


DOI: 10.15290/rtk.2018.17.1.06

 0000-0002-8732-7019*Rev. Paweł Rabczyński**Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie*

## Culture and Religion

Man is the subject of culture and religion. Culture is everything that man creates both in the material and spiritual realm. Although man creates culture, culture also shapes man through the (religious) patterns and values it transmits. Religion is expressed in culture, but religion also transcends culture because the object of religion is transcendent. Therefore, religion has a role in forming culture. Different models on the relationship between culture and religion exist, including: opposition and confrontation as well as complementarity and cooperation. The best model of culture and religion is one of creative cooperation.

**Key words:** culture, religion, values, man as the subject of culture and religion, relationship between culture and religion.

### Introduction

In numerous essays and historic works, the well-known and widely respected Romanian scholar of religion and cultural anthropologist Mircea Eliade (1907-1986), who was also a lecturer at many universities (Bucharest, London, Berlin, Bern, Paris, Chicago), emphasizes the coexistence of cultural and religious factors. For Eliade, the intermingling and interdependence of elements of the profane (*profanum*) and sacred (*sacrum*)—that is, that which belongs to the natural course of history and that which transcends it as “something irreducibly real”—is evidence that has been empirically proven.<sup>1</sup> According to

---

<sup>1</sup> See A. Bronk, *Mircei Eliadego fenomenologia religii*, in *Zrozumieć świat współczesny*, Lublin 1998, pgs. 257-282.

Eliade, rich manifestations of the sacred, including rituals, myths, beliefs, and deities, can be found in primitive (illiterate) cultures. The Romanian scholar concludes: “At the most archaic levels of culture, life, which is understood as being a human, is itself a religious act; getting food, sexual intercourse, and work have the value of a sacrament. In other words, to be a human being, to become one, means to be ‘religious.’”<sup>2</sup>

Although Eliade was justified in writing about the close relationship between culture and religion, one cannot be identified with the other. Since elements of both culture and religion co-exist and are interdependent, how can they be distinguished from each other, and how can one separate the fields of the content of their concepts, which, after all, are not synonymous?

This article presents the relationship between culture and religion, including how these two phenomena are interdependent and related. First, the article will discuss the anthropological dimension of culture (1. Man—the creator, end, and meaning of culture). Second, the article will examine culture as a set of values (2. Culture—a set of values). Third, the article will attempt to present a definition of religion (3. Religion as the relationship between man and the transcendent “You”) as well as religion’s highest value, the *sacrum* (4. *Sacrum*—the greatest value of religion). To conclude, the article will present two of the main models of the relationship between culture and religions: opposition and confrontation as well as complementarity and cooperation (5. Models of the relationship between culture and religion). The arguments contained in this article will begin and end with an introduction and conclusion, respectively.

Following the thought of Andrzej Bronk, empirical religious studies are not disposed to determining objective criteria to distinguish religious phenomena from their cultural context.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, in order to describe the rich phenomenon of religion, it is necessary to

<sup>2</sup> M. Eliade, *Historia wierzeń i idei religijnych*, Volume 1: *Od epoki kamiennej do misteriów eleuzyńskich*, Warsaw 1997, pg. 1.

<sup>3</sup> See A. Bronk, *Nauka wobec religii (teoretyczne podstawy nauk o religii)*, Lublin 1996, pg. 84.

refer to ideas from philosophy,<sup>4</sup> theology of religion,<sup>5</sup> and some of the assumptions of personalism.<sup>6</sup>

## Man—the Creator, End, and Purpose of Culture

Dogmatic  
theology

To examine the issues at hand, culture is the best place to start. The Latin terms *colo*, *colere* (*to practice, to cultivate*) were first and foremost used to refer to growing crops (*agricultura*) in antiquity and then, in a metaphorical sense, to the physical and spiritual perfecting of man, primarily through the ennoblement of his mind. In his *Tusculan Disputations* (II, 13), Cicero states that, in order for the soul to bear good fruit, it must be properly prepared and cultivated. Receptivity arises from nature, and cultivation is the work that man does (*cultura animi – cultivation of the soul, spirit*),<sup>7</sup> in order to rid himself of defects and train himself in and acquire virtues.<sup>8</sup> This understanding of the

<sup>4</sup> See M. Olivetti, *Filosofia della religione come problema storico*, Padoue 1974; K. Wuchterl, *Philosophie und Religion. Zur Aktualität der Religionsphilosophie*, Bern 1982; I. Mancini, *Filosofia della religione*, Casale Monferrato 1986<sup>3</sup>; *Filosofia della religione*, Dir. P. G. Grassi, Brescia 1988; J. Schmitz, *Filosofia della religione*, Brescia 1988; Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia. Zarys filozofii religii*, Lublin 1993; A. Bronk, *Nauka wobec religii*, pgs. 137-151; A. Bronk, *Podstawy nauk o religii*, Lublin 2003, pgs. 163-177; M. Rusecki, *Istota i geneza religii*, Lublin – Sandomierz 1997, pg. 30-35.

<sup>5</sup> See V. Boublik, *Teologia delle Religioni*, Rome 1973; A. Race, *Christians and Religious Pluralism*, New York 1982; G. D'Costa, *Theology and Religious Pluralism*, Oxford 1986; *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness: Towards a Pluralistic Theology of Religions*, (eds.) J. Hick, P. Knitter, New York 1987; T. Dola, *Teologia religii. Próba zarysu problematyki*, “*Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego*” 12 (1987) pgs. 5-18; M. Dhavamony, *Théologie des religions*, in *Dictionnaire de théologie fondamentale*, dir. R. Latourelle, R. Fisichella, Montréal – Paris 1992, pgs. 1120-1134; A. Bronk, *Nauka wobec religii*, pgs. 129-136; A. Bronk, *Podstawy nauk o religii*, pgs. 151-160; M. Rusecki, *Istota i geneza religii*, pgs. 35-44; I. S. Ledwoń, “...i nie ma w żadnym innym zbawienia.” *Wyjątkowy charakter chrześcijaństwa w teologii posoborowej*, Lublin 2006, pgs. 195-208.

<sup>6</sup> See Cz. S. Bartnik, *Personalizm*, Lublin 2008<sup>3</sup>; K. Gózdź, *Personalizm systemowy*, in *In persona Christi. Księga na 80-lecie Księdza Profesora Czesława S. Bartnika*, (ed.) K. Gózdź, vol. 2, Lublin 2009, pgs. 385-393; G. Barth, *W poszukiwaniu personalistycznego wzorca uprawiania teologii. Koncepcja metodologii teologicznej*, in *In persona Christi. Księga na 80-lecie Księdza Profesora Czesława S. Bartnika*, (ed.) K. Gózdź, vol. 2, Lublin 2009, pgs. 351-361.

<sup>7</sup> Cicero, *Cicero's Tusculan Disputation*; Also, *Treatises on the Nature of the Gods, and on the Commonwealth*, (trans.) C. D. Yonge, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/14988/14988-h/14988-h.htm> (05.01.2018).

<sup>8</sup> P. Jaroszyński, *Kultura i cywilizacja. Od Cyserona do Koniecznego*, “Człowiek w Kulturze” 10 (1998), pgs. 13-14.

term is a continuation of the Greek term *paideia*, meaning the comprehensive social and individual education of man that serves to form his highest values.<sup>9</sup> From the very beginning, the concept of *culture* was opposed to everything that existed independently of man and was referred to as *nature*.<sup>10</sup>

A general and widely accept definition of culture does not exist. Today, there are several thousands of definitions. Alfred Louis Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn have distinguished six types of definitions of culture: descriptive, enumerative, historical, normative, psychological, structural, and genetic.<sup>11</sup> In the humanities, philosophy, and theology there are a variety of descriptive terms for culture that largely depend on the point of departure, assumptions, and concept of the human being that a given discipline adopts. In a broad sense, culture is the whole of human behavior, actions, and creations.<sup>12</sup> International documents that the majority of states have adopted and follow confirm this multidimensional approach to culture. UNESCO's *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*<sup>13</sup> was unanimously accepted on November 2, 2001 during the 31<sup>st</sup> Session of the General Conference in Paris. This

<sup>9</sup> See W. Jaeger, *Paideia*, Vols. 1-2, Warsaw 1962-1964; H. I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1964<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> M. A. Krapiec, *Kultura*, in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, vol. 6, Lublin 2005, pgs. 132-133.

<sup>11</sup> A. L. Kroeber, C. Kluckhohn, *Culture. A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, Cambridge 1952.

<sup>12</sup> A. Bronk, *Kultura*, in *Leksykon filozofii klasycznej*, (ed.) J. Herbut, Lublin 1997, pgs. 332-333.

<sup>13</sup> "The United Nations Organization for Education, Science and Culture was established on November 16, 1945. [...] UNESCO is a multilateral organization that coordinates activities aimed at developing international cultural, educational, and scientific cooperation. By creating standards of cooperation through the establishment of international law in these areas and by mobilizing the international community to work together, UNESCO pursues the policy goals that are now called public diplomacy. Assuming that peace is not only a state of non-war, the organization actively seeks to develop a culture of peace in the world. [...] Assuming also that peace is a choice that is based on respect for diversity and is not possible without dialogue, UNESCO promotes dialogue between nations and civilizations. The organization supports the exchange of experiences, the aim of which is sustainable development, based on the assumption that future generations will be able to enjoy the heritage that is shared by modern people. [...] One of UNESCO's basic goals is to mobilize national governments and local communities to protecting cultural and natural heritage, cooperate in the fields of science and education, and create an informational society." Polski Komitet ds. UNESCO, *Misja UNESCO* [online], <http://www.unesco.pl/unesco/misja-unesco> (02.04.2017).

document cites previous regulations<sup>14</sup> that define culture as “the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, that it encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs.”<sup>15</sup>

Similar descriptions of culture can be found in confessional documents. For example, the Second Vatican Council’s Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World: *Gaudium Et Spes* (1962-1965) states:

The word ‘culture’ in its general sense indicates everything whereby man develops and perfects his many bodily and spiritual qualities; he strives by his knowledge and his labor, to bring the world itself under his control. He renders social life more human both in the family and the civic community, through improvement of customs and institutions. Throughout the course of time he expresses, communicates and conserves in his works, great spiritual experiences and desires, that they might be of advantage to the progress of many, even of the whole human family [...] Different styles of life and multiple scales of values arise from the diverse manner of using things, of laboring, of expressing oneself, of practicing religion, of forming customs, of establishing laws and juridic institutions, of cultivating the sciences, the arts and beauty. Thus the customs handed down to it form the patrimony proper to each human community.<sup>16</sup>

The definitions of culture mentioned above emphasize its personal, social, and axiological dimensions. From these definitions one can conclude that man is the only creator of culture, which he then uses for his own development and perfection. So understood, culture then becomes the form of human life as well as a way of existing.<sup>17</sup> As Stanislaw Kowalczyk notes, culture is the objectification of the human spirit, the actualization of ideas created by man, and a decision of the will. It is man’s inner need. The way that man creates culture is

<sup>14</sup> See UNESCO, *World Conference on Cultural Policies*, July 26–August 6 (Mexico City, 1982); *World Communion on Culture and Development* (Our Creative Diversity, 1995); *Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development* (Stockholm, 1998).

<sup>15</sup> UNESCO, *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, Paris (11.02.2001). [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=13179&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13179&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html) (Accessed 05.01.2018).

<sup>16</sup> Second Vatican Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World: *Gaudium et Spes*, (12.07.1965), no. 53.

<sup>17</sup> John Paul II, Speech at UNESCO, “In the Name of the Future of Culture,” Paris (06.02.1980). <http://inters.org/John-Paul-II-UNESCO-Culture>.

not coincidental, but rather intentional, and he does so with all of his own potentiality: intellect, consciousness, conscience, will, and work effort. Referring to the philosophy of personalism, we can state that the whole man expresses himself in culture as a person, thereby developing his humanity and confirming his personal dignity. Therefore, man himself—and, more specifically, his comprehensive development—is the end and meaning of culture.<sup>18</sup>

The personalistic understanding of culture presented above is opposed to various ideas and tendencies that are present in the modern world, including economics, technocracy, and consumerism.<sup>19</sup> Pope John Paul II spoke emphatically against these trends by emphasizing that man is the integral subject of culture and, at the same time, its only proper object and end.<sup>20</sup> By establishing that man is the free and autonomous creator of culture, John Paul II asserted that there must be a correlation between material culture and spiritual culture:

It is through culture that man as a human being becomes more human, ‘exists’ more fully and has more ‘being’. And it is therein that the fundamental distinction between what man is and what he has, between being and having, is grounded. Culture is always essentially and necessarily related to what man is, while its relation to what he has, to his ‘possessions’, is not only secondary, but entirely relative. All that man ‘possesses’, is of importance for culture, and a factor creative of culture, only in so far as man, by virtue of what he ‘possesses’, is also able to ‘be’ more fully man, to become more fully man at all levels of his existence and in everything which marks out his humanity. The experience of the different periods of history, not excluding the present, shows that we think about culture and speak about it first and foremost in connection with human nature, and only secondarily and indirectly, in connection with the world of human production. [...] It is man, and man alone, who ‘acts’ or ‘makes’ culture; man, and man alone, expresses himself in culture and finds his own balance in it.<sup>21</sup>

## Culture—A Set of Values

The personal component of culture is closely connected with its axiological component. Taking into consideration the values that are realized in human activity, it is possible to distinguish the following

<sup>18</sup> See S. Kowalczyk, *Filozofia kultury. Próba personalistycznego ujęcia problemu*, Lublin 1996, pgs. 91-96.

<sup>19</sup> See Ibid, pg. 96.

<sup>20</sup> See John Paul II, *W imię przyszłości kultury*, pgs. 54-56.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, pg. 55. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0006/000628/062863eo.pdf>

areas in culture: philosophy and science (the truth), morality (the good), religion (*sacrum*—the sacred), art (beauty), technique (instrumental and practical proficiency).<sup>22</sup>

As previously stated, man creates culture. Only he has the unique ability to engage in various activities that create a space for him to express himself, his rationality, and his freedom. Culture is the way in which man realizes his goals and, consequently, improves them according to accepted values. A close relationship between culture and values exists. Culture cannot exist without values, and it is not possible to actualize values without culture; for, culture is the proper place where values are presented and experienced. The activities in which man engages in order to create culture are always carried out according to specific values that correspond to man's needs. Therefore, these values flow from his biological, cognitive, emotional, moral, and religious nature. In this sense, culture can be defined as a totality of the values that man recognizes, upholds, desires, and realizes.<sup>23</sup> Therefore, on the one hand, man creates culture, and, on the other hand, he is formed by it due primarily to the fact that culture is a set of values and transmits them.

How should one understand the concept of values? Apart from a number of particular issues pertaining above all to the way that they exist and the cognitive dimension of evaluative utterances, first it is necessary to emphasize that the act of evaluating, meaning expressing evaluative judgments, belongs to the basic forms of human existence. Generally, a value is that which is valued; that which a person desires; that which is the object of a person's pursuits and longings; that which satisfies one's needs and interests; and that which provides satisfaction.<sup>24</sup> Man is unique in his axiological sensitivity, and values give his life meaning. As Andrzej Bronk states, "value is connected with meaning: that which is valuable (absolutely or instrumentally) has meaning just as it gives meaning to human life."<sup>25</sup> Just as there are different kinds of values, so too are there different hierarchies among values, even among the same kinds of values. Life confirms that man makes decisions according to criteria connected with the hierarchy of values

<sup>22</sup> A. Bronk, *Kultura/kultury*, in *Leksykon religii*, (eds.) F. König, H. Waldenfels, Warsaw 1997, pg. 209.

<sup>23</sup> S. Kowalczyk, *Filozofia kultury*, pg. 54.

<sup>24</sup> See A. B. Stępień, *Aksjologia*, in *Leksykon filozofii klasycznej*, (ed.) J. Herbut, Lublin 1997, pgs. 24-25.

<sup>25</sup> See A. Bronk, *Zrozumieć świat współczesny*, Lublin 1998, pgs. 184-185; W. Stróżewski, *W kręgu wartości*, Cracow 1992, pg. 38.

to which he ascribes. Some hierarchies are absolute, fundamental, and final, while others are instrumental, utilitarian, and pragmatic.<sup>26</sup> As the protagonist of culture, man is also the active creator of that which is valuable as well as the recipient of values that exist independently of him.

## Religion as Man's Relationship with a Transcendent "You"

Prescientific cognition reveals that culture and religion have many things in common. For both, man and his actions are at the forefront. The fact that the human person is the subject of culture and religion is the foundation for the relationship between religion and culture. The fact that man is the subject and object of culture is obvious and has already been stated above. The same, however, is not always considered true about religion, and the reasons for this will be presented and examined below.

Like culture, religion is a universal fact. Religions have been present in all historical eras and throughout the history of peoples, nations, and civilizations. They are also part of the personal experience of man, his existence, goals, aspirations, meaning of life, and in his passion to learn about and understand reality. The multifaceted complexity of the phenomenon of religion, the multifaceted nature of the study of religions, and the fact that the definition of religion depends on previously adopted epistemological and ontological assumptions make it impossible to determine one common definition of religion.<sup>27</sup> The typology of current definitions of religion makes it possible to state that the essence of religion is the relationship between man and a transcendent "You" (the Absolute, the Cause of everything, God, or gods). This also concerns the relationship between morals and worship.<sup>28</sup> In terms of culture, religion has three dimensions: theoretical

<sup>26</sup> See A. Bronk, *Zrozumieć świat współczesny*, pgs. 192-193.

<sup>27</sup> See Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pgs. 274-300; A. Bronk, *Nauka wobec religii*, pgs. 77-87.

<sup>28</sup> See S. Kamiński, Z. J. Zdybicka, *Definicja religii a typy nauk o religii*, in S. Kamiński, *Światopogląd – religia – teologia. Zagadnienia filozoficzne i metodologiczne*, Lublin 1998, pgs. 71-75; A. Bronk, *Podstawy nauk o religii*, pgs. 103-124.



(beliefs, doctrine), practical (rites, worship, and moral behavior), and social (organization, institutions).<sup>29</sup>

From the above it follows that man is the subject of the relationship that results from the phenomenon of religion. Man exists as a rational and free being; he is aware of his existence, greatness, and limitations. Man is open to transcendental reality, in which he seeks an explanation for the meaning of life, the reason for his existence, and the prospect of being ultimately fulfilled (salvation). As the subject of religion, man is capable of freely and responsibly choosing the Absolute as the end in which he can fulfill himself in every dimension of his being. This Absolute—this transcendent “You”—is the primary subject of a religious relationship. The transcendent “You” can be understood as essentially different from any other reality, so much so that it exceeds every other reality. The basis for the existence of a religious act (act of religious faith) is a belief in the real existence of its object—broadly speaking, a Supreme Being, or God. The secondary subject of religion, which is intimately connected with the primary subject, is religious truths. These truths concern created beings, the world, man, and the principles of moral behavior.<sup>30</sup>

## The *Sacrum* – the Highest Value of Religion

The object of religion—the transcendent “You”—appears to the subject—that is, to man—as the highest value: the sacred (*sacrum*, *holiness*). *Sacrum* is a religious category, meaning the object of religious experience, regardless of its type and form.<sup>31</sup> It is commonly accepted that religious acts actualize the value of sanctity. This value can also be described as perfection, which is understood as the full realization of human possibilities in relation to God—the Most Perfect Being, who is the Absolute being and highest value.<sup>32</sup> Because of the excellent character of the subject of religious experience, man wants to liberate himself of everything that is unholy, morally evil, and disordered. On

<sup>29</sup> See Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pg. 360; S. Kamiński, Z. J. Zdybicka, *Definicja religii a typy nauk o religii*, pg. 89; W. Piwowarski, *Socjologia religii*, Lublin 2000, pgs. 25-44; J. Mariański, *Społeczny charakter religii*, in *Religia w świecie współczesnym. Zarys problematyki religiolologicznej*, (ed.) H. Zimoń, Lublin 2000, pg. 129-164.

<sup>30</sup> See M. Rusecki, *Istota i geneza religii*, pgs. 56-68.

<sup>31</sup> See Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pgs. 408-412; J. Splett, *Sacrum*, in *Leksykon religii*, (eds.) F. König, H. Waldenfels, Warsaw 1997, pgs. 424-425. See also: *Le Sacré*, (ed.) E. Castelli, Paris 1974; R. Otto, *Das Heilige*, München 1987.

<sup>32</sup> Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pg. 350.

the other hand, man also wants to connect with the *sacrum* because it fascinates and attracts him. In relation to the subject of religious experience, therefore, there are two mysteries: the *mysterium tremendum* (anxiety, fear, and awe) and the *mysterium fascinans* (attraction, enchantment, and fascination). Because he himself is not holy and is imperfect, man perceives in the Holy One the possibility to be completely fulfilled.<sup>33</sup>

While the *sacrum* is not a separate category from the truth, the good, or the beautiful, it cannot be equated with such values, as Paul Natorp and Wilhelm Windelband assert, because this would essentially equate religion with culture.<sup>34</sup> As Sofia Zdybicka notes, *sanctity* is a value “added” to all the others that assembles them; it is connected with human existence, which grows and develops in view of the transcendent “You.”<sup>35</sup> To the subject, the *sacrum* appears as the absolute value (in every respect) that integrates all of the highest values that are lasting and immovable. Religion is not a way to other values. Rather, it has its own absolute area of values—namely, the *sacrum*.<sup>36</sup>

All of man’s rational and free actions carried out on natural (immanent) reality essentially take place in the realm of culture. The realm of religion arises when man enters into a relationship with a transcendent reality, meaning a reality that transcends nature and is divine.<sup>37</sup> Religious values transcend the limits of every culture, even if individuals practice these values in specific historical situations. Religious values manifest man’s relationship with the highest value—the *sacrum*—and that which is particularly valuable to man, meaning that which is holy.

## Models of the Relationship Between Culture and Religion

Discussing the relationship between culture and religion is not a simple task because different concepts of both culture and religion have existed throughout history. Since the relationship between culture and religion has already been mentioned briefly, the following considerations will include generalizations and simplifications of these topics. Over the centuries, two main models that present the

<sup>33</sup> See M. Rusecki, *Istota i geneza religii*, pg. 62.

<sup>34</sup> See Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pg. 372; M. Rusecki, *Istota i geneza religii*, pg. 146.

<sup>35</sup> See Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pgs. 349-350.

<sup>36</sup> See M. Rusecki, *Istota i geneza religii*, pgs. 61-62.

<sup>37</sup> See *Ibid*, pg. 59.

relationship between culture and religion have been created: 1) opposition and confrontation, and 2) complementarity and cooperation.<sup>38</sup>

## Opposition and Confrontation Model

Dogmatic  
theology

Proponents of the opposition and confrontation model believe that a creative bond between culture and religion does not exist, whereas only contradictions and inconsistencies do. These individuals uphold that culture dominates religion, or vice versa.

Basing their understanding on empiricism, sensualism, and a scientific concept of knowledge, the Enlightenment materialists and French encyclopaedists (Julien Offray de La Mettrie,<sup>39</sup> Paul d'Holbach,<sup>40</sup> Voltaire,<sup>41</sup> and François-Marie Arouet) believed that religion is the enemy of a naturalistic understanding of culture, progress, science, and freedom.<sup>42</sup> When criticizing contemporary Western culture, which was based largely on Christianity, Frederick Nietzsche favored atheism and claimed that religion and the morality that results from it are creations of the human mind that is burdened by erroneous reasoning.<sup>43</sup>

When culture is regarded as supreme, religion is most often considered as arising from a primitive and primal stage of human development that lacked scientific knowledge, and, therefore, gave rise to a belief in the Absolute and transcendent values. The founder of positivism, August Comte, regarded religion in this way.<sup>44</sup> Similarly, the proponents of neopositivism, Rudolph Carnap and Alfred Jules Ayer, deny that religious truths have cognitive significance.<sup>45</sup> The empirist, Bertrand Russell, stated that a contradiction exists between science and religion. According to Russell, a fear and ignorance of natural phenomena, which in turn leads to the personification of the forces of nature, lies at the root of religion.<sup>46</sup> Sigmund Freud thought that

<sup>38</sup> See S. Kowalczyk, *Filozofia kultury*, pg. 171.

<sup>39</sup> See J. O. de La Mettrie, *Człowiek – Maszyna*, Warsaw 2011.

<sup>40</sup> See P. d'Holbach, *Etokracja, czyli rząd oparty na moralności*, Warsaw 1979.

<sup>41</sup> See Voltaire, *Traktat o tolerancji napisany z powodu śmierci Jana Calasa*, Warsaw 1988.

<sup>42</sup> See S. Kowalczyk, *Filozofia kultury*, pg. 172.

<sup>43</sup> See F. Nietzsche, *Antychryst. Próba krytyki chrześcijaństwa*, Cracow 2003.

<sup>44</sup> See A. Comte, *Metoda pozytywna*, Warsaw 1961, pgs. 238-241.

<sup>45</sup> See R. Carnap, *Filozofia jako analiza języka nauki*, Warsaw 1969, pg. 20 nn.

<sup>46</sup> See B. Russell, *Dlaczego nie jestem chrześcijaninem?*, Warsaw 1956; S. Kowalczyk, *Filozofia kultury*, pg. 172.

religion was a collective neurosis and a compensation for unfulfilled desires.<sup>47</sup> Carl Gustav Jung asserted that the collective unconscious is the source of religion and that archetypes condition religious experience.<sup>48</sup>

Representatives of dialectical materialism (Karl Marks, Frederick Engels, Vladimir Lenin) thought that religion arose out of man's ignorance of the laws and forces of nature, from his primitive fear of the mysterious phenomena of nature, and from economic and social injustice (secondary alienation). Marxists believe that religion has a destructive influence on nature (understood materialistically) since it refers to spiritual (non-material) entities and, moreover, spoils social relations as the "opiate of the people."<sup>49</sup> The French sociologist, Emil Durkheim, reduced religion to the basis of social bonds and believed that the source of religion, like morality, is a collective consciousness.<sup>50</sup>

Within the opposition and confrontation model, there are views that depreciate culture and emphasize religion's role and influence on all of human life and activity. For example, advocates of extreme eschatologism emphasize the dualism of good and evil, spirit and matter, God and Satan. They also see manifestations of evil in man's material creations. According to eschatological extremists, culture and its creations are worthless and even harmful because they hinder man's liberation from the material world. These and similar views are present in religions that emphasize dualism, including varieties of Hinduism, Buddhism, Gnosticism, Manichaeism, or extreme Christian asceticism.<sup>51</sup> Similarly, in some religious sects and cults, culture and natural values are a manifestation of human pride, an illusion, or a temptation to reject the Absolute and supernatural values. According to this view, culture is a threat to religion.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>47</sup> See Z. Freud, *Człowiek, religia, kultura*, Warsaw 1962; Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pgs. 216-221.

<sup>48</sup> See C. G. Jung, *Psychologia a religia*, Warsaw 1970; Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pgs. 221-226.

<sup>49</sup> See K. Marks, F. Engels, *O religii*, Warsaw 1962; S. Kowalczyk, *Klasyki marksizmu wobec problemu ateizmu*, "Chrześcijanin w świecie" 3 (1973) no 4, pgs. 11-27.

<sup>50</sup> See E. Durkheim, *Próba określenia zjawisk religijnych*, Warsaw 1960.

<sup>51</sup> See T. Dajczer, *Teologia religii*, in *Chrześcijaństwo wśród religii*, Warsaw 1990, pgs. 45-65; J. I. Smith, *Concourse between the Living and the Dead in Islamic Eschatological Literature*, "History of Religious" 19 (1980), pgs. 224-236.

<sup>52</sup> See M. Rusecki, *Istota i geneza religii*, pg. 145.

## Complementarity and Cooperation Model

The model based on the complementarity of and cooperation between culture and religion is based on the idea that the relationship between culture and religion is one of creative cooperation. This model emphasizes the close relationship between culture and religion and their mutual enrichment.

Religion and its values significantly broaden the realm of the influence of culture and the store of values to which every culture refers, thereby enlarging the space in which human activity can create culture. Great cultural theorists such as Christopher Dawson and Thomas Stearns Eliot argue that religion is that which dynamizes culture; it is a powerfully creative force and inspiration in historical development.<sup>53</sup> Dawson thinks that every significant culture is associated with a religious tradition; therefore, in order to understand a culture, one must first know the religion it follows.<sup>54</sup> Because of the idea of inculturation that is present in many religions, religion and its references are an aid in the dialogue between cultures and in opening man up to new values.<sup>55</sup>

According to Z. Zdybicka, creative cooperation between religion and culture consists in: 1) the human person's infinite ability to develop and the prospect of existing eternally (focusing on transcendent values); 2) man's need to express religion exteriorly (in social life), which results in activities that create culture (in this sense, religion is field of culture); and 3) the enrichment of motivation for human activity.<sup>56</sup> Religion plays an important role in culture by fully affirming man, emphasizing his dignity, and affirming and demonstrating that higher values are a permanent element of social life.<sup>57</sup>

The complementarity and cooperation model affirms that religion needs culture and that it cannot exist outside of or without culture. Culture enriches religion through the use of a language that is appropriate to the mentality of modern man and in visible forms; culture

<sup>53</sup> See Ch. Dawson, *Religia i kultura*, Warsaw 1959; T. S. Eliot, *Towards Definition of Culture*, London 1948.

<sup>54</sup> See Ch. Dawson, *The Institutional Forms of Christian Culture*, in *Christianity and European Culture: Selections from the Work of Christopher Dawson*, (ed.) G. J. Russello, Washington 1998, pgs. 54-64.

<sup>55</sup> See M. Kuciński, *Relacja kultury i religii w perspektywie nauczania Benedykta XVI*, "Społeczeństwo" 4 (2016), pgs. 81-88.

<sup>56</sup> Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pg. 372.

<sup>57</sup> See Z. J. Zdybicka, *Religia a kultura*, in *Religia w świecie współczesnym. Zarys problematyki religiologicznej*, (ed.) H. Zimoń, Lublin 2000, pgs. 179-182.

transmits religious values and expresses that which is a part of the supernatural world.<sup>58</sup> The developments of cultural components such as philosophy, the empirical sciences, and semiology contribute to a better understanding of religious truths and to a more complete interpretation of what the Absolute has revealed (e.g., the Bible). History, sociology, and psychology make it possible to know the subject of religious relationship—man as a being who is open to transcendent reality. Culture and its values, particularly its higher spiritual values, make man more sensitive and direct him to the world of the signs, symbols, and highest values—the *sacrum*, which are so important to religion.

## Conclusion

Culture is everything that man has consciously and deliberately created. As a rational and free being, man changes the world around him (nature and existing reality) according to accepted ideas, plans, views, and values. Man makes his print on his surroundings; he humanizes nature and, in a sense, rationalizes it. Man develops better living conditions and, above all, creates better opportunities for his own personal development on every level: biological, cognitive, emotional, moral, and religious. By creating culture, man develops and creates himself. As a type of human cognition and activity directed toward comprehending a transcendent “You” and as a social reality, religion is part of man’s activity that creates culture. Man’s dynamic and social nature is connected with the interrelationship between culture and religion. The essence of the human person is his continual social and individual development. Man realizes himself by creating values, especially spiritual ones. This process always takes place within a specific community and culture. In this way, man transforms culture and contributes to its development.<sup>59</sup> Therefore, man’s activity that aims to create culture is always carried out according to the values that he upholds and realizes.

<sup>58</sup> See A. Dulles, *The Contribution of Christianity to Culture: An American Perspective*, in *Chrześcijaństwo jutra. Materiały II Międzynarodowego Kongresu Teologii Fundamentalnej, Lublin, 18-21 września 2001*, (eds.) M. Rusecki et al., Lublin 2001, pg. 157. For more on the topic of the crisis of contemporary culture which has ceased to convey religious values, see Paul VI, Apostolic Exhortation: *Evangelii nuntiandi*, Warsaw 1986, nr 20; Benedict XVI, Apostolic Letter “*Motu Proprio Data*” for the Indiction of the Year of Faith, (10.11.2011), 2; P. Poupard, *Ten papież jest darem od Boga. Rozmowa z M. J. Guillaume*, Katowice 2002, pg. 90; P. Rabczyński, *Nowa ewangelizacja “ludów pochrześcijańskich,” Nurt SVD 2* (2016), pgs. 264-267.

<sup>59</sup> See Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pgs. 359-370.

In this way, according to Roman Ingarden, culture is the creation of values that develop and give meaning to human life.<sup>60</sup>

Every culture ascribes to some order and hierarchy of values according to which man acts and thinks. Most often, this hierarchy is referred to as a worldview or ideology. Religion and its values (*sacrum*) hold an important place in a person's worldview. The beliefs, doctrines, and moral principles of a given religion often make up a hierarchy of values that refer directly to an Absolute, and these values are most often called spiritual or absolute values. Religion and its transcendental object (God, gods, the supernatural world) considerably expands man's cognitive perspectives. By going beyond the vital and emotional realm, religious values point to the basis, purpose, and meaning of human life, thereby strengthening and confirming all remaining cultural values.<sup>61</sup>

Although religion is a field of culture, religion clearly transcends culture. Culture pertains to man's activity on nature, the surrounding world, and himself. Religion, however, transcends the natural order, turns to supernatural values (*sacrum*), employs supernatural grounds, and its ultimate object is absolute (God, gods).

## KULTURA A RELIGIA

Podmiotem kultury i religii jest człowiek. Kultura jest tym wszystkim, co człowiek tworzy, tak w sferze materialnej, jak i duchowej. Z jednej strony człowiek tworzy kulturę, a z drugiej strony jest przez nią kształtowany, głównie dzięki temu, że kultura jest nośnikiem wzorców i wartości, także religijnych. Religia wyraża się w kulturze, choć, ze względu na swój przedmiot, transcenduje kulturę. Można mówić o kulturotwórczej roli religii. Istnieją różne modele relacji między kulturą a religią: od opozycji i konfrontacji do komplementarności i kooperacji. Właściwą jest relacja twórczej kooperacji.

**Słowa kluczowe:** kultura, religia, wartości, człowiek podmiotem kultury i religii, relacja między kulturą a religią.

## Bibliography:

1. Barth G., *W poszukiwaniu personalistycznego wzorca uprawiania teologii. Koncepcja metodologii teologicznej*, in *In persona Christi. Księga na*

<sup>60</sup> See R. Ingarden, *Książeczka o człowieku*, Cracow 1972, pgs. 13-18.

<sup>61</sup> See Z. J. Zdybicka, *Człowiek i religia*, pgs. 369-372.

- 80-lecie Księdza Profesora Czesława S. Bartnika, (ed.) K. Gózdź, vol. 2, Lublin 2009, pgs. 351-361.
2. Bartnik Cz. S., *Personalizm*, Lublin 2008<sup>3</sup>.
  3. Benedict XVI, Apostolic Letter “*Motu Proprio Data*” for the Indiction of the Year of Faith, (10.11.2011).
  4. Boublik V., *Teologia delle Religioni*, Rome 1973.
  5. Bronk A., *Kultura*, in *Leksykon filozofii klasycznej*, (ed.) J. Herbut, Lublin 1997.
  6. Bronk A., *Kultura/kultury*, in *Leksykon religii*, (eds.) F. König, H. Waldenfels, Warsaw 1997.
  7. Bronk A., *Mircei Eliadego fenomenologia religii*, in *Zrozumieć świat współczesny*, Lublin 1998.
  8. Bronk A., *Nauka wobec religii (teoretyczne podstawy nauk o religii)*, Lublin 1996.
  9. Bronk A., *Podstawy nauk o religii*, Lublin 2003.
  10. Bronk A., *Zrozumieć świat współczesny*, Lublin 1998.
  11. Carnap R., *Filozofia jako analiza języka nauki*, Warsaw 1969.
  12. Cicero, *Cicero’s Tusculan Disputation; Also, Treatises on the Nature of the Gods, and on the Commonwealth*, (trans.) C. D. Yonge, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/14988/14988-h/14988-h.htm> (05.01.2018).
  13. Comte A., *Metoda pozytywna*, Warsaw 1961.
  14. Dajczewski T., *Teologia religii*, in *Chrześcijaństwo wśród religii*, Warsaw 1990.
  15. Dawson Ch., *Religia i kultura*, Warsaw 1959.
  16. Dawson Ch., *The Institutional Forms of Christian Culture*, in *Christianity and European Culture: Selections from the Work of Christopher Dawson*, (ed.) G. J. Russello, Washington 1998, pgs. 54-64.
  17. Dhavamony M., *Théologie des religions*, in *Dictionnaire de théologie fondamentale*, dir. R. Latourelle, R. Fisichella, Montréal – Paris 1992, pgs. 1120-1134.
  18. Dola T., *Teologia religii. Próba zarysu problematyki*, “*Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego*” 12 (1987), pgs. 5-18.
  19. Dulles A., *The Contribution of Christianity to Culture: An American Perspective*, in *Chrześcijaństwo jutra. Materiały II Międzynarodowego Kongresu Teologii Fundamentalnej*, Lublin, 18-21 września 2001, (eds.) M. Rusecki et al., Lublin 2001.
  20. Durkheim E., *Próba określenia zjawisk religijnych*, Warsaw 1960.
  21. D’Costa G., *Theology and Religious Pluralism*, Oxford 1986
  22. Eliade M., *Historia wierzeń i idei religijnych*, Volume 1: *Od epoki kamiennej do misteriów eleuzyńskich*, Warsaw 1997.
  23. Eliot T. S., *Towards Definition of Culture*, London 1948.
  24. Freud Z., *Człowiek, religia, kultura*, Warsaw 1962.
  25. Gózdź K., *Personalizm systemowy*, in *In persona Christi. Księga na 80-lecie Księdza Profesora Czesława S. Bartnika*, (ed.) K. Gózdź, vol. 2, Lublin 2009, pgs. 385-393.
  26. Holbach P. d’, *Etokracja, czyli rząd oparty na moralności*, Warsaw 1979.
  27. Ingarden R., *Książeczka o człowieku*, Cracow 1972.



28. Jaeger W., *Paideia*, Vols. 1-2, Warsaw 1962-1964.
29. Jaroszyński P., *Kultura i cywilizacja. Od Cycerona do Koniecznego*, "Człowiek w Kulturze" 10 (1998).
30. John Paul II, Speech at UNESCO, *In the Name of the Future of Culture*, Paris (06.02.1980). <http://inters.org/John-Paul-II-UNESCO-Culture>.
31. Jung C. G., *Psychologia a religia*, Warsaw 1970.
32. Kamiński S., Zdybicka Z. J., *Definicja religii a typy nauk o religii*, in S. Kamiński, *Światopogląd – religia – teologia. Zagadnienia filozoficzne i metodologiczne*, Lublin 1998.
33. Kowalczyk S., *Filozofia kultury. Próba personalistycznego ujęcia problematyki*, Lublin 1996.
34. Kowalczyk S., *Klasyki marksizmu wobec problemu ateizmu*, "Chrześcijanin w świecie" 3 (1973) no 4, pgs. 11-27.
35. Kroeber A. L., Kluckhohn C., *Culture. A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, Cambridge 1952.
36. Krąpiec M. A., *Kultura*, in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, vol. 6, Lublin 2005, pgs. 132-133.
37. Kuciński M., *Relacja kultury i religii w perspektywie nauczania Benedykta XVI*, "Społeczeństwo" 4 (2016), pgs. 81-88.
38. La Mettrie J. O. de, *Człowiek – Maszyna*, Warsaw 2011.
39. Ledwoń I. S., *"...i nie ma w żadnym innym zbawienia."* *Wyjątkowy charakter chrześcijaństwa w teologii posoborowej*, Lublin 2006.
40. *Le Sacré*, wyd. E. Castelli, Paris 1974.
41. Mancini I., *Filosofia della religione*, Casale Monferrato 1986<sup>3</sup>.
42. Mariański J., *Społeczny charakter religii*, in *Religia w świecie współczesnym. Zarys problematyki religiológicznej*, (ed.) H. Zimoń, Lublin 2000.
43. Marks K., Engels F., *O religii*, Warsaw 1962.
44. Marrou H. I., *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1964<sup>6</sup>.
45. Nietzsche F., *Antychryst. Próba krytyki chrześcijaństwa*, Cracow 2003.
46. Olivetti M., *Filosofia della religione come problema storico*, Padoue 1974.
47. Otto R., *Das Heilige*, München 1987.
48. Paul VI, Apostolic Exhortation: *Evangelii nuntiandi*, Warsaw 1986.
49. Piwowarski W., *Socjologia religii*, Lublin 2000.
50. Polski Komitet ds. UNESCO, *Misja UNESCO* [online], <http://www.unesco.pl/unesco/misja-unesco> (02.04.2017).
51. Poupard P., *Ten papież jest darem od Boga. Rozmowa z M. J. Guillaume*, Katowice 2002.
52. Rabczyński P., *Nowa ewangelizacja "ludów pochrześcijańskich"*, Nurt SVD 2 (2016), pgs. 264-267.
53. Race A., *Christians and Religious Pluralism*, New York 1982.
54. Rusecki M., *Istota i geneza religii*, Lublin–Sandomierz 1997.
55. Russell B., *Dlaczego nie jestem chrześcijaninem?*, Warsaw 1956.
56. Schmitz J., *Filosofia della religione*, Brescia 1988.
57. Second Vatican Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World: *Gaudium et Spes*, (12.07.1965).
58. Smith J. I., *Concourse between the Living and the Dead in Islamic Eschatological Literature*, "History of Religions" 19 (1980), pgs. 224-236.

59. Splett J., *Sacrum*, in *Leksykon religii*, (eds.) F. König, H. Waldenfels, Warsaw 1997.
60. Stróżewski W., *W kręgu wartości*, Cracow 1992.
61. Stępień A. B., *Aksjologia*, in *Leksykon filozofii klasycznej*, (ed.) J. Herbut, Lublin 1997.
62. *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness: Towards a Pluralistic Theology of Religions*, (eds.) J. Hick, P. Knitter, New York 1987.
63. UNESCO, *Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development* (Stockholm, 1998).
64. UNESCO, *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, Paris (11.02.2001). [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=13179&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13179&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html) (Accessed 05.01.2018).
65. UNESCO, *World Communion on Culture and Development* (Our Creative Diversity, 1995).
66. UNESCO, *World Conference on Cultural Policies*, July 26-August 6 (Mexico City, 1982).
67. Voltaire, *Traktat o tolerancji napisany z powodu śmierci Jana Calasa*, Warsaw 1988.
68. Wuchterl K., *Philosophie und Religion. Zur Aktualität der Religionsphilosophie*, Bern 1982.
69. Zdybicka Z. J., *Człowiek i religia. Zarys filozofii religii*, Lublin 1993.
70. Zdybicka Z. J., *Religia a kultura*, in *Religia w świecie współczesnym. Zarys problematyki religiologicznej*, (ed.) H. Zimoń, Lublin 2000, pgs. 179-182.