Waldemar Linke

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
waldemarlinke@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0001-9800-5341

Verbum abbreviatum and *silentium Dei* in Benedict XVI's Writings and the Object and Method of Biblical Exegesis[1]

Verbum abbreviatum i *silentium Dei* u Benedykta XVI a przedmiot i metoda egzegezy biblijnej

Once, when I was giving a lecture at the university, expounding ideas I had taken over from our contemporaries, I suddenly felt like I had nothing to say, that I was standing before my students with empty hands and an empty soul.

(E. Husserl)[2]

ABSTRACT: This article deals with the development of biblical exegesis in the light of the theory of knowledge and methodology, which operates on the concepts of *verbum abbreviatum* and *silentium Dei*, which Benedict XVI caused to be included in the Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Verbum Domini*. These terms describe the object of biblical exegesis as a theological discipline. The article commences with an analysis of the use and understanding of *verbum abbreviatum* in *Verbum Domini* and continues with an addendum on the motif of *silentium Dei*. The disproportion

---

[1] Part of the article on *silentium Dei* is based on a talk entitled *The Silence of God and the Christological Interpretation of Scripture* given at the international conference Biblia Benedicti. Hermeneutical and Exegetical Legacy of Joseph Ratzinger/Benedict XVI (John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Lublin, 25–26.10.2023). The text of this talk has not been published.

[2] K. Schuhmann, *Husserl-Chronik: Denk- Und Lebensweg Edmund Husserls*, Den Haag 1977, p. 331; L. Shestov, *In Memory of a Great Philosopher: Edmund Husserl*, transl. G.L. Kline, "Russkiye Zapiski" 12 (1938), pp. 126–145, http://www.angelfire.com/nb/shestov/sar/husserl1.html [access: 5.06.2024]; cf. K. Michalski, *Logika i czas. Próba analizy Husserlowskiej teorii sensu* [Logic and Time: An Attempt to Analyse Husserl's Theory of Sense], Warszawa 1988, p. 7.

between the two corresponds to the different roles that the concepts play in the construction of the document. For *silentium Dei* is merely a supplement – as important as it is – to the theology of the Word. Together with the concept of *verbum abbreviatum* it forms the descriptive part of the article. The third part is a search for an answer to the question of what biblical exegesis deals with, and therefore what its formal object is, which leads to the fundamental epistemological problems of biblical exegesis. These are considered in the light of an analysis of the aforementioned concepts in the thought of Benedict XVI and in the document mentioned above. The phenomenological approach seeks to answer the question of what biblical exegesis is and what its methodological consequences are. The phenomenological treatment of Scripture as the object of exegesis aims to integrate the theological aspect into exegetical considerations and to show exegetical procedures as intrinsically linked to the theological interpretation of the Bible. In the methodology of Scripture exegesis, this offers the possibility of constructing a methodological project that, on the one hand, makes use of all research procedures, allows the elimination of ideological elements incorporated into the research, and, on the other hand, preserves the theological sense of exegetical research. In the last part of the article, the author analyses various attempts to frame the problem of theological exegetical method in biblical studies, and offers his proposal based on all the considerations of the topic.

ABSTRAKT: Artykuł prezentuje możliwości rozwoju egzegezy biblijnej z punktu widzenia teorii poznania oraz metodologii, które wychodzą od dwóch pojęć – *verbum abbreviatum* i *silentium Dei* – jakie pojawiają się w adhortacji *Verbum Domini* dzięki wpływowi Benedykta XVI. Te dwa terminy są istotne dla opisania przedmiotu egzegezy biblijnej jako nauki w obszarze nauk teologicznych. Analiza użycia i rozumienia *verbum abbreviatum* w adhortacji *Verbum Domini* stanowi pierwszą część niniejszego artykułu. Druga część jest dopowiedzeniem na temat motywu *silentium Dei*. Dysproporcja między nimi odpowiada różnorodności ról, jakie pełnią w konstrukcji dokumentu. *Silentium Dei* jest bowiem ważnym, ale tylko dopowiedzeniem do teologii Słowa. Razem tworzą one opisową część artykułu. Część trzecia jest poszukiwaniem odpowiedzi na pytanie, czym zajmuje się egzegeza biblijna, a więc jaki jest jej przedmiot formalny. W ten sposób przechodzi się do zasadniczych problemów epistemologicznych egzegezy biblijnej. Rozpatrywane są one w świetle analizy wyżej wspomnianych pojęć w myśli Benedykta XVI i we wzmiankowanym dokumencie. Przyjęte podejście fenomenologiczne jest jedną z dróg prowadzących do odpowiedzi na pytanie, czym zajmuje się egzegeza biblijna, oraz metodologicznych konsekwencji tej odpowiedzi. Fenomenologiczne ujęcie Pisma Świętego jako przedmiotu egzegezy biblijnej ma na celu włączenie aspektu teologicznego do rozważań egzegetycznych oraz ukazanie zabiegów egzegetycznych jako wewnętrznie powiązanych z teologiczną interpretacją Biblii. W sferze metodologii egzegezy Pisma Świętego daje to możliwość zbudowania projektu metodologicznego, który z jednej strony wykorzysta wszystkie procedury badawcze, pozwoli wyeliminować ideologiczne elementy włączane do badań, a z drugiej strony zachowa teologiczny sens badań egzegetycznych. W ostatniej części artykułu autor analizuje różne próby ujęcia problemu teologicznej metody

egzegetycznej w badaniach biblijnych, by opierając się na dotychczasowej refleksji, przedstawić własną propozycję.

Słowa kluczowe: *Dei Verbum*, Joseph Ratzinger/Benedykt XVI, *verbum abbreviatum*, *silentium Dei*, egzegeza biblijna, metodologia egzegezy biblijnej, fenomenologia

The "abbreviated" Word of God (*Verbum Dei abbreviatum*) is a Christological formula that is neither obvious nor easy to understand today. It was recalled by Pope Benedict XVI in his homily at the 2006 Midnight Mass. He spoke of the Word of God made small in the Child born in Bethlehem and made simple and graspable to the human mind, in contrast to the word of Sacred Scripture that "had become long."[3] He further developed this thought in the Exhortation *Verbum Domini* (hereafter: VD),[4] which closed the work of the XII Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops (5–26.10.2008) on the theme: "The Word of God in the Life and Mission of the Church." He brought this issue up again in an address at the Wednesday General Audience on 16 January 2013.[5] Evidently this theme does not emerge in Benedict XVI's during his pontificate by chance. Since neither the *Instrumentum Laboris* of the XII General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops nor the *Propositiones* thereof employ the expression *verbum abbreviatum*, we can assume that the commission preparing the post-synodal exhortation drew on the idea mentioned by Benedict XVI in his 2006 Nativity homily, which he also made reference to in his 2013 catechesis. Obviously, Ratzinger was recurrently concerned with that idea, even if indirectly. The question therefore merits our attention and necessitates an investigation into the role of this concept in Christology and the epistemology of biblical exegesis.

---

[3]	Benedict XVI, *Solemnity of the Nativity of the Lord*, 24.12.2006, https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/homilies/2006/documents/hf_ben-xvi_hom_20061224_christmas.html [access: 10.06.2024]; cf. Benedictus XVI, *Homilia in solemnitatem Nativitatis Domini*, "Acta Apostolicae Sedis" 99/1 (2007), pp. 11–14, especially pp. 12–13.

[4]	Benedict XVI, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Verbum Domini*, https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20100930_verbum-domini.html [access: 10.06.2024]; cf. Benedictus XVI, Adhortatio Apostolica Postsynodalis *Verbum Domini*, "Acta Apostolicae Sedis" 102/11 (2010), pp. 681–787, especially pp. 692–693. See D. García Guillén, *Verbum abbreviatum*, "Facies Domini" 4 (2012), pp. 31–72, especially pp. 32–35.

[5]	Benedict XVI, *General Audience*, 16.01.2013, https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/audiences/2013/documents/hf_ben-xvi_aud_20130116.html [access: 10.06.2024].

A perusal of *Verbum Domini*, with its logocentric Christology and theology of Scripture at the centre,[6] leads one to regard paragraphs 20–21 as highly relevant to the structure of the exhortation. Without the relationship between God the Father and the Word, an essential aspect of which is God's silence as a necessary form of His manifestation in the Logos, the Christological interpretation of Scripture as a revelatory and salvific event could not be complete.

The theme of God's silence in the Logos "appears as an important expression of the Word of God" (VD 21). We will consider it in view of another theological *topos*, somewhat more developed in the exhortation, revealing the relationship of the Word incarnate in the flesh and the Word incarnate in Scripture.

The inquiry into *verbum abbreviatum* and *silentium Dei* referenced in Joseph Ratzinger's writings will offer an answer to the question of the epistemological status of biblical exegesis. The critical point of these considerations is the question of the possibility or even necessity of placing these terms in a theological context. One must simply find out: Is biblical exegesis a branch of theology? Is the knowledge (understanding) that is worked out in biblical exegesis a scientific cognition? Where does it take (if it has one, because we are not yet prejudging anything) its scientific value from? Can (in case it can, then why?) the relationship of biblical exegesis to theology be considered more essential to its identity than, for example, its relationship to history, literary theory or sociology? These are questions relevant not only to biblical exegesis but to theology as a whole because we are asking what is the source of theology: is it Scripture (the written word) or rather the transmission of the church's understanding of revelation (Tradition). By asking about the epistemological status of exegesis, we want to put this age-old problem outside its perennial context. In doing so we hope to shed somewhat new light. We take as our guiding idea the statements penned by Ratzinger. "The biblical word bears witness to the revelation"[7] – he averred in one of his lectures. And, elaborating on this thought, he added: "The Bible bears witness to the revelation, and yet the concept of revelation as such goes beyond that. In practical terms, this means that a passage can signify more

---

6   J. Królikowski, *Theology of the Word of God in the Apostolic Exhortation* Verbum Domini *by Benedict XVI*, "Wrocławski Przegląd Teologiczny" 31/2 (2023), pp. 61–84, especially pp. 62–64.

7   J. Ratzinger/Benedict XVI, *God's Word. Scripture – Tradition – Office*, transl. H. Taylor, San Francisco 2008, pp. 122; cf. J. Ratzinger/Benedykt XVI, *Problem podstaw i drogi egzegezy dzisiaj* [The Problem of the Foundations and Path of Exegesis Today], [in:] J. Ratzinger/Benedykt XVI, *Słowo Boga. Pismo – Tradycja – urząd* [The Word of God. Scripture – Tradition – Office], transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2008, pp. 89–123, especially p. 120.

than its author himself was able to conceive in composing it."⁸ We ask about the nature of this "more": Is it a hermeneutical "surplus of meaning"⁹ as in Paul Ricœur's (1913–2005) theory of interpretation, or is it a (qualitatively) new fact: the unique and crucial event of the Incarnate Word that contains and transcends all the words that make up the "witness to the Revelation"? This way of looking at Scripture is reflected in *Verbum Domini*: "the word of God is given to us in sacred Scripture as an inspired testimony to revelation" (VD 18).¹⁰

The analysis of the relationship between Scripture and Tradition is highly sensitive, particularly against the backdrop of the polemics and dialogue between Catholics and Protestants; keep in mind that the lecture from which the words concerning the relationship between Revelation and the Bible are taken was given to students at the Lutheran Center for Religion and Society in New York, i.e. a Lutheran academic centre.¹¹ We can therefore assume that Ratzinger sought more than merely a Catholic interpretation of the question of the relationship of Revelation to Scripture. We, too, would like to model our approach on that of Ratzinger, which is why we do not intend to ask about confessional Catholic exegesis, but about the Christian relationship to Scripture.

That is also the reason why this article focuses attention on the epistemological status of biblical exegesis and its consequences expressed against the theological background of biblical interpretation. We refrain here from presenting the *status quaestionis*; we will refer to it in the last part of these considerations to facilitate the formulation of the answers to the questions raised.

---

⁸ J. Ratzinger/Benedict XVI, *God's Word…*, op. cit., p. 123; cf. J. Ratzinger/Benedykt XVI, *Słowo Boga…*, op. cit., p. 120. This is a 1989 publication reprinted in German in 2005 (J. Ratzinger, *Schriftauslegung im Widerstreit. Zur Frage nach Grundlagen und Weg der Exegese heute*, [in:] *Schriftauslegung im Widerstreit*, ed. J. Ratzinger, Series: Quaestiones Disputatae 117, Freiburg 1989, pp. 15–44).

⁹ P. Ricœur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*, Fort Worth, TX 1976; cf. P. Ricœur, *Teoria interpretacji: dyskurs i nadwyżka znaczenia*, transl. K. Rosner, [in:] P. Ricœur, *Język, tekst, interpretacja* [Language, Text, Interpretation], Warszawa 1989, pp. 61–187.

¹⁰ "Verbum Dei enim in sacra Scriptura nobis se tradit, ut inspirata revelationis testificatione" (Benedictus XVI, Adhortatio *Verbum Domini*, p. 700).

¹¹ P. Hünermann, T. Söding, *Introduction*, [in:] J. Ratzinger/Benedict XVI, *God's Word…*, op. cit., p. 9; cf. P. Hünermann, T. Söding, *Wstęp*, [in:] J. Ratzinger/Benedykt XVI, *Słowo Boga…*, op. cit., pp. 9–13, especially p. 11.

Verbum abbreviatum in *Verbum Domini*

In the *Verbum Domini* apostolical exhortation, the "Christology of the Word" is the theological foundation, laid, as the document says, on the phrase "the word was 'abbreviated'" (*Verbum brevians factum*, VD 12). It is emphasised that *Verbum* and *Logos* have a decidedly Christological meaning here: *Filius ipse est* Verbum, *est* Logos.[12] In particular, the humanity of Jesus related to the Word of God takes on its full meaning as the perfect realisation of the will of God the Father because Jesus Christ "knows the Father and he keeps his word [...]. In a perfect way, he hears, embodies and communicates to us the word of God" (VD 12).[13] Jesus is thus the Logos of God not only ontologically, but also through his perfect, filial obedience in the bond that exists between the Father and the Son, in the history of their relationship. Jesus Christ as the Word of God interpreted in terms of being a person (*ut Personam adesse*) "is the true light which men and women need" (VD 12).[14] It is important, therefore, for a proper understanding of the 2010 Exhortation to establish the basis of the idea of *verbum abbreviatum* both in the sources referred to in the document and in the theological writings of Joseph Ratzinger/Benedict XVI.

In presenting the origins of *verbum abbreviatum*,[15] the Exhortation draws on Origen of Alexandria (d. 254) and his work *De Principiis*,[16] written during the reign of Alexander Severus (222–235).[17] The work is not well-preserved, its

---

12   Benedictus XVI, Adhortatio *Verbum Domini*, p. 692.

13   Benedictus XVI, Adhortatio *Verbum Domini*, p. 693.

14   "Dei Verbum est lux vera, qua indiget homo" (Benedictus XVI, Adhortatio *Verbum Domini*, p. 694).

15   W. Linke, *Logos Wcielony i słowo przepowiadane. Teologia Słowa Bożego i praktyka przepowiadania słowa Bożego w „Verbum Domini", „Lumen fidei" i „Evangelii gaudium"* [Logos Incarnate and the Preached Word. The Theology of the Word of God and the Practice of Preaching the Word of God in "Verbum Domini," "Lumen Fidei" and "Evangelii Gaudium"], "Warszawskie Studia Teologiczne" 33/1 (2015), pp. 104–123, especially pp. 109–117.

16   Benedictus XVI, Adhortatio *Verbum Domini*, p. 692. cf. J. Szymik, *Syn jako hilasterion. Ekumeniczny wymiar chrystologii J. Ratzingera/Benedykta XVI* [The Son as the Hilasterion. The Ecumenical Dimension of the Christology of J. Ratzinger/Benedict XVI], "Communio." Międzynarodowy Przegląd Teologiczny 37/4 (2017), pp. 7–31, especially pp. 16–17. This clue in research on the history of the concept of *verbum abbreviatum* seems to have come from Henri de Lubac, who suggested that the author of this concept was Origen and that it was popularised in the West by St Jerome (see F. Manns, *Miscellanea: L'origine du thème 'Verbum abbreviatum'*, "Antonianum" 56/1 [1981], pp. 208–210, note 3); Origen, *De Principiis*, transl. F. Crombie, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0412.htm [access: 15.06.2024].

17   H. Pietras, *Wprowadzenie* [Introduction], [in:] Orygenes, *O zasadach* [On Principles], transl. S. Kalinkowski, Kraków 1996, pp. 5–37, especially pp. 35–36; Origen, *De Principiis*,

published text consists of parts in Greek, interspersed with additions from Latin, which makes its study difficult. In *Verbum Domini*, however, it is not quoted,[18] but paraphrased. Footnote 34 points to the Sources chrétiennes edition of Origen's work as the source text.[19] In this footnote, we find two terms intended by the authors of the document to express the idea of abbreviating the word of God[20] and to convey the sense of the adjective *abbreviatus*. These are the verbs παχύνεται or βραχύνεται with the subject ὁ λόγος. They are by no means synonymous; their meanings are very remotely related. For while the latter means 'to shorten something,' 'to make smaller,' the meaning of the former is almost antonymous. The *Greek-Polish Dictionary* edited by Zofia Abramowiczówna equates the meaning of the word παχύνω with 'to fatten,' and in the passive voice as 'to grow fat; to become fat.' The figurative meanings may imply a lack of manners, may point to coarseness, lack of education or to being crude, without finesse.[21] In this sense it occurs in the Septuagint.[22] Geoffrey

---

op. cit.; Berthold Altaner and Alfred Stuiber (*Patrologia. Życie, pisma i nauka Ojców Kościoła* [Patrology. Life, Writings and Teachings of the Fathers of the Church], transl. P. Pachciarek, Warszawa 1990, p. 292) narrow the time window in which this work was written to the years 222–230.

[18] W. Linke, *Logos Wcielony i słowo przepowiadane...*, op. cit., p. 109.

[19] Origène, *Traité des principes*, vol. 1, eds. H. Crouzel, M. Simonetti, Series: Sources chrétiennes 252, Paris 1978, pp. 126–129. Footnote 34 to *Verbum Domini* gives the page range "127–129," which means that the Latin text from the beginning of subsection eight in the second chapter of Book One, a text crucial to understanding the issue under study, is not included.

[20] A counterpart to the idea of the abbreviation of the Word is St Justin Martyr's concept of the seeds of the Logos (*logoi spermatikoi)* leading to the Full Logos (*ho pas Logos*); the concept was developed by Czesław S. Bartnik (*Historia ludzka i Chrystus. Szkice z chrześcijańskiej wizji dziejów* [Human History and Christ. Sketches from the Christian Vision of History], Katowice 1987, pp. 152–153), see J. Szymik, *Teologia Słowa Bożego* [Theology of the Word of God], [in:] *Ku mądrości teologii* [Toward the Wisdom of Theology], eds. K. Góźdź, E. Sienkiewicz, Szczecin 2008, pp. 231–236, especially pp. 234–235. The reasons why Benedict XVI preferred the *verbum abbreviatum* model can be found in J. Ratzinger, *Kościół. Pielgrzymująca wspólnota wiary* [Church. Pilgrim Community of Faith], transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2005, p. 193. See J. Szymik, *Najgłębsze pragnienie Boskiego Nauczyciela. Ekumenizm według J. Ratzingere/Benedykta XVI* [The Deepest Desire of the Divine Teacher. Ecumenism according to J. Ratzingere/Benedict XVI], "Studia Oecumenica" 13 (2013), pp. 71–90, especially pp. 85–86.

[21] Z. Abramowiczówna (ed.), *Słownik grecko-polski* [Greek-Polish Dictionary], vol. 3, Warszawa 1962, p. 458. Cf. L. Rocci, *Vocabolario greco italiano,* Firenze 1993, p. 1448; παχύνω, https://outils.biblissima.fr/fr/eulexis-web/?lemma=%CF%80%CE%B1%CF%87%CF%8D%CE%BD%CE%B5%CF%84%CE%B1%CE%B9&dict=LSJ [access: 16.06.2024].

[22] R. Mazur, R. Bogacz, *Słownik analityczny do Biblii greckiej* [Analytical Dictionary for the Greek Bible], vol. 3, π-ω, Kraków 2021, p. 1950.

W.H. Lampe, on the other hand, noted that in patristic literature the word took on the meaning of "make corporeal," which might indicate that the term's sense is close to that of incarnation. He quoted the phrase ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ μένων λόγος παχύνεται[23] from Sermon II (*On the Annunciation of the Lord*) of Sophronius of Jerusalem (d. ca. 638).[24] In the original language, the thought is expressed in a slightly more complex way: ἐντεῦθεν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος μένων θεὸς καὶ θεοῦ λόγος παχύνεται ("henceforth the Word of God remained God and the Word of God became material"). A similar statement can be found in a Greek-speaking author, John Damascene, living one century later (d. ca. 749). In his *Nativity Hymn* he wrote: ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων λόγος παχυνθεὶς σαρκὶ[25] ("in the end the Word became material as flesh"). The editor of the text in Patrologia Graeca 96 has translated the finite verb using a participle, and the whole phrase reads "in extremis Verbum inpinguatum carne." This edition also quotes a translation by Jacques de Billy de Prunay (1535–1581), known in Latin as Jacobus Billius, a Benedictine monk, abbot of l'Abbaye de Saint-Michel-en-l'Herm and l'Abbaye Notre-Dame-de-Ré (popularly known as des Châteliers) and a Christian humanist who published his translations of the writings of John of Damascus in Paris in 1577. This translator rendered this expression less literally, but with an even clearer reference to the incarnation of the Word of God: *postea hac se ipse texit*.[26] However, it is not the writings of these Byzantine authors, who straddled late antiquity and early Middle Ages, that will clarify for us the origins of the theological theme of *verbum abbreviatum*. Besides, in *On Principles* I 2,8 the fundamental problem posed by Origen was the question of how God's *substantia* and/or *subsistentia*[27] can be reflected in something other than God.

---

[23] G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961, p. 1054.

[24] Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Orationes VIII juxta editions Ant[oni]. Ballerini, Angeli Maii, Jacobi Gretseri, Franc[isci]. Combefissii, Joan[ni]. Bapt[isti]. Cotellerii, ex Actis Sanctorum Bolland[istarum]. et Bibliotheca Patrum*, [in:] *Procopii Gazaei opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*, vol. 3, Paris 1863 (PG 87, part 3), cols. 3201–3364, especially col. 3233 C.

[25] Joannes Damascenus, *Carmina et Cantica*, [in:] *Joannis Damasceni opera omnia quae extant*, vol. 3, ed. M. Lequien, Paris 1864 (PG 96), cols. 818–856, especially col. 820 C. John Damascene's *Carmen in theogoniam* was also published in the *Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum* compiled by Wilhelm von Christa and Matthaios Paranikas, Lipsiae 1871, pp. 205–209, especially p. 206, vv. 28–29.

[26] Joannes Damascenus, *Carmina et Cantica*, op. cit., col. 820 D.

[27] The notion of *substantia* seems to correspond to the term ὑπόστασις used in Heb 1:3 (which is the text referred to by Origen here). Of greater concern is the term *subsistentia*. It probably corresponds to οὐσία treated as a synonym of the first term (cf. F. Copleston, *Historia filozofii* [History of Philosophy], vol. 1: *Grecja i Rzym* [Greece and Rome], transl. H. Bednarek, Warszawa 1998, pp. 343–344; G. Reale, *Historia filozofii starożytnej* [History of Ancient Philosophy], vol. 2: *Platon i Arystoteles* [Plato and Aristotle], transl. E.I. Zieliński,

Of particular importance in this area is the role of the Son of God that Origen aimed to describe precisely.[28] Jesus Christ as the Logos and/or Wisdom of God is a figure of his essence and consequently reveals the essence of God – this is Origen's answer to the question he explored.

Origen, however, developed other interesting themes, not mentioned in *Verbum Domini*, that are worth our consideration. First and foremost, it is the idea of Jesus Christ, who speaks throughout Scripture as God's Logos.[29] This synthetic conclusion is rooted in Origen's conviction that all Scripture is a table set by Wisdom, which is to be interpreted Christologically.[30] This implies an organic (somatic) conception of Sacred Scripture, which is to be regarded as one body because of the unity of the Spirit present in it.[31] Another basis for the unity of all Scripture is the unity of the revelation given to the patriarchs, prophets and apostles, for they all know the same Christ, even if the ways of knowing Him were different: while the patriarchs, prophets knew Him in the manner of the promises, the apostles saw the fulfilment of those promises.[32] Therefore,

---

Lublin 2001, pp. 416–419). *Subsistentia* should not be interpreted here as 'existence' (*esse*). Aristotle distinguished between τὸ δὲ τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος and τὸ εἶναι ἄνθρωπον (Aristotle, *Anal. Post.*, II,7; 92b 10, see Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, ed. and transl. H. Tredennic, [in:] Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics. Topica*, eds. and transl. H. Tredennic, E.S. Forster, London–Cambridge 1960, p. 196). However, he did not use the noun as 'existence.' Cf. S. Gaworek, *Śladami istnienia. Wprowadzenie do zagadnień metafizycznych w świetle doktryny św. Tomasza z Akwinu* [Traces of Existence. Introduction to Metaphysical Issues in the Light of the Doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas], Warszawa 2022, pp. 351–356. The editors of Origen's treatise in Sources chrétiennes take a different view of this issue. In a footnote they express the belief that it was Rufinus of Aquileia who duplicated the term (Origène, *Traité des principes*, vol. 2, eds. H. Crouzel, M. Simonetti, Series: Sources chrétiennes 253, Paris 1978, p. 46, note 46).

[28] "Et uide ne forte, quoniam filus dei, qui et uerbum eius est et spientia dicitur et qui solus nouit paterm, et reuelat quibus uult, id est qui capaces uerbi ipsius et sapientiae fiunt, secundum hoc ispum, quod intelligi atque agnosci facit deum figuram substantiae uel subsistentiae eius dicatur exprimere" (Origène, *Traité des principes*, vol. 1, op. cit., p. 126). Cf. J. Zieliński, *Jerozolima, Ateny, Aleksandria. Greckie źródła pierwszych nurtów filozofii chrześcijańskiej* [Jerusalem, Athens, Alexandria. Greek Sources of the First Currents of Christian Philosophy], Wrocław 2000, pp. 248–249.

[29] M. Szram, *Wokół osoby i myśli Orygenesa* [Around the Person and Thought of Origen], Lublin 2021, p. 94 (literature in note 3).

[30] Origenes, *Commentarium in Epistolam B. Pauli ad Romanos* (8,17), [in:] *Origenis opera omnia*, vol. 4, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1862 (PG 14), cols. 837–1292, especially col. 1182 C.

[31] Origène, *Commentaire sur saint Jean*, vol. 2: *Livres VI et X*, ed. and transl. C. Blanc, Series: Sources chrétiennes 157, Paris 1970, p. 446.

[32] M. Szram, *Wokół osoby i myśli Orygenesa*, op. cit., p. 95.

in Scripture (although Origen does not make a distinction, the model for him here is the Old Testament) Wisdom, that is, Christ, is hidden (ἀποκεκρυμμένη) by means of mystery (ἐν μυστηρίῳ). This is a literal quotation from 1 Cor 2:7, except that Paul the Apostle refers to Christian preaching and the revelation given in Jesus Christ, whereas Origen refers this theological model to the Christ-wisdom relationship and Scripture. In this view, Scripture too, and not only the revealed Son of God, is that mystery through which God reveals himself and in which he is at the same time hidden. This is possible because Christ–Wisdom – Christ–Logos – and Scripture are mutually inclusive. As Mariusz Szram argues, Origen equated the Logos Incarnate with Scripture. "For Origen there are not two Logos, but only one signifying simultaneously the person of the Son of God and the Word of Scripture."[33] The allegorism of Origenes' interpretation is thus not due to the local and incidental obscurity of the Old Testament text. His first rationale for its application to the exegesis of Scripture is the conviction that the Christian hermeneutical frame of reference requires an ongoing transposition of "the letter"[34] of Scripture to its Spirit, that is, the divine power that is at work in the text when it is read Christologically. "The letter" is, for Origen, distinct from the biblical text, and should be understood rather as the incomplete – because achristological – sense of the text.[35]

It was Philo of Alexandria who first equated the Logos with God's mind.[36] Origen added a strictly Christian element to it – the incarnation of the Logos: "Son of God, though placed in the very insignificant (*brevissime*) form of a human body, in consequence of the resemblance of His works and power to the Father, showed that there was in Him an immense and invisible greatness (*magnitudinem*)."[37] Thus, the *brevitas* of the Logos employed in the passages of *On Principles* refers exclusively to the incarnation and its relationship to

---

[33] M. Szram, *Wokół osoby i myśli Orygenesa*, op. cit., pp. 102–103. He cited the material for this conclusion in notes 48–51, p. 103.

[34] The corporeal sense of Scripture is considered by Origen as not independent and sufficient, but rather as a "covering and veil of spiritual truths" (ἔνδυμα τῶν πνεθματικῶν; in Latin *uelamen spiritualium sensum*, Origène, *Traité des principes* [4.2.8], vol. 3, eds. H. Crouzel, M. Simonetti, Series: Sources chrétiennes 268, Paris 1980, p. 334 ; see the explanation in Origène, *Traité des principes*, vol. 4, eds. H. Crouzel, M. Simonetti, Series: Sources chrétiennes 269, Paris 1980, p. 191, note 71; Orygenes, *O zasadach*, op. cit., p. 344).

[35] M. Szram, *Wokół osoby i myśli Orygenesa*, op. cit., p. 105.

[36] D. Mrugalski, *Logos. Filozoficzne i teologiczne źródła idei wczesnochrześcijańskiej* [Logos. Philosophical and Theological Sources of the Early Christian Idea], Kraków 2006, pp. 139–141; M. Szram, *Wokół osoby i myśli Orygenesaes*, op. cit., p. 102.

[37] Origen, *De Principiis*, op. cit.; cf. Orygenes, *O zasadach*, transl. S. Kalinkowski, op. cit., p. 73. The Latin text reads: "Filius Dei brevissime insertus humani corporis formae ex

the manifestation of God in visible and humanly intelligible. It is a long way from here to connect this statement of Origenes with the Logos–Scripture relationship. It appears, then, that the genesis of *verbum abbreviatum* must be sought elsewhere, outside Origenes' work cited above.

Shortly after the year 252, when an epidemic was raging in North Africa,[38] Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) wrote the treatise *On the Lord's Prayer*.[39] His work was inspired, as Paul Monceaux has already noted, by Tertullian's text of the same title.[40] In paragraph 28, Cyprian pointed out a specific feature of the *Lord's Prayer*, namely, its synthetic character: in the *Lord's Prayer*, God "condensed in His teaching all our prayer in one saving sentence" (*omnem precem nostram, salutari sermone breviavit*).

This formulation has nothing to do with Christology or the theology of the Incarnation. The Bishop of Carthage had already outlined earlier in his work (beginning of paragraph 9) God's economy of condensing what is long and complex in "the Word of God" (*Dei Sermo*) and becomes short through our Lord Jesus Christ, who briefly collected everything and gave us a compendium of heavenly doctrine (*colligens* [...] *fecit grande compendium*).[41] In this argument, *sermo* simply means "word";[42] there is no reference to the Logos. Thus, Cyprian

---

operum virtutisque similitudine Dei Patris in se immensam atque invisibilem magnitudinem designabat per hoc" (Origène, *Traité des principes,* vol. 1, op. cit., p. 128).

[38] T. Kotula, *Afryka Północna w starożytności* [North Africa in Antiquity], Wrocław 1972, pp. 188–190; K. Harper, *Los Rzymu. Klimat, choroby i koniec imperium* [The Fate of Rome. Climate, Disease and the End of the Empire], transl. G. Smółka, Oświęcim 2021, pp. 159–168.

[39] P. Monceaux, *Histoire littérair de l'Afrique chrétienne depuis les origenes jusqu'a l'invasion arabe*, vol. 3: *Saint Cyprien et son temps*, Paris 1902, p. 311; L. Bayard, *Saint Cyprien, Correspondance*, Paris 1925, p. 53; Cipriano (Santo), *Obras. Tratados, Cartas*, ed. J. Campos, Series: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 241, Madrid 1964, p. 199; M.L. García Sanchidrián, *Introduccíon*, [in:] Cipriano de Cartago, *Cartas*, ed. M.L. García Sanchidrián, Madrid 1998, pp. 9–25, especially p. 20; G.F. Diercks (ed.), *Sancti Cypriani episcopi epistularium*, vol. 3: *Prolegomena, codices, editiones, indices,* Series: Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 3, Turnhout 1999, p. 708.

[40] P. Monceaux, *Histoire littérair de l'Afrique...*, op. cit., p. 311.

[41] Cyprian of Carthage, *On the Lord's Prayer*, transl. R.E. Wallis, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/050704.htm [access: 15.06.2024]; Cyprianus, *De oratione Dominica*, [in:] *Sancti Cypriani Thascii Caecilii opera omnia*, Parisiis 1844 (PL 4), cols. 519–544, especially col. 538 A; M. Simonetti, C. Moreschini (eds.), *Sancti Cypriani episcopi opera*, part 2: *Ad Donatum, De mortalitate, Ad Demetrianvm, De opere et eleemosynis, De zelo et livore, De Dominica oratione, De bono patientiae*, Series: Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 3A, Turnholti 1976, p. 107.

[42] M. Simonetti, C. Moreschini, *Sancti Cypriani episcopi opera...*, op. cit., p. 94. As Moreschini points out in his commentary on *De Dominica oratione*, this is the end of the general

does not mention explicitly the abbreviating of the words of Scripture in Jesus Christ as *Sermo Dei* – God's personalized address in Jesus Christ to humanity and to the individual human being: this "abbreviating" is a procedure of divine pedagogy. This shortness of the word differs from Origen's smallness of the Incarnate Word, which moves it closer to the vocabulary of Verbum Domini. We do not find here the synthesis that is characteristic of the Christology of the Logos in *Verbum Domini*. It is therefore not quite equivalent to the theological idea of *verbum abbreviatum*. Still, credit must be given to Cyprian for pointing out the pedagogical facet of *brevitatis verbi*, which is a reference to the idea of recapitulation proposed by Irenaeus of Lyons (d. ca. 202). He wrote that Jesus Christ encapsulates the promises given through the prophets,[43] who are the members of Christ.[44] He describes the incarnation as the act in which the Word of God dwelt in the Son of Man, so that man would become accustomed to receiving God.[45] The same thought comes to the fore in another work of Irenaeus as a Christological article of faith: "The Word of God, Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, [...] who also at the end of the times, to complete and gather up all things, was made man among men, visible and tangible, in order to abolish death and show forth life and produce a community of union between God and man."[46] This way of thinking Henry Pietras sees already in Pseudo-Barnabas: "1) Scripture is the written Word of God; 2) Jesus Christ is the Word of God incarnate; conclusion: all Scripture speaks of Christ."[47] Consider that St. Cyprian of Carthage's understanding of Scripture stemmed

---

introduction to the treatise. These words are followed by commentaries on individual passages of the *Lord's Prayer*; see Cipriano, *Opuscoli*, vol. 2: *L'unità della Chiesa Cattolica, La preghiera del Signore, La condizione mortale dell'uomo, Le opere di carità e l'elemosina, A Demetriano, La virtù della pazienza, La gelosia e l'invidia, A Fortunato*, eds. A. Cerretini, S. Matteoli, C. Moreschini, C. Dell'Osso, M. Veronese, Roma 2009, p. 76, note 12.

[43] Irenaeus of Lyon, *Adv. Haer.* III 16,3. Cf. T. Dekert, *Teoria rekapitulacji Ireneusza z Lyonu w świetle starożytnych koncepcji na temat Adama* [The Theory of Recapitulation of Irenaeus of Lyons in the Light of Ancient Concepts on Adam], Kraków 2007, pp. 30–36.

[44] Irenaeus of Lyon, *Adv. Haer.* IV 33,10.

[45] Irenaeus of Lyon, *Adv. Haer.* III 20,2. See J. Szymik, *Theologia benedicta*, vol. 3, Katowice 2016, p. 298.

[46] Irenaeus of Lyon, *Epid.* 6; Irenaeus, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, transl. A. Robinson, https://www.ccel.org/ccel/irenaeus/demonstr.preaching_the_demonstration_of_the_apostolic_preaching.html [access: 15.06.2024]; cf. Ireneusz z Lyonu, *Wykład nauki apostolskiej*, transl. W. Myszor, Series: Źródła Myśli Teologicznej 7, Kraków 1997, p. 28.

[47] H. Pietras, *Początki teologii Kościoła* [Origins of Church Theology], Series: Myśl Teologiczna 28, Kraków 2000, p. 133.

from the had good criteria for a Christological (typological) exegesis of the Old Testament that he employed.[48]

Cyprian essentially designated Jesus as *Dei sermo et Dei ratio*, which can be viewed as two Latin forms corresponding to the Greek ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος.[49] We find it already in the first two paragraphs of Tertullian's *Liber de oratione*, on which Cyprian relied. Tertullian explains this three-part designation, expanded by the phrase "the Spirit of God" attributed to Jesus: *Dei spiritus et Dei sermo et Dei ratio approbatus est Dominus noster Iesus Christus, spiritus quo valuit, sermo quo docet, ratio qua venit* ("our Lord Jesus Christ has been approved as the Spirit of God, and the Word of God, and the Reason of God: the Spirit, by which He was mighty; the Word, by which He taught; the Reason, by which He came").[50] Tertullian, as Bertrand de Margerie has shown, developed a synthetic account of the principles of biblical hermeneutics,[51] among which the most significant is the principle of the unity of Scripture, which is Christological in its entirety. This is so, Tertullian believed, because Christ is the marrow or core of all Scripture (*medulla Scripturarum*).[52] The French polyhistor stated that, for Tertullian, all hermeneutical rules are summarised in Christ, true God and true man, as the core of Scripture, the thought that gives direction (*pensée directrice*) to all of Tertullian's exegesis.[53]

---

[48] M. Simonetti, *Między dosłownością a alegorią. Przyczynek do historii egzegezy patrystycznej* [Between Literalism and Allegory. A Contribution to the History of Patristic Exegesis], transl. T. Skibiński, Kraków 2000, p. 238.

[49] Tertullien, *De baptismo. De oratione/Von der Taufe. Vom Gebet*, Series: Fontes Christiani 76, ed. D. Schleyer, Turnhout 2006, p. 218, note 100.

[50] Tertullian, *On Prayer*, transl. S. Thelwall, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0322.htm [access: 15.06.2024]; cf. "Omnia de carnalibus in spiritualia renovavit nova Dei gratia superducto Evangelio, expunctore totius retro vetustatis, in quo et Dei spiritus et Dei sermo et Dei ratio, approbatus est Dominus noster Iesus Christus, spiritus, quo valuit, sermo, quo docuit, ratio quo venit" (Tertullian, *De baptismo* 1.2; see Tertullien, *De baptismo…*, op. cit., p. 218). In this sentence, Tertullian drew on the ambiguity (or rather capacity) of the noun *ratio*. Dietrich Schleyer translates it by *Weisheit* ('wisdom,' cf. ibid., p. 219). Henryk Pietras here translates *Dei ratio* by "Rozum Boży [God's reason]" or "Myśl Boża [God's thought]" (H. Pietras [ed.], *Odpowiedź na Słowo. Najstarsi mistrzowie chrześcijańskiej modlitwy* [Response to the Word. The Earliest Masters of Christian Prayer], Kraków 1993, p. 33). The phrase "z myśli – bo jest przyjmowana [from thought – because it is received]" is not a formal equivalent in the translation (ibid., note 3).

[51] B. de Margerie, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse*, vol. 2: *Les premiers grands exégètes latins*, Paris 1983, pp. 26–33.

[52] B. de Margerie, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse*, op. cit., pp. 47–52.

[53] B. de Margerie, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse*, op. cit., p. 51.

This theological concept developed by ancient Christian theologians is referred to by Peter Cantor (d. 1197), a representative of Parisian monastic theology. He committed himself to exegesis,[54] which transpires in his cursory commentary on the Old and New Testaments, the biblical encyclopaedia *Abel* (from the first entry), or *Distinctiones*, where the many levels of meaning of the biblical text were employed,[55] in his *Unum ex quattuor* with their harmony of the four Gospels, and *De tropis loquendi*, a grammatical and lexicographical treatise which aims at resolving (apparent) contradictions of the biblical text. He also wrote a textbook of moral theology based on Scripture, known under the incipit *Verbum abbreviatum*.[56] This incipit is not coincidental, as Peter set himself the goal of containing the multitude of words of Scripture in one, not very extensive, work. He concentrated on moral themes according to the principle that true Christian religion is based on faith and good morals (*est de fide et bonis moribus*): reading (*lectio*) and discussing (*disputatio*) relate to faith, and preaching (*predicatio*) to morals'. He pointed out that *lectio* and *disputatio* are necessary conditions for preaching.[57] Thus, on an exegesis of the monastic type, he draws practical conclusions, intended for preachers and, what follows, for all members of the Church, for whom the abundance of the biblical text is too great to memorize and reflect on. *Lectio* and *disputatio* are therefore necessary for practical reasons, since *paucitas* is the way in which this richness is not crushed but lifted up.

Peter equated the principle of this abbreviation with the analogy between Scripture and the incarnate Word of God. "For if the Word sent to us from the womb of the Father, even if [he is] the indescribable Son of God, 'whom the whole world cannot contain', willed to be described in the small size (*breuitate*) of the virgin womb, how much more the word of Scripture (*sacre Pagine*), which he willed to leave to us in the abundance (*in arram et pingus*) of his love, in an abridged form, in which his ways and paths we would discover."[58]

Concluding this part of our discussion, let us notice that footnote 34 in *Verbum Domini* misguides the search for the content of the expression *verbum abbreviatum*. For while Origen poses a philosophical problem (the relation of

---

[54] M. Boutry, *Introduction*, [in:] Petri Cantoris, *Verbum abbreviatum. Textus conflactus*, Series: Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 196, Turnhout 2004, pp. VII–LVI, especially p. X.

[55] G. d'Onofrio, *Historia teologii* [History of Theology], vol. 2: *Epoka średniowieczna* [The Medieval Age], transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2005, p. 270.

[56] G. d'Onorfio, *Historia teologii...*, op. cit., p. 206.

[57] Petri Cantoris, *Verbum abbreviatum...*, op. cit., p. 9.

[58] Petri Cantoris, *Verbum abbreviatum...*, op. cit., p. 7.

substance to *subsistentia* – the subsistence of God), which according to him is resolved in Christ, Benedict XVI aims at resolving a strictly theological question: how in the incarnate Son of God God is revealed. This has implications for understanding the relationship between the incarnate Logos of God and the person of Jesus Christ. Scripture becomes an event (rather than a narrative of events) when Christ – the climactic event of revelation[59] – is read as a humanly engaging event whose purpose is the realisation of man's vocation to communion with God.[60] The theology of Scripture as God's word to man is the hermeneutical guideline of exegesis if that exegesis is to read the intention of the word. The exegesis of a plurality of words leads to the Word Abridged or else it is not a theologically directed exegesis. Benedict XVI explains his understanding of this problem in his address to the representatives of the cultural world delivered at the Bernardine College in Paris on 12 September 2008, where he notes that Scripture plays an important role in building this divine-human community. It also builds up the ecclesial community:

> Scripture requires exegesis, and it requires the context of the community in which it came to birth and in which it is lived. This is where its unity is to be found, and here too its unifying meaning is opened up. […] [Christianity] perceives in the words the Word, the Logos itself, which spreads its mystery through this multiplicity and the reality of a human history. […] the word of God can never simply be equated with the letter of the text. To attain to it involves a transcending and a process of understanding, led by the inner movement of the whole and hence it also has to become a process of living. Only within the dynamic unity

---

[59] "In His goodness and wisdom God chose to reveal Himself and to make known to us the hidden purpose of His will (see Eph. 1:9) by which through Christ, the Word made flesh, man might in the Holy Spirit have access to the Father and come to share in the divine nature (see Eph. 2:18; 2 Peter 1:4)" (Second Vatican Council, Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation *Dei Verbum*, 1965 [hereinafter DV], no. 2, https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651118_dei-verbum_en.html [access: 15.06.2024]). "Then, after speaking in many and varied ways through the prophets, 'now at last in these days God has spoken to us in His Son' (Heb. 1:1–2). For He sent His Son, the eternal Word, who enlightens all men, so that He might dwell among men and tell them of the innermost being of God (see John 1:1–18). Jesus Christ, therefore, the Word made flesh, was sent as 'a man to men.' (3) He 'speaks the words of God' (John 3;34), and completes the work of salvation which His Father gave Him to do (see John 5:36; John 17:4)" (DV 4).

[60] "Through this revelation, therefore, the invisible God (see Col. 1;15, 1 Tim. 1:17) out of the abundance of His love speaks to men as friends (see Ex. 33:11; John 15:14–15) and lives among them (see Bar. 3:38), so that He may invite and take them into fellowship with Himself" (DV 2).

of the whole are the many books one book (CCC 120). The Word of God and his action in the world are revealed only in the word and history of human beings.[61]

In his habilitation thesis submitted in 1955, Joseph Ratzinger wrote about St Bonaventure's theological understanding of revelation and history:

> The event of revelation takes place […] always in the duality of *verbum incarnatum* and *verbum inspiratum*, the historical message and the ever new radiation of divine light, and, to use Bonaventure's terminology once again, in the interaction of the visible and the invisible.[62]

As can be seen in Benedict XVI's approach to *Verbum abbreviatum*, this idea of the close relationship between the Incarnate Word and the inspired word – assimilated from the Seraphic Doctor – was creatively developed throughout his life. This theological topos is balanced in the exhortation by the thought of Hugo of St. Victor: "All divine Scripture is one book, and this one book is Christ" (VD 39).[63]

Silentium Dei in *Verbum Domini*

The silence of God by which God speaks is linked in VD 21 with the cross. This is, as it were, a response to André Neher's linking of God's silence in Auschwitz as a symbol of the extermination of the Jews and the genocide committed during the Second World War. In this understanding of silence in the face of suffering, it is man who is silent.[64] In *Verbum Domini*, on the

---

[61] Benedict XVI, *Meeting with Representatives from the World of Culture*, https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2008/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20080912_parigi-cultura.html [access: 15.06.2024].

[62] J. Ratzinger, *Rozumienie Objawienia i teologia historii według Bonawentury. Rozprawa habilitacyjna i studia nad Bonawenturą* [Understanding Revelation and the Theology of History according to Bonaventure. Habilitation dissertation and studies on Bonaventure], eds. K. Góźdź, M. Górecka, transl. J. Merecki, Series: Opera Omnia 2, Lublin 2014, p. 91.

[63] Hugo de S. Victore, *De arca Noe morali* 2,8, [in:] *Hugonis de S. Victore Opera omnia*, ed. J.-P. Migne, vol. 2, Parisiis 1880 (PL 176), cols. 618–680, especially col. 642 C–D.

[64] A. Neher, *L'exil de la parole. Du silence biblique au silence d'Auschwitz,* Paris 1970, p. 17. See C. Rzęchowski, *Milczenie Boga w Torze* [The Silence of God in the Torah], [in:] *Fenomen milczenia w kulturze i języku: materiały interdyscyplinarnego sympozjum poświęconego pamięci profesor Jolanty Rokoszowej zorganizowanego przez Wydział I Filologiczny PAU* [The Phenomenon of Silence in Culture and Language: Materials of the Interdisciplinary

other hand, God is silent. This silence, then, is not an aspect or attribute of human communication, including the words of Scripture, but something that pertains to the Logos Incarnate, which we said above is a synthesis of the words of Scripture infinitely superior to the sum of those words – *Verbum abbreviatum*. God speaks in silence to His Son, and He responds to Him with obedience, despite the overwhelming pain. "God's silence prolongs his earlier words" (*Dei silentium eius verba producit*) (VD 21).[65] This is in the context of the *revelation process* (*in christiannae revelationis processu*), in which the silence of God in the speech of the Word of God is a very important sign – an element of the code of revelation (*silentium ut insignis apparet Dei Verbi locutio*). The Logos Incarnate is also the silence of God full of meaning, telling who God is as the Unspeakable. This thought, although new in its formulation, is deeply embedded in Ratzinger's theology.

In the 1959 printed version of his dissertation, Ratzinger wrote.

> What is New Testament in the New Testament consists not in the novelty of the book, but in the spirit that animates the book. "Revelation" is thus here, we emphasise again, synonymous with the spiritual apprehension of Scripture; it consists in the God-given act of this apprehension and not merely in the objective letter.[66]

Also the Gospel or the letters of Paul the Apostle taken as "the letter itself" are nothing other than "Judaism" and the Old Testament, "for truly the New Testament is only where the letter is overcome by the spirit."[67] This is how, at the Bonaventure school, the young Ratzinger learns the idea of the inadequacy of the written word for the realisation of the Word through which God reveals himself to the world. This is an important approach insofar as it does not lead to a negation of Scripture or a belittling of its role, but provides the basis for a theological hermeneutic based on an understanding of revelation as a necessary complement to the "work of the text" if its understanding is to be integral and Christian, rather than reduced to literalism, which Bonaventure associates – following a tradition going back to Justin Martyr and Origen – with biblical interpretation in Judaism. In the word of Scripture, in addition to what it says,

---

Symposium Dedicated to the Memory of Professor Jolanta Rokoszowa Organised by the Philological Faculty I of the PAU], Kraków 2018, pp. 9–14; C. Rzęchowski, *Milczenie i filozofia* [Silence and Philosophy], "Studia Redemptorystowskie" 19 (2021), pp. 105–112.

[65] Benedictus XVI, Adhortatio *Verbum Domini*, op. cit., pp. 681–787, especially p. 702.

[66] J. Ratzinger, *Rozumienie Objawienia i teologia historii...*, op. cit., pp. 456–457.

[67] J. Ratzinger, *Rozumienie Objawienia i teologia historii...*, op. cit., p. 456.

there is and the word signifies what it does not say, but what it is – the very fact of God establishing communication with man by means of a linguistic instrument. The words that Benedict XVI used in an interview with Regina Einig[68] fit perfectly into this theological model. When asked about the figure of St Joseph, the Pope summarises the Gospel texts concerning this figure by stating: "His silence is at the same time his message. It expresses his 'yes' to what he took upon himself."[69] With this model, we can better understand what for Ratzinger is this silence of the word that completes the communicative aspect. It is the interpersonal relationship involving the subjects who compose it in an event that is historical but also transcends history. Thus we find in Ratzinger the source of the conviction that the fateful aspect of the written word is interpretatively so important that its omission distorts not only the sense of the written word, but the sense of the revealing Word.

In *Jesus of Nazareth,* Benedict XVI writes about Jesus' cry of abandonment on the cross.[70] He does not seem to see the role of God the Father in this scene and does not look for the meaning of his silence, but focuses on the transference of Jesus' voice to the whole corporate subject of his body, the Church, and perhaps even more broadly, to the whole of anguished and struggling humanity to preserve hope. It is a very positive view, focused on what is being said. There is no room in this view for the question of the unspoken, of silence. Ratzinger's earlier reflections shed more light. "[W]hat does the Lord's Cross mean? It is the form of that love which has totally accepted man and has therefore descended even into his guilt and his death."[71]

Jesus Incarnate is unknowable to His contemporaries except by faith. Although they see Him, witness the signs He performs, listen to His teaching, they share with those who have not believed in Him the experience of the

---

[68]   Published in "Die Tagespost" on 1 April 2021, p. 33–34.

[69]   Benedict XVI, *His Silence Is Also His Way of Expressing Himself*, [in:] Benedict XVI, *What is Christianity?: The Last Writings*, transl. M.J. Miller, San Francisco 2023, p. 202; Benedykt XVI, R. Einig, *Jego milczenie jest zarazem jego słowem. Wywiad o św. Józefie* [His Silence Is Also His Word. Interview on St Joseph], transl. D. Chodyniecki, [in:] Benedykt XVI, *Co to jest chrześcijaństwo? Testament duchowy* [What is Christianity? A Spiritual Testament], Kraków 2023, pp. 255–262, especially p. 256.

[70]   J. Ratzinger/Benedict XVI, *Jesus of Nazareth: Holy Week: From the Entrance Into Jerusalem To The Resurrection*, transl. P.J. Whitmore, San Francisco 2011, p. 213; cf. J. Ratzinger/Benedykt XVI, *Jezus z Nazaretu*, vol. 2: *Od wjazdu do Jerozolimy do Zmartwychwstania*, transl. W. Szymona, Kielce 2011, pp. 228–231.

[71]   J. Ratzinger, *The God of Jesus Christ: Meditations on the Triune God*, transl. B. McNeil, San Francisco 2008, p. 55; cf. J. Ratzinger, *Bóg Jezusa Chrystusa. Medytacje o Bogu Trójjedynym* transl. J. Zychowicz, Kraków 1995, p. 59.

cognitive elusiveness of what is essential in His mystery. The Incarnate Word not only speaks of Himself, but is also silent about Himself, because silence is a way of communicating the unspeakable. "[B]elieving is entering into the abode of Christ, into the abiding reality of Christ, to which Scripture bears witness but which Scripture itself by all means is not."[72] This is a consequence of the relationship of the Bible to Revelation: "The biblical word bears witness to the revelation but does not contain it in such a way that the revelation is completely absorbed in it and could now be put in your pocket like an object. The Bible bears witness to the revelation, and yet the concept of revelation as such goes beyond that."[73] Thus, it must be recognised that when we look at the Bible as God "speaking," He speaks, i.e. reveals Himself, also through His non-speaking, i.e. silence. Hans Urs von Balthasar put the mystery of this word-silence of God this way: "The Word, seen from the human perspective, is only silence and twilight, it is nevertheless, as John shows, the last glorification of divine love. Only the Cross is the last exegesis of God, who once and for all shows himself to be Love."[74] Silence, then, is the undermining of the exclusivity of the Word as the reality in which God opens himself as God, in which the purpose of Revelation is realised.

Robert Woźniak, speaking of the "word of the Cross" (cf. 1 Cor 1:17–18), states that it is a dialogue between Christ and the Father in which "though the Father is a hidden God, he is present at his Son."[75] Sławomir Zatwardnicki signals that exegesis must take into account the unknowability of God.[76] "The Word, even of Christ himself, does not reveal the whole mystery, but is a gateway towards it, through which one enters into the interior of what is ineffable. Scripture bears witness to Christ, but one must still come to Him in order to have life."[77] Drawing on Anna Ngaire Williams and her interpretation of the

---

[72] J. Ratzinger/Benedict XVI, *God's Word…*, op. cit., p. 57; cf. J. Ratzinger/Benedykt XVI, *Słowo Boga…*, op. cit., p. 58.

[73] J. Ratzinger/Benedict XVI, *God's Word…*, op. cit., pp. 122–123; cf. J. Ratzinger/Benedykt XVI, *Słowo Boga…*, op. cit., p. 120.

[74] H. Urs von Balthasar, *Bóg jest swym własnym egzegetą* [God is His Own Exegete], transl. Z. Hanas, "Communio." Międzynarodowy Przegląd Teologiczny 6/3 (1986), pp. 58–64, especially p. 61.

[75] R.J. Woźniak, *Różnica i tajemnica. Objawienie jako teologiczne źródło ludzkiej sobości* [Difference and Mystery. Revelation as a Theological Source of Human Selfness], Poznań 2012, p. 493.

[76] S. Zatwardnicki, *Katafatyczność i apofatyczność słowa Bożego w świetle misterium Wcielenia* [The Cataphatic and Apophatic Nature of the Word of God in the Light of the Mystery of the Incarnation], "Collectanea Theologica" 92/4 (2022), pp. 39–92, especially p. 60.

[77] S. Zatwardnicki, *Katafatyczność i apofatyczność…*, op. cit., p. 58.

thought of St Thomas Aquinas, Zatwardnicki notes that in an analogous way of speaking about God, "metaphor both conceals and reveals, but even where it conceals – it does so for a purpose that is in itself already revealing."[78] It is the "silence" of the word, its apophatic nature, that leads to the revelation of the mystery. "In the cataphasis of Christ's words is hidden the apophasis – the words are the gateway that introduces the ineffable mystery – Christ himself."[79]

Object of cognition in exegesis

Our reflections on *Verbum abbreviatum* and *silentium Dei* led to an understanding that Scripture is more than just a record of a certain message. Hence, the question that we need to ask: what should biblical exegesis be concerned with to avoid reductionism that downgrades Scripture to a purely textual dimension. This part of the discussion will deal with the formal object of biblical exegesis.

The formal object of theology based on revelation is defined by Gerhard L. Müller as the knowledge of "God Himself as the author of revelation, and in Him the unity of the various aspects of faith (*fides quae creditur*) that are explored by reason enlightened by faith."[80] He is not naïve to assume that we have simple access to it; rather, he is aware that this knowledge requires cognitive submission to the intellect. The first of the current tasks of theological epistemology, he says, is to demonstrate "that human reason, in its references to the world (sensuality, links with culture, contextuality, historicity, the social dimension), is fundamentally open to transcendence and that human reason can be the hearer of actual verbal revelation in history." This entails another task, which is the need to identify the relationship "between revelation's claim to truth and its historical structure, as well as between the historical and social conditions of access to its personal claims and to its content."[81] A cognitive approach can show us how to accomplish these tasks, a cognitive approach that has the potential to extract from the adventitiousness of factual data their necessary and supra-factual meaning. Such an approach is a phenomenological reduction, which has found its prominent place in twentieth-century theology,[82]

---

[78]   S. Zatwardnicki, *Katafatyczność i apofatyczność...*, op. cit., p. 67.
[79]   S. Zatwardnicki, *Katafatyczność i apofatyczność...*, op. cit., p. 84.
[80]   G.L. Müller, *Dogmatyka katolicka* [Catholic Dogmatics], transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2015, p. 54.
[81]   G.L. Müller, *Dogmatyka katolicka*, op. cit., p. 51.
[82]   Cf. e.g. W. Słomka, *Teologia jako refleksja nad doświadczeniem chrześcijańskim: studium w świetle fenomenologicznej metody Husserla* [Theology as Reflection on Christian

despite Martin Heidegger's (1889–1976) sceptical view of the possible connections between phenomenology and theology.[83]

The turn that phenomenology made in philosophical thinking in the twentieth century was the rehabilitation of reflection on the origins of objective cognition,[84] which made it possible to go beyond the limits set by Kantian subjectivism. The theory of cognition proposed by Roman Ingarden (1893–1970) provides a counterweight to what he called psychophysiological theory[85] and critical cognitive realism.[86] Ultimately, Ingarden advocates a form of cognitive idealism which, according to him, is based on eidetism, a Husserlian variety of apriorism.[87] Robert Sokolowski describes eidetic intuition as a variety of intentionality through which "we recognize identity in the manifold of manifestations, but this identity and manifold is different from the manifold and identity in which we apprehend individual things."[88] This requires reaching "the feature without which the existence of things would be unthinkable,"[89] and transcending

Experience: A Study in the Light of Husserl's Phenomenological Method], "Studia Theologica Varsaviensia" 12/1 (1974), pp. 45–60; A. Półtawski, *Realizm fenomenologii. Husserl – Ingarden – Stein – Wojtyła* [Realism of Phenomenology. Husserl – Ingarden – Stein – Wojtyła], Warszawa 2001, passim; K. Tarnowski, *Fenomenologia i teologia* [Phenomenology and Theology], [in:] *Metafizyka i teologia. Debata u podstaw* [Metaphysics and Theology: Debate at the Grassroots], ed. R.J. Woźniak, Kraków 2008, pp. 32–49; S. Kowalczyk, *Nurt fenomenologiczno-egzystencjalny w polskiej współczesnej filozofii Boga* [The Phenomenological-Existential Current in Polish Contemporary Philosophy of God], "Vox Patrum" 52 (2008), pp. 505–511; A. Szulc, *Stein i Heidegger – dwie fenomenologie* [Stein and Heidegger – Two Phenomenologies], "Zeszyty Naukowe Centrum Badań im. Edyty Stein" 11 (2014), pp. 31–39; R.J. Woźniak, *Praca nad dogmatem. Wybrane aspekty odnowy teologii dogmatycznej* [Working on Dogma. Selected Aspects of the Renewal of Dogmatic Theology], Series: Myśl Teologiczna 105, Kraków 2022, pp. 208–241.

[83] M. Heidegger, *Fenomenologia i teologia* [Phenomenology and Theology], transl. J. Tischner, "Znak" 31/1–2 (1979), pp. 120–134.

[84] P. Łaciak, *Husserlowski transcendentalizm w ujęciu Jacques'a Derridy* [Husserl's Transcendentalism according to Jacques Derrida], "Sztuka i Filozofia" 14 (1997), pp. 42–59, especially p. 47.

[85] R. Ingarden, *U podstaw teorii poznania* [Underlying Theories of Cognition], Warszawa 1971, p. 43.

[86] R. Ingarden, *U podstaw teorii poznania*, op. cit., pp. 71–77.

[87] R. Ingarden, *U podstaw teorii poznania*, op. cit., p. 245. Eidetism as based on the proto-fact, which is the *ego*, the cognitive subject, see D. Franck, *Dwa ciała. Wokół fenomenologii Husserla* [Two Bodies. Around Husserl's Phenomenology], transl. J. Migasiński, A. Dwulit, Warszawa 2017, pp. 69–79.

[88] R. Sokolowski, *Introduction to Phenomenology*, Cambridge 2000; R. Sokolowski, *Wprowadzenie do fenomenologii* [Introduction to Phenomenology], transl. M. Rogalski, Kraków 2012, p. 184.

[89] R. Sokolowski, *Wprowadzenie do fenomenologii*, op. cit., p. 185.

empirical universals, i.e. those regularly occurring in the sensory perception of entities of a particular category, and moving on to eidetic universals, i.e. those features that are necessary for the existence of a particular object. The distinctions made by Edmund Husserl (1859–1938) in his introduction to *Ideas for a Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy* are important: between what is a matter of facts (*Tatsache*) and what is the essence (*Wesen*), and between the real and the irreal.[90] Eidetic intuition is a way of grasping the essential, of rejecting the incidental regularities of everyday cognition, the factuality that exist outside of things, are therefore in this sense irreal and thus cognisable in the sense of phenomenological reduction. It is irreality in Husserl's sense that guarantees that they are objects of cognition constituting units of meaning whose sense does not include mental acts or other subjective experiences.[91] The category of objects of thought developed by Bernard Bolzano (1781–1848) can be applied to them.[92] This does not, however, imply the unreality of the object of cognition, but defines the type of cognition. Leszek Kołakowski calls this state of affairs the invalidation of the dichotomy of facts and values, of descriptive and value judgements.[93] According to Władysław Stróżewski, the cleansing of perceptions of irrelevant traits also concerns the essence of the world given in colloquial, spontaneous cognition or the natural attitude of the thinking subject.[94] For the point is to approach the world as a phenomenon, to first make an eidetic insight into this

---

[90] E. Husserl, *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*, vol. 1: *Allgemeine Einführung in Die Reine Phänomenologie*, ed. W. Biemel, Series: Husserliana. Edmund Husserl Gesammelte Werke 3, Den Haag 1950, p. 7; cf. E. Husserl, *Ideas for a Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy*, transl. F. Kersten, Dordrecht 1998; cf. E. Husserl, *Idee czystej fenomenologii i fenomenologicznej* [Ideas of Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy], vol. 1, transl. D. Gierulanka, Warszawa 1967.

[91] E. Husserl, *Aufgabe und Bedeutung der „Logischen Untersuchungen"*, [in:] *Phänomenologische Psychologie. Vorlesungen Sommersemester 1925*, ed. W. Biemel, Series: Husserliana. Edmund Husserl Gesammelte Werke 9, Den Haag 1962, pp. 20–46, especially 22; cf. E. Husserl, *Phenomenological Psychology*, transl. J. Scanlon, Nijhoff 1977; cf. K. Święcicka, *Husserl*, transl. S. Walczewska Warszawa 1993, p. 124.

[92] K. Michalski, *Logika i czas…*, op. cit., p. 19; cf. A. Drozdek, *Bolzano i ontologia zdań w sobie* [Bolzano and the Ontology of Sentences in Themselves], "Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria" 9/4 (2000), pp. 105–116, especially p. 107.

[93] L. Kołakowski, *Husserl i poszukiwanie pewności* [Husserl and the Search for Certainty], Warszawa 1991, p. 37.

[94] W. Stróżewski, *O metodzie fenomenologii* [On the Method of Phenomenology], [in:] *Jak filozofować? Studia z metodologii filozofii* [How to Philosophize? Studies in the Methodology of Philosophy], ed. J. Perzanowski, Warszawa 1989, pp. 78–95, especially p. 82.

primordial cognitive reality.[95] The need to link phenomenological cognition with the concreteness of sensory experience and its continuity comes to the fore in the work of Husserl's continuators, who can be considered cognitivists. Their programme originated in the circle of Francisco Varela (1946–2001).[96] Among those inspired by phenomenology, there were also radical critics of the reality of empirical knowledge and the laws of nature built upon it, such as Nancy Cartwright (1944–).[97] In our considerations, the most relevant development of phenomenology seems to be that presented by Claude Romano, who links its practice to the development of phenomenological realism, respect and interest in things and reflection on the language of description of cognitive experience.[98]

Husserl's relation to historicity is a somewhat complex matter. We must take as our starting point his statement: "I fully recognise the extraordinary value of history in the broadest sense for the philosopher."[99] However, the generality of this statement allows for much, including a critique of historicism.[100] Husserl himself made no secret of how much his discussions with Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911) meant to him in the formation of his attitude to the historicity of cognition.[101] The result of these disputes and inspirations was the recognition

---

[95] T. Bekrycht, *Fenomenologia – wprowadzenie w lekturę tekstu Edmunda Husserla „Phänomenologie (Der Encyclopedia Britannica Artikel)"* [Phenomenology – an Introduction to Edmund Husserl's text "Phänomenologie (Der Encyclopedia Britannica Artikel)"], "Filozofia Publiczna i Edukacja Demokratyczna" 4/2 (2015), pp. 92–202, especially pp. 98–99.

[96] W. Marciszewski, *Empiryzm, racjonalizm, irracjonalizm po przełomach naukowych XX wieku* [Empiricism, Rationalism, Irrationalism after the Scientific Breakthroughs of the Twentieth Century], [in:] *Przewodnik po epistemologii* [Guide to Epistemology], ed. R. Ziemińska, Kraków 2013, pp. 423–493, especially pp. 460–461.

[97] A. Grobler, *Metodologia nauk* [Methodology of Sciences], Kraków 2008, pp. 290–291; N.T. Massoni, M.A. Moreira, *Epistemologia de Nancy Cartwright: uma contribuição ao debate sobre a natureza da ciência atual*, "Ensaio Pesquisa em Educação em Ciências" 16/3 (2014), pp. 95–119. The inconsistencies or developments of her thought are illustrated, for example, by Mariusz Mazurek (*Modele w koncepcjach nauki Nancy Cartwright* [Models in Nancy Cartwright's Concepts of Science], "Edukacja Filozoficzna" 54 [2012], pp. 187–204).

[98] P. Zagórecki, *Ocalić fenomenologię z Claude'em Romanem* [Saving Phenomenology with Claude Roman], "Logos i Etos" 60/2 (2022), pp. 203–220.

[99] E. Husserl, *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy: Philosophy as Rigorous Science, and Philosophy and the Crisis of European Man*, transl. Q. Lauren, New York–Evanston–London 1965, p. 129; cf. E. Husserl, *Filozofia jako nauka ścisła* [Philosophy as Rigorous Science], transl. W. Galewicz, Warszawa 1992, p. 61.

[100] G. Łuka, *Husserlowska krytyka historyzmu jako krytyka faktyczności* [Husserl's Critique of Historicism as a Critique of Facticity], "Studia Filozoficzne" 1–2 (1982), pp. 57–75.

[101] W. Płotka, *Logos fenomenologii. Problematyka rozumu we fryburskim okresie twórczości Edmunda Husserla* [Logos of Phenomenology. Problem of Reason in the Freiburg Period of Edmund Husserl's Work], Biblioteka UKSW, Warszawa 2009, p. 130.

that the historicity of cognition – whether it is present or past – impinges on its content. Historicity, in Husserl's terms, is the 'history of reason'. In turn, he emphatically rejects historicity as one form of facticity, and thus an element to be reduced in the process of phenomenological reduction.[102]

We have already touched on the concept of intentionality, which plays an important role in Husserl's philosophy. It denotes an attribute of a certain group of experiences which are essentially acts of becoming aware of something, of directing oneself towards the object to be known.[103] Since the sense or meaning[104] "is the way in which the object is given to consciousness,"[105] and this sense is inseparable from the object but is distinct from it, as an intentional cognitive experience of the object,[106] we come to know the object through its sense taking into account the subjective (intentional) attitude. One can speak of objects of intentional reference (noemata) as a third sphere of being between the real and the ideal.[107]

Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1907–1961) pointed out that radicalism, understood as reaching into the suprasubjective (transcendental) realm, is achieved when philosophy recognises "as the fundamental philosophic problem this presumption on reason's part," when it confronts the inevitability of inductive thinking, the necessity of referring to generalisations as organising categories of knowledge.[108] At the same time, induction "makes no guesses about the causes of events."[109] The suspension of all investigated intentionalities[110] and

---

[102]   A. Gielarowski, *Kryzys kultury – kryzys człowieka. Fenomenologiczna krytyka kultury: Husserl, Lévinas, Henry* [Crisis of Culture – Crisis of Man. A Phenomenological Critique of Culture: Husserl, Lévinas, Henry], Kraków 2016, pp. 85–96.

[103]   D. Zahavi, *Fenomenologia Husserla* [Husserl's Phenomenology], transl. M. Święch, Kraków 2012, p. 21.

[104]   On the identity of these concepts, see E. Husserl, *Ideen...*, op. cit., p. 303. cf. D. Łukasiewicz, *Znaczenie i prawda w świetle niektórych prac Edmunda Husserla* [Meaning and Truth in the Light of Some of Edmund Husserl's Works], "Principia" 13–14 (1995), pp. 203–212.

[105]   K. Michalski, *Logika i czas...*, op. cit., p. 15.

[106]   K. Michalski, *Logika i czas...*, op. cit., p. 16.

[107]   W. Płotka, *Studia z fenomenologii poznania. Transcendentalna filozofia Edmunda Husserla a problem wiedzy* [Studies in the Phenomenology of Cognition. Edmund Husserl's Transcendental Philosophy and the Problem of Knowledge], Gdańsk 2015, p. 30.

[108]   M. Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, transl. D.A. Landes, London–New York 2012, p. 73; cf. M. Merleau-Ponty, *Fenomenologia percepcji* [Phenomenology of Perception], transl. M. Kowalska, J. Migasiński, Warszawa 2001, p. 82.

[109]   A. Morton, *A Guide Through the Theory of Knowledge*, Malden–Oxford–Victoria 2007, p. 48; cf. A. Morton, *Przewodnik po teorii poznania* [A Guide Through the Theory of Knowledge], transl. T. Baszniak, Warszawa 2002, p. 116.

[110]   D. Zahavi, *Fenomenologia Husserla*, op. cit., pp. 20–32.

their neutralisation – as a basic postulate of the phenomenological theory of cognition – consists in making one's own intentionalities the object of contemplation.[111] The object of cognition, therefore, is in phenomenological reductionism a consciousness that is intentionally oriented towards what is studied, freeing itself from the regularity of facts, and concentrated on eidetic universals. For phenomenological reductionism narrows the field of research in this respect necessarily to the realm of the object. "In objective thinking, therefore, there is no room for another person and for a multiplicity of consciousnesses. If I constitute the world, I cannot think another consciousness, because it too would have to constitute it, and at least this other view of the world I myself would not be constituting."[112] The objectivity of knowledge in Merleau-Ponty goes hand in hand with its linguistic nature, since thinking is linguistic, which implies a link between thought and word,[113] contemplation and conceptualisation.[114] In this context, it is worth recalling what Husserl says early on in his philosophical activity about logos as a concept that links inseparably language and communication on the one hand, and the sphere of designators on the other:

> Λόγος in the developed language means now the word and speech itself, now the thing mentioned in speech. It is again thought in the form of sentences produced by the speaker for the purpose of communication or for himself, so to speak, the spiritual sense of the linguistic affirmative sentence, that which also cannot be thought without grammar, simply calls the affirmative, precisely as that which is judged by the grammatical expressive sentence, also the sense of names. Particularly in the case of general words, logos means the attribution of general concepts to them as sense.

> [...] All these meanings of the word logos, on the other hand, take over, especially wherever scientific interests are involved, a distinct sense in which the idea of

---

[111]   R. Sokolowski, *Wprowadzenie do fenomenologii*, op. cit., pp. 59–60; W. Fasching, *Intentionality and Presence: On the Intrinsic Of-ness of Consciousness from Transcendental-Phenomenological Perspective*, "Husserl Studies" 28/2 (2012), pp. 121–141.

[112]   M. Merleau-Ponty, *Fenomenologia percepcji*, op. cit., p. 327. "By introducing reductions, Husserl seems to prepare the language of phenomenology to describe 'what appears' as something that always remains in the relation between the self and the world" (M. Waligóra, *Wstęp do fenomenologii* [Introduction to Phenomenology], Kraków 2013, p. 63).

[113]   M. Merleau-Ponty, *Proza świata. Eseje o mowie* [Prose of the World. Essays on Speech], transl. S. Cichowicz, Warszawa 1976, p. 93.

[114]   A.J. Ayer, *Filozofia w XX wieku* [Philosophy in the Twentieth Century], transl. T. Baszniak, Warszawa 2000, pp. 270–271.

the norm of reason stands out. Logos is then once the name of reason itself, as a power, then of that which is rational, namely thinking fully understood or directed towards rational truth. Logos also specifically signifies the power of constructing legitimate concepts, and in doing so it signifies the rational creation of concepts, as well as the correct concepts themselves.[115]

This extensive quotation should be considered crucial in the context of our analyses, as it reveals the deep and, as it were, organic connection between the linguistics and objectivity of cognition in Husserl. The use of the category of spiritual sense (*geistiger Sinn*) is particularly relevant and inspiring for us. It is a term used by Husserl on the verge of being figurative, but he demonstrates the necessity of this calculated semantic abuse to describe the status of the logos in the construction of the object of cognition, which is simultaneously linguistic and noematic, and cannot preserve its existence by losing one of these aspects of its existence. Already in the "Preparatory Considerations" (in *Formal and Transcendental Logic*), Husserl makes the connection between logos as spiritual sense (*geistiger Sinn)* and spiritual act (*geistiger Akt*), in which speaking and thinking are united.[116] While it is difficult in Husserl's work to make a clear distinction between sense (*Sinn*) and meaning (*Bedeutung*), this is not because of a lack of tools (for these were created by Gottlob Frege (1848–1925), but because Husserl wants to present the relationship of these concepts and the validity of their interchangeable use.[117] Ultimately, however, a distinction can be made in his texts between meaning, that is, a statement revealing some object of cognition (apophantic), and sense, which has the same apophantic capacity, as it were, in itself, in potency.[118]

The comments on phenomenology outlined above form the basis for an analysis of the Pontifical Biblical Commission's 2014 document *The Inspiration and*

---

[115]   E. Husserl, *Ergänzende Texte*, [in:] *Formale und Transzendentale Logik. Versuch einer Kritik der logischen Vernunft*, ed. P. Janssen, Series: Husserliana. Edmund Husserl Gesammelte Werke 17, Den Haag 1974, pp. 339–460, especially pp. 356–357, cf. E. Husserl, *Formal and Transcendental Logic*, transl. D. Cairns, Hague 1969.

[116]   E. Husserl, *Formale und Transzendentale Logik*, [in:] *Formale und Transzendentale Logik. Versuch einer Kritik der logischen Vernunft*, op. cit., pp. 3–335, especially p. 22 (Polish translation: E. Husserl, *Logika formalna i logika transcendentalna. Próba krytyki rozumu logicznego* [Formal and Transcendental Logic. An Attempt at a Critique of Logical Reason], transl. G. Sowinski, Warszawa 2011, p. 17).

[117]   M. Moryń, *Transcendentalizm, intencjonalność, język. O Husserlowskiej koncepcji sensu* [Transcendentalism, Intentionality, Language. On Husserl's Conception of Meaning], Poznań 1998, p. 95.

[118]   M. Moryń, *Transcendentalizm, intencjonalność, język...*, op. cit., p. 130.

Truth of Scripture. It made a bold attempt to use the phenomenological method of studying biblical texts in order to grasp the notion of biblical inspiration, one of the key concepts in the theology of Scripture.[119] This was a most valid idea, as it brought biblical research out of the confines of an epistemology fed by the belief in the immediacy with which the object of knowledge is given to us. It remains an open question, however, to what extent the basic demands of the phenomenological method were realised in the document itself.

Another thought by Sokolowski is worth recalling here. He points out that the reading of Scripture requires what the American philosopher with Polish roots calls the most basic fulfilment of Scripture in Christ: a revision and deepening of the understanding of God as God; that is how the expectation of meaning is born, which conditions the manifestation of meaning in reality viewed in the phenomenological perspective.[120] Within the framework of traditional theological language this philosophical approach means that "the Deity of Christ transcends the expectation that he fulfils,"[121] which is a linear juxtaposition that does not distinguish the peculiar point of singularity that is the Incarnation of the Son of God nor reveals what is essential in the view of both *Dei Verbum*[122] and *Verbum Domini*,[123] a text that contained a call for a new reflection on biblical inspiration to which the Pontifical Biblical Commission wished to respond.

The Commission's review of the biblical texts in terms of how the God-hagiographer relationship is reflected in them is flawed by a certain inadequacy of the declared method and the tasks pursued. This very feature of the research conducted by the esteemed expert panel leads to the conclusion that in the Old Testament the hagiographers' relationship with God is "seen in various ways," while in the New Testament it is "always mediated by the Son of God,

---

[119] Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Inspiration and Truth of Sacred Scripture: The Word that Comes from God and Speaks of God for the Salvation of the World*, transl. Th. Esposito, S. Gregg, Collegeville, PA 2014; cf. Papieska Komisja Biblijna, *Natchnienie i prawda Pisma Świętego. Słowo, które od Boga pochodzi i mówi o Bogu, aby zbawić świat* [Inspiration and Truth of Scripture. The Word that Comes from God and Speaks of God to Save the World], transl. H. Witczyk, Kielce 2014 (hereafter: ITSS), no. 51.

[120] R. Sokolowski, *Bóg wiary i rozumu. Podstawy chrześcijańskiej teologii* [The God of Faith and Reason: Foundations of Christian Theology], transl. M. Romanek, Kraków 2015, pp. 212–214.

[121] R. Sokolowski, *Bóg wiary i rozumu...*, op. cit., p. 210.

[122] *Constitutio dogmatica de Divina Revelatione*, [in:] *Documenti. Il Concilio Vaticano II*, Bologna 1966, pp. 494–523.

[123] Benedictus XVI, Adhortatio *Verbum Domini*, pp. 681–787.

the Lord Jesus Christ."[124] Admittedly, the conclusion of the key synthesising section on inspiration in this text seeks common ground, but it does so through analogy, reducing the differences between forms of inspiration to the dynamics of "the plan of divine revelation."[125] Ultimately, then, inspiration finds its basis in a mission (message) from God, which is not always grounded in the mission of the Son of God (cf. John 20:21). Thus, the intention of the members of the Pontifical Biblical Commission to ground the study of inspiration in a phenomenological approach failed, for they made the biblical text the object of their inquiry in order to derive from it the concept of inspiration as the basis for reading the text as Scripture. This could not succeed, since the text itself does not and cannot contain this scriptural feature as a necessary element. The emergence of an anthology of ancient religious and religion-related texts is not necessarily conditioned by the action of divine grace, and so in a phenomenological reduction of the concept of the biblical text, we will not reduce it to inspired Scripture.

The question of inspired Scripture does not make the slightest sense in philology, history, literary theory, sociology or any science other than theology. Therefore, biblical exegesis searching for the meaning and significance of Scripture must be placed within the scope of theology. Consequently, a serious question arises: is there anything in theology that could be its object of knowledge? From Descartes (1596–1650) onwards, we are entitled to pose this question as rooted in the critical function of philosophy, which assumes the existence only of that which it has direct experience of.

> Since I have now learned that bodies themselves are perceived not, strictly speaking, by the senses or by the imaginative faculty, but by the intellect alone, and that they are not perceived because they are touched or seen, but only because they are understood, I clearly realize [*cognosco*] that nothing can be perceived by me more easily or more clearly than my own mind.[126]

This reference to the thinking subject – the reduction of knowledge to the knowledge of one's own mind – was a turning point in philosophy, a complete novelty because the epistemology of Nicolaus of Cusa (1401–1464), with its

---

[124] ITSS 51. This dichotomy is also repeated in ITSS 52. The plurality of forms of inspiration is also mentioned in ITSS 140.

[125] ITSS 52.

[126] R. Decartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy,* transl. M. Moriarty, Oxford 2008, p. 24; R. Decartes, *Medytacje o pierwszej filozofii*, vol. 2, transl. M. Ajdukiewicz, K. Ajdukiewicz, S. Swieżawski, I. Dąmbska, Kęty 2001, pp. 55–56.

inherently irrational (or surrealist) approach,[127] provided a solid basis for subject-
-centred approach.[128] Theology defines itself vis-à-vis this approach as herme-
neutics, which has its relevance to exegetical issues. Jürgen Werbick presents
the metaphoricity of religious texts as a model for the transfer of understanding
from the intelligible to the non-intelligible.[129] He states:

> From the Christian point of view, what is the object of interpretation can […]
> apply as a criterion only intuitively, i.e. as a reality in interpretations that inter-
> pret this intuition as 'the thing of Scripture', or through external identification
> (by the Teaching Office). This occurs through an intuitive and/or authoritative
> interpretation of what the texts say on matters of principle. However, the cri-
> terion is not some quantity independent of any interpretation. The criterion
> itself is already the fruit of interpretation, the normative interpretation of the
> one who is the essential Interpreter, the Logos of God.[130]

It is an approach that bridges the gap between the role of the *verbum abbrevia-
tum* in its Christological understanding and the hermeneutical understanding
of theology, in which the Logos makes the subject. What is needed, then,
in order to preserve this character of theology and, within it, the exegesis of
Scripture, is a description that objectifies the object of interpretation. If we
regard *verbum abbreviatum* as a form of objectification of subject-oriented
reflection, this is possible within the phenomenological reduction of Scripture
given as an object with all the baggage of its various forms of facticity. Judycki
says that "consciousness is filled with a peculiar kind of intuition," which is an
intellectual intuition.[131] Among the tasks of theologians is the interpretation
of Scripture,[132] or rather the interpretation of Scripture is one of the main, if
not the fundamental task of the theologian. The exegetes, in turn, fall into the

---

[127] R. Wilkołek, *Poszerzając granice racjonalności. Epistemologiczna teologia Mikołaja z Kuzy
(1401–1464)* [Widening the Boundaries of Rationality. The Epistemological Theology of
Nicolaus of Cusa (1401–1464)], Kraków 2023, pp. 68–74.

[128] J. Hoff, *The Analogical Turn: Rethinking Modernity with Nicolas of Cusa*, Grand Rapids,
MI–Cambridge 2013, p. 64.

[129] J. Werbick, *Wprowadzenie do epistemologii teologicznej* [Introduction to Theological Epis-
temology], transl. G. Rawski, Kraków 2014, p. 199.

[130] J. Werbick, *Wprowadzenie do epistemologii teologicznej*, op. cit., pp. 203–204.

[131] S. Judycki, *Epistemologia*, vol. 1, Poznań–Warszawa 2020, p. 479.

[132] J. Wicks, *Wprowadzenie do metody teologiczne*j [Introduction to Theological Method],
transl. J. Ożóg, Kraków 1995, p. 34.

wider category of theologians.[133] Therefore, we cannot define exegetical method outside the realm of theological methods. If, then, we treat theology as a way of contemplating the created world as the effect of God's loving decision, conducted "through the prism of the Creator (*sub ratione Dei*),"[134] then the data concerning the object of cognition given through the senses (the biblical text) have a role analogous to the knowledge of geology in the theology of creation.

This approach to epistemological questions quite surprisingly converges with the conclusions reached by philosophers who combined Thomism with the idea of Christian humanism: Jacques Maritain (1882–1976) or Werner Jaeger (1888–1961). Jaeger credits Maritain with demonstrating the need to define humanism in its new sense, leaving to himself the task of pointing to the ancient sources of theocentric humanism: the *paideia* of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle.[135] This humanism was defined in opposition to its anthropocentric (considered inhuman by the French philosopher)[136] understanding. Maritain referred directly to Descartes as someone responsible for the emergence of the modern world order, which he considered bankrupt. The humanism that Maritain wanted to create from elements of the Christian tradition he called the humanism of the Incarnation.[137] However, on the ground of neo-Thomism, it was not possible to go beyond a language involving the Logos Incarnate. In this sense, the inspiration of phenomenology seems more valuable and forward-looking.

A brief review of phenomenological cognitive presuppositions leads to the conclusion that cognition that goes beyond the study of sense impressions, of what Ingarden described as the scope of a psychophysical theory of cognition, aims at creating a bridge between epistemological presuppositions and a theological approach to exegesis. We can take our consideration of the role of *verbum abbreviatum* and *silentium Dei* ascribed to them in the theology of Scripture by Benedict XVI as a premise for the conclusion that a methodological basis for correct and cognitively valid research is needed in exegetical studies, the

---

[133] J.A. Fitzmyer, *Pismo duszą teologii* [Scripture the Soul of Theology], transl. A. Baron, M. Dobrzyniak, R. Robak, Kraków 1997, pp. 73–81.

[134] P. Roszak, Extra scientiam nulla theologia? *Rola poznania naukowego w dyskursie teologicznym* [The Role of Scientific Cognition in Theological Discourse], [in:] *Teologia w dialogu z innymi naukami. Spotkania-kontrowersje-perspektywy* [Theology in Dialogue with Other Sciences. Encounters-Controversies-Perspectives], ed. D. Wąsek, Kraków 2021, pp. 31–55, especially p. 51.

[135] W. Jaeger, *Humanizm i teologia* [Humanism and Theology], transl. S. Zalewski, Warszawa 1957, pp. 39–41.

[136] J. Maritain, *Religia i kultura* [Religion and Culture], Warszawa 2007, p. 135.

[137] J. Maritain, *Katolicyzm i filozofia* [Catholicism and Philosophy], "Verbum" 1/4 (1934), pp. 470–509, especially pp. 478–482.

premise of which is to return from the biblical text to Scripture. However, it must be pointed out emphatically that there is no Scripture without the text. It is not possible without linguistic, historical, formal-literary matter and a network of intertextual or socio-cultural connections. In the exegesis of Scripture, therefore, there must be room for a description of the text that goes as deep as possible, and is equally comprehensive and extensive, of a text that is Scripture, although it does not exhaust the content of the concept of Scripture.

Scripture is the object of cognition in biblical exegesis rather than (exclusively) the biblical text, just as legal exegesis is concerned with cognition of the law and not the text of a code, statute or other normative texts. Activities around textual cognition belong to, but do not replace, disciplines related to exegesis. Philology, textual criticism, history, literary theory, historical sociology, cultural anthropology, etc. all have their own methods and objects of study. The demand for homogeneity of epistemological rules within the same science (even with differences between methodologies) is understandable and has been present in biblical studies since the 17th century; it is based on the project for the renewal of science formulated by Francis Bacon (1561–1626). Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679),[138] John Locke (1632–1704)[139] or, drawing on Descartes, Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677)[140] started from the assumption that the Bible should be treated in the same way as other sources in historical research. This is how the Bible became the object of historical research, and biblical research was reduced to historical research. If, on the other hand, we are talking about a biblical exegesis that cannot be reduced to the sum of philological, historical, theoretical-literary, sociological, anthropological, etc. studies of the Bible, we should define its own object of cognition, which must be different from the

---

[138] T. Holden, *Hobbes on the Authority of Scripture*, [in:] *Oxford Studies in Early Modern Philosophy*, vol. 8, eds. D. Garber, D. Rutherford, Oxford 2018, pp. 68–95, especially pp. 71–78.

[139] F. Copleston, *Historia filozofii* [History of Philosophy], vol. 5: *Od Hobbesa do Hume'a* [From Hobbes to Hume], transl. J. Pasek, J. Pasek, P. Józefowicz, Warszawa 2009, p. 108. Although there is no explicitly critical attitude towards the Bible as a book of special status in Locke, Adam Grzeliński's statement that in proving the existence of God Locke "refers to the evidence of Thomas rather than Anselm of Canterbury and Augustine; his proof is the argumentation of a common-sense natural philosopher" (A. Grzeliński, *Doświadczenie i rozum. Empiryzm Johna Locke'a* [Experience and Reason. John Locke's Empiricism], Toruń 2019, p. 345) makes it clear that he assumed a rationalist-empiricist critical stance towards the Bible. It is worth recalling the role that Locke played in distancing himself from simple cognitive realism, which was deeply present in the Renaissance tradition before Descartes. See G. Gottfried, *Teoria poznania od Kartezjusza do Wittgensteina* [Theory of Cognition from Descartes to Wittgenstein], transl. T. Kubalica, Kraków 2007, pp. 80–83.

[140] M.C. Legaspi, *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies*, Oxford 2010, pp. 23–25.

historical source, the literary work, the material for learning about historical (and therefore inaccessible in field or survey research) forms of cultures and social life. The object of the study of exegesis is, in the light of what we said earlier about phenomenological reduction, Scripture seen especially in terms of what makes it Sacred Scripture. In this context, *verbum abbreviatum* in its Christological sense as it is spoken of in *Verbum Domini*, and the idea of *silentium Dei* present in the same document, lead us to conclude that the object of biblical exegesis is the act of God's communication (*locutio Dei*), even if it is expressed in His silence. The cognition that is prepared on the basis of textual research, however, is not exhausted in it; it seeks to reflect on this very act of communication. This does not only apply to scientific cognition, but also – as Michal Klinger shows in the juxtaposition of John 8:2–9 and Tadeusz Różewicz's poem *The Unknown Letter* – to poetic intuition.[141]

In human cognition, the qualities and dispositions[142] of the subject play an important, almost decisive role. The thinking subject disposes of certain cognitive tools (in the sense of natural as well as cultural endowment) and occupies a certain point of view (in which the historical background of the subject plays no small part). These contribute to the production of cognitive effects.[143] Those elements of the cognitive perspective whose source is the subject's world of values and worldview also play their role.[144]

Biblical theological exegesis and its subject matter

Robert Woźniak's statement that "Scripture in its totality from the first to the new covenant is an expression of the remembrance of Jesus Christ as the supreme historical revelation of God,"[145] can be regarded, in contemporary language, as the thought behind the idea of *Verbum abbreviatum*, which presupposes a Christocentric *lectio exegetico-theologica*. The opportunity for such a Christocentric interpretation of Scripture is not always recognised in exegetical circles. Biblical scholars in the first post-Vatican II period often looked to *Dei Verbum* as a justification for widening the margin of freedom in the choice of

---

[141]   M. Klinger, *Strażnik wrót. Próby z hermeneutyki teologicznej* [Gatekeeper: Rehearsals from Theological Hermeneutics], Kraków 2019, pp. 56–59.

[142]   S. Rainko, *Rola podmiotu w poznaniu. Zarys zagadnień* [The Role of the Subject in Cognition. Overview of Issues], Warszawa 1971, p. 99.

[143]   S. Rainko, *Rola podmiotu w poznaniu...*, op. cit., p. 105.

[144]   S. Rainko, *Rola podmiotu w poznaniu...*, op. cit., p. 111.

[145]   R. Woźniak, *Praca nad dogmatem...*, op. cit., p. 40.

research methodology. At present, they are faced with a major methodological challenge, as it is becoming urgent to develop an apparatus that would make it possible to speak of theological exegesis not just as a postulate, but as a concrete proposal for conducting research. The study of Christian typology is not sufficient as a basis for working out what the exhortation *Verbum Domini* suggests in paragraphs 34–36. In particular, the warning against the danger of cognitive dualism in the approach to Scripture (VD 35) should become a guideline in the search for a method that allows for an integral and coherent reading of the Bible in the Church. A taste of this dualism is found, for example, in the dichotomy of exegesis and biblical theology, whose shared duty is to present a coherent explanation of the plain meaning of the biblical text as their resultant.[146] A condition for the coherence of exegesis and theological interpretation is that a theology of revelation adequate to contemporary epistemological models is at the heart of the definition of Scripture as an object of exegetical study.

In asking about the shape of theological exegetical method, it is necessary to return to the foundation of the theology of revelation as proposed by Karl Rahner in *The Hearer of the Word* and his other works. Epistemologically, he founds theology on man's listening to the word of God and his subjective conditioning.[147] For the listener who is ontologically oriented to the possibility of divine revelation, which is the free initiative of God,[148] there is no other possibility of experiencing it but the historical form of it, where its historicity is related to the historicity of man and to God's action in history.[149] Revelation and salvation are dialectically related: the salvific event points to the object of revelation, and salvation "becomes materially determined only in the event of revelation."[150] Although not identical, in Rahner's view salvation and revelation are two realities happening in the same event. This in turn presupposes an interpretive, hermeneutical point of view:

---

[146] R.W. Wall, *Reading the New Testament in Canonical Context*, [in:] *Hearing the New Testament. Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. J.B. Green, Grand Rapids, MI 2010, pp. 372–396, especially p. 377.

[147] K. Rahner, *Słuchacz słowa. Ugruntowanie filozofii religii* [Hearer of the Word: Laying the Foundation for a Philosophy of Religion], transl. R. Samek, Kęty 2008, p. 23; cf. K. Rahner, *Hearer of the Word: Laying the Foundation for a Philosophy of Religion*, transl. J. Donceel, London–New York 1994.

[148] K. Rahner, *Słuchacz słowa…*, op. cit., p. 132.

[149] K. Rahner, *Słuchacz słowa…*, op. cit., p. 133.

[150] K. Rahner, *Teologia i antropologia* [Theology and Anthropology], [in:] K. Rahner, *Pisma wybrane* [Selected Writings], vol. 1, transl. G. Bubel, Kraków 2005, pp. 46–67, especially p. 54.

this pronouncement of God, which we call His Revelation, requires our ability to hear Him in order for it to actually happen. [...] [W]hen the pronouncements that God addresses to us exist only in the pronouncements that we receive in our mind. [...] In order for them [the events of our historical environment of which Rahner speaks above – W.L.] to be [the events of our historical environment] there is a verbal interpretation of pure facts, which interpretation is not an external element of these events, but an internal, constitutive element of them, indispensable for them to be considered as events of Revelation.[151]

The subject-oriented approach to revelation includes an exegetical and an interpretive aspect. Exegesis is linked to interpretation not only by the fact that in interpretation we find the output of exegesis consisting in the clarification of philological, literary and historical issues of the text. Exegesis is adapted to a particular interpretation, which constitutes an exegetical pre-understanding, an exegetical hermeneutics. Theological exegesis is then that one aware of its own perspective, which is, in the case of ecclesiastical theological exegesis, the fundamental focus of the ecclesiastical subject: salvation revealed and salvific revelation, i.e. Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Word, "who became short" in order to include all the words of Scripture.

Ratzinger himself proposed several guidelines for theological exegesis. The first is a critical reference to the philosophical presuppositions of any exegetical method. The second, a consequence of the first, is a correspondingly broad notion of historicity, in which there is room for the history of exegesis itself. The third indication for theological exegesis is the appreciation of philology, literary theory and hermeneutic philosophy (even more than philosophical hermeneutics), since it speaks of the 'philosophical implications of the interpretative process'. Ratzinger felt that it was necessary to elaborate on the message conveyed by the Christian tradition of biblical interpretation (not just the Catholic tradition, as he mentions the Reformation tradition). He was more concerned with how to approach the text and the process of interpretation than with the interpreted content. He assumes that Occam's razor is necessary to cut through unnecessary hypotheses (especially concerning hypothetical sources and *Sitz im Leben*). Finally, he points to the contextual conditions of exegesis (its inevitable historicity and ecclesiality) as a fundamental determinant. It is not possible to practise theological exegesis without the (ecclesiastical) interpretive

---

[151] K. Rahner, *Kościelna chrystologia między egzegezą a dogmatyką* [Ecclesiastical Christology between Exegesis and Dogmatics], [in:] K. Rahner, *Pisma wybrane*, vol. 1, op. cit., pp. 253–283, especially p. 260.

subject being part of it.[152] In this view, which was presented by Ratzinger at the end of the 1980s,[153] we do not find the postulate of Christological exegesis explicitly presented, although Ratzinger's hermeneutics of faith is mature.[154] He emphasises the role of faith: "It is only through faith that we can freely accept the testimony of God and acknowledge him as the transcendent guarantor of the truth revealed by him."[155] Zatwardnicki, in his work on this hermeneutics, points out that after 2010 the analogy between Scripture and the Incarnation cannot be overlooked in this hermeneutics.[156]

René Laurentin (1917–2017), a dogmatist and Mariologist, faced the problem in his work written some 20 years after the Second Vatican Council: how to reconcile faith with exegesis?[157] In his answer, he drew attention to the dimension of the believer's interpersonal relationship with the Word of God. He conceives of this faith as an irrational act, not based on any certainty of meaning or any certainty of reasoning.[158] He defines exegesis as the application to the Bible of an empirical critical method.[159] He considers the methodology of biblical studies in a form characteristic of the time of the book: with the dominant role of historical criticism,[160] but also with an alternative methodological proposal to it, namely semiotic analysis.[161] Method in exegesis represents, in the French

---

[152] J. Ratzinger/Benedict XVI, *God's Word…*, op. cit., p. 123; cf. J. Ratzinger/Benedykt XVI, *Słowo Boga…*, op. cit., p. 121–123.

[153] J. Ratzinger, *Schriftauslegung im Widerstreit*, op. cit., p. 15–44.

[154] J. Ratzinger/Benedict XVI, *God's Word…*, op. cit., p. 123–124; cf. J. Ratzinger/Benedykt XVI, *Słowo Boga…*, op. cit., p. 123.

[155] Benedict XVI, *Poznanie prawdy. Wykłady papieskie* [Knowing the Truth. Papal Lectures], Kraków 2017, p. 87.

[156] S. Zatwardnicki, *Hermeneutyka wiary w nauczaniu papieża Benedykta XVI* [Hermeneutics of Faith in the Teaching of Pope Benedict XVI], Wrocław 2014, pp. 118–122. See also R. Voderholzer, *Die biblische Hermeneutik Joseph Ratzingers*, "Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift" 56 (2005), pp. 400–414, especially p. 410.

[157] R. Laurentin, *Come riconciliare l'esegesi e la fede*, transl. M. Masini, Brescia 1986, p. 5 (the original appeared in print in 1984).

[158] R. Laurentin, *Come riconciliare l'esegesi e la fede*, op. cit., pp. 151–153.

[159] R. Laurentin, *Come riconciliare l'esegesi e la fede*, op. cit., p. 153.

[160] R. Laurentin, *Come riconciliare l'esegesi e la fede*, op. cit., pp. 95–117.

[161] R. Laurentin, *Come riconciliare l'esegesi e la fede*, op. cit., pp. 118–148. On the method of semiotic analysis see, for example, O. Genest, *Analyse sémiotique et Bible. Situation et questions disputes*, "Laval Théologique et Philosophique" 36/2 (1980), pp. 115–128; Groupe d'Entrevernes, *Analyse sémiotique des textes. Introduction – théorie – pratique*, Lyon 1985, passim. It is worth noting that Laurentin, writing from a French perspective, underestimates the more widely used semantic analysis based on the research of James Barr (*The Semantics of Biblical Language*, Oxford 1961), see P. Sacchi, *Problemi teologici e problemi linguistici nell'opera del Barr*, [in:] J. Barr, *Semantica del linguaggio biblico*, transl.

theologian's view, a rational element that is insufficient for understanding the text being read. For the Bible, as written by believers and for believers,[162] requires faith as the key, and yes, irrational element constituting the object of understanding.[163] However, it is hard to resist the impression that Laurentin

---

P. Sacchi, Bologna 1980, pp. VII–XXXVIII; W. Egger, *Metodologia del Nuovo Testamento. Introduzione allo studio scientifico del Nuovo Testamento*, transl. G. Forza, Bologna 1991, pp. 95–124; H. Langkammer, *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu* [Methodology of the New Testament], Opole 1991, pp. 130–139; H. Langkammer, *Metody lingwistyczne* [Linguistic Methods], [in:] *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu* [Methodology of the New Testament], ed. H. Langkammer, Pelplin 1994, pp. 235–270, especially pp. 252–261; J. Czerski, *Metody interpretacji Nowego Testamentu* [Methods of New Testament Interpretation], Opole 1997, pp. 131–138. It is significant that the relevant chapter (or subsection) does not appear in J. Czerski, *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu* [Methodology of the New Testament], Opole 2012. This is a testimony to the displacement of the semantic approach by more dynamic varieties of linguistic approaches (pragmatics, narratology, rhetorical analysis), and at the same time an illustration of the process of rapid change in the methodology of biblical studies, which found its way to the 1993 document of the Pontifical Biblical Commission.

[162] This is a reference to the view of Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803) from *Über die erste Urkunden des menschlichen Geschlechts. Einige Anmerkungen* ([in:] J.G. Herder, *Werke zu zehn Bänden*, eds. M. Bollach et al., vol. 5: *Schriften zum Alten Testament*, ed. R. Smend, Frankfurt am Main 1993, pp. 9–178, especially p. 29) that the Bible is a book written by the people, about the people and for the people; cf. P. Zioło, *Metaforyczność poezji hebrajskiej w ujęciu J.G. Herdera* [Metaphoricity of Hebrew Poetry according to J.G. Herder], "Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny" 48/3 (1995), pp. 193–199; M. Górecka, *Biblia Lutra. Biblia w literaturze niemieckojęzycznej* [Luther's Bible. The Bible in German-language Literature], "Studia Nauk Teologicznych PAN" 4 (2009), pp. 136–145, especially pp. 140–141; P. Zarychta, *Biblia w literaturze niemieckiej od* Średniowiecza *po Klasycyzm Weimarski* [The Bible in German Literature from the Middle Ages to Weimar Classicism], [in:] *"Cóż za księga!" Biblia w literaturze niemieckojęzycznej od Oświecenia do współczesności* ["What a Book!" The Bible in German-language Literature from the Enlightenment to the Present], eds. M. Kłańska, J. Kita-Huber, P. Zarychta, Kraków 2010, pp. 21–56, especially pp. 47–48. After Daniel Weidner (*Einleitung: Lektüren im* Geist der Ebräischen Poesie, [in:] *Urpoesie und Morgenland. Johann Gottfried Herders* Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie, ed. D. Weidner, Berlin 2008, pp. 9–21, especially p. 13), Marek Karczewski (*Język raju? Walory starożytnego języka hebrajskiego w świetle «Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie» [1782/1783] Johanna Gottfrieda Herdera* [Language of Paradise? The qualities of the ancient Hebrew language in the light of Johann Gottfried Herder's "Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie" (1782/1783)], "Studia Elbląskie" 10 [2009], pp. 123–134, especially pp. 126 and 133, note 63) defends the thesis that Herder never questioned that the Bible is the word of God and not a product of human culture. In the monumental work by Henning graf Reventlow (*Storia dell'interpretazione biblica*, vol. 4: *Dall'Illuminismo fino al XX secolo*, transl. E. Gatti, Casale Monferrato 2004, pp. 223–237), one searches in vain for clarity on the matter of the theological status of the Bible with Herder. These words became (whether intended or not) the manifesto of an Enlightenment, non-theological approach to the Bible.

[163] R. Laurentin, *Come riconciliare l'esegesi e la fede*, op. cit., p. 160.

makes a certain reversal in his reasoning, since he states a little further on that faith is the experience of the thinking subject (the believing exegete).[164] It remains, then, in the interactive game between author and reader, to choose the direction in which to continue to follow the author's thought, but closer to it remains the subjective direction, for it is ultimately the "experience of faith" that lies at the root of biblical texts and interpretation.[165] Ultimately, then, the goal of reading and interpreting Scripture is, for him, a multilevel reading of the text: scientific (objective), traditional (he does not count it as scientific and reproaches it for neglecting scientific forms of exegesis, to which he counts only historical criticism and semiotic analysis),[166] catechetical (transmission of the fundamental dogmatic and moral teaching of the Bible), prophetic (motivating function) and contemplative (charismatic and mystical).[167] Thus, one can actually find in Laurentin's proposal (contrary to the conciliatory attitude declared by him) a confirmation of the inevitable methodological dichotomy between scientific exegesis and other forms of reading the Bible. More precisely, one could say that only scientific exegesis (understood by him in a very narrow and inadequate way for the state of knowledge at the time, as we have tried to show in the footnotes) is scientific. Other forms of biblical reading are based on personal, irrational and charismatic experience of faith. In spite of these very important limitations, this proposal contains a very interesting aspect in the context of our research, unhappily abandoned by the author: the intuition that faith constitutes the object of exegesis.

A similar direction in the development of theological exegesis was proposed by Thomas Söding (1956–), who suggested that scientific exegesis should take

---

[164] R. Laurentin, *Come riconciliare l'esegesi e la fede*, op. cit., p. 161.

[165] R. Laurentin, *Come riconciliare l'esegesi e la fede*, op. cit., p. 178.

[166] From the late 1960s, following Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900–2002), both Ernst Fuchs (1903–1983) and Gerhard Ebeling (1912–2001) developed the line of research we know as the reception history or history of influence (*Wirkungsgeschichte*). Its positive presentation and evaluation was given by Prosper Grech (*La nuova ermeneutica: Fuchs e Ebeling*, "Augustinianum" 12 [1972], pp. 277–296). This is further evidence that Laurentin, in his search for a solution to the methodological problem of theological exegesis, stopped at the state of exegesis in the early 1960s. See A. Tronina, *Historia oddziaływania tekstu. Wirkungsgeschichte* [History of Textual Influence. Wirkungsgeschichte], [in:] *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu*, ed. H. Langkammer, op. cit., pp. 207–231; S. Szymik, *Historia oddziaływania tekstu (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) a studium Nowego Testamentu* [History of Textual Impact (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) versus Study of the New Testament], "Roczniki Teologiczne" 51/1 (2004), pp. 127–140; J. Czerski, *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu*, op. cit., pp. 213–221; S. Szymik, *Współczesne modele egzegezy biblijnej* [Contemporary Models of Biblical Exegesis], Lublin 2013, pp. 119–131.

[167] R. Laurentin, *Come riconciliare l'esegesi e la fede*, op. cit., pp. 181–182.

the development of the reader of the Bible as its goal and the growth of Scripture with the reader as its perspective (after Gregorius Magnus, *Moralia in Iob* I,3). Its own task, in this context, is to show how Scripture as a whole and its individual parts "grew" and how it was shaped (in the historical sense – the process of creation, in the literary sense – the composition of the text, in the communicative sense – the intention). This requires, he believes, a shift of attention from the author's intention to the *sensus textus* and *receptio lectoris*.[168] This means an exegesis that is not only preceded and conditioned by hermeneutics, but it becomes hermeneutics because in this way it enters creatively into the area of theology: it describes the experience of the Logos of all being[169] in human knowledge of the world: the reading and interpretation of Scripture is the privileged place of encounter with Jesus Christ-God, who descends into human cognitive limitations, from the "above" of glory to the "below"[170] of the historicity and social character of human approach to truth.

In Poland, a systematic reflection on theological exegesis between 2005 and 2012 was led by Artur Malina (1965–), who first posed the question of the object of biblical interpretation, which he defined as "the text [...] as it has reached its final editing [...] and in the context of the larger whole which it co-creates together with other textual units." The object of exegesis thus described is shared by various forms of study, so that, for example, the socio-cultural context, which is present only in part of the methods of scientific textual study, is absent from this view.[171] The inspired text as the object of exegesis is also described by Malina elsewhere.[172] However, this is not a complete definition of the object of biblical exegesis because ultimately the scholar concludes

---

[168] T. Söding, *Fare esegesi, fare teologia. Un rapporto necessario e complesso*, [in:] *Ascoltare, rispondere, vivere. Atti del Congresso Internazionale "La Sacra Scrittura nella vita e nella missione della Chiesa" (1–4 dicembre 2010)*, ed. E. Borghi, Milano 2011, pp. 77–87, especially p. 86.

[169] J. Ratzinger, *Introduction to Christianity*, transl. M.J. Miller, San Francisco 2004, p. 67; cf. J. Ratzinger, *Wprowadzenie w chrześcijaństwo*, transl. Z. Włodkowska, Kraków 1994, p. 148.

[170] J. Ratzinger, *The God of Jesus Christ...*, op. cit., p. 60; cf. J. Ratzinger, *Bóg Jezusa Chrystusa*, op. cit., p. 62.

[171] A. Malina, *Egzegeza w kontekście* [Exegesis in Context], [in:] *Interpretacja (w) dialogu. Tożsamość egzegezy biblijnej* [Interpretation (in) Dialogue. The Identity of Biblical Exegesis], eds. A. Kucz, A. Malina, Kielce 2005, pp. 70–78, especially p. 70.

[172] A. Malina, *Najnowsze kanony (w) interpretacji początków chrześcijaństwa* [Recent Canons (in) the Interpretation of the Origins of Christianity], "Śląskie Studia Historyczno--Teologiczne" 45/1 (2012), pp. 65–83, especially p. 69.

that this role is fulfilled by "the dialogue between God and man."[173] Thus, we can see that the referenced text leads the reader away from the analysis of the biblical macro-text to the theological event of communication, the form and nature of which is Revelation. This continuum is set as its foundation on a juxtaposition of diachronic and synchronic methods (Laurentin's optics, but enriched by the knowledge of the development of different methodologies in biblical studies in the twenty years 1985–2005). Malina continued his reflection on theological exegesis in his article *Quid sit anima theologiae*,[174] in which he focused on clarifying the question of the relationship between theology and scientific exegetical study. This strand of his reflection closes with an article which is a development of a paper delivered on 16 November 2011 in Kraków at the session dedicated to *Verbum Domini*.[175] He refers to the appeal contained in the exhortation to develop a theological exegetical method. He begins by presenting an exegesis that does not claim to be theological. He identifies it with the work of Friedrich D.E. Schleiermacher (1768–1834), especially with his concept of hermeneutics, in which general hermeneutics subsumed biblical hermeneutics.[176] In exegetical practice, this means that the interpreter of the biblical text has no methodological mandate to conduct research as a person of faith. The methodological exclusion of a faith perspective would in theory be supposed to be supplemented by the approach of a theologian using the results of exegetical work. In practice, however, this is impossible because of the dichotomy of exegesis and theology adopted in the Enlightenment, which cannot mutually relate since exegesis asks about the meaning of biblical texts at different stages of its formation and theology asks about the meaning given to them by God.[177] Malina undermines the understanding of religion that refers to Schleiermacher and his experiential conception of the object of cognition and interpretation,[178] while he explicitly postulates that the supernatural reality to

---

[173]   A. Malina, *Egzegeza w kontekście*, op. cit., p. 78.

[174]   A. Malina, *Quid sit anima theologiae*, [in:] *Wierność i aggiornamento. Wokół recepcji Soboru Watykańskiego II* [Fidelity and Aggiornamento. Around the Reception of the Second Vatican Council], ed. G. Kucza, Katowice 2006, pp. 74–86.

[175]   A. Malina, *Egzegeza teologiczna Biblii* [Theological Exegesis of the Bible], [in:] *Hermeneutyka Pisma Świętego w Kościele. Wokół adhortacji* Verbum Domini *Benedykta XVI o Słowie Bożym w życiu i misji Kościoła* [Hermeneutics of Scripture in the Church. Around the Apostolic Exhortation *Verbum Domini* by Benedict XVI on the Word of God in the Life and Mission of the Church], eds. R. Pindel, S. Jędrzejewski, Kraków 2012, pp. 37–54.

[176]   A. Malina, *Egzegeza teologiczna Biblii*, op. cit., pp. 39–42.

[177]   A. Malina, *Egzegeza teologiczna Biblii*, op. cit., p. 48.

[178]   I. Mädler, *Friedrich Schleiermacher: zmysł i smak nieskończoności* [Friedrich Schleiermacher: Sense and Taste of the Infinite], [in:] *Filozofia religii. Od Schleiermachera do Eco*

which the believing Bible scholar refers should be considered a unique and at the same time objective fact.[179] He concludes his reflection by stating the necessity of presumptions that are appropriate "for the nature of the object under study," that is, a biblical hermeneutics as Ricœur understood it. We refer first of all to the hermeneutic period in the thought of the French philosopher, in which "the issue of the text is the object of hermeneutics."[180] This "issue of the text" constitutes faith understood in opposition to any psychologising reduction.[181] It is not related to the psychological fiction of the recipient, that is, the interpreter of the text. It is the text, according to Ricœur, that interprets itself by reference to its own tradition.[182] Ricœur defines the tradition by reference to the work of Werner H. Schmidt (1935–) on the origin and development of the Priestly source (P), especially in terms of Gen 1:1–2:4a.[183] This exegete presents the text of the poetic narrative of the creation of the world as the result of the internal growth of the theme and its framing. Ricœur therefore draws attention to the dynamics of the formation of meaning (i.e. the process of interpretation) in the text itself, in which the text expresses itself:[184] the reality described anew is not an arbitrary reality, but a reality belonging to the world of the reader.[185]

In biblical exegesis, the hermeneutic circle is understood as the interplay between the interpretation of the text and the self-understanding of the subject interpreting that text, which is resolved in the foundational role of the text in relation to the community, i.e. a form of asymmetry in the text-community relationship: "faith is nothing other than the confession of this asymmetry."[186] This is how, on the ground of a philosophical analysis of the interpretative

---

[Philosophy of Religion. From Schleiermacher to Eco], eds. V. Drehsen, W. Gräb, B. Weyel, transl. L. Łysień, Kraków 2008, pp. 11–18, especially p. 14.

[179] A. Malina, *Egzegeza teologiczna Biblii*, op. cit., pp. 51 and 53.

[180] P. Ricœur, *Naming God*, [in:] *Figuring the Sacred: Religion, Narrative, and Imagination*, transl. D. Pellauer, Minneapolis, MN 1995, p. 221; cf. P. Ricœur, *Nazwać Boga*, transl. R. Grzywacz, Kraków 2011, p. 53.

[181] P. Ricœur, *Nazwać Boga*, op. cit., p. 58.

[182] P. Ricœur, *Egzegeza i hermeneutyka* [Exegesis and Hermeneutics], transl. S. Cichowicz, [in:] P. Ricœur, *Egzystencja i hermeneutyka. Rozprawy o metodzie* [Existence and Hermeneutics: Treatises on Method], Warszawa 2003, pp. 348–359, especially p. 356.

[183] W.H. Schmidt, *Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1964, pp. 160–191.

[184] P. Ricœur, *Egzegeza i hermeneutyka*, op. cit., pp. 356–357.

[185] P. Ricœur, *Refleksja dokonana. Autobiografia intelektualna* [Reflection Made: Intellectual Autobiography], transl. P. Bobowska-Nastarzewska, Kęty 2005, p. 31.

[186] A. LaCocque, P. Ricœur, *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies*, transl. D. Pellauer, Chicago–London 1998, p. xvii; cf. A. LaCocque, P. Ricœur, *Przedmowa* [Preface], [in:] A. LaCocque, P. Ricœur, *Myśleć biblijnie* [Thinking Biblically], transl. E. Mukoid, M. Tarnowska, Kraków 2003, pp. 5–16, especially pp. 13–14.

process, we can arrive at what Malina does not elaborate: how to justify his postulate of the objectification of faith in the revealing God and the content of this revelation. God, in Ricœur's understanding, is a biblical figure who speaks to us,[187] but it is not a fictional character of some literary text, but an authoritative voice in relation to which the recipient (the reading community) self-identifies, defines its existence. "In the act of speaking, the subject recognises itself in the medium of speech, marking reality by means of signs and at the same time itself as belonging to a symbolic universe."[188] We arrive at this situation, in which the subject interpreting Scripture defines himself vis-à-vis God revealing himself in the written text, by going through the experience of reading the concrete semantic units of the biblical text as building the unity of the biblical *corpus*.[189] In this way, building on Ricœur's work, we can broaden the Husserlian horizon that boils down to the object-subject relationship, without rejecting the conceptual and methodological apparatus developed by Husserl[190] that makes possible the turn towards the thing, towards the object in biblical exegesis.

A relatively recent opinion in the discussion on the mutual relationship of methods in biblical and theological research was voiced by Marcin Kowalski (1977–).[191] He proposed to the community of dogmatic theologians a common methodological platform (socio-rethorical criticism) as, on the one hand, useful, in his view, also in dogmatic theology, and, on the other hand, providing guidance for the formation of the theological-dogmatic hermeneutics needed for

---

[187] P. Colin, *Herméneutique et philosophie reflexive*, [in:] *Paul Ricœur. Les métamorphoses de la raison herméneutique*, eds. J. Greisch, R. Kearney, Paris 1991, pp. 15–35, esp. 35.

[188] A. Warmbier, *Tożsamość, narracja i hermeneutyka* siebie. *Paula Ricœura filozofia człowieka* [Identity, Narrative and the Hermeneutics of *the Self*. Paul Ricœur's Philosophy of Man], Kraków 2018, p. 233.

[189] A. LaCocque, P. Ricœur, *Przedmowa*, op. cit., p. 12.

[190] P. Ricœur, *The Later Wittgenstein and the Later Husserl on Language*, "Ricœuriennes / Ricœur Studies" 5/1 (2014), pp. 28–48; cf. P. Ricœur, *Husserl i Wittgenstein o języku* [Husserl and Wittgenstein on Language], transl. M. Drwięga, "Principia" 16–17 (1996–1997), pp. 59–69; A. Przyłębski, *Znaczenie fenomenologii Husserla dla hermeneutyki* [The Significance of Husserl's Phenomenology for Hermeneutics], "Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria" 18/4 (2009), pp. 305–318, especially pp. 313–316.

[191] M. Kowalski, *Separacja – tak, rozwód – nie. Wyzwania i implikacje płynące z metodologicznego rozwoju nauk biblijnych i teologii systematycznej* [Separation – Yes, Divorce – No. Challenges and Implications Flowing from the Methodological Development of Biblical Sciences and Systematic Theology], [in:] *Dogmat i metoda. Wprowadzenie do badań interdyscyplinarnych w teologii dogmatycznej* [Dogma and Method. Introduction to Interdisciplinary Research in Dogmatic Theology], ed. R.J. Woźniak, Kraków 2021, pp. 537–569.

the assimilation of data from biblical activities.[192] It assumes that a separation of dogmatic theology and exegesis is necessary, but that dialogue and cooperation between the two is possible and necessary. This is the result of an earlier assumption, the same one that emerges in Joseph Ratzinger's reflection approving the indispensability of the historical-critical method as a tool; Ratzinger, seeing the main problem in the fact that the meaning of Scripture is reduced to the past, emphasises the indispensability of this method, which he motivates by the structure of Christian faith based on the historical fact of the Incarnation.[193] Pablo Blanco Sarto (1964–) is probably right when he points out that the formation of the German theologian's reflection on the nature and methods of exegesis came to life under the influence of the Protestant world.[194] As far as the role of historical criticism is concerned, Kowalski probably goes a little

---

[192] M. Kowalski, *Separacja – tak, rozwód – nie…*, op. cit., p. 559.

[193] J. Ratzinger/Benedict XVI, *Jesus of Nazareth: From the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration*, transl. A.J. Walker, New York 2007, pp. XV–XVI; cf. J. Ratzinger/ Benedykt XVI, *Jezus z Nazaretu*, vol. 1: *Od chrztu w Jordanie do Przemienienia*, transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2007, pp. 8–9. cf. M.M. Waldstein, *The Self-Critique of the Historical-Critical Method: Cardinal Ratzinger's Erasmus Lecture*, "Modern Theology" 28/4 (2012), pp. 732–747; S. Zatwardnicki, *Aprioryczne założenia i filozoficzne uwarunkowania metody historyczno-krytycznej według Benedykta XVI* [A-priori Assumptions and Philosophical Influence of the Historical-Critical Method According to Benedict XVI], "Scriptura Sacra" 16 (2012), pp. 141–164; S. Zatwardnicki, *Pismo Święte czytane w Kościele duszą teologii. Benedykta XVI troska o stan katolickiej egzegezy* [The Holy Scripture Read in the Church as the Soul of Theology. Benedict XVI's Concern about the State of the Catholic Exegesis], "Teologia w Polsce" 7/2 (2013), pp. 173–188; S. Zatwardnicki, *Metoda historyczno-krytyczna a hermeneutyka wiary. Propozycja syntezy w ujęciu Josepha Ratzingera (Benedykta XVI)* [Historical-Critical Method a Hermeneutics of Faith. A Proposal for a Synthesis according to Joseph Ratzinger (Benedict XVI)], "Ateneum Kapłańskie" 162/1 (2014), pp. 74–94; S. Zatwardnicki, *Granice metody historyczno-krytycznej w ujęciu Josepha Ratzingera (Benedykta XVI)* [Limitations of the Historical-Critical Method According to Joseph Ratzinger (Benedict XVI)], "Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny" 67/2 (2014), pp. 143–165; S. Zatwardnicki, *Apostazja współczesnej egzegezy. Benedykt XVI o niewystarczalności metody historyczno-krytycznej* [Apostasy of Modern Exegesis. Benedict XVI on the Insufficiency of the Historical-Critical Method], "Teologia i Człowiek" 28/4 (2014), pp. 185–204; I.G. Ajibola, *Joseph Ratzinger's Theological Hermeneutics for Christians Faith Enhancement: An Appraisal*, "Ilorin Journal of Religious Studies" 5/2 (2015), pp. 97–113; B. Pitre, Verbum Domini *and Historical-Critical Exegesis*, [in:] Verbum Domini *and Complementarity of Exegesis and Theology,* ed. S. Carl, Grand Rapids, MI 2015, pp. 26–40.

[194] P. Blanco Sarto, *Myśl teologiczna Josepha Ratzingera* [Theological Thought of Joseph Ratzinger], "Teologia w Polsce" 7/2 (2013), pp. 23–43, especially pp. 26–27. However, even the influence of Romano Guardini on Ratzinger should be taken into account, see G. Bachanek, *The Rationality of Faith: Romano Guardini and Joseph Ratzinger*, "Collectanea Theologica" 90/5 (2020), pp. 607–620, especially p. 614.

further than Ratzinger, since he considers the historical method as 'governing' theology if it wants to aspire to the status of a scientific discipline.[195] Kowalski's postulates thus remain rather limited, since they focus on the conditions for the interchangeable use of methods between biblical studies and dogmatic theology and the development of a hermeneutic of analogies between the two (taking into account the differences and specificities of the disciplines).[196] It is a minimalist programme, abandoning the search for an exegetical method that will have within its purview the theological message of the biblical text. One may think that this is the fruit of a negative evaluation of the methodological approach of Karl Barth (1886–1968), whose theology Kowalski describes after Anthony C. Thiselton (1937–2023)[197] as a Christological exegesis of the biblical text.[198] The Swiss dogmatist points to the need to overcome the paradigm derived from Schleiermacher equating religion with religious experience. Barth counters it with the assumption that God's action takes precedence over human experience and that the content of Scripture is God's thought about man. This type of thinking was highly influential in shaping the theology of Revelation at the Second Vatican Council, but met with criticism from, for example, Hans Urs von Balthasar, who accused him of a narrow and coercive approach to Revelation, in which there was no room for the autonomy of nature as a starting point for the theological knowledge of God.[199] Kowalski, however, does not develop this critique of von Balthasar and his appreciation of the natural theology, but embeds the *iunctim* of biblical and systematic theology in the Church.[200] In this way, he remains faithful to his presuppositions, since he leaves biblical research of an exegetical nature outside the sphere of this *iunctim,* where there is room for an ecclesiastical hermeneutics that makes it possible to apply the fruits of biblical research to the reality of the contemporary world.[201]

After a review of the methodological proposals linking theology and biblical studies at the level of methodology put forward in the post-conciliar period, although the list is obviously not complete, one may be tempted to formulate

---

[195] M. Kowalski, *Separacja – tak, rozwód – nie…*, op. cit., p. 565.

[196] M. Kowalski, *Separacja – tak, rozwód – nie…*, op. cit., pp. 561–568. As his inspiration Kowalski points to the article by J.B. Green, *Scripture and Theology. Uniting the Two So Long Divided*, [in:] *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies and Systematic Theology*, eds. J.B. Green, M. Turner, Grand Rapids, MI 2000, pp. 23–43.

[197] A.C. Thiselton, *Hermeneutics: An Introduction*, Grand Rapids, MI 2009, p. 187.

[198] M. Kowalski, *Separacja – tak, rozwód – nie…*, op. cit., p. 563.

[199] T.G. Guarino, *Foundations of Systematic Theology,* New York–London 2005, pp. 223–233.

[200] M. Kowalski, *Separacja – tak, rozwód – nie…*, op. cit., p. 566.

[201] M. Kowalski, *Separacja – tak, rozwód – nie…*, op. cit., pp. 567–568.

some conclusions, which themselves may constitute a set of presuppositions for theological exegetical method. Already in his doctoral thesis published in 1955, Raymond E. Brown, writing about the and its role in the interpretation of Scripture, set out clear criteria for it to be considered embedded in the field of critical research. Firstly, *sensus plenior* must be derived from the literal sense, and secondly, it must be embedded in the economy of salvation attested in the interpretive tradition. As far as the Old Testament texts are concerned, this tradition is constituted by: the New Testament, patristic exegesis, the Magisterium of the Church, the liturgy and (which he admits with some hesitation) the opinion of theologians.[202] The existence of a fuller sense in a text is suggested, according to Brown, by: 1) exaggeration in the description of the human capacity when taken literally, 2) incompatibility with the context of some narrative ("an element of brusqueness or strangeness in an otherwise simple narrative," 3) exaggerated emphasis (hyperbole) of some element of the narrative, 4) a messianic import on second-level texts (which are transcriptions of earlier texts, such as 1–2 Kings, Ezra).[203] These are criteria and indications that very much narrow the category of *sensus plenior*. Taken *à la lettre* they reduce the category to the history of textual influence and the history of exegesis. However, they can provide a starting point for developing a theological exegesis with a Christological orientation. They provide a good counterbalance to attempts to reactivate historical forms of such exegesis (allegorism, typology).[204] In the apologia presented by Paul C. Boles, Origen's allegory is a tool that can be used to concretise (incarnate) in history beyond the history of revelation. In his polemic with Daniel Boyarin he claimed that the understanding of history in Origen goes further, linking the historical reference of the text, the historical reality of the reader/hearer and the historical descent of the Logos into humanity.[205] Leroy A. Huizenga of the University of Mary in Bismarck, North Dakota, seeks a way to link allegorizing interpretation with the intertextual explorations of contemporary exegesis.[206] This exegete approaches the exegetical

---

[202] R.E. Brown, *The Sensus Plenior of Sacred Scripture*, Baltimore, MD 1955, pp. 145–146. See R.E. Brown, '*The Sensus Plenior' in the Last Ten Years*, "Catholic Biblical Quarterly" 25/3 (1963), pp. 262–285; M.W.I. Dunn, *Raymond Brown and the sensus plenior Interpretation of the Bible*, "Studies in Religion" 36/3–4 (2007), pp. 531–551.

[203] R.E. Brown, *The Sensus Plenior of Sacred Scriptur*, op. cit., pp. 146–147.

[204] P.B. Decok, *Allegorising: The Revelation of an Old Method of Interpretation*, "Acta Theologica Supplementum 11" 28 (2008), pp. 1–19.

[205] P.C. Boles, *Allegory as Embodiement: The Function of History in Origen's* Genesis Homily, "Journal of Theological Interpretation" 10/1 (2016), pp. 87–101, especially p. 100.

[206] L.A. Huizenga, *The Old Testament in the New, Intertextuality and Allegory*, "Journal for the Study of the New Testament" 38/1 (2015), pp. 17–35, especially pp. 31–32.

tradition of the ancient Church with a mixture of admiration and distrust. He delights in the boldness of thought of the exegetes of the patristic era, but he is also harbours a suspicion that, in following this method, it is necessary to go beyond the common-sense boundaries outlined by Brown, and to bend the text to the framework of typology. From the perspective of the analyses of VD 21, we can say that the tacit presence of the Word, by bringing us into the horizon of interpretation, frees us from this fear.

When Scripture is understood as an object (historical, linguistic, literary, etc.) subjected to reflection carried out within the framework of the model of the three-stage reduction,[207] then it will become apparent, as Sokolowski postulated, that it is reduced to an object that is identified with the *verbum abbreviatum* in its Christological view as introduced by Benedict XVI in *Verbum Domini*. *Silentium Dei*, understood as the fullness of Father-Son communication that passes through and transcends language, completes this picture of the object of biblical exegesis and reveals its supralinguistic nature. However, it does not do so in a way that invalidates linguistic mediation or subtracts from its dimension of factuality. Language refers back to history, social ties and the institutions in which these are realised. In this sense, biblical exegesis necessarily needs research into the factuality of the text. However, this does not change the general situation. From the perspective of the phenomenological view, we do not arrive, by way of this research, at the question of the meaning and significance of the text as a canonical mega-whole (Scripture), nor of the biblical books (Scriptures) or their constituent elements. We are speaking here of relatively autonomous units in any sense: units identified in historical-critical studies, semantic units in a structural sense, rhetorical compositional units, narrative units or others. In the case of such relatively merely autonomous units with an autonomous sense or meaning, one cannot speak of their own sense. This is because the sense must have reference to the actual totality enjoying the autonomy of the literary work. Of course, in special situations, such as the psalms, the actual autonomy of the individual psalms must be taken into account, not just that of the Psalms. In the case of the Book of Lamentations, on the other hand, there must be a serious discussion of the level of autonomy of the individual works. There are, in fact, more such special situations, and these are cited only by way of example. The general principle must be respect for the biblical text, taking into account its internal diversity, which does not allow for a scheme of research activities to be too easily presented as applicable to all of Scripture.

---

[207] E. Coreth, P. Ehlen, G. Haeffner, F. Ricken, *Filozofia XX wieku* [Philosophy of the 20th Century], transl. M.L. Kalinowski, Kęty 2004, pp. 11–17.

Such diverse cognitive activities are indispensable at the level for which they are appropriate. Without them, making sense of the whole of Scripture and individual Scriptures would be based on *a priori* assumptions arising from attributing to the whole the characteristics of some part of that whole. Such approaches must be rejected because they are *a priori*, and occur at the level of research that is appropriate to deductive processes (where they can be carried out) and inductive processes (where some form of generalisation must be supported). What we call "methods and approaches" in the 1993 document of the Pontifical Biblical Commission *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church* can be applied to different forms in the biblical text, depending on the history of the particular text and its linguistic and literary features, its interaction with other texts (from within and outside the biblical corpus). The method whose aim is to reveal the meaning and significance of Scripture and the Writings, should be continued until the meaning and significance is worked out. In this sense, in biblical studies we have only one method, which is comprehensive and inclusive.[208] It is not necessarily bound to phenomenological assumptions if we find another way or refine the one suggested in this article. We have spoken of approaches to the text as developed in Christian antiquity: one might mention by way of example the proof "from Scripture"[209] in the works of St Anselm of Canterbury.

In the preface to the *Monologion*, Anselm stated that he adopted such a method "that nothing in Scripture should be urged on the authority of Scripture itself, but that whatever the conclusion of independent investigation should declare to be true, should, in an unadorned style, with common proofs and with a simple argument."[210] On this path he concludes that "[t]his Word itself is not the likeness (*non esse ipsorum similitudinem*) of created beings, but

---

[208] This is a radically different approach from the one based on the distinction between Revelation in history and Revelation in the text postulated by Artur Sanecki (*Współczesna lektura Biblii: między historią a teologią* [Contemporary Reading of the Bible: Between History and Theology], [in:] *Biblia i kultura – dialog czy konflikt?* [Bible and Culture – Dialogue or Conflict?], eds. R. Pindel, S. Jędrzejewski, Series: Hermeneutica et Judaica 1, Kraków 2008, pp. 37–55, especially p. 54) as requiring a radically different methodological approach in biblical studies.

[209] A.P. Stefańczyk, *Wprowadzenie* [Introduction], [in:] Anselm of Canterbury, *O prawdzie. O wolności woli. O upadku diabła* [On Truth. On Freedom of the Will. On the Fall of the Devil], transl. A.P. Stefańczyk, Kęty 2011, pp. 5–42, especially p. 14.

[210] Anselm of Canterbury, *Proslogium and Monologium*, transl. S.N. Deane, [s.l.] 2006, p. 25, https://www.saintsbooks.net/books/St.%20Anselm%20of%20Canterbury%20-%20Proslogium%20and%20Monologium.pdf [access: 16.06.2024]; cf. Anzelm z Canterbury, *Monologion. Proslogion*, transl. T. Włodarczyk, Warszawa 1992, p. 3.

the reality of their being (*veram simplicemque essentiam*), while created beings are a kind of likeness of reality" (*Monologion* 31).[211] Anselm sees in the word a thought-object, the effect of an intellectual process that we might call a form of pre-phenomenological reduction, whose first subject is God, the "supreme Spirit" who "is thus eternally mindful of himself, and conceives of himself after the likeness of a rational mind" (*Monologion* 32).[212] In the same way, in the Introduction to *Cur Deus homo*, his starting point is "as if nothing were known of Christ [...] by plain reasoning" (*remoto Christo*).[213] However, in view of the fact that the word (*verbum*) is, for Anselm, the "expression, through which all things were created" (*locutione, per quam facta sunt omnia, Monologion* 29).[214] From the speech act in the process of meditation (reduction), Anselm thus arrives at a mental being in which the true and simple essence of God can be found. In *On Truth* 1, the student poses the problem of whether the Supreme Truth described by Anselm in *Monologion* 18[215] can be identified with God.[216] This leads to the need to pose the question of truth in a statement (*veritas in enuntiatione*) that is true not in terms of factuality (signifying "what is"), but rectitude/correctness (*rectitudo, On Truth* 2).[217] Therefore, in dialogues in which truth is defined as rectitude/correctness (*rectitudo*) comprehensible by the mind alone (*mente sola*),[218] it refers to evidence from Scripture. This definition of the

---

[211] Anselm of Canterbury, *Proslogium and Monologium*, op. cit., p. 55; cf. Anzelm z Canterbury, *Monologion…*, op. cit., p. 76 (the translation has been modified to be closer to the original).

[212] Anselm of Canterbury, *Proslogium and Monologium*, op. cit., p. 57; cf. Anzelm z Canterbury, *Monologion…*, op. cit., p. 78.

[213] Anselm of Canterbury, *Cur Deus homo*, transl. S.N. Deane, [s.l.] 2005, p. 7; cf. Anzelm z Canterbury, *O wcieleniu. Wybór pism* [On the Incarnation. Selected Writings], transl. A. Rosłan, Poznań 2006, p. 47. Cf. E.I. Zieliński, *Wiara poszukująca zrozumienia: św. Anzelm z Aosty* [Faith Seeking Understanding: St Anselm of Aosta], [in:] *Przewodnik filozofii średniowiecznej. Od św. Augustyna do Joachima z Fiore* [A Guide to Medieval Philosophy: From St Augustine to Joachim of Fiore], ed. A. Kijewska, Kraków 2012, pp. 137–154, especially p. 151.

[214] Anselm of Canterbury, *Proslogium and Monologium*, op. cit., p. 54; cf. Anzelm z Canterbury, *Monologion…*, op. cit., p. 71.

[215] Anselm of Canterbury, *Monologion…*, op. cit., p. 49.

[216] Anselm of Canterbury, *Three Philosophical Dialogues: On Truth, On Freedom of Choice, On the Fall of the Devil*, transl. T. Williams, Indianapolis, IN 2002, p. 3; cf. Anzelm z Canterbury, *O prawdzie. O wolności woli. O upadku diabła*, op. cit., p. 47.

[217] Anselm of Canterbury, *Three Philosophical Dialogues…*, op. cit., p. 6; cf. Anzelm z Canterbury, *O prawdzie. O wolności woli. O upadku diabła*, op. cit., p. 53.

[218] Anselm of Canterbury, *Three Philosophical Dialogues…*, op. cit., pp. 20, 27; cf. Anzelm z Canterbury, *O prawdzie. O wolności woli. O upadku diabła*, op. cit., pp. 13, 90, 105. It does not seem acceptable to interpret this *rectitudo* as "the conformity of mind and revealed

truth of an utterance was formulated for the purpose of an analysis that is not a logical meditation on a concept, but an analysis of the text of Scripture and the identification of God with truth (John 14:6).[219] Coloman É. Viola points out that this method stems from the embedding of all the issues taught in monastic schools concerning the *sacra pagina*.[220] Thus, in the didactic process, Anselm developed a model of exegesis of the biblical text in which the interpretative tools he was familiar with (philosophical logical-transcendental analysis) lead to the capture of the true and simple essence of God. It is therefore possible to base the methodological approach that is the subject matter of our research on different starting points, which would, however, require drawing a long line connecting ancient or medieval proposals with current epistemology and methodology. We have therefore taken phenomenology as our starting point. Anselm's thought was recalled for a historical reason: the problem of theological exegetical method is set at the very beginning of the medieval intertwining of philosophy, exegesis and theology.

Summary

The central problem posed in this study was to determine the role played by the Christologically understood *Verbum abbreviatum*, which Pope Benedict XVI introduced in the Exhortation *Verbum Domini*, in shaping the concept of the object of theological exegesis. This, in turn, became the starting point for the search for an answer to the question of what exegetical method we will be able to call theological. We have tried to show that such an exegesis must have a formal theological object, which is Scripture understood personally and not objectively, as is often, not to say famously, the case in exegetical methodological reflection. In the process of looking at Scripture phenomenologically, we see the possibility of reducing it to a Christological concept embedded in Scripture,

---

truth" (T. Grzesik, *Anzelm z Canterbury*, Warszawa 2004, p. 59). It seems a result of the conviction that Anselm regarded faith as a matter of subjective convictions, rather than a deposit objectified in Revelation (cf. e.g. B. Burlikowski, *Anzelma z Aosty próba racjonalizacji wiary* [Anselm of Aosta's Attempt to Rationalise Faith], Warszawa 1971, pp. 189–197). This philosopher does not provide examples of reasoning of this kind not to spoil the intention of rational justification of faith that he pursued consistently throughout his work.

[219] A.P. Stefańczyk, *Wprowadzenie*, op. cit., p. 14.

[220] C.É. Viola, *Anzelm z Aosty. Wiara i szukanie zrozumienia* [Anselm of Aosta. Faith and the Search for Understanding], transl. E.I. Zieliński, Lublin 2009, p. 20.

such as *Verbum abbreviatum*. This notion is not the only one that could fulfil this role, but following Benedict XVI, it can be considered to fulfil the full task of linking the text of the Bible to the reality of faith and the religious bond that objectifies what is often considered the content of the subjective experiences and options (ideological, worldview) of the exegete. Thanks to the inspiration drawn by exegetes from Ricœur's hermeneutics, the question of reference to Christ speaking in Scripture and through Scripture is transferred to the interpretive subject and his self-understanding. In the model presented here, the text is left the role of reference point for the subject's self-determination on the way to the Word. Understanding the text involves everything, but also exclusively what the text reveals. All the problems of the text should be solved to the extent of the possibilities provided to researchers by the various fields of knowledge. The types of research cited earlier create a wide range of issues and research methods adequate to their solution, but which are not specific to the methodological *instrumentarium* of exegesis. If we are to speak of a peculiar relay race in which the study of the Bible is handed over like a baton marking the continuity of a team's relay race, its transmission does not take place between the exegete studying the Bible with methods borrowed from the empirical sciences, the humanities, communication, literature, etc., and the theologian. Rather, it is a relay in which the results of the study of the biblical text pass from the hands of historians, sociologists or literary scholars into the hands of those who are concerned with the interpretation of Scripture, that is, of the book in which and through which God speaks to man and to the community. In order to give this exegesis the possibility of inscribing itself in theology, or at least laying the foundations of a dialogue between the two, it is necessary to exclude from it contexts and ideologies that do not inscribe themselves in the theology of revelation, that place themselves outside the cognitive self-giving of God to man.

Benedict XVI's thought refers back to the Christology of the Logos[221]: incarnate and living for ever. Without the question of the living and saving Jesus Christ in the Church, exegesis is left with no other way of making the fruits of its labour valid for the readers of the Bible than some ideology that actualises the message of the text in the world of the reader. The alternative to this often uncritical adaptation of the content of our exegetical analyses to our world is

---

[221] A very interesting approach to the question of the Logos, bringing Ratzinger closer to considerations starting from a philosophical approach to mathematics, was presented by Małgorzata Pagacz (*Mathematics as a Way Towards the Creative Logos: Joseph Ratzinger/ Benedict XVI's Understanding of Scientificity*, "Collectanea Theologica" 92/2 [2022], pp. 107–130).

to ask: "Rabbi, where are you staying?" (cf. John 1:38), asked by a contemporary disciple in relation to Christ's dwelling in today's world, and pointing to the embedding of exegetical work in the mission of preaching the gospel of Jesus the Saviour, the same yesterday and today (cf. Heb 13:8) and forever new, because He is the newness of the world he makes new (cf. Rev 21:5).

Bibliography

Abramowiczówna Z. (ed.), *Słownik grecko-polski*, vol. 3, Warszawa 1962.

Ajibola I.G., *Joseph Ratzinger's Theological Hermeneutics for Christians Faith Enhancement: An Appraisal*, "Ilorin Journal of Religious Studies" 5/2 (2015), pp. 97–113.

Altaner B., Stuiber A., *Patrologia. Życie, pisma i nauka Ojców Kościoła*, transl. P. Pachciarek, Warszawa 1990.

Anselm of Canterbury, *Cur Deus homo*, transl. S.N. Deane, [s.l.] 2005.

Anselm of Canterbury, *Proslogium and Monologium*, transl. S.N. Deane, [s.l.] 2006, https://www.saintsbooks.net/books/St.%20Anselm%20of%20Canterbury%20-%20Proslogium%20and%20Monologium.pdf [access: 16.06.2024].

Anselm of Canterbury, *Three Philosophical Dialogues: On Truth, On Freedom of Choice, On the Fall of the Devil*, transl. T. Williams, Indianapolis, IN 2002.

Anzelm z Canterbury, *Monologion. Proslogion*, transl. T. Włodarczyk, Warszawa 1992.

Anzelm z Canterbury, *O prawdzie. O wolności woli. O upadku diabła*, transl. A.P. Stefańczyk, Kęty 2011.

Anzelm z Canterbury, *O wcieleniu. Wybór pism*, transl. A. Rosłan, Poznań 2006.

Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, ed. and transl. H. Tredennic, [in:] Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics. Topica*, eds. and transl. H. Tredennic, E.S. Forster, London–Cambridge 1960.

Ayer A.J., *Filozofia w XX wieku*, transl. T. Baszniak, Warszawa 2000.

Bachanek G., *The Rationality of Faith: Romano Guardini and Joseph Ratzinger*, "Collectanea Theologica" 90/5 (2020), pp. 607–620.

Balthasar H. Urs von, *Bóg jest swym własnym egzegetą*, transl. Z. Hanas, "Communio." Międzynarodowy Przegląd Teologiczny 6/3 (1986), pp. 58–64.

Barr J., *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, Oxford 1961.

Bartnik C.S., *Historia ludzka i Chrystus. Szkice z chrześcijańskiej wizji dziejów*, Katowice 1987.

Bayard L., *Saint Cyprien, Correspondance*, Paris 1925.

Bekrycht T., *Fenomenologia – wprowadzenie w lekturę tekstu Edmunda Husserla "Phänomenologie (Der Encyclopedia Britannica Artikel)"*, "Filozofia Publiczna i Edukacja Demokratyczna" 4/2 (2015), pp. 92–202.

Benedict XVI, *His Silence Is Also His Way of Expressing Himself*, [in:] Benedict XVI, *What is Christianity?: The Last Writings*, transl. M.J. Miller, San Francisco 2023, pp. 201–206.

Benedict XVI, *General Audience*, 16.01.2013, https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/audiences/2013/documents/hf_ben-xvi_aud_20130116.html [access: 10.06.2024].

Benedict XVI, *Meeting with Representatives from the World of Culture*, https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2008/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20080912_parigi-cultura.html [access: 15.06.2024].

Benedict XVI, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Verbum Domini*, https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20100930_verbum-domini.html [access: 10.06.2024].

Benedict XVI, *Solemnity of the Nativity of the Lord*, 24.12.2006, https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/homilies/2006/documents/hf_ben-xvi_hom_20061224_christmas.html [access: 10.06.2024].

Benedictus XVI, Adhortatio Apostolica Postynodalis *Verbum Domini*, "Acta Apostolicae Sedis" 102/11 (2010), pp. 681–787.

Benedictus XVI, *Homilia in solemnitatem Nativitatis Domini*, "Acta Apostolicae Sedis" 99/1 (2007), pp. 11–14.

Benedykt XVI, *Fundamentem prawdziwej kultury jest poszukiwanie Boga. Spotkanie z przedstawicielami świata kultury w Kolegium Bernardynów*, "L'Osservatore Romano" [Polish Edition] 29/10–11 (2008), pp. 12–16.

Benedykt XVI, *Nawet ci, którzy nie wierzą, szukają oblicza Boga*, "L'Osservatore Romano" [Polish Edition] 34/3–4 (2013), pp. 36–38.

Benedykt XVI, *Poznanie prawdy. Wykłady papieskie*, Kraków 2017.

Benedykt XVI, Einig R., *Jego milczenie jest zarazem jego słowem. Wywiad o św. Józefie*, transl. D. Chodyniecki, [in:] Benedykt XVI, *Co to jest chrześcijaństwo? Testament duchowy*, Kraków 2023, pp. 255–262.

Blanco Sarto P., *Myśl teologiczna Josepha Ratzingera*, "Teologia w Polsce" 7/2 (2013), pp. 23–43.

Boles P.C., *Allegory as Embodiement: The Function of History in Origen's* Genesis Homily, "Journal of Theological Interpretation" 10/1 (2016), pp. 87–101.

Boutry M., *Introduction*, [in:] Petri Cantoris, *Verbum abbreviatum. Textus conflactus*, Series: Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 196, Turnhout 2004, pp. VII–LVI.

Brown R.E., *The 'Sensus Plenior' in the Last Ten Years*, "Catholic Biblical Quarterly" 25/3 (1963), pp. 262–285.

Brown R.E., *The Sensus Plenior of Sacred Scripture*, Baltimore, MD 1955.

Burlikowski B., *Anzelma z Aosty próba racjonalizacji wiary*, Warszawa 1971.

Christ W. von, Paranikas M., *Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum*, Lipsiae 1871.

Cipriano (Santo), *Obras. Tratados, Cartas*, ed. J. Campos, Series: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 241, Madrid 1964.

Cipriano, *Opuscoli*, vol. 2: *L'unità della Chiesa Cattolica*, *La preghiera del Signore*, *La condizione mortale dell'uomo*, *Le opere di carità e l'elemosina*, *A Demetriano*, *La virtù della pazienza*, *La gelosia e l'invidia*, *A Fortunato*, eds. A. Cerretini, S. Matteoli, C. Moreschini, C. Dell'Osso, M. Veronese, Roma 2009.

Colin P., *Herméneutique et philosophie reflexive*, [in:] *Paul Ricœur. Les métamorphoses de la raison herméneutique*, eds. J. Greisch, R. Kearney, Paris 1991, pp. 15–35.

Copleston F., *Historia filozofii*, vol. 1: *Grecja i Rzym*, transl. H. Bednarek, Warszawa 1998.

Copleston F., *Historia filozofii*, vol. 5: *Od Hobbesa do Hume'a*, transl. J. Pasek, J. Pasek, P. Józefowicz, Warszawa 2009.

Coreth E., Ehlen P., Haeffner G., Ricken F., *Filozofia XX wieku*, transl. M.L. Kalinowski, Kęty 2004.

Cyprian of Carthage, *On the Lord's Prayer*, transl. R.E. Wallis, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/050704.htm [access: 15.06.2024].

Cyprianus, *De oratione Dominica*, [in:] *Sancti Cypriani Thascii Caecilii opera omnia*, Parisiis 1844 (PL 4), cols. 519–544.

Czerski J., *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu*, Opole 2012.

Czerski J., *Metody interpretacji Nowego Testamentu*, Opole 1997.

Decartes R., *Meditations on First Philosophy*, transl. M. Moriarty, Oxford 2008.

Decartes R., *Medytacje o pierwszej filozofii*, vol. 1–2, transl. M. Ajdukiewicz, K. Ajdukiewicz, S. Swieżawski, I. Dąmbska, Kęty 2001.

Decok P.B., *Allegorising: The Revelation of an Old Method of Interpretation*, "Acta Theologica Supplementum 11" 28 (2008), pp. 1–19.

Dekert T., *Teoria rekapitulacji Ireneusza z Lyonu w świetle starożytnych koncepcji na temat Adama*, Kraków 2007.

Diercks G.F. (ed.), *Sancti Cypriani episcopi epistularium*, vol. 3: *Prolegomena, codices, editiones, indices*, Series: Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 3, Turnhout 1999.

Documenti. Il Concilio Vaticano II, Bologna 1966.

Drozdek, A., *Bolzano i ontologia zdań w sobie*, "Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria" 9/4 (2000), pp. 105–116.

Dunn M.W.I., *Raymond Brown and the sensus plenior Interpretation of the Bible*, "Studies in Religion" 36/3–4 (2007), pp. 531–551.

Egger W., *Metodologia del Nuovo Testamento. Introduzione allo studio scientifico del Nuovo Testamento*, transl. G. Forza, Bologna 1991.

Fasching W., *Intentionality and Presence: On the Intrinsic Of-ness of Consciousness from Transcendental-Phenomenological Perspective*, "Husserl Studies" 28/2 (2012), pp. 121–141.

Fitzmyer J.A., *Pismo duszą teologii*, transl. A. Baron, M. Dobrzyniak, R. Robak, Kraków 1997.

Franck D., *Dwa ciała. Wokół fenomenologii Husserla*, transl. J. Migasiński, A. Dwulit, Warszawa 2017.

García Guillén D., *Verbum abbreviatum*, "Facies Domini" 4 (2012), pp. 31–72.

García Sanchidrián, M.L., *Introduccíon*, [in:] Cipriano de Cartago, *Cartas*, ed. M.L. García Sanchidrián, Madrid 1998, pp. 9–25.

Gaworek S., *Śladami istnienia. Wprowadzenie do zagadnień metafizycznych w świetle doktryny św. Tomasza z Akwinu*, Warszawa 2022.

Genest O., *Analyse sémiotique et Bible. Situation et questions disputes*, "Laval Théologique et Philosophique" 36/2 (1980), pp. 115–128.

Gielarowski A., *Kryzys kultury – kryzys człowieka. Fenomenologiczna krytyka kultury: Husserl, Lévinas, Henry*, Kraków 2016.

Gottfried T., *Teoria poznania od Kartezjusza do Wittgensteina*, transl. T. Kubalica, Kraków 2007.

Górecka M., *Biblia Lutra. Biblia w literaturze niemieckojęzycznej*, "Studia Nauk Teologicznych PAN" 4 (2009), pp. 136–145.

Grech P., *La nuova ermeneutica: Fusch e Ebeling*, "Augustinianum" 12 (1972), pp. 277–296.

Green J.B., *Scripture and Theology. Uniting the Two So Long Divided*, [in:] *Between Two Horizons. Spanning New Testament Studies and Systematic Theology*, eds. J.B. Green, M. Turner, Grand Rapids, MI 2000, pp. 23–43.

Grobler A., *Metodologia nauk*, Kraków 2008.

Groupe d'Entrevernes, *Analyse sémiotique des textes. Introduction – théorie – pratique*, Lyon 1985.

Grzeliński A., *Doświadczenie i rozum. Empiryzm Johna Locke'a*, Toruń 2019.

Grzesik T., *Anzelm z Canterbury*, Warszawa 2004.

Guarino T.G., *Foundations of Systematic Theology*, New York–London 2005.

Harper K., *Los Rzymu. Klimat, choroby i koniec imperium*, transl. G. Smółka, Oświęcim 2021.

Heidegger M., *Fenomenologia i teologia*, transl. J. Tischner, "Znak" 31/1–2 (1979), pp. 120–134.

Herder J.G., *Über die erste Urkunden des menschlichen Geschlechts. Einige Anmerkungen*, [in:] J.G. Herder, *Werke zu zehn Bänden*, eds. M. Bollach et al., vol. 5: *Schriften zum Alten Testament*, ed. R. Smend, Frankfurt am Main 1993, pp. 9–178.

Hoff J., *The Analogical Turn: Rethinking Modernity with Nicolas of Cusa*, Grand Rapids, MI–Cambridge 2013.

Holden T., *Hobbes on the Authority of Scripture*, [in:] *Oxford Studies in Early Modern Philosophy*, vol. 8, eds. D. Garber, D. Rutherford, Oxford 2018, pp. 68–95.

Hugo de S. Victore, *De arca Noe morali* 2,8, [in:] *Hugonis de S. Victore Opera omnia*, ed. J.-P. Migne, vol. 2, Parisiis 1880 (PL 176), cols. 618–680.

Huizenga L.A., *The Old Testament in the New, Intertextuality and Allegory*, "Journal for the Study of the New Testament" 38/1 (2015), pp. 17–35.

Hünermann P., Söding T., *Wstęp*, [in:] J. Ratzinger, *Słowo Boga. Pismo – Tradycja – urząd*, transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2008, pp. 9–13.

Husserl E., *Aufgabe und Bedeutung der "Logischen Untersuchungen"* [in:] *Phänomenologische Psychologie. Vorlesungen Sommersemester 1925*, ed. W. Biemel, Series: Husserliana. Edmund Husserl Gesammelte Werke 9, Den Haag 1962, pp. 20–46.

Husserl E., *Ergänzende Texte*, [in:] *Formale und Transzendentale Logik. Versuch einer Kritik der logischen Vernunft*, ed. P. Janssen, Series: Husserliana. Edmund Husserl Gesammelte Werke 17, Den Haag 1974, pp. 339–460.

Husserl E., *Filozofia jako nauka* ścisła, transl. W. Galewicz, Warszawa 1992.

Husserl E., *Formal and Transcendental Logic*, transl. D. Cairns, Hague 1969.

Husserl E., *Formale und Transzendentale Logik*, [in:] *Formale und Transzendentale Logik. Versuch einer Kritik der logischen Vernunft*, ed. P. Janssen, Series: Husserliana. Edmund Husserl Gesammelte Werke 17, Den Haag 1974, pp. 3–335.

Husserl E., *Ideas for a Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy*, transl. F. Kersten, Dordrecht 1998.

Husserl E., *Idee czystej fenomenologii i fenomenologicznej filozofii*, vol. 1, transl. D. Gierulanka, Warszawa 1967.

Husserl E., *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*, vol. 1: *Allgemeine Einführung in Die Reine Phänomenologie*, ed. W. Biemel, Series: Husserliana. Edmund Husserl Gesammelte Werke 3, Den Haag 1950.

Husserl E., *Logika formalna i logika transcendentalna. Próba krytyki rozumu logicznego*, transl. G. Sowinski, Warszawa 2011.

Husserl E., *Phenomenological Psychology*, transl. J. Scanlon, Nijhoff 1977.

Husserl E., *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy: Philosophy as Rigorous Science, and Philosophy and the Crisis of European Man*, transl. Q. Lauren, New York–Evanston–London 1965.

Ingarden R., *U podstaw teorii poznania*, Warszawa 1971.

Irenaeus of Lyon, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, transl. A. Robinson, https://www.ccel.org/ccel/irenaeus/demonstr.preaching_the_demonstration_of_the_apostolic_preaching.html [access: 15.06.2024].

Ireneusz z Lyonu, *Adversus haereses*, transl. J. Brylowski, Pelplin 2018.

Ireneusz z Lyonu, *Wykład nauki apostolskiej*, transl. W. Myszor, Series: Źródła Myśli Teologicznej 7, Kraków 1997.

Jaeger W., *Humanizm i teologia*, transl. S. Zalewski, Warszawa 1957.

Joannes Damascenus, *Carmina et Cantica*, [in:] *Joannis Damasceni opera omnia quae extant*, vol. 3, ed. M. Lequien, Paris 1864 (PG 96), cols. 818–856.

Judycki S., *Epistemologia*, vol. 1–2, Poznań–Warszawa 2020.

Karczewski M., *Język raju? Walory starożytnego języka hebrajskiego w świetle « Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie » (1782/1783) Johanna Gottfrieda Herdera*, "Studia Elbląskie" 10 (2009), pp. 123–134.

Klinger M., *Strażnik wrót. Próby z hermeneutyki teologicznej*, Kraków 2019.

Kołakowski L., *Husserl i poszukiwanie pewności*, Warszawa 1991.

Kotula T., *Afryka Północna w starożytności*, Wrocław 1972.

Kowalczyk S., *Nurt fenomenologiczno-egzystencjalny w polskiej współczesnej filozofii Boga*, "Vox Patrum" 52 (2008), pp. 505–511.

Kowalski M., *Separacja – tak, rozwód – nie. Wyzwania i implikacje płynące z metodologicznego rozwoju nauk biblijnych i teologii systematycznej*, [in:] *Dogmat i metoda. Wprowadzenie do badań interdyscyplinarnych w teologii dogmatycznej*, ed. R.J. Woźniak, Kraków 2021, pp. 537–570.

Królikowski J., *Theology of the Word of God in the Apostolic Exhortation* Verbum Domini *by Benedict XVI*, "Wrocławski Przegląd Teologiczny" 31/2 (2023), pp. 61–84.

LaCocque A., Ricœur P., *Przedmowa*, [in:] A. LaCocque, P. Ricœur, *Myśleć biblijnie*, transl. E. Mukoid, M. Tarnowska, Kraków 2003, pp. 5–16.

LaCocque A., Ricœur P., *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies*, transl. D. Pellauer, Chicago–London 1998.

Lampe G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961.

Langkammer H., *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu*, Opole 1991.

Langkammer H., *Metody lingwistyczne*, [in:] *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu*, ed. H. Langkammer, Pelplin 1994, pp. 235–270.

Laurentin R., *Come riconciliare l'esegesi e la fede*, transl. M. Masini, Brescia 1986.

Legaspi M.C., *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies*, Oxford 2010.

Linke W., *Logos Wcielony i słowo przepowiadane. Teologia Słowa Bożego i praktyka przepowiadania słowa Bożego w "Verbum Domini", "Lumen fidei" i "Evangelii gaudium"*, "Warszawskie Studia Teologiczne" 33/1 (2015), pp. 104–123.

Łaciak P., *Husserlowski transcendentalizm w ujęciu Jacques'a Derridy*, "Sztuka i Filozofia" 14 (1997), pp. 42–59.

Łuka G., *Husserlowska krytyka historyzmu jako krytyka faktyczności*, "Studia Filozoficzne" 1–2 (1982), pp. 57–75.

Łukasiewicz D., *Znaczenie i prawda w świetle niektórych prac Edmunda Husserla*, "Principia" 13–14 (1995), pp. 203–212.

Mädler I., *Friedrich Schleiermacher: zmysł i smak nieskończoności*, [in:] *Filozofia religii. Od Schleiermachera do Eco*, eds. V. Drehsen, W. Gräb, B. Weyel, transl. L. Łysień, Kraków 2008, pp. 11–18.

Malina A., *Egzegeza teologiczna Biblii*, [in:] *Hermeneutyka Pisma Świętego w Kościele. Wokół adhortacji Verbum Domini Benedykta XVI o Słowie Bożym w życiu i misji Kościoła*, eds. R. Pindel, S. Jędrzejewski, Kraków 2012, pp. 37–54.

Malina A., *Egzegeza w kontekście*, [in:] *Interpretacja (w) dialogu. Tożsamość egzegezy biblijnej*, eds. A. Kucz, A. Malina, Kielce 2005, pp. 70–78.

Malina A., *Najnowsze kanony (w) interpretacji początków chrześcijaństwa*, "Śląskie Studia Historyczno-Teologiczne" 45/1 (2012), pp. 65–83.

Malina A., *Quid sit anima theologiae*, [in:] *Wierność i aggiornamento. Wokół recepcji Soboru Watykańskiego II*, ed. G. Kucza, Katowice 2006, pp. 74–86.

Manns F., *Miscellanea: L'origine du thème «Verbum abbreviatum»*, "Antonianum" 56/1 (1981), pp. 208–210.

Marciszewski W., *Empiryzm, racjonalizm, irracjonalizm po przełomach naukowych XX wieku*, [in:] *Przewodnik po epistemologii*, ed. R. Ziemińska, Kraków 2013, pp. 423–493.

Margerie B. de, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse*, vol. 2: *Les premiers grands exégètes latins*, Paris 1983.

Maritain J., *Katolicyzm i filozofia*, "Verbum" 1/4 (1934), pp. 470–509.

Maritain J., *Religia i kultura*, Warszawa 2007.

Massoni N.T., Moreira M.A., *Epistemologia de Nancy Cartwright: uma contribuição ao debate sobre a natureza da ciência atual*, "Ensaio Pesquisa em Educação em Ciências" 16/3 (2014), pp. 95–119.

Mazur R., Bogacz R., *Słownik analityczny do Biblii greckiej*, vol. 3, π-ω, Kraków 2021.

Mazurek M., *Modele w koncepcjach nauki Nancy Cartwright*, "Edukacja Filozoficzna" 54 (2012), pp. 187–204.

Merleau-Ponty M., *Fenomenologia percepcji*, transl. M. Kowalska, J. Migasiński, Warszawa 2001.

Merleau-Ponty M., *Phenomenology of Perception*, transl. D.A. Landes, London–New York 2012.

Merleau-Ponty M., *Proza świata. Eseje o mowie*, transl. S. Cichowicz, Warszawa 1976.

Michalski K., *Logika i czas. Próba analizy Husserlowskiej teorii sensu*, Warszawa 1988.

Monceaux P., *Histoire littérair de l'Afrique chrétienne depuis les origenes jusqu'a l'invasion arabe*, vol. 3: *Saint Cyprien et son temps*, Paris 1902.

Morton A., *A Guide Through the Theory of Knowledge*, Malden–Oxford–Victoria 2007.

Morton A., *Przewodnik po teorii poznania*, transl. T. Baszniak, Warszawa 2002.

Moryń M., *Transcendentalizm, intencjonalność, język. O Husserlowskiej koncepcji sensu*, Poznań 1998.

Mrugalski D., *Logos. Filozoficzne i teologiczne źródła idei wczesnochrześcijańskiej*, Kraków 2006.

Müller G.L., *Dogmatyka katolicka*, transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2015.

Neher A., *L'exil de la parole. Du silence biblique au silence d'Auschwitz*, Paris 1970.

d'Onofrio G., *Historia teologii*, vol. 2: *Epoka średniowieczna*, transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2005.

Origen, *De Principiis*, transl. F. Crombie, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/04121.htm [access: 15.06.2024].

Origène, *Commentaire sur saint Jean*, vol. 2: *Livres VI et X*, ed. and transl. C. Blanc, Series: Sources chrétiennes 157, Paris 1970.

Origène, *Traité des principes*, vol. 1–4, eds. H. Crouzel, M. Simonetti, Series: Sources chrétiennes 252–253, 268–269, Paris 1978–1980.

Origenes, *Commentarium in Epistolam B. Pauli ad Romanos* (8,17), [in:] *Origenis opera omnia*, vol. 4, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1862 (PG 14), cols. 837–1292.

Orygenes, *O zasadach*, transl. S. Kalinkowski, Kraków 1996.

Pagacz M., *Mathematics as a Way Towards the Creative Logos: Joseph Ratzinger/Benedict XVI's Understanding of Scientificity*, "Collectanea Theologica" 92/2 (2022), pp. 107–130.

Papieska Komisja Biblijna, *Natchnienie i prawda Pisma świętego. Słowo, które od Boga pochodzi i mówi o Bogu, aby zbawić świat*, transl. H. Witczyk, Kielce 2014.

Petri Cantoris, *Verbum abbreviatum. Textus conflactus*, Series: Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 196, Turnhout 2004.

Pietras H. (ed.), *Odpowiedź na Słowo. Najstarsi mistrzowie chrześcijańskiej modlitwy*, Kraków 1993.

Pietras H., *Początki teologii Kościoła*, Series: Myśl Teologiczna 28, Kraków 2000.

Pietras H., *Wprowadzenie*, [in:] Orygenes, *O zasadach*, transl. S. Kalinkowski, Kraków 1996, pp. 5–37.

Pitre B., Verbum Domini *and Historical-Critical Exegesis*, [in:] Verbum Domini *and Complementarity of Exegesis and Theology*, ed. S. Carl, Grand Rapids, MI 2015, pp. 26–40.

Płotka W., *Logos fenomenologii. Problematyka rozumu we fryburskim okresie twórczości Edmunda Husserla*, mps Biblioteka UKSW, Warszawa 2009.

Płotka W., *Studia z fenomenologii poznania. Transcendentalna filozofia Edmunda Husserla a problem wiedzy*, Gdańsk 2015.

Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Inspiration and Truth of Sacred Scripture: The Word that Comes from God and Speaks of God for the Salvation of the World*, transl. Th. Esposito, S. Gregg, Collegeville, PA 2014.

Półtawski A., *Realizm fenomenologii. Husserl – Ingarden – Stein – Wojtyła*, Warszawa 2001.

Przyłębski A., *Znaczenie fenomenologii Husserla dla hermeneutyki*, "Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria" 18/4 (2009), pp. 305–318.

Rahner K., *Hearer of the Word: Laying the Foundation for a Philosophy of Religion*, transl. J. Donceel, London–New York 1994.

Rahner K., *Kościelna chrystologia między egzegezą a dogmatyką*, [in:] K. Rahner, *Pisma wybrane*, vol. 1, transl. G. Bubel, Kraków 2005, pp. 253–283.

Rahner K., *Słuchacz słowa. Ugruntowanie filozofii religii*, transl. R. Samek, Kęty 2008.

Rahner K., *Teologia i antropologia*, [in:] K. Rahner, *Pisma wybrane*, vol. 1, transl. G. Bubel, Kraków 2005, pp. 46–67.

Rainko S., *Rola podmiotu w poznaniu. Zarys zagadnień*, Warszawa 1971.

Ratzinger J., *Bóg Jezusa Chrystusa. Medytacje o Bogu Trójjedynym*, transl. J. Zychowicz, Kraków 1995.

Ratzinger J., *The God of Jesus Christ. Meditations on the Triune God*, transl. B. McNeil, San Francisco 2008.

Ratzinger J., *Introduction to Christianity*, transl. M.J. Miller, San Francisco 2004.

Ratzinger J., *Kościół. Pielgrzymująca wspólnota wiary*, transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2005.

Ratzinger J., *Rozumienie Objawienia i teologia historii według Bonawentury. Rozprawa habilitacyjna i studia nad Bonawenturą*, eds. K. Góźdź, M. Górecka, transl. J. Merecki, Series: Opera Omnia 2, Lublin 2014.

Ratzinger J., *Schriftauslegung im Widerstreit. Zur Frage nach Grundlagen und Weg der Exegese heute*, [in:] *Schriftauslegung im Widerstreit*, ed. J. Ratzinger, Series: Quaestiones Disputatae 117, Freiburg 1989, pp. 15–44.

Ratzinger J., *Wprowadzenie w chrześcijaństwo*, transl. Z. Włodkowska, Kraków 1994.

Ratzinger J./Benedict XVI, *God's Word. Scripture – Tradition – Office*, transl. H. Taylor, San Francisco 2008.

Ratzinger J./Benedict XVI, *Jesus of Nazareth: From the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration*, transl. A.J. Walker, New York 2007.

Ratzinger J./Benedict XVI, *Jesus of Nazareth: Holy Week: From the Entrance Into Jerusalem To The Resurrection*, transl. P.J. Whitmore, San Francisco 2011.

Ratzinger J./Benedykt XVI, *Jezus z Nazaretu*, vol. 1: *Od chrztu w Jordanie do Przemienienia*, transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2007.

Ratzinger J./Benedykt XVI, *Jezus z Nazaretu*, vol. 2: *Od wjazdu do Jerozolimy do Zmartwychwstania*, transl. W. Szymona, Kielce 2011.

Ratzinger J./Benedykt XVI, *Problem podstaw i drogi egzegezy dzisiaj*, [in:] J. Ratzinger/ Benedykt XVI, *Słowo Boga. Pismo – Tradycja – urząd*, transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2008, pp. 89–123.

Ratzinger J./Benedykt XVI, *Słowo Boga. Pismo – Tradycja – urząd*, transl. W. Szymona, Kraków 2008.

Reale G., *Historia filozofii starożytnej*, vol. 2: *Platon i Arystoteles*, transl. E.I. Zieliński, Lublin 2001.

Reventlow H.G., *Storia dell'interpretazione biblica*, vol. 4: *Dall'Illuminismo fino al XX secolo*, transl. E. Gatti, Casale Monferrato 2004.

Ricœur, P., *Egzegeza i hermeneutyka*, transl. S. Cichowicz, [in:] P. Ricœur, *Egzystencja i hermeneutyka. Rozprawy o metodzie*, Warszawa 2003, pp. 348–359.

Ricœur P., *Figuring the Sacred: Religion, Narrative, and Imagination*, transl. D. Pellauer, Minneapolis, MN 1995.

Ricœur, P., *Husserl i Wittgenstein o języku*, transl. M. Drwięga, "Principia" 16–17 (1996–1997), pp. 59–69.

Ricœur P., *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*, Fort Worth, TX 1976.

Ricœur P., *The Later Wittgenstein and the Later Husserl on Language*, "Ricœuriennes / Ricœur Studies" 5/1 (2014), pp. 28–48.

Ricœur, P., *Nazwać Boga*, transl. R. Grzywacz, Kraków 2011.

Ricœur, P., *Refleksja dokonana. Autobiografia intelektualna*, transl. P. Bobowska-Nastarzewska, Kęty 2005.

Ricœur, P., *Teoria interpretacji: dyskurs i nadwyżka znaczenia*, transl. K. Rosner, [in:] P. Ricœur, *Język, tekst, interpretacja*, Warszawa 1989, pp. 61–187.

Ricœur P., *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies*, transl. D. Pellauer, Chicago–London 1998.

Rocci L., *Vocabolario greco italiano*, Firenze 1993.

Roszak P., Extra scientiam nulla theologia? *Rola poznania naukowego w dyskursie teologicznym*, [in:] *Teologia w dialogu z innymi naukami. Spotkania – kontrowersje – perspektywy*, ed. D. Wąsek, Kraków 2021, pp. 31–55.

Rzęchowski C., *Milczenie Boga w Torze*, [in:] *Fenomen milczenia w kulturze i języku: materiały interdyscyplinarnego sympozjum poświęconego pamięci profesor Jolanty Rokoszowej zorganizowanego przez Wydział I Filologiczny PAU*, Kraków 2018, pp. 9–14.

Rzęchowski C., *Milczenie i filozofia*, "Studia Redemptorystowskie" 19 (2021), pp. 105–112.

Sacchi P., *Problemi teologici e problemi linguistici nell'opera del Barr*, [in:] J. Barr, *Semantica del linguaggio biblico*, transl. P. Sacchi, Bologna 1980, pp. VII–XXXVIII.

Sanecki A., *Współczesna lektura Biblii: między historią a teologią*, [in:] *Biblia i kultura – dialog czy konflikt?*, eds. R. Pindel, S. Jędrzejewski, Series: Hermeneutica et Judaica 1, Kraków 2008, pp. 37–55.

Schmidt W.H., *Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1964.

Schuhmann K., *Husserl-Chronik: Denk- Und Lebensweg Edmund Husserls*, Den Haag 1977.

Second Vatican Council, Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation *Dei Verbum*, 1965, https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651118_dei-verbum_en.html [access: 15.06.2024].

Simonetti M., *Między dosłownością a alegorią. Przyczynek do historii egzegezy patrystycznej*, transl. T. Skibiński, Kraków 2000.

Simonetti M., Moreschini C. (ed.), *Sancti Cypriani episcopi opera*, part 2: *Ad Donatum*, *De mortalitate*, *Ad Demetrianvm*, *De opere et eleemosynis*, *De zelo et livore*, *De Dominica oratione*, *De bono patientiae*, Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 3A, Turnholti 1976.

Słomka W., *Teologia jako refleksja nad doświadczeniem chrześcijańskim: studium w świetle fenomenologicznej metody Husserla*, "Studia Theologica Varsaviensia" 12/1 (1974), pp. 45–60.

Söding T., *Fare esegesi, fare teologia. Un rapporto necessario e complesso*, [in:] *Ascoltare, rispondere, vivere. Atti del Congresso Internazionale "La Sacra Scrittura nella vita e nella missione della Chiesa" (1–4 dicembre 2010)*, ed. E. Borghi, Milano 2011, pp. 77–87.

Sokolowski R., *Bóg wiary i rozumu. Podstawy chrześcijańskiej teologii*, transl. M. Romanek, Kraków 2015.

Sokolowski R., *Introduction to Phenomenology*, Cambridge 2000.

Sokolowski R., *Wprowadzenie do fenomenologii*, transl. M. Rogalski, Kraków 2012.

Sophronius Hierosolymitanus, *Orationes VIII juxta editions Ant[onii]. Ballerini Angeli Maii, Jacobi Gretseri, Franc[isci]. Combefissii, Joan[ni]. Bapt[isti]. Cotellerii, ex Actis Sanctorum Bolland[istarum]. et Bibliotheca Patrum*, [in:] *Procopii Gazaei opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*, vol. 3, Paris 1863 (PG 87, part. 3), cols. 3201–3364.

Stefańczyk A.P., *Wprowadzenie*, [in:] Anzelm z Canterbury, *O prawdzie. O wolności woli. O upadku diabła*, transl. A.P. Stefańczyk, Kęty 2011, pp. 5–42.

Stróżewski W., *O metodzie fenomenologii*, [in:] *Jak filozofować? Studia z metodologii filozofii*, ed. J. Perzanowski, Warszawa 1989, pp. 78–95.

Szram M., *Wokół osoby i myśli Orygenesa*, Lublin 2021.

Szulc A., *Stein i Heidegger – dwie fenomenologie*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Centrum Badań im. Edyty Stein" 11 (2014), pp. 31–39.

Szymik J., *Najgłębsze pragnienie Boskiego Nauczyciela. Ekumenizm według J. Ratzingere/Benedykta XVI*, "Studia Oecumenica" 13 (2013), pp. 71–90.

Szymik J., *Syn jako hilasterion. Ekumeniczny wymiar chrystologii J. Ratzingera/Benedykta XVI*, "Communio." Międzynarodowy Przegląd Teologiczny 37/4 (2017), pp. 7–31.

Szymik J., *Teologia Słowa Bożego*, [in:] *Ku mądrości teologii*, eds. K. Góźdź, E. Sienkiewicz, Szczecin 2008, pp. 231–236.

Szymik J., *Theologia benedicta*, vol. 3, Katowice 2016.

Szymik S., *Historia oddziaływania tekstu (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) a studium Nowego Testamentu*, "Roczniki Teologiczne" 51/1 (2004), pp. 127–140.

Szymik S., *Współczesne modele egzegezy biblijnej*, Lublin 2013.

Święcicka K., *Husserl*, Warszawa 1993.

Tarnowski K., *Fenomenologia i teologia*, [in:] *Metafizyka i teologia. Debata u podstaw*, ed. R.J. Woźniak, Kraków 2008, pp. 32–49.

Tertullian, *De baptismo. De oratione/Von der Taufe. Vom Gebet*, ed. D. Schleyer, Series: Fontes Christiani 76, Turnhout 2006.

Tertullian, *On Prayer*, transl. S. Thelwall, https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0322.htm [access: 15.06.2024].

Thiselton A.C., *Hermeneutics: An Introduction*, Grand Rapids, MI 2009.

Tronina A., *Historia oddziaływania tekstu. Wirkungsgeschichte*, [in:] *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu*, ed. H. Langkammer, Pelplin 1994, pp. 207–231.

Viola C.É., *Anzelm z Aosty. Wiara i szukanie zrozumienia*, transl. E.I. Zieliński, Lublin 2009.

Voderholzer R., *Die biblische Hermeneutik Joseph Razingers*, "Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift" 56 (2005), pp. 400–414.

Waldstein M.M., *The Self-Critique of the Historical-Critical Method: Cardinal Ratzinger's Erasmus Lecture*, "Modern Theology" 28/4 (2012), pp. 732–747.

Waligóra M., *Wstęp do fenomenologii*, Kraków 2013.

Wall R.W., *Reading the New Testament in Canonical Context*, [in:] *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. J.B. Green, Grand Rapids, MI 2010, pp. 372–396.

Warmbier A., *Tożsamość, narracja i hermeneutyka* siebie. *Paula Ricœura filozofia człowieka*, Kraków 2018.

Weidner D., *Einleitung: Lektüren im* Geist der Ebräischen Poesie, [in:] *Urpoesie und Morgenland. Johannes Gottfried Herders* Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie, ed. D. Weidner, Berlin 2008, pp. 9–21.

Werbick J., *Wprowadzenie do epistemologii teologicznej*, transl. G. Rawski, Kraków 2014.

Wicks J., *Wprowadzenie do metody teologicznej*, transl. J. Ożóg, Kraków 1995.

Wilkołek R., *Poszerzając granice racjonalności. Epistemologiczna teologia Mikołaja z Kuzy (1401–1464)*, Kraków 2023.

Woźniak R.J., *Praca nad dogmatem. Wybrane aspekty odnowy teologii dogmatycznej*, Series: Myśl Teologiczna 105, Kraków 2022.

Woźniak R.J., *Różnica i tajemnica. Objawienie jako teologiczne źródło ludzkiej sobości*, Poznań 2012.

Zagórecki P., *Ocalić fenomenologię z Claude'em Romanem*, "Logos i Etos" 60/2 (2022), pp. 203–220.

Zahavi D., *Fenomenologia Husserla*, transl. M. Święch, Kraków 2012.

Zarychta P., *Biblia w literaturze niemieckiej od Średniowiecza po Klasycyzm Weimarski*, [in:] *"Cóż za księga!" Biblia w literaturze niemieckojęzycznej od Oświecenia po współczesność*, eds. M. Kłańska, J. Kita-Huber, P. Zarychta, Kraków 2010, pp. 21–56.

Zatwardnicki S., *Apostazja współczesnej egzegezy. Benedykt XVI o niewystarczalności metody historyczno-krytycznej*, "Teologia i Człowiek" 28/4 (2014), pp. 185–204.

Zatwardnicki S., *Aprioryczne założenia i filozoficzne uwarunkowania metody historyczno-krytycznej według Benedykta XVI*, "Scriptura Sacra" 16 (2012), pp. 141–164.

Zatwardnicki S., *Granice metody historyczno-krytycznej w ujęciu Josepha Ratzingera (Benedykta XVI)*, "Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny" 67/2 (2014), pp. 143–165.

Zatwardnicki S., *Hermeneutyka wiary w nauczaniu papieża Benedykta XVI*, Wrocław: Tum 2014.

Zatwardnicki S., *Katafatyczność i apofatyczność słowa Bożego w świetle misterium Wcielenia*, "Collectanea Theologica" 92/4 (2022), pp. 39–92.

Zatwardnicki S., *Metoda historyczno-krytyczna a hermeneutyka wiary. Propozycja syntezy w ujęciu Josepha Ratzingera (Benedykta XVI)*, "Ateneum Kapłańskie" 162/1 (2014), pp. 74–94.

Zatwardnicki S., *Pismo Święte czytane w Kościele duszą teologii. Benedykta XVI troska o stan katolickiej egzegezy*, "Teologia w Polsce" 7/2 (2013), pp. 173–188.

Zieliński E.I., *Wiara poszukująca zrozumienia: św. Anzelm z Aosty*, [in:] *Przewodnik filozofii średniowiecznej. Od św. Augustyna do Joachima z Fiore*, ed. A. Kijewska, Kraków 2012, pp. 137–154.

Zieliński J., *Jerozolima, Ateny, Aleksandria. Greckie źródła pierwszych nurtów filozofii chrześcijańskiej*, Wrocław 2000.

Zioło P., *Metaforyczność poezji hebrajskiej w ujęciu J.G. Herdera*, "Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny" 48/3 (1995), pp. 193–199.

WALDEMAR LINKE CP (FR. DR HAB.) – a Passionist priest, Associate Professor of the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, lecturer at the Faculty of Theology of this University. His research interests include the Revelation of John, late Old Testament literature (especially the books of Tobit and Judith), biblical hermeneutics and the theology of Scripture.