"OVIDIUS" UNIVERSITY-CONSTANŢA

DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

FIELD OF PHD THEOLOGY

Missionary-Pastoral challenges and opportunities of the dialogue between sciences and theology in Contemporaneity

Summary

COORDINATOR: **Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe ISTODOR**

Student – PhD: **Constantin TACHE**

CONSTANŢA

2019

Contents

Introduction. Timeliness and necessity of theme.....3

I. Modern science. Fundamentals 4

II. The attitude of the church towards modern science 6

III. Dialogue between science and theology between complementarity and antagonism.....10

IV. Opportunities for the complementarity of the science-theology dialogue 14

V.17 Research and scientific-theological Dialogue solutions: anthropic principle.....17

Conclusions 19

Selective bibliography.....21

Introduction. Timeliness and necessity of the theme

In the dialogue between theology and science, which takes place in the west on the one hand, and in the Eastern Church, on the other hand, it is admitted that what is lacking is not the qualification and evaluation of the forms of this dialogue, but the dialogue in its essence. It is important to assess the existing historical forms of this dialogue, but more importantly it is the research of the motivations of this dialogue, namely the tension of the relationship between science and theology that has existed so far. This does not mean that the issue of dialogue must be addressed from the perspective of an ad hoc philosophy or by choosing a position. On the contrary, the dialogue between science and theology only makes sense as an existential problem, starting from the immediate interior of the needs of contemporary man. This means that the initial position of any dialogue must begin from investigating this particular way of the human condition that has led to the existence of the counter-apothation of religion and science and, as a result, a whole series of speculations on Relationship between them. This is the fundamental necessity of the proposed theme.

The essence and objective of establishing a relationship between theology and science is to relate two different types of experience in the same human subjectivity and that the internal Division and the internal Division we observe in the tension between science and theology Today is not something that was implanted in the nature of Man as originally created, but rather represents a continuation of the event in Biblical history that we call "the fall". The Divine human image was distorted and its lost integrity, but intrinsically human beings are still unified creatures, having some sort of archetyscopic remembrance of their likenence to God. Therefore, the process of restoring unity in what is meant to be human-related, that is, the Union between the scientific vision and the experience of God, has as its ultimate goal the return to the likenation with God and his entry into union with God through Removal of all divisions in creation. This restoration is not a cultural or academic necessity, but rather an ascetic and spiritual imperative that results from the current human condition and the one that is implanted in the human spirit.

Therefore, we can see that the foundation of a relationship between theology and science can only be found in the depths of the human subject, which is itself a manifestation of the unity of our real experience to incarnate existence in the world. The meeting of Theology and Science

takes place within the headings of human experience, and therefore the fundamental basis for mediating between them is the internal life of human subjectivity, while facing the world through its own personal incarnation in it. Because the particular forms of functioning of human consciousness and the higher faculments of contemplation must leave traces everywhere, that is, in scientific theories and in theological teachings, the purpose of mediation between theology and science can be Understood as the re-discovery of human subjectivity in the scientific speech.

I. Modern science. Fundamentals

Modern science ismore than just a reformulation of the scientific concepts that OCCURRED in the 17th century, but this reformulation of the concepts was radical enough to justification the designation of "Revolution", which is frequently applied to him. It is also possible to speak of Science as an organized social activity. The Modern period witnessed a very large scientific activity. However, it is difficult to distinguish the science of philosophy before the 17TH centuryit itand it is equally difficult to apply the notion of "scientists" during this period. The existence of a Leibniz indicates that the compartmentation of what we now call science was far from being completed at the end of THE 17thcentury. However, until then, western Europe had, not just a few, but whole groups of people who can label themselves as „scientists". There were Well-organized societies where scientists employed in the same activity had an effective communication with a large number of men employed in the same activity.

The TWENTIETH century learns with surprise that the notion of „University" was closely connected with the church. We are accustomed to consider universities as main centres, or at least as among the main centres of scientific research. The situation also met in the Middle Ages, when almost all intellectual activity, including science, was found between the walls of the university. Not only did the universities of Europe have been the scientific points of activity and the Natural Sciences had to develop their own centers of activity independently of universities, but universities were the main opposition centres towards the new nature conception that modern science has built.[1]

[1] W.F. McComas, *The Nature of Science in Science Education: Rationales and Strategies*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, New York, 2002

Most of the research areas of Modern science have similar problems when they analyze the research data they produce. In most cases, there are no standards in the form of format or documentary style. Therefore, research data is generated or saved in different formats, which most often are not consistent semantic and meta-data they are provided incompletely. This applies to most empirical research areas. The research field of materials science can be located in the research Fields group, which performs empirical experiments to obtain new discoveries. The lack of standards in format and the incomplete supply of meta-data prevents the reuse and continuous exploitation of experimental research data to a large extent. Whether it is reused by the same institute/researchers or another, each requires a certain quality of data and their documentation, thus managing data to be able to work with research data. In order to ensure the sustainability of data and the maximum impact of predominantly expensive experiments carried out to generate them, the quality of research data must be ensured.[2]

Experimental research data are often "generated" by informal processes, which are tailored based on the research question. The main funding organisations have emphasised the management of research data in recent years. In 2009, the German Research Foundation (DFG) published a number of recommendations on the management of[3] scientific research data. Within the first recommendation, the term of research data is broadly defined as all data, which are generated during the study of sources, experiments, measurements, surveys and surveys. One important aspect is that scientific research data is considered the Foundation of Scientific publications[4]. Under this definition, each institution is free to choose to what extent and in what state of aggregation the research data will be saved. However, the second recommendation supports the need for domain-specific organisational standards for the management of research data. It is argued that the diverse nature of the different areas of research is reflected in the data and thus the individual requirements for a sufficient Gof data estimate[5].

Matter sciences are very important areas that present a very high interest in science today. Their progress and the discoveries made within them have brought us a bit of clarity regarding the surrounding world. In the context of the dialogue between science and religion, it is important to bring into question the work of Matter Sciences because they have generated a

[2] Heike Neuroth, *Nestor Handbuch*, Verlag Werner Hulsbusch, Boizenburg, 2009, p. 19
[3] *Ibid*
[4] *Recommendations for secure retention and provision of Digital Research Primary Data*, German Research Foundation, Bonn, 2009, p. 32
[5] *Ibid*

number of challenges. Next, we will outline Some aspects of the field of cosmology, mathematics and physics.

The inter-disciplinary approach provides a holistic, unified and objective understanding of the relationship between theology and the sciences of matter and, in general, on all the problems of the world, as it has been expressed in terms less elaborate and in the past, understanding, which, unfortunately, was affected to a minor extent, but with great historical resonance, the intransigent positions of some leaders of the Catholic Church, and to a considerable extent and with great social impact, both the conceptions and Classical and modern evolutionist and materialistic theories.

Inter-disciplinary research always involves dialogue between areas and the real availability of stakeholders involved in research. Brand representatives of their current life manifest their openness in the dialogue with theology, without implying an interference in theological knowledge, but only the availability for dialogue in order to express the complementarity between science and theology. It is true that there are positions of self-sufficiency of some people belonging to the sciences of life that are not open to dialogue, as well as the detention of some theologians in the dialogue with science. It is necessary for theologians who share them to overcome unjustified prejudices and to accept open dialogue with science, even though it is confounded that the world is fallen from the primordial state of perfection, balance in a state of alteration, imbalance, otherwise the realities of this world cannot be understood correctly and deeply only through a knowledge based solely on faith.

Life sciences are particularly important branches for Scientific Research today whereas their development and their progress have brought about an improvement in human life. Many particularly important areas can be brought into question, which have brought various challenges to religious life, but in our approach, we will outline a few aspects of the field of biology, medicine and genetics.

II. The attitude of the church towards modern science

It is widely accepted that Western Christianity had the first profound impact on natural sciences, which subsequently led to the emergence of problems in the relationship between science and religion from a cultural, academic and ecclesiecal perspective. Arthur Peacocke, a

prominent researcher in the dialogue of Anglican science and theology, admits in his book theology *for a scientific era* that the experience of Eastern Christianity in the relationship with science is different. In one of [6]the most important works on the orthodox perspective in science, it is said that „Orthodox Christianity has a special approach to science"[7]. Despite the recognition of the "difference" of this experience, the meaning of this difference has not yet been fully articulated and researched intheologicalLiteratur.

The "specialty" of orthodox experience in relation to science and the difference in Western forms of the dialogue between science and religion which are ultimately determined by the essential theological fundamentals, such as the nature of theology, the nature of the human ability to know God and the understanding of the place of mankind in the universe and the role in mediation between the world and God.

The differences between the western and Eastern Christian approaches to the sciences of nature are in itself a serious historical problem. Impact Greek classical culture with Christianity in Western Europe, which was articulated by the blessed Augustin and eight centuries later by Roger Bacon, it has an absolutely different long-term effect on scientific development and technology progress compared to the eastern parts of Europe, where the ways of living and theologiisation of people have been for several centuries closer to the Greek patristic tradition and different from the Latin tradition, to which it belonged Happy Augustin. We find at least interesting why until the XII century, Greek patristic thinking and Byzantine theology, with their deeply mystical dimensions, were almost forgotten in western Europe. A Greek patristic synthesis, which underpins all Orthodox theologian, contains in itself the secret of Atitudiniandspecial to the science that Orthodox theology has followed over the centuries.

Christ The Savior is the incarnate Logos of God, the one who is the Alpha and Omega of Christian theology. Science, being involved in the Orthodox theological speech, cannot avoid meeting with Christ; from the influence of Greek parents, the nature and scientific activity that concern him, cannot be seen outside of Christ, through which the meaning and purpose of the whole creation can be understood. The Incarnation of God's logos in the world as the determination of the world's comprehensibility in its full quota – that is, the Christian dimension

[6] Arthur Robert Peacocke, *Theology for a Scientific Age: Being and Becoming Natural and Divine*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1993, p. 23

[7] Stanley Harakas, "The Christian Faith Concerning Creation and Biology ", in *La Theology Dance L'Eglise Et dans Le Monde*, Chambesy, Geneva, 1984, p. 226

of the dialogue between theology and science – summarizing methodological clues to this dialogue. In this regard, the approach to dialogue between theology and science can be parallel to Thomas Torrance's "Theological Science", which in many respects seeks to use the ideas of the patristic writers to argue that "neither the doctrine of creation nor the doctrine of incarnation will allow theology to be detached from the natural or human science in which the man is offered by God the task of exploring and bringing to the word, the order and harmony of the universe, and Of all that is in it, for the universe is the sphere in which the faithful glorify and praise God the Creator, as well as the means in which God is known to man. Science is part of the religious duty of man, because it is part of his faithful response to the creator and supporter of the cosmos. "[8]

In conclusion, the hypostatic Union of the Divine and Man, the Savior of Christ, recited mankind and demonstrated to the human beings that it is their duty to be at the heart of the media between the world and God, and to praise the Creator by Creation , and to be himself a mediator between theology and science.

The Greek influence that faced the early church was a direct result of King Alexander the Great (356-323). Alexander studied the philosophy and ideals of Hellenism at Aristotle. Hellenism represented more than just Greek culture; It was a comprehensive model for falsification of a civil society. When Alexander conquered a [9]certain people, he brought the architects, the urbanists, the philosophers, and the scientists belonging to the people in question. The result was an amalgam of cultures absorbed between them, which made it easier to assimilated the conquered. Of this "common" Greek model became the dominant language of the world. Hellenism came [10]into contact with the early church by its low influence on Jewish theocracy, which fought to preserve its identity in a culture that penetrated all facets of human experience. Only after the gentons received the good news, this separation wall began to collapse and the various Greek paradigms infiltrated the Christian [11]theology (Acts 9, 26-30). Where there once existed an understanding of unity, connection and order in the universe, between

[8] Thomas Torrance, *Theological Science*, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, Edingurg, 2000, p. 39
[9] David Alan Black Thomas D. Lea, *The New Testament: Its Background and Message*, Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN, 2003, p. 13
[10] Julius Scott, *Jewish Backgrounds of the New Testament*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI, 2006, p. 113
[11] *Ibid*, pp. 116-118

individuals, their gods and the civil state, now there was the idea that these things were bad and restrictive.[12]

Science in the Middle Ages was a pretty tricky subject. Many scientific theses from the Middle Ages contravene of What the Catholic Church believes to and learn, and this led to a great debate in the Middle Ages. The church accused people with heresy if they tried to use science to reject Church teachings. Although the church had a timid attitude about the use of science in the Middle Ages in everyday life, it did not stop people from studying it.

The beginning of the Middle Ages has seen very little progress in terms of science. The church had great influence and many people feared the wrath of Church representatives. Finally, even the church realized the importance of science, but only in terms of the progress of medicine.

In the primary period, and especially in the Middle Ages, science began to grow progressively primarily due to the establishment of universities in Europe's major cities, separated and uninfluenced by the church. The funding of universities was made by certain strong families and by the state and not by the church. However, the Catholic Church was activated when the discoveries of some scientists threatened their teachings and dogma, in certain cases punished very harshly those who did not obey her teachings, as we have seen.

The culture of the time Saints is not fundamentally distinguished from the contemporary, given that the pagan revival at the beginning of modernity and the true neo-Pagan invasion nowadays, makes this cultural context from then on and today not differ greatly on reporting to Christ and His church. However, there are elements of fundamental difference between the two cultural contexts, the most important being, in our view, the one linked to the penetration of the two distinct areas today: philosophy and Science. Today there is an interpenetration that is a "parasitic" between philosophy and science, and this influence sees through the worrying proliferation of ideologies.

Although they did not confront some of the cultural – philosophical and scientific challenges at the same time – contemporary, by addressing, the answers and the way in which they managed all the challenges to the Church's teachings and mission, the Saints Capadocians, along with Saint Maxim and Saint John Damaschin , remain some models of reporting, opening

[12] James McGoldrick, *Christianity and Its Competitors: The New Faces of Old Heresy*, Christian Focus, Scotland, 2006, p. 83

and responsible ownership of the entire content of God's revealed natural work, contained in philosophy and sciences.

Stăniloae showed Maxim's logical Vision and quantum cosmology as agreeing that they represented the universe as both emergent and rationally structured. Establishing a report between theology and science, he seems to have conveyed that, in so far as quantum physics can facilitate the understanding of Maxim cosmology, his maximum insights into the nature of the universe anticipated the contemporary representation of reality. His approach was not removed. Closer to our day, Paul Davies affirmed the relationship between certain cosmological ideas of our age and medieval insights. But what matters is that for [13]. Stout The matter and the universe in its entirety were characterized by rationality.

The Relation between science and theology had a profound suffering after the founders or parents of modern sciences through their important discoveries gave the world new explanations, aimed at radically changing the perception of the world and life. Things do not stand at all in this way, but on the contrary the parents of modern sciences, recognized as such by the entire scientific community, were not merely religious people, who shared a certain stereotypical and generalized religiosity characteristic of the era, but people with strong religious conscience and profound theological concerns, some of whom were even theologians or priests.

III. Dialogue between science and theology between complementarity and antagonism

The relationship between scientific knowledge and religion has been a particularly controversial theme in recent centuries, on different plans and in different tones. It seems that, in such a discussion, we are particularly concerned about two dangers: that of superficiality and that of Arbitrar. Theologians and some philosophers will be able to be disadvantaged by an unsatisfactory understanding of the spirit of modern scientific research. Other philosophmen and many scientists will not always be able to appreciate the religious experience in all its vast and existential depth. On the other hand, it should not be lost from the view that the participants in the discussion are religious persons or people without such beliefs. The fact is not without

[13] John D. Barrow, *Origin Universe*, p. 109

consequences in terms of their ability to examine with secondality and impartiality different points of view. There will often be no willingness to accept conclusions contrary to their expectations. Whenever the grounds and arguments on which each viewpoint is supported will not be met with receptivity, the rational discussion, in which the parties strive to understand their positions and strive to agree, will be replaced with arguments for preconceptions. Even good intentions cannot shelter us from such dangers. It is, however, good to be warned over them.

Apart from the frustrations that some controversy can generate on the subject, more theoretical considerations have also been formulated, which can shake confidence in the possibility of a discussion that is able to clarify. It has been said, in good time, that the prospect of faithful and non-believer would be inseparable from distinct ways of living and feeling the existence, which would exclude a good communication from the head of the place. "Such a point of view accounts for the systematic ambiguity of the world, which can be perceived both religiously and naturalist. They are radically different forms of charging a certain thing as something[14]. "

An approach of this kind, which will be qualified in certain circles as relativist, leads to the conclusion that a discussion on the relationship between science and religion would be useful only in the circle of those who share religious beliefs or those who do not have commitments of a religious nature. It is a conclusion that it is argued whether we accept that the application of specific commitments in parentheses would be a condition of good communication between the parties. Otherwise, however, if we believe that one of the ways that useful clarifications can be obtained is that of a better understanding, by each party, of the experiences that confer the substance and consistency of the other life, religious or the scientific one.

Modern tradition was convinced that the opposition between religion and science would be completed by the failure of religion. Experimental research will win in front of the religious "myth". Christianity, seen only as a stage within humanity, was to be overcome, the world's overturning being an irreversible process.

[14] John Hick, "Seeing As and Religious Experience", In *Religionsphilosophie. Akten Des 8. Internationalen Wittgenstein Symposions,* W.L. Gombocz (ed.), Vienna, Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1984, pp. 51-52

The view that religion can be overcome, represented in the modernity of Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, Comte, Nietzsche, Freud, has been unconfirmed. "Religion has proved to be much more resilient and deeply rooted in human life than they once believed in modern critics[15].

It is particularly important the profound change that has taken place, from the modern tradition that considers religion from the perspective of overcoming it, to restoring the permanence of religion as a form of spiritual life. The call to religion is made for its potential. In the fight for humanity, religion can provide unambiguous arguments that various policies cannot, for example: Why morality and ethics mean more than a matter of personal taste or political opportunism. Religion can demonstrate in a clear way why morality and ethical values must be respected beyond all social pressure. To do this, it is necessary to accept the way of knowledge of theology and treat it as a real partner of dialogue. Religion and science must not forget that both are in the service of the humble.[16]

There are also today people convinced of the actuality of the vision of modernity, according to which religion and science are two opposing and conflicting areas. But the classic science project to fully encompass the concepts of reality failed and religion proved heavily impregnated in human life. At present, and in science there are various opinions that the theistic description of the universe fits very well with the principles of current cosmology and the initial contradiction is no longer supportive[17].

Another common bias, which if preserved with rigidity can undo any attempt of dialogue, is that between religion and science there is no conflict, but no common points, because, epistemological, their fields are parallel. Theoretically, we can say that the distinction between scientific and religious knowledge lies in the fact that the first has the objective of knowing and explaining the reality of the world, and the second- the value and purpose of the human person's life. Although the delimitation is evident, all the cosmological models promoted by science, as a last resort, are transgresating the science frameworks, gaining metaphysical valences, as we will see during this work. What we must note is that the tendency of man is to form a unified conception of the world, including the "technical" explanations of the functioning of the universe, but also the purpose of existence. This is the nodal point where religion and science can not only collaborate, but must do so.

---

[15] Andrei Marga, *Religion In Was Globalization,* Publishing Ephesus, Cluj-Napoca, 2003, p. 51
[16] Hans Kung *Global Responsibility,* SCM Press, London, 1991, p. 87
[17] Gerald Schroeder, *Book Labor And The Big Bang,* Virgil, Bucharest, 2003, p. 155-162

Through *ideology* we understand all the ideas and concepts of philosophical, religious, moral, etc. which reflects, in a theoretical form, the interests and aspirations of some categories of people in a given age. Also, when we speak of ideology, we refer to all the ideas and concepts that constitute the theoretical part of a current, a system.[18]

The ideologization of Sciences is a diversion of the very purpose and scientific object: Research, description based on the experiment, observation and reasoning of everything in God's creation. The ideologization of science means, in fact, the elimination of objective and competent research and the imposition of various modern and postmodern ideologies as true science.[19]

Religious ideologization is a diversion of the authentic religious approach, based on the Godly revelation, and having as purpose the interpretation of divine creation, of life as a gift from God. It is an attempt at all that is of holiness, spiritual life, it is the triumph of naturalism, of the denial of God, of the inexistence of the Soul – Everything summarizes itself to some random chemical-physical combinations. The fight against religion is completed by the emergence of the DICFathers atheistic, of their ideological totalitismsas the expression of universal terror triggered by the man without God.

The overwhelming influence of ideologies on science – which led to a new scientific paradigm – would not have been possible without a change in values, this is achieved with the emergence of modernity; Thus, the content of the two areas of human knowledge – theology and Science – was radical: if in the Middle Ages the public domain was dominated by theology,theprivate domain remained the InconTrolabyl Place of the most Secret experiences (scientific, but not only) in modernity. The autonomous mind and scientific research have accom the public domain, excommunicating theology, burying it in the private field.[20]

Galileo Galilei was the greatest promoter of the experience methodin astronomy, mathematics and hydrostatic. Before Copernicus and Galileo, the Earth was believed to be in the center of the world and is the place of the material, heavy, mixed. Heavenly bodies were part of a different world, light, bright and non-volatile. This finite world was included in what was called

[18] *Dex*, edition II, Encyclopedic Universe, Bucharest, 1998, p. 470-471

[19] Pr. Prof. PhD Gheorghe Eric, "Ideologisation Science And Impact Their On Dialogue Of Science And Religion "In Volume «Perspectives Romanian On Science And Theology », editor Magda Stavinschi, Ed. Court Old, Bucharest, 2006, pp. 87-117

[20] Pr. Daniels Carson, "Recent history, timeliness and perspectives of reporters between theology and the scientific representation of the world" in *Science and theology,* Bucharest, XXI publishing house: Eonul DogMatic, 2001. P. 28; See also Alexandru Mironescu, *Limits Acquainsmen Scientific,* Harisma Publishing House, Bucharest, 1994

the "sphere of the unspoken", that of the real estate. In its entirety, this world was the throne of God, which in its infinite wisdom governed the perfect movement of heavenly bodies.

The dialogue between science and theology has known multiple aspects: from radical antagonism, to proximity and mutual respect as between two authentic areas of human knowledge. Between these aspects, we also encounter a manifestation that is hurting both religious experience and scientific approach. It is about the attitude of non-selective bonding, generalized confusion, in a word of scientific-religious syncretism. This clearly rejected attitude of both Christian theology and the scientific community is found in scientological movements. These are non-oreligible movements or sects of Christian inspiration, especially in Protestant or neoprotestant environments, especially in the USA, and the proximity or use of the Christian name is clearly an abuse and manipulation, these groups have not Nothing in common with the authentic Christian Church. In these movements, it is highlighted in addition to the archically known groups of the evangelical type (Christians after the Gospel), baptismal type (Baptists with all denominations) or Advent (the Seventh-day Adventists or Jehovah's Witnesses) and certain Religious movements with mystic-Ocult Foundation. This mystic – occult completely different from traditional Christian religiousness is the general framework in which the scientology movements work.

IV. Opportunities for complementarity of science-theology dialogue

Science is the area of knowledge based on observation and testing of facts and phenomena. It is awarded as an organised knowledge and opinion body, which is systematically supported by formal evidence or observational evidence. It includes operation in an orderly system and also acting as a basis for new knowledge and a guide to how to obtain them. Teology refers to the intellectual dimension of religion[21]. Just as science is an intellectual enterprise, theology is an intellectual enterprise in religion. Theology is faith in the existence of a power of supernatural governance, the creator and the protector of the world who takes care of the order within it. The order of the world is the subject of and opportunity for dialogue between Science and theology.

[21] Rebecca Flietstra, "Theology, Not Religion, focus of the New Journal, "in *Research News,* No. 3 Vol. 3, 2002, p. 1

Theology and science have their roots from the word "knowledge". All the realms of knowledge are always in pursuit of truth. The truth in science is through experimentation, while in theology it is through faith. Knowledge sources are three, knowledge by revelation, which is TeolOgia, knowledge by observation, which is science, and knowledge by reason, which is common to both.

As both, science and TheologiansA, talk about the same reality, and postpone Pursuing the truth, it is reasonable to expect, sooner or later, to develop shared arrangements between themselves and each of the two disciplines to be able to recognize a certain level of truth reported in the other even if their methods differ.

The two fields provide correspondence or linking areas between understanding the scientific perceived nature and understanding the world, as God's creation was Theological. Several authors attempted to support the dialogue between science and theology, offering reasons, facts and figures to confirm the need to work together.

AnUmans of science and theologians should tear down the cultural wall that served for the carantination of disciplines and tackle these challenges together.

The major cultural impact of quantum physics has certainly raised questions for contemporary philosophical dogma of the existence of a unique level of reality. Here the meaning that is [22]given to the word "reality" is pragmatic and ontological at the same time. Quantum physics has led us to discover that abstract is not simply an intermediary between us and nature, a tool for the description of reality, but rather, one of the parts of nature. In quantum physics, mathematical formalization is inseparable from experience. It resists its way through its simultaneous concern for internal consistency and the need to integrate experimental data without destroying that self-consistency. To the extent that nature participates in the being of the world, we must assign an ontological dimension to the concept of reality. Nature is a huge inexhaustible source of the unknown that justifies the very existence of science. Reality is not just a social building, consensus of a collectivity or an inter-subjective agreement. It also has a trans-subjective dimension, insofar as a simple experimental fact can disprove the most beautiful scientific theory.

[22] See Basarab Nagaraju, *We, the Particle and the World*, Published by Le Mail, Paris, 1985, p. 10

Depending on the level of reality you[23] can designate a set of systems that are invariable under the action of certain general laws: for example, quantum entities are subordinated to quantum laws, which radically depart from the laws of the macrophysical world. This means that two levels of reality are different if, while we move from one to the other, there is a breaking of laws and a breakage within their fundamental concepts (such as, for example, causality). No one has succeeded in finding a mathematical formalism allowing rigorous passage from one world to another. The tautological definitions or approximations are not able to replace a rigorous mathematical formalism. Recent models of the coherent not refer to the passage between the quantum level and the macrophysical level: In fact, the main problem is not consistency, but precisely consistency.

The representatives of science are of the opinion that religion can never reconcile themselves with science. They say that man science cannot be far religious, or have a faith in God. They say this because, apparently, religion or Christianity cannot prove on the basis of the laws the truth of its teachings, while science can do so. "Religion tries to sneak in without any concrete evidence of God's existence. On the other hand, science is ready to test all assumptions and theories based on "experience". Skeptics also ask that religion cannot do so in a way that satisfies an impartial witness, from where and the conflict between the ways of religious and scientific understanding. "[24]

From a historical and philosophical perspective, it seems that this conclusion is a sad and true one at the same time. From a historical perspective, there are some examples of sad remembrance such as the persecution of scientist Galileo Galilei, as we have seen or the church's harsh opposition to the evolutionary theory issued by Charles Darwin. "The slowdown with which religious thinking has accepted such scientific ideas and the fact that many theosists still do not like them suggests that religion will never get back together with science. Since many who believe in God opposed the discoveries of astronomy, physics and biology, it is no wonder that we can speak of the antinomes between religion and science. "[25]

Thecharacteristicof the fundamental human condition is to wonder about the surrounding things and our own destiny. We know that, over the Millenians, man. In the face of the unexplained phenomena that he saw around him, storms, volcanoes, thunder, diseases, etc., could

[23] *Ibid*
[24] John Haught, *op. cit.,* P. 21
[25] *Ibid*, p. 22

not do anything other than to attribute them to the action of invisible forces which, although not part of the world, had an impact on it. That's how the gods appeared. The existence of a bear cult seems to show that the first concept was added very quickly to a second: the survival of man after death. After all, this is perfectly logical: Because the world is constantly agitated by the actions of the not-seeing spirits – which implies that they exist in a different level than the one we perceive and in which we live for what not to believe that, since we have appeared at some point in this world, when we leave this world, something in ourselves reencounters that other level Dis reality.

V. Research and scientific-theological dialogue solutions: anthropic principle

Modernity is the one that achieves an evident separation of science and theology, as two specific areas of human knowledge. It is thus based on a new paradigm of knowledge, the unitary approach to knowledge, as well as the double quality of philosopher – theologian and scientist, existing in the current and in the Middle Ages, are still so outdated. Science and theology as different areas of human knowledge have – by virtue of their autonomy – different objects and methodologies: "the object of knowledge in science is the *world,* while in theology it is God, and, in a secondary way, the *World.* Researching exclusively nature, the universe, science is exposing the risk of reducing everything to the material size of existence in a reductionist, ideological approach. The speech acquisition of information on this dimension should also reveal other levels of reality through objective and competent research. Theology, on the other hand, must not desolutize spiritual knowledge, even if by doing so, seek the sanctity of the human creature due to the grace of God; Theology must pay attention and material dimensions of God's creation — not as a priority — because this dimension is the fruit of love poured out of the Holy Trinity by the Act of creation through Logos. "[26]

In modern science, we have adopted what we know as the anthropicprinciple. This principle states that the organization, configuration and phenomena in the universe must meet certain conditions for the life (and implicitly its intelligence) to have developed so as to appear,

[26] Răzvan Andrei Ionescu, "about the model in physics and in Orthodox theology. Milestones for a possible contemporary dialogue between Science and theology "in *Perspectives Romanian On Science and theology*, Old Court Publishing house, Bucharest, 2006, p. 404

at some point, certain structures that ask questions about the composition of the universe to which they belong.

Among the many conditions postulated by the anthropic principle, there is also that of the tridimensionality of real physical space. This space has three dimensions, because otherwise there could not have been a range of phenomena that, starting with the first moments of the Big Bang, led to the emergence of human intelligence.

The new paradigm of reality, seeking to integrate human and cosmic domains, seems to give an important measure – and balanced, even traditional – in the Anthropic cosmological principle. For Jean-Michel maldame, the anthropic principle „was born from the desire of researchers to advance in the knowledge of the universe, taking into account a maximum of facts, including (and priority) of the fact that man exists" [27] (It is a largely similar approach to the ancient cosmology).

Without being an enthusiast (he only accepts the "weak" form of the principle), Roger Penrose very well surprisedThe type of questions he seeks to answer the Anthropic principle (AP): "How important is the existence of consciousness in the whole universe? Could there be a universe that is not populated by sentient beings? Are the laws of physics designed to allow the existence of a conscious life? Our particular position in the universe. In space or in time, does it have anything special? "[28]

For Father Doru Costache, these questions are similar to an opening, a transversions of a "mentality" called: resigned and vain. He also [29] concludes – "these questions were impossible or even ridiculous in the old paradigm, Copernican-Galilee, the universe cold and meaningless"[30].

We must state that the inter-disciplinary effort within science has made the anthropic principle not only formulated, but to print another type of scientific debate. Thus, Biochit has contributed greatly to the further formulation of the principle. With the experience of the American Stanley Miller, carried out in 1952, we know that the main constituents of the primitive terrestrial atmosphere (methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water) are susceptible, under

[27] Doru Costache, "paradigm God. Implications Of the anthropic principle for addressing Scientific and theological direction of the Creation „In *Science and theology*, XXI publishing House: Dogmatic Eonul, Bucharest, 2001, p. 141
[28] Roger Penrose, *Our mind... The day. About thinking, physics and computers*, Technical publishing House, Bucharest, 1996, p. 467
[29] Paul Carson, "Paradigm God", p. 141
[30] *Ibid*, pp. 141-142

the action of storms, to give rise to complex organic compounds. The very recent "exo-biology", in turn, showed the existence of organic molecules in the interstellar atmosphere and, all of a sudden, the examination of Micrometeors became extremely interesting.[31]

Tobear the discussion in its true context it is important to remember that the manner of thinking of Father Stăniloae was deeply influenced by the theological vision of the world of the Holy Maxim the Confessor, through which he decided the profound steps of the patristic tradition. The Holy Maxim has developed a very interesting picture of the relations between God, Man and Cosmos, in what might be called a theorie of unification. It is a vision of the Divine logo expanded in creation in the form of the concepts of things (the true ground ofbeying, "the foundation of the being", paraphrase on the Tillich), which ensures the being and organization of the universe, also describing the last form of creation. The reference to this context is all the more motivated, if we think that what has recently performed quantum ontology, by articulating mathematic platonic and the Aristoteles idea of potentiality, has already succeeded Father Maxim (faithful to the biblical conception of Christ as Alpha and Omega) by integrating the platonic vision of the Logos with that Aristoteles theory of becoming.[32]

Conclusions

In Contemporaneity, aRomanian rtodoxia is seen faced with a series of phenomena generated by the Western cultural space of the continent, its foreign. It is about various aspects of life and modest mentality as a market economy, capitalism, democracy, ecumenism, interracial marriages, etc., but especially science. The scientific approach of the world in which we live is a phenomenon of exclusively western provenance, emerged towards the end of the Middle Ages and the beginnings of the Renaissance and strengthened throughout the modern period until today. As it is known, science is not only a form of knowledge of the world in which we live, but also a way to influence it and even to transform it strongly through its derivative which is technology.

[31] Dominique Lecourt, *Dictionary Of History And Philosophy Sciences*, Publishing Polirom, Iaşi, 2005, p. 1094-1095
[32] Paul Carson, *Vitality*, p. 212

The problem that purely Western extraction science raises to Orthoxia is one of a philosophical nature: it is the conception that claims to be based on the purely scientific knowledge of the world and expressing the belief that real truly is only the physical, finite, material world, that only what is perceptible sensory or observable through instruments has ontological consistency and can be certified and universally recognized as existing. This identification of the real, the existence with the physical world, finite and accessible only sensory, led the Western world initially to a proportion of the proportions of religion, then to its accelerated desacration, so that today we can witness an almost total secularisation of public and even private life in this part of the world.

On her side, the Eastern Orthodox remained at the conviction for centuries that true, Maxim, absolutely even, lies not in the physical world, but beyond it in the spiritual world and, at the highest possible, in God Himself. This different identification of the "location" of the real constitutes the essence of the current problem of tense relations between modern science, on the one hand, and traditional orthosification on the other. Awareness of the nature and extent of this tension, Orthodox theology is in front of a dilemma: if he attempts to forcibly assimilate the scientific spirit into an attempt to modernise at any price, the very probable consequence will be a damage or even dissolution of her bimilenary foundations, the roots she has deep in the patristic thinking and, in the last analysis, in the revelation itself. If, on the contrary, it closes and remains opaque in the face of this assault of modernity, the same theology will enter the increasingly sharp phase in relation to the spirit of the weather in which it lives, with great losses in the pastoral and missionary plan.

In a disoriented world, of man who ran out of roots, the treimic blessing of the Kingdom of God, since the beginning of the church mass, it must awaken in us the consciousness of the eschatological dimension of the church's mission, so that the church, passing with its faithful through the orities and types of civilization created by this world, does not remain the prisoner of any of them, but to submit, with all faith, to the last target, the Kingdom of God.

The dialogue between science and religion is a special topic of the present given the Christian origin of modern science, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the Holy Trinity must represent the foundation of contemporary science. It should be said that, had it not been Christianity, modern science would not have developed rapidly with which it did. The foundation of Science in contemporaneity must be Christ, and the mission of the Church has as

its main objective the proximity of scientists to the revealed teaching, aware of its salvation role. The danger to contemporary science is not represented by the Church and its representatives, because it wants a real, constructive and beneficial outcome dialogue on both sides, but on the Islamization of Europe because Islam rejects science by not being part of the Islamic law – Sharia. The future of man depends on the dialogue of Sciences with Christian theology and how the mission of the church responds to this dialogue.

Â

Selective Bibliography

A. BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC SPRINGS

1. *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură,* Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, Bucureşti, 1994
2. Grigore Palama, *150 de capete despre cunoştinţa naturală, despre cunoaşterea lui Dumnezeu, despre viaţa morală şi despre făptuire*, 19-20; în Filocalia sfintelor nevoinţe ale desăvârşirii, vol.7 , Editura Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2005
3. Sfântul Atanasie cel Mare, *Tratat despre întruparea Cuvântului*, 41, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al BOR, Bucureşti, 2010
4. Sfântul Grigorie de Nyssa *Despre viaţa lui Moise*, II. 115, 116 în *Opera*, London: Macmillan, 1920, X.1.126.10
5. Sfântul Ioan Damaschin, *Dogmatica*, Editura Scripta, Bucureşti, 1993
6. Sfântul Ioan Gură de Aur, *Comentariu la Isaia,* Editura Mitropoliei Moldovei şi Sucevei, Iaşi, 2013
7. Sfântul Maxim Mărturisitorul, *Ambigua* , Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune Ortodoxă, Bucureşti, 1987
8. Sfântul Maxim Mărturisitorul, *Scrieri* în, PSB, vol. 53, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al BOR, Bucureşti, 1983
9. Vasile cel Mare, *Omilii la Hexaemeron*, Ed. Sofia, Bucureşti 2004

B. DICTIONARIES AND ENCYCLOPEDIAS

1. Considine, John, *Academy Dictionaries 1600-1800*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014
2. *Dictionary of Political Economy*, editat de R. H. Inglis Palgrave, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015
3. Eliade, Mircea, Ioan Petru Culianu, *Dicţionar al Religiilor*, Humanitas, 1996

4. *Encyclopedia of Consumption and Waste: The Social Science of Garbage*, Carl A. Zimring, William L. Rathje (Eds.), Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, 2012
5. *Encyclopedia of Science and Religion*, editat de Thomson-Gale, Macmillan , New York, 2003

C. SPECIALTY BOOKS

1. Abgrall , Jean-Marie, *La mecanique des secte*, Payot, Paris, 1996
2. Albert, Hans**,** *Treatise on Critical Reason,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2016
3. Aleandro, Nisati, Sharma Vivek, *Discovery Of The Higgs Boson*, World Scientific Publishing Co., New York, 2016
4. Atanasie de Alexandria, *Împotriva păgânilor* şi *Despre Întruparea Cuvântului*, Editura Sapientia, Iaşi 2013
5. Baker , Eddy Mary, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, Boston, Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy, 1934
6. Bălăceanu Stolnici, Constantin, *Cunoaştere şi ştiinţă*, Editura Fundaţiei "Andrei Şaguna", Constanţa, 1997
7. Barrow, John D. & Tipler, Frank J., *The anthropic cosmological principle*, Clarendon Press (Oxford) şi Oxford University Press (New York), 1986
8. Barrow, John D., *Originea universului*, Editura Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2017
9. Barrow, John D., Tipler, Frank J., *Principiul antropic cosmologic*, Editura Tehnică, Bucuresti, 2001
10. Bel, Pr. conf.dr. Valer, *Misiunea Bisericii în lumea contemporană,* Ed. Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2002
11. Black, David Alan; Thomas D. Lea, *The New Testament: Its Background and Message*, Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN, 2003
12. Blaga, Lucian, *Opera poetică*, Editura Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2013
13. Boerst, William J., *Galileo Galilei and the Science of Motion*, Morgan Reynolds Pub, Greensboro, North Carolina, 2004
14. Collingwood, Robin George, *The Idea of Nature*, Martino Fine, Eastford, CT , 2014

15. Coman, Pr. prof. dr. Ioan G., *Probleme de filosofie şi literatură patristică*, Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al B.O.R., Bucureşti, 1995
16. Cuciuc, Constantin, *Religii noi în România*, Editura Gnosis, 1996
17. Cyril Mango, *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome*, Londra, 1980
18. Daniels, Norman, Just Health: Meeting Health Needs Fairly, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2007
19. Darwin, Charles, *On the Origin of Species*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2008
20. Dauben, Joseph Warren, *Georg Cantor*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1990
21. Davies, Julie, *Science in an Enchanted World: Philosophy and Witchcraft in the Work of Joseph Glanwill*, Routledge, London, 2018
22. *De l'esperance à l'esclavage. Personnes victimes de sectes*, travail effectué dans le cadre de la formation ESTS présenté par Hussy François, Neupriz Mireille, Genève, 1997
23. Denton, Michael, *Evolution: Still a Theory in Crisis*, Discovery Institute Press, Seattle, 2016
24. Dericquebourg, Regis, *Religions de guérison*, Cerf, Paris, 1988
25. d'Espagnat, Bernard, *Un atome de sagesse: Propos d'un physicien sur le réel voilé,* Seuil, Paris, 1982
26. Deutsch, David, *The Fabric of Reality*, Editura Penguin, Londra,
27. Duhem, Pierre, *Essays on the History and Philosophy of Science* , Hackett Publishing Company, Inc , Indianopolis, 1996
28. Engelhard, Tristram, *The Foundations of Bioethics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996
29. Finocchiaro, Maurice A., *The Galileo Affair*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989
30. Firea, Iova, *Cosmogonia biblică şi teoriile ştiinţifice,* Bucureşti, Anastasia, 1998
31. Fitzgerald, Timothy, *The Ideology of Religious Studies*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000
32. Flonta, Mircea, *Cunoaşterea ştiinţifică şi religia între conflict şi convieţuire fără tensiuni*, în *Perspective româneşti asupra ştiinţei şi* teologiei, Editura Curtea veche, Bucureşti, 2006

33. French, Roger, *William Harvey's Natural Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006
34. Garber, Daniel, Ayers, Michael, The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-century Philosophy, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003
35. Geisler, Norman, *Apologetică creştină,* Wheaton, Illinois (SUA), Editura Societății Misionare Române, 1994
36. Gheorghe, Scripcaru, *Bioetica, ştiinţele vieţii şi drepturile omului,* Polirom, Iași, 1999
37. Ghosh, Peter, *Max Weber and the Protestant Ethic*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2014
38. Grant , Edward, *Science and Religion, 400B.C. – A.D.1550: From Aristotle to Copernicus*. Westport: Greenwood Press
39. Gregersen, Niels Henrik, *Dumnezeu într-o lume evoluţionistă*, Editura Curtea Veche, Bucureşti, 2007
40. Habermas, Jurgen, *Conştiinţa morală şi acţiunea comunicativă,* ALL, București
41. Hartmann, Nicolai, *Philosophy of Nature: Realist Ontology and Philosophical Anthropology*, Scripta Philosophia Naturalis, 2012
42. Hubbard, L.F.R., *BuIletins techique* , vol XII, New Era Editions. Paris, 1996
43. Huckle, John and Martin, Adrian, *Environments in a Changing World*, Pearson Education Ltd., Harlow, 2001
44. Huff , Toby, *The Rise of Early Modern Science: Islam, China and the West,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003
45. *Ideology and the Social Sciences*, Edited by Graham Charles Kinloch, Raj P. Mohan, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, 2000
46. Iftime, Oana, *Introducere în antievoluţionisimul ştiinţific,* Anastasia, București
47. Ionescu, Pr. Prep. Dr. Răzvan Andrei, Lemeni, Lect. Dr. Adrian Nicolae, *Teologie ortodoxă şi ştiinţă*, Ed. Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al BOR, Bucureşti, 2006
48. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Dr. Gheorghe, *Dialogul dintre ştiinţe şi religie din perspectiva Misiunii Bisericii,* Editura Do-minor SRL şi Editura Rawex Coms SRL, Bucuresti, 2010
49. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Dr. Gheorghe, *Misiunea creştină ca activitate permanentă şi practică*, Editura Sigma, Bucureşti, 2006

50. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, *Introducere în Misiologia Ortodoxă*, Editura Dominor, Bucureşti, 2009
51. John F. Haught, *Știință și religie: de la conflict la dialog,* Editura XXI — Eonul dogmatic, București, 2002
52. Knox, Kevin C., Richard Noakes, *From Newton to Hawking: A History of Cambridge University's Lucasian Professors of Mathematics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003
53. Kung, Hans, *Does God Exist?,* Fount Publisher, Los Angeles, 1983
54. Larson, David B., Francis G. Lu, James P. Swyers, *Model Curriculum for Psychiatric Residency Training Programs: Religion and Spirituality in Clinical Practice : a Course Outline*, National Institute for Healthcare Research, 1997
55. Lemeni, Adrian, *Sensul Eshatologic al creaţiei*, Editura ASAB, Bucureşti, 2000
56. Lonchamp, Jean Pierre, Afacerea Galilei, Editura XXI: Eonul Dogmatic, Bucureşti, 2004
57. Lossky , Vladimir *Teologia mistică a Bisericii de Răsărit*, Editura Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2010
58. Lynn Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science* New York, 1934
59. Lyotard, Jean-François, *Condiţia postmodernă. Raport asupra cunoaşterii*, trad. şi cuvânt înainte de Ciprian Mihali, ed. a II-a, Ed. Ideea Design & Print, Cluj, 2003
60. Maldame, Jean-Miche, L*e Christ et le cosmos. Incidence de la cosmologie moderne sur la theologie*, Desclee, 1993
61. Mayr, Ernst, *De la bacterie la om. Evoluţia lumii vii*, Editura Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2008
62. McKnight, Stephen A., *The Religious Foundations of Francis Bacon's Thought*, The University of Missouri Press, Columbia, 2006
63. Meyendorff, John, *Hristos în gândirea creştină răsăriteană*, Ed. Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al BOR, Bucureşti, 1997
64. Nesteruk, Alexei, *Universul în comuniune. Către o ipoteză neopatristică a teologiei şi ştiinţei*, Editura Curtea Veche, Bucureşti, 2009
65. Nicolescu, Basarab, *Transdisciplinaritatea. Manifest,* Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 1999
66. Nicolescu, Basarab, Transdisciplinarity and Complexity : *Levels of Reality as Source of Indeterminacy Bulletin Interactif du Centre International de Recherches et Études transdisciplinaires*, no 15, 2000

67. Nicolescu, Basarab, *Transdisciplinaritatea. Manifest*, Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 1999
68. Nicolescu, Basarab, *We, the Particle and the World*, Published by Le Mail, Paris, 1985
69. Olson, Steve, Autumn S. Downey, *Sharing Clinical Research Data*, The National Academies Press, Washington, 2013
70. Omodeo, Pietro Daniel, *Copernicus in the Cultural Debates of the Renaissance: Reception, Legacy, Transformation*, Brill, Leiden
71. Osborne, Richard, *The Universe*, Chartwell Books, Secaucus, NJ, 2009
72. Peacocke, Robert, *Theology for a Scientific Age : Being and Becoming Natural and Divine*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1993
73. Pellegrin, Pierre, *Aristotle's Classification of Animals: Biology and the Conceptual Unity of the Aristotelian Corpus*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1986
74. Penrose, Roger, *Les ombres de I'esprit,* InterEditions, Paris, 1995
75. Petraru, Pr. Gheorghe, *Lumea, creaţia lui DumnezeuI,* Editura Trinitas, Iaşi, 2002
76. Petrement, Simone, *Dualismul la Platon, gnostici şi manihei*, Sympozion, 1996
77. Popescu, Dumitru; Costache, Doru, *Introducere în dogmatica ortodoxă*, Editura Libra, Bucureşti, 1997
78. Popescu, Pr. Prof. Dr. Dumitru Gh., *Teologie şi cultură*, Ed. IBMBOR, București, 1993
79. Popescu, pr. prof. univ. dr. Dumitru, Costache, diac. Doru, *Introducere în Dogmatica Ortodoxă*, Ed. Libra, Bucureşti, 1997
80. Pullman, Bernard, *The Atom in the History of Human Thought*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998
81. Redondi, Pietro, *Galileo Heretic*, Princeton University Press, Princeton , 1989
82. Roland, Wade, *Galileo's Mistake,* Arcade Publishing, New York, 2011
83. Rus, Remus, *Curs de filosofie comparată,* București, 1984
84. Santillana, Giorgio, *The Crime of Galileo,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1955, p. 210
85. Sargen, Rose-Mary, *The Diffident Naturalist: Robert Boyle and the Philosophy of Experiment*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1995
86. Schroeder, Gerald, *Cartea Facerii şi Big Bang-ul,* Vergiliu, București, 2003
87. *Science et foi font systeme. Une approche hermeneutique*, P. Bilhler et C. Karakash (eds.), Universite de Neuchatel, Labor et Fides, Geneve 1992

88. *Scientology: theology & practice of a contemporary religion*, Bridge Publications, Los Angeles, 1998
89. Scott, Julius, *Jewish Backgrounds of the New Testament*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI, 2006
90. Shelley, Bruce, *Church History in Plain Language*, Word Publisher, Dallas, 1995
91. Sherrard, Phillip, *Human Image World Image: The Death And Resurrection of Sacred Cosmology*, Denise Harvey, Limini, 2004
92. *Social Darwinism: Linking Evolutionary Thought to Social Theory*, Open University Press, Maidenhead, Berkshire, 2000
93. Sorescu, Maria Emilia, *Fenomenul sectant în România*, Editura Beladi, Craiova, 1999
94. Southern, Richard, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages (The Penguin History of the Church)* Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1990
95. Stăniloae, Pr. Prof Dr. Dumitru, *Studii de teologie dogmatică ortodoxă*, Ed. Mitropoliei Olteniei, Craiova, 1990
96. Stăniloae, Pr. Prof Univ Dr. Dumitru, *Iisus Hristos, lumina lumii şi indumnezeitorul omului*, Anastasia, 1993
97. Stăniloae, Pr. Prof. Dr. Dumitru, *Iisus Hristos sau Restaurarea omului*, Ed. Omniscop, Craiova, 1993
98. Stăniloae, Pr. Prof. Dr. Dumitru, *Sfânta Treime sau La început a fost iubirea,* Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al BOR, Bucureşti, 1993
99. Stăniloae, Pr. Prof. Dr. Dumitru, *Teologia dogmatică ortodoxă (TOD)*, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al BOR, București , 2003
100. Stăniloae, Pr. Prof. Dr. Dumitru, *Teologia vieţii spirituale*, Casa cărţii de şiinţă, Cluj Napoca, 1993
101. Staniloae, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Dumitru, *Chipul nemuritor al lui Dumnezeu*, Editura Basilica, Bucureşti, 2013
102. *Știință și Teologie: Preliminarii pentru* Dialog, Dumitru Popescu, Doru Costache , Editura XXI Eonul dogmatic, Bucureşti, 2001
103. Stratan, Gheorghe, *Galileu! O, Galileu,* Logos, București, 1997
104. Struik, Dirk Jan, *A Source Book in Mathematics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2014

105. Thiel, Kristin, *The Germ Theory of Disease*, Cavendish Square, New York, 2017
106. Thijssen, Johannes Matheus Maria Hermanus, *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris, 1200 – 1400*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1998
107. Thirring, Walter, *Do the laws of Nature evolve,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995
108. Tonoiu, Vasile, *In căutarea unei paradigme a complexității,* Iri, București, 1997
109. Torrance , Thomas, *Theological Science*, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, Edingurg, 2000
110. Ţuţea, Petre, *Între Dumnezeu şi neamul meu*, Editura Anastasia, Bucureşti, 1992
111. van Buren, Paul, *The Secular Meaning of the Gospel: Based on an Analysis of Its Language*, SCM Press, London, 1963
112. Walker, Mark, *Science and Ideology: A Comparative History*, Routledge, London, 2003
113. Wenham, Gordon John, *Genesis*, Zondervan Academic, Grand Rapids, MI, 2017
114. Westerhoff, Jan, *Nagarjuna's Madhyamaka: A Philosophical Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009
115. Yannaras, Christos, *Abecedar al credinţei. Introducere în teologia ortodoxă*, Editura Bizantină, Bucureşti, 1996
116. Yannaras, Christos, *Introduction to Orthodox Theology*, T & T Clark, Edinburg, 1991
117. Zizioulas, Ionnis, *Comuniune şi alteritate. Fiinţare personal-eclesială*, Editura Sophia, Bucureşti, 2013
118. Zlatos, P., *Godels onthological proof of God'sexistence*, Iris Publishing, Bratislava, 2002

D. STUDIES AND SPECIALTY ARTICLES

1. Achimescu, Nicolae, *Secularismul ca atitudine spirituală care-l ignoră pe Dumnezeu*, în "Teologia", Nr. 4, Editura Universitãtii „Aurel Vlaicu", Arad, 2004
2. Arhiepiscopul Hrisostomos și Ieromonahul Patapios, „Știința și cunoașterea în Patristică și Tradițiile monahale ale Bisericii Ortodoxe Orientale ", în *Transdisciplinaritate în ştiinţă şi religie*, nr. 2 (2007)
3. Basil (Osborne) of Sarajevo, Bishop, "Beauty in the Divine and in the Nature", in *Sourosh: A jurnal of Orthodox Life and Thought*, 70, 1997

4. Borella, Jean, *Criza simbolismului religios*, trad. de Diana Morăraşu, Editura Institutul European, Iaşi, 1995, p. 65
5. Carter, Brandon, "Large Number Coincidences and Anthropic Principle in Cosmology", în *Modern Cosmology & Philosophy*, Editura Prometheus Books, Amherst, 1998
6. Chritou, Panayotis, "Maximos Confessor on the infînity of man", în *Maxinus Confessor. Actes du Symposium sur Maxime Confessor*, Fribourg (2 – 5 septembre 1980), edites par Felix Heinzer et Christoph Schonborn, Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1982
7. Costa de Beauregard, Olivier , "Cosmos et conscience," in Michel Cazenave (ed.), *Science et conscience*. Editions Stock, Paris, 1980
8. Costache, Diac. Asist. Doru, *Vitalitate şi actualitate. De la ontologia cuantică la cosmologia antropică a părintelui Dumitru Stăniloae*, în „Ştiinţă şi teologie", Editura XXI: Eonul dogmatic, Bucureşti, 2001
9. Costache, Doru, "Christian Worldview: Understandings from St Basil the Great", in rev. *Cappadocian Legacy: A Critical Appraisal*, Doru Costache; Philip Kariatlis (Editors), St Andrew's Orthodox Press, Sydney, 2013
10. Costache, Doru, "Mapping Reality Within the Experience of Holiness", in rev. *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor*, Pauline Allen; Bronwen Neil editors, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2015
11. Costache, Doru, "St Gregory of Nyssa's An Apology for the Hexaemeron", in rev. *Phronema*, no. 28 vol. 1, 2013
12. Costache, Doru, "The King, the Palace, and the Kingdom: Anthropic Thinking in Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, and Other Witnesses" in rev. *John Chrysostom: Past, Present, Future*, ed. by Doru Costache and Mario Baghos, AIOCS Press, Sydney, 2017
13. Costache, Doru, „Paradigma taborică. Implicaţii ale principiului antropic pentru abordarea ştiinţifică şi teologică a sensului creaţiei", în *Ştiinţă şi teologie*, Editura XXI: Eonul dogmatic, Bucureşti, 2001
14. Costache, Doru, „Vitalitate şi actualitate. De la ontologia cuantică la cosmologia antropică a părintelui Dumitru Stăniloae", în *Ştiinţă şi teologie*, Editura XXI: Eonul dogmatic, Bucureşti, 2001

15. Costache, Pr. Asist. Dr. Doru, “Microcosmos şi macrocosmos. Implicaţii ecologice în cugetarea Sfântului Maxim Mărturisitorul” în *Teologie şi ştiinţe* natural, Editura Mitropolia Oltenia, Craiova, 2002
16. Costache, Pr. Doru, „Istoria recentă, actualitatea și perspectivele reporturilor între teologie si reprezentarea științifică a lumii", în *Știință și Teologie,* București, Editura XXI: Eonul dogmatic, 2001
17. Costache, Pr. Doru, „Știință și teologie — spre o evaluare nouă a raporturilor”, în *Știință și Teologie,* București, Editura XXI: Eonul dogmatic, 2001
18. Courtenay , William, "Inquiry and Inquisition: Academic Freedom in the Medieval Universities" *Church History* 58, 1989
19. Flonta, Mircea, „Revoluția darwiniană ca schimbare a «ochilor gândirii»", în *Krisis,* no. 8-9,1999
20. Gheorghe Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr., “ Invatatura despre creatie in cugetarea Sfintilor Parinti Maxim Marturisitorul si Sfantul Simeon Noul Teolog”, în Biserica Ortodoxă Română, Anul CXXVI, Nr. 7-12, iulie-decembrie, 2008
21. Giberson, Robert, „Globalizing science-and-religion”, in *Research News,* no. 3, vol. 4
22. Grant, Edward, “ Late Medieval Thought, Copernicus and the Scientific Revolution” in rev. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, no 23:2 (1962)
23. Heisenberg, Werner, „Naturwissenschaftliche und religiose Wahrheit", în W. Heisenberg, *Schritte Uber Grenzen,* Piper Verlag, Munchen, 1973
24. Hess, R. S., “God and origins: Interpreting the early chapters of genesis” in *Darwin, Creation, and the Fall: Theological Challenges,* R. J. Berry ; T. Noble (Eds.), Apollos, Nottingham, 2009
25. Hess, R.S., „Genesis 1-2 in its literary context” in rev. *Tyndale Bulletin* no. 41, vol. 1, 1990
26. Ionescu, Răzvan Andrei, „Despre model în fizică şi în teologia ortodoxă. Repere pentru un posibil dialog contemporan între ştiinţă şi teologie”, în *Perspective româneşti asupra ştiinţei şi teologiei*, Editura Curtea veche, Bucureşti, 2006
27. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, “The Church’s mission in the face of great challenges that come from the sphere of modern and postmodern science”, *The 2nd Virtual International Conference on the Dialogue Between Science and Theology*, 5-11

noiembrie 2015, volume 2, Research Center on the Dialogue between Science & Theology, 2015

28. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, „Preot prof.acad.dr.Dumitru Staniloaie-chipul misionarului autentic" in volumul „Buletin stiintific", seria teologica, al Facultatii de Teologie Ortodoxa din Pitesti, AnulXIII, Nr.1, ianuarie-iulie 2008, Editura Universitatii din Pitesti
29. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, "Darwinism in the Light of Orthodoxy: Scientific Transformism Based on Materialism and Naturalism" publicată în cadrul conferinței internaționale "The 1st Virtual International Conference on the Dialogue Between Science and Theology, 6-11 noiembrie 2014; volume 1, Research Center on the Dialogue between Science & Theology, 2014
30. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, "Ideologizarea stiintelor si impactul lor asupra dialogului dintre stiinta si religie " in volumul « Perspective romanesti asupra stiintei si teologiei »,editor Magda Stavinschi,Ed. Curtea Veche, Bucuresti, 2006
31. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, "Principiul antropic in gandirea Sfantului Maxim Marturisitorul si a Parintelui Dumitru Staniloaie", in Theologia Pontica-revista Centrului de cercetari teologice,intercultural si ecumenice "Sf Ioan Cassian", volumul simpozionului international "Misiunea Bisericii si interculturalitatea", anul II(2009), nr.1, Ed.Vasiliana'98
32. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, "Raportul intre teologie si stiinta in modernitate si postmodernitate" in vol. "Simpozionului stiinta si religie – conflict sau convergenta?", Constanta, nov.2005, Ed. Vasiliana'98, Iasi, 2005
33. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, "Scientology:False Science and Religiosity" ,in revista „Transdisciplinarity in science and religion", nr.5\2009, Ed.Curtea Veche,Bucuresti, 2009
34. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, „New-Age sau revrăjirea lumii", în volumul Centrului pentru studii misionare si ecumenice, intitulat „Misiune si responsabilitate crestina", Editura ASA, Bucuresti , 2007
35. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, „The Anthropic Principle.A meeting-point between the scientific and theological perspectives" in volumul congresului

international:"Trandisciplinary Approaches of the dialogue between science, art and religion in the Europe of tomorrow", Sibiu, 9-11 septembrie 2007

36. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe, *Ideologizarea ştiinţelor şi impactul asupra relaţiei dintre ştiinţă şi religie*, în *Perspective Româneşti asupra ştiinţei şi telogiei*, Editura Curtea Veche, Bucureşti, 2006
37. Istodor, Pr. Prof. Univ. Dr. Gheorghe,"Clonarea- o altfel de nemurire" in colectia "Transdisciplinarity in science and religion",nr.1\ 2007,Ed.Curtea Veche,Bucuresti
38. Jay Gould, Stephen, "Science in Theology", in *Science and Theology News,* no. 4, vol. 10
39. Kibre, Pearl; Nancy Siraisi, "The Institutional Setting: The Universities" publicated in *Science in the Middle Ages*, 1978, Chicago
40. Manolache, pr. lect. dr. Stelian, *Întâlnirea filosofului cu gnosa eclasiastică sau credinţă şi raţiune filosofică în Stromatele lui Clement Alexandrinul*, în *Simpozionul ştiinţă şi religie. Conflict sau convergenţă?*, Ed. Vasiliana '98, Iaşi, 2005
41. Mureşan, Lect. Dr. Radu Petre, *Scientologia : Religie sau ştiinţă?*, în Studii teologice, Nr. 1, 2007
42. Nicolescu, Basarab, "*Levels of Complexity and Levels of Reality",* in *The Emergence of Complexity in Mathematics*, *Physics, Chemistry, and Biology*, Proceedings of the Plenary Session of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, 27-31 October 1992
43. Popescu, D., „Cosmologia autonomă și cosmologia teonomă", în *Știință și Teologie,* coord. D. Popescu, București, Editura XXI: Eonul Dogmatic, 2001
44. Stăniloae, Pr. Prof. Dr. Dumitru, "Natură și har în teologia bizantină" în rev. *Ortodoxia*, no. 26 vol. 3, 1974
45. Staune, Jean, "Ştiinţa şi căutarea sensului. Întâlnirea dintre cunoaşterea cea mai recentă şi intuiţiile milenare", în Basarab Nicolescu; Magda Stavinschi, Ştiinţă şi Religie antagonism sau complementaritate, Editura Noua Reprezentare a lumii XXI: Eonul dogmatic, Bucureşti, 2002
46. Staune, Jean, "Știința și căutarea sensului. Întâlnirea dintre cunoașterea cea mai recentă și intuițiile milenare", în *Ştiinţă şi religie antagonism sau complementaritate*, Editura Noua Reprezentare a lumii XXI: Eonul Dogmatic, Bucureşti, 2002
47. Thijssen, "Master Amalric and the Amalricians: Inquisitorial Procedure and the Suppression of Heresy at the University of Paris" *Speculum* 71:1 1996

48. Williams, D. H., “The evolution of pro-Nicene theology in the Church of the East” in rev. *From the Oxus River to the Chinese Shores: Studies on East Syriac Christianity in China and Central Asia*. Li Tang and D. W. Winkler (Eds.), LIT Verlag, Berlin, 2013
49. Wuest, Thorsten, Rainer Tinscher, Robert Porzel and Klaus-Dieter Thoben, „Experimental Research Data Quality In Materials Science”, in *International Journal of Advanced Information Technology,* , vol. 4, no. 6, December 2014