

Svetoslav Ribolov

## DOGMATIC THEOLOGY IN BULGARIA DURING THE 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY

**Abstract:** The author provides a brief review of research in Dogmatic Theology in Bulgaria from the late 19th century to the early 21st century. He outlines the key scholars in this field and their most notable research programs. Additionally, the author seeks to identify the main characteristics of Orthodox Dogmatic research in Bulgaria during this period, considering the specific historical circumstances. While not offering a comprehensive overview, he addresses some of the most complex questions faced by Bulgarian researchers in Dogmatics and proposes potential solutions for the revitalization of this field in Bulgaria.

**Keywords:** *Dogmatic Theology, Systematic Theology, Bulgarian Theology*

### ***Building a National Church***

Bulgarian Exarchate was founded in 1870. The basic principle of its emergence as an independent church was ethnic and not a local one. This situation was a serious challenge for the Ecumenical Patriarchate and two years later the Bulgarian Exarchate was condemned as schismatic by the local council of Constantinople in 1872 (16<sup>th</sup> of September). This specific process started developing in the 60s of the 19<sup>th</sup> century when the results of the influence of European developments and especially of Russian Pan Slavism in Bulgaria became already visible. At that time Bulgaria was part of the Ottoman Empire and under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. During the development of these events there is an important historical fact that plays a crucial role. There was a long term program for conquering the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, Constantinople and the Balkan Peninsula by the Russian kings that has been taking place since the time of Empress Ekaterina the Great. This influence, based on the common Orthodox Christian tradition, started growing amongst the Bulgarians in the beginning of 19<sup>th</sup> century when it was strongly forced by the wave of Pan Slavism (in this period Pan Slavism was a very popular

idea in Russia and in the Eastern provinces of Austro-Hungarian Empire).

As a result of this intellectual movement in Russia emerged the idea of a specific “Slavonic church model” – the Ecclesiological model of Alexey Chomyakov. I do not know if there was a direct dependence of the Bulgarian schism on Chomyakov’s Ecclesiology but it was a clear sign of the common spirit of the epoch.

Unfortunately both sides in this situation – the Bulgarian leaders in the capital of the Ottoman Empire and the high clergy of the Ecumenical Patriarchate<sup>1</sup> – refused to make a step towards a compromise and this kind of ethnically-driven ecclesiastical practice (so called National church) was defined as Ethno-Phyletism – Bulgarian Exarchate became a schismatic church for a long time.

In spite of the conciliar decision from 1872 the same ecclesiastical practice remained a serious problem for the entire Orthodox Church in 20<sup>th</sup> century and, I would say, especially for the local Orthodox churches in South-Eastern Europe. This ecclesiological problem was born in a milieu of a much delayed forming of the nations in this region. According to an orthodox scholar, archimandrite Gregorius Papatomas, this is the most serious ecclesiological problem for the Orthodox Church in an age of Post-Ecclesiality<sup>2</sup>.

This ecclesiological situation in Bulgaria has gradually influenced the theological education. The first generation of teachers in the new-founded seminaries and the high clergy of the Bulgarian Exarchate were gradutors of the famous School of Chalki in Constantinople and other educational institutions of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Their manner of teaching was very similar to the system in these schools. I shall skip out the teaching of Dogmatics in the church seminaries in the early years of 20<sup>th</sup> century because in those years there was not a very strict system of learning Dogmatics and the students used to learn their tradition mainly from the Divine Liturgy. These years the only non-Greek book in Dogmatics was translated from Russian – the five tomes of Bishop Silvester *Orthodox Dogmatic The-*

---

<sup>1</sup> It is a quite intriguing fact that the extreme circles amongst the Bulgarian elite were a minority but achieved success in these developments in the 60s and the 70s of the 19<sup>th</sup> century thanks to the Russian diplomacy and the interference of the Ottoman government that in this period had an interest to divide the Christians in the empire.

<sup>2</sup> See Gr. Papatomas, *In the age of the Post-Ecclesiality (The emergence of post-ecclesiological modernity)*. In <http://www.orthodoxa.org/GB/orthodoxy/theology/Post-Ecclesiality.pdf> (31.03.2009)

*ology with a Historic Research of the Dogmas* (Kiev, 1884-97)<sup>1</sup>. Until now this is the only book in Dogmatics that has the sanction of the Holy Synod of Bulgarian church.

### ***Dogmatic Theology in the Beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century***

The Faculty of Theology at Sofia University was founded in 1923 after the World War I. The first professors were Alexander Rozhdestvenky, Nikolay Glubokovsky, Michel Posnoff, archim. Euthymius Sapundjiev, Ivan Snegaroff, archpriest Stephan Zankoff etc. Here we can find famous scientists in Bible Studies, Church History and Canon Law but no dogmatists at all. The first research in dogmatic theology that was made by Christo Gyauroff, a professor in the Faculty of Theology at Sofia University: *Dogmatic foundations in the epistles of St. Ignatius Theophorus, Bishop of Antioch* (Sofia, 1924). Gyauroff was a specialist in New Testament Studies, but in the early years after the founding of the Faculty he taught also Dogmatics. Together with Prof. Nikolay Glubokovsky he would become one of the most important persons in Bible Studies in Bulgaria during the next few decades<sup>2</sup>.

The professor who succeeded Gyauroff in teaching Dogmatics was Dimitâr Dyulgeroff. He graduated in Russia but soon after the Communist Revolution he left Russia to spend two years in Rome continuing his studies and, after that, one year in Wien. Influenced by his socialist ideas, he was very active in organizing youth Christian movements all over the country. His works are mainly in the field of Missiology and far apart from any serious research in dogmatics. Some of his important works are: *The Pope of Rome under the Judgment of the Church History* (1924), *The Theosophical Society* (1925)<sup>3</sup>, *The Meaning of Dogma* (1927)<sup>4</sup>, *Jesus Christ – New*

---

<sup>1</sup> See Bishop Silvester, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology with Historical Research of the Dogmas*. T. I-III, Sofia, 1912 (in Bulgarian transl.). For original titles see the Bibliography on the end of the text.

<sup>2</sup> See Ivan Dimitroff, "Chair of New Testament Holy Scripture (since it's founding until nowadays)". *Duchovna Kultura* 5 (2000), 1-8 (in Bulgarian).

<sup>3</sup> With a strong influence from H. W. Schomerus, "Der Seelenwanderungsgedanke im Glauben der Völker". In *Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie* 6 Jahrgang, 2 Vierteljahrheft.

<sup>4</sup> In *Annual of Theological Faculty at the Sofia University "St. Clement of Ochrid"*, 4 (1924), 1-22 (in Bulgarian).

*Testament Archpriest and Redeemer* (1928)<sup>1</sup>, *The Mystery of Baptism – Essence and Meaning* (1943)<sup>2</sup>, *Essay on Sophia – The Wisdom of God* (1936)<sup>3</sup>, *A Course in Missiology* (1937), *The Unity of the Church of Christ* (1947)<sup>4</sup>, *Ascension of the Virgin Mary* (1948)<sup>5</sup>, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* (1937, sec. ed. 1948), *The Adventism* (1945, 1951)<sup>6</sup>.

All of these works were strongly criticized by archim. Euthymius Sapundjiev, prof. Michael Posnoff, metropolitan Symeon of Varna and many others in Bulgaria<sup>7</sup>. They accused him of too big dependence on the 19<sup>th</sup> century Russian theologians and German protestant authors. For instance, the *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* (1937) written by him in collaboration with his assistant Iliya Zonevsky, was strongly influenced by the Russian textbook of Ivan Nikolin – *Essay on Dogmatic Theology* (1911)<sup>8</sup>. Even Nikolin's textbook is too far from the Orthodox Dogmatic tradition – we do not see any word about such central themes for the Orthodox Theology as οὐσία and ἐνέργεια of God, or κτιστόν and ἄκτιστον. The whole content is classified after the manner of the textbooks of Systematic Theology in conservative Protestantism. In this methodology the formulas of the Ecumenical councils are something like philosophic abstractions and have not so much to do with Dogmatics. All the “Dogmas” are based on quoting verses from the Holy Scripture, usually out of context. The Palamitic thought is absolutely missing.

We see also a very strong protestant influence in Dyulgeroff's books *A Textbook of Missiology* (1937) and *Ascension of the Virgin Mary* (1948). For example, in the last work the author used the Orthodox liturgical tradition in such a selective way that, naturally, his conclusions sounded much more acceptable to a Protestant but not for to an Orthodox Christian. Dyulgeroff briefly explains the position of the Roman Catholics on

<sup>1</sup> In *Ibid.*, 5 (1928), 1-83.

<sup>2</sup> In *Ibid.*, 22 (1943), 3-73.

<sup>3</sup> In *Ibid.*, 18 (1936).

<sup>4</sup> In *Ibid.*, 24 (1947).

<sup>5</sup> In *Ibid.*, 25 (1949).

<sup>6</sup> In *Ibid.*, 23 (1946) and 26 (1951).

<sup>7</sup> See critical articles and reviews of all these authors in Archim Euthymius Sapundjiev (edr.), *Our Modern Dogmatic Science*. Sofia, 1934 (in Bulgarian).

<sup>8</sup> This text is published in the Russian periodic *Dushepoleznie chtenia* 1911 (March-November) – in Russian.

this theme<sup>1</sup> but provides a fragmentary image of the liturgical evidences of the belief of the Orthodox Church in the Ascension of the Holy Mother<sup>2</sup>. In conclusion he says: “The Ascension of the Holy Mother can not be declared as a dogma, because for this purpose it must be a clearly established fact and not just a statement of faith (?!), i.e. it means to be established as the historical truth... In order to establish it as a historical fact, we need proofs. But they do not exist nor in the Holy Scripture of the New Testament, neither in the Holy Tradition (?!)”<sup>3</sup>. Here as well as in the entirety of his works we are under the impression that a Dogma is something postulated somewhere in some personal mind and has anything to do with the actual liturgical life of the Church.

In a time when Orthodox theologians started seriously engaging in the discussion of Ecclesiology and in the dialogue with the other Christians, the dogmatic theology in the isolated schismatic Bulgarian Church started closing itself. A small work of Prof. D. Dyulgeroff - *The Unity of the Church of Christ* (1947), is a symptom for this process. His work is based on the Russian scholastic research studies from the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In this work Prof. Dyulgeroff points out that the lack of organizational and confessional unity amongst Christians results in the impotence of Christianity in front of the external enemies of the faith<sup>4</sup>. The main problems for the entire Christianity, points out the author, are coming from the contradictions amongst the different denominations. And the falling away from the Church is comprehended by Dyulgeroff only as a falling away from the right confession without mentioning at all the catholicity of the Church. The author concentrates his work on the polemic with the encyclical *Mortalium animos* of Pius XI<sup>5</sup> and tries to “unmask the ambitions of the Roman Pope” in achieving a Union with the Orthodox Church but preserv-

---

<sup>1</sup> D. Dyulgeroff, “Ascension of the Virgin Mary”. In *Annual of Theological Faculty at the Sofia University “St. Clement of Ochrid”*, 25 (1949), 4-22 (in Bulgarian).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 23-32.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 34. We could leave aside the non orthodox separation between Scripture and Tradition but we should point out that in Bulgarian Orthodox Dogmatics there is an obvious tendency to comprehend the Revelation as a reality manifested in these two forms. No one of the Bulgarian dogmatists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century did not consider Scripture as a natural part of the common Christian Tradition preserving the integrity of Divine Revelation.

<sup>4</sup> D. Dyulgeroff, “The Unity of the Church of Christ”. In *Annual of Theological Faculty at the Sofia University “St. Clement of Ochrid”*, 24 (1947), 3-5 (in Bulgarian).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 sq.

ing the Primacy of the Roman Bishop<sup>1</sup>. In this context he makes a review of the Ecumenical movement in the 20s and in the 30s. This work shows the signs of an extreme lack of information about what is happening out of the country at orthodox theological forums and in the Orthodox world as a whole.

In this period the idea of ecclesiastical pan-Slavism of Alexey Chomyakov (from the 1860s) is still modern in Bulgaria. The closest collaborator of Prof. Dimitâr Dyulgeroff – Iliya Zonevsky, defended his PhD thesis (titled *Ecclesiology of Alexey Chomyakov*) at the University of Marburg in 1940, but unfortunately he never published this text. In the next years he developed a very active position in the Ecumenical movement (preserving an active interest towards Ecclesiology), but as an academic scholar he started working in Patristics. Eventually, he never published anything interesting in Ecclesiology.

Prof. Archimandrite Euthymius and metropolitan Symeon of Varna were the most emblematic figures in Bulgarian Church at that time. It should be pointed that their critical voices are the first alarms against the process of profanation of the church Dogma and its study at the University in the late 20s and 30s. According to them the work of Dimitâr Dyulgeroff (and respectively of his collaborator Zonevsky) was much more a mission of a left oriented preacher than of a teacher of the Church<sup>2</sup>.

In this respect it is quite interesting to realize that an ecclesiological problem at the late years of the 19<sup>th</sup> century has its results in the 20s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and after, as a lack of ecclesiastical consciousness even in people who teach theology. A serious ecclesiastical problem such as Ethno-Phyletism leads to the secularization of spiritual life. Church and Dogma have a very different role in such kind of secular society. The Dogma in this situation is part of some other system but not of the Mystical Body of Christ in the Eucharist. The Church plays the role of a nationalistic party and the Dogma is part of its internal charter. It has nothing to do with the spiritual life in the Church of Christ. In such ecclesiastical reality there is no need of serious research in Dogmatics. Such research usually needs

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, 29-33.

<sup>2</sup> See Fr. E. Popyordanov, "About the Writing of D. Dyulgeroff: Christian Brotherhood or Church?" In Archim. Euthymius Sapundjieff, *op. cit.* 58-67; "An Appeal of His Eminence Metropolitan Symeon toward the Academic Council of Sofia University". In Archim Euthymius Sapundjieff, *op. cit.* 73-75 (in Bulgarian).

an ecclesiastical fundament based on catholicity. The lack of catholicity cannot produce an original and fruitful dogmatic theological thought. We can not think Dogma without the Church and a shifted Church reality can produce a shifted Dogmatic science.

In addition, there was also an obvious problem with the understanding of salvation. This problem in Bulgarian theological thought in this period (as well as in the Greek one) before the World War II is not very well studied and comprehended<sup>1</sup>.

First, most of the theologians had an idealistic approach embracing the common opposition in this period between *spirit* and *matter*. The theme of Salvation was usually related to the very close idea that the earthly life is just a road of temptations and the life after death is a free flight of the soul undressed from the body. This approach puts aside the theme for the Second Coming of Christ and the Orthodox teaching for the eschatological recapitulation of the whole of creation. Spiritual life is restricted to individual piety and salvation and starts looking as an individual co-existence of the undressed souls somewhere around an abstract God. The images of Christ in the icons of the temple start looking as a metaphor and not as an image of the Reality<sup>2</sup>.

Second, a further enhancement of the problem was provoked by another work of Dimitâr Dyulgeroff – *Jesus Christ – New Testament Archpriest and Redeemer* (1926)<sup>3</sup>. This text exercised an extraordinary influence on all dogmatic (and not only) research studies that had something to do with the soteriological theme in Bulgaria during the 20<sup>th</sup> century<sup>4</sup>. Since the time of the appearance of this text we can observe in Bulgarian theological research a very stable tendency of distinguishing between Redemption as an “objective potentiality” for human being and Salvation as a subjective process dependent on the personal responsibility of the

---

<sup>1</sup> See A. N. Papathanasiou, “Some key themes and figures in Greek theological thought”. In *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, Cambridge University Press, 2008 (Offprint), 219-220.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> In *Ibid.*, 5 (1928), 1-83.

<sup>4</sup> See the works D. Kiroff, *Dimensions of Man (A Study in Christian Anthropology)*. Sofia, 1998; K. Stamatova, *An Introduction in the Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*. Sofia, 2007; idem, *A Supplement to the Introduction to Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*. Sofia, 2007; idem, *If I have not love...* Sofia, 2005; idem, *The Church: A Community of Love*. Sofia, 2008 and many others.

faithful<sup>1</sup>. Dylgeroff provides the following formula of “the dogma of salvation”: “The soul of a Christian is a living altar. On this altar has to burn the fire of love; this fire burns the sin and lawlessness and gives peace, joy, salvation. Salvation is an internal process in which a Christian through creative suffering, and due to the Redemption and the graceful help of Christ, releases himself from evil and sin. Justification is given by God and salvation is an achievement of the human being with the help of God. Suffering pursues the good; striving for the release from sins is fulfilled through suffering. Howsoever this should not disturb a Christian but has to make him rejoice. God send him temptations and suffering according his strength”<sup>2</sup>.

This “internal process” that is taking place in a common Christian, has its parallel in Christ’s archpriest sacrifice. Based on the epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, Dylgeroff points out that Christ has an intermediary role as a New Testament archpriest through His earthly life. Salvation is an exchange of His life for ours. And this exchange is concentrated on the event of Christ’s death on the Cross. The Meaning of Christ’s sacrifice is *a satisfaction for our sins*<sup>3</sup> – an understanding for salvation characteristic for Anselm of Canterbury, which is articulated in detail during the controversies after the Council of Trident. It is a consequence of the conception of *contemplatio Dei*. In the Orthodox Tradition we have a concept of μέθεξις Θεοῦ, in which is absolutely impossible to have such categories as subjective and objective salvation.

It is a significant fact that the whole text criticizes the “protestant rational conception” for salvation, as well as “the juridical spirit” of the Roman-Catholic scholastics. Despite these declarations we do not see in the text any remnants of traditional Orthodox eschatology – for instance any mentioning of the Christ’s descent in hell – a central moment in the Eastern Orthodox conception of salvation.

### ***Under the Atheistic Regime***

The only adequate works on the question about the Church in that period are the ones by Fr. Stefan Zankoff, professor in Canon Law, includ-

---

<sup>1</sup> D. Dylgeroff, *Jesus Christ – New Testament Arch-Priest and Redeemer*. Sofia, 1926, 19 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 18.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 20, 79 sq.



ing: *Unity and Catholicity of the Church* (1951)<sup>1</sup>; *The Unity of the Church* (1959)<sup>2</sup> and *The Search for Unity in the Orthodox churches with other Christian churches. The Orthodox Church and Ecumenism* (1960)<sup>3</sup>. He is the only Bulgarian theologian who is well accepted in the West (especially before the World War II). He teaches for a while in the University of Berlin and often is a guest lecturer in different European Universities. In fact Prof. Fr. Stefan Zankoff is very well aware of the Orthodox tradition and during these years keeps in touch with a lot of Orthodox thinkers in Western Europe, Greece and Romania. But since the late 40s it was already difficult for him (like for everybody in Bulgaria) to travel outside of the country because of the Soviet occupation of Bulgaria and the new pro-Soviet Communist government confessing an extreme atheism and hostility towards the Church. Even since the academic 1948-1949 year the Faculty of Theology is separated from the University and continues functioning as the Theological Academy "St. Clement of Ochrid" until 1991. In this climate of hostility of the academic circles toward the Church Bulgarian theology found itself in a full isolation from the rest of the scientific and academic circles even inside of the country.

The first of above mentioned works of Fr. Zankoff is actually a result of his correspondence with Fr. George Florovsky and of the tension between him and Prof. Dimitâr Dyulgeroff. Here he concentrated his reflection on the dialogue between Western and Eastern Christianity. He makes a short historical survey of the compromises made by the Russian Church in the understanding of the sacraments of the Roman Church and also makes an overview of opinions of theologians from all over the Orthodox World on this subject<sup>4</sup> - something that is absolutely missing from the works of Prof. Dyulgeroff.

Also he reflects on the problem of the Catholicity (Conciliarity) in the West – in both Roman-Catholics and Protestants. He thinks that the Orthodox Church has much more vibrant sensibility for the Catholicity

---

<sup>1</sup> In *Annual of Theological Academy "St. Clement of Ochrid"*, 2 (1951-1952), 231-256 (in Bulgarian).

<sup>2</sup> In *ibid.*, 8 (1958-1959), 247-267 (in Bulgarian).

<sup>3</sup> In *ibid.*, 9 (1959-1960), 259-306 (in Bulgarian). However the last work is already influenced by the official course of the Bulgarian state and its reflection on the Church.

<sup>4</sup> St. Zankow, "Unity and Catholicity of the Church". In *Annual of Theological Academy "St. Clement of Ochrid"*, 2 (1951-1952), 231-240 (in Bulgarian).

than the Western Church<sup>1</sup>. He pointed out also that in the last few decades (then) the relationships amongst the Orthodox local churches started intensifying and considered this again as a witness for the conciliar character of the Orthodox Church<sup>2</sup>. In this context he can not escape from the local problems of the Bulgarian reality (including the deep dependence on the Russian church). On the basis of the Christocentric character of the Church he criticizes the idea that the Ecumenical Patriarchate should be considered as an over national institution<sup>3</sup>. As Christocentric organism the Church can be found *par excellence* in the sacrament of the divine Eucharist – the center of whole Church reality. He also puts an emphasis on a sentiment towards “the early flourishing of the Church”<sup>4</sup>.

The other two works of Fr. Stefan Zankoff that were mentioned above (*The Unity of the Church*, 1959<sup>5</sup> and *The Search for Unity in the Orthodox churches with other Christian churches. The Orthodox Church and Ecumenism*, 1960)<sup>6</sup> concentrated on the problems of the Ecumenical movement. From them we can make a general conclusion that Fr. Stefan Zankoff accepts (with some reservation) the Roman-Catholics and Protestants as being part of the Church and as having place “inside of the borders of the Church”. This statement shows a dependence on the general course of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church towards the Ecumenical movement in this specific period.

Archim. Seraphim Alexieff is another professor related to dogmatic theology in Bulgaria. He worked since 1962 to 1969 in the Department of Dogmatic theology and Missiology of the Theological Academy “St. Clement of Ochrid”. His works are in the field of polemical dogmatic re-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, 240-250.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 250.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 252. We may suppose that this critic against the Ecumenical Patriarchate (not very typical for Fr. Zankoff) is a result of the political moment. In this period the Ecumenical Patriarchate was in very close relationships with the state administration of USA and the frontline between the Soviet Camp and the Western World started dividing also the Orthodox local churches according the political orientation of their regimes.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 253.

<sup>5</sup> In *Annual of Theological Academy “St. Clement of Ochrid”*, 8 (1958-1959), 247-267 (in Bulgarian).

<sup>6</sup> In *Annual of Theological Academy “St. Clement of Ochrid”*, 9 (1959-1960), 259-306 (in Bulgarian). However the last work is already influenced by the official course of the Bulgarian state and its reflection in the Church.

search<sup>1</sup>. His central subject is the “apostasy of the Western Christianity” and somehow he does not feel very comfortable as a Professor of Dogmatics in an epoch when the Bulgarian Church joins the Ecumenical movement (in 1961)<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand, being a graduate of the University of Bern where he studied Old Catholic theology<sup>3</sup> he had not enough strong Orthodox theological arguments in his critics against the Roman Catholics, especially in the concept of Salvation.

Eventually, Archim. Seraphim Alexiaff left the Department of Dogmatic theology and Missiology in 1969 because of disagreement with the official course of the Church. In all cases, he is an interesting person: he wrote a lot of popular theological works<sup>4</sup> and had a lot of spiritual children in Sofia. Unfortunately he and his collaborator Sergius Yazadzief (former professor of New Testament) became very important figures in the Old Calendar schism in Bulgarian Church in the early 90s. Until now our Church did not overcome this long-term schism. From his texts and homilies we can conclude that he put an emphasis on the right confession

<sup>1</sup> See the most important of his texts: “Two Extreme Views of the Western Denominations on Holy Mother”. In *Annual of Theological Academy “St. Clement of Ochrid”*, 12 (1962-1963); “The Condition of Man before and after the Fall according to the Orthodox Christianity, the Roman Catholics and the Protestants”. In *Annual of Theological Academy “St. Clement of Ochrid”*, 12) 1962-1963; “The Redemption as a deed of God’s Love and God’s Righteousness”. In *Annual of Theological Academy “St. Clement of Ochrid”*, 13 (1963-1964); “Franz von Bader – an Roman Catholic Philosopher and Theologian in Search of Orthodoxy and it’s Catholicity”. In *Annual of Theological Academy “St. Clement of Ochrid”*, 14 (1964-1965); “The Heresy of the Bogomils from the point of view of the Orthodox Dogmatic basis of Presbyter Kosmas”. In *Annual of Theological Academy “St. Clement of Ochrid”*, 15 (1965-1966); “The Union of the Two Natures in Christ according to the Orthodoxy and the Non-Caledonian churches”. In *Annual of Theological Academy “St. Clement of Ochrid”*, 17 (1967-1968); (together with Archim. Sergius Yazadzief) *The Orthodox View on the New and the Old Style of the Calendar*, Sofia, 1972; *Orthodoxy and Ecumenism. Why we can not be ecumenists?* Sofia 1992 (all in Bulgarian).

<sup>2</sup> See Iv. Latkovsky, “The Theological Heritage of Prof. Archimandrite Seraphim Alexieff”. *Bogoslovska Missal* 1-2 (2003), 114 sq. (in Bulgarian).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* We have to point out that the author of this text about archim. Seraphim was between 2000 and 2004 Assist. Prof. of Dogmatic Theology and Patristic at the Faculty of Theology of Sofia University. Being maybe dependent on the thought of archim. Seraphim and old Calendar movement in Bulgaria he left Bulgarian Orthodox Church and joined an Old calendar schismatic communion in 2003. In 2004 he left also the Faculty of Theology.

<sup>4</sup> It is interesting that some of them are translated in Romanian.

as central in defining the identity of the Church, so that he never overcame his Old Catholic influence due to his theological education in Bern.

Prof. Totyu Koeff joins the Department of Dogmatic Theology and Missiology in the late 60s. He works mainly in the field of the Ecumenical Councils and this is not occasional. In 1948 the Bulgarian Church overcame the schism and the question of the catholic (conciliar) essence of the Orthodox Church is again in the centre of the theological research. His dissertation, defended in 1955 is on theme *The Dogmatic formulas of the first four Ecumenical councils* (published in 1968) and his habilitation is *The Origin of the Dogmatic Formula of the Council of Chalcedon* (1971). His interests are also concentrated on the Ecumenical movement where he takes part almost in every initiative since the late 60s. He is also one of the well accepted scientists among the socialistic intellectuals in the late 70s and 80s. Being a person of compromise in these circles he had very good achievements in times when any other theologian could not have a chance. He is maybe the most fruitful Bulgarian theologian during the Communist period<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> See just the most important of his works: T. Koev, *The Dogmatic Formulas of the First Fourth Councils*. Sofia, 1968; *Orthodox Catechesis and the epistle of the Eastern Patriarchs*, Sofia 1991; *An Introduction to the Christianity* (together with Prof. G. Bakalov). Sofia, 1992; *A Christian manual* (together with Prof. G. Bakalov). Sofia, 2001; "The Origin of the Dogmatic Formula of Chalcedon". In *Annual of Theological Academy "St. Clement of Ochrid"*, 21 (1971-1972). Sofia, 1973; "The Trinitarian Dogma". In *Annual of Orthodox Faculty of Theology of Tyrnovo University*, t. I (1991-1992), V.-Tyrnovo, 1994; "Exposition of the Orthodox Faith" of St. Constantine-Cyril the Philosopher (Dogmatic analysis)". In *Annual of Orthodox Faculty of Theology of Tyrnovo University*, t. I (1992-1993), V.-Tyrnovo, 1998; "Bulgarian and Armenian churches during the centuries". In *Bulgarians and Armenians during the centuries*. Sofia, 2001; "Bulgarian Church in the Middle Centuries". In *History of the Bulgarians*, t. I, Sofia, 2003; "The Veneration of the Holy Icons in the context of the Incarnation". *Duchovna Kultura*, 3, 1974; "Dogmatic activity of 6<sup>th</sup> Ecumenical Council". *Duchovna Kultura*, 2, 1982; "The Sacrament of Baptism according to the Orthodox Church". *Duchovna Kultura*, 4, 1985 (all in Bulgarian); "Die Entwicklung des theologischen Denkens in Bulgarien - Hervorragende bulgarische Theologen". In: *Im Dialog der Liebe. Neunzehn PRO-ORIENTE - Symposien 1971 bis 1981*. Wien, 1986; "The Sacrament of Priesthood - an Orthodox Dogmatic elucidation". *Duchovna Kultura*, 2, 1987; "The Formulas of 7<sup>th</sup> Ecumenical Council". *Duchovna Kultura*, 11, 1987 (all in Bulgarian); "Religiose Sprache und sakrale Symbole in der Gegenwartsgesellschaft Bulgariens". In: *Kirchen im Kontext unterschiedlicher Kulturen. Auf dem Weg in das dritte Jahrtausend*. Göttingen, 1991; "Das romische Dokument über den Ausgang des Heiligen Geistes aus bulgarisch-orthodoxer Sicht". In: *Pro Oriente*, Bd. XXII, Tyrolia-Verlag,

In this period Bulgarian representatives at the Ecumenical movement do not take part in discussions on basic doctrinal themes because of the lack of serious dogmatic background. In the early period of the participation of the Bulgarian Church in the Ecumenical movement Prof. T. Koeff is just an assistant professor, so he does not take part in those discussions. The only one principal position expressed on a doctrinal question at the meeting in Århus (Denmark) in 1964 is the text of Prof. Archimandrite Seraphim Alexieff *The Union of the two natures of Christ according to the Orthodoxy and the non-chalcedonians* (1968)<sup>1</sup>. It is interesting that Archim. Seraphim did not take part in the forum, he was not allowed by the Communist regime to leave the country. The text was represented by Ilia Zonevsky, at that time professor of Patristics.

Being aware of the great responsibility in taking part in the Ecumenical movement and the lack of potential for serious doctrinal discussions, Prof. Totyu Koeff was much more moderate unlike other representatives of the Orthodox Church in the movement. The reason for this fact is that he had a good sense for the specific doctrinal obstacles in this process. Actually, he was much more a diplomatic representative with secular (state) engagements than an active member of the movement for union between the churches. His activity in the Ecumenical movement was concentrated on the representation of the Bulgarian church history and spiritual heritage in the West. He also made very important personal contacts for our academic community in the West and also with Greek professors and clerics in a period when the Greek regime of the colonels and the Bulgarian totalitarian pro-Soviet regime were in not very good relationships. It should be pointed out that he is one of the most important persons for breaking through the isolation after the schism especially in the academic circles.

### ***The Wind of Changes in 1990s and Last Developments***

After the changes in of 1989 the Bulgarian Church changed its attitude towards Ecumenism. Its former compromise was dictated by the

---

Insbrug-Wien, 1998; "Der Beitrag der bulgarisch-orthodoxen Kirche zur Okumenischen Bewegung". In: *Russland und Osterreich. Pro Oriente*, Bd. XXIII, Tyrolia-Verlag, Insbruck-Wien, 1999; "Auferstehung oder Auferweckung". In: *Orthodoxe Theologie zwischen Ost und West*. Frankfurt am Main, 2002; "An Outlook over Activity of the Council of Sardice". In: *Symposium in honor of 60-years of Prof. Georgy Bakalov*. Sofia. 2003 (in Bulgarian).

<sup>1</sup> In *Annual of the Theological Academy "St. Clement of Ochrid"*, 17 (1967-1968), 313-356 (in Bulgarian).

Communist regime which wanted to represent a better picture of the religious rights in the country. But now the Church, having the deep feeling of incompetence and of lack of Dogmatic potential for taking part in this process, left WCC in 1998. It was an immune reaction after a long-term period of compromises with the faith because of the official state policy. A few years earlier at the Faculty of Theology in Sofia many students had organized a protest against the teaching “History of the Ecumenical Movement” in the framework of Orthodox Dogmatics. So, in a few weeks this course was left out of the curriculum of the Faculty. By leaving the WCC the Church just answered an expectation of the ordinary faithful people. On the other hand, it is not an advantage that, since then, this course has become a taboo in our curriculum. And also, until nowadays Bulgarian Church does not take part in any initiatives related to the dialog with the western Church.

In the academic sphere Prof. T. Koeff left a very important heritage after the changes. He was the first Dean and Founder of the Second Faculty of Theology in the city of Veliko Tirnovo (Northern Bulgaria).

In the early 90s started forming a new-old wave of Neopatristic approach in Bulgarian theology. In the late 90s there were already two visibly co-existing tendencies in the academic field of Dogmatic Theology. From one hand, we can count the successor of Prof. T. Koeff in Tyrnovo University - Prof. Maryan Stoyadinoff, who is seriously engaged in the patristic roots of the Orthodox tradition. He defended his PhD in 1998 on theme *The Grace of God* (publ. 2006), based on the Palamitic tradition<sup>1</sup>. He also contributed to the articulation of the understanding of Salvation in Bulgarian Dogmatic Theology<sup>2</sup>. As a scientist Mr. Stuyadinov has very active relationships with colleagues and clerics all over in the Orthodox world. He spent the period 2001-2002 at the Monastery Pendely in Athens and also in Thessalonika where he attended lectures at the Faculty of Theology of AUTH. He is a translator and an editor of Greek and Serbian theological literature. His interests in Orthodox Dogmatics are concentrated in 14<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See also M. Stoyadinov, «Η ακρίβεια και ύπομνη στο άσκητικό πρόγραμμα του Γέροντα Ίωσήφ». In: *IM Βατοπεδίου, 2007* (Conference dedicated to elder Joseph Hesychast, Cyprus, October 2005).

<sup>2</sup> See M. Stoyadinov, «Τò παράδοξο τής Θείας ένσαρκώσεως». *Διάβαση*, τ. 40, 2002; “Soteriological Basis of the Dogmatic Works of the Church”. In: *International Symposium in Honor of Prof. Totyu Koev*. Veliko Tyrnovo, 2005 (in Bulgarian).

century controversies and the reception of the late Byzantine theology in 15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> centuries including the influence of western theology on the different tendencies of the Orthodox Dogmatic Theology<sup>1</sup>.

M. Stoyadinoff also tries to emphasize the ecclesiological foundation of Triadological and Christological thought in the modern epoch, i.e. to reflect on the reasons for the current “retreat – he says – from this truth of the Church”<sup>2</sup>. This is an attempt to consider the ecclesiological themes through the prism of the concept of person. A few of his latest publications are in the field of iconology. In them he tries to decode the Orthodox theology of image as a “visualization” of the hypostatic principle<sup>3</sup>.

From other hand, at the Faculty of Theology in Sofia is the other successor of Prof. T. Koeff – Lyubomir Tenekedzieff. For the last few years he has been trying to overcome the influence of neo-scholastic methodology and the specific approach towards Dogmatics of Prof. D. Dyulgeroff. He defended a PhD thesis on “*The Teaching of St. John of Damascus about the Icons*” (1988). He also published two important works for the present Bulgarian milieu: *Confirmation of the Apostles’ Tradition in 2<sup>nd</sup> century* (2008) and *The Teaching of the Church in Theological Thought until the middle of 3<sup>rd</sup> century* (2008). Here we see an attempt to overcome the fragmentation of Dogmatic exposé and to situate it in specific periods of Patristic literature. He has also published his habilitation on *The Mystery of Marriage* (2009). In this work he is trying to analyze the Orthodox conception of Marriage in the framework of the relational dimensions of the person in

---

<sup>1</sup> See “The Services in the Church and the Challenges of Modern World”. In: *Orthodox Theological Symposium “Church and Modern Society”*. Rousse-Sofia, 2005; “Physical knowledge and knowledge of God in the Palamitic tradition”. In: *Ars and Scientia in the Middle Centuries*. Veliko Tyrnovo-Vratsa, 2006; “The Orthodox view on Filioque in the Context of the Council in Ferarre-Florence 1438-1439”. In: *Readings in honor of 600-years from the Dormition of St. Cyprian of Moscow*. Veliko Tyrnovo, 2008; “Disintegration of the Community as an Ecclesiological Problem”. In: *International Symposium “The Church and the Expectations of Modern Society”* (University of Tyrnovo, 6-9. 11. 2006), Sofia, 2009; *The Right Faith in the Interpretation of Ecumenical patriarch Hieremias II in His Answer to the Augsburg’s Confession, 1576. Some ecclesiological aspects*. Veliko Tyrnovo, 2009 (all in Bulgarian).

<sup>2</sup> “Soteriological Basis of the Dogmatic Works of the Church”. In: *International Symposium in honor of Prof. Totyu Koev*. Veliko Tyrnovo, 2005 (in Bulgarian).

<sup>3</sup> See “The Light in the Orthodox icon”. In: *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur*, Heft XIII, Sofia-Munich, 2007; “Dogmatic Meaning of the Icon”. In: *ibid.*, Heft XIV, 2007 (in Bulgarian).

the Orthodox tradition. I have included these works in the review of the 20<sup>th</sup> century because all of these researches were completed in the late 90s but get published in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century.

\* \* \*

We see how the years in isolation not only in schism but also during the Communist period provoked a lot of problems in the Church and its theological education. Its heavy inheritance is most obvious in Dogmatic Theology perhaps because it is the heart of our Orthodox theological education. Bible Studies in Bulgaria are very well represented by a good number of academic researchers who had enough active contacts with their colleagues abroad. Researchers in Church History, as an interdisciplinary field, always keep in touch with colleagues from different sectors of academic community both in Bulgaria and abroad. All of them had always the chance to be part of scientific discussions and working groups. But our Dogmatic Theology was in deep isolation for many years and not only during the Communism<sup>1</sup>. We can hardly expect a living dogmatic work in a situation where there is not much discussion about hot doctrinal problems and about the real dimensions of Dogma in the real world.

After the normalization of the ecclesiastical practice in Bulgaria and in the atmosphere of religious freedom we can expect a new revival of creativeness in the field of Dogmatic Theology. In this respect the works of T. Koev were a very important step forward. Valuable interactions with other local Orthodox Churches and respectively Theological Institutions were also the source of the medicine for treatment of the old wounds. For the local churches that were under pressure in the last century and passed through the persecutions of the atheistic regimes the exchange of spiritual experience, it is the right tool for overcoming all these problems. Dogmatic Theology in Bulgaria is a witness for this fact. In this respect real communion and catholicity (conciliarity) of the Church are the most important principles providing a guarantee for the authenticity of the Orthodox Doctrine.

---

<sup>1</sup> See interesting observations of the theological discussions in the country in Traychev, Emil, "Tendencies and Perspectives in the Modern Orthodox Theology and in the Theology in Bulgaria". In: Zidarova, V., Pavel Pavlov (eds.), *Bulgarian Orthodox Church – Traditions and Present*. Sofia, 2009, 188-194 (in Bulgarian).



## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Алексиев, архим. Серафим, „Два крайни възгледа на западните вероизповедания относно Пресвета Богородица”. *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 12 (1962-1963).
- Алексиев, архим. Серафим, „Изкуплението като дело на Божията любов и Божията правда”. *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 13 (1963-1964).
- Алексиев, архим. Серафим, „Богомилската ерес от гледище на православните догматически устои на презвитер Козма и на православната догматика изобщо”. *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 15 (1965-1966).
- Алексиев, архим. Серафим, „Съединението на двете природи в Христа според Православието и нехалкидонските църкви”. *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 17 (1967-1968).
- Алексиев, архим. Серафим, Богомилската ерес от гледище на православните догматически устои на презвитер Козма и на православната догматика изобщо). *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 15 (1965-1966).
- Алексиев, архим. Серафим, *Православният възглед върху стария и новия стил на календара*. София, 1972.
- Алексиев, архим. Серафим – архим. Сергей Язаджиев, *Православие и икуменизъм. Защо не можем да бъдем икументисти*. София, 1992.
- Алексиев, архим. Серафим, „Франц фон Бадер - един римокатолически философ и богослов в търсеж на Православието и неговата съборност”. *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 14 (1964-1965).
- Алексиев, архим. Серафим, „Състоянието на човека до и след грехопадението от православно, римо-католическо и протестантско гледище”. *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 12 (1962-1963).
- Гяуровъ, Хр. *Догматически основоположения във посланията на св. Игнатия Богоносеца, антиохисийски епископъ*. София: Едисонъ 1924.
- Димитров, Ив. „Катедрата по Свещено Писание на Новия Завет от нейното основаване до днес”. *Сп. Духовна култура* 5 (2000), 1-8.
- Дюлгеров, Д. *Римският папа пред съда на църковната история*. София 1924.
- Дюлгеров, Д. „Размисъл върху Sophia, премъдрост Божия”. *Годишник на Богословския Факултет на Софийския университет „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 18 (1936).
- Дюлгеров, Д. „Значение на Догмата”. *Годишник на Богословския Факултет на Софийския университет „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 4 (1924), 1-22.
- Дюлгеров, Д. „Иисус Христос – новозаветен първосвещеник и изкупител”. *Годишник на Богословския Факултет на Софийския университет „Св.*

- Климент Охридски”, т. 5 (1928), 1-83.
- Дюлгеров, Д. „Тайнство Кръщение (същина и значение)”. *Годишник на Богословския Факултет на Софийския университет „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 22 (1943), 3-73.
- Дюлгеров, Д. „Единството на Църквата Христова”. *Годишник на Богословския Факултет на Софийския университет „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 24 (1947).
- Дюлгеров, Д. „Възнесение на Св. Дева Мария”. *Годишник на Богословския Факултет на Софийския университет „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 25 (1949).
- Дюлгеров, Д. „Адвентизъм, ч. I”. *Годишник на Богословския Факултет на Софийския университет „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 23 (1946) и т. 26 (1951).
- Латковски, Ив. „Богословското наследство на доц. д-р архимандрит Серафим Алексиев”. *Сп. Богословска мисъл*, 1-2 (2003), 114 сл.
- Коев, Т. *Догматическите формулировки на първите четири вселенски събора*, София, 1968.
- Коев, Т. *Православен катехизис и Послание на източните патриарси за православната вяра*, София 1991.
- Коев, Т., Г. Бакалов, *Въведение в християнството*. София, 1992.
- Коев, Т. *Християнски справочник /съавтор с проф. д-р Г. Бакалов/*, София, 2001.
- Коев, Т. „Произход на Халкедонското вероопределение”. *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”*, т. 21, 1971-1972, София, 1973.
- Коев, Т. „Догматът за Св. Троица /Съдържание и значение/”. *Годишник на Православния богословски факултет*, т. I, 1991-1992, В. Търново, 1994.
- Коев, Т. „Написание о правой вере“ на св. Кирил-Константин Философ /Богословско-догматически анализ на части от текста/. *Годишник на Православния богословски факултет*, т. II, 1992-1993, В. Търново, 1998.
- Коев, Т. „Българската и Арменската църква през вековете”. В: „Българи и арменци заедно през вековете“. Книга 21 от библиотека „Българска вечност“, София, 2001.
- Коев, Т. „Българската църква през Средновековието”. В: *История на българите*, т. I, София, 2003.
- Коев, Т. „Иконопочитанието в светлината на Боговъплъщението”. *Сп. Духовна култура (ДК)*, кн. 3, 1974.
- Коев, Т. „Догматическата дейност на Шестия вселенски събор”. *Сп. Духовна култура (ДК)*, кн. 2, 1982. /Също в Сборник „Вяра и живот“, В. Търново, 1994/.
- Коев, Т. „Тайнството Кръщение според учението на Православната църква”. *Сп. Духовна култура (ДК)*, кн. 4, 1985. /Също в: Сборник „Вяра и живот“, В. Търново, 1994/.
- Коев, Т. „Die Entwicklung des theologischen Denkens in Bulgarien - Hervorragende bulgarische Theologen”. In: *Im Dialog der Liebe. Neunzehn PRO-ORIENTE*

- *Symposien 1971 bis 1981*. Wien, 1986.
- Коев, Т. „Тайнството Свещенство в православно-догматическо осветление”. *Сп. Духовна култура* (ДК), кн. 2, 1987. /Също в: Сборник „Вяра и живот“, В. Търново, 1994/.
- Коев, Т. „Вероопределението на Седмия вселенски събор /Съдържание и значение/”. *Сп. Духовна култура* (ДК), кн. 11, 1987. /Също в: Сборник „Вяра и живот“, В. Търново, 1994/.
- Коев, Т. „Religiose Sprache und sakrale Symbole in der Gegenwartsgesellschaft Bulgariens”. In: *Kirchen im Kontext unterschiedlicher Kulturen. Auf dem Weg in das dritte Jahrtausend*. Göttingen, 1991.
- Коев, Т. „Das romische Dokument über den Ausgang des Heiligen Geistes aus bulgarisch-orthodoxer Sicht”. In: *Pro Oriente*, Bd. XXII, Tyrolia-Verlag, Innsbruck-Wien, 1998.
- Коев, Т. „Der Beitrag der bulgarisch-orthodoxen Kirche zur Ökumenischen Bewegung”. In: *Russland und Österreich. Pro Oriente*, Bd. XXIII, Tyrolia-Verlag, Innsbruck-Wien, 1999.
- Коев, Т. „Auferstehung oder Auferweckung”. In: *Orthodoxe Theologie zwischen Ost und West*. Frankfurt am Main, 2002.
- Коев, Т. „Поглед върху дейността на Сердикийския събор (343 г.)”. В: *Сборник в чест на 60-годишнината на проф. д-р Георги П. Бакалов*, София, 2003.
- Сапунджиев, архим. Евтимий (изд.), *Нашата модерна догматическа наука*. София, 1934.
- Stoyadinov, Marian, Ἡ ἀκριβεία καὶ ὑπομονὴ στὸ ἀσκητικὸ πρόγραμμα τοῦ Γέροντα Ἰωσήφ // *IM Βατοπεδίου*, 2007 (Conference dedicated to elder Joseph Hesychast, Cyprus, October 2005).
- Stoyadinov, M. Τὸ παράδοξο τῆς Θείας ἐνσαρκώσεως // *Διάβαση*, т. 40, 2002.
- Стоядинов, М. „Сотириологични основания в догматическото творчество на Църквата”. В: *Международна конференция в чест на проф. д-р Тотю Коев*. Велико Търново, 2005.
- Стоядинов, М. „Служенията в Църквата и предизвикателствата на съвременния свят”. Сборник: *Църквата и съвременното общество. Православна богословска конференция. Сборник с доклади и дискусии*. Русе–София, 2005.
- Стоядинов, М. „Естествено познание и богопознание в паламитското богословие”. В: *Ars et Scientia в Средновековието*. Велико Търново–Враца, 2006.
- Стоядинов, М. „Православният възглед за Filioque в контекста на Фераро-флорентинския събор (1438-1439 г.)”. В: *Киприанови четения, 600 години от Успението на св. Киприан, митрополит Московски*. Велико Търново, 2008.
- Стоядинов, М. „Разпадът на общността като еклисиологичен проблем”. В: *Сборник с доклади от научна конференция с международно участие „Църквата и обществените очаквания”* (ВТУ, 6-9. 11. 2006), София 2009.

- Стоядинов, М. *Правилната вяра в интерпретацията на Вселенския патриарх Йеремия II в неговия Отговор на Аугсбургското изповедание (1576). Някои еклисиологични аспекти*. Велико Търново 2009.
- Стоядинов, М. „Сотириологични основания в догматическото творчество на Църквата”. В: *Международна конференция в чест на проф. д-р Тотю Коев*. Велико Търново, 2005.
- Стоядинов, М. „Светлината в православната икона”. Архив за средновековна философия и култура, Т. XIII, Sofia-Münich, 2007.
- Стоядинов, М. „Догматическото значение на иконата”. В: Архив за средновековна философия и култура, Т. XIV. Sofia-Münich, 2008.
- Тенекеджиев, Л. *Утвърждаване на апостолското предание през II век. Богословската мисъл през първите три века, т. I*. София: Добротолюбие, 2008.
- Тенекеджиев, Л. *Учението на Църквата в богословието от края на II до средата на III век. Богословската мисъл на първите три века, т. II*. София: Добротолюбие 2008.
- Тенекеджиев, Л. *Тайнството брак*. София: Добротолюбие, 2009.
- Трайчев, Ем. „Тенденции и перспективи в съвременното православно богословие и богословието в България (размисли върху някои страни на въпоса)”. В: Зидарова, Л., П. Павлов, *Българската Православна Църква – Традиции и настояще*. София: ИГ „Гутенберг”, 2009, 188-194.
- Цанков, протопр. Стефан, „Единството и католичността (съборността) на Църквата. *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”, т. 2 (1951-1952)*, 231-256.
- Цанков, протопр. Стефан, „Единителните стремления у православните църкви с други християнски църкви. Православната църква и икуменизмът.” *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”, т. 9 (1959-1960)*, 259-306.
- Цанков, протопр. Стефан, „Единството на Църквата”. *Годишник на Духовната Академия „Св. Климент Охридски”, т. 8 (1958-1959)*, 247-267.