

Ἡ σύνθεση σχολαστικῆς θεολογίας καὶ ὑπαρξισμοῦ στὴν Τριαδολογία τῆς δυτικῆς χριστιανοσύνης: Karl Barth καὶ Karl Rahner

ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΥ ΑΓ. ΣΙΣΚΟΥ*

1. Εἰσαγωγή

Ἡ δυτικὴ θεολογία τοῦ 20οῦ αἰῶνα χαρακτηρίζεται ἀπὸ συχνές ρήξεις μὲ τὴν προγενέστερη παράδοσή της. Σὲ μεγάλο βαθμὸ αὐτὸ συμβαίνει ἐξαιτίας τῆς ωρίμανσης τῆς δυτικῆς θεολογικῆς σκέψης σὲ σχέση μὲ τὶς πρώιμες ἀσθμαίνουσες καὶ σπασμωδικές θεολογικὲς ἀντιδράσεις τῶν δύο προηγούμενων αἰώνων ἀπέναντι στὴν κοσμικὴ σκέψη, τὴν ὁποία παρήγαγε ὁ Διαφωτισμός. Στὸν χῶρο τῆς προτεσταντικῆς θεολογίας, ὁ K. Barth προχώρησε στὴ ρήξη μὲ τὴ φιλελεύθερη προτεσταντικὴ θεολογία τῶν προτεσταντῶν δασκάλων του W. Herрман, A. Ritschl, F. Schleiermacher¹, ἡ ὁποία εἶχε ἐνσωματώσει στὴ μεθο-

* Ὁ Γεώργιος Ἄγ. Σίσκος εἶναι μεταδιδακτορικὸς ἐρευνητὴς στὸ τμήμα Ποιμαντικῆς καὶ Κοινωνικῆς Θεολογίας τοῦ Α.Π.Θ.

1. Εἶναι πολὺ χαρακτηριστικὴ ἡ ἀνυποληψία στὴν ὁποία ὑποπίπτει τὸ δόγμα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος μὲ τὸν F. Schleiermacher, ὁ ὁποῖος τὸ θεωρεῖ ἐξόχως δευτερεῖον στὴ χριστιανικὴ ζωὴ, καθὼς δὲν ἀνταποκρίνεται στὴν ἀμεσότητα τῆς θρησκευτικῆς αὐτο-συνείδησης, στὴν ὁποία ἐδράζεται ἡ ὑποκειμενικὴ διαίσθηση τοῦ ἀπολύτου, δηλαδὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Γράφει χαρακτηριστικὰ γιὰ τὸ δόγμα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος ὁ SCHLEIERMACHER, F., *The Christian Faith*, Introduction: Paul T. Nimmo, Bloomsbury T&T Clark: London New York 2016³, σελ. 738: “*this doctrine itself as ecclesiastically framed, is not an immediate utterance concerning the Christian self-consciousness, but only a combination of several such utterances*”. Μία ἴδια ἀντιμετώπιση τοῦ θέματος συναντᾷ κανεὶς καὶ στὸ ἔργο τοῦ RITSCHL, A., *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, Trans: Mackintosh, H. R. - Macaulay, A. B., T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1900, σελ. 203-238, ὅπου μὲ βάση τὴ θεώρηση τῆς θρησκευτικῆς συνείδησης ὡς παράγουσας μὴ ἀποδείξιμες ἐπιστημονικὲς ἀποδείξεις περὶ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἠθικὲς κρίσεις, ἐπικρίνει σφοδρῶς τὴ σχολαστικὴ μεθολογία ἀναφορικὰ μὲ τὶς ὄντολογικὲς ἀποδείξεις τοῦ Θεοῦ. Γιὰ τὸν πλήρη ἐκτοπισμὸ τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος ἀπὸ τὴ φιλελεύθερη προτεσταντικὴ θεολογία βλ. HILL O. P., W. J., *The Three-Personed God: The Trinity as a mystery of Salvation*, Catholic University of America Press, 1982, σελ. 83-91. WELSCH, C., *In This Name: The Doctrine of the Trinity in Contemporary Theology*, Charles Scribner’s Sons: New York 1952, σελ. 3-10 καὶ 18-23.

δολογία της τις ανθρωπολογικές μεθόδους του Διαφωτισμοῦ και ἐκμηδένιζε κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν τρόπο τὴ ζῶσα παρουσία τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς γεγονός ριζικά ἀντίθετο μὲ τις ἐγγενεῖς λογικὲς καὶ συναισθηματικὲς ικανότητες τοῦ ἀνθρώπου νὰ ἐντοπίζει τὸν Θεὸ ἐντὸς του². Γιὰ τὸν K. Barth, «Καμιὰ ἀνθρώπινη πορεία δὲν εἶναι ἱκανὴ νὰ ὀδηγήσει τὸν ἄνθρωπο στὸ Θεό: οὔτε ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς θρησκευτικῆς ἐμπειρίας (Schleiermacher), οὔτε ἡ ἱστορική, οὔτε κι αὐτὴ ἀκόμη τῆς μεταφυσικῆς. Ἡ μόνη κατορθωτὴ πορεία ξεκινᾷ μὲ ἀφετηρία τὸν Θεὸ πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπο»³. Βασικώτατο ἐρώτημα γιὰ τὸν K. Barth εἶναι ὁ τρόπος μὲ τὸν ὁποῖο ὁ Θεὸς φανερώνεται στὸν ἄνθρωπο ὡς τὸ ὅλως Ἄλλο. Ὡς καθοδηγητικὸς ἄξονας στὴ σκέψη του εἶναι ἀκριβῶς ἡ ἀπόρριψη κάθε ἀνθρωπολογίας –τῶν δασκάλων του καὶ ὄχι μόνο αὐτῶν– ποὺ θεμελιώνεται στὶς ἐγγενεῖς ἀνθρώπινες δυνατότητες γνωριμίας καὶ μετοχῆς στὸ Θεῖο. Σὲ αὐτὴ τὴν προβληματικὴ θὰ ἔρθει σὲ ἰσχυρότατη σύγκρουση μὲ τὴν analogia entis τῆς σχολαστικῆς θεολογίας καὶ τῶν σύγχρονων ἐρμηνευτῶν της, γιὰ νὰ καταλήξει στὴ ριζικὰ ἀντίθετη ἔννοια τῆς analogia relationis, τὴν ἀναλογία τοῦ τρόπου ὑπάρξεως στὶς αἰδίες σχέσεις τῶν Προσώπων τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος μὲ τὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τόσο κατὰ τις μεταξύ τους σχέσεις ὅσο καὶ κατὰ τὴ σχέση τους μὲ τὸ Θεό, ὅταν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ζοῦν ἐν Χριστῷ. Γιὰ νὰ φτάσει σὲ αὐτὸ τὸ συμπέρασμα, ὁ K. Barth

2. JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, T&T Clark: New York 2010, σελ. 15-17. McCORMACK, B. L., *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development 1909-1936*, Oxford University Press 1997, σελ. 111-125. Τὸ κέντρο τῆς ρήξης ἀφοροῦσε τὴν ἔννοια τῆς θρησκευτικῆς ἐμπειρίας τοῦ ἀνθρώπινου ὑποκειμένου, ἡ ὁποία ἐξαιτίας τῆς ὑποκειμενικῆς τῆς ἀπολυτότητας διαμόρφωσε τὴν ἱερότητα τοῦ Α' Παγκοσμίου Πολέμου στὴ συνείδηση τῶν Γερμανῶν. Αὐτὸ γιὰ τὸν K. Barth συνεπαγόταν μιὰ καταθλιπτικὴ ἀπουσία τῆς χάριτος καὶ ἕναν πλήρη ἐγκλωβισμό σὲ ἕναν θρησκευτικὸ ἀνθρωποκεντρισμό. Γράφει χαρακτηριστικὰ στὸν W. Herrmann: "Especially with you, Herr Professor (and through you with the great masters Luther, Kant, and Schleiermacher), we learned to acknowledge 'experience' as the constitutive principle of knowing and doing in the domain of religion. In your school it became clear to us what it means to 'experience' God in Jesus. Now however, in answer to our doubts, an 'experience' which is completely new to us is held out to us by German Christians, an allegedly religious war 'experience'; i.e. the fact that German Christians 'experience' their war as a holy war is supposed to bring us to silence, if not demand reverence from us. Where do you stand in relation to this argument and to the war theology which lies behind it?", McCORMACK, B. L., *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development 1909-1936*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 113, μτφρ. ἀπὸ τὸ SCHWÖBEL, C. (ed.), *Karl Barth-Martin Rade: Ein Briefwechsel*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1981, σελ. 115.

3. GIBELLINI, R., *Ἡ Θεολογία τοῦ Εἰκοστοῦ αἰῶνα*, μτφρ. Π. Ὑφαντῆς, Ἄρτος Ζωῆς, Ἀθήνα 2002, σελ. 25.

ἀρθρώνει μιὰ συστηματικὴ ἐρμηνεία περὶ Ἁγίας Τριάδος, χρησιμοποιώντας ἔννοιες καὶ σχήματα ποὺ ἀντλεῖ ἀπὸ τὸν ὑπαρξισμό καὶ τὸν περσοναλισμὸ τῆς ἐποχῆς του. Ἡ θεολογικὴ τεκμηρίωση αὐτῆς τῆς ὑπαρξιακῆς καὶ περσοναλιστικῆς γλώσσας, προκειμένου νὰ περιγραφεῖ τὸ δόγμα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος καὶ οἱ συνέπειες γιὰ τὴ σωτηρία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, εἶναι οὐσιωδῶς σχολαστικὴ. Ὅπως θὰ δειχτεῖ ἀναλυτικὰ, ἡ σύνθεση περσοναλισμοῦ καὶ σχολαστικισμοῦ παραμένει ἀπολύτως λογικὰ συνεπῆς στὸ πλαίσιο τῆς δυτικῆς χριστιανικῆς παράδοσης. Ὁ σχολαστικισμὸς οὐδόλως καταργεῖται καί, τὸνναντίον, ἀνανεώνεται γλωσσικὰ μὲ τὸ ἔνδυμα τοῦ ὑπαρξισμοῦ καὶ τοῦ περσοναλισμοῦ, παραμένοντας στὴ βάση του ἀκέραιος.

Σχεδὸν παράλληλα, ἡ ρωμαιοκαθολικὴ θεολογία δείχνει ἐνίοτε νὰ ἀσφυκτιᾷ στὶς θεολογικὲς δομὲς τοῦ σχολαστικισμοῦ, ὁ ὁποῖος καταργεῖ τὴν ἱστορικότητα τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ συχνότατα μοιάζει νὰ μὴν κομίζει λύσεις στὰ προβλήματα τῆς νεωτερικότητας καὶ τῆς πρώιμης μετανεωτερικότητας, σύμφωνα μὲ ἀπόψεις ρωμαιοκαθολικῶν θεολόγων. Σὲ αὐτὸ τὸ ἱστορικὸ, φιλοσοφικὸ καὶ θεολογικὸ πλαίσιο δημιουργεῖται ἡ Nouvelle Théologie τῶν T. de Chardin, M. D. Chenu, H. De Lubac, J. Daniélou, Y. Congar. Βασικοὶ ἄξονες τῆς θεολογικῆς ἐρμηνευτικῆς τῆς Nouvelle Théologie εἶναι: α) ἡ ἐπιστροφή στὰ θεμέλια τῆς χριστιανικῆς σκέψης, ὅπως ἡ Βίβλος καὶ οἱ Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ μάλιστα οἱ Ἕλληνες Πατέρες, β) ἡ ἀναζωογόνηση τῆς θεολογικῆς σκέψης ἀπὸ τὴν ἐπαφὴ μὲ τὰ σύγχρονα ρεύματα φιλοσοφικῆς καὶ ἐπιστημονικῆς σκέψης, γ) ἡ ἀνάπτυξη τῆς ἱστορικῆς καὶ βιβλικῆς κριτικῆς⁴.

Κάτω ἀπὸ αὐτὲς τὶς προϋποθέσεις καὶ μὲ διάθεση ρήξης μὲ τὸν νεο-σχολαστικισμό τῆς ρωμαιοκαθολικῆς θεολογίας, ἀλλὰ μὲ στόχο μιὰ ριζικὴ ἐπανερμηνεία τοῦ Ἀκινάτη, ποὺ νὰ ἀνταποκρίνεται στὶς ὑπαρξιακὲς ἀνάγκες τοῦ σήμερα, παραδίδει ὁ Karl Rahner τὴ διδακτορικὴ του διατριβή, ἡ ὁποία ἀπορρίφθηκε καὶ ἔμελε νὰ ἐκδοθεῖ ἀργότερα⁵. Ἡ διδακτορικὴ διατριβὴ προδιαγράφει καὶ τὶς προθέσεις του γιὰ τὴν ἀναμόρφωση τῆς ρωμαιοκαθολικῆς θεολογίας μέσῳ τῆς βαθειᾶς συσχέτισης τῆς θεολογίας μὲ τὴ φιλοσοφία τῶν καιρῶν⁶: «Ὁ

4. METTEPENNINGEN, J., *Nouvelle Théologie - New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II*, T&T Clark: 2010, σελ. 9-13. GIBELLINI, R., *Ἡ Θεολογία τοῦ Εἰκοστοῦ αἰῶνα*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 203-214.

5. RAHNER, K., *Spirit in the world*, Trans: William Dych, Continuum: New York 1994, σελ. XLVIII: "What I tried to do above all else was this: to get away from so much that is called 'neo-Scholasticism' and to return to Thomas himself, and by doing this to move closer to those questions which are being posed to contemporary philosophy".

Rahner είναι βαθύτατα πεπεισμένος για την ανεπάρκεια της σχολαστικής μεθόδου που ἐφαρμόστηκε στην παράδοση της ἀκαδημαϊκῆς θεολογίας, ὅπου οἱ ἔννοιες πρέπει νὰ συλλαμβάνονται καὶ νὰ ἀποσαφηνίζονται μέχρι νὰ γίνουν ἀντιληπτές. Ἀπὸ τὴ σχολαστικὴ μέθοδο ποὺ προχωρεῖ ἀπὸ πάνω, ἀπὸ τὸ ὕψος τῶν διατυπώσεων, καὶ λειτουργεῖ μέσω τῆς κατήχησης, πρέπει νὰ περάσουμε στὴν ἀνθρωπολογικὴ μέθοδο, ἡ ὁποία ξεκινᾷ ἀπὸ χαμηλὰ καὶ προχωρεῖ δυνάμει μιᾶς ἀντιστοιχίας μεταξὺ ζωῆς καὶ ἀλήθειας, ἐμπειρίας καὶ ἔννοιαι. Ὁ *Rahner* προτείνει νὰ ἐφαρμοστεῖ στὴ θεολογία μιὰ ἀνθρωπολογικὴ προσέγγιση, ἡ ὁποία νὰ ξεκινᾷ ἀπὸ τὴν ἐμπειρία ποὺ ἔχει ὁ ἄνθρωπος γιὰ τὸν ἑαυτό του καὶ νὰ ἐξετάζει μὲ ποιὸν τρόπο εἶναι δυνατόν ἡ θεολογία νὰ ἀνταποκριθεῖ⁷. Τὰ τρία συστηματικὰ κείμενα, τὰ ὁποῖα θὰ συγγράψει ὁ K. Rahner –κατὰ τὴν τεράστια συγγραφικὴ του παραγωγή– γιὰ τὸ μυστήριο τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος, περιγράφουν τὸ τελευταῖο μὲ ἐννοιολογικὰ σχήματα, καὶ γλῶσσα ποὺ παραπέμπουν εὐθέως στὸν ὑπαρξισμό καὶ τὸν περσοναλισμό, μὲ βασικὸ σκοπὸ τὴν ὑπέρβαση τῆς νεο-σχολαστικῆς θεολογικῆς ἐρμηνείας. Παρ’ ὅλα αὐτά, ὅπως θὰ δειχθεῖ, οἱ θεμελιακὲς προϋποθέσεις τοῦ σχολαστικισμοῦ σὲ αὐτὴ τὴν Τριαδολογία παραμένουν ἀκέραιες.

Κοινὴ κατεύθυνση τῶν K. Barth καὶ K. Rahner ἀποτελεῖ ἡ ἀνανέωση τῆς θεολογικῆς γλῶσσας μέσω τῶν ὑπαρξιστικῶν σχημάτων καὶ τῶν περσοναλιστικῶν διατυπώσεων. Αὐτὸ ἀφορᾷ κατεξοχὴν τὴ συστηματικὴ ἐρμηνεία τοῦ Τριαδολογικοῦ δόγματος καὶ τῆς ἀνάδειξης τῆς σημασίας του γιὰ τοὺς σημερινοὺς χριστιανοὺς. Τὰ θεμέλια τῶν δύο παράλληλων ἐρμηνευτικῶν συστημάτων στὴν Τριαδολογία ἀνήκουν ἀπὸ κάθε ἄποψη στὴ σχολαστικὴ παράδοση, χωρὶς αὐτὸ νὰ θίγει τὴν ἀνανέωση τῆς θεολογικῆς διατύπωσης καὶ ἐπιχειρηματολογίας.

2. Karl Barth

2.1 Ἡ ταύτιση Θεολογίας καὶ Οἰκονομίας

Στὸν Πρόλογο τῆς *Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Δογματικῆς* τοῦ ὁ K. Barth, ἀπολογούμενος σὲ προτεστάντες φίλους καὶ ἐπικριτὲς του, ξεκαθαρίζει τὸ γεγονός ὅτι

6. KERR, F., *Twentieth-century Catholic theologians: from Neoscholasticism to nuptial mysticism*, Blackwell Publishing 2005, σελ. 88,94. KILBY, K., “Karl Rahner”, σὸ FORD, D. F., with MUERS, R. (ed.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Blackwell Publishing 2005³, σελ. 94.

7. GIBELLINI, R., *Ἡ Θεολογία τοῦ Εἰκοστοῦ αἰῶνα*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 281.

για τὸν ἴδιο ὁ χριστιανισμὸς δὲν ξεκινᾶ τὸ 1517 –χρονολογία θυροκόλλησης τῶν 95 θέσεων τοῦ Λούθηρου στὴ Βιττεμβέργη–, ἀλλὰ ὅτι ὁ ἴδιος κινεῖται ἄνετα στὸ γῶρο τῆς ἐνιαίας δυτικῆς παράδοσης, παραπέμποντας στὸν Ἄνσελμο καὶ τὸν Ἀκινάτη χωρὶς κανένα ἴχνος φόβου, διότι ἡ σχολαστικὴ διδασκαλία εἶναι ἀπὸ πολλὲς ἀπόψεις ἐκκλησιαστικὰ ὀρθή⁸. Σὲ αὐτὸ ἀκριβῶς τὸ πλαίσιο, ὁ K. Barth κληρονομεῖ ἀπὸ τὴν ἐνιαία δυτικὴ χριστιανικὴ παράδοση τὴν ταύτιση Θεολογίας καὶ Οἰκονομίας, τὴν ταύτιση τῆς αἰδίας ὑπαρξης τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος καὶ τῆς οἰκονομικῆς τῆς φανέρωσης⁹. Ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ἀποκάλυψης εἶναι ὁ Θεὸς καθ’ αὐτός, ὅπως ὑφίσταται δι’ ἑαυτόν: *“The question: Who is the self-revealing God? always receives a full and unrestricted answer also in what we learn about God’s self-revealing as such and about His being revealed among men. God Himself is not just Himself. He is also His self-revealing... Revelation in the Bible is not a minus; it is not another over against God. It is the same, the*

8. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, Trans: G. W. Bromiley, T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1975², σελ. xiii.

9. Γιὰ τὴν ταύτιση αἰδίων προόδων καὶ οἰκονομικῶν φανερώσεων τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος βλ. AQUINAS, T., *Summa Theologica, Part I, QQ XXVII-XLIX*, 48. 3, στὸ *The “Summa Theologica” of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Second and revised edition, Burns Oates and Washbourne: London 1921, Vol. 2, σελ. 197: *“Mission signifies not only procession from the principle, but also determines the temporal term of the procession. Hence mission is only temporal. Or we may say that it includes the eternal procession, with the addition of a temporal effect. For the relation of a divine person to His principle must be eternal. Hence the procession may be called a twin procession, eternal and temporal, not that there is a double relation to the principle, but a double term, temporal and eternal”*. Ἐρμηνεύοντας τὸ συγκεκριμένο χωρίο τῆς *Summa Theologica* ὁ EMERY, G., *The Trinity ~ an introduction to Catholic doctrine on the triune God*, Trans: M. Levering, The Catholic University of America Press: Washington 2009, σελ. 193, γράφει: *“the missions bear in themselves the eternal mystery of the divine persons, the mystery of the Son begotten by the Father and the mystery of the Holy Spirit who proceeds. If one follows St. Thomas Aquinas, there is no need to reunite the economic Trinity and the immanent Trinity (after having started by distinguishing between them), because, for Aquinas, the mission or ‘temporal procession’ of the divine person ‘is not essentially different from the eternal procession, but only adds a reference to a temporal effect’”*. Γιὰ τὸ ἴδιο θέμα στὸν Ἀκινάτη βλ. καὶ OTT, L., *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, Trans: Patrick Lynch, TAN Books: Charlotte, North Carolina 1974, σελ. 73: *“the concept of sending implies not only the eternal procession, but also a new kind of presence in the created world: missio includit processionem aeternam et aliqui~ addit, sc. temporalem effectum (S. Th. I 43, 2 ad 3). The temporal missions, therefore, reflect the notions of the Divine Persons”*.

repetition of God. Revelation is indeed God's predicate, but in such a way that this predicate is in every way identical with God Himself"¹⁰.

Ταυτίζοντας, Θεολογία και Οικονομία, ὁ Κ. Barth, χρησιμοποιεῖ μὲ ἀνεση διατυπώσεις, οἱ ὁποῖες μαρτυροῦν τὴν ταύτιση οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργειῶν στὸν Τριαδικὸ Θεό, διότι οἱ ἐνέργειες τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὴν κτίση ταυτίζονται μὲ τὸν τρόπο πού ὑπάρχει ὁ Θεὸς καθ' ἑαυτόν. Αὐτὸ ἀντίστροφα συνεπάγεται τὴν ἐξαγωγή συμπερασμάτων γιὰ τὴν αἰδία ζωὴ τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος ἀπὸ τὴν οἰκονομικὴ φανέρωσή της: *"God reveals Himself. He reveals Himself through Himself. He reveals Himself. If we really want to understand revelation in terms of its subject, i.e. God, then the first thing we have to realize is that this subject, God, the Revealer, is identical with His act in revelation and also identical with its effect. It is from this fact& that we learn we must begin the doctrine of revelation with the doctrine of the triune God"*¹¹. Ἡ ταύτιση οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργειῶν πηγάζει τόσο ἀπὸ τὴ σύγχυση Θεολογίας καὶ Οἰκονομίας, ὅσο καὶ ἀπὸ τὴ φιλοσοφικὴ σχολαστικὴ ἐρμηνεία τῆς ἔννοιας *actus purus*, κατὰ τὴν ὁποία ἡ οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι καθαρὴ ἐνέργεια, διότι στὸ εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ δὲν ὑπάρχει καμία διάσταση μεταξὺ δυνάμει καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ ὄντος: *"What God is as God, the divine individuality and characteristics, the essential or essence of God, is something which we shall encounter either at the place where God deals with us as Lord and Savior, or not at all. The act of revelation as such carries with it the fact that God has not withheld Himself from men as true being, but that He has given no less than Himself to men as the overcoming of their need and light in their darkness*¹²... the concept of 'The Reality of God' ... holds together being and act instead of tearing them apart like the idea of 'essence' ... We are in fact interpreting the being of God when we describe it as God's reality as 'God's being in act', namely in the act of His revelation, in which the being of God declares it's reality: not only His reality for us –certainly that– but at the same time His own, inner, proper reality, behind which and above which there is no other¹³... the action of God that takes place in Revelation is a particular action,

10. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 299-300.

11. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 296.

12. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, Trans: T.H.L. Parker - W.B. Johnston - H. Knight - J.L.M. Haire, T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1964, σελ. 261.

13. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 262.

different from any other happening, even in contradiction to it. Actus Purus is not sufficient as a description of God. To it there must be added at least 'et singularis'"¹⁴. Ἀκριβῶς σὲ αὐτὴ τὴν ἔννοια τοῦ actus purus βασιίζεται ἡ ταύτιση τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἔργων του, δηλαδὴ ἡ ταύτιση οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργειῶν: "To the unity of Father, Son and Spirit among themselves corresponds their unity ad extra. God's essence and work are not twofold but one. God's work is His essence in its relation to the reality which is distinct from Him and which is to be created or is created by Him. The work of God is the essence of God as the essence of Him who is (N.B in a free decision grounded in His essence but not constrained by His essence) reavealer, revelation and being revealed"¹⁵.

2.2 Πρόσωπο, Οὐσία, Θέληση, Ἐνέργεια: Ἡ ταύτιση τρόπου ὑπάρξεως καὶ ἐνεργειῶν στὸν Θεό

Ἡ ταύτιση οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργειῶν στὴ βάση τῆς ἀπόλυτης ἀπλότητας τοῦ θείου Εἶναι εἶναι ἀνάλογη μὲ τὴν ταύτιση οὐσίας καὶ βούλησης στὸν Θεό, ἡ ὁποία ἔχει τὰ ἴδια θεμέλια καὶ τὶς ἴδιες προϋποθέσεις μὲ τὴν πρώτη. Ἔτσι, ὁ K. Barth μπορεῖ νὰ κινεῖται μὲ ἄνεση χρησιμοποιώντας ἓνα θεολογικὸ λεξιλόγιο, τὸ ὁποῖο παραπέμπει στὴν ταύτιση Εἶναι καὶ ἐνεργεῖν, Εἶναι καὶ βούλεσθαι, ὅπως οἱ ἔννοιες αὐτὲς χρησιμοποιοῦνται στὸν ὑπαρξισμό, παρὰ τὸ ὅτι οἱ ταυτίσεις θεμελιώνονται στὸν σχολαστικισμό: "The fact that God's being is event,

14. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 264.

15. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 371. Στὴ συνέχεια τοῦ κειμένου ὁ K. Barth διακρίνει μεταξὺ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ καθ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ποῦ ἀποκαλύπτεται, ὡστόσο ἡ διάκριση χρησιμοποιεῖται μόνο γιὰ νὰ ἐξασφαλιστεῖ ἡ ἐλευθερία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπὸ μιὰ ἀναγκαστικὴ ἀποκάλυψη τῆς οὐσίας Του. Ὁ Θεὸς ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐλεύθερα διὰ τῆς βουλήσεώς του. Ὡστόσο, ἡ βούληση ταυτίζεται μὲ τὴν οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ στὸ πλαίσιο τῆς θείας ἀπλότητας. Ἡ ἐπιμονὴ τοῦ K. Barth στὴν ταυτότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ ad extra καὶ ad intra εἶναι τὸ βασικὸ θεμέλιο τῆς ἐρμηνείας του τόσο βιβλικὰ ὅσο καὶ φιλοσοφικά.

Μὲ αὐτὸν τὸν τρόπο ἀποδίδει τὸ ἐν λόγω κείμενο καὶ ἓνας ἀπὸ τοὺς σημαντικότερους κληρονόμους τῆς σκέψης τοῦ K. Barth, ὁ καθηγητὴς JÜNGEL, E., *God's Being is in Becoming: The Trinitarian Being of God in the Theology of Karl Barth. A Paraphrase*, T&T Clark: Edinburgh 2001, σελ. 47, ὁ ὁποῖος σχολιάζοντας τὸ κείμενο τοῦ δασκάλου του γράφει: "In order to be able to speak about God's work, we must talk about the essence of the one who works. But the essence of this one who works is now thought strictly from the point of view of revelation, and so not as substance, but as the 'unity of Father, Son and Spirit among themselves' to which 'their unity ad extra' corresponds".

*the event of God's act, necessarily (if, when we speak of it, we turn our eyes solely on His Revelation) means that it is His own willed and executed decision... Now, if the being of a person is a being in act, and if, in the strict and proper sense, being in act can only be ascribed to God, then it follows that by the concept of the being of a person, in the strict and proper sense, we can understand only the being of God. Being in its own, conscious, willed and executed decision, and therefore personal being, is the being of God in the nature of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit... The real person is not man but God... God exists in His act. God is His own decision"*¹⁶.

Ἀναφερόμενος στήν Ἁγία Τριάδα προκειμένου νά περιγράψει τίς Θεῖες Ὑποστάσεις, ὁ Κ. Barth προτιμᾷ νά παραμερίσει τοὺς ὄρους Ὑπόστασις καὶ Πρόσωπον καὶ ἀντ' αὐτῶν νά εἰσαγάγει τὸν ὄρο τρόπο ὑπάρξεως (Seinsweise) γιὰ καθεμία ἀπὸ τίς ὑποστάσεις τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος. Θεωρεῖ τὴ συγκεκριμένη διατύπωση καταλληλότερη γιὰ τοὺς σημερινούς καιρούς¹⁷. Ἡ ταύτιση ὡστόσο οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργειῶν συνεπιφέρει κατὰ ἓναν ἐντελῶς φυσιολογικὸ τρόπο καὶ τὴν ταύτιση ὑποστάσεων καὶ ἐνεργειῶν, διότι τὰ πρόσωπα εἶναι τρεῖς τρόποι ὑπάρξεως τοῦ ἑνὸς Θεοῦ, δηλαδή τῆς μίας οὐσίας Του¹⁸. Συνεπαγωγικά, στὸν Κ. Barth ὁ ὄρος τρόπος ὑπάρξεως, ὁ ὁποῖος στήν ὀρθόδοξη παράδοση δηλώνει τίς σχέσεις καταγωγῆς τῶν Θεῶν Ὑποστάσεων, παραπέμπει στίς ἐνέργειες τοῦ Τριαδικοῦ Θεοῦ στήν κτίση. Δὲν καταργεῖ ὁ Κ. Barth τὸ ἀγέννητον, τὸ γεννητὸν καὶ τὸ ἐκπορευτὸν, ὡστόσο, ἀπούσης τῆς διακρίσεως οὐσίας καὶ ἐνε-

16. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 271-272. Πρὸβλ. καὶ JÜNGEL, E., *God's Being is in Becoming: The Trinitarian Being of God in the Theology of Karl Barth. A Paraphrase*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 80-81: "That means that, as event, the being of God possesses freedom of decision. Decision does not belong to the being of God as something supplementary to this being: rather, as event, Gods being is his own decision". Ἀναπόφευκτα τέτοιες διατυπώσεις εἶναι τὸ ἀποτέλεσμα τῆς εἰσαγωγῆς μιᾶς φαινομενολογίας τοῦ χρόνου στὴ ζωὴ τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος καὶ κατὰ λογικὴ συνέπεια ὁ Θεὸς φανερόνεται νά ἴσταται ἔμπροσθεν ὑπαρξιακῶν ἐπιλογῶν. Εἶναι σημαντικό τὸ ὅτι ὁ E. Jüngel βλέπει στὸ συγκεκριμένο σημεῖο τὴν ἐρμηνευτικὴ τοῦ Κ. Barth ὡς σύνθεση περσοναλισμοῦ καὶ σχολαστικισμοῦ, ἡ ὁποία δημιουργεῖ τὴν ἀρμόζουσα δογματικὴ διατύπωση γιὰ τὸν Τριαδικὸ Θεό: "because God lives solely from and by Himself, the understanding of God's being as person is not some 'personification' working itself as 'personalism versus ontology', but the understanding of being in the proper sense appropriate to God alone", ὁ.π.

17. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 359 κ.έ.

18. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 359.

γειών, αυτά καθίστανται τρόποι υπάρξεως-ἐνέργειες τοῦ Τριαδικοῦ Θεοῦ σὲ ἀναφορὰ καὶ μὲ τὴν κτίση: “*If the τρόπος ἀποκαλύψεως is a really different one from the τρόπος υπάρξεως and if the ὑπαρξις is the real being of God, then this means that God in His revelation is not really God*”¹⁹. Κατ’ αὐτὸν τὸν τρόπο ὁ τρόπος υπάρξεως τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων φανερώνονται στὴν ἀποκάλυψη καὶ ὑφίστανται διὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως, δηλαδή ταυτίζονται μὲ τὶς ἄκτιστες ἐνέργειες τῆς ἀποκάλυψης: “*In the revelation attested in the Bible God always meets us... in varying action, in one of His modes of being, or, more accurately, as distinguished or characterized in one of His modes of being... formal distinctions in the three modes of being –that which makes them modes of being– can indeed be derived from the concept of revelation*”²⁰.

2.3 Τὸ εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἀγάπη

Ἐχοντας ὀρίζει τὴν οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς καθαρὴ ἐνέργεια ἀποκαλυπτόμενη, ὁ K. Barth προχωρεῖ στὸ ἐπόμενο ἐρευνητικὸ ἐρώτημα τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Δογματικῆς του: σὲ τί συνίσταται αὐτὴ ἡ θεία ἀποκαλυπτόμενη ἐνέργεια, ἢ ὅποια ὀρίζει τὸ εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ²¹; Ἡ ἀπάντησι τοῦ K. Barth εἶναι ὅτι ἡ οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ἡ ἀποκαλυπτόμενη ἐνέργειά Του ὡς ἀγάπη. Κατὰ συνέπεια, τὸ εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ οὐσία Του εἶναι ἡ ἀγάπη: “*God loves because He loves; because this act is His being, His essence and His nature*”²². Ὁ τρόπος μὲ τὸν ὅποιον υπάρχει ὁ Θεὸς καθ’ αὐτὸς καὶ δι’ ἑαυτὸν εἶναι ἡ ἀγάπη, διότι τὸ εἶναι Του εἶναι ἡ ἀγάπη. Κατὰ συνέπεια ὁ τρόπος, μὲ τὸν ὅποιο ἀγαπῶνται τὰ Πρόσωπα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος μεταξύ Τους, εἶναι ὁ τρόπος μὲ τὸν ὅποιο ὁ Θεὸς ἀγαπᾷ τὸν ἄνθρωπο²³. Ὁ K. Barth ἐκκινεῖ ἀπὸ τὴν Οἰκονομία καὶ τὶς ἐνέργει-

19. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνήμ. ἔργ., σελ. 353.

20. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνήμ. ἔργ., σελ. 362-363.

21. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, μνήμ. ἔργ., σελ. 273: “*We must now inquire further what is this act of His, the divine act which is the divine being, so that we have to conclude from it what is divine, i.e., what is to be God, what makes God God, what God’s ‘essence’ is*”.

22. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, μνήμ. ἔργ., σελ. 279.

23. JÜNGEL, E., *God’s Being is in Becoming: The Trinitarian Being of God in the Theology of Karl Barth. A Paraphrase*, μνήμ. ἔργ., σελ. 41: “*the being of God is singular love as threeness. The self-giving in which God is already ours in advance is the self-giving in which He belongs to Himself. This self-giving is the self-relatedness of God’s being within the differentiated modes of being of the Father, the Son and the Spirit*”.

ες τοῦ Τριαδικοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὴν κτίση, γιὰ νὰ ὀρίσει τὴ Θεότητα καθ' αὐτὴν ὡς ἀγάπη: “*God’s loving is necessary, for it is the being, the essence and the nature of God... His love for us is His eternal love, and our being loved by Him is our being taken up into the fellowship of His eternal love, in which He is Himself for ever and ever... God is sufficient in Himself as object and therefore as object of His love. He is no less the one who loves if He loves no subject different from Himself. In the fact that He determines to love such another, His love overflows*”²⁴. Τὸ σύνολο αὐτῶν τῶν διατυπώσεων εἶναι συνεπὲς μὲ τὶς σχολαστικὲς προϋποθέσεις του. Στὴ βάση τῆς φιλοσοφικῆς ἀπλότητος τοῦ Θείου Εἶναι, ἡ οὐσία ταυτίζεται μὲ τὴν ἐνέργεια, ἡ οὐσία εἶναι καθαρὴ ἐνέργεια καὶ ἡ θέληση, ἡ γνώση καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη ἀποτελοῦν τὴν οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ταυτιζόμενες μὲ αὐτὴν²⁵.

2.4 Ἡ ταύτιση τοῦ Προσώπου μὲ τὴν ἀγάπη καὶ τὴν ἐλευθερία στὸν Θεό

Ὁ K. Barth, ἀντιτιθέμενος μὲ τὴ ρωμαιοκαθολικὴ-σχολαστικὴ ἀντίληψη τῆς θείας οὐσίας ὡς ἀναγκαιότητας, δηλαδή μὲ τὴ θεολογικὴ ἐρμηνεία ὅτι εἶναι ἀδύνατον νὰ μὴν ὑπάρχει ὁ Θεὸς ἢ νὰ ὑπάρχει διαφορετικὰ ἀπὸ τὸ πῶς ὑπάρχει, ἐρμηνεύει τὸ Εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἐλευθερία²⁶. Ἡ ἐλευθερία τοῦ Θεοῦ ταυτίζεται μὲ τὴν ἀγάπη. Τὸ Εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἐλευθερία τελεῖ σὲ ἀπόλυτη σύμπτωση μὲ τὸ Εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἀγάπη: «*The consideration of the mystery of His freedom cannot lead us in any other direction. It cannot lead us to another God who is not the One who loves. We must also focus on this same centre when we come to discuss the doctrine of the attributes of God, and we try to find a common explanation of the divine loving as such and the divine freedom as*

24. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 280.

25. OTT, L., *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 28 κ.έ.: “*The Divine Attributes are really identical among themselves and with the Divine Essence (De fide). The reason lies in the absolute simplicity of God. The acceptance of a real distinction (distinctio realis) would lead to acceptance of a composition in God, and with that to a dissolution of the Godhead*”.

26. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 307: “*the idea of aseity of God by the Catholic dogma that God’s being is necessary, that He is to be defined as the ens necessarium: ‘It is an intrinsic impossibility that He should not be or should be other than He is’. This is said to result from the idea of pure essence or the primary being of God... But if God is, it is the effect of His freedom, which knows no necessity, no inevitability, no straitness*”.

such. Everything will depend on our not losing the basic definition that we have now found, that God is the One who loves»²⁷.

Ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερῶνει τὸν τρόπο πού εἶναι ὁ Θεός ὡς Πρόσωπο. Πρόσωπο καὶ ἀγάπη ταυτίζονται καὶ συνεπῶς τὸ μόνο ἀληθινὸ πρόσωπο εἶναι ὁ Θεός. Οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὑφίστανται ὡς πρόσωπα στὸν βαθμὸ πού μιμοῦνται τὸ μόνο ὄντως πρόσωπο, δηλαδή τὸν ἴδιο τὸν Θεό. Οἱ ἄνθρωποι δὲν εἶναι πρόσωπα: γίνονται πρόσωπα στὸ βαθμὸ πού ἀνταποκρίνονται στὴν ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ: *“The definition of a person –that is a willing, knowing, acting I– can have the meaning only of a confession of the person of God declared in His revelation, the One who loves and who as such (loving in His own way) is the person... Man is not a person, but he becomes one on the basis that he is loved by God and can love God in return... Therefore to be a person means really and fundamentally to be what God is, to be, that is, the One who loves in God’s way... Thus to know, to will, and to act like God as the One who loves in Himself and in His relationship to His creation means to be a person. God is a person in this way, and He alone is a person in this way”²⁸. Οἱ τελευταῖες δύο περίοδοι τοῦ ἀποσπάσματος καθιστοῦν σαφῆ τὴν ὑπαρξία τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς Προσώπων, ὑποστασιαζομένων διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης ad intra καὶ ad extra²⁹. Ταυτίζεται ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦ Θεοῦ*

27. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 284.

28. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 284-285.

29. Τὰ πρόσωπα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος νοοῦνται ὡς σχέσεις τῆς θείας οὐσίας, οἱ ὁποῖες σχέσεις ὀρίζονται ἀπὸ τὴν ἀγάπη πού εἶναι ταυτόσημη τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ: *“Love, as the essence of something which exists, cannot be separated from its existence at all. The God who is love is totally identical with his essence in his existence. His existence is his essence. That is precisely what the doctrine of the Trinity formulates. It does this by thinking of the essence of God, which is love, as an essence constituted by relations and by thinking of the relations which constitute God’s essence as the divine existence... The concept of the relations which constitute the essence of God is identical with the Trinitarian ‘persons’,... the New Testament always speaks of the love of God with stringent reference to man and his world. The inner-divine self-relatedness which is love takes place as the radical relatedness of God to an other opposite to him, that is, to the human essence which he creates for that reason”, JÜNGEL, E., *God as the Mystery of the World: On the Foundation of the Theology of the Crucified One in the Dispute between Theism and Atheism*, Trans: D. L. Guder, Bloomsbury T&T Clark: London New York 2014, σελ. 371-372.*

Ἡ θεώρηση τῶν Θεῶν Ὑποστάσεων ὡς τριῶν τρόπων ὑπάρξεως τῆς Θεῆς Οὐσίας εἶναι κλασικὴ στὴ δυτικὴ παράδοση. Βλ. WILHELM, J., - SCANNELL, T. B., *A Manual of Catholic Theology based on Scheeben’s “Dogmatik”*, Benziger Bros.: London 1909⁴, σελ. 263. *“The three Possessors of the one Divinity are not really distinct from Their common Essence and Nature, as, for instance, a form is distinct from its subject; They only represent three different manners*

κατὰ τὴν ἀποκάλυψή της στὴν κρίση, μὲ τὴν οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἀγάπη καὶ καλεῖται ὁ ἄνθρωπος νὰ ὁμοιάσει μὲ τὸν Θεὸ διὰ τῆς ταυτότητος τῆς ἀγάπης.

Ἡ θέση ὅτι μόνο ὁ Θεὸς εἶναι πρόσωπο καὶ ὅτι οἱ ἄνθρωποι γίνονται πρόσωπα στὸ βαθμὸ πού μετέχουν τῆς Θεότητος, ἀντλείται ἀπὸ τὴ σχολαστικὴ θεολογία καὶ συγκεκριμένα ἀπὸ τὴν ταύτιση οὐσίας καὶ ὑπάρξεως, ἡ ὁποία εἶναι πραγματικὴ μόνο στὸν Θεό. Στὸ πλαίσιο τῆς ἀριστοτελικῆς διάκρισης δυνάμει καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ ὄντος, κατὰ τὴν ὁποία τὰ ὄντα τείνουν στὴν ἐντελέχειά τους ἀπὸ τὴ μετάβαση τοῦ δυνάμει στὸ ἐνεργείᾳ, τὸ μόνο ὄν τὸ ὁποῖο δὲν εἶναι δυνατότητα πρὸς κάτι, ἀλλὰ καθαρὴ ἐνεργεία –actus purus– εἶναι ὁ Θεός³⁰. Συνεπῶς τὸ μόνο πραγματικὸ πρόσωπο εἶναι ὁ Θεός, διότι τὸ πρόσωπο ταυτίζεται μὲ τὴν ὑπάρξη. Ἡ Ὑπάρξη στὸν Θεὸ ταυτίζεται μὲ τὴν Οὐσία Του, ὅπως δὲν συμβαίνει σὲ κανένα ἀπὸ τὰ κτιστὰ ὄντα. Συνεπῶς, τὰ ἀνθρώπινα πρόσωπα ἀληθεύουν ὡς τέτοια μόνο στὸν βαθμὸ πού μετέχουν τῆς τέλειᾳς ὑπάρξεως, τοῦ τέλειου προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ³¹.

in which the Divine Essence and Nature, as an absolutely independent and individual substance, belongs to Itself". Ἐπίσης, γιὰ τὸ ἴδιο θέμα στὸν Θωμᾶ Ἀκινάτη βλ. AQUINAS, T., *Summa Theologica, Part I QQ XXVII-XLIX*, 28.2, στὸ *The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Second and revised edition, Burns Oates and Washbourne: London 1921, Vol. 2, σελ. 18: "whatever has an accidental existence in creatures, when considered as transferred to God, has a substantial existence; for there is no accident in God; since all in Him is His essence. So, in so far as relation has an accidental existence in creatures, relation really existing in God has the existence of the divine essence in no way distinct there from. But in so far as relation implies respect to something else, no respect to the essence is signified, but rather to its opposite term. Thus it is manifest that relation really existing in God is really the same as His essence; and only differs in its mode of intelligibility; as in relation is meant that regard to its opposite which is not expressed in the name of essence. Thus it is clear that in God relation and essence do not differ from each other, but are one and the same".

30. GILSON, E., *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*, Trans: A. H. C. Downes, Charles Scribner's Sons: New York 1940, σελ. 51, "In order to know what God is, Moses turns to God... From this moment it is understood once and for all that the proper name for God is Being and that according to Saint Ephrem, taken up later by St. Bonaventure, this name denotes His very essence. Now to say that the word being designates the essence of God, and the essence of no other being but God, is to say that in God essence and existence is identical, and that in God alone essence and existence are identical. That is why St. Thomas Aquinas, referring expressly to this text of Exodus, will declare that among all divine names there is one that is eminently proper to God, namely Qui est, precisely because this Qui est signifies nothing other than being itself: non significat formam aliquam sed ipsum esse... There is one God and this God is Being".

31. GILSON, E., *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*, μνημ. ἐργ., σελ. 205, "This Being who presents Himself as personal in virtue of the sole fact that He presents Himself as Being: esse

2.5 *Analogia Entis* και *Analogia Fidei*: Οί άνθρωπινες προϋποθέσεις μετοχής και γνώσης του Θεού

Τὰ κρίσιμα ἐρωτήματα πού προκύπτουν εἶναι τὰ ἑξῆς: πῶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀποκτᾷ τὴ θεϊκὴ ἀγάπη; Σὲ τί μετέχει προκειμένου νὰ ἔλθει σὲ ταυτότητα ἀγάπης μὲ τὸ Θεό, στὸν Ὅποιο ἡ ἀγάπη ταυτίζεται μὲ τὴν οὐσία καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειά Του;

Τὰ ἐρωτήματα αὐτὰ μετασηματισμένα στὸ ἐρώτημα περὶ τῆς γνώσης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπασχόλησαν ἐκτενῶς τὸν K. Barth σὲ μιὰ μακρόχρονη περίοδο τῆς συγγραφικῆς του δραστηριότητος, διότι, ὑποστηρίζοντας τὴν *sola gratia* καὶ τὴν *analogia fidei*, ἦρθε ἀντιμέτωπος μὲ τὴ σχολαστικὴ-ρωμαιοκαθολικὴ ἔννοια τῆς *analogia entis* καὶ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τῆς ἀπὸ τοὺς ρωμαιοκαθολικοὺς θεολόγους τοῦ εἰκοστοῦ αἰῶνα, ἀρχικὰ ὅπως ἀναπτύχθηκε ἀπὸ τὸν Erich Przywara³², μὲ τὸν ὅποιο ἦρθε σὲ ἰσχυρότατη διαλεκτικὴ ἀναμέτρηση καὶ στὴ συνέχεια διαδοχικὰ μὲ τὸν Gottlieb Söhngen καὶ τὸν Hans Urs von Balthasar³³.

Ἡ *analogia entis*, ὅπως ἀναπτύσσεται ἀπὸ τὸν ρωμαιοκαθολικὸ Ἰησοῦιτη Erich Przywara στὸ βασικὸ του ἔργο *Religionsphilosophie Katholischer Theologie*, ἀφορᾷ τὴν ἐγγενῆ παρουσία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐντὸς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων κτισμάτων, διότι τὰ κτίσματα ὡς τέτοια εἶναι δημιουργήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ συνεπῶς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς εἶναι ὁ ἴδιος ὁ Θεὸς κατὰ τὴν πράξιν τῆς δημιουργικῆς του συγκατάβα-

personalis distinction; Exodi tertio; Ego sum qui sum. Christian personalism also, like the rest, has its roots in the metaphysic of Exodus; we are persons because we are the work of a Person; we participate in His personality even as, being good, we participate in His perfection; being causes, in His creative power;... in a word, as beings in His Being. To be a person is to participate in one of the highest excellences of the divine being".

32. PRZYWARA, E., *Analogia Entis: Metaphysics, Original Structure and Universal Rhythm*, (Ressourcement: Retrieval and Renewal in Catholic Thought), Trans: J. R. Betz, D. B. Hart, Eerdmans: 2014.

33. Γιὰ τὸ θέμα βλ. LONG, S.D., *Saving Karl Barth: Hans Urs von Balthasar's preoccupation*, Augsburg Fortress Publishers: Minneapolis 2014. JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ. (ἡ πιὸ ὀλοκληρωμένη διατριβὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ θέματος) von BALTHASAR, H. U., *The Theology of Karl Barth: exposition and interpretation*, Trans: E. T. Oaks, Ignatius Press: San Francisco 1992. NIELSEN, N. C., "The Debate Between Karl Barth and Erich Przywara: A New Evaluation of Protestant and Roman Catholic Differences". *Rice Institute Pamphlet - Rice University Studies*, 40, no. 1 (1953), σσ. 1-23 καὶ https://scholarship.rice.edu/bitstream/handle/1911/62714/article_RIP401_part2.pdf;sequence=1 (προσπελάστηκε στὶς 22/9/2016). BETZ, J. R., "Beyond the sublime: the aesthetics of the analogy of being (part two)", *Modern Theology*, 22:1 January 2006, σσ. 1-50. Τὸ σύνολο τῶν ἐρμηνειῶν στὶς παραπάνω ἐργασίες προσδιορίζεται καθοριστικὰ ἀπὸ τὶς προτεσταντικὲς ἢ τὶς ρωμαιοκαθολικὲς καταβολὲς τῶν γραφόντων.

σης. Ἡ ἐνανθρώπιση ἀποτελεῖ τὴν κορωνίδα τῆς συγκατάβασης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐντὸς τῶν κτισμάτων³⁴. Κατὰ λογικὴ συνέπεια, συνεχίζει ὁ Erich Przywara, ἡ γνώση τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερώνεται διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας (μεταφυσικῆς) καὶ τῆς ἀνθρώπινης συνείδησης κατὰ τὴν αὐτο-ἐνδοσκόπησή της, ἡ ὁποία ἀνακαλύπτει τὴ θεία καταγωγή τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου κτίσματος, δηλαδή τὴν ἀποκάλυψη καὶ τὴ συγκατάβαση τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς τὴ δημιουργία αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἴδιου τοῦ κτίσματος. Αὐτὸ φανερώνει τὴν *analogia entis*³⁵.

Ὅταν ὁ Erich Przywara ἐπισκέφτηκε τὸ σεμινάριο τοῦ K. Barth, ἡ βασικὴ ἔνστασις τοῦ ἀκροατηρίου ὑπῆρξε ἡ παραγνώρισις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀπὸ τὸν Erich Przywara, ἡ ὁποία καταστρέφει τὴ συνείδησι καὶ συνεπῶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἶναι ἀνίκανος δι' αὐτῆς νὰ ἔρθει στὴ γνώση τοῦ Θεοῦ³⁶. Ὁ ρωμαιοκαθολικὸς Ἰησοῦιτις, βασιζόμενος στὴ ρωμαιοκαθολικὴ ἀρχὴ ὅτι ἡ χάρις τελειοποιεῖ καὶ δὲν καταστρέφει τὴ φύση, ἀπάντησε ὅτι ὁ στοχασμὸς τῆς ἀνθρώπινης συνείδησης εἶναι τὸ πρῶτο βῆμα στὴ γνώση τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ ὁποῖο ὀλοκληρώνεται διὰ τῆς χάριτος. Τὸ κτίσμα ὡς διηνεκῶς μετέχον στὸ εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς δημιουργικῆς πράξεως ἐνέχει τὴ δυνατότητα τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἑαυτῷ. Ἡ θεωρία τῆς φύσεως ὀδηγεῖ στὴ γνώση τοῦ Θεοῦ, διότι ὁ κόσμος εἶναι δημιουργημα τοῦ

34. PRZYWARA, E., *Schriften*, vol. 2, Johannes Verlag: Einsiedeln 1962, σελ. 442, μτφρ. ἀπὸ τὸν JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 74, “For the *analogia entis* does not denote an ascertainable God contained in the limits of the creature, but a reverend looking towards God as the One to whose self-condescension is already [what marks] creation as creation, so that the creature, far from signifying an externally imposed limit to this creative power, is nothing more than the preliminary boundary which He Himself has freely set to His own voluntary self-condescension... The incarnation of God, in the midst of a true incarnation-cosmos, appears much more as the crown of the process of the self-condescension of God”.

35. PRZYWARA, E., *Schriften*, vol. 2, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 442, μτφρ. ἀπὸ τὸν JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 75, “Religion when we acquaint ourselves with it by means of the ultimate sense of *analogia entis*, signifies the active consciousness of the divine origin of the creature, the consciousness that in its ultimate essence it is the self-revelation and self-condescension of God”. Πρβλ. καὶ PRZYWARA, E., “Metaphysik und Religion”, *Stimmen der Zeit*, 104, 1922, σελ. 137-138, μτφρ. NIELSEN, N. C., “The Debate Between Karl Barth and Erich Przywara: A New Evaluation of Protestant and Roman Catholic Differences”, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 45: “Common to ‘metaphysics’ and ‘religion’ is the central point of the *analogia entis* and the presupposition of the natural self-revelation of God in his creation, so that on the one hand metaphysics bears within itself an element of religion (the presupposition of the self-revelation of God) as on the other hand religion contains an element of metaphysics (the criterion for recognition of the *analogia entis*)”.

36. JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 88-89.

Θεοῦ³⁷. Αὐτὴ ἡ γνῶσις ὀλοκληρῶνεται διὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐντὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας³⁸.

Ἡ ἱστορικὴ δήλωση τοῦ K. Barth στὸν πρόλογο τῆς *Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Δογματικῆς* του, κατόπιν ἐκτενοῦς μελέτης τῆς analogia entis τόσο στὸν Ἀκινάτη ὅσο καὶ στὸν Przywara, ἦταν ὅτι ὁ K. Barth θεωρεῖ τὴν analogia entis ὡς τὴν ἐπινόηση τοῦ Ἀντιχριστοῦ καὶ ὡς τὸν σοβαρότερο λόγο γιὰ νὰ μὴν προσχωρήσει ποτὲ ὁ ἴδιος στὴ Ρωμαιοκαθολικὴ Ἐκκλησία³⁹. Ἡ δήλωση αὐτὴ, μακρὰν τοῦ νὰ ἀποτελεῖ ἀπλῶς μία ρητορικὴ πρόκληση, ἀναλύεται ἀπὸ τὸν ἴδιο ἐπαρκῶς στὸ σύνολο τοῦ ἔργου του. Πρῶτον, ἡ ἀποκάλυψη τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι δῶρο τῆς χάριτος καὶ ὄχι ἓνα δεδομένο τῆς ἐγγενοῦς ἀνθρώπινης ἰκανότητος πρὸς ἀνακάλυψη. Ἡ analogia entis δείχνει τὴν ἀποκάλυψη ὡς στοιχεῖο ποὺ ἀνακαλύπτεται ἀπὸ μιὰ ἐγγενῆ ἰκανότητα τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου ὄντος⁴⁰. Δεύτερον, διὰ τῆς analogia entis ἡ γνῶσις τοῦ Θεοῦ σχηματίζεται ἀπὸ ἀνθρωπολογικὰ δεδομένα καὶ ὄχι ἀπὸ τὴν ἀποκάλυψη τοῦ Θεοῦ⁴¹. Τρίτον, στὴ βάση τῆς πλήρους ἐξαχρείωσης τοῦ κατ' εἰκόνα, κάθε φυσικὴ θεωρία εἶναι δαιμονικὴ, διότι ἡ μόνη δικαίωση ἔρχεται ἐκ πίστεως στὸν Χριστὸ καὶ ἀπὸ καμία αὐτο-ἐνδοσκόπηση τῆς ἀνθρώπινης σκέψης. Ὅταν γίνεται λόγος γιὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπινο Λόγο, πάντοτε γίνεται ἐντὸς τῆς πεπρωκυίας κατάστασης καὶ συνεπῶς δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ κτισθεῖ πάνω σὲ αὐτὸν

37. JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 98-99, “God is being, and everything other than God exists only by participation in God’s being. Because creatures exist by participation, they are distinct from God; but because their being is derived from God, they also exist in similarity to him. In other words, Barths summary description of ‘what is meant’ by analogia entis corresponds directly to Przywara’s description of it... Przywara does, in fact, believe that the experience of God is an inherent human capability on the basis of God’s act of creation, that a human can come to real knowledge of God through reflection upon the ‘given’ of her own existence, and that the human can arrive at this knowledge by reflecting upon the analogy between the unity of her essence and existence (one of tension) and the unity of God’s essence and existence (one of identity)”.

38. JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 91.

39. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. xiii, “because I can see no third possibility between that exploitation of the analogia entis which is legitimate only on the grounds of Roman Catholicism –that is, between the greatness and misery of a so-called natural knowledge of God in the sense of the Vaticanum– and a Protestant theology which draws from its own source, stands on its own feet, and is finally liberated from this secular misery. Hence I have no option but to say no at this point. I regard the analogia entis as the invention of the anti-Christ, and I believe that because of it, it is impossible ever to become Roman Catholic”.

40. JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 96.

41. JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 107.

καμία ἀληθινή γνώση⁴². Τέταρτον, μόνον ἡ ἐνανθρώπηση ὡς ἀποκάλυψη τοῦ Θεοῦ φωτίζει τὴν ἁμαρτία καὶ τὸ σκότος τῆς ἀνθρώπινης λογικῆς. Συνεπῶς, ἡ ἀποκάλυψη ὡς σάρκωση τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου δὲν εἶναι συμπληρωματικὴ τῆς ἀνθρώπινης φυσικῆς θεωρίας - κατὰ τὴ ρωμαιοκαθολικὴ λογικὴ τῆς χάριτος ποὺ τελειοποιεῖ τὴν ἀνθρώπινη φύση. Εἶναι ἡ μόνη ἀποκάλυψη ποὺ φέρνει τὴ θεογνωσία⁴³. Πέμπτον, δὲν ὑφίσταται καμία συνέργεια Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου στὸ γεγονός τῆς σωτηρίας. Ἡ σωτηρία εἶναι *sola gratia*. Ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἶναι νεκρὸς ἀπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτία, ὄχι ἀπλῶς πληγωμένος⁴⁴. Συνεπῶς ἡ ὅποια ἀνθρώπινη συνέργεια στὴ σωτηρία εἶναι πάλι ἡ ἴδια ἡ θεία χάρις. Τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα εἶναι ἡ θεία χάρις καὶ ὄχι ἐγγενὴς ἰκανότητα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου νὰ γνωρίζει τὸ Θεό⁴⁵.

Στερεούμενος ἐρμηνευτικὰ στὴ βασικὴ προτεσταντικὴ θέση περὶ ἀπόλυτης ἐξαχρείωσης τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτία, ὁ K. Barth ταυτίζει τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα μὲ τὴν πίστη ποὺ δημιουργεῖται στὸν ἄνθρωπο ἀπὸ τὸν Θεό⁴⁶. Ὡστόσο, καὶ

42. JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 108.

43. JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 101.

44. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 238, “*the image of God is not just, as it is said, destroyed apart from a few relics; it is totally annihilated. What remains of the image of God even in sinful man is recta natura, to which as such a rectitude cannot be ascribed even potentialiter. No matter how it may be with his humanity and personality, man has completely lost the capacity for God*”.

45. BARTH, K., *The Holy Spirit and the Christian Life: The Theological Basis of Ethics*, Trans: R. Birch Hoyle, John Knox Press: Louisville Westminster 1993, σελ. 5, “*Man as creature is not in a position from which he can establish and survey (e.g., in a scheme of the unity of like and unlike) his relation to God and thereby interpret himself as ‘open upwards’, as Erich Przywara says, and consequently describe his own knowledge as if it meant that Gods revealedness were within the compass of his own understanding by itself. The sayings ‘God has made us for himself’ and ‘man made in the image of God’ are not to be taken as meaning an abiding and sure fact of revelation that we have once and for all made our own, but it is a process of revelation, which, in the strictest sense, is first coming to us and to come, moment by moment, if, as we should, we have taken seriously what it means by the Deity of the Creator Spirit*”.

46. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 239, “*The image of God in man of which we must speak here and which forms the real point of contact for God’s Word is the rectitudo which through Christ is raised up from real death and thus restored and created anew, and which is real as man’s possibility for the Word of God. The reconciliation of man with God in Christ also includes, or already begins with, the restitution of the lost point of contact. Hence this point of contact is not real outside faith; it is real only in faith. In faith man is created by the Word of God for the Word of God, existing in the Word of God and not in himself, not in virtue of his humanity and personality, not even on the basis of creation, for that which by creation was possible for man in relation to God has been lost by the fall*”.

αὐτὴ ἡ ἴδια ἡ πίστις δὲν εἶναι μὲ κανέναν τρόπο ἓνα ἀνθρώπινο χαρακτηριστικό, ἀλλὰ εἶναι καρπὸς τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ στὸν ἄνθρωπο. Συνεπῶς, τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα εἶναι *analogia fidei*, ἡ ὁποία ὡς ἄνωθεν ἐρχομένη εἶναι *sola gratia*⁴⁷. Ἀπέναντι στὴν *analogia entis* ὡς ἐγγενοῦς ἰκανότητος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου νὰ γνωρίσει τὸν Θεό, ὁ K. Barth θὰ ἀντιτάξει τὴν *analogia fidei*, δανειζόμενος τὸν παύλειο ὄρο *ἀναλογία πίστεως*, ἡ ὁποία ὁμως ταυτίζεται μὲ τὴ θεία χάρις, δηλαδὴ μὲ τὸν ἴδιο τὸν Θεὸ Λόγο στὴ βάση τοῦ *actus purus*. Παραπέμποντας στὰ λόγια τοῦ Λουθήρου ὅτι ἡ ὀρθὴ πίστις δὲν παράγεται ἀπὸ τὸ νοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ ἀποκλειστικὰ ἀπὸ τὸ ἔργο τοῦ Θεοῦ, καταλήγει: “*The Word of God becomes knowable by making itself known. The application of what has been said to the problem of knowledge consists in stopping at this statement... The possibility of knowing the Word of God is God’s miracle on us just as much is the Word itself or it’s being spoken*”⁴⁸.

Μὲ θεμελιώδη θεολογικὴ προϋπόθεση τὴν ταύτιση Θεολογίας καὶ Οἰκονομίας καὶ τὴ συμπαρεκτεινόμενη συγχώνευση οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργειῶν στὸν Τριαδικὸ Θεό, ὁ K. Barth προχωρεῖ στὴν ἐρμηνεῖα τῆς ἐνανθρώπισης ὡς ἀναπαγωγῆς τῶν ἐνδότατων σχέσεων τῆς αἰδίου Ἁγίας Τριάδος *ad extra*. Πρόκειται γιὰ μιὰ ἀναλογία τρόπου ὑπάρξεως τῶν Θεῶν Ὑποστάσεων κατὰ τὶς αἰδιες σχέσεις τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος πρὸς τὴ σχέση τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὲ τοὺς ὑπόλοιπους ἀνθρώπους: “*If ‘God for man’ is the eternal covenant revealed and effective in time in the humanity of Jesus, in this decision of the Creator for the creature there arises a relationship, which is not alien to the Creator, to God as God, but we might almost say appropriate and natural to Him. God repeats in this relationship ad extra a relationship proper to Himself in His inner divine essence. Entering into this relationship, He makes a copy of Himself. Even in His inner divine being there is relationship. To be sure, God is One in Himself. But He is not alone. There is in Him a co-existence, a co-inherence, and*

47. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 241, “*To the image of God in man which was lost in Adam but restored in Christ there also belongs the fact that man can hear God’s Word. Only as the Word of God is really spoken in spite of his sin and to his sin, only in the grace with which God replies to sin, can this possibility revive. But in grace it does revive: not, then, as a natural capacity in man... but as a capacity of the incapable, as a miracle that cannot be interpreted anthropologically, nevertheless as a real capacity which is already actualized in faith*”.

48. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of the Word of God*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 246.

reciprocity. God in Himself is not just simple, but in the simplicity of His essence He is threefold... He is in Himself the One who loves eternally, the One who is eternally loved, and eternal love: and in this triunity He is the original and source of every I and Thou, of the I which is eternally from and to the Thou and therefore supremely I. And it is this relationship in the inner divine being which is repeated and reflected in God's eternal covenant with man as revealed and operative in time in the humanity of Jesus"⁴⁹. Στὴ βάση τοῦ *actus purus*, τῆς ταύτισης οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργειῶν, ὁ K. Barth μπορεῖ μὲ ἄνεση νὰ ὀνομάζει τὸν Θεὸ ὡς αὐτοαγάπη, ἡ ὁποία ἀποτελεῖ τὴν οὐσία Του, φανερώνοντας οὕτως τὶς ἐνδότατες σχέσεις τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων, καὶ ταυτοχρόνως ὡς ἐνεργοῦσα ἀγάπη πρὸς τὸν κόσμο, δηλαδὴ ὡς καθαρὴ ἐνέργεια. Μὲ αὐτὸ τὸ σχολαστικὸ ὑπόβαθρο, εἶναι ἐνδιαφέρον ὅτι στὸ ὄλο αὐτὸ λεξιλόγιο τῆς Τριαδικῆς ἀγάπης χρησιμοποιεῖται ἡ περσοναλιστικὴ ὀρολογία τοῦ Ἐγὼ-Σὺ, τὴν ὁποία εἰσάγει στὴ φιλοσοφία καὶ τὴ θεολογία ὁ M. Buber⁵⁰.

Ἡ ἐνανθρώπηση φανερῶνει τὴ μόνη ἀληθινὴ ἀναλογία μεταξὺ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου. Εἶναι ἡ ἀναλογία τῆς σχέσης τοῦ τρόπου ὑπάρξεως τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων ἀλληλοπεριχωρουμένων καὶ τῆς σχέσης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Ἡ μόνη ἀληθινὴ ἐρμηνεία τοῦ κατ' εἰκόνα εἶναι ὁ ἴδιος ὁ Χριστός, διότι κατοπτρίζει τὴ θεία χάρη, μὲ τὴν ὁποία ἡ ἀνθρωπότητά Του σχετίζεται μὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Ἡ ἴδια αὐτὴ χάρη εἶναι ἡ οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ στὴ βάση τοῦ *actus purus* καὶ φανερῶνει τὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεως τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ ὁποῖος εἶναι ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων μεταξὺ τους. Ἡ ἐρμηνεία τοῦ κατ' εἰκόνα ὄχι ὡς *analogia entis*, ἀλλὰ ὡς *analogia fidei*, ἡ ὁποία ὁμως εἶναι *sola gratia*, βρῖσκει τώρα διὰ τῆς χριστολογικῆς αὐτῆς ἐρμηνείας τὴν πληρότητά της: "*We now stand before the true and original correspondence... an inner divine correspondence and similarity between the being of the man Jesus for God and His being for His fellows. This correspondence and similarity consists in the fact that the man Jesus in His being for man repeats and reflects the inner being or essence of God and this confirms His being for God... The humanity of Jesus is not merely the repetition and reflection of His divinity, or*

49. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of Creation*, Vol. 3, Pt. 2, Trans: H. Knight - G. W. Bromiley - J. K. S. Ride - R. H. Fuller, T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1960, σελ. 218-219.

50. *Ich und Du*, Reclam: Stuttgart 2008. Στὴν ἀγγλικὴ BUBER, M., *I and Thou*, Charles Scribner's Sons: 1937.

of God's controlling will; it is the repetition and reflection of God Himself, no more and no less. It is the image of God. The imago Dei⁵¹.

2.6 *Analogia Relationis*: Ἡ ταύτιση τοῦ τρόπου ὑπάρξεως στήν Ἁγία Τριάδα καί τόν ἄνθρωπο

Ἡ ἀναλογία τῆς σχέσης, ἡ ἀναλογία τοῦ τρόπου ὑπάρξεως Θεοῦ καί ἀνθρώπου, τόσο στόν Χριστό πρός τόν Θεό Πατέρα καί πρός τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅσο καί –διαμέσου τοῦ Χριστοῦ– στοὺς ἀνθρώπους μεταξύ τους, προσλαμβάνει στόν K. Barth τόν τεχνικό ὄρο *analogia relationis*⁵². Εἶναι σαφές ὅτι στήν ἀντίληψη τοῦ K. Barth ἡ *analogia relationis* ἔρχεται σὲ ἀπόλυτη ἀντίθεση μὲ τὴν *analogia entis*. Ἡ πρώτη ἀποτελεῖ τὴν ἴδια τὴ θεία χάρις, σὲ ἀντίθεση μὲ κάθε ἐγγενῆ ἀνθρώπινη δυνατότητα γιὰ θεία γνώση, τὴν ὁποία ἀντιπροσωπεύει ἡ *analogia entis*. Τὸ σημαντικότερο στοιχεῖο τῆς *analogia relationis* εἶναι ὅτι δὲν χαρακτηρίζει μόνο τόν Χριστό ὡς ἀναλογία σχέσης μεταξύ Πατρὸς-Υἱοῦ καί Χριστοῦ-ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ καί τόν καθένα χριστιανὸ ἄνθρωπο, στόν ὁποῖο συμβαίνει τὸ θαῦμα τῆς πίστεως, πρός τοὺς συνανθρώπους του: “*if it is the inner essence of God which has it's creaturely correspondence and similarity in His fellow-humanity, in His being for men, how can this be denied to those for whom He intervenes, to whom God has turned so seriously and totally in this One?... They are not simply and directly the covenant partners of God as His creatures; they are destined to become this. And this means that they are*

51. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of Creation*, Vol. 3, Pt. 2, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 219.

52. Ὁ K. BARTH δανεῖζεται τὸν ὄρο ἀπὸ τὸν D. BOENHOEFFER, *Creation and Fall: A theological interpretation of Genesis 1-3*, Macmillan: New York 1959, σελ. 37. Ὁ BOENHOEFFER, ἐρμηνεύοντας τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα χρησιμοποιοεῖ τὸν ὄρο *analogia relationis* γιὰ νὰ τὸν ἀντιτάξει στήν ὀρθόδοξη ἀναλογία *analogia entis*. Τὸ βασικὸ σημεῖο καί γιὰ τὸν BOENHOEFFER εἶναι ὅτι ἡ ἀναλογία σχέσης φανερώνει τὴν ὁμοιότητα Θεοῦ καί ἀνθρώπου, μόνο καί μόνο ἐπειδὴ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνσκηπνώνει στόν ἄνθρωπο. Ἡ *analogia relationis* εἶναι *sola gratia*: “*The likeness, the analogia, of humanity to God is not analogia entis but analogia relationis... The analogia has it's likeness only from the prototype... Analogia relationis is therefore the analogia which God has established, and it is analogia only in this relation which God has established*”, ὁ.π., σελ. 65 κ.έ. σὸ GREEN, C. J., *Bonhoeffer: A Theology of Sociality*, W. B. Eerdmans: Cambridge 1999, σελ. 192-193. Γιὰ τὴν ἐξέλιξη τῆς σκέψης τοῦ K. Barth πάνω στήν ἔννοια τῆς *analogia relationis* βλ. καί LEE, J. Y., “Karl Barth's Use of Analogy in his Church Dogmatics”, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 22, 02, June 1969, σελ. 141-151.

*destined to participate in the benefits of the fellow-humanity of that One, to be delivered by Him*⁵³.

Ὑπάρχουν τέσσερις συζυγίες, οἱ ὁποῖες φανερώνουν τὴν ταυτότητα τοῦ τρόπου ὑπάρξεως τῶν ἐνδότατων σχέσεων τῆς αἰδίου Τριάδος: α) Ἡ σχέση Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ αἰδίως, β) ἡ σχέση ἀκρίστου δημιουργοῦ καὶ κτιστοῦ δημιουργήματος ὡς προβολῆς τῆς αἰδίου Τριάδος ad extra στὴ βάση τοῦ actus purus, γ) ἡ σχέση τοῦ ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ μὲ τὸν Θεὸ Πατέρα καὶ δ) ἡ σχέση τοῦ ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ μὲ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. Ταυτοχρόνως ἀπὸ τὶς τέσσερις προκύπτει ρητὰ καὶ ὁμολογημένα μιὰ πέμπτη συζυγία, αὐτὴ τῶν ἀναγεννημένων ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸς τοὺς ὑπόλοιπους ἀνθρώπους. Ὅλες οἱ παραπάνω σχέσεις κατοπτρίζουν τὴν analogia relationis, ἡ ὁποία φανερῶνει τὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεως τῆς αἰδίου Τριάδος: “for all the disparity (ἐννοεῖ ἀκρίστου καὶ κτιστοῦ)... there is a correspondence and similarity between the two relationships. This is not a correspondence and similarity of being, an analogia entis. The being of God cannot be compared with that of man. But it is not a question of this twofold being. It is a question of the relationship within the being of God on the one side and between the being of God and that of man on the other. Between these two relationships as such –and it is in this sense that the second is the image of the first– there is correspondence and similarity. There is an analogia relationis. The correspondence and similarity of the two relationships consists in the fact

53. BARTH, K., *Church Dogmatics, The Doctrine of Creation*, Vol. 3, Pt. 2, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 225. Πρὸβλ. καὶ JOHNSON, K. L., *Karl Barth and the Analogia Entis*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 197: “The logic of Barth’s analogy works as follows: the relation between God and the human Jesus corresponds to the relations between the eternal Father and the eternal Son; the relation between the human Jesus and humanity in general corresponds to the relation between the human Jesus and God; the relation between humans to other humans correspond to the relationship between the human Jesus and humanity; and thus, the relation between humans to other humans correspond to the relations within the Trinity”. TORRANCE, A. J., *Persons in Communion: An Essay on Trinitarian Description and Human Participation with special reference to Volume One of Karl Barth’s Church Dogmatics*, T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1996, σελ. 181: “The image of God in humankind is particularly manifest, Barth affirms, in the I-Thou relationship –where the human I– Thou is to be conceived as an image of the divine I-Thou. This is not an analogy of being, as traditionally understood, but an analogy of relation (analogia relationis) - ‘as the addressing I in the divine nature is related to the addressed divine Thou ... so also in human existence the I is related to the Thou, man to woman’. The similarity consists therefore in the correspondence between the I-Thou relationship of Father and Son, and the I-Thou relationship of man and woman, which he takes to provide the profoundest expression of interpersonal relationship in the human realm”.

that the freedom in which God posits Himself as the Father, is posited by Himself as the Son and confirms Himself as the Holy Ghost, is the same freedom as that in which He is the Creator of man, in which man may be His creature, and in which the Creator-creature relationship is established by the Creator... The correspondence and similarity of the two relationships consists in the fact that the eternal love in which God as the Father loves the Son, and as the Son loves the Father, and in which God as the Father is loved by the Son and as the Son by the Father, is also the love which is addressed by God to man. The humanity of Jesus, His fellow-humanity, His being for man as the direct correlative of His being for God, indicates attests and reveals this correspondence and similarity... it follows the essence, the inner being of God. It is this inner being which takes this form *ad extra* in the humanity of Jesus, and in this form, for all the disparity of sphere and object, remains true to itself and therefore reflects itself⁵⁴. Ἡ ὅλη ἐρμηνεία τοῦ K. Barth βασίζεται στήν ἀνάλυση τοῦ 17ου κεφαλαίου τοῦ *Κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγελίου* στήν προσευχή τοῦ Χριστοῦ γιά τοὺς μαθητές του. Ἡ *analogia relationis* εἶναι ἀπόλυτη συνέπεια τῆς *sola gratia* καὶ τοῦ *actus purus*, ἀφοῦ οἱ ἄνθρωποι κατὰ τὴν ἀπόλυτη ἐξαχρείωσή τους ἀπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτία πράττουν καλῶς ἀποκλειστικά στὴ βάση τῆς ἐνανθρώπησης καὶ μόνον διὰ τῆς ἐνσκηνοῦσης στοὺς ἀναγεννημένους ἀνθρώπους θείας ἐνεργείας, ἡ ὁποία καὶ ταυτίζεται μὲ τὴ θεία οὐσία. Συνεπῶς ἡ *analogia relationis* εἶναι *sola gratia*. Τὸ ὅλο ἐρμηνευτικὸ σχῆμα εἶναι ἀπολύτως συνεπὲς μὲ τίς λογικὲς καὶ θεολογικὲς προϋποθέσεις τῆς δυτικῆς σχολαστικῆς παράδοσης.

3. Karl Rahner

3.1 Ἡ κριτικὴ τῆς δυτικῆς χριστιανικῆς Οὐσιοκρατίας στὴν Τριαδολογία

Τὸ 1970 κυκλοφορεῖ στὴν ἀγγλικὴ γλῶσσα τὸ ἔργο τοῦ K. Rahner, *The Trinity*⁵⁵. Ὁ K. Rahner –ὅπως καὶ ὁ K. Barth– ἔχει ὡς βασικὴ μέρωμα ἀφ' ἐνὸς

54. Church Dogmatics, *The Doctrine of Creation*, Vol. 3, Pt. 2, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 220.

55. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, Trans: J. Donceel, Continuum: London-New York 1970. Γιά τὴν προϊστορία τοῦ βιβλίου ὡς ἄρθρου στὴ γερμανικὴ γλῶσσα βλ. COFFEY, D., "Trinity", σὸ MARMION, D., - HINES, M.E. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Rahner*, Cambridge University Press 2005, σελ. 98.

νά ἐπαναξωογονήσει τὸ δόγμα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος ἀπὸ τῆ σχολαστικῆ του ἀπό-
 θηση σὲ χώρους μακρυνὰ ἀπὸ τὶς ὑπαρξιακὲς ἀγωνίες καὶ τὰ ζωτικὰ ἐνδιαφέ-
 ροντα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφ' ἑτέρου νὰ δείξει ὅτι τὸ μυστήριο τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος
 εἶναι ὁ πυρήνας τῆς χριστιανικῆς ζωῆς. Ἐπισημαίνει χαρακτηριστικὰ ὅτι τὸ
 δόγμα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος ὡς τέτοιο δὲν συνεπάγεται ἀπολύτως τίποτε γιὰ τοὺς
 χριστιανούς, καθὼς αὐτοὶ συμπεριφέρονται ὡς ἀπλοὶ μονοθεϊστὲς ὅποιασδή-
 ποτε θρησκείας⁵⁶. Αἰτία αὐτοῦ τοῦ γεγονότος εἶναι γιὰ τὸν K. Rahner ἡ ἔμμονη
 τῆς δυτικῆς θεολογίας στὴ μία οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἡ ὁποία ἐξαφανίζει κάθε δια-
 κριτὸ ρόλο τῶν Θεῶν Ὑποστάσεων. Εἶναι τέτοια ἡ ἔμμονη στὸν ἕνα Θεό, στὴ
 μία οὐσία Του, πὸν γιὰ τὴ δυτικὴ πατερικὴ παράδοση ἡ ἐνανθρώπηση θὰ μπο-
 ροῦσε νὰ ἔχει συμβεῖ ἀπὸ ὁποιοδήποτε πρόσωπο τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος. Κι αὐτὸ
 γιὰ τὸ γεγονός τῆς ἐνανθρώπησης τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ βᾶρος τῆς δυτικῆς ἐρμηνεί-
 ας πέφτει πάντοτε στὸν ἕνα Θεὸ καὶ ὄχι στὸ συγκεκριμένο πρόσωπο τῆς Ἁγίας
 Τριάδος πὸν σαρκώνεται⁵⁷. Τὸ ἴδιο συμβαίνει καὶ στὴ Θεία Λειτουργία, κατὰ
 τὴν ὁποία τὸ Πάτερ Ἡμῶν ἀπευθύνεται ἀδιαφοροποίητα στὴν Ἁγία Τριάδα
 καὶ ὄχι στὸν Πατέρα, διὰ τοῦ ὁποίου καὶ πραγματοποιεῖται τὸ ὄλο γεγονός τῆς
 σωτηρίας. Ὅλη ἡ ἔμφαση τῆς παράδοσης πέφτει στὸ κοινὸ ἔργο τῆς Ἁγίας
 Τριάδος, ὡς οὐσίας, δηλαδὴ ὡς καθαρῆς ἐνέργειας - *actus purus*, μὲ ἀποτελέ-
 σμα τὴν πλήρη ἀγνόηση τῶν Θεῶν Ὑποστάσεων καὶ τὴν ἀπώλεια τῆς μοναδι-
 κότητάς τους μπροστὰ στὴν τελειότητα τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας⁵⁸. Καταληκτικὸ παρὰ-

56. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 10.

57. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 11: “Nowadays when we speak of God’s incarnation, the theological and religious emphasis lies only on the fact that ‘God’ became man, that ‘one’ of the divine persons (of the Trinity) took on the flesh, and not on the fact that this person is precisely the person of the Logos... No wonder, since starting from Augustine, and as opposed to the older tradition, it has been among theologians a more or less foregone conclusion that each of the divine persons (if God freely so decided) could have become man, so that the incarnation of precisely this person can tell us nothing about the peculiar features of this person within the divinity”.

58. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 12, “Thus theology considers it almost a matter of course that the ‘Our Father’ is addressed in the same way, with equal appositiveness, indifferently to the Holy Trinity, to the three divine persons; that the sacrifice of die Mass is offered in the same manner to the three divine persons. The current doctrine of satisfaction, hence also of redemption, with its theory of a double moral subject in Christ, regards the redemptive activity as offered indifferently to the three divine persons. Such a doctrine does not give sufficient attention to the fact that satisfaction comes from the incarnate Word, not simply from the God-man. It supposes that another person could, as man, have offered to the triune God a *satisfactio condigna* (adequate satisfaction)”.

δειγμα για τόν K. Rahner είναι η ρωμαιοκαθολική διδασκαλία περί χάριτος, ή όποια άντι νά παραπέμπει εϋθέως στό έργο του προσώπου του Ίησού Χριστού στη θεία οικονομία, στην καλύτερη περίπτωση προετοιμάζει τους πιστούς για μιá αντιμετώπιση τής ένανθρώπησης ώς κοινού έργου τής Άγίας Τριάδος. Αυτό κατά τόν K. Rahner συνεπάγεται μιá άναφορά πάλι στον ένα Θεό τής μιás οϋσίας, ή όποια ώς actus purus πραγματοποιεί τόσο τή δημιουργία όσο και τήν άπελευθέρωσή της από τήν άμαρτία και τόν θάνατο. Μιá τέτοια διδασκαλία περί χάριτος κατά τόν K. Rahner, άφ' ένός δέν φανερώνει για τόν άνθρωπο καμία μετοχή στην Ύπόσταση του Υίου ώς θεία υίοθεσία, άφ' έτέρου διαλύει κάθε σύνδεση μεταξύ Οικονομίας και Θεολογίας στην Άγία Τριάδα, άφου έξαφανίζει τις Θείες Ύποστάσεις στην άτομική, ιδική και ξεχωριστή φάνέρωσή τους κατά τή Θεία Οικονομία, μπροστά στο actus purus τής άπολύτως άπλης Θείας Οϋσίας⁵⁹.

3.2 Τò θεμελιώδες έρμηνευτικό άξίωμα στην Τριαδολογία: Ταύτιση άιδίου και οικονομικής Τριάδας

Τò βασικό πρόβλημα τής δυτικής θεολογίας, κατά τόν K. Rahner, τò όποιο θεμελιώθηκε στη θεολογία του ίεροϋ Αϋγουστίνου και τών σχολαστικών, είναι ή έρμηνευτική προτεραιότητα τής Θείας Οϋσίας έναντι τών Θείων Ύποστάσεων. Η θεολογία κατ' αυτόν τόν τρόπο γίνεται φιλοσοφική, στοχαστική και άφηρημένη, διότι δέν θεμελιώνεται στην ανθρώπινη έμπειρία τής μετοχής στις θεοφάνειες κάθε Θείας Ύπόστασης ξεχωριστά κατά τò όλο έργο τής θείας οικονομίας: *“It looks as if everything which matters for us in God has already been said in the treatise On the One God. This separation of the two treatises and the sequence in which they are explained probably derives from the Augustinian-Western conception of the Trinity, as contrasted with the Greek conception,*

59. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, μνημ. έργ., σελ. 13: *“the doctrine of grace, even if it is entitled ‘On the Grace of Christ’, is in fact monotheistic, not trinitarian: a participation in the divine nature leading to a blessed vision of the divine essence* We are told that this grace has been ‘merited’ by Christ. But this grace of Christ is, at best, presented as the grace of the ‘God’ -man, not as the grace of the incarnate Word as Logos. It is conceived as the recovery of a grace which, in its supralapsarian essence, is usually considered merely the grace of God, not the grace of the Word, much less of the ‘Word who is to become man’”* και σελ. 30: *“There would no longer be any connection between ‘mission’ and the intra-trinitarian life. Our sonship in grace would in fact have absolutely nothing to do with the Son’s sonship, since it might equally well be brought about without any modification by another incarnate person. That which God is for us would tell us absolutely nothing about that which he is in himself, as triune”*.

even though the Augustinian conception had not, in the High Middle Ages, developed the kind of monopoly it would later enjoy. It begins with the one God, the one divine essence as a whole, and only afterwards does it see God as three in persons... The Bible and the Greeks would have us start from the one unoriginate God, who is already Father even when nothing is known as yet about generation and spiration. He is known as the one unoriginate hypostasis which is not positively conceived as 'absolute' even before it is explicitly known as relative. But the medieval-Latin starting point happens to be different. And thus one may believe that Christian theology too may and should put a treatise on the one God before the treatise on the triune God. But since this approach is justified by the unicity of the divine essence, the only treatise which one writes, or can write, is 'on the one divinity'. As a result the treatise becomes quite philosophical and abstract and refers hardly at all to salvation history"⁶⁰. Ἀντιθέτως, ἂν ἡ θεολογία ξεκινήσει ἀπὸ τῆς Θεῆς Οἰκονομίας καὶ τὴν ἀνθρώπινη ἐμπειρία μετοχῆς πάνω στίς θεοφάνειες κάθε ξεχωριστῆς Θεῆς Ὑπόστασης, τότε ἀποκαθίσταται στὴν ὑπαρξιακὴ σημασία του τὸ μυστήριο τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος ὡς τὸ μυστήριο τῆς σωτηρίας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Ἀπὸ αὐτὴ τὴ θέση, ἐξάγεται τὸ θεμελιώδες ἀξίωμα (Grundaxiom) τοῦ K. Rahner περὶ ἀπόλυτης ταύτισης τῆς οἰκονομικῆς μὲ τὴν αἰδία Ἁγία Τριάδα: "The isolation of the treatise of the Trinity has to be wrong. There must be a connection between Trinity and man. The Trinity is a mystery of salvation, otherwise it would never have been revealed. We should show why it is such a mystery... The basic thesis which establishes this connection between the treatises and presents the Trinity as a mystery of salvation (in its reality and not merely as a doctrine) might be formulated as follows: The 'economic' Trinity is the 'immanent' Trinity and the 'immanent' Trinity is the 'economic' Trinity"⁶¹.

3.3 Οἱ ὑποστατικὲς σχέσεις τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος μὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους

Γιὰ τὸν K. Rahner τὸ κάθε πρόσωπο τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος συστήνει ἰδική, ξεχωριστὴ σχέση μὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Μάλιστα, λόγω τοῦ θεμελιώδους ἀξιώματος περὶ ταύτισεως οἰκονομικῆς καὶ αἰδίου Ἁγίας Τριάδος, κάθε Θεῆ Ὑπόσταση κοινωνεῖ τὸ ὑποστατικὸ τῆς ἰδίωματος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Αὐτὸ κατὰ τὸν K. Rahner α) ἐξασφαλίζει τὴν πραγματικότητα τῶν Θεῶν Ὑποστάσεων ὡς τέτοι-

60. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 17-18.

61. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 21-22.

ων, β) εξασφαλίζει μιὰ ὄντολογία σχέσης μεταξύ τῶν Θείων Προσώπων εἰς τρόπον ποῦ νὰ μὴ θεωροῦνται αὐτόνομα, διότι μὲ τὸν τρόπο ποῦ σχετίζονται εἰς ἄλληλα ἀδιῶς, μὲ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπο σχετίζονται καὶ μὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους⁶², γ) ἐξοβελίζει τὸν κίνδυνο τῆς συγχώνευσής τους κάτω ἀπὸ τὴν τέλεια ἀπλότητα τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας. Ἔτι περαιτέρω, στὸ πλαίσιο μιᾶς ὑπαρξιστικῆς ἀνάλυσης γίνεται λόγος περὶ ὑποστατικῆς ἐλευθερίας τῶν Θείων Προσώπων (ἄρα ἐμμέσως πλὴν σαφῶς περὶ ὑποστατικῆς θελήσεως αὐτῶν) καὶ συναφῶς περὶ ὑποστατικῆς ἐνεργείας ἐκάστου Προσώπου τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος. Ὡς πλαίσιο παραμένει, ὅπως παραπάνω, ἡ ὑπαρξιακὴ ἀνάλυση τοῦ δόγματος τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος καὶ ἡ ἄρνηση τῆς σχολαστικῆς ἐρμηνείας, ἡ ὁποία κάτω ἀπὸ τὸ *actus purus* ἐξαλείφει τὴν παρουσία τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων: “each one of the three divine persons communicates himself to man in gratuitous grace in his own personal particularity and diversity. This trinitarian communication is the ontological ground of man’s life of grace and eventually of the direct vision of the divine persons in eternity. It is God’s ‘indwelling’, ‘uncreated grace’, understood not only as a communication of the divine nature, but also and primarily, since it implies a free personal act, since it occurs from person to person, as a communication of ‘persons’. Of course, this self-communication of the persons occurs according to their personal peculiarity, that is, also according to and in virtue of their mutual relations. Should a divine person communicate himself otherwise than in and

62. Πρβλ. καὶ COFFEY, D., “Trinity”, στὸ MARMION, D., – HINES, M.E. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Rahner*, Cambridge University Press 2005, σελ. 105: “the duality in unicities experienced in time in the missions of Christ and the Holy Spirit reveals and reproduces the eternal processions of the Son and the Holy Spirit within the one God of the immanent Trinity, and indeed in the same taxis (order)”.

Πιὸ ἀναλυτικά, βλ. καὶ σελ. 98-99: “God gives Godself to human beings; God gives Godself as God truly is in Godself, not just some created effect of Godself (though God does this as well, with the effect serving at the same time as the foundation of the self-giving). Now according to Scripture and tradition (with the latter taking a decisive step at the Council of Nicea), this self-giving takes place in two different forms or ‘modalities’, that is, in the incarnation of the divine Son, in Jesus Christ, and in the ‘indwelling’ of the Holy Spirit, in Christians... The only way in which these modalities can remain distinct and yet be modalities of the self-communication of this God is if they represent a distinction that is verified not just in the economy but in the being of God himself (ἡ ὑπογράμμιση δικῆ μας). Otherwise they cannot be the self-communication of this God. But this implies (and requires) the identity of the economic and the immanent Trinity as explained above”.

through his relations to the other (ἐννοεῖ τὰ θεῖα) persons, so as to have his own relation to the justified (and the other way around), this would presuppose that each single divine person, even as such, as mentally distinct from the one and same essence, would be something absolute and not merely relative. We would no longer be speaking of the Trinity (ἡ ὑπογράμμιση δικῆ μας). In other words: these three self-communications are the self-communication of the one God in the three relative ways in which God subsists”⁶³.

3.4 Ἡ ταύτιση τοῦ τρόπου ὑπάρξεως τῶν Θεῶν Προσώπων μὲ τις ἀκτιστες ἐνέργειες

Περωνώντας στην ἀνάλυση τῶν ιδιωμάτων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅπως αὐτὰ ἐκτίθενται σὰ κλασικὰ ἐγχειρίδια δογματικῆς τῆς Ρωμαιοκαθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, ὁ K. Rahner ἀναζητεῖ τὴν ὑπαρξιακὴ σημασία τους γιὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπο. Τὸ συμπέρασμα στὸ ὁποῖο καταλήγει εἶναι ὅτι τὰ θεῖα ιδιώματα φανερῶνουν τὸ Πρόσωπο τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ὄχι τὴν Οὐσία Του. Ἀναλυτικότερα, οἱ ἐνέργειες ἐνὸς ὄντος ἀποκαλύπτουν τὸ πρόσωπό του. Τὸ ἴδιο πρᾶγμα συμβαίνει καὶ στὸν Θεό. Γίνεται σαφές ὅτι οἱ ἐνέργειες ταυτίζονται μὲ τὸ πρόσωπο καὶ μποροῦν ἀβίαστα νὰ χαρακτηριστοῦν ὡς τρόπος ὑπάρξεως τοῦ προσώπου. Ἐπομένως, αὐτὸ πὺν γνωρίζει ὁ ἄνθρωπος δὲν εἶναι τὸ «τί» τῆς Θεῖας Οὐσίας, ἀλλὰ τὸ «ποιός» τῶν Θεῶν Ὑποστάσεων κατὰ τὴ διαλεκτικὴ σχέση πὺν αὐτὲς δημιουργοῦν μὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπο. Τὰ ιδιώματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, χωρὶς τὴ συγκεκριμένη ἐρμηνευτικὴ ἀνάλυση, παραπέμπουν στὴν ἀπρόσωπη οὐσιοκρατία τῆς τέλειαι καὶ ἀπλῆς Θεῖαι Οὐσίας. Τὸ Πρόσωπο εἶναι αὐτὸ πὺν σώζει μιὰ βαθύτερη σημασία καὶ ἓνα ἀληθινὸ σωτηριολογικὸ νόημα γιὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπο ἀναφορικὰ μὲ τὴν ἔννοια τῶν ιδιωμάτων τοῦ Θεοῦ, διότι τὰ Θεῖα ιδιώματα ἀποκαλύπτουν τὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ σὲ σχέση μὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπο. Ἔχοντας ὅμως ὡς θεμελιῶδες ἀξίωμα ὁ K. Rahner τὴν ταύτιση τῆς οικονομικῆς καὶ τῆς αἰδίου Ἀγίας Τριάδος, οἱ ἐνέργειες τοῦ Θεοῦ ταυτίζονται τόσο μὲ τὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεώς Του αἰδίως, ὅσο καὶ μὲ τις ἴδιες τις Θεῖαι Ὑποστάσεις. Αὐτὸ παραμένει συνεπὲς σὲ τις σχολαστικὲς προϋποθέσεις τῆς δυτικῆς θεολογίας μὲ βάση τὸ actus purus, τὸ ὁποῖο εἶναι ἡ Θεῖα Οὐσία, ἡ ὁποία εἶναι οἱ Θεῖαι Ὑποστάσεις: “*It is only after reaching some understanding of the living and free personal being of the*

63. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 34-35.

transcendent God who is able to enter into an active dialogue with the world, that we can begin to examine the teaching of the New Testament about God's 'attributes'. For we have to know God as person before we can understand that the decisive question for human beings is not, strictly speaking, what God is, but as whom he wishes freely to show himself with regard to the world. A person does not strictly speaking have attributes with respect to another person: he has freely and personally adopted attitudes. And this is above all true of God's absolute, sovereign being as person with regard to this world"⁶⁴. Οί τελευταῖες δύο περίοδοι τοῦ ὡς ἄνω ἀποσπάσματος ἀποκαλύπτουν ἕνα γεγονός ἐξαιρετικής σημασίας. Ὁ K. Rahner, ὡς πιστὸς ρωμαιοκαθολικός, δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ ἀπαλλαγεῖ ἀπὸ τὴ σχολαστικὴ ἐρμηνεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ens necessarium, ὁπότε ἢ ὑπαρξιακὴ ἐρμηνεία, τὴν ὁποία κτίζει, δημιουργεῖ τὴ διελκυστίνδα μεταξὺ τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας ὡς ἀναγκαιότητας καὶ τοῦ Προσώπου ὡς ἐλευθερίας. Κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν τρόπο, χωρὶς νὰ ἀρνηθεῖ τὴ σχολαστικὴ παράδοση, ἐλευθερώνεται ἀπὸ αὐτήν, ἀποδίδοντας στὸ πρόσωπο τὴν ἐλευθερία καὶ στὴ φύση τὴν ἀναγκαιότητα⁶⁵. Ὁ Θεὸς δὲν φανερώνεται στὸν ἄνθρωπο ὡς ἀναγκαία τελειότητα,

64. RAHNER, K., *The content of faith: the best of Karl Rahner's theological writings*, (ed.) Lehmann, K., and Raffelt, A., Trans: H. D. Egan, The Crossroad Publishing Company: New York 2000, σελ. 246.

65. Παράλληλα ἕνας ἄλλος σημαντικὸς ρωμαιοκαθολικὸς δογματολόγος στὴν κατεύθυνση τῆς ὑπαρξιακῆς ἐρμηνείας τοῦ δόγματος, ὁ SCHMAUS, M., *Dogma 1: God in Revelation*, Sheed & Ward: London 1995, σσ. 37-38, ἐκτὸς ἀπὸ τὴν ἐπανερμηνεία τῶν σχολαστικῶν προϋποθέσεων, θέτει τὴν ἐλευθερία τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἀντίθετη εἴτε στὶς ἀναγκαστικὲς νεοπλατωνικὲς ἀπορροές τοῦ Ἐνός, εἴτε στὴν ἀναγκαία ἐγγελιανὴ κίνηση τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὅπως ἐκφράζεται στὴ διαλεκτικὴ τοῦ ὕλισμου μέσα στὴν ἱστορία: "When God acts, he does so in complete freedom. This is not, however, as many late scholastic theologians (though not Duns Scotus) believed, an arbitrary freedom. It is rather bound to the being of God as spirit, and is the expression of this. Thus the freedom we should ascribe to God in revealing himself differs both from the neo-Platonic concept of emanations and from Engels* doctrine of the self-movement of the Spirit to its highest fulfillment. If full freedom is ascribed to God, this means that he is neither compelled by his own nature to reveal himself nor forced to it by a reality other than himself. God is subject to coercion neither from within nor from without". "Ὅλα αὐτὰ εἶναι σύστοιχα μὲ τὶς ἐσωτερικὲς ἀνάγκες τῆς ρωμαιοκαθολικῆς θεολογίας νὰ ἀπαντήσῃ στὶς προκλήσεις τοῦ Διαφωτισμοῦ, μὲ ἕνα τρόπο ποῦ διαφέρει ἀπὸ τὶς ἀπολυτοποιήσεις καὶ τοὺς ἀφορισμοὺς τῆς Α' Βατικανῆς Συνόδου.

Βέβαια τὸ θέμα τῆς ἀναγκαιότητας τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας ὡς ἀναγκαίας ἀγαθότητας εἶχε ἤδη τεθεῖ καὶ στὴν Α' Βατικανῆ, ἡ ὁποία ἔκανε λόγο γιὰ τὴν ἀπόλυτη ἐλευθερία τοῦ θελήματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, χωρὶς ὡστόσο νὰ προχωρήσῃ ἐρμηνευτικὰ περαιτέρω. Ἐξἄλλου δὲν εἶχε ἐμφανιστεῖ τὸ ρεῦμα τοῦ ὑπαρξισμοῦ, τὸ ὁποῖο ἀναμφίβολα ἔθεσε σὲ κίνηση τὶς νέες ἐρμηνευτικὲς τάσεις ποῦ

ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐλεύθερο Πρόσωπο τὸ ὁποῖο διὰ τῆς βουλήσεώς Του ἐγκύπτει στὶς ἀνάγκες τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Ἀμέσως μετὰ ἀπὸ τὸ παραπάνω ἀπόσπασμα συνεχίζει: “*Certainly these free attitudes which God has adopted with regard to the world, have, so to speak, a metaphysical structure, arising from God’s necessary nature; but the attitude actually adopted is not unambiguously laid down in consequence of this structure... With respect to this God of the New Testament, then, everything depends for the human being on how God in fact behaves with regard to the person, not just on how he necessarily is in himself (οἱ ὑπογραμμίσεις δικές μας)*”⁶⁶.

3.5 Ἡ μετοχή τῶν ἀνθρώπων στὴν αἰδία ζωὴ τῆς Ἀγίας Τριάδος

Προχωρώντας τὴν ἐρμηνευτικὴ του ἀνάλυση περαιτέρω ὁ K. Rahner, προκειμένου νὰ δείξει τὴν πραγματικὴ παρουσία τῶν Θεῶν Ὑποστάσεων στὴ σχέση τους μὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπο καὶ μὲ σκοπὸ τὴν ἐρμηνευτικὴ ἐλαχιστοποίηση τῆς ρω-

ἐξετάζονται. Γιὰ τὸ θέμα βλ. ΟΤΤ, L., *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 83: “*The Vatican Council declared that God ‘with a will free from all necessity’ (voluntate ab omni necessitate libera) executed the act of Creation (D 1783, 1805; cf D 706). The Vatican definition refers primarily to ‘libertas contradictionis’, which asserts that God had the choice of creating or of not creating. It is directed chiefly against Hermes, Gunther, and Rosmini, who maintained that the goodness of God imposed on Him a necessity to create*”.

66. RAHNER, K., *The content of faith: the best of Karl Rahner’s theological writings*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 246-247. Πρβλ. καὶ σελ. 242-243 τοῦ ἴδιου ἔργου, “*the calling of nations to reconciliation and community with God is not inferred from some metaphysical knowledge of God’s necessary goodness but is the great mystery of God’s free election (ἡ ὑπογράμμιση δική μας)... It is from this experience of God’s free personal activity within history that the confession of God as creator of the world, simply speaking, also acquires its specific validity and clarity... This God who acts in nature and in human history is one who acts freely. God manifests himself as person in his activity precisely by the fact that this activity is voluntary and free. Precisely because the activity even in his world arises from God’s spontaneous resolution, which is not something given along with other ingredients in the original constitution of the world, its tendencies and finalities, it becomes clear that this active God is the God transcending natural and human worlds, that God’s activity is not just another word for the world-process, that his will is not just another word for ‘fate’. It is on the basis of a concrete experience of free irruptions into the historical course of the world, novel and unexpected and extrinsic to the world’s immanent dynamism, that the people of the New Testament recognize God as a free, transcendent person*”. Βλ. καὶ SCOTT, M. S. M., “*God as Person: Karl Barth and Karl Rahner on Divine and Human Personhood*”, *Religious Studies and Theology*, 25.2 (2006), σελ. 174. “*God is he who acts freely by creating and saving the world without any internal or external necessity*”.

μαιοκαθολικής διδασκαλίας περί παρουσίας τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων διαμέσου τῶν κτιστῶν σημείων-συμβόλων, κάνει λόγο γιὰ τὴ μετοχὴ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου στὴν αἰδία ζωὴ τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος: «*God relates to us in a threefold manner, and this threefold, free, and gratuitous relation to us is not merely a copy or an analogy of the inner Trinity, but this Trinity itself, albeit as freely and gratuitously communicated*»⁶⁷. Γιὰ νὰ καταστήσει αὐτὴ τὴν ἐρμηνευτικὴ σαφέστερη καὶ βασιζόμενος στὸ θεμελιῶδες τοῦ ἐρμηνευτικοῦ ἀξίωμα (ταύτιση αἰδίου καὶ οἰκονομικῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος), ταυτίζει τὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεως τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων αἰδίως μὲ τις ἐνέργειες τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὴν κτίση. Ἔτσι κατορθώνεται ἡ πραγματικὴ κοινωνία Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου, διότι μὲ τὸν τρόπο ποῦ ὑπάρχουν τὰ Θεῖα Πρόσωπα κατὰ τις ἐνδοτριαδικὲς σχέσεις, μὲ τὸν ἴδιο τρόπο ὑπάρχουν καὶ σὲ σχέση μὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Αὐτὸ στὴ γλῶσσα τοῦ K. Rahner σημαίνει καὶ ὀνομάζεται μετοχὴ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων προσώπων στίς Θεῖες Ὑποστάσεις καθ' αὐτές, κατὰ τὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεως τῶν Θείων Προσώπων εἰς ἄλληλα: «*the communication bestowed upon the creature in gratuitous grace can, if occurring in freedom, occur only in the intra-divine manner of the two communications of the divine essence by the Father to the Son and the Spirit. Any other kind of communication would be unable to communicate that which is here communicated, the divine persons, since these persons do not differ from their own way of communicating themselves*»⁶⁸.

3.6 Τὸ εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἀγάπη

Μὲ βάση τίς παραπάνω προϋποθέσεις, ὁ K. Rahner ὀρίζει τὸν Τριαδικὸ Θεὸ ὡς ἀγάπη, ἡ ὁποία ὡς αἰδία κοινωνία τῶν Θείων Προσώπων παρᾶχεται

67. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 35. Στὴν ἴδια ἀκριβῶς γραμμὴ ὁ KASPER, W., *The God Of Jesus Christ*, Transl: M. J. O' Connell, Crossroad Publishing: New York 1988, σελ. 227, γράφει: «*taking seriously what the New Testament says about the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and in speaking not only of an indwelling of God that is simply appropriated to the Holy Spirit but rather of a personal (hypostatic) indwelling, I also differ from Neo-scholasticism in its understanding of grace as a created reality distinct from God... Therefore uncreated grace, or the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, requires created grace to prepare the way for it, just as it also has created grace for a consequence. It is impossible, therefore, to conceive the self-communication of God in the Holy Spirit apart from the manifold gifts of the Holy Spirit that are distinct from God and therefore created*». Ἡ ἀπόπειρα τοῦ W. Kasper νὰ μιλήσει γιὰ ἄκτιστη ἐνέργεια, ἡ ὁποία ταυτίζεται μὲ τὴν ἴδια τὴν Ὑπόσταση τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, δὲν ὑπερβαίνει τίς προϋποθέσεις τῆς σχολαστικῆς θεολογίας. Τὰ κτιστὰ δῶρα τῆς χάριτος προσπαθοῦν ἀπλῶς νὰ συνδεθοῦν μὲ τὴν ἄκτιστη χάρη.

68. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 36.

ἀκριβῶς ὡς τέτοια στοὺς ἀνθρώπους κατὰ τὴ Θεία Οἰκονομία. Τὸ σχῆμα καὶ ἐδῶ εἶναι ἀπολύτως συνεπὲς μὲ τις προϋποθέσεις τῆς δυτικῆς θεολογικῆς παράδοσης. Ἐφόσον α) οὐσία καὶ ἐνέργειες στὸν Θεὸ ταυτίζονται καὶ β) αἰδία καὶ οἰκονομικὴ Τριάδα ταυτίζονται, ἡ ἀγάπη ὡς ἐνέργεια τοῦ Θεοῦ στὴν κτίση κατοπτρίζει ἀπολύτως τις σχέσεις τῶν Θείων Προσώπων εἰς ἄλληλα: «*we may now consider from the other direction the connection between immanent and economic Trinity. The one God communicates himself in absolute self-utterance and as absolute donation of love. Here is the absolute mystery revealed to us only by Christ: God's self-communication is truly a self-communication. He does not merely indirectly give his creature some share of himself by creating and giving us created and finite realities through his omnipotent efficient causality. In a quasi-formal causality he really and in the strictest sense of the word bestows himself*»⁶⁹.

Ἐφαρμόζοντας μιὰ ἀνθρωπολογικὴ, ὑπαρξιακὴ ἀνάλυση στὸν ὀρισμὸ τοῦ Τριαδικοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἀγάπης, ὁ K. Rahner κάνει λόγο γιὰ δύο βασικὰ χαρακτηριστικά της: α) ἡ ἀγάπη εἶναι ἐνέργεια ἑνὸς ἐλεύθερου Προσώπου συνδεδεμένη μὲ τὴ βούληση τοῦ τελευταίου καὶ ὄχι μιὰ ἐσωτερικὴ ἀναγκαιότητα τῆς φύσης ἐν εἶδει ἀπορροῆς, β) ἡ ἀγάπη δὲν εἶναι μιὰ ἀπλῆ ἐνέργεια, ἀλλὰ ἡ μετάδοση ὀλόκληρου τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, τοῦ προσώπου, στὸ ἄλλο ἀγαπώμενο πρόσωπο⁷⁰. Μὲ βάση αὐτὰ τὰ δύο ἀνθρωπολογικὰ χαρακτηριστικά, ὁ K. Rahner προχωρεῖ στὴν ἀνάλυση τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Τριαδικοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς τὴν τέλεια ἐκχώρηση τῶν ὑποστάσεων τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος στοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀπὸ τὸν Θεὸ Πατέρα. Ὁ ἄνθρωπος μπορεῖ νὰ μετασχεῖ τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων, διότι ὁ Θεὸς Πατὴρ ὡς ἀγάπη δίδει τὸν ἴδιο του τὸν ἑαυτὸ στοὺς ἀνθρώπους διαμέσου τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν τρόπο, ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἐνέργεια σημαίνει τὴ μετοχὴ στὶς Θεῖες Ὑποστάσεις. Παράλληλα, καθὼς ἡ ἀγάπη εἶναι τὸ ὑποστατικὸ ἰδίωμα τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος γιὰ τὴ δυτικὴ

69. RAHNER, K., *The Trinity*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 36.

70. RAHNER, K., *The content of faith: the best of Karl Rahner's theological writings*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 255: "Love is not the emanation of a nature but the free bestowal of a person, who possesses himself, who can therefore refuse himself, whose surrender therefore is always a wonder and a grace. And love in the fully personal sense is not just any relationship between two persons who meet in some third thing, whether this 'third thing' is a task, a truth, or anything else: it is the ceding and the unfolding of one's inmost self to and for the other in love".

παράδοση⁷¹, ἐκχώρηση τῆς Θείας Ἀγάπης συνεπάγεται μετοχή στήν Ὑπόστασι τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος: “*That God is love, that he has received human beings to the most intimate communion with himself in love - this has become manifest in the sending and incarnation, in the cross and glorification, of his only begotten Son... God has bestowed his very self upon us in Christ: ‘our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ’... and our fellowship is with the Holy Spirit... This fellowship of love is produced by the Pneuma of God, through whom God pours forth upon us his love for us and in this Spirit God’s most intimate personal life is unfolded to us. For he is the Spirit who searches the “depths of God”, which none knows and searches but the same Spirit of God and so leads us into the deepest intimacies of God’s knowledge. So this Spirit of God, who is the realization in us of God’s personal love and in whom God has unfolded to us his ultimate depths, is the Spirit of adoption, who gives us testimony of our adoption*”⁷².

Καταληκτικά, θὰ μπορούσε κανεὶς νὰ παρατηρήσει ὅτι ἡ ἐρμηνευτική ἀπόπειρα τοῦ K. Rahner νὰ δώσει μιὰ ὑπαρξιακή ἐρμηνεία στοῦ δόγμα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος εἶναι σὲ μεγάλο βαθμὸ ἐπιτυχῆς στοῦ πλαίσιο τῆς δυτικῆς θεολογικῆς

71. OTT, L., *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 66: “*As the personal name of a Divine Person, the name Pneuma indicates that the Holy Ghost, through an activity of the Divine Will, proceeds as the Spiritual Principle of Divine Activity (per modum voluntatis)... The appropriation of the works of love to the Holy Ghost has its basis in the personal character and ultimately in the origin of the Holy Ghost. It is, therefore, to be inferred that the Holy Ghost ‘proceeds’ by an act of love (per modum amoris). For this reason the Fathers call the Holy Ghost ‘Love’ (amor, caritas, dilectio, vinculum amoris, osculum amoris). The 11th Council of Toledo (675) declared: ‘(Spiritus Sanctus) simul ab utrisque processisse monstratur, quia caritas sive sanctitas amborum esse cognoscitur’. (that the Holy Ghost proceeds from both is seen by this that He is known as the love or sanctity of both)D 277... As a gift is the expression of love, so also this personal name of the Holy Ghost indicates His origin per modum amoris, and points to the fact that the Holy Ghost is the mutual love-gift of the Father and of the Son”.*

Γιὰ τὴν ταύτιση στὶς αἰδέιες καὶ οἰκονομικὲς προόδους τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων καὶ τὴ μετοχὴ σ’ αὐτὲς ἀπὸ τὸν ἄνθρωπο στὴ δυτικὴ παράδοση πρβλ. καὶ CONGAR, Y. M.- J., *The Mystery of the Temple or The Manner of God’s Presence to His Creatures from Genesis to the Apocalypse*, The Newman Press: Westminster Maryland 1962, σελ. 286: “*theology recognizes that it is legitimate and profitable to appropriate some essential attribute or an ad extra act to one Person, not in order to exclude the others, but because there is some similarity between the attribute or act and the Personal character, and hence something in the attribute or act which may suggest to us the special characteristic of each Person*”.

72. RAHNER, K., *The content of faith: the best of Karl Rahner’s theological writings*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 255-256.

παράδοσης⁷³. Συνδέοντας τὸ πρόσωπο μὲ τὴν ἐλευθερία καὶ συναφῶς μὲ τὴ θέληση καὶ τὴν ἐνέργεια ὡς ὑποστατικὲς καὶ συνδέοντας ἀντίθετα τὴ φύση μὲ τὴν ἀναγκαιότητα, κατορθώνει νὰ παραμερίσει τὴ σχολαστικὴ ἔννοια τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς *ens necessarium*, χωρὶς νὰ τὴν ἐξοβελίσει. Ἔτσι παραμένει πιστὸς στὴ ρωμαιοκαθολικὴ παράδοση, συγχρονιζόμενος μὲ τὰ ὑπαρξιστικὰ φιλοσοφικὰ ρεύματα τῆς ἐποχῆς του. Σὲ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐγχείρημά του ὑπῆρχαν πρόσφορες συνθήκες λόγῳ τῶν προϋποθέσεων τῆς σχολαστικῆς παράδοσης. Ἀφ’ ἧς στιγμῆς, γιὰ τὴ σχολαστικὴ παράδοση α) ἡ Οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι καθαρὴ ἐνέργεια (*actus purus*) καὶ β) ἐξαιτίας τοῦ *actus purus* ὑφίσταται μετοχὴ στὶς ἴδιες τὶς Θεεῖς Ὑποστάσεις διαμέσου κτιστῶν σημείων-συμβόλων, ἢ ἐρμηνευτικὴ μετάβαση στὴν ταύτιση τοῦ τρόπου ὑπάρξεως τῶν Θεῶν Ὑποστάσεων μὲ τὶς ἄκτιστες ἐνέργειες τοῦ Θεοῦ δὲν ἔβλαπτε τὰ σχολαστικὰ προαπαιτούμενα. Τὸ ἴδιο μπορεῖ νὰ εἰπωθεῖ καὶ γιὰ τὴν τοποθέτησή του περὶ ἀνθρωπίνης μετοχῆς στὶς Θεεῖς Ὑποστάσεις καθ’ αὐτές. Στὸ πλαίσιο τοῦ *actus purus* εἶτε γίνεται λόγος γιὰ μετοχὴ στὶς ἐνέργειες τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶτε στὰ Θεῖα Πρόσωπα δὲν ἀλλάζει κάτι. Τέλος, ἡ ἀναφορὰ τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ τῆς θέλησης στὸ Πρόσωπο δὲν ἔβλαπτε τὴ Θεῖα Οὐσία ὡς ἀναγκαστικὰ ἀγαθὴ. Τοῦναντίον, λειτουργοῦσε συμπληρωματικὰ στὴν –ἀπεχθὴ γιὰ τὶς φιλοσοφικὲς προϋποθέσεις τοῦ εἰκοστοῦ αἰῶνα– ἀναγκαιότητα τῆς θείας ἀγαθότητας ὡς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ. Πρόσωπο, Οὐσία, Θέληση, Ἐνέργεια στὶς σχολαστικὲς προϋποθέσεις περὶ Θεοῦ συγχωνεύονται κάτω ἀπὸ τὸ *actus purus* καὶ τὴν τέλεια ἀπλότητα τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας. Συνεπῶς, τὸ νὰ ἀναθέσει ὁ Κ. Rahner τὴ θέληση, τὴν ἐνέργεια καὶ τὴν ἐλευθερία στὸ Πρόσωπο κατὰ τὰ φιλοσοφικὰ πρότυπα τῆς ἐποχῆς του δὲν ἔβλαπτε σὲ τίποτε τὶς σχολαστικὲς προϋποθέσεις τῆς ρωμαιοκαθολικῆς παράδοσης. Ἡ ἁρμονικὴ συνύπαρξη ὑποστατικῆς ἐλευθερίας, θέλησης καὶ ἐνέργειας μὲ τὴ φυσικὴ ἀναγκαιότητα τῆς θείας ἀγαθότητας φανερόνεται στὴν καταληκτικὴ παρὰγραφο τῆς ἐρμηνείας τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἀγάπης: “*‘God is love’ is not primarily, then, a statement, illuminating in itself, about the nature of God, but... an expression of the experienced fact that God has bestowed his own entire self on us. Certainly, insofar as God’s free disposition in the ‘fullness of time’ of Christ is the*

73. Γιὰ μιὰ ἐπισκόπηση τῆς δυτικῆς χριστιανικῆς κριτικῆς στὸ ἔργο του, βλ. COFFEY, D., “Trinity”, MARMION, D., – HINES, M.E. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Rahner*, Cambridge University Press 2005, σσ. 108-110. TORRANCE, A. J., *Persons in Communion: An Essay on Trinitarian Description and Human Participation with special reference to Volume One of Karl Barth’s Church Dogmatics*, μνημ. ἔργ., σσ. 274-280.

*unsurpassable communication of all that God is and can be by essence and freedom, it is also a communication of the divine nature. But this depends inseparably on the fact that God, as person, freely wished to love us; and in the knowledge of this truth the entire reality of Christianity is contained (οἱ ὑπογραμμίσεις δικές μας)*⁷⁴.

4. Συμπεράσματα

Ἡ δυτική θεολογία τοῦ 20οῦ αἰῶνα, ἀντιμέτωπη μὲ τὶς φιλοσοφικὲς προκλήσεις τοῦ Διαφωτισμοῦ, ἐπιχείρησε νὰ ἀρθρώσει ἕναν λόγο, ὁ ὁποῖος ἀπὸ τὴ μιὰ νὰ ὑπερβαίνει τὴν ἐκκοσμίκευση καὶ τὸν ὀρθολογισμό τῆς φιλελεύθερης θεολογίας τοῦ Προτεσταντισμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τὴν ἄλλη τὴν ἀμυντικὴ γραμμὴ τῆς νεοθωμιστικῆς καὶ νεο-σχολαστικῆς ἐρμηνείας τοῦ Ρωμαιοκαθολικισμοῦ. Οἱ K. Barth καὶ K. Rahner ἀντιπροσωπεύουν κατεξοχὴν τὴν ἀπόπειρα ἀνανέωσης τῶν δύο δυτικῶν παραδόσεων, ὁ πρῶτος μὲ μιὰ προσήλωση στὴ Θεολογία ἐνάντια στὸν θρησκευτικὸ ἀνθρωποκεντρισμὸ τῆς παράδοσής του καὶ ὁ δεύτερος στὴν ἀνθρωπολογία ἐνάντια στὴ νεοσχολαστικὴ ἀπώθηση τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπὸ τὴν ἱστορία. Ἡ Τριαδολογία ἀποτελεῖ τὸν πυρῆνα τῆς θεολογικῆς κατασκευῆς ἀμφοτέρων. Ἀμφότεροι χρησιμοποιοῦν ἕνα σύνολο διατυπώσεων καὶ ἐννοιολογικῶν σχημάτων, τὰ ὁποῖα παραπέμπουν στὸν φιλοσοφικὸ περσοναλισμὸ καὶ τὸν ὑπαρξισμό. Τὸ ὑπόβαθρο ὡστόσο αὐτῶν τῶν διατυπώσεων καὶ σχημάτων παραμένει οὐσιωδῶς σχολαστικὸ, χωρὶς αὐτὸ νὰ ἀποκρύπτεται ἀπὸ τοὺς δύο συγγραφεῖς.

Τὰ βασικὰ σημεῖα σύγκλισης τῶν δύο στὴν ἐρμηνεία τοῦ Τριαδικοῦ δόγματος θὰ μπορούσαν νὰ συνοψιστοῦν ὡς ἑξῆς:

Πρῶτον, τονίζεται ἡ ταύτιση Θεολογίας καὶ Οἰκονομίας μὲ σκοπὸ τὴ ζῶσα καὶ πραγματικὴ φανέρωση τοῦ Θεοῦ στὸν κόσμο. Ὁ τρόπος ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ὁ τρόπος ἀποκαλύψεώς Του. Ἦδη ἀπὸ τὴν πρώτη χιλιετία ὑφίσταται στὴ δυτικὴ χριστιανικὴ παράδοση ὡς δεδομένη αὐτὴ ἡ ταύτιση, ἡ ὁποία ἐξἄλλου ὀδήγησε καὶ στὸ Filioque.

Δεύτερον, ἡ ὑπέρβαση τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς *ens necessarium* παράγει στὸν Θεὸ τὴ διάκριση τῆς φύσεως ὡς ἀναγκαιότητας καὶ τοῦ προσώπου ὡς ἐλευθερίας δια-

74. RAHNER, K., *The content of faith: the best of Karl Rahner's theological writings*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 256.

μέσου τῆς θελήσεως. Ἐδῶ, λόγῳ τῶν σχολαστικῶν προϋποθέσεων, κατὰ τὶς ὁποῖες ἡ οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ ταυτίζεται μὲ τὴ θέλησή του, δὲν δημιουργεῖται καμία θεολογικὴ ἀντίφαση. Ἡ οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ μπορεῖ νὰ ὑπάρχει ἀναγκαίᾳ ὡστόσο, ταυτοχρόνως ὁ Θεὸς ὑφίσταται ἐλεύθερα διὰ τῆς θελήσεώς Του, ἡ ὁποία εἶναι ἡ οὐσία Του.

Τρίτον, ταυτίζεται ὁ τρόπος ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ μὲ τὶς ἐνέργειές Του. Ὁ Θεὸς ὑπάρχει αἰδίως μὲ τὸν τρόπο πὸ ἀποκαλύπτεται στοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Δὲν ὑφίσταται μὲ ἄλλον τρόπο. Αὐτὴ εἶναι ἀκριβῶς ἡ διδασκαλία τοῦ *actus purus*, τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς καθαρῆς ἐνέργειας. Ὡστόσο, ἡ ταύτιση τρόπου ὑπάρξεως τῶν Ὑποστάσεων μὲ τὶς ἐνέργειες τοῦ Θεοῦ στὴν κτίση παραπέμπει σὲ μεγάλο βαθμὸ σὲ μιὰ θεολογικὴ μετάπλαση τῆς χαϊντεγκεριανῆς ἀποκάλυψης τοῦ Εἶναι ὡς παρουσίας καὶ στὴ σαρτριανὴ ἐρμηνεία τοῦ Εἶναι ὡς Εἶναι ἐν τῷ γίγνεσθαι⁷⁵.

75. Γιὰ τὴ συσχέτιση τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ἐνεργοῦντος Προσώπου, τοῦ φανεροῦντος τὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεώς Του, μὲ τὴ χαϊντεγκεριανὴ ἔννοια τοῦ Εἶναι ὡς Παρουσίας ὁ JUNGEL, E., *God's Being is in Becoming: The Trinitarian Being of God in the Theology of Karl Barth. A Paraphrase*, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 78, γράφει χαρακτηριστικά: “*God is active. In this sense Barth also specifies the concept of being with regard to God's being in his doctrine of God, whose foundational chapter is deliberately entitled 'The Reality of God' - making use of a concept 'which holds together being and act, instead of tearing them apart like the idea of 'essence'.*” On the same grounds, however, Heidegger prefers the concept of essence (Οὐσία), since this lets itself be thought verbally in the sense of presence (Παρ-ουσία)”.

Σὲ ἓνα πῶ ἀναλυτικὸ ἐπίπεδο, ἡ σύνδεση χαϊντεγκεριανῆς φαινομενολογίας μὲ τὴν Τριαδολογία καὶ τὴ Χριστολογία στὸν K. Barth, ἐρμηνεύεται ἀπὸ τὸν OSHIMA, S., “Barth's 'Analogia Relationis' and Heidegger's Ontological Difference”, *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 53, No. 2 (Apr., 1973), σελ. 187-188, ὡς ἑξῆς: “*The relationship of Jesus to His disciples is not original but an exact copy of the trinitarian fellowship, for it is grounded in the fact that God repeats within world history the Trinitarian fellowship which lies beyond this world... Jesus Christ as the head of the community ('for others') includes in Himself all its members ('with others') as well as Himself as the man Jesus ('for others'), just as the all-embracing Being differentiates itself into Ek-sistenz and entities. Since reconciliation ('for others') is the prototype of creation ('with others'), our being 'with others' is supposed to become (zu-sein) our being 'for others' The establishment of the analogia relationis between Jesus and man entails, therefore, man's transformation from being 'with others' to being 'for others' - just as Heidegger's ontological difference consists in the shift from entity to Ek-sistenz.*”

Γιὰ τὴ σύνδεση προσώπου καὶ ἐνέργειας στὴν Ἁγία Τριάδα, παραπέμπουσα στὴν ὑπαρξιστικὴ ταύτιση Εἶναι καὶ ἐνεργεῖν πρβλ. καὶ SCOTT, M. S. M., “God as Person: Karl Barth and Karl Rahner on Divine and Human Personhood”, μνημ. ἔργ., σελ. 179-180: “*Barth emphasizes that Gods personhood consists of his ability to fully execute his decision. To be a person is to be the knowing, willing, and acting 'I' who is his own, conscious, willed decision. God acts in the*

Τέταρτον, η βεβαιότητα της αληθοῦς μέθεξης της θείας ζωῆς ἀπὸ τὸν ἄνθρωπο περνάει μέσα ἀπὸ τὴ μετοχὴ στὶς ἴδιες τὶς Θεῖες Ὑποστάσεις. Στὴ σχολαστικὴ διδασκαλία, ἡ ἀπλότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ταυτίζει Οὐσία καὶ Ὑποστάσεις, καθὼς οἱ Ὑποστάσεις εἶναι τρόποι ὑπάρξεως τῆς θείας Οὐσίας. Ταυτοχρόνως ὁμως ἡ Οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι *actus purus*, ὁπότε ταυτίζονται καὶ οἱ Θεῖες Ὑποστάσεις μὲ τὶς ἀκτιστες ἐνέργειες. Ἀκριβῶς αὐτὸς εἶναι ὁ λόγος γιὰ τὸν ὁποῖο μετοχὴ στὴ θεία χάρις σημαίνει μετοχὴ στὶς Θεῖες Ὑποστάσεις.

Πέμπτον, συνέπεια τῆς μετοχῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου στὶς ἐνέργειες τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἱ ὁποῖες παραπέμπουν εὐθέως στὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεως τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων αἰδίως, εἶναι ἡ μετοχὴ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀληθῶς στὴ θεία ζωή. Ὁ K. Barth ἐκφράζεται διὰ τῆς *analogia relationis*, θέλοντας νὰ καταστήσει τὸν ἄνθρωπο ἀληθῶς κοινωνὸ τῆς θείας ζωῆς, ὁπότε καὶ ταυτίζει τὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεως τῶν Θείων Ὑποστάσεων μὲ τὸν τρόπο ὑπάρξεως τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναγεννημένων ἀνθρώπων, ἐνῶ ἡ πρόθεση τοῦ K. Rahner εἶναι ἡ ὑπέρβαση τῆς διδασκαλίας περὶ μετοχῆς στὸν Θεὸ διὰ κτιστῶν συμβόλων⁷⁶.

Καταληκτικά, ὅλα τὰ παραπάνω σημεῖα σύγκλισης συνοψίζονται στὸν ὄρισμὸ τοῦ εἶναι τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος ὡς ἀγάπης *ad intra* καὶ *ad extra*. Οἱ Θεῖες Ὑποστάσεις ὑπάρχουν ἐλεύθερα διὰ τῆς βουλήσεώς τους σὲ κοινωνία ἀγάπης. Ἡ ἀγάπη σημαίνει τὴν ἀλληλοπεριχώρηση τῶν Θείων προσώπων ὡς τρόπο

world and is his act—he is as he acts in history. Rahner also affirms that God is he who acts... True personhood cannot be dormant because subjectivity requires specific activity in order to have meaningful content: one must do something in order to be someone. One cannot simply be a person in abstraction. Activity, then, is a necessary condition for divine subjectivity. We learn what sort of person God is through salvation history, where God demonstrates his unfailing love for humanity”.

76. Οἱ ὁμολογιακὲς καταβολὲς τῶν δυὸ θεολόγων ὀρίζουν τὶς κλίσεις τους εἴτε πρὸς τὴν *sola gratia* ὡς *analogia relationis* (K. Barth) εἴτε πρὸς μιὰ ὑπαρξιακὴ ἀνάγνωση τῆς *analogia entis* (K. Rahner). Ὁ SCOTT, M. S. M., “God as Person: Karl Barth and Karl Rahner on Divine and Human Personhood”, *Religious Studies and Theology*, 25.2 (2006), σελ. 181-182, σημειώνει χαρακτηριστικὰ: “For Barth, we cannot actualize our personhood because we are not fully free. The internal and external factors that shape our existence ultimately erode our freedom. Thus, Barth emphasizes humanity’s absolute dependence on God for authentic subjectivity and downplays the reality of human freedom. Rahner, by contrast, conceives of a closer continuity between humans and God insofar as humans have the innate capacity for transcendence. According to Rahner, God grounds our subjectivity by being the infinite horizon of all our thoughts and actions, by encountering us in our transcendental experience of ourselves as given, and by inviting us to genuine dialogue in salvation history. Rahner makes more room for human agency in his anthropology than Barth”.

ὑπάρξεώς τους αἰδίως. Αὐτὸς ὁ τρόπος ὑπάρξεως εἶναι ταυτόσημος μὲ τὸν τρόπο ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ παράγει εἴτε τὴν analogia relationis εἴτε τὴ μετοχὴ στὶς Θεῖες Ὑποστάσεις, καθιστώντας τὸν ἄνθρωπο μέτοχο τῆς ἐνδοτριαδικῆς ζωῆς. Θεμέλιο ὄλων τῶν παραπάνω εἶναι ἡ σχολαστικὴ ἔννοια τοῦ actus purus, τῆς τέλειαις ἀπλότητας τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας, ἡ ὁποία ὑφίσταται ὡς καθαρὴ ἐνέργεια. Ταυτοχρόνως, καθὼς οἱ Ὑποστάσεις εἶναι τρεῖς τρόποι ὑπάρξεως τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας, οἱ Ὑποστάσεις φανερώνονται ὡς ἐνέργειες τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας.

SUMMARY

20th century Scholastic Theology Western
Trinitarian Theology: elaborating on and existentialism
in Karl Barth and Karl Rahner

By G. Siskos,
Post Doctoral Researcher School of Pastoral and
Social Theology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

The present study assesses the impact of two of the most influential theologians in the Roman Catholic and the Protestant church, namely Karl Rahner and Karl Barth, on the linguistic and notional renewal of western Trinitarian theology in the twentieth century. From different starting points, both men attempt to disclose the forgotten Trinity of their confessional traditions.

Karl Barth radically breaks up all bondage with the liberal theology of his teachers. The absolute subjectivity of religious “Gefühl” is the only way to trace the Divine Being according to liberal theologians. For Barth, however, this would mean a total annihilation of the Divine Being, which Barth adhered to as radical Otherness of the human self.

Karl Rahner, on the other side, exposes a systematic academic project, which deals with the existential meaning of theology for “everyday faith”. One of his primary concerns is the rediscovery of a Trinitarian theology, which will disclose the revelation of each divine Hypostasis and its specific role on divine economy. These were completely lost in the Neo-scholastic interpretation with the revival of essentialism and its one-sided concentration on the attributes and operations of the single divine Essence.

Despite the introduction of personalistic vocabulary and various existential notional forms, the scholastic background of Rahner's and Barth's theological interpretation remains intact and logically consistent with the innovative expressions and theological formulations. Key concepts of scholastic theology such as 1. divine simplicity, 2. divine subsistencies as relational entities, 3. God's being as actus purus, 4. Identity of divine will with divine essence, 5. a specific univocal concept for divine theology and economy, are being transformed and interpreted as 1. Distinct modes of existence or manners of subsisting, 2. Freedom of decision as God's being, 3. God's being in act, 4. Love as God's essence, 5. Identity of economic and immanent Trinity. The new expressions do not harm the solid ground of Scholasticism, albeit they seem to present it more attractively to modern thought.