Sergij Golovashchenko
Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, National University of Kiev Mohyla Academy, Ukraine

THE EUROPEAN TRADITION OF BIBLICAL STUDIES AS A PLATFORM OF RELIGIOUS AND CULTURAL PLURALISM: THE EXPERIENCE OF KYIV THEOLOGICAL ACADEMY (the Second Half of the 19th – the Beginning of the 20th Century)

While contemplating the substance and title of this compilation, we could not but pay the due tribute to the role that the European Civilization played in establishing and fostering cultural and religious pluralism. Current developments take root in one hundred (or more) years old events and processes. The plurality of cultural and religious worlds, which coexist in Europe, has always been tied to the recognition of multiple perspectives on God, God's word, the universe, the human being, and the methods and ways of understanding the reality as an inherent right of any individual.

That is why, any experience (even the oldest one) resulting from the encounter of various theological, philosophical and methodological positions is interesting to us. Such encounter is particularly important when different sides make efforts to comprehend and explore the common treasure and common legacy. Biblical studies, which became especially intensive in the second half of the 19th and continued at the beginning of the 20th century, and the role of representatives of the Kyiv ecclesiastical school (tradition) in these studies, are illustrious examples of this process as discussed in this article.

The second half of the 19th century opened a new page in the history of integration of Kyiv Theological Academy into the European context, both cultural and intellectual. The Eastern Orthodox academic environment began to incorporate itself into the cultural, confessional and methodological environment that was taking shape in Europe at that time. As a result, it had significantly broadened the perspective

for the understanding and incorporating of the world, and particularly Christian, spiritual and cultural heritage.

The historical encounter of the Kyiv academic theological school and the world biblical studies appeared to be most intensive in the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. The development of Western biblical studies based on principles of rationality and liberal theology proved to be a special test for the Eastern Orthodox Christianity. The Orthodox tradition was faced with a practical challenge of pinpointing its inner conflicts and developing its own productive approaches. Such self-awareness of the Orthodox biblical school specifically implied a critical reflection of philosophical and theological foundations that served the basis for the formation and development of the sources which the Orthodox tradition had to objectively utilize to ensure its own evolution. In our previous research, we have demonstrated that such self-reflection indeed took place in the works of a range of biblical scholars – professors of Kyiv Theological Academy (KThA)[1]. We would like to present and review certain aspects of this reflection. The objectives of this research include the following: to outline and structure the sources; to present the key theoretical standpoints with regard to the Western biblical studies and exegesis; and to define common features and key conceptual points in the critique and reception by domestic biblical scholars.

The following publications appear to be the most informative for this research:

– fragments of works by S.M. Solskyi on the history of European biblical studies[2], exceptionally well written, based on the then available Western sources;

– annual bibliographic reviews of foreign biblical studies, which were compiled between 1882 and 1888 (mainly by A.S. Tsarevskyi), 1898-1901, and in 1905 (by V.P. Rybinskyi and A.A. Glagolev)[3];

---

[1] See, e.g. S.I. Golovashchenko. *Bibleistychna problematyka v Akademii u 1861-1914 rr (za publikatsiyamy v «Trudakh KDA» – TKDA)* "Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA" 35:2004 p. 51-60; also a recent article on S.M. Solskyi's historical-isagogic and historical-exegetic studies, which should be published soon in the next issue of "The Kyiv Academy Almanac".

[2] S.M. Solskyi. *Kratkiy ocherk istorii sviaschennoy bibliologii i ekzegetiki.* TKDA 1866 issue 10 p. 157, 169-175; issue 11 p. 327, 334-335; issue 12 p. 470-473, 478-481, 486, 488-494, 499, 500-501, 502-505; idem. *Iz chteniy po Vetkhomu Zavetu. Glava 1. Istoriya nauki po Vetkhomu Zavetu* TKDA 1870, vol. 3 issue 9, p. 590-592, 593-601; idem. *Iz lektsyi po Novomu Zavetu* TKDA 1877 vol. 3 issue 8 p. 244, 246, 248-255.

[3] A.S. Tsarevskiy. *Bibleyskaya literatura istekshego goda na zapade. Vetkhiy Zavet.* TKDA 1882 issue 4 p. 341-354; idem. *Bibleyskaya literatura istekshego goda na zapade.*

– opinions and critical reviews of works of foreign biblical scholars by KThA professors, featuring attempts to critically analyze the rationalistic Protestant biblical tradition and review the experience generated by biblical studies of the orthodox apologetic tradition[4];

Novyi Zavet. TKDA 1882 issue 10 p. 206-220; idem. *Bibleyskaya literatura istekshego goda na zapade. Vetkhiy Zavet.* TKDA 1883 issue 9 p. 109-122; idem. *Bibleyskaya literatura istekshego goda na zapade. Novyi Zavet.* TKDA 1883 issue 12 p. 685-700; idem. *Bibleyskaya literatura istekshego goda na zapade. Vetkhiy Zavet.* TKDA 1884 issue 5 p. 103-123; idem. *Bibleyskaya literatura istekshego goda na zapade. Vetkhiy Zavet.* TKDA 1885 issue 4 p. 566-602; idem. *Bibleyskaya literatura istekshego goda na zapade. Novyj Zavet.* TKDA 1885 issue 11 p. 470-504; idem. *Bibleyskaya literatura istekshego goda na zapade. Vetkhiy Zavet.* TKDA 1886 issue 12 p. 675-712; idem. *Bibleyskaya literatura istekshego goda na zapade. Novyj Zavet.* TKDA 1887 issue 3 p. 425-457; idem. *Bibleyskaya literatura istekshego goda na zapade. Vetkhiy Zavet.* TKDA 1888 issue 2 p. 352-364 and issue 3 p. 436-449; V.P. Rybinskiy. *Zametki o literature po Sv. Pisaniyu Vetkhogo Zaveta za istekshiy god.* TKDA 1898 issue 3 p. 429-456 and TKDA 1899 issue 5 p. 122-144, and TKDA 1900 issue 6 p. 286-310, and TKDA 1905 vol. 2 issue 5 p. 124-146 and vol. 3 issue 11 p. 413-435; A.A. Glagolev. *Novosti nèmetskoy literatury po bibleyskoy arheologii.* TKDA 1901 issue 11 p. 466-474 and issue 12 p. 610-618.

[4] See e.g. A. Voronov. *Protestantskoe bogoslovie i vopros o bogodukhnovennosti Sv. Pisaniya.* TKDA 1864 issue 4 p. 403-447 and issue 9 p. 1-70; Kh. Orda. *Apologeticheskaya i polemicheskaya literatura na Zapade protiv sochineniya Ernesta Renana «Vie de Jesus».* TKDA 1864 issue 9 p. 71-160; A. Voronov. *Kharakteristicheskiy obraz Iisusa. Bibleyskiy opyt. soch. Danielia Shenkelia. Visbaden, 1864.* TKDA 1864 issue 10 p. 237-244; idem. *Zhizn Iisusa dlia nemeckogo naroda, obrabotannaya Shtrausom. Leipzig, 1864.* TKDA 1864 issue 10 p. 244-252; idem. *Elementarnaya i kriticheskaya istoriya Iisusa, soch. Peira. Parizh, 1864.* TKDA 1864 issue 10 p. 252-260; S.M. Solskyi. *Prorok Daniil i Apokalipsis sv. Ioanna. Sochinenie Oberlena. Perevod protoiereya A. Romanova.* TKDA 1883 issue 6 p. 365-366; V.P. Rybinskiy. *Retsenzia na F. Viguru. Rukovodstvo k chteniyu i izucheniyu Biblii. Obschedostupnyi i izlozhennyi v sviazi s noveyshimi nauchnymi izyskaniyami kurs Sv. Pisaniya. Vetkhiy Zavet. Tom 1 s illiustraciyami po pamiatnikam. Perevod sviaschennika V.V. Vorontsova. Moskva, 1897.* TKDA 1897 issue 10 p. 304-308; A.A. Glagolev. *Retsenzia na Vostochnyie obychai v bibleyskikh stranakh. G.V. Tristana. Perevod s angliyskogo V.N. Anichkovoy. Izdatelstvo Imperatorskogo Pravoslavnogo Palestinskogo Obschestva. SPb., 1900.* TKDA 1901 issue 2 p. 197-299; V.P. Rybinskiy. *K voprosu ob otnoshenii Biblii k Vavilonu (retsenziya na) H.V. Hiprecht. Die Ausgrabungen im Bel-Tempel zu Nippur. Leipzig, 1903.* TKDA 1904 issue 1 p. 46-58; D.I. Bogdashevskiy. *Retsenzii na G. S. Chamberlena «Yavlenie Khrista», perevod s nemetskogo, izdaniye tretye, SPb, 1907; I. Senderlenda, Svyaschennyie knigi Vetkhago i Novogo Zaveta. Ikh proiskhozhdenie, razvitie i harakter. SPb, 1907; E. Renana, «Zhizn Iisusa». Perevod s 19-go peresmotrennogo i popolnennogo izdaniya., SPb., 1906; Ad. Garnaka «Suschnost hristianstva». Perevod s nemetskogo, Moskva, 1906.* TKDA 1907 vol. 3 issue 9 p. 139-168; idem. *Retsenzii na knyhy M.D.Muretova pro Ernesta Renana ta yogo „Zhyttia Isusa" ta Ad. Garnaka pro Luku, avtora tretiogo Yevangeliya ta Diyan Apostolskykh, Leipzig, 1906.* TKDA 1909 vol. 3 issue 9 p. 158-60, 164-168; A.A. Glagolev. *Retsenzia na Palestina i yeyo istoriya. Shest populiarnyh lekciy professora G. fon Sodena. Perevod s nemeckogo V. Lind. Moskva. 1909. Str. VII+140.* TKDA 1910 vol. 2 is-

– a range of critical apologetic publications which, using specific biblical texts, compared the Eastern Orthodox and liberal Protestant exegetical programmes or provided critique of an entire academic theological school[5].

The development of ecclesiastical academic biblical studies as historical and theological studies, conducted by the KThA professors, has shaped an original thematic, stylistic and personal character of reflection on the Western biblical studies and theology. The nature and overall streamline of this reflection has been determined, among other things, by the social status of Kyiv professors both as official theologians and educated professionals who were thoroughly familiar with the European sources in their field. The prevalence of apologetic and didactical objectives predetermined the specific nature of philosophic and theoretical reflection on the West. The search for ways to improve the teaching of biblical knowledge based on the official Orthodox principles has uniquely displayed itself here due to the inevitable philosophic and theoretical interaction with Western European scholars. The following fundamental statement reflects it well:

> The fears that the critical study of the books of the Holy Bible might only be damaging to the discovery of their positive sides, is hardly justified. Conscious perception of their positive sides is in fact only possible through a fundamental academic analysis of existing negative criticism addressing them[6].

There is another illustrative methodological imperative voiced by one of the leading KThA biblical scholars:

---

sue 10 p. 306-308; D.I. Bogdashevskiy. *Retsenzia na knyzhku Adolfa Deismanna «Svitlo zi Shodu» Novyi Zavit ta novovidkryti teksty ellinsko-rymskogo svitu. Tübingen, 1909.* TKDA 1911 vol. 1 p. 294-298.

[5] See e.g. F. Vinogradov. *Novaya tubingenskaya shkola.* TKDA 1863 issue 6 p. 173-226; issue 7 p. 317-360; issue 9 p. 62-127; A. Olesnitskiy. *Kniga Pesni Pesney i yeyo noveyshiye kritiki.* TKDA 1881 issue 4 p. 367-451; issue 5 p. 45-77; issue 7 p. 255-323; issue 12 p. 405-465; TKDA 1882 issue 1 p. 1-44; issue 3 p. 171-201; issue 6 p. 190-207; issue 9 p. 3-51; idem. *Kniga Pritchey Solomonovykh i ee noveyshyie kritiki.* TKDA 1883 Issue 11 p. 333-395; issue 12 p. 535-616; S.M. Solskiy. *Kakov mozhet byt sostav nauchnyh vvedeniy v knigi Sv. Pisanija v nastoyascheye vremya?* TKDA 1887 issue 3 p. 358-376; D.I. Bogdashevskiy. *O Yevangeliyakh i yevangelskoy istorii (protiv sovremennogo ratsionalizma). Publichnoye chteniye.* TKDA 1902 issue 2 p. 269-302; V.P. Rybinskiy. *Bibleyskaya vetkhozavetnaya kritika.* TKDA 1908 vol. 3 issue 12 p. 575-613; D.I. Bogdashevskiy. *Kriticheskie etyudy po Novomu Zavetu.* TKDA 1908 vol. 1 issue 4 p. 477-511; TKDA 1909 vol. 3 issue 11 p. 353-80.

[6] TKDA 1887 vol. 1 issue 3 p. 360 f.

> Most of them [biblical study issues] should be addressed from the historical perspective and not in the sense [...] of a thorough critical historical review of biblical books as historical religious writings but in the sense of their *congruence for the purpose of verifying the truthfulness* [emphasis added] of certain theological statements with regard to biblical books[7].

The academic research of the Bible, as a tool of apologetic reasoning of testimonies provided by the Church tradition, has not only become a general expression of faithfulness to the Eastern Orthodoxy but also a timely response of Orthodox researches to the wide scale rationalistic transformation of European biblical studies. This transformation, starting from the mid-18th century, "turned the holy codex of biblical writings into a regular compilation of selected religious writings"[8]. Biblical writings were viewed as "nothing more and nothing less than historical memorials of religious inspiration" and the method applied to them was "the same as the one normally applied to ancient literary memorials". Therefore, the link between various pieces of information from history, literature, archaeology and other sciences was searched for "in a purely historical context [...] which disregarded any other ecclesial perception of the holy books"[9]. As the result, the study of biblical books has become a study of historical writings where the books of the Bible "were interpreted as common writings which differ from other pieces of literature only by their religious character and content"[10]. Therefore, the rationalistic movement in the Protestant theology has begun as a comparison of biblical writings and classical literature by approaching biblical studies as a branch of literary history and by applying respective critical techniques to biblical books[11]. The second half of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century, therefore, witnessed "an overwhelming triumph of rationalism [...] Einhorn, Herder [...] and many other rationalists, encyclopaedists and humanists [...]. Numerous interpreters and critics of the holy books were raised under the harmful influence of such thinkers in the late 18th and early 19th centuries"[12]. A powerful trend of critical rationalist works was formed in European biblical studies[13].

---

7 Ibid. p. 369.
8 Ibid. p. 363.
9 Ibid. p. 365.
10 Ibid. p. 366.
11 TKDA 1877 vol. 3 issue 8 p. 249, 271 f.
12 Ibid. p. 495 f.
13 TKDA 1870 issue 9 p. 598 f.

The European, primarily German, theology and biblical studies were inseminated by the German classical philosophy, prompting the rise of new rationalist theories of D. Strauss and F.Ch. Baur, the founder of the new Tübingen school, which "levelled the divine revelation down to a historical phenomenon"[14], and giving birth to the radical and so-called "negative" biblical criticism. The Hegelian pathos of systemic creationism and perspective on the history as the process of emerging and developing ideas had a decisive impact on the methodological paradigm of new Tübingenians[15]. While preserving the main critical rationalistic message of their tradition, "downgrading all the wonderful biblical stories to the level of commonplace events", Baur's followers had considerably softened the critical pathos of their teacher and his schematic approach to the study of the Holy Bible[16].

Along with Baurian and post-Baurian trends, one more tendency should be mentioned in the liberal theological tradition in the second half of the 19th century. It includes E. Reuss, K.H. Graf, W. Vatke, J. Wellhausen, who represented the documentary theory in the study of the origin of the Pentateuch. The conceptual impact of Schleiermacher and especially Hegel had predetermined such aspects of their academic outlook and methodological paradigm as: emphasizing the primacy of sentiment in religion; introducing analysis of "general historical prerequisites" in the research of the biblical text; adhering to the principle that religious forms undergo development and go through certain historical stages; viewing prophetism as the highest development stage of the Old Testament religion; and introducing Hegelian dialectical triad for the reconstruction of historical processes. At the same time, they continued the trend of critical historical analysis of the Bible, which originated in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The range of problems articulated by these scholars and theologians has defined the direction of academic debate in European biblical studies for many decades onwards.

Both the new Tübingen school and Wellhausen's school influenced E. Renan who "promoted the results of negative Protestant criticism" from quite syncretic philosophical and methodological positions[17]. His historical literary reconstructions of the Gospel and Early Christian history, translated into Russian at the beginning of the 20th century, were

[14] TKDA 1866 issue 12 p. 497 f.
[15] TKDA 1877 vol. 3 issue 8 p. 274 f.
[16] TKDA 1866 issue 12 p. 501 f.
[17] TKDA 1877 vol. 3 issue 8 p. 282.

criticized by Orthodox academic researchers, including those from Kyiv. For instance, comments by the KMA professor D.I. Bogdashevskyi on the Russian translation of Renan's *Life of Jesus* reflected not so much the academic as social and even political interest attached to this work in the Russian Empire in the first decade of the 20th century[18].

The ethicized and introverted perception of religious concepts and hyperbolized interpretation of academic potential in providing arguments and proofs of theological postulations featured in the works of A. Harnack. The use of critical academic instruments for analysis of Church narration and application of methods and tools of academic research and systematization of knowledge in biblical studies coincided with the rise of the so called "academic historical theology" and "liberal Christology". This had also predetermined the critical pathos of Orthodox researchers for decades (from the 1880s to the early 20th century).

The liberal and negative biblical criticism was effectively confronted by the so-called rational supranatural trend in the early 19th century, established by F. Schleiermacher. Schleiermacher's paradigm had an impact on positions of a great number of well-known Church historians and biblical exegetes of the 19th century. In fact, Schleiermacher's followers, who "did not share the Protestant Church's perspective but without distancing themselves from it too much"[19] represented the biblical studies and exegesis of "quite a moderate trend which counterbalanced extreme impulses of rationalism"[20].

The second trend is represented by the so-called dogmatic school which was apologetic in nature[21], and determined the views of the later orthodox oriented researchers of the mid and second half of the century, who positioned themselves closer to the Protestant Churches' stance. They are known as "apologetic critics"[22] who tried to "match the apologetic character with the modern structure of academic studies"[23]. The so-called historical and grammatical approach was the third trend. Regardless of the Church teaching and biased philosophical theories, it sought to understand the Christian doctrine in its historical and "objective" sense. It was noted that the representatives of this trend had

---

18 TKDA 1907 vol. 3 issue 9 p. 148-151.

19 TKDA 1866 issue 12, p. 500; TKDA 1870 issue 9 p. 599; TKDA 1877 vol. 3 issue 8 p. 273.

20 TKDA 1877 vol. 3 issue 8 p. 280.

21 TKDA 1866 issue 12 p. 499.

22 TKDA 1870 issue 9 p. 599 f.

23 TKDA 1877 vol. 3 issue 8 p. 280-284.

seriously transformed old rationalistic doctrines of the 18th century. By giving credit "to the historical data contained in the biblical text, representatives of this trend straightforwardly softened the rational arbitrariness in biblical exegetics"[24]. This is how the trend of historical criticism was formed in its substance, though it denied extreme opinions[25].

The distinguished trends in the totality of critical bibliographic publications of the 1880s and the first decade of the 20th century included the "apologetic" ("orthodox" or "conservative") and "critical" approaches ("biased criticism", "negative criticism", "plainly rationalist perspective"). Some works were described as "the middle trend"[26].

The issue of applying the principle of historical evolutionism and methods of historical criticism to determining the origin, authorship and historical authenticity of biblical books, primarily the Pentateuch, was one of the most prominent points of debate in the 1880s. The problem for Orthodox researchers was manifold: the preference was often given to non-biblical information; the historical authenticity of biblical writings was questioned under the influence of the "Old Testament critical school"[27]. In addition, because the rationalist Reuss-Graf-Wellhausen's documentary theory of the Pentateuch's origin asserted the primacy of prophetism and prophetic texts over legislative texts, it also affected the research of prophetic books of the Old Testament.

One more dimension of this debate was concerned with the possibility of rational verification of biblical texts using the data of specific sciences, including Egyptology, Assyriology, astronomy, geology and comparative mythology. One of the key discussions centred around the issue of whether the biblical stories about the creation of the world could be considered as historical and scientific[28]. All this has raised a steady interest of Kyiv observers and reviewers who constantly tried to spotlight examples in the Western works to illustrate the clash between "spiritualistic" views and "naturalistic criticism" perspective on the Bible history, and examples of traditional apologetic resistance to "trendy" rationalistic theories[29].

---

[24] TKDA 1866 issue 12 p. 500 f.

[25] TKDA 1877 vol. 3 issue 8 p. 275.

[26] See e.g. TKDA 1882 vol. 1 issue 4 p. 341, 349; TKDA 1883 vol. 3 issue 9 p. 109, 113; TKDA 1884 vol. 2 issue 5 p. 108; TKDA 1885 vol. 3 issue 11 p. 478, 492; TKDA 1900 vol. 2 issue 6 p. 287 f.

[27] TKDA 1886 vol. 3 issue 12 p. 694; TKDA 1890 issue 1 p. 61-98.

[28] TKDA 1898 issue 3 p. 289-329; TKDA 1903 issue 5 p. 1-29.

[29] TKDA 1882 vol. 1 issue 4 p. 341-346, 348, 350; TKDA 1883 vol. 3 issue 9 p. 109, 111-117; TKDA 1884 vol. 2 issue 5 p. 107-110; TKDA 1885 vol. 1 issue 4 p. 576-579, 580-

Ultimately it was admitted that "in order to address the complex issue of the Pentateuch, it is necessary to research the whole cultural history of Semitic antiquity"[30]. As to the problem of the divine inspiration, an indicative statement was made at the beginning of the 20th century after several decades of long lasting debates:

> New discoveries which made it necessary to review the content of the Bible, and new views on the origin and content of Old Testament books, raised the question about the divine inspiration of the Holy Bible. [...] It remains current as we still have no clear answer to this question[31].

The New Testament studies, which were conducted abroad during the examined period, revealed similar trends. For many decades, Orthodox researchers opposed the views that evolved as part of the new Tübingen school and developed in various forms until the beginning of the 20th century. The debated issues, important for the New Testament scholars in terms of establishing the authenticity and the divine inspiration of the New Testament text (similar to the Pentateuch issue in the Old Testament), included the origins and authorship of the Gospels, Book of Acts and Epistles, their authenticity, and historical accuracy of their contents[32].

The speculations by radical representatives of biblical criticism about a decisive impact of Eastern doctrines, specifically Buddhism, on the New Testament writings may be considered somewhat exotic[33]. In their time, such attempts laid the foundation for the comparative religious study of the biblical tradition. Simultaneously, in the early 20th century, we observed the sprouts of structuralist approach[34] and efforts of psychological reconstruction which still need to be examined more thoroughly[35].

Therefore, the comparison of traditional and rationalistic methodological paradigms became an important component of Kyiv theological

---

591; TKDA 1886 vol. 3 issue 12 p. 682, 687-689, 694 f., 698-708; TKDA 1898 vol. 1 issue 3 p. 430, 437 f., 441; TKDA 1905 vol. 2 issue 5 p. 124, 127-129, 132, 134-139, 140-146; issue 11 p. 414, 418-420, 423-425.

30 TKDA 1898 vol. 1 issue 3 p. 442 f.

31 TKDA 1905 vol. 2 issue 5 p. 130.

32 TKDA 1882 vol. 3 issue 10 p. 208 f., 211, 215 f.; issue 12 p. 688, 689 f., 694 f., 698 f.; TKDA 1884 vol. 3 issue 12 p. 577-585; TKDA 1885 vol. 3 issue 11 p. 477-491, 492-494; TKDA 1887 vol. 1 issue 3 p. 431-433, 435, 442, 448-454; TKDA 1907 vol. 3 issue 9 p. 139 f., 142 f., 152.

33 TKDA 1882 vol. 3 issue 12 p. 685; TKDA 1885 vol. 3 issue 11 p. 494.

34 TKDA 1882 vol. 3 issue 10 p. 213.

35 TKDA 1905 vol. 2 issue 11 p. 416 f.

academic biblical studies beginning from the 1860s. Most receptivity occurred in such areas as textology and the study of biblical languages[36], biblical archaeology[37], apologetic biblical exegesis and countering the rationalistic negative criticism[38], and biblical encyclopaedias[39]. In these areas we have observed the emergence of critical comparison of traditional and academic rationalistic methodologies, reflection on biblical criticism, and even attempts to positively evaluate its heuristic importance[40].

These processes were taking place in the "axial time" when the focal issues in biblical studies were defined for more than a century ahead, and various theories, schools and trends were taking shape and competed with each other. For the Eastern Orthodox biblical studies, those were the first attempts to collate the inherent allegiance to the Orthodox dogmatic and cultural tradition and integration into the European and global spiritual and intellectual dimension.

The article offers an overview of major evaluations made by professors of Kyiv Academy with regard to the impact which philosophy had on the Western European bibliology and exegetics. The European biblical studies of the 19th and early 20th centuries, methodologically influenced by the then prevalent philosophical schools, had seriously facilitated the use of academic methods and techniques for search and systematization of knowledge in biblical research. The article also reviews efforts by Orthodox researchers of the Bible to critically compare the traditional Church and rationalist academic methodologies, and even positively evaluate the cognitive importance of the rationalistic biblical criticism.

---

[36] TKDA 1882 vol. 1 issue 4 p. 354; vol. 3 issue 10 p. 219 f.; issue 12 p. 699 f.; TKDA 1884 vol. 2 issue 5 p. 103-107; issue 12 p. 559 f.; TKDA 1885 vol. 1 issue 4 p. 556; vol. 3 issue 11 p. 470-473; TKDA 1887 vol. 1 issue 3 p. 425-430; TKDA 1898 vol. 1 issue 3 p. 433-437.

[37] TKDA 1882 vol. 1 issue 4 p. 353; TKDA 1885 vol. 1 issue 4 p. 579 f.; TKDA 1900 vol. 2 issue 6 p. 299.

[38] TKDA 1882 vol. 1 issue 4 p. 348-349; vol. 3 issue 10 p. 211, 218; TKDA 1882 vol. 3 issue 12 p. 694 f.; TKDA 1883 vol. 3 issue 9 p. 114-11; TKDA 1885 vol. 3 issue 11 p. 494 f.; TKDA 1886 vol. 3 issue 12 p. 700-705; TKDA 1898 vol. 1 issue 3 p. 430 f., 440 f.; TKDA 1905 vol. 2 issue 5 p. 124-146; TKDA 1907 vol. 3 issue 9 p. 152; TKDA 1909 vol. 3 issue 9 p. 168; TKDA 1910 vol. 3 issue 10 p. 307.

[39] TKDA 1900 vol. 2 issue 6 p. 286-288.

[40] TKDA 1902 issue 10 p. 300-331; issue 11 p. 490-541.

PLURALIZM KULTUROWY I RELIGIJNY WSPÓŁCZESNEGO ŚWIATA

Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana
Księdzu Profesorowi
Henrykowi Zimoniowi SVD
w 70. rocznicę urodzin

Redakcja
Zdzisław Kupisiński SVD
Stanisław Grodź SVD

Wydawnictwo KUL
Lublin 2010

Opracowanie redakcyjne i komputerowe
Antoni Fetkowski

Opracowanie ilustracji
Jarosław Bielecki

Projekt okładki i stron tytułowych
Patrycja Czerniak

ISBN 978-83-7702-105-7

Wydawnictwo KUL
ul. Zbożowa 61, 20-827 Lublin
tel. 81 740-93-40, fax 81 740-93-50
e-mail: wydawnictwo@kul.lublin.pl
http://wydawnictwo.kul.lublin.pl

Druk i oprawa
elpil
ul. Artyleryjska 11
08-110 Siedlce
e-mail: info@elpil.com.pl

Teologia