

Saint Priest Confessor Dumitru Stăniloae in *Telegraful Român*: Resolving the Authorship Issue and Mapping the Intellectual Influences¹

NICOLAE DRĂGUȘIN*

Through a systematic reading of all 421 articles that Dumitru Stăniloae authored in the diocesan weekly Telegraful Român (1930-1945), the official publication of the Romanian Orthodox Church's Metropolis of Transylvania, this paper aims to address the authorship issue and to trace Stăniloae's intellectual influences. The authorship issue arises because not all the articles in Telegraful român when Stăniloae was the publication's editor-in-chief are bylined. Lacking other sources such as diaries or correspondence, the intellectual influences on Stăniloae are documented in how he reviewed and quoted books, used various periodicals, and eulogized some of the prominent intellectuals of the time. An examination of the state of research shows that of the some 1,794 references to Stăniloae's life and work in Romanian and foreign languages, only a handful of studies deal with the articles published in Telegraful român, despite the importance of his early journalism for his political, social, and later theological conception. The paper aims to make a preliminary contribution to the still unwritten history of Stăniloae's ideas and to offer a new perspective on the more recent questions concerning the most prominent Romanian theologian's engagement with the far right.

Keywords: *Dumitru Stăniloae, History of Ideas, Nationalism, Interwar, German Theology, Existentialist Philosophy*

Every tenth anniversary of Dumitru Stăniloae's (1903-1993) birth or commemoration since his death has seen a boost in the consolidation of his public memory. His 90 years of life spanned the twentieth century. He was active as a clergyman, professor of theology, prolific author of theological studies and treatises, translator, contributor to the secular

* Nicolae Drăgușin, Scientific Researcher III, Elie Wiesel National Institute for the Study of the Holocaust in Romania, Associate Lecturer, Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest, nicolaedr@yahoo.com.

¹ This article, based on preliminary research, was written during my time as a visiting researcher in Vienna at the ÖAW/ Austrian Academy of Sciences. I would like to thank Prof. Oliver Jens Schmitt and everyone at ÖAW who made my stay so intellectually memorable. I would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers who provided comments that helped me improve this article.

and ecclesiastical press, former political prisoner in communist prisons, and above all mentor of generations of theologians and leader of public opinion. The decision of the Holy Synod of the Romanian Orthodox Church (the ROC) on 12 July 2024 to approve his canonization as “Saint Priest Confessor Dumitru Stăniloae”, with his feast day on 4 October, represents the natural outcome of the overwhelmingly positive reception of his memory.

Five days later this decision sparked a critical reaction from the Elie Wiesel National Institute for the Study of the Holocaust in Romania. It challenged the positive memory associated with his sainthood by pointing to Stăniloae’s theoretical contribution to the “debates of the far right” in *Calendarul* (“The Calendar”) and *Porunca vremii* (“Command of the Times”), and his advocacy of the fascist Legionary Movement in *Telegraful român* (“The Romanian Telegraph”).² The reactions that followed in the succeeding years reveal how little is known about Stăniloae’s intellectual activity in the 1930s and 1940s.

Introduction and methodological considerations

This critical response did not arise from completely unexplored ground. Especially since 2000 contributions have been made to addressing the problem of Stăniloae’s connections with the political and ideological far right in the Romania of the 1930s and 1940s. A component of this connection (Stăniloae’s journalism in the secular and ecclesiastical press) has been insufficiently explored.

This study aims to contribute to the scientific knowledge of Stăniloae’s journalism in the pages of *Telegraful Român* (hereafter referred to as TR). Through a broad analysis of his journalism I seek to answer two questions. Which articles can be attributed to Stăniloae’s authorship? What was he reading when preparing these articles? The research questions that guide this article are necessary not only to reconstruct Stăniloae’s biography as a journalist and polemicist, which is largely neglected by the post-December recovery of his memory, but to express certain problems that appear thus far to have presented an obstacle to the secondary literature. A detailed analysis of the literature on the political and social dimension of Stăniloae’s intellectual activity demonstrates not only confusion regarding what can be attributed to Stăniloae’s authorship but also uncertainty

² Institutul Național pentru Studierea Holocaustului din România “Elie Wiesel”, “Comunicat de presă: decizia Sf. Sinod al BOR de a canoniza 16 clerici,” inshr-ew.ro/canonizare-clerici/, accessed 20 January 2025.

regarding the reading underlying his youthful journalistic writings, which may provide valuable clues concerning how his thinking evolved.

The article is divided into several sections. The first (“State of existing research”) pays considerable attention to outlining and commenting on the literature that deals with Stăniloae’s journalism in TR. The second (“What did Stăniloae write? Resolving the authorship issue”) is intended to demonstrate the difficulties in determining the precise number of articles Stăniloae wrote in the diocesan newspaper. This difficulty arises because not all the articles can be attributed to him. The third (“What did Stăniloae read? Book reviews, book references, and newspapers”) focuses on what Stăniloae was reading when undertaking his journalism. A sure way to determine Stăniloae’s reading is to identify which books he reviewed and referred to in his articles and which newspapers he used. This part is intended to map the intellectual influences on his early theological and philosophical outlook. Thus, if the second part seeks to establish which of the articles can be definitively attributed to Stăniloae, the third aims to map his intellectual influences during the Sibiu period of his life.

This article arises from the conviction that a detailed study of Stăniloae’s impressive journalistic output is impossible without an overall analysis of the type of journalism he practised in the pages of one of the most influential official publications of the ROC’s then 18 dioceses. This global analysis implies the identification and classification of the topics discussed, the books quoted and reviewed, the authors cited, the political events on which he focused, and the public debates in which he engaged. First, Stăniloae’s contributions to TR should be seen as a unitary corpus and only then thematically analysed. The methodological premise is that this annotated overview of topics, references, political events, and polemics in the secular and ecclesiastical press is a prerequisite for a further exploration of his arguments and ultimately for pinpointing Stăniloae on the map of the Romanian political and ideological (far) right.³ The huge number of articles and limitations of space mean this article explores only the authorship issue and the intellectual influences as documented in the books Stăniloae reviewed or merely quoted, the publications he used, or simply in the personal homage he paid various intellectuals. This purpose is all the more necessary if we assume that “like everyone else, theologians are shaped by their environment and by the resources of the

³ For a contribution to this topic see Ionuț Biliuță, *The Archangel’s Priests: Investigating the Relationship between the Orthodox Church and the Iron Guard in Interwar Romania 1930–1941* (Cluj: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2025).

intellectual climate in which they write.”⁴ This article thus aims to make a preliminary contribution to the still unwritten and urgently required history of Stăniloae’s political, social, theological, and philosophical ideas. At the same time it seeks to address a specific issue that I have highlighted in an earlier study: “[...] we cannot make [at this stage of research] any inference regarding a possible anti-Semitic outlook [of Stăniloae] without an exhaustive research of his writings (particularly the ones in *TR* [...]).”⁵ It would therefore be too much to expect this article to answer the question of whether Stăniloae was a fascist or an ideologue of the extreme right. Instead, the article presents the authorial problem, offering methodological suggestions for avoiding confusion when seeking to evaluate the overlapping of Stăniloae’s journalism with far-right ideologies. At the same time, it documents the intellectual influences from the reviewed books and the cited authors and newspapers. We can thus see Stăniloae’s journalism as a construction site in which there is every chance that we will find not one Stăniloae, but several.

Biographical sketch: Stăniloae’s six public images

A biographical sketch is required to frame Stăniloae’s journalism correctly. He was born on 16 November 1903 in the village of Vlădeni, where he attended the primary school. In the spring of 1917 he moved to Braşov to continue his studies. His peasant family’s poverty led him to seek and receive financial support from the Gojdu Foundation, which he received until his graduation from high school (1922). During his secondary studies he was the only one of a class of 25 to receive the maximum grade every year. He was admitted as a student of the Faculty of Theology in Cernăuţi (1922), graduating in 1927. In 1924 Stăniloae met the Metropolitan of Transylvania and Archbishop of Sibiu Nicolae Bălan (1920–1955), who supported him financially in continuing his studies and research in Athens (1927), Munich (1928–1929), and Berlin (1929).

On his return to Romania Stăniloae settled in Sibiu, beginning his work as a teacher on 2 September 1929 at the Theological Academy in Sibiu. He served this ecclesiastical institution as professor and latterly rector (from 1936) until 1946, when the communist authorities forced him

⁴ Roland Clark, “Nationalist and Trinitarian Visions of the Church in the Theology of Dumitru Stăniloae,” *Studii Teologice*, 2 (2013): 207.

⁵ Nicolae Drăguşin, “Under Nichifor Crainic’s Mantle: Far-Right Topics in the Orthodox Clergyman’s Contributions to *Gândirea*, *Calendarul*, and *Sfarmă-Piatră*,” *Holocaust. Studii şi cercetări* XIV, no. 1 (2022): 179.

to resign. His first public position was therefore as a professor of theology, with about a decade spent as rector, the highest administrative office.

In 1930 he commenced his journalism in the diocesan newspapers *Telegraful român*, *Revista teologică*, and *Anuarul Academiei*. Established in the mid-nineteenth century, TR was the official publication of the Archbishopric of Sibiu and Metropolis of Transylvania, comprising the dioceses of Sibiu, Caransebeș, Oradea, Arad, and Cluj. In 1934 he was appointed editor-in-chief of TR, thus exercising responsibility for the ROC's oldest publication. In the same year he met Nichifor Crainic (1889–1972), who invited him to contribute to *Gândirea* ("The Thought"), one of interwar Romania's most influential newspapers. Stăniloae had authored hundreds of articles and studies by 1945. His second public position was therefore as a journalist, who adopted public positions on various topics in this capacity.

After marrying Maria Mihu (1930) he was ordained deacon (1931) and priest (1932) by Metropolitan Nicolae. His third public position was therefore as a clergyman of the highest priestly rank.

In 1938 he gained his fourth public position as a theologian by publishing a theological monograph, *Viața și învățătura Sfântului Grigorie Palama* ("The Life and Teaching of St Gregory Palamas"). It was followed in 1943 by *Iisus Hristos și Restaurarea omului* ("Jesus Christ, or the Restoration of Man"). These books "already distinguished him as a very original theological thinker," "the former book" being "a groundbreaking study in Palamite scholarship", though he considered the latter "one of his major works".⁶

The advent of the first communist government in Romania (6 March 1945) and the full imposition of communism (30 December 1947) saw radical shifts in Stăniloae's life. Besides ceasing his intensive journalism and administrative duties in TR (13 May 1945), he resigned as rector of the Theological Academy in Sibiu (1946) and as a professor (1947). In 1947 he moved from Sibiu to Bucharest, where he continued his teaching at the Faculty of Theology, succeeding Crainic.

At the same time, he embarked on his fifth public position as a translator. In 1946 he published the annotated translation of the first volume of *Filocalia sfintelor nevoițe ale desăvârșirii sau culegere din scrierile Sfinților Părinți care arată cum se poate omul curăți, lumina și desăvârși* (in brief, the *Philokalia*), an endeavour that would not end until the publication

⁶ Lucian Turcescu, "Dumitru Stăniloae (1903-1993): Commentary," in *The Teachings of Modern Christianity on Law, Society and Human Nature*, vol. II, eds John Witte Jr. and Frank Alexander (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 296.

of the twelfth volume in 1991 following a politically motivated interruption between 1949 and 1975. In 1958 he was arrested by the communist authorities for alleged involvement in the *Rugul aprins* (“Burning Bush”) group. He was released from prison in 1963. Soon afterwards he testified at a public rehabilitation that enabled the continuation of his purely theological activities: his professorship in Bucharest and the continuation of his translation of the *Philokalia*. In 1978 he published the 1,347-page, three-volume *Teologia dogmatică ortodoxă* (*Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*), his magnum opus, which attempted “to blend in a very creative fashion patristic insights with contemporary theology, both Western and Eastern,” providing readers with “his own reflections based on his dialogue with the tradition and modernity, including contemporary ecumenism”.⁷ The communist regime allowed him to travel abroad and deliver papers at conferences in France, the UK, and the US.

After the fall of communism, he enjoyed a high profile in the public sphere that we may reasonably describe as his sixth position as an opinion leader. His post-1989 image as a public figure was less due to this work as a theologian and even as a translator than it was to his status as a former political prisoner, which gave him considerable public respect in the last three years of his life. One might therefore claim that the extraordinary publicity he enjoyed between 1990 and 1993 exposed the notoriety he enjoyed as a contributor to and editor of TR and as a contributor to *Gândirea* and other publications between 1930 and 1944. The young theologian Stăniloae who had been involved as a polemist in intellectual debates until 1945 was now an opinion leader, a position he enjoyed from 1990 until his death. It is difficult to decide whether he intended to be an author of great theological works during the communist period, but there is no doubt that he sought to be an apologist theologian and intellectual polemist in the public sphere. Arguably, the theological work for which he was renowned (especially abroad) represented an extended biographical parenthesis. All these positions were manifested in various intensities during his long life, but it was as a journalist that he was first famous among the public, and for many years it was for this that he was known.

Mapping and classifying Stăniloae’s oeuvre

Stăniloae’s work is undoubtedly impressive. Its breadth, and especially the depth of its handling of some theological topics, attracts attention. There have been several attempts to classify it. Their unstated goal is to

⁷ *Ibidem*, 300.

determine in which of the texts Stăniloae writes as a polemical journalist, theologian, or priest. Not all these attempts are satisfactory, however.

G. Anghelescu⁸ was the first to create a Stăniloae biobibliography. He proposes the following categories: works in volumes; translations; booklets; studies; articles; homage and commemorative articles; prefaces; sermons; speeches; popular articles; notes, annotations, and opinions; book reviews; and interviews. All Stăniloae's contributions to TR before 1945 are included in "homage and commemorative articles" (24 articles of the 35 mentioned); "sermons" (3 articles of the 12 mentioned); "speeches" (17 articles of the 19 mentioned); "popular articles" (about 300, representing the largest category); and "notes, annotations, opinions" (about 25). Although the popular articles category is the largest, there is a methodological problem because Anghelescu neither explains nor justifies its creation and the decision to include the bulk of TR contributions in it. No less important is that Anghelescu does not discuss the differences between, for example, articles (no contribution to TR included here, but some to *Gândirea*) and "homage and commemorative articles".

The second attempt belongs to the bibliographer Virginia Popa, who produced a first edition of Stăniloae's biobibliography in 2004,⁹ followed in 2013 by a revised and enlarged edition that was intended to update the list of studies on Stăniloae.¹⁰ This undoubtedly more professional and useful bibliography is structured in two parts. The first constructs Stăniloae's "systematic bibliography" according to criteria such as the document's form ("volumes and booklets", "studies, articles, and chapters", "sermons and speeches", "interviews and dialogues", "introductions, forewords, and postscripts", "book reviews", and "mailing"), the publications' chronological order, their alphabetical order, and the titles' alphabetical order. The second assembles references to Stăniloae according to two criteria: type of document (dictionaries, scientific studies, monographs, and so on); and authors in alphabetical order. Based on this classification, Stăniloae's

⁸ Gheorghe F. Anghelescu, *Bibliografia Părintelui Academician Profesor Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae* (Bucharest: Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1993); this booklet was followed by another three books that unjustly framed the overall bibliography under a specific theological trend such as patrology: Anghelescu, *Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae, promotor și exeget al gândirii patristice. Introducere în biobibliografie* (Iași: Ed. Trinitas, 1998); Anghelescu, Cristian Untea, *Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae, un urmaș vrednic al patristicii clasice (bio-bibliografie)* (Craiova: Ed. Mitropoliei Olteniei, 2008). Anghelescu, *Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae, un urmaș vrednic al patristicii clasice (bio-bibliografie)* (Bucharest: Ed. Enciclopedică, 2013).

⁹ Virginia Popa, *Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae. Bio-bibliografie* (Iași: Ed. Trinitas, 2004).

¹⁰ *Ibidem* (Bucharest: Trinitas, 2013), 2nd ed.

contributions to TR are included mainly in “studies, articles, and chapters”, but some are also included in “sermons and speeches”.

Although useful, Anghelescu’s and Popa’s classifications are not sensitive to the content of Stăniloae’s writings. I would supplement them with another classification that corresponds roughly to the main aspects of his intellectual activity and is more relevant for this study’s purpose. This approach to Stăniloae’s work classifies it in articles published in ecclesiastical and lay newspapers, theological studies, the annotated translation of the *Philokalia*, and the theological works. Concerning the theological works, one should further distinguish between theological monographs such as the one on Gregory Palama and theological treatises such as the three-volume *Dogmatics*. This possibly third classification seems more coherent with three of Stăniloae’s public images: the journalist; the professor of theology/theologian; and the translator.

Another way to approach Stăniloae’s work is to distinguish between early and mature writings, where the inflection point is the publication of *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*. The break caused by his political marginalization allows us to define the early phase of Stăniloae’s intellectual career as covering writings between 1930 and 1946, corresponding to his life in his beloved Transylvania and Sibiu, and the mature writings between 1963 and 1993, corresponding to his life in Bucharest. This framing prompts a fundamental question: is there a continuous thread in his intellectual work, or are there rupture points? How different is the intellectually mature Stăniloae from the young Stăniloae?

1. Stăniloae as a journalist: State of existing research

The bibliography on Stăniloae is even more impressive. In 2013 Popa identified no fewer than 1,794 references to Stăniloae’s life and work in Romanian and in some foreign languages. There are many ways to explain this, but one thing seems clear: especially after his death the references grew rapidly.

A particular difficulty is to identify and classify this secondary literature. This arises from its greatly varying scientific value, which requires an overview of what can be used for scientific purposes, and what can be omitted as purely acclamatory literature. This work must be accomplished with an awareness that Popa only lists the secondary literature titles, without comment. By screening the titles cited by the most up-to-date list of Stăniloae’s life and work, we can observe that in addition to laudatory memorial literature, a significant element focuses on various aspects of

his theological work, ranging from internal uses of the church to people's personal development. However, as impressive as this bibliography of secondary literature is in its size and rate of growth, it is also disproportionate in terms of the interest devoted to certain segments of Stăniloae's work. By far the largest number of contributions deals with his purely theological work. In contrast, very few deal with his contributions to the ecclesiastical and secular press. These strikingly rare contributions are the result of discoveries concerning hitherto undescribed parts of his biography, including the reasons for his imprisonment (1958), which date from when he was most active in journalism. Once Stăniloae's aura as a politically persecuted priest and theologian had faded after 1993, new questions arose: what were his connections with the Legionary movement? What did he write about democracy, ethnic and religious minorities, political parties, church-state relations, and nationalism? The very few attempts to answer these questions are nevertheless apt to create a new trend in researching Stăniloae's life and work: his political and ideological leanings and contributions to far-right discourse in the 1930s and early 1940s. This runs in parallel with perhaps another problem that is apparently better defined: what were Stăniloae's connections with the communist regime during the years of his imprisonment and after his release?

Perhaps the first critical enquiry into Stăniloae's intellectual biography was undertaken by Olivier Gillet in his *Religion et nationalisme. L'idéologie de l'Eglise orthodoxe roumaine sous le régime communiste*,¹¹ subsequently published in Romanian.¹² The original French book is an abridged version of a PhD thesis defended in 1995 at the Free University of Bruxelles. It is not by chance that this first critical interrogation of Stăniloae's political thought was realized in the context of broader research on the connection between the nationalist language of the Orthodox Church and the communist state (1948-1989). Of the approximately 33 references Gillet makes to Stăniloae, 16 are to TR (27/1941; 42/1936; 34-35/1943; 28/1936; 11/1941; 9-10/1932; 40/1940; 3/1935; 4/1939; 5/1939; 53/1934; 24/1938; 10/1938; 41/1943; 35/1941; 18/1936), and two to *Gândirea*. Most of these references occur in the chapter dedicated to the ecclesiastical understanding of the word *nation*. Gillet describes Stăniloae as "one of the most active far-right authors between the two wars"¹³ and,

¹¹ Olivier Gillet, *Religion et nationalisme. L'idéologie de l'Eglise orthodoxe roumaine sous le régime communiste* (Brussels: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1997).

¹² Gillet, *Religie și naționalism. Ideologia Bisericii Ortodoxe Române sub regimul comunist*, trad. Mariana Petrișor (Bucharest: Compania, 2001).

¹³ *Ibidem*, 161.

with Crainic, a leader “of the *gândirist* (thought-ist) movement in the ROC” that inspired the fascist movement and the Iron Guard.¹⁴ It is no accident that this chapter is followed by one devoted to “the Orthodox Church, the minorities, and the West”.¹⁵ The correct methodological presupposition is that no one can discuss nationalism without considering the minority issue. However, how Gillet uses these sources is more exemplificative than argumentative. Gillet does not use the sources in a systematic reading to demonstrate Stăniloae’s conception of nationalism and its evolution and, most importantly, in relation to the particular political events and heated polemics in which he was involved. This approach was never developed, despite the fact that the relationship between religion and nationalism in Stăniloae’s mind has since remained an important point of public and scientific interest.

Gillet’s book made a deep impression at the time. It is perhaps in this context that we should analyse Costion Nicolescu’s *Teologul în cetate* (*The Theologian in the City*).¹⁶ This book is important for two reasons: it refers to 117 of Stăniloae’s articles in TR; and it organizes these primary sources thematically (the clergy’s “participatory attitude”, “problems of political doctrine”, “freemasonry”, “anticommunist attitudes”, “politicians and political behaviour”, “the church and political parties”, “attitude to monarchy and monarchs”, “the Ion Antonescu years”, “diverse political events and periods”, “23 August 1944 and the ensuing years”, “future predictions”). The apologetic intention is obvious, though Nicolescu does not refer to Gillet’s book. Some of the weaknesses of Nicolescu’s book lie in its interpretation of these articles, especially in the selective reading of some quotations that ignore other topics such as ethnic minorities in which Stăniloae showed interest, and the correspondingly xenophobic (antisemitic) tone. Moreover, the book does not indicate the ambiguities, inconsistencies, and even contradictions that Stăniloae showed at that time in his articles, which is a shortcoming of classifying primary sources purely thematically. An example is the changing position on Marxism as bad for ideologically fuelling communism but good for protecting the workers. The book undertakes a deep exploration of relevant topics such as the Second World War. It also opens questions that even today’s research does

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, 160.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, 191-226.

¹⁶ Costion Nicolescu, *Teologul în cetate. Părintele Stăniloae și aria politicii* (Bucharest: Editura Christiana, 2003). This book develops a series of previously published articles: Costion Nicolescu, “Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae și aria politicii I,” *Cotidianul Supliment*, anul V, nr. 11 (vineri 15 noiembrie 1996): 1–2.

not attempt to answer. Starting with Niclescu's assumption that "[Father Dumitru's] [political] attitude to one event or another is to be found first in his journalism, where he often expressed it openly, and only then in his theological work,"¹⁷ we may further ask: what are the connections between the journalism and the theological work? To what extent does the mind of the journalist in the fourth decade of his life influence the mind of the theologian of the subsequent decades? How legitimate is it to separate Stăniloae's work into that of the young journalist and of the mature theologian and translator? Further research is required to address these questions, but one cannot ignore the fact that much of the ideas expressed in the articles published during the 1930s and early 1940s are visible, if not in the work of the theologian, then in his public positions between 1990 and 1993.

Less than two years after Niclescu's book was published Lucian Turcescu contributed the fifth chapter on Stăniloae to John Witte Jr.'s and Frank Alexander's edited volume *The Teachings of Modern Christianity on Law, Society and Human Nature*.¹⁸ The chapter provides the reader with a selection of "original source materials" relevant for topics such as the law (and its intersection with revelation and fallen human nature),¹⁹ the relationship between communism and the church in terms of cooperation and conflict, and the relationship between Orthodoxy and nationalism. In this latter topic, which is of interest for this analysis, Turcescu substantiates his commentary on the chosen "original source materials" by citing three numbers of TR, no. 47/1937, no. 4/1940, and no. 15/1934. The other references are to Stăniloae's mature works such as the English translation of *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*. It must be said that besides the analysis of law in a theological context, which represents an essential and now no longer explored contribution of Stăniloae to legal and political thinking, the other two topics reflect the interest of the late 2000s. However, one of the important points Turcescu makes concerns Stăniloae's conception of "ethnic nationalism in the Augustinian theory of *rationes aeternae*," which leads "to something very similar to what modern anthropologists call an "imagined community."²⁰ This may lead the

¹⁷ Niclescu, *Teologul*, 15.

¹⁸ Turcescu, "Dumitru Stăniloae."

¹⁹ The topic is revisited in Lucian Turcescu, "Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae despre lege, politică și natura umană," *Studii teologice*, no. 2 (2013): 115–40.

²⁰ Turcescu, "Dumitru Stăniloae," 315. See Benedict R. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1991).

researcher to place Stăniloae's allegedly original voice among those of the leading theoreticians of ethnic nationalism.

Although Mihail Neamțu does not refer to Turcescu's contribution, he reconsiders this connection between religion and nationalism as *ethno-theology*,²¹ and he takes a step forward by arguing for the essentially antimodern background of Stăniloae's theological-political conception. Neamțu argues that Stăniloae rejects the political modernity to which we owe the institution of citizenship and the constitutional arrangements of the modern state. He emphasizes Stăniloae's method of dichotomous thinking (East-West as a *basic schema*,²² but also city versus village, Catholicism versus Orthodoxy, etc.), and that his Transylvanian origin has a decisive influence on his outlook.²³ The problem with this study is that it substantiates its position too little with citations of articles from TR; instead, it seems to be a scholarly synthesis of secondary sources and engagement with their problematization. While correctly pointing out that Stăniloae was "politically and ideologically [...] a rightist, supporter of and contributor [...] to religious nationalism,"²⁴ Neamțu does not discuss the question of his affinity with the themes of the extreme right (e.g. the minority issue) and possibly with its political organizations. These oversights result in *provisional conclusions* that are difficult to embrace without serious amendment: "Father Stăniloae's theological nationalism never had chauvinist overtones, but it was based on categorical dichotomies."²⁵ Neamțu includes Stăniloae in the short list of interwar thinkers who contributed to ethnic nationalism, numbering him with Crainic and Nae Ionescu (1890-1940) as theoreticians of "Romanian ethno-theology."²⁶ It is therefore no accident that the literature deals with Stăniloae alongside Ionescu and Crainic as theoreticians of the reaction against the political modernity that flourished soon after this,²⁷ while others take

²¹ Mihail Neamțu, "Between the Gospel and the Nation: An Introduction to Dumitru Stăniloae's Ethno-Theology," in *New Europe College Yearbook* 6 (Bucharest, 2006), 239-79. This study was revised and improved in a Romanian version, "Etno-teologia părintelui Dumitru Stăniloae (1903-1993). Genealogie istorică și reflecții critice" in *Anuarul Institutului de Investigare a Crimelor Comunismului și Memoria Exilului Românesc*, vol. 5-6 (Bucharest, 2010-2011), 365-94, available online: anuar.iicm.ro/arhiva/volumele-5-6/. I quote from this more recent version.

²² *Ibidem*, 373.

²³ *Ibidem*, 390-91.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, 365.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, 392.

²⁶ *Ibidem*.

²⁷ Andreea Nanu, "Nichifor Crainic, Dumitru Stăniloae și Nae Ionescu: un ecumenism interbelic," *Romanian Political Science Review* 3 (2007): 625-38; Lavinia Stan, Lucian Turcescu, *Religie și politică în România postcomunistă* (Bucharest: Curtea Veche, 2008),

further steps in exploring Stăniloae's somewhat ambiguous relationship with modernity: "[...] the theologians' concepts may be called 'anti-modernist', but their attitudes as well as their thinking cannot be characterised as 'anti-modern'."²⁸ Moreover, the relationship between tradition and modernity in theology precedes by several years²⁹ the more recent explorations of Stăniloae's position on political modernity. This is not the place to assess the extent to which these publications, while taking Ionescu, Crainic, and Stăniloae together, attend to the differences between them concerning religious nationalism. What matters is to highlight that these studies raise questions that further research should not overlook: do Stăniloae's antisemitic texts represent a residue of the confrontation with political modernity? Or are they a reaction to the voluntary compliance with the ideology of the changing political regimes of the Goga-Cuza government, the National Legionary state, and Ion Antonescu's military dictatorship? Moreover, how can one evaluate Stăniloae's antisemitic texts in the context of his concept of nationalism and "Romanianness"? Does such nationalism lead him to make other xenophobic statements or only antisemitic ones in particular? In two studies³⁰ that make extensive use of Stăniloae's journalism in TR and *Gândirea* Roland Clark further explores Neamțu's concept of "ethnotheology".

Gabriel Andreescu's study³¹ takes up the subject of Stăniloae's relationship with right- and left-wing politics and ideologies, but his approach

97-102. For the original English edition see *Religion and Politics in Post-communist Romania* (Oxford University Press, 2007); Roland Clark, "Nationalism, Ethnotheology and Mysticism in Interwar Romania," *Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies* 2002 (2009): 1-47; Roland Clark, "Nationalist and Trinitarian Visions of the Church in the Theology of Dumitru Stăniloae," *Studii teologice*, no. 2 (2013): 207-26; Gelu Sabău, "Religion and Modernity: Instruments of Ideologizing the Religious Discourse," *Cogito* IV, no. 4 (December 2012): 114-32; Igor A. Ivanov, "Faith and Nation in the Ethnotheology of Archpriest Dumitru Stăniloae," *Theological Collection of the Tambov Theological Seminary*, Tambov Diocese of the Russian Orthodox Church, no. 4 (2022): 31-45 DOI: 10.51216/2687-072X_2022_4_31 (in Russian).

²⁸ Nicolai Staab, "Anti-modern without being Non-Modern? Attitudes to Modernity in the Writings of Nichifor Crainic and Dumitru Stăniloae in the Interwar Period," *Religion, State and Society* 3-4, no. 40 (2021): 316-35.

²⁹ Lucian Turcescu, ed., *Dumitru Stăniloae: Tradition and Modernity in Theology* (Iași, Oxford, Palm Beach, Portland: Center for Romanian Studies, 2002).

³⁰ Roland Clark, "Nationalism, Ethnotheology, and Mysticism in Interwar Romania," *Carl Beck Papers in Russian & East European Studies*, no. 2002 (September 2009), 1-47. Roland Clark, "Nationalist and Trinitarian Visions of the Church in the Theology of Dumitru Stăniloae," *Studii teologice* 2(2013), 207-25.

³¹ Gabriel Andreescu, "Anti-Semitic issues in Orthodox publications, years 1920-1944," in *Churches - Holocaust: Christian churches in three countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Holocaust*, eds Attila Jakab and Erika Törzsök (Budapest: CEC, Civitas Europica

is the opposite of that of Nicolescu: not only does he not downplay antisemitic statements, he foregrounds them. Andreescu's approach focuses not on Stăniloae but on "Anti-Semitic issues in Orthodox publications, years 1920–1944". However, the section "Dumitru Stăniloae and the *Telegraful român: The Antisemitism of a Theological Personality Embraced as a Representative of the ROC*" occupies an important part of the article, based on the previously stated assumptions that "the most aggressively anti-Semitic publication in the country and in Transylvania was TR",³² and that Stăniloae's replacement of the neutral George Proca at the head of TR led to its antisemitic turn.³³ Some criticisms can be made of Andreescu's study: he does not analyse the entire official press of the Romanian eparchies, resorting to only seven out of 18, and he does not distinguish between the official publication of an eparchy and various ecclesiastical publications edited by clergy (such as *Păstorul ortodox*, *Noua revistă bisericască*). The most important objection, however, is that Andreescu, in using the sources to support his argument, does not distinguish clearly between the articles signed by or officially attributed to Stăniloae and the short unsigned pieces that are probably the work of others.³⁴ If Neamțu detects no chauvinism in Stăniloae's religious nationalism, Andreescu's use of 21 TR articles leads him to the opposite conclusion: "Dumitru Stăniloae and TR (...) were central sources of chauvinism, xenophobia, and antisemitism during the interwar period".³⁵ However, a methodological question remains: how should one address the difference between Stăniloae as an author and Stăniloae as TR's editor-in-chief?

Marian Pătru offers a much more detailed and substantiated analysis of the official press published by the dioceses of the Orthodox Metropolis of Transylvania, creating a context for understanding the prominence of TR and its main author and editor-in-chief.³⁶ After 2016 we observe an increasing interest in the ecclesiastical and secular press which deals with religious topics and publishes contributions from clergy as a primary

Centralis, 2016), 151–75. The study published here adapts some minor amendments to an apparently previous text: "Antisemitic issues in Orthodox publications in Romania, 1920–1944," *VIII. Jewish Studies Yearbook of the CEU* (2011–2016): 119–43, available online at jewishstudies.ceu.edu/viii-yearbook-2011-2016. I quote from the latter study.

³² *Ibidem*, 129.

³³ *Ibidem*, 132.

³⁴ For such an ambiguity see *Ibidem*, 134.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, 139.

³⁶ Marian Pătru, *Das Ordnungsdenken im christlich-orthodoxen Raum. Nation, Religion und Politik im öffentlichen Diskurs der Rumänisch-Orthodoxen Kirche Siebenbürgens in der Zwischenkriegszeit. 1918–1940* (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2022).

source, though any researcher should consider some important methodological issues when dealing with this resource.³⁷

Fr Răzvan Perșa's more recent paper explicitly addresses "The Attitude of Father Dumitru Stăniloae towards Nazism, Legionarism, Communism, and Antisemitism during the Interwar Period".³⁸ This paper is conceived as an apologetic, and it is the first response of an Orthodox clergyman to the problem raised by the Elie Wiesel Institute's public statement. It focuses on Stăniloae's contributions to *Calendarul*, *Porunca vremii*, and *Gândirea*, as well as about 27 articles from TR, to argue that no article proves Stăniloae's affinity with National Socialism; that he distances himself from Legionary groups and leaders; that his alleged antisemitism cannot be proved from any of his articles.³⁹ However, besides claiming that Stăniloae was not a member of the Legionary groups and parties and therefore cannot be accused of Legionarism⁴⁰ as if Legionary affiliation did not imply sympathy and ideological support,⁴¹ this paper does not address some methodological questions: did Stăniloae champion an ethnic nationalism that had political implications in his articles in TR (and *Gândirea*)? If so, did such nationalism imply xenophobic and mostly antisemitic tendencies? Here, "this political Romanianness (...) has almost necessarily become anticatholic and antisemitic."⁴² Did such nationalism resonate with Legionary ideology (irrespective of his personal animosity towards individual members of the Legionary movement and his affiliation with the Iron Guard/Everything for the Country Party as political parties of the Legionary movement)? Was there an ideological connection

³⁷ For an attempt to create a methodology for reading this press based on the church's legal status, the relationship between journalist-clergymen and the diocese, and the all but unknown role state censorship played, see Nicolae Drăgușin, "War, Legionarism and Jewry in the Official Press of the Romanian Orthodox Church during the National Legionary State (1940–1941)," *Holocaust. Studii și cercetări* X, nr. 1 (2018): 311–16; Nicolae Drăgușin, "Orthodox Clergymen in *Porunca vremii* (1940–1944): A Case Study on the Perception of Jews and the Assessment of the Jewish Question," *Holocaust. Studii și cercetări* XIII, nr. 1 (2021): 209–13; Drăgușin, "Under Nichifor Crainic's Mantle," 147–50.

³⁸ Răzvan Perșa, "Atitudinea Părintelui Dumitru Stăniloae față de nazism, legionarism, comunism și antisemitism în perioada interbelică," *Tabor*, no. 8 (August 2024): 5–29.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, 28–29.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, 23.

⁴¹ For the complex and very diverse nature of how different individuals related to the Legionary movement which, beyond political groups/parties and ideological expressions, was also a social movement, see Armin Heinen, *Legiunea „Arhanghelului Mihail”* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1999); Oliver Jens Schmitt, *Corneliu Zelea Codreanu. Ascensiunea și căderea „Căpitanului”*, trans. Wilhelm Tauwinkl (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2017).

⁴² Daniel Barbu, *Șapte teme de politică românească* (Bucharest: Antet, 1997), 116.

with Nichifor Crainic, the leader of the third important far-right group during the interwar period in Romania? Finally, to express the whole issue in Neamțu's terms, did Stăniloae's antimodern political conception legitimize the discourse of the interwar radical right and subsequently the successive political dictatorships in Romania after 1938? Does all this explain why Stăniloae wrote for and served as editor of TR, which was considered "the most extremist" of the ROC's official publications?⁴³

Ionuț Biliuță's recent book on "clerical fascism", which builds on his previous dissertation in history defended at the Central European University,⁴⁴ argues that "[p]eople like (...) Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae (...) supported the movement publicly and internalized the fascist ideas without formally joining the movement or without remaining in its ranks throughout the interwar period." Biliuță argues that this is not a matter of ambiguity or ambivalence, "but (...) a certain border-crossing ability, due to their sophisticated intellectual training."⁴⁵ If we are to subscribe to this argument, it is even more necessary to explore their intellectual training by reconstructing the books they quoted and reviewed, the authors they praised or criticized, and the newspapers that informed them about the events on which they commented.

Another rapidly produced fruit of the public polemic during the second half of 2024 is Alexandru Racu's *Părinți și copii*.⁴⁶ The author engages precisely with the articles in TR that have been used in research and the public space to argue Stăniloae's affinities with far-right ideology and political groups (the Legionary movement, the National Christian Party, and Crainic's circle). In analysing them, Racu observes contradictions, even raising the question of Stăniloae as an opportunist. The book's merit lies in its analysis of the articles in their political context, and the image of what we might call a freebooting Stăniloae emerges from this. This does not mean, however, that all the problematic articles are written to please the bigwigs of the day. An extensive study of all the articles in TR at least shows some elements of continuity. As I have attempted to show

⁴³ Idem, "Etica ortodoxă și «spiritul» românesc" in Daniel Barbu, ed., *Firea românilor*, 2nd ed. (Bucharest: Nemira, 2004), 110.

⁴⁴ Ionuț Florin Biliuță, *The Archangel's Consecrated Servants: An Inquiry in the Relationship Between the Romanian Orthodox Church and the Iron Guard (1930–1941)* (PhD diss., Budapest: Central European University, 2013).

⁴⁵ Idem, *The Archangel's Priests*, idem, "The Archangel's Consecrated Servant," 30.

⁴⁶ Alexandru Racu, *Părinți și copii. Teologia politică a lui Dumitru Stăniloae și dilemele unui dosar de canonizare* (Bucharest: Tritonic, 2025).

in a recent study,⁴⁷ one such thread running through Stăniloae's journalism between 1930 and 1944 is the conception of a nation feeding ethnic nationalism and therefore a certain view of ethnic minorities and Jews.⁴⁸

2. What did Stăniloae write? Resolving the authorship issue

The noticeable disparity between the books and studies dealing with the theological dimension of Stăniloae's work and the handful of studies focusing on the social and political dimension can be interpreted in multiple ways. First, it may evince a lack of genuine interest in this dimension. Second, it may be a consequence of the ROC hierarchy's institutional discouragement of addressing sensitive issues from its own history, especially in the twentieth century.⁴⁹ If we examine who wrote and what, we observe that the social and political writings are addressed by lay authors with no institutional affiliation to the church. Third, there is a lack of any "extensively documented biography based on archival sources as a research project of an academic collective presenting [Stăniloae's] life and work, with only a summarized attempt to present his life, often with elementary mistakes (...)." ⁵⁰ It is surprising that the greatest Romanian theologian and confessor under communism, recently elevated to the rank of sainthood, does not have a comprehensive biography based on vari-

⁴⁷ Nicolae Drăgușin, "Nation, Nationalism, and Minorities in Dumitru Stăniloae's Writings from *Telegraful român*," *Holocaust. Studii și cercetări*, no. 1, vol. XVIII: 91–138.

⁴⁸ One anonymous reviewer observes that "many of the references employed are somewhat dated (e.g. Neamțu, Turcescu, Andreescu) and limited in scope," underlining that "it is also noteworthy that important contributions by scholars such as Fr. Radu Bordeianu, Jürgen Henkel, Dănuț Mănăstireanu, Adrian Agachi, Pantelis Kalaitzidis, Marius Oprea or Ciprian Apintilesei, among others, are not considered." While agreeing that these authors made "important contributions" to the scholarship of Stăniloae as a theologian, the extent to which their works are relevant to the scholarship of Stăniloae as a political journalist and polemicist is debatable. If these "references are somewhat dated," it is precisely one of this article's aims to elucidate and argue for some hypotheses. However, the public debate sparked by the Holy Synod's decision to canonize Stăniloae and the Elie Wiesel Institute's reaction has refreshed this list, opening the way to researching Stăniloae's neglected (if not hidden) past.

⁴⁹ Schmitt, *Biserica de stat sau biserica în stat? O istorie a Bisericii Ortodoxe Române. 1918-2023* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2023), 23–25, 188.

⁵⁰ Perșa, "Părintele Prof. Dr. Dumitru Stăniloae. O scurtă biografie a anilor tinereții," *Tabor* 9 (September 2024): 5.

ous archival collections⁵¹ rather than testimonies⁵² and other memories of little scientific value.⁵³ We can conclude that there is a lack of critical knowledge about all the aspects of the life of the church's most celebrated theologian. If Stăniloae's theological work is approached independently of his personal biography, his journalism, especially as it develops during the 1930s and 1940s, cannot be separated from his life, and especially from his personal contact with his protector Metropolitan Bălan and his mentor the professor of theology Crainic. To understand Stăniloae's journalism, one should adopt a methodological approach to his detailed biography as a supplementary hermeneutical key, which he himself portrays as that of a socially engaged author and more precisely of an Orthodox apologist and defender of the church in a constantly changing public arena. Finally, a further explanation that may be equally important is that the authorship issue remains unclarified. This question deserves special attention, and it guides this second part of the article.

Based on the above *status quaestionis*, the number of articles in TR used for scientific purposes between 1995 and today ranges from three to 117 out of a total of more than 400, in which the bulk is up to 21. This insufficiency may illustrate at most one or two topics but not the entire picture of the topic Stăniloae approaches in his journalism in the main ecclesiastical newspaper of the Orthodox Church in Transylvania. How many articles did Stăniloae actually write in TR? Nobody should be surprised that the number is difficult if not impossible to establish. If this is the case, it follows that there is a dispute about authorship here. Why is this so? The explanation is that he does not always publish under his full name (Dumitru Stăniloae). Sometimes he uses an abbreviation (e.g.

⁵¹ An archival collection briefly and selectively used is the one produced by the former *Securitate* (Security), which is now in the custody of the National Council for the Study of Securitate Archives. We note that it is used mostly in relation to the documents for Stăniloae's trial, not for critically engaging with the information provided to the *Securitate* by other priests and former colleagues in Sibiu, which might shed light on the relations he established with fascist circles. One such unscientific use is Florin Duțu's *Viața Părintelui Dumitru Stăniloae* (Bucharest: Floare Albă de Colț, 2015), 80. It is amusing that a booklet solemnly titled "The Life of Father Dumitru Stăniloae" has only 80 pages, suggesting Stăniloae had a rather boring life.

⁵² The most important is the testimony of his daughter, Lidia Săniloae Ionescu: *Lumina faptei din lumina cuvântului: Împreună cu tatăl meu, Dumitru Stăniloae* (Bucharest, Humanitas, 2005). Neamțu argues that it is "an excessively subjective testimony" ("Etno-teologia", 373 note 1).

⁵³ See Timotei Aioanei, ed., *Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae-mărturii și evocări* (Bucharest: Editura Cuvântul Vieții, 2013); Ștefania Coșuleanu, *Întâlnirea dintre persoană și persoană este lumină. Mărturii despre Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae la 30 de ani de la trecerea la Domnul* (Bucharest: Basilica, 2023).

D. Stăniloae), initials (D.S.), or a single initial (D. or S.). Sometimes he uses pseudonyms (Diorates, TS, Participant). Others are published anonymously and assumed by the newsroom to be him (Redacția, TR). The unsigned articles create the greatest difficulty.

Besides Anghelescu's and Popa's bibliographical editions, there is another attempt to compile the list of articles published by Stăniloae in TR. In 2012, with Patriarch Daniel's approval, the publishing house of the Romanian Patriarchate started to publish Stăniloae's *Complete Works*. In this collection the articles published in TR are in the first three volumes, titled *Cultură și duhovnicie* (*Culture and Spirituality*). Edited by Ion-Dragoș Vlădescu, all three volumes appeared in the same year. The first volume has 124 articles, published between 1930 and 1936.⁵⁴ The second has 169, published between 1937 and 1941.⁵⁵ The third has 128 (one in 11 parts), published between 1942 and 1945, to which a few articles from 1979, 1982–1983, 1988, 1990, and 1992–1993 are appended.⁵⁶ In his three-volume edition of 2,628 pages Vlădescu therefore ascribes 421 articles to Stăniloae, published in his 15 years of journalism for TR. This is not a scientific edition: the editor has not double-checked the sources the author uses. For a history of ideas enquiry this is hugely important because a primary task is to identify the genealogy of ideas based on the sources used. Regarding the authorship issue, one should ask if the 421 articles reflect an accurate number. In his "note to the edition" Vlădescu claims that this "edition gathers all the articles written by Father Dumitru Stăniloae in *Telegraful Român*".⁵⁷ "[T]o identify the texts published with the author's full signature, as well as those signed with initials or pseudonyms, we have mainly followed the bibliographical works of Virginia Popa⁵⁸ and Gherghie F. Anghelescu and Cristian Untea."⁵⁹ If one compares the first editions of Anghelescu's⁶⁰ and Popa's⁶¹ works with Vlădescu's edited work, it is obvious that despite the fact that they are signed, about

⁵⁴ Stăniloae, *Opere complete. Cultură și duhovnicie. Articole publicate în Telegraful român*, vol. 1 (1930–1936), ed. Ion Dragoș-Vlădescu (Bucharest: Editura BASILICA a Patriarhiei Române, 2012).

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, vol. 2 (1937–1941).

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, vol. 3 (1942–1993), ed. Ion Dragoș-Vlădescu (Bucharest: Editura BASILICA a Patriarhiei Române, 2012).

⁵⁷ I.-D.V., "Notă asupra ediției" in Stăniloae, *Opere*, vol. 1, 75; see the same mention in Stăniloae, *Opere*, vol. 2, 5; Stăniloae, *Opere*, vol. 3, 5.

⁵⁸ Popa, *Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae* (Iași, 2004).

⁵⁹ Anghelescu, Untea, *Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae* (Craiova 2008).

⁶⁰ Anghelescu, *Bibliografia Părintelui* (Bucharest, 1993).

⁶¹ Popa, *Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae. Bio-bibliografie* (Bucharest, 2013).

six articles Anghelescu and Popa mention as belonging to Stăniloae⁶² are excluded from the “complete works”. This figure would matter little in quantitative terms were it not to include two of the most sensitive and relevant political journalism articles.

If the unsigned articles are a common feature of TR during Stăniloae’s editorship-in-chief, the practice of using pseudonyms is specific to his early years at TR. According to Vlădescu’s edition Stăniloae publishes two articles under TS and Diorates in 1930. In 1931 seven articles are signed *Diorates*, one TS, and two D. In 1932 four articles are published under the pseudonym *Diorates*, one under TS, one under *Redacția* (*The Editorial Office*), and two under D. In 1933 there are 28 articles, two under TS and three under D. Beginning in this year, he also uses his initials (DS). From 1934 he uses TS rarely (1934, one article; 1935, 3 articles; 1938, 1 article; 1943, 1 article). Instead, he prefers the initials DS (1933, 4 articles; 1934, 9 articles; 1935, 10 articles; 1936, 7 articles; 1937, 10 articles; 1938, 3 articles; 1939, 9 articles; 1940, 4 articles; 1941, 8 articles; 1942, 2 articles; 1943, 12 articles; 1944, 6 articles; 1945, 2 articles).

The unsigned articles are the most problematic in terms of establishing authorship in TR. According to Vlădescu’s edition 60 unsigned articles between 1930 and 1945 were attributed to Stăniloae: one in 1930; two in 1931; five in 1932; three in 1933; four in 1934; two in 1935; six in 1936; ten in 1937; eight in 1938; two in 1939; two in 1940; five in 1941; none in 1942; three in 1943; four in 1944; and three in 1945. Neither Vlădescu in the introduction to his edition of “complete works”⁶³ nor the bibliographers explain the reasons for attributing these articles to Stăniloae. This issue is even more important: some anonymous articles are included in Anghelescu’s and Popa’s lists but excluded from Vlădescu’s edition; none of them provides the reader with an argument for considering some anonymous articles as belonging to Stăniloae and excluding others. Moreover, if one compares Vlădescu’s edition with Anghelescu’s and Popa’s lists with the complete edition of TR, many other unsigned articles are omitted.⁶⁴ This creates an insurmountable methodological problem

⁶² Dr D. Stăniloae, “Noul director al Școlii Normale,” *Telegraful român*, no. 5–6 (16 Jan. 1932): 4–5; D.S., “Restaurarea românismului în destinul său istoric,” *TR*, no. 39 (22 Sep. 1940): 1; [unsigned], “Biserica ortodoxă în noul regim,” *TR*, no. 41 (6 Oct. 1940): 1–2; [unsigned], “Chipul ideal de preot,” *TR*, no. 42 (13 Oct. 1940): 1; [unsigned], “În zilele sfinte ale Învierii Domnului,” *TR*, no. 18 (27 Apr. 1941): 1; [unsigned], “Șagunismul în Bisericile ortodoxe,” *TR*, no. 80 (29 Oct. 1944): 2.

⁶³ Ion-Dragoș Vlădescu, “Introducere” in Stăniloae, *Opere complete*, vol. 1, 21–74.

⁶⁴ See e.g. [unsigned], “Întregirea scaunelor vlădicești,” *TR*, no. 11 (8 Mar. 1936), 1; [unsigned], “A fost așa cum bănuiam,” *TR*, no. 12 (15 Mar.) 1936, 1; [unsigned], “În

that may cause confusion, as Andreescu indicates when attempting to address questions such as Stăniloae's engagement with far-right topics in TR, for example.

How can we deal with this authorship issue? One solution would be to exclude the unsigned articles completely. However, appropriate this solution may appear, it disregards the efforts to compile a list of Stăniloae's articles. I consider that the only reasonable methodological solution is to analyse the articles in TR as authored by Stăniloae based on Vlădescu's edition with the addition of the missing articles mentioned in Anghelescu's and Popa's lists. The other unsigned articles in TR should be analysed as articles published under Stăniloae's editorship-in-chief of TR. A reasonable methodological solution to the insoluble difficulty of the unsigned articles' authorship is thus to separate Stăniloae as a contributor to TR (1930–1945) from Stăniloae as its editor-in-chief (1934–1945).

This distinction may also enable a more direct engagement with the responsibility of Metropolitan Nicolae as the theocratic ruler of the Archdiocese of Sibiu and, as it were, the executive editor-in-chief of its official publication. In connection with the responsibilities of the anonymous author and the editor of TR the current research finds no sources to assist in assessing Stăniloae's responsibility as editor-in-chief. There are, however, some hints in the polemical articles. Replying to one of Radu Dragnea's articles in the newspaper *Înălțarea* (*The Ascension*)⁶⁵ that raises the question of whether an unsigned article is the responsibility of the editor-in-chief or of the director (Metropolitan Bălan), Stăniloae writes that "(...) we have a less rigid notion about responsibility (...) for everything that is published in a newspaper." "How many things can you squeeze onto a page, and how many omissions can you make without having to consider them all as your own? You can't reduce all your collaborators to your exact spiritual content,"⁶⁶ Stăniloae concludes.

In an article written to mark 130 years of TR's uninterrupted publication Stăniloae recalls a discussion with Metropolitan Bălan regarding the division of responsibility for the newspaper's publication. He recalls that "[t]he Metropolitan [...] proposed to entrust me with the responsibility

afară de partid," TR, no. 14 (29 Mar. 1936): 1. Some unsigned articles are politically problematic, including this apologetic of Ion Antonescu: [unsigned], "Pentru împlinirea întreagă a dreptății," TR, no. 42 (12 Oct. 1941), 1.

⁶⁵ Radu Dragnea, "În apărare. Față de atacul «Telegrafului român»," *Înălțarea*, no. 40 (23 Feb. 1941): 1. Dragnea claims that Stăniloae, in his capacity as editor-in-chief, is responsible for "an unsigned article."

⁶⁶ Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 726–27; Pr. D. Stăniloae, "Supărare excesivă," TR, no. 9 (23 Feb. 1941): 3.

of editing the newspaper.” The 27-year-old Stăniloae doubted his ability to undertake this task, but Metropolitan Bălan told him “you will send me any article you write, and I will see if it’s missing anything. That’s how I did it for a while at first.”⁶⁷ This suggests that Metropolitan Bălan read the articles for a time, after which Stăniloae received a free hand in the newspaper’s administration from his hierarchical superior.

In the following pages we resume the analysis of the articles as listed in Vlădescu’s edition, to which we add the articles listed in Anghelescu’s and Popa’s books.

3. What did Stăniloae read? Book reviews, book references, and newspapers

An overview of Stăniloae’s journalism for TR should attempt to answer a basic question: what did Stăniloae read? One approach is to examine the references (inline or footnotes) that often accompany his articles in TR. What did Stăniloae quote to support his articles’ arguments? Based on a quantitative reading, can we identify the author or book to which he refers, or which he reads most? If so, what does such a hierarchy look like? These are some of the questions guiding this section of the study.

Stăniloae was an enthusiastic book reviewer and occasional article reviewer. The scientific differences here are length and critical engagement with the reviewed book. Stăniloae’s reviews follow this line, but some convey a laudatory and critical engagement, with colourful portraits of their authors that ceases to be scientific and becomes polemical. The line between reviewing a book and citing or merely evoking it to support an argument is sometimes very vague. To avoid any confusion, I consider reviews, irrespective of their length and degree of engagement with the content, of all works (books, articles) that were no more than three years old when the review was published. Valuable indications of the academic circles with which Stăniloae sympathized most follow from this enquiry into his journalism. The reviews are presented chronologically, as this may afford some useful clues.

The attention he devotes to such journalism is evidenced by the fact that his sixth contribution to TR is a review of Silviu Dragomir’s recent book.⁶⁸ In a subsequent article he reviews Romanian translations of St

⁶⁷ Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 770–71; Pr. prof. D. Stăniloae, “Perioadele principale ale *Telegrafului român*,” *TR*, no. 13–14 (1 Apr. 1983): 1,3.

⁶⁸ Silviu Dragomir, *Istoria desrobirii religioase a românilor din Ardeal în sec. XVIII* (Sibiu: Ed. Tiparul Tipografiei Arhidiezeane, Sibiu, 1930). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 114–17; Diorates, “Mucenicii dreptei credințe,” *TR*, no. 92–93 (25 Dec. 1930), 3.

Macarius of Egypt's homilies⁶⁹ and Fr Petre Vintilescu's attempt to review the liturgical use of Romanian in the Holy Liturgy.⁷⁰ He goes on to review works by Onisifor Ghibu,⁷¹ N. Terchilă,⁷² and Hans Koch.⁷³ In 1933 he reviews a book by the military chaplain Ioan Dăncilă.⁷⁴ In 1934 he analyses Wilhelm Moock's article about the Catholic conception of the relationship between Christianity and the nation,⁷⁵ and articles by H. Teculescu,⁷⁶ I. Lupaș,⁷⁷ and Tit Simedrea.⁷⁸ There are no reviews in 1935, but he returns in 1936 with an enthusiastic presentation of Crainic's most recent book,⁷⁹ followed by reviews of works by Ștefan Meteș,⁸⁰ Ioan G. Savin,⁸¹ and Lupaș.⁸² A new and highly complimentary review of a book

⁶⁹ Sf. Macarie Egipteanul, *Omiliile duhovnicești*, trans. Fr Cicerone Iordăchescu (Chișinău, 1931).

⁷⁰ *Contribuții la revizuirea Liturghierului român. Proscomidia. Liturghia Sf. Ioan Gură de Aur*, studiu și text de Pr. Petre Vintilescu (Bucharest: Tipografia Cărilor Bisericești, 1931). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 208–13; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Două cărți prețioase," *TR*, no. 5–6 (16 Jan. 1932): 4–5.

⁷¹ Onisifor Ghibu, *Un anahronism și o sfidare: Statul romano-catolic ardelean. Studiu istoric-juridic, însoțit de concluziile Comisiunii istorico-juridice privitoare la desființarea Statului Catolic* (Cluj: 1931). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 214–16; [unsigned], "Apărătorii «Statului catolic ardelean»,", *TR*, no. 7–8 (23 Jan. 1932): 1–2.

⁷² Prof. Dr Nicolae Terchilă, *Tălcuirea Sfințelor Taine* (Sibiu, 1932). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 230–34; Deacon Dr D. Stăniloae, „Literatura Religioasă Poporală,” *TR*, no. 33–34 (23 Apr. 1932): 3–4.

⁷³ *Das kirchliche Ostproblem der Gegenwart*, Ein Vortrag von dr. Hans Koch (Wichern-Verlag, Berlin-Spandau, 1931). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 238–44; Redacția, "Problema bisericească orientală," *TR*, no. 38–39 (14 May 1932): 3–4.

⁷⁴ Fr Lt Col. Ioan Dăncilă, *Dumnezeu, Patrie și Rege* (Sibiu: 1933). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 320–22; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Probleme: fapte, comentarii," *TR*, no. 58 (5 Aug. 1933): 3.

⁷⁵ Wilhelm Moock, "Christentum und Nation," *Hochland*, 30 (1932): 233–43. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 456–64; Dr D. Stăniloae, „Creștinism și națiune - raportul lor în catolicism,” *TR*, no. 16 (15 Apr. 1934): 1–2.

⁷⁶ Horia Teculescu, *Anuarul liceului "Principele Nicolae" din Sighișoara pe anii 1929/30-1932/33* (Sighișoara: 1933). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 478–80; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 36 (2 Sep. 1934): 2–3.

⁷⁷ Ioan Lupaș, "A existat în Transilvania episcopie ortodoxă înainte de întemeierea regatului ungar," in *Biserica Ortodoxă Română*, no. 3–4 (1934): 149–53.

⁷⁸ Tit Simedrea, „Tetraevangelul vistiernicului Matiaș,” *Biserica Ortodoxă Română*, no. 3–4 (1934): 154–79. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 486–87; DS, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 37 (9 Sep. 1934): 3.

⁷⁹ Nichifor Crainic, *Puncte cardinale în haos* (Bucharest: 1936). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 819–23; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Puncte cardinale în haos," *TR*, no. 10 (1 Mar. 1936): 1–2.

⁸⁰ Ștefan Meteș, *Mănăstirile românești din Transilvania și Ungaria* (Sibiu: 1936). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 848–51; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Fortărețele credinței noastre," *TR*, no. 26 (21 Jun. 1936): 1.

⁸¹ Ioan G. Savin, *Curs de apologetică. Chestiuni introductive*, Bucharest, 1935. See Dr D. Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 889–90; DS, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 48 (22 Nov. 1936): 4.

⁸² Lupaș, *Probleme școlare* (Bucharest: Editura Cugetarea, 1936). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 895–98; Stăniloae, "Probleme școlare," *TR*, no. 52 (19 Dec. 1936): 1.

by Lupaș⁸³ opens 1937, followed the next year by a review of Crainic's latest book,⁸⁴ as well as one by Constantin C. Pavel.⁸⁵ In 1939 he reviews books by his colleague Grigorie T. Marcu⁸⁶ and the young author Petru P. Ionescu.⁸⁷ In 1940 Stăniloae reviews Crainic's new book,⁸⁸ followed by a long critical review of Blaga's most recent book.⁸⁹ Stăniloae is a critical reviewer of one of Mircea Eliade's books,⁹⁰ supporting his point with arguments from Crainic. In the same year (1941) Stăniloae returns to theological reading with a review of a book on Christ's life by his colleague from Cluj, Liviu Galaction Munteanu⁹¹ (also recently canonized by the Holy Synod). Stăniloae starts 1942 with two short reviews of Ștefan Meteș's recent books,⁹² followed by Sterie Diamandi's book about Jesus Christ.⁹³ On 31 May 1941 Stăniloae publishes the first article of a

⁸³ Lupaș, *Istoria unirii românilor* (Bucharest: Fundația Culturală Regală Principele Carol I, 1937). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 86–88; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Istoria Unirii Românilor," *TR*, no. 27 (4 Jul. 1937): 1.

⁸⁴ Nichifor Crainic, *Ortodoxie și etnocrație* (Bucharest: Ed. Cugetarea, 1938). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 264–68; D. Stăniloae, "Ortodoxie și Etnocrație," *TR*, no. 24 (12 Jun. 1938): 1.

⁸⁵ Constantin C. Pavel, *Problema răului la Fericitul Augustin. Studiu de filozofie morală* (Bucharest: Tipografia ziarului *Universul*, 1937). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 290–95; D. Stăniloae, "Problema răului la Fericitul Augustin," *TR*, no. 34 (21 Jul. 1938): 1.

⁸⁶ Deacon Dr. Grigorie T. Marcu, *Saul din Tars* (Sibiu: Tiparul Tipografiei Arhidiecezane, 1939). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 454–55; DS, "Saul din Tars," *TR*, no. 29 (16 Jul. 1939): 3.

⁸⁷ Petru P. Ionescu, *Ontologia umană și cunoașterea* (Bucharest: Fundația pentru Literatură și Artă Regele Carol II, 1939). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 508–13; D. Stăniloae, "O carte de filozofie creștină," *TR*, no. 48 (26 Nov. 1939): 1.

⁸⁸ Nichifor Crainic, *Nostalgia paradisului*, (Editura Cugetarea, [1940]). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 594–99; D. Stăniloae, "Nostalgia Paradisului," *TR*, no. 13 (24 Mar. 1940): 1.

⁸⁹ Lucian Blaga, *Diferențialele divine* (Bucharest: Fundația pentru Literatură și Artă Regele Carol II, 1940). See D. Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 623–33; D. Stăniloae, "Cosmologia domnului Lucian Blaga (II)," *TR*, no. 21 (19 May 1940): 1–2; Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 634–40; D. Stăniloae, "Cosmologia... (II)," *TR*, no. 22 (26 May 1940): 1; D. Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 641–46; Stăniloae, "Cosmologia... (III)," *TR*, no. 23 (2 Jun. 1940): 1–2.

⁹⁰ Mircea Eliade, *Oceanografie* (Editura Cultura Poporului, 1934); see Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 720–24; D. Stăniloae, "«Omenia» românească," *TR*, no. 9 (23 Feb. 1941): 1.

⁹¹ Galaction Liviu Munteanu, *Viața Mântuitorului nostru Isus Hristos* (Cluj: Editura Episcopiei Ortodoxe Române, 1942). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 765–66; DS, "Hrană pentru sufletele fraților de peste graniță," *TR*, no. 20 (11 May 1941): 3.

⁹² Ștefan Meteș, *Contribuții la studiul populației din Transilvania în trecut* (Bucharest, 1941) and *Din scrierile lui Gheorghe Sion* (Sibiu, 1941). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 36–37; Stăniloae, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 5 (1 Feb. 1942): 3. Regarding Sion, the reviewer emphasizes that Meteș's portrait of G. Sion (1822–1892) reveals him to be "openly nationalist and antisemitic."

⁹³ Sterie Diamandi, *Fiul lui Dumnezeu, Fiul Omului* (Bucharest: Ed. Cartea Românească, 1942). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 86–92; D. Stăniloae, "Iisus cel nebiruit," *TR*, no. 16 (19 Apr. 1942): 2.

series of 11, extensively reviewing and harshly criticizing Blaga's recent book.⁹⁴ In the same issue he continues with three short reviews of books by G. Cotoșman,⁹⁵ Petru Rezuș,⁹⁶ and Ștefan Moldovan.⁹⁷ In 1943 he reviews two of Ion Petrovici's books⁹⁸ and Ilarion Felea's (also recently canonized by the Holy Synod) book of sermons.⁹⁹ Petrovici¹⁰⁰ and Lupaș return to the reviewer's attention.¹⁰¹ Aurel Popa¹⁰² follows, and the year's readings end with praise for a book by Eugeniu Speranția,¹⁰³ which is described as "a marvellous event in the history of our culture" that "may be received with full confidence and joy by all who are fervent adherents of the Christian conception of life."¹⁰⁴ In 1944 he reviews Fr Constantin Nonea's short novels for children,¹⁰⁵ followed by a new review of Lupaș's book¹⁰⁶ and one of a book by the future bishop Fr. Vasile Coman.¹⁰⁷

A brief examination of the 41 book reviews reveals some highlights. First, Stăniloae especially values books by priests, followed by works of lay theologians (Crainic, Savin, Pavel, Munteanu, Rezuș). He displays

⁹⁴ Lucian Blaga, *Religie și spirit* (Sibiu: Ed. Dacia Traiană, 1942). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 105-245. The importance he gives to this series of articles results from the fact that very soon afterwards he collected and published all the articles in one book, *Poziția domnului Blaga față de creștinsim și ortodoxie* (Sibiu: Tiparul Tipografiei Arhidiecezane, 1942).

⁹⁵ Gheorghe Cotoșman, *Episcopia Caransebeșului* (Caransebeș: 1941).

⁹⁶ Petru Rezuș, *Curs de Teologie Fundamentală* (Caransebeș: 1942).

⁹⁷ Ștefan Moldovan, *Concordatul în Dreptul Internațional și Concordatul Statului Român cu Vaticanul* (Sibiu: 1942). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3, 246-48; DS, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 33 (16 Aug. 1942): 3.

⁹⁸ Ion Petrovici, *Studii istorico-filosofice* (Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943). and *Fulgurații filosofice și literare* (Bucharest: Ateliere Socec & Comp, [s.a.]). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 328-31; DS, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 3 (17 Jan. 1943): 3.

⁹⁹ Ilarion Felea, *Duhul Adevărului* (Arad: Tipografia Diecezană, 1942). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 337-39; D. Stăniloae, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 4 (24 Jan. 1943): 2.

¹⁰⁰ Ion Petrovici, *Momente solemne* (Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943).

¹⁰¹ Ioan Lupaș, *Zur Geschichte der Rumänen. Aufsätze und Vorträge* (Sibiu: 1943). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 367-73; Stăniloae, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 18 (2 May 1943): 3-4.

¹⁰² Aurel Popa, *Orizonturi noi* (Brașov: 1943). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 406-407; DS, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 24 (13 Jun. 1943): 4.

¹⁰³ Eugeniu Speranția, *Système de métaphysique implicite dans les postulats de toute connaissance possible* (Sibiu: Ed. Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943).

¹⁰⁴ See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 477-87; D. Stăniloae, "Un filosof creștin," *TR*, no. 46 (14 Nov. 1943): 1-2.

¹⁰⁵ Const. Nonea, *Comoara nefermecată* (Iași: Ed. Librăriei "Athanasie Gheorghiu," 1942?) and *Leacuri pentru minte* (Iași: Cartea Moldovei, 1943). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 536-39; [unsigned], "Un povestitor moldovean," *TR*, no. 11 (12 Mar. 1944): 4.

¹⁰⁶ Lupaș, *Studii istorice*, vol. IV, Sibiu, 1943. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 569-71; Stăniloae, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 19 (7 May 1944): 4.

¹⁰⁷ Vasile Coman, *Religie și caracter. Contribuții la cunoașterea și predarea religie în epoca adolescenței* (Brașov: 1944). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3, 624-25; D. Stăniloae, "Bibliografie," *TR*, no. 70 (17 Oct. 1944): 3.

a sensitivity to the historians of the Orthodox Church in Transylvania. This is not to say he lacks a keen eye for Christian philosophy (Ionescu, Speranția) or when necessary, an extremely critical eye for philosophy that contradicts traditional Christian teaching (Blaga). Second, Lupaș is the most reviewed author, with five books, followed closely by Crainic, Petrovici, and Meteș, with three books each. He reviews two books by Blaga, but unlike the others the reviews are negative and trigger the longest series of articles by Stăniloae in TR. He also reviews two books by C. Nonea. Third, Stăniloae's purpose in some cases is not only to review books and thus to rehearse arguments and ideas but to attempt to characterize their authors so that reviews seem only a pretext for painting laudatory or critical portraits of the people involved. In his reviews Stăniloae reserves his most encomiastic epithets for Crainic, Lupaș, and Petrovici. For example, Lupaș is characterized as "the eminent historian and judicious pedagogue" who "is continually attentive to this function [pedagogy] so essential to a nation's healthy development."¹⁰⁸ Crainic is seen "from now on in Romanian culture [as] a name that shines with a unique light, unshaken by any turmoil of today and of the future and unchallenged by any of the sensational images that forcibly impose themselves on the attention with their exaggerations and oddities. [...] [His] thinking has all the hallmarks of a prophetic vision, and it must therefore be followed inexorably as soon as possible. [...] [He] is descended from Bălcescu, Eminescu, Cuza [also known as 'the Patriarch of Romanian antisemitism' – my note], and Iorga."¹⁰⁹ Two years later, reviewing a book that is one of the ideological sources of the interwar radical right, Crainic is characterized as 'the great Orthodox thinker and nationalist'.¹¹⁰ Another two years later, in assessing Crainic's theological book on the beautiful, Stăniloae describes him as 'the great poet and thinker'.¹¹¹

However, the transition from books (ideas, facts, and arguments) to people is most evident in those articles where Stăniloae paints portraits of various figures, either deceased (obituaries, commemorations) or living (anniversaries). This category is relevant as long as it shows the personal affinities or oppositions of the people concerned. Stăniloae wrote 24 such portraits in 27 articles. Among the commemorations, Stăniloae writes

¹⁰⁸ Stăniloae, *Opere* 1, 895.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibidem*, 819.

¹¹⁰ *idem*, *Opere* 2, 264.

¹¹¹ *Ibidem*: 594.

about the philanthropist E. Gojdu,¹¹² the former TR editors Zaharie Boiu and Nicolae Cristea,¹¹³ the first Metropolitan of Transylvania Andrei Șaguna,¹¹⁴ and Inochentie Micu Klein.¹¹⁵ Stăniloae writes obituaries of the Protestant theologian Adolf von Harnack,¹¹⁶ Fr Ioan Brânzea,¹¹⁷ the legionaries Ion Moța and Vasile Marin,¹¹⁸ who had died in the Spanish civil war on the side of the nationalists, the poet, far-right politician, and former prime minister Octavian Goga,¹¹⁹ Prof. Petre Gherman,¹²⁰ and his colleague from the Theological Academy in Sibiu, Fr Ion Goron.¹²¹ Among the eulogistic portraits of his contemporaries are Crainic,¹²² Bishops Nicolae Colan of Cluj¹²³ and Nicolae Popovici of Oradia,¹²⁴ former colleagues at the Theological Academy, his uncle Fr Iordan Curcubată,¹²⁵

¹¹² idem, *Opere* 1, 418-21; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Un mare ctitor român: Emanoil Gojdu," *TR*, no. 6 (4 Feb. 1934): 1-2.

¹¹³ idem, *Opere* 1, 565-69. Dr D. Stăniloae, "Zaharie Boiu și Nicolae Cristea - doi luptători din vremuri grele," *TR*, no. 50 (25 Nov. 1934): 1.

¹¹⁴ He devotes three articles to Șaguna: Stăniloae, *Opere* 1, 110-13. [unsigned], "Ziua Sfântului Andrei," *TR*, no. 89-90 (13 Dec. 1930): 5; idem, *Opere* 1, 730-32; *TS*, "Sărbătoarea recunoștinței," *TR*, no. 50 (1 Dec. 1935): 1-2; and idem, *Opere* 3: 408-18; *DS*, "Mitropolitul Andrei Șaguna," *TR*, no. 26 (27 Jun. 1943): 1-2 with the sequel, idem, *Opere* 3, 428-33; [unsigned], "Mitropolitul Andrei Șaguna - glasuri de presă, cu prilejul împlinirii celor șapte decenii de la moartea sa," *TR*, no. 27 (4 Jul. 1943): 2-3.

¹¹⁵ Idem, *Opere* 3, 380-82; [unsigned], "Inochentie Micu Klein," *TR*, no. 20 (16 May 1943): 3.

¹¹⁶ Idem, *Opere* 1, 90-93; Dr D. Stăniloae, "†Adolf Harnack," *TR*, no. 49-50 (28 Jun. 1930): 1-2.

¹¹⁷ Idem, *Opere* 2: 29-30; Dr D. Stăniloae, "† Pr. Ioan Brânzea," *TR*, no. 2 (10 Jan. 1937): 4.

¹¹⁸ *Ibidem*: 35-36; *DS*, "Martiri pentru Hristos," *TR*, no. 4 (24 Jan. 1937): 2.

¹¹⁹ *Ibidem*: 249-53; *DS*, "†Octavian Goga," *TR*, no. 20 (15 May 1938): 1.

¹²⁰ *Ibidem*: 795-800. Stăniloae, "Cuvânt funebru lângă sicriul profesorului Petre Gherman," *TR*, no. 28 (6 Jul. 1941): 1-2.

¹²¹ Idem, *Opere* 3: 325-27; *DS*, "†Protopop Stavrofor Ion Goron," *TR*, no. 3 (17 Jan. 1943): 3.

¹²² He devotes three articles to Crainic: Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 445-48; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Un atlet al naționalismului creștin," *TR*, no. 14 (1 Apr. 1934): 1 and idem, *Opere* 2: 82-85; Stăniloae, "Nichifor Crainic," *TR*, no. 25 (20 Jun. 1937): 1-2 and idem, *Opere* 2: 772-73; *DS*, "Profesorul Nichifor Crainic la Academie," *TR*, no. 22 (25 May 1941): 3.

¹²³ Idem, *Opere* 3: 492-95; *DS*, "Preasfințitul Episcop Nicolae Colan," *TR*, no. 48 (28 Nov. 1943): 1-2.

¹²⁴ Idem, *Opere* 2: 600-602; *DS*, "Din înfăptuirile episcopului dr. Nicolae Popovici," *TR*, no. 13 (24 Mar. 1940): 3, and an article on their election as bishops and departure from Sibiu: Stăniloae, *Opere* 1, 852-55; *DS*, "Cuvânt către Preasfințiții episcopi ai Clujului și Oradei la despărțirea de Academia Teologică «Andreiană» (în 14 iunie 1936)," *TR*, no. 27 (28 Jun. 1936): 2.

¹²⁵ Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 131-35; [unsigned], "O faptă vrednică de toată lauda," *TR*, no. 43 (24 Oct. 1937): 1.

who introduced him to Metropolitan Bălan, the painter Nicolae Brana,¹²⁶ the philosopher and acting minister of Culture and Religious Affairs I. Petrovici,¹²⁷ Metropolitan Bălan,¹²⁸ Fr Arsenie Boca,¹²⁹ who was canonized by the 2024–2025 Holy Synod, Fr I. Lupaș,¹³⁰ Fr Archimandrite Iuliu Scriban,¹³¹ and the historian S. Dragomir.¹³² The philosopher Blaga¹³³ is the only one to receive a very critical portrait, illustrating Stăniloae's personal animosity, which is congruent with the previous two unfavourable reviews of his works. Following this enumeration are three adulatory portraits of Crainic and Șaguna, the mid-nineteenth-century spiritual leader of Romanian Orthodoxy in Transylvania (now a saint of the ROC), followed by Bishops Colan and Popovici, with two articles each.

Stăniloae's sincere and total adherence to the cause of Crainic is beyond doubt. Each of the latter's three books receives the attention of the theologian from Sibiu. Moreover, Stăniloae paints three portraits of Crainic, something no one else merited, with the possible exception of Metropolitan Bălan. Surprisingly, the same cannot be said of Stăniloae's relationship with Petrovici. Although he reviews three volumes and paints a portrait of him, Stăniloae may have been less frank than he was with Crainic, and there may have been more pragmatic motives behind the eulogistic words. The two cases may even be opposites, expressing something about how Stăniloae employs his journalistic writing at the influential diocesan publication. Several clues support such a hypothesis. We note that both the portrait and the reviews were written around the same time (1942–1943), when Petrovici was Minister of Culture and Religious Affairs (4 December 1941 – 23 August 1944) during Ion Antonescu's dictatorship. Crainic, meanwhile, had enjoyed the theologian's constant attention since 1936. The three books reviewed are the last of Petrovici's works and are neither original nor representative of his

¹²⁶ Idem, *Opere* 2: 790–91; DS, "Un pictor ardelean," *TR*, no. 26 (22 Jun. 1941): 4.

¹²⁷ Idem, *Opere* 3: 38–42; Stăniloae, "Dl Ministru Ion Petrovici, la Sibiu," *TR*, no. 6 (8 Feb. 1942): 1.

¹²⁸ Idem, *Opere* 2: 652–58. Stăniloae, "Douăzeci de ani de Arhipăstorire. Încinare Arhipăstorului nostru," *TR*, no. 25–26 (16 Jun. 1940): 1–2.

¹²⁹ Idem, *Opere* 3: 434–38; Stăniloae, "Lucrarea de la Mănăstirea Brâncoveanu," *TR*, no. 31–32 (8 Aug. 1943): 1–2.

¹³⁰ Idem, *Opere* 3: 474–76; DS, "Sărbătorirea dlui prof. Ioan Lupaș," *TR*, no. 45 (7 Nov. 1943): 1.

¹³¹ Idem, *Opere* 3: 499–502; DS, "Preacuvioșia Sa Arhimandritul Iuliu Scriban," *TR*, no. 50 (12 Dec. 1943): 1.

¹³² Idem, *Opere* 3: 540–42; Stăniloae, "Prof. Silviu Dragomir - cronicarul suferințelor ardeleni," *TR*, no. 12 (19 Mar. 1944): 2.

¹³³ Idem, *Opere* 3: 398–405; DS, "O victimă a grandomaniei," *TR*, no. 24 (13 Jun. 1943): 2–3.

work as a philosopher; their scholarly quality is considerably more modest than many of the other books reviewed. It is very likely that Stăniloae is not seeking to highlight a philosopher with these articles but to obtain certain favours from the Minister of Religious Affairs for “the theological education of the Transylvanian Church” which “had endured blows” from “past regimes” and “through them to the priesthood of Transylvania itself.”¹³⁴ The archival sources should in any case clarify this, especially the hypothesis that Petrovici was appointed to this position after Stăniloae had rejected the proposal from Metropolitan Bălan and the agreement in principle of Deputy Prime Minister Mihai Antonescu that he should occupy the post of Minister of Religious Affairs.¹³⁵

Apart from reviewing, Stăniloae uses books to ground his arguments in footnotes or in-text citations. However, an identification of the referenced ideas or fragments reveals that the citations do not follow a rigorous system common to all articles.¹³⁶ In these circumstances further research to identify sources is necessary. It is important to note the references’ chronological development because it reveals Stăniloae’s philosophical and theological development. We can infer that as he is reading, Stăniloae is already forming an idea of whether a book is worth discussing or should simply be mentioned in the pages of TR. His decision to discuss a book, whether in laudatory or critical terms, indicates both its importance for the public debate and his intellectual formation.

Stăniloae’s 1931 articles quote von Lama’s *Pope and Curia*,¹³⁷ recommending it to his “Greek Catholic brothers.” In 1933 he refers briefly to Bulgakov’s *The Orthodox Church* and quotes Haack’s *Protestant Church*.¹³⁸ The following year he quotes Bulgakov’s *The Lamb of God*¹³⁹ in the original Russian edition;¹⁴⁰ he returns to this book four more times in the

¹³⁴ idem, *Opere* 3, 38.

¹³⁵ Duțu, *Viața Părintelui*: 28–29.

¹³⁶ Where I was unable to identify the original source as it was quoted, I have mentioned the title in English, as is the case with Russian theologians in Paris who wrote books that are almost unknown today (my note, N.D.).

¹³⁷ Friedrich Ritter von Lama, *Papst und Kurie in ihrer Politik nach dem Weltkrieg* (Jllertissen Bayern: Martinusbuchhandlung, 1925). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 121–23; Diorates, “România în judecata catolică,” *TR*, no. 6 (17 Jan. 1931): 1.

¹³⁸ Dr Hans Georg Haack, *Die evangelische Kirche Deutschlands in der Gegenwart* (Berlin: Mittler & Sohn, 1929). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 333–36; Dr D. Stăniloae, “Protestantismul la o mare răspântie,” *TR*, no. 64 (16 Sep. 1933): 1.

¹³⁹ Sergei Bulgakov, *Agnets Bozhii* (Paris: YMCA Press, 1933).

¹⁴⁰ See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1, 449–55; Dr D. Stăniloae, “Scurtă interpretare teologică a națiunii,” *TR*, no. 15 (8 Apr. 1934): 2–3.

ensuing years.¹⁴¹ He next refers to Seifert's *World Revolutionaries*,¹⁴² and he recommends a book by Carl Wolff and Ernst Haase.¹⁴³ He refers to the Russian edition of Bulgakov's *Burning Bush* (1927)¹⁴⁴ and George Popovici's book on the union of Orthodox Romanians with the Roman Catholic Church.¹⁴⁵

An article quoting the Russian edition of Berdiaev's most recent book *Me and the World of Objects* opens 1935, and there are several mentions of Heidegger's *Being and Time*.¹⁴⁶ In another polemical entanglement with the Greek Catholics Stăniloae uses Knöpfer's *Textbook of Church History*¹⁴⁷ and returns several times to a consideration of iconography in the Russian philosophers of Christianity Berdiaev¹⁴⁸ and Bulgakov.¹⁴⁹ He twice quotes

¹⁴¹ Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 456–64; Dr D. Stăniloae, “Creștinism și națiune - raportul lor în catolicism,” *TR* no. 16 (15 Apr. 1934): 1–2; Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 603–10; Dr D. Stăniloae, “...și din Maria Fecioara S-a făcut om,” *TR*, no. 54 (25 Dec. 1934): 2–3. Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 738–46; Dr D. Stăniloae, “Pruncul Iisus,” *TR*, no. 53 (25 Dec. 1935): 2. Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 73–85; D. Stăniloae, “Învierea Domnului,” *TR*, no. 14 (5 Apr. 1942): 2–3.

¹⁴² Josef Leo Seifert, *Die Weltrevolutionäre. Von Bogumil über Hus zu Lenin* (Vienna: Amalthea-Verlag, 1931). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 456–64; Dr D. Stăniloae, “Creștinism și națiune - raportul lor în catolicism,” *TR*, no. 16 (15 Apr. 1934): 1–2.

¹⁴³ Carl Wolff, *Das deutsche Volk in Europa* (Sibiu: Ios. Drotleff, 1924); Ernst Hasse, *Weltpolitik, Imperialismus und Kolonialpolitik*, II. Band (Munich: Lehmann Verlag, 1908). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 465–68; DS, “Români, Sași și Nemți,” *TR*, no. 17 (22 Apr. 1934): 1.

¹⁴⁴ See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 570–81; DS, “Sentințe care nu rezistă,” *TR*, no. 50 (25 Nov. 1934): 1–3.

¹⁴⁵ George Popovici, *Uniunea românilor din Transilvania cu Biserica Romano-Catolică sub împăratul Leopold I* (Lugoj, 1901). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 593–602; S, “Metoda uniată: minciuna și injuria personală,” *TR*, no. 53 (16 Dec. 1934): 1–2.

¹⁴⁶ Nikolai Berdiaev, *Ia i mir obektov: Opyt filosofii odinochestva i obshcheniia* (Paris: YMCA Press, 1934). Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1927). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 613–15; Dr D. Stăniloae, “Un an nou,” *TR*, no. 1 (1 Jan. 1935), 1. He returns to Heidegger in a discussion of the problem of evil: see Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 296–305; D. Stăniloae, “Gânduri despre problema răului,” *TR*, no. 35 (28 Aug. 1938): 1–2.

¹⁴⁷ Alois Knöpfer, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1920). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 626–39; DS, “Iezuiții, dascălii Uniației,” *TR*, no. 6 (3 Feb. 1935).

¹⁴⁸ Berdiaev, *The Fate of Man*, Russian edition (Paris, 1935). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 644–47; DS, “Soluții simpliste,” *TR*, no. 8 (17 Feb. 1935): 1. In 1938 he apparently quotes the French version (*De la destination de l'homme*, 1935). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 296–305; D. Stăniloae, “Gânduri despre problema răului,” *TR*, no. 35 (28 Aug. 1938): 1–2. In another article he simply refers to Berdiaev's idea of adopting a public stance against human cremation, without indicating the source: Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 546–51; D. Stăniloae, “Incinerare,” *TR*, no. 3 (14 Jan. 1940): 1–2.

¹⁴⁹ Sergius Bulgakov, *Ikona i ikonopochitanie* (Paris, 1931). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 674–78; Dr D. Stăniloae, “Sensul icoanei,” *TR*, no. 12 (17 Mar. 1935): 1.

a book on education by another Russian theologian, Zenkovski.¹⁵⁰ In a debate about Fr Popescu-Mălăești's articles in the *Curentul* newspaper about theological education, Stăniloae quotes Fuchs's book on *Secondary Schools* to support his arguments.¹⁵¹ Surprisingly perhaps, the first general references to the Fathers of the Church come only in his fifth year of journalism, in a long series of essays about Theophany in the context of the Maglavit revelations.¹⁵²

The disputes surrounding Maglavit affords Stăniloae a new opportunity at the beginning of 1936 to employ his arguments in broader intellectual contexts. He defends the accuracy of shepherd Petrache Lupu's revelations based on P. Quercy's work on hallucination,¹⁵³ "the Russian philosopher" N. Lossky's work on saints' visions,¹⁵⁴ the physical researcher J. Maxwell,¹⁵⁵ and Rădulescu-Motru's *Course of Psychology*. The progress of his personal academic work on St Gregory Palamas allows Stăniloae to quote himself concerning Rădulescu-Motru.¹⁵⁶ In a new polemic against a Roman Catholic group from Bucharest about the publication *Farul Nou*, the priest-journalist quotes Huber on *Freemasonry*¹⁵⁷ and Barițiu on Șterca-Suluțiu.¹⁵⁸ He continues the topic in two subsequent articles

¹⁵⁰ Vasily Vasilyevich Zenkovski, *The Problems of Education in the Light of Christian Anthropology*, in Russian (Paris, 1934). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 686–91; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Cele două fețe ale spiritualității," *TR*, no. 16 (14 Apr. 1935): 1–2. Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 895–98; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Probleme școlare," *TR*, no. 52 (19 Dec. 1936): 1.

¹⁵¹ Friedrich Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1926. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 648–62; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Problema învățământului teologic," *TR*, no. 10 (3 Mar. 1935): 2–4.

¹⁵² General references to St Basil the Great as quoted by St Gregory Palamas and St (Pseudo-)Dionysius the Areopagite. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 705–11; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Încercare despre teofanii (I)," *TR*, no. 40 (22 Sep. 1935): 1.

¹⁵³ Pierre Quercy, *L'hallucination: Philosophes et mystiques*, vol. I (Paris: Félix Alcan, 1930).

¹⁵⁴ Nikolay Lossky, "The Visions of Saints and Mystics," *Puti*, nr. 43, 1934. This study published in Russian was translated to Romanian under the title "Vedeniile sfinților și ale misticilor" and published in *TR* nos. 45–46, 48–50 (1935).

¹⁵⁵ Joseph Maxwell, *Les phénomènes psychiques recherches, observations, méthodes* (Paris: Félix Alcan, 1920). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 769–78; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Încercare... (IV)," *TR*, no. 3 (12 Jan. 1936): 1–2.

¹⁵⁶ Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, *Curs de psihologie* (Bucharest: Ed. Cultura Națională, 1923). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 779–87; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Încercare... (V)," *TR*, no. 4 (19 Jan. 1936): 1–2.

¹⁵⁷ Engelbert Huber, *Freimaurerei. Die Weltmacht hinter den Kulissen* (Stuttgart: Union Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1934).

¹⁵⁸ George Barițiu, *Criticile "istorice" ale lui Josef Sterca Suluțiu de Kerpenyes scărămănate: informațiune tipărită ca manuscriptu*, (Sibiu: Tipariul lui W. Krafft, 1892). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 793–96; [Unsigned], "De răs și de plâns," *TR* no. 4 (19 Jan. 1936): 4.

with references to Meteș's,¹⁵⁹ Ciuhandu's,¹⁶⁰ and Dragomir's¹⁶¹ work on the religious life of Orthodox Romanians in Transylvania. In debating Roman Catholics on eucharistic dogma, Stăniloae cites Bulgakov's paper.¹⁶² The year ends with a new, now disapproving and prophetic, reference to Rădulescu-Motru,¹⁶³ foreshadowing a major debate about the relationship between nationalism and religion that will follow the next year.

Despite the intensity of the debates and the precipitation of events, 1937 was apparently not a good time for references. Stăniloae makes only two, to J. F. Rutherford and Bishop Grigorie Leu in writing about religious denominations (original: *secte*).¹⁶⁴

In early 1938 a controversy concerning the *Predania* legionary group leads Stăniloae to work on the issue of Christian ethics based on references to Andrusos,¹⁶⁵ St John Damascene,¹⁶⁶ Milaș's edited and annotated collection of canon law,¹⁶⁷ St Athanasius I of Alexandria, and other

¹⁵⁹ Archpriest Ștefan Meteș, *Istoria Bisericii și a vieții religioase a românilor din Transilvania și Ungaria*, vol. I (Sibiu: Ed. Librăriei Arhiepiscopale, 1935). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 797–800; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Trecutul nostru," *TR*, no. 7 (9 Feb. 1936): 2–3.

¹⁶⁰ Gheorghe Ciuhandu, *Episcopii Samuil Vulcan și Gherasim Raț. Pagini mai ales din istoria românilor crișeni (1830–1840)* (Arad: Tipografia diecezană, 1935).

¹⁶¹ Silviu Dragomir, *Istoria desrobirii religioase a românilor din Ardeal în sec. XVIII*, vol. 1–2 (Sibiu: Editura Tipografiei Arhiepiscopale, 1920 and 1930). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 807–15; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Din durerile trecutului," *TR*, no. 9 (23 Feb. 1936): 1–2.

¹⁶² Bulgakov, "Evkharisticheskii dogmat," *Puti*, nr. 20–21 (1930). This work was later translated to Romanian: Bulgakov, *Dogma euharistică* (Bucharest: Editura Librăriei Pavel Suru, 1932). No historian of religious ideas should disregard the importance of this work for the development of Romanian theology: the same work was translated to Romanian in the official review of the Archdiocese of Bucharest, *Apostolul* (no. 12, 15 June 1932), though Stăniloae had not used this early Romanian version, apparently relying on the Russian original. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 832–37; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Dumnezeiasca Euharistie," *TR*, no. 16 (12 Apr. 1936): 3–4.

¹⁶³ Rădulescu-Motru, *Românismul sau catehismul unei noi spiritualități* (Bucharest: Fundația pentru Literatură și Artă "Regele Carol II", 1936). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 1: 862–65; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Naționalismul în cadrul spiritualității creștine," *TR*, no. 36 (30 Aug. 1936): 1.

¹⁶⁴ Grigorie Leu, *Sectele din România* (Chișinău: Tipografia Eparhială Cartea Românească, 1931). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 104–13; DS, "Sectele păgâne și exploatare," *TR*, no. 36 (5 Sep. 1937): 1–2.

¹⁶⁵ Hristu Andrusos, *Dogmatica Bisericii Ortodoxe Răsăritene* (Sibiu: Tiparul Tipografiei Arhiepiscopale, 1930).

¹⁶⁶ John of Damascus, in J.P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 95 (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1864).

¹⁶⁷ Dr Nicodim Milaș, *Canoanele Bisericii Ortodoxe, însoțite de comentarii*, vol. I, partea I (Arad: Tipografia Diecezană, 1930). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 191–207; D. Stăniloae, "Elemente de morală creștină," *TR*, no. 4 (23 Jan. 1938): 1–3: 107.

Fathers of the Church from an unspecified source and from Vacandard.¹⁶⁸ Besides returning to Berdiaev and Heidegger in a discussion about the issue of evil, Stăniloae quotes Dostoyevsky and a Russian philosopher.¹⁶⁹ The year ends with citations from Carrel's book on the human being¹⁷⁰ in a personal intervention in the dispute between Dr Minea and Dr Parhon about medicine and faith.

In early 1939, in an attempt to back the King's personal dictatorship, Stăniloae writes about some *Principles of National Revival*, approvingly invoking Stange's eschatological vision.¹⁷¹ The next reference is to one of Blaga's journalistic contributions¹⁷² to a new series of articles about the relationship between the Latin spirit and Orthodoxy. Commenting on D. Gusti's "luminous exposition" of "the shaping of the social personality," Stăniloae invokes Ebner's magnum opus on the relationship between "I and you."¹⁷³ At Easter he returns to this work in a theological article about the *Love that Defeats Death*.¹⁷⁴ It is essential, at least for the history of ideas, to emphasize that Stăniloae's comments on Metropolitan Nicolae's distinction between "people" and "nation" in 1940 quotes Buber's *Ich und Du*,¹⁷⁵ alongside Meerpohl on Kierkegaard.¹⁷⁶ This is a firm indication that he has become accustomed to the "dialogical philosophy" that will mark his later theological development in 1939-1940 through Buber and Ebner. Later, he explicitly connects "the discovery of the I-thou

¹⁶⁸ Elphège F. Vacandard, "La question du service militaire et les premiers chrétiens," *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse* (Paris, 1910). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 208–20; D. Stăniloae, "Elemente... II," *TR*, no. 5 (30 Jan. 1938): 1–2.

¹⁶⁹ Boris Wyscheslawcew (Vysheslavtsev), "Tragische Theodizee," *Orient und Occident, Blätter für Theologie, Ethik und Soziologie*, eds MM Erich Lub, P. Schulz, Nicolas Berdjajew, 1929, I Heft. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 296–305; D. Stăniloae, "Gânduri despre problema răului," *TR*, no. 35 (28 Aug. 1938): 1–2.

¹⁷⁰ Alexis Carrel, *L'homme c'est l'inconnu* (Paris: Plon, 1935). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 326–31; D. Stăniloae, "Medicină și credință," *TR*, no. 41 (9 Oct. 1938): 1–2.

¹⁷¹ Carl Stange, *Das Ende aller Dinge: die christliche Hoffnung, ihr Grund und ihr Ziel* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1930). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 363–67; D. Stăniloae, "Principii de renaștere națională," *TR*, no. 3 (15 Jan. 1939): 3.

¹⁷² Lucian Blaga, "Artă și valoare," *Gândirea*, no. 1 (Jan. 1939), 28–40. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 375–81; DS, "Latinitate și Ortodoxie (II)," *TR*, no. 5 (29 Jan. 1939): 1.

¹⁷³ Ferdinand Ebner, *Das Wort und die geistigen Realitäten. Pneumatologische Fragmente* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1921). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 382–85; DS, „Personalitate socială,” *TR*, no. 6 (5 Feb. 1939): 1.

¹⁷⁴ See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 758–64; D. Stăniloae, "Iubirea învinge moartea," *TR*, no. 17 (20 Apr. 1941): 2.

¹⁷⁵ Martin Buber, *Ich und Du* (Leipzig: Insel, 1923).

¹⁷⁶ Bernhard Meerpohl, *Die Verzweiflung als metaphysisches Phänomen in der Philosophie Sören Kierkegaards* (Würzburg, 1934). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 563–68; D. Stăniloae, "Prin ce se promovează conștiința națională?," *TR*, no. 6 (4 Feb. 1940): 1.

relationship as the original and fundamental datum of human existence' with 'existentialist philosophy,' and he acknowledges the contribution of "renowned Protestant theologians" such as Friedrich Gogarten and Karl Heim to the idea of the individual's redemption within "community and communion."¹⁷⁷ A new series of four long articles that aims to investigate possible connections between Durkheim's sociology ("a Jew by origin and an atheist in conceptions") and the project of 'social service' allows Stăniloae to make a quite extensive range of bibliographical references that include authors quoted in Vasilescu's book on sociology,¹⁷⁸ Gusti's and Herseni's treatise,¹⁷⁹ Westermarck,¹⁸⁰ Schmidt,¹⁸¹ Lowie,¹⁸² Preuss,¹⁸³ and Savin,¹⁸⁴ in arguing that there is no connection, tacitly implying that "social service" is free of Jewish and atheist ideas. The year ends with citations of the existentialist philosopher Jaspers when referring to "the threat of war"¹⁸⁵ and redemption,¹⁸⁶ and the theologian Dietrich.¹⁸⁷

In a series of two articles about the "permanent national ideal" in early 1940, Stăniloae cites the Anglican theologian Lionel Spencer Thornton¹⁸⁸ and one of Fr Dăianu's articles.¹⁸⁹ The next reference is to

¹⁷⁷ See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 291–96; D. Stăniloae, "Ortodoxie și protestantism," *TR*, no. 42 (18 Oct. 1942): 1.

¹⁷⁸ Emilian Vasilescu, *Interpretarea sociologică a religiei și a moralei* (Bucharest: Editura Cugetarea-Georgescu Delafras, 1936).

¹⁷⁹ Dimitrie Gusti, Traian Herseni, *Elemente de sociologie*, ed. 8 (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1937). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 401–11; D. Stăniloae, "Există vreo legătură între Sociologia lui Durkheim și Serviciul social? (I)," *TR*, no. 18 (30 Apr. 1939): 1–2.

¹⁸⁰ Edward Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (London and New York: Macmillan Co., 1891).

¹⁸¹ Wilhelm Schmidt, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, 12 vol., 1912–1955. It is unclear which volume is quoted.

¹⁸² Robert Harry Lowie, *Primitive Society* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1920).

¹⁸³ Theodor Konrad Preuss, *Der Ursprung der Religion und Kunst* (Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg, 1904).

¹⁸⁴ Ioan G. Savin, *Ființa și originea religiei* (Bucharest: Ed. Astoria, 1937). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 412–22. D. Stăniloae, "Există vreo legătură...(II)," *TR*, no. 19 (7 May 1939): 1–2.

¹⁸⁵ *Philosophie von Karl Jaspers. Zweiter Band: Existenzerhellung*, Verlag von Julius Springer, Berlin 1932. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 464–67; D. Stăniloae, "Amenințarea războiului," *TR*, no. 36 (3 Sep. 1939): 1.

¹⁸⁶ Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 524–33; D. Stăniloae, "Mântuire," *TR*, no. 52 (25 Dec. 1939): 2–3.

¹⁸⁷ Martin Dietrich, *Theologische Ontologie im modernen Anglikanismus* (Walter De Gruyter, 1937). Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 524–33.

¹⁸⁸ Lionel Spencer Thornton, *The Incarnate Lord* (London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd, 1928).

¹⁸⁹ Archpriest Dr Ilie Dăianu, *Unificarea Română a Bisericii românești*. The newspaper is not mentioned. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 552–56; D. Stăniloae, "Idealul național permanent (I)," *TR*, no. 4 (21 Jan. 1940): 1–2.

“the great Anglican theologian” Charles Gore¹⁹⁰ in a series of articles about the reconstruction of social life after the model of the Holy Trinity. In two more Christological articles Stăniloae cites Pascal¹⁹¹ and Marcel.¹⁹² Having engaged in a polemic against Blaga on his cosmological conception, Stăniloae approvingly cites him regarding Feuerbach (“in this respect he is correct and a forerunner of contemporary philosophy”) in Löwith’s book on the individual and his account of love.¹⁹³ Stăniloae then quotes Hermann Sauer,¹⁹⁴ the first of five references.¹⁹⁵ This is one of the most quoted works; perhaps only Crainic enjoys more enthusiastically positive references than Sauer (“a great thinker”) and his book (“his epoch-making work”). The year ends with a reference to Barbarin’s claim to a heroic death.¹⁹⁶

Stăniloae begins 1941 with a defence of his colleague Popa¹⁹⁷ against Motru’s criticism of the Archdiocese of Sibiu’s publication of his book about Kierkegaard.¹⁹⁸ Stăniloae supports his colleague’s book by quoting Kierkegaard.¹⁹⁹ He also acknowledges his “existential philosophy, his dialectical theology” as the root of “the most remarkable Catholic thinkers” (Theodor Haeker and Peter Wurst). This is further testimony to

¹⁹⁰ Charles Gore, *Belief in Christ* (London: John Murray, 1922). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 569–73; D. Stăniloae, “Sfânta Treime și viața socială (I),” *TR*, no. 8 (18 Feb. 1940): 2.

¹⁹¹ Blaise Pascal, *Mystère de Jésus* (unspecified source). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 611–16; D. Stăniloae, “Mărturisirea păcatelor,” *TR*, no. 16 (14 Apr. 1940), 1–2.

¹⁹² Gabriel Marcel, *Etre et Avoir* (Paris: Fernand Aubier, 1935). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 617–22; D. Stăniloae, “Hristos cel înviat și viața noastră pământească,” *TR*, no. 18 (28 Apr. 1940): 2. He returns to Marcel in an article about property: Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 449–54. D. Stăniloae, “Instinctul proprietății,” *TR*, no. 38 (19 Sep. 1943): 1.

¹⁹³ Karl Löwith, *Das Individuum in der Rolle des Mitmenschen* (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1928). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 634–40. D. Stăniloae, “Cosmologia domnului Lucian Blaga (II),” *TR*, no. 22 (26 May 1940): 1.

¹⁹⁴ Hermann Sauer, *Abendländische Entscheidung. Arischer Mythos und christliche Wirklichkeit. 2. Aufl* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1938). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 663–67; D. Stăniloae, “Creștinism și naționalism,” *TR*, no. 40 (29 Sep. 1940): 1–2.

¹⁹⁵ See: Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 674–78; DS, “Revoluție națională,” *TR*, no. 43 (20 Oct. 1940): 1. Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 690–95; D. Stăniloae, “Munca și cultul divin,” *TR*, no. 46 (10 Nov. 1940): 1–2. Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 696–700; D. Stăniloae, “Semnele vremii,” *TR*, no. 47 (17 Nov. 1940): 1–2. Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 740–45; D. Stăniloae, “Har și vrajă (I),” *TR*, no. 13 (23 Mar. 1941): 1. Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 781–89; D. Stăniloae, “Cuvânt către studenții teologi la sfârșit de an academic,” *TR*, no. 26 (22 Jun. 1941): 1–2.

¹⁹⁶ Georges Barbarin, *Le livre de la mort douce* (Editions Adyar, 1937). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 668–73; [Unsigned], “Bărbăție creștină,” *TR*, no. 42 (13 Oct. 1940): 1–2.

¹⁹⁷ Grigorie Popa, *Existență și adevăr la Sören Kierkegaard* (Sibiu: Tipografia arhidiecezană, 1940).

¹⁹⁸ Rădulescu-Motru, *Catehismul lui Eufrosin Poteca* (Bucharest: 1941)

¹⁹⁹ Sören Kierkegaard, *Christ*, traduit du danois par P.-H. Tisseau (Bazoges-en-Pareds Vendée, Chez le Traducteur, 1937). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 715–71; D. Stăniloae, “Kierkegaard anti Luther,” *TR*, no. 8 (16 Feb. 1941): 1–2.

Stăniloae's intellectual genealogy and his tacit distinction between fiercely anti-Catholic polemic and his admiration for some "Catholic thinkers." In an article intended to defend folklore and its religious elements, Stăniloae quotes Wunderle,²⁰⁰ as well as Koch's study on *Volkskunde*,²⁰¹ referring to Hans Neumann, Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, and Hans Lüpke. The article on the Holy Spirit refers to Nebe,²⁰² and the year ends with a defence of Crainic and Ionescu against Călinescu's critique in his treatise on the history of Romanian literature.²⁰³

The richest year by far for referencing is 1942. It is therefore no accident that this is the backdrop to Stăniloae's most intense journalistic controversy (with Blaga) and the publication of his book on Jesus Christ. The year opens with two references to St Maximus the Confessor's *Four Hundred Texts on Love* and St Isaac the Syrian.²⁰⁴ Another article, dealing with the "Romanian Church", uses Uspensky,²⁰⁵ Papadoulos-Kerameus,²⁰⁶ and Stapel,²⁰⁷ "a German theologian who is sympathetic to National Socialism." Stăniloae's article on the resurrection of Christ is based on references to Petrovici,²⁰⁸ Merezhkovsky,²⁰⁹ and Heim.²¹⁰ In his polemic

²⁰⁰ Georg Wunderle, "Religionspsychologie und Volkskunde. über Aufgaben und Fragestellungen der volkskundlichen Forschung," *Volk und Volkskunde*, vol. II (unidentifiable edition).

²⁰¹ Georg Koch, "Zu Geschichte und Stand der religiösen Volkskunde im Zusammenhang der allgemeinen Volkskunde," *Theologische Rundschau*, vol. 8, no. 3, (1936): 146–66. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 767–71; D. Stăniloae, "Însemnătatea obiceiurilor religioase ale poporului," *TR*, no. 22 (25 May 1941): 1.

²⁰² Otto Henning Nebe, "Deus Spiritus Sanctus. Untersuchungen zur Lehre vom Heiligen Geist," Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, vol. 40, issue 5, G. Bertelsmann, 1939. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2, 778–80; D. Stăniloae, "Sărbătoarea Duhului Sfânt," *TR*, no. 24 (8 Jun. 1941): 1.

²⁰³ George Călinescu, *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent* (Bucharest: Fundația Regală pentru Literatură și Artă, 1941). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 2: 836–40; D. Stăniloae, "Ostracizarea literaturii religioase," *TR*, no. 43 (19 Oct. 1941): 1.

²⁰⁴ See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 43–48. D. Stăniloae, "La începutul Postului Mare," *TR*, no. 7 (15 Feb. 1942): 1.

²⁰⁵ Porphyrius Uspensky, *Khristiankiy Vostok*, Afon, vol. III (unidentified source).

²⁰⁶ Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Texte privitoare la istoria românească" in Eudoxiu Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor*, vol. XIII (Bucharest: Institutul de Arte Grafice Carol Göbl, 1909). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 58–64; D. Stăniloae, "Biserica Românească (I)," *TR*, no. 10 (8 Mar. 1942): 1.

²⁰⁷ Wilhelm Stapel, *Die Kirche Christi und der Staat Hitlers* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1933). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3, 65–72. D. Stăniloae, "Biserica Românească (II)," *TR*, no. 11 (15 Mar. 1942): 1–2.

²⁰⁸ Ion Petrovici, "Dincolo de zare," *Gândirea* no. 7, (September 1939): 353–68.

²⁰⁹ D.S. Merezhkovsky, *Tod und Auferstehung* (Frauenfeld Leipzig: Huber & Co., 1935).

²¹⁰ Karl Heim, *Jesus der Weltvollender: Der Glaube an die Versöhnung und Weltverwandlung* (Berlin: Furcht-Verlag, 1937). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 73–85; D. Stăniloae, "Învierea Domnului," *TR*, no. 14 (5 Apr. 1942): 2–3.

against Blaga's most recent book²¹¹ Stăniloae supports his arguments with references to Blaga himself,²¹² "the great apologist V. Găină,"²¹³ Scholz,²¹⁴ Engels,²¹⁵ Jeremias,²¹⁶ Pinard de la Boulaye,²¹⁷ Sten Konow and O. Franke from Saussaye,²¹⁸ Hermann,²¹⁹ and Cullberg.²²⁰ Towards the end of the year, in a speech to the students of the Theological Academy, the rector Stăniloae quotes Herrigel's view of communitarian bounds,²²¹ and later in an article about the mission of priests he quotes St Maximus's *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* as referenced by the Swiss theologian Balthasar.²²² There are recurrent returns to St Maximus's works *On Love* and *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* from the Migne edition (vols 90-91) in subsequent years;²²³ he goes so far as to link St Maximus's theology with Kierkegaard and with

²¹¹ Lucian Blaga, *Religie și spirit* (Sibiu: Dacia Traiană, 1942).

²¹² Lucian Blaga, *Censura transcendentă: încercare metafizică* (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1934). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3, 114–24; D. Stăniloae, "Poziția domnului Lucian Blaga față de creștinism și Ortodoxie (II)," *TR*, no. 23 (7 Jun. 1942): 1–2. Blaga, *Spațiul mioritic* (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1936). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 179–94; D. Stăniloae, "Poziția... (VII)," *TR*, no. 28 (12 Jul. 1942): 1–2.

²¹³ Vasile Găină, *Universalitatea, fința și originea religiei* (Cernăuți: 1899) and V. Găină, *Budism și Creștinism. Studiu apologetic* (Cernăuți: 1906).

²¹⁴ Heinrich Scholz, *Religionsphilosophie* (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1922).

²¹⁵ F. Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach und der Ausgang der klassischen deutschen Philosophie* (Stuttgart: J.H. V. Dietz, 1888).

²¹⁶ A. Jeremias, *Allgemeine Religions-Geschichte* (Munich: Piper, 1924). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 137–52; D. Stăniloae, "Poziția... (IV)," *TR*, no. 25 (21 Jun. 1942): 1–2.

²¹⁷ H. Pinard de la Boulaye, *L'étude comparée des religions: essai critique* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1929).

²¹⁸ Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, 2 vols, 4th ed. (Tübingen, 1925). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 153–65; D. Stăniloae, "Poziția... (V)," *TR*, no. 26 (28 Jun. 1942): 1–2.

²¹⁹ Nicolai von Hartmann, *Zum Problem der Realitätsgegebenheit*, (Berlin: Pan-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1931).

²²⁰ John Cullberg, *Das Du und die Wirklichkeit* (Uppsala Universitetes Arsskrift, 1933). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 179–94.

²²¹ Hermann Herrigel, *Zwischen Frage und Antwort. Gedanken zur Kulturkrise*, (Berlin: Lambert Schneider, 1930). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 283–90. D. Stăniloae, "Cuvânt către studenții teologi la începutul anului academic 1942-1943," *TR*, no. 40 (4 Oct. 1942): 1–2.

²²² Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie. Maximus der Bekenner* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder & Co Verlag, 1941). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 297–302; D. Stăniloae, "Păstorii de suflare," *TR*, no. 48 (29 Nov. 1942): 1.

²²³ See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 449–54; D. Stăniloae, "Instinctul proprietății," *TR*, no. 38 (19 Sep. 1943), 1. Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 477–87; D. Stăniloae, "Un filosof creștin," *TR*, no. 46 (14 Nov. 1943): 1–2. Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 488–91; D. Stăniloae, "Unitatea în noi și între noi," *TR*, no. 47 (21 Nov. 1943): 1. Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 514–519; D. Stăniloae, "Cununa de spini," *TR*, no. 4 (23 Jan. 1944): 1. Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 531–33; D. Stăniloae, "La începutul postului," *TR*, no. 9 (27 Feb. 1944): 1. Stăniloae, *Opere* 3, 580–84; D. Stăniloae, "Hristos pătimește cu noi," *TR*, no. 24 (11 Jun. 1944): 1.

existentialist philosophy in general, with which he has perhaps become familiar before starting to read and work on St Maximus.²²⁴

In two articles on “future times,” whose weariness contrasts greatly with the enthusiasm of the war’s early days, Stăniloae supports his optimism by quoting Neergaard’s “interesting book.”²²⁵ During this period, when the Wehrmacht and its allies are no longer excelling on the Eastern front, Stăniloae becomes more interested in topics of social theology than in previous years. For example, he acknowledges that an article about the “meaning of work” is written “under the inspiration of a recent book” by Grisebach,²²⁶ “the philosopher of resounding fame,” who with Gogarten, already cited in his articles, was a member of Karl Barth’s circle. A new contribution to the development of Stăniloae’s Christology results from Bauhofer’s distinction between Christ’s and ordinary human beings’ death.²²⁷ He then signals and quotes Crainic’s famous article about the “Transfiguration of Romanianness,” “an essay of unspeakable beauty.”²²⁸ In commemorating the Greek Catholic Bishop Klein, Stăniloae cites Păclișanu.²²⁹ A new consideration of death in the context of Pentecost is supported by arguments from the “French philosopher” Lavelle.²³⁰ Underlining the connection between the missions of the priest and

²²⁴ Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 515–16.

²²⁵ Kurt von Neergaard, *Die Aufgabe Des 20. Jahrhunderts: Die Bedeutung des biologischen Weltbildes für das Verständnis der grossen Fragen unserer Zeit in Wissenschaft, Ethik, Religion und Gesellschaftsstruktur* (Erlenbach-Zürich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag, 1940). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 321–24; D. Stăniloae, “Timpurile viitoare,” *TR*, no. 3 (17 Jan. 1943): 1. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 332–36; D. Stăniloae, “Tot despre timpurile viitoare,” *TR*, no. 4 (24 Jan. 1943): 1.

²²⁶ Eberhard Grisebach, *Die Schicksalsfrage des Abendlandes. Drei Vorträge* (Berlin-Leipzig: P. Haupt, 1942). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 349–53. D. Stăniloae, “Sensul muncii,” *TR*, no. 13 (28 Mar. 1943): 1–2.

²²⁷ Oskar Bauhofer, *Das Geheimnis der Zeiten: christliche Sinndeutung der Geschichte* (Munich: Kösel & Pustet Verlag, 1935). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 354–64. D. Stăniloae, “Cu moartea pe moarte călcând...,” *TR*, no. 16–17 (25 Apr. 1943): 2–3.

²²⁸ Nichifor Crainic, “Transfigurarea românismului,” *Gândirea* (no. 4, Apr. 1943): 177–85. See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 365–66; DS, “Supraistoria noastră,” *TR*, no. 18 (2 May 1943): 1.

²²⁹ Zenovie Păclișanu, *Correspondența din exil a episcopului Inochentie Micu Klein: 1746–1768* (Bucharest: Cultura Națională, 1924). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 380–82. [Unsigned], “Inochentie Micu Klein,” *TR*, no. 20 (16 May 1943): 3.

²³⁰ Louis Lavelle, *Dialectique de l'éternel présent. 2. De l'acte* (Paris: Aubier, 1937). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3, 395–97. DS, “Pogorârea Duhului Sfânt,” *TR*, no. 24 (13 Jun. 1943): 1.

physician, Stăniloae cites the theologian Siegfried²³¹ and the surgeon Like.²³² A series of articles about property uses references to the physician and antisemite Nicolae Paulescu's assertions about the four basic human instincts, St Maximus, Marcel,²³³ and Scheler.²³⁴ The twenty-fifth anniversary of union on 1 December 1918 affords Stăniloae an opportunity to cite Iorga²³⁵ and to underline his prophetic vision.

In 1944 Stăniloae cites "precious thoughts" on Christology in the former Metropolitan of Kiev Anthony Khrapovitsky's *Pastoral Theology*, writing that it is a "pity it has not been translated to Romanian."²³⁶ During the spring of 1944 Stăniloae resumes his writing about peace and Christianity's contribution to it, quoting, as so often, Metropolitan Nicolae Bălan and Keller.²³⁷ Writing once more of the mission of the priest, Stăniloae cites the Romanian version of Cronin's successful novel *The Keys of the Kingdom* (1941) about the mission of Fr Francis Chisholm²³⁸ as the counterpart of Potapenko's Kirill.²³⁹ The year ends with a reference to "the Christian philosopher" Laberthonnière,²⁴⁰ whose idea of society as communion is used in developing an argument on Christmas as a social and metaphysical revolution.

²³¹ Theodor Siegfried etc., *Aus der Welt der Religion. 3. Christliche Wirklichkeitsschau* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1940).

²³² Erwin Liek-Danzig, *Das Wunder in der Heilkunde*, 3rd ed. (Munich, Lehmanns, 1936). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 446–48. D. Stăniloae, "Preotul și medicul," *TR*, no. 37 (12 Sep. 1943): 1.

²³³ See note 174.

²³⁴ According to Vlădescu's edition he used the French version of Max Scheler's book: *Nature et formes de la sympathie* (Paris: Payot, 1928). As it was published in Lefebvre's translation in 1950, it is more likely that Stăniloae used the original German edition: *Wesen und Formen der Sympathie* (Bonn: Verlag von Friedrich Cohen, 1923).

²³⁵ Nicolae Iorga, "Către românii care cad pe câmpurile de luptă străine," *Neamul românesc* (10 Aug. 1914). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 496–98. TS, "Valoarea zilei de 1 decembrie 1918," *TR*, no. 48 (28 Nov. 1943): 2.

²³⁶ See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 527–30. D. Stăniloae, "O pastorală hristologică," *TR*, no. 7 (13 Feb. 1944): 1.

²³⁷ Adolf Keller, *Wiederaufbau der Welt. Geistige Voraussetzungen* (Zürich: Schulthess, 1944). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 562–68. D. Stăniloae, "Creștinismul și pacea viitoare," *TR*, no. 19 (7 May 1944): 1.

²³⁸ A.J. Cronin, *Cheile împărăției*, trans. Al. Olaru, D. Diaconescu-Daești (Bucharest: Editura ABC, 1943).

²³⁹ Ignati Nikolaievich Potapenko, *În slujba adevărată*, trans. I. Dușcian (Bucharest: Ed. Minerva, 1908). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 585–88. D. Stăniloae, "Cheile împărăției," *TR*, no. 25 (18 Jun. 1944): 1.

²⁴⁰ Lucien Laberthonnière, *Esquisse d'une philosophie personnelle*, vol. 4 (Paris: J. Vrin, 1942). See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 667–74. D. Stăniloae, "Însemnătea socială a Crăciunului," *TR*, no. 123–26 (25 Dec. 1944): 5–6.

The last of Stăniloae's articles in TR reports a conference about the Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union, reflecting testimonies from within the church that he delivered in Sibiu on 18 March 1945. Here he quotes Fedorov's propaganda²⁴¹ and various contributions from the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* (no. 2/1944; nos 1, 2, and 12/1944) that all create the image of a church fulfilling its mission, contrary to the image of a persecuted church depicted before 23 August 1944, when Romania was fighting against the Soviet Union.

What do these references say about Stăniloae's intellectual outlook? What first attracts our attention is the plurality of linguistic sources and the relative diversity of scientific fields with which the theologian deals in his reading, not only of theology and philosophy but also of medicine and science. Of the some 100 references to authors, roughly a third are citations of German theologians and philosophers. These are closely followed by Russian authors, mainly émigrés in Paris. Perhaps surprisingly, Anglican theologians follow. Only a few French authors are cited. Apparently, all are quoted from the original sources, indicating that he reads English, French, and Russian, and certainly German. Stăniloae's affinity with Anglican theologians needs further investigation in terms of both content analysis and how he uses their ideas. There is at least one main argument here: apparently, Anglican theology offers Stăniloae important reasons and ideas for an elaboration of his Christology, which Anglican theologians, especially Thornton and Gore, begin to influence in 1940.

This preliminary conclusion may challenge the main assumption of mainstream theological scholarship and official ecclesiastical discourses, which claims that Stăniloae's Christology is indebted to the Fathers of the Church. Indeed, the Fathers of the Church are quoted relatively late in his articles, and only a few attract his attention (St Maximus, in Migne's celebrated edition, is the most quoted, distantly followed by St Athanasius and a couple of other Fathers from secondary or unknown sources). It is therefore likely that the publication of Stăniloae's treatise on Jesus Christ (1943) is stimulated by his intense polemic against Blaga (1942), but this treatise is ultimately more a product of his reading and quoting of Anglican and German Protestant theologians (1939-1942) than of the Fathers of the Church in Migne's edited scientific edition. Moreover, alongside Archimandrite Iuliu Scriban, whom he praises in an

²⁴¹ See Stăniloae, *Opere* 3: 719-41; Dr D. Stăniloae, "Biserica în Uniunea Sovietică - după mărturiile din Biserica Rusească," *TR*, no. 24-25 (17 Jun. 1945): 1-3.

article, Stăniloae is one of the few theologians influenced by the intensive dialogue between the ROC and the Anglican Communion during the late 1920s and 1930s.

Although the theologians and philosophers of the Russian religious revival at Saint-Serge in Paris and later at St Vladimir's Seminary in New York occupy the second linguistic space after the German one, perhaps the most citations are of Bulgakov. As already indicated, Stăniloae's theology's dialogical perspective stems from Ebner and Buber, and it can be dated easily to 1939–1940. Stăniloae's philosophical vision evinces great enthusiasm for existentialism. He has no hesitation, for example, in considering the modern Danish philosopher Kierkegaard a kindred spirit of the ancient Greek theologian St Maximus the Confessor. Stăniloae engages in an intense polemic against Catholics, but this is a fruit of his nationalism (with Greek Catholics) and dogma (with Roman Catholics). Otherwise, he has no hesitation in using Roman Catholic theologians, some of whom have ecclesiastical roles, and whom he appreciates. Nor does he hesitate to describe the Catholic priest Wilhelm Schmidt (1868–1954) as a “great theologian” when the latter's ideas are useful to his arguments.

Another striking fact is that Stăniloae refers mostly to recent books, some no more than a year after their publication. This demonstrates his awareness of books and articles that appear abroad, the quotations (and book reviews) indirectly becoming a kind of diary of his reading that allows the researcher to elaborate the still unwritten genealogy of Stăniloae's theological and philosophical ideas. This may explain why Stăniloae refers to the Fathers of the Church so late in his journalism. It is probably no accident that his more extensive use of St Maximus than all the other Fathers of the Church occurs when he is probably beginning to work on his translation of the *Philokalia*. All these considerations call the previous observations in the existing scholarship into question, such as: “Rather than turning to Western theologians, however, Stăniloae looked to the Church Fathers, in whose writings he found many of the same themes being emphasized by existentialist theologians in Western Europe”,²⁴² and “he did not begin to seriously engage with Western theologians until his 1943 study on Christology, and even then he quoted selectively while often making derogatory criticisms of the scholars he was drawing upon.”²⁴³

²⁴² Roland Clark, “Nationalism, Ethnotheology, and Mysticism in Interwar Romania,” *Carl Beck Papers in Russian & East European Studies*, no. 2002 (September 2009): 12–13.

²⁴³ Clark, “Nationalist and Trinitarian Visions of the Church in the Theology of Dumitru Stăniloae,” *Studii teologice* 2 (2013): 213.

In his 421 signed articles in TR Stăniloae quotes or refers to a diverse range of newspapers and periodicals: *Cuvântul* (editor Nae Ionescu; Bucharest); the Greek Catholic newspaper *Unirea* (ed. Alexandru Rusu; Blaj); the Orthodox newspaper of the Serbian Patriarchate *Glasnik; Der Bund* (Berne); *Curentul* (ed. Pamfil Șeicaru; Bucharest); *Universul* (ed. Stelian Popescu; Bucharest); the Orthodox diocesan newspaper *Legea românească* (Oradea); the Orthodox diocesan newspaper *Renașterea* (Cluj); the Roman Catholic *Hochland, Die christliche Welt, and Keleti Ujsag; Calendarul* (ed. N. Crainic; Bucharest); *Gândirea* (ed. N. Crainic; Bucharest); Țara noastră (ed. O. Goga; Cluj); *Patria* (ed. National Peasant Party; Cluj); *The Daily Telegraph; Osservatore Romano*; the Orthodox newspaper *Viața Ilustrată* (Sibiu); *Reichpost* (Vienna); *Prager Presse*; the Orthodox newspaper *Viitorul; The Church Times; Erdelyi Lapok*; the Greek Catholic diocesan newspaper *Vestitorul* (Oradea); the Roman Catholic newspaper *Farul nou* (Bucharest); the Roman Catholic newspaper *Dacia creștină* (Iași); the Roman Catholic newspaper *Lumina creștină* (Iași); *Zorile; Gazeta Transilvaniei*; the Greek Catholic diocesan newspaper *Cultura creștină* (Blaj); *Libertatea* (Bucharest); *Dreptatea* (official press organ of the National Peasant Party; Bucharest); *Buna vestire* (ed. N. Ionescu; Bucharest); *Predania* (ed. G. Racoveanu; Bucharest); *Eu și Europa, Înălțarea, Luceafărul, Kyrios, Viața, and Kirchliche Blätter* (Sibiu); *Timpul; Porunca vremii* (ed. Ilie Rădulescu; Bucharest); and the Orthodox newspaper *Glasul monahilor* (Hieromonk Dionisie Lungu; Bucharest). After the change in political regimes on 23 August 1944 he quotes from *România liberă, Libertatea, Națiunea Română* (Sibiu), and *România nouă* (Sibiu). As we have already seen, Stăniloae seems familiar with *Puti*, “the review of Russian theologians and philosophers in the diaspora,” which was published in Paris, and from which he uses articles by Bulgakov and Lossky.

An attempt to reconstruct this list in hierarchical order reveals that *Unirea* is referenced in 19 articles. It is followed by *Gândirea* (14 references), *Universul* (8 references), *Curentul* (7 references), and *Calendarul* (6 references). Sixth place is occupied by *Cuvântul* and *Farul Nou*, with five references each. All the other newspapers are quoted in only one article. This hierarchy indicates how these periodicals are quoted. The cluster of Crainic’s newspapers (*Calendarul, Gândirea*) is referenced in enthusiastic and laudatory terms. Yet the Greek Catholic *Unirea* and Roman Catholic *Farul Nou* are quoted in perhaps Stăniloae’s most polemical pieces. *Cuvântul* and the other newspapers within the fascist Legionary cluster of publications (*Buna vestire, Predania*) are quoted

during Stăniloae's polemics against Ionescu, Racoveanu, Dragnea, and Protopopescu. Finally, *Universul* and *Curentul* are mostly quoted as sources of the information Stăniloae considers relevant for elaborating further arguments. This does not exclude polemics against Pamfil Șeicaru and some critical receptions of his newspaper for being overly sympathetic to Catholicism. The low profile of Orthodox diocesan newspapers in this list is striking. Of about 18 ROC diocesan newspapers, Stăniloae quotes from only two (*Renașterea* and *Legea Românească*), in 1931. Equally striking is Stăniloae's apparently feeble interest in Orthodox newspapers edited by clergy groups. Of the huge number of such publications, he refers to *Viitorul* and *Glasul monahilor*. Stăniloae superficially expresses more interest in the cluster of Catholic newspapers (*Unirea*, *Hochland*, *Die christliche Welt*, *Osservatore Romano*, *Vestitorul*, *Farul nou*, *Dacia creștină*, *Lumina creștină*, and *Cultura creștină*) than in Orthodox ones (*Glasnik*, *Renașterea*, *Legea românească*, *Glasul monahilor*, and *Viitorul*).

Conclusion

Beyond the above comments some general temporary conclusions can be formulated, albeit of somewhat hypothetical value, pending further research on the themes addressed and the numerous controversies in which Stăniloae is involved. How he cites different authors and books suggests he does not always prioritize his ideological presuppositions, but how the ideas of a particular author serve or do not serve his arguments. Two examples support this. The first is the different treatment of Durkheim and Buber, both of whom are Jewish. If in Durkheim's case Stăniloae is careful to ascertain the extent to which, as a Jew, Durkheim's ideas have inspired the vision of social service in Romania, in Buber's Stăniloae not only does not mention his Jewish origin but enthusiastically embraces his dialogical vision. In other words, he criticizes Durkheim and sees him as risky because of his atheism and subversive ideas, writing about him as a Jew. In contrast, Stăniloae neither mentions Buber's Jewish origin nor the detail that he is a practising believer, which is important because it is precisely his Jewish faith that inspires his philosophical vision. The young Stăniloae values Buber and embraces his dialogical philosophy in his work. In his old age, a year before he died, when asked if he has read Buber's book *Ich und Du*, Stăniloae answers in the affirmative. He seems less enthusiastic now; moreover, he wants to show that "I realized that it was not enough." Why? Now the origin matters: "Martin Buber is Jewish," and therefore "he only knows I and you, I and God personally.

But we [Christians] have the Trinity.”²⁴⁴ It is possible that this is what Stăniloae still remembers a little more than 50 years after he first read Buber, forgetting that the third person is always present, even if unnamed, in his little book, and which, incidentally, was what made it so influential in the intellectual circles of the time. A further enquiry into the genealogy of Stăniloae’s ideas should assess the extent to which Buber’s philosophy contributes to the anthropological theology downplayed after the ethnic nationalism of 1942. Arguably, a humanist grounded precisely in such theological anthropology coexists with the religious nationalist in Stăniloae after 1942.

The second example is the reference to the philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872), one of the main authors of modern philosophical atheism: in his polemic against Blaga’s Christian metaphysical system Stăniloae quotes him favourably as long as his statements support his own position. Bizarre as it may seem, Stăniloae quotes a theorist of atheism in a polemic against a theorist of Christian metaphysics. As this article has focused only on the references and not on a systematic reading of the quoted works to determine how Stăniloae (mis)uses his sources, further research on the topic should clarify whether “Stăniloae rarely undertook systematic analyses of the traditions from which he was drawing,” which explains why “he relied instead (...) on quotations taken out of context.”²⁴⁵

We should also note the opportunistic tendency that emerges from how Stăniloae personally refers to the cited authors who are his contemporaries. We can assume that he has a certain affinity with Petrovici, but the evocation of two minor books, published when his scientific career has ended and his political career has begun, shows that the laudatory articles he dedicates to Petrovici do not reflect their value. The articles probably represent Stăniloae’s reward for services Petrovici has rendered as Minister of Religious Affairs to Transylvania’s theological academies. However, Stăniloae expresses his devotion to Crainic, both personally and to his ideas. This study further confirms hypotheses formulated and argued in a previous study: Stăniloae, as a young priest and theologian, is perhaps the brightest and most intellectually gifted of Crainic’s disciples. We have seen that as a journalist at TR, Stăniloae is attentive to all Crainic’s publications, which he immediately reviews, and to all

²⁴⁴ Sorin Dumitrescu, *Șapte dimineți cu Părintele Stăniloae* (Bucharest: Lumea credinței și Editura Anastasia, 2025), 31.

²⁴⁵ Clark, “Nationalism, Ethnotheology, and Mysticism in Interwar Romania,” *Carl Beck Papers in Russian & East European Studies*, no. 2002 (September 2009): 4.

his important events, which he also sometimes presents in articles. Nor are citations of his ideas lacking, even if in a different form from other authors, which does not allow their inclusion in the list of references. As long as Stăniloae demonstrates a certain personal affinity with Crainic and his ideas (no critical stance has been identified in the research thus far), it follows that Stăniloae's positioning in the field of ethnic nationalism, with all its consequences, must be understood from the perspective of his mentoring by Crainic. It should thus not be viewed as chance that Stăniloae's opposition to political modernity led, in Barbu's hypothesis, to anti-Catholicism and antisemitism.

At the same time, the difference in how Stăniloae relates to Catholic authors, especially from the perspective of the distinction between Greek (from whom he does not quote) and Roman Catholics (from whom he quotes, and for whom he sometimes even has words of praise, shows that Stăniloae's anti-Catholicism is not only explained in principle but is also contextual). The signing of the Concordat with the Vatican (1927) and the ratification that soon followed (1929) were a determining factor for Stăniloae as a spiritual son of the Archdiocese of Sibiu and disciple of Metropolitan Nicolae Balan. In any case his anti-Uniatism first and then his anti-Catholicism as it was present in Romania can be seen in the particular intensity with which he quotes the publications *Unirea* and *Farul nou*, as well as other official publications of the Catholic dioceses.

This statement again proves Stăniloae's extraordinary malleability to political changes. From the perspective of Stăniloae's personal relations, it is likely that he had conflicts with the Legionaries in Sibiu, and from the perspective of his polemics against the group of Legionaries around the newspapers *Buna vestire* and *Predania*, it is equally likely that Stăniloae had reservations about some components of Legionary ideology. His sudden change of attitude during the National Legionary State can also be understood from the perspective of Stăniloae's political opportunism, not just that of the current hypothesis of Stăniloae's sincere enthusiasm.²⁴⁶ Both the continuation of the analysis initiated in this study through a thematic exploration of the articles published in TR over 15 years and an inventory of the polemics in which Stăniloae engaged may lead to the

²⁴⁶ Biliuță, *The Archangel's Consecrated Servants*, 283. The relevant paragraph reads as follows: "Reputed theologians that held moderate views up until that time, personalities that distanced themselves previously or even adversaries of the movement like Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae (...) saluted the change of regime considering the new government as an expression of a positive revolutionary radicalization of Romanian nationalism in a legionary key (Românism)."

consolidation of a new research hypothesis: it was opportunism that led Stăniloae to welcome regime changes, whether liberal, agrarian, a royal dictatorship, the National Legionary dictatorship, Antonescu's dictatorship, or the transition to communism.²⁴⁷

Finally, we note that among the Romanian authors Stăniloae most recognized and honoured were those from Transylvania who professed the type of religious nationalism promoted by Metropolitan Bălan. These authors were Lupaș, who was Stăniloae's godfather, Dragomir, and Goga. Two notable exceptions were Crainic, who came from the Old Kingdom, but who enjoyed an extraordinarily favourable audience in Transylvania, and Blaga, who was of Transylvanian origin, but for whom Stăniloae had some initial sympathy as an author of the journal *Gândirea*, but from whom he distanced himself after the famous polemic of 1942. It is noteworthy that relatively few of the books cited were by Romanian authors. Most, as we have already said, were by Germans and Russians. No less absent in Stăniloae's reporting of the main ideologues of the extreme right in the diocesan publication was N. Ionescu, the theoretician of the Legionary Movement, than was Crainic, the theoretician of extreme-right ethnocracy, present. There were sufficient reasons for Stăniloae not to overlook Ionescu, for in 1937 Mircea Eliade had edited the first edition of his mentor's articles under the title *Roza vânturilor*. When it became customary to collect previously published articles considered representative in one volume, Stăniloae received Crainic's two books most favorably, but he was silent on Ionescu.

²⁴⁷ This hypothesis is already tested by Racu, *Părinți și copii*.