TEOLOGIA

anul XVI, nr. 2 (51), 2012

The review publishes studies, translations from Holly Fathers, notes, comments and book reviews.

REQUIREMENTS

The authors are expected to send the studies that meet the specified requirements 2.0 lines spacing. The authors assume the responsability of the contents of the articles. The unpublished studies are not returned.

TEOLOGIA

Orice corespondență se va adresa:

FACULTATEA DE TEOLOGIE
310096 ARAD
Strada Academiei Teologice Nr. 9
Tel/Fax: 0040-257-285855

TEOLOGIA

Any correspondence will be sent to the following address:
FACULTATEA DE TEOLOGIE
310096 ARAD
Strada Academiei Teologice Nr. 9
Tel/Fax: 0040-257-285855

Prețuri/ Prices:
Uniunea Europeană (UE): 1 abonament (4 exemplare/ copies = 24 €; 1 exemplar/ copy = 6 €)
Alte țări/ Other countries: 1 abonament (4 exemplare/ copies = 40 €; 1 exemplar/ copy = 10 €)

UNIVERSITATEA „AUREL VLAICU” ARAD
FACULTATEA DE TEOLOGIE ORTODOXĂ

TEOLOGIA

ANUL XVI,
NR.2 (51), 2012

Editura Universității „Aurel Vlaicu”
A R A D

"Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad Publishing House
Romania, Arad, Complex universitar M, Etaj I, Sala 82, Tel. 0257/219555,
http://www.uav.ro/ro/resurse/editura-uav

Printing House:
SC "TIPO STAMPA" S.R.L. Arad
Tel. 0257.349.004
Email: stampasrl@yahoo.com

TEOLOGIA review is a quarterly scientific publication, recognized by CNCS Institution in B category
TEOLOGIA review is indexed in the database Index Copernicus (cod 6666)

e-mail: revista_teologia@yahoo.com
website: www.revistateologia.ro

ISSN 2247-4382
ISSN-L 1453-4789

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS

Secularism and Religious Spirit in Modern Times

Much has been written about the phenomenon of secularization that affects contemporary religious space, this process was defined and its causes were analyzed, looking for the remedies as well. Based on these analyzes, we tried capturing some features of the secularization, features that drew our attention and which we consider to be the most important.

In particular, Christian theology today faces the challenge of secularization phenomenon in the context of the postmodern and post-Christian society and the need to respond by resorting to the two sources of life that feed confession: the Holy Scripture and the Sacred Tradition, but the answer must be adapted to the postmodern human understanding. Although issues change during each historical epoch, the Revelation remains the same, because the world is God's plan revealed in the incarnate Son of God accomplished in history. Theology is still meant to make intelligible the mystery of God's descent to man to make him partaker of the divine nature (cf. II Peter 1, 4).

In the science of religions, we have to say that beyond any fears meant to question the persistence of *homo religiosus* typology, the threat of the secular spirit, express our optimism about the survival of the human type, as it is stated in the very nature of man. Therefore, we venture to suggest that man is revealed to be human only in so far as it manifests itself as a religious man, without the appearance of religiosity, the very survival of human species on earth is threatened. Religiosity, seen as a sacred feeling and attempt to commune with him, gives the true measure of human dignity. The same opinion is Frithjof Schuon, showing that although, in our era, it is often spoken of humanism and its benefits, we forget, however, that the man «once abandoning the prerogatives in front of the matter, the car and of the quantitative science, ceases to be truly "human"». And in a footnote on the same page of the paper *Understanding Islam. Introduction to the*

World of Muslim Spirituality adds: "fully" human "is only what gives man maximum opportunity for the world beyond, which in fact, meets his deepest nature".

There were previously two types of anti-religious attitudes. In communist countries in the East it was hoped that the religious uniformity and convergence will be achieved by abolishing or denying religion. Example in this regard was Albania where the atheist uniformity was forcibly imposed. In the sphere of the so-called free and democratic countries, it is hoped that religion would be abolished together with the scientific and technological progress, the religious dimension lacking to the new man, who will explain everything in a purely rational approach. Thus, it was argued that religion will die due to decay or suffocation. Modernism meant more than these two antireligious trends. It is enough to remind the precursors of modernism: the Enlightenment, positivism, scientism, Marxism, Kant that proposed that "religion within pure reason" the left Hegelian with Feuerbach and Marx, who denied God, considering religion as alienation or "opium" for the people, Freud who interpreted religion as an illusion or neurosis, etc.. All these ideological claimed, explicitly or implicitly, the traditional secularization theory which postulated that, with modern society the decline of religion is inevitable. Once, these ideas have been widespread and it was natural that their effect was felt in the religiosity of the masses. But the reality of the latest years proved quite the opposite, the religious revival we are witnessing today, albeit in a form that the new Christians are not satisfied, because a proliferation of new religious movements of the syncretic type. If the late nineteenth century warned us by Nietzsche's warning that "God is dead... and we are the ones who have killed him", the next century will end with an impressive religious revival, meant to refute the words of the German philosopher. A recent survey showed that more than 70.2% of the earth population takes a certain religion and more than half of the people today still believe in God.

Therefore, we can already take into account the importance of the religious phenomenon for the configuration of the culture and religiosity aspects of the twenty-first century. However, we can not deny the existence of an emphasized decentralized phenomenon, at least in the teaching of Christianity and, we dare say, in the other monotheistic religions in particular.

Deac. Ph.D. Caius Cuțaru

Adolf Martin Ritter[1]

Altchristliche Ethik zwischen Bibel und stoisch-platonischer Tugendlehre.

Eine Einführung in die Lektüre von Clemens Alexandrinus *Quis dives salvetur*

Abstract
The study Old Church Ethics between the Bible and the Stoic-Platonian Teaching about Virtue. An Introduction in the reading of 'Quis dives salvetur' by Clement of Alexandria' is a short presentation of the second Christian century as "the laboratory of the Christian theology" rather than being determined by the "Gnostic crisis"(Harnack). In Quis dives salvetur, Clement of Alexandria thinks according to the Stoical categories even when speaking about the property. Nevertheless, there are some attitudes in his work which are different from the Stoical thinking, attitudes influenced by the Holy Scriptures: on the basis of the theology of Creation he considers the material goods and property as being given by God for the welfare of man. Being detached from the matter is absolutely important. The study highlights the fact that, besides the common elements of the Stoical and Christian ethics, it is not right to call the differences as being "thin" (E: Mühlenberg). The work of Clement of Alexandria is a valuble result of the second century Christan theology, where the biblical influence is stronger than the philosophical one.

Keywords
Clement of Alexandria; second century B. C.; old Church ethics; property from a Christian point of view; Quis Dives salvetur.

Da ich es in Ihrem Kreise mit lauter Fachleuten zu tun habe, wie mir wohl bewusst ist, müssen Sie nicht befürchten, es folge jetzt eine Vorstellung von Person und Werk des Autors, mit dem wir uns heute und

[1] Ph.D., University of Heidelberg, adolf.ritter@wts.uni-heidelberg.de.

an den folgenden anderthalb Tagen beschäftigen wollen. Ich werde auch nicht allgemein auf den geschichtlichen Raum zu sprechen kommen, dem er – jedenfalls in seiner Blütezeit (d. h. im letzten Jahrzehnt des 2. Jahrhunderts) – zuzuordnen ist, und dabei besonders das *geistige* Umfeld berücksichtigen; werde schon gar nicht die Forschungsgeschichte rekapitulieren, namentlich zu seinem Werk – sein Leben bleibt ja (von besagtem Jahrzehnt abgesehen) für uns wohl endgültig, weitgehend zumindest, in undurchdringliches Dunkel gehüllt. Nicht nur aus Zeitgründen verzichte ich auf all das, sondern auch deshalb, weil davon auszugehen ist, dass alle, die in den kommenden Sitzungen in Texte des Autors einzuführen haben oder sich an deren Deutung zu beteiligen gedenken, schon deutlich machen oder doch wenigstens durchblicken lassen werden, welches *ihr* jeweiliger Zugang sei und an welchen Stellen und aus welchen Gründen *sie* sich von dem Forschungskonsens entfernen, den wir alle – mehr oder weniger deutlich – vor Augen haben; für wen das nicht zutrifft, weiß gewiss auch ohne meine Hilfe, wo er sich bequem informieren kann.

1.

Ich mache jetzt den Anfang und umreiße also zunächst *meinen* Zugang: es ist der des *Historikers,* dessen, der möglichst alles mit allem in Beziehung setzt und sich am liebsten von „außen nach innen" bewegt, wenn es ein Phänomen geschichtlich zu begreifen und begreifbar zu machen gilt. Er wird nicht auf alle seine Fragen eine Antwort bekommen; das aber [490] wird ihn nicht davon abhalten, die Fragen wenigstens zu stellen. Das ist sein spezifischer Beitrag zum Umgang mit den *Quellen,* literarischen wie nichtliterarischen.

Soweit ist das in meinem Fach, der Kirchengeschichte, näherhin der Patristik, im Prinzip unstrittig. Was das Jahrhundert des Klemens betrifft, so ist allerdings seit einiger Zeit unter Fachgenossen zu hören, es müsse ein völlig neues Bild davon her. Kritik sei überfällig, besonders an dem seit A. Harnack überkommenen Bild von der das Jahrhundert bestimmenden „gnostischen Krise" und ihrer Überwindung in Gestalt des (durch die drei sog. „katholischen Normen": Kanon, Glaubensregel [*regula fidei*] und Bischofsamt konstituierten) „Altkatholizismus"[2]. Es

[2] So z.B. Chr. Markschies in seinem Bändchen „*Die Gnosis*", München, 2001, sowie in Aufsätzen zu Kerinth, zur Kanonisierung des Neuen Testaments und zur Apostolizität und anderen Amtsbegründungen in der Antike (s.u.).

lasse sich ohne Übertreibung sagen, „dass gegenwärtig nahezu díe gesamte Landkarte der christlichen Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte des zweiten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts neu gezeichnet“ werde[3]; langsam entwickele „sich aus den verschiedenen Untersuchungen[4] zu Einzelproblemen ein neues Gesamtbild“, und es sei möglich, „unter Verwendung einer einprägsamen Metapher das zweite Jahrhundert als, Laboratorium der christlichen Theologie‘“ zu beschreiben, „in dem von unterschiedlichen Personen mit weitgehend identíschen Bestandteilen“ (gemeint sind biblische Theologie, pagane Mythologie und zeitgenössische Philosophie) „sehr verschiedene Ergebnisse ‚zusammengerührt‘ werden“[5]. Eine „überzeugende Deutung des Phänomens ‚Gnosis/Gnostizismus‘“ werde „nur im Rahmen einer Gesamtsicht der christlichen Theologiegeschichte gelingen ..., die den, Laboratoriums‘-Charakter einer, Theologie im Werden‘ ernst“ nehme[6]. - Ich frage: *Besteht* ein zwingender Anlass zu einer Totalrevision unseres Bildes vom 2. Jh.? In meinen Augen zählt es zu den bedeutsamsten Verdiensten der neuesten Gnosisforschung (nicht zuletzt der Arbeiten von C. Markschies), dass man danach die Größe und den Einfluß der gnostischen Bewegung nicht länger wird überschätzen können; von *„gnostischer* Krise“ sollte daher am besten nicht mehr geredet werden; aber sollte man deswegen auch auf den *Krisenbegriff* verzichten? Hält man sich vor Augen, was alles im 2. Jh. – im christlichen Bereich so gut wie außerhalb desselben – passiert ist (ich nenne nur – zeitnah zu unserem Autor – die Markomannen- und Quadeneinfälle, die wahrlich nicht von Pappe waren, oder die erstmals in der westlichen Welt bezeugte, verheerende Pockenepidemie zur Regierungszeit Mark Aurels [ab 165][7], díe – vielleicht – auch das

[3] Ders., Kerinth, *Wer war er und was lehrte er*?, in: JbAC 41, Münster, 1998, 48-76; hier: 48.

[4] Anstelle von „Hinweisen auf die einschlägige und weithin bekannte Literatur“ (48, Anm. 1) wird in dem genannten Aufsatz eine eigene im Enstehen begriffene längere Studie zum Thema „Pluralismus und Identität im Christentum des zweiten und dritten Jahrhunderts“ angekündigt, in der dargestellt werde, „wie sich innerhalb dieses Zeitraums christliche Identität gefestigt hat“ (ebd.). Diese ist inzwischen unter dem Titel „Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie und ihre Institutionen. Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte der antiken christlichen Theologie“, Tübingen, 2007 erschienen. Es ist mir aber eine offene Frage geblieben, ob dieses ungeheuer gelehrte Buch (vgl. bes. 339-369) den oben angemeldeten Diskussionsbedarf gestillt habe oder nicht.

[5] Ders., *Kerinth* (wie Anm. 3), 49.

[6] Ebd., 76.

[7] Vgl. dazu bes. das Kap. „*Epidemien, soziale Netzwerke und Bekehrung*” in R. Starks

ansonsten nur schwer verständliche „plötzliche Aufkommen einer starken ‚Verfinsterung' der Weltsicht" in den gnostischen Systementwürfen zu erklären hílft[8]; ferner an Fortsetzung und vorläufigen Abschluß der ebenso spannungs - wie schmerzvollen Trennungsprozesse zwischen „Kirche" und „Synagoge", die fast regelmäßig ausgeblendet bleiben in neueren Bei[491]trägen[9], genau so wie den aufschlußreichen *jüdischen* Hintergrund der frühchristlichen Geschichte mit seinen auffälligen, nachdenkenswerten Parallelen zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums[10], oder auch die durch den Montanismus ausgelösten und signalisierten Irritatíonen, von den lokalen bzw. regionalen Christenprozessen und - pogromen einmal abgesehen), so legt sich, mir zumindest, nicht unbedingt das Bild einer Idylle nahe, in der man fröhlich-friedlich, jedenfalls unbekümmert, vor sich hin forschen und experimentieren kann, ungerührt durch gelegentliche, Explosionen im Reagenzglas'. Allenfalls für den Lebensbereich einiger Gnostiker *könnte* das ein annähernd zutreffendes Bild abgeben. – Ich gebe das immerhin zu bedenken.

Wenn im gleichen Zusammenhang als künftige „Aufgabe der Erforschung von christlicher Theologie díeser Periode" umschrieben wird, „genauer zu sagen, warum bestimmte Mischungen" (wir sind, wie Síe sehen, nach wie vor bei der „Labor[atoriums]"-Metapher) „den sich etablierenden kirchlichen Konsens treffen, warum andere diesen Konsens nícht treffen bzw. schließlich nach einer bestimmten Zeit oder Entwicklung

Buch „Der Aufstieg des Christentums. Neue Erkenntnísse aus soziologíscher Sicht", Weinheim, 1997 (das engl. Original „The Rise of Christianity" erschien ein Jahr zuvor in Princeton, N.J.).

8 C. Markschies, *Die Gnosis*, München, 2001, p. 85.

9 So auch etwa in der Literaturübersicht von W. Löhr, *Das antike Christentum ím zweiten Jahrhundert - neue Perspektiven seiner Erforschung*, ThLZ 127 (2002), p. 247-262. In einer Anmerkung (247, Anm. 2) wird – trotz des, anderes versprechenden, „globalen" Titels – eingeräumt, dass „Vollständigkeit" nicht beabsichtigt und „z.B. das komplexe Problem der Ausdifferenzierung von antikem Judentum und antikem Christentum nicht behandelt" sei, mit der (wenig einleuchtenden) Begründung, dass „hier die Beschränkung auf das 2. Jh. unsachgemäß wäre" (wieso? Waren etwa nicht um 200 die Würfel in puncto Trennungsprozesse zwischen Judentum und Christentum gefallen?). Dennoch steht L. nicht an, sich zur Gesamtcharakterisierung des antiken Christentums im 2. Jh. fröhlich der „Laboratoriums"- (oder wie er sagt: der „Labor"-) Metapher zu bedienen (261). Ich halte diese Vorgehensweise für sehr problematisch.

10 Vgl. meinen Beitrag, *Israel als Gegenüber der griechischen Kirche in vorislamischer Zeit* in F. Siegert (Hg.), *Israel als Gegenüber. Vom Alten Orient bis in die Gegenwart* (SIJD 5), Göttingen, 2000, p. 202-217.

nicht mehr treffen"[11], dann geht es ersichtlich um die Problematik, die seit Harnack als Fixierung der „katholischen Normen" bezeichnet wírd. Es ist das ein Ausdruck, den manche, vielleicht sogar die meisten kirchenhistorischen Zeitgenossen gar nicht (mehr) mögen, weil er zu sehr an „die einstigen und stark von konfessioneller Polemik bestimmten Klischees von der Etablierung einer, frühkatholischen Kirche'"[12] erinnere. Doch lassen wir zunächst einmal die Frage einer angemessenen *Terminologie* aus dem Spiel und fragen, ob das bisherige Bild von der Kanonisierung des NT und der Fixierung einer bestimmten kirchlichen Ämterordnung mit dem Bischofsamt an der Spitze, die beide bislang als im großen und ganzen um die Wende vom 2. zum 3. Jh. abgeschlossen betrachtet wurden, grundlegend „neu gezeichnet" werden müsse oder nicht? Aus der mir bekannten einschlägigen Literatur habe ich, offen gestanden, die Notwendigkeít einer Totalrevision noch nicht erkennen können.[13] So denke ich denn, daß man – bis zum Beweis des Gegenteils – vor allem über die Angemessenheit der jeweils verwendeten *Terminologie* nachdenken müsse. Ich verstehe sehr gut die Vorbehalte [492] gegenüber der – jedenfalls in der protestantischen Theologie – traditionellen Redeweise, die als zu sehr „konfessionalistisch" konnotiert erscheint, als Níederschlag einer „Großerzählung" (grand narrative), dazu bestimmt, gegenwärtigen Schriftgebrauch, gegenwärtige Orthodoxien und Ämterordnungen zu legitimieren oder zu diskredítieren.[14] Allein, auch hier gilt wohl: *abusus non tollit usum!* Der Ursprungssinn

---

[11] C. Markschies (wie o., Anm. 3), p. 49.

[12] Ebd., p. 48.

[13] An zwei Beispíelen sucht C. Markschies in seinem Aufsatz *Neue Forschungen zur Kanonisierung des Neuen Testaments* (in Apocrypha 12 [2001], p. 237-262) die bisherige Sicht zu überprüfen: den Inventaren antiker christlicher Bibliotheken und den Hinweisen in der gnostischen Schrift „Pistis Sophia" auf den vorausgesetzten biblischen Kanon; doch wird nicht bedacht, dass der „Zustand vor Ort, vor allem in den kleinen Privat-, Gemeinde- und Kloster-Bibliotheken" (245) nicht ohne weiteres kanonsgeschichtliche Relevanz besitzt, da die Kanonisierung bestimmter biblischer Schriften kein Leseverbot von Nichtkanonisiertem implizierte. Und dass die hinter der „Pistis Sophia" stehenden gnostischen Gruppen „den Kanon der Mehrheitskirche so, wie sie ihn vorfanden, akzeptierten", aber „über diese kanonischen Texte eine besondere, esoterische Auslegung vortrugen" (260), berührte weniger die Kanonsfrage als vielmehr die regula fidei (als davon zu unterscheidende, wenn auch nicht zu scheidende Auslegungs-„Norm"). – Es beruhigt mich zu sehen, dass M. in seinem Nachwort zum unveränderten Nachdruck von Campenhausens, *Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*, Tübingen, 2003, p. 395-402, äußerst moderate Töne anschlägt.

[14] S. W. Löhr (wie o., Anm. 7), p. 262.

von „katholisch“, so hat uns R. M. Hübner gelehrt, hat für niemanden erwas Genierliches an sich (καθολική Ἐκκλησία in IgnSmyrn 8, 2, wo die Wendung erstmals vorkommt, hat schlichtweg den Sinn von „Kirche für alle“).[15] Und, wer kritisiert, müßte wohl auch in diesem Fall passendere Vorschläge machen. „Groß“ - oder „Mehrheitskirche“ sind zu nichtssagend (es sei denn, man dächte wie F. Schiller: „Mehrheit ist Unsinn, lieber Freund, ...“); denn nach allem, was wir wissen, waren wohl fast immer und überall *Nicht*gnostiker in der „Mehrheit“. Aber die Strukturen dieses *mainstream* haben sich im Laufe des 2. Jh. bis ins 3. hinein, mehrheitlich, gründlich gewandelt; und das verlangt nach meinem Verständnis nach möglichst präzisem Ausdruck – und wenigstens einem Hinweis, einer *Vermutung*, was zur Bildung von Mehrheit und Minderheit beigetragen haben möchte. Mit Sicherheit waren es kein *bracchium saeculare* – und wohl auch kein Lotteriespiel! Was aber dann? Mir fallen einstweilen in der Hauptsache die sich in dieser Zeit – in m. E. augenfälliger Interdependenz mit Entwicklungen auf dem „linken (‚gnostischen‘) Flügel“ – ausbildenden und durchsetzenden ominösen „Normen“ ein; und ich wenigstens habe kein Problem damit, sie – ganz unkonfessionalistisch – als „katholische Normen“ zu bezeichnen („katholisch“ hier als quellensprachlicher Begriff aufgenommen und im Sinne seiner ersten Bezeugungen verstanden, wie es für Historiker doch nur vernünftig ist).

In diesem (christlich-jüdisch-, gnostisch -„katholisch“-, philosophisch-theologischen) Beziehungsgeflecht möchte ich gern unseren Autor, den Alexandriner Klemens, angesiedelt und entsprechend gedeutet wissen.

2.

In den ersten beiden Textlektüren wird es um die *Ethik* des Mannes gehen, anhand des Textes *Quis dives salvetur* oder, richtiger, von Ausschnitten daraus. Über „Christliche Grundreflexionen zur Ethik“ bei Klemens hat zuletzt – lehrreich wie immer – E. Mühlenberg in seiner Akademieabhandlung „Altchristliche Lebensführung zwischen Bibel und Tugendlehre. Ethik bei den griechischen Philosophen und den frühen Christen“ (AAWG. P 272, Göttingen, 2006) gehandelt. In einem ersten thematischen Kapitel des Buches wird die Tradition philosophischer

[15] R. M. Hübner, *Überlegungen zur ursprünglichen Bedeutung des Ausdrucks ‚Katholische Kirche‘* (καθολική Ἐκκλησία) bei den frühen Kirchenvätern, in: Väter der Kirche (FS f. H. J. Sieben), hg. v. J.. Arnold u. a., Paderborn usw. 2004, p. 31-79.

Ethik (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Aristoteles, Epikur und der Stoa) umrissen (11-38), ehe in einem zweiten die Aufnahme derselben bei Klemens und Origenes beschrieben wird, so, wie sie für die ethische Reflexion der alten Christenheit überhaupt grundlegend geworden sei (39-76); das dritte und längste stellt nacheinander, wenn auch in unterschiedlicher Strukturierung, „die“, wie es einleitend heißt (9), „unübersehbaren Muster christlicher Lebensführung (Märtyrer, Virginität, Demut als monastische Lebensform)“ dar (77-151). Auch in diesem letzten Kapitel kommt unser Autor – anmerkungsweise – gelegentlich zur Sprache. In der Hauptsache aber wird man sich an das halten [493] müssen, was über ihn in dem vorangehenden, wie gesagt, den christlichen „Grundreflexionen zur Ethik“ gewidmeten Kapitel ausgeführt ist. Von *Qds* ist freilich auch dort nur ein einziges Mal die Rede, und das in einem (Harnack-) Zitat (41). Das ist nicht als Kritik gemeint. Die Nichtberücksichtigung unserer Homilie ist vielmehr nur die logische Konsequenz aus der Grundentscheidung M.s, in seiner Abhandlung einzig „nach dem Lebensgrund“ zu fragen. „aus dem heraus die frühen Christen über Lebensformen nachdachten und Anweisungen für ihre Zeitgenossen (und Nachfahren) gegeben haben. Eine sog. *materiale Ethik*“ sei nicht beabsichtigt (8f.; Hervorhebung von AMR).

Was M. unter seiner Fragestellung eruiert, wird in diesem Kreis wohl auf weitgehende Zustimmung stoßen, z.B. wenn er einleitend bemerkt: Klemens sammele „philosophische Lehren über die Ethik“ und nehme sie „umfassend“ auf. „Die stoische Moral“ überwiege, „oft ohne Kennzeichnung“, aber man stoße bei ihm auch auf „platonische und aristotelische Traditionen“. Das sei seit langem bekannt und studiert, und die Quellendokumentation liege vor (41f.). „In groben Zügen“, heißt es wenig später, könne „die Ethik des Klemens so zusammengefasst werden“: Es gebe eine „Zweistufenethik“, „eine Lebensführung für die Glaubenden (Paidagogos)“ und „eine Lebensführung für die Erkennenden, die Gnostiker (Stromata VII 1-88). Der Unterschied zwischen beiden Stufen“ werde „einerseits in (stoisch-) philosophischer Terminologie markiert“, d.h. dass „der Gnostiker wie der Weise“ im Sinne „der Philosophie aufgrund von eigener Erkenntnis“ handele, „während die nur Glaubenden Anweisungen“ *(praecepta)* befolgen. „Andererseits“ beschreibe er „den Unterschied mit christlicher Sprache als Handeln im Gehorsam und Handeln aus Liebe“ (42). – So viel im Augenblick zu M.s Buch. Ich kann nur raten: *Tolle, lege* – und zwar bei nächster sich bietender Gelegenheit!

3.

Unseren Text *Quis dives salvetur* zeichnet es aus, dass er die erste uns bekannte ausführliche und zusammenhängende Stellungnahme zum Problem von Reichtum (oder Eigentum) aus christlicher Sicht enthält. Er behandelt also unzweifelhaft ein Thema der „materialen Ethik", ohne allerdings grundsätzlicher Erwägungen zur Begründung christlicher Ethik gänzlich zu ermangeln. Der Form nach präsentiert er sich als (fortlaufende) Exegese der Perikope vom ‚reichen Jüngling' (Mk 10, 17ff. par.) oder, wie die neue „Zürcher Bibel" den Abschnitt überschrieben hat: von „Nachfolge und Reichtum". U.a. unter diesem Blickwinkel wird sich ein anderer, wenn ich ihn richtig verstanden habe, mit *Qds* befassen, während ich mich auf das Sachproblem konzentrieren will, auf das bereits der überlieferte, schon von Euseb (h.e. VI 13, 3) bezeugte Titel hinweist.

Wieso ist es für den Autor ein Problem? Darüber lassen gleich die drei Anfangskapitel von *Qds* nicht im Zweifel. Es geht danach in diesem Traktat nicht um die Erörterung sozioökonomischer oder auch sozial*philosophischer* Fragen nach Art von Platons Πολιτεία oder der „Politik" des Aristoteles, sondern – zunächst – um einen konkreten Gewissensrat. Der Autor sieht sich, wie er sagt, zu seiner Stellungnahme aus seelsorgerischer Verantwortung gegenüber solchen „Reichen" (πλούσιοι, πλουτούντες) veranlasst, die bereits mit dem christlichen Glauben (K. sagt: mit der δύναμις des σωτήρ) in Berührung gekommen sind, während er sich um die „Außenstehenden" (wörtlich: die „in die Geheimnisse der Wahrheit nicht Eingeweihten" [αμύητοι τής άληθείας]) im Augenblick nicht weiter kümmern will (2, 4; vgl. 1, 4; 2, 5; 3, 1). Ebenso außerstande, sich selbstgerecht über die – wie „alle Welt" [494] (Mt 28, 19) – zum Heile geladenen „Reichen" erhaben zu dünken, wie, ihnen eilfertig ein gutes Gewissen zu verschaffen, sieht er sie nicht als verabscheuungswürdige „Monstren", sondern als solche an, die – jenem .„Jüngling" von Mk 10 gleich – alle Hoffnung aufgegeben haben. Habe dieser doch die Worte Christi von „Kamel" und „Nadelöhr" (Mk 10, 25) samt der Forderung, alle Habe zu „verkaufen" (ebd., 21), missverstanden und *deshalb* seine Rettung für unmöglich gehalten *(Qds 2, 2*). Dadurch, dass die Hoffnung in den Herzen der Reichen neu belebt werde, solle ihnen Sinn und Willigkeit zu einem wirklichen „Teilen" (κοινωνία) geweckt werden (13,1; vgl. 3, 1-6; 39, 1f.). Es gebe dafür kein Zuspät (39-41). In diesem Sinn lässt

K. den Text ausklingen in einen „Mythos“ (42, 1-20), auf dessen Ernsthaftigkeit er den Leser mit einer Anspielung auf den Schluss von Platons „Gorgias“ wohl zu achten bittet[16]; die Rede ist von einem abtrünnigen Jünger des Apostels Johannes, der von diesem zur Umkehr bewogen und für die Kirche zurückgewonnen wurde.[17]

K. spricht sich mit aller Entschiedenheit gegen ein den Zusammenhang vernachlässigendes (αὐτόθεν), „vordergründig-oberflächliches“ (προχείρως), am Buchstaben klebendes Verständnis des Evangelientextes aus (2, 2 u.ö.) – in Kap. 5, 2 wird er von einem σαρκίνως ἀκροασθαι τῶν λεγομένων reden, was aber wohl auf dasselbe hinausläuft. Er verwahrt sich folglich gegen die Auffassung, als vermöge Armsein allein einen religiösen Vorzug zu begründen. Die Kernstelle ist Kap. 11, 3f., die wir einmal lesen wollen: (ich beschränke mich auf die Übersetzung – in geringfügiger Verkürzung; den griech. Text haben Sie ja alle vor Augen): „Weder ist es nämlich etwas Großes und Erstrebenswertes, überhaupt keinen Besitz zu haben, es sei denn um des (sc. ewigen) Lebens willen (andernfalls wären ja die, die vollständig mittellos sind,... Gott und ‚seine Gerechtigkeit‘ jedoch ‚nicht kennen‘ [Röm 10, 3], nur deshalb, weil sie in äußerster Armut leben ..., vor allen anderen glücklich zu preisen, von Gott am meisten geliebt und allein im Besitz des ewigen Lebens); (4) noch ist es etwas Neues, dass jemand auf seinen Reichtum verzichtet und ihn an die Armen (πτωχοί) oder an seine Vaterstadt verschenkt. Das haben vielmehr [selbst] vor Herabkunft des Heilands schon viele getan, sei es, um Muße zum Nachdenken (εἰς λόγους σχολή) zu haben und der toten Weisheit zuliebe, sei es aus törichter Ruhmessucht und Eitelkeit, Leute wie Anaxagoras, Demokrit und Krates“ (In der Anmerkung zur Stählinschen Übersetzung ist zu den drei Namen alles Nötige gesagt).

---

[16] Vgl. dazu außer dem Testimonienapparat bei Stählin z. St. (42, 1) U. Wickert, *Bemerkungen zu Clemens von Alexandrien* (Quis dives salvetur 19 und 42), ZNW 50, 1969, p. 123-132 (hier: 129ff.).

[17] Vom Kirchenhistoriker Euseb aufgenommen (h. e. III 23, 6-19) sowie in vielen Handschriften unter die Scholien zu Maximus Confessor geraten, ist diese Geschichte weithin bekannt geworden (vgl. den App. bei Schwartz, GCS, Eusebius II, 1 und O. Stählins Anm. zu seiner Übers. der Stelle in BKV2 7); noch J. G. Herder fühlte sich bemüßigt, sie dichterisch zu gestalten (in *Sämtliche Werke* XXVIII, hg. v. B. Suphan, Hildesheim 1968 [Berlin, 1884], p. 179-181: „Der gerettete Jüngling“). Ich verdanke den Hinweis M. Wacht (in Schriften der Kirchenväter, hg. v. N. Brox, München, 1983, p. 90, Anm. 57).

Klemens erteilt mit dieser Kritik und dieser bewussten Abgrenzung zugleich jener – namentlich in judenchristlich-apokalyptischen Kreisen - gepflegten „Armenfrönmmígkeit" eine Absage, wie sie vor allem im Jakobusbrief und in Anklängen auch im lukanischen Doppelwerk begegnet und noch in der Turmbauallegorie des sog. „Hirten des Hermas" *(Pastor Hermae),* einer als Apokalypse stilisierten Bußpredigt aus der Zeít um 140 n. Chr. nachklingt. Darin beschreibt der – anscheinend (nach Freilassung aus dem Sklavenstand) als kleiner Gewerbetreibender in Rom lebende Verf., welches die wahren Kirchenglieder oder, im Bilde gesprochen, welche Steine zum Turmbau taugten und welche nicht oder nur bedingt. Zu letzteren gehören auch solche, die ihrer „rund(lich)en" Form wegen nicht recht zum Bau passen wollen. Es sind das diejenigen Christen, die zwar nicht – wie Heuch[495]ler, Zweifler, Unbußfertige oder vor der Taufe Abgefallene – als von der wahren Kirche endgültig ausgeschlossen zu betrachten sind. Vielmehr haben sie wohl Glauben, besitzen aber auch „Reichtum dieser Welt" und sind deshalb allenfalls bedingt verwendbar. Denn „wenn Bedrängnís kommt, verleugnen sie ihren Herrn um ihres Reichtums und ihrer Geschäfte willen"; „wann *werden* sie zum Bau passen", fragt darauf der „Visionär" und erhält zur Antwort: „Wenn ihr Reichtum, der sie an sich fesselt, abgehauen wird" (vis. III 6, 5. 6). – Mit dieser scheinbar prinzipiellen Verdammung des Reichtums[18] steht Hermas nicht nur in seiner Zeit keineswegs allein; sondern noch mehr als ein halbes Jahrhundert später kann der (wohl etwas jüngere) Zeitgenosse des Klemens, der Nordafrikaner Tertullian, von Gott als „Verächter der Reichen" und „Helfer der Bettelarmen *(divitum aspernatorem, mendicorum advocatorem)*" sprechen (adv. Marc. N 15, 8; geschr. ca. 207/208), als dem, der „immerfort die Armen für gerecht erklärt, die Reichen hingegen *von vornherein* verdammt (semper *pauperes iustificat, divites praedamnat*) " (De pat. 7; geschr. 204).[19]

[18] Dass es sich in Wahrheit sehr viel differenzierter verhält mit der „Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im, Hirten des Hermas'", ist neuerdings bes. der gleichbetitelten Monographie von M. Leutzsch (FRLANT 150), Göttingen, 1989, sowie dessen Kommentar in SUC 3, Darmstadt 1998, zu entnehmen.

[19] Es ist allerdings einzuräumen, dass diese Äußerungen bei T. in einer kaum auflösbaren Spannung zu anderen stehen (vgl. etwa adv. Marc. IV 15, 8 Ende oder die auf den ersten Blick reichlich verwirrende Gedankenführung in apol. 39). Doch allein, dass die zitierten Aussagen überhaupt – und zwar ganz beiläufig, ohne anscheinend näherer Begründung zu bedürfen – so fallen, wie sie fallen, setzt doch wohl die Fortwirkung und Fortgeltung jener „Armenfrömmigkeit" voraus. Und nur darauf kam es hier an!

Ob es solche ‚ebionitischen' Strömungen auch in der unmittelbaren Umgebung des K. Gegeben habe, lässt sich nicht mehr mit Bestimmtheit sagen; immerhin könnte etwa das (vor allem durch Klemens und Origenes erstmals bezeugte) „Hebräerevangelium" darauf hindeuten.[20] Im Vordergrund der Auseinandersetzungen scheinen jedenfalls nicht sie, sondern Enkratiten gestanden zu haben, die K. (außer paed. II 33, 1; str. I 71, 5; VII 108, 2 noch) an zahlreichen (anderen) Stellen bekämpft, ohne sie namentlich zu erwähnen, sowie vor allem Gnostiker aller Schattierungen, darunter das (von A. Hilgenfeld[21]) sog. „gnostische Wunderkind" Epiphanes mit seiner Schrift Περί διακαιοσύνης[22]. Womöglich ging aber die Beunruhigung unter reichen Mitgliedern der alexandrinischen Christengemeinde, die K. nach seinen eigenen Worten zur Abfassung voη *Qds* veranlasste, einfach auf Bedenken zurück, wie sie „jeder Reiche... beim Lesen der Worte des Evangeliums über den Reichtum haben musste"[23]. Hingegen dürfte nichts dafür sprechen, dass K. diese Bedenken und Besorgnisse etwa erfunden oder durch frühere, eigentumskritischere Äußerungen selbst provoziert haben sollte, so dass er sich nun zu einer *retractatio* bemüßigt fühlte. – Unstrittig ist, dass bei ihm gegenüber (wie immer motivierter) radikaler Eigentumskritik ein *Sichtwechsel* erstmals auch seinen theologisch-literarischen Niederschlag gefunden hat, wie er sich auf den ersten Blick entschiedener kaum denken lässt. Dem entspricht auch, dass bei ihm die Naherwartung so gut wie keine Rolle mehr spielt (vgl. etwa str. III 49, 6 mit II 138, 2).

4.

Was hat K. dem Ideal völligen Eigentumsverzichts entgegenzustellen (etwa das Konzept *innerer* Freiheit)? Und wie begründet er seine Position? Wir lesen dazu Kap. 12, 1. Armut, hieß es unmittelbar zuvor, ist kein Wert an sich und alles andere als erstrebenswert. „Was also ist es nun", fährt

[20] Vgl. dazu P. Vielhauer/G. Strecker in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *Nt.liche Apokryphen*, I, 5. Aufl. Tübingen, 1987, 142ff.
[21] In ders., *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums urkundlich dargestellt*, Leipzig, 1884, p. 403.
[22] Vgl. das Referat bei Klemens, str. III 5, 1-1O, 1 und dazu W. A. Löhr in: Logos (FS f. L. Abramowski [BZNW 67]), Berlin, 1993, p. 12-29; ders., Karpokratianisches, ín VigChr 49 (1995), p. 23-48; G. G. Stroumsa in J. Assmann (Hg.), *Gerechtigkeit,* München, 1998, p. 149-161 („Gnostische Gerechtigkeit und Antinomismus").
[23] So O. Stählin in der Einleitung zu seiner Klemensübersetzung (BKV2 7), p. 37.

der Text fort, „das er", der Meister, dem ‚Jüngling' „als etwas Neues verkündigt, etwas, das Gott [allein] eigen ist und allein Leben verschafft, [etwas], das den früher Lebenden keine Rettung brachte? Ist (nämlich), was derjenige verkündet und lehrt, der die ‚neue Schöpfung' [nach Ko1 l, 15; 2 Kor 5, 17; Gal 6, 15 nicht nur heraufführt, sondern selber] *íst,* der Sohn Gottes, etwas Außerordentliches, so vertraut er [doch wohl] nichts Sinnenfälliges [vor aller Augen Liegendes] an, was auch andere taten, sondern etwas anderes, auf welches das Sinnenfällige [lediglich] verweist, etwas Größeres, Göttlicheres, Vollkommeneres: dass man [nämlich] die Seele selbst und seine Einstellung (διάθεσις) von den darin verborgenen Leidenschaften (τών ύπόντων παθών) reinigt und alles, was im Inneren nichts verloren hat [keinen Platz beanspruchen kann, vielmehr dem Herzen als fremd gelten muss (τά αλλότρια τής γνώμης)], mitsamt der Wurzel ausreißt und wegwirft. Das ist das dem Gläubigen eigene Lernziel (μάθημα), das ein Unterricht, des Heilands würdig".

Damit kann es allerdings für K. unmöglich sein Bewenden haben. Hat er doch schon in den Kapiteln 2 und 3 darauf hingewiesen, dass es mit der richtigen *Erkenntnis* (und demzufolge auch Gesinnung) allein nicht getan sei. Sondern wer zwar das Herrenwort richtig und sinngemäß verstehe, aber die daraus zu ziehenden Konsequenzen, anders gesagt: die „heilsamen *Werke*" schuldig bleibe, der erwarte vergeblich zu erlangen, was er erhoffe, weil er die erforderliche Voraussetzung nicht erfüllte (2, 3). Was aber sind die erwarteten ἔργα? Der Schluss von Kap. 3 nennt sie, indem er davon spricht, dass der Christ, der, der „gläubig ist und des Ausmaßes der göttlichen Liebe zu den Menschen gewärtig" (πιστός γε ὤν καὶ τὸ μεγαλείον συνορῶν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας), „sich selbst willig dem Logos als Lehrmeister im Kampf (γυμναστής) ... unterwirft. Als vorgeschriebene Speise und als Trank diene ihm das neue Testament des Herrn, seine Übungen (γνμνάσια) seien die Gebote (ἐντολαί), seine rechte Einstellung [εὐσχημοσύνη]) und sein Schmuck bestehe in den lobenswerten Verhaltensweisen (καλαὶ διαθέσεις) der Liebe, des Glaubens, der Hoffnung (1 Kor 13, l 3), der Erkenntnis der Wahrheit .... (Textlücke; vielleicht ist hier einzusetzen: der Güte [ἐπιείκεια]), der Sanftmut, der Barmherzigkeit, der Ehrbarkeit (σεμνότης), damit er ... [dereinst] mit gutem Gewisen als Sieger vor den Kampfrichter [Christus] treten kann ..." (3, 5. 6). Von da aus erscheint es noch in einem anderen Licht, wenn es am Schluss von Kap. 12 heißt: „Es ist ja illusorisch (ἀνέφικτον καὶ ἀμήχανον) [zu meinen], dass einer, dem es an dem fürs Leben Notwendigen fehlt, nicht in seinem Trachten niedergebeugt und vom Erstrebenswerteren (ἀπὸ τῶν κρειττόνων) abgehalten wird, da sein Sinnen stets darauf gerichtet ist, sich jenes (Lebensnotwendige) auf irgendeine Weise oder irgendwoher zu verschaffen" (12, 5). Das spricht nämlich nicht nur dagegen, sich einfach allen Besitzes zu entledigen, sondern weist zugleich auch darauf hin, mit wem es *zu teilen* gilt! – Man darf nie vergessen, dass K. von Anfang an zwei Zielrichtungen verfolgt: er bekämpft in *Qds* mit gleicher Energie wie die „Hoffnungslosigkeit" derer, die an einem buchstäblichen Verständnis des „Verkaufe, was du hast" (Mk 10, 21) zu scheitern drohen, die „Folgenlosigkeit" der richtigen Einsicht derer, die zwar verstehen, was Jesus dem „reichen Jüngling" sagen will, aber eben die Konsequenzen schuldig bleiben (2, 1-4).

Ich möchte nun mit Ihnen noch einen letzten Ausschnitt aus *Qds* anschauen und danach zu einem vorläufigen Fazit kommen und das Ergebnis einzuordnen versuchen. Es ist [497] das, nicht von ungefähr, vielfach als besonders dunkel empfundene und bezeichnete, Kap. 19, wo es heißt (ich lese wiederum nur meine Übersetzung): „(1) Der in Wahrheit und in rechter Weise Reiche ist also der, der reich an Tugenden ist und sich in alles, was ihm widerfährt, fromm und gläubig zu schicken vermag; der in falschem Sinne Reiche ist dagegen derjenige, der, fleischlich gesehen (in materieller Hinsicht), reich ist und sein Leben in den äußeren Besitz verlegt hat, welcher doch vergeht und verdirbt und von einer Hand in díe nächste wechselt, um am Ende überhaupt niemandem zu gehören. (2) Genau so gibt es umgekehrt einen echten Armen und einen anderen, welcher in falschem Sinne arm ist und zu unrecht so genannt wird. Der eine ist, geistig betrachtet, mithin an dem arm, was ihm wesenseigen ist (τὸ ἴδιον), der andere im Maßstab der Welt, also an dem arm, was ihm wesensfremd ist [nicht (wirklich) gehört (τὸ ἀλλότριον)]. (3) Zu dem nun, der, weltlich betrachtet, [zu ergänzen wohl: *nicht*] arm ist und im Sinne der Leídenschaften (πάθη)[24] reich, spricht der, der dem Geist nach *nicht* [hier ist ein οὐ überliefert, aber nach Stählin u. a. zu streíchen] arm ist und im Sinne Gottes[25] reich [sc. Jesus]: Gib den fremden Besitz, der in deiner Seele [als Fremdkörper] wohnt, preis, auf dass du reines Herzens werdest und Gott schauen mögest (vgl. Mt 5, 8), was mit anderen Worten

[24] Variierter Ausdruck für ὁ κατὰ σάρκα πλουτῶν (wie oben).
[25] Variierter Ausdruck für κατὰ πνεῦμα.

dasselbe besagt wie, ins Reich Gottes einzukehren. (4) Und wie kannst du ihn preisgeben? Indem du ihn ‚verkaufst'. Was aber heißt das? Solltest du statt des Besitzes Geld [in die Hand] nehmen, Reichtum gegen Reichtum tauschen und deine sichtbare Habe versilbern? (5) Weit gefehlt! Sondern wenn du deine Seele retten willst, dann gib all die Güter preis, die zuvor deine Seele in Besitz nahmen, und nimm stattdessen jenen Reichtum auf, der dich an Gottes Wesen teilhaben lässt [‚vergöttlicht'] und dir ewiges Leben schenkt: [es sind] die Haltungen [Verfassungen (διαθέσεις)], die sich Gottes Gebot unterwerfen. Der Lohn und Preis dafür wird sein unvergängliches Heil, Unsterblichkeit, die ewig währt. (6) Auf diese Weise wirst du der Aufforderung gerecht: ‚Verkaufe, was du hast': all das Viele und Überflüssige [sc. deiner Habe], das dir den Himmel verschließt, und du empfängst stattdessen, was dich zu retten vermag. Jene [Besitztümer (τὰ ὑπάρχοντα)] lass den materiell [‚fleischlich'] Armen zugute kommen, die ihrer bedürfen; du aber empfange dafür den geistigen Reichtum, und du dürftest schon [jetzt] ‚einen Schatz im Himmel haben' (Mk 10,21)".

„Gott hat uns, wie ich wohl weiß, das Recht gegeben, das Vorhandene zu nutzen (τῆς χρήσεως ... τὴν ἐξουσίαν), aber nur, soweit es das Notwendige nicht übersteigt, und sein erklärter Wille ist es, dass die Nutzung allen gemeinsam sei. Hingegen ist es widersinnig, wenn ein einzelner im Überfluss lebt, während die Mehrzahl Mangel leidet (ἄτοπον δὲ ἕνα τρυφᾶν πενομένων πλειόνων)", heißt es in paed. II 120, 5. Dass die Reichen von dem, was ihnen gehört, nicht mehr für sich selbst in Anspruch nehmen, als sich gebührt, dass sie zwar nicht einfach wegwerfen („verkaufen"), was sie haben, es aber so nutzen, dass alles, was den eigenen notwendigen Lebensbedarf übersteigt, denen zugute kommt, die es nötig haben, eben das scheint mir (wie schon vor mehr als 100 Jahren dem Neutestamentler A. Jülicher [in: ThLZ I 9(1894), 1, 20]) der naheliegendste Sinn unseres 19. Kapitels von *Qds* und insbesondere seines letzten Satzes zu sein. Eine andere Interpretation vertrat vor genau 50 Jahren der von mir ansonsten hochgeschätzte, inzwischen verstorbene U. Wickert. Hätte er recht, ginge es K. in diesem Kapitel ausschließlich um das Sichlösen von den „verderblichen Besitztümern der *Seele*", womit nach ihm die πάθη gemeint wären, so wüsste ich nicht, inwiefern dies Kapitel, mit W. zu reden, als „Höhepunkt einer Auslegung der Geschichte vom reichen Jüngling, die von der Art Zeugnis gibt, wie sich das alexandrinische [498] Christentum ... das paulinische ὡς μή zueigen gemacht hat“[26] und nicht vielmehr, etwas frech gesagt, als Zeugnis eines stoischen Missverständnisses sowohl dieser evangelischen Geschichte wie des paulinischen ὡς μή zu gelten hätte. Doch dürfte W.s Deutung im Sinne einer reinen „Allegorisierung“ oder „Spiritualisierung“ des „Verkaufe, was du hast, und gib’s den Armen“ an viererlei scheitern: 1. an der schon zu Beginn von *Qds* formulierten doppelten Stoßrichtung des ganzen Traktats (s.o.); 2. an der Erläuterung des „dem Geiste nach arm“ in 19, 2 mit „am Eigenen arm“, die es in der Tat, wie schon Jülicher richtig sah, als ausgeschlossen erscheinen lässt, dass „dem Geiste nach arm“ hier im Sinne der Seligpreisung der πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι von Mt 5, 3 positiv gemeint sei; 3. an der strikten Parallelität von (I) τῷ δὴ κατὰ κόσμον <οὐ> πτωχῷ καί πλουσίῳ κατὰ τὰ πάθη und (II) ὁ κατὰ πνεῦμα [οὐ] πτωχὸς καὶ κατὰ Θεὸν πλούσιος in 19, 3; sie zwingt entweder dazu, das οὐ in I mit Jülicher einzufügen (also zu konjizieren) und den Text in II so zu belassen, wie er (*mit* οὐ) überliefert ist, oder auf die Konjektur in I zu verzichten und dafür mit Segaar und O. Stählin (s. den kritischen Apparat bei letzterem z. St.) das οὐ in II zu streichen – M. Wacht in seiner Überarbeitung der Stählinschen Übersetzung (in Bd. 1 der von N. Brox hg. „Schriften der Kirchenväter“, München 1983), belässt es dabei, weil er meint, Stählins Übersetzung nehme keine von beiden Interpretationen vorweg (?). Doch scheint mir nach 19, 2 Ende und erst recht angesichts der Tatsache, dass wir es nach wie vor mit einer Auslegung der Geschichte vom „reichen Jüngling“ zu tun haben, *dieser* also mit dem gemeint sein muss, der, „im Weltmaßstab betrachtet, ‹nicht› arm und dafür reich an Leidenschaften“ ist, der „*Meister*“ hingegen mit dem, der, „geistig betrachtet, [nicht] arm und in Gott reich“ ist, nur die erste Möglichkeit in Betracht zu kommen. 4. steht W.s Deutung als m. E. unüberwindliches Hindernis entgegen, dass in 19, 6 vom „Verkauf“ der ὑπάρχοντα τὰ πολλὰ *καὶ περισσά* die Rede ist; das wäre doch wohl sinnlos, falls man τὰ ὑπάρχοντα (Mk 10, 21!) mit τὰ πάθη gleichzusetzen hätte. Denn von den „verderblichen Reichtümern *der*

[26] U. Wickert, Bemerkungen zu Clemens von Alexandrien (Quis dives salvetur 19 und 42), in: ZNW 50 (1959) 123-132 (Zitat: 128). W. liefert dort (128, Anm. 24) folgende interpretierende Übersetzung von Kap. 19, 6: „Jene verderblichen Besitztümer der Seele laß denen (ἐχέτωσαν hat wegwerfenden Klang), die sich in fleischlicher Weise lediglich der äußeren Besitztümer begeben und dementsprechend dieser (zuletzt angedeuteten) Tugenden ermangeln; du hingegen empfange für den Reichtum an schädlichen Leidenschaften, den du (gewissermaßen ihnen) dahíngibst, den Reichtum in Gott, und du wirst einen Schatz im Himmel haben“.

Seele“, d. h. den Leidenschaften, gälte es doch wohl im Sinne des K. nicht nur das „Überflüssige“, sondern schlechthin alles dranzugeben! Es können hier also nur die materiellen, irdischen Güter gemeint sein. Von ihnen heißt es: Lass (all das Viele und Überflüssige deiner Habe, das dir, falls du es nicht loszulassen vermagst, den Himmel verschließt) den materiell Armen zugute kommen, die es [bitter] nötig haben; du aber empfange dafür, (was du nicht nur „gewissermaßen“ [Wickert], sondern tatsächlích – hingegeben hast) den geistigen Reichtum (den Reichtum in Gott); „so wirst du einen Schatz im Himmel haben“. Kap. 19 schließt demnach „mit der Aufforderung, doch den falschen Reichtum (sc. an vergänglichen Gütern) zur Beseitigung beider Arten von Armut (sc. der fremden ‚fleischlichen‘ und der eigenen ‚geistígen‘) zu benutzen“ (A. Jülicher a.a.O.).

Fazit

Natürlich müsste man jetzt den ganzen Text von *Qds* unter unserer Fragestellung durchinterpretieren und sicherheitshalber auch die zahlreichen Parallelen im übrigen Werk des [499] Autors mitberücksichtigen, wozu ich vor vielen Jahren, in einem Aufsatz in der ZKG[27], wenigstens erste Schritte zu unternehmen versuchte. Dass zumindest die Richtung stimme, hat mir später M. Wacht bestätigt[28], der sich besonders aufgrund seiner umfang- und inhaltreichen Artikel „Gütergemeinschaft“ und „Güterlehre“ (RAC 13 [1986] 1-150) als Fachmann auf diesem Gebiet ausgewiesen haben dürfte.

Heute muss es mit einer, wie ich denke, immerhin charakteristischen Auswahl sein Bewenden haben. Dennoch lässt sich auch so ein vorläufiges Fazit wagen:

K. bewegt sich, wie zu sehen war, in *Qds* mit größter Selbstverständlichkeit besonders in stoischen Denkkategorien, so wie es M. Pohlenz 1943 in seinem Beitrag „Klemens von Alexandrien und sein hellenisches Christentum“[29] darlegte. Vor allem die Rede vom Reichtum als einem ἀλλότριον, einem der unserer Verfügung entzogenen „Außendinge“, die uns nicht weiter angehen (τὰ ἐκτός im Gegensatz zu τὰ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν), als

[27] A. M. Rítter, *Christentum und Eigentum bei Klemens von Alexandríen auf dem Hintergrund der frühchristlichen „Armenfrömmigkeit“ und der Ethik der kaiserzeitlichen Stoa*, in: ZKG 86, 1975, p. 1-25; wieder abgedr. in ders. Charisma und Caritas. Aufsätze zur Geschíchte der Alten Kirche, Göttingen, 1993, p. 283-307.

[28] In seiner Erläuterungen zu Autor und Text von Qds (in: Schríften der Kirchenväter l, München, 1983, p. 76).

[29] NAWG 1943, p. 103-180.

einem ἀδιάφορον, für unser wahres Wohl und Wesen schlechterdings gleichgültig und, für sich genommen, ethisch indifferent, sie nimmt, wie Sie wohl alle wissen, Gedanken auf, die bei Seneca wie in der Stoa überhaupt so häufig wiederkehren, dass sich ausführliche Belege erübrigen. Doch haben sich schon in den wenigen Auszügen, die wir allein näher betrachten konnten, denke ich, auch wichtige Unterschiede, z.T. sogar solche von grundsätzlicherer Bedeutung, angedeutet. Innere, geistige Unabhängigkeit von den materiellen Gütern ist für Klemens wichtig, aber nicht letztes Ziel, eher nur Voraussetzung für eine „Haltung" (διάθεσις), die er allein als eigentlich christlich bezeichnen würde. Und darin kommt wohl etwas prinzipiell Wichtiges zu Gesicht. Ich beschreibe den Gegensatz mit den Worten M. Wachts: Davon abgesehen, dass die schöpfungstheologische Begründung und Bestimmung des Reichtums, mit der unser Text bereits in Kap. 1, 2-4[30] einsetzte, „in der stoischen Lehre natürlich keine Entsprechung hat, m. a. W. die positive Charakterisierung des Besitzes als Gabe Gottes zum Wohl der Mitmenschen ein indifferentes Verhalten ausschließt": „der ‚rechte Gebrauch' ist innerhalb der Stoa gewissermaßen Sammelbegriff für das richtige Verhalten der autarken Persönlichkeit zu den äußeren Dingen. ‚Gut' oder ‚schlecht' werden bezogen auf das handelnde Subjekt und nach dessen Nutzen oder Schaden bemessen: Richtig gebrauche ich den Reichtum, wenn es der Förderung meiner sittlichen Persönlichkeit", m. a. W. meiner naturgemässen Bestimmung zur „Selbstverwirklichung" *(suum fieri)* „dient. Selbst die gewiss nachdrücklichen sozialethischen Forderungen, die die Stoa weit mehr als alle anderen philosophischen Richtungen der Antike erhebt, sind letztlich individualethisch begründet. Klemens rückt dagegen den Nächsten und seine Bedürfnisse viel stärker in den Mittelpunkt" (M. Wacht).[31]

E. Mühlenberg sieht das offensichtlich anders, obwohl, wie erwähnt, eine ‚.sog. materiale Ethik" nicht sein Darstellungsziel war in dem oben gelobten Buch; immerhin fügt er hinzu: „aber natürlich ist überzeugend

[30] Vgl. auch 6, 4-7, 2, wonach Jesus, anknüpfend an die Anrede des „Jünglings" („Guter Meister"), von eben diesem Ausgangspunkt aus seine Unterweisung beginnt, „indem er den Jünger auf Gott als den Guten, ersten und einzigen Verwalter ewigen Lebens hinweist, das der Sohn von ihm empfangen hat und uns gibt". Das ist, folgert Klemens, die „größte und wichtigste der zum Leben führenden Lehren". Aus seiner Freigebigkeit, heißt es 12, 5ff., fließen uns aber auch die irdischen Güter zu, die an sich ἀδιάφοροι sind. Es kommt allein darauf an, wie wir sie gebrauchen (15, 3).

[31] Wie o., Anm. 16 (25), 85f.

herausgestellt worden (mir ist nicht klar geworden, [500] von wem?), dass die Trennlinie zwischen antik philosophischer Ethik und einer gesonderten christlichen Ethik sehr dünn ist".[32]

Víelleicht dient ja unser Gespräch dazu, dass ich das besser verstehe. Ich danke Ihnen.

32 Wie o., S. 5.

Michael Welker[1]

Das Genie des Paulus und sein Beitrag zur interdisziplinären Anthropologie

Zusammenfassung

Die Frage der Anthropologie bei bei Paulus stellt eine wichtige Herausforderund jeder einzelenen Theologen, der sich wissenschaftlich in diesem Horizon bewegt. Dieser Beitrag versucht die Problematik im Zusammenhang der vier Schwerpunkten zu forschen: der Dualismus von Fleisch und Geist, die Vieldimensionalität des Leibes, Geist und Seele, Herz und Gewissen. Um in die theologischen Dimensionen dieses Denkens aufzusteigen, müssen die Interaktionen „im Geist" zwischen Menschen, die natürlich direkt und indirekt auch auf den einzelnen Menschen stark rückwirken, erschlossen werden. Ihre Gefährdung und ihre Stärkung durch von Menschen erzeugte und von Gott gegebene geistige Kräfte sind dann ins Auge zu fassen. Die Unterscheidung der Geister (I Kor 12, 10) wird zu einer wichtigen Funktion, in der der Geist Gottes in seiner belebenden, befreienden und erhebenden Kraft erkannt und geschätzt werden muss. Wir müssten uns dann auf das große Gebiet der Christologie einlassen, da der Geist Gottes als der Geist Christi den Menschen nahe kommt, um die Menschen zur Ähnlichkeit des Menschseins Christi zu gelangen.

Stichwörter

Dualismus, Anthropologie, Fleisch und Geist, Herz und Gewissen, menschlicher Geist

In einem mehrjährigen internationalen und interdisziplinären Forschungsprojekt hatten wir uns drei Ziele gesetzt:

Wir wollten erstens fragen: Was spricht für und was spricht gegen die dualisierenden Anthropologien in Geschichte und Gegenwart, die mit

[1] Ph.D., University of Heidelberg, maw.pnj@web.de.

Phänomen- und Denkstrukturen wie z.B. „Leib und Seele", „Geist und Körper", aber auch „Selbstbewusstsein und Bewusstsein" oder „Gehirn und Geist" ansetzen?

Wir wollten zweitens prüfen, ob die theologische Rede von „Seele und Geist" Phänomene und Funktionen erfasst hat und auch heute wissenschaftlich vertretbar zu erfassen vermag, die von Theorien wie denen des Selbstbewusstseins, die diese Größen säkularisiert oder verdrängt zu haben scheinen, nicht eingeholt und aufgehoben werden konnten.

Drittens wollten wir der leiblichen Verfassung des Menschen Rechnung zu tragen suchen, ohne in naturalistische Reduktionismen zu verfallen.

Wir starteten dieses Projekt vor einigen Jahren unter dem Arbeitstitel „Body – Soul – Spirit: Regaining a Complex Notion of the Human Person". Dabei lösten ein neutestamentlicher Impuls, naturwissenschaftliche Denkangebote zu interdisziplinärer Verständigung und eine nachdrückliche philosophische Warnung das Interesse an der komplexen Anthropologie des Paulus aus.

Der neutestamentliche Impuls wurde eingebracht durch einen Beitrag von Gerd Theißen zur Differenzierung von *sarx* und *soma* bei Paulus und seine systematisch aufschlussreichen analytischen Potentiale. Die Herausforderung von Seiten anglo-amerikanischer Naturwissenschaftler lag in rahmentheoretischen Angeboten, die sie für den Diskurs unterbreiteten. Sie experimentierten mit einem „non-reductive naturalism" oder einem „dual-aspect monism", die uns Geisteswissenschaftlern mit einer reduktionistischen Phänomenblindheit geschlagen schienen.[2] Doch unsere programmatische Idee „Regaining a Complex Notion of the Human Person" erwies sich als nicht weniger problematisch. Nachdrücklich gab der Heidelberger Philosoph Andreas Kemmerling zu bedenken:

> „Etwas, das an dem Begriff der Person zutiefst verwirrend ist, ist dies: sein unerschöpflicher Reichtum. Selbst der basale und dürrste, ‚ontologische', Begriff der Person ist unerschöpflich vielfältig. Und es ist völlig unklar, welche seiner Merkmale Kernbestandteile sind – und welche eher an den begrifflichen

[2] Vgl. z.B. die verzweifelten Bemühungen, den Dualismus von „physicalism and mentalism" durch einen „non-reductive physicalism" zu überwinden, in: W. S. Brown et al, *Whatever Happened to the Soul? Scientific and Theological Portraits of Human Nature*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1998.

> Rand gehören oder vielleicht sogar nur als von anderen abgeleitet zu betrachten sind.“[3]

Gegenüber der Furcht, im Nachdenken über menschliche Personalität durch dualisierende Reduktionismen eine Phänomenblindheit zu erzeugen und wichtige Wissensgebiete strukturell auszugrenzen, hat Andreas Kemmerling die Gefahr beschworen, „über den Reichtum (des Begriffs der Person) ins Grübeln (zu) verfallen“ und „in einem Fass ohne Boden (zu) versinken“. Er hat vorgeschlagen, die inhaltlichen und theoretischen Interessen offenzulegen, die mit einer Diskussion über diesen Begriff verbunden werden sollen, um auf diesem Wege zu versuchen, „ein bisschen Ordnung in das begriffliche Durcheinander zu bringen“.[4] Mit Hilfe einer Rekonstruktion der Anthropologie des Paulus möchte ich dieser Aufgabe in fünf Schritten nachkommen.

Im *ersten* Abschnitt werde ich den scharfen **Dualismus von Fleisch und Geist** bei Paulus beleuchten, der ja geradezu als Wurzel zahlreicher reduktionistischer Übel in der Anthropologie angesehen werden kann. Der *zweite* Abschnitt wird Paulus’ Beobachtungen zur **Vieldimensionalität des menschlichen Leibes** behandeln. **Geist und Seele** werden im *dritten* Abschnitt thematisiert. Im *vierten* Schritt wird Paulus’ Rede von **Herz und Gewissen als Indikatoren komplexer anthropologischer Themenfelder verdeutlicht**. Im *fünften* Abschnitt soll kurz aus anthropologischer Perspektive das Verhältnis m**enschlicher Geist und Gottes Geist** betrachtet werden**.**

I. Der Dualismus von Fleisch und Geist

Im Galaterbrief nennt Paulus Fleisch und Geist „Feinde“, weil sie jeweils ein „Begehren“ auslösen, das dem der anderen Seite entgegensteht. Durch diese feindselige Konstellation bedingen sie eine Unfreiheit im Menschen, die sich nur dann aufheben lässt, wenn dieser sich vom Geist leiten lässt:

> „Darum sage ich: Lasst euch vom Geist leiten, dann werdet ihr das Begehren des Fleisches nicht erfüllen; denn das Begehren

[3] Andreas Kemmerling, *Was macht den Begriff der Person so besonders schwierig*?, in: „Gegenwart des lebendigen Christus“, hg. G. Thomas u. A. Schüle, EVA, Leipzig, 2007, 541-565, 544f.

[4] Kemmerling, aaO., p. 564 und 563.

des Fleisches richtet sich gegen den Geist, das Begehren des Geistes aber gegen das **Fleisch;** beide stehen sich als Feinde gegenüber, sodass ihr nicht imstande seid, das zu tun, was ihr wollt.“ (Gal 5,16f)

Die vom Begehren des Fleisches bestimmten Menschen sind der Endlichkeit, der Vergänglichkeit und dem Verderben unterworfen; die vom Geist bestimmten „ernten ewiges Leben“ (vgl. Gal 6, 8).

Diese Überzeugung vertritt auch der Römerbrief: „Das Trachten des Fleisches führt zum Tod, das Trachten des Geistes aber zu Leben und Frieden“ (Röm 8, 6). Der nachdrückliche Rat des Paulus lautet deshalb: „Wenn ihr nach dem **Fleisch** lebt, müsst ihr sterben; wenn ihr aber durch den Geist die Taten des Leibes tötet, werdet ihr leben.“ (Röm 8, 13) Wie immer die negativ konnotierten „Taten des Leibes“ und das merkwürdige Töten dieser Taten durch den Geist im Einzelnen zu verstehen sind – es ist zunächst festzuhalten, dass Paulus das Fleisch nicht einfach als eine möglichst völlig zu ignorierende dämonische Größe ansieht.

Obwohl Paulus auch durch die scharfe Unterscheidung von *sarx* und *soma*, Fleisch und Leib, die Fesselung der geschöpflichen Dimension des Fleisches an die Vergänglichkeit immer wieder stark unterstreicht[5], ist die „Materialität“ des Fleisches gegenüber Stein und Staub durchaus eine zu schätzende Größe: Der zweite Korintherbrief betont im Anschluss an einen Assoziationszusammenhang von Ex 24, 12, Ez 11, 19; 36, 26 und Jer 31, 33: „Unverkennbar seid ihr ein Brief Christi, ausgefertigt durch unseren Dienst, geschrieben... mit dem Geist des lebendigen Gottes, nicht auf Tafeln aus Stein, sondern – wie auf Tafeln – in Herzen von Fleisch.“ (2 Kor 3, 3) Die Erwägung, dies könnte ein zufälliges oder gar verunglücktes Spiel mit Worten sein, wird durch Aussagen über den Offenbarungsdienst nicht nur des Leibes, sondern auch des Fleisches ausgeräumt, zum Beispiel 2 Kor 4, 11: „Denn immer werden wir, obgleich wir leben, um Jesu willen dem Tod ausgeliefert, damit auch das Leben Jesu an unserem sterblichen **Fleisch** offenbar wird.“

Wohl steht das Fleisch für die irdische, hinfällige und vergängliche Existenz. Aber dieser kommt nicht weniger als die Würde zu, die Abstammung eines Lebens und auch den Ernst und die Dramatik des

[5] S. dazu den Beitrag von Gerd Theißen; vgl. auch zahlreiche alttestamentliche Aussagen wie Jes 40, 6: „Alles Fleich ist wie Gras“, das verdorrt (vgl. 40, 7f); Hi 7, 5: „Mein Fleisch ist eine Beute des Gewürms.“

göttlichen Offenbarungswillens zu markieren: Nach dem Römerbrief verkündigt Paulus das Evangelium des Sohnes Gottes „der dem **Fleisch** nach geboren ist als Nachkomme Davids" (Röm 1, 3; vgl. 8, 3). Und Israel wird dessen gerühmt, dass ihm „dem Fleisch nach der (über allem stehende) Christus entstammt" (Röm 9, 5). Wird die von Paulus vielfältig betonte gottesdienstliche Bedeutung, ja Offenbarungskraft des menschlichen Leibes ernst genommen (s.u.) und wird gesehen, dass der irdische Leib auf das von ihm deutlich unterschiedene Fleisch nicht verzichten kann, so müssen primitive Entweder-Oder-Vorstellungen im Blick auf „Fleisch und Geist" verabschiedet werden. Das Fleisch gehört unabdingbar zur historisch-materiellen Basis der leiblichen und damit auch der nach Paulus höherstufigen irdischen menschlichen Existenz in Gestalt von Herz, Seele und Geist.

Allerdings wird die Größe „Fleisch" als notorisch endliche und vergängliche Basis menschlicher Existenz gefährlich, wenn sie alles „Trachten und Begehren" steuert. Paulus spielt in seinen harten Aussagen über „das Fleisch" immer wieder auf die fleischlich-leiblichen Grundfunktionen der Ernährung und der Reproduktion an. Dominiert das Interesse daran die menschliche Existenz, ohne diese Funktionen in den Dienst des Geistes zu stellen, so verfällt diese Existenz „der Sünde und dem Tod". Paulus geizt bekanntlich nicht mit Seitenhieben gegen die Völlerei, die Trunksucht und die Diversifizierung von Sexualkontakten (vgl. Gal 5, 19ff; 1 Kor 5, 1; 6, 9f. 13ff; 10, 8; 11, 20; 2 Kor 12, 21; Röm 1, 26f; 13, 13). Oberflächlich betrachtend, könnte man dies einer „Leib - und Lustfeindlichkeit" des Paulus zurechnen. Tatsächlich erwächst diese harte Kritik an sich verselbständigenden Interessen „des Fleisches" aus der Sorge, die für Gott und sein Evangelium gewonnenen Mitmenschen könnten sich wieder von Mächten beherrschen lassen, die sie an die Vergeblichkeit und Vergänglichkeit menschlichen Lebens ausliefern und die Aussicht auf die Vorhaben Gottes mit ihnen und die Perspektiven des Geistes versperren.

Eine abstrakte und totalisierende Verneinung des Fleisches wird dennoch der Anthropologie des Paulus nicht gerecht. Ebenso geht eine Begeisterung für vage metaphysische und religiöse Vorstellungen, wie die von einem „reinen Geist" und einer „unmittelbaren menschlichen Gottesbeziehung im Geist" an seinem scharf beobachtenden und differenzierenden Denken vorbei. Dies kann (und sollte) man sich anhand seiner Auseinandersetzung mit dem Zungenreden in Korinth deutlich machen: „Denn wer in Zungen redet, redet nicht zu Menschen, sondern zu Gott; keiner versteht ihn: Im Geist redet er geheimnisvolle Dinge. Wer aber prophetisch redet, redet zu Menschen: Er baut auf, ermutigt, spendet Trost." (1Kor 14, 2f) Paulus ist ersichtlich wenig begeistert von der Zungenrede, der er immerhin bescheinigt, direkt „im Geist" zu reden, und zwar „zu Gott". Auch hier liegt keine einmalige Entgleisung vor, die begeisterte Mystiker und moderne religiöse Transzendentalspießer beruhigt abtun könnten. Nicht nur öffentliche Rede „in Zungen" wird von Paulus milde kritisiert. Auch Gebet und Doxologie „in Zungen", angestrebt und hergestellt im menschlichen „Geist" als Direktkontakte zu Gott, unterliegen seiner Kritik: „Denn wenn ich nur in Zungen bete, betet zwar mein Geist, aber mein Verstand (*nous*) bleibt unfruchtbar. Was folgt daraus? Ich will nicht nur im Geist beten, sondern auch mit dem Verstand. Ich will nicht nur im Geist Gott preisen, sondern auch mit dem Verstand." (1 Kor 14, 14f)

Diese Ausführungen sind in mehrfacher Hinsicht aufschlussreich. So wie Paulus nicht „das Fleisch" en bloc verdammt, so kritisiert er nicht vernichtend glossolalische oder andere spirituelle Versuche einer direkten Kontaktaufnahme mit Gott. 1 Kor 14, 18 dankt er gegenüber den Korinthern Gott, dass er „mehr als ihr alle" in Zungen rede – auf welcher Vergleichsbasis auch immer. Dennoch bietet er in diesem Kontext ein starkes Plädoyer für eine vernünftige Rede in einem vernünftigen Gottesdienst: „Wenn du nur im Geist den Lobpreis sprichst und ein Unkundiger anwesend ist, so kann er zu deinem Dankgebet das Amen nicht sagen; denn er versteht nicht, was du sagst. Dein Dankgebet mag noch so gut sein, der andere hat keinen Nutzen davon." (1 Kor 14, 16f) Drastisch hält er fest, er wolle „vor der Gemeinde lieber fünf Worte mit Verstand / Vernunft (*nous*) reden, um auch andere zu unterweisen, als zehntausend Worte in Zungen stammeln." (14,19) Höchst eindringlich warnt er vor einer „im Geist" ausrastenden Gemeinde: „Wenn also die ganze Gemeinde sich versammelt und alle in Zungen reden, und es kommen Unkundige oder Ungläubige hinzu, werden sie dann nicht sagen: Ihr seid verrückt!" (14, 23)

Die deutliche, aber nicht völlig vernichtenden Kritik an der Glossolalie im direkten Kontakt zu Gott „im Geist" verbindet sich mit einer deutlichen Sympathieerklärung für den Gebrauch des *nous* auch in geistlichen und gottesdienstlichen Kontexten, sogar im Gebet und in der Doxologie. Verstand und Vernunft sind dabei keine hochkomplizierten, nur durch transzendentale philosophische Bildungsanstrengungen erreichbare Größen. Sie müssen nicht, wie bei Kant, durch post-pietistische Läuterungsprozesse hindurch errungen werden. Nous steht vielmehr für verstehbare und mit klaren Überzeugungsinteressen verbundene Äußerungen. Auch Außenstehende sollen belehrt werden und überzeugt einstimmen können („Amen sagen"). Emotionale Überwältigungsversuche, kognitiv oder moralisch, sind keine Markenzeichen „des Geistes". Das Profil des Geistes wird nicht in der abstrakten Entgegensetzung gegen „das Fleisch" und in einer wesentlich numinosen oder individualistisch weitgehend gegen Außenkontakte abgeriegelten „rein geistigen" Gottesbeziehung erkennbar. Es bedarf vielmehr einer reflektierten Wahrnehmung und Würdigung des Leibes, um den Geist und seine Wirkstätten im individuellen und gemeinschaftlichen menschlichen Leben zu erfassen.

II. Die Vieldimensionalität des Leibes

Beachtet man nur die Aussagen des Paulus über den irdischen, verweslichen Leib (1 Kor 15), der uns in der Fremde fern von Gott leben lässt (2 Kor 5), der, von der Sünde beherrscht (Röm 6), seiner Erlösung und Rettung aus der Verlorenheit und Sterblichkeit heraus harrt (Röm 8), so ist man leicht geneigt, *sarx* und *soma*, Fleisch und Leib, zu identifizieren. Doch obwohl der irdische Leib fleischlich ist und damit auch an den Hinfälligkeiten und Gefährdungen des Fleisches Anteil hat, muss er nach Paulus deutlich von ihm unterschieden werden. Er ist keineswegs nur vom Fleisch, sondern auch von vielfältigen psychischen und geistigen Kräften geprägt und weist ganz andere Dynamiken auf als das auf seinen Selbsterhalt ausgerichtete Fleisch.

Paulus sieht den Leib nicht einfach als eine „materiale Instanz und Basis" an, die bloßer Träger interessanterer und höherwertiger „Vermögen" wäre. Der Leib ist vielmehr ein komplexer vielgliedriger Organismus, der sehr verschiedene Dienste und Funktionen miteinander verbindet. Als solcher ist er ein Bereich, eine Sphäre, in der Gott „wohnen" und durch die Gott verherrlicht werden will: „Oder wisst ihr nicht, dass euer Leib ein Tempel des Heiligen Geistes ist, der in euch wohnt und den ihr von

Gott habt? Ihr gehört nicht euch selbst; denn um einen teuren Preis seid ihr erkauft worden. Verherrlicht also Gott in eurem Leib!“ (1 Kor 6, 19f)

Paulus kann den Leib geradezu als Offenbarungsträger darstellen, an dem Leben und Sterben Jesu erkennbar werden (2 Kor 4, 10; Gal 6, 17): „Darauf warte und hoffe ich, dass... Christus in aller Öffentlichkeit - wie immer, so auch jetzt – durch meinen Leib verherrlicht wird, ob ich lebe oder sterbe.“ (Phil 1, 20) Im Blick auf den Leib als vielgliedrigen Organismus veranschaulicht Paulus langatmig die Existenz des nachösterlichen auferstandenen Christus und die Verfassung seiner Kirche (vgl. besonders 1 Kor 12, 12ff):

> „Denn wie der Leib eine Einheit ist, doch viele Glieder hat, alle Glieder des Leibes aber, obgleich es viele sind, einen einzigen Leib bilden: so ist es auch mit Christus. Durch den einen Geist wurden wir in der Taufe alle in einen einzigen Leib aufgenommen, Juden und Griechen, Sklaven und Freie; und alle wurden wir mit dem einen Geist getränkt.“

Wiederholt fordert Paulus die angeschriebenen Mitchristen auf, sich als zusammenwirkende Glieder am einen Leib Christi zu verstehen: „Ihr aber seid der Leib Christi, und jeder einzelne ist ein Glied an ihm.“ (1 Kor 12, 27; s.a. Röm 12, 4f).

Im Blick auf die „Erbauung“ und die Lebendigkeit des vielgliedrigen Leibes versucht Paulus, das Wirken des göttlichen Geistes und die hohe Bedeutung der Sakramente Taufe und Abendmahl zu verdeutlichen. Die in die Herzen der Glaubenden durch den Geist „ausgegossene Liebe“ (Röm 5, 5) schließt diese zum Leib Christi zusammen.[6] Dabei wirkt Gott durch den Geist an jedem einzelnen Menschen. Der Geist teilt jedem Menschen „seine besondere Gabe zu, wie er will“ (1 Kor 12, 11). ((„Nun aber hat Gott jedes einzelne Glied so in den Leib eingefügt, wie es seiner Absicht entsprach.“ (1 Kor 12, 18))) Das Wunder des organischen Zusammenspiels der individuellen Glieder im einen Leib ist geistgewirkt.[7] Geistgewirkt ist

---

[6] Zur Relevanz der Figur der „Ausgießung des Geistes“ s. M. Welker, *Gottes Geist. Theologie des Heiligen Geistes*, Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen 4. Aufl. 2010, 132ff und 214ff.

[7] John Polkinghorne hat vorgeschlagen, die Personalität des Geistes in seiner Kontext-Sensitivität zu erkennen: J. Polkinghorne u. M. Welker, *An den lebendigen Gott glauben. Ein Gespräch*, Gütersloher Verlagshaus, Gütersloh 2005, 103ff; ders., *The Hidden Spirit and the Cosmos*, in: M. Welker (ed.), *The Work of the Spirit. Pneumatology and Pentecostalism*, Eerdmans: Grand Rapids and Cambridge 2006, 169ff; s.a. die

aber auch die gemeinsame Ausstrahlung und gezielte Aktivität der Glieder des Leibes. Die Betonung dieses Zusammenwirkens von Geist und Leib kann noch einmal die Kritik des Paulus am Bemühen um eine „rein geistige" Kontaktaufnahme mit Gott in der Zungenrede unterstreichen.

Schließlich wird die hohe Bedeutung des Leibes auch in seiner spezifischen Materialität durch die Einsetzung des Abendmahls betont. Das geteilte und die Gemeinde zeichenhaft nährende und „erbauende" Brot ist der „Leib Christi". Das Brot wird nicht als zum Verzehr und zum Vergehen bestimmtes „Fleisch Christi" bezeichnet. Das „gebrochene und geteilte Brot" symbolisiert nicht nur das Nahrungsmittel, sondern auch friedevolle Tischgemeinschaft. Es nährt zeichenhaft und verbindet zeichenhaft durch die teilende Teilhabe eine Vielzahl von Menschen und wird so mit dem „Leib" Jesu Christi identifiziert. Nicht nur „im Geist", sondern auch sinnfällig und „im Leib" geht der auferstandene Christus – durch die Schöpfungsgaben Brot und Wein vermittelt – in seine Glieder ein, die zu Trägerinnen und Trägern seiner nachösterlichen Existenz erbaut werden.[8] Ein nicht leicht zu erfassendes Zusammenspiel von Geist und Leib in Autonomie und Kooperation der Glieder des Leibes liegt vor. Dieses Zusammenspiel weist dienend über den Selbsterhalt des Organismus hinaus und wird so zu einem Hoffnungszeichen für die eschatologische Bestimmung der leiblichen Existenz der Glaubenden.

Das wunderbare belebende Zusammenwirken des Geistes mit dem vielgliedrigen Leib ist ein Anzeichen dafür, dass der Leib in seiner Fleischlichkeit nicht aufgeht und mit seiner fleischlichen Hinfälligkeit und Endlichkeit nicht identifiziert werden muss. Vor allem aber verweist die wunderbare Erbauung der auch natürlich-organischen Gemeinschaft des „Leibes Christi" auf die Macht des Geistes, eine neue Wirklichkeit zu schaffen, die der vom Geist geprägten leibhaftigen Existenz eine Hoffnung auf ein Leben über ihre „fleischliche" Endlichkeit hinaus weckt.[9] Paulus fasst

---

Beiträge in: M. Welker (hg.), *The Spirit in Creation and New Creation: Science and Theology in Western and Orthodox Realms*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids u. Cambridge / U.K. 2012.

[8] Vgl. M. Welker, *Was geht vor beim Abendmahl*?, Gütersloher Verlag, Gütersloh, 4. Aufl. 2012, 90ff.

[9] Dazu J. Polkinghorne u. M. Welker (ed.s), *The End of the World and the Ends of God: Science and Theology on Eschatology*, Trinity Press, Harrisburg, 2000; H.-J. Eckstein u. M. Welker (ed.s), *Die Wirklichkeit der Auferstehung*, Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 4. Aufl. 2010, bes. 311ff.

dies im Philipperbrief in die Hoffnung, dass Christus „unseren armseligen Leib verwandeln wird in die Gestalt seines verherrlichten Leibes, in der Kraft, mit der er sich alles unterwerfen kann. (Phil 3, 21) In anderen Schreiben sieht er diese neuschöpferische Kraft vom Schöpfer, vor allem aber vom Geist Gottes ausgehen (vgl. Röm 5, 5ff; 8, 21ff; 1 Kor 15, 34ff; 2 Kor 3, 18). Paulus lässt sich in diesen Überlegungen nicht einfach von religiösen Wunschvorstellungen und Phantasien tragen. Beobachtungen hinsichtlich der inneren Verfassung des menschlichen Geistes und anderer „mentaler" Kräfte bestärken ihn in seinen eschatologischen Ausblicken.

III. Geist und Seele

In vielen religiösen und nicht-religiösen Kontexten wird „Geist" assoziiert mit mentalen und kognitiven Begabungen und Aktivitäten. Die zugleich trivialen und höchst erstaunlichen Fähigkeiten, Gegenstände, Personen und Ereignisse zu erinnern und zu imaginieren und sie trotz raumzeitlicher Distanzen zu verknüpfen, werden dem menschlichen Geist zugeschrieben. Sowohl in theologischer als auch in anthropologischer Hinsicht ermöglicht der Geist Kopräsenz und Kontakt mit Abwesenden. Über unsere Erinnerungen und Imaginationen können wir „im Geist" über raumzeitliche Differenzen hinweg mit anderen Menschen in Kontakt treten. Nach Paulus' Überzeugung kann diese Kontaktaufnahme bis zu Graden authentischer Kopräsenz und Interaktion gesteigert werden. Über die Erinnerung an eigene Besuche, die Lehre und die Verkündigung, über die Fürbitte vor Gott, aber auch durch Briefe und Botenberichte vermittelt, will Paulus „im Geist" in der Gemeinde präsent werden. Diese Präsenz ist nicht nur ein Faktor seiner eigenen Imagination. 1 Kor 5 beschreibt er einen solchen geistigen Kommunikations- und Koaktionsprozess: „Ich meinerseits habe – leiblich zwar abwesend, geistig aber anwesend – mein Urteil über den dies verübt Habenden schon jetzt gefällt, als ob ich persönlich anwesend wäre: Im Namen Jesu, unseres Herrn, wollen wir, wenn ihr und mein Geist versammelt seid..." (1 Kor 5, 3f). Dabei spielen „der Name" und „die Kraft des Herrn", und gewiss auch der an dieser Stelle nicht ausdrücklich erwähnte Geist Gottes eine wichtige verbindende Rolle im Zusammenschluss der Gemeinde – auch ganz generell, also mit und ohne leibliche Kopräsenz. Es ist aber keineswegs so, dass man auf den Heiligen

Geist Bezug nehmen müsste, um den geistigen Kommunikationsprozess zwischen Paulus und den Korinthern nachzuvollziehen.

Schwieriger zu erfassen ist der nur 11 Mal im *corpus paulinum* begegnende Begriff der *psyche*, der bald mit „Seele“, bald mit „Leben“ oder auch „Mensch“ übersetzt wird. Er nimmt den Ausdruck *näfäsch* aus dem Alten Testament auf, der mit „Kehle, Hals, Begehren, Seele, Leben, Person“ und als Pronomen übersetzt werden kann.[10] Bemerkenswerterweise ist nach 1Kor 2,14 der „psychische Mensch“ „unfähig, das Wirken durch den Geist zu vernehmen“.[11] Der Ausdruck *psyche* umfasst ein individuelles irdisches Leben, die irdische leiblich-geistige Individualität, die zwar von Gott geschaffen, aber damit (noch) nicht von Gottes Geist erfüllt ist. Der „erste Adam“ wird von Paulus als „lebendige psyche“ und damit als vergängliches Wesen angesehen, während Jesus Christus als der „letzte Adam“ ein „lebendigmachender Geist“ ist (vgl. 1 Kor 15, 45). Nicht nur an seiner Verkündigung, sondern an seiner leib-geistigen „*psyche*“ gibt Paulus den Thessalonichern Anteil, weil er sie lieb gewonnen hat (1 Thess 2, 9). Er schwört den Korinthern vor Gott und bei seiner Psyche, und er versichert, sich für ihre Psychen aufreiben zu wollen (2 Kor 1, 23 und 12, 15), wobei der Ausdruck wohl unmissverständlicher in beiden Fällen mit „Leben“ übersetzt werden sollte (so auch Phil 2, 30 und Röm 2, 9; 11, 3).

Man wird den heute so beliebten Ausdruck „ganzheitlich“ nur zögernd mit *psyche* verbinden, wenn man nicht geistliche und theologische Dimensionen menschlichen Lebens ausblenden will. Nach Röm 13,1 soll „jede *psyche* der staatlichen Gewalt, die von Gott eingesetzt ist, Gehorsam leisten“. Paulus könnte aber kaum sagen: jeder Mensch solle dem Staat „von ganzem Herzen und mit allen Kräften des Geistes dienen“. Gegenüber heute in euro-amerikanischen Kontexten erwartbaren Assoziationszusammenhängen ist die Rede von *psyche* im Sinne von „Seele, Person und Leben“ bei Paulus ganz offensichtlich säkular gefasst. Andererseits werden Vernunft und Verstand (*nous*) durchaus mit Gebet und Doxologie verbunden (1 Kor 14; s.o.). Dem „Gesetz der Sünde“, von dem die fleischlichen Glieder des Leibes beherrscht sind, wird im Römerbrief ausführlich das „Gesetz meiner Vernunft“, das vom Geist bestimmt ist, entgegengestellt (Röm 7, 23ff). Paulus kann sogar von einem

[10] Hans Walter Wolff, *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments*, Kaiser, München 5. Aufl. 1990, 25ff.

[11] Schnelle, *Paulus*, p. 615.

nous Gottes sprechen (Röm 11, 34) und von einem auf die Erkenntnis des Willens Gottes hin erneuerbaren *nous* des Menschen (Röm 12, 2). Paulus sieht also Verstand respektive Vernunft als kompatibel mit Religiosität an, sieht allerdings auch die Möglichkeit, dass Gott Menschen an einen „verwerflichen nous" dahingibt (Röm 1, 28). So wenig Gebet, Doxologie und Erkenntnis des göttlichen Willens auf rationale Konsistenz verzichten sollten, so sehr ist doch rationale Konsistenz im Abwegigen zu fürchten.

IV. Herz und Gewissen als neue Themenfelder der Anthropologie

Obwohl die *psyche* nach Paulus die irdische leiblich-mentale Einheit eines Menschen chiffriert, ist sie keine soteriologische Größe. Paulus steht damit im fast flächendeckenden biblischen Konsens (außer Tobit 3, 17; 4, 3), dass „der Seele" an sich nicht Unsterblichkeit und andere eschatologische Privilegien zukommen. Nicht in die *psyche* direkt wirkt der Geist Gottes hinein. Sondern über das Herz, die *kardia*, im menschlichen Leib berührt der Geist dann auch indirekt die Seele. Das Herz ist in der Anthropologie des Paulus eine überaus wichtige Größe. Wie schon im Alten Testament (861 Belege für *leb* bzw. *lebab*) verbindet es „vegetative, emotionale, noetische und voluntative Funktionen".[12] Chiffriert die *psyche* die irdische leiblich-mentale Einheit eines Menschen, so steht das Herz für die instanziierte emotional-voluntative Tiefe. Über das Herz erreicht der göttliche Geist den Leib und die mentalen Kapazitäten des Menschen (2 Kor 1, 22; 3, 3; Gal 4, 6; Röm 3, 29; 5, 5). Ja, Gott selbst kann im Herzen des Menschen „aufleuchten" (2 Kor 4, 6). Das göttliche Wort weckt im Herzen den Glauben (Röm 10, 8ff).

Wie der Geist kann auch das Herz auf Abwesende ausgerichtet sein und sie imaginativ, ja sehnend präsent werden lassen: „weil ihr uns fern seid, den Augen fern, nicht dem Herzen; deshalb haben wir uns in größter Sehnsucht... bemüht, euch wiederzusehen" (1 Thess 1, 17). Das Herz kann den Abwesenden „Raum geben" im Inneren des Menschen (2 Kor 3, 2; 6, 11; Röm 7, 2f). Allerdings ist es so an den Leib und „das Innere" des Menschen gebunden, dass man nicht sagen kann: Mein Herz ist bei

[12] Diese Funktionen und ihre Interdependenzen erläutert eindrücklich Bernd Janowski, *Konfliktgespräche mit Gott. Eine Anthropologie der Psalmen*, Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen 2. Aufl. 2006, p. 166-170.

euch präsent! Es ist vielmehr auch der Ort verborgener Intentionen und Gedanken, die nur mit Hilfe des Geistes aufgedeckt werden können (1 Kor 14, 25), mitunter erst durch Gottes Geist im eschatologischen Gericht (1 Kor 4, 5; Röm 8, 27). Das Herz bündelt emotionale und moralische Energien, es gibt charakterliche „Festigkeit", empfängt Trost und Orientierung (1 Thess 3, 13; 1 Kor 7, 37; 2 Thess 2, 17; 3, 5); es ist der Ort des Eifers und der festen Vorsätze und des geistlichen Gehorsams (Röm 6, 17; 8, 16; 9, 7). Als menschliches Vermögen kann es aber auch unverständig sein, ja mit Begierden dem Fleisch dienen, sich gegen Umkehr sträuben und sich „in Arglosigkeit" verführen lassen (Röm 1, 21; 1, 24; 2, 5; 16, 18).

In all seiner möglichen Festigkeit und Energie ist das Herz als an den irdischen Leib gebundenes Organ doch von der Melancholie der Endlichkeit angefochten:

> „Auch wir, obwohl wir als Erstlingsgabe den Geist haben, seufzen in unserem Herzen und warten darauf, dass wir mit der Erlösung unseres Leibes als Söhne (Gottes) offenbar werden... So nimmt sich auch der Geist unserer Schwachheit an. Denn wir wissen nicht, worum wir in rechter Weise beten sollen; der Geist selber tritt jedoch für uns ein mit Seufzen, das wir nicht in Worte fassen können. Und Gott, der die Herzen erforscht, weiß, was die Absicht des Geistes ist: Er tritt so, wie Gott es will, für die Heiligen ein." (Röm 8, 23. 26f)

Die auf Gotteserkenntnis und Wahrheitserkenntnis ausgerichtete Erschließungskraft des Geistes manifestiert sich auch im menschlichen Gewissen (*syneidesis*). Es handelt sich dabei nicht um eine in einfacher personaler Selbstbeziehung zu verortende Instanz. Das Gewissen ist nach Paulus eine dynamisches, unruhiges und sensibles Forum der Selbstbeurteilung,[13] ein sich beständig auch im Blick auf die Mitmenschen irritierendes und befragendes Normbewusstsein, in dem sich „die Gedanken gegenseitig abklagen und verteidigen" (Röm 2, 15). Die vom Geist Gottes ergriffenen und erfüllten Menschen, die ein differenziertes Urteils- und Handlungsvermögen entwickeln, können sich einerseits durch die Verbindung von subtilem Einfühlungsvermögen und Festigkeit der eigenen Überzeugung „dem Gewissen aller anderen Menschen empfehlen" (2 Kor 4, 2). Sie sind andererseits zu taktvollem Umgang mit den Mitmenschen

[13] Und nur indirekt eine „Instanz", vgl. Schnelle, Paulus, 606-609; Hans-Joachim Eckstein, *Syneidesis bei Paulus*, WUNT 2.10, Tübingen 1983, 242f.

aufgefordert, die die Freiheit des Glaubens und ihr traditionsbestimmtes Normbewusstsein in ihrem „schwachen Gewissen“ nicht vermitteln können (vgl. Röm 14).[14] Im Gewissen konzentrieren sich im Individuum die kognitiven und normativen Vermittlungsprozesse zwischen vielgliedriger Komplexität und geistiger Kohärenz, die Paulus im Blick auf den Leib und den Geist vor Augen stehen. Sowohl im Gespräch mit Psychologie und Philosophie als auch im Kontakt mit Sozialanthropologien sollten Versuche unternommen werden, die Phänomenzusammenhänge in heutigen Forschungskontexten zu identifizieren, die Paulus mit seiner Rede von *kardia* und *syneidesis* benennt.

V. Menschlicher Geist und Gottes Geist

Dieser Beitrag hat sich auf die Anthropologie des Paulus unter weitgehender Abstraktion von seiner Theologie konzentriert. Er sollte zeigen, dass Paulus eine vieldimensionale Lehre vom Menschen und seinen leiblichen und geistigen Vermögen entwickelt, die monistischen, dualen und dualistischen Reduktionismen und Verzerrungen entgegenzuwirken vermag. Die Anthropologie des Paulus bietet eine Fülle erhellender und provokativer komplexer Phänomenwahrnehmungen:

Sie ist provokativ und gesprächsfähig auf der Ebene der aggressiven Affirmation einer rein biologischen Existenz in Formen des „selfish gene“ oder anspruchsvollerer naturalistischer Theorien, aber auch auf der Ebene der multifunktionalen Existenz des Leibes. Sie liefert Denkanstöße, die psychosomatischen Phänomenzusammenhänge zu erschließen, die er mit der Rede vom Herzen chiffriert, die psychosoziale Verfassung des Gewissens zu diskutieren und darüber nachzudenken, warum seines Erachtens Verstand / Vernunft nicht nur als religionskompatible Kräfte, sondern als Frömmigkeit und Religiosität fördernde Kapazitäten anzusehen sind. Sie erstaunt in der kühlen Beurteilung der spirituellen Gottunmittelbarkeit ebenso wie mit der Wahrnehmung von Seele und Geist als auch säkular bestimmbare Größen.

Um in die theologischen Dimensionen dieses Denkens aufzusteigen, müssen die Interaktionen „im Geist“ zwischen Menschen, die natürlich

[14] Zu den entsprechenden moralischen Kommunikationsprozessen s. Michael Welker, *Kirche ohne Kurs*?, Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1987, p. 55-62.

direkt und indirekt auch auf den einzelnen Menschen stark rückwirken, erschlossen werden. Ihre Gefährdung und ihre Stärkung durch von Menschen erzeugte und von Gott gegebene geistige Kräfte sind dann ins Auge zu fassen. Die Unterscheidung der Geister (1 Kor 12, 10) wird zu einer wichtigen Funktion, in der der Geist Gottes in seiner belebenden, befreienden und erhebenden Kraft erkannt und geschätzt werden muss. Wir müssten uns dann auf das große Gebiet der Christologie einlassen, da der Geist Gottes als der Geist Christi den Menschen nahe kommt, sie umgibt und sie durchdringt.[15] In Taten der Liebe, Vergebung und der wechselseitigen Annahme werden sie vom Geist dessen umgeben und durchdrungen, der durch Tischgemeinschaft, Heilung, an Wahrheit, Gerechtigkeit und Barmherzigkeit orientierter Verkündigung und Lehre unter den Menschen wirkte. Sie gewinnen aber auch am Geist dessen Anteil, der durch die Verkündigung des kommenden Gottesreiches die Kräfte des gewaltlosen Widerstand gegen die herrschende Weltmacht Rom und der Transformation der religiösen Traditionen und Institutionen Israels in und unter ihnen wirksam werden lässt. Das aber ist ein sehr viel weiteres Feld als das ohnehin schon große und fruchtbare Gebiet der Anthropologie des Paulus, auf das dieser Beitrag aufmerksam machen wollte.

[15] Dazu Michael Welker, *Gottes Offenbarung. Christologie*, Neukirchener, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2012.

Cristinel Ioja[1]

Emilian Vasilescu – An Apologist of Orthodox Values in the Context of Interwar Society

Abstract
This study highlights the theological-apologetic thinking of one reference Romanian Orthodox theologians in the twentieth century, namely: Deacon Emilian Vasilescu. Although he excelled in the study of History of Religions, especially after the establishment of the communist regime in Romania, Emilian Vasilescu can be claimed without reservation a tenacious representative of the Romanian Apologetics. He emphasizes a close relationship between Apologetics, the interwar Romanian intellectual achievements and also the specific confessional attitudes of that period, being a connoisseur of modern philosophy to interference with the aspirations of the Christian religion. Following Fr Dumitru Stăniloae, he also has considerable merit to intuit the spiritual side of the Orthodox Apologetics beyond its rational, argumentative and demonstrative aspect. By Emilian Vasilescu, the Orthodox Apologetics succeeds to present its position as constantly overcoming the scholastic and modern influences that affected it.

Keywords
Emilian Vasilescu, theological-apologetic thinking

Preliminaries

Emilian Vasilescu is surprisingly in the center of the Romanian Orthodox apologetics through his works, and especially by his way to receive and respond to the multiple materialist-atheistic and philosophical-scientific challenges of the period. In the articles he published in various journals he

[1] Ph.D., „Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, cristi.ioja@yahoo.com.

perceived nuances and aspects of various concepts introduced in the West or by Romanian intellectuals in the interwar period. The Orthodox values and the dogmas of the Church were pertinently defended, not only from a theological point of view, but a philosophical one too[2]. The theological contribution of Deacon Emilian Vasilescu, Professor at the "Andreeană" Academy in Sibiu is not only in the history of religions, but also in apologetics, as a fine interpreter and connoisseur of Orthodox theology in the diverse and multiple ways confrontation with the modern philosophy and science and the Western confessional theology. In his various incursions in the philosophers thinking or doctrine, Emilian Vasilescu will apply the selection principle of patristic inspiration, but he will not categorically overcome the apologetic Romanian Orthodox theology - heavily influenced by the Western disputes of theology, philosophy and science - until the end of the first half of the century twentieth-century. By that time, influenced by the valorification of the Palamism by Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae (1903-1993), he manages to notice some new and welcomed dimension in Orthodox epistemology as cataphatic- apophatic gnoseology of experience.

In the light of the selection principle, which does not always manifested with extreme caution, Emilian Vasilescu will approach and analyze the central problem of philosophy, that was included and discussed in the main concepts of modern thought - spiritualism, materialism, idealism, realism, namely: the relationship between soul and body, especially in Bergsonian view. He was convinced that Henri Bergson's contribution of to clarify this issue is considerable, his work remaining "a rich source of spirituality" for the Romanian theologian[3].

[2] Besides his well-known study *The Sociological Interpretation of Religion and Moral.* The French Sociological School. Critical Review. Prefaced by professor Gaston Richard, Bucharest, 1936 (XVI+176 p.), he also wrote *Introductory Lessons in Philosophy,* Bucharest, 1943 (88 p.) taught to the students in theology, thus filling a gap in the theological literature, as no manual of philosophy conceived in orthodox spirit.

[3] Emilian Vasilescu, *Soul and Body,* in „Rays of Light", year V (1933), no. 4, p. 269-274, p. 269; year V (1933), no. 5, p. 325-333. If Bergson's philosophy condemned Catholicism and Protestantism "tends to turn Bergsonian intuition into the religious knowledge instrument par excellence", Orthodoxy - in our theologian's opinion – "in the search of its own methods and philosophical orientation, must not neglect services it could get from Bergsonian intuitionism, with all the necessary reserves" (p. 333).

His writing is directed against the materialism in its metaphysical meaning which considers the soul as a product of matter, the mental an attribute of physical and the thinking a product of matter. Thus, he made a brief historical excursion from the initiators of this philosophy, ancient Leucippus and Democritus, to the materialism of to the modern age analyzed in a critical way and to the influence of this "ontological materialism" in Romanian culture, particularly through the philosopher Vasile Conta (1845-1882) who thought the matter was infinite and changed constantly, that brought him denying the existence of God and the soul. Thus, according to Conta, "the world is ruled by a strict determinism of a universal mechanicism and spiritual life is merely the product of matter"[4]. He also analyzed the thought of professor P.P. Negulescu who claimed, influenced by the philosopher Herbert Spencer, that between living matter and dead matter is not a difference of essence, but one of degree, so that "the whole universe is composed of a single material of unknown nature, that may occur as living matter, or dead matter"[5]. In the same way he combated professor Negulescu's pupil, Al. Popescu from the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters in Bucharest who supported the "ontological materialism" and advocated for the imposition of this concept in the Romanian contemporary thinking. Emilian Vasilescu points out the failure of this concept that "is combated even in the elementary books of philosophy"[6]. He also invites Al. Popescu to reflect on the conclusions of the dispute between N. Paulescu and D. Voinov, while expressing regret - after proving the groundlessness of this view - that this concept "that enchanted many people in the West in the last century, managed to find resonance in our country too"[7].

1. Orthodoxy faced with Thomistic philosophy and modern philosophy. Accents of a dispute between E. Vasilescu and I. Miclea

The confrontation between Deacon Emilian Vasilescu, Professor at the Theological Academy in Sibiu and Priest Ioan Miclea, Professor at the

[4] Dr. Emilian Vasilescu, *The Ontological Materialism,* in „R.T", year XXXIII (1943), no. 9-10, p. 427-444, p. 434.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 435.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 437.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 444.

Greek Catholic Seminary in Blaj held both in the press and at conferences attended separately. Emilian Vasilescu - who regarded the articles and gestures of the teacher from Blaj to be a new and ingenious Roman Catholic attempt to attract the Orthodox to Catholicism - gave a replica to Ioan Miclea in church magazines since he claimed that Thomism is not a *Christian philosophy* but *the* Christian philosophy, that is the only and true Christian philosophy. In support of his position he brought arguments in an article that responded to various articles published by Miclea in *Christian Culture* from Blaj and joined the volume *Romanian Tangencies to Christian Philosophy* (in Blaj, 1942). Authentic Christian tradition - in the opinion of E. Vasilescu - is not the one that is based on Aristotelian naturalism asserted by Thomas Aquinas in the Middle Ages, but one that uses platonic spiritualism and Plotinian mysticism, dominating the entire Patristic era, led by St. Augustine and extending until today in the East by newer Christian thinkers and the West in the Augustinian current. This tradition of Christian philosophy has its basis in the Holy Scripture and continues by Justin the Martyr and Philosopher, Athenian Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, the Capadociens, Eusebius of Caesarea, Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, Maximus the Confessor, John Damascene, Michael Pselos, Gregory Palamas, and later by Russian thinkers: Kireievski, Homiacov, Solovyov, Sergius and Eugene Trubetzkoi, N. Lossky, Florensky, Berdyaev, Bulgakov, Frank Simon, Florovsky. Augustinian current in the West is represented by John Scotus Eriugena, Anselm of Canterbury, Bernard de Clairvaux, School of Chartres, Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, Bonaventura, Nicholas of Cusa, Blaise Pascal, Port Royal School, Malebranche, Bossuet, Fenelon, de Bonald, Lamennais, Gratry, Maine de Biran, Olle-Laprune, Lucien Laberthonnière, Maurice Blondel, Max Scheler, etc. By this E Vasilescu tries to emphasize how the Church Fathers chose the Platonic philosophy in their theological thinking rather than the Aristotle one, and therefore show the dissonance between Thomistic philosophy and the spirit of Eastern Christianity[8]. Of course,

[8] Deacon Dr. Emilian Vasilescu, *Thomistic Philosophy and Modern Philosophy. Orthodox Point of View in a Discussion,* in “RT”, year XXXV (1945), no. 7-8, p. 284-307, p. 285-286. See also Ibid, “*Why Thomism is not “the Christian philosophy”?* in “The Thinking”, year XXI (1942), no. 8, p. 465-469. I. Miclea reduced Christian philosophy to Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and John of the Cross. E. Vasilescu proved by arguments that Christian philosophy begins not from them and do not identify with them, and the Orthodox Church does not need a philosophy officially recognized

our theologian falls into a pattern that milled the West for a long time that is Platonism versus Aristotelianism or Aristotelianism versus Platonism, the appeal to revelation being somewhat suspended.

E. Vasilescu's arguments fail to change the vision of I. Miclea which continues to publish several articles in *Christian Culture* for the benefit of his theory articles gathered in volume *Philosophies and Christian Philosophy. Why is Thomism the Christian Philosophy?* (Blaj, 1943). The main ideas of this volume are exposed in a conference held by priest I Miclea at "King Ferdinand I" University in Cluj-Sibiu, organized by the Romanian United Students Association (ASTRU) under the title *Thomistic Philosophy and Modern Philosophy*. If I. Miclea reduces all the Christian philosophy in Thomistic philosophy, the only genuine philosophy, a week later in the same hall Petre Hossu, PhD in philosophy will hold a conference urging a return to the Gospel and dispense with all the Christian philosophy. A week later at the students invitation from Romanian Orthodox Brotherhood (FORS), Deacon Emilian Vasilescu is invited to present the same issue from the Orthodox point of view. In this conference, basing just on the arguments of the French neo-Thomistic philosophers - Le RPAD Sertillanges, B. Romeyer SJ, Joseph Souilhé SJ, Regis Jovilet, Etienne Gilson, Jacques Maritain - I. Miclea supported his theory with the specification that anyone who opposes it was considered not only "ignorant", but also the enemy of Catholicism and Christianity[9]. In his conference Professor E. Vasilescu disclosed the sufficiency and disdain of those who made from Thomistic philosophy the only philosophy, ignoring the other side of Christian philosophy. Thomism was not always the Christian philosophy even within the Roman Catholic: see confrontations between the Franciscans as representatives of the Augustinian current and

as happened in the West when in 1879 Pope Leo XIII decreed Thomism the official philosophy. The experience of introducing the Thomism occurred before in Russia, when, in the eighteenth century, Metropolitan Petru Movilă introduced Thomism in the Kiev Theological Academy. Later he realized the incompatibility between it and the Eastern spirit and thus published a commentaryc to *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* by St John of Damascus. Moreover, the theory that without Thomism, the Orthodox Theology will not have the necessary arguments to prove God's existence, E. Vasilescu responds that these arguments can be greatly found to Plato and the Church Fathers. One of these arguments is borrowed by Thomas Aquinas precisely from St. John Damascene, and on issues concerning philosophy, theologians will appeal to the patristic method of selection.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 287.

the Dominicans as representatives of Thomist philosophy that arose in the middle ages personalities that were opposed to Thomism, like Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, Occam[10]. Thomism formalization is done in the Roman Catholic Church in a difficult context created by the revolutions of 1789 and 1848, by the emergence of innovative ideas and beliefs condemned by the *Mirari vos* encyclical, by the occurrence of hermesien movement and A. Günther trends to rationalise the dogmas by denying the value of scholastic, by the appearance of the Ontologist current in Italy, especially sustained by Gioberti and Rosmini. Trying to win in the unity of reason, the Roman Catholicism "crushed" the Augustinian current which was more conciliatory for the modern philosophy[11].

For I. Miclea Thomism is the Christian philosophy par excellence, because by distinguishing between reason and faith, it meets both the philosophic and the Christian requirements, being "the only living and organic synthesis of the philosophical and of the Christian truth"[12]. At

---

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 289.

[11] *Ibid.,* p 290.

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 291. I. Miclea considered Thomism is embraced in the Romanian philosophy by I Petrovici and N. Crainic, for which E. Vasilescu will make his point in the magazine "The Thinking" (Emilian Vasilescu, *Romanian Tangents to the Christian philosophy*, in "The Thinking", year XXI (1942), no. 3, p. 157-158). E. Vasilescu will also expose exaggerations and unfounded allegations of the united theologian of Blaj in another intervention in *The Thinking* magazine, showing that not only Ioan Petrovici and Nichifor Crainic have no link to Thomistic thought but nor have Mircea Eliade, Nae Ioneascu and N Bagdasar, and accusing Ioan Miclea of sectarianism as trying to monopolize the Christian philosophy and to reduce it to Thomism. He analyzes the texts of the work of Nae Ionescu, especially *History of Logic* (Bucharest 1941) and *Metaphysics,* and he highlights not only the orientation of the Romanian philosopher to Platonism, Neoplatonism and Eastern theology, but also an attitude of separation and opposition to Aristotelianism as the core of Thomistic philosophy, but also to some manifestations of Roman Catholicism. The Orthodox theologian invites Ioan Miclea to seek Romanian common points of Thomist philosophy not in the works of N. Crainic, Nae Ionescu and Mircea Eliade, but at other Orthodox theologians and thinkers, especially the apologists Vasile Găină, Irineu Mihalcescu, Ioan G. Savin or the essays of Christian philosophy of Dumitru Stăniloae who wrote a detailed study about the "most vibrant philosophical-theological dispute of the Orthodox medieval: the hesychastic dispute" in *Life and Teaching of St. Gregory Palamas* (1938), or Cicerone Iordachescu's works or Serban Ionescu's works of moral philosophy. The accusation of superficiality and biased and arbitrary interpretation of the problem does not delay to point at the theologian from Blaj: "So I ask Mr. Miclea not to accuse me of superficiality and scrupulousness, since he wrote a whole book about Romanian

this point, Emilian Vasilescu notes that precisely by making a distinction between reason and faith, Thomism does not follow the traditional Christian philosophy as the Church Fathers

> "have never conceived that split of the human being in order to accept the Christian truth, by faith, and by reason - a philosophy whose eternal truths, like those of faith be consistent with this. The theology of the double concordist truth is a kind of theology with shelves: below, "pure" philosophy based on "natural reason" and above, pure theology, based on positive revelation. No matter how fertile this formal distinction proved to be in theology or philosophy - made even by some Augustinian - it leads to immense difficulties of matching the truths of faith and truths of reason and to inevitable sacrifices on one side or the other, or even open the way for separation of philosophy from theology and even to the opposition between them"[13].

Thomist theology vision on the relationship between faith and reason was the basis for out breaking the conflict between theology and philosophy, conflict that was absent in the East since the fathers regarded holy philosophy the very Christian teaching. In support of this he quotes Georges Florovsky, the Russian theologian from Diaspora, who thinks there is no separation between faith and reason, and the starting point of Christian philosopher is different from that of the philosopher with no faith, namely: divine revelation[14].

The theologian from Sibiu moves discussions on dogmatic realm and thus analyses the dogmatic differences between the two Churches who give rise to a number of philosophical differences even higher than those generated by Platonism or Aristotelianism orientations. In this respect, it is discussed how Catholic theology conceives primordial state of man before

---

philosophy, without even opening books of the Romanian philosophers, but using only *The History of Romanian Philosoph*y by N. Bagdasar, from which he took almost all quotations. When someone from simple assumptions, calles Nichifor Crainic, Nae Ionescu and many other Romanian philosophers and thinkers "Romanian friends of Thomism" he should be more stingy with invectives against his opponents. For otherwise he may be called before the same court – of the truth and conscience - before Mr. Miclea to summoned me". (See widely: Emilian Vasilescu, "*Romanian Friends of Thomism*", in "The Thinking", year XXI (1942), no. 7, p. 410-412).

[13] *Ibid*.

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 293-294.

and after the fall, based on a study of Father Dumitru Stăniloae about Orthodox anthropology stressing that the Western view on the primary state affects all dogmatic[15]. From here it begins the whole conflict between reason and faith, the tendency to rationalize the dogma being alien to East who does not know the ontological dualism in the primordial man: nature and *donum superadditum*. However grace is constitutive to the man called to deification in Jesus Christ[16]. Priest I. Miclea is invited to read not only Jacques Maritain's intransigent Thomism, but also the "graceful" Thomism of philosophers like: Rousselot, Etienne Gilson or Sertillanges who urge the Roman Catholic theology to a deeper reflection on the danger of its rationalism.

A final point discussed by Deacon Professor E. Vasilescu is the differences between Thomistic thinking which follows the line of Judeo-Arabic Aristotelian-Thomistic naturalism, and the thinking of the Fathers and the Augustianism related to the problem of knowledge that takes place inside a path oriented to God and not to the world. Certainly, we can notice the influences of Western theology in the Romanian Orthodox theologians' thought that make confusion between the Eastern intuitive and the Augustinian knowledge without distinguishing between Augustinian psychologism and personalist-ontological knowledge specific to the Eastern Fathers. This influence is also indicates by the fact that some Orthodox theologians fall - as mentioned - in the conflict between Platonism and Aristotelianism held a few centuries in the West and had little to do with the Fathers' thinking.

Although he quotes Father Stăniloae and the hesychastic controversy from the fourteenth century on the distinction between Eastern mysticism and scholar rationalism, Professor Emilian Vasilescu does not perceive the distinction between Eastern and Augustianic mysticism or the fact that νους, the mind is not a spark of Divinity in the human soul or of divine essence[17]. This Catholic tendency of the opposition between mind and natural reason leads to unilateral and dangerous accents even for the Orthodox theology. The Orthodox theologian opposes the Eastern

---

15 *Ibid.,* p. 295. See Prof. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Orthodox Anthropology. Comments on the Primordial State of Man*, in "Yearbook of Andreiana Theological Academy", year XVI (1939-1940), Sibiu, 1940.

16 *Ibid.,* p. 296.

17 *Ibid,.* p. 301.

epistemology to the Thomist epistemology supported by I. Miclea - without going into details – represented by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Evagrius of Pontus, Dionysius the Areopagite, Maximus the Confessor, Symeon the New Theologian, Gregory Palamas[18].

To reveal the attitude of Orthodox theology to modern philosophy defined as "a gigantic effort of the human mind, independently of any theological implications" E. Vasilescu calls for the Fathers' model to relate to ancient philosophy of their time, how they used philosophy in the formulating dogmas, the reception mode of the Logos theory by Justin the Martyr and the Philosopher, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, the Capadociens and Augustin, who used selectively their time philosophy and science as a tool[19]. The response of E. Vasilescu on modern philosophy is meant to be a balance between Solafideism of the "dialectical theology" and the vicious Scholastica of the Catholic Middle Ages. In the modern philosophy the Orthodox theology will use the principle of selection, wearing friendly attitudes towards the philosophies that "touch the sky" and being hostile to materialism, epicureism, skepticism, sophism[20].

2. Emilian Vasilescu - the rational arguments and the renewal of Orthodox gnoseology by turning to account the Palamism

Towards the end the first half of the twentieth century, when *rational arguments to prove God's existence* already had careers in the West, i.e. in the Roman Catholic theology and generated enough approach and works in Orthodox theology too, Emilian Vasilescu - staunch defender of the faith truths of the Church in the interwar period - gives us a remarkable

[18] *Ibid.,* p. 302. It is worth mentioning that starting with the 40s the Romanian Orthodox theology began although formally to absorb St. Gregory Palamas' thought through the contributions of Father Dumitru Stăniloae. Of course, as already mentioned, the Palamites theology was initially just a more apologetic argument which address the relationship between reason and faith on the one hand, and on the other hand the relationship between eastern and western theology and not a base line for a cosmic, personalist, ontological vision on human experience with God in the deifying and uncreated grace.

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 304-305. See also Idem. *The Relation between Religion and Philosophy*, Bucharest, 1943.

[20] *Ibid.,* p. 306.

synthesis of that time on the place and role of rational arguments in the Orthodox gnoseology. His approach is in line with renewal of theology opened by Nichifor Crainic and especially Dumitru Stăniloae, line that was not approved by the majority of leading representatives of the Romanian Orthodox theology. We affirm this because Deacon Vasilescu's gnoseologic investigations do not stop by the mentioned categories of rational arguments, but are configured in a synthetic and antinomic vision on knowledge framed in the Church tradition vision and expressed with great clarity and force by St. Gregory Palamas.

Emilian Vasilescu made an introduction of the Palamites vision in the gnoseology, though fragile, under the direct influence of priest Dumitru Stăniloae's research, who was perceived at that time as a great theologian and orthodox thinker. In our theologian study can we notice a shift of emphasis in Romanian apologetics from a strictly rational approach of gnoseology, towards a more comprehensive approach that experiential knowledge plays an increasingly central part. This aims to show that, on one hand, the problem of religious knowledge and rational proof of God's existence arises otherwise in Orthodox theology than for Roman Catholics. Orthodox theology does not formalize any particular philosophy and has the freedom to use selectively the philosophical thinking of different ages. On the other hand God can not be known through deductive or inductive methods or philosophical speculation and rational argument, however having no value if there is no religious experience.

E. Vasilescu becomes aware of a certain lack of unity in the methods of knowledge, particularly those concerning the rational arguments, opposed to the existing unit within Roman Catholic theology. T.A. Golubinski and Jacobi Friedrerich reject the rational arguments on the grounds that God's existence can not be proved from the existence of the world. Hristu Andrutsos appreciates them to be serious logical errors, although in terms of piety some might be somewhat useful. Macarius the dogmatist enumerates them in the means of knowledge of God's existence, although the main route is pious life. A middle position between them is that of Silvester of Caneva and Peter Svetlov, considering it available only to complement and refine the knowledge given to us by "the sense of divinity" planted in man by God[21]. As regards the Romanian theology we notice that Romanian

[21] Deacon Dr. Emilian Vasilescu, *The value of rational arguments to prove the existence of God*, in "Theological Academy Yearbook Andreene", Archdiocesan Press, Sibiu,

theologians - V. Găină, I. Mihalcescu, G.I. Savin, I. Todoran, and P. Rezuş – put an accent on the demonstrative strength of the rational arguments, subordinating that indirect knowledge by arguments, to the knowledge by faith and love. In the Roman Catholic theology, the metaphysical value of reason - influenced by Thomism and Aristotelianism - was stronger than in the philosophical rationalism in general, though disputed by some modern philosophical currents.

E. Vasilescu makes a brief incursion into this gnoseologic issue starting with Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Wolff – who were convinced of the metaphysical value of reason - and to Kant, who gave a hard blow to the man's full confidence in the powers of reason. Although Kant denied the objective value of the rational arguments to prove God's existence, he did not deny their subjective value. He tried to give religion what he raped from it by the path of pure reason using the way of the practical reason, thus emphasizing the moral life, the living religion and faith. Due to Kant's criticism of the rational arguments, philosophy was divided in two directions: idealism / solipsism and phenomenalism / agnosticism, slipping more and more towards positivism, scientism and materialism, while post-Kantian philosophy shipwrecked into pantheism or indifferentism. Thus philosophy and science became "weapons" for fighting against God and religion.

No Western Roman Catholic and Protestant theology, escaped the influence of Kantian criticism. Starting from the Kantian subjectivism, Protestantism gave birth to two categories: voluntarism (Albrecht Ritschl followed by W Hermann, J. Kaftan, and H. Schultz) and theological sentimentalism (F. Schleiermacher contrary to Troeltsch, Bousset, Stange claiming the importance of reason in the religious act too). The dialectical

---

1946, p. 28-67, p. 29-30. To overcome the lack of unity, E. Vasilescu believes that Orthodox theology should be guided by the Western Augustinian current and should keep free from formalizing any particular philosophical system or from dogmatizing a particular method of religious knowledge, and making it the faith truth. By dogmatization of a particular method of knowledge, the Roman Catholic theology has come to affirmation of knowing God through natural reason light *naturali rationis lumine*. This knowledge is an exclusive apostherioric mediated one, based on the visible parte of creation, and using the principle of causality and sufficient reason (p. 32). Orthodox theology while suffering from a certain lack of unity in the methods - being involved in the mimetic game of theological import - still remains open to contemporary gnoseologic research without falling into anti-intelectuallist deviations or idolatrizing the reason or the rational arguments.

theology inspired by Sören Kierkegaard and represented by K. Barth, Fr. Gogarten, Thurneyen, and E. Brunner fights not only against any natural theology, but also against rational arguments to prove the existence of God[22]. The Roman Catholic theology has to face various affirmation of the Augustinian current. Here are some of these forms: *Traditionalism* - as a reaction against the philosophy of "lights", represented by Joseph de Maistre, De Bonald, Lamennais - supported the knowledge of God through faith and tradition and not by philosophical methods. *Fideism* - related to traditionalism and represented by Huet, bishop of Avranches, Bautain, Gerbet, Bonnety - affirmed the Fathers believed that faith is above reason and there is no other way of knowledge besides the Revelation. *Ontologism* - represented by Geoberti, Rosmini, Gerdil, Mamiani, Fabre, Branchereau, Augouin, Rothenflue, Bercellone and based on the Augustinian gnosiological Enlightenment and on Malebranche's theory of "vision of God" - claimed direct knowledge of God.

The so-called "method of imitation" initiated by the philosopher Maurice Blondel – is the way to know God through the act. This started wide discussions and controversies and the attitude of philosophers Edouard Le Roy and Max Scheler towards the arguments to prove the existence of God, forced Roman -Catholic theology to reconsider some old positions. Therefore some theologians like Lower Geyser, Fr. Sawicki, A. Miterer, left the argument line of Thomas Aquinas[23]. For E. Vasilescu, Maurice Blondel, Edouard Le Roy and Max Scheler are "the sources which might be an inspiration for an Orthodox gnoseology", besides Augustianism and Bergsonian intuitionism, pointing to phenomenologism, philosophy of values - W. Windelband, H. Rickert, N. Hartmann - and existentialism - M. Heidegger, Jaspers K, L. Lavelle, R Le Sennne. E. Vasilescu gives a certain value to these philosophies that can inspire Orthodox theology. They do not share the intransigent intellectualism of Roman Catholic theology, but come closer to the Augustinian intuitionism which is mistakenly perceived by our theologian – as being part of the Eastern Christian contemplation. He falls into the trap of the scheme marked by the Western confrontation between Platonism/Augustinianism and Aristotelianism/Thomism without critically receipting the way patristic theology was reported to Greek Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy, and which is the difference between

[22] *Ibid.,* p. 38-39.
[23] *Ibid.,* p. 40-41.

Eastern Fathers theology and Augustinian, and between Eastern Fathers onto-psychologism and the internalized Augustinian personalism.

However, it is remarkable that our theologian perceived the implications of *theosis* and *mystical* concepts in Patristic gnoseology from Origen to Gregory Palamas, recalling Philokalia too. These concepts and their implications help Emilian Vasilescu emphasizing how close are the Orthodox gnoseology and the intuitionist philosophies of his time and also the difference to Western Aristotelian-Thomistic intellectualism. Moreover, he emphasized the act of God knowledge as an act of seeing inside the cosmos and of experiencing a living and personal God through the uncreated energies and not an *actus purus* God, that is "absolutely petrified".

> "Contrary to Western thinking, seeing God even in this life is possible for the Eastern one. The first thinking grants this opportunity only to the rightful in future life and to some chosen already here on earth: Moses, Paul and maybe the Holy Virgin. Savior said that the pure in heart shall see God. Therefore, if this condition is fulfilled here on earth, then the fulfillment of the promise will be here on earth too. The whole battle of St. Gregory Palamas in the fourteenth century, against Western rationalism of Barlaam and Achindin's has no other purpose than to prove the soul cleansed of passions can see God right here on earth. Of course, he can not see the very essence of God, which always remains unknown and incomprehensible, but only the uncreated divine energies that penetrate the entire being, illuminating the human spirit and making him a part of the divine life(...) Indeed, *the living God*, God of religious experience, is the Orthodox knowledge God. In Orthodox religious knowledge the closeness, even the familiarity of man with God, becomes easily understandable by the Palamite concept of uncreated divine energies. These emanate (the word retains here its Orthodox meaning) from God and deificate the world, without the unfathomable depths of God flowing into them or undergoing any change. That's why I said that this view of God, fulfill the seekers of God's need to be in contact with the Absolute and it does not modify God's absolute characteristics"[24].

[24] *Ibid.,* p. 58-59.

This text and others of Emilian Vasilescu – under Father Professor Dumitru Stăniloae's influence - will help understand the Orthodox gnoseology from other coordinates than before, much rooted in the Romanian dogmatics. Certainly the forced march of Romanian entry in the new age of Sovietisation and of the Orthodox theology as well will break for a long time the renewal of Orthodox theology Father Stăniloae began, by rediscovering the Palamite theology and turning it worth, by translating Patristic and Philokalic texts and having the awareness to overcome a dry and arid dogmatic theology in a lifeless system. Deacon Emilian Vasilescu's contribution was stopped for reasons beyond the will of some Romanian Orthodox theologians, but also with the help of some Romanian scholars' conservative resistance, who were the defenders of the old scholastic inspiration positions acquired in the West or Chernivtsi. Using the Palamites theology Emilian Vasilescu will expose the Western dualism, i.e. the separation between God and man by created grace and the intellectual implications of the two kinds of knowledge: the purely natural knowledge and knowledge through faith. For the Orthodox gnoseology the religious act is not a *purely natural act,* but a theandric act, God being present in the world and not far away like in deism. Moreover, the world is not governed by second causes, foreign of God's action and work, "but His energies enter it, knead it and help it achieve its destiny of transfiguration and deification"[25]

The Orthodox gnoseology is not of syllogisms and logic deductions, but of knowledge in and through *love*. By arguing this thesis the Romanian theologian uses texts from the Scripture; St. Maximus the Confessor, Myra Lot Borodin, Max Scheler, love being a theandric act that leads to the transfiguration and deification of man. However, the arguments should not be removed from the treaties of theology or from the practical work of the Church, though - in E. Vasilescu's opinion - they might undergo revisions and adjustments in accordance with the scientific requirements of the time. The conclusion on these arguments is built on an inter-confessional perspective specific for those times, with emphasis on highlighting the unilaterality of the two Western denominations and on the experience, dynamism, freedom, balance and lack of seclusion of Orthodox theology: "… the Orthodox theology gives a certain value to the rational arguments to prove the existence of God. It does not find them flawed in terms of

[25] *Ibid.,* p. 60.

logic and recommends their use in the Church practice. But it will never find it's enough only to use syllogisms, and thus give birth to the belief in "the living God" of religious life. The rational arguments themselves have nothing religious and their premises are also out the religious sphere. Therefore we should not necessarily expect to find the God person at the end of the judgments, because our souls feel the need for a loving

> "me and You" relationship. To complete this is the role of the religious sense planted by God in the human soul. By understanding the value of rational arguments, the Orthodox theology avoids one-sidedness and exaggeration of Roman Catholic theology, which dogmatized the mediated knowledge of God. At the same time it also avoids the unilaterality of opposite extreme that is the traditionalist, pietist, ontological, sentimentalist, proactive, intuitionistic and Protestant extreme in general, that simply throws overboard any rational argument to prove God's existence. The Orthodox gnoseology has something in common with each of them, but also has something different and beyond them"[26].

Emilian Vasilescu affirms another aspect of gnoseology worth mentioning - although he is not always categoric - that of the "whole man"[27] knowledge. He asserts a complete human presence in the act of knowing God, that is body and soul, and not only the presence of soul, as some Orthodox theologians used to say. Thus, in the interwar period until the establishment of communism the Romanian theologian thinking has some notable positive accents of gnoseology and Orthodox anthropology that were affirmed in the context of the virulent expanding of various Western philosophical and religious concepts in the theological and Romanian cultural space. Deacon Emilian Vasilescu remains a true apologist of his time, his thinking making important steps to a genuine assertion of Orthodox theology in the apologetic and cultural context.

[26] *Ibid.,* p. 63-64.
[27] *Ibid.,* p. 64.

Michael Kinnamon[1]

The Theological Basis of Conciliar Ecumenism

International Consultation of National Councils of Churches (NCCs) and Regional Ecumenical Organizations (REOs) February 6-10, 2012

Abstract
This article discusses the theological basis of conciliar ecumenism as it appears in several very important documents. In this regard, the author identifies three major theological arguments.

The basic problem that arises in the ecumenical councils of Churches, which represent a new reality in church history, is of ecclesiological nature: To what extent the reality of the Church is expressed in the councils of churches? And how can councils contribute to the visible expression of unity of the church? The author, inspired by the ecumenical documents of the last mid-century, presents the specific relations between the churches that make up a Council of Churches. A council is not as much an organization that joins churches, as it is a mutual commitment they make, in order to form a community of churches. Another reality is that membership in a church council does not necessarily imply recognition of other members of the church, in the full sense of the word, but must recognize that they have, however, very little elements of the true church. A central theme of the consultations in 1971 was the idea that councils are “instruments of unity”.

The article ends with the problem of identity of every church in the ecumenical movement in which they participate.

Keywords
The ecumenical councils of Churches, unity, ecumenical dialogue, regional organizations of the Churches

[1] Ph. D., Seattle University, former General Secretary at the National Council of Churches (NCC).

I. Introduction

A. This paper is not a description of what NCCs and REOs have actually said in our various basis statements, but a summary of what ecumenical representatives have written about the theological basis of conciliar ecumenism in several widely-influential documents, especially 1) the reports of the three previous international consultations of NCCs and REOs (1971[2], 1986[3], and 1993[4]); 2) the World Council of Churches' Toronto Statement (1950[5]); 3) "Towards a Common Understanding and Vision of the WCC" (CUV, 1997[6]).

B. In one sense, beginning with a paper on theology needs no defence or explanation, since God is always our focus and foundation; but there is another reason that theology figures so prominently in our agenda. Many NCCs and REOs are facing the prospect of reorganizing in the face of financial pressure, and there is always a temptation to make "orthopaedic" changes when the real problems are "cardiac" - i.e., to restructure without addressing the theologically important issue of the churches' relationship to one another. With this in mind, I will try in this paper to begin our discussion of how a firm grasp of the theological foundation might enable us to deal more effectively with challenges facing councils in this era.

II. The Theological Foundation of Ecumenism

A. Before talking specifically about councils, we should acknowledge the broader theological context. Three convictions seem particularly significant, and may be sufficient to stimulate our conversation.

1. The Chief Actor in the ecumenical movement is the creator God, incarnate in Jesus Christ, and present through the Holy Spirit. Whenever the movement "moves", it is not our achievement that we celebrate, but God's grace and power for which we give thanks.

[2] „Ecumenical Review", vol. 23, no. 4 (1971), p. 442-48.

[3] Thomas F. Best, ed., *Instruments of Unity: National Councils of Churches within the One Ecumenical Movement,* WCC, 1988, p. 96-127.

[4] „Ecumenical Review", vol. 45, no. 3 (1993), p. 291-98.

[5] Michael Kinnamon and Brian E. Cope, eds., *The Ecumenical Movement: An Anthology of Key Texts and Voices,* WCC and Eerdmans, 1997, p. 463-468. Chapter IX from this anthology contains a number of important texts related to conciliar ecumenism.

[6] Available on the website of the World Council of Churches.

2. God's purpose (mission) is the wholeness, the shalom, of all creation; and God has called forth the church, the communion of Christ's disciples, to be a sign, instrument, and foretaste of this divine mission. It follows that the ecumenical movement is **ultimately** concerned with the wholeness of the world and penultimately concerned with the wholeness of the church. (This reordering of the sequence of priorities [God-world-church, rather than God-church-world] represents a significant shift in ecumenical theology over the past forty years.[7])

3. Unity is a key mark of the church, a characteristic that is crucial to its participation in God's mission. The church's unity, consistent with the first point (above), is not our achievement. In the words of the Toronto Statement, the churches which confess Jesus Christ as incarnate Lord "do not have to create their unity; it is a gift of God. But they know that it is their duty to make common cause in the search for the expression of that unity in work and life." The task of the ecumenical movement, therefore, is to address divisions of human making in order that God's gift of reconciled community may be visible to the world, to be the setting for the churches to become what they are, the one body of Christ, in order that together they may witness to God's will for righteousness and peace throughout creation.

B. Clarity about these theological convictions should affect the way churches understand, and participate in, councils (which are major expressions of the ecumenical movement). As Willem Visser't Hooft once wrote, a fellowship of churches which know there is no sovereignty except that of Christ is **essentially** different from a pragmatic gathering of churches that think of themselves as sovereign.[8]

III. The Theological Basis of Conciliar Ecumenism

A. Discussion of the nature and purpose of councils of churches often isn't couched in explicitly theological terms. The underlying issue, however, is ecclesiological: To what extent is the reality of the church expressed in councils of churches? And to what extent (in what way) can councils contribute to the visible expression of the church's unity?

---

[7] This reordering is named in the report of the 1971 consultation and made very explicit in CUV, pars. 2.4 and 2.5.

[8] W.A. Visser't Hooft, *The Significance of the World Council of Churches*, in "Man's Disorder and God's Design: The Amsterdam Assembly Series", Harper, 1949, p. 185.

B. As several ecumenical leaders have observed, councils of our sort (**conceils**) are a new thing in the history of the church, one for which there has not been adequate theological vocabulary.[9] Since the middle of the last century, however, there have been important attempts to fill this void, especially in the documents we are examining. While brief summary is difficult, the following three points have been repeatedly affirmed.

1. The essence of a council of churches is the relationship of the member churches to one another, not their relationship to the structure of the council. A council is not so much an organization that churches join as it is a mutual commitment they make in order to form a fellowship or community of churches. Whenever churches regard a conciliar body as "they" rather than "we", as "that organization" rather than "our fellowship", then conciliar life has been radically misunderstood-and the accountability that ought to go with conciliar membership is minimized. Former WCC staff member, Victor Hayward, after visiting eighty NCCs, put the matter this way at the 1971 consultation:

> "A council committee usually means a gathering of church leaders to decide what the council shall do, instead of what their churches should do together through the council. The churches are not really committed to one another... This means that councils are too frequently an ecumenical facade behind which the churches in practice remain as unecumenical as ever."10

(This is another example of change in ecumenical thinking. The point is made with increasing force in the series of NCC/REO consultations, is much more prominent in the CUV text than in the Toronto Statement, and is the crucial insight behind the new "churches together" conciliar model [e.g., in Britain and Ireland]).

2. While membership in a council of churches does not necessarily imply recognition of the other members as churches in the full sense of the word, it does (or should) imply a recognition "that the other members belong to Christ, that membership in the church of Christ is more inclusive than the membership of their own church, and that the others possess at the very least elements of the true church" (CUV, echoing Toronto). Otherwise, the council will be seen as a purely utilitarian structure and not

[9] E.g., Nikos Nissiotis, *Christian Councils and the Unity of the Local Church*, in "One in Christ", vol. VIII, no. 2 (1972), p. 163.

[10] Victor Hayward, *A Survey of National Christian Councils*, in "International Review of Mission", vol. 60, no. 240 (1971), p. 518.

as an expression, however, partial and preliminary, of fellowship given in Christ.

3. The fellowship or community that is at the heart of a council of churches is "a dynamic, relational reality" (CUV) which ought to change and, hopefully, deepen as a result of interaction in the council. It follows that councils of churches should be regarded as provisional, should be prepared to die in order that fuller manifestations of communion may be born. They are steps toward deeper fellowship as the church, which is why councils betray their calling, and actually hinder the work of ecumenism, if they become self-perpetuating service organizations. Decisions about union are obviously left to the churches, but councils are settings in which trust can grow, divisive issues can be discussed, and reception of the results of ecumenical dialogue can be encouraged.

A central theme at the 1971 consultation was that councils are "instruments of unity". When this calling is forgotten, said Catholic theologian Jean Tillard at the 1993 consultation, councils of churches become like de Gaulle's description of the Vichy government: institutions whose effect is "to make the shame of defeat acceptable".[11]

C. By way of summary: Councils of churches are not the church. Their "ecclesiological significance" stems from their identity as **fellowships or communities of churches**, giving partial expression to the unity that is our gift in Christ and to the calling Christians have to make that gift visible as a sign of God's reconciling love for all creation. To put it another way, their theological significance inheres in a) the relationship of the churches to one another, b) the pressure to deeper fellowship that comes with life in the council, and c) the common mission that the churches do together as council.[12]

---

[11] J.-M.R. Tillard, *The Mission of Councils of Churches*, in "Ecumenical Review", vol. 45, no. 3 (1993), p. 276. The WCC's Faith and Order Commission put this in the form of questions. "Do councils continue to serve the cause of unity, or do they rather institutionalize a limited degree of unity and perpetuate division? Do they serve to go on to the next step on the road, or do they give the churches a good conscience by leaving them at a stage where they are not quite divided but not yet united?" *Sharing in the Hope*, Bangalore, 1978, WCC, 1978, p. 282.

[12] The 1971 report goes further than the others: "Even now, when churches share in some common life, and witness and act together, a new ecclesial reality appears - not in the council as an organization, but among the member churches as they share this ecumenical experience through the council's instrumentality", in "Ecumenical Review", vol. 23, no. 4 (1971), p. 443 (emphasis added).

D. The points made above raise obvious tensions or concerns that are lifted up, especially, in the reports from the NCC/REO consultations.

1. An overemphasis on councils as "churches together" runs the risk of diminishing their potential for prophetic, pioneering witness. A council is **both** a fellowship of the churches **and** a distinctive, structured organization, **both** a community of the churches **and** an instrument of the ecumenical movement. As such, said Lukas Vischer at the 1971 consultation, a council should be "a thorn in the flesh of the churches", prodding them to go beyond what they initially see as their agenda.[13]

But the challenge (the thorn) will likely be resisted unless the churches recognize that it comes, ultimately, from the mutual commitments they have made.

2. An overemphasis on the unity agenda runs the risk of diminishing the integrative, multi-dimensional character of councils of churches. Councils, unlike church union dialogues or single-issue coalitions, are the place where all of the streams of the movement-justice, service, mission, worship, education, as well as church unity-find expression and are brought into relation with one another. To say it another way, unity is central to the agenda of councils so long as we recognize that the churches are divided not only by the traditional themes of Faith and Order (e.g., sacraments, ministry, and authority) but also by racism, violence, poverty, and such questions as how Christians best witness to Christ in an interfaith world.

IV. Possible Implications of Conciliar Theology

A. This is an area for general conversation, but I will prime the pump with four observations. These points are hinted at in the documents, but not made so explicitly.

1. If we who give leadership in councils of churches can truly affirm that God is the Chief Actor in the ecumenical movement, it should sustain us in times of challenge. The fact that we cannot revel in institutional success may drive us to affirm the spiritual foundation of ecumenism; and that spiritual foundation is surely what keeps us from giving up in the face of denominational self-centeredness and shrinking resources.

[13] Lukas Vischer, *Christian Councils-Instruments of Ecclesial Communion*, in Kinnamon and Cope, p. 472.

2. If church leaders can affirm that unity is a gift God has given through Christ and the Spirit-can affirm that Christians are already intimately bound to one another thanks to what God has done, not our human agreements-then they should be able to disagree while staying at the conciliar table. If churches think that unity is dependent on their agreement, then they avoid dealing with divisive issues and are tempted to settle for occasional cooperation in the face of conflicts.

3. If churches can grasp and affirm that councils are, most essentially, the relationship they have with other member churches, it should strengthen their sense of mutual accountability and deepen their understanding of the meaning of membership. Instead of speaking of what "that council" should do, they may begin to ask whether their own ecumenical commitment is adequate to the imperative of the gospel.

4. If churches (church leaders) can internalize the points made in sections II and III above, it might help strengthen ecumenical commitment in times of financial distress. Times like these **could** be an opportunity to take seriously the famously-ignored "Lund Principle": "...doing all things together except those which deep differences of conviction compel us to do separately"[14] (or, at least, doing ecumenically what the churches can no longer afford to do denominationally!). But, in the absence of a convicting vision of unity in Christ, times like these can reinforce the pull toward ecclesiastical introversion, protecting what is "theirs" rather than sharing resources with one another for the sake of our common witness to the gospel.

B. All that I have said above points to the importance of theological formation on the conciliar agenda. "Being ecumenical" is often equated with tolerant cooperation, thereby missing the theological basis of the movement and sidestepping the challenge to deeper commitment and renewal. Ecumenism is often (generally?) viewed as an add-on to the churches' "real work", or even as a threat to their "real identity". Instead of being seen as the integrating context for faithfulness, ecumenism's concern for manifesting our oneness in Christ is played off against other priorities (e.g., social justice or evangelism). Thus any real change in councils requires deep-seated change in the churches. This is the greatest challenge for councils of churches in this-or, probably, any-era.[15] **Appendix**

[14] See Kinnamon and Cope, p. 463.

[15] The theology of conciliar ecumenism is discussed in greater depth in Diane Kessler and Michael Kinnamon, *Councils of Churches and the Ecumenical Vision,* WCC,

I hope that our final report will reflect something of the historical and cultural context of this consultation. With that in mind, I want to highlight the work of the Lebanese writer, Amin Maalouf, best known for such novels as *The Rock of Tanios* and *The Gardens of Light*. The book I have in mind, however, is *In the Name of Identity*: *Violence and the Need to Belong*, a work that stems from Maalouf's own experience of being an Arabic-speaking Lebanese Christian who lives in France and writes in French.

Identity is, or should be, a key theme of the ecumenical movement. I have often presented the ecumenical vision by insisting that "Christian" is the noun that defines us (identifies who we are), a claim which relativisms all other identity markers. I, for example, am a white, male, American, Protestant **Christian**. Scripturally, this brings to mind Galatians 3, 27-28. Paul is a Jew, freeborn, male-all thing that gave him privileged status in his society. And yet, all of these "identities", he declares, are made secondary by our baptismal identity in Christ. This is the basis of our unity.

Maalouf's book, however, challenges-or, at least, complicates- such an argument in two ways. First, drawing on the Lebanese experience, he insists that particular identities are incredibly important (whether we like it or not), and they inevitably affect how we understand ourselves as Christians (whether we like it or not). We are related in Christ, but it is of real consequence whether we are African Christians or European Christians, Orthodox Christians from Lebanon or Protestant Christians from Sri Lanka.

Second, again drawing on the Lebanese context, he argues passionately that when any single identity marker is raised to the status of most important, especially if it is a religious affiliations, then communities often become exclusivist, even murderous. People, he thinks, should be encouraged to

2000, chs. 1-3. See also a very substantive 1963 report by the Department of Faith and Order Studies of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA: "The Ecclesiological Significance of Councils of Churches," in Joseph A. Burgess and Jeffrey Gros, eds., *Growing Consensus: Church Dialogues in the United States*, 1962-1991, Paulist Press, 1995, p. 585-613; the report of a 1981 meeting sponsored by the Joint Working Group between the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church, published in *Mid-Stream*, vol. XXII, no. 2 (1983), p. 222-37; and Thomas F. Best, *Councils of Churches: Local, National, Regional* in *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement*, WCC, 2002, p. 255-63.

see themselves as unique amalgamations of various identities. And "what has to do with religion must be kept apart from what has to do with identity" if we are ever to stop feeding fanaticism and terror.

That is a debate worth having! For myself, a preferable alternative is to affirm Christian identity, but to work hard at redefining how we express that identity-not in terms of distinction and separation, but in terms of radical hospitality. Who are we? The followers of Jesus Christ who calls and empowers us to welcome others as he has welcomed us (Romans 15, 7). What is the Church? The community in which this identity of hospitality is formed and practiced. What is a council of churches? A community of communities in which our sense of Christian identity is constantly tested and enlarged through living relationship with Christians who are shaped by other particular cultures and experiences.

Wrestling with this issue of identity may be a way of taking very seriously, not only our ecumenical calling, but the Lebanese context in which we meet.

Michael Kinnamon[1]

Baza teologică a ecumenismului sinodal (conciliar).
Consultarea internațională a Consiliilor Naționale ale Bisericilor (CNB) şi a organizațiilor regionale ecumenice (ORE) 6-10 februarie, 2012

Rezumat
Articolul se referă la baza teologică a ecumenismului conciliar aşa cum apare aceasta în mai multe documente foarte importante. Autorul identifică, în acest sens, trei argumente teologice majore.

În consiliile ecumenice ale Bisericilor, care reprezintă o realitate nouă în istoria bisericii, problema de bază, care se pune, este de natură ecleziologică: În ce măsură realitatea Bisericii este exprimată în consiliile bisericilor? Şi în ce fel pot consiliile contribui la expresia vizibilă a unității bisericii? Autorul, inspirându-se din documentele ecumenice de la mijlocul secolului trecut, prezintă specificul relațiilor dintre Bisericile ce compun un Consiliu Ecumenic al Bisericilor. Un consiliu nu este atât o organizație la care bisericile se alătură, cât este un angajament reciproc pe care îl fac, în scopul de a forma o comunitate de biserici. O altă realitate este aceea că, calitatea de membru într-un consiliu de biserici nu implică neapărat recunoaşterea celorlalți membri ca biserici, în sensul deplin al cuvântului, dar trebuie recunoscut că aceştia posedă, totuşi, elemente, chiar foarte puține, din biserica adevărată. O temă centrală de la consultările din 1971 a fost ideea că, consiliile sunt „instrumente ale unității".

Articolul se încheie cu prezentarea problemei identității fiecărei biserici în mişcarea ecumenică la care participă.

Cuvinte cheie
Consiliul Ecumenic al Bisericilor, unitate, dialog ecumenic, Organizații Regionale ale Bisericilor

---

[1] Dr., Universitatea din Seattle, fostul Secretar General la Consiliului Național al Bisericilor (CNC),

I. Introducere

A. Această lucrare nu este o descriere a ceea ce CNB şi ORE au spus de fapt, în diversele noastre declarații de bază, ci un rezumat a ceea ce reprezentanții ecumenici au scris despre baza teologică a ecumenismului sinodal (conciliar) în mai multe documente răspândite pe scară largă şi de influență, în special: 1) rapoartele a trei consultări internaționale anterioare ale CNB şi ORE (1971[2], 1986[3], şi în 1993[4]); 2) Declarația de la Toronto a Consiliul Mondial al Bisericilor (1950[5]), 3) „Către o înțelegere şi viziune comună a CMB" (CUV, 1997[6]).

B. Într-un sens, începând cu o lucrare legată de nevoile teologiei, care nu are nevoie de nici o apărare sau explicație, deoarece Dumnezeu este întotdeauna centrul şi fundamentul nostru, există un alt motiv pentru care teologia primează atât de proeminent în agenda noastră. Mai multe CNB şi ORE se confruntă cu perspectiva de reorganizare în fața presiunii financiare, dar există întotdeauna tentația de a face schimbări „ortopedice", atunci când problemele reale sunt „cardiace" - adică, să restructureze fără abordarea teologică a importanței relației dintre biserici. Cu aceaste gânduri în minte, voi încerca în această lucrare să încep discuția noastră despre modul în care o înțelegere fermă a fundamentului teologic ar putea să ne permită să abordăm mai eficient provocările cu care se confruntă consiliile în această eră.

II. Bazele Teologice ale ecumenismului

A. Înainte de a vorbi în special despre consilii, trebuie să recunoaştem contextul teologic mai larg. Trei convingeri par deosebit de importante, şi pot fi suficiente pentru a stimula discuția noastră.

---

2 „Ecumenical Review", vol. 23, no. 4 (1971), p. 442-48.

3 Thomas F. Best, ed., *Instruments of Unity: National Councils of Churches within the One Ecumenical Movement,* WCC, 1988, p. 96-127.

4 „Ecumenical Review", vol. 45, no. 3 (1993), p. 291-98.

5 Michael Kinnamon and Brian E. Cope, eds., *The Ecumenical Movement: An Anthology of Key Texts and Voices,* WCC and Eerdmans, 1997, p. 463-468. Capitolul IX din această antologie conține un număr de texte importante legate de ecumenismul conciliar.

6 Disponibil pe site-ul web al Consiliului Mondial al Bisericilor.

1. Actorul principal în mişcarea ecumenică este Dumnezeu Creatorul, întrupat în Iisus Hristos, şi prezent prin Duhul Sfânt. Ori de câte ori mişcarea „se mişcă", nu este realizarea noastră pe care noi o sărbătorim, ci harul şi puterea lui Dumnezeu, pentru care mulţumim.

2. Scopul lui Dumnezeu este integritatea creaţiei, şi Dumnezeu a chemat biserica, comuniunea dintre ucenicii lui Hristos, să fie semn, instrument, şi pregustare a acestei misiuni divine. Rezultă că mişcarea ecumenică este în cele din urmă legată de totalitatea lumii şi anterior acesteia de totalitatea Bisericii. (Această reordonare a secvenţei de priorităţi [Dumnezeu-lume-biserică, mai degrabă decât Dumnezeu-biserică-lume], reprezintă o schimbare semnificativă în teologia ecumenică în ultimii patruzeci de ani.[7])

3. Unitatea este un semn cheie al bisericii, o caracteristică care este crucială pentru participarea sa la misiunea lui Dumnezeu. Unitatea Bisericii, în conformitate cu primul punct (de mai sus), nu este realizarea noastră. În cuvintele Declaraţiei de la Toronto, bisericile care-L mărturisesc pe Iisus Hristos ca Domn întrupat „nu trebuie să creeze unitatea lor, aceasta este un dar al lui Dumnezeu. Dar ei ştiu că este de datoria lor de a face cauză comună în căutarea exprimării acelei unităţi în muncă şi viaţă". Sarcina mişcării ecumenice este de a face vizibil în lume darul lui Dumnezeu de împăcare a comunităţilor, pentru a fi locul unde bisericile pot deveni ceea ce sunt, trupul lui Hristos, pentru că împreună pot asista la voia lui Dumnezeu pentru dreptate şi pace în întreaga creaţie.

B. Claritatea cu privire la aceste convingeri teologice ar trebui să afecteze modul în care bisericile înţeleg să participe la consiliile, (care sunt expresiile majore ale mişcării ecumenice). După cum a afirmat Willem Visser't Hooft, o comuniune de biserici, care ştiu că nu este nici o altă suveranitate, cu excepţia suveranităţii lui Hristos, este în esenţă diferită de o adunare pragmatică de biserici, care se consideră suverane.[8]

III. Bazele teologice ale ecumenismului sinodal

A. Discuţiile despre natura şi scopul consiliilor bisericilor de multe ori nu este formulată în termeni teologici în mod explicit. Problema de bază, cu

[7] Această reordonare este numită în raportul de consultare din 1971 şi a fost făcută foarte explicită în CUV, pars. 2.4 şi 2.5.

[8] W.A. Visser't Hooft, *The Significance of the World Council of Churches*, în "Man's Disorder and God's Design: The Amsterdam Assembly Series", Harper, 1949, p. 185.

toate acestea, este de natura ecleziologică: În ce măsură realitatea Bisericii este exprimată în consiliile bisericilor? Şi în ce măsură (în ce fel) pot consiliile contribui la expresia vizibilă a unităţii bisericii?

B. Aşa cum mai mulţi lideri ecumenici au observat, consiliile sunt un lucru nou în istoria bisericii, unul pentru care nu a existat un vocabular teologic adecvat.[9] Cu toate acestea, de la mijlocul secolului trecut au existat tentative importante pentru a umple acest vid, în special în documentele pe care le discutăm. Deşi este dificil de rezumat, următoarele trei puncte au fost în mod repetat afirmate.

1. Esenţa unui consiliu de biserici este relaţia dintre bisericile membre, una cu cealaltă, nu relaţia lor cu structura Consiliului. Un consiliu nu este atât o organizaţie la care bisericile se alătură cât este un angajament reciproc pe care îl fac, în scopul de a forma o comunitate de biserici. Ori de câte ori bisericile consideră un organism sinodal ca „ei" mai degrabă decat ca „noi", şi „acea organizaţie" mai degrabă decât „părtăşia noastră", atunci viaţa sinodală a fost radical prost înţeleasă şi responsabilitatea pe care ar trebui să se potrivească cu calitatea de membru sinodal este minimizată. Fostul membru al CMB, Victor Hayward, după ce a vizitat optzeci de CNB, a pus problema în acest fel la consultarea din 1971: „Un comitet de consiliu înseamnă, de obicei, o adunare a liderilor bisericii de a decide ce va face consiliul, în loc de ce ar trebui să facă împreună bisericile prin intermediul Consiliului. Bisericile nu sunt realmente angajate una alteia... Acest lucru înseamnă că, consiliile sunt prea des o faţadă ecumenică în spatele căreia bisericile în practică rămân mai neecumenice ca niciodată."[10] (Acesta este un alt exemplu de schimbare în gândirea ecumenică. Acest lucru este evident în seria de CNB / REO consultări, este mult mai proeminent în textul CUV decât în Declaraţia Toronto, şi este sensul ascuns al modelului conciliar „bisericile împreună" [de exemplu, în Marea Britanie şi Irlanda]).

2. În timp ce calitatea de membru într-un consiliu de biserici nu implică neapărat recunoaşterea ceilalţi membri ca biserici, în sensul deplin al cuvântului, implică totuşi (sau ar trebui), o recunoaştere, „că alţi membri aparţin lui Hristos, calitatea de membru în biserica lui Hristos este mai inclusivă decât calitatea de membru al bisericii lor, şi că alţii posedă

[9] E.g., Nikos Nissiotis, *Christian Councils and the Unity of the Local Church*, în "One in Christ", vol. VIII, no. 2 (1972), p. 163.

[10] Victor Hayward, *A Survey of National Christian Councils*, în "International Review of Mission", vol. 60, no. 240 (1971), p. 518.

elemente foarte puţine din biserica adevărată" (CUV, ecou Toronto). În caz contrar, Consiliul va fi văzut ca o structură pur utilitaristă, şi nu ca o expresie parţială şi preliminară, de părtăşie în Hristos.

3. Părtăşie sau comunitate, relaţia în centrul unui consiliu de biserici este „o realitate relaţională dinamică" (CUV), care ar trebui să se schimbe şi, sperăm, să se aprofundeze, ca rezultat al interacţiunii în cadrul Consiliului. Rezultă că consiliile de biserici ar trebui să fie considerate ca fiind provizorii, ar trebui să fie pregătite să moară pentru ca manifestările mai pline de comuniune să se poată naşte. Aceştia sunt paşi spre comuniunea profundă ca biserică, care este motivul pentru care consiliile trădează chemarea lor, şi care împiedică, de fapt, munca ecumenismului, în cazul în care devin organizaţii de servicii auto-perpetuante. Deciziile cu privire la unire sunt, evident, lăsate la latitudina bisericilor, dar consiliile sunt locurile unde încrederea se poate dezvolta, problemele dezbinării pot fi discutate, precum şi primirea rezultatelor de dialog ecumenic pot fi încurajate.

O temă centrală de la consultările din 1971 a fost ideea că, consiliile sunt „instrumente ale unităţii". Atunci când această chemare este uitată, a declarat teologul catolic Jean Tillard la consultarea din 1993, consiliile de biserici devin ca descrierea lui de Gaulle a guvernului de la Vichy: instituţii a căror efect este „de a face de ruşine înfrângerii acceptabilă".[11]

C. În rezumat: Consiliile de biserici nu sunt biserica. „Semnificaţiile lor ecleziologice" provin din identitatea lor de comunităţi de biserici, dând expresie parţială unităţii, care este darul nostru în Hristos şi apelului creştinilor de a face acest dar vizibil ca un semn al iubirii reconciliatoare a lui Dumnezeu pentru întreaga creaţie. Cu alte cuvinte, semnificaţia lor teologică constă în: a) relaţia dintre biserici una cu alta, b) presiunea de a face părtăşia mai profundă, care vine cu viaţa în consiliu, şi c) misiunea comună pe care bisericile o fac împreună ca şi consiliul.[12]

---

[11] J.-M.R. Tillard, *The Mission of Councils of Churches*, în "Ecumenical Review", vol. 45, no. 3 (1993), p. 276. Comisia Credinţă şi Constituţie a CMB a exprimat acest lucru sub formă de întrebări. „Oare nu consiliile continuă să servească cauza unităţii, sau mai degrabă ele instituţionalizează un grad limitat de unitate şi perpetuează diviziunea? Nu servesc la a face pasul următor, sau nu dau bisericilor un sfat bun lăsându-le într-o etapă în care acestea nu sunt nici foarte divizate, dar nici foarte unite?" *Sharing in the Hope*, Bangalore, 1978, WCC, 1978, p. 282.

[12] Raportul din 1971 merge mai departe decât celelalte: „Chiar şi acum, când bisericile au o oarecare viaţă comună, mărturisesc şi acţionează împreună, o nouă realitate ecle-

D. Punctele de mai sus au generat tensiuni evidente sau preocupări care sunt abordate, în special, în rapoartele de la consultările CNB / REO.

1. Un accent special pe rolul consiliilor ca „biserici împreună”, duce la riscul de a diminua potențialul lor de mărturie profetică, de pionierat. Un consiliu este atât o întovărăşire a bisericilor şi o structurată distinctiv organizată, cât şi o comunitate a bisericilor şi un instrument al mişcării ecumenice. Ca atare, a declarat Lukas Vischer la consultarea din 1971, un consiliu ar trebui să fie „un ghimpe în trupul bisericilor”, împingându-le să meargă dincolo de ceea ce ele văd inițial ca ordine de zi.[13]

Dar provocarea (ghimpele) va fi probabil acceptată în cazul în care bisericile recunosc că este vorba, în cele din urmă, de angajamentele reciproce pe care le-au făcut.

2. Un accent deosebit pe ordinea de zi duce la riscul de a diminua caracterul integrator, multi-dimensional al consiliilor de biserici. Consiliile, spre deosebire de dialogurile de unire a Bisericilor sau coalițiilor de dezbatere a unei probleme, sunt locul în care toate fluxurile de mişcare-justiție, servicii, misiune, cult, învățământ, precum şi unitatea Bisericii îşi găsesc expresia şi sunt aduse în relație una cu alta. Altfel vorbind, unitatea este subiectul central pe ordinea de zi a consiliilor atâta timp cât noi recunoaştem că bisericile sunt împărțite, nu numai de temele tradiționale de Credință şi Constituție (de exemplu, taine, slujire şi autoritate), dar, de asemenea, de rasism, violență, sărăcie, şi probleme, cum ar fi modul în care creştinii aduc o mai bună mărturie a lui Hristos într-o lume a credinței.

IV. Posibilele implicații ale teologiei sinodale

A. Aceasta este o zonă de conversație generală, dar voi porni cu patru observații. La acestea se face aluzie în documente, dar nu sunt detaliate.

1. Dacă noi, cei care suntem la conducere în consiliile de biserici putem afirma cu adevărat că Dumnezeu este actorul principal în mişcarea ecumenică, ar trebui să ne susțină în vremuri de provocare. Faptul că nu ne

zială apare - nu în consiliu ca o organizație, ci printre bisericile membre, întrucât acestea împărtăşesc această experiență ecumenică prin instrumentalitatea consiliului”, în “Ecumenical Review”, vol. 23, no. 4 (1971), p. 443 (sublinierea noastră).

[13] Lukas Vischer, *Christian Councils-Instruments of Ecclesial Communion*, în Kinnamon and Cope, p. 472.

putem lăuda cu succesul instituțional ne poate împiedica să afirmăm baza spirituală a ecumenismului; şi fundamentul spiritual este cu siguranță ceea ce ne determină să nu îngenunchem în fața egocentrismului confesional şi a resurselor care se diminuează.

2. Dacă liderii bisericii pot afirma că unitatea este un dar pe care Dumnezeu l-a dat prin Hristos şi Duhul Sfânt, se poate afirma că creştinii sunt deja strâns legați unul de altul, datorită a ceea ce Dumnezeu a făcut, nu datorită acordurilor noastre umane, atunci ei ar trebui să poată să fie în dezacord în timp ce stau la masa sinodală. Dacă bisericile cred că unitatea este dependentă de acordul lor, atunci ei evită să se ocupe cu probleme ce vizează dezbinarea şi sunt tentați să stabilească o cooperare ocazională în fața conflictelor.

3. În cazul în care bisericile se pot înțelege şi afirma că consiliile sunt, în esență, relațiile pe care le au cu alte biserici membre, ar trebui să consolideze sentimentul de responsabilitate reciprocă şi să aprofundeze înțelegerea sensului de membru. În loc de a vorbi de ceea ce „acel consiliu" ar trebui să facă, ei pot începe să se întrebe dacă angajamentul lor este adecvat imperativelor Evangheliei.

4. Dacă bisericile (liderii bisericii) pot aprofunda punctele menționate în secțiunile II şi III de mai sus, s-ar putea ajuta la consolidarea angajamentului ecumenic, în vremuri de dificultăți financiare. Aceste ocazii ar putea fi o oportunitate de a lua în serios faimosul ignorat „Principiul Lund": „... a face toate lucrurile împreună, cu excepția celor pe care diferențele profunde de convingere ne obligă să le facem separat"[14] (sau, cel puțin, să facem ecumenic ceea ce bisericile nu-şi mai pot permite să facă în mod denominal). Dar, în absența unei viziuni convingătoare a unității în Hristos, momentele de criză pot îndemna spre introversiune ecleziastică, protejând ceea ce este „al lor", mai degrabă decât împărtăşind resursele de dragul mărturiei noastre comune a Evangheliei.

B. Tot ce am spus mai sus, subliniază importanța formării teologice prezente pe ordinea de zi conciliară. „A fi ecumenic" este adesea asimilat cu cooperarea, toleranța, lipsind astfel baza teologică a mişcării şi încercând să ocolească provocarea de a aprofunda şi de a reînnoi angajamentul. Ecumenismul este de multe ori (în general?), privit ca un ceva în plus pentru „lucrarea reală" a bisericilor, sau chiar ca o amenințare la adresa „identității reale". În loc să fie văzut ca un context de integrare pentru

[14] Vezi Kinnamon and Cope, p. 463.

credință, preocuparea ecumenismului pentru manifestarea unicității noastre în Hristos este cedată altor priorități (de exemplu, dreptate socială sau de evanghelizare). Astfel, orice schimbare reală în consilii necesită o profundă schimbare în biserici. Aceasta este cea mai mare provocare pentru consiliile de biserici în această-sau, probabil, în orice eră.[15]

Apendice

Sper că raportul nostru final va reflecta ceva din contextul istoric şi cultural al acestei consultări. În această ordine de idei, vreau să subliniez opera scriitorului libanez, Amin Maalouf, a cărui cele mai cunoscute romanele sunt: *Stânca de la Tanios* şi *Grădinile de Lumină.* Cartea la care mă voi referi este *În numele identității*: *Violența şi necesitatea de a aparține,* o lucrare care decurge din experiența proprie a lui Maalouf, de a fi un creştin libanez, vorbitor de arabă, care trăieşte în Franța şi scrie în limba franceză.

Identitatea este, sau ar trebui să fie, o temă cheie a mişcării ecumenice. Am prezentat de multe ori viziunea ecumenică insistând asupra faptului că cuvântul „creştin" este un substantiv care ne defineşte (identifică cine suntem), relativizând toți ceilalți marcări de identitate. Eu, de exemplu, sunt un alb, de sex masculin, american, creştin protestant. Scripturistic, acest lucru ne aminteşte de Galateni 3, 27-28. Pavel este un evreu, născut liber, de sex masculin - toate atuurile care i-au dat un statut privilegiat în societatea lui. Şi totuşi, toate aceste „identități", declară el, sunt secundare identității noastre date de botezul în Hristos. Aceasta este baza unității noastre. Cu toate acestea, cartea lui Maalouf contestă sau, cel puțin, complică - un astfel de argument în două moduri. În primul rând,

[15] Teologia ecumenismului conciliar este discutată în mai mare profunzime în Diane Kessler şi Kinnamon Michael, *Councils of Churches and the Ecumenical Vision,* CMB, 2000, cap. 1-3. A se vedea, de asemenea un foarte substanțial raport din 1963 al Departamentului de Studii Credință şi Constituție al Consiliului Național al Bisericilor lui Hristos, în Statele Unite ale Americii: „The Ecclesiological Significance of Councils of Churches", în Joseph A. Burgess şi Jeffrey Gros, EDS, *Growing Consensus: Church Dialogues in the United States*, *în* 1962-1991, Paulist Press, 1995, p. 585-613, raportul unei reuniuni din 1981 sponsorizate de către Grupul mixt de lucru între CMB şi Biserica Romano-Catolică, publicat în *Mid-Stream,* vol.. XXII, nr. 2 (1983), p. 222-37, şi Thomas F. Best, *Councils of Churches: Local, National, Regional*, în *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement,* CMB, 2002, p. 255-63.

bazându-se pe experienţa libaneză, el insistă asupra faptului că identităţile particulare sunt incredibil de importante (indiferent dacă ne place sau nu), şi acestea afectează în mod inevitabil, felul în care ne înţelegem pe noi înşine ca şi creştini (indiferent dacă ne place sau nu). Noi suntem uniţi în Hristos, dar are o reală consecinţă faptul că suntem creştini din Africa sau creştini europeni, creştini ortodocşi din Liban sau creştini protestanţi din Sri Lanka.

În al doilea rând, din nou, pornind de la contextul libanez, el susţine cu pasiune că, atunci când orice marker de identitate unică este ridicat la statutul de cel mai important, mai ales dacă acesta este unul cu afilieri religioase, atunci comunităţile devin de multe ori exclusiviste, chiar criminale. Oamenii, crede el, ar trebui să fie încurajaţi să se vadă ca amalgamuri unice de identităţi diferite. Şi „Ce are de a face cu religia trebuie să fie separat de ceea ce are de a face cu identitatea", dacă suntem vreodată pentru a opri alimentarea fanatismului şi a terorii.

Aceasta este o dezbatere care merită atenţie. Din punctul meu de vedere, o alternativă de preferat este să se afirme identitatea creştină, dar să lucreze din greu la redefinirea modului în care ne exprimăm acea identitate, nu în termeni de distincţie şi de separare, dar în termeni de ospitalitate radicală! Cine suntem noi? Urmaşii lui Iisus Hristos, care ne invită şi ne împuterniceşte să primim pe alţii aşa cum ne-a primit El (Romani 15, 7). Ce este Biserica? Comunitatea în care această identitate de ospitalitate este formată şi practicată. Ce este un consiliu de biserici? O comunitate de comunităţi, în care sentimentul nostru de identitate creştină este în mod constant testat şi extins prin relaţie vie cu creştinii care sunt modelaţi de către alte culturi şi experienţe specifice.

Lupta cu această problemă de identitate poate fi o modalitate de a lua foarte în serios nu numai chemarea noastră ecumenica, dar si contextul libanez în care apare.

Constantin Rus[1]

Provisions of the Constitution of 1866, 1923 and 1938 on the religious ceremony of marriage

Abstract

Christian marriage is essentially a meeting of two beings in love, a human love which can be transformed, by the sacramental grace of the Holy Spirit, into an eternal bond, indissoluble even by death. But this sacramental transformation does not suppress the human character of the whole complex of emotions, actions, joys, or vicissitudes connected with marriages: acquaintance, dating, courtship, the decision itself and, finally, common life with its difficult responsibilities. The New Testament teaching on marriage is addressed to concrete human beings, who are not only committed to Christ, but are also living in the conditions of the present world. The various rules and disciplines which have been and still are proposed to Christians in connection with marriage are there to protect and preserve the fundamental meaning of marriage in the concrete conditions of human life. These rules are not ends in themselves, for they would be substitutes for love, but their aim is to protect both the divine and the human reality of marriage from the consequences of man's fall.

In this paper we try to analyze the rules of the fundamental laws of Romania from 1866, 1923 and 1938 regarding to the Christian marriage. This paper will have its center of gravity in Romanian legal history of the last one hundred forty six years. We have analyzed how there was the freedom of choice and decision which is the first condition of the Christian marriage maintain.

Keywords

marriage, roman law, legal marriage, Civil Code, constitutional law, civil marriage.

[1] Ph.D., „Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, rusconstantin15@yahoo.com.

1. Customary land and the law

Constant link - made by mutual consent - between two people of opposite sex in order to help each other to give birth and raise children was founded by God, as Scripture says: „This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my body, it shall be called Woman, because of her husband was taken. Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife and two shall become one flesh" (Genesis 2, 23-24).

Monogamy and monoandria - essential conditions to divine institutions - were then replaced by polygamy and even polyandry. Lamech, the tribe of Cain, was the first who deviate from the rules of marriage established by God. After the flood, first parents allowed polygamy, but only for a short time and as urgent justification: had to multiply the earth people injured by the flood. In time, however, sensuality rises above reason and practicing polygamy is allowed, and is justified by the following argument: polygamy will be a delay before the bodily fornication. Polygamy, instead to move more moral state, led to immorality and debauchery.

All attempts of moralists of the ancient world to eradicate polygamy did not have any effect because they were guided by the people. Someone above people had to come, to bring back those lost in the divine example, and He was Jesus Christ, who told the Pharisees: „Haven't you read, that he who has done first, man and female created them?... They are no longer two but one flesh. So what God has joined together, let man not separate" (Matthew 19, 4, 6).

Saviour Christ restored marriage to its original meaning, moreover, he raises it to the rank of mystery. This elevation, made in connection with the sacrament of baptism (one who was baptized joined the Church of Christ and others add to this body by marriage), took place at the wedding at Cana in Galilee.

Marriage has a double aspect: religious-moral and as such is a church institution, and socio-legal, whereas it is based family, which is the basic not only the Church but also the state and thus it is a State institution. Therefore both Church and State reserves the right legislation and jurisdiction in matrimonial cases, the first on the sacrament of marriage, and the second of contract.[2]

[2] Pr. Valerian Şesan, *Curs de drept bisericesc universal,* Cernăuți, 1938, p. 2-8.

Roman people, putting marriage between private institutions, namely the civil law, considerred marriage as a civil matter. However Romans had a marriage reserved for patricians, called referred confarreatio, which consists of a religious ceremony celebrated by priests in front of ten witnesses and a woman share offering called Panis farrens (hence confarreatio), committed in man's home before images of deified ancestors.[3] This marriage is considered to exist in legal terms at the time when the woman was introduced in the man's house. Both confarreatio and other forms of termination of marriage in Roman law (coemptio and usus) were replaced by the simple marriage consent form terminating the marriage in force during emergence Christianity.

Christian Church imposed State the observation forms of the marriage - so the marriage by consent - which filled in with the blessing of marriage. First, State gave no attention to marriage and could not be an obligation of the wedding.

Only emperor Justinian provides that people from middle class can show their decision to marriage in a church before that lawyer and he had to bring three or four clergymen who were found there to testify the day he admitted contracting marriage and other such moments and then release the contractors and clergy. This testimony, which was placed in the church archives, is evidence of contracting marriage performed and had the same importance as if it had occurred before the civil authority.[4]

Emperor Leo VI the Philosopher, in the year 893 or 894, gave Novell 89 under which only marriage blessed by the church is a iustum matrimonium, thus all classes were forced to conclude religious marriage. Emperor Alexius Comnenus by his Novells of 1086 and 1095, and Andronicus Paleologus, by the Novel since 1306, have renewed the provisions on the obligation of religious marriage. Alexis Comnenus by his Novel of 1086, entrusts bishops and his suffragans the knowledge of matrimonial causes, giving the church full jurisdiction in matrimonial causes.

History of Romanian law makes memory the works of Paul Giovio and Leonhardus Goreccius, because these two scholars from the sixteenth

---

[3] Dr. Ion M. Anghel, *Drept privat roman,* vol. I, Editura Hyperion XXI, Bucureşti, 1991, p. 53-56, în special p. 55; Cf. şi Vladimir Hanga, *Principiile Dreptului Privat Roman,* Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1989, p. 58-67; I. C. Cătuneanu, *Curs elementar de drept roman,* Bucureşti, 1927, p. 147.

[4] Dr. Nicodim Milaş, *Dreptul bisericesc oriental,* trad. de D. Cornilescu şi V. Radu, Bucureşti, 1915, p. 476.

century have investigated the two Romanian principalities and each one wrote a paper on the situation of the Romanian people. Leonhardus Goreccius wrote: *Descriptio belli Ivoniae palatini Valachiae*, *quo dis anno 1574 cum Selymo II Turcarum imperator gessit* (1582 and Paul Giovio wrote: *Historia sui temporis ab ano 1494 ad anum 1547* (Paris, 1553). At the latter situation we find briefly described the people *apud Valahos enim, non Romanae modo disciplinae certi mores, et leges vigent, sed ipsa quoquo Latinae linquae vocabula servantur.*

Learning ruler Cantemir admits „Dacia, when it was under the Romans, was ot headed only by the Romans, but also after its rules.[5] Then "Moldavians marry their children at the age which is determined by the Church... In the evening, after vespers [young people] go to church" where is the religious ceremony.

Therefore, in the Romanian Principalities, our ancestors served the Roman law and Roman habits. The law was the Justinian Code, which was brought to these parts to the population who fled south of the Danube and situated at its north. So in Wallachian parts, religious ceremony was required only as it is shown by Dimitrie Cantemir, which describes in detail how to commit marriage. Roman, Latin was so rooted in the land of Dacia, that any storm, any unhappiness could not snatch it. The ark of the law was kept intact with the Romans who had escaped with their existence in the ravines of the mountains, where they fled from the barbarian conquests. When he retired last wave of this flood, forest people went out to fertile plains of the country and brought their old habits, their attachment to ancestors and Romans in the administration or the military art, either in legislation. Indeed, the Romanians of the two dismounted thought to re-foundation of their State, which was targeted model eyes was all ancient Rome, in all relationships.

Acording to the learned Professor S. G. Longinescu[6] - shared by most experts - the first Romanian law was written by Alexander the Best, gleaned from Roman and Byzantine emperors laws. He gleaned

[5] Dimitrie Cantemir, Descrierea Moldovei, Bucureşti, 1909, p. 21 şi 101.

[6] Dr. doc. Valentin Al. Georgescu, *Ştefan G. Longinescu. Dascălul Universitar. Profesorul Gânditor. Romanistul,* partea a II-a, în „Studii de Drept Românesc", serie nouă, 1 (4), anul I (34), octombrie-decembrie, 1989, p. 381-392. Pentru Partea I – ca portret de ansamblu – a acestui studiu-evocare, vezi *„Studii de Drept Românesc",* nr. 1, 1988, p. 77-84. A se vedea şi Valentin Al. Georgescu, *In memoriam. S. G. Longinescu. La zece ani de la moarte,* în „Dreptul", nr. festiv, 3 (1943), p. 20-21.

from Greek Basilika and Roman Codices only what he found necessary and appropriate to the needs of his country, upholding customary land.[7] Almost general opinion of experts, this law forms Part I of Rule Vasile Lupu (1646) and has 282 articles.

From the seventeenth century we have these Rules: (1) of Eustathius in Moldova, (2) the Small Rule, translated by Michael Moxalie, (3) Correction of the Law or the Great Rule, printed in Târgovişte in 1652 which is the official collection of Romanian laws, (4) Vasile Lupu's Rule, printed in Iaşi in 1646, entitled "Romanian Book of lesson from royal Rules and other *giudețe* with itself and with all expenses of Vasile, Voivode and Lord of Moldavia, from many scripts translated in Romanian language from Latin language ..."

The most significant of these is the great Rule or the straightening of Law. It is five times the Rule of Vasile Lupu, who deal almost exclusively with civil matters. Moreover, the straightening of Law includes provisions from Manuil Malaxa ‚s Nomocanon and Aristen Alexis's comment, and a good part of the Rule of Vasile Lupu. The fact that the law of Vasile Lupu was contained in the statutes of Matei Basarab, which he said it mandatory in the Romanian country, means that the law of Moldova was declared mandatory in Romanian Country in 1652, thus leading to a unit law between the two Romanian Principalities. Romanian principalities legislative union was achieved 207 years before the political union. The Rule of Vasile Lupu, head. 58 § 2, provided that the royal Rules have power as the earth habits. The royal Rules- as described by scholar Longinescu - include: Basilika, Novells of Justinian's, Novells of Leo VI the Philosopher, the Synopsis, paraphrase Institutiones of Justinian, Jus graeco-Romanus and manuals of the juice or Hexabiblos of Harmenopulos, legislation that provides just exclusive jurisdiction of the Church in matrimonial causes.

The Great Rule, in Part II of the marriage, the chapter: For wedding and its forms, it says: „Marriage is a sacrament in which two sides, ie man and woman unite with each other in the church in order to live together all their lives to fruition. „And at paragraph 13 stated: „The priest, that Protopresbyter, is published, the research ..."[8]

Chapter XV of Caragea's Code, paragraph 3, includes the following: "It breaks the engagement which will be against marriage's rules", and in

[7] S.G. Longinescu, *Legile vechi româneşti şi izvoarele lor,* Bucureşti, 1912, p. 13.
[8] *Îndreptarea Legii,* Editura "Pelerinul Român", Oradea, 2002, p. 301.

art. 4, 5, 6 and 7 provides that priests are carriers of registers transcript, because they have jurisdiction in matrimonial causes. In 1833, prince of Moldavia, C. Sturza, appoint a committee for drafting a new Civil Code. This committee included: Petrache Asachi and jurisconsults Hristian Flechtenmacher and Damascus Bojinca - Banat. The draft law prepared by them becomes official on November 26, 1833. This Code strengthens the above provisions, completing them if they had shortcomings. So it made the priests responsible if they did not notice the impediment made in free and unfree marriages (art. 163-167). The middle of the nineteenth century marked an era ends of the Romanian legislation. So far, in the Romanian countries, laws were created and adapted to the needs of the place, time and people. Our Rules and earth habits were local creations adapt to reality. Then it came the time when laws, laws that seek to change the mentality of this people.

2. The age of foreign influences in legislation

Great French Revolution of 1789 overthrew all the cultural, religious and social, first in France, then the rest of Europe. It was broken all ties from the past between the State and the Church, ie with the Christianity. Separation of French state from the Church, for the emancipation from the papal supremacy, produced breaking the link with Christian principles. Romanian revolutionaries in 1848, adapting the principles of the French Revolution, sought to translate the ideas of „light" of Western philosophy to the Romanian people, although its traditions, culture and mentality were contrary to this trend.

It is intended that the church people to be deprived of any autonomy, power and authority by some people who had no special knowledge of history and canons. Our lawyers have opened even modern problem: the sacred canons of the Orthodox Church throughout the opportunity to have any force of law and negatively resolved the issue, „because the canons were, for some people, narrow and strange ideas and thus incompatible with progress mankind".[9]

[9] Dr. Valerian Şesan, *Catedra de Drept bisericesc la Facultăţile de drept*, în „Candela", nr. 1-12, an. 1938, p. 246.

In this spirit was kneaded the first Civil Code, which governed all matters of civil law among all citizens of the two Romanian Principalities.

How it was prepared, foresee the superficiality with which to work during this period to the importance of a lawful civil code, which was in force for three quarters of a century. Imitation disease of what was in France, was more fashionable than ever. A Civil Code, which includes 1914 articles, made by a committee of six members in a record time of only seven weeks (October 10-December 4, 1864), has made us unique in our way. Other countries, when they drafted a code they developed after studies, public talks, debates for 5-10 years;we have translated our Code Napoleon in seven weeks, almost word for word and gave the country a civil lawful. Even more, by copying some provisions of the Civil Code and by failing in accordance with the provisions of the Code Napoleon, the High Court of Cassation had to eliminate these contradictions.

Wisdom of ruler Alexandru Ioan Cuza was great, because without beilng a lawyer, he ordered the State Council to take as a model for drafting the first civil code of United Principalities, the recently Italian Civil Code, because only then the project was published, became later law. The commandment of the ruler was not taken into account.

Hamangiu lawyer characterized the way we have composed Code: „The rush of the composition work was at the expense of perfection, this hastily explains most of the gaps, errors, contradictions and uncertainty experienced by our code phrase.

Secularized spirit that was in vogue during the preparation of the French Civil Code has not yet definitively settled into the principalities, nor in 1865, yet the art. 61 of the Romanian Civil Code provides „that your marriage is a civil contract formed by an agreement solemnly expressed will of both spouses in the civil status officer, celebrating marriage". Civil legislator mistake was so obvious that the 1866 Constitution did not let the art available. 61 Romanian Civil Code. to offend the religious-moral sense of the great crowds that had not been drunk with the smell of perfume against the church in Paris.

The legislature of the 1866 Constitution, considering that marriage tradition was deeply rooted in religious mores of the population and in order not to uprising the Orthodox in this issue - especially since it was perfectly aware that for the peasant, only religoius marriage has value - modified art available. 61 Romanian Civil Code. by art. 22 of the Constitution, providing that „all acts of marriage must be made before religious blessing, that the validity of marriage is compulsory, except for certain cases that will be provided by law". By this text, the Constitution makes marriage a mixed contract, that is committed first marriage, after which prospective spouses are necessarily kept to go to church to have their share religious blessing, because otherwise the marriage is void. The texts are definite. Nobody can doubt the meaning as expressed in the Constitution of 1866 firmly in the art. 22 and yet those who did not find it's better this provision have been formed teams and have fought against mandatory religious marriage. Those who have studied in the West, have found that art. 22 of the Constitution of 1866 can not be put into practice. Moreover, even the Court of Cassation Court has had almost constant in that art. 22 must be understood that only purely civil marriage is mandatory for the validity of marriage, because otherwise if it admits the real meaning of art. 22, that the blessing of the Church is necessary for the validity of marriage, thus „would undermine the freedom of conscience".

The reasons supporting the doctrine are:

1. It was not provided in art. 22 of the Constitution of 1866 expressly sanction that should apply in case of failure this article. This article says that religious blessing, to make the marriage valid, is compulsory. What sanction should be provided? If the validity of the marriage shall require two conditions - is imperative and necessary - then the marriage is invalid without one. On the other hand, civil law is broad in interpretation, putting on hand the following means:

a) legislative analogy: if the spirit of art. 22 can see that the legislator wanted to make the constitution so that mandatory religious marriage and civil - as Hamangiu say - then there can be no valid marriage if not fulfilled both. Then if the church wedding is not valid if the first marriage never took place, so if that is not committing civil marriage followed by religious blessing, marriage is void.

b) Historical considerations, ie facts and circumstances which prompted the legislature to legislate (occasio legis) and its legislative purpose (ratio legis) could serve all the servants of justice to see that the interpretation of art. 22 of the Constitution was made to serve their hidden goals they pursued.

If art. 22 of the Constitution of 1866 was made specifically to remove the damage done by art. 61 Romanian Civil Code. and in order to satisfy the outraged world lawlessness committed in 1864, what may be the interpretation of art. 22 of the Constitution than that sharing religious blessing is as necessary and required as civilian. The lack of one - any kind - producing invalid marriage and lack of legal consequences after its conclusion.

2. Those who were against the marriage of the church objected to the fact that art. 22 of the Constitution of 1866 does not apply because the law announced in the final part of this article was never completed and thus can not know where the validity of marriage is not dependent on religious blessing.

This objection can be answered as follows. Lack of promised law could not make lawyers and courts in particular the fundamental pact fool the provisions of the State, which is the Constitution. The fact that Art. 22 of the Constitution of 1866 is inconsistent with Art. 61 of the Civil Code of 1865 and available as art. 22 is the art. back. 61 Civil Code, that the available art. 61 Romanian Civil Code is repealed from that of art. 22 of the Constitution, especially since the Civil Code is an ordinary law and the Constitution a fundamental law.

If the art. 22 of the Constitution were repealed art. 61 Romanian Civil Code. - Put in effect until one year before - when a broad interpretation to say that repealing the new provisions relating to religious ceremony - the mentality of foreign provisions of the Romanian people - sought to revive its provisions were in force before the start application of the Civil Code of 1865. Thus we need to return to the rulers of principalities written law, ie the Romanian Country Code and Code Caragea Calimachi in Moldova, which had precisely, that the Church is only entitled to have in matrimonial matters. That being so, the provisions of Codes and Caragea Calimachi were not in contradiction with Art. 22 of the Constitution, nay, more, these codes serve as a means of interpretation of this text, because it requires religious marriage and Constitution to put it together - especially – and civil marriage. So both were equally necessary for the validity of marriage.

Both doctrine and the courts were wrong to see their support, because he can see that after voting unanimously civil, religious marriage tradition was so deeply inserted in the mores of the people, that immediately after the civil contract, the couple went to church to receive the blessing from the priest and to share all the gifts received from God through the divine mystery.

If the tradition was stronger than the law and therefore the civil marriage was not valid without the religious marriage, is that supposed to be in operation authority customary law with all its functions, because between tradition so deeply rooted of religious marriage, between the provisions of art. 22 of the Constitution there was no contradiction, nay, more, that customary law is helped in his art. 22 of the Constitution.

For 57 years there was this controversy: church ceremony is mandatory or not? Marriage ended before the civil status officer is not followed by religious blessing - a valid marriage or not? In the beginning were very heated discussions between the two parties: those who were leaning toward the West and those who sought to combine Western ideas with Eastern and Western borrow only what is fit needs of the country at that time. Later fight specify position, because the Court of Cassation and doctrine - represented by people who studied in Paris - have sided with those who were willing to import all of the West. But fighting continued until another fundamental law of this country has definitely clarified the controversy arose. This fundamental law is the Constitution of the Great March 29, 1923.

Drafting the 1923 Constitution was a necessity because after reunification of Romania in its natural borders, and had to be a fundamental law governing State new life so different from that which was until 1916. World War I was fought along with France, won a victory there and it has contributed more than anyone to completion our borders, so Romanians had to be grateful France, and its leaders could only be those who know. So it's no wonder that Art. 23 of the Constitution of 1923 provides: „Civil Status Acts are the prerogatives of civil law. The preparation of these documents will have to precede all religious blessing".

The 1923 Constitution gave the final blow to the Church, because for the Romanian state, religious blessing not is of no importance. What has conspired for 57 years to finally governed by the constitution of 1923, and Romanian Church had no right to matrimonial causes.

In Transylvania the Hungarian marriage law was introduced in 1894, entitled Act XXXI: 1894, introducing civil marriage instead of religious marriage, which until then had been in place. Another law, acts of civil status, order the preparation of these documents may not be priests of different religions duties - as it was before - but their preparation is for the officers of civil status.The discontentof the believers was so great as the church leadership. But if a similar complaint was not considered in a state eminently orthodox, could not expect believers and leaders complains of a Church of a dominant state with another church, to be taken into account. This discontent expressed in the Diocesan Synod of Caransebes Bishop,Nicholas Pope, on March 31, 1896, when he said:

> „Times are hard and full of seriousness for us. Difficulties and troubles are quickly one after another incessantly. Last year (1895, note) was especially eventful bad for our Church. The most sentient of these difficulties and troubles are undoubtedly those who, quite disturbing touch our religious freedom of our conscience, our church life and our ancient customs and habits, i.e. so-called political reform church, which became law in this country, whose consequences may be the most sad and damaging to our Church, if we do not know how to defend by all means and all possible legal means".[10]

In Bessarabia and Bukovina, the priest was entitled to January 1, 1930, that if he officiated religious service, had to score the transcript records that had been entrusted. Thereafter, the right has passed to municipalities.[11]

3. Return to the Rules

The provision of Art. 23 of the Constitution of 1923, followed by various laws, enshrined the previous practice of historical events and people were subject to part of this provision. Most of our faithful, after the marriage ended, did not start living together until they went before the altar to receive the blessing of the Church. This meant that the fullness of marriage is obtained with observation requirements of sacrament of marriage. Some people go without requiring the blessing of the Church and not the consequences were immediate, such as early marriages, divorces and especially numerous catastrophic decline of births.

Primates of the Church have not ceased to present danger that threatens to rouse the people astray. Thus, the tribune of Parliament, the church pulpit and pastoral, showed the greatest danger that it is the „secularization" of

---

[10] *Protocolul Sinodului eparhial al diecezei gr. or. rom. a Caransebeşului. Periodul al XI. Sesiunea III*, Caransebeş, 1896, p. 35.

[11] A se vedea, Al. Scvoznicov, *Căsătoria religioasă şi civilă*, Chişinău, 1939, p. 7.

marriage. It took a long time until the various parties were off some people who fought against foreign influences.

The Herald of this change was Octavian Goga. In the speech program, delivered to radio on the night of New Year 1938, he says: „What we believe? We firstbelieve in the spiritual revival of Romanism by mysteries and lights our Church...”. So the main condition for the revival of Romanism is to respect our Church teachings on sacraments and receiving teaching Christianity which is giving light.

Our passion poet therefore requires compliance sacraments as our holy Church teaches us. And, of course, his thoughts turned first to the mystery of marriage, for the other six sacraments State has not mixed. His thought are confirmed by his former minister of religion, because at the question: What is the contribution of the Ministry of Religious Affairs to reintroduce compulsory religious marriage?, he answers the following:

> ”According to the suggestion shared by Prime Minister, this matter was under study. Since art. 23 of the Constitution establishes the principle that religious blessing must be preceded by civil marriage, legal solution possible without touching the text of the Constitution is indicated by a motivated request to the Ministry of Justice to prepare a decree-law, that completes the art. 94 of the law of civil status acts in the sense of being declared void all civil marriages which, within 30 days, will not be followed by the celebration of religious marriage. This cancellation can be requested from the Office of the Public Ministry, the Ministry of Religious Affairs or any Christian. Because it wasn’t sanctioned the marriage made without the Church blesssing, produced disastrous effects, weakening faith and opening the gates of many contradictions for the nation unity. The expected change’s salutary aim was to restore the prestige of faith,contributing to the strengthening of moral and religious faith in family as to the good revival of church traditions.[12]

All the good intentions of the Goga government, to reintroduce the religious marriage, by issuing a decree-law supplementing the art. 94 of the law relating to civil, could not become reality, for reasons independent of this government, because he was dismissed before he could accomplish something.With the dismissal of the Goga government set up a new

[12] *Curentul*, din 31 ianuarie 1938.

government led by former Patriarch Miron Cristea, who oneof his first measures was suspending the old Constitution of 1923 and to prepare a new one. All are expected to fulfill the old desire of believers and church leaders, that religious ceremony to be declared binding on Christians and to provide for penalties to strike those who do not comply with the provisions enshrined in the Constitution. The new Constitution promulgated on February 27, 1938, instead of thanking those who have put all their hope especially in Patriarch Miron, deceived those who expected the realization of an old goal. This for the following reasons:

(1) 1938 Constitution in place to determine more precisely the rights of the Church in the Romanian State, they overlook some of which were stated in the Constitution of 1923.

(2) It is true that art. 20 of the Constitution of 1938 provides: „Acts of civil status are the prerogatives of civil law. The preparation of these documents must always precede the religious blessing, which is mandatory for all members of cults", but what use that was not specified any sanction of religious marriage compulsory.The text article. 30 of the 1938 Constitution is quite explicit and therefore from its appearance have issued several opinions. So, for example, some believed that religious blessing must precede civil marriage, and others vice versa.Ministry of Justice had to interfere and give a statement revealing the art. 20 of the Constitution of 1938, showing that the chronological order of committing civil marriage and religious marriage is the old: the bride and groom will present first the registry office for civil marriage, then to church for religious wedding ceremony.

All who have known contradiction between the Romanian Civil Code of 1865 and the Constitution of 1866, when they saw how it was written the article 20 of the Constitution of 1938, thought that nothing has changed with the new Constitution.

What was the situation in 1866 and was one in 1938. In 1866 it was voted - with legal forms - a Constitution that in art. Article 22 provides an opposite disposal to art. 60 of the Romanian Civil Code. Although after all the rules of law, the provision of Art. 61 of the Romanian Civil Code should be repealed and therefore no legal value, which was abolished by the previous Constitution. However, the situation was totally contrary to law. For in place to happen naturally, the Romanian Civil Code disposal repealed the provision of the Constitution, because High Court of Cassation was: only civil marriage is obligatory, religion is only optional. In 1938 Civil Code was in force also in 1865 - of course with changes between 1865-1938 - and for civil law in 1929. They had the only civil marriage is obligatory, religion is only optional, leaving the obligation to the registrar to advise the groom to ask the blessing of the Church.

Constitution of 1938 made marriage to be a contract and a misteri in the same time, but not expected sanction if someone wanted to ask the blessing of the Church after the declaration of consent to the civil status officer, necessary for civil marriage... Moreover, these provisions of the Constitution - the way foreseen in art. 20 - could not apply. How could compel the bride and groom married, related to grade 5 by close relatives, to go to church to receive the blessing, the sacred canons blame marriage to grade 7 inclusive.

There is a clear similarity between the provisions of the Constitution of 1866 and in 1938 in the compulsory religious marriage. The same similarity is found then inthe contradiction between the provisions of the Constitution, the Romanian Civil Code of 1865 and the Law on Civil Status Acts. But according to the law could not be a distinction between the consequences of conflict between an ordinary law and the Fundamental Constitutions of 1866 and 1938 respectively. In both cases, constitutions provisions were repealed by ordinary legislation (Romanian Civil Code and Law on Civil Status Acts).

Also in the Constitution from 1938, we find a provision which we are interested in investigating the problem, namely art. 98 of. 4, which provides:

> „All conflicts and laws shall be reviewed in order to unify state law, putting into harmony with the principles of the present Constitution. From day to the Constitution promulgation, are abolished those provisions of laws, decrees, regulations and other acts which are contrary to those laid down in this Constitution".

Conclusions

Of the above mentioned, we can formulate the following conclusions:

1. Marriage was a contract from its beginning naturally. Church, the authentic interpreter of natural law, it alone can know and determine which links are not consistent and which are consistent natural law.

2. Marriage was raised by Jesus Christ to the rank of mystery and he gave the Church the divine right guard, to explain it. Therefore only the Church alone can determine which are or which are not the contrary provisions for this divine right.

3. Marriage, being a moral and spiritual agreement contains certain moral issues, such as mutual love, mutual help, religious growth of children, salvation etc., which will largely depend on the marriage, the marriage that falls within the scope of legislative spiritual power, which God gave things divine and moral leadership. Finally, the Church has care for religion and morality, so she has power over marriage because a good marriage promotes the morality and a bad marriage destroys it.

4. Therefore the Jews and the romans marriage, even before the Saviour Christ, was among the sacred things.Legal right of the Church in marriage problem and proves that Jesus Christ raised marriage to the dignity of the sacrament, saying monogamous and indissoluble marriage, which He would not have made if the marriage would have been something profane, civil.

5. Right of lawmaking of the Church in matrimonial matters is proved by its uninterrupted practise, which followed the example of Christ and the Apostles, from the beginning, and promulgated laws on marriage, such as: Council of Neocezareea (314) set impediment-laws (canon 2), Council of Ancyra (314) in canon 10 deals impediment kidnapping, fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451) in canon 16 sets impediment of public honesty. Therefore the power of marriage comes only from divine right.

ΓΙΑΝΝΗΣ Θ. ΜΑΖΗΣ[1]

ΤΑ ΘΕΙΑ ΕΠΑΓΓΕΛΜΑΤΑ: Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΑΡΧΙΤΕΚΤΩΝ, ΠΟΛΕΜΙΣΤΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΓΡΑΦΕΥΣ

(ΜΙΑ ΣΗΜΕΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΑΝΑΛΥΣΗ)[2]

Resumé

Dans cet article nous essayerons de mettre en évidence la dimension spirituelle du Travail humain. Notre but consiste à offrir un point d'appui fondamental pour la construction de la approche scientifique qui soutient l'idée de la spiritualité du Travail.

Notre intention est de faire paraître que toutes les activités humaines doivent être envisagées comme reflections materielles de l'Activité Divine. En plus, si les professions humaines seront considerées en tant que symboles des reflections platoniques de l'Activité Divine sur le monde materielle des mortels, nous essayerons ici, d'arriver à leur decodification et désymbolisation comme base de notre thèse hermeneutique, presentée ci-dessous.

Notre effort est basé sur notre conviction de la presence archetypique à l'intérieur du Divin Biblique judaique, des trois caracteristiques fontamentaux suivants: i) Le «Kallos (Beauté), ii) La «Iskhys» (Force) et iii) La «Sophia» (Sagesse).

Mots clés

Travail humain, spiritualité du Travail, professions humaines comme symboles de l'Activité Divine, antropologie

[1] Ph. D., University of Athens, irenechristinaki@yahoo.com.

[2] Διαμορφωμένο κείμενο από ομότιτλη, περίπου, εισήγηση στην Εταιρεία Κερκυραϊκών Σπουδών - 14/12/94.

Στο πονημάτιο αυτό, θα προσπαθήσουμε να εμφανίσουμε την πνευματική διάσταση της ανθρώπινης εργασίας, θέλοντας μ' αυτόν τον τρόπο να τοποθετήσουμε ένα θεμελιώδες αποδεικτικό έρεισμα στην οικοδόμηση της αντιλήψεως της πνευματικότητος της εργασίας. Πρόθεσή μας είναι ν' αποδείξουμε ότι όλες οι ανθρώπινες δραστηριότητες είναι δυνατόν, αλλά και πρέπει, να αντιμετωπίζονται ως επί μέρους εγκόσμιες αντανακλάσεις του πολυπλόκου έργου της Θείας Δραστηριότητος.

Και εφόσον θέλουμε να θεωρούμε τα ανθρώπινα επαγγέλματα ως αντανακλάσεις της Θείας Δραστηριότητος, δεν μπορούμε παρά να παραδεχθούμε ότι αποτελούν σύμβολα αυτής της Δραστηριότητος, και η δική μας αποστολή συνίσταται στην αποκρυπτογράφηση και ερμηνεία αυτών των συμβόλων, των μόνων ικανών να μας βοηθήσουν στην αντίληψη της θεωρητικής βάσεως για την οποίαν ομιλούμε.

Η προσπάθειά μας αυτή στηρίζεται στην πεποίθηση της αρχετυπικής παρουσίας εντός του Θείου των τριών βασικών του, κατ' εμάς, χαρακτηριστικών: του Κάλλους, της Ισχύος (Δυνάμεως) και της Σοφίας.

Με δεδομένο όμως ότι η όλη αυτή προσπάθεια τελείται επί της βάσεως της μυστικής εμπειρίας του Ανθρώπου και της πρωτογενούς (αρχαϊκής) νοοτροπίας των πρωτογόνων κοινωνιών ως προς το θείο (της αρχετυπικής, λεγομένης, νοοτροπίας), θα πρέπει να καταθέσουμε μερικούς ορισμούς ικανούς να διευκρινίσουν στον ερευνητή μερικά βασικά μεγέθη αποτελεούντα και τους δομικούς λίθους της, υιοθετουμένης από τον γράφοντα, μεθοδολογίας.

Σύμφωνα με τον Lévy-Bruhl[3] η "πρωτόγονη νοοτροπία" ή "αρχαϊκή" ή "αναλογική σκέψη" κατά τον K. Jung, δεν κυβερνάται από μια λογική διαφορετική από τη δική μας, αλλά από μια λογική η οποία διέπεται από νόμους διαφορετικούς από αυτούς της δικής μας λογικής.

Η πρωτόγονη νοοτροπία, που σύμφωνα με τις τελευταίες διατυπώσεις της, ορίζεται ορθότερα ως "αναλογική σκέψη" είναι βασισμένη στη "μυστική εμπειρία", δηλαδή στο συναίσθημα της απ' ευθείας επαφής με την υπερφυσική πραγματικότητα την ευρισκομένη

[3] Βλ. Lévy-Bruhl, *Les fonctions Mentales dans les Societés Infénures*, Paris, 1910.

εντός μυθικού χώρου και χρόνου, η οποία όμως, για την περίπτωση του Ανθρώπου των πρώτων κοινωνιών δεν αποτελούσε αποδοχή προς ζημίαν κάποιου "λογικού" συστήματος σκέψεως αλλά αυτό καθ' εαυτό το "είναι" της Υπάρξεως. Και σύμφωνα πάντα με τον Bruhl[4] αυτή η "νοοτροπία" αποτελεί μέρος της συγκροτήσεως της ανθρωπίνης φύσεως στην οποία προσδίδουμε την ονομασία "πρωτόγονη", απλούστατα διότι εμφανίζεται ως ισχυρότερη στην πνευματική δομή του αρχαϊκού ανθρώπου παρά σ' αυτήν του σύγχρονου.

Γι' αυτό και κατά τον J. Caseneuve,[5] μπορεί να θεωρηθεί ότι η πρωτόγονη νοοτροπία αφενός αποτελεί τον πιο σταθερό και αμετάβλητο παράγοντα στην ανθρώπινη φύση και αφετέρου ότι, σε αντίθεση με τις λογικές δομές, δεν αντιλαμβάνεται τον εαυτό της άμεσα ως δομή και γιαυτό δεν έχει συνείδηση των ιδίων της αρχών.

Η προσφυγή μας στον Lévy-Strauss θα ενισχύσει την άποψη του ότι το αμετάβλητο στοιχείο της ανθρώπινης φύσης συνιστάται αφενός μεν στο σύνολο των φυσικών ετεροπροσδιορισμών της ανθρώπινης πνευματικής συγκροτήσεως, αφετέρου δε ότι οικοδομεί κοινωνικούς κανόνες σε συνάρτηση με μια σειρά μεταβαλλόμενους παράγοντες, άρα και διαφόρους εν πολλοίς μεταξύ τους, δηλαδή το ότι παράγει πολιτισμό.

Στο σημείο ακριβώς όπου συναντάται η πολιτισμική δράση με τη Φύση και ως εκ τούτου διαμορφώνονται οι κοινοί όροι του πολιτισμού, εκεί ακριβώς αναδύεται γλαφυρά και η παγκοσμιότητα των αρχών του. Για το λόγο αυτό, κατά τον Cazeneuve[6] ερευνώντας τις κοινές αρχές όλων των μορφών του πολιτισμού μπορούμε να καταλήξουμε στις αμετάβλητες αρχές της κοινωνικής ζωής.

Είναι δε σημαντική η βοήθεια που μας προσφέρει ο Lévy-Strauss από μεθοδολογική σκοπιά, όταν γράφει ότι

> «οι άνθρωποι παντού ανέλαβαν το ίδιο έργο, καθορίζοντας το ίδιο αντικείμενο και κατά τη διάρκεια του "γίγνεσθαί" τους, μόνο τα μέσα διαφοροποιήθηκαν. Θα ήταν λοιπόν δυνατό να αναχθούμε στα δομικά στοιχεία των συμβολικών μορφών που έχουν αναλογίες με τη γλώσσα: την Τέχνη, το Μύθο, την Ιεροτελεστία, τη Θρησκεία».

[4] Βλ. Lévy-Bruhl, *Les Carnets de Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, Paris*, 1949.
[5] Βλ. J. Caseneuve, *La mentalité archaïque*, Paris, 1961.
[6] Βλ. όπ. παραπ. σ. 82.

Τα τέσσερα παραπάνω στοιχεία όμως έχουν μια θεμελιώδη οδό πρόσβασης και μια ισχυρή κλείδα: το Σύμβολο.

Το σύμβολο, το οποίο για την αναλογική σκέψη, την αρχαϊκή, αλλά και τη σύγχρονη σκέψη είναι απαραίτητο για τη δημιουργία της μυστικής εμπειρίας, διότι απλούστατα επιτρέπει την υλοποίησή της με γνωστικές μεθόδους.

Τι είναι όμως το σύμβολο και ποιά ήδη συμβόλων έχουμε;

Σύμφωνα με τον R. Barthes ο οποίος ορίζει το σύμβολο ως σημαινόμενο ενός σημείου, έχουμε δυο ειδών σημαινόμενα / σύμβολα: 1) τα σημαινόμενα χαρακτηρισμού ή γνωστικά που η σημασία τους είναι άμεση και 2) τα σημαινόμενα συνεμφάσεως ή συναισθηματικά (συγκινησιακά), συνειρμικής προελεύσεως που η σημασία τους είναι έμμεση. Σ' αυτήν τη δεύτερη ποιότητα συμβόλων θα βασίσουμε την ανάλυσή μας που ανάγεται στις δομές της αρχαϊκής, της αναλογικής σκέψεως.

Κατά τον M. Eliade[7], το σύμβολο αποκαλύπτει την ουσιαστική ενότητα πολλών περιοχών της πραγματικότητας και ταυτίζει της βιο-ανθρωπο-κοσμικές περιοχές με μια αρχή. Η λειτουργία του συμβόλου συνίσταται στην παράσταση μιας πραγματικότητας απρόσιτης σε άλλα μέσα της γνώσεως και δεν αναφέρεται σε "υπερβατικές" αποκλειστικά πραγματικότητες, διότι ο διαχωρισμός "πνευματικού-υλικού" δεν υφίστατο στην αρχαϊκή σκέψη. Στη σκέψη εκείνων των κοινωνιών, οι δύο αυτές πτυχές του κόσμου λειτουργούσαν απολύτως συμπληρωματικά.

Παράδειγμα αυτού του γεγονότος είναι η έννοια του Ιερού Χώρου ή Ιερού Σημείου στην αρχαϊκή σκέψη. Η αντίληψη ότι το Ιερό αυτό Σημείο βρισκόταν στο Κέντρο του Κόσμου δεν αναιρούσε τις χρηστικές του ιδιότητες λόγω κλιματολογικών, οικονομικών και κοινωνικών συνθηκών.

Ο Jung[8], από την πλευρά του, διαχώριζε τα αρχετυπικά σύμβολα σε "φυσικά" και "πολιτιστικά". Τα φυσικά αρχετυπικά σύμβολα ως προερχόμενα από το ασυνείδητο εκφράζουν ουσιαστικά βασικές αρχετυπικές παραστάσεις. Ο δρόμος που ανοίγουν οδηγεί σε πανάρχαιες συλλογικές μνήμες/αντιλήψεις των πρωτόγονων / αρχαϊκών κοινωνιών.

---

[7] Βλ. M. Eliade, *Images et symboles*, Paris, 1964.

[8] Βλ. C. G. Jung, *L' Homme et ses Symboles*, Paris, 1964.

Τα πολιτιστικά αρχετυπικά σύμβολα, όμως, είναι επεξεργασμένες και μεταλλαγμένες εικόνες που θέλουν να εκφράσουν „αιώνιες αλήθειες” και εντοπίζονται ως εκ τούτου σε όλες τις θρησκείες.

Πρόκειται για εικόνες που λόγω του θρησκειακού τους περιβάλλοντος και προελεύσεως, κατέληξαν να αποτελούν αποδεκτές συλλογικά παραστάσεις και για τις σύγχρονες κοινωνίες. Φυσικά, διατηρούν τη μυστικιστική τους γοητεία και τις ισχυρές -όσο και ευεργετικές- ψυχολογικές επιρροές τους. Αυτό ακριβώς δηλαδή, που προκαλεί σ’ έναν πιστό την αίσθηση της θείας ανακούφισης και γαλήνης, αφήνοντας τον αγοραίο κόσμο και δρασκελίζοντας το κατώφλι μιας οσοδήποτε ταπεινής εκκλησούλας. Αυτή η μικρή εκκλησία είναι ο Ναός, το εγκόσμιο αρχέτυπο του Ουράνιου Οίκου, του Σύμπαντος Κόσμου αλλά και του ίδιου του εσώτερου εαυτού του πιστού. Κατά την είσοδό του εις το Ναό, ο πιστός, καταδύεται αφενός στο εσώτερο “είναι”, το αναλλοίωτο και αμετάβλητο, στην αρχή του μυθικού χρόνου, στην αρχή της Αχρόνου Υπάρξεως. Εκεί “ξαναγιεννιέται” για να εκτοξευθεί μέχρι το Θόλο του Ναού “κατακυριεύοντας το Σύμπαν”, κοντά και μέσα συνάμα στο Θεό του, τη Θεία Πηγή κάθε ζωής.

Όλα τα παραπάνω αποτελούν μια βάση που πάνω της ο ανθρωπομορφισμός του θείου όπως αυτός προκύπτει από την Αγία Γραφή, δηλαδή από ένα κείμενο θείας προελεύσεως, μας οδηγεί, μας προσφέρει, θα έλεγα, τη δυνατότητα, να ξεπεράσουμε την εύκολη λύση μιας απλής φιλολογικοποιητικής μεταφοράς και να προχωρήσουμε σε κάτι πολύ πιο ουσιαστικό: μια μετάθεση από το Ανθρώπινο στο Θείο επίπεδο. Μια μετάθεση όμως που συμβαίνει στο επίπεδο του “γιγνώσκειν” και όχι στο επίπεδο του “είναι”. Το πνεύμα περνά από το επίπεδο του αισθητού στο νοητικό, χωρίς αυτό να καταλήγει σε μια αξιολογική απόρριψη του γεγονότος ότι το νοητικό προϋπήρξε του αισθητού. Τουλάχιστον στο χριστιανικό κόσμο, οφείλουμε και δυνάμεθα να δεχόμαστε το γεγονός αυτό, ως το μόνο που θεμελιώνει το πιστεύω μας για την δημιουργία του ορατού και του αισθητού - μεταξύ άλλων - κόσμου από αυτήν τη θέληση του Θεού και μόνον. Οι ανθρώπινες δημιουργικές δράσεις, οι δράσεις που έχουν σκοπό τη διατήρηση ή την αποκατάσταση της επιγείου αρμονίας, όπως δεοντολογικά τουλάχιστον οφείλουν, στοιχειοθετούν παράλληλα αλλά και περιγράφουν την επίγεια τάξη.

Μια τάξη, που σύμφωνα με την αρχετυπική μας μεθοδολογική προσέγγιση και με δεδομένη τη χριστιανική μας πίστη οφείλει να εντοπίζεται, συμβολικά πάντα, μέσα στην άπειρη πολυμορφία της Θείας Δραστηριότητος και να αναγιγνώσκεται ιδεατά στον επίσης άπειρο χώρο της Θείας Τάξεως. Χρησιμοποιώντας τον ίδιο με τον Μάξιμο τον Ομολογητή χριστιανικό συμβολισμό, η ύπαρξη αυτού του «principia mundi» μπορεί να παραλληλισθεί με το αόρατο κέντρο ενός κύκλου. Και λέγω αόρατο, διότι ως σημείο δεν έχει διαστάσεις κατά τον μαθηματικό ορισμό. Εντός του σημείου αυτού λοιπόν, ενυπάρχουν πριν ακόμη εκδηλωθούν, όλες οι ακτίνες που παράγουν, υλοποιούν άρα και «δημιουργούν» στον ορατό χώρο την περιφέρειά του, δηλαδή συμβολικά , αυτό το ίδιο σύμπαν ως Θείο Δημιούργημα. Θα μπορούσαμε ακόμη να στηρίξουμε την αναφορά μας στη Θεία αυτήν αρχετυπική Τάξη πάνω στη σημαντική αναφορά του Ιησού «Ὁ Πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι» (Κατὰ Ἰωάννην 5, 17). Κι αλήθεια, όλα τα επαγγέλματα είναι κατ’ εικόνα των Θείων Δραστηριοτήτων, διότι όπως και αυτές, έτσι και εκείνα δρουν και συμβάλλουν προς την αέναη μετατροπή των υλικών και των συνθηκών με σκοπό τη την εγκόσμιο δημιουργία, την λείανση του ακατέργαστου λίθου, την τάξη και την αρμονία. Αυτή τους ακριβώς η λειτουργία αποτελεί και τη βάση της πνευματικής τους διάστασης[9].

1. Ο Θεός Αρχιτέκτων και Οικοδόμος
(Κάλλος).

Είναι προφανές ότι ο Δημιουργός του Σύμπαντος, «ὁ ποιητὴς Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Γῆς», Αυτός που τα «πάντα ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐποίησε», αυτός ο γνώστης του Μέτρου και της Αρμονίας δεν μπορεί παρά να είναι ο «Εἷς» ο μόνος Αρχιτέκτων «ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων». Όπως λέγει η σχολαστική επωδός: Unus artifex est Deus: Ο Θεός είναι ο

[9] Σ.Σ.: Τις παραπομπές των Jung, Bruhl, Strauss, Caseneuve αι Eliade αντλώ-επεμβαίνοντας, όπου κρίνω πως είναι απαραίτητο, στη διατύπωση-από την πολύ ενδιαφέρουσα δημοσιευμένη διδακτορική διατριβή του κ. Γιώργου Προκοπίου με θέμα: *Ο Κοσμολογικός Συμβολισμός στην Αρχιτεκτονική του Βυζαντινού Ναού*, Εκδ. Πύρινος Κόσμος, Αθήνα, Δεύτερη Έκδοση, 1980 (;). Υποστηρίχθηκε στον Καθηγητή του Αριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης κ. Χ. Μπούρα το Δεκέμβριο του 1980.

μόνος Τεχνίτης. Ένας τεχνίτης ο οποίος μπορεί να εμφανίζεται με διάφορες ειδικότητες ανάλογα με το είδος του Οικοδομήματος. Και εις επίρρωσιν αυτού του δογματικού θεμελίου λίθου του χριστιανισμού έρχονται τα λόγια του Ευαγγελιστού Λουκά ο οποίος αναφέρει ότι «οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ποιήσητε πάντα τὰ διαταχθέντα ὑμῖν, λέγετε ὅτι δοῦλοι ἀχρεῖοί ἐσμεν, ὅτι ὅ ὠφείλομεν ποιῆσαι πεποιήκαμεν». Διότι ο Θεός ως μόνος «Ὢν» είναι και ο πραγματικά Δρων.

Το γεγονός ότι ο Θεός είναι ο μόνος Αρχιτέκτων και ο μόνος Οικοδόμος, μπορεί να γίνει αντιληπτό κατά δύο τρόπους.

Πρώτον, από το ότι η αρχιτεκτονική δεν είναι αυτή καθ' εαυτή μια ανακάλυψη του Ανθρώπου, αλλά μια Τέχνη που ο Θεός δίδαξε στον άνθρωπο, όπως ακριβώς συνέβη και με τη γεωργία, κατά τη γνωστή γλαφυρότατη αναφορά του Προφήτου Ησαΐα:

> «μὴ ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἀροτριάσει ὁ ἀροτριῶν; ἢ σπόρον προετοιμάσει πρὶν ἐργάσασθαι τὴν γῆν; οὐχ ὅταν ὁμαλίσει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς, τότε σπείρει μικρὸν μελάνθιον ἢ κύμινον καὶ πάλιν σπείρει πυρὸν καὶ κριθὴν καὶ κέγχρον καὶ ζέαν ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις σου;... […] οὐ γὰρ μετὰ σκληρότητος καθαίρεται τὸ μελάνθιον, οὐδὲ τροχὸς ἁμάξης περιάξει ἐπὶ τὸ κύμινον» (Ἡσαΐας 28, 24-27).

Και όντως, η αρχιτεκτονική δεν είναι τίποτε περισσότερο από την εφαρμογή των φυσικών νόμων και μαθηματικών κανόνων που προϋπάρχουν του Ανθρώπου και οι οποίοι ρυθμίζουν αναγκαστικά την τοποθέτηση των οικοδομικών υλικών στο οικοδόμημα αλλά και την εν γένει μορφή του. Ο Άνθρωπος δεν μπορεί να απομακρυνθεί από αυτούς τους νόμους, όπως δεν μπορεί να απομακρυνθεί από τους νόμους της βλαστήσεως όταν επιθυμεί να καλλιεργήσει τη γη, όπως δεν μπορεί να απομακρυνθεί από τους νόμους της οπτικής όταν θέλει να ιδεί.

«Πρέπει να αναρωτηθούμε, αν κάποιες αρχιτεκτονικές μορφές, ως "εικόνες", δεν περικλείουν συμβολικές συσχετίσεις με τις Ιδέες. Για το εάν ο αρχιτέκτων συνθέτοντας το κτίριό του ακολουθώντας το καθιερωμένο Σχέδιο, δεν αναζητούσε -εκτός από την σταθερότητα της κατασκευής- και την αναπαράσταση ενός ιδεώδους Αρχέτυπου τελώντας κατ' αυτόν τον τρόπον μια ιερουργία[10]:

[10] Σ.Σ.: αναπαράγοντας τη Θεία Δραστηριότητα, θα λέγαμε εμείς. Διότι Ιερουργία δεν είναι τίποτε περισσότερο από την επανάληψη των Θείων Δραστηριοτήτων

την πραγμάτωση ενός συμβόλου;[11]».

Άλλωστε «…η αρχιτεκτονική δεν αρκείται στην επίλυση των κτιριολογικών και οικοδομικών προβλημάτων αλλά επιζητεί να προικίσει τα κτίρια ή τα μνημεία με ιδεατούς παράγοντες. Επιδιώξεις τέτοιες διαπιστώνει κανείς από την αυγή των πολιτισμών […] Τις εξωτερικεύσεις αυτές του εσωτερικού κόσμου και των προλογικών μεν, αλλά πάντως μεταφυσικών πεποιθήσεων των πρωτογόνων λαών, πρέπει να συνδυάσουμε, όπως μας διδάσκει η σύγχρονη επιστημονική έρευνα, περισσότερο με εξωαισθητικά κίνητρα, όπως είναι οι μαγικές ή συμβολικές επιδιώξεις, που θα ενσωματωθούν αργότερα στα θρησκευτικά δόγματα[12]».

Για τούτο λοιπόν

«…ο ιστορικός που θα ερμηνεύσει χωρίς προ-τοποθετήσεις, την προέλευση των αρχιτεκτονικών μορφών, θα φθάσει στο συμπέρασμα πως αυτές δεν μπορούν να ερμηνευθούν ως αποτέλεσμα κατασκευαστικών αναγκών ή αισθητικών επιδιώξεων μόνον, αλλά πρέπει να αναζητηθούν μέσα στο σύνολο των πλεγμάτων των πολιτιστικών δομών απόπου οι μορφές αυτές πηγάζουν. Κατανοεί κανείς έτσι πως ορισμένα αρχιτεκτονικά δεδομένα ανάγονται στις εποχές του «μύθου», της πολύ γνωστής στους ανθρωπολόγους “αρχαϊκής” ή “πρωτόγονης νοοτροπίας”, “Mentalité Archaïque” et “Pensée Sauvage”, σωστότερα σήμερα διατυπωμένης ως “αναλογικής σκέψεως”[13]».

Η έννοια της «Θείας Οικοδομήσεως» και ο συμβολισμός της σε ό,τι αφορά την πρωταρχική αυτή Θεία Δράση ξεπροβάλλει ανάφλυφη στον Απόστολο Παύλο, όταν αυτός λέγει: «Πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος

που δημιούργησαν το Σύμπαν, το Θείο Οίκο και τον ίδιο τον Άνθρωπο νοούμενο ως *Εκκλησία* και *Οίκο του Θεού* διότι «*κατ’ εικόνα [Του] και ομοίωσιν, εποίησεν ο Θεός τον Άνθρωπο*».

[11] Βλ. L. Hautecoeur., *Mystique et Architecture, Symbolisme du Cercleet de la Coupole*, Paris, 1954.

[12] Βλ. Δ. Κωνσταντινίδη, *Περί Αρμονικών Χαράξεων εις την Αρχιτεκτονικήν*, Αθήνα, 1961. εις το Γ. Προκοπίου…

[13] Βλ. P. Ackerman, *Symbolic Sources of some Architectural Elements*, JSAH, December, 1953, ibid.

κατασκευάζεται ὑπό τινος, ὁ δὲ τὰ πάντα κατασκευάσας Θεός » (Παύλος, Πρὸς Ἑβραίους 3, 4).

Δεύτερον, από το συμβολισμό της Κατασκευής του Ναού του Θεού. Ο Θεός είναι σ' αυτήν την περίπτωση ο άμεσος κατασκευαστής του Ναού του, του ιδίου του Οίκου του. Στην κλασσική θεολογική σκέψη, η κατασκευή του Ναού αποτελεί έργο του ίδιου του Θεού.

Εν ολίγοις, ο επίγειος Ναός κατασκευάζεται κατ' εικόνα ενός επουράνιου αρχετύπου ο οποίος μεταφέρεται στους ανθρώπους μέσω ενός Προφήτου ή κάποιας άλλης Θείας προσωπικότητος. Φυσικά, ως αρχέτυπος της επουρανίου, συμπαντικής Αρχιτεκτονικής, η οποία διέπεται από την Θεία Αρμονία του Δημιουργού της δεν είναι δυνατόν παρά να χαρακτηρίζεται από το Θείον Κάλλος.

Θα λέγαμε ότι από τούδε και στο εξής, το Κάλλος αυτό θα είναι συνώνυμο της Θείας Αρχιτεκτονικής αλλά και του επιγείου αντιστοίχου της, το οποίο θα θεωρείται ως αντανάκλαση της αντίστοιχης Θείας Δραστηριότητος.

Λαμπρά παραδείγματα των ανωτέρω αποτελούν τα διάφορα θυσιαστήρια της Παλαιάς Διαθήκης τα οποία κατασκευάσθηκαν συμφώνως με τις εντολές του Θεού. Λέγει χαρακτηριστικά ο Θεός στον Μωϋσή μεταξύ άλλων: «καὶ ποιήσεις μοι ἁγίασμα, καὶ ὀφθήσομαι ἐν ὑμίν˙ καὶ ποιήσεις μοι κατὰ πάντα ὅσα σοι δεικνύω ἐν τῷ ὅρει, τὸ παράδειγμα της σκηνῆς καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα πάντων τῶν σκευῶν αὐτῆς˙ οὕτω ποιήσεις» (Ἔξοδος 25, 7-8). Ας αφήσουμε βέβαια την λεπτομερή περιγραφή που ακολουθεί σε ό,τι αφορά τις διαστάσεις και τα υλικά όλων των μερών, κινητών και μονίμων, του θυσιαστηρίου, ακόμα δε και των ιερατικών στολών που θα φέρουν οι υιοί Ααρών οι οποίοι θα τον «ιεράτευον». Πρόκειται για μια περιγραφή που εκτείνεται σε 133 στίχους της Εξόδου (Έξοδος 25-28).

Μη λησμονήσουμε ακόμη οτι ο Δαυΐδ παραδίδει στον υιό του Σολομώντα, τους κανόνες και τους όρους οι οποίοι θα πρυτανεύσουν κατά την κατασκευή του Νέου Ναού (Παραλειπομένων Α, 28-29).

Με τη σειρά του ο Ιεζεκιήλ, συλαμβάνει σε ένα όραμα, την περιγραφή του μελλοντικού Ναού: ένα υπερφυσικό όν που κρατά μία ράβδο μετρήσεως, δίδει στον προφήτη ταυτόχρονα με την γενική περιγραφή του Οικοδομήματος και όλες του τις διαστάσεις:

> «…καὶ διαγράψεις τὸν οἶκον καὶ τὰς ἐξόδους αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ νόμιμα αὐτοῦ γνωριεῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ διαγράψεις ἐναντίον αὐτῶν, καὶ φυλάξονται πάντα τὰ δικαιώματά μου καὶ πάντα τὰ προστάγματά μου καὶ ποιήσουσιν αὐτά˙ καὶ τὴν διαγραφὴν τοῦ οἴκου ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ ὄρους, πάντα τὰ ὅρια αὐτοῦ κυκλόθεν ἅγια ἁγίων» (Ἰεζεκιὴλ 43, 11-12).

Και επιτέλους, τί πιό υπέροχη απόδειξη της εκ Θεού μεταφοράς των ιερών αρχιτεκτονικών διαστάσεων και υλικών με στόχο την ανεπανάληπτη μυστική μεγαλοπρέπεια, το άπειρον Κάλλος του Θείου Οικοδομικού έργου, από το παρακάτω απόσπασμα που περιγράφει την επουράνιο Ιερουσαλήμ της Αποκαλύψεως του Ιωάννη και το οποίο παρουσιάζω σε μετάφραση των Καθηγητών των Πανεπιστημίων Αθηνών και Θεσσαλονίκης κ.κ. Γαλίτη, Καραβιδόπουλου, Βασιλειάδη και Γαλάνη:

> «Κι αυτός που μου μιλούσε είχε για μέτρο ένα χρυσό καλάμι για να μετρήσει την πολιτεία και τις πύλες της και το τείχος της. Η πολιτεία ήταν τετράγωνη˙ το μήκος της ήταν όσο και το πλάτος της. Και μέτρησε την πολιτεία με το καλάμι˙ ήταν δώδεκα χιλιάδες στάδια. Το μήκος το πλάτος και το ύψος της ήταν τελείως ίσα. Μέτρησε επίσης το τείχος της, που ήταν εκατόν σαράντα τέσσερις πήχες, σύμφωνα με τα ανθρώπινα μέτρα που χρησιμοποιούσε ο άγγελος. Το τείχος ήταν κατασκευασμένο από ίασπη, κι η μαλαματένια πολιτεία έλαμπε σαν καθαρό γυαλί. Τα θεμέλια του τείχους της πολιτείας ήταν στολισμένα με κάθε είδος πολύτιμο πετράδι. Ο πρώτος θεμέλιος λίθος ίασπης, ο δεύτερος ζαφείρι, ο τρίτος χαλκηδόνιο, ο τέταρτος σμαράγδι, ο πέμπτος όνυχας, ο έκτος σάρδιο, ο έβδομος χρυσόλιθος, ο όγδοος βήρυλλος, ο ένατος τοπάζι, ο δέκατος χρυσόπρασος, ο ενδέκατος υάκινθος, ο δωδέκατος αμέθυστος».

Ο αρχέτυπος του Θείου Οικοδομήματος όμως, μπορεί να αναλυθεί στα εξής κυρίαρχα μέρη: το έδαφος, που αποτελεί τη βάση του, τη σκεπή του, που το προστατεύει και έναν ενδιάμεσο χώρο περιχαρακωμένο και κλειστό μεταξύ τοίχων. Συμβολίζει λοιπόν αυτό το αρχετυπικό οικοδόμημα και αναπαράγει την αρχιτεκτονική του Σύμπαντος εφόσον το έδαφος αντιστοιχεί στη γη, ο ενδιάμεσος χώρος στην ατμόσφαιρα και η σκεπή του στον ουράνιο θόλο.

Προκύπτει λοιπόν με αυτή τη ερμηνεία ότι ο Θεός είναι ο Αρχιτέκτων του Σύμπαντος κόσμου εφόσον, και για ένα λόγο παραπάνω, η επίγειος αρχιτεκτονική δεν θα υπήρχε εάν δεν υπήρχε η Συμπαντική Αρχιτεκτονική. Η τελευταία αποτελεί την ικανή και αναγκαία συνθήκη υπάρξεως της πρώτης. Από την άλλη πλευρά, πρέπει να σημειώσουμε ότι και μόνη η ονομασία του δημιουργήματος ως «Κόσμου» φανερώνει το άπειρο Θείον Κάλλος του αρχιτεκτονικού δημιουργήματος. Δεν θα μπορούσε το Οικοδόμημα της Θείας βουλήσεως παρά να χαρακτηρίζεται από το απόλυτο Κάλλος.

Ο Ιώβ είναι συγκλονιστικός όταν μεταφέρει το διάλογό του με το Θεό και συγκεκριμένα στο παρακάτω υπέροχα αδυσώπητο απόσπασμα των αλλεπάλληλων ερωτήσεων του Θεού προς τον ίδιο (εν ολίγοις τον Άνθρωπο). Ρωτά ο Παντοδύναμος: «ποῦ ἦς ἐν τῷ θεμελιοῦν με τὴν γῆν: […] τίς ἔθετο τὰ μέτρα αὐτῆς, εἰ οἶδας; ἤ τίς ὁ ἐπαγαγὼν σπαρτίον επ'αὐτῆς; ἐπὶ τίνος οἱ κρίκοι αὐτῆς πεπήγασι; τίς δὲ ἐστιν ὁ βαλὼν λίθον γωνιαῖον ἐπ' αὐτῆς;» (Ἰὼβ 38, 4-6).

Δηλαδή σε μια δική μου μετάφραση:

> «Πού βρισκόσουν όταν θεμελίωνα τον κόσμο; Γνωρίζεις μήπως ποιός όρισε τις διαστάσεις του; Ποιός εφάρμοσε σ' αυτόν το νήμα της στάθμης; Πού στηρίζονται οι κολώνες του; Ποιός είν' αυτός που τοποθέτησε τον ακρογωνιαίο λίθο του ώστε να τον στηρίξει;»

Το υπέροχο αυτό κείμενο του Ιώβ, ανακαλεί στη συλλογική μας μνήμη το μεγαλείο του αρχαίου κόσμου. Του κόσμου όμως εκείνου που διεφθάρει και κατέρρευσε από την αμαρτία. Έτσι ο Θεός αποφάσισε να τον ανοικοδομήσει. Κι αυτός ο νέος κόσμος εν τω γίγνεσθαι είναι η επουράνιος και η επίγειος Εκκλησία, το αριστούργημα αυτό του Θείου Τεχνίτη, αυτού που όπως μας φανερώνουν οι Ψαλμοί οικοδόμησε την Ιερουσαλήμ[14].

[14] «καί οίκοδομηθήτω τή τείχη Ιερυσαλημ» (Ψαλμ.50, 20), «οίκοδομην Ιερυσαλημ ο Κύριος» (Ψαλμ. 146, 2)..

Στο οικοδόμημα αυτής της Εκκλησίας ο Θεός ως Μέγας Οικοδόμος και Αρχιτέκτων τοποθετεί τον ακρογωνιαίο λίθο όπως μας μαρτυρά ο προφήτης Ησαΐας: «διὰ τοῦτο οὕτω λέγει Κύριος Κύριος˙ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιὼν λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον, ἔντιμον, εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ» (Ἡσαΐας 28, 16).

Άλλωστε, πόσο γλαφυρά ο Απόστολος των Εθνών αναφέρει στην προς Εβραίους Επιστολή του τις ιδιότητες αυτές του Θεού. Παραθέτω το κείμενο και την μετάφραση από την εγκεκριμένη έκδοση της Καινής Διαθήκης από την Βιβλική Εταιρεία, των Καθηγητών κ.κ. Γαλίτη, Βασιλειάδη, Καραβιδόπουλου και Γαλάνη:

> «Πίστει παρῴκησεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ὡς ἀλλότριαν, ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, τῶν συγκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς˙ ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν, ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ Θεός » (Πρὸς Ἑβραίους 11, 9-10).

Η μετάφραση της Βιβλικής Εταιρείας, του ίδιου αποσπάσματος μας δίδει:

> «Με πίστη [ο Αβραάμ] εγκαταστάθηκε στη γή που του υποσχέθηκε ο Θεός, ξένος σε άγνωστη χώρα, ζώντας σε σκηνές με τον Ισαάκ και τον Ιακώβ, που κιαυτοί ήταν κληρονόμοι της ίδιας υπόσχεσης. Κι αυτό, γιατί περίμενε την πόλη που θα είχε στέρεα θεμέλια και που αρχιτέκτονας και δημιουργός της θα ήταν ο Θεός».
>
> Και συνεχίζει ο Απόστολος στην προς Εφεσίους Επιστολή του: «ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμέλιῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ˙ ἐν ᾧ πάσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένῃ αὔξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν Κυρίῳ˙ ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι» (Πρὸς Εφεσ. 2, 20-22).

Και η εγκεκριμένη μετάφραση του χωρίου:

> «Προστεθήκατε κι εσείς στο οικοδόμημα που έχει θεμέλιο τους αποστόλους και τους προφήτες κι ακρογωνιαίο λίθο αυτόν τον ίδιο το Χριστό. Μ’ αυτόν δένεται ολόκληρο το οικοδόμημα και μεγαλώνει, ώστε να γίνει ναός άγιος για τον Κύριο. Ο Κύριος οικοδομεί κι εσάς μαζί με τους άλλους, για να γίνετε πνευματική κατοικία του Θεού».

Η σχολαστική έρευνα των γραφών μπορεί να μας εφοδιάσει με πλήθος παρόμοιων αναφορών. Η πλημμελέστατη, όμως, δική μου έρευνα με τροφοδότησε με τα παραπάνω εδάφια τα οποία κρίνω πως τεκμηριώνουν αρκετά την εικόνα του Θεού ως Θείου Αρχιτέκτονος και Οικοδόμου αλλά και συμβόλου του Κάλλους. Κλείνοντας αυτήν την ενότητα λοιπόν, θα αρκεστώ στην πασίγνωστη αναφορά του Ιησού, του Θεμελίου Λίθου και Αρχιτέκτονος της χριστιανικής Εκκλησίας μας, ο οποίος λέγει χαρακτηριστικά στον Πέτρο:

«Κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ πύλαι ᾍδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς » (Κατὰ Ματθαίον 16,18).

2. Ο Θεός Πολεμιστής (Ισχύς-Δύναμις).

Η έκφραση «Κύριος Σαββαώθ» συναντάται διαρκώς στα χωρία της Π. Διαθήκης όπου ο Θεός εμφανίζεται ως «Άρχων των Όπλων», εκλεκτός ήρωας του λαού Του στον διαρκή πόλεμο εναντίον των εχθρών του.

Η ιδιότητα του αυτή αναγιγνώσκεται επίσης εις τα κείμενα της Κ. Διαθήκης όπου προσωποποιείται και εντοπίζεται στον Ιησού. Εδώ αναπτύσσεται, θα έλεγε κανείς, μια στρατιωτική αντίληψη της ζωής και της σωτηρίας στο πλαίσιο της οποίας ο πολεμικός συμβολισμός ερμηνεύει με εντυπωσιακό τρόπο την βαθύτερη φύση της χριστιανικής πνευματικότητος και ηθικής.

Ας αρχίσουμε όμως με τη μελέτη μερικών εδαφίων της Π. Διαθήκης που παρουσιάζουν γλαφυρά τον αρχέτυπο της πτυχής αυτής του Παντοδύναμου.

> Α. «ἐταράχθησαν ἔθνη, ἔκλιναν βασιλεἶαι˙ ἔδωκε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, ἐσαλεύθη ἡ γῆ. […] δεῦτε καὶ ἴδετε τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅ ἔθετο τέρατα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ανταναιρῶν πολέμους μέχρι τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς τόξον συντρίψει και συνθλάσει ὅπλον καὶ θυρεοὺς κατακαύσει ἐν πυρί. σχολάσατε καὶ γνῶτε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Θεός˙ ὑψωθήσομαι ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὑψωθήσομαι ἐν τῇ γῇ. Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων μεθ’ ἡμῶν, ἀντιλήπτωρ ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακὼβ» (Ψαλμοί 45, 7-12).

Ας κρατήσουμε λοιπόν το πιο πιο σημαντικό κομμάτι στη μνήμη μας: «…Ο Άρχων των Όπλων είναι μαζί μας, ένα κάστρο είναι για μας ο Θεός Ιακώβ…».

Β. «...ὅτι Θεὸς συντρίβων πολέμους Κύριος, ὅτι εἰς παρεμβολὰς αὐτοῦ ἐν μέσῳ λαοῦ ἐξείλατό με ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν καταδιωκόντων με» (Ἰουδείθ 16, 2).

«...οτι στρατοπέδευσε στο μέσον του λαού του για να τον απελευθερώσει από τα χέρια των εχθρών του…» θα μετέφραζα, θέλοντας να αποδώσω την καθαρά στρατιωτική χροιά του χωρίου.

Γ. Και εκείνη η παλόμενη, γεμάτη φωτιά πίστης και υποταγής στον κύριο των Δυνάμεων, προσευχή του βασιλιά Δαυίδ, έχει να μας δείξει δυο υπέροχα χωρία:

1. «ἀνάστηθι, Κύριε, πρόφθασον αὐτοὺς καὶ ὑποσκέλισον αὐτούς, ρῦσαι τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἀπὸ ἀσεβοῦς, ρομφαίαν σου ἀπὸ ἐχθρῶν τῆς χειρός σου. Κύριε, ἀπὸ ὀλίγων ἀπὸ γῆς διαμέρισον αὐτοῦς ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτῶν» (Ψαλμοί 16, 13 -14).

2. «…πολέμησον τοὺς πολεμοῦντάς με. ἐπιλαβοῦ ὅπλου καὶ θυρεοῦ καὶ ἀνάστηθι εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου, ἔκχεον ρομφαίαν καὶ σύγκλεισον ἐξεναντίας τῶν καταδιωκόντων με» (Ψαλμοί 34, 1-3).

Δ. Ψάλλουν οι υιοί Ισραήλ και ο Μωυσής μετά το θαύμα της διανοίξεως των υδάτων της Ερυθράς Θαλάσσης που έσωσε τους ίδιους και σκόρπισε πανωλεθρία στους Αιγυπτίους. Ψάλλουν και ευχαριστούν το Πολέμαρχο Θεό τους, τον Κύριο των Δυνάμεων, των Όπλων, που στάθηκε πλάι τους, που τους έσωσε και τους χάρισε τη νίκη:

> «…ἄσωμεν τῷ Κύριῳ, ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται˙ ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην ἔρριψεν εἰς θάλασσαν. […] Κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους, Κύριος ὄνομα αὐτῷ. Ἅρματα Φαραὼ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ ἔρριψεν εἰς θάλασσαν, ἐπιλέκτους ἀναβάτας τριστάτας κατεπόντισε ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ, […] Ἡ δεξιά σου, Κύριε, δεδόξασται ἐν ἰσχύϊ, ἡ δεξιά σου χείρ, Κύριε, ἔθραυσεν ἐχθρούς. Καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῆς δόξης σου συνέτριψας τοὺς ὑπεναντίους˙ ἀπέστειλας τὴν ὀργὴν σου καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτοὺς ὡς καλάμην». (Έξοδος 15, 1-7).

Ε. Στο Δευτερονόμιο άλλωστε (32, 41-42) ομιλεί ο ίδιος ο Κύριος στον Μωυσή και παραθέτω μιαν απόδοση δική μου στο άγριο αυτό χωρίο:

«Κι' όταν σαν αστραπή ακονίσω το μαχαίρι Μου, κι αποφασίσω ν' αποδώσω τη δικαιοσύνη Μου, η εκδίκησή Μου θάρθει να πλήξει τους εχθρούς Μου, κι αυτούς που Με μισούν θα τους φερθώ κατά τα έργα τους. Με το αίμα τους τα βέλη Μου θε να μεθύσουν, κι η λάμα του σπαθιού Μου τη σάρκα τους θε να σπαράξει. Τα όπλα Μου θα βάψω στο αίμα των νεκρών και οι ρηγάδες τους θα χάσουνε ζωή και λευτεριά».

ΣΤ. Θέλω να κλείσω την αναφορά μου στα σχετικά χωρία της Π. Διαθήκης με το πιο άγριο, κατά την ταπεινή μου γνώμη, χωρίο της. Αυτό του προφήτη Αβακούμ που μέσα σ' έναν όλο δέος λυρισμό, σ' ένα δοξαστικό θανάτου και καταστροφής παρουσιάζει με τη βιβλική του δύναμη την φλογερή εικόνα του Κυρίου των Δυνάμεων, του Άρχοντα του Πολέμου, του Εκδικητή των πυρακτωμένων μεσανατολικών ερήμων. Θα ήθελα να το μεταφέρω σε μια δική μου απόδοση ελπίζοντας να περάσω στο νεοελληνικό κείμενο ένα μέρος τουλάχιστον απ' την οσμή της φωτιάς και του θειαφιού του πρωτοτύπου κειμένου:

«Θε νάρθει από τη Θάιμαν ο Θεός,
Ο Άγιος θάρθει απ' την καρδιά
του δάσους του κατάμαυρου.
Η δόξα Του σκεπάζει ουρανούς
κι η γη σκεπάζετ' από ύμνους στ' όνομά
Του.
Σκορπίζει αστραπές από φωτιά
κι η δύναμη φωλιάζει μές τις χούφτες
Του.
Μπροστά Του περπατά ο Θάνατος,
Ο Άγγελος ο Εξολοθρευτής πατά στα
βήματά Του.
Σταμάτησε κι εσείστη η γή
με μία Του ματιά διαλύθηκαν τα έθνη-
μ' ένα Του βλέμμα διάλυσαν τα έθνη
σωριάστηκαν τα όρη τα ψηλά
κι εγίναν στάχτη.
[…] Ω Κύριε Εσύ
που για να σώσεις το λαό Σου

ανέβης στ' άρματά και στ' άλογά Σου.
Εσύ, θ' αδράξεις το δοξάρι σου στο τέλος
Εσύ θα το τανύσεις ενάντια στα Έθνη.
[…] Ο ήλιο Ήλιος κι η σελήνη Σελήνη κρύφτηκαν στα
παλάτια τους
[…] και ο Λαός Σου βάδισε στο φως
από τα βήματά Σου
ανάμεσα στις αστραπές
των πύρινών Σου όπλων.
Με το θυμό Σου γκρέμισες τη Γη
με την οργή Σου σκιάχτηκαν τα έθνη…
Σφαγμένους ξάπλωσες στη Γη
τους πιο σκληρούς πολεμιστές της…
(Αβακούμ 3, 4-14)».

3. Ο Θεός Γραφεύς (Σύμβολο Σοφίας)

Όλες οι γλώσσες, κατ' αρχήν, πρέπει να θεωρηθούν ως εμπεριέχουσες το θείο στοιχείο διότι αποτελούν αντανάκλαση του Πρώτιστου Λόγου που είναι και η Πηγή της Θείας Δημιουργίας. Εξάλλου «...Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς γενηθήτω φῶς˙ καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς» (Γεν. 1,3).

Είναι άλλωστε γνωστή όσο και ανεξερεύνητη σε όλη την υπέροχη ανεξιχνίαστη ακόμη σημασία της, η κατά θείαν εντολή αναφορά του αγαπημένου Αποστόλου του Ιησού, του Ιωάννη «Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, κι ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. Οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὅ γέγονεν » (Ἰωάν., 1-3) κι ακόμη « Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὅ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον» (Ἰωάν. 1, 9).

Η εγκεκριμένη από την Ιερά Σύνοδο Μετάφραση της Βιβλικής Εταιρείας (1989) αποδίδει ως εξής τα δύο αυτά παραθέματα από το κατά Ιωάννην Ευαγγέλιο:

«Απ' όλα πρίν υπήρχε ο Λόγος
κι ο Λόγος ήτανε με το Θεό,
κι ήταν Θεός ο Λόγος.

Απ’ την αρχή ήταν αυτός με το Θεό.
Τα πάντα δι’ αυτού δημιουργήθηκαν
κι’ απ’ όσα έγιναν,
τίποτα χωρίς αυτόν δεν έγινε».
[…]
«Ο Λόγος ήταν το αληθινό το Φώς
που φωτίζει κάθε άνθρωπο
καθώς εκείνος έρχεται στον κόσμο» [15].

Κι αυτή λοιπόν η παρουσία της Απολύτου και περί των πάντων Γνώσεως, της Θείας Σοφίας, η alma mater της Δημιουργίας του παντός, δεν μπορούσε παρά να αποτελεί ομοούσιο του Θεού στοιχείο.

Η Θεία Εντολή περί της δημιουργίας του παντός εδώθη μετά Λόγου και δια του Λόγου. Τι το ιερότερο όμως από τη Θεία δημιουργία την κατ’ εικόναν και ομοίωσιν του Παναγάθου; Άρα τι το ιερότερο από το Λόγο μετά και δια του οποίου δημιουργήθηκε το Σύμπαν;

Στα ερωτήματα αυτά απαντούν κατηγορηματικά τα ιερά κείμενα της χριστιανοσύνης δια χειλέων του ιδίου του Ιησού στην επί του Όρους Ομιλία «ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ναὶ ναι, οὔ οὔ˙ τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστιν» (Ματθ. 5, 37). Κι είναι φυσικό να σεβόμεθα και να μην κακοποιούμε ή να διαστρέφουμε το Λόγο ακριβώς γιαυτή του τη θεμελιώδη ιερότητα, για να είναι ικανός να συνεχίζει το Θείο Έργο επί γής ως ταπεινή συνέχεια του Υπέρ πάντος χρόνου Θείου Λόγου.

Λέγει δε ο Ιησούς «ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ» (Ματθ. 12,37). Από το λόγο λοιπόν και τη χρήση του εξαρτάται ακόμη κι αυτή η τελική κρίση του ανθρώπινου γένους. Από το λόγο και τη χρήση του, γιατί αυτός συνεχίζει και διατηρεί ή διαστρέφει τις Θείες Εντολές οι οποίες μετά Λόγου και δια του Λόγου μεταφέρθηκαν στον άνθρωπο.

Γιατί άλλωστε είναι τόσο σαφής και κατηγορηματική η εντολή «Οὐ λήψει τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ σου ἐπὶ ματαίω»; Γιατί το Όνομά Του είναι «ο Λόγος». Ο «Λόγος» που εμπερικλείει το Θείο Μυστήριο.

---

[15] Σ.Σ.: Χρησιμοποιώ την επεξηγηματική υποσημείωση (β) της σ. 184 της μεταφράσεως. (Βλ. *Η Καινή Διαθήκη*, μτφση Βιβλικής Εταιρείας, Γ. Γαλίτη, Ι. Καραβιδόπουλου, Ι. Γαλάνη, Π. Βασιλειάδη, σ. 184, Αθήνα, 1989).

Φυσικά, μπορούμε να μιλήσουμε για την επέκταση που συμβολικά αλλά και κατ' ουσίαν γίνεται από την επίγεια άυλη φωνητική μορφή που ο Λόγος λαμβάνει ως ομιλία, στην, επίσης επίγεια, υλική γραπτή μορφή που λαμβάνει με τη σειρά της η ομιλία μετατρεπόμενη σε γραπτό λόγο.

Μα άν ο Υιός του Θεού έγινε Υιός του Ανθρώπου, εάν το ανθρώπινο γένος τιμήθηκε όσο κανένα άλλο πλάσμα της δημιουργίας μ' αυτήν την Θεία ενανθρώπιση, πού αλλού μπορούμε να το αποδώσουμε αν όχι στην υπέρτατη ανάγκη της εγκοσμιοποιήσεως, της ενανθρωπίσεως, άρα και της δυνατότητος κατανόησης του Θείου Λόγου από τον άνθρωπο; Και με ποια άλλη μορφή κάτι τέτοιο θα μπορούσε να συμβεί παρά με το όχημα του προφορικού και γραπτού λόγου; Του προφορικού λόγου για τις μεγάλες μάζες που δεν είχαν τη δυνατότητα της γνώσεως των γραμματικών συμβόλων και των νόμων αλλά και των πεπαιδευμένων ανθρώπων που είχαν τη σοφία -για την εποχή- της γνώσεως και του χειρισμού του γραπτού λόγου. Σε τί άλλο, λοιπόν, αποσκοπούσε ο γραπτός λόγος, παρά στην αποτύπωση του Θείου Μηνύματος, στην ιστορικοποίησή του, στη διατήρησή του σε αναλλοίωτη μορφή;

Να λοιπόν γιατί η Τέχνη του χειρισμού των γραμματικών συμβόλων, των γραμμάτων, όπως και το λειτούργημα του Διδασκάλου και Γραφέως αποτελούν δραστηριότητες σε απευθείας συσχέτιση με το θείο αφού και η πιό παλαιά μορφή λογοτεχνικής δημιουργίας ήταν αυτή των ιερών κειμένων όλων των λαών και των πολιτισμών. Κειμένων, δηλαδή, θείας προελεύσεως.

Ο γραφέας όμως των πρώτων οργανωμένων ανθρώπινων κοινωνιών ανήκε de facto εις το ιερατείο της κοινωνικής ή εθνικής του ομάδας. Το "ιστορικό" του αντίστοιχο ήταν ενός κληρικού (συμβόλου ιεροσύνης) διότι χειρίζονταν τα γράμματα, τα σύμβολα αυτά που διατηρούσαν και μετέφεραν στην κοινωνία το Θείο Λόγο, ταυτόσημο με την Άχρονη και Υπερτάτη Θεία Αλήθεια, όπως γίνονταν αυτή αντιληπτή στην αρχαία σκέψη.

Αυτό ακριβώς εξέφραζε το αρχαίο Αιγυπτιακό ιερατείο όταν τοποθετούσε τους Γραφείς υπό την σκέπη του θεού Θώτ του επονομαζόμενου «Γραφέως του Μάατ» δηλαδή της Θείας Αλήθειας και Δικαιοσύνης.

Δεν είναι λοιπόν δύσκολο να αναγνωρίσουμε, μετά απ' όλα αυτά, το Θεό ως Λόγο περιγραφόμενο με τα χαρακτηριστικά και τις ιδιότητες του Γραφέως.

Έχουμε όλοι ιδεί πολλές αγιογραφίες του Ιησού Χριστού εν δόξη που στολίζουν το θόλο και τις θύρες των εκκλησιών, παντός χριστιανικού δόγματος: Ο Κύριος καθισμένος σε θρόνο, ευλογεί με την δεξιά και με την αριστερά κρατά ένα βιβλίο ανοιχτό. Η παράσταση αυτή αντιστοιχεί στην επίκληση του Ιησού ως Δικαστού κατά την Δευτέρα Παρουσία. Το βιβλίο είναι το σύμβολο της Βίβλου της Ζωής, της liber vitae των Γραφών, όπου είναι καταγεγραμμένες όλες οι πράξεις των ανθρώπων αλλά και τα ονόματα των εκλεκτών του Θεού.

Παραπέμπω στην Αποκάλυψη του Ιωάννου «Ὁ νικῶν οὗτος περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξαλείψω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς βίβλου τῆς ζωῆς καὶ ὁμολογήσω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρός μου καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ» (Αποκ. 3,5).

Και ο Απόστολος των Εθνών αναφέρει στην Προς Φιλιππησίους επιστολή του «ναὶ ἐρωτῶ καὶ σέ, σύζυγε γνήσιε, συλλαμβάνου αὐταῖς, αἵτινες ἐν τῷ εὐαγγέλιῳ συνήθλησάν μοι μετὰ τὰ καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν συνεργῶν μου, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς» (Πρὸς Φιλιπ. 4, 3).

Στην δε Έξοδο ο Μωυσής αναφέρει με δέος προς τον Κύριο των Δυνάμεων «καὶ νῦν εἰ μὲν ἀφεῖς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτῶν, ἄφες˙ εἰ δὲ μή, ἐξάλειψόν με ἐκ τῆς βίβλου σου, ἧς» (Ἔξοδος 32, 32) για να λάβει την απάντηση από Αυτόν για να λάβει την απάντηση από Αυτόν «εἴ τις ἡμάρτηκεν ἐνώπιόν μου, ἐξαλείψω αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς βίβλου μου» (Ἔξοδος 32, 33).

Είναι προφανές λοιπόν ότι η Βίβλος αυτή περιέχει το σύνολο της Δημιουργίας εφόσον αυτή αντανακλάται στις σκέψεις, τις πράξεις και τους λόγους των ανθρώπων, που ούτως ή άλλως περιέχονται στις σελίδες της. Είναι λοιπόν η liber mundi[16], η Βίβλος του Κόσμου, τις τύχες του οποίου ο Θεός καταγράφει, γνωρίζει και χειρίζεται όπως ο Γραφεύς. Αυτό αποδεικνύουν άλλωστε και τα δύο γράμματα Α και Ω του ελληνικού αλφαβήτου, που βρίσκονται πάντοτε χαραγμένα στην αριστερή και δεξιά σελίδα του ανοικτού αυτού βιβλίου και που συμβολίζουν το Άπαν της Υπάρξεως, την Αρχή και το Τέλος της,

[16] Σ.Σ.: Γνωστή από τις ροδοσταυρικές παραδόσεις του Μεσαίωνα.

στο πρόσωπο του θείου Λόγου «ἐγὼ τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος» (Αποκ. 22, 13). Ο Θεός είναι ο Πρώτος, διότι είναι Αυτός ο Δημιουργός του Παντός, η απόλυτη ικανή και αναγκαία συνθήκη. Είναι επίσης ο Έσχατος διότι είναι Αυτός ο κρίνων πάντας ζώντας και νεκρούς, Αυτός κοντολογίς που οδηγεί τα πάντα προς το τέλος τους. Είναι το ίδιο το τέλος τους, η απόλυτη τελική αιτία.

Μ’ αυτή τη λογική καταλαβαίνουμε εύκολα ότι τα υπόλοιπα γράμματα που περικλείονται μεταξύ των δύο αυτών άκρων συμβολίζουν το σύνολο των όντων που περιέχει η Βίβλος της Ζωής που βρίσκεται στο αριστερό χέρι του Ιησού στη χριστιανική εικονογραφία.

Επίλογος

Όλες οι παραπάνω σκέψεις, που δεν διεκδικούν το τίτλο της «ορθοτόμησης του λόγου της Αλήθειας», είναι σκέψεις ενός πιστού του 20ου αιώνα που προσπαθεί να λύσει το μεγάλο μυστήριο της Βασιλικής Τέχνης του «ζειν». Μέσα όμως σ’ ένα Κόσμο που θάπρεπε κάποτε να ξανασυναντηθεί και να «ουσιωθεί» με την θαυμαστή σημασία του ίδιου του ονόματός του.

Αν ο σύγχρονος Άνθρωπος δεν έχει τουλάχιστον ακόμα χάσει την πίστη του στον Άνθρωπο ως έσχατο σημείο αναφοράς, δεν πρόκειται να χάσει την πίστη του στο Θεό. Με αυτό ως προϋπόθεση, ο σύγχρονος Άνθρωπος θα μπορούσε να γίνει Διδάσκαλος των Έργων, Αρχιτέκτονας της σκέψης και της ζωής του, «κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν» Εκείνου.

Θα μπορούσε να το επιτύχει καταφεύγοντας σε μια βιωματική πνευματικότητα, τροφοδοτούμενη από την «κοινωνία» και «επικοινωνία» με το σύμβολο, την μόνη ικανή να τον καταστήσει ικανό να περάσει από την εργασία νοούμενη ως «βάσανον», στην εργασία νοούμενη ως εξαγνισμό της σκέψεως, των πράξεών του και των συναισθημάτων του.

Τί περισσότερο επείγον, λοιπόν, για τη σύγχρονη κοινωνία, από την εκμάθηση και εφαρμογή των τριών αυτών Θείων Τεχνών.

Adina Roşu[1]

Maecenas: ipso suo facto

Abstract
Statesmen, glorious commanders or wise leaders valued and contributed to the development of literature, arts and sciences, but the one who cultivated best the love for literature was Maecenas.

The period in which Maecenas lived equals with the Augustan period or „golden" age in regaining prosperity, glory and peace, of restoration of fundamental roman values. The literary patronage was a structure but also an ideology.

The name of Maecenas became a symbol of its qualities and principles. Maecenas, was recognized by everyone as a great patron of literature, he was a noted political and public figure.

Keywords
Pietas, virtus, patronus, cliens, officium, beneficium, societas, libertas

One of the most distinguished literary patrons, patron of scholars, courageous soldier and astute politician was Maecenas - Caius Cilnius Maecenas (~70-8 BC) originating from a wealthy family of equestrian[2] rank of Arretium (Etruria).

From a historical perspective, the period in which Maecenas lived equals with the Augustan period or "golden age" in regaining prosperity, glory and peace, of restoration of fundamental roman values.

Development of culture, literature and arts reached the highest peaks in this period, called "Augustan" not only in conjunction with the name

1 Ph.D., University of Oradea, adinarosu@ymail.com.

2 Pierre Grimal, *Literatura Latină*, translated by Mariana and Liviu Franga, supplementary notes and foreword by Liviu Franga, biography of Pierre Grimal by Eugen Cizek, PH Teora, Bucharest, 1997, p. 215.

Augustus, assigned in 27 BC[3] to Octavian, but especially because of great changes made in almost all areas. The term *augustus* is put in relation with the verb "increase", "grow", "enhance" *augere*, with the noun *auctoritas*, influence, prestige and *omen*, harbinger of the future, who gives signs, which improves the action, the derived adjective *augustus* meaning the one established by the Auguri or done under the favorable auspices[4]. In Rome, the Senate meeting place was always a temple. Decisions had to be taken in a sacred place, in the presence of the Gods, and the auspices were consulted, and if there was any fateful sign on the sky, the assembly vanished[5]. Before taking important decisions the Auguri needed to ensure that the gods were favorable, everything being under the dominion of city religion.

Professor Robert Etienne shows that the term "century" (saeculum) in Antiquity has three different meanings: designates a specific time, amounts to a generation of people, or designates a historical sequence[6]. Eugene Cizeck proposes the fourth sense, the key moment in history, a moment that marked an intense flowering of civilization and culture, as the century of Pericles, of Scipione, the century of Augustus[7].

Sustainable and valuable achievements of the Augustan period were due to the imposed policies by Augustus regarding unchanging values and ideals.

Augustus had a new power, *cura legum morumque*, the care of laws and manners[8].

Augustus's concern for literature was a natural consequence of his education. In *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, Suetoniu reported that Augustus "had studied eloquence and liberal arts with passion, supported

[3] N. A. Maşkin, *Principatul lui Augustus. Originea şi conţinutul lui social,* State PH for Scientific Literature, Bucharest, 1954, p. 274, Dio Cassius, *Istoria Romană,* translation and notes by dr. A. Piatkowski, Bucharest, 1977, vol. II, c. L III, p. 371.

[4] A. Ernout, A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, Paris, Klincksieck, 2001, p. 56.

[5] Fustel de Coulanges, *Cetatea antică. Studiu asupra cultului, dreptului şi instituţiilor Greciei şi Romei,* translated by Mioara and Pavel Izverna, notes translation by Elena Lazăr, foreword by Radu Florescu, PH Meridiane, Bucharest, 1984, p. 123.

[6] Eugen Cizek, *Istoria Romei*, PH Paideia, Bucharest, 2010, p. 237.

[7] Idem, *Istoria literaturii latine*, „Adevărul" Company SA, Bucharest, 1994, vol. I, p. 246.

[8] Idem, *Mentalităţi şi instituţii romane,* PH Globus, Bucharest, 1998, p. 228.

from early childhood [...] during the war of Mutina, despite the overflowing activity, he has not ceased to read, write and declaim daily”[9].

The real change from the time of Augustus was to revitalize the moral ideal of *res republica*, meaning “the city”, a community of interests, a *res populi*[10]. The aspirations of Augustan era for peace and return to traditional values corresponded with the views of the most important Roman writers of that time as Horace, Virgil, Ovid, Propertius, Titus Livius. The period of Augustus may be called “the golden century” of Roman literature. Literature became at that time a weapon of political propaganda.

Horace’s *Roman odes* present those virtues and the importance of Augustus’s role in the return policy to traditional virtues. Titus Livius believed in the eternity of Rome - *Roma aeterna* - perceiving Roman history as instructive example of conduct and human behaviour. Like Virgil, Titus Livius understood Roman experience in terms of human experience. History shows where to look for role models examples.

Remedia mentioned by Titus Livius were given by the religious restoration of Augustus. Concepts such as *iustitia*[11] and *prudentia*[12] were at that time much more pronounced.

Virgil was part of the generation of those who associated Augustus with peace, harmony and stability, during which the Republic was restored, and the Roman state has prospered by knowing and accepting its old values . *Virtus*, *clementia*, *iustitia* and *pietas* were qualities through which Augustus remarked himself, characteristic features of the ideal Roman. Augustus started the defense of the Republic as a private citizen and his courage (*virtus*) was rewarded by honours. He revenged his father’s death (*pietas*) in a lawful manner (*iustitia*) and the wars he waged showed kindness (*clementia*)[13].

9 Suetoniu, *Viețile celor doisprezece Cezari,* PH RAO, Bucharest, 1998, translation from Latin, foreword and annexes by Gheorghe Ceauşescu, p. 100.

10 Andrea Giardina, *Omul roman,* PH Polirom, Iaşi, 2001, p. 29.

11 A. Ernout, A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, Paris Klincksieck, 2001, p. 329, *iustitia*, derivated from *ius* according to right, just things, *ius*, *iuris*, word that at its origin meant „religious form that forced the law”, from which the plural *iura*, *iura legesque* was formed, and then *iudex*, the one that says the form of justice and *iuro*, to pronounce the sacred form thatobligates.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 329, *prudentia*, trem which in the current speech lost the sense of *provideo* and became the large sense of the one who knows, the one who is aware of.

13 N. A. Maşkin, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

Cicero, also a writer and justice orator, mentioned often in his pleadings the importance of keeping these virtues[14].

Virgil contributed to capturing the glorious deeds composing the epos of a new Rome. *Aeneid's* characters sustain each something typical and fundamental Roman, they are examples of symbols. Aeneas's devotion to its duty, *pietas* represents the very spirit of the Augustan age.

Virgil supported Augustus admiring his political and social initiatives. *Georgics* claimed Augustus policy to encourage small farmers to develop agriculture, *Bucolics*, published between 39 and 38 BC, have been dedicated to him after the victory in year 40 BC in Perusia[15].

The elegiac poets Propertius and Tibullus (~ 50 BC) have mirrored themselves the Augustan culture through their artistry and allegorism, expressing the desire to become each strong public voices.

The altar of peace, *Ara Pacis*, opened in year 9 BC, based on a decision of the senate, celebrated the peace instituted by Augustus. Art in Augustus period became an important part of civic life. All these have developed large, favored by domestic peace.

Poetry has played an essential role in spiritual and moral transforming caused by the crisis of civil wars. Aware of the powers that the poem secretly kept, Horace speaks in *Ars Poetica* about the moral purpose of poetry: „saxa movere sono testudinis et prece blanda ducere, quo vellet. Fuit haec sapientia quondam, publica privatis secernere, sacra profanes, concubitu prohibere vago, dare iura martis, oppida moliri, leges incidere ligno"[16].

(That by the sound of lira and tender prayers
Stones move anywhere. For once, wisdom has been
Discern the what's your's and what's the congregation's, sacred profane,
To found settlements, with a law carved in wood).

Poets enjoyed a special status in society. They were in the entourage of high-class people of the city[17] and had a role as important as the people

[14] Mommsen Theodor, *Istoria română*, translated by Ioachim Nicolaus, Scientific and Encyclopedic PH, Bucharest, 1987, vol. III, p. 338.
[15] P. Grimal, *op. cit.*, p. 209.
[16] Horatius, *Opera omnia*, cared edition, introductive study, notes and indexes by Mihai Nichita, PH Univers, Bucharest, 1980, vol I, *Ode* 3.30, p. 328.
[17] P. Grimal, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

of the state, having beside the role of attendants or advisers also politic responsabilities. Their poetry concerns the historical moment in which they wrote their works. Poetry wore, as poets claimed, a secret truth of her's which can survive in time:

„Exegi monumentum aere perennius
regalique situ pyramidum altius"[18]
(I raised a monument, which is more eternal than the weapon
and so tall that not even the royal pyramids are)

The writer prestige increased once with the establishment of literary circles, public lectures, public libraries, schools of rhetoric. Many of them were created or supported by Octavian Augustus.

The habit of public recitals, *recitationes* has grown among the Roman public. The public was invited to rooms where works of all genres were recited. In the same time were organized games and grand performances. In year 17 BC, Augustus ordered the celebration of secular games.

Writers in the Age of Augustus enjoyed social prestige. They rivaled the great models of Greek poetry, inventing new genres of literature, assuming the trends that became normatives of classical aesthetics.

Roman aristocrats promoted the assertion of valuable writers through literary circles. The most famous literary circles were those of Asinius Pollio (Caius Asinius Pollio), Messala (Marcus Valerius Messala Corvinus), the Literary Circle of Scipione and Metella. Messala, orator and opponent of Augustan policy, keeper of republican ideals, wrote pamphlets, cultivated bucolic poetry, promoted Tibul.

Asinius Pollio, known scholar, initiated public lectures and established public libraries, the first public library founded by him in year 37 BC, in the atrium of Liberty on the Aventine, includes masterpieces of Greek and Latin literature, but also art objects and sculptures.

The most important literary circle was the circle of Maecenas, attended by almost all major poets of that time. Maecenas friends were magnificent people with different talents: Valgius (Caius Valgius Rufus) - poet, elegies orator and epigramist, Pollio (Caius Asinius Pollio) - poet, historian, orator, politician, consul in year 40 BC, Varius (Lucius Varius Rufus) - poet and prominent member of the literary circle, Fundanius - a very talented comic writer, Domitius Marcus - epigramist, Plotius, Tucca, Areus of Alexandria - philosopher and friend of Augustus, Melissus and

[18] Horatius, *Opera omnia*, vol I, *Ode* 3.30, p. 248.

Fuscus Aristius – educated grammarians, Heliodoros - great Greek orator, Pedius, Publicola, Mesalla Corvinus - historian, orator, noble, Caius Furnius - tribune of the people and his son, a historian that Augustus raised to the consular dignity[19].

In the circle of Maecenas, material protection was coupled by the moral side of the relationship but also by a discreet ideological guidance. Horace describes Maecenas's house as being always open to talented poets and writers, but didn't receive those who wrote of envy or malice: „Magnum hoc ego duco, quod placui tibi, qui turpi, secernis honestum, non patre praeclaro, sed vita et pectore puro".

(It's the biggest honor that was given to me
To cherish my hard-work, you who never
The villains on a level with those honest put
And see in man not race, but his dignity).

Writer himself, Maecenas understood best that creative enthusiasm requires financial support. Unlike other rich people, Maecenas used his wealth not to achieve his goals, but to help the foremost Latin poets, by not restricting their creative freedom and independence. Friendship and poetry were the most important aspects of the literary group governed by him. Those whom he thought worthy of consideration and his attention he always rewarded them favors. These include especially poets, himself being a loving and beloved of the Muses.

The presence and help of Maecenas brought Propertius immortality. Maecenas was to Propertius a role model on moderation, humility and loyalty to his own endowments: „hic status ad pacem, hic castrensibus utilis armis: Naturae sequitur semina quisque suae"[20]

(one is for peace, and one of the camps and weapons,
for they all follow the germs of their own nature)

Valuing his loyalty to own principles, Propertius says he will strive to go beyond Maecenas in refusing honors and opportunities. Maecenas refused all functions (consul, praetor, imperator) to reach Senator.

Propertius was aware of the fact that he will remain known to posterity as one who was part of the group of Maecenas (in partes tuas v. 60). The

[19] M. Richter, R. Schomberg, *The Life of Maecenas With Critical and Historical Notes*, (1748), p. 42.

[20] Sexti Propertii, *Opera omnia*, cared edition, fixed text, foreword, original translation and notes by Vasile Sav, PH Univers, Bucharest, 1992, III, 2, p. 156.

beliefs of both were similar, and their essence was that every man must follow nature to excel in its field. Ovid, Propertius, Tibul have depicted an elegant, refined, lacked of ambition and vain worries world, for which the beautiful had to be fully valued. Their poetry illustrated a reaction to the time before, that of civil wars.

To Maecenas's circle belonged elegist poets who despised military activity - Ovid, Propertius, Tibul and poets who supported Augustus's reforms, military virtues, country beauties, country life, ancestors religion, such as Virgil and Horace. The literary patronage was a structure but also an ideology. Maecenas has a real and poetic presence for Virgil, a source of inspiration for his themes.

The composition of the *Georgics* or of the „earth poem" is about the influence of Maecenas who asked Virgil to write a poem about field culture, in order to support the promotion of economic policy imposed by Augustus. Maecenas was a favorite of Octavian, because of his attachment, loyalty and discretion.

During the civil wars of Mutina, Philippi, Perusia, Sicily, and Actium, Maecenas was the intimate adviser of Octavian, together with Agrippa, he served as prefect of Rome (the prefect was one of Rome's magistrates)[21].

Poetry, politics, friendship, mystical view of nature, philosophy by evoking serenity are the great themes of vergilian thinking. Horace was introduced into the circle of Maecenas by Virgil and Varius (Lucius V. Rufus) and soon was among those who were close to Maecenas: „Virgil, post hunc, Varius dixere, quid essem"[22]. Maecenas played an important role since the first published writings of Horace, *Satires* (35 BC) and we find him frequently mentioned as recipient in *Epodes*, *Odes* and *Epistles*.

The farm received from Maecenas was everything what Horace cherished: peace, tranquility, a place to write and where he could discuss ethical and moral issues of interest. Horace and Propertius were approximately contemporans and shared a common patron, Maecenas, each managing to maintain freedom of poetic creation, beyond help, support and encouragement.

The solidarity of interests and concerns was what created parity between Maecenas and Horace or Maecenas and Propertius, despite of

[21] Suetoniu, *Vieţile celor doisprezece Cezari*, p. 61.

[22] Horatius, *Opera omnia*, cared edition, introductive study, notes and indexes by Mihai Nichita, PH Univers, Bucharest, 1980, vol. II, p. 58.

the obvious difference of social conditions. The feelings of real friendship between Horace and Maecenas exeeded social or economic differences between them.

Grace or gratitude itself to Maecenas is expressed through poetry. The „currency” of poetic language had value that depended on its audience. The poet wishes to thank, praise the generosity of the patron by composing poems. The duty transferred through a gift in the sphere of good will, of unselfish devotion. The name of Maecenas became a symbol of its qualities and principles. Maecenas, was recognized by everyone as a great patron of literature, he was a noted political and public figure.

Statesmen, glorious commanders or wise leaders valued and contributed to the development of literature, arts and sciences, but the one who cultivated best the love for literature was Maecenas. Even those who criticized him, couldn’t make not to recognize his greatness „because he was always like this: no talented man enjoyed appreciation without forgiving him any lack [...] defects: they are so united with qualities that the latter would also be deleted”[23].

Beyond the historical or literary record limits (subjective or objective), remain written works in posterity through which Maecenas contributed to the happiness and welfare of human society, facts which put before us, offer not only a grand and unique show to imagination, but ways to the true happiness of a fulfilled life.

[23] Seneca, *Epistole către Lucilius*, PH Polirom, Iaşi, 2008, translation, notes and appendix by Ioana Costa, vol. II, p. 204.

Gabriel Valeriu Basa[1]

The Eastern Church in the 9th Century Theological Profile

Abstract
Taking into account the close relations between the Byzantine emperors and the Patriarchs of Constantinople, this survey points out the way in which the theological thinking evolved throughout the IX th century. First the author of the study exposes the evolution of the political circumstances and their effects on the life of the church and he ends by running over the names of the most important personalities of that time. The Christian missions initiated by the great Patriarch Fotie had a tremendous influence on the development of the religions culture and had on overwhelming contribution to the publishing of a great deal of books dealing with the clear explanation of many major basic notions of the Christian theology. Looking back at the amount of works written by the huge scholars of the Church in the IX th century we could draw the conclusion that depending on the problems that had generated them a development of the Byzantine theology based on the works of the Holy Fathers happened. The continuous progress in the religions culture was due to this fight against iconoclasm – at the beginning of the century – and to the outstanding personality of the Patriarch Fotie through out its second half.

Keywords
Byzant, politics, emperor, patriarch, theology, monachism, schism, christianizations, culture

Theology was the "science which passionately interested the Byzantine thinking" and "it is remarkable that it covers almost half of what the Byzantine literature produced… only a few writers or uninitiated persons did not approach it" said Charles Diehl in his work ”Byzantine Figures", page 140.

[1] Pd.D., „Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, gavaba@yahoo.com.

In Byzant the theological discussions interested not only the common people[2] but also the emperors, some of them came to know certain problems of faith[3] very well, due to the place occupied by the Church in the state's life when Christianity was legislated. Close links were kept in public life between the political and the church problems. It permitted the emperor's intervention in the church affairs and the patriarch's intervention in political affairs.

Monachism was a force acting by the patriarch, interfering in big problems, divided into two parties: one of the relentless, defeating the autonomy and liberty of the church against the emperor, sometimes revolutionary against the emperor or even the patriarch, and that of the liberals who thought that a good cooperation and understanding with the emperor can reinforce the rights of the church.[4]

Taking into account the relationships between the Byzantine emperors and the patriarchs from Constantinople it will be easy to understand the way the theological thought evolved in the 9th century, according to the problems existing at that time, but only after the presentation of the political and religious situation, as well as that of the remarkable personalities of the time will be made.

The Political and Religious Situation in the Byzantine Empire in the 9th Century

Having a look at the whole situation of the 9th century, we can notice that emperors belonging to three dynasties ruled throughout it:

- The isaurian one – founded by Leon Isaurus from 717 finished in 802;
- The amorian one – from 802 to 867 – its name comes from the name of the emperor Michael II the Stammerer originally from Amorion;

[2] Rev. Prof. Dr. Milan Şesan, *Patriarch Fotie and Rome* in magazine „Metropolitan Church in Transylvania" (M.A.), nr. 7-8 / 1960, p. 516.

[3] Prof. Teodor M. Popescu, Rev. Teodor Bodogae and Prof. George Gh. Stănescu, *Universal History of Church (I.B.U.) Handbook for Theological Institutes*, 2nd ed., Bucharest, 1975, vol. I, p. 378.

[4] Asist. Dr. Milan Şesan, *Schism between the Patriarchs Fotie and Ignatie?*, Cernăuți, 1936, p. 12-14.

- The Macedonian one – founded by Basile I the Macedonian; it will be over in the 11th century.[5]
- At the end of the 8th century and the first two years of the 9th century the Byzantine Empire was ruled by empress Irina (797-802). Her reign was a disaster from political point of view. It put the end of the isaurian dynasty.[6]

From the religious point of view, while ruling in the name of her son, Constantin VI (780-797), Irina succeded to convoke the 7th ecumenical synod and restablish the worship of icons, forbidden by the iconoclastic emperors, starting with Constantin V. But the iconoclasm, a religious movement with political and social meaning, originated in the emperors' fear of the monks'power in the state due to their wealth and influence[7] did not finish then. It tormented the byzantine world till the end of the amorian dynasty.

In october 802, due to the crisis of her rule, Irina is removed, by a palace revolution, by Nichifor, the Minister for Finance, who was crowned by the patriarch Tarasie. The new emperor ruled till 811, when he died in a battle with the Bulgarians. During his rule, the economical measures consolidated the byzantin state and on February 25, 806 the chronicler Nichifor the Confessor was named patriarch.

Although in the religious plan there weren't special deeds, the fight between the church –partisan of a moderate politics – and the group of the relentless monks who were protesting against the election of a laic patriarch would stir up. This fact will lead to the monks' confinement.[8]

In 811 in autumn, the son of Nichifor I, Staurakios (Stavrachios) is elected emperor. Wounded in the battle in which his father died, he will rule only for a short time, till his death.[9]

Under such circumstances, the emperor will be Michael I Rangabe, the son-in-law of Nichifor I (811-813). He couln't face the enemies abroad so, in 812, he acknowledged Carol the Great emperor and the existence of two empires. The uprising initiated by Leon, the strategist of Anatolia, during the battles with Bulgaria, will determine Michael I to abdicate and go to

5 ***, *Byzant's World*, Bucharest, 1972, p. 44-45.
6 Stelian Brezeanu, *A History of the Byzantine Empire*, Bucharest, 1981, p. 68.
7 Charles Diehl, *Byzantinian Figures*, Bucharest, 1969, p. 240.
8 S. Brezeanu, *op. cit*., p. 69-70.
9 Rev. Prof. Dr. Mircea Păcurariu, *Course of Byzantinism* – typed, p. 55.

the monastery. Proclamed emperor by the army, Leon V the Armenian (812-820) will do his best to refresh the military power.[10]

On the religious field, the patriarch Nichifor the Confessor, who hasn't reconcile the intransigents yet, will have to face the wraths of the new iconoclast politics. He refused to take part to an assembly at the palace by the end of the year 814 when the emperor announced that the struggle against the icons was starting again and he disaproved the edict given in March 815, it leading to a conflict with the emperor.[11] That's why the patriarch Nichifor the Confessor was taken from the palace and thrown in the marketplace at night time in hope that he would be killed by the iconoclasts, since he had been very ill and he couldn't move easily. Then he was taken in a boat and driven to Chrisopolis and obliged to resign and exile.[12]

The synod gathered in March 815 in Constantinople by the emperor Leon V, which anathematized the decisions of the 7th ecumenic synod, chose as patriarch Teodot (Theodotos) Melissenos, on April 1st.[13]

The oposition against the emperor and his iconoclastic politics was led by Theodor the Studit, but he was caught, arrested and finally exiled in Bitinia.[14]

The emperor's cruelty in the religious and political field had increased due to his military succeses so he became odious. Everybody pointed to his ancient fellow Michael of Amorion who had got the public consideration. Being in jail and accused of rebellion, Michael's partisans decided to kill Leon V the Armenian on December 25th 820.[15]

The new emperor Michael II the Stammerer (820-829) had to face the uprising led by Thoma the Slav and the arabian danger but as a whole his reign was not too bad. Although partisan of iconoclasm and due to political reasons,h e tried to reconcile the two groups, calling the studits back from their exile.[16]

---

10 S. Brezeanu, *op. cit*., p. 71.
11 Drd. Mihai Spătărelu, *St. Nichifor the Confessor, Patriarch of Constantinople; life,work and studies*, in the magazine „Voice of Church" (G.B.), no. 2 / 1986, p. 67.
12 Nicolae Bănescu, *Figures in the History of Byzant*, Albatros Publishing House, 1971, p. 97.
13 S. Brezeanu, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
14 N. Bănescu, *op. cit*., p. 98.
15 *Ibid.*, p. 99-103.
16 S. Brezeanu, *op. cit*., p. 73.

The previous patriarch Nichifor the Confessor was not called back from his exile and named patriarch again because he had refused the imperial compromise which claimed the giving up to the 7th ecumenic synod.

Living in exile till his death on June 2nd 828, he was visited by his ancient rival St. Theodor the Studit by 821, when they discussed about the patriarch Tarasie's place among the fathers of the church. Nichifor the Confessor's attitude full of dignity was highly appreciated by the great defender of the icons at that time.[17]

In 821 in Constantinople, Antonie 1st will become patriarch till 837.[18] The great defender of the icons, Thedor the Studit will die in 826. He left a great epistolary work, homilies, panegyrics and liturgical, poems.[19]

In 829, at the emperor's death, his son Teofil (829-842) will succeed to the throne. He will carry a wise economical politics on which will lead to the financial recover of the state, the development of education and the building of many imposing public edifices. From the religious point of view, Teofil will have an iconoclastic politics. In 832 he convoked the local synod in Constantinople, advised by the future patriarch John VII the Grammarian; the decisions of the synod in 754 are reintroduced, althgough the patriarch of Alexandria, Antiohia and Jerusalem had protested against it. In 837 John VII the Grammarian became patriarch. He led the persecutions against the supporters of the icons after the death of Teofil. Many monasteries were closed, the monks were driven away or sent to jail and the walls of the churches were painted with birds and animals.[20] It is said that „the emperor's sister Theoctista taught her children to kiss the icons and make the sign of the cross so he forbade his daughters to visit their aunt. Even his wife was on the point to lose her life when a fool of the court denounced her to have hidden many valuable icons." (Teodor M. Popescu, Teodor Bodogae and George Gh. Stănescu – History of Universal Church – Handbook for Theological Institutions, 1st edition, Bucharest 1956, 2nd volume, page 292).

---

[17] Drd. M. Spătărelu, *art. cit.*, p. 67-68.

[18] Prof. Teodor M. Popescu, Rev. Teodor Bodogae and Prof. George Gh. Stănescu, *op. cit.*, 2nd edition, Bucharest, 1975, vol. I, p. 436.

[19] S. Brezeanu, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

When he died in 842, the power was taken over by a regency for his son Michael III (842-867), led by his wife Teodora, just as he decided before his death. Teodora's first decision was to restablish the cult of icons, but the patriarch John VIII the Grammarian did not agree to it. That's why he was rejected and Metodie was elected the new patriarch. In March 843 he convoked a synod in Constantinople. It proclamed the validity of the decisions taken by the seven ecumenic synods, rehabilitated all those who suffered under the iconoclasts and anathemized the last ones. The cult of icons was restabished on March 11th 843. From now on, the victory of orthodoxism is celebrated every year on the first Sunday of the Lent. It is called the Sunday of Orthodoxism.[21]

The new patriarch had to face the problem of those who had given the orthodox faith up during the iconoclasm, whom the functions would be given back to, and to find new bishops with moderate views. The moderate politics of Metodie will cause a conflict with the intransigent group of the studit monks because they considered themselves leaders. When they protested publicly, the patriarch Metodie punished them and when they refused to sign the condamnation of St. Teodor's writings against the patriarchs Tarasie and Nichifor they were anathemized.

Even more, they were shown that they had to live separetely and should not be involved in the religious and political problems of the time. This led to a „schism" apparently not solved yet at Metodie's death in 847, although the patriarch had tried to find a solution to this problem even before his death and reconcile the refractory monks.[22]

The emprice Teodora chose Ignatie, son of Michael I Rangabe, instead of Metodie because he had a noble origin and was a keen defender of the icons.[23] But she did not pay attention to this choice, to the opinion of the two monastic „parties" or to the habitual procedure to get from the synod three names; that's why her choice can be considered illegal. Ignatie had neither tact nor diplomacy, but he involved in the imperial politics defending Teodora and this would lead to his failure.[24]

21 Prof. T. M. Popescu, rev. T. Bodogae and Prof. G. Gh. Stănescu, *op. cit.*, 1st Edition, Bucharest, 1956, p. 292-293.

22 J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Clareden Press, Oxford, 1986, p. 69.

23 Rev. G. Georgescu, *Foțiu and His Hierarchical Activity in the Presence of Rome's Bishop*, Bucharest, 1895, p. 27.

24 J. M. Hussey, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

Short time after the coup d'etat in 856 planned by Michael III, major meanwhile, Teoctist was killed and the emprice Teodora had to withdraw. Ignatie started to have conflicts with the new leaders because he used to criticise the way of living of the new monarch and of his protector, the Caesar Bardas, Teodora's brother. He conspired with Michael III against his sister.[25] The patriarch did not want to give Bardas the eucharist at Epiphany in 858, but without checking previously up what it was said about him, if he was living in incest with his daughter –in –law or not. Face to such a public humiliation and Ignatie's refusal to go to the monastery- as he is asked to by the ancient emprice, on November 23rd the same year, he was accused of conspiration against Bardas and exiled to the Isle of Terebintus in the Marmara Sea.[26] Living in exile, the patriarch Ignatie refuses to resign, but after a compromise which admitted the legitimacy of his patriarchate and episcopal holy orders, he will advise his partisans to elect a new patriarch.[27]

The new election was not an easy one, because a well-prepared new person was needed, to find a solution to the problems of the time and be accepted by the political forces. Finally, the ancient imperialsecretary Fotie was elected, also recommended by the permanent synod from Constantinople, at Bardas's demand, of course. Although a laic, Fotie

> „possessed the most beautiful gifts that nature could ever offer to a man. High intelligence, sharp wisdom, vivid spirit, astonishing energy, incredible activity and golden and iron volition, keen of literature; he was a master of oratory, a perfect writer in prose and poetry, reminding the ancient writers; he was a master of the sciences of his time and of those of the past and nobody could equal him. To all these merits his nice appearance, his serious and modest attitude, his joyful face, his sweet and natural manners can be added; shorty – all the external forms that attract and charm."[28]

[25] Ch. Diehl, *op. cit*., p. 303.
[26] Prof. T. M. Popescu, rev. T. Bodogae and Prof. G. Gh. Stănescu, *op. cit*., p. 353.
[27] Drd. Lucian D. Colda, *Between Rome and Constantinople: St. Fotie, Patriarch of Constantinople – a Life, a History, a Destiny,* in „Romanian Telegraph" (T.R), nr. 17-20 / 2001, p. 6.
[28] Pr. G. Georgescu, *Fotiu and His Hierarchical Activity towards the Bishop of Rome*, Bucharest, 1895, p. 34.

This presentation shows us clearly why Fotie, who passes all the stages of hirarchy in six days only, has a central place in the religious history of the 9th century.

He became ordained at Christmas in 858; two bishops – partisans of the ignatian movement were present, too-one of them was probably the metropolitan of Herakleia, the other was the archbishop Gregor Asbestas of Syracuse.[29] Due to the participation of the latter who was in conflict with the ancient patriarch Ignatie who had been removed because of the accusations brought by the partisans of Ignatie for not having taken into account the compromise, would gather in the church St. Irina and reconsider Ignatie as legal patriarch.

Face to this situation, Fotie convoked in the spring of 859 a synod in the church of Saint Apostles. In the presence of 170 bishops, some of them were against him, he declared null the decisions of the ignations, taken in the church of St. Irina, removed Ignatie and some extremist bishops for ever and admitted Fotie as a canonical patriarch.

The next year Fotie sends to Rome and to the Eastern patriarchs a Letter in which he announces his setting up and his confession, explaining that only after Ignatie's removal he accepted to be elected in the high position, even against his volition. The Pope sends a delegation made up of two bishops – Rodoald of Porto and Zacharia of Agnani – to explore the situation on the spot and only after his apostolic notification will be given asking also the restauration of his jurisdiction upon Illiria, Sicily and Calabria.[30]

In April 861, at the arrival of the Pope's delegates at Constantinople, the emperor convokes a new synod, considered the second session of that in 859 when the patriarch Ignatie was removed, Fotie's election is declared canonical, recognized by the Pope's delegates and finally by even Ignatie.

Then the iconoclastic heresy was condemned and in 17 disciplinary canons all the monachal and episcopal abuses had been solved. The Letter sent to the Pope by Fotie, after the synod, together with its documents, explains to the Pope Nicholas that the problems of jurisdiction regarding the imperial territories were representing state affairs and did not involve his competence. The same thing might have been explained to the Pope by the byzantin ambassador Leo and it seems that Leo made the Pope to change his mind concerning this aspect.

---

29 *Ibid.*, in „T.R”. no. 21-24 / 2001, p. 2, col. 1.
30 J. M. Hussey, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

But the Pope Nicholas I did not accept the decisions of the Synod in 861 and disapproving its attitude, declares the case still open. When the proignatian abbot Teognost arrives at Rome in 863, carrying a petition in Ignatie's problem, the Pope convoked a synod in the Latheran Palace in which he declared Ignatie patriarch and excommunicated Fotie, the final judgement belonging to the Saint Chair.[31]

When the Bulgarian's leader, Boris, was christianized in 863 in Constantinople, due to the military threats and the presence of some Latin bishops sent by the Pope to chase the byzantine ones, led to new misunderstandings between the Pope and the patriarch Fotie. Even mor, in a synod in the autumn of 867, the Pope Nicholas I was removed and excommunicated.[32] On September 24, 867 after a conspiracy, Michael III is killed and the throne is occupied by Basil I the Macedonian who puts the basis of the Macedonian dynasty. On November 13, 867 the Pope Nicholas I dies before learning of his removal. On November 23, the new sovereign who wanted the Pope's support, will remove Fotie and recognize Ignatie as patriarch. It was confirmed by a synod convoked at the end of 869 and the beginning of 870.[33] Fotie was exiled, but the next years he was brought to Constantinople as a teacher of the emperor's sons and he reconciled with Ignatie.

Supposing that at Ignatie's death Fotie will be patriarch again, the emperor Basil I writes to the Pope of Rome in 877 to ask for Fotie"s rehabilitation. Since Ignatie dies on October 23, 877 the Pope is asked to take part to a synod to make null the measures against Fotie. The Pope is going to recognize Fotie on condition that he begs his pardon from the synod. But Fotie refused to and the letters sent by the Pope John VIII to the synod of 879-880 were modified before being read in public.

The synod was held in the church of St. Sophia, 383 of bishops were there, as a proof of the support offered to Fotie, the decisions of the synod in 869-879 were made null and the Synod II of Niceea was admitted as ecumenic (787). Bulgaria's problem was debated in the second session, when the Bulgarian leaders took themselves a decision in the favour of Constantinople.[34]

---

31 *Ibid.*, p. 74-76.

32 *Ibid.*, p. 78.

33 S. Brezeanu, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

34 J. M. Hussey, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

On the contrary to some older opinions, according to whom the Pope John VIII would have condemned Fotie again, a new schism being born, both J.M.Hussey in his work „The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire", based on an essay of Fr. Dvornik and Stelian Brezeanu in his work „A history of the Byzantine Empire", but other researchers too, show that the relationships between Rome and Constantinople haven't been interrupted any longer cause the arabian threat and the carolingian state's crisis.

In 886 at the death of Basile I the Macedonian, the throne is occupied by his son, Leon VI the Philosopher (886-913), who obliged Fotie to resign. His brothe Stefan, aged only 18 was named patriarch.[35] Fotie resigns in 887, then he is exiled, but the new patriarch follows him as he was Fotie's apprentice.[36] He will live in the monastery till his death, busy with his studies. Stefan will be patriach till 893. Antony II will follow him and, in 901, he puts the end of the constantinopolitan patriarchs of the 9th century.[37]

All this time the byzantine church had to face many problems, mainly due to the four marriages of the new sovereign which provoked new tensions in the religious field at the beginning of the 10th century.[38]

2. The Christian Mission in the East in the 9th Century and their Importance for the Development of the Theological Culture

Byzant's missionary activity, started centuries ago, will be a successful one in the 9th century. On a hand its success is due to the superiority of christianism to paganism and on another hand due to the fact that the political and religious leaders, in the second half of the 9th century, realized that the religious missions contributed to closer links between the religious centre and the states and their peoples.[39]

[35] Toma G. Bulat, *Fotie Patriarch of Constantinople*, Chişinău, 1940, p. 7.
[36] Prof. Milan Şesan, *The Patriarch Fotie and Rome*, in „M.A.", no. 7-8, 1960, p. 555.
[37] Prof. T. M. Popescu, Rev. T. Bodogae and Prof. G. Gh. Stănescu, *op. cit.*, 2nd Edit., p. 436.
[38] Rev. Prof. Dr. M. Păcurariu, quoted lecture, p. 68.
[39] Prof. M. Şesan, *Orthodoxism in the Past of Central Europe* in „Teological Studies" (S. T.), 2nd year, no. 1-2 / 1950, p. 8.

The importance of the missionarism was noticed by the great patriarch Fotie, whose name remains as a symbol in the history of culture and civilization.[40] The missions contributed to the development of the theological culture as well by the patriarch's own works and those of the great Slav missionaries St. Kiril and Metodie. At the same time, the orthodox principle of using the national language in the religiuos life, in oposition with the trilinguistic Western principle,[41] facilitated the byzantine orthodox thelogy to be spread among christianized peoples and in the world as well.

St. Kiril and Metodie's success was based on their previous knowledge acquired in their youth, but on their life experience, too. Metodie resined at the monastery on Mount Olympus in Bitinia after ten years of administrative and military career among the Slavs. He acquired solid knowledge of Slav language, too. His brother Constantine-Kiril got to the monastery after having been a professor of phylosophy at the University of Constantinople where, after 851, when Fotie dedicated himself to the political life, he continued his tasks, too. In 851 he was a member of the Embassy sent to the Arabians.[42] In this monastery they made the Slav-religious alphabet, which was called later the kirilic alphabet. Together with some apprentices they translated into Slav language some religious and orthodox instruction works, necessary to the missionary activities: the Psalter Book, the Apostole, the Gospel, the Hymn Book and the Missal. Constantine-Kiril wrote in Greek the following works: • *Elogium to St. Gregor theThelogist;* • *three treatises about St. Clement and • about his discussions against the iconoclasts, the Saracins, the Hazars, the Jewish and the Muslims and Metodie, metropolitan of Moravia and Panonoa, translated other religious books and even the juridical work Zakon sudnăi liudem.* [43]

St. Kiril's Mission at the Hazars

Caused by the apparition of the varego-russians at Constantinople in 860, this mission had to strengthen the hazar-byzantine alliance. Constantine-

[40] Vasile V. Munteanu, *Byzanthinism*, Timişoara, 1999, 1st vol., p. 136.

[41] Rev. Prof. Dr. M. Şesan, *About post-patristic Theology*, in „M.A.", no. 4-6 / 1966, p. 293.

[42] Rev. Prof. Ioan I. Rămureanu, *Eleven Centuries from the Missionary Activity of Saints Kiril and Metodie*, in „Orthodoxism", 19th year, no. 1 / 1967, p. 19.

[43] Rev. Prof. Dr. M. Şesan, *About post-patristic Theology*, in „M.A.", no. 4-6 / 1966, p. 286.

Kiril was not only a political emissary representing the caesar Bardas and the emperor Michael III, but also a religious one from Fotie's part.

The aim of this mission was successfully achieved and Kiril showed to the Hazars the superiority of the Gospel to Moses's Law. It is regrettable that his work „Against the Jewish" couldn't be kept, it having theological aspects of the discussions held in Krimea and being tranlated into Slav by his brother.[44]

Kiril and Metodie's Mission at the Moravs and the Czechs

The czecho-morav Slavs to whom the emperor Charles the Great sent missionaries in 796, had already known christianism even at their coming to this region, due to christian elements existing there from the Goths time.[45]

The latin missionaries contributed to the political enslavement of the country, too. That's why the Principle of Great Moravia, Rastislav addressed himself to Byzant in 862 asking for „political, military and religious help" because, due to the great distance, Byzant was not a danger for Moravia.

Emperor Michael III and the patriarch Fotie answered this request by sending the two brothers St. Kiril and Metodie, who translated religious books and the Holy Scriptures in old-slav which was understood by the Moravs, too. They worked in Velehrad between 863-867, forming a group of apprentices at the emperor's request.[46]

In 867 the two brothers left for Constantinople, they passed through Venice then they were invited by the Pope to Rome to give information about their mission. Constantine-Kiril dies there and Metodie goes back to Moravia, after becoming bishop. He was arrested at the order of the German bishops and in 872 he became Archbishop of Moravia. The latin bishops in Rome accused him to alter the habits of the catholic church, so he was called by the new Pope John VIII who imposed him to read the Gospel and the Apostle only in Latin and a German locum tenens, Viking. Metodie kept his orthodoxism, fought against „filioque" abuse, supported by the latin Franks and his visit to Constantinople in 882, where patriarch

---

44 Rev. Prof. I. I. Rămureanu, *art. cit*., p. 20-21.

45 Rev. Prof. Dr. M. Şesan, *The kirilo-metodian Problem*, in "Banat's Metropolitan Church" (M.B.), 13th year, no. 1-2 / 1963, p. 83.

46 Rev. Prof. I. I. Rămureanu, *art. cit*., p. 22-23.

was Fotie again. He was received in a friendly mannerr and got presents in religious books in Slav. One of his apprentice was in charge to introduce to the greek priests knowledge of Slav language and mass.

This school of „Slav studies" was one of Fotie's great contributions to the development of the Eastern church.[47]

Back to Moravia he went on his activity despite his discussions with Viking, till his death in 885. Viking considered it to be a prifitable moment to fight against the Kirilo-metodian tradition. The apprentices had to leave the country and go to Poland, Czeck, Russia and Bulgaria.[48]

From Moravia christianism penetrated Czeck by Borivoi's prince baptise and then by his marriage, in 873, with Ludmila, Sveatopluk's daughter. Their example was followed by a part of the Czeck people, but after Ludmila's death in 927, her brother had to obey the German emperor Otto I and accept the latin – papal christianism. But the kirilo-metodian tyraditions could not be destroyed and they reappeared later.[49]

The Bulgarians' Christianization

Although the Bulgarians came in touch with the customs and the language of the Slavs, the christian mission made little progess till 864 when the tzar Boris himself was baptised at Constantinople,getting the name of Michael. Despite the Bulgarians'revolt, he faced the situation. Short after 864 Fotie sent him a Letter in which the doctrine of the Church is presented. It was meant to demonstrate the superiority of christianism to paganism, making the ideal portrait of the leader Boris is compared to Constantine the Great in his effort to to make the Gospel known. Boris did not get autonomy, so he turned to the West, asking from the Pope a patriarch and some priests for his country, welcoming the papal missions and rejecting the greek clergy.[50]
In the spring of 867, Fotie sends to the leaders of the other Eastern churches an Encyclical Letter – referring to the events from Bulgaria, comparing the latin missionaries to „the thunder, hail and wild boars which spoil God's vineyard". Concerning the doctrine, the patriarch writes about the customs and the false sly methods imposed to the Bulgarians: including

---

[47] George Every, *The byzantine patriarchate*, London, S.P.C.K., 1961, p. 127.

[48] Rev. Prof. Dr. M. Şesan, *The kirilo-metodian Problem*, in M.B., 13th year, no. 1-2 / 1963, p. 85-86.

[49] Rev. Prof. I. I. Rămureanu, *art. cit.*, p. 28.

[50] D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, Saint Vladimir's, Seminary Press, Crestwoods, New York, 1971, p. 118-120.

the Saturday fasting, shorten the fasting with one week, the conviction of the married priests, paying attention to the dogma of the filioque promoted by the latin clergy which is a real heresy.[51] It is a real apology of true faith. The synod of 870 which sends Fotie in exile, discussed about Boris's problem, too and decided to subordinate Bulgaria to the Patriachate of Constantinople and send there a greek bishop.[52]

The coming of St. Kiril and Metodie's apprentices from Moravia to Bulgaria brought about the penetration of the slav christianism in Bulgaria. Under Clement they settled in two centres the Big Preslav and Ohrid which had an important role in spreading the christianism among the Bulgarians and the Serbians.[53]

The flourishing of the old-slav literature was possible under the tsar Simeon. Between 926-927 the Bulgarian church became patriarchate, according to Boris's wish.

The Serbians' christianization – took place in two stages: • that initiated by the emperor Heraclie (610-641) who asked for missionary priests from the Pope in Rome and • that of Basil I the Macedonian, made after 868 by priests and bishops sent by Constantinople.[54]

This last one was strengthened by the kirilo-metidien apprentices, arrived there after being rejected from Moravia in 885.

In spite of their christianization only in the 10th century, both the Russiuans and the Hungarians, they knew the christianization even in the 9th century. It shown by the Encyclical of Fotie who ordained in 865 an archbishop named Michael and then sent him to Russia accompanied by a few priests, but the place where he activated is not known.[55] The Hungarians got into touch with this bishop when settled in Atelkuz. It is also known that, one day during his mission in Krimea, St. Kiril was surrounded by Hungarians who wanted to kill him, but as he stoo still they let him alone.[56] Surveying these christian missions of the 9th century initiated by the great

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 127.
[52] G. Every, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
[53] Rev. Prof. I. I. Rămureanu, *art. cit.*, p. 30.
[54] Rev. Prof. I. I. Rămureanu, *Sebians'Christianization under Basile I the Macedonian*, in „S.T.", 12th year, no. 13 / 1960, p. 27.
[55] Idem, art. *Russians' Christianization in the Light of New Historical Researches*, in „S.T.", 9th year, no. 5-6 / 1957, p. 25-26.
[56] Idem, art. *The Beginnings of the Hungarians' Christianization to the Orthodox Faith*, in „S.T.", 9th year, no. 1-2 / 1957, p. 25-26.

patriarch Fotieone can notice their profitable influence upon the development of the theological culture and contributed to the coming out of some works explaining many of the fundamental notions of christianism.

3. The 9th Century's Theological Culture

The 9th century brought remarkable progress in the development of the theological culture determined in the first half of the century by the fight against iconoclasm and in the second half by the great Fotie's erudition. This progress was encouraged by the caesar Bardas's preferance for culture. In 863 he decided the re-organization of the University of Constantinople where Fotie and Constantine the Philosopher (later Kiril) as well as many other distinguished teachers taught.

The row of the byzantine teologists who lived and worked then is open by the patriarch Nichifor the Confessor who, due to his moderate attitude got in touch with the group of the intransigent monks and got their respect. Although his activity was in the service of defending the icons,his writings had a historical character; among them we can mention: the Shortened History also known as the Breviary (Vademecum) which presents the events of the years 602-679, having important information about the South-Eastern part of Europe and a short chronograph with notes from Adam till 829.

Having a historical and teological importance, the Letter to Pope Leon III, after making a presentation of the trinitary and hristological doctrine, makes an appeal to cooperation and unity.

The teological – eulogistical works can be chronologically presented as follows:

- *The Little Apology* – written by the end of 814 and the begnning of 815 in order to defend the 7th ecumenic synod and make the emperor Leon V to give up the iconoclastic politics.
- The work Judgement or Explanation of Some Fragments Quoted not Appropriately by Those who Attacked the Right Instruction of the Church is - as its title shows - a fighting against their iconoclastic decisions and the patristicflorilegium.
- *The Big Apology* – contains a history of iconoclasm starting with the reign of Leon III the Isaurus, rejects the accusation of idolatry

brought to those who honoured the icons and names the Saviour the supreme sovereign of the Church.

- The three *Antirrhetics* – contains a fighting against the whole iconoclastic conception in the time of Constantine V and bring principles from the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Traditions for Christ's icon.
- The work Against Eusebio and Epiphany – rejects the patristic quotations invoked by Constantine V and in the work The Twelve Chapters against the Iconomachs – had the role to make Nichifor's writings popular and especially the last one.

The documents of the iconoclastic synod from 815 are known today due to their presentation in the firstpart of the work Critics and Fighting against the Outlaws and the False Eres. In the second part it criticises the patristic florilegium.[57]

A special contribution to the development of the cult of icons had Saint Thedor the Studit, whose perfect character and personality, made him praise-worthy among the big figures of the byzantine teologists.

His teological work contains polemical issuesagainst the iconoclasts: 3 treatises, Some Problems and Seven Chapters but also more than 300 Cateheses addressed to the monachs showing him to be a great defender of orthodoxism. There are also 134 speeches with homilitical value and more than 550 letters, all of them as a proof of his extraordinary activity.[58]

In the second half of the century, the work of the greatest scientist of the time, Fotie, is a remarkable one.

It can be divided in two big categories (six big bags of manuscrips were distroyed in 867): • works of general knowledge and • teological works, to which a great number of letters iare added.

Among the works of general knowkledge a special place is occupied by Myriobiblion or Biblitheca In 280 volumes (not equals) he makes the systematical fine and critical analysis of the works of some pagan authors and those of Demostenes and Plutarch, Eusebio and Hrisostom.[59]

Its value consists in the fact it presents almost 80 writers who, otherwise, should have remained unknown (their works do not exist any longer), but also well – known writers of the time or even writers unknows

---

57 Drd. M. Spătărelu, *art. cit*., p. 68-71.

58 Prof. T. M. Popescu, Rev. T. Bodogae and Prof. G. Gh. Stănescu, *op. cit*., 2nd Edit., p. 381-382.

59 J. M. Hussey, *op. cit*., p. 88.

those days.[60] Fotie's Lexicon had as aim to make easier the reading of the holy books and of the clasics,[61] it being a list of words and constructions of the atic alphabet.[62]

Among the teological works we can mention:

- *Amphilochia* – written under the form of answers to the questions of metropolitan Amfilohie of Cizic, contains many religious problems. It also proves not only Fotie's knowledge as a philologist but also an expert of the Bible.[63]
- *Mystagogia on the Holy Spirit* - was a Latin work written against the author takes in all its magnitude the problem procession of the Holy Spirit and it includes most of the arguments in this regard Oriental.[64]

We can also mention • Polemical Treatises upon Roman Pretentions*;* • Collection of Canons and Religious Laws; • Oratorical Speeches (later gathered in two volumes) • Collection of Moral Laws.[65]

We can notice that in the 9th century the development of the byzantine teology was based upon patristic works.

In Nichifor's work one can distiguish exact and precise answers to the iconoclasts' accusations, answers based upon solid scripturesc arguments. He contributes to the development of the learning about the holy icons by explaining some specific words and new terms of the doctrine, necessary at that period of iconoclatic attacks.[66]

The contribution of St. Theodor the Studit to the development of the teological culture during the 9 th century was remarkable. His whole work imposed him as the greater defender of orthodoxism and monachal life. He also encouraged the „mistagogical" teology in which he explained the role of the holy sacraments.[67]

---

[60] Rev. G. Georgescu, *op. cit*., p. 102.
[61] Prof. T. M. Popescu, Rev. T. Bodogae and Prof. G. Gh. Stănescu, *op. cit*., 2nd Edit., p. 383.
[62] Lucian D. Colda, *art. cit*., in „T.R.", nr. 25-28 / 2001, p. 6, col. 4.
[63] J. M. Hussey, *op. cit*., p. 89.
[64] Toma G. Bulat, *op. cit*., p. 13.
[65] *Ibid*., p. 12-14.
[66] Drd. M. Spătărelu, *art. cit*., p. 75.
[67] Rev. Prof. Dr. M. Şesan, *About post-patristic Theology* in „M.A.", no. 4-6 / 1966, p. 283.

The excellent qualities he possessed helped Fotie to write the golden pages of the teological culture, he succeeded in stoping the Popes' mixture in the inner problems of the Church in Constantinople and fight against all their pretentions upon the universal jurisdiction.[68] He also fights against the latin inovations based upon his knowledge as a philologist but also the scripturistic and patristic ones, leaving invaluable works.

Having a look at the whole activity developped during this century we nan notice the permanent progress of the teological culture, caused in the first part of the century by the fight against iconoclasm and in the second one by the most prominent figure of the byzantine culture of the time – the patriarch Fotie.

[68] Magistrand Dumitru Găină, *Pariarch Fotie's Canonical Activ ity*, in „S.T.", 15th year, no. 5-6 / 1963, p. 45.

BOOK REVIEWS

Rev. Ph.D. Dumitru Megheşan, *Jesus Prayer: Therapeutic Means of Mind Purification*, Oradea, University Press, 2010, 277 p.

Constituting itself as the basis of Orthodox spirituality, or ”her spinal column”, as Nichifor Crainic says, much was written over time about “*Jesus Prayer*” or the method of “*the holy prayer and internalized attention*”. Rev. Ph. D. Dumitru Megheşan from the Faculty of Orthodox Theology in Oradea, treats the same subject from a perspective adapted to the modern man’s life, who is somewhat confused in the life relativism. His life is determined by specific postmodern age anxiety, rooted mainly in economic, financial and commercial, and animated by super-technology at the expense of the spiritual dimension of human life.

His book, entitled *Jesus Prayer: Therapeutic Means of Mind Purification* (Oradea, University Press, 2010, 277 pages), succeeds to enhance the mind, as central place of the spiritual life in the spiritual determination and meant to fulfill the febrile contemporary human searching. The book is divided into eight chapters, as follows:

Chapter I ”*The Problem of the Contemporary World*” (p. 15-71) refers first to the reasons for the Jesus Prayer topic debate. Then there is an analysis of the mind health, as a gift of the divine creation, followed by its illness as psychological trauma, when the man fell into sin.

Chapter II examines “*The Pathology of the Fallen Mind*” (p. 71-101), evidenced by the perversion of knowledge, by the twisted perception of reality, by the reverse rational itinerary of the mind, by the desire derivation and by the pleasure perversion.

Chapter III “*The Psychological Sanogenesis Factors*” (p. 101-146) focuses on the psicho-profylaxis action and its relation to mental prayer and on the primitive human impulses mystagogy.

Chapter IV presents “*A Plea for Mental Prayer*” (p. 146-175) and Chapter V concretly treats “*Jesus Prayer or the Human Mind Adjustment to Christ’s Mind as a State of Kenotic Metanoya*” (p. 175-185); followed by Chapter VI on "*Psycho-physical Therapy by Mental Praye*r" (p. 185-245).

The last chapter is a "*Proposal for Reorientation of Human Life, Stifled by Civilization: the Path to Angels*" (p. 245-261) and in the final part, that is Chapter VIII, is presented the Akathist of St. John the Theologian as "*Return to the Virginity of the Mind*" (p. 261-277), which was written by most reverend Father Daniel from Rarău (Sandu Tudor), mentor of "the Burning Bush" at the Antim Monastery.

This summarized presentation of the main issues discussed offers the possibility to appreciate the diverse and meaningful content of this study as a guide designed to enlighten the reader soul, directing it toward an ever opened horizon of its axiological becoming. It also prompts him to leave the labyrinth of passionate search, in order to receive the light of Christ's life that gives him his own identity, as the writer Leo Tolstoy urged: "... come to your senses for an hour and you will clearly see that the only important thing in life not something external. We just need what is already in us" (*On God and Man – From the Last Years Diary*, Humanitas, Bucharest, 2006, p 188-189). In this context, *Jesus' prayer* is a real spiritual remedy, able to help contemporary man to overcome the secular dissipation, dominated by uncertainty, stress and depressive anxiety, and to bring him the much-needed peace of soul as retrieving of himself in Jesus name grace, opener of joy full of dynamic and creative optimism.

As a result, we highly recommend this volume, with appreciation that the issue discussed is judiciously shaped, thoroughly documented and academically presented, in a sober, smooth and accessible style.

We are also satisfied that the author, after thorough studies in the country and abroad, honors the Department of Dogmatic at the Theology Faculty of Oradea, his first steps in theology being made at the Theological Seminary of Caransebeş, as a part of the class that gave five Romanian academics to the theological education.

Rev. Ph.D. Sorin Cosma

Richard N. Longenecker, *Introducing Romans: Critical Issues in Paul's Most Famous Letter*. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011. pap. XXVII + 490 p. ISBN 978-0-8028-6619-6.

Richard Longenecker, professor emeritus at Wycliffe College, University of Toronto, is one of the leading North American specialists in Pauline literature. His Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, to appear in the New International Greek Testament Commentary series, will crown a long and distinguished career. Because the limitations imposed to this series of commentaries do not allow a detailed treatment of introductory questions, the author makes such a thorough introduction in this book.

Longenecker begins with generally undisputed issues. Today no serious scholar question the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Romans or the fact that it was written by Tertius, as Paul's amanuensis. There is a growing consensus on the integrity of the epistle. Older theories according to which chapter 16 would have belonged to the Epistle to the Ephesians are widely rejected, and the existence of a short form of the text ending at 14, 23 is best explained, as Origen once showed, through the intervention of Marcion on the text.

The circumstances and date of the epistle are quite clear matters. Paul writes from Corinth (or from the neighboring port, Cenchrea) being about to return to Jerusalem at the end of his third missionary journey and then hoping to visit Rome to be supported in the journey he intended to do to Spain. The probable date of writing is the end of A.D. 57.

Longenecker then proceeds to what he calls the "two pivotal issues": the recipients and purpose of the epistle. In each case, he presents the specialists' debates and the major options. Though being in agreement with those who see a Gentile Christian majority in the Roman Church, he does not give much importance to Claudius' edict of expulsion of the Jews, in 49, doubting that all the Jewish Christians left Rome. He also deviates from the traditional line by identifying the source of tensions in the Roman Church not in the ethnic differences between Jews and Gentiles but in the theological differences between a law-centered and a law-free lifestyle. He doesn't consider the Judaizing party to be a problem here, as in Galatia, but a Christian way of life tinged with Jewish, characteristic of the first converts of the city, who were Jews and were probably present in Jerusalem in the of Pentecost in A.D. 30.

The two main purposes of the letter are those that emerge most clearly from the words of the Apostle in the Epistle: to impart a spiritual gift to the Christians in Rome and seek their support for his mission in Spain. The former is reflected in the letter itself. Paul's detailed understanding of the gospel is the best gift he can give this church that he did not personally found. There are other secondary purposes of the epistle, which include: the defense of Paul and his Gospel against misinterpretation, mediation of the dispute between "the strong" and "the weak" and the urge to pay taxes to the state, especially in the context of the rebellion of some citizens following the abuses of local officials.

Longenecker and then proceeds to a very detailed and useful analysis of the possible influence of Greco-Roman rhetoric on the Epistle to the Romans and Paul's use of more Jewish forms of writing, including his handling of the Old Testament. He finds numerous examples of oral patterns related to those rhetors used in their speeches, while taking account of the differences between oral rhetoric and written letters. Longenecker notes that the book of Romans does not fit neatly into any forensic, deliberative or epideictic rhetoric. So he abstains from identifying in the epistle's structure rhetoric categories such as *exordium*, *narratio*, *probatio*, *exhortatio*, etc., limiting himself to classifying its content as exhortational or protreptic speech.

Regarding Paul's use of the Old Testament, it is noted that it is barely present in chapters 5-8, as compared to the rest of the theological body of the epistle. This observation is the starting point of the last major section devoted to the structure of the epistle, in which the author argues that the letter has four major parts: 1, 16-4, 25; 5, 1-8, 39; 9, 1-11, 36 and 12 , 1-15, 13, with chapters 5-8 being the most important section, written mainly for those in the Church who overemphasized a law-free gospel. Here St. Paul is based less on Hebrew Scriptures, knowing them to be insufficiently appreciated, particularly among the Gentile Christians in this group.

At the same time, Longenecker touches other less directly related subjects: general problems of textual criticism and important theological issues. The latter category includes "righteousness of God" which is both attributive and communicative, "'justification by faith" which is to be understood in the Reform manner, partially mystical interpretation of the "in Christ" formula, understanding the phrase *pistis tou Iesou / Christou* as subjective genitive and an approach to the "new perspective" which is appreciated more for its first century Palestinian Judaism interpretation than Pauline theology understanding.

At the end of each chapter a very substantial bibliographical list is placed. It is clear that Longenecker has consulted a vast secondary literature, which he exploits judiciously. However, it is difficult to understand how the works of an author of prime importance, such as N.T. Wright, are barely mentioned, especially in the section on "new perspective".

There are many repetitions of ideas from one chapter to another, sometimes going down to literal takeovers of whole sentences or parts of paragraphs. Probably Longenecker foresaw that readers will consult only certain chapters of his book, but it is nevertheless surprising to find of such textual repetitions instead of cross-references to a previous treatment of a subject. Another oddity is the abundance of general information from the field of textual criticism (without direct application to the Romans), which is unnecessary for such an introduction.

Longenecker himself admits that many of his statements require a more serious substantiation, which will come along with his forthcoming commentary. So we look forward to this work which will mean of course a landmark in the study of the Epistle to the Romans.

Rev. Ph.D. Adrian Murg

David G. Bissias, *The Mystery of Healing – Oil, Anointing, and the Unity of the Local Church,* Orthodox Research Institute, Rollinsford, New Hampshire, 2008.

The year 2012, dedicated by the Holy Synod of our Church to the Mystery of Holy Unction and care for the patients, is a happy occasion to present to the readers of Romania, Father David G. Bissias' work, *The Mystery of Healing - Oil, Anointing, and the Unity of the Local Church*, Orthodox Research Institute and published by Rollinsford, New Hampshire, in 2008.

Father David G. Bissias is the Parish Priest of the Saint Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church of Hammond, IN, and Special Administrative Assistant to Metropolitan Iakovos of Cicago.

Fr. Bissias' work begins with a Foreword signed by the Metropolitan Iakovos and an Introduction. It is structured in 7 chapters and an Appendix followed by the presentation of the Bibliography used in preparing the work, an index of names and theological themes and a few words about the author.

Chapter I of the paper called *Liturgy and Healing*, has several subsections: The Problem (p. 1-4), The Worship in Spirit and Truth (p. 4-7), Reducing the Mystery (p. 7-20) and The Subject of the Mystery (p. 20-25).

In Chapter II, the author refers, in several subchapters, to the Holy Oil used in the Sacrament of Holy Unction, considering The Significance of Oil (p. 25-30); a very large subchapter refers to the Rituals of Anointing in the Church (p. 30-85); notions about Liturgical Piety and Oil (p. 85-96) and finally, a chapter of Conclusions.

The third Chapter of the book considers the New Testament biblical foundation for Holy Sacrament of Unction, touching on the biblical basis of the Sacrament (p. 99-104), the text of the Epistle of St. James 5, 1-16 and its theological significance (p. 104-113). A very interesting reference, in a chapter of this part of the work, regards God's presence, mediated by the service, in the life of those who do not participate at this Holy

Sacrament (p. 113-124) and of course, some conclusions regarding the issues presented in this chapter.

Chapter IV, entitled Holy Unction: Past and Present, refers to the liturgical development of the service (p. 127-157); the chapter Praying by Numbers refers to the symbolism of the number 7 found within the service - 7 apostles, 7 Holy Gospels, 7 prayers, 7 litanies, 7 moments of anointing - (p 157-165). There are also mentions about the invocation of God's name in this Holy Sacrament and its theological-spiritual significance and it is pointed out that the enunciation of ones name, invokes his presence, in the chapter What Is in a Name? (p. 165-171). Chapter is concluded with some references to the Holy Unction in the Present (p. 171-185).

In Chapter 5 of the paper it is largely developed the issue of the celebration of the Holy Unction in the Holy Week for the whole parish. At the beginning of the chapter there are presented the practical realities of the Church and the habits of committing the Sacraments especially on Holy Wednesday and Holy Thursday (pp. 185-187), explaining theologically and spiritually, why it is justified that the Holy Unction should be celebrated on these days of the Great Week (p. 209-223). The chapter ends with some references about the Popular Perception and Problems (p. 223-237).

Chapter VI of this study relates to the precedents and analogies related to this Mystery. At first there is a brief introduction (p. 267-271) followed by the presentation of the precedents in a subchapter entitled: Precedent: Evaluating History in the Present (p. 238-248). At the end of the chapter there are presented the analogies (p. 248-264) and the conclusions.

Chapter VII, and the last of the paper, is entitled Mystery and Unity; the introduction is a short summary of this issue (p. 267-271). Then, the author refers to the issue of the Local Church and liturgical Conformity (p. 271-282) and the Expanding our Vision (p. 282-295).

At the end is presented an Appendix, with the following entitling: Two Bi-lingual Texts of Holy Unction (p. 295). The first subchapter of the Appendix refers to the History of Two Bi-lingual (Greek-English) Texts, followed by the presentation of the Greek Texts of Papadeas Contos / Kezios. Last part of this Appendix critically analyzes the text of the Holy Unction in Bi-lingual Translation (p. 306 - 317).

The Bibliography brings together a number of impressive works, some of them from Greek Orthodox literature and another part from Orthodox literature from Diaspora.

The thematic index is very rich in contents and includes names, theological notions and concepts related to the Holy Sacrament of Unction, in alphabetical exposure.

The work of Fr. Bissias, a very interesting and useful for the theological study dedicated to the Sacrament of Holy Unction, should be continued or enlarged with a mystical-symbolic explanation of the sacrament ordinance, in order to create a comprehensive monograph.

Rev. Ph.D. Lucian Farcaşiu

Rev. Prof. Ph.D. Ioan Tulcan, *Ilarion V. Felea's Contribution to the Development of Orthodox Dogmatic Theology,* "Aurel Vlaicu" University Press, Arad, 2010, 283 p.

A book dedicated to the great personality of the Romanian Orthodox theology is a cultural approach that can be extremely useful and beneficial, in a century of ideological mystification and relativisation of the fundamental values that constitute the European culture and spirituality foundation. Rev. Prof. Ph.D. John Tulcan, Dean of the Faculty of Theology in Arad, goes on the publications about the last rector of the Theological Academy Arad, Prof. Dr. Ilarion V. Felea (1903-1961), who taught here Apologetics, Dogmatics and Mystic (1938-1948). In this book published by "Aurel Vlaicu" University Press in Arad, 2010, he tries to present Fr Ilarion V. Felea contribution to the development of Orthodox Dogmatic Theology.

The author's motivation is professed in the Preface: "I felt as a duty of conscience and personal responsibility for bending with humility and admiration over the personality of the theologian from Arad, and his theological work, which has beneficial, bright and fruitful consequences in the Romanian theology, but in the pastoral-missionary, liturgical and homiletical work of the Church, which he illustrated in a masterly way" (p. 5).

The author wishes this work to be an appropriate moment to capture how the Romanian Orthodox theology developed in the last century and how a representative theologian of that time answered the demands of academic theology, and pastoral mission of the Church, crowned with martyrdom. It also wants to be a tribute to the reverend Professor and to highlight the beauty and valences of the Orthodox theology.

The work is divided into fourteen chapters, the author exposing Father Felea's theological thought, captured in a systematic way according to major themes of theology. Thus, in the introduction, Father John Tulcan revealed the stage of theology to Father Felea, showing his starting point that is the question: "What is Christianity?". Thereby he responded to this by the books he wrote, such as*: The Spirit of Truth*, *Love Religion*, *Culture Religion*, *The Religion of Cleansing and Perfection.* He sees the specifics, wealth and continuity of Jesus Christ's teachings, through an overall vision of theology presented in an apologetic and lively spirit." He manages to present the dogmatic, apologetic and spiritual truths make to the believers with an extraordinary ability to penetrate into their consciousness through the sermon, the speeches, his liturgical service and his way of being" (p. 9-11).

In Chapter II the author presents "The Importance of Revelation for Dogmatic Theology" (p. 13-22), its knowledge, need and opportunity as well as the stages and the revelation development and its fruitfulness in the Church, as they appear reflected in Father Felea thinking.

Chapter III "The Ways of Revelation Transmission or its Sources- the Holy Scripture and the Holy Tradition" (p. 23-36) outlines Father Ilarion vision that "the word of Scripture is of exceptional importance, because Scripture comes to correct any deformation, sin and forgetfulness of God in human life". The Scripture testimony concerning the existence and importance of Holy Tradition are passionately and coherently presented by the theologian from Arad, making interesting theological connections. For him, tradition is not a treasure or plain, abstract or lifeless document, but it is closely related to the presence and work of the Holy Spirit, Who gives life and makes saving the teaching and life of Jesus Christ (p. 29). According to His Holiness, dogmas have a profound regenerative force, transforming people's hearts in true temples of the Holy Spirit.

In Chapter IV "The Existence and Knowledge of God. The Ways to Know Him" (p. 37-46), Father John Tulcan shows that the theologian Ilarion V. Felea confesses God as one who lives in His absolute transcendence, but is also very close to people. Him we can know through reason and creation and supernatural way, by faith and mystical experience. Faith has a gnoseologic function and without faith we can not approach God as true feeling occurs through the power of love. For him, knowing God means union with Him and "seeing" Him.

Chapter V deals with the "Holy Trinity - the Fundamental Dogma of the Church" (p. 47-52), managing to provide hints, prefigurations and discoveries of the Holy Trinity outside the New Testament, and then full revelation of the Trinity in the New Testament. Father Felea says that "in the Church and in the faithfull's life the Holy Trinity has a central and essential place. The first and most profound teaching of the Christian Church is teaching about God" (p. 47).

Chapter VI presents "The Christian teaching about the Creation of the World in General and of the Seen One, in Particular" (p. 53-58), that is how the world was created out of nothing and the order of creatures' appearance, and the reason and purpose of creation. Rev. Prof. Felea thinks the ultimate goal of creation is to be transformed by the power of God sanctifying grace.

Chapter VII deals with "Creating the Unseen World" (p. 59-64), the being and service of the angels, the angelic hierarchy, the appearance of evil angels and their work as well as the origin of evil in the world.

In Chapter VIII the author considers the anthropological issue (p. 65-98), covering the following aspects: the origin and nature of man, image and likeness of God, man's value, the human soul and its existence, the spirituality, freedom and immortality of the soul, the primordial state of the first people, their fall into sin and its consequences. The theologian from Arad supports arguments concerning the existence of the soul on the following considerations: self-awareness, self permanence, the struggle between spirit and matter, the existence of mysteries, the work and death.

The ninth chapter speaks about "The Person of the Saviour" (p. 99-112), showing the messianic prophecies about Christ coming. The Incarnation of the Son of God is seen by Father Ilarion Felea as the horizon wearing the mystery of creation and God's care for His creation.

Chapter X presents "Jesus Christ's Saving Work. His Three Ministries, Calling or Dignities" (p. 113-128). The author refers to Jesus Christ, first as teacher, then as a priest for ever and then as King.

"The Main Acts of the Redemptive Work of God" (p. 129-138), Passion, Crucifixion and His death, resurrection and His ascension are captured in the eleventh chapter of the book.

Ecclesiology is shown in Chapter XII (p. 139-158) of the book, with reference to the following aspects: establishment of the Church, names given to the Church, its mission and purpose, Christ - Head of the Church, the Church - His Body, the Church and Heavenly kingdom, attributes of the Church.

The chapter XIII refers to the personal salvation in the Church (p. 159-182). This deals with the grace and its necessity for salvation, the faith as human response to God's call to salvation. Finally it is shown the importance of good deeds in the work of salvation.

The Sacraments of the Church are presented individually in the Chapter XIV (p. 183-226), from the Sacrament of Baptism, the Sacrament of Chrismation, the Confession Sacrament (or the Penance), Mystery of the Eucharist (or the Communion), the Sacrament of Marriage, the Sacrament of Ordination) and the Holy Unction.

Chapter XV deals with the problem of "Eschatology" (p. 227-258), with the following references: Christian teaching about death, contact with the dead, veneration of saints and of the Virgin Mary, the resurrection of the dead, Parousia (Second Coming) of the Lord - universal Judgment and eternal life.

The last Chapter - XVI it is reserved for conclusions. Rev. Prof. John Tulcan theologian considers martyr Ilarion V. Felea's contribution to the development of Orthodox Dogmatic Theology of exceptional importance from several points of view: his entire theology is deeply founded and inspired by divine revelation lights, his theology is founded on the writings of the Fathers and of the Church theologians; he created a wide, reasoned and clear work. In conclusion, observing Father Prof. Ilarion V. Felea's method of work, modern theology has to get down from the schools walls and be transformed into the spiritual nourishment for the faithful. Also, Father John Tulcan stresses that Father Felea's theological creation is renovating in some of its aspects.

In its conclusion the book has two appendices: a CV of Father Ilarion V. Felea (p. 269-270) and three sharp evocations of some contemporaries to Rev. Felea (p. 271-279).

Rev. Prof. John Tulcan has merit to present the difficult period when the Romanian Dogmatic theology developed, with its directions common to Orthodox theology, but also the specific features of Professor Ilarion V. Felea Rev., who is presented as one of the greatest theologians of the first half of last century.

His theological writing is characterized by clarity, solid documentary and precision of ideas. The author proves scientific accuracy, by employing over 300 subsidiary notes in the 283 pages (often with references to the Orthodox theologians and their theology, as well as different explanations), using as references the 28 springs, 17 works of Rev. Prof. V. Felea Ilarion and 45 books and theological studies.

The work of Rev. Prof. Ph.D. Ioan Tulcan, *Ilarion V. Felea's Contribution to the Development of Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* has the exquisite merit to awaken the reader to the theological, cultural, social and even existential values, incarnated in the life of the personality he presented in his study, who becomes a model for generations of today and tomorrow.

Rev. Ciprian Sălăvăstru

Writing requirements for the studies included in the “Teologia” review

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The description of the theoretical framework of the theme
- accuracy in description and presentation;
- present interest and relevance of the bibliography used in connection with the theme;
- relevance of the information regarding the theme;

The aim of the study
- accuracy of expression;
- originality;
- relevance of the aim for the analysis and the innovation of the suggested theme;

The objectives of the study
- accuracy of expression;
- relevance and operational degree according to the stated aim;
- relevance regarding the stated theme;

The advanced hypothesis and the considered variables
- accuracy of expression;
- relevance of hypothesis according to the stated theme, aim and objectives;
- correlation between hypothesis and variables;

The description of the research methodology
- accuracy of building up research techniques;
- accuracy in applying the research techniques;
- relevance of the used methodology according to the theme, aim and
- objectives;

The presentation of the resultus of the investigation
- relevance of the results according to the theme, aim and objectives;

- quality of the results and their presentation according to the stated aim;
- quantity of results;

Interpretation of the results obtained

- relevance of interpretation according to the hypothesis, aim and objectives ;
- relation of the interpretation with the theoretical framework of the theme;
- accuracy, originality and extent of interpretation;

Suggestions

- innovative degree of suggestions;
- capacity of the suggestions to solve the identified problems;
- transferable value of the launched suggestions;

Remarks:

- the author is obliged to specify the domain of the scientific research of the study;
- the consultant and the editorial stuff reserve the right of publishing the article according to the epistemic or/and the editing requirements;
- each article will be analyzed according to the requirements of the domain it belongs to, the above requirements being the reference framework;
- the editorial stuff guarantees the author the feedback right, during the first week after receiving the article;
- the editorial stuff will, confidentially, send and comment both the positive and the negative feedbacks;
- the consultant and the editorial stuff will accept for publication the rejected articles, in an improved form.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Contributions should be written in English, German, French or Italian. The article should not be longer than 12.000 words, including footnotes.

Articles should be accompanied by an abstract (max. 150 words), preferably in English. The abstract should present the main point and arguments of the article.

The academic affiliation of the author and his e-mail address must write at the first note of the article.

GENERAL STRUCTURE OF A FULL ARTICLE

- Title
- Abstract
- Keywords
- Main text:
  - Introduction
  - Methods
  - Results
- Conclusion

MAIN TEXT

Authors are kindly asked to submit the final form of their article, carefully edited according to the instructions below, proofed for language, spelling and grammar. Articles with spelling and grammatical errors cannot be accepted.

Please use Normal Style, with Times New Roman, 12 point font, single line spacing, justified, first line indented at 0.8 cm. (0.32 in.). For headings use Heading 2 Style.

For Hebrew and Greek quotations please use Bible Works fonts (BWhebb, BWgrkl), Hebraica, Graeca, or Scholars Press fonts (the latter can be downloaded from the Biblica site)

FOOTNOTES

Footnotes are numbered continuously, starting with 1.

Footnote numbers in the text should be inserted automatically (Insert footnote), placed in superscript after the punctuation mark. Do not use endnotes or other methods of inserting notes. For Footnotes use Footnote Text Style with Times New Roman, 10, single, justified, hanging indent at 0.5 cm. (0.2 in.).

QUOTATIONS WITHIN THE BODY OF THE ARTICLE:

Please avoid unnecessarily long quotations, unless they are very important for your point. Quotations shorter than four lines should be included in the text, between quotation marks, followed by the footnote indicating the source.

Please use quotation marks according to the rules of the language in which you write: “English”, „German”, and «French» or «Italian».

Quotations longer than four lines should be written as a different paragraph, without quotation marks, indented 0.5 cm (0.2 in.) left and right.

REFERENCES

References to books and articles have to be placed in the footnotes. Do not add a bibliography.

The last name of the author(s) should be written in SmallCaps, the title of the book, article, periodical, volume in italic.

Books:

DUMITRU STĂNILOAE, Spiritualitate şi comuniune în Liturghia ortodoxă, EIBMBOR, Bucureşti, 20042, 109.

KIRSOOP LAKE, The Apostolic Fathers, vol. I, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1959, 233.

D. F. Tolmie, Jesus’ Farewell to the Disciples. John 13,1-17,26, in Narratological Perspective (Biblical Interpretation Series 12), Brill, Leiden, 1995, 28-29.

Articles from periodicals and collective volumes:

DUMITRU STĂNILOAE, La centralité du Christ dans la théologie, dans la spiritualité et dans la mission de l’Eglise, in „Contacts”,vol XXVII, no. 92, 1975, 447.

DUMITRU POPESCU, Ştiinţa în contextul teologiei apusene şi al celei răsăritene, în vol. „Ştiinţă şi Teologie. Preliminarii pentru dialog", coord. Pr. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Popescu, Editura Eonul dogmatic, Bucureşti, 2001, 11.

DAVID E. AUNE, Magic in Early Christianity, in „Aufstieg Und Niedergang Der Römischen Welt", Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1980, 1510.

Patristic works:

IOAN GURĂ DE AUR, Omili la Facere, II, 4 în „Scrieri", partea I-a, col. „Părinţi şi Scriitori Bisericeşti", vol. 21, trad. Pr. D. Fecioru, EIBMBOR, Bucureşti, 1987, 43.

Ambrosius, Expositio evangelii sec. Lucam II, 87, PL 14, 1584D-1585A.

Once the full information on a book or article has been given, the last name of the author should be used. If you refer to several works of the same author, mention the short title after the first name (for example, Wolff, Hosea, 138), without any reference to the first note where the full title was given. Please avoid general references to works previously cited, such as op. cit., art. cit.. Also avoid f. or ff. for "following" pages; indicate the proper page numbers.

Special Notification

The Authors are expected to send the studies that meet the specified requirements 1.0 lines paging. The Authors assume the responsibility of the contents of the articles. The unpublished are not returned

AUTHORS LIST

Basa, Gabriel, Rev. Ph.D, Theology Faculty of „Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, Romania

Cosma, Sorin, Rev. Ph.D, Letters, History and Theology Faculty of West University of Timişoara, Romania

Farcaşiu, Lucian, Rev. Ph.D, Theology Faculty of „Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, Romania

Ioja, Cristinel, Ph.D, Theology Faculty of „Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, Romania

Kinnamon, Michael, Rev. Ph.D., School of Theology and Ministry, Seattle University, United States of America

Mazis, Giannis, Ph.D, Theology Faculty of University of Athens, Greece

Murg, Adrian, Rev. Ph.D, Theology Faculty of „Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, Romania

Ritter, Adolf Martin, Rev. Ph.D, Theology Faculty of Heidelberg University, Germany

Rus, Constantin, Rev. Ph.D, Theology Faculty of „Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, Romania

Roşu, Adina, Ph.D, Theology Faculty of University of Oradea, Romania

Sălăvăstru, Ciprian, Ph.D, at Theology Faculty of „Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, Romania

Welker, Michael, Rev. Ph.D., Theology Faculty of Heidelberg University, Germany