

ORTHODOXY

This paper discusses the major problems faced by scholars dealing with Orthodoxy within the framework of the REVACERN Project. Its aim is to provide a theoretical and methodological basis necessary for the harmonization of their work. Therefore the paper is focused on next main issues:

- State of religious studies in the field of Orthodoxy (necessary for locating the proposed papers on the research map)
- Major theses, relevant to the subarea “Orthodoxy” (that will help to define the priorities in our work on the proposed papers)
- Blind spots (linked with the priorities as well as the opportunity to attract external experts on “Orthodoxy” in order to present a balanced picture of it)
- Problems and challenges in the Orthodox part of Europe and their coverage by the papers, initiated within the REVACERN (Opportunities for cooperation and its limits)
- Sources and methodological suggestions for further work

The State of Orthodoxy Studies

“Orthodoxy Studies” is a special term introduced for the purposes of the REVACERN Project and particularly for its subarea “Orthodoxy”. It shifts the study of Orthodoxy from the traditional discipline-based approach, i.e. Orthodox theology, also called Orthodox studies, to a problem-oriented one, i.e. an interdisciplinary study of Orthodoxy in its various dimensions such as teaching, dogma, religious practices, institutional structure, social communication, community network, etc. Orthodoxy studies follow the logics of a series of new scientific disciplines such as peace, gender and regional studies that require the joint efforts of scholars from different fields. Therefore, interdisciplinarity is their major feature. By this moment, however, most of the scholars engaged in religious studies of Orthodoxy continue to limit their research within the borders of one of next academic areas – theology, church and religious history, political, legal or social sciences. They are analyzed below from the most developed and traditional ones to the least developed and new ones.

1. Theology can be defined as the most developed, but also the most isolated branch of Orthodoxy studies. Today it continues to keep its focus on purely theological disciplines such as liturgical studies, biblical studies, church dogmatics, patrology, etc. Meanwhile, the ecumenical approach in Orthodox theology, developed in the beginning of the twentieth century by the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the churches of Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Romania was abandoned after World War II by those Orthodox churches where communist regime was established. Only the Serbian Orthodox Church under Tito and the Romanian one – under Ceausescu restored their ecumenical activities as part of their opposition to the Soviet Union. Between the 1960s and the 1980s the communist regimes attempted to make use of the World Council of Churches only for political ends, not for ecumenical ones. In 1998, this organization was left by the Bulgarian and Georgian Orthodox Churches, while the Patriarchate of Moscow resists many of its initiatives. Together with the Bulgarian and Georgian churches, the Russian one regards the Orthodox doctrines and dogmas as the only ones that have preserved Christianity in its wholeness and truthfulness. On these grounds they tend to reject the Catholic and Protestant teachings as wrong from the very beginning.

Orthodox theology seems also to refrain from joint enterprises with 'secular science'. There are, however, some theological disciplines that are more open for such cooperation, e.g. religious history, church art and canon law. It brought about some extraordinary works on Orthodoxy, e.g. Georgy Florovsky, *Puti Russkogo Bogoslovia* [Roads of Russian Theology, Paris, IMKA-PRESS, 1937; Jaroslav Pelikan (of Lutheran background), *Imago Dei: The Byzantine Apologia for Icons*, Princeton University Press, 1990 and the second volume of *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (1971-1989). Bollingen Foundation, 1990; some books by John Meyendorff on Orthodox spirituality, etc. Generally these works are influenced by the spirit of St. Serge Orthodox Ecclesiastical Academy in Paris and are written either by its professors or their students. Most of them are oriented to the early stages of Orthodoxy, while very few deal with the contemporary challenges faced by Orthodoxy, e.g. John Erickson, *The Challenges of Our Past*, Crestwood, NT: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991 as well as single studies by hierarchs of different Orthodox Churches such as Bishop Hilarion (Alfayev) of Vienna and Austria from the Moscow Patriarchate, Archbishop Anastasios (Yannoulatos) of Albania and Tirana, Metropolitan Ioannis (Zizioulas) of Pergamon from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, etc.

2. Religious and church history, i.e. the history of Orthodox faith and its institutions and/or communities, especially in modern times, is an area where Orthodox theologians can cooperate with so-called secular historians, philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists, etc. The signs of such cooperation could be traced back to the eighteenth-nineteenth century. Most of them were written by scholars from Orthodox ecclesiastical academies or theological faculties, but influenced by their secular colleagues. The first works discussed the history of the Russian Orthodox Church and Old Believers (P. V. Znamensky, A. Kartashev, etc.) as well as the early stages of the development of the Orthodox doctrine (V. Bolotov, M. Posnov, E. Smirnoff). At the same time, the modern history of Balkan Orthodox churches became object of research after the liberation of their states from the Ottoman rule. Among the exceptions are the works of Russian scholars such as K. Leontiev and E. Golubinsky. In the first decades it focused either on the pre-Ottoman times or discussed the modern developments in a highly polemic way. The first scientific studies on the modern history of Balkan churches appeared in the interwar period. Under communism church history, together with the other theological disciplines, was excluded from secular scholarship and remained underdeveloped. Nowadays the studies on Orthodox Church history follow the manner of writing state histories, i.e. there are parallel histories of different Orthodox churches, but no comparative or regional ones, i.e. about the churches within the Russian Empire or the Ottoman one or about the Orthodox churches in diaspora in Western Europe or in America. Another weakness of this branch of Orthodoxy studies relates to the insufficient number and quality of books dealing with the developments from the last two centuries. To a great degree it is a result of the communist regimes that obstructed the advancement of any research linked with religion, including the church history between two world wars. As a result, there is no general history of the Orthodox Church from the Great Schism to the present, except for some not very successful attempts, e.g. and Bishop Kalistos (Ware).

3. Church-State Relations in Orthodox countries is a relatively new direction in 'secular' religious studies. Until the end of WWII it was not of special importance for the Orthodox countries that still observed the traditional principle of mutual recognition and respect between church and state. There were debates on adopting the French model of church-state separation during the interwar period, but they did not change the system and had purely theoretical significance for theologians and jurists, e.g. Stefan Tsankov's studies on church and state in Orthodox countries and Western Europe. The issue of church-state relations in Orthodoxy became important for scholars as well as for western politicians, when

the Bolsheviks took the power in Russia and especially after the communist takeover in Eastern Europe that followed WWII. All socialist countries, except Romania, repeated Lenin's formula about the separation of Church from State in their constitutions. This act was based on ideological arguments and enforced despite the resistance of theologians, who considered it as incompatible with Orthodox canons.

While the academic debate on church-state separation was silenced in Eastern Europe, it entered in the scope of research in the West. It was studied mainly by representatives of political sciences and history (not jurists), especially in Germany, UK and US. The majority of them were monographs focused on the Soviet case, while those on Eastern European countries were single articles or studies jointly published in several volumes. (E.g. P. Anderson, 1944. *People, Church and State in Modern Russia*, New York: Macmillan; 1955. *Church and State behind the Iron Curtain: Czechoslovakia, Poland Hungary Romania with an introduction on the Soviet Union*, ed. by Vladimir Gsovski, New York: Frederick A. Praeger; W. Stroyen, 1967. *Communist Russia and the Russian Orthodox Church 1943-1962*, Washington: The Catholic University of America Press; 1969. *Religion and the Soviet State: A Dilemma of Power*, ed. by M. Hayward and W. Fletcher, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers; 1964/1965. *The Church and State Under Communism (A special Study prepared by the Law Library of the Library of the Congress for the Subcommittee to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws of the Committee of the Judiciary United States Senate)*, part I: The U.S.S.R., Part II Eastern Europe, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office; S. Alexander, *Church and State in Yugoslavia since 1945* (Cambridge University Press, 1979); 1988. *Eastern Christianity and Politics in the Twentieth Century*, ed. P. Ramet, Durham: Duke University Press). The scientific quality of these books, however, suffers from the Cold War one-sided ideological approach as well as from the inaccessibility to sources.

Since the early 1990s a new series of works appeared on the church-state relations in Eastern European countries. For the first time, scholars have been able to use documents from the archives of the former communist regimes. The major weakness of these publications roots in the lack of theological education of their authors. Being aware neither of the pre-communist development of the corresponding Orthodox churches, nor of Orthodoxy specificity they often misjudge about the effect of communist regime on these religious institutions and communities. The most important works on the Cold War developments in the Soviet Union belong to M. Shkarovsky, Olga Vasileva, M. Pospelovsky, V. Tsy-pin, G. Stricker; in Tito's Yugoslavia – R. Radic and J. Belovich, in Bulgaria – D. Kalkandjieva, and S. Raikin, in Romania – S. Ramet and L. Leustean, etc. There is also interest in publishing volumes of archival documents on contemporary Orthodox churches history, but mainly in Russia.

A new trend in the studies on church and state is the research on the activities of the Russian and Serbian Orthodox Churches on the territories of the newly independent states, e.g. in Macedonia, Ukraine and the Baltic States, which *de facto* have never been object of special research for both communist and post-communist period. Another novelty is the study of current church-state relations in Orthodox countries by experts in legal studies and canon law. A series of articles in this field were produced by the European Consortium on Church and State. Each of their volumes is dedicated to a specific legal issue discussed country by country, e.g. post-communist laws on religion, nationalism, and religious minorities. Scholars outside legal studies also have interest in the post-communist developments of church-state relationship, e.g. a volume of articles and sources for the legal position of the churches in South-Eastern Europe in 2004 was published by the Institute for Ethnic and Religious Studies (ISCOMET) and the University of Maribor. The post-Soviet church-state relations in Russia

are studied by M. Odintsov, Marat Shterin and P. Ramet, while in Eastern Europe – by Metropolitan Daniel Ciobotea – the present Romanian Patriarch, Zoe Knox, Radmila Radic, D. Kalkandjieva, Dimitar Mirchev, etc.

The Cold War studies of church and state under communism brought about a new field – the persecution of religion by totalitarian regimes, mainly the communist and Nazi ones. It was explored by Russian and Ukrainian émigré religious and lay writers (D. Pospelovsky, J. Meyendorf, B. Bociurkiw, A. Bogolepov, D. Konstantinov, N. Struve, N. Timasheff, S. Troitsky, Bishop G. Grabbe, S. Fomin, M. Nazarov, V. Samarin, D. Konstantinov), Soviet decedents (Lev Regel'son, *Tragedia Russkoy Tserkvi*; G. Yakunin), Eastern European emigrants (S. Raikin, M. Pundeff,.....), and western scholars (J. Curtiss, W. Stroyen, W. Fletcher, H. Fireside, V. Alexeev, P. Anderson, M. Bourdeaux, W. Kolartz, J. Ellis). About the mid-1970s, it was transformed into a human rights issue in the western studies on communist societies.

4. Orthodoxy and politics is another area that suffers from the lack of sufficient research. It embraces four major areas: the Church policies, the domestic politicization of religion, the interaction of Orthodoxy with international affairs and the process of eurointegration.

4. a. The policies of Orthodox churches in ecology, health (euthanasia, birth control, abortion), social works, education, human rights, etc. is one of the blind spots in Orthodoxy studies. It is partly result from the relatively weak activities of the Orthodox churches in these areas as well as the lack of specific church doctrines and official statements. There are only single articles, e.g. Vsevolod Chaplin wrote on the social program of the Russian Orthodox Church and Lavrendios Dellassoudas on that of the Greek Orthodox Church; some statements were made by the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Romanian Orthodox Church on ecology, Metropolitan Hierotheos Vlahos of Nafpaktos wrote on Orthodoxy and science, Church and civil society, etc. There is, however, an area which is better presented in last several years. It concerns religious education, e.g. Jonathan Sutton, Nikolai Mitrokhin, Peter Schreiner, Dan Sandu, Evie Zambeta, D. Kalkandjieva. It consists of case studies that are far from general theoretical conclusions for Orthodoxy's policy in the particular fields. They also do not cover all Orthodox countries, but the available empirical research allows further comparative and theoretical advancement.

4. b. The politicization of Orthodoxy in post-communist lands is one of the consequences of the collapse of atheist monopoly. The resurgence of religion in these lands often comes hand in hand with nationalism, rightist or leftist ideologies. In some former communist countries Orthodox clergy became influential not only in public sphere, but politics and economics. These developments have quite negative consequences for the democratic processes in society and for Orthodoxy as religion. They attracted the attention mainly of scholars in political sciences and specialists on contemporary Russia, e.g. Anastasia Mitrofanova, William van den Bercken, Zoe Knox, Alar Kilp, etc. This process is less studied in the Balkan region despite some evidence on similar processes, especially in the Romanian Orthodox Church. Some hypotheses on this issue have been raised during a conference in 1993, which papers are published in the volume *Orthodox Church in a Changing World* (Athens: 1998).

4. c. The issue of Orthodoxy and international affairs is at a very early stage of its research. The only monograph specifically focused on Orthodoxy and world politics is W. C. Fletcher's, *Religion and Soviet foreign policy, 1945-1970* (London: Oxford Univ. Press., 1973). Some aspects, connected with the international activities of the Moscow Patriarchate during World War II and the Cold War were discussed by western scholars in books dedicated

to religion in the Soviet Union (W. Stroyen, H. Fireside, D. Kirby, D. Dun). After the opening of Soviet archives some Russian and Eastern European scholars also contributed to this issue, e.g. M. Shkarovsky, O. Vassileva, V. Kossik, V. Tsy-pin and D. Kalkandjjeva's (unpublished dissertation). All of the mentioned studies, however, concern the communist era and there is almost nothing about the post-1989 development.

4. d. The impact of Eurointegration on the Orthodox churches in Eastern Europe and their reaction to it has been discussed by very few international conferences, e.g. the Cornell University's seminar on "Fracturing and Integrating Europe from the Periphery? Religious Communities and Europeanization" (2003); "Christianity and Eurointegration" in Belgrade (2003); "Religion and European Integration" in Maribor (2005). The Orthodox perspective was also taken into consideration in the arrangement of a volume of selected studies on religion in Europe – "A Theology for Europe: The Churches in Expanding Europe" (Peter Lang, 2005). This state of affairs reveals that the tendency Orthodoxy to be discussed separately by theologians and secular scholars still prevails. At the same time, some Orthodox Churches demonstrate more open attitude to a dialog with non-Orthodox theologians. There is also better communication between theologians and 'secular' scholars dealing with Orthodoxy in the USA, that in Europe, where the traditional division between secular science and theology persists.

5. The interest of social sciences in Orthodoxy has appeared *de facto* after the collapse of communism. The main exception was Tito's Yugoslavia, where the sociology of religion was well developed probably for the purposes of his federalist policy. The interest of social scientists in Orthodoxy was provoked by its intensive resurgence in post-communist societies. Being the least developed area of religious studies, social sciences mark fast progress in former communist countries thanks to the joint efforts of domestic and foreign scholars. Their research is characterized by openness to other disciplines and sciences in the field of Orthodoxy, especially theology and history. There is also a tendency for a greater emphasis on the quantitative methods as major tools for grasping the essence of this form of Christianity. This quick advancement in sociology of Orthodoxy is followed by anthropology, while the psychology and economics of Orthodoxy lag far behind them.

Sociologists of religion in Eastern Europe contribute to a shift in the analysis of Orthodoxy from the previously dominating institution-centered approach to a community-oriented one. This change brings about new horizons for the study of Orthodox Christianity and its interaction with the processes of modernity, secularization, nationalism, globalization, pluralism, etc. It also creates grounds for discussing issues of gender equality, human rights, interreligious dialog and the relations between different worldviews. One of the most peculiar features of the post-communist studies on Orthodoxy is the joint efforts of scholars from different national, religious and worldview backgrounds to explore this Christian tradition, e.g. American, British, Russian, Greek, Bulgarian, etc.; Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant researchers; secular and religious scholars. (Archbishop Anastasios Yannoulatos of Albania and Tirana, Archbishop Demetrios of America, Richard Falk, Emmanuel Clapsis, Victor Roudometof – on globalization; Peter Berger, Elizabeth Prodromou, Angela Ilić – on pluralism and democracy; Thomas Bremer – on Catholic-Orthodox encounter; Paschalis Kitromilides, Thomas FitzGerald, Sabrian Ramet, Vjekoslav Perica – on nationalism; Christos Mylons, Philip Walters – on fundamentalism and proselytism; Paul Mojzes, Leonard Swidler, Mirko Djordjević, Anca Şincan – on interreligious dialog; Metropolitan Daniel Ciobotea - the present Romanian Patriarch, David Little, Christos Yannaras, Alexander Webster – human rights; Bishop Kalistos Ware (Oxford, UK) and Elizabeth Behr-Sigel – on women). An important volume of articles that need to be mentioned here is *Orthodox Churches in a*

Pluralistic World: An Ecumenical Conversation, which includes the papers read in the conference at the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology (2002).

Among the less explored topics one should point to secularization and identity. The former is usually linked with church-state separation, i.e. the legal studies approach prevails, while the impact of secularization on Orthodox societies remains unexplored. (Victor Roudometoff – on secularization in Greece, D. Kalkandjieva – about the Bulgarian case of the nineteenth century secularization as a specific one, i.e. realized without national state and church. Both authors, however, have not explored well the twentieth century). As a rule, the identity issue is discussed from its ethnic prospective and thus is linked with nationalism. This is the usual approach of historical and political studies, but the issue of religious identity in Orthodoxy remains an enigma. The impact of Orthodoxy on the different social strata on post-communist society, according to their age, gender and economic divisions, is not studied as well.

Major theses on Orthodoxy

The main theses on Orthodoxy are often statements, made on the basis of occasional observations, rather than scientific hypotheses built on arguments. There are two images of Orthodoxy that shape the attitude to it not only of ordinary people, but also of distinguished scholars. According to the first one, Orthodox Christianity is backward and totalitarian. The arguments for it do come from an analysis of its doctrine, dogmas and religious practices but from historical events located in concrete times and lands. They relate either to communism, or to the Byzantine times. In the first case, Orthodox churches and communities in Greece, Turkey, Middle East and those of the Orthodox diaspora are not taken into account, i.e. the conclusions are not based on entire Orthodoxy. In the second case, the accusations of backwardness refer to the Byzantine heritage and especially to the specific type of church-state relations, called *symphony* by Orthodox theologians and *caesaropapism* by secular scholars. The claims for the backwardness of Orthodoxy, however, have been raised by scholars who are not experts in Byzantine studies but in contemporary political sciences and who tend to use contemporary notions in the analysis of the Middle Ages, e.g. S. Huntington. Their observations are not supported by the works of distinguished specialists in Orthodox and Byzantine studies such as Sir Steven Runciman, Fr. Dvornik, Jaroslav Pelikan, Gilbert Dagron, Ioannis Karayannopoulos, etc. In short, the summary of the state of Orthodoxy studies reveal that Orthodoxy and its institutional and community aspects are still unexplored in comparison with the western forms of Christianity. This asymmetry and lack of knowledge allows wrong conclusions and misconceptions on this form of Christianity. Therefore, the statements about its backwardness and inclination to totalitarianism should be taken for granted. The REVACERN papers on Orthodoxy will contribute for overcoming this gap in Orthodoxy studies.

According to the second thesis, Orthodoxy is a mystic and liturgy-centered form of Christianity. The notion of mysticism was strongly influenced by Russian writers and philosophers from the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, whose works became popular in the West thanks to the White Russian emigration after the Bolshevik revolution (F. Dostoevsky, V. Lossky, S. Bulgakov, N. Berdyaev, V. Solovyev, P. Florensky, A. Men', etc.). It is also influenced by some academic studies on Orthodox icons, e.g. J. Pelikan. The issue of Orthodox liturgy was explored in depth by Orthodox and non-Orthodox theologians, e.g. A. Schmemmann, R. Taft, H. Wybrew, etc. Despite the importance of liturgy in Orthodoxy and the many in-depth studies on it, they reveal one aspect of Orthodoxy. At the same time, the encounter of Orthodox ecclesiology and canon law with the modern times is not sufficiently explored. The community aspects of the Orthodox Church are also less

studied than the institutional ones. In this respect, theologians could help their secular colleagues in the development of Orthodoxy studies.

The blind spots

On the basis of the short review of the state of Orthodoxy studies and the main theses and notions about Orthodoxy one can define several major areas that need further research

1. The development of Orthodox churches since the eighteenth century, not only during the communist period is not sufficiently explored, especially in the case of the Balkan churches. There is a need of historical, anthropological and sociological research based on written sources, oral history records and other artifacts. Research questions: What has changed in the traditional models of Orthodoxy based on ancient theological doctrines since the eighteenth century? Orthodoxy and challenges of modern world: modernity, secularization, totalitarian state, etc. **The REVACERN project is focused mainly on the post-communist developments.**
2. The diplomacy of Orthodox churches at various levels: inter-church relations within Orthodoxy; ecumenical relations with the other Christian churches; interreligious relations with Islam and Judaism; inter-institutional relations with states and international bodies; the new problem of role of Orthodox churches in the Eurointegration. This sphere requires the united efforts of experts in theology, international relations and political sciences. Research question: What is the specificity of Orthodox Church diplomacy and what are its rules, agencies and mechanisms? What is the impact of Eurointegration on Orthodoxy and vice versa? **Covered by papers 65 “Geo-Politics of Contemporary Eastern Orthodoxy” and partly by 46 “Eastern Orthodoxy and European Enlargement,” which do not cover sufficiently the ecumenical and interreligious relations. The latter will be partly analyzed in the paper 45 “Religious Pluralism and Inter-religious Dialogue in Post-communist Countries.”**
3. The relations between the three major actors/strata in the Orthodox churches, i.e. between laity, priesthood and hierarchy as well as between black and white clergy, i.e. monks and priests (schisms, sects, NGOs). This area will benefit from untied research efforts of theologians, sociologists and historians. Research questions: Is a denominational approach possible, i.e. can Orthodox churches turn into voluntary organizations (Berger’s suggestion)? What are the transformations in the role of laity in contemporary Church’s life? What are the duties of Orthodox hierarchy in the present? **Covered by papers 06 “Orthodox Churchliness - Forms of Belonging to the Church,” 21 “The Role of Women in Orthodoxy” and 52 “Orthodox Monasticism: Development and Role in Society,” but the role of Orthodox hierarchy remains the least developed issue here.**
4. Church policies in contemporary society and their deficiencies and advantages. In this case specialists on specific field studies should be invited in research on equal foot with theologians and sociologists. Research questions: Which are the sources of Orthodox churches that provide grounds and arguments for their policies (e.g. theology, social, political and economic developments, science, etc)? What is the role of Orthodox churches in different social areas (e.g. health, education, intensified migration, media, gender equality, etc.)? **It is covered by paper 70 “Religious Education in Orthodox Countries” as well as by 21 “The Role of Women in Orthodoxy,” but there are many issues linked with Orthodox church policies that remained unexplored.**

5. The encounter of Orthodox canons with present civil and European laws, e.g. on freedom of religion and human rights. This area needs the joint efforts of secular and church jurists. Research question: Which are the common grounds between civil and canon law and which issues cause tensions and conflicts? This issue is developed to a great degree in paper 64 “Church-State Relations in Orthodox Countries: Traditions, Innovations and Challenges,” but there is need of more studies on the canon law aspects.
6. The post-communist encounter of Orthodox theology with popular beliefs, practices and traditions. The best results here could be achieved only if theologians are open for collaboration with anthropologists and sociologists. Research questions: Which popular beliefs and practices have survived communism, which have been revitalized after its fall and which are completely new for these societies? What is the attitude of the Orthodox churches to them (acceptance, accommodation, rejection)? This issues are covered by paper 04 “Orthodoxy and Values, Based on Aufbruch 2” and partly by 06 “Orthodox Churchliness - Forms of Belonging to the Church.” An anthropological paper dealing with the popular beliefs will be a useful contribution for the subarea “Orthodoxy.”
7. Orthodoxy after the Cold War: the encounter with democracy, pluralism, fundamentalism/neotraditionalism, NRMs, globalization. This area requires the knowledge and experience of theologians, sociologists and political science scholars. Research questions: Orthodoxy as a source of religious identity vs. the thesis of unity between religion and ethnos in Eastern Europe. The contested monopoly of Orthodoxy in Eastern Europe and the reaction of the local churches and societies. This area is covered by paper 46 “Eastern Orthodoxy and European Enlargement” and partly by 04 “Orthodoxy and Values, Based on Aufbruch 2” and 64 “Church-State Relations in Orthodox Countries: Traditions, Innovations and Challenges.” The issue of pluralism is partly analyzed by paper 45 “Religious Pluralism and Inter-religious Dialogue in Post-communist Countries,” but still Orthodox fundamentalism or the impact of globalization on Orthodoxy are almost unexplored.

The Challenges

- New fields that need to be explored and developed: psychology of Orthodoxy (from a taken for granted religion to the possibility of change of religion or the ways of its understanding and practicing), anthropology of Orthodoxy, economics of religion/Orthodoxy, etc.
- The development of interdisciplinary approaches and research teams.
- Lack of uniform terminology used by different sciences and disciplines concerning religion, and more specifically Orthodoxy, e.g. the term “denomination” is used by theologians to distinguish between the different teachings and practices within the same religion. There are three in Christianity: Catholicism, Protestantism and Orthodoxy. Sociologists in America, e.g. Richard Niebuhr and Peter Berger, however, used the term denomination in religious studies to signify “a church rather than a sect, but to which individuals adhere voluntary and which accepts the right of existence of other churches.” (Peter Berger, “Orthodoxy and Global Pluralism” in: *Demokratizatsiya: The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization*, vol. 13, No. 3 (Summer 2005): 440;

Berger, *Religion in .new Europe*, ed. K. Michalsky, Budapest: CEU Press, 2006, 89)

The REVACERN Subarea "Orthodoxy": Sources and methodological suggestions for further work

The subarea covers the next research topics:

- 04. Orthodoxy and Values, Based on Aufbruch 2
- 06. Orthodox Churchliness - Forms of Belonging to the Church
- 21. The Role of Women in Orthodoxy
- 52. Orthodox Monasticism: Development and Role in Society
- 46. Eastern Orthodoxy and European Enlargement
- 64. Church-State Relations in Orthodox Countries: Traditions, Innovations and Challenges
- 65. Geo-Politics of Contemporary Eastern Orthodoxy
- 70. Religious Education in Orthodox Countries

The first four of them are analyzed mainly from the prospective of sociology of religion, combined with methods and approaches from gender studies, anthropology and ethics. The other four give priority to history but also make use of legal, political and social studies as well as Orthodox theology. The proposed topics cover many issues which have never been studied before – Orthodox churchliness, European enlargement and geo-politics. Others have never been studied from specific scientific point of view, e.g. Orthodox monasticism and women from a sociological point of view or on the basis of new sociological data (Aufbruch 2), e.g. Orthodoxy and values. Two of the papers, those on church-state relations and religious education, make use of the available empirical research to propose more general concepts about the specificity of Orthodoxy and to suggest hypotheses or theories that will assist the future studies in these fields. In addition to the attempt to shed light on many unexplored aspects of contemporary Orthodoxy the proposed papers are also characterized by their comparative approach. Each of them deals with a least three Orthodox countries. In short the contribution of "Orthodoxy" subarea could be defined as research on unexplored issues, interdisciplinary approach, and comparative analysis. There are also conditions that facilitate such enterprise. The most important among them include the accessibility to sources, the freedom of doing sociological surveys in the religious sphere (unavailable under communism) and the opportunity to use the achievements of western social sciences and their methodology in the study of religion in Eastern Europe. The project is focused mainly on the post-communist countries which are less studied than those on the other side of the Iron Curtain. Still Greece, and partly Cyprus, is used as reference point in the comparative analysis on the post-communist countries. Another characteristic of the project is its Europe-centered approach. It does not mean that the papers exclude broader geographic areas and developments or important topics as globalization, but they enter in the scope of research only when they are relevant to the concrete topic, e.g. the paper on geo-politics.

There are, however, some serious problems: the lack of critical mass of empirical and case studies on Orthodoxy that will allow us to move to more general conclusions and theories; the shortage of cadres due to underdevelopment of religious studies and the dominance of the traditional discipline based system of higher education and research that impedes interdisciplinarity; the deficit of elaborated terminology among the different sciences dealing with Orthodoxy, e.g. denomination, diocese, bishop, churchliness; the insufficient

state and social support and understanding for the need and profit of such studies; the resistance of Orthodox churches against non-theological studies of Orthodoxy. Finally there are still many topics that need research on empirical level, therefore in the case of subarea “Orthodoxy” some case studies should be supported within the framework of “Exchange Program,” despite they do not fulfill the requirements for comparativeness or as individual papers in the planned workshop on Orthodoxy. In conclusion, the papers form “Orthodoxy” subarea lay grounds for a new branch in religious studies – “Orthodoxy studies, by introducing and analyzing a series of issues of great significance for the understanding of Orthodox Christianity, its present state and problems.