Cornell University: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1308.4526v4.pdf> (last visit: December 14, 2013).
- 4 Benedict XVI, Encyclical Letter *Deus Caritas Est*, 25 December 2005, n. 1: “Being Christian is not the result of an ethical choice or a lofty idea, but the encounter with an event, a person, which gives life a new horizon and a decisive direction.”
- 5 For a profound discussion of the varied aspects of “the way of love” in the context of an extensive commentary on Benedict XVI’s encyclical *Deus Caritas Est*, cf. Livio Melina and Carl Anderson, *The Way of Love. Reflections on Pope Benedict XVI’s Encyclical, Deus Caritas Est*, Ignatius Press, San Francisco 2006.

brothers?” (*Mt* 12:48). The answer is: those who do the will of God. We can be sure that Mary qualifies as Jesus’ mother also under the new definition her son gave to the term, and yet one may still wonder whether Our Lord is not depreciating the ties of natural human kinship here. Elsewhere Jesus announces how the Gospel will not bring peace and reconciliation but rather division into families, to the point that “a man’s foes will be those of his own household” (*Mt* 10:36). Jesus calls his disciples to leave everything behind, including their families.

At the same time, it is important to note that among his disciples family relations continued to play an important role. Among the apostles there were two pairs of brothers: Simon Peter and Andrew; John and James, the sons of Zebedee. It was Andrew who led Simon to Jesus (*Jn* 1:42), so that without his brother, Simon would never have become the Rock of Peter. And while it is true that on receiving Jesus’ call to follow him, John and James immediately left behind their father and their fishing business (*Mt* 4:21-22), it is also true that they took their mother with them, a woman who was to become one of Jesus’ most faithful disciples, staying close to him even at the hour of his crucifixion (cf. *Mt* 27:56). When the *Acts of the Apostles* relate how people came to believe and be baptized, we repeatedly find the formula “with all his/her household” (cf. *Acts* 11:14; 16:15; 16:34; 18:8). In *Acts* and in the letters of St. Paul we learn about the evangelizing couple Priscilla and Aquila and “the Church in their house” (*1 Cor* 16:19). Hence we see that from the times of Jesus and the apostles, family relationships played an important role for the followers of Christ.

Apart from reflecting on the above mentioned passages, we need to take note of something that is so fundamental and obvious that at times we are tempted to overlook it. The family’s central importance in Scripture can be seen from the fact that it provides the fundamental analogies for God’s relation to his people and for the relations in God himself. Thus, Jesus calls God “Father” (*Jn* 17:5) and himself the Son of God (*Jn* 11:4). He teaches his disciples, too, to call God “Father,” which would constitute them brothers and sisters. Paul speaks about the Church as “the household of God” (*1 Tim* 3:15; *Eph* 2:19) – the Greek word *oikos* meaning precisely “house” or “family.” In *Ephesians* 5 the spousal relation between a man and a woman becomes the analogy

for the relation between Christ and his Church (*Eph* 5:32), Christ being the “Bridegroom” and the Church being the “Bride.”

3 THE MODERN HOSTILITY TO THE FAMILY

The family is thus central for the Gospel message. What meaning could there be to the proclamation of God as Our Father, of Jesus as the Son of God, and of us as God’s adopted sons and daughters if people were no longer born and raised in the bosom of a family? They would not possess the fundamental experiences at the heart of the Christian faith: paternity, filiation, and fraternity, and thus this faith would become simply unintelligible to them. Therefore, if we want to spread the Gospel, it is important to understand the meaning of and the reasons for the ideological attack to which the family has been exposed for past two-hundred years or so.

In his 1884 *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Friedrich Engels describes the family a bourgeois institution for the systematic subjugation of women.⁶ In 1848, together with Karl Marx he predicts the family’s soon demise, given that its only purpose is the accumulation and protection of capital, a function superfluous under

6 Cf. Friedrich Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Penguin Classics, New York 2010, pp. 95-96 (chapter II, section 4): “[Monogamy] was the first form of the family to be based not on natural but on economic conditions – on the victory of private property over primitive, natural communal property. The Greeks themselves put the matter quite frankly: the sole exclusive aims of monogamous marriage were to make the man supreme in the family and to propagate, as the future heirs to his wealth, children indisputably his own. [...] Thus when monogamous marriage first makes its appearance in history, it is not as the reconciliation of man and woman, still less as the highest form of such reconciliation. Quite the contrary monogamous marriage comes on the scene as the subjugation of the one sex by the other; it announces a struggle between the sexes unknown throughout the whole previous prehistoric period. ... The first class opposition that appears in history coincides with the development of the antagonism between man and woman in monogamous marriage, and the first class oppression coincides with that of the female sex by the male.”

communism.⁷ Closer to our own times, in her 1949 *The Second Sex*, Simone de Beauvoir famously speaks of the social construction of female identity: “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman.”⁸ Elsewhere she advises women to be on their “guard against the trap of motherhood and marriage.”⁹ Though some women may really desire to have children, they ought to think about all that is entailed in this situation, “because being a mother these days is real slavery.”¹⁰ Again, marriage and family keep women down, preventing them from seeking and finding their self-fulfillment. De Beauvoir’s not-husband-yet-life-companion Jean-Paul Sartre remarks that while the act of begetting children is certainly something exquisite, having them is evil. According to him, this is quite independent of anything the father is or does inasmuch as the relation of fatherhood in itself is something bad, depriving the child of his or her freedom and autonomy.¹¹

Today the nature of the ideological attack on the family has changed with respect to what it has been until the 1960s and 70s. As

-
- 7 Cf. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Communist Manifesto*, trans. Samuel Moore, Penguin Books, New York 1968, p. 239 (part II, chapter 2): “Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists. On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form, this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution. The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.”
- 8 Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, trans. H. M. Parshley, Vintage Books, London 1997, p. 295.
- 9 Alice Schwarzer and Simone de Beauvoir, *After the Second Sex: Conversations with Simone de Beauvoir*, trans. Marianne Howarth, Pantheon, New York 1984, p. 73.
- 10 *Ibid.*
- 11 Jean-Paul Sartre, *The Words*, Vintage Books, New York 1981, p. 19: “There is no good father, that’s the rule. Don’t lay the blame on men but on the bond of paternity, which is rotten. To beget children, nothing better; to *have* them, what iniquity. Had my father lived, he would have lain on me at full length and would have crushed me. As luck had it, he died young.”

it has proven difficult, if not impossible, to purge the word “family” from public discourse, the tendency today is no longer to confront the institution “family” upfront, but to empty the word “family” of all meaning. Thus, in a recent census in Italy, a one-person household was identified as a one-person “family.”¹² Likewise, efforts to describe people living together in *de facto*, civil or same sex unions as forming a “family” empty the word of any meaning and affirm the absolute power of the State over human language.

Where does the modern suspicion or hatred of the family come from? Why would anyone be interested in abolishing the family – by direct confrontation or by undermining its meaning? If we want to present the Good News about the love of God the Father as a love that is given to us in his Son and communicated to us through Holy Mother Church; if thus we want to present a message that for its very intelligibility presupposes the family, then it will be very useful first of all to consider why someone might *not* think that the family is really good news. We will ask why someone may be convinced that abolishing the family would be an invaluable contribution to human civilization and moral progress. If we look at relevant statistical data, or simply read the news, we may begin to understand where these people are coming from. There certainly exists, for example, the grave problem of *family violence*. According to the US Bureau of Justice Statistics in 2002, family members were responsible for 21,5% of all murders in the United States. In the case that the victim was a female, this figure was even at 43%.¹³ In the papers we read time and again of family members exerting violence on each other or even killing each other from anger, despair, or to redress what some consider the “honor” of their family. The family seems to be a dangerous place to live in.

In addition, there is the problem of *pathological family relationships*. Erik Erikson notices how some of his patients with similar pathogenic

12 Cf. Istat, *Manuale della rilevazione 15° censimento generale della popolazione e delle abitazioni*, Istituto Nazionale di Statistica, Rome 2011, p. 15: «Una famiglia può essere costituita anche da una sola persona».

13 Cf. Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Family Violence Statistics. Including Statistics on Strangers and Acquaintances*, June 2005 (<http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/fvs03.pdf>; last access: 21 December 2013).

tendencies had similar problematic relations with their parents. These patients tend to have mothers who love them, “but they love fearfully, plaintively, intrusively; they are themselves so hungry for approval and for recognition that they burden their young children with complicated complaints, especially about their fathers.”¹⁴ Is the family not a place of intrusiveness, jealousy and rivalry, a place where neuroses are born?

Furthermore, we may refer to the fact that families can constitute significant *power structures* in society. In medieval times all of Europe for centuries was ruled by a few royal families of the names of von Habsburg, von Hohenzollern, Bourbon or di Savoia just to name a few. Many times mediaeval wars took on the character of gigantic family feuds. Often it was not nations, but royal families that made war on each other in violation of the true interest and good of the countries they were governing. Still today families are eluding the complete control of the State (and already for this reason seem suspect to many rulers). Historically, the United States have not possessed a royalty and aristocracy, and yet they have families such as the Kennedy or Bush clans of quasi-aristocratic or even quasi-royal status which have been exercising a decisive influence on political affairs for the past fifty years or more. Let us take Italy as a second example. Here the Agnelli family has had a great influence on the economy and with that also on politics and society at large. Besides, the country is known for other family power structures that are working less openly. In the face of the phenomenon of manipulative, oppressive, and closed families, some sociologists speak of an “amoral familism”: an extreme loyalty to family members, but an almost complete absence of solidarity that goes beyond the confines of the clan.¹⁵ It may at times appear that the solidarity of the family is of the same kind as the solidarity among robbers. One is loyal to the members of one’s group but shows no concern for individuals outside it nor for the common good at large.

14 Erik Erikson, “The Problem of Ego-Identity,” in *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 4 (1956), 92.

15 Cf. Edward C. Banfield, *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, The Free Press, New York 1958.

4 THE MESSAGE OF THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY AS GOOD AND NEW

What, then, does Benedict XVI mean when he says that marriage is “a Gospel in itself, a Good News for the world of today”¹⁶? What does John Paul II intend when he proclaims that the family is “the school of love, of the knowledge of God, of respect for life and for human dignity”¹⁷? Is marriage and the family truly a good news? We would like to propose that when the Church is proposing the Gospel of Marriage and Family, she is not simply advocating a return to what is called “the traditional family.” The “traditional family” is nothing other than the bourgeois family, which is characterized by its rigid role division, power structure, and collective egoism. The Gospel, inasmuch as it is good *news*, indeed brings a novelty. But what is *new* and what is *good* about the Gospel of the *Christian* family?

The Good News of the “Forever”

There is first of all the conviction that marriage and family intrinsically has something to do with love. The Vatican II Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et spes* speaks of an “intimate partnership of married life and love.”¹⁸ It is possible to live the family relations as relations of *love* and not domination. While according to *Ephesians* 5 the wife is to be “subordinate” to her husband, the husband is called to love his wife “as Christ loved the Church and handed himself over for her” (*Eph* 5:21 and 25). This love finds expression in the possibility of the “forever.” The indissolubility of marriage is not an additional heavy burden placed on the Christian spouses. Rather it is quintessential part of the meaning of true love and is given the followers of Jesus as a new possibility. The indissolubility of marriage is good news; it is divorce that is the bad news. Divorce derives from “the hardness of the human heart” (cf. *Mt* 19:8). When Jesus says, “What God has joined

16 Benedict XVI, *Homily at the Opening of the Synod on the New Evangelization*, October 7, 2012.

17 John Paul II, *Address to the Third General Conference of the Latin American Episcopate*, Puebla, January 28, 1979.

18 Vatican II, Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et spes*, December 7, 1965, n. 48.

together, no human being must separate” (*Mt* 19:6), he also provides the *possibility* of life-long fidelity. In him all things were created. He is the Eternal Word by which the Father made the universe (cf. *Col* 1:16). God said, and it was (cf. *Gen.* 1). Jesus says that faithfulness is possible. In the novel *Per sempre* (*Forever*) by Susanna Tamaro, the protagonist is asked by his wife: “Does the ‘forever’ exist?” The answer he gives her is, “The only thing that exists is the ‘forever.’”¹⁹ True love wants to say “forever.” If it does not say “forever,” it is not true.

In a magnificent sonnet William Shakespeare expressed the intricate connection between love and the “forever” in the following moving terms:

Let me not to the marriage of true minds
 Admit impediments. Love is not love
 Which alters when it alteration finds,
 Or bends with the remover to remove:
 O no! it is an ever-fixed mark
 That looks on tempests and is never shaken;
 It is the star to every wandering bark,
 Whose worth's unknown, although his height be taken.
 Love's not Time's fool, though rosy lips and cheeks
 Within his bending sickle's compass come:
 Love alters not with his brief hours and weeks,
 But bears it out even to the edge of doom.
 If this be error and upon me proved,
 I never writ, nor no man ever loved.²⁰

The “forever” is a *good* news. No one who has ever loved would not want this love to last forever. The question is another: it is not whether we want it, but whether we think it possible. And here the good *news* comes in. The forever is a true novelty brought by Christ, a new possibility that corresponds to the deepest yearnings of our hearts.

19 Susanna Tamaro, *Per sempre*, Giunti, Milan 2011, p. 12.

20 William Shakespeare, *Sonnet* 116.

The Good News of Forgiveness

A reason why this love can be faithful is that it is *forgiving*. Christian spouses can forgive each other because they know that they themselves have been forgiven. “As the Lord has forgiven you, so you also must forgive” (*Col 3:13*). This command to forgive, expressed by the Apostle, is not imposed from the outside as another heavy burden on the followers of Christ. The willingness to forgive is rather the natural consequence of one’s awareness of having been forgiven. Persons who know that they have received a great gift can themselves be generous. We are speaking of a generosity that flows from a sense of gratitude, which in turn derives from the realization that one has received a great gift. This would seem to be the essence of Christian existence: “A Christian is someone who knows that ... he lives first and foremost as the beneficiary of a bounty; and that consequently all righteousness can only consist in being himself a donor, like the beggar who is grateful for what he receives and generously passes part of it on to others.”²¹ Hence, forgiveness is possible because of God’s initiative, and as such it is the visible and concrete witness to his activity.

Forgiving does not simply mean forgetting or pretending that the offense suffered did not matter after all. Rather, the one who forgives participates in the hope that God has for the other,²² refusing to tie him or her down to the one evil act committed. Basing ourselves on Robert Spaemann’s profound reflections on the topic, we can say that the one forgiving tells the offending party, “I know that this is what you’ve done, but I refuse to believe that this is what you’ve become! I have hope for you. This is not you.”²³

In reconciliation, which is forgiveness offered and received, the relationship between the offender and the offended is reestablished,

21 Joseph Ratzinger, *Introduction to Christianity*, Ignatius Press, San Francisco 1990, p. 196.

22 Cf. Livio Melina, *Building a Culture of the Family. The Language of love*, St Pauls, Staten Island 2011, p. 34.

23 Cf. Robert Spaemann, *Persons. The Difference between “Someone” and “Something.”* Oxford University Press, Oxford 2006, p. 234: “One who forgives abandons the right to take the offender as he found him, and gives the offender the opportunity to take himself differently, too.”

their friendship is restored. It is here that the center of the Gospel message is manifested, a Good News that Paul calls the “the message of reconciliation” (2 Cor 5:19). We may wonder whether forgiveness might not witness God’s saving presence even more powerfully than miracles of physical healing. *Forgiveness* is a novelty and truly a *good* novelty, a Good News.

The Good News of Fruitfulness and Hospitality

There is finally the Good News of *fruitfulness*. Superabundance is a characteristic of the Kingdom of God. When Jesus is turning the water into wine (*Joh* 2:1-12) or breaking the bread for the multitudes (e.g. *Mt* 14:13-21), he produces a superabundance of bread and wine by far exceeding the immediate needs of the people present.²⁴ The Christian family is called to a supernatural fruitfulness. Jesus is saying to the family: “*Effata*” – open up! (cf. *Mt* 7:31-37). Children, as the natural fruit of marriage, are no longer seen simply in function of the family – to let one’s name endure. The Christian family has a horizon that transcends itself: children are birthed into the Kingdom. It is in the family that the faith is passed on. As Pope Francis says in *Lumen fidei*, “In the family, faith accompanies every age of life, beginning with childhood: children learn to trust in the love of their parents.”²⁵ Biological fruitfulness is linked to spiritual fruitfulness and to hospitality to strangers. As Abraham receives the three strangers he obtains the promise of a son (*Gen* 18:1-15). Hospitality is a central virtue of the Christian family.²⁶ This is hospitality in the literal sense and hospitality to children, which

24 Cf. Joseph Ratzinger, *Introduction to Christianity*, p. 197.

25 Francis, Encyclical Letter *Lumen fidei*, June 29, 2013, n. 53.

26 A. Scola, *Il mistero nuziale 2. Matrimonio – Famiglia*, PUL-Mursia, Roma 2000, p. 143: “La potenza dello Spirito del Risorto è all’opera nella famiglia cristiana, quando nell’amore fecondo degli sposi si documenta la logica dell’accoglienza dell’altro nel suo bisogno, espressione, magari inconsapevole, del desiderio di pienezza dell’umano. Le famiglie cristiane sono chiamate ad essere una *dimora* aperta, in cui gli altri possano sperimentare, attraverso il fascino del matrimonio, la bontà dell’umano esistere.”

are also in a real sense strangers or “guests” that are coming from afar.²⁷ Children are received and welcomed as the fruit of love and not as the product of a human design.

Christian parents, aware of the fact that their children’s true Father is the one in heaven, will find it easier to accept their children’s otherness. They will find it easier not to impose their own plans on their children, but will seek together with them their true vocation from God the Father. Having received and welcomed many children, a family will easily be open to strangers. A family with five children will find it easy to welcome a sixth one from the outside, temporarily or permanently. The family’s hospitality overcomes any “familism”.

In fact, Christians know that the family is only a penultimate reality. The family is not an end in itself; it is not the final end for which everything else needs to be sacrificed. In his Catecheses on Human Love, John Paul II reflects on Christ’s words on marriage and the family. On one occasion Jesus is going back to the beginning, referring to *Genesis* 2:24: “For this reason a man will leave his father and mother...” (*Mt* 19:5). But John Paul II points out that Christ also reveals our final destiny: “In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage” (*Mt* 22:30). For the followers of Jesus, the love between husband and wife is not absolutized nor isolated. Marriage is seen in the context of God’s action. God himself is the Giver, who is present in the gift which is the woman to the man and the man to the woman. God himself entrusts the two to each other.²⁸ The family points beyond itself towards the reality of the future world. Precisely this is why it can be supernaturally fruitful. This supernatural fruitfulness is good news. It is in this Christian family, based on faithful, forgiving, and fruitful love that the faith is passed on to the children and witnessed before the world. Hence John Paul II can rightfully speak of the family as “the school of love, of the knowledge of God, of respect for life and

27 Cf. Livio Melina, *Building a Culture of the Family*, p. 19.

28 Cf. Carl Anderson – José Granados, *Called to Love. Approaching John Paul II’s Theology of the Body*, Doubleday, New York 2009, p. 68: “So who first gives Adam and Eve to each other? The answer is God ... God is the original Giver who entrusts Eve to Adam and invites him to give himself to her (and vice versa).”

for human dignity,” which is why for him “evangelization in the future depends largely on the domestic Church.”²⁹

5 THE FAMILY AND THE NEW EVANGELIZATION

In the light of what we have said so far, the findings of the sociologist Mary Eberstadt in her *Why the West Really Lost God*, should not surprise us. She notes how statistical data for the Western world clearly suggests a correlation between religiosity and family. What is less clear is the question in which way the influence goes. Do people become more family-focused when they are more religious (more God = more family), or are the dynamics mainly working the other way around, in the sense that people who tend to have more of a family life thereby tend to become more religious (more family = more God)? While for a long time the dominant view among sociologists was the former, Eberstadt provides substantial statistical evidence that suggests that the influence moves at least both ways, probably favoring the latter position.³⁰ According to her, the relevant data shows that what she calls “the family factor” has a highly relevant impact on a people’s or a culture’s religiosity. Her main thesis, then, can be summarized as “more family, more God – less family, less God.”

If we suppose that she has read the sociological data correctly and that family life indeed favors religious practice, while the demise of the family tends to bring with it the abandonment of such practice, it will still be necessary to give possible reasons for this connection. In her own attempts at an explanation, Eberstadt notices the different ways in which the family opens people up to the transcendent. There is, for

29 John Paul II, *Address to the Third General Conference of the Latin American Episcopate*, Puebla, January 28, 1979.

30 Mary Eberstadt, *How the West Really Lost God*, Templeton Press, West Conshohocken, PA 2013, p. 22: “Family and faith are the invisible double helix of society – two spirals that when linked to one another can effectively reproduce, but whose strength and momentum depend on one another.” Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 98: “It is at least as plausible – in fact, given the evidence ahead, it is *more* plausible – to assume the opposite: *that something about having larger or stronger or more connected families is making people more religious, at least some of the time.*”

one, the moment of childbirth, which “is routinely experienced by a great many people as an event transcendental as no other.”³¹ In birth, a new human life is manifested. The parents know that they are the authors of this life and that yet the effect exceeds the cause. The child is experienced as something greater than what they could have been responsible for by themselves. Second, it is in the family that people start caring about others more than they care about themselves, which, too, means opening themselves up to the transcendent. Eberstadt writes: “All men and women fear death; but only mothers and fathers can be counted upon to fear another individual’s death more than their own, for almost all do.”³² In the family people learn what it means to have something to live for and to have something to die for.

As Benedict XVI says, it is in the family that human persons discover that their identity “is founded in being called to love,” to receive themselves from others and to give themselves to others.³³ A person’s identity is always relational. The fundamental, identity-forming relations are familial ones: being a father or mother, a spouse, a son or daughter. These relations reveal the person’s fundamental identity as someone who is loved and called to love. Children are born of the love of their parents. In their children, the man and the woman’s love becomes a substantial reality that transcends them. The parents naturally love their children. Children are persons who are loved and called to love in return. It is in these relationships that the love of Christ enters, perfecting, healing and elevating the natural love among the members of the family. The family thus becomes “a saved and a saving community.”³⁴ The Christian family is intimately linked to the way of love as highroad for the new evangelization, which is why Benedict XVI can say, “The Christian family, to the extent it succeeds in living love as communion and service as a reciprocal gift open to all, as a journey of permanent conversion supported by the grace of God, reflects the

31 *Ibid.*, p. 156.

32 *Ibid.*, p. 159.

33 Benedict XVI, *Discourse to Representatives of the John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and Family*, May 13, 2011.

34 John Paul II, Apostolic Exhortation *Familiaris Consortio*, November 22, 1981, n. 49.

splendour of Christ in the world and the beauty of the divine Trinity. St Augustine has a famous phrase: ‘immo vero vides Trinitatem, si caritatem vides’ — ‘Well, if you see charity, yes indeed you see the Trinity’ (*De Trinitate*, VIII, 8).³⁵ This, then, is the “way of love” – the most convincing proof for the existence of God: a family that lives in the communion of the reciprocal gift and thus reflects the love that is the very being of God. This is the way in which “marriage” – and, we may add, the family – “is called to be not only an object but a subject of the new evangelization.”³⁶

ÚDAJE O AUTOROVI

Prof. Stephan Kampowski
Pontificio Istituto Giovanni Paolo II
per studi su Matrimonio e Famiglia
Piazza San Giovanni in Laterano, 4
00120 Città del Vaticano
kampowski@istitutogp2.it

35 Benedict XVI, *Address to the Pontifical Council of the Family*, December 1, 2011.

36 Benedict XVI, *Homily at the opening of the Synod on the new evangelization*, October 7, 2012.

KÁNONICKO-PRÁVNE ASPEKTY NOVEJ EVANJELIZÁCIE

CANONICAL AND JURIDICAL ASPECTS OF THE NEW EVANGELIZATION

Miroslav Konštanc Adam, O.P.

Abstrakt

Týmto príspevkom chcem prispieť k tomu, aby som poukázal, akú odpoveď by mala dať Cirkev v niektorých tradične katolíckych krajinách kresťanského Západu, v ktorých je spoločnosť do značnej miery odkresťančená. Odpoveď spočíva v novej evanjelizácii, čo je aj obsahom tohto sympózia. Výchadzám z výrokov pápežov Pavla VI., Jána Pavla II. a Benedikta XVI., zo synody o novej evanjelizácii, ktorá sa konala v Ríme v októbri 2012¹ a z nedávno publikovaných príspevkom kardinála Raymonda Leo Burkeho,² prefekta Najvyššieho tribunálu Apoštolskej signatúry, a preláta Mons. Markusa Graulicha, S.D.B.,³ sudcu Rímskej roty.

-
- 1 Porov. SINODO DEI VESCOVI – XIII ASSEMBLEA GENERALE ORDINARIA, *La Nuova Evangelizzazione per la trasmissione della fede cristiana. Lineamenta*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2011; ID., *La Nuova Evangelizzazione per la trasmissione della fede cristiana. Instrumentum laboris*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2012.
 - 2 Porov. R. L. BURKE, *Dimensioni pastorali e giuridiche della nuova evangelizzazione*, in M. GRAULICH – J. PUDUMAI DOSS (eds.), *Vino in otri vecchi? Sfide Pastorali e Giuridiche della Nuova Evangelizzazione*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2013, 131-148.
 - 3 Porov. M. GRAULICH, *Evangelizzare la cultura giuridica*, in M. GRAULICH – J. PUDUMAI DOSS (eds.), *Vino in otri vecchi? Sfide Pastorali e Giuridiche della Nuova Evangelizzazione*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2013, 185-214.

Kľúčové slová: Nová evanjelizácia. Kánonické právo. Pavol VI., Ján Pavol II., Benedikt XVI. Apoštolská signatúra. Rímska rota.

Abstract

In this article I want to point out to the answers of the Church to the present situation and questions in some of the traditionally catholic countries of the Christian West, where society nowadays is largely dechristianized. This answer of the Church is to be found, according to this article, in the new evangelization (which is also the main theme of today's symposium). My findings are based on statements of the Popes Paul VI., John Paul II., and Benedict XVI., upon the conclusions of the Synod on the new evangelization, held in Rome in October 2012, and also on recently published papers of Raymond Leo Cardinal Burke, Prefect of the Supreme Tribunal of the Apostolic Signatura, and prelate Mons. Markus Graulich, S.D.B., Judge of the *Rota romana*.

Key words: New evangelisation; Kanon Law; Paul VI.; John Paul II.; Benedict XVI.; Apostolic Signatura; *Rota romana*.

1 NOVÁ EVANJELIZÁCIA V MAGISTÉRIU PAVLA VI.

Hovoriac o novej evanjelizácii je treba, aby sme začali pontifikátom pápeža Pavla VI., ktorý vo svojej apoštolskej exhortácii *Evangelii nuntiandi* o evanjelizácii v súčasnom svete z 8. decembra 1975, vyzval k novému ohlasovaniu Evanjelia v kontexte, ako to on sám pomenoval, „situácií odkresťančenia, častých v našich dňoch“⁴. V rokoch, ktoré nasledovali po skončení Druhého vatikánskeho koncilu, spomínaný pápež bol svedkom progresívneho zosvetštenia spoločnosti a ničivých dôsledkov vo vnútri Cirkvi.

Vo svojej homílii na slávnosť svätých apoštolov Petra a Pavla v r. 1972, napr. keď uvažoval nad situáciou Cirkvi vo svete, vyjadril svoj dojem, že „cez nejakú štrbinu vošiel Satanov dym do Božieho

4 Porov. PAULUS VI, Adhortatio Apostolica *Evangelii nuntiandi*, „De Evangelizatione in mundo huius temporis“, 8 Decembris 1975, in AAS 68 (1976), 40-41, n. 52.

chrámu⁵. Hovoril o prenikajúcom pochybovaní, neistote, nepokoji, nespokojnosti a nesúhlase, o strate dôvery v Cirkev, i o tom, že súčasne rýchle narastá dôvera vo svetských prorokoch, ktorí sa vyjadrujú prostredníctvom tlače alebo sociálnych hnutí, a od ktorých sa očakáva recept na pravý život.⁶ Pápež konštatoval, že aj v Cirkvi prevažuje stav neistoty, nakoľko po Druhom vatikánskom koncile sa verilo, že začne „slniečny deň pre dejiny Cirkvi“, zatiaľ čo prišiel „deň zamračený, búrka, tma, hľadanie a neistota“⁷. A dodal, že vo všeobecnosti je tendencia vkročiť dopriepasti, namiesto toho, aby sa jej vyhlo.⁸

Lamentovaním pápež Pavol VI. chcel poukazať na rozdelenie vo vnútri Cirkvi, ktoré bolo spôsobené neschopnosťou niektorých vidieť organickú povahu života, ktorú Cirkev prijíma od Krista počas staročí ako dar Ducha Svätého na evanjelizáciu sveta. Toto rozdelenie vzniklo kvôli tomu, že niektorí prišli k záveru, že mnohé udalosti cirkevných dejín, počnúc od apoštolov, boli istým druhom zrady a že Cirkev preto musí byť *nanovo* založená, a to tak, že sa nejako vrátíme k spôsobu života prvotných kresťanských spoločenstiev, ktoré boli predstavované naivným spôsobom a nebrali sa do úvahy ich vážne ťažkosti vo vnútri, ktoré Cirkev musela prekonávať od samého počiatku, a o ktorých sa dočítame v Skutkoch apoštolov, v listoch svätých apoštolov Pavla, Jána, Petra a Jakuba.

Vo svojich príhovoroch sudcom Rímskej roty v rokoch od 1969 do 1973 pápež Pavol VI. sa opakovane zaoberal stratou rešpektu pred nenahraditeľnou a skromnou službou kánonického práva, ktoré ono poskytuje veriacim pri usmerňovaní ich kresťanského života v Cirkvi. Jeho opakované výzvy, aby sa viac dbalo na disciplínu v Cirkvi, naznačujú vážnosť vtedajšej situácie. Postavil sa proti mienke, na základe ktorej ako keby Druhý vatikánsky koncil bol odstránil potrebu kánonického práva, a tak vyhlásil: „Koncil nielenže neodstránil

5 Porov. PAULUS VI, „Per il nono anniversario dell’Incoronazione di Sua Santità: ‘Resistite fortes in fide’”, 29 Junii 1972, in *Insegnamenti di Paolo VI*, vol. X (1972), Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1973, 707.

6 Porov. *Ibid.*, 707-708.

7 Porov. *Ibid.*, 708.

8 Porov. *Ibid.*, 708.

kánonické právo, predpisy, ktoré upresňujú záväzky a obhajujú práva členov Cirkvi, naopak, vyžaduje ich a chce, ako dôsledok právomoci zverenej Kristom svojej Cirkvi, ako požiadavku, ktorá vyplýva z jej spoločenskej, viditeľnej, komunitárnej a hierarchickej povahy, aby tieto predpisy usmerňovali veriacichv ich náboženskom živote a privádzali ich ku kresťanskej dokonalosti, aby boli právnou zárukou pravej slobody.⁹

V inom príhovore sudcom Rímskej roty, v roku 1970, pápež sa vyjadril k pomýlenej rozdvojenosti medzi kánonickým právom a slobodou v Cirkvi, pričom poukázal na skutočnosť, že kánonické právo nie je opakom slobody, ale slúži na to, aby „zabezpečilo bezpečnú a účinnú ochranu spoločných dohier, medzi ktorými je treba spomenúť predovšetkým užívanie vlastnej slobody, ktorú môže dostatočne zaručiť len dobre usporiadaný život.“¹⁰

Roky, ktoré nasledovali po Koncile, keď starý Kódex prestal platiť a nový ešte nebol vyhlásený do platnosti, sa v mnohých krajinách dajú charakterizovať všeobecnou neznalosťou cirkevnej disciplíny a dokonca presvedčením, že kánonická disciplína sa viac nehodí k povahe Cirkvi. Spôsobovalo to ťažké škody v Cirkvi, napr. hrubé porušovanie liturgických predpisov, revolúciu vkatechéze, ktorá často poskytovala bezobsahové, zmätené a niekedy aj bludné vyučovanie náboženstva, zrušenie disciplíny počas obdobia formovania seminaristov a v živote kléru, zanechanie podstatných prvkov rehoľného života a zničujúca strata smerovania v mnohých mužských i ženských rehoľných inštitútoch, strata identity charitatívnych, školských a zdravotných organizácií, ktoré sa pýšili tým, že sa volali katolícke, nedostatok rešpektu a úcty pred sviatostnou povahou manželstva a iné.

9 Porov. PAULUS VI, Allocutio “Ad Praelatos Auditores, Officiales et Advocatos Tribunalis Sacrae Romanae Rotae, novo litibus iudicandis ineunte anno coram admissos”, 27 Ianuarii 1969, in AAS 61 (1969), 177.

10 Porov. PAULUS VI, Allocutio “Ad Praelatos Auditores, Officiales et Advocatos Tribunalis Sacrae Romanae Rotae, a Beatissimo Patre novo litibus iudicandis ineunte anno coram admissos”, 29 Ianuarii 1970, in AAS 62 (1970), 115.

2 NOVÁ EVANJELIZÁCIA V MAGISTÉRIU JÁNA PAVLA II.

Pontifikát pápeža Jána Pavla II. je charakterizovaný neústalou výzvou k tomu, aby Cirkev bola verná voči svojmu poslaniu, ktoré prijala od Boha, v úplne zosvetšenej spoločnosti, a aby odpovedala na túto výzvu novou evanjelizáciou. Nová evanjelizácia znamená vyučovať vieru prostredníctvom kázania, katechézy a všetkých ostatných foriem katolíckej výchovy; sláviť vieru prostredníctvom posvätnej liturgie, takisto jej predĺžením, to jest, modlitbami a zbožnosťou; a prežívať vieru praktizovaním čností. Pritom je treba konať toto všetko, ako keby po prvý raz; inými slovami, so zápalom a nadšením prvých učeníkov a misionárov, ktorí prichádzali k našim predkom, tak ako to asi robili svätí Konštantín a Metod na našom území pred 1150 rokmi.

Zhrnutie učenia pápeža Jána Pavla II. o novej evanjelizácii sa nachádza v jeho apoštolskom liste *Novo millennio ineunte* „Na konci Veľkého jubilea roku Dvetisíc“. Vo vážnej situácii, v akej sa nachádza súčasný svet, tento veľký pápež nám kladie za vzor prvých učeníkov, ktorí po vypočutí kázania sv. Petra na deň Turíc, pýtali sa jeho i ostatných apoštolov: „Bratia, čo teda máme robiť?“ (Sk 2,37). Podobne ako prví učeníci uprostred pohanského sveta, ktorý ani nepočul hovoriť o našom Pánovi Ježišovi Kristovi, tak aj my sa nachádzame v spoločnosti, ktorá zabudla na Boha a je nepriateľská voči Božiemu zákonu, vpísanému do srdca každého jedného z nás.

Mysliac na veľkú výzvu, pred ktorou stojí súčasná Cirkev, pápež Ján Pavol II. nám pripomína, že nemôžeme zachrániť seba samých ani náš svet tým, že by sme objavili nejaké „zázračné zaklinadlo“, „magická formula“ alebo by sme vynašli nejaký „nový program“.¹¹ Veľmi jasne vyhlásil: „Nie, nezachráni nás nijaké zaklinadlo ani magická formula, ale len jedna Osoba, a istota, ktorú nám zaručuje: Ja som s vami!“¹²

Ten istý pápež potom pripomína, že program, na základe ktorého musíme dať odpoveď na duchovnú výzvu určenú Cirkvi, je napokon Ježiš Kristus, ktorý žije v Cirkvi. Vysvetlil to týmito slovami: „Program

11 Porov. IOANNES PAULUS II, Epistula Apostolica *Novo Millennio Ineunte*, „Magni Iubilaei anni MM sub exitum“, 6 Ianuarii 2001, in AAS 93 (2001), 285, n. 29.

12 Porov. *Ibid.*, 285, n. 29.

už jestvuje: je stále ten istý e jeho pôvod sa nachádza v Evanjeliu a v živej Tradícii. Sústreďuje sa v samotnom Kristovi, za účelom, aby sme ho poznali, milovali, nasledovali, prežívali s ním trojičný život a aby sme spolu s ním zmenili dejiny a to tak, aby našli svoje završenie v nebeskom Jeruzaleme.¹³

V krátkosti povedané, program, ktorý vedie každého jedného z nás k slobode a ku šťastiu je svätosť života, primeraná k životnému stavu každého jedného z nás. Vlastne, pápež Ján Pavol II. predstavil kompletný pastoračný program pre Cirkev v zmysle svätosti života: „Naozaj, predložiť pastoračný program v znamení svätosti je výberom, ktorý má následky. To znamená, že keď si uvedomíme, že krst je skutočný prístup k Božej svätosti vďaka naštepeniu sa na Krista a vďaka tomu, že v pokrstenom prebýva jeho Duch, potom by nemalo zmysel, aby sa pokrstený uspokojil s priemerným životom, pri minimálnom zachovávaní etických zásad a povrchnej náboženskosti. Položiť otázku katechuménovi: „Chceš prijať krst?“, znamená, ako keby sme sa ho opýtali: „Chceš sa stať svätým?“ Znamená to, byť radikálny v zmysle Ježišovej reči na vrchu: „Budte dokonalí, ako je dokonalý váš nebeský Otec“ (Mt 5,48).¹⁴

Odvolačujúc sa na Druhý vatikánsky koncil, pápež Ján Pavol II. učí, že „tento ideál dokonalosti neznamená, žeby svätosť vyžadovala nejaký druh mimoriadneho života, ktorý by boli schopní uskutočniť len niektorí „géniovia“ svätosti.“¹⁵

Ten istý pápež nás učí, čo znamená mimoriadnosť nášho všedného života. Mímoreadnosť, o ktorej je reč, pochádza zo skutočnosti, že je prežívaná v Kristovi a preto v nás spôsobuje neporovnateľnú krásu svätosti. Vyjadril to takto: „Cesty svätosti sú rozličné a prispôbené k povolaniu každého jedného... Dozrel čas, aby sme znovu ponúkli všetkým, a to s presvedčením, túto „vysokú úroveň“ normálneho kresťanského života. Celý život cirkevných spoločenstiev a kresťanských rodín musí byť nasmerovaný na tento smer.“¹⁶

13 Porov. *Ibid.*, 285-286, n. 29.

14 Porov. *Ibid.*, 288, n. 31.

15 Porov. *Ibid.*, 288, n. 31.

16 Porov. *Ibid.*, 288, n. 31.

Každý deň prežívame obrátenie, ktorým sa snažíme dosiahnuť vysokú úroveň svätosti, „vysokú úroveň všedneho kresťanského života“. Naše sestry a naši bratia takto objavujú veľké tajomstvo vlastného všedného života, v ktorom ich Boh každý deň napĺňa svojou láskou bez konca a bez miery, a povoláva ich k svätosti života v Kristovi, svojom jednorodenom Synovi. Podobne to vyjadril pápež Ján Pavol II. vo svojej apoštolskej exhortácii *Christifideles laici*: „Obnoviť kresťanské tkanivo spoločnosti“ je možné len tak, že sa obnoví „kresťanské tkanivo kresťanských spoločenstiev“, počnúc jednotlivcami vo vlastnej rodine, vo vlastnom dome¹⁷.

3 NOVÁ EVANJELIZÁCIA V MAGISTÉRIU BENEDIKTA XVI.

Vo svojom prvom príhovore k Rímskej kúrii pred vianočnými sviatkami roku 2005 pápež Benedikt XVI., spomínajúc na 40. výročie ukončenia Druhého vatikánskeho koncilu, uvažoval o roztržke, ktorú opísal ako boj medzi dvomi výkladmi Koncilu. Jednoducho povedané, pápež hovoril o roztržke, ktorá je „v riziku, že môže skončiť v roztržke medzi predkoncilovou a pokoncilovou Cirkvou“, lebo niektorí podávajú výklad Koncilu, ktorý sa nezakladá ne textoch schválených koncilovými otcami, ale na niečom, čo niektorí nazývajú „pravý duch Koncilu“, ktorý nachádzajú „medzi riadkami v koncilových textoch, ktoré naznačujú smer k novému“¹⁸. O dôsledku tejto roztržky v Cirkvi pápež Benedikt XVI. sa vyjadril takto: „Mám na mysli to, že niektorí žijú v omyle, pokiaľ ide o samotnú povahu Koncilu, ktorý považujú za istý druh ústavodarného zboru, ktorý ruší starú ústavu a vyhlásuje novú. Veď ústavodarný zbor však potrebuje, aby mu niekto dal poverenie a aby ten to, čo mu dal poverenie, ho potvrdil. To znamená, že ľud je ten, ktorý dáva poverenie, lebo ústava má slúžiť ľudu. Koncilovi otcovia však nemali nijaké takéto poverenie a nikto im ho ani nedal. Napokon, ani nikto im ho nemohol dať, lebo základná ústava Cirkvi pochádza

17 Porov. IOANNES PAULUS II, Adhortatio Apostolica *Christifideles Laici*, “De vocatione et missione Laicorum in Ecclesia et in mundo”, 30 Decembris 1988, in AAS 81 (1989), 455, n. 34.

18 Porov. BENEDICTUS, Allocutio “Ad Romanam Curiam ob omina natalicia”, 22 Decembris 2005, in AAS 98 (2006), 46.

od Pána, ktorý nám ju dal, aby sme mohli dosiahnuť večný život. Len v tomto zmysle dokážeme pochopiť časný život i samotný čas.¹⁹

Táto analýza poukazuje na nevyhnutnosť novej evanjelizácie, ktorá sa má sústrediť na dar života, ktorý nám Kristus daroval, či už ako jednotlivcom alebo spoločstvu, ktoré vytvára Cirkev. Vďaka tomuto nadrirodzenému daru žijeme a môžeme slúžiť blížnemu.

4 ŠPECIFICKÝ SPÔSOB NOVEJ EVANJELIZÁCIE PROSTREDNÍCTVOM KÁNONICKEJ DISCIPLÍNY

Z doteraz povedaného vyplýva, že poznanie kánonickej disciplíny a rešpekt voči nej sú nevyhnutnými, pokiaľ ide o odpoveď Cirkvi na pozvanie k novej evanjelizácii. Je veľa spôsobov, ako začať novú evanjelizáciu prostredníctvom kánonickej disciplíny. Poukážem na štyri, o ktorých pojednáva prefekt Najvyššieho tribunálu Apoštolskej signatúry kardinál Raymond Leo Burke v jednom svojom príspevku:²⁰

Prvý spôsob je rešpekt k právu, ako nenahraditeľný prostriedok na správne vzťahy a činnosť vo vnútri Cirkvi. Je treba postaviť sa voči tendenciám v kultúrnom a spoločenskom živote, ktoré sú nepriateľské voči organickej jednote Cirkvi, Kristovho mystického tela. Súčasne je treba postaviť sa voči pomýlenému konfliktu, ktorý jestvuje medzi kánonickým právom a pastoračnou povahou Cirkvi, medzi pravdou a láskou.

Druhý spôsob novej evanjelizácie je štúdium prameňov kánonických inštitútov vo Svätom písme a v Tradícii. Napr. je treba vedieť, že predpisy, ktoré sa vzťahujú na osoby, ktoré pretrvávajú vo verejne známom fažskom hriechu, a ktoré nemôžu pristúpiť k svätému prijímaniu, majú pôvod v časoch svätého apoštola Pavla.

Tretím spôsobom je štúdium kánonického práva a to tak, že sa musí rešpektovať úmysel zákonodarcu a takisto vylúčiť každý spôsob formalizmu. Kánonická disciplína má solídne právne, kánonické a teologické základy, ktoré môže objaviť len ten, kto má pokorného

19 Porov. *Ibid.*, 46.

20 Porov. R. L. BURKE, *Dimensioni pastorali e giuridiche della nuova evangelizzazione*, in M. GRAULICH – J. PUDUMAI DOSS (eds.), *Vino nuovo in otri vecchi. Sfide pastorali e giuridiche della nuova evangelizzazione*, Città del Vaticano, 2013, s. 144-146.

ducha. Všetky formy manipulácie zákona za účelom podporiť isté projekty napokon spôsobia ťažké škody pre veriacich i pre celú Cirkev.

Napokon, štvrtý spôsob novej evanjelizácie, prostredníctvom kánonického práva, je liturgické právo, ktoré ma dostať prednostné postavenie medzi kánonickými predpismi, pretože sa týka najposvätnějších skutočností v Cirkvi. Je dobré poznamenať, ako sa pápež Ján Pavol II. vo svojej prvej encyklike *Redemptor hominis* postavil proti zneužívaniu spovede a generálneho rozhrešenia, ktoré narúša podstatne osobné stretnutie s Kristom vo sviatosti pokánia, pričom pripomenul, že právo na takéto stretnutie má nielen kajúcnik ale aj samotný Kristus.²¹ Vo svojej poslednej encyklike *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* sa ten istý pápež vehementne postavil proti zneužívaniu cirkevnej disciplíny pokiaľ ide o sviatosť Eucharistie. Takto sa vyjadril: „Je nutné, aby som pripomenul povinnosť, aby počas eucharistického slávenia sa liturgické predpisy presne dodržiavali... Apoštol Pavol sa veľmi zápalisto obrátil na komunitu veriacich v Korinte, kvôli ich hrubým nedostatkom počas eucharistického slávenia, čo napokon spôsobilo rozdelenie veriacich, ktorí sa podelili do frakcií (porov. 1 Kor 11, 17-34). Aj v našich časoch musíme znovuobjaviť poslušnosť voči liturgickým predpisom a mať ich v úcte, nakoľko v každom eucharistickom slávení je prítomná jedna a všeobecná Cirkev.“²²

V každom prípade, znalosť a zachovávanie kánonickej disciplíny nás oslobodí, aby sme sa stali nástrojmi, prostredníctvom ktorých prítomnosť Krista, Dobrého Pastiera, medzi svojimi sa stane viac viditeľnou a vysluhovanie sviatostí a slávenie posvätnej liturgie sú toho najvynikajúcejším príkladom.

5 PRÁVO NA RODINU A MANŽELSTVO

Keď hovoríme o novej evanjelizácii v kontexte právnej kultúry, rád by som pokázal aspoň na jeden aktuálny príklad, o ktorom v jednom

21 Porov. IOANNES PAULUS II, Litterae Encyclicae *Redemptor hominis*, “Pontificali eius ministerio ineunte”, 4 Martii 1979, in AAS 71 (1971), 314, n. 20.

22 Porov. IOANNES PAULUS II, Litterae Encyclicae *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, “De Eucharistia eiusque necessitudine cum Ecclesia”, 17Aprilis2003, in AAS 95 (2003), 468, n. 52.

príspevku zoširoka pojednáva pápežský prelát Mons. Markus Graulich, S.D.B.,²³ sudca Rímskej roty. Týka sa práva na rodinu a manželstvo. V niektorých krajinách boli v civilnej oblasti právne uznané nezobášané heterosexuálne páry a homosexuálne dvojice boli postavené na roveň manželstva. Pápež Benedikt XVI. obhajuje pravdu o manželstve proti relativizmu a právnemu pozitivizmu, ktoré „považujú manželstvo len za formálnu spoločenskú úpravu citových zväzkov. V dôsledku toho, takéto manželstvo nielen sa stáva náhodným, akými môžu byť ľudské city, ale sa predstavuje ako nejaké zákonná nadstavba, ktorú by ľudská vôľa mohla ľubovoľne manipulovať, dokonca by ju mohla pozbaviť aj jej heterosexuálnej povahy.“²⁴

V Cirkvi sa však vychádza z „nediskutovateľného predpokladu, že manželstvo obsahuje svoju pravdu, na objavení a prehĺbení poznania ktorej harmonicky spolupracuje rozum a viera, to znamená, že ľudské poznanie osvietené Božím slovom nám umožňuje spoznať pohlavný rozdiel medzi mužom a ženou, ich vzájomné dopĺňanie, definitívne darovanie a výlučnosť.“²⁵

Táto pravda o manželstve, ktorá je súčasne antropologická a spásonosná, sa nachádza vo Svätom písme, ktoré predstavuje manželstvo v zmysle stvorenia (*Genesis*) a vykúpenia (Ježiš, Pavol). „Pre pozitívne zmyšľajúcich právnikov, právny vzťah v manželskom zväzku je len výsledkom aplikácie nejakého ľudského normatívu formálne platného a účinného. V dôsledku toho ľudská skúsenosť života a manželskej lásky zostáva niekde mimo „právneho“ inštitútu manželstva. Vytvára sa takto roztržka medzi právom a ľudskou existenciou, ktorá radikálne popiera možnosť antropologického založenia práva. Úplne rozdielne je tradičné učenie Cirkvi v ponímaní

23 Porov. M. GRAULICH, *Evangelizzare la cultura giuridica*, in M. GRAULICH – J.PUDUMAI DOSS (eds.), *Vino in otri vecchi? Sfide Pastorali e Giuridiche della Nuova Evangelizzazione*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2013, 208-210.

24 Porov. BENEDICTUS XVI, *Allocuzione alla Rota Romana*, 27 gennaio 2007, in AAS 99 (2007), 87.

25 Porov. *Ibid.*, 88.

právneho rozmeru manželského zväzku, ktoré má základ v učení Ježiša Krista, apoštolov a svätých otcov.²⁶

Vidiac súčasné vyššie spomínané zákonné úpravy, poznačené subjektívnym relativizmom, „tradícia Cirkvi potvrdzuje jasne prirodzene právny charakter manželstva, to jest, že je prirodzenou súčasťou oblasti spravodlivosti v medziludských vzťahoch. V tomto zmysle sa právo skutočne stretáva so životom a láskou, ako jeho vnútorná potreba bytia“²⁷.

Tento aspekt je treba zdôrazniť v službe aj voči občianskej spoločnosti, čo je vlastne svedectvom o pravde Evanjelia. Súčasná právna kultúra stále ešte potrebuje príspevok kresťanstva, ktorý v sebe musí spajať aspekt rozumnosti a viery.

Ak právo chce ešte chrániť rodinu a nielen konštatovať istý rozvoj sprevádzaný predpismi a ktoré nepripúšťajú iné možnosti, potrebuje príspevok kresťanstva, ktoré predstavuje myšlienku a ideál rodiny, založenej na manželstve.

6 ZÁVER

V súčasnej právnej kultúre, vo všeobecnosti poznačenej relativizmom, Cirkev stojí pred tromi úlohami: musí sa osmeliť, musí viesť dialóg a musí formovať.

Osmeliť sa, ako to robili prví kresťania, a predložiť evanjeliové videnie človeka; poukázať v spoločnosti na hodnotu a význam Evanjelia a kresťanskej viery, tak ako to povedal pápež Benedikt XVI. vo svojej apoštolskej postsynodálnej exhortácii *Verbum Domini*: „Iste, hlavnou úlohou Cirkvi nie je vytvoriť spravodlivejšiu spoločnosť, hoci jej prislúcha právo a povinnosť zaujať stanovisko v etických a mravných otázkach, ktoré sa týkajú dobra osôb a národov. Je úlohou predovšetkým veriacich laikov, vychovaných v škole Evanjelia, aby priamo zasiahli v sociálnej a politickej oblasti.“²⁸ Pokiaľ ide o novú evanjelizáciu, Cirkev je povolaná k tomu, aby obhajovala dôstojnosť a transcendentnosť

26 Porov. *Ibid.*, 89.

27 Porov. *Ibid.*, 90.

28 Porov. BENEDICTUS XVI, Esortazione apostolica postsinodale *Verbum Domini* sulla parola di Dio nella vita e nella missione della Chiesa, 30 settembre 2010, n. 100, in AAS 102 (2010), 770.

ľudskej osoby a uznanie týchto skutočností aj v civilno-právnej oblasti. Cirkev musí ohlasovať, že len v Ježišovi človek môže spoznať plnosť svojho povolania, pretože len Kristus zjavuje človeka človeku.²⁹

Cirkev musí viesť rovnocenný a skutočný dialóg, ktorý sa neobmedzuje len na kritizovanie zla, ktoré jestvuje, ale má predkladať ozajstné a zmysluplné návrhy, ktoré sa nezakladajú len na sociologických výskumoch, ako to robia takmer všetci, ale predovšetkým na evanjeliomom poslanstve. Cirkev musí byť presvedčená, že ohlasovanie morálnych princípov, ktoré sú súčasťou tohto poslanstva, je jej úlohou, lebo má strážiť ľudskú dôstojnosť. Počnúc Evanjeliom, v súčasnej spoločenskej diskusii kresťania majú ohlasovať, že ľudská dôstojnosť nie je dôsledkom nejakého pozitívneho legislatívneho aktu. Dôstojnosť človeka má svoj pôvod v skutočnosti, že človek je obrazom Boha. Preto ľudské práva, ktoré z toho vyplývajú, nie sú len vyjadrením vôle zákonodarcu, ale výrazom spravodlivosti. Pápež Benedikt XVI. vo svojom príhovore na pôde Organizácie spojených národov dňa 18. apríla 2008 sa k tomu vyjadril takto: „Skúsenosť nás učí, že často zákony prevažujú nad spravodlivosťou, keď naliehanie nad dodržiavaním ľudských práv ich predstavuje akoby boli výlučným produktom zákonodárnych postupov alebo rozhodnutí tých, ktorí sú práve pri moci. Keď sa ľudské práva predstavujú len v zmysle zákonov, práva sú v ohrození, že sa stanú slabými návrhmi odtrhnutými od etického a rozumného rozmeru, čo je vlastne ich základom a cieľom.“³⁰

V tomto dialógu právna kultúra potrebuje, aby sa očistila vierou. Nielen vo svojom sociálnom učení „Cirkev predkladá dôvody, pochádzajúce z rozumného uvažovania a prirodzeného práva, to znamená, že vychádza z toho, čo sa zhoduje s povahou každého ľudského bytia. Cirkev vie, že nie je jej úlohou, aby politicky zabezpečila uživotnenie tohto sociálneho učenia. Cirkev ponúka službu formovania svedomia v politike a chce prispieť k tomu, aby vzrástalo povedomie skutočnej potreby spravodlivosti a pripravenosť konať v záujme

29 Porov. IOANNES PAULUS II, Enciclica *Redemptor hominis* all'inizio del suo ministero pontificale, 4 marzo 1979, n. 10, in AAS 71 (1979), 274-275.

30 Porov. BENEDICTUS XVI, *Discorso all'ONU*, 18 aprile 2008, in AAS 100 (2008), 335.

spravodlivosti, hoci sa to niekedy nezosuladzuje s osobnými záujmami. To znamená, že vybudovanie spravodlivého sociálneho a štátneho zriadenia, vďaka ktorému každý dostane to, čo mu patrí, je hlavnou úlohou každej generácie. Pokiaľ ide o politickú úlohu, táto nemôže byť bezprostrednou záležitosťou Cirkvi. Nakoľko je to primárnou ľudskou úlohou, Cirkev má povinnosť ponúknuť prostredníctvom rozumného uvažovania a etického formovania svoj osobitný príspevok, aby požiadavky spravodlivosti sa stali zrozumiteľnými a spoločensky realizovateľnými.³¹

Nakoniec, je to úloha formovať, pretože záväzok prispieť k evanjelizácii právnej kultúry je povinnosťou, ktorá sa týka predovšetkým laikov, ktorí pôsobia v politike, v zákonodarstve a v civilnom práve. Je treba ich vychovať, vzdelávať a pripraviť, aby boli schopní vniesť na aeropág právneho svetla evanjeliového posolstva, a s ním aj hodnotné kritérium, ktorým sa bude dať rozlišovať medzi spravodlivosťou a nespravodlivosťou, medzi dobrom a zlom, medzi právom a tým, čo ním nikdy nemôže byť.

ÚDAJE O AUTOROVI

Prof. Miroslav Konštanc Adam, O.P.

Angelicum - Pontificia Università San Tommaso d'Aquino

Largo Angelicum 1

00184 Roma

31 Porov. BENEDICTUS XVI, Enciclica *Deus caritas est* sull'amore cristiano, 25 dicembre 2005, n. 28a, in AAS 98 (2006), 239.

ODBORNÉ PROFILY AUTOROV

Juraj Feník, S.T.D.



Odborný asistent na teologickej fakulte KU v Košiciach so špecifikáciou na Nový Zákon. Základné štúdiá filozofie a teológie absolvoval na Rímskokatolíckej Cyrilometodskej bohosloveckej fakulte – teologický inštitút, Košice. Postgraduálne štúdiá absolvoval na The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC. Je členom Catholic Biblical Association of America, člen redakčnej rady Studia Biblica Slovaca a Verba Theologica.

David Hunter, BA, M.A., PhD.



David G. Hunter je predsedom Cottrell - Rolfes katedry katolíckych štúdií na University of Kentucky. Vyučuje na katedre dejín a klasických štúdií, ako aj na katedre moderných a klasických jazykov, literatúry a kultúr. Odborne sa zameriava na rané kresťanstvo, patrológiu - štúdiá o ranokresťanskom myslení, histórii a literatúre, manželstvo a celibát v ranej cirkvi. Absolvoval štúdiá latinčiny na Catholic University of America, a štúdiá teológie na University of St. Michael's College a University of Notre Dame. Jeho súčasný výskum sa zameriava na históriu kňazského celibátu v katolíckej cirkvi, spisy Ambroziastera a Augustína. Je autorom niekoľkých publikácií a mnohých článkov o autoroch ranej cirkvi ako je Augustín, Ambróz, Hieronym, Klement Alexandrijský, Ján Zlatoústý.

Hunterova nedávna kniha *Manželstvo, celibát a herézy v Starovekom kresťanstve: Joviniánov spor* (Oxford University Press, 2007) sa zaoberá ranokresťanskými debatami o manželstve a celibáte. Je spoluautorom Oxfordskej príručky ranokresťanských štúdií (2008), bol prezidentom Severoamerickej patristickej spoločnosti (2006-2008), je aktívnym členom poradných orgánov časopisov *Vigiliae Christianae*, *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, *Journal of Late Antiquity*, *Augustiniana*. V súčasnosti je redakčným riaditeľom série prekladov „Cirkevní otcovia“ ako aj „Encyklopédie raného kresťanstva“ vo vydavateľstve Brill.

**Prof. Stephan
Kampowski**



je profesorom filozofickej antropológie na Pápežskej Lateránskej univerzite na Inštitúte Jána Pavla II. pre štúdium manželstva a rodiny v Ríme. Je jedným z koordinátorov odboru Bioetika a Formácia, ktorý zabezpečuje v spolupráci s Katolíckou univerzitou Najsvätejšieho Srdca v Ríme. Medzi jeho najvýznamnejšie publikácie patria: *Arendt, Augustine, and the New Beginning* (2008) a *Una libertà più grande: la biotecnologia, l'amore e il destino umano. Un dialogo con Hans Jonas e Juergen Habermas* (2010).

**Prof. Miroslav
Konštanc Adam, OP**



Dominikán, profesor kanonického práva. Základné filozoficko-teologické štúdiá absolvoval na Palackého univerzite v Olomouci. Licenciátne a doktorské štúdium kánonického práva na Pápežskej univerzite sv. T. Akvinského (Angelicum) v Ríme. Jazykovo sa zdokonaľoval na Katolíckej univerzite v Lille (Francúzsko), na Pápežskej univerzite v Salamanke (Španielsko) a v Providence College (Rhode Island, New England, USA). V rokoch 2001-2009 bol prvým prvým provinciálom slovenskej provincie rehole dominikánov. V roku 2005 bol vymenovaný za profesora na Fakulte kánonického práva Pápežskej univerzity sv. T. Akvinského v Ríme. V roku 2006 bol ustanovený za sudcu Interdiecézneho Tribunálu Rímskej diecézy a ostatných diecéz oblasti Lazia. V roku 2009 bol vymenovaný za komisára Kongregácie pre náuku viery a Kongregácie pre inštitúty zasväteného života a spoločnosti apoštolského života v Ríme. Od roku 2009 bol vymenovaný za rektora a dekana Fakulty kanonického práva Univerzity sv. T. Akvinského Angelicum.

RODINA A FARNOSŤ:
PERSPEKTÍVY NOVEJ EVANJELIZÁCIE
Zborník z vedeckej konferencie s medzinárodnou účasťou
20. september 2013, Hlavná 89, Košice.

Mgr. Bc. Richard Kucharčík, M.A. PhD.

Pre Teologickú fakultu Košice, KU v Ružomberku vydalo
Michal Vaško – Vydavateľstvo, Prešov,
v roku 2014 ako svoju 940. publikáciu

Náklad XXX. kusov

Tlač a knihárske spracovanie
Michal Vaško – Vydavateľstvo
Nám. Kráľovnej Pokoja 3, 080 01 Prešov

ISBN 978-80-7165-940-2