

TEOLOGIA

anul XV, nr. 2, 2011

The review publishes studies, translations from Holy 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 responsibility 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 The unpublished studies are not returned.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 well 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 XV,  
NR. 2, 2011

Editura Universității „Aurel Vlaicu”  
ARAD

## **EDITORIAL STAFF**

### **PUBLISHER**

The Orthodox Theology Faculty from “Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad

### **PRESIDENT OF HONOR:**

M.R. Ph D. TIMOTEI SEVICIU, Archbishop of Arad

### **CHAIRMAN OF EDITORIAL BOARD:**

Rev. Ph.D. IOAN TULCAN, „Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad  
*tulcan\_ioan@yahoo.com*

### **EDITOR IN CHIEF:**

PhD. CRISTINEL IOJA, „Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad  
*cristi.ioja@yahoo.com*

### **ADVISORY BOARD:**

Rev. Ph.D. ȘTEFAN BUCHIU, University from Bucharest (*prstefanbuchiu@yahoo.com*); Rev. Ph.D. CONSTANTIN RUS, „Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad (*constantin.rus@uav.ro*); Rev. Ph.D. ERNST CHR. SUTTNER, University from Wien (*ernst.suttner@univie.ac.at*); Ph.D. IRINI CHRISTINAKIS-GLAROS, University from Athens (*irenechristinaki@yahoo.com*); Ph.D. DIMITRIOS TSELENGIDIS, University from Thessaloniki (*tseleng@theo.auth.gr*); Ph.D. ARISTOTLE PAPANIKOLAOU, Lincoln Theology Center of Fordham University (U.S.A.) (*papanikolaou@fordham.edu*); Rev. Ph.D. FADI GEORGI, University from Balamand (*fadi.georgi@balamand.edu.lb*); Ph.D. PYOTR MIHAILOV, St. Tihon’s Humanitarian University of Moscow (*locuspetri@rambler.ru*); Ph.D. MICHEL STAVROU, “Saint Serge” Institute from Paris (*stavrou@orange.fr*); Ph.D. ANDREAS HEISER, Humboldt University from Berlin (*heisers@freenet.de*); Rev. Ph.D. DANIEL BUDA, “Lucian Blaga” Univeristy from Sibiu (*daniel77bde@yahoo.de*)

### **EDITORIAL BOARD:**

Rev. Ph.D. CAIUS CUȚARU, „Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad (*c.caius@yahoo.com*); Rev. Ph.D. ADRIAN MURG, „Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad (*adrian.murg@yahoo.com*); Rev. Ph.D. FILIP ALBU, „Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad (*filipalbu@yahoo.co.uk*); Rev. Ph.D. LUCIAN FARCAȘIU, „Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad (*lucian.farcasiu@yahoo.com*); Rev. Ph.D. ȘTEFAN NEGREANU, „Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad (*negreanus@yahoo.com*)

### **Text collection, correction, English translation summaries:**

Prof. ANCA POPESCU, GEORGIANA COSTESCU

### **Desktop Publishing:**

CĂLIN CHENDEA

### **“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](mailto:stampasrl@yahoo.com)

TEOLOGIA review is a quarterly scientific publication, recognized by CNCSIS Institution in C category (cod 545)  
TEOLOGIA review is indexed in the database Index Copernicus (cod 6666)

e-mail: [revista\\_teatologia@yahoo.com](mailto:revista_teatologia@yahoo.com)

website: [www.revistateologia.ro](http://www.revistateologia.ro)

ISSN 2247-4382  
ISSN-L 1453-4789

# CONTENTS

## EDITORIAL

<b>About “the Nature and Mission of the Church” in the Concerns of the Orthodox Theologians .....</b>	<b>7</b>
---	----------

## STUDIES AND ARTICLES

Jürgen Moltmann <b>Ökumene, orthodoxie und ökotheologie in Europa .....</b>	<b>9</b>
--	----------

Eva Maria Synek <b>„Frauen sind [...] als ausgeschlossen zu betrachten“: laienrechte für frauen? Kanonistische streiflichter vom ausgehenden 19. Jahrhundert .....</b>	<b>20</b>
---	-----------

Michael Welker <b>Theology and Science: Theological Impulses for the Dialogue .....</b>	<b>29</b>
--	-----------

Ioan Tulcan <b>The Dogma of the Holy Trinity and its Missionary Implications .....</b>	<b>43</b>
---	-----------

Svetoslav Ribolov <b>Understanding of Divine Inspiration (Insights from the Modern Orthodox Theological Thought) .....</b>	<b>52</b>
---	-----------

Lucian Pietroaia <b>A Jubilee of Romanian Culture and Spirituality: 440 Years Since Printing Coresi’s Liturgical Book - Liturgikon Braşov, 1570 .....</b>	<b>66</b>
--	-----------

**BOOK REVIEWS**

**Bart D. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why*, San Francisco:HarperSanFrancisco, 2005, 242 p, ISBN 0-06-073817-0 (Rev. Adrian Murg)..... 86**

**Reverend Adrian Murg Ph.D., *Soteriology of the Lucan Writings (Doctoral Thesis)*, “Aurel Vlaicu” University Press, Arad, 2011 (Lucian-Victor Baba) ..... 93**

**WRITING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE STUDIES INCLUDED IN THE “TEOLOGIA” REVIEW ..... 95**

**AUTHORS LIST..... 100**

# About “the Nature and Mission of the Church” in the Concerns of the Orthodox Theologians

Ecclesiology, that is the teachings about the Church, was a constant concern of the last century theologians. That is why the previous century was called “*the century of the Church*”. Echoes of these concerns connected with the Church are still to be felt in the inherited themes and the challenges in order to be deepened, emphasized and reconsidered by those eager to know more about the different aspects of the reality of the Church.

There are several reasons which contributed to the continuation of the concerns connected with what means Church for the salvation of the people and of the world.

Let’s not forget the fact that the Church means the testimony of the community life of the Holy Trinity inside the humanity as God’s will is the one uttered by Jesus Christ before His Passions:” They may be one; as you, Father, are in me, and I in You, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that You has sent me” (John 17, 21). The Church established by Jesus Christ represents the vehicle which gathers inside the unity of the Holy Trinity all those who believe or will believe in Him, inspiring all regarding the consciousness of belonging to the Body of the Church and receiving Christ’s gifts inside the same communion.

The life and love communion of the Holy Trinity is reveled and shared with the people through the incarnated word of God, Who became man for the salvation of all the people, that through Him all should be included in Father’s unifying love, love reveled by the Son. The starting point of the partaking of Jesus’ gifts is The Pentecost, when, through the Holy Spirit, Jesus’ life is partaken, as a holy, reviving and salvation life.

The reality or the form taken by the workings of the son of God , incarnated, dead, resurrected and raised to the heavens to Father’s right

*About “the Nature and Mission of the Church”...*

side, is the Church as Jesus’ Body in the Holy Spirit. This is the starting point for the mission of the Church, too, namely, to transmit over the centuries the love and communion life of the Holy Trinity, to reconcile people with God and with one another, to be a witness of God’s grace for a divided, embittered and spiritually impoverished humanity.

The Orthodox theologians referred to these aspects of the Church, especially the ones present at Aya Napa – Cyprus, during a inter-Orthodox meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> -9<sup>th</sup> March 2011 (see *Service Orthodoxe de Presse*, nr. 357, April 2011, p. 4-5). The occasion of the meeting was to analyze a document of the Ecumenical Council of the Churches referring to the nature and mission of the Church. The document was drafted by the Faith and Constitution Committee of this ecumenical forum in 2005 with the intention to express the common position regarding the Church, regarding its nature and mission, and they also identified the ecclesiological problems which keep dividing the Church nowadays. The Orthodox theologians, present in Cyprus, debated different aspects of the Orthodox teachings regarding the Church, referring to the document of the Ecumenical Council of the Churches, too, drafting their own document including the themes of the ecumenical document, offering , at the same time, the perspective of the overcoming of the present state of division of the Christians, in opposition to Jesus’ command “that all may be one” (acc. to John 17, 21) as He and His Father are one in communion with the Holy Spirit. Today, the Christians are not allowed to neglect their unity and the unity as a whole, they have to re-considerate the present state of division they live in, and to find the ways that lead to the full communion with the Church, on the basis of Christian faith and common confession, of common partaking with Jesus’ gifts in the Holy mysteries and, especially, in the Holy Eucharist. The life of the Churches and the two thousand years history of the Church contain enough impulses towards this kind of Christian behaviour.

That’s why, the working of the Christians and of the Church never dies; on the contrary, it is always alive and dynamical, always having the right answer for each question, each need, each expectation of a humanity thirsty of life, light, truth, reconciliation and unity.

**Rev. Ph. D Ioan TULCAN**

# STUDIES AND ARTICLES

**Jürgen Moltmann<sup>1</sup>**

## **Ökumene, orthodoxie und ökotheologie in Europa**

### **Zusammenfassung**

*Die orthodoxe Theologie liebt über die Schönheit Gottes zu sprechen, indem sie eine Widerspiegelung dieser Schönheit in der Welt und in der Kirche zu spüren ist. Für die evangelische Theologie befindet sich die Selbstoffenbarung Gottes, in Tod und Auferwehung Jesus Christ, im Zentrum des Evangeliums, die durch die Kirche verkündigt wird. Wichtig ist festzuhalten, dass den Schatz des apostolischen Glaubens sowohl im Westen, als auch im Osten, entdeckt werden kann. Jesus Christus stellt gleichsam einer tiefgreifenden Bindung zwischen Erde und Himmel indem er „der Erste und der Letzte, das Alpha und das Omega“ ist.*

### **Stichwörter**

*Schönheit Gottes, Evangelische Theologie, Gottesgerechtigkeit, apostolischer Glaube, orthodoxe Völker, orthodoxe Tradition, Christus Pantokrator*

Dieses Internationale Symposium in Bamberg erfüllt mich mit großer Freude. Eine solche Begegnung von Ost und West, von Abendland und Morgenland im neuen Europa hatte ich mir immer gewünscht. Ich danke meinem früheren Schüler und jetzigen Kollegen Dr. Daniel Munteanu für die Idee und die Organisation und Professor Heinrich Bedford-Strohm für diesen geschichtsträchtigen Ort Bamberg. Ich bin dankbar für die starke Präsenz orthodoxer Theologen aus Griechenland, Rumänien, Bulgarien, der Ukraine und Russland. Die orthodoxe Christenheit gehört zu Europa und Europa gehört zur weltweiten ökumenischen Christenheit. Europa wäre arm dran, wenn es nur das Lateinische Abendland wäre.

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD., Tübingen University, Germany.

Ich beschränke mich in diesen einleitenden Bemerkungen auf 1. Die orthodoxe Theologie und die Schönheit Gottes, 2. auf die evangelische Theologie und die Gottesgerechtigkeit, 3. auf die ökumenische Gemeinschaft im apostolischen Glauben, 4. auf Europa und die orthodoxe Tradition, 5. die Ökotheologie des Christus Pantokrator.

## 1. Die orthodoxe Theologie und die Schönheit Gottes

Die Nestorchronik berichtet über die Taufe Russlands in den Jahren 986 - 988: Fürst Wladimir schickte Gesandtschaften aus, um den Glauben anderer Völker zu erkunden. „Sie fahren zuerst zu den islamischen Bulgaren an die Wolga, dann zu den Deutschen in Westeuropa und von dort zu den Griechen nach Konstantinopel. Nach Kiew zurückgekehrt berichten sie von ihren Erfahrungen: Bei den Mohammedanern fühlen sie sich abgestoßen: Es ist keine Freude bei ihnen, sondern Trauer: Sie verbieten das Weintrinken! Bei den Deutschen ist es nicht viel besser: Wir sahen viele Gottesdienste in den Kirchen, doch keine Schönheiten haben wir gesehen. Aber über die Gottesdienste der Griechen sagen sie: Wir wissen nicht, ob wir im Himmel waren oder auf der Erde. Denn einen solchen Anblick und eine solche Schönheit gibt es nicht auf Erden. Dort weilt Gott bei den Menschen, und ihr Gottesdienst ist besser als der aller anderen Länder, denn wir können diese Schönheit nicht vergessen". Daraufhin, so berichtet die Chronik, nahm Wladimir das Christentum in seiner byzantinischen Form an und schickte nach Konstantinopel, um die Prinzessin Anna zu heiraten (Ludolf Müller, Die Taufe Russlands, München 1987, 98). Wo das Schöne erscheint, da sind auch das Wahre und das Gute präsent, lehrt uns die altgriechische Philosophie. Schönheit ist der sinnliche Ausdruck der Wahrheit. Ich denke, dass darum im Zentrum der orthodoxen Theologie die Orientierung an der Liturgie und in der Liturgie an der Doxologie steht. Die Liturgie ist Echo und Resonanz auf die übernatürliche Offenbarung Gottes des Vaters durch Jesus Christus im Heiligen Geist. Orthodoxe Theologie ist eine ausdrücklich kirchliche Theologie. Sie vergegenwärtigt die *Traditio Dei*, d. h. die Selbstmitteilung Gottes, wie sie in den traditiones des Heiligen Schrift und der Kirchenväter überliefert wird. Die Kirche ist „das Organ der Bewahrung und Fruchtbarmachung der Offenbarung Gottes", wie es in der Orthodoxen Dogmatik von Dumitru Staniloae heißt.

### *Ökumene, orthodoxie und ökotheologie in Europa...*

Orientiert sich die christliche Theologie an der göttlichen Liturgie, dann wird man in ihr auch die Spuren dieser Liturgie wiederfinden. Die Orthodoxe Dogmatik ist in ihrem Aufbau und ihren Gedanken auch schön zu nennen, denn sie hat etwas von der Ruhe und der Harmonie geschlossener Systeme an sich. Doch so wie jeder Gottesdienst in der irdischen Geschichte ein Abbild des himmlischen Gottesdienstes und eine Antizipation des kommenden Gottesreiches darstellt, so ist auch unser theologisches Wissen nach dem Apostel Paulus „Stückwerk und unser prophetisches Reden ist Stückwerk ... Wir sehen hier durch einen Spiegel ein dunkles Bild, dann aber von Angesicht zu Angesicht: Wenn das Vollkommene kommt, hört das Stückwerk auf (1 Kor 13, 9-13). Diese eschatologische Ausrichtung von Liturgie und Theologie macht es, dass wir darum zu Tradition und Schrift zurückkehren, um der verheißenen Zukunft Gottes gewiss zu werden. Wir „Bewahren“ die Kraft der Erneuerung und „Erinnern“ die Zukunft Gottes, die in der Auferstehung Christi schon begonnen hat. Unsere Traditionen hüten nicht die Asche vergangener Zeiten, sondern das Feuer der Zukunft. Ich denke, das ist auch der Grund, warum wir sie durch Hermeneutik und Vergegenwärtigung „fruchtbar machen“ müssen. Niemand kann bei christlichen Traditionen stehen bleiben, sie sind wie ein reißender Strom, der uns dem Kommen Gottes entgegen treibt. Wir werden das bei der Entwicklung einer gemeinsamen Ökotheologie sehen, mit der wir die Gefahren der modernen Welt überwinden wollen.

## **2. Die Evangelische Theologie und die Gottesgerechtigkeit**

Evangelische Theologie folgt, wie der Name sagt, dem Lauf des Evangeliums durch die Zeiten und die Räume. Sie formuliert die Selbstoffenbarung Gottes im Tod und Auferweckung Jesu Christi, die das Evangelium verkündigt. Im Zentrum reformatorischer Theologie steht die Christuserkenntnis der Rechtfertigung allein aus Gottes Gnade, allein durch den empfangenden Glauben. Darum ist die Gerechtigkeit für die evangelische Theologie der persönliche und politische Ausdruck der Wahrheit. Aber die im Glauben erfahrene Gottesgerechtigkeit ist erst die Antizipation jener neuen Erde, auf der Gottes Gerechtigkeit „wohnt“ (2 Petr 3, 13). In der öffentlichen Verkündigung des Evangeliums wird seine zukünftige Erscheinung in universaler Herrlichkeit vorweggenommen.

Im Zentrum der evangelischen Theologie steht das Ereignis des Geistes, in dem Wort und Glaube zusammentreffen. Darum bringt evangelische Theologie als „Glaubenslehre“ immer auch die Rezeption des Evangeliums in den Hörern des Wortes zur Sprache. Das ist die evangelische Hermeneutik des Wortes Gottes in drei Dimensionen: im Kairos der Zeit, im Kontext der Gesellschaft und in der *Communio* der Glaubenden.

Die Verkündigung des Evangeliums in Wort und Sakrament ist der Kern des Evangelischen Gottesdienstes. Es ist eine öffentliche Verkündigung durch das *ministerium publice*. Evangelische Theologie ist eine Theologie mit dem Gesicht zur Welt. In ihrer öffentlichen Theologie nimmt die evangelische Christenheit an den *res publica* der Gesellschaft teil und geht auf die persönlichen, ethischen und politischen Probleme der Zeitgenossen ein: Wenn es gelingt, auf prophetische Weise; wenn es nicht gelingt, auf konservative Weise. Wie die Traditionen des Widerstandsrechtes beweisen, widersteht sie totalitären Ideologien und autoritären Diktaturen, dringt auf Gerechtigkeit für die Schwachen und Machtlosen in der politischen Welt und für die Opfer von Unrecht und Gewalt in der ökonomischen Welt.

Im Bereich der Ökumene haben wir dafür den Konziliaren Prozess gefunden: „Für Gerechtigkeit, Frieden und die Bewahrung der Schöpfung“ und neuerdings den Einsatz für „Gerechten Frieden“ auf der Erde und mit der Erde. Öffentliche Theologie fordert eine Zivilgesellschaft und fördert die demokratische Willensbildung des Volkes. Die evangelische Kirche ist nicht oder nicht mehr Staatskirche, sondern versteht sich als Teil der demokratischen Zivilgesellschaft.

### **3. Ökumenische Gemeinschaft im apostolischen Glauben**

Die Ostkirchen und die Westkirchen in Europa scheinen sich seit ihrer Trennung 1054 weit auseinander gelebt zu haben. Es waren nicht nur ihre inneren Entwicklungen, sondern auch ihre verschiedenen politischen Lebensumstände. Als in Westeuropa die kulturellen Umbrüche der Renaissance, der Reformation, der Aufklärung und der demokratischen Revolutionen die Moderne Welt schufen, mussten orthodoxe Länder auf dem Balkan unter otomanischer Herrschaft existieren. Nach dem Fall von Byzanz 1453 wurde Moskau zum „Dritten Rom“ und zum Zentrum der Orthodoxie. Nach der Oktoberrevolution und der Ermordung des Zaren

*Ökumene, orthodoxie und ökotheologie in Europa...*

existierte die russischorthodoxe Kirche 70 Jahre lang unter atheistisch-stalinistischer Herrschaft und war von den Entwicklungen im Westen abgeschnitten. Erst seit 1990 und den gewaltfreien Überwindungen der Diktaturen treten West- und Ostkirche auf unserem Kontinent wieder in ein gemeinsames Zeitalter ein. Wir werden einander gleichzeitig. Aber das kostet viel gegenseitige Anerkennung und Anpassung aneinander. Wir stehen jedoch vor einer neuen, gemeinsamen Aufgabe. In ihre Lösung können wir unsere verschiedenen Traditionen einbringen.

In der Perspektive des Glaubens begegnen wir uns nicht als Fremde und müssen unsere Gemeinschaft auch nicht erst suchen oder neu erfinden. Der Leib Christi ist ungeteilt, denn er ist Christi Leib. Im hohepriesterlichen Gebet Jesu Joh 17, 20-23 sind wir in Ewigkeit „eins“. Wir gehen im Glauben nicht davon aus, dass unsere Einheit nur ein frommer, aber unerfüllter Wunsch Christi ist, sondern dass sein Gebet für uns vom Vater erhört worden ist. Das ist der feste Grund der ökumenischen Gemeinschaft aller Christen. Welche Differenzen wir auch immer entdecken, welche Streitigkeit wir auch immer haben, welche Exkommunikationen auch immer wir aussprechen, in der Fürbitte des Sohnes und ihrer Erhörung durch den Vater bleiben wir „eins“. Wo immer wir uns darum nach langer Trennung begegnen, wächst im Geist zusammen, was schon zusammen gehört.

Unter dieser Voraussetzung entdecken wir dann auch in unserer Geschichte mehr Gemeinsamkeiten als Differenzen. Es gibt einen consensus quinque saecularis. Unsere gemeinsamen politischen Wurzeln liegen in der konstantinischen Wende im 3. Jahrhundert. Unsere gemeinsamen theologischen Wurzeln liegen in Alexandria, Antiochien und Kappadozien. Unser gemeinsames altkirchliches Erbe liegt nicht in Rom, sondern Konstantinopel. Im Jahr 1981 feierten wir 1600 Jahre nach 381 das Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum. In den Klingenthal-Konferenzen 1979 und 1981 haben wir, so weit an uns liegt, das alte filioque-Problem gelöst, so dass wir heute mit einer Stimme und den gleichen Worten unseren Glauben bekennen.

Der rumänisch-orthodoxe Theologe Dumitru Staniloae hat uns sehr geholfen, die Brücke zwischen Ost- und Westkirchen im Verständnis des Heiligen Geistes zu finden. Endlich haben die Lima-Papiere der Kommission „Faith and Order“ 1982 zu einem „gemeinsamen Ausdruck des apostolischen Glaubens“ in Taufe, Eucharistie und Amt geführt. Die

Lima-Liturgie wird in vielen Gemeinden gefeiert. Wie immer auch das Ansehen der Ökumene in der Gunst der Zeitgenossen schwankt, die Ökumenische Bewegung der letzten 60 Jahre ist das wichtigste Ereignis in der Christenheit in der modernen Zeit und eine große Hoffnung für alle Kirchen.

#### **4. Die orthodoxen Völker gehören zu Europa und ohne die orthodoxe Tradition ist Europa unvollständig**

Es wird zur Zeit in Deutschland viel diskutiert, ob der Islam zu Deutschland gehöre, aber viel wichtiger ist es, dass wir Europa in der orthodoxen Welt erkennen, denn die Wurzeln Europas liegen im biblischen Jerusalem, im philosophischen Athen und theopolitisch in Konstantinopel. Ost- und Westkirchen verdanken sich der „konstantinischen Wende“. Es ist dumm, wenn deutsche Politiker nur vom „christlichen Abendland“ sprechen und das christliche Morgenland vergessen. Ich erinnere mich noch gut: Am Anfang der Europadebatten schlug Ralf Rahrendorf vor, Europa nur in den Grenzen der lateinischen Völker zu vereinigen und die orthodoxen Völker draußen zu lassen. Auch Sam Huntington rechnete in „Clash of Civilizations“ das orthodoxe Europa zum Osten, wo er den Islam vermutete. Er schrieb in seiner Unkenntnis: „Europa hört dort auf, wo das westliche Christentum aufhört und Orthodoxie und Islam beginnen“. (Der Kampf der Kulturen, München 1996, 252) Zum Glück haben wir heute die orthodoxen Länder Griechenland, Rumänien und Bulgarien in Europa und warten auf Serbien. Damit sind die Grenzen der Europäischen Gemeinschaft nach Osten offen: zur Ukraine und nach Russland.

Aber es gibt unsichtbare Grenzen in Europa, die wir überwinden müssen, wenn wir die europäische Gemeinschaft suchen, und es sind die Christen, die diese Grenzen überwinden können. Als ich vor Jahren in Ungarn war, sprach einer von der unsichtbaren „Theodosiuslinie“, die die lateinischen und die orthodoxen Völker auf dem Balkan seit Jahrhunderten trennt. Sie sei nicht einmal durch Heiraten zu überwinden. Die ethnozentrischen Kriege im zerfallenen Jugoslawien haben gezeigt, wie eng Volkstum und Konfession verbunden sind.

Als ich im vorigen Jahr in Bukarest war, wurde ich als einer begrüßt, der „aus dem Abendland“ kommt. Auf meine Nachfrage wurde das or-

*Ökumene, orthodoxie und ökotheologie in Europa...*

thodoxe Rumänien als das „Morgenland“ bezeichnet. Wenn man bei uns vom „Morgenland“ spricht, denken alle an die „Drei Weisen aus dem Morgenland“ und vermuten dieses Land südlich von Bethlehem, aber nicht an der Donau. Orthodoxe Theologen aber sprechen wie selbstverständlich von ihrer „morgenländischen Theologie“, z. B. Staniloae in seiner Orthodoxen Dogmatik.

Wenn wir einmal auf die Landschaft blicken und nicht auf die historischen Traditionen, erkennen wir sofort, dass es dieselbe Sonne ist, die das Morgenland und das Abendland verbindet. Und was immer die mysteriöse „Theodosiuslinie“ sein mag, es waren und sind die Flüsse, die die Völker verbinden: Dort ist der Rhein in Westeuropa und hier ist es die Donau, die Süddeutschland, Österreich, Ungarn und die Balkanländer seit Jahrhunderten verbunden hat. Die Meere haben durch ihre Küsten gemeinsame Kulturen hervorgebracht und die Donau hat die Kulturen von Oberschwaben bis ans Schwarze Meer geprägt, wie der italienische Kulturhistoriker Claudio Magris in seinem wunderbaren Buch: *Donau, Biographie eines Flusses*, München 2009, dargestellt hat. Wir begrüßen darum die „Donau-Friedenswelle“ der Kirchen im Rahmen der ökumenischen Dekade zur Überwindung der Gewalt: „Es ströme das Recht wie Wasser“ (Arnos 5, 24). Diese „Welle“ begann auf dem 2. Ökumenischen Kirchentag in München 2010 mit nach orthodoxen Ritus geweihten Wasser in der Isar und wird im Juli 2011 mit einem ökumenischen Gottesdienst an der Donau in Ulm vollendet.

Wenn einmal der Nationalismus des ausgehenden 19. Jahrhunderts in Europa überwunden wird und wir beginnen, in Regionen zu denken, werden die genannten Trennungslinien überflüssig sein und unsere Grenzen dienen dann dem Austausch und nicht mehr dem Ausschluss. „Der Westen“ ist keine moralische Bedrohung für die orthodoxen Völker, die aus einer anderen Geschichte kommen, und „Der Osten“ wird sich der westlichen Zivilisation in seinem kulturellen Reichtum erschließen.

Es geht jedoch nicht nur um das Zusammenwachsen der verschiedenen kulturellen und religiösen Traditionen, die auf reiche gemeinsame Wurzeln in den ersten 5 Jahrhunderten zurückblicken können. Es geht im 21. Jahrhundert auch um eine neue Aufgabe, die unsere Zusammenarbeit fordert: Wir stehen am Ende des modernen Zeitalters und am Anfang des ökologischen Zeitalters. Es ist ein neues ökologisches Paradigma im Entstehen begriffen, das die menschliche Kultur und die Natur der Erde

anders verbindet, als es im modernen Paradigma geschehen ist. Die moderne Machtergreifung über die Natur und ihre Kräfte ist seit Tschernobyl 1988 an ihre Grenze gekommen. Seit der europäischen Katastrophe von Tschernobyl wissen wir, dass die Kernkraft die Grenzen menschlicher Kontrolle übersteigt. Wer es damals noch nicht eingesehen hat, lernt es heute durch die Katastrophen in den japanischen Kernkraftwerken von Fukushima. Wie lange wird Tschernobyl unbewohnbar bleiben? Wohin mit dem Atommüll? Wie lange sind die Endlager zu bewachen? Wir brauchen ein neues Naturverhältnis in unserer wissenschaftlichtechnischen Zivilisation. Eine neue, ökologische Theologie wird dazu helfen, denn das moderne Naturverhältnis gründete auch in einer Theologie: in der Theologie der Weltherrschaft des göttlichen Menschen.

## 5. Ökologie: Christus Pantokrator

Es gibt einen hinterlistigen Witz für die ökologische Wende, die uns bevorsteht:

Zwei Planeten treffen sich im Weltall. „Wie geht es Dir?“, fragt der Eine den Anderen. Der Andere antwortet: „Ach, ziemlich schlecht. Ich leide. Ich habe homo sapiens“. Tröstet der Eine ihn und sagt: „Das ist sehr unangenehm. Ich habe das auch gehabt. Aber das geht vorüber“.

Ist das Menschengeschlecht für den Planeten Erde wichtig oder nur störend? Ist unser Planet für den Kosmos wichtig oder eine Randerscheinung? Wir wissen es nicht. Wir wissen aber, dass der Planet Erde für das Menschengeschlecht wichtig ist, denn wir sind Erdgeschöpfe. Die Erde ist nicht auf uns angewiesen, aber wir sind auf die Erde angewiesen. Also können wir die Erde nicht anthropozentrisch vom Menschen her verstehen, sondern müssen umgekehrt unser Menschsein von der Erde her verstehen.

Man sagt, die abrahamitischen Religionen seien Geschichtsreligionen, um sie von den Naturreligionen zu unterscheiden, denn Gott offenbare sich in kontingenten Ereignissen der menschlichen Geschichte, nicht in den Ordnungen der Natur. Der Mensch sei das einzige Ebenbild Gottes in der Schöpfung und sei zur Herrschaft über die Erde und seine Mitgeschöpfe bestimmt (Gen 1 und 2, Psalm 8). Damit ist der Anthropozentrismus begründet, nach dem es der Mensch ist, der zwischen Gott und der Natur

*Ökumene, orthodoxie und ökotheologie in Europa...*

vermittelt. Diese Ansicht ist im Blick auf die Bibel sehr einseitig und selektiv und hat in der europäischen Neuzeit verhängnisvoll gewirkt.

Hiob 38-40 ist die ausführlichste Darstellung der Schöpfung im Alten Testament. Das Universum, das hier dargestellt wird, ist Gottes unermessliche, wilde Schöpfung. Sie existiert ohne den Menschen. Durch Gottes Fragen wird Hiob seine Bedeutungslosigkeit klar gemacht: Wo warst du, als ich die Erde gründete? Kannst du die Bande des Siebengestirns zusammenbinden? Und der Mensch muss antworten: „Siehe, ich bin zu gering, was soll ich antworten?“ (40, 4) Selbst an den gefährlichen Chaosmächten Behemoth und Leviathan hat Gott seine wilde Lust. Hiob 38-40 lehrt uns „kosmische Demut“ (Richard Bauckham) und warnt uns: Die „Hochmütigen“ werden von der Erde verschwinden.

Auch der Schöpfungpsalm 104 preist Gottes Gegenwart in den Wolken und Winden, im Feuer und in den Wassern: „Herr, wie sind deine Werke so groß und viel. Du hast sie alle weise geordnet und die Erde ist voll deiner Güter“ (104, 24). Gott atmet durch die ganze Schöpfung. In seinem Lebensgeist werden alle Lebewesen lebendig, und „du erneuerst das Antlitz der Erde“. (104, 29 - 30) Menschen sind Mitgeschöpfe in der bunten Schöpfungsgemeinschaft. Ihre „Sonderstellung“ besteht nur in ihren negativen Möglichkeiten:

„Die Sünder werden ein Ende nehmen auf Erden  
und die Gottlosen nicht mehr sein“. (104, 35)

Wenn wir hier eine Ordnung erkennen, dann ist sie:

Zuerst der Kosmos - dann die Menschen, und der Schöpfer spricht aus seiner Schöpfung zu den Menschen.

Im Neuen Testament scheint alles auf den menschengewordenen Sohn Gottes und damit auf das Heil der Menschen konzentriert zu sein. Sieht man genauer hin, bemerkt man jedoch, dass der Schein trügt. In dem auferweckten Christus erkennen die Jünger und die Frauen offenbar von Anfang an den „Ersten und den Letzten“, „das Alpha und das Omega“, denn der Auferstandene ist nicht nur personal der Erste aus der allgemeinen Totenauferstehung, sondern auch kosmisch der Anfang der Neuschöpfung aller Dinge: In ihm ist der Tod überwunden und das wahre Leben erschienen. Schon Paulus schreibt -20 Jahre nach dem Tod Jesu - „Wir haben einen Gott, den Vater, von dem alle Dinge sind und wir zu ihm, und einen Herrn Jesus Christus, durch den alle Dinge sind und wir durch ihn“ (1 Kor, 8, 6). Ich füge hinzu: „Und einen Geist, in dem alle Dinge sind und wir in ihm“.

Auch die Versöhnungsbotschaft des Apostels geht über den Kosmos:  
„Gott war in Christus und versöhnte den Kosmos mit sich selbst, ...  
und hat unter uns aufgerichtet den Dienst der Versöhnung". (2 Kor, 5, 19)

Die Versöhnung des Kosmos ist das Thema des Kolosserbriefs.

„Denn es hat Gott gefallen, dass in ihm alle Fülle wohnen sollte und durch ihn alles mit sich versöhnte, es sei auf Erden oder im Himmel, indem er Frieden machte durch sein Blut am Kreuz". (1, 20)

Durch die Gegenwart Gottes im Gekreuzigten gewinnt die Lebenshingabe Jesu auf Golgatha transzendentes Gewicht, durch seine Erhöhung zur Rechten Gottes gewinnt sie kosmische Relevanz. Das ist die Allversöhnung.

Aber braucht der Kosmos wie sündhafte Menschen Versöhnung mit seinem Schöpfer? Im Kosmos handelt es sich nicht um „Sünden", sondern um Zerrüttungen durch herrenlose „Mächte und Gewalten". Paulus nennt sie „Herrschaft, Macht und Gewalt". (1 Kor 15, 24) Der Epheserbrief spricht von „Reichen, Gewalten, Macht und Herrschaft" und meint nicht nur die in der Antike gefürchteten kosmischen Urgewalten, sondern wie Paulus auch ungerechte politische Gewaltherrschaften. Es sind die Gewalten, die Christus am Kreuz zu Tode gebracht haben. Durch die Auferweckung Christi hat Gott diese „Mächte und Gewalten ihrer Macht entkleidet und sie öffentlich zur Schau gestellt und in Christus über sie triumphiert". (Kol 2, 15)

Paulus und seine Schüler unterscheiden sich in dem, was dann mit diesen Mächten geschieht: Nach Paulus (1 Kor 15, 28) wird Christus zuletzt alle Herrschaft, Gewalt und Macht „vernichten", damit Gott „alles in allem" sei: nach Eph und Kol werden sie nicht „vernichtet", sondern zurecht gebracht, so dass sie dem Leben, nicht dem Tod dienen. Das geschieht durch die *anakephaleiosis toon panton* (Eph 1, 20). Der erhöhte Christus wird zum Pantokrator, d.h. zum „Haupt aller Mächte und Gewalten". (Kol 2, 10) Er verwandelt sie aus Gewalten des Todes zu Kräften des Friedens wie „Schwerter zu Pflugscharen".

Für die frühe Christenheit war dieser kosmische Friede wichtig, denn sie lebte in einer Umwelt der Vergötterung und Dämonisierung kosmischer Kräfte. Es sind uns keine „interreligiösen Dialoge" mit den vielen antiken Kulturen der Fruchtbarkeit und numinoser Mächte überliefert. Offenbar griff das Evangelium vom kosmischen Frieden in Christus diese Kultur an der Wurzel an und machte sie überflüssig. Der Glaube an den kosmischen

*Ökumene, orthodoxie und ökotheologie in Europa...*

Christus befreite die antike Welt von Naturängsten und Naturvergötterungen und verbreitete Vertrauen in die Weisheit des Kosmos und die Weltvernunft.

Das Evangelium vom kosmischen Frieden ist heute so aktuell wie damals. Wie wollen Menschen ein Leben bejahen und lieben können, das von Erdbeben und Tsunamis, von Krebs und HIV-Viren bedroht wird? Es macht gewiss einen Unterschied, ob Menschen unberechenbaren Naturkatastrophen ausgeliefert sind, oder ob die Natur zur Müllhalde unberechenbarer Menschen verkommt. Aber es ist dasselbe Evangelium des kosmischen Friedens, das uns sagt: Wir leben weder in einer chaotischen Welt noch in einem paradiesischen Kosmos. Wir leben in einer zerrütteten, aber schon versöhnten Welt, in einer versöhnten und schon erneuerten Welt.

Die göttliche Weisheit wohnt schon im Kosmos. Was auch kommen mag: „Es wird regiert“, wie Karl Barth zuletzt auf seinem Totenbett sagte. Nur wir Menschen müssen die Weisheit im Kosmos erst noch entdecken und in uns selbst erst noch lernen. Wir werden lernen, entweder durch Einsicht oder durch Katastrophen. Die Weisen lernen durch Einsicht, die Dummen durch Katastrophen. Ich bin für das Lernen durch Einsicht. Darum lassen Sie uns eine gemeinsame Ökologische Theologie entwickeln.

Eva Maria Synek<sup>1</sup>

**„Frauen sind [...] als ausgeschlossen zu betrachten“<sup>2</sup>: laienrechte für frauen?  
Kanonistische streiflichter vom  
ausgehenden 19. Jahrhundert**

**Zusammenfassung**

*Dieser Beitrag versucht die Rolle und den Status der Laien in der Kirche, im allgemeinen, und der Frauen, im besonderen, herauszustellen. Die Autorin ist daran bedacht, die kanonistischen Streiflichter im Bezug auf die Rechte der Laien im Leibe Christi – der Kirche, hervorzuheben. In diesem Sinne, werden viele Argumente aus den Werken der Autoren hervorgebracht, die sich mit dem Kirchenrecht beschäftigt haben. Darunter; seien erwähnt: Apostolos Christodoulos, Nikodemus Milasch, Andreias Schaguna, Thomas Brenner, Paul Bruszanowski u. a. Der Hauptgedanke dieses Studiums besteht darin, die Art und Weise, zu betrachten, wie die kirchliche Bemühung der Frauen in der Kirche im 19 Jahrhundert eingeschätzt worden ist.*

**Stichwörter**

*Laienrechte, kanonistische Aspekte, Volkskirchenkongresse, Kirchenrecht, Trauzeugen*

Gemessen an den religiösen Pflichtenkatalogen haben Christenrechte in der kanonistischen Reflexion bis heute konfessionsübergreifend immer nur eine geringere Rolle gespielt. So sagt auch die Art und Weise, wie z. B. das Recht, unter bestimmten Bedingungen zur Eucharistie zugelassen

<sup>1</sup> PhD., University of Wien, Austria, [eva.synek@univie.ac.at](mailto:eva.synek@univie.ac.at).

<sup>2</sup> *Nikodemus Milasch [Nikodim Milaš]*, Das Kirchenrecht der morgenländischen Kirche, Mostar <sup>2</sup>1905, 595.

„Frauen sind [...] als ausgeschlossen zu betrachten“...

zu werden, in den Handbüchern von Şaguna und Milaš thematisiert wird<sup>3</sup>, weit weniger über dessen grundlegende Bedeutung aus, als darüber, wie wenig selbstverständlich der Kommunionempfang von Laien in den zeitgenössischen orthodoxen Gemeinden genauso wie im katholischen Milieu war. Die Diskrepanz zwischen der zeitgenössischen Praxis und jener der Alten Kirche konnte keinem Kenner der alten Kanones verborgen bleiben, auch wenn sie nicht jeder so deutlich ansprach, wie Archimandrit Apostolos Christodoulos, der Autor eines frühen griechischen „Manuals“ des Orthodoxen Kirchenrechts<sup>4</sup>.

Das heißt aber nicht, dass Laien deswegen in der kirchlichen Praxis um 1900 immer nur eine untergeordnete Rolle gespielt hätten. Nicht nur in der von Richard Potz beschriebenen Konstantinopler Kirchenverfassung<sup>5</sup>, auch in den serbischen Volkskirchenkongressen (*sabori*)<sup>6</sup>, in den auf Bruderschaften zurückgehenden hauptstädtischen orthodoxen Gemeinden der Habsburgermonarchie<sup>7</sup> und den Kirchengremien der Hermannstädter Metropole<sup>8</sup> war das Laienelement sogar sehr ausgeprägt. Entsprechend wäre es verzerrend, Laienrechte nur unter der sakramentalen Perspektive wahrzunehmen bzw. auf spezifische Aspekte des Ehe- und Familienrechtes zu konzentrieren. Wie allerdings die Frage ehelicher Rechte besonders deutlich macht, wurden die Träger spezifischer Rechte in der zeitgenö-

<sup>3</sup> Vgl. *Andreas von Şaguna [Şaguna]*, Compendium des kanonischen Rechtes der einen, heiligen, allgemeinen und apostolischen Kirche, Hermannstadt 1868, 49; *Milaš*, Kirchenrecht, 561 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Vgl. *Apostolou Christodoulou*, Δοκίμιον Ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ δικαίου, Konstantinopel 1896, 414 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Vgl. *Richard Potz*, Patriarch und Synode in Konstantinopel. Das Verfassungsrecht des ökumenischen Patriarchates (Kirche und Recht 10), Wien 1971, 97.

<sup>6</sup> Vgl. *Thomas Bremer*, Ekklesiale Struktur und Ekklesiologie in der Serbischen Orthodoxen Kirche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (Das östliche Christentum N.F. 41), Würzburg 1992.

<sup>7</sup> Vgl. *Willibald M. Plöchl*, Die Wiener Orthodoxen Griechen. Eine Studie zur Rechts- und Kulturgeschichte der Kirchengemeinden zum Hl. Georg und zur Hl. Dreifaltigkeit und zur Errichtung der Metropolis von Austria (Kirche und Recht 16), Wien 1983.

<sup>8</sup> Vgl. *Paul Bruszanowski*, Reforma constituțională din Biserica Ortodoxă a Transilvaniei între 1850-1925 [Verfassungsreform der Orthodoxen Kirche in Siebenbürgen zwischen 1850-1925], Cluj 2007; *ders.*, Rumänisch-orthodoxe Kirchenordnungen 1786-2008. Siebenbürgen – Bukowina – Rumänien, Köln 2011, 19-97; *Johann Schneider*, Der Hermannstädter Metropolit Andrei von Şaguna. Reform und Erneuerung der orthodoxen Kirche in Siebenbürgen und Ungarn nach 1848, Köln 2005, 175 ff, bes. 200 ff.

ssischen kanonistischen Literatur im seltensten Fall mit einem weiblichen Gesicht gedacht. Milaš's grundlegende Darstellung des orthodoxen Kirchenrechts<sup>9</sup>, die auf der Basis von Übersetzungen über die serbische Kirche hinaus bis heute panorthodox noch wesentlich stärker rezipiert wurde als Šaguna's Pionierwerk ist hier durchaus symptomatisch. So suggeriert zwar die Überschrift eines Subkapitels – „Rechte und Pflichten der Ehegatten“<sup>10</sup> – in Milaš's Handbuch in der Ehe zunächst durchaus eine Gleichheit von Männern und Frauen. Dagegen steht dann aber die als „göttliches Recht“ verstandene, mit Referenzstellen sowohl aus dem Alten als auch dem Neuen Testament<sup>11</sup> untermauerte Vorrangstellung des Mannes in der Familie. Die Position des Mannes als „Haupt der Familie“<sup>12</sup> umfasst nach Milaš die Kompetenz, „die Familie zu leiten und sich hierbei des wohlwollenden Rates zu bedienen“ und impliziert einen „Anspruch auf Achtung und Gehorsam der Familie.“<sup>13</sup> Wenn sich „nach dem selben Recht“ (das heißt also in der Sicht von Milaš wiederum: *ius divinum!*) die korrespondierende Rolle der Frau als jene eines „untrennbare[n] Genosse[n] des Mannes“ darstellt, meint dies aus der Perspektive des Kanonisten alles andere als ansatzweise Gleichberechtigung. Vor allem geht es ihm darum, dass die Ehefrau ihren Ehemann „zu unterstützen und seinen Anordnungen zu gehorchen“ hat.<sup>14</sup>

Dennoch wäre es falsch, aus den eherechtlichen Ausführungen die Schlussfolgerung zu ziehen, dass die klassische orthodoxe Kanonistik aus der altkirchlichen Rechtsentwicklung einen im Grunde exklusiv männlichen Laienbegriff übernommen hätte.<sup>15</sup> Grundsätzlich ist für Milaš Geschlecht bei aller faktischen Relevanz (vom Weiherecht<sup>16</sup> über das Eherecht bis hin

<sup>9</sup> Serbische Originalausgabe 1895; deutsche Übersetzung 1897; ich beziehe mich in diesem Beitrag auf die überarbeitete deutsche Zweitaufgabe.

<sup>10</sup> *Milaš*, Kirchenrecht, 626.

<sup>11</sup> *Milaš*, Kirchenrecht, 627, Anm. 5, rekuriert „u. a.“ explizit auf Gen 3, 16; 1 Kor 11, 3; 1 Tim 2, 12 und Tit 2, 5; Anm. 6 für die korrespondierenden Frauenpflichten „u. a.“ auf die Haustafeltexte von Eph 5, 22 und 1 Petr 3, 1.

<sup>12</sup> *Milaš*, Kirchenrecht, 627.

<sup>13</sup> *Milaš*, Kirchenrecht, 627.

<sup>14</sup> *Milaš*, Kirchenrecht, 627.

<sup>15</sup> Zur Diskussion um die Inklusivität des patristischen Laienbegriffs vgl. *Eva Synek*, *Laici – viri aut mulieres*. Bemerkungen zum patristischen Laienbegriff, in: *Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht* 43 (1994) 102-134.

<sup>16</sup> Einerseits stellt nach *Milaš*, Kirchenrecht, 258, „das männliche Geschlecht“ zwar ein „fundamentales Erfordernis zur Erlangung der Cheirotomie“ dar; andererseits erwähnt

„Frauen sind [...] als ausgeschlossen zu betrachten“...

zur Funktion des Trauzeugens) *keine* eigene verfassungsrechtliche Kategorie!

Auf diesem Hintergrund bewegt sich die Frage der In- bzw. Exklusion von Frauen in orthodoxen Laien im ausgehenden 19. Jahrhundert grundsätzlich offenstehenden kirchlichen Funktionen in einem spannenden Schnittfeld von kirchenrechtsgeschichtlicher und sozialgeschichtlicher Forschung.

## 1. Taufpaten und Trauzeugen

Der Konstantinopler Kanonist Christodoulos hielt dem nicht zuletzt in der Donaumonarchie weit verbreiteten Brauch, zugleich einen Mann und eine Frau als Paten zu nehmen, entgegen, er sei weder in den Kanones noch in der Praxis der Alten Kirche begründet.<sup>17</sup> Das heißt aber nicht, dass er Taufpatinnen ablehnte – im Gegenteil: von ihm wurde diese kirchliche Funktion – wie bis heute in der Praxis z. T. üblich – auch rechtlich explizit „gegendert“: Für Knaben soll ein Mann, für Mädchen eine Frau Pate stehen. Dies steht in den kirchenrechtlichen Handbüchern von Şaguna und Milaš so ausdrücklich nicht, doch stellt die Übernahme des (Tauf)patenamtes durch Frauen auch nach diesen jedenfalls kein prinzipielles Problem dar.

Ganz anders sieht es mit der Funktion des Trauzeugens („Beistands“) aus: Sie ist sowohl bei Şaguna als auch bei Milaš explizit als reine „Männersache“ konzipiert.<sup>18</sup> Dies ist umso beachtlicher, als Konfessionsverschiedenheit zwar unerwünscht, aber jedenfalls im Habsburgerreich faktisch doch nicht unbedingt ein Hindernis für die Wahl des Beistands war, selbst wenn dieser in der Regel unkanonischer Weise dann auch als Pate künftiger Kinder agieren und als solcher im Notfall als „Ersatzvater“ einspringen würde. Şaguna's Compendium reflektiert in diesem heiklen Punkt nüchtern die Siebenbürgischen Realitäten: Im Fall der Fälle müsse „bei der Taufe der

---

er sowohl im Abschnitt über „die fundamentalen Erfordernisse für den Eintritt in den Klerus“ (a.a.O., 257-259, hier: 259) als auch im Kapitel über „die Diakone und die Kirchendiener“ (427 f) durchaus das historische Diakonisseninstitut.

<sup>17</sup> Christodoulou, Δοκίμιον, 404.

<sup>18</sup> Vgl. Şaguna, Compendium, 45 ff; Milaš, Kirchenrecht, 56, der aber anders als Şaguna Nichtorthodoxe explizit ausschließt. Faktisch war es üblich, dass bei männlichen Kindern der Trauzeuge als Pate fungierte, bei Mädchen aber dessen Frau.

Kinder der Priester oder der Kirchensänger im Namen des Beistandes fremder Religion das ‚Credo‘ sagen“. „Jedenfalls muß aber der Beistand ein Mann von untadelhaftem Rufe sein, damit er im Nothfalle bei seinem Taufkinde Elternstelle vertreten könne.“<sup>19</sup>

Expliziter thematisiert wurde die Gender-Frage durch Milaš. Gegen seine allgemeine Umschreibung des Laienbegriffs – Laien sind alle jene nicht durch die Weihe zu einem besonderen kirchlichen Dienst bestellten „durch die Taufe vollberechtigte[n] Mitglieder der Kirche“, die „als solche das Recht haben, an allem teilzunehmen, was das Leben der Kirche betrifft“<sup>20</sup> – hielt er hinsichtlich der Frage der Zulassung von Frauen als Trauzeuginnen fest: „Frauen sind von der Zeugenschaft bei Trauungen als ausgeschlossen zu betrachten.“<sup>21</sup>

Im alten kanonischen Recht spielt diese Frage anders als etwa weibliche Lehrtätigkeit und die Frage des Betretens des Altarraums durch Frauen<sup>22</sup> bekanntlich keinerlei Rolle. Milaš konnte sich für seine Position daher auch nicht unmittelbar auf die Heiligen Kanones berufen. In einer Anmerkung versuchte er sie allerdings mit einem Hinweis auf Balsamons Kommentar zu c. 70 Quinisextum (Trullanum) zu untermauern. Das Konzil hatte in Fortschreibung der patristischen Lehrverbotstradition<sup>23</sup> im Rückgriff auf 1 Kor 14, 34 f ein frauenspezifisches Rede- und Schweigeverbot während der Liturgie normiert. Dieses wiederum nahm Theodor Balsamon zum Anlass für einen breiteren Überblick über die Restriktionen für Frauen im byzantinischen Kaiserrecht<sup>24</sup>, zu denen u. a. auch Zeugenrechte zählten.

<sup>19</sup> *Şaguna*, Compendium, 65 f.

<sup>20</sup> *Milaš*, Kirchenrecht, 215.

<sup>21</sup> *Milaš*, Kirchenrecht, 595.

<sup>22</sup> Während c. 44 Laodikeia das Betretungsverbot frauenspezifisch formuliert, enthält c. 69 des Quinisextum einer genderneutrale Fassung, die Laien mit Ausnahme der „kaiserlichen Macht“ generell den Zutritt zum Altarraum verwehrt.

<sup>23</sup> Aus der Fülle der einschlägigen Literatur vgl. u. a. *Eva Synek*, In der Kirche möge sie schweigen, in: *Oriens Christianus* 77 (1993) 151-164; speziell zu c. 70 Quinisextum *Joëlle Beaucam*, Les femmes et l'Église: droit canonique, idéologie et pratiques sociales à Byzance, in: *Carl G. Fürst – R. Potz* (Hrsg.), Mutter, Nonne, Diakonin. Frauenbilder im Recht der Ostkirchen (= Kanon 16), Egging 2000, 87-112, hier: 90 f sowie *Heinz Ohme*, Das Concilium Quinisextum / Das Konzil Quinisextum (FC 82), Turnhout 2006, 118 f.

<sup>24</sup> Vgl. Theodor Balsamon, Kommentar zu c. 70 Quinisextum: ed. *Georgios Rhalles – Michael Potles*, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων* Bd. 2, Athen 1852 (Nachdruck: 1966 u. 1997), 468 f.

„Frauen sind [...] als ausgeschlossen zu betrachten“...

Dass Milaš den angeblichen Ausschluss von Frauen aus der Zeugenfunktion erst eigens herausstellen musste und sich obendrein die Mühe machte, eine wackelige Begründung anzuführen, deutet freilich daraufhin, wie wenig gesichert das ausschließlich „männliche“ Profil des Trauzeugen im ausgehenden 19. Jahrhundert in Wirklichkeit war. So geben nicht nur die kürzlich ausgewerteten Kirchenbücher der Banater Pfarre Caransebeș für das ausgehende 19. Jahrhundert wiederholt die Namen von Frauen an, die – gemeinsam mit einem Mann – als Trauzeugen fungierten, z. B. „Ioan Brancoviciu und seine Frau Iuliana“ oder „Emilia, die Frau des Bischofssekretärs Ioan Bartolomei und der Major A.D. Mihail Ritter von Iacobici“<sup>25</sup>. Auch die zeitgenössische ethnographische Literatur geht davon aus, dass es jedenfalls bei Ruthenen<sup>26</sup> und Rumänen<sup>27</sup> weithin üblich war, dass als Beistände (auch als „Brautvater“ und „Brautmutter“ bezeichnet) jeweils ein Mann und eine Frau fungierten, während zwei Trauzeugen desselben Geschlechts – in seltenen Einzelfällen konnten sogar zwei Frauen als Zeuginnen fungieren<sup>28</sup> – in der Praxis die berühmte Ausnahme von der Regel darstellten.

## 2. Wahl- und Repräsentationsrechte

Bei „selbstverständlich“ noch rein männlich gedachten Rechten konnte man hingegen gut darauf verzichten, dies eigens zu betonen. Besonders markant ist dies bei Wahlrechten zu kirchlichen Gremien, denen in der Donaumonarchie besonders für Serben und Rumänen auch hohe zivilgesellschaftliche und nationalitätenpolitische Relevanz zukam. Șaguna schloss Frauen – im Unterschied zu späteren rumänischen Kirchenstatuten – in „seiner“ Kirchenverfassung aus solchen nirgendwo explizit aus. Und er thematisierte die Frage auch nicht in seinem Compendium, aber nicht,

<sup>25</sup> Vgl. *Ovidiu Laurentiu Rosu*, Marital Options at the Orthodox Parish of Caransebeș Between the Years 1873-1895, in: *Romanian Journal of Population Studies. Supplement* 2009, 809-818, hier: 814.

<sup>26</sup> Vgl. *Alexander Manastyrski*, Die Ruthenen, in: *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild. Bukowina*, Wien 1899, 228-271, hier: 241; 243 ff.

<sup>27</sup> Vgl. *Johann Sbiera – G. Fl. Marian*, Die Rumänen, in: *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild*, Wien 1899, 191-228, hier: 212; 214.

<sup>28</sup> Vgl. *Manastyrski*, Die Ruthenen, 241.

weil der Hermannstädter Metropole hier eine Vorreiterrolle zugekommen wäre, sondern weil er bei all seiner Offenheit für partizipatorische Strukturen<sup>29</sup> offensichtlich nicht im Traum an Frauen als Wählerinnen oder gar gewählte Repräsentantinnen in den in Anlehnung an die serbischen *sabori* konzipierten Siebenbürgener Kirchengremien dachte.

Die Frage zumindest aktiver Wahlrechte ist dennoch viel weniger anachronistisch, als es auf den ersten Blick hin scheinen mag.<sup>30</sup> Dies zeigt nicht nur die allgemeine politische Entwicklung. So erhielten Frauen in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts nach evangelischen und katholischen Vorbildern entstehenden orthodoxen Frauen- und Jugendorganisationen durchaus Sitz und Stimme.<sup>31</sup> Frauenfragen fanden auch immer öfter auf die Agenda der von engagierteren Geistlichen im Rahmen von Volksbildungskampagnen, Predigten und Broschüren diskutierten Themen. Zu den wichtigsten rumänischen Advokatinnen von Frauenrechten gehörte mit Maria Baiulescu (1860-1941), der Initiatorin der „Uniunea Femeilor Române“ [Union rumänischer Frauen] und nach dem ersten Weltkrieg Gründungsmitglied der „Asociația pentru emanciparea civilă și politică a femeilor române“ [Vereinigung für die bürgerliche und politische Emanzipation rumänischer Frauen], wohl nicht ganz zufällig eine Siebenbürgener Pfarrerstochter.<sup>32</sup>

Auf innerkirchlicher Ebene herrschte beim russischen Landeskonzil breiter Konsens für die rechtliche Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern

<sup>29</sup> Vgl. *Brusanowski*, *Reforma constituțională; ders.*, Rumänisch-orthodoxe Kirchenordnungen, 27 ff; auch *Eva Synek*, 140 Jahre „Compendium des kanonischen Rechts“ von Metropolit Andrei von Șaguna, in: *Ostkirchliche Studien* 57 (2008) 193-221.

<sup>30</sup> Vgl. *Maria (Mihaela) Stan*, Frauenrollen und Frauenrechte in der Rumänisch-Orthodoxen Kirche, in: *Eva Synek* (Hrsg.), *Frauenrollen und Frauenrechte in der Europäischen Orthodoxie* (= Kanon 17), Egling 2005, 122-139, hier: 135 ff.

<sup>31</sup> Schöne Beispiele bieten der 1914 konstituierte Frauenverein von Săliște und die wenig später erfolgte, ebenfalls durch den rührigen Protopresbyter Ioan Lupaș in die Wege geleitete, verbandsmäßige Organisation der Dorfjugend beiderlei Geschlechts. Das sich an sächsische Vorbilder anlehrende Statut dieser Jugendorganisation sah ein weibliches Mitglied im Leitungsteam vor, dessen Entsendung dem Frauenverein vorbehalten blieb. Vgl. näherhin *Wolfgang Wünsch*, *Der Auftrag der Kulturorthodoxie. Ein Beitrag zum Wirken des Protopresbyters Dr. Ioan Lupaș* (Academia 11), București 2007, 316-337.

<sup>32</sup> *Tanya Dunlap*, Baiulescu, Maria, in: *Francisca de Haan – Krassimira Daskalova – Anna Loutfi* (Hrsg.), *A Biographical Dictionary of Women's Movements and Feminisms. Central, Eastern, and South Eastern Europe, 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries*, Budapest 2006, 48-50.

„Frauen sind [...] als ausgeschlossen zu betrachten“...

in Bezug auf Wahlrechte.<sup>33</sup> Dabei wurde in der Debatte auch darauf hingewiesen, dass Frauen in der russischen Kirche in Einzelfällen bereits zu diesem Zeitpunkt faktisch, wenn auch ohne Rechtsgrundlage als Starosta (Kirchenältester) agierten. Aber auch in Österreich blieb die Zeit nicht stehen: Die Durchführungsverordnung zum Statut der Wiener griechischen Dreifaltigkeitgemeinde 1909 legitimierte Frauen zwar noch nicht passiv. Just nachdem in der österreichisch-ungarischen Wahlrechtsentwicklung das Allgemeine Männerwahlrecht auf Kosten im 19. Jahrhundert noch vorhandener bescheidener Ansätze für Frauenwahlrechte verwirklicht worden war<sup>34</sup>, gaben die wohlhabenden Wiener Griechen ihren Frauen auf der Ebene der Kirchengemeinde das aktive Wahlrecht!<sup>35</sup>

### 3. Ausblick auf die neuere Entwicklung

Einzelne Fragen der Gleichbehandlung männlicher und weiblicher Laien in liturgischen Kontexten (wie beispielsweise der Zutritt zum Altarraum, die Übertragung von Funktionen wie jener eines Kirchensängers bzw. Lektors oder die Betrauung mit dem Predigtamt) werden bis heute sehr kontrovers diskutiert und in der Praxis lokal ausgesprochen unterschiedlich gehandhabt.<sup>36</sup> Dagegen wurde die Gleichstellung männlicher und weiblicher Laien auf der Ebene von Wahl- und Repräsentationsrechten parallel zur allgemeinen Wahlrechtsentwicklung panorthodox betrachtet relativ kon-

<sup>33</sup> Vgl. *Rudolf Prokschi*, Die Rolle der Frau in der Kirche. Ein intensiv diskutiertes Thema auf dem Landeskonzil der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche von 1917/1918, in: *Ostkirchliche Studien* 49 (2000) 105-144.

<sup>34</sup> Vgl. *Brigitta Bader-Zaar*, Frauenbewegung und Frauenwahlrecht, in: *Helmut Rumpler – Peter Urbanitsch*, Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918. Bd. VIII/1 Politische Öffentlichkeit und Zivilgesellschaft, Wien 2006, 1005-1027; *Susan Zimmermann*, Die bessere Hälfte? Frauenbewegungen und Frauenbestrebungen im Ungarn der Habsburgermonarchie 1848 bis 1918, Budapest 1999, 323 ff; *dies.*, Frauenbewegungen und Frauenbestrebungen im Königreich Ungarn, in: *Helmut Rumpler – Peter Urbanitsch*, Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918. Bd. VIII/1 Politische Öffentlichkeit und Zivilgesellschaft, Wien 2006, 1359-1491, hier: 1457 ff.

<sup>35</sup> Vgl. *Plöchl*, Wiener orthodoxe Griechen, 74. In Anbetracht der bruderschaftlichen Strukturen der Gemeinde handelt es sich *de facto* auch um eine Art „Zensuswahlrecht“.

<sup>36</sup> Vgl. hier und im Folgenden den Sammelband „Frauenrollen und Frauenrechte“ (= Anm. 29).

sequent fortgeschrieben. Eine Ausnahme machte nur die Rumänische Orthodoxe Kirche, in der der stillschweigende Ausschluss von Frauen auf der Ebene der Wahl- und Repräsentationsrechte im Statut Şagunas in den Nachfolgestatuten des 20. Jahrhunderts zu einem Ausschluss *expressis verbis* werden sollte. Jedenfalls im europäischen Vergleich stellte der andauernde Ausschluss rumänischer Frauen aus kirchlichen Wahlrechten auch noch zu Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts einen Anachronismus dar, der erst durch das 2007 von der Synode beschlossene und 2008 in Kraft getretene neue Statut der Rumänischen Orthodoxen Kirche behoben wurde. Insofern im selben Statut Laienrechte insgesamt zurück genommen wurden, ist man allerdings versucht, in der nunmehrigen Angleichung von Frauen- und Männerrechten einen Pyrrhus-Sieg zu sehen. Hier ist allerdings nicht der Ort für eine grundsätzliche Analyse der seit dem 19. Jahrhundert in der orthodoxen Kanonistik kontroversen Bewertung der Legitimität historisch gewachsener partizipatorischer Rechte von Laien, die einer expliziten Verankerung in den Heiligen Kanones entbehren.

Was die frauenrechtliche Dimension der Frage betrifft, so wurde die Inklusion von Frauen in die in den seit dem 19. Jahrhundert entstandenen Kirchenstatuten unterschiedlich stark konzipierten allgemeinen Laienrechte zweifelsohne durch das Fehlen expliziter Regelungen in den Heiligen Kanones begünstigt. Darüber hinaus dürfte es wohl auch ein Vorteil gewesen sein, dass die ältere kanonistische Standardliteratur diese Frage schlicht übergangen hatte.

Michael Welker<sup>1</sup>

## Theology and Science: Theological Impulses for the Dialogue

### Abstract

*The author tries to establish a dialogue between theology and the natural sciences on topics of eschatology and when speaking about a reality of “spiritual” gifts, “spiritual” food, and, most provocatively, of the “spiritual body” of the resurrected. There would be no substantial hope for our lives if there was not a continuity between our bodily existence on earth – undeniably also shaped by the flesh – and our spiritual body, shaped by the powers of faith, love and hope. Those who live in Christ as members of his body are transformed into his likeness and are preserved towards the eternal life of God.*

### Keywords

*Resurrection, eschatology, dialogue, Creation*

### The Reality of the Resurrection. Can Theology and the Natural Sciences Engage in a Meaningful Discussion of Eschatological Themes?

Can we imagine and can we penetrate the reality which classical theology had in mind when it spoke of “spiritual” gifts, “spiritual” food, and, most provocatively, of the “spiritual body” of the resurrected (1Cor 15:44)? Moreover, can we convince non-theological mind-sets that these concepts do not only make sense in the orbit of religion, but that they have illuminating power beyond this realm because they are firmly rooted in a reality and not just confined to one complex mode of religious discourse? In my view, this question has to be answered in the affirmative in order to

---

<sup>1</sup> Ph D., University of Heidelberg, [maw.pnj@web.de](mailto:maw.pnj@web.de).

make the dialogue between theology and the natural sciences on topics of eschatology possible. In order to prepare for this dialogue a few sophisticated preliminary steps are required.

We *first* have to differentiate between “old style” and “new style” metaphysics as two possible frameworks for the approach.

*Second*, we have to discern an understanding of “creation” in the light of “old style” metaphysics on the one hand and in the light of biblical creation accounts on the other.

*Third*, on this basis the conviction can set in that the notion of a creator grasped as a mere sustainer of the universe is spiritually not satisfying and salvific.

This will, *fourth*, prepare us for an understanding of the role of the resurrection in divine creativity in general and will provide an understanding of the nature and the importance of the “spiritual body” of Jesus Christ in particular.

*Fifth*, we will try to comprehend the transformative power of this spiritual body and the involvement of human beings and other creatures in it.

*Finally*, on this basis we want to engage non-theological academic thinkers by asking them whether the sustaining, rescuing and ennobling interaction between God, creation and spiritual information has analogies in their realms of experience and whether such interaction can challenge reductionistic concepts of matter.

## I. Differentiating Between “Old Style” and “New Style” Metaphysics

My proposal to differentiate between “old style” and “new style” metaphysics does not imply that “old style” metaphysics is outdated and should simply be replaced by “new style” metaphysics. “New style” metaphysics is a constructive reaction to the lament that after Kant metaphysics as the production of ultimate and closing thoughts about the totality of reality is no longer possible. Indeed, philosophy has to face the dilemma that in late modern societies – and also in their academic and religious settings – a plurality of forms of life and rationalities has established itself which can no longer be convincingly ordered in “a hierarchy of the more or less valuable.”<sup>2</sup> In this situation “old style” metaphysics can be used as

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. for many voices Jürgen Habermas, *Metaphysik nach Kant*, in Konrad Cramer et al (eds.), *Theorie der Subjektivität*, Suhrkamp: Frankfurt 1987, 434.

*Theology and Science: Theological Impulses for the Dialogue...*

a means to question the current epistemic setting at least in the academy in the West. Recently, Richard Swinburne has presented us with an impressive example of this approach, combining 18<sup>th</sup> century Anglican natural theology with 20<sup>th</sup> century probabilistic logic.<sup>3</sup> In a more modest and empirically argumentative way, “new style” metaphysics responds to the same challenge by reducing the metaphysical claim to the exemplary exploration of two areas of discovery and research (instead of covering “the totality”).

It was Alfred North Whitehead who in a most helpful way differentiated between old and new style metaphysics (without using these terms, however). On the one hand, he states in terms of “old style” metaphysics: “By ‘metaphysics’ I mean the science which seeks to discover the general ideas which are indispensably relevant to the analysis of everything that happens.”<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, in the mode of “new style” metaphysics, Whitehead does not speak of “the”, but of “a” metaphysics and of a “metaphysical description” which “takes its origin from one select field of interest. It receives its confirmation by establishing itself as adequate and as exemplified in other fields of interest.”<sup>5</sup> Whitehead makes it clear that “a metaphysics” can emerge from different homelands: mathematics, a science, religion, common sense. As soon as a solid bridge theory can be established between at least two areas of interest by indicating that basic ideas, concepts and intellectual operations can work in both areas, we are in the process of a “metaphysical description” and on the way to “a metaphysics” – which I call “new style” metaphysics.

It is the “bottom-up” approach over against “top-down” thinking that is characteristic of “new style” metaphysics. Such a metaphysics tries to cultivate common sense, to challenge it and to move it to higher levels of insight by confronting it with specific “fields of interest” which require specific modes of thinking in order to be adequately explored. The differences between common sense thought and the thinking required to access at least one of these fields of interest provide the impulses to develop a “new style” metaphysics. This holds also true for the differences between

---

<sup>3</sup> Most of the arguments he offered can be found in: Richard Swinburne, *Is There a God?*, Oxford University Press: Oxford 1996.

<sup>4</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Religion in the Making* (1926), Meridian: New York 1960, 82.

<sup>5</sup> Whitehead, *Religion in the Making*, 86f.

the cognitive explorations of at least two of these fields of interest (for instance, of science and theology).

## II. “Creation” According to “Old Style” Metaphysics and According to Classical Biblical Accounts

Most theological and philosophical thinking about “creation” has been dominated by the concepts of “bringing forth” and “utmost dependence.” Creation as *creatura* was nature, the cosmos or a vaguely conceived totality as brought forth and dependent on one or several transcendent power(s) or will(s) or personal entity(ies) mostly named God or gods. Creation as *creatio* was the activity or energy of bringing forth, keeping in dependence or even in “ultimate” dependence and at the same time sustaining nature, the cosmos, totality (sometimes with explicit reference to culture and history as well). Connected with this type of thinking were ideas and concepts of God such as “the all-determining reality” (Bultmann, Pannenberg), the “ground of being” (Tillich), the “ultimate point of reference” (G. Kaufman), the “whither of absolute dependence” (Schleiermacher), which were highly en vogue.<sup>6</sup>

In striking contrast, the classical biblical Priestly creation account Genesis 1 offers a much more subtle picture. Through the word of God chaotic matter is enabled not only to win forms and shapes, energy and life. The heavens, the stars, the earth, the waters and the humans are to actively participate in God’s creative energy and power. The same verbs used for the divine process of creating are also used for the co-creativity of what and who is created. Over against a wide-spread fear of a “synergistic” confusion of God and creature in the case of co-creativity it has to be recognized that the biblical creation account does not think in one-to-one structures (God and creation, God and world, God and the human being). The account describes one-to-many structures in which selected creatures gain a graded share in the creative activity. In various ways selected creatures participate in the formation of creation. The heavens part, the stars govern the times and festive days, the earth brings forth creatures, and the humans are assigned the task to rule over creation and thereby reflect the image of God.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. M. Welker, *Creation and Reality*, Fortress: Philadelphia 1999, chapter 1.

*Theology and Science: Theological Impulses for the Dialogue...*

In this one-to-many relationship between God and “the world” no creature has the power to act in God’s stead, yet the power of the co-creative creatures is sizable. This power does not only enable humans as well as other creatures to exercise their creaturely freedom and act independently; it also makes creaturely self-endangerment and self-destruction possible. There are several indications in the creation account which support this realistic reading over against all metaphysical illusions of the “perfect-watchmaker” (illusions which as a rule have the theodicy question in the back-pack). The co-creative creatures remain creatures. Despite their powers they are no gods (as other ancient creation accounts would have it). Neither the heavens nor the sun, moon and stars nor the earth are divine powers. The slave-holder and conqueror language in the infamous “call to dominion” indicates that a constant conflict between humans and animals in their common area of nourishment has to be regulated. The creaturely and even co-creative existence, even if it is highly conducive to life and called “good” by God (Hebrew TOB, life-furthering) does not reach the level of divine glory. The difference between God’s glory and the creation judged by God to be “good” and “very good” is still maintained. Creation is not paradise. It is on its way towards the “New Creation”.

### **III. Creation Itself Points Beyond God as a Mere Sustainer of the Universe**

It belongs to the rituals in the science-and-theology or science-and-religion discourses and their public radiations that some of the scientists involved connect their summarizing perspectives with religious awe and respect for the power and wisdom of a divine creator. The power of mathematics and rational thinking in illuminating hidden secrets of nature, observations of unquestionable beauty and astounding rhythmic orders, the fecundity of life and its potential to generate “higher forms” are named in order to support such views.<sup>7</sup> Others, however, leave such discourses with the summary: “The more I looked at the universe, the more I found it pointless.” Or they think along the line of Whitehead’s words: “Life is robbery and requires justification.”

---

<sup>7</sup> See John Polkinghorne and Michael Welker, *Faith in the Living God. A Dialogue*, Fortress: Philadelphia and SPCK: London 2001.

At this point we become aware of the fact that any “natural awareness of the Divine” is connected with pressing problems – as Calvin showed so powerfully at the beginning of his *Institutes*. No perspective on God as creator and sustainer of the world can overcome the ambivalence and ultimate inconsolability of a “natural” theology of creation. Calvin calls this natural “sense of Deity” – which he does see – “fleeting and vain”.<sup>8</sup> If we do not overrule the realistic experience of creation with “old style” metaphysics, we have to acknowledge that a power which merely sustains the universe – impressive as it is – is ultimately not worth being called “divine.” And the instantiation, the “whither” of this power is not worth being called “God.” For instance, I simply would not find it in me to adore Richard Swinburne’s omnipotent substance, which he obviously is able to equate with a simple omniscient and perfectly free personhood.<sup>9</sup> Confronted not only with the finitude of life, but also with the fact that life can only live at the expense of other life and that the co-creative power of the creatures is full of self-endangerment and destructive potentials, we have to ask for the saving and ennobling workings of the creative God in order to overcome the deep ambivalence just depicted.

“Saving and rescuing” creativity can in this case, as we easily see, not just mean repairs in the course of natural processes. To be sure, experiences of birth and healing, of forgiveness, reconciliation and peace mirror the depth of God’s creative care and guidance and lead to gratitude and joy, praise and glorification. But the haunting question remains whether God’s creativity can ultimately overcome the finitude and deep ambivalence of creaturely life itself. This question cannot be answered without addressing the difficult topics of eschatology, i.e., the resurrection and thus at least the dawn of new creation.

#### **IV. Divine Creativity in the Resurrection and the Spiritual Body of Christ**

The resurrected Jesus Christ is not the resuscitated pre-Easter Jesus of Nazareth. Although a few witnesses to the resurrection in Luke – and certainly all kinds of Christian fundamentalists and their agnostic critics

---

<sup>8</sup> *Institutio*, I,3,3.

<sup>9</sup> *Is There a God?*. 47 and often.

*Theology and Science: Theological Impulses for the Dialogue...*

– seem to confuse resurrection and resuscitation, the biblical insights with regard to this topic are clear. They report that in the encounter with the resurrected people pay him homage, they fall down in worship (*proskynesis*) before this theophany – and yet this revelation of God is mixed with doubt at the same time.<sup>10</sup> Jesus' resurrection is a reality which, on the one hand, has characteristics of something sensory, while on the other hand it retains the character of an appearance, even an apparition. The Emmaus story is especially revealing: the eyes of the disciples are kept from recognizing the resurrected one. Their eyes are opened through the ritual of the breaking of the bread. Then in the next verse it says: "And he vanished out of their sight." Instead of complaining about a spooky event, about just having seen a ghost, the disciples remember a second experience which had not seemed to be a revelation at first: "Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked to us on the road, while he opened to us the scriptures?" (Luke 24:30ff).

The witnesses recognize the resurrected one not only by his salutation, the breaking of the bread, the greeting of peace, the way he opens up the meaning of Scripture, and other signs, but also through his appearances in light. These clearly speak against any confusion of the resurrection with a physical resuscitation. A multitude of diverse experiences of encounter with Christ brings about the certainty that Christ is, remains and will be bodily present among us. In contrast, the stories of the empty tomb show that a single moment of revelation alone, even if it is a spectacular one involving heavenly messengers, is not in itself enough to cause belief. Instead, what remains after the empty tomb are fear, amazement and silence (Mark). Meanwhile, the belief that the corpse was stolen is disseminated, used for propaganda purposes, and becomes widespread (John and Matthew). According to Luke, the visions at the empty tomb are dismissed as "women's chatter."

The certainty that Christ has risen does not imply that he is present in the way the pre-Easter Jesus was present. In fact, *the complete fullness of his person and his life is now present* "in Spirit and in faith." This presence

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. for the following Hans-Joachim Eckstein and Michael Welker (eds.), *Die Wirklichkeit der Auferstehung*, Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2nd ed. 2004; Ted Peters, Robert Russell, Michael Welker (eds.), *Resurrection: Theological and Scientific Assessments*, Eerdmans: Grand Rapids 2002, esp. 31-85; John Polkinghorne, *The God of Hope and the End of the World*, Yale University Press: New Haven and London 2002, 66ff.

“in Spirit and faith” is hard to comprehend, not only for naturalistic and scientific thought, but also for Common sense which instead tends to fixate itself on the pros and cons of a physical resuscitation. In contrast, **the fullness of the person and life of Christ accentuates the community of witnesses in Spirit and faith for which the entirety of Jesus’ life, his charisma and his power are present and efficacious in the resurrected and exalted one.**

The presence of the resurrected one conveys the powers of love, forgiveness, healing, and his acceptance of children, the weak, the rejected, the sick, and those in misery. Furthermore, the struggle to confront the so-called “powers and principalities” begins to take shape in his presence, for example in conflict with political and religious institutions in the search for truth and demands for justice. The person and life of Jesus Christ brings about normative and cultural renewals and other creative impulses. The presence of the resurrected Christ is perceived among the witnesses in many signs – including small ones – signs of love, healing, forgiveness, devotion, acceptance and the passionate search for justice and truth. In this often inconspicuous way Christ and the kingdom of God are “coming.”

Apart from this emergent coming, for which we pray in the Lord’s Prayer, the biblical traditions also offer visions of the “final coming of the Son of Man”. They deal with so-called “end-time” eschatological visions, and these are necessarily visions, because the resurrected and exalted one will not come only in a specific year or to a specific area of the world. The resurrected and exalted one comes in all times and to all areas of the world. He will, as the Apostle’s Creed says, judge “the living and the dead.” This is a vision which necessarily transcends all natural and empirical conceptions. But it is this important and healing vision which opposes all explicit and implicit egoisms of particular cultures and eras. However, if we only have a vision of the Son of Man coming from the heavens with his angels, “we are of all people most to be pitied,” to echo Paul in 1 Cor 15. If we had only this vision in eschatology, the conversation between theology and science on eschatology would be over before it began. The reason for the fact that the talk of the “coming” Christ becomes transparent for immanent perception and realistically comforting is, first, that the one who is “coming” will not be revealed for the first time only at the end of all times and eras, but rather he is already among us now as the crucified and resurrected one; and, second, that the crucified and resurrected one is

*Theology and Science: Theological Impulses for the Dialogue...*

the one who, in the historical pre-Easter Jesus, has been revealed in his incarnational and kenotic nearness of his human life and work. For this reason we cannot separate the memory of the historical Jesus from the realization that the crucified and resurrected one is present and will “come again” in his full parousia. The creating and saving God is present here, surrounding and carrying us in his confirmation of life against the powers of sin and death. These powers are dramatically depicted at the cross of Christ.

At the cross of Christ, Jesus is condemned in the name of politics and in the name of religion. He is executed in the name of both the Jewish and the Roman law. Even public opinion is against him: “Then they cried out again ‘Crucify him!’” (Mark 15:13f. par.) Jews and Gentiles, Jews and Romans, natives and foreigners are all agreed. All principalities and powers work together, and all worldly “immune-systems” collapse. The reciprocal checks and balances among religion, politics, law and morality fail in the event of the cross. Conflicts between the occupiers and the occupied, the world superpower and an oppressed people are simply glossed over. Even the disciples betray Jesus, when they abandon him and flee, as the tradition of the Last Supper, the Gethsemane story and the “night of betrayal” only make all too clear.

The cross, as the biblical texts say, reveals “the world under the power of sin.” It reveals “the night of godforsakenness,” not only of Jesus himself – but of the whole world. The cross reveals the presence of this dire misery, not only in Jesus’ hour of death, but as a real and present danger in all times. The resurrection liberates from this night of godforsakenness. God’s activity alone, and not a human initiative, brings salvation. The true saving power and the vital necessity of the resurrection first become manifest against the background of the cross. That God and God alone brings salvation to humanity becomes recognizable in view of the harrowing possibility and reality that, despite the best intentions and the best systems, humanity alone is doomed. Even God’s “good law” – whose the impressive normative dynamics we discussed in the previous presentation – can become fully corrupted and be abused by humanity under the power of sin. Perversions of religion, law, politics, and public opinion then triumph. Therefore it is crucial to recognize that God has saved and saves humanity which is completely lost without God. The way in which God does so is also crucial: in a powerful yet emergent way without fanfare and drumbeats.

Impressive as the Isenheim altar-piece's portrayal of the resurrection may be, the witnesses to the resurrection in the biblical traditions describe the reality of God's salvific work in quite a different way.

## V. The Transformative Power of the Spiritual Body: Sustenance, Rescue, and Ennoblement Into Eternal Life

Although the experiences of the resurrected Christ both of the first witnesses and of contemporary witnesses do have the character of visions, memories and anticipatory imaginations, they are not mere mental or psychic phenomena. They respond to the self-presentation of the resurrected and elevated Christ in his post-Easterly body and they participate in his real life. The structured pluralism of the canonical witnesses, the structured pluralism of the ecumenical witnesses, the structured pluralism<sup>11</sup> of a multi-disciplinary theology and the structured pluralism in the families of Christian liturgies work time and again against illusionary productions of Jesus-images, wishful Jesus-morals and Jesus-ideologies.

It is the faithful realistic response to his presence and his word in truth- and justice-seeking communities which critiques and purifies the witness to Christ and to the workings of the Triune God and thus saves it from being confused with all sorts of self-made religiosity.

In order to do focus on this reality it is crucial to respect both continuity and discontinuity between the life and body of the pre-Easter Jesus, of the resurrected and exalted Jesus Christ and Christ as the ultimate Judge and Saviour of the world in his parousia. John Polkinghorne has rightly stressed the general eschatological relevance of this perspective: "In so far as present human imagination can articulate eschatological expectation, it has to do so within the tension between continuity and discontinuity. There must be sufficient continuity to ensure that individuals truly share in the life to come as their resurrected selves and not as new beings simply given the old names. There must be sufficient discontinuity to ensure that the life to come is free from the suffering and mortality of the old creation."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> It is crucial to differentiate a context-sensitive multi-systemic pluralism from a mere "plurality" of individuals, groups and their various goals and opinions. The first constellation challenges us to understand a complex structure and circulation of power; the second presents just a soft relativism.

<sup>12</sup> The God of Hope and the End of the World, 149.

*Theology and Science: Theological Impulses for the Dialogue...*

The amazing continuity between the pre-Easter and the post-Easter body of Christ and also of the Christian witnesses as the members of his body is described by Paul with the imagery of the seed and the full-grown plant (1. Cor. 15:36-38.44). Yet this amazing continuity is correlated with almost frightening discontinuities: “the *dying* of the seed and an act of (*new*, M.W.) *creation* by God (15:38). Our whole perishable person will be transformed (*metaschematizo*, Phil 3:21) into a new and imperishable heavenly personality that will be qualitatively different from our first. It will be – thank God – much better!”<sup>13</sup>

Both continuity and discontinuity are expressed in the term “**spiritual body**.” Since Paul differentiates between “*flesh*”, (*sarx*, as perishable matter) and “*body*” (*soma*, as matter shaped by mind and Spirit into a living spiritual existence bearing information and giving information), he can perceive continuity and discontinuity in the following way: the body as flesh and as dominated by non-divine powers will decay and die; the body as the spiritual body will be recreated by God’s grace in the resurrection.<sup>14</sup> Although “*flesh*” is definitely doomed to decay and to death, it is full of energies and logics of self-sustenance and of self-perpetuation. However, since these energies fall short of aiming at the existence of the “*spiritual body*,” they are bound to “*sin and death*.”

There would be no substantial hope for our lives if there was not a continuity between our bodily existence on earth – undeniably also shaped by the flesh – and our spiritual body, shaped by the powers of faith, love and hope. Paul challenged the Corinthians who wanted to connect Christ and the soul here and in eternity, but wanted to leave room for any behaviour in terms of sex and food since the earthly body would die in any case. “In Paul’s holistic perspective ... the reality of salvation is not *another* reality apart from the outer everyday life, not just a religious reality for the *inner* life of a person. It grasps and embraces the whole of human existence, the entire personality ... For exactly this reason, Paul talks about ‘resurrection’ and not of such things as ‘spiritual immortality’ and ‘ascending souls.’”<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Peter Lampe, Paul’s Concept of a Spiritual Body, in: The Resurrection: Theological and Scientific Assessments, 103-114, 108.

<sup>14</sup> It is most important not to associate “*flesh*” with an understanding of matter in a Newtonian sense as “solid, massy, hard, impenetrable, moveable particles.” The notion of “*flesh*” is not to be confused with “*material stuff*” without any information.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Lampe, 104f.

Connected with this anthropological realism is an eschatological realism which sees all possible perspectives on creation already in the light of the new creation. This eschatological realism affirms that the creative God is not a mere sustainer of the world, since this world is full of ambiguity and despair because of creaturely co-creative freedom and its potentials to misuse; it is full of ambiguity and despair because of the inert brutality and finitude of life in the flesh. The mere affirmation that the Triune God opens much richer perspectives for creation than its continuation until a timely or untimely death is not strong enough to sustain a viable faith and hope towards our eternal existence in a spiritual body. According to Paul, it is rather the presence of the resurrected Christ – in continuity and discontinuity with his pre-Easter life and body and the rich spiritual orientation and information given with this presence – which opens up a totally new perspective. Those who live in Christ as members of his body are transformed into his likeness and are preserved towards the eternal life of God.

It is not only the life of the believers and followers of Christ which gains a salvific perspective through its participation in Christ's spiritual body. In the celebration of the Holy Communion / the Eucharist the "elements" bread and wine also participate in the edification of the spiritual body. These gifts of creation (not just gifts of nature, but gifts of the interaction between nature and culture and thus already richly blessed by the working of the Holy Spirit!)<sup>16</sup> become gifts of the "new creation." Bread and wine do not only symbolically edify the natural bodies of the community assembled. As "bread and wine from Heaven," as the body and blood of Christ they edify the members of the body of Christ, the members of the "new Creation," the bearers of the fruits and gifts of the Holy Spirit. Here the continuity between creation and new creation, between creation old and new becomes palpably present in the middle of the overwhelming discontinuity. It is the "spiritual information"<sup>17</sup> – to call it thus in search of a more appropriate term – which operates on the material fleshly bodies and minds through the presence of Christ in word and sacrament, causing

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Michael Welker, *What Happens in Holy Communion?*, Eerdmans: Grand Rapids 2000.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. John Polkinghorne, *Faith, Science and Understanding*, SPCK: London 2000, 96f; 123ff; *idem.*, *Science and the Trinity: The Christian Encounter with Reality*, SPCK: London 2004, 82ff.

*Theology and Science: Theological Impulses for the Dialogue...*

sometimes dramatic, but mostly only very calm emergent transformations. It remains to be discussed whether this process can mirror analogies in non-religious and even scientific areas of exploration and interest. With the help of “new style” metaphysics we should try to explore such analogies in the interactions between God, earthly and fleshly creatures, and spiritual orientation.

**VI. Eschatological Reality Mirrored in Bottom-Up Experience**

In this respect, the realistic anthropology of Paul, which we discussed in the fourth presentation, can provide some clues, when we look at his description of the activities of the spirit. From both theological as well as anthropological perspectives, the Spirit enables a co-presence, contact and even interaction with those who are absent, respectively a presence in absence. Through his Spirit, the invisible God communicates with the human spirit and imparts to it creative impulses. But the communicative power of the spirit can also be vindicated in an anthropological bottom-up approach. According to Paul, even those who are absent can have authentic contact with others “in the spirit”, despite their different locations in space and time. By remembering his own visits, his teaching and preaching, and through his petitions before God, but also through the letters and messages of others, Paul is present to the community “in the spirit”. This presence is not merely a figment of his imagination.

Paul sees himself becoming “spiritually” present in the community. In 1 Cor 5 he describes this process of spiritual communication and co-action: “For though absent in body, I am present in spirit; and as if present I have already pronounced judgement in the name of the Lord Jesus ... When you are assembled, ... my spirit is present with the power of our Lord Jesus ...” (1 Cor 5:3–4). One does not need to make reference to the “Holy Spirit” in order to understand the spiritual process of communication between Paul and the Corinthians. We can explain basic functions of the human spirit without direct reference to theological realms.

Memory and imagination are not just “mental constructs” in the “inner subjectivity” which somehow happen to connect and intersect with each other, thus allowing common understanding, consensus and the guided common search for truth. As instances which support individual certainty,

communal consensus and the oriented progress of truth-seeking communities<sup>18</sup> they certainly do have “points of reference” in natural space-time and the matter correlated with it. But in the mediation from empirical experience to shared forms of memory<sup>19</sup> and sustainable common imagination there is a “spiritual loadedness” of the experienced material reality and a transfiguration of it, which will have to be unfolded in future cooperation in the discourse between the humanities and the sciences in general and the theology and science discourse in particular.

In secular terms, this transformation and the mental and bodily participation in it has been beautifully expressed by Wordsworth in his romantic poem “The Daffodils”:

*“Ten thousand saw I at a glance,  
Tossing their heads in sprightly dance ...  
I gazed – and gazed – but little thought  
What wealth the show to me had brought:  
For oft, when on my couch I lie  
In vacant or in pensive mood,  
They flash upon that inward eye  
Which is the bliss of solitude;  
And then my heart with pleasure fills,  
And dances with the daffodils.”*

Wordsworth celebrates the revelatory and life-enhancing power of a specific event in nature, transformed into a “spiritual information”. This spiritual information in memory and imagination has an effect on his mind and his bodily emotions via the heart. Through the poem he passes this spiritual information on. Analogous imaginations can thus be created, and other memories of spring can appear before the “inward eye”, seemingly *ex nihilo*, “out of nothing”. The spiritual information inherent in them enables the memories and imaginations to “eternally” generate joy. Impressive as these events are – they are just a plausibilizing footnote to the impact of the spiritual body of Christ which transforms world and creation.

<sup>18</sup> The texture of truth-seeking communities is described in the last chapter of Polkinghorne and Welker, *Faith in the Living God*.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*, Beck: München 1992; Assmann, *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis*, Beck: München 2000; Michael Welker, *Kommunikatives, kollektives, kulturelles und kanonisches Gedächtnis*, *JBTh* 22 (2007), *Die Macht der Erinnerung*, Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2008, 321-331.

**Ioan Tulcan<sup>1</sup>**

## **The Dogma of the Holy Trinity and its Missionary Implications**

### **Abstract**

*The author shows that the Holy Trinity is not only the heart or the centre of the Orthodox Theology but also the fire core of the Christian mission which shows the way the Church has to lead in order to communicate the gifts and the blessings of the Holy Trinity to the people. Orthodoxy sees the mystery of the Holy Trinity as being closely related to the mystery of man and to his daily and eternal needs. This synergy is done by the Church during its ceremonies, especially during the Holy Liturgy, which all celebrate the mystery of the Holy Trinity in its redeeming work or economy. The almighty power which gives life to the Church in its missionary activity is the power of the Holy Spirit. An essential characteristic of its mission is to be pneumatological, that is, to be sustained by the Holy Spirit, as Spirit of the Son through which we can call God our Father. The Holy Spirit That comes from the Father and rests inside the Son and shines through Him, comes into our hearts and lifts us at the height of the loving relations between the Persons of the Holy Trinity, through the mission of the Church.*

### **Keywords**

*Holy Trinity, Dogmatic Theology, the Mission of the Church*

### **1. General considerations**

The Church's dogmas are those truths revealed by God and formulated by the Church, preached to the believers for their salvation. Therefore, the dogmas' mission is to mediate the personal salvation of people into the Church, by the Holy Spirit. The dogmas must be transmitted, communicated,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ph D., „Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad, [tulcanioan@yahoo.com](mailto:tulcanioan@yahoo.com).

explained and defended by the Church's ministers to achieve this saving purpose. So, their fundamental purpose is to have a missionary purpose. Preaching dogmas means opening the profound meanings of the revealed truths, gathering people to be part of the loving communion of the Holy Trinity. In this way, the Holy Trinity represents the dogmas' heart and the Church's meaning and mission in the world. Even more, the Church itself is the Holy Trinity's sanctuary and its work, its thought and its feeling is organized by the Holy Trinity so that we can get to know the Son and thus become beloved sons of the Father through the Son.

Therefore, the Church becomes the divine environment where the saving grace operates, where salvation is shared, where the renewed human nature<sup>2</sup> expresses itself through the personal experiences, which thus become renewed themselves. These trinitarian structures, present in the sacred mysteries, in the creed, in the Church's theology itself, are inseparable from the reality of the trinitarian dogma. This life in communion with the Holy Trinity, this participation to the Trinity, this distinction and this reciprocity within the unity, is neither a dream nor a men's achievement, but is a gift that God wants to give.<sup>2</sup> The Holy Trinity is the basis for the whole life and the Church's pastoral-missionary activity. Therefore, the Christian mission starts with the Holy Trinity's eternal communion of love and salvation. The Church's mission is a real contribution to the Son's and the Holy Spirit's mission in the world, (John 20, 21-23; John 14, 26), which, in turn, are an expression of the Holy Trinity's life in communion, making humanity part of this communion. The Church - The Body of Christ - animated by the Holy Spirit, is in a permanent mission. This mission has a soteriological dimension and mediates the Holy Trinity's life in the world, through the power of the Holy Spirit. "As the willful and saving work of God, the Christian mission is the activity which unites God's work and man's work, according to each man's potency, and also is an activity used by God in order to awake, save and perfect the fallen man through Jesus Christ."<sup>3</sup> The

<sup>2</sup> Bosis Bobrinsky, *Taina Preasfintei Treimi*, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune a Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 2005, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Valer Bel, *Misiune, parohie, pastorație*, Editura Renașterea, Cluj-Napoca, 2002, p. 6; Ioan Tulcan, *Accente ale misiunii ortodoxe în contextul unificării europene*, în „Teologia”, VIII, nr. 4/2004, p. 45: "The Christian activity, as preaching the Gospel to all nations, (cf. Matthew 28, 19-20; Mark 16, 15-16) shows a dynamic relationship of God with the whole world. We see this open, intense and personal relationship in the Old Testament, where it is revealed God's very strong interest for the the chosen nation, than He guides, promises, blames but saving him eventually".

*The Dogma of the Holy Trinity...*

heart of the Christian mission is interfering with the Holy Trinity's love life and communion." Orthodoxy breathes spiritually according to the never-ending call 'Kyrie eleison' ("Lord, have mercy") and to the doxology: 'Glory to the Father and Son and the Holy Spirit, now and forever...' For the Orthodoxy, the Holy Trinity is the first and the last mystery of the unity in diversity and communion in freedom."<sup>4</sup>

In the following, we will refer in particular to the the Holy Trinity's coordinates, as an embracing dogma of the Church trying to show the way in which these aspects of the Holy Trinity influence the missionary work of the Church in the world.

## **2. The mystery of the Holy Trinity as a communion and inter community of Persons- base and inspiration for the Church's mission**

According to the divine revelation, God exists as a Trinity of perfect and eternal Persons, connected by a permanent movement of love which moves them towards each other and highlights each other in a complete reciprocity. As a personal Trinity, God is an inexhaustible source of love which confirms their eternal love, love that sustains life and love in the world. Actually we can speak about a dynamic of the Trinitarian love and life which also reflects in the Church's life and activity.

This activity makes possible the man's salvation and glorification in order to reach the Holy Trinity's life of community. That is why, "The Trinity reveals itself essentially in the act of salvation and so the Trinity is the base of salvation".<sup>5</sup> We cannot understand anything from the Gospel's richness, from the existence of the creation and of the world, without the Holy Trinity. Only the Trinity's dogma, as the Christianity's truth, explains everything that there is. The living God is "a Trinity of Persons who have everything in common, without getting confused between them. This involves a perfect love because love demands a complete unity

<sup>4</sup> † Daniel, Patriarhul Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, *Comori ale Ortodoxiei*, Trinitas, Iași, 2007, p. 25.

<sup>5</sup> Dumitru Stăniloae, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (TDO)*, București, 1978, vol. I, p. 285." It is impossible for a unipersonal God to own love and eternal communion and share it with us. He would not embody but he would give us some rules to live properly or, if he would embody, he wouldn't have, as a man, a relationship with God, as with a special person" (*Ibidem*, p. 287).

and reciprocity of the persons who love each other. Here the absolute is tripersonal, not something impersonal.”<sup>6</sup>

We know by Revelation that God is a Trinity of Persons and so we understand He is the one who represents complete life and love and who inclines to spread this life of love and communion outside/all around Him.

The Trinitarian theology explains the Church's mission. Thus, the Church's mission is grounded on the Holy Trinity's communion of life and love, on the dynamic of the Father's love for the Son and the Son's love for the Father, in the fullness of love and communion of the Holy Spirit. Saint John says: “and life has been shown and I have seen it and we confess and we proclaim the eternal life, that has been at the Father and has been shown to us. We proclaim what we have seen and what we have heard so that you can also share it with us. And our sharing is with the Father and His Son, Jesus Christ” (I John 1, 2-3). The Church's mission is to share this divine triple bright life, which embraces all the Church's members wishing to embrace the whole world. The Orthodoxy's mission in the world is sharing this life in communion. The expression of this life in communion in the world is the Holy Trinity. There is a strong contact between the Holy trinity's life in communion and the humanity's life. ”The humans' unity and their individual distinction are the nearest expression of the Holy Trinity.

Of course, we need more than this effort in order to understand the Holy Trinity, known through the revelation, and the realization of the unity between us. We definitely need the Holy Trinity's power and help to make the unity strong.”<sup>7</sup>

So the power of the Holy Trinity determines the believers to imitate the Trinity's life and love; also it makes them get closer to the unspeakable beauty of the Holy Trinity, by prayer and faith. This can happen because there is a strong connection between the mutual abnegation of the Holy Trinity's Persons and people, who are made in the Trinity's image, as the Church says: ”I am the icon of your unspeakable glory even though I bear the wounds of my sins.” (Saint John Damascene's hymns, said at the funeral service)

This is the only way that the possibility of communication and communion between the holy triple divinity and man as a carrier of the eternal icon of God can be explained. “Each Person of the Holy Trinity, revealing itself in the world and working among people, shows a perfect

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 81.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 289.

*The Dogma of the Holy Trinity...*

unity to the other two Persons through the being and the perfect love for them. But at the same time, it brings, from the one it has for the other Persons, its love to the people...we are asked to improve the love for others and for God, through the uncreated divine virtues.”<sup>8</sup> The missionary activity of the Church develops man's communication with God, Christ's life in each part of His Body and anticipates the joy and the love of the Holy Trinity's kingdom. Therefore, the Church's activity improves the Holy Trinity's love and dedication in each man who carries Jesus Christ's life.

### **3. The unity and the diversity of the holy Trinity Persons - source of attraction and configuration of the Church's mission.**

There is only one God even though there is an otherness in the mystery of God revealed. Saint John Damascus says that the Divinity, that mind can not comprehend, is one, eternal, without beginning. “There is one not two, Trinity and not crowd, because there is a real unity within the Trinity; It's a Trinity not some entities who can be separated. There is just one Divinity who exists as a unity and stands forever.”<sup>9</sup>

There is a movement of the Trinity's Persons but they never leave their unity; The Unity within the Trinity and the Trinity within the unity express the living and loving God's way of existence. “The *ad intra* movement within the Trinity means that the Father is the One who gives the origin and being to the Son and the Holy Spirit through eternal birth and procession. The *ad extra* movement of the Trinity means the creation, the providence, the saving and the perfection of the world to deify itself. Therefore, in God there are two movements. The first movement refers to the inner mystery of the Trinity and the second refers to the overflow of the Trinitarian love.”<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 291. Saint John Damascene says about the the Holy Trinity's Persons: Everything the Son and the Holy Spirit have, also belongs to the Father; the existing itself. There is no Son and Spirit without the Father. If the Father doesn't own anything, the Son and the Spirit also don't have anything. Because there is the Father, there is the Son and the Spirit.Thanks to the Father, the Son and The Spirit have everything that Faher have but borning and proceeding.” (*Dogmatica*, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 2005, p. 33).

<sup>9</sup> Saint Maximus the Confessor, *Ambigua*, Trad. rom. de Pr. prof. dr. Dumitru Stniloae, București, 1983, PSB, vol. 80, p. 46, apud Mihai Himcinschi, *Doctrina trinitara ca fundament misionar*, Editura Reintregirea, Alba Iulia, 2004, p. 50.

<sup>10</sup> Mihai Himcinschi, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

Both the unity and the trinity in God can only be explained and understood as a movement of the eternal personal love.

“If the love belongs to God, it means that the reciprocal love must also have a being-like basis even though the positions that the Persons occupy remain unchanged. Within God there must be the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Persons do not change these places between them.<sup>11</sup> The Persons of the Holy Trinity are in a perfect unity and their unity does not exclude their diversity. Within the Trinity there has always been a movement of eternal love which does not cancel their personal distinction, but rather, their Trinity is confirmed by Their unity or Their communion. As we approach to the Holy Trinity’s mystery, we must see ”the divine being as a relationship within the unity. Neither the unity nor the relationship must be overlooked in favor of the other even though the Holy Trinity is beyond our understanding about the unity and the relationship.”<sup>12</sup>

In the Church – as Christ’s Unitarian Body-there is a spiritual movement between the members of this body, that urges people to pray for each other, to teach each other and to glorify the Holy Trinity as the one who is our Salvation.

The Church’s mission is modeled after the unity and diversity of the Holy Trinity which carries the ray of understanding and communion to all that have received the gift of rebirth to a new life in Christ starting with the Holy Baptism. In this way, the Christian movement, as a means of transmitting the teachings of Christ’s Scripture, and of God’s Himself, is configured after the model unity-relation that exists within the Holy Trinity.

#### **4. The Son’s role in understanding the Divinity Sun and its missionary consequences**

The Holy Trinity’s Persons are in a mutual transparence. The fathers of the Church are very convinced about the three over bright and over transparent Suns who are included in each other and they mutually highlighted. The Holy scripture says that the Son reveals the Father: “That Who has seen me, has seen the Father. Why are you asking me to show you the Father? Don’t you believe that I’m within the Father and the Father is within me?” (John, 14, 9-10) “the Father, or the Sun, as a paternal sustenance of the

<sup>11</sup> Dumitru Stăniloae, *op. cit.*, p. 297.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem.*

*The Dogma of the Holy Trinity...*

eternal light, makes the Son appear in Him as a filial Son, he includes Him and shows Himself brighter through Him.”<sup>13</sup>

The incarnate Son of God knew that he was not only revealing the Father, proposing people to listen to Him, but he felt as a Human that He could talk to Him in the most important moment of this messianic activity, as He did in the Gethsemane Garden when He asked the Father: “Father, if there is any possibility, please take away from Me this glass..” The most important thing that the Son felt was the entire submission because “He listened to His Father till the death... (cf. Philippians 2, 8); “The One who sent me wants not to lose anyone He gave me, but to rise them in the last day” (John 6, 39). “I came down from Heaven to do what the Father wanted me to do, not what I wanted” (John 6, 39).

“The hierarchical prayer from the 17<sup>th</sup> chapter of the John’s Gospel is the climax of the revelation of the mystery between the Father and the Son. This Prayer exceeds the time before Christ’s passions. Jesus’ prayer is more than a mediation, is a balance, a thank prayer, a resolution.”<sup>14</sup>

The Church’s mission draws people’s attention to the one who sent it in the world, and this person is Jesus Christ, the Church’s head. Having its eyes and thought set towards Jesus Christ, the Church proposes to everyone a model according to which each member of the Church must configure their personal existence. In its preaching work the church always discovers new meanings for the life of Jesus Christ and his teachings through which it always comes with new answers to the problems people have, in every historical period. God’s will and its fulfillment in the world is assimilated to the eternal Kingdom of the Trinity which is possible as an earthly reality, in order to discover this kingdom at the Parousia, if we fulfill God’s will. The Holy Spirit is the one who animates and guides the Church in its missionary activity for each generation of believers.

## **5. The Holy Spirit’s role in updating the salvation by Christ, in the Church.**

The Church can’t exist without the Holy Spirit, without His divine virtues; the Holy Spirit is the one who succeeds from the Father and rests in the

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 294.

<sup>14</sup> Boris Bobrinskoy, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

Son.<sup>15</sup> The incarnate Son of God, sits at the Father's right in a perfect communion of the Trinity; He emits the grace which illuminates and sanctifies the human's lives and the whole world.<sup>16</sup>

"The Holy Spirit belongs to the Church. This is another feature of Him. So, we can not mention the grace without the Church but within the Church. The Church continues the Holy Spirit's activity; the grace works only in the Church."<sup>17</sup> The grace's activity in the Church shows that it's absolutely necessary for our salvation, which is not solely the work of man himself, but of man through the sanctifying and saving grace, that is, through synergy. That is why, everything that the Church does in order to ensure people's salvation is closely related to the grace of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, we receive the communion with Christ through grace; His deified humanity spreads the Holy Spirit's saving virtues.

## Conclusions

1. The strong connection between the Holy Trinity's dogma and the Church's mission expresses the living reality of the Christian mission's base and purpose.

2. Therefore, the Church's mission is animated and guided by the Holy Trinity's life of love and communion; this mission of the Church reveals the divine promises, to the people.

3. The Holy Trinity is the heart of the Christian mission; it shows us the way that must be followed by the Church, in order to share to the people the Holy Trinity's gifts and blessings.

4. The orthodoxy considers the Holy Trinity to be strong related to the human's mystery and to his temporary and eternal needs. The Church

<sup>15</sup> For a better understanding read Mihai Hincinschi, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

<sup>16</sup> The Anthifons highlight that the Holy spirit is the source of love, wisdom, goodness etc. „In the Holy Spirit we can find the whole holiness and wisdom, which holds every creature...” (Glory...now..., Anthifon II, sound 3) Every soul lives by the Holy Spirit, rises with purity, lights himself by holiness” (Glory... now..., Anthifon I, sound 4); „The Holy Spirit springs the grace's sources that waters the creature for the life's fortification.” (Glory...now.. Anthifon II, source 4). „Everything lives by the Holy Spirit; because God is above all, Master of all, unapproachable light, everyone's Life”. (Glory...now..., Anthifon I, sound 7).

<sup>17</sup> Dumitru Stăniloae, *op. cit.*, p. 310.

*The Dogma of the Holy Trinity...*

realizes this synergy by its religious services, the Holy Liturgy especially, because all these celebrate the Holy Trinity's mystery in her saving activity.

5. The incarnate Son of God made Himself accessible to the people by his humanity. He came in the world as the Father sent Him: "As the Father sent Me..." (cf. John, 20, 21-23). So, Jesus Christ is the Father's Missionary for our saving.

6. Jesus Christ sent the disciples to preach the gospel and call the people to the repentance, to their saving, so they can become citizens of God's Kingdom.

7. The Holy Spirit is the power that animates the Church's missionary activity; he proceeds from the Father and rests in the Son and He comes in our hearts and raises us to the loving relationship between the Holy Trinity's Persons.

8. Therefore, the Holy Trinity is shared to the people by the Gospel and the Holy sacraments, extending the Holy Trinity's love and life in the world; so the humanity can reach the Holy Trinity's Kingdom, according to its progress toward a new, holy and perfect humanity.

Svetoslav Ribolov<sup>1</sup>

## Understanding of Divine Inspiration (Insights from the Modern Orthodox Theological Thought)

### Abstract

*The Eastern Orthodox conception of Divine inspiration is not a Dogma but, during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, is still a subject of discussions. The attempts of formulating position on this subject are a result of the Western debates after the Reformation. We can notice two tendencies in the Eastern Orthodox Theology related to the theme in question. The first one can be characterized as a borrowing and modification of the positions of Roman Catholics and Protestants. The second one is concentrated on the understanding of Chalcedonian formula (451) of the relation between the human and the divine nature of Christ; it tries to apply this relation in the understanding of the process of synergy between divine inspiration and the authors' approach of the scriptural writers.*

### Keywords

*Divine inspiration, Revelation, dogmas, Scripture, tradition*

The subject in question has a clear dogmatic character and, to some extent, is not of a central interest for the entire theological thoughts until the Reformation. An overview of this subject needs a complex approach which involves different aspects of the Christian teaching. One can not isolate it from the other components of the whole mystical experience in the Christian history of sanctity. However it is a problematic topic for the Roman Catholics and the Eastern Orthodox theologians.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D., "St. Clement of Ochrid" University of Sofia, [icxcnika@mail.bg](mailto:icxcnika@mail.bg).

### *Understanding of Divine Inspiration...*

Since 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> century the Eastern Orthodox world starts with a practice of composing compendiums of texts explaining the basic dogmas of the Church after the pattern of the Roman Catholic catechetical books. In all these catechetical compendiums the question about the Revelation is explained in a very simple and clear scheme coming from the scholastic methodology. There is a Revelation which is divided into natural and supernatural one. The natural one is a subject of the Christian philosophy and the supernatural is subject of the very theology. The supernatural is divided into Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition. Both of them are equal sources of Divine inspiration. But then raises a reasonable question. If this scheme is borrowed from the Western theology, what is the Eastern Orthodox position on this subject?

#### **1. A Western Debate**

The scheme in question is product of an unknown for the Eastern Christians debate between Reformism and Contra-Reformism in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Then the early Protestants refused the authority of the Roman Church and even gave up the idea for a centralized church hierarchy. As a reaction to the Luther's Reformation the Pope called for a council in Trent between 1545 and 1563. There under a very active discussion is one of the six postulates, raised from Martin Luther against the authority of the Roman Pope as a "Head of the Church" and against the Tradition as a basic principle of his ancient authority. It is the Luther's postulate *Sola Scriptura*. It means: the Scripture as only criterion of the faith, which is interpreted in itself and through itself.

As an opposition of this postulate the Roman Catholics for the first time in the history of Christianity postulated as a Dogma that there are two equal sources of Divine Revelation. These are the Holy Scripture (*Sacra Scriptura*) from one side and the Holy Tradition (*Sacra Traditio*), from the other. It is quite intriguing that an opposition of this kind can not be found anywhere in the earlier church literature. According to this opposition the Holy Scripture is the Old Testament history of the Jewish people and the recorded by the Apostles preaching of Jesus Christ and the Holy Tradition are the unrecorded words of Christ transferred down through the generations of His disciples with the help of the Holy Spirit until the end

of this world.<sup>2</sup> In the Roman Catholic Catechesis published in 1997 this scheme is further systematized. In the so called apostolic tradition we find an unwritten and a written tradition. The former is transferred in an unwritten form in the Church and the latter are the different documents of councils, the writings of the Fathers, liturgical texts, etc.<sup>3</sup>

The same methodology we find in all the Eastern Orthodox Catecheses until the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. But this separation (even just methodological) of the Scripture from its context, from the whole Christian tradition, provoked a specific self-reflection in the last few centuries among all the Christian denominations. It made us not to search our Christian identity as part of a long term historical road, since the very beginning of this world till the end of time (in an eschatological perspective), as part of an ecclesiastical body, which brings in itself the cultivating agents of historical experience of the Community. But it made us to exercise our religious experience in the very close area of a few texts or a few kind of social activities that would content the mystery of Salvation.

It is quite characteristic that this kind of self-reflection of modern Christians is inclined to see the eschatological character of our faith just as a remembrance of the New Testament events. It is a very specific tendency especially in the Protestant world but we can find it also in the other denominations.<sup>4</sup> We can call this process of forgetting the eschatological character of Christianity as “counter-perspective eschatology”. Object of this kind of eschatology is only the Scripture and naturally we start forgetting the whole historical experience of our Church, which tensely expects the Second Coming of Christ and enjoys it in its’ mystical life. In this way the Christian faith from existentiality, from a holistic feeling of recovery of the whole created being, becomes a dry and moralistic confidence in a group of texts which give us patterns of moral behavior. We start repeat the vivid words of the Apostles as sacred formulas usually out of their real meaning and context.

---

<sup>2</sup> It might be interesting that in a similar way one can interpret the definition of Tradition, which St. Basil puts in *De Spirito Sancto* and his *Canon 91*.

<sup>3</sup> Follows the documents of Vatican council II: *Acta Apostolicae sedis*, Vol. 58, p. 820 sq.

<sup>4</sup> See N. Ματσούκα, «Ἐκκλησία καὶ Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ: Ἱστορία καὶ Ἐσχατολογία». In Π. Καλαϊτζίδης (ἑκδ.), *Ἐκκλησία καὶ Ἐσχατολογία*, Ἀθήνα: «Ἰνδικτος», 2003, 63 sq.

### *Understanding of Divine Inspiration...*

But there is another tension following the Trends' debates. We can also find it in the Orthodox theology of the last a few centuries. We, the orthodox Christians, start thinking the Holy Tradition in another extreme way. We start concerning it as a compendium of documents to which we apply the same characteristics like to the Holy Scripture. It becomes something as a "second scripture". But why we never call it "Second Scripture"?<sup>5</sup>

We can find the main reason for developing such a schematic view of the Divine Revelation in adoption of the idea of a verbal Divine inspiration. I am inclined to think that for the Roman Catholics this kind of position is just a result of influence of the Protestant theology. It is adopted by the Roman Catholics during their disputes with the Reformism. For the Orthodox theologians until the 20<sup>th</sup> century it is just a possible solution of the question, adopted under the influence of the developments in the West. For the Protestants however their position of the verbal inspiration is of essential significance. It is a logical consequence of the specific position of Martin Luther about the ancestors' sin and the human nature generally. In the tendency in question the Holy Scripture is observed as a result of the work of sacred authors who were under the extraordinary inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It is somehow autonomous from the history and respectively – form the common tradition of the Church. These sacred writers under this extraordinary inspiration wrote the canonical books of the Bible. These books have to be a sure guide of the Church that has to originate latter.<sup>6</sup>

The roots of this conception are to be found deep in the Luther's interpretation of the Augustinians' anthropology. According to Martin Luther the man has fully lost his abilities to strive for good here on the earth and to seek the supreme God, i.e. God, because of the fall of our ancestors. For doing good the man needs an extraordinary help from above. He is not able to do it alone.

According to Luther there are not any human deeds that deserve the God's mercy. That's why the man is saving and justifying himself through faith – *sola fide*. The faith is a God's gift for good deeds. After the same principle the man is impossible to write-down something true for God, if he is not greatly excited by the Holy Spirit.<sup>7</sup> In this condition the sacred

<sup>5</sup> See Vl. Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God*, New York: SVS Press, 1985, 142.

<sup>6</sup> N. Ματσούκα, *Δογματική και Συμβολική Θεολογία, Α'*, 187.

<sup>7</sup> See M. Lutheri Quaestio de viribus et voluntate hominis sine gratia, cum Fragmento Lectionum Lutheri. 1516. In *D. Martini Lutheri Opera Latina. Varii argumenti ad Reformationis historiam*. Vol. I, Frankfurt ad M. 1865, 232-254.

writers are driven on to record the sacred text. So we see how the so called “mechanic theory” originated. This theory makes us to think until now that the difference between the numbers of the books in the Scripture according the different Christian denominations is a very basic theological problem. But the fact is that in the actual ecclesiastical reality it is not a problem.

Although the Roman Catholics do not share the anthropological views of Martin Luther, on the council of Trent under the pressure of Reformism they declare the verbal Divine inspiration of the Holy Scripture with the statement that the sacred writers were writing-down the sacred texts “under the dictation of the Holy Spirit” (*Spiritu Sancto dictante*).<sup>8</sup>

It is quite curious to find out but the Roman Catholic theologians latter realized that this kind of conception of the Divine inspiration is not compatible with the whole catholic doctrine and on the Vatican council I (1870) they substitute the word “dictation” with a much more mild *inspiratio* (inspiration). The same one can see in the documents of the Vatican council II.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See *Concilium Tridentinum*. Sessio IV, 8 apr. 1546, [Decretum de Canonicis scripturis]: Sacrosancta oecumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata praesidentibus in ea eisdem tribus Apostolicae Sedis legatis hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens ut sublatis erroribus puritas ipsa Evangelii in Ecclesia conservetur quod promissum ante per prophetas in scripturis sanctis Dominus noster Iesus Christus Dei filius proprio ore primum promulgavit deinde per suos apostolos tamquam fontem omnis et salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinae omni creaturae praedicari iussit perspiciens quae hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus quae ab ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptae aut ab ipsis apostolis *Spiritu Sancto dictante* quasi per manus traditae ad nos usque pervenerunt orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta omnes libros tam veteris quam novi testamenti cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor nec non traditiones ipsas tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes tamquam vel oretenus a Christo vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et venerator.

<sup>9</sup> See *Concilium Vaticanum II*. Constitutio dogmatica de Divina Revelatione Dei Verbum, c. II, De Divinae Revelationis transmissione. In *Acta Apostolicae sedis*, vol. 58 (1966), 820-21: Quae Deus ad salutem cunctarum gentium revelaverat, eadem benignissime disposuit ut in aevum integra permanerent omnibusque generationibus transmitterentur. Ideo Christus Dominus, in quo summi Dei tota revelatio consummatur (cf. 2 Cor. 1,20 et 3,16 - 4,6), mandatum dedit Apostolis ut Evangelium, quod promissum ante per Prophetas Ipse adimplevit et proprio ore promulgavit, tamquam fontem omnis et salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinae omnibus praedicarent, [8] eis dona divina communicantes. Quod quidem fideliter factum est, tum ab Apostolis, qui in praedicatione orali, exemplis et institutionibus ea tradiderunt quae sive ex ore,

*Understanding of Divine Inspiration...*

In 1882 cardinal Francelin offers a conception according which the Holy Bible is composed under the immediate extraordinary impact of the Holy Spirit. The concrete words in the Scripture are selected by the sacred authors with the help of the Holy Spirit.<sup>10</sup>

In the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the Roman Catholic theologian Fr. J.-M. Lagrange attempts to make a difference between Revelation and Divine inspiration. He says that if in the Revelation in front of the human beings are revealed new statements about God, about the faith and the life, the Divine inspiration is a form of impact on the will and the reason of the sacred writer. He is stimulated by the Holy Spirit to choose for reflection some words or facts. The Prophet or the Apostle writes as a common writer but permanently guided by the Gods' Spirit.<sup>11</sup>

This theory has an enough good success until the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. After the World War II popular is the theory of Karel Rahner. He attempts to connect the question of the Divine inspiration with the ecclesiology and the question of the Canon of the Scripture. Rahner however did not escape from the understanding of conception of "Divine impulse" in the process of inspiration. According to him this "impulse builds the Church and reaches to the consciousness of the sacred author."<sup>12</sup> But he, as we see, makes a step back towards an extraordinary intervention of the Holy Spirit on the writer, i.e. as an autonomous event somehow expelled from the life of the Church inside of the historical time.

In the documents of the Vatican council II (1962-1965) the participants of the dioceses of the Roman Church recorded a definition about the Divine inspiration of the Scripture, which is again very close to the Trident definition. However it is much milder and confirms that the divine truth is revealed under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and transferred in the Church through the Apostles' faith. The author – they say – of the whole Scripture is only God (*Deum habent auctorem*), because the books of

---

conversazione et operibus Christi acceperant, sive a Spiritu Sancto suggerente didicerant, tum ab illis Apostolis virisque apostolicis, qui, *sub inspiratione eiusdem Spiritus Sancti*, nuntium salutis scriptis mandaverunt.

<sup>10</sup> Александр Мень, "Боговдохновенность, или богодухновенность, свящ. Писания". In *Словарь по библиологии*. Т. 1, Санкт Петербург, 2002, 133. (in Russian).

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>12</sup> See K. Rahner, *Sendung und Gnade. Beiträge zur Pastoraltheologie*. Innsbruck-Wien-München, 1959, 469-489.

the Scripture are composed with the assistance of the Spirit.<sup>13</sup> In order to compose the sacred books God choose man, whom He attracted, using their powers and abilities so that after His operation on them and through them, they like true authors to transfer in the written text only His intention. If we accept that the books of the Scripture teach clearly, truly and ineffable the truth, which God wanted to see, transferred in these books in favor of our salvation, we must say that all the statements of the inspirited authors of other ecclesiastical documents, lives of saints, etc., are to be conceived as statements of the Holy Spirit.<sup>14</sup>

So we see how after a long term discussion the Roman Catholic theology achieved a good compromise between the verbalism of the Council of Trent and the conception of the Protestants about the extraordinary operation of the Holy Spirit out of the ecclesiastical body and its' experience in the historical time. It is a useful balance achieved in discussion and after a considerable development of the arguments.

## 2. The Eastern Orthodox Position

In the Orthodox East we can not find this kind of speculation until the 17<sup>th</sup> century. But similar conception we see here first time in the Catechesis of Peter Mogila (1596-1647), who founded after the pattern of the Roman Catholic schools the first theological academy in Kiev's Russia in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Naturally it was under the strong influence of the western theology.<sup>15</sup>

We have to make a short remark that if among the Christians in the Middle East and South Eastern Europe this influence is powerless. In Russia

---

<sup>13</sup> *Concilium Vaticanum II. Constitutio dogmatica de Divina Revelatione Dei Verbum*, cap. III [De sacrae scripturae divina inspiratione et de eius interpretatione]. In *Acta Apostolicae sedis*, Vol. 58 (1966), 823.

<sup>14</sup> See *Ibidem*: In sacris vero libris conficiendis Deus homines elegit, quos facultatibus ac viribus suis utentes adhibuit, [18] ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente, [19] ea omnia eaque sola, quae Ipse vellet, ut veri auctores scripto traderent. [20] Cum ergo omne id, quod auctores inspirati seu hagiographi asserunt, retineri debeat assertum a Spiritu Sancto, inde Scripturae libri veritatem, quam Deus nostrae salutis causa, Litteris Sacris consignari voluit, firmiter, fideliter et sine errore docere profitendi sunt.

<sup>15</sup> Д. Попмаринов, *Съвременни богословски проблеми*. София: Омофор, 2004, 32, п. 5. (in Bulgarian)

### *Understanding of Divine Inspiration...*

it is strong enough and even leads to transformations in the Liturgical rite. In Russia under this influence takes place fast development of the symbolism, sentimentalist idealized pictures and baroque art, when in the West in fashion is the Pietism. This spirit leads also to the introduction of the sentimental melodies in the church chanting in the period in question. And also, naturally, in Russia we see introduced elements of the discussions of the western Christians.<sup>16</sup>

The strong influence of the Western debates on the Eastern Orthodox Christianity leads a lot of orthodox thinkers to borrow from the West few dogmatic principles. Already in the 19<sup>th</sup> century we find in all over the East Orthodox local Churches the Roman Catholic concept of two equal sources of Divine Revelation – Scripture and Tradition, and the Protestant concept about the verbal and autonomous (from the Divine economy, i.e. the historical dimension of the Revelation) Divine inspiration of the Holy Scripture.

Being just a borrowed element of the doctrine this conception of the Divine inspiration does not fit very well with the Eastern Orthodox spirituality and for a long time is out of the interest of the theologians.

In the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century are made the first efforts by Orthodox theologians to articulate independent answers to the question: in what is consistent the Divine inspiration of the Holy Scripture. From this answer logically follows the understanding of Tradition. In the period in question the Orthodox theologians connect the inspiration mostly with the question if there is “a human element” in the process of writing-down the Scripture or there is just “a Divine interference”, and the human one is reduced to a simple unconscious assistance. This limited question by itself gives a relative solution. It neglects the main presuppositions of the relation between God’s grace and human will as it is understood by the traditional theology of the Fathers.

For instance the Russian theologian Pavel Leporsky, in the first years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, to a considerable degree repeats the protestant position of the verbal inspiration. According to him “the human element” in this process is expressed in the different inexactnesses in the biblical text. The reason of these obvious mistakes in the text is the injured by the sin human nature. This opinion repeats to some extent the Luther’s anthropological presuppositions about the original sin. But this concept is basically different

---

<sup>16</sup> See Ал. Шмеман, *Евхаристия, Тайнство Царства*. Paris, 1984, 55 sq. (in Russian)

from the Eastern Orthodox understanding of the human being. According to the Eastern Orthodox tradition the man preserved, although in a reduced form, his abilities after the original sin. The reason is that these abilities are put in him by his Creator whose image and likeness is he. He is called to become God by grace and to be in union with God in His Divine life (or in His Divine being). The Salvation, in the Orthodox tradition usually we call it divinization (θέωσις), is a process of ontological recovery of the original condition of the human nature, which is participial in the Divine life as an image and likeness of God (Gen. 1:26).<sup>17</sup> In this context the Eastern Orthodox Christians understand the words of Apostle Peter: “His divine power has granted to us all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him who called us to his own glory and excellence, by which he has own glory and excellence, by which He has granted to us his precious and very great promises, that through these you may escape from the corruption that is in the world because of passion, and become *partakers of the divine nature* (γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως)” (2 Pet. 1:3-4).<sup>18</sup>

The biblical concept of the creation of man relates him to God. God “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life” (Gen. 2:7). The most of the Fathers relate this act to the Divine Word – the second person of God. And the man is partaker, in this way, in the Gods’ being, i.e. in the Divine energies. It is something natural for him, and it is not an extraordinary act of intervention of God in the fate of elected by Him persons. The famous in the Western theological debates opposition between “nature” and “grace” is unknown in the Orthodox East.<sup>19</sup> For the Eastern Orthodox Christians the saints (all the sacred writers are saints) has overcome the consequences of the sin thanks to their participation in the Gods’ grace (i.e. in the Divine energies which exist absolutely objectively) and are heavenly citizen on the Earth. Therefore the argument about the humans’ weakness in the process of inspiration in an Eastern Orthodox context leads to an obvious contradiction.

<sup>17</sup> See Vl. Lossky, *Théologie mystique de l’Église d’Orient*. Aubier: Édition Montaigne, 1944, 65; eiusdem, *In Image and Likeness of God*. NY: SVS Press, 1974, 97-110; see also P. Evdokimov, *L’Orthodoxie*. Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé S.A., 1959, 93 sq.

<sup>18</sup> The scriptural text according to Revised Standard Version of the Old and the New Testament of the Holy Bible.

<sup>19</sup> Иоанн Мейендорф, *Введение в святоотеческое богословие*. Прев. Л. Волохинской, Вильнюс: RSR, 1982, 33 sq. (in Russian)

*Understanding of Divine Inspiration...*

Howsoever with his intuition Pavel Leporsky reaches the idea that a solution of this problem might be found in the understanding of the Church about the two natures of Christ formulated in the Council of Chalcedon (451). Unfortunately Leporsky did not develop this idea.<sup>20</sup>

Another Russian theologian who touches the question about the Divine inspiration is S. Glagolev, professor at the Moscow Theological Academy in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. He says that the humans' element is close connected with "many objective historical and individual conditions related to the text [of the Scripture] and as well as with the destructive influence of the secondary interferences in him." In his research Glagolev shares that in spite of his long research he can not formulate an exhaustive definition of Divine inspiration – "something natural for the Orthodox theology"<sup>21</sup>

On the First Congress of the Eastern Orthodox theological schools in Athens (1936) Boris Sove, then professor of Bible Studies at the Theological Academy "St. Serge" in Paris, expresses the idea that the inspiration of the Scripture, and especially the human element in it, would be examined in the light of Chalcedonian definition and that the Orthodox theology have to escape the developed in the West approach to use the Scripture for all the questions in this world. In the centre of his text is the Old Testament and naturally he says: "The Old Testament inspired writers are mainly theologians and teachers of faith, they are not encyclopedists"<sup>22</sup>. The same opinion share during the Congress the Greek Professors archimandrite Aemilianos Antoniadis<sup>23</sup> and B. Vellas.<sup>24</sup>

Two years later archimandrite Aemilianos Antoniadis develops in details this subject based on a large research of Fathers' texts. He concludes that the Divine inspiration is in fact the presence, the supervision of the

<sup>20</sup> П. Лепорски, "Боговдохновенность или по другой терминологии – Богодухновенность". In *Православная Богословская Энциклопедия*, т. 2, Петроградъ, 1901, 729-748. (in Russian)

<sup>21</sup> С. Глаголев, "Задачи русской богословской школы". *Богословский Вестникъ*, 11 (1905), 420-421. (in Russian) We have to point out that Glagolev is indeed a specialist of eastern religions and especially of Islam. This fact obviously explains his attitude towards the Divine inspiration.

<sup>22</sup> See Б. Сове, "Тезисы по Священному Писанию Ветхого Завета". *Путь*, 52 (Paris 1937), 68. (in Russian)

<sup>23</sup> See below n. 24.

<sup>24</sup> See B. Vellas, "Bibelkritik und kirchliche Autorität". In *Procès-Verbaux du 1-er Congrès de théologie orthodoxe*, Athènes, 1939.

Holy Spirit in order the sacred writes to understand all the events revealed in the community of the Gods' nation (ὁ λαός). It helps him to interpret in the right way and in this way to prevent the nation of God from errors like the numerous cases of idololatriy in the Old Testament history and in heresy in the history of the New Testament Church.<sup>25</sup>

In the same time, in 1938, after the discussions on the Congress, the famous Professor of the University of Athens Panayiotis Trempelas shares a position which is closer to the protestant one.<sup>26</sup> In his book *Dogmatic of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, published after the World War II, he says: "The authority of the Holy Scripture does not fully draws on the Church but directly on the speaking in it God. The Church by itself does not create the Holy Scripture".<sup>27</sup>

In 1944, A. B. Kartashov, Professor at the Theological Academy "St. Serge" in Paris, stimulated by the statement of Boris Sove in Athens in 1936, again put forward the idea that the Divine inspiration can be explained through the formulated in Chalcedon (451) relation between human and divine nature in Christ, in the context of the Orthodox concept of sanctifying and divinization of the human nature by the God's grace. Developing this idea he opens an important perspective observed in the Fathers approach to the Scripture. It is the perspective of critical examination of the events, reflected in the text. The statement, he says, that the "God is the author of the holy books" is something like "a monophysitic diversion from our Orthodoxy".<sup>28</sup> So Kartashov thinks that the Scripture is actually an exegesis of these miraculous God-human events fulfilling the history of the relationships between God and his people since the same creation.

The same line in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century supports Fr. Andrey Knijazev. He is a disciple of Kartashov at the Orthodox Academy in

<sup>25</sup> See Αἰμ. Ἀντωνιάδου, *Ἐπὶ τοῦ προβλήματος τῆς θεοπνευστίας τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς*. Ἀθῆναι, 1938.

<sup>26</sup> See Π. Τρεμπέλας, *Ἡ θεοπνευστία τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς*. Ἀθῆναι, 1938.

<sup>27</sup> Π. Τρεμπέλας, *Δογματικὴ τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, τ. Α'*, Ἀθῆναι, 1959, 102-103.

<sup>28</sup> Α.Β. Καρτάшов, *Ветхозаветная библейская критика*, Париж, 1947, 72. (in Russian) The reflection that the inspiration of the Scripture might be observed in the perspective of Chalcedon is intuitive anticipated by the Russian bishop Silvester in his five tomes *Dogmatic: Православное догматическое богословие. Съ историческое изслѣдование догматовъ*, т. I, Кіевъ, 1884-1897, 282-287. (in Russian)

*Understanding of Divine Inspiration...*

Paris. He bases his arguments of the relation between divine and human element in writing-down the Scripture on the complex balance between divine and human nature of Christ after the definition of Chalcedonian council. For him the key of the divine inspiration of the Scripture is so called collaboration (synergy) between God and man in the economy of salvation.<sup>29</sup>

Almost in the same time the similar opinion, without to a detailed analysis, shares Fr. Sergey Bulgakov in his famous book *Dialog between God and man*.<sup>30</sup>

The preliminary committee for the forthcoming Great council of the Eastern Orthodox Church in its session in London (1972) tried to formulate an opinion about “the Divine Revelation and the way in which it is expressed in salvation’s favor”. Obviously this question would be one of the subjects in the coming council. The most important in this formula is that already by a conciliar institution of the Eastern Orthodox Church will be accepted the principle of Chalcedonian formula with regard to the Divine inspiration: the man remains an author and initiator of the sacred text but being under the graceful effect of the Holy Spirit. “He is a stream of revelation from God according the purposes of His eternal will<sup>31</sup>... The active participation of the humans abilities is included in the inspiration. It is in accordance with the divine element which as it is pervasive in all... [Sometimes] are revealed to the human brain truths that are inaccessible and unapproachable for him”.<sup>32</sup>

In the end of the edited text the participants in the session make a step back. They again bring in the idea of “bilateral” character of the inspiration as a central issue. But it is not already as “two sources of Revelation”. The source is already one – the very God’s Revelation as a series of events. It is a positive and realistic approach but the real step back is the definition of the “Divine word” made by the session. The “Divine Word” according

<sup>29</sup> А. Князев, “О боговдохновенности Свящ. Писания”. *Православная Мысль*, 8 (1951), 117-122. (in Russian)

<sup>30</sup> S. Bulgakow, *Dialog zwischen Gott und Mensch. Ein Beitrag zum christlichen Offenbarungsbegriff*. Marburg, 1961, 31.

<sup>31</sup> *Towards the Great Council. Introductory Reports of the Interorthodox Commission in Preparation for the next Great and Holy Council of the Orthodox Church*. London, 1972, 5.

<sup>32</sup> *Towards the Great Council*, p. 6.

to the delegates includes “a written and an unwritten God’s word”,<sup>33</sup> which again repeats the Roman Catholic position on the subject.

An orthodox dogmatist from the next generation, a Professor of the University of Thessalonica, Nikos Matsoukas (†2006), in the same pattern but escaping the “bilateral character” of the inspiration, develops his reflection. According to him in order to deep in the core of the process of inspiration we should think this process in the framework of the historical events in which God reveals Himself to the humankind, in sense of an active meeting with God in the Church, but not as unwritten traditions preserved in an unknown way until the time when they are fixed on paper. In this way he complements the reflection of archimandrite Aemilianos Antoniadis and follows the reflection of Fr. Geogre Florovsky about the Revelation as historical events and the interpretation of these events.<sup>34</sup>

\*

According to a modern Bulgarian biblical scholar: “What we nowadays call authority of the Scripture, in Antiquity is something natural. The Scripture is observed as an implicit reality in the holistic liturgical life of the Church... In the Ancient Church the attitude towards the Scripture is formatted simultaneously with the building of the Church.”<sup>35</sup> For the Christians then were enough the words of Apostle Paul: „All the scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work” (2 Tim. 3:16-17).<sup>36</sup>

But it does not mean that nowadays we should not reflect and deep into the question of Divine inspiration. On the contrary: we have to have in mind the new arguments and the new challenges about the Christian Dogma. It is not a static true somewhere in the past but a living reality expressing itself constantly in the actual life of the Church, in the Community of

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> Ν. Ματσούκα, *Δογματική και Συμβολική Θεολογία Α΄. Εισαγωγή στη θεολογική γνωσιολογία*. Πουρναρά: Θεσσαλονίκη, 2000, 186-187. See also G. Florovsky, "The Lost Scriptural Mind" and "Revelation and Interpretation" in *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*, Collected Works of Georges Florovsky, Vol. I (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1972).

<sup>35</sup> Д. Попмаринов, *Op. cit.*, 36. (in Bulgarian)

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

*Understanding of Divine Inspiration...*

Gods' nation. If we believe in the constant supervising presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church we should not be afraid even by the concept of "development" of the Dogma. It is a historical reality, confirmed by the councils of the Church in its blessed history. Its' pledge is given by the Holy Spirit.

Lucian Pietroaia<sup>1</sup>

## A Jubilee of Romanian Culture and Spirituality: 440 Years Since Printing Coresi's Liturgical Book - Liturgikon Braşov, 1570

### Abstract

*Deacon Coresi offered Romanian culture a great gift: a Liturgical Book that he printed in Brasov, in 1570. It is the first translation and printing of St. John's Liturgical Book in Romanian. This moment represents the opening of a long process, related to the translation of all religious books from Slavonic and Greek in Romanian and during time, in this difficult yet noble work there have been engaged other personalities belonging to The Romanian Orthodox Church and our culture: Saint Bishop Simeon Stefan of Transilvania, Saint Bishops Dosoftei and Varlaam of Moldavia, Noble Steward Serban Cantacuzino, Saint Bishop Antim of Ungrovlahia and others. Coresi's Liturgical Book is considered a milestone for closing a long period during which, due to different historical reasons, Romanians had to listen the Ceremony in other languages that were considered "sacred" – Greek and Slavonic and also the beginning of a new cultural era: Romanian language was brought home and entitled to be used in full rights.*

*By his entire work, Coresi is considered one of the pioneers of Romanian literary language and certainly one of the founders of Romanian Liturgical language. The printing quality, the beauty of the language and the translation, and nevertheless the use of Romanian language, make Coresi's Liturgical Book, a work which was so less studied, a Liturgical, Linguistic and bibliophile piece of work which certainly will be written about in the future.*

### Keywords

*Liturgical Book, Deacon Coresi, manuscript.*

<sup>1</sup> Ph D., Lecturer at the History, Philosophy and Theology Faculty, "Dunărea de Jos" University, [invatamant@edj.ro](mailto:invatamant@edj.ro).

## I. Motivation of a required study

Because of its essential importance for the Romanian culture and Orthodox worship, the Liturgikon always attracted the interest of the specialists as a bibliophile part<sup>2</sup> and element of heritage<sup>3</sup>, as testimony and source of studying the development of Romanian language<sup>4</sup>, and also as a religious

---

<sup>2</sup> See catalogues like: Ion Bianu și Nerva Hodoș, *Bibliografia românească veche*, tomurile I-IV, Edițiunea Academiei Române, București - Atelierele Socec & Co., Soc. Anonimă, 1901, 1912, Gabriel Ștrempel, *Catalogul manuscriselor românești B.A.R. 1-1600/1601-3100*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1978, 1983, Daniela Poenaru, *Contribuții la Bibliografia românească veche*, Muzeul Județean Dâmbovița, Târgoviște, 1973, Dan Râpă Buicliu, *Cartea românească veche. Studia bibliologica și Bibliografia românească veche. Additamenta I (1536-1830)*, Editura Alma, Galați, 2000 and more than other 40 works, published in the last 100 years, that cited the Liturgikon oftenly.

<sup>3</sup> In many works like dr. Ionel Câdea, *Însemnări pe cartea veche românească din patrimoniul județului Brăila*, în vol. „Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Etnografie Vrancea. Studii și comunicări. II”, Focșani, 1979, p. 245-255, dr. Olimpia Mitric, *Manuscrise și cărți vechi în colecțiile vrâncene (secolele XVII-XX) – prezentare generală*, în „Revista Română de Istorie a Cărtii”, II (2005), nr. 2, p. 86-94, drd. Liviu Streza, *Manuscrise liturgice românești în Biblioteca Arhiepiscopiei Sibiului (prezentare generală)*, în rev. „Mitropolia Ardealului”, XIX (1974), nr. 4-6, p. 233-249.

<sup>4</sup> In the Histories of the Romanian Literature by: Petre Haneș (Editura Autorului, București, primul pătrar al sec. XX, ), Sextil Pușcariu (Tiparul și editura Kraft & Drotleff, Sibiu, 1930), Gheorghe Cardaș (Tiparul „Oltenia”, București, 1939), George Călinescu (București, 1941), Dimitrie Murărașu (Editura „Cartea Românească”, București, 1943), I.D. Lădat (Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1968), George Ivașcu (București, 1969), I. Șiadbei (Editura Albatros, București, 1975), Alexandru Piru (Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1977), Ștefan Ciobanu (Editura Eminescu, București, 1989), Ion Rotaru (Editura Porto Franco, Galați, 1994), Nicolae Cartoian (Editura Fundației Culturale Române, București, 1996) we can find many references to the Liturgikon and its role to the improvement of the Romanian liturgical, literary and spoken language. There are three critical editions (*Liturghierul lui Macarie*, cu un studiu de P.P. Panaitescu, și un indice de Angela și Alexandru Duțu, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1961; *Liturghierul lui Coresi*, text stabilit, studiu introductiv și note de Alexandru Mareș, Editura Academiei, București, 1969; *Dosoftei. Dumnezăiasca Liturghie, 1679*, ediție critică de N. A Ursu, Iași, 1980) și una anastatică (*Liturghierul lui Macarie 1508-2008*, cu un Cuvânt Înainte de dr. Nifon Mihăiță, arhiepiscopul Târgoviștei, Editura Arhiepiscopiei Târgoviștei-Bibliotecii Academiei Române, Târgoviște, 2008)

book<sup>5</sup>. Thus, we get the complete image of this book, which therefore can be fully known and studied. The fascination exerted by the Liturgikon appears from its ability to be useful: at the Shrine, in schools, libraries or museums. This is precisely why it was printed and reprinted in dozens of editions<sup>6</sup> which have a visible improvement in text quality, in consistency and correctness of rules indications, in graphic terms. The "birth" of each edition involved bishops, university professors, men of culture, monks. There are many studies on editions and reference copies (see Notes 1, 2 and 3), and in 2008, proclaimed the year "of Holy Scripture and the Liturgy" by the Romanian Orthodox Church, the interest for this topic increased. Many articles, studies, and jubilee edition, as well as exhibitions, albums, documentaries were released under the patronage of the Patriarchate, the Academy and National Library and the involvement of several dioceses and cultural institutions.

The year 2010 gives us the opportunity to bring back to the attention of Romanian culture lovers one of the most prominent landmarks in our ancient literature of the sixteenth century - Deacon Coresi Liturgikon printed in Brasov in 1570. This is the first Liturgikon printed in Romanian, although from the first century and to that date, priests never stopped to serve the Divine Liturgy in the whole geo-spiritual area inhabited by Romanians, using copied liturgical manuscripts<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> There are many works: Petre Vintilescu (de ex. *Litughierul explicat*, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 1998 ș.a.), Ene Braniște (de ex. *Observațiuni și propuneri pentru o nouă ediție a Litughierului românesc. Adăugiri, complectări și precizări de făcut*, în rev. „Biserica Ortodoxă Română”, LXIV (1946), nr. 7-9, p. 333-351 ș.a.), Nicolae Necula (în cele 4 volume „Tradiție și înnoire în slujirea liturgică”, Editura Episcopiei Dunării de Jos, Galați, 1996 și 2001, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 2004 și 2010). The most recent study belongs to pr. Lucian Petroaia – *Litughierul românesc. Studiu liturgic (teză de doctorat)*, București, 2009 – still not printed.

<sup>6</sup> There are 148 editions from 1508 until 2009. Therefore, the Liturgikon is the most printed Romanian religious book after the Bible.

<sup>7</sup> Virgil Molin și Dan Simionescu comment on these Slavic, Greek and Romanian manuscript of the 13 and 14 century, that they were used by ieromonach Macarie, for his first edition of Liturgikon in Slavic (Târgoviște, 1508) – see their work *Tipăriturile ieromonahului Macarie pentru Țara Românească (la 450 de ani de la imprimarea Litughierului, 1508)*, în rev. „Biserica Ortodoxă Română”, LXXXVI (1958), nr. 10-11, p. 1006.

### *A Jubilee of Romanian Culture and Spirituality...*

This print is a "milestone", a referential point for Romanians, for the Romanian Orthodox Church history and our culture history. This is the reason why "celebrating" the 440 years since its printing in Brasov press is a sacred duty for us and a form of gratitude and remembrance of the many workers led by Deacon Coresi.

## **II. Deacon-printer Coresi and his era**

Coresi's epoch<sup>8</sup> is one of great turmoil: the reforms of Luther, Calvin and Zwingli, which were preceded by the Hussite movements and prepared by Wyclif and Savonarola's views. All these transformations took place during two centuries and their two major cultural streams: Humanism and the Renaissance. The progressive ideas of Erasmus of Rotterdam, Thomas More and Niccolo Machiavelli quickly penetrated in the Romanian principalities. Their entrance gate is Transylvania.

Among the many effects germinated by these new ideas, one of the most important is the change of Romanians mentality on their language. The Romanian language had no liturgical right as the "sacred" language of printing (Latin, Greek, and Slavic) had. It was considered, as all the other European languages, unworthy to express in writing God's words to man and man's to the Lord. Coresi took advantage of this external context, being helped by some providential internal situations. After a period in which he apprenticed in Targoviste, at Oprea - one of the former followers of Dimitrie Liubavici, the printer takes the lead here, and prints a Triodion - Pentecostarion (1558).

---

<sup>8</sup> Deacon Coresi (? - cca.1583) is the first clergyman and the first Romanian scholar who fought in the mid XVI century, the introduction of Romanian language in worship. He was a disciple of Dimitri Liubavici, from whom he learned the art of printing. He printed dozens of books, 10 in Romanian: *Întrebare creștinească* (1560), *Tetraevanghelul* (1561), *Apostolul* (1563), *Tâlcul Evangheliilor* (1567), *Liturghierul* (1570), *Pravila Sfinților Părinți* (între 1570-1580), *Psaltirea* (1570), *Psaltirea slavo-română* (1577), *Tetraevanghelul slavo-român* (1580), *Evanghelia cu învățătură* (1580-1581). At his typography in Brasov he had apprentices like deacons Calin Lorinț, Tudor, Mănăilă, Marian and his son - Serban - best printers themselves later, defenders and promoters of the Romanian language. His work, which has survived until today largely contributed decisively to the formation of literary and liturgical language of Romanian.

When he finally moved to Brasov, he opened his own typography<sup>9</sup>, and gathered at least ten apprentices. He chose Brasov because he had the conscience of the common roots of language and nation of the two Romanian provinces, thus inaugurating a providential cultural co-operation between Walachia and Transylvania, on the two axes: Oltenia - Sibiu, Targoviste - Brasov. Walachia was troubled by the change to the throne: the reigns Mircea Ciobanul family ceased and there it came the opposite side - Patrascu's family. Beyond its better geographical position away from Turkish or Tatar invasions, Brasov became Coresi's home. However, Transylvania was facing serious religious problems, and the principles had difficulties in managing them. They had an obviously hostile attitude towards the Orthodox Romanians of Transylvania. The population was religiously divided: after 1564 ("the council" of Aiud), the Hungarians from this territory became Calvinist or Unitarian, and the Saxons remained Lutheran. The strengthening of the Protestant denominations was not a passive phenomenon; their policy was to continuously attract the Romanians, thereby creating moments of high pressure. The Romanians were forced to defend both their culture and religion.

After the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, influenced by the Reformation ideas, the Transylvanian rulers organised intense campaigns of making the Orthodox Romanians Calvinist. The Romanians defended themselves at two priests "councils" in 1568 and 1569. Attracting the Romanians was a refined diplomatic mission: they printed religious books in Romanian, but with altered doctrinal content, that is Calvinist. However brutal methods were used as well: the Romanians were intimidated and threatened, were called to Calvinist "councils", where the Calvinists tried to inoculate non-Orthodox religious ideas, or Calvinist bishop received them personally and called them to "evangelical justice and pure science". Those who did not want to give up were persecuted and expelled from the country. For example the Calvin Bishop George of Sângeorz put a strong pressure on the Romanian priests in the area, but without success, in spite of all his endeavours (he provided the priests a Calvin Cazania or the Homiliary and Molitfelnicul or The Euchologion from 1564). His successor, Bishop Paul Tordași continued this policy with greater skill. The Orthodox Romanians

---

<sup>9</sup> Virgil Molin, *Personalitatea diaconului Coresi și rolul lui în cultura românească*, în "Biserica Ortodoxă Română", LXXVII (1959), nr. 3-4, p. 303.

*A Jubilee of Romanian Culture and Spirituality...*

of Transylvania were offered Calvin services in Romanian, which were reduced to the text that had direct argumentation in Scripture and was almost completely purified from the Orthodox liturgical tradition. Thus the service was limited to the Scripture, giving up to the cult of saints, to the services for the people such as funeral services or the Blessing of Waters, and instead of the Divine Liturgy they emphasised on readings of psalms and hymns. The people's reaction was however steady and therefore saving: they did not accept the spiritual "poison" and were very reluctant to gifts. Conclusion: they could not change the Romanians' faith<sup>10</sup>.

Prince John Sigismund, Romanian speaking and understanding of the Romanian spirit, was interested in not losing all the results of this lengthy, difficult and costly Calvinists propaganda, but he also agreed on formally preserving the Romanian Orthodox worship and the right to attend Orthodox Liturgy. He immediately approved the printing of Orthodox Romanian books.

It should be noted that there was a large Saxon typography in Brasov - first in Transylvania - which belonged to Johan Honterus. This could be the start for a printing emulation<sup>11</sup>. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the typographies in Brasov edited 98 books (73 in Latin, 13 in Greek, 8 in Romanian). In addition, in the same city it was founded the first paper mill, that of Johann Fuxen and Johann Benkner<sup>12</sup>.

At that time Metropolitan Gennadius I was the head of the Orthodox Church in Transylvania, and he helped Coresi by ordering several books (e.g. *Evangelhia cu învățătură* in 1581). In these circumstances, only in one year - 1570 - Coresi printed at his typography in Brasov a Psalter and a Liturgikon, both in Romanian. On September 1 1570, both books were printed.

Among the 25 Coresi books printed in Targoviste and Brasov during only 24 years (1559-1583) - 10 in Romanian, 2 in Slavic-Romanian February, 13 in Slavonic (of which another Slavonic Liturgikon in 1568 -1570), the Romanian Liturgikon from 1570 occupies a special place.

<sup>10</sup> See prof. Nicolae Sulică, *O nouă publicație românească din secolul al XVI-lea - Liturghierul diaconului Coresi, tipărit la Brașov, în 1570*, Tg.-Mureș, 1927, p. 3-9.

<sup>11</sup> Herman Tontsch, *Tipografia «Honterus» din Brașov (1533)*, în rev. „Boabe de grâu“, V (1934), nr. 4, p. 207.

<sup>12</sup> Virgil Molin, *Personalitatea diaconului Coresi...*, p. 294.

### III. Therefore, two Coresi's Liturgikon

Coresi's first Liturgikon was printed in 1568 in Brasov. While some attribute it to the mysterious "fugitive deacon Lorinț" (ca. 1540 - post. 1593)<sup>13</sup>, newer research findings shows that printing is the work of Deacon Coresi following Macarie's model of Liturgikon. Ion Bianu<sup>14</sup> indicates a copy at the Romanian Academy Library. Its printed format is 19 x 15 cm. The copy has sufficient defects caused by the lack of time and care in the use, without some pages, and consists of 26 books of 4 sheets, numbered in the Cyrillic system.

The arguments that the researchers support on attesting this print belongs to Coresi, are: he used the same letters as when printing the Gospel and the Psalter, there is the usual watermark paper, same ink, same decoration (e.g., the same frontispiece, used by Macarie, Coresi and Serban). The strongest argument, however, is language-in a specific Coresian style. The copy contains *Dumnezeiasca slujbă după Sfântul Părintele nostru Ioan Gură de Aur. Rugăciunea deasupra cădelniței, Liturghia Sfântului Vasile cel Mare și Slujba dumnezeiască înainte-sfințită, Rugăciunea pe care o zice diaconul la citirea Vecerniei Mari, Rugăciunea pe care o zice arhiereul sau duhovnicul pentru păcatele cele cu voie și fără de voie, la jurăminte și afurisiri și pentru orice păcat.*<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, this is not the object of our study.

In 1570, in Brasov, printed Coresi a deacon Liturgikon, which includes *Tokmeala slujbeei dumnezeiască întru ia și diiak(o)stvele*. It contains only the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. It is printed in quarto, with 42 sheets - 84 pages, the last missing, unnumbered, with 18-19 lines per page. After the 84 pages, one of the owners or users attached several manuscript pages containing prayers from Euchologion and texts from Triodion. The only copy reported or extant until nowadays belonged to Professor Nicholas Sulica from Tg. Mures. In 1953, it became a part of the collection of the Metropolitan Library in Sibiu. The covers are made of pressed cardboard

<sup>13</sup> Nicolae Iorga, *Octoihul diacului Lorinț*, în AAR, Mem. Secț. Ist., seria III, tom XI, mem. 7, 1930-1931, p. 203. The hypothesis is partially accepted by I. Gheție and Al. Mareș.

<sup>14</sup> Noticed by Barbu Teodorescu, *Repertoriul cărții românești vechi 1508-1830*, în rev. „Biserica Ortodoxă Română”, LXXVIII (1960), nr. 3-4, p. 344.

<sup>15</sup> Ion Bianu, *op. cit.*, tom. IV, p. 11.

*A Jubilee of Romanian Culture and Spirituality...*

and paper, tied with leather corners. It has a fragile state of conservation<sup>16</sup>. Some historians say that Calvin Bishop Paul Tordași mentioned this print, that costs "32 dinari" in his letter of 9 December 1570<sup>17</sup>, and demanded that all Transylvanian priests purchase the Liturgikon and Psalter. Other specialists show that, in fact, it is a Psalter translated from Hungarian, with Latin letters and a book of Calvinist songs that Bishop Paul imposed on the Romanian priests to buy in order to bring them to Calvinism<sup>18</sup>.

The Liturgy text has plenty of errors, caused by a faulty translation, apparently from Slavic manuscripts from the sixteenth century.

**IV. Disputes on Deacon Coresi's printed Liturgikon at Brasov in 1570**

There are two printed Liturgikons by a Slavonic (1568-1570) and a Romanian one (1570); the latter is the subject of our study. We can specify the exact time and place it was printed: in Brasov, between June 1 and July 15<sup>th</sup> 1570. It is a very short period, which testifies the printout was an opportunity that could not be lost. It also shows Coresi's skill and interest invested in this paper.

Coresi used older translations and Romanian manuscripts as liturgical sources, *which he corrected, changed, often removing the archaisms and provincialisms, or replacing them with phrases and words used in Walachia and southeastern Transylvania*<sup>19</sup>. Some believe that Coresi used an earlier Slavonic Liturgikon<sup>20</sup>. The source of inspiration for making the

<sup>16</sup> Notes by Pr. prof. dr. Mircea Păcurariu, *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române (manual pentru Facultățile de Teologie)*, Editura Trinitas, Iași, 2004, vol. I, p. 482, Doina Braicu, *Cartea veche românească din sec. XVI-XVII, în colecțiile Arhiepiscopiei Sibiului*, Editura Centrului Mitropolitan, Sibiu, 1980, p. 27.

<sup>17</sup> Ion Bianu, *op. cit.*, tom. IV, p. 12. See also Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria Bisericii Românești.*, Editura Ministerului de Culte, ediția a II-a, revăzută și adăugită, București, 1928, retipărită prin fotocopiare la Editura Gramar, București, 1995, vol. I, p. 181 – 182, Barbu Teodorescu, *Repertoriul cărții românești vechi 1508-1830...*, p. 344.

<sup>18</sup> Pr. prof. dr. Mircea Păcurariu, *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române (manual pentru Facultățile de Teologie)...*, vol. I, p. 440-441, 482.

<sup>19</sup> Idem, *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române (manual pentru seminarile teologice)*, ediția a IV-a, Editura Episcopiei Dunării de Jos, Galați, 1996, p. 153.

<sup>20</sup> Pr. dr. Spiridon Căndea, *Primul Liturghier românesc tipărit*, în "Mitropolia Ardealului", IV (1959), nr. 9 - 10, p. 748, 770.

medallions and vignettes of Coresi's several books, the Liturgikon from 1570 included, is Macarie's Liturgical Book<sup>21</sup>.

There were sufficient doubts regarding the Coresian paternity of this liturgy. Philological arguments would deny this. Thus, a confrontation between the Coresian Liturgikon and priest Ioan from Suiug' manuscript from the same period - demonstrates that Coresi used a newer and more advanced Romanian language (e.g. using "mâini" instead of "mânule" or "îmbe / mânule"). The most difficult argument against paternity would be the lack of reliable clues that commonly are found in the colophon or the epilogue. These unique items are missing from the incomplete copy discovered by Nicolae Sulică at St. Nicholas Church "from Șcheii Brașovului and now preserved in the Metropolitan Library in Sibiu. However, a lot of specialists subscribe to the Coresian paternity: Nicolae Cartojan, Ion Bianu, Dan Simionescu, Nicolae Drăgan, Virgil Molin, Lucian Predescu, Spiridon Câdea, Petre P. Panaitescu<sup>22</sup>.

Arguments are as follows:

- A "little book" printed by Coresi was sent to Prince John Sigismund on September 1<sup>st</sup> 1570: it is Coresi's Liturgikon from 1570, which contains only the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, of small size - the only print that can be called "little book "

- The Romanian priests are called at Cluj, on 18 January 1571 to buy this Liturgikon with only 32 dinars. That was a small price in comparison to the Psalter from the same year (1 florin).

- It has the same format as 1570 Psalter - against whom there is no doubt about paternity. It is printed in two colours (black and red), the same number of rows (18 - 19 - 20) per page, with the same type of letter, the same paper (with trade mark of Brasov typography), the same translation mistakes and the same specific spelling, as all Coresi's prints.

## V. Technical aspects of printing the Liturgikon from 1570

The most important technical elements of printout are: *the format is in quarto, with 18 or 19 lines per page, it has 84 pages and no column-cipher. Only the first and last facsimiles are numbered in Cyrillic. The paper is of*

<sup>21</sup> Virgil Molin, Personalitatea diaconului Coresi..., p. 302.

<sup>22</sup> Pr. dr. Spiridon Câdea, *Primul Liturghier românesc...*, p. 733.

### *A Jubilee of Romanian Culture and Spirituality...*

*poor quality and has the crown of Brasov as watermark...*<sup>23</sup> Compared to Macarie's Liturgikon, Coresi's edition is much less attentive to details: the letter has not the same good print but it is still "fine and elegant", airy and pleasant, as N. Iorga said.

Technically speaking, Coresi did not meet accomplish Macarie's performance for several reasons: he did not have engraver specialists as Macarie did; there were more copies for pecuniary reasons too (at least the idea of depreciation expenses), Brasov being a quasi-mercantile city. The letters are small, and only a few capital letters (B, D, H, etc.). The ground line is imperfect, like Macarie's. Residues mirror is 24 x 36 Cicero. The words and letters are not equally placed on the page.

Punctuation is awkward, as it was at the beginning in the Romanian language, and it sometimes plays an ornamental part - they used two colours.

Ornamentation is much poorer than Macarian prints, probably because the parent manuscript and the other sources were not at all decorated. The red letters are placed upside down, showing the lack of professionalism in printing, like the Venetian prints of the time, for example. There are no frontispiece or borders, because of the haste to print the work<sup>24</sup>.

## **VI. The content of the Liturgikon from 1570**

1. The Liturgikon has no title page. So we could not tell as Coresi called it: *Slujebnik, Liturgy*. The top of text is entitled *tocmeala slujbeei dumnezeiasci întru ia și diac(o)nstvele* ("the deacon's" - Ed) which contains priest guidance on preparing for the Divine Liturgy and rules of worship in the church, vesting and Proskomedia. This initial content is common to Macarie's Liturgikon and it is actually a translation of Diataxa Patriarch of Constantinople Filoti. First, the priest is advised how to prepare physically and spiritually to celebrate the Liturgy: *datoriu iaste întâi amu în pace să fie cu toți, sășu păzească cugetulu de hiclenie, să se postească puțintelu de cu searișu. și să se trezvească pânî în vreamea de slujbî.*

**The prayers** are very much alike to those of today. For example, at the end of the ritual worship the prayer is: *Doamne, tremite mîna ta de susu, de*

<sup>23</sup> Ion Bianu și Dan Simionescu, *Bibliografia românească veche...*, tom IV, p. 12.

<sup>24</sup> For details see pr. dr. Spiridon Cîndea, *Primul Liturghier românesc...*, p. 739-746.

*în sf(î)ntulu sălaşulu tău, și mă întăreaște întru această slujbî a ta ce e pusî înainte. să nu cu osîndî înainte să stau înfricoșatului tău altariu. Și fără de sânge jrătvî să sfrășescu. că a ta iaste tăria întru veaci. aminu.*<sup>25</sup>

We can notice the lack of Trisagion prayers, the humility troparia, the worship of icons prayers, prayer of washing hands and difference of ecphonesis formula.

2. **Proskomedia** has the same structure as today's Liturgy. However, the terms „agneț“ (the Lamb) and „miridă” (portion) are missing.

The Lamb is cut out using the same liturgical movement and the same formula, like today. We find the same note as in Macarie's Liturgikon about the prosphora that if is *caldu și cu aburu, atunce să zacî cu dosulu în susu, dereptu să nu facî dedesuptu udăturî*. Deacon pours wine and water into the chalice, but *să zicî mainte cătrî preutulu. bl(a)gosloveaște, părinte și să priimeascî deacealea blagoslovenie*. The blessing for mixing the Holy Things misses too.

When the priest cut out the portion for Theothokos from the second prosphora he said: *întru ci(n)ste și în pomeanî preabl(a)goslovitei împărîteasa noastră alu dumnezeu născîtoare și curatî fatî maria ce derept cu rugîciunea ei, priimeaște, Doamne, jrătva aceasta ce e între ceriu al tău jrătăvnicu*, and did what the Liturgikon indicated, the same thing as nowadays: *să ia o parte* (from the prosphora - Ed.) *cu sfânta copie, să o puie ea de-a stînga sfinteei pâine*. The words for placing this portion near the Lamb are missing *De față a stat Împărîteasa, de-a dreapta Ta....*

There are different characteristics for the portions of the nine ranks, cut out from the third prosphora. The portions for the first and the second rank are cut out in the honour of the Holy Cross - *cu tăria a cinstitei și viațî făcîtoare crucea* and of the holy angels - *cinstiții ceriului tării fără trupure*. The only prophet mentioned is *cinstitulu și slăvitulu proroculu innainte curîtoriu și botezătoriu ioanu*. The Apostles are mentioned only as a group and not individually. The portion for the author of the Divine Liturgy misses as well (inn this case that for St. John Chrysostom). As to the other ranks there are a lot of saints remembered today and not in Coresi's Liturgikon: Spiridon, Theodore Stratilat, Tecla, Barbara, Paraskeva, Pela-

<sup>25</sup> For a theologic - liturgic study of the Liturgikon we used the work of pr. dr. Spiridon Cîndea, *Textul Liturghierului românesc publicat de Diaconul Coresi*, din rev. "Mitropolia Ardealului", V (1960), nr. 1-2, p. 70-92. We also used Alexandru Mareș, *Liturghierul lui Coresi*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1969.

*A Jubilee of Romanian Culture and Spirituality...*

gia, Theodosia, Anastasia, Evpraxia, Fevronia, Teodula, Euphrosyne, Mary of Egypt, Cyrus, John, Ermolae. However, it is mentioned St. *Sava alu srăbilor* (in the archbishop rank) and *Simeonulu srăbilor* (in the monastic saints' rank). Regarding how to remove and place these portions, the text is laconic and imprecise: *și așa să ia fărâmî, să o puie în naceaia parte stănga. josu și a lalte pre rându să le puie.*

From the forth prosphora the priest cut out the portion for the local bishop, the civil authorities and clergy: *de toată episcopiia care-i derept-slăvesc, de episcopulu nostru, zii pre nume (sic!), și cinstita preuție ce e de hs. Slujbî. Și totu cinulu preuțescu. De bunii, cinstiți și de dumnezeu păziți împărații noștri. de șerbulu lu dumnezeu zii pre nume igumenului (sic!). de frații noștri și cu slujitorii și preuții și diaconii, și toți frații noștri cei ce cheamî întru a ta împreunare dereptu a ta miloste că ești de toț mai bun doamne.* And from the fifth prosphora it was cut out a *fărâmî* for the founder *de fericatî pomeanî* and *lăsarea păcatelorlu fericatu ctitorulu sfntului hram acesta*<sup>26</sup>.

There is the same indication as in Macarie's Liturgikon that the deacon may take portions for himself and his family, living and the dead.

The two prayers for the living and the reposed are missing too.

When blessing the incense the priest prayed: *Cădire aducemuți hrstoase doamne domnulu nostru. Întru mirizmî de bunî mirosenie. Ce luom întru alu tău jrătvnicu. Tremeate noao dulceața ta pre sfntul alu tău dhu*<sup>27</sup>. The prayers for covering the offered Gifts are the same as today but with an old time fragrance as cited above.

A feature of these ordinances is the priest gesture before blessing the offered Gifts, saying only one time *blgoslovitu dumnezeu ce așa vru acmu și pururea și în veacii de veacu: deacia leageșu amândoao mâinile sale (?) și să se închine cu smerenie. grăiascî.*

We can find the full text of Psalm 50, which the deacon pronounces when he censes *oltariulu totu și besearica*. The dismissal of the Proskomedia is not in the Liturgikon.

**3. The preparing for the beginning of the Divine Liturgy** was done in the same order as in today's Liturgikons: priest and deacon stand before the Altar Table and worship three times, saying *împăratulu ceriului mângăitoriu de suflete adevërite. Cēla ce de pretutindēnea toate*

<sup>26</sup> *Liturghier*, Brașov, 1570, f. 6 v.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibidem*, f. 8 r.

*imple. vistiarulu dulceșilor. și viași dătătoriu. vino răpausâte întru noi. Și curățeăștene de toați spurcâciunea și spășeaște dulce sufletele noastre,* three times, with the same words; when making the reverence, only the priest kisses the Gospel, and the deacon just kisses the Holy Table. The text has no indication for the beginning of the Liturgy - *a technical error or a servile imitation of the source ... some of the old Greek manuscripts*<sup>28</sup>. It continues with the preliminary dialogue between the priest and deacon< the last one asked for the blessing: *blagosloveaște doamne*<sup>29</sup>, from the place *de obiceai, înaintea sfintelor uși*.

**4. The rite of St. John Chrysostom's Liturgy.** This is the only Liturgy in this book and the beginning title is *slujba. ce e întru sfinții părintele nostru ioannu cu rostulu de auru. rugâciunea spre cădire*. The Proskomedia ends only at this point.

After the great blessing it follows the great litany, called *diaconstvele*. Here are some parts of this great litany that shows the beauty of the language: *lumiei domnului să ne rugăm. de susu pace și de spășenia sufletelor noastre domnului să ne rugăm. de păcele a toați lumea și de dulce tocmeale sfintele domnului beseareci și de împreunarea tuturor domnului să ne rugăm. de sfântă casa aceasta și de ceia ce cu credinși și cu dulce smerenie și cu frica lu dumnezeu ceia ce înblî întrânsî domnului să ne rugăm. de mai marele episcopulu nostru imr. și de curata preuție ce sântu de hs. slujbe de toați încetirea și oamenii domnului să ne rugăm. de dulce cinstiți și de dumnezeu păziți împărații noștri de toate curțile și de voinicii lor... de bunî mestecarea a văzduhului, de mulțimea rodului pământului, și de vreamă ... de noștorii și cale făcătorii neputincioșii ceea ce se chinuiescu prîdații și de spasenia lor... foloseaște, spășeaște, miluiaște și fereaște noi domn cu a ta dulceași...*The closing prayer of this litany had to be *strige* by *popa* and is a good example for showing the immaturity of that time Romanian language: *că cadeșă toați măriia cinste și închinâciune tatâlu și fiulu și sfntulu dhu, acmu și pururea și în veacii de veacu*. The prayers of the antiphons - placed before the antiphons - should be spoken *cu strigare* (loudly).

<sup>28</sup> Pr. prof. dr. Ene Braniște, *Liturghierul slavon tipărit de Macarie...*, p. 1048.

<sup>29</sup> The vigil moment of the Great Incense is still in the contemporary Liturgikon. The priest /ieromonach says, „Binecuvintează!”. At the beginning of the Liturgy the deacon also says „Binecuvintează, părinte!” – see *Liturghier*, ediție jubiliară, București, 2008, p. 17, 131, 198, 270, 509.

*A Jubilee of Romanian Culture and Spirituality...*

Coresi's text contains only parts of the first antiphon: *blagosloveaște sufletulu meu domnulu. sau blagoestu* and just indicates the second antiphon with verses. This is a reminiscence of the antiphonic psalms that were sung in the first centuries: *domnulu împărățise. macarâ. laudâ sufletulu meu domnulu. până însfrășatu* (verses 1, 2 and 7 of Psalm 92, n.n.). *slava ininea. e dinorodnii snu*. There follows the third antiphon: *spăseștene fiulu lu dumnezeu cela ce înviseși de înmoarte cântămuți laudămute*, used as refrain for saying the verses: *veniți să ne bucurâmu domnului, să strigăm domnului nostru... să ainte apucâmu fața lui înispovedire și în cântare să strigâmu lui... că zeulu mare e și domnu și împăratu mare spre totu pământulu...că în mâinile lui cunplitele pământului, și înnalteloru codrilor ale lui sântu. că a lui iaste marea și elu feaceo. și uscatulu mânile lui feaceri* (verses 1-5 of Psalm 94, n.n). Now come the *blajenile* (the Beatitudes) and at "Glory...", after making the proper reverences, it comes the little entrance, which is well said and perfectly similar to the little Entrance of current Liturgikons.

The chapter of Trisagion (*tristoe*) is introduced by the closing prayer *sfntu ești dumnezeulu nostru și ție mărire tremitemu...* and deacon's saying *și în veaci de veacu*. Another part missing are the three "O Lord, save the God-fearing" and the text of the Trisagion which is placed at the end of the prayer. At the fourth time of "Holy God..." after Glory... the priest made only one reverence to the Altar and not to the Proskomide.

And to the Cathedra he said *blgoslovitu ești cela ce pre scaunulu mării împărăției tale șezi...*, without adding "who sit on the Cherubim".

Before and after reading the Apostle the rules were to read a psalm also called *cânteculu lu david*. The incense was offered only before the Apostle and only in the Altar. The dialogue between priest and deacon took place quietly and in the altar. Priest's blessing has an unusual ending: *dumnezeu dereptu ruga sfntului aplu . ms. să dea ție grai dulce vestindu cu tărie multî întru împlerea evliei iubitulu fiulu lui domnulu și dumnezeu și spășitoriulu nostrum is. hs. cu aceluia dulceați și la oameni iubire<sup>30</sup>*.

At the Litany of Fervent Supplication there is missing the part mentioning the queen of the principate, present in the edition from 1508, but "de mai marii episcopii noștri" part is added. The Litany for the Departed does not exist in the text and also the details how to place the Gospel on the Holy Table and unfold the antimimension, the proper movements and words when unfolding it.

<sup>30</sup> *Liturgier*, Brașov, 1570, f. 20 r.

At the Cherubic Hymn, the deacon used the incense as Macarie's Liturgikon prescribed too. The Great Entrance ended when priest and deacon prayed together: *Pomeneasci toți voi domnulu dumnezeu împărăția lui*. Then followed a dialogue used nowadays only at the church consecration. The priest said: *luați poarta domnilor voștri și luose poarta de veaci, și întru împăratulu de slavî...* and the deacon answered: *blgslovitu vino în numele domnului dumnezeului nostrum. Domnulu ivies noao*. When the Gifts were placed on the Holy Table a single troparion was sung: *dulce obrazu iosifu de pe cruce luose preacuratu trupulu tău, cu pănz curatî învălitu puselu*<sup>31</sup>, and the deacon incensed the Gifts. The next dialogue between the priest and the deacon, and the litany and prayer are the same as the contemporary ones.

We highlight other theological and liturgical differences, between Coresi's Liturgikon and the current editions:

5. The priest did not wave the air at the Creed but he lifted it up a little and said *sfinte doamne, sfinte tare sfinte fără moarte...*;

6. There is no troparion for the third hour, or its verses before the Epiclesis;

7. The hierarch is not mentioned at the Diptics and the Megalyrion;

8. After breaking the Holy Body it is not mentioned which part the priests partook the communion, and when pouring the warm water the deacon said: *căldura duhului sfânt*;

9. The deacon girded himself with his orarion cruciformly only before partaking the communion.

10. The brotherly kissing happened only after the communion and the deacon kissed the priest on his cheek and said *Hristos în mijlocul nostru* and the answer: *Este și va fi...*;

11. There is no *Iată, s-a atins de buzele mele...*;

- The ending of the service is done by the deacon (who said *pășiți* when inviting the people to commune and *Cu pace să ieșim*).

Here are some other grammar and lexical notes on this translation:

12. The Liturgy text has no clear phrases and sentences and no signs of punctuation so necessary to a liturgical text.

13. The proper nouns did not have capitals (e.g.: instead of "Maria", is written "maria");

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, f. 26 v - 27 r.

### *A Jubilee of Romanian Culture and Spirituality...*

14. The text contains a lot of words that prove its slavonic origin: *rost* (mouth), *pocrov* (veil), *blagosloveaște* (bless), *blajenile* (Beatitudes), *jrăt-va* (sacrifice);

15. There are many Greek words made Romanian: *despoetoriule* (“Master” from Greek „despota“, *hs* - the Greek capitals *XC* from Christ, *andimis*) that show the translator knew also the Greek text of the Liturgy.

16. Some liturgical terms are still awkward: e.g.: *blid* instead of *diskos*.

17. There are some translation and printing inconsistencies. E.g.: at the great litany when mentioning Theothokos, the text is *despuietoarea noastră și curată fată maria*, and at the Litany of Fervent Supplication after the Great Entrance: *despuetoare a noastră și alu dumnezeu născitoare și pururea fecioară mariia*. The correct and complete text is used only before the Creed.

18. We can notice the beauty of the Romanian language even young but full of expressiveness. There is the blessing before reading the Apostle (II Corinthians 13, 13): *Dulceața domnului nostru is.hs., și dragostea domnului și a tatălui, și împreunarea sf(î)ntului dhu fie cu toți voi*.

## **VII. The Coresi's Liturgy text: literary and liturgical Romanian language thesaurus**

The beauty of Romanian dialect in the Brasov area and degree of maturity reached by the Romanian language in 1570 are proved by comparing the Coresian text to other most recent editions of the Liturgy. For example, here are some formulas of the Proskomedia from four non-regulatory editions:

### **Brașov, 1570, tab 4 r-v**

*Ca oaia spre junghiere adusese... Ca mielul înaintea tunzătorului lui fără de glas așa nuș deșchidea rostul lui... Întru smereniia lui luose... Născutul lui cinel va spune...*

Except for a few archaisms, several misspellings and punctuation - if they relate to current regulations - that are easily detected, to understand the spoken language is not a difficult task, and the liturgical changes are

totally insignificant. It is more interesting to compare a liturgical text - triple Litany, for example, between two important editions: the Liturgy of Brasov in 1570 and that printed by St. Metropolitan Dosoftei in Iasi, in 1679:

Braşov, 1570, f. 21 r-v.	Iaşi, 1679, p. 51-54.
<p><i>miluiaşte noi după mare mila ta rugămuţâne auzi şi miluiaşte noi.</i></p> <p><i>înncî rugămune de dulci cinstiţi împăraţii noştri de ţinutui, de biruire, de lăcuire. de pace, de sănătate, de spăsenia lor. ce iaste cătrî domnul dumnezeu nostru mai vrătos a spori şi a ajuta lor întru toate şi a pleca supt picioarele lor tot draculu şi vrăjmaşul.</i></p> <p><i>înncî rugămune de dulci cinstitori şi de hs iubitori împăraţii noştri imr.</i></p> <p><i>înncî rugămune de mai marii episcopii noştri imr.</i></p> <p><i>înncî rugămune de toţi fraţii noştri şi dereptu toţi creştinii”.</i></p>	<p><i>Miluiaştene, Dumnezău, după mare mila Ta, rugămu-ne Ție ascultă şi miluiaşte.</i></p> <p><i>Încă ne rugăm pentru bun credincios şi iubitoriu în XC Domnul nostru, Ioan, cutare şi cinstita lui Doamnă cutare şi iubiţii lor fii cutare.</i></p> <p><i>Tărie, biruire, petrecere, pace, sănătate şi spăsenia lui şi pentru ca Domnul Dumnezăul nostru ca mai vărtos să-i sporească şi să-l întărească întru tot şi să plece supt picioarele lui pre tot pizmaşulşi luptătoriu.</i></p> <p><i>Încă ne rugăm pentru Arhiepiscopul nostru , cutare.</i></p> <p><i>Încă ne rugăm pentru fraţii noştri preuţii, sveštenoinocii şi pentru toată în Hristos a noastră frăţime.</i></p>

Beyond the differences in content, explained by the fact that the process of “organic development” enriched books, it is very easy to spot the similitude of the texts. The 110 years that passed did not produce unintelligible changes in the text. There are some places, where Coresi’s language is much closer to that of today than Dosoftei’s.

A third experience is the comparison between many editions (among them being the forth regulatory editions of 1508, 1570, 1679, 2008) of a certain text - the Apostolic Blessing (II Corinthians 13, 13), a widely used text in theological literature:

<p><b>Târgoviște,</b> <b>1508,</b> <b>f. 22r.</b></p>	<p><i>Harul Domnului nostru Iisus Hristos și dragostea lui Dumnezeu Tatăl și împărășirea Sfântului Duh să fie cu voi cu toți.</i></p>
<p><b>Brașov,</b> <b>1570,</b> <b>f. 30 r.</b></p>	<p><i>Dulceața domnulu nostru is hs, și dragostea domnului și a tatălui și împreunarea sfântului dhu să fie cu voi cu toți.</i></p>
<p><b>Iași,</b> <b>1679,</b> <b>p.74.</b></p>	<p><i>Harul Domnului nostru Iisus Hristos și dragostea lui Dumnezeu Tatăl și cumenecăciu- nea Svântului Duh să fie cu toț cu voi.</i></p>
<p><b>București,</b> <b>1741,</b> <b>file nenum.</b></p>	<p><i>Darul Domnului nostru Iisus Hristos și dragostea lui Dumnezeu Tatăl și împără- șirea Sfântului Duh să fie cu voi cu toți.</i></p>
<p><b>Chișinău,</b> <b>1856,</b> <b>f. 136 v.</b></p>	<p><i>Darul Domnului nostru Iisus Hristos și dragostea lui Dumnezeu Tatăl și împărășirea Sfântului Duh să fie cu voi cu toți.</i></p>
<p><b>Blaj, 1931,</b> <b>p. 86.</b></p>	<p><i>Darul Domnului nostru Iisus Hristos și dragostea lui Dumnezeu Tatăl și împărăși- rea Sfântului Duh să fie cu voi cu toți.</i></p>
<p><b>București,</b> <b>2008,</b> <b>p. 166</b></p>	<p><i>Harul Domnului nostru Iisus Hristos și dragostea lui Dumnezeu – Tatăl și împărășirea (părășia) Sfântului Duh să fie cu voi cu toți.</i></p>

During five centuries and seven editions, the lexical and theological-liturgical changes are not significant. Therefore, we can show both the liturgical language stability and the pure, beautiful forms of the literary and spoken language since the 1500. Coresi's Liturgikon is an important milestone.

**VIII. The importance of the 1570 Liturgikon**, as of the whole Coresi's work is great for the maturation and crystallisation of the Romanian language. Coresi addressed his people through his Romanian printings, and he struggled to speak and write the sacred word in his language. Here are Coresi's words in the preface of the Romanian Gospel Book (Tetraevangheliar): *și am scris aceste sfinte cărți de învățatura, să fie popilor românești să înțeleaga, să învețe rumânii cine-s creștini, cen găiește și Sfântul Apostol Pavel către Corinteni 14 capete: în sfânta biserică mai bine e a grăi cinci cuvinte pe întales decât zece mii de cuvinte în limbă străină...*<sup>32</sup>. Coresi provides Romanian books to his people and its culture, thus contributing to the unification of Romanian literary language and culture, in anticipation of the desire and success of martyr prince Michael the Brave.

This Liturgikon is an example of rapid maturation of the Romanian language. Serving the Liturgy in Romanian, thousands of times in hundreds of churches in the ears of tens and hundreds of thousands of Romanian in decades, meant preparing other great moments in the Romanian culture, as in a continuous prayer of a nation that knows to appreciate the language, and to give it a priestly dignity, showing it to the world, with unforgettable words: *Tatăl nostru ce ești în ceri sf(i)nțeascîse numele tău. să vie înpărîția ta să fie voia ta cumu în ceriu așa și pre pămîntu. pita noastră sățioasă dăne noao astăzi. și iartî noao greșalele noastre. cumu iertămu și noi greșiților noștri. și nu ne duce în năpaste ce ne izbăvește pe noi de hitleanulu*<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> Predoslovie" la *Tetraevanghelul românesc*, Brașov, 1561, apud prof. Cornel Rădulescu, *Primele traduceri românești ale cărților de ritual, secolele XVI-XVIII (Studiu istoric, liturgic și lingvistic)*, partea a II-a, în rev. „Glasul Bisericii”, XXXIV (1975), nr. 5-6, p. 574.

<sup>33</sup> *Liturghier*, Brașov, 1570, f. 36 r.

## **IX. Conclusions**

Coresi and his Liturgikon of 1570 demonstrate the maturity of the Romanian, its ability to express any emotion, any feeling, and any idea. The Romanians of the time were eager to write in their own language, to have books and create culture in their language. Therefore, Coresi's Liturgikon marks a great start. It is *the beginning of writing in a language designed to all the Romanians, which would become the literary language through the printing books. This language was Romanian dialect of southern Transylvania and northern Walachia*<sup>34</sup>. It is the beginning of a great courage and heroism in faith and a culture that will move mountains and will be generalised in the three Romanian countries! On this basis, not long after Coresi great scholars (Bishop Stephen Simon, Prince Serban Cantacuzino, Metropolitans Saints Varlaam, Dosoftei, Antim Ivireanul) will translate all the religious books. Without their books, Romanian culture would have been very poor today, but they made possible to show the Romanian spirituality to the world.

---

<sup>34</sup> Pr. prof. dr. Ene Braniște, *Limba liturgică la români, privită în evoluția ei din edițiile Liturghierului și importanța sa pentru formarea și unitatea limbii noastre literare*, în "Almanahul Parohiei Ortodoxe Române din Viena pe anii 1982-1983", Viena, 1983, p. 93.

## BOOK REVIEWS

**Bart D. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why*, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005, 242 p, ISBN 0-06-073817-0**

Bart Ehrman is a university professor as well as a widely acknowledged expert in the field of biblical textual criticism—the study of the available manuscript evidence from which the various translations of the Bible have been produced. He is also an excellent writer. Unfortunately, the main thrust of this book is not as commendable. Contrary to what the title might suggest, Bart Ehrman's book *Misquoting Jesus* is not primarily about sayings of Jesus that have been "misquoted". Ehrman's preferred title was "Lost in Transmission", reflecting his personal opinion that much of the original wording of the New Testament has been "lost" through the inaccuracies of the early scribes who hand-copied the text. For marketing reasons (one would presume) the publisher preferred the existing title. The subtitle of the book doesn't add any clarity either. "The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why" gives the impression that the reader will learn of a sinister historical plot to distort Scripture. Nothing could be further from the truth, or from the actual content of Ehrman's book.

### **Contents of the Book**

Most of *Misquoting Jesus* is actually a very readable, accurate distillation of many of the most important facts about the nature and history of textual criticism, presented in a lively and interesting narrative that will keep scholarly and lay interest alike.

Successive chapters treat, in brief, (1) the formation of the Hebrew and Christian canons, (2) the mechanics of copying a text in the ancient world and in the early transmission of the Christian Scriptures, (3) highlights in the history of the production of increasingly critical editions of a reconstructed Greek New Testament, along with the kinds of changes, both accidental

**Bart D. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus...***

and intentional, that scribes introduced into the thousands of manuscripts still in our possession, thus necessitating those reconstructions, (4) key post-Reformation textual critics involved with the production of the most well-known reconstructions, from Simon to Westcott and Hort, (5) modern methods of textual criticism, combining external and internal evidence, with several of the more interesting examples of significant changes in the New Testament, (6) more tantalizing examples of theologically motivated changes, and (7) similar examples where the social world of the scribes led them to introduce changes in the meanings of their exemplars. A brief conclusion returns to his personal story, reiterating how, in light of the numerous changes that preclude us from saying we either have the original texts or can perfectly reconstruct them, he finds it impossible to hold to biblical inerrancy or inspiration and insinuates (without ever saying so in many words) that reasonable persons should come to similar conclusions.

Thus a substantial majority of this book provides information already well-known and well-accessible in other sources, such as Bruce Metzger's works on the text and transmission of the New Testament (including one that Ehrman himself recently helped to revise), but in slightly more popular form that is likely to reach a wider audience. What most distinguishes the work are the spins Ehrman puts on some of the data at numerous junctures and his propensity for focusing on the most drastic of all the changes in the history of the text, leaving the uninitiated likely to think there are numerous additional examples of various phenomena he discusses when there are not. Thus his first extended examples of textual problems in the New Testament are the woman caught in adultery and the longer ending of Mark. After demonstrating how neither of these is likely to be part of the originals of either Gospel, Ehrman concedes that "most of the changes are not of this magnitude" (p. 69). But this sounds as if there are at least a few others that are of similar size, when in fact there are no other textual variants anywhere that are even one-fourth as long as these thirteen- and twelve-verse additions.

A second supposition necessary for Ehrman's case is that the non-professional scribes that he postulates did most of the copying of New Testament documents until the fourth-century, when Constantine became the first emperor to commission new copies of the Bible, did not do nearly as careful a job as the professional scribes that he postulates did most of

the post-Constantinian copying. Not only are both of these postulates unprovable (though certainly possible), but the actual textual evidence of the second and third centuries, though notably sparser than for later centuries, does not demonstrate the sufficiently greater fluidity in the textual tradition that would be necessary to actually support the hypothesis that we cannot reconstruct the most likely originals with an exceedingly high probability of accuracy, even if that probability remains in the high 90s rather than at 100 %.

Ehrman's discussion of Erasmus and the famous Johannine Comma (I John 5,7-8) is both lucid and entertaining. But, again, what is lacking is any acknowledgment that there is no other known example in all of the history of textual criticism of a similar insertion to a critical Greek text being made on the basis of only one, most likely altered, late medieval manuscript. Moreover, Ehrman writes as if the doctrine of the Trinity stands or falls with this spurious addition, which ignores the numerous other Trinitarian references in the New Testament.

One of the most valuable and least duplicated parts of the book comes in the chapters that discuss theologically and sociologically motivated changes. Ehrman's revision to Metzger's standard textbook introduces several of these as well, though more briefly, but most primers on the discipline largely ignore them. It is very helpful to understand how Mark's probable reference to Jesus' anger in Mark 1,41 (rather than compassion) fits his overall presentation of Jesus, just as Luke's original "omission" of Jesus sweating great drops of blood in the garden in Luke 24,43-44 reflects his picture of a more "imperturbable" Christ. Ehrman's suggestion that Hebrews 2,9 originally read that Christ tasted death "apart from God" rather than "by the grace of God" seemingly founders on the sheer paucity of external evidence for the reading. But if Origen was right that the reading stood in the majority of manuscripts of his day, then perhaps it was original. No unorthodox theology results (recall the cry of dereliction in the Gospels), but one can see why the vast majority of scribes would have adopted the reading that is far better known today.

Perhaps the only example in these chapters that is altogether unconvincing is the idea that I Corinthians 14, 34-35 was missing from Paul's original text, simply because a few very late manuscripts have moved the verses to the end of the chapter (where they flow much more naturally), and because a few older manuscripts include marginal signs

**Bart D. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus...***

the *might* point to some kind of textual question (but even this could be adequately accounted for by doubts about the location of the verses). Few textual critics of any theological stripe elsewhere accept as probable suggestions that the originals of any New Testament book read differently from all known copies, because of the sheer number and antiquity of the copies that we have, until a passage becomes too awkward for their overall theological systems (and even then most seek some other resolution of the tension than textual emendation).

One surprising factual error occurs when Ehrman insists that Acts 4, 13 means that Peter and John were illiterate (the term *agrammatos* "unlettered" in this context means not educated beyond the elementary education accessible to most first-century Jewish boys). But otherwise, the most disappointing feature of the volume is Ehrman's apparent unawareness of (or else his unwillingness to discuss) the difference between inductive and deductive approaches to Scripture. The widely-accepted Christian formulations of inspiration and inerrancy have never claimed that these are doctrines that arise from the examination of the data of the existing texts. They are theological corollaries that follow naturally from the conviction that God is the author of the texts (itself suggested by II Tim 3,16, Jesus' own high view of Scripture and his conviction that the Spirit had yet more truth to inspire his followers to record). But if the texts are "God-breathed," and if God cannot err, then they must be inspired and inerrant.

Ehrman offers no supporting arguments for his claims that if God inspired the originals, he both could have and should have inerrantly preserved them in all subsequent copies. It would have been a far greater miracle to supernaturally guide every copyist and translator throughout history than to inspire one set of original authors, and in the process it probably would have violated the delicate balance between the humanity and divinity of the Bible analogous to the humanity and divinity of Christ. All that is necessary is for us to have reason to believe that we can reconstruct something remarkably close to the originals, and we have evidence for that in abundance. No central tenet of Christianity hangs on any textually uncertain passage; this observation alone means that Christian textual critics may examine the variants that do exist dispassionately and without worrying that their faith is somehow threatened in the ways that Ehrman came to believe.

## Argument Inconsistencies

A close reading of the book reveals the fact that Ehrman's work is founded on a contradictory thinking that ultimately leads him to an arbitrary and illogical conclusion. Thus, Bart Ehrman admits throughout the book that there exists an "original text", even though no one possesses it and it very well may no longer exist anywhere in physical form. What he means is that somewhere within the multitude of *copies* of Scripture exist the *original words* of Scripture, though partially obscured by the effects of time and scribal inaccuracies. And to his credit, it is this conviction that leads him to believe that fully recovering the exact original wording is still at least a theoretical possibility. His continued efforts as a textual critic, one who seeks to gain more and more certainty as to the original wording of Scripture, point in this direction also.

I find it tragically ironic, however, that in seeking to recover the original wording of the New Testament, Bart Ehrman is seeking to recover something that will ultimately disprove his own point. Let us remember his conclusion that God did not inspire the original text of Scripture. More importantly, let's remember how he arrived at that conclusion: "If one wants to insist that God inspired the very words of scripture, what would be the point if we don't have the very words of scripture? In some places, as we will see, we simply cannot be sure that we have constructed the original text accurately. . . . The fact that we don't *have* the words surely must show, I reasoned, that [God] did not preserve them for us. And if he didn't perform that miracle, there seemed to be no reason to think that he performed the earlier miracle of inspiring those words" (p. 11).

Because God providentially permitted scribes to make errors when copying Scripture, and therefore permitted a few tiny portions of the biblical text to remain uncertain today, Bart Ehrman "reasoned" that God did not inspire the original writings. First of all, the presence of scribal errors in the *copies* does not logically demand a non-inspired *original*. One must make an extraordinary mental leap to reach the one position from the other. In order to arrive where he did, in fact, Bart Ehrman had to first *assume* what he desired to *conclude*. The irony lies in the fact that after basing his denial of the doctrine of inspiration on the presence of a few unresolved textual variants, Ehrman seeks to resolve those same variants. In other words, while stubbornly maintaining his own denial of

**Bart D. Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus...***

the doctrine of inspiration, he seeks to do away with the very points of evidence which (in his view) justify his denial of the doctrine.

In some ways Bart Ehrman is like a man attempting to climb to a mountain peak that is partially shrouded in mist. Because he cannot see the peak clearly, he insists that it has never existed, yet he keeps on climbing. According to Ehrman's reasoning, this man might say, "If God wanted me to believe that the peak was actually there, He would not have permitted it to be obscured by clouds". To say the least, such reasoning is fallacious. And the man's continued efforts to reach the top make no sense when compared with his stated beliefs. After all, what would you think of a mountain climber who says, "I'm convinced that the top of this mountain does not exist, and I'm going to prove I'm right by climbing to the top myself? As long as he continues his climb, one would wonder what he is hoping to discover. And when he reaches the top, proving that it was there all the time, one would be surprised if he were not somewhat ashamed to have discovered it.

Even more ironic in Bart Ehrman's case is the fact that in some places, he seems to have every confidence that textual scholars are quite capable of recovering what they seek to recover: "[*Misquoting Jesus*] is written for people who know nothing about textual criticism but who might like to learn something about how scribes were changing scripture *and about how we can recognize where they did so*. . . . It is written for anyone who might be interested in seeing how we got our New Testament, seeing how in some instances we don't even know what the words of the original writers were, seeing in what interesting ways these words occasionally got changed, and seeing how we might, through the application of some rather rigorous methods of analysis, *reconstruct what those original words actually were*" (p. 15, emphasis mine). Here Bart Ehrman speaks out of the self-affirming side of his mouth, exalting the abilities of textual critics like himself. Such experts, he claims, can not only recognize where changes have been made to the original words, they can also "reconstruct what those original words actually were". This self-affirming slant is also self-serving, of course, because it puts Ehrman in the position of being the expert to which everyone should look for answers. But in other places, when speaking out of the skeptical side of his mouth, he seems to have abandoned all confidence in his own field of study, effectively relegating the science of textual criticism to an ultimately useless intellectual hobby. So,

in the end, who is Mr. Ehrman? An expert who is capable of reconstructing the original text of Scripture, or a befuddled scholar looking at a hopeless problem in despair?

## Conclusion

While Ehrman presents a lot of interesting factual and technical information, his presentation is so one-sided that the reader is given a distorted view of reality and deprived of a great deal of pertinent information that would clear things up.

If anything is certain about *Misquoting Jesus*, it is that Bart Ehrman's skepticism, not his objective or responsible handling of the facts, led him to the position he now advocates. An objective and unbiased investigation, on the other hand, will lead us to understand that the Bibles we now possess are not based on "error-ridden" manuscripts, as Ehrman would have us believe. They are based on the oldest surviving forms of the original biblical texts—manuscripts which (as Bart Ehrman himself admits), are "no doubt closely (*very* closely) related to what the author originally wrote" (p. 62, emphasis Ehrman's).

Christians' confidence in the Holy Scripture's inspired testimony to the salvific work of God through Jesus Christ should remain undaunted in the face of Mr. Ehrman's attack. *Misquoting Jesus* may seem at first like a powerful and destructive weapon against such confidence, but in the final analysis, the book just makes a lot of noise and creates a lot of confusion—like a cannon that fires confetti. There are still a few textual matters that continue to puzzle scholars. No one should deny that. But the fact is, they involve miniscule portions of the Bible. And the presence of these few remaining unresolved textual matters should not lead anyone to doubt the perfection of the originals from which our translations have been painstakingly produced. Even Bart Ehrman provides no foundation for arriving at that "reasoned" conclusion (p. 11). The fact is, he has taken an unnecessary and illogical leap into spiritual quicksand by trusting his own fallible reason over what we are expressly told in the infallible Word of God: Holy Scripture is ultimately divine, not human, in its origin.

**Rev. Adrian Murg**

**Reverend Adrian Murg Ph.D., *Soteriology of the Lucan Writings* ( Doctoral Thesis), “Aurel Vlaicu” University Press, Arad, 2011**

The outstanding work of the New Testament Bible Study written by Priest Adrian Murg Ph.D., from the Faculty of Orthodox Theology in Arad comprises 326 pages and it is structured in four parts, each part having between two to four chapters and several smaller chapters in order to analyze and clarify the subject.

The “*Foreword*” which precedes the doctoral thesis (pages 7 -17) can be considered a Biblical theology study, genuine and authorized, addressed by Priest Prof. Vasile Mihoc Ph.D., the thesis advisor and it can be followed like a red line throughout the theme in “*Soteriology of the Lucan Writings*”, showing that salvation is a Divine-human work, both in the New Testament and the Old Testament. Salvation is the restoration of Israel through the prophets’ Spirit and later achieved by Jesus Christ the Savior on the Cross and completed by the work of the Holy Spirit in Church. (pages 13-15).

The two parts which precede the paper: “*Introduction*” and “*Preamble*” (Chapter 1) (pages 18 – 35) open the author’s perspective and points of view in approaching the theme, both in the Gospel According to Luke and in the Apostles’ Deeds, with a careful insight on Lucan soteriology and especially its incorporation in the New Testament theology.

The creation of the Universe and Man, as well as humanity’s work of salvation belong to the Holy Trinity, as it appears from the Lucan theology in the two Holy books of the New Testament, beginning with anticipations of salvation in Childhood’s Gospel (chapter 1 – 2) and moving on with God’s Salvation Plan in Luke – Deeds, (pages 36 – 63), with the Eschatology and history of redemption in the first part entitled “*God the Savior*”.

*The second part* entitled “*Jesus the Savior*” is focused on the work of salvation itself, achieved by the Son of God on the Calvary Cross, the

Priest Adrian Murg Ph.D., *Soteriology of the Lucan Writings...*

cosmic dimension of salvation, on wonders performed by Jesus through healing illnesses, forgiving sins and others throughout His messianic activity until God's Ascension to Heaven. (pages 73-228)

*Part three* entitled "Salvation as work of the Holy Spirit and participation in the life of Church" outlines the completion or fulfillment of the salvation work by the third person of the Holy Trinity – the Holy Spirit named also "Spirit of prophecy" in Apostles 'Deeds, Chapter 2, or "prophetic Spirit", restoration of Israel in the Old Testament and becoming the Church or the Holy Community in the New Testament (pages 231-266).

In *the last part* (the fourth) the author explains God's words from the Holy Gospel: "What do I have to do in order to be saved?", in two □ chapters: "Divine initiative" and "Man's role in salvation", reminding of conversions of important people: Cornelius the Centurion and Saul of Tars, as well as strong conditions for salvation: Faith, Repentance and the Christian Christening (pages 269 – 300).

The bibliography, so carefully selected, predominantly from foreign languages is impressive through its content and number (almost 500 works by almost as many authors), while the bibliographic notes and the exegesis total double theology specialized papers, while bringing an outstanding contribution to the New Testament Bible Study.

**Lucian-Victor Baba**

# 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 staff 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 staff guarantees the author the feedback right, during the first week after receiving the article;
- the editorial staff will, confidentially, send and comment both the positive and the negative feedbacks;
- the consultant and the editorial staff 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 și comuniune în Liturgia ortodoxă*, EIBMBOR, București, 2004, 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, Știința în contextul teologiei apusene și al celei răsăritene, în vol. „Știință și Teologie. Preliminarii pentru dialog”, coord. Pr. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Popescu, Editura Eonul dogmatic, București, 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. „Părinți și Scriitori Bisericești”, vol. 21, trad. Pr. D. Fecioru, EIBM-BOR, București, 1987, 43.

Ambrosius, Expositio evanghelii 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

**Baba** Lucian-Victor, Ph. D., Orthodox Theological Seminary, Arad, Romania

**Moltmann** Jürgen, Rev. Ph. D., Protestant Theology of Tübingen University, Germany

**Murg** Adrian, Rev. Ph. D. Theology Faculty of “Aurel Vlaicu” University, Arad, Romania

**Pietroaia** Lucian, Ph. D., History, Philosophy and Theology Faculty, “Dunărea de Jos” University, Galați, Romania

**Ribolov** Svetoslav, Ph. D., “St. Clement of Ochrid” University of Sofia, Bulgaria

**Synek** Eva Maria, Ph. D. Faculty of Catholic Theology, University of Wien, Austria

**Tulcan** Ioan, Rev. Ph. D. Theology Faculty of “Aurel Vlaicu” University, Arad, Romania

**Welker** Michael, Ph. D., Theology Faculty of University of Heidelberg, Germany