

VLADAN TATALOVIĆ

Orthodox New Testament Scholarship in Serbia

1. Introduction

The eminent German Slavist and Byzantinist Gerhard Podskalsky (1937-2013) wrote prolifically about where and how the Bible was translated, read, and understood among the South Slavs, as well as about the theological sources and climate of medieval Serbia. In the preface to his principle work about the theological literature of the Middle Ages in Bulgaria and Serbia,¹ Podskalsky maintained that knowledge of medieval sources

¹ G. Podskalsky, *Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien (865-1459)* (München, 2000; Serb. ed. Belgrade, 2010). As is clear from the title of this extensive study, it encompasses the medieval era, which is commoly divided into three crucial periods: 1) The first commenced in the middle of the ninth century with the Christianization of the Slavs through the missionary work of equal-to-the-Apostles Cyril (869) and Methodius (885), which was primarily based on the translation of selected liturgical and biblical texts into the Slavonic language using the newly standardized *glagoljica* (Glagolitic) alphabet. This first period gave birth to entire generations of disciples who would later on play particularly important roles, like Naum (910) and Clement (916), and who are also to be appreciated for the regeneration of an ecclesiastical entity called the Archbishopric of Ochrid, with one of its later archbishops, Theophylact (1126), being the most translated exegete among the Slavs. 2) Then, there is a period when medieval Serbia was gaining power and independence, starting from the second half of the twelfth century on, which is altogether inseparable from the granting of autocephaly to the Serbian Orthodox Church in 1219—that is, it became independent from the Ochrid Archbishopric. In this period, two key figures spurred the flourishing of the Serbian national and spiritual identity: Stefan Nemanja (1199), later monk Symeon, the founder of the ruling Nemanjić dynasty, and his youngest son Sava (1236), the first Archbishop of the Serbian church. 3) Finally, there is a period that started with the Battles of Maritsa (1371) and Kosovo (1389), and the subsequent fall of a vast Serbian empire at the end of the fourteenth century, to end with the weakened Serbian Despotate being conquered by the Ottomans in 1459. For more on the rise and development of Serbian theological literature in the medieval era, see: H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (München, 1959; 2nd ed. 1977); I. Duichev and S. Nikolov, *Kiril and Methodius: Founders of Slavonic Writing. A Collection of Sources and Critical Studies* (New York, 1985); F. Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs* (New Brunswick, 1970); F. Grivec, *Kon-*

and the ways in which they were transmitted has a decisive significance for understanding modern Orthodox Christianity that goes far beyond appreciating the standpoints of contemporary intellectuals (many Orthodox among them), who occasionally cannot refrain from polemics and bias.² Although we share Podskalsky's conviction about the broader significance of the medieval sources of Serbian thought and culture, we nevertheless observe that in the West there have been no detailed studies of the tendencies in modern Serbian theology, although information of this kind surely would be of utmost importance for the following discussion, which is dedicated to the narrow topic of modern biblical studies up to the present moment. Therefore, remarks about the broader contexts are crucial, for we must examine those historical roots and well-springs of theological literature in modern Serbian society. Without such a foundation, an evaluation of the scientific output by individual scholars in a specific field of inquiry is not actually possible. So, we will turn our attention first to the tendencies in theological education and consequently to the foundation and development of theological schools in Serbia, wherefrom we will shift our focus to the founding of the Faculty of Orthodox Theology in Belgrade [FOTB] (1920)—that is, to its Biblical Theology Department, which is expected to be a “queen bee” of Serbian biblical scholarship.

stantin und Method: Lehrer der Slawen (Wiesbaden, 1960); J. Matl, “Der heilige Sawa als Begründer der serbischen Nationalkirche: Seine Leistung und Bedeutung für den Kulturaufbau Europas,” in J. Matl, *Südslawische Studien* (SOA 63; München, 1965), 32–44; H. Miklas, “Kyrillomethodianisches und nachkyrillomethodianisches Erbe im ersten ostslavischen Einfluß auf die südslawische Literatur,” in *Symposium Methodianum. Beiträge der Internationalen Tagung in Regensburg (17. bis 24. April 1985) zum Gedenken an den 1100. Todestag des heiligen Method* (eds. K. Trost, E. Völkl, and E. Wedel; Selecta slavica 13; Neuried, 1988), 437–472; D. Obolensky, *Six Byzantine Portraits* (Oxford, 1988), 34–82, 115–172; Ch. K. Papastathès, *Tò νομοθετικὸν ἔργον τῆς κυριλλομεθοδιανῆς ἱεραποστολῆς ἐν μεγάλῃ Μοραβίᾳ* (Thessalonike, 1978); P. J. Schaffarik, “Übersicht der vorzüglichsten schriftlichen Denkmäler älterer Zeit bei den Serben und anderen Südslawen,” *JL* 53 (1831), 1–58; K.-D. Seemann, ed., *Gattungen und Genologie der slavisch-orthodoxen Literaturen des Mittelalters. Dritte Berliner Fachtagung 1988* (VOEI 73; Wiesbaden, 1992).

² One of the most controversial issues in contemporary Orthodox thought concerns not the challenges of biblical exegesis but those of liturgical renewal; however, the noise of these polemics remains inversely proportional to the scholarly use of sources, as may be seen from the following study: N. Glibetić, “Liturgical Renewal Movement in Contemporary Serbia,” in *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship. Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Rome, 17–21 September 2008* (J ECS 12; ed. B. Groen, S. Hawkes-Teeple, and S. Alexopoulos; Leuven, 2012), 393–414.

2. Analyzing the context: Serbian theological education before the opening of the FOTB

Nowadays, it is widely known that the European educational system stemmed historically from Christianization, as shown by the fact that many West-European colleges had their forerunners in monastic schools.³ In this regard, Serbia did not fall behind the most developed European nations: figures such as Cyril and Methodius, Clement, Naum, and Theophylact, and especially the first Archbishop Sava, have always been regarded as the *enlighteners of nations*,⁴ while the monasteries of Ochrid, Studenica, Žiča, Peć, and Chilandar on Mount Athos⁵ may be

³ Among the many reference monographs that deal with the rise and development of the medieval universities, see especially the following: A. B. Cobban, *The Medieval Universities: Their Development and Organization* (London, 1975); H. Denifle, *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400* (Berlin, 1885; repr. Graz, 1956); W. Rüegg, *Geschichte der Universität in Europa. Band 1: Mittelalter* (München, 1993); J. Verger, *Les universités au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1973; new ed. 2013). Also noteworthy is the renowned work of Serbian bishop (of Banat), who was one of the first professors (of canon law) at the FOTB, Vikentije Vujić (1874-1939), “Европски универзитети од постанка им до хуманистичких покрета” (“European Universities from their Emergence until the Humanistic Movements”), *Божјословски гласник (Theological Herald)* 21 (1912), 26-31, 145-152, 236-246, 344-353, 425-443. With the recently published study, B. Šijaković and A. Raković, *The University and Serbian Theology: The Historical and Educational Context of the Establishment of the Faculty of Orthodox Theology in Belgrade* (Los Angeles: Sebastian Press, 2014; Serb. ed. Belgrade, 2010, 2014), the FOTB shows a pressing need to [re]think its existence in the context of the emergence, evolution, and contemporary situation of European universities (see esp. 7-35: B. Šijaković, “University and Theology: The Educational Context of the Intellectual History and the Faculty of Orthodox Theology in Belgrade”).

⁴ Synodic of [Bulgarian] Tsar Boril (1207-1218), most probably written in 1211, mentions Cyril the Philosopher as “the leader of the Slavic apostles and the enlightener of Bulgarian nation”: M. G. Popruženko, *Sinodik carâ Borila (Synodic of Tsar Boril)* (Sofia, 1928), 77. At about the same time (1242/1243), an Athonite (Chilandarian) monk Domentian (1264), who stands as a major figure in medieval Serbian literature, wrote the first biographies of Archbishop Sava and his father Nemanja (St. Simeon the Myrrh-streaming), frequently calling both of them “the enlighteners of the homeland”: R. Marinković, *Домениџијан. Живої св. Саве и Живої св. Симеона (Domentian. Life of St. Sava and Life of St. Symeon)* (Belgrade, 1988), passim; in addition to this title, see: A. Schmauss, “Die literaturhistorische Problematik von Domentijans Sava-Vita,” in *Vorträge auf dem V. Internationalen Slawistenkongress, Sofia, 1963* (Opera Slavica 4; eds. M. Braun and E. Koschmieder; Göttingen, 1963), 121-142. Also take into account the following: S. Hafner, *Stefan Nemanja nach den Viten des hl. Sava und Stefans des Erstgekrönten* (vol. 1 of *Serbisches Mittelalter: Altserbische Herrscherbiographien*; Graz/Vienna/Cologne, 1962).

⁵ See D. Bogdanović et al., *Chilandar: On the Holy Mountain* (Belgrade, 1978); M. Đurasinović et al., *Medieval Monasteries and Churches in Serbia* (Belgrade, 2006); S. Mileusnić, *The Medieval Monasteries of Serbia* (Novi Sad, 1995; 4th ed. 1998).

counted worthy of belonging to the Eastern and Western medieval tradition of monasteries as the chief, if not sole, centers of literacy and education.⁶ However, under these circumstances, larger monasteries in the West began, in addition to monastic education (*schola interna*), to develop alternative paths of education in secular services (*schola externa*), whereas in the East, in Byzantium and Serbia, it was rare to find a monastic school not closely related to taking monastic vows.⁷ Subsequently, in the East, people were educated mainly in diocesan and parish theological schools,⁸ and attending monastic schools did not become cus-

⁶ Since *Vita S. Joannis Calybitae* shows that only one book (the New Testament) should be considered both the spiritual and material property of a Byzantine monk (PG 114:569), it is also assumed that biblical books played a major role in the Serbian medieval school system, which was placed almost entirely within the monastery walls after the arrival of the Ottomans in the mid-fifteenth century. An extensive list of all available editions of medieval Slavic translations of the biblical books is to be found in Podskalsky (*Literatur*, 144-152 [n. 1]). Regarding biblical interpretation among the medieval Slavs, Podskalsky draws his conclusions by starting his review with the genre of homilies and noticing that, compared to Kievan Russia, exegesis emerged as a new literary genre, though not a dominant one (*Literatur*, 169-170 [n. 1]). In fact, except for John the Exarch (ca. 930), hardly any layman independently dealt with professional exegesis in Bulgaria and Serbia, and if anyone did, it was in a random and discontinuous manner; Theophylact of Ochrid, after all, was an archbishop, not a layman (*Literatur*, 227-236 [n. 1]). Finally, we should also mention the work of a renowned Serbian historian, a professor at FOTB, Radoslav Grujić (1878-1955): “Школе и манастири у средњовековној Србији” (“The Schools and the Monasteries in Medieval Serbia”), *Гласник Скопјској научној друштва* (*Herald of Skopje’s Scientific Society*) 3 (1928), 43-50.

⁷ Although it may be further discussed whether the cause of this difference lies in the fact that the Church in the West consciously overtook the role of cultural savior during the chaotic Middle Ages, or whether it may be explained by the fact that the Eastern Orthodox monks, always being regarded as “τὰ νεῦρα καὶ ἔδραιώματα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας” (Theodore the Studite, *Sermo* 114; PG 99:657), were less interested in secular or theological education than in maintaining the true Christian faith, it will suffice here simply to acknowledge, as Podskalsky also does in his other representative work, *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz: der Streit um die theologische Methodik in der spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14.-15. Jh.)*, seine systematischen Grundlagen und seine historische Entwicklung (BA 15; München, 1977; Serb. ed. Belgrade, 2010), 34-48, that the reorganization of monastic life in the medieval East, unlike the reformation of contemplative orders at about the same time in the West, did not take fields of study into account (see: n. 124, p. 37).

⁸ See Podskalsky, *Theologie*, 48-64 (n. 7); in Serbia: S. Ćirković, “Pismenost i obrazovanje u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji” (“Literacy and Education in Medieval Serbia”) in *Istorija škola i obrazovanja kod Srba (History of Schools and Education of the Serbs)* (ed. E. Hasanagić; Belgrade, 1974), 9-30; Ć. S. Drašković, “Die kirchliche Ausbildung der Serben zur Zeit der Nemanjićen,” *Ostkirchlichen Studien* 8 (1959), 230-239; J. P. Ilić, “Српске школе у доба

tomary before the period of Ottoman rule⁹—though now with a completely different foundation and results dissimilar to those in the West.¹⁰ On the eve of the fourteenth and at the dawn of the fifteenth century, Serbian culture was on the rise, but this potential hive of humanistic and Renaissance ideas, ready to turn its primary educational centers into more acclaimed institutions, was violently and abruptly interrupted. Moreover, since it was afterwards systematically sabotaged and even destroyed, it is quite understandable that it had to wait for a new set of circumstances, so as to reappear like a subterranean river.¹¹

This became possible at the beginning of the eighteenth century. A conjunction of rather intricate and, for Serbians, very unpleasant historical circumstances resulted in massive migrations to the areas north of the Sava and Danube, then under Habsburg rule and today within Serbia.¹² As soon as the first compact cells of Serbian society grew on the

Немањића” (“Serbian Schools in the Time of Nemanjići”), *Гласник Српске Православне Цркве (Herald of the Serbian Orthodox Church)* 27 (1946), 175-181; A. Veselinović, “Образовање у средњовековној Србији” (“Education in the Medieval Serbia”), in *Образовање код Срба кроз векове (Education of the Serbs through the Centuries)* (eds. R. Petković, P. V. Krestić, and T. Živković; Istorijski institut [Historical Institute] 21; Belgrade, 2003), 9-19; M. Vukičević, *Школе и ширење писмености у држави Немањића (The Schools and the Spread of Literacy in the State of Nemanjići), Годишњица Николе Чујића (Anniversary of Nikola Čupić)* 18 (1898), 191-232.

⁹ For more on medieval Serbian education under Ottoman rule, see: J. Parlić-Božović, “Образовање Срба у време турске власти” (“The Education of Serbs During Turkish Rule”), *Зборник радова Филозофског факултета у Приштини (Proceedings of the Faculty of Philosophy in Priština)* 41 (2011), 555-568; R. Samardžić, “Општи услови српске образованости под Турцима” (“General Conditions of Serbian Education under the Turks”), in *History of Schools and Education of the Serbs* (n. 8), 31-36.

¹⁰ It was a monk (named Sava) from Dečani Monastery (Kosovo), who composed the first Serbian alphabet book at the end of the sixteenth century, having printed it in Venice. See: *Prvi srpski bukvar Inoka Save: Venecija 1597 (The First Serbian Alphabet Book of Monk Sava: Venice 1597)* (ed. M. Blečić; Belgrade, 2009; 2nd ed. 2010).

¹¹ Šijaković and Raković, *University and Serbian Theology*, 26-27 (n. 3).

¹² Let us explain these circumstances in the shortest possible way: After the failure of the Turks’ thrust into central Europe (1683), when more Southern Slavs than ever before partook in the war against the occupiers, the Sultan’s armies and landholders had to withdraw southward; but shortly after this defeat, they put down the rebellion and pushed back the Austrians together with the Serbian combatants. Escaping a furious revenge, the Serbian people migrated northward in great numbers, across the rivers Sava and Danube (1690), being led by their Patriarch Arsenije III (1633-1706), to seek shelter under the auspices of the Habsburg Empire. See: Ch. Jelavich, “Some Aspects of Serbian Religious Development in the Eighteenth Century,” *Church History* 23 (1954), 144-152;

soil of this organized Christian empire, ambitions to establish a modern Serbian school system naturally appeared. In this endeavor, the following towns gained in importance: Karlowitz or Sremski Karlovci, the center of a newly-formed Serbian Metropolitan, evolved from an exiled elite into a leading entity of Serbian *national and spiritual identity*. Belgrade, which remained free from Turkish rule for almost two decades (1718-1737) thanks to the Austrian conquests, proved significant, too. Also important was the newly established city of Novi Sad (as its Latin name says: Neoplanta).¹³ In response to pleas from the metropolitans of Karlovci and Belgrade, Russian authorities sent learned emissaries, who assisted in the formation of first theological schools,¹⁴ whereafter Serbi-

Паїријарх српски Арсеније III Чарнојевић и велика сеоба Срба 1690. године (Serbian Patriarch Arsenije III Čarnojević and the Great Migration in 1690) (ed. S. Vuković; Belgrade, 1997); D. Popović, *Velika seoba Srba 1690. Srbi seljaci i plemići* (The Great Migration of Serbs, 1690: The Serbian Peasantry and Nobility) (Belgrade, 1954); H. Schreckeis, "Die Grosse Wanderung der Serben ab 1690," *Donauschwäbische Forschungen – und Lehrerblätter* 39 (1993), 12-17; M. Svirčević, "Migrations and Patriarchate in 18th Century Serbia," *Yugoslav law* 31 (2004), 63-80.

¹³ Having emerged in such a short time and in such a confined space, many educational initiatives proved somewhat fruitful despite ambivalent state and political circumstances; see J. Ph. Adler, "Habsburg School Reform among the Orthodox Minorities, 1770–1780," *Slavic Review* 30 (1974), 23–45; S. Dabić, "Српско школство у Хабзбуршкој Монархији до половине XVIII века" ("Serbian Education in the Habsburg Monarchy until the Mid-Eighteenth Century") in *Education of the Serbs through Centuries* (n. 8), 31-39; P. Despotović, *Школе Срба у Угарској и Хрватској* (The Schools of Serbs in Hungary and in Croatia) (Kragujevac, 1888); R. Čurić, "Српске школе у Хабзбуршкој Монархији до половине XVIII века" ("Serbian Schools in the Habsburg Monarchy until the Mid-Eighteenth Century") and N. Gavrilović, "Српско школство у Хабзбуршкој Монархији у другој половини XVIII века" ("Serbian Schools in Habsburg Monarchy in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century") in *History of Schools and Education of the Serbs* (n. 8), 99-153; R. M. Grujić, *Српске школе у Београдско-Карловачкој Митрополији (од 1718 до 1739 г.)*. Прилози културној историји српскога народа (Serbian schools in the Belgrade-Karlovci Metropolitanate [from 1718 to 1739]: A Contribution to the Cultural History of the Serbian People) (Belgrade, 1908); D. Kirilović, *Srpske škole u Vojvodini u XVIII veku* (Serbian Schools in Eighteenth Century Vojvodina) (Sremski Karlovci, 1929), 1-13, 20-25, 33-37; M. Nešković, *Историја српских школа у Аустро-Угарској Монархији* (A History of Serbian Schools in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy) (Sremski Karlovci, 1897).

¹⁴ For a better understanding of this new beginning, R. M. Grujić (n. 6) published primary sources that contain pieces of original correspondence between Serbian metropolitans and Peter the Great: "Прилози за историју српских школа у првој половини XVIII. века" ("Contributions to the History of Serbian Schools in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century"), *Споменик Српске Краљевске Академије* (Monument of the Serbian Royal Academy) 42 (1910), 99-43. This publication includes an important letter

an students were sent to the Kiev Spiritual Academy for theological education and to strengthen their own teaching skills.¹⁵

Although there is plenty of room for discussion of a whole spectrum of consequences that sprang from the aforementioned historical circumstances, we will limit ourselves here to one crucial observation.¹⁶ In Europe, the dawn of the Enlightenment was already shining brightly

of Maxim Suvorov (dated 9 October 1726) to the Metropolitan of Belgrade and Karlovci, Mojsije Petrović (1677-1730), which tells about the Russian theologian's agreeing to come to Sremski Karlovci and establish a school there (p. 103). Under Suvorov's direction, this newly opened school was organized in accord with the Kievan and implicitly Jesuit educational model, whose cornerstone was the arts of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*; furthermore, at the request of Metropolitan Mojsije, Suvorov expanded this model by opening another school in the second administrative center of Belgrade (1727), whereafter he left for Russia due to many unexpected obstacles he had to deal with (p. 108). However, this "Latin Academy" system in Sremski Karlovci and the initiative of bringing Russian theologians did not cease with his leaving. In 1733, the next Metropolitan of Karlovci, Vikentije Jovanović (1689-1737), brought a group of Kiev professors of Latin, philosophy, and rhetoric, under the direction of an academic, Manuil Kozachinskiĭ (1700-1755), who would become the rector of the school; see: D. Ruvarac, *Истѳорично-критична црѳпа о Вићентију Јовановићу православном митрополиту деоградском и карловачком (1731-1737) (Historical-Critical Note on the Orthodox Metropolitan of Belgrade and Karlovci Vićentije Jovanović [1731-1737])* (Zemun, 1886), 46-47.

¹⁵ For more on Serbian students in Kiev, see: M. Jovanović, "Срби у руским школама у XVIII веку" ("Serbs in Eighteenth Century Russian Schools"), *Црква и Живот (Church and Life)* 1-2 (1926), 16-30; N. I. Petrov, "Воспитанники Киевской академии из Сербов с начала синодального периода и до царствования Екатерины II (1721-1762)" ("Serbian Students of Kiev Academy from the Beginning of the Synodal Era until the Reign of Catherine II [1721-1762]"), *Известия отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии Наук (Proceedings of the Department of Russian Language and Literature of the Imperial Academy of Sciences)* IX 4 (1904), 1-16; N. Radojčić, "Киевска Академија и Срби" ("Kiev Academy and Serbs"), *Српски књижевни гласник (Serbian Literary Gazette)* 307 (1913), 668-673; cf. also: S. Vogojavlenskii, "Из русско-сербских отношений при Петре Первом" ("From Russian-Serbian Relations under Peter the First"), *Вопросы истории (Questions of History)* 8-9 (1946), 19-41.

¹⁶ One of the consequences was a Russian influence on the development of an artificial Slavonic-Serbian language or Slavoserbian, which did not bear resemblance to a single living Serbian dialect and which grew into the modern Serbian language no sooner than the middle of the nineteenth century. It was the personality of the Serbian philologist and linguist Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787-1864) to whom this reform owes the greatest debt. See: Th. Butler, "The Origins of the War for a Serbian Language and Orthography," *HSS* 5 (1970), 1-80; E. Kraft, "Die Säkularisierung der serbisch-russischen Beziehungen an der Wende vom 17. zum 18. Jahrhundert," *Südost-Forschungen* 47 (1988), 87-108; D. Wilson, *The Life and Times of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, 1787-1864: Literacy, Literature, and National Independence in Serbia* (Oxford, 1970).

and the consequences of rethinking medieval social arrangements, according to which the Church was the primary, if not the only, engine of the entire culture, were about to burgeon. The development of Serbian theological scholarship, however, became possible only *through the very arrangements that were in decline elsewhere in Europe*.¹⁷ At approximately the same time (1690), when almost the entire Serbian nation was crossing its northern borders carrying an embryo of its future academic life to be revived in the lap of the Habsburg monarchy, already mature university traditions in the West outgrew their existing framework, giving priority to other faculties but not to the faculty of theology.¹⁸ Owing to the Enlightenment concept of science, which tended to be oriented towards secular issues and pragmatism and not towards the study of theology, but also thanks to the constitutional right to academic freedom of thought, the faculty of philosophy gained the status of the fun-

¹⁷ Regarded as the most important representatives of the Serbian people, the metropolitans of Karlovci and Belgrade played a decisive role in activities not only of an ecclesiastical but also secular nature, as Metropolitan Vikentije Jovanović (n. 14) put it in one of his letters: "The Serb people has only one common symbol, namely the great and Holy Church which has been preserved when all else has perished" (R. M. Grujić, "Pisma pečkih patrijarha iz drugog i trećeg decenija XVIII-tog veka" ["The Letters of the Patriarchs of Pecs from the Second and Third Decade of the Eighteenth Century"], *Monument of the Serbian Royal Academy* 51 [1913], 113-119, 117); also see: J. Ph. Adler, "Nation and Nationalism among the Serbs of Hungary, 1790-1870," *EEQ* 13 (1979), 271-283; L. Hadrovics, *Le peuple serbe et son Église sous la domination turque* (Paris, 1947), 118-121; R. Okey, "State, Church, and Nation in the Serbo-Croat Speaking Lands of the Habsburg Monarchy 1850-1914," in *Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe 1850-1940. Volume 2: Religion, State, and Ethnic Groups* (ed. D. Kerr et al.; New York, 1992), 51-78; also: E. E. von Radić, *Die Verfassung der orthodox-serbischen Particular-Kirche von Karlovitz* (Prague, 1880); idem, *Die Orthodox-orientalischen Partikularkirchen in den Ländern der ungarischen Krone* (Budapest, 1886).

¹⁸ Although theology played a key role within the early modern universities, the previously dominant faculty of theology came to be rivalled by other faculties (e.g., the faculty of law). In accordance with Halle's model of a modern university, which gave priority to the law school with its foundation in 1694, and then with that of Göttingen, many European universities were reformed, enlightened, and became open to practical and useful sciences. Christian Wolf (1679-1754), who taught in Halle and Marburg, had expressed the goal of the new science with a Latin motto, *ad usum vitae*; see: N. Hammerstein, "Relations with Authority," in *A History of the University in Europe. Volume 2: Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800)* (ed. H. de Ridder-Symoens; Cambridge, 1996), 114-153, 142; C. Shilakowsky, "Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg," in *International Dictionary of University Histories* (eds. C. J. Summerfield, M. E. Devine, and A. Levi; Chicago, 1998), 256-259.

damental faculty within the eighteenth-century European university—that is, it had the capacity to *assess all others*.¹⁹

This comparison *additionally* (but not totally) clarifies why the newly enlivened Serbian educational system did not keep pace with a trend stipulated by the Age of Reason. However, to say that Serbian scholarship was not aware of this trend and did not partly adhere to it, would be erroneous. In the first Serbian school of higher education, *Collegium Vissariono-Pawlovicsianum Petrovaradinense*,²⁰ in which theology and other sciences were still kept together as tended to be the case in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Serbian schools, the Bishop of the Diocese of Budim, Dionisije Novaković (1705-1767), started his lectures in philosophy and theology with a famous programmatic speech entitled, “On the Praise and Use of Liberal Arts” (1739),²¹ which clearly confirms that the envisaged curriculum originated from the classical education model developed at European universities as *artes liberales*. Setting *modern foundations* to classical and humanistic sciences among Serbs by following exactly *this model* is of no surprise. The Serbian Church naturally played a major role in education in the southeastern territories of the Habsburg Monarchy, but there was also a natural desire to make amends for all the things missed in science over centuries. We must bear in mind that the very title of this speech alludes to a profound belief of the Church—that is, of the entire nation—that *advancement in the sci-*

¹⁹ This argument was first made in a treatise of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804): *Der Streit der Facultäten in drey Abschnitten* (Königsberg, 1798) = *Kants Werke. Akademie Textausgabe* (Berlin, 1968), 1-116, 27-29, in which he defended the scholarly superiority of the *facultas artium* over the higher faculties, grounding a new idea of the university at the same time. His idea, however, did not remain a mere academic exercise but became a reality with the foundation of Berlin University (1810) and was further developed by Fichte, Schleiermacher, von Humboldt, Jaspers, and other modern philosophers. See: W. Rüegg, “Theology and the Arts,” in *A History of the University in Europe. Volume 3: Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800-1945)* (ed. W. Rüegg; Cambridge, 2004), 393-458; Šijaković and Raković, *University and Serbian Theology*, 19-22 (n. 3).

²⁰ Primarily dedicated to the spiritual education of priests and having existed for only a few decades, this school was established by Bishop of Bačka, Visarion Pavlović (1670-1756), in Novi Sad in the mid decades of the eighteenth century; see V. Đorđević, *Грчка и српска просвета (Greek and Serbian education)* (Belgrade, 1896), 101.

²¹ Published in D. Ruvarac, “Дијонисије Новаковић први учени српски богословски књижевник, професор, а потом владика будимски” (“Dionisije Novaković: The First Serbian-Educated Theological Writer, Professor and Then the Bishop of Budim”), *Herald of the Serbian Orthodox Church* (n. 8) 13 (1924), 196-203, 197-203.

ences is immensely important. In other words, these developments imply a strong urge to raise awareness, to strengthen, and to somehow integrate crumbled national fragments into a whole.²²

In the meantime, what was happening with higher theological education *per se*? After dwelling for centuries in parishes and monasteries, Serbian theological seminaries were now opened as independent, yet strictly Serbian, schools, while some candidates, for the sake of higher education, were sent to those schools considered to be the most reputable Orthodox academic institutions of the times, such as the Russian theological academies in Kiev, Moscow, and St. Petersburg.²³ Things

²² This is closely yet paradoxically related to the Austrian Empire's strong objection to the Serbian inclination towards Russia and to Serbian political and cultural isolation in general. Accordingly, integration regulations introduced by Maria Theresa, in addition to their negative impact on genuine Orthodox tradition, gave rise to secular schools and led to the establishment of the first Serbian printing house in Vienna (1770), thanks to which Enlightenment ideas penetrated Serbian culture with less difficulties. All of these bore obvious fruit in the First Serbian Uprising against the Ottomans (1804), which marked the formation of the first modern Serbian state, and in many other momentous events, such as the opening of the College (1808) in the recently liberated city of Belgrade (n. 27). It is worth mentioning here that this institution, the forerunner of Serbian University (1905), was also opened by a speech, similar to the one of Metropolitan D. Novaković, entitled "О дужном почитанију к наукам" ("On the Necessity of Respecting Sciences"), given by the most learned Serb of the time, Dositej Obradović (1739-1811), in whom lethargic shadows of Theresian Orthodoxy gave way to the clarity of Enlightenment ideas. However, there was no room for studies of theology at the Grande École, although as many as six of its rectors were learned theology scholars, which implies that Serbian theologians did set the basis for national higher education together with their colleagues from other professions. See: Šjaković and Raković, *University and Serbian Theology*, 32 (n. 3); for more on D. Obradović, see his autobiography: *The Life and Adventures of Dimitrije Obradović, Who as a Monk was Given the Name Dositej, Written and Published by Himself* (trans. and ed. G. R. Noyes; Berkeley, 1953); also: N. Curčić, *The Ethics of Reason in the Philosophical System of Dositej Obradović: A Study of his Contribution in this Field to the Age of Reason* (London, 1976); R. Jovanović-Gorup, "Dositej Obradović and Serbian Cultural Rebirth," *Serbian Studies* 6 (1991), 35-55; M. S. Tasić, *Dositej Obradović* (Belgrade, 1994).

²³ Being established in a rather complex political and religious climate, these Russian academies—as well as their Serbian "daughters" in Karlovci and Belgrade—earned a glorious reputation in the course of time, although this reputation was shaded with prevalent, polymorphic Jesuit influence from their very beginnings in the seventeenth century, as was observed by the renowned Russian Orthodox theologian Georges Florovsky (1893-1979): *Ways of Russian Theology. Part One* (Belmont, 1979), 65. Nevertheless, they had represented the main, if not only, Serbian destination until the theological faculty in Chernivtsi was opened in 1875 (36 Serbian students attended it), and even when, at the end of the nineteenth and the dawn of the twentieth century, especially after the Oc-

changed, however, and the need for higher theological education crystallized among Serbs at the end of the nineteenth century, when the seminaries in Karlovci and Belgrade were no longer able to equip students to meet the intellectual challenges priests faced in towns.²⁴ This need for a change raised the important question of whether to establish a faculty within the rising University or to create an academy as an independent Church institution,²⁵ as preferred by the Church Hierarchy, who mostly attended Russian academies.²⁶ Nonetheless, when the highest educational institution in Serbia (Grande École) turned into Belgrade University (1905), it was comprised of the departments of Orthodox Theology, Philosophy, Law, Medicine, and Engineering.²⁷ Fif-

tober Revolution, Serbian students began to attend colleges in Athens, Halki, Bern, and Oxford, the Russian academies did not lose their appeal. What is more, they would later serve as role models for future Serbian theological institutions of the highest rank. For more on the Russian theological schools and their biblical studies, see: M. Kozlov and V. A. Theodorov, "Академии духовные православные в России" ("Orthodox Spiritual Academies in Russia"), in *Православная Энциклопедия (Orthodox Encyclopedia)*, Vol. 1 (Moscow, 2000), 349-352; A. Negrov, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church: A Historical and Hermeneutical Perspective* (BHT 130; Tübingen, 2008), 54-65.

²⁴ For more on this theme, see R. Radić, "Образование священства Српске православне цркве у 19. веку и у првој половини 20. века" ("Education of the Serbian Orthodox Church's Priests in the Nineteenth Century and in the First Half of the Twentieth Century") in *Education of the Serbs through the Centuries* (n. 8), 101-125.

²⁵ Šijaković and Raković, *University and Serbian Theology* (n. 3), illustrate this debate in a detailed manner (22-23, 41-78, 108-112), showing that the discussion revealed a far deeper problem in the understanding of the concept of the university: Is a university a collective institution comprising vocational schools and departments resting upon inherent rational criterion, assessing the legitimacy of everything else and yet declining to prove its own, with the sole aim of ruling the world, or is the university a gathering place of universal knowledge where the faculty of theology serves to remind humankind of its role in the salvation and elevation of creation? The main deficiency of this debate among Serbian as well as European scholars of the time lay in the fact that it was conducted in the tone of Enlightenment rationality, within the borders of the "one and only" reality given and described by science. The entire debate was to ripen only after many failures in the twentieth century, as witnessed by Karl Jaspers (1883-1969) in his work, *Die Idee der Universität* (Berlin, 1946).

²⁶ On the Serbian Orthodox Church in the nineteenth and twentieth century, see Th. Bremer, *Ekklesiale Struktur und Ekklesiologie in der Serbischen Orthodoxen Kirche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Östliche Christentum n. F. 41; Würzburg, 1992); and P. Pavlovich, *The History of the Serbian Orthodox Church* (Toronto, 1989), from p. 184 on.

²⁷ The history of the University of Belgrade starts at the beginning of the nineteenth century, when D. Obradović founded the Collegium in 1808 (n. 22). Thirty years later, it turned into the Lyceum (1841) and then into the Higher School or Grande École (1863), which was

teen years had to pass, however, for the Faculty of Orthodox Theology to start its work, due to a lack of teaching staff and raging wars.²⁸ Only then, in a newly created Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (1918), with the reestablished Patriarchate (1920), and due also to a painful migration of Russian scholars into Serbia,²⁹ did it become possible for the highest theological institution to begin to function.³⁰

recognized throughout Europe. Early in 1905, Serbian King Peter I Karadorđević (1844-1921) signed the decree that brought Belgrade University into existence. See S. Ćunković, *Školstvo i prosveta u Srbiji u XIX veku (Schools and Education in Nineteenth Century Serbia)* (Belgrade, 1971); V. Tešić, "Škole i nastava u Srbiji (1878-1918)" ("Schools and Education in Serbia [1878-1918]"), in *Istorija srpskog naroda (History of the Serbian People)*, Volume 6/2 (ed. A. Mitrović et al.; Belgrade, 1983), 506-549; V. Tešić, *Razvoj Liceja i Velike škole (The Development of the Lyceum and the Higher School)* (Belgrade, 1988).

²⁸ Let us mention here the Balkan Wars (1912-1913) which preceded WW1 (1914-1918) and in which Serbia finally freed itself from five centuries of Turkish rule. For more on these wars, see the following studies: E. J. Erickson, *Defeat in Detail: The Ottoman Army in the Balkans, 1912-1913* (Westport, 2003); A. Gerolymatos, *The Balkan Wars: Conquest, Revolution, and Retribution from the Ottoman Era to the Twentieth Century and Beyond* (New York, 2002); R. C. Hall, *The Balkan Wars, 1912-1913: Prelude to the First World War* (London, 2000).

²⁹ On the migration of the Russian intellectuals to Serbia due to the revolution in 1917 and afterwards, especially the coming of the Church Hierarchy to Sremski Karlovci and establishing the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia (Русская Православная Церковь Заграницей) there in 1921, see A. B. Arsenev, *Русская эмиграция в Ср. Карловцах (Russian Emigration in Sr. Karlovci)* (Moscow, 2003). This migration played a key role in many aspects of the development of Serbian cultural in the first half of the twentieth century, particularly in the formation of the FOTB. Ć. S. Drašković, "Четрдесет година Богословског факултета у Београду" ("Forty Years of the Faculty of Theology in Belgrade"), *Богословље (Theology)* 1-2 (1961), 1-27, 5-9, lists its first professors, among whom we find six from Russia: A. P. Dobroklonskii (1856-1937) became a professor of Church History (1920-1937), Th. I. Titov (1868-1935) taught Biblical History and Archeology (1920-1935), M. A. Georgievskii (1888-1950) lectured on Hebrew (1920-1929), A. P. Rozhdestvenskii (1854-1930) remained for only a few months a professor of Old Testament (1921), N. N. Glubokovskii (1863-1937) taught Patrology for a short period (1922), and V. F. Fradinskii (1892-1961), who even studied at the newly formed FOTB (1921-1926), was appointed professor of Church History (1939-1961), succeeding to the chair of the late Dobroklonskii. Drašković, however, does not mention V. V. Zenkovskii (1881-1962), who taught philosophy (1920-1923) at the Faculties of both Theology and Philosophy of Belgrade University. For more on the Russian professors at FOTB, see V. Puzović, "Русские эмигранты – преподаватели Православного богословского факультета в Белграде (1920-1940 гг.)" ("Russian Emigrants – Professors at the Faculty of Orthodox Theology in Belgrade [1920-1940]") *Труды Киевской духовной академии (Proceedings of the Kiev Theological Academy)* 15 (2011), 199-208.

³⁰ A rising opportunity to elevate the theological seminaries in Karlovci and Belgrade to a higher rank (as in Russia) did not, however, come to fruition. Moreover, the tem-

3. Orthodox New Testament scholarship in Serbia after the opening of FOTB

Prior to 1800, there was hardly one Serbian seminary inquiring into the subject that would later be called biblical studies. Apart from the aforementioned difficulties, another cause of this lies in the hermeneutical, methodological, and cultural distance between Eastern Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment context of modern biblical scholarship. Therefore, since Holy Scripture had traditionally been a school subject in the curriculum of Serbian seminaries, the discipline here in question actually might have had its origins in the first biblical studies handbooks that were written looking towards an Orthodox model of that time —the Russian one.³¹ However, despite being pioneering undertakings in Serbian theology, the reception of these handbooks cannot be assessed in a straightforward manner, since they were not used for subjects related to biblical studies in the Karlovci seminary. Rather, these subjects were taught relying upon unpublished translations of the works of the German Protestant, C. F. Keil (1807-1888).³² This may be explained in part

porary closure of the seminary in Karlovci proved to be collateral damage caused by the establishment of the Faculties of Orthodox Theology in Belgrade and Zagreb (which existed for only two years: 1920-1922), as well as by their mutual yet short-lived rivalry. For more on this process, see Šijaković and Raković, *University and Serbian Theology*, 79-107 (n. 3); A. Raković, “Karlovci Seminary: From One Step to the Level of the Faculty (1914-1920) Towards Subsequent Recognition of the Faculty Level (1925-1933),” *Teološki pogledi (Theological Views)* 2 (2013), 583-598.

³¹ A decade after they returned from what was then the “Jerusalem” of Orthodox theology, two Kiev academy graduates, Belgrade seminary professor Nikanor Zisić (1829-1866) and Metropolitan of Belgrade Mihailo Jovanović (1826-1898), a most remarkable figure of nineteenth century Serbian Orthodoxy, published the first textbooks in biblical studies, yet not in the reformed Slavonic-Serbian language (n. 16): M. Jovanović, *Херменевтика (Hermeneutics)* (Belgrade, 1864); N. Zisić, *Увѣштѣво за читанье Свѣтѣи Писма Стѣарѣи у Нової Завѣтѣи (An Introduction for Reading the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testament)* (Belgrade, 1864). Conceived to follow the Russian model, these two treatises signified a rare but advantageous opportunity for students to get acquainted with scientific principles of two biblical disciplines that apparently had an academic status at higher theological schools (isagogics and hermeneutics = exegesis). For more on the Russian approach to these disciplines, which were followed by Zisić and Jovanović, see Negrov, *Interpretation*, 93-109, 111-117 (n. 23).

³² N. Gavrilović, *Карловачка дојословија (1794-1920) (Karlovci Seminary [1794-1920])* (Sremski Karlovci, 1984), 84, has pointed to the sources that clearly demonstrate the aforementioned fact, though they remain imprecise in citing Keil’s works. They mention “introductory lessons,” which may refer to Keil’s *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einlei-*

by the fact that the school was situated in a German-speaking environment and also by certain sympathies that arose among the Orthodox on behalf of this Protestant theologian's scientific erudition and conservatism.³³ Moreover, those first handbooks were written in the unreformed language tradition, which, due in large part to the first translation of the Holy Scriptures into the reformed Serbian language around the middle of the nineteenth century, was soon regarded as outdated as compared to reformed Serbian.³⁴ Also, we should not readily dismiss the possibil-

tung in die kanonischen und apokryphen Schriften des Alten Testamentes (Frankfurt a. M., 1853; 3rd rev. ed. 1873), and also a more concrete title, "Христианское чтение" ("Christian Reading"), which is not to be found among any of Keil's works; it is actually the name of a Russian theological journal (St. Petersburg, 1821-1918; 1990-), where translations of some of Keil's texts might have been published. It is also noteworthy that Florovsky found Keil's *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung* one of the most popular handbooks among Russian biblical scholars during the second half of the nineteenth century, and he claims that this handbook was published by the Kievan journal *Proceedings of the Kiev Theological Academy* in 1871 (G. Florovsky, *Ways of Russian Theology. Part Two* [Belmont, 1972], 127). Florovsky might have been wrong, however: it is actually Keil's *Handbuch der biblischen Archeologie. Bd 1-2* (Frankfurt a. M. 1858-1859; 2nd ed. 1875) that was published by the aforementioned journal: K. F. Keil, *Руководство к библейской археологии. Часть 1-2* (*Guide to Biblical Archaeology. Volumes 1-2*) (Kiev, 1871-1876). Finally, although the recently written handbooks of Zisić and Jovanović (n. 31) could not push Keil's works out of the Karlovci seminary, the impression remains that the principles of Russian biblical interpretation lived on in its classrooms. After all, if the facts presented above are to be believed, Keil had been a favorite scholar among the Russian and Serbian theologians.

³³ C.-F. Keil might have attracted Orthodox theologians due to his "offenbarungsgläubige Bibelforschung," which he paired with a sharp opposition towards the rationalism of W. de Wette (1780-1849) and others. For more on the theological personality of Keil, see the following: P. Siemens, *Carl Friedrich Keil: Studien zu Leben und Werk* (Gießen, 1989); A. Siedlecki, "Keil, Carl Fridrich (1807-88)," in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. J. H. Hayes; Nashville, 1999), 18-19.

³⁴ The first translation of the New Testament into the modern Serbian language was published in 1847 by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (n. 16), who did not, however, use Greek but Russian-Slavonic, German, and Latin texts as his basis, while the translation of the Old Testament into reformed Serbian was published in 1868 by Đuro Daničić (1825-1882), a philologist and great supporter of Karadžić's work, who used a Latin edition of Immanuel Tremellius' (1510-1580) translation from Hebrew as the base text. There were other Bible translations into the Serbian language during the nineteenth century, but they had less impact, since they were published in the unreformed language: these are the translations of a few Old Testament books (1860) by Platon Atanacković (1788-1867), a bishop of Budim (1839-1851) and later of Bačka (1851-1867), and the translation of the New Testament (1824) by Atanasije Stojković (1773-1832), a noted physicist and member of the Russian Academy of Sciences. For a more detailed survey of Serbian Bible translations,

ity that the seminary might have found certain attitudes old-fashioned, no matter how far-fetched such a possibility may seem. We should take into account the following: once Ilarion Zeremski (1865-1931), a young graduate from the Moscow academy, was appointed teacher of New Testament at the seminary in Sremski Karlovci on the turn of the nineteenth century, he succeeded in ousting Keil's works from the curriculum without taking advantage of the existing Serbian textbooks. Since his work marked the glorious dawn of New Testament theology, which is also to be regarded as the beginning of the heyday of New Testament studies in Serbia at the newly founded FOTB, careful consideration of this topic follows, assessing his scholarly contribution.

3.1. Ilarion Zeremski (1865-1931)³⁵

Born in the Habsburg monarchy (Turija, today's Vojvodina), Zeremski was oriented first towards the neighboring schools in Novi Sad and Budapest, while his subsequent studies in Moscow, where he acquired a magisterium degree in theology (1890),³⁶ are deeply rooted in the traditional orientation of the Serbian Church towards Russia. Thanks to the contributions of Florovsky and Negrov, the theological climate of the Russian spiritual academies has become clearer and thus more relevant for our present topic: though there were substantial contributions to philology and archeology, two major disciplines, a dogmatically inspired isagogics and a morally oriented exegesis formed the mainstay of Moscow biblical studies at the end of the nineteenth century.³⁷

see R. Rakić, "Нови преводи Новог Завета у нас" ("New Translations of the New Testament among Us"), *Theology* (n. 29) 2 (1987), 93-106.

³⁵ For a detailed analysis of Ilarion Zeremski's life and contribution to biblical scholarship in Serbia, see V. Tatalović, "Иларион Зеремски као професор Новог Завета на Богословском факултету у Београду" ("Ilarion Zeremski as a New Testament Professor at the Faculty of Theology in Belgrade"), *Српска теологија у двадесетом веку (Serbian Theology in the Twentieth Century)* 3 (2007), 100-111.

³⁶ Tatalović, "Zeremski," 100-101 (n. 35).

³⁷ The isagogics popular in the church took the form of short prolegomena accompanying biblical publications so as to inform readers succinctly on traditional understandings of authorship and the purpose of particular books. When such approaches proved insufficient for the growing needs in Russia, the work on defining isagogics more carefully by selectively choosing conservative Western authors began, only to receive its final shape within the Orthodox dogmatic perspective. A classic example of this method is *Введение в чтение Нового Завета (Introduction to the Reading of the New Testament)* (Moscow, 1891) by Metropolitan of Moscow Filaret Drozdov (1782-1862), printed after

This is indeed the cornerstone of Zeremski's entire opus, moderate though it is. As a follower of a powerful academic model with an apologetic structure that he would have encountered in Moscow, he indiscriminately adopted principles of nascent Orthodox biblical studies, being privileged to become a member of a narrow and freshly formed circle of Orthodox biblical scholars. The best witness of this orientation is a handbook of isagogics³⁸ he devised on his return to Karlovci and which he most likely used in the course of his two decades of work at the seminary (1891-1911). Its pages echo the tones of dogmatics and apologetics, answering the question of why Russian (Serbian) biblical studies did not adopt a more "positivistic" approach: as an ecclesial-historical subject, the science of introduction cannot be put on strictly historical grounds, since it aims not only at objectively reviewing the origins and contents of biblical texts, but also at the rudiments of "comprehending the spirit and essence of knowledge of God and the economy of salvation."³⁹ At the same time, Zeremski did not minimize the

Ilarion's departure from Moscow and frequently cited in Nikanor's already-mentioned *Introduction* (n. 31). Similarly, exegesis (i.e., hermeneutics—as this discipline was long called) followed suit by pumping, from a vast sea of Western exegetical tradition, primarily the waters of the linguistic-historical school, channeling them to satisfy demands primarily of a moral and social nature. As such, it did not fully develop into a true historical method but rather into a sort of "positive theology" (Florovsky, *Ways*, 2, 151 [n. 32]). The status of Russian academies as independent Church institutions, which were somewhat isolated from the more open atmosphere of the universities, additionally contributed to the formulation of these two disciplines. Moreover, this "Russian" conflict, formed and driven by the selective choice between Roman Catholic and Protestant, conservative and liberal theologians, might have been more moderate had Russian theology been able to define itself on the basis of Orthodox ideals rooted in the patristic tradition. Lacking the confidence to articulate an academic theology in light of this unbroken tradition, Russian theology, with regard to biblical studies, tended to rely on imported views, whether through adopting or refuting them. For more on the development of the basic biblical disciplines in the Russian theological milieu of the second half of the nineteenth century, see Negrov, *Interpretation*, 93-131 (n. 23).

³⁸ I. Zeremski, *Увод у Нову Завету (Introduction to the New Testament)* (Sremski Karlovci, 1891). This textbook has never been printed, but having been written down by a student of the seminary (Hristifor Milošević), it exists only in a manuscript form (246 pages) and is today kept in the Library of Matica Srpska in Novi Sad.

³⁹ Zeremski, *Introduction*, 14 (n. 38). It is worth mentioning here that Zeremski did not rely on Drozdov's *Introduction* (n. 37), probably because its first integral edition was published in the same year that Ilarion's handbook was written down (1891), but he did rely on the work of Drozdov's successor in elaborating this apologetically and dogmatically inspired Russian isagogics, V. G. Rozhdestvenskiĭ (1839-1918) *Историческое обозрение*

importance of introduction as a historical science but regarded it as useful due to its ability to illumine the development of the sacred text and its translation; moreover, “reading the Holy Scripture without a sense of history leads to the harmful production of would-be allegories.”⁴⁰ Relying on the historical method in the study of the Bible requires serious precautions, however, since historical criticism tends to attack and even to destroy the [Orthodox] Church. What is more, this tendency may be regarded as the main reason why such a “historical” science like introduction should even exist in the Orthodox Church.⁴¹

These were also the governing principle of this Russian graduate’s exegesis, which was otherwise dedicated almost exclusively to both the translation and interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount and the main episodes of the infancy narratives.⁴² As the first professor of New

священных книг Нового Завета (Historical Review of the New Testament Books) (St Petersburg, 1878); see Zeremski, *Introduction*, 22 (n. 38).

⁴⁰ Zeremski, *Introduction*, 3-4 (n. 38).

⁴¹ Zeremski, *Introduction*, 4 (n. 38). This *Introduction* offers insight into the shape of the battlefield among the Russian theologians of the time, indirectly brought into Serbian classrooms: J. S. Semler (1725-1791) and J. D. Michaelis (1717-1791) “initiated... the destructive wave” (p. 18), which is continued by the work of F. Ch. Baur (1792-1860) and D. F. Strauss (1808-1874), while *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen, 1808) by a Roman Catholic scholar, J. L. Hug (1765-1846), may be considered the respected one, even among the Protestant theologians (p. 19). According to the Kievan professor S. M. Solskii (1835-1900), conservative Roman Catholic and Protestant scholars are actually to be learned from while writing and composing Orthodox biblical introductions: “Каков должен быть состав научных введении в книги св. Писания в настоящее время?” (“What Should Be the Composition of the Scholarly Introduction to the Books of the Holy Scripture Today?”), *Proceedings of the Kiev Theological Academy* (n. 29) 3 (1887), 358-376, 366-367.

⁴² Unlike Ilarion’s isagogics, his exegetical work was printed in the form of short articles, published in *Theological Herald* (n. 3), the most eminent Serbian theological journal of the time (1902-1914), the founder and editor of which was Ilarion himself: “Беседа И. Христа на гори” (“J. Christ’s Sermon on the Mount”) 1 (1902), 18-25, 81-92, 161-172, 233-243, 305-314, 369-377; and 2 (1902), 3-24, 129-146, 209-220, 273-282, 353-361; “Сретеније” (“The Presentation of Jesus at the Temple”) 3 (1903), 3-16; “Благовест пресв. Богородици” (“The Annunciation to the Most Holy Virgin Mary”) 3 (1903), 169-182; “Исцельење слепога од рођења” (“The Healing of the Man Born Blind”) 3 (1903), 249-270; “Рођење и обрезанье св. Јована Крститеља” (“The Birth and the Circumcision of St. John the Baptist”) 3 (1903), 329-342; “Прича о милосрдном Самарјанину” (“The Parable of the Good Samaritan”) 4 (1903), 217-228; “Рођење И. Христа” (“The Birth of J. Christ”) 4 (1903), 273-292, 361-371; “Библијско учење о савести” (“Biblical Teaching on Conscience”) 4 (1903), 206-216, 293-299, 371-376; “Богородица у посети код Јелисавете” (“Virgin Mary Visiting Eliza-

Testament studies at the FOTB, which began its work thanks to the arrival of the Russian immigrants, Ilarion built the academic principles of the Russian tradition into the foundations of his department. However, he spent less than a year in this post, for in 1921 he was elected bishop of the distant Diocese of Gornji Karlovci (Croatia), where he passed away after a decade of his episcopacy. At the FOTB, he was to be succeeded by his student and seminary colleague:

3.2. Dimitrije Stefanović (1882-1943)⁴³

Stefanović was born in 1882 (Zmajev, today's Vojvodina) and attended schools in Novi Sad, Sremski Karlovci, and Chernivtsi, where he earned his doctoral degree in theology.⁴⁴ Having been given Zeremski's vacancy at the Karlovci seminary, he taught New Testament and Greek language (1907-1920), and in the meantime (1910-1913), for teaching and learning purposes, he published a three-volume New Testament *Introduction*.⁴⁵ The preface to this compendium evidently shows that Dimitrije

beth") 5 (1904), 89-97, 185-194; "Благовест Захарији" ("The Announcement to Zechariah") 5 (1904), 345-354, 425-437; "Говор Господа нашег И. Христа против књижевника и фарисеја" ("The Speech of Our Lord J. Christ Against Scribes and Pharisees") 6 (1904), 145-153, 225-235, 305-320, 385-401; "Мази са Истока" ("Magi from the East") 7 (1905), 3-11, 81-87, 161-170; "Одлазак св. породице у Египат" ("The Flight of the Holy Family into Egypt") 9 (1906), 3-8, 81-86, 153-162; "Кушање Господа нашег Исуса Христа" ("The Temptation of Our Lord Jesus Christ") 9 (1906), 282-305; "Тенеалогичја Господа нашег Исуса Христа" ("The Genealogy of Our Lord Jesus Christ") 10 (1906), 76-89, 277-285; 11 (1907), 31-40, 224-230.

⁴³ For a detailed analysis of Stefanović's life and contribution to biblical scholarship in Serbia, see I. Bulović, "Dr Dimitrije Stefanović," in *Theology* (n. 29) 1-2 (1980), 165-170; V. Tatalović, "Димитрије Стефановић као професор Новог Завета на Богословском факултету у Београду" ("Dimitrije Stefanović as a New Testament Professor at the Faculty of Theology in Belgrade"), *Serbian Theology in the Twentieth Century* (n. 35) 2 (2007), 117-128.

⁴⁴ When the Czernowitz Higher Theological School (Bukovina) grew into the Franz-Josephs-Universität in 1875, which consisted of three faculties (Orthodox theology, law and philosophy), this German speaking University (today: Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University) became one of the most important destinations for Serbian students at the turn of the twentieth century. Although Stefanović's Doktorvater Dionysious Jeremijczuk taught practical theology, he explicitly declared himself a New Testament scholar (Tatalović, "Stefanović," 117-118 [n. 43]). For more on the Serbian students at the University in Chernivtsi, see R. Rakić, *Православни дојословски факултет у Черновцима (Faculty of Orthodox Theology in Chernivtsi)* (Belgrade, 2009).

⁴⁵ Having written an article on isagogics while still a Ph.D. candidate (see n. 44), "Апостол Павле и Филиплјани" ("The Apostle Paul and the Philiphians"), *Theological Herald* (n.

was a true representative of the Serbian biblical theology tradition: “The entire *Introduction* has not resulted from many years of teaching practice and experience but came into being in a rather short time in order to fulfill an unpleasant void that seminary teachers and students of the New Testament were particularly aware of. So, it should be perused with such an understanding, without seeking comprehensive, well-grounded, acclaimed, and impeccable information in it.” Further on, Stefanović continues slightly more confidently: “Such a degree of perfection cannot be found in the best Roman Catholic and Protestant compendiums either, which I naturally used when writing this Introduction.”⁴⁶

Like the *Introduction*, his papers and books in exegesis, which are of a predominantly didactic nature and range thematically from the Pauline epistles to the Gospels,⁴⁷ also relied considerably on “the latest com-

3) 6 (1904), 65-83, Stefanović published his three-volume *Introduction* after his return from Chernivtsi, thus leaving aside Zeremski's manuscript handbook (n. 38): *Четипу канонска јеванђелија (Four Canonical Gospels)* (Sremski Karlovci, 1910; 2nd ed. Belgrade, 1954); *Из новозаветне исагогике (Дела апостола, Посланице Св. апостола Павла, Саборне посланице и Апокалипсис) (From the New Testament Isagogics [Acts, St Paul's Epistles, Catholic Epistles, and Apocalypse])* (Sremski Karlovci, 1912; 2nd ed. Belgrade, 1957); *Увод у Св. Писмо Новој Завети (оūhu geo) (Introduction to the Holy Scripture of the New Testament [General Part])* (Sremski Karlovci, 1913); this third volume was previously published in a series of articles in the *Theological Herald* (n. 3), printed under the same title: 22 (1912), 161-175, 249-267, 321-329; and 23 (1913), 1-10. There are three other works of Stefanović in isagogics that should be mentioned here: “Четврто канонско јеванђелије” (“The Fourth Canonical Gospel”), *Theological Herald* (n. 3) 17 (1910), 241-250, 321-334, 401-413; 18 (1910), 251-260, 323-328, 522-528; 19 (1911), 3-10, 99-106; “Синоптичка и четврто јеванђелије” (“The Synoptic and the Fourth Gospel”), *Theology* (n. 29) 2 (1927), 270-276; “Адресати посланице Ефесцима” (“Addressees of Ephesians”), *Theology* 4 (1932), 277-279.

⁴⁶ D. Stefanović, “Preface,” in *Introduction*, n. p. (n. 45). Stefanović's use of foreign compendiums has not been without critics: an anonymous reviewer publicly complained about the similarities between his first introductory monograph (*Four Canonical Gospels* [n. 45]) and a work of the Roman Catholic biblical scholar Jakob Schäfer (1864-1933): *Die Evangelien und die Evangelienkritik* (Freiburg i. Br., 1908; 2nd ed. 1911). However, it may also be observed that these anonymous critics, whom Stefanović tended to refute convincingly, did not show up following the publication of the criticized monograph but rather at the moment its author applied for a full-time professorship at the FOTB in 1929! For more on this issue, see Tatalović, “Stefanović,” 119-120 (n. 43).

⁴⁷ These are the following studies: “Пастирске посланице св. апостола Павла” (“The Pastoral Epistles of the Holy Apostle Paul”), *Theological Herald* (n. 3) 13 (1908), 137-150, 339-344; 15 (1909), 401-407; 16 (1909), 18-25, 161-165, 253-262, 342-348, 414-422; 17 (1910), 94-102; “Тумачење недељних и празничних јеванђелија” (“Commentary on Sunday

pendiums and commentaries of German Catholic and Protestant biblical scholars.”⁴⁸ Generally speaking, with this zealous priest and tenured professor at the FOTB (1921-1943),⁴⁹ the Serbian tradition got its first complete New Testament scholar in the modern sense of the word, who skillfully worked to unify domestic and foreign traditions, as well as contemporary developments in biblical studies. Therefore, it is not a strange coincidence that a pioneering translation of the New Testament from Nestle’s Greek edition into Serbian (1934) crowned his career.⁵⁰

and Festal Gospel Readings”), *Theological Herald* 15 (1909), 436-440; 16 (1909), 3-7, 95-101; “Посланице св. апостола Павла” (“Epistles of the Holy Apostle Paul”), *Theological Herald* 19 (1911), 241-251, 321-330; 20 (1911), 81-88, 161-164, 401-404; “Посланица Галатима св. апостола Павла” (“Epistle to the Galatians of the Holy Apostle Paul”), *Theological Herald* 25 (1914), 16-28, 105-111, 201-207, 377-387; *Свѣѣо Јеванђељује њо Маѣјеју* (*Holy Gospel According to Matthew*) (Sremski Karlovci, 1917; 2nd ed. Belgrade, 1924); *Св. Аѣо-сѣѣола Павла две ѡсланице Солуњанима* (*The Holy Apostle Paul’s Two Epistles to the Thessalonians*) (Sremski Karlovci, 1919); *Живоѡѡ и рад Аѣосѣѣола Павла са ѣумачењем њѣѡвих ѡсланица Галаѣѣѡма, (2) Тимоѣѣѡју, Тѣѣѡу и Филимону* (*Life and Work of the Apostle Paul With the Commentary on His Epistles to Galatians, [2] Timothy, Titus and Philemon*) (Belgrade, 1926); “Апостол Павле ѡ Цркви Христовој (Ефес. 2, 11-22)” (“Apostle Paul on Christ’s Church [Eph 2, 11-22]”) *Theology* (n. 29) 4 (1930), 277-282.

⁴⁸ D. Stefanović, “Preface,” in *Life and Work*, n. p. (n. 47).

⁴⁹ Tatalović, “Stefanović,” 118 (n. 43).

⁵⁰ *Нови Завеѣѡ Гѡсѡѡга нашеѣ Исуса Христѣѡа* (*New Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ*) (Belgrade, 1934). Touching upon Stefanović’s translation, let us also refer to other translation endeavors in Serbia at that time, in addition to those already mentioned (n. 34). First of all, the New Testament translation by V. S. Karadžić (1847) into the vernacular won a broad audience, thus making the earlier version of A. Stojković (1824) in the unreformed (Slavoserbian) language unusable, as well as other minor attempts, but this rendition still lacked theological accuracy since it did not originate from Greek, but from Slavonic, German, and Latin base texts; furthermore, Karadžić himself was not a theologian. Thus, in the first decades of the twentieth century, an urgent need was felt for a more precise translation, particularly because of the progressive contributions of the newly opened FOTB to the Serbian theological atmosphere. As an answer to this need, a translation of the Fourth Gospel showed up first, made by V. M. Petrović and F. W. Kingston and published by London’s Central Translations Institute: *Свето Јеванђеље по Јовану* (*The Holy Gospel According to John*) (London, 1927). Not long afterwards, Dr. Lujo Bakotić (1867-1941), a Dalmatian Serb and thus also known under the pseudonym “Dalmatikus,” offered his translations of the New Testament: *Novi Zavet* (*The New Testament*) (Belgrade, 1930) and of the whole Bible: *Sveto Pismo Staroga i Novoga Zaveta* (*The Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testaments*) (Belgrade, 1933), having them published by the British and Foreign Bible Society (1804-), whose missionary branch was active in Serbia since 1868 (officially since 1918). However, neither of these newly published versions that used the Greek text and thus aimed to satisfy the “urgent need” were recognized as better—that is, as more traditionally Orthodox—than the Bible successfully completed in 1868 by Daničić

Although the papers and reviews of this prolific biblical scholar, most of which were printed in the journal *Theology* as an official organ of the newly established FOTB (n. 29), show an enviably deep understanding of contemporary global trends and thus added to the journal's quality, their contents reflect a variety of influences.⁵¹ Having never attended the more renowned Orthodox schools, Stefanović did not acquire the habit of simply filtering the modern critical tradition but rather wanted to approach modern thought straightforwardly, independently, and more courageously than others had done. Although the academic orientation of the newly formed Faculty favored such an approach, his work was nonetheless not free of the apologetic spirit of his time. Inevitably challenged by the historical method, Stefanović deepened the apologetics of Zeremski, having dedicated a series of articles to the quest for the historical Jesus—or, to be more precise, to its reception in the framework of Serbian academic theology.⁵² Although these studies show that

[OT] – Karadžić [NT]. In reference to these two new translations, Stefanović wrote two pronouncedly negative reviews in the journal *Theology* (n. 29), entitled with the names of these freshly printed renditions: 3 (1927), 237-238; 3 (1930), 230-231. As Stefanović observed—thus preparing the way for his own translation—even the use of the Greek text could not compensate for the fact that neither Petrović – Kingston nor Bakotić were theologians. And although he had rightly considered himself the one who was capable of answering the “urgent need” in the most accurate way, his translation did not experience the desired goal of ousting the popular version of Karadžić, which remained in use until the 1980s. For more on this issue, see Tatalović, “Stefanović,” 125-127 (n. 43).

⁵¹ Stefanović's scholarly affinities may also be traced through the titles of the foreign (mostly German) compendiums that he reviewed in *Theology* (n. 29), but that would not have even been reviewed (= recommended) for reading had he had a negative impression while studying any of them: “Dr. Paul Feine, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Leipzig 1930⁵,” 2 (1931), 167-169; “Knopf – Weinel, *Einführung in das Neue Testament*, Giessen 1934¹,” 4 (1935), 438-441; “J. Schneider, *Der Sinn der Bergpredigt*, Berlin,” 3-4 (1937), 356-360; “K. Th. Schäfer, *Grundriss der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Bonn 1938,” 3-4 (1939), 329-332.

⁵² These articles were published in *Theology* (n. 29): “Личност Исуса Христа” (“The Personality of Jesus Christ”) 1 (1926), 5-14; “Речи Исуса Христа и њихова судбина” (“Words of Jesus Christ and Their Destiny”) 4 (1926), 303-309; “Исус Христос као Учитељ” (“Jesus Christ as a Teacher”) 3 (1929), 203-212; “Како је гласила анђелска химна о рођењу Исуса Христа?” (“What Was the Angelic Hymn about the Birth of Jesus Christ?”) 1 (1930), 44; “Исус Христос и Његови најближи” (“Jesus Christ and His Loved Ones”) 3 (1933), 198-203; “Исус Христос и Јован Крститељ” (“Jesus Christ and John the Baptist”) 1 (1934), 1-4; “Исус Христос и социално питање” (“Jesus Christ and the Social Question”) 3-4 (1938), 193-198; “Зашто је Исус Христос морао страдати?” (“Why Did Jesus Christ Have to Suffer?”) 2 (1939), 103-108; “Исус Христос пред јеврејским и римским трибуналом” (“Jesus Christ Before the Jewish and Roman Tribunal”) 2 (1940), 81-90.

Stefanović was more aware of the overall cultural significance of the historical questions than his predecessor(s), they still lack an accurate scholarly method for delineating the traditionally nourished Gospel image of Christ; scholarly method was substituted by apologetics that self-confidently counted on the readers' faith: "Whoever today, in a time of criticism and doubt, sets about to delineate the personality of Jesus . . . has firstly, however briefly, to answer these two questions: did Jesus of Nazareth live and exist at all, and, if he did, whether . . . the Gospels contain fiction in addition to the truth."⁵³

Such a spirit had already been strikingly present in the Orthodox world because of the "selection method," which was then the only way of dealing with new challenges. Indeed, this method fits with Albert Schweitzer's characterization of the second phase of the quest of the historical Jesus as a division into the camps of aggression and apologetics.⁵⁴ Therefore, Stefanović's opus is permeated with apologetics in spite of being of high quality and despite his being well informed on global trends. In his rather independent and original attempts to offer apolo-

⁵³ Stefanović, "Personality," 5 (n. 52). Stefanović's attitude towards the quest for the historical Jesus may also be traced through the titles of his (predictably positive!) reviews in *Theology* (n. 29): "Артур Ц. Хедлам, Исус Христос у историји и вери, с енглеског превео Драгомилр Марић, Београд 1927" ("Arthur C. Headlam, *Jesus Christ in History and Faith*, translated from English by Dragomir Marić, Belgrade 1927") 1 (1928), 78-80; "Dr. Joseph Klausner, *Jesus von Nazareth*, Berlin 1930," 1 (1932), 70-74; "F. M. Willam, *Das Leben Jesu im Lande und Volke Israel*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1934," 1 (1936), 119-123; "H. Felder, *Jesus von Nazareth*, Paderborn 1937," 2 (1938), 168-171.

⁵⁴ A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen, 1906; 9th ed. 1984), 5. It is important to note that Stefanović did not remain alone in these sharp apologetics; his younger colleague Radivoj Josić (1889-1960), the first professor of apologetics at the FOTB, wrote an intriguing study: "Значај личности Исуса Христа за хришћанство" ("The Significance of the Personality of Jesus Christ for Christianity"), *Theology* (n. 29) 2 (1926), 153-176, and not too long afterwards a monograph of similar content: *Борба њро-пџиу и за јеванђелској Исуса Христџа (Struggle against and for the Gospel Image of Jesus Christ)* (Belgrade, 1936). This title is of no surprise, for the first Serbian "Vita Jesu" novel appeared only two years earlier: D. Damjanović, *Живој Исуса Назарећанина (Life of Jesus of Nazareth)* (Belgrade, 1934), but it was vocally condemned by the Church authorities and so doomed to failure. See: V. Tatalović, "Осврт на проблематику историјског Исуса у српској теолошкој средини I" ("Reviewing the Historical Jesus Problem in the Serbian Theological Milieu I"), *Serbian Theology in the Twentieth Century* (n. 35) 7 (2009), 9-18; idem, "Осврт на проблематику историјског Исуса у српској теолошкој средини II" ("Reviewing the Historical Jesus Problem in the Serbian Theological Milieu II"), *Serbian Theology in the Twentieth Century* (n. 35) 8 (2010), 9-18.

getic answers to some challenges, he often resorted to Church doctrine as a key criterion. “Believe the Orthodox Church doctrine or the historical-critical school,”⁵⁵ he often wrote, frequently judging modern criticism for being destructive and ungrounded since “it does not teach or argue but rather defiantly goes against Tradition.”⁵⁶ In this respect, the development of Serbian New Testament theology was not so much determined by scientific argumentation or even the academic articulation of Orthodox Tradition. Half a century later, the Serbian theological milieu became well aware of this deficiency when Stefanović was characterized as an exegete who “paid a toll to his time and his education since he did not delve deeply into the inexhaustible source of the Holy Fathers’ hermeneutics.”⁵⁷ The development of Serbian New Testament theology was determined first and foremost by new findings that were reshaped in accord with the logic of a religious nation whose soul was pregnant with a deep faith that readers were expected to possess without question. In the age of Communism that followed, the Serbian people would be deprived of this very logic, but even in such times of ordeal, they were able to offer another solid approach through the personality of:

3.3. Emilijan Čarnić (1914-1995)⁵⁸

Emilijan Čarnić was born in Čakovo (Ciacova, today in Romania). He studied at both the Faculties of Theology and Philosophy at Belgrade University, though he earned his Ph.D. degree in theology at the Athenian university, having written a doctoral thesis entitled, “Who Is the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews?”⁵⁹ On his return to Belgrade, he

⁵⁵ Stefanović, *Four Canonical Gospels*, 103 (n. 45).

⁵⁶ Stefanović, *Four Canonical Gospels*, 87-88 (n. 45).

⁵⁷ Bulović, “Stefanović,” 167 (n. 43).

⁵⁸ For a detailed analysis of Čarnić’s life and contributions to biblical scholarship in Serbia, see V. Tatalović, “Емилијан Чарнић као професор Новог Завета на Богословском факултету у Београду” (“Emilijan Čarnić as a New Testament Professor at the Faculty of Theology in Belgrade”), *Serbian Theology in the Twentieth Century* (n. 35) 1 (2006), 13-28 = *Theology* (n. 29) 1 (2006), 13-28.

⁵⁹ Ε. Τσάρνιτς, *Τίς ὁ συγγραφεὺς τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς*; (Athens, 1954). It may be important to note here that Čarnić spent little more than a year in Athens (1952-1954), where his doctoral father was the renowned scholar, Nicholaos Louvaris (1887-1961)—about whom see an extensive monograph: *Νικόλαος Λούβαρις: ο φιλόσοφος, παιδαγωγός και θεολόγος* (ed. Th. I. Dardaveses; Thessalonike, 2011). Although this period may seem too short for writing a Ph.D. thesis, even if it consisted of only 85 pages as Čarnić’s

was immediately appointed a lecturer at the Faculty of Orthodox Theology (1954),⁶⁰ which was by then already expelled from the University (1952) by an Act of the Communist authorities and as such, being a Faculty of the Serbian Orthodox Church,⁶¹ was doomed to suffer five decades of unpleasant social isolation (1952-2004). Under circumstances unfavorable for the development of any aspect of biblical theology—when the nation was struggling to recover from the wounds inflicted by WW2⁶² and suffering under the totalitarian communist regime that followed shortly thereafter⁶³—deacon Emilijan Čarnić was delivering lec-

did, an FOTB archive document shows that he started to write the thesis a little earlier, spending an academic year (1951-1952) as a guest student at the Christkatholische Theologische Fakultät of Bern University, where he attended the lectures of noted NT scholars E. Gaugler (1891-1963) and W. Michaelis (1896-1965); see: Tatalović, “Čarnić,” 14-15 (n. 58).

⁶⁰ Tatalović, “Čarnić,” 15 (n. 58). It is clear that Čarnić attended Stefanović’s lectures while studying at the FOTB, but it still remains unknown to us who delivered these subjects at the FOTB between 1943/1945, when Stefanović retired/passed away, and 1954, when Čarnić was appointed a lecturer. This ambiguity cannot be fully explained by the fact that these hard years for the whole nation might have demanded improvisations in the FOTB teaching system nor by the fact that Čarnić taught “New Testament Greek language” as an assistant at the FOTB since 1947. Did he immediately replace Stefanović? For more on this, see Tatalović, “Čarnić,” 14 (n. 58).

⁶¹ This painful process has been analyzed in the following three articles published in *Serbian Theology in the Twentieth Century* (n. 35): D. Bondžić, “‘Нова власт’ и Богословски факултет у Београду 1944-1952” (“The New Authorities’ and the Faculty of Theology in Belgrade 1944-1952”), 1 (2006), 126-144; P. Ruzović, “Православни богословски факултет 1945-1952: Од државне до црквене институције” (“Faculty of Orthodox Theology 1945-1952: From State to Church Institution”), 1 (2006), 145-169; D. Bondžić, “Православни богословски факултет Српске православне цркве 1952-1960” (“Faculty of Orthodox Theology of the Serbian Orthodox Church 1952-1960”), 7 (2010), 79-92. Also consult R. Radić, “Издавање Богословског факултета из оквира Београдског универзитета” (“The Extradition of the Faculty of Theology from Belgrade University”) in *Mărturisiri confluente* (ed. I. Baba; Timișoara, 1997), 255-262, and pair the list of titles there with the following one: Č. S. Drašković, *Bibliographie der orthodoxen Theologie in Jugoslawien 1945-1960* (Würzburg, 1961).

⁶² Let us mention here the personality of Savo Djukanović (1911-1942) who earned his Ph.D. in Bern, having defended the thesis *Heiligkeit und Heiligung bei Paulus* (Novi Sad, 1939) under the supervision of E. Gaugler (n. 59). Had not this young scholar suffered in WW2, he might have been appointed a NT professor in Belgrade, since he got the position of assistant at FOTB shortly before the War broke out. For more on WW2 in Serbia, see, e. g., *Serbia and the Serbs in World War Two* (eds. S. P. Ramet and O. Listhaug; New York, 2011).

⁶³ For more on the Communist repression in Serbia after WW2, see the following two recently published studies: S. Cvetković, *Između srpa i čekića: represija u Srbiji 1944-1953*

tures on the “Holy Scripture of the New Testament” and the “New Testament Greek Language” until his retirement in 1980,⁶⁴ when another Athenian Doctor of theology, at the time a hieromonk and now Bishop of Bačka, Irinej Bulović (1947-), succeeded his professorship in the Department.⁶⁵

Professor Čarnić belongs to a circle of theologians who, after the Russian revolution, turned to Greek schools (Athens, Thessaloniki, Halki), which were, owing to a variety of factors, gradually gaining in academic potential and importance in the Orthodox world.⁶⁶ In the decades to come, Athens would serve chiefly to imbue with meaning the return of the Serbian Church to authentically Orthodox roots—that is, Athens would help inspire the revival of Serbian patristic and liturgical tradition, thus spurring powers from within to create new ideas in biblical studies. Nonetheless, the title of Čarnić’s thesis proves that the Athenian theological climate at that time was still determined by some traditions that were soon after regarded as incommensurate with what was recognized and emphasized as truly Orthodox.⁶⁷ Like the majority of

(*Between the Hammer and Sickle: Repression in Serbia 1944-1953*) (Belgrade, 2006); idem, *Između srpa i čekića: represija u Srbiji 1953-1985* (*Between the Hammer and Sickle: Repression in Serbia 1953-1985*) (Belgrade, 2011).

⁶⁴ Tatalović, “Čarnić,” 15-17 (n. 58).

⁶⁵ For more on Bishop Irinej and his contribution to theological thought in Serbia, see the following section.

⁶⁶ For more on these schools in the beginning of the twentieth century, see D. S. Mpalanos, *Ἡ Θεολογικὴ Σχολή τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Ἀθηνῶν (ἱστορικὴ ἐπισκόπησις 1837-1930)* (Athens, 1931); G. S. Andreades, *Ἡ Θεολογικὴ Σχολή τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης: Ἡ ἴδρυσις αὐτῆς ἀνάγκη ἐπιβεβλημένη, ἐπείγουσα, ἐπίκαιρος* (Thessalonike, 1932); V. Th. Stayridou, *Ἡ Ἱερά Θεολογικὴ Σχολή τῆς Χάλκης: Μία συνοπτικὴ θεώρησις* (Thessalonike, 1994).

⁶⁷ During the widespread changes in worldview that occurred by the middle of the twentieth century, a significant change of perspective in biblical scholarship also happened among the Orthodox Churches. However, although it may have progressed from apologetics to a broader acceptance of the historical sciences, it still was not capable of going further towards harmonizing the available achievements with the traditional approaches; rather, Orthodox biblical scholarship retained what may be considered a subtle kind of maternal apologetics, because of which critical scholarship found its safest ground in the domain of isagogics. This is the reason why many experts in isagogics emerged in mid-twentieth century Orthodoxy, especially in Greece (where Communist threats to the Tradition were less felt), as is witnessed by Čarnić’s disciple at the FTOB and another Athenian doctor, today Serbian Metropolitan of Montenegro and the Littoral Amfilohije Radović (1938-): *Ἱστοριοῦςκι ἕρεσεκ ἡγумаचेња Свѣтлој Завеѣа* (*A Historical Review of the Interpretation of the Old Testament*) (Nikšić, 1996; digital edition: Belgrade,

the Greek professors educated at Western, German universities of the time, Čarnić's mentor Louvaris could not but succumb to the strong influence of historical-criticism that, as is clearly exemplified in his candidate's thesis, constantly incited Orthodox thinkers into creating some sort of scholarly mechanism that served to justify the Tradition academically, or at least to reconcile the Tradition with the results of historical-critical scholarship. The degree to which Čarnić's doctoral thesis offered a scholarly answer to this challenge of a (still artificial) articulation of the Tradition, is not very difficult to conclude once we discern that this Athenian graduate applied an argument based on faith that he must have learned while in Belgrade. After arguing in countless pages *pro et contra* various theories, mostly of Western origin, related to the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews,⁶⁸ he found it convenient to appeal to readers' faith on the last page of his dissertation: "The Holy Spirit, who acts through the author of the Epistle . . . and who dwells and operates in the Church, could not leave the Church in ignorance regarding [Paul as its] author."⁶⁹ In other words, one cannot do anything else but believe the Tradition, which undoubtedly bore witness to the Apostle Paul as the authentic author of Hebrews.

The later works of this most prolific Serbian biblical scholar proved more moderate in their attempts to rescue the sinking traditional standpoints from drowning in the all-embracing sea of critical doubt. After spending ten years proving the Pauline authorship of Hebrews and investigating the contexts and the contents of this epistle,⁷⁰ Čarnić fol-

2001) n. p. [cited 20 July 2014]. Online: http://www.mitropolija.me/stari/dvavoda/knjige/aradovic-stari_zavjet_1.html.

⁶⁸ It is worth mentioning here that he used only two Orthodox monographs that, not surprisingly, originated from his doctoral mentor Louvaris: *Ἐπιστολῶν Παύλου χαρακτήρ* (Thessalonike, 1911); *Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὰς περὶ Παύλου σπουδὰς* (Thessalonike, 1919).

⁶⁹ Τσάρνιτς, *Συγγραφεύς*, 84 (n. 59).

⁷⁰ Having earned his Ph.D. on Hebrews, Čarnić did not cease to grapple with the question of this epistle's author. Although his dissertation has never been translated into Serbian, he provided Serbian readers with the different theories about this problem by publishing a series of studies: after the first one, "Учење Посланице Јеврејима о Старом Завету" ("The Teaching of Hebrews on the Old Testament"), *Herald of the Serbian Orthodox Church* (n. 8) 1-2 (1955), 8-14, all others were published in *Theology* (n. 29): "Хипотеза о Варнави као писцу Посланице Јеврејима" ("Hypothesis about Barnabas as Hebrews' Author"), 1 (1957), 80-86; "Хипотеза о Аполосу као писцу Посланице Јеврејима" ("Hypothesis about Apollon as Hebrews' Author"), 2 (1957), 68-82; "Питање александризма Посланице Јеврејима" ("The Question of Alexandrism of Hebrews"),

lowed the example of his predecessors and fulfilled his teaching duty by writing the necessary textbooks,⁷¹ publishing his commentaries to almost every NT book,⁷² and translating the New Testament from the Greek original (1973).⁷³ Ultimately, he integrated traditionally Ortho-

1 (1958), 27-39; "Питање филонизма Посланице Јеврејима" ("The Question of *Philonism* of Hebrews") 2 (1958), 9-26; "Хипотеза о Луки као писцу Посланице Јеврејима" ("Hypothesis about Luke as Hebrews' Author"), 1-2 (1959), 40-45; "Посланица Јеврејима као литерарни проблем" ("Hebrews as a Literary Problem"), 1-2 (1960), 31-46; "Питање адресата Посланице Јеврејима: део I" ("The Question of Hebrews' Addressees: Part I"), 1-2 (1961), 33-51; "Питање адресата Посланице Јеврејима: део II" ("The Question of Hebrews' Addressees: Part II"), 1-2 (1962), 57-78. Only after he exhausted these introductory questions about Hebrews did Čarnić begin to deal with its content. In so doing, he offered exposition of Christ's high priesthood in Hebrews rooted in both patristic and modern literature; these studies were printed in *Theology* as well: "Архијереј по реду Мелхиседековом: део I" ("A High Priest according to the Order of Melchizedek: Part I") 1-2 (1973), 17-42; "Архијереј по реду Мелхиседековом: део II" ("A High Priest according to the Order of Melchizedek: Part II") 1-2 (1974), 17-48. The publication of his last study on Hebrews marks a crucial turning point in Čarnić's scholarly work, reflected in his abandoning the overall climate of Orthodox biblical scholarship (n. 67) and in achieving an authentic exegetical expression, which unfortunately did not go much further than educating the students.

⁷¹ These are the following handbooks: *Посланице апостола Павла: уџбеник за V разред богословије* (*Epistles of the Apostle Paul: A Handbook for Seminary's Fifth Grade*) (Belgrade, 1967); *Ерминевтика* (*Hermeneutics*) (Belgrade, 1971); *Увод у Свејџо Писмо Новој Завейџа: ојшџиу део* (*Introduction to the Holy Scripture of the New Testament: A General Part*) (Belgrade, 1973); *Увод у Свејџо Писмо Новој Завейџа: џосебни део* (*Introduction to the Holy Scripture of the New Testament: A Special Part*) (Belgrade, 1978).

⁷² Having defined the principles of Orthodox exegesis in "Православни принципи тумачења Светог писма" ("The Orthodox Principles of the Exegesis of the Holy Scripture"), *Православна мисао* (*Orthodox Thought*) 1-2 (1965), 1-14, Čarnić commenced to interpret NT books, providing his commentaries with his own translation of the NT from the Greek: *Посланица Ефесцима св. апостола Павла* (*Holy Apostle Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*) (Belgrade, 1969); *Јеванђеље џо Маџеју: део I, џлаве 1-11* (*The Gospel according to Matthew: Part I, Chapters 1-11*) (Belgrade, 1979); *Јеванђеље џо Маџеју: део II, џлаве 12-28* (*The Gospel according to Matthew: Part II, Chapters 12-28*) (Belgrade, 1981); *Јеванђеље џо Марку* (*The Gospel according to Mark*) (Belgrade, 1983); *Јеванђеље џо Луки* (*The Gospel according to Luke*) (Belgrade, 1983); *Дела апостола* (*Acts*) (Крагујевац, 1984; 2nd ed. 1989); *Јеванђеље џо Јовану* (*The Gospel according to John*) (Крагујевац, 1986); *Оџкривење Јованово* (*The Revelation of John*) (Крагујевац, 1989); *Посланица Галаџима* (*The Epistle to the Galatians*) (Крагујевац, 1992); *Саборне џосланице* (*The Catholic Epistles*) (Belgrade, n. y.).

⁷³ As is witnessed by a distinguished Serbian historian Dimitrije Bogdanović (1930-1986), the Serbian Orthodox Church used a (revised) version of V. S. Karadžić's NT translation (n. 34) after WW2, although the version of Stefanović was available for decades; moreover,

dox ideas with an adroit use of modern critical tools, and he was often able to do so in such a way that these approaches became widely disseminated in Serbian theology.⁷⁴ It is no coincidence, then, that Čarnić treated the accomplishments of the historical method in his mature scholarly years more freely, having obviously overcome the long-lived tension between science and the Tradition found among Orthodox biblical scholars: “The Protestants work a lot on the interpretation of the Holy Scripture, especially in the profane field, i.e., philological, historical, and archeological. Therefore, their achievements may profitably help every Orthodox exegete.”⁷⁵ As hardly any biblical scholar in Serbia, he effectively valorized the historical method, providing read-

a sort of indifference towards efforts to reach a new and more accurate translation was even felt during the 60s and 70s: “Нови Завет у преводу Емилијана Чарнића” (“The New Testament in the Translation of Emilijan Čarnić”), *Orthodox Thought* (n. 72) 23 (1976), 127-131, 127. But despite the fact that this indifference was overcome by Čarnić’s translation in 1973—made from the eighth edition of A. Merk’s critical edition of the Greek New Testament (Rome, 1957)—this attempt was evaluated by the Church authorities only as a “private one,” even though lone acknowledgements of its quality could be heard from a few bishops. The main reason for this negative reaction of the Hierarchy may be his resignation from the Church Committee that prepared the future edition of the Synodal translation (1984), as well as his eventual decision to finish the task of translation alone (Tatalović, “Čarnić,” 22-23 [n. 58]). However, the most positive review of Čarnić’s translation was given by a renowned Serbian philosopher Ksenija Atanasijević (1894-1981): “Превод на српски Новог Завета професора др Емилијана Чарнића” (“The Translation of the New Testament into Serbian by Professor Dr. Emilijan Čarnić”), *Theology* (n. 29) 1-2 (1973), 177-179. When we combine this with the no less enthusiastic evaluation of Bogdanović cited above, we may conclude that this NT rendition did not go unnoticed among the Serbian intellectuals of the time. For more on Čarnić’s translation principles, his three studies are to be mentioned here: “Поводом припрема за критичко издање византијског текста Светог Писма Новог Завета” (“About the Preparations for the Critical Edition of the Byzantine Text of the Holy Scripture of the New Testament”), *Theology* (n. 29) 1-2 (1963), 1-7; “Традиционални и нетрадиционални фактори у преводу Светог Писма” (“Traditional and Nontraditional Components in Translating the Holy Scripture”), *Theology* 1-2 (1972), 31-41; “Нови завет: превод Вука Стеф. Караџића” (“The New Testament: Translation of Vuk Stef. Karadžić”), *Orthodox Thought* (n. 72), 173-175. Finally, also worth mentioning are his numerous translations of liturgical texts from the Greek language into modern Serbian (listed in: Tatalović, “Čarnić,” 24-25 [n. 58]), which show his deep awareness of the need for Orthodox worship to be accessible to ordinary laypeople.

⁷⁴ Though this attitude may be traced through the reviews he wrote, there is only one of them that is known to us: “K. H. Schelkle, Die Gemeinde von Qumran und die Kirche des Neuen Testaments, Patmos-Verlag Düsseldorf 1960,” *Theology* (n. 29) 1-2 (1961), 122-124.

⁷⁵ *Hermeneutics*, 37 (n. 71).

ers with historical, archeological, and philological material, but he refrained from the application of this method in its full rigor. Indeed, his valorization of the historical method remained somewhat superficial, for he tended to assemble only the positive, mostly popular results of modern biblical scholarship, in order to obtain a broader audience. It is of no surprise, then, that the final crown of his exegetical opus was a Tetraevangelion accompanied by commentaries and entitled *Jesus Christ: The Life and Deeds*.⁷⁶

In essence, Čarnić's thought is permeated with the ethical and juridical spirit of the not-as-yet thoroughly reformed Orthodox system of thought.⁷⁷ In his view, "following Christ means, first and foremost, living the appropriate religious-moral life and bearing the Cross,"⁷⁸ while "the Last Supper is the feast of remembrance of Christ's death and re-

⁷⁶ Belgrade, 1993. The present work cannot, however, list all of Čarnić's popular papers of an exegetical nature. These papers bear witness to his courage in spreading the Gospel during the hard times of the Communist repression. One of his great contributions to the broader popularity of the Word was his active participation in preparing the Serbian edition of J. E. Krause et al., *Die Bibel: Ausgewählt, nacherzählt und illustriert für junge Menschen* (Stuttgart, 1968; 15th ed. München, 1986): *Илустрирована Библија за младе* (*The Illustrated Bible for Youth*) (ed. D. Krstić et al.; Belgrade, 1969; 5th ed. 1994).

⁷⁷ Already in 1936, at the First Congress of Orthodox Theology in Athens, with his programmatic lecture G. Florovsky pointed to the need for a radical reform of Orthodox theology, proclaiming the need for a *neo-patristic synthesis*: "Patristics and Modern Theology," in *Procès Verbaux du Premier Congrès de Théologie Orthodoxe à Athènes, 29 Novembre – 6 Décembre, 1936* (ed. A. S. Alivizatos; Athènes, 1939), 238-242. He correctly observed that Palamite teaching on the divine *ἐνέργειαι* is hardly mentioned in most of the Orthodox textbooks and that this essential peculiarity of the Eastern tradition on the doctrine of God and His attributes has been completely misunderstood and even forgotten. Moreover, patristic doctrine on *theosis* has been more or less ignored in the modern systems of Orthodox education, while the doctrine of redemption has been most commonly expounded by Anselm of Canterbury or a later Post-tridentine authority. Florovsky argued that the Orthodoxy of his day completely overlooked the idea that the Resurrection is the climax and real source of victory over death, an idea strongly emphasized in patristic and liturgical traditions. Likewise, the idea of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ had been completely forgotten, as evidenced by the fact that theology professors have virtually no knowledge of the writings of Nicholas Cabasilas (1392) and Symeon of Thessalonica (1429). However, this call for an urgent and vital reform of theological education through the renewal of the patristic mentality still had to wait a long time for its realization (in Serbia), so this wave of renewal did not influence Čarnić's exegetical work, in which the inherited ethical concerns strongly prevail over ecclesiology—i.e., the Eucharistic catholicity of the Orthodox Church.

⁷⁸ Čarnić, *Mark*, 79 [n. 72].

demptive sacrifice for the sins of many.”⁷⁹ That is why “the Holy Communion is the greatest good for a human being’s soul, a source of salvation, spiritual and moral strength, peace, consolation in life’s hardships, blessed calmness on a deathbed.”⁸⁰ All in all, the gospel truth lies in the following: “Jesus founded the Kingdom of God on Earth, which has to completely dominate the souls of human beings . . . and which primarily depends upon the complete fulfillment of God’s will . . . that angels and the souls of the righteous in heaven fulfill in a perfect way.”⁸¹ These effective but rather old-fashioned Orthodox views were soon to be fundamentally reshaped in the Serbian context, through the works of Čarnić’s successor and another Athenian doctor of theology:

3.4. Irinej Bulović (1947-)⁸²

Irinej Bulović was born in Stanišići (Vojvodina), and he studied theology in Belgrade, Paris, and Athens, where he earned his Ph.D. degree after a decade-long study in theology that culminated in defense of his thesis on the thought of St. Mark of Ephesus (1392-1444).⁸³ Together with a few contemporaries who were already advanced in age, he belongs to the tradition of those Serbian monks, intellectuals, and Athenian doctors of theology who are to be thanked for a fundamental spiritual rebirth of the Serbian Church in the course of the twentieth

⁷⁹ Čarnić, *Jesus*, 319 [n. 71].

⁸⁰ Čarnić, *Mark*, 111 [n. 72].

⁸¹ Čarnić, *Jesus*, 118 [n. 71].

⁸² In addition to the fact that there are no published biographies or well-rounded opinions on the scholarly work of Bishop Irinej, the author of this study has plenty of scruples about expressing any definitive conclusions about the contributions to NT scholarship of a man who continues to be an active, full professor of “New Testament” and the “New Testament Greek language” at the FOTB. Nonetheless, as a resident of Serbia, who has witnessed the diverse circumstances of the last two decades at least, but also as an assistant of Bishop Irinej for almost a decade, the author of this study will take the risk of informing readers about several significant facts concerning our current topic.

⁸³ Ει. Μπούλοβιτς, *Τὸ Μυστήριον τῆς ἐν τῇ Ἁγίᾳ Τριάδι Διακρίσεως τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας καὶ Ἐνεργείας κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιον Μάρκον Ἐφέσου τὸν Εὐγενικόν* (Thessalonike, 1983). With regard to the content of this dissertation, there are three more studies of Bulović to be mentioned here, which were published in the Serbian Orthodox Church’s journal *Theological Views* (n. 30): “Μοναστήριον καὶ προβλήματα τοῦ ἁγίου Μάρκου τοῦ Ἐφεσίου” (“Monasticism and the Problem of Suffering”), 3 (1972), 172-190; “Ἑλληνισμός καὶ Ὀρθόδοξη Θεολογία” (“Hellenism and Orthodoxy”), 4 (1972), 263-270; “Ἐκκλησιολογία καὶ ἑκκλησιολογία κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιον Μάρκον Ἐφέσου” (“Theology of Dialogue according to St. Mark of Ephesus”), 1 (1975), 5-35.

century. This tradition commenced with Bishop Nikolaj Velimirović (1881-1956),⁸⁴ a double doctorate graduate of Bern University,⁸⁵ an erudite and ascetic, an affable persona yet a hesychast. Without being able to delve into the opus of this canonized saint (2003)⁸⁶ and most prolific Serbian theologian,⁸⁷ we must nonetheless emphasize the importance his expansive spirit bore for scattered and crucified Serbian identity in the hardships of the twentieth century. Despite never teaching at the Faculty of Theology, not to mention the Department of New Testament, Velimirović interpreted the New Testament in a homiletic, pastorally popular but methodologically accurate manner,⁸⁸ and his interpreta-

⁸⁴ For more on Bishop Nikolaj, see Bremer, *Struktur*, 112-160 (n. 26); G. van Dartel, "Nikolaj Velimirović (1880-1956): Eine umstrittene Gestalt der Serbisch-Orthodoxen Kirche," *Glaube in der 2. Welt* 21 (1993), 20-26; Fr. D. M. Rogich, *Serbian Patericon: Saints of the Serbian Orthodox Church. Volume 1* (Forestville, 1994), 221-245; I. Dobrijević, "Bishop Nicholai Velimirovich: A Contemporary Orthodox Witness," *Serbian Studies* 10 (1996), 198-209; R. Bigović, *Og Svечовека до Бојочовка: хришћанска филозофија Владике Николаја Велимировића (From All-Man to God-Man: The Christian Philosophy of Bishop Nikolaj Velimirović)* (Belgrade, 1998); R. Ch. Grill, *Serbischer Messianismus und Europa bei Bischof Velimirović († 1956)* (dissertation; St. Ottilien, 1998); J. Byford, *From "Traitor" to "Saint": Bishop Nikolaj Velimirovic in Serbian Public Memory (Analysis of Current Trends in Antisemitism 22; Jerusalem, 2004)*. M. D. Janković, *Ејуској Николај – живој, мисао, гело (Bishop Nikolaj – Life, Thought, Works)* (Belgrade, 2002); U. von Arx, "Bischof Nikolaj Velimirović (1880-1956) und seine Berner Zeit im Rahmen der christkatholisch-serbisch-orthodoxen Beziehungen," *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 95 (2005), 1-33.

⁸⁵ Bishop Nikolaj defended two doctoral dissertations in Bern, while he also spent some time at Halle, Oxford, and Geneva Universities (where he might have defended his third thesis, dedicated to the philosophical thought of George Berkeley). The first thesis belongs to the NT area and was written under the supervision of E. Herzog (1841-1924): *Der Glaube an die Auferstehung Christi als Grunddogma der apostolischen Kirche* (Bern, 1910), while the second one belongs to the domain of philosophy and was supervised by Ph. Walker (1848-1924): *Französisch-slavische Kämpfe in der Bocca di Cattaro 1806-1814* (Bern, 1910).

⁸⁶ See B. Božović, "Ein neuer Heiliger der Serbischen Kirche: Bischof Nikolaj (Velimirović)," *Orthodoxie Aktuell* 7 (2003), 3-6.

⁸⁷ N. D. Velimirović, *Сабрана гела ејускоја Николаја у 13 књиџа (Collected Works of Bishop Nikolaj in 13 Volumes)* (Düsseldorf/Himmelsthür, 1976-1986; repr. ed. Valjevo, 2014); also consult the works listed in Grill, *Messianismus*, 215-232 (n. 84), and additionally: I. Knežević, "Дела Владике Николаја у преводу на енглески језик" ("Works of Bishop Nikolaj in English Translation"), *Српска теологија данас (Serbian Theology Today)* 2 (2010), 634-642.

⁸⁸ Nikolaj's homilies are published in the sixth volume of his collected works (n. 87): *Омилије на недељна и њразнична јеванђеља ејускоја охридској Николаја (Homilies on Sunday and Festal Gospel Readings of Bishop of Ochrid Nikolaj)* (Düsseldorf, 1976).

tion is especially noted for its depth and clarity.⁸⁹ In Serbian national and spiritual circles, but also further abroad, this archpriest's image is inseparable from the personality of Archimandrite Justin Popović (1894-1979),⁹⁰ an Athenian doctor of theology⁹¹ and professor of Dogmatics at the Faculty (1934-1948), who was confined to live within the premises of Ćelije monastery (Western Serbia) by order of the Communist authorities (1948-1979), a spiritual father and a role model to whom the young monk Irinej looked up.⁹² Justin Popović, also canonized as a saint by the Serbian Orthodox Church (2010) and who enlivened the Serbian nation through the neo-patristic movement of modern Orthodoxy, was not a biblical scholar by vocation, though his work

⁸⁹ Therefore, Nikolaj was honored as the "New Chrysostom" in the Serbian Orthodox Church, a title that refers to the Patriarch of Constantinople, St. John the Chrysostom (407). See: Rogich, *Patericon*, 221 (n. 84).

⁹⁰ For more on Justin Popović, see J. Meyendorff, "Archimandrite Justin Popovich," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 23 (1979), 118-119; E. Hill, "Justin Popović (1894-1979)," *Sobornost* 2 (1980), 73-79; N. Radovanović, "Leafing through the works of Archimandrite Dr Justin Popović, 1894-1979," *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* 2 (1984), 48-52; Bremer, *Struktur*, 161-252 (n. 26); D. M. Makojević, *Christology: A Survey of the Teaching of Archimandrite Justin Popović* (New York, 1995); A. Jevtić, *Човек дојочовека Христуса: сѹ-меница сѹ Јусѹиу Поѹовиу (1879-1979) (The Man of God-Man Christ: A Memorial to Father Justin Popović [1879-1979])* (Belgrade/Trebinje, 2004); B. Lubardić, *Јусѹиу Телујску и Русѹја: ѹѹѹеву рецеѹиѹје руске философије и ѹѹолоѹје (Justin of Ćelije and Russia: Ways of Reception of Russian Philosophy and Theology)* (Novi Sad, 2009); *Оѹѹаѹ Јусѹиу Поѹовиу: живоѹѹ и дело (Father Justin Popović: Life and Deeds)* (ed. S. Denić; Vranje, 2010); V. Tatalović, "Ermeneutical Principles of Archimandrite Dr Justin Popović", *Срѹска ѹѹеолоѹѹја у двадесѹиу веку (Serbian Theology in the Twentieth Century)* (n. 35) 5 (2010), 17-29.

⁹¹ Fr. Justin earned his Ph.D. from Athens University in 1921, having written a thesis on St. Macarius of Egypt's teaching on personality and cognition: *Ι. Πόποβιτς, Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς προσωπικότητος καὶ τῆς γνώσεως κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιον Μακάριον τὸν Αἰγύπτιον* (Athens, 1926).

⁹² Following in the Archimandrite's footsteps, Irinej arrived in Athens for his Ph.D. in theology, having joined there three other older disciples of Popović. Besides Metropolitan A. Radović (n. 67), then a hireomonk who researched Palamite trinitarianism—*Α. Πάντοβιτς, Τὸ Μυστήριον τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιον Γρηγόριον Παλαμά* (Thessalonike, 1973)—there was hieromonk Atanasije Jevtić (1938-), today a retired Bishop of Zahumlje and Herzegovina, who wrote a thesis on Paul's ecclesiology, *Α. Πέβριτς, Ἡ ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου* (Athens, 1984), and also *Artemije Radosavljević (1935-), a recently defrocked Bishop of Raška-Prizren and Kosovo-Metohija (2010), who defended his dissertation on St Maximus the Confessor's soteriology: Α. Ραντοσάβλιεβιτς, Τὸ Μυστήριον τῆς Σωτηρίας κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιον Μάξιμον τὸν Ὁμολογητὴν* (Athens, 1975). On their return from Athens in the early 70s, both Radović and Jevtić were appointed professors at the FOTB, where they remained for decades.

was unparalleled for its scope and influence.⁹³ In slightly different ways, both of the saints maintained the rule that Justin Popović put succinctly in the following way: “Do to understand. It is the fundamental principle of Orthodox exegesis.”⁹⁴

This may be the crucial reason why the exegesis of Nikolaj and Justin, aided in effect by their living examples, contributed to a fundamental spiritual change in Serbian church life (its advance being inversely proportional to the waning of the Communist totalitarian regime), while the exegesis of Belgrade New Testament scholars did not leave the Faculty premises (or, at least, had no need for doing so). Therefore, the challenge Bishop Irinej faced after being appointed a docent at the Faculty (1980), when the most fertile professional New Testament scholar abandoned the Department and the most influential Abba of modern Serbia abandoned the earthly living (1979), was not at all negligible: it required more than just a complex synthesis of both academic and Church traditions; it also required a synthesis capable of answering the needs of a society already estranged from Church life.⁹⁵ Irinej’s scholar-

⁹³ Compared to Bishop Nikolaj, Fr. Justin’s exegetical work made use of more scholarly comments that were modeled upon patristic interpretations, but from within imbued with an authentic experience of profound but also traditional, folk faith. His *Collected Works* (Belgrade, 1998-) are planned to be published in 30 volumes, but this project is not complete. Among these works, the following contain exegetical content in the narrow sense: *Тумачење Свејџої Еванђеља њо Мајџеју (Commentary on the Holy Gospel according to Matthew)* (Belgrade, 2000); *Тумачење Свејџої Јеванђеља њо Јовану. Тумачење њосланица Св. Јована Бојослова (Commentary on the Holy Gospel according to John. Commentary on the Epistles of St John the Theologian)* (Belgrade, 2001); *Тумачење њосланица њрве и друге Коринћанима Св. Ајосџола Павла (Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians of St. Paul the Apostle)* (Belgrade, 2001); *Тумачење њосланице Ефесцима Св. Ајосџола Павла. Тумачење Посланице Филијљанима Св. Ајосџола Павла. Тумачење њосланице Галајџима и I и II Солуњанима Св. Ајосџола Павла (Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians of St. Paul the Apostle. Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians of St. Paul the Apostle. Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians and on I and II Thesalonians of St. Paul the Apostle)* (Belgrade, 2002).

⁹⁴ J. Popović, *Тумачење Светог Еванђеља по Матеју (Interpretation of the Holy Gospel According to Matthew)* (Belgrade, 1979), 7.

⁹⁵ This central concern of Bulović may be seen in his two works, published in *Theology* (n. 29): “Косовски Завет у светлости Новог Завета” (“The Testament of Kosovo in the Light of the New Testament”), 1-2 (1989), 1-9; “Откривење Јованово – књига за нас данас” (“The Revelation of John – a Book for Us Today”), 1-2 (1996), 3-9; also see his study: “Философски и хришћански појам о Бору” (“The Philosophical and the Christian Concept of God”), in *Појам Боја у филозофију (The Concept of God in Philosophy)* (ed. M. A. Perović; Novi Sad, 1996), 125-131.

ly contributions to such an undertaking may be seen through works of various forms and through the newest, Synodal translation of the New Testament (1984).⁹⁶ Irinej's professorship, however, was largely impeded by his election as Bishop (1989), as well as by a wide range of duties that took their toll especially during the last decade of the twentieth century, when the Serbian nation was once again stricken by raging wars and migrations.⁹⁷ Ultimately, his major contribution to Serbian theology in general, and therefore to biblical scholarship, is evident in his inconspicuous though unsparing struggle for the readmission of the Faculty to Belgrade University (2004), as well as for its survival amidst extremely complex ecclesiastical, political, and social relations. These circumstances inspired Bishop Irinej's continuous endeavors to ensure versatile education to future generations at other academic and Church institutions, especially abroad.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ For more on the Synodal translation, see Dr. I. Bulović, "Нови превод Светог Писма Новог Завета" ("The New Translation of the Holy Scripture of the New Testament"), *Православни мисионар* (Orthodox Missionary) 160 (1984), 257-272; I. Bulović, "Вук и Црква" ("Vuk and the Church"), *Theology* (n. 29) 1-2 (1987), 53-63.

⁹⁷ For more on this still not fully researched topic, consult Eι. Μπούλοβιτς, "Το σημερινό δράμα της Σερβίας και ή δοκιμασία της Όρθοδοξίας," in *Βαλκάνια και Όρθοδοξία* (n. e.; Athens, 1993), 102-116; Th. Bremer, *Kleine Geschichte der Religionen in Jugoslawien: Königsreich, Kommunismus, Krieg* (Freiburg i. Br., 2003), 75-139, where other important works on the same issue are listed as well (140-141).

⁹⁸ Bishop Irinej took his disciple Porfirije Perić (1961-) down the same spiritual and scholarly road that he himself traveled. Perić, a recently enthroned Metropolitan of Zagreb and Ljubljana (2014-), earned his Ph.D. in Athens, having defended his thesis on the reception of Paul's gnoseology in Chrysostom's works: Π. Πέριτς, *Τό δυνατόν τής γνώσεως του Θεού εις τον Άπόστολον Παύλον κατά τον Άγιον Ιωάννην τον Χρυσόστομον* (Athens, 2004), and he currently teaches "New Testament Theology" and "Pastoral Theology with Psychology" at the FOTB (2005-). Beside these two archpriests, there are two other younger colleagues at the department of New Testament at the same Faculty, whose scholarly path was also determined by the decisions of Bishop Irinej: Prof. Dr. Predrag Dragutinović (1972-), who specialized in Bern and Athens, but who defended his doctoral thesis at the FOTB: *Μисија и комуникација у раном хришћанству. Путовање хришћана као израз јединства Цркве у Новом завету и код αἰσίοτοπικων οἰαία* (*Mission and Communication in Early Christianity: Christian Travelling as an Instrument of the Unity of the Church in the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers*) (Belgrade, 2010); and the author of the present study (1977-), who specialized in Thessalonica and Münster, but whose dissertation on "The Son of Man in the Gospel and in the Revelation of John" has recently been defended at the FOTB (2014). Finally, the department of Biblical Scholarship as a whole currently includes three colleagues who specialized in the field of Old Testament in Germany, but who have or will receive doctoral degrees from the FOTB (Prof. Dr. Ili-

4. Concluding remarks

To conclude our study, we will present three key insights, which in our view should serve as an agenda for any future work on Orthodox New Testament scholarship in Serbia:

1) First, returning to the initial thought of Podskalsky from the beginning of this study, according to which a scholarly assessment of the various streams of history is essential for understanding the development of the Serbian theological milieu, we should recognize that a complete consideration of the origin and development of Serbian New Testament scholarship could not be achieved in this work, even though almost all scholarly papers in the field of New Testament theology by the four previous professors at the FOTB were listed. We have been able only briefly to contextualize their thought historically and theologically, and we have mentioned only in passing the progress in translation attempts. Moreover, in the future, it will be necessary to shed light on the contributions of the professors of Old Testament, as well as the various other achievements in the field of biblical scholarship outside the faculty, which could have influenced the development of New Testament scholarship significantly. The Sixth International East-West Symposium of New Testament Scholars in Belgrade clearly shows that Serbian biblical scholarship has a future in international, cooperative endeavors. Indeed, the author of the present study does not hide his joy at the fact that those Serbian New Testament scholars present at this Symposium have experienced a profound encounter with their Western colleagues and their scholarly tradition, an experience that they had probably been waiting for their whole lives.

2) Second, the research above reveals that the question of exegetical method poses a central problem of pan-Orthodox and hence Serbian biblical scholarship. Despite all that has been hitherto achieved and the tendency of domestic professors towards the historical-critical method, the fact is that this environment has not caught up with the vivacious fountains of Western criticism. For instance, literary approaches have lately attracted considerable attention, but their real influence on the domestic ecclesiastic and scholarly atmosphere will not come for

ja Tomić [1952-], Prof. Dr. Rodoljub Kubat [1969-], and Nenad Božović [1985-]). In the future, their work will be significantly determined by the work of the first Serbian Bible Institute, which was recently founded within the FOTB (2013).

a good while, for we know that domestic thought only recently summoned up courage to cooperate seriously with the colossus of historical criticism. The attempt to offer a final presentation of any universal Orthodox method of interpreting Scripture bears a certain amount of risk, since it is based on a momentary and therefore fragmentary perception of contemporary biblical scholarship in the world and makes use of domestic scholarly resources weakened by various factors. Therefore, it is all the more important to develop an Orthodox method by reexamining the authentic exegesis of the domestic context, while refining it through the corrective lens of biblical scholarship on a larger scale. There is no particular need to show that possibilities for such endeavors are significantly improved precisely with the Sixth International East-West Symposium of New Testament Scholars in Belgrade.

3) And finally, as a third observation, albeit one inseparable from the previous two, comes the fact that, given the circumstances, all previously mentioned Serbian biblical scholars pursued the improvement of teaching tools by sending young candidates abroad (on purpose), or by compiling textbooks, or giving lectures, or translating biblical texts and organizing seminars. Setting aside the entire problem of education in Serbia, which, along with inherent methodological and hermeneutical problems, has led to a whole range of consequences related to the decades-long isolation of the Serbian Orthodox region, the exegesis of domestic theologians who were not professional biblical scholars have indisputably played a decisive role in the revival of Church life. Therefore, being prone to a creative synthesis of traditional and modern, patristic and historical-critical approaches, Orthodox biblical scholarship in Serbia should strive towards a synthesis of S/spirit and science, hoping to create an academic exegesis, the method of which will be capable of the constructive rethinking of *actual Church life*—in other words, of offering perpetually active help in seeking authentic self-expression within the given framework. And so, as in the case of the previous two insights, with the closure of this third one, and hence the closure of this entire study, it is not particularly difficult to feel the prospects that open for such a synthesis precisely with the Sixth International East-West Symposium of New Testament Scholars in Belgrade.