
Caritative Social Work and the Issue of Patristic Anthropology

Karitatīvais sociālais darbs un patristiskās antropoloģijas jautājums

Dace Dolace, Mag theol. (Latvia)

By developing in Latvia innovative theory and practice of Caritative social work, the strategic attention should be paid to the anthropological foundation of this discipline. Article defines the term of social charity (*caritas*) and seeks for its roots in the concept of Patristic anthropology that has been developed in the Orthodox paradigm of the Early Christianity and contains a holistic view of a person, in that way serving as an essential resource in establishing modern practice of Caritative social work and in overcoming the pragmatic view of life or the so called 'instrumental rationality' of a modern human being. According to the principle of interdisciplinarity, article analyses the following categories of the Patristic anthropology – ontology of a person, image of God (*Imago Dei*) in a person, person's ontological transformation, anthropological identity – by stressing the social capacity of these categories and their links with the practice of Caritative work.

Key words: Caritative social work, charity (*caritas*), Patristic anthropology, person, ontology of a person, hamartological passions/ pathologies, anthropological identity.

Introduction

Concept and theory of Caritative social work in Europe has long history and stable traditions that are rooted in European cultural consciousness, which in turn historically has developed under the influence of Christian Church, philosophy of humanism and Christian democracy. In Latvia, Caritative social work is a new profession¹. Its mission in our country is to put into practice integral social and ecclesial practice, at the same time giving also witness that Latvia has more close connection with the historical paradigm of social policy being characteristic for Europe than with the American liberal and individualistic model of social work that has already left a specific influence on social welfare system of Latvia.

The basic strategy of social policy in its essence should be defined by existing understanding in society of a human being or anthropological concept. Although in the centre of social work sense there should be exactly the human question, nevertheless history shows that link between anthropology and the helping professions not always is understood or reflected upon, or strategically developed.

One of the reasons is that anthropological concept in the tradition of European reasoning of the New era has developed problematically, because anthropology as independent discipline has always been attributed the secondary role: in the traditional European philosophy and system of knowledge human concept has developed under the influence of philosophy and is structurally fragmented in philosophical basic categories, thus losing its holistic status. For its turn, in the ideological atmosphere of Eastern Europe the understanding of a human being has been subjected to historical, economical reduction. These trends have influenced also the process of social assistance both focusing on human social and material development and leaving unnoticed other anthropological aspects, as well as making a human being into ideological instrument.

This kind of influence of socially reduced or deformed by materialism anthropological views on social policy strategy is unconscious and spontaneous, instead so that social policy would be analysed and planned in goal-oriented way, and would become the builder of 'solidary civilization' (The *Caritas Europa Strategy*, 6). Lacking anthropological reflection, social work and social policy has not possibility to critically evaluate existing trends in society, as well as risks and influences of the existing age on a human community, which all in all brings life of society *in general* and social assistance *in particular* away from the human factor.

The humanitarian sciences – philosophy, psychology, theology – were also faced with the similar problem of “dehumanization” at the beginning of 20th century. Therefore there happened a counter-reaction in these disciplines in the form of so called “Anthropological Turn”. Anthropologization of theology and philosophy happened under the flag of “overcoming the metaphysics” (Хоружий, 2004, 157) with the goal to resign from abstract theoretical systems in humanitarian sciences. As a strong example of it in philosophy there emerged the discourse of philosophy of existentialism. In its turn, in theology the “anthropological turn” of 20th century was marked by returning to older anthropological roots of dogmatic systems of the age of rationalism that from its beginnings forms Christian teaching and experience. It is generally known expression of the Orthodox theologian J. Meyendorff that “nowadays theology must become an anthropology or theology should develop on the basis on anthropology” (Мейендорф, 1981, 88).

Anthropology by design is overarching science about a human being. Its disciplines study human being in different modes – biologic, ethnologic, social, culturological and religious. In 20th century the modern social and cultural anthropology has strengthen its positions, especially ethnological anthropology (B. K. Malinovsky, C. G. Seligman a.o.). It is historically developed trend of anthropology to focus more on the studies not of its own but to other societies (Cl. Levi-Strauss, L. Lévy-Bruhl, G. G. Fraser a.o.) thus seeking the answers on scientific questions to what is human as being; what is the morphological structure of a human that defines human behaviour; what is transcendent in a human, and what – socially, ethnically, culturally determined.

In this palette of anthropological disciplines as invaluable contribution is the Patristic of Byzantine human concept, which has formed in the paradigm of the Early Christianity. It is of importance to stress that Patristic anthropology reveals

a human being not as narrowly understood religious being, but as a holistic person in its cosmological, sacred, social, biologic dimensions, drawing special attention to a human activity where sacred and social aspects form inseparable unity.

The term of Caritative social work

Serious attention should be turned to anthropological issue when formulating and realizing the content and methods of Caritative social work, as well when educating specialists of this work. It is defined, first of all, by the very definition of profession itself – Caritative social work is a professional activity being directed towards renewal of social and spiritual functioning of an individual or group, based in the principles of solidarity and caritative cohesion. It anticipates the increase of life quality of human being and society, as well as inclusion of human being or social group into society but with the condition that these social changes should happen along with moral and spiritual changes in the very personality of human being. Caritative social approach sees social and spiritual functioning as integrated wholeness where social problems of a particular person and those of society are in dynamic connection with spiritual condition of a human being and society.

Charity based in solidarity and cohesion is the attitude, method that is rooted in anthropology. Here we should examine the very term of charity. *Caritas* is a Latin term, the Greek equivalent of which is ἀγάπη (*agapē*); in the discourse of Christianity it primarily means ‘love that is a carrier of divine energy; divine love’ (Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. I, 1964, 21-55). In the scriptures of the New Testament it is revealed in two dimensions: as a conclusion that God is love (*Deus caritas est*, 1 John 4:8) and as setting of Christ that every person should become a person of love and should love God and one’s neighbour even if it is an enemy (Mark 12: 30-31). This meaning for the term of charity dominates also in post-apostolic period and theology of the Church Fathers. During history under the influence of socially active Protestantism (especially in England) the Latin term *caritas* to great extent transformed into English *charity* meaning ‘practical mercy; philanthropy.’ Nowadays in the Church’s social teaching the term of charity, regaining its topicality, dynamically include all historical layers of meaning – both the love impulse full of God’s mercy, and involvement of human being thus becoming an agent of this divine love, a carrier of love and its practical embodiment in the world. Catholic social teaching and caritative work is based in the principle of apostolic charity. Catholic priest, doctor of philosophy William Ferree, when interpreting the text of Apostle Peter (1 Peter 4:8): “Love covers over a multitude of sins” (*caritas operit multitudinem peccatorum*), emphasizes that caritative work is solidary approach to a human being, taking as a strategic starting point not negations and sinful state of a person, but the good, the vital that every person possesses in expressions only characteristic for him or her. Caritative approach accepts a human situation as it is, in all of its realism and at the same time focuses on the human potential. Thus, the nature of charity is integrating one (Ferree, 2003, 11). Father Ferree states that only such an approach is able to reanimate creative power of spirit inherent in a person – ability to answer the charity and become a companion in life-witnessing processes in one’s own life and those of society.

At the foundation of caritative perspective there lies integrative understanding about a human being or holistic anthropology.

Descriptive setting of education problem of the social work

In Latvia, the only higher education institution that already for twenty years forms and develops the concept of Caritative social work is Latvian Christian Academy. *Caritative social work* is accredited base program of the academy, however the strategic goals of academy extends to more extensive interconnections, not only the preparation of professionals for the needs of labour market. One of the topicalities of academic work is to work out the philosophy and methodology of Caritative social work within the context of social policy of Latvia and that of European Social agenda. Similarly, the program of Caritative social work anticipates that in acquisition of profession the students are not limiting themselves with narrow learning of skills and professional functions, because the specifics of profession asks for

- creative, socially and theologically integrated approach to social processes and problems, namely, solid knowledge in the disciplines of theology and sociology as well the operational activity of researcher;
- new attitude towards so called *client* – solidary dialogue, at the foundation of which is conceptually deepened, ecclesially anthropological perspective on formerly passive recipient of service and assistance (client);
- ability to recognize and activate the Church's resources in the system of social welfare. In Latvia, this is an innovative approach and is being based in the ability of a caritative specialist to be a member of the Church – Christ's sacramental body – or the embodier of divine-human nature of the Church in society. Only being in this described condition a human being is able to realize in authentic way caritative social task.

Consequently, academy is faced with a constant challenge in the education process – in what way together with students to overcome pragmatological limits of profession and to provide Caritative social work with the necessary education of wholeness, whose unifying centre is a 'human factor.'

Further in the article the descriptive formulation of problem of Caritative social work education perfectly demonstrates the relevance of anthropological dimension. Conclusions are based in the experience that the author of this article has gained working as an assistant professor at Latvian Christian Academy and giving lectures in the disciplines of Caritative social work, including Methodology of Caritative social work, Mental pathologies of human consciousness, Christian counselling, and Palliative care. The content of the subjects mentioned is directed towards providing assistance and care to people in different critical social and spiritual problem-situations and difficulties. During 2013-2015 within the study subjects there were regularly performed questionnaires of opinions of students, made observations and initiated discussions with the goal to recognize the main expectations, views and wishes of becoming specialists of Caritative social work while acquiring the professional skills, as well to recognize how the students understand the content of caring profession for the human, what kind of meaning they attribute to their profession, and, coming out of that – what aspirations and requirements students put forth for their education.

Questionnaires and observations gave witness about one, typical, dominating trend in the understanding of students on what is the meaning of qualitative education of Caritative social worker and successful activity in the helping professions: acquiring the disciplines mentioned above, there dominates a demand among students

that in education process they should be taught the specific approaches, techniques, and methods (among them, 'Christian techniques' and methods) how to provide assistance to the client. Most typical expressions are: "I wish to acquire what I should specifically do"; "how to help"; "what to say to a dying person, alcoholic, etc."; "how to behave in the presence of a patient with serious disease"; "how to convince a drug addict, suicide, a.o."; "how to correctly solve specific situations"; "how to save a person"; "how to correctly proclaim the Gospel to unbeliever"; "what are the right answers to questions of people why they are in trouble", and similar.

Conclusion – there exists a problematic, even dangerous tendency to reduce professional education only on acquiring skills and techniques for achieving specific goals and quick, safe results. This problem have causes on different levels:

1) *Psychological causes.* There exists valid risk that behind the positive wish of students "to know how to help", "to know how the problem should be solved" and "to achieve a result" there lies self-protecting impulse of a human being – fears from awareness of one's own weakness; fears to experience a psychological discomfort; a desire to feel psychologically safe and by no circumstances to lose self-assurance, self-sufficiency. This serves as a soil for the following shift of values: the needs and interests of clients in the process of providing assistance may be replaced by the needs of a specialist. Then as a primarily task (usually unreflected, unconscious) for assistance provider becomes the overcoming, removal of his or her own psychological discomfort or, putting in other words, – ensuring of one's own psychological comfort. This kind of psychological need of self-sufficiency turns the new specialist into a closed individualistic monad that is not directed on communication and cooperation in the process of providing assistance. Professional education is responsible for this ethical aspect. Otherwise, professional activity is being threatened with the following risk factors: obtaining ego-centered, uncontrolled power over the "object" of assistance; orientation to outward, short-term result by ignoring that the other person is of value and uniqueness.

In education as well as in professional activity there are the need for specific road signs that would allow a person to orientate in one's own conditions of soul, and to learn one's own unreflected, ego-centric motives. As such road signs there serve the spiritual criteria of inner inspection of conscience cultivated in the Church's tradition, which direct the inner analysis of a person to the sacrament of confession of sins, which becomes an integral part of identity of Caritative social worker;

2) *Social causes.* In the professional fields (such as social work, pedagogy, psychotherapy, public relations, and other) there have developed specific orientation towards quick acquiring of professional skills and techniques in order to engage as soon as possible in one's own career. The demand of career-driven education realizes a typical pressure of market-oriented society on the strategy of education nowadays, – there happens its technologization, rapid and un-critical overtaking of different methods, not respecting cultural and social context and human factor in education. Such disposition is influencing also the training of Christian laity or diaconal work organized by the Church. Practical theologian J. Loder calls this trend in Christianity as an "anxious pragmatism that demands: Give us a program, any program, that will work. And give us some plan that will work for young people. The notion of "workability" is seldom deeply probed. Most crassly, the aim become bringing more bodies into the church, when instead it ought to be for the church to embody the Spirit of Christ in the world" (Wright & Kuentzel, 2004, 316);

3) *Anthropological background.* In this case, it is possible to diagnose the uncontrolled invasion of human concept influenced by philosophy of pragmatism in the strategy of higher professional education. A *practical, pragmatic, achievement-oriented* individual of modern market society is one more typical example of a reduced anthropology. This anthropological type has been defined by J. Habermas calling the practice of such a person as “instrumental behaviour” that is based on “instrumental rationality”. Instrumental behaviour is a threat to peers of a person and nature, because everything is being subjected to achieving only the individual goals of the operating subject by ignoring the communicative activity (Habermas, 1990; Young, 1989);

4) *Perspective of practical theology.* All the mentioned about instrumental approach refers the same way to the activity of Christian assistance, if it realizes towards the receiver of assistance in unreflected way instrumental or paternalistic approach that in the discourse of practical theology critically is expressed with the Greek term τέχνη (*tehnē*) – ‘agility of craft; cliché-type activities’ and for performing of which there is no need for creative and spiritual efforts of human being. However, practical theology defines that Christian efforts for the sake of other people always are spiritually creative as a newly-set task, which should be solved by using a totally different competence, – not the competence of “technical handbook” but the so called strategy of πράξις (*praxis*) (Anderson, 2001, 59). In theological discourse *praxis* is used as untranslated Greek term expressing specific “charged” practice that is defined by practical theology as God’s action mediated through human action, handing over of God’s activity, incarnating it in human situations and society (Heitink, 1999, 8). Caritative *praxis* includes in organic unity both the outward, materially subjected and inward spiritual activity, and that asks for qualitatively other requirements also for education of Caritative worker. Human personality and how it “feels” oneself in the world should change within the education process: human is not a performer of instructions (“we should raise funds and open soup kitchen for the homeless, should organize humanitarian aid for the needy”; “we should teach young people, or drug addicts, how to believe in God”) but more a practitioner-explorer who by doing finds out and reveal the inner, divine goal – τέλος (*tēlos*) or spiritual meaning of the task to be performed.

For example, the outward goal of social ministry and, along with that, the product of activity is the very delivered plate with food or package of clothes. But such an action in itself may be traditionally paternalistic – as protective, tutorial assistance from “above”, following unified example, program: “We know what you need and how to give it to you.” And today international deacony and social work organizations recognize the prevalence of this paternalistic attitude and approach as a threat to much of work of social deacony of European Churches. In that way the likeness of God of a receiver of assistance is being denied, and along with that his or her human dignity, mysterious power of life and in consequence – human ability to be incorporated in community (see: *The Conference of European Churches*). If the work of social assistance and Christian ministry is directed only towards the outward goal, that deepens the condition of social exclusion for the receiver of assistance and does so because it does not seek for God’s action and fulfilment (*tēlos*) being inherent for this situation. The activity of Spirit in principle is inclusive, cohesive, not exclusive, isolated or schismatic.

Practical theology in fact tries to renew the integrity of human understanding that under the influence of a modern world is subjected to deformation and fragmentation or – to anthropological crisis;

5) *Context of modern anthropological crisis.* Turn of 20th and 21st century is characterised by all-embracing shift of social, cultural and theological anthropological paradigm. It is connected to the crisis of traditional anthropological views. Sign of crisis is inefficacy of existing knowledge about human being in situations where one should find answers and solutions to modern social, educational, religious and other problems in conditions of aggressive social dynamics of the century. Symptoms of crisis, first of all, are expressed in practice – there happens rapid changes with the person. Human being is not who he or she was, the previous, seemingly so known, in the basis unchangeable object, – instead of it a human being has become a subject of active changes and intensive anthropological dynamics. To the expressions of this dynamics there belong, for example, extreme psycho-practices, suicidal terrorism, pseudo-mystical sects, drug addiction, immersion into virtual reality, criminal behaviour, terrorism and similar. Philosopher and theologian Sergey Horuzhy for the designation of these phenomena uses the term “park of anthropological deviations” (Хоружий, 2004). S. Horuzhy the mentioned anthropological deviations describes as critical moving closer to the ultimate border situations of one’s existence and the existence in them. Theoretical crisis of anthropology is characterised by the fact that existing theories and concepts cannot describe and explain this newly-emerged dynamics. That refers also to the main basic elements of European human concept. And now one should admit that this coherent, integral scheme with all of its terms is not working because it cannot provide an explanation to what really happens with a human being, and cannot provide strategic practices for education, psychology, social work for overcoming the pathological conditions of this human existence.

Philosopher and theologian Constantine Sigov, one of the prominent interpreters of French philosopher Emmanuel Levinas, describes anthropological crisis as a break between ontology and ethics in modern teachings on human being. With this break there are associated socially anthropological processes that E. Levinas define in the “theory on disappearance of a human being” (Сигов, 2004).

The description of basic terms of Patristic anthropological paradigm in the Caritative social perspective

Today in seeking for a new holistic anthropological paradigm, philosophy, theology and pedagogy comes back to the Patristic or Byzantine anthropology (of the Church Fathers of 4th to 14th centuries) (*see* Хоружий, 2005; Torrance, 1998; 2001). In the system of theological and philosophical ideas the model of Patristic anthropology is no more divided and subjected to other disciplines but interpreted as an authentic science about human being as independent, ontological, and not-reducible wholeness. In the Patristic theology human science contains undivided unity of theory and spiritual empirical practice.

The treasure of the Patristic anthropology is developed through centuries, based and verified in the experience of tradition of spiritual practice, nevertheless this anthropological school is not esoterically closed. Quite opposite, – it is open for dialogue by providing paradigmatical positions to other humanitarian sciences.

The theology of Greek or Byzantine Church because of its unaffected holistic identity in the most authentic way today is able to approach the interdisciplinary dialogue and to realize a principle called “theology as a radical human science.” The methodology of realizing this interdisciplinary principle is worked out by

Catholic theologian Karl Rahner. He believes that “theological anthropology is not at all the extension of secular human science but its center” or *radix* – Lat. ‘root’. Namely, “if we would analyse the expressions of theological anthropology each separately, we would come to conclusion that they are mere radicalization (bringing to its roots, the deepening of the layers of meaning – *author’s comment*) of secular disciplines” (Rahner, 1975, 387-406; Kīslings, 2004, 47-57).

Therefore, the point of interdisciplinary integration is to be looked for inside the key terms and propositions – in the layers of their meaning. Consequently, within this article the Patristic anthropology will not be described all-inclusively, but by proposing only those basic positions and terms that may serve as an integrative anthropological resource for overcoming the recognized problem of social welfare (and modern education) – the tendency of pragmatism and instrumental rationality.

In the period until 4th century after Christ, the Church in dynamic discussions with hellenized cultural environment of Europe and the Middle East developed its theological basic postulates. One of them is an ontological concept of a **person**². The Church Fathers’ theology of 4th century raised philosophical understanding of a human being to a new level – by revealing a person as a live, unique personality. There was created ontology of a person that did not exist in a classic Greek-Roman philosophy before and could not exist because of its monistic cosmology. Understanding of human as a person developed gradually – Greek philosophy did not define person ontologically: that was done by their Christian successors – Greek theologians of the 4th century (so called Cappadocian Fathers and Athanasius the Great who developed until its completion the doctrine of God as a Triad). Consequently – human being as a person was interpreted resulting from God who is a Person and at the same time – the source of all personological reality. Christ who unites in himself two natures – divine and human – is “*personalizing Person*, and we are *personalized persons* who derive from him the true personal existence of ours” (see Torrance, 1989).

The term “person” in Greek – *πρόσωπον* (*prosōpon*) originally was used with anatomical meaning: ‘the part of head, forehead, face’ (see Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. VI, 1968) denoting only the visible part of a human being. However in Hellenism, the same way as in Christianity, human being has always been **psychosomatic** being or unity of substance and spirit; in Hellenic anthropology body was understood as less important component, as short-term container of soul, not as visible sign of person’s fullness and wholeness (health!).

Body as epiphany of a person, as manifestation of human’s spiritual content, – is quality that later in the era of Christian theology will characterise human as a person. Therefore, a person is a concentrated, mysterious unity of body and soul, “co-existence of visible and invisible nature, microcosm of the natural and supernatural” (Иоанн Дамаскин, 2002). These two components makes human being a person with one precondition: if this unity is inseparably organic “mystery of fusion or sacrament” (Яннарас, 2005); even more, if this organic fusion in principle is eternal. That allows theoretically and practically to relate to a person as of carrier of materialised spirituality and the opposite – as of spiritualised body that opens creative possibilities for solution of human biological, medical and social problems.

One more semantic meaning of the term *prosōpon* is connected to the world of antique theatre: the actor’s mask is denoted with this word, later – a role³. In deeper meaning both terms express also philosophical views of the era on human being:

person is understood as a mask. In Greek cosmology where Logos keep all things together in harmonic order – human being as unique, individual does not possess ontological value. In Plato's "Laws" (*De Legibus*) there is expressed that tragic contradiction, which is revealed also in Greek tragedy: "World (cosmos) doesn't exist because of the human but human exists because of the world" (Zizioulas, 1985). Person is nothing but "mask", which is carried by cosmos; idea, which is expressed as a moral necessity; "mask", which from within is ruled by some stronger order, which in its turn determines human will, making the term of freedom relative and empty. Consequently, here it is not possible to speak about ontological status of a person, because one of the qualitative characteristics of a person is exactly **freedom, free will, free choice** that leads a person into the sphere of **responsibility and love**.

The Latin equivalent to the Greek *prosōpon* is Roman *persona*, the dominating meaning of which is 'role', with the content more close to individuality (for example, in the philosophy of Cicero). That conforms to Roman views about human as of carrier of social role, about person as creator of social relationships (as kinds of relationships here appears organizations, collegiums, councils, associations, contracts, after all – state). Freedom of individual is alien term also in this concept of personality, – freedom is realized by state as community of organized relationships that defines limits. Concept of state determines the content of concept of a person. Certainly, **social aspect** is one of the determining ones in the understanding of person also in modern theories of personality; however here is the need for other defining foundation of personality.

Greek-Roman idea puts forth idea about a person and dimension of existence that can be called a personological, however the specifics of this worldview is that cosmological concept does not allow to substantiate this dimension ontologically, because existence of personality is derived from other categories – cosmos and state.

In order to set free a person ontologically, there was a necessity for radical cosmological revolution that historically was realised by theologians of the Greek Church in their efforts to attribute formulations to the content of their faith – Triune God. In Western theology already in the 3rd century the Church apologist Tertullian used the term of person in the doctrine of Trinity (*una substantia, tres personae* – 'God is one essence, three persons'), however that was not accepted in Greek Eastern theology, because the term "person" was lacking ontological heavy-weight, and understanding of Triune God was turned into a heresy: "One God that expresses itself in three roles" (Žilsons, 1997). Biblical worldview breaks apart Hellenic cycle of closed ontology (that cosmos exists and functions following the principle of ontological necessity and human person is the adjunct of it).

First of all, Bible doctrine on creation *ex nihilo* ('from nothing') gives radically different understanding of existence: world (cosmos) is traced back to its very origins, to the transcendently, sovereignly Existing – God. That allows for theology to formulate cosmos not as necessity but as "the product of freedom and love, – with Christian doctrine of creation the 'origin' – ἀρχή (*arhē*) of the world was moved to the sphere of freedom" (Zizioulas, 1985).

Secondly, the very existence of God himself is identified as a Person. God is not an abstract divine essence but primarily Father, which in love freely releases from himself in existence Son (Logos) and Holy Spirit. God's ontological freedom is in fact that God transcends, overcomes his necessary nature, comes out of his self-sufficient, monadic existence and as Father gives birth to Son.

That is God's **ecstatic** (Gr. ἔκ-στασις (*ek-stasis*) 'being outside; a condition outside') character: God's essence is identical to love or act of community realized freely. Love is ontologically realized freedom: coming out of one's own person in order to create a community with other person. Love is existence mode of God. Thus God's person becomes a world-shaping and ruling principle in general, and God's person that has created a **human being after his divine image and likeness** becomes an ontological foundation of human being as a person. **Human person inherits the same mode of existence – love as *ek-stasis***. Today in theology of high relevance has become a question about divine Trinity or Triad as a basic model of relationships, – being a concept of derivation of all human relationships from the mystery of love relationships among the Persons of God (Torrance, 1975; Grenz, 2001).

Modern Greek Christian philosopher Christos Yannaras who actualize the Byzantine theological tradition of the 4th century in the context of modern existential philosophy accentuates exactly this ecstatic theology as existentially and socially powerful (Яннарас, 2005). Chr. Yannaras shows that the relationship fact of person has already been rooted in the difficult semantics of the Greek term: prefix *πρός* (*pros-*) together with noun *ὄψ* (*ōps*) 'a look, stare, eye' (in genitive *ὠπός* – *ōpos*) forms composite term *πρός-ὠπόν* (*pros-ōpon*) 'something that is in front of eyes; a look being directed to something.' Thus, the term "person" expresses mutually correlated reality. Person originally is subject of immediate relationships; person in principle is co-related with some Other. Both the etymology of the term and roots of person in divine reality excludes individualistic understanding of a person outside the space of relationships. Ecstatic exceeding of oneself is the essence of relations. That is ascetic **self-refusal from self-sufficiency of an individual nature**, it is giving oneself away, devotion in orientation to the Other. Category "**Other**" shows to ethical dimension of Patristic anthropology. Emanuel Levinas says – "*onto-anthropo-logy* being isolated from ethics expresses itself with the words of Cain to God: "Am I my brother's keeper?" (Gen 4:9)".

Only in love relationships there can be revealed **person's uniqueness, mystery, its transcendental core** that allows a person to participate in God's life and for God – in a person's life. This conceptual line is developed further by modern Christian psychology being based in the antique tradition of the Church and in the practice of relationships consequently respecting ontological nature of person. T. Florenskaya speaks about **principles of love of caritative dialogue** and possibility of being (Флоренская, 2001):

1) main condition – the recognition of potential spiritual "I" of the other person. (It should be mentioned that this spiritual "I" is not a simple metaphor, image but, according to the anthropological views of Biblical science, centre of personality, in which takes place the life of spirit of a person – hypostatic communication with God's spirit of person or Christ (more detailed on that *see*: Hierotheos (Vlachos), Metropolitan of Nafpaktos, 2000);

2) from it results that in principle there is not possible to make pressure and lead a person by not doing him or her harm. The deepness of other person is a secret to us. In the dialogue, thanks to the quality of relationships, personality of companion unfolds itself, it allows to see its mystery. Also the authority of 20th century pastoral theology Metropolitan of Surozh Anthony (Bloom) points out that in communication with a seriously ill or spiritually injured person the basic law is to avoid a dominating activity,

which is expressed as efforts to help him or her by calming down, preaching and convincing about spiritual issues (before this person has even asked it!). The condition of caritative approach in that way become – waiting, which is regarded as equal to inner, charged with tension, silence, which in turn is charged with prayer, utmost devotion, listening and concentrating on the other. This caritative scarifying or *ekstasis* is goal-oriented coming closer to a break in relationships when an individual, which has closed him or herself in suffering, first one gives an impulse for a serious conversation about things that touch his core of personality (Антоний (Блюм), 2005);

3) qualitative relationships are the ones, in which there takes place acceptance of a person and that are based in conviction about spiritual dignity (image of God in personality) of that person, not considering the actual state of this person. Wisdom of love exists in ability to see in dynamic unity the person's both spiritual potential (seeing his or hers spiritual face) and actual existence, as well as in ability to critically separate and evaluate this actual behaviour, and in case of need to express one's firm attitude towards it;

4) caritative dialogue is also a therapeutic process (in most general sense), in which partners help one another to make spiritual "I" of each one real, visible – to embody it in actual processes of social life, respectively, to help the other realizing, acknowledging him or herself as a person;

Consequently, from the conclusion that God is a person there results the understanding of human being as a person. Human being as a person is ontologically characterized by 1) conformity to the image and likeness of God, 2) in psychosomatic nature as unique and organic fusion of body and spirit, 3) freedom that protects human concept from determinism and reductionism and makes the very person morally capable to love and accept responsibility, and 4) sociality or orientation to relationships, solidarity that is realized as ecstatic overcoming of individualism.

The paradigm of Patristic anthropology, when seeing a human being in the perspective of **God's image and likeness**, especially focuses on given ability (potentiality) to human being to engage in dynamic and working (energetical) relationships of mutual or synergic cooperation with God.

Using the anthropological terms of Apostle Paul (1 Corinthians 2: 14-15), it is possible to say that the subject of caritative action is the so called 'spiritual man' who has received a "Spirit that comes from God in order to understand what God has given to us." Here anthropology comes in connection with epistemology, because God's revealed truth to a person becomes understandable with the mediation of God's given spirit of discernment – "explaining spiritual realities with Spirit-taught words" (2:13).

Patristic anthropology being based in the theology of Apostle Paul (Romans 8; Galatians 5) accentuates also a borderline between two anthropological modes: 1) ἄνθρωπος πνευματικός (*anthrōpos pneumatikos*) – 'spiritual man' or the 'inner', 'new person, being born from God' who is capable of understanding of divine logics and being embodier of it in situations of social ministry, and 2) ἄνθρωπος ψυχικός (*anthrōpos psihikos*) – 'physical or soulish man' who is led by 'mind of flesh' and who is called by the Scriptures and the Church Fathers an 'old man' or 'outward man'.

Existing in relationships of belonging with one's own source of Life, the human being can experience the "**ontological auto-transformation**" (Хоружий, 2004), the goal of which is deification (Gr. *theosis*) of the human or his uniting with God. In this regard it is exegetically interesting to read the words of ap. Paul:

“Do not conform to the pattern of this world (συσχηματίζεσθε – *sishēmātizesthe*), but be transformed (μεταμορφουσθε – *metamorfūsthe*), by the renewing of your mind (νοῦς – *nūs*), then you will be able to test and approve what God’s will is” (Romans 12:2). Greek term ‘transformation, changing, altering’ is expressed with the opposition of theological terms: μορφή (*morfē*) – ‘essential form of existence’ *versus* σχήμα (*shēma*) – ‘outer outlook, outer form or structure sensed by senses > a figure or position in dance > outfit, clothing’ (Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. VII, 1971, 954-55). *Schema* here serves as a symbol for outer socialization that can be characterised as putting on a social mask and acquiring specific social roles, not changing the orientation of one’s personality. Without anthropological criteria, the solutions in social work may stay at the level of this outer schema.

In opposition to these schematically adaptive changes, the goal of anthropological transforming is the emergence of new forms of essence. In result, a person is adapted in his or her new mode of existence what the Church theology calls differently: a person’s sacred, sacramental, ecclesial status. In the Christian Orthodox understanding, spirituality of a human being always has been *ecclesio*-centric, as only the Church is *locus* where the ontological joining with Christ is possible. J. Zizioulas describes it as the ‘mode of person’s Eucharistic being’ (Zizioulas, 1985). S. Horuzhy, in its turn being well aware of the heritage of Patristics, for the explanation of given transformation uses the term “**Anthropological Boundary**,” – overcoming of the boundary of natural human existence when in specific border areas being faced with the divine reality of the Existence-of-other-kind, which changes and sanctifies the mode of human existence, thus giving to the personality an authentic identity.

It is of importance to notice that structurally (not contentually) theological anthropology presents the same dynamic tendency of a person to leave his or her natural centre and come closer to border situations, which we discussed in the beginning regarding modern man when it strives to exist in pathologic anthropologic border situations and conditions. It means that theological anthropology has much more dynamic discourse than classic European anthropology, which in its static categories is not capable to describe and explain processes, in which a person finds him or herself nowadays. By comparing both anthropological border areas – the one oriented to deification and the other oriented to pathology – S. Horuzhy defines the difference: finding oneself in the first creates in a person *ontological change* – holiness, because a person, when crossing the limits of his or her natural “I”, is faced with *meta-anthropological* reality. That spiritualizes all personality of a human, all its aspects (mind, feelings, body) and, along with that, this coming out of one’s natural “I”-centre is not breaking human identity but exactly forms and consolidates it. However, finding oneself in this second, pathological border area creates only *ontic changes*, which have not the character of personality stabilizing but devastating nature, because a person, when “coming out of oneself”, finds himself in the captivity of anthropological (not meta-anthropological) reality: S. Horuzhy describes it as dominating influence of outer circumstances above human’s “I” and at the same time as the uncontrolled liberation of unconscious destructive powers and authority over a person (Хоружий, 2005).

In the Patristics these destructive powers of the unconscious are called **hamartological (caused by sin) pathologies** or **passions of soul** (> Gr. πάθος (*pathos*) ‘disaster; suffering; affect; passion’). The Church Fathers (St. John Cassian, St. Nilus of Sinai, St. Ephraim the Syrian, St. John of the Ladder) (*see* Филокалия/Philokalia, 2000)

consider passions as inner sicknesses of personality. They are expressed as uncontrolled drives for and addictions from things and conditions, which are contrary to the Spirit. Hamartological pathologies are captivity of soul, besides, as St. Justin the Martyr declare, – indulgence of oneself in unrestrained desires is the lowest form of captivity and slavery. Becoming a habit, they get rooted in a person's heart and become the dominating component of human nature. Pathologies that come “from within, out of a person's heart” rule over human mind and “defile a whole person” (Mark 7: 21-23). Their power over an individual is hidden in person's ignorance, – in the lack of knowledge and reflection about one's own nature and operation of inner devastating powers. Patristic tradition preserves differentiated typology of passions, which encompasses *eight* pathological basic types: *gluttony* (insatiability regarding products and substances), *covetousness* (greed), *sexual unchastity*, *anger*, *sadness*, *melancholy*, *vainglory* and *pride*. From these pathologies all the network of human vices and deviations are derived. The Church Fathers in their anthropological treatises describe in detail the symptoms of these pathologies as well as their activity in the field of psyche and in that of social relationships. They reveal also the genesis of pathologies and setting free from them, anticipating a serious spiritual intervention and practice that far beyond exceeds the limits and competence of psychotherapeutic approaches.

The reconstruction of strategical basic principles of education in the perspective of theological anthropology

In the context of Caritative social work, a professional should be educated in pathological mechanisms of these passions, which direct a person away from his identity or personality centre. Being aware of typology of passions helps explaining human behaviour that otherwise stays incomprehensible. In most of social cases specialist faces with such causes of social problems that are deeply rooted in human nature and asks for anthropological interpretation and competent caritative intervention.

In conclusion, it would be appropriate to propose the term of **anthropological identity** that in interdisciplinary studies has been defined as a “conformity of the subject to a source, from which comes out the entirety of one's behavioural norms, and even more deeper – as an awareness of one's belonging to some more universal wholeness, which contain the discourse of legitimization of a person” (Миненков, 2004).

Reformulating Caritative social work after criterion of *anthropological identity*, in the centre there emerges the following functions of Caritative social work, and namely: to form or to renew person's identity of integrity (wholeness) by preventing personality's inner destructions and pathologies, which are inner cause of social deviations, and by leading a person in understanding of more universal spiritual and ethical causations, in personal interrelation with the level of meanings. This contributes to the formation of one's sacred identity (belonging), finding the point of reference for one's own identity.

As it was already mentioned, it anticipates transformation of anthropological mode. If there is a lack of this deeper “source of norms”, human being acquires skills how to put a “social mask” on, staying at the level of outer signs. The formation of anthropological identity as a strategical task for Caritative social work means as well that for human (in this case for both the Caritative social worker

and receiver of assistance) there develops the capability of transcending (Latin *transcendentia* 'crossing-over, trespassing'). Practical theologian J. Hull describes this ability the following way: "That is ability and skill to transcend one's own biological reality, respectively, ability to make one's own biological organism into an instrument for achieving over-biological and over-instinctive goals. This kind of transcending potential contains ability of abstract and critical reasoning, imagination, empathy, ability to perceive spiritual symbols and capacity to integrate experience and knowledge by confirming all what is meaningful, what is higher than individual feeling of pleasure or pain" (Hull, 2003). Definition marks human transcendence, first of all, as overcoming of modern individualism, and, secondly, as qualitative revolution of "instrumental thinking": not to make the people around into instruments for achieving one's own goals but to instrumentalize one's own natural anthropological dimension for reaching higher goals. That is coming closer to the creative area of Anthropological Border, beyond which there begins the sanctification or deification of life, including bodily life.

Caritative social work as activity being based in solidarity relates to modern sociological statements and prognosis about crisis of individualism and liberalism in society. J. Habermas, speaking on the so called "instrumental rationalism", characterises it as ultimately simplified attitude of secularized society towards education and culture. To his mind, instead of this type of consciousness there should appear communicative activity as precondition of becoming a person. Communicative interrelation as indispensable component of modern society means that any form of human activity exists within the limits of ethics (Young, 1989). Patristic anthropology deepens this perspective by putting forth ethical basic terms that exist as unity of concepts "**humility – confession of sins – serving.**" The Church Fathers define humility as an existential state, as all-embracing "confession of sins" (Осипов, 2004). The essence of this state can be described by understanding given to a man, personal revelation that there is individualistic in-sufficiency to become a perfect personality on one's own. A human being becomes a person only through living relationships, respectively, through universal communication, formula of which is embodied in the Tradition of the Church, namely, "coming closer to God, people come closer to each other." The Church Fathers teach that the true sign of human identity and health of personality is paradoxical one: it is awareness of one's own imperfectness and acceptance of it. Thus, human being opens the limits of his or her own anthropological space for communication between different levels, in a professional context – for caritative cohesion and solidarity with the person in pain (client). In that way, quality of person's life inherit essential new dimensions and a person – specialist – become a change-agent in society exactly with his newly-gained mode of life as a tool of intervention.

REFERENCES

- 1 On December 20th, 2007, in the amendments to the *Law of Social services and social assistance* of the Republic of Latvia (31.10.2002.) the paragraph No. 1 (point no. 16) was supplemented with the term of *Caritative social worker* legalizing this profession.

- 2 Here deliberately is not used the term “personality” but *person* as known basic or original term that reveals deeper layers of different modern explanations of what is personality.
- 3 There exists version the term person etymologically can be explained by Etruscan term *phersu* ‘ritual or theatre mask’.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson R. (2001) *The Shape of Practical Theology*. Downers Grove: IVP, 342 p.
2. Ferree W. (2003) *Social Charity*. Minneola, L.I., N.Y.: Center for Economic and Social Justice, 48 p.
3. Grenz J. (2001) *The Social God and the Relational Self. A Trinitarian theology of the Imago Dei*. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 345 p.
4. Habermas J. (1990) *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 229 p.
5. Heitink G. (1999) *Practical Theology. History, theory, action domains*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 358 p.
6. Hull J. M. (2003) A Spirituality of Disability: The Christian heritage as both problem and potential. In: *Studies in Christian Ethics*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 21-35.
7. Kīslings K. (2004) *Jūs sveicina mīlestība. Raksti par diakonisku kultūru* [Kiessling K. ‘Love greets you’. Articles on deaconal culture]. Jūrmala: Latvijas Kristīgā akadēmija; Izglītība [Latvian Christian Academy; Publishing House “Education”], pp. 47-57.
8. Hierotheos (Vlachos), Metropolitan of Nafpaktos. (2000) *Orthodox Psychotherapy. The Science of the Fathers*. Leviaia, Greece: Birth of the Theotokos Monastery, 369 p.
9. Rahner K. (1975) Die theologische Dimension der Frage nach dem Menschen. In: *Schriften zur Theologie*, Bd. XII, Einsiedeln, S. 387-406.
10. *The Caritas Europe Strategy 2005-2010*. (2004) *To Live Solidarity and Partnership in Europe and in the World*. Dubrovnik (Croatia), 33 p.
11. *The Conference of European Churches*. Nilsson E. Diaconia and the Political Challenges. See: <http://www.ceceurope.org/>
12. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. I (1964)/ G. Kittel, G. Friedrich (Eds.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, p. 645.
13. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. VI (1968)/ G. Kittel, G. Friedrich (Eds.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, p. 1003.
14. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. VII (1971)/ G. Kittel, G. Friedrich (Eds.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, pp. 954-55.
15. Torrance T. F. (1975) *Theology in Reconciliation*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 302 p.
16. Torrance T. F. (1989) *The Christian Frame of Mind. Reason, order, and openness in theology and natural science*. Colorado Springs: Helmers & Howard, 164 p.

17. Torrance T. F. (1998) *The Incarnation: Ecumenical studies in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 202 p.
18. Torrance T. F. (2001) *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic hermeneutics*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Publishers, 439 p.
19. Wright D. R. & Kuentzel J. D. (Eds.) (2004). *Redemptive Transformation in Practical Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/ Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
20. Zizioulas J. (1985) *Being as a Communion: Studies in personhood and the Church*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 345 p.
21. Žilsons E. (1997) *Kristīgās filozofijas vēsture Viduslaikos* [Gilson Étienne. History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages]. Rīga: Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts [Riga: Institute of Philosophy and Sociology], 342 p.
22. Young R. E. (1989) *A Critical Theory of Education: Habermas and our children's future*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 240 p.
23. Антоний (Блум), митрополит Сурожский. (2005) *Пастырство* [Anthony (Bloom), metropolitan of Surozh. *Pastorship*]. Таганрог [Taganrog]: Новые Мехи, 459 с.
24. Иоанн Дамаскин. (2002) *Источник знания*. Москва: Индрик, 414 p. [John of Damascus. *Fountain of Knowledge*. Moscow: Hendrik.]
25. Мейендорф И. (1981) *Православие в современном мире*. Нью-Йорк, p. 175. [Meuyendorff J. *Orthodoxy in the Modern World*. New York.]
26. Миненков Г. Я. (2004) Проект идентичности в контексте образования: антропологическая перспектива [Minenkov G. Y. Project of Identity in the Educational Context: Anthropological perspective]. In: *Наука и богословие: антропологическая перспектива*/ Ред. В. Порус [Science and Theology: Anthropological perspective/ Ed. by V. Porus]. Москва: Библийско-богословский институт св. апостола Андрея [Moscow: Bible-Theological Institute of St. Apostle Andrew], pp. 284-298.
27. Осипов А. (2004) Святость человека в православной аскетической традиции [Osipov A. Holiness of Person in the Orthodox Tradition of Ascetism]. In: *Православное учение о человеке* [Orthodox Teaching on Person]. Москва-Клин: Синодальная Богословская Комиссия [Moscow-Klin: Theological Commission of the Synod], pp. 138-153.
28. Сигов К. (2004) Проблема разрыва между онтологией и этикой в современных учениях о человеке [Sigov K. Problem of Separation Between Ontology and Ethics in Modern Teachings on Person]. In: *Православное учение о человеке* [Orthodox Teaching on Person]. Москва-Клин: Синодальная Богословская Комиссия [Moscow-Klin: Theological Commission of the Synod], pp. 340-356.
29. *Филокалия* [Philokalia] (2000), Vol. 3.
30. Флоренская Т. А. (2001) *Диалог в практической психологии: наука о душе* [Florenskaya T. A. Dialogue in Practical Psychology: Science of a soul]. Москва: Владос [Moscow: Vldos].
31. Хоружий С. С. (2004) Православно-аскетическая антропология и кризис современного человека [Horuzhy S. S. Orthodox-Ascetic Anthropology and Crisis of a Modern Person]. In: *Православное учение о человеке* [Orthodox Teaching on Person]. Москва-Клин: Синодальная Богословская Комиссия [Moscow-Klin: Theological Commission of the Synod], pp. 154-167.

32. Хоружий С. С. (2005) *Очерки синергической антропологии* [Horuzhy S. S. Treatise on Synergic Anthropology]. Москва: Институт синергической антропологии [Moscow: Institute of Synergic Anthropology], pp. 146-163.
33. Яннарас Х. (2005) *Личность и эрос*/ Пер. с греч. [Yannaras Chr. Personality and eros/ Transl. from Gr.] – Москва: «Российская политическая энциклопедия» (РОССПЕН) [Moscow: Russian Political Encyclopedia], 2005, 480 с. – («Книга света» [Book of Light]).

Karitatīvais sociālais darbs un patristiskās antropoloģijas jautājums

Kopsavilkums

Raksta mērķis ir atklāt veidu, kā teoloģiskās (patristiskās) antropoloģijas pamata koncepti un pamattermini var kalpot par būtisku avotu, izstrādājot karitatīvā sociālā darba stratēģiju. Sekojot integratīvās teoloģijas metodei, pētījums ietvers sekojošus posmus:

- 1) Karitatīvā sociālā darba koncepta definīcija un izskaidrojums, kas izriet no caritas koncepta; sociālā darba, sociālās politikas un antropoloģisko priekšstatu saites raksturojums, demonstrējot nepieciešamību pēc antropoloģiskās refleksijas humanitārajās zinātnēs,
- 2) sociālā darba izglītības problēmas deskriptīvs uzstādījums,
- 3) patristiskās antropoloģiskās paradigmas pamatjēdzienu raksturojums, un
- 4) karitatīvā sociālā darba stratēģisko pamatprincipu rekonstrukcija teoloģiskās antropoloģijas perspektīvā.

Iztrūkstot antropoloģiskajai refleksijai, nav iespējas kritiski izvērtēt pastāvošās tendences sabiedrībā, to riskus un laikmeta ietekmes uz cilvēces kopienu, kas aizvirza sabiedrības dzīvi prom no cilvēcības apliecinājuma.

Sociālā darba izglītības problēmas deskriptīvs uzstādījums

Par antropoloģiskās dimensijas svarīgumu izglītības procesā varēs spriest, izejot no konkrētiem aprakstošiem faktiem. 2013.-2015. gadu periodā Latvijas Kristīgajā akadēmijā tika veikts pētījums, kurā tika intervēti karitatīvā sociālā darba studiju programmas studējošie. Kopējais pētījuma mērķis bija izprast galvenās topošo karitatīvā sociālā darba profesionāļu vēlmes, gaidas un priekšstatus, apgūstot savu arodu, un atklāt, kādas jēgu un nozīmju dominantes viņi izceļ cilvēku aprūpējošajā profesijā. Intervēšanas rezultāti ir sekojoši: studenti konstanti uztur prasību, lai viņiem tiktu iemācītas noteiktas *pieejas, paņēmieni, iemaņas, metodes*, kā sniegt palīdzību klientam. Secinot var teikt, ka ir vērojama problemātiska, pat bīstama tendence profesionālo izglītību reducēt uz iemaņu un tehniku apguvi noteiktu mērķu un ātra, droša rezultāta sasniegšanai.

Var atpazīt problēmas *psiholoģiskos cēloņus* – vēlme justies psiholoģiskā drošībā un nekādā veidā nezaudēt pašapliecinātību, pašpārliecinātību, bailes piedzīvot psiholoģisku diskomfortu. Riska faktors: egocentrētība, nekontrolētas varas iegūšana pār palīdzības “objektu,” orientācija uz ārēju, īslaicīgu rezultātu, ignorējot, ka otra cilvēka persona ir vērtīga un unikāla. Problēmas *sociālie aspekti*: karjeras orientēta izglītība sabiedrībā, kas pieprasa ātru profesionālo prasmju un paņēmieni apguvi,

tādējādi veicot uz darba tirgu orientētas sabiedrības spiedienu uz izglītības stratēģiju. Problēmas *antropoloģiskie aspekti*: ir iespējams diagnosticēt pragmatisma filozofijas ietekmē tapušā cilvēkkoncepta nekontrolētu invāziju augstākās profesionālās izglītības stratēģijā, – praktiskais, pragmatiskais, uz veikumu orientētais modernās tirgus sabiedrības cilvēks ir vēl viens tipisks reducētās antropoloģijas paraugs. J. Habermāss definē šāda cilvēka raksturīgo darbību kā “instrumentālo darbību,” kas bāzējas “instrumentālajā racionalitātē”. Instrumentālā darbība ir līdzcilvēkus un dabu apdraudoša, jo viss tiek pakļauts darbīgā subjekta individuālo mērķu sasniegšanai, ignorējot komunikatīvo darbības aspektu.

Visi minētie aspekti tiešā vai netiešā veidā iespaido izglītības zinātnes teoriju un praksi, radot diskusiju par cilvēkproblēmas devalvāciju un nepieciešamību pēc jauniem apvāršņiem gan antropoloģisko zināšanu sfērā, gan izglītības pasaulē un tās procesos.

Patristiskās antropoloģiskās paradigmas pamatjēdzienu raksturojums

Šodien holistiskas antropoloģiskās paradigmas meklējumos filozofija, teoloģija un pedagoģija atgriežas pie patristiskās jeb bizantiskās (4.-14. gs. Baznīctēvu) antropoloģijas, ņemot vērā, ka tā satur nedalītu teorijas un garīgās empīriskās prakses vienotību. Kaut arī patristiskās antropoloģijas nenovērtējamais dārgums ir gadsimtu gaitā attīstījusies un nostiprinājusies, pieredzē balstīta un verificēta garīgās prakses tradīcija, tomēr šī antropoloģiskā skola nav ezotēri noslēgta. Tieši otrādi, – tā ir atvērta dialogam, piedāvājot paradigmatiskas pamatnostādnes citām humanitārajām disciplīnām.

Grieķu jeb Bizantijas Baznīcas teoloģija savas neskartās holistiskās identitātes dēļ visautentiskāk šodien spēj pietuvoties starpdisciplinārajam dialogam un īstenot principu “teoloģija kā radikāla cilvēkzinātne.” Šī starpdisciplināritātes principa īstenošanas metodoloģiju ir izstrādājis katoļu teologs Karls Rāners. Viņš uzskata, ka “teoloģiskā antropoloģija nav vis sekulārās cilvēkzinātnes papildinājums, bet gan tās centrs” jeb *radix* – lat. ‘sakne.’ Tātad starpdisciplinārais integrācijas punkts meklējams atslēgas jēdzienu un izteikumu iekšienē, to jēgas slāņos. Sekojoši, patristiskā antropoloģija dotā raksta ietvaros netiek izklāstīta visaptveroši, bet izvirzot tikai tās pamatnostādnes un jēdzienus, kas var kalpot kā integratīvs antropoloģiskais resurss sociālās labklājības problēmas – pragmatisma un instrumentālās racionalitātes tendences pārvarēšanā.

Austrumu patristiskās antropoloģijas paradigma skata cilvēku caur sekojošām perspektīvām: 1) pirmkārt, **Dieva tēla un līdzības** perspektīvā, kas nosaka arī cilvēka eksistences dinamismu, īpaši uzsverot cilvēkam doto spēju (potencialitāti) stāties dinamiskās un darbīgās (enerģētiskās) savstarpējās līdzdalības jeb sinerģijas attiecībās ar Dievu. Atrodoties piederības attiecībās ar savu Dzīvības avotu, cilvēks var piedzīvot “**ontoloģisku autotransformāciju**” (Хоружий, 2004), kuras mērķis ir cilvēka dievišķošanās jeb savienošanās ar Dievu, nomainot savas esamībasodus; 2) S. Horužijs, apzinot patristisko mantojumu, dotās transformācijas skaidrojumos lieto jēdzienu “Antropoloģiskā Robeža,” – cilvēka dabiskās eksistences robežas pārvarējumu, zināmos robežapgabalos saskaroties ar dievišķās Cītesamības realitāti, kas izmaina cilvēka esamības stāvokli, sakralizē to; 3) **hamartoloģiskās (grēka izraisītās) kaislības** jeb **dvēseles patoloģijas**; un 4) **anthropoloģiskā identitātes perspektīva**, kas tiek definēta kā “subjekta atbilstība avotam, no kura izriet viss viņa uzvedības normu kopums, un dziļāk – kā savas piederības apzināšanās kādam universālākam veselumam, kas satur personas leģitimizācijas diskursu”;

un galu galā 5) tādas kategorijas kā “Otrs”, “pazemība – grēknožēlas – kalpošana”, kas parāda patristiskās antropoloģijas ētisko dimensiju. Baznīctēvi formulē pazemību kā eksistenciālu stāvokli, kā visaptverošu garīga rakstura “grēkatziņu”, kā cilvēkam dotu sapratni, personisku atklāsmi par savu individuālistisko nepietiekamību veidoties par pilnīgu personību, kas kalpo kā izejas punkts jaunas identitātes iegūšanai.

Izglītības stratēģisko pamatprincipu rekonstrukcija teoloģiskās antropoloģijas perspektīvā

Sekojošā antropoloģiskās identitātes kritērijam, karitatīvais sociālais darbs tiek definēts kā personības iekšējās destrukcijas un patoloģiju novēršana, veidojot vai atjaunojot cilvēka veseluma identitāti, un ievadot cilvēku universālāku garīgo un ētisko sakarību izpratnē, sekmējot viņa sakrālās piederības veidošanos un atskaites punkta atrašanu savai identitātei.

Antropoloģiskās identitātes formēšanās kā karitatīvā sociālā darba stratēģiskais uzdevums nozīmē arī to, ka gan karitatīvajam darbiniekam, gan palīdzības saņēmējam tiek izkoptas transcendēšanas spējas, proti, spēja “pārvarēt (transcendēt) savu bioloģisko realitāti” (J. Hull), saprotot ar to tādu cilvēka potenciālu, kas padara viņa bioloģisko organismu spējīgu sasniegt pār-bioloģiskus mērķus. Šāds transcendēšanas potenciāls ietver abstraktās un kritiskās domāšanas spēju, iztēli, empātiju, spēju uztvert garīgus simbolus, un kapacitāti integrēt pieredzi un zināšanas, apliecinot visu jēgpilno, kas ir augstāks par individuālo patikas vai sāpju sajūtu. Tādējādi cilvēks atver savas antropoloģiskās telpas robežas dažādu personības līmeņu saskarsmei, profesionālā kontekstā – karitatīvai kohēzijai un praktiskai solidaritātei ar cietēju (klientu). Tādējādi cilvēka dzīves kvalitāte iegūst jaunas dimensijas un persona – speciālists – kļūst par izmaiņu aģentu sabiedrībā tieši ar jauniegūto eksistences modu kā intervences instrumentu.

Atslēgas vārdi: karitatīvais sociālais darbs, karitāte (*caritas*), patristiskā antropoloģija, persona, personas ontoloģija, hamartoloģiskās (grēka izraisītās) kaislības/ patoloģijas, antropoloģiskā identitāte.



Mag. theol. Dace Dolace

Assistant professor at Latvian Christian Academy,
Researcher of Latvian Social Dialogue Education Centre,
Interdisciplinary Research Institute, Supervisor (LCA)

Docente Latvijas Kristīgajā akadēmijā, supervizore,
Latvijas Sociālā Dialoga Izglītības centra pētniece,
Starpdisciplinārās Pētniecības institūta pētniece (LKRA)

Address: Vienības prospekts 23, Jūrmala, LV-2010, Latvia
E-mail: kursi@kra.lv