

FORUM THEOLOGICUM SARDICENSE

prius

БОГОСЛОВСКА МИСЪЛ

2/2015

annus XX

*Издание на Богословския факултет
при Софийския университет „Св. Климент Охридски“*

РЕДАКЦИОННА КОЛЕГИЯ

Главни редактори:

доц. д-р Светослав Риболов, доц. д-р Павел Павлов

Членове:

о. проф. д-р Порфириос (Джеорджи), проф. д-р Мария Йовчева, доц. д-р Йон Мариан Кройтору, проф. д-р Илияс Евангелу, гл. ас. д-р Андриан Александров

COLLEGIUM EDITORUM

Svet. Riboloff & Pavel Pavloff

Fr. Porphyrius Georgi (University of Balamand), Maria Yovcheva (University of Sofia St. Clement of Ochrid), Ion Marian Croitoru (University of Valachia, Targoviste), Ilias Evangelou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki), Andrian Alexandrov (University of Sofia St. Clement of Ochrid)

© Богословски факултет на СУ „Св. Климент Охридски“

© Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“

ISSN 1310-7909

СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ

Предговор	5
Dietmar Schon <i>Die Orthodoxie im Dialog mit dem Islam (1986-2012) – ein vergleichender Überblick zu Themen, Methoden und Ergebnissen</i>	7
Petcu Cristian Vasile <i>Abortion – Moral, Ethical and Canonical Issues</i>	25
Fr. Petăr P. Simeonov <i>Σύντομη ἀνασκόπηση στὴν ἱστορία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Βουλγαρίας κατὰ τὸ πρῶτο ἡμῖς τοῦ 13^{ου} αἰῶνα</i>	37
Iulian Mihai L. Constantinescu <i>Canonical Institution of Autocephaly and Diaspora. The Recent Conflict between the Jerusalem Patriarchate and the Romanian Patriarchate</i>	57
Светослав Риболов <i>Богословие на творението в българската богословска мисъл на XX век</i>	79
Pr. Nicușor Beldiman <i>Părintele profesor Marin C. Ionescu – orator talentat și misionar conștiincios</i>	89
Георги Чочев <i>Учението за девството у св. Григорий Нисийски</i>	103
Цветин Цеков <i>Възможен ли е „антропният принцип“ като богословски аргумент?</i>	111
Ion Marian Croitoru <i>Father Arsenie Papacioc and the Proper Arrangement of Spiritual Life. Glimpses of His Experiences in the Communist Prisons</i>	125

CONTENTS

Foreword	5
Dietmar Schon <i>Orthodoxy in Dialogue with the Islam (1986-2012): a Comparative review of the Topics, Methods and Results of This Dialogue</i>	7
Petcu Cristian Vasile <i>Abortion – Moral, Ethical and Canonical Issues</i>	25
Fr. Petăr P. Simeonov <i>A Short Overview of the Ecclesiastical History of Bulgaria in the Second Half of the 13th Century</i>	37
Iulian Mihai L. Constantinescu <i>Canonical Institution of Autocephaly and Diaspora. The Recent Conflict between the Jerusalem Patriarchate and the Romanian Patriarchate</i>	57
Svetoslav Ribolov, <i>Theology of Creation in the Bulgarian Theological Thought of the 20th Century</i>	79
Pr. Nicușor Beldiman <i>Fr. Prof. Marin C. Ionescu – a Talented Orator and Productive Mirrionary</i>	89
Georgi Chochev <i>St. Gregory of Nyssa on the Virginity</i>	103
Tsvetin Tsekov <i>Is the Anthropic Principle Possible as a Theological Argument?</i>	111
Ion Marian Croitoru <i>Father Arsenie Papacioc and the Proper Arrangement of Spiritual Life. Glimpses of His Experiences in the Communist Prisons</i>	125

ПРЕДГОВОР

С настоящия брой списание *Forum Theologicum Sardicense* (с предишно заглавие „Богословска мисъл“) изпълва своята двадесета година като официално периодично издание на Богословския факултет при Софийския университет „Св. Климент Охридски“. Макар и неголям, настоящият том представя изследователи от четири страни. Отец Дитмар Шон е дългогодишен преподавател в Католическия факултет на Регенсбургския университет и изследовател на православната традиция. Неслучайно работата му е посветена на православно-ислямския диалог. Румънският преподавател Петку Василе представя опит за анализ на проблема с абортите от православна богословска гледна точка, което със сигурност ще бъде от значение за дискусията в нашата страна. Тази дискусия се води вече години. Отец Петър Симеонов представя изключително интересен и сложен период от църковната история на Българи. Неговото проучване е базирано на задълбочено познаване не само на изворите от епохата, но и на изследванията в областта. Работата е писана по време на докторантурата му в Атинския Каподистриев университет и със сигурност ще привлече вниманието на медиевистите. Юлиан Константинеску поставя тежък дискуссионен въпрос. Той разисква възникналия преди четири години конфликт между Православната църква в Румъния и Патриаршията на Йерусалим, след като румънски клирици построиха храм в Йерусалим, който да обслужва румънски поклонници. Това неканонично действие предизвиква спор между двете поместни църкви и до днес остава неразрешен докрай въпрос. Румънската страна се оправдава с въведената от руснаците още преди векове практика за изнасянето на енории на територията на други православни църкви, и то най-вече в Светите Земи, а Йерусалимската патриаршия държеше на стриктното спазване на канона, който не позволява една поместна църква да изнася енории в друга такава. Единствената православна църква, която по канон може да държи ставропигии в други поместни църкви, е Вселенската патриаршия — майка-църква на православните. Константинеску представя подробно аргументите на румънската страна, което по никакъв начин не задължава нашето издание с неговата теза. По-скоро очакваме дискусия по въпроса.

Светослав Риболов и отец Никушор Белдиман, автори от България и Румъния, изследват съвременни богословски въпроси. Единият е посветил текста си на присъствието на темата за творението в богословската мисъл в

България през XX в., а другият – на пастирското дело на известния румънски мисионер и проповедник отец Марин Юнеску. Георги Чочев е докторант по теология в СУ „Св. Климент Охридски“ и прави кратък анализ на визията на св. Григорий Нисийски за живота в девство и непорочие, а Цветин Цветков, магистър по теология на същия университет, представя своята богословска визия за проблемите, свързани с т.нар. „антропен принцип“ в изследването на православната християнска традиция. Накрая е текстът на румънския патрист Йон Мариан Кройтору, който тук разработва интересната тема за подвига на румънския свидетел на вярата по време на комунистическите гонения над Църквата.

CP

Dietmar Schon

DIE ORTHODOXIE IM DIALOG MIT DEM ISLAM (1986-2012) – EIN VERGLEICHENDER ÜBERBLICK ZU THEMEN, METHODEN UND ERGEBNISSEN¹

Abstract: *Orthodoxy in Dialogue with the Islam (1986-2012): a Comparative Review of the Topics, Methods and Results of this Dialogue.* The lecture is based on a long-term research on the efforts of the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches to engage in a dialogue with representatives of the Islam. This commitment is demonstrated in different concepts and forms. The reference points of the lecture topic are two main concepts: 1) On the one hand, there is the bilateral interreligious dialogue, which involves only Orthodox Christians and Muslims. 2) On the other hand, there is the participation of Orthodox Churches in joint multilateral initiatives for dialogue, which engages members of different Christian churches in a dialogue with Muslims, thus aiming to display their Christian attitude.

Keywords: Ecumenical Dialogue, Theological Dialogue, Orthodox Church, Theology, Islam

Zunächst möchte ich Herrn Dekan Omarchevski und dem Professorenenkollegium der orthodoxen Fakultät Sofia herzlich für die Einladung zu dieser Gastvorlesung danken. Die Fakultät hat erst kürzlich eine bemerkenswerte Initiative ergriffen und eine neue Studienrichtung religionswissenschaftlicher Ausrichtung eröffnet. Dies gibt mir Gelegenheit, Ihnen von meinen Forschungsergebnissen zum Thema „Die Orthodoxie im Dialog mit dem Islam“ zu berichten.

¹ Vortrag am 22. Mai 2017 an der theologischen Fakultät der Universität Sofia.

1. „Koordinaten“ der Untersuchung und des Vortragsthemas

Im Hintergrund meines Vortrags steht eine mehrjährige Untersuchung zu den Bemühungen der autokephalen orthodoxen Kirchen, in ein Gespräch mit Angehörigen des Islam einzutreten. Dieses Engagement hat sich in verschiedenen Konzeptionen und Formen ausgedrückt. Zunächst sind zwei Grundkonzeptionen zu unterscheiden:

- einerseits einen bilateralen interreligiösen Dialog, bei dem nur orthodoxe und muslimische Gläubige in einen Diskurs eingetreten sind;
- andererseits eine orthodoxe Beteiligung an multilateralen Dialogereignissen, d.h. Angehörige von verschiedenen christlichen Kirchen sind gemeinsam in einen Dialog mit Muslimen eingetreten, um so ein christliches Zeugnis einzubringen.

Besonders vielfältig sind die Formen interreligiösen Dialogs: die Bandbreite reicht von großen, international ausgerichteten Symposien über regionale Fachtagungen bis hin zu lokalen Arbeitsgruppen. Einmalige Zusammenkünfte stehen neben Veranstaltungsreihen und auf Dauer angelegten offiziellen Kommissionen wie etwa der russisch-orthodox/iranischen Dialogkommission oder auch sogenannten interreligiösen Räten. Große Bedeutung haben zudem Begegnungen hochgestellter Persönlichkeiten, die z.T. nachhaltige Fortschritte eingeleitet haben. Nicht zu unterschätzen ist schließlich die Rolle von speziell dem interreligiösen Dialog gewidmeten Organisationen, an denen die Orthodoxie sowohl administrativ wie durch inhaltliche Beiträge beteiligt war und ist.

Um ein annähernd vollständiges Bild von den orthodoxen Beiträgen im interreligiösen Dialog mit dem Islam zu bekommen, war es notwendig, möglichst viele Dialogereignisse aller Konzeptionen und Formen zu erfassen. Allein in den Jahren 1986 bis 2012 waren dies Hunderte von Anlässen. Dabei liegt ein Wert bereits in deren Durchführung, denn Begegnung und Austausch fördern wechselseitige Kenntnis, vermögen Missverständnisse aufzudecken und die authentischen religiösen Lehren von deren Entstellung durch extremistische Kräfte zu unterscheiden, ein Problem, das heute besonders im Islam anzutreffen ist. Allerdings sind solche im Dialog erreichten Klärungen oder Entkrampfungen kaum „messbar“, handelt es sich doch wesentlich um eine persönliche Bewusstseinsveränderung und –erweiterung bei den Dialogpartnern. Um neben den Dialogereignissen auch die Dialogergebnisse fassen zu können, bedurfte es eines anderen

methodischen Ansatzes. Theoretisch gibt es dazu verschiedene Lösungen.² Einen Weg haben die Teilnehmer am interreligiösen Dialog jedoch selbst gewiesen, indem sie die Ergebnisse ihres Austauschs in einer typischen Form zusammengefasst haben, den sogenannten Schlusserklärungen. Solche Schlusserklärungen stehen zwar nur am Ende eines Teils der Dialogereignisse. Dafür haben sie den Vorteil der Unmittelbarkeit und der Authentizität, weil die betreffenden Texte im Rahmen der jeweiligen Dialogereignisse entwickelt, diskutiert und teilweise sogar abgestimmt wurden. Streicht man aus dem so zur Verfügung stehenden Material nochmals solche Schlusserklärungen heraus, die stereotype Wiederholungen darstellen oder lediglich formal-formelhaft z.B. eine gute Gesprächsatmosphäre betonen, bleiben rund 160 Texte übrig. Meiner Untersuchung liegt eine Analyse dieser Texte zugrunde, die z.T. recht ausführlich die Gedankengänge, die Punkte einer Übereinstimmung oder Divergenz sowie die tragenden Motive schriftlich niederlegen.

2. Dialog als neuer Ansatz zum Umgang mit faktischem religiösem Pluralismus

Die Ausgangslage ist von einem Faktum bestimmt: dem eines religiösen Pluralismus. Ein solcher religiöser Pluralismus existiert insbesondere auch im Territorium der autokephalen orthodoxen Kirchen, in den meisten Fällen sogar seit vielen Jahrhunderten.³ Aus dem Blickwinkel der Orthodoxie betrachtet, können heute *alle* autokephalen Kirchen in ihrem Verbreitungsgebiet dem Islam begegnen. Daraus allein ergibt sich jedoch keine vorgefertigte Antwort, wie mit dem Faktum religiöser Pluralität umzugehen ist. Metropolit Anastasios von Tirana und Ganz Albanien

² Eine dieser Lösungen besteht in einem sozialwissenschaftlichen Ansatz, mittels Interviews (neue) Daten zum Dialoggeschehen zu erheben, losgelöst vom einzelnen Dialogereignis. Der Nachteil besteht darin, dass diese Methode nur für begrenzte Räume und Zeitspannen anwendbar ist; zudem wird durch die vorbereiteten Fragen das Ergebnis „gefiltert“. Insofern tritt ein „Minus“ an Unmittelbarkeit und Authentizität auf. Der Ansatzpunkt „Schlusserklärungen“ ermöglicht demgegenüber auch die Berücksichtigung von Dialogereignissen, die u.U. bereits Jahrzehnte zurückliegen und überwindet zugleich das Problem der faktisch globalen Durchführung von Dialogereignissen.

³ Eine der Ausnahmen betrifft Tschechien und die Slowakei. Die dortige orthodoxe Kirche gehört nach ihrer Entstehung zu den jüngsten; die Präsenz von Muslimen ist erst in den letzten Jahrzehnten durch Migration entstanden und in ihrer Größenordnung marginal; zudem sind die wenigen Muslime in beiden Ländern nicht organisiert.

hat darauf hingewiesen, dass historisch gesehen die mittelalterliche Kontroverse zwischen Christentum, speziell der Orthodoxie, und dem Islam einen ersten Ansatz gebildet hat.⁴ Zeugnis dessen ist eine umfangreiche Kontroversliteratur, an deren Anfang seitens der Orthodoxie z.B. der hl. Johannes von Damaskus steht.⁵ Vor allem in christlichen Beiträgen hat sich der Grundton – zumindest im islamischen Machtbereich – bald zu einer Apologetik christlicher Lehren gemildert. Hier liegen die Anfänge eines Wegs, der für Jahrhunderte beschritten worden ist, nämlich den Blick auf die eigene Gemeinschaft zu begrenzen, „die anderen“ so weit wie möglich zu ignorieren und sie stillschweigend Gottes Ratschluss zu überlassen. Damit wird religiöse Pluralität einfach nicht zur Kenntnis genommen; konsequenterweise gibt es dann keinen interreligiösen Dialog. So spricht auch Metropolit Anastasios von Tirana sehr anschaulich von einer „Periode des Schweigens und des Monologs“.⁶ Die Alternative besteht darin, der mit dem angesprochenen Monolog einhergehenden Realitätsverweigerung zu widerstehen, indem die „anderen“ als existent und als in der Gesellschaft präsent wahrgenommen werden. Daraus entsteht dann Bedarf an einer Antwort auf die Frage, wie unterschiedliche Religionen und ihre Anhänger miteinander umgehen (können) – und dann bietet interreligiöser Dialog Zugänge zum anderen. Um es mit der in einem Dialogdokument pointiert festgehaltenen Einsicht zu formulieren: Man könne einander nicht nur als eine Art notwendiges Übel tolerieren, es reiche nicht, lediglich nebeneinander zu leben; vielmehr gelte es zu lernen, miteinander zu leben und die Fähigkeit zu erwerben, es füreinander zu tun.⁷

Neben der bewussten Annahme des faktisch existenten religiösen Pluralismus steht eine Öffnung für interreligiösen Dialog in eindeutigem Zusammenhang mit dem Phänomen „Globalisierung“. Die Notwendigkeit eines interreligiösen Dialogs wird in immer neuen Anläufen aus den jüngsten Entwicklungen eines gesellschaftlichen, ja globalen Wandels abgeleitet. Mehr noch: Die Globalisierung der letzten Jahrzehnte, der dadurch stetig

⁴ Metropolit Anastasios Yannoulatos, „Dialogue with Islam“, in: ders., *Facing the World. Orthodox Christian Essays on Global Concerns*, WCC Publications, Geneva, 2003, 103-126 (104f).

⁵ Vgl. Dietmar Schon, „Die mittelalterliche Auseinandersetzung um „wahre Religion“ – Orthodoxe Argumentationsmuster gegenüber dem Islam bei Johannes von Damaskus und Theodor Abu Qurra“, *Ostkirchliche Studien* 65 (2016), 76-118.

⁶ Metropolit Anastasios Yannoulatos, *op. cit.*, 103-126 (114).

⁷ Vgl. die Schlussklärung der Konferenz 2./3.5.2006 (Pec), *Nachrichtendienst Östliches Christentum* (NÖK) Ausgabe 19/6 Teil C (10.5.2006) Nr. 4.

wachsende Pluralismus bei parallel zunehmender Säkularisierung stellen Phänomene dar, die von den Religionen – und innerhalb des Christentums auch für die verschiedenen Konfessionen – zunehmend als Herausforderung und Aufgabe wahrgenommen wurden.⁸

Seitens der Orthodoxie fand diese Wahrnehmung Gestalt in einem panorthodoxen Beschluss, sich für interreligiöse Zusammenarbeit zu öffnen, zunächst ansatzweise im Jahr 1976,⁹ deutlicher entfaltet im Jahr 1986.¹⁰ Das darin grundgelegte Bemühen um interreligiöse Zusammenarbeit war Teil der Vorbereitungen zu einem Großen und Heiligen Konzil der Orthodoxen Kirche und steht damit im Zusammenhang einer groß angelegten Initiative, kirchliche Antworten auf die Herausforderungen der Zeit zu formulieren. Seither wurden – auch im Licht der bereits vorliegenden praktischen Erfahrungen – die Möglichkeiten und Ziele eines solchen Dialogs mehrfach fortgeschrieben, teils in gemeinsamem Bemühen aller bzw. mehrerer autokephaler Kirchen, teils in Verantwortung der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche.

Zeitlich setzt das Votum der Orthodoxie zugunsten religionsübergreifender Zusammenarbeit mit der beginnenden Auflösung der politischen Blöcke im Ost-West-Gegensatz ein. Es wächst gleichsam aus den Bemühungen um politische Lösungen im sogenannten Helsinkiprozess und aus blockübergreifenden Friedensbemühungen christlicher Kirchen im Rahmen des ÖRK und der Konferenz Europäischer Kirchen (KEK) heraus, an denen auch orthodoxe Kirchen beteiligt waren. Als weitere Wurzeln des interreligiösen Dialogs können spezifische Erfahrungen des Patriarchats Antiochia und der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche gelten. Die bereits 1965 beginnende interreligiöse Arbeit im Patriarchat Antiochia hängt mit der spezifischen Situation des Libanon zusammen. Der Protagonist dieses Engagements, Metropolit Georges Khodr, gehörte bezeichnenderweise auch zu den Teilnehmern einer der ersten interreligiösen Initiativen des ÖRK, der Konferenz 16.-25.3.1970 (Ajaltoun/Libanon) sowie nachfolgender in-

⁸ Vgl. Dietmar Schon, „Globalisierung“ und Orthodoxe Kirche. Streiflichter zur Auseinandersetzung der Orthodoxie mit einem aktuellen Phänomen, *Ostkirchliche Studien* 63 (2014), 80-124.

⁹ Vgl. den Beschluss der I. Vorkonziliaren Panorthodoxen Konferenz (1976), *Episkepsis* N° 159 (15.12.1976) „Décisions“, 8-14 (11f).

¹⁰ Vgl. den Beschluss der III. Vorkonziliaren Panorthodoxen Konferenz (1986), *Episkepsis* N° 369 (15.12.1986), 2-28 (19).

terreligiöser Konferenzen dieser primär ökumenischen Institution.¹¹ Zwei frühe,¹² von der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche veranstaltete interreligiöse Konferenzen der Jahre 1977 und 1982 fügten sich sowohl formal wie inhaltlich als östlicher Beitrag in das bereits angesprochene blockübergreifende Friedensengagement vor allem des ÖRK und der KEK ein. Damit hatte interreligiöser Dialog schon von seinen Wurzeln her eine internationale, ja globale Ausrichtung mit der entsprechend deutlichen Wahrnehmung eines wachsenden Pluralismus.¹³

Von außen an die Religionsgemeinschaften herangetragene Entwicklungen haben zudem das Umfeld von und für Religion verändert. Nicht mehr nur Globalisierung und wachsender Pluralismus, sondern auch wachsende Säkularisierung und gesellschaftliche Ausgrenzung von Religion gelten in zahlreichen der untersuchten Schlusserklärungen als von der jeweiligen Religion her mit zu gestaltende bzw. zu deutende Entwicklung und damit (auch) als eine weitere Herausforderung der Zeit, die des Dialoges bedarf. Um der jeweiligen Sichtweise der beteiligten Religionen über die eigene Gemeinschaft hinaus Räume zu verschaffen, wurde den Medien und dem Erziehungsbereich spezifische Aufmerksamkeit zugewandt. Man könnte insoweit von einer gemeinsamen apologetischen Motivation zur Abwehr der Gefahr einer Verdrängung aus dem öffentlichen Raum sprechen, der sowohl Christentum wie Islam ausgesetzt sind.

Angesichts dieser Gegebenheiten gilt, einer prägnanten Formulierung zufolge, interreligiöser Dialog neuer Prägung als Denkweise, als ein Geist

¹¹ Vgl. die Teilnehmerliste mit dem Namen des Metropoliten bei Stuart E. Brown (Hrsg.), *Meeting in Faith. Twenty Years of Christian-Muslim Conversations Sponsored by the World Council of Churches*, WCC Publications Geneva, 1989, 19. Vgl. weiterhin die Teilnehmerliste der Konferenz 12.-18.7.1972 (Broumana/ Libanon) bei Stuart E. Brown (Hrsg.), *Meeting in Faith*, aaO, S. 19f, wo Metropolit Georges Khodr und der seinerzeitige Archimandrit und spätere Metropolit von Tirana und Ganz Albanien, Anastasios Yannoulatos, aufgeführt sind.

¹² Eine von der Russischen orthodoxen Kirche verantwortete interreligiöse Konferenz von Zagorsk im Jahr 1952 bleibt hier als politisch orchestrierte Verlängerung sowjetischer Interessen ausgeklammert. Dies gilt auch für die Beteiligung insbesondere der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche an der „Christian Peace Conference“ seit 1958; diese Aktivitäten waren zudem nicht interreligiös, sondern innerchristlich ausgerichtet.

¹³ Vgl. George Khodr, „Christianisme dans une monde pluraliste“, *Irenikon* 44 (1971), 191-202. Zur Einordnung dieses Beitrags in die moderne antiochenische Theologie vgl. Assaad Elias Kattan, „Les lignes directrices de la pensée théologique antiochienne contemporaine“, *Istina* LVI (2011), 379-391 (384).

und als Haltung, aufgebaut auf wechselseitigem Respekt.¹⁴ Gefahren für eine harmonische und friedliche Koexistenz sollten gemeinsam angegangen werden. Intendiert wurde ein Gespräch über die Schlüsselfragen und -werte, die den Religionsgemeinschaften gemeinsam sind, ein Gespräch über gemeinsame Initiativen zur Förderung der Versöhnung, des Friedens, gegenseitigen Vertrauens, gemeinsamen Lebens und der Zusammenarbeit durch eine institutionalisierte Dialogform und in konkreten Projekten. Für diesen neuen Ansatz galten auch neue Spielregeln. Im Zuge dessen wurden insbesondere die Umgangsweisen mit der Unterschiedlichkeit der Religionen neu bewertet, Aufgaben und Ziele von interreligiösem Dialog bestimmt und eine dezidierte Abgrenzung zu Synkretismus und Proselytismus vorgenommen. Die Orthodoxie hat sich an diesen Klärungsprozessen aktiv beteiligt. Deren Analyse hat gezeigt, dass eine Gefahr für die Authentizität des Glaubens zu keinem Zeitpunkt bestanden hat, ein – wie ich meine – aussagekräftiges Ergebnis.

Die Herausforderungen der Zeit bestehen für alle autokephalen Kirchen in prinzipiell gleichem Maß: sie alle begegnen dem Islam in ihrem kanonischen Territorium; die grundlegende Antwort der Orthodoxie zugunsten interreligiöser Zusammenarbeit bzw. eines Dialogs wurde gemeinsam formuliert. Dennoch zeigen sich Unterschiede in der Intensität, in der sich die orthodoxen Kirchen dann auch tatsächlich am Dialog beteiligt haben. Als intensiv hat sich das interreligiöse Engagement des Ökumenischen Patriarchats, des Patriarchats von Antiochia, des Patriarchats von Moskau und Ganz Russland, des serbischen Patriarchats und – etwas abgestuft – der Kirche von Albanien erwiesen. Andere autokephale Kirchen, wie z.B. das Patriarchat von Jerusalem, sind gelegentlich oder phasenweise beteiligt. Bei einer dritten Gruppe von autokephalen Kirchen ist das Engagement – zumindest im Dialog mit dem Islam – gering ausgeprägt oder nicht feststellbar. Dazu zählt auch das Patriarchat von Bulgarien, das sich vorrangig dem Dialog mit einer anderen Religion, dem Judentum, gewidmet hat. Zu erinnern ist aber an den 2008 eingerichteten „Nationalen Rat der religiösen Gemeinschaften in Bulgarien“, dem Vertreter der Bulgarischen Orthodoxen Kirche, der katholischen Kirche, der armenisch-apostolischen

¹⁴ So die Formulierung im Dokument der Konferenz 12.-14.3.1979 (Chambésy/CH), vgl. Juliette Nasri Haddad (u.a.) (Hrsg.), *Déclarations Communes Islamo-Chrétiennes* (1954-1995), Université Saint Joseph, Beyrouth, Institut d'Etudes Islamo-Chrétiennes, Dar el Machreg, Beyrouth 1997, 184-194 (Déclaration N° 19).

Kirche, der vereinigten protestantischen Kirchen, des Judentums und des Islam angehören.¹⁵

Weiterhin gilt es, ein verbreitetes Missverständnis zu klären. Der Begriff „interreligiöser Dialog“ suggeriert, dass er von offiziellen Vertretern des Islam und der Orthodoxie (und/ oder anderer christlicher Kirchen) geführt würde. Die Teilnehmer am Dialog agieren jedoch nicht als bevollmächtigte Botschafter ihrer Kirche oder Religionsgemeinschaft, sondern als Gläubige. Das gilt auch dann, wenn es sich um hochgestellte Würdenträger handelt.

Analysiert man die Teilnehmerlisten an Dialogereignissen, zeigt sich, dass nicht selten dieselben orthodoxen wie muslimischen Persönlichkeiten an vielen verschiedenen Veranstaltungen teilgenommen haben. Zum anderen fällt die intensive Rolle interreligiös orientierter Organisationen bei der Planung und Durchführung von Dialogereignissen ins Auge. Daran werden zwei Faktoren greifbar:

- eine rasch im Dialoggeschehen einsetzende *Spezialisierung*, bei der sich Erwerb von sachlicher Kompetenz, spezifische Erfahrung und Ausübung einer Funktion zuweilen gegenseitig bedingen;
- eine ebenso rasch einsetzende *Institutionalisierung*, im Zuge derer interreligiöser Dialog zur Aufgabe besonderer Einrichtungen und damit gleichsam seitens der Religionsgemeinschaften delegiert wird.

Beide Faktoren, Spezialisierung und Institutionalisierung, geben einer überschaubaren Zahl von Akteuren innerhalb des Gesamtgeschehens von interreligiösem Dialog besonders Gewicht. Sie bringen ihre Erfahrung und Kompetenz in ein Dialogereignis ein und nehmen aus ihm fortentwickelte und doch ähnliche Einsichten in das nächste Dialogereignis mit. Über Jahrzehnte trägt dies zur Ausbildung einer inhaltlichen Konvergenz der Dialogergebnisse bei. Spezialisierung und Institutionalisierung stehen zusammengenommen allerdings auch für zwei relative Schwächen des Dialoggeschehens und seiner Ergebnisse:

- sie spiegeln nicht das in der Orthodoxie und im Islam vorhandene tatsächliche Meinungsspektrum gegenüber „den Anderen“;

¹⁵ Ina Merdjanova/Patrice Brodeur, *Religion*, aaO, S. 71f. Vgl. Aziz Nazmi Shakir/ Ina Merdjanova, „Bulgaria“, in: Joergen Nielsen u.a. (Hrsg.), *Yearbook of Muslims in Europe* 3, aaO, 113-125 (123).

- sie sind von ihrem Kontext her vom Erlebnis- und Verständnishorizont der Massen der jeweiligen Gläubigen weit entfernt und müssen deshalb erst in diesen hinein transponiert werden, um ihr ausdrücklich erklärtes inhaltliches Ziel auch zu erreichen, nämlich eine Bewusstseins – und Verhaltensveränderung der Gläubigen.

3. Themen, Inhalte und Ergebnisse des interreligiösen Dialogs unter Beteiligung der Orthodoxie und des Islam

Die Untersuchung der Schlusserklärungen von Dialogereignissen hat ergeben, dass theologische Aussagen über Gott und Gottes Handeln nur ein Randphänomen darstellen. Selbst der gemeinsame Monotheismus ist nicht zur Quelle theologischer Erwägungen geworden. Vielmehr hat von Anfang an die Verschiedenheit der Religionen im Vordergrund des Bewusstseins gestanden. Diese Verschiedenheit gilt in vereinzelt prägnanten Formulierungen sogar als Ausdruck von Gottes Willen und wird generell als Faktum anerkannt, dem mit wechselseitigem Respekt zu begegnen ist. Dies schließt die durchgängig bekräftigte Überzeugung ein, dass die Integrität und Authentizität der Religionen durch konsequenten Verzicht auf Proselytismus und Synkretismus bewahrt werden müsse. In Summe dieser Grundlinien *konnte* die Erarbeitung theologischer Aussagen weder Gegenstand, noch Ziel des interreligiösen Dialogs werden.

Das interreligiöse Bemühen hat sich statt dessen von Anfang an der Ethik zugewandt. Ausgehend von der grundsätzlichen Bedeutung der Menschenwürde wurde im Bereich von ethischen Werten eine detaillierte und differenzierte Arbeit geleistet. Sie hat eine gemeinsame Basis ethischer Werte ermittelt und aufgezeigt. Aber auch diese gemeinsame Basis ist nicht als solche Gegenstand eines akademischen Interesses der Dialogpartner. Die religionsübergreifende Gemeinsamkeit an ethischen Werten gilt vielmehr als interreligiöser Handlungsimpuls und kennzeichnet vor allem ein erfolgsversprechendes Arbeitsfeld. Die Ausführungen zu einzelnen ethischen Werten in den Schlusserklärungen sind facettenreich; sie haben verzweigte Zusammenhänge ethischer Werte untereinander und mit konkreten Feldern von Lebenswirklichkeit aufgezeigt. Die entsprechenden interreligiösen Einsichten gruppieren sich vor allem in Aussagen zur Menschenwürde, zum Wert „Frieden“ und seiner Umsetzung in „friedliche Koexistenz“, weiterhin vor allem zu Gerechtigkeit, Toleranz, wechselseitigem Respekt und in einer Achtung vor dem, was anderen heilig ist. Die positive

Darlegung dessen wird komplementär ergänzt durch ebenso differenzierte Aussagen zu einem interreligiösen Einsatz gegen die Verletzung ethischer Werte. Einigkeit besteht ausweislich der Schlusserklärungen, dass die Beachtung der als besonders relevant herausgearbeiteten ethischen Werte bzw. ein konsequenter Verzicht auf deren Verletzung nicht nur die inneren Haltungen der Menschen mit Gutem durchwirkt. Nach ethischen Werten geprägte Menschen *handeln* auch ethisch gut. Sie kultivieren dabei den Umgang mit anderen Menschen, tragen in Summe zu einem positiven gesellschaftlichen Klima bei, in dem sich Spannungen abbauen und ein der Menschenwürde angemessener Lebenszusammenhang als gesichert wahrgenommen wird.

Worauf drängt dementsprechend die geleistete Arbeit im weit verstandenen Bereich der Ethik? Bei der Untersuchung der Dialogereignisse und -ergebnisse ist immer wieder ein Begriff aufgetaucht, der gewissermaßen als ein Leitmotiv das ganze Dialoggeschehen durchzieht: friedliche Koexistenz.¹⁶ Das ganze Gewicht dieses Leitmotivs wird jedoch erst erkennbar, wenn man solche Bezüge hinzunimmt, bei denen „friedliche Koexistenz“ als Begriff zwar unausgesprochen bleibt, aber in eindeutiger Weise als *Wirkung* bestimmter interreligiös erwünschter Haltungen bzw. Aktivitäten vorausgesetzt ist. Wenn Menschen ethische Werte konsequent leben, prägt das nicht nur ihre inneren Haltungen. Ethisches Leben des Einzelnen wirkt auch nach außen, beeinflusst den Umgang von Menschen miteinander und prägt bei noch weiterem Blickwinkel letztlich die gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse. Werden wechselseitiger Respekt, Toleranz, Gerechtigkeit geübt und letztlich die Menschenwürde beachtet, dann bauen sich Spannungen ab, die Menschen gegeneinander aufbringen könnten, und friedliche Koexistenz realisiert sich (wieder). Dasselbe gilt für den ethisch richtigen und interreligiös geforderten Verzicht auf Diskriminierung, Hass, Intoleranz, Fanatismus, Gewaltanwendung usw. Je konsequenter ein solcher Verzicht geübt

¹⁶ Das Engagement zugunsten von friedlicher Koexistenz zählt z.B. zu den Antworten des interreligiösen Dialogs auf die Herausforderungen der Zeit, zu den Zielbestimmungen von interreligiösem Dialog als solchem, folgt aus der dem Menschen von Gott auferlegten Verpflichtung zum Eintreten für das menschliche Leben. Friedliche Koexistenz ist Teil der gemeinsamen Basis an ethischen Werten, ist in spezifischer Weise verbunden mit dem Einsatz für den Wert „Frieden“, wird durch Beachtung der Menschenrechte gesichert, hängt mit der Umsetzung von Religionsfreiheit und Gleichheit zusammen, gehört zu den Aufgaben spezifischer interreligiöser Organisationen. Staat und Politik sind in der Pflicht, die Voraussetzungen für friedliche Koexistenz zu schaffen; friedliche Koexistenz wird gefördert durch Zusammenarbeit von Staat und Religionsgemeinschaften.

wird, desto seltener werden Menschen zu Opfern unethischer Haltungen oder Handlungen. Damit mündet nicht nur ethisch gestaltetes Leben, sondern auch die Vermeidung von unethischen Verletzungen in dieselbe Wirkung, nämlich friedliche Koexistenz. Darüber hinaus gibt es noch ein drittes Feld, das zur vollständigen Bestimmung von friedlicher Koexistenz als einem Leitmotiv einbezogen werden muss: friedliche Koexistenz als erklärte *Zielsetzung* des Dialoggeschehens oder als *Motivation* dazu. Der panorthodoxe Beschluss von 1976 deutet einen entsprechenden Beweggrund der Orthodoxie zwar nur durch die spezifisch wertorientierte Zielsetzung einer künftigen interreligiösen Zusammenarbeit an, darin gefolgt vom panorthodoxen Beschluss von 1986.¹⁷ Bereits die Botschaft der Oberhäupter der autokephalen Kirchen vom Jahr 2000 zieht die 1976/ 1986 begonnene Linie jedoch deutlich weiter, bis hin zur Verwendung des Begriffs „friedliche Koexistenz“ in direktem Zusammenhang mit Dialogbemühungen.¹⁸ Die Botschaft der Synaxis von 2008 hat demgegenüber den Blick eher auf Gefährdungen von friedlicher Koexistenz durch Spaltungen gelegt, denen durch Dialog zu begegnen ist; der Begriff wird in diesem Text nicht verwendet.¹⁹ Um so deutlicher ist aber die Botschaft der Ersthierarchen der Kirchen des Nahen Ostens von 2011 gefasst, in der gleich mehrfach von friedlicher Koexistenz als einem Hauptziel des noch zu intensivierenden Dialogs gesprochen wird.²⁰ Auch die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche greift in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit Möglichkeiten und Zielen eines interreligiösen Dialogs die Formel „friedliche Koexistenz“ ausdrücklich auf.²¹ Schließlich

¹⁷ Vgl. die Formulierungen in Abschnitt A 5. des Beschlusses: „l'établissement de relations fraternelles entre les peuples“ bzw. des Abschnitts F 4. „L'Orthodoxie confesse que chaque être humain (...) est porteur de l'image de Dieu, qu'il est notre frère ou notre soeur, membre à part égale de la Famille humaine“.

¹⁸ Vgl. Text der Botschaft in: *Episkepsis* 31. Jg. N° 579 (31.1.2000), 3-8 (5f). Die entscheidende Formulierung lautet: „...créer les présupposés les plus favorables à un dialogue avec elles afin de favoriser l'instauration d'une coexistence pacifique entre tous les peuples“.

¹⁹ Vgl. die den interreligiösen Dialog betreffende Passage der Botschaft der Synaxis in: *Orthodoxie Aktuell* 12. Jg. (11/ 2008), 15-19 (16).

²⁰ Vgl. deutsche Übersetzung von Kommuniké und gemeinsamer Botschaft der Synaxis in: *Orthodoxie Aktuell* 15. Jg. (10/ 2011), 19-24. Französischer Text vgl. *Service Orthodoxe de Presse* N° 361 (Oktober 2011), 28-31 (29f).

²¹ Vgl. die Empfehlungen der Bischofsversammlung vom Februar 2010 in: *Messenger de l'Eglise orthodoxe russe* N° 19 (Januar-März 2010), 25-29 (29); vgl. das Dokument „Concept of the Missionary Work of the Russian Orthodox Church“ vom März 2013, online zugänglich auf der homepage des Außenamts unter <https://mospat.ru/en/2013/09/02/news90265/> (abgerufen 13.3.2017).

gehört „friedliche Koexistenz“ zur Zielsetzung zahlreicher interreligiös aktiver Organisationen, an denen sich (auch) die Orthodoxie sowohl administrativ wie mit inhaltlichen Beiträgen beteiligt hat. Zusammen genommen stellt interreligiöser Dialog moderner Prägung einen wesentlichen Beitrag zur friedlichen Koexistenz von Menschen verschiedener Religion bzw. zur Beendigung oder Prävention religiös konnotierter Konflikte zugunsten friedlicher Koexistenz in pluralen Gesellschaften dar.

4. Interreligiöser Dialog in der Schnittstelle von staatlich – politischen und kirchlichen Interessen

Dieses Ergebnis muss nun noch in einen größeren Zusammenhang eingeordnet werden. Ein erster wichtiger Faktor ist die zu beobachtende enge Verzahnung von Politik und Religion hinsichtlich interreligiösem Dialog. Offensichtlich tragen für ein gelingendes Zusammenleben von Angehörigen verschiedener Religionen im selben gesellschaftlichen Kontext sowohl die Religionsgemeinschaften wie auch staatlich-politische Institutionen Verantwortung. Das hat letztere motiviert, interreligiöse Dialogereignisse mitzutragen bzw. mitzugestalten. In formaler Hinsicht betrifft dies die Organisation, die personelle oder logistische Beteiligung an Dialogereignissen, die Finanzierung. Die Zusammenarbeit zwischen Staat bzw. Politik und den interreligiösen Akteuren im engeren Sinn manifestiert sich z.B. in der Bildung von speziellen Organisationen oder Institutionen. Inhaltlich steht ein staatlich-politisches Interesse an einem Zusammenwirken mit den Religionen zur Abwehr von (vorgeblich) religiös motivierter Gewalt im Mittelpunkt. Hinzu kommt noch die gesteigerte Glaubwürdigkeit einer staatlich-politischen Nutzung des entsprechenden, interreligiös entwickelten Instrumentariums zugunsten friedlicher Koexistenz. Wenn sich solche Motivationen zu Überzeugungen staatlich-politischer Institutionen verdichten, was interreligiöser Dialog bewirken *soll*, muss in Einzelfällen allerdings auch mit einer (partiellen) Instrumentalisierung des Dialoggeschehens gerechnet werden.

Umgekehrt haben aber auch die Religionsgemeinschaften gegenüber Staat und Politik spezifische Interessen. Sie versuchen, sich im Rahmen ihrer Dialogbemühungen als relevante, „Gesellschaft“ mit gestaltende Kräfte neu zu positionieren. Der tragende Grund hierfür ist der gemeinsame Wunsch, sich in eine Mitgestaltung gesellschaftlicher Verhältnisse einzubringen und so letztlich einer Marginalisierung von Religion entgegenzuwirken oder zu-

vorzukommen. Die im Dialog erarbeiteten zahlreichen Übereinstimmungen in Bezug auf ethische Werte sollen nicht nur von den jeweiligen Gläubigen gelebt, sondern übergreifend zur Gestaltung friedlicher Koexistenz in pluralen Gesellschaften herangezogen werden. Am deutlichsten kommt dies dort zum Ausdruck, wo sich die Religionsgemeinschaften mit ihrer gemeinsamen ethischen Konzeption als Modellfall gesamtgesellschaftlicher Relevanz präsentieren.²² Zur praktischen Umsetzung sehen die Religionen aber die für die Gesellschaftsordnung primär verantwortlichen staatlichen und politischen Autoritäten gerufen. Der inhaltliche Schwerpunkt liegt dabei auf der positiven Gestaltung eines gesellschaftlich-sozialen Miteinanders in wechselseitigem Respekt und in der Beachtung bestimmter grundlegender Werte, darunter besonders Frieden und friedliche Koexistenz, die Beachtung der Menschenwürde und -rechte sowie das Bemühen um (soziale) Gerechtigkeit und Entwicklung. Noch entschiedener wird die Mitwirkung der Politik am interreligiösen Einsatz gegen gesellschaftlich oder sozial destruktiv wirkende Fehlhaltungen eingefordert, insbesondere im Abbau von Missbräuchen, Ausgrenzung und Gewalt einschließlich gemeinsamer Abwehrbemühungen gegenüber Terrorismus, Extremismus, Fanatismus und des manipulativen Missbrauchs von Religion.

*5. Interreligiöser Dialog als „Dialog des Lebens“ –
Zur Umsetzung der Dialogergebnisse in das Leben der Gläubigen*

Trotz dieser wechselseitigen Interessenlagen sind primärer Adressat für die Ergebnisse des interreligiösen Dialogs die Gläubigen der jeweiligen Religionsgemeinschaften. Bei ihnen soll eine Veränderung der inneren Einstellung und des Verhaltens gegenüber Andersgläubigen erreicht werden. Deshalb wenden sich viele der untersuchten Schlusserklärungen zunächst nach innen, um einen positiven Umgang mit einer faktisch vorhandenen religiösen Pluralität bei den jeweils eigenen Gläubigen zu entwickeln. Die Meinungen über andere Religionen und deren Gläubige sollen ebenso wie das Verhalten ihnen gegenüber immer mehr von den im Dialog herausgearbeiteten ethischen Werten bestimmt sein. Damit wird zugleich eine wesentliche Voraussetzung für die Mit- bzw. Umgestaltung gesellschaftlicher

²² So z.B. die Schlusserklärung der Konferenz 13./14.12.2001 (Moskau), *The Ecumenical Review* 54 (2002), 523-525; vgl. das Dokument der Konferenz 14./15.12.2001 (Belgrad), *Una Sancta* 57 (2002), 173-176; vgl. die Schlusserklärung der Konferenz 14.-17.12.2003 (Sevilla), *Islamocristiana* 30 (2004), 220f.

Verhältnisse geschaffen, indem sich Gläubige mit einem verinnerlichten Wertesystem in die entsprechenden Prozesse einbringen.

Formal kennzeichnend für diese interreligiöse Ausrichtung nach innen sind die zahlreichen und inhaltlich sehr konkreten Selbstverpflichtungen der an den Dialogereignissen Beteiligten in ihren gemeinsamen Schlusserklärungen.²³ Hinzuzunehmen sind die durchaus beeindruckenden (Schuld-)Bekenntnisse zu konkreten Fehlern der Vergangenheit,²⁴ die Betonung der Notwendigkeit, schlechte historische Erfahrungen durch wechselseitigen Respekt, durch Toleranz im Umgang miteinander, durch eine grundsätzliche „Achtung vor dem Heiligen“ usw. zu überwinden. Um dies zu erreichen, gelten eine Vertiefung des jeweils eigenen Glaubens und die akzentuierte Hervorhebung der Glaubensgrundsätze zu den Themen „Frieden“, „Toleranz“, „Respekt“ usw. in der Verkündigung an die Gläubigen als zentrale Aufgaben. Zugleich sollen die Religionen im Rahmen ihrer Verkündigungstätigkeit die authentischen Lehren gegenüber manipulativen Fehlinterpretationen oder einer Orientierung an überholten Stereotypen in ihrer Integrität verteidigen. Eine starke, eher reaktive Weise der Einwirkung nach innen besteht in der Ausgrenzung von Akteuren, die schwerwiegendsten ethischen Fehlhaltungen erliegen: internen Gruppen gewaltbereiter Individuen wird entgegengehalten, dass Inanspruchnahme von Religion zur Ummantelung von Verbrechen eine Gotteslästerung darstellt;²⁵ diese Einsicht wird flankiert durch die Qualifikation von Übergriffen als „sektiererische Gewalt“. Beide Argumentationslinien bezwecken die Ausgrenzung gewaltbereiter Individuen und Gruppen innerhalb der jeweiligen Religionsgemeinschaft. Durch die Summe derartiger Maßnahmen zur Umsetzung interreligiöser Einsichten innerhalb der Religionsgemeinschaften sollen sie sich zum Modellfall praktizierter Toleranz und respektvollen Umgangs entwickeln, damit sie sich mittelbar als glaubwürdiger Modellfall für die ganze Gesellschaft präsentieren können. Die Wirkung des interreligiösen Dialogs nach innen erweist sich damit als pro-

²³ Prägnante Beispiele bieten insbesondere die Konferenzen 12.-18.12.1994 (Barcelona), *Islamochristiana* 21 (1995), 204-206; 18.3.2005 (Tirana), *Islamochristiana* 31 (2005), 203f; 20.-23.10.2008 (Brüssel/ Mechelen), *Islamochristiana* 34 (2008), 216-218; 1.-4.11.2010 (Genf), *Islamochristiana* 36 (2010), 327-329.

²⁴ So z.B. die Konferenz 12.-18.12.1994 (Barcelona), *Islamochristiana* 21 (1995), 204-206.

²⁵ Sehr deutlich z.B. die Konferenz 20.-22.1.2002 (Alexandria), vgl. *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 53 (2003), 184-188 (185f); Die Tötung Unschuldiger im Namen Gottes stelle eine Profanierung von Gottes heiligem Namen dar und sei zugleich eine Verleumdung der Religion.

zesshaft, als erzieherisch orientiert und als durch ein starkes Element von Umkehr geprägt. Neben der Verkündigung sind dabei Informationsmaterialien und Mediennutzung von zentraler Bedeutung. Aber auch eine dementsprechende interreligiös-ethische Aus- oder Weiterbildung des Klerus bzw. der Imame wurde als wirksamer Beitrag erkannt.²⁶

Eine wichtige interreligiöse Erkenntnis besagt, dass der Dialog ein „Dialog des Lebens“ sein müsse, der eine „Diapraxis“ einschließe, in einer Lebenskultur zu verankern sei und offen sei für eine praktische Zusammenarbeit.²⁷ Damit wird die Aufgabe umschrieben, den Gläubigen Zugänge zu eigenen, spezifisch interreligiösen Erfahrungen zu eröffnen. Die untersuchten Schlusserklärungen sind Ergebnisse des Dialogs, nicht der „Diapraxis“. Sie lassen deshalb nur in Einzelfällen erkennen, in welchen Formen eine solche Umsetzung stattfinden kann. Hinzuzunehmen sind deshalb Hinweise in den inhaltlichen Beiträgen zu den Dialogereignissen. Dabei zeigt sich: Die angesprochenen interreligiösen Erfahrungen werden im Rahmen zahlreicher Initiativen vermittelt, die Dialogergebnisse bis zu den einzelnen Gläubigen durchreichen. Dazu gehören z.B. interreligiöse Jugend- und Bildungsarbeit, der Aufbau interreligiöser Gruppen, Programme zum Austausch von Professoren und Studenten, religionsübergreifende Seminare und Schulungen. Gemeinsam ist solchen Initiativen und Programmen, dass Personen verschiedener Religionszugehörigkeit auf lokaler Ebene in – befristet angelegte – Gruppen zusammengeführt werden, um gemeinsam zu lernen, sich auszutauschen und dabei „den anderen“ kennenzulernen. Dabei können vorhandene Ängste abgebaut und die Umsetzung von Werten wie Toleranz und wechselseitiger Respekt eingeübt werden. Im Hintergrund dieser Initiativen stehen entsprechende positive

²⁶ Ein Beispiel hierfür stellt die vom „Middle East Council of Churches“ initiierte Formatoren Ausbildung dar. Ein weiteres Beispiel ist die von der Konferenz 11.-13.12.2008 (Athen) beschlossene „Interreligious Training Partnership Initiative“. Vgl. weiterhin das Ausbildungsprogramm für religiöse Nachwuchskräfte des „Council of Religious Institutions of the Holy Land“. Weitere Beispiele sind das „Centre d'études islamo-chrétiennes“ der orthodoxen Universität von Balamand und die „Fondation de Recherches et de Dialogues Interreligieux et Interculturels“.

²⁷ So die Konferenz 18.-20.12.2001 (Kairo) in: Juliette Nasri Haddad (u.a.) (Hrsg.), *Déclarations Communes Islamo-Chrétiennes* (1995-2001), Université Saint Joseph, Beyrouth, Institut d'Etudes Islamo-Chrétiennes, Dar el Machreq, Beyrouth, 2003, 241-257 (Déclaration N° 50, CAI 01). Vgl. die Schlusserklärung der Konferenz 3.-5.3.2008 (Berlin); der Text der „Berlin Declaration“ ist online zugänglich auf der homepage des Außenamts des Moskauer Patriarchats unter <http://orthodoxeurope.org/page/14/142.aspx> (abgerufen 13.3.2017).

Erfahrungen, die Dialogpartner bei den interreligiösen Dialogereignissen gewonnen haben. Die Ortsgruppen mancher interreligiöser Organisationen verfolgen eine ähnliche Zielsetzung, sind aber auf Dauer angelegt.

Ergebnisse des interreligiösen Dialogs bedürfen nicht nur der Umsetzung nach außen, in einen gesellschaftlich-sozialen Zusammenhang hinein. Sie müssen vielmehr auch nach innen, d.h. in das Leben der Gläubigen hinein, vermittelt werden. Zielpunkt dessen ist eine Formung von Meinungen und inneren Haltungen des Einzelnen entsprechend ethischer Werte, vor allem im Rahmen der Verkündigung bzw. Vertiefung der eigenen Religion. Eine neue Sicht auf die jeweils andere Religion soll ins Bewusstsein der Gläubigen gelangen. Dazu wurden im Dialoggeschehen Grundsätze und konkrete Vorschläge erarbeitet, die einem respektvollen Umgang miteinander dienen, Feindbilder der Vergangenheit überwinden helfen und – unter Wahrung der Integrität der jeweiligen religiösen Überlieferung – Türen für Begegnung und Zusammenarbeit öffnen. Die damit verbundene Erfahrung von Gemeinsamkeit mit dem religiös und/ oder ethnisch Anderen dient nicht zuletzt dazu, friedliche Koexistenz aus persönlicher Erfahrung wachsen zu lassen. Dabei kommt natürlich auch dem Erziehungsbereich und den Medien besondere Bedeutung zu.

Abschließend sei nochmals die Bedeutung von Organisationen bei der Umsetzung interreligiöser Einsichten unterstrichen. Interreligiöser Dialog wird vor allem von interreligiös orientierten Organisationen vorbereitet, geplant und durchgeführt. Dieselben Organisationen sind die hauptsächlichen Multiplikatoren, welche die Einsichten und Ergebnisse des interreligiösen Dialogs in die beteiligten Glaubensgemeinschaften und den jeweiligen gesellschaftlich-sozialen Kontext hinein transportieren. Dazu nutzen sie ihre zuweilen tief gestaffelten Strukturen (von internationaler bis lokaler Ebene), aber auch die Medien, vor allem das Internet. Eine besondere Rolle spielen Bildungseinrichtungen der religiösen Gemeinschaften, die z.T. künftige Träger des Dialogs heranbilden, z.T. als Motor des Dialogs wie als Vermittler von dessen Ergebnissen wirken.

6. Zusammenfassung

Die Orthodoxie hat sich in großer Treue und in Authentizität zur ursprünglichen Zielsetzung des panorthodoxen Beschlusses von 1986 am interreligiösen Dialog beteiligt und zugleich geholfen, diesen kreativ weiterzuentwickeln. Die einzelnen Schritte dieser Entwicklungen und Akzent-

setzungen einer orthodoxen Sicht auf interreligiösen Dialog zeigen klare Konturen: in Blickrichtung auf den interreligiösen Dialog sind sie Zeugnisse einer Fortschreibung orthodoxen Engagements in diesem Bereich anhand der erreichten Dialogergebnisse; in Blickrichtung auf die Orthodoxie sind sie ein Einsammeln gewonnener Einsichten in offiziellen kirchlichen Dokumenten und damit deren Integration in orthodoxes kirchliches Leben. Im Ergebnis erscheinen die in der pan-orthodoxen Beschlussfassung betreffend interreligiösem Dialog festgehaltenen Absichten, Ziele und Erwartungen sowie deren Weiterentwicklung in späteren Texten als vorausschauend, praxisnah, und leitend. Die Orthodoxie hat ihre selbst gesetzten Maßgaben konsequent verfolgt und hat ihre Erfahrungen, Möglichkeiten und Ziele – ohne jeglichen Synkretismus – in einen breit angelegten interreligiösen Dialog mit dem Islam eingebracht. Auch wenn sich nicht alle autokephalen Kirchen gleichermaßen an diesem Prozess beteiligt haben und nicht alle Initiativen konsequent weiterverfolgt werden konnten, so stellt die orthodoxe Beteiligung am interreligiösen Dialog doch einen beindruckenden Neuanfang dar: Nach der mittelalterlichen Kontroverse bzw. Polemik und einer frühneuzeitlichen Periode des Schweigens wurde ein dritter Weg beschritten, der eines an ethischen Werten orientierten Diskurses und einer Zusammenarbeit zugunsten von friedlicher Koexistenz. Die Kohärenz zwischen der inner-orthodoxen Beschlussfassung von 1986 und dessen Fortschreibungen sowie dem wachsenden Bestand interreligiöser Einsichten ist augenfällig. Deshalb kann resümiert werden, dass die Orthodoxie wirksam beigetragen hat, dem interreligiösen Dialog mit dem Islam spezifische Konturen und Richtung zu geben.²⁸

²⁸ Zuletzt hat sich die Synode von Kreta nicht nur zur Notwendigkeit und Sinnhaftigkeit des interreligiösen Dialogs bekannt, sondern ihm auch neue Impulse für die Zukunft gegeben. Als wesentlich erscheinen dabei einerseits Bezüge zu den erreichten Dialogergebnissen, aber auch die Formulierung konkreter Erwartungen an den Dialog sowie die Erschließung neuer ethischer Themenfelder für dessen Fortführung. Anregungen für künftige Dialogereignisse sind u.a. verknüpft mit den Stichworten „Fundamentalismus“ und „negative Folgen der Globalisierung“, aber auch in der Betonung der Bereiche „Bio-wissenschaften/Lebensschutz“ sowie „Bewahrung der Schöpfung“.

Petcu Cristian Vasile

ABORTION – MORAL, ETHICAL AND CANONICAL ISSUES

Abstract: The present study aims to examine the issues surrounding abortion and its consequences from the standpoint of the current legislation in Romania and the countries of the European Union and as they relate to Christian theology, in particular the canonical tradition of the Christian East. This will allow us to highlight a whole series of testimonies from the rich Christian tradition, which are genuinely useful and, paradoxically, of the greatest relevance to the current ethical and social debates on the value and rights of the person, including in the embryonic stage.

Keywords: Theology, Legislative Process, Christian Tradition, Ethics

From the perspective of the current legislation in Romania, no major differences can be observed with regard to abortion, compared with the Penal Code in force. According to Article 185,¹ a woman who induces a

¹ Art. 185 Cp. Termination of a pregnancy, by any means, committed in any of the following circumstances: a) in a medical institution or medical office authorised to this end; b) by a person who is not a qualified physician; c) if the period of the pregnancy exceeds fourteen weeks, it is punishable with imprisonment of between six months and three years. Termination of a pregnancy, carried out in any circumstances, without the consent of the pregnant woman is punishable with imprisonment of between two and seven years and the proscription of certain rights. If by the acts stipulated in paragraphs 1 and 2 any serious bodily harm has been done to the pregnant woman, the punishment is imprisonment of between three and ten years and the proscription of certain rights, and if the act results in the death of the pregnant woman, the punishment is imprisonment of between five and fifteen years and the proscription of certain rights. In the case where the act stipulated in paragraphs 2 and 3 was committed by a physician, then besides the punishment of imprisonment, there shall also apply the interdiction to continue in the medical profession, according to article 64 letter c). See: <http://www.codpenal.ro/legislatie/document/lege-301->

miscarriage is not punishable under the Penal Code, as non-punishment is deducible from the regulations as a whole,² and so the new Penal Code has clarified this issue by introducing Paragraph (7), Article 199: “A pregnant woman who terminates her pregnancy is not punishable.”

In order for a crime to exist, one of the following circumstances must exist: the termination is made outside a medical institution or medical practice authorised to do this; is carried out by a person who is not a qualified physician; is effectuated after the fourteenth week of pregnancy. The material element of the crime is the act of terminating the pregnancy. The act can be carried out by any means, even without the consent of the pregnant woman.³ We ascribe to the opinion according to which: “from the examination of the alternative conditions stipulated in the text of the incrimination it results that the legislator has not meant to ban abortion, but has aimed to ensure that pregnancies be terminated only by qualified persons under safe conditions.”⁴

From the standpoint of legislation on abortion, the EU countries can be divided into three groups. The first includes Malta, Ireland, and (in ef-

din-2015-codul-penal-articol-190-avortul-1260-63256.html. Termination of a pregnancy carried out by a physician is not punishable: a) if termination of the pregnancy was necessary in order to save the life, health or bodily integrity of the pregnant woman from serious and imminent danger that could not otherwise be prevented; b) in the case stipulated in paragraph 1 letter c), when termination of the pregnancy was required for therapeutic reasons, in accordance with the legal provisions; c) in the case stipulated in paragraph 2, when the pregnant woman was not able to express her wishes, and the termination of the pregnancy was required for therapeutic purposes, in accordance with the legal provisions.

² Up until the publication in *Monitorul Oficial* no. 4/27 December 1989 of Decree no. 1/1989 regarding the repeal of certain laws, decrees and other acts, articles 185-188 of the Penal Code made abortion illegal. According to article 186, pregnant women who terminated their pregnancies were to be punished with prison terms of between six months and two years or a fine. Law no. 140/1996 to amend and supplement the Penal Code, published in *Monitorul Oficial* no. 289/14 November 1996 introduced article 185 regarding illegal inducement of an abortion, which referred to termination of a pregnancy in certain circumstances, according to the specialist literature on conditions of safety for the bodily integrity, health and life of the pregnant woman, for the birth of children without malformations, and for increasing the birth rate. If the legislator had wished to sanction pregnant women for terminating pregnancies, the clauses of article 186 of the Penal Code would have been retained.

³ Lack of consent on the part of the pregnant woman constitutes an aggravating circumstance according to paragraph 2, article 185 Cp.

⁴ O. Loghin, T. Toader, *Drept penal român. Partea specială*, Bucharest, 1993, 127.

fect) Poland, to which may also be added Northern Ireland, part of the United Kingdom.

- Malta completely bans abortion, despite huge pressure from the UN and EU, which demand this legislation be altered;

- In Ireland, abortion is banned except in cases where the mother is at risk of committing suicide, although both the government and the Catholic Church are trying to do away with this loophole;

- In Poland and Northern Ireland, an abortion may be carried out, in theory, if the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest, if the foetus has serious malformations, and if the life and health of the mother are placed in danger; but in effect, both the specific regulations and state assistance for women seeking to terminate pregnancies significantly reduce the number of abortions. In Poland, the rate of abortion is very low: in 2002 there were three abortions per ten thousand births.

The second group includes states where it is possible to have an abortion under certain quite relaxed conditions: Cyprus, the Faroe Islands (a Danish territory), Finland, Luxembourg, Spain, Portugal and Great Britain.

- Abortion motivated by difficult social and material circumstances is, in effect, allowed only in Great Britain (which might sooner be included in the third group) and Finland;

- In the Faroe Islands, the consent of the husband is required, if the woman is married;

- In Luxembourg, the woman must be given counselling as to the alternatives and wait for seven days before having the abortion. Here, objections on the grounds of conscience, generally for religious reasons, are frequent.

The third group includes all the other EU member states, where abortion is available “on request.” These include the former communist bloc countries, with the exception of Poland—the Baltic states, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Hungary—which have retained such legislation from the time of the “Iron Curtain” (this is explainable, given that the first country in the world to legalise abortion was the USSR, in 1922) and countries with a longstanding democratic and liberal tradition, where so called “individual freedoms” are fundamental: Belgium, Holland (where “euthanasia” has also been legalised), Germany, France, Sweden, Denmark. Italy is also part of this group.

In the view of Christian theology, infanticide is taken to be the killing of both a newly born child and the product of conception, the foetus. The embryo or foetus is, according to the Church Fathers, a person in its own

right. They make no distinction between abortion and the killing of a newly born child. Their claims are based on the biblical texts and the givens of science.⁵ Although the human body since man's fall has its origin in the seed of Adam, the soul is given by God at the moment of conception, becoming the body's principle of life.

Of the Ten Commandments that God handed down to Moses on Mount Sinai, the first four concern man's relationship with God and the following six relations between men. The Sixth Commandment says: "Thou shalt not kill" (Exodus, 20:13). This commandment forbids murder, given that life is the most precious gift that God has given to man.⁶ In the first centuries of the Church, many of the Fathers and a large number of synodic canons took a stance against the practice of infanticide, which seems to have been widespread throughout the pagan world.⁷

In apostolic times, Christianity recognised that abortion is incompatible with turning towards God. The oldest texts that describe life within Christ speak of the issue of abortion. For example, in *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (or *Didache*), a work dating from 50-70 A.D. (which among other things describes Christian conduct, showing that Christians fasted on Wednesdays and Fridays as early as the apostolic period), abortion is included among the serious sins: "Thou shalt do no murder; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not commit sodomy; thou shalt not commit fornication; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not use magic; thou shalt not use philtres; thou shalt not procure abortion, nor commit infanticide."⁸

Similar interdictions, including abortion, can also be found in the *Letter of Barnabas*, from the first or second century: "Thou shalt not commit fornication, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not commit sodomy . . . Thou shalt not procure abortion, thou shalt not commit infanticide."⁹ Abortion has always been condemned by Christianity, and this has remained constant in time. The third and fourth centuries abound in Christian declarations against abortion. For example, Tertullian (160-240) stressed: "But, with us, murder is forbidden once for all. We are not per-

⁵ See Father John Breck, *Darul sacru al vieții*, Cluj: Editura Patmos, 2001, 187-221

⁶ Eugeniu Safta – Romano, *Arhetipuri juridice în Biblie*, Jassy: Editura Polirom, 1997, 173.

⁷ Elena Scurtu, „Avortul sau rățacirea în umbra morții”, *Ziarul Lumina* 10, November, 2013.

⁸ *Didache*, II, 2. *The Apostolic Fathers*, trans. Kirsopp Lake, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1965, 403.

⁹ *Ibid.*

mitted to destroy even the foetus in the womb, as long as blood is still being drawn to form a human being. To prevent the birth of a child is a quicker way to murder. It makes no difference whether one destroys a soul already born or interferes with its coming to birth. It is a human being and one who is to be a man, for the whole fruit is already present in the seed.”¹⁰ He goes on to ask what is the nature of human conception, whether it involves both the substance of the body and that of the soul, and whether both are formed simultaneously or whether one has priority over the other: “My view is that both are conceived, formed, and perfected at the same time, just as they are born together, and there is not a moment’s interval in their conception by which any priority might be assigned to either one of them. Now, from man’s last moment of life we may get some idea of his first. If death is nothing else than the dissolution of body and soul, life, then, should be defined as the union of soul and body . . . we believe that life begins at conception, since we hold that the soul begins to exist at that time.”¹¹

We find a similar position in the works of Octavius Minucius Felix (170-215). Christian ethics in the apostolic period classed the taking of human life as immoral. But after Christianity was reconsolidated after the persecutions, there appeared synodic canons against abortion, which asserted that the embryo was a person. The first important local synod was held at Ancyra in the year 314 and its twenty-first canon reduced the epithymia for abortion to ten years, underlining that the act of abortion previously entailed an interdiction from communion for life. “Concerning women who commit fornication, and destroy that which they have conceived, or who are employed in making drugs for abortion, a former decree excluded them until the hour of death, and to this some have assented. Nevertheless, being desirous to use somewhat greater lenity, we have ordained that they fulfil ten years [of penance], according to the prescribed degrees.”¹²

Around the year 315, the sixth canon of the Synod of Neo-Caesarea, when speaking of the baptism of pregnant women, recognises the child in its mother’s womb as a separate person: “Concerning a woman with child, it is determined that she ought to be baptised whenever she will; for in this the woman communicates nothing to the child, since the bringing forward

¹⁰ Tertullian, *Apologia* 9.8, in: *Apologetical Works*, trans. Rudolf Arbesmann, Sr. Emily Joseph Daly, Edwin A. Quain, Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1999, 31-32.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² <http://www.elpenor.org/ecumenical-councils/ancyra-314.asp?pg=21>.

to profession is evidently the individual privilege of every single person.”¹³ The second part of the canon regards the child in its mother’s womb as a person for whom individual baptism is required. The baptism of the mother has no connection with the baptism of the child. The child must have a separate place within the Church and be baptised in its own right, and this is possible only after it has been born.

The canonical punishment of abortion is repeated consistently throughout the first two third of the first millennium. For example, in his *Canonica Prima* (Letter 188), St Basil the Great forbids abortion, as follows: “The woman who purposely destroys her unborn child is guilty of murder. With us there is no nice enquiry as to its being formed or unformed. In this case it is not only the being about to be born who is vindicated, but the woman in her attack upon herself; because in most cases women who make such attempts die. The destruction of the embryo is an additional crime, a second murder, at all events if we regard it as done with intent. The punishment, however, of these women should not be for life, but for the term of ten years. And let their treatment depend not on mere lapse of time, but on the character of their repentance.”¹⁴

Likewise, Apostolic Canon 66, Canon 5 of St Gregory of Nyssa, and Canons 13, 45 and 55 of St Basil demands the defrocking of priests guilty

¹³ <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3803.htm>

¹⁴ *The Treatise De Spiritu Sancto, the Nine Homilies of the Hexaemeron and the Letters of Saint Basil the Great, Archbishop of Caesaria*, trans. Rev. Blomfield Jackson, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895, 225. “Faced with the physical and metaphysical evil of abortion, St Basil adopts the most effective position to combat it, in the conditions of his time. Rather than the distinction between the formed/unformed or ensouled/non-ensouled foetus, which was of Judaic origin (inspired by the text of Exodus 21:22-23), a distinction that seemed ‘scientific’, but was very controversial, St Basil draws on two concrete arguments, which are impossible to refute. Regardless of the moment when the foetus can be regarded as a person, abortion must be tried as murder because: a) it voluntarily destroys that which ‘will be a man,’ since this is precisely what is aimed at in its destruction, and whose coming into the world rests under God’s absolute providence; and b) it involuntarily affects the life of the mother, but with very grave consequences. Even today, the advocates of ‘human rights’, some legislators and even certain experts seek all kinds of phases in the continuous development of the foetus as a human being, prior to which this is supposed to be nothing but a ‘mass of cells,’ and when they can no longer find them, they invoke the ‘rights’ and even the ‘health’ of the mother. The truth is that medicine is increasingly in agreement with St Basil, both with regard to the life of the foetus and the consequences of abortion. The unborn foetus is the only innocent party, but not the only victim.” See: <https://teologiesibiu.files.wordpress.com/2010/01/05-avortul-dupa-sfintele-canoane.pdf>

of complicity with those who commit the crime of abortion, whether they have granted invalid absolution during confession to those that have no awareness of the true gravity of their sin or whether they themselves are guilty of the crime, it having been committed in their own family. St John the Abster, Patriarch of Constantinople, says the same thing in his twenty-first canon. Abortion is singled out for special punishment in Canon 91 of the Quinisext Synod, which drew up canons for two councils. Orthodox Christianity's consistent position is accepted, without there ever being any question of whether or not the embryo is a creature with a soul and, even less so, without there ever being any distinction drawn between early and late abortions.

The same view falls within the Orthodox teaching which, according to St Gregory of Nyssa, holds that the foetus in the mother's womb is a person possessed of both body and soul from the moment of conception, in the image and likeness of God and therefore in possession of human identity.¹⁵

In this respect, Jean Claude Larchet says: "Abortion is from many points of view a genuine tragedy. It is a tragedy because it involves the death of a creature that is already a human being. It is a tragedy because such a death always profoundly affects the mother and results in a trauma which, even if it does not cause conscious suffering, injures her deeper sensibility, often scarring her unconscious forever. Even in the case of voluntary abortion, the Church regards the mother not only as guilty, but also as a victim, taking her to its bosom, comforting her, soothing the wounds of her soul, supporting her and helping her to begin a new life."¹⁶ This vision is in keeping with Orthodox teaching, which, according to St Gregory Nyssa, says that even in the womb, the human being has both a body and a soul: "

This is how things stand in Christianity, although it is known that according to the Book of Exodus, in the Septuagint version, a distinction is made between the fully formed and the not fully formed embryo, between early abortion and late abortion caused by violence done by a third party. The subject dealt with in the Septuagint demands special attention, given the particular influence of western Christian circles in the second millennium. The text is as follows: ἐὰν δὲ μάχωνται δύο ἄνδρες καὶ πατάξωσιν γυναῖκα ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσαν καὶ ἐξέλθῃ τὸ παιδίον αὐτῆς μὴ ἐξεικονισμένον

¹⁵ Grégoire de Nysse, *La Création de l'homme*, trans. Jean Laplace, s.j., (Sources Chrétiennes 6, 2002), 222-227.

¹⁶ Jean-Claude Larchet, *Etica procreației în învățătura Sfinților Părinți*, trans. Marinela Bojin, Bucharest: Editura Sophia, 2003, 143

ἐπιζήμιον ζημιωθήσεται καθότι ἂν ἐπιβάλῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ τῆς γυναικός δώσει μετὰ ἀξιώματος. ἔαν δὲ ἐξεικονισμένον ἦν δώσει ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς, ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος χεῖρα ἀντὶ χειρός πόδα ἀντὶ ποδός, κατάκαυμα ἀντὶ κατακαύματος τραῦμα ἀντὶ τραύματος μώλωπα ἀντὶ μώλωπος (If two men fight each other and strike a pregnant woman and her not fully formed [μὴ ἐξεικονισμένον] child be miscarried, damages shall be levied inasmuch that if the woman's husband demand, he [the other man] shall pay according to that which is thought fit. If it be fully formed [ἐξεικονισμένον], he shall pay a soul for a soul, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a hand for a hand, a foot for a foot, a burn for a burn, a wound for a wound, a bruise for a bruise (Exodus, 21: 22-25).

The sense of the Hebrew *textus receptus* is as follows: “And when men strive, and have smitten a pregnant woman, and her children have come out, and there is no mischief, he is certainly fined, as the husband of the woman doth lay upon him, and he hath given through the judges; and if there is mischief, then thou hast given life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe” (Exodus, 21: 22-25, Young's Literal Translation). The Hebrew makes no distinction between the fully formed and the not fully formed embryo, while verse 23 refers only to the injuries suffered by the adults as a result of the fight.

Two issues need to be pointed out. Firstly, the text ought to deal with the question of abortion, but refers to a case of manslaughter. Secondly, nor is the Septuagint version more elastic and in fact deals with the punishment for manslaughter more than the Hebrew version. The Septuagint version may therefore be understood as an intermediary phase between the more lax approach permitted by Moses and the more exigent and fuller understanding achieved by Christianity. As Christ reminds us in the case of divorce, “Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so” (Matthew, 19:8), the Law of Moses demanded less of the Jews than is now demanded of the Christians.¹⁷

¹⁷ In the divine economy, those who prevent the birth of a foetus „contravene the plans of God with regard to the world, and these plans are thwarted precisely through the stifling of the life of people sent by the deity in order to contribute to the good of mankind or even to its salvation.” This probably refers to Isaiah: “The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart: and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come” (Is. 57:1). See Petre Semen, „Cuvîntul Scripturii în fața

What is important for Christians is that the distinction between fully formed and not fully formed embryos is categorically rejected by Christianity as without theological significance.¹⁸ Basil the Great argues clearly against such a distinction when discussing the ethics of abortion in the aforementioned Epistle to Amphilochius (Letter 188): “The woman who purposely destroys her unborn child is guilty of murder. With us there is no nice enquiry as to its being formed or unformed.”¹⁹

St Basil the Great’s position needs to be placed in opposition to two significant questions, the first moral, the second biblical. The moral question regards the Christian duty not to shed innocent blood, a duty that mirrors a fundamental biblical interdiction (Genesis, 9:6), regardless of any consideration as to whether or not the embryo has a soul, and which is expressed in the Christian condemnation without exception of abortion ever since the apostolic period. The biblical question has two viewpoints. Firstly, as mentioned above, the Septuagint version of Exodus does not diminish, but makes more drastic the legal punishment for killing with intent. Secondly, what was demanded of the Jews in the 613 rules of the Law of Moses in general and with regard to abortion in particular cannot be employed without careful examination when establishing what exactly is demanded of Christians.

For example, the Talmud recognises that the law regarding abortion is harsher for ben Noah (pagans) than for Jews (Sanhedrin 57b), and so, at least according to some orthodox Jewish scholars, as long as for Jews abortion be permitted in a number of certain situations, it ought not be permitted to ben Noah (pagans). For a pagan, abortion represents an infringement of one of the seven interdictions of the Covenant of Noah and constitutes a crime punishable with death.²⁰

imoralității: pruncuciderea, abandonul de copii, divorțul, drogurile și homosexualitatea”, in: *Dialog Teologic*, Review of the Roman-Catholic Institute, Jassy, Year 1, No. 2, 1998, 45

¹⁸ The central concept of the ethical argument regarding abortion is that of personhood and all that this entails. By virtue of their personhood, which includes their awareness of self, reason, relationships and so on, people have rights, including the fundamental right to life. See Christopher Kaczor, *The Ethics of Abortion. Women’s Rights, Human Life and the Question of Justice*, New York and London: Routledge, 2011, 48

¹⁹ *The Treatise De Spiritu Sancto, the Nine Homilies of the Hexaemeron and the Letters of Saint Basil the Great, Archbishop of Caesaria*, trans. Rev. Blomfield Jackson, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895, 225.

²⁰ Baruch A. Brody, „The Use of Halachic Material Discussions of Medical Ethics“, *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 8 (1983), 317-328.

In short, the orthodox Hebrew authorities are in agreement with Basil the Great: it is not possible to base an argument, as the Roman Catholic Church did in the Middle Ages,²¹ on the exigencies of the Law of Moses with regard to involuntary manslaughter. Orthodox Christianity, unlike Western Christianity, recognises that the Law of Moses cannot be employed as an unmediated guide to a correct understanding of the ethics of abortion. The position of St Basil the Great and the canons of the Church, which were validated by St Photius the Great (810-895) in the Constitution of the Canons and the Nomocanon, as reconsidered at the command of Emperor Constantine VI, delimits Orthodox Christianity from the various innovations with regard to abortion that arose in the Latin Church in the early twelfth century.

But it should also be noted that the Catholic Church of today firmly condemns the practice of abortion. John Paul II was consistent in this point of view, as are the majority of Roman-Catholic and Orthodox bishops. In the matter of abortion it is possible to speak of unanimity between the Orthodox and Roman-Catholic Churches both in the past and in the present. John XXIII reconfirmed the principles of the Western Church in *Mater et Magistra* (paragraph 194) when he emphasised the harmful effects of legalised abortion on the whole of human society: "Human life is sacred—all men must recognize that fact. From its very inception it reveals the creating hand of God. Those who violate His laws not only offend the divine majesty and degrade themselves and humanity, they also sap the vitality of the political community of which they are members."²²

Conclusions

It is regrettable in a democratic country that in the analysis of problems of such general interest the teaching of the Church has been ignored and, out of commodity, avoided, thereby demonstrating both a lack of understanding and a lack of love toward our fellow man. Moral and social issues with a great reverberation in the consciousness of civil society, such as incest and abortion, need to be treated with responsibility and in depth.

²¹ *Corpus Juris Canonici Emendatum et Notis Illustratum cum Glessae: decretalium d. Gregorii Papae Noni Compilatio* (Rome, 1585), *Glossa ordinaria*, vol. 5, title 12, chapter 20, 1713. Between 1234 and 1869, with the exception of the period 1588-1591, the Roman-Catholic Church did not regard early abortion as murder.

²²http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_150_516_61_mater.html

Let us not overlook the fact that eighty-seven per cent of Romania's citizens are Orthodox Christians, responsible members of this society, promoters of moral values, and as such responsible legislation should not be put forward and promulgated without consultation with representatives of all the religions in this country.

In fact, the claim to legitimise abortion from the legal standpoint refuses to see the intrinsic juridical contradiction on which it is based. If the idea of the "rule of law" arose and has been consolidated over the course of time by virtue of the fact that it has defended the rights of all, against anarchy or totalitarianism, then how can its legal framework allow a law that makes the fundamental and primary right, the right to life, the object of an arbitrary concession? If each of us is alive because his mother was not given this "gift", then it is no longer possible genuinely to speak of a "right," but then the whole concept collapses and the structure of the modern rule of law with it, since its primary and fundamental right has been rendered nothing more than a favour.

Therefore, in losing his religious sense, which in fact constitutes his fundamental sense, man has taken upon himself an unlimited freedom, becoming the prisoner of an exacerbated subjectivism, which has allowed him completely to dispose of life and death. Based on its inherent dignity and value, human life, at whatever stage, must be protected from the moment of conception to that of natural death.

ΣΥΝΤΟΜΗ ΑΝΑΣΚΟΠΗΣΗ ΣΤΗΝ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΒΟΥΛΓΑΡΙΑΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟ ΠΡΩΤΟ ΗΜΙΣΥ ΤΟΥ 13^{ΟΥ} ΑΙΩΝΑ

Astract: La présente recherche constitue une étude brève sur l'histoire ecclésiastique de la Bulgarie pendant la première moitié du XIII^e siècle. L'auteur y examine le développement des rapports entre l'Église et l'État en Bulgarie ainsi que les relations entre celle-ci et le Patriarcat œcuménique, d'une part, et le Saint-Siège, de l'autre, sous le règne de trois souverains bulgares: Kalojan /1197-1207/, Boril /1207-1218/ et Jean II Asen /1218-1241/. Le premier d'entre eux, Kalojan, a soumis la Bulgarie à Rome en acceptant formellement une union avec l'Église romaine (1203-1204) qui s'est poursuivie sous le règne de Boril. L'union a été définitivement rejetée par Jean II Asen. C'est à son initiative que l'archevêque bulgare s'est vu attribué en 1235 le titre de Patriarche par le Synode du Patriarcat œcuménique.

Keywords: Church History, Bulgarian History, Medieval Church, Byzantine Church, Roman Church

Από τη στιγμή που ξέσπασε η εξέγερση των Ασενιδών, το 1185-6, και με τις πρώτες επιτυχίες στα πεδία των μαχών τέθηκε ως βασικός στόχος η ισχυροποίηση της ανεξαρτησίας του ανανεωμένου από αυτούς Βουλγαρικού κράτους με τη ρύθμιση των σχέσεων με τα γειτονικά κράτη, αλλά και η οργάνωση ανεξάρτητης εθνικής Εκκλησίας¹. Η αλλαγή της στάσης

¹ Прβλ. F. Uspenskij, *Obrazovanie Vtorogo bolgarskogo carstva*, Odessa, 1879, 74 εξ.; A. Xénopol, "L'empire valacho-bulgare", *Revue historique* 47 (1891) 277 εξ.; V. Zlatarski, *Istorija na Bălgarskata dăržava prez srednite vekove*, II: Bălgarija pod vizantijsko vladičestvo (1018-1187), Sofia, 1938, 410 εξ.; P. Papahagi, *Un Probleme d'histoire médiévale. Création et caractère du Second Empire bulgare (1185)*, Bucarest, 1943; R. L. Wolff, "The Second Bulgarian Empire: Its Origin and History to 1204", *Speculum* 24 (1949), 180 εξ.; Genoveva

των Βουλγάρων απέναντι στο Πατριαρχείο Κωνσταντινουπόλεως και την Αρχιεπισκοπή Αχρίδας διαδραμάτισε καθοριστικό ρόλο στην απόφασή τους να ανακηρύξουν αυτόβουλα τον νεοχειροτονηθέντα αρχιεπίσκοπο Τυρνόβου για προκαθήμενο της Εκκλησίας της Βουλγαρίας². Με στόχο να εξασφαλίσουν την αναγνώριση από κάποια ανώτερη εκκλησιαστική ή κοσμική αρχή στην Ευρώπη, οι Ασένιδες υποχρεώθηκαν να προσεγγίσουν την Εκκλησία της Ρώμης και στη συνέχεια να αποδεχθούν Ουνία μ' αυτήν. Το γεγονός αυτό δεν υπήρξε μεμονωμένη περίπτωση και έχει προηγούμενο στη βουλγαρική ιστορία. Τρεις αιώνες νωρίτερα ανάλογες συνθήκες οδήγησαν τον Βούλγαρο ηγεμόνα Βόρι (852-889) σε επαφή με τον πάπα Νικόλαο Α' (858-867)³.

Cankova-Petkova, "La libération de la Bulgarie de la domination byzantine", *Byzantino-bulgarica* 5 (1978), 95 εξ.; Της ίδιας, *Bălgarija pri Asenevci*, Sofia, 1978, 26 εξ.; Iv. Bozilov, *Familijata na Asenevci (1186-1460). Genealogija i prosopografija*, Sofia, 1994, 11 εξ.; Αικατερίνη Χριστοφιλοπούλου, *Βυζαντινή Ιστορία, Γ' 1 (1081-1204)*, Αθήνα, 1998-2001, 179 εξ.; Για περισσότερη βιβλιογραφία βλ.: G. Ostrogorsky, *Ιστορία του Βυζαντινού κράτους, Γ'*, (Μτφρ. από γερμανικά) "Ιστορικές εκδόσεις Στέφανος Βασιλόπουλος", Αθήνα 1997, 297-299, σημ. 155; D. Angelov, "Văstanieto načelo s Asenevci", *Istorija na Bălgarija v čeririnadeset toma*, III: Vtora bălgarska dăržava, Sofia, 1982, 118 εξ.

² I. Pitra, cardinalis, *Analecta Sacra et Classica Spicilegio Solesmesi Parata*, VI: Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum. Selecta paralipomena, Parisiis – Romae 1891, 43-44, 564; P. Nikov, "Prinos kăm istoričeskoto izvoroznanie na Bălgarija i istorijata na bălgarskata dăržava", *Spisanie na Bălgarskata Akademija na Naukite*, Sofia 20 (1921), 20 εξ.; Εκτενέστερα βλ.: V. Zlatarski, *Istorija*, II, 470 εξ.; Iv. Dujcev, "Tărnovo kato političeski i duhoven centăr prez kăsnoto srednovekovie", *Bălgarsko srednovekovie*, Proučvanija vărhu političeskata kulturna istorija na srednovekovna Bălgarija, Sofia, 1972, 425; I. Ταρνανίδης, *Ἡ διαμόρφωσις τοῦ αὐτοκέφαλου τῆς Βουλγαρικῆς Ἐκκλησίας (864-1235)*, "Εταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν", [Επιστημονικαί Πραγματεῖαι 13], Θεσσαλονίκη, 1976, 118; Δ. Γόνης, *Ιστορία τῶν Ὁρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησιῶν Βουλγαρίας καί Σερβίας*, Αθήνα, 2000, 56; Για τη διοίκηση της αρχιεπισκοπῆς Τυρνόβου κατά την περίοδο 1185-1204 βλ.: Bistra Nikolova, *Ustrojstvo i upravljenje na Bălgarskata pravoslavna cărkvna (IX-XIV v.)*, Sofia, 1997, 207 εξ., όπου και σχετικές πηγές και βιβλιογραφία.

³ D. Detschew, *Responsa Nicolai I papae ad consulta bulgarorum*, Serdicae (Sofia), 1939; Iv. Dujcev, "Die Responsa Nicolai I. Papae ad consulta Bulgarorum als Quelle für die bulgarische Geschichte", *Festschrift des Haus-Hof und Staatsarchivs*, I, Wien, 1949, 349-362; Εκτενέστερα βλ.: Ταρνανίδης, *Ἡ διαμόρφωσις*, 65; Εμμ. Κωνσταντινίδης, "Ἡ πολιτική τῶν Φράγκων εἰς τὴν Βουλγαρίαν ἐπὶ Βόριδος (852-889)", *Τιμητικὸς τόμος εἰς τὸν καθηγητὴν Γεράσιμον Κονιδάρην «Ἀντίδωρον Πνευματικόν»*, Ἀθῆναι, 1981, 3 εξ.; Μτφρ. στα βουλγαρικά: Em. Konstantinidis, „Politikata na frankite v Bălgarija po vremeto na Boris I (852-889)”, *Izvestija* 2 (1984), 91 εξ.; Bistra Nikolova, "Svedenija za otnošeniata meždū Bălgarija, Rim, Zapada i Latinskata imperija s starobălgarskata knižnina (IX-XIV v.)", *Istoričeski pregled* 4 (1987), 55 εξ.; Της ίδιας, *Neravnijat păt na priznanieto. Kanonično*

Στην προσπάθεια να αποκομίσει το μέγιστο δυνατό όφελος για το κράτος του ο Βόρις-Μιχαήλ εκμεταλλεύθηκε τις διαφορές μεταξύ Ρώμης και Κωνσταντινούπολης προκειμένου να κερδίσει την αναγνώριση από πλευράς του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου για αυτόνομη ορθόδοξη Αρχιεπισκοπή⁴. Αυτή την πολιτική γραμμή διατήρησε και ο διάδοχός του Συμεών Α' (893-927), αντιλαμβάνοντας τις σχέσεις Εκκλησίας-Κράτους επιλεκτικά και χρησιμοποιώντας το θεσμό της Εκκλησίας για την ενίσχυση της πολιτικής του εξουσίας. Οι Βούλγαροι αντιμετώπιζαν την Ορθοδοξία μάλλον επιλεκτικά, δηλ. ως μια αποκλειστικά πολιτική και ιδεολογική δομή και ένα παράγοντα για τη διατήρηση της ενότητας του κράτους τους κι όχι με την έννοια της ενότητας με τον υπόλοιπο ορθόδοξο, κυρίως βυζαντινό, κόσμο. Έτσι, στην προσπάθειά τους να αποφύγουν τη βυζαντινή επιρροή, αλλά παρά τούτα υιοθετώντας το βυζαντινό μοντέλο για τη σχέση Κράτους-Εκκλησίας, οι Βούλγαροι υπήρξαν θεμελιωτές μιας άγνωστης μέχρι τότε πρακτικής στην Ορθόδοξη Ανατολή για τοπική Εκκλησία που οικοδομείται σύμφωνα με την κρατική και την εκκλησιαστική ενότητα όσον αφορά τα εδαφικά και διοικητικά όρια, τις πολιτισμικές διαστάσεις και τη γλώσσα. Σημαντικό ρόλο στην κατεύθυνση αυτή διαδραμάτισε η σλαβική γλώσσα και γραφή, που συνέβαλε στο αρχικό στάδιο, ακόμα στην ανεξάρτητη πολιτισμική και εκκλησιαστική ανάπτυξη, αλλά ταυτόχρονα αποξένωσε τους Βουλγάρους από το βυζαντινό ορθόδοξο πρότυπο και προπαντός από την βυζαντινή χριστιανική και εκκλησιαστική παράδοση. Κατά

položenie na Bălgarskata cārkva prez Srednovekovieto, Sofia, 2001, 19 εξ.; Για τις πιο σημαντικές μελέτες πάνω στην ιστορία των σχέσεων μεταξύ Βουλγαρίας και Εκκλησίας της Ρώμης για την περίοδο από τον 9^ο ως τον 14^ο αι. και για το ζήτημα της Ουνίας βλ.: V. Gjuzeev, "Das Papsttum und Bulgarien im Mittelalter (9.-14. Jn.)", *Bulgarian Historical Review* 1 (1977), 34 εξ.; Του ιδίου, "Bălgarija i Rimskata cārkva (IX-XIV v.)", *Bălgarija v sveta ot drevnostta do naši dni*, I, Sofia, 1979, 275 εξ.; Του ιδίου, *Forschungen zur Geschichte Bulgariens im Mittelalter*, Wien, 1986, 175 εξ.; Cvetana Čolova, "Bălgarskata cārkva i opitite za unija prez Srednovekovieto", *Religija i cārkva v Bălgarija. Socialni i kulturni izmerenija v pravoslavieto i negovata specifika v bălgarskite zemi*, Sofia, 1999, 116 εξ.

⁴ Για τη διαμάχη μεταξύ Ρώμης και Κωνσταντινούπολης σχετικά με το λεγόμενο «βουλγαρικό εκκλησιαστικό ζήτημα» βλ.: V. Zlatarski, *Istorija*, I/2: *Pārvo bălgarsko carstvo. Ot slavjanizacijata na dāržavata do padaneto na Pārvalo carstvo (852-1018)*, Sofia, 1927, 127 εξ.; Ταρνανίδης, *Η διαμόρφωσις*, 53 εξ.; Βλ. Φειδās, *Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία*, Β', Αθήνα, 1995, 59-65, 122 εξ., 214 εξ.; Γόνης, *Ιστορία*, 15 εξ.; V. Gjuzeev, "Kratāk očerk vārhu otnošienijata meždū Rimskata cārkva i Bălgarskoto carstvo prez srednovekovieto (IX-XIV v.)", *Katoličeska duhovna kultura i nejnoto prisāstvie i vlijanie v Bălgarija*, Sofia, 1992, 71 εξ.; P. Angelov, "Bălgarija meždū Rim i Konstantinopol", *Ličnostta v istoričeskoto razvitie. Alternativa v istorijata*, Sofia, 1995, 99 εξ.; Nikolova, *Neravnijat pāt*, 24 εξ.

συνέπεια ενισχύθηκε η επιδίωξη να αποκτήσουν αυτοκέφαλη Εκκλησία και τον ανώτερο τίτλο για τον προκαθήμενο της Εκκλησίας τους.

Όπως οι ηγεμόνες του λεγόμενου Α΄ Βουλγαρικού Κράτους, έτσι και Ασένιδες επιφύλαξαν στον εαυτό τους το προνόμιο να καθορίζουν το γενικό πλαίσιο της εκκλησιαστικής πολιτικής του ανανεωμένου από αυτούς βουλγαρικού κράτους. Μέχρι την ενθρόνιση του τρίτου αδελφού, Ιωαννίκιου (Καλογιάννη) το 1197, το νεοσύστατο κράτος δεν κατόρθωσε να κερδίσει την αναγνώριση από καμιά κοσμική ή εκκλησιαστική αρχή στην Ευρώπη. Ο κίνδυνος τόσο από το Βυζάντιο όσο κι από την Ουγγαρία εξακολουθούσε να υφίσταται, η τελευταία μάλιστα είχε βλέψεις σε εδάφη που βρίσκονταν υπό την εξουσία των Βουλγάρων. Στην πολιτική σκηνή πρόβαλε και μία νέα απειλή στο πρόσωπο των πορευομένων προς την Κωνσταντινούπολη σταυροφόρων, οι οποίοι έμελλε να προβάλουν με τη σειρά τους τις διεκδικήσεις τους στα Βαλκάνια⁵. Οι διαπραγματεύσεις που ξεκίνησαν μεταξύ Καλογιάννη (1197-1207) και Ρώμης, στα τέλη του 1199 και τις αρχές του 1200, διήρκησαν τέσσερα χρόνια και διεξάγονταν με ιδιαίτερη ένταση μετά την εισβολή των Ούγγρων στα δυτικά βουλγαρικά εδάφη και την εμφάνιση των Σταυροφόρων κάτω από τα τείχη της Κωνσταντινούπολης, αλλά καρποφόρησαν μόλις μετά την άλωση της πρωτεύουσας του

⁵ Για τις βούλγαρο-ουγγρικές σχέσεις κατά την διάρκεια της βασιλείας του Καλογιάννη βλ.: V. Zlatarski, *Istorija*, III: Vtoro bălgarsko carstvo, Bălgarija pri Asenevci (1187-1280), Sofia, 1940, 149 εξ.; L. Tauti, "Le conflit entre Johannitza Asen et Emeric roi de Hongrie (1202-1204)", [Studi e Testi 233], 1964, 367 εξ.; Hr. Dimitrov, *Bălgaro-ungarski otnošenija prez srednovekovieto*, Sofia 1998, 110 εξ.; Για την Δ΄ Σταυροφορία ενδεικτικά βλ.: R. Grousset, *L'Empire du Levant*, Histoire de la question d'Orient, Paris, 1946; R. L. Wolff, "Romania. The Latin Empire of Constantinople", *Speculum* 23 (1948), 1 εξ.; Του ιδίου, "The Latin Empire of Constantinople", *A History of the Crusades*, II: The Later Crusades (1189-1311), Philadelphia, 1962, 187 εξ.; J. Longnon, "The Frankish Staates in Greece, 1204-1311", *Πάλι εκεί*, 235 εξ.; St. Runciman, *A History of the Croisades*, III, Cambridge, 1955, 107 εξ.; A. Frolow, *Recherches sur la déviation de la IV^e croisade vers Constantinople*, Paris, 1955; D. Queller, *The Fourth Crusade. The Conquest of Constantinople /1201-1204/*, Pennsylvania, 1977; G. Ostrogorsky, *Ιστορία του Βυζαντινού κράτους*, Γ΄, 85 εξ.; Ι. Καραγιαννόπουλος, *Ιστορία του Βυζαντινού κράτους*, Τόμος Γ΄: Ιστορία ύστερας βυζαντινής περιόδου (1081-1453), Μέρος πρώτο: Τελευταίες λάμψεις (1081-1204), Θεσσαλονίκη, 1999, 339 εξ.; Χριστοφιλοπούλου, *Βυζαντινή ιστορία*, Γ΄1, 213 εξ.; Snežana Rakova, *Četvrtijat krăstonosen pohod v istoričeskata pamet na pravoslavnite slavjani*, Sofia, 2007, 21 εξ.; M. Angold, *The Fourth Crusade. Event and Context*, "Pearson-Longman", New York, London, Paris etc., 2003, 129 εξ.; Krasimira Gagova, *Krăstonosnite pohodi i srednovekovna Bălgarija*, Sofia, 2004, 118 εξ.

Βυζαντίου το 1204⁶. Μολονότι η Δ' Σταυροφορία δεν έχει άμεση σχέση με την αλληλογραφία που ξεκίνησε ανάμεσα στο Τύρνοβο και τη Ρώμη, τρία χρόνια αργότερα η Σταυροφορία αυτή διαδραμάτισε καθοριστικό ρόλο στην οριστική απόφαση του Καλογιάννη να αποδεχθεί την Ουνία και να κερδίσει την αναγνώριση μάλιστα από την Παπική Έδρα.

Η πρώτη επιστολή, που έχει διασωθεί, του πάπα Ιννοκεντίου Γ' (1198-1216) προς τον Καλογιάννη εστάλη μέσω του φιλενωτικού βυζαντινού πρωτοπρεσβύτερου στο Πρίντεζι Δομνίκου και απευθυνόταν μόνο στον Βούλγαρο ηγεμόνα, αλλά όχι και στον προκαθήμενο της Εκκλησίας της Βουλγαρίας⁷. Ο πάπας άφησε τον αρχιεπίσκοπο Τυρνόβου να προχωρήσει μόνος του στο πρώτο βήμα και να απευθυνθεί στη Ρώμη με επιστολή, η οποία μάλιστα δεν άργησε. Το φθινόπωρο του 1202, μαζί με την επιστολή του Καλογιάννη,⁸ ο πάπας έλαβε και την επιστολή του αρχιεπισκόπου Βασιλείου⁹. Το εκκλησιαστικό ζήτημα δεν αναφερόταν στις απαντήσεις των Βουλγάρων προς τον πάπα, αλλά ο ίδιος ο Ιννοκέντιος Γ' έδωσε ιδιαίτερη έμφαση ακριβώς σ' αυτό το ζήτημα στην επόμενη του αποστολή, την οποία ανέλαβε ο καπελάνος Ιωάννης στη Βουλγαρία το 1203. Από τα γράμματά

⁶ Για την πορεία των διαπραγματεύσεων του πάπα Ιννοκεντίου Γ' με τους Βουλγάρους βλ.: E. Golubinskij, *Kratkij očerk istorii pravoslavnych cerkvej bolgarskoj, serbskoj i rumjinskoj*, Moskva 1871, 264 εξ.; P. Nikov, "Bălgarska diplomacija v načaloto na XIII vek", *Bălgarska istoričeska biblioteka*, Sofia 3 (1928), 84 εξ.; Evg. Bosilkov, *Za unijata na Bălgarskata carkva i Rimskata carkva prez pārvata polovina na XIII v.*, (διδακτορική διατριβή), Ρώμη, 22 Νοεμβρίου, 1931, Μετάφραση από λατινικά στα βουλγαρικά στο: *Evgeni Bosilkov (1900-1952), Dokumenti ot arhivite na Bălgarija i Francija*, [Arhivite govornjat 23], Sofia, 2002, 19 εξ.; R. Janin, "Bulgarie, Patriarcat bulgare de Turnovo", *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, XII, Paris 1938, 1137 εξ.; V. Zlatarski, *Istorija*, III, 149 εξ.; Iv. Dujcev, "Prepiskata na papa Inokentij III s bălgarite, uvod, tekst i beležki", *Godišnik na Sofijskija Universitet, filosofsko-istoričeski fakultet* 3 (1942), 1 εξ.; Του ιδίου, *Iz starata bălgarska knižnina*, II, Sofia 1944, 1 εξ., 293 εξ.; R. L. Wolff, "The Second Bulgarian Empire", 190 εξ.; P. Petrov, "Unijata meždū Bălgarija i Rimskata carkva prez 1204 g. i Četvārtijat krāstonosen pohod", *Istoričeski pregled* 2 (1955), 25 εξ. Παπαδόπουλος, ΧΡ., *Ἡ Ἐκκλησία Βουλγαρίας*, Ἀθήναι, 1957, 44 εξ.; Ταρνανίδης, *Ἡ διαμόρφωσις*, 121 εξ.; V. Gjuzelev, "Das Papsttum", 42 εξ.; Του ιδίου, "Bălgarija", 276 εξ.; Γόνης, *Ἱστορία*, 57 εξ.; Για τις διαφορετικές εκδόσεις της αλληλογραφίας του πάπα με τους Βουλγάρους βλ.: *Dāržava i carkva prez XIII v.*, "Slavia orthodoxa", Sofia, 1999, Επίλογος από τον Ivan Božilov, 111. Η τελευταία έκδοση της αλληλογραφίας στο: Dall' Aglio, *Innocenzo III*, 27, 41 εξ. Εδώ θα χρησιμοποιήσουμε την πιο διαδεδομένη και εύκολα προσβάσιμη, δηλ. *Patrologiae cursus completus*, Series latina, έκδ. J. P. Migne, Paris (PL).

⁷ PL 214, 825 A-C.

⁸ PL 214, 1112 C – 1113 D.

⁹ PL 214, 1115 D – 1116 B.

του που έστειλε με τον καπελάνο γίνεται σαφές ότι ο πάπας επιθυμούσε πρώτα να εξασφαλίσει την εξουσία του επί της Εκκλησίας της Βουλγαρίας. Για το σκοπό αυτό ο Ιννοκέντιος Γ' έχει εξουσιοδοτήσει τον απεσταλμένο του να ρυθμίσει κατά βούληση την κατάσταση αναφορικά με τη διοίκηση της Εκκλησίας του Τυρνόβου, την πνευματική ζωή και τα εκκλησιαστικά πράγματα στη Βουλγαρία, καθώς επίσης να χειροτονήσει και τους κατάλληλους μητροπολίτες και επισκόπους¹⁰. Στις διαπραγματεύσεις του με τους Βουλγάρους ο πάπας έθεσε με σαφήνεια τον όρο ότι πρέπει να αναγνωριστεί το πρωτείο του στο νομοθετικό, το διοικητικό και το δικαστικό τομέα και αξίωνε να αποτελεί την ύψιστη εφετική αρχή για κάθε εκκλησιαστική και κοσμική εξουσία. Αφού ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Τυρνόβου έδωσε όρκο πίστης στην Αγία Έδρα, στις 8 Σεπτεμβρίου 1203, σ' αυτόν χορηγήθηκε το πάλλιο (*pallium*) που του έστειλε ο πάπας και ανακηρύχθηκε «*αρχιεπίσκοπος Ζαγοράς*»¹¹. Στα τέλη του ίδιου έτους ο καπελάνος περάτωσε την αποστολή του στο Τύρνοβο και πήρε το δρόμο της επιστροφής προς τη Ρώμη, έχοντας στις αποσκευές του εκτός από τις επιστολές του αρχιεπισκόπου Τυρνόβου και άλλων αρχιερέων της Βουλγαρίας, που ζήτησαν να υπαχθούν στη δικαιοδοσία της Ρώμης, και τον όρκο πίστης εν είδει χρυσοβούλλου που υπέγραψε ο ίδιος ο Βούλγαρος ηγεμόνας¹². Με το έγγραφο αυτό ο Καλογιάννης έθεσε το κράτος και την Εκκλησία της Βουλγαρίας υπό τη δικαιοδοσία της Παπικής Έδρας.

Κατά την εξέλιξη του εκκλησιαστικού ζητήματος στις διαπραγματεύσεις του Καλογιάννη με τη Ρώμη πρωταγωνιστικό ρόλο διαδραμάτισε ο ίδιος ο ηγεμόνας. Η γενική κατεύθυνση της εκκλησιαστικής πολιτικής στη Βουλγαρία χαρασσόταν αποκλειστικά κατά τη βούλησή του και σύμφωνα με τις αντιλήψεις του. Ο Βούλγαρος ηγεμόνας διεξήγαγε τις διαπραγματεύσεις του με τη Ρώμη σαν να επρόκειτο για αποκλειστικά κρατικό ζήτημα. Ο ίδιος μάλιστα επέμενε για την ανακήρυξη του αρχιεπισκόπου Τυρνόβου στο αξίωμα του πατριάρχη και μάλιστα προσπάθησε να τον στείλει το 1203 στη Ρώμη ως αντιπρόσωπό του¹³. Ο ίδιος ηγεμόνας ασχολήθηκε ακόμη και με ζητήματα αποκλειστικά εκκλησιαστικού χαρακτήρα, όπως λόγου χάρη το ζήτημα της παρασκευής Αγίου Μύρου¹⁴. Έτσι η πολιτική του Καλογιάννη, όσον αφορά στην Εκκλησία, ακολουθούσε την πολιτική γραμμή των

¹⁰ PL 214, 1113 D – 1115 D, 1116 D – 1118 B. Πρβλ. PL 215, 157 B-C. 158 A-B.

¹¹ PL 215, 288 A – 289 C.

¹² PL 215, 287 A – 288 A. 288 A – 289C. 289 C – 290 A. 290 A – 292A.

¹³ PL 215, 155 B – 156 C.

¹⁴ PL 215, 291B.

αδελφών του, Ασέν και Πέτρου, των ηγετών της εξέγερσης του 1185-6, αλλά και την πολιτική που είχαν χαράξει οι ηγεμόνες των Βουλγάρων της περιόδου του 9^{ου}-10^{ου} αι., ενώ ο ίδιος θεωρούσε τον εαυτό του ως διάδοχό τους¹⁵. Ο Καλογιάννης συνειδητοποίησε εγκαίρως ότι αυτή ήταν η στιγμή της μέγιστης κυριαρχίας του Παπικού Θρόνου και ότι ήταν προτιμότερο να λάβει από τον ίδιο τον πάπα έγκυρη αναγνώριση της εξουσίας του. Η αναγνώριση αυτή θα είχε κύρος όχι μόνο για τους γείτονές του από ΒΔ – τους Ούγγρους, αλλά και για τους νέους κυριάρχους στην Κωνσταντινούπολη – τους Λατίνους, με τους οποίους μάταια προσπάθησε αρκετές φορές να έρθει σε επαφή¹⁶.

Παρά τις προσπάθειες του Ούγγρου βασιλιά να παρεμποδίσει τις διαπραγματεύσεις των Βουλγάρων με τη Ρώμη, το φθινόπωρο του 1204 η τρίτη παπική αποστολή με επικεφαλής τον καρδινάλιο Λέοντα κατάφερε να φτάσει στο Τύρνοβο. Ο Καλογιάννης επίσημα αναγορεύθηκε από τον παπικό λεγάτο βασιλιάς (*rex*) των Βουλγάρων και των Βλάχων και έλαβε διάδημα και σκήπτρο που του έστειλε ο πάπας. Ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Τυρνόβου ανακηρύχθηκε πριμάτος (*primas*) όλης της Βουλγαρίας και της Βλαχίας και χρίστηκε κατά τον δυτικό τρόπο από τον παπικό καρδινάλιο. Ο πριμάτος με τη σειρά του έχρισε τους Βουλγάρους αρχιερείς, οι οποίοι ακολουθώντας όφειλαν να ενημερώσουν τον κλήρο και το λαό για την ένταξη της Βουλγαρίας στους κόλπους της Ρωμαιοκαθολικής Εκκλησίας. Οι δύο αρχιεπίσκοποι, Βελεβουσδίου και Πρεσλάβας, που χειροτονήθηκαν το προηγούμενο έτος από τον καπελάνο Ιωάννη, έλαβαν επίσης πάλλια που τους έστειλε ο πάπας και με αυτά εντάχθηκαν άμεσα υπό την εξουσία του¹⁷. Από τον επισκοπικό κατάλογο (*notitia*) που συντάχθηκε σύντομα μετά την αποδοχή της Ουνίας, για τη διοίκηση της Εκκλησίας της Τυρνόβου, έχουμε

¹⁵ PL 215, 290 C.

¹⁶ Για τις σχέσεις Βουλγάρων και Λατίνων στο πρώτο μισό του 13^{ου} αι. βλ.: Angelov, “Văstanieto načelo s Asenevci”, 138 εξ.; B. Primov, “The Papacy. The Fourth Crusade and Bulgaria”, *Byzantino-bulgarica*, Sofia 1 (1962), 183 εξ.; Του ιδίου, “La Bulgarie et l’Europe occidentale au début du XIII^e siècle”, *Etudes Historiques*, Sofia 2 (1965), 101 εξ.; Genoveva Cankova-Petkova, “Bălgaro-grăcki i bălgaro-latinski otnošenija pri Kalojan i Boril”, *Izvestija na Instituta za istorija* 21 (1970), 149 εξ.; Ani Danceva-Vasileva, “Les relations politiques bulgare-latines au cours de la période 1218-1241”, *Bulgarian Historical Review* 1 (1979), 75 εξ.; Της ίδιας, *Bălgarija i Latinskata imperija (1207-1261)*, Sofia, 1985, 28 εξ.; V. Gjuzev, “Kalojanova Bălgarija i Latinskata imperija (1204-1207)”, *Odrinskata bitka*, 13 εξ.

¹⁷ Για την αποστολή του καπελάνου Ιωάννη στη Βουλγαρία, βλ. τα χωρία από την ίδια αλληλογραφία: PL 215, 279 D, 286 C – 287 A, 292 B-C, 293 C-D, 294 A, 295 D, 552 B, 554 A-B.

την εικόνα για τα ακριβή όρια των υφιστάμενων της επαρχιών αλλά και για τη νέα της διοικητική διάρθρωση¹⁸. Πέραν του ότι νομιμοποίησε το καθεστώς της Αρχιεπισκοπής Τυρνόβου, ο Ιννοκέντιος Γ΄ αναγνώρισε και το καθεστώς της παλαιάς πρωτόθρονης Αρχιεπισκοπικής έδρας της Πρεσλάβας και της Αρχιεπισκοπικής έδρας του Βελεβουσδίου, την οποία κατέταξε δεύτερη μετά την του Τυρνόβου. Στην ίδια εποχή ανάγεται και η είδηση για μια νέα Επισκοπική έδρα – της Λοβτζού, η οποία κατά πάσα πιθανότητα αναδείχθηκε με πρωτοβουλία των Βουλγάρων στη διάρκεια των παπικών αποστολών στη χώρα τους¹⁹.

Παρά την ισχυρή δέσμευση της Αρχιεπισκοπής Τυρνόβου με τη Ρώμη, που απείχε πολύ από τις όποιες αντιλήψεις για το αυτοκέφαλο της Εκκλησίας, όπως το επιθυμούσαν οι Ασένιδες, δεν πρέπει να ξεχνάμε το γεγονός ότι ο Καλογιάννης στράφηκε προς τη Δυτική Εκκλησία για την εξυπηρέτηση των πολιτικών συμφερόντων του κράτους του. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, η αναγνώριση που έλαβε για το Κράτος και την Εκκλησία του τη συγκεκριμένη στιγμή τον εξυπηρετούσε, δεδομένης της περίπλοκης πολιτικής συγκυρίας στα Βαλκάνια στις αρχές του 13^{ου} αι. Ασφαλώς οι Βούλγαροι έμειναν ικανοποιημένοι, προπαντός από τον τίτλο που χορηγήθηκε στον προκαθήμενο της Εκκλησίας τους από τη Ρώμη. Στις δεκαετίες που ακολούθησαν οι ίδιοι χρησιμοποιούσαν και ερμήνευαν τον τίτλο αυτό ως πατριαρχικό, ερμηνεία που είχε διατυπωθεί και από τον ίδιο τον Ιννοκέντιο Γ΄, ενώ προσέδιδαν την ανάλογη σημασία και έννοια στο πλαίσιο της γνώριμης σε αυτούς ανατολικής παράδοσης και κανονικής πρακτικής. Ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Τυρνόβου εκλάμβανε ως ανακήρυξη στο πατριαρχικό αξίωμα το χρίσμα του, γεγονός που καταδεικνύεται από την ευχαριστήρια επιστολή του προς τον πάπα. Στην επιστολή αυτή ο Βασίλειος ισχυρίζεται ότι ο παπικός καρδινάλιος τού προσκόμισε πλήρες το πατριαρχικό αξίωμα και ότι τον έχρισε Πατριάρχη²⁰.

Ο Ιννοκέντιος Γ΄ παραχώρησε στο Βούλγαρο πριμάτο το δικαίωμα να χρίει και να στέφει με την εξουσία της Αποστολικής Έδρας τους βασιλείς των Βουλγάρων και των Βλάχων, απαιτώντας από αυτούς και όρκο πίστης

¹⁸ A. Weildenbach, *Calendarium historico-christianum medii et novi aevi*, Regensbourg, 1855, 276-277; G. Erler, *Der Liber cancellariae apostolicae vom Jahre 1380 und Stilus palatii abbreviatus Dietrichs von Nieheim*, Leipzig, 1888, 39-40.

¹⁹ PL 215, 289 A-B. 289 C – 290 A. Εκτενέστερα βλ.: Nikolova, *Ustrojstvo i upravlenie*, 118-120, 219-220, 233-234, 236-238, όπου οι σχετικές πηγές και η βιβλιογραφία.

²⁰ PL 215, 553 B – 554 A. Πρβλ. PL 215, 552 B. *Gesta Innocentii III Papae*: PL, 214, CCIX A-B. (§ CXXV). Pitra, VI, 43, 564. Βλ. ακόμη: Dujcev, “Prepiskata”, 95.

προς τη Ρώμη²¹. Οι εκλεγμένοι υποψήφιοι για τις θέσεις του πριμάτου και των δύο αρχιεπισκόπων, σύμφωνα με τις εντολές του πάπα, έπρεπε να χειροτονούνται από τους Βουλγάρους αρχιερείς, αφού έδιναν όρκο πίστης στην Αποστολική Έδρα. Οι εν λόγω αρχιερείς έπρεπε να στέλνουν και εκπροσώπους στη Ρώμη για να ζητούν πάλλιο από τον πάπα²² και με αυτόν τον τρόπο ο Ιννοκέντιος Γ΄ αποκτούσε το δικαίωμα για άμεση επέμβαση στα εκκλησιαστικά ζητήματα της Βουλγαρίας. Ο πάπας επέτρεψε στην Εκκλησία της Βουλγαρίας να παρασκευάζει μόνη της και άγιο μύρο, το οποίο χρησιμοποιείτο όχι μόνο στις βαπτίσεις, αλλά και τη χειροτονία επισκόπων και το διορισμό των ιερέων. Μαζί με το άγιο μύρο, ο πάπας έδωσε τις οδηγίες του: μια φορά το χρόνο, τη μεγάλη Πέμπτη, να παρασκευάζεται και έλαιο για το μύρωμα των κατηχουμένων και των ασθενών,²³ πρακτικές άγνωστες μέχρι τότε στην Ανατολή, οι οποίες σύμφωνα με τη δυτική κανονική παράδοση είχε δικαίωμα να εκτελεί μόνο ο επίσκοπος.

Οι αξιώσεις του Ιννοκέντιου Γ΄ για πρωτείο στον κοσμικό και τον εκκλησιαστικό τομέα ωστόσο δεν βρήκαν έδαφος στους Βουλγάρους. Παρά την κατ' επίφαση ειλικρίνεια του ηγεμόνα και του κλήρου της Βουλγαρίας και τον όρκο πίστης του Καλογιάννη προς τη Ρώμη, που δέσμευε όχι μόνο τον ίδιο αλλά και τους διαδόχους του, οι Βούλγαροι δεν επέτρεψαν η Ουνία να γίνει αφορμή για άμεση επέμβαση του εκάστοτε πάπα στις εσωτερικές υποθέσεις του κράτους τους, ούτε να διαδραματίσει καθοριστικό ρόλο στην εξωτερική τους πολιτική. Ωστόσο, ο Ιννοκέντιος Γ΄ προσπάθησε να αναλάβει το ρόλο του μεσολαβητή και να επηρεάσει την πολιτική του Καλογιάννη έναντι των γειτόνων του²⁴. Κι ενώ ο Βούλγαρος ηγεμόνας κατόρθωσε να εκμεταλλευτεί τον πάπα για να ρυθμίσει τις τεταμένες του σχέσεις με την Ουγγαρία,²⁵ ο τελευταίος δεν μπόρεσε να ασκήσει επιρροή για τη βελτίωση των πολιτικών σχέσεων των Βουλγάρων με τη Λατινική

²¹ PL 215, 280 A.

²² PL 215, 281 A-C.

²³ PL 215, 281 C – 282 B, 282 Πρβλ. PL 215, B – 287 A.

²⁴ PL 215, 705 A -706 A, 1162 A-D.

²⁵ PL 215, 552 A – 553 A. Βλ. ακόμη: Wolff, “The Second Bulgarian Empire”, 202-203. Του ιδίου, “The Latin Empire”, 201-202; Chr. Kolarov, J. Andreev, “Certaines questions ayant trait aux manifestations de continuité d'idées en Bulgarie médiévale au cours des XII^e – XIV^e siècles”, *Etudes Historiques*, Sofia 9 (1979), 90; Snezhana Rakova, “Le Orthodoxes et les Catholiques au temps des Croisades: La mémoire historique des Sources Slaves”, *Srednovekovna hristijanska Evropa: Iztok i Zapad. Cennosti, tradicii, obštuvane. Dokladi ot Meždunarodnata naučna konferencija v Sofija (2-5 septemvri 2000 g.)*, Sofia, 2002, 447.

Αυτοκρατορία της Κωνσταντινούπολης και τη Σερβία²⁶. Ο Καλογιάννης όμως κατάφερε να διατηρήσει σε καλό επίπεδο τις σχέσεις του με την Παπική έδρα, και σ' αυτό συνέβαλε κυρίως η στρατιωτική ισχύς που διέθετε.

Η τοποθέτηση της Βουλγαρίας υπό την κηδεμονία της Ρώμης υπήρξε αποτέλεσμα τόσο των κρατικών και πολιτικών κινήτρων του Βουλγάρου ηγεμόνα, όσο και της επιδέξιας πολιτικής του πάπα στην Ανατολή. Το σημαντικό αυτό φαινόμενο στην πολιτική και την εκκλησιαστική ζωή στη Βουλγαρία αποτελεί τη μεγαλύτερη περίοδο επαφών της Εκκλησίας της Βουλγαρίας με τη Ρώμη. Με ανάλογο τρόπο διαδραματίστηκαν τα γεγονότα και στη γειτονική Σερβία και τη Βοσνία, όπου, υπό την πίεση των εξελίξεων στη νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη, οι ηγεμόνες αναγκάστηκαν να αποδεχθούν την Ουνία με τη Ρωμαιοκαθολική Εκκλησία και την κηδεμονία του πάπα²⁷. Η Ουνία όμως για τους Βουλγάρους παρέμεινε μόνο μία συμφωνία πολιτικού χαρακτήρα και δεν επέφερε σημαντικές αλλαγές στη θρησκευτική τους ζωή. Εντοπιζόταν μάλλον στην αναγνώριση του πρωτείου του Παπικού θρόνου. Ο ίδιος ο Ινοκέντιος Γ' δεν τόλμησε να επέμβει έντονα στην εσωτερική εκκλησιαστική ζωή της Βουλγαρίας και γι' αυτό και οι νεωτερισμοί που έφεραν οι απεσταλμένοι του στη Βουλγαρία είχαν περισσότερο ιεραρχικό, κανονικό και λειτουργικό χαρακτήρα και δεν πρόλαβαν να οδηγήσουν σε κανενός είδους θρησκευτικές και δογματικές αλλαγές. Παρόλο που η Ουνία επιτεύχθηκε σχετικά εύκολα λόγω της πολιτικής συγκυρίας, η πράξη αυτή ήταν αποτέλεσμα συγκεκριμένης πολιτικής στάσης και δεν υποσχόταν τη σταθερότητα και τη διάρκεια που θα επιθυμούσε ο πάπας. Το ζήτημα της δέσμευσης με τη Ρώμη είχε για τους Βουλγάρους απλώς τυπικό χαρακτήρα και δεν συνδεόταν στο μέλλον με κάποια ενεργό επαφή με τον Παπικό Θρόνο²⁸. Ασφαλώς θα μπορούσαμε να υποθέσουμε ότι σε διαφορετική εξέλιξη των ιστορικών γεγονότων στα Βαλκάνια η Ουνία στη Βουλγαρία θα είχε λάβει πιο σταθερή μορφή και το πρωτείο του πάπα θα είχε εφαρμοστεί στην πληρότητά του.

²⁶ P. Nikov, "Bălgarskata diplomacija", 98-99. Του ιδίου, "Sădbata na severozapadnite bălgarski zemi prez srednite vekove", *Bălgarska istoričeska biblioteka* 1 (1930), 123-124.

²⁷ G. Ostrogorsky, *Ιστορία του Βυζαντινού κράτους*, Γ', 82.

²⁸ Πρβλ. P. Nikov, "Cărkovnata politika na Ivan Asenja II", *Bălgarska istoričeska biblioteka*, Sofia 3 (1930), 70-71; V. Zlatarski, *Istoriija*, III, 210, 353 εξ.; Petrov, "Unijata", 56-57; N. Šivarov, "Papskijat primat i unijata s Bălgarija ot 1204 g.", *Izvestija* 3 (1985), 125; Του ιδίου, "Tărnovskijat arhiepiskop – Primas na Bălgarija", *Duhovna kultura*, Sofia 3 (1985), 8; Του ιδίου, "Sledstvija ot unijata pri car Kalojan za Bălgarskata cărkva", *Katoličeskata duhovna kultura i nejnoto prisăstvie i vlijanie v Bălgarija*, Sofia, 1992, 86 εξ.

Δεδομένων των λόγων που επέβαλαν την Ουνία, της παντοδυναμίας του Παπικού Θρόνου επί Ιννοκέντιου Γ' και πάνω από όλα της πολιτικής συγκυρίας στα Βαλκάνια στις αρχές του 13^{ου} αι., μπορεί να ερμηνευτεί και η τυπική στήριξη της πράξης αυτής στις δεκαετίες που ακολούθησαν από το διάδοχο του Καλογιάννη στο θρόνο, τον Βορίλο /1207-1218/²⁹. Ο νέος ηγεμόνας ακολουθούσε την πολιτική του προκατόχου του και δεν βιαζόταν καθόλου να διακόψει τις σχέσεις της Βουλγαρίας με την Παπική Έδρα. Απεναντίας, κατά τη δεύτερη περίοδο της βασιλείας του, κατά πάσα πιθανότητα, ακριβώς η Ουνία διαδραμάτισε σημαντικό ρόλο για τη σύναψη συμμαχιών με τις καθολικές Λατινική αυτοκρατορία και Ουγγαρία, οι οποίες επικυρώθηκαν και με επιγαμίες³⁰. Αυτή μάλιστα ήταν κι η βούληση του πάπα ήδη από την αρχή της Ουνίας το 1204, και μόλις τώρα στάθηκε δυνατόν να υλοποιηθεί.

Η οικονομική και η κοινωνικο-πολιτική κρίση, η αποδυνάμωση της κεντρικής εξουσίας και η διάσπαση, που επήλθαν μετά το θάνατο του Καλογιάννη, συνέβαλαν στην ενδυνάμωση της αίρεσης των Βογομίλων. Οι προκατόχοι του Βορίλου αντιμετώπιζαν το Βογομιλισμό με σχετική ανοχή, αλλά επί της βασιλείας του η αίρεση αυτή έλαβε επικίνδυνες για την ενότητα του κράτους και της Εκκλησίας διαστάσεις³¹. Γι' αυτό το λόγο ο Βο-

²⁹ Εκτενέστερα βλ. M. Drinov, *Istoričeski pregled na Bălgarskata cърkva ot samoto načalo do dnes*, Vienna, 1869. Το ίδιο στη συλλογή: *Izbrani sčinenija*, II, Sofia, 1971, 80 εξ.; V. Vasilievskij, "Obnovlenie bolgarskago patriaršestva pri Joane Asene II v 1235 g.", *Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosvěštenija*, Sankt Peterbourg 238 (mart-aprelj 1885)", 11, 13; Nikov, "Cърkovnata politika", 71-73; J. Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la Principauté de Morée*, Paris, 1949, 149; Iv. Dujcev, "Borilovijat sinodik kato istoričeski i literaturni pametnik", *Bibliotekar* 7-8 (1977), 27; Βλ. επίσης: Danceva-Vasileva, *Bălgarija i Latinskata imperija*, 99-100; N. Šivarov, "Otnosno njakoi sãobraženija i motivi za svikvane na Tãrnovskija sãbor prez 1211 godina i za negovija obrazec", *Godišnik na Sofijskija Universitet, Centãr za slavjano-vizantijski proučvanija*, Sofia 1 (1987), 142 εξ.; P. Stefanov, "Nov pogled kãm unijata meždú Bălgarskata i Rimskata cърkva prez XIII v.", *Preslavska knižovna škola* 5 (2001), 344.

³⁰ Πρβλ. E. Gerland, *Geschichte des lateinischen Kaiserreiches von Konstantinopel*, II: *Geschichte des Kaiser Balduin I und Heinrich 1204-1216*, Hamburg, 1905, 154 εξ.; L. Bréhier, *L'Église et l'Orient au Moyen Age. Les Croisades*, Paris, 1911, 173; Cankova-Petkova, "Bălgaro-grăcki i bălgaro-latinski otnošenija", 165 εξ.; Της ίδιας, *Bălgarija pri Asenevci*, 101 εξ.; Danceva-Vasileva, *Bălgarija i Latinskata imperija*, 105 εξ.; T. Sabev, *Samostojna narodnostna cърkva v srednovekovna Bălgarija*, Sofia, 1987, 312.

³¹ Εκτενέστερα βλ. D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manicheism*, Cambridge 1948, 231; B. Primov, "Bălgari, gãrci i latini v Plovdiv prez 1204-1205 g. Roljata na bogomilite", *Izvestija na Bălgarskoto istoričesko gružestvo*, Sofia 22-24 (1948),

ρίλος αναγκάστηκε να συγκαλέσει στο Τύρνοβο σύνοδο, το 1211, η οποία έπρεπε να καταδικάσει την αίρεση των Βογομίλων³². Με την ιδιότητα και το κύρος του βασιλιά της Βουλγαρίας ο ίδιος συμμετέσχε ενεργά στη σύνοδο και διαδραμάτισε σημαντικό ρόλο στην ανάκριση και τη δίκη των αιρετικών. Παρόλο που και ίδιος ο Ιννοκέντιος Γ' είχε ξεκινήσει παρόμοιο αγώνα εναντίον αιρετικών στη Δύση, ο Βορίλος δεν επέτρεψε στον πάπα να επέμβει στην εσωτερική και την εκκλησιαστική πολιτική του κράτους του. Ο ρόλος του βασιλιά στη σύνοδο του 1211 υποκατέστησε ακόμα και το ρόλο του Βουλγάρου πριμάτου. Γι' αυτό το λόγο ακριβώς ενάμιση αιώνα αργότερα ο Βορίλος ανακηρύχθηκε στο Συνοδικό της Εκκλησίας της Βουλγαρίας ως αληθινός αγωνιστής και υπέρμαχος της καθαρότητας της ορθόδοξης πίστεως³³.

Αν και δεν υπάρχουν στοιχεία για δραστήριες επαφές του Τυρνόβου με τη Ρώμη, καθώς και για οποιοδήποτε ρόλο του βουλγαρικού κλήρου στη ζωή της Δυτικής Εκκλησίας, ο Ιννοκέντιος Γ' εξακολουθούσε να αντιμετωπίζει την Εκκλησία της Βουλγαρίας ως ευρισκόμενη υπό την δικαιοδοσία του. Η στάση αυτή μαρτυρείται και από την πρόσκληση του πάπα προς τον βουλγαρικό κλήρο για συμμετοχή στη Σύνοδο του Λατερανού το 1215³⁴. Ακόμα κι αν υποθέσουμε ότι ο πριμάτος του Τυρνόβου είχε μείνει πιστός στον όρκο του για αφοσίωση στην Παπική Έδρα, καθώς δεν υπάρχουν μαρτυρίες για το αντίθετο, εξαιτίας αντικειμενικών ή υποκειμενικών λόγων δεν μπόρεσε να εκτελέσει τα καθήκοντά του προς τον πάπα, αφού το όνομά του απουσιάζει από τον κατάλογο των συμμετασχόντων στη

154 εξ.; Του ιδίου, "Otnošenieto na bogomilite i na tehните zapadni posledovateli kām truda, častnata sobstvenost i dāržavata", *Istoričeski pregled*, Sofia 1 (1956), 54 εξ.; D. Angelov, *Bogomilstvoto*, Sofia, 1993, 374; Βλ. ακόμη: V. Zlatarski, *Istoriija*, III, 297 εξ.; B. Primov, "Utvärždavane i teritorialno razširenie na Vtorata bālgarska dāržava v kraja na XII i načaloto na XIII v.", *Istoriija na Bālgarija v čeririnadeset toma*, III: Vtora bālgarska dāržava, Sofia, 1982, 150 εξ.; Γόνης, *Ιστορία*, 61 εξ.

³² Το κείμενο του Συνοδικού του τσάρου Βορίλου έχει εκδοθεί τρεις φορές με επιμέλεια του ιδίου εκδότη – M. Popruženko: 1. *Sinodik carja Borisa ili Borila*, Odessa, 1896, II (Προσθήκη), 1-82; 2. *Sinodik carja Borisa*, Odessa, 1897· η τελευταία και πληρέστερη εκδοχή, στην οποία δίνονται παράλληλα και τα δύο γνωστά χειρόγραφα είναι: 3. *Sinodikā carja Borila*, [Bālgarski starini XIII], Sofia, 1928, 2-96. Βλ. ακόμη: V. Kiselkov, "Borilovijat sinodik kato istoričeski izvor", *Istoričeski pregled* 6 (1963), 66-73; Iv. Dujcev, "Borilovijat sinodik kato istoričeski i literaturen pametnik", *Bibliotekar* 7-8 (1977), 26-31.

³³ Πρβλ. Vasilievskij, "Obnovlenie", 14-15; Γόνης, *Ιστορία*, 61, 104.

³⁴ Mansi, XXII, 963 D. Βλ. ακόμη: Nikov, "Čärkovnata politika", 72-73; V. Gjuzeev, "Das Papsttum", 44; Danceva-Vasileva, *Bālgarija i Latinskata imperija*, 110; N. Šivarov, "Tärn. arhiepiskop", 8.

σύνοδο. Παραμένει άγνωστο, γιατί ο Βασίλειος δεν ανταποκρίθηκε στην πρόσκληση του πάπα, όπως θα όφειλε να είχε πράξει, καθώς είχε αυτή την υποχρέωση μετά την αποδοχή της Ουνίας. Δεν υπάρχουν επίσης στοιχεία για το εάν εστάλη πάλλιο για τον νεοχειροτονηθέντα αρχιεπίσκοπο στη Βουλγαρία μετά το 1204.

Οι πολιτικές και οι εκκλησιαστικές αλλαγές στην ιστορία των Βουλγάρων στα τέλη του 12^{ου} και τις αρχές του 13^{ου} αι. αναπόφευκτα διαμόρφωσαν εμφανώς ανταγωνιστική, αν όχι και αρνητική, στάση προς το βυζαντινό κλήρο. Οι Ασένιδες υιοθέτησαν σταθερή ακόμη και κυρίαρχη παρεμβατική γραμμή στα εκκλησιαστικά πράγματα στα εδάφη, τα οποία είχαν προσαρτήσει στο κράτος τους, αλλά εξακολουθούσαν να βρίσκονται υπό έντονη βυζαντινή πολιτιστική και θρησκευτική επιρροή. Η παρέμβαση αυτή συνδεόταν με την εθνική πολιτική που εφαρμοζόταν, με σκοπό την αντικατάσταση όχι μόνο του ανώτερου αλλά και του κατώτερου βυζαντινού κλήρου με βουλγαρικό³⁵. Κατ' αυτό το τρόπο η εξέλιξη του εκκλησιαστικού θεσμού ακολουθούσε την ιστορική πορεία του κράτους και η Εκκλησία της Βουλγαρίας κατόρθωσε να οικοδομήσει το κύρος της, στηριζόμενη αποκλειστικά στην κοσμική εξουσία και τη στρατιωτική της ισχύ σε όλα τα εδάφη που βρέθηκαν στην επικράτεια της.

Όταν στο βασίλειο της Ηπείρου προσαρτήθηκε ένα μέρος από τα πρώην βυζαντινά εδάφη της Μακεδονίας, που είχαν βρεθεί στις τελευταίες δεκαετίες υπό την πολιτική και την εκκλησιαστική εξουσία των Ασένιδων, ετέθη σε ημερήσια διάταξη και το ζήτημα της κανονικότητας του κλήρου, που είχε τοποθετηθεί από τους Βουλγάρους στις επαρχίες αυτές. Με πρόσκληση του ηγεμόνα της Ηπείρου Θεόδωρου Δούκα (1215-1230) στην Αχρίδα συγκλήθηκε σύνοδος (ανάμεσα στα έτη 1217 και 1219), η οποία εξέτασε και ρύθμισε τον τρόπο ενσωμάτωσης των Βουλγάρων εξέπεσαν στις εν λόγω περιοχές. Οι επίσκοποι καταδικάστηκαν σε αποπομπή, επειδή είχαν τοποθετηθεί από την κοσμική εξουσία, παρά τους εκκλησιαστικούς

³⁵ Pitra, VI, 39-48. Εκτενέστερα βλ.: Μηλιαράκης, Αντ., *Ιστορία τοῦ βασιλείου τῆς Νικαίας καί τοῦ δεσποτάτου τῆς Ἡπείρου (1204-1261)*, Ἀθήναι – Leipzig, 1898, 171 εξ.; Iv. Snegarov, , *Istorija na Ohridskata arhiepiskopija*, I: Ot osnovavaneto i do zavladjavaneto na Balkanskija poluostrov ot turcite, Sofia, 1924, I, 101 εξ.; D. Nikol, *The Despotate of Epiros (1267-1479)*, Oxford, 1957, 29 εξ.; V. Gjuzelev, "Pravoslavnata i katoličeskata carkva v istorijata na balgarskija narod prez XIII – načaloto na XV v.", *Makedonski pregled*, Sofia 1 (1992), 98; Σταυρίδου-Ζαφράκα, Αλκμήνη, *Νίκαια καὶ Ἡπειρος τόν 13^ο αἰῶνα*. Ἰδεολογική ἀντιπαράθεση στήν προσπάθειά τους νά ἀνακτήσουν τήν αὐτοκρατορία, [Εταιρεία Βυζαντινῶν Ἑρευνῶν 7], Θεσσαλονίκη, χ.χ, 65 εξ, όπου αναφέρονται οι σχετικές πηγές και η βιβλιογραφία.

κανόνες που απαγορεύουν κάτι τέτοιο. Οι ιερείς όμως που είχαν χειροτονηθεί απ' αυτούς έγιναν δεκτοί μετά από επιβολή επιτιμίου³⁶. Παρόλο που κατά τη διάρκεια της Συνόδου είχε αμφισβητηθεί η κανονικότητα εν γένει της Εκκλησίας του Τυρνόβου, στις αποφάσεις της Συνόδου δεν επισημαίνεται καθόλου ο διαχωρισμός των Βουλγάρων επισκόπων σε Ορθόδοξους και Ουνίτες, ενώ δεν αναφέρονται καθόλου διχογνωμίες ανάμεσα στους Βουλγάρους κληρικούς σχετικά με το ζήτημα αυτό. Το γεγονός αυτό είναι ένα ακόμα στοιχείο τεκμηρίωσης της άποψης ότι παρόλο που εισήχθησαν ορισμένα λατινικά λειτουργικά και κανονικά έθιμα στην εκκλησιαστική ζωή, η Ουνία δεν έλαβε ουσιαστικές διαστάσεις. Η ανοικοδόμηση ορθόδοξων ναών και μοναστηριών στο πρώτο τέταρτο του 13^{ου} αι. και η μετακομιδή λειψάνων πολλών ορθοδόξων αγίων στην πρωτεύουσα, Τύρνοβο, είναι δυνατόν επίσης να θεωρηθούν ως στοιχεία που επιβεβαιώνουν τη διατήρηση του ορθοδόξου πνεύματος στην Εκκλησία της Βουλγαρίας. Τα φαινόμενα αυτά είχαν τόσο θρησκευτικές αφορμές όσο και πολιτικά κίνητρα, με σκοπό την ενίσχυση της επιρροής του ηγεμόνα στο λαό και συγχρόνως η πρωτεύουσα του ανανεωμένου κράτους να αποκτήσει το χαρακτήρα σημαντικού εκκλησιαστικού και πολιτικού κέντρου και να ενισχυθεί η ενότητα του κράτους και του λαού.

Πολιτικοί ήταν οι λόγοι που οδήγησαν στην αποδοχή της Ουνίας το 1204, όπως πολιτικοί ήταν και οι λόγοι που προκάλεσαν την ακύρωσή της επί Ιωάννου Β' Ασέν /1218-1241/. Στην αρχή της βασιλείας του ο ηγεμόνας αυτός επιδίωξε να συνάψει ειρήνη με την Ουγγαρία και τη Λατινική Αυτοκρατορία στην Κωνσταντινούπολη που επικύρωσε στη συνέχεια με επιγαμίες³⁷. Μετά την εκλογή όμως του Ιωάννου Βρυεννίου /†1237/ στο θρόνο της Λατινικής Αυτοκρατορίας και την άφιξή του στην Κωνσταντινούπολη το καλοκαίρι του 1231, οι ελπίδες του Ιωάννου Ασέν για πολιτική

³⁶ Pitra, VI, 563-570. Εκτενέστερα βλ.: Nikov, "Prinos", 50 εξ. Παπαδόπουλος, *Ἡ Ἐκκλησία Βουλγαρίας*, 45 εξ.; Ταρνανίδης, *Ἡ διαμόρφωσις*, 116 εξ.; Γόνης, *Ιστορία*, 56; Il. Iliev, "Dimităr, po Božija milost arhiepiskop na Părva Justiniana i na cjala Bălgarija", *Istoričeski pregled*, Sofia 1-2 (2004), 3 εξ.; Του ιδίου, "Ohridskata arhiepiskopija i pārvite vladeteli na vāzobnovenoto Bălgarsko carstvo (kraja na XII – sredata na XIII v.)", *Dăržava i cārkva – cārkva i dăržava v bălgarskata istorija*, Sofia, 2006, 87 εξ.

³⁷ V. Zlatarski, "Ivan Asen II (1218-1241)", *Bălgarska istoričeska biblioteka*, Sofia 3 (1930), 2 εξ.; Του ιδίου, *Istoriija*, III, 325 εξ., 419; V. Gjuzelev, "Bălgarskata dăržava i Nikeja v borba sreštu Latinskata imperija (1204-1261)", *Izvestija na Nacionalnija Istoričeski Muzej*, Sofia 2 (1978), 14. Danceva-Vasileva, "Les relations politiques", 78 εξ.; Της ιδίας, *Bălgarija i Latinskata imperija*, 115 εξ. Βασική βιβλιογραφία για τον Ιωάννη Β' Ασέν στον: Bozilov, *Familijata*, 88, σημ. 2.

επιρροή στο χώρο αυτό ματαιώθηκαν. Ο Βούλγαρος βασιλιάς δεν αποτελούσε την αναμενόμενη από τον πάπα Γρηγόριο Θ' /1227-1241/ εγγύηση για την ασφάλεια της Λατινικής Αυτοκρατορίας και γι' αυτό εξελέγη ως νέος αυτοκράτορας ένας από τους πιο πιστούς υποστηρικτές της Παπικής Έδρας, ο πρώην βασιλιάς της Ιερουσαλήμ Ιωάννης Βρυέννιος³⁸. Οι πάπες θεωρούσαν την Κωνσταντινούπολη ως ένα από τα σπουδαιότερα σημεία, στα οποία στηριζόταν η επιβολή της παγκόσμιας κυριαρχίας τους και γι' αυτό ο Γρηγόριος Θ' επικέντρωσε τις προσπάθειές του αποκλειστικά στη διατήρηση πάση θυσία της Λατινικής Αυτοκρατορίας που είχε ιδρυθεί εκεί. Η συνειδητή καταπάτηση των συμφερόντων του Βουλγάρου ηγεμόνα από μέρους του πάπα σε τελική ανάλυση διαδραμάτισε καθοριστικό ρόλο για μία νέα αλλαγή στη εξωτερική και κατ' επέκταση και στην εκκλησιαστική πολιτική της Βουλγαρίας³⁹. Έτσι, μετά από τριάντα χρόνια υποταγή στη Ρώμη, αρχικά με επιδέξιους διπλωματικούς χειρισμούς από πλευράς του Ιννοκέντιου Γ' που απέβλεπαν στην ενσωμάτωση της Βουλγαρίας στη Ρωμαιοκαθολική Εκκλησία, στη συνέχεια με τη διακριτική πολιτική από πλευράς του Ονωρίου Γ' /1216-1227/, τελικά η αμφίσημη πολιτική στάση του Γρηγόριου Θ' απομάκρυνε για πάντα τους Βουλγάρους από τους κόλπους της Εκκλησίας της Ρώμης και αυτοί με τη σειρά τους απέρριψαν οριστικώς την Ουνία.

Οι πολιτικές συνθήκες απαιτούσαν επίσης αναθεώρηση της εκκλησιαστικής πολιτικής της Βουλγαρίας, δεδομένης της ολοένα και μεγαλύτερης αποδυνάμωσης της Λατινικής Αυτοκρατορίας της Κωνσταντινούπολης προς όφελος της ισχυροποίησης του ρόλου της Αυτοκρατορίας της Νίκαιας. Το 1230, μετά τη νίκη του Ιωάννου Β' Ασέν επί του βασιλιά της Ηπείρου Θεοδώρου Δούκα στην Κλοκότνιτσα, το Βουλγαρικό κράτος

³⁸ Βλ. εκδεικτικά: Cankova-Petkova, *Bǎlgarija pri Asenevci*, 112 εξ.; K. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571)*, I: The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, Philadelphia, 1976, 55; Danceva-Vasileva, *Bǎlgarija i Latinskata imperija*, 114 εξ. Πρβλ. Ostrogorsky, *Ιστορία του Βυζαντινού κράτους*, Γ', 114.

³⁹ Εκτενέστερα βλ.: Vasilievskij, "Obnovlenie", 35; Nikov, "Čarkovnata politika", 77 εξ.; V. Zlatarski, *Istorija*, III, 357 εξ.; Iv. Dujcev, *Cară Ivan Asen II (1218-1241)*, Sofia, 1941, 31-32. Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, 172; Cankova-Petkova, *Bǎlgarija pri Asenevci*, 118; Ostrogorsky, *Ιστορία του Βυζαντινού κράτους*, Γ', 115 εξ.; Ταρνανίδης, *Η διαμόρφωσις*, 149 εξ.; Danceva-Vasileva, *Bǎlgarija i Latinskata imperija*, 133 εξ.; Hr. Dimitrov, *Bǎlgaro-ungarski otnošenija prez srednovekovieto*, Sofia, 1998, 136 εξ.; Για τις σχέσεις μεταξύ Νικαίας και Βουλγαρίας κατά τη διάρκεια της βασιλείας του Ιωάννου Β' Ασέν πιο αναλυτικά βλ.: P. Žavoronkov, "Nikejsko-bolgarskie otnošenija pri Ivane II Asene (1218-1241)", *Vizantijskie očerki* (1977), 195 εξ.; V. Gjuzev, "Bǎlgarskata dăržava i Nikeja", 7 εξ.

επεκτάθηκε σημαντικά στη Θράκη και τη Μακεδονία⁴⁰. Στην εκκλησιαστική διοίκηση του Τυρνόβου εντάχθηκαν πολλές βυζαντινές επισκοπές με σταθερά ορθόδοξο πληθυσμό, ο οποίος άλλαξε την ισορροπία προς όφελος των άντιουνιτικών διοικήσεων. Το γεγονός αυτό διαδραμάτισε επίσης σημαντικό ρόλο για τον επανακαθορισμό της εκκλησιαστικής πολιτικής της Βουλγαρίας προς νέα προσέγγιση με το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο στη Νίκαια⁴¹. Μολονότι η Ουνία στη Βουλγαρία ήταν μόνο τυπική και δεν είχε δογματικό και έντονα λειτουργικό χαρακτήρα, εξακολουθούσε ωστόσο να αποτελεί απειλή για την ενότητα, την οποία το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο επιδίωκε να προωθήσει στα Βαλκάνια με την ενσωμάτωση των Δυτικών επαρχιών και την αναγνώριση της αυτοκέφαλης Αρχιεπισκοπής της Σερβίας. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, εάν οι σχέσεις της Παπικής Έδρας με τη Βουλγαρία είχαν εδραιωθεί, δεν θα αποκλειόταν και η επίτευξη μόνιμης Ουνίας, η οποία θα αποτελούσε σοβαρό κίνδυνο για ολόκληρη τη Βαλκανική.

Ο μητροπολίτης Αγκύρας Χριστοφόρος, ο οποίος εστάλη το 1232 στη Δύση ως πατριαρχικός έξαρχος, έσπευσε να έρθει σε επαφή με τον Βούλγαρο ηγεμόνα και να τον ενημερώσει για τις συνθήκες κάτω από τις οποίες θα πραγματοποιούνταν η επανένταξη της Βουλγαρίας στην Ορθοδοξία⁴². Ο ίδιος ο Ιωάννης Ασέν ανέλαβε ενεργό ρόλο στην επίλυση του εκκλησιαστικού ζητήματος στο κράτος του. Ωστόσο, ο πριμάτος του Τυρνόβου δεν ενέκρινε τη νέα αλλαγή στην εκκλησιαστική πολιτική του ηγεμόνα, και ως ένδειξη διαμαρτυρίας εγκατέλειψε την έδρα του και αποσύρθηκε στο Άγιο Όρος. Στη χρεώουσα θέση εξελέγη ένας μοναχός, ο Ιωακείμ, ο οποίος αναχώρησε για τη Νίκαια, προκειμένου λάβει χειροτονία από τον ίδιο τον Οικουμενικό Πατριάρχη. Αυτός ήταν ένας από τους όρους, που τέθηκαν στην Εκκλησία της Βουλγαρίας, για να αποκατασταθεί η λειτουργική της κοινωνία με το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και να λήξει η Ουνία⁴³.

⁴⁰ Iv. Dujcev, *Cară Ivan Asen II*, 21 εξ.; V. Gjuzelev, "Bălgarskata dăržava i Nikeja", 15 εξ.; Krasimira Gagona, *Trakija prez bălgarskoto srednovekovie*, Istoričeska geografija, Sofia, 2002, 220. Για περισσότερη βιβλιογραφία βλ: Bozilov, *Familijata*, 89, σημ. 35.

⁴¹ Πρβλ. Vasiljevskij, "Obnovlenie", 49. Βλ ακόμη: V. Zlatarski, "Ivan Asen II", 24. Του ιδίου, *Istorija*, III, 360-361; Danceva-Vasileva, *Bălgarija i Latinskata imperija*, 134.

⁴² Vasiljevskij, "Obnovlenie", 48 εξ.; Nikov, "Cărkovnata politika", 80 εξ. Βλ. ακόμη: Σταυρίδου-Ζαφράκα, *Νίκαια και Ήπειρος*, 85 και αναφερόμενες πηγές και βιβλιογραφία.

⁴³ St. Kozuharov, "Neizvesten letopisen razkaz ot vremeto na Ivan Asen II", *Problemi na starobălgarskata poezija* I, BAN, "Institut za literatura", Sofia, 2004, 314. Βλ. επίσης: Iv. Dujcev, "Părvite Asenevci", *Stranici ot minaloto*, očerci, Sofia, 1983, 246 εξ., Του ιδίου, "Văzobnovjavane na bălgarskata patriaršija v 1235 g.", *Πάλι εκεί*, 274 εξ.; Genoveva Cankova-Petkova, "Vosstanovlenie bolgarskogo patriaršestva v 1235 g. i meždunarodnoe

Στα τέλη του 1234 στην Καλλίπολη έλαβε χώρα συνάντηση μεταξύ του αυτοκράτορα της Νίκαιας και του Βουλγάρου ηγεμόνα με σκοπό την υπογραφή συμμαχικής συμφωνίας που στρεφόταν εναντίον της Λατινικής Αυτοκρατορίας. Η συμμαχία επικυρώθηκε το επόμενο έτος με το γάμο ανάμεσα στο διάδοχο του θρόνου της Νίκαιας Θεόδωρο Β' Λάσκαρη (1254-1258) και την πριγκίπισσα της Βουλγαρίας Ελένη, κόρη του Ιωάννου Β' Ασέν. Στη συνάντηση στην Λάμψακο συγκαταβατικά ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Τυρνόβου αξιώθηκε με τον τίτλο του πατριάρχη από την ενδημούσα σύνοδο των αρχιερέων του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου, η οποία συγκλήθηκε από τον πατριάρχη Γερμανό Β' (1222-1240). Για τη λήψη της απόφασης αυτής σημαντικό ρόλο διαδραμάτισε αφενός η πολιτική συγκυρία, η στρατιωτική ισχύς της Βουλγαρίας, την οποία είχε ανάγκη η Νίκαια, και αφετέρου η έντονη επιθυμία του Βουλγάρου βασιλιά ο προκαθήμενος της Εκκλησίας στο κράτος του να φέρει αυτόν τον τίτλο, με τον οποίο άλλωστε ήταν γνωστός στη δική του και στις όμορες χώρες⁴⁴. Ήδη από την εποχή της Ουνίας ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Τυρνόβου είχε την πεποίθηση ότι ήταν πατριάρχης και γι' αυτό τον διαβεβαίωνε και ο ίδιος ο πάπας Ιννοκέντιος Γ'⁴⁵. Το γεγονός αυτό αποτέλεσε βασικό επιχείρημα για τον Ιωάννη Ασέν να ζητήσει την αναγνώριση του πατριαρχικού τίτλου και κατά πάσα πιθανότητα υποχρέωσε τη βυζαντινή διπλωματία να προχωρήσει σε ένα έστω συμβιβασμό, τουλάχιστον όσον αφορά τον τίτλο. Ουσιαστικά το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο δεν έκανε κάτι παραπάνω από το να αναγνωρίσει και να νομιμοποιήσει μία εδραιωμένη στη συνείδηση των Βουλγάρων θέση της Εκκλησίας του Τυρνόβου και της έδωσε επίσημα το δικαίωμα ο προκαθήμενός της να εκλέγεται και να χειροτονείται από τους ίδιους τους αρχιερείς της και με αυτόν τον τρόπο εκφραζόταν ουσιαστικά και το αυτοκέφαλο. Έτσι, η ενότητα της Ορθόδοξης Εκκλησίας, η οποία είχε διασπαστεί με τη μη κανονική ίδρυση της Αρχιεπισκοπής Τυρνόβου στα τέλη του 12^{ου} αι. και την απόσχισή της από τον ορθόδοξο κόσμο με την αποδοχή της Ουνίας το 1204, αποκαταστάθηκε.

položenie Bolgarskogo gosudarstva", *Vizantijskij vremennik*, Moskva 28 (1968), 139. Γόνης, *Ιστορία*, 65.

⁴⁴ Γεώργιος Ακροπολίτης, *Χρονική συγγραφή*, I, 'Εκδ. Α. Heisenberg, Lipsiae, 1903, 50-51. Εκτενέστερα βλ.: Vasiljevskij, "Obnovlenie", 211; Nikov, "Cărkovnata politika", 91-92; V. Zlatarski, *Istorija*, III, 384-385; Ταρνανίδης, *Η διαμόρφωσις*, 148-149, 154; Γόνης, *Ιστορία*, 65-66.

⁴⁵ PL 215, 281 A. Πρβλ. PL 215, 552 B, 554 A,

Ο πατριάρχης Τυρνόβου έλαβε τον τίτλο του σε στιγμή πολιτικής αδυναμίας της Αυτοκρατορίας της Νίκαιας, όταν έπρεπε η ίδια να επιδείξει επιδέξια διπλωματική προσέγγιση με τους Βουλγάρους, που μόλις είχαν στραφεί εκ νέου προς την Ορθοδοξία. Για τη βυζαντινή διπλωματία ήταν αδιαμφισβήτητη η επιτυχία, ανεξάρτητα από το γεγονός ότι στο εξής ο Βούλγαρος πατριάρχης θα ερμήνευε κατά τη δική του κρίση τα δικαιώματα που προέρχονται από τον τίτλο του. Ακριβώς γι' αυτό το λόγο το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο περιέβαλε τον τίτλο του Βουλγάρου πατριάρχη με σχετική ασάφεια κι επέβαλε ορισμένες υποχρεώσεις, που ο τελευταίος έπρεπε να έχει έναντι αυτού. Ο Βούλγαρος πατριάρχης όφειλε να μνημονεύει στις λειτουργίες τα ονόματα όλων των πατριαρχών της Ανατολής, ενώ εκείνοι δεν ήταν υποχρεωμένοι να τον μνημονεύουν. Ο ίδιος έπρεπε να πληρώνει και φόρο στη Μητέρα Εκκλησία (το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο) και να λαμβάνει από αυτή άγιο μύρο, όπως και να προσέρχεται προκειμένου να δικαστεί, όταν δεν τηρούσε τις υποχρεώσεις του⁴⁶. Υπ' αυτή τη έννοια ο πατριαρχικός τίτλος που δόθηκε στον Ιωακείμ στη Λάμψακο για τους βυζαντινούς ήταν μάλλον τιμητικός και είχε ως αποτέλεσμα το όνομά του να μην καταχωρηθεί στα δίπτυχα των ορθοδόξων Πατριαρχείων κατά τον 13^ο και κατά τον 14^ο αιώνα⁴⁷.

Οι ενέργειες του Ιωάννου Β' Ασέν και η κατάργηση της Ουνίας δικαιολογημένα προκάλεσαν την οργή και τις διαμαρτυρίες του ίδιου του πάπα Γρηγόριου Θ'. Από τη στιγμή που δεν μπορούσε να επαναφέρει τους Βουλγάρους στους κόλπους της Εκκλησίας της Ρωμης, ο πάπας στράφηκε φανερά εναντίον τους, κατηγορώντας τους ως σχισματικούς και αιρετικούς, που έπρεπε να αφοριστούν, ενώ έπρεπε επίσης να οργανωθεί Σταυροφορία που θα επέβλεπε στην κατάκτηση του κράτους τους⁴⁸. Ανεξάρτητα από τις

⁴⁶ Fr. Miklosich, J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, I: *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani*, Vindobonae, 1860, 438-439, 441-442. Βλ. επίσης: Vasiljevskij, "Obnovlenie", 212-213.

⁴⁷ Ταρνανίδης, *Η διαμόρφωσις*, 163-169. Γόνης, *Ιστορία*, 66-68. Βλ. ακόμη: D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe, 500-1453*, London 1974, 313-314; Παπαδόπουλος, *Η Έκκλησία Βουλγαρίας*, 46; Sabev, *Samostojna narodnostna carkva*, 324-325; H.-G. Beck, *Ιστορία της Όρθοδόξης Έκκλησίας στη Βυζαντινή Αυτοκρατορία*, Β' (Μτφρ. από γερμανικά) "Ιστορικές εκδόσεις Στέφανος Βασιλόπουλος", Αθήνα, 2004, 115-116.

⁴⁸ Aug. Theiner, *Vetera Monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, I, Romae, 1859, 140-141 (No 249), 144 (No 255). Βλ. ακόμη: *Acta Honorii III (1226-1227) et Gregorii IX (1227-1241)*, Έκδ. Al. L. Tăultu, Romae, 1950, 290 (No 214). Εκτενέστερα βλ: Nikon, "Cărkovnata politika", 98 εξ.; V. Zlatarski, *Istoriija*, III, 390-391; Παπαδόπουλος, *Η Έκκλη-*

φανερές απειλές προς τους Βουλγάρους, ο πάπας δεν μπόρεσε να αντισταθεί αποτελεσματικά στη συμμαχία του Ιωάννου Β΄ Ασέν με τη Νίκαια και στην απόφασή του να ασπαστεί ξανά την Ορθοδοξία. Το 1245 ο επόμενος πάπας Ιννοκέντιος Δ΄ (1243-1254) προέβη σε δεύτερη ανεπιτυχή προσπάθεια να αποκαταστήσει την Ουνία με τον γιο του Ασέν από την Ουγγαρέζα σύζυγό του Κολομάνου (1241-1246)⁴⁹. Με την άνοδο στο θρόνο του Μιχαήλ Β΄ Ασέν (1246-1256), γιου του Ιωάννου Β΄ Ασέν από τη δεύτερή του σύζυγο Ειρήνη Κομνηνή, ετέθη οριστικά τέρμα στις ουνιτικές τάσεις στην εκκλησιαστική πολιτική της Βουλγαρίας. Ωστόσο, τα σημάδια της ρωμαιοκαθολικής επίδρασης από την εποχή της Ουνίας αναπόφευκτα διατάραξαν την εσωτερική ζωή της Εκκλησίας της Βουλγαρίας και εξακολούθησαν να υπάρχουν μέχρι το δεύτερο μισό του 14^{ου} αι., την περίοδο του Ησυχασμού.

σία Βουλγαρίας, 46. Γόνης, *Ιστορία*, 68. Πρβλ. Hr. Dimitrov, *Bălgaro-ungarski otnošenija prez srednovekovieto*, Sofia 1998, 139.

⁴⁹ Theiner, *Vetera Monumenta*, I, 196-197 (No 365). Εκτενέστερα βλ.: Longnon, *L'Empire latin*, 184-185. V. Zlatarski, *Istorija*, III, 426-427; Iv. Dujcev, "Za dokumentite iz Vatikanskija arhiv, otnasjašti se do bălgarskata istorija (IX-XIV vek)", *Bălgarsko srednovekovie*, Proučvanija vărhu političeskata kulturna istorija na srednovekovna Bălgarija, Sofia, 1972, 283-284; Gjuzelev, "Das Papsttum", 50; Του ιδίου, *Srednovekovna Bălgarija v svetlinata na novi izvori*, Sofia, 1981, 92; Danceva-Vasileva, *Bălgarija i Latinskata imperija*, 155-156; Γόνης, *Ιστορία*, 69-70.

Iulian Mihai L. Constantinescu

CANONICAL INSTITUTION OF AUTOCEPHALY AND DIASPORA

THE RECENT CONFLICT BETWEEN THE JERUSALEM
PATRIARCHATE AND THE ROMANIAN PATRIARCHATE

Abstract: In this study we will evaluate ecclesiological-canonical and historical the canonical doctrine of the Orthodox Church, regarding the autocephaly, the manner of the constitution, on canonical bases, of the local autocephalous Churches, the problem of proclaiming the autocephaly and of the autocephalous Churches jurisdiction over their own ecclesiastical units in Diaspora, emphasizing the contribution of Romanian theologians and canonists in the inter-orthodox dialogue towards the canonical problems of great actuality. I began to write this study based on my own paper, *The Principle of Ecclesiastical Autocephaly and the Problems of Inter-orthodox Jurisdiction. An Actual Ecclesiological and Canonical Contribution* (2008)¹, in order to discuss the issue of autocephaly, of the canonical territory and of the rights of the autocephalous Patriarchates and their jurisdiction over their own Diaspora, an issue of great actuality, with canonical implications in the inter-Orthodox relations. This very issue, along with some other local problems of a different nature, stood at the basis of ecclesiastical conflict between the historical Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Romanian Patriarchate, a conflict that led to the breaking of communion with the Romanian patriarch and to the defrocking of the Romanian Patriarchate's representative in Jerusalem.

Keywords: Autocephaly, Autonomy, Ethnic Principle, Jurisdiction, Inter-Orthodox Relations, Diaspora, Jerusalem Patriarchate, Patriarchate

¹ Iulian Mihai L. Constantinescu, „The Principle of Ecclesiastical Autocephaly and the Problems of Inter-orthodox Jurisdiction. An Actual Ecclesiological and Canonical Contribution”, in: *The Place of Canonical Principles in the Organization and Working of Autocephalous Orthodox Churches*, The Canon Law International Symposium (10-12 Sept. 2008), Arad, 2008, 220-243.

*1. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem – its current jurisdiction and legitimacy.
The issue of the blessing for erecting altars*

We are all surprised by the current conflict at the Holy Places of Christianity, a conflict with canonical implications in the inter-Orthodox level that was unduly initiated by the historical Patriarchate of Jerusalem, more specifically by the current Greek hierarchy who makes up the Holy Patriarchal Synod. After a profound analysis, it is not difficult for us to understand the real stake of this conflict (the extreme vanity of the Jerusalem Greeks, encouraged by theologians from Constantinople, concerning the issue of autocephaly and Diaspora; economic interests, too), that could have been avoided following the path of brotherly dialogue, of the inter-Orthodox meetings, of the mutual correspondence and visits, all of these being well established inter-Orthodox means for keeping the canonical unity in Orthodoxy. Ignoring the canonical principles for the organization and functioning of the Church (can. 34 Apostolic), the historical tradition of Orthodoxy, but also the application of the principle of reciprocity, in the current context of the Orthodox Church, inevitable in the current situation concerning the exercise of the jurisdictional authority in the Diaspora of each autocephalous Church, the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem made an unilateral decision, deciding to break the communion with the Romanian Patriarch and to defrock the representative of the Romanian Patriarchate to the Holy Places, Archimandrite Ieronim Crețu (elected bishop). The reason invoked by the Jerusalem Greeks is the erection of a center for Romanian pilgrims, by the Romanian Patriarchate, in Jericho, without ecclesiastical approval (written blessing of the Patriarch of Jerusalem). They considered that the active involvement of the representative of the Romanian Church in the erection of this center, which also includes a church, is without any canonical grounds, even non-canonical, being a lack of obedience to the local bishop. The erection of the altar without the aforementioned blessing was considered a fact that generated a schism with the Primate. The entire problematic starts from the understanding of autocephaly, Diaspora, canonical territory, the rights of autocephalous Churches over their own Diaspora and the exercise of the ecclesiastical authority, in particular of the judiciary work (the canonical giving of decisions and penalties), as a part of the pastoral or jurisdictional activity of the Church. *We will deal in the following lines with some general aspects concerning the*

context of this conflict, a canonical evaluation and the promotions of several suggestions

The Patriarchate of Jerusalem is an autocephalous patriarchy, historical, that received, through the canon 36 of the Council in Trullo the fifth place in the Pentarchy of the patriarchs and the fourth place in the current patriarchal Tetrarchy. Its canonical territory² was established through canonical decisions of the Ecumenical Synods (can. 7 I Ec.; 3 II Ec.; 28 IV Ec.; 36 VI Ec.). Therefore, the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem is beyond any doubt in the Holy Land, being confirmed by the common canonical work of the Ecumenical Synods. The election and the enthronement of the patriarch is recognized and greeted by the sister Churches, also. It is an autocephalous Church that exerts the full educational, consecrating and governing authority in its jurisdictional territory³.

The Patriarch is elected by the Holy Synod, which is made up, mainly, of the Brothers of the Holy Sepulcher of the Lord, a congregation of Greek brothers who takes care of the entire ecclesiastical administration and who influences, in a great proportion, the election of the Greek patriarch, although the ecclesial body of the Patriarchate is made up, mainly, of Orthodox Arabs, which are in a permanent conflict with the Greek hierarchy. This congregation of monks, led by the Patriarch, as a pressure group, it is not representative, being an innovation in Canon Law. This congregation, more correctly called a pseudo-monastic order, took over, in an abusive manner, the administration of the Church of the Resurrection, the Patriarchate and the entire Palestine. Therefore, the caste of these “zealous of the Holy Resurrection of Christ”, organized in the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulcher, dedicated itself to the organization of pilgrimages, with the support of the Patriarch. This is natural, because he has been leading them since 451, since the Fourth Ecumenical Synod. The Patriarchs felt obliged to the congregation from the Holy Sepulcher, and they took very seriously their obligations as abbots. The Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre assumed the leading role in the ecclesiastical life of Palestine, and this congregation became a kind of monastic staff, headed by the Patriarch.

² G. Nedungatt, „Autonomy, Autocephaly, and the Problem of Jurisdiction Today”, *Kanon* 5 (1981), 19-20.

³ Fr. Liviu Stan, „The origin of autocephaly and autonomy. New Theses” (Obârșia autocefaliei și autonomiei. Teze noi – in Romanian), *Mitropolia Olteniei* XIII/ 1-4 (1961), 81.

It is completely illegitimate for a Greek minority leadership to govern a historical Patriarchate mainly consisting of Arab Orthodox faithful, because there is a strong link between primacy (primate) and ethnicity. Thus, this script proclaimed autocephalies, not respected by the historical Patriarchates, must be defended and continued. In our case, we deal with the lack of respect concerning the autocephaly of the Romanian Orthodox Church by the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, through the hurried unilateral decision and through the defrocking of a cleric belonging to our Church. This way, the ecclesiastical authority of our Church was trespassed, as well as the jurisdiction right over the Diaspora and its own right of exerting the ecclesiastical authority in the territorial-administrative units of our Church. We ask a natural question: If the Romanian Patriarchate exists within and for the people who compose it, could there be a Patriarchate without country, like in the case of Jerusalem? Unfortunately, there is a tendency of seizing other ethnicities, from the part of the Greek Patriarchates, despite the apostolic principles, a fact that represents a true disaster for the Eastern Christianity.

The Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem, although being the poorest among all the historical patriarchates, it is the most venerable, given its status of guardian of the Holy Sepulcher, and benefits from both ecclesiastical and political help. Following the loss of properties, its main income sources are the donations and the pilgrimages. The Patriarch of Jerusalem himself does not have a well-organized eparchy, the great canonist Liviu Stan actually calling him abbot (stareț) of the Holy Places, with jurisdiction over the pilgrimages. We should not forget that the Patriarchate of Jerusalem was economically supported, throughout the time, by Romanian and Russian faithful. Russia, as a great world power, also offered political and diplomatic support, receiving immediate gratitude. As an expression of this gratitude, the Russian Church was allowed to exert its jurisdiction over a number of churches in the Holy Land. But the hierarchs of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem should also be grateful to the Romanian faithful who go to the Holy Places and for the donations made by the Romanian people.

The explanation for this measure taken by the Greeks is simple. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem wants to have a monopoly over the pilgrimages in the Holy Land, because of economic reasons, the only ones that could be of interest for the Jerusalem Greeks.

But being a canonical territory of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, no altar may be erected on it without the written blessing of the Primate; other-

wise, we would deal with an ecclesiastical interference. The spiritual rights of the bishop, who has unconditioned jurisdiction over all the churches, monasteries and other establishments with ecclesiastical purpose on his canonical territory (the boundaries of his eparchy), should be beyond any doubt. Emperor Justinian regulated, through novella 67, in agreement with the holy canons (can. 31, 34 ap.; 5, 6 Gangra; 4 IV Ec.)⁴ the compulsoriness for the person who wants to build a church to obtain the blessing of the local bishop. But in the case of the church in Jericho we could discuss about the blessing of the late Diodorus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, but without the written blessing. This could be obtained only through the path of brotherly dialogue, taking into the account the principle of reciprocity, the canon 34 apostolic, concerning the ethnic principle and the current context of the canonical institution of autocephaly and jurisdiction over Diaspora. The Office of the Romanian Patriarchate to the Holy Places (Jerusalem, Jordan, Jericho) is a part of the Romanian Orthodox Church, in its jurisdiction (cf. art. 6, Statute) and the representative of the Romanian Patriarchate obeys the Primate of the Romanian Orthodox Church, as an autocephalous patriarch and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The means through which the canonical obedience to a hierarchy is expressed are the laying on of hands (cheirotony), his mentioning and the right to be judged by him (this is not our case).

Consequently, the Romanian Orthodox Church recognized the autocephaly of Jerusalem and the rights of the Patriarch and of his Synod, by addressing the request for blessing, but the Patriarch's death delayed the effort of the Romanian Patriarchate. The center from Jericho, within the jurisdiction of our Church (cf. art. 6 Statute, adopted by the Holy Synod of our Church) is the property of the Romanian Orthodox Church and cannot be transmitted to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The position of the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem is regrettable and non-canonical, being a blow to the ecclesiastical dignity of the autocephalous Romanian Patriarchate, ignoring the frequent occasions of reciprocity (e.g. the Romanian parish in Sofia; the parish in Constantinople).

The decision of breaking the communion with the Romanian patriarch is questionable, because this kind of measure is taken only for heresy (45 ap.) and cannot be accepted at the inter-Orthodox level.

⁴ Fr. Jivko Panev, „Quelques remarques sur l'autocéphalie”, *Contacts* 170 (1995), 125-133.

Consequently, the path of brotherly dialogue is the only way of solving this problem, which can be solved, in principle, only at the inter-Orthodox level.

2. The exercise of the judiciary power. The penalty of defrocking

Through the administering of the Holy Sacrament of Priesthood by the competent bishop, he who is worthy and receives with responsibility the grace of the divine instituted priesthood, specific to each step of priesthood, becomes a member of the clergy, of the respective Church, acquiring canonical and civil rights. But, in the same time, he assumes obligations well defined by the Church Canon Law, and imposed by the spiritual service and the respective hierarchical rank that enjoys the authority specific to the grace state, along with the personal authority given by the personality and the qualities of each cleric. One of these obligations of the clerics is the canonical obedience (ὕπακοή κανωνική, *obedientia canonica*). Based on the hierarchical principle⁵, as an effect and a corollary of its applications, although the canonical obedience could be a canonical principle, the inferior ecclesiastical levels obey the superior levels of priesthood, within the autocephalous Church, the laymen obey the hierarchy and this one the superior Synodal organs. The canonical obedience has a biblical ground, because “Whoever listens to you listens to Me” (Luke 10:16), but canonical ground, also (can. 55 ap.; 8, 23 IV Ec.; 57 Laodicaea; 31 Cartagena), being expressed in the ecclesiastical legislations of the autocephalous Churches. Therefore, through the cheirotony each candidate assumes the obligation of canonical obedience, because between the members of the clergy⁶ there are canonical relations conditioned by the precedence of the clerics on higher hierarchical levels over the one on lower levels. Particularly, the Holy Canons refer to the obedience to the bishop, as a spiritual father of the priests. Those who trespass this regulation are punished with the deposition. The authority and the dignity of the bishop must be respected and not denigrated. Actually, all those on the higher levels of the clergy must not be denigrated by the lower level clerics or by laymen, while the State authority must not be denigrated by the clergy or by the faithful. The representative of the Romanian Patriarchate to the Holy Places obeyed the Romanian pa-

⁵ J. L. Boojamara, „Problems concerning autocephaly: a response”, *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, t. XXIV (1979), no. 2-3, 195.

⁶ Dumitru I. Găină, “The Holy Apostles and the Bishops” (Sfinții Apostoli și Episcopii – in Romanian), *Studii Teologice*, XIV/ 9-10 (1962), 582-597.

triarch within whose jurisdiction he is. The exercise of the ecclesiastical authority (the three branches: educational, consecrating and governing), which is to be done only through the valid administration of priesthood and in strong dependence to the competent bishop, is achieved only within the boundaries of the jurisdictional competence. Thus, a bishop or the Synod of a Church cannot exert this authority within another autocephalous Church, because this work would be null, non-canonical and unrecognized. To obey the competent bishop (based on the right of jurisdiction over the Diaspora, can. 34 ap.), without canonical obedience to the local bishop, who is an alien to the Church in which you are a full member, with all the rights and obligations, and to be non-canonically accused of schism (can. 31 ap.; 5 Antioch; 10 Carthage) could be called an abuse from the part of some conceited hierarchs, without any canonical ground – an interference in the affairs of our Church.

The penalty of defrocking for schism is canonical, but it becomes non-canonical for two reasons: 1. in this particular case we cannot discuss about schism, because the schism, the split (the Romanian word *dezbinare* comes from the Latin *disglut(i)nare* and it refers to the state create through misunderstanding, conflict, discord, schism – in Latin *schisma*, -atis, schismaticus, a, um; *dissidium*-ii; *discissio*; in Greek *σχίζω* – to separate) occurs within the same Church, when the cleric separates himself from his bishop (11 Carthage; 6 Gangra), through a lack of obedience to the competent ecclesiastical, disciplinary and administrative authority; 2. a canonical penalty cannot be pronounced in the case of a member of another autocephalous Church and without an investigation, according to the canonical procedure. As a matter of principle, a bishop may defrock only clerics from his eparchy, who have the right to appeal to the metropolitan or to the metropolitan synod (can. 5 I Ec.; 6 Antioch; 14 Sardica). The defrocking can be approved by the patriarch, as a final decision, if it is a canonically pronounced and administered penalty. This kind of penalty is without any value for the mother Church of the cleric, and for the other Orthodox Churches, too.

About defrocking we could say that is the penalty imposed by the ecclesiastical authority to the clerics who are part of the divinely instituted hierarchy (bishop, priest and deacon), if they are found guilty of serious violations of the ecclesiastical regulations established by the religious-ethical, canonical, disciplinary and social rules, which regulate the model behavior of the Church members. Through the defrocking, the cleric is totally for-

bidden to exert the ecclesiastical authority any more, in its three branches (educational, consecrating and governing), being transferred into the category of laymen and losing the clerical name and dignity.

According to the canonical doctrine of our Church, the ecclesiastical judiciary organs, individual and collegial or Synodal, which are competent to pronounce the penalty of defrocking, are the local bishop (can. 5 I Ec.; 6 Antioch; 14 Serdica) and the metropolitan (can. 14, 15 Antioch; 12, 20, 100 Carthage).

In conclusion: From our presentation we can observe the lack of jurisdictional competence of the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and of the patriarch to pronounce such a canonical penalty, not recognized by our Church. Because it is not possible to talk about a patriarchal stavropegial institution, allowed only within the territorial boundaries of the respective patriarch, the path of dialogue is the only solution to this ecclesiastical crisis. The path of ecclesiastical diplomacy is able to lead to the canonical recognition of Jericho, the same way that the Russians managed to obtain a number of churches and monasteries.

The issue of the Holy Places must be approached at the inter-Orthodox level... "As the international situation of Jerusalem is not entirely solved even nowadays, the issue of the Holy Places, linked to the first problem, was not solved, too. These two problems continue to concern both the religious organizations and the political interested ones"...

3. The institution of autocephaly. A historical-canonical view

In the latest decades, in the bosom of ecumenical Orthodoxy were carried numerous discussions on the institution of autocephaly, as form of organization of the orthodox ecclesiastical territorial units⁷, as well as the procedure of their constitution and this despite the canonical regulations

⁷ Iulian Mihai L. Constantinescu, *op. cit.*, 220-243; Nowadays, in the Roman-Catholic Church there are no ecclesiastical territorial units organized as autocephalies, the principle of autocephaly being used in the Western Church until the Schism from 1054. We may say that forms of autocephaly exist nowadays too in the Roman-Catholic Church, but without being referred as autocephalies. A restraint autonomy is attributed to the different settlements or associations, irrespective of their rite, Latin or Byzantine. The existent situation in Catholicism does not justify the critic position towards the autocephaly principle in the Orthodox Church. See here Fr. X. Wernz, *Ius Decretalium*, 1st vol., 2nd edition, Rome, 1905, 110-112; P. Bastien, "Autonomie", in: *Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique*, 1st vol., Paris, 1935, col. 1482-1490.

and the traditional practice of the Church. Although there were – and still are – numerous dissension regarding the institution of autocephaly and the ecclesiastical jurisdictions, all canonists accept that the interpretation of the canons that concern the principle of autocephaly and the other principles in tight connection it can be realized only in the light of the historical data, data which must also be related to the orthodox canonical doctrine⁸.

As the Romanian orthodox canonist Fr. Liviu Stan⁹ noted, the new theses¹⁰ issued at the half of the 20th century, besides their provocative character in Orthodoxy, ignored the dogmatic and canonical principles of the Orthodox Church, through these contesting the very canonicity of the proclamation acts of autocephaly by the ancient patriarchates. These theses, unfortunately embraced nowadays too in the Greek orthodox world, were supporting the exclusive competence of authority of the ecumenical synod to proclaim the autocephaly of the ecclesiastical territorial units, all the post-Synodal (i.e. after 787) autocephalies having a simple provisional character, these autocephalies being canonical incomplete, with the exception of the historical Patriarchates. Supporting the idea of canonical incompleteness of the post-Synodal autocephalies and the necessity of presenting them for examination to a future Ecumenical Synod, it is questioned not only the concept of canonicity but also the canonicity in the inter-orthodox relations, after the era of ecumenical synods. These non-canonical theses, out of the orthodox ecclesiology and out of the entire canonical doctrine of our Church, had an echo in Orthodoxy and still have, questioning the ecumenical unity of the Orthodox Church, the “one, holy, catholic and apostolic”. These positions of Prof. Trembelas were launched before the debut of the inter-orthodox Commissions and Pan-orthodox and Pre-Synodal Conferences for the preparation of the Holy and Great Synod of the Orthodox Church, exactly to open the way of a heated dialogue on the problem of autocephaly, truly a problem with canonical implications in the inter-orthodox relations, still unsolved despite the fundamental decisions taken in the inter-orthodox meetings from the Orthodox Center of the Ecumenical Patriarchate from Chambésy /Genève (Switzerland).

⁸ J. H. Erickson, „The Orthodox Canonical Tradition”, *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 3 (1983), 167.

⁹ Fr. Liviu Stan, *op. cit.*, 81.

¹⁰ The Greek theologian Prof. Panaghiotis Trembelas presented these theses in an article from the *Θεολογία* journal (1957).

Other theologians, ignoring the orthodox canonical regulations, non-accepting the existence of particular Churches, support the idea of remaking the unity of Orthodoxy through the recognition by the local Churches of the complete jurisdictional rights of a “supreme seat”, i.e. the Ecumenical Patriarchy of Constantinople¹¹. All these non-canonical theses legitimately claim the clarification of inter-orthodox jurisdictional relations, the precise distinction between autocephaly and autonomy, as well as the procedure of recognition and proclamation of the autocephaly of local Churches, independently constituted from the administrative-jurisdictional point of view, on a Synodal-hierarchical basis.

In the last years, the orthodox theological writing tackled the problem of the autocephalies that marked the history of the Orthodox Church in the 19th and 20th century, giving birth to numerous discussions at an inter-orthodox level. The notion of “autocephaly” was understood in different ways¹², either as an independence of the local Churches in the bosom of ecumenical Orthodoxy, independence by which it is given a complete expression of the non-altered unity of the Church¹³, or as a quasi-political term by which the emancipated Churches have in their lead an administrative and spiritual authority, and the frontiers of Churches are the same as the ones of states. Thus, canonist T. Pharmakides maintained in 1820 that the Church is not free but in its internal work regarding the dogmas and the cult, while the administration of a “national” Church and its relations with other Churches are of the exclusive competence of the civil power¹⁴.

“Autocephaly”¹⁵ represents a reality in the life and organization of the Church, being present from the very beginning of the ecclesiastical setup,

¹¹ Archdeacon Ioan N. Floca, *Orthodox Canon Law. Ecclesiastical legislation and administration* (Drept canonic ortodox. Legislație și administrație bisericească – in Romanian) 2nd vol., Eeimbtor, Bucharest, 1990, 320.

¹² Fr. Jivko Panev, *op. cit.*, 125-133.

¹³ Cf. S. Troitsky, „Autocéphalie ecclésiastique”, *Messenger de l'exarchat du patriarcat russe en Europe occidentale* 11 (1952).

¹⁴ Apud Spyridon Galanis, „Comment fut déclarée l'autocéphalie de l'Église grecque”, *Contacts* 133, 37-47 and no. 134, 128-148.

¹⁵ The term of autocephaly appears for the first time in a list of hierarchical ecclesiastical units that were under the jurisdiction of the Constantinopolitan seat, list named “Notitia Episcopatum” and attributed, most probably, to Saint Epiphanius of Cyprus (311-403), although some scholars maintain its provenance from the 7th century. Thus, the word autocephaly continues to appear in the lists of the seats from the canonical territory of the historical patriarchates, although they were modified in time.

acquiring new shapes in time, together with the settlement of the territorial structure and with the working of the Church on a Synodal-hierarchical basis. Although present in the life of the Church – the rights of the autocephalous local Churches being mentioned in the text of numerous canons of the Ecumenical and local Synods – the term of autocephaly does not appear in any canon. Truly, one canon, previous to the era of Ecumenical and local Synods canons, included the two words which the term of autocephaly was born from (αὐτός and κεφαλή), that is the 34th Apostolic canon. In consequence, the term αὐτοκέφαλος (αὐτοκέφαλον – used in biology) acquires a new meaning, unknown by the profane speaking, which the social sciences used the term αυτονομία for, understood as the personal independence, the social independence or the sovereignty under juridical aspect. Thus, in the most authentic meaning, the autocephaly does not concern “the obedience of one bishop to another, or of a province to a bishop, but it is applied to a group of churches in a province which is capable to guarantee its own integrity and existence”¹⁶, the independence of local churches that lived in unity, without any primacy, being showed by the New Testament.

In consequence, we specify here that the right of each Church to independence or autocephaly was consecrated by ecclesiastical practice transformed in time into a juridical regulation, then in a custom with law power that was mentioned in the text of the different canons. This right to autocephaly of the local Churches “consists in the freedom ensured by law, on count of every ecclesiastical unit that can exist through itself, to organize and govern itself into an independent manner to other ecclesiastical units found in the same situation, that is in equal situation in respect of rights even though in respect of territorial extension of the title or of the honorific hierarchy that one would found itself on a superior rank”¹⁷.

Despite these, as far back as from the apostolic age until the 2nd – 3rd centuries, the local Churches were ruled in an autocephalous manner by the bishops¹⁸, subsequently the leadership of ecclesiastical units passing to

¹⁶ J. L. Boojamara, „Problems concerning autocephaly: a response”, 195.

¹⁷ Pr. L. Stan, “The support of the independency combat of the Romanian people through the combat of the Church for autocephaly” (Sprijinirea luptei de independență a poporului român prin lupta Bisericii pentru autocefalie – in Romanian), *Orthodoxia* XX/ 4 (1968), 611.

¹⁸ See details at L. Stan, “About autocephaly” (Despre autocefalie – in Romanian), *Orthodoxia* 3 (1956), 374-375; I. Moisescu, *The ecclesiastical hierarchy in the apostolic era* (Ierarhia bisericească în epoca apostolică – in Romanian), Bucharest, 1955, 52-56; Fr. Nicolae V. Dura, “Forms and status of manifestation of the autcephaly of the Romanian Orthodox

the local, provincial synods (34th, 37th apost. can.), by introducing the metropolitan system (4th century) the metropolitan synods being constituted by the bishops in the province, headed by the metropolitan (4th, 5th, 6th, 7th cans. I ec.)¹⁹. Thus, although the term of autocephaly does not appear in canons, not being used in the first centuries, the autocephaly manifested itself through time in different manners²⁰.

The Holy Apostles, being conscious of their unique and unrepeatable authority received from Savior Jesus Christ, enjoying universal jurisdiction by virtue of the extraordinary apostolic grace, preached the Gospel of our Savior Jesus Christ as far as the ends of the world (Mt 28:19), outreaching the boundaries of a single community, founding numerous local Churches which they endowed with an autocephalous government through the ordination of bishop in their lead. These local communities, headed by bishops, administrated themselves independently one from another, although all the bishops governed the whole Church in communion, without enjoying universal jurisdiction, but only a local one, hence limited to the boundaries of their diocese²¹. The bishop, being ordained for the local community, becomes a testimony of the faith of his local community, being integrated in the Episcopal college and therefore he becomes the testimony of the entire apostolic teaching and tradition²², as the theologian W. Beinert affirms. The ordination of the bishop does not mean dependency or subordination of the one who ordains, but placing the Episcopal seat at disposal towards the service of the local Church which the bishop was ordained for²³.

Church through the centuries. Historical and canonical testimonies" (Forme și stări de manifestare a autocefaliei Bisericii Ortodoxe Române de-a lungul secolelor. Mărturii istorice și canonice), *Centenarul autocefaliei Bisericii Ortodoxe Române 1885-1985*, Eibmbor, Bucharest, 1987, 280-287; Bishop P. L. L'Huillier, „Problems concerning autocephaly”, in: *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, vol. XXIV/2-3 (1979), 167; J. Gaudemet, „L'Eglise dans l'Empire romain au IV-ème siècle”, in: *Histoire du Droit et des Institutions de l'Eglise en Occident*, t. III, Paris, 1958, 474.

¹⁹ Cf. Gheorghe I. Soare, *The Metropolitanate in the Orthodox Canon Law* (Mitropolia în Dreptul Canonic Ortodox – in Romanian), Bucharest, 1939, 17.

²⁰ Fr. Liviu Stan, *op. cit.*, 85.

²¹ Dumitru I. Găină, *op. cit.*, 582-597.

²² W. Beinert, „The Church of Christ as a local Church in the first five centuries”, *Wort und Wahrheit* 3 (1976), 11.

²³ *Ibidem*; In the head of Episcopal synods from the 2nd and the 3rd centuries there was a primate, called “protos”, which expresses in a symbolic manner the autocephaly of the local Church in whose head he was. (34th apost. can.). Thus, these ecclesiastical units leaded by synods in whose head there was a “protos”, recognized as the head, become, as the great

The next step of the ecclesiastical setup meant the apparition, in the 4th century, of the autocephalous metropolises (4th, 5th, 6th, 7th cans. I ec.; II ec.), after that of the exarchates (4th century) and patriarchates (4th – 5th century) as autocephalous units (6th, 7th cans. I ec.; 2nd, 3rd cans. II ec.; 9th, 17th, 28th cans. IV ec.), the last ones including several exarchates. This kind of evolution of the setup and administrative working of the ecclesiastical territorial units was marked by changes regarding the canonical statute of these local communities. The bishoprics, which were initially autocephalous, kept only the autonomy of one of another, together forming the autocephalous metropolises, which later were going to become autonomous, too, in the bosom of exarchates and the in the patriarchates (9th, 12th, 17th, 28th cans. IV ec.; 8th, 35th cans. VI ec.; 3rd, 6th cans. VII ec.). However, like some exarchates or diocese, some metropolises kept their autocephaly, too, either as metropolises or as archbishoprics²⁴; we could mention here the metropole of Tomis²⁵ or the Archbishopric of Cyprus, which has remained autocephalous until nowadays (8th can. III ec.; 39th can. VI ec.). Other ecclesiastical semi-autocephalous units, called autocephalous archbishoprics, became more and more numerous since 4th-5th centuries.

Therefore, the 34th apostolic canon (the beginning of the 4th century) includes the canonical principles of organization and working of the Church,

Romanian orthodox canonist Prof. Liviu Stan shows, standard autocephalous units. To this autocephalous ecclesiastical setup it is given an expression, it is canonically settled, in the text of the 34th apostolic canon, which includes the principle of autocephaly, too, being, in the 5th century, interpreted through the 8th canon of the 3rd ecumenical Synod (Ephesus, 431) and rediscovered in the canonical resolutions of the 4th ecumenical Synod (Chalcedon, 451).

²⁴ *Ibidem*, 88.

²⁵ The Tomis seat was also „prima sedis episcopalis” from our country, until the 14th century his hierarch being the Head of the Church of all Romanians. It is recalled by Sozomen in the 4th century, showing that the hierarch of Tomis defended its independence of the other seats, having all the rights of a metropolitan, without having though suffrage bishops. Fr. Nicolae V. Dură affirms: “The Church from Scythia Minor, organized as a metropole from the First Ecumenical Synod era (cf. 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th canons) it was *ab antiquo* autocephalous... That is why it is improper and erroneous to affirm that the Church from Scythia Minor would have been under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchy of Constantinople, as some Romanian and foreign historians and theologians still affirm”, see Nicolae V. Dura, *Scythia Minor (Dobrudja) and its apostolic Church. The archiepiscopal and metropolitan seat of Tomis (4th-14th century)* („Scythia Minor” (Dobrogea) și Biserica ei apostolică. Scaunul arhiepiscopal și mitropolitan al Tomisului (sec. IV-XIV) – în Romanian), EDP, Bucharest, 2006, 14.

two of them being the ethnic principle and the autocephaly. Through the application of these principles it was possible to keep the orthodox canonical unity, this ecclesiastical unity receiving its expression even since the apostolic era²⁶. Thus, the autocephaly of local Churches, formed in the ethnic framework, is mentioned by the 34th apostolic canon, as we affirmed, its dispositions being taken over by other canons too, these ones showing the criteria for the establishment of the identity of a Church: place, nationality, ethnicity and rite²⁷.

The constitution of local autocephalous Churches in the ethnic framework is based on some grounds that can be natural, historical, doctrinal, dogmatic and canonical, as it is specified in Ioan N. Floca's work, *Orthodox Canon Law. Ecclesiastical legislation and administration*²⁸ (Drept canonic ortodox. Legislație și administrație bisericească – in Romanian). The Romanian canonist appreciates that the natural grounds consist in the necessity to model the ecclesiastical units according to the same natural laws that are used by all human communities, for their leading and organization. We find the historical ground for the constitution of the autocephalies in the ecclesiastical history and tradition, the whole ecclesiastical regulation being settled as customary law and then found in the text of the canons, precisely on the long practice basis. The dogmatic grounds have their source in the harmony between the organizational regulations of the ecclesiastical units and the truths of faith, mentioning here the two canonical principles with dogmatic and juridical background, the Synodal principle and the hierarchical one. The canonical grounds are included in the canons that mention the constitution of autocephalous Churches in the apostolic era (34th, 35th, 37th apost. can.), in the era of the ecumenical synods (7th can. I ec.; 2nd, 8th can. III ec.; 9th, 12th, 17th, 28th can. IV ec.; 8th, 36th, 38th can VI ec.) and of the local synods (9th, 14th can. Ant; 3rd, 6th Sard.; 13th, 18th Cart.), all these canons giving expression to the autocephaly principle, developing an settling it in the legality plan. Besides these grounds there

²⁶ Nicolae V. Dură, "The Church of Alexandria and its hierarchs canonical-pastoral activity until the synod from Chalcedon (451) (Biserica Alexandriei și activitatea canonic-pastorală a ierarhilor ei până la sinodul de la Calcedon (451) – in Romanian), *Studii Teologice* XXXIII/ 1-2 (1981), 5-25.

²⁷ Idem, "Forms and status of manifestation of the autocephaly of the Romanian Orthodox Church through the centuries. Historical and canonical testimonies", p. 284; G. Nedungatt, „Autonomy, Autocephaly, and the Problem of Jurisdiction Today”, 19-20.

²⁸ See 2nd vol., Eibmbor, Bucharest, 1990, 321.

can be added some political grounds, i.e. the presence of national of multinational states, constituted by administrative units, to all these adding the political interest of different states to strengthen the organization of their own national Church through autocephaly and the interest to tear it out of the foreign jurisdiction²⁹.

To obtain the autocephaly, the autocephalous Churches can interfere, having in the same time the right not to recognize some autocephalies, more than that they can interfere to withdraw the autocephaly, if there are not fulfilled all the conditions. The proclamation of autocephaly by the mother-Church means, in fact, the execution of this act in the name of the Ecumenical Church, by exercising the authority that the whole Church possesses solidarity³⁰. The consequence of proclaiming the autocephaly is the obtaining of rights by the Church recognized as autocephalous³¹.

But, concerning the principle of autocephaly it is worth mentioning the importance of correct knowing and understanding of the notion of “canonical territory”, this being in tight relation to the autocephalous Church and to their jurisdiction and of a real importance in the inter-orthodox and inter-Christian relations. This term was not used in history, but is recent, although it refers to ecclesiological realities present even since the apostolic era.

The notion of canonical territory is marked by an evolution in time, even since the first three centuries asserting itself the principle “a city – a bishop – a Church”, which implies the exercise of the ecclesiastical authority by a bishop into a well-settled territory³². Thus, the apostolic Canons forbid the trespassing of the ecclesiastical boundaries by bishops and clergy, being combated the practice of bishops and priests who left their dioceses and went to officiate services in other ecclesiastical units (14th apost. can.). The same manner, the bishops are not allowed to ordain outside their diocese (35th apost. can.) and they cannot receive in Eucharistic communion people excommunicated in other dioceses (12th can.) or cancel the eccle-

²⁹ *Ibidem*.

³⁰ Archdeacon Ioan N. Floca, *op. cit.*, 333.

³¹ See details at Liviu Stan, „On Autocephaly” (Despre autocefalie – in Romanian), *Orthodoxia* VIII/ 3 (1956), 391-395; Idem, „The autocephaly and the autonomy in Orthodoxy” (Autocefalia și autonomia în Ortodoxie – in Romanian), *Mitropolia Olteniei* XIII/ 5-6 (1961).

³² Hilarion Alfeyev, „La notion du territoire canonique dans la tradition orthodoxe” (*Conférence au symposium international de droit canonique à l'Académie théologique catholique de Budapest, 7.II.2005*), in: http://fr.hilarion.orthodoxia.org/6_12, 07.09.2008.

siastical sanctions pronounced by other bishops in their own jurisdiction boundaries (16th, 32nd can.).

We may say that the notion of canonical territory at the level of the Episcopalian Churches appeared in the times of the Holy Apostles and developed in the ecclesiastical practice from the 2nd and the 3rd centuries and later, through the apparition of new forms of ecclesiastical organization.

We will mention below some actual aspects regarding the canonical territories of the autocephalous Churches and the application of this notion to the jurisdictions.

4. The ethnic principle³³ – a divine and canonical fundament of the autocephaly and of the jurisdictional right over the own “Diaspora”

The nation is part of the creation plan, bearing the seal of eternity and perpetuating itself only through faith and belief in God's help. As the Romanian canonist Prof. Iorgu Ivan affirms, the family constitutes the ground of every nation and the language of every nation is a distinctive sign and a means of externalizing the religiosity, being a divine regulation that every nation to have its own language³⁴. Not to respect the specificity of each nation, of its language and traditions is truly a trespassing of the divine regulation. All these are easier to understand by considering the divine Revelation of the Old and the New Testament.

The divine authority of the principles established by the Holy Apostles in organizing and governing the Church cannot be put in doubt. These principles were settled in the text of the canons, relevant in this sense being the 34th apostolic canon, which, besides other organizing and working principles of

³³ The ethnic link is a canonical principle of organization of the Church, as Lord Jesus Christ founded the Church for all people, endowing it with principles of organization and working. The principles of ecclesiastical organization and leading, together with the spiritual means at the disposal of the Church for the fulfillment of its existential purpose, were going to ensure, in time, the unity of the Church, with all the diversity of nations and languages of those who were becoming subjects of law in the Church, through the administration of the Holy Sacrament of Baptism.

³⁴ Iulian Mihai L. Constantinescu, *op. cit.*, 220-243; Iorgu Ivan, “The Ethnos – nation – divine ground and canonical fundamental principle of the ecclesiastical autocephaly” (Etnosul – neamul -, temei divin și principiu fundamental canonic al autocefaliei bisericești – in Romanian), in: *The Centenary of the autocephaly of the Romanian Orthodox Church 1885 – 1985* (Centenarul autocefaliei Bisericii Ortodoxe Române 1885-1985 – in Romanian), Eibmbor, Bucharest, 1987, 186.

the Church (e.g. the hierarchical principle, the Synodal principle, the principle of autonomy, the principle of autocephaly, the territorial principle), includes the ethnic principle, too, understood as “the organization of a nation’s Church with bishops and priests from that nation, forced to preach the right teaching and to celebrate the entire cult – the Holy Sacraments and Hierurgies – in that nation’s language, respecting its traditions and customs that do not come in conflict with the orthodox doctrine and morals”³⁵.

Considering the development of the ecclesiastical organization and its adaptation to the administrative organization of the state, we note that the Fathers of the Ecumenical synods affirmed the equality and independence of the greater autocephalous ecclesiastical units, without enjoying jurisdictional rights one towards another. In the same time, they strengthened the indispensability of the ethnic element in organizing an autocephalous Church, as a divine regulation. The ethnic principle was invoked by Churches to obtain their independence of foreign jurisdictions – the case of Georgian or Russian Church; the Ecumenical Patriarchy itself quoted the text of the 34th apostolic canon at the recognition of the autocephaly of the Russian Church (1448). In this context, the term “*ἔθνος*” was correctly interpreted by the Ecumenical Patriarchy, in sense of “nation”. Later, this term was misinterpreted by the Greek historians and canonists, exactly to justify their illegitimate pretensions of the Ecumenical Patriarchy on the jurisdiction of the entire Diaspora³⁶. Thus, the term “*ethnos*” was reduced to the sense of diocese, like the 9th canon from Antioch, continuing this way the misinterpretation of the 28th canon of the IV Ecumenical Synod from Chalcedon.

Despite these, the ethnic link is a ground of the right and obligation of every autocephalous Church to organize and guide the religious life of its own Diasporas, in order to keep the ancient orthodox faith, as well as in order benefit in Diaspora from the spiritual content shared by the Church with its sons in the respective national state.

Even since the beginnings of Christianity the Diaspora kept a tight relation with the bishop in whose community they had received the baptism,

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 193.

³⁶ See here Archim. Grigorios D. Papathomas, *Essais de Droit canonique orthodoxe*, Firenze, Università degli Studi di Firenze/Facoltà di Scienze Politiche “Cesare Alfieri” (coll. Seminario di Storia delle istituzioni religiose e relazioni tra Stato e Chiesa-Reprint Series, no. 38), 2005, IV, 77-114; Vlassios Phidas, *Droit canon. Une perspective orthodoxe*, Centre Orthodoxe du Patriarcat Œcuménique, Chambésy-Genève, 1998.

this way having the complete sentiment of being in permanent spiritual communion with the members of the community they had left and with the entire Church. This fact is expressed by the 2nd canon from the II Ecumenical Synod, which establish that all the Diasporas outside the Roman Empire to be governed by the bishops who had the respective area under their jurisdiction, before being occupied by the barbarians. A century later, the Fathers of the fourth Ecumenical Synod from Chalcedon (451), through the 28th canon, a controversial one³⁷, unaccepted by the Roman-Catholic Church and long debated in the ecumenical Orthodoxy, recognized the jurisdiction of the Constantinopolitan seat over the dioceses of Asia, Pontus and Thrace. This sort of exception, adopted because of political reasons, could be considered, as Prof. Iorgu Ivan affirms, as a confirmation of the old custom at which referred the 6th can. I ec. and the 2nd can. II ec., canons that respected the principle of canonical territoriality, that each bishop of the diocese to exert his jurisdiction only in the boundaries of his own diocese³⁸.

The heads of the autocephalous Churches enjoyed equal power, non-existing the confusion between the jurisdictional rights and the honorific primacy. This fact is highlighted by the great canonist of the 13th century, Joannes Zonaras who, interpreting the 17th can. IV ec. maintained that the Patriarch of Constantinople is a judge only in the boundaries of his own jurisdiction. In consequence, the metropolitans found under the jurisdiction of the other historical Patriarchies are not under his authority. In fact, even the Constantinopolitan seat recognized in the Tomus of autocephaly, on the ground of the 34th apostolic canon³⁹, that the Churches organized in an ethnic framework, Churches that had been by then under the jurisdiction of Constantinople, now are independent and with their own administration, due to attainment of the autocephaly. In consequence, the Patriarchy of Constantinople itself, with all its privileges recognized by the ecumenical synods (3rd can. II ec., 28th can IV ec.)⁴⁰, maintained that all Churches recognized as autocephalous are equal in the Orthodoxy, without being able to exercise

³⁷ Ioan N. Floca, *Canons of the Orthodox Church. Notes and comments* (Canoanele Bisericii Ortodoxe. Note și comentarii), 3rd edition amended Sibiu, 2005, 102.

³⁸ Iorgu Ivan, *op. cit.*, 197.

³⁹ Nicolae Dură, "Forms and status of manifestation of the autocephaly of the Romanian Orthodox Church through the centuries. Historical and canonical testimonies", 287.

⁴⁰ J. H. Erickson, „Autocephaly in Orthodox Canonical Literature to the Thirteenth Century”, *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, XV/1-2 (1971), 29; Also see Marcel Ciucur, "The right to grant autocephaly in the Orthodox Church" (Dreptul de acordare a autocefaliei în Biserica Ortodoxă – in Romanian), *Studii Teologice*, XXIX/5-8 (1977), 536-541.

their jurisdiction over another autocephalous Church, irrespective of their seniority or the number of believers⁴¹. Any pretension of an autocephalous Church to have jurisdiction over other autocephalous Churches or over their Diasporas was against the teaching of the Holy Bible and the canons of the Orthodox Church. The 34th apostolic canon expresses in a positive manner the importance of the ethnic principle as a fundament of the ecclesiastical organization and of the exercise of jurisdiction over the own Diaspora⁴². Every Orthodox Church has its own shape “only because of the national character proper to the orthodox people who that Church belongs to”⁴³. Even so, the autocephalous Orthodox Churches, although are organized in a precise manner into a ethnical and geographical framework⁴⁴, we may say that “there are neither abdications nor falls from the Christian universality, but the natural and canonical expression of the agreement between these two face of some organic realities: the plurality, after creation, of nations and unity by grace of the Christian Church”⁴⁵.

Despite these realities from the life of the Church, in time, the Patriarchy of Constantinople and the theologians who supported the Constantinopolitan seat, putting in doubt the ethnic principle in organizing and working of the autocephalous Churches, accused these autocephalous Churches of ethnophyletism, these aversion culminating with the synod in Constantinople from 1872, where it was combated the phyletism as a heresy against the teaching of faith, against the canons of the Holy Fathers, considering those who admitted the ethnical principle as “out of the Church and schismatic”⁴⁶. The phyletism is regarded by these theologians, supporters of the Constantinopolitan seat, as a nationalist principle applied

⁴¹ Iorgu Ivan, *op. cit.*, 198.

⁴² I. D. Ivan, “The age and forms of the relations of the Romanian Orthodox Church with the other Orthodox sister-Churches” (Vechimea și formele raporturilor Bisericii Ortodoxe Române cu celelalte Biserici Ortodoxe – in Romanian), *Glasul Bisericii*, XL/10-12 (1980), 794.

⁴³ Cf. A. D. Kiriakos, “The system of Autocephalous Orthodox Churches” (Sistemul Biseriilor Ortodoxe Autocefale – in Romanian), translated from Greek by D. Demetrescu, *Biserica Ortodoxă Română*, XXV/5 (1901-1902), 382.

⁴⁴ V. Șesan, *The right of devolution of the patriarch and metropolitan* (Dreptul de devoluțiune al patriarhului și al mitropolitului – in Romanian), Cernăuți, 1937, 13.

⁴⁵ I. Gh. Savin, “Christianity and nationalism” (Creștinism și naționalism – in Romanian), *Fântâna darurilor*, X/9 (1938), 417-418.

⁴⁶ Hiéromoine Pierre, „Notes d’Ecclésiologie Orthodoxe. Le Patriarche Oecuménique et les Eglises Orthodoxes Autocéphales”, *Irenikon* X/6 (1933), 445.

in the ecclesiastical area, ignoring in the same time the word of our Savior, addressed to His disciples before His Ascension: ““All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to Me. Therefore go and teach all the nations” (Mt 28:18-19), all the nations being called in the virtue of their particularities to participate at the life in God⁴⁷.

The Greek canonist, Fr. Prof. Grigorios Papathomas maintain that those who support the ethnic principles make a confusion between Church and Nation⁴⁸, assimilating the Church to the Nation, non being accepted the jurisdiction over an ethnic group and in conclusion more jurisdictions, but an universal jurisdiction, the one of the Ecumenical Patriarchy. We respond here to the Greek theologian through the words of an authoritarian voice of the Orthodoxy from the 20th century, the greatest orthodox dogmatist of his time, Fr. Prof. Dumitru Staniloae: “The Orthodoxy is universal in the sense that is sent to preach Christ to “all the nations” (Mt 28:19). But precisely through this sending to nations and not to individuals without any ethnic qualification it is shown that it is not irrespective of the particularity of the nations, but it affirms and support them in this particularity... By this, the orthodoxy inside every people is attaching in a particular way with its love to de nation in the middle of what is working, helping it in its life aspirations and making a synthesis between them and the aspirations to salvation that it keep awake in the soul of those who form it”⁴⁹.

We mention here that the importance and the necessity of spiritual dependency of the orthodox communities in Diaspora of the mother-Churches and of their original countries was underlined even by the Ecumenical Patriarchy, in the epistles sent in 1908 to the Holy Synod of the Greek Church, as well as in the Synodal Tomus no. 2388 from 1908, through which the Ecumenical Patriarchy was going to cede to the Greek Church all the authority for the protection of the entire Greek Diaspora, with the purpose of befriending

⁴⁷ Ilie Moldovan, “Ethnicity and ecclesiastical autonomy. Theological and moral considerations with the occasion of the Romanian Orthodox Church centenary anniversary” (Etnicitate și autonomie bisericească. Considerații de ordin teologic-moral cu ocazia aniversării autocefaliei Bisericii Ortodoxe Române – in Romanian), *The Centenary of the autocephaly of the Romanian Orthodox Church 1885 – 1985* (Centenarul autocefaliei Bisericii Ortodoxe Române 1885-1985 – in Romanian), Bucharest, 1987, 241.

⁴⁸ Archim. Grigorios D. Papathomas, „Face au concept d’“Église nationale”, la réponse canonique orthodoxe: *l’Église autocéphale*”; in: http://orthodoxe.free.fr/files/carances_ecclesiologiques.pdf (05.09.2008).

⁴⁹ Dumitru Stăniloae, *Nation and Christianity* (Națiune și Creștinism – in Romanian), ed. Elion, Bucharest, 2004, 273.

ing and protecting the interests of Hellenism in the world⁵⁰. This Synodal Tomus is in the spirit of the 34th apostolic canon, being invoked the ethnical principle, all the arguments of the Ecumenical Patriarchy being used by the other autocephalous Churches as a ground for their right of jurisdiction over their own Diasporas. We could say that with the same purpose – the defending of the interests of Hellenism – a decade later, in 1922, the Patriarchy of Constantinople was retaking into its jurisdiction the whole Greek orthodox Diaspora, working nowadays, too, in tight cooperation with the Greek Church and with the Greek state to promote the values, traditions and interests of Hellenism on all the continents⁵¹.

The actual situation of the orthodox Diaspora is due to the misinterpretation of the canons that concern the jurisdiction over the Diaspora in the Greek world, especially of the 28th canon from the Fourth Ecumenical Synod from Chalcedon, which is the only canon that refers to the Diaspora of the Constantinopolitan Church, mentioning that the archbishop of Constantinople may ordain the bishops from the barbarian lands, i.e. the Churches from Pont, Asia, Thrace, Churches that included more metropolises⁵². The text of the canon shows expressly the jurisdiction of the Constantinopolitan seat over the three dioceses, as well as over their barbarian lands, that is over their Diasporas. We cannot see this as an attribution of jurisdictional rights over the entire Diaspora. These jurisdictions attributed to the Constantinopolitan seat is explained by the fact that, being in the capital of the Empire, it had a small diocesan jurisdiction, considering it necessary to increase the jurisdictional territory, corresponding to its dignity of patriarchal seat of the imperial capital. By attributing the right to ordain the bishop from Diaspora, in fact is conferred the entire jurisdictional power, being “the act through which is ensured the apostolic

⁵⁰ See here Damaskinos Papandreou, Metropolitan of Switzerland, *Church, Society, World* (Biserică, Societate, Lume – in Romanian), Trinitas, Iași, 1998.

⁵¹ Iorgu Ivan, *op. cit.*, 201.

⁵² Liviu Stan, “The Orthodoxy and the Diaspora. The actual situation and the canonical position of the orthodox Diaspora” (Ortodoxia și Diaspora. Situația actuală și poziția canonică a diasporei ortodoxe – in Romanian), *Ortodoxia*, XV/ 1 (1963), 26-27; also see † Justinian, Patriarch of Romania, “The actual validity of the 28th canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Synod from Chalcedon” (Valabilitatea actuală a canonului 28 al Sinodului IV ecumenic de la Calcedon – in Romanian), *Ortodoxia*, III/2-3 (1951), 173-187; Archbishop Peter L’Huillier, *The canon law at I-IV Ecumenical Synods* (Dreptul bisericesc la sinoadele ecumenice I-IV – in Romanian), romanian translation by Alexandru I. Stan, Gnosis, Bucharest, 2000.

succession in each ecclesiastical unit, succession that conditions the entire delivering work”⁵³.

We don't want to extend here the commentaries to the 28th canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Synod from Chalcedon (451), but we underline the central idea through the words of the great Romanian canonist, Prof. Liviu Stan: “In consequence, there is out of question the idea that the dispositions of the 28th canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Synod would confer the Constantinopolitan seat a universal jurisdiction over Diaspora, but, contrariwise, they ascertain and consecrate the right of every autocephalous Church to exert its jurisdiction over its own Diaspora”⁵⁴.

As it can be well seen in the Report presented by the inter-orthodox preparatory Commission from Chambésy in 7-13 November 1993, the Romanian Orthodox Church, invoking the 34th, 35th and 37th apostolic canons, as well as the 2nd canon of the Third Ecumenical Synod and the 12th canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Synod, maintained the presence in history of the autocephalous Churches, constituted on the ethnic principle basis, before and after the era of ecumenical synods, other Churches being autocephalous after the decision of the ecumenical synods. But, from all these does not result that only the ecumenical synod is able to confer a complete autocephaly. Complete autocephalies may exist even without the express approval of an ecumenical synod, the ecclesiastical autocephalous units being able to constitute themselves either spontaneously, or through autocephaly proclamation acts issued by certain existent autocephalous Churches. Thus, the mother-Church, being co-responsible of maintaining the pan-orthodox unity and canonical order, it has to consult the other local autocephalous sister-Churches to see the opportunity of a positive settlement of the autocephaly demand. After a consensus is reached, the mother-Church recognizes formally the autocephaly of its daughter-Church, either through a Synodal decision, or through a Synodal Tomus. In case of disagreement between the autocephalous Church and the one that asks for autocephaly, it can be made an appeal to a pan- orthodox decision⁵⁵.

⁵³ *Ibidem*, 28.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*; Also see Athénagoras Peckstadt, „L'autorité dans l'Eglise: une approche orthodoxe”, *Irénikon*, t. LXXV/1 (2002), 35-52.

⁵⁵ Damaskinos Papandreou, *The Holy and Great Synod of Orthodox: Thematic and preparatory works* (Sfântul și Marele Sinod al Ortodoxiei: Tematică și lucrări pregătitoare – in Romanian), Trinitas, Iași, 1998, 158-159.

Светослав Риболов

БОГОСЛОВИЕ НА ТВОРЕНИЕТО В БЪЛГАРСКАТА БОГОСЛОВСКА МИСЪЛ НА XX ВЕК

Abstract: *Theology of Creation in the Bulgarian Theological Thought of the 20th Century.* Theology of Creation in Bulgaria during the 20th century appears in a framework of a discussion about the religious education at the state schools and finds itself on the frontline between the powerful evolutionistic sentiments and the traditional legacy of the Orthodox Church. The basic social and intellectual motivation of the Theology of Creation before the WW2 in Bulgaria, is practically an polemic struggle with the secular ideas shared by a considerable part of Bulgarian society then. The situation one can encounter during the second half of the 20th century gradually develops much more denominational orientated theological features based on a revisited Eastern Orthodox traditional spiritual heritage. The latter created a basis of strong theoretical arguments in favor of a realistic Creationism. Unfortunately with the return of the old discussion about the religious education at the state schools in the late 20th and early 21st century, the well forgotten discussion about the compatibility between Scripture and Sciences opened again an old fashion discussion in the country.

Keywords: Orthodox Theology, Modern Theology, 20th Century Theology, Bulgarian Theology, Dogmatics

Богословски книги на славянски диалект или на старобългарски език в средновековна България се пишат от IX в. Повечето от тях са преводи от гръцки език на библейски, литургични, канонични и патристични текстове. Според някои изследвания преводите са пред-

ставявали повече от 80% от цялата старобългарска книжнина¹. Оригиналните творения на автори от Първото българско царство са сравнително малко на брой. Един от най-популярните от тези преводи, който обаче комбинира превод, компилация и оригинални елементи в изложението си, е „Шестоднев“, съставен от екзарха на Вселенската патриаршия в столицата на тогавашна България на име Йоан. Вероятно текстът е издаден някъде в началото на X в. и в съдържанието си се опира на особено обичания във Византия „Шестоднев“ на св. Василий Велики, но същевременно съдържа и части от няколко други съчинения с екзегетичен и естественонаучен характер, както и някои бележки от съставителя, включително забележителното описание на царския дворец. Тази книга очертава много важен проблемен пункт между Християнството и паганизма в опит да се дистанцира от последния на базата на теология на творението².

Въпреки че още в онази епоха се появяват важни съчинения на славянски в Българското царство, гръцкият остава важен административен и елитарен език за клира, аристокрацията и като цяло за богословстването в продължение на следващите векове. Това става още по-явно във Второто българско царство, което се ограничава до територията на Балканския полуостров и славянският елемент се редуцира силно. Това довежда и до постепенното отслабване на ползването му през Османската епоха.

Българският език се завръща в доста променена форма като книжовен език в края на XVIII и през първата половина на XIX в. в рамките на т.нар. национално формиране. Неговата поява като книжовен език, на който вече се пишат и научни текстове, е свързана с влиянието на Руската империя и руското образование на Балканите – в рамките на Османската империя.

Докато при началото на съвременното българско образование в средата на XIX в. теологичните съчинения са свързани с образователните институции на Вселенската патриаршия и гръцкият език, много скоро и особено след основаването на Българската екзархия през 1870 г. започват да се печатат богословски книги, в повечето случаи преведени от руски език. Влиянието на руското богословие става пов-

¹ Вж. М. Yovcheva, L. Taseva, “Translated Literature in the Bulgarian Middle Ages as a Social and Cultural Phenomenon”, *Scripta et e-Scripta* 10-11 (2012), 271-323.

² Вж. Ivan Christov, “The Creative Logos, the Nature of Things and their Uniqueness in the ‘Hexaemeron’ of Joannes Exarchus”, *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 24 (1996), 99.

семестно и поради факта, че много млади българи са поети финансово от руските власти да завършат духовно или светско образование в Русия още от средата на века.

Въпреки това учителите в новоосновените семинарии и голямата част от висшия клир остават възпитаници на Голямата християнска школа в Истанбул или на школата в Халки. Така онова, което предлагат като познание на своите възпитаници, не се различава базово от преподаваното в Халки например. Следващото поколение обаче църковници и теолози, поради изолацията от останалите православни школи заради положението на схизма след 1872 г., се ориентира към западни образователни институции и доста богослови и клирици завършват немски, австроунгарски и швейцарски университети. Това е и време на своеобразно разцъфване на академично богословие по западен образец. Особено влияние оказват школите в Швейцария, които, макар и оставащи деноминационни по характера на преподавания в тях материал, все пак запазват академична автономност по силата на специфичното швейцарско законодателство, което не допуска намеса на висшия клир в делата на академичните образователни институции, било те и деноминационни. Тази специфична система е изградена след последните вълнения и сблъсъци между католици и протестанти в средата на XIX в. По този начин държавата е смятала, че ще се преодолеят крайните радикалистски възгледи, промотирани понякога от калвинистки или католически висши проповедници и клирици.

Именно по образца на швейцарската система е основан през 1923 г. Богословският факултет на Софийския университет след дългогодишен натиск от страна на Синода на Екзархията върху няколко правителства. Тук работят забележителни учени в областта на библеистиката, църковната история и каноничното право. Известни имена като Александър Рождественски, Николай Глубоковски, Михаил Поснов са руски емигранти, а сред българите, завършили на Запад, са архимандрит Евтимий Сапунджиев, Иван Снегаров, Иван Марковски, Стефан Цанков и много други. Още от първите стъпки на академичната теология в България въпросът за творението става един от централните.

Първият автор, направил опит да развие богословие на творението, е библеистът, работещ най-вече в областта на библейската археология и старозаветната теология, Иван Марковски. Той е и първият българин

професор по Стар Завет и веднага след основаването на Богословския факултет издава първата си книга, посветена на библейския разказ за творението. В предговора той отбелязва, че е тласнат да публикува съчинение точно по този въпрос поради засиления интерес в българското общество към еволюционната теория и че всъщност *креационизмът* не се радва на одобрение от българската интелигенция³. Въпреки уговорката на автора, че не се занимава с апологетика или догматика, той всъщност поставя книгата си върху оста на разминаване между креационизъм и еволюционизъм⁴. Неговото намерение, казва той, е да постигне съгласие между Библията и науката на базата на последните постижения на археологията в Близкия изток и на откритията в сферата на съвременните природни науки.

Втората тема на Марковски в неговата книга е „историко-критическият метод“ на Friedrich Delitzsch и академичната школа на Julius Wellhausen⁵. Българският библеист критикува методологията на немските учени, но въпреки това се опитва да комбинира същата тази методология с традиционната визия за творението в библейския разказ от началото на книга Битие, като има предвид няколко нови по онова време открития в археологията на Близкия изток⁶. Въпреки тази декларация Марковски остава в рамките на методологията на историко-критическия метод в своя херменевтичен труд⁷. Трябва да отбележим, че той познава отлично постиженията на нем-

³ Иван Марковски, *Библейският разказ за сътворението (Бит. 1 до 2,3) и най-новите археологически и научни открития*, София 1924, 3. В преработен вид книгата е преиздадена през 1933 г. в София под заглавие „Произход и устройство на света според Библията и науката“.

⁴ Пак там, 6.

⁵ Пак там, 82-83 и сл. Същият проблем е разработен по-концентрирано екзегетически в студията му „Вавилонският мит за сътворението на вселената“ в *Годишник на Богословския факултет на СУ „Св. Климент Охридски“*, т. 26, 1948-1949, 1-27. Той критикува историкокритическия метод в екзегезата на този библейски разказ, която е силно зависима от митологията на Близкия изток. Според него прилики между двете има, но те са базирани на общия фолклор и подчертава, че не бива да се оттегля вниманието от факта, че библейският разказ за сътворението е боговдъхновен, а библейският мит е базиран на политеизма и пантеизма.

⁶ Иван Марковски, *цит. съч.*, 20-22.

⁷ Донякъде той е зависим от Fr. v. Hummelauer, *Der biblische Schöpfungsbericht*, 1877; Idem, *Nochmals der biblische Schöpfungsbericht*, 1898; J.H. Kurtz, *Bibel und Astronomie*, Berlin, 1892; B. Schäfer, *Bibel und Wissenschaft*, Münster, 1881; F. W. Schultz, *Die Schöpfungsberichte nach Naturwiss. und Bibel*, Gotha, 1865.

ската библеистика от края на XIX и началото на XX в., доколкото е немски възпитаник.

Много характерно за тази работа като цяло е липсата на патристична екзегеза, което води от своя страна до голяма дистанция от христологическата тема. Все пак една христологична перспектива в тълкуването на творението не би била силен аргумент в дискусиата в България по онова време. Не бива да забравяме, че в българското общество и предимно сред интелектуалците и учителите се разпространяват най-вече леви идеи – комунистически или националистически, носещи в сърцето си еволюционизма, и че по-известните интелектуалци са отрицателно настроени към креационизма като „вече неактуална теория, отречена от науката“. Въз основа на тази дискусия важни обществени движения се обявяват публично за изваждане на уроците по религия от училищата, като на няколко пъти успяват да го направят за известни периоди. Дори през 1929-1930 г. се прави предложение в Народното събрание да бъде закрит Богословският факултет или да бъде присъединен към Историческия. Съответно следват редица парламентарни прения.

От друга страна, позицията на Иван Марковски изглежда е поставена като потенциална основа за развитие на диалог с други монотеистични религии в страната – елемент от българското богословие, който никога не е влизал в погледа на нашата школа през XX в. Може да се предполага, че Марковски осъзнава нуждата от такъв диалог и като възпитаник на стара европейска школа с отворен и демократичен академичен характер той мисли сериозно в тази посока.

Подобна тенденция откриваме в трудовете на друг учен от онова време. Това е апологетът Борис Маринов – професор в Богословския факултет на Софийския университет. Той също е ангажиран с тогава модерните теории за възникването на света и подминава отдалеч въпроса за христологичната база на християнското разбиране за творението. Неговата книга е издадена в два тома, или две части⁸. Тя е

⁸ Борис Маринов, *Произходът на света и история на земята според науката и Библията*, София 1941; *Същият, Има ли противоречие между науката и Библията по въпроса за същията, произхода и развитието на живота?* София 1942. Първата книга, или част, е посветена на възникването на неживата природа, а втората – на живата, въпреки че той все пак не се съобразява напълно с тази схема, тъй като съчинението е насочено към широката публика.

съсредоточена върху дискусията в тогавашното българско общество относно обучението по религия в прогимназиите и гимназиите⁹.

Двете книги имат изключително апологетичен характер и предоставят широка палитра от сведения относно последните тогава научни постижения в областта на естествените науки, които не стоят в противоречие с библейската концепция за произхода на света. На основата на широките си енциклопедични познания Борис Маринов подкрепя твърдението, че е налице очевидно съгласие между наука и Библия в тази област. Той се опитва да докаже в съчинението си, че нито една сериозна научна теория за възникването на света не може да докаже някакво негово самовъзникване или евентуална вечност. От това твърдение той достига до извода, че никой не може да отрече съществуването на разумен първоизточник на Вселената¹⁰.

Във втория том Борис Маринов не отрича изцяло еволюционната теория, а се опитва да я съчетае с библейския креационизъм. Все пак той възприема, че еволюцията не е процес напълно изяснен от науката, за да бъде направено обективно и цялостно заключение¹¹.

Неговият основен аргумент е целесъобразността на функционирането на всички живи организми на земята¹². Практически по-голямата част от книгата е посветена на чисто научни въпроси, които дори не се докосват до богословски проблеми – тенденция, определена от средата, в която Маринов работи. Да не забравяме, че той е ангажиран с пътувания и публични беседи из страната с ученически християнски организации. Очевидно българското общество по онова време се вълнува от бързата си модернизация и научните постижения в областта на естествознанието вълнуват много повече младите хора от базовите въпроси на теологията. Също така в Европа се разпространяват неимоверно комунистическата и националсоциалистическата идея. И двете имат за своя основа еволюционизма. И двете не приемат актуалната човешка природа. Комунистите изграждат погрешна социология, целяща да я коригира, а националсоциалистите

⁹ Почти 10 години по-рано е публикувал два тома, в които се е докоснал до този проблем: *Лекции за християнски младежки братства в началното училище*, София: Синод. изд., 1933, 18-33; същият, *Лекции за християнски младежки братства в прогимназиите*, София: Синод. изд., 1934 и сл.

¹⁰ Борис Маринов, *Произходът на света...*, 59-60.

¹¹ Борис Маринов, *Има ли противоречие...*, 165.

¹² *Пак там*, 169-170 и сл.

– погрешна антропология, имаща същата цел. В тази среда Маринов е трябвало да работи изключително с данни от сферата на научното познание, за да разобличава тези заблуди, претендиращи за научност и изключителност.

Българското общество дори преди Втората световна война, преди съветската окупация (1944-1948), е особено секуларизирано. Трудовете на Борис Маринов и Иван Марковски са свидетелство за този процес. Така техните текстове се оказват дистанцирани от чисто богословските изследвания в православен контекст и представляват по-скоро апологетични опити, обърнати към широката обществено-ност. Това е и причината те да не са конкретно ангажирани с патристичната традиция и христологичната интерпретация на креационизма. Дори, като изключим предговорите на книгите, името на Иисус Христос липсва от изложението и на двете книги.

От друга страна, христологичната тематика стои в пряка връзка с въпроса за Вселенските събори. А темата за съборността не е удобна тема в българското богословие по време на схизмата в периода 1872-1945 г. Дори в онзи период символът на вярата е променен. За да не се говори за „една, света, *съборна* и апостолска църква“, в тогавашните издания на църковни книги в текста на символа на вярата се казва за „една, света, *вселенска* и апостолска църква“.

Въпреки просъветския режим и репресиите против Църквата след 1956 г. виждаме интересни развития в нашата сфера. Публикувани са няколко важни изследвания върху вселенските събори – което връща темата за съборността и поставя важен акцент върху христологията в българската академична теология¹³. Под влиянието

¹³ Вж. важните съчинения на Т. Коев: *Догматическите формулировки на седемте вселенски събора*, София, 2011; *Догматическите формулировки на първите четири Вселенски събори*, София, 1968; *Православен катехизис и Послание на източните патриарси*, София, 1991; *Въведение в Християнството* (заедно с Г. Бакалов), София, 1992; *Християнски наръчник* (заедно с Г. Бакалов), София, 2001; „Произход на Халкидонското вероопределение“, *Годишник на Духовната академия*, т. 21 (1971-1972), София, 1973; „Догматът за Пресветата Троицата“, *Годишник на Православния богословски факултет на Великотърновския университет*, т. 1 (1991-1992), Велико Търново, 1994; „Почитането на светите икони в контекста на Въплъщението“, *Духовна култура* 3 (1974); „Religiose Sprache und sakrale Symbole in der Gegenwartsgesellschaft Bulgariens“, *Kirchen im Kontext unterschiedlicher Kulturen. Auf dem Weg in das dritte Jahrtausend*, Gottingen, 1991; „Das romische Dokument über den Ausgang des Heiligen Geistes aus bulgarisch-orthodoxer Sicht“, *Pro Oriente*, Bd. XXII,

на тези нови развития между 60-те и 80-те години на XX в. се появяват и няколко текста в тази област на отец Николай Шиваров – професор в Софийската духовна академия (наследник на БгФ на СУ) по библейска археология. Неговата перспектива обаче е чисто екологична и актуално отразява развитията в икуменическия диалог през онази епоха¹⁴. Тази линия е продължена в изследванията на неговите наследници в областта на библеистиката в България през следващите десетилетия и представлява негов творчески принос към българската богословска наука¹⁵.

Друг изследовател, който работи в полето на теологията на творението през XX в. в България, е професорът по християнска философия Антони Хубанчев. Неговите текстове, посветени на темата, са публикувани най-вече през 70-те години на века и също са свързани с участието на БПЦ в икуменическото движение от края на 60-те години практически до самия край на XX в. Може да отбележим, че работите му са особено актуални в онзи период с иновативния си подход и взимането предвид на важни идеи от патристичната литература относно теологията на творението. Доста често той прибегва към авторитети като св. Йоан Дамаскин, св. Максим Исповедник, св. Атанасий Александрийски и св. Иринеи Лионски. Неговата перспектива е ярко христологично ориентирана, като не изоставя направеното в областта от Борис Маринов и Иван Марковски – той всъщност често се позовава на техните книги¹⁶.

Неговата базова теза, върху която развива всичките си текстове в областта, е, че светът е сътворен като добър по своята природа.

Tyrolia-Verlag, Innsbruck-Wien, 1998; „Auferstehung oder Auferweckung“, *Orthodoxe Theologie zwischen Ost und West*, Frankfurt am Main, 2002; „Преглед на дейността на Сардикийския събор“, в: *Симпозиум в чест на 60-годишнината на проф. Г. Бакалов*, София, 2003. Както и архим. Серафим Алексиев, „Съединението на двете природи в Христос според Православието и според Нехалкидонските църкви“, *Годишник на Духовната академия* 17 (1967-1968).

¹⁴ Вж. Н. Шиваров, Сл. Вълчанов, в: *Вечното в двата библейски завета*, Велико Търново, 1993. Това е сборник от статии, издавани през 70-те и 80-те год. на XX в.

¹⁵ Вж. Д. Попмаринов, „Професор протопр. Николай Шиваров“, в: Д. Попмаринов, *Международна конференция, посветена на проф. протопр. Николай Шиваров – 23-24 ноември, 2001*, Велико Търново 2005, 11-16.

¹⁶ Вж. последната му работа: А. Хубанчев, „Сътворение, телеологизъм, есхатологичен завършек. Есе върху програмата CERN, Женева“, *Духовна култура* 2 (2009), 15-21.

В него са вложени логосни начала, които представляват нещо като програма за развитие. Като функциониращ по този начин светът не може да приключи своето съществуване, унищожен от самия себе си, в ядрена война или разрушен по някакъв друг начин със средствата на науката. Хубанчев прокламира нуждата от нова екологична етика, построена върху базата на християнското разбиране за творението, като има предвид божествения призив към човечеството да следва творческата дейност на Бога – единствения извор на живота. Той отбелязва също, че тази нова екологична етика трябва да бъде есхатологично ориентирана, за да запази специфичното християнско тежжение към вечността. Нашето спасение, казва той, настоява върху преобразяването на света, който в настоящото си състояние е помрачен от човешките грехове. Човекът като съработник на Твореца и благодарение на преките си отношения с Него – с въплътеното Слово – е призован да твори¹⁷.

В заключение може да отбележим, че доколкото българското общество силно се секуларизира още от края на XIX в. и не вижда пряка нужда от духовно образование в училищата – дискусията се води непрестанно след освобождението до съветската окупация – темите на всички, които пишат „теология на творението“ практически до самия край на XX в., са апологетично ориентирани и имат повече визионерски характер в защита на библейската креационистка традиция. Важен втори тласък, въпреки ограниченията и репресиите на комунистическия режим, се оказва участието на БПЦ в икуменическото движение, което стимулира богословски опити в посока на теология на екологията и дискусии върху новите постижения за науката, но вече поставени извън опозицията еволюция–креационизъм.

¹⁷ Пак там, 18-19.

Pr. Nicușor Beldiman

PĂRINTELE PROFESOR MARIN C. IONESCU – ORATOR TALENTAT ȘI MISIONAR CONȘTIINCIOS

Abstract: *Fr. Prof. Marin C. Ionescu – a Talented Orator and Productive Missionary.* The present article represents the contributions of Fr. Marin C. Ionescu for the Orthodox Mission in Romania as well as his research achievements in Ecclesiastical Rhetoric and Homiletics. His works in this field were basic material for the education of the Romanian Orthodox Priests for a few decades after the WW 2.

Keywords: Orthodoxy in Romania, Homiletics, Ecclesiastical Education, Missionary

Preliminarii. De aproape două mii de ani de creștinism, cuvântul dă-tător de viață, predica sau omilia slujitorilor lui Hristos de pretutindeni a înviorat simțămintele ascultătorilor, le-a îmbogățit cunoștințele și le-a înălțat înțelegerea spre o mai profundă trăire liturgică. Conștienți de misiunea încredințată lor, preoții români, propovăduind învățătura lui Hristos timp de douăzeci de veacuri, au risipit îndoieli, prejudecăți și păcate, au semănat încredere și speranță și au determinat convertiri, reforme și renașteri spirituale. Aceștia rămân, pentru noi, modele și culmi neîntrecute, în ceea ce privește pasiunea lor pentru răspândirea Evangheliei, zelul predicatorial, ardoarea și arta predicării, pe care o remarcăm și astăzi în cuvântările lor scrise. În prima perioadă a secolului al XX-lea (1900-1945) s-au remarcat predicatori străluciți, teologi de mare erudiție și personalități de înaltă conștiință sub aspect misionar și patriotic, rostind cuvântări pline de învățătură teologică ortodoxă, de subtilități dogmatice și morale, acestea fiind oglinda frământărilor, convingerilor și trăirilor interioare religioase

ale lor. Unii dintre ei, conștienți de răspunderile pe care le aveau și înțelegând „semnele timpului”, au prevăzut pericolul comunismului-ateu și au presărat în predicile lor îndemnuri la păstrarea conștiinței național-ortodoxe, fapt pentru care au avut mai apoi de suferit felurite prigoane, inclusiv închisori, în care, o parte din ei, și-au dat obștescul sfârșit.

Dintre slujitorii de seamă ai Amvonului românesc, care s-au ostenit nu numai cu propovăduirea cuvântului pentru contemporani, ci și cu tipărirea lui pentru urmași, îl amintim pe *preotul dr. Marin Ionescu*¹, unul din cei mai activi predicatori ai Capitalei. Înzestrat cu un remarcabil talent oratoric, dar posedând și o temeinică pregătire teologică, dublată de cea laică, era unul din cei mai gustați vorbitori, mai ales prin verva și prin imaginile și comparațiile cu care știa să-și presare cuvântările și să captiveze auditoriul, încât, în duminicile și sărbătorile când predica, biserica era arhiplină. A desfășurat o bogată activitate misionară, atât la amvon, cât și la catedră ca profesor la mai multe școli din București, susținând impresionante conferințe și înălțătoare predici misionare. Din nefericire, toate aceste calități nu au convenit noului regim instaurat, părintele fiind deținut politic în închisorile comuniste de la Jilava, Poarta Albă, Ajud, Ocnele Mari. Pe lângă studii și cărți din domeniul predării Religiei, a publicat și câteva cărți de predici și studii omiletice: *Pentru luminarea ta, Nestorie! Predici rostite în cursul anului 1924 în biserica Sf. Ștefan Cuibu cu barză*²; *Predica misionară*³; *Inimă și suflet. Omiletica vremurilor noastre. Planuri și exerciții de predică*⁴; *Secerișul este mult, secerătorii puțini. Predici*⁵; *Chemări de departe. Predici la*

¹ Născut la 10 august 1891, în Deagurile, jud. Argeș. Studii la Seminarul „Central” (1904-1912), apoi la Facultatea de Teologie din București (1912-1916), unde obține titlul de doctor în anul 1925, cu teza – *Preotul și armonizarea claselor sociale*. Pedagog și spiritual la Seminarul „Central”, profesor de Religie la Școala Normală de fete „I. Oteteleşanu” (1921), la Liceul „Gh. Lazăr” (din 1926), apoi la Seminarul Pedagogic Universitar din București. Preot la biserica „Sfântul Ștefan – Cuibu cu barză” (1926-1951), apoi la parohia „Apărătorii Patriei” (1954-1965). Președinte al Asociației profesorilor de Religie din întreaga țară (până în anul 1948). Atrecut la cele veșnice în 27 iunie 1965, în București. Pe lângă studiile și cărțile cu caracter omiletic a mai scris: *Îndrumări privitoare la învățământul religios în școlile secundare*, București, 1922; *Biblia și educațiunea religioasă în biserici, în școli...*, București, 1922; *Inima e cârmaciul minții. Catehetica vremurilor noastre*, București, 1926; *Duh și viață. Studii modeste de psihologie și de educație religioasă a tineretului*, București, 1940; *Sectarismul, mare pericol social*, București, 1941.

² București, f.a.

³ București, f.a.

⁴ București, 1927.

⁵ București, 1927.

radio (în colaborare cu preoții Toma Chiricuță, Gh. Comana și Manea Popescu)⁶; *Lumină lină. Doamne, Tu ai cuvintele vieții veșnice. Material omiletic și catehetic*⁷; *Catedra și Amvonul. Schițe de lecțiuni practice, de predici și conferințe religioase*⁸.

Dintre acestea, ne rețin atenția următoarele **volume de predici**:

Secerișul este mult și secerători puțini⁹

Titlul, constând dintr-un verset biblic – Luca 10, 2 – , ne duce cu gândul la trimiterea Sfinților Apostoli la propovăduire, în fiecare cetate și loc, misiune care ar trebui să constituie scopul suprem al fiecărui preot din zilele noastre. Autorul, puternic marcat de nedreptățile suferite de reprezentanții Bisericii în vremea sistemului comunist, când „nici tipăriturile, nici activitatea științifică și nici haina clericală nu ne mai poate pune la adăpostul legilor și regulamentelor învățământului nostru teologic superior”¹⁰, declară cuprins de durere sufletească: „Nimeni nu citește prefața unei lucrări! Cu toate acestea ne simțim siliți să așternem aici anumite mărturisiri sincere, care pe cât sunt de adevărate, pe atât sunt de triste! Tipărim această colecție de predici rostite în biserica Sf. Ștefan „Cuibu cu barză”, nu cu gândul de a adăuga încă o lucrare la cele tipărite până acum, ca tot atâtea drepturi legitime, care ne-ar îndreptăți să ne prezentăm cu fruntea sus la examenele de docență și agregatie pentru catedra de catehetică și omiletică de la Facultatea de Teologie din București... Râvna pentru lucrul mântuirii sufletelor ne-a încălzit inima și ne-a determinat să dăm la lumina tiparului acest volum de predici și cuvântări”¹¹.

Cele 29 de predici – 3 omilii exegetice, 20 predici tematice, 4 panegirice și 2 pareneze – cuprinse în volumul de față, conțin un fond tematic moral bogat, temele fiind argumentate într-o expunere firească și accesibilă, având ca suport textele din Sfânta Scriptură și citatele din Sfinții Părinți. Iată câteva titluri de predici: *Smochinul neroditor*, *Despre răbdare*, *Castitate și caritate*, *Nu opriți simbria lucrătorilor*, *Rostul social creștin al femeii*. Inegale ca dimensiune, cuvântările se întind adesea pe mai mult de 20 de

⁶ București, 1929.

⁷ București, 1938.

⁸ București, 1942.

⁹ București, 1927, 301.

¹⁰ Pr. Marin Ionescu, „În loc de Prefață!”, in: *Secerișul este mult și secerători puțini*, vol. II, Tipografia Națională Jean Ionescu & Co. 1, București, 1927, 6.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, 5.

pagini, demonstrând înzestrarea autorului cu ușurința de a vorbi, care se risipește, nu de puține ori, într-o locvacitate ieftină¹².

Structura predicilor. Se remarcă o predilecție a autorului către utilizarea digresiunilor, întrucât pildele și istorioarele abundă în omiliile sale, la fel și adresarea directă către ascultători, autorul mizând pe stabilirea unei legături afective cu aceștia, urmărind înțelegerea de către credincioși a mesajului transmis. Se observă, de asemenea, bogăția întrebărilor retorice, ele având drept scop trezirea enoriașilor din starea de nepăsare cu privire la viața lor sufletească. Iată cum, în predica intitulată *Lăsați copiii să vină la Mine*, preotul Marin C. Ionescu se folosește de următoarea istorisire – printre alte câteva – , ilustrând sfințenia copiilor și nevinovăția lor: „Un mare bogătaş avea un copil evlavios la care ținea ca la ochii lui din cap. Copilul crescuse și sporise atât de mult în duhul evanghelic, încât vedea totul în jurul lui numai prin lumina evangheliei. Ziua întreagă nu vorbea decât despre păcat și avea o spaimă mare față de satana, scuturându-se cumplit ori de câte ori era silit să-i rostească numele. Faptul acesta îl nedumerea pe tatăl care într-una din zile nu se mai putu stăpâni și zise: „Copilul meu, spune-mi, te rog, ce te face să te neliniștești atât de păcat și de diavol?”... „Iată de ce, iubite tată”, zise grăbit copilul. „Așa e că ție îți place mult vânatoarea de păsări sălbatice?! Așa e că ori de câte ori tragi foc asupra unui cârd de rațe sălbatice, le lași pe cele ucise și alergi cu sete și cu ciudă mare după cele ce s-au ales numai cu o rană oarecare? De cele ucise nu te mai îngrijești, căci ești sigur de ele. Tot ceea ce te frământă și te tulbură pe tine nu este oare dorul neînfrânat de a le prinde pe cele rănite?”. „Adevărat este”, zise tatăl. „Ei bine, iubite tată” zise din nou copilul, „tot așa este și cu Satana. Lui îi place grozav de mult vânatoarea de suflete. Sufletul tău este demult ucis de diavol; iar sufletul meu este abia rănit. Diavolul nu mai aleargă după sufletul tău, care zace ucis la picioarele lui, fiind sigur de el; în schimb, însă, aleargă cu multă ciudă după sufletul meu rănit”...”¹³. După expunerea istorisirii, predicatorul trage imediat învățături din ea, folosind întrebări retorice precum: „Ascultătorule! Nu cumva și tu stai nepăsător la picioarele satanei?! Nu cumva și pe tine te nedumeresc copiii nevinovați care fug de ochii vicleni ai diavolului?! Ești tu ucis, sau numai rănit de uneltele veninoase ale

¹² Pr. Ion L. Băjău, *Omiletică generală...*, 343.

¹³ Pr. Marin Ionescu, „Lăsați copiii să vină la Mine”, in: *Secerișul este mult și secerători puțini...*, 12-13.

duhului satanic?! Vei avea oare puterea să te împotrivești cu îndărătnicie duhului viclean?!¹⁴.

În structura cuvântărilor sale, alături de formula unică de adresare – *Fraților!*, deosebim trei părți constitutive: *introducerea*, anunțând de regulă tema dezbătută ulterior, de cele mai multe ori printr-o povestire cu temă morală, cum se întâmplă, de pildă, în predica intitulată sugestiv *Grăunțele de grâu și neghinele!*: „Munca câmpului moralizează viața ostenitorilor ei. Numai cu ochii spre ceruri, agricultorul nostru își desfășoară munca lui sânguitoare. Plugarul are totdeauna cerul în suflet și sufletul în cer. Nicio dată nu-și întoarce privirile înapoi și nu-și îndoaie nădejdea lui evalvioasă îndreptată pururea înaintea pașilor lui mișcați după puterea și după măsura credinței lui în Dumnezeu”¹⁵ sau în predica purtând titlul *Mironosițele*: „Nimic nu e mai înspăimântător decât ceasul morții. Moartea sapă un hotar prăpăstios, peste care nu pot trece simțurile omenești. Cât s-a ostenit omul să afle ce este dincolo de mormânt și toate ostenelile lui au rămas zadarnice! Multe taine a dezlegat mintea omenească prin firea ei născocitoare; însă numai zăvorul morții a încredințat-o despre propria ei neputință... Răspunsul cel adevărat căutat de mintea bietului muritor l-au găsit aceste trei femei mironosițe sub piatra de pe mormântul Domnului și sună astfel: „Hristos a înviat! Nu este aici, ci mergeți de spuneți ucenicilor lui și lui Petru că va merge mai înainte de voi în Galileea” (Marcu 26, 1-9)”¹⁶.

În *tratare*, autorul dezvoltă tema anunțată în *introducere*, discutând pe larg semnificațiile scripturistice ale întâmplărilor descrise și a cuvintelor rostite de către Mântuitorul Hristos. La fiecare pas întâlnim presărate istorioare ce tâlcuiesc textul evanghelic și sporesc atenția ascultătorilor: „O altă însușire sufletească a femeilor mironosițe, prin ajutorul cărora izbutesc să grăbească găsirea răspunsului celui mare, este hărnicia lor în cele ale credinței. Ele nu-și pierdeau vremea cu nimicurile pământești, ci zoreau pe drumul răspunsurilor sufletești. Timpul se scurge cu multă ușurință și mulți muritori și-l petrec în nelucrare. Fiecare dintre noi are un ceas de buzunar și se uită deseori să vadă cum orele se scurg și cu toate acestea pierde vremea și nu merge grăbit la datoria lui. Unul are ceasornic de aur, altul are de argint, altul de nichel sau alt metal, și cu toate acestea orice muritor are ceasuri de aur: ceasurile pierdute în trândăvie. Nicio pagubă nu se poate măsura cu pagubele sufletești pricinuite de vremea trăită în moleșală și

¹⁴ *Ibidem*.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, *Grăunțele de grâu și neghinele!*, 33.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, *Mironosițele*, 83-84.

în nelucrare. „Răscumpărați-vă vremea, căci zilele grele sunt”. Osteniți-vă neîncetat cu cele sufletești! Nu pierdeți vremea, căci vă împiedicați singuri în drumurile vieții voastre”¹⁷.

Încheierea se prezintă, cel mai adesea, sub forma unui îndemn părintesc spre fapte bune și desăvârșire spirituală, cum vedem, de pildă, în finalul predicii *Mironosițele*, pe care am folosit-o spre exemplificare: „Și tu ai pe sufletul tău, care-ți înăbușă plăpânda ta fință: este inima ta împietrită de duhul necredinței. Apropie-te cu sfială de mormântul gol al Domnului și sufletul tău deșert se va umple de duhul evlaviei. Fii tu pururea cu candelă sufletului tău aprinsă și așteaptă cu răbdare venirea Domnului pe norii cerurilor. Asemănă-te fecioarelor înțelepte care au în orice clipă candelile pline cu untdelemn și mergi întruna pe urma neobositelor mironosițe și nu uita că drumul Golgotei nu e drumul morții, ci drumul vieții! Amin!”¹⁸ sau în predica *Bănuții Văduvei*, care se încheie astfel: „Dați cu inimă curată și cu dragoste spre aproapele ca să vă întăriți în dragoste către Dumnezeu și ca dragostea voastră să nu fie mincinoasă, căci cine are bogățiile lumii acesteia, vede pe fratele său în nevoie și își închide inima față de el, cum rămâne în el dragostea de Dumnezeu? Fiii mei! Să nu iubim cu vorba, nici cu limba, ci cu fapta și cu adevărul (I Ioan 3, 17, 28). Dați cu bucurie, „căci cine dă cu bucurie îl iubește Dumnezeu” (II Corinteni 9, 7)”¹⁹.

Părintele Ionescu se remarcă printr-o înflăcărată dorință de apărare a Bisericii Ortodoxe, fapt vizibil în predica intitulată *Romano-Catholicism, Protestantism și Ortodoxism*, unde se străduiește din răspuțeri să înrădăcească în sufletul credincioșilor dreapta credință: „De la o vreme se accentuează la noi mai mult ca oricând tendințe de oscilare sufletească, care ne fac să ne înclinăm periodic când într-o parte, când într-alta, părăsind concepțiile de viață creștinească ale ortodoxismului nostru secular! Nu rareori se observă că mulți dintre ai noștri respiră aerul catholicismului papist în vreme ce alții destul de numeroși plutesc în norii mistici ai pietismului protestant și sectant!”²⁰. În încheiere, adaugă: „Nu vrem monarhismul religios, imperialismul geografic și cultul imperial al Romano Catholicilor și nici anarhismul dogmatic și latreutic al Protestanților de toate nuanțele, ci mesianismul veșnic înfrățit cu federalismul vremelnic reprezentat și urmărit

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, 85.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, 90.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, *Bănuții Văduvei*, 150-151.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, *Romano-Catholicism, Protestantism și Ortodoxism*, 105.

de ortodoxismul nostru strămoșesc!”²¹ Ba mai mult, în predica misionară *Înfruntare publică pentru adventiști*, părintele combate cu severitate această orientare, grăind următoarele: „Adventismul este o monstruoasă excrescență socială. Ea nu este nici mai mult nici mai puțin decât un mosism deghizat, lăsându-se a fi purtat pe aripile acelui nesăbuit vis de a cuceri și de a stăpâni întreaga față a globului pământesc”²².

Prin redarea unor cântecele specific românești sau oferirea informațiilor despre muzicieni clasici, ca de pildă Beethoven, predicatorul încântă și menține viu interesul ascultătorului până la sfârșit. Unele predici sunt puțin cam lungi, ajungând la douăzeci de pagini, însă, folosind tehnica dialogului cu auditoriul său, autorul comunică direct cu acesta și transmite cu și mai multă forță învățăturile morale. Opinăm că limbajul predicilor este unul învechit, unde termenii necesită a fi actualizați: „morței”, „mireazmă”, „mănuchi”, „acestea”, „ca de obicei”.

Chemări de departe. Predici la radio²³

Acest volum de predici reunește 20 de cuvântări orânduite în două părți. Prima parte cuprinde 8 predici referitoare la explicarea rugăciunii *Tatăl nostru*, așezate în ordinea celor șapte cereri din *Rugăciunea Domnească*, iar cea de-a doua parte conține 12 cuvântări grupate sub denumirea de *Alte predici*. Cinci dintre predicile acestui volum, au drept autor pe părintele Toma Chiricuță (*Despre rugăciune; Facă-se voia Ta, precum în ceruri așa și pe pământ; Inima ta; Adevărata pace; Veniți la Cină*). Patru predici aparțin părintelui dr. Marin C. Ionescu (*Tatăl nostru carele ești în ceruri; Pâinea noastră cea de toate zilele dăne-o nouă astăzi; Rugăciunea și Sfânta Cruce*). Părintele Marian Comana semnează ca autor a cinci predici: *Sfințească-se numele Tău; Și ne iartă nouă greșalele noastre; Lumina cea de sus; Pentru tineret, precum și Din scăderile vremii noastre*. Nu în ultimul rând, cel de-al patrulea autor al acestei sinteze omiletice este părintele Manea S. Popescu. Pe lângă cuvântul de început semnat de acesta, prin care se deschide volumul, alte cinci predici întregesc conținutul acestei lucrări: *Vie împărăția Ta; Și nu ne duce în ispită; Fiul risipitor; Buna Vestire și De la îndoială la credință*.

²¹ *Ibidem*, 114.

²² *Ibidem*, *Înfruntare publică pentru adventiști*, 206.

²³ Editura Librăriei Pavel Suru, București, 1929, 230.

Această colecție de predici reprezintă un omagiu de recunoștință, devotament și admirație adus de către cei patru autori, patriarhului Miron Cristea, cu prilejul împlinirii a 10 ani de păstorire în această demnitate. Pentru a accentua acest lucru, părintele Manea S. Popescu provoacă cititorul cu un studiu introductiv pe baza conținutului, formei și stilului predicilor Patriarhului Miron²⁴.

Tematica cuvântărilor din volumul prezentat tratează teme de actualitate teologică profunde. Astfel, în două predici se vorbește despre *rugăciune*²⁵; *iertarea* este tratată de pr. Gh. Comana în predica *Și ne iartă nouă greșalele noastre*²⁶. Înțelesul *minunilor* este lămurit în cuvântarea *Pentru tineret*²⁷ a autorului de mai sus. *Despre Sfânta Cruce*, vorbește părintele Marin C. Ionescu²⁸, în timp ce părintele Manea S. Popescu alege să trateze importanța *credinței* în predica *De la îndoială la credință*²⁹.

În ceea ce privește materialul utilizat, predicatorii reuniți în acest volum folosesc cu preponderență Sfânta Scriptură, întărită și explicată de unii Sfinți Părinți ai Bisericii. Argumentarea scripturistică este nelipsită, mai ales că predicile sunt inspirate din pericopele evanghelice duminicale sau de anumite versete din predica de pe munte (în cazul predicilor ce explică rugăciunea *Tatăl nostru*). În ceea ce privește argumentarea patristică a discursului omiletic, aceasta este prezentă sporadic. Astfel, când se vorbește despre cea mai puternică rugăciune, ca fiind Rugăciunea Domnească, se reliefează argumentul Sfântului Ciprian: „printr-însa nu numai că ne rugăm în numele lui Iisus, dar chiar cu înseși cuvintele lui”³⁰, ea fiind „cea mai deschisă și cea mai obștească dintre rugăciuni”³¹. Tot în acest sens este utilizat și exemplul Sfântului Ioan Gură de Aur, această rugăciune fiind „sâmburele tuturor rugăciunilor particulare și publice”³². Când se vorbește despre rugăciune în general, se întăresc ideile expuse prin cuvintele Sfântului Ioan Damaschin „singurătatea este mama rugăciunii”³³.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, 7-28.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, 29-36 și 109-116.

²⁶ *Ibidem*, 83-92.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, 153-166.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, 195-204.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, 219-227.

³⁰ Pr. dr. Marin C. Ionescu, „Tatăl nostru, carele ești în ceruri”, in: *Chemări de departe. Predici la Radio*, Editura Librăriei Pavel Suru, București, 1929, 38.

³¹ *Ibidem*, 41.

³² *Ibidem*, 38.

³³ *Ibidem*, *Rugăciunea*, 113.

Structura predicilor. Predicile ce alcătuiesc acest volum sunt structurate în general după schema clasică, lipsind din aceasta *motto-ul* introductiv la 19 din cele 20 de cuvântări. *Formula de adresare* utilizată este adaptată spațiului în care au fost rostite predicile (la radio), de aceea, autorii s-au oprit la următoarele adresări: *Iubitul meu frate nevăzut!*, *Iubi-te frate!*, *Fraților!*, *Iubitul meu!*, *Iubitul meu ascultător necunoscut!*, *Iubiți frați!*, *Frați creștini!*, *Evlavioși creștini!*, în celelalte cuvântări, toate aceste formule având rolul de a pregăti ascultătorul, de a-l apropia la nivel spiritual. Se observă din acestea căldura sufletească și dragostea manifestată de predicatori, precum și dorința ca mesajul omiletic să ajungă în inimile și sufletele credincioșilor ascultători.

De cele mai multe ori, după formula de adresare, în predicile exegetice urmează redarea integrală sau parțială a textului scripturistic și uneori chiar povestirea efectivă a acestuia. Uneori *începutul* este foarte scurt, intrându-se direct, fără o laborioasă pregătire în tema aleasă: „azi vreau să vorbesc cu tine despre rugăciune”³⁴. Alteori se începe printr-o întrebare retorică: „Ai tu convingerea că trăiești în timpul de față în împărăția lui Dumnezeu”³⁵. În unele cuvântări, pentru a observa continuitatea ideilor de la o predică la alta și rațiunea rostirii lor, se realizează o legătură cu cele rostite înainte: „așadar, iubitul meu, tu ai descoperit că ai un Tată. Este Tatăl cel minunat...”³⁶. Introducerea în unele predici este lungă, utilizându-se uneori exemple ample pentru a ajunge la subiectul dorit: „ce frumos lucru este o pajiște înflorită! Dar dacă lumea trece mereu peste ea cu privirea, se obișnuiește, iar dacă o calcă se tocește și frumusețea ei nu mai înviorează sufletul. Ce lucru nou am putea spune tălmăcind cuvintele Domnului despre iertare?”³⁷.

Brusc este realizată introducerea temei despre ispită: „Cu această cerere se încheie rugăciunea domnească”³⁸, la fel și cea despre inima omului: „inima este rădăcina din care crește puternic arborele umanității”³⁹, sau în cea despre rugăciune: „rugăciunea este în religiune ceea ce este cugetarea

³⁴ Pr. Toma „Chiricuță, Despre rugăciune”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 29.

³⁵ Pr. Manea S. Popescu, „Vie împărăția Ta”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 58.

³⁶ Pr. Toma Chiricuță, „Facă-se voia Ta, precum în ceruri așa și pe pământ”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 65.

³⁷ Pr. Gh. Comana, „Și ne iartă nouă greșelele”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 83.

³⁸ Pr. Manea S. Popescu, „Și nu ne duce în ispită”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 93.

³⁹ Pr. Toma Chiricuță, Inima Ta, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 104.

în filozofie”⁴⁰. Uneori, unele predici se deschid cu ajutorul unor digresiuni pregătitoare: „știți ce este un scafandru? Este un om îmbrăcat într-un costum special, el se scufundă în adâncul mărilor fie pentru a culege bogățiile ei, fie pentru a cerceta fundul apelor. Se coboară în apă legat cu o frânghie... printr-un tub i se trimite aer... Este o mare asemănare între coborârea omului în apele păcatelor și coborârea scafandrierului în apele mărilor...”⁴¹. Alteori se realizează un dialog imaginar cu credincioșii pentru a sublinia importanța actului omiletic: „ori de câte ori mă urc aici pe acest amvon și mă uit la adunarea voastră îmi pun o întrebare: pentru ce voi veniți aici cu atâta statornicie?... sunt oare vrednic pentru o slujire atât de înaltă?”⁴².

Tratarea reprezintă punctul cel mai dezvoltat al predicilor din acest volum. Când se vorbește despre importanța rugăciunii se afirmă că „omul își descoperă Dumnezeu numai în măsura în care se roagă lui”⁴³, aceasta fiind „întoarcerea către Domnul, privirea către El, o așteptare, un strigăt...”⁴⁴. Când trece la explicarea rugăciunii *Tatăl nostru* subliniază interpretarea specială a primelor cuvinte: „cuvântul Tată reprezintă iubirea de Dumnezeu... cuvântul *nostru* înseamnă iubirea aproapelui”⁴⁵. Sunt enumerate trei motive pentru ca noi, oamenii, să-L numim pe Dumnezeu, Tată: „Ne-a creat, ne-a dat viața nouă prin Botez și fiindcă ne-a făgăduit viața veșnică în ceruri”⁴⁶. Pentru a sublinia transpunerea cunoștințelor în faptă și astfel a dobândi sfințenia lui Dumnezeu se precizează că „în toată propovăduirea noastră trebuie să urmărim numai preaslăvirea lui Dumnezeu în vorbă și în faptă... sfințenia Lui vădindu-se în faptele noastre”⁴⁷. Despre stilul vieții omului credincios se reliefează următoarea remarcă: „cine nu va începe a trăi această viață pământească ca un cetățean al împărăției lui Dumnezeu, nu se va împărtăși nici după moarte de bunurile și de binecuvântările ei”⁴⁸.

Cuvântul *pâine* din rugăciunea domnească are mai multe accepțiuni: „ideea de hrană și îmbrăcăminte, mulțumirea datorată lui Dumnezeu, este

⁴⁰ Pr. Marin C. Ionescu, „Rugăciunea”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 109.

⁴¹ Pr. Manea S. Popescu, „Fiul risipitor”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 127-128.

⁴² Pr. Toma Chiricuță, Veniți la Cină, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 179.

⁴³ Idem, „Despre rugăciune”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 33.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, 34-35.

⁴⁵ Pr. Marin C. Ionescu, „Tatăl nostru, carele ești în ceruri”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 42.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁷ Pr. Gh. Comana, „Sfîntească-se numele Tău”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 51.

⁴⁸ Pr. Manea S. Popescu, „Vie împărăția Ta”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 60.

darul lui Dumnezeu față de noi, fiind și o datorie a milosteniei obștești⁴⁹, de aici rezultând faptul că rugăciunea trebuie împlinită zilnic, fiind hrana vieții spirituale. Iertarea este privită ca având trei valențe: „graiurile Evangheliilor, pilduirea sfinților și propovăduirea slujitorilor Bisericii”⁵⁰. Ispita diavolească este văzută ca fiind „un minunat mijloc de cercetare personală și de cercetare a forțelor spirituale”⁵¹. Rugăciunea este tratată ca fiind „esența cea mai tainică a religiunii”⁵², precum și „plămânul vieții religioase”⁵³. Când se vorbește despre înțelesul minunilor, acestea sunt definite ca fiind „o realitate a unei lumi spirituale, ceva ce dovedește cu prisosință bunătatea lui Dumnezeu”⁵⁴, acest lucru fiind în Sfânta Evanghelie „ceva obișnuit”⁵⁵, ea neconstituind „un scop, ci un mijloc”⁵⁶, scopul fiind înțeles drept mântuirea, iar mijlocul este învederarea lucrării lui Dumnezeu în lume. Pacea este privită ca „armonia cu universul”⁵⁷, aceasta reprezentând temelia adevăratei fericiri omenești. Salcia, de asemenea, este simbolul păcii lui Dumnezeu, dar și al „nădejzii mlădițelor cuvântului lui Dumnezeu”⁵⁸.

O temă destul de interesant tratată este cea a dansurilor cu ocazia nunților, a botezurilor sau a diverselor baluri caritabile care nu trebuie să se desfășoare într-o atmosferă imorală, nedemnă pentru un creștin adevărat, iar pentru a diferenția o acțiune morală de alta imorală, ni se oferă următorul principiu de urmat: „o acțiune este morală numai când scopul este moral”⁵⁹. Cât privește credința, aceasta este definită ca fiind „dispoziția curată și sinceră a inimii de a primi dovezile descoperite de Dumnezeu”⁶⁰. Înaintea lui Dumnezeu, uneori, îndoiala este îngăduită, precum și necredința, dar o înțelenire permanentă în acestea rupe orice legătură cu dumnezeirea:

⁴⁹ Pr. dr. Marin C. Ionescu, „Pâinea noastră cea de toate zilele dăne-o nouă astăzi”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 81.

⁵⁰ Pr. Gh. Comana, „Și ne iartă nouă greșelele”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 84.

⁵¹ Pr. Manea S. Popescu, „Și nu ne duce în ispită”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 98.

⁵² Pr. Marin C. Ionescu, „Rugăciunea”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 109.

⁵³ *Ibidem*, 110.

⁵⁴ Pr. Gh. Comana, „Lumina cea de sus”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 118.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, Pentru tineret, 154.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁷ Pr. Toma Chiricuță, „Adevărata pace”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 142.

⁵⁸ Pr. dr. Marin C. Ionescu, „Osana! Fiul lui David”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 149.

⁵⁹ Pr. Gh. Comana, „Din scăderile vremii noastre”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 215.

⁶⁰ Pr. Manea S. Popescu, „De la îndoială la credință”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 221.

„Dumnezeu nu osândește îndoiala nici necredința, osândește doar rămânerea încăpățânată în necredință”⁶¹.

În cele mai multe cazuri predicile acestui volum *se încheie* cu îndemnul la o aplicare practică a învățăturilor discutate, la o transpunere practică în viața creștină: „tu îndreaptă-te pe tine și pentru acesta cere iertare și iartă și tu pe aproapele tău”⁶² sau: „ce fericit aș fi dacă cuvântul lui Dumnezeu și-ar găsi loc în sufletul tău, frate drag...”⁶³. Pe de altă parte, încheierea este realizată prin rostirea unor rugăciuni pe baza textului evanghelic explicat sau a temei tratate: „Să ne rugăm Tatălui ceresc ca și pre noi să ne învrednicească de harul lui mântuitor, pentru ca întemeiați pe el, să nu mai privim la socotelile și judecățile noastre omenești, ci credincioși bunei vestiri adusă de înger, să ne nevoim a intra în împărăția cea veșnică”⁶⁴.

Remarci conclusive. O primă trăsătură caracteristică a acestor predici reunite în volumul prezentat este aceea a transpunerii acestora sub forma literară din forma auditivă inițială. Oralitatea stilului dezvăluie acest lucru. Dacă temele tratate în această carte nu prezintă o noutate pentru domeniul omiletic, abordarea și interpretarea acestora este deosebită, adaptată ascultătorilor, caracterizată de dorința de a se adresa cât mai multor categorii de vârstă. În ceea ce privește ineditul predicilor, exemplificăm următoarele explicații ce redau fidel gândurile în această privință. Definiția omului ca persoană este memorabilă: „omul este un fragment din univers care gândește”⁶⁵. De asemenea, interpretarea simbolurilor din pilda fiului risipitor este deosebită: „sărutarea reprezintă nădejdea, veșmântul nou primit este curăția și nevinovăția sufletească, inelul înseamnă neîntrerupta legătură cu Dumnezeu, iar încălțăminte credința ce te apără de ghimpii ispitelor, masa încărcată este masa Euharistică... toate acestea fiind semne ale iubirii Tatălui...”⁶⁶.

În ceea ce privește manifestarea credinței nu numai la o vârstă înaintată, ci chiar din tinerețe, este remarcabilă afirmația: „religia este bună pentru cei bătrâni dar ea cu anevoie se prinde de sufletul celui bătrân dacă nu a fost credincios în tinerețe. S-or fi altoind și pomi bătrâni, dar ce roade mai poți

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, 224.

⁶² Pr. Gh. Comana, „Și ne iartă nouă greșelele”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 92.

⁶³ Pr. Manea S. Popescu, „Și nu ne duce în ispită”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 99.

⁶⁴ Pr. Manea S. Popescu, „Buna vestire”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 177.

⁶⁵ Pr. Toma Chiricuță, „Facă-se voia Ta, precum în ceruri așa și pe pământ”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 67.

⁶⁶ Pr. Manea S. Popescu, „Fiul risipitor”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 135.

aștepta de la ei...”⁶⁷. Nu în ultimul rând, un exemplu grăitor al predicilor din acest volum este cel al curajului arătat în fața sistemului politic care, după cum bine se știe, monitoriza cu strictețe orice cuvântare sau predică din Biserică. De notat este în acest sens expresia utilizată cu prilejul predicii ce avea ca punct de plecare pilda celor poftiți la cină, când se ajunge la concluzia că unii oameni sunt ipocriți și în zilele noastre: **„există și oameni (farisei și cărturari) care-L urmăreau pe Domnul pentru a-L spiona... poate sunt și pe aici astfel de oameni...”**⁶⁸. O ultimă trăsătură caracteristică și totodată originală a acestei cărți este ușurința cu care predicile pot fi parcurse, dar aceasta nu înseamnă că învățăturile ce le cuprind sunt ușor de remarcat. O lectură atentă este necesară pentru înțelegerea subtilităților și bogățiilor omiletice transpuse în această colecție.

⁶⁷ Pr. Gh. Comana, „Pentru tineret”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 158.

⁶⁸ Pr. Toma Chiricuță, „Veniți la Cină”, in: *Chemări de departe...*, 184.

Георги Чочев

УЧЕНИЕТО ЗА ДЕВСТВОТО У СВ. ГРИГОРИЙ НИСИЙСКИ

Abstract: *St. Gregory of Nyssa on the Virginity.* The article examines the basic ideas of the virginity in the works of Gregory of Nyssa. It affirms a close connection between these ideas and his Christological views which is the key to a complete understanding of his theology.

Keywords: St. Gregory of Nyssa, Chastity, Christology, Byzantine Theology, Patristics

В исторически аспект отношението на човечеството към интимността между половете е твърде разнообразно. Основната причина за това е постоянната лукава измама на демоничните сили, водеща до маловерие и сериозна деформация в ценностната система на човечеството. Горчивият плод на тази измама е поставяне на временното физическо преживяване над духовните трепети и пренебрегване на мястото на девството в естествения живот на човека. Тази историческа реалност поставя пред православния богослов задачата за един ретроспективен, но и съвременен прочит на християнското разбиране за девството, в което се разкрива неговата ценност.

Времето между II и IV в. е един от най-трудните периоди в историята на Църквата, но и най-благодатен в богословско отношение. Тогава се изясняват и догматизират редица християнски верови истини, но се изясняват и много нравствени въпроси. Сред последните попада и християнското отношение към брака и девството. В творчеството си редица църковни отци съумяват да избегнат противопоставянето им. „Равночестието между брак и безбрачие дава основание на църковните отци да защитят девството и да изтъкнат неговата висока

нравствена стойност пред еретиците.¹ За тях както животът в брак, така и този в девство са еднаква основа за постигане на спасение. Св. Йоан Златоуст например „в цялото си творчество поставя наравно в домостроителството на спасението както брака, така и безбрачието в девство.“²

В периода II–IV в. са написани едни от най-значимите съчинения за девството. Особено популярни сред тях са творенията от отци като св. Методи Олимпийски³, св. Григорий Назиански⁴, св. Григорий Нисийски⁵, св. Йоан Златоуст⁶.

Особено място на тази тема отделя св. Григорий Нисийски, който ѝ посвещава своето първо съчинение и я доразвива в по-късното си творчество⁷. Неизменна част от антропологическите му разсъждения е тясно свързана с неговия възглед за девството. Той не го разглежда само в нравствен аспект, а се фокусира и върху неговото същностно значение, като по този начин му придава есхатологична перспектива. В съчиненията си св. Григорий често използва като синоними на девство следните термини: чистота (καθαρότης), нетленност, безсмъртие (ἀφθαρσία), безстрастие (ἀπάθεια). Последното понятие най-често се употребява като синоним на девство в съчиненията му. Този израз в богословието е заимстван от стоическата философия, където безстрастието се разглежда във връзка със свободата (ἐλευθερία). Св. Григорий влага в него смисъл на средство, чрез което би могло да се възстанови духовното девство и се преодолява човешката телесност. Безстрастието е и Христов дар, чрез който човек се уподобява на ангелската природа. Използвайки горните термини като синоними на девство, той издига православното богословие на нивото на античната философска мисъл: „Тълкуването на християнството в гръцките понятия и категории, извършено от отците кападокийци, предста-

¹ Л. Тенекеджиев, *Тайнството Брак*, София: Добротолюбие, 2008, 133.

² Л. Тенекеджиев, „Девство и целомъдрие“, в: Людмила Зидарова и др., *Българската православна Църква Традиции и Настояще*, София: Гутенберг, 2009, 126.

³ *Convivium decem virginum* (PG 18, 27-229).

⁴ *Laudem virginitatis* (PG 37, 522 -578).

⁵ *De virginitate* (PG 46, 578-631).

⁶ *De virginitate* (PG 46, 318-415).

⁷ *De vita Moysis* (PG 44, 279-429); *Vita s. Macrinae* (PG 46, 960-1000); *In sextum Psalmum* (PG 44, 608-616); *In Canticum Canticorum, homiliae 5, 44* (PG 44, 755-1119).

вява един действителен културен синтез, бележещ нов етап в развитието на Църквата“⁸.

За св. Григорий девството е нормално състояние на човешкото битие. То е вложено от Твореца при създаването на човека. Тази мисъл по-късно доразвива св. Йоан Дамаскин, който казва: „Уповавайки се на въплътения чрез Девата Бог Слово, ние казваме, че девството е било посадено свише и изначално в природата на човека“⁹. За нисийския епископ девството не е само физическо, но и духовно състояние. Според св. отец физическият аспект е необходимо условие за духовното девство. С постигане на пълнотата на физическо и духовно девството възстановява в човека неговото изначално състояние. Според св. отец девството носи онтологични и есхатологични измерения. Християните са участници в Царството Божие, когато живеят в чистота. Свети евангелист Матей казва: „Блажени чистите по сърце, защото те ще видят Бога“ (Мат. 5:8). Пребъждането в девство е предпоставка есхатонът да придобие реалност. Ако човек опази девството си, има възможност да обнови своето битие и по този начин се приближава към своето изначално състояние.

В тази връзка св. Григорий Нисийски задава въпроса: „Как може човекът, смъртен, подчинен на страстите и с кратък живот, да бъде образ на безсмъртната, чиста и вечна природа?“¹⁰ Бог сътворява човека по Свой образ и по Свое подобие. Венецът на творението, сътворен по образ на своя Творец, в началото не съдържа деление на полови. Но Бог видя, че за човека „не е добре да бъде сам“ (Бит. 2:18). И тъй като не се намери помощник „нему подобен“, даде на човека: „дълбок сън; и когато заспа той взе едно от ребрата му...И създаде Господ Бог от реброто взето от човека, жена...“ (Бит. 2:21-22).

Но половите отношения и размножителният процес не са реализирани в райското им състояние. Прародителите „Адам и Ева пребъдвали в Рая, украсени с девство“¹¹. Това потвърждава и св. Йоан Дамаскин: „В Рая процъфтявало девството“¹². „Праотците, на които грехът бил чужд, биха имали духовно свят и физически чист брак.

⁸ Ив. Христов, „Понятията същност и ипостас в XXXVIII писмо на св. Василий Велики“, *Архив за Средновековна философия и култура* IV (1997), 31.

⁹ Joannes Damascenus, *De fide orthodoxa* (PG 94, 1205 D).

¹⁰ Gregorius Nyssenus, *Sermones de creatione hominis* (PG 44, 180B).

¹¹ Joannes Chrysostimus, *De virgin.* 8, 6 (PG 62, 1003).

¹² Joannes Damascenus, *De fide orthodoxa* 4, 24 (PG 94, 824).

Със своята духовна чистота, те напълно биха покорили идеала за девство.¹³ Интимност и размножение са реализирани едва след падането им в грях. Затова според св. отец девството е важна крачка към спасението.

То превъзможва страстите и човек може да започне да реализира образа и подобие на Божие в себе си. Девството е първо стъпало, водещо към Рая. Животът в девство възобновява човешката природа и насочва човешката любов към съзерцание на Твореца, а не към похотта на тялото. Пребиваването в девство – според св. Григорий – е средството, чрез което човек може да победи смъртта и по този начин да се прекъсне цикълът тление–смърт: „С други думи, девственото тяло затваря изхода за разпространето на смъртта, започнало от първия човек и стигнало до девственика. Девството, взето само по себе си само като биологично състояние, не притежава никаква биологическа или сотериологическа (спасяваща) ценност. Без друго и Ева, която отведе света в грехопадението, беше девица. Именно в девствено състояние тя прие съвета на дявола и роди непослушанието и смъртта“¹⁴. За да се постигне победа над смъртта, е нужна и благодатната помощ на Св. Дух, която изисква нашата свободна воля: „Слушали сме словата Господни към Никодим, че: „роденото от плътта е плът, а роденото от Духа е дух“ (Йоан 3:6). Знаем също, че плътта е подчинена на смъртта, поради греха, но Божият Дух е нетленен, животворящ и безсмъртен“¹⁵. Въпреки че не отрича достойнството на брака, Нисийският епископ пише, че смъртта ще загуби своята сила, когато единението между хората, в брака, спре да предоставя жертви, които трябва да умрат. Несъвместимостта на смъртта с девството е подобна на огъня със сеното и дървото. Така както нито сеното, нито дървото могат да стоят в огън, без да изгорят, така и смъртта не може да властва над девството.

Св. Григорий оприличава девството на духовен брак между Твореца и творението. Достигането на неговата пълнота дава възможност на човека да постигне знание за Бог и да участва в славата Му: „Човек не може да разбере нито Отец, нито Сина в Бог, ако не се вземе

¹³ Л. Тенекеджиев, *Тайнството Брак*, 139.

¹⁴ Г. Мандзаридис, *Православен духовен живот*, прев. Ан. Христова, Свет. Риболов, София: Синод. изд. 2011, 82.

¹⁵ Gregorius Nyssenus, *De virginitate* (PG 46, 377A).

предвид девството¹⁶. За св. Григорий архетип на девството е Словото Божие, Който се ражда от Отца, безстрастно и стана човек от девствена жена. Той казва: „Синът е неповторим пример за девство, тъй като е роден безстрастно от Отца, така както светлината произлиза от светлина, и Той остава Единороден: девството се разбира заедно с единородния Син, Който дарява безсмъртие, тъй като заблестя с чистота и безстрастие в Неговото раждане. И отново, Синът, заченат чрез девство е еднакъв парадокс“¹⁷. Св. Григорий Нисийски подобно на св. Иринеи Лионски прави типологичен паралел между Адам и Христос, но в контекста на девството. Както старият Адам беше създаден от девствена земя, така и Словото Божие се роди от девическа утроба.

Идеята за Христос като архетип на девството е широко застъпена и в богословието на св. Методий Олимписки. Според него загубата на девството е най-големият недостатък за човечеството. Този дефицит бива запълнен с раждането на Христос. Само чрез Словото е възможно да се приеме девството. Тъй като Христос е този, Който дойде в света и възстанови девството, Той е и негов архетип.

Учението за девството е неизменна част и от теотокологията на св. Григорий. За да разгърне важността на това духовно състояние за Богородица, той се основава на много места от Свещ. Писание (срв. Лук. 1: 26-38, Изх. 3: 1-6, Ис. 7: 14 и Прем. 9:1.).

За Майката Божия девството е естествено състояние на душата и тялото. Израз на тази потребност е аскетическият живот, който Тя води от най-ранна възраст. Това състояние на Богородица е както духовно, така и телесно. Девството е една от причините Бог да избере Нея за Майка на Словото Божие. Св. Григорий подчертава, че чрез девството Майката Божия предугава победата ѝ над смъртта, която в пълнота осъществи Нейният Син. Той подчертава, че „ако смъртта не може да премине отвъд девството, но прекъсва и изчезва в него, това ясно показва, че девството е по-силно от смъртта. Затова добре наричат непорочно тялото, което не се е подчинило в служба на тленния живот и не приема да бъде инструмент за продължаване на смъртното потомство. Защото в него непрекъснатостта в реда на тлението и смъртта, започнало от първозданныя (Адам) и последователно достига до живота на девстващия“¹⁸. Девството на Богородица

¹⁶ *Ibid.* (PG 46, 325).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Gregorius Nyssenus, *De virginitate* (PG 46, 377C).

има важна сотериологична роля. В утробата на Девата Майка Изкупителят е заченат безсеменно и безстрастно, за да спаси хората¹⁹. Една жена е едновременно Майка и Дева. В това се състои Нейната уникална роля в икономията на спасението. За св. Григорий раждането не уврежда девството ѝ. За да утвърди тезата си, той си служи със старозаветния разказ за неизгарящата къпина: „Моисей пасеше овците на тъста си Иотора, Мадиамския свещеник. Веднъж откара стадото далеч в пустинята и дойде при Божията планина Хорив. И яви му се Ангел Господен в огнен пламък изсред една къпина. И видя той, че къпината гори в огън, но не изгаря. Моисей рече: ще ида и ще погледам това велико явление, защо къпината не изгаря“ (Изх. 3:1-3). Така както огънят не повредил хроста, така и раждането на Сина Божи не нарушило девството на Неговата Майка. Във връзка с учението за раждането на Христос от девическа утроба св. Григорий изяснява и това, че то е станало без болка. По този начин законите на природата са преодоляни. Трябвало е Словото Божие, Кое е Живот и извор на живота за цялото творение, да надмогне природните закони и мъката да стане радост. Масперо отбелязва, че „като правилно коментира св. Григорий, ако Ева е била осъдена да ражда с болка, то Майката на Живота трябва да започне зачатие в радост и да осъществи раждането в радост“²⁰. Ако чрез една дева грехът влезе в света, а чрез него и смъртта, то чрез другата възтържествува радостта, животът и справедливостта. Тайната на девството на Мария е „тайна от историята на спасението...“²¹.

Св. Григорий разглежда девството и в контекста на разбирането за безплътните сили. Учението за девството като характерна част на ангелската природа присъства в съчиненията на Амвросий Медиолански, блаж. Йероним и св. Методий Олимпийски. Според св. Методий целта на живота в девство е да съедини девствениците с ангелската природа. За Амвросий Медиолански чрез девствениците на земята човек вижда ангелския живот. Но за основа на учението на св. Григорий служи това на по-големия му брат св. Василий Велики, който уподобява опазилите го хора на ангели: „Този, който е избрал ан-

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 1136A.

²⁰ *The Brill Dictionary of St. Gregory of Nyssa*, edited by L. Francisco Mateo-Seco & G. Maspero, translated by Seth Cherney, Leiden&Boston, 2010, 479.

²¹ Maspero, „El misterio de la Virgen toda limpia en en Gregorio de Nisa“, *ScrdeM* II/1 (2004), 203.

гелоподобния живот, е издигнал себе си за нетленен начин на живот, тъй като е надминал обикновените способности на човешката природа. Защото подобава на ангелската природа да е освободена от брака и да не позволява да бъде отклонена от съзерцанието, на което и да е друго лице освен божественото²². Осланяйки се на това разбиране, св. Григорий описва ангелите като безплътни същества, призвани да бъдат посредници между творението и Твореца. Те са безстрастни и безплътни сили, които помагат на хората в тяхното спасение. В съчинението си „Животът на Макрина“ описва как съпровождат човешката душа до рая. Той съзерцава как девството „танцува сред хорове от ангели“²³. Като свързва учението за ангелите с това за девството, св. Григорий разкрива важността на последното. Безплътните ангели пребъдват в девство и служат на Твореца. Той избира тях, за да бъдат постоянно около Него и да изпълняват всичко, което им възложи.

Според св. Григорий девството има важно значение за човека и спасението му, защото чрез него се достига най-висша възможна степен на обожение възможна за творението. За епископа на Ниса чрез девството се уподобяваме на Бог. Човешките сили не са достатъчни, за да се практикува девствен живот: „Практикуването на девство изисква свръхчовешки усилия, които са възможни само чрез Божията сила“²⁴. Според св. Григорий Нисийски практикуването на девство изисква добродетелност и отхвърляне на страстите. Тези, които са опазили девството, са блажени, защото вече не живеят по законите на плътта. Друга причина, поради която св. Григорий нарича девствените блажени, е, че с равноангелския си живот те вече са получили обещаните блага на Царството Божие.

²² Basilius Caesariensis, *Sermo asceticus*, 2 (PG 31, 873B).

²³ Gregorius Nyssenus, *De virginitate* (PG 46, 370).

²⁴ Г. Мандзаридис, *Християнска етика*, т. 2, София: Омофор, 2013, 341.

ВЪЗМОЖЕН ЛИ Е АНТРОПНИЯТ ПРИНЦИП КАТО БОГОСЛОВСКИ АРГУМЕНТ?

Abstract: *Is the Anthropic Principle Possible as a Theological Argument?* Present research deepens into a discussion with Chistos Yannaras and George Dragas on so called “Anthropic Principle” in the modern Orthodox Theology. The author concludes that Anthropocentrism in a theological milieu is not a proper methodological approach.

Keywords: Dogmatics, Apologetic Theology, Methodology, Positivist Epistemology

Една от използваните думи, с които започва еврейският текст на Свещ. Писание в първи стих, глава първа: „В началото Бог сътвори небето и земята“ (Бит. 1:1), е *bara* – глаголът сътворявам, който има за субект винаги Бога. Бог твори по Своя собствена, свободна Воля, като творението е създадено за слава на Бога¹. Бележитият руски богослов Владимир Лоски подчертава, че „нищо в Божиата природа не представлява необходима причина за създаване на тварите: тварното е могло и да не съществува – Бог е можел и да не твори“², като тварта

* АП се използва като съкращение на Антропния принцип.

¹ Срв. Св. Йоан Златоуст, *Творения*, т. 7, Света Гора, Атон: Свети „Вмчк. Георги Зограф“ 2008, 24; срв. Йоан Дамаскин, *Точно изложение на православната вяра*, Света Гора, Атон: Свети „Вмчк. Георги Зограф“ 2008, 62-63; вж. Макариополски еп. Николай, архим. Серафим, *Вяра, Надежда, Любов. Свещена история на Стария и Новия Завет. Православен катехизис. Православно богослужение. Църковно-обществено сдружение „Антим I“*, Видин, 1994, 15-16; срв. *Катехизис на католическата църква*, София, 2002, 98.

² В. Лоски, *Очерк върху мистическото богословие на Източната църква*, София: Омофор, 2005, 91.

„няма своя основа, нито сама в себе си, понеже е създадена от нищо, нито в Божията същност, защото никаква необходимост не подтиква Бога да твори“³. Нищо при сътворяването на света не е основа на творческия акт, а сътворението е свободен акт на Неговото желание и това е основа на битията⁴. Самият човек, сътворен по Образ Божи и Божие подобие (Бит. 1:26-27), също не може да бъде разглеждан като основа и върховна цел на творението. Върховната цел на сътвореното е самият Бог, Който е създател на всичко. Сътвореното за слава на Бога се стреми към своя Създател – Той е неговата крайна и върховна цел. Владимир Лоски утвърждава догматическата истина, че всички твари са призвани към съвършено единение с Бога, и позовавайки се на Дионисий Ареопагит, още че творението се издига до взаимодействие на синергия с Него, тласкано от Благодатта и Силата, дадени му от Бога, към единение със Създателя си и нарастване в това единение⁵. Бог, като върховна и крайна цел на сътвореното, тласка и увелича всяка твар към единение със Себе Си. Съвършенството на човека не се състои в подобие му на останалото творение, а на това, което го различава от него и го уподобява на Твореца⁶. Въпреки това човекът също не е крайна цел на творението, тъй като е призван към единение с Бога и неговата крайна цел е самият Бог. Богообщението е стремеж към самия Бог. Св. Атанасий утвърждава, че не Той е създаден за Нас, а ние сме създадени за Него⁷. Тварта е „сздадена, за да участва в Бога, Който е не само изначалният двигател и цел на сътвореното, но и крайният смисъл на неговата устойчивост“⁸.

Всяка антропоцентрична и антроподетерминистична позиция влиза в противоречие с този основен догматически постулат и е особено некохерентна, когато се основава върху език, непозволяващ и за който са несвойствени определени генерализации, като езика на научното познание. Настоящият текст, от една страна, представлява рефлексия както върху вътрешната състоятелност на подобен тип позиции, изградени върху постиженията и езика на научното познание, а от друга – върху възможността за апологетично аргументиране

³ Пак там, 91.

⁴ Вж. пак там.

⁵ Вж. пак там, 95.

⁶ Срв. пак там, 111.

⁷ Вж. Й. Майендорф, *Византийското Богословие*, София: Гал-Ико, 1995, 165.

⁸ Вж. пак там, 171.

и изграждане на защитими богословски становища върху последните. Това се осъществява чрез фокус върху *антропния принцип*, който представлява по-скоро постулиране на определена светогледна визия и нагласа, отколкото аргумент сам по себе си. Преди да се пристъпи към едно по-цялостно разглеждане на АП, би следвало първо да се индикират основните имплицитни отличия и противоречия (характерни и за повечето антропоцентрични и антроподетерминистични позиции), непозволяващи разглеждането му като възможен богословски аргумент и аргументативна реалия изобщо спрямо издигнатата претенция от самия него. АП, който има повече от една версия или формулировка, постулира привилегирована позиция на човека във Вселената, предестинация на целия неин ход от антропоцентричен характер. Това обуславя основно противоречие с вече посочената догматическа постановка за Бога като основен двигател и цел на цялото творение. Същевременно в АП липсва вътрешна логическа структура като вместо такава се изреждат пропозиции със съмнителна кохезия помежду си, което също конституира невъзможността съответната светогледна визия да бъде основание на богословски апологетичен аргумент.

От една страна, АП е невъзможен като богословски аргумент защото имплицира като крайна цел на целия еволюционен ход на Вселената самия човек, сам по себе си, и е противен на християнското разбиране за творението като йерархия, намираща своята крайна цел в Бога, всеки чин от която се издига според собствената си аналогия до взаимодействие със Създателя си⁹. Както беше отбелязано, според светите отци човекът не е самоцел на творението – АП обаче го интерпретира като самоцел на една възможна телеология на целия еволюционен процес на Вселената. За разлика от гносеологическите изходни позиции на биологическите и естествените науки АП не прави дори опит да определи човека, изхождайки от природата, на против – АП изхожда от човека като определение за целия естествен еволюционен ход. От друга страна, въведеният от АП антропоцентричен детерминизъм, т.е. предопределението на еволюционния ход на Вселената, при който човекът е причина и основание за този ход, противоречи на догматическата позиция, че нищо при сътворяването на света не е основа за творческия акт освен Божията Воля. Тук

⁹ Вж. В. Лоски, *цит. съч.*, 95.

е важно да се отбележи, че Бог не е предопределен в действията Си от нищо. Опитвайки се да докаже своята антропоцентрично-детерминирана позиция относно естествения еволюционен ход, АП изпада във вътрешно противоречие, без да изгражда дефиниция върху определена логическа структура. Вместо това в аргумента просто се изреждат противоречиви пропозиции. АП не е възможен като теологически аргумент поради постулирането на антропоцентричен детерминизъм в природния еволюционен процес, който прави невъзможна предполагаемата импликация за референция за наличието на творчески акт поради изредените причини. Аргументът няма логическа структура и е изграден хаотично. Той дори не утвърждава противоречиви предикати към референт, нещо често срещано в теориите на квантовата механика, а се гради на несвързани по никакъв начин помежду си тези. Ако в съвременните физически теории на квантовата механика съответната логическа структура (а.~а) на утвърждаването на противоречиви предикати към референт има смисъл, АП няма тази структура и изрежда несвързани помежду си тези, така манипулирайки наличието на такъв. АП е невъзможен като богословски аргумент и още защото се изгражда неясно, без да е установен логическият процес, чрез който от поредица данни за акциденции на обекти, които предоставя науката, се извеждат в аргумента същностни следствия за цялостни процеси. АП е невъзможен като теологически аргумент, тъй като наличието на телеология в еволюционния ход на Вселената и нейните процеси не е достатъчно основание да се твърди, че Бог съществува или е неин деятел.

За творчеството на светите отци и апологетическия дискурс на източната Църква не е чуждо използването и позоваването на постиженията на научното познание. Един от многото примери за това е *Точно изложение на православната вяра* на преп. Йоан Дамаскин, където авторът излага редица постижения на натурфилософията от своята епоха и ги използва като потвърждение на акта на творението и догматическите истини¹⁰. Въпреки това Църковното учение, Преда-

¹⁰ Преподобният разглежда поредица от природни феномени в няколко трактата от *Точно изложение на православната вяра* и ги ситуира спрямо верската истина: „За светлината, огъня и светилата – слънцето, луната и звездите“, „За въздуха и ветровете“, „За водите“, „За моретата“, „За земята и това, което се ражда от нея“. Срв. св. Йоан Дамаскин, *Точно изложение на православната вяра*, Света Гора, Атон: „Вмчк. Георги Зограф“ 2008, 70-86.

нието, наследството на светите отци никога не е използвало езика на научното познание за изграждане на своя онтология, какъвто призив съществува в съвременното гръцко богословие от страна на Христос Янарас¹¹. Той предполага възможност за онтология, изградена на езика на квантовата механика или постфройдистката психология, т.е. за свързване на Евангелието с категориите на този език вместо възвеждането им до Евангелската истина. Ако Христос Янарас желае свеждане на Евангелието до езика на постмодерната наука и психология, то самият този език, конституиран от случайните постижения на научното познание, би станал определящ и конституиращ възможността за Евангелска и богословска изказност и е противен на цялата богословска традиция, където Евангелската истина ситуира изменчивото научно познание¹². Главният аргумент тук е, че езикът на научното познание е бързо изменчив и зависим от емпиричните данни, несигурно ситуирани в една изменчива и непълна концептуална рамка (хипотези, теории). Свеждането на Евангелието до езика на научното познание би означавало изхождане не от вечната пълнота на Истината, а от несигурната, непълна изказност и концептуализация, лишена от цялост на научното мислене и познание. Изниква като въпрос пред съвременното православно богословие доколко остава релевантно като възглед предупреждението на Св. Григорий Палама за това, че „знанието, което се придобива с външна ученост, не само, че не е подобно, но е и противоположно на истинното и духовното“¹³ и определянето на неговия призив „внимавай над себе си“ като „лукава примамка“¹⁴. То не може да бъде редуцирано до най-вулгарната интерпретация на антинаучен дискурс. Развитието на научния процес обаче потвърждава една описана от св. Григорий Палама вътрешноприсъща некохерентност както на резултатите, така и на самата

¹¹ Вж. „Христос Янарас в разговор с Калин Янакиев, о. Николай Нешков и Георги Тенев“, *Християнство и култура* 3 (2002); електронен ресурс: http://svetnikolay-sofia.info/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/www.hkultura.com_db_text_2002_3_4_cristosjanaras.pdf [Последен достъп: 27.06.2017 г.]

¹² Като потвърждение и пример за следването на тази традиция може да бъде посочено ситуирането както на астрономически така и на общомедицински научен дискурс спрямо мъдростта на *Псалтира* в Беседа 11 на св. Йоан Златоуст; вж. св. Йоан Златоуст, *Творения*, т. 7, Света гора, Атон: Свети „Вмчк. Георги Зограф“, 2008, 123.

¹³ Св. Григорий Палама, *Триади в защита на свещенобезмълващите*, Света гора, Атон: Манастир „Св. Вмчк. Георги Зограф“, 2011, 20.

¹⁴ Вж. *пак там*.

методология на научното мислене, от която са изведени тези резултати. Светителят твърди, че „чрез помощта на външната ученост, прекомерно възхвалявана... (се придобива) повече незнание, отколкото знание“¹⁵ и още „учените мнения се различават и взаимно се изключват и на всяко от тях винаги се появяват повече противоположни... безразсъдно (е) да се надяваме, че в някое от тях ще бъдат разгадани законите на творещия ум“¹⁶. Ако изходим от предупреждението на Св. Григорий Палама за вътрешната противоречивост на научното мислене и познание, изниква причината, поради която неговият език не може да послужи както за изграждане на своя собствена онтология, така и да бъде конструктивен за изграждане на предполагаемата от Янарас съвременна православна онтология, също и защо е невъзможен АП като богословски аргумент. Същевременно е невъзможна и констатацията на отец Драгас, че антропният принцип „има крайно важно епистемологическо значение“¹⁷, съществено за богословското аргументиране и антропологията.

От една страна, противоречиво и парадоксално е, че езикът на научното мислене описва контингентното и акциденталното, а има претенцията конструктите му да се занимават по същностен начин с природните феномени. Самите свойства на обектите, които научното познание изследва и описва, са изменчиви и случайни спрямо същността на последните. Изменението в масата, скоростта или плътността на дадено тяло не означава изменение в същността на самото тяло. Езикът на научното познание е релативен, доколкото не изследва самите обекти, а взаимодействията между акциденции, отношенията между тях. Тъй като научното познание придава същностен характер на акциденциите на обектите, то е твърде далеч и от тезите на св. Василий Велики, според които обектите стават познаваеми по действието си. Заменяйки същност с акциденция, научното познание не може да изходи от действието на обекта, за да го познае, тъй като акцидентални качества като маса, скорост, плътност не са същностните действия на даден обект. То съди само опосредствено чрез измененията в акциденциите на обекта относно действия му, като логи-

¹⁵ Вж. св. Григорий Палама, *цит. съч.*, 8.

¹⁶ Вж. *пак там*.

¹⁷ Вж. Г. Драгас, „Антропичният принцип и човешката природа“, *Християнство и култура* 7 (2011); електронен ресурс: www.hkultura.com/images/br/2011/64/2011_64.pdf [последен достъп 17.08.2014 г.]

чески остава неясно как дадено действие е индуцирано от тези изменения. За научното познание не съществува облак, какъвто пример въвежда Айнщайн в своето популярно изложение на Специалната и обща теория на относителността¹⁸, а точка с определено отстояние до земята, някаква неопределеност, която има дадени акциденции като размери, плътност и др., неотнасящи се по никакъв начин към същността на изследвания обект. Тук изследваният обект е рефериран като неопределеност, тъй като е ирелевантно какъв е при боравенето в научното познание с посочените акциденции. Ако за научното познание обектът на изследване е ирелевантен, а акциденциите са заменили в познавателния процес естествените действия на обекта, които го правят познаваем, както твърди св. Василий Велики, то е невъзможен и опитът за прокарване на сходство между терминологията на Византийското богословие и съвременната физика. Макар православното богословие да твърди, че Бог, както и всеки тварен обект, е познаваем по действие, то силно се отличава от научното, при което обектът е сведен до произволно описание на произволни акциденталии. След Рене Декарт (1596–1650) научното мислене търси основа на своите занимания, то все повече се фундира не в търсенето на скрити закономерности, а в контингентното и акциденталното.

От друга страна, самата методология на научното мислене, имаща своята генеалогия от Декартовата, предполага определянето на научното познание като произволно. Съществуващата неяснота как се осъществява преходът в научното мислене от описанието на хаотично натрупани акциденции и отношенията между тях към обектите и действията им е лесно обяснима с факта, че науката никога не достига последните. Рене Декарт изхожда в своята методология от геометричната методологична структура, която според него е образец на методологична структура за всяко научно познание. Геометрията изхожда от наличието на прости понятия (точка, права линия, равнина), които могат да бъдат свързвани в определени представи и да изграждат прости твърдения (аксиоми) и които по силата на тези представи са верни¹⁹. Макар и вярата да има своите аксиоматични положения (догматите), то те са Богооткровени и се

¹⁸ А. Айнщайн, *Специална и обща теория на относителността*, София: Прометей, 2005, 19.

¹⁹ Вж. *пак там*, 15.

интерпретират в светлината на едно непрекъснато Богооткровение, докато науката тепърва дефинира своите аксиоматични положения. Откровение и наука са крайно различни, като Откровението функционира *от горе надолу* (т.е. от Бог, който дава непосредствено знание към човека за Себе Си и за света), докато научното познание от контингентното и акциденталното, чрез които никога не достига общи принципи. Следдекартовата философия и наука релативизира познанието, като разглежда онова, което нарича природни и научни закони, просто като характеристики на отношения и дефинира тавтологично тези отношения отново чрез отношения, изхождайки от методологичната структура на геометрията, издигана като образец за научно познание. При тази методологична структура, въведена от Рене Декарт и Галилео Галилей (1564–1642), се въвеждат определен брой аксиоматични твърдения, изградени от основни понятия, като на тяхна основа се извеждат нови производни понятия²⁰. Този аксиоматичен подход има недостатъка, че провеждането на логическото извеждане на новите производни понятия предхожда установяването на истинността на базисните твърдения, от които започва то. Ако тази методологична структура може да претендира за логическа последователност, безпротиворечивост, тя обаче не може да докаже своята истинност. Подобно на геометрията, от която е взет този методологичен подход, при която за аксиомите и основните понятия не се провежда проверка, а са начало на логически процес, науката започва да борави с понятия при изграждане на своите аксиоматични положения, чието съдържание е недоуточнено, а се разчита на някакво интуитивно произволно разбиране, което компрометира последвалия логически процес за извеждане на нови понятия и аксиоматични положения. Самата физика признава своята окаяност „като основните понятия, чрез които се изграждат аксиоматичните ѝ положения, „са въведени свободно...притежаващи единственото свойство да удовлетворяват основните твърдения на теорията“²¹. Самият метод предполага разглеждане на предметите, с които се занимава, през отношения – геометрията, която не пита

²⁰ Срв. Хр. Христов, „Класическа физика – Специална теория на относителността – Обща теория на относителността“, в: *Относителност и космос*, София: Народна просвета, 1968, 4.

²¹ *Пак там*, 5.

за същността на своите основни понятия, като *точка*, *права линия*, *равнина*, а ги представя през възможните отношения помежду им, води след себе си и невъзможността в науката да бъде осъществена рефлексия върху базисните понятия – те отново се представят чрез отношения, при което се изпада в тавтологичност. Онова, което се счита за налично, е ограничено до поредица от отношения по методологичния модел на Рене Декарт. Науката дори и да изследва акцидентите, които влизат в отношения и с чиито *отношения* се занимава, тя отново го прави през перспективата на *отношения*, без да знае или да може да даде някакво познание извън интуитивното при базисни понятия, с които борави. Така тя влиза в затворен кръг на непрекъснато доуточняване на различни *отношения* между обекти, без да може да даде извънинтуитивно обяснение на базисните понятия, с които си служи при дескрипция на тези *отношения*. Теориите за строежа на атома, например от модела на Ръдърфорд (1856–1940) до квантово-механичния модел на Шрьодингер (1887–1961), описват *отношения* между определени частици, електрони, позитрони, неутрони, боравят с определени характеристики на тези отношения, без да дават извънинтуитивно познание за самите частици (заряди), или когато ги изследват, те отново описват единствено *отношения*, въвеждайки вече използвани понятия, без реално да се посочва какво е съдържанието на тези понятия, извън перспективата на *отношения*. Атомът е определено *отношение* между частици, *отношение* с определени характеристики, но когато трябва да бъде описано що са тези частици, се въвежда същият модел на дескрипция на характеристики на отношения между частици [(заряди) кварки, кванти], без да се посочва какво са те. При модела на Ръдърфорд се описва отношението и неговите характеристики на „привличане между положителните и отрицателните електрически заряди“²², което „държи електроните в орбитите им“²³, а когато характеристиките на отношението престанат да дават резултат или да са приложими, науката сменя описателната структура, без да дава познание какво е тя извън дескрипция на *отношения*. Моделът на Ръдърфорд описва електрона като *отношение* на дължина на вълна, зависеща от скорост²⁴. Мисленето през

²² С. Хокинг, *Кратка история на времето*, София: ИнфоДар, 2004, 86.

²³ *Пак там*.

²⁴ Вж. *пак там*.

отношения не представя съществуващото само по себе си, нито пък познава предмета през действието, каквато теза издига св. Василий, защото според издигнатия критерий на съответната теза обектът става познаваем, а не само действието, до което научното мислене не достига, както вече беше разяснено. В научното познание то представлява описателен модел, изхождащ при своето конструиране от базисни аксиоматични твърдения, които водят следствия, изведени чрез логически процес, т.е. е вид интерпретиране, чиито следствия ако не бъдат потвърдени, интерпретацията може да бъде променена. Научното мислене гради интерпретации върху интерпретации, като е твърде съмнително дали даден верифициран резултат потвърждава цялата мисловна верига на интерпретацията, от която е изведен.

Научното мислене не достига своята пълнота и цялост в изградените хипотези и теории поради споменатата характеристика на функциониране на методологията му, на непрекъснатото търсене и предефиниране на първични принципи, от които да изходи. Тъкмо поради това то изгражда „непрекъснато противоречиви“, както ги нарича Св. Григорий Палама, конструкции, чиято вътрешна кохезия цели, но не може да постигне.

АП, който е изграден върху същата несигурна методология, не може да бъде богословски аргумент. Постулираното от него отношение: еволюционен ход на свят – разумен наблюдател, от една страна също се дефинира чрез акциденции и ирелевантни модални определения. Той е редуccionистки по своя характер, свеждайки изпълваните от него същности до удобни за изграждането на тезата акциденталии, приписвайки им съответна релация. Същевременно се изгражда върху изреждане на противоречиви, несвързани пропозиции. Тяхната генеалогия се базира на произволно изведени и ситуирани данни за акциденции на обекти, които предоставя науката, без да е установен логическият процес, чрез който от поредицата на тези данни се извеждат в аргумента същностни следствия за цялостни процеси. Както беше отбелязано, за АП не е свойствена и логическата структура (а.~а), която е имплицитна на постиженията на съвременната квантова механика.

Научната революция (според въведения от Томас Кун термин, описващ състоянието на изменение на научните теории и на промяна в стандартните им модели за обяснение при период на криза²⁵),

²⁵ Вж. Т. Кун, *Структура на научните революции*, София: Петър Берон, 1996, 40.

осъществена в прехода от *класическата* към *квантовата механика*, е често сочена и като преход от *класическата* към *некласическата логика*²⁶. Теорията за т.нар. сума от истории на Ричард Фейнман и мисловният експеримент „котката на Шрьодингер“ привидно влизат в противоречие с Аристотеловия *Закон за непротиворечието* (Principium contradictionis), който постулира $\sim (a \sim a)$ или според една възможна дефиниция, която описва съответния логически принцип: не могат да бъдат утвърждавани противоречиви предикати за един и същ референт в едно и също отношение и време²⁷. Трябва да се отбележи, че логическата структура $(a \sim a)$, предполагаща възможността обект да има онтологически статут на *съществуване и несъществуване* и влизаща в противоречие с логическия постулат за *непротиворечието*, не е характерна единствено за квантовата механика и не е въведена от нея: като пряко формулирана се среща в будистките текстове на пали канона Милинда панха и имплицитно присъства в Платоновата онтология и гносеология, където обектите в *света на мнението* едновременно са, доколкото принадлежат към своите ейдоси, и не са, доколкото клонят към небитието на неформоструктуриращия принцип – материята. Квантовата механика разработва поредица от модели относно физическите феномени от микросвета, които, както беше отбелязано, се основават на същата – *парадоксът на котката на Шрьодингер*, постулиращ комбинация от състояние на смърт и живот²⁸ на експерименталния субект и теорията за корпускулярно вълновия дуализъм, според която квантовите обекти се проявяват и като вълни, и като частици. Нейните парадокси, изградени върху утвърждаване на противоречиви предикати за един и същ референт, присъстват и конституират теорията на американския физик Ричард Фейнман за *сумата от истории* на частица, според която „от частицата не се очаква да има една-единствена история

²⁶ Такава теза поставят Бъркхоф и Нюман в статията си „Логиката на квантовата механика“, вж. G. Birkhoff and J. von Neumann, „The logic of quantum mechanics“, *Annals of Mathematics* 37, № 4, October, (1936), 1.

²⁷ Вж. В. Стефанов, *Въведение в дедуктивната логика*, София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2007, 97.

²⁸ Вж. Р. Пенроуз, *Новият разум на царя*, София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 1998, 335.

или път в пространство-времето... Вместо това се предполага, че тя изминава разстоянието... по всички възможни пътища²⁹.

Логическата структура (а.~а) обаче не е имплицитна на т.нар. антропен принцип. Въпреки че смисловият епицентър на *антропния принцип* се фундаира в привилегированата ситуация на човека във Вселената, двете негови версии са противоречиви, като, от една страна, силният АП твърди за наличието на вътрешноприсъща телеология на развитието на Вселената, при която фундаменталните физични константи и закони, както и цялата вселенска еволюция са такива, каквито са, за да се зароди самосъзнанието на определен етап от нейната еволюция³⁰. Слабият АП, от друга страна, предполага, че ние виждаме Вселената такава, каквато е, защото съществуваме – това, което можем да видим, е ограничено от условията, необходими за нашето присъствие като наблюдатели; ако Вселената би била друга, не би имало някой, който да попита защо Вселената е такава, каквато е³¹. И двете версии не се изграждат върху изреждането на противоречиви предикати за един и същ референт и представляват парадокс дори от перспективата на неклассическата логическа структура (а.~а) и тъй като са просто изреждане, ще бъде използвано символното означение (а,~а). *Слабият антропен принцип* е конструиран чрез две противоречиви твърдения, първото, изразено чрез пропозиция от типа **а**: *Вселената не е предопределена да е изградена такава, каквато е, за да съществува разумен наблюдател*; и противоположната пропозиция **~а**: *но тя е такава, каквато е тъкмо защото има разумен наблюдател, който я установява предопределена за съществуването му, и целият ѝ еволюционен ход е довел до наличието на разумен наблюдател*. Ако пропозиция **а**: не предполага предопределеност; пропозиция **~а**: твърди, че Вселената не се е случила по различен начин освен по предопределен за съществуването на разумния наблюдател. *Слабият антропен принцип* е изграден върху несвързаното изреждане на противоречиви пропозиции (непредопределеност,~непредопределеност). *Силният антропен принцип* се основава на противоречие в отправната си

²⁹ Вж. С. Хокинг, *Кратка история на времето*, София: ИнфоДар, 2004, 88.

³⁰ Срв. А. Стефанов, *Теории на съвременното природознание*, София: Парадигма, 2008, 101.

³¹ Вж. пак там, 99-100.

точка, като веднъж изхожда от съществуването на наблюдателя и обратно на това от самия еволюционен ход на Вселената. Перифразата на Декартовото положение, която от перспективата на *антропния принцип* се формулира “*cogito ergo mundis talis est*” (мисля, защото светът е такъв)³², имплицира наличието на изхождане веднъж от субекта, като пропозицията на перифразата започва със субектното действие мисля **a**: мисля → *целият еволюционен процес е*; и противоположна по значение пропозиция, предполагаща, че еволюционният ход, като изходна позиция $\sim \mathbf{a}$: *целият еволюционен ход е* → мисля, като се вмъква следствие, чиято логическа генеалогия е неясна, че *еволюционният ход на Вселената е телеологичен, за да се случи наблюдателят му*. Изреждането на противоположни, несвързани изходни позиции: мислене – еволюционен ход и еволюционен ход – мислене, не остава скрита и във вече посочената формулировка на *силния антропен принцип*. Двете изредени логически несвързани, противоположни пропозиции ($\mathbf{a}, \sim \mathbf{a}$) при силния аргумент са отправните точки (еволюционен ход на Вселената, $\sim$ еволюционен ход на Вселената). И двете версии на *антропния принцип* не се основават на логическа структура и могат да бъдат изразени чрез структурата на изреждане ($\mathbf{a}, \sim \mathbf{a}$) и редуцират данните от научните теории до антропен детерминизъм.

Противопоставянето на основната догматическа постановка, че крайната цел на сътвореното е самият Бог, чрез една необосновано постулирана антропоцентрична хипотеза конституира като невъзможен опит за обосноваване на богословска апологетична рефлексия чрез *антропния принцип*. Ако самият език на научното познание и неговите резултати се извеждат от занимания с акциденталии на феномени/обекти, то е силно оспоримо и становището на о. Георги Драгас, че АП представлява цялостна философия. Споменатите особености на научния език ситуират разглеждания принцип по-скоро като светогледна визия, изградена върху неверифицируема хипотеза със спорна изводимост от език, конструиран за описание и боравене с реалии, несвързани със същностните качества на обектите/феномените, а както вече беше разяснено, с техните акциденталии. Една цялостна философия е невъзможна без аргументиране и извеждане на същностни следствия от език, занимаващ се с описание на същност-

³² Вж. А. Стефанов, *цит. съч.*, 102.

ни свойства и качества, какъвто езикът на науката не е. Самият АП няма откъде да обоснове своите собствени противоречиво изредени пропозиции. Всички тези предпоставки не предполагат *антропният принцип* да е възможен и като теологичен аргумент.

Ion Marian Croitoru¹

**FATHER ARSENIE PAPACIOC
AND THE PROPER ARRANGEMENT
OF SPIRITUAL LIFE.
Glimpses of His Experiences
in the Communist Prisons**

Abstract: Father Arsenie Papacioc lived his life in the middle of many transformations of the Romanian nation, passing from the “fascination” of the Legionary Movement to “the foolishness” of monastic life. He had the experience of the prisons of different periods of the regimes in Romania, but also of the wilderness, getting to represent the life of the Orthodox Church prior to, under and after the communism. For this reason, Father Arsenie’s life is intertwined with the lives of many remarkable cultural, political and especially ecclesial characters of the history of the Romanian society, from the Patriarch Justinian to the Archimandrites Cleopa Ilie and Ioanichie Bălan, from the community of the monasteries Cozia, Tismana (Cioclovina Skete), Sihăstria, Antim, Slatina, Neamț, Cheia, Căldărușani, Dintr-un Lemn, Cernica and Techirghiol to the members of the Burning Bush Movement, from the multitude of believers to hierarchs of the Orthodox Church of Romania, from the parish of Filea de Jos (then Filea de Sus, as well) and those of Orthodox faith to those of other religious denominations and convictions. Thus, Father Arsenie marked the epoch he lived in by the proper arrangement of his spiritual life at the measure of holiness, receiving many charismata from the God glorified as the Holy Trinity.

Keywords: Father Arsenie Papacioc, Communist Regime, Prisons, Wilderness, Spiritual Life, Orthodox Church, Monastic Life, The Burning Bush Movement (Mișcarea Rugul Aprins).

¹ The author is an Assoc. Professor Dr. at the Faculty of Orthodox Theology and Education Sciences, Valahia University of Târgoviște.

The recollection of the persons who have marked our lives is combined with emotions and feelings animated by honour and gratitude, vivid memories and the formation of milestones by the advice received. Due to these aspects, on the one hand, it is not desired to diminish in any way their personality, and, on the other hand, one ought to cultivate humility and objectiveness, so as not to interpret the things left behind on paper in a manner alien to the spiritual state they had in accordance with the teaching of the Orthodox Church. The abundance of the experiences lived by their side is permanent spiritual food, meant to also satisfy the hunger of those around us, especially when one can note, with great joy, that others, too, have already fed on the same spiritual food for a long while. For this reason, I have chosen to evoke Father Arsenie Papacioc, in the homage year of the Romanian Patriarchate dedicated to those who suffered in the prisons of the communist regime to defend the faith in Jesus Christ and the perennial values of the human society², not just relying on the presentation of my own series of experiences by the side of the great Black Sea Spiritual Father, but also based on already published testimonies, some of them narrated to me personally as well by Father Arsenie himself, in the course of time³.

² First, I evoked the personality of Father Arsenie Papacioc at the meeting of the students from the Faculty of Orthodox Theology and Education Sciences of “Valahia” University, a meeting organized during the period 15-16 May 2017, on the topic *Religious Art in the Service of the Promotion of the Christian Spirituality Values. Forms of Resistance of the Romanian Orthodoxy against Totalitarianism* (*Arta religioasă în slujba promovării valorilor spiritualității creștine. Forme de rezistență ale Ortodoxiei românești în fața totalitarismului*), then during the spiritual evenings organized by Stelian Gomboș at Saint Anthony Parish of Bucharest (Titan neighborhood), an event that took place in the evening of 20 May 2017, and, finally, during the International Symposium organized by the above-mentioned Faculty, during the period 30-31 May 2017, on the topic *Theology, Iconography, Testimony - Church Resilience by Culture and Spirituality* (*Teologie, iconografie, mărturisire - Rezistența Bisericii prin cultură și spiritualitate*).

³ I consider it a great gift from the world's Saviour Jesus Christ that I met Father Arsenie Papacioc even since the summer of the year 1986, when, as a graduate of the 1st year of high school at the Theological Seminary in Bucharest, I came to Techirghiol, accompanying Ion Filon, administrator of the Seminary at that time, to work at the Priestly Sanatorium situated in the same location as the then *Saint Mary Skete* (now *Saint Mary Monastery*). Since that summer I kept a spiritual relation with Father Arsenie Papacioc, to whom I owe so much.

1. Biographic milestones

Born on 15 August 1914⁴ and passed into the life beyond the grave on 19 July 2011, Father Arsenie Papacioc came, according to his paternal lineage, from a family of Aromanians of Macedonia, arrived and settled in Misleanu, nowadays Perieți Village, of Ialomița County⁵. The Father's great-grandfather was a priest in Macedonia and had a long beard, which would explain the origin of the family name Papacioc, meaning "popă cu cioc" ("bearded priest")⁶. His father was called Vasile and he was a sanitary agent *in charge of six villages*. *He was*, according to the Father's testimony, *both a veterinary physician, and a doctor for men, and a dentist*. His mother was called Stanca, she was of the Mușat lineage, coming from Drăguș Village, situated in the vicinity of Făgăraș. Vasile and Stanca had seven children, two daughters and five sons. Stanca's last child, born when she was 47, was Anghel, namely Father Arsenie. Stanca gave birth to her children on her own, her situation being common, as there were few midwives at that time, and in the villages, more often than not, women gave birth like Stanca. Father Arsenie's mother also experienced the pain for the loss of her first child, who was only a year and ten months old, right on the day when she was giving birth for the second time. *You can realize what my poor mum was feeling*, later on Father Arsenie remarked, *one dead on the table and she was in birth pains!* Father Arsenie's family was somewhat rich. It had 12 hectares of land, horses that they used to till the fields, cows producing milk, sheep and goat herds, and all kinds of poultry⁷.

⁴ In the civil records one can find the date 13 August 1914, yet Father Arsenie knew from his mother that he was born on 15 August 1914, a date he declared time and again. Back then, births were not recorded precisely, see Părintele Arsenie Papacioc, *Mici îndemnuri spre mântuire*, edition supervised by Hieromonk Benedict Stancu, Editura Sophia, București, 2009, p. 7; Sorin Alpetri, *Între timp și veșnicie. Viața Părintelui Arsenie Papacioc*, second edition, significantly improved and completed, Editura Accent Print, Suceava, 2015, p. 16, note 12 (= Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*). See also the homage volume *Părintele Arsenie Papacioc. 1914-2014. O sută de ani de la naștere*, Editura Basilica, București, 2014 (= *Părintele Arsenie Papacioc. 1914-2014.*). In some books dedicated to Father Arsenie one can also meet the date 13 August 1914, yet this thing indicates the editors' intervention, who ignore, willingly or not, the Father's statements, see Părintele Arsenie Papacioc, *O clipă inima mi se făcuse cer*, edition supervised by Hieromonk Benedict Stancu, Editura Elena, Constanța, 2012, p. 11 (= Părintele Arsenie, *O clipă inima*).

⁵ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 14.

⁶ *Ibid.*, note 6.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-18.

On the day when Anghel was born, on 15 August 1914, there was a solar eclipse⁸. The father, when he saw his son, as he had not been present at the time of his birth, said: *The Sun disappeared and my son appeared!*⁹

Anghel's childhood was an ordinary one, namely that of a child grown up in the countryside, in full harmony with his family, but also with nature. *We were seven and we spent our time during our childhood mostly outdoors*, Father Arsenie used to say, who considered it a great benefit for any child to grow up in an extended environment, preferably in nature, where he can develop harmoniously physically and spiritually. Moreover, he was born in an atmosphere of reverence to God. *I thank God for the fact that I had Christian parents*, the Father noted towards the sunset of his life. *What you have from the family remains for the rest of your life*¹⁰. Consequently, Anghel drew close to the Church by himself, around the age of seven, obtaining an *inner presence from God*, which he will feel throughout his life¹¹. One day he asked his mother why the sheep, before going to sleep, stumps its foot. His mother answered: *It is crossing herself, dear, it is crossing herself*. His mother's answer got him thinking: *Therefore, why shouldn't I, too!*¹²

Thus, Father Arsenie ponders over existential problems since his childhood, in the context of the ongoing First World War (1914-1918), being endowed with different gifts. He was, for instance, skilled at drawing, which is why he went to the Polizu High School in Bucharest, the Sculpture Section¹³; he also had a sense of poetry, which is why he often answered in rhymes; he also had a formidable memory because he could remember, in his old age, poems learnt by heart during his childhood and adolescence¹⁴.

Actually, Father Arsenie soon stood out in many respects. Around the age of 13-14, he thought for the first time about becoming a monk, although

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 24. The great Romanian sculptor Ion Jalea was his colleague (Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 24).

¹⁴ See Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 23, 27. His memory was also accompanied by a great attention, as he could remember since the age of just 3-4 that, during the First World War fights, his father would *dig trenches in the ground for them, while hiding the girls in the haystack*. *From the trenches*, he would look up and see the dust from the explosions, and thought he should take care that it should not get into his eyes (Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 17-18).

he had neither known the monastic life until then, nor seen any monastery¹⁵. In certain circumstances, he could feel in himself a maturity going beyond the number of his years. For example, at the age of 15-16, his elder brother, editor at a magazine, took Anghel as a contributor. In the newsroom, the following problem emerged: *if you take a drop from the sea, you take nothing*. Those who were working there argued on this theme for a long while. Then, they asked Anghel, as well, who told them: *when they analysed the sea water composition, they took a drop. But the way you ask the question, even if you were to take tons of water from the sea, you would still take nothing. And starting with that moment, they began to consider my opinions*¹⁶. At the exhortation of the same brother, Anghel began to read all he could find in the collection *The Library for All* (*Biblioteca pentru toți*). He was particularly impressed by the novel *The Miserables* by Victor Hugo [translated into Romanian], so that he was saying about its main character, Jean Valjean, that he had passed *from hell to heaven*. However, around the age of 28, he discovers another reading, namely, the *Egyptian Paterikon*, observing that *a single event of the Paterikon concentrates in it the events of a whole novel, be it even "The Miserables"*¹⁷. From a young age, Anghel began to demonstrate the gift of guiding men, and when he returned to his village, during his holidays, he was *programmed on houses, today in one house, tomorrow in another, having a schedule established several days previously*¹⁸. At the same time, he shows from an early age the power to forgive those who were unjust to him, later on remembering them at the preparation of the *Proskomedia*¹⁹ for the *Divine Liturgy*²⁰. He practiced several sports [football, swimming, athletics

¹⁵ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 25.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 26. Actually, Anghel also won a poetical creation contest held by this magazine. He had this poetical talent throughout his life, due to it managing to express in an original manner spiritual realities and exhortations, often using examples, situations and stories found in books from extremely varied domains (Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 27).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹⁹ It is about the moment of the remembrance or the commemoration of the living and the dead at the *Proskomedia*.

²⁰ For instance, he was walking, during a summer holiday, with other young people of the village on the border of Fundata Lake, rich in a sort of mud that was healing many people. A drunken villager drew near him, called Marinache, came to them, accusing them that they had stolen a bell from one of his sheep, which was not true. They denied it, but he ran after them to beat them. The young men ran away, after they had split into two groups. Some ran towards a little hill nearby and Anghel to the lake. Followed by the

(speed, jumps)], including rugby, being called, for his jumps, during the rugby matches, the *Blond Panther*. Due to sport, he also developed a friendship with King Mihai I of Romania († 2017)²¹.

After his military service²², Anghel joined the Pyrotechnics Section, the level engineering assistant, at the Faculty of Chemistry in Bucharest, which he graduated in two years. During this time, he joined as a free auditor other courses, including Nae Ionescu's philosophy courses. Anghel joined this Faculty to get a job at the "Malaxa" Arms Factory, named after the rich businessman Nicolae Malaxa, built on the suggestion of King Carol II, near Tohanu Vechi, in the region of Braşov, with the aim of replacing the armament and military technique import from Czechia. At this factory was also working his brother Radu, as a foreman²³. Anghel manufactured the first sample of mercury fulminate in Romania and managed to reduce its manufacturing time to half compared to the Czechs, from whom the armament was imported before the construction of the respective factory²⁴.

Due to certain circumstances²⁵, Anghel is sent to prison, together with his brother Radu, in the Concentration Camp of Miercurea Ciuc (1938-1940), and after his deliverance (18 April 1940) he went to Zărneşti, a locality near Braşov, where he took a job as a lawyer's secretary. For a short

villager, when he arrived on the border of the water, Anghel took his clothes off and began to swim. The villager ran after him, on the border of the lake, but when Anghel arrived on the opposite border, two people caught him and held him until Marinache arrived, who hit him several times with a twig. When his father and brothers found out, they wanted to punish Marinache, yet, finally, they did nothing against him, because Anghel had forgiven him. Later on, when Anghel became a priest and remembered those of his village at the preparation of the *Proskomedia* for the Divine Liturgy, the first of them was Marinache (Sorin Alpetri, *Viaţa Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 30-31).

²¹ Sorin Alpetri, *Viaţa Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 33-34.

²² It took place at Regiment 40 Infantry "Călugăreni" of Bazargic Town (today Tolbuhin, Bulgaria). About Anghel's achievements in the army, see Alpetri, *Viaţa Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 43-49. It is worth noting that Anghel rises to the rank of sergeant, and he is requested to remain in the army, but he refuses. During his military service, which lasted for two years, he also sculpted a roadside crucifix, made of oak wood, which remained at Bazargic (Sorin Alpetri, *Viaţa Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 49, 53).

²³ Sorin Alpetri, *Viaţa Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 50.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 51. As a reward, he received a bonus, and this salary increase allowed him to afford a Ford with two drivers. The car number was 144 on the level of Romania, namely this was the 144th car in Romania (Sorin Alpetri, *Viaţa Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 51).

²⁵ They will be shown in the second part of this presentation, highlighting Father Arsenie's prison years, detention places etc.

while (since August until the beginning of September 1940), Anghel was called to arms at Regiment 40 Infantry, situated at Bazargic, in Bulgaria. During that time, Southern Dobruja (Cadrilater) was handed over. Anghel reacted, protesting against the handing over of this region without any fight, but he was *incarcerated*. Returning to Zărnești, Anghel was appointed head of the Legionary Movement for the Zărnești small rural district, namely for the county subregion including thirteen localities, then he was elected mayor of Zărnești Town (October 1940)²⁶. Being just 26, he was the youngest mayor in Romania (1940-1941)²⁷.

Following the *legionary rebellion* of January 1941, during which mayor Papacioc had been involved in no armed incident at all, the new authorities issued a warrant on his name. He presented himself in front of the authorities willingly, being condemned to six years of correctional prison. He spent only several months in Brașov Penitentiary (until August 1941), then he was freed as he requested to go to the front²⁸.

For the period of the years 1941-1946, I shall return with details in the second part of this study, and for this reason I shall move on to the moment when Anghel Papacioc took his monastic vows, namely after his deliverance from the Aiud Prison, on 8 September 1946. He had been imprisoned by Marshal Ion Antonescu's regime and was set free by the communist regime.

As he himself confesses, Father Arsenie had vowed, together with a high school friend, to go both of them to the monastery, when they were 13 years old. His friend got married, yet he cultivated his promise, both when he was in prisons, and when, being free, he enjoyed professional success and social recognition. All these made him affirm that *at the monastery you need to go as a winner, not as a loser*²⁹. His mother, Stanca, had not really agreed to this desire that he had, yet she had moved to the Lord while Anghel was in the Aiud Prison. His relatives did not agree to his decision either, but he did not let himself influenced, regarding his joining the monastic life as the reaching of *the summit from which we can see much farther, [perceiving] the other world, where self offering means living in the spirit of God*³⁰, thus going beyond belonging to any kind of ideology.

²⁶ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 59.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 60. About Anghel's feats, in the context of the Vienna Award (1940), see Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 60-65.

²⁸ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 66-68.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

It was 13 January 1947 and Father Arsenie recalls: *I went to the Patriarchate to honour Saint Demeter. These were the first holy relics I was honouring, I was very moved, yet I had not lost my senses. When I went out of the church and I saw the free sky, I felt such a thrill inside, that I felt I could jump into that free sky, I had that foolishness for Christ. And I was not mistaken!*³¹ This decision was reinforced to him by several signs: 1) He had been asked by a colporteur to give a book to the shop assistant from the book shop that was *down the street leading to the Patriarchate*. He did not know the shop assistant, and in front of the shop there were two women. He gave the book to the shop assistant and, going some 30-40 meters away, one of the women came after him, telling him that the respective shop assistant was calling him. *I went back to him, he handed over a book to me and said: "Keep your promise!" This was all that he said. You can realize, I did not know him, he did not know me, he did not know what I was thinking, what my most secret promises were. This was yet another sign that I needed to go on;* 2) As he was walking down the street, a photo adhered to the sole of his foot. Lifting it, he saw on it a representation of the Turin Shroud. Anghel considered this fact as yet another sign that he needed to continue *on the road he had set on*, and he kept this photo throughout his life in a *Small Euchologion (Aghiasmatar)*, a book that he always took with him; 3) At the same time, Angel met on the street his former army captain, who had become a major in the meantime. He proposed to him to remain in the army, but Anghel refused, letting him know that he wished to become a monk³².

All these events and the way he left for the monastery represent what Father Arsenie affirmed after years: *I left for the monastery out of foolishness for Christ. I went to become a monk with a lot of zeal, yet if there is no foolishness for Christ, you cannot resist. Here you lose yourself in order to be able to find yourself, in an angelic position*³³.

Remarkable is the itinerary covered by Anghel Papacioc, which I shall present in brief, which could be the topic of another study. He first goes to Frăsinei Monastery, where he is not received, the old starets Simeon telling him: *I won't take you, brother. I see you are a little more educated and I cannot ask you to take care of the oxen. And then, what will the brothers say: you are keeping this one in the office, while you are asking us to do*

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 94.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

the hard works!³⁴ From Frăsinei he left for Cozia Monastery, where he is received (15 January 1947)³⁵ and he is entrusted the mission of verger³⁶. Many things marked him there, including the veneration of the Holy Relics of Saint Pahomie, who had been a hermit in those places³⁷. The Security had him under permanent surveillance at Cozia, having him declare any travel and checked almost monthly. During that period, brother Anghel and his starets, Father Ghermano (Gherman Dineață), were appointed to teach the discipline *Education* at the school set up in the vicinity of Turnu Monastery. Brother Anghel taught the students *About Christ (Despre Hristos)*, for a trimester, after which the school director required him to change the topic and teach about communist materialism. Brother Anghel refused and resigned, in exchange, the starets accepted compromise for a salary of 200 lei, which represented an important sum during that time. In front of this situation, brother Anghel had the courage to reprimand his starets: *How did you accept, Father Starets, to abjure Christ?* Since that moment, the starets changed his conduct towards Anghel, whom he was calling *an angel* (in Romanian: *înger*). He moved him from his cell into one that had a stone wall washed by the waters of the Olt River, so that in winter the entire wall got full of ice. Although Anghel had already proved his spiritual maturity, and the Fathers of Cozia Monastery and even the Starets of the nearby monasteries often came to him for advice, Father Ghermano, to get rid of him, sent him to Comanca, a locality situated two kilometres away from Caracal. There was a 300 hectares estate, belonging to six monasteries, each monastery sending, in turn, a monk or a nun, to oversee the estate management. Among the six monasteries there was also Tismana. The Starets of this monastery, Father Gherasim Iscu, when he saw Anghel there, reproached the starets of Cozia: *How can you keep such a man here?!* He even proposed Anghel to come to Tismana, yet he answered that he is not going anywhere without his starets' blessing³⁸.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

³⁵ Părintele Arsenie, *O clipă inima*, p. 11.

³⁶ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 96-97.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 98-99.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 100-101. About the miracles lived here, see Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 101-103. Impressive is the event with a she-goat, which he had taken to feed on its milk. Anghel would go into a barn, where he would pray. Once, entering there as he was used to, this she-goat, which had remained outside, made such noise that he decided to let it inside the barn. He bent its front knees and put the animal by his side during his prayer. The next day, when he entered the barn, at prayer time, this she-goat came by itself, got

Usually, the brothers would stay at Comanca for one month, Anghel stayed there for 16 months, finally obtaining Father Ghermano's blessing to go, after he had saved the wheat harvest of the six monasteries, which the communists wanted to take³⁹. In August 1948, Anghel went to Tismana Monastery, where he remained only for a day, because Father Starets Gherasim Iscu sent him to the Cioclovina Skete. There he lived on his own, for five months, his mission being to take care of twenty beehives. The spiritual life at the skete was not devoid of temptations, to which one can add the communists' attempts to arrest him. Thanks to the wolves, he escaped the arrest, but Father Gherasim Iscu did not, and so he passed to the Lord in prison⁴⁰. Brother Anghel was proposed by the new starets of Tismana for the tonsure in the monastic life. The exarch of the monasteries in the Archiepiscopate of Craiova, coming to inspect the skete, even proposed him as a spiritual counsellor of the Seminary of Mufleni, Craiova. Bishop Firmilian approved the appointment, yet the Security was against it, with the result that Anghel was obliged to leave the Archiepiscopate of Craiova⁴¹.

In January 1949, brother Anghel was at Sihăstria Monastery, where he had arrived on the advice of Father Gherontie Bălan, an acquaintance from Cozia whom he met once more in Bucharest. Father Cleopa Ilie, the starets of the monastery, ordered that he should no longer be called "Brother" Anghel, but "Father" Anghel, because he had noticed that he had a great influence over the believers. For this reason, Father Cleopa let him stay on his chair from his cell porch, entrusting him with the mission to teach people in his absence⁴². Standing out for having attained a special spiritual height, although just a rassophore⁴³ (for two years), Anghel was sent alone in the wilderness, according to a secret council of the most advanced Fathers of Sihăstria Monastery: Cleopa Ilie, Paisie Olaru, Ianuarie, Casian and Macarie. Anghel had pre-tasted *the sweetness of the wilderness* at the age of 27, when he stayed for a few months by the side of a hermit Father in the Piatra Craiului Mountains⁴⁴. At his departure for the second experience of the

itself on its knees and stayed there without making any noise. This impressed Anghel, who would take advantage spiritually of any situation (Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 102).

³⁹ About this episode see Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 103.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 104-105.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 107.

⁴³ Namely a robe-bearer.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

living in the wilderness (the winter between the years 1948-1949, therefore at the age of 34), Father Cleopa gave him a bag full of bread crumbs, and Father Paisie 18 pieces of sugar, whose *spiritual sweetness* was felt by Father Arsenie throughout his entire life⁴⁵.

After a while, brother Anghel was sent, as obedience, to the Biblical Institute of Bucharest. In the morning he was a sculptor at this Institute, and in the afternoon he was a verger at Antim Monastery, where he also had his cell. During this time, he knew the important representatives of The Burning Bush Movement (1945-1948), like the Fathers Benedict Ghiuș, Sofian Boghiu, Petroniu Tănase, Agaton Tudor (Sandu Tudor) etc. or the intellectuals Alexandru Codin Mironescu, Paul Sterian, the composer Paul Constantinescu, the writers Vasile Voiculescu and Ion Marin Sadoveanu, the architect Constantin Joja, the professor Alexandru Elian and many others⁴⁶. The tonsure in the monastic life took place on the day of 26 September 1949, at Antim Monastery, yet on behalf of Sihăstria Monastery. Father Sofian Boghiu read the prayers of the respective service, Father Benedict Ghiuș tonsured him, and Father Tănase Petroniu, who drew sorts for his monastic name (Arsenie), was his God-father in his monastic life⁴⁷.

Father Cleopa Ilie was, during that time, the starlets of Slatina Monastery, where he wanted Father Arsenie. Things were so arranged, by the divine oikonomia, that Father Arsenie left for this monastery, in the month of June of the year 1950. In the meantime, he is ordained deacon at the Calamfidești Monastery, near Rădăuți, and on 26 September 1950, so, exactly one year after his tonsure as a monk, he is ordained as a priest at Agafton Monastery, near Botoșani⁴⁸. Father Cleopa would say: *I have proposed him for priesthood. He was as clean as he had come out of his mother's womb!*⁴⁹ Immediately after having received the Holy Mystery of Priesthood, Father Arsenie was appointed confessor and professor at the *Nicodemus*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 111-112; *Iată Duhovnicul. Părintele Arsenie Papacioc*, vol. 2, edition arranged by Hieromonk Benedict Stancu, Editura Sophia, București, 2006, pp. 26-27 (= *Iată Duhovnicul*, vol. 2); Arhim. Arsenie Papacioc, *Epistole*, Editura Accent Print, Suceava, 2015, p. 225.

⁴⁶ See Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 113-115.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 116-117. Great was his joy when he noticed that Saint Arsenios is celebrated on 8 May, as Saint John the Evangelist, also celebrated on the day of his tonsure as a monk, making him say to himself: *The Apostle of love is following me!* (Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 117).

⁴⁸ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 118.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 118, note 142.

*the Sanctified (Nicodim cel Sfințit) Seminary of Neamț Monastery (1950-1952)*⁵⁰.

After the episode of his arrest (December 1951), Father Arsenie returned at Slatina Monastery, where he was in 1952. Given the Security pressures, Father Cleopa and Father Arsenie withdraw for two years in the Stănișoara Mountains (1952-1954)⁵¹. The two went out of the wilderness on the order of Justinian Marina the Patriarch, pressed by the communist regime, which was accusing the monks of the wilderness that they were giving help to the people who opposed the respective regime. They went to Slatina Monastery⁵², then to Bucharest (June 1954), being called by Justinian the Patriarch, who hosted them in the Palace, to save them from prison⁵³. Father Arsenie constantly appreciated Patriarch Justinian, about whom he would say that he was *very brave*, and whom he personally defended against the accusations that he would have been the man of the regime, as he had understood *his cautious and intelligent attitude* in front of the communist regime. *War is a game of intelligence, yet war is still war*, as Father Arsenie would say⁵⁴. The Patriarch sent the two Fathers at the monasteries Țigănești, Pasărea, Căldărușani, Suzana, Zamfira and Cheia, to reinvigorate the spiritual life. At Pasărea Monastery they were arrested,

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 120-121; Părintele Arsenie, *O clipă inima*, p. 12.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 123; *Iată Duhovnicul*, pp. 35-41. It should be mentioned that Father Arsenie was at his third experience of the wilderness. His first experience took place during the period September 1941 - February 1942, and the second during the winter of the years 1948-1949. In relation to the experience of the wilderness and that of the prison, Father Arsenie affirms: *I have been asked by many where it was harder: in prison or in the wilderness, because I have lived in the wilderness as well. In prison, those who did not believe in God suffered torment and they felt bad. Because there was no invisible force to stop a little the wild impulses of cruelty, of hate, pressing in on man continually. That was missing. In the wilderness, however, the devils one is fighting against were afraid of God and it was easier, despite all the whims of the weather: winter, snow, wild beasts, tension [was present] there, too. Yet, there was, however, a note of freedom. Because you all do not know how precious freedom is and why God left it to us. There is nothing as precious with God as the time he is giving to us to live. Because to breathe in and out is still from God. And then the Lord Christ had great prudence to say that "no hair moves unless such is My will" [Părintele Arsenie Papacioc, "Nu contează decât maniera în care mori" ("The only thing that matters is the way you die"), in Mărturisitorii. Minuni. Mărturii. Repere, edition supervised by Lucian Voicilă, Editura Lucman, București, 2010, p. 118].*

⁵² Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 131-132.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

during the service of the Mystery of the Holy Oil, but they were freed by the nuns, over a hundred, arrived with working tools at the Police Section .

Father Arsenie considered it inadequate for them to go from monastery to monastery, thus ignoring the local spiritual fathers. On his proposition of having a monastery where the two could live and be found by anyone for advice, Slatina Monastery was chosen, where the two had also been before. Father Cleopa was appointed starets, and Father Arsenie hegumen (1955), while around them emerged a community of 120 dwellers⁵⁵. Due to these monks' training, of whom many had, later on, an important role in the life of the Church, Slatina Monastery was called *Spiritual Academy* (*Academie duhovnicească*), and the local metropolitan also put under their spiritual supervision other monasteries, namely Sihăstria, Sihla, Râșca, Rarău and Cămârzani, so that all of them, having Slatina Monastery as their headquarters, were called *The Community of Saint Theodore the Studite* (*Obștea Sfântului Teodor Studitul*)⁵⁶.

In the spring of the year 1955, the Fathers Arsenie Papacioc and Cleopa Ilie took part in the action of the Romanian Patriarchate meant to enlighten and fight the Stylites in Moldavia, but they were also involved, together with other Fathers, in drafting a text directed against the Monastery of Vladimirești⁵⁷.

After the period of detention in Suceava, Bucharest, Jilava and Aiud (1958-1964), Father Arsenie was not received in any monastery. The Metropolitan of Moldavia refused him, due to the fact that Father Arsenie was 50 years old and was under the restrictions of the *Decree* 410 of the year 1959. In Bucharest, Patriarch Justinian tried to send him to Cernica Monastery, yet the Security, by the Department of Cults, permanently opposed this fact, fearing his presence near Bucharest⁵⁸. Under these circumstances, Patriarch

⁵⁵ See *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁵⁶ Among them were the Fathers Paisie Olaru, Petroniu Tănase, Emilian Olaru, Gherontie Bălan, Dosoftei Murariu, Iustinian Stoica, Roman Braga, hierodeacon Antonie Plămădeală, future hierarch of the Romanian Patriarchate, monk Marcu Dumitrescu etc. In relation with them was also Father Daniil (Sandu) Tudor of Rarău Skete (Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 135, 138, 151). Father Arsenie was the confessor of Father Andrei Scrima, who, before going to India, came to Slatina Monastery, to take a blessing, see Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 147.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 134. About the order cultivated at Slatina Monastery see *Ibid.*, pp. 135-136.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 143. For this text, see *Iată duhovnicul. Părintele Arsenie Papacioc*, Editura Sophia, București, 2010, pp. 228-302. As far as the practice of Father Ioan Iovan of Vladimirești Monastery regarding mass confession and, especially, the frequent Divine Communion

Justinian sent him to the Metropolitan of Ardeal (Transylvania), Teofil, who received him *very well* and entrusted to him the parish of Filea de Jos Village (1965), and a year later also Filea de Sus Village (1966), where he managed, with his pastoral tact, to bring everyone back to the Orthodox faith⁵⁹.

In July 1967, Patriarch Justinian called Father Arsenie at Cheia Monastery, where he appointed him starets and confessor, so that he was coming back at the monastery after nine years (six years of prison and three years of pilgrimage)⁶⁰. In December 1971, Father Arsenie was moved to Căldărușani Monastery, where he was given the mission of treasurer and cashier⁶¹. After nine months, in September 1972, he is moved, under the pressure of the Security, at Dintr-un Lemn Monastery, as a confessor and celebrant⁶², where he remained until 9 October 1974, when the communist authorities asked him to go to Cernica Monastery⁶³. During that time, some archeological discoveries had been made on the bank of the Ialomița River, also visited by the president of the country Nicolae Ceaușescu⁶⁴. The road was passing by the Balaciu Monastery, then in ruin, and Ceaușescu, seeing it, gave order to be restored also with the State contribution. Father Arsenie, who had been ordained as a celebrant at Cernica Monastery, was envisioned as overseer of this restoration, which, because of the great

see Lect. dr. Ion Marian Croitoru, "Deasa sau rara participare a credincioșilor la Dumn-ezeiasca Împărtășanie? Dezbateri euharistică în Ortodoxia românească de la jumătatea secolului al XX-lea", in *Euharistie, Spovedanie, Martiriu, Lucrările Simpozionului internațional al Facultății de Teologie Ortodoxă din Cluj-Napoca (3-5 noiembrie 2014)*, vol. II, coordinators: Vasile Stanciu, Adrian Podaru, Editura Renașterea, Cluj-Napoca, 2015, pp. 363-404; for another analysis of "the spiritual phenomenon" of Vladimirești and Sihastru see also Cristian Vasile, *Biserica Ortodoxă în primul deceniu comunist*, Editura Curtea Veche, București, 2005, pp. 251-257.

⁵⁹ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 208-210.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 212-213.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 218-219.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 230.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 234.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 249. This change was also due to the Security, which imposed to Patriarch Justinian to move Father Arsenie. In relation to this moment, Father Arsenie affirmed: *The Patriarch protected me, as far as he is concerned, as much as he could. He would say: "This Father defended me in prison, while others were denigrating me, and so how could I move him?" But he had no choice, it was impossible to reach any agreement with the communists* (*Ibid.*, p. 248).

costs, no longer took place⁶⁵. However, the Father is appointed, in 1976⁶⁶, celebrant and confessor at *Saint Mary Skete of Techirghiol*, later on turned into Monastery, where he will remain until the end of his earthly life (19 July 2011)⁶⁷. The Security informers seized Father Arsenie Papacioc's work, affirming about him that *he enjoyed very much popularity in the county and in the country, many believers waiting for him at the cell by the church*⁶⁸.

2. Glimpses of Father Arsenie's experiences in the communist prisons

In the social, cultural and spiritual context of a chaotic epoch deprived of spiritual senses, the young Anghel joined the *Legion of the Archangel Michael* (*Legiunea Arhanghelul Mihail*), in 1933, being part of the Iancu Jianu "nest" (*cuibul Iancu Jianu*), which also included Misleanu Commune. He was attracted by the Christian dimension of the Movement, namely by the principles that guided the *Legion*: *the knowledge and accomplishment of the commandments of the Evangel, the reading of the Psalter, going to church, the confession of sins, the Holy Communion, fasting, common sense, love for our fellow, charity*, all these being obligatory for those who wanted to call themselves legionaries⁶⁹. As Father Arsenie testified, the *Legion* helped him enormously, promoting an education that was committing you to something. *This got me out of a latent state of young man who wanted something and did not know what. And the Legion appeared, with enthusiasm, with valiance, patronized by the Archangel Michael*. In contact with this Movement, the young Anghel was able to delineate a spiritual ideal for himself, which he followed his entire life: *We had no other ideal except to be granted by God the happiness to die ripped and persecuted for the spark of Truth that we*

⁶⁵ The type of these archaeological discoveries is not specified in the text (*Ibid.*, p. 249).

⁶⁶ See *Ibid.*, pp. 249-250.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 262. It has been affirmed that Father Arsenie got to Techirghiol rather due to some intrigues, because he was going to be starets at Cernica Monastery ("Părintele Arsenie Papacioc, apostolul iubirii neamului românesc. Portret", in *Atitudini. Îndrumar de gândire și trăire ortodoxă*, 3/18 (2011), pp. 20-21; Părintele Arsenie, *O clipă inima*, p. 12, note 1).

⁶⁸ On that day I was in Veria (Greece), where I was transcribing, together with Father Matei Vulcănescu, the dialogue that Father Arsenie had had with the Greek Professors Father Georgios Metallinos and Dimitrios Tselengidis, in the morning of the day of June 1, 2010.

⁶⁹ ACNSAS, *Fond informativ, dosar 185003*, vol. 3, f. 409, apud Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 265.

*know we have in us, for whose defense we will set out to battle the rulers of darkness like grim death. This is my motto!*⁷⁰

Yet, Anghel knew how to maintain a balance, and did not let, as far as he was concerned, the Legionary Movement go above the Christian teaching. For this reason, he did not agree to the crimes committed. *Many mistakes were made in the Legionary Movement, because murder was encouraged, but the Father had no idea about what was behind these crimes or the inner plotting, which people were talking about.* However, Anghel met valuable people in the framework of the Movement, who were going to be models of morality, courage and heroism for many young people, animated by the movement's team work spirit and the exhortation to sacrifice⁷¹.

During his military service, Anghel interrupted his activity in the *Legion*, and then he resumed it, while working at the Armament Factory near Braşov. In 1938, Carol II instated a dictatorship, and on the occasion of a reunion of the legionary elite, attended by about 90 persons, he gave the order that about half of them be killed. Anghel had been convoked as well, but due to God's providence he had to be elsewhere⁷².

The first detention of Father Arsenie was as a layman, for two years (1938-1940), in the Prison or Labour Camp of Miercurea Ciuc, following a false denunciation regarding his brother, Radu, whom he was working with at the Malaxa Armament Factory. The denunciation was that Radu could have shut Carol II, while the latter was visiting the respective factory. The investigation took two years, finally revealing the innocence of the Papacioc brothers, Anghel remaining in prison all of this time⁷³. However, Anghel turned this situation as well to his spiritual advantage. *I used to go to the attic of the building and pray profoundly..., and the devil would torture me terribly. He came in front of me several times and there I fought him. Yes, I wrestled with him for hours on end,* he told a detention mate. He was just

⁷⁰ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 38.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 38. One of the principles of the education received was the keeping of the physical and spiritual cleanliness, namely of the virginity by the unmarried and of the conjugal fidelity by those who had a family. Father Arsenie held on to this principle all his life, and when he was a mayor in Zărnești, being present at a festive opening of a meeting of a Legionary Movement women group, said: *If among you there is any girl who is not a virgin or any married woman who has ever cheated on her husband, she should leave the group at once! It was all that I said and they all shivered* (Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 62).

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39. About Anghel's participation in the Legionary Movement and its camps, see *Ibid.*, pp. 39-42.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

25 years old⁷⁴. Many Legionnaires were imprisoned in the Labour Camp of Miercurea Ciuc, where they took care to maintain an atmosphere of *permanent prayer*. They would manufacture little necklace crosses, roadside crosses and icons, and for one hour, day and night, each inmate would pray or read from the *Holy Scripture, Psalter*, stopping only when he was replaced. *At night, the collective prayer was concluded*, according to the testimony of Mircea Eliade, who was also with him in the same labour camp, during the same period, *with an impressive "God is with us" ("Cu noi este Dumnezeu"), sung by 300 voices*⁷⁵.

The second detention was because of the *legionary rebellion* of January 1941. He took part, as mayor of Zărnești locality, to the Brașov event, where he brought a group of people, yet with no shooting of any bullet⁷⁶. However, he was arrested by the new authorities and condemned to six years of correctional prison, in the Brașov Penitentiary⁷⁷. During this detention, Anghel made a *chapel*, to which he also sculpted the holy doors. Moreover, he got to become the prison leader, even *as inmate*. *How much trust did people have in me and how they were listening to me! Not just in administrative matters, but especially in matters of living and soul. At my door there was a true pilgrimage and I almost had no time to listen to everyone and give the proper advice. I was asking myself, then: what do these people find in me, to be looking for me?*⁷⁸

This detention only lasted for a few months, Anghel being delivered in August 1941, following his request to go to the front⁷⁹. After his deliverance, Anghel came to Regiment 40 Infantry, to be sent to the front. Father Anghel recalls: *The soldiers' Distribution Center was in Fetești. I was dis-*

⁷⁴ Radu will be killed by shooting, together with nine legionnaires, in the night of 21 to 22 September 1939, under the false pretext that they wanted to evade. The ten could have included Anghel or anyone else. This is why Father Arsenie would say, later on, to his pain mates from Aiud, that Saint Nicholas kept him safe from death, then, at Miercurea Ciuc. Moreover, after his deliverance, his brother's killer got to be his subordinate. Anghel could have done any thing to him, even kill him, yet he preferred to act by reference to God: *But I thought: if I leave him alone and do not take revenge, God will owe me one; and so I relaxed* (*Ibid.*, pp. 56-58).

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 55; Fabian Seiche, *Martiri și mărturisitori români din secolul XX*, Făgăraș, 2010, p. 39.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

tributed to battalion 40 with which I was supposed to go to Odessa. I left to join them and before getting to them, the battalion joined the fight and they all were decimated. I was distributed to another battalion, still in Odessa. I left again and before I got there, the battalion joined the fight and again they were all killed. Then I returned to Fetești. The colonel in charge of all these distributions said: "This man is protected by God lest he should die!" And so they discharged me. I wanted to go to the monastery and this is why God was protecting me, Father Arsenie would say, after many years⁸⁰.

Nevertheless, the authorities were trying to imprison him again, and even kill him. For this reason, Anghel hid himself in the mountains, first at Piatra Craiului⁸¹. Living in a cabin, one day a family comes along over there, with just one daughter. The discussions were beautiful, and he confessed to the young family his desire to become a monk. 17 years later, that man will be in the position of torturer of the Father in the trial of the Burning Bush lot⁸². In the Mountains of Piatra Craiului, Anghel met a hermit, with whom he spent two months. He stayed in the mountains for several months, from September 1941 until February 1942⁸³.

During the spring of the year 1942, Anghel went at Timișoara⁸⁴, intending to cross the border and go to Germany, because many legionnaires had managed, in this way, to escape the authorities that were after them⁸⁵. His attempt to cross the border did not succeed. It was the month of July 1942. He is caught, arrested and taken to Brașov, where he was judged and condemned to six years of prison. He was 28 years old. He was first taken to a labour camp in Vaslui. The detainees were put into chains with rivets, to

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 69-71.

⁸⁵ During his stay in Timișoara, Anghel did the drawing of Saint Paul the Apostle, holding a sword in his left hand, the *Evangel* to his bosom and the pointer of his right hand pointing to heaven. The explanation of the drawing is written at the bottom, where Anghel put the quotation from *Colossians* 3: 2: *Set your minds on what is above, not on the things that are on earth*. During that time, he also read the *Egyptian Paterikon*, a reading that will be useful to him in the years of prison (*Ibid.*, p. 72). I shall mention that I also have a photo of this drawing, which the Father himself gave to me. Actually, Father Arsenie used to give those who stayed a while in his cell one copy of his drawings. *They were like a business card for him or, maybe, like a lure using which he could catch those sincerely longing for better, for more beautiful* (*Ibid.*, p. 295).

prevent their escape. *I had chains with rivets, not with lock. When my turn came to be enchained, he couldn't. First he was unable to put the rivet, the second time a chain link broke loose, the third time the hammer handle broke. When he saw it, the man hammering the rivets said angrily that he was no longer going to enchain me. I asked him to put the chains on me because, otherwise, they would kill us both. For as long as I prayed inside me, he was not able to put me in chains, but when I saw him getting angry for being unable to enchain me, I stopped praying and then he was able to enchain me*⁸⁶. After an exhausting trip by train, the detainees arrived in Vaslui, where, going down, they went to and fro, and Anghel found himself alone in the train station, with the chains on his hands and feet. In the mean time, a truck had come, and, embarking the detainees, took them to the other part of the town, where the labour camp was. *I had gotten terribly scared, the Father would recall, because I was afraid lest they should accuse me of attempted escape. Never have I been afraid of freedom as much as then. I went out of the train station quickly and I took directly to the center of the road crossing the city, in the sight of everyone, carrying my chains as visibly as possible, in order not to be met hidden among the people and be accused that I wanted to escape. The people were amazed and crossed themselves, but I was minding my way. Since then I remember Vaslui as the longest town in the country, with a single interminable road, at whose end I arrived after a forced and straight march, and my colleagues, when they saw me, jumped with joy that I had not been shot. They loved me a lot and, for the joy of recovering me, held me on their arms for the blacksmith to cut the rivets from the chains*⁸⁷.

Vaslui was followed by Aiud or Antonescu's prison, where, for an ideal and much love for the nation, as Father Arsenie confessed, Church servants and thousands and thousands of believers were under locks and heavy chains, under barbed wire and under the most devilish disdain and human hate, with no signs that they would go out or the slightest relief⁸⁸. The detainees divided themselves into three groups⁸⁹. The first group was looking by all means for a political solution and wanted to be informed about everything that was going on in the country. The second group, smaller as dimension, was formed of those who had become indifferent and were willing to make compromises

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 73; Pr. Prof. Ion Buga, *Minipatrologie contemporană*, București, 1994, pp 34-35.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 74; Arhim. Arsenie Papacioc, *Scrisori către fiii mei duhovnicești*, Mănăstirea Dervent, Constanța, 2001, p. 142 (= Arhim. Arsenie, *Scrisori*).

to get out of prison. The third group was even smaller, called the *mystics'* group, who assumed their presence in that place, understanding that *it was for their own sins and the sins of the people they loved that they were there and that they have the duty to repent, to pray and to do the Evangel's actions as much as they could*⁹⁰. This last group included: Anghel Papacioc, Traian Trifan, Traian Marian, Valeriu Gafencu, Virgil Maxim, Ion Ianolide, Marin Naidim, Constantin Pascu, Iulian Bălan, Father Vasile Serghie, Constantin Dumitru (future Father Marcu from Sihăstria) and others⁹¹. It ought to be mentioned that the Security was considering Anghel as the respective group's *religious theorist*⁹², because he would follow the line drawn by the respective group, namely *a line of Christian and Romanian conduct for all the political detainees, valid not just for the period of Antonescu's dictatorship, but also for the entire life of those imprisoned as model of attitude*⁹³.

Thus, Anghel Papacioc delineates, together with Traian Trifan and Traian Marian⁹⁴, the new conduct to follow, namely, *vertically, that is towards spiritual perfection, as opposed to the horizontal line, which represented the political activity.* His opinion will be, therefore, that the Legionary Movement should no longer be overlapped with the Christian teaching, and his argumentation was as follows: *in the political realm often an intervention is needed, in which the authority and moral person of the Church cannot indulge*⁹⁵. He saw a collaboration between the Church, by its spiritual people, and the adequate political groups, but the latter ought to be led by living Christians⁹⁶. Consequently, one can notice that Anghel had given up the political activity even since the years 1942-1944, even before the instauration of the communist regime in Romania⁹⁷. On 8 September 1946, he is freed from Aiud, but Romania was under communist regime since 1944⁹⁸.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 74, note 76.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 75, note 81.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-75; Virgil Maxim, *Imn pentru crucea purtată. Abecedar duhovnicesc pentru un frate de cruce*, Editura Antim, 2002², p. 180 (= Maxim, *Imn*).

⁹⁵ Anghel knew these two even since his mandate as a mayor in Zărnești. Traian Trifan had been the prefect of Brașov, and Marian Traian the mayor of Brașov, Anghel having good relations with both of them (Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 61).

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 75, note 78.

In the prison of Aiud, the *mystics'* group's life was focused on prayer, both personal and in common (night vigils, the service of *The Hours*), accompanied by study programme, meditations and exegetic discussions. The seal of their Christian living can be observed as well from the fact that they had a special prayer for their persecutors: *Lord, Jesus Crist, You, Who have suffered for the entire human nation and have forgiven all those who repent for their sins, make it so that none of the ones who hate and persecute us may suffer anything bad, because of us, at Your judgement. But turn their souls to the conscience of the Truth and give them true repentance, so that Your all-holy Name may be glorified through them as well. As for us, make us worthy to confess You, the true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, for the glory of Your Name and the salvation of our souls. Amen!*⁹⁹ Anghel Papacioc stood out among all the group members, being exceptionally zealous for attaining the stages of virtuous, pure, holy life, and a fervent animator for hesichastic prayer¹⁰⁰. He was a monk in lay clothes and when he was praying, he no longer heard and saw anything around him. This state characterized Father Vasile Serghie as well. They were completely absorbed by prayer¹⁰¹. About what he lived there, Father Arsenie confesses over the years: *I bless that time. I have spent years in the wilderness, but there I did not have the possibility to deepen the things of eternal nature, of divine nature, as in suffering. Suffering also united us. Those of us who have managed to know one another on the cross have remained united. The image of my prison is together with this small group in which I felt very good. Among us there was great unity. All of them were ready to die. These people, Gafencu, Trifan, Marian, all of them, Maxim, Pascu and the others, I would sanctify (canonize) them all. Was, any of them, better than the other? What matters is the way you receive suffering. I would sanctify them all, because they were sincere and because they did not hesitate in sacrificing themselves. They were all sacrificing. They all went, one by one. With a joy hard to explain, during the Proskomedie I remember them all as fighters, next to the great voivodes of the country*¹⁰².

We ought to signal that the regime in prisons grew worse beginning with the spring of the year 1943. The detainees were arranged one per cell and supervised rigorously, food got worse, they began to be punished physically, isolated in punishment rooms or at *Zarcă*, namely in a place

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 77; V. Maxim, *Imn*, p. 91.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 77; V. Maxim, *Imn*, p. 110

¹⁰² Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 77; V. Maxim, *Imn*, p. 107.

considered a sort of *prison in prison*, with a tough regime, even an extermination regime. In *Zarcă*, the detainee was obliged to stand up or stand on the bed side from 5 in the morning till 22 in the evening. If anyone was ill, he had no medical care, and food was scarce. *No grain of bean, no grain of wheat, no piece of potato was allowed. At the window, blocked shutters. There was also a wood ratio: three splints, and in winter, in the morning, the liquid in the sanitary tube had a layer of ice in it*¹⁰³. Anghel passed through this *Zarcă*¹⁰⁴ several times, impairing his health¹⁰⁵.

After 23 August 1944, when the Russian troops entered the country, a period of several months followed, dominated by chaos and uncertainty, yet some rights were also granted to the *political detainees*, who were allowed to stay together in cells according to their preference, read the *Holy Scripture*, confess their sins once a week, do different works inside, but also outside the prison, and the priests imprisoned had the right to serve in the prison chapel. The detainees in Anghel's group were trying to spend their time in prayers and spiritual conversations. *To make a program of study, meditation and prayer*, Virgil Maxim narrates, at that time a cell colleague of Anghel Papacioc¹⁰⁶, *we set ourselves meeting hours or days; instead of the guards closing us, we made ourselves inner locks. When you found the door locked, you knew that there the lamp of the heart was lit and was burning for Christ. You returned on the day and at the hour indicated on the door*¹⁰⁷.

For a while, in the cell with the two stayed Father Vasile Serghie as well, who was also their confessor. One day, Father Vasile had a moment of great spiritual torment, realizing that the Holy Mystery of Priesthood was greater than him, and he was trying to avoid accomplishing his service as a priest. Then, Anghel Papacioc, drawing close to him, with tears in his eyes, said to him: "O, Father Vasile, now you really are a good Priest! Now, when you live with the conscience of your unworthiness! "For God's power is made known

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 78; *Sfântul închisorilor. Mărturii despre Valeriu Gafencu, adunate și adnotate de Monahul Moise*, Editura Reîntregirea, Alba Iulia, 2017², pp. 43-44.

¹⁰⁴ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 78; Ion Ianolide, *Întoarcerea lui Hristos. Document pentru o lume nouă*, edition arranged by Mănăstirea Diaconești, Editura Christiana, București, 2006, p. 47, note 9.

¹⁰⁵ One can see, therefore, that *Zarca* was not the invention of the communist regime, but of Antonescu's regime, but during the communists' time the conditions become even tougher.

¹⁰⁶ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 78.

¹⁰⁷ He needed permanent help, so that Virgil Maxim remained to take care of him (Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 79; V. Maxim, *Imn*, pp. 107-108).

in powerlessness and God gives grace to the humble". How good it would be, if each priest were to live with this conscience of his unworthiness. With how much attention, with how much fear and trembling he would accomplish his service of apostle of Christ on earth?!" Falling into each other's arms, they were crying; tears of reassurance and encouraging joy came together on their cheeks... Anghel Papacioc was then mysteriously a priest and a monk!¹⁰⁸

During the time of this detention, Anghel sculpted different decorative or liturgical items: a beautiful frame, declared *the most beautiful work in the entire prison museum*, which the then prison director took for himself, to frame his portrait, although it was meant for the portrait of Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej; several oil icon lamps, including the one that he had in his monastery cell from Techirghiol. Called *the never-sleeping icon lamp*, which he kept permanently lit, the Father explained to those visiting him its symbolism: the candle was delimited in two areas by a belt, which unites and separates, at the same time, the two worlds, celestial and terrestrial, but also the two parts of the human being, soul and body. The belt is considered, in this composition, the symbol of power, which makes the connection respectively between heaven and earth, and between soul and body. The icon lamp is set in a pedestal, put on the wall and which has represented on it some crosses. In the lower area of this pedestal there are three broken crosses, symbolizing the fact that the Truth is persecuted in the world, and the cross above them, situated in the upper area, is straight and overflows with rays downwards, illustrating that the Truth is to prevail in the end, because the fight is from down here, on the earth, but the victory comes from up High, from Heavens¹⁰⁹.

Anghel Papacioc is delivered from the Aiud prison on 8 September 1946¹¹⁰, finding the Romanian society, as mentioned also above, under the dominion of the communist regime.

¹⁰⁸ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 81; V. Maxim, *Imn*, p. 107.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 82; V. Maxim, *Imn*, pp. 115-116.

¹¹⁰ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 85-86. Anghel's achievements in sculpture were several: the holy doors for the chapel of the Brașov prison (realized during the period 1941-1942); the entrance doors of Turda Bank (before his deliverance from Aiud, in 1946); other holy doors for some churches in Bucharest (after the deliverance of 1964); the ark according to the model of the church of Curtea de Argeș Monastery, at the realization of the project participating several detainees (for their names, see Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 86; V. Maxim, *Imn*, p. 118), having many sculpture models (about 45-47) realized in miniature by Anghel Papacioc and his disciples Iulian Bălan, Petru Foti and Sebastian Avram. Finished in April 1946, the ark was donated to the *monastery of virgin*

After he received the ordination as a priest (26 September 1950), Father Arsenie was appointed confessor and teacher at the Seminary of Neamț. Followed by the Security, he is arrested, in December 1951. After his deliverance, Father Arsenie went to Slatina Monastery, where he can be found in 1952¹¹¹. By their living, the Fathers Cleopa Ilie and Arsenie Papacioc attract many believers. This thing bothered the Security, which began threatening them. Father Arsenie was taken to different Security centres of Suceava County, was thrown into dirty, cold and deserted rooms, under the threat of death. In this context, the two Fathers Cleopa and Arsenie decided to retreat in the mountains nearby the monastery, namely in the Mountains of Stânișoara¹¹². Father Arsenie spent two years in this wilderness (1952-1954), as mentioned in the first part of this study as well, and what they were living made him exclaim: *Great is the power of humility! Great is the power of the Holy Fathers! The wilderness means by all means a state from beyond the human being, from beyond high human calculations, because the spiritual life is not a calculated life, it is a life lived without words*¹¹³. The two Fathers' life of hermits was stopped at the pressure of the Security on Patriarch Justinian, who called them to Bucharest (June 1954), to help them escape prison. After a while, the Fathers Arsenie and Cleopa returned to Slatina Monastery (1955). Yet, the activity undertaken here was not on the liking of the Security, which had observed that among the dwellers of Slatina Monastery and of the monastic settlements belonging to it there were also people who had taken part in the spiritual meetings of Antim Mon-

nuns of Vladimirești, where it actually arrived, yet it disappeared after 1955, when the respective monastery was abolished. It is supposed to have been taken by the Russians. It ought to be mentioned that the ark was seen, in Bucharest, also by the sculptor Ion Jalea, colleague of Anghel Papacioc at the School of Arts and Trades, who exclaimed: *If Anghel had not been imprisoned, he would have prevailed over all of us* (Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 87-88; V. Maxim, *Imn*, p. 118). Father Arsenie sculpted his monastic cross as well (1949), much appreciated in the epoch, but also later. He sculpted a similar cross for his God-father in the monastic life, who was Father Petroniu Tănase (S. Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 115-116). Later, Father Arsenie made a drawing in pencil, representing death under the form of a skull. He multiplied this drawing and gave it to his spiritual sons, to teach them the meaning of death (S. Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 146-147). At Dintr-un Lemn Monastery, Father Arsenie made a few other drawings: *Prefacerea Sfintelor Daruri* (*The Transformation of the Holy Gifts*) or *Epicleza* (*Epiclesis*); *Crucea din care ies raze de jur împrejur* (*The Cross Overflowing with Rays*) (*Ibid.*, pp. 244-245).

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 123.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

astery, in the framework of the Burning Bush Movement. To this fact one can add two more that reinforced the suspicions of the Security: 1) the presence in Bucharest of the Fathers Arsenie and Cleopa in the homes of Alexandru Mironescu and Constantin Joja, members of the Burning Bush; 2) the consideration of religion as a danger for the communist regime¹¹⁴. Consequently, the Security did several arrests, along the year 1958.

Father Arsenie was arrested at Slatina Monastery, in the night of 13-14 June 1958, on a rainy and cold weather. It was past midnight, and the monastery community was at the office of *Matins*. 98 security officers, descended from three trucks and two cars, endowed with raincoats, armament and strong lanterns, surrounded the monastery and the church. At two o'clock in the morning, when the office came to an end and, according to the order of the monastery, the first to get out of the church was the celebrant, who had been Father Arsenie, and then the starets, the verger opened the great doors and, all of a sudden, flashlights were turned on in their eyes: *Anghel Papacioc, where is he? Here I am, sir!* He was surrounded by arms, to the horror of all the monks, and taken to his monastic cell, and the same was done with all the monks. All night, till morning at 10, Father Arsenie's cell was ransacked. Important documents, copybooks with notes and remarks, many books were confiscated to him. In the morning, realizing the ridicule of the situation they had created, the officers apologized to Father Arsenie, who told them: *The mountain quivered and a mouse came out*¹¹⁵. Together with the Father was also arrested brother Constantin Dumitru (future Father Marcu), being taken to Suceava, where the hearing and the research of the materials taken from the cell began. Initially, they accused Father Arsenie of having had connections with the partisans in the mountains, yet, finding no evidence, they continued to search through his copybooks. After the research, they put him in a room that had an area of one square meter and was about five meter tall. Because of a chair that was there, he could not move and he was dressed only in his robe. He had to sleep on the concrete floor, because on that chair it was impossible¹¹⁶. On the second day, the detainees who were in Suceava were put in a truck, blindfolded,

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 124-125. About Father Arsenie's living in this wilderness, see *Ibid.*, pp. 124-132.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 153-154.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 155-156; it is a paraphrase to the verse *Parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus* of Horace's *Ars poetica*, see *Mic dicționar enciclopedic*, Editura Enciclopedică Română, București, 1972, p. XXIII.

and transported to Bucharest, cramped and without the possibility of making any move. In Bucharest, the Father was imprisoned in the Security cellars and, in very tough conditions, the investigation began¹¹⁷. Father Arsenie never detailed the torments endured in prison, and his expression, *how unbearable was the investigation*, hid in it those sufferings that cannot even be described, thought or understood by those who did not live them¹¹⁸.

Father Arsenie's hearings took 90 days, being accompanied by terrible pains and tortures, to find out something from him by force. *For me*, Father Arsenie confessed, *who was better known, it was more difficult, because they wanted me to tell on others as well, to judge and imprison them, too. But I did not do such a thing, God forbid!*¹¹⁹ *They would kill you and beat you, only to say like them.* Touching are Father Arsenie's thoughts and experiences in those moments: *It was the pain that you were looking at your dangerous fellows, because they had no fear of God. And I was looking at their loss. Because I was no longer wondering about the problem of my life, the way they had started to slap, and to hurt, and to accuse, it was impossible to think that you were going to live. And then you accepted death by all means. And then you no longer suffered the chains... You were saddened by the fact that it was your fellows who were doing these things. I, who in a way had known the fight against the devil previously, said that "these are more dangerous because they have no fear of God... the devil had fear of God!"*¹²⁰ *And I had to bear by all means that my enemies are my fellows. If you are the man of God, He knows about anything and the more you let yourself in His will, the more He will defend you. But surely you, too, all the more you need to love God and your fellow. And one cannot say that my fellow is my enemy. These spiritual states were coming like thunderbolt through your heart and through your reason. But, indisputably, those were the elements that were keeping you present in every moment. But one cannot do without sacrifice. One cannot do without the cross, this was what it was, this is what I recommend and this is how I want to live by all means. And cross means bearing what you do not like! People's great mistake in the world is that they will not bear suffering and*

¹¹⁷ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 157.

¹¹⁸ About the methods used, see the Presidential Commission for the Analysis of the Communist Dictatorship in Romania (Comisia Prezidențială pentru Analiza Dictaturii Comuniste din România), *Raport final (Final Report)*, București, 2006, http://media.hotnews.ro/media_server1/document-2007-12-20-2118604-0-raportul-tismaneanu.pdf (02.01.2018).

¹¹⁹ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 159, note 186.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 160.

*do not understand that it is the only action, the only preoccupation, the only living against everything that is bad from under the devil's patronage*¹²¹. For this reason, Father Arsenie affirmed: *Nothing helped me more than suffering in life. Only suffering is the supreme chair of theology. I am sure that the angels were jealous of us, because they do not have this suffering exceeding our nature*¹²².

Until the investigation was finished and the verdict was pronounced, Father Arsenie was taken to Jilava Penitentiary, where the Burning Bush lot was imprisoned¹²³. The trial took two days and they were judged at night, *without defence*, as the Father confessed¹²⁴. The reasons of Father Arsenie's condemnation to *20 years of forced labour and 10 years of civic disenfranchisement*¹²⁵ were: his spiritual living, having the experience of the hesichastic life and of the Jesus Prayer, acts that the communist regime characterized as *mysticism and obscurantist bigotry*; his participation to the Burning Bush Movement, which the same regime considered *subversive association*; the accusation that in his youth he had been a legionnaire, although Father Arsenie had moved away from the policy of the Legionary Movement even since the time of the Aiud Prison, to which one can add

¹²¹ I remember that when I visited the Jilava Prison, guided by Marcel Petrișor, and I was together with Father Georgios Metallinos, participating all together at the International Symposion *Moartea martirică* (*Martyric Death*), organized by the Saint Irene (Sfânta Irina) Foundation, during the period 11-12 October 2010, in Bucharest, Father Georgios, heeding the suffering and torments the political detainees had been submitted to, as described by Marcel Petrișor, declared: *Not even the devil has been able to imagine so many methods of torture and terror. Man can become unimaginably evil to man.*

¹²² Arhim. Arsenie Papacioc, *Veșnicia ascunsă într-o clipă*, Editura Reîntregirea, Alba Iulia, 2004, pp. 57-58 (= Arhim. Arsenie, *Veșnicia*). It ought to be mentioned that one of the investigators was that man who had come, 17 years earlier, at the cabin on Mount Piatra Craiului, with his wife and their daughter aged around 10-12, who had appreciated young Anghel so much back then and had seen him *as an angel*, being unable to understand his desire to become a monk, see Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 69-70, 161.

¹²³ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 162.

¹²⁴ Among those imprisoned and who were part of the respective lot there were: Hieroskemamonk Daniil Sandu Tudor (Alexandru Teodorescu), the Fathers Arsenie Papacioc, Benedict Ghiuș, Adrian Făgășeanu, Roman Braga, Dumitru Stăniloae and Sofian Boghiu, the painter Felix Dubneac, the doctors Vasile Voiculescu and Gheorghe Dabija, the students Văsâi Gheorghe, Nicolae Rădulescu, Emanoil Mihăilescu and Dan Pistol, the scholar Alexandru Mironescu and his son Șerban [*Ibid.*, p. 164; Ahim. Andrei Tudor, Mariana Conovici, Iuliana Conovici (ed.), *Am înțeles rostul meu... Părintele Arsenie Papacioc în dosarele Securității*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2014, p. 122 (= *Am înțeles rostul meu...*)].

¹²⁵ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 165.

the fact that, having joined the monastic life, he had renounced the world and everything in it¹²⁶. After his condemnation, Father Arsenie was taken away from Jilava and led, for the second time in his life, to Aiud. During the first months of prison, the Father was *very grieved* for those he had left outside and who maybe needed him, but, later on, turning his *face to the inside*, he observed that also in prison there *were so many people with the same needs and the same life as those outside*¹²⁷. When Father Arsenie arrived at Aiud, the penitentiary was going through a series of changes, delineated especially after the year 1962 and whose aim was to begin an action of *homicide* from a moral perspective of the political detainees, correlated to the *extermination by hunger* or by the punishment of the detainees in the terrible *isolation rooms*¹²⁸. This action will be called *the reeducation from Aiud*, and at its center was the destruction of all the values, aiming to make the detainees utter blasphemy against the Christian teaching and the Church, to make them abjure Jesus Christ and to make them admit their docility to the communist ideology¹²⁹.

Many years later, Father Arsenie affirmed that only God made him come out alive from the prison of Aiud, transformed into a sort of monastery in which some even attained the state of holiness, since *prison itself is a great [spiritual] endeavour*¹³⁰. Many of Father Arsenie's recollections are memorable, yet, to make a profitable use of time, I shall remind of just one. Father Arsenie served the *Divine Liturgy* daily, managing to improvise, simply and practically, all the necessary things. Instead of epitachelion, he made a rope chain, which, in the morning, before starting the office, he would bless and pass with a lot of piety over his neck, and after having finished the office, he would wind around a button of his coat. The fireplace took the place of the Holy Table, and the Holy Cross was made up of two minute sticks, kept undone, in order not to let anyone notice, in the inside pocket of his coat. He matched these sticks very carefully on the fireplace, before the start of the office of matins, putting in front of them a thicker stick, in order not to be seen through the peeping hole. The Holy Disk was,

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 166. Finally, the Father was condemned to 40 years of prison, out of which 20 years served (*Ibid.*, p. 167).

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 165-166.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

¹²⁹ *Vezi Ibid.*, pp. 172-173.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 169; see also Demostene Andronescu, *Reeducarea de la Aiud. Peisaj lăuntric. Memorii și versuri din închisoare*, Editura Christiana, București, 2009.

sometimes, made of stone, at other times made of a piece of wood, which he wore very carefully in the back pocket of his pants, and a nail was used as spear (liturgical knife). The mug of water took the place of the Holy Chalice in which he put water instead of wine. The Holy Lamb was taken from the upper part of the loaf of bread received as daily share. The only thing he missed was the Holy Antimension. At the beginning, he had had a little piece of the Holy Relics of Saint Mercurius, but he lost them in a search in Jilava. Up to 7 in the morning, when the opening was announced, the office improvised so was ready, and those in the cell communed, one by one, with a piece of bread and a sip of water. The Father would perform the office as in the church, having the conviction that God, seeing their endeavour, could turn the bread and the water into His very Body and Blood. *It was not Holy Communion, but was more than the Anaphora*, the Father affirmed when he remembered those times¹³¹, keeping himself in a state of humility.

While those in his cell enjoyed both the Holy Mystery of the Confession (Penance), and the Divine Communion, those in other cells could benefit, by Morse code, only of the Holy Mystery of the Confession. The Father also told them that if they should get out alive from prison they should go and confess their sins again, while, if they died in the Lord in prison, the Holy Mystery of the Confession, received by Morse code, would remain valid¹³².

Due to the fact that the detainees were moved instead of one another, Father Arsenie had the occasion to stay in the cell with many personalities, although, as he himself confessed, *any detainee was a personality*¹³³. In April 1960, the leadership of the Aiud Prison opened, on the name of Father Arsenie, an individual surveillance file, being put down in it, during the communist regime, all the places of his pilgrimage¹³⁴. The Father was reinforced by the grace of God and managed to overcome suffering beyond any description (for instance, haemorrhoid operation without anaesthesia,

¹³¹ *Ne vorbește Părintele Arsenie*, vol. 1, under the supervision of Archim. Ioanichie Bălan, Editura Episcopiei Romanului, 1996, p. 98.

¹³² Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 176-177, 188-189; *Iată duhovnicul. Părintele Arsenie Papacioc*, Sfânta Mănăstire Dervent, 1999, pp. 16-17. I have received this book from Father Arsenie himself, on 30 December 1999, who also wrote for me the following dedication: *Love the whole world as it is and, surely, the good God will love you as you are.*

¹³³ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 178.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

having a continual pain for 70 days¹³⁵) and isolation in *the most difficult part of the prison, Zarca*, created precisely for the detainees to be liquidated using biological means. *Everything was death regime*, the Father affirmed, in 1991¹³⁶. Those who survived this regime felt *God's help* in their hearts, a help without which *one could not have lived. It is very hard*, as the Father expressed himself, *to be able to say the complexity of the sufferings in heavy chains, in a regime of people completely devoid of heart and of God*¹³⁷.

At the end of the month of July 1964, Colonel Gheorghe Crăciun himself read to the detainees in *Zarcă*, namely those who had opposed re-education and the denial of the faith in Jesus Christ, the amnesty decree, saying to them openly: *You those from Zarcă have won!... You have won! You have won! God, you have won!*¹³⁸ Father Arsenie was freed on 1 August 1964, being no longer imprisoned later on¹³⁹.

Taking into consideration the life of Father Arsenie Papacioc between the years 1938-1964, one can note that he had the experience of the arrest over 40 times and stayed in prison, in total, for 14 years, as he himself confessed¹⁴⁰.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 183, 213. Father Arsenie affirmed after 1990: *I have suffered and lived in a continual fear and strain of soul throughout the communist period* (*Ibid.*, p. 213).

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 192-193. It was a noted fact that, in isolation room, people would die in three days. Father Arsenie was put in isolation room for three days on several occasions and did not die, another time he was in isolation room for five days, then for seven days, getting out alive. The Father was punished even to ten days of isolation, starting with the date of 24 December 1963. During this punishment, Father Arsenie lived two miracles: exhausted, after three days spent in that Tartarus, he no longer resisted and sat down, which meant sure death because of the cold air draft, but he felt someone, actually, an Angel, who pulled him by his legs and told him: *Get up, Arsenie, if you do not want to die! Here one cannot sleep! Your time has not come yet!*; at night, the wife of the prison director, Gheorghe Crăciun, had a nightmare, so that he delivered everyone from the ten *punishment boxes* (Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 198-199; Arhim. Arsenie, *Veșnicia*, p. 62). In another similar situation, when the Father was imprisoned in the cooler room and felt his end near, but was praying insistently, our Saviour Jesus Christ appeared to him, in divine light and heat, dressed in detainee uniform, in stripes, and was suffering Father Arsenie's suffering (Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 199-200).

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 204; Anca Bujoreanu, *Sfinți martiri și mărturisitori români din secolul XX*, Editura Adenium, Iași, 2014², p. 176.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 204-205.

Until December 1989, the Security permanently kept an eye on Father Arsenie Papacioc, giving him several edifying code names [*Călugărul II* (*The Monk II*), *Viteazul* (*The Brave*) or *Căldăraru* (*Tinker*), *Bărbosul* (*The Bearded*) or *Izolatul* (*The Isolated*), *Duhovnicul* (*The Spiritual Father*)¹⁴¹ etc.] and setting all kinds of objectives or traps (infiltration of agents among his spiritual sons and daughters, correspondence censorship, installation in secret in the cell of audio recording means, secret perquisitions in his cell etc.), because they wanted to find out every thing that the Father was thinking and doing, with the obvious aim of restraining or even annihilating his activity and influence in society, under the accusation of betrayal of the communist regime. It ought to be mentioned that in September 1978, the Security decided the conclusion of the personal surveillance file, but preserved the informative surveillance, although it had acknowledged officially that the Father was an authentic monk, who did not aim to do politics under the monastic mask¹⁴². Actually, the Intelligence Services [the *Safety Services* (*Serviciile de siguranță*) and, later on, the *Security Services* (*Serviciile de Securitate*)] permanently supervised Father Arsenie Papacioc, even since his first arrest in 1938 and until 1989, with the result that many documents were put together regarding Father Arsenie, summing up over 3,500 pages in the *Information Fund* (*Fondul Informativ*), gathered in eight files, namely 15 volumes¹⁴³.

3. *Teachings and pieces of advice from Father Arsenie Papacioc's spiritual heritage*

In 1990, after the fall of the communist regime and the so-called Revolution, there were voices in the press which, referring to the communist period, ostentatiously asked the question: *Where was the Church?* To this tendentious question, Father Arsenie's answer was firm: *in cruel prisons, terrible humiliations, pagan beating, insults full of venom... Hundreds and thousands of priests, living monks, faith brothers, wore heavy chains, chains hammered on anvil in hidden cellars. They pulled our beards out and they were carrying us by the beard as animals by the bridle. They submitted us to terrible hunger intending to exterminate us... They asked us to abjure Christ*

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 72, 129, 205.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 232, 250; *Am înțeles rostul meu...*, pp. 21-23.

¹⁴³ ACNSAS, *Fond informativ*, dosar 185003, vol. I, ff. 256-257, apud *Ibid.*, p. 278; *Am înțeles rostul meu...*, p. 23.

and His Saints and we did not abjure, God forbid!... They asked for these renunciations insistently and systematically, isolated and put into cooler rooms for them to be able to obtain at least a word against the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. And we did not give up... Here was the Church: in prison. Here, where there were thousands of Christians requesting spiritual strenghtening, forgiveness of sins, encouragements and hopes that we were giving to them by knocking on the wall (Morse code). We got out of prisons, those of us who did, happy that we had been helped by the good God... We came out beardless, with no flesh on us, toothless, with our eyes hidden in our orbits, yet still shining. We came out without the look of clerics¹⁴⁴.

In front of these sufferings, Father Arsenie's conviction was, among others, that *any move, any incident is no incident. Each of us is guided by God so mysteriously and anonymously, to act properly. We have been saved from many misfortunes, each of us, because God ordained that the blow should not hit us¹⁴⁵*. Therefore, any man is under God's oikonomia or providence, but, depending on his spiritual position, his life can agree with or be contrary to this divine oikonomia or providence. When he was arrested in 1958 and taken from Suceava to Bucharest, in the Uranus Prison, Father Arsenie was searching for the east in his cell, to pray. *The tram passing down the street was somehow reflected on the cell wall. I kept on thinking how it was that the Sun could reflect on the cell wall, but I was not sure. Then I remembered Alexandru, telling me: "Wherever you turn your face, may God help you!"* He had seven children and no company hired him, because of the obligation to pay a sum of money for each child. Father Arsenie, knowing his situation, would call him to Slatina Monastery, assuring the necessities of life to him. *And I would give him a bit of everything. All that I was giving him was from my monastic cell. After I had given him, I would look through the cell and I could see that nothing was missing. Alexandru would always tell me a word: "Father, wherever you turn your face, may God help you!"* Then, in prison, the Father remembered these words of Alexandru and said to himself: *it makes no difference where the east is, since Alexandru told me this. Here is what he was prophesying about to me!... And then I started such crying... But*

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 278. To these pages one can add about 2,500 pages in the *Criminal Fund* (*Fondul Penal*) and about 150 papers in the *Documentary Fund* (*Fondul Documentar*), see *Am înțeles rostul meu...*, p. 13.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 205-206.

*I kept my courage throughout the prison years, although hard years followed with the Aiud Prison*¹⁴⁶.

Only suffering is the supreme chair of theology, Father Arsenie often affirmed¹⁴⁷, who considered that sacrifice is the essence of Christianity. You sacrifice a pleasure, a pain, a desire, to let there be peace. In order to burn, the wax candle sacrifices wick and wax, while the oil icon lamp sacrifices oil. This is why candles are lit in church, to remind us of sacrifice. One cannot live without sacrifice, one must renounce something to win the day. Peace is four times greater than justice. If you make peace, you win four; if you make justice, you win just one¹⁴⁸.

Father Arsenie cultivated the string of all the virtues and the varied bouquet of the ascetic actions, yet he always highlighted the benefactions of charity, which he practiced permanently. He was convinced that charity is one of the great preparations for eternity. To break something out of you. You see, charity is all the Scripture... It has been said that charity rose against justice and charity prevailed... The poor are biblical characters, they will never disappear from the face of the Earth. They are let by God for the rich to have the possibility to be saved as well, by being charitable... God makes many miracles, but you will never see the miracle of God telling lies. If God says that he returns a hundredfold to those who are charitable, this is so. And if this does not happen, it means that the one who gave was not sincere, or gave with a pinch of heart, or gave for who knows what other reasons¹⁴⁹.

During his military service, the general came for inspection and asked the soldiers, arranged in line, what battle plan means. No one knew the answer, except for Anghel, who said: Battle plan means precise determination of your position, then of the enemy's position, calculation of the distance between you and the enemy and type of armament used. However, this tactics, I have used it in the spiritual life as well, this is why some have called me: the military monk. First, the precise determination of your position means knowing what position you are fighting your life battle from: that of layman, monk, cleric. The enemy's position refers to the identification of the one you are fighting against. In the spiritual world, the enemy is the devil. For we are not battling, as Saint Paul the Apostle says, against body and blood, but against the powers of darkness. The distance is the one that separates you from the

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 158-159.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 298-299.

sin nearest to you, because Saint Anthony the Great says: "The greatest sin is the one nearest to you". You are not going to battle a sinful passion that is not waging war against you at the moment, you are going to fight the sin that has dominion over you now. The armament is fasting, prayer, charity, state of cheerfulness, patience, silence, education of love to those around, innocence¹⁵⁰. It is through man that man is saved. To be able to save someone, we need to fix ourselves, to be a departure point of our Saviour by which He may save the one next to us. Man through man. It is like a cannon placement. The canon, if it has no placement made of earth, has strong recoil and throws you off, but since it has it stops in its fixed position. So, man is a sort of placement that God makes use of towards other men¹⁵¹.

During his stay at Antim Monastery, where he was also tonsured into monk (1949), yet on behalf of Sihăstria Monastery, Father Arsenie had contacts with the representatives of the Burning Bush Movement. An impulse for this Movement was given by Father John Kulăghin, also known under the name of "the Foreigner" ("cel Străin"), who brought with him a rare book on the practice of the prayer of the mind, called *Sbornic*. Translated in Romanian, the book will circulate in manuscript. Father Arsenie, being a monastery brother, was not for an excessive theorizing of this prayer, which was supposed to be a mysterious one, of the heart. When someone knocked on his cell's door and asked him for the *Sbornic*, he said: *I will give you gladly!* Yet, he returned with a prayer rope, which he gave to the willing young man, with the exhortation: *Shut up and say!*¹⁵²

Actually, the prayer that Father Arsenie incessantly said was the prayer of the mind or of the heart, also called the Jesus prayer or the prayer of the one thought. God had given to him the gift of this prayer, a fact felt by

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 305-306.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 44. The same position regarding the need for a battle plan can be met as well with Saint Paisios the Aghiorite: *In the spiritual endeavour it is necessary to mark the weak points of our character, our weaknesses and, then, try to hit there. Because if you know concretely the points the enemy is in, you move safely. You put the map down and you say: "The enemy is here and here. We need to get to obtain these and these points. From there we shall ask for reinforcement, here we need these arms" etc. This means that you can develop a plan. But in order to find out where the enemy is, you need to watch and search, instead of sleep* (Cuviosul Paisie Aghioritul, *Cuvinte duhovnicești. III. Nevoință duhovnicească*, translation from Greek by Ieroschim. Ștefan Nuțescu, Editura Evanghelismos, București, 2003, p. 153).

¹⁵² Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 44-45.

many of those who came in touch with the Father¹⁵³. I found out about this thing later on, from some recollections of Father Arsenie, even since the time when I was in high school at the Theological Seminary in Bucharest. However, it was only during my studenthood that I was going to become aware of the importance of this prayer for the spiritual life, and the one who spoke to me most convincingly about this prayer was the Professor Virgil Căndeă. He spoke to me about the practice of Father John the Foreigner, accompanied by his disciple Leonte or Leontie Calmăc¹⁵⁴, to give his blessing to those who wanted to practice the prayer of the heart, because, according to the experience of Father John the Foreigner, this prayer cannot be practiced without the advice and blessing of someone who is familiar with it. Following these discussions, I arrived, one day, at Father Arsenie Papacioc, at the exhortation and advice of Professor Virgil Căndeă, to ask from him for a blessing to practice the Jesus prayer. I was in a spiritual connection with Father Arsenie since the summer of the year 1986¹⁵⁵. I told Father Arsenie: *Father, I have come to you to give me your blessing to say the prayer of the mind or of the heart! Who told you that this thing is necessary?*, the Father asked me. *Mister Professor Virgil Căndeă!*, I answered. He smiled with contentment and gave me his blessing on the top of my head, saying to me: *Say it once and for all!* I was amazed. *What does this thing mean, Father?* He explained to me: *That is, say it everywhere, even in the bathroom when you go for your natural urges, and any time, and never stop saying it!* Actually, the Father affirmed that *we need, above all, not people who say prayers, more or less regularly, but people who feel the prayer, namely the prayer of the mind or of the heart. We have been called to get down not from the mind, but with the mind. The aim is not “the prayer of the heart”, but “the prayer of the mind in the heart”, because the different forms of understanding, including reason, are a gift from God and need to be used in His service, not rejected. This “union” of the mind with the heart means the restauration of our fallen and fragmented creature, the restauration of our original integrity. The prayer in the heart is a return in Paradise, earnest and anticipation of the time that is to come, something that, in the time that is right now, is never fully accomplished. The Jesus prayer helps us see Christ in every man and*

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 284-285. For instance, Father Constantin Galeriu affirmed as well this thing about Father Arsenie, see *Părintele Arsenie Papacioc. 1914-2014.*, p. 55.

¹⁵⁵ About the portraits of the two, see Alexandru Mironescu, *Calea inimii. Eseuri în duhul Rugului aprins*, Editura Anastasia, București, 1998, pp. 29-36.

each man in Christ, makes out of each of us “a man for the others”. The way of the Name is open, generous, not limited by rigid and immutable rules. Prayer is work; to pray is to be working in the highest degree, and for our breath to become one with the Divine Breath, which supports the Universe¹⁵⁶.

According to the experience of Father Arsenie, one ought to be looking for intensely lived prayer moments, during which man's entire being should be concentrated on the meeting with God, so that our feeling may not be stolen to any thought or state of sin. I, personally, Father Arsenie affirmed, *am not for the tipikon prayer. That prayer has its special use, especially disciplinarily. Man must not be dogmatic. He must be dogmatic as procedure, regarding the desire to become pneumatized. We do not necessarily need a tipikon prayer. We need a continual presence of the heart, this continual state of love, of relation with God, this is the essence of prayer. Because even a deep silence means a deep prayer. And a deep prayer means a deep silence... I am rather for a continual spiritual sparkling. For this reason, ... any moment can be a time and any sigh can be a prayer. Sighing is not done like this: “Ugh!”, but you do it to God, as going from the deep towards Him. This is how He will show Himself to us. Because He does not show Himself to a sharp mind..., but only to him who has a clear heart, to him who has the heart towards Him, continually¹⁵⁷.* By these words, Father Arsenie did not annul the tipikon or the external manifestation of faith, but thought, based on his own experience, *that it is not the multitude of prayers or prostrations which is the most important, “although even those will be written somewhere”, but the state of presence (watchfulness) which man needs to have permanently, “because prayer is a necessarily useful means, yet the watchfulness is an aim attained”¹⁵⁸.* One must not push the “pedal” of endeavour too much, but an intensity of it. It is not time that can decide, but the quality of the living, by a continual spiritual disposition, not giving room to opaque bitterness; by a sincere and hard-pressed regret, which will bring a truer humility, so well received unto forgiveness and so beneficial unto new hopes and revelations above human reason, with which God's love enriches the humble man

¹⁵⁶ It was my first holiday as high school student at the Theological Seminary, which I was spending at the Priestly Sanatorium in Techirghiol. I was working at the respective Sanatorium, which was in the same location as the *Saint Mary Skete*. The community was made up of nuns, and the celebrant priest and their father confessor was precisely Father Arsenie Papacioc. See above also note 2.

¹⁵⁷ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 286-287.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

more than the one strait-laced into a sadness and tough endeavour. The Lord Christ gives Himself with more pleasure to a wounded, yet repentant and humble, heart than to a heart with fasting and prayer, but which of course is asking for its right. Saint Basil the Great says: "The widow or the virgin have no other rank in heaven than the one set by their humbleness!"¹⁵⁹

In the process of cultivation of the spiritual states, the advice of Father Arsenie is not to neglect the prayer to our guardian Angel. Even since the time spent in the wilderness of the Stânișoara Mountains, Father Arsenie understood the help of the guardian Angel, for which reason he affirmed in his old age (93 years old): *This is it, we have guardian Angel! And it is not just him that is helping us, because they, all the Angels, in their nature are one. And if we are in relation with our guardian Angel, [then] we are in relation with all the Angels, miriads and miriads*¹⁶⁰.

Father Arsenie had acquired many charismata, by which he was helping those fallen in different sins and vices to stand up and not be discouraged: *Do not get discouraged! Here is the entire subtle fight of the holy "Paterikons" and a great mystery of the spiritual life, namely to stand up, not to remain under the heavy and terrible stone of the fall. I am telling you a great word, according to the spiritual order there is no longer fall, there is only rising. No calamity means anything and nothing is lost as long as the faith remains up, as long as the head is raised again and the soul does not abdicate*¹⁶¹.

One must note that Father Arsenie cared very much for the *Proskomedia* and for God's work through it. The Father even would say that the *Proskomedia* is the greatest thing in heaven and on earth¹⁶², and *Liturgy without Proskomedia is a rationalized thing, is a symbol, is no longer a Truth*¹⁶³. Consequently, he would commemorate the diptychs with great responsibility, taking out for each name a particle on the Holy Disk. Personally, I have heard him affirming about the spiritual role of the remembrance of the name and of taking out a particle for each name. *The Divine Liturgies* are, according to the conviction of Father Arsenie, *beyond the human mind, the greatest work in God's creation and it, namely the creation,*

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 141; *Ne vorbește Părintele Arsenie*, vol. 2, edition supervised by Archim. Ioanichie Bălan, Editura Episcopiei Romanului, 1997, p. 35.

¹⁶⁰ Arhim. Arsenie, *Veșnicia*, p. 49.

¹⁶¹ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, pp. 125-126.

¹⁶² Arhim. Arsenie, *Scrisori*, p. 58; Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 269.

¹⁶³ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 271; see also Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 141.

*rejoices the most at this [work]*¹⁶⁴. For this reason, suggesting the grace-giving work of the *Divine Liturgy*, Father Arsenie expressed himself: *Can you realize what it means for a people that it has Liturgy? What it means for a people that it has Orthodoxy?*¹⁶⁵

Towards the end of the year 2000, Father Arsenie had a surgical intervention, and at the hospital the doctors asked him to tell them a word about medicine. *And I said*, the Father tells: *As technique, I am very pleased with what I see here. But the secret would be this, dear doctors: put the ill man in the situation of participating himself to his recovery as well. If only the ill person believes in the prescription and the medicine given to him, and has to a certain extent trust and great hope of salvation, he can be healed*¹⁶⁶.

*Our Orthodox Church carries us safely on the road of salvation and, because of the depths of the beauty of its teaching, it has many enemies*¹⁶⁷. Father Arsenie saw, by the suffering and tribulations lived, *the power and the truth of the Orthodox Church*¹⁶⁸, which he considers *the actual Church*. It is not divided, people are divided, people have separated themselves. *The Church is only one, and that is all, and only the Orthodox Church explains in truth the teaching of our Saviour Jesus Christ*¹⁶⁹. *The Truth is Christ, the Orthodox Church, since people have interpreted and will interpret infinitely: the roads, the ways that lead to salvation and it is just one: this one kept on without any change, and even with zeal and with living, the Orthodox Church*. It is the one which patronizes the road to our salvation by all means, in the Orthodox style, as set at the Councils regarding the respective dogmas¹⁷⁰.

About Romania and the Romanian nation, so seriously put to the test, Father Arsenie had a vision of a rare optimism: *It is a country of divine future. It led no offensive, but only defence wars. Because it is not the one who hits that is victorious, but the one who is patient. The Romanian nation will have, in my opinion, a great mission. Why? Not because it had a Stephen the Great in Moldavia, a Michael the Brave, whom I support with all my soul, in*

¹⁶⁴ Arhim. Arsenie Papacioc, *Singur Ortodoxia*, Constanța, 2005, p. 15 (= Arhim. Arsenie, *Singur Ortodoxia*).

¹⁶⁵ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 272.

¹⁶⁶ Arhim. Arsenie Papacioc, *Cuvânt despre bucuria duhovnicească. Convorbiri*, Editura Eikon, Cluj-Napoca, 2003², p. 91.

¹⁶⁷ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 313.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 202.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 202.

¹⁷⁰ Arhim. Arsenie, *Singur Ortodoxia*, p. 61, 75.

Wallachia¹⁷¹ and a Vlad the Impaler. Not for this. But because the Romanian nation did not forget the banging of the bells¹⁷². For this reason, the Father's exhortation was that every priest, be he a monk or a priest for the laypeople, should do his service as a priest, because, paraphrasing Saint Philaret of Moscow, *a country stays alive by her spiritual fathers*¹⁷³.

Although he was proposed many times high ranks in the Church, especially after 1989, Father Arsenie refused them¹⁷⁴. He represents that spiritual father and Church servant speaking with the Holy Fathers' authority, because he was living in their spirit and prolonged, in this way, their thinking in the present, having in view man's contemporary conditions and needs¹⁷⁵.

And because we are at a Symposium organized by the Faculty of Orthodox Theology and Education Sciences, I ought to conclude my presentation of Father Arsenie with Christ's exhortation which he felt mysteriously regarding the priestly service, throughout his life: *When you celebrate the Holy Liturgy, priest, thousands of angels fill the Church, adoring Me and glorifying Me. They are My servants, but you are "My priest". You order Me to come down from heaven and be born in your hands. Oh, how your holiness ought to be greater than the Angels' holiness! Together with Me you are a mediator between God and man. Priest, you have the desire to obtain for the people the graces they need! But how could God listen to you, if you are His enemy? I have come to throw fire on earth and you are the ignited torch that will take it in the souls. But how are you to kindle this fire in the souls, if your heart is of ice? My greatness itself depends on your victory. Could I have entrusted to you such great power without giving you the grace to acquire it with diligence?... By dignity I have made you somewhat god, yet I have let on you the burden of the human weaknesses, for My power to be made apparent in your weaknesses. I have made you a destroyer of sin, but leaving you in its danger, a sharer of the supernatural life, but in danger of losing it yourself, out of the fear that My gifts' greatness should not fill you with pride and make you forget that you are nothing... By ordination into priest you were made a partaker of My dignity of head of the Church. The grace of baptism gives you*

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 34-35.

¹⁷² Named also the Romanian Country.

¹⁷³ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 277.

¹⁷⁴ Saint Philaret of Moscow affirmed: *give me good spiritual fathers and I will change the face of the world* (*Ibid.*, p. 283).

¹⁷⁵ See Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 15, note 10.

the power to live as a good Christian. The grace of ordination helps you to accomplish your service as a priest with holiness. Before, you were just a simple believer, you were busy first of all with your personal salvation. Now you are a partaker of the dignity of the Head, your heart embraces the whole Church. Your priestly dignity goes above that of the Cherubim and Seraphim, but the grace received by ordination is proportional to this dignity. In My Church I have performed two great miracles: I have created the Theotokos (the Lord's mother) and priesthood. Although a simple creature, My Mother has been made worthy to give birth to a God. And you, My priest, you are a weak mortal. By the grace of ordination, you have been given the power to give birth to Me, with worthiness, on the Holy Altar and in the souls. This grace gives you the right to all the help that you need to be holy and to represent Me, with worthiness, among the people... Pray, entrust yourself to My Mother, the eternal help, the priests' empress! She will help you to listen to My voice. Oh, how bound you are to Me and to My Mother!... Beware of making of the chair of the truth a stage on which to pretend daily your own esteem and to scold the believers. You need to know to scold firmly but gently, without ruining the remedy with the venom of your own lack of patience. Simplicity and benevolence will win more souls for Me than scholarly speeches. Gentleness and humility will give you the key to the most closed hearts... Don't be a small soul, put your trust in the grace you have received at your ordination! Make it bring fruits of "holiness" for you and others! Oh, if only you knew how many graces I decreed for you on the day of your ordination! If only you could understand how many rights your priesthood is giving to you upon My heart and upon the riches it comprises!¹⁷⁶ In relation to the service of priest, Father Arsenie recommended not just to the priests and monks but also to the lay people to wear a beard, which he considered, based on the confession of "Saint" Clement of Alexandria, as emanating a great magnetic power and having a special influence on the thinking, being in close connection with the innermost substrata of faith¹⁷⁷.

¹⁷⁶ Mitropolitul Serafim, "Părintele Arsenie – duhovnicul trezviei și al iubirii", in *Am înțeles rostul meu...*, p. 7. Father Arsenie was part of what the Romanian intellectuals, like Alexandru Duțu, called the *pneumatic hierarchy* or, rather, the *pneumatic*, namely spiritual, *priesthood*, in whose hands was the shepherding of the Church believers during the communist regime (Alexandru Duțu, *Ideea de Europa și evoluția conștiinței europene*, All Educational, București, 1999, p. 217).

¹⁷⁷ Arhim. Arsenie, *Scrisori*, pp. 148-152.

Everywhere, knowledge keeps heaping up, yet to no avail. The Orthodox Church does not press mainly the “knowledge” pedal, but rather the “living” pedal. It has been possible to note that by living you know much and do not know where you know from. And the theologians come, in order to freshen up, to the livers, who are simple according to people’s inventory, have no knowledge, but have a continual presence with God. If the branch calls for sap abundantly, it will be given abundantly¹⁷⁸. Therefore, important is for the believer to be a branch in the wine, namely in Christ, because the Saviour is the Way, the Truth and the Life (John 14: 6). Commenting on these words of our Saviour, Father Arsenie affirmed: *If there is no way, there is no walking, if there is no truth, there is no knowledge, if there is no life, there is no living*¹⁷⁹. During the Lent of the year 2003, Father Arsenie held a conference at the Cultural Centre of Constanța, attended by about 3,000 people. To conclude, the Father said at the end of the conference: *The Truth, Who is Christ, is the touchstone, it is around this Truth that everything revolves. To fight this Truth, all sort of philosophies, trends, ideas have emerged, which bring nothing new except for a new vocabulary, new words, but do not clarify anything, because Christ’s truth is complete and they do nothing except to hit against this Truth*¹⁸⁰.

¹⁷⁸ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 149.

¹⁷⁹ Arhim. Arsenie, *Veșnicia*, p. 126.

¹⁸⁰ Sorin Alpetri, *Viața Părintelui Arsenie*, p. 311.

Forum Theologicum Sardicense
2/2015

Главни редактори:

доц. д.р Светослав Риболов и доц. д-р Павел Павлов

Издателска редакция

Гергана Борисова

Художник на корицата:

З. Карчева

Издание на:

© Богословски факултет при СУ „Св. Климент Охридски“

© Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“

www.unipress.bg

Адрес на редакцията:

Богословски факултет

на СУ „Св. Климент Охридски“

София 1000, пл. „Св. Неделя“ № 19

e-mail: bogoslovskamissal@gmail.com