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philosophy, bound up in his Christian faith, enabled him to minister both to his fellow inmates and to those who were charged with keeping and re-educating them.

In summation, perhaps it could be said that two basic features distinguish Țuțea’s philosophy. The first of these is his unique utilization of philosophy and broad cultural learning to compose a wide-ranging Orthodox Christian philosophy. The second is his consistent practice of this philosophy even under the most difficult circumstances.

The author of this book, Alexandru Popescu, is a Bucharest psychologist and an Oxford theologian. He came to know Țuțea when he was a first-year medical student assigned to the floor of the Bucharest hospital on which Țuțea was being treated in 1980. Popescu was drawn to Țuțea’s philosophical preaching, and although it was risky, he continued his relationship with Țuțea for twelve years, eventually finding his own Christian faith under Țuțea’s tutelage.

Systematically describing Țuțea’s philosophy is a difficult task. This is because Țuțea’s disavowed systemization, partly as a reaction against the over-systemization of communist ideology, and partly because of Țuțea’s philosophical position that reality transcends the limits of human rationality and therefore is not susceptible to human systemization. Popescu’s presentation of Țuțea’s philosophy is stylistically analytical but at the same time strangely vague on this account. Popescu does not argue for, nor present Țuțea’s arguments for, Țuțea’s philosophy. Țuțea himself refrained from arguing for his beliefs, presenting them exhortingly rather than argumentatively. Popescu’s description of Țuțea’s prison experiences is also vague, purportedly because Țuțea preferred not to talk about them.

The book itself is nicely laid out, with a map of Romania in the front, a seven-page chronological table comparing Țuțea’s life with other important events in Romanian history, the usual forwards and prefaces, et al., a series of plates located in the center of the book, brief appendices on Romanian history and the Hesychast movement in Romania, a detailed bibliography, and an index. Although the book is paperback, the binding seems very durable. The back cover of the book contains glowing endorsements from such notable figures as Rowan Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Michael Bourdeaux, founder of the Keston Institute at Oxford. The style is that of an intellectual biography, although it proceeds somewhat slowly because of the esoteric nature of Țuțea’s philosophy and experience. That Popescu has thoroughly researched his subject is clearly reflected in the numerous footnotes.

*Petre Țuțea: Between Sacrifice and Suicide* is not a book for the casual reader. It is, however, a well-written book. At times it gets a little bogged down in detail and analysis; at other times it leaves one asking for more specifics. All in all, though, it is a good treatment of someone who appears to be a difficult but interesting philosopher. This book will be of particular interest to those who are interested in Christian resistance to the communist oppression of religion in Eastern Europe, and also to those who are interested in religious perseverance in general. Although it is not a systematic philosophy, it will certainly be of interest to those who are interested in the development of an Eastern Orthodox philosophy. It is also of great interest to those who, like myself, have an interest in Romania.

*Michael S. Jones, editor, Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*


Usually comparisons between the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church among Croats tend to be rather biased affairs, very much at the expense of one of those churches. More often than not the Serbs and their church fare worse. Klaus Buchenau’s book, fortunately does not belong in this category. Despite the fact that the author deliberately undertook a comparative study of the two churches and their roots in their respective societies he succeeded in maintaining a praiseworthy scholarly objectivity, shedding light rather than additional heat on a generally conflictual relationship.
that boiled over in the 1990s. I consider this book as the most comprehensive, most erudite, and most balanced study of the two churches focusing primarily on the period under socialist rule but actually providing a reliable introductory history that gives the reader a dependable insight into the workings of these two churches which are located half-way between Constantinople and Rome to which they ardently gravitated.

German scholarship is proverbially thorough, based on sound linguistic abilities and attention to details and Klaus Buchenau is the product of this proud tradition. The book is based on the author’s doctoral dissertation and hence it begins with a review of previous literature in the field, followed by a consideration of methodological issues and the already mentioned survey of the histories of the Orthodox Church among the Serbs and the Catholic Church among Croats. It will not surprise most readers that these two churches followed entirely different paths of development which would be seen as self-evident if it were not for the remarkable, and now entirely unpopular and frequently denied similarity between the Serbs and Croats.

The pattern of presentation in the book is that the author deals with numerous aspects of church life in separate chapters or sub-topics following a pattern of first presenting the issues within the Serbian Orthodox Church followed by Roman Catholic developments. This provides for a clear comparison as well as the possibility to isolate issues if the reader is unable to read the entire book but wishes to explore a particular aspect, such as their activities during World War II, their response to Communist control, theological education, assistance from abroad, or charitable activities. In addition to the previously available primary and secondary sources the author made use of state archives (available perhaps for the first time), especially minutes and reports of the federal and republican committees on church affairs. Regrettfully neither of the two church’s archives were available to the author but he compensated by the copious use of church publications and the writings of a few Serb or Croat authors who provided thorough historical analyses. If and when church archives become available to researchers we may obtain additional, perhaps corrective information but until then I expect that Buchenau’s investigation will remain authoritative in the way in which Stella Alexander’s *Church and State in Yugoslavia* was for a previous generation.

The major conclusion of the book is that historically and during the communist period both churches deliberately saw themselves as promoters of the national interest of their people which they closely associated with their religious missions. Therefore it is accurate to view them as contributing to the 1990s war between Serbs and Croats, which, while not a part of this book, nevertheless is clearly in the mind of both the author and the reader. Thus the author concludes that the churches definitely contributed to the rise of nationalism that ended so tragically in the recent wars. However, the author also declares that they were not the main manipulators of nationalism; other factors contributed more decisively to the tragedy of the 1990s.

However, the author also declares that they were not the main manipulators of nationalism; other factors contributed more decisively to the tragedy of the 1990s. Buchenau is also helpful in pointing out that certain developments are not simply explainable by conventional answers. For instance, the greater Catholic resistance to Communism than displayed by the Orthodox is frequently described due to traditional caesaro-papism, i.e. subservience of the church to the state than was the case in Catholic lands. True enough, but not enough to explain things well. Buchenau points out that the Catholic Church had significant foreign sources of financial support as well as a greater tradition of community support by church attendance of a celibate clergy with fewer financial needs, while the Orthodox clergy was married and impoverished and living in poorer parts of the country thus the Orthodox hierarchs had to depend more on the state’s willingness to provide a unstedy measure of support which, naturally, subjected the church to greater state pressures for accommodation.

On the other hand, the traditionally more extensive theological education of Catholic priests and the steadier adherence to church authority by lay Catholics as well as the ability of the hierarchy to resist pressures by explaining it as a matter of ecclesial loyalty to the pope as well as Yugoslavia’s need to court Western countries gave the Catholic church both more moral and financial support in its resistance to Communist authorities while the Orthodox Church had no such ally abroad; Orthodox sister churches were frequently in even greater trouble than they.
The book is also a great source for the examination of several other sub-themes. Among them are the role of the Orthodox Bishop Nikolaj Velimirovic (who lived after World War II in exile) and the theologian Justin Popovic (who lived in house arrest in a Serbian monastery) who fueled an anti-Western near-fundamentalist Orthodoxy that influenced an entire group of contemporary Serbian Orthodox bishops. Another is the Macedonian Orthodox Church schism and the American diocesan schism under bishop Dionisije, and finally the role of the Serbian Orthodox church in prodding the Serbs to an awareness of the fate of the Kosovo Serbs that eventually fueled Serbian nationalism to a frenzied state by the use of Kosovo mythology.

On the Catholic side the author deals with the Alojzije Cardinal Stepinac controversy and its role in solidifying Croat nationalist feeling behind the Catholic Church and the very skillful navigation by the Catholic hierarchy of anniversary celebrations of Marian and Eucharistic congresses that brought a mass influx of people back to the Church as an expression of their ethnoreligiosity. Buchenau also examines briefly the support by the Catholic Church leaders of the rising movement of Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica (Croatian Democratic Union) under the leadership of Franjo Tudjman. Buchenau raised the question of Serbian Orthodox victims to ustaša genocides during World War II and the Catholic hierarchy’s unwillingness to express apologies or regrets which Orthodox hierarchs frequently requested of them. Only Bishop Alfred Pichler, bishop of Banja Luka in Bosnia-Herzegovina, issued a statement of regret. I am somewhat surprised that Buchenau did not press this issue but did engage in a short discussion whether the number of claimed victims during World War II by the Serb side is exaggerated and concludes that the much smaller numbers proposed by some Croats is more accurate. That may well be so, though more work is necessary to establish the extent of the World War II genocides. But the question is, what made the Catholic bishops so unwilling to condemn the genocides, their Catholicism or their Croatianism? There are a whole slew of other topics to be found in this extensive treatment: the role of the association of priests, the use of punitive taxation by the state to control non-cooperative priests, the role of the Concordat between the Vatican and the Yugoslav state, and so forth.

In my opinion no serious scholar of religion of the former Yugoslavia will be able to by-pass this book without seriously impairing her/his ability to understand this complex issue. It would be highly desirable to have an English translation of this book in order to make it available to a wider circle of readers. The question only is its marketability as its readers would be primarily graduate students and scholars in the field. It would fit well the mission of a university press.

Paul Mojzes, Rosemont College


Written by a sociologist of religion who teaches at the University of Sarajevo, in the School of Political [Social] Sciences, this work grows out of the author’s attempt to come to grips with the role played by the various religions in the Bosnian war of 1992-1995, but it also attempts to examine the larger issue of the interrelationship of religion and war.

As a sociologist Cvitković begins with an observation about religion in Bosnia and Herzegovina that sets the stage for the entire analysis to follow. Among the various factors that differentiate people in Bosnia and in other parts of Europe – traits such as religion, culture, traditions – in most of Europe language is the most important factor in defining national differences. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, on the other hand, where linguistic differences are not significant, religion plays the largest role in social differentiation. Furthermore, “it is on this basis that the consciousness of the fundamental identity between religious affiliation and ethnic group is formed,” even though in other parts of the former Yugoslavia the connection is not as close (9; all translations by reviewer).

The layout of the book follows from this initial observation. Cvitković begins by looking at different religions/confessions before the war, and then examines the role of religion in situations of social conflict. Several chapters are devoted to methodological questions before he once again