

ORTHODOX VIEW OF VICTORY AND DEFEAT IN WAR¹

Review article

DOI: 10.7251/DEFENG1637002G

COBISS.RS-ID 6133272

UDK 355.01:271.222(497.11)

Borislav Grozdić, PhD,

*University Business Academy, Faculty of Economics and Engineering Management,
Novi Sad*

Ilija Kajtez, PhD²,

*University Union – Nikola Tesla, Faculty of International Politics and Security,
Belgrade*

Dragan Gostović, PhD,

*University Union – Nikola Tesla, Faculty of International Politics and Security,
Belgrade*

Abstract:

This paper analyses the Orthodox view of victory and defeat in war, which means that, beside the shared Christian standpoint, it focuses on the peculiarities of Orthodox Christianity of the issue. The Orthodox view is based on the ideas, beliefs and values found in the Scriptures, both the Old and New Testament, and the teachings of Church Fathers, Orthodox Church canons, hagiographic writings of Christian-Orthodox saints, opinions of Orthodox theologians and philosophers and the views and practices of local Orthodox Churches. The core of the paper is represented by exposition of spiritual and moral aspects of war, the Orthodox view of the goal and purpose of war and waging war, and by solution of tensions between honest combat and victory in war.

Keywords: *war, victory, defeat, moral, ethics, Christianity, Orthodox, God*

¹ This paper was produced as part of the research project called *Ethical Education in the Defense System of the Republic of Serbia* (code-name of the project VA-DH/1/13–15, head of the project – Borislav Grozdić, PhD, Associate Professor), which was approved by the Senate of the University of Defence and Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Serbia. Presented on The 13th International Law and Ethics Conference Series (ILECS) What does it mean to win a war? Belgrade, June 25–27, 2014.

² Corresponding author: **Ilija Kajtez**, PhD, University Union – Nikola Tesla, Faculty of International Politics and Security, Belgrade, e-mail: ilijasbm@ptt.rs.

INTRODUCTION

Among many questions of Christian ethics regarding war and warfare, which are to be answered from the Orthodox point of view, the questions of victory and defeat in war are notably interesting and significant³. Modern armed conflicts make them even more essential, and the Orthodox philosophical and theological thought is unable to keep up with the challenges of war that the Orthodox world is facing. In that sense, many questions and dilemmas remain open for Christians. Firstly, why are more wars waged between Christians than between non-Christians, even when both parties in war are Orthodox? Does Christian conscience have to accept every political decision no matter what? Do interests of a government, state or people justify involvement of Christians in war? What if Christian conscience advises the opposite? What should a Christian do if a political authority is obviously forcing him to participate in an unjust war?

Since the Orthodox view of victory and defeat in war is not specifically and evidently given, there arises the question of how to reconstruct it. The process faces numerous and complex difficulties. Moral life of a man is being developed as dependent on an authority. Christian ethics understands moral as realization of God's will, in the manner explained in the Scriptures, Holy Tradition and the life of the Church. It is considered that a man comprehends the will of God in two ways: firstly, on the base of his inner being (inner, natural), and secondly, by revelation and positive commandments, proclaimed by God and incarnate Lord Jesus Christ (exterior, supernatural).

As in Christianity in general, Orthodoxy does not have one single authority that interprets ethical questions and defines what is moral and what is not.⁴ Christians don't have a common view of which authority can interpret the will of God. There are differences between the Orthodox, Catholics and Protestants. In Roman-Catholicism, it is the Pope, in Protestantism it is special interpreters of the Bible, and the Orthodox recognize three types of authority: firstly, the Scriptures, which is interpreted literally and arguments are often found in specific parts of the Bible, and characteristic views of Church Fathers; secondly, the institutions of the Church, bishops, individual or synod ("synod commissions"), and thirdly, clergymen, who, using their clairvoyance and the gift of judgment, can authoritatively indicate what is right and what is wrong (Zizijulas, 2003).

The ideas, beliefs, and values in Orthodoxy regarding victory and defeat in war are mostly going to be reconstructed based on opinions found in the Scripture, both the Old and New Testaments. The Bible describes quite a number of wars, and holds vast experience on their causes, victories and defeats, and it is understandable what the Orthodox bishop and theologian Saint Nikolaj (Velimirović) claims: "There is no philosophy of war that could adequately answer the causes of war and predict the victory or defeat of one side in war. Only the Bible can give such answers and such predictions" (Velimirović, 1993:60).

The Orthodox view of victory and defeat in war will also be examined by relying on the doctrine of Church Fathers (Doctors of the Church), canons (rules) of the Orthodox Church, hagiographic writings of Orthodox saints, insights of Orthodox theologians and philosophers, and the views and practices of local Orthodox Churches.

A specific context is necessary for posing the problem of the Orthodox understanding of victory and defeat in war. First, the Orthodox view of the phenomena of war

³ Elaborated in: Babić, 2005, 86.

⁴ Elaborated in: Grozdić, Kajtez & Gostović, 2012a, 335–364.

has its own peculiarities, and offers a number of divergent answers, compared to Roman-Catholicism and Protestantism. There is no absolute opposition to war in Orthodoxy, which would make the question of victory and defeat unnecessary. In addition, Orthodoxy debunks and rejects the idea of a unified global state, which would dispute the right of states and peoples to defend themselves or an armed conflict among relatively equal sides, and leave armed interventions to the “police actions” of such a “state”. Orthodoxy highlights that on behalf of love of God and the Church, love for the fellow neighbors, the country, it is necessary to sacrifice the most important things, and even take part in war.

Looking back at Orthodox traditions and beliefs, we do not find concepts of holy wars, good wars and justified wars, or a justification of the Crusades. Orthodoxy views war as a necessity in certain situations, for the sake of protecting the innocent and preventing a far greater evil. Taking part in war can be a religious and patriotic duty (Iljin, 2001:137), inevitable alternative, and, nevertheless, in essence, war is considered to be an evil.

Killing in war cannot be considered morally right, sinless and justified. The canons (rules) of the Orthodox Church only sanction such act differently, condemning it as a rule, which has remained in the Orthodox spirit and tradition until today.⁵ That is why we fail to find a formulation of terms for engaging in war (*jus ad bellum*) that would justify it, and we could say that Orthodoxy has never elaborated a theory of just war, in the true sense of the word. Peace, as an ideal, was normative, and theoretical elaborations that would regard war as positive are rare.

From the perspective of modern philosophy and science, the Orthodox point of view can truly appear as a myth, legend, fairy tale, imagination, a collection of prejudices, superstition, with no philosophical and scientific value. However, to put it mildly, it is frivolous to consider the modern-rational system of ideas and values as absolutely privileged, and everything outside it as darkness, barbarity and superstition. Julius Evola points out this great contrast between the modern and traditional world, between the modern and traditional man, a contrast that is spiritual, idealistic, metaphysic. Modern civilization denies traditional spirit, denies simultaneous existence of two orders, physical and metaphysical, and “the traditional man (unlike the modern one, example authors) knew that there was an order of existence much wider than that one we consider today to be “reality”” (Evola, 2010:21). That “invisible” is not only real, it is even more real than what we can experience through the physical senses, and judging by consequences it is crucial for both individual and collective life. Therefore, the Orthodox view is, at least, entitled to a legitimate coexistence with other views, even if it might be considered as a relic of “war idealism”.

LORD SABAOTH – THE DECISIVE FACTOR OF WAR

When it comes to war, the leading idea, that stems from the Old Testament, is that God, Lord Sabaoth,⁶ governs war and peace. Everything regarding war is in God’s

⁵ Elaborated in: Grozdić, 2010, pp. 87-104 and Grozdić, Gostović & Kajtez, 2013, 33–42.

⁶ Sabaoth is the Greek form of the Hebrew word Cebaot, “army”, and hence Jahwe-Cebaot is translated as “Lord of the hosts”. We find it in the Old Testament 279 times, and it signifies God as a commander of heavenly armies, against the pagan star cults. The name has finally been accepted as a intensive plural, and pre-

hands, war starts as God's wills it and His will decides whether we will be victorious or not. With His help, much stronger enemy can be defeated. "When thou goest out to battle against thine enemies, and seest horses, and chariots, and a people more than thou, be not afraid of them: for the Lord thy God is with thee, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (Deuteronomy 20:1)⁷. Thus, the Old Testament belief on war states that, before starting a war, a priest should gather the people "and shall say unto them, Hear, O Israel, ye approach this day unto battle against your enemies let not your hearts faint, fear not, and do not tremble, neither be ye terrified because of them; for the Lord your God is he that goeth with you, to fight for you against your enemies, to save you" (Deuteronomy 20:3-4).

The biblical understanding of divine power is that it is absolute, greatest, original, almighty, eternal and invisible. To rely on God's power actually means to rely on the greatest, absolute power. "I can do all things through Christ which strengthens me" (Philippians 4:13), says Apostle Paul in his Epistle to Philippians. One of the dogmatic teachings of the Orthodox Church is that one of God's qualities is omnipotence, because God realizes everything that pleases His will, and does everything that He wants.

Not war but the first murder described in the Bible is Cain murdering Abel. What did this conflict and murder cause? Envy was the cause. Cain did not kill his brother in a battle for survival, he killed him because he was permeated with envy because God had favored Abel's gift over Cain's. This is what caused such envy in Cain that he murdered his own brother. The cause of the first fratricide is of spiritual, not material, nature; the cause is envy, not hunger.⁸ Hence, man's sin towards God causes man's sin towards man, i.e. man's war against God causes man's war against man (Velimirović, 1993:63).

It is undisputable that envy is in the core of many feelings, attitudes, actions, it is often the main source of ostensibly unexplainable tension and conflict among men. Envy, as something unpleasant, devastating, negative, obnoxious, is condemned in every religion, culture and language. The notion of envy was used and precisely defined by the late XIX century, but ever since then secular science has not been able to comprehend it. However, we can find that political and social conflicts are understood thanks to this phenomenon in Orthodoxy. Since it is not only a psychological phenomenon, and does not only deal with an individual, the roots of envy are in the spiritual sphere, and no matter how much we deny or underestimate it, it is so tough that it is a mere illusion that society will ever be able to free itself from it. As a spiritual cause, Orthodoxy sees the root of political conflicts in envy, which is followed by specific political causes. In the New Testament it is said that lust is the main cause of wars.

One of the most striking examples from the Bible, which testifies about how military victory belongs to the Almighty God, is the example of Moses taking Jews out of Egypt to Canaan and conflicting with the king of the Amaleks. Moses commanded Joshua to choose some men to go into battle against the Amaleks, while he himself stood on the

sumed the meaning "Lord Almighty" which denies the existence of gods of sky and stars. LXX (Septuaginta, gr: *Μετάφραση των Εβδομήκοντα* – the translation of the Seventeen, which is translation of the Old Testament into Greek, made for Jews in Diaspora who did not speak Hebrew) translates the word Sabaoth as "Lord Almighty". The name is found two times in the New Testament. It shows the unlimited power of God, His reign over all creatures, His omnipotence and His glory. He is the Lord of armies, the Lord of powers.

⁷ The abbreviations of biblical books are given throughout the text as in: Rakić, 2004.

⁸ Elaborated in: Šek, 2008, 22.

top of the hill with the rod of God in his hand. While Moses was keeping his hands up in prayer, the Israelites prevailed, but as soon as he let down his hands, the Amaleks prevailed. Since the battle kept going for the whole day and old Moses couldn't hold his hands up any longer, Aaron and Hur put a stone for him to sit, and held his hands up, one on each side. Moses held his hands in this position, in prayer, until the sundown. "And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword" (Exodus 17:8–16). Then Lord told Moses to write that down for a memorial in a book, and to tell Joshua that the Lord will completely eradicate the people of Amalek on Earth. Moses built an altar in the place where he prayed, and called it "Lord is my banner" saying: "Because the Lord hath sworn that the Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation" (Exodus 17:8–16).

The above mentioned event undoubtedly shows the biblical understanding of who held the key to victory and success in a war conflict. It was not in the hands of Joshua, who under the instructions of Moses fought against the enemies of the Chosen people, nor in the hands of Moses who held his hands up in prayer, but in the hands of God. Victory was achieved by the mercy of God, primarily by shouting of Moses to the Lord, not by weapons, strength or skill of Joshua. Saint Nikolaj (Velimirović) writes: "The chief commander does not command the army, but stands silent in prayer with his hands raised to God, while his assistant commands and fights against the enemy. And the merit does not belong to the one that headed the battle as much as to the one that prayed. The law of sin was alleviated by God's mercy, because of the prayer of Moses, the leader of the people" (Velimirović, 1993:67).

According to the Old Testament, the power of God manifests itself with the few and weak, which can be seen in the example of Gideon's victory over Midians. When, because of their sins, the Israelites distanced themselves from God, God allowed them to be enslaved by Midians and tormented them in many ways for seven years. The Israelites cried for help and prayed to the Lord to liberate them from the Midians. The Lord first sent them a prophet to remind them of their covenant with God, and their deviation from it, and after that, an angel informed Gideon that he had been chosen as a leader of the people with the mission to take them out of slavery.

Various signs from God convinced him that he was the chosen one, so Gideon gathered all the people to lead into battle. In order to show Gideon and the Chosen people that victory and defeat are in His hands⁹, the Lord asked of Gideon to release everyone who was afraid, and the number of those was around 22.000 people. Since Gideon was left with 10.000 people, enough to trick the people into thinking that they saved themselves, the Lord commanded Gideon to choose 300 warriors who would be victorious. With God's help, Gideon defeated the Midians with these 300 unarmed warriors. Panic broke out among the Midians, who started to run and kill each other. Gideon did not stop, but continued to pursue the enemy with his army of 300, until he reached a complete victory and executed the enemy's commanders. When the Israelites asked Gideon to become their leader, and his offspring after him, Gideon refused saying: "I will not be your master, nor will my son; the Lord will be your master".

⁹ "The people that are with thee are too many for me to give the Midianites into their hands, lest Israel vaunt themselves against me, saying, Mine own hand hath saved me" (Judges 7:2).

The Bible holds a paradox – the power of God reveals itself in weakness: “And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ’s sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong” (2 Corinthians 12, 9–10). These words are an expression of the teaching that the power of man is insignificant compared with the power of God, and that a man lays his hopes into His power until he is completely powerless when forgetting God.

One of the most important ideas in the Scriptures is that no danger is so great that God cannot help you, nor there is any enemy, no matter how powerful, that can win without God’s permit. God destroyed the Syrian army with an apparition, and they ran, and thus saved Israel (2 Kings 7 - 6). Jerusalem was saved from the great Babylonian army only thanks to the prayers and cries of the king Hezekiah (2 Kings 19:35). It is obvious that the ancient Jews thought of God as their political patron, protector, who gave them victories and defeats in wars; they thought and believed that the content of religion coincides with the content of historical knowledge and political wisdom.

“IN THIS CONQUER!” – THE MOST POWERFUL WEAPON OF CHRISTIAN VICTORS

The victory of Emperor Constantine over Maxentius at the Milvian bridge, not far from Rome, in 312 AD, is a permanent example and eternal inspiration for Christians. Lactancius is the first who informs us about the battle, in his work “De mortibus persecutorum” written in 317/8, in which he describes a mystical encounter of Constantine and God – a vision that was crucial. Likewise, in a similar manner, Constantine’s biographer, Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea writes in “Vita Constantini”, quoting, under oath, the words of the emperor himself. Fearful, outnumbered, being conscious that it is not enough to trust in human powers and resources, that he needs help of a higher power, from above, the help that he had sought from his earlier wars, Constantine prayed to God whom his father had respected as well.

The next afternoon, right before the sundown, Emperor Constantine had a mystical experience on his way to Rome. He saw a cross made of stars in the sky that shined brighter than the Sun, and on the cross there was written – “In this conquer!” (Greek - Τοῦτο νικά; Latin: In hoc signo vinces!) The whole army had the same vision, including the duke Artemis, and that caused fear, since the cross was considered to be a bad omen for the reason that criminals and robbers were condemned to crucifixion. Emperor Constantine remained unsure and careful when it came to the meaning of the vision, and the next day Lord Jesus Christ spoke to him, and told him: “Make a cross like this, and order it to be carried in front of your army, and you will be victorious, not only against Maxentius, but against all of your enemies” (Popović, 1996:494). The Christians that were close to him understood the symbol as a symbol of immortality and triumph over death. The biggest and most important victory is the one over death, the victory of Christ. If the Son of God could triumph over death, the most cursed problem of man, then His power is endless and every other victory is possible.

Constantine ordered the cross to be made of gold, pearls and gems and placed on war flags, in the shape he saw in the sky, with the Christ monogram made of Greek letters X and P, which would replace the Roman gonfalons, and the soldiers had to carry a sign of cross on their weapons, helmets and shields. He himself wore the monogram of „Christ“ on his helmet. We possess few facts concerning this battle. After the victory over Maxentius, who got drowned in the Tiber while escaping, Constantine was convinced that the victory was made possible only with the help of God, so he ordered his soldiers to read a prayer every Sunday, and summoned Christian priests to introduce him to Christianity. Since that October 312 Emperor Constantine regarded himself to be the servant of God with the mission entrusted to him to convert the Roman Empire into Christianity.

The change of Christian standpoint and practice regarding war is interpreted differently, from comprehension that military service and force were completely rejected until the acceptance of possibility that Christians could kill under certain circumstances. The understanding and views of the Church since the first centuries and Middle Ages has developed in various directions, depending on views on violence and non-violence. The Protestants accuse Constantine of this, calling this change “subversion of Christianity”.

The Orthodox interpretation of Church history, in that sense, shows evolution, as an action of the Holy Spirit and a gradual process of understanding the truth, which cannot be predicted. With passing of time, Christians became majority in states, so the Church had to be politically responsible. *Responsibility* and *successfulness* start to function as ethical principles, demanding of Christians not to be neutral concerning political and social changes in the world. Since Constantine the Great, Christians have accepted the criteria of political reality and successfulness when considering the use of force. It was found that non-violence simply does not function, and that Christians have to act realistically and responsibly. If Christians do not use force when necessary, they will no longer be just or free, because there will be no Christians.

During the thousand year long history of Byzantine, the understanding of war changed from only defensive to the demand for reclaiming lost territories, and in that sense we can speak of four periods of Byzantine “type of war”. The Byzantine social order was considered sacred, and unconditional subjugation to order, i.e. discipline and obedience were considered the biggest virtues. Order and obedience stand for peace, and peace represents the best assumption of salvation for Christians.¹⁰ Defying order, which is granted by God, was considered sacrilege. Struggle against the ones that distort the existing order, by violence as well, was considered just and permissible. In that struggle the Church and the state stood together. The emperor waged wars both against the inner enemies of the order (heretics) and the exterior enemies.

During the first period, from the separation of the East and Western Roman empire in 395 AD to the VIII century, the whole life and history in Byzantium were governed by two principles: the first one was the preservation and defending of the borders of Byzantium, and the second – reclaiming the territories of the Western Roman empire, and the creation of an Universal Roman, Romeian (as the Byzantines called themselves) empire. War was constant in the history of Byzantium. The second period, from VIII to IX century, was characterized by efforts to defend Byzantium from Arabic and Slavic at-

¹⁰ Understanding of peace in Christianity elaborated in: Grozdić, Kajtez & Gostović, 2012b, 41–53.

tacks. The defense of Byzantium was equated with the defense of Christianity. Every defensive war in which Christian blood was not spilled was considered pure and noble. In the third period, from the mid IX century to the mid XI century, territorial expansion began once again. War was waged not only against pagans, but also against other Christian peoples, especially Bulgarians. The understanding of war without spilling Christian blood was pushed aside, and new arguments were introduced for the sake of justifying aggressive endeavors. The Church supported the state in its plans to reclaim lost territories (Arveler, 1988:61). The Patriarch of Constantinople Photius the Great, in the *Codex of Epanagogues*, determining the goal of a Christian ruler, points out: “The goal of an emperor is to preserve the existing goods with his virtues; to reclaim with his fruitful alertness the lost goods, to gain with his ardor, his diligence and his just victories the lacking goods” (Arveler, 1988:59–60), focusing on “just victories”.

In the fourth period, after the IX Crusade in 1204, when Constantinople was devastated and a huge part of Byzantine was conquered, the focal point of Byzantines was the liberation of Constantinople and expulsion of Latins, because of which people were summoned to war. Ottomans from the East were considered equally dangerous enemies as Latins from the West, but the Latins, former brothers, were hated even more. The devastation of Constantinople in 1204 revealed the true face of the Pope, and represented the culmination of hatred towards the Orthodox Byzantines, hatred and evil shown in many forms much before the Schism between the Eastern Orthodox and the Western Catholic Christianity in 1054. Since 1204 great antagonisms have emerged between the East and West because of ecclesial matters, followed by a series of Union councils.

The Crusades, started and led by the Roman Popes, show a great and essential difference between Catholic and Orthodox understanding of war. The symphony, as a harmonious relationship between secular and spiritual authorities, resulted in the understanding of Byzantines that war was a matter of rulers, not of the Church, which led to seeing the Crusades as sacrilegious acts of Roman Popes and the usurpation of secular authority by the Church. Numerous Catholic priests took part in the Crusades. Such thing was unacceptable for the Church in Byzantium, where it was even forbidden for clerics to carry weapons. Absolution of sins in advance, which was promised to the Catholic crusaders, was unthinkable in the eyes of Byzantines, and it was incompatible with Eastern Christianity.

Absolution of sins in Orthodoxy in advance has never been observed, and it is impossible for the sake of fighting in war. Byzantines were suspicious towards the Catholic crusaders from the very beginning. Simply put, the Roman Popes organized campaigns for the sake of liberation of Holy Places independently of Byzantine, which considered itself to be the only legitimate guardian of Christianity and for centuries controlled the Holy Places on its territories.

In Orthodox countries, the Mother of God, holy soldiers George, Demetrius, Theodor Tyron, Procopius, Mercurius, and others, were considered the patrons of people in war. The sword and the spear were exclusive symbols of victory, which can be seen in the iconography of holy warriors. The spiritual nature of war is demonstrated in great virtues of human character, which were forged in war: manliness, courage, self-sacrifice, heroism and chivalry. Modern armed conflicts do not have any character of holiness for Christians, which wars had in the past when weapons and equipment were blessed, icons were carried in front of armies, and wars were waged for the defense of Orthodox religion

and fatherland. Nikolai Berdyaev said that modern wars resemble more and more the clashes of criminal gangs and not a chivalrous competition.

In Orthodoxy we find a permanent conviction that war and peace happen by providence, or by the will and permission of God. The final outcome of war or any other form of political conflict is definitely in the hands of God. There is deep conscience about the fact that no matter how strong the army is, there is no hope for success in war, and final victory, without God's help.¹¹ It is not enough to rely on human power and means, because support from above is needed: "If God be for us, who is against us?" (St. Paul to Romans 8:31). "My help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth" (Psalm 121:2).

In the core of this belief lies the understanding that God has unlimited, absolute power, incomparable to the power of man, overcoming it greatly. That power is mystical, mysterious, invisible and unknowable, man depends on it, his life is controlled by it. A man is not given the power to foresee any action of God. It is precisely because of this feeling of dependence on God's omnipotence, which can help or hinder man in war or some other form of political conflict, that man has to try to influence it, control it with certain acts and behavior – prayer, life, confession, fast, repentance. Such understanding comes from the essence of Christian faith and anthropologic view that man hopes and relies not on himself and his power, but primarily on God.

In Orthodox iconography Christian rulers are often portrayed receiving weapons from Heavens, angels or Archangel Michael. Divine origin of weapons in the hands of victorious Orthodox rulers was first painted in Byzantium¹², and we find it in Serbian art not until the middle of the XIV century, and it has been preserved only on wall paintings. Emperor Dušan was the first to be represented in that manner, between 1343 and 1345, on the western facade of the church of Saint George in the village Pološki in FYR Macedonia.¹³

In the Middle Ages it was common for Orthodox rulers to wear a pectoral cross in battles, which had a symbolic function, especially a victorious one, portraying not just the ruler but the entire country too (Byzantium, Latin Empire, Serbia, Bulgaria, Georgia, Russia). Serbian rulers from the Middle Ages and the rulers of surrounding states (Byzantium, Bulgaria, Hungary) and most other European states wore pectoral crosses as a part of their insignia,¹⁴ as a symbol of victorious cross of honor. This was not the custom of only Orthodox rulers, but also of Catholic and Protestant. Simeon the Myrrh-bearer (Ste-

¹¹ It is interesting that a modern secular philosopher, H. Arendt, who studies violence, admits that "violence holds the added element of arbitrariness; nowhere fortune, good or bad luck, plays a more decisive role than on the battlefield, and this involvement of something completely unexpected does not disappear when people call it "coincidence" and find it scientifically doubtful; it cannot be eliminated by simulations, scenarios, theory of games and such. There is no certainty in these situations, not even the final certainty of mutual destruction under certain anticipated circumstances" (Arendt, 2002:9).

¹² The oldest presentation of that kind has remained in the Psalter of Basil II that is kept in Venice. After the war with the Arabs in the East, between 1001 and 1005 or around 1019 AD, after having defeated the army of emperor Samuel, Basil II is shown on a miniature on a decorated throne, dressed in tunic and armor, while from above, from the segments of Heaven pectoral Jesus gives him a stem that Archangel Gabriel sets on his head, flying in from the right. Meanwhile, Archangel Michael, coming from the left, brings a spear that the emperor takes with his right arm. In his left arm he already has a sword in scabbard.

¹³ Serbian emperor Dušan stands painted with a cross-like scepter in his right hand while an "angel of God" descends from the right and puts a sword in scabbard into his left hand.

¹⁴ Signs, symbols, signs of distinction, rank or dignity, honorary symbols.

fan Nemanja) sent a pectoral cross¹⁵ from Mount Athos to his son Stefan the First-crowned, in order to be of a manifold use, but primarily for protection and military victory. Many miraculous icons are venerated in Orthodoxy, mostly those of the Mother of God, which are believed to have brought victories in wars.

To what extent military victory is important can be deduced from the *Great Euchologion*, where we find prayers for: consecration of military flags and blessing of the army before war; blessing of military weapons, blessing of a war ship and its soldiers, etc. (*Veliki trebnik*, 1993:526–539). When consecrating a military flag a priest prays: “Almighty and eternal God ... This flag, which we prepared for battle, visit with your heavenly blessing, bless and consecrate, so that your army can defeat the enemy and give it victory: and that, guarded by You, make the army of all our enemies flee; and let it always be terrible and horrid to all enemies of Christians, and let it be a hope that your loyal servants can rely on, let it be a reliable hope in victory and bravery and strength; and, secured with the prayers of Your holy, and surrounded by armies of Your angels, let it show Your servants the symbols of joy and strength, symbols of victory and courage and heroism against the enemies.” And when he sprinkles it, he says: “Blessed is this military flag for the sake of strength and encouragement of the Christ-loving army and the victories against all enemies; sprinkling this water I bless it in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, Amen” (*Veliki trebnik*, 1993:530–531).

When a priest blesses a weapon, he says: “Send Your heavenly blessing upon this weapons (he lists them by name), give power and strength to be carried for fortification and protection of Your holy Church, and of the poor and widows, and on the land of your holy heritage; and make it awful and frightening to every enemy army; and show it always victorious in Your glory” (*Veliki trebnik*, 1993:534).

Prayers which are recommended by the Orthodox Church in times of war, for various goals, are based on the Second Epistle to Corinthians: “Now thanks be to God, who always maketh us to triumph in Christ Jesus, and manifesteth the odour of his knowledge by us in every place” (2 Corinthians 2:14); and from Gospel of Matthew: “Ask, and it shall be given you: seek, and you shall find: knock, and it shall be opened to you. For every one that asketh, receiveth: and he that seeketh, findeth: and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened. Or what man is there among you, of whom if his son shall ask bread, will he reach him a stone? Or if he shall ask him a fish, will he reach him a serpent? If you then being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children: how much more will your Father who is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him?” (Matthew 7:7–11). Hagiographic writings show that, besides praying for help to God, directly to Jesus Christ, mediation is often asked from Virgin Marry, Saint George, Saint Nicholas and other saints. There are examples of taking vows before the battle, such as Stefan of Dečani taking a vow before the battle of Velbuzhd in front of the icon of Saint George, promising to decorate it and reward greatly the temple it is in if he is victorious.

More than once a prayer is found for the Christ-loving army in the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom. These prayers are believed to be added to the Liturgy after the

¹⁵ Pectoral crosses exist in other countries of the Byzantine world, Georgia and Bulgaria. Chronologically and geographically, the Bulgarian example is especially close to ours. A pectoral cross that belonged to the Bulgarian emperor George Terter is kept at the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mount Athos; the inscription does not make it clear whom the cross belonged to, George I (1281–1292) or George II (1321–1323). The inscription shows that the cross was considered a symbol of George’s victory over the “barbarians”.

time of Emperor Constantine. I. Ilyin responds to the question why the Church is praying for a Christ-loving army, when the task of an army is to plan and prepare for war, i.e. destruction, killing and bloodshed, all the things opposite to the teaching and the life of Christ, in his article ‘About Christ-loving army’: “But there are wars that are spiritually just and morally necessary. Those are the wars that the Church refers to when praying for the Christ-loving army. And the warrior, if he is a Christian believer, cannot be separated from Christ in any work or moment of his life. Even when, by military duty, he goes to war and battles. And he will not be worthy of his soldier’s title if he ‘fights without Christ’ or ‘opposite to Christ’, but only when he clearly and strongly remembers his Christian title and calling” (Iljin, 1939).

THE GOAL OF WAR – FOR WHAT AND FOR WHOM IS LIFE WORTH GIVING FOR IN WAR?

The questions ‘What are the legitimate goals of war that we can justly strive to?’ and ‘What is a just goal of a just war?’ have many answers: faith, freedom, justice, fatherland, people, etc. Michael Walzer claims that professional soldiers in war are guided by passion for victory: “When soldiers believe they are fighting an aggressor, war is no longer just a state to be endured. It is a crime they must resist – although they have to suffer its consequences in order to resist it – and they can hope for a victory that is more than simple redemption from an imminent brutal combat. Experiencing war as hell creates what we call higher ambition: it does not try to negotiate with the enemy, but to defeat and punish him, and if not to end the tyranny of war, then to minimize the probability of its future reign. And when someone is fighting for these kinds of causes, victory becomes very important” (Walzer, 2010:67). However, the argument that modern wars represent a struggle for the survival of soldiers, more than a purposeful action, is reasonable. Pure physical and biological survival is becoming the essence of war, not the fight for a higher spiritual cause, because the modern man and his community have lost the deep spiritual meaning.

What does Orthodoxy recognize as the purpose of war? This is one of the most difficult questions that have bothered Christian ethics from the beginning: “Taking on a sword makes sense only if there is something to die for: for the sake of God’s work on earth. It is pointless for those who know nothing above themselves and their personal life on Earth to take on swords; it is better for him to throw the sword away and run for his life, even for the price of a humiliating subjugation to the enemies” (Iljin, 2001:156), argues Ivan Iljin in a completely Orthodox style.

The crucial and most important thing is that Jesus Christ conquered ‘the world’, discovering the meaning of life and existence of man, but not only that, but showing him the way to it as well. The goal is eternal life in the Heavenly Kingdom, and the way is Christ himself, who says: “I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life” (John 14:6), which means that the way to the objective is to follow the example of Christ and observe His commandments. It is imperative for Christians to strive for the fundamental thing, the Kingdom of God, and His justice, and everything else will be added to them (Matthew 6:33): food, clothes, health, knowledge, peace etc. Consequently, there is no war of man against man, or people against people. In that sense, the only desirable and completely justified and necessary war is the one that a Christian should wage against himself, his

passions and sins. According to the spiritual codex, only if that war is permanent, there will be no armed conflicts, but if it is not permanent, that would inevitably lead to war against God, followed by war between men (Velimirović, 1993:162).

Establishing peace as the purpose of war is a concept that Christianity adopted from the ancient world, hence violence should be kept on minimum, as little as it takes to reach the satisfaction from the enemy. But the question emerges, why peace, what is the purpose of peace, why is peace such a popular topic? The usual answers are: personal security, state, culture, economic progress, progress in every way. Victory in war is not a value in itself, but a presumption of reaching higher causes. Celebrating God is the essence of peace, and if anything stands in the place of celebrating Him, then peace is unsustainable, and we can expect war, sooner or later. In the well-known 'Khazar debate' between Saint Cyril and the Muslims, which is inevitably used when considering the Orthodox view of war and answering the question why do Christians go to war, Saint Cyril quotes Jesus: "This is my commandment, that you love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John 15:12–13), and points out the goal of war: "We do it because of our closest relatives, lest their soul would be enslaved along with their bodies" (Kliment & Konstantin, 1964:63). The care for souls is substance and the greatest value that comes from victory in war, because otherwise, in the case of defeat, our closest ones would be led to doing 'God-opposing evil deeds', which means that they would be forced to deviate from the faith that leads them to salvation.

Is the Christian-Orthodox view that war is only legitimate if there are realistic perspectives for victory? This argument is based upon the New Testament, in the Gospel according to Luke, in the famous metaphor that Jesus uses to explain what it means to truly follow Him: "Or what king, about to go to make war against another king, doth not first sit down, and think whether he be able, with ten thousand, to meet him that, with twenty thousand, cometh against him? Or else, whilst the other is yet afar off, sending an embassy, he desireth conditions of peace" (Luke 14:31–32).

The view that war is only legitimate if there is a reasonable chance of success – victory, and if not, then we should pray for peace, is not exclusive. The Orthodox Serbian history did not stick to that view much. On the contrary, there were often deviations. The leading thought was that the value that was defended was of the outmost significance, not the certainty of success and victory. The magnitude of force and power is not measured only by its empirical effects in Orthodoxy. The whole world lies in wickedness, evil and suffering rule the world, and armed violence and war are just one of the manifestations. The Orthodox Christians believe in victory over the 'world', which saves the world as a construct enslaved by powers of evil, mostly out of trust in the words of Christ: "In the world you shall have distress, but have confidence, I have overcome the world" (John 16:33).

TENSION BETWEEN VICTORY AND HONEST STRUGGLE – AN ORTHODOX SOLUTION

What is the relationship between victory (defeat) in war and respecting the rules of war? The fact is that the rules of war changed throughout history, and that they are not permanent in any war. At best they are respected as long as victory is certain (Walzer,

2010:284). Michael Walzer realistically states: “The belief that victory is of the most moral value plays an important role in the so-called ‘logic of war’. We do not call war hell because it is led without any restraint. It is more accurate to say that when we come cross a certain restraint, the hell of war forces us to neglect every other restraint in order to win. This holds the greatest tyranny: the ones resisting the aggression are forced to imitate, if not even exceed the brutality of the aggressor” (Walzer, 2010:67).

We witness the absence of any mercy, honesty and chivalry in modern armed conflicts, uprisings, civil wars, anti-terrorist and anti-rebel operations, ‘humanitarian interventions’ and in other untraditional forms of hostility.¹⁶ The supremacy of ‘force over the law’ is effective, and the discussion about ‘values’ and justice is becoming noting more than rhetoric that is “put in motion by the phrases and hypocritical declarations of principles, as additional means of the brutal will for power” (Evola, 2010:190). Defeat in war can sometimes be fatal, with tragic and huge consequences, which can lead up to the extermination of one people or some social community. This makes the tension between victory and rules of war eternally significant, both theoretically and practically, and the answers and actions differ depending on the context and participants.

What is the Christian-Orthodox view? The first obstacle is the establishment of rules; is it the medieval code of feudal warrior or the eight rules of Mao Tse Tung or something else? The Orthodox view, typically deontologic, is deeply founded in the commandments and Revelation of God. Namely, Christian rules (laws) are only significant if they are the expression of the will of God¹⁷ and not if they are created by the free and volatile will and mind of man. Failing to obey or violating such rules, which are moral laws, represent a sacrilege, sin with consequences far greater than the ones for violating any law of man or nature. Since they are from ‘above’, the laws (rules) of God have sense because respecting them leads us “upwards” into the Heavenly Kingdom.

The Old Testament specifically demands that the law of God be strictly respected in war, and that it must not be violated in any commandment: “When thou goes to war against any enemies, thou shalt keep thyself from every evil thing” (Deuteronomy 23:9). Robbery, marauding, adultery, desecration of sanctity or any other sin are an obstacle for victory in war and lead directly to defeat. Such a thing must not be done by army commanders or by the army itself, down to the last soldier, if they wish to achieve victory in war. The higher the rank of the soldier, the greater obstacle his sin is for his army to win. “The sin of commanders of an army against God and divine law is equal to planned treason and surrender to the enemy” (Velimirović, 1993:74), claims the Holy Nikolaj (Velimirović).

Looting in war is explicitly forbidden, because it is considered to inevitably lead to defeat. From the perspective of war and warfare, it is unconceivable to fight for higher causes and simultaneously sink to the worldliest trivialities. There are numerous examples of that in the Old Testament, and the most striking one is the unexpected defeat of the army of Joshua at the Amorite city of Ai (Joshua 7:5). Stunned by the outcome, commander Joshua cried out to the Lord asking Him to reveal the mysterious cause of the

¹⁶ In modern times of shameless competition, instead of love among men and observing other Christian values, the highest values are egoism, narcissism and success at every cost. Such society is doomed to ruthless wars. Such society is less and less based on Christian values of good, forgiveness, sacrifice and compassion.

¹⁷ The rules of Ecumenical and Regional councils and those of the Church Fathers are considered to be just like that, an expression of God’s will.

defeat. In the long prayer in front of the Ark of Testimony it was revealed to him that the defeat was caused by looting of someone in his army. "Israel hath sinned, and transgressed my covenant: and they have taken damned things, and they have stolen and lied, and have hidden them among their goods" (Joshua 7:11).

In his search for the thief Joshua finds the culprit Achan the son of Carmi of the tribe of Judah, who admits to taking a mantle, 200 shekels of silver and a bar of gold from the city of Jericho, and burying them under his tent. Joshua punished the robber gravely – by stoning him and his entire family, along with the cattle and his entire property. After this expurgation of sins, Joshua easily conquered the city of Ai.

We find similar ideas, beliefs and values in the Orthodox tradition of Serbs. The biographer Theodosius describes the way that Saint Sava taught the soldiers: "He taught the soldiers to avoid violence and unjust taking, and advised them to be content with their wages, wives and gifts from the emperor" (Teodosije, 1992:167). Theodosius basically attributes to Saint Sava the words of Saint John the Baptist addressed to the soldiers: "Do violence to no man; neither calumniate any man; and be content with your wages" (Luke 3:14). Instead of using Saint John's word 'violence', Saint Sava, according to Theodosius, tells the soldiers to 'avoid violence and unjust taking' (violence, not every use of force; unjust taking, not every appropriation of the spoils of war), not only to be 'content with their wages', but also with 'wives and gifts from the emperor'. Unjust taking is surely considered looting in war. In the famous 'Dušan's Codex' war looting was also forbidden: "whoever finds anything in the land of the emperor, he shall not take it, and then not say, I will give it back, if someone recognizes it, and if he accepts or takes it, he shall pay as a robber and a thief, and if he finds anything in a foreign land, on a soldier, he shall bring it in front of the emperor and the duke" (*Dušanov zakonik*, 1986:73).

Numerous places in the Scriptures, hagiographic and other writings indicate that debauchery in war is the cause of misfortune and defeat. The result of this sin in war is seen in the example of the chosen Jewish people when 'committed fornication with the daughters of Moab' (Numbers 25:1). Along with the adultery of the flesh, the Israelites committed the adultery of spirit, which means that they had forgotten God, and started respecting and bowing to Moab idols. That was a reason enough for the entire people to be punished. Instead of defeating the Moabs, the Israelites were defeated. The punishment was, once again, severe. Aaron's grandson Fines entered the tent of an Israelite that brought a Madianite woman for adultery and lanced them both with a spear. Moses ordered for all of the people's leaders who had committed adultery and fornication to be hung. After that, the Israelites advanced and won victories over the enemies.

In a number of biographies of holy warriors we can find the significance of withholding from fornicating in war, for example, the successful resisting the passion of the Roman duke Nicholas from the time of Roman emperor Nicephor I (802–811), then the holy soldier Taksioth and others.¹⁸ The aforementioned demand of Saint Sava for soldiers to be content with 'their wives' is nothing more than a warning to soldiers to be wise and preserve their marriage, and a lesson that debauchery and fornicating in war bring misery. It is interesting how Saint Sava adds his lesson to a well-known gospel advice of John the Baptist. The knowledge of this remained in Serbian people maybe until World War I, but has faded ever since, along with the fading of faith.

¹⁸ Elaborated in: Grozdić, 2013, 225, 381.

Christ does not lull us into the illusion that there will be no war, but realistically reveals that armed conflict will be present until the end of days: “And you shall hear of wars and rumors of wars. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom” (Matthew 24:6–7). However, Jesus teaches us how not to cause war. We find numerous examples in the Scriptures of how infidelity and immorality of military and people’s leaders cause war and defeat. In contrast, because of fairness and goodness of the leaders, the ones that respect God and His commandments, Lord gives the peace and prosperity to a nation, peace to the state, and victory if it comes to war.

Facing danger, states and nations are prepared to become allies with anybody, to ‘make a pact with the devil’, just to win, neglecting the morality and faith of potential allies, relying only on their military and economic power. It is believed that such an ally brings misfortune, because ‘partnering with evil, brings evil to all partners’, and then there will no longer be any help from the strongest and the most reliable ally – God.

The Scripture advises that weapons and the number of soldiers are not crucial for achieving victory, but spiritual and moral factor: “Weapons do not help, General, where God does not help. And where God helps, victory can lie in a sling of a shepherd.”¹⁹ Every sin in war is revenged much quicker than in peace, and there are no accidents. “A soldier has to be pure of sin in war, and fearfully stand with his spirit straight as a candle in front of God. That has been known by peasant peoples of the Balkans forever” (Velimirović, 1993:75), writes holy Nikolaj (Velimirović). We must admit that many members of these ‘peasant peoples of the Balkans’ forgot about this in armed conflicts during the disintegration of former SFR Yugoslavia.

In Orthodoxy there are no exceptions to the emphasis on obeying the rules of war and merciful behavior, because trust in divine support comes from that feeling of just acting, and trust in victory from it. As soon as sin emerges in a victorious army, it is followed by defeat, because it is believed that one cannot sin against the law of God and live in peace. War is not a state where no rules and inhibitions apply, where moral and spiritual laws are non-existent. In Orthodox understanding, fairness in war is not a guarantee of victory, but it is surely a condition. Unfair fighting is, on the other hand, a guarantee of defeat, maybe not instantly, but absolutely on the long run.

The basis for this argument is found in the Scripture, namely in the Epistle of Apostle Paul to the Ephesians: “Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of God that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God” (Ephesians 6: 10–17). Apostle lists the following weapons of God: to girt the loins with the truth, to enrobe the breastplate of righteousness, to put the Gospel of peace on the feet, to take the shield of faith, and the helmet of salvation, the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God,

¹⁹ Refers to the fight of David and Goliath (Velimirović, 1993:109).

prayer and patience. This obviously refers to a spiritual struggle, spiritual war, but as means and methods that could be applied to physical war too.

There is no dilemma that murder in war is a sin for Orthodox Christians, regardless of higher and selfless motives. "According to the Church, man does not govern the mystery of life and death, and thus cannot take what he has not given..." (Grozdić, Gostović & Kajtez, 2013:41). However, is it not a sin to peacefully watch the wrongdoings of the aggressor? That is why Christian's duty is to go and commit a sin in his external combat against evil, if his withholding from combat would result in a greater sin. A Christian should not remain passive for the sake of 'clean hands' and because of the notion that evil in the world cannot be completely destroyed. On the contrary, his duty is to oppose evil with physical force, if in that moment it is the most efficient means of defending the world from it. It is necessary to differentiate between the Orthodox-Christian view of *essential overcoming of evil*, which is possible only using good, and *defending the world from evil*, when it is not only permitted but also necessary to oppose evil with physical force.

CONCLUSION

Political thoughts in general in Orthodoxy contain a higher political ideal, bound by the teachings of the New Testament on salvation, not only personal, but on salvation of all Orthodox peoples as spiritual communities. Political thoughts and political acts can be best understood just through this ideal, as a key to the puzzle, even when it comes to the issues of war, its victory or defeat. Salvation as an ideal gives sense to every undertaking, pervades every decision. The concept of victory had and still has a significant role in the Christian-Orthodox view of war. No matter what is considered a legitimate reason for entering war, victory was always the aim. Why? Because victory and defeat were seen as a sign from God, victory as a confirmation of justice, law and truth, and defeat as punishment for injustice, transgression and lie. Victory in war is considered a confirmation of true faith and morality in general. Therefore, a specific value of the Orthodox view of war and armed conflict in general, along with victories and defeats, is a deep insight and confirmation of the utmost importance of spiritual and moral factor, compared to the material, regardless how much it resembles 'war idealism' from the modern point of view.

The understanding that God represents a first-class political factor, that He is an absolute sovereign and the source of political and every other authority, the bearer and source of absolute political power, dominates Orthodoxy. In armed forces conflicts, with all of their material and physical resources, the will of God is crucial and is above everything. So, men are only the masters of causes of wars never the outcomes. Uncertainty, suspense and risk of the outcome, as its essential attribute, in the Orthodox view is diminished by showing the ways and means of spiritual and moral nature, which certainly lead to victory. Victory and defeat in war can be a logical consequence of what happened before, and how a community, people or state acted, how truly their rulers served God.

Unequivocally, the Orthodox view is that the side in war which is granted victory by God's will, which has the purest and strongest faith in God and respects God's law more consistently wins. Those who are like this will be spared of war, or will be victori-

ous in war, regardless of their numbers, culture and weapons, but those who have fallen from God, who do not respect the law of God, will be defeated, regardless of their material and technological supremacy. It means that victory is a material realization, implementation of something that has a higher cause, meaning and sense. If people, along with their leaders, would follow Jesus, they would be spared of war, or would triumph in it.

REFERENCES

- Arent, H. (2002). *O nasilju*. Beograd: Aleksandria Pres.
- Arveler, E. (1988). *Politička ideologija Vizantijskog carstva*. Beograd: Filip Višnjić.
- Babić, J. (2005). Ratni zločin kao zločin poraza, u: *Moral i naše vreme*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- *Biblija ili Sveto pismo staroga i novoga zavjeta* (1974). Beograd.
- *Veliki trebnik* (1993). Prizren: Eparhija raško-prizrenska.
- Velimirović, N. (1993). *Rat i Biblija*. Beograd: Svetosavska književna zadruga.
- Volzer, M. (2010). *Pravedni i nepravedni ratovi*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Grozdić, B. (2010). Nomokanon Svetoga Save o ubistvu u ratu. *Theoria*, 4, 87–104.
- Grozdić, B. (2013). *Sveti ratnici – Žitija svetih vojskovođa i vojnika*. Beograd: MC Odbrana.
- Grozdić, B., Gostović, D. & Kajtez, I. (2013). Attitude to Murder in the Canons of the Orthodox Church. *Defendology*, 33, 33–43.
- Grozdić, B., Kajtez, I. & Gostović, D. (2012a). Complexity of the Conception of Pacifism in Orthodoxy. *Filozofski godišnjak*, 25, 335–364.
- Grozdić, B., Kajtez, I. & Gostović, D. (2012b). Understanding of Peace in Christianity, *ANALE SERIA DREPT, Volumul XXI*, 41–53.
- *Dušanov zakonik*, priredila Biljana Marković (1986). Beograd: Prosveta – SKZ.
- Evola, J. (2010). *Pobuna protiv modernog sveta*. Čačak – Beograd: Gradac.
- Zizijulas, J. (2003). Ontologija i etika. *Sabornost*, 1–4, Požarevac.
- Iljin, I. (1939). O hristoljubivoj vojsci, Rusija – Njujork. Beograd: magazin *Odbrana*, 15.12.2006, translated from Russian: Nebojša Kovačević.
- Iljin, I. (2001). *O suprotstavljanju zlu silom*. Beograd: ZEPTER BOOK WORLD – NIC Vojska.
- Kliment, O., Konstantin, P. i nepoznati pisci (1964). *Ćirilo i Metodije – Žitija, službe, kanoni, pohvale*, priredio Đ. Trifunović, translated by I. Grickat, O. Nedeljković, Đ. Trifunović. Beograd: SKZ.
- Popović, J. (1996). *Žitija svetih za maj*. Valjevo: Manastir Čelije.
- Rakić, R. (2004). *Biblijska enciklopedija*. Srbinje – Foča: Duhovna akademija.
- Teodosije (1992). *Žitije Svetog Save*, translated by L. Mirković, redacted by D. Bogdanović. Beograd: SKZ.
- Šek, H. (2008). *Zavist – jedna teorija društva*. Beograd: Algoritam.

Paper Received: 18. 1. 2016

Paper Approved: 5. 8. 2016