

# “As is my custom and in keeping with my way of being”: The Homiletical Ethos of Nicolae Steinhardt

## Article history:

Received: 25.03.2026

Revised: 15.04.2026

Accepted: 27.04.2026

Available online: 01.07.2026

**Tudorel-Constantin RUSU**

“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași

**tudorel.rusu@uaic.ro**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9450-0986>

<https://doi.org/10.56177/eon.7.2.2026.art.5>

**Abstract:** Within the Eastern Orthodox Church, the role of preaching is primarily assigned to bishops, followed by priests, as outlined in the church canons. However, Nicolae Steinhardt, despite not being an ordained priest and serving only as a monk at Rohia Monastery, was entrusted with the blessing – and thus the responsibility – to deliver sermons to the monastic community and the faithful on various occasions. Responsibility, he acted very successfully. My research identifies and presents Steinhardt's ambon declamations that best circumscribe and fall within Aristotle's first means of persuasion – ethos. Considering that Neo-Aristotelian rhetorical criticism is primarily used if the artifact is a speech, my paper analyses two Steinhardtian artifacts about which there is solid evidence that they are declaimed homilies or ad litteram transcriptions: The Renunciation of Christ (Lepădarea de Hristos), and Sermon Orthodoxy Sunday (2) (Predică la Duminica Ortodoxiei 2).

**Keywords:** Nicolae Steinhardt, homilies, ethos, credibility, persuasion.

**TITLU:** „Așa cum îmi e obiceiul și potrivit firii mele»: ethos-ul omiletic al lui Nicolae Steinhardt”

**REZUMAT:** În cadrul Bisericii Ortodoxe Răsăritene, responsabilitatea predicării revine în primul rând episcopilor, urmați de preoți, după cum prevăd canoanele bisericești. Cu toate acestea, lui Nicolae Steinhardt, după tunderea în monahism, i s-a încredințat binecuvântarea, adică ascultarea, de a rosti omilii de la amvonul Mănăstirii Rohia, deși nu a fost niciodată hirotonit într-una dintre treptele clericale superioare. Prezentul articol se raportează la universul omiletic steinhardtian prin lentila primului dintre mijloacele de persuasiune ale tripticului aristotelic, anume ethos-ul. Criticismul retoric neo-aristotelic este folosit în primul rând atunci când artefactul este un discurs; prin urmare cercetarea mea analizează două creații steinhardtiene despre care există dovezi solide (înregistrare și transcriere ad litteram) că au fost cuvântări declamate de la amvon: Lepădarea de Hristos și Predică la Duminica Ortodoxiei.

**CUVINTE-CHEIE:** Nicolae Steinhardt, omilii, ethos, credibilitate, persuasiune.

## Introduction

Upon his joining the community of St. Anne Rohia Monastery (he was tonsured into monasticism on 16 August 1980) after his prison journey, Nicolae Steinhardt, following his monastic vow of obedience, asked Justinian (Chira) of Maramureș, the assistant bishop of the Archdiocese of Vad, Feleac, and Cluj – under whose canonical authority the monastic settlement falls – if he could still write. The response, which was initial, for a few moments, a religious pedagogical refusal, left the newly ordained monk “almost stunned, yet delighted at the same time” (Chira 2020, 36): “Until now, you have written of your own accord. From now on, Father Nicolae, not only are you allowed to write, but more than that, you have the obedience to write and publish hundreds and thousands of times more.” (Chira 1992,7; Chira 2006,5). When trying to clarify what he should write about, the monk Nicolae received the following answer: “Write whatever God inspires you to write (...). Write without fear, without restraint, do not bury your talent. You know what and how to write. And I am sure that you will write only what is necessary for people today, for people in general, dispelling the darkness in which we find ourselves” (Chira 1992,7). Following the instructions he had received, Nicolae Steinhardt continued to write in literary and theological publications and, although he was not part of the superior clergy of the Romanian Orthodox Church, “the Rohia monastery made

the church ambon at his disposal" (Hodea 2006, 7). From 1980 until 1989, the year of his passing, "he delivered more than fifty speeches – true religious essays – which were published after his death in the volume *By Giving Thou Shalt Receive*" (Hodea 2005, 8).

For this paper, which discusses means of discursive persuasion and how an oral artifact persuades its audience, it is essential to determine whether the texts in the volume *By Giving Thou Shalt Receive: Words of Faith* are *ad litteram* transcriptions of sermons declaimed from the ambon by Father Nicolae, or not. This selection is a matter of research method: Neo-Aristotelian rhetorical criticism and Aristotle's triad of persuasiveness, on which my article is centred, is primarily used if the artifact is a speech; it "has limited use for other types of artifacts" (Croucher and Cronn-Mills 2019, 255).

### Neo-Aristotelian Rhetorical Criticism

As Erica F. Cooper points out in *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods* (2017, 1087), although the first theories of rhetoric date back more than 2,500 years, there were no transparent methodologies or guidelines for analysing rhetorical texts before the 20th century. In 1925, Cooper notes, Herbert A. Wichelns presented some of the basic features of the first method of rhetorical criticism, namely the neo-Aristotelian approach. Thus, in his essay titled "Literary Criticism of Oratory," Wichelns defined rhetoric as persuasive speech and sought to distinguish between rhetorical and literary criticism. In Wichelns' view, "rhetorical criticism is unique because it highlights the effects of a speech on an audience. Literary criticism, on the other hand, is more concerned with identifying the aesthetic qualities associated with written texts" (Cooper 2017, 1087). Drawing on Aristotle's ideas in *Rhetoric*, as well as those later developed by the Roman orators Cicero and Quintilian, Wichelns described rhetoric as the process of generating high-quality arguments presented to an audience in a specific context. Thus, by considering the audience and context, rhetorical criticism can determine whether an orator's arguments are suitable and effective. Due to the strong influence of the classics, especially Aristotle, this method became known as the neo-Aristotelian method or approach, or neo-classical criticism and, in some textbooks, as the traditional approach to rhetorical criticism (Cooper 2017, 1088).

Although Neo-Aristotelian Criticism considers all five canons of rhetoric systematized by Cicero – *invention*, *organization* (*arrangement*), *style*, *delivery*, and *memory* –, as Stephen M. Croucher and Daniel Cronn-Mills point out, the majority of scholars who use this approach "focuses on the canon of invention", which is "the discovery of ideas and arguments for use in a persuasive appeal" (2019, 255), neo-Aristotelian criticism differs from other types of rhetorical analysis primarily in that, following Aristotle's definition – "Let rhetoric be [defined as] an ability, in each [particular] case, to see the available means of persuasion" (Aristotle 2007, 37) – it aims to examine the arguments that are presented only in the context of a persuasive speech. In Aristotle's view, means of persuasion or proof (*pisteis*) can be of two kinds: *atechnic*, such as witnesses, testimonies from torture, contracts, which are not procured by the orator but exist before the speech and must be used by the orator but cannot be invented, and the *entechnic* ones, which must be invented and used by the orator.

The *entechnic* *pisteis*, those that are "provided through speech" (Aristotle 2007, 38), are of three kinds: "for some are in the character [ethos] of the speaker, and some in disposing the listener in some way [pathos], and some in the speech [logos] itself, by showing or seeming to show something" (Aristotle 2007, 38). First systematized by Aristotle, and later discussed by Cicero and Quintilian, the *ethos-pathos-logos* triptych has stood the test of time and remains a benchmark for rhetoric and communication research today: "Aristotelian triad *ethos* (orator), *pathos* (auditor), and *logos* (language, discourse)" is "significant for any oratorical approach, and (...) is still today the criterion for ordering the art of oratory" (Meyer 1993, quoted in Sălăvăstru 2010, 23). It is also important to note that the Aristotelian distinction between the *entechnic* *pisteis* and *atechnic* *pisteis* results also in the distinction between *inventio* and the other canons of rhetoric (Maftai 2011, 374). *Heurein*, the word used by Aristotle in his *Rhetoric*, meaning "to find," will become the regular Greek word for rhetorical invention (Aristotle 2007, 38). Knowing that the means by which the audience is persuaded are the character or credibility of the orator (*ethos*), logical arguments (*logos*), and emotional appeals (*pathos*), and considering that Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian developed theories of rhetoric "during a time in which public speaking was the only form of rhetoric", it makes sense that in the neo-Aristotelian criticism method the "public speeches serve as the

primary texts. Written forms of public discourse such as poetry, short stories, and letters<sup>1</sup> are excluded...” (Cooper 2017, 1088).

## Two Steinhardtian artifacts

Regarding Steinhardt's homilies, which could provide primary sources for the neo-Aristotelian approach – meaning literal transcriptions, video or audio recordings – are almost absent. In the editions of the volume *Giving Thou Shalt Receive: Words of Faith*, only one text belongs to that type of “primary orality, first degree”, namely *The Renunciation of Christ* (*Lepădarea de Hristos*) (Steinhardt 2008, 191-199), which both in the preserved typescript and in most editions, except for the first and last, has a subtitle that is important for the present research: “Word of teaching, as it was spoken in the church of Rohia Monastery on the first Sunday after Pentecost, 1987.”<sup>2</sup> Moreover, in most editions, this text begins with a formula of address – “Christian brothers”, another important clue that it is a transcription of an oral artifact, not a text revised for publication. Ștefan Iloae admits that “of all the speeches included by the author in the volume, *The Renunciation of Christ* best preserves the oral style” and that “it was probably transcribed from an audio recording” (Iloae 2008, 19). In the same way, Rodica Zafiu refers to *The Renunciation of Christ* as “the only authentic sermon” in Steinhardt's volume, which is “reproduced with all its deictic and phatic marks” (Zafiu 2010, 31).

As for Steinhardt's video or audio artifacts, it is assumed that many of the monk Nicolae's homilies were audio recorded. This is evidenced by the testimony of Bishop Justin Hodea in the introduction to the 2006 edition of the volume: “We witnessed these events and were concerned because we knew for certain that they were being recorded by the emissaries of those who were following him closely and that one day they might frame him for something to bring him before the courts serving the communist regime, as had happened to so many others” (Hodea 2006, 7). Similarly, George Ardeleanu states in an interview that Nicolae Steinhardt's sermons “enjoyed a large audience, were recorded, and people at the service had tape recorders” (Șimonca 2010). However, the only known Steinhardt sermon in audio format is titled *Sermon on Orthodoxy Sunday (2)* (*Predică la Duminică Ortodoxiei 2*) and was found in a private collection (Iloae 2018, 18). The audio artifact was made available to buyers of the 2008 edition of the volume *Giving Thou Shalt Receive: Words of Faith*, published by Polirom Publishing House in Iași, initially on a CD, then by scanning a QR code. Later, the sermon was also posted on the Polirom Publishing House website, where it can still be heard today by anyone who's interested.<sup>3</sup> Although this homily was not transcribed or edited by the author for publication in the volume of sermons, it was included for the first time in the 2008 edition (Steinhardt 2008, 543-557). The audio artifact is also valuable in that it provides insight into how Father Nicolae prepared his sermons. While most of the texts in the volume of sermons prepared by the author were found in typewritten form, or manuscripts, or drafts that were extremely loyal to the final text, in the case of *Sermon on Orthodoxy Sunday (2)*, only a very brief summary was found (Iloae 2018, 19).

In a 2012 paper, Vasile Gordon, referring to “the only recorded sermon by Father Nicolae known to date,” expressed his “optimistic assumption” that “it is possible that other recordings of sermons may be found in the archives of the Securitate in Cluj (now the SRI) or in the CNSAS archives. I find it impossible to believe that being under surveillance most of the time and often secretly recorded, there was no officer tasked with recording his sermons, or at least some of them” (Gordon 2012, 19). Unfortunately, no other audio artifacts containing Steinhardt's sermons have been found to this day.

Taking all this evidence into account, two Steinhardtian oral artifacts recited from the ambo of the Rohia Monastery church are analyzed – *The Renunciation of Christ* (*Lepădarea de Hristos*), and *Sermon Orthodoxy Sunday (2)* (*Predică la Duminică Ortodoxiei 2*) – through the lens of Aristotle's triad of persuasiveness. I want to add that, following the insights of George A. Kennedy in *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* and Jaroslav Pelikan in *Divine Rhetoric: The Sermon on the Mount As Message and As Model in Augustine, Chrysostom, and Luther*, I consider<sup>4</sup> it is significant for the present paper

<sup>1</sup> Exceptions can be epistles or letters intended for public recitation, such as the pastoral letters of eparchial bishops. Once declaimed and recited in public, they can also be analyzed from a rhetorical perspective.

<sup>2</sup> The 1994, 1997, 1999, 2000, and 2002 editions.

<sup>3</sup> <https://polirom.ro/modules/productaudioplaylistplugin/upload/3020/8c657949d7af576062d6266ff726bf089662f3b5.mp3>

<sup>4</sup> See also Rusu Tudorel-Constantin, “Ethos-Pathos-Logos: Aristotle's Triad of Persuasiveness in Homiletical Discourse”, *Hermeneia: Journal of Hermeneutics, Art Theory & Criticism*, no. 32 (2024): 97-98.

that the Greek word *pistis*, which Aristotle uses to describe the three types of artistic means of persuasion – ethos, pathos, and logos – has been regarded as the most fitting term to represent the biblical concept of “faith.” According to dictionaries and online resources like [www.billmounce.com](http://www.billmounce.com), *pistis* appears 243 times in the New Testament. The word appears thirty-nine times in the Epistle to the Romans (O’Rourke 1973, 188). Considering this and recognizing that Aristotle defines rhetoric as “an ability, in each [particular] case, to see the available means of persuasion” (Aristotle 2007, 37), it becomes clear that the triad of ethos, pathos, and logos holds significant value in homiletic discourse as well.

James L. Kinneavy reminds us “that the Greek word for persuasion was *pistis* and that the Christian word for faith was also *pistis*” (Kinneavy 1987, 3) and argues that most Greek speakers in Late Antiquity would have been aware of both meanings of the word. In discussing Kinneavy’s framework, Pat Youngdahl demonstrates that Kinneavy “argues that the New Testament writers and their audiences understood *pistis* (usually translated *faith*) to refer not only to human trust in God (the concept of faith emphasized in the Hebrew scriptures) but also to the human process of giving free assent, despite some uncertainty, to a new perspective (the notion of persuasion exemplified in the writings of Isocrates and Aristotle). The early church assumed, as Kinneavy’s analysis reveals, that persuasion to the faith was not a once-and-for-all event, essential only for potential converts, but an ongoing process, a day-by-day assent that would likely increase in depth and power as doubt was explored and commitment was tested” (Youngdahl 1996, 573).

### Stenhardtian Ethos

For Aristotle, “[There is persuasion] through character (*ethos*) whenever the speech is spoken in such a way as to make the speaker worthy of credence; for we believe fair-minded people to a greater extent and more quickly [than we do others], on all subjects in general and completely so in cases where there is not exact knowledge but room for doubt” (Aristotle 2007, 38). The key point in Aristotelian rhetoric regarding the development of the theory of ethos seems to be the statement “character is almost, so to speak, the most authoritative form of persuasion” (Aristotle 2007, 39). Thus, if an orator succeeds in convincing his audience of his own moral virtue, then he becomes trustworthy in the highest degree. With this opinion of the speaker, the audience will believe everything they are told and, therefore, focus on the truth of the issue being discussed (Maftei 2011, 375). Even though “Aristotle does not include in rhetorical ethos the authority that the speaker may possess due to position in government or society, previous actions, reputation, or anything except what is actually said in the speech” (Aristotle 2007, 39), for Isocrates, Cicero<sup>1</sup>, and Quintilian, the social authority and reputation of the orator contribute to his rhetorical ethos. “Is the power of speech, bound up with the authority and credibility of the orator, an integral dimension of verbal exchange? Should ethos be considered as a purely language-related construction or as an institutional position?” (Amossy 2001, 2). Ruth Amossy asks and proposes a re-examination of the contemporary notion of rhetorical ethos, in which both the discursive ethos and the prior ethos (Amossy 2000, 94-96). contribute to persuading the audience. A distinction is thus commonly drawn between prior or pre-existing ethos, defined as what the audience already knows or believes about the speaker, and discursive ethos, which is constructed within discourse through style, attitude, argumentation quality, and rapport with the audience. These two types of ethos may converge or diverge, depending on whether the discursive construction of an image confirms or challenges the audience’s preconceptions (Zafiu 2010, 28).

In the case of Nicolae Steinhardt, when we refer to his status as a church orator or pulpit preacher, it is impossible to separate him from the various roles of his pre-existing ethos. The preacher Steinhardt “can only be understood in the context of his life and concerns as a whole. He was at once a lawyer, writer, civic activist, political

<sup>1</sup> See Cicero, *On the Orator: Books 1-2*, Translated by E. W. Sutton, H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library 348 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967), 327-329: “A potent factor in success, then, is for the characters, principles, conduct and course of life, both of those who are to plead cases and of their clients, to be approved, and conversely those of their opponents condemned; and for the feelings of the tribunal to be won over, as far as possible, to goodwill towards the advocate and the advocate’s client as well. Now feelings are won over by a man’s merit, achievements or reputable life, qualifications easier to embellish, if only they are real, than to fabricate where non-existent. But attributes useful in an advocate are a mild tone, a countenance expressive of modesty, gentle language, and the faculty of seeming to be dealing reluctantly and under compulsion with something you are really anxious to prove. It is very helpful to display the tokens of good-nature, kindness, calmness, loyalty and a disposition that is pleasing and not grasping or covetous, and all the qualities belonging to men who are upright, unassuming and not given to haste, stubbornness, strife or harshness, are powerful in winning goodwill, while the want of them estranges it from such as do not possess them; accordingly the very opposites of these qualities must be ascribed to our opponents.”

prisoner, monk, diligent librarian at Rohia, good advisor to hundreds of pilgrims, and benevolent mentor to young theology students" (Gordon 2012, 19). He was "an erudite, refined intellectual" (Porumb 2024, XI), and "he established himself as a prominent essayist of those time" (Porumb 2024, XVI).

In the exordium<sup>1</sup> of his thematic homily, *The Renunciation of Chris*, an *ex-abrupto*, the monk Nicolae doubles his pre-existing ethos, demonstrating courage, openness, and honesty, but also seriousness regarding the pastoral necessity of his words: "*As is my custom and in keeping with my way of being, I will speak to you today very openly and bluntly*. This is even more so because the Gospel text of the day is not composed of kind, comforting, and shy words, but is also written with harsh and very blunt words" (Steinhardt 2008, 191). Establishing a parallel between the orator's words and the sacred word of Scripture enhances the orator's authority in the perception of the audience. Furthermore, this passage is an example of self-thematisation, in which the self-definition of ethos serves as a pragmatic preface (Zafiu 2010, 30).

In the same homily, ethos manifests itself primarily through the epistemic and meta discursive self (Zafiu 2010, 30): "*I consider it best that we read again, together, the Gospel text contained in the Gospel of Saint Matthew the Apostle*."; "*I find it hard to believe that the God of love could want us to be hostile towards one another. I personally believe that today's Gospel text should not be understood only according to what it seems to preach, in other words, according to its strictly literal meaning. I believe it must be interpreted and understood in its deeper meaning. And I suspect that its deep and edifying meaning is in accordance with Christian teaching: we should love our wives, brothers, sisters, children, parents, and home*" (Steinhardt 2008, 193).

Recognized as a confessor and respected for his courage and moral integrity, the monk from Rohia reinforces his pre-existing ethos in his discourse as he seeks to persuade the faithful of the necessity of publicly professing the Christian faith: "...are words really that important? (...) I answer: yes, they are significant, yes, their importance is overwhelming. (...) It is not enough to believe in your heart. We need a public declaration. It is not just a matter of certain words and phrases, certain words and empty talk. Confessing with a loud voice is something else; it is something completely different. It is the same as taking a stand, adopting a stance, revealing our inner being, exposing ourselves openly and publicly, showing who and what we are, where we stand, what we believe in, what we are looking for on this earth, what meaning we give to our presence on earth, how we define ourselves" (Steinhardt 2008, 196). In this way, "beyond the interpretation of the word of Scripture or the mixture of biblical quotations and everyday human life", Steinhardt's homily was "a personal confession" (Gordon 2012, 21).

The discursive ethos continues by using complex modal and meta discursive first-person formulas, marked by ceremonious caution – "There is, Christian brothers, a terrifying image, which *I beg* to evoke before you. *I confess that it often comes to mind, that it haunts me, shaking me and terrifying me*." ("Există, frați creștini, o imagine înfricoșătoare, *cer voie să o evoc înaintea dumneavoastră. Vă mărturisesc că-mi vine adeseori în gând, că mă obsedează cutremurându-mă și îngrozindu-mă*) (Steinhardt 2008, 198) – which continues also in the sermon peroration: "This image *haunts me, and I confess to you, beloved faithful, that I often pray to God that it will not be so for me when I come to Judgment*." ("Imaginea aceasta mă obsedează și vă mărturisesc, iubiți credincioși, că adesea mă rog lui Dumnezeu să nu fie așa și pentru mine când voi veni la judecată") (Steinhardt 2008, 199). Though not as explicit as in other parts, Steinhardt's ethos also comes through in his reference to informers as "Judas' friends, followers, and believers" ("prietenii, urmașii și credincioșii lui Iuda") (Steinhardt 2008, 199); the audience was aware that the monk they were listening to had been imprisoned precisely because he refused to be a witness for the communist prosecution.

The second Steinhardtian sermon proposed for this analysis begins<sup>2</sup>, like most Christian Orthodox sermons, with the formulation "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," which precedes the cultic or liturgical role, and serves a rhetorical function by establishing ethos and persuasion. The preacher does not speak in a personal capacity but adheres to the ethos characteristic of the Christic discursive tradition, as the apostolic and patristic traditions continue it (Rusu 2024, 148-149). Whereas clergymen preachers, such as priests and bishops, acquire an indelible and pre-existing ethos through public ordination or "cheirotonia" (laying on of hands), Nicolae Steinhardt, as a simple monk, symbolically assumes this ethos by publicly requesting and

<sup>1</sup> The established parts of discourse in classical rhetoric, according to the treatises of Aristotle and Cicero, are *exordium*, *narratio*, *confirmatio*, *refutatio*, and *peroratio*. Quintilian also mentions other parts, such as *divisio*, *propositio*, and *digressio*.

<sup>2</sup> The audio version includes this formulation and the address "Christian brothers," both of which are absent from the text version in the 2008 edition of the volume.

receiving the blessing to preach. He accomplishes this through the invocation<sup>1</sup>: “Bless me, reverend father, that I may say a few words of teaching!” (“Binecuvintează, preacuvioase părinte, ca să rostesc un scurt cuvânt de învățătură!”), which is followed by the blessing pronounced at the altar: “Through the prayers of our Holy Fathers, Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on us” (“Pentru rugăciunile Sfinților Părinților noștri, Doamne Iisus Hristoase, Fiul lui Dumnezeu, miluiește-ne pe noi”) and the response “Amen!” („Amin!”). According to the testimonies of those who heard his sermons in person, the monk Nicolae always proceeded in the same way: “After coming out in front of the iconostasis and sitting down next to the prepared tetrapod, he would ask the priest on duty for his blessing to speak: *To say a short word of teaching, bless us, reverend father* (he always used this formula.)” (Gordon 2012, 21).

In the *Sermon on Orthodoxy Sunday* (2), discursive ethos is evident through explicit subjectivity, as seen in phrases such as “forgive me,” (“să mă ierți”), “I remind you,” (“vă reamintesc”), and “I tell you” („eu v-o spun”). Additionally, the frequent use of the first-person plural in the conventional authorial form, accompanied by declarative verbs (Zafiu 2010, 30), such as “it is right to speak,” (“se cuvine să vorbim”), “let us specify,” (“să precizăm”), “let us go a little further,” (“să trecem puțin”), “let us see,” (“să vedem”), and “let us resume,” (“să reluăm”), further demonstrates ethos. From a rhetorical perspective, the following Steinhardtian phrase is significant because it demonstrates how ethos can extend the persuasive impact of logos and enhance overall rhetorical effectiveness: “Here, Christian brothers, ends the argument of St. John Damascene, but *I would like to ask you, if you have a little patience, to allow me to say a few words of my own, personal words. Why do I believe that icons are not only good and useful? Why do I believe that they are also inevitable, that they are, so to speak, akin to us, that they are part of our nature, why do they truly belong to man, why are they natural things for man?*” (“Aici, frați creștini, se încheie argumentarea Sfântului Ioan Damaschin, dar *eu vreau să vă rog pe dumneavoastră, dacă mai aveți puținică răbdare, să-mi permiteți să vă spun și eu câteva cuvinte ale mele, personale. De ce cred eu că icoanele sunt nu numai bune și utile, de ce cred eu că sunt și inevitabile, că ele ne sunt nouă, ca să spun așa, afine, că fac parte din firea noastră, de ce ele într-adevăr îi aparțin omului, de ce sunt lucruri firești pentru om*”) (Steinhardt 2008, 557). In the peroration, the ethos is marked by ceremonious caution: “My advice, I daresay, is...” („*Sfatul meu, îndrăznesc să vi-l dau, este...*”) (Steinhardt 2008, 557).

### In lieu of conclusions: What are Steindardt’s insights into ethos?

Upon closer inspection, the volume *By Giving Thou Shalt Receive: Words of Faith* is not only the primary source for Steinhardt’s ambon declamations that best circumscribe and fall within Aristotle’s triad of persuasiveness but also illustrates the monk-scholar’s vision for crafting and delivering contemporary homilies. Specific passages in this Steinhardtian volume, although they do not explicitly name ethos, may serve as important references for specialists interested in the art of homiletic persuasion. The most fitting example is the following discursive sequence from the *Sermon on the Sunday before Great Lent* (*Predică în Duminica dinaintea Marelui Post*): “What is a sermon? Is it a lesson that, like a teacher in a classroom, a priest or monk gives, and parishioners, like students, listen to? I don’t think so. A sermon is not only a “word of teaching”, but also a profession of faith by the one who utters it, a confession that reveals his opinions, nature, and personality – *Sermon on the Sunday before Great Lent* (*Ce este predica? O lecție pe care, asemenea profesorului în clasă, preotul ori monahul o dă, iar enoriașii, asemenea elevilor, o ascultă? Cred că nu. Predica nu este numai un “cuvânt de învățătură”, ci și o profesiune de credință a celui ce o rostește, o mărturisire a sa, care-i dă în vileag părerile, firea, personalitatea*) (Steinhardt 2008, 531).

### References:

- Amossy, Ruth. 2000. *L’argumentation dans le discours. Discours politique, littérature d’idées, fiction. Comment peut-on agir sur un public en orientant ses façons de voir, de penser?*. Paris: Nathan.
- Amossy, Ruth. 2001. “Ethos at the Crossroads of Disciplines: Rhetoric, Pragmatics Sociology”. *Poetics Today* 22 (1): 1-23.
- Aristotle. 2007. *On Rhetoric. A theory of civic discourse*. Translated with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by George A. Kennedy. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chira, Justinian Episcopul Maramureșului și Sătmăruului. 1992. “Întemeiere întru cuvînt”. In N. Steinhardt (Monahul Nicolae Delarohia), *Dăruind vei dobîndi. Cuvinte de credință*. Baia Mare: Editura Episcopiei Ortodoxe Române a Maramureșului și Sătmăruului.

<sup>1</sup> Present in the audio version.

- Chira, P.S. Justinian Episcopul Maramureșului și Sătmăruului. 2000. "În memoria Părintelui Nicolae Steinhardt". In *Caietele de la Rohia (II): N. Steinhardt în amintirea contemporanilor*. Baia Mare: Editura Helvetica, 34-43.
- Cooper, Erica F. 2017. "Neo-Aristotelian Criticism". In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods* (4). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc, 1088-1090. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411.n374>
- Croucher, Stephen M., and Cronn-Mills, Daniel. 2019. *Understanding communication research methods: a theoretical and practical approach*. Second edition. New York: Routledge.
- Gordon, Vasile. 2012. "Loc de cinste pentru monahul Nicolae Steinhardt în omiletica românească". *TABOR. Revistă de cultură și spiritualitate românească* 6 (08): 18-28.
- Hodea, Justin Sigheteanul Arhiereu-vicar. 2005. "Argument". In Nicolae Steinhardt, *Jurnalul fericirii*. Rohia: Editura Mănăstirii Rohia, 9-12.
- Hodea, Justin Sigheteanul Arhiereu-vicar. 2006. "Argument la volumul «Dăruind vei dobândi»". In Nicolae Steinhardt, *Dăruind vei dobândi. Cuvinte de credință*. Rohia: Editura Mănăstirii Rohia, 7-8.
- Iloae, Ștefan. 2008. "Trăire și mărturisire creștină în eseurile teologice ale părintelui Nicolae Delarohia". In N. Steinhardt, *Dăruind vei dobândi. Cuvinte de credință*. Iași: Polirom, 17-35.
- Kinneavy, James L. 1987. *Greek Rhetorical Origins of Christian Faith*. New York: Oxford UP.
- Maftei, Ștefan-Sebastian. 2011. "Note și comentarii." In Aristotel. *Retorica*. Translated with introduction and index by Maria Cristina Andrieș. București: Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 369-424.
- O'Rourke, John J. 1973. "Pistis in Romans". In *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35 (2), 188-194.
- Porumb, Răzvan. 2024. "Foreword". In Nicolae Steinhardt, *The Journal of Joy*, Yonkers, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, IX-XXXII.
- Rusu, Tudorel-Constantin. 2024. "Ethos-Pathos-Logos: Aristotle's Triad of Persuasiveness in Homiletical Discourse". *Hermeneia: Journal of Hermeneutics, Art Theory & Criticism* 32: 94-102.
- Rusu, Tudorel-Constantin. 2024. *Ethos, Pathos și Logos. Resurse ale oratoriei clasice în discursul pastoral*. Iași: Editura Universității "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" din Iași, 2024.
- Sălăvăstru, Constantin. 2010. *Mic tratat de oratorie*. Ed. 2. Iași: Editura Universității "Alexandru Ioan Cuza".
- Steinhardt, N. 2008. *Dăruind vei dobândi. Cuvinte de credință*. Iași: Polirom.
- Șimonca, Ovidiu. 2010. "«Demnitatea lui Steinhardt este fără resentiment». Interviu cu George Ardeleanu". *Observator cultural*, no 509, 21 January.
- Youngdahl, Pat. 1996. "Pulpit Oratory." In Enos, Theresa (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age*. New York And London: Routledge, 572-575.
- Zafiu, Rodica. 2010. "Ethos, Pathos, Logos în textul predicii". In *Text și discurs religios* (2). Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 27-38.

## BIONOTE:

**Tudorel-Constantin RUSU**, Ph.D., is currently a Lecturer at "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iași (UAIC), Romania, in the Department of Communication Sciences and Public Relations. For 11 years, he worked as a journalist in the Media and Communications Department of the Metropolitanate of Moldova and Bucovina. He is the author of the volume *Ethos, Pathos și Logos. Resurse ale oratoriei clasice în discursul pastoral (Ethos, Pathos and Logos: Resources of Classical Oratory in the Homiletical Discourse)*, published in 2024 by the Publishing House of UAIC. His areas of interest, where he has been professionally active and published several scientific articles, include mass media, digital media, photojournalism, visual storytelling, rhetoric, and discursive theory.