DOI: 10.2298/GEI1101049S
UDK: 316.654:006.955(497.11) ; 316.654:271.2-564(497.11)
ID: 187223820
Accepted for publication 09. 16. 2011

Milesa Stefanovic-Banovic

Institute of Ethnography SASA, Belgrade
kimia@eunet.rs

The Issue of Reform of the Church Calendar: the Level of Information and Positions of Citizens of Serbia[1]

Even though the issue of the Calendar used by the Serbian Orthodox Church has been discussed for more than one century, it is still equally as current as in the time of the first attempts aimed at its reform. In the discussions on this topic, the Church Calendar is frequently connected to the religious, i.e. national identity and traditions.

This paper is aimed at exploring whether and how citizens of Serbia consider this issue and which arguments are employed by the most fervent supporters of the Calendar, or the opponents of its reform. It aims at providing answers to a range of issues, among which the impact of knowledge and level of information relating to positions about this topic has the central position.

Key words:

reform of the Church calendar, Julian Calendar, Gregorian Calendar, knowledge and level of information

Introduction

Even though the issue of the Calendar used by the Serbian Orthodox Church has been discussed for more than one century, it is still equally as current as in the first attempts aimed at its reform. In relatively frequent discussions on this topic, the main arguments of the opponents of its revision include preservation of national and religious identity through tradition, the Calendar being an integral part thereof. Some of them revoke Church dogmatists; there are even voices in favour of greater accuracy of Julian Calendar as opposed to Gregorian Calendar (Карелин 2005).

[1] The paper is the result of research on project No. 177028 financed entirely by Serbian Ministry of Education and Science.

Even though vociferous, the extent to which these positions are generally accepted in the society is not known. It is especially interesting to investigate whether and how citizens of Serbia consider this issue nowadays, and what arguments are employed by the most fervent supporters of the Calendar, or opponents of its reform, as well as what kind and what extent of impact knowledge and information have on this topic.[2]

Historic Overview of the Calendar-Related Issue

Julian Calendar came into force on 1 January 45 BC, by a decree passed by Julius Cesar. It was created through the reform of the old Roman calendar, in which the period of one year was not fixed; instead, in order to provide for harmony with a solar year,[3] a *council* headed by *pontifex maximus* determined the duration of the intercalation month.[4] Such a manner of determination of the duration of the year was susceptible to abuse, for instance, for the purpose of earlier or later tax collection, etc. (*Old style calendar*, Wikipedia 2011)

Astronomer Sosigenes was commissioned to write the reform of the Calendar of Alexandria.[5] According to the then available data, the duration of the solar year was 365.25 days, which is why every fourth year was proclaimed a leap year, and was added another day. The year was divided into 12 months, and started from 1 January, when the Roman Senate was in its traditional session.

The Christian Church was never in the position to create its own Calendar, but always used calendars used by local communities (Janković 2007). Thus, naturally, the first calendar used by the Church was Julian.

According to modern research, a Julian year lasts for 11 minutes and 13.92 seconds longer than the solar year, which is why once in every 128 years the Julian year is longer than the solar year by one day (*Year*, Wikipedia 2011). This discrepancy was noticed back (there) in the early centuries, on composition of tables used

---

[2] The research was conducted through a survey, i.e. questionnaire, as well as through analysis of media and Internet forums. In this paper, due to limitations of space, only a part of the results acquired in survey analysis will be presented.

[3] A solar year is the time in which the Earth passes one cycle in its rotation around the Sun. Depending on the referential body used to determine the position of the Earth against the Sun, a solar year may be tropical, sidereal, anomalistic, etc. For the purpose of this paper, a tropical solar year will be considered the solar year, except where differently emphasized. About the solar year, see: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Year#Sidereal.2C_tropical.2C_and_anomalistic_years.

[4] The intercalation month occurs in lunisolar calendars, in which the duration of the month is determined according to phases of the Moon, while the length of the year is determined against the Sun. As the solar year does not comprise a full number of phases of the Moon, certain years are complemented by an intercalation month, which is aimed at making up for the difference between the lunar year. See: http://en.wikipedia.org/ wiki/Intercalation.

[5] Sosigenes of Alexandria, first century BC, mathematician and astronomer. Not much is known about him, and is quoted as the creator of Julian Calendar by Pliny Senior in his encyclopedia *Naturalis Historia*. See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sosigenes_of_Alexandria.

to determine the day of Easter. Following numerous attempts at reform, on 24 February 1582, the Catholic Church adopted a new calendar, after a decree of Pope Gregory XIII.[6]

The Issue of Revision of the Calendar

Gregorian Calendar was immediately accepted in most Catholic countries. It took another two centuries and a lot of resistance for Protestant countries to accept it as well (Radić 2011). As far as Orthodox population is concerned, especially that living in the areas of expansionist policy of the Catholic Church, every distinction was perceived as a way to preserve identity; thus, preservation of Julian Calendar was deemed an important element of authenticity (Slijepčević 1966, 155–158). However, the undeniable accuracy of Julian Calendar left open the issue of its revision. This issue was one of the central topics at the Congress of Orthodox Churches, held in Constantinople in May 1923, upon convocation of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The motion of Professor Milutin Milankovic, member of the Serbian delegation, received absolute support on this occasion. Milankovic's proposal envisaged introduction of another rule for determination of leap years[7], which would reduce the discrepancy from the Solar year to only two seconds. In this case, aberration would amount to only one day in every 43,200 years. This motion, however, never lived to be used in practice.

At the session held in the same year (1923), the Episcopal Synod of SOC accepted Milankovic's motion in general, but postponed its enforcement waiting for all Orthodox churches to harmonise their positions on the issue. As this has still not happened, Julian Calendar remains in use.

At the Congress held in December 1923, Greek Orthodox Church adopted Gregorian Calendar for fixed holy days, but kept Julian Calendar for the movable ones. Such rapid developments resulted in separation of a number of episcopes, priests and believers and establishment of the community of "Orthodox Christians", which proclaimed Greek Orthodox Church "renegade from Orthodoxy" (Pavle 1998). At the last conference treating this issue, held in Champesy in Switzerland in 1982, Orthodox Churches of Russia, Jerusalem, and Serbia stated they could not initiate revision of the Calendar because of fear of possible schism (Radić 2011).

[6] At that moment, the discrepancy form Julian and Solar year amounted to 10 days, which was, within the new Calendar, compensated so that 4 October 1582 was followed by 15 October. The manner in which leap years were determined was modified: the years in which centuries end are simple, unless if divisible by 400. Thus, years 1700, 1800, and 1900 were simple years by Gregorian Calendar, but leap years by Julian Calendar, so that the difference between the two calendars nowadays amounts to 13 days. As of the year 2100, the difference will be increased to 14 days.

[7] Leap years at the end of centuries would be only the ones resulting in balance of 2 or 6 when divided by 9.

Arguments of Opponents of Revision

The astronomical facts given so far doubtless speak in favour of revision of the Calendar from the standpoint of mathematical calculations. Some arguments of opponents of the reform will be presented in this chapter.

After the Congress in Constantinople in 1923, Russian Patriarch Tychon was among the ones who reacted, stating reasons both against legitimacy of the Congress and the adopted revision of Julian Calendar (Tihon 2006). In his interview with the Central Soviet Committee, conducted in 1924, he stated his arguments which even nowadays may be deemed equally as current. Even though he believed that revision of the Calendar was not in opposition to the doctrines of the Church, and that it would benefit the believers in many aspects, the Russian Patriarch also warned that there were several important reasons for the reform not to be conducted after all. The main reasons given were the perceived threat to unity of Orthodox Churches, fear of schism, similar to what had happened in Greece, the feeling of imposing by civil authorities and resistance of poorly prepared believers, because "poor familiarity of people with canons and dogmas would lead to the perception of the Calendar reform as an attack against religious identity".

One of the opponents of the Calendar reform was the frequently quoted Archimandrite Raphail Karelin. His positions provide an insight into shifting of the focus of the argument against the reform from the socio-culturological into the theological sphere.

Among arguments in the area of social phenomena, Karelin noted that other religions also used calendars which were not aligned with the astronomical year, which did not cause any troubles in religious rituals, but were however deemed an inseparable part of the tradition: Jews and Moslems use Lunar calendars, while in Japan traditional Imperial and modern calendars are used simultaneously (Karelin 2004). Emphasizing the relativity of the human concept of time, he believes that the Calendar has not only mathematical, but philosophical and religious dimensions as well. As an argument in favour of "greater accuracy of Julian Calendar as opposed to Gregorian Calendar", he states the fact that duration of a Julian year is the value between a tropical and a sidereal year[8], in which he found the balance between "Earthly and cosmic time". Also, he warns that no calendar may be absolutely accurate in astronomic terms, and that, if Church opted for revision, it would always have to "break and deform the constitution and forms of its religious service" (Karelin 2005). It is important to note that this source never gave the opinion occur-

[8] A tropical year is the period of time which elapses between two solar transitions through the same imaginary point in the sky, and amounts to 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes and 46 seconds. A sidereal year is determined by solar transition through the same point in relation to remote stars, and is longer than the tropical year by 20 minutes and 26 seconds. A Julian year lasts for 365 days and 6 hours, which is why it is longer than the tropical year by about 11 minutes, and shorter than the sidereal year by about 9 minutes. See: http://static.astronomija.co.rs/kalendar/knjiga/godina.htm

ring in certain respondents, that Julian Calendar was "consecrated" and that it was a part of Church dogmas and traditions.

Research and Respondent Profile

The survey conducted with the aim to acquire a snapshot of how citizens of Serbia nowadays think about this issue encompassed 67 respondents.

Age, educational, and professional structures of the respondents were diversified. The respondents were people from different professional and educational backgrounds, born between 1955 and 1990. The responses indicate that age, profile, and educational background of the respondents had no impact on their positions. Thus, this data is not separately given in the analysis of the survey, except in cases where this was related. The results also indicate that the attitudes of an individual to religion, Church and identity are not always of crucial importance in forming a position. It may be said that the position on the Calendar revision is mostly individual matter, but that it primarily depends on individual level of information about this issue.

During the analysis of the survey, the respondents were divided in three groups, based on whether they declared themselves as religious or not and how often they went to church. The group of *traditional believers* included non-practicing believers, those who went to church only for major holy days, infrequently or never, but who declared themselves as Orthodox (21 of them). *Practicing believers* (24 of them) were the ones who went to church several times a month, or *regularly*. This group comprised three Catholic and 21 Orthodox believers, including 12 respondents with formal education in theology. The third group comprised the *non-religious,* those who said they were not religious, 10 of them. Interestingly, four of them at the same time declared themselves as Orthodox, and one as Christian.

In order to learn about the importance of the secular/Church calendar of holy days in the lives of the respondents, they were asked several questions relating to their attitude to their a/religious identity and important days in the annual holy day cycle. Interestingly, when asked which holy day they considered most important, unlike the practicing believers, who all stated Easter in their response, the group of traditional believers included some respondents (10 of them) who did not include Easter among important religious holy days. As many as seven respondents said the most important day was their family patron saint's day. The non-religious respondents stated Easter in one case only, Christmas in four cases, while the other responses were as follows: "none"; "it does not matter"; "my annual leave".

When asked *which is the state and which is the Church Calendar*, traditional believers, all but one, answered correctly; however, even this one case may have resulted from permutation, which may be observed from the respondent's replies to other questions. Almost all the practicing believers also responded correctly (21 out of 24). There was an interesting reply: "on 13 January we entered year 7520"; one respondent believes that the Church uses Milankovic's calendar. The

non-religious respondents mainly answered correctly to this question (eight correct, two incorrect responses).

When asked *do you know the difference between Julian and Gregorian Calendars* five traditional believers knew about the correct, 13-day difference. The others stated the difference of 14 days, but other additional details as well, such as "difference in relation to the Sun and stars", "increasing discrepancy", "the number of leap years in one century". One of the replies was "Gregorian Calendar is cursed". As many as half of active believer replied correctly, while the others replied with "yes", without any explanation, which may not be taken as a correct answer. One respondent believes that the difference is "of no importance". All educated theologians knew the correct answer, however, a large number of non-religious respondents (8 of them) also responded correctly.

The question of *which Calendar is more accurate* was deliberately formulated slightly inaccurately, in order to leave possibility for the respondents to express their attitudes on their definitions of accuracy. About a half of traditional believers (11 of them) quoted Gregorian Calendar in their replies. Most active believers (17 of them) opted for Gregorian, or Milankovic's calendar. Similar responses came from about a half of the non-religious respondents (4 of them), which all speak in favour of the fact that accuracy mainly implies astronomical accuracy. Respondents who considered Julian Calendar more accurate included several respondents who also provided an additional comment: "Julian Calendar is more accurate in spiritual terms"; "accuracy does not matter"; and "time is relative". As many as 10 respondents did not know, or did not provide a reply to this question. There is an interesting position of a theologian: "which one is more accurate – in mathematical terms – I don't know, in religious terms – it dos not make any difference".

When asked whether the Church should perform a revision of the Calendar, respondents' opinions were divided, but rather equally. The supporters of the Calendar revision within the group of traditional believers (8 of them) mainly did not state any reason in favour of the reform, or believe that the Calendar should be modified only in agreement with other Orthodox Churches, to prevent possible schism. The practicing believers (14 of them) state more concrete reasons: "the Church should go along with the time and the community living in it"; "the solution of the issue of liturgical time"; "celebration of holy days together with other Christians"; "making the factual use of Gregorian Calendar official"; "to alleviate life of believers in Diaspora". The theologians were the most numerous supporters of the reform (9 out of 12); they believe that the inappropriate moment resulting in lack of preparation and information among most believers could be an obstacle.

The first reason of the traditional believers who were against the reform (11 of them) was that the Calendar presented a part of identity of the Church and its tradition: "cutting off the spiritual connection with Saint Sava and aberration from the truth of the Orthodoxy"; "Papal calendar". Positions of the opponents of the reform among the practicing believers (16 of them) were mainly moderate; however, some were more extreme, frequently based on distorted or erroneous "theological" theses: "Biblical determinants should be observed"; "Julian Calendar is the only one which

is blessed"; "the Church condemned Gregorian Calendar"; etc. It may be observed that the opponents of the reform state their arguments in a more concrete and more animated manner.

In the group of non-religious respondents, four of them were in favour of the reform, three were against it, while three of them said they were not interested in the matter. The reasons in favour of the reform included the following: "to be harmonized with the world"; alleviation of life of believers in Diaspora; one respondent said that: "we may not be kept in medieval chains forever".

Interestingly, there is a number of respondents who are neither in favour of the reform nor against it which may not be ignored (9 of them). Within this group, there is a rational perception of the reasons in favour of the reform on the one hand, and personal preference for the traditional (Julian) calendar on the other: "I am not sure; on the one hand, it is more practical, but on the other, I like diversity".

The calendars proposed for adoption in case reform was conducted were equally as frequently Gregorian Calendar (15 respondents) and Milankovic's calendar (13 respondents). A small number of respondents (6 of them) would accept the decision of the Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church, regardless of what the decision would be; the number of those who would not accept the decision is similar (5 respondents), for instance: "I would not go to churches performing service according to the new calendar".

The Issue of Easter

Before the first Ecumenical Congress[9] there had been no strict rules in determining the day of Easter. Christians determined Easter day against Jewish Passover; however, the day of Passover was not unique to all Jewish communities. Apart from this, Christians could also not come to an agreement as to which day is to be celebrated as the holy day of resurrection against Passover.[10] Thus, it happened that different Christian communities would not celebrate their greatest holy day together.

This issue was one of the central topics of the First Ecumenical Congress, where the decision was passed that Easter be celebrated on the first Sunday after the full moon on or upon the day of the spring equinox (Pavle 1998, 146). It was also decided that Christian determination of Easter should be separated from the Jewish calendar. In order to ensure single celebration of this holy day in all Churches, the

[9] The First ecumenical Congress, Held in Nicaea (Asia Minor) in year 325. (See, for instance, in Поповић 2002).

[10] In early centuries, Christians from Asia Minor celebrated Easter on the 14th day of the Jewish month of Nisan, when Christ was crucified according to tradition. Christians outside Asia Minor celebrated Easter on first week after the Jewish Passover. At the First Ecumenical Congress, the decision was passed that Easter be celebrated on Sunday, while the custom of celebrating Easter on 14the Nisan, *quartadecimenism* (Latin *quarta decima*=fourteen), was abolished and condemned. (Mirković 1961, 178–179)

Patriarchate of Alexandria was commissioned to calculate the day of Jesus' resurrection, as it had the best observatory and atronomers. It is important to note that the decisions of the First Ecumenial Congress do not tie the day calculated as Easter to any calendar, but to astronomical phenomena – the equinox and full Moon (Pavle 1998, 147–148).

The Paschal tables of the Patriarchate of Alexandria were complemented several times; finally, in 6th century, having complemented the existing Grand Indiction, Roman monk Dionisius Exiguus established the "eternal Paschalion", which envisaged cyclical repetition of the dates of Easter in the intervals of 532 years. Thus, connecting Easter to Julian Calendar originates from Paschal tables which were created out of sheer necessity, not from the First Ecumenical Congress, as it is thought frequently, but erroneously.[11]

Historical facts also testify that determination of the Easter day does not have anything to do with the calendar, but with the adopted Paschalion. Judging by the results of the survey, respondents without formal theological education were generally not familiar with this, or were only familiar with certain aspects which are, consciously or not, interpreted in an erroneous context. Partial familiarity is illustrated with characteristic replies to the question *what will happen with the day of celebration of Easter if the Calendar is reformed: "*Easter would sometimes be celebrated on another day"; "it would be moved for two weeks"; "there would be no changes, because it is a movable holy day"; "all Christians would be celebrating Easter at the same time"; "the rules of Ecumenical Congresses would be violated".

As it has already been pointed out, the liturgical Calendar of the Orthodox Church is a part of its rules (canons), but not teachings (dogmas). Apart from the theologians, only two respondents knew that this was a "matter of agreement between the Churches", while the largest number of respondents said that the Calendar was "a dogma adopted at the First Ecumenical Congress". Answers to the question *why does Orthodox Church use Julian Calendar* are also versatile: "for practical reasons"; "they believe it is more accurate"; "they are but the slaves of the past"; "because the Jews used it too"; "because it originates from the period of Jesus Christ"; "it was adopted by the Holy Spirit via the Holy Fathers at Ecumenical Congresses"; "it is the only blessed Calendar". Among the non-religious believers, there was mainly not much interest in the issue; however, there were responses such as: "because of the dogmas"; and "preservation of root Christianity".

[11] In time, inaccuracy of Julian Calendar resulted in the spring calendar equinox coming earlier than the astronomical equinox. In 16 century, this discrepancy amounted to 10 days. After passing of the Bull *Inter gravissimas* by Pope Gregory XIII, this error was corrected. Also, in item 10, in the attempt to determine the day of Easter as accurately as possible, it is said that new tables will be used in order to calculate this date. These tables allowed for Easter in some years to come before the Jewish Passover, which was unacceptable for Orthodox Churches, and became the main point of disagreement between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches in terms of Easter Day.

Consequences of Possible Reform of the Calendar

The opinions of the respondents are quite equally divided when it comes to the impact of possible reform of the Church Calendar to everyday life in Serbia and personal lives of the respondents. Those who believe that the impact would be significant (15 respondents) mainly quote negative consequences of the reform, regardless of whether they support or oppose it: "there would be schism"; "Zealots would use the reform to incite the people against the Church"; "the Serbian Orthodox Church is divided in this matter"; dissatisfaction caused by changes in traditional holy days, weakening of the national community, loss of identity, difficulties in getting used to new circumstances; "St. Valentine's Day would thus become an official holy day, as well as New Year with Santa Claus, and a range of Catholic and other influences"; "betrayal of our holy religion". As many as 14 respondents believe that the reform would have moderate or little impact, while 18 respondents believe that the reform would not have any impact whatsoever. On the other hand, when quoting positive consequences, it is believed that they would be of little or moderate importance in lives of individuals and the community: shorter season of winter holidays, fewer days off work, "tourism".

There are three interesting responses, in which the respondents point to the lack of religious education in the society. They say that the importance of the Calendar reform would be: "education of believers in terms of Calendar-related issues, as well as general attempt to guide the dialog of Christian Churches", "great, because the people are idle and ill-educated in religious terms"; and "religiousness in Serbia is too superficial for the reform to have any significance".

Due to historical and geographical vicinity with the Serbian Orthodox Church, calendar reform in the Greek Orthodox Church could provide indications of the social phenomena which could possibly be pertinent to the reform of the Calendar in SOC. When asked about their positions on the Calendar reform in Greece and other Orthodox countries, the majority of respondents (20 of them) did not provide any reply or did not have a position on the issue. As many as 14 responses related to schism which was a direct result of the Calendar reform. Versatility of the responses is interesting, as they range from mere quotation of schism (11 respondents), via its negative qualification (12 respondents): "shame, we could not allow ourselves to do that"; "they do not know what they want, because they celebrate Easter after Julian Calendar, and the other holy days after Gregorian Calendar"; "unnecessary outrage and separation of different little groups from the Church"; there are some respondents (15 of them) who perceive the reform in Greece as positive, without any negative consequences: "I do not think the Greek Church is heretic because it accepted the new Calendar"; "some people did it on time"; "a harmonized personality of a citizen and Christian". As many as 7 respondents believe that this is an internal matter of the Greek Orthodox Church and that it has nothing to do with the Serbian Orthodox Church: "their decisions should be observed"; "we should not look up to others, but should look for what is good for us".

Impact on the Positions on the Calendar Revision

The majority of respondents (22 of them) replied that their position on the issue of revision of the Calendar was developed without any particular influence, while only three of them quoted the impact of media and personal sources of information. Interestingly, none of the respondents quoted influence of any SOC officials, or another figure of religious authority. Such result may be connected with the quite unique response of all respondents on absence of a unanimous position of the Serbian Orthodox Church itself in this, but also many other issues.

The other quoted elements with influence on the position on the Calendar were those relating to: the Church ("silence of the Church"; "SOC"; "poor relations among Christians because of the issue of the Calendar", "personal understanding of the essence of the Church"); "personal feeling"; tradition ("preservation of tradition"; traditions of the Holy Fathers"; education and information; practical reasons (pragmatism"; "double celebration"); "a little bit of this and a little bit of that"; here there is also an interesting reply: "my opinion could not be influenced by any reasoning".

Conclusion

The survey indicated that the majority of the respondents expressed certain interest in the issue of the reform of the Calendar of the Serbian Orthodox Church.

The group of supporters includes both religious and non-religious respondents, who perceive the reform of the Calendar as a step towards harmonization with everyday civic life and/or renewal of unity of all Christians.

Somewhat more than a half of the respondents were not in favour of the reform, stating various arguments which may be divided in two groups. One group, mostly comprising traditional believers but non-religious respondents as well, condemned any attempt at revision, even discussion on the matter, as a source of potential weakening of religious and/or national identity. The second group, comprising mainly active believers, believes that the issue of the Calendar should not be ascribed excessive importance, but that regardless of astronomical inaccuracy of Julian calendar, the social situation is not favourable to conduct the reform, because it could lead to separations. Numerous respondents, even though aware of the shortcomings of traditional Church Calendar, believe its reform should not be insisted on, quoting personal preferences, the feeling of uniqueness of other religions which use separate calendars as the main reasons. The most obvious result of the survey is the fact that the majority of respondents were insufficiently informed about this issue, which is likely to cause abuse and manipulation both within the Church and externally.

Even though, according to facts, there are no dogmatic obstacles for the reform of the Calendar, the current mood of the majority of citizens when it comes to this issue is not in favour of such a move. It is evident that this issue is not something to be resolved urgently, but also that any discussion on the reform of the Ca-

lendar could only be conducted subject to systematic education and provision of information, in order to avoid possible abuses and divisions in the society.

References:

Dragović, Drago. 2002. "Kalendar kroz istoriju". *Astronomija.* http://static.astronomija.co.rs/kalendar/knjiga/godina.htm

Janković, Dragomir. 2007. "Liturgijska funkcija crkvenog kalendara", master rad. Beograd: Pravoslavni bogoslovski fakultet SPC.

Karelin, arhimandrit Rafail. 2004. "Oko kalendara". *Svetosavlje*, http://www.svetosavlje.org/listarhiva/Home.aspx/Topic?topicId =783.

Karelin, arhimandrit Rafail. 2005. "O cerkovnom kalendare". *Oficialni sait arhimandrita Rafaila Karelina*, http://karelin-r.ru/stories/8/1.html

Mirković, Lazar. 1961. *Heortologija*, 178–179. Beograd.

Old style calendar, Wikipedia 2011: Wikipedia contributors. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Old_style_calendar

Pavle, patrijarh srpski. 1998. "Stav Srpske pravoslavne crkve o starom i novom kalendaru" In: *Da nam budu jasnija neka pitanja naše vere*, 139–158. Beograd.

Popović, Radomir. 2002. "Vaseljenski sabori: odabrana dokumenta." Beograd.

Radić, Radmila. 2011. "Kalendarsko pitanje." *Peščanik*, http://www.pescanik.net/content/view/6210/178/

Slijepčević, Đoko. 1966. *Istorija Srpske pravoslavne crkve II: od početka XIX veka do kraja Drugog svetskog rata*. Minhen.

Sosigenes of Alexandria. Wikipedia 2011: Wikipedia contributors. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sosigenes_of_Alexandria

Tihon, patrijarh ruski. 2006. „Bio bi to težak greh." u *Crkva i vreme*, Vladimir Dimitrijević, 160–167. Hilandar.

Year, Wikipedia 2011: Wikipedia contributors: 2011. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Year#Sidereal.2C_tropical.2C_and_anomalistic_years