

THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE AS A SINCERE SEARCH FOR TRUTH: BETWEEN SCIENTIFIC EXPERIMENT AND RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE¹

Ilche Micevski–Ignat

UDK 165.023

271.2–1:001

001:2–582

<https://doi.org/10.32701/dp.27.1.1>

Review

Received: 19.12.2025

Accepted: 17.2.2026

Abstract

The search for truth has been a very old preoccupation since ancient times. Ancient philosophers and sages were engaged in it. The search for truth has not stopped but continues to this day. We can say that the greatest seekers of truth today are scientists in all areas of scientific research. On the other hand, there are theologians that know Who is the Truth (John 14:6), trying to be in communion with the truth through spiritual life. This study attempts to explain the dialogue between Orthodox theology and science, as well as their different methods through which they come to the knowledge of truth. The path to truth can be found, but the methods are different because science and theology use different approaches. Both can have the same goal, which would be to find the truth, but the different experiences that science and Orthodox theology have must be specified. Science uses observation and experimentation of the things it wants to know, explaining them through rational discourse, but on the other hand it has its own limitations. Theology uses the centuries–old spiritual experience gained in the life of the Church, whose goal is the knowledge of God and communion with Him. When a comparison is made, a difference appears in the knowledge of the material and the immaterial. Although the methods seem different, the goal seems to be the same, and that is to find the answers that lead

* Assist. Prof. PhD, Ilche Micevski–Ignat, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Faculty of Orthodox Theology “Saint Clement of Ohrid”, E-mail: i.micevski@pbf.edu.mk

1 An earlier version of this review was presented at the First CePOZiR Conference, held in Zagreb from 24–26 September 2025, in the section “The Relationship between Science and Religion.” The conference was organized by the Centre for the Study of the Relationship between Science and Religion at the Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies, University of Zagreb.

humanity to the knowledge of the truth. Science and theology can find a common understanding for finding and knowing the truth.

KEYWORDS: dialog, experiment, limitation of science, science, spiritual experience, theology, truth;

Introduction

We live in a time when we are witnesses of great technological development. A time in which we witness great scientific discoveries that reveal information about the world that we did not know existed before. Although science progresses and constantly brings new knowledge about the world around us, many things still remain a secret for all of us. On the one hand, some of the secrets are revealed to us by science, and on the other hand, they are revealed to us by theology. Although at first it seems that these two are opposed, they still have many things in common. The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship between science and orthodox theology that develops in mutual dialogue, as well as the difference that exists between the methods used to understand the world around us. We will give special attention to authors of Romanian origin who are actively involved in the dialogue between orthodox theology and science. Each of them has a significant contribution to the dialogue between orthodox theology and science in contemporary scientific thought. We want to see whether orthodox theology and science can have the same goal or are completely different. Some may think that science and orthodox theology have nothing in common and therefore there can be no dialogue between them. However, dialogue exists and contributes to a better understanding of scientific discoveries by theologians, as well as a better understanding of metaphysical (spiritual) secrets by scientists. Prejudices that exist must be overcome, because we live in a multicultural and multi-religious society and we need to learn to listen to each other. Dialogue reveals to us that everyone can make their own contribution to explaining the secrets of creation, be they theologians or scientists.

To better understand the dialogue between orthodox theology and science, it is important to see whether the two fields achieve the same knowledge of the world. Therefore, it is important to see whether they reach that knowledge through the same method or whether it differs. In science, the most common method through which new knowledge is obtained is the experiment, a method that gives visible and measurable results. The data resulting from the experiment can be preserved, analyzed by other scientists and serve as a starting point for new experiments. In theology, the experiment is not a method through which new knowledge is obtained. In theology, the spiritual experience of a person who is actively engaged in the spir-

itual life and is directly related to the personal relationship with God is very important. Since spiritual (religious) experience is experienced personally by a person, we can say that it cannot be experimentally repeated. However, in the history of Christian spirituality and from the lives of the saints, we can notice that spiritual experience gives the same results, although not everyone experienced it in the same way. Theology and science have different methods of acquiring knowledge, but somewhere in the middle they meet and reveal to us that it is possible to seek answers to the same questions. In the following lines, we will briefly examine the two methods, of science and of orthodox theology, to see whether they are on the same path or have two different directions in terms of acquiring knowledge.

Scientific Experiment

Science deals with accurate data that must be obtained from observations and measurements of the physical world, which are then confirmed through experiments. If the experiment does not confirm theoretical expectations or does not give the same result every time, it is considered that what is being investigated is not scientifically proven. Science, since its beginnings, has been oriented towards the observation of nature and the logical explanation of physical phenomena. The rational approach is the first step we take in science to achieve the knowledge we desire. “The first path of knowledge is specific to the rational approach made concrete through a methodology oriented towards the diversity of the external world, (...) achieved through the logic of discursive reason” (Mihalache et al. 2014, 26). Scientific methodology aims at observing the external world with everything that the world contains. Therefore, science aims to explain the functioning of the natural world so that we can understand it more easily. “The purpose of natural science is to help us understand how nature behaves” (Ionescu 2015, 54). Understanding how nature works is the basis for the development of science itself. Man is forced to find answers and explain them to himself in a way that is understandable to him, and this is closely related to rational thinking. Precise data are key to correctly interpreting scientific findings. Therefore, the experiment has a large and important role in science, because science is based on experiments. “In conclusion, the scientific method presupposes the existence of precise key concepts belonging to the methodological register. Modern science is based on experimentation (...)” (Ionescu 2015, 61). Although an experiment can yield new data or confirm previous ones, the question arises as to how reliable it is in confirming the exact truth about the object under investigation. Can science then provide concrete and complete explanations according to the results obtained through an experiment?

The experiment provides certain information about certain things and phenomena, but that does not mean that it can provide complete explanations that will fully cover the research. The truth that science is trying to find out is also questioned, that is, is science capable of providing all the answers to all the questions that man can ask? The world around us, as well as man himself, are great mysteries. It would be difficult to provide an answer for everything that exists. This tells us that there are great limitations in describing the world and its secrets. Professor Ștefan Trăușan–Matu from the Polytechnic University of Bucharest tells us about the limitations of science and scientific experiment. He lists five limitations that science faces in trying to provide explanations for everything. The first limitation is that “Science can provide only limited explanations for many phenomena” (Trăușan–Matu 2021, 103). The limited explanations provided by science are natural and prove that man could not know literally everything. Many of the phenomena that scientists study still remain unsolved mysteries, which is why the explanations are limited. The world hides many secrets that are still impossible to explain scientifically.

“A second limitation of scientific explanations lies in the complexity of things” (Trăușan–Matu 2021, 103). Things in the world are very complex, and this tells us that there are no simple answers to complex things. If science tries to give answers that are simple, but describe complex things, the problem immediately arises because of too many descriptions of one thing that led nowhere. To understand well how something works, you must know each part and the connection of that part to the other parts and their relationship to each other. There are no simple phenomena in complex things. They retain their complexity all the time. This leads us to the third limitation of science: “the fact that ultimately, one must formulate a number of axioms; complex phenomena cannot be endlessly explained by the interactions of simpler ones, some basic facts should be claimed without a proof” (Trăușan–Matu 2021, 103). This limitation is related to the second. Trăușan–Matu is right when he says that complex phenomena cannot be described endlessly by the relationships of simpler ones. Thus, the desired answers will never be reached. He is also right when he claims that some basic facts should be accepted without evidence, because they exist and are visible to the scientist, but it is not always possible to explain them logically. Sometimes it is good to leave the mystery of things that say a lot but cannot be explained rationally.

The description of phenomena by science can sometimes be a very difficult task, not always managing to describe and explain everything. Human language is capable of describing and explaining many things, but it does not always manage to get to the essence of things. Here we come to the fourth limitation of science: “Any scientific theory has to be described

by employing an idiom, a form of language; it must be expressed through a discourse, as in science it is essential to present the results obtained to the scientific community, whose members jointly contribute to the progress of knowledge” (Trăușan–Matu 2021, 105). Each domain of the vast field of science has a specific terminology with which to describe the findings of research. Each branch of science has developed a specific language with which it is used to provide answers to the questions arising from the experiment. Every new scientific discovery needs to be described and defined, but the most appropriate terms for this cannot always be found. Of particular importance is the ability to describe the result of a scientific experiment because only in this way does it become accessible to the scientific and wider public. If there is no appropriate terminology, then it is not possible to define and communicate the results of a scientific experiment. More importantly, if scientists cannot describe what they have seen and measured, then access to knowledge is limited or impossible. Therefore, the appropriate language and terminology necessary to present and define scientific results are essential for understanding the knowledge that the experiment provides. Otherwise, we cannot get to the essence of things if they are not understandable to us and if we cannot explain them to ourselves. Closely related to the ability of man to express himself is the relationship between reason and mind, here Trăușan–Matu lists the fifth limitation of science. “A fifth limitation of science is revealed by the issue of the discursive–intuitive relationship, the long–investigated problem of the relationship between *dianoia* and *nous*” (2021, 106). The professor goes on to explain that it is not always possible to arrive at fully formulated new discoveries in the real world through new axioms and mechanically applied rules. Many axioms can lead to many theories that lead nowhere (Trăușan–Matu 2021, 106). The scientist must be careful when expressing himself in relation to a theory, in order not to go beyond the framework of scientific research and enter the framework of speculation where there are no axioms, but unrealistic claims. On the other hand, not everything can be explained rationally, because there are things in this world that exceed rational thinking. These things enter the sphere of the unknown to the human mind and are part of the secrets of creation. The precision of science is replaced by the impossibility of knowing everything, which is why theology intervenes here, which claims from the very beginning that man cannot know everything, many things are left to be still a mystery to us. “Unlike the scientific method, which is interested in finding a precise, mathematical model, rigorous and free from any antinomies to account for the phenomena under scrutiny in order to explain and anticipate their occurrences, theology postulates the impossibility of fully knowing and comprehending God’s logoi” (Trăușan–Matu 2021, 112–13). Science wants to confirm every claim with accurate data, with a precision that will

eliminate any doubt regarding the results that arise from the scientific experiment. But it is not always possible to confirm this. Sometimes there is a lack of much data that would form the complete picture of what is to be found and confirmed by the scientific experiment. Religious experience has a different approach to knowledge and does not always rely on reason. Therefore, it is good to consider the method of religious experience.

Religious Experience

Opposite to a scientific experiment is a religious or spiritual experience. These are two different ways of knowing that are used with different methods. If science is used with the method of experiment to obtain knowledge, theology is used with the method of spiritual experience gained through spiritual life. So, the orthodox theology has the goal of perfecting man and preparing him for eternal communion with God, its method is not identical with that of science. Theology goes beyond rational knowledge, entering the sphere of spiritual mystical knowledge that comes from God, not from human reason. “To speak of theology as a way of knowing from a purely epistemological perspective is impossible. The Christian is led by God to a becoming first of all in the plane of being, which is not the case in the field of science” (Mihalache et al. 2014, 25). The epistemological way of knowing is not a characteristic of orthodox theology. For orthodox theology, the fulfillment of man on a spiritual level and the realization of communion with the personal God are more important. Through spiritual life, man comes to know the secrets and meaning of the world, and natural phenomena are only part of those secrets of the world. For the spiritual man, the functioning of the world is only part of the knowledge that brings him closer to communion and knowledge of God. Therefore, this type of knowledge, which is different from the method of science, is “specific to the spiritual life” (Mihalache et al. 2014, 26).

Since early Christianity, more attention has been paid to the personal relationship with God and to the perfection of man through spiritual life. In this sense, the Church Fathers will write their theology, which was concentrated on the union of man with God. But their knowledge was not obtained through rational analysis, but through their own spiritual experience gained through personal union with God. “The Holy Fathers of the first Christian centuries, through the proposed synthesis, explained the nature of the Truth by relating it to communion. They did not do this through a structured approach through conceptual analysis, but, renewing their minds through ecclesial experience, they confessed the Truth as an expression of the fullness of ecclesial communion” (Mihalache et al. 2013, 68). Man’s communion with God and with his neighbor is the beginning of knowledge that later only

becomes greater and deeper. But the knowledge that man receives through spiritual experience is not logical (rational) knowledge but is considered a gift from God. Those things that are inaccessible to man from the point of view of knowledge, become known through the grace and knowledge given by God Himself. “Spiritual and theological vision is not a natural power, the result of a strictly human competence, but a charisma given by God. God Himself makes the spiritually blind eyes capable of perceiving Him” (Ionescu 2015, 68). The knowledge gained through spiritual experience is not the result of human reasoning. God is the One who gives that knowledge. In fact, the goal of knowledge is not only the universe, but its Creator Himself. The goal is not to know only the material world and what that world contains, but also to know God. “God Himself is the ‘object of knowledge’ of theology and the only possible way to encounter Him is prayer and the gracious experience that it gives birth to in the human being through divine goodwill” (Ionescu 2015, 69). Knowledge in the spiritual life is acquired through constant prayer and spiritual struggle. The virtues acquired throughout life are important, but nothing is possible without constant prayer. “Prayer is the experiential theological path par excellence” (Ionescu 2015, 67). That is why the Holy Apostle Paul advises us to pray constantly (1 Thess. 5, 17).

The Christian life is not limited to biological existence but means much more than simple survival. The Christian life is always aimed at the perfection of man on an existential level that surpasses ordinary life. That higher level is always aimed at God and His presence through His grace and through the Mysteries of the Church. The spiritual perfection of man is not a product of human intellect but implies a great effort on the part of man (Mihalache et al. 2014, 23). However, not every person can attain this spiritual knowledge and not everyone receives it as a gift from God. A person who does not strive in his life to perfect himself spiritually cannot obtain high spiritual knowledge. In addition to knowing God, a person also knows the world in which he lives, according to his abilities for that knowledge. “In this regard, Father Stăniloae states that everyone must know the world according to the power given to them (...)” (Mihalache et al. 2014, 24). Each person is given the gift of knowledge differently because each person is different, has different spiritual and rational powers of understanding. Then, the spiritual secrets that man knows from God’s revelation, he cannot all understand with his reason, therefore they are considered secrets that human reason is not capable of knowing. In this case, the difference between the scientific and theological approach to knowledge appears. The Holy Fathers of the Church knew how to make this distinction; therefore, their works are proof for us of the possibility of knowledge through the spiritual method, different from the modern scientific method. “The distinction between the approach of scientific knowledge according to natural competences (the pro-

posal of modern science is «horizontal» knowledge, that is, a knowledge indifferent to everything, meaning transcendent) and that through spiritual competences (theology is knowledge anchored in the ‘vertical’ that unites heaven with earth, the uncreated with the created, the fruit of the synergy between man and God; we are talking here about a spiritualized reason and an understanding knowledge) is of patristic inspiration” (Mihalache et al. 2014, 24–25). The difference in the competences of scientific and spiritual knowledge is also revealed by their known methods of acquiring knowledge. Science is always anchored in the material and rarely turns to the spiritual, while theology, although its goal is spiritual perfection and the knowledge of God, does not exclude the knowledge of matter. Science and orthodox theology are divided between transience and eternity. “The experience of professions, of scientific knowledge, of social conditions belongs to the plane of temporal, empirical existence; the experience of salvation and resurrection in Christ is the experience of eternity” (Mihalache et al. 2014, 25). Through science, man better knows what surrounds him, and through theology, that is, through spiritual experience, he knows what can lead him to eternal life. Man lives in a material, transient world, but his thoughts and life are directed towards immaterial eternity. Through life in the Church, man makes a good distinction between autonomous rational knowledge and that which he receives with God’s help, through the grace of the Holy Spirit (Mihalache et al. 2014, 25–26).

The Truth, The Connection Between Science and Orthodox Theology

Although the methods of science and orthodox theology are different, we believe that both sides have the same goal. Whether it is an investigation of the material world or the spiritual, science and orthodox theology seek to discover the truth about our existence and the meaning of our lives. “We could say that both science and theology express the effort to discover hidden treasures” (Mihalache et al. 2014, 28). For science, the hidden treasure is the secrets of the world we live in and that surrounds us, and for orthodox theology, it is the spiritual secrets of man’s relationship with God and creation. “Both the scientific experiment and the religious experience are the result of a personal approach to inner reflection of reality. Science does it through an intellectual filter of the logical thinking type, a filter continuously perfected through methodological development. Theology, not being just an approach of reflection, but a way of doing, of living, proposes a different filter, of the heart, more precisely of the inner consciousness put to work with the power of prayer. This filter is continuously trained and perfected

through life within the Church. As a natural consequence, both science and theology produce results that are tributary to the paradigm of approach, depending on the method used. Science discovers the world as a rationally encoded presence, composing intellectual representations by highlighting with priority the regularities and repeatabilities in nature, since it uses logical thinking, with demonstrable efficiency through a strictly intellectual approach. Theology discovers the world as being structured by a rationality imbued with love, a rationality which appeals more to the symbol than to analytical categories of thought. It is a matter of a rationality that is shown to be inevitable through the work of grace that carries you inwardly into the proximity of an overwhelming, meaning-giving and life-giving Presence” (Mihalache et al. 2014, 27). Science and the orthodox theology see the same world as a structure that reveals many secrets to us. Science observes the mathematical realities present in the world, while orthodox theology sees the same realities as a mystery that reveals to us the wisdom of the Creator and the harmony that exists in the world. The way in which science and orthodox theology approach the knowledge of the world reveals the method used by each side, but also the same interest in finding out the truth about the world and its existence. The scientist explores and learns what is outside of him, while the Christian knows the world through his interiority and the spiritual experience he receives through divine grace.

The parallelism between the two paths, scientific and theological, emphasizes their different nature. While technical equipment facilitates the “extension” of man outwardly, the penetrating power of reason providing coherence and systematization to the approach of observing nature, Christian living presupposes the growth of the inner man through which the regenerated, restored spiritual senses determine a transfiguration of the human person’s participation in the world. The foundation of the scientific experiment remains the production of precise information regarding nature, its interrogation being declared effective if it has responded within a correct framework within the investigation paradigm, while the “object” of the theological experience is a transcendent personal reality that fundamentally escapes any manipulation by man and which can only be known authentically to the extent that man opens himself to divine grace. (Mihalache et al. 2014, 28)

The results of science and orthodox theology are confirmed by the community. In science, scientific results are subjected to and approved by the criticism of the scientific community. In orthodox theology, knowledge and assertions are compared and confirmed by what is called the church conscience, through comparison with the teaching of the Holy Fathers. Theology, which is dedicated to the knowledge of the Truth which is God (Jn. 14:6), can be a good partner of modern science. “Such a theology committed to the experience of Truth, articulated to the life of the ecclesial community, is witnessing and becomes relevant for the science and culture of the current era” (Lemeni 2011, 53). Contemporary orthodox theology is open to dialogue

with science and can contribute greatly to the understanding of many things related to the knowledge of the world. Theology that is dedicated to the experience of Truth can bring sincerity to the dialogue with science.

But is there a great distance between science and orthodox theology in terms of their purpose or their different methods? Ștefan Trăușan–Matu argues the following: “Actually, there is no gap separating science from religion. (...) the rational knowledge offered by science must not be rejected. However, religion offers access to a different type of knowledge, which reaches further than the rational one. This apophatic knowledge involves a different approach than the scientific method” (2021, 113). Science and orthodox theology should not be rivals when it comes to understanding the world. Although they have different approaches and methods, they share the same goal of discovering the secrets of the world. Therefore, dialogue can contribute to both sides understanding each other better. “Dialogue is built on the basis of comparing specific research methodologies, in which both similarities and differences can be observed. A form of dialogue is proposed when science reaches the limit of its research possibilities and is interested in complementary forms of understanding, when current scientific results raise questions beyond the possibilities of answers offered by current scientific methodology” (Lemeni and Ionescu 2007, 89). When science cannot explain things that go beyond scientific investigation, orthodox theology can contribute with its methodology to explain more things or to say that some things are part of apophatic knowledge. When science remains committed to the search for the truth of things in the world, then a fruitful dialogue with theology can be had (Lemeni and Ionescu 2007, 90). “Scientific knowledge can meet theological knowledge only to the extent that it recognizes the epistemological value of wisdom as a way of life that involves the search for Truth” (Lemeni and Ionescu 2007, 92). The wisdom that people have sought since ancient times is once again the link that can contribute to the dialogue between science and theology. Wisdom implies a search for existential meaning, and that meaning is found in the research of science and in spiritual experience. The sincerity of science and theology in their approach can lead them to the discovery not only of the truth about the world, but also of the discovery of Truth, which is God Himself. The very search for Truth occurs gradually in both science and theology. Truth is not discovered all at once. Adrian Lemeni and Răzvan Ionescu argue the following:

(...) Both theological experience and scientific experiment presuppose an inner coherence in order to develop knowledge: in theology, spiritual obedience takes precedence, the inclusion in a line of conduct with rules and freedom coordinated through spiritual paternity, while in science, the rules of logic and professional competence, related to the critical community spirit, ensure the coherence of the experimental approach. Both approaches, both scientific and theological, presuppose a gradual growth: theology through experimentation in

the “laboratory” of liturgical life, and science through research in the laboratory associated with the discipline within which the research takes place. (Lemeni and Ionescu 2007, 203)

The scientific laboratory and the Church as a laboratory of virtues and grace contribute to the gradual discovery of Truth. Science and theology have specific competencies that build the confidence of the scientist and the Christian to have the courage to explore the depths of the world and of Truth (God). Today, it is especially important to have sincerity and courage in the process of knowing, whether it is a matter of scientific research or a spiritual experience, if both lead to the one and only Truth.

Conclusion

The rational approach to knowing the world implies very precise data that science must find and explain. No matter how successful science is in its experimental research, there always remains a large part of the world that continues to be a mystery to scientists. Also, science cannot provide an answer to everything that exists because it has many limitations. It is limited in terms of its inability to explain the complexity of the world. Then, it does not always have the appropriate language and terminology to describe what it discovers and cannot try to create new theories, just to justify that it scientifically proves something. A scientific experiment does not always provide rational answers to what surrounds us. A scientific experiment is confirmed by the scientific community.

Unlike a scientific experiment, spiritual experience has a clear goal in terms of what it wants to know. The goal of spiritual life is the knowledge of God and the acquisition of eternal life. In addition to the virtues, the most important method through which spiritual experience is realized and fulfilled is prayer. Spiritual persons have the ability to know much, but they learn as much as God reveals to them or as knowledge is adapted to their own abilities. Spiritual knowledge is confirmed by the church community and the church conscience, preserved through the centuries in the works of the Holy Fathers.

No matter how different the methods of science and of orthodox theology are, we believe that both are on the same path. Science and orthodox theology seek the truth about the world and about man, so we can say that they seek the same truth. Science and theology seek the existential meaning of existence. With the mutual dialogue that exists between science and the orthodox theology, one can come to a mutual complementation of knowledge and the methods by which one comes to know the world. If the dialogue is fruitful and sincere, then one can come to the answer that everyone

is looking for. If the knowledge of science and theology are united, then we are confident that they will reach the sought-after goal, which is the knowledge of the eternal Truth, the personal God. For theology, truth is God, and science can come to the discovery of the same Truth because matter itself reveals that it has a creator. The dialogue between science and theology is current, the methods are different, there are many unresolved issues that arise during that dialogue that we hope will be resolved slowly with the passage of time. Opinions are not yet aligned, but we hope that with dedication and sincerity, agreement can be reached on certain issues. Science and orthodox theology should not be afraid of each other—they should engage in dialogue more often, because only through dialogue and listening to the opinion of the other can we answer our questions and create a better society. Where there is no dialogue, there is hostility. The search for truth is a sufficient reason to hear more opinions, and we believe that science and theology are sincere in seeking and affirming the truth. According to the words of the holy Apostle and Evangelist John, only the truth can set us free (John 8:32). Therefore, anyone who sincerely seeks the truth will honestly share it with the world.

References

- Ionescu, Răzvan Andrei. 2015. *Teologie Ortodoxă Și Știință. Conflict, Indiferență, Integrare Sau Dialog?* Iași: Doxologia.
- Lemeni, Adrian. 2011. *Adevăr și comuniune*. București: Editura Basilica a Patriarhiei Române.
- Lemeni, Adrian, and Ionescu Răzvan. 2007. *Teologie ortodoxă și știință*. 2nd ed. București: Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române.
- Mihalache, Sorin, Răzvan Ionescu, and Cristinel Ioja. 2013. *Apologetica Ortodoxă*. Edited by Adrian Lemeni. I. București: Basilica.
- Mihalache, Sorin, Răzvan Ionescu, and Cristinel Ioja. 2014. *Apologetica Ortodoxă*. Edited by Adrian Lemeni. II. București: Basilica.
- Trăușan–Matu, Ștefan. 2021. “Knowledge, Method, Language.” In *The Relationship Between Theology, Philosophy and Science: An Eastern Christian Perspective*. București: Basilica.

*Sažetak***DIJALOG IZMEĐU TEOLOGIJE I ZNANOSTI KAO
ISKRENA POTRAGA ZA ISTINOM: IZMEĐU
ZNANSTVENOG EKSPERIMENTA I RELIGIJSKOG
ISKUSTVA**

ILCHE MICEVSKI-IGNAT

Potruga za istinom vrlo je staro nastojanje koje postoji još od drevnih vremena. Njome su se bavili antički filozofi i mudraci. Potraga za istinom nije prestala; ona se nastavlja sve do danas. Možemo reći da su danas najveći tragači za istinom znanstvenici, u svim područjima znanstvenog istraživanja. S druge strane postoje teolozi koji znaju Tko je Istina (Ivan 14,6) i nastoje biti u zajedništvu s istinom kroz duhovni život. Ova studija nastoji pojasniti dijalog između pravoslavne teologije i znanosti, kao i njihove različite metode kojima dolaze do spoznaje istine. Put do istine može se dosegnuti, ali metode su različite jer znanost i teologija koriste različite pristupe. Obje mogu imati isti cilj — pronaći istinu — ali potrebno je naglasiti različita iskustva koja imaju znanost i pravoslavna teologija. Znanost koristi promatranje i eksperimentiranje nad stvarima koje želi upoznati, objašnjavajući ih racionalnim diskursom, no s druge strane ima i svoja ograničenja. Teologija koristi stoljećima staro duhovno iskustvo stečeno u životu Crkve, čiji je cilj spoznaja Boga i zajedništvo s Njim. Kada se napravi usporedba, pojavljuje se razlika u spoznaji materijalnoga i nematerijalnoga. Iako se metode čine različitima, cilj se čini istim — pronaći odgovore koji vode čovječanstvo do spoznaje istine. Znanost i teologija mogu pronaći zajedničko razumijevanje u traženju i spoznaji istine.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: dijalog, eksperiment, ograničenja znanosti, znanost, duhovno iskustvo, teologija, istina

* Assist. Prof. PhD, Ilche Micevski–Ignat, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Faculty of Orthodox Theology “Saint Clement of Ohrid”, E-mail: i.micevski@pbf.edu.mk