

1. The argumentation and objectives of the research

The man of the 21st century, regardless of the religious identity to which he belongs, experiences the world in a much more complex and transparent way than the man of the previous centuries. The new communication techniques, global networks of economic, cultural, and social relationships are constantly reconfiguring the world in a fluid sense. Religion, as a cultural-social segment, is becoming fluid in the sense that local religious patterns are de-territorialized, being implemented, especially through the migration phenomenon, in other spaces. This fluidization of religion does not necessarily imply the dilution of local, particular identity or the creation of a syncretism; however, it boosts the visibility of religious diversity: in the same space, either Western or Eastern, several religions coexist through the people who assume such an identity. This new everyday experience implies a *plurality/pluralism* of religious expressions, each claiming to hold the absolute truth. Nevertheless, beyond the expression of religious plurality, different people of different faiths relate, interact, collaborate, a fact which has articulated from a political and normative point of view the adjustment of *tolerance* as a means of cohabitation in a multi-ethnic and multi-religious space and avoidance of conflicts.

From these reasonings, the PhD thesis *Tolerance and religious pluralism. A missionary evaluation* is intended to be a modest contribution to the observation, interpretation and evaluation from a missionary theological point of view of the reality of contemporary religious pluralism. Basically, the major questions theologians reflect upon in the 21st century are, most likely, a result of Christianity's interface with the world's other major religious traditions. The twentieth century has irreversibly brought theology into the modern historical consciousness¹. Almost every aspect of the Church's life and teaching has been rethought in broad terms from an archaeological, cultural, linguistic, and historical research point of view, beyond the claims of skeptical sociological research on the constant relevance of Christianity for the contemporary man. Within the unfolding of globalization trends, increasingly present in human societies, questions about Christian *faith and practice* are raised in a mental environment quite different from anything we have seen probably since the ancient Church moved from a Jewish

¹ Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1972, p. 124.

cultural and religious context to a Hellenistic cultural and religious context². The issues of religious tolerance, dialogue and cooperation are not only inevitable, they are missionary emergencies.

How should we relate and bear witness to people of other faiths? This seems to be the most important missiological question theologians, and implicitly all Christians, are being faced with at the beginning of the 21st century. While some go to the consultative relationships with the followers of other faiths (under headings such as "broader ecumenism"), others seek peaceful ways to communicate the meaning of the Christian faith with the intention of convincing (or converting) them to the Christian identity³. Different patterns have been developed, some efficient, others less so, precisely because of the fluidity of today's societal rhythm.

The *religious pluralism* theme is very complex and occupies an increasingly important place in missiology, the sociology of religion, politics, social culture, practically in all the areas which analyze society and the presence of religion in the public and private space. The merits of researching this topic, regardless of the angle from which we look at things, are doubled in interdisciplinary analyses: firstly, the reality of the diversity of religions has become widely acknowledged, each with its own identity structure, more or less connected with the others in common doctrinal and social points; secondly, it has shifted the analytical debate from the juxtaposition between the proponents of the *secularization theory* and those who opposed the evidence of the religious rebirth to a more articulate perspective which seems able to better explain and interpret what happens in the complex of religious diversity and contemporary spiritualities⁴.

Pluralism is a key concept to understanding what is happening in our current world, even if the risk, as in the case of all the words that suddenly become popular and fashionable, is for it to become an umbrella under which we put together quite different and heterogeneous phenomena, sometimes hardly consistent with each other. This error, which still occurs often in many missiological and sociological productions, is the overlapping of the meaning of *pluralism* with that of *diversity*, as if they were synonymous. In fact, as some researchers with

² See Karl Rahner in „Toward a Fundamental Theological Interpretation of Vatican II,” *Theological Studies* 40 (1979): pp. 716–727.

³ See Daryl Balia & Kirsteen Kim, eds. *Edinburgh 2010. Witnessing to Christ Today*, Oxford: Regnum Books International, 2010, pp. 34-60.

⁴ See Giuseppe Giordan, „Introduction: Pluralism as Legitimization of Diversity” in *Religious Pluralism. Framing Religious Diversity in the Contemporary World*, Giuseppe Giordan, Enzo Pace (eds.), Springer, 2014, p. 1.

expertise on this topic⁵ have argued, we should not confuse the *normative-regulatory level* of pluralism with the *descriptive level* of empirical diversity. Additionally, even when taking for granted the distinction between the normative and empirical aspects, the concept of *religious pluralism* must be much more refined to be useful for the study of different missionary and socio-religious situations. Therefore, one of the objectives of our analysis is to define as clearly as possible the concept of *religious pluralism* and then to make its explanatory potential obvious by applying it to the missionary dynamics.

The perspective of *religious pluralism*, understood as an empirical diversity of the multitude of religions in the same space, places the study of missiology outside the space to which missiology has been limited for several decades, namely the simple observation and acceptance of the reality of religious diversity - that is it; not the articulation of concrete answers, applicable, and not exclusively theoretical, to everyday life. Thus, although there have certainly been valuable exceptions and dissenting voices, there is no doubt that the *secularization theory* has largely dictated the agenda of the sociological study of religion, without which contemporary missiology could not be connected to the contemporary realities, especially in Europe, starting with the 1960s. It is interesting to note what has happened in this modern 60 years interval, in which the secularization category, which at the time of its widest acceptance had become almost a *sociological dogma*, slowly but inevitably lost its explanatory power. That is because the indisputable evidence of today's - in the year 2021 - religious diversity proves the presence of religion in human consciousness and in the social-public expression.

What we suggest in the PhD thesis is, as a framework objective, the evaluation of religious pluralism and religious tolerance from a theological-missionary perspective, in order to verify the legitimacy of certain missionary strategies applied by the Church today. This framework objective is achieved on the basis of a series of underlying objectives, which complete the background of the thesis: specifying the multilateral meaning of religious pluralism; statistical highlighting of today's religious diversity; enunciating the current global trends which are socially reconfiguring the relationship between religious traditions; deciphering the way in which democratic political norms establish religious freedom; specifying the significance of religious tolerance as a relationship between religions with the

⁵ See James A. Beckford and James T. Richardson, „Religion and regulation,” in *The SAGE handbook of the sociology of religion*, ed. James A. Beckford and N. Jay Demerath III, London: Sage, 2007, pp. 396–418; James A. Beckford, „The management of religious diversity in England and Wales with special reference to Prison Chaplaincy,” in *MOST Journal on Multicultural Societies* 1(2), 1999, p. 10.

aim of avoiding religious conflicts; enunciating sets of missionary strategies (such as contextualization, inculturation) which are relevant in preaching the Gospel in a global world.

The demonstration we intend to make in our argumentation is that the *mission*, no matter how it is approached, in a pluralistic world, presumes *openness to dialogue*. We can understand the signs of the Spirit in different religious traditions and in the plurality of cultures. That is why a dialogical spirituality in a world of religious pluralism requires a confessional humility capable of feeding equality between the parties and increasing the conviction that the other is a gift that can enrich us. This horizon is a fixed point in the missionary and theological reflection. The importance of dialogue, as a type and tool of open meeting, is one of the key issues in rethinking the mission of the Church in relation to other religions. The belonging of one person cannot be an obstacle and it cannot determine the relevance of the interpersonal meeting, just as our beliefs must be set aside when they are inappropriate for the *other's* understanding. That is the reason why ecclesial communities must experience this type of dialogue within the mission, which essentially means transforming that humanity from within, making it new.

If dialogue can produce knowledge and mutual enrichment, it is because it enables us to change, to experience the event of *conversion* as an opening to the encounter with the truth, which the Spirit offers when He accompanies any encounter wanting to reach the heart of the matter. It is obvious, however, that the style of dialogue requires us to rethink the way we understand and live religion, because where religious experience is insensitive to the search for a safe meaning of life, when it violates people's dignity, resorting to inflexible and fundamentalist positions, it loses its truest purpose: *to promote freedom and the pursuit of the common good*. It is no coincidence that where there is no religious freedom, then one of the decisive conditions – the dialogue itself - no longer exists.

Therefore, the following few points are important to highlight in the mission of the 21st century, when the effervescence of religious diversity is an everyday experience: the dynamics of interculturality, ecumenism and interreligious dialogue. A decision that can no longer be postponed refers to the *dialogical encounter of the cultures*, despite the objections that intercultural dialogue is the generator of a certain cultural relativism. Meeting a different culture is an event which can allow people to face directly a different way of thinking, which can sometimes, if not often, be radically different. However, we cannot neglect this aspect if we want to have a responsible dialogue on life's issues. Therefore, we should not be surprised to learn that interculturality is not just about welcoming the other; it also creates a conflict of understanding because it leads to the construction of a new form of civil coexistence. Within

these coordinates, Christianity seeks to build a new culture, able to focus on dignity and rights, especially for those who are excluded and marginalized as a result of ideological policies.

Religions must learn how to cooperate in building a new world of rights and duties, in the logic of responsibility. This requires a high degree of maturity. The principles of religious freedom and equality are no longer enough, although still being decisive. We need a new style of cooperation between the states and religions. It is true that, in the deep crisis of the recent years, the forced demand for an identity and symbols in which to recognize oneself has boosted religious affiliation and values. However, the emphasis on the social, cultural, and political dimension of religion should include all religions; otherwise, there is the risk of recreating ideological blocs and of discrimination between strong and well-rooted religious groups and new religious movements, religious minorities and other religions. This aspect highlights the importance of rediscovering *ecumenical tension* and *interreligious dialogue* as a means of creating the conditions for acceptance and discussion on the functional goals within a fairer society, more attentive to the needs of each person.

2. The contemporaneity and relevance of the researched topic

It should be mentioned from the start that the two issues analyzed in the PhD thesis - *religious pluralism*, respectively *religious tolerance* - require an interdisciplinary analysis. We cannot treat and evaluate pluralism and tolerance from a missionary perspective if we do not take into account the sphere of sociology and politics. One gives us the conclusive data of today's religious reality, the other one regulates the framing and classification of religion, pluralism, tolerance in the functionality of a society, be it Western or Eastern. The reality of diversity in the second decade of the 21st century is omnipresent.

We consider that the topic is relevant to the missionary research and modern, given the fact that each of us is contemporary with this phenomenon of evidence of pluralism and interaction between various religious identities. A number of factors - theological, political, historical, cultural, economic, psychological - are involved in the daily experience of multi-religiosity. The transition from the twentieth century to the twenty-first century has been characterized by a process of transnational migration which has radically transformed the social and cultural landscape of large areas of the world. Such a process of global mobility has led to a transformation from a cultural and religious homogeneity, real or socially constructed in many nations, especially in Europe, to the recognition of diversity. Religious differentiation,

therefore, is played out on several levels: an individual level, with what we would call the *democratization of the sacred*, and a social one, with the differentiation of the supply on a *religious market*: if on the one hand the demand for religious goods and services is becoming increasingly complex, on the other hand, the supply of such goods and services is also becoming complex, and this is the result of the new closeness between different cultures and religions.

The sociological estimates made by *Pew Research Center* (*Center demographic projections*) in 2015 unequivocally highlight the reality of religious pluralism in the world of the 21st century: Christians - 31.2%, Muslims - 24.1%, religiously unaffiliated - 16%, Hindus - 15.1%, Buddhists - 6.9%, popular religions - 5.7%, other religions - 0.8%, Jews - 0.2%.⁶

It is interesting to note the metamorphoses of the percentage indices anticipated by 2050 globally⁷.

Year	Christians	Muslims	Religiously unaffiliated	Hindus	Buddhists	Popular religions	Other religions	Jews
2010	31.4%	23.2%	16.4%	15%	7.1%	5.9%	0.8%	0.2%
2020	31.1%	23.2%	15.6%	15.2%	6.6%	5.6%	0.8%	0.2%
2030	31%	26.5%	14.8%	15.2%	6.1%	5.4%	0.8%	0.2%
2040	31.1%	28.1%	14%	15.1%	5.7%	5.1%	0.7%	0.2%
2050	31.4%	29.7%	13.2%	14.9%	5.2%	4.8%	0.7%	0.2%

As we have mentioned, a number of factors are involved in contemporary religious diversification, factors which generate the phenomenon of migration. The effect of people's mobility from one space to another *de-locates* some religious traditions and implements them, with the same doctrinal, cultic, social structure, in societies completely foreign to them from a cultural, religious, etc. point of view. According to the United Nations Population Division⁸, the number of migrants in the world has increased in the last 50 years from 80 million to 214 million, i.e., from 2.6% to 3% of the world's population. The millions of migrants who have moved from one part of the globe to another have brought with them, in addition to the hope of improving their own and their families' living conditions, the culture, values, traditions and religions of their home countries. Undoubtedly, the places where such changes are most visible are the cities, as here is the highest concentration of migrants and there is no city in the West that has not experienced a profound social reconfiguration due to the migratory flows of the recent decades.

⁶ Conrad Hackett & David McClendon, *Christians remain world's largest religious group, but they are declining in Europe*, April 5, 2017 (www.pewforum.org).

⁷ *Pew Research Center Religion & Public Life*. Religious Composition by Country, 2010-2050 (April 2, 2015), www.pewforum.org.

⁸ <https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/data/global-migration-database>.

Just to give a few examples of how these global cities have to deal with an unprecedented social and cultural diversity, we can take as an example the cities in Great Britain (e.g., Birmingham), where a study and social action program has been launched entitled "Superdiversity": the local university and the local council worked to understand the challenges and opportunities offered by the presence in the same urban space of an unusual variety of languages, ethnic groups, beliefs and traditions that make the daily interaction of citizens a complex reality. An experience of superdiversity like the one in Birmingham is found in many cities of the Western world, as well as in the Latin American universe or in some African metropolises.

In the coming years, this will be the reality of many cities in Asia where, according to a World Development Bank forecast, by 2030 more than 50% of the population of these countries will settle around the urban areas. Given this situation, on the one hand, it is not difficult to imagine, given the scale of the urbanization processes, that in the coming decades the issue of religion will be among the most relevant on the agenda of political authorities of large global cities, contrary to the secularization thesis which announced the disappearance of religion. On the other hand, it is practically impossible to make predictions about the results of this combination of cultures, traditions, and religious beliefs.

What we can say with certainty is that such a religious diversity will have to be "governed" in a way by civil authorities, and the increasingly diverse requirements for the free practice of one's religion will find in the State a principle of regulation, which will seek to combine the general interests of the community with the legitimate demands for the recognition of "minorities" and individual believers. The transition from "religious diversity" to "religious pluralism" consists precisely in the elaboration of institutional norms, especially of a legal nature which regulate the diversity, and in ideas of a political and philosophical nature which tend to consider cultural and religious diversity as a relevant value.

Legal, normative, and cultural responses to religious diversity vary constantly from country to country: there are contexts in which all religions, from traditional, historically established, to new religious movements and religious beliefs that group several hundred followers, can proliferate without any interference from the political authority; on the other hand, there are contexts in which religious diversity is governed very strictly, if it is not banned. The reasons for such a difference are justified in accordance with the problems that such diversity raises: they often affect the very identities of the nations, built in many cases on a more or less recognized identification with a single religious tradition, but which have to do with national security, public order and the protection of human health and dignity. Public

authorities monitor in particular religious groups that could cause problems to the national security (e.g., Islam in many European countries, but not only in Europe) or that could be dangerous for the people who join them (e.g., cases of mass suicide operated by the Order of the Solar Temple in Switzerland, France and Canada)⁹.

Religions do not passively suffer from the external regulation exercised by the State against them: they react by implementing adaptation strategies that may involve both the legal and the normative plan, as well as cultural awareness and social mobilization. In this regard, Beckford and Richardson¹⁰ explained in detail how religion is at the same time both a subject and an object of regulation: in the first case, religion and religious organization exercise their controlling power in their own area of influence and in the external area where they operate; in the latter case, it is the political and military agencies who exercise control over religion. The ways of controlling and being controlled vary not only from country to country, but also according to different historical periods. The economic and financial crisis which erupted in 2008, for example, redefined the migratory flows and changed the attitude of citizens and politicians from many states towards immigration. Suffice it to recall what two political leaders from Germany and Great Britain stated just a few months apart: in October 2010, Angela Merkel announced that the German attempt to build a multicultural society had "totally failed", and 4 months later, in February 2011, British Prime Minister David Cameron declared that the multiculturalism experiment failed in Britain.

Statements of this kind have important consequences on the reading and interpreting cultural and religious diversity, and then, later on, on the different types of religious pluralism that are attested. When we talk about pluralism, it is important to remember that we are not referring to a single way of adapting and dealing with the diversity of culture, in general and religion, in particular, but rather we are referring to a series of strategies involving religions, the state and civil society. It is a continuous process of negotiation and renegotiation, in a continuous effort to maintain and preserve the borders between the different social spheres in a world which makes these borders more and more porous and fragile.

Finally, the issue of religious pluralism helps theologians to become aware of today's reality which is plural in itself and which in an ideological and artificial way has been understood as homogeneous and singular. The church is within the society, it preaches within

⁹ See Jean-François Mayer, *Apocalyptic Millennialism in the West: The Case of the Solar Temple, Critical Incident Analysis Group*, 2003.

¹⁰ James A. Beckford and James T. Richardson, „Religion and regulation”, in *The SAGE handbook of the sociology of religion*, ed. James A. Beckford and N. Jay Demerath III, London: Sage, p. 399.

the society, it supports its mission within society. And today's society is pluralistic in many ways. It is in this very society that the word of the Gospel must be proclaimed and the Christian teaching specified. In this society, the Christian mission must be rethought in terms of new patterns of discourse relevance.

As N. Ammerman pointed out¹¹, *religious pluralism* is the "normal state of affairs" and this is not only because religion is a multidimensional reality, but also because the institutions that govern it are multiple, both within the religious field and outside of it. Moreover, the emphasis on religious pluralism has made visible the religious traditions that have been present for centuries in countries where the religious market was monopolized by a single religion that made all the other religions invisible.¹²

3. The framework of the thesis

For the purpose of a systematic presentation of the analyzed topics (religious pluralism, religious tolerance, Christian mission), the PhD thesis is structured in four chapters. Chapter I - *The reality and transparency of religious pluralism. The intensification of religious diversity in the 21st century* - is intended to be a conceptual analysis of religious pluralism, in order to better clarify the meaning of the relationship between religious pluralism and religious diversity. Moreover, here we find the theme of the pluralization of today's society, which is related to the theory of the secularization of the disappearance of religion and deconfessionalization and freedom of religious choice.

Chapter II - *Religious tolerance – an axiom of the relationships within the diversity of multi-religious identities* - tackles, in addition to the conceptual clarifications of religious, political and legal nuance of tolerance, current issues, such as: the contemporary migration as a phenomenon of de-territorialization of religious traditions, and Chapter III - *Tolerance and religious freedom in the church's mission register. Past experiences and contextualizations of the present* - reiterates in more detail the issue of religious freedom and pluralism, relying on the experience of the historical context of antiquity, in which Christianity developed organically, as well as on contemporary experience. Also, in this chapter the perspective of the

¹¹ Nancy T. Ammerman, „The challenges of pluralism: Locating religion in a world of diversity”, in *Social Compass* 57 (2), 2010, p. 159.

¹² Francisco Diez De Velasco, „The visibilization of religious minorities in Spain”, in *Social Compass* 57 (2), p. 239.

Second Vatican Council towards religious tolerance, as a way of relating to non-Christian religions is evaluated.

The last chapter - *Reconfigurations of the Christian mission in a pluralistic and diverse world* - summarizes the missionary assessment of religious pluralism and religious tolerance. The evaluation is not made strictly only from an Orthodox point of view, as the mission is a much more extended reality than the confessional pattern. The basic idea of this evaluation lies in the fact that in the 20th - 21st centuries there is a redefining of missionary vectors in tandem with the social, political and economic developments in the world. Therefore, we have also focused on the evolution of the missionary attitude from the Edinburgh conference in 1910 up to the present and delved into two missionary paradigms in a pluralistic context: the contextualization of the Gospel and the inculturation of the faith.

4. The methodological toolbox used

As we have specified in the section on the contemporaneity and relevance of the researched topic, the priority for our analysis was the missionary evaluation of religious pluralism and religious tolerance. Being two topics which involve constitutive factors of sociological, political, cultural order, the research has an interdisciplinary dimension. It is simply impossible to analyze in a theological-missionary order the reality of pluralism (religious diversity) if one does not appeal to the statistical, conclusive data provided by the sociological research. In the same situation is religious tolerance, which involves legal, political, social normative factors. Our intention is to offer a theological interpretation of a missionary nature, but not a dogmatic one, on these factors that fall within the horizon of the analyses of the two topics. All the more so as the reference to sociological and judicial-political barometers situates our analyses in the concrete reality of the religious transformations that contemporary societies are experiencing.

Consequently, as an analytical toolbox we have applied the historical, phenomenological, comparative and systematic methods in combination with a quantitative sociological research, which facilitated the interpretation of the data on the number of believers for each religion and of the predictions about the phenomenon of migration. The historical method has helped us observe the evolution of the missiological attitude towards the intensification of religious diversity in the 20th – 21st centuries, referring to a few essential events: the Edinburgh conference of 1910, the Second Vatican Council, etc. The phenomenological method guided us in understanding the process of contextualizing the

mission, as well as the exercise of inculturation. Last but not least, the comparative method helped us understand the relationships between different religious traditions in today's global dynamics, as well as the evaluation on legitimacy criteria of the different interpretations given to pluralism and tolerance in the theological, political and legal order. However, overall, the most used method is the systematic one, indispensable in presenting, framing, and interpreting the information presented.

The works of important missionaries from the West, but also from our country, whose interpretation guided our analyses, have been of great use to us. We mention here D. Barrett¹³, D. J. Bosch¹⁴, Donald A. Carson¹⁵, Dean Flemming¹⁶, Jehu J. Hanciles¹⁷, Paul G. Hiebert¹⁸, Albert Peter Rethmann¹⁹, Brian Stanley²⁰. Among the Romanian missionaries, we mention Pr. Mihai Himcinschi²¹, Pr. Gheorghe Istodor²², Pr. Gelu Călina²³, Pr. Cristian Sonea²⁴.

¹³ „Missiometrics 2008: Reality Checks for Christian World Communions”, in *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 32, 2008, pp. 27-30, *World Christian Encyclopaedia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

¹⁴ *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*, 2011.

¹⁵ „Church and Mission: Reflections on Contextualization and the Third Horizon”, in *The Church in the Bible and the World: An International Study*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1987, pp. 213–257.

¹⁶ *Contextualization in the New Testament: Patterns for Theology and Mission*, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2005.

¹⁷ „Migration and Mission: The Religious Significance of the North-South Divide”, in Andrew Walls & Cathy Ross, eds., *Mission in the Twenty-first Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Global Mission*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2008, pp. 118-129.

¹⁸ *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1985; *Transforming Worldviews: An Anthropological Understanding of How People Change*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

¹⁹ „Mission and dialogue – being Christian in a plural society”, in *Mission and Dialogue. Approaches to a Communicative Understanding of Mission*, Edited by Klaus Krämer and Klaus Vellguth, Claret Publishing Group, 2021.

²⁰ *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910*, Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2009.

²¹ *The church in society. Missionary aspects of the Church in the current society [Biserica în societate. Aspecte misionare ale Bisericii în societatea actuală]*, Reîntregirea Publishing House, Alba-Iulia, 2006; *Mission and dialogue. The missionary ontology of the church from the perspective of interreligious dialogue [Misiune și dialog. Ontologia misionară a bisericii din perspectiva dialogului interreligios]*, Reîntregirea Publishing House, Alba-Iulia, 2003.

²² *Introduction to Orthodox Missiology [Introducere în misiologia ortodoxă]*, Do-Minor Publishing House, Bucharest, 2009; *The Christian Mission as a Permanent and Practical Activity of the Church [Misiunea creștină ca activitate permanentă și practică a Bisericii]*, Sigma Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006.

²³ "A Few Notes on Religious Tolerance [Câteva note despre toleranța religioasă]" in *Making Mission from the Model of Christ. The Specificity of Orthodoxy and Ecumenism Today*, ASTRA Museum Publishing, 2013, pp. 206-216; 'On the Religious Tolerance and Its Necessity in the Changing World', in *Humanities and Social Sciences Review*, Volume 01, Number 03 (2012), pp. 267-271.

²⁴ *The theology of inter-Christian dialogue. An introduction [Teologia dialogului intercreștin. O introducere]*, Cluj University Press, 2017.