National and Ecclesial Legitimacies between Austro-Marxism and Revolutionary Discourse

at the Beginning of the 20th Century in Romania

Ovidiu Panaite

1. Argument

The present study contains a significant challenge related to the need to reinterpret the concept of identity by valuing and acknowledging a type of non-urban spirituality without radicalizing attitudes. The rural spirituality, the so complex portrait of the rural man, creates the premises of a memory-type Christianity, representing the national spine and understanding the national identity in a more extensive frame than the situational offer.

A crucial issue is the proper use of the operational terms: nation, faith, nationalism, identity, patriotism, ethnic and ecclesial unity, sociology and national becoming. In a classic definition, the nation is a stable community, historically constituted as a state, based on linguistic, territorial, economic, and psychological unity, manifested in the national cultural specificity and in the awareness of common origins and destiny. The question of how the Romanians have ethnically identified in time can receive multiple answers.[1]

The definition of a nation can lead to controversy. There are two main outlooks on nation: the first one considers the nation to exist in the concrete reality, while the second one considers the nation a cultural artefact, which cannot be considered a virtual existence (the theory of nation as an invented community). There are also two main theories in defining a nation: the French theory equals *state* and *nation*, while the German theory states that *parts of a nation can live outside a state's borders*.

We find definitions of national states in Ukraine, Lithuania, and Croatia, three new states self-defined as national, in the ethnic meaning of the word, in order to defend themselves. The second group of states, the civic nations, do not define themselves as national states, but they regulate the nation's right by using constitutional regulations, stating that the power comes from the nation. Such states are Belgium, France, Poland, and Slovakia. Other states differentiate between nation and people, for example, Spain, Estonia, Hungary, and Greece. Some states do not mention the nations on their territory, but the people living there: Andorra, Czechia, Austria, Germany, Switzerland, Fin-

land, Portugal, and Sweden. A last group of states do not define themselves as national and do not speak in the name of people: Bosnia, Herzegovina, Cyprus, Denmark, Lichtenstein, Luxembourg, Norway, the Netherlands, Serbia, Montenegro, and Macedonia.[2]

2. Identity: Historical, Experienced, Acknowledged and Accepted

The national identity has a genesis that a historian can rigorously reconstruct, and it is not at all a myth. The recourse to *national specificity* (a way of being and feeling, the people's nature, traditions, etc.) was compromised many times in history. For the Romanians, the most recent compromise occurred during Ceauşescu's regime, when the *Romanians' nature* was invoked to create the impression that democratic forms are not appropriate for the Romanians. The national identity is not a feature similar to other national features, but something that exists and manifests itself in the other features. Concerning this aspect, Father Dumitru Stăniloae writes that religion is not a surface element; it is an element conferring deep meaning to the entire national heritage: *the entire life of a nation bears the seal of religion*. Father Stăniloae prudently highlights the nation's contents as a concept; the premises of his approach is that the nation, a natural given, becomes an authentic spiritual existence within Christianity. The world is made of nations, natural entities, but they contain a supernatural component, as God's creations restored by Jesus Christ. Contradicting other authors, Father Stăniloae expresses his disagreement with the fact that a nation is defined only by language and territory. He does not deny these essential elements: *the language, as ideas, ideals, and feelings specific to people, is a vital element for a nation by mirroring a specific type of soul. A Romanian will express a specific soul even in a foreign language, while a foreigner speaking Romanian cannot express things as Romanians do until they acquire a Romanian soul*.[3] The specific soul structure is essential in depicting a nation. Any historical, geographical, and hereditary element in this soul structure determines its later development. Equal to the intensity of various needs, we feel the need for being ourselves, expressing a specific identity, with the self and with others. We satisfy this need by placing ourselves in a space (a particular place) and within a time (a specific history). The nation is not determined by social, political, or economic heredity; the foundation layer is understood and defined in spiritual, theological heredity: *the fathers ate sour grapes, but the children's teeth are set on the edge*, Eucharistic consanguinity.

Søren Kierkegaard transformed the cultural acknowledgement of identity into the key to understanding human life. The identity passes from individualizing *personal existence* to individualizing *communal existence*. Herder highlighted the cultural specificity of nations and set is as a cornerstone to the interpretation of history. Identity is invoked to criticize specific groups (the Germans are rigid, the Englishmen are gentlemen, or the Romanians always get by). Some uses of *national identity* are *ideological*. To say that a nation loves freedom but chooses tyrants, that it wants justice while it tolerates poverty, that it is creative when it does not solve its issues, or to say that a nation is united,

when some individuals pass to another community on the first occasion, all these are ideological uses. Constantin Noica coined the phrase *the Romanian sense of being*.[4] We observe the fact, also confirmed by the historical and psycho-sociological research, that identity does not appear suddenly either for a person or for a community. Christianity is the eyes with which Romania sees the world. To establish policies according to the spiritual portrait of a nation means a guarantee of duration, the path for the political act to become an actualization and propagation frame for the asynchronous factors and an order in harmony with divine guidance, as the sociologist Ilie Bădescu shows.[5] Related to the construction of the concept of identity, Vasile Băncilă contended that *the nation (the homeland) is a time shaped by history*.

There are many examples of group identities. To show how the Romanians' identity emerged, we need to define it first. The simplest definition may be: the identity is the Romanians' common way of being and feeling, based on several characteristics: language, faith (Christianity), origins, culture (spiritual creations and adjacent institutions), territory, and traditions.[6]

According to facts, we must distinguish between the *experienced identity*, depending on the historical events, the *identity assumed* by a community, and the *identity recognized* by others. Often hijacked by ideological controversies, the national identity must be always based on accurate facts. These facts are the nation's test. Another difference exists between the *historical identity*, based on past facts, and the *present identity*, is based on new facts. The present identity mostly depends on the historical identity, sometimes as a prolongation thereof, other times as an occultation through discontinuities. The national identity emerged as a historical outcome through interaction in time and as a way to perceive and assume history.[7]

3. The Romanians between the Non-Identity Austro-Marxism in the West and *Homo Sovieticus* in the East

THE 20TH century is the century of social doctrine. At the beginning of the century, revolutionary ideas were not circulating. In Europe, the Treaty of Vienna (1815) temporary restored the privileges of authoritarian monarchies. However, the supporters of the revolution remain active, even if clandestine or exiled. For them, the political revolution in 1789 gave people the illusion of change. It led to plutocracy, a profoundly unequal political system governed by significant fortunes based on human exploitation.[8]

Thus, it was necessary to continue preaching *a social revolution*, the new movement for the future configuration of European development. Limited in the beginning to some conspiracy theorists, faithful to the thinking of Gracchus Babeuf, the revolutionary path started to gain adepts. We refer here to authors such as Louis Auguste Blanqui (a political agitator determined to destroy the bourgeoisie) and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon

(who wanted to defend the total freedom of the individual against the authorities and to achieve a socialist democracy, seen as a workers' democracy). Karl Marx, ten years younger than Proudhon, found inspiration in these visions.

The end of the 19th century's main feature are the *revolutionary speeches*, starting from Nietzsche's scepticism to an extensive range of activism. These attitudes' adepts gather around a common creed: *the source of all injustice is maintaining authority structures with an arbitrary influence on people and natural groups*. They instigate not only to fight against the bourgeoisie, but also to destroy the political, social, economic, and cultural institutions, which, in their vision, alienated the human freedom: the state, the Church, the property regime, the army, the academies, all the authorities enslaving the humans.

Intellectuals like Max Stirner and Friedrich Nietzsche express this new attitude in philosophy. The anarchist movement characterizes the end of the 20th century in Europe. When moving toward the realities of the Romanian people's evolution in such a complicated religious, political, and economic European landscape, at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the Great Union's process appears in a new light, which shows a powerful connection between people and faith and between Church and nation, an aspect not met in Europe at that time. Moreover, the Austrian socialists were the authors of a very original Marxist interpretation, *placing the nation at the core of the revolutionary project*. This popular current in the Austro-Hungarian Empire is called Austro-Marxism. Its representatives are Karl Renner (1870–1950) and Otto Bauer (1881–1938), contemporary with the Romanian Great Union. Austro-Marxism proposes *the separation between nation and state* and between Church and state. In their opinion, the solution resides in *eliminating any territorial reference from the nations* and creating *open communities* grouped around cultural, social, or religious affinities but lacking a defining criterion. Following the theory of self-determination, each person would have had the possibility to choose their nation.

Therefore, to the West the Romanians encountered the so-called open non-identity communities, a sort of federalism, with no territorial reference. In exchange, in the East there began to emerge the mutations of an entire world and of a whole century caused by the revolutionary Marxism and, after 1917, by the Bolshevik revolution.

4. Between Criticism and Construction: Rădulescu-Motru, Blaga, Stere and Culianu

Ioan Petru Culianu (1950–1991) formulates a critique called the *enemies of capitalism*, where he does not hesitate to single out renowned scholars. The Romanian historical studies, says Culianu, did not factor in the work of Max Weber. He contends that there was only one historical school in Romania, belonging to N. Iorga (1871–1940), who supported the idea of a primordial socio-cultural tradition and historical devolution: in the beginning, the honest and enterprising Romanians lived in harmony, and were later undermined, infested and, in the end, destroyed by foreign interventions

(Hungarian, Turkish, Russian, Jewish, etc.).[9] The diversification of the fundamental principle of cultural tradition takes three distinct and independent forms: to the left, the *Poporanism* (nativism), in Culianu's opinion, a derivation of socialism identifying the national identity with the cultural identity; in the center, the vision of Iorga's *Sămănătorul* (The Sower) journal; the extreme right is the Iron Guard, which, combining the socialist Poporanism, Iorga's reformism, Orthodoxy and anti-Semitism (reduced to its non-racial, economic and cultural dimension), intended to create the New Man, a *restitutio ad integrum*, at the beginning of history, uncorrupted by foreigners.[10]

A moment occured at the beginning of the 20th century and coloring the Romanian landscape concerns the political refuge of Constantin Stere (1865–1936) from Bessarabia. Arrived in Iaşi in 1892, Stere establishes the Poporanist movement (the translation of the Russian *narodnichevstvo*). Stere cooperates with the magazine *Contemporanul*—suspended in 1891 and reinvented in 1893 as *Evenimentul literar* (The Literary Event)—, forbidden in Russia for supporting the peasants' revolutionary ideas. The aim was to enlighten the masses and support moral art. Unlike Marxism, Poporanism was not a political and economic doctrine. In Stere's vision, Poporanism is a disposition of the soul involving *unequalled love for the nation* because it is the only one that is correct in any historical circumstances. Starting with 1906, together with G. Ibrăileanu, Stere publishes a crucial review, *Viaţa românească* (Romanian Life), which together with *Evenimentul literar* will become a program melting the differences between the political and cultural groups.[11] The quintessence is as follows: *for a representative culture and political life, we must address the sovereign nation, which is a cultural entity, not an ethnic entity.* This affirmation is the source of the effort to define the cultural constants that are the essence and the distinctive features of the Romanian nation: from the simple remark that something *exists* to establishing that *something*.[12] The accent falls more on the rural communities' presentation (also the rural parishes, built on the same inner algorithm) as *natural groups*.[13]

The literary jewel of *Viaţa românească* was *Sămănătorul*, built within Iorga's spiritual and cultural environment. The historian was chairman of *Sămănătorul* from 1903 to 1906. The program supported the achievement of a culture affirming a nation's soul in a form adequate for the culture of that time: a national culture in synchronicity with Western culture. The adepts of Poporanism and Sămănătorism interpret Romania's moves in a cultural key: since the peasants are the significant population, the national soul is rural, and its expressing culture must go toward rurality.[14] This type of vision will be assimilated by the interwar cultural elite, becoming a program. Lucian Blaga will express it in 1937 in his reception speech to the Academy.

N. Iorga, talking about Mihail Kogălniceanu, found the best formula to define Romanian thinking: organic realism. This formula will become an interpretative matrix for future generations of researchers, scholars, and philosophers, and an exigency for the relation between hermeneutics and the concrete geographical space. Nae Ionescu, five years older than Blaga,C. Rădulescu-Motru's assistant, fruitfully determined the passage from Maiorescu's and P. P. Negulescu's academic philosophy to a Romanian philosophy capable of offering Eliade and Cioran to the world.

In 1936, Lucian Blaga (1895–1961) became a member of the Romanian Academy with a reception speech delivered one year later, on 5 June 1937. He chose a topic that resonated with him and caught King Carol II's attention (Carol II chose Blaga's speech from three proposed speeches). The speech highlighted *the village's spiritual structure* (our stylistic matrix) to Dumitru Stăniloae, Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, Nicolae Iorga and Nae Ionescu. The village is perceived as a living and dynamic organism, internalized as inner experience:

> *The village lives in me more vividly, as a living experience . . . In its most hidden layers, my soul was formed under the influence of those anonymous powers, which I scholarly name "stylistic determinants" of the collective life.*[15]

The relation between childhood and village is expressed in terms of maximum interiority:

> *Childhood in the country seems the only great childhood . . . the childhood and the village complete each other . . . because, while it is true that the village is the most appropriate and fecund childhood environment, it is also true that the village, in its turn, supremely blossoms in the child's soul.*[16]

Organized around the Church and the graveyard:

> *I saw the village . . . around God and the departed ones . . . Each village is the center of the world, similar to each man placing himself at the world's center. It is the only way to explain the vast horizon of folk creation in poetry, art, and faith, a feeling participating in everything, the certainty of creation, the abundance of subtexts and nuances, the infinite resonant implications, and the continuous spontaneity.*[17]

In Blaga's consciousness, the village is in the center of the world and continues a myth in a cosmic destiny; this is its latent consciousness. Concluding the antithetical comparison between the urban and the rural civilization, Blaga remarks:

> *To live in the city means to live in a fragmented space, . . . to live in the country means to live in the cosmic horizon and within the consciousness of a destiny coming from eternity . . . I thought that at night the stars come closer to the village . . .* [18]

In his studies, Blaga constantly expounds a Romanian sense of destiny.

While the 19th century represented the legitimation of nations as substances manifesting national sovereignty, the 20th century became the time for the nations' struggle for historical existence.[19] Therefore, discourses place two elements face to face: *legitimation* and *selection*. In this context, in 1936, C. Rădulescu-Motru (1868–1957) asked if the concept of Romanian spirituality is legitimized in relation with other similar elements: nationalism, irredentism, patriotism, autochthonism, ethnicism, etc. because it was another element manifesting the organic reality of spirit and nation. Europe changed in the

19th century into a continent of spiritual dilettantism, its nations competing in building a future inspired by contemporary times. Therefore, this century amounts to baseless national spirituality. Romanian spirituality is not of this type.[20] It has a new nature, with no precedent in our history. As C. Rădulescu-Motru shows, *spirituality is the unique soul climate containing the tendency towards a transcendent absoluteness*,[21] while Romanian spirituality is *a manifestation of the Romanian historical reality*.[22]

5. From Autocephaly to Patriarchy

The state unity achieved on 1 December 1918 also brought modifications in the ecclesial organization. The most critical issue to be solved was connected to the ecclesial administrative unification under the Bucharest Holy Synod's coordination. On 23 April 1919, the Orthodox hierarchy of the Metropolitan See of Transylvania declared the Transylvanian Synod's dissolution, asking for inclusion in the Synod of Bucharest. This event required identifying the new organization and functioning principles of the Church to ensure the solving of all ecclesial issues. The commission that dealt with the proceedings worked the entire year of 1919 to devise a future ecclesial organizational regulation. The Organic Statute (1868) of Andrei Şaguna attracted the commission's attention. The Statute had two fundamental principles: autonomy from the state, protection from any secular authority, and synodality (cooperation between the clerics—1/3—and laypeople—2/3—in deciding on ecclesial matters).[23]

In parallel with the commission's works, the first Transylvanian Priest' Congress after the union of 1918 took place, after preparations made by a committee run by the historian Ioan Lupaş (1880–1967), a dean of Sălişte a Sibiului. The Congress met on 6–8 March 1919, with an impressive number of clerics and laypeople. Among the papers presented there, we highlight the work of Dean Gheorghe Ciuhandu (1875–1947), who, for the first time, firmly affirmed the necessity of a Romanian Patriarchate: "The unification of Romanian Orthodox Churches in a single Romanian Orthodox Church and its relation to the State."[24]

The hierarchical Synod of the Romanian Orthodox Metropolitan See of Transylvania decided:

> *I. The Romanian Orthodox Church in Transylvania, Banat and the Romanian lands in Hungary, with great joy, returns to the Romanian Orthodox Church . . . , from which it was separated in difficult times, and renews its unity with the Metropolitan See of Ungrovlachia, desiring to be part of the mother Church of Romania united to Bessarabia and Bukovina.*
>
> *II. In this regard, our episcopate reverently asks the episcopal Holy Synod in Bucharest to welcome with brotherly love all the bishops in our Metropolitan See among the members of the Episcopal Synod, in their hierarchical order.*
>
> *III. Our Synod takes note of the necessity for a uniform Church organization in the entire country, introducing an autonomy perfected on the basis of 50 years of ecclesial-constitutional experience. We also recognize the necessity to admit laymen in the administrative,*

cultural, financial, humanitarian, social and electoral ecclesial formations and support the priests', bishops', and ecclesial synod's hierarchical rights as the supreme authority of the Church.

IV. Until a uniform organization, our Metropolitan See shall maintain its organization based on the Organic Statute and as an integral part of the Romanian Church in the unified Romanian state.state.[25]

During the debates of June 1919, the commission from Sinaia presided by the Metropolitan Pimen Georgescu of Moldavia established the following crucial points:

I. To declare the hierarchical and canonical unity of the Romanian Orthodox Church in all reunited provinces of the country and begin its work with the supreme forum of ecclesial leadership, the Holy Synod.

II. Based on the reunification principle, to summon to the following meeting of the Holy Synod all the hierarchs of the Romanian Orthodox Church, from all the provinces, as members with historical rights.

III. To start the debate over the canonical and autonomous ecclesial organization, from representative, administrative, legislative, and jurisdictional points of view, from the Organic Statute of the Transylvanian Romanian Orthodox Metropolitan See.[26]

The Holy Synod meeting in Bucharest on 30 December 1919 acknowledged the commissions' work and approved the desideratum of hierarchical and canonical unity of the Romanian Church. Besides the ecclesial organisms' efforts towards ecclesial unification, several cultural personalities contributed to clarifying some issues important for the future of the Church.[27] In this regard, N. Iorga,[28] Alexandru Lapedatu and Simion Mehedinţi constantly supported the necessity of a Romanian Patriarchate based on considerations outside the ecclesial sphere.[29] In 1919–1924, the voices supporting the idea of future Patriarchate became more numerous.

The Holy Synod met in Bucharest at the end of 1924 and completed the discussions only in February 2005; it debated transforming the Romanian Church into a patriarchy. Based on the entire file documenting this issue, and especially on the proposal of Metropolitan Pimen Georgescu of Moldavia, the Synod members unanimously approved the Patriarchate. Nectarie Cotlarciuc of Bukovina expressly stated:

The Metropolitan See of Ungrovlahia, with the Metropolitan residing in Bucharest, must become a Patriarchate; the Metropolitan of Ungrovlahia, who is also the president of the Holy Synod, must be the Patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church, with the residence in Bucharest.[30]

The civil state authority also approved the proposal; in the end, Vartolomeu Stănescu, the bishop of Râmnic (1875–1954), read the Official Founding Act of the Romanian Patriarchate. On 1 November 1925, Miron Cristea (1868–1939), the former Archbishop and Metropolitan of Ungrovlachia, became the first Patriarch.

6. Orthodox Priests from Alba de Jos (Alsó-Fehér) County As Titular Delegates to the Great Union

The documents list 36 delegates from Alba de Jos County, among which seven Orthodox priests, twelve lawyers, four landlords, one furrier, one ensign, one praetor, one Greek Catholic priest—Alexandru Nicolescu, one professor, one botanist, one engineer, one physician, one pharmacist, two miners, one economist; the archpriest of Alba Iulia was Ioan Teculescu.[31]

1. *Electoral circle of Vinţu de Jos:* Iuliu Maniu, Ph.D., lawyer, Blaj; Zaharie Muntean, Ph.D., lawyer; Ioan Marciac, Ph.D., lawyer; Vasile Haţegan, Ph.D., landlord;Virgil Haţegan, Ph.D., landlord, all from Alba Iulia.

2. *Ighiu circle:* Ioan Pop, Ph.D., lawyer, Alba Iulia; Mihail Costea, landlord, Sohodol; Pompiliu Piso, landlord, Cărpiniş; Emanuil Beşa, landlord, Zlatna; Ioachim Totoian, landlord, Miceşti; and as substitute: Francisc Botean, landlord, Barabanţi.

3. *Aiud circle:* Candin Suciu, priest, Măjina; Aurel Sava, Ph.D., praetor, Teiuş; Alexandru Nicolescu, Ph.D., canonic; Ştefan Dragoş, industrialist, both from Blaj; George Bărbat Jr., administrator, Blaj-Sat; and as substitutes: Nicolae Radu, administrator, Tâmpahaza; Gavriil Raţiu, landlord, Teiuş; Victor Macaveiu, Ph.D., professor; Dănilă Sabo, PhD., lawyer, both from Blaj; Ioan Puşcaş Jr., administrator, Blaj-Sat.

4. *Abrud circle:* Laurenţiu Pop, Ph.D., lawyer; Alexandru Borza, Ph.D., physician; Candin David, Ph.D., lawyer, all from Abrud; Mateiu Moruşca, landlord, Presaca; Alexandru Vasinca, miner; Alexandru Bureştean, miner, both from Roşia Montană.

5. *Electoral circle of Alba Iulia:* Joachim Fulea, lawyer; Virgil Vlad, pharmacist; Alexandru Fodor, Ph.D., physician; Aurel Stoica, engineer; Camil Velican, lawyer; and as substitutes: Nicolae Cadariu, priest; Antoniu Cricovean, landlord, all from Alba Iulia.

6. *Ocna circle:* Ioan Dordea, Ph.D., lawyer; Nicolae Cristea, Ph.D., lawyer; Isaia Popa, priest; Alexandru Vidrighinescu, landlord; Eugen Pantea, landlord, all from Ocna.

7. *Mureş-Uioara circle:* Iuliu Morariu, Ph.D., lawyer; Petru Roşea, priest; Marian Dreghici, ensign, all from Uioara; Ştefan Roşian, professor; Ionel Pop, Ph.D., lawyer, both from Blaj.

We present a set of synthetic information aiming at building micro-biographies of some personalities actively involved in the discussed history. They represent a mentality which includes the contemporary components: national project, confessional project and others.

Emanoil Beşa, an Orthodox priest from Zlatna, Alba de Jos County, delegated by the Ighiu circle, originating from Prundu Bârgăului, born in 1870 and died on 7 February 1919. He was born in Prundu Bârgăului (Bistriţa-Năsăud). He attended primary school in his native locality, and then he enrolled in the military high school in Năsăud. He completed his university studies at the Faculty of Theology in Sibiu. He started his professional activity as a schoolmaster in Poiana Sibiului, being later ordained and settled as a priest in Zlatna, where he worked between 1896 and 1919. He strongly asserted himself here as a good scholar and lover of Romanians. The Hungarian authorities pursued him for a

very long time for this reason. On 1 October 1916, he was arrested, together with his son Eugen, escorted by four gendarmes to Abrud, where they walked them on the city's streets for eight days, to be jeered, spat at and mocked. From here, they took them to Odorhei prison. At the trial, on 2 January 1917, he was accused of nationalist attitude during a deputy election from 1904 and convicted to 6 months in prison; he was imprisoned in Becicherecu Mare (Zrenjanin). He was released on 1 July 1917, but his heart disease contracted during detention ended his life too early (he died on 7 February 1919).[32] In light of his activity, Emanoil Beşa was elected among the five titular delegates of the Ighiu circle.

Ioachim Totoian (12 September 1874–30 March 1919) was born in Micești commune, Alba County. He was a priest in his native commune. His merits as a priest and a Romanian were widely recognized in the region. He was selected among the five titular representatives of the Ighiu electoral circle at the Great National Assembly from Alba Iulia for these remarkable merits. He died soon after the Great Union, on 30 March 1919, in Micești commune.

Candin Suciu (1 January 1872, Măgina, Alba County–1958, Măgina), participated at the Great Union as a titular delegate for the Aiud circle. Born as the son of Constantin Suciu, the Orthodox priest from Măgina, Candin Suciu attended primary school and the first high-school classes at Bethlen High-School in Aiud. He continued his high-school studies in Blaj, and then he enrolled at the Theological Academy in Sibiu, being ordained a priest on 6 December 1901. Between 1893 and 1901 he was a schoolmaster at the village school, and from 1902 until 1943, when he retired, he served at the parish church in Măgina. He married Maria Truță from Sâncel and had nine children: three boys and six girls.

After the ordination, he asserted himself as a distinguished scholar. The leading Romanian Transylvanian writers and poets from the beginning of the 20th century cherished him, some of them also being his friends. Besides this, there was an address of the ASTRA Association Aiud-Teiuș Department, asking the priest Candin Suciu on 13 November 1908 to teach an "educational course to illiterate adults in order to teach them to read and write."

Before the First World War and during it, he compensated for the lack of teachers at the village school. Moreover, in this period, he worked as a teacher of religion (catechist) at Bethlen High-School in Aiud. He actively fought against the national oppression policy promoted by the government in Budapest by participating in manifestations occasioned by the Memorandum activists' trial held in Cluj in 1894. Because of his political-national attitude, he was arrested in 1916 and placed in internment close to Sopron, until the fall of 1918. He was one of the titular delegates of the electoral circle of Aiud to the Great National Assembly from Alba Iulia. After the Great Union he continued to carry out a valuable Romanian patriotic activity, as Orthodox priest in his village. Noting the lack of teachers, after fulfilling the national goal, he worked as a teacher, simultaneously administrating the newly founded Orthodox Parish of Aiud. At his initiative and with the villagers' contribution, the village's elementary school opened in 1920 on land donated by the Orthodox Church in Măgina. In 1920, again at the priest's initiative, a monument was built to the fallen heroes of the First World War. The current parish church was built due to the efforts of the same priest Candin Suciu, between 1931 and 1940, on the old stone church

site from 1790. After retiring, he continued to serve the altar, together with the new parson, Father Vasile Avram, a son of the village, until 10 September 1958, when he died.[33]

Matei Moruşca (19 February 1890, Cristeşti village, Întregalde commune, Alba de Jos County–16 January 1979), a priest in Presaca Ampoiului, was one of the delegates who represented the Abrud circle. Before being appointed as a full-time teacher, Matei Moruşca served as a substitute priest in the Orthodox parish of Şeica Mică, Sibiu County. Later, he was a teacher in Presaca Ampoiului, Alba de Jos County, where he worked within the Teachers' Association, which he represented at the Great National Assembly of Alba Iulia, as a rightful member. His elder brother was the first bishop of the Romanians in America, Policarp (Pompei) Moruşca (1883–1957). A younger brother, Aurel Moruşca, participated in the Great Assembly of Alba on 1 December 1918.[34] Through his mother, Ana, born Cado, he comes from another family of Transylvanian priests that continues up to German Popoviciu, who was a parson in Pâclişa between 1762 and 1784. His wife, Aurelia, born Nicola, comes from the family of Nicola Ursu (Horea). Between 17 October 1946 and 30 April 1947, he secretly held the writer Nichifor Crainic in the parish house from Iclandul Mare, because he was the object of an arrest warrant.

Alexandru Nicolescu, Greek Catholic priest, born in Tulgheş (Gyergyótölgyes), Ciuc (Csík) County, currently Harghita County, on 8 July 1882. He studied in Reghin, Blaj, and in 1898–1904 in Rome, at the Propaganda Fide College, where he earned his Ph.D. in Theology and Philosophy. He returned to Blaj; then, he was sent as a missionary in North America. He was a moral theology professor at the Theological Academy in Blaj and a canon in the archbishopric chapter. During the First World War, he refused to sign the Declaration of loyalty to Austria-Hungary, so he was considered a traitor by the authorities. In 1919, he was sent as an ecclesiastical and political missionary at the Paris Peace Conference, and, on this occasion, he had significant contributions to the delineation of the current western borders of Romania. He was fluent in English, French and Italian. His disease, the beginning of the Second World War in August 1939, and the loss of Northern Transylvania in the summer of 1940, sped up his death. On 5 June 1941 (the Thursday before Pentecost), he died a little before the war in the east began on 22 June.

7. Conclusions

The introduction of modern culture with the individualist type in the religious experience has, as a consequence, a subjective relation between Christianity and the religious tradition. Michel de Certeau and Jean-Marie Domenach characterized the new cultural relation caused by secularization, which appears as a tension between faith and institutional affiliation. Supposedly, through the long process of secularization, the religious function of symbols disappears. In that case, they are still valid, but valued in other fields: the development of aesthetic creations, the legitimization of some political movements, the participation in the definition and orientation of cultural domains, and the justification of some ethical positions, without this corpus of symbols, attached to some religious significations.[35] Modern religiosity, under the sign of indi-

vidualism, spread widely in Europe. The French case proves the orientation of this type of individualism towards vibrant communities or a new laicity. In this perspective, God is no longer a person, but only an impersonal and superior force, and the adhesion to Christianity is the acceptance of a code that might contain a set of moral values.[36]

The case of Belgium is similar; we witness here a restructuring of the faith, starting from the same data of individualism, scepticism and relativization. Studies in the sociology of religion proved the existence of some combinations between the traditional practices of faith and various mystical-esoteric movements, in which the decisional act is at the periphery of an individual's freedom, offering numerous options. All of them build collective systems of significations, which will manifest later in an autonomous mode, creating some cultural faiths, similar to those imagined by Grace Davie: "believing without belonging."[37]

Empowerment creates a favorable climate for the proliferation of micro-groups or micro-communities based on systems of social, cultural, and spiritual interest. We can identify the character of cultural modernity behind such options, which does not accept Church-type groups, the individual's freedom manifesting itself in the cult-type spirituality. This persistence of the antimodern protestant dimension follows the parallelism determined by the apparition and evolution of new religious communities in Europe and by the economic, social, and cultural crisis of 1970. All these practices are part of a modern and rational logic of *do ut des*, oriented toward *Wertrationalität* (rationality oriented towards value) more than toward *Zweckrationalität* (rationality oriented towards aims). Romania evolved in a mottled landscape, if we consider the Great Powers' interests in the area. Whether we speak about the pressure of non-identity Austro-Marxism in the West or the constraints to accept the revolutionary discourse from the beginning of the 20th century in the East, the rural spirituality was the catalyst, the coagulant of the Romanian people's energies. Blaga captures, perhaps the best, the essence of these types of energies capable of creation, stability, and perspective.

❑

Notes

1. Andrei Marga, *Identitate națională și modernitate* (Brașov: Libris Editorial, 2018), 122–123.
2. Iain McLean and Alistair McMillan, eds., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, 3rd edition (Oxford–NewYork: Oxford University Press, 2009).
3. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Ortodoxie și naționalism* (Bucharest: Supergraph, 2011), 12–18.
4. Constantin Noica, *Sentimentul românesc al ființei* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1996).
5. Ilie Bădescu, *Sociologie noologică: Ordinea spirituală a societății: Strat și substrat sufletesc* (Bucharest: Mica Valahie, 2007), 336.
6. Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Identitatea românească: Felul de a fi român de-a lungul timpului* (Bucharest: Contemporanul, 2016), 17.
7. Gabriel Bărbuleț, "The Ethnography of Speaking and the Structure of Conversations," *Annales Universitatis Apulensis* (Alba Iulia), ser. *Philologica* 8, 2 (2007): 261–264.

8. Olivier Nay, *Istoria ideilor politice*, translated by Vasile Savin (Iaşi: Polirom, 2008), 539.
9. Ioan Petru Culianu, "Duşmanii capitalismului," in *Mircea Eliade*, 3rd edition, rev. and enl., translated by Florin Chiriţescu and Dan Petrescu, with a letter of Mircea Eliade and an afterword by Sorin Antohi (Iaşi: Polirom, 2004), 183.
10. Ibid., 184.
11. Z. Ornea, *Viaţa lui C. Stere*, vol. 2 (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1991), 8–9.
12. C. Stere, *Scrieri*, edited by Z. Ornea (Bucharest: Minerva, 1979), 277.
13. Ibid., 361.
14. Culianu, 182.
15. Lucian Blaga, "Elogiu satului românesc," in *Discursuri de recepţie la Academia Română*, edited by Octav Păun and Antoaneta Tănăsescu (Bucharest: Albatros, 1980), 250, 251.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., 252, 254.
18. Ibid., 253, 254.
19. Florin Dobrei, "Frământări confesionale de altădată oglindite în vechi file de Cronică bisericească," in *Vocaţia istoriei: Studii în memoria profesorului Nicolae Boçşan*, edited by Ligia Boldea and Rudolf Gräf (Cluj-Napoca: Mega, 2017), 221–234.
20. Marga, 123.
21. C. Rădulescu-Motru, *Românismul, catehismul unei noi spiritualităţi* (Bucharest: Semne, 2008), 17–18.
22. Ibid., 110–111.
23. Mircea Păcurariu, *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române*, 3rd edition, vol. 3 (Iaşi: Trinitas, 2008), 362–366.
24. Cf. "Congres al preoţimii din Mitropolia românilor ortodocşi din Ardeal, Banat, Crişana, Maramureş, ţinut la Sibiu în zilele de 6/19–8/21 martie 1919," *Analele Asociaţiei Andrei Şaguna a clerului Mitropoliei Ortodoxe din Ardeal, Banat, Crişana şi Maramureş* (Sibiu) (1919): 81–132, quoted in Alexandru Moraru, *Biserica Ortodoxă Română între anii 1885–2000: Biserică. Naţiune. Cultură* (Bucharest: Institutul Biblic şi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 2006), 676.
25. Moraru, 676.
26. Ibid., 106.
27. Niculae Şerbănescu, "Înfiinţarea Patriarhiei Române (1925)," *Biserica Ortodoxă Română* (Bucharest) 93, 11–12 (1975): 1384–1400.
28. "Nu mai putem rămâne cu primaţia," in Antonie Plămădeală, *Contribuţii istorice privind perioada 1918–1939: Elie Miron Cristea: Documente, însemnări şi corespondenţe* (Sibiu: Tiparul Tipografiei Eparhiale, 1987).
29. Tit Simedrea, ed., *Patriarhia românească: Acte şi documente* (Bucharest: Tipografia Cărţilor Bisericeşti, 1926), 12.
30. Ibid., 24–25.
31. *Gazeta Oficială* (Sibiu), nos. 11–12 and 14–15, 1918; Ioan I. Şerban and Nicolae Josan, eds., *Dicţionarul personalităţilor Unirii: Trimişii românilor transilvăneni la Marea Adunare Naţională de la Alba Iulia* (Alba Iulia: Altip, 2003).
32. Sebastian Stanca, *Contribuţia preoţimii române din Ardeal la războiul pentru întregirea neamului (1916–1919)* (Cluj: Institut de Arte Grafice, Editură şi Librărie "Cartea Românească," 1925), 50; Grigore N. Popescu, *Preoţimea română şi întregirea neamului*,

vol. 2, *Temniţe şi lagăre* (Bucharest: Tipografia "Vremea," 1940), 17 (the recounts of the gendarmerie of Zlatna, in 1937).

33. The file is based on Candin Suciu's life information, in a biographical evocation by his son, the lawyer Ioan Suciu, in June 1987.
34. See Silviu Borş, Alexiu Tatu, and Bogdan Andriescu, eds., *Participanţi din localităţi sibiene la Marea Adunare Naţională de la Alba Iulia din 1 Decembrie 1918* (Sibiu: Armanis; Cluj-Napoca: Mega, 2018), 156, 164.
35. Michel de Certeau and Jean-Marie Domenach, *Le Christianisme éclaté* (Paris: Seuil, 1974), 96.
36. Danièle Hervieu-Léger, "Credere nell'ambito della modernità: Aspetti del fatto religioso contemporaneo in Europa," in *La religione*, edited by Frédéric Lenoir and Ysé Tardan-Masquelier, scientific consultant Michel Meslin, editorial coordination Jean-Pierre Rosa, Italian version edited by Paolo Sacchi, vol. 5, *I temi: etica ed escatologia, i comportamenti religiosi, religione e politica* (Turin: UTET, 2001), 533.
37. Grace Davie, "Believing Without Belonging: Is it the Future of Religion in Great Britain?" *Social Compass* 37, 4 (1990): 455–469.

Abstract

National and Ecclesial Legitimacies between Austro-Marxism and Revolutionary Discourse at the Beginning of the 20th Century in Romania

The national identity has a genesis that a historian can rigorously reconstruct, and it is not at all a myth. Identity is closely related to spirituality. Rural communities have best preserved spirituality. This study aims to analyze the Romanian society in the context of a double pressure: the non-indigenous Austro-Marxism in the West and the revolutionary discourse in the East. In the same context of the twentieth century, the Romanian Orthodox Church would become a patriarchy.

Keywords

Austro-Marxism, rural communities, revolutionary discourse, identity