

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2026-2-8>

THE GENESIS OF THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPT OF JUST WAR IN THE POLITICAL AND LEGAL DOCTRINE OF AMVROSII MEDIOLANSKYI

Vasyl Patlachuk,

Doctor of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9488-7946

vndekabrist@ukr.net

Artem Shyposha,

Postgraduate Student,

Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs (Kharkiv, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0009-0005-0938-2126

ashyposha@ukr.net

Abstract. In this article, the authors examine the issues of war and peace, combining the concepts of war and justice, opening the discourse on ‘just war’ in the works of the outstanding Roman philosopher, lawyer, theologian, statesman and church leader Ambrose of Milan (c. 339/340-397). Analysing his works, the authors reveal how Ambrose formulated the principles of justice in the context of war, emphasising the importance of moral and ethical aspects in military conflicts. The study also focuses on the relationship between religious beliefs and legal norms that influenced the formation of the concept of ‘just war’ in the ancient world. The article offers an in-depth analysis of Ambrose of Milan's influence on the development of legal and moral ideas about war, as well as his contribution to the formation of a Christian approach to justice in military affairs. The authors explore how his ideas can be applied to contemporary conflicts, offering new perspectives for understanding the ethics of war in the context of global challenges. Thus, the article not only contributes to the study of the philosophy of war, but also opens new horizons for research on justice in military conflicts in the modern world.

Key words: Ambrose of Milan, ‘just war,’ political and legal discourse, Roman Empire.

Introduction. The problem of war and peace is traditionally considered one of the ‘evergreen’ topics in the history of political and legal teachings. Developed within the framework of legal, political, sociological and historical sciences as much as possible, military issues, as well as the question of the use of violence and its restriction by law in interpersonal relations, have long been of concern to philosophers, lawyers, politicians and social scientists. Due to the extremely high conflict potential of social life, this issue has a particularly pronounced pragmatic orientation, as evidenced by the active development of modern international humanitarian law, whose important task is considered to be ‘focusing attention on the legal dimension of war and related phenomena, on the problems of its limitation, on procedural guarantees to mitigate the destructive consequences of armed conflicts’ (Behrouz, 2023).

Particularly noteworthy in this context are concepts that justify the conditions and procedural guarantees for the lawful use of force, limit it, and argue for the combination of the concepts of war and justice, thereby opening up the discourse on ‘just war.’ Usually, the topic of just war increasingly penetrates scientific and social discourse in times of profound social change, growing conflict, and the ignition and escalation of armed conflicts. In this sense, the study of the origins of the concept of just war can hardly be overestimated. It naturally belongs to the number of normative-axiological concepts on which the efforts of peoples and states are based to curb the ‘demons of war’ and introduce certain normative safeguards into the conduct of wars that would eliminate (or at least minimise) manifestations of uncontrolled violence and prevent excessive casualties among the civilian population.

In justifying the conduct of war, authors often refer to the classics of the theory of 'just war' by Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Aurelius Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, H. Grotius, E. de Vattel and other classics (Poda, 2016). At the same time, they ignore the genesis of the concept of just war, which in the late Roman period was linked to the synthesis of the traditional political and legal heritage of Ancient Rome and Christian doctrine. The author of this synthesis and, accordingly, the founder of the concept of just war in Christian political and legal discourse was the outstanding Roman philosopher, theologian, lawyer, statesman and church leader Ambrose of Milan (c. 339/340 – 397). Scholars often associate his name not only with the beginning of the 'just' (legal-centred) trend in understanding the problems of war, but also with the creation of a solid ideological basis for the continuation of this intellectual trend in the works of his student Aurelius Augustine (354-430), as well as in the works of prominent later medieval thinkers (Isidore of Seville, Gratian, Thomas Aquinas, etc.).

Main text. The aim of the study is to prove the unique intellectual contribution of Ambrose of Milan to the development of the concept of just war in the history of European political and legal thought based on Christian doctrine and to analytically identify the key elements of this concept in the context of the state-legal and intellectual development of the late Roman Empire.

The teachings of Ambrose of Milan in general and his ideas of just war in particular have attracted the attention of a large group of foreign experts, whose attention is focused on various aspects of his philosophical, theological, political and legal thought. These include, first and foremost, the works of L. Arnold, R. Beinton, A.J. Bellamy, R.L. Wilken, A. Downnton-Feyer, I.J. Davidson, V.I. Daly, J. Johnson, J. Kadu, J. Kalantzis, D. Klug, K. Corino, C.E. Curran, A. Lennox-Coningham, H. Litzman, J.I. Macdonald, N. Maclean, J. Moorhead, A. Paredi, B. Ramsay, D. Rodin, F. Russell, L.J. Swift, J. Sebayn, R. Sorabji, D. Whiteman, P. Frost, A. Holmes, T. Shannon, and others. The main directions of their research focus on two opposing ideas: either proving the uniqueness of Ambrose of Milan's contribution to the conceptualisation of just war against the backdrop of the development of Christian discourse, or justifying the secondary nature of his ideological contribution, in particular in comparison with the ideas of M.T. Cicero (106-43 BC) (Cicero, 2021), which the Bishop of Milan creatively used in his works, in particular in his leading work, *On the Duties of Clerics* (Ambrose, 1896). At the same time, for example, N. Maclean noted that Ambrose's political and ideological influence significantly distinguished him from his contemporaries in the Church, and his name carried considerable weight in the circles of Roman senators, courtiers and military leaders (McLynn, 1994). R. Beinton argues that Ambrose was the first to attempt to formulate a Christian ethic of just war, having no doubt about the necessity of Christians fulfilling their military duty and performing military service (Bainton, 1979: 89). L. Swift argues that Ambrose's attitude towards war and violence was greatly influenced by Roman feelings of justice, loyalty, courage and civic responsibility, and that the participation of Christians in the war was justified because they were defending their faith and the empire (Swift, 1970).

Compared to foreign political and legal studies, Ukrainian science has not yet sufficiently explored the contribution of Ambrose of Milan to the development of the concept of just war. His theological ideas began to be studied by the classic of the Ukrainian Renaissance, M. Smotrytsky (1577–1633) (Shchepanskyi, 2015). It was these ideas that attracted the most attention from philosophers and theologians, while the political and legal elements of his legacy, especially those related to military-political and military-legal issues, were virtually ignored by domestic scholars. Thus, it must be noted that there are no special scientific studies in this area.

In general, contemporary scientific research on the issue of just war in Ukraine is characterised by a certain denial (or, more precisely, ignorance) of Ambrose of Milan's contribution to the development of this concept. For example, in the only special dissertation study in Ukrainian science today, by I. Panafidin, which is entirely devoted to the evolution of the idea of just war, the ideas of Ambrose of Milan are not considered at all (Panafidin, 2014), although the author quite rightly notes that 'the

natural law concept of just war appears in the philosophical tradition of Ancient Rome' (Panafidin, 2014: 65). Another domestic researcher, R. Kokhanchuk, notes in one of his publications that the first to expound a systematic Christian doctrine of war, which he partially learned from his teacher, Bishop Ambrose of Milan, was Aurelius Augustine (Kokhanchuk, 2003: 26). In another publication, the author notes that the concept of a 'just war' emerged only in the Middle Ages. Although Soviet sources, in his opinion, claim that its ideological premises were laid down in Augustine's works, the phrase 'just war' was first used by Pope Stephen III in his letter to the Frankish magnates (753) (Kokhanchuk). However, this is not the case, because in fact the term just war first appears in Aristotle (384-322 BC) in his work *Politics* and is used to describe the wars waged by the ancient Greeks 'in the name of spreading culture and civilisation' against non-Greeks, as they were considered savages and barbarians (Semchynskyi, 2004: 95). Finally, some domestic researchers tend to attribute the development of the theoretical basis of the idea of a just war to the Middle Ages and even the early modern period (for example, L. Moiseenko believes that this idea 'was actively developed in the context of the Crusades, the Reconquista in Spain and the Ottoman invasion of Europe' (Moiseyenko, 2018: 550)).

Instead, only isolated elements of the rich political and legal heritage of Ambrose of Milan (Ambrose, 1896) have been studied in the works of O. Borisova, O. Butkevych, V. Korniyenko, R. Kokhanchuk, K. Lukyanenko, O. Radzivill, K. Semchynsky, M. Finkievich, and Z. Yudin. However, even among these authors, only K. Lukyanenko directly states that the ideas of Ambrose of Milan (along with the ideas of his student Augustine) 'actually create the doctrine of just war' (Lukyanenko, 2022: 162).

Thus, the unsatisfactory (for domestic science) state of research into Ambrose of Milan's contribution to the development of the concept of just war demonstrates the need for a comprehensive objective analysis of his ideas, which has both purely scientific historical and legal grounds and relevant political and legal grounds.

Traditionally, in the history of European political and legal thought, it is believed that the concept of just war has acquired various ideological implications and undergone significant modifications throughout its evolution and changes in the intellectual 'climate' (Johnson, 2009). In the context of our study, it is particularly important to emphasise that against the backdrop of the Roman theory of just war, in which force was considered the legitimate right of the state, and the Old Testament (Jewish) tradition of divinely sanctioned war, early Christians unreservedly accepted the radical pacifism of Jesus' teaching that hatred should be repaid with love; one should love one's enemies (Zagrebelny). Jesus directly advises St. Peter to put away his sword in the Garden of Gethsemane; commands his followers to turn the other cheek if struck on the right; promises that those who live by the sword will perish by it. "The Gospel gives love for enmity, kindness for hatred, prayers for curses, help for the persecuted, patience for the hungry, and the grace of reward. How much more perfect is the athlete who feels no injury!" (Love your enemies)

Jesus' Sermon on the Mount and St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans seem to advise detachment from the political sphere, perhaps because the coercive roles of warrior, jailer, lawyer, tax collector, and judge are incompatible with the radical demands of following the commandments of God, who responds to sin with love and allows the sun to shine equally on the heads of the wicked and the good. Therefore, literally following the teachings of Jesus Christ, early Christians tried to create separate, self-sufficient communities in which all were brothers and sisters in faith and where the only direct form of coercion was social isolation. Instead, the participation of believers in Roman life required behaviour that clearly contradicted Jesus' preaching, as it involved oaths of allegiance to the Roman emperor and worship of the Roman gods, and also exposed Christians to the general moral depravity associated with military life and military service. The combination of pacifism with the use of force in war became an increasingly pressing issue as the Roman Empire became Christianised, especially in the period after the Edict of Milan (313) (Popsuenko, 2009) was issued by Emperor Constantine I the Great (306-337). This momentous event forced the leaders of the Christian Church to face a new

set of political responsibilities that early Christian communities could afford to reject. In addition to inheriting all the coercive organs of the state – and the associated bureaucracies, cultures and professional classes – there was a theological conviction that the social stability recommended by St. Paul was no longer justified by the inevitability of Christ's return, and that in fact the current Christian era would last indefinitely (Johnson, 1991: 9). The Pax Romana provided a solid material basis for the profession and spread of Christianity by proclaiming the empire Christian (Omelchuk, 2011: 244–246). But in return, the empire demanded obedience and service from Christians, which meant participation in wars waged by emperors both on the periphery of the empire and within it against usurpers. Meanwhile, Christians were often accused of showing sympathy for their enemies (War and Christian Ethics, 2005: 55), which directly contradicted Roman ideas about legalism in relation to public authorities and loyalty to the emperor. With the intensification of barbarian pressure on the borders of the Roman Empire and the complication of the military-political situation within the empire in the second half of the 4th century, non-resistance to evil in the form of barbarians seeking to capture parts of the empire and settle there directly undermined the state's defence capability from within. Therefore, these circumstances exacerbated the need to reconcile the ruling legal consciousness, inspired by traditional Roman virtues, with pacifist Christian attitudes.

Thus, it was precisely the complex military and political situation that objectively required the harmonisation of Roman models of warfare with the prevailing Christian doctrine. This reconciliation had to combine the legalised view of war since Cicero (based on the idea of the dominance of justice and law in public and state life) with the latest trends in limiting violence promoted by Christianity. Such a synthesis of ideas, leading to a broad justification of the concept of just war, was proposed by Ambrose of Milan in the second half of the 4th century.

Ambrose, who came from a wealthy patrician family in Trier (Trier), first held the position of lawyer in Dalmatia, then prefect of the province of Emilia-Liguria with his residence in Mediolanum (now Milan). Due to the religious struggle between Orthodox Christians and Arians, he, as an uninvolved person, not even baptised yet, was recommended for the position of bishop of Milan by the Roman emperor Valentinian I (374). After being baptised and ordained as bishop, Ambrose donated his vast wealth to the church and took a vow of non-profit, which he kept throughout his pastoral ministry (Radziwill, 2017: 141).

J. Sebein and T. Thorson place Ambrose alongside two other prominent theologians of the late empire, St. Augustine and St. Gregory, noting that “none of them set themselves the task of developing a systematic church philosophy and formalising the relationship between the church and the state; these figures belonged rather to the period of the formation of Christian thought, they dealt with issues of primary importance at the time” (Sebein George, Thorson Thomas, 1997: 188). As the oldest representative of this ‘trinity,’ Ambrose formulated views that became the foundation of Christian beliefs and an integral part of the Christian concept of the relationship between the state and the church as a cross-cutting issue in the further political and legal development of Europe (Sebein George, Thorson Thomas, 1997: 188).

Ambrose became not only the bishop of one of the largest cities of the empire, but also one of the most influential figures in the ancient Roman imperial hierarchy, advising emperors Valentinian I (364–375), Gratian (375–383) and Theodosius I the Great (379–395) [30, XIII], who, under Ambrose's influence, fought against paganism in the Empire, adopting the principles he had declared: recognition of the independence of the church from the state in its own sphere, recognition of the role of the church as a model of morality and its right to protection by the state (Kornienko, 2014). It should not be thought that in this respect he differed in any way from other Christians of his time, but the very nature of the formulation of his beliefs and his unwavering fidelity to them in the face of his opponents made Ambrose an indisputable moral authority for subsequent generations of Christian authors, who referred to him in their works. Ambrose himself unequivocally stated that in spiritual matters,

the church has jurisdiction over all Christians, including the emperor, because the emperor, like any other Christian, is a child of the church, that is, 'is within the church, not above it' (Sebein George, Thorson Thomas, 1997: 188).

The bishop openly challenged state violence in 390, when a mob killed a Roman commander in Thessaloniki, and thousands of people were subsequently killed in response. The bishop condemned the massacre and forced Emperor Theodosius I to publicly repent (Lenox-Conyngham, 2005). Thanks to this symbolic gesture, what had once been simply the prerogative of the state—its monopoly on violence to secure its monopoly on power—was elevated to a moral principle that constrained not only ordinary people but the state itself.

Ambrose, like some earlier Christian thinkers (Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius the Great), realised that it would be foolish for the empire not to support Christianity, which promoted obedience to the emperor's authority. At the same time, Christianity, as the religion of the empire, had to find a way to legitimise war if it wanted to maintain its position at the centre of the state. For Ambrose, the transition from radical pacifism to the legitimisation of war was a fairly easy step. In his opinion, when speaking of non-resistance to evil, Jesus was referring only to a specific individual when he forbade killing others for self-defence. However, nowhere in his sermons did he deny the protection of others – the weak and defenceless. Thus, the rule of 'turning the other cheek' was an internal inclination of the heart, not a rule of external human behaviour (Bellamy, 2006: 24). According to Ambrose, a true Christian could use violence only to protect others, not for self-defence. The next step taken by the thinker was to declare all citizens of Rome as needing protection and to equate the protection of the empire with the protection of its population and the Christian faith.

The second criterion for justifying the war for Ambrose was the establishment of the image of the empire as the only refuge for believers, a Christian fortress surrounded by enemies on all sides, the defence of which is clearly a godly cause, since the survival of the Christian faith and the possibility of its spread to other lands depend on it. Thus, his definition of 'Christian love' required the protection of Christian society, in particular that which he considered orthodox (The Ethics of War, 2006: 112). In his opinion, a Christian warrior "had to be like David, Joshua, and Samson, who waged wars and glorified themselves. Their glory was the result of their courage, but true courage cannot exist without righteous deeds, otherwise foolish actions lead to dishonour" (Borisova, 2022: 7).

According to R. Kokhanchuk, it was "following the thoughts of Cicero, who argued that there are two ways of committing injustice: the first is to commit injustice oneself, the second is to allow others to commit injustice and remain unpunished, Ambrose came to the conclusion that there are wars that it would be unjust not to wage" (Kokhanchuk, 2003: 27). At the same time, the turning point was the thinker's definition of the subject of establishing the justice of war. The thinker entrusts this mission to the Church – 'the repository and measure of justice. Such a doctrine not only forced Christians to participate in wars that the Church deemed just, but also gave the Church itself the right to decide matters of war and peace' (Kokhanchuk, 2003: 27). Thus, Ambrose insists on the need to distinguish between just and unjust wars, believing that in some circumstances war can be considered the lesser of two evils. Accordingly, he justifies war that was intended to punish crimes or was defensive in nature. Therefore, for Ambrose, not all wars were immoral (Lietzmann, 1952: 70).

According to Ambrose, it is fundamentally important when waging war to determine its nature: whether it is just or not (Ambrose, 1896). At the same time, he emphasises the need for a prudent approach in determining the just nature of war and draws attention to the danger of a false attitude towards wars, since those who replace justice with injustice 'are cursed by God' (Ambrose, 1896). Therefore, Ambrose concludes, justice must be upheld even in war (Ambrose, 1896). In his concept, a just war appears as a legitimate (lawful) war of Christians (the Christian state, personified by the Roman Empire of that time) against injustice and, at the same time a kind of military sanction (punishment) addressed to another state or people for injustice (aggression, attack on allies, etc.).

To distinguish just wars from unjust ones, Ambrose proposes to reject the views of Eusebius of Caesarea (between 260 and 270-339/340), who believed that any war started by a Christian emperor would automatically be just, and that the enemies of the Empire were enemies of God (Dahm, 2021). Instead, the bishop proposes that a just cause for war should be considered the key criterion. Thus, in his opinion, war cannot be just when it is waged with aggressive intentions, 'seeking great power at the cost of freedom,' because in a war of conquest, 'the blessing of kindness to all is lost.' War as an instrument of justice should be waged only to help others, not oneself. 'For courage... in war protects one's country from barbarians, or at home protects the weak, or comrades from robbers, is full of justice' (Ambrose, 1896). War should not be waged for one's own glorification, but rather for the benefit of others. Explaining this idea, Ambrose refers to the Old Testament as his justification: "... according to the will of God and the unity of nature, we must... help each other through a sense of devotion or duty, giving money or doing something, in any case in some way... Thus, Saint Moses was not afraid to start terrible wars for his people, he was not afraid of the weapons of the most powerful kings, nor was he afraid of the savagery of barbarian peoples. He rejected the idea of his own safety in order to give people freedom" (Ambrose, 1896).

The justice of war is confirmed by its goal, which is inextricably linked to its desired outcomes. War that seeks to acquire land is rejected, but war that follows Moses' goal of giving 'freedom to his people' should be emulated. Referring to the following example from the Old Testament (apocryphal) and again to the works of Cicero, Ambrose discusses the desired outcome of war. He speaks of Eleazar, a warrior of Judas Maccabeus, who ended the war with King Antiochus and the Greeks through his actions. His greatest feat in Ambrose's eyes is that he 'left peace as the heir to his courage. These are the signs of triumph' (Ambrose, 1896). Therefore, war must be waged to achieve peace: '... wars should be started for this purpose, so that we may live in peace, without injustice; and once victory is secured, those who were not cruel or savage in war should be pardoned' (Ambrose, 1896).

Citing numerous examples from the history of wars, Ambrose concludes that war is a weapon of power, but in order to achieve peace, prudence must still be exercised in its conduct. Justice extends beyond the violence of war: 'the greatness of justice can be judged by the fact that there is no place, no person, no time with which it has nothing to do' (Ambrose, 1896). Thus, Christian principles of love for all people are linked to the doctrine of justice set forth by Cicero. Ambrose continues his reflections on justice during war, saying that it must be preserved in all relations with enemies. The thinker introduces the criterion of honesty in relations with the enemy, considering it repugnant to achieve victory by deceiving the opponent, because everything 'achieved by deception loses the advantage of openness' (Ambrose, 1896). It is characteristic that the traditional Roman rules of warfare, loyalty and respect for the rights of the enemy in Ambrose's concept also had to be observed (although such rules seem to have been relaxed in the case of barbarian heretics) (Russell, 1975: 13–15).

Finally, Ambrose believes that the Church should stay out of war, no matter how legitimate such actions may be for individual Christians (Swift, 1970: 537–538). A just war is incompatible with the purpose and functional role of the clergy: '... the idea of military matters seems foreign to the duty of our office, since our thoughts are more focused on the duty of the soul than on the duty of the body; our business is not to look at weapons, but rather at peaceful matters' (Ambrose, 1896); 'the duty of a priest is to harm no one, to be ready to help everyone...' (Ambrose, 1896). This was a radical departure from pagan Rome, where religion was the key to uniting people for war. Therefore, it is wrong to assume that Christianity ceased to be pacifist when it became the official religion (Frost, 2010).

Finally, the last point in Ambrose's justification of the concept of just war is that war should be the last resort in resolving conflicts. To confirm this idea, he refers to the Old Testament example of King David: 'David never waged war unless he was provoked to do so. Thus, prudence was combined in him with courage of spirit in battle' (Ambrose, 1896). Ambrose distinguishes between two types of conflict, noting that 'one occurs through debate, the other through force. Since the former is

the proper concern of humans, and the latter that of beasts, the latter should be resorted to only when the former cannot be used' (Ambrose, 1896).

Conclusion. If we summarise Ambrose's views on just war, at first glance it may seem that there is no consistent strategy in them. However, through his scattered remarks, the key features of this concept still emerge: a just war is morally justified and is a lesser evil than radical pacifism, which can open the way to evil; it is waged as a last resort; its purpose is to help and protect others, not to gain any benefit for oneself; it is defensive in nature; it is waged in order to achieve peace; a just war is an attribute of the actions of exclusively legitimate public authority. In developing this concept, the thinker combined the Jewish and Christian traditions of the Old Testament with the Roman tradition of Cicero, which made the Christian approach to just war more dependent on Roman thinking and Jewish heritage than on the postulates of Christianity. Ambrose undoubtedly used elements of the three intellectual traditions he had acquired (Roman, Jewish and Christian) in his own way to formulate a concept of just war that would incorporate elements of each of them. The fact that the Christian pacifist tradition was the main one that 'lost' in this intellectual competition was perhaps inevitable in a situation where it was absolutely necessary to legitimise war, which was necessary to defend and support the empire with Christianity as the only officially recognised state religion. Thus, the role of Ambrose's concept of just war was to support the empire in strengthening its defence capabilities, as well as to legitimise the imperial regime and, at the same time, to satisfy the spiritual needs of the empire's inhabitants. To this end, he placed Christianity at the service of the military-political and ideological needs of the state on a par with its military forces, their equipment and traditional Roman values (military valour, patriotism, endurance, courage, etc.).

In Ambrose's work, it is evident that elements of Jewish and Roman traditions had a decisive and greatest intellectual influence on him. However, it would be wrong to think that all this thinker did was to create a kind of 'mixture' of both traditions, without contributing anything new and original to the conceptualisation of a just war. Instead, he creatively used the ideas contained in the texts of the Old Testament as part of the Christian tradition, applying them to the situation in which the Christian church and its believers found themselves. He borrowed much more from the Roman tradition, but his use of Cicero's ideas does not appear to be plagiarism, as his ideas are reinterpreted and Christianised rather than borrowed directly. The next step in conceptualising the idea of a just war was the political and legal teachings of Ambrose of Milan's student and ideological successor, Aurelius Augustine, which demonstrated the continuity of Christian tradition in substantiating the key elements of the corresponding concept of a just war.

References:

1. Bekhruz Kh.N. (2023) Poniattia viiny u mizhnarodnomu pravi : problemy kontseptualizatsii [The concept of war in international law: problems of conceptualisation]. *Yurydychnyi naukovi elektronnyi zhurnal*. № 2. S. 558-561 [in Ukrainian].
2. Borysova O.V. (2022) Doktryna spravedlyvoi viiny u rozrobtsi khrystyianskykh myslyteliv chasiv Serednovichchia [The doctrine of just war in the works of Christian thinkers of the Middle Ages]. *Visnyk Luhanskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka : Istorychni nauky*. № 4 (352), cherven. S. 4-20. [in Ukrainian].
3. Zahrebelnyi I. Khrystyianske stavlennia do viiny [The Christian attitude towards war]. *Rozvytok doktryny vid pershykh vikiv khrystyianstva do Serednovichchia*. <https://politteo.online/materialy/hrystyianske-stavlennya-do-viiny/>. (accessed 10 February 2026) [in Ukrainian].
4. Korniienko V.O. (2014) Mediolanskyi Amvrosii [Ambrose of Mediolanus]. *Istoriia politychnoi dumky : navch. entsykl. slovnyk-dovidnyk dlia studentiv VNZ / Za zah. red. N. M. Khomy [V. M. Denysenko, L. Ya. Uhryn, H. V. Shypunov ta in.]*. Lviv : "Novyi Svit-2000". S. 24–25 [in Ukrainian].
5. Kokhanchuk R. (2003) Stanovlennia doktryny viiny v rannomu khrystyianstvi [The emergence of the doctrine of war in early Christianity]. *Ukrainske relihiieznavstvo*. № 26. S. 20–30. [in Ukrainian].

6. Kokhanchuk R. Stanovlennia kontseptsii spravedlyvoi viiny v katolytsyzmi. URL: https://risu.ua/stanovlennya-koncepciji-spravedlyvoji-viyni-v-katolicizmi_n33486 (accessed 10 February 2026) [in Ukrainian].
7. Lukianenko K.I. (2022) Zbroini konflikty v istorychnii perspektyvi. Shcho mozhe daty dosvid mynuloho dla rozuminnia sohodennia? [Armed conflicts in historical perspective. What can the experience of the past offer us in understanding the present?] *Vid Vebera do Valerstaina: istorychna sotsiologhiia derzhav ta svit-system* : Materialy X Mizhnarodnoi nauk.-prakt. konf. (m. Kyiv, 9–10 chervnia 2022 r.) / Ukladachi P. V. Fedorchenko-Kutuiev, O. L. Yakubin, O. M. Kazmirova ta in. Kyiv : Universytetska knyha. 248 s. S. 161-163 [in Ukrainian].
8. Liubit vorohiv vashykh [Love your enemies] (Lk 6:31-36). URL: <https://dyvensvit.org/blogs/1031575/> (accessed 10 February 2026) [in Ukrainian].
9. Moisieienko L. (2018) Problemy viiny ta myru v traktuvanni khrystyianskykh konfesii [Issues of war and peace in the interpretation of Christian denominations]. *Istoriia relihii v Ukraini* : Naukovyi shchorichnyk. Vyp. 28. Ch. IV. S. 545–565. [in Ukrainian].
10. Omelchuk V.V. Lisnycha V. M. (2011) Relihiina polityka starodavnikh i serednovichnykh derzhav [Religious policy of ancient and medieval states] : Navchalnyi posibnyk. Kyiv : Personal, 608 s. [in Ukrainian].
11. Panafidin I.O. (2014) Evoliutsiia idei spravedlyvoi viiny v konteksti teorii vichnoho myru (sotsialno-filosofskyi aspekt) [The evolution of the idea of a just war in the context of the theory of eternal peace (socio-philosophical aspect)] : dys. ... kand. filos. nauk : 09.00.03. – sotsialna filosofii ta filosofii istorii / Kryvorizkyi pedahohichnyi instytut DVNZ “Kryvorizkyi natsionalnyi universytet”. Kryvyi Rih, 200 s. [in Ukrainian].
12. Poda T.A. (2016) Teoriia “spravedlyvoi viiny” : vid antychnosti do suchasnosti [The theory of “just war”: from antiquity to the present day]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatyinoho universytetu. Serii : Filosofiia. Kulturologhiia*. № 1 (23). S. 66–69. [in Ukrainian].
13. Popsuienko L.O. (2009) Milanskyi edykt 313 r. – yurydychne pidgruntia v protsesi formuvannia pravovoho statusu khrystyianskoi tserkvy [The Edict of Milan of 313 – the legal basis for the formation of the legal status of the Christian Church]. *Aktualni problemy polityky* : Zbirnyk naukovykh prats / Kerivnyk avt. kol. S.V. Kivalov; vidp. za vyp. L.I. Kormych. Odesa : “Feniks”, Vyp. 36. S. 327–334. [in Ukrainian].
14. Radzivill O.A. (2017) Pravo narodiv vid neolitu do Novoho chasu [The rights of peoples from the Neolithic to modern times] : monohrafiia. U 2 t. T. 2. Kyiv : NAU, 428 s. [in Ukrainian].
15. Sebain Dzhordzh H., Torson Tomas L. (1997) Istoriia politychnoi dumky [History of political thought] / Per. z anh. Kyiv : Osnovy. 838 s. [in Ukrainian].
16. Semchynskyi K. (2004) Kontroversa teorii spravedlyvoi viiny u pratsiakh filosofiv i khrystyianskykh teolohiv [The controversy surrounding the theory of just war in the works of philosophers and Christian theologians]. *Ukrainske relihiieznavstvo*. № 29. S. 95–103. [in Ukrainian].
17. Tsitseron M.T. (2021) Tuskulanski besidy. Pro oboviazky [Tusculan Disputations. On Duties] / per. V. Lytvynov. Kyiv : Apriori. 440 s. [in Ukrainian].
18. Shchepanskyi V.V. (2015) Retseptsiiia relihiinoi filosofii serednovichchia u “Trenosi” M. Smotrytskoho [The Reception of Medieval Religious Philosophy in M. Smotrytsky's “Trenos”] : dys. ... kand. filos. nauk : 09.00.11. – relihiieznavstvo / Natsionalnyi universytet “Ostrozka akademiia”. Ostroh. 195 s. [in Ukrainian].
19. Ambrose. Duties of the Clergy. Ambrose. Selected Works and Letters by Philip Schaf. Christian literature Company, 1896. 700 p. URL: https://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/1819-1893,_Schaff,_Philip,_3_Vol_10_Ambrose,_EN.pdf.
20. Ambrose. Selected Works and Letters by Philip Schaf. Christian literature Company, 1896. 700 p. URL: https://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/1819-1893,_Schaff,_Philip,_3_Vol_10_Ambrose,_EN.pdf. (accessed 10 February 2026)
21. Bainton R.H. (1979) Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Revaluation. New York and Nashville : Press. 300 p.

22. Bellamy A.J. (2006) *Just Wars : from Cicero to Iraq*. Malden, MA : Polity. 296 p.
23. Dahm K. (2021) Commotion, Rebellion, and War. Eusebius of Caesarea's Narrative of Jewish Violence Against Roman Rule in His Ecclesiastical History. *Journal of Early Christian Studies*. Vol. 29. Issue 4. P. 495-523.
24. Frost P. (2010) The Roman State and Genetic Pacification. *Evol Psychol.* Jul. Vol. 8. Issue 3. P. 376–389.
25. Johnson J.T. (1991) Historical Roots and Sources of the Just War Tradition in Western Culture. In : *Just War and Jihad* / Ed. J. Kelsay and J.T. Johnson. New York : Greenwood. P. 4-30.
26. Johnson J.T. (2009) Thinking Historically about Just War. *Journal of Military Ethics*. Vol. 8. Issue 3. P. 246-259.
27. Lenox-Conyngham A. (2005) The Church in St. Ambrose of Milan. *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church*. Vol. 5. P. 211–225.
28. Lietzmann H. (1952) *The era of the church fathers*. London : Lutterworth Press. 212 p.
29. McLynn N.B. (1994) *Ambrose of Milan : Church and Court in a Christian Capital*. Berkeley, CA : University of California Press. 436 p.
30. Russell F.H. (1975) *The Just War in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge University Press. 332 p.
31. Swift L.J. (1970) St. Ambrose on Violence and War. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. Vol. 101. P. 533–543.
32. *The Ethics of War : Shared Problems in Different Traditions* / R. Sorabji and D. Rodin, ed. Burlington, VT : Ashgate, 2006. 264 p.
33. *War and Christian Ethics : Classical and Contemporary Readings on the Morality of War*. 2nd / ed. Holmes A.F., ed. Grand Rapids, MI : Baker Academic, 2005. 412 p.