

---

# RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL IDEAS AND ECCLESIASTICAL EDUCATION OF THE RUSSIAN ÉMIGRÉ COMMUNITY

**Kristina Viktorovna Birukova<sup>\*</sup>, Rozalya Moiseevna Rupova,  
Olga Anatolievna Evreeva, Larisa Ivanovna Bystrova and  
Gennadiy Pavlovich Otutskiy**

*Russian State Social University, 4 Wilhelm Pieck St., Moscow, 129226, Russia*

(Received 14 January 2016, revised 4 March 2016)

---

## **Abstract**

The authors see the goal as the comprehensive research of the religious and philosophical ideas and ecclesiastical education of the Russian émigré community in 1920-1940s. The research covers the repressions against the intellectuals by the Soviet regime. The paper touches upon their reasons and consequences. The institutionalization of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia (ROCOR) is studied as one of the consequences of the anti-clerical policy of the Soviet government greatly affecting the religious and philosophical ideas of the Russian émigré community and the establishment of the ecclesiastical education system among the Russian emigrants. Special attention is paid by the authors to the so-called 'Parisian school' of religious and philosophical ideas, studying its formation, main ideas and the areas of work: neo-patristic synthesis, liturgical revival, reconsideration of the Russian history and culture, development of the Russian religious and philosophical, theological ideas.

*Keywords:* émigré community, Philosophers' Ship, Parisian school, ecclesiastical education

---

## **1. Introduction**

The Russian émigré community is a certain historical and cultural phenomenon greatly affecting Russia's culture and the culture of recipient countries. The study of the cultural heritage of the Russian émigré community still is an urgent goal. This research is devoted to the review of the religious and philosophical ideas and ecclesiastical education of the first wave of the Russian émigré community.

The post-revolution wave of refugees from Russia had an intensive nature and complex structure. The Russian émigré community of that period was internally unstable with numerous migrations in various directions continuing throughout 1920-1940s [1]. "Great force of attraction was for the Russian

---

<sup>\*</sup>E-mail: anariel80@mail.ru

refugees in Germany and France, where there were some 600 and 400 thousand Russians respectively in early 1920s” [1, p. 25].

The main emigrant flows of the end of the Civil War – Crimean, northern and Far-Eastern – were actual operations on troops evacuation. Those originally military operations were burdened by extra refugees causing their extreme nature. Out of about 150 thousand people leaving Crimea on the Russian vessels there were some 70 thousand military men [1, p. 17]. The Far-Eastern wave was rather specific, integrated in the society and the infrastructure of the old Russian Harbin city and Chinese Eastern Railway [1, p. 27].

## 2. Methodology and results

The research applied comparative historical, generalization and analysis methods.

### 2.1. Philosophers' Ships

Regarding the religious and philosophical ideas of the Russian émigré community, *Philosophers' Ship* of 1922 should be noted. To be exact, there were two ships. In autumn of 1922, over 60 scientists, political activists, writers, doctors and engineers were banished from Petrograd on board *Prussia* and *Oberburgermeister Haken* vessels. The expression *Philosophers' Ship* was firstly used by the researchers studying that issue in 1980-1990s. There were some philosophers among the passengers. Many of them got global fame later [D.A. Gusev, *Philosophers' Ship*, [http://www.spho.ru/ob\\_obshestve/phil\\_par](http://www.spho.ru/ob_obshestve/phil_par), accessed 17.05.2015].

The issue on the number of the repressed remains disputable. For instance, A.V. Repnikov stresses: “Now we may say that the repressions of that period covered about 225-228 people, and under administrative procedures 55-57 people were banished, i.e., less than 30% of the total banishment list” [2]. V.G. Makarov and V.S. Khristoforov, upon the study of 224 investigation cases, give the following interesting data: 78 people were banished abroad, 57 people were exiled by administrative order, including 7 students, banishment was cancelled for 33 people, 2 people were condemned, while there is no information on 54 people [*Passengers of "Philosophers' Ship" (Destinies of the Intellectuals Repressed in Summer/Autumn of 1922)*, 2003, [russcience.chat.ru/papers/mak03vf.htm](http://russcience.chat.ru/papers/mak03vf.htm), accessed 17.05.2015].

By the summer of 1922, the internal political situation got severe. It is obvious that the idea of mass act against the intellectuals emerged in early 1922, when the authorities faced mass strikes of higher school professors and teachers and revival of public movements among the intellectuals (congresses of doctors, engineers, etc.) [3].

On June 1, 1922 the chairman of the State Political Directorate sent a report to the Political Bureau *On anti-Soviet groups among intellectuals* made by Y.S. Agranov. That report was executed via the commission of L.B. Kamenev,

D.I. Kurskiy and I.S. Unshlikht “for final consideration of the list of persons among the leaders of unfriendly intellectual groups subject to banishment” [3, p. 128].

Simultaneously, a set of measures was adopted to control the higher education system in the country. The higher school restructuring in particular provided for public rights crackdown in higher school [3, p. 236].

On June 22, 1922 the Political Bureau adopted the resolution *On consideration of doctors' congress delegates banishment*. Then, banishment of professors, students and advocates was initiated [3, p. 157]. In the records, the exiled persons are characterized as Mensheviks, Black-Hundreders, Constitutional democrats [3, p. 29]. The operation against the anti-Soviet intellectuals was maintained on the night of August 16/17, 1922, when over 100 famous Russian cultural and scientific leaders were arrested in Moscow, Petrograd and other large cities of Russia and Ukraine (on the night of 17/18 August) [3, p. 78].

The reasons causing the Bolsheviks to make such a massive action against the national cultural elite were reasoned in the preface of the circular letter of the All-Russian Special Commission for Combating Counter-revolution, Sabotage, and Speculation No. 26 dated November 23, 1922: *Opposition to the Soviet regime* [3, p. 81].

Within the first years of the New Economic Policy a lot of bans were cancelled including those related to culture and arts. Private book publishers were established along with exhibitions, theatres, new magazines, etc. In 1921-1922, there were some philosophical societies in Russia: Moscow Psychological Society, Free Academy of Spiritual Culture in Petrograd and Moscow, Saratov Philosophical and Historical Society [3, p. 92].

Criticism also emerged: for instance, critical comments on the Soviet regime and its economic model were published in *Economist* journal in Petrograd, while the professorship clamored against the Bolshevik restructuring of higher school in 1921, etc. [[http://www.spho.ru/ob\\_obshestve/phil\\_par](http://www.spho.ru/ob_obshestve/phil_par)].

The researchers stress the numerous reasons for the banishment of the intellectuals. For instance, that decision was preceded by publishing of the Russian edition of O. Spengler's *The Decline of the West* by philosophers N.A. Berdyaev, F.A. Stepun and S.L. Frank. After reading that book, Lenin wrote to Gorbunov, the secretary of the Council of People's Commissars: “I opine that it looks like a literature-based veil of a White guardians' organization” [2].

But those are rather causes. The real reason was the uncertainty of the Soviet leaders in their ability to keep the powers and in the attempt to set up the ideological control via banishment of the intellectual elite, people capable of thinking and analysing freely and independently.

### **3. Establishment of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia**

After the revolution of 1917 in Russia followed by the Civil War, the Russian Orthodox Church was affected and the phenomenon of the Russian foreign clerical community emerged.

In May 1919 in Stavropol, Interim Supreme Church Department of Episcopacies of the Russian South-East was established for the territories, controlled by the Volunteer Army and isolated from the Moscow Patriarchate by the front. On November 19, 1920, on board the vessel *Great Prince Alexander Mikhailovich*, in Constantinople port, was a meeting attended by metropolitans Antonius (Khrapovitskiy) and Plato (Rozhdestvenskiy), Archbishop Theophanes (Bystrov) and Bishop Benyamin (Fedchenkov) [4]. The meeting resolved on appointment of Eulogius (Georgiyevskiy) the supervisor of Russian churches in the Western Europe including Russian parishes in Bulgaria and Romania, retaining control over the Russian churches in Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey.

Supreme Church Department rationalized its operation by the need to guide the refugees and the remaining people from the Volunteer Army “in all the states not relating to the Saint Patriarch” [4]. The reasons for the activity were seen by the arch-flamens via the rules 37 and 39 of the 6<sup>th</sup> Ecumenical Council [N. Milosz, *Rules of the Saint Orthodox Church with Interpretations*, [azbyka.ru/dictionary/10/nikodim\\_pravila\\_tserkvi\\_s\\_tolkovaniyami\\_196-all.shtml](http://azbyka.ru/dictionary/10/nikodim_pravila_tserkvi_s_tolkovaniyami_196-all.shtml), accessed 17.05.2015]. As an indirect evidence, Resolution of Patriarch No. 362 of November 20, 1920 may be considered [5] (although, that document was unknown to the Russian clerical émigré community for a long time), as well as the Order No. 424 of April 8, 1921 *On the subordination of all Russians churches in Western Europe to the canonic jurisdiction of former Volyn archbishop Eulogius (Georgiyevskiy)*.

Interim Supreme Church Department was on the territory of Constantinople Patriarchate. As a result of negotiations with the head of Patriarchate metropolitan Dositheus, Epitrophy was established (commission, in the church law, a self-governing structure of the executive power, often temporary) subordinate to Ecumenical Council which was not going to accept an independent church authority on its canonical territory [4, p. 91]. But the temporary supervision considered itself identical with the Supreme Church Department of the Russian South.

In summer 1921, it moved to Yugoslavia (then called Kingdom of Serbians, Croats and Slovenians) which became the centre of the Russian Church life. Since October 21, 1921 till December 2, 1921, in Yugoslavian city Srijemski Karlovci, Church council was held.

Possibly, active participation in the council of military and political leaders brought some discussion in its activity. Part of the Council’s messages is of clear political nature. All-abroad Supreme Church Department outside Russia was established, chaired by Metropolitan Antonius (Khrapovitskiy), called deputy Patriarch, and Synod was elected also chaired by Metropolitan Antonius who was assigned all the powers of Supreme Church Department. Metropolitan

Eulogius (Georgiyevskiy) then did not consider it necessary to obey Synod, formally referring to the Order of Patriarch Tikhon of May 5, 1922, in which Patriarch admits Srijemski Karlovci Council having no canonical effect, abolishes the structures established by him and acknowledges the canonical rights of Metropolitan Eulogius for supervising Russian Orthodox parishes in the Western Europe (judging from the fact that Metropolitan Eulogius was officially addressed so) [5, p. 71].

The discussion on West European metropolis was held at Bishops' Councils in Srijemski Karlovci on May 31, 1923 and October 16, 1924, in June 1926. Then, in 1926, there was the final break of Metropolitan Eulogius and his followers with the foreign Synod.

#### **4. The Parisian school of religious and philosophical thought of the Russian émigré community**

Metropolitan Eulogius was supported by most of the Paris émigré community. Paris was one of the places where the intellectual masses of the emigration concentrated. The Russian thought throughout its development has been in the dialogue with the West. The new situation not just simply deepened that dialogue. Russia's clash has much sharpened the problematic issues of the Russian culture, put the task to contemplate the reasons of that catastrophe, to seek the ways out. The Silver Age of the national philosophy, its inevitable renaissance of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century put a lot of questions that failed to be answered. It was an accelerator on the way of the Russian thought 'from Marxism to idealism'. The entire post-revolutionary situation both in Russia and outside facilitated an extreme existential concentration of all the philosophical issues and their religious rethinking. In 1922, Saint Sergius Theological Institute was opened in Paris which became the largest centre of the Orthodox theology in the European space in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This institute united the best brains of Russia living in exile: S.N. Bulgakov, B.P. Vysheslavtsev, G.V. Florovskiy, V.V. Zenkovskiy, A.A. Afanasyev, L.A. Zander and others. "Contemplating on the establishment of a higher school, the founders were rather modest and did not dare to call it a typical name of Church Academy but called it Theological institute in the memory and continuation of the Theological institute open in Petrograd in 1919-1921 after the clash of Church Academy", A.V. Kartashev wrote, one of the founders and first professors of the institute [Official Web Page of Orthodox Theological Institute of Blessed Sergius of Radonezh in Paris, [saint-serge.ru/about.html](http://saint-serge.ru/about.html), accessed 17.05.2015]. Saint Sergius Theological Institute became the nucleus for a whole circle of philosophers and theologians called the *Parisian school*. Many scholars from that community were teaching in the institute, some were lecturing or reporting at conferences, some were in the course of a dialogue or even polemics, but it may be definitely said that in Paris since mid-1920s there was a meaningful intellectual field of high stress. In the dialogue with the Western philosophy, Catholic and Protestant theology, the Russian émigré community not just came to the perception of the spiritual

Orthodox tradition but opened it for the West. After that discovery, many European thinkers turned to the religious and philosophical discourse of the eastern Christianity or became Orthodox. Analysing the topical spectrum of the creative research done by the Parisian school, the four major directions may be specified [6]. The main one, causing so-called patristic revival, is associated with Archpriest Georgiy Florovskiy (1893-1979), Archbishop Vaslily (Krivoshein, 1900-1985), V.N. Losskiy (1903-1958), Archimandrite Cyprianus (Kern, 1909-1960), Archpriest John Meyendorf (1926-1992).

## 5. Neo-patristic synthesis

Georgiy Florovskiy found the core idea of the contemporary reading of the heritage of Saint Fathers. "Studying of Theology", he wrote, "has recently driven me to the idea which I call neo-patristic synthesis today. It should be not just a collection of statements and acknowledgments by Fathers. It should be the synthesis, a creative rethinking of insights sent to the saint ancient people. That synthesis should be patristic, compliant with the spirit and contemplation of Fathers, ad mentem Patrum. Meantime, it should be neo-patristic, being addressed to the new century facing the typical problems and issues." [7]

Contemplating the crisis of the Russian society caused by the revolution bringing all the devastating social consequences in the book *Ways of the Russian theology* published in 1937, G. Florovskiy is finding the way to overcome it, acknowledging the most direct and dedicated link with the moral crisis.

"Restoration of the patristic style is the first and basic postulate of the Russian theological revival. The point is neither about any restoration, nor repetition, nor coming back. To Fathers, anyway, is always forward but not back. The point is the faith in Fathers' spirit, not only letter... Fathers may be quite followed only via creativity, but not imitation..." [8] It was the doctrine disclosing the treasures of the Byzantium's spiritual tradition. Under its direct influence, the movement *To Fathers* emerged in the Western European soil as well. In 1940s in France, the gloomy period of Hitler's occupation coincided with the Golden Age of return to Fathers [9].

The quantity and quality of publications during those years is amazing, especially taking into consideration the material conditions and the atmosphere of that incentive. There are some data on the publications of that period [9]: in 1938, *Catholicism* by Henry de Lubac was published, a book full of citations and inspired by the thought of Greek Church Fathers; doctoral thesis by Henry Marrou was issued [H.I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*] followed by the publication in the same 1938 of the anthology by von Balthazar about Origene. In 1941, Balthazar published his monograph on Maximus the Confessor (*Kosmische Liturgie*), in 1942 – *Presence et Pensee, essai sur la philosophie religieuse de Gregoire de Nysse*. During those years, the famous series *Sources Chretiennes* began to be published by J. Danielu and H. de Lubak with *Life of Moses* by Grigoriy Nisskiy. Currently, that series amounts to over 500 volumes; the scientific level of that edition is so high that it is a compulsory

source for those studying Fathers. In 1944, two monographs were published: *Platonisme et théologie mystique, la doctrine spirituelle de Grégoire de Nysse* by Daniélou and *Introduction à l'étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l'Écriture* by Mondésir, heading *Sources Chrétiennes*. In 1944, *Origène* by Daniélou was also published.

What is the reason for that turn? In 1946, in *Études* journal, Daniélou explained their deep motive as follows: “For us, Fathers are not only reliable witnesses of the past situation. They are still giving the most important information for today’s people, as in them we are finding the categories lost by the scholastic theology, describing today’s life.” [9] That statement of Catholic philosophers and theologians is of great value and attests that the Western culture, survived the modernist crisis in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in search of a way out appealed to the source, uniform for the entire Christian civilization – the Greek Patristics.

The idea was formulated by G. Florovskiy, but being in the air during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, inspired a series of research in patristics both in the Russian émigré community and in the western scholarship. Many thinkers, not belonging to the Eastern Orthodox tradition, stepped outside the confessional barriers and were able to open for themselves and for the western world the heritage of the great Fathers of the Eastern Church: I. Ozerr, C.U. von Balthazar, W. Völker, L. Prestige, W. Jaeger, J. Daniélou, H. de Lubak, J. Kausten, J. Kelly, Jaroslav Pelikan, cardinal K. Schönborn, G. Bunge, S. Brok and others.

## **6. Basic directions of the Parisian school**

Within the described patristic renewal concept, something rather important for the whole history of the Russian philosophy occurred. If, before the revolution, the national philosophy could be classified as a special school in the course of classic West European philosophical tradition, then, as a result of the seeking for the new status of the Russian thought, originated in the tsarist Russia and accelerated by the historical circumstances, there emerged a view that the Russian philosophy reached a totally new level – self-identification as a different philosophical tradition. This new tradition is the contemporary philosophy built on the foundation of the eastern Christianity, i.e., on the ontology, differently related to the West: “the status of parallel tradition which would internally comply with our position in the Christian Eucumene, was first intuitively perceived in the theology of the Russian diaspora, in self-perception of the Russian orthodox Christianity set in the intellectual reality of the West. That is a great contribution of the Russian diaspora in the Russian self-consciousness and philosophical self-determination.” [10]

Another direction in the activity of the Parisian school relates to liturgical revival of Orthodox Christianity. It was developed in works by archpriests Nikolay Afanasiev (1893-1966) and Alexander Shmeman (1921-1983), where the major role of Eucharist in Church’s life was reasoned, discovering the richness of the liturgical legend.

The third direction is the perception of the Russian history, culture, literature; it relates to A.V. Kartashev (1875-1960), G.P. Fedotov (1886-1951), Archpriest Sergius Chetverikov (1867-1947), I.M. Kontsevich (1893-1965), N.A. Zernov (1898-1980).

The fourth direction was developing the traditions of the Russian religious and philosophical doctrine. It is associated with the names of N.A. Berdyayev (1874-1948), N.O. Losskiy (1870-1965), L.P. Karsavin (1882-1952), I.A. Ilyin (1882-1954); B.P. Vysheslavtsev (1877-1954), Archpriest Vasilii Zenkovskiy (1881-1962), S.L. Frank (1907-1950), L.I. Shestov (1866-1938). In the works of those scholars, the topics were creatively developed that had started in the pre-revolution period of the Russian philosophical renaissance; new stages of the way from Marxism to idealism were gone through; numerous contacts with European personalism, phenomenology and existentialism brought their results.

A great contribution within a few directions of Parisian school was made by Archpriest Sergius Bulgakov. In 1935, Paris saw a series of sharp discussions on sophiology. Sophia, the wisdom of God, which was associated with Christ in the Eastern Christian tradition since the ancient times, acquired hypostatic status in works of Vladimir Soloviev and, dressed in philosophical and poetical clothes by its creator, entered the heritage of virtually all Russian philosophers of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. While other philosophers could afford it, Sergius Bulgakov, the head of the Dogmatic Theology Department of Saint Sergius Theological Institute in Paris, needed high faith-teaching strictness. Theological analysis of works by Archpriest Sergius was done at the request of Metropolitan Sergius (Stargorodskiy) by V.N. Losskiy, who criticized them a lot and concluded in the incompliance of the author's sophiological views with the Orthodox theology. Such a principal approach caused active protest among the thinkers who got used to total philosophical freedom. It may be said that V.N. Losskiy finished the Russian sophiology, dividing the saint fathers' tradition of the Orthodox Christianity with the free philosophical search.

The Parisian school is indirectly associated with the name of Archimandrite Sofronius (Sakharov, 1896-1993), a tutee of a famous Athos man of faith, starets Silouan, canonized in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Archimandrite Sofronius confined the spiritual insights of his teacher to the world and contributed to so-called theological personalism, stressing the communication of personal God and a man as a personality.

Eurasian doctrine, an affluent doctrine of social and philosophical thought of the Russian émigré community, did not pass by Paris; it emerged in 1921 in works of N.S. Trubetskoy, P.N. Savitskiy, L.P. Karsavin and others, causing a lot of oral and written discussions. In the works by those scholars, Russia was considered as a totally special cultural and historical phenomenon being a synthesis of Europe and Asia – Eurasia. However, Paris saw the period of split-off in the Eurasian community, when Eurasian periodicals began publishing articles calling for idea-based political unity and cooperation with the Soviet regime.

## **7. Theological pastoral school in Bulgaria**

Some theologians – both ‘academic’ and ‘free’ – were invited as professors at Orthodox theological faculties in Belgrade, Sofia, Bucharest, Warsaw. The field of our study covers Prague, Belgrade, Warsaw and Sofia universities and pastoral theological school of Saint Quiricus monastery in Bulgaria.

Among the first theological schools in the Russian emigration, there was pastoral theological school (PTS) of Saint Quiricus monastery in Bulgaria. It was established due to the initiative and work of archbishop of Tsaritsyn Damian (Govorov), who, despite the initial objections by Episcopal Synod, managed to convince its members of the importance of his incentive and thereafter that school was admitted the main and only theological school of Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia in Europe (Church bulletin, 1923). Initially the school put forward the task on pastoral training but later it began to exercise some other apostle functions while some of its graduates entered the Theological Faculty of Sofia University. Saint Vladimir’s brotherhood was established in the monastery engaged not only in collecting funds for the school but also publishing, keeping and developing the Russian spiritual culture and Pan-Slavic cultural mission.

The academic plan of the school, submitted by Bishop Damian to Episcopal Synod in 1923, included some theological disciplines (introduction in the Old and New Testaments of the Holy Bible, the Holy Writ of both Testaments, works of holy fathers of Church, general and Russian history of Church with Church geography, basic Theology, Dogmatic theology including study of various deviations, Moral theology); pastoral disciplines (Church regulations and liturgies, Church rhetoric, Pastoral theology, Church law as applied to parish service, History and rebuke of Russian Old Belief and sectarianism, Church reading, Church singing and Precentorship), as well as small general education course (Russian language and literature, Civil history, Psychology, Logic, basics of Philosophy and Didactics [State Archive of the Russian Federation, f. 6343, series 1, file 222, list 8-8ob, 40-41ob, 121-124, 161, 318]. Students lived according to the monastery’s schedule; graduates serving in the monastery in church rank would go to serve and preach to nearby parishes when requested by Bulgarian Church authorities.

However, there were some difficulties, one being the problem of calling for teachers: besides eminent Damian, there were 3-4 PhDs in Theology from Russian Church academies, other teachers were called when possible. There were rather few books and theological literature. In autumn 1925, PTS was graduated from by the first 10 people, while during the period of existence (1923-1936) some 50 diplomas were granted to Russian and Bulgarian students. PTS graduates in Church ranks served in parishes of Bulgaria, France, Serbia, England; those without a rank taught in theological and church schools – higher, high – in Bulgaria, France, Lithuania [SARF, f. 6343, series 1, file 222, list 288-290ob, 328-329ob, file 106-109, 136; Central state archive in Sofia, f. 791k, series 1, storage unit 65, list 43]. Since 1928, PTS began extra-mural education

by sending lectures to students from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Serbia, France, Germany, Northern and Southern America and receiving compositions and tests back. In 1930, PTS opened theological and teaching summer classes. Surely, the scale of activity was not large – for instance, in 1930-1931 there were 12-14 extra-mural students, but still the opportunity to get theological education was of great importance. After the death of the founder in 1936, the school was closed [Central state archive in Sofia, f. 791k, series 1, storage unit 65, list 43].

## **8. Theological Faculty of the University of Belgrade**

In the universities, the first theological faculty was opened in the University of Belgrade. It was scheduled to open in 1905 but was opened in 1920: on September 6 the first meeting of the Academic Council of the Faculty took place, on December 15 the classes began and in late June of 1921 there were first examinations. Professorship of the faculty comprised three groups: Church of the old pre-war Kingdom of Serbia, professors from the former Austrian Empire – mainly doctors from the Chernivtsi University, and professors from Russian theological academies and universities. Although the dean was a representative of the first group, professor of Serbian Church history Archpriest Stephan Dmitrievic, the main theologians represented the old Russian theological school: graduate and former professor of Russian Church history from the Kiev Theological Academy (KTA) archpriest Fyodor Titov, graduate and former professor of the Holy Writ of Old Testament from the Saint Petersburg Theological Academy (SPTA) archpriest Alexander Rozhdestvenskiy, graduate of the Moscow Theological Academy (MTA), former professor of theological schools and professor of Church history in the Novorossiia University A.P. Dobropoklobskiy, graduate of MTA and former professor of the Holy Writ of Old Testament from SPTA N.N. Glubokovskiy. All of them were doctors in Theology and had much experience in teaching in higher theological institutions of education, conceptualizers of advantages/disadvantages, seekers of new more efficient methods and forms of theological scientific education. They were joined by some professorship from Russian universities. The most active was a graduate and former privatdocent from the Historical and Philological Faculty of the Petrograd University, a Hebrew scholar M.A. Georgiyevskiy [11].

Russian students were preparing to serve the Church in exile, hoping to be of use in pastoral, scientific and theological, preaching areas. In the first group there was a woman and there were no further limits on enrolment. Via joint efforts of professorship and students and the Russian Church diaspora, the Theological Faculty established some sort of education and training. Its typical features were: special accent on independent scientific and cognitive activities of students in groups and clubs, regular church and service life and spiritual guidance, pastoral talks, contacts with theologians from Orthodox Churches and other Christian confessions.

Within the first years of the work of the Theological Faculty a great number of students united in the club of John Saint Apostle and Evangelist, for discussions of scientific, theological, philosophical and church practice, moral and spiritual problems. Since the very beginning the club had two directions: spiritual ascetical and cultural missionary.

The two above directions gave a lot of materials for thinking exchange. Active members were also among teachers: Professors N.N. Glubokovskiy, V.V. Zenkovskiy who taught Psychology on the Philosophical Faculty, S.S. Bezobrazov, future Cassian bishop who taught in Petrograd in the Orthodox Theological Institute opened after closing theological academies. Besides full-time members, the club was visited by metropolitan Antonius (Khrapovitskiy) who became the spiritual guard of many club members, ‘Serbian Chrysostom’ bishop Nikolay (Velimirovic).

Theological faculty students participated actively in the life of the Russian parish in Belgrade – that was the main aspect of church education. Numerous Russian diaspora in Belgrade was church-related, services were regular, the archpriest of the parish Pyotr Belovidov called students to read and sing in stalls and for pastoral and missionary work. Metropolitan Antonius and other Russian bishops living in Serbian monasteries near the capital city often served in church: Archbishop of Poltava Theophane (Bystrov), Bishop of Chelyabinsk Garviil (Chepur), Bishop of Okhrid and Zhich Nikolay (Velimirovic). Students of the Theological faculty made pilgrimages to Hopovo monastery, where the spiritual father of some of them, starets-archpriest Aleksey Nelyubov was serving. Students got connected with Athos men of faith – in particular, hieromonk Quiricus who came from Athos to ask King Alexander to protect Russian monasteries. Later, in 1935-1944, a famous Serbian theologian Archimandrite Iustin (Popovic) taught at the Theological Faculty.

Students of the Theological Faculty of the University of Belgrade then became teachers of Orthodox theological schools of Europe. Many of them began their training and serving activity in the Bitola Theological Seminary, in the Saint Sergius Theological Institute in Paris and then in American theological schools. Among the graduates of the Belgrade theological school there were M.B. Maksimovich (1896-1966), future holy bishop John of Shanghai; K.E. Kern (1899-1960), future archimandrite Cyprianus, a liturgician and patrologist; N.N. Afanasyev (1893-1966), future arch-priest, ecclesiologist and canonist. There were some people who played important parts in the life of the foreign Church: Arch-priest Georgiy Grabbe, Archbishop Seraphim (Ivanov), Archbishop Sabbas (Sovetov), Bishop Philipp (Gardner), Archbishop Antonius (Senkevich), Bishop Mitrophan (Znosko-Borovsky) and others [12].

## **9. Theological education in Czechoslovakia**

Theological education soon became available in the Prague University. Czechoslovakia by 1923 became the largest centre of the Russian émigré community. The main goal was to give the Russian students, who were fighting

in the Volunteer Army an opportunity to finish their education. In October 1921, a few Russian professors, including N.N. Glubokovskiy, were elected members of the Collegium for Russian Students' Education in Czechoslovakia. In the first half of 1920s Prague became the academic centre of the Russian diaspora. In 1922, by the incentive of Professor P.I. Novgorodtsev, Russian Law Faculty was opened there, and Professor Novgorodtsev became its dean. He sought to invite to Prague for working at the Faculty the best Russian professors in emigration: N.O. Losskiy, P.B. Struve, G.V. Florovskiy, G.V. Vernadskiy, A.A. Kizevetter, V.V. Zenkovskiy, Archpriest Sergius Bulgakov [13]. The Faculty was not initially intended for theological education alone but the professorship fixed that opportunity as well. For teaching theological disciplines in Prague, blessing was asked for from Metropolitan Eulogius (Georgiyevskiy) who supervised the Russian churches in Europe. Metropolitan Eulogius blessed teaching theology at the Russian Law Faculty of the Prague University, in particular, for Archpriest Sergius Bulgakov. Prague for a few years became a significant centre of the Orthodox Church life. In Prague there was stably operating Russian parish, important for guardianship for the Russian students.

By Sergius Bulgakov's incentive, since 1923 a journal called *Spiritual World of Students: Bulletin of the Russian Christian movement in Europe* was published in Prague. The goal of the journal was the description of students' life, brotherly unity and enhancement of spiritual interests. The first issue of the journal covered the activity of Christian students' organizations in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, France, Yugoslavia, Germany; since the second issue, extracts from the works by saint fathers were published together with articles written by Archpriest Bulgakov, professors V.V. Zenkovskiy, S.S. Bezobrazov, V.F. Martsinkovskiy, etc.

In Czechoslovakia, Santa Sophia Brotherhood was recreated, existing in Russia since the end of 1919. In October 1923, in Moravian city Prerov the first assembly of the Russian students' Christian movement took place. At that assembly Brotherhood was blessed by metropolitan Eulogius, who approved the charter of the organization. Brotherhood existed in Prague till the middle of 1925, after which it moved to Paris [14].

## **10. Theological Faculty of Sofia University**

The third theological faculty in Slavic countries was opened in Sofia University in 1923. The Act *On people's education* adopted by Bulgarian People's Assembly in 1921 provided for opening the Theological Faculty in Sofia University with 8 departments: Holy Writ of Old and New Testaments (separately), Systematic Theology, History of Religions and Christianity, Church Archaeology and Liturgy, Pastoral Theology and Patristics, Church Law and Homiletics. The act provided for that the first three professors should be elected from the Academic Council of the University. In November 1922, Academic Council appointed a graduate from KTA, doctor of theology Archimandrite Euthimius (Sapundzhiyev) a professor of Systematic Theology Department, in

January 1923, Arch-presbyter doctor Stephan Tsankov was appointed a professor of Church Law Department and Archpriest Alexander Rozhdestvenskiy was appointed a professor of Holy Writ of New Testament Department. So, the first Council of the professors of the Faculty was formed chaired by the dean Archpriest Stephan Tsankov. In spring 1923, Academic Council of the Faculty formed the following tasks of theological education: 1) training decent clericals and church officers for Bulgarian Orthodox Church; 2) development and expansion of the Orthodox theology; 3) support of spiritual enlightenment in general. Classes at the Theological Faculty began in autumn 1923. A serious support for scientific and theological component of the Faculty was Professor N.N. Glubokovskiy who arrived in Sofia before the beginning of studies [15].

## **11. Theological education in Poland**

The Theological Faculty of the University of Warsaw was opened in 1924. The University of Warsaw had the Theological Faculty before the revolution, but it was closed. The new stage of the Theological Faculty of the University of Warsaw was started by the efforts of Metropolitan of Warsaw and Poland Dionysius (Valedinskiy), graduate and master of Theology of Kazan Theological Academy. Metropolitan Dionysius was the dean of the Theological Faculty, exercising spiritual guidance and developing the general line. The education matched the general university schedule but included some elements of the Russian pre-revolutionary church school. The Theological Faculty had two tasks: scientific theological education and pastoral training.

The best teachers were called for work together with those from the Humanitarian Faculty. But the corporation was made in a rapid way by the opening of the Faculty, so the professorship was diverse: graduates from various church and secular higher schools: Romanians, Ukrainians, Greeks and Russians. It was a failure to call big scientists as Russian emigrants settled in other countries by 1924 while living in Poland was not comfortable. Russians and Ukrainians were lecturing in Russian, Greeks – in French. Metropolitan Dionysius lectured Pastoral theology and Christian church art at the Theological Faculty. The Theological Faculty utilized the system of scientific theological attesting, although incomplete. PhD degree could not be obtained, graduates received the degree of Master of Theology upon passing all examinations and writing Master's thesis, approved by commission of professors. Those wishing to continue the scientific activity could write doctoral thesis at another faculty on that faculty's topic but having a theological component. Those wishing to teach often got pedagogical education at the University's Humanitarian Faculty simultaneously or upon graduating from the Theological Faculty [16].

The Theological Faculty of the University of Warsaw before the German-Polish war of 1939 prepared hundreds of theologically educated pastors, out of which 20 became bishops in war and post-war time and served in various church jurisdictions.

In Poland there also were two Orthodox Church schools in Kremenec and Vilna. Russian Orthodox Church schools in Poland were not supervised by Moscow Patriarchate, as Orthodox Church in Poland left the jurisdiction of the Russian Church. The conditions in which Russian Orthodox schools were working were hard; the government tried to polonize the Faculty and the school till outright ban to teach in Russian. The existence of those schools which were regarded by the Polish chauvinists, like all Russian Orthodox Church, as the shatters of the hated Russian Empire, was threatened but they were closed by Soviet or Nazi authorities during Poland's occupation.

In 1934, the Academic Committee of the Episcopal Synod of ROCOR was established chaired by Metropolitan Antonius (Khrapovitskiy) for coordination of theological and educational activity of ROCOR. The committee comprised: Archbishop of Berlin Tikhon (Lyaschenko) and professors N.N. Glubokovskiy, A.P. Dobroklonskiy, S.V. Troitskiy, N.S. Arseniev and M.V. Zazykin. That was one more unimplemented project of pre-revolutionary Russian Church school. After the death of metropolitan Antonius in 1936, the Committee was chaired by his successor Metropolitan Anastasius (Gribanovskiy), but soon the activity of the Committee was interrupted for some time. It recommenced its activity in 1940 chaired by Archbishop Tikhon comprising Archpriest Georgiy Florovskiy, professors S.V. Troitskiy and V.F. Fradinskiy.

## **12. Conclusions**

In autumn of 1922, over 60 scientists, political activists, writers, doctors and engineers were banished from Petrograd on board *Prussia* and *Oberburgermeister Haken* vessels. The issue on the exact number of the exiled is under discussion. Apparently, the true reason of the banishment of the intellectual elite was the desire of the Soviet regime to leave only one dominant ideology – the Soviet one [17].

The exile to some extent contributed to the revival of the Russian philosophical doctrine abroad. That allowed saving the lives of a lot of philosophers. Unknowingly, it facilitated the concentration of intellectuals including philosophers in the countries, which became cultural centres of the Russian émigré community. The events in Russia of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century made them to rethink a lot.

The second important factor of the development of philosophical doctrine of the Russian émigré community was the establishment of ROCOR and related discussion matters of canonicity, legitimacy from the standpoint of the church law. Nonetheless, that brought the Christian doctrine in the Russian foreign philosophy.

The results of this research may be used for teaching historical, historical clerical, philosophical disciplines. Some parts of this article were discussed among the professorship and teachers of Saint Sergius Theological institute in Paris.

The authors suggest their further research in 'Establishment of a new philosophical anthology on the basis of Orthodox theology of energies', 'Development of neopatriotic synthesis', 'Theological education in the Russian émigré community'.

Hence Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia managed to implement their Russian ideas in exile – although, in a modest way. The idea of theological education in university discussed in Russia, sought for by many representatives of the Russian spiritual school in some or other way was realized in the universities of the Slavic Europe with participation of Russian theologians. Some traditions of Russian Church schools were moved to those faculties, enabling to solve the tasks on theological training and education of clergymen. The latter has been much doubted in the discussion of university form of theological education, but the experience of Slavic universities showed that it was possible if extra efforts were applied for spiritual guardianship and supervision of students of theological faculties, getting them involved in the clerical life of Church.

## References

- [1] Y.I. Pivovarov, *Russian Émigré Community. Social and Historical Phenomenon, Role and Place in Cultural and Historical Heritage*, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, 2008.
- [2] A.V. Repnikov, *Archivist's Bulletin*, 4-5(94-95) (2006) 465-470.
- [3] V.G. Makarov and V.S. Khristoforov (eds.), *Exilement Instead of Shooting. Banishment of the Intellectuals in Documents of All-Russian Special Commission for Combating Counter-revolution, Sabotage, and Speculation – State Political Directorate. 1921-1923, Russkiy put'*, Moscow, 2005, 544.
- [4] A. Kostyukov, *Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia in the First Half of 1920s. Church Management Organization in Emigration*, Saint Tikhon's Orthodox University, Moscow, 2007, 39.
- [5] \*\*\*, *Acts of St. Patriarch Tikhon and Recent Documents on Succession of Supreme Church Power in 1917-1943*, Saint Tikhon's Orthodox University, Moscow, 1994.
- [6] I. Alfeyev, *Church in History*, Veche, Moscow, 2013, 274-341.
- [7] Y.S. Senokosov (ed.), *Georgiy Florovskiy: Clergyman, Theologian, Philosopher*, Progress, Moscow, 1995, 416.
- [8] G. Florovskiy, *Ways of the Russian Theology*, YMKA-PRESS, Paris, 1983, 57.
- [9] P. Prospero, *Return to Fathers: Sources Chretiennes*, Proc. of International Theological Conference 'Orthodox Theology and West in XX century', Moscow Patriarchate of the ROC, Moscow, 2004, 75-94.
- [10] S.S. Khoruzhiy, *Philosophic Ideas of the Russian Émigré Community*, in *Cultural Heritage of the Russian émigré community*, Vol. 1, Russian Ministry of Culture, Moscow, 1994, 233-240.
- [11] V. Đuriž, *Letopis Srpske Pravoslavne Crkve 1946-1958*, Vol. 1, Serbian Orthodox Church, Belgrade, 2000, 352-360.
- [12] P. Puzovič, *Izdvajanje Bogoslovskogo Fakulteta iz Sastava Beogradskogo Universiteta*, in *Srpska Pravoslavna Crkva: Prilozi za Istoriju*, Vol. 2, Serbian Orthodox Church, Belgrade, 2001, 277-295.

- [13] I. Savitskiy, *Prague and Foreign Russia (Sketches on the Russian Émigré Community in 1918-1938)*, Saratov State Technical University, Prague, 2002, 154.
- [14] N.A. Struve (ed.), *Santa Sophia Brotherhood: Files and Documents, 1923-1939*, Russian way: YMCA-PRESS, Moscow, 2000.
- [15] Metropolitan of Sofia Stephen, *Church Bulletin of West European Episcopacy*, **6-7** (1937) 14-18.
- [16] A. Martos, *On Christ's Field*, Holy Trinity Orthodox Mission, Minsk, 2003, 547, online at [churchby.info/rus/98/3](http://churchby.info/rus/98/3).
- [17] M.V. Maksimov, *Soloviev's Studies*, **37** (2013) 184-190.