New Europe College Yearbook 2005-2006

RALUCA ALEXANDRESCU
JÓZSEF BENEDEK
LIVIU CHELCEA
RODICA-GABRIELA CHIRA
RADU DUDĂU
BOGDAN IANCU
MIHAIL NEAMȚU
CORINA L. PETRESCU
ANCA STERE

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

MIHAIL NEAMȚU

Born in 1978, in Făgăraș

Ph.D. candidate, King's College London, United Kingdom (due 2007),
Dissertation: *The Nicene Christ and the Desert Eschatology*

Editor of *Archaeus. Studies in the History of Religions* (founded 1997)

Visiting Scholar, Central European University, Budapest,
Religious Studies Department, 2006

Participation at scholarly conferences and symposia in England, Germany,
Hungary, Ireland, Romania, Spain

Articles and studies in various academic publications and volumes

Books
Bufnița din dărâmături. Insomnnii teologice [An Owl Among the Ruins.
Theological Insomnias] (Bucharest: Anastasia Publishers, 2005)

Gramatica Ortodoxiei. Tradiția după modernitate [The Grammar of Orthodoxy. Tradition after Modernity] (Jassy: Polirom Publishers, 2006)

BETWEEN THE GOSPEL AND THE NATION AN INTRODUCTION TO DUMITRU STĂNILOAE'S ETHNO-THEOLOGY

Cultural Wars in Great Romania

It was in 1918 when the great powers acknowledged first, by the Treaty of Versailles, the legitimacy of the monarchist state of Great Romania. This international recognition put an end to the transitional period of struggle for union between Transylvania, and the other two Romanian provinces (i.e., Walachia and Moldavia). At last, Romania felt part of the great family of European countries. Its towns and cities, but above all the capital, were called to a radical modernisation, by emulating one of the many Western models available. It was perhaps also the time to do so.[1] At the dusk of the 19th century, to many English people, for example, Romania seemed more like a Chinese puzzle. Indeed, very few high-browed intellectuals had a first-hand knowledge of the Romanian realities.

> "No further back than four years before the Russo-Turkish war [1877-1878], in which the Rumanian army took a distinguished part, we find the English consul in Bucharest complaining that letters sent to that city sometimes went to India in search of Bokhara; and he even tells of a summons from London addressed, 'Bucharest, in the kingdom of Egypt.'"[2]

In the inter-war period, the Romanian authorities did all they could to do away with this embarrassing stereotype, which placed a South-European country on the intellectual map of Orientalism.

In the wake of the First World War, Romania became finally independent of any direct influence or pressure coming from Russia or the Ottoman Turkey. Its economic and social policies moved clearly towards the West. However, this shift was exempted from a wide range

of cultural ambiguities. While satisfied with their integration into the European project, the Romanian intelligentsia was left stranded between roughly two different options.[3] The first group of liberal intellectuals emerged in counter-reaction to the traditionalist movement, which seemed to be both Romantic and conservative, backward looking, and happy to celebrate the religious dimension of every sober human enterprise.[4] Among the advocates of Western secularism one counts the cosmopolitan sociologist and historian of ideas Mihai Ralea (1896 – 1964), the literary critic Eugen Lovinescu (1881-1943), and the social philosopher Ştefan Zeletin (1882-1934). They all criticised Orthodoxy for its alleged contribution to civic fatalism and economic backwardness among the rural population, calling for a complete break from the Slavic influence upon the national ethos.[5]

In response, an ethnocentric group of intellectuals claimed to have at the grassroots level more legitimacy than the camp of the Westernisers. It stemmed from a previous movement represented by the so-called "Sămănătoriştii,"[6] advocating the return to the pristine soil, the untainted roots, and the sublime countryside. "*Semănătorismul*" was the Romanian equivalent of the Russian *pochvennichestvo*. The biblical metaphor of the seed (*sămânţa*) and the sower (*semănătorul*) carried with it a vast array of religious and poetic meanings. Among the members of this new elite, one should mention the monumental polygraph Nicolae Iorga (1871-1940), the geographer Simion Mehedinţi, the poet and political activist Octavian Goga (1881-1938), the philosopher Constantin Rădulescu-Motru (1868-1957), or the more original thinker Lucian Blaga (1895-1961). None of these luminaries was inclined to shelter his nationalist discourse under the roof of the Orthodox theology, nor were they committed to leave Romania outside the political borders of Europe. Each one in his way favoured the preservation of the local brands, pleading for a better management of the cultural values of traditional Romania in accord with the Western standards. "Synthesis" seemed to have been the watchword of their ideology.

Religious Nationalism: Three Authors and an Argument

A more dramatic form of metaphysical nationalism appears in the writings of Nichifor Crainic (1889-1972) and Dumitru Stăniloae (1903-1993). Crainic, in particular, churned out his ideas under the

influence of Oswald Spengler (1880-1936).[7] The epoch-making book entitled "The Decline of the West" (1918) encouraged him to promote the idea of political authoritarianism. His readers went into rapture over the classical contrast between culture and civilisation, derived from Ferdinand Tönnies' distinction between *Gesellschaft* and *Gemeinschaft*, and coined for the first time in 1887. Crainic overlapped these terms with the notions of rural existence and urban life-style. His literary prose and poetry teemed with lyrical solemnities about the purity of the peasantry. At times, Crainic's journalism would indulge in offensive comments about the ethnic minorities from Romania. Thoroughly nostalgic and regressively utopian, he also believed in the future of an ethnocratic state.[8] Crainic illustrated at best the messianic trope of the orthodoxist group surrounding the "*Gândirea*" journal, easily comparable with the Russian Slavophiles, such as Aleksey Khomiakov (1804-1860) and Ivan Kyreevsky (1806-1856).[9] As it is well known, the latter group liked to draw emphatic parallels between the Church vocation to redeem the souls and the call of their particular nation (e.g., Russia) to illumine the world. Lay Christians and ecclesiastical officials were inclined to produce self-centred tracts of defence in favour of Orthodoxy. According to the Slavophile manifesto, which clearly influenced Crainic, a faithful Christian had to be rather weary of secular institutions and shy of technological progress. The genealogy of the Western values was univocally linked to the "heresies" of the Roman-Catholic and Protestant churches. Scholarship was distrusted as mere tool of intellectual scepticism. Anti-Semitism was not un-common.[10] The attacks of cosmopolitanism commended singing the heroic past of the nation.

Against this background, many theologians felt free to endorse the exceptional character of the Romanian case. An easy appeal to theological arguments, such as hope in the "resurrection of the nations"[11], helped the Church officials in their construal of the nation as a metaphysical entity. For Dumitru Stăniloae, for instance, 'nation' appeared to be that 'spiritual reality' working under the divine guidance of the Providence, capable to offer each person *a priori* schemes of understanding the fallen history and, above all, the meaning of the divine revelation.[12] Stăniloae regarded the ethnic determination of the individual as something literally *inalienable*. Against this background, it is not at all surprising that the understanding of the local traditions often took dualistic undertones. Often, the perception was polarised between two antithetic categories: the local identity ("good"), and the foreign (usually Western) influence ("bad").

241

This agonistic economy of symbols and images characterised both the political debates and the historiographic reconstruction of the Romanian past. According to the national vulgate, which remains valid until today, the emancipation of the Romanian people from its crude oppressors was paralleled by the implacable Christianisation of the nation itself. The unity of the nation was the "basis for the Church unity."[13] Following this providential logic of history, the enemies of the Romanian people could be seen as the Church's adversaries, and vice versa. Orthodoxy gradually becomes thus a political commodity. It ceases to speak with equal power to the ethnic groups of Hungarians, Germans or Gypsies. The Gospel was divested from its original universality.

Less enthralled by the myths of the Romanian peasantry and more adapted to the flexible directions of the inter-war *Realpolitik* was Nae Ionescu (1890-1940).[14] Educated in Germany at the dawn of the 20th century, influenced by Carl Schmitt in his ideas[15], Nae Ionescu became in the early 1930s an intellectually sophisticated spokesman for the right-wing party, "Iron Guard."[16] He had numerous disciples in the academic circles, and beyond. Not all did always share his fondness for Orthodoxy and political radicalism.[17] But most of them deplored the limitations of positivism in philosophy (as with Constantin Noica), and sympathised with the antidemocratic movements of the youth (as with Emil Cioran). For the exceptionally gifted polymath M. Vulcănescu (1904-1952), Orthodoxy was an intrinsic determination of the Romanian character, as he pointed out in an influential essay.[18] Mircea Vulcănescu, whose contribution to a Romanian philosophy of nationhood deserves in itself a separate study, can be placed in the context of yet another intellectual movement comprising young intellectuals holding very diverse ideological convictions, namely "Criterion."[19] This latter group spoke against the narrow tenets of the "Gândirea Movement," promoting a sober form of cultural ecumenism. Left-wing sympathisers met with right-wing intellectuals, in search for a real dialogue on issues of common interest. Some iconoclastic members of this "sect" condemned all attempts "to indigenise universals such as space, time, and being."[20] As in the works of Mircea Eliade, a shift towards the more universalistic dimension of religion or spirituality could be noted. The exclusivist logic of "either/or" was never dominant among the "Criterion" circles. This very feature explains its quick dissolution.

At the grassroots level, the message of, respectively, Nichifor Crainic, Dumitru Stăniloae and Nae Ionescu had greater impact than the

intellectual sophistication of the "Criterion" group, or the all too straightforward pro-Western agenda of the intellectuals surrounding Lovinescu. As Christian theologians, Crainic, Stăniloae and Ionescu illustrate a dramatic paradox in the European history of modern ideas. Traditionally, a teacher of Christianity would be expected to stand up for a universalistic faith, called to embrace and harmonise the multicultural texture of many traditional societies.[21] Despite this fundamental vow to catholicity, some Orthodox theologians used a rhetoric, which did legitimise not only patriotism as such, based on civic values, but even radical forms of nationalism. Often, this was done along with the official Church discourse, at the expense of softening the universalistic criteria of the traditional Christian identity. Ethnic loyalty outstripped religious affiliation. This very fact proves that, at least in the case of some Eastern-European countries, secular nationalism (especially, its 19th century version) did not easily replace religious discourse. It is necessary, therefore, to ask here several questions regarding this cultural dialectics.

What was the main driving force behind the theological arguments, which could currently justify the nationalist proclivities of the mainstream Romanian Orthodoxy? Which was the self-understanding of the Eastern Orthodox Church at the dawn of the national states' foundation, on the basis of which a particular reading of history (more aptly called, "historiosophy") could emerge? What was the context, which favoured the outward show of nationalism in protochronist garments? Which were the possible theological rationales behind the nationalist themes, which still persist in the Church official discourse until today? Where was the borderline between blind nationalism and serene patriotism trespassed? In order to answer at least some of these questions, the works of the late Dumitru Stăniloae (1903-1993) provide us with one of the best possible case studies. For the Western reader, this may sound as a paradox. Outside the borders of his native country, Stăniloae is virtually known only for his universalistic message, which encouraged some even to call him "the greatest Orthodox theologian of the 20th century" (Olivier Clément).

Indeed, Stăniloae was one of the most prolific and inspired scholars of Eastern Orthodoxy during the 20th century. He penned a great many books on Christian doctrine, liturgy and spirituality, together with translations and exegetical works on the early Church Fathers. Recently, these volumes started to receive a considerable attention among Western theologians.[22] It remains nonetheless important to understand the contributions of Fr Dumitru Stăniloae towards the elaboration of an "ethno-theology", together

with its *sui-generis* character. More than Crainic and Ionescu, Stăniloae's understanding of the rapport between the Church and the nation has been accepted as almost normative in the official circles of the lay theologians and hierarchs. It is therefore paramount that a research of Stăniloae's contribution to the 20th century Orthodox "ethno-theology" will preface any general assessment of the Romanian, and indeed Eastern European case. A biographical sketch can serve as the best introduction to a more detailed discussion of Stăniloae's ideas.

An Unsettled Youth

Dumitru Stăniloae was born on 16th November 1903 in Braşov county, the youngest child of simple and devout peasants.[23] He had a basic education in Braşov founded on strict German principles. The young Dumitru started his theological studies in 1922 at the University of Cernăuţi (the cultural centre of the former Romanian province Bucovina, now part of Ukraine). Disappointed by the Scholastic methods of teaching theology in Cernăuţi, Stăniloae enrolled at the University of Bucharest, where he read Classics and Literature. At the recommendation of Nicolae Bălan, then the Metropolitan of Transylvania, Stăniloae completed his theological studies, despite the rather dull and compromising environment, which affected this subject. In 1927, he graduated with a somewhat short dissertation on "Infant Baptism in the Early Church tradition." Shortly afterwards, Stăniloae received a series of scholarships for post-graduate research in Athens (1927), Munich (1928, where he followed the courses of the famous scholar in Byzantine studies August Heisenberg), Berlin and Paris (1929) and, in the event, Istanbul (1930). These trips were often interrupted by short visits to Romania, where his contribution to the improvement of the theological education was expected to make a difference. Thus, in 1928, Stăniloae received his doctorate after submitting a thesis on "The Life and the Works of Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem."[24]

During his postdoctoral stages of work in Europe, Stăniloae improved greatly his knowledge of German and Byzantine Greek, being also able to peruse to the growing literature on patristics, Church history and systematic theology. It was in the West first where Stăniloae read extensively Protestant authors such as Karl Barth (1886-1968) or Emil Brunner (1889-1966). In Paris and Istanbul, Stăniloae did his first research on the works of the late Byzantine theologian, St Gregory Palamas

(1296-1359). Moved by anti-Catholic sentiments, the young Stăniloae first presented the life and the work of Gregory Palamas in his influential monograph published in 1938. Together with Nichifor Crainic, Stăniloae was among the first Romanian professors of theology to substantially redirect the interest of his students towards the rich sources of the mystical tradition of the Orthodox Church. Throughout his approach, which emphasised more the richness of the Oriental Christianity, Stăniloae remained nonetheless fond of the opposition "East *versus* West,"[25] to which he added a distinctive „antirömischen Affekt" (to use here the famous phrase coined by Hans Urs von Balthasar).[26] An article published in 1930 put it thus:

> "The Roman-Catholic tradition is rationalist and empirical, while Eastern Orthodoxy is mystical and transcendent."

and,

> "For the Roman-Catholics, the Church is a social body opposed to, and fighting other social bodies in search for supremacy within the same life experience, and not the divine-and-human body, which penetrates the other social bodies from above."[27]

Notwithstanding these polemical exaggerations, Dumitru Stăniloae displayed much more than just an abrasive non-ecumenical ethos, as one recent commentator suggested.[28] His theological position was rooted in the radical eschatological insights professed by great thinkers and mystics of the Byzantine tradition. In his harsh criticism of the Western passion for juridical discipline and rational clarity, Stăniloae echoes again the position of St Gregory Palamas. The latter rejected the claims of Barlaam of Calabria, according to which "profane knowledge" (such as mathematics or natural philosophy) converges necessarily with the "spiritual knowledge" inspired by God. The exercise of dialectics, for example, is not needful for the achievement of salvation, whereas the understanding provided by the divine Scriptures remains fundamental, having saving effects for every single Christian soul. The Western tradition, Stăniloae suggests, has forgotten this crucial truth of the patristic tradition, reappraised later by the Byzantine monastics of the fourteenth century. The limits of scholarship and discursive thought are dramatic, since they cannot pay off the lack of personal communion with the Holy Spirit.

There is first the "human wisdom" pertaining to the created realm of being, and then the "wisdom from above," which is the effect of God's revelation in man's heart.[29] In other words, one should never confuse the uncreated grace of God (which illiterate people, such as some among the apostles, are perfectly capable to receive) with the natural gifts of human intelligence, which can still be associated with a perverted heart. Discursive thought, moreover, is divisive, while spiritual knowledge unites the human self in the light of God's united being. This is why, in the light of the Christian tradition, the apostles were greater than the greatest philosophers of the Hellenistic age. On the other hand, this does not mean that, before the advent of Christ, grains of truth could not have been found there where the pursuit of goodness was selfless and genuine.[30] It remains nonetheless important that Christians from all walks of life do not ignore this right epistemological order and adequate hierarchy of gifts. Attributing more value to the scholarly endeavour than to prayer and meditation can have harmful effects for one's personal salvation, and for the ecclesial life by enlarge. By stating this theological truth, Stăniloae remained indebted to the stark positions adopted by St Mark of Ephesus (†1444) during the "unionist" council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-45). In other words, Stăniloae claimed that the Byzantine tradition was the true heir of the Patristic wisdom, expressed both in the splendours of its mystical theology. Unlike the West, where theologians lapsed into unnecessary speculations on the nature of God, the Orthodox Church focused on the transfiguration of human person through prayerful contemplation of the divine light. It was this theological difference, perceived often in the specific terms of the monastic spirituality, which set limits to the dialogue between East and West, and not mainly a cultural idiosyncrasy.

"Political" versus "Mystical" Theology

Married in 1930 to Maria, his life-long wife and companion, Dumitru Stăniloae was ordained priest in Sibiu, just one year later. Before and during the World War II, Stăniloae exerted his influence for more than a decade in the field of theological and historical studies, despite not having a mentor in whose footsteps he could walk. Gradually, he became a public intellectual, very keen on making the voice of Orthodoxy being heard among the more secular members of the political elite. This exercise

was rather novel among the Romanian advocates of the Orthodox Church, which for centuries remained silent, adorned only in its liturgical garments.[31] During the 19th century, in comparison to Russia, for instance, Walachia and Moldova benefited from much less theological debates regarding the rapport between tradition and modernity, or the transfer of concepts from the private to the public sphere. In such an impoverished context, Stăniloae's theoretical indecisions strike the reader as normal. At times he seemed in favour of Crainic's apology for an ethnocratic state, while in other cases the same Stăniloae rejected any form of political fascism, xenophobia or cultural exclusiveness.

In 1934, Stăniloae could brand communism as anti-Christian, while ten years later he identified the roots of social equalitarian in the Gospel. It is more than obvious that Stăniloae's indulged himself in sweeping generalities about the history of the nation, and the role that Christianity had played in the invisible formation of the Romanian ethos. He simply did not use any elements of social and economic expertise, which could have illuminated more the past of his own nation. Equally, an inadequate training in political theory pushed him to make risky statements, often tainted with utopian elements. Some of his theological inquiries were nonetheless groundbreaking, given the rudimentary level of religious instruction at that time. He was a person that could read with genuine interest not only the writings of the Church Fathers, but also the books of Sherlock Holmes[32], or even the essays of an ultimate nihilist figure, such as Emil (E.M.) Cioran.[33] His literary input was extraordinary.

Stăniloae published hundreds of articles, some of which tried to show the compatibility between political nationalism and the distinctive theological tenets of the Church. There must be a specific way of being Romanian, not only in social terms, but also in a religious sense. Stăniloae overlapped the modern category of "nation" with the more ancient concept of "ethnicity" (the "civic nationalism" being branded as "insufficient").[34] The Greek word *ethnos* is widely used in the classical and biblical literature, being commonly translated either as "people" (Romanian: *neam*), "tribe" (Romanian: *seminţie*) or, somewhat misleadingly, with the more modern equivalent of "nation" (Romanian: *naţiune*).[35] Particularly in the New Testament corpus, the meaning of ethnos (often taken as identical with *laos*) covers a historical reality that can hardly match the modern configuration of the European national identities, in the wake of World War I. For example, in St Paul's speech recorded by Luke the Evangelist in the book of the Acts of the Apostles

(13, 16-41), there is a reference to the "seven nations (*ethne hepta*)" from Canaan, which perished at the will of God so that the Israelites could finally seize the Promised Land. The nations taken here into consideration could not have possibly represented the socio-political units, which flourished during the modern period in Europe and elsewhere. The Israelites and their foes alike (with the exception of the Egyptians, perhaps) could be at best described in a contemporary language as "tribes" in search for geographic expansion and economic sovereignty. Stăniloae did not, or could not appreciate the historical transformation of the notion of "nation" and "nationality", which instead of the previously ethnic connotations ("the blood") acquired a strong political significance.

On the other hand, it has to be said that Stăniloae's ethnic sensitivities had no totalitarian connotations.[36] Albeit rejecting pacifisms as such, and while critiquing the weaknesses of modern democracy, Stăniloae called for the implementation of the virtue of moderation in the every sort of political endeavour. Under this warrant, he condemned the acts of violence perpetrated by the members of the "Legionary Movement" in their exercise of power. Critical of communist internationalism, and sceptical of papal universalism, Stăniloae tried to explain how only the Orthodox Church is capable to welcome and blend the character of every nations by performing a particular theological synthesis that resembles, to some extent, the Platonic paradigm of the "One-among-many." Stăniloae thought this was the vocation of a strong participatory theology, that sees in the event of the Incarnation the very paradigm for the union between the human and the divine.

Stăniloae's interest in the "prophetic", that is to say public dimension of the Church life had its pair in the purely theological concerns that he developed from an early age. He penned several apologetic books, among which the most notable is his first essay in Christology.[37] A close knowledge of the Patristic authors (St Maximus the Confessor, in particular), and the fruitful dialogue with the modern Russian tradition (Metropolitan Anthony Khrapovitsky and Serghei Bulgakov, in particular), along with the interaction with some major Western philosophers (Martin Heidegger, Maurice Blondel, Louis Lavalle, Ludwig Binswanger), placed the early Stăniloae in the frontline of Orthodox thinking. In his book on "Jesus Christ and the Restoration of Man," Stăniloae showed himself to be one of the most notable Orthodox theologians of the 20th century ready to defend the doctrine of deification (*theosis*), in the footsteps of the Church Fathers. His growing interest for the monastic spirituality of

Eastern Christianity determined Stăniloae to start his monumental translation of *The Philokalia.*[38] The first volume appeared in 1946, and the last in 1991. This famous compilation of texts on prayer and contemplation, comprising the wisdom of the ascetic Church Fathers from the fourth up to the fourteenth century, was issued in Romanian in not less than twelve volumes. In contrast, the English edition, following the initial design of St Nikodemos the Athonite and St Makarios of Corinth, has only five volumes (the latter to be published soon). Regarded by Stăniloae himself as the best achievement of his theological career, the Romanian edition of *The Philokalia* had and perhaps still has a significant impact on the development of monastic life in Romania, shortly after the Soviet occupation[39], and following the political revolution of 1989. To this day, *The Philokalia* is a best seller on the religious book market.

The Imprisonment

Starting with the summer of 1940, the "The Burning Bush Conferences" started being organised at the most important ecclesiastical centre of Bucharest, namely the Antim Monastery.[40] However, Stăniloae s involvement in this movement was short-lived and not comparable with the strong commitment of even more influential figures, such as the hieromonk Ioan Kulighin, Rev. Benedict Ghiuş or Rev. Sofian Boghiu, the poet Sandu Tudor (the future Fr Daniil) and Dr. Vasile Voiculescu. Stăniloae s arrest and imprisonment eighteen years later was not so much a result of his connection with the "Burning Bush Movement" from Antim. Indeed, under pressure during the criminal investigations, he claimed that his link with the monastic and literary circle of Antim was casual. The explanation, then, must be found elsewhere. It would seem that it was his public defence of the "hidden treasure" kept by the great theological tradition of Orthodoxy, which precipitated the arrest of *doctor philocalicus.*[41] Between 1947 and 1955, Stăniloae was severely marginalised, and his courses at the Faculty of Theology in Sibiu were totally suppressed. In 1947, he had to move to Bucharest. It was more than ten years later, in 1958, when Stăniloae was allowed to author a book (in cooperation with other colleagues from the Faculty of Orthodox Theology in Bucharest) on Church dogmatics.[42]

From 1955 to 1958, Stăniloae attended some private seminars, arranged by his former friends of the "Burning Bush" movement. They read and

commented on books on early Christian spirituality. Under surveillance by the secret police, the members of the "Burning Bush" were arrested again on the night of 13/14 June 1958.[43] Stăniloae was arrested on 3rd September 1958, when his friends had already been sent to prison. On 8th November 1958, Stăniloae was sentenced to five years imprisonment, considered as an "obscurantist propagandist" of the *ancient régime*.[44] On 15th January 1963, he was released from prison and allowed to enrol as a teacher at the Institute for Orthodox Theology in Bucharest. In 1964, all the political and religious prisoners of Communist Romania had to be liberated, given the increasing pressures exerted by international bodies. Stăniloae spent most of his time in the dreadful prison of Aiud.[45] Later on, he used to say that this harsh period of deprivation and humiliations helped him to practise the unceasing prayer of the heart ("Lord, Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy upon me"). Over the centuries, this prayer has been much cherished by the hesychast monks of Eastern Christendom, being regarded as the corner stone of the Christian path to deification.

After Liberation

In 1963, Stăniloae was released from prison, and was asked, in return, to write some articles with positive appreciation of the Communist regime. However, the maltreatment continued until 1969, when the communist Department for Religion set out to project a better image of Romania in the West.[46] Thus, Stăniloae and other theologians were allowed to travel abroad. In 1970, he went to Oxford, hosted by the Convent of the Incarnation ("Sisters of the Love of God"). There he met his life-long friend, Canon A. M. Allchin, and other Anglican friends. He also received innumerable international awards, among which one could mention "The Cross of St Augustine of Canterbury" offered by the Bishopric of London. In 1976, the second series of *Philokalia* (from volume five onwards) started being published in Romanian, though in a very small number of copies, badly circulated. In the same year, the State University of Thessalonica offered Dumitru Stăniloae the title of *doctor honoris causa.*

In was in the same period that, quite embarrassingly, Stăniloae endorsed his former views on the Uniate Church. Seeing the Orthodox Church as a constitutive element of the Romanian national identity, Stăniloae approved in 1948 of the artificial "union" between the Uniates and Orthodox congregations.[47] Like most of the other Orthodox leaders at

that time, Stăniloae overlooked the forceful character of this "union", accomplished under the diktat of the Communist government. Stăniloae s take could have only pleased the Communist officials, who aimed at the total suppression of the last remnants of the Greek-Catholic Church, called the "Church from the underground." Unlike the Orthodox, the Greek-Catholic theologians and historians had no rights to worship[48], to gather publicly, let alone to defend themselves in journals or newspapers.[49] Quite surprisingly, the polemical perspective embraced by the young Stăniloae survived also his personal experience in the Communist prisons, where he must have met and shared the friendship of many people with different Christian backgrounds. In 1973, Stăniloae published a collection of essays under the provocative title: "The Uniate Church in Transylvania: an Attempt to Tear Apart the Romanian Nation."[50] Here, Stăniloae reinforced his views on the Uniate Church, seen as a mere expression of the Roman-Catholic proselytising action within the traditionally Orthodox frontiers. The immediate consequence of this theological decision had a political character: namely, that of dividing along religious lines the Romanians from Transylvania, from their brothers and sisters living the Orthodox faith beyond the Carpathians. Stăniloae's reading of history was inevitably biased, since it ignores the voluntary commitment of a great number of Uniate intellectuals to the national cause, in a time when the Romanian Orthodox faithful from Transylvania were still under the jurisdiction of the Serbian ecclesiastical see from Karlowitz (*Sremski Karlovci*). With the dim exception of Inochentie Micu,[51] whose patriotic deeds Stăniloae does praise, the activity of most other Uniate characters who were responsible for the political emancipation of the Romanians in Transylvania seem not to count. Stăniloae evokes instead the exceptional, but almost solitary personality of the Orthodox Metropolitan Andrei Şaguna (1809-1873), who indeed played fought as few others for the setting free of the Romanian Orthodox Christians from Transylvania.[52]

It is noteworthy that Stăniloae constantly balanced his polemical moves in the field of theological and intellectual debate, with a prominent dedication for the common spiritual roots of the Christian Church: namely, the patristic tradition. In the late 1970s, though aged and fragile, Stăniloae had the great stamina and inspiration to write his monumental work of systematic theology, issued in three volumes. His commentaries on the works of the spiritual masters of the East (from St John Climacus to St Isaac the Syrian and St Symeon the New Theologian) drew the attention

of many Romanian intellectuals and monastics.[53] Among them, one should mention Fr Ilie Cleopa[54] (1912-1998) from Sihăstria and Fr Paisie Olaru (1897-1990) from Sihla, who both had words of praise for the work of Reverend Stăniloae.[55] Moldavians by birth, these towering figures of Romanian monasticism are remembered nowadays as two unmistakable candidates for canonisation, along with other Romanian hermits and confessors who died during the 20th century. Stăniloae's publication of *The Philokalia* was a direct appraisal of this radical Christian culture, which put obedience, poverty and chastity at its hear. A clear indication of Stăniloae's recognition among the monastic circles is also offered in the writings of Archimandrite Ioanichie Bălan.[56]

Struggle and Triumph

Gradually, the depths of Stăniloae   s theological thinking and his well-balanced ecumenical openings received the just appreciation among Western theologians. Jürgen Moltmann[57] and John Meyendorff saluted the freshness of Stăniloae's approach to historical theology. The way he dealt with the sources was rejuvenating and inspiring for many young theologians, less acquainted with the patristic tradition. According to his daughter Lidia, in the early 1980s, Stăniloae travelled to Chicago, where he met the celebrated Romanian historian of religions, Mircea Eliade. Allegedly, Stăniloae had a prayerful conversation with Eliade in private.[58] Returning back home, Stăniloae plunged into his studies with an indefatigable energy, writing even more theological books, with a particular emphasis on the meaning of Christian worship.[59] This theological orientation is no surprise, since the Communist authorities emphasised that the Orthodox Church, like any other Christian communities, should not manifest herself outside the liturgical borders. Religious education, work for the charities and public mission were all forbidden. Limited by this environment, Stăniloae continued his translations of the theological works written by great theologians, such as Sts Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria or Maximus the Confessor. Not all of his translations have been published during Stăniloae's lifetime, given the strict regulations that governed the publishing houses in Romania at that time.[60]

By the end of the 1980s, Romania was probably the most badly damaged country by Communism in Eastern Europe.[61] Many intellectuals

learnt how to forget their captivity into the social misery of Communism by taking refuge into a mild sort of Platonism. Utopias of any sort, from the mystical journey into that self which is "interior intimo meo"[62], to the most whimsical forms of artistic, literary and philosophical escapism, proved to be little short of a personal redemption.[63] In those days, theology lost is its access to prophecy, while philosophy was embarrassed to face the naked truth of the historical reality. For those cared for his mental sanity, the world of culture seemed to be the last resort. In the words of Andrei Pleşu, "the only reason to concern oneself with culture, to do culture within a totalitarian system, is that it must be done, regardless of audience, circumstances, outcome."[64] In one or another way, this attitude required a certain belief either in the secular judgement of history, or the theological aftermath of eschatology. After years of deprivation and harassment, Dumitru Stăniloae was prepared to regard history, like the great philosopher Constantin Noica did, as if it were a matter of sheer meteorology.[65] In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the time for a confrontational approach had long passed. Noica and Stăniloae, who both supported in their youth the idea of political action, were favouring now, each one in his different way, a solitary form of asceticism put in the service of a great tradition: either the philosophical, or the theological one.

The somewhat open character of the collaboration between the State authorities and the Church, and the incapacity of most of the Orthodox theologians to resist to the ideological pressures exerted by the dictatorial regime of Nicolae Ceauşescu (1918-1989), damaged the image of Romanian Orthodoxy.[66] The "national Church" seemed to have failed the test of real patriotism, which would have meant for her leaders a more active resistance against the horrific acts of social engineering perpetrated by the Communists. The recovery from this slump of unpopularity among the local intelligentsia was rather slow. After 1989, Romania trapped in political and economic corruption. Rampant poverty, especially among the elderly people, and loss of hope for the youth, made the ruthless plague of the post-communist transition. In this rather gloomy atmosphere, dominated by corruption on all levels of the social structures, the Orthodox Church was more often silent than vocal. Only rarely one could hear the traditionally Christian plea for truth, justice and reconciliation in a society haunted by the traumas of the past.

The Later Years

Encouraged by the freedom gained after December 1989, Stăniloae voiced his criticism, calling the Church to act with greater responsibility in the social sphere. He complained for the lack of sobriety and prophetic spirit among the ecclesial milieu, defending also the promotion of Christian values in the public realm.[67] Not unlike other Orthodox theologians, such as Metropolitan John Zizioulas, Fr. Stăniloae joined some circles of the civil society in his criticism of the non-ecological policies of the state. As a citizen of the world, he was anxious for the future of humankind, sharing with Heidegger an ongoing concern for the global spread of destructive technology (expressed by the German philosopher through the concept: *das Gestell*).[68] On the other hand, Stăniloae did not trouble himself for the lack of political emancipation and for the economic backwardness, which was responsible for so many social disorders and educational shortcomings in the rural area. Until his later years, Stăniloae did not show much confidence in the historical agents of modernisation: free market, political institutions, and a civil society regulated by critical reasoning. He remained a pessimist, prone to hold onto unilateral solutions.

On the other hand, Fr Stăniloae stayed in touch with many personalities of the Romanian Diaspora, among whom one counts Eugène Ionesco, former member of the French Academy. In 1991, Stăniloae was welcomed in the Romanian Academy, being also awarded the *doctor honoris causa* of the Universities of Athens (1991), and Bucharest (1992). Only in these last years of life, Stăniloae published his more serene *Reflections on the Spirituality of the Romanian People*, in which he envisages, not without utopian moments of thining, a societal model for the new Europe emerging from behind the Iron Guard. Stăniloae pleaded for the rediscovery of the Christian principle of personhood after so many years of Communist dictatorship, and against the nihilistic drive of Western individualism.[69] In this sense, Stăniloae's ideas were in accord with the theology of other contemporary theologians, such as John Zizioulas or Christos Yannaras. They all thought that only the retrieval of the dialogical, Eucharistic and self-giving attributes of Christ could open new ways of experiencing communion among people.

Throughout his life, Dumitru Stăniloae had an ascetic conduct. Even when 90 years old, he would still wake up at three or four o'clock in the morning, saying his prayers and writing unabatedly, while in the afternoon and during the evenings he was ready to welcome visitors. He was known

and remembered as a cheerful, and yet conservative character, as an affectionate father and gentle professor, immune to depression, always compassionate, and jovial. A man of prayer and a pastor, Stăniloae showed much consideration for the people forming the body of the Church, trusting their "spiritual instincts."[70] On the 4th October 1993, Reverend Dumitru Stăniloae passed away, leaving behind an impressive theological legacy.

Bucolic Nostalgia

Before we scrutinise at the institutional aspects of Stăniloae's spicy attachment to religious nationalism, one should grasp his subjective perceptions, as filtered through various articles, essays, interviews and testimonials left in the religious press of his time. It is probably apt to look especially at the literary style used by Stăniloae in order to celebrate the marriage between the Gospel and the nation. A certain romantic rhetoric betrays the inebriation with the idea that the peasants are the only true heirs of Christian spirituality. Notwithstanding, Stăniloae was one of the many Romanian hierarchs and theologians who claimed during the interwar period that the rural life was the matrix of pristine religiosity, and the only source for the spiritual renewal of the nation. He shared the values of the Slavophile intelligentsia, being himself born into a family of peasants who lived their Christian faith in strict accordance with the traditional norms of Eastern Orthodoxy. For many personal reasons, and less perhaps from a scientific perspective, Stăniloae saw the life of the peasants before the industrial revolution "filled with many blessings."[71]

This puritan dream for the Romanian village never completely lost its stamina, remaining particularly attractive for those members of the urban intelligentsia who have been brought up and educated in strongly secular centres of Europe. This phenomenon represents a specific pathology of modernity, which encourages a somewhat essentialist bovarism of a poetic kind. Often, an almost complete lack of instruction in social and economic history contributes to the literary idealisation of the "perennial village." There, against the odds of modern history, the "archaic ontology" of the Romanian peasant unfolded its pre-modern (though not anti-modern) story.

It is true that the church, in the Romanian territories and elsewhere, was at the heart of the traditional Christian village.[72] Like an *axis mundi*, the temple structured the symbolic geography of ordinary people. Time and space were shaped by an innate sense of awe towards the sacred.

The Psalter was widely known among the more committed believers. Crucifixes and shrines would mark the crossroads and the entries into every village. Pilgrimages to monasteries were omnipresent during the great festivals of the Church. Often, a turreted belfry would inform the peasants living at a distance about the time for daily prayer, or the time for mourning for those departed. Normally, Orthodox Christians had their work and food sanctified in prayer by the sign of the cross.[73] The presence of God was felt in the most ordinary circumstances of life.

Stăniloae's attachment to bucolic nostalgia has, therefore, a profoundly sentimental touch. Later, in the 1980s, Stăniloae recalled during his conversations with Costa de Beauregard, the cardinal virtues of the peasant family life: modesty, discreetness, and kind-heartedness. Such human qualities were the essential ingredients of "the joys," as opposed (in Augustinian fashion) to the mundane "pleasures" of life.[74] Ideally, Stăniloae thought, the community life of the peasant Christians would be shaped by the oblatory ethos of Orthodoxy. Ascetic endurance and humility were the virtues that fed their natural admiration for the diversity and order of creation. The young Stăniloae strongly believed that the Gospel had nourished the substance of the Romanian folk traditions. Different rites of passages celebrated anticipated patterns of the "cosmic liturgy." He would have subscribed to the words of Mircea Eliade, in whose eyes "the Romanians have preserved, deepened and valued the Christian vision on cosmos, as it was expressed in the first centuries of Christianity. Thus, the conservatism and archaic character of Romanian folklore protected a heritage that belonged to Christianity, but which historical processes of various sort wanted to destroy."[75]

Looking at the ancient culture of the Romanian peasants, Stăniloae did not put on the critical eyeglass of the cultural anthropologist. He never took the trouble to identify the pagan reminiscences in the fables, stories, and legends that perhaps even nowadays, in folk music and dances, capture the imagination of the last Romanian peasants. In his youth, he went so far that he conceded a certain theological orthodoxy to the uncanny experiences of "illumination" and "prophecy" ascribed to the Wallachian peasant Petrache Lupu, nicknamed "Moșul" ("The Elder").[76] This elder from Maglavit (Dolj County) claimed that God bestowed on him the miraculous gifts of healing, clairvoyance and prophesying. Though not a monk and without sticking to a specific churchmanship, Petrache Lupu was revered by thousands of people, who in the 1930s visited him in great numbers. Some other Orthodox theologians, such as the layman

Mihai Urzică, resisted the claims made by Petrache Lupu and his adepts, putting them under a serious doubt.[77] On the other hand, the learned Stăniloae felt the need to give a patristic explanation of that phenomenon by comparing the hesychastic tradition of the Byzantine mystics with this dogma-free manifestation of folk religiosity. Never did he express an explicit embarassement with regards to this episode, which suggests that his personal belief (never officially validated by the Church) did not change.

Stăniloae's strong attachment to the rural values of Christianity was not exceptional in the interwar period.[78] On behalf of Stăniloae himself and other Church officials, this attitude betrays only the hesitant acceptance of the inevitable changes that the modernisation of Romania brought about. For those acquainted with the history of early Christianity, this seems to be a real paradox. In the New Testament texts, rural culture hardly enjoys a privileged status.[79] On the contrary, nearly all the Pauline letters were sent to important city centres from the Roman Empire, and the later success of the Byzantine project cannot be explained without reference to the urban network, which eased the proximity of the religious and the political decisions.

Trauma of Secularisation

Albeit the urban ethos of early Christianity, the shift from the rural to the urban setting in modern times had traumatizing effects for any religious individual or community, particularly in the case of those who received no historical instruction.[80] For a better understanding of the roots of this modern and still persistent perception, one has to look at the phenomenon of secularisation connected (though not exclusively) to the Westernisation of various religious habits and practices. In Europe, particularly, secularisation was seen as an integrative, if not dissolving factor, which allowed the dialogue between different cultures to emerge. Among all the other Romanian principalities, Transylvania was the first to have experienced the explosion of different strategies of secularisation, regarded as necessary steps in the process of modernisation. Transylvania was the space where the Roman-Catholic Christians encountered the Evangelicals, and where the Uniate Christians met with the Eastern Orthodox. They all agreed and had disputes on many points, only to notice later that the new Christian confessions (such as the Baptist or the Adventist churches)

emerged and prospered among their former coreligionists. Different churches had different attitudes towards food-rites and their symbolism, allowing a greater or smaller degree of flexibility in terms of cuisine innovation. The neo-Protestant churches, in particular, seemed prone to forget the deep symbolism of the religious meal ceremonies, which represented the backbone of traditional Orthodoxy. The idea that "bread" was intrinsically sacred was inconceivable for those who refuted the argument of the tradition, for the benefit of biblical literalism. Notwithstanding these tensions, all Christian bodies came across the secularisation vector, especially during the second half of the 19th century, and the early 20th century (when a mass migration of workers boosted the hybridisation phenomenon). Between 1848 (a time of political and cultural revolution) and 1948 (when the cross-fertilisation culture disappears under the "red horizons"), Transylvania staged ambivalent actions, which pertain to different interpretations. Dumitru Stăniloae preferred to see secularisation as the by-product of Western theology, and thus as having exclusively negative effects.

Priestly sermons, local magazines, journal chronicles, travellers' diaries, some pieces of private correspondence – all these documents reflect at times the radical transformation of the traditional understanding of fundamental practices, such as the religious feasting and fasting. Different *vestigia* record the loosening up of certain dietary rules ascribed for different periods of the liturgical year.[81] They were, indeed, paralleled by the appearance of new codes of dressing (e.g., priests shaven, wearing no cassock in public), challenging beliefs, demythologised attitudes towards courtship and love. The rhythms of nature had been ignored for the benefit of labour efficiency and economic profit. Time and space started being shaped according to non-hierarchical categories, while the old narrative practices (such as the reading of the Psalter in connection to the Great Lent period) disappeared.

Thus, the church ceased to be the very *axis mundi* of the symbolic geography of ordinary people. Crucifixes stopped marking the crossroads of the new towns and cities, the religious festivals becoming the object of mockery for many sceptics. Food was not anymore sanctified in prayer by the sign of the cross. The unity between the micro- and the macro-cosmos became blurred, with the special status ascribed to the matter (regarded as apt to become an incarnational vehicle) disappearing almost completely. The natural ecology insured by the theological economy of the basic elements (air, fire, earth, water) seemed endangered.

The bread was not anymore capable to carry out an universal symbolism, or to display metonymically a theological significance (*pars pro toto*: the Eucharist being the crucified and resurrected image of the world, taken as gift). Where it was still practiced, fasting lost its connection to the all-encompassing narrative of *ekklesia*. The acts of piety became dramatically individualised. The connection between the body and the word was simply defected. New tastes appear to surface, but also old recipes are lost. Soaked in the new liberal ethos, the notion of rite itself is put under question. In fact, the very idea of religious identity cannot hold as it used to, in the past. The urban majority does not hail anymore the seasonal ceremonies of the religious communities. The "natural symbols" (Mary Douglas) embedded on the traditional system of food prohibitions lose their force and integrity.[82] "Pure" and "impure" are not anymore categories as clear as they used to be. Less and less ambiguities (or taboos) confront the experience of eating. The immediate connection between the acts of, respectively, refraining and repenting, looks almost nonsensical. Readings ascribed to specific parts of the liturgical year are simply lost. The complementarity of virtues (such as fasting and almsgiving, or supplication) seems not obvious. Thus, what is threatened is the very notion of celebration (with "frugality" or "abstinence" as its correspondent term).

The sense of belonging to a "cosmic Christianity" faded away, with the entrance into the complex space of modernity. The implementation of the functionalist approach to food, the invention of new medical notions of hygiene, the oblique attachment to scepticism among the intellectuals and the new bourgeoisie, the loss of authority of the traditional fortress of Christian piety (exemplified by the opposition established by Metropolitan Andrei Șaguna between the schools, seen as necessary, and the monasteries, seen as futile[83]), the industrialisation process, the constant changes of the urban calendar and time perception, the erosion of the Byzantine memory among the traditional Orthodox, along with the appearance of an informal ecumenical practices at the grassroots level (triggered, in part, by mixed marriages) – all these events contributed to the transformation of all rites of passages.[84]

It is because of all these losses that the young Stăniloae did not disguise his liking for the "humble character" of the Romanian ethos. Stăniloae sided with those religious leaders, rural conservatives and the supporters of old folk traditions who expressed their strong opposition towards the secular homogenisation. On the other side, there were the partisans of

social rejuvenation, who defended the need to adapt the traditional *rites de passages* to the new conditions of life, marked by economic transactions across different symbolic borders.

The National Ideal and the Orthodox Ecclesiology

Along this partly legitimised nostalgia for the mythological realities of the peasant life, Stăniloae defended the dignity of the concept of "nation-State" as somebody who, in his childhood, experienced the political union of Great Romania. At the age of 15, Dumitru Stăniloae witnessed this thrilling, which was publicly celebrated in Alba-Iulia on 1st December 1918 in the presence of a great number of Church officials, as well.

Stăniloae was an offspring of an ordinary Transylvanian family, religiously engaged and remarkable only for its unmistakable sober ethos. Pundits in psychohistory may help with some arguments, which could explain the difference between the Transylvanians and their Romanian fellows living in the already constituted Kingdom (proclaimed by 1881, under the rule of King Carol I). Modest and honest, so the story went, the Romanians from Transylvania knew better than anybody how to work for their survival under foreign occupation.[85] Toiling always with a long-term plan in his mind, the ordinary Transylvanians adopted very quickly the administrative and economic skills developed first by the Austrians, the Germans and the Hungarians.[86] This can explain the better response to modernisation that is to be found in Transylvania after 1918.

The Wallachians, on the other hand, managed to appropriate the more stagnant ethos of the Balkans, which could not make great economic progress, or contribute to political freedom. Seen as less talkative than the Wallachians and perhaps less creative than the Moldavians, the ideal Transylvanian citizen understood better the historical mission surrounding the "national ideal." Resentment and frustration must have almost inevitably fuelled the rhetoric of young Transylvanians, such as Dumitru Stăniloae, at the sight of the "compromising deals" between the government from Bucharest and the Vatican administration. The Orthodox Transylvanians defended their patriotic rights against "the foreign" and "heretic" influence in counter-reaction to Vatican's attempts from 1927 to establish a concordat with the Romanian state.[87] More than anybody else, the Orthodox from Transylvania remembered the acts of injustice

perpetrated during the Austro-Hungarian occupation (1867–1918) and, beforehand, under the rule of the Habsburgs (1526-1867).[88] The role of the recent memory, unhealed by historical distance and participatory hermeneutics, was thus crucial for the later developments of Stăniloae's polemical stance.[89]

To these considerations one should add Stăniloae's strong convictions about the Orthodox ecclesiology, contrasted by the Roman-Catholic dogma of universal jurisdiction. Instead of the papal authority, Stăniloae saw the bishop as the one who

"[o]verses the keeping of the faith in his diocese, having the charge to keep it the same as the other dioceses of the whole Church. This is why he is ordained by two or three other bishops, as they ask him to confess his faith as precondition, and that it be the same as that of the bishops who ordain him. The bishop is thus also the structure of the link of his diocese with other dioceses and with the universal Church in matters of faith. This is why he must be in uninterrupted communion with other bishops."[90]

Stăniloae was suspicious of the potentially totalitarian tendencies hidden by the office of St Peter's vicar, under the appearance of a missionary umbrella.

"Both the principle of communion and the transcendent origin of sanctifying action in the Church are concentrated in Episcopal synodality. Synodality shows that sanctification and perfection do not exist outside communion. But sanctification as power of raising up to higher communion is distinct from general communion, because it comes from above. Since nothing higher than Episcopal synodality exists, the sanctification of transcendent origin in the Episcopal order can only come through the highest sanctifying organ, which is Episcopal communion or synodality itself."[91]

Not only does the Roman-Catholic Church give more power to the pope than to his collegial bishops, but she also tends to water down the natural differences between the nations of the globe. The true ethnic plurality and cultural diversity, Stăniloae thought, was celebrated in Orthodoxy as a divine gift.[92] He opposed what he took to be the canonical Roman-Catholic view (which has radically changed since Vatican II) with an organicist understanding of the "nation" and a conciliary vision about the Church. One nation, claimed Stăniloae, cannot be reduced to

a simple gathering of people sharing the same language, history and culture. Despite the transitory character of the ethnical entities, Stăniloae could not regard the nations as being "like chaff driven by the desert wind," or put "on fire" (Isaiah 47, 14).

In other words, the Orthodox ecclesiology does not see the notion of Christian identity as free-floating, being defined by some rather exact forms of territorial belonging.[93] Ideally, the bishop is master over not an abstract flock, but the close friend of those gathered together to worship in one given place, which makes the body of the local church. It was this theological sense of being able to justify the local and the particular in the light of the traditional Christian teaching that allowed Stăniloae to make harsh statements about the allegedly power-driven structures of Roman-Catholic universalism. On the ideal map of Orthodox ecclesiology, the individual call of each nation seemed to fit together, better than anywhere else. While making these claims, Stăniloae overlooked the complex interaction, if not conflicts between modern nationalist rhetoric, and the pastoral mission of the Orthodox churches in their diasporas. More than once, the Christian communities living outside the traditional Orthodox borders perceived with great pain the lack of unity in the actions pursued by different ecclesiastical centres (from Moscow and Constantinople, to Bucharest and Belgrade). In other words, Stăniloae did not challenge the shortcomings of Orthodox ecclesiology revealed by the very dynamics of modern life, when the traditional notion of territorial identity and the imperial authorisation of ecumenical debates do not have the same weight.

Narcissism in Historiography

Along with the bucolic nostalgia intensified by the trauma of secularisation, and his Transylvanian sensitivity, together with his deep theological convictions about the truth of Orthodox ecclesiology, Dumitru Stăniloae embraced the nationalist agenda for reasons that have to do with historical scholarship. While attacking the Uniates, Stăniloae tried to legitimise the Orthodox contribution to the formation of the Romanian nation. One of his articles bore the eloquent title: "The Contribution of Orthodoxy to the Formation and the Maintenance of Romanian People and National Unity,"[94] where the common vulgate of nationalist historiography was directly implemented. According to Stăniloae,

Orthodoxy was the original form of Christianity, which landed on the proto-Romanian territories. Following the conquest of Dacia by the Romans (II-III century), a Romanian nation was born, *tout court*, Christian. The natural conclusion of this logic, which loses sight of all the historical discontinuities recorded by the archaeologists, suggests that birth of the Romanian people emerges as a providential miracle in history.[95] A betrayal of the Orthodox faith is, thus, an act of treason with regards to the Romanian identity as well.

It mattered very little for Dumitru Stăniloae that the factual history of early Christianity in the territories of *Romania antiqua* was rather poorly documented, lending itself only to mere conjectures. What to a foreign historian it looked like an unconvincing picture, to a Romanian traditionalist was absolutely obvious: "the Romanians were born Christians."[96] That the birth of the nation coincided with the birth of Christianity on the Romanian land was an undisputed matter among the Orthodox hierarchs, this claim being also reflected in the Constitution from 1923 (which called the Orthodox Church the "national Church"). The triumphal emancipation of the Romanian nation from the crude oppressors, says the Church official vulgate, is paralleled by the equally brave story of Christianisation – in Orthodox terms, only – of this young nation. To quote one epitomising myth that troubles this ethno-theological discourse of the Church official – embraced, at least in part, by Stăniloae too – is that related to the story of St Andrew, the brother of apostle Peter. This first-called among the apostles is regarded as the seal of the Orthodox tradition, which was planted from the very beginning in the soil of the Romanian nation. All the other missionary actions taken on the territories of *Romania antique* are to be seen in the glowing shadow of St Andrew, whose feast in the Orthodox calendar (30 November) has been recently equated with the eve of the National Day (1 December).

But what do the historians say about this narcissistic narrative about divine election, continuity and triumph? To begin with, in his *Church History* (iii. 1) Eusebius of Caesarea describes Andrew as the "apostle of Scythia." This geographic appellation used to denote in the past the region lying north of the Caspian and of the Black Sea. This explains why the Russians claimed later to have St Andrew as their patron saint. The majority of scholars are inclined to think that Eusebius refers to Scythia Minor (today Dobruja, which extends from the western banks of the lower Danube to the eastern shores of Black Sea). In 46 AD Scythia Minor was incorporated to the Roman Empire as part of the Moesia Inferior region,

becoming later a Byzantine province. Hereby, the Greek emissaries sent from Constantinople gradually Christianised Dobruja. Most of the historical records, which demonstrate a Christian presence in Scythia Minor, date from the fourth century. Around 300 AD, the persecution of the Church initiated by Diocletian reached the territories of Dobruja, and countless of Christians saw their death in places such as Niviodunum (today Isaccea) Axiopolis (today Cernavodă), or Tomis (today Constanța). Starting with the fourth century, the ecclesiastical structure of Dobruja began to be fortified. Mark, a bishop of Tomis, attended the gatherings of the first ecumenical council from Nicaea 325. The same Dobruja can boast with famous monk John the Cassian[97], bishop Teotim I (a defender of Origen, and a friend of St John Chryostom), and Dionysius Exiguus ("the Small One") who calculated first the date of birth of Christ, were originally from the same Dobruja. On the map, Dobruja represents, however, only a small fraction of the contemporary Romania.

The successful conversion of this Pontic region to orthodox Christianity, coming to pass first under the influence of the Roman colonists and later under direct supervision from Constantinople, cannot account for the Church history in Transylvania, Moldavia and Walachia.[98] These provinces, which make almost complete the present borders of the country, eschewed the Byzantine influence. Significant archaeological evidence (consisting of religious objects, inscriptions on stones, and remnants of churches) proves the existence of early Christian communities, going back to the early fourth century. For centuries, the proto-Romanians must have experienced a semi-nomadic life in the hilly regions on all sides of the Carpathians, where they could be out of sight for the invaders (e.g., Goths, Huns, Slavs). They lacked the opportunities available to all those Christian communities living in the proximity of the urban centres of the Mediterranean. This inevitably resulted into lack of literary culture, which makes almost impossible today the identification of the very source of Christianisation in Walachia, Moldova and Transylvania. In Walachia and Moldova, which for two century largely formed "the free Dacia" (a buffering zone between the Roman Empire and the *terra incognita* of the barbarians), the rather slow and discontinuous process of religious conversion took place from the second century AD (following the invasion of Dacia by Emperor Trajan, between 101-106) up to the early fourteen-century. At that point, the sense of religious belonging to the Byzantine commonwealth is well testified among the Romanian princes. Transylvania represents a special case. It is probably safe to say that, to

the extant it embraced Christianity, the Latin-speaking population of Transylvania maintained its allegiance to the creed and the liturgical languages (Greek and Slavonic) of the Eastern Orthodox Church until very late, towards the dawn of the 18th century.[99]

Historians find it very difficult to prove the necessary connection between the appearance of Christianity in the ancient Romanian territories and the birth of the Romanian nation in the first millennium. The early Christian communities of *Romania antiqua* were extremely diverse: they included Orthodox and Arian, as well as Greek-speaking and Latin-speaking churches. Before the sixth century, it is very likely that religious syncretism was characteristic for the inland territories of ancient Romania (Dobruja being probably the only exception). As many pieces of Romanian folklore show, the process of Christianisation of the rural population continued until very late. Magic, superstition and pagan rites were never completely uprooted from the cultural soil of the Romanian peasantry, despite the great efforts paid by the Church.[100] The official historiography, however, found it very difficult to come to terms with this aching truth.

Conclusions

"Theology and nationalism" remains a topic of paramount importance for the intellectual history of modern Romania, and of the Balkans in general.[101] Many historians of modern Romania have studied the cultural and political trajectory of the "national idea" up until 1918. Very few scholars failed to underline the instrumental role played by the Eastern Orthodoxy during the agonising birth of the Romanian self-consciousness, especially during the 19th century.[102]

The political rapport between the Orthodox Church and the national state of Romania is rather well documented, while the study of the "dangerous liaisons" between secular nationalist discourse and the works of different Christian theologians still need pioneering research. This study aims to be an introduction to Dumitru Stăniloae's ethno-theology. A systematic examination of the nationalistic themes present in the writings of the greatest Romanian theologian, Fr Dumitru Stăniloae (1903-1993) has not as yet been carried out, despite the fact that his views still capture the imagination of many leaders of Romanian Orthodoxy. The great influence exercised by his reflections on the nation and the Church

explains why the enquiry into the roots of Stăniloae's ethno-theology cannot be postponed for too long.

This present study, written in the form of an introduction, aimed at presenting the theological tensions at work in the writings of Dumitru Stăniloae. There, one finds a passionate involvement in history, seen as the domain of the "many", which is paralleled by the vertical contemplation of the ineffable "One," that is beyond any fragmentation. In literary terms, one could call the first type of discourse, as the "prophetic" trope, while the latter, and the most important one, would be "the sapiential." I have identified four major causes, which hold Stăniloae responsible for his defence of a *sui-generis* ethno-theology: a) the genuine bucolic nostalgia, rooted in his personal memoirs; b) the severe trauma of secularisation, which was perceived with intensity by the Transylvanians; c) the sincere belief in the rightfulness of the Orthodox ecclesiology (based on the notion of local authority, exercised by the bishop, and territorial identity, protected by the parish), against the Roman-Catholic claims to universal jurisdiction made by the papal office; d) the gullible captivity in the narcissist discourse of a neo-Romantic historiography, adopted by the Orthodox Church officials during the 20th century (both in Romania, and elsewhere in Eastern Europe).

However, in the pan-Orthodox circles, the lasting memory of Stăniloae's life-long activities stems not from his nationalistic agenda, but from a truly inspired and creative reading of the Scriptures and the Church Fathers. For more than fifty years and under the most austere circumstances, the Romanian theologian worked indefatigably for the construction of a "neo-Patristic synthesis." In his case, the attempt to refresh the theological thinking of the Orthodox Church, caught up in a long cultural and religious captivity under Ottoman Rule, and the unilateral impact of the Western *Aufklärung*, was rather successful. Stăniloae, along with other Orthodox theologians, such as Vladimir Lossky or Fr Justin Popovitsch, tried to answer the challenges of modern culture and to surpass the barren "theology of repetition," in which even the greater minds of the post-Byzantine tradition were hopelessly stuck. This return to the biblical and patristic sources of Christian theology, in which he saw the only possible bedrock for the ecumenical dialogue among the Christian communities, was paralleled by a genuine interest in the Continental philosophy of the 20th century. Between Stăniloae's struggle for the Gospel and his early nationalist temptations, the universality of his theological commitments prevailed.

NOTES

[1] On the social conditions of Romania before WW II, see Kenneth Jowitt (ed.), *Social change in Romania, 1860-1940*: *A debate on Development in a European Nation* (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, 1978).

[2] M. Beza, "English Travellers in Romania," *The English Historical Review*, vol. 32 (April 1917) no. 126, p. 277. On this false but widespread etymology of Bucharest, see the hackenyed article of M. Timuș, "De unde ne vin uzbecii?," *Revista 22*, XIV (30 august-5 septembrie 2005).

[3] Irina Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation Building, and Ethnic Struggle*, 1918-1930 (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995), and the reviews of C. Carmichael in *Europe-Asia Studies*, vol. 48 (1996) no. 5, p. 861-2; Mary Ellen Fischer in *The American Historical Review*, vol. 101 (October 1996) no. 4, p. 1244; and John W. Cole in *Contemporary Sociology*, vol. 25 (November 1996) no. 6, p. 740-1.

[4] Even the former sceptic Titu Maiorescu, in his later years, succumbed into explicit exhortations of religion. See the account of Raymund Netzhammer, *Episcop în România: într-o epocă a conflictelor naționale și religioase*, vol. I & II, edited by Nikolaus Netzhammer in cooperation with Krista Zach, Romanian translation by George Guțu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 2005), p. 449. Maiorescu reportedly said: „în curând, ar trebui ca lumea să fie răzbătută de o mișcare religioasă, altfel s-ar prăpădi toată civilizația și ar veni alte popoare care cred!" For the German edition, see Archbishop Raymund Netzhammer, *Bischof in Rumänien. Im Spannungsfeld zwischen Staat und Vatikan*, edited by Nikolaus Netzhammer and Krista Zach, vol. 1 & 2 (Munich: SOKW-Verlag, 1995, 1996).

[5] See also Adrian Marino, "Luminile românești și descoperirea Europei," *Pentru Europa* (Jassy: Polirom Publishers, 1995), p. 157-190.

[6] Zigu Ornea, *Sămănătorismul* (Bucharest: Editura Fundației Culturale Române, 1998).

[7] For an English biography of this leader of the traditionalist journal *Gândirea*, see Christine M. Hall, "*Jesus in my Country*". *The Theology of Nichifor Crainic with Special Reference to the Cultural and Historical Background* (PhD thesis, King's College London, 1986). In Romanian, see Nichifor Crainic, *Ortodoxie și Etnocrație* (Bucharest: Albatros Publishers, 1997), and the heavily biased study of D. Micu, "*Gândirea" și gândirismul* (Bucharest: Minerva Publishers, 1975). The latter was harshly reviewed (and rightly so) by V. Ierunca, *Dimpotrivă* (Bucharest: Humanitas Publishers, 1994), p. 60-72.

[8] In 1938, D. Stăniloae endorsed Crainic's views on ethnocracy, as it appears from his articles included in *Națiune și creștinism*, edited and prefaced by C. Schifirneț (Bucharest: Elion Press, 2003), p. 62. Stăniloae also mounted a critique (op. cit., 33-35) of the "Sămănătorism Movement" (labelled as "cheaply Romantic"), paralleled by an appraisal of "*Gândirea* Movement."

[9] The standard monograph on this subject remains that of Andrzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).

[10] A. Oişteanu, *Imaginea Evreului în cultura română* (Bucharest: Humanitas Publishers, 2004[2]). I did not have access to William O. Oldson, *Providential Anti-Semitism: Nationalism and Polity in Nineteenth-Century Romania* (American Philosophical Society, 1991), reviewed by R. V. Burks, *American Historical Review*, vol. 97 (April 1992) no. 2, p. 579, and discussed in detail by D. Deletant, "The Holocaust in Romania: Murderous or Providential Anti-Semitism," *East European Politics & Societies*, vol. 15 (Spring 2001), no. 1, p. 190.

[11] There is always a hint to be found to the scriptural verse from the book of Revelation 21, 24. See D. Stăniloae, *Naţiune şi creştinism*, p. 119.

[12] *Ibidem*, p. 9.

[13] See Metropolitan Nestor Vornicescu, *Desăvârşirea unităţii noastre naţionale – fundament al unităţii Bisericii străbune* (Craiova: Mitropolia Olteniei Press, 1988). In order to refute this parasitic view on national history, Lucian Boia authored the best-seller *History and Myth in Romanian Consciousness*, ET by James Christian Brown (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2001). Boia should be, however, read only in the light of the sound criticism provided by Sorin Antohi and Ioan-Aurel Pop, the latter being also critically reviewed by Ovidiu Pecican.

[14] Nae Ionescu should not be confused with Eugen Ionescu (later Eugène Ionesco), who particular inter-war position is analysed in Jeanine Teodorescu, "Nu, Nu, and Nu. Ionesco's 'No!' to Romanian politics and culture," *Journal Of European Studies*, vol. 34 (2004), no. 3, p. 267-287.

[15] See the convoluted testimony of M. Eliade, *Jurnalul portughez şi alte scrieri*, vol. 1, preface and critical edition by Sorin Alexandrescu, introduction by Sorin Alexandrescu, Florin Ţurcanu and Mihai Zamfir (Bucharest: Humanitas Publishers, 2006), p. 133.

[16] On the Iron Guard, one of the best available monograph belongs to Armin Heinen, *Die Legion 'Erzengel Michael' in Rumänien: soziale Bewegung und politische Organisation* (Munich, 1986).

[17] The most relevant articles on this topic have been gathered in Nae Ionescu, *Teologia. Integrala publicisticii religioase* (Sibiu: Deisis Press, 2003); an alternative journal to Crainic's populist magazine *Gândirea* was the short-lived *Predania* (editor-in-chief: Gh. Racoveanu), reprinted in 2001 with a preface by Ioan I. Ică Jr. (Sibiu: Deisis Press, 2001); the best biography of Nae Ionescu is available only in Romanian: D. Mezdrea, *Nae Ionescu. Biografie*, vol. I-IV (Bucharest: Universul Dalsi Publishers, 2002-2005); for the nationalist proclivities of yet another influential disciple of Nae Ionescu, see Mac Linscott Ricketts, *Mircea Eliade: the Romanian Roots 1907-1945* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988). For a recent study of yet

another disciple of Nae Ionescu, see Alexandru Popescu, *Petre Ţuţea between Sacrifice and Suicide* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishers, 2004).

[18] M. Vulcănescu, *Dimensiunea românească a existenţei* (Bucharest: Fundaţia Culturală Română, 1943[1], 1991[2]).

[19] From a subjective perspective, see the account provided by M. Vulcănescu, "Revista 'Criterion' – oglindă a realităţii culturale şi sociale," *Opere*, vol. I., "Către fiinţa spiritualităţii româneşti," edited, with notes and introduction by M. Diaconu (Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic & Editura Fundaţiei Naţionale pentru Ştiinţă şi Artă, 2005), p. 746-749. For an excellent presentation of all the intricacies of this cultural grouping, see Florin Ţurcanu, *Mircea Eliade, Le prisonnier de l'histoire*, preface by Jacques Julliard (Paris: Editions La Découverte, 2003), chapter IX (in Romanian translation, Bucharest: Humanitas Publishers, 2003, p. 223-263). See also Matei Călinescu, "The 1927 Generation in Romania," *East European Politics and Societies*, vol. 15 (Fall 2001), no. 3, p. 649-477.

[20] For an excellent genealogy of the Romanian ethnic ontologies, see S. Antohi, "Romania and the Balkans: From geocultural bovarism to ethnic ontology," *Tr@nsit-Virtuelles Forum*, vol. 21 (2002).

[21] On this topic, see M. Neamţu, "Re-Visiting Orthodoxy and Nationalism," *Pro Ecclesia*, vol. 15 (2006) no. 2, p. 153-160.

[22] Ioan Ică Jr. and Gheorghe F. Anghelescu have collected the best bibliography of Dumitru Stăniloae in the posthumous *Festschrift* entitled *Persoană şi comuniune* (Sibiu: Diecezana Press, 1993), p. 16-67. The English reader could find the following volumes available in translation: *Theology and the Church*, foreword by John Meyendorff (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980); *The Experience of God*, vol. I, 1st part, foreword by Kallistos Ware (Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1994); *The World, Creation and Deification*, vol. I, 2nd part (Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2000); *Orthodox Spirituality* (St Tikhon's Seminary Press, 2002). The Community of Sisters of the Love of God (Fairacres, Oxford) published three pamphlets on *Eternity and Time; The Victory of the Cross* and on *Prayer and Holiness (The Icon of Man Renewed in God)*. For an excellent introductory study into Stăniloae's dogmatic theology, see A. Louth, "The Orthodox Dogmatic Theology of Dumitru Stăniloae," *Modern Theology*, vol. 13 (1997) no. 2, p. 253-267, with the hackenyed remark at page 259: "it was only with Calvin's *Institutes* that the notion of Christ's threefold office assumed the structural significance with which he invests it." A detailed study of Stăniloae's ecclesiology is available in Ronald C. Robertson, *Contemporary Romanian Orthodox Ecclesiology. The Contribution of Dumitru Stăniloae and Younger Colleagues* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1988), along with Stefan Lupu, *La sinodalità e/o conciliarità esspressione dell' unità della catolicità della Chiesa in Dumitru Staniloae (1903-1993)* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1999); and Lucian Turcescu (ed.), *Dumitru Stăniloae: Tradition and Modernity in Theology* (Jassy: Center for Romanian Studies, 2002). For

Stăniloae's theological metaphysics, see Daniel Neeser, "The World: Gift of God and Scene of Humanity's Response: Aspects of the Thought of Father Dumitru Staniloae," *The Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. 33 (1982), p. 272-282; Maciej Bielawski (OSB), *The Philocalical Vision of the World in the Teology of Dumitru Stăniloae* (Bydgosycy, 1997, translated into Romanian by Ioan Ică Jr: *Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae: o viziune filocalică despre lume*, Sibiu: Deisis Press, 1998); Emil Bartos, *Deification in Eastern Orthodox Theology. An Evaluation and Critique of the Theology of Dumitru Stăniloae* (Carlislie: Paternoster Press, 2000); S. Rogobete, *O ontologie a iubirii. Subiect și realitate personală supremă în gândirea lui Dumitru Stăniloae* (Jassy: Polirom Publishers, 2000); C. Miller, *The Gift of the World: An Introduction to the Theology of Dumitru Stăniloae* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001), amply reviewed by D. Mănăstireanu in *International Journal for Systematic Theology*, vol. 3 (November 2001) no. 3, pp. 333-340; Jürgen Henkel, *Eros und Ethos. Mensch, gottesdiensliche Gemeinschaft und Nation als Adressaten theologischer Ethik bei Dumitru Stăniloae* (Münster-Hamburg-London: Lit Verlag, 2003). In French, see D. Stăniloae, *Dieu est amour* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1980); and the fine volume of conversations with Fr Costa de Beauregard, *Ose comprendre que je t'aime* (Paris: Cerf, 1983); and *Le génie de l'Orthodoxie* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1985); in Italian, one has the short volume D. Stăniloae, *La preghiera di Gesu e lo Spirito Santo. Meditazioni teologiche* (Rome: Editrice Citta Nuova, 1990). In German, see Stăniloae's three-fold systematic work, *Orthodoxe Dogmatik*, transl. by H. Pitters, foreword by J. Moltmann (1984, 1990, 1995). I discussed and extrapolated Stăniloae's views on tradition, Scripture, and the theological language of Orthodoxy in M. Neamțu, "Confesiunea apostolică," *Gramatica Ortodoxiei* (Jassy: Polirom, 2006), ch. 2.

[23] For the biography of the Romanian theologian, I rely on M. Păcurariu, *Dicționarul teologilor români* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2002), 455 ff. The English reader can consult the article written by Ioan Ică Jr, "Stăniloae, Dumitru (1903-1993)," in Trevor A. Hart (ed.), *The Dictionary of Historical Theology* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Pater Noster Press – William B. Eerdmans, 2000), p. 527-531. For a more subjective account, see Lidia Stăniloae, *„Lumina faptei din lumina cuvântului": împreună cu tatăl meu, Dumitru Stăniloae* (Bucharest: Humanitas Publishers, 2000). For the late Stăniloae, see also S. Dumitrescu, *Șapte dimineți cu Părintele Stăniloae* (Bucharest: Anastasia Publishers, 1992[1], 2003[2]). Insightful but short portraits are available in the following books: Petre Pandrea, *Amintirile mandarinului valah* (Bucharest: Albatros Publishers, 2001), *passim;* Al. Paleologu, *Despre lucrurile cu adevărat importante* (Jassy: Polirom Publishers, 1998[2]), p. 102 ff. M. Lovinescu, *Jurnal* 1981-1984 (Bucharest: Humanitas Publishers, 2003), p. 23 (the entry: 10 octombrie 1981); Sanda Stolojan, *Nori peste balcoane* (Bucharest: Humanitas Publishers, 1996), p. 41 ff, and p. 111.

[24] D. Stăniloae, "Viața și activitatea patriarhului Dositei al Ierusalimului și legăturile lui cu țările românești," *Candela*, vol. 40 (1929), p. 208-276.

[25] With his sensational genius and awareness of historical details, Henry Chadwick has described the theological ironies comprised by this historically cemented opposition. See H. Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church. From Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

[26] For a philosophical defence of *this* Roman (and Catholic) identity, see R. Brague, *Eccentric Culture: a Theory of Western Civilisation*¸ ET by Samuel Lester (South Bend Indiana: St Augustine's Press, 2002).

[27] D. Stăniloae, "Ortodoxie și catolicism," *Națiune și creștinism* (ed. C. Schifirneț), p. 19, and p. 20.

[28] C. Badilita, "Dumitru Stăniloae, ses affinités et ses idiosyncrasies patristiques," in C. Badilita & Ch. Kannengiesser, *Les Pères de l'Eglise dans le Monde d'aujourd'hui* (Paris-Bucharest: Beauchesne- Curtea Veche Publishers, 2006), p. 281-310.

[29] D. Stăniloae, *Viața și învățăturile Sfântului Grigorie Palama* (Bucharest: Scripta Publishers, 1993), p. 27 sq.

[30] Ibidem, p. 30.

[31] S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968).

[32] M. Constantinescu, *Doctori la oameni de seamă. Amintiri, evocări, comemorări* (Bucharest: Anastasia, 2000), p. 14. For references to Cioran, see D. Stăniloae, *Chipul nemuritor al lui Dumnezeu* (Craiova: Editura Mitropoliei, 1988), *passim*.

[33] E. M. Cioran (1911-1995) was born the son of a priest and went to elementary school in Sibiu. Then, as a young student in philosophy, he became infatuated with the personality of Nae Ionescu and supported publicly the political ideas of the extreme right-wing movement. Exiled to France after WWII, he became one of the most important essayists of the 20th century. Following is a list of his works translated into English: *The Temptation to Exist*, ET by Richard Howard (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968); *The New Gods*, ET by Richard Howard (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1974); *The Fall into Time*, ET by Richard Howard (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1974); *The Trouble With Being Born*, ET by Richard Howard (New York: Viking Press, 1976); *A Short History of Decay*, ET by Richard Howard (New York: Viking Press, 1976); *Drawn and Quartered*, ET by Richard Howard (New York: Seaver Books, 1983); *Anathemas and Admirations*, ET by Richard Howard (New York: Arcade Publishers, 1991); *On the Heights of Despair*, ET by Ilinca Zarifopol-Johnston (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); *Tears and Saints*, ET by Ilinca Zarifopol-Johnston (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); *History and Utopia*, ET by Richard Howard (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

[34]   D. Stăniloae, *Naţiune şi creştinism*, p. 68.

[35]   For this history of this notion in the Romanian literature, see Dionisie Petcu, *Conceptul de etnic* (Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1980); and Adolf Armbruster, *Romanitatea românilor. Istoria unei idei (*Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1993).

[36]   This is also the argument of Costion Nicolescu, *Teologul în cetate: Părintele Stăniloae şi aria politicii* (Bucharest: Editura Christiana, 2003).

[37]   D. Stăniloae, *Iisus Hristos şi restaurarea omului* (Sibiu: Diecezana Press, 1943). In 1993, a second edition of this books was reprinted at Craiova (Omniscop Publishers). Unfortunately, this volume is littered with spelling mistakes in Greek and German.

[38]   Summing up more than five thousand pages, Stăniloae's edition of *The Philokalia* includes many more patristic writings than the first Greek edition. Here are the *supplementa* coined by Stăniloae. Vol. I (1946[1]): Evagrius, *On prayer*; Mark the Ascetic, *On Baptism*; Vol. II (1947): Maximus the Confessor, *On the ascetic life*; the *scolia* to *Chapters on love*; *Quaestiones et dubia*; Vol. III (1948): *Quaestiones Ad Thalasium*, instead of *Various chapters*; Vol. IV-V are identical with the Greek version; Vol. VI (1977): *Ethical discourses* 1 and 5 by St Symeon the New Theologian; plus *On paradise* by St Nikitas Stithatos; Vol. VII (1977): Gregory Palamas, *The Triads* II. 2-3; *On the godly and deifying participation*; Vol. VIII (1979): A study by D. Stăniloae on the history of Romanian hesychasm, and some texts on prayer written by various Romanian saints (Vasile from Poiana Mărului, Calinic from Cernica, and Iosif from Văratec, from the 19th century); Vol. IX (1980): *The Ladder* of St John Climacus, Abba Dorotheos, *Instructions* i-xiv; *Letters* 1-2; Vol. X (1981): St Isaac the Syrian, *The Ascetic Writings* (Greek version); Vol. XI (1990): The writings of Abba Barsanuphius and John; Vol. XII (1991): *The Writings of Abba Isaiah the Solitary*. In a letter dating from 22 June 1985, Emil Cioran commented on Stăniloae's greatest achievements: „V-am spus la Paris, însă ţin să repet că *Filocalia* este un monument capital în istoria limbii noastre. În acelaşi timp, ce lecţie de profunzime pentru un neam nefericit şi uşurelnic! Din toate punctele de vedere, o astfel de operă este chemată să joace un rol considerabil. Sunt nespus de mândru că vă cunosc de mai mult de o jumătate de veac." See E. Cioran, *România Liberă*, vol. 49 (25-26 mai, 1991), no. 406, p. 5.

[39]   See André Scrima, "L'avénement philocalique dans l'orthodoxie roumaine," *Istina*, vol. V (1958), p. 295-328; p. 443-374.

[40]   For some insights into the yet not fully documented, but tragic episode of the history of the Romanian Orthodox Church, see André Scrima, *Timpul Rugului Aprins. Maestrul spiritual în tradiţia răsăriteană*, foreword by A. Pleşu (Bucharest: Hu-manitas Publishers, 1996), in Italian translation: André Scrima, *Padre spirituale* (Bose: Edizioni Qiqajon, 2001); Antonie Plămădeală, *Rugul Aprins* (Sibiu: Editura Mitropoliei Ardealului, 2002); M. Rădulescu, *Rugul*

Aprins. Arestare. Condamnare. Achitare (Bucharest: Agapis Publishers, 2003), with caution.

[41] Cf. M. Bielawski, "Dumitru Stăniloae and his *Philokalia*," in L. Turcescu (ed.), *Tradition and modernity*, p. 52. A moving testimony about the outstanding behaviour of Fr Dumitru Stănilae during his prison years can be found in the exquisite literary portraits drawn by Petre Pandrea, *Reeducarea de la Aiud* (Bucharest: Vremea Publishers, 2004), p. 140-146.

[42] N. Chițescu, I. Todoran, I. Petreuța, D. Stăniloae (eds.), *Teologia Dogmatică și Simbolică*, 2 vol. (Buhcarest: Editura Institutului Biblic, 1958).

[43] I follow here the data provided by D. Enache, "Arestarea și condamnarea lui Dumitru Stăniloae," *Rost. Manifest românesc* (2003), no. 9.

[44] A thorough exposition of the cultural and historical shock brought about by the early communist occupation is provided by Dennis Deletant, *Communist Terror in Romania: Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej and the Police State (1948-1965)* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1999). I did not have access to A. Johansens, *Theological Study in the Rumanian Orthodox Church under Communist Rule* (London, 1961).

[45] For an insight into penitentiary life in Aiud (Romania) during the hard times of the Soviet occupation, and following, see Alexandru Popescu, *Petre Țuțea. Between Suicide and Sacrifice* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing House, 2004), p. 61-90.

[46] On this interesting shift, see K. Verdery, *National Ideology under Socialism: Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceaușescu's Romania* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991). A clear depiction of the Ceaușescu's tyrannical regime is offered by D. Deletant, *Ceaușescu and the Securitate: Coercion and Dissent in Romania 1965-1989* (Portland, Or.: Book News, Inc., 1994), along with Vladimir Tismăneanu, *Stalinism for All Seasons: A Political History of Romanian Communism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), who emphasises how Ceaușescu's era cannot be understood except if we take into consideration the Stalinist imprint of the first version of Romanian Communism. See also the review of Robert Levy, *East European Politics and Societies*, vol. 18 (2004) no. 4, p. 697-701.

[47] D. Stăniloae, "Întoarcerea fraților," *Glasul Bisericii*, vol. VII (1948) no. 10, p. 64-68; "Restaurarea unității Bisericii străbune," *Glasul Bisericii*, vol. VIII (1949), no. 5-6, p. 15-26; "Reîntregirea Bisericii strămoșești," *Glasul Bisericii*, vol. IX (1950) no. 6, p. 27-33. After he left the prison, Stăniloae wrote the highly polemical tract on "Uniatismul: opera unei întreite silnicii," *Biserica Ortodoxă Română*, vol. 87 (1969), p. 355-390. It should be noted here the insistent reference to "the Church of our ancestors" (or "the Church of our forefathers"), instead of, simply, the more adequate theological designation in use ("The Orthodox Patriarchate of Church"). Like in the Communist Russia or China, "the popular Church" was a phrase coined by the party officials, who could easily dictated the rules of speech for the Christian

Orthodox hierarchs. Until nowadays, the confusion between the Church, the Army and the State, seen as legitimate means to rule a Christian nation, persists. See the study of Ana Daniela Budică, "Imaginea despre sine a Bisericii Ortodoxe Române și revista Biserica Ortodoxă Română," in Mirela L. Murgescu and Simeon Călția (ed.), *Exerciții întru cunoaștere. Societate și mentalități în noi abordări istoriografice* (Jassy: Do Minor Publishers, 2003), p. 231-264. For an official example of ethno-theological discourse, see the sermons of Patriarch Teoctist: "Cuvântări rostite de PFPF Teoctist marcând evenimente importante din viața noastră bisericească," *Biserica Ortodoxă Română*, no. 1-6 (1997), p. 70. For an excellent overview of contemporary Church discourse, see Iuliana Conovici, "L'Orthodoxie roumaine et la modernité. Le discours officiel de l'Eglise Orthodoxe Roumaine après 1989," *Studia politica*, vol. IV (2004) no. 2, p. 389-420.

[48] In 1948, the official number of Greek-Catholic Christians in Romania was around 1, 560 000 souls.

[49] The circulation of Orthodox ecclesiastical newspapers in Communist Romania reached the astonishing total of 60,000 copies. cf. G.A. Maloney, *A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453* (Belmond Mass.: Nordland, 1976), p. 288.

[50] D. Stăniloae, *Uniatismul din Transilvania: încercare de dezmembrare a poporului român* (Bucharest : Editura Institutului Biblic, 1973). Some of the articles mentioned above were included in this book. Delia Despina Dumitrica, 'Uniate *vs.* Orthodox: What Lays behind the Conflict? A Conflict Analysis,' *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, vol. 3 (Winter 2002), p. 99-114.

[51] On this important figure of the 18th century Romanian intelligentsia, D. Stăniloae wrote with respect and resignation in his study "Lupta și drama lui Inochentie Micu Clain," *Biserica Ortodoxă Română* 86 (1968), p. 1137-1185.

[52] The best monograph on Șaguna remains K. Hitchins, *Orthodoxy and Nationalism: Andrei Șaguna and the Rumanians of Transylvania, 1856-1873* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977).

[53] Nicolas Stebbing, *Bearers of the Spirit: Spiritual Fatherhood in Romanian Orthodoxy* (Kalamazoo, Cistercian Publications, 2003). Archimandrite Teofil Părăianu (b. 1928) once said that Fr Stăniloae had told him that he considered the publication of "The Philokalia" to be his greatest achievement (oral report).

[54] Elder Cleopa of Romania, *The Truth of Our Faith: A Discourse from Holy Scripture on the Teachings of True Christianity (*Greece: Uncut Mountain Press, 2000*); for a hagiographical piece on Fr Cleopa, see Ioanichie Bălan, Shepherd of Souls, Elder Cleopa the New Hesychast of Romania (Platina, Alaska: St Herman Brotherhood Press, 2000).*

[55] For an impressionistic description of Fr Paisie's personality, see H.-R. Patapievici, *Flying against the Arrow: an Intellectual in Ceausescu's Romania*, ET by M. Adăscăliței (Budapest: Central European University, 2003), p. 106-118.

[56] Ioanichie Bălan, *Convorbiri duhovniceşti*, vol. 2 (Roman: Editura Episcopiei Romanului, 1988).

[57] J. Moltmann, "Gleitwort," in D. Stăniloae, *Orthodoxe Dogmatik* (Zurich, Einsiedeln, Köln: Benzinger Verlag; Gütersloh: Güthersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1985), p. 10: "Der Verfasser ist im Westen noch within unbekannt, er ist aber der einflussreichste und kreativste orthodoxe Theologe der Gegenwart."

[58] Lidia Stăniloae, *op. cit.*, passim.

[59] D. Stăniloae, *Spiritualitate şi comuniune în Liturghia Ortodoxă* (Craiova: Editura Mitropoliei, 1986).

[60] See the interviews carried out by Lidia Vianu, *Censorship in Romania* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1998).

[61] There are some important books, which, on a personal note, reflect the religious persecution perpetrated by the Communist authorities in Romania. See, for example, Nicolae Steinhardt, *Journal de la félicité*, French translation by Marily Le Nir, preface by Olivier Clement (Paris: Arcanters, 1999); for the Italian version, see N. Steinhardt, *Diario della felicità*, Italian translation by Gabriella Bertini Carageani (Bologna: EDB, 1996). Of great importance remains also the witness of R. Wurmbrand, *In God's Underground* (Living Sacrifice Book Co.: 1993); *Tortured for Christ* (Living Sacrifice Book Co.: 1998); *Alone With God: God and Suffering: New Sermons from Solitary Confinement* (Living Sacrifice Book Co.: 1999). For the Church (in particular, Catholic) resistance in Eastern Europe, see George Weigel, *The Final Revolution: The Resistance Church and the Collapse of Communism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992)**.** See also the vibrant recollections of the archimandrite Roman Braga, *Trepte duhovniceşti* (Alba-Iulia: Editura Arhiepiscopiei, 1998).

[62] St. Augustine, *Confessions* 3.6.11 ("more inward than my most inward").

[63] This history of the intellectual life in Romania during the 1980s still needs to be written. Glimpses of it can be found in the large number of diaries, interviews, essays or chronicles, which emerged in the wake of the "Revolution" (December 1989). Notwithstanding, these personal testimonies would deserve a systematic exposition and subsequent interpetation.

[64] Andrei Pleşu, "Intellectual Life under Dictatorship," *Representations*, vol. 49 (Winter 1995), p. 61-71, here p. 69.

[65] Cf. S. Antohi, "Commuting to Castalia: Noica's 'School', Culture and Power in Communist Romania," in G. Liiceanu, *The Paltinis Diary: A Paideic Model in Humanist Culture*, ET by James Christian Brown, (Budapest: Central European University, 2002), p. xix.

[66] Paul Caravia, *Biserica întemniţată: România, 1944-1989* (Bucharest: Institutul National pentru Studiul Totalitarismului, 1998).

[67] On the intrinsic theological ambiguities that pertain to this issue, as it is made clear in Aristotle Papanikolaou, "Byzantium, Orthodoxy, and

Democracy," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, vol. 71 (March 2003), no. 1, pp. 75-98, where the opposed positions of Vigen Guroian and Stanley Harakas are discussed. See also Stanley Harakas, "Orthodox Church-State Theory and American Democracy," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, vol. 21 (1976), p. 399-421; and Vigen Guroian, *Ethics after Christendom: Toward and Ecclesial Christian Ethic* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1994). A more substantial historical dossier is to be found in Pedro Ramet (ed.), *Eastern Christianity in Politics in the Twentieth Century* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1987).

[68] M. Heidegger, *The Question concerning Technology and other essays*, ET by W. Lovitt (New York: Harper and Row, 1977).

[69] cf. D. Stăniloae, *Reflecţii despre spiritualitatea poporului român* [1992[1]] (Bucharest: Editura Elion, 2001), 31-32.

[70] Cf. S. Dumitrescu, *op. cit.*, 34.

[71] For time in the archaic ontology of the Romanian peasant, see M. Eliade, *Zalmoxis: The Vanishing God: Comparative Studies in the Religions and Folklore of Dacia and Eastern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972); on how these stable rhythms of life have been disturbed by the aberrant economical policies of communism, see P. Ronnas, "Turning the Romanian Peasant into a New Socialist Man: An Assessment of the Rural Development Policy in Romania," *Soviet Studies*, vol. 41 (1989), no. 4, p. 543-559. Horia Bernea (1938-2001), painter and curator, has offered in the galleries of of the famous "Musem of the Romanian Peasant" from Bucharest (www.mtr.ro). This is an impressive reconstruction of the symbolic world of the traditional Romanians taken directly from the countryside.

[72] B. Ştefănescu, "Dimensiunea rituală a structurării comunitare în lumea rurală transilvăneană la începutul epocii moderne," in Nicolae Bocşan, Ovidiu Ghitta, Doru Radosav (eds.), *Tentaţia istoriei. În memoria profesorului Pompiliu Eliade* (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2003), p. 83-118.

[73] This practice would go back to the practices of the early monks of the Egyptian desert, who used the sign of the Cross in order to chase out the evil spirits. See Athanasius the Great, *Vita Antonii* 74-75; and in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (collectio alphabetica), see Abba Ammonas 8, Abba Poemen 8, etc.

[74] Stăniloae's description of the life of the Christian peasant in an Orthodox country could be paralleled with a similar testimony given by St Silouan the Athonite (†1938). See, Archimandrite Sophrony, *Saint Silouan* (Essex: Stavropegic Monastery of Saint John the Baptist, 1991), p. 12.

[75] M. Eliade, "Destinul culturii româneşti" (1953), *Împotriva deznădejdii* (Bucharest: Humanitas Publishers, 1992), p. 173. A former monk, the Romanian poet T. Arghezi was of a wholly different opinion, when he claimed that "not a single fairy tale or a chant has ever had contacts with the Orthodox ethos," *Kalende*, vol. I (2 December 1928), no. 2, p. 27-28 (*apud.* Zigu Ornea, *Anii treizeci*, p. 105).

76   D. Stăniloae, *Ortodoxie și Românism* (Sibiu: Diecezana Publishers, 1938), p. 179-235.

77   In his startling essay *Minuni și false minuni* [1940] (Bucharest: Anastasia Publishers, 1993[2]), p. 177-229, M. Urzică provided a sharp theological critique of the "Petrache Lupu Movement." Along the lines of this early critique, one should read the cautious remarks of Archimandrite Ilie Cleopa, *Despre vise și vedenii* [1962[1]] (Bacău: Bunavestire Publishers, 1994[2]). See also the historical account of F. Müller, "Maglavit – proiecții social-politice," in Nicolae Bocșan, Ovidiu Ghitta, Doru Radosav (eds.), *Tentația istoriei. În memoria profesorului Pompiliu Eliade* (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2003), p. 287-304.

78   See also Ion Agârbiceanu, *Preotul și familia preoțească. Rostul lor etnic în satul românesc*, Ed. Subsecției Eugenice și Biopolitice a Astrei și a Institutului de Igienă și Biopolitică al Universității Cluj-Sibiu, Sibiu, 1942.

79   Christopher R. Seitz, *Word Without End* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998).

80   Fred Davis, *Yearning for Yesterday: a Sociology of Nostalgia* (New York: Free Press, 1979).

81   D. Radosav, *Sentimentul religios la români. O perspectivă istorică* (sec. XVII-XX) (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia, 1997), *passim*.

82   M. Douglas, *Natural Symbols* (London, 1970).

83   A. Șaguna, *Corespondență*, vol. I (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2005).

84   José Casanova, *Public Religion in the Modern World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), with an analysis of the North-American transformation of secularism and public religion; Friedrich W. Graf, *Die Wiederkehr der Götter. Religion in der modernen Kultur* (Munich, 2004).

85   For an anthropological study of the Transylvanian ethos in the 19th century, see Sorin Mitu, *National Identity of Romanians from Transylvania* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2001).

86   For a better understanding of this point, see the well-balanced considerations of the Romanian historian Sorin Mitu, *Transilvania mea* (Jassy: Polirom Publishers, 2006).

87   Ștefan Lemny, *Originea și cristalizarea ideii de patrie în cultura română* (Bucharest: Minerva, 1986).

88   The actions carried out against the contemplative monasteries (both Orthodox and Roman-Catholic) by General Bukow are an almost constant reference in Stăniloae's polemical prose (which forgets to mention he sufferings to which the Roman-Catholic faithful had been subjected during the long periods of tyranny).

89   The voice of another Transylvanian was particularly acute in the 1930s. See Emil Cioran, *Schimbarea la față a României* (Bucharest: Humanitas Publishers, 1990), *passim*.

[90] Dumitru Stăniloae, "Autoritatea Bisericii," p. 207, quoted by Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 26. I use here Robertson's translation.

[91] Dumitru Stăniloae, "Temeiurile teologice ale ierarhiei," p. 171, *apud.* Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

[92] Stăniloae, *Ortodoxie și Românism*, p. 13.

[93] Grégoire Papathomas, "La relation d'opposition entre Église établie localement et diaspora ecclésiale," *Contacts* (Paris), vol. 57, no. 2 (2005), p. 96-132.

[94] D. Stăniloae, "Rolul Ortodoxiei în formarea și păstrarea ființei poporului român și a unității naționale," *Ortodoxia*, vol. XXX (1978) no. 4, p. 584-603.

[95] In this, Stăniloae follows the rhetoric legitimised by professional historians, such as G. I. Brătianu, *O enigmă și un miracol: poporul român* [1942[1]] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1988). The phrase in the title belongs to Ferdinand Lot ('une énigme et un miracle historique'). Andrei Brezianu once noticed that the Romanian historiography lacks a contribution similar to F. Braudel's monograph on *L'identité de la France*. See A. Brezianu, "Ieri și azi. Schiță de tablou moral pentru o societate în tranziție," *Idei în dialog* vol. 10 (iulie 2005), p. 13.

[96] This blunt statement belongs to Fr Ioan Iovan from the "Monastery of the Nativity of the Mother of God" (Recea, Târgu Mureș), interviewed by Victoria Clark, *Why the Angels Fall. A Portrait of Orthodox Europe from Byzantium to Kosovo?* (Oxford: MacMillan, 2000), p. 211: "we are Christians grown, like grass which has never been cut." This was the view shared by the members of *Gândirea* movement, and it is currently still endorsed by the Church historian Mircea Păcurariu in his first volume of the *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române* (București: Editura Institutului Biblic, 1980-1981), 3 vols.

[97] H.-I. Marrou, "La patrie de Jean Cassien," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, vol. XIII (1947), pp 588–96.

[98] This is a huge topic, but I refer the reader to A. Madgearu, *Rolul creștinismului în formarea poporului român* (Bucharest: All, 2001); for an English equivalent, see Alexandru Madgearu, "The Spreading of the Christianity in the Rural Areas of Post-Roman Dacia (4th-7th centuries)," *Archaeus*, vol. VIII (2004), no. 1-4, pp. 41-59. On Christianity as 'folk religion,' see the challenging studies of N. Zugravu, *Geneza creștinismului popular al românilor* (Bucharest: 1997).

[99] P.P. Panaitescu, "'Perioada slavonă' la români și ruperea de cultura apusului [1944]," *Interpretări românești. Studii de istorie economică și socială*, 2nd edition by Ștefan S. Gorovei and Maria Magdalena Székely (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1994).

[100] For one famous example of Shamanic practices discovered by Christian missionaries in the Carpathian Mountains during the 17th century, see V. A. Ureche, *Codex Bandinus: Memoriu asupra scrierii lui Bandinus dela 1646* (Bucharest: Analele Academiei Române, 1895), p. 154, commented by Mircea Eliade, *Zalmoxis: The Vanishing God*, ET by W. R. Trask (Chicago:

The University of Chicago Press, 1972), p. 191-194, and Moshe Idel, *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism. Pillars, Lines, Ladders* (Budapest, New York: Central European University Press, 2005), p. 148-150.

[101] On this wide-ranging issues, see the studies of Emanuel Turczynski, *Konfession und Nation: zur Frühgeschichte der serbischen und rumänischen Nationsbildung* (Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann, 1976); Krista Zach, *Orthodoxe Kirche und rumänisches Volksbewusstsein im 15. bis 18. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1977); Janice Broun, *Conscience and Captivity: Religion in Eastern Europe* (Washington DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1988); P. Kitromilides, "'Imagined Communities' and the Origins of the National Question in the Balkans," *European History Quarterly*, vol. 19 (1989) no. 2, p. 149-192; V. Makrides, "Aspects of Greek Orthodox Fundamentalism," *Orthodoxes Forum*, vol.5 (1991), p. 49-72; T. Lipowatz, "Orthodox Christianity and Nationalism: Two Aspects of Modern Greek Political Culture," *Greek Political Science Review* (1993), vol. 2, p. 31-47; Paschalis Kitromilides, *Enlightenment, Nationalism, Orthodoxy: Studies in the Culture and Political Thought of South-eastern Europe* (Aldershot, 1994); Peter F. Sugar, *East European Nationalism. Politics of Religion* (Ashgate Variorum, 1994); V. Georgiadou, "Greek Orthodoxy and the Politics of Nationalism," *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society* vol. 9 (1995), no. 2, p. 295-316; John S. Micgiel, ed. *State and Nation Building in East Central Europe: Contemporary Perspectives* (New York: Institute on East Central Europe, Columbia University, 1996); Ina Merdjanova, *The Postcommunist Palimpsest: Religion, Nationalism, and Civil Socity in Eastern Europe* (Edwin Mellen Press, 2001); and Vjekoslav Perica, *Balkan Idols. Religion and Nationalism in Yugoslav States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), especially p. 2-16.

[102] Among the titles available in English, see especially the following works by Keith Hitchins, *The Rumanian National Movement in Transylvania 1780-1849* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969); *Studies on Romanian National Consciousness* (Pelham N.Y., etc.: Nagard Publishers, 1983); *A Nation Affirmed. The Romanian National Movement in Transylvania 1860-1914* (Bucharest: Enciclopedica Publishers, 1999); *Rumania, 1866-1947* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); The Romanians, 1774-1866 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996). For the earlier period, see Ovidiu Pecican, "Ethnicity and Faith in the Romanian-Slavic Literature of the 14th to the 15th Centuries," in Maria Crăciun and Ovidiu Ghitta (eds.), *Church and Society* (Cluj-Napoca: EFES, 1998). For an excellent synthesis for the period between the 17th and the 19th century, see Katherine Verdery, "Moments in the Rise of the Discourse on National Identity. I. Seventeenth through Nineteenth Centuries," in I. Agrigoroaiei, Gh. Buzatu, and V. Cristian (eds.), *Românii în istoria universală*, vol. III (Jassy: Universitatea "Al. I. Cuza" Press, 1988), p. 25-92.