

THE UNIVERSE AS A COSMIC LITURGY: OVERCOMING THE MECHANISTIC PARADIGM (DESCARTES AND NEWTON) THROUGH THEOCENTRIC ANTHROPOLOGY

Ioan Stelian ȚĂRAN,

Ph.D.'s., Faculty of Theology, University of "Ovidius", Constanța,
ROMANIA,

E-mail: pr_stelian@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The mechanistic paradigm inaugurated by Descartes and Newton conceived the universe as a closed system of matter in motion, governed by deterministic laws and devoid of intrinsic purpose or meaning. This article argues that the concept of the universe as cosmic liturgy - grounded in the patristic tradition, especially in Maximus the Confessor, Athanasius of Alexandria, and the sacramental theology of Alexander Schmemmann - offers not a naïve pre-modern alternative to the mechanistic worldview, but a philosophically rigorous anthropological and cosmological framework that addresses the very limitations which the physical sciences have themselves identified within the mechanistic paradigm. The argument proceeds in three stages: a diagnosis of the mechanistic paradigm and its internal critiques from within modern physics; a constructive exposition of the patristic concept of the cosmos as a network of divine logoi oriented toward the Logos; and a proposal of theocentric anthropology as the locus of integration, in which the human being as homo adorans both discovers and actualizes the liturgical structure of the cosmos.

Keywords: *cosmic liturgy, mechanistic paradigm, theocentric anthropology, Maximus the Confessor, logoi, homo adorans, sacramental cosmology, quantum mechanics, orthodox theology.*

INTRODUCTION

The title of this study brings together two terms that apparently belong to irreducible orders of discourse: "liturgy" - a term of ecclesial theology and practice, designating the act by which the Christian community offers the world of God and receives in return the divine-human life of Christ - and "universe" - a term of cosmology and physics, designating the totality of spatio-temporal reality described by equations and measurements. To speak of the universe as a cosmic liturgy is not, in the intention of this study, a poetic metaphor by which religious feeling dresses in beautiful clothes a content that science has already exhausted. It is an ontological statement about the structure of reality, a statement that claims to be more rigorous, than the mechanistic paradigm it challenges.

The mechanistic paradigm—inaugurated by Descartes and Newton, strengthened by the classical physics of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and inherited by modern culture as an implicit ontology—conceived of the universe as a closed system of matter in

motion, governed by deterministic laws, and devoid of any purpose or intrinsic meaning. This conception has produced modern science, with its extraordinary achievements, but it has also produced a deep ontological fracture: the separation of the world described by science from the world lived by man. If the universe has no meaning of its own, if things are only things and processes are only processes, then questions about beauty, purpose, responsibility, and worship inevitably become subjective, projections of a human subject onto a neutral cosmos, not discoveries of objective realities inscribed in the structure of the world.

The concept of the cosmic liturgy, as articulated in this study from the sources of Eastern patristics and contemporary Orthodox theology, challenges this fracture at its deepest level—not by denying the achievements of science, but by showing that the mechanistic paradigm operates at an insufficient ontological level. The universe is not only matter in motion described by equations—it is a reality created through the Logos, carrying in its structure *the divine reasons* by which the Creator inscribed His meaning and orientation, and called through man to consciously return to his origin. Man - as *homo adorans*, as a liturgical being by nature - is not a spectator of a neutral spectacle, but the central actor of a cosmic act of giving and receiving, of offering and transfiguration.

The study is structured in three analytical stages. The first section diagnoses the mechanistic paradigm, identifies its internal limits - highlighted by twentieth-century physics itself - and shows why its contestation is not a pre-modern regression, but a philosophical requirement of rigorous thought. The second section presents the patristic alternative: the cosmology of St. Maximus the Confessor, the doxological vision of St. Athanasius, the dialogical cosmology of Father Stăniloae, and the concept of *homo adorans* elaborated by Schmemmann as the nucleus of the theocentric anthropology of the liturgical universe. The third section integrates the two directions - the critique of mechanism and the patristic alternative - and articulates the conclusions of the study.

1. THE MECHANISTIC PARADIGM AND ITS LIMITS

1.1. Constitution of the mechanistic paradigm

There is a relatively precise moment in the history of European thought when the universe ceased to be a cosmos—that is, a beautiful, oriented, meaningful order—and became a machine. That moment is the Cartesian project of the first half of the seventeenth century: a universe explainable entirely by matter and motion, without secondary qualities, without immanent finalities, without any trace of divine presence anywhere else than in the original act of creation and motion¹. Descartes' program produced modern science and, with it, the most spectacular transformation of human capacities in the history of civilization. No one can dispute this achievement, and no critique of the mechanistic paradigm should overlook it. But the program has produced something else: an image of the universe as a closed system of deterministic processes, in which there is no room for meaning, for purpose, for beauty as an objective property, for divine presence. The cosmos—in which everything has its own place, purpose, and beauty—has been replaced by a mechanism in which everything is explainable by particle mechanics and nothing is goal-oriented. This mutation is not only methodological—it is ontological. Descartes did not propose only a method of investigating nature; he proposed an ontology: nature is extension, and extension is governed

¹ René Descartes, *Le Monde ou Traité de la Lumière* (1629-1633, published posthumously 1664), in: *Oeuvres de Descartes*, ed. Charles Adam and Paul Tannery, vol. XI, Paris, Cerf, 1909, pp. 3-18.

by motion, and motion is described by equations. Everything that does not come down to it is subjective, illusory, or, at most, epiphenomenal.

Schmemmann identified the cultural and spiritual consequence of this ontological mutation with a clarity that remains of reference: secularism is not the absence of religious faith – it is an ontology, a way of seeing the world in which things are only things, people are only complex organisms, and nothing is no longer a sign or presence of something else². Secularism is the direct heir of the mechanistic paradigm: a universe devoid of its own *logos*, of divine orientation and presence, is inevitably a secularized universe - not as a cultural or ideological choice, but as a consequence of the ontology it has adopted.

1.2. Internal critique of the mechanistic paradigm

What is perhaps surprising is that the critique of the mechanistic paradigm came not only from the outside, from theology or speculative philosophy, but from within physics itself, as twentieth-century science produced models of reality profoundly incompatible with the Cartesian image of the universe as a deterministic machine. Quantum mechanics, formulated in its entirety in the 1920s and 1930s, undermined classical determinism at the most fundamental level. Heisenberg's uncertainty principle is not a limitation of our measuring instruments, for it describes an ontological indeterminacy inherent to quantum reality: subatomic particles do not simultaneously have a well-determined position and velocity, not because we do not know them, but because they do not have them³. Quantum reality is not completely describable in terms of classical objects separated in space and time – it involves relationships and contexts that cannot be eliminated.

Alfred North Whitehead formulated, in his philosophical analysis of modern physics, the critique that he called the bifurcation of nature: the separation of primary qualities—measurable, objective, real—from secondary ones—subjective, experiential, supposedly illusory⁴. This bifurcation, which underlies the entire Cartesian program, produces an insoluble problem: if color, sound, beauty, meaning are secondary qualities—projections of the subject onto a colorless, silent, and meaningless nature in itself—then the subject itself becomes inexplicable. The mind-body problem, which persists as the difficult problem of contemporary analytic philosophy, is the direct heir to the Cartesian bifurcation.

Ilya Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers brought another challenge to classical mechanism through the thermodynamics of irreversible processes: an open universe, in which time has a real arrow, in which order emerges spontaneously from fluctuations, in which biological and psychological complexity is not reducible to simpler physical processes⁵. Prigogine explicitly proposed that the mechanistic paradigm must be overcome through a vision of nature as a dialogue partner, not as an object of control. David Bohm, independently, proposed an ontology of the order involved, a holistic cosmos in which spatio-temporal separability is an abstraction from a deep reality in which everything is interconnected.

² Alexander Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy*, Crestwood NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973, pp. 14-19.

³ Werner Heisenberg, *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), pp. 55–82.

⁴ Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, New York: Macmillan, 1925, pp. 54-78.

⁵ Ilya Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers, *La Nouvelle Alliance: Métamorphose de la science*, Paris, Gallimard, 1979, pp. 89-124.

None of these internal criticisms propose a return to pre-modern cosmology or a substitution of physics by theology. But they all show that the mechanistic paradigm is not a complete and final description of reality, that the physical universe, described by physics' own tools, goes beyond the Cartesian model in directions reminiscent of philosophical and theological themes that that model had eliminated.

1.3. The crisis of meaning as a symptom of ontological insufficiency

The mechanistic paradigm has produced, in the field of culture and spirituality, a crisis that it cannot solve by its own resources: the crisis of meaning. A universe devoid of *Logos* - of its own meaning, of orientation, of divine presence - is a universe in which man is condemned to be the solitary producer of all meaning. The nihilism and crises of identity and purpose that characterize late modernity are not historical accidents, they are the direct consequence of an ontology that has evacuated meaning from nature.

Jürgen Habermas - from a secular philosophical, not a theological perspective - recognized that religious traditions preserve semantic resources of human solidarity that secular modernity has not been able to reproduce through its own tools⁶. The observation is important precisely because it comes from outside any religious commitment: it recognizes that the mechanistic paradigm and the secular ontology it has produced are not self-sufficient, since they depend, for the moral and cultural cohesion of societies, on resources that they cannot generate from their own principles. This is not an argument for returning to a pre-modern cosmology or for abandoning the achievements of modern science. It is an argument for a deeper ontology, which includes, not denies, the physical description of the universe, but situates it in a framework that makes intelligible not only the processes, but also their meaning. And this is precisely what the cosmology of divine reasons in the Eastern patristic tradition offers.

2. THE UNIVERSE AS A COSMIC LITURGY: THE PATRISTIC ALTERNATIVE

2.1. The Cosmos as a Network of *Logos*: St. Maximus the Confessor

St. Maximus the Confessor is, of all patristic theologians, the one who most systematically elaborated a cosmology capable of standing face to face with the mechanistic paradigm, not because he anticipated its problems, but because he asked the same questions about the structure of reality from a deeper level. The doctrine of *divine reasons* is the center of this cosmology. The divine *logos*, the Son of God, the Second Person of the Trinity, contains within Himself the reasons (*logoi*) of all created things.

Every creature, from the simplest element to the most complex organism, from a particle to a galaxy, has a *logos* of its own - a principle of existence, a meaning, an orientation towards the purpose for which it was created. The universe is not a sum of mechanical processes - it is a network of *logos* that manifest and reveal the Logos from which they come and towards which they tend: "One is the Logos of God the One and Simple, Who does not multiply by His descent to us [...]. On the contrary, He draws to unity the separate and brings about the turning of the created to Himself."⁷

⁶ Jürgen Habermas, *Between Naturalism and Religion*, trans. Ciaran Cronin, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008, pp. 101-113.

⁷ Saint Maximus the Confessor, *Ambigua*, 7, PG 91, 1077C, trans. Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 2006, p. 97.

This view is incompatible with the mechanistic paradigm at a precise level: it asserts that the universe has a semantic structure of its own—that things have a meaning before man assigns one to them, that orientation and finality are not imported into nature from the outside, but are constitutive of created reality. *The Logos* of a flower is not the meaning that we project onto it, but it is its principle of existence and growth, inscribed in it by the divine Logos Who created it. This means that the beauty, order, and coherence of nature are not subjective properties projected by an observer onto a neutral nature, but are partial revelations of the Logos through the reasons (*logoi*) of creatures.

The consequence for understanding the world as a cosmic liturgy is direct: if each creature exists by virtue of a *logos* that orients it towards the divine Logos, then the existence of each creature is, by its structure, a form of relationship to the Creator, an implicit praise, a constitutive orientation towards its source and purpose. St. Athanasius of Alexandria formulated this intuition in *Contra Gentes*, describing the cosmos as a choir (*choros*) in which all the elements, each in its place and according to its order, sing the praise of the Creator: "Since creation is a beautiful and orderly choir, tuning the voices of all through the care of Divine Providence, he who looks at it with pure eyes sees its harmony and the Logos Who ordains it."⁸ The harmony of the universe is not a neutral property, but a form of doxology—not because it is conscious, but because it is the expression of *the logos* through which the Logos inscribed His presence in creation.

2.2. The Dialogical Cosmology of Stăniloae and the Personal Character of the World

Father Dumitru Stăniloae deepens Maximian cosmology with a special sensitivity to the personal and dialogical dimension of the relationship between man, the world and God that is characteristic of his thought. He elaborates a dialogical cosmology: the world is created by God as a medium of dialogue between the Creator and the rational creature, not a neutral background in which human history unfolds, but an active partner in dialogue, a gift that carries within it the word of God⁹.

This perspective has an important ontological consequence: the world is not an object towards which man positions himself as the dominant subject, but an interlocutor towards which man positions himself as a listener and respondent. To perceive the world correctly means to hear in it the word of God - *the logos* of creatures as expressions of the divine Logos - to act correctly in the world is to respond to this word. Ecological responsibility, from this perspective, is not an external duty imposed by a civic conscience - it is a form of responsiveness to a word received, a form of dialogue with God mediated through creation.

Father Stăniloae also articulates the relationship between the rationality of the world and human rationality: man can understand the world because both are created by the same Logos and carry within them the same reasons (*logoi*). Scientific rationality - man's ability to decipher the laws of nature - is not an evolutionary accident, but the expression of the constitutive affinity between the human mind and the structure of the world. This does not

⁸ Saint Athanasius of Alexandria, *Contra Gentes*, 35, PG 25, 69A, trans. Fr. Dumitru Fecioru, PSB 15, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1987, p. 42.

⁹ Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, vol. 1, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1978, pp. 225-268. Stăniloae elaborates dialogical cosmology - the world as a medium of dialogue between the Creator and the rational creature - and shows that the rationality of the world is the expression of the constitutive affinity between the human mind and the structure of creation, both of which come from the same Logos.

invalidate science - it grounds it more deeply: science is possible because the universe is not chaos, but cosmos; and the cosmos is not cosmos at random, but because it was created through the Logos¹⁰.

2.3. Saint Maximus and *Mystagogy*: The Liturgy as an Icon of the Cosmos

St. Maximus the Confessor, in *the Mystagogy*, elaborates a vision in which the Liturgy and the cosmos are mutually iconic: the Liturgy is the icon of the cosmos, and the cosmos is the icon of the Liturgy. This reciprocity is not a decorative analogy, but expresses an ontological conviction: the liturgical structure of the act of adoration is not imported into the cosmos from the outside, but reveals the structure that the cosmos carries within itself through divine reasons.

"The Holy Church of God is the image and icon of the world itself, made up of visible and invisible essences, for she has the same unity and diversity with her." ¹¹This means that when the ecclesial community celebrates the Liturgy, it does not superimpose an artificial religious order on top of a neutral cosmos—it reveals and actualizes the order that the cosmos carries within itself as a structure imbued with divine reasons. The Liturgy is not an escape from the cosmos into the sacred—it is the revelation of the sacredness of the cosmos, the actualization of its constitutive liturgicity.

The implication for the theme of this study is decisive: the universe is a cosmic liturgy not in the sense that it would consciously celebrate a ritual act, but in the sense that its logoi-based structure is a structure of orientation, giving, and reception—the same structure that the Liturgy consciously and communally actualizes. Man, as a rational and free being, is the only one who can make this structure explicit—which can transform the implicit liturgy of the cosmos into an explicit, conscious, and personal liturgy.

2.4. *Homo adorans*: man as an articulation of the cosmic liturgy

Schmemmann formulated the essence of the human vocation to the cosmos through the concept of *homo adorans*, man as a liturgical being by nature, capable and called to offer the world of God¹². Unlike all other creatures, who praise God implicitly - by the simple way of their existence, by their *logos* - man can recognize the world as a gift and can offer it back to God in the explicit doxological act. This is his specific cosmic function: not the master of nature, not its efficient administrator, but its priest, the one who articulates the praise that nature silently bears.

The ecological crisis, understood from this perspective, is the crisis of *homo adorans* who have ceased to adore, who have transformed the liturgical act of offering God's creation into an act of consuming creation for himself. Man who no longer brings God's world inevitably becomes destructive to it, because he empties it of the meaning that held it together. Not because it is evil by nature, but because a wrongly oriented function produces effects that are the opposite of its purpose. Materialism is not first and foremost a philosophy, but a practice, the way of being in the world of the one who has forgotten that the world is a gift, not a property.

¹⁰ Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology...*, pp. 240-260.

¹¹ Saint Maximus the Confessor, *Mystagogia*, 1, PG 91, 664C, trans. Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae, in: *Filocalia*, vol. 2, Bucharest, Harisma, 1993, p. 12.

¹² Alexander Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy*, Crestwood NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973, pp. 14-19.

Pavel Florensky had elaborated a philosophy of the icon that provides an additional ontological framework for the vision of the universe as a cosmic liturgy. He proposes that physical objects can be icons of divine reality not by convention or metaphor, but by actual participation in what they represent¹³. If the world is the icon of God—and Maximus and Athanasius suggest that it is—then man's relationship to the world is *eo ipso* a relationship to God. The way man treats nature—carefully or carelessly, with recognition or ignorance—is how he relates to the Logos through which nature exists. The ecological crisis is, from this perspective, first and foremost a liturgical crisis: man has ceased to see the icon of God in the world and has begun to see a storehouse of resources.

2.5. The Eucharist and the Return of the Cosmos to God

If the cosmic liturgy is the proper structure of the universe - the network of *logos* oriented towards the Logos - then the Eucharist is the moment when this structure becomes most transparently visible and actualized. Paul Evdokimov articulated this precisely: in the Eucharistic act, the bread and wine - representatives of the entire material creation - are offered to God and transformed into the Body and Blood of the Incarnate Logos¹⁴. Matter is not inert and neutral - it is capable of the divine, the supreme proof of this capacity being the Incarnation, in which the Logos assumed real matter without canceling it.

The Eucharist is the periodic and communal actualization of this cosmic capacity of matter: the world brought before God, the world turned towards the purpose for which it was created. Schmemmann had insisted that the Liturgy is not an activity separate from the life of the world, but the moment in which the reality of the world becomes most completely itself: a gift brought to God, a creation that recognizes its Creator¹⁵. This perspective makes any separation of the Eucharistic life from responsibility for creation impossible: the one who brings God's world into the Eucharist cannot destroy it outside of it.

St. John Chrysostom described heaven as a silent sermon, a Gospel that anyone can read: "The heavens speak the glory of God, and the work of His hands proclaims the strength¹⁶." If the cosmos is a silent Gospel, then the man who studies it is not a mere observer of a neutral spectacle, but is a reader of the cosmic Gospel. And if this Gospel can be read in heaven, then all the other pages of the cosmos—the structure of crystals, the geometry of galactic spirals, biological symmetry, fundamental physical constants—are pages of the same Gospel. Natural science, in this perspective, is not an opponent of theology, but is a way of reading the cosmic Gospel with more precise tools.

3. SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS: TOWARDS AN INTEGRATIVE ONTOLOGY

3.1. Limits of dialogue and real gains

The proposal of the universe as a cosmic liturgy is not a magical solution to the problems generated by the mechanistic paradigm, and should not be presented as such. There are clear limits to the dialogue between patristic cosmology and modern physics, and methodological honesty demands that we recognize them.

¹³ Pavel Florenski, *The Iconostasis*, trans. Boris Buzilă, Bucharest, Anastasia, 1994, pp. 67-89.

¹⁴ Paul Evdokimov, *Orthodoxy*, trans. Dr. Irineu Ioan Popa, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1996, pp. 302-315.

¹⁵ Alexander Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy...*, p. 14-19.

¹⁶ Saint John Chrysostom, *Homily VI on Genesis*, PG 54, 605, trans. Fr. Dumitru Fecioru, PSB 21, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1989, p. 83.

Alexei Nesteruk, an Orthodox physicist and theologian, who proposed the most systematic dialogue between modern cosmology and Eastern patristic theology, formulates this limitation precisely: modern cosmology can describe space-time, but it cannot answer the question of why something exists rather than nothing, or what makes possible the existence of a universe with the laws we observe¹⁷. This is precisely the level at which the cosmology of divine reasons operates—the level of the condition of possibility of a universe with its own semantic structure. And that is precisely why it remains a relevant interlocutor for the philosophical problems raised by modern physics, without conflicting with its empirical conclusions. The real gain of dialogue is not concordist, but hermeneutic: patristic cosmology provides a framework in which the data of modern physics—including the internal critique of mechanism in quantum mechanics and the thermodynamics of irreversible processes—become more philosophically intelligible. A relational, open universe with a structure of emergence and progressive complexity is easier to think about within an ontology of divine reasons than within classical mechanism.

3.2. Theocentric Anthropology as a Coherent Alternative

The central proposal of this study can now be formulated precisely: theocentric anthropology—the vision of man as *homo adorans*, as priest of creation, as mediator between the cosmos and the Creator—offers a coherent alternative to the mechanistic paradigm, not by substituting physics for theology, but by providing the ontological framework in which the data of physics, philosophy, and theology can be integrated without reductionism and dualism. A universe created through the Logos, oriented towards the Logos, administered by a being created in the image of the Logos—this is the vision that Eastern patristic theology proposes. It does not eliminate scientific questions, but situates them in a framework in which they make sense not only as problems to be calculated, but as aspects of a larger mystery. It does not eliminate human responsibility towards the cosmos, it grounds it more deeply, showing that this responsibility does not come from social conventions or ecological pragmatism, but from the ontological structure of man as priest and mediator of creation.

The mechanistic paradigm produced, in the field of culture and spirituality, the crisis of meaning that I had diagnosed at the beginning of this study. Nihilism and modern alienation are not historical accidents, but are the consequence of the ontology that has evacuated meaning from nature and left man alone, the solitary producer of all possible meaning. The ontology of divine reasons proposed by the Eastern patristic tradition does not restore a pre-modern Eden, but proposes a deeper and more coherent vision of reality, in which meaning is not produced by man, but discovered and articulated by him in dialogue with the Logos that sustains everything.

CONCLUSIONS

The universe as a cosmic liturgy is not a poetic metaphor, but an ontological statement: that the universe has a semantic structure of its own – the network of *logos* oriented towards the Logos – that man is the being through whom this structure becomes conscious and articulated, and that the liturgical act is the moment when the constitutive relationship between the cosmos and the Creator becomes most visible and actualized. The

¹⁷ Alexei V. Nesteruk, *The Universe as Communion: Towards a Neo-Patristic Synthesis of Theology and Science* (London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 112–167.

mechanistic paradigm has not demonstrated that this is false – it has ignored it, operating at a different level of description of reality and proclaiming, sometimes unjustifiably, that its level is the only relevant one. Internal critique of mechanism in twentieth-century physics and philosophy showed that the proclamation was premature: a quantum, irreversible, relational, and emergent universe goes beyond the Cartesian model and raises again the questions it thought it had eliminated.

Saint Maximus the Confessor saw the furthest in this direction. Man's vocation is not only to understand the cosmos or to administer it effectively, but to offer it to God, to actualize in the liturgical and moral act that union of all in the Logos which creation bears as the structure of divine reasons and towards which it tends as its constitutive goal. The man who fulfills this vocation not only cares for creation - he transfigures it, raises it towards the destiny for which it was created from the beginning: participation in the life of God.

And perhaps this is ultimately the deepest stake in challenging the mechanistic paradigm: not that science is wrong in its descriptions, but that its descriptions are not sufficient. A universe that is only matter in motion does not need priests, it needs engineers. A universe that is a cosmic liturgy, created through the Logos, oriented towards the Logos, mediated by a being created in the image of the Logos, needs *homo adorans*: the man who knows that what he holds in his hands is holy and that his function is not consumption, but transfiguration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- [1] Saint Athanasius of Alexandria, *Contra Gentes*, trans. Fr. Dumitru Fecioru, PSB 15, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1987.
- [2] Saint John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Genesis*, trans. Fr. Dumitru Fecioru, PSB 21, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1989.
- [3] Saint Maximus the Confessor, *Ambigua*, trans. Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 2006.
- [4] Saint Maximus the Confessor, *Mystagogia*, trans. Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae, in: *Filocalia*, vol. 2, Bucharest, Harisma, 1993.
- [1] Evdokimov, Paul, *Orthodoxy*, trans. dr. Irineu Ioan Popa, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1996.
- [2] Florenski, Pavel, *The Iconostasis*, trans. Boris Buzilă, Bucharest, Anastasia, 1994.
- [3] Nesteruk, Alexei V., *The Universe as Communion: Towards a Neo-Patristic Synthesis of Theology and Science* (London: T&T Clark, 2008).
- [4] Schmemmann, Alexander, *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy*, Crestwood, NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973.
- [5] Stăniloae, Dumitru, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, vol. 1, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1978.
- [1] Descartes, René, *Le Monde ou Traité de la Lumière*, in: *Oeuvres de Descartes*, ed. Charles Adam and Paul Tannery, vol. XI, Paris, Cerf, 1909.
- [2] Habermas, Jürgen, *Between Naturalism and Religion*, trans. Ciaran Cronin, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008.
- [3] Heisenberg, Werner, *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958).
- [4] Prigogine, Ilya and Stengers, Isabelle, *La Nouvelle Alliance: Métamorphose de la science*, Paris, Gallimard, 1979.
- [5] Whitehead, Alfred North, *Science and the Modern World* (New York: Macmillan, 1925).