IMPORTANCE OF THE INCARNATION IN THE WORKS OF C.S. LEWIS AND S. KIERKEGAARD

Tibor Máhrik[1*], Martina Pavlíková[2] and Jerry Root[3]

[1] *Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of General and Applied Ethics, Hodžova 1, 949 74 Nitra, Slovakia*
[2]*PhD. studies, Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Humanities, Charles University, U Kříže 8, 158 00 Praha 5, Czech Republic*
[3] *Wheaton College, BGC 226, 501 College Avenue, Wheaton, IL 60187, U.S.A.*

(Received 18 October 2017, revised 2 November 2017)

Abstract

The Incarnation plays an important role in the thinking and writing of C.S. Lewis as well as that of S. Kierkegaard. This study points to the wider perspective in the thinking of both authors namely in terms the exploration of values and ethical frameworks arising from the Incarnation. We claim here that though coming from different historical and cultural backgrounds yet both these thinkers came to a similar understanding, namely that it is precisely love and obedience rooted in the reality of the biblical Incarnation that offer the potentiality sufficient for the meeting of prescriptive ethical challenges of a single individual as well as of society. Such a perception of morality relates well to human brokenness and also to the individual's inner longing for a perfect relationship with the world as a whole, while both these polarities are seen as offering a conduit for human effort and a human anticipation of progress in society.

Keywords: philosophy, epistemology, theology, love, obedience

1. C.S. Lewis and the Incarnation

Lewis had been an atheist even into his early years of teaching at Oxford University. Furthermore, he had embraced Materialism as a world view that supported him in his atheism. Over time, however, Lewis began to be suspicious of both the presuppositions of Materialism and therefore whether or not, as a world view, it could sustain his atheistic commitments. A Materialist seeks to answer the ontological question as to what, in a world of cause and effect, might transcend such processes and give merit to the universe as we experience it. If, in a world of contingencies, anything exists, something must be eternal. During the days of his atheism Lewis believed that Matter was eternal, it merely reconfigured itself, but matter itself was permanent. If he was asked where did thought come from, or what lent legitimacy to emotions such as love, or joy, or anger. Lewis's response was that there actually isn't anything that we could call love *per se*. In fact, a man might look at a woman and her

[*]E-mail: tmahrik@ukf.sk

image is projected on his retina. Through a series of electrical impulses along the optic nerve the brain is stimulated and responds by producing certain hormones. The man may call it love, but it is merely chemistry: matter reconfiguring itself. Lewis bought into this explanation until he saw, in it, a contradiction. For the materialist looked at the lovers and their image was projected on his retina. The message travelled along his optic nerve to his brain. Hormones were secreted and he called it an explanation. Lewis realized if the lovers can't say 'Love' it is merely chemistry, then consistency would require that the Materialist cannot say 'Explanation' for the same reason, his explanation is nothing more than cerebral biochemistry [1]. While Lewis could admit that biochemical things are happening in the brain whenever we think, or perceive, mere biochemistry was insufficient to account for all that is happening in matters of reason, or love, as well as concerns about justice and morality.

As Lewis records in his autobiography, it wasn't long after seeing the contradiction in materialist ontology that he became a theist. Nevertheless, Lewis's brand of theism seemed to drive him into a cul-de-sac. He speculated that he didn't think he could ever know God any more than Hamlet could ever know Shakespeare [2]. It is interesting that Lewis speculates this around 1929, ironically the very decade Lugi Pirandello, the Sicilian playwright produces his play, *Six Characters in Search of an Author*. Pirandello's play ends in despair as the characters come to the conclusion, if authors do exist, characters could never break out of the play and get to know them. Lewis, however, after nearly a year of wrestling with this conundrum, ended his speculation more optimistically. He came to the conclusion, if Hamlet, the character in Shakespeare's play could ever get to know the author, it could never depend on Hamlet breaking out of the paly to meet the author. In fact, if such a meeting between character and author could ever occur, the initiation would have to come from the author. It was at this point Lewis speculated that, in fact, Shakespeare could have written himself into the play as a character and thereby makes the introduction between character and author possible. Lewis, at this point speculates perhaps it was something like this that occurred in the Incarnation when the God of the Universe wrote Himself into the play of human experience.

Some of Lewis's thinking on this matter was prompted by his close friend J.R.R. Tolkien, author of the classics works, *The Hobbit*, and the three volumes, *The Lord of the Rings*. Lewis and Tolkien, joined by another friend, Hugo Dyson, had a late-night conversation as they were strolling around Addison's walk, a path circling Magdalen College, Lewis's college at Oxford University. Tolkien reminded Lewis that he always loved the mythological stories of God breaking into the worlds of man and making encounters between the gods and man possible. Then Tolkien suggested to Lewis, if he found these stories so moving and satisfying, why did he never consider the one possibility where such an account claimed to be true. Here Tolkien pointed to the Incarnation of Christ. Lewis found this explanation by his friend to be imaginatively satisfying. In time, he accepted it as true.

2. The Incarnation as described in the Bible

The apostle Paul sets forth a description as to the dynamics of the Incarnation in Philippians 2.5-11. "Have this attitude in yourselves which was also in Christ Jesus, who, although He existed in the form of God, did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a bond-servant, and being made in the likeness of men. Being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross. For this reason also, God highly exalted Him, and bestowed on Him the name which is above every name, so that at the name of Jesus every knee will bow of those who are in heaven and on the earth and under the earth, and that every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father". This has been called, in theological parlay, the Kenotic Passage, the name being derived from the word Kenosis, or empty, in verse seven. The term was a military one and spoke of an officer laying aside his insignias of rank before leading his troops into battle. The marks of rank made the officer a target. If the officers are killed, it is likely that the fighting unit, no longer understanding what they are to do in the heat of battle, is likely to panic, and scatter. This emptying, by Christ, is stated as a voluntary act on His part, "He emptied Himself".

As one theologian understood it, two features of the Kenosis can be seen in Christ's act. First there was the voluntary surrender of His divine glory. In a sense he turned down the 'dimmer-switch' on His divine glory. He turned it up briefly at the Mount of Transfiguration. While this is significant, it is of no deep concern for us here. What is worthy of note is the second thing the Kenosis embodies in the Incarnation: that is In Jesus we see the voluntary surrender of the independent use of His Divine attributes. This is in evidence throughout the Gospel of John particularly where the reader runs across Jesus making comments like, "All that the Father has told me to say, that I have said" (John 7.16, 8.26, 28), or, "All that the Father has told me to do, that I have done" (John 5.19-20, 36; 8.28, 38-39; 10.17-18, 37-38). Therefore in Jesus's Incarnation we find one who is able to make the perfect, atoning sacrifice for sins, but also one who lived a life in total submission to the will of the Father. He models perfect obedience to the Father, and He called the Disciples to walk in a similar way, during the 'Last Supper'. In His teaching, Jesus calls His disciples to walk in a manner similar to how He walked.

Throughout its history, since Nicaea, the Christian Church has assumed the doctrine of the Trinity, that is, that there is One God, eternally existent in Three Persons: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. The coherence of the Three Persons in One Being may be understood in this way: relational attributes (such as love) in a non-contingent Being presuppose that relationship must be necessary in the Being. As God exists in relationship (Father, Son and Holy Spirit) so too, man made in the *Imago Dei*, was made as a relational being. In virtually all of its descriptions, the Christian Scriptures make it clear that sin is man playing God. Sin therefore isolates and estranges

the creature from the creator. Furthermore, it isolates creatures from one another; those who are each playing God of their own lives are like anarchists; and, anarchists make bad for community. The purpose for the Incarnation was, in part, to reconcile lost humanity to God the Father, through the atoning work of God the Son. This atoning work, not only reconciles people to God, and one another, according to the Scriptures, it is the beginning of a process of transformation in the lives of all who, through faith, come to know God in Christ. This process has some kenotic similarities in an analogical way. This is indicated by Christ in the Upper Room discourse as Christ instructs His disciples at the last supper, the night of his betrayal and subsequent crucifixion and Resurrection.

In the Upper Room, Jesus tells his disciples if they have seen Him they have seen the Father (John 14.9, 15.15) because the words Jesus spoke He received from the Father, and the things He did, He did because He saw the Father doing them. Furthermore, Jesus tells His disciples they will be given the gift of the Holy Spirit who will live in them and will disclose to them (in a Kenotic way) what they are to stay and do (John 14.16-26, 15.26-27). He washes the disciples' feet and then instructs them to do what they have seen Him do; He also instructs them to say what He has said. The call is to obedience; an obedience that exhibits the will of the Father and the Son as well as testifies to the work of God in the world.

3. The benefits of obedience

From this can be drawn the conclusion that there are benefits in acts of obedience when both doing what Christ has said as well as doing what He has modelled. How might this be so? Borrowing from Lewis (as well as authors who influenced him) we can see at least five benefits of obedience, built off of the words and works exhibited by Christ in the Incarnation.

First, in his anthology of George MacDonald, Lewis quotes MacDonald as saying that "Obedience is the opener of eyes" [3]. Moral philosophy from Aristotle to the present age has marked the phenomena called Akrasia, that characteristic employed by those who cover up their morally inappropriate acts by self-justification, rationalization and excuses. Aristotle actually wrote, "Vice is unconscious of itself", there is a risk that excuse-making can lead to moral blindness. With this in mind, Lewis wrote, "Continued disobedience to conscience makes conscience blind" [4]. Similarly, the Apostle Paul wrote that "We suppress the truth in our unrighteousness" (Romans 1.18). If the practice of disobeying conscience leads to moral blindness, then it stands to reason that the practice of obeying moral dictates, properly understood, can provide an antidote that restores sight.

Second, Lewis seems to indicate that obedience can also act like a splint that God places on a broken life that it might mend. He actually states it this way: "A *perfect* man would never act from a sense of duty; he'd always *want* the right thing more than the wrong one. Duty is only a substitute for love (of

God and other people), like a crutch, which is a substitute for a leg. Most of us need the crutch at times; but of course it's idiotic to use the crutch when our own legs (our own loves, tastes, habits, etc.) can do the journey on their own!" [5] Again, in the context of the Incarnation, it is understood that Jesus not only makes atonement for sin and reconciles us to God, but also, He instructs His followers in a remedial way. Obedience is essential to the process of remaking humans into something that is progressing towards the restoration of the *Imago Dei*.

Third, as Lewis indicated above, this obedience is a substitute for love. Love needs no instruction to obey. It would simply do the right thing and it would be intrinsically motivated to do so. Pascal wrote in the Pensees that Christians have two laws better than all the laws of statecraft: "Love God. Love your neighbour". Those who love in this way do not need the legal reminders to do what they have a natural proclivity to do. And in a culture where love of God and love of neighbour have grown cold, the pages of Penal codes thicken, legal statutes proliferate, and the shelves of law libraries are freighted with increased numbers of volumes. Certainly this is why Jesus, four times in the Upper Room Discourse predicated his teaching on obedience by saying, "If you love me you will obey me" (John 14.15, 21, 23-24; 15.10).

Fourth, borrowing from G.K. Chesterton, whose writing had a profound influence on C.S. Lewis, a fourth benefit of obedience can be seen. Chesterton asserts that all positive joy exists on condition [6]. This is a theme he develops in Orthodoxy and also something in an extended reading in an essay 'Fairy Tales' reproduced below.

"If you really read the fairy tales, you will observe that one idea runs from one end of them to the other — the idea that peace and happiness can only exist on some condition. This idea, which is the core of ethics, is the core of the nursery-tales. The whole happiness of fairyland hangs upon a thread, upon one thread. Cinderella may have a dress woven on supernatural looms and blazing with unearthly brilliance; but she must be back when the clock strikes twelve. The king may invite fairies to the christening, but he must invite all the fairies or frightful results will follow. Bluebeard's wife may open all doors but one. A promise is broken to a cat, and the whole world goes wrong. A promise is broken to a yellow dwarf, and the whole world goes wrong. A girl may be the bride of the God of Love Himself if she never tries to see Him; she sees Him, and he vanishes away. A girl is given a box on condition she does not open it; she opens it, and all the evils of this world rush out at her. A man and woman are put in a garden on condition that they do not eat one fruit: they eat it, and lose their joy in all the fruits of the Earth."

"This great idea, then, is the backbone of all folk-lore — the idea that all happiness hangs on one thin veto; all positive joy depends on one negative. Now, it is obvious that there are many philosophical and religious ideas akin to or symbolised by this; but it is not with them I wish to deal here. It is surely obvious that all ethics ought to be taught to this fairy tale tune; that, if one does the thing forbidden, one imperils all the things provided. A man who breaks

his promise to his wife ought to be reminded that, even if she is a cat, the case of the fairy-cat shows that such conduct may be incautious. A burglar just about to open someone else's safe should be playfully reminded that he is in the perilous posture of the beautiful Pandora: he is about to lift the forbidden lid and loosen evils unknown. The boy eating some one's apples in some one's apple tree should be a reminder that he has come to a mystical moment of his life, when one apple may rob him of all others. This is the profound morality of fairy tales; which, so far from being lawless, go to the root of all law. Instead of finding (like common books of ethics) a rationalistic basis for each Commandment, they find the great mystical basis for all Commandments. We are in this fairyland on sufferance; it is not for us to quarrel with the conditions under which we enjoy this wild vision of the world. The vetoes are indeed extraordinary, but then so are the concessions. The idea of property, the idea of someone else's apples, is a rum idea; but then the idea of there being any apples is a rum idea. It is strange and weird that I cannot with safety drink ten bottles of champagne; but then the champagne itself is strange and weird, if you come to that. If I have drunk of the fairies' drink it is but just I should drink by the fairies' rules. We may not see the direct logical connection between three beautiful silver spoons and a large ugly policeman; but then who in fairy tales ever could see the direct logical connection between three bears and a giant, or between a rose and a roaring beast? Not only can these fairy tales be enjoyed because they are moral, but morality can be enjoyed because it puts us in fairyland, in a world at once of wonder and of war." [7]

Lewis's wife, Joy Davidman, wrote the book *Smoke on the Mountain* where she expresses a similar sentiment to that of Chesterton. In her book Davidman suggests that the Ten Commandments needs, often enough to be reconsidered in a positive light in order to grasp more fully how the commands to obey and not so much restrictive as they are liberating. The command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before thee" is God, in essence saying, "Thou shalt have me" that is, "Thou shalt find thy fulfilment in me". It is God's self-offering in order to benefit his creatures. Similarly commands such as "Thou shalt not bear false witness against your neighbour" is positively stated "Thou shalt speak well of your neighbour". "Thou shalt not commit adultery would be restated as, "Thou shalt fulfil your vows" Or "Thou shalt find constancy and joy in your spouse". The command, "Thou shalt not murder" would be understood as "Thou shalt affirm life". With this in mind, the last command, "Thou shalt not covet" becomes "Thou shalt be content". The command to obey sets up a fence that protects the obedient one from the things that would harm him, while also defining within the perimeter of the commandment, the very playground on which life was meant to be enjoyed. The only thing restricted is that which would likely lead to peril.

The fifth and final benefit of obedience, to be considered in this paper is that obedience accesses the benefits of Omniscience. If, in fact, the biblical commands to obey are generated by the Omniscience, then every act of obedience brings the benefits of Omniscience into my life. As humans, given all

that there is to know in the Universe, we know very, very little. The Widener Library at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts has 19,000,000 volumes under that one roof. Who has read them all? For that matter, who has read all the books in their local town library? Come to think of it, most people have not even read all of the books they have on their own library shelves in their own homes. We know so very little. But, once again, every act of obedience brings into proximity all the benefits of Omniscience.

In the Incarnation, we see embodied in Christ a model of obedience to the Father. This is made explicit in the Kenosis passage in Philippians 2.5-11, and believers in Christ are instructed "Have this attitude in yourselves which was also in Christ". Furthermore, in the Upper Room Discourse Jesus instructed His disciples to do the very things they saw Him do. Christians are called to emulate what they see Jesus did and this is to be manifested in many ways: proclamation of the Gospel message of the reconciling love of God and the forgiveness of sins. Also, Christians are to show compassion to the infirm, the poor, the marginalized, the alien in the land, those who suffer in anyway. Since the meeting of human needs was never separated from the preaching of the Gospel, obedient Christians will seek to do both. To separate these things from each other is like asking which wing of an airplane is most important: the right one, or the left. Of course, it takes both wings for the plane to fly. The Gospel having touched a life must follow in ministry to others. On the other hand, service and addressing matters of injustice may change a society for a brief time, but lasting change comes through the transformed hearts of the people. All of this is captured in the obedience modelled by Christ.

4. S. Kierkegaard on the Incarnation

For Kierkegaard the Incarnation was the pivotal point of his thought right through his writing corpus and from which he developed some particular concepts he focussed upon during his writing. He obviously oscillates between two poles – Socratic reasoning and a characteristic Christian concept. They form the dialectical and conceptual basis for understanding existence in terms of the individual in all spheres of human life. One of these is a philosophical concept of truth and the other we could label as the theology of salvation. He simultaneously opens his themes of correspondence between these two viewpoints and unites them again in the world of logical theory and epistemology on the one hand and the world of soteriology on the other. With masterful skill Kierkegaard achieves the level of handling this task in a way that the reader finds it hard to recognize and decode the perception of reality of the author himself, which is hidden under various pseudonyms.

Kierkegaard deals with the Incarnation in a hidden way by using metaphors, stories and terms like 'absolute paradox or God-man relationship in order to set a proper space for rigorous philosophical reasoning, humorous indirect communication and ethical challenges. For example, in the parable about the King of love and his love for a poor maiden Climacus presents God's

love which initiates, actualizes and accomplishes an 'absolute paradox' for man's eternal salvation. In this parable God in time does not save man by raising him *above*, but he comes *down* to man to save him, which is the vertical dimension of salvation as defined by Climacus, historically actualized in God's incarnation in a human body. There is the "absolute relationship between God and His acts" and his *essentia involvit existentiam*, Jesus Christ as "crucified God" [8] becomes man's Saviour.

The redemption is thus for Kierkegaard complete, sufficient and eternal as well as existentially phenomenological in time as it "makes man man" [8, p. 244]. It is impossible to overlook his deep biblical knowledge behind his reasoning and the dominance of the Gospel when searching for a relevant existential application for single individual. Even the centrality of 'a single individual' in his perceptive approaches to many aspects of human life somehow correlates with the importance of an individual being as *Imago Dei*. Man, according to Kierkegaard always approaches life as a single individual and therefore only when he leaves the masses and becomes an individual can he meet the truth about himself and surrounding reality. He has to, however, want it and desire it. In this process, it is essential and necessary that man make a decision and it cannot be a one-off decision, but it has to be a recurring one.

Kierkegaard claims that Christianity is a historical phenomenon and therefore it is an objective fact. He struggles with the fact that God is an invisible timeless being while man is not. Hence, he deals with epistemological horizons on the human side when thinking about a direct or indirect relationship with God. "God in time" became "equal to man" [8, p. 62] and came into the world as man to "enable man to learn about God" (man is not able to learn about God by himself, and that is why he needs help from the external world). The historical event of the incarnation has for Kierkegaard a transhistorical meaning in the sense of helping man, and here the situation occurs when man cannot completely understand, because it is not possible to invert *absolute unlikeness into absolute likeness*. Under the pseudonym of Climacus, Kierkegaard presents a 'double paradox', which has a negative aspect in the absolute difference between man and God regarding sin and the positive aspect in the fact that the difference is to be absolutely annulled by the absolute similarity between man and God [8, p. 61-63]. The historical event of the incarnation of Jesus Christ as the epicentre of a 'double paradox', however from an individual's point of view also bears a different paradox – historically it is an objective certainty (the what) and in the individual's relation to eternity it is an absolute uncertainty (the how).

5. Consequential Love and Obedience under the arch of Truth

For Kierkegaard the priority is the relationship to God and consequently his commandments become the primary stimulus for the activities of man. If man has a knowledge of God, he gets to know how he should be guided – and then one will have put into one's life „substance and truth and durability" [9].

Kierkegaard gets himself into a paradoxical situation in which he refuses cognition and prefers action, but at the same time cognition or rather knowledge of God becomes the point of departure for the action of an individual. Man is obliged to love the truth and „in love of the truth and humanity to will to make any sacrifice in order to proclaim the truth and, on the other hand, to will not to sacrifice the least bit of the truth." [9, p. 366] For Kierkegaard the truth is therefore the highest entity facing which man must not give in to and must renounce „this selfish or cowardly and timorous hankering after the winning of the approval of other people – as if it were the approval of others that decides whether something is true or not" [9, p. 366-367].

Kierkegaard's reflections on the truth in his *Works of Love* oscillate around the central motif formed by the practical consequences in the life of an individual who is attached to love. Kierkegaard openly appeals to man in the category of duty if he is to prove his relationship to the truth (God) by works of love – i.e. practically. Love perceived like this becomes the intersection of a horizontal line with a vertical line. Only then will the works of love be authentic and truthful. This is also the reason why Kierkegaard again stresses the choice which one is faced with at any given moment. The choice is for him also the very solution to the dilemma of man who wants to live, but also faces the limits of his own rationality.

This choice determines not only his deed, but consequently also his „state of being", his love of his neighbour, of God. With reason's help it is „truth and deception in equilibrium which balances the opposite possibilities" that are placed before man [9, p. 227]. Being in equilibrium, it can become apparent how and according to what man will reason and act – i.e. what is his essential personal character after all. The decision of man is here seen in a dialectical relationship to his rational capacities which are limited as concerns the truth and life in the truth. Kierkegaard stresses the obedience and subordination of man to God in his relationship to truth. The concept of *obedience* opens wider anthropological perspectives than the 'free choice' of an individual. It contains the dimension of decision, but overcomes it in a dialectical relationship to „duty', which is the challenge to act.

When elaborating on obedience in the life of a single individual Kierkegaard turns back to the Absolute paradox. Kierkegaard analyses Christ's sufferings and his obedience to God: „in the fullness of time he learned obedience from what he suffered" and despite this „what he suffered when he came to his own nation and they did not recognize him, when he went around in the lowly form of a servant" [10]. Kierkegaard contrasts the suffering of Jesus and the fact that he is the truth. „Vinegar could not have been a more acid drink for the Holy One than the scatterbrained attention of the idlers and nauseating sympathy of inquisitiveness when one *is the Truth*!" [10, p. 254] In the part of this work entitled *The Joy of It That in Relation to God a Person Always Suffers as Guilty* Kierkegaard solves the problem of truth as a testimony of man: „When we hear a beautiful, edifying, gripping true saying, we usually also ascertain who said it, on what occasion, and in what situation" [10, p. 264]. He

warns that „a true saying that does not have its truth in the speaker is disheartening, like a blessing that curses the one who is blessing“ [10, p. 264]. He again stresses the Hebrew unity of thought and action.

In the third part of the work *Training in Christianity* Christ is presented in connection with the truth as follows: „'From on high', for when he walked on earth in lowliness, he certainly wanted to draw all to himself. He called them to himself, all those who laboured and were burdened; he went to those who were sick and sorrowful. But he also had something else to carry out: he himself had to express the truth through his own life, he himself had to portray what is to be truth, and as truly human he consequently had this something else as his task – to accomplish this himself. So he had something to accomplish himself; he himself learned from what he suffered, learned obedience. He – to speak altogether humanly and certainly justifiably about true man – he was developed to become and to be the truth." [11] Christ as the truth becomes a universal principle touching all people in the sense that the truth is potentially accessible – accordingly from the outlook of an individual; and also in the current sense – because Christ as the truth has realized himself in real life and in the world.

Kierkegaard refuses to reduce Christianity to a mere doctrine – which he counts as a „monstrous mistake" [11, p. 206]. In that way Kierkegaard responds to the Christianity of his times which has been transformed into doctrine and from which the practical life had departed. Kierkegaard compares the Christianity of his times with original biblical Christianity where „all the expressions were formed according to the view that truth is a being" [11, p. 206]. Kierkegaard turns his attention to the relationship of man to God from the point of view of an individual: „It is surely easy enough to perceive that it is a lie, deceit, and sin to want to admire in relation to Christ – or what amounts to the same thing, to want to admire adoringly – instead of imitating him" [11, p. 243]. Kierkegaard demands imitation – practical life in which man through his deeds demonstrates his affiliation to Christianity [12-17]. Thus, he opens the room for the cognitive dimension of an individual's existence as related to metaphysical truth in such a way where man is able to find God even without the help of ecclesiastical institutions [18-22].

6. Conclusions

Although the two thinkers of C.S. Lewis and S. Kierkegaard lived and acted at different times and socio-cultural contexts, the biblical story of the incarnate God in the form of man became a powerful source of inspiration for their works. If Lewis perceives the incarnation of Christ rather as a metaphysical phenomenon that opens up the human face of the panorama of the perception of the world and its place within it, for Kierkegaard, the incarnation of Christ is an absolute paradox in which he presents the limits of human rationality and the boundaries of man's cognitive capacities as well as the potentialities of personal development. Lewis seeks an apologetic justification for the incarnation 'from the outside,' while Kierkegaard in finds in the

incarnation the key argument for human movement 'from within,' while both authors perceive ethical implications for human life as rising out of the Son of God's incarnation. The existential attitude of obedience to God is, in both cases, the basis of ethical frameworks in which one finds the proportionate origins of relation to himself and his neighbours. Here Lewis and Kierkegaard see the necessary presumption of the positive future formation of society.

Acknowledgement

This paper was created with the support of the international project ZML-2017/1-508:191006 – KIERKEGAARD'S ETHICS AND ITS MEANING FOR SOCIETY.

References

[1] C.S. Lewis, *Miracles: A Preliminary Study*, The Centenary Press, London, 1947, 21-22.
[2] C.S. Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, William Collins, London, 2016, 259-264.
[3] C.S. Lewis, *George MacDonald: An Anthology, with an Introduction by C. S. Lewis*, Geoffrey Bles, London, 1970, 42.
[4] C.S. Lewis, *A Preface to Paradise Lost*, Oxford University Press, London, 1942, 10.
[5] C.S. Lewis, *C.S. Lewis: Letters to Children*, L.W. Dorsett & M. Lamp Mead (eds.), Macmillian Publishing Company, New York, 1985, 72.
[6] G.K. Chesterton, *Orthodoxy*, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1986, 258-259.
[7] G.K. Chesterton, *'Fairy Tales' All Things Considered*, Sheed and Ward, London, 1955, 95-96.
[8] S. Kierkegaard, *Philosophical Fragments or a Fragment of Philosophy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1967, 404.
[9] S. Kierkegaard, *Works of Love*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1998, 118.
[10] S. Kierkegaard, *Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2009, 253-254.
[11] S. Kierkegaard, *Practice in Christianity*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1991, 181-182.
[12] R. Králik, Xlinguae, **10(3)** (2017) 37-44.
[13] P. Kondrla and R. Králik, Konštantínove Listy, **9(2)** (2016) 95.
[14] R. Králik and S. J. Tinley, Komunikácie, **19(1)** (2017) 26-27.
[15] M. Valčo, Eur. J. Sci. Theol., **13(1)** (2017) 47-58.
[16] R. Králik, Eur. J. Sci. Theol., **13(1)** (2017) 25-34.
[17] C. Turčan,, Eur. J. Sci. Theol., **13(1)** (2017) 5-13.
[18] P. Kondrla and L. Török, Eur. J. Sci. Theol., **13(1)** (2017) 79-86.
[19] M. Ambrózy, R. Králik and J. G. Martin, Xlinguae, **13(4)** (2017) 6.
[20] M. Štúr and K. Mitterpach, Eur. J. Sci. Theol., **13(1)** (2017) 35-46.
[21] P. Kondrla and P. Repar, Komunikacie, **19(1)** (2017) 21-23.
[22] D. Hajko, Komunikacie, **19(1)** (2017) 64-68.