

IOAN-VASILE LEB

GABRIEL-VIOREL GÂRDAN

**NATIONALITY AND CONFESSION IN
ORTHODOXY**

The relation between Christianity and nation is a very old but also a permanent theme within the Ecumenical Movement. Our aim is to explain why this relation is so important for us, the Europeans, because Europe is in fact, a continent of nations that have to be known by their traditions and by the reciprocal manifestations which, unfortunately, are sometimes conflicting. This is why it is not very easy to speak or to write about it. From the Orthodox point of view, the ideal of the nation can be completely integrated in the Christian ideal. Such an ideal makes possible the development of a nation's natural qualities. It does not lead to a uniformity of nations, on the contrary, it leads to their growth within the unity of the Christian faith.

Ioan-Vasile Leb

Professor, Ph.D. at the Faculty of Orthodox Theology, "Babeș-Bolyai" University, Cluj, Romania. Email: lebioan@yahoo.com.

Gabriel-Viorel Gârdan

Lecturer, Ph.D. at the Faculty of Orthodox Theology, "Babeș-Bolyai" University, Cluj, Romania. Email: ggardan@yahoo.com

Key Words:

nationality, confession, Christianity, Orthodoxy, ecumenical movement

From the Orthodox point of view, the word „nation” cannot be excluded from the history of the nations. Although in time it has not been understood in the same way, its content has always been linked with the natural or geographical settings and with the outlook and the spirit of the language of the respective times, and generally speaking, with the cultural tradition as well. The cooperation of these elements also brings about a tendency towards consolidation, in addition to the need to find its expression in a certain state form, which of course corresponds to the political ideas of each age. “State” and “Nation” shouldn't necessarily be identical notions, because each nation tries continuously to find its expression in a concrete state form, although it isn't always possible. For this reason, there are cases in which either the state is bigger than the nation, or the nation is bigger than the state itself¹.

The Christian position towards the national dimension was determined by the fact that there is an unconditional relation established by Jesus Christ between providence and the history of salvation - from the beginning to the end.

The creation of man and of the world by God, the original sin, the promise of salvation, the selection of the “chosen people”, the perfection of the first creation in Jesus Christ, the foundation of the Church and of God's Kingdom: all constitute the basic hermeneutic criteria of Christian teaching, of the relation between God, man and the world; the Christian position towards the national dimensions is given by these criteria. With the help of such a criterion it is easier to understand the teaching of the

New Testament, as regards the assertion of the nation and victory, which are part of the structures and functions of this “Corpus Ecclesiae”².

The divine creation and its fulfillment in Jesus Christ is lived in the wider reality of the Church, as a healing experience and one of eschatological await of the new relations in Christ between God, man and the world: “He had made of one blood all nations of man to dwell on all the face of the earth, and had determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation, that they should seek the Lord, if happily they might feel after him and find him, though he not be far from every one of us. For in Him we live, and move and have our being” (Acts 17, 26-28). The fulfillment of God’s promise in Christ, as written in the Old Testament, had been especially prepared by the selection of “the chosen people”. According to the biblical account of the creation, all the nations had been prepared for it – although in a quite different way. “For when the pagans, who have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves; they show the work of the law written in their hearts by their conscience and by their thoughts” (Romans 2, 14-15). This is the framework within which we are to understand the answer given to the Apostle Paul, when he was asked: “Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not the God of the pagans? Yes, He is of the pagans’ also” (Romans 3, 29). It is therefore clear that the pagans are actually co-heirs, they are members of the same Body, and they share the same promise in Christ by the Gospel (Ephesians 3, 6), following God’s salvation work, performed through Jesus Christ, in which the whole world has been summarized (Anakephalaiosis)³.

Jesus Christ’s work of salvation, which embraced the whole of the Universe and humankind, is very well expressed in the direct commandment He gave to His Apostles: “Go, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (Matthew 28, 19-20). This commandment was necessary for “the repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem” (Luke 24, 47) and for the Gospel of God’s Kingdom to be spread out all over the world, so that it should be heard by all nations (Matthew 24, 14; Mark 13, 10). The Church, this “Corpus Ecclesiae” was made manifest in history through Jesus Christ’s work of salvation and through the apostolic preaching. All Christians who were united by a divine leader are part of Him, becoming a “chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people”, a nation that became its special property, the nation of God (I Peter 2, 9)⁴.

Transcending nation’s framework, as well as accepting it are both fully included in God’s salvation plan, which is accomplished by Jesus Christ, because God made the pagans righteous as much as their faith is concerned, and it had been already said to Abraham that “In you shall all nations be blessed” (Galatians 3, 8). According to this truth which was

revealed to us by Jesus Christ, all those who had been baptized in the name of Christ became “the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ ... there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Jesus Christ. And if you be Christ’s then you are Abraham’s seed and heirs according to the promise” (Galatians 3, 26-29). The meaning of this teaching resides in the fact that the affirming of and parting from the national dimension operated in Christ, included in God’s salvation plan, has two distinct stages in world’s history. The first one states that the affirmation of a nation is closely related to the adoption of the chosen people; this stage had been created in order to prepare the entire humankind. The second stage leads us to an eschatological view of transcending the national difference, as it is sung in one of the Whit Sunday songs: “When the Almighty gave us the Word, He continued to share it with us, when He gave the Holy Spirit like a fire, He called everybody to the unity”. But the ultimate surpassing of this limit is to be understood as an eschatological await. It will be gradually realized within the Church and in the expected coming of God’s Kingdom.

The actual source of the restoration of humans’ unity to that of the first couple created by God produces the following values: freedom, brotherhood and social justice. The Christian teaching about the recapitulation of all in Christ (see Ephesians 1, 10) is that He reestablished the holiness and the greatness of man and so the causes of scission, alienation, color bar and hatred were abolished. The union of the whole humanity and of the world with Christ brings them together in one single body. However, we should admit that this unity does not have anything stable or monolithic in itself. On the contrary, it has a great dynamism and variety because it is born from people’s communion, one in the likeness of that of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity.

II

This teaching of the New Testament about the assertion and surpassing of national differences was systematically developed by the tradition of the Holy Fathers. It presents a strong Christological and ecclesiological aspect. The criteria for practicing the future tasks of the church in the world have been established in the same way. These criteria had been openly used in church sermons, between assertion and surpassing, in the national specifics. The task given to the Apostles by Jesus Christ and the example they gave during their missionary work, are the basic principles that have led to bearing esteem of the national identity and to favoring certain elements of their spiritual heritage, within this “Corpus Ecclesiae”. Furthermore, another specific feature is that the mission and the organization of a local church have made manifest a special understanding of the national identity and of the heritage of different people who had received the Christian faith. It is well known that

in the Roman and Byzantine ages, the political idea of an all-embracing Empire had tried to defeat the multitude of nations by establishing special laws, which especially underlined the political, religious, and social unity, and generally speaking, the spiritual unity of the Empire's peoples. However the national groups acted against this state idea and emphasized their specific cultural elements (language, faith, cultural tradition etc.) in order to defend their inner unity within a much more difficult historical process.

In spite of the eschatological view and of its teaching according to which the national differences and the other differences in Christ are abolished, the Christian Church has always supported through its criteria the national sensitivity of different people. The reception of the nations in this new reality of "Corpus Ecclesiae" was established by its spiritual task in the world, according to which the preaching of the Gospel, baptism, and Christians' participation in the "Corpus Ecclesiae" are accomplished, at any given place and time, as a revelation of the one, holy, ecumenical and apostolic Church. The local manifestation of the church mystery, that constitutes the "Corpus Ecclesiae" on a local basis, largely designates its relation with the nation, because the existence of the latter is closely connected to a certain local framework. The relation between the nation's local constraint and the local manifestation of the church mystery has always been an authentic expression of accepting not only the mystery but the nation's perspectives as well. This is in fact the reason why the organization of the local churches, from the administrative point of view, has never confused the particularity of the national identity and the cultural heritage of Christian peoples. In this respect the 34th apostolic canon is greatly important, as it states: "The bishops of each nation ..."⁵.

However, the division of humankind into different nations and the Christian teaching about the recapitulation of its initial unity in Christ included a completely opposite dynamics. The nation tried to use the Christian faith for consolidating the spiritual differences which it had inherited and the church stressed, on its side, the dynamics of the eschatological expectation in order to defeat the national in Christ and to achieve God's Kingdom. Thus we can see that the nation has always been an element making the difference between the Christian peoples, in the view of their being accepted in the Corpus Ecclesiae, but it has also been an element that stressed their unity; this was founded on the common baptism and on experiencing the collective faith. The unity was spiritual in nature and it neutralized the elements of the national identity, so that each local church, according to the apostolic tradition and to the Fathers, realizes completely the Body of Christ in its concrete Eucharistic gathering⁶.

This fundamental ecclesiological principle had a decisive role in establishing the relation between nation and the local church. The local

church represents the local manifestation of the Universal Church; it is independent in the experience and the life of the faith's content.

Its unity with other local churches in the world is Christo-centric. It means that it relies on the identity of the experience of each local Eucharistic local gathering. Christ is "everything in all". He himself is "undivided in all and undivided in each part". This is the way that the unity of all local churches can be represented, by the means of the concentric circles scheme: all having the same diameter and being equal when overlapped. The center of all is Jesus Christ for all of us, who has taken within His humanity the whole of the Church, with each and every of its local manifestations.

This Christo-centric and Eucharistic ecclesiology is the one which maintains the harmonious and well-balanced relation between one's ecumenical loyalty, which is Catholic, and the apostolic Church of God, and it also maintains the functional relation between the church unity and the national division of Christianity. The national self-awareness, which joins in the local "Corpus Ecclesiae", excludes the local borders and makes clear what exactly means to be an entire human being which has been received in Him and with Him by Jesus Christ's Embodiment and by his human nature; this is the way in which the Church, on one hand, receives the nation in its local manifestation in order to join it to "Corpus Ecclesiae" that contains the entire world and, on the other hand, the nation becomes more aware of its inner independence by joining the church that should lead to the unity of the whole mankind⁷.

This essential feature of the patristic and Orthodox ecclesiology characterizes the entire history of the missionary work in the Orthodox Church. It has been active alongside the baptism of the people in the Christian faith, "pouring" the whole Christian tradition into their cultural heritage. This spiritual mystery, which is a harmonious synthesis of two traditions, proved to be positive for the Church and nation. We can say indeed that the Church lives, this way, its ecumenical dimension of the Gospel completely, and the nation improves its spiritual heritage without losing the specific elements of national identity. The formation and the development of a written national language had been improved by the Christian sources and treasures, which had an important contribution in achieving higher spiritual values, to all official and private sectors of nations' lives. Thus, we can easier understand the Byzantine missions to the Goths, the Ethiopians, the Bulgarians, the Serbians, to the inhabitants of Moravia, the Cossacks, the Russians and all the other nations that migrated from the Central Europe to Ural and Persian Gulf and from the Mediterranean to the Baltic Sea⁸.

The organization of these national churches followed the territorial criterion that had been imposed by the borders of those states and that had determined the spiritual unity of the local "Corpus Ecclesiae". The moving of the local organizational structures to bigger ones has nonetheless made

relative the exclusiveness of the national borders for the spiritual and ecclesial connections of these people, in the benefit of the patriarchal administrative system of the church, which was supported by the Mother Church and it also determined churches' desire for the administrative independence. This independence usually tends towards a local church's own administration or to its proclamation of its autocephaly. It does not mean that an autocephalous church has ever broken the relation with the Mother Church from the administrative point of view, which in its turn continued to keep the canonical rights, thus succeeding in consolidating the spiritual life of these churches⁹. For example, the Romanian Orthodox Church, that has been organized as autocephalous patriarchate since 1925, continues to keep, without any change the following juridical statement: "The Romanian Orthodox Church is and will be independent from any other foreign hierarchy, but it continues to maintain the unity with the Ecumenical Church of the Orient, as far as the dogmas are concerned"¹⁰. For example, the 34th article of the Bulgarian statute also shows that the Bulgarian Orthodox Church is a segment of the one, holy, Ecumenical and Apostolic Church. This relation with the whole Orthodox Church is called the unity in faith (the 110th article, the 1st paragraph), in cult (the 110th article, the 20th paragraph) and in the juridical organization (the 3rd article)¹¹. We could present other examples as well.

However while the nation has continuously cultivated the elements which make it different, the Church has always stressed – as we have already mentioned – the common elements of its spiritual identity that attach it to other nations in a common ecclesial body, in its turn nurtured by the common source of life. Maintaining a balance between these two opposite tendencies has always been understood by the Orthodox Church as being the main task of its relationship with the world. This way we can explain why the problems that had been conditioned by time, have not been lost in the tendencies to isolate the nation, they have rather been transmitted it the expectations of the ecumenical conscience (that spread out in the entire world)¹².

The contemporary thinking of Western Europe, has, on the one side, eliminated the idea of the nation from this harmonious synthesis with the Christian faith, which can be experienced in the benefit of the spiritual life of the church, and on the other hand, generalized the beliefs of the national conscience in order to underline its difference in relation with the other nations, within the framework of the development of an excessive state authority. Moreover, a church is often called racist, because of the confusion of the national and nationalist elements. This is simply a defective use of the terms.

The experience of the Orthodox Church, which has lasted centuries, provides many examples concerning a very close relationship between church and nation, one that reaches its climax in a successful evangelization and in the growth of the virtues in the spiritual and cultural

developing of Christians. As real facts, the national and the nation can't be eliminated at all, because otherwise the Church would have to expect limited and sometimes superficial success. However, each nation's church has the responsibility to develop the latent abilities of its people and to help maintaining its individuality. This is the way in which the Romanian people supported the blessed work of its church too: language, writing, literature, arts and architecture cannot develop but with the contribution of the bishop and of the clergy. In the long history of the Romanian Orthodox Church it became almost a law that the bishops and the archbishops should also be the spiritual leaders of people¹³. From this point of view we should keep the borderline between the relation with the people and nationalism.

In principle, the national characteristics and Christians' outlook can stimulate the progress of the life of the church, for keeping the real faith and for spiritual thriving. This situation is especially obvious in the case of a foreign or religious oppression. At the same time, the danger for the national to develop as an obstacle for the unity of the Universal Church persists, being present in two directions – from both the strong nation and from the national church, and from the weaker one. In the first case, we could call this nationalism, in the sense of the church imperialism, while in the second case we are dealing with a nationalist separatism. Both forms are different manifestations that can determine the breaking with the Ecumenical Church. Nikolaj Berdjaev (1874-1948) rightly notices that the modern nationalism means a dischristianization of society or even its paganization¹⁴. Both nationalism and racism must be condemned because they have nothing to do with the real love for people¹⁵. Both are essentially, an expression of the chauvinistic desire of different people, and was condemned at the third pan-Orthodox Conference (Chambesy 1986). In fact, the Conference established the following:

1. In God's Kingdom, which starts on earth and has an important spiritual character, there is no place for either nationalist hatred, or for any other enmity or intolerance. (See the Exodus 11, 6 and Romans 12, 10).

2. In this context, the Orthodox position concerning the racial discrimination should be clarified even further. This is a very clear position: the Orthodox Church believes that God "had made of one blood all nations of man to dwell on all the face of the earth" (the Acts 17, 26) and that "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3, 28). According to this faith the Orthodox Church doesn't agree with any forms of racial discrimination, because this is always an unequal appreciation of human races, in order to offer to all the people in the world the possibility of personal development. However, it does not limit itself to supporting the abolishment of any discrimination on grounds of color, a discrimination manifested only in certain parts of our planet, but it also supports the fight against any discrimination that is harmful to a minority.

3. A minority, whether it is religious, linguistic or ethnical, must be respected in its diversity. Each community must have the possibility to develop itself according to its characteristic features. In fact such pluralism should define the life of the countries. The unity of a nation, of a country or a state should include the right to diversity of the human community.

4. The Orthodoxy blames without any compromise the inhuman system of the racial discrimination and the blasphemous assertion of the so-called concordance of such a system with Christian ideals. When Jesus was asked, "Who is our neighbor?" He answered with the story of the Good Samaritan. Thus He teaches us to avoid any hostility or prejudice.

The Orthodoxy considers that a man, irrespective of color, religion, race, nationality or language, has the face of God and as our brothers, our sisters are all equal members of the human family¹⁶. This is what the pan-Orthodox conference established.

III

Finally, we can say that the diversity of the life of the church is a gift God gave us, starting with the Whit Sunday when the foundation of the Church took place as the Holy Spirit descended over the Apostles. Because of the fact that the Holy Spirit makes the Apostles speak foreign languages, He is the one who also raises the nation to become part of the Church. This shows the very close relationship between church and nation and justifies the existence of the national churches; we should see however that the word "nation" must only be used retrospectively¹⁷.

The nations are different unities of the world and they have to be accepted as such within the body of Christ's Church. Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite (the 5th – 6th century) considered that each city or nation had its own protective Archangel. In other words, peoples' national unities participate to the hierarchical life of the Christian spirituality¹⁸. It is true that in Christ's Church there is neither Greek nor Jew (Galatians 3, 28) because all the nations on the earth have their own place in the cosmic organism of the Church. The unity of all nations in Jesus Christ is in fact spiritual – it is a unity in faith; but it must keep the world's natural diversity in a creative way and develop itself through it. The Orthodox Church perfectly reflects the incredible relation between "local" and "universal" which is expressed in the Christian life. For this reason there are as many local churches as there are Orthodox nations, and also there are so many local parts of an Ecumenical and cosmic Church, which is one. All these local units have the same teachings and the same faith¹⁹.

Therefore, all the local Orthodox churches are part of the one Orthodox Church and at the same time each local Orthodox Church keeps the features of the same Unique Orthodox Church. The present diversity of the traditions does not separate the Orthodox Church from its basic

principle which ensures the living according to Christ's wish and His work through the Holy Spirit.

In the Orthodox Church, diversity is based on the following factors:

1. Specific national traditions
2. The different nature of the Orthodox peoples
3. Different historical circumstances

Each of these factors gives the following aspects of the tradition:

1. During the conversion to Christianity of the peoples that are currently Orthodox, the Church has taken some pagan customs and has made them Christian. This thing continues to happen with the new traditions or even with some folklore customs. These traditions and customs gave those peoples' ethos a certain feature, which can be easily seen in the religious sermon. For instance, there are the local customs of the prayers for the dead, but there can probably appear certain tensions between them and the apostolic tradition. These unpleasant situations can be solved by the fact that the apostolic tradition itself can be developed, up to a certain point, only through national and historical traditions²⁰. Nevertheless, Christians should pay attention not to estrange themselves from the real Father because of their customs.

2. The different character of the Orthodox peoples, which can be explained by their traditions, and which is thus expressed, finds its role in emphasizing the undivided, equal and apostolic tradition. In the early church, we can explain the existence of the severe asceticism within the Egyptian Christianity, as well as the underlining of the divine nature of Jesus Christ, up to the point of denying His human nature, through their special love and devotion to God. On the other hand, the Western countries' juridical thinking and the fact that they stressed the anthropological sphere can be partly explained by the Roman pagan customs²¹. We should not regret these different aspects as on the contrary, they should be evaluated as rich elements within Jesus Christ.

This is how the catechetical schools from Alexandria and Antiochia have been developed, and this thing is also valid in the writings of the Holy Fathers of the Orient, who had appropriated the Greek philosophy in a particular way. The Latin Fathers had been strongly influenced by the Roman laws. Such nuances mean that there are many possibilities to express the life within Christ, where Christians can be satisfied with what they possess and with what they can fully accomplish themselves²².

3. Certain historical situations, which contributed to the development of different churches, can live their mark upon the apostolic native tradition. Thus, for instance, for the Romanian people from Transylvania and for the other Orthodox too, especially from the Balkan Peninsula, the Orthodox Church represents a national institution²³, in which the bishops and the metropolitan bishops, such as Andrei Șaguna²⁴, were important Romanian personalities. The Orthodoxy simply represented to Romanians the easier possibility to express their national self-respect and, most

importantly, that in which Romanians felt safe, within a super-national Orthodox community. We should pay attention here to the fact that the national development of the local Orthodox Church is to be understood as strictly different from nationalism – as we have already mentioned. This is very easy to prove, if we were to consider the history of the Romanian people alone, a people that lived peacefully together with the Evangelical Saxons, the Calvinist Hungarians and even the Turks, the Tartars and other nations of different religions who continue to live here to the present day.

From what we have already said, we can see that, from the Orthodox point of view, the ideal of the nation can be completely integrated in the Christian ideal. This would have been the most beautiful goal of a nation, namely the development of the spiritual in Christ. Such an ideal only makes possible the development of a nation's natural qualities. It does not lead to a uniformity of nations, on the contrary, it leads to their growth within the unity of the Christian faith.

The Romanian people discovered more and more the significance of their Christian faith, which is the main part of their nature. This is why people can develop in the Christian European community by it²⁵.

As Europe is considered to be the house of the nations, the Romanian people can participate with their own heritage, representing a real bridge between East and West, because its basic principles are the Latin origin and the Orthodox faith²⁶.

This way, the Orthodox Romanian Church and the Romanian people have the possibility to bring an important contribution to the European unity within its diversity of nations and confessions.

Bibliography

Bălan, Mitropolit Nicolae. "Biserică și națiune". in *Ortodoxia Românească*, 33-37. București: Editura Institutului Biblic al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1992.

Centenarul autocefaliei Bisericii Ortodoxe Române 1885-1985. București: Editura Institutului Biblic al BOR, 1987.

Crainic, Nichifor. *Ortodoxia, concepția noastră de viață*. Sibiu: 1937.

Crăciun, Maria and Ghitta, Ovidiu. *Ethnicity and Religion in Central and Eastern Europe*. Cluj-Napoca: University Press, 1995.

Hitchins, Keith A.. *Die Idee der Nation bei den Rumanen in Transsylvanien (1691-1849)*. Bukarest: 1989.

Hitchins, Keith A.. *The Romanian National Movement in Transylvania (1780-1849)*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Hitchins, Keith A.. *Ortodoxie și naționalitate. Andrei Șaguna și românii din Transilvania 1846-1873*. trad. Aurel Jivi, București: Editura Univers enciclopedic, 1995.

Ioniță, Viorel. “Die Einheit der Kirche und die Vielzahl der Nationem”. in Karl Christian Felmy, *Kirchen im Kontext unterschiedlicher Kulturen: Auf dem Weg ins dritte Jahrtausend; Aleksandr Men im memoriam (1935-1990)*. Göttingen: 1991

Ivan, Iorgu D.. “Etnosul-neamul - temei divin și principiu fundamental canonic al autocefaliei bisericești”. in *Centenarul autocefaliei Bisericii Ortodoxe Române 1885-1985*, 86-201. București: Editura Institutului Biblic al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1987.

Leb, Ioan Vasile. *Die Rumänische Orthodoxe Kirche im Wandel der Zeiten*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană, 1998.

Leb, Ioan Vasile. “Die Rolle der Orthodoxen Kirche im neuen vereinigten Europa”. in Harald Heppner & Grigorios Larentzakis (Ed.), *Das Europa-Verständnis im Orthodoxen Südosteuropa. Grazer Theologische Studien*, 21, (1996): 93-105.

Moldovan, Ilie. “Etnicitate și autonomie bisericească. Considerații de ordin teologic-moral”. in *Centenarul autocefaliei Bisericii Ortodoxe Române 1885-1985*, 202-233. București: Editura Institutului Biblic al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1987.

Papandreou, Damaskinos. “Die Einheit der Kirche und die Vielheit der Nationen”. in Karl Christian Felmy (Ed.), *Kirchen im Kontext unterschiedlicher Kulturen: Auf dem Weg ins dritte Jahrtausend; Aleksandr Men im memoriam (1935-1990)*. Göttingen: 1991

Păcurariu, Mircea. *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române*. vol. I-III. București: Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1980-1981.

Phidas, Vlassios I.. *Droit Canon. Une perspective Orthodoxe*. Chambésy, Genève: Centre Orthodoxe du Patriarcat Oecumenique, 1998.

Plămădeală, Mitropolit Antonie. “Catolicitate și etnicitate”. in *Ortodoxia Românească*, 18-32. București: Editura Institutului Biblic al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1992.

Plămădeala, Dr. Antonie. *Dascăli de cuget și simțire românească*. București: Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1981.

Plămădeală, Dr. Antonie. “Zece teze despre catolicitate și etnicitate”. *Studii Teologice* 1-4 (1979): 301-315.

Stăniloae, Dumitru. “Universalitatea și etnicitatea Bisericii în concepția ortodoxă”. *Ortodoxia* 2 (1977): 143-152.

Stăniloae, Dumitru. “Unitate și diversitate în tradiția ortodoxă”. *Ortodoxia* 3 (1970): 333-346.

Șesan, Milan P. and Bodogae, Teodor. “Popoare creștinate de Bizanț”, in *Istoria Bisericească Universală*, vol. I (1-1054), 472-492. București: Editura Institutului Biblic al BOR, 1987.

Șivarov, Nikolaj. “Kirche und Nation. Theorie und Praxis im gegenwärtigen Bulgarien”. in Karl Christian Felmy (Ed.), *Kirchen im Kontext unterschiedlicher Kulturen: Auf dem Weg ins dritte Jahrtausend; Aleksandr Men im memoriam (1935-1990)*. Göttingen: 1991.

Turcynski, Emanuel. *Konfession und Nation. Zur Frühgeschichte der serbischen und rumänischen Nationsbildung*. Dusseldorf: 1976.

Notes:

¹ Damaskinos Papandreou, “Die Einheit der Kirche und die Vielheit der Nationen”, in *Kirchen im Kontext unterschiedlicher Kulturen: Auf dem Weg ins dritte Jahrtausend; Aleksandr Men im memoriam (1935-1990)*, ed. Karl Christian Felmy, (Göttingen: 1991), 417.

² Damaskinos Papandreou, 418.

³ Damaskinos Papandreou, 418-419.

⁴ Damaskinos Papandreou, 419

⁵ Damaskinos Papandreou, 420-421. This is the entirely text: „Les évêques de chaque nation doivent reconnaître leur primat et le considerer comme leur chef ; et ne rien faire de trop sans son avis...Mais, lui aussi, qu il ne fasse rien sans l'avis de tous; car ainsi regnera la concorde et sera glorifié le Père et le Fils et le Saint Esprit”, Cf. Vlassios I. Phidas, *Droit Canon. Une perspective Orthodoxe* (Chambésy, Genève: Centre Orthodoxe du Patriarcat Oecumenique, 1998), 67-68.

⁶ Damaskinos Papandreou, 422.

⁷ Damaskinos Papandreou, 422.

⁸ Damaskinos Papandreou, 423; Milan P. Șesan, Teodor Bodogae, “Popoare creștinate de Bizanț”, in *Istoria Bisericească Universală*, vol. I (1-1054), (București: Editura Institutului Biblic al BOR, 1987), 472-492.

⁹ Damaskinos Papandreou, 423; *Centenarul autocefaliei Bisericii Ortodoxe Române 1885-1985*, (București: Editura Institutului Biblic al BOR, 1987).

¹⁰ Ioan Vasile Leb, *Die Rumänische Orthodoxe Kirche im Wandel der Zeiten*, (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană, 1998), 90.

¹¹ Nikolaj Ŗivarov, "Kirche und Nation. Theorie und Praxis im gegenwärtigen Bulgarien", in *Kirchen im Kontext unterschiedlicher Kulturen: Auf dem Weg ins dritte Jahrtausend; Aleksandr Men im memoriam (1935-1990)*, ed. Karl Christian Felmy (Göttingen, 1991), 460.

¹² Damaskinos Papandreou, 424; Dumitru Stăniloae, "Universalitatea Ńi etnicitatea Bisericii în concepția ortodoxă", *Ortodoxia*, 2 (1977): 143-152.

¹³ See: Mircea Păcurariu, *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române*, vol. I-III, (București: Editura Institutului Biblic Ńi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1980-1981); Dr. Antonie Plămădeala, *Dascăli de cuget Ńi simțire românească*, (București: Editura Institutului Biblic Ńi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1981).

¹⁴ Nikolaj Berdjajev, *Mnogobozie i nacionalism*, in Put, 1934, S. 4-43. Vezi N. Ŗivarov, *Kirche und Nation*, 460.

¹⁵ It seems to have been decided at the local Synod from Constantinople in 1872. We can find important information about it at: Dr. Antonie Plămădeală-Ploieșteanu, "Zece teze despre catolicitate Ńi etnicitate", *Studii Teologice*, 1-4 (1979): 311.

¹⁶ Damaskinos Papandreou, 425-426.

¹⁷ Viorel Ioniță, "Die Einheit der Kirche und die Vielzahl der Nationem", in *Kirchen im Kontext...*, ed. Karl Christian Felmy, 412.

¹⁸ Nichifor Crainic, *Ortodoxia, concepția noastră de viață*, (Sibiu, 1937), 31.

¹⁹ Viorel Ioniță, 413.

²⁰ Dumitru Stăniloae, "Unitate Ńi diversitate în tradiția ortodoxă", *Ortodoxia*, 3 (1970): 342.

²¹ Viorel Ioniță, 414.

²² Dumitru Stăniloae, "Unitate Ńi diversitate în tradiția ortodoxă": 343.

²³ Keith A. Hitchins, *Die Idee der Nation bei den Rumanen in Transsylvanien (1691-1849)*, (Bukarest: 1989), 17.

²⁴ Keith A. Hitchins, *The Romanian National Movement in Transylvania (1780-1849)*, (Cambridge: Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969); Keith A. Hitchins, *Ortodoxie Ńi naționalitate. Andrei Ŗaguna Ńi românii din Transilvania 1846-1873*, trad. Aurel Jivi, (București: Editura „Univers enciclopedic”, 1995); Emanuel Turcynski, *Konfession und Nation. Zur Frühgeschichte der serbischen und rumänischen Nationsbildung*, (Dusseldorf: 1976).

²⁵ Viorel Ioniță, 415.

²⁶ Ioan-Vasile Leb, 124-132; Ioan-Vasile Leb, "Die Rolle der Orthodoxen Kirche im neuen vereinigten Europa", in *Das Europa-Verständnis im Orthodoxen Südosteuropa. Grazer Theologische Studien*, ed. Harald Heppner & Grigorios Larentzakis, 21, (1996), 93-105.