

History of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia from Its Beginning to the Present (1983)

[Including additions from 1988 and 1992-1993]

By Dr. Gernot (Fr. George) Seide

Translated from the German by Jacqueline Xenia Endres-Nenchin
with the assistance of Reader Isaac Lambertsen

Edited by Hierodeacon Samuel Nedelsky and Reader Isaac Lambertsen

<http://www.rocorstudies.org/2012/02/15/gernot-seide-history-of-the-russian-orthodox-church-outside-russia-from-its-beginning-to-the-present-1983/>

PART I

The Establishment and Structure of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia until 1944/1945

Chapter 1

The Russian Civil War and the Establishment of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration (1919-1920)

Throughout the course of history, many events and people have received from posterity the sobriquet “the Great,” while their contemporaries never attained it. Without a doubt, this held true of the events in Petrograd in 1917, when the “Great Socialist October Revolution” broke out a rather local event, which the populace of the city would hardly have noticed. During the storming of the Winter Palace, where an incompetent government with several officers’ schools and a battalion of women were “entrenched,” the theatres, restaurants and Petrograd salons were well attended, just as on any other evening.

In all probability, the entire event which took place in Petrograd on October 25th would have faded into obscurity, had the political powers in Russia, which had governed the nation from March of 1917, merely enacted a reform program that would have gained the approval of the hungry and war-weary populace primarily in the cities. (The rural population accepted whatever was decided in the cities). The Bolshevik decrees and declarations on peace, reform, national self-determination and so forth were not real programs, but rather promises made in order to mobilize the people to side with the new rulers. That, despite these promises, the Bolsheviks did not succeed in converting the population to its “new politics” is apparent in the election of representatives to the Constituent Assembly on 25 November/8 December 1917. The Socialist and Social Democratic parties received 62% of the vote, the Bolsheviks 25%, and the Citizens 13%. Of the 715 delegates, only 183 were Bolsheviks, who nonetheless claimed to represent the majority of the people. They did not represent the majority either in the spring of 1918 or in the time of Stalin and his successors. The Bolsheviks, however, were able to rely on the support of the armed forces in Petrograd; so after eight days of heavy fighting in Moscow with the aid and support of armed workers and soldiers, they prevented the elected representatives of the people from establishing parliamentary democracy in Russia in January of 1918. When within a few weeks, it became obvious that the Party dictatorship they had created would not find favor with the people, the Civil War broke out, bringing the country, already sorely racked by war and hunger, to the brink of ruin. When it was over, the nation’s industry was in a state of total collapse and a horrible famine had begun, in which millions of people perished.

The dissolution of the Assembly revealed the Bolsheviks in a clear light to the vast majority of the population. The German advance into the Baltic provinces and Ukraine resulted in the loss of this territory to Russia, inasmuch as the people of these lands were then able to avail themselves of Lenin’s decree on national self-determination. In the south of the country, the Don Cossacks proclaimed an independent Republic of the Don, which was able to survive for a mere few weeks

before its suppression by the Reds, when its defensive measures dissolved amid partisan infighting.

It was certain, however, that within, at most, a few weeks after the Bolsheviks had seized power, resistance rose up everywhere in the country. In the spring of 1918, this resistance turned into the Civil War. With the support of troops from the Entente nations, the “Whites” pressed towards Moscow from the south, the west, the north and the east. In the summer of 1918, the north (General Miller), the Baltic States (General Yudenich), the Ukraine and Southern Russia (Generals Denikin and Krasnov), Siberia and eastern portions of European Russia (Admiral Kolchak), and a large part of the southern Volga Region (the Cossacks), were in the hands of anti-Bolshevist forces.

The political division of Russia into two opposing camps posed enormous problems for the Church leadership. The Church’s faithful were living on both sides of the front. Thus, it is understandable that, for most of the population, Patriarch Tikhon embodied Church unity and united all believers in one flock. “Thus, he was cherished and loved by Christians on both sides of the front. He was also the embodiment of the popular conscience. “One listened to his voice as if it came from heaven.” ¹

The great esteem in which the Patriarch ² was held by his faithful required him to be extremely cautious politically and to avoid supporting any one party. For him, as for the whole Church, the Civil War was fratricide, the enemy, the disruption and disunity of the people. This stance, however, did not mean that the Patriarch remained silent during the victimization and persecution of the Church by the Bolsheviks. His letter of 19 January 1918, in which the Communists were anathematized, excoriated the crimes of the new rulers. On the first anniversary of the October Revolution, 25 October 1918, the Patriarch released another letter which was addressed directly to the Soviet government. It began with the words “All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.” He continued by saying that “the streams of the blood of our brothers, who are being murdered without mercy on your command, cry out to heaven and compel us to direct this bitter word of truth to you... You have split the entire nation into opposing camps. No one feels safe; everyone lives in constant fear of house searches, plundering, expulsion, arrest, execution. The defenseless have been arrested by the thousands; they are forced to languish in prison for months; they are put to death. Not only those who have in some way opposed you are put to death but also those who are innocent and have been imprisoned by you only as hostages. These unfortunate ones have been killed out of vengeance for these crimes which were not only not committed by those of like mind with them but were often perpetrated by your own partisans or sympathizers. Bishops, priests, monks, and nuns are being executed who have in no way transgressed. You have promised freedom... The freedom which you have granted consists of the satisfaction of the baser instincts of the rabble, of freedom from punishment for murder and theft... Where is freedom of speech and the press? Where is the freedom of preaching in church? Many bold preachers have already paid for their courage with the blood of martyrdom. What else can I say? I would not have enough time to describe all the sufferings which have befallen our homeland.” ³ The Patriarch concluded his

letter with an exhortation for a turn-about and a call to use the anniversary of the Revolution to halt the shedding of blood, to put an end to acts of violence and the devastation.

This letter was a stern lecture for the new rulers, whose terror against the Church in the course of a year had attained frightening proportions. Numerous hierarchs, including Metropolitan Vladimir of Kiev, Archbishop Andronicus of Perm, Archbishop Hermogeneses of Tobolsk, Archbishop Ephraim of Selenginsk, Archbishop Basil of Chernigov, Bishop Theophanes of Solikamsk, and countless clergymen, monks, and nuns had fallen victim to the persecution.⁴ Yet the Patriarch did not confine himself to the spoken word when defending members of the Church. When the news of the assassination of the Imperial Family reached Moscow, he served a memorial service for the slain, and then a Liturgy for the departed. In his sermon, he condemned the murder, which had, without due process of law, shed the blood of the imperial children. He emphasized that while the politics of the Emperor might be deplored, killing him could only be characterized as a criminal offense. Likewise, the Patriarch spoke out on behalf of the faithful and prayed for the innocent victims of the Revolution and the Civil War.

The aforementioned declarations did not constitute the Patriarch's principal political stance, as his opponents frequently charged. They could not be viewed as the political creed of one of the two Parties involved in the Civil War. They were pleas that the Patriarch, as behooved the head of the Church and a priest, was compelled to issue in order to plead for an end to murder and crime throughout the country. What the Patriarch imposed on himself, he also required of his priests. On 25 September 1919, he issued a decree forbidding all clergy from becoming politically involved in any way with the Civil War.⁵ The gravity of this decree can be measured by noting that the Patriarch refused to bless the weapons of the White Army when asked to do so. If individual bishops and priests displayed partiality, one can hardly fault the Patriarch, inasmuch as such instances occurred on the territory of the White Guard. After the outbreak of the Civil War, contact across the front for all intents and purposes ceased. There was no news from the other side. Neither was there the possibility of personal contact, nor the exchange of news along the way by journalists, nor any other means of communication.

For the Church leadership, the situation was further complicated by the fact that the Synod and the Patriarch were hindered from exercising their proper authority and were greatly distanced from the faithful. There existed only a loose relationship with the dioceses located in territories controlled by the Bolsheviks; the dioceses located in White Army territories were completely cut off. The bishops were forced to rule their dioceses autonomously. Thus, it was only natural that the bishops on each side maintained contacts with one another and strove for a joint administration to guarantee an orderly church life.

The bishops who found themselves within the territory held by Admiral Kolchak and his troops – the greater part of Siberia and the provinces of the Far East – attempted to establish just such a joint (centralized) ecclesiastical administration in Omsk. Almost nothing is known of this administration's decisions and participants.

The second center of ecclesiastical administration existed in southern Russia and included all the dioceses within the territory controlled by Generals Denikin, Krasnov and Wrangel. This church

administration was located first in Novocherkassk, then in Ekaterinodar, and finally in Novorossisk. The area stretched across the territory from Orel to Kursk on the Ukrainian border and then in an easterly and more southerly direction in a line between Orel, Voronezh, and Tsaritsyn to Astrakhan and the Caspian Sea. North of Astrakhan lay a narrow strip held by the Red Guards. It was this which prevented a connection between the regions of the White Guard in southern Russia and the region controlled by General Kolchak. Also, the ecclesiastical administrations in Omsk and Novocherkassk were unable to form any relationship with one another.⁶

The ecclesiastical administration of southern Russia traces its establishment to a council that was held between 18-24 May 1919 in Stavropol.⁷ The idea of convening this council was Archpriest Shavel'sky's, and its objective was to put ecclesiastical relations in southern Russia in order. The council was convened by Archbishop Agathadorus of Stavropol, the senior hierarch in southern Russia. Sixty-eight people took part: eleven hierarchs, twenty-two priests, one monk, and thirty-four laymen. The bishops were Agapetus, Archbishop of Ekaterinoslav and Mariupol; Agathadorus, Archbishop of the Caucasus and Stavropol; Arsenius, Bishop of Azov and Taganrog; Gabriel, Bishop of Chelyabinsk and Troitsa; Hermogenes, Bishop of Adsay; Demetrius, Archbishop of Tavurien and Simferopol; John, Bishop of the Kuban and Ekaterinodar; Macarius, Bishop of Vladikavkaz and Mosdok; Metrophanes, Archbishop of the Don and Novocherkassk; Michael, Bishop of Alexandrovsk; and Sergius, Bishop of Sukhumi. All these bishops were on the territory of the White Russian Army of the South. All participants in the Pan-Russia Council of 1917-18 who were in southern Russia were also invited, as well as members from each diocesan council. The most important question to be deliberated by the Council was the future administrative organization of the ecclesiastical life of southern Russia. It was decided that the dioceses represented would jointly exercise autonomy, inasmuch as the Civil War made it impossible to have any normal relations with the Patriarch and the Holy Synod in Moscow. The provisional administration, to be called the "Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration" (SEA), was to have its seat in Novocherkassk, and would be under the leadership of Archbishop Metrophanes (Krasnopolsky) of Novocherkassk. His deputy was Archbishop Demetrius. In addition to them, the administration also comprised Archpriests G. Shavel'sky and A. Rozhdestvensky, Count V. Musin-Pushkin and Professor P. Verkhovensky.⁸ At the Council, a series of administrative changes were also made; the Vicariates of Kuban, Rostov, Sukhumi, and Chernomorsk were made independent dioceses. (The diocesan bishops of Stavropol, the Don and Tiflis, to whose dioceses these vicariates had belonged, protested these decisions in vain.)⁹

The administrative divisions were necessary and sensible for practical reasons, in that the dioceses in question encompassed vast areas. Before 1917, out of financial considerations, the borders of each diocese were left unchanged, although the necessity of creating new dioceses was recognized by all.¹⁰ It was significant that, from the point of view of canon law, the right to establish new dioceses and to change the borders of old ones, belonged to the Patriarch and the Holy Synod alone. Patriarch Tikhon's subsequent confirmation of the Stavropol decisions was tantamount to a recognition of the legitimacy of the Council and of the SEA by the leadership of the Russian Church. The Patriarch thereby also recognized the right of the SEA to create its own

dioceses for those territories that were under its jurisdictional authority. This fact was of particular significance for the later measures taken by the SEA and played an important role in the schism of the West European Diocese of Metropolitan Eulogius (Georgievsky) and of the North American Diocese of Metropolitan Platon (Rozhdestvensky).

As proof of Patriarch Tikhon's and the Holy Synod's recognition of the decisions of the Stavropol Council is the fact that all the resolutions concerning administrative changes in southern Russia were entered in the Synodal register of the Russian Church in Moscow, and thereby received the approbation of the Church's leadership. ¹¹

The competence of the Council in canonical authority was neither at this point in time nor for some time thereafter, questioned by any Church authority. Only after the schism of Metropolitan Eulogius and Metropolitan Platon in 1926, was the Church Abroad's right to create new dioceses challenged.

In November of 1919, the head of the SEA, Archbishop Metrophanes, summoned all the bishops who were on the territory of southern Russia to a Council in Novocherkassk. Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky) of Kiev and Galich was also asked to participate. Due to the fighting in and around Kiev, Metropolitan Anthony's departure was delayed; he, therefore, requested a few days postponement of the episcopal conference. He departed Kiev on 4 November, arrived in Kharkov on 7 November, then continued on via Taganrog and the Don to Novocherkassk. In Taganrog, the Metropolitan had a brief meeting with General Denikin. ¹²

The session in Novocherkassk lasted three days. Twelve bishops in all took part, among them Metropolitan Anthony, who, as the senior hierarch, presided over the meeting, and Archbishops George, Metrophanes, Demetrius, the Bishops Theodore, Alexis, Arsenius, Benjamin, and Hermogenes. The assembly made a number of important decisions:

1. Archbishop Agapetus (Vishnevsky) of Ekaterinoslav would be retired;
2. Bishop Hermogenes (Maximov) would take charge of the diocese; ¹³
3. Bishop John (Levitsky) ¹⁴ of Kuban was brought before an ecclesiastical court, and because he had violated the Church's canons, he was retired and sent to a monastery;
4. Bishop Demetrius of Uman, vicar bishop of Kiev, was to take over the diocese and was to be simultaneously elevated to the rank of the archbishop;
5. The Vicariate of Uman was to be taken over by Archimandrite Vitalius (Vvedensky), whose consecration was to take place on the following Sunday.

Bishop Demetrius and Archimandrite Vitalius were sent telegrams informing them of these decisions, but they did not receive them; thus, these appointments were never carried out. The temporary administration of the diocese of Kuban, until the arrival of Bishop Demetrius, was assumed by Metropolitan Anthony, who on 6 December had learned that Kiev had been conquered by the Bolsheviks, making his return to his diocese impossible. ¹⁵ After the Bolsheviks had advanced to Taganrog and Rostov, Metropolitan Anthony transferred his residence to Ekaterinodar, the city to which the SEA had also moved in the meantime. The SEA

remained in Ekaterinodar for a few weeks and was again moved – this time to Novorossisk, where in the course of the subsequent weeks numerous clergy, driven away by the Reds, arrived. In September of 1920, the SEA retreated with the remainder of the White Guard from Novorossisk to the Crimea. From there they undertook a journey lasting several months to Constantinople, Athens, and Mt. Athos (during which time Metropolitan Anthony returned to Russia).¹⁶

In Simferopol¹⁷ on the Crimea, the last session of the SEA before what proved to be its withdrawal from Russia took place in October of 1920. The session was presided over by Metropolitan Anthony and made a few more far-reaching decisions, including the consecration of Archimandrite Seraphim (Sobolev) as Bishop of Boguchar.¹⁸ More significant, however, was the decision to appoint Archbishop Anastasius (Gribanovsky)¹⁹ as Head of the Russian community in Constantinople and as representative of the SEA to the Ecumenical Patriarchate.²⁰

Furthermore, it was decided at the session that Archbishop Eulogius (Georgievsky)²¹ would take over the administration of the Russian communities in Western Europe. This appointment was at the written request of Eulogius, who thereby recognized the competence of the SEA also over non-Russian territory. This decision, however, was not executed at that time because the appropriate communique did not reach Archbishop Eulogius before the evacuation.²² Several weeks later, on 6 November (O.S.), 1920, General Wrangel's Supreme Command of the White Russian Army, the SEA, and more than 150,000 Russian refugees arrived in Constantinople on more than 125 ships.²³

Thus, the first phase of the history of the SEA ended. In May of 1919, they had begun with the decision to organize a joint ecclesiastical administration. After several subsequent sessions, the final one took place in October of 1920 in Simferopol.

In the few months following its establishment, the SEA had acted as a self-sufficient and independent Church by numerous decisions, such as the creation of new dioceses, the nomination and transfer of bishops, and the restoration of relations with Sister Churches (Archbishop Anastasius being named as representative to the Ecumenical Patriarch, and Archbishop Eulogius in August of 1920, as representative of the Russian Church the World Christian Congress). It had exercised the rights that, after the Pan-Russia Council of 1917-18, only the Patriarch and the Holy Synod had the competence to do. Thus, it raised the question of whether this governing body was in violation of the Church's canons or with the blessing and consent of the Patriarch – albeit after the fact. In retrospect, when studying the conduct of the supreme ecclesiastical leadership in Moscow regarding the decisions of the southern Russian SEA, one must come to the conclusion that the Patriarch and the Holy Synod concurred with the SEA. Had the Patriarch and the Holy Synod disapproved of the way the southern Russian Ecclesiastical Administration acted and viewed these acts as a usurpation of their authority by these bishops and as a violation of Church canons, they could have annulled all the decisions of the Stavropol Council and all subsequent councils.

The fact that the ecclesiastical leadership in Moscow did not, however, distance themselves from the decisions and resolutions of the southern Russian SEA is certainly confirmed by the entry

into the Synodal Register of these decisions; this can only be viewed as the subsequent approval of the Patriarch. Official confirmation of the Stavropol Council by the Patriarch would have been extremely unwise politically, in that the Bolsheviks would have interpreted it as a collaboration by the Patriarch with the counter-revolutionary forces. This accusation could have been founded on the mere fact that the majority of bishops who had participated in the sessions of the southern Russian SEA had emigrated and thereby made their opposition to the new regime quite clear. After the establishment of the Church Abroad, the southern Russian SEA and the Stavropol Council were still denounced by the Bolsheviks as a “counter-revolutionary, White Guard union.”²⁴

If one must view the conduct of the Moscow ecclesiastical leadership as an indirect confirmation of the SEA, so can the decree Number 362 of 7/20 November 1920, issued by the Patriarch and Holy Synod, be interpreted as subsequent written approval. The date of issuance is significant: It was issued after the evacuation of the White Russian troops and the SEA had been accomplished. The emigres were on the high seas when the Patriarch and the Holy Synod composed this document, which to this day the Church Abroad considers to be its Magna Carta. The decisive section which the Church Abroad gives as the basis for their canonical existence reads: “If a diocese loses contact with the Supreme Central Ecclesiastical Administration or the same [the Patriarch and the Holy Synod in Moscow] for some reason discontinues its activities, then the diocesan bishop should unite with the bishops in neighboring dioceses in order to organize a higher body of ecclesiastical authority... If this should prove to be impossible, then the diocesan bishop should himself exercise full control.” This document²⁵ by the Patriarch confirmed the establishment of the SEA in southern Russia after the fact. Had it been issued in May of 1919, the Patriarch’s directive would have directly called for the establishment to the SEA. However, the question remains: What sense did this decree make in November of 1920 after the evacuation of the SEA? The answer to this can only be that therewith the Patriarch wanted to provide additional guidance for the future. The date of the decree may be explained by the fact that the ecclesiastical leadership in Moscow might have become aware of the existence of the SEA of southern Russia and its decisions only shortly before they formulated the new directive. As was already mentioned, there was no form of contact between the Whites and Reds. In consequence of the Bolshevik conquest of the territory in the south of Russia, the Patriarch might have for the first time learned of the Church events in this territory and of the hierarchs who had collaborated in those decisions and who were still living in those territories. The decree itself was issued but a few weeks after the conquest of this territory so that a connection between the decree and the church events in southern Russia cannot be ruled out.

On the other hand, the contents of this document should not be limited to the southern Russian Church Authority alone. During these weeks of turmoil, many diocesan bishops were prevented from having direct contact with the Moscow ecclesiastical leadership and were forced to reach their own decisions on many occasions. Thus, by his decree, the Patriarch legalized the activities of the ecclesiastical administration completely. There was nothing new in the Church’s situation in the autumn of 1920 [Trans.: nothing, that is, which would otherwise have precipitated this decree].

On this basis, one may find a direct connection between the ecclesial events in southern Russia during the eighteen months from May of 1919 – November of 1920, the Bolshevik conquest of this territory in the autumn of 1920, and Decree No. 362 of 7/20 November 1920, even though today we can only present conjecture concerning the real motivation for the decree since the archives of the Holy Synod (in Moscow) are not accessible to us.

Footnotes

1. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte Rußlands der neuesten Zeit*, Band 1. Munich-Salzburg, 1965. p. 131. ↵
2. Rößler, *Kirche und Revolution*; Vinogradov, “Über einige sehr wichtige Augenblicke”; J. Chrysostomus, *Gedanken*; Felmy, *Patriarch Tichon*; Swan, *Patriarch Tikhon*. ↵
3. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 1, pp. 365-370. ↵
4. Pol’sky, *Mucheniki*; Regel’son, *Tragedia*. ↵
5. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6: pp. 56-58. ↵
6. *Russ. Prav.* Ts, 1: p. 25; “Kanonicheskoe polozenie” 10. ↵
7. Kandidov, *Belogvardeiskii Sobor*. This work, published in Moscow in 1930, tries to prove the counterrevolutionary character of the Stavropol Council. If one overlooks the propagandistic goal of this book, it can be considered one of the best sources on this Council in evaluating all the Council’s acts. ↵
8. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6: pp. 56-58. ↵
9. D’Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, p. 1; *erk. Ved.* (1926) 15-16: p. 15. ↵
10. Before the Revolution there were only 65 dioceses in the Russian Empire to which Poland and Finland belonged. In the 1950s there were 73 dioceses. Today (1980) there are 65, of which only 57 are administered by their own ruling bishops. ↵
11. D’Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, p. 14/ ↵
12. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 4: pp. 293-299. ↵
13. Bishop Hermogenes emigrated to Yugoslavia and was a member of the Synod of Bishops from 1922. ↵
14. Bishop John joined the Renovationists in 1923, cf. Regel’son, *Tragedia*. ↵
15. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 4: pp. 299-300. ↵
16. *Ibid*, pp. 313-321. ↵
17. *Ibid*, p. 321. ↵
18. Bishop Seraphim was named head of the Russian communities in Bulgaria, cf. Ch.4, 1.1, 2 Chapter IV. ↵

19. Archbishop Anastasius — from 1935 Metropolitan — was Metropolitan Anthony's successor and First Hierarchy of the Church Abroad from 1936. ↵
20. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, p. 14. ↵
21. Archbishop of Volynia and from 1922 Metropolitan, cf. Biography Section. ↵
22. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, pp. 14-15. ↵
23. The full text of the document is in the document section. ↵
24. Kandidov, *Tserkovno-belogvardeiskii sobor*. ↵
25. The full text of the document is in the document section. ↵

Part I. Chapter 2

From the Time of the Evacuation of the SEA until the Resettlement in Sremsky-Karlovtsy (November 1920 – July 1921)

At the beginning of November 1920, the Red Army had almost entirely conquered the White Russian territory in the south. The remnant of the White Army left the Crimea on 6/19 November. On 125 ships – including 66 warships and 9 passenger ships – 150,000 people evacuated. The remainder of these refugees consisted of some 100,000 soldiers, 20,000 women, and approximately 7,000 children. The rest of the refugees included thousands of people who had been a part of the old administration and government: officials, office workers, teachers, professors, as well as clergy, monks and nuns. ¹

The exact number of Russian emigres after World War I has never been precisely established. Estimates vary between one million and two and a half million. This wide discrepancy indicates that the authorities in the countries which harbored them, and later the refugee organization of League of Nations, undertook census registrations at different times. One example may clarify this: The “German-Russian Union” in May of 1919 counted 60,000 – 80,000 Russian refugees who had left their homeland before the end of the Civil War. ² In December of 1920, the German section of the American Red Cross counted 560,000 Russians in Germany, while other censuses spoke of 300,000 emigres. ³ Many of these emigres traveled to other countries after a stay of only a few weeks. Their ranks swelled at the outbreak of the 1921 famine in the Soviet Union, so that in 1921 the Russian Archive in Prague gave the number of Russians in Germany as 230,000 – 250,000, while by contrast, in Germany the Ministry of State for the Interior (Reichsministerium des Inneren) only listed 50,000 – 80,000. ⁴ These statistics in Germany alone, which played a special role as a place of transit for many emigres, give an indication of how difficult the counting of Russian refugees was.

For the year 1928, there is a count by “The Refugee Inspection of the International Labor Office of the League of Nations,” which numbered the Russian emigres in the world at 919,000. The Refugee Inspection of the International Labor Office of the League of Nations divided the Russian refugees in each country as follows: ⁵

France	400,000
Germany	150,000
Poland	90,000
China	76,000
Latvia	40,000
Yugoslavia *	36,380
Czechoslovakia	30,000
Bulgaria	26,494

Lithuania 10,000

Other Countries 20,000

**Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, & Slovenes*

This list omits completely, for example, the U.S.A., Africa, and Asia. In Manchuria alone, 120,000 –160,000 Russians lived; they were not included in the list of the League of Nations. ⁶ If one adds these refugees, and especially those who then lived in the U.S.A. and in South America, to the International Labor Office of the League of Nations list, at the end of the 1920s there would have been well over one and a half million Russians who had left their homeland since 1917 and lived outside of the Soviet Union. ⁷

The greater part of these refugees came from those areas that were traditionally Orthodox. If one considers that among the refugees there were also very many who were not attached to the Church, then one can count the Orthodox emigres at over one million. This large number alone justifies its own ecclesiastical administration for the care of the faithful who found themselves in non-Orthodox countries.

The first session of the evacuated SEA took place on 6/19 November 1920, aboard the ship “The Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich”, during the crossing to Constantinople. At this session the following hierarchs, who sailed with the flotilla, took part: Metropolitan Anthony, Metropolitan Platon of Kherson and Odessa, Archbishop Theophanes of Poltava and Pereyaslav, Bishop Benjamin of Sevastopol, head of the military chaplains on land and at sea, ⁸ and Archpriest G. Spassky. The participants in this session decided that the SEA should be concerned with the future religious needs of the many refugees in the “various parts of the world,” because the refugees desired to have no further relations with Soviet Russia and were unable to establish any contact with the remnant of the Holy Synod headed by the Patriarch. The seat of the SEA should be in Constantinople; therefore, official contact with the Patriarch of Constantinople should be established. This ecclesiastical body should, by summoning other members, be expanded, and all ways and means should be exhausted to inform Patriarch Tikhon of the establishment of this organization. A further session of the Synod was to take place in Constantinople on 9/22 November. ⁹ Among these initial decisions, the SEA’s promise to care for all the refugees in the world was significant. This declaration was also cosigned by Metropolitan Platon, who later renounced the Synod of Bishops’ jurisdiction over North America.

In the next session, which took place in Constantinople, Archbishop Anastasius became a member of the Ecclesiastical Administration. At the session of 16/29 November, Metropolitan Anthony and Bishop Benjamin were assigned the task of establishing official relations between the SEA and the Ecumenical Patriarch. ¹⁰

On 22 December 1920, the Ecumenical Patriarchate issued the Decree No. 9084, in which he granted the Russian bishops full authority to order the ecclesiastical and religious problems of the Russian emigres on the territory of the Patriarch’s jurisdiction. This full authority gave the Russian hierarchs a virtually autonomous status in ordering their Church life. The Patriarchate, however, retained oversight and the sole competence to rule on the divorces of Russian faithful.

In practice, the Russian bishops in Constantinople administered the Russian communities completely independently of the Patriarch and considered the area as their own diocese at the head of which stood Archbishop Anastasius, who had been the representative of the SEA since the autumn of 1920. In the immediate vicinity of the capital, there were over twenty churches in the Russian camps; another ten churches were on the island of Lemnos; and in Gallipoli, where a portion of the refugee soldiers were quartered.

The SEA maintained its official seat in Constantinople for approximately half a year, from November of 1920 through May of 1921. Metropolitan Anthony was the President of the SEA until 3/16 February 1921; then, after his departure for Yugoslavia, Archbishop Anastasius represented the President until the relocation to Sremsky-Karlovtsy. The composition of the SEA remained unchanged until the resettlement in Yugoslavia and consisted of Metropolitans Anthony and Platon, Archbishops Anastasius and Theophanes, and Bishop Benjamin. ¹¹

In January 1921, the SEA renewed the decision it had made in the autumn of 1920 to appoint Metropolitan Eulogius administrator of the Russian communities in Western Europe, as these communities were no longer able to have any contact with their bishop. Before the outbreak of the Revolution, all of these communities were administered by the Metropolitan of Petrograd. As it was no longer possible for Metropolitan Benjamin (Kazansky, who was executed by the Bolsheviks in 1922) ¹² to rule the affairs of those communities outside of the country, the SEA decided to entrust Metropolitan Eulogius with the direction of these communities. The official installment of Metropolitan Eulogius by Metropolitan Anthony took place on 2/15 April 1921, although already in March Archbishop Eulogius was commemorated at the divine services throughout Western Europe, instead of the Metropolitan of Petrograd. In practice, this elevated these communities to the level of a diocese. In a letter dated 2 April, Eulogius was granted the rights of a diocesan bishop. In addition to the Western European communities, he was also entrusted with the embassy churches in Sofia and Bucharest. This also meant that all other churches in the Balkans and in Asia were the direct responsibility of the SEA. All of these decisions were only to remain valid until such time as proper relations with the Patriarch could be restored. ¹³ Not long after, at the request of the Berlin communities, Eulogius appointed Archimandrite Tikhon (Lyashchenko), ¹⁴ who had been the rector of the Embassy Chapel in Sofia, rector in Berlin, and Bishop Seraphim (Sobolev) took over the administration in Sofia. This appointment was later modified by the SEA, giving Bishop Seraphim jurisdiction over all Russian communities in Bulgaria, subject to the SEA in turn. These administrative changes were accepted by Eulogius. ¹⁵

Without a doubt, the SEA appointed Eulogius to his position. At that point in time, Eulogius also did not contest his own appointment, thereby recognizing the jurisdiction of the SEA. During his stay in Berlin, on 2 May, he was asked about these proceedings by a delegation from the Russian communities. To the question as to whether he had received his appointment from the Patriarch, he answered "No." At the invitation of the delegation to ascertain that this appointment was in agreement with the Church's canons, Eulogius in his episcopal authority had to prove that his appointment was canonical. ¹⁶

Up to this point in time, Archbishop Eulogius still did not know that his nomination was also to be confirmed by the Patriarch and the Holy Synod. The confirmation of Eulogius came about as a result of an inquiry by the Archpriest I. Smirnov, the rector of the St. Alexander Nevsky Church in Paris. Archpriest Smirnov had doubted the validity of the SEA, and through the mediation of Archbishop Seraphim (Lukianov) of Finland,¹⁷ he addressed the Patriarch. At the session on 26 March/8 April 1921, the Patriarch and the Holy Synod confirmed Eulogius's appointment, thereby simultaneously recognizing the jurisdiction of the SEA for the Russian communities abroad.¹⁸

The appointment of Bishop Seraphim (Sobolev), which followed in August of 1921, as head of the Russian communities in Bulgaria, including the embassy chapel in Sofia, was likewise recognized by Eulogius, who surrendered his supervision thereof (which he had been assigned in April).¹⁹

In April, the SEA again met in Constantinople. The session lasted only two days. Bishop Benjamin was charged with establishing a commission, which would develop a program for deepening the religious consciousness of the emigration. Among other things, the commission proposed to convene a Pan-Diaspora Council (Russkoe Zagranichnoe Tserkovnoe Sobranie) in Karlovtsy, in November of 1921. To prepare for this church assembly, a preparatory committee was set up under the leadership of Archbishop Theophanes (Bystrov).²⁰ In July of 1921, he summoned the SEA to another session and presented the results of his commission's work for discussion.²¹ The next meeting of the SEA took place in Sremsky-Karlovtsy (Yugoslavia). At this meeting, in addition to a discussion of the commission's work, the SEA decided upon the renaming of this church governing body which was still officially entitled "The Southern Russian Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration." The new name was "The Supreme Russian Church Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad" (Vyshee Russkoe Tserkovnoe Upravlenie Zagranitsei). Through this new moniker, the stipulation "abroad" was clearly defined. The new administration consisted of Metropolitan Anthony as the President and Metropolitan Platon (Rozhdestvensky), Archbishop Theophanes (Bystrov), Bishop Gabriel (Chepur), Bishop Michael (Kosmodamiansky) and Bishop Benjamin (Fedchenko), and, as secretaries, E. Makharoblidze and T. Ametistov.²²

Until the convening of the Council of Karlovtsy, the "Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad" was faced with still more decisions on behalf of the Russian emigration: in July of 1921, they made the Vicariate of Alaska an independent diocese over the protest of the ruling diocesan bishop, Archbishop Alexander (Nemolovsky).²³ This happened with the consent of Patriarch Tikhon, who permitted the SEA to choose its own candidate for the new episcopal see. Metropolitan Anthony chose Archimandrite Anthony (Dashkevich),²⁴ rector of the Russian parish in Copenhagen.²⁵ In August, the SEA registered all emigres in the church registers and circulated directives for all church pastors and military chaplains to increase church dues.²⁶ In addition, they appealed to all the clergy in Western Europe, Turkey, and Bulgaria, to the Archbishop of North America, and to the bishops in China and Japan, to take up collections for the victims of the famine in the Soviet Union.²⁷ In September, the SEA appointed Metropolitan Anthony as leader of the Russian communities in Yugoslavia.²⁸

No one protested against any of these directives, nor did anyone question the validity of the jurisdiction of the SEA. With their appeals and directives, they turned directly to the individual parishes and parish priests, passing over the ruling bishops. They thereby exercised the same authority in the parishes of the emigration as the Patriarch did within Russia. In addition to this, their authority extended over all the Russian communities which had existed before the Revolution (Western Europe), and furthermore over those individual diocesan bishops whose full authority had stemmed from the Russian Church before 1917: the Dioceses of Finland, North America, China and Japan.

Thus, the jurisdiction of the SEA was recognized by the emigre bishops, who had in part personally collaborated in the decisions of the SEA: Metropolitans Anthony of Kiev and Platon of Odessa, Archbishops Theophanes of Poltava, Anastasius of Kishinev, Eulogius of Volynia, and Bishops Gabriel of Chelyabinsk, Michael of Alexandrovsk, Benjamin of Sevastopol, Seraphim of Boguchar (Lubny), Theophanes of Kursk, Apollinary of Belgorod, Sergy of Sukhumi, Damian of Tsaritsyn, Metrophanes of Sumi and Hermogenes of Aksay.²⁹

In addition to this, the SEA was recognized by the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Serbia, and it maintained relations with the Orthodox Churches of Greece and Bulgaria. Over the course of the next months, they made contact with yet other bishops, who had been consecrated before the Revolution but had because of changes in the political situation and national boundaries found themselves abroad after 1918; these hierarchs, among whom were the bishops in the new Baltic States, in Finland, Poland, Japan, China, and America,³⁰ recognized the SEA as the highest ecclesiastical administrative organ for the emigration.

Footnotes

1. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5:5. ↵
2. Volkmann, p. 4. ↵
3. Ibid, p. 5. ↵
4. Ibid. ↵
5. Ibid, p. 6. ↵
6. Seide, *ROK in China*, p. 182. ↵
7. A whole series of autocephalous Orthodox Churches, including the ancient Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch, the Orthodox churches in Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Church of Cyprus are numerically smaller. ↵
8. Compare the biographies of these hierarchs in Part VI. ↵
9. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, pp. 6-7. ↵
10. Ibid., p. 8. ↵
11. Ibid., pp. 11-15. ↵

12. On the fate of Metropolitan Benjamin cf. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 1:161-166, 218-221; Struve, *Christen*, pp. 39-41; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6: pp. 70-72; Polsky, *Mucheniki*, 1: 25 ff. ↵
13. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 375-376. ↵
14. From 1924 Bishop of Potsdam, cf. Part VI. ↵
15. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, p. 18. ↵
16. "Protokol delagatsii berlinskago prikhoda, prinyatoi preosvyashchennym Evlogiem 2-ogo maya 1921 goda" (quotation taken from D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, p. 17, note 3). ↵
17. From 1927-1945 head of the West European Diocese of the Church Abroad, cf. Part VI. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5: pp. 19-20. ↵
18. *Tserk. Ved.* (1926) 15-16, p. 7; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5: pp. 19-20. ↵
19. *Ibid.* (1922) 3, pp.7-8. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 438. ↵
20. Cf. Part VI. ↵
21. *Zagranichnoe Russkoe Tserkovnoe Sobranie. Materialy podgotovitelnoe kommissii*. Constantinople 1921. ↵
22. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5:16-17, 23-24; D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, pp. 17-18. ↵
23. Cf. Part VI. ↵
24. Cf. Part VI. ↵
25. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5: pp. 20-21; *Severnoi Amerike*, p. 7. ↵
26. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 2, p. 9. ↵
27. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, p. 18. ↵
28. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 2, p. 9. ↵
29. Cf. Part VI. ↵
30. Andreev, *Kratkii obzor*, p. 91 ↵

Part I, Chapter 3

From the Karlovtsy Council in 1921 until the Schism of the Church Emigration in 1926

Early in February of 1921, Metropolitan Anthony received an invitation from the Patriarch of Serbia to relocate to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats & Slovenes (after 1929 known as the Kingdom of Yugoslavia). Five other Russian hierarchs were already residing there: Archbishops Eulogius and George (of Minsk), and Bishops Metrophanes, Gabriel, and Apollinarius. Before the autumn of the same year, Archbishop Theophanes and Bishops Michael, Benjamin, Theophanes, Sergius, and Hermogenes also settled in that country. Until 1934, Archbishop Anastasius, who lived in Jerusalem, visited Karlovtsy annually and took part in the sessions of the Synod of Bishops. Other visitors were Bishops Seraphim and Damian, who came from Bulgaria; Archbishop Seraphim from Finland (who was later to rule the Western European Diocese); Apollinarius, Platon, Theophilus, and Tikhon from North America; and Metropolitan Meletius, Archbishop Nestor, and Bishop Demetrius from China and Manchuria, only to name a few. ¹

Certain bishops were appointed and consecrated by the Church Abroad in Yugoslavia: Archimandrite Arsenius (Chagovtsev) as Bishop of Winnipeg; Nicholas (Karpov) as Bishop of London; Tikhon (Troitsky) as Bishop of San Francisco; Ioasaph (Skorodumov) as Bishop of Montreal; Theodosius (Samojlovich) as Bishop of Detroit; John (Shleman) as Bishop of Urmia; Victor (Sviatin) as Bishop of Shanghai; Vitalius (Maximenko) as Bishop of Detroit; John (Maximovich) as Bishop of Shanghai; Gregory (Ostroumov) as Bishop of Cannes; and Basil (Pavlovsky) as Bishop of Vienna. ²

The list of bishops alone demonstrates the importance of Yugoslavia for the Russian church emigration in the period between the wars. The Serbian Patriarch had given Metropolitan Anthony a home in his summer residence in Karlovtsy, and here the latter made his permanent residence. After the resettlement of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad, the administrative center of the Church Abroad was located there. Subsequently, when the Synod of Bishops was formed, all-important sessions of the Synod took place in Karlovtsy, where two Pan-Diaspora Councils (1921 and 1938) were also held. The Synod of Bishops of the Church Abroad has been called the “Karlovtsy Synod” by its opponents in a derogatory manner. The designation “Karlovtsy Synod” is correct inasmuch as two First Hierarchs of the Church Abroad – Metropolitan Anthony until 1936, Metropolitan Anastasius until 1944 – had their residence in Karlovtsy, as did the Synod of Bishops, which held its meetings in Karlovtsy. After World War II, the location was no longer viable. The designation “Jordanville Jurisdiction,” which is often used today, has never been valid, in that Jordanville has never been the seat of the First Hierarch. Jordanville, in upstate New York, has certainly been the spiritual center of the Church Abroad, since the location maintains a monastery and seminary, and has hosted various Councils of Bishops,]and the Third All-Diaspora Council in 1974. However, at no time has Jordanville been the official see of the First Hierarch, headquarters of the Synod, or of the central administration. Several places have served as administrative headquarters of the Synod since the departure from Karlovtsy: Munich (1945-1950), the New Kursk Hermitage (Mahopac, N.Y. 1950-1959), and,

finally, New York City (since 1959). However, for the period between the wars, the designation “Karlovtsy Synod” is accurate. In the immediate vicinity of Karlovtsy are the Frushka Mountains, a wooded region with fourteen monasteries. The Serbian Orthodox faithful call this region the “Serbian Athos.” Numerous Russian emigre bishops lived in the monasteries of “Frushka Gora.” In addition to these, the Russian Convent of the Lesna Icon and the Russian Milkovo Monastery were also close to Karlovtsy. ³

The reasons for the transfer of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad from Constantinople were apparent: in addition to material help, the Serbian Patriarch vouchsafed the Russian hierarchs full autonomy to organize the church life of the Russian emigration. ⁴

The need to convene an ecclesiastical assembly that, in addition to the émigré bishops, would also include the lesser clergy and laity, had become apparent since the evacuation from Russia. The small number of Russian churches that existed outside Soviet Russia was insufficient to care for the many refugees: In Europe, there were fifty-five churches outside the Russian borders. The majority of these were in buildings that had been attached to imperial embassies and consulates and were closed since there were no diplomatic ties with Soviet Russia. In addition to these, there were a number of churches near health resorts and spas, which had been frequented by the Russian nobility before the Revolution.

Before the Revolution, these churches had been under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Saint Petersburg. Ultimately, contact with this hierarch having become impossible, the local priests and communities were in doubt over who their legitimate ecclesiastical authority was. For example, the Russian communities in Paris and Berlin questioned the legitimacy of the appointment of Archbishop Eulogius as the administrator of the Western European parishes. The Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad was also confronted with the question of whether to create new dioceses for the many communities that were being newly constituted everywhere or simply to appoint a bishop for a given area.

A further problem resulted from the religious environment in the diaspora: Only in southeastern Europe were there national Orthodox Churches; in Western Europe, North Africa, the Americas, and Asia the refugees were confronted not only with the existence of other Christian confessions but with non-Christian religious groups. The bishops were concerned not only about the influence of Protestant sects – such as the Baptists, Adventists, and Pentecostals, among others – but also of Roman Catholicism, the Reformed churches, and Communism; moreover, they were worried about the dangers of Freemasonry and occult and Theosophist societies. ⁵ The Council devoted much time to the consideration of the theological education of the refugees and to the mission. ⁶ In that there is an extensive treatment of the Council in Chapter III.1, only those questions which are important for the consolidation of church life will be considered here: the development of a central administration, the administrative division into regions and districts, and general decisions regarding the organization of church life. The development of the individual dioceses will be considered in separate chapters. The Council lasted from 21 November/3 December to 3/16 December 1921 and recorded in its official list of participants 155 people, of whom, however, only 103 were present, the rest participating through correspondence. ⁷ The official list registered sixteen bishops, thirty-three priests, and 106

laymen; actually, present were thirteen bishops, twenty-three priests, and sixty-seven laymen.⁸ The selection of delegates was made in accordance with the decisions of the Pan-Russian Council of 1917/18. Metropolitan Anthony presided; Patriarch Demetrius of Serbia was an honorary president.

All the Serbian bishops were also invited, of whom two took part in person – Metropolitan Hilarion and Bishop Maximilian – and another eight sent messages of greeting. Representatives of other national Orthodox Churches were not invited. Only Metropolitan Stephen of Sofia personally greeted the Council in the name of the Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church and took part in the session on 22 November/4 December.⁹ In addition to these guests, a number of honorary members were invited to the Council, but were not permitted to speak or to vote. These were various deputies and representatives of the old Russian Empire – the Supreme Commanders of the White Army, imperial ambassadors and consuls, high officials, and other dignitaries. The voting participants of the Council represented fifteen districts (okrugi) and sixteen regions (rayoni). Each was supposed to be represented by seven people (one bishop, two clergymen – a priest or deacon – and four laymen). A bishop could allow a clergyman to represent him. The districts represented were: North America, Japan, China, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Germany, France, Italy, Serbia, Bulgaria, Turkey, and the Far East. The regions represented were: Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, England, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Switzerland, Romania, Palestine, Alexandria, Greece, Africa, and Tunisia.¹⁰

Many of the districts – North America, Japan, China, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland – represented pre-Revolutionary Russian dioceses or parts of dioceses. From these districts either no participants came to the Council, or only a few people came who did not officially represent the region. It is significant, however, that the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad, in its capacity as the representative of the Russian emigration and the pre-existing communities and missions (such as the missions in Palestine, China, Persia, Korea, and Japan) took these regional divisions into consideration. Besides this, they claimed the former Russian dioceses in the Baltic States, Poland, and Finland. The new anti-Russian governments of these areas hindered the respective bishops from having any contact with the Karlovtsy Synod and promoted the establishment of their own national Orthodox Churches (Lithuania with its small Orthodox minority was a notable exception).¹¹ Otherwise, the Karlovtsy Synod was able to affirm its authority in the following year and placed under its jurisdiction all the existing Russian Orthodox communities outside Russia.

Originally, the Council was convened as an “ecclesiastical assembly” for the Russian emigration. The assembly did not at first claim to be a Council. The resolution of July spoke definitely of a “convocation of an ecclesiastical assembly abroad.” The participants, who included Archbishop Eulogius, spoke as much of a “religious assembly” as of a “Council.” The Serbian Patriarch Demetrius and King Alexander called the assembly a “Council” in their messages of greeting. A group of participants moved that the assembly be considered a Council;¹² this motion was passed. This renaming was justified on the grounds that the assembly complied with the regulations for the convocation of a Council as defined by the All-Russian Council of 1917/18.

This also applied to the decision-making process: Decisions of the General Assembly became valid if they were approved by the Episcopal Assembly. This right of the bishops to veto – as at the Council of 1917/18 – was required.

Under the presidency of Metropolitan Anthony, the “Committee for the Workings of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration” was formed; its task was to define the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad’s tasks and powers. The final version of the ratified text adheres very closely to the definitions of ecclesiastical administration set forth by the Pan-Russian Council of 1917-18.¹³ In this document, it was confirmed that the leadership of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad is subordinate to the Patriarch and the Holy Synod. The First Hierarchy of the Church Administration is the Deputy of the Patriarch and is answerable to the Patriarch as well as to the Council of the Church Abroad. At his side is a Synod and a chancery, which is presided over by the Deputy (i.e., the First Hierarchy) and, in case of his illness or incapacity, by the most senior hierarchy of the Synod. The following excerpt diverges from the Pan-Russian Council and relates exclusively to the situation of the Church Abroad:

“4: The Russian Synod Abroad is recognized by the Ecumenical Patriarch, the Patriarch of Russia, and the Patriarch of Serbia; the Synod consists of the Deputy to the Patriarch, as President, and bishops, whose number and selection has to be confirmed by the Patriarch”.¹⁴

The Deputy of the Patriarch exercises his office jointly with a chancery over which he presides and which consists of a further five members: a bishop of the Synod Abroad, two clergymen, and two laymen.

These decisions on ecclesiastical administration and leadership were accepted by all participants of the Council, including Metropolitan Platon and Archbishop Eulogius. This “ecclesiastical constitution” clearly expressed that the Council desired to order its affairs autonomously and considered itself answerable only to the Patriarch and Holy Synod in Moscow. Thereby, the church leadership was to exercise, in effect, the same authority for the Russian communities outside Russia as the Patriarch did in Russia.

In addition to the chancery, there were seven other working committees, which were concerned with matters concerning the administration of the communities, of business, financial and legal questions, of pastoral care, and of the mission. Yet another committee, which was chaired by Archbishop Anastasius was concerned with “the spiritual rebirth of Russia.” This committee was to discuss the future form of government in Russia.

After detailed discussions, this committee on rebirth issued an appeal to the “Children of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Diaspora and in Exile,” in which it was stated that being mindful of the great founders of Russia, the Council supports the re-establishment of the monarchy in Russia. This decision was agreed upon by all members of the committee; in its wake, however, came furious discussion on the question of dynastic succession.

Two factions formed over this issue: the minority faction, which included, among others, Archbishops Eulogius and Anastasius, and Bishops Apollinarius, Benjamin, and Sergius, which

did not want to endorse a particular dynasty; and the majority faction, led by Metropolitan Anthony and six other bishops, who championed the Romanov dynasty. The majority of the clergy was inclined to side with the minority faction; whereas the laity tended to side with the majority faction. The latter felt bound by loyalty to the last Tsar and desired to assert the continued right of the Romanov dynasty to the Russian throne. The discussion centered around the political nature of the question of a future dynasty. While both sides agreed that the idea of an Orthodox monarchy, headed by an anointed sovereign, was a question that directly concerned the Church, the minority faction rejected the discussion of dynastic succession on the grounds that it was a political matter, not an ecclesiastical one.¹⁵ Finally, over the protest of the minority faction, an epistle was approved, which called for the restoration of the monarchy with “a lawful Orthodox Tsar of the house of Romanov.”¹⁶

This decision has been held fast by the Church Abroad to the present day, as it recognizes the monarchy as the only possible form of government in a post-Bolshevik Russia. Since the death of the Grand Duke Cyril Vladimirovich, a nephew of Tsar Alexander II, in 1938, his son, Vladimir Kirillovich, born in 1917 and married to Leonida Georgievna, Princess Bagration-Muchranksy, has been viewed as the heir apparent to the throne. The Grand Duchess Maria Vladimirovna is the only issue of this marriage.

The Council’s resolution on the restoration of the monarchy with a candidate from the House of Romanov must be viewed today as a decision colored by the circumstances of the year 1921. Understandably, it was made in view of the political situation in the Soviet Union at that time: the new regime was not diplomatically recognized by any government; Communist experiments in Central and Western Europe (Hungary and the Socialist Republic of Bavaria) collapsed after a few weeks. Russia itself was in a state of total anarchy: industry was disrupted; the country was in the throes of a famine, during which millions perished. Thus, monarchy appeared to many émigrés as the best solution for a future form of government after the short-lived civil republic had proved too weak to withstand the Bolshevik dictatorship. The decision was urged by a majority of the Council’s laity – representatives of the old government – and a strong monarchist faction among the clergy.

On the question of the form of government, all participants were of one mind. But the question of dynastic succession resulted in discussions and disputes. While the monarchy as a form of government with a divinely-anointed sovereign takes on a theological dimension, and today is still supported by many in the Church Abroad, the dynastic question has lost much of its political significance. Those among the older clergy and, in particular, the bishops, who in the past had close relations with the House of Romanov, were ultimately unable to evolve from a pre-Revolutionary frame of mind. In the emigration, their stance was strengthened by the influential monarchist circles in the Balkans: close ties between the monarchy and the Church were preserved by the Orthodox Churches of Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Romania. Today it is important to consider that the murder of Tsar Nicholas and his family was memorialized with a memorial service in all Russian churches abroad; this commemoration is not to be seen as proof of the monarchist character of the Church Abroad because the Church Abroad similarly commemorates all the dead laity of the Orthodox Church. The formation of monarchist ideas in

the ranks of the Orthodox Church appears, for example, in the question of the canonization of the last Tsar's family: during the 1930s there were numerous attempts to canonize only the Imperial Family, supported by several Serbian circles – whereas more recently the view has changed to the idea of canonizing all victims of the Bolsheviks (see II.3).

The decision of the Council was neither confirmed nor revised by any later assemblies. The pros and cons of the discussion of the form of government and the dynasty is first and foremost a matter of personal belief among the faithful. Among the clergy, the question of the monarchy as a form of government should be determined by theological thought; the dynastic question is hardly ever discussed.

With its resolution on the reestablishment of the monarchy in Russia, the Council, and, in turn, the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad, necessarily placed itself in sharp opposition to the Soviet regime. In a further resolution, which was passed on 18 November/1 December, the Council expressed its condemnation of socialism and Communism. In the resolution, it was stated that socialism and Communism are incompatible with Christianity because the materialistic world-view of the former negates any form of religion, Christianity in particular.¹⁷ Christianity and socialism are at opposite poles, and their relationship can only be adversarial. This basic political stance – the total rejection of socialism and Communism – has been maintained by the Church Abroad until the present day. Not only has it refused to compromise in any way with socialism – such as in a dialogue between Christianity and Marxism – but it has consistently warned of the dangers which atheistic ideology poses for government, society, and the family.

Following the conclusion of the Council, the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad began the reorganization of church life in the emigration. The regularization of contacts with Archbishop Innocent of Peking was of particular importance.¹⁸

He requested that the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad nominate Archimandrite Simon as vicar to the Bishop of Peking and China. On 4/17 January 1922, the nomination took place, as well as the establishment of the Vicariate of Shanghai.¹⁹ This was the first time that there was official contact between the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad and the hierarchs in the Far East. Until the Communist takeover in China and Manchuria and the expulsion of the Church Abroad from those countries, these hierarchs were one of the mainstays of the Church Abroad. They turned to the Synod of Bishops with various proposals in the following year, such as suggesting that the Church Abroad declare itself autocephalous, or that Metropolitan Anthony be called upon to be head of the entire Russian Church.²⁰ These efforts were not new: At the Karlovtsy Council, a proposal had been submitted, suggesting that Metropolitan Anthony should allow himself to be proclaimed locum tenens (substitute) of the Patriarch. Among other grounds for this proposal was the fact that at the election of the Patriarch, Metropolitan Anthony had been the candidate with the most votes. Metropolitan Anthony himself, however, rejected this proposal by pointing out that the Patriarch's approval was required.²¹

Regarding the district in the Far East, a few other basic decisions were made, which demonstrate the far-reaching and full authority of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad: In March 1922, the Diocese of Harbin (which had formerly been a vicariate of Peking and China) was created. The new diocese included the territory along the eastern Chinese railroad in Manchuria, which before the Revolution had belonged to the diocese of Vladivostok. Indeed, Bishop Michael of Vladivostok contested this step, but the resolution was not altered.²² This creation of a new diocese essentially continued the measures taken by the Stavropol Church Authority. Archbishop Methodius of Orenburg was to assume the administration of the new diocese with the title of Archbishop of Harbin and Chichikar. In June 1921, a second vicariate was created for the Diocese of Peking and China: Archimandrite (Saint) Jonah was consecrated Bishop of Tientsin.²³ In the summer of 1922, the ecclesiastical district of the Far East was organized into “a separate administrative body under the jurisdiction of the Synod.”²⁴

In March of 1922, new regulations were passed for the administration of church divorces. The competence to dissolve church marriages was divided among the hierarchs of the Church Abroad: Metropolitan Anthony for Yugoslavia; Archbishop Eulogius for Western Europe; Bishop Seraphim for Bulgaria; Archbishop Alexander for North America; Bishop Anthony for the Aleutians and Alaska; Archbishop Innocent for China; and Archbishop Methodius for Manchuria. All other areas – Greece, Cyprus, Jerusalem, Egypt, and South America – were directly subject to the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad.²⁵ Archpriest P. Krachmalev was appointed administrator of the Russian communities in Greece and Bishop Apollinarius of Belgorod was appointed to take over the administration of the Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem.²⁶

For Constantinople, Greece, Bulgaria, and Serbia, the administration of the Russian communities was entrusted to a bishop. Because the Orthodox canons recognize only the local national Church in Orthodox countries, no independent Russian dioceses were created in these countries. In the meantime, the Russian bishops, however, set up a diocesan council; thus, de facto Russian dioceses did exist in these countries. This is seen clearly in the example of Greece: At the request of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad, the Archbishop of Athens agreed that the Russian communities in Greece could be put under the supervision of a Russian bishop. The Archbishop recognized the right of a self-ruled diocese for the Russian communities. Bishop Hermogenes assumed the rule of the diocese, which included the communities in Cyprus and Egypt, with the exception of military communities.²⁷ Similar arrangements of de facto Russian dioceses existed as well in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and, later, in Constantinople.

The creation of new dioceses was often accomplished with the consent of Patriarch Tikhon, though also at times independently of him, by the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad alone. From the spring of 1922 onwards, ecclesiastical developments in Russia required far-reaching, independent decision making outside Russia, in that hardly any contact between the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad and the Patriarchate remained possible.

In practice, the authority of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad was recognized by all bishops outside territorial Russia. Before 1923, a total of thirty-four bishops

directly collaborated on the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration's decisions or otherwise accepted the jurisdictional validity of the Karlovtsy Synod: Metropolitans Anthony (Khrapovitsky), Platon (Rozhdestvensky), Eulogius (Georgievsky); Archbishops Anastasius (Gribanovsky), Alexander (Nemolovsky), Eleutherius (Bogoyavlensky), Innocent (Figurovsky), Methodius (Gerasimov), Panteleimon (Rozhnovsky), Seraphim (Lukianov), Sergius (Tichomirov), Theophanes (Bystrov), John (Pommer); and Bishops Anthony (Dashkevich), Adam (Philippovsky), Apollanarius (Koshevoi), Vladimir (Tikhonitsky), Benjamin (Fedchenko), Gabriel (Chepur), Hermogenes ((Maximov), Damian (Govorov), Euthymius (Ofiesh), Mar Elijah (Gerargisov), Jonah (Pokrovsky), Michael (Bogdanov), Nestor (Anisimov), Seraphim (Sobolev), Sergius (Petrov), Sergius (Korolev), Stephen (Dzhubai), Simon (Vinogradov), and Theophanes (Gavrilov).²⁸

Archbishop Sergius (Tichomirov) of Japan was not directly subject to the jurisdiction but turned to the Synod in Karlovtsy at various times during the 1920's for financial aid. Bishops Eleutherius of Lithuania, Panteleimon of Poland, and John (Pommer) of Riga²⁹ recognized the validity of the Synod for the Russian emigration, but were able to maintain only a very tenuous relationship with the Synod, as the governments of their respective countries made official contact difficult. Bishop Stephen rejoined the Unia; from 1923, he was a member of the Uniate Church in the USA.

That the legitimacy of the Karlovtsy Synod was recognized by the aforementioned bishops, even in cases where they did not directly belong to the jurisdiction, is shown in the example of Archbishop Seraphim of Finland. He turned to the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad with an inquiry as to how to handle the case of Hieromonk Barsonuphius. After his studies at the Theological Seminary in Petersburg, the latter had been unable to take the final examination and desired to complete it. The Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad decreed that the candidate could sit for his test before Archbishop Seraphim and Professor Glubokovsky, who would, however, subsequently have to submit the test to the Synod before the final grade could be given. Archbishop Seraphim accepted this.³⁰ Another example is when Archbishop Sergius of Japan permitted the Synod to have jurisdiction over the Russian communities in Korea.³¹ Yet another instance was when Bishop Damian of Tsaritsyn requested permission from the Synod to open a school for the education of priests; the Synod reserved the right of financial oversight.³²

In February of 1922, the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad issued a decree announcing the need to have an official journal. The first plans had been made as early as 1920 but were abandoned because the establishment of a church printing press had to be postponed due to the evacuation from the Crimea to Constantinople. The need for an official publication became more and more pressing as all sorts of rumors were circulating within the ecclesiastical emigration concerning the situation of the Church in the homeland, where the Renovatist schism was causing confusion and unrest. In the official part of the newspaper, important reports written by the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad and the Church's First Hierarchy were published. On the other, unofficial, part there were general notices about church life in the emigration and in the homeland. The first issue of the newspaper Church Register: A

Publication of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad (Tserkovnaya Vedomosti: Izdanie pri Vysshem Tserkovnom Upravlenii Zagranitse) appeared on 15/28 March 1922. ³³

The newspaper was from that time onwards a mirror of the emigration's ecclesiastical development as well as of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad's self-understanding. All proclamations until the dissolution of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad began with the words "with the blessing of Patriarch Tikhon..." From August of 1922, the newspaper no longer appeared as a publication of Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad, but rather as "a publication of the Provisional Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad," ³⁴ and finally, after June 1923, as the official mouthpiece of "The Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad." ³⁵

The Karlovtsy Council defined the position of the First Hierarch of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad as the Deputy of the Patriarch. The plan to name Metropolitan Anthony locum tenens was again allowed to fall through, as Metropolitan Anthony considered himself the Patriarch's "administrator" for the Russian Church emigration. This is apparent from the fact that all the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad's decrees were published in the name of the Patriarch. The monarchist and anti-Communist position of the Karlovtsy Ecclesiastical Administration was clearly expressed in a series of declarations, among which was an appeal to the World Conference which opened in Genoa in April of 1922. In this appeal, the émigré bishops called for the participants to raise they're in behalf of the Russian people in the homeland and to promise not to undertake anything that could lead to a strengthening of the position of the Soviet regime. For the Soviet representatives, who for the first time had been invited to an international conference, this appeal was all the more embarrassing in that it pointed out the atrocities committed against the clergy in Russia, the persecution of the Church, and the horrible famine. The appeal ended with a call for all people of Europe and the world to help the Russian people by giving them arms, in order "to drive Bolshevism – that cult of murder, rapine, and blasphemy against God – out of Russia and out of the entire world." ³⁶

The declaration by the Karlovtsy Council, as with other declarations of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad, was taken by the Communists as a pretext to take measures against Patriarch Tikhon. For weeks there was a press campaign conducted against the Patriarch, accusing him of collaboration with the emigration. This accusation was supported by the fact that Metropolitan Anthony published his decrees and correspondence "in the name of the Patriarch." These accusations against the Patriarch were most clearly expressed in an article in Izvestia on 28 March 1922, which, among other things, stated: "Who made the Karlovtsy Synod into a hotbed of bigoted monarchists? Who would, in the name of the Church, make Russia into the domain of the House of Romanov by reestablishing the might of the Tsar and the times of lawlessness? Tikhon's administrator, the Black Hundreds activist Metropolitan Anthony, the Black Hundreds activist Archbishop Eulogius, and the rest of the pogrom-happy bishops." ³⁷

This article was followed in subsequent weeks in all the daily newspapers of the land by attempts to hold the Patriarch accountable and responsible for all the activities of the Supreme Russian

Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad. Certainly, various decisions were made by the Administration with the consent of the Patriarch. Archbishop Eulogius was elevated to the rank of metropolitan in January of 1922 on the instructions of the Patriarch.³⁸ In early May of 1922, Mr. Colton, an American, and Father Theodore Pashkovsky (later Metropolitan Theophilus of North America) met with Patriarch Tikhon in Moscow to discuss the appointment of Metropolitan Platon as head of the North American Diocese.³⁹ It would have been absurd to hold the Patriarch responsible for the aforementioned declaration. The fact that this did indeed happen proved that the authorities in Moscow intended to defame the Church and its leader.⁴⁰

On 9 May 1922, the Patriarch was charged, placed under house arrest, and then put in a GPU prison, where he remained for six weeks. Shortly before his incarceration, the Patriarch published Decree no. 348, dated 22 April/5May 1922; the recipients were Metropolitans Anthony and Eulogius. In this decree, the Patriarch declared that the epistles of the Karlovtsy Council to the emigration, in which the reestablishment of the House of Romanov was discussed, as well as the letter to the Conference in Genoa, were not of an ecclesiastical nature and had no canonical bearing, but were rather of a purely political nature. This being the case, the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad should be dissolved, as it was pursuing politics in the name of the Church. The administration of the Russian parishes in Western Europe, as well as the administration of the Russian church communities abroad, should be taken over by Metropolitan Eulogius. Furthermore, all bishops making political declarations should be brought before an ecclesiastical court. The inauthenticity of this decree was recognized by both Metropolitans.⁴¹ Metropolitan Eulogius described this decree in a letter to Metropolitan Anthony as “undoubtedly composed under duress from the Bolsheviks” and believed as late as 1925 that it had been composed “by a third party, who had forced the Patriarch to sign it.”⁴² Metropolitan Anthony shared this view.

The decree placed the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration in a quandary as to its continued existence. For this reason, a Council of Bishops was convened in Karlovtsy, in which ten bishops, in addition to Metropolitans Anthony and Eulogius, took part. The object of the deliberations was the reorganization of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad. At the assembly it was unanimously decided:

1. To dissolve the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad;
2. To convene a General Council of the Russian Church Abroad;
3. To transfer the administration to a provisional Synod of Bishops.

Therewith, the governing body of the “Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad” was changed to the “Provisional Synod of the Russian Orthodox Bishops Abroad.”⁴³ This document was signed by Metropolitan Eulogius as the deputy of Metropolitan Anthony.

The members of the new Synod were: Metropolitans Anthony and Eulogius, Archbishop Theophanes, and Bishops Gabriel and Hermogenes. The provisional Synod of Bishops acted with the same authority as the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad had and exercised jurisdiction over the same territory. Among the first orders of business for the new

Synod were the removal of Archbishop Alexander as head of the North American Diocese; the transformation of the Diocese of Kamchatka into an independent diocese, headed by Archbishop Nestor; the summoning of a diocesan assembly by hierarchs in the Far East under the condition that it would be convened in the name of the Synod of Bishops; the appointment of Bishop

Damian as superior of the Monastery of Saint Cyricus in Bulgaria. Besides these matters, it was decided to take up a collection in all Russian Churches for the Russian monasteries on Mount Athos. In December of 1922, the Synod, protested “in the name of the three million Russian émigré in America, Japan, China, and Finland, organized into fifteen Russian dioceses, the oppression of the Ecumenical Patriarch by the Kemal Turks.”⁴⁴ The Synod also turned to various Sister Orthodox Churches, which had been approached by the Renovationists, to recognize the Church headed by Patriarch Tikhon as the legitimate Church in Russia.⁴⁵

The fifteen dioceses mentioned were as follows: in Europe: Western Europe, Finland, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, and Turkey; in Asia: Peking, Harbin, Vladivostok, Tokyo, Transbaikal, and Kamchatka; in America: North America, Chicago, and the Aleutians.⁴⁶

In September of 1922, the Provisional Synod of Bishops invited all the bishops of the Russian Church in emigration and the Russian bishops from Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, to take part in a Council of Bishops. Twelve bishops took part in person, sixteen bishops as “corresponding members,” and four bishops did not participate.⁴⁷

The following questions were handled by the Council: the convocation of a Pan-Diaspora Council; the final organization of a Supreme Church Authority in exile; the transfer of full authority and jurisdiction of the Patriarchal governing body to this until the restoration of the Patriarch’s or his locum tenens’ freedom; the stance on ecclesiastical developments in Russia, e.g., schism, the False Council,⁴⁸ the judgment of this “Council” on the Patriarch and his deposition; the Bolshevik condemnation of the Patriarch; relations with the Syrian Church in America,⁴⁹ and other points.⁵⁰ After the Patriarch’s decree concerning the dissolution of the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad, a decision about the future form of ecclesiastical authority was of particular importance. The bishops present unanimously agreed that it was imperative to have a central ecclesiastical authority for the administration of the Church. The highest ecclesiastical authority should be the Council of Bishops – the assembly of all the bishops. All bishops should be invited to the Council of Bishops and a minimum of twelve bishops must attend. Although all bishops should make every effort to participate, they could, however, in case of illness or other hindrance, participate in writing, thereby exercising their influence on individual matters set before the Council. The Council of Bishops was to have jurisdiction over all general ecclesiastical questions, such as questions pertaining to the Faith, church discipline, wide-reaching administrative decisions, and so forth.

A standing Synod of Bishops, having permanent members and administering the Church between meetings of the Council of Bishops, was to be subordinate and accountable to the Council. Important decisions of the Synod, e.g., the creation of new dioceses, required subsequent confirmation by the Council of Bishops. Above all else, the Synod was empowered with ecclesiastical jurisdiction as a court of appeals for the lower clergy and for Church-

sanctioned divorces, which in special cases could be granted.⁵¹ In addition to this, the Synod could maintain relations with other Local Orthodox Churches and with government agencies. This right was also given to Metropolitan Eulogius for his diocese.⁵²

Both organs – the Council of Bishops and the Synod of Bishops – represented episcopal authority in the Russian Church Abroad. Thus, from the middle of 1923, the central ecclesiastical administration for the Russian emigration was based on the agreement of twelve attending hierarchs, including Metropolitan Eulogius. Another sixteen hierarchs recognized this new central administration over the course of the following two weeks. The proposal, which came from the Far East, to make the Synod or the Council of Bishops the spokesman for the whole Russian Church and to endow it with the full authority of the Patriarch failed because

Metropolitan Eulogius resolutely rejected this plan. Metropolitan Eulogius's alternative proposal to achieve decentralization by creating four ecclesiastical provinces – Western Europe, America, the Near East, and Eastern Europe – and allowing these provinces greater autonomy in ordering local affairs, was also rejected.⁵³

However, Metropolitan Eulogius did achieve a concession: his province – that of Western Europe – was granted the autonomous status of a metropolitan province. The Council defined the rights of the ruling bishop of a metropolitan province and the degree of autonomy in eight points. The fact that Metropolitan Eulogius was charged in this document with the rule of the diocese is important because, in the Patriarch's decree of April 1921, he had only been appointed on a provisional basis.⁵⁴

The Council of Bishops met again in October of 1924. Three metropolitans took part – Anthony, Eulogius, and Platon – as well as two archbishops and nine bishops; another sixteen hierarchs participated as corresponding members. Several questions were proposed for debate: relations with the autocephalous Orthodox Churches; the stance towards the Russian Church in the homeland; problems of the diaspora as well as church developments in Russia. The Council heard Metropolitan Platon's report on church developments in the United States, where the Renovatianist movement, under the influence of "Metropolitan" John Kedrovsky, had begun taking over parishes. The Russian communities in Czechoslovakia were to be entrusted to Metropolitan Eulogius. The Council confirmed the appointment of Bishop Tikhon as a vicar bishop for Germany. An attempt to curtail Metropolitan Eulogius's autonomy failed.⁵⁵

The Council of 1924 was the last assembly which united all the Russian bishops in the emigration. At the Council in June of 1926, Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon quit the episcopal sessions in protest. This boycott led to the fateful schism within the church emigration, which continues to the present day.

With the Council of 1926, the first phase of the history of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad came to an end. It had begun with the Stavropol Council in May of 1919 and the evacuation and flight of over one million Russians, who had to establish their own ecclesiastical administration outside the Soviet Union. After relations with all the refugee communities around the world were restored, the validation of a central ecclesiastical administration by the Council of 1923 facilitated the building up and consolidation of the émigré church life. With the schism of the

Western European and North American dioceses, new difficulties, strife, and confusion arose in the communities. The Karlovtsy Synod's claim to be the legitimate heir of the Russian Church to whom the emigration was entrusted was now challenged by Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon. This led to the formation of several concurrent "Russian Churches" in the emigration.

Footnotes

1. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5:28. ↵
2. Ibid. p. 271; cf. the biographies in Part VI. ↵
3. Manuchina, *Evlogii*, pp. 366-368. The history of both Russian convents in Part IV, Chapter 2. ↵
4. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, p. 24. ↵
5. *Deyaniya Karlovtsakh* pp. 44-46. This book is extremely rare and is hard to find even in libraries. The Synod in New York and the Ostkirchliches Institut in Würzburg each have one copy. The Council is discussed in detail in Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6:9-45 and in D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, pp.19-43. The essay "The First Council" by Nicholas Zernov is of interest because the author, who was a participant, depicts his personal impressions and describes several of the participants. ↵
6. *Deyania Karlovtsakh*, pp. 44-46, 72-80. ↵
7. List of the participants of the Council: *ibid.*, pp. 8-15. ↵
8. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, p. 30. ↵
9. The participation of the Bulgarian Metropolitan was an extremely delicate matter for the Russian bishops because the Bulgarian Church had been excommunicated by the Ecumenical Patriarch in 1872. Before the Revolution, the Russian Orthodox Church had maintained friendly relations with the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. However, the Russian bishops could not afford a confrontation with Constantinople at this point, Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6:11-12. ↵
10. *Deyania Karlovtsakh*, p. 6; *The Russian Orthodox Church*, 1:28. In the official count of 16 church provinces, only fifteen are named. Bizerta was not listed separately but was included with Africa. A large part of the Russian Navy was under French command in Bizerta. ↵
11. Concerning the development and situation of Orthodoxy in Finland and the Baltics, compare the essays by Bogoyavlensky, Eleutherius "Moi otvet", Glubokovsky, Yanin, Kahle, Klement, Laatsi, Sudoroff, and Vello. ↵
12. *Deyaniya Karlovtsakh...*, p. 59. ↵
13. *Ibid.*, p. 38. Both texts are contrasted by D'Herbigny/Deubner, in *Evêques Russes*, pp. 34-35. ↵

14. *Tserk. ved.* (1922) 2, p. 7. ↵
15. *Deyaniya Karlovtsakh*, pp. 47-53; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6:24-38. ↵
16. On the political question of the monarchy in the emigration compare Volkmann p. 84ff.: In the discussion about the succession to the throne, the Grand Duke Nicholas Nikolaevich (d. 1929, childless), nephew of Tsar Nicholas I and uncle of Tsar Nicholas II, laid claim to the throne, as did the Grand Duke Demetrius Pavlovich, and the Grand Duke Cyril Vladimirovich, who in 1924 declared himself and his son born in 1917 successor to the throne. The mother of the Tsar, who lived in exile in Copenhagen, refused to recognize any of them because she did not want to believe that her sons, Tsar Nicholas II and the Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovich were dead as long as no official report of their death had been released. ↵
17. Compare Volkmann “Genealogical Tables I-III” in the Appendix on the matter of the succession to the throne after 1917. ↵
18. *Deyaniya Karlovtsakh...*, pp. 84-86. ↵
19. For his biography, see Part VI. ↵
20. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 3, pp. 7-8. On the history of the Dioceses of Peking and China compare Seide “The Russian Orthodox Church” and Part IV: Chapters 1.3. ↵
21. *Tserk. Ved.* (1925) 15-16, p. 3. ↵
22. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6: pp. 38-39. ↵
23. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 10-11, p.15. ↵
24. *Ibid.* (1922) 10-11, pp. 12-13. ↵
25. *Ibid.* (1922) 16-17, p. 3. ↵
26. *Ibid.* (1922) 4, pp.10-11. ↵
27. Seide, *Jerusalem*. ↵
28. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 11-12, p. 12. ↵
29. Andreev, *Kratky obzor*, pp. 91-92. ↵
30. Eleutherius supported Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky) from 1927 and in 1939 traveled to Moscow, after which he opposed the Karlovtsy Synod. Panteleimon, Archbishop of Pinsk and Novgorod, lived in Poland and, therefore, could not have official contacts with the Synod because the Polish Orthodox had submitted to the Ecumenical Patriarch. John, from 1917 Archbishop of Riga and Latvia, felt closely tied to the Synod until his murder in 1934 and remained opposed to the question of autonomy and calendar reform for the Estonian and Latvian Orthodox. His martyrdom for the Faith is honored by the Church Abroad, cf. *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 29, p. 9; (1974) 22, p. 9. ↵

31. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 10-11, p.14; 14-15, pp. 3-4. ↵
32. D’Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, p. 61. ↵
33. Cf. Part IV, 4. ↵
34. On the further development of the periodical as well as general printing and publishing in the Church Abroad compare Seide “Druckerei und Verlagswesen” and Part IV, 3. ↵
35. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 11-12 from 1/14 Aug. 1922 was the last publication by the SEA; the next issue appeared as the publication by the Synod of Bishops. ↵
36. *Tserk. Ved.* (1923) 11-12. ↵
37. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6: pp. 17-24. ↵
38. Quoted from Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 1: pp. 78-79. ↵
39. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 401. ↵
40. *Severnoi Amerike*, p. 7. ↵
41. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6: pp. 47-204. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 1: 186-195. ↵
42. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 2, p. 4; Nikon, 7, pp. 7-32. ↵
43. D’Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, pp. 54-55. ↵
44. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 12-13, pp. 3-4. ↵
45. D’Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, pp. 61-62. ↵
46. On the ecclesiastical schism of the 1920s cf. Levitan-Krasnov/Shafrov *Ocherki po istorii russkoï tserkovnoi smuty*. ↵
47. *Tserk. Ved.* (1926) 15-16, pp.16-17. ↵
48. *Ibid.* (1923) 11-12, pp. 9-10; 13-14, pp.1-2. ↵
49. The Renovationists’ Council of 1923 was declared to be a pseudo-council, which, among other things, had decided that the Patriarch ought to be deposed, cf. “Pomestniy sobor.” The Renovationist Movement had been most severely condemned by the Patriarchate for years. Compare the works (in the Bibliography) by Goudal, D’Herbigny, “L’Eglise ‘vivante’”; Krasnov, “Obnovlentchestva”; Maklakov N.N., “Deux conciles”; Shishkin; Stratonov; Stupperich, “Zhivaya tserkov”; Titilinov; Troitsky, “Zhivaya tserkov”; Sergius (Larin). ↵
50. North America was a Russian Diocese. According to Orthodox canon law, the Russian diocesan bishop had jurisdiction over all the Orthodox. From 1904, the Syrian-Arab Christians had a diocese of Brooklyn. Bishop Rafael was Bishop Tikhon’s (Bellavin) vicar bishop. In 1917 the patriarch of Antioch addressed the Russian Bishop Alexander,

imploing him to consecrate a new bishop. This was Bishop Aftimos, who, from 1917, was under the authority of the Russian diocesan Bishop, cf. *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 32ff. ↵

51. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7: pp. 33-40, here p. 34. ↵

52. Those marriages dissolved by the Synod were regularly announced in its main publication *Tserk. Ved.* ↵

53. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7: pp. 35-37. ↵

54. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, pp. 66-67. ↵

55. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7: pp. 37-40. ↵

Part I. Chapter 4

Church Development in the Years 1926-1928

The schism within the Russian Church in the emigration from 1926 and church developments in Soviet Russia during the years following Patriarch Tikhon's death have had a lasting influence on the further development of the Russian Church Abroad. The schism of the Western European and North American communities, and the differing appraisals of the policies of Metropolitan Sergius in Moscow, essentially determined the further development of the church emigration. In order to clarify the differences between the individual jurisdictions within the Russian Church, we shall henceforth distinguish between these jurisdictions: the Moscow Patriarchate, the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, the Russian Orthodox Exarchate/Archdiocese in Western Europe (the Paris Jurisdiction), and the Russian Greek Catholic Orthodox Church in North America (the Metropolia).

The three Churches of the emigration were viewed as uncanonical by Patriarch Tikhon's successors, though this in no way hindered the Paris group from placing all its priests and bishops under the Patriarchal Jurisdiction for a time, or, after sixty years of discussion, the North American Metropolia from receiving "autocephaly" from Moscow, and thereafter (since 1970) being known as "The Orthodox Church in America and fighting for recognition as the fourteenth autocephalous Orthodox national church. The Church Abroad considered the Paris and North American groups to be schismatic and imposed a ban upon concelebration with the episcopate and priests, a ban which was likewise reciprocated by both groups against the Church Abroad. The Moscow Patriarchate, i.e. the supreme ecclesiastical leadership of the Russian Church in the homeland, has considered the Church Abroad uncanonical since 1927. The accusations of the respective groups intensified over time to the extent that each individual group considered itself to be the only legitimate heir of the Russian Church and designates the other jurisdictions as "schismatic" (but never heretical). This also explains the fact that in receiving clergymen from one jurisdiction to another, only a formal release is required most of the time, accompanied by an ecclesiastical admission of repentance or penitence. ¹

There was no lack of appeals calling for an end to the schism and to re-establish unity. Compromises abounded; thus Patriarch Alexis I proposed: "We shall restore to each bishop and clergyman the corresponding rank which he has held in the sacred service." Many of the hierarchs who returned to the Moscow Patriarchate attained higher offices, such as Metropolitan Benjamin (Fedchenko), Metropolitan Seraphim (Lukianov), Metropolitan Nestor (Anisimov), and others. ²

The opposing standpoints were and are, however, so diverse that no reunification has succeeded, with the exception of the American Metropolia, which was reconciled with the Church Abroad from 1936 to 1946. According to the Constitution of the Church Abroad, the reestablishment of full ecclesiastical unity can only be decided by a Council that includes the bishops of all parts of the Russian Church meeting in complete freedom. This doubtlessly genuine Orthodox principle of conciliar deliberations by the bishops on the future of the Russian Church has been impossible to realize thus far, and will not be realized as long as the Soviet government remains in power,

keeping the Russian Church from having a free voice, from acting and speaking independently from the state and from the Communist Party's control over the expression of opinions.

Between the Church Abroad and the Paris Jurisdiction, as well as the American Metropolia, there was always an additional contradiction: the national versus the territorial principle. Archpriest George Grabbe (later Bishop Gregory) writes that one must separate the question of jurisdiction into the two following areas:

1. the area of the autocephalous Church, i.e., the territorial; and
2. the area outside this territory, i.e., the national.³

According to the territorial principle, all Orthodox believers, regardless of nationality, who live on the territory of an autocephalous Orthodox Church are subject to that Church. This principle was applied in the Russian Empire, where the Orthodox Estonians, Germans, Kirghiz, and Poles all belonged to the Russian Orthodox Church. The idea of establishing an Estonian Orthodox Church, a Belorussian Orthodox Church, or a Ukrainian Orthodox Church never manifested itself, from the canonical point of view, before 1917. This happened for the first time after the Revolution when there were attempts to establish national states for the Ukrainians and Belorussians. The granting of autonomy or autocephaly to the Orthodox Churches of these nations could have been accomplished only by the Russian Church. The Patriarchate and the Church Abroad considered the founding of national Orthodox Churches in the Baltic States or in Poland to be uncanonical and denied the Ecumenical Patriarchate's right to grant autonomy or autocephaly in these regions. In 1944, these Churches were absorbed by the Moscow Patriarchate.

Grabbe also maintains that the Russian parishes in Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, and Constantinople enjoyed a special status, which he terms "canonical hospitality," as recognized by Canon 39 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council. Indeed, he maintains that such refugee communities do not constitute a parallel jurisdiction in any canonical sense. Their situation is more a matter of exercising the "law of love," the benevolence of the national Church.

The national principle applies only in the diaspora, i.e., in areas outside the territory of a national Church. The Church Abroad bases itself on this principle. This means that there is a close bond between the Church and people. The Church Abroad is composed of all those of Russian nationality regardless of territorial considerations. However, "Russian nationality" is not narrowly defined to ethnic Russians alone, but to mean all those baptized into the Russian Orthodox Church. Thus, the jurisdiction of the Russian Church Abroad cannot be limited to a certain geographical area, but rather extends worldwide to care for all those who belong to the Russian Church, i.e., all those faithful who were baptized into the Russian Orthodox Church. The emphasis on "Russian nationality" also finds expression in the fact that even today the usage of Church Slavonic prevails in the majority of the Church Abroad's parishes. In those places where a mission has been established within an indigenous community, allowances are made to permit the local language to be used in Divine Services and, if possible, to educate and prepare native speakers for the priesthood. It is on this basis that the Church Abroad never considered submitting itself to the Ecumenical Patriarch, because, as the "Russian Orthodox Church

Abroad,” it has always formed an integral part of the one Russian Church, and has even been considered as such by the Moscow Patriarchate, which in its appeals for union addresses the “Russian flock” in the emigration, by which is meant the Church Abroad.

The Ecumenical Patriarch’s claim of jurisdiction over those who dwell in “barbarous lands,” i.e., non-Orthodox countries, was repudiated by the Russian Church before the Revolution, which had by then established communities in Western Europe, governed by the Metropolitan of Saint Petersburg, and had even created dioceses in America, China, and Japan.

The Church Abroad has continued to uphold this standpoint, as did the Patriarchal Church after its re-entry into the church life of the Orthodox diaspora in the West.

The Paris Jurisdiction had made the Ecumenical Patriarch’s principle its own, that the Orthodox Church, as a truly ecumenical Church above all ethnic and national divisions, can be divided along regional lines. Consequently, bishops have jurisdiction over a particular territory without consideration of ethnicity or nationality. The Patriarch of Constantinople stands as the first bishop among equals, having oversight over those faithful who live outside the territory of a national Church.⁴ That Constantinople itself has not always maintained this principle can be seen in the establishment of the “Russian Orthodox Archdiocese of Western Europe,” which exists as a national diocese for the Russian Orthodox faithful within the “Greek Orthodox Metropolia of France.”⁵ Similar special national situations also exist in the “Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America,” where “Carpatho-Russian,” “Ukrainian,” and “Albanian” dioceses existed or still exist.⁶ The Russian Orthodox Archdiocese of Western Europe under the jurisdiction of Constantinople (Paris Jurisdiction) has, for the most part, preserved its Russian character, as was clearly expressed in negotiations with the Ecumenical Patriarch in 1971. In submitting itself to Constantinople, the Paris Jurisdiction has clearly recognized the territorial principle.⁷ This territorial principle is seen most clearly in the North American “Metropolia,” which has since 1924 — with an interruption from 1936-46 — striven to be the local Orthodox Church in North America, to which all the Orthodox in North America of various nationalities should belong. The Metropolia achieved at least a partial success in 1970, when it was granted autocephaly by the Moscow Patriarchate.⁸

It is not the purpose of this work to investigate the canonicity of the individual jurisdictions. This must wait for work on canon law. In the current study of church history, this problem can only be touched upon. In the years since the schism of 1926, numerous works have been published which strive to prove the canonical legitimacy of the individual Russian jurisdictions. These works vary greatly in their arguments, but they have one trait in common: they were written by representatives of the respective jurisdictions and always pursue the goal of portraying their own jurisdiction as the blameless party in the schism, and those in the other jurisdictions as falsely interpreting the canons. Unfortunately, this has led to a hardening of divisions and to the deepening of disunity.⁹

The Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration entrusted the administration of the Western European Russian communities to Metropolitan Eulogius in the years 1920-22. As Metropolitan Eulogius himself writes, the Patriarch’s Decree No. 424 of 26 March/8 April 1921 confirms the Supreme

Ecclesiastical Administration's previous appointment. In any case, transferring the Western European communities to him was a provisional measure until such time as a regular administration by the Metropolitan of Saint Petersburg would again become possible.¹⁰ After Patriarch Tikhon's decree of May 1922, in which the Patriarch dissolved the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration, this appointment remained valid, retaining, however, its provisional character.

Many years later, writing in his memoirs, Metropolitan Eulogius expresses himself unclearly, claiming that in the Patriarch's Decree No. 347 of 22 April/5 May 1922, ecclesiastical authority over the diaspora had been transferred to him alone.¹¹ In fact, the decree simply confirmed Metropolitan Eulogius in his position as administrator of the parishes in Western Europe. Metropolitan Eulogius, in his memoirs, equates the administration of the Russian parishes in Western Europe with authority over the entire diaspora.¹² Furthermore, he indicates that the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration, after its dissolution, was supposed to work out a "new plan for church administration." The Patriarch's aforementioned decree did not in any way touch upon this last point. Metropolitan Eulogius, however, presumably later interpreted it in this manner in order to justify his continuing involvement in the new order.

Furthermore, Metropolitan Eulogius's plan to establish four metropolitan provinces with autonomous rights [trans., Far East, Western Europe, North America, and Eastern Europe] under the supreme authority of the Council of Bishops and the Synod of Bishops was, as mentioned, vetoed by the Council, although a limited autonomy was granted to the Western European province in 1923. Metropolitan Eulogius later viewed even this very autonomy of the Diocese of Western Europe alone as a distortion of the Patriarch's wishes.¹³ If Metropolitan Eulogius saw the decision of the Council of Bishops in 1923 as a contravention of the authority of the Patriarch, then the questions arise: Why did Metropolitan Eulogius not call this uncanonical behavior to the attention of his peers? How could he have justified his attendance at the Council of Bishops in the following year? He writes that since the Council of 1923 there was an "ecclesiastical struggle" against him. Why then did he consult the Synod of Bishops?

He did so, for example, when, in April of 1924, the Synod nominated Archimandrite Tikhon as vicar Bishop for Western Europe, with his see in Berlin, at Metropolitan Eulogius's suggestion; the Synod consecrated Tikhon bishop in the same month. In that the All-Russian Council of 1917/18 legislated that only the supreme authority of the Church has the right to create new dioceses or vicariates, Metropolitan Eulogius must have still recognized the Karlovtsy Synod of Bishops as the supreme ecclesiastical administration, at least for the emigration. The fact that he considered the Karlovtsy Synod of Bishops competent to approve and enact the creation of a new vicariate within his own autonomous diocese indicates logically that he must have equated the authority of this institution with that of the Patriarch. Thus, the Council of Bishops of 1924, in which Metropolitan Eulogius took part and whose competence he recognized, exercised its authority with the creation of the Berlin vicariate.

Another example is when Metropolitan Eulogius later requested the approval of the Synod to create another vicariate: in October of 1924, a vicariate for the Diocese of Western Europe was created in Prague, to be headed by Bishop Sergius (Korolev)¹⁴ of Bely. The Council created the

third vicariate in Cannes in April of 1924, to be headed by Archbishop Vladimir (Tikhonitsky, the successor to Metropolitan Eulogius in 1946).¹⁵ Archbishop Vladimir was to head this vicariate with the full authority of a diocesan bishop; Metropolitan Eulogius contested this.

In connection with the creation of the vicariate of Cannes and the full (diocesan) authority of its bishop, a dispute between Metropolitan Eulogius and the Synod of Bishops arose. Metropolitan Eulogius maintained that the Synod was not allowed to have much say in the administration of the Diocese of Western Europe, and its authority could not extend to the appointment of a vicar bishop empowered to rule independently of him. The Synod doubtlessly wanted to dismantle the autonomy which Metropolitan Eulogius had built up. This had already been attempted at the Council of 1924 but had failed.

Thus, the Council in June of 1926 met under unfavorable conditions. In North America, the forces that strove for an autonomous status and desired the Synod of Bishops to provide merely a “moral” oversight were gaining the upper hand. The ultimate goal was autocephaly. These aims became clear after the “Council of Detroit” in 1924.¹⁶ Metropolitan Eulogius feared for the survival of his diocesan autonomy. In addition, there were difficulties over the establishment of the Saint Sergius Theological Institute in Paris, founded at the initiative of Metropolitan Eulogius, which was awaiting the approval of the Synod to begin its academic work, and which received financial support from the YMCA, which the Council was about to condemn as “masonic.”¹⁷

The unity of the Russian Church Abroad shattered in the face of these questions. After Metropolitan Platon had presented the decisions of the “Council of Detroit,” there was a proposal to discuss “general questions in connection with the leadership of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad.” Metropolitan Eulogius refused to enter this discussion and left the Council in anger over the course of the debate on the proposal to limit the autonomy of the dioceses, probably without intending thereby to cause a break, as his written questions presented to the Council on the next day seem to indicate. Metropolitan Platon declared his solidarity with Metropolitan Eulogius’s step and refused to sign the minutes of the session.¹⁸

The Council, however, continued its deliberations. On the following day, Archbishop Innocent of Peking’s plan to give the Church Abroad autocephalous status was discussed.

Further, the Council decided that henceforth the name of Metropolitan Antony should be mentioned in divine services after Metropolitan Peter (Patriarchal locum tenens since the death of Patriarch Tikhon). This decision, which was intended to be binding upon all Russian churches in the emigration, was of the greatest significance, in that it was equivalent to the acknowledgment of Metropolitan Antony as First Hierarch of the Church Abroad. In addition to this, the assembled episcopate discussed the legitimacy of the successor to the Patriarch in Russia (see below).

On the following day, the YMCA was condemned as a freemasonic organization of an anti-Christian character;¹⁹ however, under the influence of Metropolitan Antony Archbishop Apollinarius, Bishop of San Francisco, of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, this

characterization was later changed to an “interconfessional organization of a Christian character.”²⁰

Concerning Metropolitan Eulogius, it was decided that he and his vicar bishops should provide explanations as to whether they recognize the Council of Bishops and the Synod of Bishops as the sole spiritual authority, or consider themselves as a canonical jurisdiction, possessed of the right to lead the Russian Church in the emigration. Metropolitan Eulogius was still recognized as a member of the Synod of Bishops until such time as he renounced the Council and the Synod in written form. The Synod requested a written response within one month; otherwise, an ecclesiastical court would be convened. In addition to this, the Synod posed a series of questions to Metropolitan Eulogius, including why he had provided a special status for his vicar bishops; why he had opened the Theological Institute in Paris before the Synod had accepted the Institute’s constitution; why he had forbidden his parishes — against the directives of the Synod — to send delegates to the Monarchist Congress in 1926; and why he had, over the course of five years, administered his diocese with the help of a diocesan council chosen by him, which was neither elected nor authorized by the Synod of Bishops.²¹

The Council also decided that in order to strengthen an orderly church life in Germany, and in view of the schismatic tendencies of the “Living Church” (the “Renovationist Church”) in Germany, the vicariate of Berlin should be transformed into an independent diocese. An epistle was sent to all the parishes in Germany, informing them that they were to be part of the Berlin Diocesan Administration and no longer part of the one in Paris.²²

A similar epistle to that sent to Metropolitan Eulogius was dispatched to the Russian bishops in America. They were given five months to answer whether they considered the Council of Bishops and its executive branch, the Synod of Bishops, to be canonical, and whether they recognized their legal and administrative authority. In addition, they were to relate their position on the vote for or against the autocephaly decided upon by the so-called “Council of Detroit.”

Immediately after his arrival in America, Metropolitan Platon characterized the Synod as uncanonical in an epistle to the faithful in North America. This epistle was signed by four out of five of his vicar bishops: Bishops Amphilochius of Alaska, Theophilus of Chicago, Aftim (Euthymius) of Brooklyn, and Arsenius of Winnepeg. Bishop Apollinarius (Koshevoi) of San Francisco alone refused to sign. The break was complete, and the schism of the North American Diocese was an accomplished fact.²³

On 28 June/11 July, an answer arrived from Metropolitan Eulogius, challenging the Council’s right to transform the Berlin vicariate into an independent diocese. These measures necessarily resulted in enmity and division among the faithful. The Synod’s handling of the situation constituted interference in his diocese and seemed to be a contravention of the Patriarch’s established order [trans., according to Eulogius]. Subject to the Council’s agreement, Metropolitan Antony replied to this letter saying that in the past they had acted in the same way in other dioceses: the creation of the diocese of Kuban, Rostov, Sukhumi, the Aleutians, Harbin, and Kamchatka were all against the will of the ruling diocesan bishop and were recognized by Patriarch Tikhon. How could one question this recognition? Metropolitan Eulogius had no right

to assume that the Patriarch, were he still alive, would veto the creation of a new German diocese. Furthermore, Metropolitan Antony accused Metropolitan Eulogius's fellow bishops of a series of interferences in parishes not under their jurisdiction, in Australia, the Jerusalem Mission, and Finland.

The bishops of the Western European Diocese answered this letter in August. They indicated that their canonical hierarch was Metropolitan Eulogius, who recognized the Council and the Synod as more a spiritual than a canonical authority. He would not deny the canonical character (i.e., an administrative and legal jurisdiction) which these institutions possess, but would like only to make certain that it is understood that these provisional institutions had not received their canonical confirmation from the central Russian ecclesiastical authority (the Patriarchate) and, therefore, can exercise no jurisdictional force. The bishops continued that they indeed recognized a canonical authority, that of the Patriarch and his locum tenens. Thus, the provisional power of the Council and the Synod should take into consideration the autonomy of Metropolitan Eulogius's diocese, which is based on the decree of the Patriarch.²⁴

This response was signed by Metropolitan Eulogius, Archbishops Seraphim,²⁵ and Vladimir, and Bishops Sergius and Benjamin. They avoided taking a clear-cut stand like the bishops in America had, but this was characteristic of Metropolitan Eulogius's group, which did not want and could not dispute either the canonicity of the Council or of the Synod, since Metropolitan Eulogius had, on the whole, agreed with all the decisions of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration, the Council, and the Synod. Presumably, Metropolitan Eulogius wanted to avoid a break, which, however, still came about when Metropolitan Eulogius suspended Bishop Tikhon from serving and warned him that he was acting uncanonically.²⁶ The situation became more critical when, at Metropolitan Eulogius's request, Archpriest Prozorov of Berlin, who had been suspended from serving, was again permitted to serve. Metropolitan Eulogius did not comply with the Synod's request for him to submit himself to the Synod in November, and therefore he was judged to be in violation of the canons and suspended from serving. In turn, Metropolitan Eulogius broke off relations with the Synod.²⁷

Metropolitans Eulogius's and Platon's severance of relations with the Church Abroad was closely connected with attempts to accomplish a far-reaching decentralization and the creation of individual provinces whose administration would be entirely transferred to the diocesan bishop. Besides Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon, the bishops in China and Manchuria attempted with various proposals to create their own ecclesiastical provinces. Archbishop Sergius (Tikhomirov) of Japan spoke out against the creation of such autonomous provinces.²⁸ In contrast to Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon, the hierarchs in the Far East were not striving to weaken the Karlovtsy Synod, but rather to simplify the administration. Their faithfulness to the Synod was never in doubt, because they had, among other things, proposed that Metropolitan Antony should be the nominal head of the autonomous province. From the hierarchs in the Far East also originated the idea of granting the Church Abroad an autocephalous or autonomous status. This was vetoed, however, because the Church Abroad desired to preserve the unity of the Russian Orthodox Church.²⁹

There were various attempts to make the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad fully independent before 1926/27. These plans always concerned the unity of the Church Abroad, which basically was not questioned even by Metropolitan Eulogius, who held to a “moral unity.” However, in North America the hierarchs — and the clergy and laity even more — strove for an autocephalous American Church from the very beginning. The 200,000 or so believers in France were primarily Russians who had left their country in consequence of the Civil War and thus were émigrés in a more narrow sense, whereas in North America the majority of the faithful had willingly emigrated before 1914. The émigrés who left between 1918 and 1920 considered the emigration as enforced and transitory, and dreamed about returning home to Russia. The pre-1914 emigrants had left their homeland in search of better living conditions and hardly thought about returning to their old homeland. Thus, the bond between them and the Russian Church Abroad was essentially less intimate. Besides this, a new problem had developed in these immigrant communities: the youth had grown up in America and had been assimilated well, speaking English better than the language of their fathers. With the influx of Orthodox believers from Asia Minor and the former western provinces of Russia, these became mixed language parishes and progressively lost their national Russian character. Understandably, these parishes also strove to introduce the use of English in Divine Services. Thus in North America after 1917/18, there were two types of Russian parishes: the emigrant parishes, made up largely of former Uniates, who desired to settle in America permanently; and the communities of more recent émigrés who saw the United States only as a temporary homeland. The latter group remained faithful to the Church Abroad after 1926.

Since the Revolution, the situation of the Patriarch and the Russian Church had been altered by political events. The new rulers spared no effort to weaken the position of the Church, whose unity was equally threatened by the national ecclesiastical developments in the Ukraine and Belorussia and by splits in its own ranks. As long as the Patriarch and the Holy Synod in Moscow were not hindered in the exercise of their office, attempts at schism met with little success. However, the Patriarch was placed under house arrest in 1922 and then imprisoned. When, within a few weeks, fifty bishops united themselves to the various groups of Renovationists, such as the “Living Church”; these schismatics were able to give the appearance that the Patriarch had transferred his official duties to them and had resigned.³⁰

The threat of arrest hung over Patriarch Tikhon in the spring of 1922. As already mentioned, in early May, the Patriarch declared the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad dissolved, probably to meet the accusations connecting him with the “White Guard monarchist émigrés.” Metropolitan Antony, as well as Metropolitan Eulogius, described this decree as “doubtless written under the influence of the Bolsheviks <...> by a third person <...> who merely presented it to him to sign.” In fact, it is known that, on the very day on which Decree No. 347 ordered the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad to dissolve, the Patriarch was under house arrest by the GPU.

The authenticity of two other extremely important documents allegedly signed by Patriarch Tikhon has also been brought into doubt by recent historical research. These are the Patriarch’s statement of 3/16 June 1923, which was intended to lead to his liberation, and the Patriarch’s

testament of 25 March/7 April 1925. Both documents are apparently signed by the Patriarch, but are at the same time written in the style of the atheist Soviet regime.³¹

In the statement in June of 1923, the Patriarch distanced himself from his earlier epistles, though not invalidating them, mentioning the following documents: the epistle on the occasion of the Treaty of Brest, the epistle of January, 1918, which excommunicated the communists, and his decree on the occasion of the requisition of church valuables to help the starving. The Patriarch excused his attitude than as a result of his “pre-Revolutionary upbringing and education,” and recognized that he should eliminate the influence of his anti-Soviet company. He confirmed to the masses that his arrest was a consequence of his anti-Soviet activities and concluded with the words: “At the same time I declare that I shall no longer be the enemy of the Soviet regime. I am disassociating myself finally and expressly from those abroad as well as from the internal monarchist — White Guard — counterrevolution.” This letter is conspicuous in that it is not only a total departure from his earlier declarations but also has “a style which is not characteristic of an Orthodox hierarch, but rather more readily of a Soviet functionary.”³²

Naturally, the Soviets were not satisfied with these attainments and strove relentlessly to subjugate the church administration. The unexpected death of Patriarch Tikhon on 25 March/7 April 1925 brought distress to the leadership of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Soviets successfully exploited this opportunity to attribute to the deceased Patriarch a highly questionable “Testament,” which subsequently became the basis of a new policy of the Church towards the regime. The following outlines the essence of the thoughts expressed in the Testament:

1. The Soviet regime is a genuine people’s regime and therefore firm and unshakable;
2. Every agitation against it, therefore, is to be condemned;
3. A special commission should be set up to investigate and, if necessary, remove “from the leadership of the Church those archpastors and pastors, who persist in their errors and refuse to confess and repent before the Soviet rulers;”
4. The activities of the hierarchs living abroad should be subjected to a strict investigation, to try them in absentia, inasmuch as they refuse to suspend these activities and return to the homeland;
5. “Without any compromises in matters of Faith, we must be upright in our civil relations with the Soviet regime.”³³

The authenticity of the document was in question from the very beginning and was considered falsely attributed to the Patriarch.³⁴ Yet, even if the document had been genuine, the church emigration would have had to ask itself what shape its future relationship with the Patriarchate should take, after the leader of the Russian Church could have so succumbed to pressure that he was prepared to issue such a statement; or else that the rulers through extortion and deceit could so manipulate future church policies in whatever direction they pleased.

However, before expounding on this problem, the further development of the Russian Church in the homeland should be briefly discussed. Patriarch Tikhon had made arrangements for an administration of the Patriarchal See in the event of his death: “In the event of our repose our rights and duties as Patriarch, until the lawful election of a new Patriarch, should be temporarily

assumed by the Most Reverend Metropolitan Cyril. Should he through some circumstances be unable to take over the aforementioned rights and duties, then these should be assumed by the Most Reverend Metropolitan Agathangelus. Should it be impossible for this Metropolitan, then these Patriarchal rights and duties should be transferred to the Most Reverend Metropolitan Peter of Krutitsa.”³⁵

This arrangement was validated and signed by the fifty-nine bishops who took part in the Patriarch’s funeral. These hierarchs confirmed the authenticity of the document and went on to state: “In that, neither Metropolitan Cyril nor Metropolitan Agathangelus, who are both presently outside Moscow, is in a position which would allow him to take up the duties mentioned in this document, we recognize that the Most Reverend Metropolitan Peter <...> must take on the duties of Patriarchal locum tenens in fulfillment of the wishes of the late Patriarch.”³⁶

In view of the difficult situation of the Church in Russia and the constant threat of arrest, Metropolitan Peter, in turn, composed a document, in which he regulated the transfer of the administration in the event of his arrest. He named the following three substitutes: Metropolitan Sergius of Nizhni-Novgorod, Metropolitan Michael, Exarch of Ukraine, and Archbishop Joseph of Rostov. However, he stated, “The commemoration of my name as the patriarchal locum tenens remains obligatory.”³⁷ Thereby Metropolitan Peter clearly expressed that he, like the late Patriarch, was the legitimate leader of the Russian Church until the election of a new Patriarch. Shortly thereafter he was arrested. The official duties were taken over by Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky), who was a deputy of the Patriarchal locum tenens. He carried out the official duties for barely a year and was arrested in December of 1926. Contributing to his arrest, among other things, was a letter to the émigré bishops, written in a friendly and personal tone and employing a mode of speech entirely different from the alleged testament of the Patriarch, with its stark condemnation of the émigré bishops. Metropolitan Sergius indicated in his letter that he could not interfere in the disputes of the bishops abroad, in that he did not know “what persons and which bishops belonged to the Synod, nor what authority they have.”³⁸ However, he recommended that the bishops establish a higher authority for the settling of disputes, and in the event that this could not be achieved, the émigrés should subject themselves to the local Orthodox Churches.

The Church Abroad recognized Metropolitan Peter as a legitimate locum tenens of Patriarch Tikhon and commemorated him as its head until his death in 1936. After his death, Metropolitan Cyril was commemorated until 1941, the year of his death.³⁹ He was considered to be a legitimate locum tenens to Patriarch Tikhon, in that his right to succession could be traced back to the Patriarch’s will, which the hierarchs who had taken part in the burial of the Patriarch had accepted. They denied Metropolitan Sergius’ right to successor status, in that he was only a deputy locum tenens. For his part, Metropolitan Sergius considered Metropolitan Cyril⁴⁰ to be uncanonical from 1930, when he put him on trial before an ecclesiastical court made up of his so-called “temporary Synod,” which condemned him. Metropolitan Sergius had no right to do this in the eyes of the legitimists. This view was also shared by the renowned expert on canon law, Professor Troitsky, who upon his return to the Soviet Union after 1945, renounced all his earlier works.

The Church Abroad rejected Metropolitan Sergius inasmuch as he had taken an uncanonical course from 1927. This began with Metropolitan Sergius's infamous Declaration of 16/29 July 1927.⁴¹ In this Declaration, Metropolitan Sergius acknowledged the Soviet government as the legitimate government in Russia and condemned any opposition to it. He demanded complete submission to the government by the clergy and the faithful. He also demanded this of the clergy abroad, from whom he required a written declaration of loyalty. In the event of their refusal, he threatened the hierarchy and the clergy with ex-communication from the Patriarchal Church. This Declaration triggered indignation not only among the bishops, but also among the faithful. In the homeland, numerous hierarchs (such as Metropolitan Cyril of Kazan, Metropolitan Joseph of Petrograd, and dozens more) broke off fellowship with the administration of Metropolitan Sergius. After this, a legal existence was impossible for them, so they retreated underground and continued as the "Catacomb Church." Much has been written in the West about the existence and size of the Catacomb Church. Its existence can certainly not be denied. Establishing the Catacomb Church's size and the number of its faithful would certainly benefit from serious scholarly study.⁴² The Church Abroad considered the Catacomb Church to be its true sister Church in Russia, in that the Patriarchal administration headed by Metropolitan Sergius had acted entirely uncanonically and compromised with the Soviet regime.⁴³

With his Declaration, the dictatorship of Metropolitan Sergius began. Though the Declaration was signed by few other bishops, Sergius had his way. Another serious violation was that Metropolitan Sergius ordered that his name be commemorated in all churches. This directive, dated 27 December 1936, was published without a communiqué on the death of Metropolitan Peter.⁴⁴ Thereby Metropolitan Sergius made it known that thenceforth he was to be Patriarchal locum tenens. He had no right to this, however, so long as Metropolitan Cyril was still alive. The "election" of Metropolitan Sergius as Patriarch in 1943 was also considered uncanonical, in that he was elected by a mere eighteen bishops, while at this time there were still approximately one hundred other bishops under arrest. Therefore, Sergius's election represented a violation of canonical order and of the Council of 1917/18, which provided that the Patriarch had to be elected at a general Church Council. It can be concluded that Metropolitan Sergius did not possess the trust of the whole episcopate, but rather only that of a small minority who had capitulated to the government. "Thus began in the Church a hitherto unheard of the epoch of dictatorship by the First Hierarch, which has been in force until the present day in the Moscow Patriarchate."⁴⁵

On 27 August/9 September 1927, the Synod of Bishops expressed its policy regarding Metropolitan Sergius' Declaration. This letter, circulated to all the faithful, was signed by Metropolitan Anthony, Archbishops Theophanes and Seraphim (Lukianov), and Bishops Sergius, Gabriel, Hermogenes, Theophanes, and Seraphim (Sobolev). The bishops declared their severance of relations with the church administration in Moscow on the grounds that relations with it were no longer possible since the canonical leadership of the Church of Russia had been suppressed by the authorities: Metropolitan Peter had been arrested, and Metropolitans Cyril and Agathangelus were exiled from Moscow. Furthermore, the letter stated that the severing of relations meant that the Church Abroad, until the restoration of normal relations and the "liberation of our Church from persecution by the godless Soviet authorities," would administer

itself in agreement with the Holy Canons, the decisions of the Council of 1917/18, and the decree of the Patriarch dated 7/20 November 1920 (No. 362), with the help of the Synod of Bishops and the Council of Bishops. The Russian Church Abroad would remain an inseparable part of the one Russian Orthodox Church. It would commemorate in its Divine Services Metropolitan Peter, the Patriarchal locum tenens. Metropolitan Sergius' exclusion of the bishops and clergy of the Church Abroad from the ranks of the clergy of the Moscow Patriarchate as desired by the Soviet government was seen as an uncanonical act. The petition of Metropolitan Sergius and his Synod to certify the legitimacy of the Soviet regime is decided to be rejected as an uncanonical demand and as most harmful for the Church in Russia as well as abroad. ⁴⁶

This letter explicitly defined the future stance of the Church Abroad towards the Moscow Patriarchate. To the present day, the Church Abroad considers itself to be an organic part of the Russian Church and proceeds from the oneness of the Russian Church. The Church Abroad considered itself, however, as the free part, and the Moscow Patriarchate as the captive part.

Which of the two parts, over the course of history, has acted in accordance with the Holy Canons can only be decided by a future Council of the whole Russian Orthodox Church meeting in complete freedom, free from state interference.

That Metropolitan Sergius's demand for loyalty to the Soviet regime was in practice not feasible for the clergy abroad can be seen in the example of Metropolitan Eulogius and his bishops, who initially acquiesced. After their break with the Synod of Bishops, Metropolitan Eulogius and his vicar bishops — Archbishop Vladimir (Tikhonitsky) and Bishops Sergius (Korolov) and Benjamin (Fedchenko) — joined Metropolitan Sergius. Metropolitan Eulogius was named exarch for the Moscow Patriarchate. Bishops Seraphim (Lukianov) and Tikhon (Liashchenko) broke with Metropolitan Eulogius and placed themselves under the jurisdiction of the Synod of Bishops.

Metropolitan Eulogius and his clergy complied with the demands of Metropolitan Sergius and refrained from any participation in anti-Soviet activities. After the wave of the persecution of the Church had reached a peak in 1930 in the Soviet Union, protests and prayer services for the persecuted Church in Russia began among Western Christians. Metropolitan Eulogius was unable to avoid such services; he did not wish to lose face entirely. When he attended one such prayer service, which was held by the Archbishop of Canterbury in London, Metropolitan Sergius protested against this act. Metropolitan Eulogius answered the Metropolitan's complaint by maintaining that the service was not a political demonstration, but rather a religious act. A few weeks later Metropolitan Sergius removed Metropolitan Eulogius from his office and suspended him from celebrating the Divine Services because of his disobedience. Metropolitan Sergius named Archbishop Vladimir as Metropolitan Eulogius's successor. At a diocesan meeting convened by Metropolitan Eulogius, Metropolitan Sergius's order was debated, and it was unanimously decided to ignore his directive. As a result, Metropolitan Eulogius had to decide the future jurisdictional status of his communities. This was to change more than once up until the present day. The Western European parishes of the Paris Jurisdiction have belonged, in turn, from October of 1920 to July of 1926, to the jurisdiction of the Karlovtsy Synod of Bishops; then from August of 1927 to 1930, to the Moscow Patriarchate; from February of 1931

to May of 1945, to Constantinople; in September of 1945, for a brief time, again to Moscow; then for almost fifteen months as “an autonomous archdiocese”; from March of 1947 to 1965, to Constantinople again, which this time Constantinople released under duress from Moscow; from 1965 to 1970, the communities were again an autonomous diocese; and since 1970 they have been again under Constantinople. ⁴⁷

Footnotes

1. Compare the works of Troitsky, Polsky, Grabbe. See also footnote 9 below. ↵
2. *JMP* (1957) 3, pp. 5-8, p. 7. Seite “In Memoriam,” p. 140. ↵
3. Grabbe, *Tserkov' i uchenie*, 1, pp. 265-270, here pp. 267-270. ↵
4. The claim was based on the canons of the Ecumenical Councils, particularly the 28th Canon of the Fourth Ecumenical Council. ↵
5. Patock, “Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche in Westeuropa”; *Episkepsis* (1971) 2/23 pp. 2-4. ↵
6. *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie*, pp. 32-33. ↵
7. *ECR* (1971) 4, pp. 450-453, the older laymen spoke out against an “Archdiocese of France and Western Europe,” because the word “Russian” was not in the title. ↵
8. Compare in particular: *Aftokephaliya Russkoi Ameriki*; Bepuda; Bogolepov; Bishop John, *Puti mitropoli*; *Ibid*, *Utverzhdenie*; Kovach; Leontius; Seraphim, *Church Unity*; Tarazar. ↵
9. The standpoint of the Church Abroad in Grabbe, “Canonical Position”; *ibid*. *Ocherk Polozheniya*; Tal'berg, *Tserkovnoi raskol*; *ibid.*, *Sorokoletiyu*. The standpoint of the Patriarchate in Troitsky, “O nepravde.” (Troitsky lived in the emigration and represented the standpoint of the Church Abroad until his involuntary return to the Soviet Union. Cf. Troitsky, *Tserkvena jurisdiktsia*.) The standpoint of the Metropolia in Schmemman; John, *Utverzhdenie*. ↵
10. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 603. ↵
11. *Ibid.*, p. 605. ↵
12. *Ibid.* ↵
13. *Ibid.*, p. 607. ↵
14. Cf. Part VI. ↵
15. Cf. Part VI; D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, p. 72. ↵
16. Cf. above, footnote 8; *Severnoi Ameriki*, pp. 9-16; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7:385-386. ↵
17. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 446-453. Cf. also Part IV, Chap. 4. ↵

18. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7: pp. 108-113, 388-390. ↵
19. Ibid. pp. 63-67, 111-112. ↵
20. *Tserk. Ved.* (1926) 13-14:3; D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, p. 82. ↵
21. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, pp. 84-85. ↵
22. *Tserk. Ved.* (1926) 19-20, p. 2. ↵
23. The further development, see Part IV, Chapter 1.4. ↵
24. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7:113-123; D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, pp. 96-97. The collected correspondence and circulars are published in Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7:113. ↵
25. According to a postscript, the correspondence was not presented to Archbishop Seraphim! ↵
26. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7: pp. 123-124. ↵
27. Ibid., pp. 164-172. ↵
28. Seide, *Russische Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 177-179. ↵
29. Ibid., p.177. ↵
30. Regel'son, *Tragediya*, pp. 528-530; Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 1, pp. 149-263. ↵
31. Ibid., pp. 372-378; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6, p. 151. ↵
32. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 1:287. ↵
33. Kischkowsky, *Religionspolitik*, p. 50. ↵
34. Vinogradov, "Über einige sehr wichtige Augenblicke." Cf. also Rößler *Kirche und Religion*, pp. 194-218. The author comes to the conclusion that neither "authenticity" nor "forgery" could be proven. Archbishop Vasily (Krivoshein) of Brussels shares the same view of Chrysostomus, cf. *Messenger* (Paris: 1970) 69, pp. 69-78. ↵
35. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2, pp. 23-24. ↵
36. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6, p. 208. ↵
37. Ibid., pp. 220-221. ↵
38. Polsky, *Mucheniki*, 1, pp. 135-143; 2, pp. 287-289. ↵
39. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2, pp. 133-134. ↵
40. For the biography of Metropolitan Cyril, cf. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2, pp. 223-229; Polsky, *Mucheniki*, 2, pp. 295-299. According to Polsky (p. 296), Metropolitan Cyril was shot in 1937; according to Regel'son, who cites from Metropolitan Manuel, Metropolitan Cyril was alive until 1941 (see Regel'son, *Tragediya*, p. 560). ↵

41. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6, pp. 223-227; Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2, pp. 155-161. ↵
42. On the existence of the Catacomb Church as well as the underground Church in general, compare Andreev, *Zametki*; Fletcher, *The Russian Underground*; “Dokumentalnaya deyaniya” (*Vladimirsky kalendar* 1964-70); Fr. George, *God’s Underground*; Gustafson, *Die Katakombenkirche* (in English, *The Catacomb Church* [Jordanville 1960]). Further, a series of smaller essays, see the Bibliography. Chrysostomus in earlier years spoke of the existence of a Catacomb Church (*Kirchengeschichte*, 2, pp. 241-242 and his essays: “Orthodoxie in der UdSSR”; “Katakombenkirche”), but today he calls the existence of such a Church a mere “fairy tale”. (Cf. *Die russisch-orthodoxe Kirche*). ↵
43. For more on the relationship between the Church Abroad and the Patriarchal Church, see Part V:1. ↵
44. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2, p. 301. ↵
45. Polsky, *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*, pp. 34-75 (here p. 64); Grabbe, *Pravda*; *ibid.* Canonical Position; Konstantinov, *Kirche in der Sowjetunion*, pp. 117-122. ↵
46. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6, pp. 228-232. ↵
47. Polsky, *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*, pp. 133-155. ↵

Part I, Chapter 5

The Consolidation of the Church Abroad and its Further Development in the Years after the Schism (1926 – 1939)

The break with the Moscow Patriarchal administration led to the independence of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, which considered itself to be the free part of the Church of Russia and the spokesman for the oppressed Church in the Soviet Union. Indeed, this had been done in the past also, in that the Church Abroad had turned to Western Christians – but above all to the Orthodox – imploring them to support the persecuted Church in Russia. This became particularly clear after the arrest of Patriarch – and during the “Renovationist” schism.¹ But more importantly, the Church Abroad in the 1930s repeatedly pointed to the dangerous situation of the Church in the Soviet Union, at a time when hardly any news of the true religious situation reached the West. If one follows the ecclesiastical press of these years or the general émigré press, one can find noteworthy contributions to the church life and general religious situation in the Soviet Union, which would even today hold up as a scholarly analysis. Indeed, this applies to *Church Register (Tserkovniye Vedomosti)* and its successor *Church Life (Tserkovnaya Zhizn’)* or to semi-official *Orthodox Russia (Pravoslavnaya Rus’)*, which, after the German conquest of the western part of the Soviet Union, reported in detail about the religious life of this area.

For the Moscow Patriarchate – but above all for the Soviet government – this voice of the free Russian Church was a burden, in that the Soviet descriptions of the “true situation” of the Church and the faithful in the Soviet Union were more often than not just blatant lies. Therefore, after 1945, the Moscow Patriarchate sought to silence this voice, as will be described in detail later.

Until the end of World War II, it was the concern of the Church in the emigration alone to enter into theological dialogue with the other Christian churches, as the Patriarchal Church was prevented by the authorities in general from nurturing inter-confessional contacts. Thus, in 1933, Metropolitan Sergius appealed to the Serbian Patriarch Barnabus of Serbia to relinquish his support for the Karlovtsy Synod, in that, Metropolitan Sergius maintained, the Synod was of a purely political nature and used the Soviet government as a pretext to work against the Church in the homeland. In addition to this, the other Orthodox Sister Churches were antagonistic towards the Patriarchal Church and rejected it; Metropolitan Sergius argued that this could only be seen as a result of the Karlovtsy Synod’s activities.²

The Karlovtsy Synod was recognized as the legitimate Russian Orthodox Church in the emigration by all local Orthodox Churches, and even by Western Christian denominations, until the end of World War II, none of whom questioned its canonicity. After 1945, the Orthodox Churches in the Soviet-bloc nations severed their relations with the Church Abroad. In the 1960s, the Protestant and Catholic Churches followed this step after having officially recognized the Moscow Patriarchate, which made a break with the Church Abroad a prerequisite for normal relations. This should not delude us into thinking that the Russian Church Abroad has not maintained contact with many Western Christian denominations, though not officially.³

A peculiar situation arose from the ecclesiastical schism in the emigration. As already mentioned, the Church Abroad kept to the principle of “nationality,” upon which it claimed to be

entrusted with all the Russian émigrés throughout the world, including Russian Orthodox faithful of non-Russian ethnic origins. Because the schismatic bishops and clergy of the Paris Jurisdiction and the American Metropolia had been suspended from serving, the Church Abroad was forced to establish its own parishes in Western Europe and North America in order to give the faithful the possibility to participate in divine services celebrated by canonical clergy. Out of the claim to care for the faithful worldwide arose the obligation to establish parishes wherever Russian Orthodox faithful were found, no matter the size of these communities.

After the schism, the Synod of Bishops remained under the presidency of Metropolitan Antony who, after the separation of Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon, was the undisputed leader of the Church Abroad. He commanded great prestige as a theologian, not only within the emigration but also among the other Orthodox Churches. For his outstanding achievements, he was granted the honorific title “His Beatitude,” and was thus addressed by the Serbian Patriarch and the King of Yugoslavia.⁴ On the theological activities of the Metropolitan cf. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, esp. volumes 9-17. This title is normally appropriate only for the head of an autocephalous or at least an autonomous Church. The other members of the Synod at this time were Archbishop Theophanes of Poltava and Pereyaslavl’ (retired in 1931), Archbishop Sergius of Chernomorsk (d. 1935), from 1934 Archbishop Anastasius of Kishinev, the Bishops Theophanes of Kursk (d. 1944), Hermogenes of Aksaya (d. 1944), Seraphim of Lubny (until 1945), Tikhon of Berlin (since 1938); and, as secretary until 1930 Exocustodian Macharoblidze, and thereafter Count George Grabbe (from 1978 Bishop Gregory, retired in 1986, d. 1995).

The jurisdiction consisted of the following hierarchs: Metropolitans Antony (Khrapovitsky), Innocent (Figurovsky) and Methodius (Gerasimov), Archbishops Anastasius Gribanovsky), Damian (Govorov), Theophanes (Bystrov), Gabriel (Chepur), Hermogenes (Maximov), Meletius (Zaborovsky), Nestor (Anisimov), Seraphim (Lukianov), Sergius (Petrov), and Simon (Vinogradov); and Bishops Apollinarius (Koshevoi, from 1926), Demitrius (Voznesensky, from 1934), Theodosius (Samoilovich, from 1931), John (Maximovich, from 1934), John (Shlemar, from 1931), Joasaph (Skorodumov, from 1930), Juvenal (Kilin, from 1935), Nicholas (Karpov, from 1929, d. 1932), Seraphim (Lade, from 1931), Seraphim (Sobolev), Tikhon (Lyashchenko), Tikhon (Troitsky, from 1930), Victor (Svyatin, since 1932) and Vitaly (Maximenko, from 1934). Bishop Jonah of Hankow and Bishop Michael of Alexandrovsk reposed in 1925. The bishops who went into schism were the following: Metropolitan Eulogius and his vicar bishops: Archbishops Vladimir (Tikhonitsky) and Sergius (Korolev), Bishop Benjamin (Fedchenko, joined the Moscow Patriarchate in 1931) in Western Europe; and Metropolitan Platon (Rozhdestvensky) with Bishops Adam (Philippovsky), and Arsenius (Chagovtsev) in America. The latter bishops, together with the newly-consecrated hierarchs of the North American Diocese Bishops Leontius (Turkevich), Macarius (Ilinsky), and Benjamin (Basalyga), again joined the Church Abroad in 1936.

A total of eighteen bishops belonged to the Synod after the schism in 1927. Seven bishops broke with the Synod and two new jurisdictions were established. One bishop joined the Moscow Patriarchate but remained abroad. Not included in this list are Archbishop Alexander (Nemolovsky), who lived on Athos until 1928 and then joined Metropolitan Eulogius,

Metropolitan Eleutherius of Lithuania (who was subordinate to Moscow), Archbishop John of Riga and Latvia (to whom Patriarch Tikhon had granted autocephaly for his lifetime, murdered in 1934), Panteleimon of Pinsk, and Sergius of Japan. The positions of these hierarchs with regard to the Synod had not altered: they were unable to participate officially in the sessions due to their difficult circumstances but continued to recognize the Synod's moral authority.

Thus, out of a close group of émigré bishops and bishops who had been consecrated by the Church Abroad when it was united, eighteen recognized the Synod's authority, and eight renounced it, of whom three joined the Ecumenical Patriarchate, four established their own jurisdiction (the American Metropolia), and one joined Moscow.

In subsequent years, another seventeen more bishops joined these eighteen bishops, receiving consecration from the Synod of Bishops. New consecrations were necessary to replace hierarchs who had died and to fill those dioceses which had been left leaderless by the schism.

The Council of 1928 was the first convened in which there was not a single debate over the question of legitimacy and canonicity. Metropolitan Eulogius had separated himself; therefore, the Synod had to fill his diocesan see anew. The break with the church administration of Metropolitan Sergius in Moscow was complete, so its consent was not needed.

At the Council in Karlovtsy, which lasted from 20 August/2 September to 27 August/9 September 1928, ten bishops took part in person; Archbishop Anastasius gave his written consent to the minutes, as he had only been able to take part at the last session. In addition to this number, Bishop Benjamin came from Paris to deliver Metropolitan Sergius' demand for a declaration of loyalty to the Soviet government; this demand was naturally rejected.⁵

The most important decision to be made concerned the Western European communities. After confirmation by an ecclesiastical court presided over by Archbishop Innocent and Bishop Simon (Vinogradov), Metropolitan Eulogius was removed as head of the Western European Diocese and suspended from serving. This also applied to his vicars: Archbishop Vladimir, and Bishops Sergius, Benjamin, and Alexander (from 1928). Archbishop Seraphim (Lukianov) was chosen to head the Western European communities of the Church Abroad. The new diocese of Western Europe included parishes in France (17), Austria (2), Hungary (1), England (2), Belgium (1), Italy (2), Luxembourg (2), and Switzerland (4).⁶ Communities under Metropolitan Eulogius existed in France (43, of which seven were in Lille), Germany (4), Belgium (5), Czechoslovakia (2), Italy (2), Holland (1), Sweden (1), Romania (1), Denmark (1), and Norway (1). Metropolitan Eulogius also had clergy in England, Vienna, and Morocco, but no parishes.⁷

These numbers changed over the years, though the 2:1 Eulogius/Seraphim ratio remained more or less constant. Germany became an independent diocese and was not ruled by Archbishop Seraphim. In 1929, Archbishop Seraphim received a vicar bishop for the London communities, Bishop Nicholas, who was the only Russian Orthodox bishop ever to have held the title "Bishop of London."⁸

The Council confirmed the independence of the German diocese and placed Bishop Tikhon at its head.⁹ He remained in that position from 1926-1938 and was succeeded by Bishop Seraphim

(Lade), who had been head of the Austrian communities from 1931-1937.¹⁰ In 1938, Austria became a vicariate of Germany; Bishop Basil became its head. The establishment of the Church Abroad's Western European Diocese resulted in parishes of the Church Abroad existing side by side with parishes of the Paris Jurisdiction in many cities. In a few of the larger cities, a third Russian jurisdiction (the Moscow Patriarchate) joined them, even though at least until 1945, only the smallest splinter groups belonged to the latter. Paris and Berlin were typical examples of this. In Berlin, there had been a parish of the Church Abroad since 1926, first on Fehrbelliner Platz, and from 1938 in the newly-built cathedral on Hohenzollerndamm. Metropolitan Eulogius's parish held divine services on Nachodstrasse and in the Tegel Cemetery Church. After Metropolitan Eulogius was suspended for disobedience by Metropolitan Sergius, under whose jurisdiction he was from 1927-1930, a third parish came into existence. This parish assembled on Fasanenstrasse and was financially subsidized by Metropolitan Eleutherius.¹¹

Similarly, in the North American Diocese, as in Western Europe, there were duplicated administrations. After Metropolitan Platon's schism, only Bishop Apollinary (Koshevo) remained faithful to the Synod. He had been appointed Bishop of Winnipeg at the request of Platon in 1924, but in the same year was made ruling bishop of the San Francisco diocese. Despite good personal relations with Metropolitan Platon and the participants at the Councils of 1924 and 1926 in North America, he refused to break with the Synod of Bishops and remained faithful to it. The Synod ordered Bishop Alexander, who had been living in the Saint Andrew Skete on Mount Athos since 1921, to return to his diocese. He had administered the Russian Diocese of North America from 1917-21 and then relinquished his post to Metropolitan Platon. After Metropolitan Platon's break with the Synod of Bishops, Bishop Alexander was intended to assume the leadership of the Russian Church Abroad's North American Diocese. Bishop Alexander did not comply with this request and was therefore tried by an ecclesiastical court and deposed.¹²

Thus, Bishop Apollinarius assumed the rule of the diocese on 1 February 1927. Two years later, the Synod elevated him to the rank of Archbishop of North America and Canada "for special labors and moral suffering undergone in the course of standing for canonical truth."¹³ To support him, vicariates were created in San Francisco under Bishop Tikhon (Troitsky), in Detroit under Bishop Theodosius (Samoilovich), and in Montreal and Canada under Bishop Joasaph (Skorodumov).¹⁴

The administrative division of North America remained unchanged until the repose of Archbishop Apollinarius in 1933. At this time, sixty-two parishes in the United States and Canada belonged to the Church Abroad.¹⁵ After the repose of Archbishop Apollinarius, the administration was entrusted briefly to Bishop Tikhon, and then in September 1934, to Bishop Vitalius (Maximenko), who became the head of the province of North America. This consisted of three individual dioceses: that of Eastern America, ruled by Archbishop Vitalius, whose see was in Jersey City; that of Western America, ruled by Bishop Tikhon, whose see was in San Francisco and included Alaska; and the newly-created Diocese of Edmonton and Canada, ruled by Bishop Joasaph.¹⁶ This arrangement was, however, not long-lived. After the Metropolia's reunion with the Church Abroad in 1936, there were eleven dioceses and vicariates in

total.¹⁷ This administrative arrangement, which had been made necessary by the schism of the Western European and North American communities, was only a temporary solution. The new arrangement remained in effect, with only slight changes, until the outbreak of the Second World War.

The parishes in South America were likewise reorganized in 1934. The administration of these communities had been taken over by Archpriest Constantine Izraztsov, who had been a priest at the Russian embassy church in Buenos Aires from 1891. In 1934, Bishop Theodosius (Samoilovich) was named Bishop of San Paulo and Brazil and entrusted with the direction of all the South American communities, except for the communities in Argentina, which remained under the administration of Father Izraztsov. This administrative order remained in force until 1945; soon thereafter, a new administrative arrangement became necessary due to the fresh influx of Russian émigré.

The consolidation of ecclesiastical administration was of the highest importance; it was a prerequisite for the strengthening of church life. The creation of new dioceses was necessary primarily in order to have a sensible administrative organization of those communities located in a specific territory, often within national boundaries. This was the case with the dioceses in the Far East, in North America, and also partly in Europe (Germany, England, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey). Widely dispersed communities were subordinated to one diocesan bishop, for example, in South America and in Europe, where one bishop was entrusted with various countries.

A number of parishes were directly under the Synod of Bishops (stavropegial), such as certain ones in Asia, Australia, and individual parishes in North Africa. For these communities simply having a priest was of the greatest importance. In most cases, this was possible in the 1920s, because there existed sufficient clergy. As time passed, an ever-increasing problem developed in the emigration, because a great many priests died and there were no educational institutions subject to the Synod to make it possible for all candidates to study theology and prepare for ordination. As shown in the list of the episcopate earlier in this chapter, by the mid-30s approximately half of the émigré bishops had died and been replaced by younger candidates. These were mostly hierarchs who had received their education before the Revolution. Yet the problem of educating their own candidates became increasingly more pressing the longer the emigration lasted. These problems naturally affected the lower clergy in the same proportion. The shortage of priests worsened due to the schism, in that now in numerous cities parishes of various jurisdictions each required their own priest.

Archbishop Damian of Tsaritsyn took the first step towards creating a facility for the education of priests by founding a school for pastoral studies in Bulgaria in 1923.¹⁸ Individual candidates were able to study at the theological seminaries and graduate facilities in Warsaw, Sofia, and Belgrade; yet the diaspora and émigré communities still lacked their own educational institution, which would meet their special needs. The possibility of using the Saint Sergius Institute in Paris was effectively destroyed as a consequence of the schism. In the province of the Far East, pastoral courses were begun in 1928, which developed to such an extent that by 1934 a theological faculty at the Saint Vladimir Institute in Harbin was founded. This faculty, which

enjoyed state recognition of its diploma, continued the tradition of the pre-Revolutionary Russian academies and was the first graduate theological institution under the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad, though its students were overwhelmingly from the Far East. In America, where the unity of the Church emigration had been reestablished in 1936, Saint Vladimir's Theological Seminary was founded in 1937; today it is under the jurisdiction of the Orthodox Church in America. For Europe, there was an attempt to organize courses to prepare men for the priesthood at the Monastery of Saint Job in Ladomirova. The hope that this would develop into a seminary was to be realized only after World War II. If today one wonders why the Synod waited so long to establish its own educational institution, the answer must be that the majority of émigré viewed the emigration as temporary, and counted on a quick return to Russia. Of course, financial considerations also came into play, though these were not decisive.

Wherever it was not possible to have a priest, there was at least an attempt to help the faithful by means of distributing Orthodox literature. The dissemination of information and the propagation of the Faith through church literature were realized by a series of diocesan and parish journals, church calendars, and books and pamphlets of catechetical, theological, spiritual, historical, and literary content. Besides the religious-catechetical publications, which served to inform and instruct the people in the Church about their Faith, the Church Abroad also published books and brochures intended to help the émigrés preserve their Russian heritage.¹⁹

However, the establishment of theological schools for the education of priests and of new printing presses and publishing houses would have been unthinkable without the Russian monasteries and convents.²⁰ The need for publishing houses became increasingly more urgent after the danger of schism arose within the Church Abroad in 1924. Missionary work had already begun in the monasteries: in Harbin, the Convent of the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God was founded in 1924 and the Monastery of the Kazan Icon of the Mother of God in 1925; in Ladomirova, Czechoslovakia, the Monastery of Saint Job was founded in 1924; and the Convent of the Lesna Icon of the Mother of God, to which an orphanage was attached, was established in Yugoslavia in 1920. One major achievement of this convent lay in the fact that during the time between the wars it renewed twenty-seven Serbian convents, thereby not only doing the Serbian Church a great service but also repaying a small part of the debt owed by the Russian Church Abroad to the Serbian Church for its generous help and support. This convent, like all the other monastic houses existing in the emigration, has had a lasting influence on the spiritual life and theological mind of the Church Abroad in a most profound and enduring way. As spiritual centers, the monasteries have been places of pilgrimage for thousands, as well as centers for the renewal of the Church, whence many of the most important hierarchs of the emigration have come. The spiritual and theological radiance of the monasteries has attracted men and women filled with the desire for a life of prayer and obedience entirely directed towards God. The continuation of its monastic traditions demonstrates most clearly that the Church Abroad is the heir of the pre-Revolutionary Russian Church, whose spiritual and theological life was likewise closely bound to its monasteries. If one notes the accomplishments of the Church Abroad in preserving the monastic ideals and traditions of old Russia, one must also recognize that it is the only one among the Russian émigré jurisdictions which can claim to have preserved this thousand-year tradition of the Russian Church. Neither the Paris Jurisdiction nor the American

Metropolia (OCA) has been able to found an enduring monastic community comparable to those that the Church Abroad has produced and continues to produce.

This success in consolidating church life could not hide the fact that the schism of the Western European and North American dioceses was perceived both by the emigration and by the sister Orthodox Churches as deplorable and burdensome. Appeals to reestablish unity were not lacking. In 1933, the Patriarch of Romania and the Archbishop of Athens made just such an appeal to the emigration, with the Serbian Patriarch acting as mediator.²¹ In August of 1934, an appeal from twenty-four hierarchs to reestablish church unity appeared in the journal *Orthodox Carpatho-Russia* (*Pravoslavnaya Karpatskaya Rus'*), signed by Dionysius, the Metropolitan of Warsaw and Bishop John (Buillen) of Pechora.²² Numerous bishops answered this appeal with letters of agreement sent to the editor, including all the hierarchs in North America, except Bishop Leontius (who remained a lifelong defender of autocephaly in North America), Benjamin (Basalyga) and Antonin, and from the West European Exarchate, Archbishop Vladimir (Tikhonitsky) and Bishop Alexander (Nemolovsky) agreed with the appeal, though Metropolitan Eulogius and Bishop Sergius (Korolev) did not answer.²³

This appeal was preceded by a resolution of the Council of Bishops of 1933, based on Archbishop Seraphim's report, in which he indicated that strong tendencies were noticeable among the faithful of North American and Western Europe to reestablish church unity. After this report, the Council published a resolution, in which the bishops expressed their regret over the 1926 schism and their desire for a reunion in the interest of the spiritual and national union of the emigration. The Council guaranteed that all hierarchs who had separated from the Church Abroad since 1926 would be accepted back into the community of worship when they would be ready to acknowledge the Synod and the Council as their canonical authorities. Furthermore, it stated that the Church Abroad did not consider itself autocephalous and that all its dioceses, ecclesiastical missions, parishes, and monasteries formed an inseparable branch of the Russian Church, whose first hierarch was Metropolitan Peter of Krutitsa, Patriarchal locum tenens.²⁴ In May 1934, Metropolitan Antony directed an appeal to the faithful in North America. Metropolitan Theophilus, the successor to Metropolitan Platon, who had since died, responded positively to this appeal. He said that he was prepared to enter into discussions with Bishop Tikhon, who had at this point taken over the administration of the American diocese of the Church Abroad.²⁵

Following this, in August, the Synod lifted the ban on celebrating the divine services, which had been imposed in 1927. In March of 1935, Archbishop Vitalius, leading the North American Diocese of the Russian Church Abroad and Metropolitan Leontius of the American Metropolia, joined together for the first time in serving the Liturgy in the Cathedral of the Protection, in New York.²⁶ Thus, an important step was taken towards reunification, which was confirmed in 1935.

In the Western European Dioceses, there were noticeable factions that were in favor of overcoming the division, but also influential circles that were opposed to unification. Metropolitan Eulogius characterized this time as a conciliatory period.²⁷ For this reason great hopes were placed in the trip that Metropolitan Eulogius made in May 1934 to visit Metropolitan Antony. The official journal of the Synod of Bishops, *Church Life*, commenting on this journey

in a report, that there was much talk of reconciliation in the émigré press in connection with this meeting – as if the misfortune of the schism had been caused by the personal relations of the two bishops. Metropolitan Antony insisted that he had at no time been in a state of enmity with Metropolitan Eulogius, but, on the contrary, felt deep friendship towards Metropolitan Eulogius, then as now, regardless of all the sad incidents in the last years. If Metropolitan Antony had broken liturgical communion with Eulogius, this did not happen as the consequence of personal discord, but because Metropolitan Eulogius separated himself from the Synod of Bishops.

Metropolitan Eulogius's going to Belgrade was only in connection with Metropolitan Antony's, poor state of health. Liturgical communion could be resumed as a broad first step towards reunification. In any case, the full reestablishment of unity could not yet be concluded by the two hierarchs, since Eulogius would still have to obtain the consent of the Ecumenical Patriarch and Metropolitan Antony that of the Council of Bishops.²⁸ A further article appeared with the title "On the Path to Unity."²⁹

In Belgrade, there were several meetings between Metropolitans Eulogius and Antony and a session of the Synod of Bishops in which Metropolitan Eulogius, Bishop Seraphim (Lade) of Vienna, and the newly-consecrated Bishop Vitalius (Maximenko) participated, together with other permanent members of the Synod of Bishops. Metropolitan Antony gave a report on the possibilities of reestablishing liturgical communion, but also indicated that this step would require the agreement of the Council of Bishops.³⁰ After this session, Eulogius received a telegram from the chairman of his diocesan consistory, Count Kokovtsev, reading: "I ask you to take no final steps towards reconciliation."³¹

The possibility of the reestablishment of liturgical communion was suggested by both sides; the preconditions were to be clarified at a meeting between the first hierarchs of the Churches in the autumn, with Patriarch Barnabus presiding. Eulogius's readiness to reconcile fully with the Synod was already in doubt. Upon his return home from Belgrade, he declared that "nothing had changed."³²

In the summer, all the preparations had been completed to such an extent that Patriarch Barnabus was able to send invitations to the leaders of the four ecclesiastical provinces to begin negotiations under his direction in October: Metropolitan Eulogius for Western Europe, Metropolitan Anastasius for the Balkans, Metropolitan Theophilus for America, and Bishop Demetrius (Voznesensky) for the Far East. The negotiations were most difficult and lasted eighteen days,³³ but statutes led finally to a common protocol on "The Provisional Statutes of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad."³⁴ In these "statutes," which required the consent of the individual ecclesiastical provinces, it was established that the "Russian Orthodox Church Abroad" is an inseparable part of the Russian Orthodox Church and recognizes the Patriarchal *locum tenens*, Metropolitan Peter, as its primate, who should be commemorated in Divine Services of all churches. The supreme legislative, juridical, and ruling body of the Church Abroad is the Council of Bishops, which meets annually; and its executive branch is the Synod of Bishops. Chapter III defines the duties of the Council of Bishops; Chapter IV that of the Synod of Bishops. In Chapter III, concerning the Council of Bishops, paragraph 4 was of special significance, discussing the establishment and abolition of episcopal sees and changes of

diocesan boundaries. Chapter VI sets forth the following: the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia consists of four provinces: Western Europe, the Near East, North America, and the Far East. Chapter VI, paragraph 3: The division of the territory and the communities of these provinces must be approved by a general episcopal Council.

This protocol on the “Provisional Statutes” had the great advantage of defining the validity and rights of the administration precisely and thereby prevented any future “interpretations.” The negotiators – Metropolitan Eulogius, Theophilus, and Anastasius – and the secretary of the negotiations, Bishop Demetrius, signed the “Provisional Statutes.” Patriarch Barnabus signed as the presiding hierarch of the negotiations.

Upon his return to America, Metropolitan Theophilus praised this document as the “canonical foundation” of the Russian Church in North America. In November, an assembly of bishops took place at Saint Tikhon’s Monastery in South Canaan, Pennsylvania, which approved the statutes. In subsequent weeks solemn divine services were held, which liturgically blessed the reestablished unity.³⁵ From the beginning, Metropolitan Eulogius seems not to have genuinely desired to participate in the negotiations for reunification. It was also evident that he had hoped to find understanding and support from Metropolitan Theophilus.³⁶

Upon his return to Paris, Metropolitan Eulogius visited his vicar, Bishop Sergius of Prague, who gave him to understand that he could not abide by many points in the “Provisional Statutes.”³⁷ A session of the diocesan council in Paris above all else expressed criticism of the strong central authority of the Council and the Synod. They decided only to agree to the “Provisional Statutes” if the Ecumenical Patriarch would agree to release the Western European province from his jurisdiction and allow it to rejoin the Karlovtsy Synod of Bishops. It was a foregone conclusion that Constantinople would express reservations. In his Nativity Epistle to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Metropolitan Eulogius wrote soon thereafter: “Our bishops wanted to separate me from Your Holiness’ jurisdiction for reasons which are not entirely clear, but my flock and I cannot agree to this.”³⁸ In June of 1936, an assembly of Eulogius’s diocese met, in which all 109 of his clergy participated. A heated debate arose between the supporters and the opponents of the “Provisional Statutes,” leading to the formation of a “Committee for Reunification”; yet the agreement was finally vetoed.³⁹ Metropolitan Eulogius informed the Serbian Patriarch and Metropolitan Anastasius that he could only agree to a “moral unity,” but not an administrative one. Thereby, Metropolitan Anthony’s attempt to re-establish the unity of the Russian Church in Western Europe was shattered.

Today it is difficult to determine whether Metropolitan Eulogius had seriously desired reconciliation and reunification or had participated in the negotiations only for tactical reasons. The Patriarch of Serbia, as a mediator, enjoyed the great respect of the Russian émigré for having given the utmost support to the émigré bishops and the Church Abroad in general. Metropolitan Eulogius had also enjoyed this hospitality in the first years of his exile. Thus, he could hardly have refused an invitation from the Patriarch. He also had to account for those factions of the emigration that supported unity, which in 1933-35 were numerically strong. Indeed, Metropolitan Eulogius himself called this epoch the “conciliatory period.” So for him, there were important reasons to participate in the negotiations, as he did not want to be held responsible for

the schism. This danger was all the greater for him, in that the majority of the American bishops favored reunification even before the negotiations had begun. In his memoirs, the Metropolitan mentions only the views of Bishop Sergius of Prague but remains entirely silent about the views of Archbishops Vladimir and Alexander. Both had spoken out in favor of unity in a letter to the newspaper *Orthodox Carpatho-Russia*. It can be assumed that Archbishop Vladimir had the desired reunification, because later, as head of the Paris Jurisdiction, he took various steps to re-establish unity.⁴⁰ The greatest opposition came from the laity on the diocesan council and the professors of the Saint Sergius Institute. Both these groups, it seems, decisively declined to accept the “Provisional Statutes,” thereby allowing the reunification to fail.

Metropolitan Antony did not take part in the negotiations due to very poor health. On 30 September/13 October 1935 the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood was celebrated in Belgrade, at which Patriarch Barnabus of Serbia, Metropolitan Elias of Lebanon, eight Russian bishops, and representatives of other national Orthodox Churches took part. Congratulatory messages came from the heads of all national Orthodox Churches, and from Metropolitans Eulogius and Theophilus, as well as from representatives of non-Orthodox denominations. At the festivities, representatives of the Russian emigration, including members of the House of Romanov, took part, as well as members of the Serbian Royal Family and Yugoslav government officials. The Jubilee committee published a 432-page anniversary volume entitled *A Collection of Selected Writings of His Beatitude Antony, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia, with a Portrait and a Biography of the Author (Sbornik izbrannykh Sochinenii Blazhenneishago Antoniya, Mitropolita Kievskago I Galickago s portretom i Zhizneopisaniem avtora. Yubileinoe izdanie ko dnyu 50-letiya svyashchennosluzheniya)*.⁴¹

These festivities were the last great public event in which Metropolitan Antony participated. At Pascha of 1936, he was only able to attend divine services in a wheelchair. Since 1927, his health had been deteriorating, so that standing and walking had become difficult for him. In addition to his physical deterioration, he suffered deep pain over the situation of the Russian Church in the homeland and in the emigration.⁴² His health deteriorated rapidly from the end of July 1936. On 28 July/10 August 1936, Metropolitan Antony reposed in the Lord. After a memorial service on 29 July/11 August in the Karlovtsy Cathedral, his remains were taken to Belgrade and the following day he was laid in state in the Cathedral of the Serbian Patriarchate, where the official funeral took place. The funeral was served by Patriarch Barnabus, Metropolitan Anastasius, Archbishop Hermogenes, a number of Serbian bishops, and archimandrites, archpriests, priests, and deacons. Patriarch Barnabus and Archbishop Anastasius eulogized the life and works of the late hierarch. The funeral procession began at the Patriarchal Cathedral and went first to the Holy Trinity Russian Church, and then to the Church of the Iveron Icon of the Mother of God, where the Metropolitan was finally laid to rest in the crypt below.⁴³

In the obituaries and telegrams of condolence, which came on the occasion of Metropolitan Antony’s death, the First Hierarch was called the “founder” of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. This was an accurate appellation. In over one hundred theological works he had not only influenced the theological thought and spiritual life of the Church Abroad for posterity but through his personal example had formed an entire generation of bishops and clergy. The idea of

an indivisible, integral whole Russian Church, whose free part was represented by the Church Abroad, stemmed largely from him. His prestige, which he also enjoyed in the homeland, will never be more clearly documented than by the fact that after the news of his repose reached Russia, numerous clergy served memorial services (panikhidi). As a consequence of these services, over one hundred priests from Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev were arrested and/or deported. ⁴⁴

Metropolitan Anastasius (Gribanovsky) succeeded Metropolitan Antony; the former had been the First Hierarch's deputy since 1932 and had been elevated to the rank of Metropolitan in 1935. The reestablishment of the unity of the Russian Church, if only in America, was due in part to his skill in negotiation. Metropolitan Anastasius (b. 1873, d. 1965) carried out his duties as First Hierarch of the Church Abroad until 1964 when he stepped down from this position due to advanced age. The twenty-nine years during which he presided over the Church Abroad were distinguished by the year 1938 when the Church tended over one thousand parishes, and the years 1945-49 when the Church had to begin anew after suffering heavy losses in Eastern Europe, China and Manchuria.

Footnotes

1. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6, pp. 95-183; here there are many documents in defense of the Patriarchal Church and the Patriarch. ↵
2. *Echos d'Orient* (1934) 173, pp. 107-108. ↵
3. A typical example is the Second Vatican Council, at which the representatives of the Patriarchal Church, the Church Abroad and the Paris Jurisdiction took part. Cf. Patock, *Auslandskirche und Vatikanisches Konzil*. ↵
4. Andreev, *Kratkij obzor*, p. 108. *Echos d'Orient* (1932) 165, pp. 95-96. ↵
5. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7: pp. 185-213. ↵
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 235-236. ↵
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 233-235; Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 409-571. ↵
8. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7: pp. 277-278. ↵
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 272-275. ↵
10. Seide, *Russische Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*. ↵
11. Volkmann, pp. 20-21; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7:272-275. ↵
12. *Tserk. Ved.* (1928) 5-6, p. 1. ↵
13. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7: pp. 390-391. ↵
14. *Ibid.*, 7: pp. 398-400; 5: pp. 276-280. ↵
15. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1933) 7, p. 133. ↵

16. For further developments, cf. Part IV, Chaps. 1.4-1.5. ↵
17. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) 7, p. 104-105. ↵
18. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 4. ↵
19. Seide, *Drückerei und Verlagswesen*. ↵
20. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 2; Seide, *Die Klöster der ROK*. ↵
21. *Echos d'Orient* (1934) 174, p. 107-108. ↵
22. *Prav. Karp. Rus'* (1934)1/14.8. 1934. ↵
23. *Severnoi Ameriki*, pp. 62-68. ↵
24. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7:311-312; *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp. 76-77. ↵
25. *Severnoi Ameriki*, pp. 64-65. ↵
26. *Ibid.*, p. 67. ↵
27. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 269. ↵
28. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1934) 6, pp. 95-96. ↵
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-99. ↵
30. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7:337; Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 629. ↵
31. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7: 337. ↵
32. *Tserk. Zhizn'*, (1934) 8, pp.127-131. ↵
33. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7:375-379; *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1:82-86. ↵
34. The Four Protocols of the session and the Provisional Statutes are published in *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1935) 11-12, pp. 164-178; for the translation of the Provisional Statutes, see below pp. 439-444. ↵
35. *Severnoi Ameriki*, pp. 72-73; *Prav. Rus'* (1936)1, p. 5. ↵
36. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 638. ↵
37. *Ibid.*, p. 642. ↵
38. *Ibid.*, p. 643. ↵
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 643-644. ↵
40. *Mitropolit Vladimir*, p. 145. ↵
41. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10: pp. 172-192; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) 4-5, pp. 52-56. ↵
42. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10: pp. 215. ↵

43. Ibid., pp. 215-237. ↵

44. Ibid., p. 237. ↵

Part I, Chapter 6

The Last Years of the Karlovtsy Emigration (1936 – 1944)

In 1936, the Council of Bishops appointed Metropolitan Anastasius successor to Metropolitan Anthony. They also accepted the results of the negotiations of the previous year and the “Provisional Statutes” as the “Charter” of the Church Abroad. The administration of the Church was formed by the four metropolitan districts: the Near East (the Balkans) ruled by Metropolitan Anastasius, Western Europe ruled by Metropolitan Seraphim (Lukianov), North America and Canada ruled by Metropolitan Theophilus (Pashkovsky), and the Far East ruled by Archbishop Victor (Sviatin). The district with the most bishops was that of North America, with one metropolitan, three archbishops, and seven bishops.

In essence, this order prevailed until 1945. Only in Central Europe was there a change in administration at the behest of the National Socialist regime. In 1938, Bishop Tikhon was relieved of his duties as ruling bishop of the German diocese and replaced by Bishop Seraphim (Lade, a native German),¹ who had fled the Soviet Union in 1930, and until 1937 had been a vicar bishop of the German Diocese, administering the communities in Vienna and Austria. From the time of his appointment as Bishop of Berlin in 1938, he was a member of the Synod of Bishops. In 1939, he was elevated to the rank of Archbishop, and in 1942 to the Metropolitan of Central Europe. At that time, a new metropolitan district was formed within the Church Abroad, consisting of Greater Germany, Belgium, Slovakia, and Luxembourg. Belgium and Luxembourg had been removed from the metropolitan district of Western Europe. Eulogius’ vicar bishops Alexander and Sergius, who had been residing in Brussels and Prague, were forced by the German authorities to place themselves under the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad. Alexander refused and was, therefore, placed under house arrest in Berlin; Sergius recognized the new situation, but lived in seclusion in Prague, celebrating only in his own church and otherwise avoiding public appearances. The vicariate of Austria was transferred to Bishop Basil (Pavlovsky) in 1938. In 1942, Germany was given a vicar bishop, Bishop Philip (von Gardner) with his see in Potsdam.² This necessary reorganization of Central Europe remained in effect until the collapse of Germany.

For the Church Abroad, the most significant event in the 1930s was the second Pan-Diaspora Council [...] in 1938.³ Already at the Council of Bishops in 1923 the question of the convocation of a new Council was discussed.⁴ After signs of reconciliation began to appear in 1934-35, the question of convening such a Council again became pressing. In January of 1935, Metropolitan Anthony read a report before the Synod of Bishops, in which, among other things, he enumerated the tasks that would confront a future Council. In addition to the problems of strengthening Church organization and the ordering of church property, the most important question would be the future course of the Church in the spiritual rebirth of the faithful and instruction in the Faith. Also, ways and means had to be found to struggle against sectarianism and the general anti-clerical efforts of certain circles within the emigration.⁵ After this report, the Synod decided to appoint a preparatory Commission for the Council, which was supposed to meet in 1936. Metropolitan Anthony’s death necessitated a postponement.⁶ At the meetings of the Council of Bishops in 1936 and 1937, the matter of the Pan-Diaspora Council was taken up

anew, and an agenda was drafted. It was then decided that the Council should be convened in 1938, which coincided with the 950th anniversary of the Conversion of Russia to Christianity.

Ninety-seven people took part in the Council, who, according to a report in *Orthodox Russia* on 20 September 1938 (No. 17-18), “represented the entire Russian emigration.” This was certainly true if one understands this to include only the Church organizations. Naturally, the Paris Jurisdiction did not participate. For his part, Metropolitan Eulogius accused the Council of having “great canonical shortcomings” and Metropolitan Anastasius of not possessing the full authority to convene such a Council. He also criticized the Council’s claim that it was a “Pan-Diaspora” assembly as false, since his “organization,” which has greater claims to canonicity, was not represented.⁷

It was certainly regrettable that Eulogius’ communities were not represented at the Council, though they themselves were mostly to blame. Nevertheless, the Council represented the absolute majority of the Russian ecclesiastical emigration. Besides the Russian dioceses and ecclesiastical districts, the diaspora communities in Africa and Asia, the Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem, the Peking Ecclesiastical Mission and the Mission in Urmia (Persia) were equally represented there. The Council consisted of fifty-eight lay participants, who formed the majority, and thirty-nine clergymen (bishops, priests and monks). This occurred because representatives of academic and theological institutions took part in the Council, such as, for example, the Russian-Academic Institute in Belgrade, the Palestine Society, the Cadet Corps of the Imperial Army and Navy, the Russian Veterans’ Organization, [...] representatives from the St. Vladimir Institute, the Vladimir Brotherhood of Berlin and [...] the Imperial (Dynastic) House.⁸ Altogether, twenty-eight reports were delivered, and two epistles to the faithful were written. The ecclesiastic-religious character of this Council had essentially stronger representation than at the Council of 1921, where the question of dynastic succession had brought about heated discussions. Indeed, the conservative monarchist circles had hoped that Council would have decided to canonize Tsar Nicholas II and his family, though no such radical decisions were made.⁹

After [...] detailed reports on the situation of the Russian Church in the homeland,¹⁰ the ecclesiastic-religious problems of the emigration stood at the center of further deliberations. There were detailed discussions on the spiritual and theological instruction of the emigres, catechism for the youth, questions of ecclesiastical discipline, the education of priests, the relations of the Church Abroad with Orthodox and non-Orthodox Churches, the relationship to the ecumenical movement, Roman Catholicism and finally, to the Paris Jurisdiction.

Regarding the schism of the Paris Jurisdiction, the Council stated that it was with “profound regret” that they took cognizance of the continued schism, after all, that Metropolitan Anthony and the Serbian Patriarch had done to overcome it. By subordinating himself to the Ecumenical Patriarch, Eulogius had gone against the directives of Patriarch Tikhon, who had considered the Western European Diocese Abroad part of the Russian Church. Thus, Eulogius had trodden an uncanonical path, in that he and his communities were only a “part of a diocese” (the Diocese of Petersburg) and, therefore, a component part of the Russian Church. A part of a diocese cannot subordinate itself to another jurisdiction.¹¹

With regard to spiritual and religious education, all clergymen were called upon to conduct more work among the youth, and an appeal was sent to the communities to support the building of community schools – elementary and secondary. ¹² To promote the idea of a future Orthodox Russia with an Orthodox government, the “Vladimir Brotherhood” was founded, whose members were required to align their lives with Church precepts (by attending Sunday services, by keeping church feasts and fasts) and to place their family lives on a Christian basis (morning and evening prayers, daily readings from the Gospel). All men and women over eighteen years of age were eligible for membership; a special youth group would be founded for minors. Efforts were to be made to found brotherhoods at all cathedrals, missions and larger communities; these brotherhoods were to keep their feast on the 15th of July annually – the feast of the St. Vladimir (and the day on which the Conversion of Russia is commemorated) – with festive divine services and commemorative events. ¹³

If Russia were liberated from Communism, the monasticism preserved in the diaspora would play a special role, because the Soviets had marked monasticism in the homeland for destruction. ¹⁴ In the emigration, missionary courses were set up at the monasteries to educate specialists in the Church services (experts on the Church ordo, singers, precentors, etc.) Besides this, graduates of such courses were also supposed to learn how to run printing presses, so that later, in a free Russia, the great printing presses in the Lavra of the Kiev Caves, the Holy Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra, Pochaev and Shamordino could be rebuilt. Also, young monks and nuns were to be prepared, who might later be in a position to assume the leadership of Russian monasteries in the homeland. The monasteries were to form a spiritual and meditative center for the life of the emigration but were also to fulfill social, charitable, missionary, and pedagogical functions. ¹⁵

From this brief summary alone, one can see what a comprehensive program the Council had to deal with. The reports, the subsequent discussions, and the resolutions and decisions of the assembly were compiled and published in a 745-page volume entitled *Acts of the Second All-Diaspora Council of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia (Deyaniya Vtorogo Vsezarubezhnago Sobora Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi Zagranitsei)*, Belgrade, 1939. ¹⁶

The Second Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad took place at a time when the persecution of the Church in the Soviet Union had reached its height. ¹⁷ “The year 1937 remains in the memory of millions of people as a year of indescribable horror and terror. In that year, the Communists indulged in real orgies of terror, and the country fell mute in its desperate fear... Bloody waves of terror were directed against religion in Russia. The blows of the atheist government even now paralyze impulses of religious life in the U.S.S.R.” ¹⁸ In that year alone, 8,000 churches were closed. Hand in hand with these mass closures went mass arrests of the clergy. ¹⁹ During this reign of terror against the clergy and faithful, which can only be documented with difficulty since no precise figures or data are available, there are hints to be found in the fate of the bishops, which show what losses the Church must have suffered in those years:

Number of Bishops, who

	in the year were arrested,	died,	retired,	consecrated ²⁰
1935	14	2	7	3
1936	20	1	10	2
1937	50	7	3	0

In 1939, the only four bishops still ruling their dioceses were Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky, Patriarch from 1943), Alexis (Simansky, Patriarch from 1945), ²¹ Nicholas (Yarushevich), and Archbishop Sergius (Voskresensky). ²² To these one must add almost another dozen bishops, who were either retired or who functioned as rectors in individual churches. ²³ The result of this terror became even more apparent when Metropolitan Sergius was elected to the office of Patriarch. ²⁴ Before the Revolution there were 163 bishops. During the confusion of the '20s, when numerous hierarchs were incarcerated or exiled and replaced by newly-consecrated bishops, there were a total of 260 canonical bishops, i.e. bishops who were under the official Patriarchal Church (Tikhonites). ²⁵ The destruction of the Church in the Soviet Union was nearly complete before the outbreak of World War II. Originally in 1917, there were over 1,200 convents and monasteries, but after 1929 there were none; of the 79,000 Orthodox churches and chapels “only 400 were left.” ²⁶ The theological academies, seminaries, parochial schools, libraries, archives etc. were closed for twenty years; some of them were simply destroyed. The Church was forbidden to conduct any form of missionary activity, to spread the Word of God in any way outside of the church building. Considering the few churches allowed to continue their existence in the country, this meant that the Church was condemned to silence and could no longer fulfill its duty to care for souls. Terror and oppression could indeed have destroyed the outward existence of the Church, but not the faith of the people. This was proven in the 1937 census, the results of which were not made public. Loud proclamations by the militant atheists indicated that 50% of urban dwellers and 70% of rural inhabitants were “believers.” ²⁷ It should be taken into account that many citizens certainly did not answer the question out of fear of possible reprisals. Moreover, the atheists would surely have doctored the results in their favor so that they would not have to answer for the total failure of their “struggle against religion.” The true situation became apparent after the German invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941, when in the occupied territory hundreds, even thousands, of churches were reopened within a very brief period of time; priests, monks and nuns returned to their old communities, and monasteries from the catacombs. This religious spring, which also affected the faithful in unoccupied territories, ²⁸ forced the Soviet government to make a radical change with regard to its policy towards religion, which was clearly shown to be completely ineffective.

While the Moscow Patriarchate was shattering under the blows of brutal persecution, ecclesiastical life in the emigration blossomed after overcoming the Schism. Metropolitan Eulogius' Paris Jurisdiction counted some seventy-five communities with 110 priests and 3 vicar bishops (Vladimir of Nice, Alexander of Brussels and Sergius of Prague) and its own theological seminary for the education of priests. At this time, the Paris Jurisdiction possessed only a small minority of emigres compared to the Church Abroad, which cared for the great majority of them.

There were approximately 1,000 communities in the Church Abroad worldwide at the end of the '30s. Most communities had their own church or chapel, or at least a temporary church. Many of these churches had been built by the emigres without government or outside assistance. To give just one example: in Manchuria alone during the years 1920-45, 48 churches were built, 27 of them between 1930 and 1945.²⁹ Most communities of the Church Abroad had one priest, of whom more and more were receiving their education in the emigration. Metropolitan Anastasius had been the First Hierarch of the Church Abroad and President of the Synod of Bishops since 1936; the Synod had five to seven standing members. The jurisdiction of the Church Abroad consisted of four metropolitans, ten archbishops and fourteen bishops; they were: Metropolitans Anastasius (Gribanovsky), Theophilus (Pashkovsky), Meletius (Zaborovsky) and Seraphim (Lukianov); Archbishops Adam (Philipovsky, retired in 1938), Hermogenes (Maximov), Nestor (Anisimov), Seraphim (Lade), Seraphim (Sobolev), Simon (Vinogradov), Tikhon (Lyashchenko), Tikhon (Troitsky), Victor (Svyatin), Vitalius (Maximenko); and Bishops Arsenius (Chagovtsev), Alexis (Panteleev), Demetrius (Voznesensky), Theodosius (Samoilovich), Theophanes (Gavrilov), Gregory (Ostroumov), Hieronymus (Chernov), John (Maximovich), John (Shleman), Joasaph (Skorodumov), Juvenal (Kilin), Leonty (Turkevich), Macarius (Ilinsky), Basil (Pavlovsky) and Benjamin (Basalyga). They administered 24 archdioceses, dioceses and vicariates: in North America – the Metropolia of All America and Canada, the Archdioceses of Western America and Seattle, Philadelphia and the Carpatho-Russians, Eastern America and Jersey City, and the Dioceses of Detroit and Cleveland, Alaska and the Aleutians, Illinois and Chicago, Western Canada and Calgary, Pittsburgh and West Virginia, Eastern Canada and Montreal, Boston; in South America: Sao Paulo and Brazil; in Europe: Brussels and Western Europe (Metropolia) with the vicariates of Cannes, Berlin and Germany with the vicariate of Vienna and Austria, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria; in the Far East: Peking and China with the vicariate of Shanghai, Harbin and Manchuria with the vicariates of Chichikar and Khailar, Kamchatka and Seoul).

In the monasteries there lived 180 monks and 40 novices and 450 nuns. The monasteries and convents were distributed geographically as follows: in Palestine, one monastery, the Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem with 20 monks, four convents with 300 nuns; in Serbia, comma one monastery with 25 monks and one convent with 70 nuns; in Bulgaria, comma one monastery, and one convent with 10 occupants; semicolon in Czechoslovakia, comma one monastery with 30 monks; in China, comma one monastery with 26 monks, one convent and three church houses with 40 nuns; in Manchuria, one monastery with 30 monks and 40 novices, and one convent with 30 nuns; and, finally in the United States, two monasteries with 40 monks between them.³⁰

In numerous larger communities there were parochial schools, which provided regular instruction. In addition to these, the Church also maintained boarding schools for girls, many orphanages, hospitals, clinics, dispensaries, homes for the elderly and nursing homes, apprentice workshops for the youth and numerous handicraft enterprises.³¹

The education of future priests took place at two seminaries and a theological faculty whose academic program was comparable to that of a theological academy in Russia. At the St.

Vladimir Institute in Harbin, in addition to the Theological Faculty there was also a faculty of arts and sciences, and one of architecture and electrical engineering. (The Institute had received certification and the status of a university from the Chinese authorities.) The need for ecclesiastical utensils, icons and vestments were overwhelmingly met by church and monastery workshops. Church books, gospels, prayer-books, periodicals and religious literature were published by Church printing presses, of which the largest were those at the Monastery of St. Job in Ladomirova and at the Convent of the Kazan Icon of the Mother of God in Harbin. Since 1933, the official journal of the Synod of Bishops has been the journal *Church Life (Tserkovnaya Zhizn')*, which was issued biweekly (currently, quarterly). Along with this, two semi-official journals were also published – *Orthodox Russia (Pravoslavnaya Rus')* since 1926, and *The Bread of Heaven* since 1930.³²

The outbreak of World War II and the Communist seizure of power in Eastern Europe, China and Manchuria, were stunning blows to the Church Abroad, for it lost all its possessions in these territories, though it succeeded in reorganizing Church life anew and gathering together the dispersed flock once again.

With the outbreak of the War in 1939, contacts were interrupted between the Synod of Bishops and many dioceses and communities of the diaspora. The “Provisional Statutes of 1936” had given the North American and Far Eastern Metropolitan Districts far-reaching autonomous administrations, though they still had to receive the ratification of the Synod of Bishops for their most important decisions, e.g. the appointment, advancement or deposition of bishops, the opening of theological seminaries, pastoral courses, the publication of ecclesiastical literature, etc. Thus, when contacts were broken, the administrative divisions and the personal existence of the hierarchy remained practically unaltered until 1945 (with the exception of the Central European Metropolia). The Council of 1938 had made decisions and resolutions that, in the following years, served as ecclesiastical and political guidelines for the bishops and clergy administering their territory. The last council of Bishops met in Vienna in 1943, primarily to discuss the election of Metropolitan Sergius as the new Patriarch.

Much has been written on the political stance of the Synod of Bishops since World War II. Frequently, the Church Abroad, or certain of its hierarchs, has been accused of collaborating with the Nazis. Often, these accusations are based on ignorance, insufficiently researched contentions, or an erroneous evaluation of the political tenets of the Church Abroad. If one looks first at the Soviet accusations, then at those in Western writings, one finds that the latter are the same as the former. A typical example can be found in an essay by Maier-Hultschin, which appeared in 1954 and has been repeated by many authors without [...] verification.³³ This author’s report is notable for its crass mistakes and ignorance of the Church Abroad, so much so that it would be necessary to rewrite it again from scratch. Archpriest George Grabbe (later Bishop Gregory) did just this in a detailed essay in 1955.³⁴ Nevertheless, the essay’s tendencies seem to be typical for similarly misleading works, and Maier-Hultschin’s contentions can be found repeated even today.³⁵ The superficiality of Maier-Hultschin’s research can be seen, for example, when he speaks about Metropolitan Anastasius, whom he consistently designates as “Patriarch Athanasius”, and to whom, among other things, he falsely attributes the title of

“Patriarch of Moscow,” who was held in the highest esteem by the emigration. This “Patriarch Athanasius” had allegedly received financial support from Hitler as early as 1933, thus at a point in time when Archbishop Anastasius was still in charge of the Jerusalem Mission and was not yet even a member of the Synod (he became one in 1934). Similarly, close ties were also construed by Gunther in his memorandum, which traces the collaboration between the Church Abroad and the Nazis back to 1921!³⁶ At that time, Archbishop Eulogius ruled the German Diocese, which did indeed belong to the Church Abroad, which was directly responsible to the Patriarchal Church. One more thing in connection with Gunther’s Memorandum of 1980 – he is a Russian Orthodox Christian belonging to a Patriarchal Church in the Federal Republic of Germany. It is lamentable that the opponents of the Church Abroad are not completely subjective in their argumentation and have instead remained silent about many known facts, thereby disqualifying themselves as objective scholars. They have used documents and sources not for a critical exposition, but rather only to support their theses. Theirs are one-sided critical voices, whose purpose is to debase the prestige of the Church Abroad. From an abundance of documents, they have chosen only certain ones, while simultaneously passing over other sources and documents in silence. Typical examples of these unscholarly and subjective works of the more recent past are the works of Gunther, Gaede and Pospelovsky.³⁷ Whereas one must take into consideration that the historian Gaede lives in East Berlin and her work must be subjected to the Communist censors and cannot therefore be neutral, Gunther and Pospelovsky live in democratic countries and are themselves answerable for own biases, which they have indeed consciously chosen. All three authors discuss the relationship of the Church Abroad to the National Socialists, and as their main piece of evidence of close cooperation present Metropolitan Anastasius’ letter of 1938 to Hitler. In this letter, Metropolitan Anastasius expresses his gratitude for the German government’s support during the building the Russian cathedral in Berlin. This letter has occasioned all three authors to malign the Church Abroad as friendly to the Nazis. They considered this letter to be so important, that they quoted from it and discussed it extensively.

On the other hand, there was a letter³⁸ from Hieromonk John (Shakhovskoy) (later an OCA archbishop of San Francisco), then living in Berlin, which was composed during the German invasion of the Soviet Union; this letter was either passed over in silence (by Gunther and Gaede) or excused as harmless (by Pospelovsky). Pospelovsky writes, “Fr. John was an ordinary priest and his errors were only his own, while Metropolitan Anastasius was speaking in the name of his entire Church organization.”³⁹

Another argument may also be made here: all the bishops of the former “Metropolia” in North America, which had reunited with the Church Abroad in 1936, also belonged to Metropolitan Anastasius’ Church organization in 1938. Why did they not protest against the alleged sympathies of their First Hierarchy towards the Nazis? One cannot even compare Metropolitan Anastasius’ situation with that of John Shakhovskoy. Metropolitan Anastasius, on account of his visible position, had also to keep in mind the welfare of his flock in Germany, and was also forced to write a letter of thanks, which he had cause to write, because the Berlin cathedral had been built with massive material support from the German authorities. Hieromonk John, on the other hand, was an ordinary parish priest and had no particular responsibility whatever. His submissive and repulsive homage to Hitler arose from an inner necessity. It had neither a logical

foundation nor a need. It occurred voluntarily and out of [...] personal desire. There were another dozen or so [...] Russian priests of the Church Abroad in Germany, none of whom found it necessary to distinguish himself as Fr. John had done. It is also clear why the remaining Russian priests living in Germany refrained from this. The essence and character of National Socialism with its racist delusions – also directed against the Slavs, including the Russian people – were known to them. They evaluated the future situation of Russia under the National Socialists correctly and realistically. The authors have not anywhere substantiated that John Shakhovskoy would have qualified as an opponent to the Nazis in any way before 1945. On the contrary, today the Russian emigres still remember that Shakhovskoi always allowed himself to be carried away in his sermons in Berlin with expressions of friendliness towards the regime! Thus, Pospelovsky's excuse for Fr. John's behavior is demonstrably incredulous and threadbare. It is certainly regrettable that there are still "historians" who convey these one-sided interpretations and are incapable of maintaining a critical distance. Perhaps the truth lies in the foreword to Pospelovsky's work, when Professor Meyendorff writes: "Russian emigre authors tended to write apologies for their own particular political stands."

Accusations from the Soviet side (see below) since 1945 were overall weakened by Metropolitan Theophilus in 1946, in a telegram to the President of Switzerland: "Metropolitan Anastasius heads our Church Outside of Russia in the best possible way and shows himself to be a person with the highest ecclesiastical principles and a blameless way of life, who does not interfere in politics. The present campaign in the Communist press is most regrettable and undesirable and should simply be ignored. I implore Your Excellency most respectfully to allow him to continue to remain in Switzerland for the good of the Russian Church."⁴⁰ Metropolitan Theophilus had written this telegram on 21 January 1946, at a time when there were already negotiations with the Patriarchal Church over a possible reunification, and a few weeks before the break between the Metropolia and the Church Abroad. It would also have been unlikely that Metropolitan Theophilus, who, as head of the ROCOR in North America during the World War II, had been a loyal American citizen, would not have known, at this point in time, of the actual activities of the Church Abroad during the War, and that this telegram had been sent on erroneous information. It must indeed be assumed that the telegram reflected the genuine conviction of its author.

Yet one ought to attach even greater importance to the statement of Patriarch Gabriel of the Serbian Orthodox Church, who had been arrested by the Germans and ultimately imprisoned by them in the Dachau concentration camp. After his release, he traveled to London for the christening of Prince Charles, the heir to the British throne. When he heard accusations made by pro-Communists, that Metropolitan Anastasius had collaborated with the Germans, Patriarch Gabriel made a public statement, declaring that "Metropolitan Anastasius conducted himself with great wisdom and tact under the Nazis, was ever loyal to the Serbs, had several times been subjected to searches by the Germans, and was not trusted by them." This authoritative statement by Patriarch Gabriel, who had suffered under the Nazis, effectively counters the malicious slander with which the enemies of the Russian Church Abroad, falsely accusing Metropolitan Anastasius of collaboration with the Germans, tried to besmirch him.⁴¹

The statement of Patriarch Gabriel was published in two American periodicals: the magazine *The Russian-American Church Messenger*, (#3, 1946) and the newspaper *Rossia* (8 November 1945 issue). Later, Professor S.V. Troitsky tried to dismiss these words of the Patriarch of Serbia as the fabrication of the emigre press: “He had only just died, and already they were ascribing to him such convenient words.”⁴² But then the question arises as to why the Patriarch was not questioned about this after the publication in 1945-46, the more so in that he only reposed in 1950. Here, doubts can arise only with respect to the slanderous insinuations of Troitsky. Furthermore, the fact that the Serbian Orthodox Church has continued in prayerful communion with the Church Abroad up to the present time, and that the bishops of both concelebrate the divine services, despite pressure from the Moscow Patriarchate to compel the Church of Serbia to break off relations with the Church Abroad, weighs against Troitsky.

The communist press campaign against Metropolitan Anastasius mentioned in the telegram also clearly pursued the aim of defaming the Church Abroad, which persistently refused to reunite with the Patriarchal Church. Thus, the true reason for the negative attitude was always passed over in silence, and the Church Abroad’s friendly attitude to Germany is not further clarified so as not to reveal the Soviets’ own pact. The background to the Church Abroad’s friendly attitude towards Germany is clearly to be found in their opposition to the Soviet government and the Communist system. The Church Abroad has never made a secret of this. The sharpest condemnation of the Patriarchal Church and its leading bishops touches in the first place upon the accusation of their collaboration with the government and support of Soviet policy at the expense of the faithful in the Soviet Union. The faithful of the Church Abroad, who as members of this Church all identify with the canonical and ecclesial-political course of their bishops, fully supported the Church Abroad in rejecting the Soviet government and the Patriarchal Church. This statement can be confirmed by the fact that the great majority of emigre Russians refused to become members of communities belonging to the Patriarchal Church, even though the latter Church has established communities world-wide since 1945. On the contrary, the Patriarchal Church had no success in establishing numerically important communities of Russian emigres, and one sees only communities [...] dominated by those of non-Russian nationalities. This also met with no success before 1945, when the Patriarch attempted to find Russian emigre followers in Western Europe and even appointed Bishop Benjamin (Fedchenko), who had emigrated and was inclined to be a monarchist, to that see.

After 1945, whenever political circumstances did not work in their favor, the Patriarchal Church had no success in exercising any influence over the emigres. For example, in the Federal Republic of Germany, where, according to the words of a member of the Patriarchal Church, approximately 500 faithful belong to the Patriarchate “whereby the lion’s share falls to the church community in West Berlin,” the Church Abroad, in the opinion of this author, shepherds 5,000 of the faithful.⁴³ This is all the more astounding, because the Church Abroad has only twenty clergymen to care for its faithful, while the Patriarchal Church has fourteen clergymen, including three archbishops, for its 500 faithful!⁴⁴

This situation, wherein only a few cases the emigres choose to return to the Patriarchal Church, continued until 1945. The example of the West European communities provides ample evidence

of this: as opposed to the five Patriarchal communities, there were 200 emigre communities belonging either to the Paris Jurisdiction of the Church Abroad. Also, before 1945, the Church Abroad was representing its members whenever it condemned the Communist government. One can find a gradual difference between the Church Abroad's assessment of the Patriarchal Church and the Paris Jurisdiction's assessment of the same, though this difference will not be found in their rejection of Soviet Communism. The struggle against the political system in the Soviet Union and the overthrow of the Soviet regime were the starting points in the Russian emigration's political views since 1920, wherever the emigres were living. Many of them saw the Third Reich of the '30s, which stood at the pinnacle of the world-wide anti-Communist movement, as their natural ally in the struggle against Stalinist Russia. The emigres' sympathies for the German government went to this extent. However, one should not necessarily conclude from this that these sympathies also extended to the National Socialist movement and its objectives, the degeneration and political consequences of which at the outbreak of war in 1939 were fully perceived neither by the Russian émigrés', nor by the German populace.

Footnotes

1. Cf. Part IV. ↵
2. *Tserk. Zh.* (1942) 6, pp. 81-87. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 1.8. ↵
3. Cf. Part III, Chap. 1. ↵
4. *Tserk. Ved.* (1923) 11-12, pp. 9-10; 13-14, pp. 1-2. ↵
5. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1:106-107; *Deyania vtorogo sobora*, pp. 3-5. ↵
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6. ↵
7. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 646-647. ↵
8. *Deyania vtorogo sobora*, pp. 12-15 (List of Participants). ↵
9. Cf. the question of canonization in Part III, Chap. 1 & 2. ↵
10. *Deyania vtorogo sobora*, pp. 58-123. ↵
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 557-583. This report by Count Grabbe can also be found in Grabbe *Tserkov' i eya uchenie v zhizni*, 1, pp. 222-252. ↵
12. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 5; *Deyania vtorogo sobora*, pp. 209-237. ↵
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 39-50. ↵
14. Seide, *Die Klöster der ROK*. ↵
15. *Deyania vtorogo sobora*, pp. 377-389. ↵
16. Today, the book is extremely rare and only available in a few libraries, mostly in the private collections of émigrés. Two copies are in the library at Holy Trinity Seminary in Jordanville and one at the Synod in New York. A comprehensive survey can be found in

- the periodical *Russie et Chretiené* (1938-39), pp. 205-247, also in *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1:107-131. ↵
17. Cf. Fireside; Fletcher, *Study in Survival*; Heyer, *Ukraine 1917-1945*; Kandidov, *Tserkov' i shpionazh*; Polsky, *Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi v SSSR*; Timaschew, *Religionen im Sowjetstaat*. ↵
 18. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2, pp. 305-306. ↵
 19. *Ibid.*, p. 308. ↵
 20. Regel'son, *Tragedia*, pp. 553-557. ↵
 21. Seide, *In Memoriam*. ↵
 22. In 1941 Archbishop Sergius succeeded the departed Metropolitan Eleutherius. He also remained faithful to Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky) during the German Occupation, but vigorously attacked the Communist regime on account of its persecution of the Church. He was murdered in 1944, cf. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 3, pp. 31-33; Alexeev, *Serge Voskresensky*; Treulieb, *Metropolit Sergii*. ↵
 23. Regel'son, *Tragedia*, pp. 553-557. ↵
 24. Polsky, *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*, p. 40. ↵
 25. Cf. The list of canonical bishops in *Tserk. Ved.*, (1926) 23-24: pp.9-10; (1927) 3-4: pp. 13-14; 5-6: p. 20; 11-12: pp. 14-16; 17-18: p. 8; 19-20: p. 8; 21-22: pp.11-12. ↵
 26. According to a report in *Russkaya Mysl'* of 16 Jan. 1965 on p. 3. The number is considered to be too low (Chysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 3: p. 310), though it may not have been significantly higher. Struve (*Christen*, p. 61) speaks of "a few hundred churches." ↵
 27. Kischkowsky, *Religionspolitik*, p. 68. ↵
 28. Seide, *Sibirien und Mittelasien*. ↵
 29. Seide, *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, p. 184. ↵
 30. *Deyania vtorogo sobora*, pp. 386-387. ↵
 31. Cf. Part IV. ↵
 32. Seide, *Druckerei und Verlagswesen*; see also Part IV. ↵
 33. Maier-Hultschin, *Orthodoxie in Hitlers Spiel*. ↵
 34. Grabbe, "Fantasticheskaya istoria" in *Tserkov' i uchenie*, 2, pp. 161-172. ↵
 35. Günther, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in der BRD*. Memorandum. ↵

36. Ibid, p. 36. “Now the collaboration of the Russian Orthodox Church with the National Socialist Movement from 1921 and in particular from 1933 could be rewarded.” ↵
37. *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 114. ↵
38. Günther, p. 70. ↵
39. For the 30-115 million believers (Günther, p. 68) in the USSR, there was a total of 70-75 bishops, of which a dozen live abroad. ↵
40. How senseless and macabre these allegations where is shown in the example of the Jews in the USSR. Countless rabbis and Jewish believers who were arrested by the Gestapo between 1936 and 1938 and convicted of espionage (Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte 2*, p. 309). ↵
41. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, pp. 165-166, Alexeev, *Foreign Policy*, p. 51. ↵
42. *JMP* (1950), 4: pp. 21-28. The fact that Archbishop Seraphim did not participate was interpreted by the JMP as a rejection of the Synod. The participation be Bishop Sergius (Korolev), who was likewise subject to the Patriarchal Church, was passed over in silence, because it did not fit into their interpretation. ↵
43. *Prav. Rus'* (1943) 5-6, p. 15; 7-8, pp. 15-16; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1942) 8, pp. 120-122. ↵
44. Cf. Part V, 3: Struve, *Christen*, pp. 78-83; Alexeev, *Occupation allemande*; Fireside, *German Occupation*. ↵

PART II

The Russian Orthodox Church Abroad since 1945

Chapter 1

The Losses Suffered by the Church Abroad in Eastern Europe, China, Manchuria, and Palestine in the Years 1944-1949

The occupation of parts of Eastern and Southern Europe, the Baltic Republics, and Manchuria by Soviet troops led to the Communist seizure of power in these countries. The collapse of the German-Romanian southern front in April of 1944 and the occupation of Romania led to the conquest of the remaining countries of Eastern and Southern Europe in the following months. Because the advance of the Soviet troops into these territories was foreseeable, countless Russian émigrés, and with the clergy of the Church Abroad, fled westward to the German Reich, and then again to the Western Allied-occupied zones of Germany and Austria.

The situation in the Far East was entirely different. After the occupation of Manchuria by Japanese troops in 1931, the independent state of “Manchukuo” was set up and proclaimed an Empire in 1934. After the outbreak of the War in the Far East, the Japanese occupied Manchuria/Manchukuo. While many Russian refugees had already left Manchuria in the 1930s and after the renewed Japanese occupation, the mass of Russian émigrés did not escape the Soviet invasion. Some 100,000 faithful and 200 priests were still living in Manchuria in 1944-45.

In Eastern Europe, the majority of the émigrés and clergy left their parishes. Most of those who stayed behind were elderly and infirm or were in areas where émigrés did not expect an invasion by the Red Army (as in the case of Bulgaria, which had declared war on the Western Allies though not on the Soviet Union). The immediate consequence of the advance of the Soviet troops was the loss of all the Church Abroad’s possessions in these areas. A further impoverishment was the loss of all the properties in Israel, including the Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem with its extensive complex of buildings, the Gorny Convent, and numerous churches and plots of land, which were transferred to the Soviet government, which in turn handed them over to the Moscow Patriarchate for use. The transfer of the Church Abroad’s property in Eastern Europe occurred in all cases without compensation. This held true both for those assets which were built with émigré donations or with the host countries’ governmental support.

If one looks at the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, relatively few churches and plots of land outside Russia which had belonged to the Russian Church before the Revolution,¹ and one quickly gleans that the émigrés had built most of the churches, monasteries, homes for the elderly, hospitals, and obtained land and other real estate holdings before 1944-45 with their own financial means, and were, therefore, the rightful owners of these buildings and property. The Soviet Union, or its representative the Moscow Patriarchate, could really not have had any legal claim to this property, or to those properties taken over by the national Orthodox Churches, because these assets had never belonged to them. The situation was different with those churches and plots of land that had belonged to the Russian Church before 1917.

The struggle over the ownership of Russian ecclesiastical property outside the borders of the Soviet Union is practically as old as the Church Abroad itself. During the First World War, Russian property on the territory of the Central Powers was mostly under Swiss and Spanish trust administration. Embassies, missions, churches, and chapels were closed. After the October Revolution and the refusal of other nations to recognize the new Soviet government, the property of former Imperial Russia was administered by the governments in whose countries they were located. The churches, chapels, and buildings designated for church use were handed over to the émigrés, i.e., the Russian Church Abroad, for use. Because ecclesiastical unity existed in the early 1920s, there were no jurisdictional problems here. In all cases, the Church Abroad received the right to use the property. The struggle over these rights began with the schism. The Paris Jurisdiction claimed to be the legitimate heir of the Russian Church; if this were true, theoretically all churches should have to belong to it. Of course, the Church Abroad contested this claim, maintaining that the Paris Jurisdiction was in schism from the Church Abroad.

The situation in North America between 1926 and 1936 was similar. A legal struggle ensued between the émigré jurisdictions over the rightful use of church buildings, a struggle that continues even to this day.² After the émigré jurisdictions broke with the Moscow Patriarchal Church in 1927 and 1931, the latter then made additional claims on the former possessions of the Russian Church.³ After the 1920s the Patriarchal Church was represented by the Soviet government in legal struggles over the property. When diplomatic relations were established between the Soviet government and the governments of Western nations, the Soviets laid claims on the transfer of Russian ecclesiastical property in the respective countries, thereby creating difficult situations for many émigré parishes. Due to the exposure in the West of Soviet behavior towards religion, their demands, for the most part, met with no success. The Soviets decided to turn the Saint Alexander Nevsky Church in Paris into an exhibition hall for Soviet art, which naturally led to protests not only on the part of the émigrés but of others as well.⁴ There was a similar situation at the embassy church in Tehran. When the émigré parishioners were supposed to be removed, they occupied the church and held continual divine services until the Soviets repealed their decision to close the church. The Soviets then decided to hand it over to the Renovationists, though this attempt likewise was aborted when the émigrés opposed it.⁵ The Church Abroad's canonical specialists, and indeed most of the lawyers in the host countries, took the position that the Soviet Union could have no legal claim to church property. These embassy churches had belonged to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Soviet law on the separation of Church and State not only ignored the canons but also could not be applied to the situation abroad since it concerned only the property within Russia.⁶ Soviet law had no validity abroad. Furthermore, in Orthodox nations, Orthodox ecclesiastical law was valid. Only in the case of the embassy churches could ecclesiastical law not be applied because these were located on foreign soil and also had never been subject to the Metropolitan of Petersburg. At any rate, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs only ever acquired legal possession of the buildings, not however the church objects (church utensils, icons, books, etc.), which remained the property of the Church. The question of whether the Soviet State or the Church Abroad owned church property arose in all cases except those concerning embassy churches. According to the interpretation of Russian legal experts – Professor N. Suvurov was named explicitly – churches could only be legally used for divine services. This interpretation is also applied in Romano-Germanic law (*res divina* – *res*

sacra). Thus, the Soviet government infringed upon a generally recognized, basic interpretation of the law when it used churches for other purposes. Accordingly, embassy churches must also be used for divine services. According to the parish by-laws of the Russian Church – and this coincides with the interpretation of the Orthodox canons – the parish church is the sanctuary of the parish. Article 112 of the parish by-laws state that church buildings, houses of prayer, and chapels are not alienable and are not subject to state legislation. Therefore, the state should have no legal right to rule on this property, since it is subject to canon law.⁷

For the most part, the émigrés met with success when they used these arguments, all the more so in that the Soviet government was concerned with public opinion rather than the émigrés' petitions. While various opinions prevailed concerning the property of the Russian Church before 1917, the properties acquired by the Church Abroad after 1918 clearly belonged to the émigrés.

In Palestine, the situation was for the most part similar until the partition. After the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain in 1924, the Soviet government made a proposal to the Administration of the British Mandate on the transfer of Russian ecclesiastical property in Palestine.⁸ This proposal was rejected. The British pointed out that in Palestine Ottoman law had jurisdiction over the holy places. Consequently, the status of the holy places could not be changed. Thus, the Russian Church Abroad retained possessions in Palestine until 1948. After the partition of the country, the Israeli government transferred the administration of the property in Israel to the Soviet Union, which, in turn, transferred it to the Patriarchal Church for its use. The Israeli Parliament and the Church Abroad contested this decision, though all protests were unsuccessful because the Israeli courts declared themselves “not competent” and likewise quoted Ottoman legislation (*status quo ante*). With the recognition of the Soviet Union as the heir to Imperial Russia, the rights to the Russian Church property in Palestine were, according to Israeli law, legally transferred to the Soviet government.

That these arguments were based upon unsound reasoning that can be seen in Israeli behavior in 1953. After the severing of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Israel, the Israeli government returned the Russian Church properties to the Church Abroad, but then a few weeks later reversed its decision when relations were reestablished. This made it clear to the Soviet government and the Patriarchate that their ownership was very tenuous indeed. Between Israel and the representatives of the Soviet government – not of the Patriarchal Church – negotiations were initiated over the sale of Russian real estate, which continued for over ten years. Only in the autumn of 1964 was an agreement reached: the Russian Square in Jerusalem with its extensive building complex – the Church of the Resurrection, the building of the Ecclesiastical Mission, and one other in which the Israeli Supreme Court was housed and which had belonged to the former Palestine Society – were excluded from the negotiations, as well as all the remaining church buildings and plots of land except the churches in Jaffa, Haifa, Nazareth, and on Mount Tabor, which were sold to Israel for four and a half million pounds sterling. (Originally the Israelis had offered three million, while the Soviets had demanded six million).⁹

The Russian Church Abroad, as well as the organization which succeeded the Palestine Society, protested against this confiscation of property. The Church Abroad filed a lawsuit lasting many

years over the rights of ownership for the church in Jaffa, to which an extensive orange grove was attached. This lawsuit was abandoned in 1970 on the grounds that state courts have no jurisdiction in religious matters, since this concerned a holy place. Thereupon, the Church Abroad once again instituted legal proceedings in order to clarify whether the church in Jaffa, on whose land the grave of Saint Tabitha is located, is a holy place; were that found to be the case, the place would then fall under the jurisdiction of Ottoman law. In October of 1972, the District Court of Jaffa handed down a verdict that this was not a holy place; thus, Israeli legislation had jurisdiction over the matter. The fate of the other property rights to be decided upon by the Court also hung in the balance.¹⁰ In 1979, the rights to the church in Jaffa were awarded to the Church Abroad, but nevertheless the Moscow Patriarchate continues to occupy it. The attorney for the Patriarchal Church immediately lodged an appeal against this decision. In Israel in 1948, Russian Church properties were valued at 100 million U.S. dollars.¹¹

Whereas in the West the Church Abroad has been able to fight for its property rights in court, this possibility did not exist in communist-dominated lands.

A few weeks after the conquest of the Eastern European countries by the Red Army, emissaries of the Patriarchal Church traveled to these countries to inspect the Russian émigré parishes there. Bishop Sergius (Larin) of Kirovgrad visited Yugoslavia in April of 1945.¹² Likewise, Archbishop Gregory (Chukov) visited the Russian parishes in Bulgaria in April of 1945.¹³ Archbishop Photius (Topiro) of Orlov visited the parishes in Austria and Czechoslovakia.¹⁴ The Eastern Slovaks, who formed the Diocese of Mukachevo-Preshov (which was subject to the Serbian Patriarchate), had already been received into the Moscow Patriarchate in the autumn of 1944. The official “reunification” of the diocese took place on 22 October 1945.¹⁵ The reports of such trips made by the emissaries of the Patriarchal Church as published in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate maintain that the reunification took place with the unconditional consent of the faithful and their priests, who unanimously sought to be received into the Moscow Patriarchate. Certainly, there had been priests and laymen who did agree to join, but the majority was opposed to it. Wherever there was perceptible opposition to Moscow’s plans, those groups of people were arrested and deported to the USSR. This fate was shared by laypeople and priests alike who opposed Moscow’s wishes. Thus, for example, Archimandrite Isaac, Bishop Sergius’ (Korolev) assistant, and the Priest M. Vaznetsov were arrested in Prague and sentenced to ten years of forced labor. The official reasons for such arrests were listed in most cases as “collaboration with the Germans” during the war. The real reason, of course, was their refusal to join the Patriarchal Church.¹⁶ This fate awaited not only the Russian émigrés. Attempts to subordinate smaller Orthodox parishes sometimes met with bitter opposition. The Hungarian-speaking Orthodox refused to submit to Moscow. This led to the arrest of numerous believers and priests, including the Hungarian Archimandrite John (Peterfalvy), who was under the jurisdiction of Constantinople. His refusal to submit to Moscow and his canonical loyalty to the Ecumenical Patriarchate earned him ten years of forced labor in Siberia.¹⁷ The union with the Moscow Patriarchate occurred “voluntarily and at the request of” these parishes if one is to believe the Journal’s reports.

An example from the Russian communities in Yugoslavia will serve to illustrate the actual attitude of the émigrés. The relationship between Moscow and Belgrade underwent a fundamental change after the break between Tito and Stalin, and it was this change that revealed the true reactions of the émigrés who had remained in the country. During his visit to the Russian Orthodox communities in April of 1945, Bishop Sergius (Larin) maintained that the émigrés were petitioning for “reception into the Moscow Jurisdiction.” The nuns of the Lesna Convent and the Convent of the Entry of the Mother of God into the Temple expressed their desire to “be allowed to return to the homeland.” After a divine service in the Holy Trinity Russian Church in Belgrade, the senior priest, Father John Sokal, announced the reunification of his parish with the Patriarchal Church.¹⁸ The fact was, however, that none of the aforementioned nuns “returned home” and, besides Archpriest Sokal, only Archpriest Nekludov joined the Patriarchal Church. The parishes remained under the jurisdiction of the Serbian Patriarchate. In February/March of 1946, Bishop Sergius undertook a second trip to Yugoslavia. He again celebrated the Liturgy in the Holy Trinity Church. It had also been stated, contrary to the facts, that besides Archpriests Sokal and Nekludov the “young talented Archimandrite” Anthony (Bartosevich – later Archbishop of Geneva and Western Europe), Archpriest Tarasiev, Priest Moshin, and Archdeacon Kachinsky joined. Even the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate writes this time that only Archpriests Sokal and Nekludov expressed the desire to be received into the Patriarchal Church. Of the remaining clergy, nothing further was reported in this regard.¹⁹

After the break between Tito and Stalin, the émigrés’ situation changed. They were again permitted to travel to the West. Archimandrite Anthony, the entire sisterhood of the Lesna Convent, nuns from the Entry of the Theotokos Convent – which as a Serbian convent as part of the Serbian Patriarchate but had been revitalized by Russian nuns – went to the West in 1949-50. Both Father Sokal and Father Nekludov were arrested by the Yugoslav authorities and convicted of espionage for Moscow.²⁰ Archpriest Tarasiev remained in Yugoslavia and took over the administration of the Russian émigré parishes. At this time, he joined the jurisdiction of the Serbian Patriarchate, since contact with the Church Abroad was, of course, not permitted by the Communists. In November of 1954, the Moscow Patriarchate officially relinquished the administration of the Russian parishes in Yugoslavia and “transferred its churches, clergy, and parishes to the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church.” The Moscow Patriarchate retained Holy Trinity Russian Church as a representation of the Moscow Patriarchate in Belgrade, headed by Archpriest Tarasiev.”²¹ These statements appeared in the 1958 Jubilee Volume of the Moscow Patriarchate Church. The Moscow Patriarchate thus acknowledged the real situation in Yugoslavia, where the Russian parishes had been under the jurisdiction of the Serbian Patriarchate since 1948. In return for this acknowledgment, the Serbian Patriarchate permitted the Holy Trinity Russian Church to function as the “outpost” of the Moscow Patriarchate.

The case of the Russian parishes in Bulgaria was similar. The administration of the parishes and both Russian monastic communities in Bulgaria after 1945 remained with Archbishop Seraphim (Sobolev), whom the Moscow Patriarchate confirmed in this responsibility. After his death in 1950, the Holy Synod in Moscow resolved to transfer all the parishes and monasteries to the Bulgarian Church. The Moscow Patriarchate retained only the Church of Saint Nicholas in Sofia,

which had originally been built as an embassy church in 1911-14, and which became the residence of the Moscow Patriarch's representative to the Bulgarian Church.²²

In Romania a different situation existed; there were no Russian parishes except in Bucharest. The Orthodox Russians who lived there were cared for by the Romanian Orthodox Church. All parishes in Bessarabia (Moldavia) were subsumed by the Russian Patriarchal Church after the re-annexation of the region.

In Czechoslovakia in 1945, Bishop Sergius (Korolev) was the administrator of the parish in Prague, which included the Dormition chapel in the Russian cemetery. Hierarchs of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autonomous Church, Bishops Anthony (Marchenko), John (Lavrinenko), and Daniel (Juzviuk) were also staying there. Presumably, they were overtaken in their flight to the West by the advancing Soviet troops. All four bishops joined the Patriarchal Church. After their return "home," which they had left just a few weeks earlier, Bishops Anthony, John, and Daniel wrote an article in the Journal about their first impressions of church life in the homeland, praising the complete freedom of Church and religion.²³ Similar articles, which pursued the same ideas, extolling religious freedom in the USSR, appeared in these months in the Journal. They originated mostly with bishops and clergy of the Church Abroad who was forced by the political events of these years to become part of the jurisdiction of the Patriarchal Church.

What little success the Patriarchate met within annexing the Church Abroad's communities is illustrated in the example of Palestine. In May-June of 1945, Patriarch Alexis I personally undertook a trip to the Holy Land. The trip was a prelude to the new policy of the Patriarchal Church, which thenceforth was to intensify constantly its contacts with other Churches, in which undertaking the Patriarchal Church received massive financial support from the Soviet government.²⁴ This first visit of a Russian Patriarch to the Holy Land can be seen as a mixture of religious and political goals. The motive of bringing all the Church Abroad's communities into the Patriarchal Church was doubtlessly behind the visit of the Patriarch and his entourage to the various Russian churches in Palestine.

Perhaps the Moscow Patriarchate hoped that now, after the end of the War, their ally, England, would ultimately give Moscow the communities and properties that belonged to the Church Abroad. This matter was first broached in 1944. The simplest way would, of course, have been for the convents and communities to have freed themselves from the Church Abroad on the occasion of the Patriarch's visit and joined Moscow. In this respect, the Patriarch's visit was a failure. With the exception of one parish in Alexandria, all communities remained faithful to the Church Abroad. The official report in the Journal again gave the appearance that Patriarch Alexis and his entourage were cordially received everywhere. Thus, the report reads that among the onlookers at the Jerusalem airport were "our people who had been taken by surprise here by the War of 1914," that at Golgotha the Patriarch was "greeted by the administrators of the Russian communities," that "he paid a visit to the convents in Gethsemane and on the Mount of Olives, and to the chairmen of the Pan-Slavic Committee and to Russian families." Furthermore, the report continues to say that "Russian nuns" accompanied the Patriarch on 5 June. The reader is given the impression that the Patriarchate and the Russian émigrés were on friendly terms. The report of the head of the Ecclesiastical Mission, Archimandrite Anthony (Sinkevich, later

Archbishop of Los Angeles) was quite different. The Patriarch, accompanied by representatives of the Jerusalem Patriarchate, visited the churches on the Mount of Olives and in Gethsemane, entered the sanctuary, and after a short time left the churches, without greeting or blessing the nuns, who remained silent and did not take any notice when the Patriarch visited the churches.²⁵ Archimandrite Anthony was even sought out by the Patriarchate's representatives, who proposed that he and his communities join the Patriarchate, promising that he would, in turn, be elevated to the rank of Metropolitan. Archimandrite Anthony refused, declaring that the Mission was part of the Church Abroad.²⁶ That such offers of promotion were rings true since numerous clergymen who defected to the Moscow Patriarchate were invested with high offices. Thus, after joining the Patriarchate in June of 1945, Hieromonk Alexis of Saint Alexander Nevsky Church in Alexandria was elevated to the rank of archimandrite in the following year; later, in November of 1949, was appointed Patriarchal Exarch in Czechoslovakia; in January of 1950 was consecrated Bishop of Preshov; and finally, in 1957, was made Archbishop of Vilnius and Lithuania.²⁷

Since this trip was unsuccessful with regard to the émigrés, Metropolitan Gregory (Chukov) of Leningrad returned to Palestine in the following year. This time the representatives of the Church Abroad were portrayed in quite another light. Archimandrite Anthony's refusal to join the Moscow Patriarchate was "politically motivated." He also spread a "malevolent mood" and "terrorized" the nuns there, who acknowledged the "Moscow Patriarch as their head." This time the Journal gave the impression that there were differences of jurisdictional allegiance between the archimandrite and the lower clergy.²⁸ However, the Patriarchate, in fact, was compelled to conceal its complete failure with regard to the émigrés because they were now, as before, refusing to recognize the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. Only after the forcible division of Palestine in 1948 did the Patriarchal Church succeed in annexing some of the Russian properties in the Holy Land.²⁹

While the Patriarchal Church handed over the Church Abroad's former property in the Orthodox countries of Eastern Europe to the local Orthodox Churches of these countries, it also tried to subordinate other – even non-Russian – parishes directly to the Patriarchal Church. In Hungary, a deanery was set up for the Hungarian-speaking parishes. In Austria, a deanery was likewise set up, although apart from the Saint Nicholas embassy church in Vienna the Patriarchate had no other parishes anywhere in Austria. After the creation of the Central European Exarchate of the Moscow Patriarchate, the Bishop of Vienna and Austria was subordinated to the exarch of the Patriarch, who resided in Berlin and to whom all Russian parishes in East Germany, West Berlin, and West Germany were subject.³⁰ All of the church properties in East Germany – overwhelmingly churches that existed before 1917 – and the Cathedral of the Resurrection in West Berlin, which had been built for the émigrés with help from the German government, were confiscated from the Church Abroad after 1945. A special situation existed in the Far East after the Red Army's invasion of Manchuria and the outbreak of the Chinese Civil War. The metropolitan district of the Far East³¹ was, without doubt, the most important within the Church Abroad during the years 1920-45. The bishops in China and Manchuria, the Korean Mission, and numerous parishes of the diaspora in Southern Asia belonged to it, with a total of some 250,000-300,000 faithful, of whom 150,000 lived in Manchuria. From 1941-45, four bishops belonged to

the Diocese of Harbin: Metropolitan Meletius (the ruling bishop), Bishop Demetrius of Chailar, Bishop Juvenal of Zizikar, and Archbishop Nestor of Kamchatka and Seoul. There were 217 priests in approximately 150 parishes for some 100,000 faithful, who owned seventy churches, and numerous chapels and temporary church buildings. This diocese also had a number of monasteries, theological faculties, schools, and social and charitable facilities.

Bishop John (Maximovich) of Shanghai belonged to the Chinese diocese, which was ruled by Archbishop Victor of Peking and China. The exact number of priests and parishes is unknown, but the number of faithful may have been around 100,000 in 1945. Information on the number of believers in China and Manchuria around 1945 is contradictory due to the political situation; a civil war shook the country and no statistical research could be carried out. Many Russians left Manchuria for China during the years 1943-45. Approximately 100,000 émigrés may well have lived in Manchuria and China at the end of the 1940s.³²

In the Chinese Diocese, there were nine monasteries and convents, approximately fifty churches, numerous social and charitable facilities, church schools, workshops, and extensive real estate, including twenty-three cemeteries. Most churches, buildings, and land set aside for church use were built or obtained by the émigrés using money collected in donations. The entire property of the Church Abroad was given to the Patriarchal Church in the years between 1945-49, then after 1956 to the Chinese Orthodox Autonomous Church.

After the invasion of the Red Army, emissaries of the Moscow Patriarchate – as in Eastern Europe³³ – immediately traveled to Manchuria in order to prepare the émigré communities to enter their jurisdiction.³⁴ The Patriarchate charged Bishop Elevfery (Vorontsev) of Rostov and Taganrog with the task of preparing the communities in Manchuria and China for reunification with the Patriarchate. The exchange of greetings between the hierarchy of Manchuria and the Patriarchate then led to the “reunification” of the separated churches. While the hierarchs and priests of Manchuria, in view of the Soviet occupation, had hardly any other choice, Archbishop Victor of Peking and China declared himself in favor of joining the Patriarchal Church, while his vicar in Shanghai, Bishop John (Maximovitch), remained faithful to the Church Abroad. Bishop John remained in China until the last possible moment in 1949 and then left with many of the clergy and the faithful. Until his repose in 1966, he remained the nominal leader of the Peking Mission and the spiritual father of the refugee communities that had settled in Taipei, Hong Kong, and Manila. He exercised especial care over the refugees in China who had not left the country in time, and he made certain that they could later emigrate to the West.

The administrative structure established under the Church Abroad was retained by the Moscow Patriarchate: Metropolitan Meletius remained head of the Diocese of Harbin until his repose in 1946. His successor was Archbishop Nestor, who bore the title of patriarchal exarch, and who, after the repose of Metropolitan Meletius, united the parishes in Manchuria in the Exarchate of Eastern Asia. However, Archbishop Nestor was arrested in 1947, leaving the diocese vacant. In 1950-56, Bishop Nicander (Viktorov) headed the diocese.

The Vicariate of Chichikar remained in existence until 1946. Bishop Juvenal (Kilin) headed this vicariate; he was later appointed by the Patriarchate to head the Vicariate of Shanghai. Bishop

Juvenal was arrested by the Chinese nationalist authorities during his journey to Shanghai and, as a result, returned to the USSR in 1947, where he was named Archbishop of Izhevsk and Udmurtia. The Chailar vicariate was next ruled by Bishop Demetrius (Voznesensky), whom the Patriarchate elevated to the rank of archbishop, but who soon thereafter returned to the Soviet Union and lived in retirement in the Pskov Caves Monastery; he died in 1947, in Leningrad.

After the reunification of China and Manchuria in 1949, Archbishop Victor was named the patriarchal exarch of Eastern Asia. He was given the administration of all the parishes in China and Manchuria. Thus, all the territory of the former Far Eastern district came under a central administration for the first time. However, this led to the Diocese of Harbin losing much of its significance. The vacant Diocese of Shanghai was reoccupied in 1950: the Chinese Father Simon (Dou) was consecrated Bishop of Shanghai, becoming the first Chinese to attain the high office of Orthodox bishop.³⁵

After the proclamation of the People's Republic of China and the reunification with Manchuria, the Soviet government seems to have used the Russian émigrés and the Church to penetrate the country politically.³⁶ Otherwise, the new Chinese rulers' attempt to supplant Soviet influence on Orthodox parish life by setting up a Chinese Church organization would not be comprehensible. This development began as early as 1950, when the Chinese authorities demanded that the Russian émigrés who had remained in the country leave, giving them the choice of immigration to the Soviet Union or to the West. The consecration of Bishop Simon (Dou) must be seen in connection with this nationalization. While Moscow was intent upon bringing back to the Soviet Union as many émigrés as possible, tens of thousands succeeded in reaching the West. In many respects, the situation resembled that of Yugoslavia, where the break between Tito and Stalin resulted in the émigrés' departure for the West.

From 1953 onwards, the World Council of Churches, the United Nations, and numerous Russian, church, and private (especially American) took up the cause of the exiles.³⁷ Before 1956, some 50,000-60,000 left the country. Most went to Australia and to North and South America. The emigration lasted into the mid-'60s and included groups of up to 1,000 people. The clergy of Russian descent also left. Of the 200 clergymen who lived in Manchuria in 1949-50, in 1953 100 were left, and in 1955 only thirty remained. A year later, twenty-seven priests and Bishop Nicander were expelled, leaving only three clergymen of Russian extraction in China. Archimandrite Philaret, who in 1964 was elected First Hierarch of the Church Abroad, was one of these three. He had refused to accept a Soviet passport and tended the ever-decreasing Russian flock until 1962, the year of his departure. Officially, all Russian clergy left the People's Republic of China in 1956 at the request of the Chinese authorities. From the early 1960s until the summer of 1966, the only Russian priest who lived in Harbin was Father Victor Tsernych, who then immigrated and lived in a French home for the aged until his repose in 1967. Until his departure, he celebrated divine services regularly in the Church of Saint Elias for the few Russians who had remained; their number had dwindled from 45,000 to a few hundred.³⁸

With the expulsion of the Russian clergy and the majority of the faithful, the nationalization of the Orthodox community was complete. In May of 1957, the "Chinese Autonomous Orthodox Church" was formed out of the former metropolitan province of the Church Abroad and the

Patriarchate's Exarchate of the Far East. The First Hierarchy of the new Church was Bishop Basil (Shu-an), who was consecrated Bishop of Peking. In 1950, there had been an attempt to consecrate him Bishop of Tientsin, but he had refused this office. Bishop Basil headed the Chinese Autonomous Orthodox Church until his repose in 1962. The Vicariate of Shanghai was ruled by Bishop Simon until his death in 1965 or 1966. A total of some 20,000-30,000 Chinese belonged to the Chinese Autonomous Church. Very little is known about the number of Chinese priests. In 1954, Archbishop Victor ordained eight deacons to the priesthood, and Bishop Basil ordained "a few Chinese priests" for the parishes in Harbin.³⁹ In 1964, for example, in Harbin, divine services were held only in the Church of the Iveron Mother of God, where a certain Father Gregory had a small parish; a Father Stephen served at the Church of Saint Alexis; and Father Nicetas at the Saint Nicholas Church. All three were Chinese. In the Monastery of the Kazan Icon, only a few aged Russian émigrés lived in the home for the aged; divine services were no longer held. There were no monks living in the monastery. In the Convent of the Vladimir Icon, a few Chinese nuns gathered for common prayer, since there was no longer a priest.⁴⁰

From the early 1960s, there was a campaign to close all churches and temples in the entire country, including Orthodox churches. During the Cultural Revolution, all churches were closed, and most of them were destroyed. The Chinese priests "proved themselves to be brave and true to the Faith," but were somehow forced to participate in the destruction of their churches.⁴¹ The years 1965-66 was the climax of this persecution. In Harbin alone, where some 400 Russians lived, the Church of Saint Nicholas (built-in 1898-1901), the Church of the Iveron Mother of God, in which divine services were celebrated to the very end, the Church of Saints Boris and Gleb, the Church of Saint Alexis, and numerous smaller churches were destroyed. The largest church, the Church of the Annunciation (built in the thirties), was turned into a circus, the Church of Saint Alexander Nevsky into a restaurant, and the Church of Saint Sophia into a warehouse.⁴² A letter from Harbin about the horrific depredations of the Red Guard reached the West; it was a shocking document describing these occurrences.⁴³ In the rest of China, similar scenes took place. The largest churches were confiscated for secular purposes; the smaller ones were simply destroyed. Church utensils were confiscated; icons and books were burnt. Bishop Simon is reported to have perished during the wave of persecution.

With the crushing of the Chinese Autonomous Orthodox Church, the 280-year-long history of Orthodoxy in China nearly came to an end. Thanks to the Russian émigrés in the time after 1918, throughout the country it had been possible to spread Orthodoxy, which had been given such a hopeful beginning by the missionary groundwork of the Russian Church before 1917.⁴⁴ Astonishingly, according to recent information, in 1981 the repair of one of the Orthodox churches in Harbin was begun and divine services have also been celebrated.⁴⁵ Whether other Orthodox communities have been revived remains unknown.

Footnotes

1. In *Bratsky ezhegodnik, Pravoslavnye i Russkaya uchrezhdeniya zagranitsei* (Petrograd: Izd. Berlinskago Sv. Kn. Vlad. Bratstva, 1906). In this extremely rare book, all church buildings and land outside the borders of Russia are described. ↵

2. The court cases over the church in Bad Ems, which was occupied by the Paris Jurisdiction, and the church in Baden-Baden, which was occupied by the Patriarchal Church were decided by the German Constitutional Court during the 80th in favor of the German diocese of the ROCOR, Cf. Seide: *Kirchenbesitz in der BRD*. ↵
3. A many years-long legal battles over St. Nicholas Cathedral in New York (on East 97th St.) was finally decided in 1972 in favor of the Patriarchal Church, after the Orthodox Church in America, which had been granted autocephaly by Moscow, renounced its claim to the church. (Court of Appeals, State of New York: St. Nicholas Cathedral of the Russian Orthodox Church of North America. Case on appeal [Vol. III, pp. 997-1672, Folios 4459 to 5516, inclusive. NY o. J.]). In the conflict over the church in Los Angeles, the judgment also exists in printed form. Here the Church Abroad brought suit against the Metropolia, which claimed the Los Angeles Cathedral after the schism. Cf. *In the Supreme Court of the State of California*, County of Los Angeles. Jordanville, 1949; Polsky, *Los-Angelosky Protsess*. ↵
4. *Tserk. Ved.*, (1925) 1-2, p. 13. ↵
5. *Ibid.* (1925) 7-8, pp. 12-14. ↵
6. In the decree it says expressly: “2: Within the borders of the republics, 13: all former church property or religious societies on Russian territory will be nationalized.” (Struve, *Christen*, pp. 461-462.) ↵
7. *Tserk. Zhizn'*, (1934) 8, pp. 131-135. ↵
8. *Tserk. Ved.*, (1924) 9-10, p. 1. ↵
9. Seide, *Jerusalem*, pp. 153-156. The *Neue Züricher Zeitung* maintained in its edition of 10-8-1964 that the property would be sold for \$4.5 million, whereas *Irenikon* (1964) 37, p. 112 gives the same sum in pounds sterling. However, the latter data seems to be true, because in 1948 the total property had been valued at \$100 million. Cf. *HK* (1949/50) 4, p. 252f.; *Proche Orient Chrétien* (1960) 10, p. 275f. ↵
10. Seide, *Jerusalem*, p. 153; “Press Release of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem” (10-12-1972). ↵
11. *Obozrenie* [Montreal] (1979) 47, p. 76. ↵
12. *JMP* (1945) 6, pp. 18-27. ↵
13. *Ibid.*(1945) 5, p. 22. ↵
14. *Ibid.* (1945) 11, pp. 14-19. ↵
15. *Ibid.* (1945) 1, pp. 5-10; 11, pp. 20-21. ↵
16. *Tserkovnye letopis'* [Lausanne] (1946) 2, pp. 28-29. ↵
17. Seide, “Ungarische Kirche”, pp. 109-113. ↵

18. *JMP* (1946) 6, pp. 18-27. ↵
19. *Ibid.* (1946) 5, pp. 37-44. ↵
20. *Prav.Rus'* (1949) 23, p. 13. ↵
21. "Russische Orthodoxe Kirche" *Einrichtungen*, pp. 151-152. ↵
22. *JMP* (1978) 10, pp. 36-39. ↵
23. *JMP* (1946) 9, pp. 54-57 (Bishop Anthony), pp. 58-62 (Bishop John), pp. 63-64 (Bishop Daniel); *JMP* (1948) 11, pp. 30-34 (Hegumen Paul Golyshev); A.T.S. Politische Pilgerfahrten. ↵
24. Seide, *Jerusalem*, pp. 163-171. ↵
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 164-165. ↵
26. *Tserkovnaya letopis'* [Lausanne], Dec. 1945, pp. 26-27. ↵
27. Alexeev, *Orthodox Bishops; Foreign Policy; JMP* (1959) 6, pp. 34-36. Likewise, the aforementioned Archpriest John Sokal, who, after his return to the USSR, received all priestly honors and, after the death of his wife in 1955, became Bishop of Smolensk, cf. *JMP* (1965) 7, pp.18-20. A similar case was that of Mstislav (Volonshevich): he had to leave West Berlin on account of a breach of morals and joined the Patriarchate in East Berlin. Two days later he had already become Bishop of Veliki Luki. Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk) was retired by the Synod of Bishops on account of immoral behavior. He then joined the Patriarchate, which in turn appointed him Archbishop of Edmonton and Canada and administrator of the Patriarchal communities in Canada. ↵
28. *JMP* (1946) 12, pp. 4-8; Alexeev, *Foreign Policy*, pp. 29-34. ↵
29. Cf. Part IV: 1, 2. ↵
30. Cf. Part IV: 1.2 and 1.8. ↵
31. Cf. Part IV: 1.3. ↵
32. Seide, *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 182-188. ↵
33. Fletcher, *Foreign Policy*, pp. 16-29. ↵
34. *JMP* (1945) 10, pp. 5-6; Alexeev, *Foreign Policy*, p. 40. ↵
35. *JMP* (1950) 8, p. 39; 10, p. 3 (1960) 6, p.17. ↵
36. About the exploitation of the Patriarchate for Soviet foreign policy purposes cf. Fletcher, *Foreign Policy*. ↵
37. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2: pp. 1348-1353. Cf. Part IV 1, 1.9. ↵
38. *Der christliche Osten* (1967), pp. 181-182; *Prav. Rus'* (1964) 9, p. 13. ↵

39. For further developments, compare Seide, *Russische Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 190-192. ↵
40. *Prav. Rus'* (1964) 9, p. 13. ↵
41. *Der christliche Osten* (1967), pp. 181-182; *Internationale Zeitschrift* (1965) 55, p. 29. ↵
42. *Prav. Rus'* (1965) 1, p. 11; 17, p. 13; (1966) 18, p. 14; 20, p. 14; (1967) 3, p. 13. ↵
43. Printed in *Der christliche Osten* (1967), pp. 181-182. ↵
44. Cf. Part IV, 6. ↵
45. *Der Spiegel* (1981) 35 No. 18, pp. 166, 170. ↵

Part II, Chapter 2

*The Restoration of Church Life and the 1946 Council of Bishops **

The year 1945 had a profound effect upon the life of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia. In addition to the loss of their dioceses and parishes in the countries which fell under Communist domination, a new schism developed in North America in 1946. Because of the Communist seizure of power in Eastern Europe, the Orthodox countries in those lands came under the control of the Moscow Patriarchate. Of course, this meant that their contacts with the Church Abroad were terminated. In the West, the Patriarchate attempted to exercise its influence among the émigrés, though these efforts were largely unsuccessful. The Patriarchate was only able to establish new parishes in North America and France in subsequent years. Essentially, this was so because of the uncertain stance of the leadership of the American Metropolia and the Paris Jurisdiction in the years 1943-46. ¹

It seemed as though the Church Abroad, perhaps the entire Russian ecclesiastical emigration in general, was nearing its end. Metropolitan Eulogius (Georgievsky), with the bishops, priests, and parishes of the Paris Jurisdiction, also joined the Moscow Patriarchate. In his three-volume *History of the Russian Church*, Chrysostomus (who is certainly no well-wisher of the Church Abroad) writes as follows, “Metropolitan Eulogius <...> seriously believed that the old Orthodox Russia had been reborn; he literally rhapsodized over Soviet marshals and generals. Later, he even submitted a request for a Soviet passport and received it. He showed himself to be an extreme Sovietophile in all things Metropolitan Nicholas found him a reliable ally, not to say a willing instrument, for the implementation of the objectives of the Moscow Patriarchate.” ² The Paris group moved so quickly to join with Moscow that, in the summer of 1945, it was in two jurisdictions simultaneously. It had not yet withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate when it united with Moscow.

A similar coup was brought off by Stalin and the Soviet Union in that part of the Russian emigration which was in North America, the ecclesiastical administration of one portion of which met the Moscow Patriarchate half-way, in the sense that it entered into negotiations with it, beginning in 1944, to consider the possibility of uniting the North American parishes with Moscow. Bishops Alexis (Panteleev) of Sitka and Alaska and Macarius (Ilyinsky) of Brooklyn were dispatched to Moscow for the talks, and, early in 1946, they defected to the Moscow Patriarchate while still in the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, the Church Abroad unexpectedly recovered from these blows. This was primarily due to three facts: (1) the immediate and energetic leadership of Metropolitan Anastasius during the difficult months following the end of the War; (2) the loyalty of many of the adherents of the Church Abroad – bishops, priests, monastics, and the majority of its faithful as well; and (3) the mass of new emigrants who escaped from the Soviet Union in 1944-45 and who lived in Germany, at first as foreign laborers, and later as “D.P.’s” (Displaced Persons). The memory of the terror of Stalin’s Purge and the complete subservience of the Moscow Patriarchate to the Soviet regime were fresh in the memories of these millions of emigrants, so they were hardly prone to share the Sovietophile ecstasies of some of the old Russian emigres, bishops and

priests. Thus, these new emigrants – bishops, clergymen and faithful – unhesitatingly joined the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia. Even the enemies of the Church were compelled to acknowledge these facts: S.S. Struve wrote “It [the Church Abroad] exerted a significant, magnetic force upon the new emigration, which was composed of several hundred thousand emigres”;³ and D. Pospelovsky, whose history of the Church is infamous for its intransigence towards the Church Abroad, wrote that the Church Abroad “achieved a reunification of bishops and clergy in Germany.”⁴ The “directly pro-Soviet attitudes [of the Metropolia] led to the establishment of Synodal churches in America and Canada by the new refugees from Germany.”⁵ Both authors, however, pass over in silence the fact that the pro-Soviet position of the bishops in North America and France caused confusion and unrest among the ranks of the diaspora and the parishes of those emigrations, resulting in the separation of many parishes, from which the Moscow Patriarchate gained the most: from the Paris Jurisdiction in Western Europe and northern Africa, approximately twenty parishes dissociated themselves and joined the Moscow Patriarchate; and in North America, the Patriarchate was in control of more than fifty parishes by 1947.⁶ The Paris Jurisdiction and the Metropolia realized too late that unification with the Moscow Patriarchate was impossible: Paris severed its relations with Moscow once again, as it had once before, in 1931; and the Metropolia terminated its negotiations in 1946.

In 1945, the well-defined position of Metropolitan Anastasius with regard to the Moscow Patriarchate was diametrically opposed to the Sovietophile positions of the bishops of the Paris Jurisdiction, as well as to the position of a certain element in the episcopate in North America. Chrysostomus writes of this as follows: “But despite all such difficulties, the Munich Synod did not for a moment entertain any thought of submission to Moscow.” Metropolitan Anastasius addressed an Epistle to his flock, in which he forthrightly rejected the Patriarchate’s proposal [which would have entailed the submission of the Church Abroad] and set forth in detail the reasons that such submission to the Moscow Patriarchate was unacceptable to the Church Abroad under the present circumstances. This Epistle is a document remarkable for its clarity and determination. One must also not forget that it was written at a time when any harsh criticism of Bolshevism and the Soviet system was readily branded as “fascism.” The bishops at Munich were, in all likelihood, seriously threatened by the Soviet commissars, who were, at that time, forcibly “repatriating” Russian emigrants in western Germany, often by employing brute force. It was at just this time that the terrible tragedies in Lienz, Plattling, and several other places, were played out, when thousands of Russian prisoners of war were, against their will, handed over to the Soviet forces, and many of them, seeing no escape, chose to commit suicide. These dreadful scenes were still fresh in the memory of many. Every harsh statement against communism could be interpreted as “fascist propaganda” and could be cause for arrest, and in several cases for the extradition of some emigrants to the Soviet Union as well. For this reason, Metropolitan Anastasius’s Pastoral Epistle to the faithful deserves particular attention. In it, he insistently emphasizes that the Russian Church Abroad has never severed its canonical, prayerful and spiritual unity with its Mother Church.⁷ The basic positions of this Epistle state that:

“The division between Metropolitan Sergius and the administrative organ of the Church Abroad began from that point at which he, consciously and out of conviction, entered into concord with the godless regime, expressing his new relationship to it in his well-known Declaration of 29

May 1927. Everyone understands what turmoil this act caused in the soul of the faithful Russian people, both in Russia itself and in the diaspora. The bishops abroad could not accept the views expressed in it, because they [i.e., Metropolitan Sergius' views] are manifestly opposed to the spirit of the teaching of the Gospel, the apostles and the fathers of the Church, and are profoundly at variance with the ordinances of our Mother Church. Our posterity will be ashamed when they compare the language of the present primates [i.e., the hierarchs of the Moscow Patriarchate] in their address to those who rule with what the ancient Christians said to the Roman emperors... If many of the bishops of the diaspora, and with them a great number of the clergy and faithful laymen, remain aloof from any canonical ties with the present ecclesiastical authorities in Russia, they are not compelled to this by 'pride' – the mother of all heresies and schisms – but by the voice of their ecclesiastical awareness and their Orthodox conscience, which demands obedience to God rather than to man (Acts 4:19). Each of us knows that it is easier to walk by the wide road, the so-called path of least resistance than to walk the narrow way... The only completely competent judge between the Church Abroad and the present head of the Church of Russia can be a freely and legally convened council of the entire Church of Russia, totally independent in its decisions, with the participation of as many as possible of the bishops abroad and, especially, of those presently imprisoned in Russia. Before such a council, we are prepared to render account for each moment and all of our actions during our sojourn abroad.”⁸

The result of this Pastoral Epistle was a campaign of slander against Metropolitan Anastasius and the Church Abroad, not only in the communist press but also on the part of opponents of the Russian Church Abroad, who, while situated in the free world, expressed their solidarity with Moscow by attempting to accuse the Synod Abroad of collaboration with Hitler's regime.² The membership of the Synod of Bishops, the highest organ of the Church Abroad's administration, consisted solely of Metropolitan Anastasius, Metropolitan Seraphim (Lade), and Protospesbyter George Grabbe (Count Grabbe, later Bishop Gregory). The following bishops were all those bishops who were still subject to the Church Abroad in summer of 1945: In Europe – Metropolitans Anastasius and Seraphim (Lade), and Bishops Philip (von Gardner), Alexander (Lovchy, ordained in July of 1945), and Basil (Pavlovsky, died in October of 1945); in North America – Metropolitan Theophilus (Pashkovsky), Archbishops Vitalis (Maximenko), Tikhon (Troitsky), Leontius (Turkevich), Alexis (Penteleev), Hieronymus (Chernov), and Bishops Joasaph (Skorodumov), Arsenius (Chagovtsev) and Macarius (Ilyinsky); in South America – Archbishop Theodosius (Samoilovich); and in the Far East – Bishop John (Maximovich) of Shanghai. In all, there were sixteen bishops remaining.

The bishops of the Belorussian and Ukrainian Autonomous Churches had not at that time yet submitted themselves to the Church Abroad, but they were collaborating with it closely in ministering to the emigrants in Germany. The fact that the competence and authority of the Synod of Bishops had not yet been challenged by the North American parishes, which later seceded to form the Metropolia, irrefutably proceeds from the following: The Council of Bishops which met in America on 24 May 1945 declared that unification with Moscow was impossible at present and that relations with the Synod of Bishops would be restored:

The American Metropolitan District has hitherto collaborated with the Council [of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church] Abroad, on the basis of the Temporary Statutes worked out under the presidency of Patriarch Barnabas of Serbia and accepted by the All-America Church Council of 1937, which remains in force to the present time. ¹⁰

Thus was the former unity, as it existed in 1936-1937, restored. For this reason there were no changes in the composition of the episcopate from the very outset of the War. After the restoration of contacts with the Head of the Church and the Synod of Bishops, Metropolitan Theophilus appealed to the Synod, which decided to make several changes. One change was to elevate Bishops Leontius and Joasaph to the rank of archbishop (16 October 1946). Another was to consecrate Archimandrite John (Zlobin) as bishop of Sitka and Alaska to replace Archbishop Alexis, whose retirement was approved by the Synod. Also, Archbishops Vitalis and Tikhon were rewarded for their services with the right to wear the jeweled cross on their klobuks (19 February/3 March 1946). All of these decisions were accepted by the Synod at the request of Metropolitan Theophilus, clearly demonstrating that the Metropolitan accepted and acknowledged the competence and authority of the Synod of Bishops in Munich over the Church in North America. As far as possible, contacts were reestablished with other dioceses and ecclesiastical institutions. It was decided to appoint a vicar bishop in Paraguay, for the Diocese of Brazil (26 August/8 September 1945). ¹¹

However, it was extremely difficult to reestablish contacts with the rest of the dioceses while situated in Germany. One ought not to forget that, even between the zones of occupations controlled by the three Western allies in the summer of 1945, there was still no postal communication. It was restored only in October of 1945. For communication outside the individual zones of occupation, the permission and approval of the authorities was required. Thus, one begins to understand why Metropolitan Anastasius sought to make the administrative governance of the Church easier and, therefore, accepted the invitation to relocate to Switzerland. The Swiss government even offered to issue a Swiss passport to him and other clergymen. In September of 1945, Metropolitan Anastasius moved to Switzerland; he did so at a time when postal communications had not yet been restored in Germany, and it was even difficult to foresee when that difficulty would be overcome. Thus, the slanderous assertion of the enemies of the Church Abroad, who to this day maintain that Metropolitan Anastasius “escaped to Switzerland” or “fled to Switzerland,” is total without foundation.

Metropolitan Anastasius remained in Geneva until April of 1946. Prior to his relocating in Switzerland only three sessions of the Synod of Bishops had been held: from September to March of 1946, there were six sessions. It was resolved, however, that all decisions made prior to relocation concerned the Diocese of Germany alone. At the session of 1/14 July 1945, it was decided to set the Austrian parishes apart as an independent diocese, separating them from the Diocese of Germany. The new bishop received the title “of Vienna and Austria”; Bishop Basil (Pavlovsky) was assigned to govern the new diocese. At the following session, which took place on 24 August/6 September 1945, the episcopate of the Ukrainian Autonomous Church was accepted into the Church Abroad, and Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudik), formerly of Kiev, was appointed a member of the Synod.

Only after relocation to Switzerland did contacts outside the boundaries of the Diocese of Germany become possible: the contact with North America mentioned above was restored at the first session in Geneva (16/29 October 1945); there followed the restoration of relations with the Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem (13/16 November 1945); the retirement of Abbess Tabitha from her position as superior of the Gorny Convent and the appointment of her successor, Sister Galina (Elizabeth Ampenova), as well as the elevation of Hieromonk Basil (Kondratovich) to the rank of archimandrite. Furthermore, Protopresbyter Michael Polsky of the London parish was given an award, since he had not followed his ruling bishop (Metropolitan Seraphim [Lukianov]) into the Moscow Patriarchate. In February of 1946, the rector of the parish in Beirut, Archimandrite Hermogenes, was awarded the right to wear the miter, since he had also refused to submit to Moscow. The widowed Diocese of Western Europe was provided with a new bishop: Archimandrite Nathanael (Lvov) was consecrated bishop of Brussels and Western Europe (decision dated 10/23 February; consecration on 25 February/10 March 1946). On 10/23 February 1946, the episcopate of the Belorussian Autonomous Church was accepted into the Church Abroad. By a decision of 7/20 March 1946, Bishop Nathanael was appointed a member of the Synod of Bishops, and it was decided to consecrate Archimandrite Seraphim (Ivanov) as bishop of Santiago and Chile.

Over the course of half a year, the Synod was able to re-establish contacts with a great many parishes and dioceses. This was of tremendous significance, and for this reason, beginning with 1945-46, agents of the Moscow Patriarchate began to appear everywhere; their objective was to bring the émigré parishes into subjection to Moscow. And although instances of the submission of parishes of the Church Abroad to the Patriarchal Church continued to be the exception rather than the rule, there was a real danger that they would increase in number so long as contact with the Ecclesiastical Administration and the Synod of Bishops was in abeyance since many of the parishes were not even aware that the Synod continued to exist at all. By his move to Switzerland, Metropolitan Anastasius foiled the plans of the Patriarchate and the hope of the opponents of the Church Abroad that it would cease to exist. Thus, the far-seeing decision of Metropolitan Anastasius, to make his residence temporarily in Switzerland, was to a significant degree responsible for the post-War restoration of the Church Abroad.

Also significant is the fact that the Synod of Bishops had acquired new members. By spring of 1946, the following hierarchs constituted the membership of the Synod: Metropolitan Anastasius, as president; Metropolitan Seraphim (Lade) for the Central European Metropolitan District; Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudik) as representative of the Ukrainian clergy and faithful; and Bishop Nathanael (Lvov), representing the Diocese of Western Europe. Also, Protopresbyter George (Grabbe) attended the sessions in the capacity of secretary.

Even in this connection, the enemies of the Church Abroad again and again voiced their contention that, after the evacuation, the Synod of Bishops had not the least authority, since, they would have us believe, “no bishops” belonged to it anymore. Thus, Professor Troitsky, in his book *The Falseness of the Karlovtsy Schism* (p. 113), to which we have made reference above, maintains that Metropolitan Seraphim no longer belonged to the Synod after 1945, quoting a letter allegedly written by Metropolitan Seraphim, in which the writer complains that he was

driven from the Synod. The provenance of this letter is extremely dubious; furthermore, Troitsky himself only cites the fact that the letter was written on the Metropolitan's stationery ("on the original of the letter are the letterhead and seal of Metropolitan Seraphim"); no mention is made, however, of any signature. The Metropolitan's chancery had fallen into the hands of the Soviets when they invaded Berlin; but even if they had not found official stationery, paper and a seal could have been easily fabricated. The fact remains that Metropolitan Seraphim was appointed a member of the Synod of Bishops on 11 June 1942¹² and remained such to the end of his life. After the conclusion of the War, he regularly took part in the sessions of the Synod. Thus, mention is made that he delivered a report at the session of 16 August/8 September 1945.¹³ At its 15 April/4 May 1946 session, the Synod of Bishops retroactively approved all appointments.¹⁴ The fact that Metropolitan Seraphim belonged to the Synod was repeatedly announced in his own periodical.¹⁵

The number of its members notwithstanding, the authority of the Synod of Bishops, as well as that of the Head of the Church, was, in any event, not subjected to doubt at this time, as we have pointed out in detail above. This was done much later, by certain elements within the American Metropolia, to cloak their own apostasy of 1946 in the guise of legitimacy.

The restoration of contacts with the dioceses and parishes in Western Europe and overseas – and North America in particular – constituted the prerequisite for the convocation of a Council of Bishops. In the Temporary Statutes of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia of 1935, which were still in effect, the objectives and competence of the Council of Bishops (III, pars. 1-10) and the Synod of Bishops (IV, pars. 105, a-n) were set forth.

Among the duties and responsibilities of the council of Bishops were "the issuance of epistles on behalf of the entire Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia" (III, 4), "the establishment of episcopal sees, their closure, the alteration of their boundaries, outside the borders of the districts" (III, 7), and "awarding bishops honors"(III). During the intervals between Councils of Bishops, the above-mentioned duties and responsibilities could be exercised temporarily by the President of the Synod of Bishops – i.e., the Head of the Church – and the Synod of Bishops, but had to be confirmed or rejected by the next Council of Bishops.

The last Council of Bishops in which all the bishops of the Church Abroad took part met immediately after the Pan-Diaspora Council of 1938. After the outbreak of the War, the convocation of the Council of Bishops became impossible, since the majority of the bishops were in areas occupied by the Allies. In 1943, a Council of Bishops met, in which a total of eight bishops from Europe, including two bishops of the Belorussian Autonomous Church – Archbishop Philotheus (Narko) and Archbishop Benedict (Bobkovsky) – took part. At this Council, the election of Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky) as Patriarch of Moscow was condemned as uncanonical, since only eighteen of the approximately one hundred hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church had participated in the vote. Furthermore, the directives of the Pan-Russia Council of 1917-18 regarding the election of the Patriarch were violated in the crudest fashion.

Thus, the convocation of a Council of Bishops became all the more urgent, the more so in that the great number of decisions and the appointment of the Synod of Bishops and the Head of the Church required confirmation by the Council of Bishops and, with it, the approval of the entire Church.

Here one ought first to point out the “Epistle to the Russian Orthodox People concerning the ‘Address of Patriarch Alexis to the Archpastors & Clergy of the So-called Karlovsty Orientation,’ of October, 1945,” in which Metropolitan Anastasius clearly and unambiguously refused Patriarch Alexis’ proposal that the Church Abroad subject itself to Moscow.¹⁶ Although this Epistle was addressed to the Russian flock abroad, thus falling within the competence of the Head of the Church, according to the “Temporary Statutes” (V), it was simultaneously an epistle written on behalf of the entire Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia (par. III, 3), thus falling within the competence of the Synod of Bishops. Hence, this Epistle was so important for the well-being of the entire Church, that its ratification or rejection by the Council was desirable, the more so in that in North America a portion of the Church was already prepared to enter into negotiations over reunification with Moscow. Furthermore, a whole series of decisions which required the agreement of the Council had been submitted: the consecration of new bishops (Bishops Alexander, Nathanael, and John), the exclusion from the Church Abroad of those bishops who had defected to the Patriarchate (Metropolitan Seraphim [Lukianov], Bishops Alexis and Macarius), changes in the boundaries of dioceses (the founding of the Diocese of Vienna and Austria; the consecration of Archimandrite Seraphim [Ivanov] as bishop of Santiago and Chile); the elevation of bishops to a higher rank, as well as their appointment as members of the Synod of Bishops; and, finally, the unification of the episcopates of the Belorussian and Ukrainian Autonomous Churches with the Church Abroad.

At the same time, events in Germany also took a positive turn: Early in 1946, the American occupation authorities turned over to the Synod a spacious building at 5 Donaustrasse in the Bogenhausen area of Munich. (This building at present houses the Austrian General Consulate). There was sufficient room in the building for a domestic church, the Synod’s chancery, quarters for the Metropolitan, and so on. The new church was dedicated to the Holy Prince Vladimir, Equal of the Apostles. After the transfer of the Synod to the United States, the iconostasis of this church was presented to the Serbian Orthodox church in Munich as a gift, repaying the Serbs in token measure for the assistance the Church Abroad had received from the Church of Serbia. This also served as an expression of the good and close relations between both Churches. Even today, the Serbian church in Munich (on Infanteriestrasse), which is dedicated to St. Vladimir, is adorned with this iconostasis.

At one of the last sessions of the Synod of Bishops in Geneva (on 7/20 March 1946), it was decided to convene an “assembly” of all the bishops residing in Germany, to deliberate upon a whole series of important questions.¹⁷ On Pascha (8/21 April) of 1946, Metropolitan Anastasius returned to Munich. On 5/18 April 1946, invitations had been sent out to the hierarchs. These invitations, however, spoke not of an “assembly,” but of a “Council of Bishops.” Invitations were directed to Metropolitans Seraphim (Lade) and Panteleimon (Rozhnovsky), the primate of the Belorussian Church; Archbishops Panteleimon (Rudik), Benedict (Bobkovsky), Philotheus

(Narko); and Bishops Stephen (Sevbo), Leontius (Filippovich), Eulogius (Markovksy), Theodore (Rafailsky), Demetrius (Magan), Athanasius (Martos), Gregory (Boriskevich), Nathanael (Lvov) and Alexander (Lovchy). Metropolitan Anastasius presided. In certain sources, one sometimes finds reference to sixteen bishops attending. It is possible that this number envisions the participation of Bishop Paul (Meletiev), who, however, was not invited and did not take part in the Council. In 1947, he founded the “Belorussian Autocephalous Orthodox Church.” ¹⁸

How difficult the situation in Germany still was is apparent from the invitations: The accommodation of such a number of bishops entailed considerable hardship. Thus, the invitation was accompanied by the question: “Do you have friends or acquaintances in Munich with whom it would be convenient for you to stay during the Council?”

The Council opened on 24 April/6 May 1946 and lasted for three days. In addition to the fifteen bishops present in person, eleven bishops ratified the decisions of the Council in writing during the following weeks.

The Council’s agenda was very broad, since it was confronted not only with the task of reviewing a whole series of the decisions of the Synod of Bishops, but also had to work out extremely important principles for the reorganization of the Church.

After the solemn divine service at the opening of the Council, in which all fifteen invited hierarchs took part, Metropolitan Anastasius delivered a report on the life of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia. ¹⁹ The Metropolitan pointed out the difficult position of the Synod of Bishops since the outset of the War and emphasized that, with the exception of the Diocese of Germany, practically all contact with the remaining dioceses had been interrupted. Even with Metropolitan Seraphim (Lukianov) in Paris, i.e. with the Diocese of Western Europe, contact was only occasional and was made in a roundabout way, through the Diocese of Germany. The German authorities placed obstacles in the way of anything that might have benefited the Church: “The German authorities were definitely against our unity.” After the evacuation from Belgrade, the Germans hindered the restoration of contacts between the various bishops. “For a long time, we had no news of one another.” This also continued in the months following the end of the War. Only after relocation in Geneva did the situation change radically since relations with parishes throughout the world could then be restored. The encyclical Epistle he composed in response to Patriarch Alexis’ invitation to submit to the Patriarchate could be sent out to parish leaders only after resettlement in Geneva. Unfortunately, the bishops in Manchuria had by then already joined the Moscow Patriarchate. In the Diocese of Western Europe, only four clergymen joined Metropolitan Seraphim in submitting to Moscow, while seventy-five parishes of the Paris Jurisdiction of Metropolitan Eulogius took that step. ²⁰ In the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate you can read “We consider Metropolitan Eulogius and his vicar-bishops, Archbishop Vladimir and Bishop John, with all their seventy-five parishes, united with the Mother Church, Metropolitan Seraphim and the parishes [N.B.: no indication of number] of his circle are considered reunited with the Mother Church... Further on, the Metropolitan addressed the situation in the Near East, and in North and South America. Describing the critical situation in the United States, where tendencies to unite with Moscow had been noted, he later stressed that this step had been taken only by Bishops Alexis and Macarius,

while the majority of the bishops were continuing in their loyalty to the Church Abroad: “The unity of the North American bishops with us is a great bulwark for us in the present grievous times.” The Metropolitan did not touch upon the state of the Central European Metropolitan District in more detail, as Metropolitan Seraphim (Lade) was to deliver the report on this.

Immediately after this report, the Church Abroad’s attitude toward the Moscow Patriarchate was discussed in detail, and the Epistle of Metropolitan Anastasius was approved. Furthermore, a resolution of the following content was adopted: ²¹

“The supreme ecclesiastical administration in Russia, in the person of the present head of the Church of Russia, Patriarch Alexis, has repeatedly appealed to the bishops abroad, urging them to enter into canonical submission to the Patriarchate; but, obedient to our own pastoral conscience, we find it morally impossible to meet these appeals halfway while the supreme ecclesiastical authority in Russia is in unnatural union with the godless regime, and while the entire Church of Russia is bereft of the true freedom inherent to it according to its divine nature.

We do not wish to close our eyes to the fact that the Soviet regime has, since the outset of the War, had to restore to the Church certain of the legal rights of which it had been deprived. However, the freedom afforded the Church of Russia bears a very limited – and, furthermore, a more outward and seeming, rather than genuine and essential – character. This freedom must be bought, moreover, by obligations imposed by the regime upon the clergy, which are inconsistent with the exalted dignity of the Church. If the communist government in Russia wishes to demonstrate a real respect for the Church of Russia and to create normal conditions for its activity, it must provide it with complete freedom for the realization on earth of the calling it has received from on high, and assure it of the position it enjoyed from of old in Orthodox Russia. First and foremost, the regime is obligated to open the gates of the prisons and concentration camps, to free the archpastors and pastors incarcerated there to this day, who have shown themselves to be true confessors of Orthodoxy, and to allow the clergy full freedom to preach the Word of God by word and in writing and to take care for the religious upbringing of the young generations.

Profoundly grieved by the present subordinate position of the hierarchy and clergy in Russia, we do not want to demand of them excessive sacrifices and or to lay upon their shoulders a burden beyond their strength to bear; however, we cannot without sorrow fail to point out that the upper hierarchy of the Church of Russia has taken an incorrect and dangerous path, in that, on the one hand, it keeps silence about the truth which is bitter to the Soviet regime, presenting the state of the Church and of society in Russia as other than it is in reality, and forgetting the dictum of Gregory the Theologian, that, in such cases, “silence is a betrayal of God”; and, on the other hand, consciously upholds the blasphemous falsehood that the Church is not, and never has been, persecuted by the Bolshevik regime in Russia, and thus mocks the feats of suffering of the multitude of hieromartyrs and martyrs, whom it dares to compare to political criminals who, it would have us believe, are deservedly subjected to retribution by the government.

This is a truly great sin of blasphemy against their sacred memory and of calumny against our Mother Church, for which the hierarchy, and especially its leaders, will have to render a serious account before God and the tribunal of history.

Paying reverent homage before the image of our great passion-bearers, who have suffered for the Faith and for the truth of God, we earnestly pray for their repose, and for that of many other Russian people, especially for the thousands of prisoners of war who have suffered martyrdom at the cruel hands of the so-called German Nazis. We hope that their sacrifice, and that of others, has not been in vain, and that over their martyrs' bones a new, free Russia will arise, mighty in its Orthodox righteousness and the brotherly love with which it illumined the world of old. Then all its scattered children, without any application of force or compulsion, but freely and joyfully, will rush into its maternal embrace from every quarter. With full awareness of our unseverable spiritual bonds with our homeland, we fervently entreat the Lord to heal as quickly as possible the wounds inflicted upon our native land by the grievous, albeit victorious, War, and bless it with peace and all good will".²²

The Resolution was approved by all the bishops – even by those who did not personally attend at the Council, in particular the North American bishops.

However, properly speaking, the import of the resolution lay in the fact that any further departure of parishes to the Patriarchal Church was halted. It led even to the return of many parishes and pastors to the Church Abroad, mostly in Europe (among them the parish in Cannes, with Archbishop Gregory [Ostroumov], who had joined Moscow for a period of approximately six months).

Subsequent sessions of the Council dealt primarily with the reorganization of the Church. First, administrative changes previously adopted by the Synod of Bishops were approved. Archbishop Philotheus reported on the state of the émigrés in the camps and the difficulties between refugees from Belorussia, the Ukraine and other provinces of the Soviet Union, all of whom were Orthodox. It was pointed out that everything should be done to preserve the unity of the Church. The Council pronounced anathema against a group of Ukrainian nationalists who wanted to form their own, independent Ukrainian Orthodox Church (the so-called Autocephalists).²³ With this in view, the reception of the Belorussian and Ukrainian episcopates and clergy by the Synod of Bishops was again, deliberately approved. To minister better to the needs of the parishes, it was decided to form vicariates in the individual zones of occupation.²⁴ One ought not to forget that by this time almost a million refugees were living in the three zones of Western occupation. If by the end of the War there were fifteen Russian parishes in Germany, their number had risen to eighty parishes by mid-1946, according to information communicated by Metropolitan Seraphim (Lade) at the first diocesan assembly in Germany, held in June of 1946.²⁵ The number of parishes at this time increased almost daily, ultimately totaling more than a hundred. The difficult situation of the refugees was dealt with in a separate memorandum, which was published shortly afterward in German, Russian, English and French (*Memorandum sur la situation de l'emigration orthodoxe dans le diocese d'Allemagne*, Munich, 1946).

The Council directed its attention particularly to the religious education of the faithful, especially the young. One should not forget that the majority of the refugees had had almost no contact at all with the Church in the homeland, since the Church as an organization had been all but destroyed by 1939. The children had not received instruction in the fundamentals of the Faith; rather, they had been brought up in the spirit of Marxism. For this reason, it was decided to arrange instruction in the elements of the Faith and catechetical courses in those refugee camps where such had not already been organized. Bishop Gregory (Boriskevich) gave a lengthy report on the opening of a theological institute in Europe for the training of future priests (Notes for the Report on the Organization within the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad of a Theological Pastoral Institute in Western Europe).²⁶ Furthermore, since it no longer had the possibility of educating future clergymen at the Belgrade Theological Faculty, which it had enjoyed in the period between the wars, the founding of its own theological school became imperative, the more so in that there were among the refugees a considerable number of candidates who wished to receive pastoral training. Bishop Gregory proposed a solid program of instruction for the institute when it was founded: four courses of study were envisioned, consisting of some thirty hours of classes per week. Individual subjects followed the teaching plan of the former seminaries in Russia.

However, these plans were not realized in Europe, since there were no suitable buildings, nor was there any substantial material support. Moreover, the possibility of housing students near some monastery did not exist (the Monastery of St. Job in Munich had not yet been organized). Two years later, Bishop Gregory's plans were realized in the founding of Holy Trinity Seminary in Jordanville, New York, which has since become the most significant educational institution within the Russian Church Abroad and has done its best to preserve the ideals of the seminaries which existed in Russia in the past.²⁷

In Germany, the plans were realized only partially: In the Fischbek Camp near Hamburg, theological courses were taught between 1946 and 1948, under the direction of Archimandrite (now Metropolitan) Vitalis, which followed the course of study outlined by Bishop Gregory. With other clergymen of the Camp, Archimandrite Vitalis provided an education for the first priests of the post-War period.

Based on the aforementioned decisions of and the developments emanating from the Council of 1946, one may with justification call it "historic." Its special significance lay in the fact that it restored the authority of the bishops within the Church, since it was in a position to cite the agreement of twenty-six bishops. The ecclesiastical administration managed to deflect the pretensions of the Moscow Patriarchate vis-a-vis the émigré parishes and to stem the flow of parishes from the Church. This was first and foremost thanks to Metropolitan Anastasius, who from his vantage point in Switzerland gathered together his scattered flock over the period of several months. The Council was the culmination of the first period of the post-War history in the life of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, which, thanks to the loyalty of its senior adherents and the confessors' witness of the new refugees of World War II, found itself stronger after the vicissitudes of that difficult period.

*Additional chapter added after the original publication.

Footnotes

1. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 3, pp. 147-174; Part IV: Chap. 1, 1.3. ↵
2. Seide, *The 1946 Council*. ↵
3. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2, p. 164. ↵
4. Struve, p. 511. ↵
5. Pospelovsky, 1, p. 284. ↵
6. *Ibid.*, p. 271. ↵
7. *Ibid.*, p. 295. ↵
8. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 3, pp. 146-147. ↵
9. Anastasius, *Sbornik*, pp. 216-225. ↵
10. Cf. Part I, Chap. 6. ↵
11. *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 100. ↵
12. See the decisions of all the sessions for 1945-1946 in *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1947) 1, pp. 3-7 and 2, pp. 1-6. ↵
13. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1942) 7, pp. 7-8. ↵
14. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1947) 1, p. 4. ↵
15. Synodal Archives: *Council of 1946*, henceforth abbreviated as *C.B. 1946*, decrees 841-843. ↵
16. *Rasporyazhenie* (1946) 4, p. 2. ↵
17. Anastasius, *Sbornik*, pp. 213-228. ↵
18. *Tserk. Ved.* (1946) Minutes, p. 6. ↵
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 738, 724-737. ↵
20. *Ibid.*, unnumbered. ↵
21. *JMP* (1945) 9, p. 13. ↵
22. Cf. Part V, Chap. 1. ↵
23. *Tserk. Ved.* (1946): Decision; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1947) 3-4, pp. 5-6. ↵
24. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1947) 1, pp. 2-3. ↵
25. *Ibid.* 1: pp. 2-3. ↵
26. *Rasporyazhenie* (1946) p. 3. ↵

27. *Tserk. Ved.* (1946), unnumbered. ↵

Part II, Chapter 3

The Years of the Munich Emigration (1945-49) and the Transfer of the Synod of Bishops to the United States

The expulsion of the Church Abroad from Eastern Europe effectually deprived it of the Serbian Patriarchate's material support. The Serbian Patriarchate, however, remained in communion with the Church Abroad after 1945, thereby becoming the only autocephalous local Church which maintained relations with both the Church Abroad and the Patriarchal Church.¹ The re-entry of the Moscow Patriarchate into the church life of the West and the re-establishment of relations with the Orthodox Sister Churches and the non-Orthodox Christian Churches led to a situation in which more attention was devoted to the ecclesiastical developments in Russia in the years after 1945. The Patriarchate used these developments to force the far-reaching isolation of the Church Abroad by making the severance of relations with the Church Abroad a precondition for the establishment of relations with these other Churches. The interest in the ecclesiastical developments in the Soviet Union, and the diminution of involvement with the ecclesiastical developments in the emigration, can clearly be seen in the ecclesiastical and academic newspapers and periodicals of the years both before and after 1945.

Thus, the journals *Irenikon*, *Russie et Chrétienté*, and the *International Church Journal* had in their chronicles been reporting on developments in the ecclesiastical emigration in detail for years, only touching on the Patriarchal Church and the religious situation in the Soviet Union. After 1945, the opposite was the case, until the Church Abroad almost disappeared from their editorial conscience. This was manifestly achieved for example, in the *Shepherd's Correspondence* (*Herderkorrespondenz*). From 1945-55, there were up-to-date and extensive reports on the Church Abroad; thereafter, one seldom finds even a mention of that Church Abroad.

The catastrophic economic situation in Western Europe – especially in Germany and Austria, both of which at first received the mass of émigrés – caused the majority of them to try to emigrate overseas. With the outbreak of the Cold War and the Korean War, and with the fear that there would be a new war between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers, this emigration took on a mass character. Whoever was not forced to remain in Europe on grounds of health or age emigrated abroad. Most of the refugees went to the United States or to South America. In New York alone from 1950 to 1955, there were about 200,000 Russian refugees. The Church leadership also followed suit in 1950, transferring its headquarters to the United States, where the numerically largest communities and the most important church institutions were located.

Metropolitan Anastasius spent from September 1945 until April 1946 in Switzerland, while the Synodal administration remained in Munich. From Geneva, in the subsequent weeks, he made contact with many communities, especially in North America, where since 1943 the proponents of autonomy had again been winning influence with the goal of separating from the Church Abroad. Differences of opinion came about in the analysis of the ecclesiastical events in the Soviet Union since 1943. Whereas the Council of Bishops in Vienna had condemned the election of Metropolitan Sergius as Patriarch as uncanonical, Metropolitan Theophilus, under the influence

of the laity, had decided to acknowledge the election as “an accomplished fact,” and, with the consent of a regional council of North American bishops, began commemorating the name of the newly-elected Patriarch before that of Metropolitan Anastasius in October of 1943. This was tantamount to a recognition of Sergius as the head of the whole Russian Church.²

The Metropolia sent a delegation to the election of Patriarch Alexis, which was also supposed to negotiate the matter of the Moscow Patriarchate granting autonomy for the Metropolia.³ The negotiations with the Patriarchate, which lasted almost two years, ultimately failed, because the latter did not want to grant the degree of autonomy demanded by the Metropolia, which more closely resembled autocephaly.⁴ At the Council of Bishops of the North American Diocese in December of 1945, four of the eleven bishops protested against the Moscow Patriarch: Archbishops Vitalis and Tikhon, and Bishops Joasaph and Hieronymus. Two other bishops, Macarius and Alexis, left the Metropolia in January of 1946 and joined the Patriarchate.⁵ In November of 1946, the Seventh All-American Local Council met in Cleveland. It decided, by a vote of 187 to 61, that, in the event of a failure in the negotiations with the Patriarchate, the Metropolia should maintain an autonomous status. There were additional discussions within the Patriarchal faction over the degree of autonomy from Moscow: no agreement could be reached on whether the Patriarch should be the canonical or spiritual head. The opponents of the resolution rejected any form of recognition of the Patriarch and wanted to recognize only the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad. At the Council of Bishops, which was supposed to confirm the decisions of the Cleveland Council, the adherents of the Church Abroad had the majority. This being so, Bishops Leontius and John left the assembly, thereby preventing a ballot from the Council of Bishops.

After the Council of Cleveland, Metropolitan Theophilus feared that there would be a schism within the Metropolia. The Bishops of the Church Abroad rejected the decision of the full assembly as uncanonical because it did not receive the consent of the Council of Bishops. For this same reason, the Church Abroad also viewed the Cleveland Council as uncanonical. On March 28, 1947, Archbishops Vitalis, Tikhon, Hieronymus and Joasaph, and Bishop Seraphim (Ivanov), were excluded from the ranks of the clergy of the Metropolia. Thus, a new schism in North America began, which culminated in 1970, with the Moscow Patriarchate’s granting of autocephaly to the former Metropolia. It seems that Metropolitan Theophilus had brought about this schism through his own timidity. His behavior towards Metropolitan Anastasius in the years 1945-47 indicates that he was an adherent of unity with the Church Abroad. However, he was too much under the influence of a circle which most strongly supported autocephaly. Metropolitan Theophilus was also not strong enough as a theologian to refute the arguments of this circle. Metropolitan Eulogius had characterized him in 1936 as a “sort of provincial cathedral priest”, who would rather avoid conflicts and was prepared to give in to the majority.⁶ The fact that Metropolitan Theophilus also accepted Metropolitan Anastasius as head of the Church Abroad after 1945 and did not question the authority of the Munich Synod has already been presented in detail.⁷

The developments in North America from 1943 through the summer of 1945 can be traced to the interruption in the relations between the Synod and the North American Metropolia. The

different evaluations of the elections of Metropolitans Sergius and Alexis as Patriarch have shown this. The regrettable break in North America, which already hovered over the Council of 1946, required an administrative reordering a few months later, which affected almost all dioceses. Many of the bishops and priests who went overseas had to share the fate of their faithful, and were, therefore, very close to them. Thus, many of the new refugee communities the world over were entrusted to the priests of the second emigration. In comparison with the first emigration, however, they had the advantage of drawing on the experiences of the old emigration in setting up new dioceses and parishes.

Hope for an improvement in living conditions over those in Germany and Austria, where millions of their own refugees needed help, was a decisive factor in the desire to emigrate overseas.

At the Synod in Munich, a bureau of emigration was set up, which helped the refugees in an advisory capacity. Those working there helped fill out travel papers and provided information on the countries which were accepting the refugees because many of the would-be émigrés had no idea about the political, economic, cultural, or climactic conditions of the countries that would receive them. This was because in the Soviet Union there were few reports about life abroad, and where any did exist, they were purely negative. The bureau not only provided information but also tried at the same time to dispatch priests with the groups of refugees, who would, in turn, organize church life in their new homeland. The parishes were few and far between, especially in Australia and the Far East, where the refugees from the Far East were heading. Most of the refugees were unable to join the pre-existing communities but rather had to establish new parishes and churches. Australia offers a typical example: Before 1945, there were only two communities, in Brisbane and Sydney. When Archbishop Theodore (Rafailsky) died in 1955, there were 12 parishes with their own churches, and the foundation of the convent was imminent.⁸ At present, the diocese has over 25 parishes.

To better coordinate church work and the supervision of these new communities, several new dioceses were also created. In 1946, Bishop Theodore was appointed head of the Australian diocese. However, he only assumed his duties in 1948 due to difficulties with his visa. Bishop Seraphim (Ivanov) was supposed to assume the rule of the Chilean diocese; instead, he became abbot of the St. Job Brotherhood in the United States. The Diocese of Caracas and Venezuela was set up, over which Bishop Eulogius (Markovsky) was supposed to preside. However, he went to the United States as a member of the Synod. Bishop Theodosius (Samoilovic) took over the administration of the South American communities in 1947, because the head of the Argentine communities, Archpriest Izraztsov, had joined the North American Metropolia (after the schism of 1946-47). To help Archbishop Theodosius, a diocese of Paraguay was set up in 1947 under the leadership of Bishop Leontius (Philipovich). Argentina became a separate diocese in 1947, under the leadership of Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudik). Thus, in South America, there were separate dioceses in Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, Chile, and Venezuela.² In North America, a renewed schism by the Metropolia necessitated the creation of the Synod's own dioceses. As a result, the pre-1935 tradition was revived: Archbishop Vitalius (Maximenko) became head of the Dioceses of North America and Canada, which consisted of the following

dioceses: Eastern America and Jersey City under Archbishop Vitalius; Western America and San Francisco (with the communities in Alaska) under Archbishop Tikhon (Troitsky); Detroit and Flint under Archbishop Hieronymus; and Bishop Seraphim was abbot of Holy Trinity Monastery. In Canada, there were only two dioceses: Edmonton and Western Canada under Archbishop Joasaph (Skorodumov) and Montreal and Eastern Canada under Archbishop Gregory (Boriskevich). In 1950, Archbishop Panteleimon was transferred to Canada and Archbishop Joasaph to Argentina, because the former had to leave Argentina at the request of the authorities. The Vicariate of Vienna, which had existed since 1938, became an independent diocese in 1946. Archbishop Stephen (Sevbo) took over its administration. With this, the administrative rearrangement came to a close. It had been necessitated by the establishment of numerous new communities overseas, where hitherto hardly any Russian émigrés had lived. In Europe, the creation of the Diocese of Vienna and Austria was justified by the fact that after 1945, 100,000 Russian refugees were living there, cared for by 32 priests.¹⁰ In Germany, three vicariates (Bavaria, Hesse and Northern Germany) were created. Also, for the Belorussian and Ukrainian refugees, their own bishops were appointed: Archbishop Benedict for the Belorussians; Bishop Eulogius for the Ukrainians.¹¹

It was not only the laypeople who had to be cared for; through expulsion and flight, almost all the monks and nuns who were living in Eastern Europe, China, Manchuria, and Israel, had become homeless. The difficulty in accommodating this group of people lay in finding appropriate buildings with sufficient space to house them, and a financial basis for the continuing existence of these monastic communities. In most cases, this meant that the monastery would also have to have land so that the community could at least have the means to provide itself with food. And not only refugee monks and nuns had to be accommodated, but also the laypeople, who desired to take up the monastic life.

The fate of the St. Job Brotherhood at Ladomirova well illustrates the difficult situation confronting the monks and nuns. In the summer of 1945, there were forty-nine monks in the brotherhood, who during the flight were joined by monks from the Soviet Union (e.g. Archimandrite Agapitus, later Bishop of Goiana) and new candidates (e.g. Nicholas Gamanovich, later Bishop Alypius). A building was quickly found for the brotherhood in Munich-Obermenzig, which had enough room for the cells and a small church, though the monks were still had to face the problem of finding ways to support themselves. The small plot of land of 12,000 square meters that belonged to the monastery was, of course, insufficient to feed forty-nine men. The monks planted fruit trees, berry bushes, and vegetables, but the crop was too small. The brotherhood was also unable to live off of the proceeds of the printing press, because the refugees, who were for the most part completely without means, had first to satisfy other needs. Thus, eighteen monks, having obtained Swiss travel passes, left for the United States and Palestine, where they joined the Ecclesiastical Mission which shortly thereafter lost its territory in Israel. Other monks went to France, where they hoped to found a new monastery under the direction of Hegumen Nicodemus (Nagaev) and Hieromonk Panteleimon (Rogov). A third group went with Bishop Leontius to Paraguay intending to establish a monastery there. All told, over thirty monks had to leave the monastery. The attempts in France and Paraguay failed due to a lack of financial possibilities because the money to purchase or rent land was lacking. The

majority of the monks took over the care of the communities in their new homelands.¹² In Munich, only between eight and ten monks ultimately remained behind; their main responsibility was to support the Synod before its resettlement in the United States.

The situation with other monasteries founded after 1945 was similar. Today it is hardly possible to envisage what privation and need these monks and nuns endured at this time when there were no donations or outside support. Today, for example, if one visits the Novo-Diveevo Convent outside of New York City and views the whole layout, with its numerous new buildings for the old age home and the sisterhood, and wanders through the extensive properties, including the cemetery and the park, it is hard to imagine that at one time the nuns were in such dire need that Fr. Adrian (later Archbishop Andrew) had to sift through the refuse from the nearby weekly market for food for the sisterhood. When he once noticed a fishmonger who wanted to throw away fish because it was crushed, Fr. Adrian implored him to give him the fish. When asked why he wanted it, Fr. Adrian explained the difficult straits of the sisterhood to the fishmonger, who thereafter promised to give the nuns fish free of charge as long as he remained in business.¹³ The situation was similar to many other émigré communities, who wanted to build churches and chapels in their new homeland. Priests were generally available to organize church life. The number of refugee priests is not known precisely, though it must have been several hundred. After the lack of priests in the late 1930s, the Church leadership was again able to assign clergy to all the parishes.

Yet the experiences of the past had shown that they had to think about the education of their own priests in order to be prepared for the future. After the loss of the St. Vladimir Institute in Harbin with its Theological Faculty, St. Vladimir's Seminary in New York and St. Tikhon's Seminary in Pennsylvania – the latter two through the Metropolia Schism, – the Church Abroad no longer had any educational institutions for the training of future priests. With the Decree #5603 of 16 August 1948, the Synod resolved to establish a seminary at Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville, which was to be directed by Archbishop Vitalis and Bishop Seraphim. That very year, the seminary was opened and first began its curriculum of studies as a school for the education of the monastery's young monks. This school quickly developed into the seminary for the theological education and preparation of future priests. In 1956, the State University of New York recognized and certified the Seminary, by its academic qualifications, with the right to grant the degree of Bachelor of Theology. In the more than forty years of its existence, well over 200 priests have been educated there, and at least as many others have graduated, who later pursued other careers.¹⁴

Barely five years had passed since the flight from Yugoslavia. It had seemed that the Church Abroad would be unable to recover from the heavy losses of the years 1944-49, yet the Church leadership, with the support of the faithful, succeeded in reorganizing ecclesiastical life. To build up parishes in South America and Australia, as well as in the United States and Canada, bishops and priests were sent there, because the majority of the faithful had emigrated to these countries. By 1953, 214,000 Russian émigrés had entered the United States alone.¹⁵ The altered situation had made it necessary to create new dioceses, which for the most part were ruled by bishops who had remained true to the Church Abroad after 1945 or had joined the Church Abroad after their

own escape. Excluding the two bishops of the “Autocephalous” Belorussian and Ukrainian Churches, not one refugee bishop joined an émigré Church other than the Church Abroad. This also applied to most of the priests and faithful, who saw the Church Abroad as the true heir of the Russian Church. The rebuilding of Church life, including the founding of churches, chapels, monasteries, church schools, social institutions, printing presses, and a seminary was accomplished in most cases through the efforts of the faithful. Yet the fact that Church and government institutions in the countries receiving the émigrés, as well as international organizations, rendered the émigrés so much support also warrants mention here. In the early years, the Roman Catholic Church was particularly helpful in giving material support; the Lesna and Novo-Diveevo Convents are located, for example, on the grounds of former Roman Catholic convents. Thus, it is also thanks to this outside support that the émigrés in the West were able to build up their existence anew.

A large portion of the credit for this rebuilding is owed to Metropolitan Anastasius, who enjoyed the great respect not only of the faithful in his own Church but also of the other Christian churches in the host countries.¹⁶ Despite his advanced age – in 1943 he turned 70 years old – the First Hierarch never tired of consoling the refugees and awakening in them hopes for a brighter future. He visited the refugee camps with the Wonderworking Kursk-Root Icon of the Mother of God, the heavenly protectress and patroness of the Church Abroad, celebrated the divine liturgy and distributed the sacraments. In the Synodal Church in Munich, in which the Kursk Icon was enshrined, Metropolitan Anastasius celebrated the divine liturgy daily. Many of the émigrés went there before leaving Germany or Austria, to entreat the protection of the Mother of God. In his sermons and epistles, the Metropolitan repeatedly warned against the dangers of Communism, exhorted his faithful to thank God for the freedom they had regained, and prayed for the oppressed Church and the faithful in the homeland.¹⁷ In 1946 and 1948, the Metropolitan celebrated two anniversaries: 1946 marked the 40th anniversary of his consecration to the episcopate and his 10th anniversary as First Hierarch, and 1948 marked the 50th anniversary of his monastic tonsure. On the occasion of these two jubilees, he was awarded the highest honors. For his service to the Church Abroad, as had his predecessor Metropolitan Anthony been, he was granted the title “His Beatitude” and the right to wear two panagias along with the pectoral cross, the highest ecclesiastical honor.¹⁸

Except for the communities that existed before 1945, the church life of that year in Germany and Austria was completely transferred to the refugee camps. There was a total of nearly 20 such camps, of which the largest in size were in Hamburg, Kassel, Hannover, Heidelberg, Kempten, Munich, and Salzburg.¹⁹ In them, there lived up to 10,000 displaced persons, mostly workers from the East (Ostarbeiter). Within a very short period of time, an extensive political, cultural and church life developed among the refugees. This arose from political and national groups, who, employing the crudest means, printed journals, books, brochures, and programs, in which they presented their political, economic and cultural-political ideas. The instruction was provided for the small children and the youth. In the larger camps, such as Salzburg, Munich, and Kassel, a regular school system was set up, which extended from kindergarten through elementary and secondary levels. By the summer of 1946 in West Germany alone, seven Russian high schools and ten elementary schools had been established. Refugee teachers taught the classes. The goal

of these educational institutions was to provide the students with a diploma, which would later enable them to continue their education. A completely new subject of instruction at these schools was religion and catechism, which was taught by the camp clergy because there were almost no qualified religious instructors among the refugees. In general, the schools and lesson plans were set up very much along church lines, because the Christian and humanitarian world view took the place of Marxist-atheist indoctrination. Much was also done for the education of adults. There were courses in land-surveying, business and industry, electronics, motor transport, agriculture, architecture, tailoring, music, theatre, ballet and much more. There were also language courses: English, German, French, and Spanish. ²⁰

The Church organized religious, catechetical and missionary courses and church choirs. Young people and adults attended these in equal measure. They need to deepen Orthodox Christian ideals was especially pressing in the years after the war, when, on account of the horrible experiences of the preceding years and the privation and misery which surrounded them, many people sought consolation in the Faith and in Christianity. The desire to enter into the service of the Church or into a monastic community was also particularly pronounced. Yet much was done also in the “old communities.” Churches had been in part destroyed or damaged during the War and required repair. Building plans long in abeyance were again taken up because the communities had grown through the influx of refugees.

A particularly joyous event of these years was the consecration of the Church of St. Job in Brussels, which had been built as a memorial to the family of the last Tsar and all the victims of the Russian Revolution and its aftermath. The planning and building of the church took more than over twenty years before the church, built in northern Russian style, with blue, 24-meter high onion domes visible from afar, was finally able to be consecrated. The consecration took place on 18 Sept./1 Oct. 1950. Metropolitan Anastasius, Bishops Nathaniel and Leontius (Bartoshevich), and numerous clergy and representatives from the Romanov family took part. Since then, the Church has been subjected directly to the First Hierarch of the Church Abroad. In view of the Church Abroad’s canonization of the victims of Communism in 1981, this church has taken on a particular significance. ²¹

In the autumn of 1949, the Synod of Bishops began to plan the move from Munich to the United States, because the majority of the faithful had, in the meantime, gone there to live, and most of the Church’s institutions were located there, including several monasteries, the seminary at Jordanville, and an array of social and charitable institutions. Also, since the schism of the American Metropolia, it had become ever clearer that the Church Abroad had a serious competitor not only in North America, for the Metropolia was also trying to entice communities outside of North America – in South America and Japan, Southeast Asia and Australia – into joining its jurisdiction. In order for the Church Abroad to retain the mass of émigrés who had emigrated to the New World in these years, it was preferable for the central ecclesiastical administration and the First Hierarch to move to the United States. Such a move threw into the scales the tremendous authority which the Synod, and even more importantly Metropolitan Anastasius, possessed, the more so to increase the advantage of the Church Abroad over the Metropolia.

* The numbering of endnotes is off by 2 – the 1st two are in the previous chapter.

Footnotes

1. On the relationship with the Serbian Orthodox Church, cf. Part V, Chap. 3. ↵
2. 2. Polsky, *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*, p. 164. ↵
3. Ibid., p. 165. ↵
4. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, pp. 53-58; *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 120ff. ↵
5. Polsky, *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*, p. 165. ↵
6. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, p. 54. ↵
7. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 638. ↵
8. Part II, Chap. 2. ↵
9. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2, p. 1318ff. ↵
10. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2:1001. ↵
11. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in der BRD*, p. 173. ↵
12. Seide, *Die Klöster*, pp. 103-107. ↵
13. Ibid., pp. 136-140. ↵
14. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 4. ↵
15. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1954) 5-6, p. 1. ↵
16. Anastasius, *Sbornik*, p. 24. ↵
17. Cf. the Christmas and Paschal Missives of the Metropolitan in *Sbornik*, pp. 57-120. ↵
18. Ibid., p. 26; *Tserkovnaya letopis'* (Paris: 1946) 3, pp. 7-45. ↵
19. Ibid., pp. 45-50. ↵
20. Memorandum sur la situation. ↵
21. *Tserkovnaya letopis'* (Paris: 1946) 3, p. 55. ↵

Part II, Chapter 4

The Rebuilding of Church Life since 1950

In 1945, the Synod had 350 communities in North America. Through the influx of refugees from Europe and the Far East, the existing communities were numerically strengthened. However, numerous new communities were also established, as the refugees often resettled in large self-contained groups.¹

The renewed schism of the Metropolia posed a danger to the Church Abroad for a time, in that the latter could have lost its influence over church life in America. In contrast to the mere 70 communities which had remained with the Church Abroad, 300 communities belonged to the Metropolia at the end of the 1940s. Thus, for the newly arrived refugees, the possibility of joining a Metropolia community was much greater than that of joining a Synodal one.

Nevertheless, the Church Abroad strengthened its position in subsequent years and established new communities. In addition to both exile groups, however, since 1946 the Moscow Patriarchate again entered the stage as a rival. The success of the Patriarchate – in 1946 only 6 communities – is partly explained by the vacillating attitudes of the Metropolia towards the Patriarchate during the years 1944-46. After having achieved initial recognition, numerous communities refused to participate in the renewed break and remained under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate, which in the mid-1960s had some 80 communities in the United States and Canada, and with the granting of autocephaly to the Metropolia gained yet another 60 or so communities.²

The strengthening of the position of the Church Abroad in North America was due to various circumstances; as in 1927, a portion of the clergy and communities remained faithful to the Church Abroad. The 70 or so communities that remained form the basis for the present community life in North America. They were the same communities that had belonged to the Church Abroad at the time of the death of Archbishop Apollinarius in 1933. At that time, the Synod of Bishops had had 64 communities.

To these “old communities,” however, new communities were quickly added. These consisted mostly of refugees who were arriving from Europe and the Far East. In 1952, the Church Abroad had approximately 100 communities there, today [trans., 1983] there are 143.³ The refugees who came to North America beginning in 1945 felt closer to the Church Abroad than to the Metropolia or even the Patriarchal Church. The Church Abroad had given them spiritual care in Europe and the Far East after their expulsion. Now the Church leadership strove to help build up Church life by sending priests to the new communities. Thus, the Church Abroad had an advantage over the Metropolia in America, and even over the Paris Jurisdiction in Europe, in that at that time the Church Abroad had more than enough priests since almost all of the refugee clergy had been under the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad. The uncompromising anti-Communist stance of the Church Abroad was essentially closer to the political convictions of these émigrés than the vacillating stance of the Metropolia’s leadership. Similarly significant was the fact that many Metropolia communities were using English as the liturgical language in the

place of Church Slavonic in the divine services. These communities did not represent the new émigrés the Russian Church whose children they considered themselves to be.

The situation of the expelled monastic communities paralleled that of the clergy and laity. When one looks at isolated monks and nuns, one sees that only a small group of four nuns under the direction of Mother Juliana of Harbin joined the Metropolia. In 1949, when they arrived in California, they were given a building in Calistoga, in which they founded the convent of the Dormition of the Theotokos.⁴ These sisters, however, had no knowledge of the jurisdictional situation in North America in 1949, because developments in the United States after 1945 were certainly not known to them.

In the other countries – in South America and Australia – the situation was even more favorable for the Church Abroad, which was either the only Russian Church in these countries or, in the case of newly-founded communities, the only one which was in the position to send a priest. Schisms from the Church Abroad, such as the one in Argentina, where Archpriest Izraztsov joined the Metropolia in 1947, remained a rare exception. In Australia and New Zealand, the Russian Church was only represented by two communities. Of the 61 communities today in South America, Australia, and New Zealand, almost all were founded after 1945.⁵

Thus, the starting position of the Church Abroad in the territories overseas after 1945-49 was essentially more favorable than one might assume. Until the mid-1950s, the number of communities grew steadily worldwide and reached around 500 at its high point. Since that time, however, the number has decreased, finally standing at about 350 communities. This has changed little in the 20 years since. The abandonment of over 100 communities has had various causes. The complete dissolution of the refugee camps in the Far East (in the Philippines, Taiwan, and Hong Kong) and Europe (in Germany, Austria, and Italy) led to the closure of numerous parishes in these countries. After the closure of the refugee camps, small parishes existed for a while and consisted of only a few families that had remained in neighboring communities; subsequently, they were also dissolved. Some of the smaller diaspora communities had to be abandoned in Asia, Africa and parts of South America, because, through assimilation, emigration and the aging (of the faithful), the communities had dissolved by themselves. Such developments have, for example, also been typical of some communities in North America, where since the end of the 1950s many émigrés have moved away. The number of communities also decreased because of financial considerations. Inasmuch as the parish church was housed in rented or leased buildings, smaller communities were often unable to meet the rent and were forced to assimilate with larger communities. There have also been cases, of course, where the building or plot of land had previously only been rented, but subsequently were sold by the owners, forcing the closure of the churches and chapels. There have even been cases where the churches were closed for reasons of safety, as in the case of the Cathedral of the Ascension in the Bronx (New York). This was the old cathedral from the time of Archbishops Apollinarius and Vitalis. After clergy and the faithful had been attacked on numerous occasions, parishioners no longer got married in the church. Finally, the church had to be closed as a result of the growing crime rate in the Bronx.

The growth of the communities and the influx of refugees to the United States after 1948 led the Church leadership to consider moving its headquarters there. The principle difficulty was finding their own building, which had to be in or near New York, in order to transfer the administration of the Church Abroad there. Bishop Seraphim (Ivanov) was charged with the planning and search. The Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville, which was gradually developing into the spiritual and theological center of the Church Abroad, and since 1948 has accommodated a seminary for priests, was of central significance for the Church, but the premises available there were insufficient. Due to the influx of 20 monks from Europe and the Far East, the accommodation of the seminary and its students, and the further establishment of the printing press, the spatial capacities of the monastery were entirely exhausted. The main buildings housing the monastic cells and the administrative offices were built only in 1954-57. Thanks to the support of Prince Beloselsky-Belozersky, who expressed his readiness to sell his estate in Mahopac, New York, some 40 miles north of New York City, the Church was able to purchase a freehold plot of land adequate for a monastery and to which the Synod of Bishops and the First Hierarch could move. The transfer of this property took place in December of 1949. The renovation of the main building and the erection of a small church were completed in November of 1950, a few days before the arrival of Metropolitan Anastasius. On 23 January/5 February 1951, the wonderworking Kursk Icon of the Mother of God arrived in New York from Germany and was installed in the new monastery, which was to be the headquarters of the Synod. The New Kursk-Root Hermitage was reminiscent of the former monastery near Kursk in which the Kursk Icon had been venerated before the Revolution.⁶

The New Kursk-Root Hermitage remained the headquarters of the Synod until 1957. Though the monastery was only a residence, it was still located too far outside the city. For this reason, a second residence for the winter months was sought in New York City, which was finally found in 1952 at 312 West 77th Street in Manhattan. The building was small and housed the chancery and a house chapel.⁷ It was indeed nearer to the faithful, but its limited space meant that it could only be a temporary solution. The house chapel was too small to accommodate all the worshippers at the divine services.

Finally, in 1957, a freehold building was acquired at the corner of Park Avenue and East 93rd Street in an elegant residential section of Manhattan. Thanks to the financial assistance provided by Serge I. Semenenko (1903-1980),⁸ who not only offered the money to purchase the building and land but also the means to convert and restore the house, Metropolitan Anastasius and the Synod was able to move into the new building.⁹ In the building with its over forty rooms, were located the residence of the First Hierarch and the Chancery of the Synod, along with the archives, assembly halls, two churches, and the Synodal high school. In a spacious side wing, the Cathedral of Our Lady of the Sign (the Kursk Icon) was established. On the ground floor of the main building is the Chapel of St. Sergius of Radonezh. In this church, the divine services are held daily, in Church Slavonic on weekdays and in English on Sundays. In the cathedral, divine services are held on the twelve great feasts and other important feasts and on Sundays. The iconostasis of the cathedral was painted by the monastic iconographers Cyprian (now Archimandrite) and Alypius (now Bishop of Chicago), who for this work was awarded the golden cross. The consecration of the Cathedral took place in October of 1959.¹⁰ The two monks

also painted the iconostasis of the St. Sergius Church in the style of 18th-century Russian iconography. The royal doors of this iconostasis came from a Russian village church and had been brought out of the Soviet Union by some refugees. The completion of the sides of the iconostasis in the same style as these royal doors represents the especially successful work of both iconographers.

The Wonder-Working Kursk Root Icon is housed in the Synodal building in New York in the Metropolitan's private quarters. It is brought daily to church for the divine services in order to give the faithful the opportunity to entreat the protection of the Mother of God before it. At the end of the divine service, the icon is replaced by a copy (or another icon of the Mother of God, in particular, the Wonder-Working Icon "The Joy of All Who Sorrow" from Harbin). The consecration of the new Synodal building took place in October of 1959, during a Council of Bishops. Since then the Church Abroad, of all the Orthodox jurisdictions in North America, has at its disposal the most commodious accommodation. In 1952, the faithful in California obtained a building in Burlingame, in which a second summer residence was established for Metropolitan Anastasius. In 1964, in place of this building, a new building was consecrated, in which the Church of All Saints of Russia, the quarters of the Metropolitan, a chancery and a small elementary school were located.¹¹ In this metochion, the First Hierarch spent the summer months; though from the mid-1970s Metropolitan Philaret spent most summers at the Lesna Convent in France until he became too ill to travel such distances.

The move of the Synod to the United States indubitably strengthened the position of the Church Abroad in North America. The sessions of the Council of Bishops, which met every three years, were held thereafter in North America: from 1957 in the New Kursk-Root Hermitage and then from 1959 in the Synodal building in New York. Only the Councils in 1971 and 1974 took place elsewhere: in 1971 in Montreal,¹² and in the second case at the end of the Third Pan-Diaspora Council in Holy Trinity Monastery.

The Metropolia saw this move to America above all else "as an aggressive act."¹³ The position of the Metropolia, which claimed to be the only representative of all the Orthodox, was not sufficiently well-rooted. Many of the faithful had turned away from it and joined the Moscow Patriarchate. Their First Hierarch of many years, Metropolitan Theophilus, died in 1950. His successor was Metropolitan Leontius. At that time, even reunification with the Church Abroad could not have been ruled out, because the heightened East-West opposition had drawn the émigrés closer together.¹⁴ The hierarchs of the Church Abroad, such as Archbishops Vitalis and Tikhon, held memorial services for the departed Metropolitan Theophilus; after moving to the United States, Metropolitan Anastasius visited Metropolitan Leontius. The Synod side proposed that the relationship between both Churches be formed "without the old strife over canonicity", that it be conducted in the spirit of "brotherly love in Christ with the goal of reestablishing complete communion."¹⁵

This remarkable attempt to overcome the schism ultimately failed, however, as a result of the different objectives which both Churches pursued in view of the future. While the Church Abroad understood itself to be part of the whole Russian Church and strove for a restoration of unity after the liberation of the Russian Church from state tutelage, Metropolitan Leontius

pursued a separation from the Mother Church with the ultimate goal of autocephaly for American Orthodoxy, which as the heir of the Russian Church had trodden its own path for 150 years. In the 1950s and 1960s, the administrative composition of the Church Abroad took on the form which it still has today. In North America, a total of six dioceses were created by combining already existing dioceses and creating new ones. In 1951, the Diocese of Western America received the Vicariate of Los Angeles, under the direction of Archimandrite Anthony (Sinkevich). In 1962, this vicariate was transformed into an independent diocese. Therefore, Western America received the Vicariate of Seattle, under the direction of Bishop Nectarius (Kontsevich). The Vicariate of Syracuse and Holy Trinity, under the direction of Bishop Abercius, became independent in 1967. The Dioceses of Chicago and Cleveland and Detroit and Flint were joined together in 1957, following after the deaths of both their ruling bishops. They thus became a single diocese – that of Chicago and Detroit in 1957, whose ruling bishop was thereafter Seraphim (Ivanov). In 1974, Bishop Alypius (Gamanovich) was assigned as his vicar. After the death of Archbishop Vitalis (Maximenko) in 1960, Metropolitan Anastasius assumed the title of Metropolitan of Eastern America and New York. Since 1967, the diocese has borne the official designation of Eastern America and New York. Over the years, there have always been two vicariates which bore various titles (Rockland, Washington and Florida, Boston, Manhattan, and Erie). In Canada, the Dioceses of Edmonton and Western Canada and of Montreal and Eastern Canada were joined together. Bishop Vitalis (Ustinov), from 1957 Archbishop and from 1986 Metropolitan, ruled this combined diocese. In South America, the Diocese of Santiago and Chile was created, under the rule of Bishop Leontius (Philippovich).

After he, then Archbishop, was charged with the administration of Argentina and Paraguay, Chile was joined to the latter diocese. Since 1971, the Diocese of Chile has again existed as a separate diocese under the administration of Archimandrite Benjamin (Vosnyuk). The Diocese of Argentina was created in 1948, and since the 1970s has also included communities in Paraguay and Uruguay. From 1955, it was ruled by Archbishop Athanasius (Martos), and after his repose in 1983, by Bishop Innocent (Petrov). The Diocese of Caracas and Venezuela was ruled from 1957 by Bishop Seraphim (Svezhersky), now retired. Brazil became a diocese in 1943, and was ruled by Archbishop Theodosius (Samoilovich) until 1968; he was followed by Bishop Nicander (Paderin), who reposed in 1987. Australia became a diocese in 1946, with two vicariates – Melbourne (1950-1970) and Brisbane (1964-1977). In Europe, the dioceses of Geneva and Western Europe, Berlin and Germany, Vienna and Austria, and Richmond and Great Britain, continued to exist.

From 1945 to 1981, the following bishops were consecrated: Agapitus (Kryzhanovsky, 1957), Alexander (Lovchy, 1945), Alypius (Gamanovich, 1974), Andrew (Rymarenko, 1968), Anthony (Bartoshevich, 1957), Anthony (Medvedev, 1956), Anthony (Sinkevich, 1951), Abercius (Taushev, 1953), Constantine (Yessensky, 1967), Daniel (Alexandrov, 1988), Gregory (Grabbe, 1978), Hilarion (Kapral, 1984), Innocent (Petrov, 1983), Jacob (Thomps, 1951), Jacob (Akkerschijk, 1965), John (Kovalevsky, 1964), Laurus (Skurla, 1967), Leontius (Bartoshevich, 1950), Mark (Arndt, 1980), Nathaniel (Lvov, 1946), Nectarius (Kontsevich, 1962), Nicodemus (Nagaev, 1954), Nikon (Rklitsky, 1948), Paul (Pavlov, 1967), Sabbas (Raevsky, 1945), Sabbas (Sarachevich, 1958), Seraphim (Ivanov, 1947), Seraphim (Svezhevsky, 1957), Theodosius

(Putilin, 1969), and Vitalis (Ustinov, 1951). Also, Archimandrite Philaret has consecrated Bishop of Brisbane in 1963, having just emigrated from China in 1962. Metropolitan Anastasius proposed him, as the youngest hierarch, to be his successor in 1964 after the election of a new First Hierarch was locked in a tie between Archbishops Nikon and John. In 1941, Archbishop Philotheus (Narko) was consecrated Bishop of Slutsk, and in 1942 Archbishop Athanasius (Martos) was consecrated Bishop of Vitebsk, by the Belorussian Autonomous Orthodox Church. Both joined the Church Abroad at the Council of Bishops in Munich in 1946.

Over the years, just as in the case of the bishops, there was a change of generations in the clergy. In the '60s it became necessary to replace many of the refugee clergy, who had died or were too old to serve. Already at the Councils of Bishops in the 1950s, the problem of the gradually developing shortage of priests was given more attention.¹⁶ For example, in the Australian Diocese in 1952, there were 24 priests – 4 between 70-80 years of age, 4 between 60-70, 11 between 50-60, 4 between 40-50 and one under 40 years old. Practically speaking, this aging meant that in the next 10-15 years half of the priests would have to be replaced by younger candidates.¹⁷ The situation was similar in other dioceses. Around 1970 in Germany, 80% of the clergy were over 50 years of age.¹⁸ The contention that the education of priests “is not simple”¹⁹ can only apply to those dioceses outside of America. While in America, thanks to Holy Trinity Seminary in Jordanville, the problem with regard to priests has not been as acute; however, outside the United States and Canada, there were great shortages in some places. The Council of Bishops in 1959 appealed to all parish clergymen to encourage their parish youth to enter Holy Trinity Seminary. The Council also said that pastoral courses should be offered as well as preparatory courses for reception into the seminary in the dioceses. The Synod formed an academic committee, whose task it was to prepare a program of instruction for such courses and to coordinate the work in this area.²⁰

From the 1970s, Holy Trinity Seminary in Jordanville has registered a growing number of students. While, for example, in 1967 only 6 new students entered the seminary, in 1976 there were 14 new students, and in the 1980 academic year, there were even 25 new students.²¹ By the mid-1970s, over 100 priests were educated, including 2 bishops, many hegumens, archimandrites and over 20 hieromonks (another of whom has in the 1980s become a bishop). Of the over 300 clergymen of the Church Abroad, easily half have received their education at Holy Trinity Seminary. One should not overlook the fact that many of the graduates have not taken up the priesthood. Of eight candidates who graduated from the seminary in 1980, only one became a priest. Many candidates cannot make the decision to become a priest in view of the difficult material circumstances in which the families of priests find themselves. Only in a few countries do the clergy receive supplemental financial support from government and church agencies. Only the larger communities can pay their priests enough, though even such priests must subsist on very modest means. In view of the over-emphasis on everything material in our society, it is understandable that younger people find it hard to make the decision to forego many comforts, which the majority of their fellow countrymen take for granted as a part of their everyday life. While in the United States and Canada almost all communities have their own clergyman; in other countries, the priests have more than one community in their care: of the 34 communities in Germany, only 20 have their own priests; of the 4 in Austria, only one; the parishes in

Argentina and Paraguay are cared for by 3 archpriests, 2 priests, and 3 deacons; and in Australia-New Zealand, there is only one priest for every other community.²² Added to the general problem of providing parishes with priests is the special problem of language, which became acute in the 1970s. The candidates for the priesthood today have for the most part been born in the West, or at least have grown up there.

Despite all the Church's care in preserving its traditions and its efforts in maintaining the Russian language and culture, one cannot close one's eyes to the fact that these young people communicate better in the language of their country than in their mother tongue. Thus, for example, the pupils at St. Sergius High School in New York (opened in 1958 and closed by the Synod in 1985-6) spoke fluent Russian, yet almost without exception spoke English among themselves. There are several places where pupils receive a good part of their education in Russian to this day – the high school in San Francisco and both orphanages for girls in Bethany and Santiago. All other émigré children can only learn the language of their fathers and forefathers in the parish schools ("Saturday schools," often catechetical) because in many of the post-War émigré families they learned only colloquial Russian. Meanwhile, however, a new generation has been growing up, who have started their own families, in which one often finds that one spouse is not Russian. Thus, many communities within the Church Abroad lost their pure Russian character years ago. Wherever priests find themselves in this situation, they say a part of the liturgy also in the language of the country or serve the liturgy in that language at regular intervals. When considering this issue of multi-nationality, one must also not forget that non-Russian Orthodox émigrés have often joined the Russian Church Abroad. The 1978 Council of Bishops made reference was the first time this apparent change was acknowledged.²³ In part, this transformation to multi-nationality was also a result of the missionary work of the Church Abroad, because in many countries non-Russian Orthodox communities were formed side by side with Russian ones, whose existence can be traced back to the Church Abroad.

The gradual transformation to accommodate other nationalities can be seen clearly, for example, in the monasteries. Up until the present time, the Russian language has remained the colloquial language in the monasteries, and the liturgy is still celebrated in Church Slavonic; yet of 100 monks now living in monasteries, there are 10 Greeks, 20 Americans, 5 Englishmen and several of other nationalities, and of some 2000 nuns more than two-thirds are non-Russians.²⁴ In Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville, there have been regular English language services, and half of the monks speak English better than Russian. This is indeed a missionary success, of which the Church Abroad can be proud, yet it fills many of their clergy with sadness, in that it is a sign of their long exile from their homeland.

In close connection with this development is the existence of church schools, the establishment of which intensified from the beginning of the 1950s. While the schools in the refugee camps had had the task of enabling the pupils to obtain a diploma, the parish community school is, in addition to strengthening the Faith, supposed to deepen the consciousness and knowledge of Russian national culture among the émigré children. Except for those within the Church, there are no Russian national schools outside the Soviet Union, other than those schools attached to the Soviet embassies and missions, which are only attended by those from Socialist countries.

Almost all Councils of Bishops and the Third Pan-Diaspora Council in 1974 passed resolutions on the strengthening and building up of the Faith among the youth.²⁵ The same 100 parish schools which exist today were almost all founded at the beginning of the 1950s. For the older émigrés, the Church was not only a religious center, but also a center for meeting one another. Parishes endeavored to build parish halls, libraries, and reading rooms, in order to give their members the possibility of meeting with others of like mind and establishing small libraries to provide them with books and literature in their mother tongue. This was especially important because outside of these parish libraries there was no possibility for the émigrés to obtain Russian literature. The Church printing presses published historical, literary, and other writings in addition to religious literature. The churches and parish centers were for many of the faithful a part of their old homeland, where they could converse with their fellow countrymen in their native tongue, and keep the customs and traditions of their homeland. Music and dance ensembles, theatre groups and craft groups were formed in many communities. Their members met in the Church-owned buildings for various events. Thus, the parishes had a far-reaching significance for many Russians beyond that of religious care. This is also a reason that the parish members were prepared to support their churches and community centers with generous financial means. In the mid-1950s, after the greatest necessity of the first years was overcome and the material situation of most families gradually improved, there was a church building boom. Of some 150 churches today which were built in the Russian style, the majority were built after 1945. Besides the parish churches, most of the cathedrals were built in these years, including the cathedrals in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Montreal, Caracas, Salzburg, Hamburg, and many others. The largest new building of these years was the Cathedral of the Mother of God, the Joy of All Who Sorrow in San Francisco, California.²⁶ In their epistles to the faithful, in particular in their paschal and Christmas messages, the Synod and the Church leadership, the Council of Bishops and the diocesan bishops, referred to the responsibility of each individual believer to contribute to the strengthening of church life. Much attention was devoted to the inner mission, the strengthening of the Faith among their flock. Again and again, the Church leadership stressed the freedom of the émigrés and the Church Abroad and pointed out the responsibility resulting from this freedom for their brothers and sisters in the homeland. The Councils of Bishops discussed the plight of the faithful and the Mother Church in the homeland at every meeting. They turned to the Sister churches and the non-Orthodox churches with appeals, in which they brought to the latter's attention the persecution of the Church and religion in the Soviet Union. When the reception of the Russian Patriarchal Church into the World Council of Churches in 1961 was under debate, the Church Abroad's leadership sent a letter to the Conference of Churches in New Delhi and emphasized the dangers that might arise for the ecumenical movement, from the reception of the Patriarchal Church. They emphasized in their letter that the Patriarchal Church had hitherto opposed the ecumenical movement most vehemently. If they were now changing their stance, it was at the command of the government, which was thereby pursuing its own political aims. The Soviet government wanted to deceive the world into believing that freedom of religion existed in the Soviet Union and that the Church possessed the freedom to decide if they would like to join the movement. This, however, was not the case, because simultaneously a new wave of persecution against the Church and the faithful had begun in the Soviet Union, from which the Soviets hoped to divert the attention of the Free

World. In 1959, as the new persecution of the Church was initiated, the Council of Bishops turned to the Free World with an appeal to keep their eyes open to the “true situation” of the Church in the Soviet Union. This appeal, like so many other appeals in which the Church Abroad interceded for the faithful in the Soviet Union, went unheeded in most Western countries.²⁷ Despite the appeals issued by the Church leadership, between 1959 and 1961 alone, 8,500 churches were closed in the Soviet Union²⁸ without the full extent of the new persecution even being acknowledged in the West.

A notable act of ecclesiastical autonomy was the canonization of St. John of Kronstadt. The 1964 Council of Bishops, at which the new First Hierarch Metropolitan Philaret was elected, resolved upon this. The preparations for this canonization began in 1953 and it was carried out in 1964, in view of the righteous life which John of Kronstadt had led.²⁹ The great significance of this step can be seen in the fact that since 1918 the Russian Church had not canonized anyone. In July of 1918, the canonization of St. Sophronius of Irkutsk was the last time a Russian saint had been canonized.³⁰ The Church in the homeland could not risk such a step because of State policy, which was particularly directed against the relics and veneration of saints. Thus, the Church Abroad decided to take the first step in this direction. The last canonizations had all taken place before the Russian Revolution: In 1903, St. Seraphim of Sarov, in 1911 Joasaph, Bishop of Belgorod, in 1913 Hermogenes, Patriarch of Moscow, in 1914 Pitirim, Bishop of Tambov, and finally in 1916 John, Metropolitan of Tobolsk were all solemnly glorified as saints.³¹

The Patriarchal Church has never officially recognized the canonization of St. John of Kronstadt, nor can such a recognition take place, for to do so would mean that the Patriarchal Church recognized the Church Abroad’s spiritual authority to act on behalf of the Russian Church. Also, the canonization of St. John of Kronstadt would certainly have been unacceptable to the Patriarchal Church, since he had been chaplain to the Imperial Family and had had close contacts with the ruling dynasty. [Trans. note: He had also prophesied the Revolution and its dire aftermath.] The Patriarchate protested against this canonization by the Church Abroad, without, however, denying the sanctity of the new saint.

After the Metropolia received autocephaly, the new Church resolved to canonize Herman of Alaska; the Church Abroad denied that the former had the right to take this step, but did not question the sanctity of Herman. But in view of the great veneration in which the latter was held by many of the Church Abroad’s faithful in North America, the Synod of Bishops resolved to conduct a simultaneous canonization of Herman of Alaska, who thereby became the first Orthodox saint to live and die in North America. Since then, he has been recognized as a saint by the Church Abroad, the Orthodox Church in America, and the Patriarchal Church, but not by the Paris Jurisdiction, because the Patriarch of Constantinople did not recognize the Metropolia’s autocephaly.³² At the Council of Bishops in 1978, the Church Abroad glorified Blessed Xenia of Petersburg among the ranks of Russian saints. The Church Abroad ascertained that the new saint was also venerated greatly by the faithful in the Soviet Union; this was confirmed by a 1962 atheist brochure. In this brochure entitled “The Truth about Petersburg’s Holy Shrines,” it says, Of all of the pilgrimage sites to which the faithful had streamed even in Tsarist Petersburg, the Chapel of Blessed Xenia attracts the greatest number of pilgrims from the city and neighboring areas... Here, the divine services are often held and visitors flock to them. The candles burn in

great numbers, clouds of incense rise, church singing resounds. Numerous people attending the service put many slips of paper on the grave, on which various requests are inscribed.

Naturally, the author of this brochure also has an explanation at hand for these occurrences: “Perhaps the cult of this shrine would, like so many others, long ago have disappeared. But to keep up this fairy-tale, the servants of the cult, who live in revelry and riot, propagate Blessed Xenia in every way possible. Thus it is not surprising if the clergy fill the faithful with all possible ‘miracles.’”³³ Meanwhile, the chapel at the Smolensk Cemetery was walled up and an oversized bust of Lenin sculpted within it. [Trans. note: Shortly after completion, the bust of Lenin was defaced. In 1987, the chapel was reopened and cleaned up; the walls were structurally restored and painted. This took place in anticipation of the Millennium of Rus’ and, it may be assumed, with the expectation of an influx of tourists and pilgrims from the West.] Both the presentation in the atheist brochures and the measures taken by the State since the canonization, give the Church Abroad through this glorification the right to act upon the mood and ideas of the Russian Christians in the homeland.

The glorification of the New Martyrs took place at the Council of Bishops in 1981, at which all the victims and witnesses of the Faith, who were martyred during the Russian Revolution, the Civil War and the Communist persecution, were canonized, including the Imperial Family, Patriarch Tikhon, the bishops, priests, monks, nuns, and laity. The canonization of these “new martyrs and confessors” had been discussed since the 1930s. In Brussels there had been a church dedicated to them for years. In many Russian churches and émigré homes there is an icon depicting “All Saints of Russia,” whose feast was introduced for the first time by the Moscow Council in 1917. Some time ago, Archimandrite Cyprian painted a large triptych icon of this feast, the middle section of which measures 400 x 250 cm. On this icon³⁴ are depicted the Russian saints and martyrs, who were canonized by the Russian Church. On the right-wing of this triptych, the martyrs and confessors who were canonized in 1981, are depicted, including the Imperial Family, Patriarch Tikhon, and numerous bishops who lost their lives during their lives at the hands of the Bolsheviks. In a practical way, this wing of the triptych was an anticipation of the long-discussed canonization, which, as we know, was also desired by many in the Soviet Union. In a September 12, 1979 letter, the dissidents Fr. Gleb Yakunin, Basil Fonchenkov, Victor Kapitanchuk, and Leo Regelson petitioned for just such a canonization. Concerning the question of the canonization of the last Tsar and his family, the letter says,

“The Imperial Family occupies an entirely special place among the martyrs of the 20th century. The question of canonization has long been in the consciousness of Orthodox Russians... First one must distinguish between the canonization of the Tsar and that of his family. In our days, we have met no one, even among the atheists, who would defend the execution of the Imperial Children. The purity of their life and death also covers the death of their parents with a saintly crown. That the Tsar and his wife partook of the same martyrdom as their children must be seen as a witness before God that they were chosen. Nicholas II may have been a poor ruler and a sinful Christian, <...> but according to universally recognized teachers of the Church and the rite of canonization itself, the gravest sins and mistakes of church members committed during their life cannot stand in the way of their ecclesiastical glorification. If the question of the

canonization of Nicholas II and his wife is to be decided upon, it is appropriate to recall the words from the Epistle to the Hebrews: “Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation.” (Heb. 13:7) Their gentleness and the courage with which they met their fate led the imperial pair to the highest plane of Christian activity. The willingness of their sacrifice elicits a feeling of deep respect. Their end as brings to mind unbidden the first princely saints of the Russian land, its heavenly protectors Boris and Gleb... Through God’s dispensation, they were chosen to suffer, no longer having any political power and surrendering any desire to assume this power again. Nicholas II suffered as a victim of the Orthodox Empire, as the bearer of centuries-old ecclesial ideas concerning the power of God on earth... In this fact, that he was found worthy to suffer in this way, we see God’s witness to his sanctity.” ³⁵

This stance taken by Russian Christians in the Soviet Union has been extensively quoted to show, that the Church Abroad’s opinion in this matter was neither extreme nor totally unsupported. Furthermore, Patriarch Tikhon served a memorial service for the Imperial Family when he learned of their murder, and the Church Abroad merely continued serving them on the subsequent anniversaries of their death – a tradition which Patriarch Tikhon had begun and which is normal practice for friends and relatives of the departed. The arguments brought against canonization in the case of the Imperial Family cannot be considered to be in keeping with the thought and traditions of the Church. Furthermore, the canonization must be viewed in connection with the canonization of the many known and unknown witnesses for the Faith, who also lost their lives during the Bolshevik persecution of the Church. The other Orthodox Churches cannot close their eyes to this fact. ³⁶

Moreover, the canonization of the New Martyrs by the Church Abroad has been welcomed by the Patriarch of Jerusalem. In May of 1982, Patriarch Diodorus received a delegation of the Church Abroad, which consisted of Archbishops Anthony of Geneva, Paul of Sydney, Laurus of Syracuse, and Bishop Gregory of Washington, in the throne room of his residence. The hierarchs were in the Holy Land for the solemn translation of the relics of the New Martyrs, the Grand Duchess Elizabeth and the nun Barbara. Patriarch Diodorus stressed the necessity of the canonization in his address, and said: “Their arrival here is holy, as also the fact of the canonization of the holy New Martyrs is holy because of one like the other concerns those people who have suffered martyrdom for Orthodoxy.”

Furthermore, His Beatitude pointed out that the Church Abroad “for various reasons finds itself outside its homeland, and the Church in Russia provides us with New Martyrs daily, and millions of people follow the examples of the Imperial Martyrs and the holy Martyr, the Grand Duchess Elizabeth.” “And we,” His Beatitude said, “cannot remain indifferent to such an exalted event, as the canonization of the martyrs; their celebration is taking place in territory under our jurisdiction. Therefore, we have resolved to take part in this holy matter by sending a delegation, to bear witness to our Orthodox unity and by this official act to stress its legitimacy.” His Beatitude Diodorus concluded his greeting with the wish “that the blood of the Martyrs, which has been shed, might be sanctified water, which would richly irrigate the timber of Orthodoxy, whereby we may be strengthened in unity and truth through the prayers of all the New Martyrs.” ³⁷

Patriarch Diodorus's words contained two extremely important points: first, that the Jerusalem Patriarchate recognizes the right of the Russian Church Abroad to act and speak for the Russian Mother Church in the homeland (the legitimacy of this official act), and secondly, that the Patriarchate of Jerusalem considers the Church Abroad to be its Orthodox Sister Church and proceeds, based on the unity of both Churches, to bear witness to "our Orthodox unity." The significance of this statement is so very great because the opponents of the Church Abroad have maintained that the Church Abroad is not "recognized" by any other Orthodox Sister Church. This assertion can only be made on the basis of disinformation; its truthfulness is corroborated by the word of Patriarch Diodorus alone.

In 1977, the Patriarchate of Moscow resolved once again to canonize a saint, though this passed "almost unnoticed" by the faithful and by publicity. At the request of the Orthodox Church in America, Metropolitan Innocent (Veniaminov) was glorified as the "Apostle of North America and Siberia." The OCA simultaneously celebrated his canonization. This canonization has not been recognized by the Church Abroad.

The Church Abroad has also glorified St. Paisius Velichkovsky (1982) and the Optina elders (1990), and has officially begun to collect materials in preparation for the canonization of Archbishop John (Maximovich).

The Church Abroad's canonizations have been the result of decades of struggle within the Church Abroad to determine its own position and spiritual authority. This development began with the creation of dioceses by the Stavropol Council in 1919. This path was continued outside of Russia as the Church Abroad established its own ecclesiastical organization. The break with the Mother Church which later followed and the lack of recognition of each other's canonical bases have led to a situation in which both Russian Churches claim to be the Russian Church of Patriarch Tikhon and have grown further and further apart, treading their own separate paths for decades. The canonizations of recent years, and the mutual refusal to recognize the new saints, are the conclusion of the struggle over canonical and spiritual authority between both Churches. Though the continuation of this struggle cannot diminish the merits of these new saints, all Russian Christians, however, are grieved by it. Thus, the authors of the aforementioned letter wrote: "Can it really be that the demands to fulfill the religious duties towards the martyrs, to partake in the paschal joy of their glorification, would not prove to be more important than the differences and conflicts, which in our day so tragically separate the Russian Orthodox Christians?.. For us, because we live in Russia, it is beyond a doubt that the glorification of the saints cannot be a private concern of one of the jurisdictions of the Russian Church. We bear witness to the fact that the veneration of the martyrs and confessors through prayer is becoming more and more widespread in Russia and expresses the deep confidence that the act of canonization, even if it is only to be accomplished by the Synodal Church, will be met with true religious zeal and enthusiasm by the Russian clergy and faithful."

Since 1945, there have been 20 Councils of Bishops and one Pan-Diaspora Council. Representatives of the clergy and laity took part in the Third Pan-Diaspora Council, which was held at Holy Trinity Monastery. In contrast to the previous two councils (1921 and 1938), no volume about the sessions and resolutions was published. The reports and resolutions were

printed in "Orthodox Russia," "Church Life," and many other journals of the Church Abroad. All the acts of the last Pan-Diaspora Council are in the Synodal Archives (File 2/72) as well as those of the preparatory sessions (File 4/65 and 1/71). Fourteen bishops, 38 priests, representatives of the diaconate and monastics, and 53 lay people participated in the Council. The focal point of the Council was the development of the Church Abroad and the religious situation in the homeland, as well as the developments of the Patriarchal Church. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Vladimir Maximov, and Andrew Sinyavsky were questioned about the developments in the homeland. The Patriarchate directed an appeal for reunification to the participants; the Church Abroad for their part appealed to the Paris Jurisdiction and the OCA to overcome the schisms, though the Council did not achieve this end. However, in connection with the Old Believer Schism, the Council lifted the ban that had been imposed upon this group by the Russian Church in 1656 and 1667. With this decision, the Council the Pan-Russia Council of 1917-18, which had recommended the lifting of the ban, but had not brought forth a resolution due to the cessation of the Council sessions in consequence of the political developments. Only a verbal decision was reached.

A further event in the life of the Church Abroad of these years was the election of a successor to Metropolitan Anastasius, who retired from his position as First Hierarch of the Church Abroad in 1964 on account of his advanced age. The new First Hierarch was Metropolitan Philaret, who had only been consecrated bishop in 1963. Metropolitan Anastasius had been the First Hierarch for almost thirty years. He was the last hierarch of the Russian emigration to have been consecrated bishop before the Revolution. His main service to the Church consisted of rebuilding the Church Abroad during the difficult post-War years. After its heavy losses, it appeared that the Church Abroad would not recover from these blows. The great respect in which Metropolitan Anastasius was held by many of the old émigrés and the refugees who fled their homeland was, however, more than enough to avert further calamity from the Church Abroad.

The center of ecclesiastical life was transferred overseas to America. Thus, it was only natural that the Church administration be moved there. The consistent stance of the Church leadership towards the Moscow Patriarchate and its uncompromising rejection of Communism also determined the ecclesiastical and political basis of the Church Abroad after 1945. After the administrative reorganization of the Church, the Church's principal objective was the strengthening of the Faith and the preservation of Russian national culture among the faithful. The Church leadership's view of itself as the free and independent part of the whole Russian Church, which could act in the name of the Russian Church, acquired a new dimension during the tenure of Metropolitan Anastasius: the preparation for the canonization of John of Kronstadt had been in progress for fifteen years before the 1964 Council of Bishops carried it out. The cooperation between of the old and new First Hierarchs – Metropolitans Anastasius and Philaret – on this canonically significant event also ensured continuity on the path to complete autonomy for the Church Abroad. The restoration of relations between the Patriarchal Church and the other Christian Churches led to the latter's severing of relations with the Church Abroad, which thereby won a new freedom: they no longer needed to defer relentless exposure of the oppression of the Church and the faithful and were answerable for this criticism to no one but themselves. That the Church Abroad spared neither the leadership of the Patriarchal Church, nor the bishops, nor the priests, who were silent about the real situation of "freedom" of the Church in the Soviet

Union, and who denied that any persecution was being waged for religious reasons, was not only natural but was also their duty.

In 1970, the Church Abroad celebrated the 50th anniversary of its establishment. On this occasion, a small commemorative volume was published, which was mainly directed to the remove “the” those who were not members of the Church Abroad, a short synopsis on the Church in Exile entitled *The 50th Anniversary of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia (Pamyatka 50-letiya Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi Zagranitse: 1920-1970* [Montreal 1970]). This anniversary volume appeared in a bilingual form, in Russian and English. In 1968, a two-volume work produced under the editorship of Count A.A. Sollogub, entitled *Russkaya Pravoslavnaya Tserkov Zagranitse* (Volumes I-II, New York. 1968.) appeared. In this work, following a brief historical introduction, the Church Abroad gives a survey of its dioceses, communities, institutions, and properties in the West. Almost all the parish churches, monasteries, and other properties were pictured. Also, in both these volumes, there are numerous pictures of community life and joint church meetings. This noteworthy work, which unfortunately has not obtained a wide distribution, again reflects the presence of the Church Abroad in the West but says far too little about the achievements the Church had attained for the Russian emigration. Nevertheless, the Church Abroad can rejoice in the fact that neither the Paris Jurisdiction nor the Metropolia in North America can point to such a global representation. The smallest diaspora communities in the farthest corners of the world have been and are cared for by the Church Abroad, which is the only Church outside of Russia from its establishment to the present day to have parishes wherever Russians live. Despite all the hostilities and attempts to question the canonical basis of this Church, it has been the only one among the Russian émigrés to understand how to master the difficult task of guarding and maintaining the Faith of their forefathers.

Though these achievements are not particularly noted in this aforementioned double jubilee album, they are nonetheless apparent in the photographs, which often express more than words. In 1988, the Russian Church celebrated the Millennium of the Baptism of Russia. It was, unfortunately, unthinkable that the Russian Church could celebrate this event as a reunited Church, but it would have been a giant step forward if the emigration had been able to celebrate this anniversary together. If the “canonical disputes” should have proven to be weaker than the thousand-year heritage of the Russian Church, there would then have been the great hope for the future of the Russian Church. A united Church in the emigration, which would speak for all the Russian faithful outside of Russia would possess not only great spiritual authority but also could win back recognition by all of Orthodoxy as a Church on equal footing with the Patriarchal Church.

Footnotes

1. “Kirche in Nordamerika. Geschichte,” in *HK* (1949) pp. 135-139; “Lage in Nordamerika” in *HK* (1954) pp. 140-142. ↵
2. Orthodoxy in America. Some statistics in: *ECR* (1968) pp. 70-73; *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches* (1978), pp. 87, 127. ↵

3. *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 210; *Spisok* (1981) pp. 3-18. ↵
4. Tarazar, p. 302. ↵
5. *Spisok* (1981) pp. 28-32. ↵
6. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 2; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1, pp. 482-505. ↵
7. *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 4, p. 15. ↵
8. The parents of J. Semenenko had been friends of Metropolitan Anastasius from pre-revolutionary times. Their son had become vice president and director of the First National Bank of Boston and had built up considerable assets. He died in May 1980. (*Newsletter*, 30, May 1980, pp. 1-2). ↵
9. *Prav. Rus'* (1958) 3, p. 10; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1:181-198. ↵
10. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1959) 5-6, pp. 65-66; 9-10, pp. 143-144. ↵
11. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1:505-507. ↵
12. *Pamyatka 50-letiya*, pp. 49-64. ↵
13. *Prav. Rus'* (1950) 23-24, p. 29; (1951) 6, p. 3. ↵
14. The situation of the Church Abroad in *HK* (1950) pp. 24-25. ↵
15. *Prav. Rus'* (1951) 6, pp. 3-7. ↵
16. *Ibid.* (1953) 19, pp. 4-8; 20, pp. 3-6; 21, pp. 11-12; (1956) 21, p. 5; (1959) 24, pp. 10-11. ↵
17. *Ibid.* (1952) 13, pp. 8-9. ↵
18. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*, p. 169. ↵
19. The situation of the Church in Exile in the realm of Western culture, in *Ostkirchliche Informationsdienst* (1964) 12, pp. 10-11. ↵
20. *Prav. Rus'* (1959) 24, pp. 10-11. ↵
21. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 4. ↵
22. *Spisok* (1981). ↵
23. *Orthodox Life* (1983) 6, pp. 27-28. ↵
24. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 6. ↵
25. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 5. ↵
26. Cf. the pictures in *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp. 664-665; Part IV, Chap. 6. ↵
27. *Prav. Rus'* (1959) 21, pp. 4-9. ↵

28. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte* 3, p. 252. ↵
29. *Russ. Prav.* Ts. 1:366-371; *Prav. Rus'* (1953) 12, p. 14; 18, pp. 1-2; 23, pp. 7-10; 24, p. 15; HK (1953/54) pp. 363-364; *Prav. Rus'* (1964) 11: pp. 4-9; 12: pp. 1-2; 18 (the entire issue); *Der christliche Osten* (1964) 3, p. 72. ↵
30. Tal'berg, *Istoria Russkoi Tserkvi*, p. 853. ↵
31. *Ibid.*, p. 853. ↵
32. *Der christl. Osten* (1970) 4-5, p. 138; *Prav. Rus'* (1970) 14, pp. 1-4; 15, p. 3; 16, pp. 3-5. ↵
33. Quoted from the Information Service of *Glaube in der zweiten Welt*, 28 Nov. 1978, pp. 15-16. ↵
34. Cf. the photographs in *Russ. Prav.* Ts., 1, pp. 526-527. ↵
35. *Volnoe Slovo* (1979) 35-36, pp. 129-138. ↵
36. *Prav. Rus'* (1979) 6, p. 8. ↵
37. *Bote der deutschen Diözese* (1982) 3, pp. 4-5. ↵

Part II, Chapter 5

The Dioceses and Institutions of the Church Abroad at the Present Time (1988)

By right not only of its numerical significance but also of its spiritual and ecclesiastical influence, the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia is of considerable consequence among the Orthodox Churches. If one excludes the other Orthodox Churches in exile, the Church Abroad, with its hundreds of thousands of active members,¹ its twenty monasteries and sketes, the printing presses, the seminary, and other institutions, is far from being the smallest among the autocephalous and autonomous Orthodox Churches. The number of faithful is about equal to that of the Orthodox Church of Czechoslovakia and is significantly larger than several national Orthodox Churches (e.g. The Autonomous Orthodox Churches of Finland and Japan number 50,000 and 30,000 faithful, respectively, the suppressed Chinese Orthodox Church likewise numbered only 30,000), the autonomous archdioceses (Sinai, Dodekanes) or the ancient eastern Patriarchate (Jerusalem). In the Church Abroad's monasteries, there live more monks and nuns than in the monasteries of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and Antioch, the Autocephalous Church of Poland and the Autonomous Churches of Sinai, Finland, and Japan combined. In its printing presses, more theological and religious literature is produced than by the Moscow Patriarchate's publishing house. The Church Abroad's circulation of periodicals is many times that of the Patriarchate. In contrast to the Mother Church, it can carry out charitable works, maintain schools, and conduct missionary activities. It is the only Russian Church outside of Russia that has for seventy years had parishes in all parts of the Free World. Since World War II, the Church Abroad has no longer enjoyed the official recognition of all the Orthodox world, but it has also not at any time been officially driven out of the Orthodox world. There are "simply no relations." However, this has not hindered many clergies of other Orthodox Churches from maintaining "unofficial" contacts with the Church Abroad's representatives.²

The leadership of the Church lies in the hands of "the Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia," with its headquarters in New York. Since 1986, the President of the Synod is Metropolitan Vitaly. The other permanent members of the Synod are Archbishops Anthony (Medvedev), Archbishop Laurus (Skurla) and Bishop Hilarion (Kapral). The Council of Bishops meets approximately every three years; it comprises the full assembly of bishops. The Council decides all important matters concerning the entire Church, such as the creation of dioceses, questions of the Faith, the election of the First Hierarch, etc. At the Council of Bishops, all hierarchs take part either in person or in writing.

The Church³ is made up of 14 dioceses and three vicariates. These dioceses are administered by 8 diocesan bishops and 3 vicar bishops, and one administrator with the rank of archimandrite. Three bishops, Archbishop Seraphim (Svezhevsky), Bishop Gregory (Grabbe) and Bishop Constantine (Essensky), live in retirement. A total of 316 parishes/communities belong to the Church Abroad. Of these, 161 are in the United States and Canada, 36 in South America, 83 in Europe, 25 in Australia and New Zealand, and 11 in Africa and Asia. The five monasteries in the Holy Land, and several churches, as well as a number of communities in North America, Europe, Asia, and Africa, are subject directly to the First Hierarch. Several Greek, Romanian, Bulgarian, French and English Orthodox communities and a community of Old Ritualists, have joined the

Church Abroad. The Russian St. Elias Skete and the Annunciation Skete on Mount Athos are in a close spiritual relationship with the Church Abroad, which financially supports the sketes and their inhabitants.

The communities are cared for by 1 metropolitan, 6 archbishops, 2 bishops and 3 vicar bishops, 10 archimandrites, 2 hegumens, 86 archpriests, 152 priests, 63 archdeacons, protodeacons and deacons, 80 monks, and over 200 nuns. In almost all of the monasteries, Russian is the spoken language, and the liturgy is celebrated in Church Slavonic. Among the monks are also monastic clergy of all ranks, from hierodeacon to metropolitan.

[The statistical data given here reflect the situation in the years 1992-1993, updating the German edition. Statistics about new developments in Russia have also been omitted. In the German edition, the years 1980/81 was taken as a base year. In comparison with the latest statistics, a few interesting statements can be made: the number of parishes in this time period has decreased by 33, but this decrease can be almost exclusively traced to Europe, where a total of 27 parishes had to be given up. These parishes had all been founded after World War II in refugee camps and their environs, and by the 1970s consisted of only a few families. The divine services were celebrated only at irregular intervals, sometimes only once a year. In contrast, the number of communities in South America and Australia has remained unchanged. In North America, the number has increased. Considering that a number of the Greek parishes (including the monastery and convent in Boston) have seceded from the Church Abroad and joined a group of Greek Old Calendarists, the Church Abroad can reflect upon a not insignificant success. The new parishes are, in part, parishes which on account of the modernism in the OCA have separated from the same, and also in part new, completely English-speaking parishes, which have developed from the missionary activities of the Church Abroad. There is a particularly positive balance between the number of parishes and clergy, including monastic clergy, in parish service. The number of parish priests has also increased. What is particularly pleasing is the fact that the average age of the clergy has dropped sharply, and today is under 50 years of age. In the priesthood, the change of generations can be clearly perceived. This applies to all dioceses. The supplying of parishes with priests is quite uneven. While in North America and Australia the majority of parishes have their own priests – with the exception of the smaller diaspora communities in remote areas, in South America and Europe the shortage of priests is menacing. There only every other community has its own priest. In Europe, the situation is somewhat more favorable than in South America because the number of priests in Europe has risen slightly. Particularly positive here is the ordination of many younger candidates. The situation of the episcopate is more difficult. In 1981 there were 18 ruling bishops; today [1992] there are only ten ruling and three retired hierarchs. Indeed, there are a few candidates among the monks who are as yet too young to be consecrated, i.e., they do not have a sufficient amount of spiritual experience. Whereas the Moscow Patriarchate, for example, consecrates candidates who are just 30 years old, the Church Abroad is very reluctant to do this. Thus, in the coming years, they will certainly continue to consecrate only older candidates, before a turning point will become apparent.

Also, a particular change can be noticed in the monasteries. Candidates of non-Russian heritage, especially of English-speaking heritage, have increased in number sharply. The situation of the

monasteries in the Holy Land is particularly difficult. On account of the uncertain political situation connected with the constantly rehashed claims of the Moscow Patriarchate to the Church property, many candidates hesitate to move to Jerusalem.

The Dioceses of the Church Abroad (1987/1988)

Eastern America and New York

Ruling bishop: Metropolitan Vitalis (Ustinov, b. 1910; 1951 consecrated Bishop of Montevideo).

Vicar bishops: Bishop Hilarion (Kapral, b. 1948; 1984 consecrated Bishop of Manhattan),

Bishop Daniel (Alexandrov, b. 1930; 1988 consecrated Bishop of Erie).

Sixty-six parishes are cared for by 3 archimandrites, 2 hegumens, 25 archpriests, 47 priests, and 19 deacons.

1 monastery, 1 convent.

1 home for the elderly and 1 nursing home with hospital facilities.

16 parishes are directly subject to the First Hierarchy; for the most part, these are located on the territory of the diocese.

Syracuse and Holy Trinity

Ruling bishop: Archbishop Laurus (Skurla, b. 1927; 1967 consecrated Bishop of Manhattan).

15 parishes are cared for by 3 archpriests, 7 priests and 2 deacons, and as needed by the monastery clergy, which includes 3 archimandrites, 3 hegumens, 4 priests and 7 deacons.

1 monastery with a printing press and publishing facilities.

1 convent with 2 nuns.

1 seminary with approximately 40 students.

Chicago and the Midwest

Ruling bishop: Archbishop Alypius (Gamanovich, b. 1929; 1974 consecrated Bishop of Cleveland).

19 parishes are cared for by 1 archimandrite, 1 hegumen, 2 archpriests, 16 priests, and 3 deacons.

1 monastery.

Among the 19 parishes, there are many English-speaking missionary communities.

San Francisco and Western America

Ruling bishop: Archbishop Anthony (Medvedev, b. 1908; 1956 consecrated Bishop of Melbourne).

Vicar Bishop: Bishop Cyril (Dmitrieff, b. ; 1992 consecrated Bishop of Seattle).

27 parishes are cared for by 1 archimandrite, 14 archpriests, 15 priests, and 10 deacons.

2 convents and 1 skete.

2 printing presses, 1 nursing home with hospital facilities, 1 high school.

Los Angeles and Southern California

Ruling bishop: Archbishop Anthony (Sinkevich, b. 1903; 1951 consecrated Bishop of Los Angeles).

5 parishes are cared for by 1 hegumen, 1 archpriest, 2 priests, and 1 deacon.

Montreal and Canada

Ruling bishop: Metropolitan Vitalis (Ustinov, b.1910; 1951 consecrated Bishop of Montevideo).

25 parishes are cared for by 2 archimandrites, 2 hegumens, 7 archpriests, 16 priests, and 2 deacons.

3 sketes, 1 convent, 2 printing presses with publishing facilities.

2 Bulgarian parishes and 1 Romanian parish belong to this diocese.

Berlin and Germany

Ruling bishop: Archbishop Mark (Arndt, b. 1941; 1980 consecrated Bishop of Munich and Southern Germany).

47 parishes are cared for by 1 hegumen, 6 archpriests, 10 priests, and 3 deacons.

1 monastery with a printing press.

The parish in Copenhagen is included in this diocese.

Vienna and Austria

After the repose of Archbishop Nathaniel (1986), the diocese was abolished; the parishes were absorbed by the Diocese of Western Europe.

Geneva and Western Europe

Ruling bishop: Bishop Seraphim (1993 consecrated Bishop of).

46 parishes are cared for by 4 archimandrites, 1 hegumen, 13 archpriests, 13 priests, and 11 deacons.

Of the parishes, 8 are in Switzerland, 15 in France, 3 in Belgium, 3 in Holland, 1 in Luxembourg, 5 in Italy and 11 in Austria.

1 convent and 3 homes for the elderly.

Richmond and Great Britain

Ruling bishop: Archbishop Mark (Arndt, b. 1941; 1980 consecrated Bishop of Munich and Southern Germany).

9 parishes are cared for by 2 archimandrites, 1 hegumen and 2 priests.

1 convent, 1 monastery.

Buenos Aires, Argentina, and Paraguay

Ruling bishop: Bishop John (Legky, consecrated Bishop of Buenos Aires, Argentina, and Paraguay).

18 parishes are cared for by 5 archpriests and three deacons.

Of the 18 parishes, 14 are in Argentina, 3 in Paraguay and 1 in Uruguay. A Romanian parish is directly subject to the First Hierarch.

Santiago and Chile

See vacant.

Administrator: Archimandrite Benjamin (Vosnyuk).

2 parishes.

1 convent with an orphanage, boarding house, and school.

Sao Paulo and Brazil

See vacant.

12 parishes are cared for by 1 archimandrite, 2 archpriests, 4 priests, and 1 deacon.

1 printing press.

Caracas and Venezuela

See vacant 6 parishes are cared for by 1 archpriest, 2 priests, and 1 deacon.

1 home for the elderly.

Sydney, Australia, and New Zealand

Ruling bishop: Archbishop Paul (Pavlov, b. 1927; 1967 consecrated Bishop of Stuttgart).

25 parishes are cared for by 5 archpriests, 15 priests, and 6 deacons.

1 skete, 1 convent, 4 homes for the elderly, 1 printing press.

Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem

Head: Archimandrite Theodosius (Klar, 1993 appointed head of the Mission).

2 archimandrites, 2 hegumens and 2 monks belong to the Mission.

The Mission has 2 monasteries, 2 convents, 1 boarding house for girls with a school, as well as extensive properties with churches.

8 parishes in Africa and the Near East are cared for by members of the Mission, wherever political circumstances permit. In 1989, the Synod ordained a priest, Fr. Stephen Evnich, for Iran, where only native clergy are permitted to serve.

Footnotes

1. "Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland" in *Glaube in der zweit. Welt* 3/4 Q74: p. 8. ↵
2. Cf. Part V, Chap. 4. ↵
3. *Spisok* (1988). ↵

PART III

The Structure of the Church Abroad

Chapter 1

The Synod of Bishops

The central administrative body of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad is the Synod of Bishops. Its official name today is the “Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad” (“Arkhieireisky Synod Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi Zagranitsej”). Since its establishment in 1922, the President of the Synod has always been the First Hierarchy of the Church Abroad. In addition to the President, the Synod has anywhere from five to eight permanent members. Sessions of the Synod are held several times a year. The Synod of Bishops is canonically answerable and subordinate to the Council of Bishops (the general assembly of all the bishops). That means that the Council of Bishops, as the supreme governing body and spiritual authority, is competent for all important decisions of the Church Abroad: for example questions of faith, order, and discipline, while the Synod of Bishops is responsible above all else for the administration of the whole Church Abroad. As a “small Council of Bishops,” the competence of the Synod as the “governing body” of the Church Abroad has, however, always been very broadly interpreted.

Both bodies together, the Synod of Bishops and the Council of Bishops, constitute the episcopal authority and leadership of the Church Abroad. Through general ecclesiastical assemblies — e.g., the Pan-Diaspora Council — the lower clergy and the laity are guaranteed a voice in the governing of the Church Abroad. Since the Church Abroad was formed, there have only been three Pan-Diaspora Councils: in 1921 the Church Abroad’s constitution was decided upon; at the second Pan-Diaspora Council in 1938, the spiritual and theological life of the Church Abroad was strengthened; the Third Pan-Diaspora Council in 1974 met at a time when a religious renaissance had begun to spread in Russia and the Christian structure of life in the non-Communist West was disintegrating. A second forum for the “voice of the people” to be heard is the local diocesan assembly, in which the bishop, the parish clergy, and the laity participate. The decisions of the General Assembly of the Pan-Diaspora Council become valid only with the consent of the Council of Bishops, which meets simultaneously. The principle of episcopal government of the Church is thus maintained.

From a historical standpoint, the General Council was at the source of the Church Abroad. It was at the Stavropol Council, which met in May of 1919, that it was decided to establish a “Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration.” This Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration, which existed from 1921 to 1922, was the direct predecessor of the Synod of Bishops. The first Council of Bishops met in 1921 during the first Pan-Diaspora Council, thus at a time when the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration could already reflect upon three years of work.

Even when the assembly of bishops, which had been invited by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration, met in Novochoerkask in November of 1919, the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration had already been in existence for half a year, thus crediting the Synod with a

longer historical continuity. This Council in Novocherkask is, however, not counted in the chronology of the Council of Bishops of the Church Abroad, which considers its first Council to be that of 1921. ¹

Patriarch Tikhon's Decree No. 362 of 7/20 November 1920 speaks only of the creation of a "Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration," which should coordinate the administration of several dioceses. It spoke of the formation of such an administration by those bishops who had lost contact with the central ecclesiastical administration in Moscow but did not specify just how such an administration should be set up. Because all the decisions of such a Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration were provisional and subject to a later ratification by the central administration of the Church (i.e., the Patriarch and Holy Synod), it became necessary, with the increasing difficulties of the central administration, and the deterioration of communications, to form a central administration of hierarchs outside of the areas controlled by the Soviets. This became necessary for the first time when the emigration's own ecclesiastical developments began to require attention. The emigration had to make the decisions autonomously and responsibly on their own; direct confirmation of individual decisions by the Patriarch was impossible to obtain due to the ever-weakening contacts with the central administration. It was only natural that the Council of Bishops as the Supreme Administration was formed later and the early leadership of the southern Russian dioceses and later the Church Abroad lay in the hands of a central administrative body, whose decisions would be subject to later acknowledgement by the Patriarch and the Holy Synod in Moscow. ²

The Stavropol Council had, among other things, decided to transfer the administration of the southern Russian dioceses to a "Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration." It initially consisted of two archbishops, two archpriests, and two laymen. Its executive function superseded that of a regional diocesan Council, in that it functioned not only among dioceses, but also entered into contact with other local Orthodox Churches. It had, among other things, appointed Archbishop Anastasius as head of the Russian communities in Constantinople, as representative of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration to the Ecumenical Patriarch, and permitted Archbishop Eulogius to participate as the representative of the Russian Church in the World Congress of Christians, and entrusted him with the administration of the Russian communities in Western Europe.

Until the evacuation in November of 1920, the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration existed under this name. Its official administration, however, extended over the southern Russian provinces, and this was referred to in official nomenclature: "The Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration of Southern Russia" (Vyshee Tserkovnoe Upravlenie na yuge Rossii.) A renaming to the "Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad" ("Vyshee Tserkovnoe Upravlenie Zagranitsei") occurred after the evacuation to Constantinople at the first or second sessions of this body on 9/22 November or 16/29 November, 1920. ³ The general jurisdiction over unnamed territories was thereby indicated for the first time. The members of this body were Metropolitans Antony and Platon, Archbishop Theophan, Bishop Benjamin, Archpriest G. Spassky, and as secretaries E. Makharoblidze and T. Ametistov. Over the course of the next weeks, Archbishop Anastasius and Bishops Gabriel and Michael were received. Archpriest

Spassky left.⁴ Metropolitan Antony and Bishop Benjamin were charged with entering into official relations with the Ecumenical Patriarch, who recognized the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration officially by Decree No. 9084 on December 22, 1920.⁵

This Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration's most important decision for the future development of the Church Abroad was made in April of 1921, when Bishop Benjamin was charged with convening a Pan-Diaspora Council in the same year in Karlovtsy. At the Karlovtsy Council, a document was circulated which proposed the establishment of the future leadership of the Church Abroad.⁶ Therein, for the first time, mention is made of the "Russian Synod" Abroad, which, together with an "ecclesiastical chancery," is to support the Patriarchal deputy (Metropolitan Antony) in leading the Church Abroad. While in Articles 1 and 2 there is only a very general mention of a "Russian Synod," in Article 3 the "Holy Russian Synod" appears in reference to the All-Russian Council of 1917-18. The deputy is to preside over this Synod. About the other members, it is only said that they should be appointed by the Patriarch. In an annotation, it was added that all bishops taking part in the Synod have a vote. The chancery was more precisely defined in Article 5: The deputy of the Patriarch should preside over it and a bishop of the Synod, duly chosen by the latter, and two clergymen and two laymen chosen by a general Council, belong to it. In an annotation to this article, it says that should it be prevented from meeting, the affairs of the Church Abroad were to be decided by the Synod. This document is in accordance with the decisions of the All-Russian Council of 1917-18. The "chancery" mentioned in Article 5 corresponds to the "Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration."

On 22 April/5 May 1922, Patriarch Tikhon ordered the dissolution of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration by Decree 348.⁷ At the Council of Bishops, which met in August/September of the same year, it was resolved to dissolve the same and simultaneously decided that the supreme leadership of the Church Abroad should be given over to a "Provisional Holy Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad."⁸ The members of this were Metropolitan Antony as President, Metropolitan Eulogius, Archbishop Theophanes, and Bishops Gabriel and Hermogenes. Thereby the governing body, which to the present day represents the central leadership of the Church Abroad, was established. It took the place of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration and was endowed with the same full authority, covered the same territory of the Russian Church emigration and was, like its predecessor, recognized by all Russian bishops in the diaspora over the course of subsequent weeks. The difference between the Synod and the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration lay in one particular quality: only bishops belonged to this new body, whereas the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration had also included clerics and laity.⁹ The chancery mentioned at the Council and which had been almost identical with the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration no longer existed.

With this resolution, the future leadership of the Church Abroad came to rest in the hands of the bishops, and the lesser clergy and the laity were excluded from the central leadership. The decision of the Council of Bishops put into effect Article 4 of the Karlovtsy Council, which had until then existed, but had remained without practical application and had provided for a strengthening of episcopal authority.

E. Makharoblidze served as the secretary of the Synod of Bishops until 1931. His deputy, who became his successor, was Count George Grabbe (from 1978, Bishop Gregory). He directed the Synodal chancery until his retirement in 1986. After his consecration to the episcopate, he became a permanent member of the Synod of Bishops. Secretaries alone, if they are not bishops, do not have the right to vote. (Archbishop Laurus of Syracuse and Holy Trinity succeeded Bishop Gregory as secretary and Bishop Hilarion of Manhattan became Deputy Secretary as well as a permanent member of the Synod).

The Synod existed as the “Provisional Synod of Bishops” until 1923. The First Hierarchy of the Church Abroad has concurrently been the President of the Synod. Of the émigré bishops, Bishops Theophanes (Gavrilov), Gabriel (Chepur), Hermogenes (Maximov), and Sergius (Petrov) belonged to the Synod for many years. Metropolitan Eulogius (Georgievsky) was a member until 1925. Other long-standing members included hierarchs consecrated by the Church Abroad: Archbishops Tikhon (Lyashchenko), John (Maximovich), Nikon (Rklitsky), Vitalis (Maximenko), and Seraphim (Ivanov).¹⁰ In 1998, the Synod consisted of the following hierarchs: Metropolitan Vitalis (a member since 1967) as President, Archbishop Antony (Medvedev, a member since 1968) as first deputy, Archbishop Laurus (a member since 1967) as secretary, Archbishop Mark (since 1994), Archbishop Hilarion (since 1984), and Bishop Gabriel (since 1997) as deputy secretary.

It was resolved in 1923 that the Synod would be transformed into a permanent Synod of Bishops, which should meet regularly and should be entrusted with the administration of the Church Abroad between the sessions of the Council of Bishops. Metropolitans Antony (President) and Eulogius and Archbishop Anastasius belonged as permanent members to this first Synod; another five hierarchs were elected from among the ranks of bishops of the Church Abroad: Archbishop Theophanes (Bystov) and Bishops Sergius, Michael (Kosmodaminasky) Gabriel, and Hermogenes.

The Synod maintained relations with representatives of other Orthodox Churches, non-Orthodox denominations, and governmental agencies. Excluded from its responsibilities was the territory of the Western European Metropolitan District alone, which had received an autonomous status. Also excluded were the Synod’s court of appeals for the lesser clergy and jurisdiction over ecclesiastical marital laws, which could pronounce divorce decrees.¹¹ At the Council of 1923, twelve bishops participated personally; another sixteen bishops made their opinions known over the next weeks. They all acknowledged the Council of Bishops and the Synod of Bishops as the central ecclesiastical governing bodies. Thus, both these institutions could claim in practice the consent of all the Russian bishops outside Russia.

The Synod and Council of Bishops existed in this form for the next twelve years. Their tasks and competence were formulated anew in 1935; this was necessitated by the negotiations over reunification. The Council of Bishops was redefined in Chapter III and the Synod of Bishops in Chapter IV in the aforementioned “Provisional Statutes,” and their respective tasks and competence were separated from each other.¹² Both institutions remain basically unchanged to the present day. In the area of the Synod’s competence, among other things, are the appointment of the heads of the ecclesiastical missions and dioceses outside of any metropolitan

provinces; ¹³ the reunification of bishops who have fallen away; the enhancing and strengthening of the spiritual life of the Church Abroad and the execution of the decisions of the Council of Bishops; the granting permission for the printing of liturgical and other books; and the direction and oversight of missionary work. In addition, the consent of the Synod is needed for regional Councils to create new dioceses, make vicariates into independent dioceses, or to change diocesan boundaries.

In the document of 1935, the Council of Bishops was given supreme competence. The creation of four metropolitan provinces with far-reaching administrative autonomy was agreed upon, though the Synod in practice always remained the primary decision-making body in all administrative matters. The latter was strengthened after World War II when the provinces suffered the loss of the dioceses in Eastern Europe and the Far East, the schism of the North American Metropolia took place, and the very justification of its own existence was called into question. Today, the Synod appoints almost all bishops and vicar (titular) bishops, the latter in collaboration with the diocesan bishop. Because all dioceses today are directly subject to the Synod and no autonomous ecclesiastical provinces (metropolitan provinces) survive, the Synod is consulted in important matters at the diocesan level. The administrative importance of the Synod of Bishops and its President is also manifested in the fact that a number of communities in the diaspora in Africa and Asia, the Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem, as well as all the monasteries and convents in the Holy Land, Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville, Novo-Diveevo Convent in Spring Valley, and some missionary communities, are directly subject to the Synod. This arises from the continuing particular significance of these institutions or out of the historical context of their establishment. The historical examples are the case of several communities in Africa and Asia, which today are almost extinct, but in the 1930s and 1950s were still active parishes.

After resettlement in the United States, the Synod was recognized as a legal entity under American law and endowed with the right to maintain its own agencies and, as the central administration, to order the affairs of the Church Abroad in all countries. In practice, this meant that property of the Church Abroad, especially that which is directly subject to the Synod, belongs to an entity recognized in law in the United States. This brought entailed definite legal security for the Synod, giving its rights over its properties and, according to American jurisprudence, the protection of the United States government.

As the central administrative body of the Church Abroad, the Synod is faced with meeting ever-rising administrative costs, as well as with problems ensuring the financial support of individual communities and monasteries that are directly subject to the Synod. Before World War II, these expenditures were largely met by the Serbian Patriarchate, which also provided the offices for the Synodal chancery and a residence for the First Hierarchy. After World War II, as this generous material aid came to an end, the Synod's expenditures had to be met almost exclusively by the faithful of the individual dioceses.

The Synod receives funding from all the dioceses and monasteries which are on a healthy financial basis. A special "Fund for Assistance of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia" ("Popechitelstvo o nuzhdach Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi Zagranitsei"), which was founded in

1959 and was under the direction of Prince T. K. Bagration-Muchransky (d. 1993), also supports the Synod.¹⁴ This fund obtains most of its income from donations from Church members. This money is donated for the support of the Synod, the Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem, and designated monasteries, church schools, needy clergymen, and missionary work.¹⁵ The Synod receives some income from donations to the New York Synodal Cathedral and the Church of Saint Sergius of Radonezh at the Headquarters of the Synod. The income from donations and the purchase of candles and prosphora are not inconsiderable, though both these churches also have expenditures. The expenditure required for the general maintenance, heating, electricity, etc., of the Synodal building, which is in reasonably good condition (but needs some capital repair on its exterior) are considerable due to its size. The building itself, which at the time of its transferal in 1958 was valued at \$550,000 (its estimated current value is \$7 million) within five years after adding the costs of renovations and rebuilding was worth another \$300,000. The Synod also bears the costs of the First Hierarch's official visits. The most modest sum is expended on the clergy who live and serve at Synod. The Synod's larger expenditures arise from the support of smaller mission communities, the Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem with its convents, and various benevolent funds for the support of destitute priests and laymen.

The greater part of the administrative work, as well as the greater part of correspondence and the publication and editing of the official periodical of the Synod Church Life (which is printed in Jordanville) was done by Archpriest George Grabbe (later Bishop Gregory), helped by his wife until her repose, upon which their daughter, Matushka Anastasia Schatiloff, assumed her duties. She resigned upon his retirement in 1986. After him, Bishop Gabriel was responsible for much of the administrative work and was assisted by both Russian-language and English-language secretaries from the clergy and laity.

The Synodal archives are of particular importance in understanding the development and history of the Church Abroad. They were located in Sremsky-Karlovtsy before World War II and included an extensive collection of documents and papers on the history of the Church Abroad from the time of the Stavropol Council. There were also rare books and periodicals from the time before 1917 kept at Karlovtsy. The archives and library had to be evacuated to Germany to save them from the advancing Soviet troops. Five train cars were provided for this purpose by the German troops, though these could only contain the most essential items. In the end, of these five wagons only two were dispatched; the rest remained behind in Yugoslavia with parts of the archives and library. No one knows for certain what happened to them. It is supposed that the entire remainder was withheld and then transported to the Soviet Union.

In today's archives, there are therefore only relatively few documents left from the period prior to 1945. These — as well as rare books and periodicals — were for the time up to 1936 used extensively by Archbishop Nikon for his comprehensive biographical work on Metropolitan Antony. Archbishop Laurus, who has been a member of the Synod of Bishops since 1967, secured and organized the archives. He produced a comprehensive bibliography of the whole collection, which was put in order by subject. According to this, most documents that existed before 1945 came from the western dioceses. Documents are available concerning the following communities and missions before 1945: Australia and New Zealand from 1936, Alexandria from

1937, Argentina from 1936, the Jerusalem Mission from 1920, the Lodomirova Monastery of Saint Job from 1927, the Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking and the Diocese of Shanghai from 1935, Metropolitan Peter of Krutitsa, the communities in Teheran from 1923, and Harbin from 1936, to mention only a few. Permission to make full use of the archives for scholarly purposes had not hitherto been granted. The decision to allow access for research depends on the Secretary of the Synod.

Footnotes

1. *Prav. Rus'* (1962) 21, pp. 3-6; here p. 4. ↵
2. Cf. below, Document Appendix. ↵
3. Polsky, *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*, p. 113; D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, p. 16; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, p. 8. ↵
4. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, p. 17. ↵
5. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, p. 8 ↵
6. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, p. 17. ↵
7. Cf. Part I, Chap. 3. ↵
8. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 33-40. ↵
9. *Prav. Rus'* (1959) 23, p. 2. ↵
10. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 33-40. ↵
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 36-37. ↵
12. Cf. Document Appendix VII, 2. ↵
13. The Metropolitan Districts consisted as autonomous ecclesiastical districts only until the end of World War II. ↵
14. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp. 476-477. ↵
15. The balances of the fund were in part published in *Prav. Rus'*, (1970) 11, p. 8; (1973)18, p. 15. ↵

Part III, Chapter 2

The Council of Bishops

In Orthodox ecclesiology, the importance of episcopal Councils in the life of the Church is stressed time and again. One thinks first of the Ecumenical Councils, which, in accordance with their title, represented the entire Orthodox Church. The decisions of the Ecumenical Councils are binding upon all of Orthodoxy. Alongside the Ecumenical Councils, there are also regional Councils, which are made up of several local Churches. In the individual local Orthodox Churches, the local Council forms the supreme ecclesiastical authority.

According to the decisions of the All-Russian Council of 1917/18, the lower clergy and laymen should also participate in church Councils. The decisions of the whole general assembly must, however, be endorsed by the bishops in order to be valid. The bishops meet afterward to agree upon the decisions of the general assembly. Thus, episcopal authority cannot thereby be overridden by a majority of the lower clergy and laity, since the bishops can refer decisions to the general assembly for renewed deliberations, or reject them altogether.

Both assemblies, the general Council and the Council of Bishops are referred to as the “Sobor” or Council. However, one must differentiate between the “Pan-Diaspora Council” and the “Council of Bishops.” Since the evacuation of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration in November of 1920, there have been, to date (updated to 1988), thirty-two Councils of Bishops.¹

The first Council of Bishops met during the Council of Karlovtsy in 1921. Thereafter, the bishops were supposed to meet yearly, which was the case in the 1930s. Since World War II, twenty-one Councils of Bishops have met at periodic intervals of approximately three years, though with greater frequency in the last few decades.² The second Council of Bishops met in August of 1922. Twelve hierarchs took part in a person. This Council dissolved the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration and transferred the temporary leadership of the Church Abroad to the “Provisional Synod of Bishops.” The assembly seems not to have considered itself representative of the whole Church Abroad since in the following year it summoned all the bishops to Karlovtsy, where the future leadership of the Church Abroad was to be rearranged. The Council of 1923 created both the governing bodies which hitherto comprise the leadership of the Church Abroad: the Council of Bishops and the Synod of Bishops. The tasks and competence of both institutions were precisely defined and distinguished from one another.

The following, among other points, were set forth.³ The Council of Bishops forms the supreme authority for the entire Church Abroad and should meet annually. All bishops, or their appointed representatives, are to participate. Metropolitan Antony is to preside over the assembly. The Council of Bishops exercises jurisdiction over all matters of Faith and morality, the intensification of the spiritual life of the Church Abroad, and the question of education and missionary work. It acts in the name of the Russian Church Abroad as a whole and disseminates appeals and epistles for the entire Church Abroad. It appoints bishops, erects and abolishes dioceses, and selects episcopal candidates. It is enabled, as an ecclesiastical court, to make decisions over bishops if twelve participants of the assembly are present, which must include a

minimum of seven bishops. ⁴ At a Council of Bishops at least twelve bishops or their representatives must take part. The Council is also responsible for various financial matters. ⁵

The supreme ecclesiastical authority of the Church Abroad was vested in the Council of Bishops. The decisions of the Council of 1923, at which twelve bishops took part in person and another sixteen by correspondence, remained in effect in the case of the Synod of Bishops for over ten years. In the “Provisional Statutes” ⁶ adopted in 1935, it states that the President of the Council of Bishops is also the President of the Synod of Bishops. All diocesan bishops are to take part in the sessions of the Council. Bishops who do not take part in person may send a proxy. Decisions at the Council require the vote of all participants and may be passed by the majority. A tie is decided by the vote of the President. Questions of a general ecclesiastical character, special matters of the Faith and morality, liturgics, the administration of the Church Abroad and discipline, as well as ecclesiastical jurisprudence fall to the Council of Bishops.

Furthermore, all matters of an international nature, such as the defense of the legal rights of the Russian Church Abroad before state and international organizations, as well as all questions in connection with schisms, are to be decided at a Council. In addition, the Council sends out all correspondence which concerns the Church Abroad as a whole, can erect and abolish episcopal sees, and change the boundaries of dioceses. All the bishops who endorsed the minutes acknowledged by these decisions the central significance of the Council of Bishops for their ecclesiastical provinces. After his return, Metropolitan Eulogius rejected the minutes after deliberations at a diocesan assembly. The rejection was certainly brought about because his authority and sphere of competence — despite the rights which he possessed as the administrator of a metropolitan province — would have been reduced. The Council of Bishops who held true to the Synod would have always had oversight over him and could have brought him before an ecclesiastical court for a violation of ecclesiastical order. The resolutions of the Council of Bishops of 1923 and the negotiations of 1935 defined the sphere of activity of both governing bodies of the Church Abroad. Essentially, this delineation of their areas of competence remains unchanged today.

The sessions of the Council of Bishops are conducted as follows: first, the President of the Council reports on important events in the life of the Church Abroad since the last Council meeting. To this are added reports by the diocesan bishops. Then matters which concern the Church Abroad as a whole are discussed: e.g., missionary work and religious instruction, the growth of church life, the condition and situation of the missions and monastic houses, church schools, printing presses, and charitable institutions. The bishops devote special attention to the sessions to questions of the religious upbringing of youth and parish life. In correspondence, they point to the necessity of observing the canons, maintaining the right Faith, and warning against modernist tendencies, sectarianism, and pseudo-religious groups. Almost every Council concerns itself in detail with the development and situation of the Russian Church in the homeland. In the past, after such discussions, the bishops often published appeals to the Free World, in which they drew attention to the suppression of religion in the Soviet Union and warned against state-sponsored atheism.

The Councils are opened and concluded with solemn divine services. Following the Synod's move to the United States, all Councils of Bishops were held in North America, but recently (1993/4) in Western Europe as well. Today all bishops normally take part in the Council in person; but in case of illness or some extenuating circumstance, they can express their opinion and position as a corresponding member. In the 1920s and 1930s, twelve to fifteen bishops usually participated, primarily the bishops from Europe, while the majority of the bishops from the Far East and North America either sent proxies or statements in writing. Since World War II, more than twelve bishops have usually been present in person at the Councils; in 1959 as many as seventeen bishops participated. That was the Council at which the most bishops took part since 1921. ⁷

The following section gives a short synopsis of the individual Councils of Bishops, chronologically with their most important decisions. ⁸

1921: This Council of Bishops met concurrently with the First Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad, in Sremsky-Karlovtsy. At the center of this Council are questions of the organization of the life of the Church Abroad. The Council advocated the restoration of the monarchy in Russia, while the question of dynasty resulted in differences of opinion. The minority faction (Archbishops Eulogius and Anastasius and Bishops Apollinarius, Benjamin, and Sergius) declined to endorse a particular dynasty on the grounds that such would be an exclusively political decision. In all, fifteen Russian (and two Serbian) bishops took part in the Council: Metropolitans Antony and Platon, Archbishops Eulogius, Anastasius, and Theophanes (Bystrov), and Bishops Apollinary, Benjamin, Damian, Gabriel, Germogen, Michael, Metrophanes, Seraphim, Sergius, and Theophanes (Gavrilov). ⁹

1922: This Council resolved to dissolve the "Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration" and to set up a "Provisional Holy Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad," which was to be confirmed by an assembled Council of all the Bishops. Thirteen bishops participated. ¹⁰

1923: At this Council a new structure of the Church Abroad was worked out. The supreme central governing body is the Council of Bishops, which is to meet once a year. Its executive body in between meetings of the Council is the Synod of Bishops, to which belong three permanent and five elected bishops with the right to vote. The Western European communities under the direction of Metropolitan Eulogius are granted autonomous status within the Church Abroad. At the Council twelve bishops took part in person and another sixteen by correspondence. ¹¹

1924: This Council discussed the "Renovationists" as an illicit organization and warned the other local Orthodox Churches against recognizing these schismatics. The Council also dispatched a series of letters to ecclesiastical and governmental representatives to call attention to the difficult position of the Patriarchal Church. At this Council fourteen bishops took part in person, sixteen by correspondence. ¹²

1926: This Council resolved to recognize Metropolitan Peter of Krutitsy as the legitimate successor to the departed Patriarch Tikhon and, therefore, to commemorate him as the patriarchal *locum tenens* at all the divine services of the Church Abroad. Discussion of the central

significance of the Synod as the “spiritual” or “canonical” authority of the Church Abroad brought several problems to remove “come” to ahead. The pretention to autonomy in Western Europe and North America remove “has” led to the schism of these regions from the Church Abroad. The bishops refused to adopt an autocephalous status for the Church Abroad. Eleven bishops take part in the Council. ¹³

1928: At the center of discussion was the declaration of Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky) and his demand for a declaration of total loyalty to the Soviet government. The Council confirms the break with the Patriarchal Church, but declares the Church Abroad to be an “inseparable part” of the whole Russian Church. The unity of the Russian Church continues to exist — the free part being formed by the Church Abroad, and the captive part by the Patriarchal Church. Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon, together with those bishops who remain subject to them, are suspended from serving. The formation of the Church Abroad’s own dioceses and communities in Western Europe and North America is confirmed. At the Council ten bishops participated in person, others in writing. ¹⁴

1931: At this Council, the proposal to convene an Eighth Ecumenical Council was rejected, because, given the lack of participation by the whole Russian Church (the Patriarchate and the Church Abroad), 90% of the Orthodox population would not be represented. The introduction of the New Calendar and the celebration of Pascha according to the Western Paschalion were categorically rejected. The situation of the Church in the Soviet Union and in emigration was discussed in detail. An appeal was addressed to the schismatic Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon and their bishops, pleading for the restoration of ecclesiastical unity. The proposal to appoint Metropolitan Antony as the locum tenens of the Patriarch and exarch of the Russian Church is rejected. Thirteen hierarchs participated in the Council in person, six hierarchs (from the Far East and North America) took part through correspondence. ¹⁵

1932: Above all else, internal ecclesiastical problems were discussed: Civil divorce was rejected as being incompatible with the canons; cremation of the dead was condemned as a godless custom, and freemasonry was condemned as an anti-Christian organization. ¹⁶

1933: This Council defined the competence of the Council of Bishops, the Synod of Bishops, and the President of the Synod. It also produced a detailed encyclical arguing against any collaboration with the atheist Soviet government and describing the formation and history of the Church Abroad from 1920. Metropolitan Sergius’ demands for loyalty to the Soviet government were again sharply condemned. The Council also expressed itself against the schism in the emigration. ¹⁷

1934: This Council appealed to Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon for reunification. The suspension from serving imposed upon Metropolitan Eulogius was vacated. At the Council, thirteen bishops participated, and six sent in their positions by correspondence. ¹⁸

1935: This Council appointed Metropolitans Anthony and Anastasius to negotiate for the restoration of unity in the Russian Church emigration. It condemned the sophiological teachings of Archpriest Sergius Bulgakov. ¹⁹

1936: This Council approved negotiations for the restoration of unity with the American Metropolia and confirmed Metropolitan Anastasius as remove “the” successor to Metropolitan Antony. ²⁰

1937: This Council resolved to convoke a Pan-Diaspora Council in 1938, with the participation of clergy and laity, on the occasion of the 950th anniversary of the Baptism of Russia. ²¹

1938: At the Pan-Diaspora Council, ecclesiastical and religious questions were the focal point of the discussions. The continued separation of Metropolitan Eulogius’s group was acknowledged with regret. Twenty-eight bishops of the Church Abroad participated in the Council, thirteen of them in person. The administrative reorganization, confirmed by the Council, remained in effect until the end of World War II. ²²

1943: After the outbreak of the War, no further Councils took place. In 1943 eight hierarchs assembled at a Council of Bishops in Vienna, including two bishops of the Belorussian Autonomous Church. They condemned as uncanonical the election of Metropolitan Sergius as Patriarch of Moscow and issued an appeal calling for the liberation of Russia from Bolshevism. ²³

1946: This first Council of Bishops after World War II was held in Munich in 1946. Fifteen bishops took part in person. Nine bishops from the Belorussian and Ukrainian Orthodox Autonomous Churches joined the Church Abroad at this Council. The assembly unanimously rejected an appeal from Patriarch Alexey I, whose election was condemned, to unite the Church Abroad with the Patriarchal Church. ²⁴

1950: For the first time in the history of the Church Abroad, a Council of Bishops met in North America. After the solemn consecration of the Holy Trinity Cathedral in Jordanville, the sessions took place at the New Kursk Hermitage, in Mahopac. The focus is on the reconstruction of parish life and the strengthening of church life. Metropolitan Anastasius and the bishops consecrate Holy Chrism. ²⁵

1953: The rebuilding of church life overseas and the provision of parishes with priests, as well as the education of priests, were discussed extensively. A commission was formed to prepare for the glorification of Saint John of Kronstadt. Sixteen bishops took part in person. ²⁶

1956: The development of the Church Abroad and its relationship to the Patriarchal Church are discussed. With regard to cremation, the clergy must make clear that this is un-Christian. The importance of monasticism in the life of the Church Abroad was emphasized. ²⁷

1959: For the first time, the Council met at the Synodal Cathedral on East 93rd Street in New York City. Of particular concern to the assembly was the supplying of the parishes with priests, because many of the clergies were elderly and there were not enough replacements amongst the rising generation to fill the ranks. The general recognition of the Patriarchal Church by the Free World was acknowledged with regret because the true situation of the Church and religion in the Soviet Union would no longer be truthfully represented. Seventeen bishops took part in the Council, including the exiled Romanian Bishop Theophilus. ²⁸

1962: The Patriarchal Church's participation at the Orthodox Conference at Rhodes and its entry into the World Council of Churches moved the bishops to take a renewed stand on the situation of religion in the Soviet Union. ²⁹

1964: At this Council, Metropolitan Philaret was elected to succeed Metropolitan Anastasius. The glorification of Saint John of Kronstadt was the first canonization performed in the Russian Church in fifty years. This action by the Church Abroad was simultaneously a sign of its ecclesiastical independence and made good its promise as the free part of the Russian Church to act on behalf of the entire Russian Church. ³⁰

1967: This Council reconfigured a number of dioceses and established four vicariates. Particular attention was devoted to the religious education of youth; broadening of the church school system was discussed. ³¹

1972: At the invitation of the head of the Canadian diocese, Archbishop Vitalis, the Council met in Montréal and discussed the 1971 election of Patriarch Pimen of Moscow. The election was repudiated as uncanonical, since it was not conducted in accordance with the decisions of the Pan-Russian Council of 1917-1918 concerning the election of a patriarch. The granting of autocephaly to the American Metropolia and of autonomy to the Japanese Orthodox Church was judged to be invalid because the Moscow Patriarchate was not the legitimate heir of Patriarch Tikhon's Russian Church. The Church Abroad celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its establishment. ³²

1974: This Council met simultaneously with the Third Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad, to discuss the newly-manifested religious revival in the homeland and the decline of the Christian way of life in the West. Ecclesiastical developments in the Soviet Union and the consolidation and strengthening of the ecclesiastical life of the Church Abroad were discussed at length. ³³

1978: At this Council, Blessed Xenia, the Fool-for-Christ, was glorified as a saint. The situation of the Russian diaspora was discussed in particular detail. For the first time in the history of the Church Abroad, stress was placed on the multi-nationality of the Church Abroad remove "was stressed", which now includes among its faithful not only Orthodox Russians, but also Orthodox Serbs, Romanians, Greeks, Chinese, Americans, Englishmen, Arabs, Germans, Frenchmen, Spaniards, and individuals of other nationalities. ³⁴

1981: At this Council, which met in New York City, fifteen bishops took part, and two bishops participated by correspondence due to illness (Archbishop Philotheus and Archbishop Nathaniel). The most significant decision was to glorify the New Martyrs and Confessors of Russia, the victims of Bolshevism martyred for the Orthodox Faith. Among the New Martyrs were Patriarch Tikhon, the Imperial Family and other members of the House of Romanov, numerous clergymen of all ranks, monks, nuns, and 30,000 of the faithful. Along with this, various administrative measures were taken, and Bishops Laurus, Nathaniel, and Paul were elevated to the rank of archbishop. The administration of the Diocese of Great Britain was entrusted to Bishop Constantine; the Diocese of Washington and Florida was formed as an independent diocese under the direction of Bishop Gregory of Manhattan.

[Trans.: This concludes the original text concerning the councils. The following accounts were added after the publication of the German edition.]

Addendum to Part III, Chapter 2

1983: At this Council, fourteen bishops took part in person; four bishops were prevented from doing so due to ill health. The Council met at the Holy Transfiguration Skete in Canada, where for the first time the Wonder-working, Myrrh-streaming Iveron Icon of the Mother of God was also present. The focal point of the discussions was the situation of the Church and the faithful in the Soviet Union. Membership in the World Council of Churches was again rejected because the WCC attempts to create the impression that among its members there is no difference in faith. The Lima Liturgy was also sharply condemned. Ecumenism was declared a heresy, to be condemned by anathema at every Sunday of Orthodoxy service. Considering non-Russian speakers, it was decided that local languages may be introduced in parts of divine services.

1985: At this Council, again at the Transfiguration Skete, fifteen bishops took part in person. The focal point was the preparation for the celebration of the Millennium of the Baptism of Russia. The Council appealed to Russian youth in the Soviet Union to hold fast to the Orthodox Faith which has been handed down to them, in spite of atheist education and anti-religious propaganda. Moreover, the Council decided to review all available documents on the life and works of the Optina Elder Ambrose, with the possibility of his glorification envisioned.

1986: Fifteen bishops took part in this Council in person in New York City; two are unable to attend due to illness. At the Council, Archbishop Vitalis was elected to succeed Metropolitan Philaret as First Hierarch. Bishop Gregory retired as secretary of the Synod of Bishops after more than fifty years of dedicated service, on grounds of old age. His successor as secretary was Archbishop Laurus. Bishop Constantine retired due to ill health; Bishop Mark assumed the governance of the Diocese of Great Britain. Archbishop Anthony of Geneva was appointed a permanent member of the Synod.

1987: At this Council, administrative questions were the first order of business. Following the repose of Archbishop Nathaniel, the Diocese of Vienna and Austria was dissolved and its parishes were incorporated into the Western European Diocese. Bishop Alypius became the ruling bishop of the Diocese of Chicago and Detroit; Archbishop Seraphim of Chicago retired due to old age.

1988: At the Council, all thirteen bishops took part. The emphasis of the Council was on the Millennium celebrations in the diaspora and the homeland, the current Soviet conciliatory policies towards the Moscow Patriarchate, and administrative matters such as the need for a bishop in South America. Bishop Alypius was elevated to the rank of archbishop. A new bishop, Daniel, was consecrated for the newly-created vicariate of Erie, to care for the Old Ritualist faithful who returned to the Orthodox fold.

[Trans.: The above additions were by the translator.]

Footnotes

1. The Synod archives in New York has an extensive collection of acts and documents from the councils since 1945: 1946, file 76/46; 1950, file 6/50; 1953, file 39/53; 1956, file 2/55; 1959, file 2/59; 1962, file 5/61; 1964, file 1/64; 1967, file 1/66; 1971, file 2/71; 1974, file 1/74; 1976, file 1/75; 1978, file 3/77. ↵
2. Nikon, „Arkhieireiskie Sobory” in *Prav. Rus'* (1962) 21, pp. 3-6. ↵
3. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 21, pp. 12-13, pp.3-4. ↵
4. The fact that the bishops could be represented in voting by their clergy was restricted so that at an ecclesiastical trial of a bishop, at least seven bishops had to be present. ↵
5. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 35-36. ↵
6. Cf. the “Document Appendix,” VII, 2. ↵
7. *Prav. Rus'* (1959) 20, 11-12. ↵
8. Nikon, “Arkhieireiskii sobor” in *Prav. Rus'* (1962) 21, pp. 3-6. ↵
9. Cf. *Deyaniya Karlovtsakh*, here pp. 11-15. ↵
10. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 19-22. ↵
11. *Ibid.*, 6, pp. 124-128; 7, pp. 33-40. ↵
12. *Ibid.*, 6, pp. 122-124; 7, pp. 53-67. ↵
13. *Ibid.*, 7, pp. 107-123. ↵
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 185-213. ↵
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 259-269. ↵
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 284-310. ↵
17. *Ibid.*, 6, pp. 269-298; 7, pp. 311-331. ↵
18. *Ibid.*, 7, pp. 349-368. ↵
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 369-373. ↵
20. *Prav. Rus'* (1962) 21, p. 5. ↵
21. *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, pp. 5-6. ↵
22. Cf. the collected volumes *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*. ↵
23. *Prav. Rus'* (1943) 11-12, pp. 1-4. ↵
24. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp.134-137. ↵
25. *Prav. Rus'* (1950) 22, pp. 1-3; 23-24, pp. 2-3, 8-9, 25-27; (1951) 1, pp. 4-8, 10-11; 2: pp. 8-10; 3, pp. 5-10; 4, pp. 10-12. ↵

26. *Prav. Rus'* (1953) 19, pp. 4-8; 20, pp. 3-6; 21, pp. 11-12; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1953) 9-12, pp. 161-168. ↵
27. *Prav. Rus'* (1956) 16, pp. 1-4; 18, pp. 1-3; 19, pp. 12-15; 20, pp. 2-4, 8-9; 21, pp. 3-5; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1956) 1-6, p. 57; 11-12, pp. 141-153. ↵
28. *Prav. Rus'* (1959) 20, pp. 11-12; 21, pp. 1-5, 13, 23: pp. 1-5; 24, pp. 10-11. ↵
29. *Ibid.*, (1962) 16, pp. 1-4; 20, pp. 10-11; 21, pp. 3-6; 23, pp. 8-9; *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp. 306-318. ↵
30. *Prav. Rus'* (1964) 11, pp. 4-9; 12, pp. 1-2; *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp. 320-346. ↵
31. *Prav. Rus'* (1967) 12: pp. 5-11; *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2, pp. 1442-1551. ↵
32. *Pamyatka*, pp. 49-123. ↵
33. *Prav. Rus'* (1974) 21, pp. 11-13; 22, pp. 13-14; "Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland: Ihr III Gesamtkonzil" in *G2W*, 3/4 Q74. ↵
34. *Orthodox Life* (1978) 6, pp. 19-22. ↵

Part III, Chapter 3

The Pan-Diaspora Council

Since the establishment of the Church Abroad, three Pan-Diaspora Councils have met: in 1921 and 1938 in Karlotsy, and in 1974 in Jordanville. The Stavropol Council can be added to these three Pan-Diaspora Councils, in that it founded the autonomous administration of the Southern Russian dioceses and thereby laid the groundwork for the existence of the Church Abroad. It should be made clear that in referring to these Councils — as also to the Pan-Russia Council of 1917-18 — one is referring to a local council of one of the national Orthodox Churches, as opposed to the ecumenical council of all Orthodox Churches.

The Ecumenical Council is universally accepted as the supreme assembly having authority over the rules for governance and the teaching of each and every part of the Orthodox Church. All local Orthodox Churches have the right to be represented at it. Its authority stems from Christ's promise of the invincibility of the Church, the truth of its doctrine, and its acceptance by the Orthodox Church at large.¹

Local Councils can only handle questions concerning one local Church. They differ essentially from the Ecumenical Council in that they do not deal, strictly speaking, with matters of dogma, but with the practical concerns of regulating church life.

Thus, at the Russian local Councils since 1917, matters of urgent concern to church life have always stood in the center of discussion. This is equally applicable to the Council of 1917-18 as to the Councils of the Church Abroad and the Councils of the Patriarchal Church. The latter has convened five Councils since 1917: including those in 1945, when Patriarchs Alexis I (Shimansky) was elected; in 1971, when Patriarch Pimen (Izvekov) was elected; and in 1988, for the Millennium of the Baptism of Russia. [Trans., The last was not mentioned in Seide's original text but was contemporary with this translation, and so has been added.] It may well be assumed that in the future the only reason for convening a local council may be for the election of a new patriarch. It is the patriarch's duty to convene a council of bishops to resolve the "more important ecclesiastical problems," yet this occurs almost as seldom as a local council. When, in 1961, church order had to be changed under pressure from the state, the Council of Bishops met again for the first time since 1945, although these questions could really have been deliberated by a local council.²

In both of the preceding sections, it has been shown that very precise resolutions and definitions on the convocation and tasks of the Synod of Bishops and the Council of Bishops of the Church Abroad have been drawn up. Whereas the Synod of Bishops meets regularly as a governing body and the Council of Bishops is periodically convened, no such order exists for the Pan-Diaspora Council. This is because the Pan-Diaspora Councils of the Church Abroad are bound by the decisions of the Council of 1917 and, therefore, are convened when it is particularly necessary to hear the voice of the clergy and laity. It was, however, never expressly defined when such a necessity exists. Thus, for example, the Council of Bishops of 1923 maintained in its first point that it was necessary to convene a Council of clergy and laymen,³ yet it was another fifteen years before the Council actually met. However, the reasons for the convocation were

abundantly present in 1923 when, with the dissolution of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration, the administration of the Church Abroad had to be reorganized, and the two most important governing bodies, the Synod of Bishops and the Council of Bishops, were constituted. The convocation in 1938 finally took place in conjunction with the 950th anniversary of the Baptism of Russia, after a postponement due to the repose of the First Hierarch, Metropolitan Anthony, in 1936. The Council of 1974 met after longer preparations in view of the “newly-manifest religious reawakening of the Russian people in the homeland and, on the other hand, the rapidly advancing decline of the Christian way of life in most countries in the non-Communist world.”⁴

A significant reason for the infrequent convocation of Pan-Diaspora Councils is the enormous financial burden which they place upon the Church Abroad as a whole and upon the individual dioceses. In 1974, the Third Pan-Diaspora Council had a total cost in excess of \$39,800 for the delegates’ travel arrangements, room and board, publications, administration, and other arrangements entailed by the Pan-Diaspora Council. For these expenses, \$34,000 was collected through donations, \$16,000 in the Eastern American Diocese alone. And these were only the expenses incurred by those who were in the United States. The cost of the travel of delegates to the United States and Jordanville, New York, the meeting-place, was borne by the dioceses, placing an additional burden on them.⁵

At the Pan-Diaspora Council all bishops, as well as the elected delegates of the individual dioceses, took part: as a rule, the number of elected diocesan representatives was two clergymen and three laymen. Also included were representatives of the monasteries, and of certain ecclesiastical and academic institutions. This composition was roughly determined by the decisions of the Council of 1917-1918.⁶ At the Stavropol Council in May of 1919, there were sixty-eight participants: eleven archbishops and bishops, twenty-two priests, one monk, and thirty-four laymen.⁷ At the First Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad in 1921, officially 155 people took part, though in fact, only 109 delegates were actually present: thirteen bishops, twenty-three priests, and sixty-seven laymen.⁸ At the Second Pan-Diaspora Council in 1938, ninety-four people took part: thirteen bishops, twenty-three priests and monks, and fifty-eight laymen.⁹ At the Third Pan-Diaspora Council in 1974, 101 delegates were represented: fourteen bishops, thirty priests, four deacons, eight monks, and fifty-three laymen.¹⁰ At the first two Councils held at Karlovtsy, there were representatives of academic and social institutions, e.g., “The Russian Academic Institute in Belgrade,” “The Palestine Society,” “The Saint Vladimir Institute,” and other institutions closely connected to the Church. To the Stavropol Council, as well as to both Karlovtsy Councils, all the participants in the 1917-1918 Pan-Russia Council living in the emigration were invited. All the participants in the Councils were men; women did not participate in any sessions.

The sessions of the Council usually lasted some ten to twelve days. For speedy handling of individual problems, working committees were formed under the leadership of a bishop. At the sessions of these working committees interested delegates had the opportunity to participate. The results were presented to the entire assembly for consent.

At the Pan-Diaspora Councils of 1921 and 1938, the Serbian Patriarch took part as the honorary president. All Serbian bishops were also invited to participate in these sessions. From the sister Orthodox Churches no representatives were invited; however, they sent written messages to the Councils. At the first Council, Metropolitan Stephen of Sofia took part in the opening session and personally delivered greetings on behalf of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. The first Council, in 1921, stood as a marker of the foundation of the Church Abroad. A total of eight committees were established: (1) Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration Affairs Committee, Chairman, Metropolitan Anthony; (2) Parish Affairs Committee, Chairman, Bishop Michael; (3) Economic and Financial Affairs Committee, Chairman, Bishop Apollinarius; (4) Legal Matters Committee, Chairman, Bishop Theophanes; (5) Enlightenment and Education, Schools, and Printing Presses Committee, Chairman, Bishop Gabriel; (6) Mission Committee, Chairman, Bishop Seraphim; (7) Military Chaplaincy Committee, Chairman, Bishop Benjamin; and (8) Committee for the Spiritual Rebirth of Russia, Chairman, Archbishop Anastasius. ¹¹

If one considers the individual committees and their competence, it is apparent that working groups 1-7 were concerned with the special problems of the emigration and the Church Abroad, and only one committee, the eighth, was occupied with the current and future situation in Russia. The resolutions of this eighth committee, under the chairmanship of Archbishop Anastasius led to heated discussions, especially concerning the question of the form of government and the ruling dynasty in a future Russia free of Bolshevism. These discussions, as well as the passing of a resolution concerning the irreconcilability of socialism and Christianity, ¹² the correspondence to the Genoa Conference and to the children of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad ¹³ at the Council, have to a great extent overshadowed its true significance, as a result of which the real work of the Council has remained in the background. The real achievement of the Council was certainly the organization and consolidation of the emigration's church life. One should not overlook the fact that the communities that existed outside Russia before 1914 no longer had any contact with their bishop in Petrograd and had been largely isolated since 1914. The continued organization of these established communities was already under threat, and a complete collapse into chaos was distinctly possible in the newly-constituted refugee communities. Whereas before the Karlovtsy Council no central ecclesiastical administration existed that could be supported through the general recognition of the emigration, this situation changed within a few weeks of the Council's conclusion. Practically all émigré bishops and the Russian bishops in Poland, the Baltic Republics, Finland, the Far East, and America recognized the competence of the church leadership in Karlovtsy. Without a doubt, the Council had contributed substantially to this.

Considering that the majority of refugees expected their emigration to be temporary and were awaiting the speedy collapse of the Soviet system, it is admirable that the Council constructed plans for the organization of the spiritual, educational and administrative aspects of church life that had enduring value. Thus, particular attention was given to the religious education of the refugees. The special situation of the diaspora in non-Orthodox countries was also discussed in detail. The internal mission needed to be strengthened in order to protect the faithful from the influences of the Protestant and Catholic Churches, sects, and pseudo-religious ideas. By establishing church schools and printing presses, by consolidating parish life, and by providing special training for priests in the new circumstances prevailing in the diaspora, the faithful would

be protected from alienation from their own Church and culture.¹⁴ New sects such as the Seventh-Day Adventists and the Baptists were viewed as particularly dangerous, followed by anti-Christian and God-hating Freemasonry and militant Catholicism.¹⁵ The faithful were also warned against the false prophecies and promises of materialism as represented by Socialism, Communism, and Bolshevism. The most important measures to be taken against this threat was, above all else, to be the intensifying of Church-sponsored work among youth, which included, besides catechetical instruction, the setting up of Orthodox youth groups and groups of children and teens, dedicated to questions of Faith, and based upon the teachings of the Orthodox Church and Russian cultural traditions.¹⁶ The parishes were entrusted with the execution of these tasks.

The establishment and administration of the parishes were based on the parish by-laws of 7/20 April 1918, which were adopted by the Council of 1917-1918.¹⁷ After the Council at Karlovtsy, the goal and tasks of the parishes were defined to provide a spiritual and material union for the mutual help and support of the faithful. The parishes were also to ensure the protection of children from non-Orthodox influences and make preparations for a return to Russia. Besides performing Divine Services, parish work was to consist of education and instruction and charitable and benevolent work.¹⁸ The leadership and oversight of several communities were entrusted to a bishop. In this connection, the creation of new dioceses for the administrative consolidation of several parishes was discussed. Petitions were presented at this discussion by the refugee communities in Greece and France, which requested the Council to send a bishop.¹⁹ Further discussions on this point, produced the “Decree on the Russian Diocesan Administration Abroad” of 17/30 November 1921, which entrusted the administration of Russian Church communities in the individual provinces to a bishop, who was to rule the province in agreement with the Holy Councils and Canons. A diocesan council should exist at the bishop’s side, which should have as elected representatives at least three clergymen and two laymen or, in case of necessity, two clergymen and one layman. Thus, the Council created the administrative basis — parochial and diocesan — requisite for the building-up of the emigration’s church life.²⁰

The central leadership of the Church Abroad, as already mentioned, was transferred to the Council and the Synod. Many of the measures decided upon by the Council were realized only years later (e.g., the establishment of printing presses, the formal education of priests). However, the Council did serve as a guide for further ecclesiastical developments in the 1920s and had a lasting influence on the Church Abroad for decades to come. There had been plans to convene a Second Pan-Diaspora Council since 1923, but it was postponed for some fifteen years. The reason for this lay in the developments within the Church Abroad after 1924-26, as the pretension to autonomy on the part of the Western European and North American Dioceses led to the fateful schisms of the emigration. These attempts at reunification, which were at least successful in the case of the North American Metropolia, led to the convocation of the Second Pan-Diaspora Council. At this Council, only the Western European communities under Metropolitan Eulogius were not represented, though in 1938 only a small minority of the church emigration as compared with the Church Abroad, which represented some 90% of the Church-organized émigrés. 1 The Council, therefore, claimed to represent the “whole Russian emigration.” In summarizing the Council in the newspaper *Orthodox Russia* (1938, No.17-18), Archimandrite Seraphim (Ivanov, later Archbishop) writes that the Council presented a picture

of complete unanimity and agreement of all opinions and views; the more conservative representatives had collaborated on the individual working committees with the more liberal in total harmony. They had found a common language, a unity of interests. The Council had in this way demonstrated its creative strength, the unity of the Church, its spiritual greatness and radiance.²¹

The complete agreement of views was in direct contrast to the First All-Diaspora Council in 1921, at which the resolutions of the committee chaired by Metropolitan Anastasius had led to forcefully expressed differences of opinion. At the Second Council, only strictly ecclesiastical and religious questions were discussed. The reports delivered on the situation of the Russian Church in the Soviet Union, as well as on the difficult situation of the faithful, were not likely to elicit protests, as they expressed the convictions and views of the participants. At the Council, a total of thirty reports were read, seven protocols of the sessions' minutes were signed, and two epistles to the faithful in the homeland and in the emigration were composed. Two reports dealt with ecclesiastical and religious developments in the Soviet Union and were read at the beginning of the Council.²² Count Grabbe (later Bishop Gregory) added a report on the relationship between the Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate.²³ The subsequent reports covered the situation of the emigration and were concerned with the establishment of a Russian national and cultural center for the emigration to preserve its spiritual and cultural heritage since the Bolsheviks were systematically destroying this heritage in the homeland.²⁴ Subsequently, the education of priests and the material situation of the clergy, as well as care for the elderly, were discussed.²⁵ Further reports dealt with the religious upbringing of the youth, for whom their own school system should be established, and the broadening of catechetical courses.²⁶ Dismay was expressed over the general slackening of church discipline, especially amongst the intelligentsia, who in part intentionally maintained an "estranged ignorance" of church rules. The clergy called on the faithful to follow church rules and pointed to the ecclesiastical penalties incurred by their violation thereof.²⁷ Bishop Seraphim (Lade, later Metropolitan) read three reports: "On the Ecumenical Movement," "The Oxford Conference," and "Catholicism and Bolshevism". N. F. Stepanov enlarged upon these later in two reports concerning the relationship between "The Vatican and the Ecumenical Movement" and "Judeo-Catholic Rapprochement and Further Perspectives in the Development of the Ecumenical Movement as a Consequence."²⁸

The relationship to the ecumenical movement and the condemnation thereof led to lengthy debates. Two separate directions crystallized out of this: one which rejected any contact with ecumenism and wanted to forbid the laity to participate in the conferences and organizations of this movement in any way, while the other group favored attendance at ecumenical meetings in order to clarify the Orthodox standpoint to non-Orthodox confessions. In the debate, no agreement was reached, so this problem was to be handed over to the Council of Bishops for further deliberation. The decisions on the Oxford Conference, which had concerned itself with the "burning questions" of Christendom in the world, were utterly rejected because its statements concerning the capitalist form of the economy had glossed over the realities of the Communist system and could have led to a false assessment thereof. The Conference's attempt to discover Christian ideals of equality and brotherhood in Marxist economic practices completely ignored the facts of Soviet reality. The Pope had made a realistic assessment of Bolshevism, as

emphasized in the encyclical “Divini Redemptoris,” in which the struggle against Bolshevism was announced.

Further reports dealt with the relationship of the Church Abroad to its sister Orthodox Churches,²⁹ the situation of the Orthodox Churches since the end of World War I, the “Persecution of Orthodoxy in Poland,” and the “Eastern Rite” churches in union with Rome. Particular attention was paid to Rome’s attempt to bring Orthodox Christians to the Unia. This attempt had taken the form of persecution of the Orthodox in some countries in the past. Two further reports dealt with the situation of Metropolitan Eulogius’s Paris Jurisdiction. Count Grabbe disputed the canonical basis of the Paris Jurisdiction and denied that it had any right to subordinate itself to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Archbishop Seraphim denounced the teachings of Father Sergius Bulgakov, which the Council condemned as heretical.³⁰ Naturally, the condemnation of Bulgakov’s teachings was in equal measure a condemnation of the Saint Sergius Institute in Paris and ultimately Metropolitan Eulogius. This condemnation meant that after 1938 a rapprochement became all the more unlikely.

The 1938 Pan-Diaspora Council had, in barely two weeks, taking decisions on all the important questions of contemporary church life. Whereas at the First Pan-Diaspora Council the building-up of the Church Abroad had been the central issue, and the delegates at the Second Pan-Diaspora Council had again to deal with the strengthening of the emigration’s church life, the relations of the Church Abroad to the other Christian denominations stood much more in the foreground of the discussions. This Council also clarified the independence of the Church Abroad, which for the almost twenty years since its establishment as the Church in exile had stood on its own. The Council determined the basic features of its position with regard to the Ecumenical Movement and the Roman Catholic Church. While the delegates differed in appraising involvement in the Ecumenical Movement, most of them concurred in the criticism of the Roman Catholic Church. Whereas the Church Abroad remained a regular observer at the conferences of the Ecumenical Movement into the 1950s, this changed upon the entry of the Moscow Patriarchate and the other Churches of the Soviet bloc countries into the World Council of Churches, when the Church Abroad, fearing (not without justification) a strong politicization of the World Council of Churches, withdrew.³¹ The real achievement of the Second Pan-Diaspora Council lay, however, in the fact that the delegates succeeded in strengthening the inner life of the Church Abroad to the extent that in the subsequent years of war, during which contact between the dioceses and the church leadership was cut off, the Church Abroad was able to survive this.

The Third Pan-Diaspora Council met in Jordanville in 1974. The Council was opened with solemn divine services on 8 September, at which fourteen bishops, more than forty priests and deacons, the brotherhood and seminarians of Holy Trinity Monastery, and many of the laity, took part. No other divine service had included so many hierarchs and clergy since the 1938 Council. The Council ended with a service of thanksgiving in the New York Synodal Cathedral. There the Council of Bishops was convened and ratified all the decisions, resolutions, and epistles of the whole assembly.³²

At the Council, thirty reports were presented, and ten resolutions were passed. In contrast to the Council of 1938, however, the developments in the Ecumenical Movement and of the Catholic and Protestant churches were only discussed peripherally. Only three reports dealing with this theme: Father Alexander Lebedev spoke about the latest developments in the Reformed Churches, particularly studying the North American Protestant Churches; Archpriest Rostislav Gan gave a survey of the Ecumenical Movement since the entry of the Churches from the Soviet bloc countries; and finally, Professor S. Grotov spoke about the tendencies towards modernism within the Roman Catholic Church, which had led to a crisis in Catholicism.

At the focal point of the reports and discussions was the Russian Orthodox Church. After a detailed report by Metropolitan Philaret on events in the life of the Church Abroad since the Council of 1938, Archpriest George Grabbe discussed the canonical foundations of the Church Abroad. Two further reports covered the situation of the Church Abroad in modern society (Archbishop Antony of Geneva) and the preservation of Russian traditions throughout the diaspora (Priest Vladimir Shishkoff). The missionary work of the Church Abroad³³ in the diaspora and its efforts to reach the faithful in the homeland by sending religious publications, broadcasting radio programs, and making contacts with Soviet citizens formed a large part of the discussions.

The situation of the younger generation was discussed. On the problem of youth in the diaspora, Archbishop Seraphim of Chicago and Detroit, Bishop Nectarius of Seattle, and the leaders of five Russian youth organizations in exile (including the Russian Scout Movement, Orthodox Action, and others) reported on youth work in and out of school. G. Lukianov, the inspector of church schools in the Diocese of Eastern America, emphasized the significance of the church school system, while Archbishop Seraphim evaluated the positive experiences of summer and winter camps of Russian youth. In these vacation camps, which were operating in some dioceses, young people from the ages of eight to sixteen were gathered and experienced more closely the life of the Orthodox Church and the cultural traditions of their fathers.

In connection with a letter from Alexander Solzhenitsyn to the Council, the situation of the Russian Church in the homeland and the schisms of the Church were discussed at length.³⁴

Solzhenitsyn agreed with the condemnation of Metropolitan Sergius' declaration, which he described as an unconditional capitulation which made it easier for the authorities to carry out "the planned, stealthy destruction of the Church." He also confirmed the misuse of the Moscow Patriarchate by the government for political, cosmetic ends, and for interference in international church affairs. He warned the Church Abroad, however, against falsely evaluating the religious situation in the Soviet Union. The role of the "Catacomb Church," whose earlier existence he confirms and whose revival he foresees if the State repression of the Church increases, was stressed. In connection with this, he warned against a too far-reaching condemnation and rejection of the official Church, a "Church in chains, an enslaved Church, one pressed against the floor, but in no way a fallen Church." The unworthy hierarchs of the Church do not disturb the Body of the Church, "nor the numerous faithful priests and the masses of worshipers in the Church." This Church has brought forth many confessors, before whom it bows down. After these words, the respected writer and dissident turned to the situation of the Church emigration.

He acknowledged with pain the schism of the Church in diaspora: “The most important facts of this discord, however, I know, and it appears to me that each of the Churches (struggling with one another) has a discernible canonical basis, with which fault can be found, as well as the Moscow Patriarchate with its consequences. No one will find unconditional, indisputable canonical rights... Which danger is unhealthier for Russian Orthodoxy — external suppression by force or inner collapse through disunity?” The cause of this discord and the collapse of the Russian Church as a united entity, Solzhenitsyn sees in the situation of the Russian Church at the outbreak of the Revolution, because it was too weak to stand as a united body above the political parties. In the spiritual unity of the Russian Church alone, in the union of its physical and spiritual strength, lay the hope for a revival of Russia and of the Russian people. In order to help the Russian Church in the homeland most effectively, the free Russian Orthodox Church in exile must overcome its divisions and bury its strife. ³⁵

In his answer to this letter, Archpriest George Grabbe indicated that those in the Church Abroad must always distinguish between the unworthy hierarchs such as Metropolitan Sergius and worthy faithful and priests. One must consider as “catacomb clergy” in the broadest sense all those priests who administer the Mysteries without demanding the registration of the faithful. Yet now as before, there are priests who are active outside the Patriarchal Church, acting as “catacomb priests.” As for the schism of the emigration, Father Grabbe pointed above all else to the denationalization of the Paris and American groups, where Russian traditions were being increasingly suppressed. He corrected the writer’s false evaluation of the future role of the Church Abroad in a liberated Russia: “Solzhenitsyn also errs in this, that we ostensibly count on returning to Russia as a judge or a commander. I know no one who feels and thinks this way. We have long since had little hope that Russia will again be free at all... But we see ourselves as a part of the Russian Church, albeit even such a small part. Therefore we very much hope to be represented at a freely assembled Russian Council, if such becomes possible. ³⁶ How great, however, will our weight at such a Council be, none of us have even taken into consideration.” ³⁷

A further point which Solzhenitsyn touched upon in his letter concerned the Old Ritualists. He regretted their condemnation and anathematization by the Russian Church. The Council resolved, therefore, to take under consideration that the Council of 1917-1918 was unable to leave behind a written resolution on this matter, but had practically decided to lift the ecclesiastical ban — the ex-communication and ban of the Councils of 1666 and 1667 were against individuals — as nullified and to consider it as invalid from the beginning. ³⁸

Appeals for reunification were addressed to the Paris Jurisdiction and to the “Orthodox Church in America,” which, however, in both cases sadly met with no results, since all three Churches held to their standpoints. ³⁹ The ten resolutions passed by the Council were directed to the faithful. In them were called to strengthen the Church and the Faith. The relationship to the Moscow Patriarchate, the canonical basis of the Church Abroad, the situation of the Orthodox Church in the modern world, the goals and tasks of the faithful and of the Church by helping their oppressed co-religionists in the homeland and, lastly, two resolutions on the significance of the ecclesiastical printing presses and the Church educational system for the missionary tasks of the Church Abroad were discussed. ⁴⁰

In a special epistle to the faithful, the bishops reported on the results of their deliberations and mentioned their exchange of letters with Alexander Solzhenitsyn. The bishops spoke in this epistle of the religious renaissance impending in Russia and exhorted their own faithful to stand firm in the Orthodox Faith because only the Faith can lead “to a renewal of mankind, which today is in such confusion.”⁴¹

With this epistle, the Council ended its session. Archbishop Antony of Geneva wrote an epistle to his faithful, stating that this Council was more “than merely a council of the diaspora because the living forces of today’s Russia had contributed to its success. At the Council, the voice which had formerly been silent — the voice of our homeland tested by suffering — resounded. As such a voice, the writers Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Vladimir Maximov, and Andrei Sinyavsky — Christian of conviction and great artists — are counted with the foremost sons of our land. . . This experience of a genuine connection to the homeland gave the Council particular significance, lifted it up to a higher plane than that of our existence in the diaspora. Many perceived the Council as the first step towards a Pan-Russian Council.”⁴²

Footnotes

1. Biedermann, *Zur Frage der Synode*, p. 124. ↵
2. Struve, *Christen*, pp. 89-91; Patock, *Bischofssynode*; Voss, *Bischofssynode und Patriarchenwahl*. ↵
3. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 34. ↵
4. *III Gesamtkonzil*, p. 11. ↵
5. Cf. Part III, Chap. 1, note 16. ↵
6. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte*, 1, p. 80. ↵
7. Kandidov, pp. 42-44. ↵
8. *Deyaniya Karlovtsakh*, pp. 8-15; D’Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêque Russes*, p. 30. An interesting description of the participants can be found in Zernov’s *Sremski Karlovtsi*. ↵
9. *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, pp. 6-8. ↵
10. *III Gesamtkonzil*, p. 16. ↵
11. *Deyaniya Karlovtsakh*, pp. 21-23. ↵
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-86. ↵
13. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6, pp. 17-34. ↵
14. *Deyaniya Karlovtsakh*, pp. 44-46, 72-75. ↵
15. The Jesuits and the “propaganda fide” are seen as representatives of militant Catholicism. ↵

16. *Deyaniya Karlovtsakh*, pp. 76-80. ↵
17. *Ibid.*, p. 81. ↵
18. *Ibid.*, p. 42. ↵
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 46-53. ↵
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 81-83. ↵
21. In addition to the collected volumes *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, detailed reports on the Council appeared in *Prav. Rus'* (1938) 17-18 (Sept.) through 24 (Dec.). ↵
22. *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, pp. 58-123. ↵
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 124-143. ↵
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 147-169. ↵
25. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 4. ↵
26. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 5. ↵
27. *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, pp. 253-287. ↵
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 295-350, 492-556. ↵
29. Cf. Part V. ↵
30. *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, pp. 177-192. ↵
31. Cf. Part V, Chap. 4. ↵
32. On the course of the Council, the reports and resolutions, this time — in contrast to the years 1921 and 1938 — no comprehensive volumes were published. There was a plan to publish a book in English (cf. *Prav. Rus'* (1974) 22, p. 13), yet this did not materialize. All reports and documents on the III Council are in the Synod archives in file 2/72; all reports on preparations are in file 1/71. G2W published a special issue in German entitled *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland. Ihr III Gesamtkonzil 1974. Mit Solzhenitsyns Rede* (Zürich 1974). Also, reports on the Council appeared in *Prav. Rus'* (1974) 21, pp. 11-13; 22: pp. 13-14; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1974) 7-12, pp. 13-16; (1975) 1-6, pp. 7-112, as well as in many other periodicals of the Church Abroad. ↵
33. Part IV, Chap. 6. ↵
34. The wording of the letter and an answer by Archpriest George Grabbe are given in *III Gesamtkonzil*, pp. 20-39. An interpretation of the exchange of letters in Fr. Chrysostomus's view can be found in *Ostkirchliche Studien* and in his *Solzhenitsyn* and *Gesamtkonzil*. On Solzhenitsyn's relationship to the Patriarchal Church, C. Patock published an essay in the same periodical: Patock, "Solzhenitsyn." ↵

35. *III Gesamtkonzil*, pp. 20-24. ↵
36. Grabbe means that the Paris Exarchate and the OCA can no longer be represented at All-Diaspora Council because both have renounced their Russian origins by splitting from the Russian Church. ↵
37. *III Gesamtkonzil*, p. 58. ↵
38. *Ibid.*, pp. 55-58; *Prav. Rus'* (1974) 23, pp. 6-7. ↵
39. *III Gesamtkonzil*, pp. 47-50, pp.51-544, pp. 69-72. Cf. Part V, Chap. 2. ↵
40. The wording of the resolutions are found in *Prav. Rus'* (1974) 21, pp. 11-13; 22. pp. 13-14. ↵
41. *III Gesamtkonzil*, pp. 40-46. ↵
42. *Ibid.*, p. 16. ↵

PART IV
Church Life

Chapter 1

Dioceses and Parishes

Before 1917, the Russian Orthodox Church possessed numerous parishes and missions outside the borders of Russia. The majority of these parishes had been established since the 18th century, when Russian colonies of diplomats and merchants with corresponding diplomatic, economic, and cultural links, were founded.

In Western Europe, Russian churches appeared in the 17th century “...At the end of the 17th century Orthodoxy in China began to spread. In the first quarter of the 18th century, the first Russian church in Constantinople was built; later another five Russian Orthodox churches were established in that city and its environs. At the end of the 18th century, Orthodoxy found its way into North America, a hundred years later into South America. In 1833, a Russian Church in Athens was opened; in 1852, the Russian Church erected the Church of the Holy Trinity there. In 1847, the Russian Mission in Jerusalem was established. The missionary activity of the Russian Orthodox Church in Japan began in 1870; twenty-seven years later Orthodoxy appeared in Korea. In 1898, a mission in Persia (Iran) opened, whose task was to strengthen in Orthodoxy amongst the Syro-Chaldean Nestorian Christians, who had united themselves with the Russian Church. In Finland, a diocese of the Russian Orthodox Church existed from 1919.”¹

These communities outside the Russian Empire came under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg. In a few cases, the Russian Church appointed bishops abroad. In North America, a Russian diocese existed from 1870; a vicar bishop administered the Canadian communities from 1905. In China and Japan, several bishops were active at the beginning of our century, ruling the young, blossoming missionary churches of these countries.

The massive flight of the Russian faithful after the October Revolution led to the creation of new dioceses of the Russian Church beyond the reach of Soviet power.

When the Moscow Patriarchate was again able to care for its own parishes in the free world, it appointed bishops for the parishes that had remained faithful to the Patriarchal Church. The hopes of the Moscow Church leadership, that the émigrés would join the Patriarchal Church, led in general to the dispatching of their own bishops where émigré bishops were already residing. If one looks at the index of the “Episcopate of the Russian Orthodox Church,” as it appears in the Orthodox Church Calendar of the Moscow Patriarchate, one finds numerous titles of hierarchs of the Patriarchal Church, which are identical to the dioceses of the Church Abroad or coincide with the diocesan boundaries: Berlin and Germany, Baden and Bavaria, Vienna and Austria, Brussels and Belgium, The Hague and the Netherlands, Argentina and South America, Edmonton and Canada, and many others.²

Presently, the Church Abroad has fifteen dioceses and two vicariates. In 1938, there were twenty-four dioceses and vicariates. As a rule, the direction of a diocese is in the hands of a

bishop. The title of the bishop always refers to a city and the territory of his diocese. The named city is, with a few exceptions, the seat of the bishop. For instance, the diocese of Archbishop Vitalis of Montréal and Canada stretches over the whole Canadian territory, and the seat of the bishop is Montréal. With a few of the titles, the historical origins of the diocese are more important than the actual residence. For example, Bishop Mark of Berlin and Germany's title refers to all of Germany, including the German Democratic Republic; the seat of the bishop, however, is in Munich. The title of a vicar bishop usually refers to a city, and then the title of the vicariate follows: Bishop Hilarion of Manhattan, Vicar Bishop of Eastern America and New York. A particular deviation from this system took place in Germany after World War II, where vicar bishops, in addition to the title of the city, bore the name of a geographical area: Bishop Paul of Stuttgart and Northern Germany, and Bishop Mark of Munich and Southern Germany. This can be explained by the fact that the unity of the German diocese was indeed retained, though in practice, since 1950, it consisted of two almost independent dioceses: Northern Germany with the seat in Hamburg and Southern Germany with the seat in Munich.

A diocesan council assists the ruling bishop in the administration, as does also a vicar bishop in geographically large or numerically significant dioceses. The diocesan council, chaired by the bishop, consists of two to five clergymen and as many laymen; it has competence over administrative, economic and financial matters, providing parishes with priests, building churches, founding parishes, etc., in so far as this cannot be carried out by the parishes themselves. At the seat of the bishop, there is a cathedral, usually the diocesan administration with church archives as well as other important facilities depending on the size and importance of the diocese: church printing presses, schools, charitable institutions, etc. The dioceses may organize priestly and pastoral courses, establish monasteries in their territories, church workshops, and businesses. The head of the diocese [the bishop] has oversight over these and also over the individual parishes, and also watches over the church discipline of his flock and clergy and addresses the faithful in epistles. The bishop visits the individual parishes on special occasions, usually on the patronal feast of the church, for the consecration of churches and altars, for the priests' and communities' anniversaries. At periodic intervals — yearly or with greater lapses of time — a diocesan assembly takes place. At these assemblies, the bishop, his vicar bishops, the members of the diocesan council, the clergy, the rectors of the parishes and from each community a layman — usually, a member of the diocesan council — take part. At the assemblies, general questions of church life, the strengthening of parish life, the opening, closing, division of parishes, the missionary work of the Church (church schools, youth work, publications), etc., are discussed. The deliberations and decisions of these sessions are published in the diocesan papers; a few dioceses even print their own publications on the sessions.³

The smallest organizational unit of church life is the parish. In accordance with the size of a parish, it has its own church and parish administration. The organizational basis of the parish is founded upon the "Normal Parish By-laws," as passed by the Council of 1917-18. The Church Abroad has modified these by-laws several times; the 30 June/13 July 1951 version accepted by the Synod is valid up until the present day.⁴

In these “By-laws,” each respective parish is registered as a parish belonging to a diocese of the ROCOR. The goal of the parish is to organize the religious and ecclesiastical life of the parish members and to bring them into an agreement with the Church’s decisions and canons. Also, the parish should fulfill general ecclesiastical and social obligations and guide their members in the spirit of the Orthodox Church. Furthermore, these By-laws define who is a member of a parish and which governing bodies should be established for the purpose of administration. The parish council consists of the parish clergyman as the chairman and of representatives of the laity and is responsible for the administration of the parish. The parish council meets once per month, convened by the president (i.e. the parish priest); in the event of a tie, the vote of the president decides. The final chapter describes the directives over the parish and church in the event of the dissolution of a parish. The parish church forms a church center for the individual Orthodox Christian. In it, the divine services, in accordance with the church typikon, are celebrated, as well as the personal church celebrations: baptism, memorial services, molebens (services of supplication), funerals, receptions into the bosom of the church, confession, and the distribution of the sacraments. Thus, it is understandable that the faithful have at all times given their donations for building their own churches and community centers in a generous manner.

Footnotes

1. *Russische Orthodoxe Kirche*, photographs, p. 144; *Bratskii Ezhegodnik*. ↵
2. *Episkopat Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi*. ↵
3. There were regular publications on the diocesan assemblies of the North American Diocese, which were printed by the diocese themselves, cf. the Index: *Otchet eparkhialnogo s'ezda*. ↵
4. *Normal Parish By-laws* (Jordanville 1951). ↵

Part IV, Chapter 1.1

The Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem and the Diaspora in Africa and Asia

The Holy Land, or the “Orthodox East,” as one says in Russian, played a special role in the consciousness of the simple Russian faithful: This was the veneration of the “holy, praised land” as the place where the Savior walked.¹ Connected with this veneration was the desire to visit these places, which were sanctified by Christ’s life, suffering on the Cross, and Resurrection. It is, therefore, understandable that the project of a “Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in the Holy Land” would sooner or later have had to find its way into Russian Church circles in order to afford the thousands of pilgrims who yearly visited the holy places with refuge and religious care.

On the background and history of the Russian Mission in Jerusalem, there is much literature available.² In 1847, the Holy Synod decreed the establishment of a Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem in order to strengthen the contact between the Jerusalem Patriarchate and the Russian pilgrims who journeyed to Jerusalem. The first head of the Mission was Archimandrite Porphyrius (Uspensky), who was known and famed as a theologian and scholar for his writings on the Near East. His successor was Antoninus (Kapustin), who headed the Mission from 1865-1894. During his nearly thirty years of leadership, the Mission secured enormous property holdings in Palestine, on which it built churches, monasteries, pilgrim hostels, hospitals, schools and other buildings. Financially, the purchase was made possible by the independent “Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society,”³ which raised its money from donations.

In the Russian Mission in Jerusalem, the Jerusalem Patriarch Cyril II consecrated the only churches in the Mission — the Church of the Holy Martyr Empress Alexandra and the Holy Trinity Cathedral — the only churches of the Mission, in 1864 and 1872 respectively.⁴ On property obtained in 1868, another Holy Trinity Church, with a secondary dedication to the Forefather Abraham and Foremother Sarah, was built. In 1886, the Church of the Ascension was built on the Mount of Olives, and two years later, in 1888, the Church of St. Mary Magdalene has erected only a few minutes’ walks away. With their numerous gilded domes, they bore witness to the Russian presence in the Holy Land.⁵ At Ein Karem (Lk. 1:39) near Jerusalem, a woman’s monastic community was established in 1871, which in 1886 received recognition as a convent.⁶ A few years later, in 1890, the first Russian nuns settled on the Mount of Olives near the Church of the Ascension with its 64-meter-high belfry (the “Russian Candle”). Their community received recognition as a convent in 1906.

Before the outbreak of World War I, the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission and the Palestine Society possessed thirty-seven plots of land with eight churches and several chapels, two convents, five hospitals, seven pilgrim hostels, and ninety-three schools with 10,741 pupils (5,777 boys and 4,964 girls). The schools were located in Palestine and Syria. There were 417 teachers, including only 25 Russians. A teaching seminary also existed from 1886, at which pedagogical skills were developed. Especially in the realm of schooling, Imperial Russia did much, because they took in Christian Arabs, who had no Orthodox school of their own.⁷

In connection with such extensive purchases of land and the construction of so many buildings, there were accusations against Imperial Russia that political motives lay behind the acquisition. Yet the numerous buildings were justified by the yearly influx of the 12,000 Russian pilgrims into the country before 1914. This would have been easily silenced because for years all Christian confessions had striven and contended with each other over possession of the holy places. The envy of most observers was aroused by the fact that in little more than a half of a century Russia had succeeded in obtaining influence in Palestine, for which the other confessions, who unlike the Russian Orthodox were not supported by the State, had sought in vain.

Doubtless, political questions did play a rôle, though here the words of Metropolitan Philaret (Drozdov) should not be forgotten. He said: “Will the political influence of Russia thereby be magnified? Will the Orthodox Church thereby be heightened? Will Catholic propaganda thereby be weakened? In order to attain such goals, one does not need large buildings, but rather capable and enthusiastic people.”⁸

With the outbreak of World War I, the blossoming life of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem was suddenly interrupted: the stream of pilgrims and the financial support stopped; monks and nuns had to depend on themselves. Turkey, which was at war with Russia, considered the activity of the Mission to be “hostile” and abruptly closed it and its monasteries, churches, and retreats, and confiscated all Russian property. The head of the Mission, Archimandrite Leonid (Sentsov), with his priests, monks, and nuns were sent out of Palestine. A part of the possessions was turned into Turkish barracks. Great Britain took up the defense of the clergy, who had gone to Alexandria. Then the defense of their rights to the church property was taken up first by the Italian, then, after 1916, by the American, and finally, after 1917, by the Spanish Consuls. Upon the collapse of the Ottoman Rule and the takeover of Palestine under mandate by Great Britain (1919), for the first time, it became possible for the Russian refugees to return to Jerusalem. The confiscated Mission and the churches were reopened. Hieromonk Meletius was appointed administrator in place of Archimandrite Leonid (Head of the Mission from 1903-1914, died 1918). This appointment was accepted by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration at its 16/29 November 1920 session. Simultaneously, a letter was sent to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, in which the SEA asked the Patriarch to elevate Hieromonk Meletius to the rank of hegumen. Until 1923, Meletius, as Archimandrite from 1922, headed the Mission.⁹

The SEA’s arrangement of the Jerusalem Mission’s affairs at this early point in time underscores the significance the Mission had for the Church Abroad from the beginning.

In March of 1921, a resolution was published assigning Archbishop Anastasius the task of putting the affairs of the Mission in order “in view of the material value of its possessions.” Anastasius acted as direct appointee of the SEA and was the President’s deputy in all ecclesiastical, canonical, legal and other matters.¹⁰ In the summer of 1921, he traveled to Jerusalem, where he spent several weeks. During his stay in Jerusalem he also personally came into contact with Patriarch Damian, who maintained a good personal relationship with Metropolitan Anthony. Because Damian’s election had been opposed by several bishops of the

Patriarchate, Patriarch Damian and Archbishop Anastasius together consecrated new bishops, who were under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch.

The subsequent excellent relations between the Jerusalem Patriarchate and the Church Abroad may be traced back to this time; Archbishop Anastasius lived in Jerusalem until 1934. In 1932 he took part in the consecration of Timothy (later Patriarch) to the episcopate, who maintained close contacts with the Church Abroad until his repose in 1955. ¹¹

In November of 1921, the SEA published a list of the Mission clergy: the head was Hegumen Meletius, the Mission personnel consisted of three hieromonks (Tikhon, Hilarion, and Polycarp), an archdeacon (Seraphim), and a novice. ¹² Bishop Apollinarius was appointed to audit the financial situation of the Mission. ¹³ He spent nearly two years in Jerusalem before taking over the Diocese of Winnipeg at the request of Metropolitan Platon, in 1924.

The main concern of the SEA, and later the Synod of Bishops, was to maintain the property of the Mission, which suffered greatly after the stream of pilgrims stopped and further donations were not forthcoming from Russia. The convents became noticeably impoverished. On their own resources, they were able to tend to the needs of their residents but were hardly able to maintain the upkeep of the buildings and the extensive properties. Thus, after 1920, the Mission relied exclusively upon the money obtained from the emigration. Before World War II, the expenditures of the Mission were some £5,000 annually. This money was spent mainly on the upkeep of the buildings and the most necessary repairs. Those in the Mission — between 200 and 450 people (including the convents) — received £0.50 per month in support of each person. ¹⁴

Between the wars, the Mission also received help from the Serbian and Jerusalem Patriarchates. After the establishment of the State of Israel, the Mission lost all of its property in the Israeli part of Palestine, including an extensive orange orchard, which belonged to the church in Jaffa and which represented a not insignificant source of income for the Mission. ¹⁵ The Moscow Patriarchate, to which the Israeli Parliament handed over all the property located in Israel, sold the land and those buildings not used for church-related purposes to the State of Israel for £4.5 million. The Church Abroad only retained those possessions which lay in the Jordanian portion of Palestine: a total of eighteen pieces of land with the churches and monasteries. Of these, seventeen have to be financially subsidized; only the Convent of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives is able to support itself by its own cultivation. Since this time, the Mission has been completely dependent on the financial help of the Church Abroad. The main support of the Mission comes from the Synod and various benevolent funds, including the Palestine Committee (Palestinsky Komitet), which was set up in 1956, ¹⁶ the “St. John of Kronstadt Benevolent Fund,” the “Archbishop Averky Fund,” and others. Also, special collections were instituted throughout the Church Abroad for the support of the Mission and convents. Furthermore, there was a flow of income into the Mission from the publication of books and recordings of religious music.

All of these helpful measures cannot, however, hide the fact that the material situation of the Mission was extremely bad, since the maintenance of the buildings, which date back to the last

century, demand ever greater expenditures. Thus, in 1969, \$39,000 was spent for repairs on the roof and cupolas of the St. Mary Magdalene Church in the Garden of Gethsemane.

Despite the difficult financial situation, the Church Abroad has not only succeeded in maintaining its property but has even expanded it with extensive new buildings (see below). Before the division of Palestine, the principal property of the Mission was the Holy Trinity Cathedral. In this building complex, the administrative offices of the Mission, two churches, an extensive library and archives with valuable inventory of church books and newspapers from pre-Revolutionary Russia, a printing press and various workshops (candle-works, an icon workshop) were located. The Mission also had four convents: the Gorny Convent (at Ein Karem, outside the Jerusalem Gate), which had some 100 nuns, the Convent of the Ascension, with some 200 nuns, the Gethsemane Convent and the Bethany Convent, in which some 50-60 nuns lived. There were two monasteries — one at Abraham's Oak and one in Pharan. The brotherhood at the former usually consisted of two or three monks, while St. Chariton's Skete at Pharan, some seven miles from Jerusalem, had two or three monks until the early 1960s, after which it has no longer had any permanent dwellers. The Church Abroad lost the Ein Karem convent through the division of Palestine.

Besides these convents, the Church Abroad had over a dozen churches at various biblical sites. The Church of the Forefather Abraham at Abraham's Oak (traditionally believed to be the Oak of Mamre, together with the monastery, is a particularly holy site of the Church Abroad.¹⁷ Other churches were located in Jaffa on the land where St. Tabitha is said to have been buried, on the Mediterranean Sea, in Jericho, Carmel, Magdala, and other places.¹⁸ All of these churches fell into the hands of the Moscow Patriarchate through the division of Palestine.¹⁹

During the period 1920-1945, the Mission personnel consisted of some 20-30 monks of all ranks and 300-350 nuns. From 1934 the Mission published its own newspaper, *The Holy Land* (Svyataya Zemlya), which appeared monthly; each issue was approximately twenty-five pages long. Hieromonk Philip (von Gardner, later the Bishop of Potsdam) edited it; he was followed by Archimandrite Anthony (Sinkevich). The newspaper was printed at the Mission printing press and largely sent to subscribers outside of Palestine.²⁰

The Mission was administered from 1918-1922 by Hieromonk (Hegumen) Meletius, who from 1922-23 as archimandrite was its head. His successors were Archimandrite Hieronymus (Chernov), Archimandrite Meletius, and Hieromonk Rafael.²¹ In 1928, Archimandrite Cyprian (Kern) was appointed Head of the Mission; he remained so until 1933.²² He was succeeded by Archimandrite Anthony (Sinkevich), who first took over the administration, then [officially] became Head of the Mission in 1937.²³ He remained in Jerusalem until 1951 when he was consecrated Bishop of Los Angeles. It is largely thanks to him that the Church Abroad today is still able to administer the churches and monasteries in the Jordanian part of Palestine. During Patriarch Alexis' visit to Palestine in 1945, his aides offered to consecrate the then Archimandrite Anthony as a metropolitan of the Patriarchal Church if he and the other members of the Mission would submit [to his authority]. Archimandrite Anthony refused, indicating that the legitimate heir of the Russian Mother Church is the Church Abroad.²⁴ From 1951 to 1968, Archimandrite Demetrius (Byakai) was Head of the Mission, followed until 1986 by

Archimandrite Anthony (Grabbe);²⁵ the Mission was then temporarily administered by Archpriest Valery Lukianov (rector of the St. Alexander Nevsky Church in Lakewood, New Jersey), then Archpriest Vladimir Skalon (rector of Holy Resurrection Church in Buenos Aires, Argentina) until March 1988, and at present by Archimandrite Alexis (Rosentool), who was appointed the new Head of the Mission in 1988.

From 1924 to 1934, Archbishop Anastasius lived permanently at the Jerusalem Mission. He had spiritual oversight over the Mission and the Convents within the Church Abroad, but was not, however, the head of the Mission, as this position can be held only by someone in the rank of archimandrite.

Despite the aforementioned difficult material situation of the Mission and those belonging to it after 1918, it was possible to complete a few significant buildings since then. In 1925, the building of the church at Abraham's Oak was completed, which had been begun in 1906. The church was consecrated by Patriarch Damian and Archbishop Anastasius in memory of the Forefather Abraham, who had lived there.²⁶ The most significant building, however, was on a piece of land in Bethany. In 1934, on a 2,000 square meter plot in the Garden of Gethsemane, the cornerstone was laid for an orphanage with a school for Orthodox Arab girls. The St. Mary Magdalene Church and the nuns of the Gethsemane Convent were already located on this land when two Scottish converts to Orthodoxy, Mother Mary (Barbara Robinson) and Mother Martha (Alice Sprott) received Metropolitan Anastasius' permission to establish a second convent. Both had been High Church Anglicans on their way to India, where they were to have worked as medical aides, when in Palestine they became acquainted with Orthodoxy, to which they felt attracted. After a year's stay in Palestine, they left for India but decided to convert to Orthodoxy after a visit to the Patriarch of Antioch, and then returned to Jerusalem. Archbishop Anastasius tonsured them nuns, and they lived for a while in the Gethsemane Convent. In the following year, they received permission to establish a women's monastic community (the Bethany Community of the Resurrection of Christ) with the aim of opening a boarding school and a day school. Archbishop Anastasius, who in the meantime had been elevated to the rank of Metropolitan, appointed Mother Mary head of the newly founded community.²⁷

Within two years, the convent building for the sisterhood was completed, and the building of the orphanage and school was begun. Metropolitan Anastasius blessed the opening of the school in 1939. Seventy girls permanently lived there, and another seventy girls attended the school as day scholars. In 1966, these buildings were extended through the addition of a new building, in which the nuns' cells, the guest rooms, and the administrative offices are housed.²⁸

Above all else, the question of growth after 1918 was problematic for the convents and the Mission. The complexes, which had been planned for several hundred nuns and monks, received no more monastics from Russia after 1914. The Ein Karem Convent, containing some two-hundred nuns, had been the largest convent before the outbreak of World War I. The Convent of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives had one hundred nuns, and the Gethsemane Convent had some twenty nuns. The majority of the nuns were Russians. During the 1920s, again and again, isolated nuns from the emigration joined the convents, as well as small groups of nuns from the convents of Romanian Bessarabia, who rejected the Romanization of their convents and various

reforms (such as the change to the New Style Calendar). Over the course of time, however, more and more Arab women joined the convents. In the Mount of Olives Convent, for example, between the years 1951 and 1965, seventy-five of the very aged nuns died, whereas only fifty new nuns entered the convent, including only two Russians. Today about one hundred, mostly of Arab extraction, live in the Convent.²⁹ Since the 1930s, approximately 50-60 nuns have at all times belonged to the Gethsemane and Bethany Convents. After the division of Palestine, from the Ein Karem Convent (which had fallen into the hands of the Moscow Patriarchate) about forty nuns, who remained faithful to the Church Abroad, joined the three aforementioned convents. These nuns, however, did not remain there, but rather continued on to England and Chile, where they founded new convents.³⁰ Despite the Arabization of these convents, they have continued to preserve their Russian character: Russian has remained the spoken language, and Russian customs and traditions continue to be observed.

The situation concerning those belonging to the Ecclesiastical Mission is more favorable. In the 1920s, the size of the Mission personnel increased to twenty, because émigré monks from Russia and monks from the Valaam monastery (proponents of the Old Calendar) joined the Mission. Candidates from émigré circles joined the Mission again and again. After World War II, monks from the St. Job Brotherhood in Lodomirova joined the Mission, after which the material needs of the established monastery [of St. Job] in Munich forced them to travel further. Yet the ravages of aging also affected the Mission. Since the early 1960s, the Brotherhood has become ever smaller. In 1968, the Mission — besides the head, Archimandrite Demetrius — included an Archimandrite, a hegumen, three hieromonks, and two hierodeacons, a schemamonk, a monk and five novices, altogether fifteen people.³¹ In 1981, six archimandrites, two hegumens, two monks, a total of ten people, belonged to the Mission, but no novices, no younger coworkers.³²

The Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society, which had largely made possible the acquisition of the properties in Palestine in the 19th century, was the owner of numerous pieces of land and buildings. After the Russian Revolution, its assets, like that of other unions, were also nationalized. In the emigration, former members of the Society founded a [new] organization as its successor — the Palestine Committee. The goal of this committee is to protect the property titles of the Society in Palestine. This Committee protested to the State of Israel against the confiscation of its property by the Moscow Patriarchate.³³ The Committee, which collaborates closely with the Church Abroad, earlier had its headquarters in Versailles. In 1968, it became directly subject to the Synod and was registered as an association in New York. The buildings and land of the Imperial Palestine Society are registered as the Society's property in the Israeli and Jordanian parts of Palestine.³⁴ The President of the Society at that time, M.G. Khripunov, looked after the interests of the Committee.

Members of the Mission are also responsible for the Russian churches in Tehran, Beirut, and Addis Ababa, though only Tehran has its own clergyman. All of these churches are directly subject to the Synod in New York.

In Iran, the Church Abroad has ten communities, of which half have their own church.³⁵ After the 20,000 or so Nestorian Christians joined the Russian Orthodox Church in 1898, an ecclesiastical mission in Iran was established. After 1918, the Mission made contact with the

SEA, to whose authority the Mission's head, Abunmar Elias submitted in 1921.³⁶ His successor was Bishop John (Shleman),³⁷ who as representative of the Mission participated in the Second Pan-Diaspora Council in 1938.

Since the turn of the century, various Russian churches had sprung up in the country, because Persia was seen as a new field of missionary endeavor. The churches were taken over by the émigrés who fled to Persia. The most important parish was in Tehran. When diplomatic relations were established between the Soviet Union and Persia, after long opposition, the émigrés had to evacuate the embassy churches, which they had been using. Thus, they decided to build their own church, which was consecrated in 1944 in honor of St. Nicholas the Wonderworker. Built in the Novgorod style, the church had a small community center and an adjacent building that served as the rectory.³⁸ The first rector of the new parish was Archimandrite Vitalis (1944-46),³⁹ followed by Archimandrites Vladimir (1946-51), Seraphim (1951-61), and Victorinus (1961-68). With the appointment of Archimandrite Victorinus, who had belonged to the Brotherhood at the New Kursk Hermitage, parish life took a turn for the better. After a fundamental renovation of the Church, the community center was expanded by the addition of a library and a parish school. The school began giving instruction in 1962. In the first academic year, seventy-nine pupils were enrolled; they were taught by four teachers in as many classes. The school was equipped with its own 1200-volume library.⁴⁰ In the same year, a Russian library was opened, which contained 13,000 books and had over 100 regular visitors.⁴¹ In Tehran, there was also a Russian cemetery (from 1894), a cemetery chapel (from 1905) and a small home for the elderly. After the death of Fr. Victorinus, there were no more priests until 1989. The parish was placed in the care of the head of the Jerusalem Mission.

[Trans. Note. After the outbreak of the Islamic Revolution, there was little possibility of caring for the flock there, because only Iranian nationals could serve as clergy in Iran, and an appropriate candidate was only recently found. The remaining parishes in Iran had been cared for by the clergy who served the Tehran parish. Many émigrés left the country in the course of the year and immigrated to America. In 1989, a priest, Fr. Stephen Evnich, an Iranian national who had grown up in Russia, was ordained to the priesthood at the Synod in New York to serve in Tehran.]

In Beirut, there has been a small Russian colony since 1927, which set up its own place of worship in an Arab Orthodox church. When, in 1946, a part of the community joined the Moscow Patriarchate, the Church Abroad's faithful gathered in Arab Orthodox churches. After Archimandrite Athanasius (Mogilev) moved from Cairo to Beirut, the community opened a house chapel in his residence. Since the 1970s, the remainder of the community has been entrusted to the members of the Jerusalem Mission.⁴²

The small Russian community in Addis-Ababa was founded in 1927. It was located in the house of S. Khvostov, a former officer, and lawyer, who was in the service of the Ethiopian Imperial House. A total of twenty White Russian émigrés lived in the city. From 1927 to 1937, Fr. Paul Voronovsky cared for the community. After his death, the church was closed. When Russian and Serbian families came to Ethiopia after World War II, they reopened the small house church. Fr. A. Milovidov directed the community until the end of the 1950s.⁴³ The Ethiopian Imperial

House gave [financial] support to the community. The Empress gave the Church Abroad an extensive piece of property in the environs of the capital, upon which a Russian convent was to be founded. This present was a gesture of thanks because the nuns of the Mount of Olives convent had offered the Imperial Family refuge during its flight from Ethiopia in 1935. The property consisted of more than 320 acres and, in addition to a convent, there was a plan to establish a school and an infirmary modeled upon the Bethany Convent. The financial means for the building were to be provided by the Imperial House, and the Synod planned to send there the three nuns of the St. Olga Sisterhood, who lived at the church house in Montréal.

Another four nuns from Harbin were to join them.⁴⁴ Their plans were not realized, and the small community remaining came under the direction of Archimandrite Anthony (Grabbe).

In East and South Africa, there were a few smaller communities, which mostly consisted of a few families. These communities were serviced from Johannesburg and Nairobi, where Archimandrite Alexis and Fr. Simon Starikov had built chapels. After the outbreak of the independence movements in these countries, the émigrés left their new homeland and moved to South Africa or further overseas.⁴⁵

In Egypt and North Africa, a dozen or so numerically significant communities existed, which had an active church and cultural life. These communities were founded by refugees from the first emigration. After World War II, many refugees joined them, hoping for a better life in North Africa.⁴⁶ Community life blossomed in every way. Churches, schools and community centers were built; youth camps were organized; dance and music groups were founded. When the struggles for independence broke out in Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria, many émigrés, especially from Algeria, moved to France, North and South America, and Australia. A similar development had occurred a few years earlier in Egypt when many Russians had to leave or voluntarily left after the overthrow of the monarchy. In consequence, the newly revitalized church life was extinguished; the families who remained behind were no longer in the position to support their own priest. The communities and churches in Tunis, Bizerta, Algiers, Casablanca and Rabat today are directly subject to the Synod of Bishops. Clergy from France occasionally visit in order to celebrate the services for the few faithful remaining.⁴⁷ The first émigrés came to these countries in 1920; the English evacuated 2,000 sick and young Russians to Egypt. The French housed the former Russian Black Sea Navy and crews in Bizerta and Tunis.⁴⁸ From there, many servicemen moved to Algiers and Morocco.

These communities were made up of the most part of men. This resulted in the communities becoming ever smaller over the course of time, as the members died without progeny. Most marriages were of a mixed nature: Russian-French or Russian Arab. In the case of the former, subsequent emigration to France became easier.

Only the second emigration, after 1945, insured a normal social structure in these communities, because among the new émigrés were both women and children. In Egypt, there were two Russian communities, which like all communities in North Africa fell under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Alexandria, but in spiritual regard belonged to the Synod.⁴⁹ The administration of the Russian-exile Communities in this area came about very much as in the Orthodox Balkan

countries, practically independent of the Patriarch of Alexandria, who granted these communities an autonomous status and in part supported them materially. Both Egyptian communities, in Alexandria and Cairo-Heliopolis, were founded in 1922. The community in Alexandria assembled in the former Russian consulate church, whereas the community in Cairo had at its disposal a chapel in the Old City and in the suburb of Heliopolis, where a Russian home for the elderly and a Russian cemetery were located. These institutions were obtained and built by the émigrés with the support of the Patriarch of Alexandria.⁵⁰ During his visit to the Patriarch of Alexandria in 1945, Patriarch Alexis also visited the Russian community of this city. The parish priest, Fr. Alexis Dekhterev, and Deacon Nicholas Prozorov joined the Moscow Patriarchate along with most of the parish. This was the only parish in the Near East to separate itself from the Church Abroad during Patriarch Alexis' visit.⁵¹

About fifty people remained faithful to the Church Abroad, including Prince Roman Petrovich and the former Imperial Russian Ambassador. With his mother and sister, Tsar Symeon II of Bulgaria also joined the parish; he had found asylum in Egypt. The small community succeeded in setting up a house church in a residence; Fr. Zosimas (Anisimov) was their priest. After the Egyptian Revolution, the aristocratic families were banished from the country and went to America. The small remaining community was in the care of a Greek Archimandrite Dorotheus for a few more years and finally joined the Patriarchate of Alexandria.⁵² The Cairo community was entrusted to Archimandrite Athanasius (Mogilev) until 1960 when he was transferred to the community in Beirut. These communities also joined the Patriarchate of Alexandria.

The communities in North Africa, which experienced a revival through the influx of new refugees, were then put under the direction of Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk). After his appointment as Bishop of Buenos Aires and Argentina in 1948, Archpriest Metrophanes Znosko-Borovsky assumed the position. In 1953 Bishop Nathaniel (Lvov) administered the communities; in the subsequent years until 1959, Archpriest Znosko-Borovsky resumed the position.⁵³

In Morocco, there were communities in Casablanca, Rabat, Burnasel, Tangiers, and Marrakesh. In Rabat, there was the Church of the Resurrection of Christ, whose rector, Archimandrite Barsanuphrius (Tolstukhin) was subordinate to Metropolitan Eulogius. When Barsanuphrius joined the Moscow Patriarchate in 1948, only about 130 of the faithful followed him, while the majority of the community about 1,000 people joined the Russian exile colony in Casablanca. There were two small communities, one in the city and one in the suburb Burnasel, each of which had their own churches. In the early 1950s, the parish of the Dormition Church obtained a 1000 square meter plot of land, upon which a new church and community center were built, which was consecrated in 1958. Until 1964 the community had its own priest; thereafter, Fr. K. Lois took over the care of all the North African communities. In Burnasel and Tangiers, they built their own chapels after 1945 but did not have their own clergymen.⁵⁴

Since 1969, there have been no Russian clergy in Morocco. The 1,500 faithful of the Church Abroad who lived there were spread over twenty-two cities and villages. The church in Casablanca still belongs to the Synod in New York; the remaining communities were dissolved. Clergy from France occasionally celebrate the divine services there. Otherwise, the Greek clergy of the Patriarchate of Alexandria care for the faithful.⁵⁵

The two most important church buildings were built after the Second World War in Tunisia, where there had been communities in Bizerta and Tunis since 1920. Upon the initiative of Bishop Nathaniel, the house chapel of the former sailors from the Black Sea Fleet was replaced by a new building in the North Russian style. Six to seven hundred Russians who lived in and around Tunis belonged to the Holy Resurrection Church in the 1950s.⁵⁶ By 1965, the parish lost almost all its parishioners through emigration and death. Only forty-eight mostly elderly émigrés belonged to the parish, which today is practically deserted. The situation was similar to that of the 200-strong community in Bizerta, which after the Second World War had begun to build a church dedicated to St. Alexander Nevsky. Hegumen Panteleimon (Rogov), who had been part of the St. Job Brotherhood in Lodomirova, was rector of the community. After the re-establishment of the monastery in Munich, he traveled first to France, where he was supposed to establish a monastery. When these plans had to be given up, he was transferred to the community in Bizerta. This community had also lost almost all its faithful by 1965 through emigration and death. In 1965 only six people still belonged to the church. Today the church is likewise deserted but is still under the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad.

In Algiers, a community has been in existence since 1923 and has a makeshift church in a barracks. Up to this time “a few hundred” Orthodox Russians lived in the country. In the 1930s, the church was situated in the center of Algiers, where a house chapel was set up in a residence. Plans to build a church, for which the community obtained a plot of land in 1957, were not realized, because almost all the émigrés left for France on account of the war in Algeria.⁵⁷

Today the only reminders of the Church Abroad’s former communities are the churches and a few Russian cemeteries. The political circumstances, as well as the sociological structure of the communities, led to the death or emigration of these communities over the years. This also applied to all the diaspora communities in Africa. Providing these parishes with priests put a strain on the personnel resources of the Church Abroad. Yet the Church made every effort to provide for its faithful flock even in the furthest corners of Africa, as long as a community life could be maintained. The building of churches in North Africa may perhaps appear to the observer today as superficial, but it proves the great closeness between their church and the faithful, who were ready to take upon themselves a heavy financial sacrifice in order to celebrate their divine services in Russian churches. For them, the Church was the last part of the homeland; their faith gave them the courage and hope to live.

Footnotes

1. This chapter essentially follows a 1973 publication by the author: Seide, *Jerusalem* (especially pp. 150-163.). The part on the Church Abroad has been expanded by new sources. On the Mission of the Moscow Patriarchate and the ecclesiastical policy of the Patriarchal Church, compare in the same source, pp. 163-171. ↵
2. Smolitsch, *Mission in Jerusalem*; Stavrou, *Interest in Palestine*; *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp. 412-475; *Russkaya Deyatel'nost'*. ↵

3. Smolitsch, *Mission in Jerusalem*, p. 134; *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche Einrichtungen*, p. 158. ↵
4. Cf. The photographs in *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche*, p. 157. ↵
5. Cf. The photographs in *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1:425-449. ↵
6. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland/Monasteries*. ↵
7. Seide, *Jerusalem*, p. 151. ↵
8. Beth, pp. 177-178; *Tserk. Ved.* (Munich 1958) 8-10, pp. 9-10. ↵
9. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, pp. 17; *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 10-11, p.15. ↵
10. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, pp. 17-18. ↵
11. Ibid., p. 18; Anastasius, *Sbornik*, p.12; Seide, *Jerusalem*. ↵
12. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 4, p. 11. ↵
13. Ibid., p. 10. ↵
14. *Prav. Rus'* (1958) 13, p. 5. ↵
15. Cf. Part II, Chap.1; Seide, *Jerusalem*. ↵
16. The exact title reads: "Komitet pomoshchi pravoslavnyim uchrezhdeniyam na Svyatoi Zemli." ↵
17. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp. 461-466. ↵
18. *Tserkovnaya letopis'* (Lausanne Dec. 1945) pp. 26-27. ↵
19. Seide, *Jerusalem*, pp.163-171. ↵
20. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1934) pp.141, 159. ↵
21. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 10-11, p. 15; (1925) 1-2, p. 4. ↵
22. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, pp. 289-291; *Tserk. Ved.* (1928) 13-14, p. 1. Archimandrite Cyprian joined Metropolitan Eulogius in 1933, who appointed him instructor at St. Sergius Institute in Paris. ↵
23. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 285. ↵
24. *Tserkovnaya letopis'* (Lausanne Dec. 1945) p. 27. ↵
25. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1, pp. 412-423. ↵
26. Ibid., pp. 461-467; *Prav. Rus'* (1958) 9, p. 9. ↵
27. *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 24, pp. 4-7. ↵

28. On the history of the convents, cf. Seide, *Klöster*; *Russ. Prav.* Ts. 1, pp. 425-471. ↵
29. In the 1930s, 200 nuns were living in the convent; in 1958 there were 150 nuns, and in 1961 there remained 130. ↵
30. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
31. *Russ. Prav.* Ts., 1, p. 423. ↵
32. *Spisok* (1981) p. 27. ↵
33. Seide, *Jerusalem*, p. 54. ↵
34. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1968/1969) 1-12, p. 47. ↵
35. *Russ. Prav.* Ts., 2, pp. 1268-1275. ↵
36. *JMP* (1950) 10, p. 33. ↵
37. Cf. Part IV. ↵
38. *Russ. Prav.* Ts., 2, pp. 1268-1270. ↵
39. *Prav. Rus'* (1948) 15, pp. 13-14. ↵
40. *Ibid.* (1964) 4, pp. 9-10. ↵
41. *Ibid.* (1963) 20, p. 11; *Russ. Prav.* Ts., 2, p. 1270. ↵
42. *Ibid.*, 2, pp. 1276-1279; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1953) 5-6, p. 113; *Prav. Rus'* (1950) 9, p. 1. ↵
43. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1950) 1-2, p.3; (1951) 1, pp.29-30; (1954) 3-4, p.69; *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 1, p.15; (1957) 12, p. 14. ↵
44. *Prav. Rus'* (1962) 9, p.12; *Pravoslavonii vestnik v Kanade* (1962) 7, p. 8. ↵
45. *Russ. Prav.* Ts., 2, pp. 1308-1317; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1951) 2, p. 29; (1953) pp. 5-6, p. 114; *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 20, pp. 12-13. ↵
46. *Russ. Prav.* Ts. 2:1282. ↵
47. *Ibid.*, 1282-1307. ↵
48. *Prav. Rus'* (1955) 18, pp. 13-14; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, p. 11. ↵
49. After the schism of the Church in the diaspora in 1926, individual parishes joined Metropolitan Eulogius, who had been caring for the parishes in Morocco. Cf. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 548-554; Nikon *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, p. 235. ↵
50. *Russ. Prav.* Ts. 2:1300-1307. ↵
51. *JMP* (1945) 10, pp. 12-13. Hieromonk Alexis (Dekhterev) was elevated to archimandrite by the Patriarch in 1946. In 1948 he was arrested by Egyptian authorities for spying on

behalf of the Soviet Union and was deported. In 1950 he was consecrated Bishop of Preshov, in 1956 Bishop of Vilnius and Lithuania, in 1957 archbishop. He died in 1959. Alexei "Moi put' na rodine" appeared in *JMP* (1949) 10, pp. 58-61. His biography was in *JMP* (1959) 6, p. 34ff.; *Ostkirchliche Studien* (1968), pp. 51-52. ↵

52. *Prav. Rus'* (1955) 18, pp. 13-14. ↵

53. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2, p. 1282. ↵

54. *Prav. Rus'* (1950) 9, p. 15; (1952) 20, pp. 8-11. ↵

55. *Ibid.* (1979) 15, pp. 14-15. ↵

56. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2, pp. 1293-1296; *Prav. Rus'* (1953) 2, pp. 15-16; *Tserk Zhizn'* (1956) 1-6, p. 59; (1953) 1-3, pp. 32-33. ↵

57. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2:1299-1300; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1952) 3-4, pp. 66-70; *Prav. Rus'* (1953) 12, p. 15; (1958) 7, p. 11. ↵

Part IV, Chapter 1.2

The Communities in Eastern Europe

The collapse of Imperial Russia in 1917-18 led to the national independence of the western fringe of the Russian Empire: Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland became independent republics. The resurrected Polish state and the newly-founded kingdom of Romania used the weaknesses of the Soviet state to expand their eastern borders. In Finland, the Baltic States, Poland, and Czechoslovakia lived millions of Orthodox faithful, who before 1918 had belonged to the Church of Russia: Orthodox Russians, Belorussians, and Ukrainians, Finns, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Romanians, and numerous small national minorities.

Except for Romania, which annexed the territory between the Pruth and Dniester Rivers (Bessarabia and Moldavia), the Orthodox formed a religious minority in all other countries, though in Poland it was a noticeably large group. In Poland between the Wars, five to six million Orthodox lived.

The establishment of a national Orthodox Church in this country beginning in 1921 and the granting of autonomous or autocephalous status should have been accomplished according to Orthodox Canon Law by the Russian Mother Church, from which the missionary Church originated. The people of these countries, who were fighting for their national recognition and identity, were anti-Russian in sentiment after 1918. Added to their national (anti-Russian) inclination was also a political element: the rejection of the Communist Soviet government. For the Russian Church-oriented Orthodox faithful, this meant a double separation from their Mother Church. The government prevented the faithful from having contact with the Patriarchal Church; the Soviet government prevented the Patriarchal Church for their part from caring for their faithful abroad.

The most simple and canonically unimpeachable solution to the problem would have been for the Orthodox leadership in these countries to have handed over the leadership to the Russian bishops there who had received consecration by the Russian Mother Church until normal relations could be reestablished with the Patriarchal Church. Archbishop Seraphim (Lukianov) lived in Finland; Archbishops John (Pommer) and Eleutherius (Bogoyavlensky) were in the Baltics; Archbishop Panteleimon (Rozhnovsky) and the Bishops Sergius (Korolev) and Vladimir (Tikhonitsky) resided in Poland. In the emigration, there were also other bishops whose divided dioceses lay in part in the new countries: Metropolitans Anthony and Platon, and Archbishops Eulogius and Anastasius. All these hierarchs could raise legitimate claims to the care of the Orthodox in these lands.

Because Romania was a special case, i.e., an Orthodox national Church already existed, it could care for the Orthodox in annexed Bessarabia, even if this had originally been part of the Russian Church. With the exception of Estonia, the local national Orthodox groups comprised a minority.

In Finland there lived 500,000 Orthodox, including only 50,000 Finns; in Estonia, there were 212,764 (in 1934) Orthodox – 118,000 Estonians and 92,000 Russians; in Latvia (1935) lived 174,389 Orthodox and 107,195 Old Believers, of which 210,633 were Russians; in Poland, there

were 5-6 million Orthodox (largely Belorussian and Ukrainians), of whom only 400,000 were Poles.¹ Nonetheless, after 1918, suppression of the Russian influence also set in on church life, which found its parallel in the political, cultural, and economic realm.

The goal of these strivings was the establishment of national Orthodox Churches, which would be independent of the Russian Church. This nationalization was distinguished before all else by two things: the introduction of the local language into the divine services and the introduction of the New Calendar (the Julian Calendar, which is still used today in the Russian Church, is 13 days behind the Gregorian). The Russian minorities opposed these reforms in these countries. Thus, for example, numerous monks and nuns left the monasteries which had once belonged to the Russian Church in Bessarabia and Finland (Valaam and Konevets) and joined the Church Abroad, after these adherents of the Old Style (the Old Calendarists) were persecuted as “schismatics” and “sectarians.”² In Poland during the time between the Wars, there was even official persecution of Orthodoxy. With the consent of the government, the Roman Catholic Church confiscated a part of the property of the Orthodox Church. Churches, monasteries, and other institutions were turned into Roman Catholic property.³ The nationalist, anti-Russian stance of the governments of these countries also prevented these communities – even the purely Russian ones – from joining the Karlovtsy Synod of Bishops. The ruling Russian bishops in these countries, after entering into conflicts with the various opponents striving for the autonomy of the national Churches, were hindered from exercising their office and ultimately banished from these dioceses and countries.

The national Orthodox groups’ strivings for independence were not only supported by their respective governments, but also by the Œcumenical Patriarchate, which held out the prospect of autonomy and autocephaly. The Estonian Orthodox Church took the lead in 1921, with its some 118,000 Orthodox Estonian members. The Diocese of Tallinn was set up by them under the direction of Bishop Alexander (Paulus, later Metropolitan). After that, the Orthodox Estonians, as the Estonian Autonomous Orthodox Church, subordinated themselves to the Œcumenical Patriarchate. In that country, there were 164 clergymen, including 3 bishops, 138 priests, and 23 deacons.⁴ There was also a convent with a skete and podvorye [metochion, dependency] (the Dormition Convent in Pukhtitsa), in which over a hundred nuns lived.⁵ After the Soviet annexation of Estonia, “the Estonian Schism” came to an end through the reunification of these communities with the Patriarchal Church. The Diocese of Tallinn and Estonia has existed since that time.⁶

In Latvia, developments occurred very much the same as in Estonia. With the support of the Latvian government, a local council met in 1920, at which the Latvian Church decided to be independent of the Russian Church. Archbishop John (Pommer) of Riga and Latvia became its head. The majority of the faithful there were Russians (some 210,000 Orthodox and Old Believers compared with 71,000 Latvians).⁷ For this reason, autonomy was more difficult to realize there than in Estonia. The Orthodox and the Old Believers had 165 churches and 130 clergymen, a theological seminary in Riga, and a monastery (St. Alexis) and convent (Holy Trinity), in which 200 monks and nuns lived.⁸

Archbishop John (Pommer)⁹ was essentially closer to the Church Abroad after the schism, than to the jurisdiction of metropolitan Eulogius; but the latter had many supporters among the laity and the lesser clergy. Thus, for example, Archbishop John forbade the Christian Student Union, which had a close spiritual connection to Metropolitan Eulogius' jurisdiction, from conducting any activities in those communities under his direction. This led to divisions within the communities. The Archbishop also opposed Latvian autonomy. In 1934, he was murdered; the case was never solved.¹⁰

After his death, the advocates of Latvian autonomy achieved their aim with the support of the government and established the Latvian Orthodox Church, which declared itself "Autocephalous." The First Hierarch was Bishop Augustine (Augustine Peterson, until 1936 archpriest, after 1940 Metropolitan). He joined the Œcumenical Patriarchate.¹¹ The Russian émigrés living in the country welcomed this step in so far as it meant a final break with the Moscow Patriarchate, which the majority of the faithful rejected after Metropolitan Sergius' Declaration.

After the Soviet invasion in 1940, the Orthodox were "reunited" with the Patriarchal Church. On April 11, 1941, Metropolitan Augustine signed a protocol in Moscow on the dissolution of the Latvian Church, which was to join the Patriarchate. The latter, in turn, designated Metropolitan Sergius (Voskresensky) as Exarch for the Orthodox in the Baltics. Metropolitan Augustine was supposed to retain the leadership of the Latvian Orthodox, but he requested permission to retire. In 1944, the Metropolitan was evacuated to Germany, and from 1946, he maintained communion with the Church Abroad. After his death in 1955, he entrusted his small flock to the Church Abroad.¹²

The preconditions for the autonomy or autocephaly of a Church were most favorable in Poland, where 5-6 million faithful lived and where a few hundred churches were cared for by priests and bishops. The Russian bishops living there remained canonically faithful to their Mother Church and were decisive opponents of the strivings for autocephaly, which the Polish Orthodox minority propagated and demanded of the government and which resulted in a weakening of the Orthodox Church. After the expulsion of Bishops Sergius and Vladimir, Archbishop Panteleimon was retired and lived in the Zhirovitsy Monastery of the Dormition.¹³

In 1925, the Orthodox there finally received an independent Church. The Œcumenical Patriarchate granted them autocephaly: the Russian Church did not recognize the Polish Orthodox Autocephalous Church. In 1948, under changed political circumstances, the Patriarchate recognized the autocephaly of the Polish Church, whereas the Church Abroad rejected it. Today, some 500,000 faithful belong to the Church, which is organized into four dioceses and has a Theological Faculty and two small monasteries.¹⁴ During World War II, the First Hierarch of the Polish Orthodox Church, Metropolitan Dionysius (Valedinsky), gave his consent to the formation of autonomous Belorussian and Ukrainian Churches. The Polish Orthodox Church lost over 80% of its faithful thereby. The bishops, clergy, and faithful of both these churches were united in the emigration with the Church Abroad.¹⁵

In Finland, there had been a Russian Diocese since 1892. After the Finnish Declaration of Independence, the independence of Finnish Orthodoxy was established by constitutional law in

1918. This one-sided declaration of independence was not recognized by any other Church; it was condemned decisively by the Russian Church, for whom Archbishop Seraphim (Lukianov) remained the rightful head of the Church of Finland. The Ecumenical Patriarchate supported the struggle for independence, by granting the Finnish Orthodox Church autonomy in 1923. Bishop Herman (Aav) became the First Hierarch; he had been consecrated by the Estonian Archbishop Alexander (Paulus). The Russian Church considered this consecration to be uncanonical and declared the appointment of Bishop Herman as the First Hierarch of the Orthodox communities in Finland as invalid.¹⁶ The Finnish authorities reacted to this condemnation by exiling Bishop Seraphim, who had been elevated to archbishop for his faithfulness to the Mother Church. When the New Calendar was introduced into the Orthodox Church of Finland in 1925, many communities were split. The advocates of the Old Calendar were often also advocates of the jurisdictional membership in the Russian Church and, therefore, separated themselves from their parishes. Wherever they succeeded in establishing their own communities, e.g. in Helsingfors and Vyborg, they maintained contacts with the Russian Church. In any case, these communities were again divided because in their midst were supporters of the Patriarchal Church, the Church Abroad, and the Paris Jurisdiction.¹⁷

After the cession of Karelia to the Soviet Union in 1939/1944, the Finnish Orthodox Church lost some 90% of its property, including the ancient Russian monasteries on the islands in Lake Ladoga (Valaam and Konevets). The government gave support to the intensive rebuilding work of the approximately 60,000 faithful remainings. Since 1969, there have been attempts in progress to obtain autocephaly.

Whereas, according to the opinion of the Russian Church, the jurisdictional authority over the Orthodox communities in the aforementioned countries was rightful that of the Russian Church, the canonical situation in the countries of southeastern Europe was clear cut. According to Orthodox canon law, all Orthodox faithful – irrespective of nationality – on the territory of an Orthodox Church belongs to the local Church. This principle was also never violated.

The jurisdictional competence outside the territory of autocephalous Churches, is, however, contested, and upon it Constantinople laid claims.¹⁸ The Church Abroad's experts on canon law have not questioned Orthodox canon law in the instance of the territories of Local Orthodox Churches, where Russian refugee communities were located. The extensive autonomous administration of the Russian communities in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey, North Africa (the legal jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Alexandria), and also Czechoslovakia¹⁹ can be explained by "canonical hospitality," as well is also acknowledged in the 39th Canon of the Sixth Ecumenical Council. The refugees' establishment of parallel jurisdictions in many of these countries can only be explained by "the law of love," i.e., the goodwill of individual national Churches.²⁰ Thus, it is also essentially irrelevant to consider whether in the Orthodox countries of southeastern Europe Russians had their own dioceses or the communities belonged to the Local Church.

In Romania, this question simply did not arise because, with the exception of the Russian embassy church in Bucharest, all other Russian refugee churches belonged to the Romanian Orthodox Church, and the refugees did not have their own ecclesiastical administration there.

The Bucharest parish was under the authority of Metropolitan Eulogius.²¹ Czechoslovakia was not an Orthodox country. During the time between the Wars, most of the Orthodox in eastern Slovakia (Carpatho-Russia/Carpatho-Ukraine) belonged to the Serbian Orthodox Church, which had set up its own diocese in Preshov-Mukachevo. Those Church Abroad communities located in Czechoslovakia had the same status as the Russian communities in Yugoslavia.²²

In Turkey, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Greece, the Russian refugee communities were granted an autonomous ecclesiastical administration by the primates of the Local Orthodox Churches. They gave a Russian bishop jurisdiction over these communities and even permitted them to set up diocesan councils to support the bishop in his administration. This resulted in de facto Russian dioceses because all of the prerequisites for such existed. The Œcumenical Patriarch initiated this with Decree No. 9084, dated 22 December 1920, which gave the Russian bishops full authority to rule their ecclesiastical and religious affairs independently. The Patriarch, however, reserved the right to oversee and make decisions concerning martial law.²³ Archbishop Anastasius was given the right to care for the 20 or so communities in close proximity to Constantinople and the ten communities on the island of Lemnos and in Gallipoli, where large numbers of refugees lived at that time.²⁴ In August of 1921, Bishop Seraphim (Sobolev) was assigned to oversee the Russian communities in Yugoslavia.²⁵ In the autumn of 1921, the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration directed an inquiry to the Archbishop of Athens with the request for his consent to allowing the administration of the Russian communities in Greece to be transferred to a Russian bishop. The archbishop clearly recognized the “right to a self-administered diocese” in his answer to the Russian communities. Bishop Hermogenes (Maximov) assumed this task, which also included the Russian communities on Cyprus and in Egypt, with the exception of the military communities, which remained under the care of Bishop Benjamin (Fedchenko).²⁶ Thus, by the end of 1921, there existed de facto Russian dioceses in Constantinople (Turkey), Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Greece.

On the territory of Constantinople, there were six Russian churches before 1914. After the evacuation of the White Army, tens of thousands of Russian refugees lived there, organized into 20 communities. These refugees were joined by still more members of the White Army, who were quartered in Gallipoli and on Lemnos. The Church Abroad considered the church province of Constantinople to be its “first Russian Diocese.”²⁷ The SEA had its first session here in 1922. In addition to Metropolitans Anthony and Platon, Archbishops Anastasius and Theophanes and Bishop Benjamin were in the diocese at that time. The refugees lived in refugee camps, which had been erected in barracks outside the city. Within a short time, they had formed almost 80 different unions and organizations, which pursued political and cultural aims. A self-formed council took control of the coordination of these unions; Archbishop Anastasius presided over this council.²⁸

The mass of émigrés remained in Turkey only for a brief period of time and soon after the evacuation made arrangements to travel further because the economic outlook for establishing themselves there was extremely poor. Also, the SEA, and all the bishops except for Archbishop Anastasius, had left. The older émigrés and the sick remained behind, not having received entry visas from any country. Archbishop Anastasius remained in charge of this diocese until 1924. In

the same year, he attended the Pan-Orthodox Congress, which was convened on the initiative of the Œcumenical Patriarch Meletius IV. At the Congress, the main themes were modernizations in the Church, such as the introduction of the New Calendar, second marriages for priests, and permitting married bishops. At this Congress, Archbishop Anastasius was the spokesman for the opposition, which was synonymous with opposing the Œcumenical Patriarch, who advocated many of the reforms. In subsequent weeks, there was a permanent deterioration of relations, which finally led to Archbishop Anastasius' departure from Turkey in April of 1924.²⁹

In subsequent years, relations between the Church Abroad and the Œcumenical Patriarchate deteriorated further still. The cause of this development was Constantinople's granting of autonomy and autocephaly to the Orthodox Churches in Finland, the Baltics, and Poland.³⁰

No successor to Archbishop Anastasius was appointed. Most of the communities had, in the meantime, been dismantled, because the refugees had left the country. In the five years of its existence, 100,000 faithful had lived there. Permitting them their own bishop seems to have been more than justified. In the course of that year, practically all Russian émigrés left the country. The few families remaining in Istanbul still have a church but have not had their own priests for many years.

In Greece, in the first years after the evacuation, there were a number of Russian refugee communities. After the Archbishop of Athens granted them an autonomous status, Archpriest P. Krakhmalev was given charge of the communities. In May of 1922, Bishop Hermogenes took over the communities.³¹ He remained head of the Russian diocese in Greece and the communities in Cyprus and Egypt until 1929, when he relinquished this position upon his appointment as Bishop of San Francisco and Western America, though he did not assume this position due to ill health and instead resided in Yugoslavia.

The focal point of the Russian communities in Greece was the Russian Church in Athens, which was built in 1850 and had served as the embassy church. In an Athens suburb, a Russian home for the elderly was built, which was supported by the Grand Duchess Helena Vladimirovna, who lived in Athens. In this home between sixty and eighty people lived. On the property, there was a small Russian chapel built in north Russian style and dedicated to St. Seraphim of Sarov. The Russian monks on Athos donated the icons and church utensils as a gift to the parish. Until the 1960s, Russian priests cared for the parishes in Athens and Piraeus. In the summers, several clergymen from North America and a few monks from Holy Trinity Monastery at Jordanville also spent a few months in the Russian old age home and served in the parishes in Athens and Piraeus.³²

Although the Diocese of Constantinople existed only until 1924, and the Diocese of Greece until 1929 [most of the émigrés had left by those years], the dioceses in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia existed until the end of World War II. In both countries, many thousands of émigrés lived until 1945, having formed their own communities and social organizations. Bulgaria, which had its own Black Sea ports, had received a part of the Russian refugees who had been evacuated overseas. In the first years after the defeat of the White Army, 50,000 Russian émigrés lived there. Whereas the Bulgarian people generally received the Russians with hospitality, the

Bulgarian government was initially very reserved towards them. After Bulgaria's War of Liberation against Turkey, friendly relations had existed between Russia and Bulgaria. During World War I, Bulgaria fought on the German side against Russia, which had supported the Serbian claim to Macedonia, but which Bulgaria claimed as a part of its country. The initially deplorable relationship improved quickly because King Boris III was amiably disposed towards the Russian émigrés. On the part of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, the refugee clergy were well-received. Five Russian schools were opened with government support, which included kindergartens. Some two thousand Russian students completed their studies at Bulgarian universities, the majority with government stipends. Russian professors obtained positions in institutions of higher education there. Professors Glubokovsky, Poznov, Zyzykin, and Archpriest Shavel'sky taught at the Theological Faculty of the University of Sofia.³³ Despite these favorable conditions, half of the Russians left the country because labor conditions in an overwhelmingly agrarian state were poor.³⁴ The others emigrated to France and Belgium where they found work in the industries and mines.

In Bulgaria, there were two Russian churches. In Sofia, there was a church at the former Russian embassy in honor of St. Nicholas, and in Shipka Pass there was a church in honor of St. Alexander Nevsky. They were built for those soldiers who were slain in the Russian-Turkish War.

Archimandrite Tikhon (Lyashchenko, later Bishop of Berlin and Germany) served at the embassy church in Sofia. In April of 1921, the SEA transferred the embassy churches in Sofia and Bucharest to Metropolitan Eulogius, while all other churches in the Balkans were subject to the SEA's jurisdiction.³⁵ At the request of the Berlin community, Eulogius appointed Archimandrite Tikhon as a head clergyman in Berlin and transferred the community in Sofia to Bishop Seraphim (Sobolev). In August of the same year, the SEA charged Bishop Seraphim with the administration of all the Russian communities in Bulgaria. Metropolitan Eulogius accepted this arrangement. He himself wrote in his memoirs that "church affairs in Bulgaria had not interested him."³⁶ This "disinterest" might, however, have more readily stemmed from the fact that the Russian communities in Bulgaria had left no doubt as to their canonical faithfulness to the Church Abroad, and their leader, Bishop Seraphim, was a theologically well-versed opponent to the teachings of Sergius Bulgakov.³⁷

Bishop Seraphim was in charge of the Russian communities in Bulgaria from 1921 to 1950. He was elevated to archbishop for his services in 1934. Moreover, he had been the first bishop to be consecrated by the SEA before the evacuation. Besides him, Bishops Damian (Govorov) of Tsaritsyn and Bishop Theophanes (Bystrov) of Jamburg resided in Bulgaria.

Bishop Damian, (archbishop from 1931), lived from 1921 until his death in 1936 in Stanimaka (since 1934 Asenovgrad) in the Monastery of St. Cyril, where he established a pastoral school for the education of Russian clergy.³⁸ Bishop Theophanes lived from 1925 to 1931 at the Synodal residence in Sofia and led a reclusive life. He left his cell only to attend the divine services.

Seven Russian communities and two Russian monasteries were subject to Bishop Seraphim. The largest communities were in Sofia, Varna, Pernik, Plovdiv, and Stara Zagora. Besides the Russian churches in Sofia and at Shipka Pass there were no other Russian churches in the country. The Russian embassy church in Sofia was built in the years 1911-14, and after the end of World War II, it served as a parish church for the Russian émigrés in the country. When Bulgaria recognized the Soviet Union in 1934, this church became an object of contention because the Soviet government demanded that the “White Guard” leave the embassy church. To protect the interests of the émigrés, a committee was formed, presided over by Bishop Seraphim and the Bulgarian Bishop Boris; they finally succeeded in having the embassy church transferred to the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, which, in turn, rented the Bulgarian Church of St. Nicholas, which was located very near the former embassy church, to the émigrés.³⁹ The remaining communities in Varna, Plovdiv, Pernik, and Stara Zagora used the Bulgarian Church’s houses of worship, including also former Greek churches. Such was the case in Varna, where the Russian community held their divine services in the Greek Church of St. Athanasius the Great.⁴⁰

At the Russian Memorial Church in Shipka Pass, there was a spacious building, which had originally served as a hostel. It was suggested that a pastoral school be opened in this building. However, when Bishop Damian was asked to open such a school in the Monastery of St. Cyril, the vacant house at Shipka Pass was turned into a home for invalids, which housed between 300 and 400 people.⁴¹

Many Russian émigrés dispersed throughout the country, and where they could not form their own parishes, joined the Bulgarian Orthodox ones, as the divine services were celebrated in Church Slavonic. Refugee Russian priests were active in many communities, and they joined the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. A total of 100 priests and deacons of the Russian Church were assigned to care for Bulgarian parishes.⁴²

In addition to these communities, there existed two smaller Russian monastic houses where refugee monks and nuns lived. The monastery was originally located in the Bulgarian Monastery of St. Alexander Nevsky at Jambol. Subsequently, in the 1920s, it moved to the Monastery of St. Cyril in Stanimaka in order to give support to Bishop Damian.⁴³ The Convent of the Protection of the Mother of God was located in Knyazhev. Both had some ten monastics.

In 1945, there was a reconciliation between the Bulgarian Church and the Russian Patriarchal Church. The Moscow Patriarchate also recognized Archbishop Seraphim as head of the Russian communities in Bulgaria after 1945 and did not, in practice, alter the status of the Russian communities, which, however, became subject to the Patriarchal Church. The Bulgarian Church and the Russian Patriarchal Church exchanged numerous visiting delegations.⁴⁴ In contrast to other countries where the Patriarchal Church attempted to move the émigré clergy, monks and nuns to return to the “homeland,” this seems not to have been the case in Bulgaria, because the émigré communities and the Russian monasteries continued to exist. After the death of Archbishop Seraphim in 1950, negotiations between the Patriarchal Church and the Bulgarian Church were concluded, with the agreement that all Russian parishes and monasteries in Bulgaria should be subject to the Bulgarian Orthodox Church.⁴⁵ In this arrangement, the Russian Church in Sofia was excluded from this agreement and was designated a podvorye [metochion,

dependency] of the Patriarchal Church. Since then, an archimandrite has been stationed there to serve as the head and representative of the Russian Church to the Bulgarian Church.⁴⁶ Thus ended the history of the Russian Church in Bulgaria, which had been a diocese of the Church Abroad until 1945 and thereafter a deanery of the Patriarchate for another seven years.

The Church Abroad had its center in Yugoslavia between the Wars. In contrast to numerous other countries, there was not a single Russian church in the country. The Serbian Patriarchate put many churches at the disposal of the émigrés. In Belgrade alone, two Russian churches were built with the support of the Serbian Patriarchate after 1920: Holy Trinity Church⁴⁷ in the center of Belgrade (near the Parliament) and the Chapel of the Iveron Icon of the Theotokos at the Russian cemetery in a suburb of Belgrade. Holy Trinity Church was built in a north Russian style, and its iconostasis was painted in the style of Andrew Rublev. Moreover, in this church, the wonderworking Kursk Icon of Theotokos, from the former Korennaya Hermitage, which since 1920 has been the principal holy object of the Church Abroad, was also venerated. The small church in honor of the Iveron Mother of God was a copy of the Moscow Church of the same name, which the Communists had destroyed. The iconostasis of this church was painted in the style of 19th century Russian Realism. Archimandrite Anthony (Bartosevich, later Archbishop of Western Europe) had frescoed the crypt and painted other icons in both churches as well.⁴⁸ Holy Trinity Church in Belgrade formed the church center for the several-thousand-strong Russian community. Here, many hierarchs of the Church Abroad were consecrate, and festive divine services were celebrated, in which often up to twelve bishops took part. At the cemetery near the Church of the Iveron Icon of the Theotokos émigré Russians, including Metropolitan Anthony, found their final resting place.⁴⁹

In Belgrade there were numerous educational institutions for Russian émigrés. Elementary and secondary schools, technical schools, and vocational courses of all types were instituted; libraries and cultural institutions were opened. The émigré professors received teaching positions at the universities and high schools of the country; students were able to continue their studies with government stipends. At the Belgrade Theological Faculty, sometimes as many as 200 Russian students were enrolled. Along with this there existed also political, economic and cultural unions and organizations. The Royal House and the Serbian Church financially supported the émigrés.⁵⁰

A total of 35,000-40,000 Russians lived in Yugoslavia.⁵¹ The majority of them, approximately 25,000, had come there after the evacuation of the Crimea, though large groups had begun to stream in as early as 1919 when the French began the first evacuations, and in the autumn of 1920, after the Bolshevik conquest of Novorossiisk.⁵² In February of 1920, the first group of Russian hierarchs arrived in Belgrade, including Archbishops Eulogius and George, and Bishops Metrophanes, Gabriel, and Apollinarius.⁵³ They were met by the Russian Ambassador N. Strandtman. On the same day, Metropolitan [later Patriarch] Demetrius granted them an audience in the residence of the primate.⁵⁴ The next day, Alexander, the Prince Regent (later King Alexander, 1921-1934) received them. Both Metropolitan Demetrius and the Prince Regent promised them every imaginable help and support, including a monthly stipend of 1,000 dinars.⁵⁵

The Metropolitan (Patriarch from 1921) invited the Russian bishops to make Serbian monasteries their temporary residence. The majority of the bishops lived in later years in these monasteries, which were located in the Frushka Mountains, some ten miles south of Karlovtsy. There were 15 Serbian monasteries there, on account of which this area was often spoken of as the “Serbian Athos.”⁵⁶

The friendly reception which these first émigré hierarchs found in Serbia caused other Russian bishops to come to Serbia by the autumn of 1921, including Metropolitan Anthony, to whom the Serbian Patriarchate offered the old summer residence in Sremsky-Karlovtsy as a permanent headquarters for administration. In addition to Metropolitan Anthony, who had been living in Serbia since February of 1921, Archbishop Theophanes of Poltava, Bishops Benjamin of Sevastopol, Michael of Alexandrovsk, Theophanes of Kursk, Sergius of Chernomorsk and Hermogenes of Ekaterinoslav emigrated to Yugoslavia.⁵⁷ In Karlovtsy, where Metropolitan Anthony resided, the First and Second Pan-Diaspora Councils met, as well as a dozen councils of Bishops of the Church Abroad. Here in the years 1934-35, the negotiations for the reconciliation of the schism of the church emigration took place. Numerous bishops of the Church Abroad traveled to the sessions of the Council of Bishops in Karlovtsy, including Metropolitans Platon and Theophilus from North America, Meletius from the Far East, Archbishops Anastasius, Seraphim, Tikhon, Nestor, and others.

The Russian hierarchs also promised to rejuvenate Serbian Orthodox church life. Thus, the nuns of the former Lesna Convent, who had first found refuge in Romanian Bessarabia, were invited to Serbia, where they found a new home in the former Serbian monastery in Hopovo in the Frushka Mountains. The invitation was accompanied by the hope that the convent would be able to reawaken Serbian woman’s monasticism. This wish was more than fulfilled in the 25 years the convent remained in Serbia; a total of 27 convents and communities of nuns were founded by the Lesna nuns. In many of the new Serbian convents, Russian nuns assumed the leadership and educated the Serbian sisters, who were enabled to lead and establish new convents. The Russian convent of the Lesna sisters took over the supervision of the Serbian convents. Not only Serbian woman’s monasticism reawakened through the efforts of the Church Abroad, but also Serbian men’s monasticism experienced new life through the influx of Russian monks. The Milkovo Monastery at Lapovo, in which some 25 Russian monks lived, was a spiritual and ecclesiastical center for both the Church Abroad and for the Serbian Church.⁵⁸ The great importance of the Russian Church emigration for the Serbian Church is clearly documented in the fact that the Serbian Patriarch transferred the supervision of Serbian monasteries and convents to Metropolitan Anthony, whereby the entire monastic life of the Serbian Church came under the spiritual supervision of the Church Abroad.

The leadership of the Russian communities in Yugoslavia was in the hands of Metropolitan Anthony from 1921 until 1936, then from 1936 until 1943/44 in the hands of Metropolitan Anastasius. After the outbreak of the War, the beginning of the Communist partisan struggle and the creation of the Croatian Ustashi state, the bloodiest epoch in the history of the Serbian Church, began. The Russian émigré communities were also caught up in this persecution. In the first months of 1943 alone, five Russian priests were murdered by Communist partisans.⁵⁹ The

Lesna Convent was attacked and pillaged many times and finally burnt down in 1943. Monks, nuns, clergy, and faithful fled the war zone and retreated to the larger cities, whence finally many fled from the advancing Soviet troops to Germany in 1943/44.

In the spring of 1945, representatives of the Moscow Patriarchate entered Belgrade in order to negotiate the annexation of the Russian communities in the country. The representatives of the State, which in the meantime had come to be ruled by Communists, received these emissaries in a friendly manner. The Serbian Church, which had supported the émigré Church – alienated from the [Moscow] Patriarchate – conducted itself in a reserved manner and did not participate in numerous receptions. The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate generally reported that the Russian émigrés there had expressed the wish to be reunited with the Mother Church and to return to the Soviet Union, though this did not actually reflect the facts, as was shown later after the break between Tito and Stalin,⁶⁰ when the Yugoslav government permitted the Russian émigrés to emigrate to the West. Many refugees who had not left the country in time in 1944 now arrived in the West, including the sisters of the Lesna Convent, Archimandrite Anthony (Bartosevich), and many clergymen. After 1944, Archpriest Neklyudov first took over the leadership of the Russian communities; he was the rector of Holy Trinity Church in Belgrade, then Archpriest Sokal, and from 1950, Archpriest Tarasiev.⁶¹ In 1954, contacts were resumed between the Russian Patriarchal Church and the Serbian Church, the Russian Church subordinated all the communities and churches to the Serbian Church and retained only the Russian Holy Trinity Church in Belgrade under its jurisdiction, which has since then served as the Russian Church's representation to the Serbian Church.⁶²

Approximately 30,000 Russians emigrated to Czechoslovakia.⁶³ Above all else, these were the members of the Russian intelligentsia, who were politically on the liberal, left-wing of the emigration and were primarily anticlerical. Among the refugees there were 5,000 students and nearly 1,500 professors, teachers, academicians, and artists.⁶⁴ Most of the students were able to continue their studies at Czech universities with government stipends; professors and teachers received positions in schools and high schools there. After the émigrés established their own academic institutes, including the Russian Faculty, the Handel Academy, the People's University and other institutions, many of them taught at these.⁶⁵

In many spa resorts in Czechoslovakia, there were Russian churches that had been founded in the 19th century, when Russian families traveled to these baths to “take the cure”. There were churches in Marienbad, Franzenbad, Karlsbad, Pilsen, and Pressburg. In Prague, there was the Russian Church of St. Nicholas and, at the Russian (Olshinsky) Cemetery, the Chapel of the Dormition, which was under Bishop Sergius (Korolev), who joined Metropolitan Eulogius.

All Russian parishes belonged to Metropolitan Eulogius' West European Diocese. According to the decisions of the Council of Bishops of 1923, Metropolitan Eulogius was supposed to create vicariates, including a vicariate for the Russian community in Czechoslovakia. After the Polish authorities expelled Bishop Sergius (Korolev), Metropolitan Eulogius appointed Bishop Sergius vicar bishop of Czechoslovakia with his see in Prague. The vicariate belonged to the Church Abroad for two more years; then Bishop Sergius joined the Paris Jurisdiction after the schism of

1926. Of the communities, only a part of the Prague parishes and the communities in Brunn and Pressburg joined in this break.⁶⁶

Until the National Socialist new order for Central Europe, this situation remained unchanged. After the establishment of the Central European Metropolitanate, whose head was Metropolitan Seraphim (Lade), the communities of the “Protectorate” [Czechoslovakia] were united with the Church Abroad upon the demands of the National Socialist rulers. Bishop Gorazd was martyred. Bishop Sergius joined the Synod. Yet this church restructuring was not of long duration. With the Soviet invasion, the Church Abroad also lost its parishes in Czechoslovakia.

They were then made subject to the Moscow Patriarchate, which maintained an exarchate in Czechoslovakia until 1951, when the Orthodox Autocephalous Church of Czechoslovakia took over all the parishes.⁶⁷ Bishop Sergius (Korolev), who remained in Prague, as well as the Bishops of the Ukrainian Autonomous Orthodox Church, who were overtaken in their flight to the West by the Soviet troops, were forced to recognize the Moscow Patriarchate and to “return to the homeland.” These were Bishops Daniel (Yuzviuk), Anthony (Marchenko), and John (Lavrinenko).⁶⁸

The spiritual and ecclesiastical center of the Russian emigration in Czechoslovakia from the mid-1920s was, however, the Monastery of St. Job in Lodomirova in eastern Slovakia (Kreis Svidnik).⁶⁹ The Orthodox in the Carpathians had been part of the Serbian Orthodox Church since 1919, because of a pact between Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, which gave Serbia rightful jurisdiction over the Diocese of Preshov-Mukachevo. Bishop Vladimir (Liubomir Raich) was the ruling bishop. After many Uniates in this area left the Unia and returned to Orthodoxy, a plan was developed to establish an Orthodox Mission there, which would minister to the faithful with literature and care for their souls. Lodomirova was chosen as the location for this; the inhabitants there had been the first to have left the Unia and return to Orthodoxy.⁷⁰

Archimandrite Vitalis (Maximenko), who planned to build a monastery with a printing press, took over the direction of the Mission.⁷¹ In the course of a few years, he had founded the Monastery of St. Job of Pochaev and the printing press of the same name, which became the most significant printing press of the Church Abroad before World War II. Many renowned hierarchs have originated from the brotherhood of the monastery, such as Archbishop Vitalis (Maximenko), Archbishop Seraphim (Ivanov), Metropolitan Vitalis (Ustinov), Bishop Nathaniel (Lvov), Archbishop Laurus (Skurla), and others. The Brotherhood fled to Germany and overseas before the advancing Soviet troops in 1944. Many of the Church Abroad’s present-day monasteries and printing presses would be hard to imagine without the St. Job Brotherhood.

Except for the Church of the Archangel Michael, the monastery in Lodomirova was destroyed.⁷² In Hungary, according to the census of 1930, 1,687 Russian émigrés lived.⁷³ They cared for a small church in Budapest. After the schism of 1926, this community divided. From that time, there were two Russian parishes in Budapest, which belonged to the two different jurisdictions.⁷⁴ After the outbreak of the World War II, both parishes, as well as the Hungarian-speaking Orthodox communities, were united with the Church Abroad and placed under the direction of a Russian priest. After the Soviet occupation of Hungary, the Moscow Patriarchate

established a Russian deanery for the Orthodox communities under its jurisdiction. The Russian parish had hardly any faithful after 1945 because most émigrés had fled to the West.⁷⁵

Footnotes

1. Dubanaitis, pp.153-154; Laatsi, pp. 63-73; Kahle, pp. 89-107. *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie 1976/77*, pp. 37-38, 158-160, 163-164. ↵
2. *Prav Rus'* (1938) 1, p. 2. ↵
3. On the situation of Orthodoxy in Poland between the wars, see Lissek, *Orthodoxe Kirche in Polen*; Verdernikov, *Delo polskoi tserkvi*; Zheleznyakovich, *K istorii... v Polshe*; Popov, *Gonenie... v Polshe*. After the re-annexation of this territory by the Soviet Union, there was a movement to revive Orthodoxy, which was particularly directed against the Uniates, whose Church was forbidden. ↵
4. Cf. Part V; Dubnaitis, p. 153. ↵
5. K. Soop, & U. Keskkjula, *Kuremyaevsky monastyr'*; Zybkovets, p. 127. ↵
6. *JMP* (1945) 4, pp. 3-6. ↵
7. Dubnaitis, p. 154. ↵
8. Zybkovets, p. 127. ↵
9. Cf. Part I, Chap. 3, note 30. ↵
10. Balevic, p. 13 – This work by Balevic explains the development of the Latvian Church. Despite its Marxist Soviet standpoint, it includes important facts on the history of Orthodoxy in Latvia. Cf. also Part I, Chap. 3, note 11. ↵
11. Balevic, pp. 14-15. ↵
12. *Prav. Rus'* (1955) 21, p. 12; “The Orthodox Church Under German Occupation” in *Eastern Churches Review* (1974) pp. 131-161. ↵
13. Metropolitan Vladimir, pp. 156-157: on the biography of Metropolitan Panteleimon. ↵
14. *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie 1976/77*, pp. 158-162. ↵
15. On the history of the Ukrainian and Belorussian Autonomous Orthodox Churches, cf. Part I, Chap. 6, p. 75f. ↵
16. Glubokovsky, *Voina i mir*; Zheleznyakovich, *Finlandskaya tserkov'*; *Tserkovnye Vedomosti* (1924) 19-20, p. 6. ↵
17. *Prav. Rus'* (1937) 11, p. 5. From 1945 there were parishes in Vyborg and Helsingfors, which belonged to the Patriarchal Church: *JMP* (1945) 11, pp. 5-13; (1953) 9, pp. 7-18; (1959) 1, pp. 60-63; *Russische Orthodoxe Kirche* “Einrichtungen,” p. 161. ↵
18. Cf. Part I, Chap. 4. ↵

19. In Czechoslovakia after 1922 there was a small Czech Orthodox Church under the leadership of a former Catholic, Bishop Gorazd (Pavlik), to which 1,000 faithful belonged. This Church was under the jurisdiction of the Serbian Church. ↵
20. Grabbe, *Tserkov' i uchenie* 1, pp. 267-268. ↵
21. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 7, p. 234. ↵
22. After the Soviet annexation of this territory, the Serbian Church relinquished its diocese, which in turn became part of the Russian Church. *Russie et Chretiente* (1947) pp. 89-90; *JMP* (1945) 11, pp. 14-19; (1950) 4, pp. 10-18. ↵
23. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, p. 16. ↵
24. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, pp. 6-11. ↵
25. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Eveques Russes*, p. 18; *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 2, p. 9; *Ibid.* 3, pp. 7-8. ↵
26. *Ibid.*, 11-12, p. 12. ↵
27. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, p. 12. ↵
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-15. ↵
29. Anastasius, *Sbornik*, pp. 12-13. ↵
30. Cf. Part V, Chap. 3. ↵
31. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 10-11, p. 12; (1922) 14-15, p. 4. ↵
32. *Prav. Rus'* (1966) 18, p. 13; (1976) 22, p. 13. ↵
33. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, p. 32. ↵
34. Volkmann, p. 6. ↵
35. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 375-376. ↵
36. *Ibid.*, p. 438. ↵
37. *JMP* (1950) 4, pp. 21-28. ↵
38. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 5. ↵
39. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1934), p. 138. ↵
40. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, p. 33. ↵
41. *Deyaniya Karlovtsakh*, p. 75; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1934) p. 138. ↵
42. *Pravoslavny Russky Kalendar'* (1927), p. 36. ↵
43. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*; Ermakov. ↵

44. *JMP* (1945) 5, pp. 19-24; (1945) 9, pp. 29-44; (1946) 6, pp. 3-19. ↵
45. *Ibid.* (1952) 7, pp. 32-46; (1953) 7, pp. 16-21. ↵
46. *Ibid.* (1978) 10, pp. 36-39; *Russische Orthodoxe Kirche*, “Einrichtungen,” p. 162. ↵
47. Cf. the photographs of churches in *Russ. Prav.* Ts. 1, p. 41. On the history of both churches, see Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10, p. 223. ↵
48. *JMP* (1946) 5, pp. 37-44. ↵
49. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10, p. 223. ↵
50. *Ibid.*, 5, pp. 27-31, 73-138. ↵
51. Volkmann, p. 6. ↵
52. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, p. 73. ↵
53. Bishop George of Minsk returned to Poland, where he died in 1923. Bishop Metrophanes of Sumi later joined the Serbian Patriarchate. ↵
54. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, p. 27. ↵
55. *Ibid.*, pp. 27, 74. All émigré bishops later received these allowances from the Yugoslav government, which established a “State Committee for the Support of the Russian Refugees in the Country.” ↵
56. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 366. ↵
57. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, p. 28. ↵
58. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
59. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1943) 5, p. 75. ↵
60. *JMP* (1945) 6, pp. 18-28; (1946) 5, pp. 27-44. This is a detailed report on the meetings with representatives of the government. There is no mention of a meeting with representatives of the Serbian Church. Cf. *JMP* (1948) 1, pp. 66-69; (1948) 7, p. 64. ↵
61. Cf. Part II, Chap. 1, p. 85; *JMP* (1956) 5, pp. 67-75. ↵
62. *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche*, “Einrichtungen,” pp. 161-162. ↵
63. Volkmann, p. 6. ↵
64. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, pp. 34-35. ↵
65. *Ibid.*, p. 34. ↵
66. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 459-461; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, p. 234. ↵
67. *JMP* (1945) 11, pp. 14-21. ↵

68. In the spirit of “new Soviet Patriotism,” they reported on their “return to the homeland,” which they had left only a few weeks earlier, cf. *JMP* (1946) 9, pp. 54-64. ↵
69. Seide, “*Klöster im Ausland/Monasteries*”. ↵
70. Vitalis, p. 193; Heger, p. 20ff.; *JMP* (1957) 5, pp. 61-65. ↵
71. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 3. ↵
72. *Tserkovnaya letopis'* [Lausanne] (1946) pp. 28-29. ↵
73. Seide, *Ungarische Kirche*, p. 108. ↵
74. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1942) 7, pp. 108-110. ↵
75. Seide, *Ungarische Kirche*, pp. 110-113; *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche*, “Einrichtungen,” pp. 159-160; *JMP* (1954) 4, pp. 13-15. ↵

Part IV, Chapter 1.3

The Dioceses in China and Manchuria

Since the 17th century, there has been a presence of the Russian Orthodox Church in Peking: the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission. This Mission cared for a small Orthodox colony which consisted of the descendants of former prisoners of war, merchants, and diplomats.¹ The real significance of this mission existed for two centuries in the area of research: they translated books from the Chinese, published dictionaries, and built an extensive library on the culture and history of China. From the second half of the 19th century onwards, religious literature was translated from Russian into Chinese: the New Testament, the writings of the Holy Fathers, the Psalter, and liturgical books. These translations formed the precondition for a successful mission, which was set up at the turn of the century. For two hundred years, the Mission cared for only some 200 Russian faithful. Then, in 1906, there were 650 people. In the following years until the outbreak of World War I, the number increased drastically: in the years 1906-1910, there were between 200 and 300 baptisms, later even 500. In 1913, there were 3,812 Orthodox Chinese; two years later there were already 5,587.²

This new development of the Mission was largely dependent upon Archimandrite Innocent (Figurovsky, d. 1931 as Metropolitan). He came to Peking as the head of the Mission in March of 1897 and implemented the following program: (1) the founding of a monastery and social security for the missionaries, (2) daily divine services (liturgies) in Chinese, (3) institutions for the support of needy Albazines,³ (4) the dispatching of missionaries from Peking into the country's interior, (5) the building up of parishes and parish work, and (6) the establishment of local social centers.⁴

Also, instruction at the two existing schools was to be reorganized and a third school founded. Furthermore, there was a plan to publish a regular church periodical. This journal *The Chinese Messenger* (*Kitaisky Blagovestnik*) appeared regularly from 1902 to 1956: however, already in the years 1896-97, individual issues had appeared at irregular intervals. When the journal began it was a constant 16 pages in length and was printed in Harbin; later, each issue appeared with 30 to 40 pages. Most articles originated with Bishop (from 1902) Innocent and the members of the Mission. Besides entries of a purely academic nature, there were also those with a general ecclesiastical and religious content and missionary questions. From 1907, the journal was published in Peking.⁵ Also, from 1904 there was the journal *News of the Brotherhood of the Orthodox Church in China* (*Izvestiya Bratstva Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi v Kitaye*), which lasted only a few years and was later merged with *The Messenger*.

By Synodal Resolution No. 1348 of 26 March 1901, the head of the Mission, Archimandrite Innocent, was appointed bishop, and China was raised to the standing of an independent diocese, with Peking as the episcopal residence. In June of 1902, Innocent was consecrated Bishop of Peking & China.⁶ The new bishop's jurisdiction extended not only over China, but also over all the parishes along the 1700-mile Eastern Chinese Railroad, and also over parts of Manchuria, and over Mongolia, which had been dominated by Russia for centuries and was under Russian

influence. Subject to the bishop in the years 1912-13 were 2 archimandrites, 15 priests, 26 monks and novices, 15 churches, 34 missionary outposts and chapels, 5 cemeteries, a hospice for the elderly with 34 residents, a seminary, 10 boys' schools and 2 girls' schools with a total of 403 students. In 1916, the following belonged to the Mission: the Monastery of the Ascension in Peking, the hermitage of the Elevation of the Cross near Peking, a convent in Peking, 5 monastery churches in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Harbin and Dalny (Manchuria), 19 churches, including 4 in Peking, 32 mission churches, 14 of which were in the Chihli Province, 12 in the Province of Hupeh, 4 in the Province of Hunan, 1 in Tsien-fu and 1 in Mongolia (Urga), also 5 cemetery chapels, 11 boys' schools, and 3 girls' schools.⁷

This budding mission church had within fifteen years established a network of mission stations, churches, and schools, and baptized 6,000 Chinese. This work suffered a serious setback during World War I, the Russian Revolution and the subsequent Civil War: relations with the homeland and the Mother Church were nearly severed, and all financial support was halted. A stream of needy refugees flooded the country. Simultaneously, Russian émigré communities came into existence everywhere, and for Orthodoxy in China, there was a new beginning.

The success shown by the Russian Orthodox Mission in China in the fifteen years prior to the outbreak of the Russian Revolution led to a proposal at the 1917/18 Pan-Russia Council, which met in Moscow, by Archimandrite Simon ([Vinogradov], later head of the Mission) to reorient the missionary work in China and the administration of the diocese and to set the diocese upon a sound financial basis. The Council was, however, unable to consider this proposal.⁸ In consequence, the Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking, as well as the numerous Russian communities in Manchuria, had to rely upon themselves alone, and after the severing of relations with the Mother Church, had to master the new situation by itself.

While the task of the Russian Church in Manchuria was principally the care of Russian settlers who had lived there since the end of the 18th century, the Church in China itself was a that of a genuine missionary church for the native population. This also explains the later administrative division.

In 1921, initial contacts were made between the Diocese of China and the SCA, which had by then established itself in Karlovtsy (Yugoslavia). In the summer of 1922, Archimandrite Simon (Vinogradov) was consecrated vicar bishop of Shanghai. Archbishop Innocent ruled the Diocese of Peking & China and the vicariate of Shanghai. For Manchuria, a separate diocese was created, which Archbishop Methodius (Gerasimov) of Orenburg ruled. In June of 1922, the Synod of the ROCOR empowered Archbishop Innocent to consecrate a second vicar bishop for the Diocese of Peking, namely Archimandrite Jonah, for the new vicariate of Tientsin.⁹ In this way, the organizational structure of the Russian communities in China was rearranged.

The Diocese of China received yet another vicar bishop when Archimandrite Juvenal (Kilin) was appointed vicar bishop of Tsintsan in Chinese East Turkestan, for the spiritual care of the Russian émigrés there. Juvenal was, however, unable to travel to Sinkiang, which was under Soviet influence, and returned to Harbin in 1936. Juvenal's appointment was presumably in connection with the visit of the Patriarchal locum tenens, Sergius (Stragorodsky), who had

placed the émigré communities in Sinkiang under his own jurisdiction. In April of 1934, Sergius had named Archpriest Sergius Tchen, who was one of the oldest acting Chinese Orthodox priests in China, as “rector of the Orthodox Mission” in Sinkiang and “administrator of the Orthodox communities in China”; thus, he became head of the Orthodox Churches in China in practice and subject to the jurisdiction of Archbishop Sergius of Tokyo. Thereupon, Bishop Victor (Svyatin) deposed Tchen and appointed the Chinese Elias Wen as archpriest of the communities in Sinkiang. Consequently, Tchen returned to the Karlovtsy Jurisdiction. ¹⁰

For Manchuria, Bishop Demetrius (Voznesensky, the father of Metropolitan Philaret) was appointed vicar bishop with his see in Khailar. This administrative structure of the Church Abroad’s Far East Province remained intact until 1945 in Manchuria and 1949 in China. After the outbreak of World War II, relations with the Karlovtsy Synod were again broken, and both dioceses were again left on their own. Under the Bishop of Peking & China, the vicar bishops came in the following order chronologically. From 1922, Bishop Jonah resided as a vicar bishop in Tientsin; in 1925, he died at the age of 34 in Tsitsihar. The next time a vicar bishop was consecrated for Tientsin was in 1950. The Moscow Patriarchate granted Bishop Simon Du this title, though in the same year he received the title of Vicar Bishop of Shanghai, when the Vicar Bishop of Shanghai up to that time, Bishop John (Maximovich), who belonged to the Church Abroad, left China. Archimandrite Basil, out of humility, refused the appointment as Vicar Bishop of Tientsin. On 30 May 1957, Patriarch Alexis consecrated him Bishop of Peking. The following bore the title “Vicar Bishop of Shanghai” in sequence: Bishop Simon (Vinogradov) 1922-32, Bishop Victor (Svyatin) 1932, Bishop John (Maximovich) 1934-49 for the Church Abroad; and Bishop Juvenal (Kilin) 1946-50 for the Moscow Patriarchate. In the last twelve years of the diocese’s existence (until 1962), the Chinese Bishop Simon (Du) headed it. The Diocese of Peking & China, and simultaneously the Ecclesiastical Mission, were ruled by Bishop Innocent (Figurovsky) from 1902-31, Bishop Simon (Vinogradov) 1931-33, Bishop Victor (Svyatin) from 1933-56, who returned to the Moscow Patriarchate in 1945, and finally Bishop Basil (Shuan) from 1957-62. After its establishment in 1922, the Diocese of Harbin & Manchuria was ruled for ten years by Bishop Methodius (Gerasimov) and, from 1932 to 1946, by Bishop Meletius (Zaborovsky) (from the autumn of 1945 under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate.) After his death, the Moscow Patriarchate assigned Bishop Nestor (Anisimov) to administer the Diocese of Harbin & Manchuria. Bishop Nestor was apparently arrested in 1947, after which the diocese remained vacant until 1950 when Bishop Nicander (Viktorov) administered it until his return to the USSR in 1956. Thereafter, the Diocese remained vacant. The following vicar bishops were subject to the Bishop of Harbin: in 1941, Bishop Juvenal was named Vicar Bishop of Tsitsihar and bore this title until 1946. Bishop Nicander (Viktorov) received, as Bishop of Zizikar, a Moscow Patriarchate delegation under the direction of Bishop Nestor (Sidoruk), which visited the parishes of Manchuria. ¹¹ Bishop Nicander presumably bore the title of Vicar Bishop of Tsitsihar in the years 1946-50 and was then named Bishop of Harbin. There was also the title of “Vicar Bishop of Khailar,” which Bishop Demetrius (Voznesensky) bore from 1934-46. (In 1946, he joined the Moscow Patriarchate; like many others, he had been convinced by the extensive Soviet propaganda campaign in the Far East that the Soviet Union had changed for the better after the War and that the Church would be free, and so he returned to Russia). After the establishment of the Chinese Autonomous Orthodox Church in 1957, the

Diocese of Harbin & Manchuria was no longer occupied, and likewise, the titles of the vicariates were no longer granted.

The Moscow Patriarchate maintained the Russian Church Abroad's administrative structure [in that region] of two dioceses with vicariates, while it simultaneously received the Church Abroad's bishops into its jurisdiction. The single exception was Bishop John (Maximovich), who refused to recognize Moscow's jurisdiction and continued to belong to the Church Abroad. Archbishop Victor (Svyatin) was appointed Archbishop of Krasnodar & Kuban upon his return in 1956, and finally Metropolitan of this diocese. Bishop Juvenal (Kilin), who was named the vicar bishop of Shanghai in 1946, returned to the USSR in 1947 and was named Bishop of Chelyabinsk & Zlatoust. Bishop Nestor (Anisimov) was elevated to the rank of Metropolitan of Novosibirsk & Barnaul. Bishops Meletius (Zaborovsky) and Demetrius (Voznesensky) died in 1946 and 1947, respectively [Trans., the latter under suspicious circumstances].

The stream of refugees that flowed into Manchuria and China after 1920 led to the establishment of many communities and churches there. An estimated count of refugees is 200,000-250,000, most of whom lived in Manchuria. Another 15,000-20,000 refugees lived in Chinese East Turkestan (Sinkiang) and founded seven parishes there, centered in Urumchi. This province came under Soviet influence in the 1920s and 1930s and retained only a loose connection (as an autonomous province) with the rest of China. In China itself – without Manchuria and Sinkiang – there lived, according to information from the “People's Union,” around 76,000 refugees in 1927.¹² Considering that before the Revolution the number of Orthodox in China without Manchuria was around 6,000, the growth of the already existing communities from the influx of these refugees can be measured. This, however, only applied to the communities in Manchuria. In China proper, the Chinese communities continued to exist autonomously, as also under the Bishop of Peking and consequently under the Church Abroad. The Chinese communities held for their faithful their own schools, social organizations, and various other charitable institutions, whereas the Russian émigrés built up their own communities. Only in a few instances were their communities of Chinese and Russians mixed. This was mostly the case when the Russian colonies were too small to establish their own parishes.¹³

The ecclesiastical province of the Far East, its hierarchs, and its faithful formed a pillar of the Church Abroad from 1920 onwards. There was never any doubt about their canonical loyalty to the Church Abroad could arise. In contrast to the bishops in North America and the group around Metropolitan Eulogius, they never doubted the canonical rectitude of the Church Abroad. They recognized the Synod as its presiding head and the Council of Bishops as the supreme church authority for the emigration. After the arrest of Patriarch Tikhon and Metropolitan Sergius' Declaration, they expressed themselves decidedly for separation from the Moscow Patriarchal Church. Thus, Archbishop Innocent sent an epistle to Metropolitan Anthony in January of 1925, asking that he allow himself to be proclaimed the first hierarch of the whole Russian Church since Patriarch Tikhon was no longer able to make decisions freely.¹⁴ This time, as they already had in earlier cases, the majority of the émigré bishops rejected this plan,¹⁵ though similar plans always kept resurfacing.

The bishops in the Far East also pursued a certain decentralization of the Church, in order to simplify the administration, yet this never resulted in a dissolution of the Synod of Bishops.¹⁶ The bishops of the Far East also condemned the schism of 1926 most sternly. Significantly, Archbishop Innocent presided over the Council of Bishops of 1928, which dealt with Metropolitan Eulogius' schism and Metropolitan Sergius' Declaration.¹⁷ For their canonical loyalty to the central ecclesiastical leadership, Archbishops Innocent and Methodius were elevated to the rank of Metropolitan and granted the right to wear a cross on their white klobuks.¹⁸ In the province of the Far East, Harbin and Peking formed the two ecclesiastical and cultural centers: for the Russian émigrés – Harbin, for the Chinese Orthodox communities – Peking with the Ecclesiastical Mission. Harbin in Manchuria, which, at the turn of the century, had been a trade outpost with only 12,000 inhabitants, had approximately 500,000 in the 1930s. In each part of the city, there were Russian communities with their own churches. The Church Abroad had over 20 churches in the city, a monastery and a convent, a metochion of the Peking and Kamachatka Mission, and numerous church educational institutions.¹⁹ Whereas in 1920, for example, there were only four Russian secondary schools in the city, in 1930 there were already 20 schools.²⁰

In the city, there were, however, not only communities and institutions of the Church Abroad. The city was also the see of a bishop of the Russian Catholics. This group had its own high school (St. Alexander Nevsky Gymnasium). The diocese published its own diocesan newsletter from 1931, which appeared monthly and was 30 pages long. In addition to the community of Russian Catholics, there was also an even larger community of Old Believers, and a few smaller communities of Molokans, Seventh-Day Adventists, Pentecostals, and Lutheran-Evangelicals in the city. These communities also had their own church schools (Sunday schools) and published their own church newspapers.²¹

In addition to these numerically important Russian colonies, there existed a large Russian community in Shanghai, with 20,000 faithful, a community in Tientsin, with 5,000 and a community in Mukden, with 2,000 faithful.²² After the Japanese occupation of Manchuria, many Russians left the country and traveled to China, where they joined the already existing communities.

There were some 50 communities and 70 churches in the Harbin Diocese. Along the western railroad line (Harbin to Tsitsihar) lay 19 churches; on the eastern stretch (Harbin to Blagoveshchensk) 9 churches; and on the southern line (Harbin to Kilin) four churches.²³ The majority of these churches were built between 1920 and 1945. In the years 1930-45 alone 27 churches were erected.²⁴

The most important church was St. Nicholas Cathedral, which served as the episcopal cathedral. The largest church was the Cathedral of the Annunciation, which held 2,000 worshippers.²⁵ During the Cultural Revolution (1965-66), most of the churches were destroyed; the larger ones were turned into beer halls, a circus, and a restaurant.²⁶

The largest church structure of the emigration period was the Convent of the Vladimir Icon of the Theotokos,²⁷ which was under the direction of Abbess Rufina, and which became a new

home for many refugee nuns. In 1939, thirty nuns belonged to the Convent, which ran an orphanage and home for the elderly. After the Red Army occupied Manchuria, the nuns fled to Shanghai, and from there traveled to the U.S. In Shanghai, they stayed in its sister convent, which had been established in the 1920s. Sixty-four nuns belonged to the combined convents; they cared for 150 orphans and elderly. The plans to resettle in the U.S. were later realized by Abbess Rufina's successor, Mother Ariadne, who, together with her fellow nuns, established a new convent near San Francisco.

Those monks who fled after the Revolution laid the cornerstone for the building of the Monastery of the Kazan Theotokos in 1922.²⁸ The monastery was subject to Archimandrite Juvenal (Kilin). It took ten years to build the entire complex: in 1925, the church of the same name was consecrated; in 1929, a printing press was completed, in 1931 a home for the poor and elderly together with a pharmacy was able to function and the building of a hospital was begun. The monastery also had numerous workshops and handicraft businesses: a locksmith, a book bindery, a tailor, joinery and an icon workshop. Two archimandrites, seven hieromonks, four hierodeacons, eight monks and forty novices, workers and their families were attached to the monastery. The monastery distinguished itself by its charitable and missionary activities. On the monastery's own printing press, church journals, church calendars, prayerbooks, gospels, and other literature were published and attained noteworthy circulation.²⁹ In the monastery's medical center, which included a hospital, an outpatient clinic, a pharmacy, and medical practitioners, 2,763 patients were handled in the years 1931-39 and 61,802 patients were examined – 27,970 of them free of charge. In the apothecary, 30,737 prescriptions were filled, most of them free of charge or at a nominal cost.³⁰

The social work carried out by the monastery has never had any parallel in the Church since then. This work was made possible thanks to the considerable profits generated by its handicrafts and printing press. The brotherhood of the monastery was able to support itself on its what it produced itself; this enabled them to utilize all profits for charitable and missionary work.

Beginning in 1932, émigré circles considered founding an institution of higher learning (a university) with various faculties. After a two-year preparatory period, the Institute of St. Vladimir opened with four faculties in the summer of 1934: a theological faculty under the direction of Archimandrite Basil (Pavlovsky, later Bishop of Vienna), an economics and science faculty, a faculty of architecture, and one for electrical engineering. (The late First Hierarch of the Church Abroad, Metropolitan Philaret Voznesensky received his education on the electrical engineering faculty.) The Institute received financial support from the YMCA and the St. Vladimir Brotherhood, which was also established in 1934 and pursued the goal of educating the émigré youth in the "spirit of Holy Russia." In the first academic year, a total of 177 students studied at the Institute, 40 of whom studied at the Theological Faculty. Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky) was the Honorary Chairman, Archbishop Meletius was the Honorary President, and Bishop Demetrius was the Rector. The First Minister of State of Manchukuo became the patron and promised his support. He was represented on the Institute's Council by a Japanese of the Orthodox Faith (M. Nakamura). The theological faculty claimed to be the direct successor of the theological academies in Russia. The annual number of students who attended it was between

30 and 40. This theological faculty (academy) was supplemented by the addition of a theological seminary in 1938, for the education of priests and deacons.³¹

Metropolitan Methodius, who had ruled the diocese for ten years and had had the responsibility of establishing and organizing the émigré communities, died in 1932. His successor was Archbishop Meletius, who was elevated to the rank of Metropolitan in 1939, on the 50th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. Under Meletius, community life was consolidated, the real building period having already been completed. Simultaneously, relations with the Synod of Bishops in Karlovtsy became more firmly based: from 1931/32, yearly reports on the life of the diocese were sent to Karlovtsy, and it was determined that the head of the diocese, in this case, Bishop Nestor, who lived in Harbin, should visit each church and community every three years. The diocesan administration was expanded by adding the following commissions: a revision committee, a council for the mission, and a control commission for religious instruction, with three subdivisions.³²

During the years 1941-45, the Diocese of Harbin had 4 bishops, 217 priests, 70 churches, 3 monasteries, and approximately 100,000 faithful.³³ During the Japanese occupation, from 1943 to 1944, much pressure was put upon the communities and the priests, by which community life was severely hindered. Numerous faithful fled to China just before and during this occupation.

A new influx of émigrés began later, in 1945, during the Red Army invasion of Manchuria. After the Japanese Occupation, the Red Army was met by many émigrés as if they were liberators. At the same time, the Soviet occupation meant the end of the Karlovtsy Jurisdiction in this territory. The Moscow Patriarchate sent Bishop Eleutherius (Vorontsev) of Rostov & Taganrog to Manchuria to prepare the émigré communities to return to the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. The exchange of greetings between the hierarchy in Manchuria and the Patriarchate later led to the reunification of the separated churches.

Until his death on 6 April 1946, Metropolitan Meletius remained head of the Diocese of Harbin. Thereafter Archbishop Nestor (Anistimov) ruled the Manchurian communities. The Moscow Patriarchate elevated Nestor to the rank of Metropolitan of Harbin & Manchuria; the diocese was reclassified as an exarchate. At the same time, the newly founded Exarchate of East Asia also encompassed the Chinese communities, which at this time were still subject to the Church Abroad. From the time of Nestor's arrest in 1947, the communities of Manchuria were left on their own.

After the Communist takeover in China, which reunited China and Manchuria, all Orthodox communities in the People's Republic of China were made directly subject to the Bishop of Peking. Thus, for the first time, a central administrator of the entire territory, formerly the Church Abroad's Far East Province, became possible, though it led to the Diocese of Harbin's loss of importance.

In contrast to Manchuria, where Harbin was the undisputed center, in China there were two equal Orthodox centers: the Archdiocese of Peking with the Ecclesiastical Mission and the Diocese of Shanghai with its community of 20,000 émigrés.³⁴ Whereas in the Shanghai community the Russians set the tone, in the Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking, the Chinese element played a

noticeable rôle, especially in the smaller communities of the other cities. The later priests of the Chinese Autonomous Orthodox Churches were almost all from these communities. After 1918, missionary ideas were most strongly represented here, a fact supported by the abundance of religious literature in Chinese in Peking and Shanghai.

Furthermore, in Peking, Shanghai, and Tientsin, the Orthodox Chinese had their own schools. The main difficulty for the continuance of a successful mission lay in insufficient financial support; the emigration was not in any position to help. Only with the consolidation of the communities could this pre-Revolutionary work be taken up again, with the support of the émigrés. In Peking, Shanghai, Tientsin, Zindao, and Mukden, catechism courses for the native population were instituted in the 1930s. At the Ecclesiastical Mission, of the nine clergies, four were Chinese: Protodeacon Eumenius In, Missionary Archpriest Michael Min, Basil De, Archpriest of the Ascension Cathedral, and Archpriest Vladimir Du. Also belonging to the Mission were Archimandrite Pachomius, Abbot Nathaniel, numerous monks, and fifteen nuns of the convent. On the Mission's land, there were extensive farm buildings, workshops and gardens, a printing press and a library with over 4,000 volumes on the history and culture of China.

In all larger communities, there was considerable building activity in the 1920s. After the Shanghai church was destroyed in 1927 during the Chinese Civil War, the members of the community collected \$31,000 for its rebuilding in just a few years.

The exact number of communities in China cannot be determined. In the Peking Diocese alone, which was the most important, there were 17 parishes, 4 monasteries, 5 metochia, and 23 cemeteries with chapels. Bishop John (Maximovich) of Shanghai also had authority outside of China over Russian communities in Hong Kong, Macão, Manila, and the communities in Canton and Tsindao. In Chinese East Turkestan (Sinkiang), there were other seven Orthodox communities, in which the Chinese remained the liturgical language; after 1948, Archpriest Demetrius (Mlodanovsky) undertook an energetic missionary activity there.

Most churches had community centers with parochial schools, libraries and community halls. In addition to these, social and charitable institutions were established with the support of the Church: in Tientsin, there was an asylum and a home for invalids to which the old, sick, the mentally handicapped and the crippled were admitted. The poor and needy received free meals there and came daily from the city and surrounding areas, where they lived. In other cities, there were similar social centers and schools.³⁵

After the outbreak of the Chinese Civil War, the head of the Mission, Archbishop Victor (Svyatin), joined the Moscow Patriarchate, whereas Bishop John of Shanghai remained true to the Church Abroad. During a visit to Shanghai, Victor was accused, at the request of Bishop John (Maximovich), of being a "Communist agent," and was arrested by the nationalist Chinese authorities.³⁶

Before the Communist takeover in 1949, some 50,000-60,000 Russians left the country and went to the West (Australia, North and South America).³⁷ This emigration lasted until the mid-1960s and included groups of up to 1,000 persons.³⁸ The majority of these refugees were from China, whereas the Russians who lived in Manchuria were forced to return to the Soviet Union. This

also applied to the Russian priests, who, in 1956, except for individual priests who refused to take Soviet passports, had to leave the country. Archimandrite Philaret, later First Hierarch of the Church Abroad, was among those clergy who refused to return to the Soviet Union. In 1957, he was offered a passport to travel to the West, but he did not take this, because he wanted to remain with his small flock in Harbin, where, at this time, only a few hundred of the once 45,000 still lived. Only in 1962 did he leave, via Hong Kong for Australia.³⁹

For the refugees, who left the country between 1945 and 1949, communities were founded in South East Asia, which continued in existence until the 1950s. There were such communities in the Philippines, on the island of Java, on Formosa [Taiwan], and in Hong Kong. On the island of Tubabão, approximately 5,500 Russian émigrés from China lived under the most primitive conditions, in tents and bamboo huts, waiting for permission to travel to North and South America.⁴⁰ The émigrés found better conditions on the island of Java, where they managed to build a church,⁴¹ which existed until the end of the 1950s. A small church (the Church of the Resurrection of Christ) was founded in Hong Kong for the refugees, who were permitted to emigrate to the West in 1949. This church existed from 1949 until its closure in the late 1960s when no more émigrés were leaving China. For many years, it was entrusted to the care of the priest Elias Wen, who traveled to California at the end of the 1950s, and has since then been a priest at the cathedral in San Francisco, to which several Chinese Orthodox families also belong.⁴² The remaining refugee communities in Southeast Asia were closed down in the 1960s because most Russians had left.

Footnotes

1. Cf. on the history of the Mission before 1902 Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodox Kirche in China*, pp. 106-176 for more details. Also, see M.K. *Bei Guan': Yubeleiny Sbornik 1685-1935*; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10, pp. 9-34; *Kratkaya istoria missii*; Innocent, *Orthodox Mission in China*; Petrov, *Missia v Kitae*; Widmer, *Mission in Peking*. ↵
2. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 174-175. ↵
3. The Albazines were descendants of those prisoners of war from the city of Albazine (at the juncture of the Sitka and Argun Rivers), who were sent to Peking in 1685. The Ecclesiastical Mission was established for them, cf. Petrov, *The Albazines in China*. ↵
4. Innocent, pp. 681-683. ↵
5. *Kitaisky Blagovestnik* (1933) 3-4, pp. 1-4. ↵
6. *Bei Guan'*, pp. 24-25; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10, pp. 13-15; Metropolitan Innocent. ↵
7. Daubray, p. 372; Innocent, p. 684; *Bei Guan'*, p. 21. ↵
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62. ↵
9. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Eveques Russes*, pp. 44-47. ↵
10. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 179-180. ↵

11. Ibid., pp. 180-182. ↵
12. Ibid., p. 182. ↵
13. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1935) 8, pp.123-126. ↵
14. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Eveques Russes*, pp. 38-39. ↵
15. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 6, pp. 38-39. ↵
16. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 177-179. ↵
17. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, p. 173; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 185-213. ↵
18. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, p.173. ↵
19. Archimandrite Constantine, *Pamyati Kharbina*; Nestor, *Manchuria*; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10, pp. 16-25. ↵
20. Nathaniel, *Ocherki Manchury*, p. 6. ↵
21. *Church News* (1940) 11, pp. 35-40. ↵
22. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, p. 182; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 10:11-12. ↵
23. Ibid. 10: p. 17. Cf. the pictures of the Harbin church in *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp. 219-239, and the churches outside of Harbin in *Pravoslavnye khramy v severnoi Manchury* [Harbin] (1931). ↵
24. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, p. 184. ↵
25. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10, p. 18. ↵
26. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 191-192, and Part II, Chap.1, p. 91. ↵
27. Details on the monasteries in Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
28. *Kratky ocherk vozniknoveniya*; Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
29. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 3. ↵
30. *Church News* (1939) 7, pp. 53-63; *Kratky ocherk vozniknoveniya*. ↵
31. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 4; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10, pp. 19-25; Nathaniel, *Ocherki Manchury*, pp. 6-8; *Irenikon* (1934), p. 205. ↵
32. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10, pp. 22-23. ↵
33. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, p. 186. ↵

34. Ibid., pp. 186-188; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 10, pp. 10-13; Zhiganov, *Russkie v Shanghaye*. ↵
35. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1933) 4, p. 71; (1935) 8, pp. 123-126. ↵
36. Cf. Part II, Chap. 1, p. 89. On the further fate of the Chinese Orthodox parishes, see Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 188-192; Brunello, *Chieso di Cina*. ↵
37. Cf. Part II, Chap. 1, p. 90. ↵
38. In the year 1985, for example, 943 Old Believers left Manchuria for Brazil, *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (1958) p.134); in 1962, 5,000 emigres settled in California (*Kirche im Osten* [1962], p. 44.) ↵
39. *Prav. Rus'* (1956) 9, p. 16. ↵
40. *Russky national'ny kalendar* (1951), pp. 116-119. ↵
41. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp. 248-249: the church in Java, whose rector was Archimandrite Innocent, is depicted here. ↵
42. *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 3, p. 15; (1958) 19, p. 16; *Spisok* (1989). ↵

Part IV, Chapter 1.4

The Dioceses in the U.S.A.

From 1945, the center of church life was transferred overseas because the mass of refugees since 1948/49 had emigrated, especially to the U.S.A. and Canada. Half of all the communities of the Church Abroad today are situated in the U.S.A. and Canada, where the only seminary and numerous monasteries, printing presses, and special church institutions are to be found. The most numerically significant communities are located in Eastern America, California, and the Canadian province of Québec. Over half of all the faithful live today in the U.S.A. and Canada.

The Orthodox in North America can look back upon a two-hundred-year history.¹ In the autumn of 1794, eight Russian monks from the monasteries on the islands of Valaam and Konevets set landed at Kodiak Island in the Gulf of Alaska. One of these monks, Herman, was glorified as a saint in 1970. The small group was supposed to establish an Orthodox Mission among the inhabitants of the Aleutians. Within only two years, twelve thousand people had converted to Orthodoxy.²

In 1799, the Holy Synod resolved to create a diocese of Kamchatka and North America, and assigned the direction thereof to Archimandrite Joasaph (Bolotov), who was already in charge of the Mission. Archimandrite Joasaph returned to Russia and was consecrated bishop, but on the return, journey lost his life in a shipwreck. No successor was named.³ It took forty years for the Mission to recover from this setback. In 1838, there were 10,313 faithful, thus less than forty years earlier.⁴ In 1840, the Mission took a turn for the better, when the widowed priest John Veniaminov was consecrated Bishop Innocent of Kamchatka, the Kuril Islands, and the Aleutians. Fr. John, together with his family, had come to the island of Unalaska from Siberia in 1824. After a three-year stay in Petersburg (1836-39), he succeeded in convincing the ecclesiastical and civil authorities that with sufficient personnel and material support the Mission on the American continent would have a bright future.

Bishop Innocent (the Patriarchal Church glorified him as a saint in 1978) returned to Sitka (Novoarchangelsk) in September of 1841, where he began to build up the Mission. A theological school was founded, which was transformed into a Theological Seminary in 1844. The number of clergy and missionaries increased, and the education of native priests began. The Mission energetically undertook the task of evangelization among the inhabitants of Alaska and the Kuril and Aleutian Islands. In 1850, Bishop Innocent, “the Apostle of Alaska”, was elevated to the rank of archbishop for his labors, and this diocese was expanded to include the huge territory of Yakutia, in Siberia. In 1853, the episcopal see of Sitka was transferred first to Yakutsk, and then, four years later, to Blagoveshchensk. For the former diocese of Alaska, a vicar bishop, Bishop Peter (Sysakov), was appointed in 1857; the episcopal residence was in Sitka.⁵

In 1870, the vicariate was erected as the independent Diocese of the Aleutians & Alaska, and the episcopal residence was transferred to San Francisco, where numerous Orthodox faithful resided. In this manner, the first diocese of the Russian Church on the North American continent came into existence. Bishop John (Metropolsky), who resided in San Francisco after 1872, took over the direction of the diocese. His successors were the following bishops: Nestor (Zakkis, 1879-82;

1882-88 ruled the Diocese of St. Petersburg), Vladimir (Sokolovsky, 1888-91), Nicholas (Ziorov, 1891-98), Tikhon (Bellavin, 1898-1907), Platon (Rozhdestvensky, 1907-14), Eudocius (Meshchersky, 1915-17), and Alexander (Nemolovsky, 1914, 1917-21).⁶ After 1870, the jurisdiction of the bishop in practice comprised all of North America. Bishop Vladimir was recognized as the canonical authority by all the Orthodox who lived in the country;⁷ at this time, he was the only Orthodox bishop in North America. Under his successor, Bishop Nicholas, numerous Uniate communities (mostly Carpatho-Russian faithful) reunited with the Russian Orthodox Church. This led to a fundamental strengthening of Orthodoxy in the country.

The Russian Orthodox Church's jurisdiction over the Orthodox in America was confirmed in 1895 by the resolution of the Holy Synod to establish a Syro-Arabic Mission there for the Syrian Orthodox Christians, which was subject to the Russian Church (not to the Patriarch of Antioch). The latter recognized this.⁸ Under Bishop Tikhon (Bellavin, later Patriarch), Orthodoxy experienced a further upswing. In 1900, the diocese was renamed the Diocese of Alaska & North America; in 1904, two vicariates were created. The Syrian Archimandrite Rafael (Hawaweeny) was appointed Bishop of Brooklyn for the Syrian-Arab Christians. Innocent (Pustinsky) was appointed vicar bishop for Alaska. All three bishops were subject to the Holy Synod in Moscow. In the following year (1905), the episcopal see of San Francisco was moved to New York, where the Cathedral of St. Nicholas on East 97th Street, was completed. Also, a theological seminary was founded in Minneapolis, which was to educate priests who were born in the country. In Canada, a mission was founded, which was to take over the care of the Orthodox communities there.⁹ Archimandrite Alexander (Nemolovsky) assumed the direction of the Canadian Mission in the years 1905-1909. Also, the first Orthodox monastery was founded, in 190,5 in South Canaan (Pennsylvania): St. Tikhon's, whose first abbot was Hieromonk Arsenius (Chagovtsev; from 1926 Bishop of Winnepeg).¹⁰ In 1907, another noteworthy event in the life of North American Orthodoxy was the meeting of the first Local Council of the "Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America, under the direction of the Russian Church," in Mayfield, Pennsylvania. Bishops Tikhon, Rafael and Innocent, and representatives of the clergy and laity, took part.

The Orthodox communities of Greeks and Serbs in the U.S., which were headed by archimandrites, recognized the jurisdiction of the Russian Church. When Bishop Platon succeeded Bishop Tikhon, in 1907, he was greeted by representatives of the Greek and Serbian communities. Bishop Rafael delivered the welcoming speech, in which he among other things said:

"Out of the little acorn of the Orthodox Ecclesiastical Mission and the Aleutian Diocese has grown the mighty oak of the North American Diocese, with two vicar bishops – of the Aleuts (for the inhabitants of the Aleutians and the islands of Alaska) and of Brooklyn for the Syrian-Arabs – and the heads of other Orthodox missions: the Greek Archimandrite Theocletos of Galveston, the Serbian Archimandrite Sebastian for the Serbs, and the American priest Nathaniel for Americans, with five journals – in Russian, Arabic, Serbian, English and Ukrainian.¹¹ Also in the North American Diocese there are two seminaries (in Minneapolis and Sitka), two theological schools (in Cleveland and Unalaska), an orphanage, a monastery, many Sunday

schools and cemeteries, and more than a hundred communities, of which the majority have their own churches, the most notable of which is this wonderful cathedral. ¹² The Church has one hundred priests, at whose head Your Eminence stands.” ¹³

The number of 100 communities was arrived at, because the communities in Canada, the Aleutians, Alaska and so forth were included. Actually, the diocese had 72 communities in 1914; at the time of Archbishop Platon’s departure, though the number grew to 137. ¹⁴

The vicariates were ruled as follows: Bishop Innocent (Pustinsky) ruled the Alaskan Diocese from 1904 to 1909, and Bishop Alexander (Nemolovsky) from 1909 to 1916. He was appointed administrator of the North American Diocese, in 1914, because Bishop Eudocimus (Meshchersky), as a result of wartime events, only arrived in North America in 1915. From 1916-21, Philip (Stavitsky) was Bishop of Alaska. The Vicariate of Brooklyn, for the Syro-Arabs, was headed, first by Bishop Rafael from 1904-1915, and then remained vacant for two years; from 1917-33, Bishop Euthymius headed it. Bishop Alexander was transferred to the Canadian Mission, which had been in existence since 1906; in 1916, he was appointed Bishop of Canada, with this see in Winnipeg. In practice, however, he did not assume this position because Bishop Eudocimus ¹⁵ had to travel to the Pan-Russia Council in Moscow. Thus, Bishop Alexander served as the head of the North American Diocese until 1921. When it was certain that Bishop Eudocimus would not return to the U.S.A., Bishop Alexander was elected Bishop of America & Canada in 1919 by a diocesan assembly. ¹⁶

For the Carpatho-Russian faithful, yet another bishop was consecrated in 1917. After Archpriest Alexander Dzubai returned to Orthodoxy from the Unia, and was consecrated Bishop Stephen of Pittsburgh. The hope that he would succeed in bringing more Uniate communities back to Orthodoxy were not fulfilled, however. He himself returned to the Unia in 1924 and was succeeded by Bishop Adam (Philippovsky).

The Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration (SEA) recognized the 1919 election of Alexander as bishop. The SEA granted Bishop Alexander competence over church divorce, thereby recognizing him as ruling bishop of the diocese. ¹⁷ The jurisdictional competence of the SEA over North America seems not to have been challenged. Thus, the Vicariate of the Aleutians & Alaska was elevated to a ruling diocese, against which Bishop Alexander protested in vain. ¹⁸ The rule of the new diocese was transferred to Archimandrite Anthony (Dashkevich; from 1918 the rector of the Copenhagen parish), who, however, was unable to assume his responsibilities due to ill health.

In April of 1921, Metropolitan Platon was instructed by the SEA to undertake a visitation to the U.S.A., where churches were being mortgaged and church property was being sold after financial support from Russia had ceased and stipends for priests and missionaries were no longer being received. ¹⁹ Metropolitan Platon made this trip at the directive of the SEA. Who named Metropolitan Platon ruling bishop in North America is contested.

In June of 1922, Archbishop Alexander resigned the rule of the North American Diocese in a letter to Metropolitan Platon. He simultaneously requested that the Metropolitan take over the direction of diocese. Platon agreed, on 3 July 1922, providing that he would not be held

responsible for all financial debts from the preceding time. In this manner, Platon inherited the administration of the diocese from Archbishop Alexander, who left America and retired to the Russian Skete of St. Elias, [on Mount Athos].

As previously mentioned, in May of 1922, Mr. Kolton, the president of the YMCA in the U.S.A., and Archpriest Theodore Pashkovsky (later Metropolitan Theophilus), visited Patriarch Tikhon. During this conversation, the Patriarch expressed the wish to transfer the rule of the North American communities to Metropolitan Platon. Kolton conveyed this wish of the Patriarch to the “Provisional Synod of Bishops” in July of 1922. On this basis, the Synod appointed Metropolitan Platon provisional leader of North America.²⁰ The letter should have reached Metropolitan Platon after the retirement of Archbishop Alexander. Platon’s appointment by the Church Abroad was based on an oral directive from Patriarch Tikhon, upon which the Synod in its correspondence also reported expressly. Platon, however, wanted a direct written confirmation from the Patriarch, in order for no doubt to be left as to his appointment. He received this confirmation in September of 1923, again via the Synod of Bishops to whom the Patriarch had addressed himself. In this decree, the Patriarch decreed that Metropolitan Platon should be appointed ruling bishop of the North American Diocese, and Archpriest Theodore Pashkovsky should be consecrated Bishop of Chicago. A copy of the decree was forwarded to Metropolitan Platon and was simultaneously published in Church News.²¹

The appointment of Platon was accomplished by the Patriarch and the Holy Synod in April of 1922, and was finally confirmed in September of 1923. Platon assumed his office on the basis of an oral communiqué from the Synod, which, in turn, appointed him. The fact that Patriarch Tikhon sent his decree to the Synod in Karlovtsy, instead of directly to Platon, indicated that the Patriarch himself recognized the Synod’s competence over the emigration and, furthermore, as the only de jure central ecclesiastical governing body for the emigration.

Patriarch Tikhon’s confirmation of September 1923 did not change the de facto situation that had been in effect since July of 1922. Platon must have viewed the appointment by the Synod of Bishop as valid, because, in November of 1922, at the Pan-America Church Council, he allowed them to elect him First Hierarch of the North American Diocese and assumed the title of “Metropolitan of All America & Canada.”²²

The influx of Orthodox immigrants from Eastern Europe, Southern Europe, and Turkey after 1920 led to the establishment of many new communities. In 1924, there were already over 300 communities in the U.S.A. and Canada.²³ To better care for these communities, new bishops were sent in the course of subsequent years. In 1922, Archpriest Theodore Pashkovsky was consecrated Bishop of Chicago, with the name Theophilus. The Alaskan missionary and administrator of the Canadian communities, Archimandrite Amphilocius, who served there for many years, was consecrated Bishop of Alaska. Archimandrite Adam (Philippovsky) assumed the direction of the Canadian communities; he was consecrated by Bishops Stephen (Dzubai) and Gorazd (Pavlik), in 1922.²⁴ In 1924, Adam succeeded Bishop Stephen, who relapsed to the Unia. The former also took over the direction of the Carpatho-Russian communities. At the request of Metropolitan Platon, Bishop Apollinarius (Koshevoi) came to America in 1924 and became the Bishop of Winnipeg. In the same year, he was transferred to San Francisco, where he

made the old 19th-century cathedral – the Cathedral of the Joy of All Who Sorrow – his cathedral.²⁵ He was the only hierarch who did not join the schism of 1926, thereby saving the position of the Church Abroad in North America. Bishop Arsenius (Chagovtsev, the founder of St. Tikhon’s Monastery, had been consecrated Bishop of Winnipeg in Belgrade, upon the request of Metropolitan Platon. A few weeks after his consecration, the schism occurred. Bishop Arsenius joined Metropolitan Platon.²⁶

The following hierarchs belonged to the Church Abroad in North America before the schism in 1926: Metropolitan Platon of All America & Canada (ruling bishop of the diocese), Archbishop (since 1923) Euthymius of Brooklyn for the Syrian-Arabs, and Bishops Theophilus of Chicago, Amphilocius of Alaska, Apollinarius of San Francisco, Arsenius of Canada, and Adam of Philadelphia. However, the Synod had imposed a ban on the celebration of the Holy Mysteries by Bishop Adam.²⁷ After the schism, Metropolitan Platon restored him again to his office.

A significant event in church development in North America, as well as in the Church Abroad, was the Detroit Council of 1924.²⁸ Present at this Council were Metropolitan Platon and Bishops Stephen, Theophilus, and Apollinarius, as well as representatives from 111 communities, about half of all the communities in North America. Despite the presence of four bishops, including the ruling bishop in North America, none of the hierarchs presided over the assembly. On the ground of this violation against church order, as well as the fact that only about half of all the communities were represented, the canonical character of the Council was contested from the beginning.

At this Council, it was decided that the Orthodox communities of North America should administer themselves in the future. A constitution for an “American Orthodox Church” was supposed to be written, which would create a quasi-autocephalous status. One hundred and eleven communities agreed to these resolutions, which were initiated by the majority of the laity and several representatives of the clergy, including Archpriest Leonid Turkevich (later Metropolitan Leontius). Another 42 communities agreed to these resolutions in the weeks after the Council; 12 Canadian communities also agreed to the project at an assembly in the summer of 1924. Altogether, 164 of some 220 communities voted for separation from the Church Abroad.

Metropolitan Platon could not have disregarded the result of this vote, when he traveled to Karlovtsy, in 1926, as a participant in the Council of Bishops. His position was additionally weakened because he had been accused, as “leader of the North American Diocese”, of counterrevolutionary acts against the Soviet regime, in an alleged decree, dated 16 January 1924, by Patriarch Tikhon, which was also signed by Archbishops Seraphim and Peter.²⁹ The fact that Metropolitan Platon had not desired a break in 1926 is significant, but in view of the behavior of his communities in North America, he used Metropolitan Eulogius’ differences of opinion with the Synod to blame the schism on the Synod. At this point, the course of the 1926 Council must once again be studied. The differences of opinion at the Council certainly did not justify a break, but rather the further developments of subsequent weeks resulted in the fateful church schism.³⁰

Metropolitan Platon disputed the Synod's jurisdiction over the communities in North America and called the Synod uncanonical.³¹ Metropolitan Platon's explanation was hardly convincing. Since the evacuation, he had participated in all the important resolutions of the SEA, the Synod of Bishops, and the Council of Bishops. While journeying to Constantinople, he had endorsed the document that declared the SEA's competence over the refugees in all countries where normal relations with the Patriarch were not possible.³² He allowed himself to be appointed by the SEA as a cleric for the Athens embassy church, in November 1920. In January of 1921, he allowed himself to be sent to America to bring order to the affairs of the Church there. And finally, he obtained the Synod's provisional appointment as ruling bishop in North America.³³ He took part in the Karlovtsy Council in 1921, and at the sessions of the Synod of Bishops until 1926. Not unjustly was he considered to be a co-founder of the Church Abroad.³⁴

The "Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic & Apostolic Church in North America," which Metropolitan Platon originated, was not recognized by any Orthodox Church³⁵ and was, until the reunification with the Church Abroad in 1936, completely isolated. The "Metropolia" had 250 communities during these years. After the break in 1926, it kept about 90% of all the faithful, and all the hierarchs, except Bishop Apollinarius, had joined the schism.

The Synod of Bishops responded to the break by deposing Metropolitan Platon as head of the North American Diocese and by imposing a ban on the celebration of the Holy Mysteries.

The Synod appointed Bishop Apollinarius as a provisional head.³⁶ In two epistles, the Synod notified the faithful that it had deposed Metropolitan Platon and the other hierarchs and banned them from celebrating the Mysteries.³⁷ Bishop Alexander (Nemolovsky), who was still living on Athos, was instructed by the Synod to return to his diocese in North America and take over its direction. Because he did not heed this demand, he was put on ecclesiastical trial and relieved of his post.³⁸ Bishop Apollinarius was appointed in his stead. In 1929, the latter was elevated to the rank of archbishop. From 1929 until his death in 1933, he ruled over the North American communities with the title of Archbishop of North America and Canada. To provide support for him, three vicariates were created: in 1930, Archimandrite Tikhon was consecrated Bishop of San Francisco;³⁹ a few months later, Archimandrite Joasaph was consecrated Bishop of Montréal;⁴⁰ and in January of 1931, Archimandrite Theodosius was consecrated Bishop of Detroit.⁴¹ Bishop Theodosius was then entrusted with the rule of the newly-created Diocese of São Paulo & Brazil. Archimandrite Vitalis was consecrated Bishop of Detroit, but in the same year was given the leadership of the North American Diocese.⁴² Archimandrite Hieronymus became Bishop of Detroit in the following year.

After the death of Bishop Apollinarius, in 1933, Bishop Tikhon became a provisional leader in North America. He held this position from July of 1933 until September of 1934, finally as Archbishop. In September of 1934, Bishop Vitalis was appointed Archbishop and leader in North America & Canada. Simultaneously, two independent dioceses were created: Eastern America & (Eastern) Canada, with its see in New York, headed by Archbishop Vitalis, and Western America & San Francisco, headed by Archbishop Tikhon. The Diocese of Western America also included the Western Canadian communities and those in Alaska. At first, a vicar

bishop resided in Canada, but later, at the end of 1934, the vicariate was turned into the independent Diocese of Edmonton & Canada. Thus, the Church Abroad, in 1935, shortly before the reunification, included the following dioceses: Eastern America & New York, Western America & San Francisco, and Edmonton & Canada.

In 1933, when Archbishop Apollinarius died, 62 communities belonged to these three dioceses, recognizing the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad. In 1935, there were already 80 communities.⁴³ Considering that in 1927, 90% of the faithful had separated themselves from the Church Abroad, Archbishop Apollinarius achieved remarkable success, having over sixty communities, for he had begun with barely a dozen communities in Western America.

The most significant decision, the importance of which, however, was not foreseeable in 1930, was the blessing to found the Holy Trinity Monastery, in Jordanville. Hieromonk Panteleimon (Nizhnik) had joined the Church Abroad after the 1926 Schism and left St. Tikhon's Monastery. He and a few co-workers had bought a plot of land in the late 1920s, in order to found a monastery. They received permission to do this from Archbishop Apollinarius, who was later to find his last resting place there in the monastery's cemetery. His successor, Archbishop Vitalis, consecrated the small monastery church in 1934; he, however, is buried at the St. Vladimir Memorial Church [in Jackson, New Jersey]. Holy Trinity Monastery was the first monastery of the Church Abroad in America. In the course of its existence, it developed into the most important ecclesiastical and spiritual center of the Church Abroad and took the place of the Church Abroad's monasteries in Eastern Europe and Manchuria.⁴⁴

For the residence of the ruling bishop, Archbishop Apollinarius chose the Cathedral of the Elevation of the Cross in the Bronx, a borough of New York City.⁴⁵ This church remained the cathedral until 1940 when it was transferred to another building, consecrated as the Cathedral of the Ascension. The new cathedral remained Archbishop Vitalis' church until his death in 1960. Thereafter, this building lost its significance, because, at the end of the 1950s, the new cathedral was consecrated at the headquarters of the Synod of Bishops. When racial unrest shook the Bronx in the mid-1960s, the old cathedral had to be closed.

In the Cathedral of the Ascension, important relics were preserved and venerated. In 1934, the Brotherhood of the Pochaev Monastery sent the parish a copy of the Wonder-working Pochaev Icon of the Theotokos. The Lodomirovo Monastery Brotherhood sent the community relics of St. Panteleimon, after Archbishop Vitalis, the [former] abbot of the Lodomirovo Monastery, made the church into his cathedral. The left wall of the church was adorned from 1947 with a very large icon of "All Saints of Russia" by Archimandrite Cyprian.⁴⁶ This icon is today located in the Cathedral of Our Lady of the Sign, at Synod. The copy of the Pochaev Icon hangs in the winter Church of St. Job of Pochaev, in Jordanville.⁴⁷

The most important communities belonging to the Church Abroad in these years were as follows: in New York, the cathedral parish, the parishes of the Holy Fathers of the Seven Œcumenical Councils, and of the Holy Trinity; in Seattle, the parish of St. Nicholas the Wonderworker; in Detroit, the parish of the Dormition; and in Los Angeles, the Transfiguration parish. All these churches still exist today and serve as cathedrals.⁴⁸

The administrative structure of the Church Abroad was only of short duration. It was barely completed when reunification with the schismatic Metropolia came about. Even before the death of Metropolitan Platon, a change was in evidence. In a letter in 1933, Metropolitan Platon declared himself in favor of “reconciliation” with the Synod, under the condition that he be allowed the right to maintain the title “Metropolitan of All America & Canada.”⁴⁹ This amounted to the fact that the Russian communities in North America, with their far-reaching autonomy in ordering their internal affairs, would recognize the Synod’s canonical competence and spiritual authority in deciding questions of the Faith, church order, and relations with other Churches – concessions that were also made during the negotiations of 1935. The work of reunification, however, was to fall to Metropolitan Theophilus.

After the restoration of Church unity, over 350 communities and half a million faithful belonged to the North American Metropolia.⁵⁰ This Church province, therefore, was the most numerically significant province of the Church Abroad. However, proportionally North America was greatly surpassed in spiritual and ecclesiastical splendor by the dioceses in Europe and the Far East, with their monasteries, printing presses, and seminaries.

From 1934, the rule of this large diocese fell to Metropolitan Theophilus, who, like his predecessor, bore the title “Metropolitan of All America & Canada.” Ten bishops were subject to him: Archbishop Tikhon of Western America & Seattle, Archbishop Adam of Philadelphia & the Carpatho-Russians, Archbishop Vitalis of Eastern America & Jersey City, Bishops Arsenius of Detroit & Cleveland, Alexis of Alaska & the Aleutians, Leontius of Chicago & Minneapolis, Ioasaph of Western Canada & Calgary, Hieronymus of Eastern Canada, Benjamin of Pittsburgh & West Virginia and Macarius of Boston.⁵¹ Bishops Theophilus, Tikhon, Adam, Vitalis, Arsenius, Joasaph, and Hieronim were either consecrated bishops before the 1926 schism or were consecrated by the Church Abroad in the interim. Only Bishops Alexis, Leontius, Benjamin, and Macarius received their consecration from the Metropolia.

The reunification of Church unity was celebrated in the ecclesiastical center of both Churches with festive divine services, amidst the participation of numerous hierarchs. In St. Tikhon’s Monastery, Metropolitan Theophilus and Archbishop Vitalis celebrated together with Bishop Adam, Leontius, Benjamin, Hieronymus, and Macarius. A few days later, another service took place in Archbishop Vitalis’ Cathedral of the Elevation of the Cross, in New York.⁵² The faithful universally welcomed the reunification; many communities joined together in one community because there was no longer any sacramental separation.

The new unity was not of long duration. After the outbreak of the War, there were no more contacts between the Synod and the North American Dioceses. Above all else, ecclesiastical developments in the Soviet Union were judged differently: whereas the Council of Bishops of the Church Abroad condemned the 1943 election of Patriarch Sergius as an uncanonical act, in a decree of November 1943, Metropolitan Theophilus demanded that his communities commemorate the Patriarch, which was tantamount to a recognition of the Moscow Patriarch as head of the Russian Church.⁵³ A total confrontation against the Patriarchal Church and Communism was not possible in practice, because the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. were allies in the war against Hitler.⁵⁴

Ultimately, this confused stance towards the Moscow Patriarchate destroyed the unity in North America anew. The Church Abroad's hierarchs Vitalis, Tikhon, Joasaph and Hieronymus, took an uncompromising stand against the Patriarchate; Bishops Macarius and Alexis joined the Patriarchate; Bishops Theophilus, Leontius, Arsenius, and John (Zlobin, consecrated Bishop of Sitka and Alaska, in 1946, after Bishop Alexis joined the Patriarchate) were proponents of autonomy, which would allow them to be subject only to the spiritual and moral oversight of the Moscow Patriarch.

The renewed division of 1946/47 sent the Metropolia into isolation again, which was ended only by the Moscow Patriarch Alexis I's granting of autocephaly in 1970 because the Orthodox Church in America did not obtain recognition from any national Orthodox Church.⁵⁵ In comparison with the 1926 schism, the position of the Church Abroad in 1947 was much more favorable. It had distinguished bishops and clergy, who had been caring for their communities since the 1920s. The decision of which jurisdiction a community joined lays with the clergy, who chaired the parish council. For the most part, the majority of communities followed their priest; a minority separated itself and joined whomever, in their members' opinion, was the "canonical" Church leadership. The Church Abroad had the advantage over the Metropolia, in that the newly-arrived émigrés from Europe joined it. Because most of the refugee priests and bishops did the same, the Church Abroad was in the position to send priests to the new communities, whereas the Metropolia had not nearly enough priests even for the old [already established] communities.⁵⁶

At the third diocesan assembly of the Church Abroad, which met in October of 1949, the number of communities was given at 68. Thus, it seems to involve essentially the same communities, which before the reunification had seen the Church Abroad as the true Church for the emigration. Of these 68 communities, 22 were in Eastern America, 10 in Western America and 36 in Canada. These communities had 8 bishops, 3 archimandrites, 6 abbots, 32 archpriests and protopresbyters, and 12 priests and deacons.⁵⁷ Only two years later, there were already 100 communities.⁵⁸ At the assembly in 1952, Archbishop Vitalis indicated that 2 or 3 communities per month were being founded, since the last session a year previously: a total of 25 communities.⁵⁹ At the sixth diocesan assembly, the number of parishes was 110, of these 21 in the U.S.A. and 12 in Canada had been newly founded. Of these 110 parishes, 30 held their own divine services in churches owned by other confessions, and 30 in rented buildings; 43 had their own churches; and 7 parishes had no building in which to serve. Most communities developed a regular parish life: lay brotherhoods and sisterhoods were formed in many communities, which in turn organized Church life; work with the young and the elderly was carried out. Also, many communities set up their own libraries and schools and published parish bulletins.⁶⁰

In 1954, the Church had over 116 communities/parishes and 200 priests, not including readers and missionaries. The largest communities were in New York and Eastern America, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. Special attention was paid to the internal mission [among Russians] and also to the mission among the English-speaking non-Orthodox, for which the "American Orthodox Mission" was founded in 1951, under the leadership of Archbishop James (Thomps).⁶¹ The internal mission's goal was to strengthen the Faith amongst the Russian flock,

especially the youth and the children. In this regard, the importance of church school was proven by the fact that, already in the early 1950s, a tremendous upswing had begun to be evident when everywhere in North America new schools were founded.⁶² The mission to those outside the Orthodox fold undertaken by Archbishop James, who was retired in 1956, and by many others (notably in the 1970s by the abbots and monks of St. Herman Monastery in Platina and Holy Transfiguration Monastery in Boston) have met with varying degrees of success and have often been hampered by a lack of adequately-trained American clergy and ethnic misunderstandings. Today, Bishop Hilarion is most active in both types of missionary activities.

From 1954, the number of the faithful grew at an essentially slower rate than in the preceding years. From the mid-1950s onwards, Church life began to stabilize. At the same time, regular church building activity developed because the larger and more financially prosperous parishes began to build their own parish churches. Of the 157 parishes existing today in North America, more than 100 were founded after 1947, because many of the older parishes were closed or combined with new parishes (e.g., in New York and other large cities).⁶³ Also, almost all church institutions, such as schools, printing presses, homes for the elderly, libraries, cemeteries and so forth, came into existence after 1947. Of the 12 existing monastic communities in North America, only Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville originated before 1947.

The most important ecclesiastical institutions to come into existence after World War II were the monasteries, which formed the spiritual and ecclesiastical centers of their dioceses, and to which thousands of the faithful yearly go on pilgrimage.⁶⁴ Moving the Synod to the U.S.A. was of particular importance. In conjunction with this, the New Kursk Root Hermitage, the Synodal building with its Cathedral of Our Lady of the Sign, and the Synodal metochion in California were established. The largest new church buildings were the St. Vladimir Church (built to commemorate the 950th anniversary of the Baptism of Russia, in 1938), and the Cathedral of the Joy of All Who Sorrow in San Francisco. Holy Trinity Monastery, in Jordanville, New York, was enlarged and expanded after 1947, due to the influx of monks from Europe and the Far East, by the building of Holy Trinity Seminary and by the installation of a printing press. Holy Trinity Cathedral, with its many gilt cupolas, has become the Church Abroad's most famous landmark. The vital significance of the monastery for the Church Abroad is documented by the fact that one often falsely hears reference to the "Jordanville Jurisdiction."⁶⁵

The schism of 1947 led to the reorganization of the ecclesiastical administration in North America. The pre-1935 administrative membership was resumed: Archbishop Vitalis was appointed head of the dioceses in North America and Canada, and once again bore the title of Archbishop of Eastern America & Jersey City. The Archdiocese of Western America & San Francisco reverted to the rule of Archbishop Tikhon. In addition to this, Detroit & Flint came into existence as its own diocese, and there were two dioceses in Canada: Western Canada & Edmonton under Archbishop Joasaph, and Eastern Canada & Montréal under Archbishop Gregory. The direction of the Jordanville Monastery was transferred to a bishop, Bishop Seraphim of Holy Trinity. Also, a vicariate of Florida was created, subject to the rule of Bishop Nikon.

The most important diocese, with the most parishes, the administrative headquarters of the First Hierarchy, and the largest monasteries, is that of Eastern America. Until his repose in 1960, Archbishop Vitalis ruled this diocese. Thereafter, until 1964, Metropolitan Anastasius bore the title “Metropolitan of Eastern America & New York, First Hierarchy of the ROCOR.”⁶⁶ From 1964 until his repose in 1985, Metropolitan Philaret ruled the diocese. As a rule, two vicar bishops belong to this diocese, who have borne various titles: Bishop Nikon of Florida, Archbishop Andrew of Rockland, Bishop Constantine of Boston, Bishops Laurus, Gregory and Hilarion of Manhattan, and Bishop Daniel of Erie.

The vicariate of Holy Trinity became an independent diocese in 1953 when Archimandrite Abercius was consecrated Bishop of Syracuse & Holy Trinity. The rule of this diocese belonged from 1953-1976 to Bishop Abercius (from 1967 Archbishop), and from 1976 to Bishop Laurus (from 1981 Archbishop). The vicariate of Florida became the diocese of Washington & Florida in 1967, Archbishop Nikon having assumed the governance thereof.

After his death, no replacement was named, and the parishes were joined to the Diocese of Eastern America. The Diocese of Detroit & Flint was headed by Archbishop Hieronymus from 1946-57. In 1954, a Diocese of Cleveland & Chicago was created, the direction of which Archbishop Gregory assumed. After Bishops Hieronymus and Gregory reposed in 1957, both dioceses were combined and transferred to the rule of Bishop Seraphim, who assumed the title of Bishop of Chicago-Detroit & the Midwest. This diocese consisted of 14 parishes. In 1974 another vicar bishop was appointed for this diocese, Bishop Alypius of Cleveland. Upon Archbishop Seraphim’s death, Bishop Alypius became Bishop of Chicago.

The Diocese of Western America & San Francisco has been in existence since 1930. Archbishop Tikhon ruled this diocese from 1930-63, which at times included Western Canada and Alaska. From 1963-66, Archbishop John (Maximovich) ruled this diocese. In 1966, Metropolitan Philaret took over the administration of the diocese, which, after 1967, was transferred to Archbishop Anthony (Medvedev). From 1951, this diocese had a vicar bishop, Bishop Anthony (Sinkevich) of Los Angeles. This vicariate was changed into an independent diocese in 1962 and included the communities in Texas and Southern California. The title of the ruling hierarchy was therefore changed to that of “Los Angeles & Texas.” In 1971, the diocese was renamed of “Los Angeles & Southern California,” and for the Diocese of San Francisco, a vicar bishop was appointed to Seattle. Archimandrite Nectarius (Kontsevich) was consecrated for this position.⁶⁷ Today, the Seattle Vicariate remains vacant and is administered by Archbishop Anthony of Western America & San Francisco.

It can be assumed that the present administrative structure in North America will also be maintained in the future because reunification with the “Orthodox Church in America” can be all but counted out. The existing dioceses form administrative units of regional communities: Eastern America, the Midwest, Western America, Southern California, and Holy Trinity.

Outside these areas, there are hardly any communities of the Church Abroad. In all of the Midwest, from west of the Mississippi to the California state line, there are only a few communities. The most numerically important communities of the Church Abroad are usually

also the sees of dioceses or vicariates, because these communities have larger churches, which are used as cathedrals, though this does not exclude other significant communities and churches in the diocese. Historical reasons also play an important role in the choice of individual episcopal residences.

Footnotes

1. On the development in North America, cf. Part I, Chap. 4. ↵
2. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, p. 15; Besin, *The Orthodox Church in Alaska*. ↵
3. *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 4. ↵
4. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, p. 17; Ushimaru, *Bishop Innocent*. ↵
5. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, pp. 17-18; *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 3. ↵
6. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, pp. 20-28, 121. ↵
7. *Ibid.*, p. 21. ↵
8. *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 4. ↵
9. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, pp. 24-25. ↵
10. St. Tikhon's Monastery is generally accepted as the first Orthodox monastery in North America, although this is not exactly correct because St. Herman had founded a skete called New Valaam in the 1830s on unoccupied Spruce Island, where he reposed in 1837. ↵
11. This refers to the Ukrainian language. ↵
12. The address was delivered in St. Nicholas Cathedral in New York. Today this cathedral belongs to the Moscow Patriarchate after it had been in the hands of the Renovacionist "Metropolitan" Kedrovsky. ↵
13. Seraphim, *Church Unity*. ↵
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28. ↵
15. Bishop Eudocimius did not return to the USA. He joined the Renovacionists in 1923. ↵
16. *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 7. ↵
17. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 4, p. 10. ↵
18. D'Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques russes*, p. 93. ↵
19. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 383-385. ↵
20. *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 7. ↵
21. *Ibid.*, p. 384. ↵

22. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, p. 30. ↵
23. *Ibid.*, p. 31. ↵
24. Bishop Adam was a native Carpatho-Russian, was converted to Orthodoxy by Bishop Gorazd (Pavlik), rector of the small Czech Orthodox Church in Prague, and was ordained by Bishop Stephen. ↵
25. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 269-272. ↵
26. *Ibid.*, 5, p. 272. ↵
27. *Tserk. Ved.* (1926) 17-18, p. 4. ↵
28. *Severnoi Ameriki*, pp. 9-16; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 385-386; Seraphim, *Church Unity*, pp. 30-31. ↵
29. This alleged decree of Patriarch Tikhon was published in Seraphim's *Church Unity*, p. 126. It was either presented to the Patriarch just for his signature or completely falsified in order to strengthen the position of Metropolitan Kedrovsky against Metropolitan Platon in the ongoing court case over St. Nicholas Cathedral in New York. ↵
30. Cf. Part I, Chap. 4. ↵
31. *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 28. Cf. on the ecclesiastical schism in North America, the work of Lebedev, *Razrukha*, which was published in Belgrade in 1929 and comprised the first detailed description of the schism. ↵
32. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, pp. 6-7. ↵
33. *Severnoi Ameriki*, pp. 23-26. ↵
34. *Ibid.*, p. 23. ↵
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 36-39; Seraphim, *Church Unity*, pp. 32-44; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 396-398. ↵
36. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 7:390-391. ↵
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 392-396. ↵
38. *Tserk. Ved.* (1928) 5-6, p. 1. In 1924 the Synod ordered him to return to his diocese of Alaska. When he did not follow this order, he was deposed as Bishop of Alaska. In 1928 he joined Metropolitan Eulogius. ↵
39. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, p. 276-278. After the 1926 schism, Metropolitan Platon deposed Bishop Apollinarius as head of the San Francisco Diocese and replaced him with Archimandrite Alexis (Panteleev). (*Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 29). ↵
40. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, pp. 278-280. ↵

41. Ibid., pp. 280-282. ↵
42. Vitalis, *Motivy moei zhizni*. ↵
43. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, p. 399; *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 59. ↵
44. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
45. Cf. the photographs in *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, p. 520. ↵
46. Cf. Part IV, Chap.7. ↵
47. Cf. the photographs in *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 1, pp. 521-534. ↵
48. Ibid., 1, pp. 535, 676, 743, 747; 2, pp. 769-770. ↵
49. *Severnoi Ameriki*, p. 52. ↵
50. *Church News* (1940) 7, pp. 47-51. ↵
51. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) 7, pp. 104-105. Cf. Part VI. ↵
52. *Prav. Rus'* (1936) 1, p. 5. ↵
53. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, p. 53. ↵
54. *Severnoi Ameriki*, pp. 85-103. ↵
55. Cf. Part V, p. 2. ↵
56. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, p. A122 gives a statistical survey of the Orthodox parishes in North America in 1968. At that time the following statistics were given:
- The Metropolia had over 348 parishes, 123 without priests. The Church Abroad had over 109 parishes, 15 without priests. The Patriarchate had over 66 parishes, 20 without priests.
- Statistics in *Eastern Church Review* (1968), pp. 70-73 show that:
- The Metropolia had 411 parishes (174 without priests), 272 priests, and 27 deacons.
- The Church Abroad had 101 parishes (14 without priests), 120 priests, and 13 deacons.
- The Patriarchate had 77 parishes (39 without priests), 55 priests, and 13 deacons. ↵
57. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1949) 10-12, pp. 54-55. ↵
58. *Severnoi Ameriki*, pp. 210-212; *Prav. Rus'* (1949) 20, pp. 2-11. ↵
59. *Otchet 5-ogo s'ezda*, p. 31. ↵
60. *Prav. Rus'* (1953) 9, pp. 7-19. ↵
61. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 6; *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 10, pp. 4-9; 11: pp. 2-4; *Otchet 5-go s'ezda*, p. 31. ↵

62. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 5. ⇐

63. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1, pp. 520-761; 2, pp. 763-803; *Otchet eparkhial'noe sobranie.* ⇐

64. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland.* ⇐

65. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 7. ⇐

66. *Prav. Rus'* (1960) 9, p. 12 ⇐

67. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1967) 1-12, p. 29; (1972) 1-6, pp. 1-2; *Prav. Rus'* (1960) 9, p. 12; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1444-1446. ⇐

Part IV, Chapter 1.5

The Dioceses in Canada

The Orthodox communities in Canada were at first subject to the ruling bishop of Alaska & North America. After the creation of two vicariates – Brooklyn and Alaska – in 1904 for the North American Diocese, an Orthodox mission was established a year later in Canada. The Canadian communities were thereby granted a certain degree of self-administration. The head of the mission was Archimandrite Alexander (Nemolovsky), who was appointed administrator of the Canadian communities. He headed the mission from 1905-09. Also, after his appointment and consecration as Bishop of Alaska, he remained administrator of the Canadian communities. It was not until 1914 that Archimandrite Amphilochius (Vokulsky) was appointed the new administrator of the Canadian mission. ¹

The real reason for establishing a mission was, however, that in Canada many communities were composed of immigrants from the Western Ukraine (e.g., Volynia and Bukovina), the greater majority of whom belonged to the Uniate Church. The mission's goal was to return these people to Orthodoxy. Therefore, Hegumen Amphilochius of the Aleutian Mission was given this task and was simultaneously elevated to the rank of archimandrite. From 1901-1914, he had had great missionary success among the Alaskan and Aleutian population. ² The preconditions for a successful mission in Canada at this time were most favorable because there were no Uniate priests there, and the Roman Catholic priests who had parishes, which were mostly French or Polish, knew no Ukrainian. The use of Ukrainian in the divine services played such a significant role for the faithful, that in the 1930s, Bishop Joseph of Western Canada & Calgary complained that [the use of] Ukrainian determined where the faithful would attend church. This was also the case in the 1950s, when Archimandrite Anthony (Medvedev) was the administrator of the diocese. ³ Adherence to the Ukrainian language was the reason that the Russian Orthodox Church experienced no particular missionary success among these communities. After Rome refused to dispatch Uniate priests, these communities declared themselves independent in 1918 and founded the "Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada," whose "Faith and dogma are identical to the various already-established Greek Orthodox Churches, and which holds to the Faith and dogma of the first Seven Councils of the Christian Church." ⁴

With this resolution, those Uniates who had been with Rome "returned" to Orthodoxy. For the Russian Church, there was for a short time the possibility of receiving these faithful into its jurisdiction, because in 1918 the communities turned to Bishop Alexander (Nemolovsky) with the request that he be the temporary head of the Church, until "the Ukrainians had their own bishop." Bishop Alexander agreed, as did his successor, Metropolitan Platon in 1921. Shortly before his return from America, however, Alexander declined the invitation on the grounds that the Ukrainians did not have the right to found their own Church and must join the Russian Church. ⁵ Presumably, Alexander had decided this, because in the Soviet Union in 1919 a "Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church" had been founded, and he must have feared that the developments in Canada could follow suit. This danger indeed existed, as later developments showed. This new Church likewise rejected the Ukrainian Autocephalists. Until 1924, the Church was subject first to Metropolitan Herman (Germanos) of the Syrian Orthodox Church

and then to Archbishop John (Teodorovich), who had emigrated from Ukraine. Through emigration, the Church grew until today there are four dioceses, three bishops, 260 communities in Canada and 15 in Australia, and more than 100,000 faithful. Based on these developments, the Russian Church in Canada may have passed up the chance to bring more than 100,000 faithful into Orthodoxy and its jurisdiction.

Of the total Canadian population in 1961, 239,766 (1.3%) and in 1971, 316,605 (1.5%) belonged to the Orthodox Church. The majority of the faithful are Ukrainians, of whom, in 1961, there were 473,337, and in 1971 there were 580,000 in the country.⁶ The number of Russians living in Canada was given as follows: in 1951, 91,279; in 1961, 119,168; in 1971, 64,475.⁷ The growth in the 1950s can be attributed to the arrival of émigrés from Europe, the Far East, and North Africa. Of those 64,475 Russians living there in 1971, 31,745 gave Russian as their mother tongue, of whom only 12,590 used Russian as their colloquial language in the family. In 1976, only 23,480 Russians still considered Russian to be their mother tongue.⁸ These developments illustrate the powerful assimilation of the émigrés, which can be attributed to the fact that outside of a few larger centers in the provinces of eastern Canada, the Russian émigrés lived widely dispersed throughout the country, mostly as farmers in central and western Canada. Between 20,000 and 30,000 faithful belong to the Church Abroad at this time in Canada.

In 1916, Bishop Alexander was appointed Bishop of Canada, with his see in Winnipeg, Manitoba Province. Bishop Alexander never took up this post, because shortly thereafter he had to take over the rule of the North American Diocese, as Archbishop Eudocimus was traveling to the Council in Moscow. Only in 1922 was a bishop again consecrated for Canada: Bishop Adam (Philippovsky), who spent only a short time in the diocese, because in 1924 he succeeded Bishop Stephen, who had returned to the Unia. In accordance with Metropolitan Platon's desire, Archimandrite Arsenius (Chagovtsov) was consecrated Bishop of Winnipeg, vicar bishop for Canada. A few weeks after his consecration, he joined Metropolitan Platon, who had broken with the Synod.⁹ The communities of the Church Abroad were then subject to Bishop Apollinarius, who became the head of the North American communities in 1927.

There are no precise figures as to the number of communities in Canada at this time. It is only known that 12 Canadian communities agreed with the decisions of the Detroit Council in 1924. These must have joined the Metropolia. A total of only 60 communities had rejected the Detroit Council; the Church Abroad could claim at the most a dozen or so communities in Canada.

After the renewed schism in 1947, the Church Abroad had 36 communities in Canada and another 32 in the U.S.A.¹⁰ By 1953, another 12 communities had joined,¹¹ so that in the mid-1950s there must have been some 50 communities in Canada. Today, the Diocese still has 23 Russian communities, a Bulgarian one, a Macedonian-Bulgarian one, and a Romanian one.¹² The loss of almost half the communities can be explained by the fact that the many small diaspora parishes in central and western Canada were lost to attrition as the communities died out. Also, a dozen communities joined the Patriarchate with Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk), which now has more than 22 churches and some 3500 faithful.¹³

The Church Abroad created a Canadian vicariate in 1934. Archimandrite Joasaph (Skorodumov) was consecrated Bishop of Montréal but resided in Calgary. ¹⁴ Until 1934, this was his title, but after 1934, he was named Archbishop of Edmonton & Western Canada. After reunification with the Metropolia, a second diocese was created in Canada, which included Montréal & Eastern Canada, headed by Bishop Hieronymus, who had been consecrated Bishop of Detroit in 1935. ¹⁵ This diocesan structure of two dioceses remained in force until 1957.

Archbishop Joasaph ruled the Western Canadian Diocese from 1930 until 1950; he then became Bishop of Buenos Aires & Argentina. His successor was Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk), who, however, only took up his duties at the end of 1951. Archimandrite Anthony (Medvedev) took over the administration from 1950-52. Archbishop Panteleimon remained ruling bishop until 1954; his successor until 1957 was Bishop Vitalis (Ustinov). Thereafter, the diocese existed only as a vicariate. Bishop Sabbas (Sarachevich) directed it until 1971 when he retired. He died in 1973, and no successor was appointed.

The Diocese of Montréal & Eastern Canada was ruled by Bishop Hieronymus from 1936-47. His successor, from 1947-54, was Bishop Gregory (Boriskevich, after 1952 Archbishop), after which Archbishop Panteleimon ruled the diocese from 1954-57. In 1957, the Synod retired him. Since that time, the rule of the Diocese of Montréal & Canada has been in the hands of Archbishop Vitalis, who was represented in Edmonton by Bishop Sabbas between the years 1958-1971. ¹⁶

The administrative structure of the Canadian diocese reflects the life of the Orthodox communities in Canada. Until the end of World War II, most communities were located in Western Canada. Thus, the first bishops all bore the title of the cities of Winnipeg, Calgary, or Edmonton in their designated positions. Most of the immigrants from eastern Europe had lived in the Canadian provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia since the turn of the century. Only after World War II did a move to eastern Canada occur, where today the largest communities are found in the Provinces of Québec and Ontario.

Bishop Joasaph resided in Calgary, where in 1930 a small community of 20-30 people existed. ¹⁷ They succeeded in building a small wooden church in honor of All Saints, which simultaneously became the cathedral. This also had a small dwelling attached for Bishop Joasaph. The church was replaced by a new building, with a parish hall and a residence for the priest. Since then, the parish has had some 200 parishioners. ¹⁸ In 1938, Bishop Joasaph moved his residence to Edmonton, where the Russian community had obtained a former Protestant church. The church was consecrated in honor of St. Vladimir and served as the cathedral church for Edmonton & Western Canada. The parish house on the land was turned into a metochion and was to have been for a proposed monastic brotherhood. The most noteworthy thing about this cathedral was that no parish belonged to it. The community was comprised of some 30 people from the environs of the city. These were mainly Orthodox farmers of Ukrainian descent, who had rejected a Ukrainian Orthodox Church and traditionally felt connected to the Russian Orthodox Church. ¹⁹

By the establishment of a monastery in his diocese, Bishop Joasaph hoped to create a spiritual and theological center for the Church Abroad, which should have become the departure point for

a mission among the Uniates and Orthodox Ukrainians in the diocese.²⁰ The hierarch made the first attempt in 1936-37 when he founded a small monastery 100 miles north of Edmonton called St. Sergius Hermitage. The bishop largely drew up the plans himself, intending it to be a summer residence. The Hermitage had 80 acres of land, a small chapel, and a frame house with cells for eight to ten monks.²¹ In 1938, Bishop Joasaph made a further similar attempt some 120 miles northeast of Edmonton. This was the St. Seraphim Monastery at Good Fishlake, a fish-rich lake in the middle of a wooded region. On the land belonging to the monastery, a cemetery was also supposed to be established, where Bishop Joasaph wanted to be buried. Both attempts failed, however, because no monks could be found for a monastic community.²²

The desire to establish a monastery was finally to be fulfilled in the last years of his office. In 1948, monks from Europe and the Far East came to Canada, who began the building of the Holy Protection Skete, in Bluffton, in 1949. Three monks belonged to the Brotherhood. When, in 1951, nuns arrived from the Shanghai Convent of the Vladimir Icon of the Theotokos, the monks turned the monastery over to them. The monks moved into the metochion in Edmonton.²³

The Holy Protection Convent has existed since 1952. Since then, some six to eight nuns have resided there, living off their farmland and the financial support of their mother convent.²⁴ For the monks formerly of the Holy Protection Skete, a plot of land near Bluffton (near Bellis) was purchased, and a skete in honor of St. Nicholas was established, attached to which is an additional 10 acres of farmland and another 130 acres of forest. Archimandrite Anthony consecrated the skete in 1952. Hegumen Ambrose directed the Skete until the 1960s. Today it remains unoccupied. In the small church divine services are occasionally celebrated.²⁵

Together with Bishop Vitalis, the new Bishop of Edmonton & Western Canada, seven monks came from Brazil, who belonged to the St. Job Brotherhood of Bishop Vitalis. The Brotherhood had been formed in Germany in 1947 by Archimandrite Vitalis, and in 1955 consisted of 12 people. Now the realization of the desire to establish a monastery in Canada seemed to have come much closer. In the environs of Northville (Province of Alberta), the Brotherhood purchased a plot of land and began building a monastery. Within a short space of time, a small church and main building with monastic cells were completed. This hopeful new beginning was again endangered two years later because Bishop Vitalis was named Archbishop and took over the rule of the Diocese of Montréal & Canada. In the Dormition Skete at Northville, only two monks remained behind; the rest accompanied him to Montréal. Hieromonk Seraphim (Philimonov) took over the direction of the skete and is still there.²⁶

Presently, of the monasteries and sketes in western Canada, only the Holy Protection Convent and the Dormition Skete remain. The rest were closed in the 1950s.

When, in the 1950s, other Russian émigrés from Europe, the Far East, and North Africa came to Canada, many of them found work in the coal mines of western Canada. The majority of new Russian émigrés joined the Church Abroad, so that for the first time there was an increase in larger communities. In Vancouver and Edmonton, there are two parishes, and there are also parishes in Calgary, Edson, Northville, Wildwood, and other cities. Many of the old wooden churches were, over the course of time, replaced by brick or stone churches.²⁷ The willingness

of the faithful to donate money to the Church made it possible also for average and smaller communities to build new houses of worship. Thus, for example, the community of only 70 people in Calgary collected \$25,000 to build a new church, the total cost of which amounted to \$40,000.²⁸

The care of the faithful in western Canada has always been problematic because the communities are spread so far apart, and many people live in rural areas. On average, city parishes have around 100 members. Many communities have fewer. Thus, the clergy often had to care for more than one community, because the smaller ones did not have sufficient financial means to support their own priest. During its existence, the diocese always received financial subsidies from other North American dioceses, which had larger revenues.²⁹ After the renewed schism of 1947, the Church Abroad established its own Diocese of Eastern Canada, with Montréal as the bishop's residence. Whereas, before World War II, the eastern Canadian communities were mostly very small, today the most numerically significant communities are found there. One of the oldest communities on Canadian soil is in the Diocese of Eastern Canada. It is the community in Lachine (Province of Québec), which was founded in 1911.

Besides Russians, also Orthodox Romanians, Poles, Slovaks, Carpatho-Russians, Greeks, and other nationalities belong to this community.

The cities of Montréal and Toronto are the centers in eastern Canada. Besides Russian parishes, the Church Abroad has also a Romanian one in Montréal, a Bulgarian one in Willmot (near Niagara Falls), and a Bulgarian-Macedonian one in Toronto.

In 1957, both Canadian dioceses were merged, and Archbishop Vitalis (Ustinov) took over the rule of the diocese.

In 1970, Archbishop Vitalis had a vicar bishop in Edmonton, three archimandrites, two hegumens, seven archpriests, eight priests, four hieromonks, and two hierodeacons.³⁰ In many of the dioceses of the Church Abroad in the 1970s, the number of priests was decreasing due to old age; but by the early 1980s, there were thirty clergymen for 23 Church Abroad parishes³¹ in Canada although they also occasionally dispatched clergy to other dioceses in order to alleviate the shortage of priests. Among these were, for example, Archbishop Paul of Australia, who had been a member of the St. Job Brotherhood and administered the Diocese of Southern Germany, and Archimandrite Theodore (Galitzine), who looked after the communities in southern Germany.

The material situation of the Canadian Diocese is decidedly good. The Church headquarters in New York receives regular financial subsidies from Montréal to take care of its diverse tasks. The administrative and spiritual center of the diocese is Montréal. The Cathedral of St. Nicholas is there; it was consecrated in 1964 and is located in a large building complex in the city center. The total price of the plot was to have been \$180,000 but was subsequently reduced to \$130,000 because the building was in need of repair. The plot with the old cathedral, which in the meantime had become dilapidated, was sold to the city for \$100,000 so that the new cathedral and a large adjacent building could be paid for in short order.³²

The church's iconostasis consists of three tiers of icons, which total 115 in number.³³ The church utensils and liturgical books come from the old cathedral. In a side part of the building is the parish center, which includes a spacious hall for meetings, a library with a bookshop, a parish school, and so on. Next to the cathedral lies a second building with forty rooms. In this house is the archbishop's residence, a residence for the St. Job Brotherhood, a chapel in honor of St. Seraphim of Sarov, the diocesan offices, and a small printing press and publishing house. The press has been producing the periodical *Orthodox Messenger in Canada (Pravoslavny Vestnik v Kanade)* since 1961. Since 1964, this has appeared in printed form with approximately 12 pages per issue and 12 issues per year.

From time to time, a few nuns have also lived at the cathedral in addition to the St. Job Brotherhood. The former, together with the lay sisterhood named in honor of St. Olga, undertook to work with the young and elderly. There were as many as seven nuns and twenty women in the lay sisterhood. Among the nuns were four very aged and invalid sisters from Harbin, whom the Communist authorities had allowed to leave China in the late 1950s.³⁴ Mother Theodosia (Baranova, later Abbess of the Mt. of Olives Convent in Palestine) took over the direction of the sisterhood.

For the monks of the St. Job Brotherhood who had come to Montréal from Edmonton with Metropolitan Vitalis, a skete named in honor of Christ's Transfiguration was built on the Canadian-U.S. border in the early 1960s.³⁵ This monastery has a church, consecrated in 1976, several houses with cells for monks and guests, a candle works, a printing press, a Russian cemetery, a small farm, and extensive woodlands. The skete is only occupied in the summer, for the Brotherhood winters in Montréal.³⁶

The Brotherhood's printing press and publishing house is of special significance to the Church Abroad in general, as well as to the Canadian diocese. Since 1947-48, the Brotherhood has also published the journal *Orthodox Observer (Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie)*, which has enjoyed wide distribution. In 1972, the Brotherhood began publishing an English-language periodical *The True Vine*, the publication of which had, however, to be suspended. The publishing house has also produced many books in addition to periodicals, e.g. the two-volume edition of Archpriest George Grabbe's *The Church & Its Teaching in Life (Tserkov i eya uchenie v zhizni)* (1964 and 1970), a bilingual (Russian/English) anniversary album in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Russian Church Abroad, and numerous smaller books and writings.

The Herald reports on diocesan life and the individual Canadian parishes, as well as the life of the Church Abroad. It also regularly publishes the budget of individual parishes, including the Montreal cathedral, whose budget in the 1960s was approximately \$30-35,000. Income exceeded expenditures by \$25,000. Income was derived primarily from the sale of candles (ca. \$8,000) and from donations (approximately \$10,000), the remainder coming from other sources. The main expenditures were at \$7,800 for the support of the clergy and another \$2,000 for candle supplies. After the money owed on the cathedral and the adjacent building was repaid, the parish had a profit of \$5,000-\$10,000 annually. In the mid-1970s the profit amounted to \$50,000.³⁷ The journal also published the budgets of smaller communities from time to time. Thus, the parish in

Vancouver had an income of \$5,700, in contrast to its expenditures of \$7,000. The parish in Winnipeg had an income of \$6,900, and expenditures of \$6,800. Both statistics came from the year 1970. ³⁸

The development of this blossoming church life is largely thanks to the labors of Archbishop Vitalis. For his work, he was awarded a jeweled cross for his *klobuk* in 1971; and in 1976, he was named the second deputy to Metropolitan Philaret. Due to his excellent knowledge of French (he had attended the French Lycée in Lemain, near Paris), he was able to maintain positive contact with the authorities in the French-speaking province of Québec and with the local populace. Through lectures and publications in Russian, French, and English, he did much to awaken and gain an understanding of the Church Abroad.

Footnotes

1. Seraphim, *Church Unity*, pp. 24-25; *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2, p. 806. ↵
2. *Church News* (1940) 7, p. 40. ↵
3. *Otchet 5-go s'ezda*, pp. 40-41. ↵
4. *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie* (1976/77) pp. 194-200, here p. 195. ↵
5. *Ibid.*, p.195. ↵
6. *Canada Yearbook* (1978/1979), pp. 161-162. Also, 189,653 Uniates lived there in 1961 and 227,730 in 1971. ↵
7. *Ibid.*, p. 161. ↵
8. *Ibid.*, p. 162. ↵
9. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, p. 272. ↵
10. *Prav. Rus'* (1949) 20, pp. 2-11. ↵
11. *Ibid.* (1953) 9, pp. 7-19. ↵
12. *Spisok* (1989), pp. 16-18, 27. ↵
13. *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches* (1978), p. 127. ↵
14. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 5, pp. 278-279. ↵
15. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) 7, pp. 104-105. ↵
16. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2, pp. 806-808. ↵
17. *Ibid.*, p. 821; *Otchet 5-go s'ezda*, p. 41. ↵
18. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2:, pp. 821-823. ↵
19. *Otchet 5-go s'ezda*, p. 40. ↵

20. *Arkhiepiskop Ioasaf v vospominaniyakh*, p. 38. ↵
21. *Church News* (1940) 9, pp. 53-56; 10, p. 55. ↵
22. *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 6, p. 13; *The Orthodox Word* (1968), pp. 85-87. ↵
23. *Otchet 5-go s'ezda*, pp. 40-41. ↵
24. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
25. *Russ. Prav.* Ts. 2, pp. 851-853. ↵
26. *Ibid.*, p. 854. ↵
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 820-846. ↵
28. *Pravoslavny vestnik v Kanade* (1964) 7, p. 8. ↵
29. *Otchet 5-go s'ezda*, p. 44. ↵
30. *Pravoslavny vestnik v Kanade* (1970) 3, p. 2. ↵
31. *Spisok* (1989) pp. 16-18. ↵
32. *Pravoslavny vestnik v Kanade* (1964) 4, p. 7; 7, p. 6. ↵
33. *Ibid.* (1972) 18-19, Supplement with unnumbered pages. ↵
34. *Ibid.* (1962) 7, p. 8. ↵
35. *Russ. Prav.* Ts. 2, pp. 818-819. ↵
36. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
37. *Pravoslavny vestnik v Kanade* (1964) 3, p. 5; (1970) 1, p. 10; (1975) 2, p. 13. ↵
38. *Ibid.*, (1971) 8, p. 12; 10, P. 8; (1974) 8-9, p. 16. ↵

Part IV, Chapter 1.6

The Dioceses in South America

Before World War I, there was only one Russian Orthodox parish in South America, ¹ the Holy Trinity Church in Buenos Aires. After the severing of relations with the Russian Patriarchal Church, this community was forced to become self-administering. The first Russian immigrants arrived in Brazil in 1921. From the mid-1920s onwards, other groups of émigrés followed suit.

Practically all Russian Orthodox parishes in South America today can trace their origins to the Church Abroad, except the aforementioned parish in Buenos Aires. This also applies to the parishes presently belonging to the Moscow Patriarchate. The latter's first parish came into existence in 1941 as the result of a schism in the Holy Trinity Church in Buenos Aires. They were received into the Patriarchal jurisdiction in 1946. Almost twenty years later, in 1968, they were able to consecrate their own Church of the Annunciation. The Moscow Patriarchate's hope that it would annex other émigré parishes was, however, not fulfilled. Only in Argentina did a minority of émigré communities split apart, establishing their own parishes under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. In the remaining South American countries, the Moscow Patriarchate is practically unrepresented. ² A few communities, mostly in Argentina, joined the North American Metropolia after 1947 for a period of time. Among these was the Holy Trinity Church in Buenos Aires, which, however, like other parishes, returned to the Church Abroad in 1961. A part of the Ukrainian-speaking Orthodox joined the so-called "Ukrainian Autocephalous Church," which has over 30 communities in Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, and Paraguay. ³

The Russian Orthodox Church Abroad is represented today in South America by 2 dioceses, 34 parishes, and a small convent with an orphanage in Chile. Fifteen priests and one deacon care for the parishes. Many parishes which had been founded in the 1930s and 1940s had to be closed in the 1960s because their members had died out. This happened for the most part in diaspora communities located in remote parts of the country.

The parishes that are still in existence today in Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, and Chile are located in the densely populated areas of the main cities or the industrial regions where larger groups of Russian émigrés live. The parishes in Paraguay, Uruguay, and Peru may continue to exist as diaspora communities made up of very small émigré groups, but are only barely able to maintain their existence.

In 1889, the first Russian church in South America was consecrated by decree of Emperor Alexander III, dated 1888. It was a small house chapel at the Russian Embassy, which, aside from the diplomatic envoys of the Russian Empire, counted also Orthodox Greeks, Syrians, and Southern Slavs among its faithful. Its first clergyman, Father Constantine Ivraztsov, was appointed in 1891. Because this small chapel could not meet the needs of an increasingly populous community, Father Izraztsov undertook a journey to Russia in order to collect money to build a new church. Icons, church utensils, and liturgical books were quickly donated by the Holy Synod and the faithful so that after a three-year building period, the Holy Trinity Church in the center of the city could be consecrated. It has five cupolas and was built in the southern Russian style. The church's iconostasis is of particular artistic value: it was built in the style of a

church portal and consists of three ranks of icons painted in a realistic style. Over the royal doors is a bow stretching upwards, which is crowned by four onion-shaped cupolas. As an example of Russian church architecture at the end of the 19th century, the church today is under protection as a landmark. Since its return to the jurisdiction of Church Abroad in 1961, it is directly subject to the Synod in New York.⁴ Until the end of World War I, the church remained the only Russian Orthodox Church in South America.

It is not known precisely at what point in time Father Constantine Izraztsov recognized the Church Abroad as the supreme ecclesiastical governing body of the Russian emigration. At the Council of Karlovtsy in 1921, the Argentine community was not represented. The parish continued to exist in those first years as an independent body and Father Izraztsov registered the parish with the Argentine authorities as a “Russian Orthodox Union” with the rights of a legal person. In the principal periodical of the Synod of Bishops, there was a reference to the Argentine parish in the summer of 1926. It said that Father Izraztsov maintains good relations with various Greek and Syrian families, who have their children baptized in his church because he intones litanies and the Gospel in Greek; faithful of various nationalities belong to his parish.⁵ Presumably this report is based on reports and correspondence between the Synod and Father Izraztsov, who must have made contact with the church leadership in Karlovtsy around this time. On 10/23 July 1926, the Synod finally appointed Father Izraztsov “head of all parishes in South America.”⁶ At this point in time, there were no other parishes in South America besides Buenos Aires. The appointment was, therefore, probably more a plan for the future because, from the mid-1920s, large groups of émigrés arrived in South America. These remained under the direction of Father Izraztsov, who in turn was directly subject to Bishop Theodosius.

In 1934 Bishop Theodosius of Detroit was appointed Bishop of São Paulo & Brazil and was given jurisdiction over the Russian parishes in South America, with the exception of the parishes in Argentina, which remained under Father Izraztsov, who was directly subordinate to Bishop Theodosius. The appointment of Bishop Theodosius as Bishop of São Paulo & Brazil was successful, for in the 1930s Brazil gained many parishes.

This arrangement remained in effect until 1946/47. After the North American Metropolia’s schism, Archpriest Izraztsov, with a part of his parish and the Holy Trinity Church, joined the North American Metropolia. The Synod then created its own diocese of Buenos Aires & Argentina, whose rule was given to Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk). A third diocese existed in Paraguay: the Diocese of Asuncion & Paraguay, governed by Bishop Leontius (Philippovich). There were also bishops appointed for Venezuela and Columbia: Bishop Eulogius (Markovsky) received the title of Bishop of Caracas & Venezuela, though he was unable to assume office due to poor health. He remained, until his death in 1951, a member of the Synod, and reposed in Mahopac, NY. Bishop Nathaniel (Lvov) was appointed Bishop of Columbia in 1952. However, he took over the administration of the Russian parishes in North Africa instead.

The Diocese of Paraguay existed only between the years 1947-53. In Paraguay there was a small parish, its membership consisted mostly of Russian officers and engineers belonged, who had come there as advisors to the government. With financial support from Argentina, they were able to consecrate a small church dedicated to the Holy Protection. Other parishes, all with less than

fifty faithful, existed in Encarnacion, Miranda, and Fram. When, after World War II, larger groups of émigrés from Europe were brought into Paraguay, the Synod decided to create a separate diocese for Paraguay. This arrangement was also supposed to prevent the parishes from falling away from the Church Abroad after Archpriest Izraztsov had joined the Metropolia. He had had a close relationship with the parishes in Paraguay. With the appointment of Bishop Leontius, there were also hopes that a monastery would be founded because together with him five monks from the Saint Job Brotherhood in Munich arrived in Paraguay. The brothers wanted to found a monastery in Miranda because there was a six-hectare plot of land attached to the church there. After the parish refused to put their church at the disposal of the Brotherhood as a monastery church, these plans had to be dropped. The Diocese of Paraguay has not occupied again and was joined to that of Argentina.⁷ Today there are only two parishes of the Church Abroad in Paraguay; the aged Archpriest I. Petrov was entrusted with the pastoral care of the families in the country. A few thousand faithful were alleged to be present in the country.⁸ After the effort in Paraguay failed, Bishop Leontius was finally appointed ruling bishop of the new Diocese of Santiago and Chile. The monks from Paraguay left for Argentina and Chile.

The Chilean Diocese is the smallest diocese of the Church Abroad. There is one parish in Peru and one in Chile, with a convent near Santiago, which is the only Orthodox convent in South America. The community in Peru has existed since 1949. Besides Russians, Orthodox Arabs, who have been living in the country for decades, also belong to the community. Because they have partially forgotten their mother tongue, divine services are conducted in Church Slavonic for the Russians and in Spanish for the Arabs.⁹ In 1963 the parish was able to consecrate its own church. However, a few weeks after the consecration, the parish joined the North American Metropolia.¹⁰ Those who remained loyal to the Church Abroad are cared for by the clergy from Chile.

The first Russian émigrés who came to Chile were from the Far East and belonged to those refugees who, after the communist seizure of power, had to leave China. They arrived in Chile in the early 1950s. The majority of them remained there for only a short time because they were unable to find work and traveled on to other South American countries. Only in Santiago was a small parish established, which was able to consecrate the Holy Trinity Cathedral at the end of that decade.¹¹ Besides the cathedral, there were also Russian Orthodox chapels in Vina del Mar and Concepcion. The latter was destroyed in an earthquake in 1960. Near Puente Alto (in Santiago Province) there is a Russian cemetery. Until Allende seized power, there were another six parishes, which, however, had no place to hold divine services. After the leftist government seized power, most Russians left the country.

The focal point of church life was the Convent of the Dormition, founded in 1958 near Santiago.¹² The first occupants took up an invitation from Bishop Leontius. They came from the Holy Land and were joined by nuns from Brazil, who were living in Villa Alpina, where a small community of nuns existed. The goal of this group was the foundation of an orphanage and a school on the model of the Bethany Convent near Jerusalem. In 1969, the orphanage and school were opened. In the orphanage, there were over 40 Chilean children between 2 and 10 years of age, who were all baptized into the Orthodox Faith. At the school, 100 children received

instruction at first, though this number rose. In 1977, 186 students attended the school. The curriculum corresponds to that in the Chilean schools, with the additional subjects of Russian language, history, and literature, and Orthodox catechism. Children of Russian émigrés, as well as Chilean children, attend school. ¹³

After the death of Archbishop Theodosius of Brazil in 1968, Bishop Leontius was appointed Archbishop of São Paulo & Brazil. From 1969 until his death in 1971, he headed both the Diocese of São Paulo & Brazil and that of Santiago & Chile. After his repose, the administration of the Chilean diocese was transferred to Archimandrite Benjamin (Vosniuk).

The youngest ecclesiastical region in South America is that of Caracas & Venezuela. As already mentioned, the Synod named Bishop Eulogius to the see of Caracas & Venezuela, though he did not assume this office. Only in 1957 was Archimandrite Seraphim (Svezhevsky) consecrated Bishop of Caracas & Venezuela. He headed the diocese until his retirement in 1984. (He reposed in 1996). From 1968-1976, he was simultaneously also the ruling bishop of São Paulo & Brazil. In 1976 he relinquished the latter to Bishop Nicander. Orthodox faithful, mostly Greeks and Arabs, had been living in Venezuela since the 1920s. There were no Orthodox priests. Only in 1947 did a Russian priest arrive, together with a group of Russian émigrés. Other priests followed in 1948 and 1949, to care for the Russian faithful. The first parishes were in Caracas, Valencia, Atavisa, Barkismento, and other cities. The direction of the parishes was given to Archpriest John Baumanis, who was formerly a clergyman attached to the cathedral in Riga, Latvia. Archbishop Theodosius of Brazil oversaw the spiritual life there. Within a few years, six parishes came into existence; each had its own priest. The first stone church, the Church of the Mother of God of the Sign, a flat structure with a large cupola, was consecrated in 1950 in Valencia. ¹⁴ Around the same time the parishes in Barkismento, Maracay, and Caracas started building their own churches. In Maracay, a church dedicated to Saint Nicholas was consecrated in 1953, likewise a stone church. Finally in 1955, Saint Nicholas Church in Caracas was consecrated; it was built in Pskov style. The inside of the church was frescoed in its entirety; the icon screen was painted in the traditional Russian style. After Archimandrite Seraphim's consecration as Bishop of Caracas, the church became the episcopal cathedral. In 1960 a small home for the elderly was opened in Valencia. The first plans for this date back to 1950. The financial resources, however, only covered the cost of the parish church. With the support of other parishes, the necessary money was finally collected for the purchase of a plot of land, and the building of the small home for the elderly was begun. ¹⁵ In Caracas, where the most émigrés lived and there are three communities, a cemetery was established in 1965.

From 1958, its own journal, *Eparkhial'nyi Vestnik (Diocesan Herald)*, was published, which, however, has more recently been suspended. Today, six parishes remain in Venezuela; all have their own churches. The parishes are cared for by an archbishop, three archpriests, and two hieromonks. From their very beginnings, the parishes had their own priests because among the refugees there were priests accompanying them. Each of the churches had parish sisterhoods that conducted work with the parish youth and elderly, church maintenance, and charitable work. The parishes supported community centers with libraries and church schools. ¹⁶

The largest numbers of faithful in South America live in Argentina and Brazil. The Holy Trinity Cathedral in Buenos Aires formed the ecclesiastical center for the Russian Orthodox communities in South America in the 1920s and 1930s. After the appointment of Archbishop Theodosius in 1934, the center of church life shifted to Brazil, because most of the émigrés went there.

In his parish, Archpriest Constantine Izraztsov cared for not only Russian émigrés, but also for numerous Orthodox Greeks and Arabs. In 1936 he opened a parish school, which was attended by forty children of various nationalities. Instruction took place on Saturdays.

Simultaneously, Father Izraztsov began to build a parish library.¹⁷ In 1941, Father Izraztsov had already been serving at Holy Trinity Church in Buenos Aires for fifty years. His faithful held him in high esteem. When, in 1947, he decided to break with the Synod and join the North American Metropolia, most of the faithful joined him in this step in order to remain with the priest who had faithfully served them for so many years. The canonical question may have played only a minor role because upon Father Izraztsov's repose in 1961, the parish returned to the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad.¹⁸ The confusion that ensued within the Argentine diocese on account of this schism was exploited by the Moscow Patriarchate, which consecrated its own bishop for South America; Hegumen Theodore (Tekuchev) was appointed Bishop of Buenos Aires & South America. Thereupon, a portion of the faithful joined the jurisdiction of the Patriarchal Church. The faithful who remained true to the Church Abroad in Argentina were in the minority. This changed suddenly, starting in 1948, with the influx of Russian refugees into Argentina. Today the Church Abroad in Argentina has the largest number of faithful, while the Patriarchal Church has no parishes beyond Buenos Aires, as Sister Angelina, who is herself a member of the Patriarchate, writes.¹⁹

In 1947 Bishop Nathaniel visited Eva Peron in Switzerland in order to negotiate the reception of Russian refugees into Argentina.²⁰ The result of this visit was the opening of the Argentine borders to several thousand Russian refugees from Europe. Priests were dispatched to accompany the émigrés and organize their future parish life. Archimandrite Michael (Dikii) became the administrator of the Church Abroad's parishes. He had been a priest at the church in Bratislava and had been educated for the priesthood at the Saint Job of Pochaev Monastery in Ladomirova.²¹ He organized a new parish, which was consecrated as the Holy Resurrection Church, for the faithful who had been forced to leave Holy Trinity Church. A parish school was opened for children of the refugees arriving from Europe, which 30 children attended.²² In 1957 the community laid the cornerstone for a new church, which at the same time was to serve as the bishop's cathedral. In 1960 Holy Resurrection Church was consecrated.²³ A year later, Holy Trinity Church returned to the jurisdiction of the Synod of Bishops.

The wave of emigration that started in 1948 led to the establishment of numerous new parishes in the country. In 1948 alone, the following parishes were constituted: the parish of Saint Sergius of Radonezh in Ballester, which built its own church in the Pskov style during the years 1956-59,²⁴ the parish of Saint Hermogenes in Quilmes, which in 1952 was able to consecrate a spacious stone church,²⁵ and the parish of the Holy Protection of the Mother of God in Temperley, where there was also a home for invalids.²⁶ Finally, the parish of Saint John the

Forerunner was founded in Villa Diamante, which just one year later was able to consecrate a makeshift church in a barrack.²⁷ These parishes, like most of the other communities founded by 1950, were all located in the Province of Buenos Aires.

Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk), who was appointed Archbishop of Buenos Aires & Argentina, was to administer the parishes and build up church life. He remained in his diocese only until 1950 and then had to leave the country by order of the authorities. Archbishop Joasaph took over the rule of the diocese from 1951-55. Under his rule, church life in Argentina blossomed. The authorities officially acknowledged him as head of the Russian parishes there. In 1958 the parishes joined together in a “Russian Orthodox Congregation in Argentina,” which received recognition as a legal person, and since then has been the legal possessor of all churches and church property of the Church Abroad in Argentina. The bishop, who must be appointed by the Synod, is the head of the “congregation,” thereby preventing a change in the ownership of church property should individual priests or faithful change jurisdictions.²⁸

The publication of their own diocesan journals and parish newsletters began. The parish in Buenos Aires published *Pravoslavnoe Slovo* (Orthodox Word); the community in Temperley published *Blagovestnik* (Good News). The former appeared monthly in printed form with approximately sixteen pages. It was replaced in 1969 by the *Tserkovnyi Vestnik Argentinskoi Eparkhii Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi Zagranitsei* (*Church Herald of the Diocese of Argentina of the Russian Church Abroad*), which, however, only appeared in mimeographed form.

Archbishop Joasaph, who worked all his life to establish monastic communities, also undertook an attempt to establish a monastery in Argentina. In 1951 Mother Gabriela (Plitenko) was tonsured a nun; she was the first to be tonsured there.²⁹ Mother Gabriela had belonged to the community in Ballester and was to direct a community of nuns because individual nuns had also come to Argentina among the refugees.³⁰ The attempt to establish a convent failed, however, due to a lack of financial means. The nuns were then active in various parishes and later joined the convent in Santiago.

The rule of the diocese lay in the hands of Archbishop Joasaph until 1955. In 1952, in recognition of his service, he was awarded the jeweled cross for his *klobuk*. After his death, Bishop Athanasius (Martos) took over the rule of the diocese. He was elevated to the rank of archbishop in 1956, and in the following year, he was awarded the jeweled cross for his *klobuk*. In the same year the parish in Montevideo (Uruguay) was placed under his rule and in 1976 also the parishes in Paraguay. Until his death in 1983, he bore the title of Archbishop of Buenos Aires, Argentina, & Paraguay. In 1982, the hierarch celebrated his fortieth anniversary as a bishop. He is the most senior hierarch of the Church Abroad.

Eleven parishes in Argentina, two in Paraguay, and one in Uruguay were subject to him. Besides these, five parishes in the diocese were directly subject to the Synod in New York, including Holy Trinity in Buenos Aires, a Romanian Orthodox exile parish, and three parishes in the Province of Misiones. These parishes formerly belonged to the Metropolia; they returned to the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad in the 1960s.

In 1934, the first Russian diocese in South America was created in Brazil. Bishop Theodosius took over the rule of the diocese with the title of Bishop of São Paulo & Brazil. All South American parishes except the ones in Argentina were subject to him. The appointment of a bishop for the Russian community was sensible inasmuch as the country had received thousands of Russian refugees in the 1920s. The first group of Russian immigrants came to Brazil in the summer of 1921. These were the members of the White Russian Army and former government officials, who had been evacuated from the Crimea by the French on the ships “Aquitaine” and “Provence” to Brazil, where they were given work on the coffee plantations.³¹ The second group of immigrants came in 1925/26. This time there were 15,000 people, mostly from the Baltics and Bessarabia.³² At the end of the 1920s, there must have been up to 20,000 Orthodox faithful living in Brazil. Other, smaller groups joined them in the 1930s, from the Far East and Eastern Europe. The third wave of immigrants came later, after World War II. These were refugees from the Far East, who fled Communist China. A total of 20-30,000 émigrés from the Far East are reported to have come to Brazil.³³ In 1964, the total of Russian Orthodox living there was estimated at about 30,000.³⁴ Most refugees lived in São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Goiana.

The first parish established in Brazil was the Church of Saint Nicholas in São Paulo. From 1927, it had been located in the parish hall of the Syrian Orthodox parish and was first entrusted to the guidance of the Syrian priest. Among the émigrés from the Baltic, there was a Russian priest named Father Michael Klyarovsky, who arrived in Brazil in January of 1927 and assumed the direction of the Russian community.

The Holy Trinity parish in Villa Alpina, a suburb of São Paulo, started building the first Russian church in 1932. They planned to build the church in Northern Russian style, as well as to build a community center in adjacent buildings. The building project was realized within a short time.³⁵ When Bishop Theodosius was named head of the Brazilian communities, he wished to make the church in Villa Alpina his residence. Because the church was not large enough, however, Saint Nicholas Church in São Paulo undertook to construct its own cathedral. The parish purchased its own land in 1937, and two years later the new cathedral was ready for consecration.³⁶ The church, built in northern Russian style, could hold around 700 faithful. Also, a church dedicated to Saint Seraphim of Sarov, with an attached residence, was built in Carabucuiba, a suburb of São Paulo. This became Bishop Theodosius’s summer residence.

Other parishes, including the ones in Porto Alegre, Niteroi, Rio de Janeiro, and other cities, were likewise founded in the 1930s. The majority of them consisted of 20 to 50 families.

Yet there were many faithful widely dispersed throughout the country, who on account of the distances were only able to attend services on feast days. Bishop Theodosius was concerned with just these faithful during his pastoral visits. Thus, he baptized thirty children during a single trip in 1935.³⁷ To strengthen the Faith among the people, their own journal appeared, *Golos pastyria* (*Voice of the Pastor*), which the contents of which were predominantly of a missionary and catechetical nature.

After 1948, when other refugees arrived, Archimandrite Vitalis (Ustinov) was appointed vicar bishop for Brazil with the title of Bishop of Montevideo. He arrived in Brazil in 1949 with his

Brotherhood of Saint Job of Pochaev. The group settled in Villa Alpina and founded Holy Trinity Monastery there. Twelve people belonged to the Brotherhood, including Father George Moissevsky (in monasticism Gregory) and the 20-year-old Tikhon Kalinin.³⁸ The Brotherhood had its own printing press, which published the diocesan newsletter, *Svet Khrista (The Light of Christ)*. The Brotherhood also printed various journals, books, and brochures. After Bishop Vitalis was transferred to Canada, the press and the monastery remained in existence for yet a while longer. In the end, a few older nuns lived in the house, but publication had to be suspended because there was no one to continue the work. In 1954, the diocesan administration established a school committee, because many children were to be found amongst the refugees from the Far East. The first school was dedicated in the same year in Indianapolis, a suburb of São Paulo, which in 1957 already had 50 pupils.³⁹ Other schools existed in Itu and Santos. In Villa Alpina, a boys' boarding school was opened; it housed ten orphans from Harbin. For the elderly in need of care, a nursing home was opened in São Paulo.⁴⁰

After Bishop Vitalis was transferred, Archimandrite Agapitus was appointed Vicar Bishop with the title of Bishop of Goiana. His successor as Vicar Bishop was Bishop Nicander with the title of Bishop of Rio de Janeiro. In 1968, Archbishop Theodosius died; he had led the diocese for 30 years. The leadership next fell to Archbishop Seraphim of Caracas & Venezuela, and then, in 1976, to Bishop Nicander. Today the diocese has 11 parishes, which are cared for by one bishop, four priests, one archimandrite, and a deacon.

The largest and most active parishes of the Church Abroad in South America are located on the Brazilian and Argentine coasts, in Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, and Buenos Aires, and in the north, on the Venezuelan coast, in Caracas and Barquisimeto. In Chile, the convent in Santiago forms the spiritual center on the west coast of South America. The remaining parishes in the interior locations of Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Peru and (in part) Chile have grown continually smaller or have been abandoned because of assimilation and further migration. Today, those parishes that remain are located in the center of the Russian immigrant communities, where numerous Orthodox believers of other nationalities also live. Therefore, they might have a robust chance of survival.

Footnotes

1. *StdO* (1969) 4, pp. 22-26. *JMP* (1954) 9, pp. 8-9. ↵
2. Cf. the Patriarchal parishes in the articles: *StdO* (1967) 3, pp. 21-27; (1970) 5, pp. 17-19; 11, pp. 7-18; (1973) 4, pp. 20-27. In Chile and Brazil, the attempts to establish their own parishes seem to have failed. In any event, no Patriarchal parishes are mentioned *StdO* (1967) 3, pp. 21-24; (1969) 6, pp. 29-32. ↵
3. *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie* (1976/1977) p. 191. ↵
4. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2, pp. 1180-1184. ↵
5. *Tserk. Ved.* (1925) 7-8, p. 15. ↵
6. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2, pp. 1183. ↵

7. Ibid., pp.1206-1213. ↵
8. *Prav. Rus*, (1977) 21, p. 15. ↵
9. *Tserk. Zhizn'*(1950) 5-6, p. 43; *Prav. Rus'* (1972) 10, pp. 9-10. ↵
10. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1240. ↵
11. Ibid., pp. 1238-1239; *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 3, pp. 15-16. ↵
12. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
13. *Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie* (1979) 47, pp. 63-68; *Prav. Rus'* (1972) 10, pp. 9-10. ↵
14. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1951) 1, p. 28; *Prav. Rus'* (1950) p. 14; (1951) 4, pp. 10-12. ↵
15. *Eparkhialny Vestnik [Venezuela]* (1960) 7, pp. 17-19; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1264. ↵
16. Ibid., 2, pp. 1244-1267. ↵
17. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) 4-5, p. 78. ↵
18. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1189. ↵
19. Angelina, *Orthodoxie in Argentinien*, pp. 15-24. ↵
20. *Prav. Rus'* (1947) 13, p.14. ↵
21. Ibid., p.14; (1948) 8-9, pp. 5-7. ↵
22. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1949) 5-6, p. 41. ↵
23. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1185. ↵
24. Ibid., pp. 1190-1193. ↵
25. Ibid., pp. 1195-1196. ↵
26. Ibid., pp. 1198-1205. ↵
27. Ibid., pp. 1193-1195. ↵
28. *Prav. Rus'* (1958) 7, pp. 10-11. ↵
29. Ibid. (1952) 2, p. 15. ↵
30. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1951) 5-6, p. 59. ↵
31. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1214; *Russky natsionalny kalendar'* (1951) pp. 120-125. ↵
32. Ibid., p. 122. ↵
33. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, p. 189. ↵
34. *Der christlichen Osten* (1964) 3, pp. 100-101. ↵

35. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1229-1231. ⇐
36. *Prav. Rus'* (1937) 13, p. 6; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1220. ⇐
37. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1935) 8, pp. 132-134. ⇐
38. *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 5, p.15; (1955) 7, p. 16. ⇐
39. *Ibid.*, (1964) 4, pp. 9-10. ⇐
40. *Der christlichen Osten* (1964) 3, pp. 100-101; *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 5, p. 15; (1967) 24, pp. 7-8. ⇐

Part IV, Chapter 1.6

The Dioceses in South America

Before World War I, there was only one Russian Orthodox parish in South America, ¹ the Holy Trinity Church in Buenos Aires. After the severing of relations with the Russian Patriarchal Church, this community was forced to become self-administering. The first Russian immigrants arrived in Brazil in 1921. From the mid-1920s onwards, other groups of émigrés followed suit.

Practically all Russian Orthodox parishes in South America today can trace their origins to the Church Abroad, except the aforementioned parish in Buenos Aires. This also applies to the parishes presently belonging to the Moscow Patriarchate. The latter's first parish came into existence in 1941 as the result of a schism in the Holy Trinity Church in Buenos Aires. They were received into the Patriarchal jurisdiction in 1946. Almost twenty years later, in 1968, they were able to consecrate their own Church of the Annunciation. The Moscow Patriarchate's hope that it would annex other émigré parishes was, however, not fulfilled. Only in Argentina did a minority of émigré communities split apart, establishing their own parishes under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. In the remaining South American countries, the Moscow Patriarchate is practically unrepresented. ² A few communities, mostly in Argentina, joined the North American Metropolia after 1947 for a period of time. Among these was the Holy Trinity Church in Buenos Aires, which, however, like other parishes, returned to the Church Abroad in 1961. A part of the Ukrainian-speaking Orthodox joined the so-called "Ukrainian Autocephalous Church," which has over 30 communities in Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, and Paraguay. ³

The Russian Orthodox Church Abroad is represented today in South America by 2 dioceses, 34 parishes, and a small convent with an orphanage in Chile. Fifteen priests and one deacon care for the parishes. Many parishes which had been founded in the 1930s and 1940s had to be closed in the 1960s because their members had died out. This happened for the most part in diaspora communities located in remote parts of the country.

The parishes that are still in existence today in Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, and Chile are located in the densely populated areas of the main cities or the industrial regions where larger groups of Russian émigrés live. The parishes in Paraguay, Uruguay, and Peru may continue to exist as diaspora communities made up of very small émigré groups, but are only barely able to maintain their existence.

In 1889, the first Russian church in South America was consecrated by decree of Emperor Alexander III, dated 1888. It was a small house chapel at the Russian Embassy, which, aside from the diplomatic envoys of the Russian Empire, counted also Orthodox Greeks, Syrians, and Southern Slavs among its faithful. Its first clergyman, Father Constantine Ivraztsov, was appointed in 1891. Because this small chapel could not meet the needs of an increasingly populous community, Father Izraztsov undertook a journey to Russia in order to collect money to build a new church. Icons, church utensils, and liturgical books were quickly donated by the Holy Synod and the faithful so that after a three-year building period, the Holy Trinity Church in the center of the city could be consecrated. It has five cupolas and was built in the southern Russian style. The church's iconostasis is of particular artistic value: it was built in the style of a

church portal and consists of three ranks of icons painted in a realistic style. Over the royal doors is a bow stretching upwards, which is crowned by four onion-shaped cupolas. As an example of Russian church architecture at the end of the 19th century, the church today is under protection as a landmark. Since its return to the jurisdiction of Church Abroad in 1961, it is directly subject to the Synod in New York.⁴ Until the end of World War I, the church remained the only Russian Orthodox Church in South America.

It is not known precisely at what point in time Father Constantine Izraztsov recognized the Church Abroad as the supreme ecclesiastical governing body of the Russian emigration. At the Council of Karlovtsy in 1921, the Argentine community was not represented. The parish continued to exist in those first years as an independent body and Father Izraztsov registered the parish with the Argentine authorities as a “Russian Orthodox Union” with the rights of a legal person. In the principal periodical of the Synod of Bishops, there was a reference to the Argentine parish in the summer of 1926. It said that Father Izraztsov maintains good relations with various Greek and Syrian families, who have their children baptized in his church because he intones litanies and the Gospel in Greek; faithful of various nationalities belong to his parish.⁵ Presumably this report is based on reports and correspondence between the Synod and Father Izraztsov, who must have made contact with the church leadership in Karlovtsy around this time. On 10/23 July 1926, the Synod finally appointed Father Izraztsov “head of all parishes in South America.”⁶ At this point in time, there were no other parishes in South America besides Buenos Aires. The appointment was, therefore, probably more a plan for the future because, from the mid-1920s, large groups of émigrés arrived in South America. These remained under the direction of Father Izraztsov, who in turn was directly subject to Bishop Theodosius.

In 1934 Bishop Theodosius of Detroit was appointed Bishop of São Paulo & Brazil and was given jurisdiction over the Russian parishes in South America, with the exception of the parishes in Argentina, which remained under Father Izraztsov, who was directly subordinate to Bishop Theodosius. The appointment of Bishop Theodosius as Bishop of São Paulo & Brazil was successful, for in the 1930s Brazil gained many parishes.

This arrangement remained in effect until 1946/47. After the North American Metropolia’s schism, Archpriest Izraztsov, with a part of his parish and the Holy Trinity Church, joined the North American Metropolia. The Synod then created its own diocese of Buenos Aires & Argentina, whose rule was given to Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk). A third diocese existed in Paraguay: the Diocese of Asuncion & Paraguay, governed by Bishop Leontius (Philippovich). There were also bishops appointed for Venezuela and Columbia: Bishop Eulogius (Markovsky) received the title of Bishop of Caracas & Venezuela, though he was unable to assume office due to poor health. He remained, until his death in 1951, a member of the Synod, and reposed in Mahopac, NY. Bishop Nathaniel (Lvov) was appointed Bishop of Columbia in 1952. However, he took over the administration of the Russian parishes in North Africa instead.

The Diocese of Paraguay existed only between the years 1947-53. In Paraguay there was a small parish, its membership consisted mostly of Russian officers and engineers belonged, who had come there as advisors to the government. With financial support from Argentina, they were able to consecrate a small church dedicated to the Holy Protection. Other parishes, all with less than

fifty faithful, existed in Encarnacion, Miranda, and Fram. When, after World War II, larger groups of émigrés from Europe were brought into Paraguay, the Synod decided to create a separate diocese for Paraguay. This arrangement was also supposed to prevent the parishes from falling away from the Church Abroad after Archpriest Izraztsov had joined the Metropolia. He had had a close relationship with the parishes in Paraguay. With the appointment of Bishop Leontius, there were also hopes that a monastery would be founded because together with him five monks from the Saint Job Brotherhood in Munich arrived in Paraguay. The brothers wanted to found a monastery in Miranda because there was a six-hectare plot of land attached to the church there. After the parish refused to put their church at the disposal of the Brotherhood as a monastery church, these plans had to be dropped. The Diocese of Paraguay has not occupied again and was joined to that of Argentina.⁷ Today there are only two parishes of the Church Abroad in Paraguay; the aged Archpriest I. Petrov was entrusted with the pastoral care of the families in the country. A few thousand faithful were alleged to be present in the country.⁸ After the effort in Paraguay failed, Bishop Leontius was finally appointed ruling bishop of the new Diocese of Santiago and Chile. The monks from Paraguay left for Argentina and Chile.

The Chilean Diocese is the smallest diocese of the Church Abroad. There is one parish in Peru and one in Chile, with a convent near Santiago, which is the only Orthodox convent in South America. The community in Peru has existed since 1949. Besides Russians, Orthodox Arabs, who have been living in the country for decades, also belong to the community. Because they have partially forgotten their mother tongue, divine services are conducted in Church Slavonic for the Russians and in Spanish for the Arabs.⁹ In 1963 the parish was able to consecrate its own church. However, a few weeks after the consecration, the parish joined the North American Metropolia.¹⁰ Those who remained loyal to the Church Abroad are cared for by the clergy from Chile.

The first Russian émigrés who came to Chile were from the Far East and belonged to those refugees who, after the communist seizure of power, had to leave China. They arrived in Chile in the early 1950s. The majority of them remained there for only a short time because they were unable to find work and traveled on to other South American countries. Only in Santiago was a small parish established, which was able to consecrate the Holy Trinity Cathedral at the end of that decade.¹¹ Besides the cathedral, there were also Russian Orthodox chapels in Vina del Mar and Concepcion. The latter was destroyed in an earthquake in 1960. Near Puente Alto (in Santiago Province) there is a Russian cemetery. Until Allende seized power, there were another six parishes, which, however, had no place to hold divine services. After the leftist government seized power, most Russians left the country.

The focal point of church life was the Convent of the Dormition, founded in 1958 near Santiago.¹² The first occupants took up an invitation from Bishop Leontius. They came from the Holy Land and were joined by nuns from Brazil, who were living in Villa Alpina, where a small community of nuns existed. The goal of this group was the foundation of an orphanage and a school on the model of the Bethany Convent near Jerusalem. In 1969, the orphanage and school were opened. In the orphanage, there were over 40 Chilean children between 2 and 10 years of age, who were all baptized into the Orthodox Faith. At the school, 100 children received

instruction at first, though this number rose. In 1977, 186 students attended the school. The curriculum corresponds to that in the Chilean schools, with the additional subjects of Russian language, history, and literature, and Orthodox catechism. Children of Russian émigrés, as well as Chilean children, attend school. ¹³

After the death of Archbishop Theodosius of Brazil in 1968, Bishop Leontius was appointed Archbishop of São Paulo & Brazil. From 1969 until his death in 1971, he headed both the Diocese of São Paulo & Brazil and that of Santiago & Chile. After his repose, the administration of the Chilean diocese was transferred to Archimandrite Benjamin (Vosniuk).

The youngest ecclesiastical region in South America is that of Caracas & Venezuela. As already mentioned, the Synod named Bishop Eulogius to the see of Caracas & Venezuela, though he did not assume this office. Only in 1957 was Archimandrite Seraphim (Svezhevsky) consecrated Bishop of Caracas & Venezuela. He headed the diocese until his retirement in 1984. (He reposed in 1996). From 1968-1976, he was simultaneously also the ruling bishop of São Paulo & Brazil. In 1976 he relinquished the latter to Bishop Nicander. Orthodox faithful, mostly Greeks and Arabs, had been living in Venezuela since the 1920s. There were no Orthodox priests. Only in 1947 did a Russian priest arrive, together with a group of Russian émigrés. Other priests followed in 1948 and 1949, to care for the Russian faithful. The first parishes were in Caracas, Valencia, Atavisa, Barkismento, and other cities. The direction of the parishes was given to Archpriest John Baumanis, who was formerly a clergyman attached to the cathedral in Riga, Latvia. Archbishop Theodosius of Brazil oversaw the spiritual life there. Within a few years, six parishes came into existence; each had its own priest. The first stone church, the Church of the Mother of God of the Sign, a flat structure with a large cupola, was consecrated in 1950 in Valencia. ¹⁴ Around the same time the parishes in Barkismento, Maracay, and Caracas started building their own churches. In Maracay, a church dedicated to Saint Nicholas was consecrated in 1953, likewise a stone church. Finally in 1955, Saint Nicholas Church in Caracas was consecrated; it was built in Pskov style. The inside of the church was frescoed in its entirety; the icon screen was painted in the traditional Russian style. After Archimandrite Seraphim's consecration as Bishop of Caracas, the church became the episcopal cathedral. In 1960 a small home for the elderly was opened in Valencia. The first plans for this date back to 1950. The financial resources, however, only covered the cost of the parish church. With the support of other parishes, the necessary money was finally collected for the purchase of a plot of land, and the building of the small home for the elderly was begun. ¹⁵ In Caracas, where the most émigrés lived and there are three communities, a cemetery was established in 1965.

From 1958, its own journal, *Eparkhial'nyi Vestnik (Diocesan Herald)*, was published, which, however, has more recently been suspended. Today, six parishes remain in Venezuela; all have their own churches. The parishes are cared for by an archbishop, three archpriests, and two hieromonks. From their very beginnings, the parishes had their own priests because among the refugees there were priests accompanying them. Each of the churches had parish sisterhoods that conducted work with the parish youth and elderly, church maintenance, and charitable work. The parishes supported community centers with libraries and church schools. ¹⁶

The largest numbers of faithful in South America live in Argentina and Brazil. The Holy Trinity Cathedral in Buenos Aires formed the ecclesiastical center for the Russian Orthodox communities in South America in the 1920s and 1930s. After the appointment of Archbishop Theodosius in 1934, the center of church life shifted to Brazil, because most of the émigrés went there.

In his parish, Archpriest Constantine Izraztsov cared for not only Russian émigrés, but also for numerous Orthodox Greeks and Arabs. In 1936 he opened a parish school, which was attended by forty children of various nationalities. Instruction took place on Saturdays.

Simultaneously, Father Izraztsov began to build a parish library.¹⁷ In 1941, Father Izraztsov had already been serving at Holy Trinity Church in Buenos Aires for fifty years. His faithful held him in high esteem. When, in 1947, he decided to break with the Synod and join the North American Metropolia, most of the faithful joined him in this step in order to remain with the priest who had faithfully served them for so many years. The canonical question may have played only a minor role because upon Father Izraztsov's repose in 1961, the parish returned to the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad.¹⁸ The confusion that ensued within the Argentine diocese on account of this schism was exploited by the Moscow Patriarchate, which consecrated its own bishop for South America; Hegumen Theodore (Tekuchev) was appointed Bishop of Buenos Aires & South America. Thereupon, a portion of the faithful joined the jurisdiction of the Patriarchal Church. The faithful who remained true to the Church Abroad in Argentina were in the minority. This changed suddenly, starting in 1948, with the influx of Russian refugees into Argentina. Today the Church Abroad in Argentina has the largest number of faithful, while the Patriarchal Church has no parishes beyond Buenos Aires, as Sister Angelina, who is herself a member of the Patriarchate, writes.¹⁹

In 1947 Bishop Nathaniel visited Eva Peron in Switzerland in order to negotiate the reception of Russian refugees into Argentina.²⁰ The result of this visit was the opening of the Argentine borders to several thousand Russian refugees from Europe. Priests were dispatched to accompany the émigrés and organize their future parish life. Archimandrite Michael (Dikii) became the administrator of the Church Abroad's parishes. He had been a priest at the church in Bratislava and had been educated for the priesthood at the Saint Job of Pochaev Monastery in Ladomirova.²¹ He organized a new parish, which was consecrated as the Holy Resurrection Church, for the faithful who had been forced to leave Holy Trinity Church. A parish school was opened for children of the refugees arriving from Europe, which 30 children attended.²² In 1957 the community laid the cornerstone for a new church, which at the same time was to serve as the bishop's cathedral. In 1960 Holy Resurrection Church was consecrated.²³ A year later, Holy Trinity Church returned to the jurisdiction of the Synod of Bishops.

The wave of emigration that started in 1948 led to the establishment of numerous new parishes in the country. In 1948 alone, the following parishes were constituted: the parish of Saint Sergius of Radonezh in Ballester, which built its own church in the Pskov style during the years 1956-59,²⁴ the parish of Saint Hermogenes in Quilmes, which in 1952 was able to consecrate a spacious stone church,²⁵ and the parish of the Holy Protection of the Mother of God in Temperley, where there was also a home for invalids.²⁶ Finally, the parish of Saint John the

Forerunner was founded in Villa Diamante, which just one year later was able to consecrate a makeshift church in a barrack.²⁷ These parishes, like most of the other communities founded by 1950, were all located in the Province of Buenos Aires.

Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk), who was appointed Archbishop of Buenos Aires & Argentina, was to administer the parishes and build up church life. He remained in his diocese only until 1950 and then had to leave the country by order of the authorities. Archbishop Joasaph took over the rule of the diocese from 1951-55. Under his rule, church life in Argentina blossomed. The authorities officially acknowledged him as head of the Russian parishes there. In 1958 the parishes joined together in a “Russian Orthodox Congregation in Argentina,” which received recognition as a legal person, and since then has been the legal possessor of all churches and church property of the Church Abroad in Argentina. The bishop, who must be appointed by the Synod, is the head of the “congregation,” thereby preventing a change in the ownership of church property should individual priests or faithful change jurisdictions.²⁸

The publication of their own diocesan journals and parish newsletters began. The parish in Buenos Aires published *Pravoslavnoe Slovo* (Orthodox Word); the community in Temperley published *Blagovestnik* (Good News). The former appeared monthly in printed form with approximately sixteen pages. It was replaced in 1969 by the *Tserkovnyi Vestnik Argentinskoi Eparkhii Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi Zagranitsei* (*Church Herald of the Diocese of Argentina of the Russian Church Abroad*), which, however, only appeared in mimeographed form.

Archbishop Joasaph, who worked all his life to establish monastic communities, also undertook an attempt to establish a monastery in Argentina. In 1951 Mother Gabriela (Plitenko) was tonsured a nun; she was the first to be tonsured there.²⁹ Mother Gabriela had belonged to the community in Ballester and was to direct a community of nuns because individual nuns had also come to Argentina among the refugees.³⁰ The attempt to establish a convent failed, however, due to a lack of financial means. The nuns were then active in various parishes and later joined the convent in Santiago.

The rule of the diocese lay in the hands of Archbishop Joasaph until 1955. In 1952, in recognition of his service, he was awarded the jeweled cross for his *klobuk*. After his death, Bishop Athanasius (Martos) took over the rule of the diocese. He was elevated to the rank of archbishop in 1956, and in the following year, he was awarded the jeweled cross for his *klobuk*. In the same year the parish in Montevideo (Uruguay) was placed under his rule and in 1976 also the parishes in Paraguay. Until his death in 1983, he bore the title of Archbishop of Buenos Aires, Argentina, & Paraguay. In 1982, the hierarch celebrated his fortieth anniversary as a bishop. He is the most senior hierarch of the Church Abroad.

Eleven parishes in Argentina, two in Paraguay, and one in Uruguay were subject to him. Besides these, five parishes in the diocese were directly subject to the Synod in New York, including Holy Trinity in Buenos Aires, a Romanian Orthodox exile parish, and three parishes in the Province of Misiones. These parishes formerly belonged to the Metropolia; they returned to the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad in the 1960s.

In 1934, the first Russian diocese in South America was created in Brazil. Bishop Theodosius took over the rule of the diocese with the title of Bishop of São Paulo & Brazil. All South American parishes except the ones in Argentina were subject to him. The appointment of a bishop for the Russian community was sensible inasmuch as the country had received thousands of Russian refugees in the 1920s. The first group of Russian immigrants came to Brazil in the summer of 1921. These were the members of the White Russian Army and former government officials, who had been evacuated from the Crimea by the French on the ships “Aquitaine” and “Provence” to Brazil, where they were given work on the coffee plantations.³¹ The second group of immigrants came in 1925/26. This time there were 15,000 people, mostly from the Baltics and Bessarabia.³² At the end of the 1920s, there must have been up to 20,000 Orthodox faithful living in Brazil. Other, smaller groups joined them in the 1930s, from the Far East and Eastern Europe. The third wave of immigrants came later, after World War II. These were refugees from the Far East, who fled Communist China. A total of 20-30,000 émigrés from the Far East are reported to have come to Brazil.³³ In 1964, the total of Russian Orthodox living there was estimated at about 30,000.³⁴ Most refugees lived in São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Goiana.

The first parish established in Brazil was the Church of Saint Nicholas in São Paulo. From 1927, it had been located in the parish hall of the Syrian Orthodox parish and was first entrusted to the guidance of the Syrian priest. Among the émigrés from the Baltic, there was a Russian priest named Father Michael Klyarovsky, who arrived in Brazil in January of 1927 and assumed the direction of the Russian community.

The Holy Trinity parish in Villa Alpina, a suburb of São Paulo, started building the first Russian church in 1932. They planned to build the church in Northern Russian style, as well as to build a community center in adjacent buildings. The building project was realized within a short time.³⁵ When Bishop Theodosius was named head of the Brazilian communities, he wished to make the church in Villa Alpina his residence. Because the church was not large enough, however, Saint Nicholas Church in São Paulo undertook to construct its own cathedral. The parish purchased its own land in 1937, and two years later the new cathedral was ready for consecration.³⁶ The church, built in northern Russian style, could hold around 700 faithful. Also, a church dedicated to Saint Seraphim of Sarov, with an attached residence, was built in Carabucuiba, a suburb of São Paulo. This became Bishop Theodosius’s summer residence.

Other parishes, including the ones in Porto Alegre, Niteroi, Rio de Janeiro, and other cities, were likewise founded in the 1930s. The majority of them consisted of 20 to 50 families.

Yet there were many faithful widely dispersed throughout the country, who on account of the distances were only able to attend services on feast days. Bishop Theodosius was concerned with just these faithful during his pastoral visits. Thus, he baptized thirty children during a single trip in 1935.³⁷ To strengthen the Faith among the people, their own journal appeared, *Golos pastyria (Voice of the Pastor)*, which the contents of which were predominantly of a missionary and catechetical nature.

After 1948, when other refugees arrived, Archimandrite Vitalis (Ustinov) was appointed vicar bishop for Brazil with the title of Bishop of Montevideo. He arrived in Brazil in 1949 with his

Brotherhood of Saint Job of Pochaev. The group settled in Villa Alpina and founded Holy Trinity Monastery there. Twelve people belonged to the Brotherhood, including Father George Moissevsky (in monasticism Gregory) and the 20-year-old Tikhon Kalinin.³⁸ The Brotherhood had its own printing press, which published the diocesan newsletter, *Svet Khrista (The Light of Christ)*. The Brotherhood also printed various journals, books, and brochures. After Bishop Vitalis was transferred to Canada, the press and the monastery remained in existence for yet a while longer. In the end, a few older nuns lived in the house, but publication had to be suspended because there was no one to continue the work. In 1954, the diocesan administration established a school committee, because many children were to be found amongst the refugees from the Far East. The first school was dedicated in the same year in Indianapolis, a suburb of São Paulo, which in 1957 already had 50 pupils.³⁹ Other schools existed in Itu and Santos. In Villa Alpina, a boys' boarding school was opened; it housed ten orphans from Harbin. For the elderly in need of care, a nursing home was opened in São Paulo.⁴⁰

After Bishop Vitalis was transferred, Archimandrite Agapitus was appointed Vicar Bishop with the title of Bishop of Goiana. His successor as Vicar Bishop was Bishop Nicander with the title of Bishop of Rio de Janeiro. In 1968, Archbishop Theodosius died; he had led the diocese for 30 years. The leadership next fell to Archbishop Seraphim of Caracas & Venezuela, and then, in 1976, to Bishop Nicander. Today the diocese has 11 parishes, which are cared for by one bishop, four priests, one archimandrite, and a deacon.

The largest and most active parishes of the Church Abroad in South America are located on the Brazilian and Argentine coasts, in Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, and Buenos Aires, and in the north, on the Venezuelan coast, in Caracas and Barquisimeto. In Chile, the convent in Santiago forms the spiritual center on the west coast of South America. The remaining parishes in the interior locations of Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Peru and (in part) Chile have grown continually smaller or have been abandoned because of assimilation and further migration. Today, those parishes that remain are located in the center of the Russian immigrant communities, where numerous Orthodox believers of other nationalities also live. Therefore, they might have a robust chance of survival.

Footnotes

1. *StdO* (1969) 4, pp. 22-26. *JMP* (1954) 9, pp. 8-9. ↵
2. Cf. the Patriarchal parishes in the articles: *StdO* (1967) 3, pp. 21-27; (1970) 5, pp. 17-19; 11, pp. 7-18; (1973) 4, pp. 20-27. In Chile and Brazil, the attempts to establish their own parishes seem to have failed. In any event, no Patriarchal parishes are mentioned *StdO* (1967) 3, pp. 21-24; (1969) 6, pp. 29-32. ↵
3. *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie* (1976/1977) p. 191. ↵
4. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2, pp. 1180-1184. ↵
5. *Tserk. Ved.* (1925) 7-8, p. 15. ↵
6. *Russ. Prav. Ts.*, 2, pp. 1183. ↵

7. Ibid., pp.1206-1213. ↵
8. *Prav. Rus*, (1977) 21, p. 15. ↵
9. *Tserk. Zhizn'*(1950) 5-6, p. 43; *Prav. Rus'* (1972) 10, pp. 9-10. ↵
10. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1240. ↵
11. Ibid., pp. 1238-1239; *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 3, pp. 15-16. ↵
12. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
13. *Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie* (1979) 47, pp. 63-68; *Prav. Rus'* (1972) 10, pp. 9-10. ↵
14. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1951) 1, p. 28; *Prav. Rus'* (1950) p. 14; (1951) 4, pp. 10-12. ↵
15. *Eparkhialny Vestnik [Venezuela]* (1960) 7, pp. 17-19; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1264. ↵
16. Ibid., 2, pp. 1244-1267. ↵
17. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) 4-5, p. 78. ↵
18. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1189. ↵
19. Angelina, *Orthodoxie in Argentinien*, pp. 15-24. ↵
20. *Prav. Rus'* (1947) 13, p.14. ↵
21. Ibid., p.14; (1948) 8-9, pp. 5-7. ↵
22. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1949) 5-6, p. 41. ↵
23. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1185. ↵
24. Ibid., pp. 1190-1193. ↵
25. Ibid., pp. 1195-1196. ↵
26. Ibid., pp. 1198-1205. ↵
27. Ibid., pp. 1193-1195. ↵
28. *Prav. Rus'* (1958) 7, pp. 10-11. ↵
29. Ibid. (1952) 2, p. 15. ↵
30. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1951) 5-6, p. 59. ↵
31. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1214; *Russky natsionalny kalendar'* (1951) pp. 120-125. ↵
32. Ibid., p. 122. ↵
33. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, p. 189. ↵
34. *Der christlichen Osten* (1964) 3, pp. 100-101. ↵

35. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1229-1231. ⇐
36. *Prav. Rus'* (1937) 13, p. 6; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1220. ⇐
37. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1935) 8, pp. 132-134. ⇐
38. *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 5, p.15; (1955) 7, p. 16. ⇐
39. *Ibid.*, (1964) 4, pp. 9-10. ⇐
40. *Der christlichen Osten* (1964) 3, pp. 100-101; *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 5, p. 15; (1967) 24, pp. 7-8. ⇐

Part IV, Chapter 1.7

The Dioceses in Western Europe & Great Britain

In Europe, most Russian Orthodox churches outside Russia are located in the central and western parts of the continent. In 1640, a church was consecrated in the Russian Trade Building in Stockholm. Trade and diplomatic relations between Russia and Western Europe since Peter I (the Great) led to the establishment of Russian churches in residences and capitals. Divine services were held at the embassy church in London from 1716, 1718 in Berlin, and 1720 in Paris.

The building of Russian Orthodox churches in Western Europe increased, particularly in the second half of the 19th century. The churches were built with the blessing of the Metropolitan of Saint Petersburg, to whom the Russian churches in Western Europe were subject. Thus, the following churches were consecrated in the following years: in 1855, Saint Elizabeth Church in Wiesbaden; in 1861, in Paris, both Holy Trinity Church and the Saint Alexander Nevsky Church; in 1866, in Geneva, the Church of the Elevation of the Cross; in 1874, in Dresden, the Church of Saint Simeon; in 1876, in Ems, the Church of the Martyred Empress Alexandra; in 1882, in Baden-Baden, Church of the Transfiguration; in 1883, in Copenhagen, the Church of Saint Alexander Nevsky; in 1889, in Vienna, the Saint Nicholas Church; in 1902-03, in Florence, the Church of the Nativity of Christ and the Saint Nicholas Church; in 1922, in Nice, the Church of Saint Nicholas and the Church of the Martyred Empress Alexandra. All these churches were built in order “to meet the religious needs of the Orthodox Russians resident in various countries of Western Europe.”¹

The establishment of diplomatic relations, the numerous dynastic connections between the Russian and European ruling houses – above all with the German nobility – were some of the main causes for the establishment of Russian churches in Western Europe. From the mid-1800s, the Russian nobility and the affluent middle class, desiring to travel, were coming to Europe; the German and Austrian spas, the Italian Riviera, and the French Côte d’Azur, all attracted Russian travelers in summer and winter: those who did not want to spend the summer months in Petersburg, Moscow, or other Russian cities, or who fled the raw winter to the balmy Mediterranean. Between San Remo and Cannes (barely 40 miles), a dozen Russian churches are located.

The Revolution and the famine in Russia brought masses of Russian émigrés into Central and Western Europe. In Germany alone, 560,000 Russians are estimated to have lived.² In 1929, according to a League of Nations’ study of refugees, 400,000 émigrés were living in France and 150,000 in Germany.³ Thus, numerous parishes and new churches were established.

Since the establishment of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad in 1920, there has been no other ecclesiastical province in which there were more schisms and jurisdictional changes than in the Western European Diocese. The schism with the most serious consequences was the separation of Metropolitan Eulogius’ group from the Synod of Bishops in 1926. Since then, that group changed its jurisdictional loyalty as follows: from June 1926 until August 1927, it was autonomous; from August 1927 until October 1930, it belonged to the Moscow Patriarchate; from February 1931 until August 1945, to the Patriarchate of Constantinople; from September

1945 until March 1947, to Moscow and Constantinople simultaneously; then until 1965, again to Constantinople; from 1965 until 1970, it was again autonomous; and finally, in 1970, it returned to the jurisdiction of Constantinople. At each change, bishops, priests, and faithful broke away. In 1931, Bishop Benjamin (Fedchenko) separated from Eulogius and remained under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate; a half dozen parishes joined him. From 1945 to 1947, Bishops Sergius (Korolev) and Alexander (Nemolovsky) separated from the Paris Jurisdiction, after Archbishop Vladimir (Tikhonitsky) had again submitted to Moscow. This new change was not made by several parishes, which remained under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate, including the Saint Nicholas Church in Brussels, the Belgian Orthodox Mission, the communities in Holland, and a few in England and North America.⁴

The Paris Jurisdiction of Metropolitan Eulogius was not unique in its changes of loyalty.

Metropolitan Seraphim (Lukianov), who had ruled the Church Abroad's Western European Diocese, likewise joined the Patriarchal Church in 1945. (He later returned to the Church Abroad.) Bishop Gregory (Ostroumov) of Cannes left the Church Abroad and took his parish with him. Shortly before his death, in 1947, he and his parish returned to the Church Abroad. The Church Abroad's cathedral parish in Paris, the parish of the Mother of God of the Sign, separated from its bishop of many years, Metropolitan Seraphim, and joined Metropolitan Vladimir (Tikhonitsky), who was the successor to Metropolitan Eulogius. The jurisdictional changes of the clergy and bishops were rejected by many of the faithful. Thus, schisms multiplied and formed the basis of new parishes. This hit smaller parishes especially hard, as they often lost not only their places of worship but also their priests.

The Patriarchal Church was the beneficiary of the schisms in the émigré Church after World War II. Before 1945, Moscow had only five parishes in Western Europe.⁵ After his break with the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration, Metropolitan Eulogius had seventy-five parishes, of which fifty were in France; the Church Abroad's ruling bishop had thirty-one parishes, of which seventeen were in France.⁶ Considering that in 1926 Archbishop Seraphim had only two parishes in England, it is remarkable that he was able, in just a few years after taking over the rule of the Western European Diocese, to put the Church Abroad on a firm basis. One should not overlook the fact that these 31 parishes largely grew out of already existing communities that had split. In only a few cases did entire parishes join the Church Abroad and renounce Metropolitan Eulogius's leadership.

The departure of faithful, the retirement of priests, and the loss of church buildings led to bitterness and reproaches on both sides. Today the positions of both groups are so firmly entrenched that, after over 70 years of separation, a reunification of these two parts of the Russian Church sadly appears to be largely out of the question.

The rule of the Western European communities was transferred to Archbishop Eulogius by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration in October 1920. This temporary appointment was confirmed in January 1921 by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration. Patriarch Tikhon and the Holy Synod succeeded in confirming this appointment on 26 March/8 April 1921 (Decree No. 424).⁷ Eulogius himself never denied his appointment by the Supreme Ecclesiastical

Administration. He himself wrote: “The rule of the Western European Diocese <...> was transferred to me in 1920 by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration.”⁸

After the Patriarch dissolved the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration in May 1922, Metropolitan Eulogius, who in the meantime had been elevated to the rank of metropolitan, continued to cooperate closely with the Synod of Bishops. At the Council of Bishops in 1923, he proposed a plan to decentralize the administration through the creation of four autonomous ecclesiastical provinces, without putting the canonical and spiritual authority of the Synod of Bishops in question. The plan was only accepted in part: Metropolitan Eulogius was given autonomous authority over the Western European communities.⁹ Metropolitan Eulogius was also assigned to entrust the bishops of the most “important centers” of Russian émigrés, especially in Germany and Italy, with the administration of parishes.¹⁰ The first appointment took place in 1924: Archimandrite Tikhon was consecrated Bishop of Potsdam.¹¹ In the following year, Metropolitan Eulogius transferred the administration of the communities in the south of France to Archbishop Vladimir of Nice, who had come from Poland.¹² To Bishop Sergius of Bely (Poland) he entrusted the administration of the Russian communities in Prague,¹³ and to Archbishop Seraphim (from Finland) the communities in England. Thus, by early 1926, within the Western European Diocese there were vicariates in Potsdam for the Russian communities in Germany, in Nice for the south of France, in Prague for the communities in Czechoslovakia, and in London for the communities in England.

All of these appointments were carried out by Metropolitan Eulogius with the consent of the Synod of Bishops. Metropolitan Eulogius, therefore, recognized the central administration in Karlovtsy then as before. However, it appears that the Synod of Bishops went too far in the granting of autonomous administration of the Western European Diocese to Metropolitan Eulogius. The first attempts to restrict this autonomy had already taken place at the Council of Bishops in 1924. After Metropolitan Eulogius had created four vicariates between 1924 and 1926, the Synod presumably feared losing control over the important Western European ecclesiastical province; at the same time, Metropolitan Eulogius began to question the control of the Synod. Church unity was shattered in a struggle over the question of limits of authority within the Church Abroad. When Archpriest Prozorov in Berlin questioned the jurisdictional authority of the Synod in Karlovtsy, Bishop Tikhon forbade him from serving. Metropolitan Eulogius raised this question again, whereupon Bishop Tikhon turned to the Synod. Thereupon, Metropolitan Eulogius suspended Bishop Tikhon from his office and accused him of being disobedient to his bishop. The Synod decided that the entire affair should be reviewed at the next Council of Bishops. Metropolitan Eulogius’s removal of Tikhon was in clear violation of the canons, inasmuch as a bishop may only be deposed by an episcopal court, at which no less than eight hierarchs should take part.

After these occurrences, further difficulties arose at the Council of 1926. After Bishop Tikhon was confirmed in his office, the Council of Bishops decided to transform the vicariate of Potsdam into an independent diocese. Metropolitan Eulogius protested against this resolution and denied the Council the right to create new dioceses; however, he had to acknowledge that his

views did not meet with the majority opinion at the Council. Thus, he was left with the choice of recognizing the Council as the supreme ecclesiastical authority or breaking with it.

The Synod of Bishops viewed Metropolitan Eulogius's conduct as disobedience to the central ecclesiastical authority. His rejection of the Council of Bishop's decision was seen as a rebellion against proper ecclesiastical order. Therefore, Metropolitan Eulogius's establishment of his own ecclesiastical administration signified a split from the Church Abroad, which until then had been united, and which Metropolitan Eulogius had recognized from its establishment, and upon the decisions of which he collaborated, and of which he was a co-founder.

Both Bishops Sergius and Vladimir, his vicars, separated from the Synod along with Metropolitan Eulogius, as well as Bishop Benjamin, who had taken over the direction of the Saint Sergius Institute in Paris. Archbishop Alexander (Nemolovsky), who lived on Athos, joined Metropolitan Eulogius in 1928 and was appointed vicar Bishop of Brussels.

Archbishop Seraphim and Bishop Tikhon separated themselves from Metropolitan Eulogius and remained faithful to the Church Abroad. After all the attempts to save the unity of the Russian Orthodox Church in emigration, it shattered in the weeks following. At its session of January 1927, the Synod of Bishops resolved to bring Metropolitan Eulogius before an ecclesiastical court and to transfer the provisional rule of the Western European Diocese to Archbishop Seraphim.¹⁴ The Synod informed the faithful in Western Europe by circular letter of these decisions.¹⁵

At the Council of 1928, Metropolitan Eulogius and Bishops Vladimir, Sergius, Benjamin, and Alexander were suspended from their posts. The Church Abroad's own new administrative set-up in Western Europe was decided upon; Archbishop Seraphim was now appointed the official ruling bishop of the Western European Diocese of the Church Abroad.

Besides the parishes in France,¹⁶ the diocese included two in Austria, one in Hungary, two in Italy, one in Belgium, two in Luxemburg, and four in Switzerland. Some communities in Germany and Austria, which remained under the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Eulogius, were excluded in 1938. In 1929 the diocese received a vicar bishop, Bishop Nicholas of London, who took over the administration of the English parishes. A second vicariate was created in 1936, for the south of France, the administration of which Bishop Gregory (Ostroumov) took over. He received the title of Bishop of Cannes (later of Cannes & Marseille), and had jurisdiction over the Russian communities in San Remo, Menton, Nice, Cannes, and Marseille. After the passing of the aforementioned "Provisional Statutes," which foresaw the creation of the four ecclesiastical provinces, the Western European Diocese was elevated to the rank of a Metropolitan District. The rule of the diocese, and then of the Metropolitan District, was Archbishop Seraphim's from 1928-45; he was elevated to the rank of Metropolitan in 1938.

After Metropolitan Seraphim joined the Moscow Patriarchate, Bishop Nathaniel (Lvov) took over with the title of Bishop of Brussels & Western Europe. He ruled the diocese between 1946 and 1951. His successor was Archbishop (Saint) John (Maximovich). He transferred the diocesan administration from Brussels to Versailles. Bishop Anthony (Bartoshevich, from 1963

Archbishop) succeeded him in 1962. He bore the title of Archbishop of Geneva & Western Europe and resided in Geneva.

Bishop Leontius (Bartoshevich) was appointed a vicar bishop for Geneva in 1950; he held this position until 1956. After his repose, his brother (Bishop Anthony) was named vicar Bishop of Brussels. However, in the same year, he moved to Geneva.

A second vicariate existed in England: Bishop Nathaniel, as Bishop of Preston & the Hague, first administered the diocese from 1951-55; he was followed by Bishop Nicodemus (Nagaev) from 1954 to 1963, after 1957 as Bishop of Richmond, and finally as Bishop of Richmond & Great Britain. In 1963 England became an independent diocese. After the repose of Archbishop Nicodemus in 1976, the administration of the diocese was assigned to Archimandrite Alexis (Podjoy) [trans., Pobjoy, an English convert]. In 1981, Bishop Constantine (Essensky) was appointed to rule the diocese.

A bishop was consecrated in 1964 for the French-speaking Orthodox – Bishop John (Kovalevsky), who bore the title Bishop of Saint-Denis.¹⁷ Just two years later he broke with the Synod and negotiated with the Romanian Patriarchate for his reception into that jurisdiction, in which he remained until his death in 1972.¹⁸ A French-language deanery existed for some years under the direction of the late Archimandrite Ambroise (Fontrier), but this group left the Church Abroad in 1987 and joined a jurisdiction of Greek Old Calendarists.

For the Dutch-speaking Orthodox, Archimandrite Jacob (Akkersdijk) was consecrated Bishop of the Hague & the Netherlands. The very successful mission amongst the Dutch,¹⁹ to which a monastery and convent belonged, was subject to the Church Abroad from 1965-71. Then Bishop Jacob, together with his flock, separated from the Synod, because they could come to no agreement with the Synod over the calendar question. After the Moscow Patriarchate declared its willingness to oblige this group, by allowing them to celebrate according to the New Calendar, they joined Moscow.²⁰

Both these bishops, John (Kovalevsky) and Jacob (Akkersdijk), were vicars to the ruling bishop of the West European Diocese.

Since the creation of the Western European Diocese, the majority of parishes were in France. At first, there were 17 parishes under the Synod. In 1935, there were already 24.²¹ In 1935, 34 parishes in all were located on what is now the territory of the Western European Diocese (excluding England, Austria, and Hungary); currently there are 54 parishes.

The constant jurisdictional jumping, that a few communities went through, can be seen in the example of the Church of Saint Nicholas in Bari. This church was built in 1913 in order to give pilgrims who were on their way to the Holy Land via Bari, where the relics of Saint Nicholas are enshrined, the opportunity to attend Orthodox divine services. A hostel for pilgrims was also built near the church. After the schism of 1926, the church remained with the Synod until 1948. After the parish priest left the Synod in 1948 and joined the Paris Jurisdiction, the church belonged to them until 1970. The parish in Bari did not go along with the Paris group's new jurisdictional change, which was joining Constantinople again, but instead returned to the

Synod.²² In Rome, there has been a Russian church since 1836, which was founded as the embassy church. In 1932, this church had to be closed. The community was given space in the palazzo of Princess Chernycheva on Via Palestro and built a church dedicated to Saint Nicholas. After her death, the princess left the house to the Church Abroad, which made the church directly subject to the Synod of Bishops. Besides Orthodox Russians, Orthodox Serbs and Bulgarians also belonged to the community, in all some 50 people.²³ In addition to these two parishes, there were communities in Turin, Genoa, San Remo, Bologna, and Milan, of which today only the last two still exist.²⁴ For a time, the clergy of these churches had to care for the Russian and Serbian Orthodox refugees, who lived in the refugee camps in Trieste and were waiting for a residence permit for other countries in Western Europe and overseas. In 1953, 1,056 Russians and 1,087 Orthodox Serbs still lived in this camp.²⁵

In Holland before the Second World War, there was only one parish – in the Hague, which, however, remained under the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Eulogius. The Church Abroad established its own parishes there for the first time after the War because the Dutch government was accepting refugees from the camps in Germany, Trieste, and Austria. These were almost exclusively the elderly and infirm so that the communities became smaller and smaller through the years. The members of the Holland Mission took over the care of these parishes. Including the Russian home for the elderly in the Hague.²⁶

The situation in Belgium was more favorable. There, a small Russian parish had been in existence since 1920; from the mid-1920s, sizable immigration from Bulgaria and Germany joined them. In Brussels, there was a church in the Russian embassy, which after 1926 joined the Paris Jurisdiction. After 1928 Archbishop Alexander resided there as a vicar bishop to Metropolitan Eulogius. Thereupon, the Church Abroad's faithful established a temporary home, which was able to move to a spacious building. The church was dedicated to the Resurrection of Christ. Between 1953 and 1957, Archimandrite Anthony administered this community; he was consecrated Bishop of Brussels in 1957. Under his leadership, parish life took a turn for the better. In 1953 the Saint Vladimir School was established; it had its own school building. The school was attended by Serbian children in addition to Russian children. It was also possible to open a small home for the elderly, into which ten people were received. Since the 1950s, the community has had a monthly parish newsletter, *The Voice of Our Church (Golos Nashei Tserkvi)*.²⁷

There is another church in Brussels – the Church of the Righteous Job the Long-Suffering – dedicated to the memory of the martyred Imperial Family and to all the victims of the Russian Revolution and its aftermath. The initiative to build this church came from the Grand Duchess Xenia Alexandrovna, youngest sister of the last Emperor, in 1930.²⁸ With the financial support of the whole Russian emigration, the Serbian Royal Family, and the Serbian Patriarchate, the cornerstone was laid in 1936. The completion thereof was delayed by the outbreak of the War, until 1950. The consecration of the church, which was built in North Russian style and crowned by a huge, 70-foot high, dark blue cupola, was celebrated by Metropolitan Anastasius, and Bishops Nathaniel and Leontius, together with numerous clergy.²⁹ The church has since then been directly subject to the First Hierarchy. The parish has been publishing a small parish

newsletter since 1962, called *The Herald of the Memorial Church (Vestnik Khrama-Pamyatnika)*. It appeared first in printed form, and only later in hectographed form, and contained articles about the life of the last Imperial Family as well as news about the building of the church. Besides both parishes in Brussels, there were seven smaller communities in Belgium, of which only the parishes in La Hulpe and Braine le Comte survive today. In Luxemburg, the Church Abroad originally had two parishes – one dedicated to Saint Nicholas and the other to Saints Peter and Paul. From 1933 onwards, when the economic situation forced numerous Russians to emigrate to South America, Saint Nicholas Church was closed. Since then, only the Church of Saints Peter and Paul has continued to exist, which was for many years accommodated in a former farmhouse. The city administration gave them a plot of land, and in 1980 this parish was able to lay the cornerstone for a new church, which was completed and consecrated in 1982.³⁰

The diocesan administration, and also the seat of the ruling bishop of the Western European Diocese, was located in France from 1928-1962. At first, Bishop Seraphim had to manage with a house church, because the Paris community had joined Metropolitan Eulogius. Only the parish of the Resurrection of Christ in Meudon (a suburb of Paris) voted to remain with the Church Abroad. In Versailles, there was a “cadet school” with a house chapel, which was visited by future “officers.” In addition to regular instruction, the school gave military drills without weapons.³¹

Bishop Seraphim’s goal was to build his own cathedral church, which finally was ready for consecration in 1936. It was located on Rue Boileau in the 16th arrondissement. In an adjacent building, the residence of the archbishop and the diocesan administration, as well as a spacious hall, were located. The church was dedicated to the Icon of the Mother of God of the Sign. The iconostasis consisted of four rows of icons in the Old Russian style.³² During the War, the church was greatly damaged, so the parish moved to rue Michel Ange, where a make-shift church was set up. Only the parish house on rue Rondeau could still be used. After Metropolitan Seraphim’s change of jurisdiction, this church property was finally lost to the Moscow Patriarchate. His successor, Bishop Nathaniel, resided in Brussels and used the Church of the Resurrection of Christ as his cathedral. From 1952, Archbishop [Saint] John (Maximovitch) again lived in France and used the Church of the Resurrection in Meudon as his cathedral.³³ With the appointment of Bishop Anthony in 1962, the administration was moved to Geneva, where there was a 19th-century church built in the Moscow style, which also had adjacent rooms for the bishop’s office. After 1926, only the church of the Archangel Michael in Cannes and a church in Pau, which had been obtained as the bishops’ churches, remained in France. Both churches, however, were too unfavorably located to serve the parishes outside France. From 1894, the church in Cannes was cared for by Father Gregory Ostroumov, the later Bishop of Cannes. He remained faithful to the Synod after 1926.

Today Archpriest Igor Dulgov serves in this church and cares for the two Russian homes for the elderly in Cannes. In these homes, which were set up in a former hotel in the 1950s, 300 people lived. Both homes received financial support from various institutions, including the Tolstoi

Foundation, the United Nations Refugee Committee, the World Council of Churches, and other organizations.³⁴

The second church was located in Pau and was consecrated in 1867. It has served since then as the church for the Russian faithful. After 1917, the community consisted only of a few faithful. Following the death of the appointed priest in 1907, the priests from Biarritz and Tarascon cared for them. In 1949, six monks from the Saint Job Brotherhood in Munich settled in Pau in order to establish a monastery. The group was under the direction of Hieromonk Panteleimon (Rogov). Attached to the church was some land and a house, where the monks were supposed to live. The brothers renovated the church, the adjacent buildings, and the garden. Two brothers also found work at a neighboring farm. The monastery was supposed to become a spiritual center for the Orthodox in the south of France. The realization of these plans had to be abandoned, however, because the Brotherhood lacked the necessary capital to purchase the land upon which the future monastery and a farm were to be established.³⁵ Today only the church in Pau still exists; it was renovated in 1967 on the centennial of its foundation.³⁶

Igumen Nicodemus (Nagaev, later Archbishop of Richmond) with three monks made a second attempt to establish a monastery, near Ozoire la Ferriere in northern France. Bishop Nathaniel, the initiator of this idea, hoped to establish a monastery in the north of France, which was to be a place of pilgrimage for the Russian communities of the region. This plan also did not come to fruition.³⁷

The desire to establish a monastery as a spiritual center for the Russian Orthodox communities in France was to be realized finally by the resettlement of nuns from the Lesna Convent from Yugoslavia. Bishop Nathaniel had formed a committee in 1949, to which the Catholic Archbishop of Paris and representatives of the Protestant communities in France also belonged.³⁸ The goal of this committee was to prepare for the arrival of Russian refugees, who lived in camps or wanted to leave Eastern Europe. With the help and support of this committee, the Lesna sisters succeeded in leaving Yugoslavia and resettling in France. The Roman Catholic Church offered a former seminary in Fourqueux near Paris as a domicile at their disposal. The thirty nuns remained here until 1967 when they moved to Provement, a small village in Normandy, where they have found a permanent home in the former château of Etrépany.³⁹ In Provement, as well as in Fourqueux, the monastery was a popular place of pilgrimage for the Orthodox faithful of France, Europe, and even overseas. For the faithful of the Paris Jurisdiction, the convent, in which the Wonder-working Icon of the Lesna Mother of God is venerated, is also a place of pilgrimage. The convent was even visited by Metropolitan Vladimir, the successor of Metropolitan Eulogius.⁴⁰

The remaining parishes in France were all established after 1928. Due to a lack of funds, they were unable to build their own churches, except in rare cases, for example in Lyon.⁴¹ This parish, founded in 1928, was able to consecrate a spacious stone church in 1938. After Metropolitan Seraphim joined the Moscow Patriarchate, the parish voted to decide which jurisdiction they should join. After the majority voted to remain with the Synod, 139 parish members left the church and joined either the Moscow Patriarchate or the Paris

Jurisdiction.⁴² Most of the Synodal communities in France had only small churches and chapels, which were set up in homes or barracks.

In Sainte Geneviève-des-Bois, a suburb of Paris, there is a Russian cemetery, which was established in 1928. The cemetery was established on a plot of land which belonged to Princess K. Meshcherskaya. In the château, a home for the elderly was founded. A cemetery chapel in the Northern Russian style was ready in 1939. Today, there are over 5,000 graves there, making it the largest Russian cemetery in Western Europe, with the remains of nearly 12,000 Orthodox Russians from France and Western Europe. In the crypt of the church, Metropolitan Eulogius has found his final resting place. It is worth mentioning that at this cemetery not only have the faithful of all three jurisdictions found their last resting place, but all three jurisdictions have also cared for the cemetery together. The administration of the cemetery consists of members of the Paris Jurisdiction, the Church Abroad, and the Moscow Patriarchate.⁴³

In Switzerland, the Church Abroad presently has 13 parishes. The focal point of Church life is Geneva, with its Cathedral of the Elevation of the Cross. There is a 19th-century church in Vevey. The other parishes, in Zurich, Lausanne, Bern, Basel, and Weesen, only have chapels.

Most parishes came into existence after World War II, when former Swiss, who had emigrated to the Baltics and Russia in the 19th century, returned to the homeland of their forefathers. Having converted to Orthodoxy in Russia, mostly as a result of marriages, they joined the Church Abroad on their return to Switzerland.⁴⁴

The Swiss vicariate published its own journal from 1956-61, the *Herald of the Swiss Vicariate (Vestnik Shveitsarskavo Vikariatstva)*. It appeared to publish in Paris the journal *Word of the Church (Slovo Tserkvi)* in 1949, which considered itself to be the “ecclesiastical-religious supplement” to the Paris emigré journal *Russian Thought (Russkaya Mysl’)*. The journal was published until 1951 and then discontinued. After he took office in 1962, Archbishop Anthony regularly published the diocesan journal for the West European Dioceses, *Herald of the Western European Diocese (Vestnik Zapadno-Evropеiskoi Eparkhii)*, which came out bi-monthly in the 1960s. Since the beginning of the 1970s, the journal appeared quarterly with 50-60 pages. A second, French-language newspaper, the *Messenger-Information Bulletin of the Diocese of Western Europe of the Russian Church Abroad (Messenger, Bulletin d’Informations du diocese de l’Europe Occidentale de l’Eglise Orthodoxe Russe Hors Frontières)* is directed at the French Orthodox faithful. It appeared quarterly since the 1950s and prints above all else missionary and theological articles.

The London parish has been in existence for over 270 years and has always been dedicated to the Dormition of the Mother of God. Its church, functional until 1920, still exists, having reverted to its owners (the estate of the Dukes of Bedford) and, like the rest of their property in the area of Bloomsbury in London, is now used by the University of London as a lecture hall. The church building was deliberately abandoned after the Revolution and subsequent emigration because it was obviously inadequate and unsuitable for the needs of the rapidly growing parish.

Until 1926, there was only one parish in London, to which 1,000 faithful belonged. After the schism of 1926, this community divided into two equally strong groups. The parish church,

which was in the former Anglican Church of Saint Philip, continued to be used by both groups on alternate weeks. This arrangement continued until 1955, at which time the church was closed.⁴⁵ Archimandrite Nicholas (Karpov) was appointed in 1928 to administer the Church Abroad's parishes. Out of the financial means at his disposal, he bought a small house in London, in which he founded a *podvorye* (episcopal residence or church house), because he wanted to start a small brotherhood of monks. In the house, he set up a Chapel of All Saints in order to celebrate Divine Services regularly with his flock. In subsequent years, the community celebrated the divine services alternately at the Church of the Dormition (in Saint Philip's Church) and at the Chapel of All Saints.

In June of 1929, Archimandrite Nicholas was consecrated Bishop of London, vicar to the Western European Diocese. The consecration took place in the parish church in London and was performed by Metropolitan Anthony, Archbishop Seraphim, and Bishops Theophanes and Simon (of Kremenets). At this first consecration of an Orthodox bishop in London, numerous clergy of the Anglican Church was in attendance.⁴⁶

Another chapel was opened in Prince Galitzine's house in a London suburb. In the meantime, Bishop Nicholas's brotherhood consisted of two hieromonks and a hierodeacon, who all lived in the *podvorye* and provided pastoral care for the three London churches.⁴⁷ The Grand Duchess Xenia Alexandrovna, Prince Meshchersky, and the Volkovoi and Ampenov families greatly supported the clergy. (Abbess Elizabeth, the former superior of the Gorny Convent (Ein Karem) in Palestine, and the current abbess of the London Convent of the Annunciation is from the Ampenov family.)

Parish life quickly stabilized; in 1930, a summer school for children was opened, which was attended by some 40 to 50 children. At the church, a sisterhood was established, headed by the Grand Duchess Xenia. In addition to charitable works, the sisterhood labored amongst the English populace to deepen knowledge of Russian history and culture, the Russian Orthodox Church, and the situation of religion in the Soviet Union, by means of lectures.

Bishop Nicholas headed the London community for a mere three years. In the summer of 1932, he traveled to Karlovtsy to participate in the Council of Bishops. At the end of the Council, he died at the age of only 40 from appendicitis. On his deathbed, he wrote to the London community, exhorting them to persevere in the true Faith. He implored them to maintain the *podvorye* and appointed Father Anatole the head of the small monastery.⁴⁸ The community fulfilled his wish. After the War, Archimandrite Vitalis's monastic brotherhood settled there. Thereafter, it served for some time as the residence of the superior of the English communities. Today there is also a chapel dedicated to Saint Gregory the Dialogist for the English-speaking Orthodox.

Until the end of World War II, church life was practically confined to the London congregation. Father Boris Molchanoff took over the direction of the parish in 1933, then Father Michael Polsky, followed by Archimandrite Vitalis in 1948. Archimandrite Vitalis was appointed because, after 1945, the Russian colony in England grew significantly. In 1948, 10,000 Russians are supposed to have lived in England, most of whom finding work in the industrial areas of the

Midlands and the north of England. ⁴⁹ The London parish also greatly increased. It had 1,000 faithful; the next largest community was in Bradford, with 800 faithful.

The six parishes outside London were all established after World War II. This also holds true for both of the English-speaking parishes, which are located in London and Bath. In Barton-on-Sea (southern England) there is a small home for the elderly, which originally housed refugees from Harbin and the displaced persons camp in Trieste. ⁵⁰

After Archimandrite Vitalis took over the administration of the communities in England, a brotherhood of monks again lived at Bishop Nicholas's *podvorye*. They set up a small printing press, which began publishing journals and books. The printing press existed for only a brief time because Archimandrite Vitalis with the Brotherhood moved to Brazil.

His successor was Bishop Nathaniel, who was also responsible for the parishes in Holland. For this reason, he bore the title of Bishop of Preston and the Hague.

In 1953, the Synod decided to establish a vicariate in England. Bishop Nicodemus took over the administration in 1954, with the title Bishop of Preston, then from 1957 with the title Bishop of Richmond. In 1963, the vicariate became an independent diocese, and the parishes in England were separated from the Western European Diocese, to which they had belonged since 1928. Under Bishop Nicodemus, parish life of the Church Abroad's faithful was noticeably strengthened. After the London community lost Saint Philip's Church in 1955, it remained at the All Saints Church in the aforementioned *podvorye*. In 1959, the community consecrated a new church, located in a former Scottish Presbyterian Church in the SW7 section of London. It was dedicated, like the earlier church, to the Dormition of the Mother of God. The new church was adorned with icons from Saint Philip's Church, which the parish had had to share with the Moscow Patriarchal Church from 1945, at which time the community, which had been under Metropolitan Eulogius, separated from the Paris Group. The Patriarchal Church was able to obtain another church from the Church of England. Both communities received these properties on a lease, as a temporary measure. The Patriarchal parish succeeded in buying their church outright in the 1970s and now has it as their permanent center.

For the Church Abroad in England, the most significant event took place in 1959. After two years of preparation, the Convent of the Annunciation was consecrated in Brondesbury Park, London (NW6). Since then, the convent has been under the direction of Abbess Elizabeth (Ampenova), and has contributed to the spiritual life of the Church Abroad's communities in London and England. There are six nuns at the convent, who were once active in caring for the sick and elderly and in educating the emigre children. Since 1954, there has been a Saturday school. By 1964, the nuns had graduated 84 children, including a dozen or so children from Protestant and Catholic families, who had converted to Orthodoxy. ⁵¹ For the faithful of London and England, the convent has been a custodian of Russian traditions. The nuns, of whom only Mother Elizabeth is Russian by birth (the rest are Arabs), all speak fluent Russian and English.

Mother Elizabeth who, with a part of the sisterhood, had left the Ein Karem Convent for London after the latter was given to the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate, made it her task to inform the English through lectures about the true situation of the Church and the faithful in the

Soviet Union. This task seemed to her to be of the greatest importance because the Patriarchate has had a parish in London since 1945. On account of the existing official relations between the Patriarchal Church and the Church of England, this parish strongly influenced the formation of opinions in English church circles on the religious situation in the Soviet Union. Mother Elizabeth dealt with this during her speaking tours. ⁵²

Missionary work among the English has been successful. The English Orthodox community, which has two churches, includes some 500 faithful, an English priest, Fr. Yves Dubois, and a hierodeacon.

Footnotes

1. *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche: Einrichtungen*, p. 148. ↵
2. Volkmann, p. 5. ↵
3. *Ibid.*, p. 6. ↵
4. *Russische Orthodoxe Kirche: Einrichtungen*, pp. 150-153; Dneprov, “Pod krylom” in *JMP* (1955) 8, pp. 66-76; Nikolai, “Vo Frantsii” in *JMP* (1945) 10, pp. 14-25; *Idem.*, “V Angliyu” in *JMP* (1945) 8, pp. 27-52. On the Patriarchal parishes in Western Europe, cf. the articles in *StdO* (1968) 5, pp. 17-20; 9, pp. 8-16; (1969) 1, pp. 8-12; 5, pp. 43-44; (1971) 6, pp. 16-18; (1973) 6, pp. 23-24. ↵
5. *JMP* (1945) 10, pp. 14-25. ↵
6. The numbers fluctuated constantly because the parishes were always changing jurisdictions. ↵
7. Cf. Parts I and II. ↵
8. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 603. ↵
9. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 7, pp. 37-40. ↵
10. *Ibid.*, p. 40; *Tserk. Ved.* (1924) 9-10, p. 13; 23-24, p. 3. ↵
11. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 418-419. ↵
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 423-425; *Metropolit Vladimir*, pp. 40-41. ↵
13. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 428-431. ↵
14. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 164-169. ↵
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 169-177. ↵
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 235-237. ↵
17. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 6: *ECR* (1970), pp. 110-112; (1973) pp. 79-80. ↵
18. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1967) 1-12, pp. 2-6; *Prav. Rus'* (1967) 2, p. 12. ↵

19. Cf. Part IV, Chap. 6. ↵
20. Synodal archives, File 1/65. ↵
21. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, p. 236; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1935) 2, p. 33; *Spisok* (1981) pp. 23-25. In the same time frame, the number of parishes in the Paris Jurisdiction declined constantly. Whereas there were 75 parishes in this jurisdiction in 1926, in 1971 only 60 parishes belonged to the Paris Jurisdiction. This group lost most of its communities in Europe and North Africa outside of France, while numerous parishes joined the Patriarchal Church. ↵
22. *Prav. Rus'* (1970) 9, p. 13; (1972) 21, p. 15. ↵
23. *Tserk Zhizn'* (1934) 2, p. 31; *Prav. Rus'* (1948) 23, pp. 13-14; (1965) 15, p. 11; (1967) pp. 12-13. ↵
24. *Ibid.* (1948) 7, p. 15. ↵
25. *Prav. Rus'* (1953) 21, pp. 14-15. ↵
26. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1146-1151; *Prav. Rus'* (1959) 11, p. 14; (1977) 22, pp. 15-16. ↵
27. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1132-1143. ↵
28. *Prav. Rus'* (1935) 5, p. 6. ↵
29. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1154-1178; Anastasius, *Sbornik*, pp. 74-79, 111-112. ↵
30. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2:1128-1133; *Vestnik Zapadno-Evropeskoi Eparkhii* (1980) 15, p. 33. ↵
31. *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 1, p. 13. ↵
32. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1937) 4-5, pp. 74-75. ↵
33. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1100. ↵
34. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1954) 1-2, pp. 31-32; *Prav. Rus'* (1971) 3, pp. 13-14. ↵
35. *Prav. Rus'* (1949) 23, p. 12; (1950) 4, p. 15; (1951) 13, pp. 10-11; *Vladimirsky kalendar'* (1952) pp. 156-162. ↵
36. *Prav. Rus'* (1967) 2, p. 10. ↵
37. *Ibid.* (1949) 24, p. 19; (1950) 1, p. 15. ↵
38. *Ibid.* (1949) 2, p. 15. ↵
39. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2: 1101-1113. ↵
40. *Metropolit Vladimir*, p. 220. ↵
41. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1117-1118. ↵

42. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1948) 1, pp. 46-48; *Prav. Rus'* (1977) 14, p. 16. ↵
43. *Der Christlichen Osten* (1964) 1, pp. 26-27; *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 8, pp. 14-15. ↵
44. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1076-1089; *Prav. Rus'* (1957) 22, pp. 4-11. ↵
45. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1039-1040. ↵
46. *Echos d'Orient* (1930) p. 116; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*, 7, pp. 272-275. ↵
47. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 7, p. 277. ↵
48. *Ibid.*, 5, pp. 275-276. ↵
49. *Prav. Rus'* (1950) 3, p. 15. ↵
50. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1072-1074. ↵
51. *Prav. Rus'* (1957) 7, p. 13; (1958), p. 14. ↵
52. Seide, *Kloster im Ausland*; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1046-1065. ↵

Part IV, Chapter 1.8

The Dioceses of Germany & Austria

The Russian Orthodox Church in Germany ¹ can look back over a more than 270-year history if one looks at the refugee communities in eastern Prussia, which came into existence as a result of the religious intolerance of the Moscow government. ²

After the establishment of diplomatic relations between Russia and Prussia under Peter I, the Great, a Russian chapel was built in Berlin in 1718. This church existed until 1837 when it was moved to the building at Unter den Linden, No. 7, where the Russian embassy was located. The embassy church was dedicated to the Holy Equal-to-the-Apostles Prince Vladimir, who had brought Christianity to Kievan Rus in 988 AD. Until the outbreak of World War I, this was the most important Orthodox community on German soil. Some 5,000 Orthodox Russians, Serbs, Bulgarians, Greeks, Romanians and members of other nationalities belonged to it. The renowned Archpriest A. P. Maltsev (1854-1915) was rector from 1886. ³

Archpriest Maltsev formed the “Brotherhood of St. Vladimir” in 1890. The members made it their task to support the Orthodox parishes on German soil financially. They also devoted themselves to charitable work and tried to awaken understanding for Orthodoxy by promoting the translation of Orthodox liturgical texts into German. Archpriest Maltsev translated almost all the important liturgical text into German. To this day, his translations (in revised editions) form the basis for Orthodox divine services in the German language. ⁴

Besides this Russian church in Berlin, there were other Russian communities with churches in the German princedoms before 1914. The majority of these churches were founded in the 19th century when the dynastic ties between the Russian ruling house and the German nobility became closer and closer. In addition, Russian families visiting the German spas led to the building of Russian churches from the mid-19th century.

For example, the building of the Russian chapel in Kiel, which existed from 1727-1799, can be traced back to the marriage of the Grand Duchess Anna Petrovna, the consort of the Duke Friedrich of Holstein-Gottorp. In Potsdam, a temporary church existed since the 18th century. In 1829, it moved to the newly-built Church of St. Alexander Nevsky in Potsdam’s Russian colony, “Alexandrovka”. In 1808, the mortuary Church of the Apostles Peter & Paul was consecrated in Ludwigslist. Other churches were consecrated: in 1846, in Stuttgart; in 1847, in Leipzig; in 1861, in Wiesbaden; in 1862, in Weimar; in 1865, a chapel in the castle of Karlsruhe; in 1874, a church in Dresden, the largest Russian church in Germany; in 1876, in Bad Ems; in 1882, in Baden-Baden; in 1893, in Berlin-Tegel; in 1899, in Bad Homburg and Darmstadt; in 1901, in Bad Kissingen, Gorbetsdorf (Silesia) and Hamburg. The last churches before World War I were consecrated in Bad Neuheim and Bad Brucknau, in 1908; and in Leipzig and Danzig 1913-14. ⁵

All these churches still exist today. The ones located on the territory of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) are subject to the Moscow Patriarchate. ⁶ The Theophany Church in Baden-Baden was subject to the Moscow Patriarchate from 1945, but to the Church Abroad after a court

decision from 1980.⁷ The church in Bad Ems was subject to the Paris Jurisdiction but was handed over to the Church Abroad after a court decision in 1981.⁸

Twice since 1918, Germany has had to cope with the burden of Russian émigrés. After the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, the first wave of refugees came to Germany; the end of the Civil War and the outbreak of the catastrophic famine in Soviet Russia led to a massive exodus. In 1921, 50,000-80,000 Russian refugees are estimated to have lived in Germany; the number rose to 600,000 in 1922 but dropped to 150,000 by 1928. The reason for the tremendous emigration was the economic situation in Germany after 1923-24. Inflation and unemployment drove the refugees to emigrate further, especially to France, but also overseas. Nevertheless, in the 1920s, Germany was a spiritual and political center of the Russian emigration: it had its own schools, academic, economic, cultural and political institutions.⁹

The situation was similar in Germany after World War II. Hundreds of thousands of refugees left [Trans., the Soviet Union] with the German troops for Germany, where thousands of Ostarbeiter (workers from the East), who had been abducted from their homeland during the War and conscripted into the German economy, were already living. Many of these people no longer wanted to return to their homeland after the German defeat. As long as they found themselves on the territory of the Western Allies, they were able to remain. Those who were in the Soviet-occupied part of Germany and Austria were returned to the Soviet Union and deported to Siberia to do forced labor. The number of refugees who lived in Germany after 1945 is not precisely known. There may have been between 500,000 and a million. The German West Zones, in which seven to ten million German refugees lived, were not economically in any position to care for or assimilate these refugees. Thus, most of them tried to emigrate overseas, where they sought a better future. Between 1948 and 1952, almost all young and healthy refugees left Germany. The elderly and the sick remained behind; as other countries would not grant them entry permits. The size of this emigration can be clarified by the following statistics. At the assembly of the German Diocese, which met from 19-21 July 1949, in Munich, it was announced that since the previous assembly, in August 1947, the number of communities had decreased from 91 to 77 and the number of clergy from 184 to 134. Of the clergy, all the younger ones had left Germany.¹⁰

As already mentioned, the SEA had appointed Metropolitan Eulogius head of the West European communities. This also included the communities in Germany and Austria.

Metropolitan Eulogius arrived in Berlin on 26 April 1921, whence he would administer the West European communities. Berlin was chosen because most of the political, cultural and other émigré organizations were located there. In Berlin, a few days after the arrival of Metropolitan Eulogius, there was to be an important meeting. On 2 May, Eulogius received a delegation from the Berlin Russian community, which questioned him forcefully as to whether he was acting on the instructions of the Patriarch. Eulogius replied to this question with a clear “no.” Thereupon, the delegates asked him to assure them that his actions were not “against the canons.” Eulogius then assured them, by his episcopal authority, that his actions were fully in agreement with the canons.¹¹ Because Eulogius gave this assurance at a point in time when he had not yet received from Patriarch Tikhon the appointment to assume the administration of the West European Diocese, he proved with his words that he not only acknowledged the Church Abroad’s

jurisdiction over these communities, but also held this governing body to be canonical: “He himself writes nothing of this in his memoirs, but dates the receipt of the Patriarch’s Decree No. 423, by which he was appointed ruling bishop, himself in “May-June.” ¹²

At the request of his Berlin community, Eulogius appointed Archimandrite Tikhon (Lyashchenko) rector of the Berlin Church, who duly arrived at his new place of appointment. Until December 1922, Berlin remained the official administrative headquarters of the West European Diocese; at that time, Metropolitan Eulogius moved to Paris. The altered situation in Berlin no doubt was certainly instrumental in the move. After the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Germany, in April 1922, the Soviet Union was given the embassy building on Unter den Linden. The embassy church, which had served as the parish church for the émigrés, was closed by the Soviet authorities. The director of the Russian-German Gymnasium in Nachodstrasse offered a room to the parish, where a small chapel could be set up. This sufficed as a parish church but was much too small to accommodate the worshippers. On this account, Eulogius decided to move to Paris, because the magnificent St. Alexander Nevsky Church was located there, to which spacious adjacent buildings belonged, which could serve as administrative headquarters.

The administration of the Berlin communities lay in the hands of Archimandrite Tikhon, who also had oversight of the communities in Tegel and Potsdam. In agreement with the resolutions of the Council of Bishops of 1923, which charged Eulogius with installing vicar bishops in the “most important centers” of the Russian emigration, especially in Germany and Italy, Eulogius created a vicariate in Germany in May 1924. He transferred the administration to Archimandrite Tikhon, who after his consecration bore the title of Bishop of Potsdam. The numerically most significant communities were located at this time in Berlin, where most Russian émigrés lived. The communities in Dresden, Wiesbaden, Baden-Baden, Leipzig, and other cities all had their own clergy but were not particularly large. ¹³

New communities came into existence in Danzig and near Eckertsdorf (East Prussia). The Danzig chapel served for Russian Orthodox refugees, while the Eckertsdorf chapel was built for the Old Believer community (Edinovertsy), who were cared for by the Church Abroad. ¹⁴

At the Council of Bishops of 1926, the German Vicariate was finally elevated to an independent diocese. Metropolitan Eulogius protested in vain against this decision, though he could not reverse it against the majority of bishops. ¹⁵

Eulogius’s break with the Synod also led to the schism of many parishes in Germany.

Nine communities remained with Eulogius: St. Vladimir Church in Berlin (Nachodstrasse), Sts. Constantine & Helen Church in Tegel, Holy Transfiguration Church in Baden-Baden, St. Simon Church in Dresden, St. Alexis Church in Leipzig, St. Elizabeth Church in Wiesbaden and the house chapels in Danzig, Eckertsdorf and Munich. Archpriest P. Adamantov, who served at the church in Wiesbaden, also cared for those in Bad Ems and Darmstadt. He joined the Synod in 1934. The rector of St. Vladimir Church in Berlin was Archpriest G. Prozorov. After Eulogius joined the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1931 because Metropolitan Sergius had prohibited Eulogius from serving. Prozorov remained faithful to Moscow and broke with Eulogius. Thus, in

1934, only the churches in Tegel, Baden-Baden, Dresden, and Leipzig, and both chapels in Danzig and Eckertsdorf were subject to Eulogius.

Bishop Tikhon began to build up his own communities in Germany. In Berlin, the majority of the faithful joined the Church Abroad. He succeeded in buying a large house: on the upper story, the new church of the Resurrection of Christ would be built. Bishop Tikhon hoped to pay off the mortgage for the purchase of the house by rental income from the apartments in the lower stories of the house. At first, this community developed very well. A sisterhood and a parish school were founded, at which religious and language instruction was offered. When the stock market crashed and the banks collapsed in 1929, the community lost all its funds and had to declare bankruptcy. The house in which the church was located had to be auctioned off.¹⁶

The new landlord was the National Socialist “German Work Front,” which, of course, did not like the neighboring Russian church on the upper floors. Termination of the lease or demolition of the church did not seem to be opportune at the time, as the new government was busy trying to establish itself as the leader of the anti-Communist movement of the whole world. At this time, in the Soviet Union, the Church’s struggle was at its height; one read daily in the press of the closing and destruction of Russian churches. So it was practically impossible to close or destroy the Berlin church. As an alternative, it was proposed that the community leave the building and a new church should be built. As financial means for this were lacking, the government of the Prussian State declared that it would support the building project. After the government had made available a place for the building on Hohenzollerndamm¹⁷ and promised credit, the new building project was begun. The general recognition of the Church Abroad by its Orthodox Sister Churches is shown in the building of this church. Metropolitan Dionysius of Poland donated the iconostasis; the Serbian Patriarch donated a large sum of money; the Patriarch of Antioch and the Archbishop of Athens sent their congratulations; the governments of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia donated money because their faithful in Berlin were cared for by the Church Abroad.

Metropolitan Anastasius consecrated the new cathedral in 1938.¹⁸

In connection with the new building of this cathedral, there was also a legal rearrangement of the Russian diocese in Germany. In order to obtain property rights to the new building, the Ministry for Church Affairs negotiated to obtain the rights of a legal person for the Diocese of the Church Abroad.

This also seemed to be necessary because, since Metropolitan Eulogius’s split from the Church Abroad, there were numerous suits over Russian Church property; both sides laid claims to certain churches. Thus, the final ruling was also in the interest of the government, which owned the plot of land on Hohenzollerndamm (“Contract of 12 November 1937 between the Reichsminister for Church Affairs and Bishop Tikhon,” Land Register at the Lower Court, Charlottenburg, Volume 125, p. 3730).

Bishop Tikhon received recognition from the German government as the legitimate representative of the Russian Church in Germany. By decision of the Prussian State Ministry, dated 14 March 1936 (RMB1. IV, 1936, p. 673), “The Russian Orthodox Diocese of the Orthodox Bishops of Berlin & Germany” was granted the “rights of a public-legal

corporation.”¹⁹ Two years later, the decision of the Prussian State Ministry of 1936 was broadened by the law on the property of the Russian Orthodox Church in Germany, dated 25 February 1938 (RGB1. I, S. 215), whereby a fundamental state law was created for the Orthodox Church.²⁰ In this law, which remains in effect to the present day, it says in Section 1: “The real estate situated in Baden-Baden, Bad Ems, Darmstadt, Stuttgart and Wiesbaden, which is set aside for the particular purposes of the Russian Orthodox Church, should be kept for these purposes. The Reichsminister for Church Affairs can hereto regulate the conditions of ownership for this real estate, as well as the manner and extent of its uses, with legally binding authority, and can rule extralegally on disputes over this real estate. Restricted real estate rights will not be affected hereby.” It was simultaneously decided that the legal proceedings over this real estate would be dropped. By Reich’s law of 1939 (RGB1. 1939, p. 379), this law was also applied to the Dresden church.

According to this Church constitution, all people of the Orthodox confession, regardless of the fact that the churches belonged to the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and “regardless of their citizenship, and under the full protection of their national interests,” will be received into the Russian Orthodox (German) Diocese. As a result of this constitution, all people of the Orthodox Faith, who were listed in the parish rolls by a priest, belonged to the Orthodox parishes of the Russian Church. Nevertheless, this ruling was not special treatment for the German Diocese, but rather tied to Orthodox tradition, which places all Orthodox in a given area under the direction of a ruling bishop. Before 1918, this rule was followed throughout the world and was recognized by all local Orthodox Churches. For the first time, with the existence of colonies of émigrés and immigrants, above all in North and South America, this principle was violated due to the various national Churches setting up their own ecclesial administrations.

In 1940, a further law was passed, which regulated tithing for the “Orthodox Church in Germany.”²¹ As a result of this law, the Church was able to raise funds from all registered members, the amount of which was determined in proportion to the member’s income.²²

A few weeks after the consecration of the new cathedral on Hohenzollerndamm, Bishop Tikhon was recalled from the administration of the parishes in Germany. He had ruled the diocese for 12 years in all, another two as vicar bishop. During his time in office, he succeeded in reorganizing the Russian communities in Germany, which had been hard hit by the schism of 1926, and in giving them a legal basis. This legal basis is valid even to the present day and was also recognized by the courts in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), which awarded the churches in Baden-Baden and Bad Ems to the Church Abroad. Concerning the cathedral on Hohenzollerndamm, which the Allies gave to the Moscow Patriarchate in 1945, another law is in force, because in Berlin the Allies’ laws apply and the German courts “have no jurisdiction.” Thus, the Patriarchal Church may continue to use the church built by the émigrés.

The successor to Bishop Tikhon was his vicar, Bishop Seraphim (Lade). He was a German by birth, who converted to Orthodoxy in 1903. After graduating from the Petersburg Theological Seminary and the Moscow Theological Academy, he was active as a clergyman in the Soviet Union from 1916-30. In 1924, he was consecrated Bishop of Zmiev. In 1930, he allowed himself to be deported by the Soviet authorities. In the West, he joined the Church Abroad and was

appointed administrator of the Austrian communities (1931-38). After he assumed office, he concerned himself with reducing the tense relations with the followers of Metropolitan Eulogius. He confirmed the clergy of the Paris Jurisdiction in their posts and entitled them to a far-reaching autonomous administration. In the agreement of 21 October 1939, “the settlement of disputes within the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad” was regulated by the jurisdictional allegiance of all Russian communities in “Greater Germany” to the Karlovtsy Synod of Bishops. The communities and clergy of the Paris Jurisdiction in Germany, Austria, and the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia recognized the spiritual and canonical authority of the Council of Bishops in Karlovtsy as the supreme ecclesiastical authority; they received, however, a far-reaching autonomous status in the administration of their communities.

The Austrian communities were grouped together into a vicariate, the direction of which was transferred to Bishop Basil (Pavlovsky) in January 1939, who had been the Dean of the Theological Faculty in Harbin.

Bishop Seraphim was elevated to the rank of archbishop in 1939. All Russian communities in greater Germany, and both Bishop Basil of Vienna and Bishop Sergius of Prague, who had been Eulogius’s vicar bishop until 1938, were subject to him. After the outbreak of the war and the German invasion of Poland, France, the Benelux nations and other countries, the German government placed all the Russian communities there under the rule of Archbishop Seraphim.

In April 1942, all Orthodox parishes in greater Germany, Belgium, Luxemburg, and Slovakia were made subject to the Russian Church Abroad, which, with Resolution No. 245 of 5/18 April 1942, established a Central European Metropolitan District, the rule of which Seraphim (Lade), now elevated to Metropolitan, received. This new district had 77 communities (Belgium and Luxemburg were taken out of the West European Diocese). Simultaneously, under pressure from the German authorities, a vicariate was created in Germany under the direction of Archimandrite Philip (von Gardner), making him Bishop of Potsdam.²³

Archbishop Alexander (Nemolovsky) of Brussels & Belgium, who lived in Brussels, refused to recognize the new Church order and was consequently arrested in 1940 by the Germans, who placed him under house arrest in Berlin. After the Soviet occupation of Berlin, he joined the Moscow Patriarchate.

After the German invasion of the Soviet Union, Metropolitan Seraphim supported the faithful building up new communities in Soviet territory. With the financial help of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, Metropolitan Seraphim allowed the St. Job Monastery in Ladomirova, which now was part of his district, to print Gospels, prayerbooks, apologetical brochures, and other religious literature, which the German troops distributed in the occupied territories. The Brotherhood also prepared 400 antimensia, which Metropolitan Seraphim consecrated.²⁴ The first contacts were made with the newly-established autonomous Orthodox Belorussian and Ukrainian Churches, which was to significantly facilitate the subsequent reception of bishops, priests and faithful.²⁵

The new Church order was not of long duration. With the end of the War, the old administrative structure of the Church Abroad was reestablished. Metropolitan Seraphim continued to hold the

title of Metropolitan of the Central European Metropolitan District, though only the communities in the FRG belonged to it.

Austria became an independent diocese; the parishes in Belgium and Luxemburg again became part of the West European Diocese. The communities in reestablished Czechoslovakia, and in the Soviet-occupied zones in Germany and Austria, became subject to the Moscow Patriarchate. ²⁶

Despite the losses of numerous parishes, the number of Russian communities in Germany rose dramatically due to the reception of the main mass of refugees from the East. The exact number of communities is not known. It may have been as high as 150 because as late as 1961, the divine services were celebrated in 142 places, even when the parishes there no longer existed. ²⁷

At the assembly in 1949, the number of parishes was given at 77, whereas in 1947 it was alleged to have been 91. ²⁸ Caring for these communities in 1947 were 16 bishops and 184 priests; three years later there were only 135 priests for some 50-60,000 faithful. In 1961, there were still 78 parishes; since the 1970s, there have been only 53, which are cared for by 18 clergymen. Of these 53, only 13-14 have their own priests. The decline in the number of parishes is directly attributable to the considerable emigration overseas. The priests also accompanied the faithful, in order to organize parish life anew in their new homeland.

Thus, the spiritual care of the refugee communities presented no problem. This changed for the first time in the 1950s, when many of the older priests, who had remained behind, died or retired. If one considers that, for example, in 1945, in northern Germany, only the small house chapel dedicated to St. Nicholas existed in Hamburg, but that in 1947, the Church Abroad had its own churches in Lubeck, Kiel, Schleswig, Hannover, Göttingen, Fischbek, Ringelheim, Salzgitter, Meerbeck, Kleve, Kassel, and other cities, it can be easily seen what activity the Church Abroad developed. ²⁹ By the autumn of 1946, more than 30 churches, 7 high schools, and 10 elementary schools were established. ³⁰

A large number of new communities, which consisted overwhelmingly of faithful who had for years, on account of the persecution of the Church in the Soviet Union, hardly had any contact with the Church and whose children had never had religious instruction, made comprehensive missionary work in the communities necessary. A prerequisite among others was a strict organization of Church life. At the diocesan assembly of 1946, a complete administrative reordering of the German diocese was decided upon; thus, under the leadership of Metropolitan Seraphim, more vicariates were created. Archbishop Philotheus was named vicar bishop of Hessen, with his seat in Wiesbaden. Bishop Alexander became the vicar bishop of Bavaria, with his seat in Kissingen. Bishop Athanasius became the vicar bishop of the British Zone, with his seat in Hamburg. Bishop Benedict was entrusted with the care of the Belorussian communities, and Bishop Eulogius was entrusted with the care of the Ukrainian communities. Bishop Gregory took over the administration of the Schleissheim camp near Munich, where 7,000 refugees lived. ³¹ The diocesan administration was transferred to Munich, where the center of Church life has been located ever since. In the Munich area, there were, for a time, twelve Russian churches and chapels, a monastery, three Russian high schools, and several elementary schools. Also,

from 1946-1950, the headquarters of the Synod of Bishops and the First Hierarchy of the Church Abroad were resident in Munich. The Ladomirovo Monastery of St. Job was reestablished, in 1946, in Munich-Obermenzing, and had 49 monks initially. Archimandrites Nathaniel and Seraphim have consecrated bishops in 1945 and 1947, respectively. Thirteen monks resettled in Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville with Bishop Seraphim. Two groups of monks, under the direction of Hieromonk Panteleimon and Hegumen Nicodemus (later Archbishop of Britain), went to France in order to establish a monastery there. A third group, under Bishop Leontius, left for Paraguay to establish monasteries there. These three attempts failed due to insufficient financial means. The fourth group of monks went to the Holy Land and joined the Jerusalem Ecclesiastical Mission. Thus, the monastery in Munich, which was without an economic base, to begin with, lost 30 monks by the beginning of 1947; many of the monks ended up in Jordanville. In the 1950s, there were 8 to 10 people in the monastery [in Munich]. In the 1960s, only three monks lived there.

The printing press, which had been re-established by the Brotherhood in 1946, ran until the beginning of the 1970s. From 1951-1971, it published the diocesan newsletter of the German diocese, Church News (Tserkovnye Vedomosti), at first monthly, then mostly bi-monthly, and finally, only quarterly.³² In the monastery at the beginning of the 1950s, regular conferences for the Orthodox in Germany took place. In 1954, a two-year course for priests began, at which five candidates for the priesthood, two deacons, one reader and two other people took part.³³

From 1966-80, the direction of the monastery lay in the hands of Bishop Nathaniel. In December 1980, Bishop Mark, who is the present abbot of the monastery, transferred the diocesan administration to the monastery and settled there with a brotherhood founded by him and to which three people belong.³⁴ In the monastery, a new printing press and candle factory were set up. In the candle factory, the candles necessary for the entire diocese are made. The monastery now has a solid financial basis. Since 1987, the printing press has published a bi-monthly diocesan newsletter, The Herald (Bote/Vestnik), in German and Russian. A church calendar also appears regularly, and a new series of books, entitled Meeting with Orthodoxy (Begegnung mit der Orthodoxie), in which the lectures delivered at the Frankfurt seminar are published.

After the end of the War, the old divisions in the German Diocese resurfaced. The Church of the Resurrection of Christ, in Berlin, was given to the Patriarchate. The churches in Bad Ems and Baden-Baden were returned to the Paris Jurisdiction.

After Archbishop Vladimir, the successor to Metropolitan Eulogius, had again left the Moscow Patriarchate, the community in Baden-Baden did not follow suit, but remained under the Moscow Jurisdiction; the community in Bad Ems remained with the Paris group. The Moscow Patriarchate has attempted, since 1960, to found its own parish in West Germany, and has even appointed three bishops for West Germany, but has had practically achieved no success amongst the Russian émigrés. Besides the Berlin community, the only ones subject to the Patriarchate are a few faithful in Baden-Baden, Munich, Dusseldorf, and Konstanz. These “communities” consist of German converts; the Russian émigrés will not join the Patriarchate.

Especially painful for the Church Abroad was the loss of their parishes and churches in Berlin. The ruling bishop of the German Diocese bears the title Bishop of Berlin & Germany. However, since 1948, the Diocese has only had a small house chapel there, which is cared for by clergy from Munich. It is located at 6 Kulmbachstrasse. A few Germans also belong to the parish, in addition to Orthodox Russians.³⁵

Despite enormous financial hardships, the Diocese has survived primarily on the donations of its faithful and has even been able to build a few new church edifices since 1945. In part, the Church also receives support from German agencies, the Evangelical and Catholic Churches in Germany. The St. Procopius Cathedral in Hamburg, which was built in Novgorod style and was consecrated in 1964, is one of these new buildings. At the cathedral, there is an adjacent building, in which Bishop Philotheus lived, and there is also a parish hall and the bishop's office.³⁶ Another spacious church was consecrated in Frankfurt, in 1979: St. Nicholas Church, which was built in Pskov style and can accommodate 400 people. It replaced the old church, which had been built by Ostarbeiter during World War II. Nearly another forty churches and chapels have been in rented or leased buildings since 1945. Most of them still exist today and often serve a community consisting of only a few families. The parish in Munich hopes, in the next few years, to build a new cathedral, which is to be dedicated to the Millennium of the Baptism of Russia (1988). The parish can indeed raise the money for the new building, to which a dwelling for the priest would be attached, but for a freehold piece of property, the city of Munich is demanding over a million marks. A generous ruling, such as in the building of the cathedral in Hamburg (where the city placed a plot of land at their disposal and helped with credit), remains for the (Munich) community only an ephemeral hope.

The aforementioned vicariates existed only until the early 1950s. In 1953, Archbishop Philotheus was appointed the vicar bishop of northern Germany. The rule of the German diocese lay from 1926-1938 with Bishop Tikhon, from 1938-1950 with Metropolitan Seraphim, from 1950-1951 with Archbishop Benedict, from 1951-1971 with Archbishop Philotheus, from 1982 with Bishop Mark.³⁷ In 1967, Archimandrite Paul was consecrated Bishop of Stuttgart, vicar bishop of Germany. After Archbishop Alexander stepped down in 1971, Bishop Paul bore the title of Bishop of Stuttgart & Southern Germany and ruled a quasi-independent south German diocese. The diocesan consistory also remained in Munich after 1971. After the appointment of Bishop Paul as ruling bishop of Australia in 1980, Bishop Mark took over the administration of the communities in southern Germany. He bore the title of Bishop of Munich & Southern Germany until the autumn of 1982, when he became the successor to Archbishop Philotheus, Bishop of Berlin & Germany.

After the end of World War II, the Russian Church lost its status as a corporation under public law, because the granting of such a status was not in the jurisdiction of the federal government, but rather in that of the local governments. Metropolitan Seraphim appealed by letter to the appropriate local governments, and in 1946 received recognition from Bavaria, in 1947 from Baden-Württemberg, Hessen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Berlin, and Hamburg. In practice, this granting meant a renewal of the corporate status by the local governments.

In Austria, there has been only one community in Vienna since 1918. They held their services in the former embassy church of St. Nicholas. After the establishment of diplomatic relations between Austria and the Soviet Union, the church was closed. The parish then established a small chapel in the house of Count Razumovsky and moved to Baden near Vienna, where a chapel could be set up in a hall of the spa house. Small communities also existed in Graz, Linz, and Salzburg, which did not have their own priests. In 1924, the Baden community in Vienna, where most of the faithful lived, was again able to open its own church. ³⁸

The Austrian communities were subject to Metropolitan Eulogius until 1926, in that they were part of the West European Diocese. After the schism, there was also a schism within the Austrian communities, between Eulogius' and Anthony's followers. The former's community in Vienna was cared for by Archpriest Vanichkov; the Synodal community in Vienna and Graz by Archpriest Krachmelev.

In 1931, the administration of the Church Abroad's Austrian communities was transferred to Bishop Seraphim (Lade). In addition to the Vienna community, he had in his care also the communities in Baden, Salzburg, and Pechlan. During the 1930s, barely more than 300 faithful lived in Austria.

After the annexation of Austria by Nazi Germany in 1938, Eulogius's community in Vienna was joined to the Synodal parishes. After the appointment of Bishop Seraphim as bishop of Berlin & Germany, Archimandrite Philip (von Gardner), who belonged to the Brotherhood in Ladomirovo, took over the direction of the Austrian Diocese. At the Second Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad, it was decided to create a vicariate of Austria. Bishop Basil, who arrived in Vienna in January 1939, became head of the community. After the outbreak of the war with Soviet Russia, the latter's embassy was closed, and St. Nicholas Embassy Church was given to the Church Abroad. ³⁹ The Church remained under the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad only until 1945, when it was given to the Moscow Patriarchate. ⁴⁰

From 1943/44, the first refugees from southeastern Europe entered Vienna, which in subsequent months was to become a transit station for thousands of refugees from southeastern Europe. The Synod of Bishops was also evacuated to Munich via Vienna and Karlsbad. In 1945, more than 100,000 refugees might have lived in Austria. In Linz, there were 30,000 Cossacks with their families, who had fought on the German side against the Soviets. There was an agreement between the Soviet government and the Allies to extradite these "Soviet citizens" to the Soviet Union. On 1 June 1945, the transfer to the Soviet troops of these Cossacks who were in English hands was accomplished. Because a part of the extradition was resisted, firearms were also used. Many people lost their lives during this transfer, during which some even committed suicide in order not to be extradited to the Soviets. The number of victims is not known. Since 1956, there has been a memorial cemetery at the place of the transfer, which was entrusted to the Church Abroad, which regularly, on the anniversary of the tragedy, celebrates memorial services and liturgies with special commemorations for the dead. ⁴¹

Only 3,000 people, mostly women and children, and 28 clergymen were not extradited. They lived for a few years more in the Peggez Camp before they succeeded in traveling overseas. ⁴²

The statistics on the refugees who remained in Austria fluctuated very sharply, from “tens of thousands” to 100,000.⁴³ In 1947, there were alleged to have been 30,000 refugees still there, who were organized into 33 communities and entrusted to 32 clergymen.⁴⁴ The largest refugee camp was near Salzburg, where nearly 10,000 refugees lived. In the camp, there was a high school, which was attended by 350 children, of whom 100 graduated by 1950 and 20 went on for further study at Austrian universities.⁴⁵

As in Germany, from 1947 a tremendous emigration overseas began. In 1951, only 2,000 refugees still lived in the camps; by 1953, 90% of all the refugees had left the country, and of the 32 clergymen, only two were left there. They had to serve nine communities.⁴⁶ In 1965, there were still 2,085 faithful registered with the diocesan administration.⁴⁷ Today there are still 11 communities in Austria, which three priests and two deacons serve.

From 1938 until 1945, Bishop Basil administered the Austrian communities as a vicar bishop of the German diocese. In 1946, the vicariate was changed into an independent diocese and the administration was given to Archbishop Stephen, who bore the title of Bishop of Vienna & Austria. He assumed this office when he was 74 years old and died at 93; despite his advanced age, he concerned himself intensely with the parish life of his diocese. In 1964, he was still able to take part in the Council of Bishops in New York. Shortly before his death, Archbishop Stephen was able to consecrate the new cathedral in Salzburg, for which he had worked so hard.⁴⁸ After his death, Archbishop Alexander took over the administration of the diocese. From 1966 until 1971, Archbishop Anthony of Geneva administered the diocese; then, from that time, Bishop Nathaniel, who bore the title Bishop of Vienna and Vicar Bishop of Western Europe. In 1976, he was appointed Bishop of Vienna & Austria; in 1981, he was elevated to archbishop.

Today the most active parishes in Austria are located in Salzburg, Vienna, Linz, and Villach. There are smaller communities in Oberösterreich, Tirol, and Karnten. For the most part, they consist of only a few families. With the exception of the Salzburg Cathedral, no other churches were built there. The communities that still exist today only have make-shift churches and chapels at their disposal in rented buildings and chapels.⁴⁹

In both the Dioceses of Germany and Austria, there are still more than 60 parishes of the Church Abroad. The majority of them no longer have their own priest and consist only of a few faithful, mostly elderly people. As a rule, the clergy have to serve several parishes, and amongst the clergy, only the younger ones are in the position to do so. In the long run, the Church Abroad will probably be forced to close many of these smaller parishes. On the other hand, the existence of Orthodox parishes in a few cities has come to be strongly mixed; not only Russians belong to these, but also German Orthodox groups. Because in many émigré families, the Russian language is spoken and understood less and less by the children and grandchildren, it has been necessary to take this into account also in the divine services. Thus, in the course of the last decade, individual communities have changed, celebrating parts of the Liturgy or a monthly divine service in German. At his consecration, Bishop Mark addressed this problem and emphasized that he would give more attention to the bilingualism of many of his faithful.⁵⁰ Moreover, today this problem not only affects the Russian émigré community, but also the communities of Serbian and Greek Orthodox Gastarbeiter (visiting workers) because

many of these families' children speak German better than their families' native tongue. Whether this development will lead one day to a German Orthodox Church remains to be seen.

Footnotes

1. An article was published in 1971 on the German Diocese (Seide, "Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD"). The present chapter essentially follows this article in abbreviated, reworked form, because through obtaining and evaluating new materials in the meantime, new findings have come to light which made it necessary to readjust earlier statements. This was expanded to include East German parishes (Seide, " ", pp. 46-64). [Trans.: Seide finished a complete 500-page history of the Russian Church in Germany which will be printed soon (*Russische Orthodoxe Gemeinden in Deutschland*). In this manuscript you will find – besides the general history of the Russian Church in Germany – a detailed description of more than 250 Russian parishes that existed in Germany since 1715.] ↵
2. Forstreuter, pp. 88-101. ↵
3. Günther, *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche am Vorabend*, pp. 55-64; Polozhensky, *Mal'tsev*; Kahle, *Propst Maltzew*; Thon, *Probst Maltzew*. ↵
4. Mal'tsev, *Vladimirskago Bratsva*. ↵
5. Cf. the photographs of these churches in *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 902-997. ↵
6. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*, pp. 179-182. ↵
7. Günther, *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*. ↵
8. The two communities have objected against both decisions. Until a final decision can be made, the Church Abroad can use both churches. Cf. also Link, *Exilkirche und ihr Kirchengut*. ↵
9. Volkmann, *Die russische Emigration in Deutschland 1919-1929*; Williams, *Culture in Exile*. ↵
10. *Prav. Rus'* (1949) 15-16, p. 30; *Herder Korrespondenz* (1949/50), pp. 158-159. ↵
11. Cited according to D'Herbigny/Deubner *Eveques Russes*, p. 17. ↵
12. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 386. ↵
13. 13. *Ibid.*, pp. 418-423. ↵
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 455-459. ↵
15. *Tserk. Ved.* (1926) 15-16, pp. 6-17. ↵
16. *Prav. Rus'* (1938) 12, pp. 5-6; Seide, p. 48 (photos of the old and new Berlin cathedral). ↵

17. Haugg, *Kirche des Ostens*, pp. 297-300. ↵
18. Anastasius, *Sbornik*, p. 17; *Prav. Rus'* (1938) 12, p. 61. ↵
19. Haugg, *Kirche des Ostens*, pp. 297-300. ↵
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 62, 288-293. ↵
21. Here the official designation "Orthodoxe Kirche in Deutschland" ["Orthodox Church in Germany", trans.] surfaces, whereas prior to this it was always referred to as the Russian Orthodox Church. ↵
22. Haugg, *Kirche des Ostens*, pp. 300-304. ↵
23. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1942) 4, pp. 62-64; 6, pp. 81-87. ↵
24. Seide, "Druckereiwesen," pp. 290-291. ↵
25. Cf. Part I, Chap. 6. ↵
26. Kolchitsky, in *JMP* (1945) 12, pp. 4-13; "Polozhenie germanskoi eparkhy" in *Golos Pravoslaviya* [East Berlin] (1952) 7, pp. 3-7. ↵
27. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*, p. 173. ↵
28. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1949) 7-9, pp. 31-32. ↵
29. *Prav. Rus'* (1947) 13, pp. 13-14. ↵
30. Memorandum sur la situation, p. 15. ↵
31. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1947) 2, pp. 39-40. ↵
32. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*, pp. 174-175. ↵
33. *Ibid.*, p. 170; *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 19, pp. 8-13; 20, pp. 3-5. ↵
34. Seide, *Die Klöster im Ausland*; *Idem.*, pp. 56-60. ↵
35. *Prav. Rus'* (1979) 17, p. 15. ↵
36. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 888-899; Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*, pp. 61-62 (photographs of the recently built churches in Hamburg, Frankfurt, and Munich-Ludwigsfeld). ↵
37. Günther, *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*, p. 64. ↵
38. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 98-100. ↵
39. *Tserk Zhizn'* (1943) 7, p. 109. ↵
40. Arsenius, "Vensky khram" in *JMP* (1953) 8, pp. 23-25; A. S., "Sobor" in *JMP* (1949) 7, pp. 61-64. ↵

41. *Prav. Rus'* (1977) 17, p. 16. ↵
42. *Ibid.* (1959) 1, p. 7. ↵
43. *Tserkovnaya letopis'* [Lausanne] (1946) 2, pp. 45-46; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1001. ↵
44. *Prav. Rus'* (1947) 15, p. 14. ↵
45. *Russky natsional'ny kalendar'* (1951), pp. 126-131, here p. 131. ↵
46. *Tserk Zhizn'* (1951) 5-6, p. 54; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1004. ↵
47. *Ibid.* ↵
48. *Prav. Rus'* (1964) 15, p. 11. ↵
49. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 998-1035. ↵
50. *Prav. Rus'* (1981) 1, pp. 11-13. ↵

Part IV, Chapter 1.9

The Dioceses of Australia & New Zealand

The Orthodox Russians in Australia all belong to the Church Abroad. The Moscow Patriarchate does not maintain parishes of its own in Australia. Their attempt to establish parishes there failed in 1968. In that year, small groups of faithful split from the Church Abroad over the question of church property. This dispute involved the registration of the Russian church property, which was valued at \$200,000, and which had been administered by elected parish representatives until 1968. When, at this time, the parishes were supposed to register as the owners, various groups of the faithful, who wanted to maintain the status quo, protested against this. In a few communities, splits resulted. Among these were also two clergymen of the Sts. Peter & Paul Cathedral in Sydney, of whom one joined the Polish Orthodox Church and the other joined the North American Metropolia (though this did not result in the Metropolia making inroads amongst the Russians). The Patriarchal Church probably hoped at this point that there would be further schisms. In any event, Archbishop Leonid of Kharkov, accompanied by several clergymen, visited Australia at the invitation of the Soviet-Australian Friendship Society, though they met with practically no Russian émigrés.¹ Also, the great majority of schismatics rejoined the Church Abroad in 1977. The schismatics from the Sts. Peter & Paul Cathedral held a vote; 87 people against 14 voted to place the church property under the Diocese of Australia & New Zealand. Additionally, it was decided that the “parish by-laws, as accepted by the Synod of Bishops in 1951, would form the legal basis for the Russian parishes.”²

Thus, peace in the Church in Australia was restored. In addition to the faithful of the Church Abroad, there are also groups of faithful in Australia who historically belong to the Church Abroad. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Exile cares for some 2,000 faithful there, who are organized into their own diocese under the rule of Metropolitan Mstislav. Fourteen parishes with about as many priests belong to the diocese.³ The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada also has 15 communities and eight priests there. The number of faithful is unknown.⁴ The Belorussian Autocephalous Orthodox Church is the third group represented in Australia. Since the death of their First Hierarch, Archbishop Sergius (Okhotenko), in 1971, the parish life of this group seems to have suffered a setback. Little is known about the number of parishes and faithful.

The first Russian émigrés arrived in Australia in the early 1920s. Principally, these were refugees from Siberia, who emigrated to Australia via China. The oldest community in Australia was founded in 1925, in Brisbane. This parish, which is dedicated to St. Nicholas, only had a small house chapel at first; but in 1926, it was able to have its own church. In 1933, this was replaced by a new structure. The new church was located on parish land, had a bell tower, and could accommodate some 200-300 faithful. After Australia was elevated to an independent diocese, in 1946, the St. Nicholas Church became the cathedral for the newly appointed bishop. Until 1950, the St. Nicholas Cathedral remained the residence of Bishop Theodore (Rafailsky). Then, between 1950 and 1953, after the episcopal residence had been transferred to Sydney, St. Nicholas Cathedral served as the cathedral of the vicar bishop of Australia. In 1963-64, Bishop

Philaret was the vicar there, before he was elevated to Metropolitan and enthroned as the new First Hierarch of the Church Abroad. ⁵

A second Russian émigré community has been in existence in Sydney since 1938. They had only a small house chapel dedicated to St. Vladimir. After 1950, most Russians settled in the Sydney area, so Archbishop Theodore decided to transfer his episcopal see to this city and used the small St. Vladimir chapel from 1950-1953 as his cathedral. The necessity of building their own cathedral became apparent when the small chapel could no longer meet the needs of the community. In 1950, the cornerstone for the Sts. Peter & Paul Cathedral was laid. Three years later, the new spacious church was consecrated. The conspicuous belfry towered above the church built in classical style. The three-tiered iconostasis was adorned with icons from the old St. Vladimir Chapel and completed with other icons by the iconographer N.I. Orlik. The iconostasis was finally completed in 1960. In 1965, three bells were blessed and the parish school was opened. It is attended by approximately 140 children and has eight teachers. The archbishop's residence and the diocesan office were located in a small building behind the new cathedral during the early years; this building is now used as a parish center. The residence and offices were moved to a new building in 1960, in the Croydon section of the city. ⁶

These two communities, in Brisbane and Sydney, remained the only Russian ones in Australia until 1945. They belonged to the church district of the Far East and were administered by the Bishop of Peking. There are very contradictory data on the number of faithful in Australia before 1945. Though mostly one reads of "small groups" and "a few émigrés," there is a longer article in a 1937 Orthodox Russia that discusses the "blossoming parish life" in Australia. ⁷ The article indicates that 37,000 Orthodox are supposed to have lived in Australia, New Zealand, and the surrounding islands. The interest in Orthodoxy would have been great. The Peking Ecclesiastical Mission, therefore, sent Archimandrite Theodore to Australia to organize parish life anew. He arrived in Australia in November 1935 and received permission from the Australian government to establish a monastery, which was supposed to serve as the center of the planned mission, because the prospects for a mission were to be great. Therefore, in Peking, there were plans to create a Diocese of Australia & New Zealand. An appeal was sent to the Synod, as well as to the entire diaspora, to support these plans with financial assistance.

Besides this report, there other announcements on the further development of the project followed. Why these plans were not carried out is unknown. Presumably, the statistical information referred to all the Orthodox of various nationalities, who lived there. Otherwise, there would be no way to explain why no further parishes of the Church Abroad were established until the end of 1948.

After 1948 the number of Russian immigrants to Australia grew dramatically. The refugees came from Europe and China. Already in 1946, the Synod resolved to send a bishop to Australia, who was supposed to take over the administration of the new communities, because numerous refugees wanted to emigrate to Australia. Bishop Theodore (Rafailsky) was entrusted with the rule thereof. In 1942, he had been consecrated Bishop of Taganrog of the Ukrainian Autonomous Church and had joined the Church Abroad in 1946. On account of difficulties with his visa, Bishop Theodore only arrived in Australia in 1948. At this time, there were already 16 priests

and 3 deacons serving 11 parishes.⁸ There were approximately 5,000 Russian faithful in the new diocese.⁹ By early 1950, both aforementioned parishes in Sydney and Brisbane were joined by the following parishes: St. Nicholas Parish in Adelaide, the Holy Protection Parish in Melbourne, the Elevation of the Cross Parish in Hobart (Tasmania), the St. Seraphim of Sarov Parish in Brisbane, Sts. Peter & Paul Parish in Perth; and four parishes in New Zealand (Christ the Savior Parish in Wellington, the Archangel Michael Parish in Dunedin, the St. Nicholas Parish in Christchurch, and the Christ the Savior Parish in Auckland).¹⁰

In February 1950, Bishop Theodore was granted the title of Archbishop of Sydney, Australia & New Zealand, and at that time he transferred his residence from Brisbane to Sydney. He remained head of the immense diocese until his repose in 1955. His successor was vicar bishop Sabbas (Raevsky) of Melbourne, who was elevated to archbishop in 1957 and ruled the diocese until 1970, when he retired on grounds of ill health. He reposed in 1976, in Sydney. His successor was Bishop Theodosius (Putilin), who was consecrated vicar bishop of Melbourne in 1969. Bishop Theodosius, since 1971 archbishop, ruled the diocese until 1980. After his death Bishop Paul (Pavlov), since 1981 archbishop, became the new head of the diocese.

In order to better administer the widely dispersed communities, a vicariate and two deaneries were created in 1950. The deaneries were located in Adelaide for southern Australia and in Melbourne for Victoria. Today the deaneries are centered in the cities of Sydney and Brisbane.

The vicariate was created in Melbourne and assigned to Bishop Athanasius (Martos). At this time, there were about 600 faithful living in the city. Because the Melbourne community did not have its own church, Bishop Athanasius resided in Brisbane, where the St. Nicholas Cathedral was located. After his appointment to the see of Buenos Aires & Argentina, the vicariate of Melbourne was transferred to Bishop Savva (Raevsky), who, however, in the very next year had to assume the rule of the Australian Diocese, because Bishop Theodore died. Bishop Savva's successor was Bishop Anthony (Medvedev). He administered the vicariate of Melbourne from 1956-67 until he was appointed Archbishop of San Francisco & Western America. For two years, the vicariate remained vacant. In 1969, the long-time rector of the Sts. Peter & Paul parish in Perth, Archpriest Sergius Putulin, after he had taken monastic vows, was consecrated the new vicar bishop of Melbourne with the name Theodosius. Bishop Theodosius remained the administrator of the vicariate for barely two years. In 1970, he succeeded Archbishop Savva.

A second vicariate was established in 1963. Archimandrite Philaret, who had only shortly before arrived in Australia from Harbin, was in charge of the administration. Because the Synod of Bishops chose Bishop Philaret the following year to be the successor to the aged Metropolitan Anastasius, the vicariate of Brisbane remained vacant from 1964-67. Archimandrite Constantine (Essensky) was consecrated Bishop of Brisbane in 1967 and remained in this office until 1976. No successor was named for him. The churches of the vicar bishops of Brisbane and Melbourne have remained as cathedrals so that today there are three cathedrals in the diocese. The vicariate of Melbourne has had a spacious church since 1954, which the community had taken over from the Anglican Church. Approximately 2,500 people belong to the Melbourne cathedral parish, into which two smaller parishes were absorbed; the faithful were almost overwhelmingly

émigrés from China, who came to Australia at the beginning of the 1950s. The parish school was at one time attended by 170 children. ¹¹

The first diocesan assembly took place in December 1950, at which the importance of the new diocese was emphasized. In the diocese, there were two bishops and 24 clergymen, including three archimandrites, an archpriest, a hegumen, priests and deacons. There were references, however, also to the age of the clergy, of whom four were over 70 years old, another four were between 60 and 70 years old, eleven were between 50 and 60 years old, and only five were under 50. Therefore, Archbishop Athanasius proposed the establishment of a pastoral school in order to prepare possible candidates for the priesthood. ¹² There was also a suggestion to establish a monastery as a spiritual and religious center, the head of which was to be Archimandrite Theodore (Pudashkin). Also, the founding of kindergartens and schools was planned. ¹³ The number of communities had, in the meantime, rose to 15, besides another 9 in camps to which the refugees had been evacuated. From 1949-1954, the diocese published its own journal, *The Orthodox Christian (Pravoslavnyj Christianin)*, published by Bishop Athanasius. It was succeeded by *The Word of the Church (Tserkovnoe Slovo)*. This journal has been appearing regularly since 1956 and is printed by the small diocesan press in Sydney. From 1967, there was also the journal, *The Call (Prizyv)*, the printing of which has since had to be suspended.

The pastoral school was not established, due to a lack of financial funds and teaching staff. The desire to establish a monastery was pursued further, however, and in 1955 finally took on a concrete form. Two monks from Harbin, Hieromonk Demetrius and Hierodeacon Peter, obtained a 20-hectare plot of land, upon which the monastery was to be founded with the support of the diocesan administration, in the area of Kentlyn, near Campbelltown, some 30 miles from Sydney. The monastery was first supposed to undertake the care and organization of the refugees from Manchuria and China who, since the 1950s, were receiving exit visas to the West. The building of the monastery went forward. The main building, a long flat structure with monastic cells, a house chapel, and a few other rooms, was finished within a year. Then further building came to a standstill because the volunteer workers withdrew and the health of Hieromonk Demetrius did not permit further progress. The monastery was given to a few nuns, who were living in the Russian home for the elderly in Cabramatta. The nuns belonged to a group of nuns from the former Harbin convent of the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God and had arrived in Australia a short time before. In the years following, the monastery was finished and extended by the addition of a few barracks, with financial help from America, from the Australian authorities, and from church and international agencies; refugees were supposed to be housed there. In the 1950s and 1960s, the particular significance of the monastery also lay in the fact that it essentially bore the responsibility of preparing the refugees for life in Australia and helped in assimilating these people into the economic life of Australia. Later, these refugee barracks were transformed into a hostel for pilgrims and a home for the elderly, which was cared for by approximately six nuns; between 20 to 30 people lived there. ¹⁴

While the convent flourished from the time of its establishment, all plans to establish a monastery in Australia failed. In 1965, Schema-monk Gurius (Demidov) made an attempt and founded a hermitage dedicated to St. John the Baptist only a few miles from the convent. This

hermitage has a small house with a chapel, cells for the monks and guest rooms. Besides Fr. Gurius, no one else joined the monastery. The hermitage has been abandoned since the mid-1970s. ¹⁵

A new attempt was made in 1985. A few hours' drive from Melbourne in the middle of the Australia wilderness, a skete dedicated to the Holy Transfiguration was founded. Great strides have been made in the building up of this skete. A chapel, as well as living quarters for the brotherhood and for guests, have been set up, and a small church has been started. At this time, three people belong to the brotherhood.

The Diocese of Australia & New Zealand deserves credit for helping the refugees from Manchuria and China. When they tried to obtain exit visas to travel to the West during the 1950s, the Diocese appealed to the Australian authorities on their behalf to issue entry permits to Australia. Bishop Savva devoted great attention to the refugees. On his initiative, the Diocesan Refugee Committee was established in 1956. Bishop Savva contacted the Australian authorities, the Refugee Committee of the United Nations, the World Council of Churches, and American institutions, and implored them for financial and moral help. The particular problem with these refugees lay in the fact that many were elderly: a group of 500 elderly people were waiting to enter Australia; in Harbin, another 5,000 people were waiting for exit visas, including 1,000 elderly. ¹⁶ Shortly thereafter, there was another group, which included 600-700 elderly people. ¹⁷ With the support of various institutions for the elderly people in need of nursing care, a few homes were established, in which between 10 and 50 people lived. Such homes are located in, among other places, Cabramatta and Campbelltown (near the convent), two in Melbourne, in Hillsville, in Sydney (Stratfield) and in Hamondville. In the course of its existence, the Refugee Committee cared for 4,000 people. ¹⁸ New Zealand also received large groups of refugees from China and Manchuria. Refugees were admitted beginning in 1948. The parishes, which still exist today, were founded by the former refugees from China. The aging of the immigrants has led in this decade to these communities becoming smaller and smaller because many of the parishioners have died. ¹⁹

Most parishes in Australia have their own churches, of which practically all have been built since 1948. In Australia at this time, there are still twenty parishes, in New Zealand four, and in Tasmania one. The New Zealand communities are cared for by Archpriest A. Godzhaev, and the one in Tasmania by Fr. M. Protopopov, from Blackburn. In 1980/81, the clergy of the diocese consisted of one bishop, four archpriests, one hieromonk, ten priests, three archdeacons, and one deacon. ²⁰

The largest church building complex was the Sts. Peter & Paul Cathedral in Sydney, to which the All Saints Church, with the episcopal residence and the diocesan administration in Croydon, also belong. Large churches were consecrated in Cabramatta (Holy Protection Church), in Adelaide (St. Nicholas Church) and near Blackburn (The Joy of All Who Sorrow Church). The Melbourne community was able to obtain a redundant Anglican church, the interior of which they adapted to their needs. Besides this church, a dozen or so smaller churches and chapels were built. The communities that exist today practically all have their own churches.

Besides these churches, the convent “New Shamordino” (now “Kazan’ Icon”), to which a home for the elderly is also attached, was systematically built up since 1956/57. Today, it serves as a place of pilgrimage for many of the diocesan faithful, who celebrate feast days together with the nuns in the monastery. The convent is supposed to be replaced in the coming years by a new building because the old wooden barracks are dilapidated due to termites and have become uninhabitable. For this reason, Archbishop Paul published an appeal in *Orthodox Russia* to the whole emigration for financial support.²¹ With the support of state agencies and international organizations, it was possible to build numerous smaller homes for the elderly, whose residents were entrusted spiritually to the clergy of the diocese.

The larger communities have their own parish schools and libraries, lay sisterhoods and various youth groups. The diocesan newsletter has been appearing for more than 25 years and reports on the life of the diocese and the Russian Church Abroad.

Footnotes

1. *Prav. Rus'* (1968) 22, p. 12. ↵
2. *Ibid.*, (1972) 9, pp. 6-7; (177) 5, pp. 11-12. ↵
3. *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie* (1976/77) p. 188. ↵
4. *Ibid.* (1972) 9, pp. 11-12. ↵
5. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) 1, p. 17; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1318-1324, 1414-1415; Patock, *Australien*, pp. 183-187. ↵
6. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1325-1326, 1362-1367. ↵
7. *Prav. Rus'* (1937) 7, p. 6. ↵
8. *Ibid.* (1950) 2, p. 15. ↵
9. *Ibid.*, 18, p. 16. ↵
10. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1362-1441. ↵
11. *Ibid.*, p. 1411. ↵
12. *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 13, p. 9. ↵
13. *Ibid.*, (1951) 3, pp. 5-10; (1952) 2, pp. 14-15; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1952) 5-6, pp. 96-101; 7-8, pp. 141-45. ↵
14. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
15. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1240 ff. ↵
16. *Prav. Rus'* (1957) 8, pp. 14-15; (1958) 1, p.15; Anderson, pp. 4-6, 10-11. ↵
17. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 1348. ↵

18. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1958) 1-6, pp. 32-33; *Prav. Rus'* (1961) 9, p. 15. ⇐

19. Read, pp. 81-84. ⇐

20. *Spisok* (1981), pp. 31-32. ⇐

21. *Prav. Rus'* (1981), p. 12. ⇐

Part IV, Chapter 2

Monasteries & Convents of the Church Abroad

& Their Significance for the Church Life of the Emigration

Most closely linked with the spiritual and ecclesiastical life of the Russian Orthodox Church are its monasteries and convents. This held true for the Russian Church before 1917, and it does for the Russian Church Abroad as well. Before the October Revolution, there was no country in which the monastic life was held in such high regard as in the Russian Empire. Since the end of the 19th century, monastic life there had been experiencing a revival. In the 30 years before the Revolution, 300 monasteries were established. In the more than 1200 monasteries that existed in 1917, there lived 33,572 monks and nuns and 73,462 novices. A large number of novices, primarily younger people, most conspicuously documents the attraction that the monasteries exercised on young people. It was not so much the large monastic centers, the lavra-monasteries that attracted the young people, but rather the remote “wilderness-monasteries.”¹

The Bolshevik seizure of power endangered the very existence of the monasteries, and their properties were supposed to be nationalized by 1921. This goal was not reached in so brief a period of time, although the monasteries’ continued existence was greatly challenged. Within three years, 722 out of 1,257 monasteries were closed. If one eliminates another the 100 or so monasteries that ended up outside the Soviet Union after the new national boundaries were established in Eastern Europe, then in Russia itself there were only about 300 monasteries, mostly smaller communities. All these monasteries and convents were also closed by 1929/30.

The mass closure of monasteries and the expulsion of their inhabitants could only outwardly terminate the existence of monastic communities, but not the idea of monasticism.

After the expulsion, monks and nuns held fast to their monastic vows and founded communities at homes in remote areas of the country. The maintenance of the monastic ideal and its deep roots within the people became clear when, in 1941-44, new monasteries came into existence everywhere in the country.

The German occupation of the Western parts of the Soviet Union during World War II led to a religious renaissance, which not only overcame but also showed the uselessness of the atheist propaganda. Within a few years, many closed churches were reopened, including venerable monasteries such as the Kiev-Caves Lavra, Holy Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra, St. Florus and Holy Protection Convent in Kiev, and many more. Within a few weeks of the reopenings, 100-300 monks or nuns had come to live in them, having returned from exile or emerged from underground. By the end of World War II, 104 monasteries and convents had opened, of which 69 were still in existence in 1958 and at present only 16.² In these 16 monasteries, there lived over 1,000 monks and nuns at the beginning of the 1970s; whereas in 1946 there had been 5,000.³

The decline of the monasteries and monasticism can only be explained by the government’s coercive measures against monastic communities. The ultimate goal of this policy is the complete closure of all monasteries, because the atheistic concept is that the “institution of

monasticism has entered its final arena <...> and in the socialist society <...> it is nothing more than an anachronism.”⁴ Yet already in the 1920s and 1930s, these same authors also had to admit that in the “remote corners” of Siberia, the so-called wilderness monasteries and cells were reestablished, founded by groups that would not recognize Soviet laws and refused to serve in the army.”⁵ The state’s coercive measures in the last twenty years have led to a situation where more Russian monasteries are located outside the Soviet Union than within. The Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia has more than twenty monastic houses; the autocephalous Orthodox Church in America has five;⁶ and the Russian Orthodox Archdiocese of Western Europe has one convent in France.⁷ In addition to these, there is another convent in Israel, the Ein Karim convent, and a monastery and convent in the Hague (both a part of the Dutch Orthodox Church); these three are subject to the Patriarchal Church. Therefore, there are more than 30 monastic communities abroad that can be traced back to the Orthodox Church in Russia.

The idea of monasticism was always most firmly rooted in the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. The Paris Jurisdiction had indeed made various attempts to establish monasteries, yet they were never entirely successful. Before the War, there were three small sketes in France, which existed for a few years. Metropolitan Eulogius himself wrote with resignation in his memoirs that “monasticism could not blossom in the emigration.”⁸ This may have been the case for the Paris Jurisdiction, though it has in no way held true for the Church Abroad which, during Metropolitan Eulogius’s lifetime, had significant monasteries and convents. For the first time, Mother Eudoxia’s initiative to establish a convent near Bussy-en-Othe (Dep. Yonne) succeeded in 1946; at this time, ten nuns belong to it, including five Russians.

The OCA has five monastic communities today, including St. Tikhon’s Monastery. It is the oldest monastery on American soil and was founded by Patriarch Tikhon, then Bishop, in 1905. During the period between the Wars, 20 to 30 monks belonged to the monastery. Since then, the number has declined. At the present time, between five and ten monks live there.

North of San Francisco, near Calistoga, there is a convent in which six nuns live; they had belonged to the Church Abroad’s former convent in Harbin and, after their flight in 1946, they joined the North American Metropolia. In addition to these two, there are another two convents and one monastery in New York State and Pennsylvania, which are primarily inhabited by Americans who converted to Orthodoxy. English is the language used in these monastic houses.⁹

It is thus understandable that the Church Abroad considers itself the guardian of the tradition of Russian monasteries and has attempted to stand guard over the goals and tasks of the Russian monasteries from pre-Revolutionary times.

The monastic communities see as their most important tasks the care of the faithful who seek out the monastery to venerate its shrines and to pray together with the monks and nuns, as well as to pray and meditate.

Before World War II, the Church Abroad considered the monasteries to be a departure point for a reanimation of Russian monasticism, after the monastic communities in the homeland had been dissolved and the monasteries and convents themselves shut. At the Council that took place in 1938 in Karlovtsy, Archimandrite Seraphim (Ivanov, from 1947 bishop) presented an extensive

report on “The Monasteries and Monasticism.”¹⁰ In his presentation, he pointed to the historical and cultural significance of Russian monasticism in the history of Russia. In addition to this, monasticism has earned great renown as the guardian and caretaker of the old shrines of the most important churches and monasteries. In order to continue these aims, it would be necessary to establish monastic schools in the larger monasteries of the Church Abroad. In these preparatory schools, candidates for monasticism should be acquainted with the rules of the monastery and be trained in ecclesiastical chant, in psalm reading, and so forth. These schools were supposed to be an introductory course before reception. After their reception into the monastery, the future monks were to be educated in missionary courses for service in the church and the monasteries. They should also be acquainted with the ecclesiastical canons, the organization of parishes and monasteries, in order to form a cadre for the rebuilding of church life in Russia, when it is liberated. The most important task would, however, consist of preparing their own candidates, who could reestablish the old monasticism in a liberated Russia, which would be in a position to rebuild the large printing presses in the Kiev-Caves Lavra, in the Pochaev Lavra, in Holy Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery, in Shamordino Convent and in others.

These cadres should be taught and provided with experience to administer the monasteries and to be able to fulfill the social and charitable functions thereof. To this end, the monasteries of the emigration should be divided into the following main categories: (1) missionary monasteries with missionary courses and monastic schools, (2) monasteries with monastic printing presses and their own publishing houses, (3) monasteries with social and charitable functions for the care of orphans and the elderly, hospitals, asylums, etc., and (4) monasteries for the contemplative life. All monasteries should, as far as possible, be self-administered. The abbot was usually an archimandrite or a bishop.

During the time between the Wars as well, as in the present, the Church Abroad’s monasteries have fit into these categories. In the St. Job Monastery in Ladomirova, and in the Convent of the Kazan’ Icon of the Mother of God in Harbin, there were sizeable printing presses. Since the 1930s, monastics were educated in them, and their own courses for missionaries and monks were instituted. They were supported by the Milkovo Monastery and the Convent of the Lesna Icon of the Mother of God in Yugoslavia, in which monks and nuns were educated who could take over the administration of a convent. St. Tikhon’s Monastery in the U.S.A., the Convent of the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God with its sister convent, the Lesna Convent and the Bethany Convent, all maintained orphanages. The Kazan’ Convent in Harbin maintained a home for the elderly and a nursing home, as well as a clinic with several doctors, and had its own pharmacy. If the Church Abroad could show evidence that it was in a position to continue the tradition of the old Russian monasteries, then its claim that its monasteries were supposed to form a departure point for reanimation of the Russian monasteries in the homeland was not totally unrealistic. Between the Wars, the Lesna Convent in Yugoslavia was the focal point of the renewal of Serbian woman’s monasticism. Due to the Lesna Convent’s missionary activities, 32 larger convents and numerous smaller sisterhoods were established.¹¹ Yet it was not only the Serbian convents that experienced a fresh impetus due to the refugee Russian nuns; the monasteries also experienced a renaissance, for which by in large they have the Russian Church Abroad to thank. The Russian Milkovo Monastery was for Russian and Serbian monks — a spiritual center for the

Church Abroad and for the Serbian Church in like measure. The great significance of the Russian emigration for the Serbian Orthodox Church is clearly testified to by the fact that the Serbian Patriarch transferred the supervision of the Serbian monasteries to the Russian Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky) and subjected all Serbian convents to the Russian Lesna Convent in Hopovo.¹²

Among the refugees that had left Russia after the Revolution and Civil War were also numerous monks and nuns. Outside the borders of Russia, monasteries already existed: a monastery in Peking (the Dormition Monastery) with a podvorye in Peking and Harbin, as well as a convent in Harbin (the Dormition Convent). Both belonged to the Peking Ecclesiastical Mission. In the monastery, five monks lived, in both of the podvoryes three monks, and in the convent ten nuns. In the U.S.A., there was St. Tikhon's Monastery, which had no monks in 1917, a skete in Alaska (St. Triphon's Monastery) with two monks, and the Holy Virgin Protection Convent in Springfield [New Hampshire] with five nuns. Except for St. Tikhon's, no other monks and nuns lived in these monasteries and convents in the 1930s. The Ein Karem Convent with 20 nuns was in existence in the Holy Land.¹³ The building of the Convent of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives was suspended on account of the War. On Mt. Athos, in the Russian monasteries and cells, there lived some 1,000 Russian monks, and in the monasteries on the islands of Valaam and Konevets another 300 monks. These monasteries were subject to the Ecumenical Patriarch from 1920, like the Mt. Athos monasteries. Some 100 Russian monasteries existed in Bessarabia, Poland and the Baltics between the Wars, and were subject to the local Orthodox Churches of these countries.

Whereas a smaller number of monks and nuns were able to gain entry into the already-existing monasteries and convents, the great majority had to find new housing venues. In Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, the national Churches gave them empty convents. In Czechoslovakia, Manchuria, China, and the Holy Land, new monasteries were built, and old buildings were reoccupied. In North America, the schism of the North American communities led to the establishment of Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville, which today forms the spiritual and ecclesiastical center of the Church Abroad.

Before the outbreak of World War II, 180 monks and 40 novices and 450 nuns lived in the monasteries of the Church Abroad. Monasteries were located in the following places: in Palestine – 2 monasteries and the Jerusalem Ecclesiastical Mission with 20 monks, 4 convents with 200 nuns; in Serbia – 1 monastery with 25 monks and 1 convent with 70 nuns; in Bulgaria – 1 monastery and 1 convent with 10 inhabitants; in Czechoslovakia – 1 monastery with 30 monks; in China – 1 monastery with 2 podvoryes and 26 monks and 1 convent with 3 podvoryes and 40 nuns; in Manchuria 1 monastery and 1 convent with 30 monks and 40 novices and 30 nuns; and finally in the U.S.A. – 2 monasteries with 40 monks.¹⁴

Most monks and nuns who lived in the monasteries and convents in the 1920s had received their tonsure – or had professed – before the Revolution; however, during the 1930s, a change of generations took place. More and more candidates came from the ranks of the émigrés. In Ein Karem, and the Vladimir Mother of God Convent in Yugoslavia, there were large groups of nuns, who had already formed a community before the Revolution. Yet also in these convents,

there were new candidates. If the Lesna Convent, for example, had 35-40 nuns at all times, then one must not forget that the newly-founded convent was always dispatching nuns, and in this way in the course of the years, more than 30 nuns were released from its community. The Ein Karem Convent in the Holy Land has constantly had approximately 40 nuns. At the end of the 1930s, 300 nuns lived in the Holy Land. In St. Job Monastery in Czechoslovakia, in St. Tikhon's, and in Holy Trinity Monastery in the U.S.A., there were monks who came exclusively from the ranks of the émigrés. To the 180 monks and 40 novices who lived in the monasteries, one must, of course, add the higher clergy (there were 28 bishops) and the many hieromonks of all ranks, who served as parish and monastery clergy. Their number is not precisely known, though it may have exceeded 100. Thus, before World War II, the Church Abroad had some 300-350 monastic members and 450 nuns.

These numbers underscore the fact that, before World War II, the Church Abroad could not have been wrong in claiming to be the Russian Exile Church. It is understandable that after the reunification with the American Metropolia, the Paris Jurisdiction could only be viewed as schismatic.

As a consequence of World War II, the Church Abroad lost nearly all its monasteries.

Excluding the monasteries in the Holy Land, after 1945 the Church Abroad had only Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville, in which approximately 10 monks lived. If its jurisdiction today again has 20 monasteries and sketes, this is proof of how firmly the monastic ideal is rooted in the faithful and what great respect the monasteries enjoy.

This is borne witness above all by the following facts: year after year, thousands of faithful make pilgrimages to the monasteries' feasts, thereby documenting their closeness to their Church and its monasteries. The reestablishment of the monastic communities after 1945 was facilitated by their donations and support. Today, monasteries and convents exist wherever the Church Abroad is present: in Western Europe, North and South America, in Australia and in the Holy Land.¹⁵

Among the 20 monasteries and sketes was a Greek monastery and a Greek convent, and an English-speaking convent in the U.S.A. Except for these three, Russian has remained the spoken language in all other monasteries, and Church Slavonic is used in the celebration of the divine services. The most unexpected thing, however, is that all monasteries, after having experienced a slight decline in the 1960s, have admitted more candidates over the past several years. Thus today, of the 40 monks in Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville about half are under forty years of age, including seven novices between 20 and 25. Holy Transfiguration Monastery in Boston has 30 monks, mostly younger ones. The latter monastery follows the Athonite monastic rule with strict asceticism and lengthy services and prayers. The preservation of the old traditions of the Russian convents and the strict adherence to the monastic rules are also the reason that the monastery of the Church Abroad today again has more candidates than, for example, the monasteries of the O.C.A. If the Church Abroad is often accused of "stagnant conservatism," these critics suppress the fact that the Church Abroad alone holds fast to the sacred traditions of Orthodoxy and strives to preserve the inheritance of the pre-Revolutionary Russian Church. The unwillingness to compromise with the false reforms like the abridgment of the Liturgy, as is

practiced in many Orthodox Churches, a deviation from the monastery rules is unthinkable for the Church Abroad. Their clear stance has, however, also attracted many new members in the last twenty years, including new candidates for its monasteries.

Among the candidates who enter the monasteries today, there are the late vocations, who take up the monastic life after being widowed or reaching retirement age, as well as young people who come from traditional Orthodox families, but have for a time lost contact with the Church. This is, for example, also the case in the U.S.A., where the descendants of Uniate and Orthodox immigrant families have again found Orthodoxy. Many candidates are from the ranks of the converts or the recent immigrants from the Soviet Union. At the current time, there are three new candidates in the Lesna Mother of God Convent, all under 20, who was recently able to leave the Soviet Union. The influence of the monasteries on the life of the emigration is independent of the number of residents. As religious centers, all monasteries and convents are of particular importance in areas where émigré communities are located at great distances from one another, as for example in Australia, Chile, and Canada. It is precisely in these areas that the monasteries are church centers for pilgrimage and veneration of their shrines.

The number of residents says little about the significance of the monastery. This was shown in the example of the St. Herman Monastery at Platina. The Brotherhood had only two monks at first, but the literature published by the Brotherhood was wisely disseminated and played a considerable rôle in the spiritual and religious education of the faithful, predominantly, however, in the mission among the English-speaking population. Thus, the number of inhabitants of the monasteries is quite diverse—from hermitages with one to two inhabitants to average monasteries with five to ten inhabitants, like the St. Job Monastery in Munich, the Annunciation Convent in London, or the Dormition Convent in Chile, up to monasteries with 20-50 inhabitants, eg. Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville, the Lesna Convent in France, and the convents in the Holy Land.

The economic basis of the monasteries is often very diverse. Whereas the Mount of Olives Convent in Jerusalem can buy in large life off of its agricultural produce, Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville is able to live off of its agricultural produce and publishing house, and the Greek Monastery of the Transfiguration of Christ can subsist on its incense production combined with donations, the other communities must depend financially, to a greater or lesser degree, on the Synod of Bishops and the individual dioceses, on the donations of the faithful and on certain funds for the support of the monasteries. This is in part also the result of the tasks that the monasteries have undertaken. Though the monks and nuns are able to make their own livelihood mostly by agricultural work and handiwork (the manufacture and sale of church utensils, icons and candles) as well as printing presses or book binderies, they need help with the repair of buildings and churches, the upkeep of the grounds, the running of schools, orphanages; homes for the elderly and hospitals. The faithful's willingness to make donations over the decades has made it possible not only to establish monasteries, to purchase freehold land with buildings but also to subsidize the inhabitants and finance their social, charitable and educational endeavors.

Most monasteries have accommodations for guests, who are always welcome in the monasteries. In accordance with the old tradition, guests' room and board are provided at no cost. They may,

however, support the monastery by making a donation. The course of a day in a monastery follows a routine similar to the following: at 4 A.M. rise from sleep; at 5 A.M. morning prayers and matins; between 7 A.M. – 9 A.M. or so, the Liturgy, followed by communal breakfast; at 12 noon, the midday meal; between 6 P.M. and 7 P.M., vespers, followed by supper; then, at around 8 P.M., compline and evening prayers (as in the morning).¹⁶ In a few monasteries, such as the St. Job Monastery in Munich, the Athonite rule is followed. Here, the services begin between 2 A.M. and 4 A.M., and last until 8 A.M. The remaining time – some eight to ten hours – is set aside for work, which is done in the monastery's workshops. During the midday and evening meals, writings from the Church Fathers, the Lives of the Saints, and so forth, are read. All meal times begin and end with a common prayer. The meals consist of vegetables, fruits, bread, and grain dishes (buckwheat, among others), and, at appropriate times, also dairy products. Fish, when it is available, is eaten on feast days and Sundays, not, however, during the fasts. Meat and poultry are forbidden. The main meals consist mostly of cabbage soup, potatoes, bread, and tea. Meals are taken together. In a few monasteries, the residents and guests eat in a common refectory; in others, men and women are separated for the meals. During the divine services, men and women stand separately from one another [Trans., men on the right and women on the left]. The cells of the monks and nuns may be visited only by inhabitants of the monastery, not, however, by visitors. The ordering of the monastery follows the rules for monasteries passed by the Council of Bishops in 1959, which in part follows the ordering of 1853.

In the monasteries, wonderworking icons and relics of the saints and martyrs, which have been brought from Russia, Mt. Athos, the Holy Land, and the old Russian monasteries, are venerated. Many of these icons and relics (for example, the Lesna Icon of the Mother of God or the Wonder-working Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God and the Icon of the God of Sabbaoth) were brought by refugee monks and nuns from Russia. Others were made for the new monasteries by the Athos monks, the monks from the Valaam Monastery, and the convents in Palestine as a present, whereby these old monastic houses expressed their closeness to the new monasteries of the émigrés. The faithful made pilgrimages to these shrines and prayed for protection and assistance. The great significance which is accorded the patron saint of the monastery is evinced when the faithful from afar visit the monastery to celebrate the divine services together with the monks and the nuns.

Before World War II, the following monasteries and convents belonged to the Church Abroad:¹⁷

Monasteries:

Milkovo Monastery, near Lopovo in Yugoslavia, founded in 1926 by Hieromonk (later Archimandrite) Ambrose (Kurganov). Approximately 20-25 monks belonged to the monastery. Many hierarchs of the Church Abroad, including Bishops Theodosius (Samolovich), [Saint] John (Maximovich), Leontius and Anthony (Bartoshevich), Nikon (Rklitsky), Joasaph (Skorodumov), Savva (Sarachevich), Seraphim (Ivanov) and Tikhon (Troitsky), were very close to this monastery in their younger years.¹⁸

Alexander Nevsky Monastery in Stanimaka (Asenovgrad, Bulgaria). Some twelve monks belonged to the monastery, which supported Bishop Damian's pastoral school.

St. Job Monastery in Ladomirova (Eastern Slovakia). The monastery was founded in 1924 by Archimandrite Vitalis (Maximenko, later Archbishop.) Thirty to forty monks belonged to the monastery. The Brotherhood enjoyed widespread respect for its printing press and publishing house. Also, some 20 clergymen were educated in the monastery. The Brotherhood produced Archbishops Vitalis (Maximenko), Vitalis (Ustinov), Seraphim (Ivanov), Nicodemus (Nagaev), Nathaniel (L'vov), Bishop Agapitus (Kryzhanovsky), and others.

Dormition Monastery in Peking was founded in 1792 and was subject to the Church Abroad from 1920. The monastery belonged to the Peking Ecclesiastical Mission and had two podvoryes. There were 25 monks in the brotherhood, including numerous Chinese, such as the late Bishop Basil (Shuan). The Brotherhood was held in particular respect by the Mission in China for the large quantity of literature it published.

Monastery of Kazan' Icon of the Mother of God in Harbin. The monastery was founded in 1922 and had 40 monks in 1939 and as many novices. The Brotherhood deserves particular credit for its social and charitable work, in addition to its publishing work, because the monastery also had a medical center with a clinic, a hospital, and a pharmacy. Out of this Brotherhood likewise came many later bishops, including Bishops Juvenal (Kilin), Basil (Pavlovsky), Nicander (Vintorov, who was consecrated by the Patriarchate), and Metropolitan Philaret (Voznesensky), who belonged to the Brotherhood at the end of the 1950s.¹⁹

St. Tikhon's Monastery in the U.S.A. It was founded in 1905 and belonged to the Church Abroad only in the years 1920-26 and 1935-46. In the 1930s, 20-30 monks lived there.

Also subject to the Church Abroad was ***the Holy Trinity Monastery*** in Jordanville (and two monasteries in Palestine (see below).

Convents:

Convent of the Lesna Icon of the Mother of God, near Hopovo in Yugoslavia. The convent was reestablished in Yugoslavia by approximately 60 nuns, who had belonged to the convent of the same name in Kholm, which had been founded in 1885. The number of nuns belonging to it remained constant. They deserved credit for the rebirth of Serbian Orthodox women's monasticism. In the years between the Wars, the convent reestablished some 32 Serbian convents. The nuns also cared for an orphanage attached to the convent, which accommodated 35 children (from 1920-1945, a total of over 500 children).²⁰

Convent of the Protection of the Holy Virgin, near Knyazhev, in Bulgaria, was founded in the early 1920s, by ca. 10 Russian nuns. They lived by cultivating the land and directed their life entirely to meditation and prayer.

Dormition Convent in Peking. The convent was founded in the 19th century. Ten nuns belonged to it.

Convent of the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God, in Harbin, was founded in 1924 by 20 nuns under the direction of Abbess Rufina. Subject to it were sister convents in Shanghai, Mukden, and Dairen. More than sixty nuns belonged to the sisterhood in the 1930s. They deserve credit

for their nursing care of the elderly and for the education of children. In the home for the elderly and the orphanage attached to the convent lived some 150 elderly people, most in need of nursing care, and some 100 children. ²¹

Ein Karem Convent, in the Holy Land, with some 50-60 nuns, as well as the *Mount of Olives*, and both of the convents in *Gethsemane* and *Bethany*, were subject to the Church Abroad. Some 250 nuns belonged to them (see below).

The Church Abroad lost all of these aforementioned monasteries and convents except Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville and the monasteries in the Holy Land when the Communists seized power. The Ein Karem Convent in Israel was given by the Israeli government to the Moscow Patriarchate. St. Tikhon's Monastery in the U.S.A. joined the North American Metropolia in 1946.

The monasteries and convents of the Russian Church Abroad that exist today were almost all reestablished after World War II, or, like Jordanville's Holy Trinity Monastery, were built up and extended. Only the convents in the Holy Land remained under the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad.

Monasteries (since 1945)

The Stavropegic Holy Trinity Monastery

Abbot: Archbishop Laurus (Skurla).

Address: Holy Trinity Monastery, Jordanville, New York 13361.

The monastery was founded by the Hieromonk (later Archimandrite) Panteleimon (Nizhnik), and was built up after World War II thanks to an influx of monks from the Ladomirovo St. Job Monastery and the Kazan' Monastery in Harbin, who joined the brotherhood. At this time, some 35 monks and 7 novices belong to the monastery. The monastery has more than 1,000 acres of land, upon which there are two Russian cemeteries, hostels for pilgrims, and many buildings. Holy Trinity Cathedral, with its many gilt cupolas, forms the focal point of the monastery and has become the landmark of the Church Abroad. The main building contains the monks' cells, the printing press and publishing house of St. Job, the administrative and financial offices. The Church Abroad's seminary is located in a spacious adjacent building, which also contains the seminary library, an archive, and a museum. The printing press is of particular importance to the monastery, for it meets all the demands for liturgical and spiritual literature of the Church Abroad today. ²²

New Kursk-Root Hermitage

Administrator: Fr. Konstantin Fedoroff.

Address: Russian Orthodox Monastery, P.O. Box Z, Mahopac, New York 10541.

Bishop Seraphim founded the monastery in 1950; it served as the headquarters of the Synod of Bishops until 1957. Today, Bishop Constantine (Essensky) lives in retirement there, and where

there is a lay brotherhood, which to a great extent adheres to the order for monasteries with daily services.

St. Herman of Alaska Monastery

Abbot: Hegumen Herman (Podmozensky).

Address: St. Herman of Alaska Monastery, Beegum Road, Box 7 Platina, California 96076.

The monastery was founded in the 1960s and had set as its objective the advancement of missionary work among the English-speaking Americans. Since 1965, the small brotherhood has had its own printing press and has been publishing Orthodox literature in the English-language, which has attained wide distribution and considerable circulation.

Holy Transfiguration Monastery

Abbot: Archimandrite Panteleimon (Metropolis).

Address: Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 278 Warren Street, Brookline, MA 02146.

The monastery was founded at the beginning of the 1960s, by Hieromonk [later Archimandrite] Panteleimon (Metropolis), who had lived briefly in the Russian Monastery of St. Panteleimon on Mt. Athos. This Greek monastery near Boston was the first subject to the Ecumenical Patriarch, then to the Church Abroad in the years 1965-1986. The Brotherhood lived in strict asceticism and follows the Athonite Rule for monasteries. Thirty monks of various nationalities belong to the brotherhood. There are more candidates than places at the monastery. The monastery receives its income from cultivating its land and manufacturing incense.

Holy Transfiguration Monastery

Abbot: Archbishop Vitalis (Ustinov).

Address: Russian Orthodox Monastery, Mansonville, Quebec, R.R. 1, Canada.

This monastery was established in the early 1960s by Archbishop Vitalis's brotherhood. It is only occupied in the summer because the brotherhood lives at the archpastoral residence in the winter. The brotherhood has a small printing press, in which it prints journals and religious and theological books.

Skete of the Dormition of the Mother of God

Abbot: Hieromonk Seraphim (Filimonoff).

Address: Hieromonk Seraphim Filimonoff, Post Office Northville, Alberta TOE-1, Canada.

The monastery was founded in the mid-1980s and is inhabited by English-speaking Americans. It has a printing press and primarily distributes missionary literature.

Dormition Skete

Abbot: Hieromonk Seraphim (Filimonoff).

Address: Reverend Seraphim Filimonoff, Post Office Northville, Alberta TOE-1, Canada.

The skete was built in 1955-57 and was supposed to be occupied by the St. Job Brotherhood of Archbishop Vitalus. After Bishop Vitalius was appointed ruling bishop of the entire Canadian Diocese, the Brotherhood moved to Montréal and founded the above-named Skete of the Transfiguration. Only Hieromonk Seraphim remained behind. Besides him, two novices and a few lay workers live in the monastery.

St. Nicholas Skete

Address: St. Nicholas Church, Bari, Italy.

The skete was founded in 1952. Hegumen Ambrose headed the skete until the end of the 1960s. Today the skete is unoccupied.

The Monastery of St. Job of Pochaev

Abbot: Bishop Mark (Arndt)

Address: Orthodox Monastery of St. Job, Schirmerweg 78, D-8000 Munich 60, West Germany.

The monastery was founded in 1946 to offer the refugee Brotherhood of St. Job a new home. The Brotherhood consisted of 49 monks in 1945, of which about 30, however, emigrated to the U.S.A., Palestine, France, and South America, because the Munich monastery did not have the financial wherewithall to support such a large brotherhood. Until the mid-1960s, some six monks belonged to the monastery, which ran a small printing press. After the death of Abbot Cornelius, Bishop Nathaniel was appointed abbot of the monastery. Early in 1981, Bishop Mark (Arndt) moved to the monastery and has since become its abbot. A new brotherhood founded by him came with him, and there are now seven members in the community. In 1981, a candle factory and a new printing press were set up in the monastery. Since 1981, the monastery has been directly subject to the German Diocese; formerly, it was subordinated directly to the Synod.

Monastery of the Oak of Mamre and the Holy Forefathers

Abbot: Vacancy.

Address: Hebron, Israel.

The monastery is located in a former hostel for pilgrims near Abraham's Oak, in the environs of Hebron, and is subject to the Jerusalem Mission. Since the 1920s, a few monks have at all times lived at the monastery; at the present time, there are no monks living there.

Also subject to the Church Abroad in the Holy land is the monastery of St. Chariton, which the Russian Church acquired in the 19th century. Since the 1960s, no monks have lived in the monastery. The members of the Jerusalem Ecclesiastical Mission celebrate the divine services on feast days and commemorative days in the oldest monastery in the Holy Land.

Convents

Novo-Diveevo Stavropegial Convent of the Dormition

Abbess: Nonna.

Address: Russian Orthodox Convent “Novoe Diveevo”, Smith Road, Spring Valley, New York 10977.

The convent was an initiative of Father Adrian Rymarenko, later Archbishop Andrew, to thank for its existence, and was founded in 1948. It was intended to be a place of contemplation and pilgrimage for the faithful near New York. More than forty nuns belonged to the convent at one time. At the present time, some twenty nuns and a few novices live in the convent. The sisterhood succeeded, initially with very modest means, in purchasing 22 hectares over a number of years, upon which they established a cemetery, which at the present time contains 3,600 graves. It has become one of the largest Russian cemeteries in the emigration. In recent years, modern home for the elderly has been opened on monastery land, in which 100 people live. The main service of the nuns, however, has always been, that they take in those without means and émigrés who do not know English.

The Convent of the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God

Abbess: Ariadna (Michurina).

Address: Russian Convent of Our Lady of Vladimir, 3365 19th Street, San Francisco, California.

In 1948, the convent was reestablished by refugee nuns from the Harbin convent of the same name. The convent also has a skete dedicated to St. Seraphim on the coast of California, some 20 miles from San Francisco. The convent also has a sister convent in Canada (see below), which was founded by nuns from the former Shanghai convent. Twelve nuns belong to the convent in San Francisco. The convent runs a small printing press and primarily publishes religious educational literature.

St. Xenia Skete

Abbess: Nun Brigid.

Address: St. Xenia Skete, Wildwood Rural Branch, Redding, California 96001.

After 1978, when the Fool-for-Christ Blessed Xenia of Petersburg was canonized, a few nuns founded a small sisterhood that was granted the status of a convent. At the present time, four nuns who converted to Orthodoxy belong to the convent, which is located near St. Herman Monastery in Platina. The sisterhood follows the Athonite rule for monasteries. The Divine Liturgy is celebrated in English. The monastery has a small printing press but is currently estranged from the Church Abroad.

Holy Nativity Convent

Abbess: Nun Stephania.

Address: Holy Nativity Convent, 57 Orchard Street, Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts 02130.

This is a Greek convent, which like the aforementioned Greek monastery, was part of the Church Abroad from 1965-1985. In the convent twelve nuns, mostly of Greek and/or American extraction, lived.

Holy Protection Convent

Abbess: Nun Ambrosia (Belomestova).

Address: St. Mary's Convent, Bluffton, Alberta Canada.

The monastery was founded in 1953, by nuns from the Shanghai convent; others joined in Canada. The nuns live by farming and are subject to the mother convent in San Francisco. The very isolated convent is a place of pilgrimage for many pilgrims from western Canada, who mostly spend several days and weeks in the convent.

Dormition Convent

Abbess: Hegumenia Juliana.

Address: Convento Ruso Orthodoxo, Casilla 14493, Correo 21, Santiago, Chile.

This is the only convent in South America. It is run by nuns who came from the Ein Karem Convent in Palestine, who refused to subject themselves to the Moscow Patriarchate and held true to the Church Abroad. Four nuns and seven novices belong to the convent, as well as a few lay co-workers, who help the nuns in the care of the orphanage containing forty Chilean children, who are all baptized Orthodox. The convent also has a school, which is attended by 100 children.

Convent of the Lesna Icon of the Mother of God

Abbess: Athanasia.

Address: Couvent de la St. Vierge de Lesna, Provment 27150, Etrépagny, France.

The convent was re-established in France in 1950 by 32 nuns from the convent of the same name in Yugoslavia after the Yugoslav authorities granted them an exit visa to the West. From 1950-67, the convent was located in Fourqueux near Paris. After the property, which belonged to the Catholic Church, was purchased, the nuns found a new home in the Chateau of Etrépagny. With the support of the faithful, the nuns were able to obtain the former chateau with an old church and extensive land. Over the years, the convent lost more than twenty nuns, though almost as many have joined the sisterhood, to which today some 30 nuns belong. The monastery is a place of pilgrimage for the faithful from Europe and overseas, who venerate the wonderworking Lesna icon.

Convent of the Annunciation

Abbess: Hegumenia Elizabeth (Ampenov).

Address: Convent of the Holy Annunciation, 26 Brondesbury Park, London NW6, England.

The convent was founded in 1954/59, by the Abbess of the Ein Karem Convent and several other nuns who had left with her. The six nuns arrived in London in 1954 and were finally able to occupy the present house in 1959. The nuns deserve credit for their missionary labors. The monastery is dependent upon financial support because it has no sources of income other than a small bookbindery.

Convent of New Shamordino

Abbess: Hegumenia Eupraxia.

Address: All Saints Convent, 32 Smith Road, Kentlyn, N.S.W. 2560, Australia.

The convent is located in a former monastery, which was never finished. Since 1956, nuns from Harbin have lived there. On the convent's land are many refugee barracks that were set up for the Russian émigrés from China. Since they left the camp, a home for the elderly has been located on the convent property, for which the nuns care.

Cenobia of the Forerunner St. John the Baptist

This was founded as a monastery by schemamonk Gurius (Demidov) in 1965, and was supposed to be built up into a monastery. These plans failed, because there was no one to occupy it. Today, this coenobium is part of the above convent.

Today, the Church Abroad has some 100 nuns and 50 novices in the Holy Land. Almost all the nuns are Arabs. Nevertheless, these Russian Convents have preserved their Russian character. Russian is the spoken language. The liturgy is celebrated in Church Slavonic.

Russian usages are kept in all monasteries. The Arab nuns are women from Arab Orthodox families who attended the Bethany Convent school or lived there at the boarding school.

The three convents remain under the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad up to the present day because they lie in the Jordanian part of Palestine, and the Jordanian government did not change the property status. The Jerusalem Ecclesiastical Mission spiritually cares for them.

Without exception, the Mission personnel is monastic. The head of the Mission is an archimandrite (at present, Archimandrite Alexis). In the 1930s, more than 20 monks of all ranks belonged to the Mission for a time.

Convent of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives

Abbess: Theodosia (Baranova).

Address: P.O. Box 19-229, Jerusalem, Israel.

The convent was founded at the turn of this century. Before World War I, 100 nuns belonged to the convent; in the 1930s, as many as 200 nuns. Since then, the number of nuns has declined; at the same time, fewer and fewer nuns joined the community. At present, about 50 nuns and 50 novices still live in the monastery — the majority of Arab descent. The convent subsists on its own farming, a candle factory, an icon workshop, and a vestment-sewing workshop.

Gethsemane Convent and Gethsemane Community of the Resurrection of Christ

Abbess of both convents: Barbara (Svetkova), died 1983.

Address: P.O. Box 19-238, Jerusalem, Israel.

Both convents are set in an extensive plot of land in the Garden of Gethsemane. At the center of the monastery is the Church of St. Mary Magdalene with its gilt onion domes, visible on the landscape from afar. A total of 30-40 nuns belong to both convents. A school for girls with a boarding house belongs to the Bethany Convent. The school is attended by 140 girls, half of whom live in the boarding school. Many of the Arab nuns, who live in the Russian convents today, came from this boarding house and school.

Footnotes

1. There is a 180-page manuscript about the monasteries of the Church Abroad. Regarding the publication of the manuscript, see above, p. XI. [Trans., *Monasteries and Convents of the Church Abroad* was later published by St. Job of Pochaev Press in Munich in 1990.] For further details, cf. *Klöster im Ausland*.

Russian monasteries and convents are divided into two major groups: the cenobitic and the hesychist (anchorites). In cenobitic monasteries, all property belongs directly to the monastery, and the inhabitants are property-less; therefore they are taken care of by the monastery. In hesychist monasteries, the inhabitants receive free dwelling places and food; clothes, shoes, icons and other things are private property. Of the 1,000 monasteries and convents in pre-revolutionary Russia, 624 were cenobitic (cf. Zybkovets, p.22). The general names for a monastery in Russian are “monastyr” or “obitel’.” There are three different types of monastery: “lavra,” “pustyn’,” and “skete.”

Lavra: The title “lavra” means that the monastery has played a significant role in the spiritual and cultural development of the people. In the Russian Empire, there were four monasteries by that name: the Kiev Caves Lavra, the Alexander Nevsky Lavra, the Holy Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra and the Pochaev Lavra.

Pustyn’: Hermitage or wilderness monasteries were originally isolated monasteries in the forests or at the edge of the steppes or the desert, which had only had a few inhabitants. Over the course of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, these monasteries attracted many young people who were seeking a solitary way of life. Thus, the number of inhabitants grew sharply. In the Russian Empire there were 74 hermitages for monks and twelve for nuns.

Skete: A skete is a small group of hermits or monks dependent upon a monastery, who live in small huts and houses. The elders (senior spiritual leaders among the monks) dwelt mostly in sketes.

Stavropegic Monasteries: These are monasteries which do not belong to a diocese, but rather are directly subject to the First Hierarch (in Russia – to the Patriarch; in the Church Abroad to the Metropolitan). The word comes from the Greek “stavros”, meaning “cross”, and “pegnymi”, meaning “I confirm.” It means that the First Hierarch personally consecrates the cross and the

antimens, liturgically confirming his authority. Before 1918 there were eight such monasteries in Russia. In the Church Abroad today, Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville and Novo-Diveevo Convent in Spring Valley enjoy that status. Until 1981, the Monastery of St. Job in Munich [Trans., and Holy Annunciation Convent in London] also had this status. ⇐

2. Seide, *Klöster des Patriarchats*, pp. 8-17; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1942), pp. 108, 156. ⇐
3. From the secret *Furov Report*, Part 3: "The Monasteries of the Russian Orthodox Church", German version in "Glaube in der 2-en Welt" (1980), pp. 43-48. ⇐
4. Zybkovets, p. 112. ⇐
5. *Ibid.*, p. 111. ⇐
6. *Yearbook of Orthodoxy* (1976/1977), pp. 203-204; C. Tarasar, J. Erickson, pp. 102-112 & 302. ⇐
7. "In a Russian Convent" in *Glaube in der 2-en Welt* (1980) 5, pp. 1-2; *ECR* (1978) 1-2, p. 153. ⇐
8. Manuchina, pp. 563-573. ⇐
9. *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie* (1976/1977), pp. 171-173. ⇐
10. Seraphim, pp. 377-388. ⇐
11. *Prav. Rus'* (1960) 18, p. 5. ⇐
12. N. Schidlovskaya; Z. Frid, pp. 8-12. In 1978 there were 160 Orthodox monasteries in Serbia with 1,100 monks and nuns. The largest monastery is Studnica Monastery with 15 monks; the largest convent is the Ljubostina Convent with 60 nuns, cf. *Prav. Rus'* (1978) 11, p. 14. ⇐
13. Zybkovets, pp. 196-197. ⇐
14. Seraphim, pp. 386-387. ⇐
15. *Spisok* (1980/1981). ⇐
16. There are differences in individual monasteries, cf. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, p. 123. ⇐
17. On the history of the individual monasteries and for more detailed information, cf. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ⇐
18. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, pp. 122-128. ⇐
19. *Kratky ocherk voznikoveniya*. ⇐
20. *Lesninsky monastyr'*; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, pp. 128-130. ⇐
21. *Svetloi pamyati*. ⇐

22. Bobrov, *Troitsky monastyr'*. ⇐

Part IV, Chapter 3

The Printing Presses & Publishing Houses

For the religious and spiritual education of its faithful, the strengthening in the Orthodox Faith and the Christian truths, the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia has taken a twofold path. The first is the proclamation [of the Faith] by the priest in the parishes, who teaches the Gospel in the divine services and in his sermons and instructs the youth in the parish schools.

The second path is the proclamation and propagation of the Faith through Church literature: in the diocesan and parish periodicals, in the Church calendars with its religious articles, and in books and writings with religious-pedagogical, theological, historical, literary, philosophical and catechetical content. In this way, the teachings and traditions of the Russian Orthodox Church are passed on diachronically and disseminated synchronically. In addition to the religious-catechetical publications, which serve to proclaim the Faith and to instruct the people of the Church in religion, the Church Abroad publishes a series of books and periodicals with the aim of preserving the Russian national culture among the émigrés. These publications of historical, political, literary, and linguistic content extend from new editions of the classical works of pre-Revolutionary Russia to works by émigrés and textbooks for parish schools. These books and periodicals are produced in Church-owned publishing houses and on Church-owned printing presses. The published literature may then be purchased directly from the publisher or from Russian bookstores in the emigration.

The Brotherhood of St. Job of Pochaev is most closely associated with printing and publishing. It established numerous printing presses in Europe and overseas. The founder and Abbot of the Ladomirovo Monastery of St. Job (in eastern Slovakia), Archimandrite Vitalis (Maximenko), who later became Archbishop of New York & Eastern America and Abbot of Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville, particularly distinguished himself in this area. He had laid the cornerstone of the printing press in Ladomirovo. Within 10 years, under his direction, it became the most important printing press of the Church Abroad. After the loss of this monastery and its printing press in 1944, Archbishop Vitalis established one in Holy Trinity Monastery, dedicated to St. Job of Pochaev. After World War II, this was the most important printing press in the Church Abroad. Besides these, there are printing presses and publishing houses in the United States, Canada, South America, Europe, Australia, and the Holy Land. Most of them are run by monks and nuns of the Church Abroad, who in this way earn money for the upkeep of their monasteries and convents. The particular rôle played by the monasteries and convents in the publication and distribution of religious literature has been stressed again and again at the sessions of the Synod of Bishops and at the Councils of the Church Abroad. Thus, in a decision of the Second Pan-Diaspora Council in 1938 on the tasks of the monastic communities, among other things, it named “the publication and distribution of literature among the faithful. To this end the monks must learn the printing business, as did, for example, the Russian monasteries on Mt. Athos or the monks of the St. Job of Pochaev Printing Press, or our convent of the Kazan’ Icon of the Theotokos in Harbin.”¹

It is precisely in the realm of Church publishing that the Church Abroad can document, that the free part of the Russian Church is in the position to continue the traditions of pre-Revolutionary times. On the other hand, the Moscow Patriarchate was only allotted modest publishing facilities in 1943. The nationalization of all businesses after 1917 also affected the printing presses and publishing houses in the Soviet Union. While at the beginning of the 1920s a few Church journals could still be published on a diocesan level, mainly the schismatic Renovatianist ones, the Patriarchate, which had been restored in 1917, was denied a central journal. At the end of the 1920s, the printing of these journals was finally halted, the Soviet authorities had already forbidden the printing of service and liturgical books and Bibles. A modest concession made to the Patriarchal “locum tenens,” Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky) in 1927 when he made the fateful Declaration of Loyalty, was the promise to allow the Patriarchate to publish its own journal. The promise was fulfilled for the first time four years later: from 1931-1935, a small edition, *the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate (Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii)*, appeared. Its publication was again halted in 1935 when the struggle against the Church reached its pinnacle. The situation changed for the first time with the outbreak of the War against Hitler’s Germany: on Good Friday, in 1942, the work *The Truth About Religion in Russia*, by Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky), later Patriarch, was published in 50,000 copies. This is the largest number of copies of a single book printed by the Patriarchate to this day. This was a book which was intended to be sent abroad, since it was published in seven languages and was a prelude to a new beginning for publishing by the Patriarchal Church, which has since been allowed to publish special editions, including, for example, one marking the 500th anniversary of the autocephaly of the Russian Church in 1948; the Acts of the Conference of Autocephalous Churches in Moscow in 1949; a few propaganda volumes on the Peace Conferences initiated by the Russian Church; a collection of sermons by Metropolitan Nicholas (Yarushevich) of Krutitsa & Kolomna, and Patriarchs Alexis and Pimen; and an anniversary album entitled, *The Russian Orthodox Church: Its Organization, Situation & Activities* (Moscow, 1958). All these publications were meant more for people abroad than for their own faithful, which is demonstrated by the fact that translations appeared in German, English, French, Swedish, Spanish and even Arabic, among others languages. The purpose of these editions was to paint a picture abroad of a Church that can exist, free and unhindered, despite the state ideology of atheism. That this has succeeded over the years is a sad truth as it is bitter, for the Orthodox Russian population has hardly been able to find an advocate for its basic religious freedoms who is not persecuted anew for it daily.

In addition to these publications of all sorts, *the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate (JMP)*, with an edition of 10,000 copies per month, and containing approximately 80 pages, has been published again since 1943. Since 1968, there has been a Ukrainian edition, and since 1971, an English edition. Abroad, four other journals are published by the Patriarchate: in Berlin, *Voice of Orthodoxy (Stimme der Orthodoxie)*, since 1961; in Budapest, *Church Chronicle (Egyhazi khronika)*, since 1952; in England, *Souroz*; and in New York, *One Church*. The distribution of these newspapers bears no relationship to the number of the faithful to whom these journals were directed. The Central European Exarchate numbers a dozen communities in the GDR, FRG, and Austria; the Hungarian deanery includes nine parishes; in the U.S.A., Canada, and Great Britain, there are 60 communities. So, some 80 communities have three of their own journals, plus an

English translation of *the Journal*, whereas in the Soviet Union today, for every open church there is are most three or four copies of the Russian *Journal*.

In addition to the *JMP*, the Patriarchate has published a church annual since 1945; also since 1965, 21 theological volumes of *Theological Works (Bogoslovskie Trudy)* have been published. All these editions have only a small distribution and are not available for purchase. These can only be ordered directly from the publishing house, or also obtained in the churches, where they are sometimes displayed. The greatest lack since the Revolution is, however, in the area of liturgical books, as well as in editions of the New Testament and Bibles for the faithful. These have only appeared in very limited editions since 1948, mostly as photocopied reproductions of editions from Tsarist times. The first new one appeared in 1956, in a run of 25,000 copies, in a clumsy and oversized format, marking the first Bible distribution since the Revolution. It was meant for a Church that had 30 million faithful and 22,000 parishes (as of 1961), did not have its own church printing press, and was unable to publish its works in the state-controlled book market. Since that time, there have been two further editions of the Bible and a few editions of the New Testament. Yet the total circulation only reached 125,000 copies (in 1956, 25,000; in 1968, 50,000; in 1979, 50,000). Thus, all publications of the Patriarchate to date are only a drop in the ocean of atheist literature. The great lack of religious literature is most clearly revealed by the prices one must pay for Bibles, New Testaments, etc. on the black market. In comparison with the publishing houses of the Church Abroad, the Moscow Patriarchate's publications appear quite modest.²

To these quantitative limitations, one must also add a series of qualitative restrictions. Thus, Fr. Gleb Yakumin, in a report delivered in Moscow in 1979, speaks of "a whole series of themes forbidden to the Patriarchate: apologetics, criticism of materialism, publications for children, themes connected with the betterment of pastoral qualifications, methodological recommendations for confessions, sermons, and so forth."³

The two largest waves of emigration from Russia after World Wars I and II included, along with political, national and religious groups, representatives of the intelligentsia of all nationalities of the Russian Empire. As diverse also as the cultural, national and spiritual, religious backgrounds of these groups may have been, one thing they all had in common was the need to continue their spiritual and religious heritage. The spiritual diversity of this emigration is nowhere clearer than in the numerous periodicals, newspapers, and brochures that they published.

The writer Brumberg noted: "Also, whoever has read only a little of this literature must be impressed by the significance that the émigré publications have as a source of information, not only for the political and spiritual trials in the Russian émigré communities in the West but also for developments within the Soviet Union."⁴ Besides noteworthy belles-lettres, there is also an impressive philosophical and political literature of considerable extent. In this area of theological thought and scholarship, it has been the émigré's task over the decades to conduct theological discussions with Catholicism and Protestantism, because, in the Soviet Union, nothing on these subjects was permitted to be published, and the theological seminaries and academies were all closed in the 1920s. The first typewritten and hectographed newspapers were published already in the refugee camps; later, these were often to become leading mouthpieces of certain

groups. *The Index of Periodical Publications of the Emigration from Russia and the U.S.S.R. in the years 1919-52*,⁵ published by the U.S.S.R. Research Institute, listed 2,356 periodicals in 35 countries: 1,571 in Russian, 537 in Ukrainian; 84 in Belorussian, and another 35 in other national languages. Added to this were another 125 titles, which were published by Russians, Ukrainians and other nationalities in West European languages. Not included in this index were the Baltic languages. Many of these periodicals had a very brief run; this applied above all else to the camp periodicals after 1945. However, many of them can look back on decades of existence. Most periodicals originated in Germany, followed by France, Czechoslovakia, the U.S.A., China, Canada, and Poland, but other journals were also published in South America, Australia, and North Africa. Some 100 titles were published by the Russian Orthodox Church [in emigration] (the Church Abroad, Metropolitan Eulogius' Jurisdiction, and the North American Metropolia); around 15 to 20 journals have now existed for decades. Because of their large volume, it is impossible to treat all titles here. Only those that, due to their volume or their long existence, has left a strong impression upon the faithful of the Church Abroad and have found wide distribution can be examined.

The journals with religious and moral content have increased since the mid-1920s in volume and circulation because, after the schism, each jurisdiction published its own newspapers. The number of titles published by the émigré Church has always taken fourth place numerically among the total of journals, with 12 of 102 titles, after the political, general and literary and artistic periodicals.⁶

While many journals were at first published by the simplest means, over the years their volume, regularity of publication, and technical production and distribution improved more and more. After the loss of the Church presses through the Revolution, the Russian Church had only two presses abroad: at the Peking and Jerusalem Missions. The Peking printing press was founded in the 19th century and devoted itself primarily to the translation of divine service and liturgical books from Russian into Chinese. During the Boxer Rebellion, the printing press and the valuable Mission library were destroyed. Under the new head of the Mission, Archimandrite Innocent (Figurovsky, later Archbishop, and from 1929 Metropolitan of Peking & China), a new press was established in 1906. In contrast to the old one, which had been run with steam engines, the new one was electric and one of the most modern presses of its time.⁷ In the Jerusalem Mission's printing press, books and writings for the schools and the Mission in Palestine were printed. They still print literature today in Russian, Church Slavonic, English, Arabic, and Greek.

The presses in Peking and Jerusalem were not in any position to meet the tremendous need for liturgical books, prayer books, Church calendars and journals overall in the newly-formed parishes and churches of the emigration. The greatest shortage prevailed in the area of liturgical books, Bibles and catechisms, which the Church leadership at first had published in Bulgaria, Serbia, and Poland, where there were Cyrillic typesetters. This shortage held true for both the wave of emigration after 1917 and that after 1945. There was also the possibility of placing orders with the printing presses in the newly-formed Baltic States and the Russian St. Panteleimon's Monastery on Athos. The desire to have their own efficient printing press, which would also be in a position to publish a central Church journal and the communiqués of the

Synod of Bishops, was, therefore, present from the beginning and also necessary for financial reasons, in order to save on the cost of printing.

The importance that the Church attached to printing and publishing is also underscored by the fact that it formed its own commissions to deal with this problem. At the Third Pan-Diaspora Council, in 1974, in Resolution VIII on the “Commission for Missions and Publishing,” it was resolved, among other things, to build up community libraries and the editions of books, brochures, journals, and so forth in the Russian language, as well as in other languages, and to increase the distribution of these printed products in churches of the Church Abroad. ⁸

The first plans to establish an official church mouthpiece, which was to report on the events in the Church emigration, and most of all on the relations between the SCA and the Patriarch of Russia, stemmed back to 1920. Because of the evacuation, it never came about. Thus, it was only possible to realize these plans in early 1922. The necessity for a journal with official pronouncements were becoming more and more urgent, the more so because all manner of rumors were circulating about events in the emigration and about the situation in the homeland. In the official section, important pronouncements were to be published on the life of the Church emigration, such as the appointments of the clergy, administrative directives, epistles and the SEA’s pronouncements, and so forth. In the unofficial part, there are general reports on the situation in the emigration and in Russia. The first issue appeared on 15/28 March 1922 under the title Church News. Publication by *the Supreme Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad (Tserkovnie Vedomosti, Izdanie pri vysshem russkom tserklovnom upravlenii zagranitsei)*. E.I. Macharoblidze, long-time secretary of the Synod of Bishops, was the editor. The journal was published every two weeks and was 8-10 pages long. For the Church developments in the emigration, as well as for those in the Soviet Union, it represents a comprehensive source, because all important developments can be traced in the official part. The unofficial part, the chronicle, reports on the life of individual dioceses and communities of the Church Abroad, and also presents many interesting articles on the situation in Russia and the plight of the Patriarch. Among other things, in 1926 (No. 23-24) and 1927 (No. 3-6 and 11-12) there is a complete list of all canonical bishops in the Soviet Union, i.e. those bishops who were included in the Tikhonite hierarchy, and a list of canonically consecrated bishops who had joined the Renovationists. The first list contained the names of 260 bishops and the second another 17 bishops.

At the end of the 1920s, the periodical encountered financial difficulties and had finally to cease publication. In 1933, it was resumed under the name *Church Life (Tserkovnaya zhizn’)*, which was published by the Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia as its official mouthpiece. Its temporary publication was suspended after the June 1944 issue. It appeared again, from 1947, in Munich, first with 50 pages per issue, mostly as a double issue.

From 1951-1976, it was edited in the U.S.A., first in Mahopac, then in New York, but printed in Jordanville. After the War, except for the period in Munich, when it was edited by Archpriest Pomazansky and Archimandrite Abercius (Taushev), Archpriest Grabbe remained the editor.

From the mid-1950s, 5-6 issues were published per year; from the mid-1960s, only 3-4. Count G.P. Grabbe (today Bishop Gregory) was the editor of the periodical, first in Karlovtsy, then in Munich, Mahopac and New York, until 1976, at which time publication was again suspended due to financial difficulties. Since 1983, it is again being published. In the interim, *Orthodox Russia* took over some of its tasks by printing the pronouncements and directives of the Synod of Bishops (see below).

The periodical Church Life was published at first monthly, with 15-20 pages, then later, as a double issue. Like its predecessors, it had an official and an unofficial part with a chronicle, and in all the years of its existence, it comprehensively mirrored the ecclesial developments of the Church Abroad and also of the Patriarchal Church, on which it regularly reported.

Archimandrite Vitalis (Maximenko), who had a great experience in this area, took the initiative to establish the Church's new printing press. He can rightly be called the father of all publishing and printing in the Church Abroad. Archimandrite Vitalis had been appointed to be in charge of the printing press at the St. Job of Pochaev Dormition Monastery as early as 1900; this press had been established in 1618. This oldest church printing press in the south of Russia had lost much of its significance by the end of the 19th century and published only a Church calendar and a diocesan bulletin. Within barely 15 years, Archimandrite Vitalis succeeded in making it one of the most important printing presses in Russia. From five coworkers, the number grew to 150; the eight printing machines had more than 220,000 pounds of matrices. During World War I, the press was moved to the interior of Russia, where it was able to continue working on a small scale.

Archimandrite Vitalis was put in a Polish prison and sentenced to death for collaboration with the Ukrainian nationalists, but finally, on the intervention of leading statesmen and church figures, among others the French President Clemenceau and the Serbian Patriarch, he was pardoned and exiled from the country. He arrived in Lodomirova in eastern Slovakia, via Yugoslavia, in order to establish a monastery for the Orthodox there; the monks were appointed to give pastoral care to and run a mission among the populace. In the new monastery, which was dedicated to St. Job of Pochaev,² and from which later many hierarchs of the Church Abroad came, the first ecclesiastical; printing press of the Church Abroad came into existence, and in subsequent years it developed into one of the most important presses of the Church emigration.

Within a year from the arrival of Archimandrite Vitalis in the autumn of 1924, the small printing press began its work. The basic equipment was a few steam-driven machines with 440 pounds of matrices that Vitalis obtained in Prague from the former Russian Black Sea Legion. Printing was done in Church Slavonic and in Russian. At this time, the Brotherhood consisted of five people, who at first had to be trained in printing. Within a few years, the press was built up and other machines were procured. At first, liturgical books, such as the priest's *Service Book (Sluzhebnyk)*, *the Book of Needs (Trebnik)*, *the Small Collection (Maly Sbornik)*, *the Commemoration Book (Pomyannik)*, as well as other prayer books and catechisms, were printed. From 1925, a Church calendar was published yearly; it was called the Orthodox Church Calendar¹⁰ and contained a monthly section (mesiatseslov) with the typicon (the order of services) and a section with readings (dlya chteniya) for specific feast days and Sundays. There were also theological,

religious-educational, historical and literary articles. The most extensive work that the Brotherhood published in these first years was a four-volume edition of *the Great Collection (Veliky Sbornik)*, which included the principal divine services celebrated in the churches of the Church Abroad. After 1945, a few monks, who had gathered together in the Fischbek Camp near Hamburg around Archimandrite Vitalis (Ustinov, later Metropolitan), reproduced it in order to care for the new refugee communities and camp churches that were coming into existence everywhere in Europe and overseas.

After the outbreak of the War with the Soviet Union, the Lodomirovo Brotherhood published Bibles, prayerbooks, and liturgical books, some of which were printed in editions of as many as 100,000 copies, in order to send them into the German-occupied areas of the Soviet Union, where they were distributed to the newly-established parishes and faithful. ¹¹

The Brotherhood received financial support for this missionary work from the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, which in 1942/43 had put at their disposal 900,000 leva. By 1943, they had published 3,000 Gospel books, 100,000 Gospels according to St. John, 35,000 small prayer books, and 30,000 apologetical brochures. A further 300,000 Gospels according to St. John and 60,000 prayer books were planned. Also, a mission series was begun. Of this series, entitled *For the Faith (Za veru)*, six different titles were published by 1943, for example, “Is there a God?”, “Why Do the Communists Persecute Christ?”, and “Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy.” The Brotherhood also produced 400 antimensia, which were blessed by Metropolitan Seraphim (Lade). ¹² Besides these religious writings and books, the printing press also published books on church history, history, and political themes. ¹³

Alongside these periodicals, which had a primarily regional significance for the population of eastern Slovakia, there also appeared the following titles: *Russian Pastor (Russky Pastyr)*, *Orthodox Lemkovshchina (Pravoslavnyaya Lemkovshchina)*, *Orthodox Carpatho-Russia (Pravoslavnyaya Prikarpat'skaya Rus')*, and others. However, *Orthodox Russia. An ecclesiastical and social periodical (Pravoslavnyaya Rus'. Tserkovno-obshchestvenny organ)*, which has attained the greatest importance, has appeared regularly every 14 days with a 15-20 page content since 1928.

In 1943, the state authorities forbade the newspaper and another 700 periodicals from publishing for a few months because there was not sufficient paper. However, they were able to resume publication in the summer of 1943, until October 1944, when the Brotherhood fled. Since 1947, the newspaper has been published in Jordanville, usually with two issues per month. In 1972, issue No. 23, dated 1/14 December, published its 1,000th issue as a jubilee edition.

This periodical is the central mouthpiece of the Church Abroad, in which all important decisions of the Synod of Bishops, the correspondence, Paschal and Christmas epistles of the First Hierarch of the Church, sermons by the bishops and priests, the biographies of the hierarchs and a regular chronicle of the communities and dioceses throughout the world, appeared. Also, alongside theological articles, one finds articles on church history and political history (for example, the rôle of the monarchy in the past and future, the relationship of the Church to the monarchy, to the situation in the Communist sphere of influence), stories and reports from old

Russia from the time of the emigration, descriptions of the Russian cultural monuments, biographies of its rulers and its Church hierarchs and much more. In the jubilee issue, the periodical published the aims that it had set at its establishment in 1928. ¹⁴ Among other things, it says therein that it wants to consider itself the central mouthpiece of the Russian Orthodox emigration, whose Orthodox consciousness of self it would like to strengthen. Furthermore, its aims are to spread unity among the Russian Church emigration and defend Orthodoxy in the face of sectarianism, occultism, and theosophy. The periodical has faithfully pursued these aims. In 1971, in an advertisement for subscriptions, the following are listed: (1) instruction on the most important general Church events and their appreciation, (2) instruction on the actual Church life of the whole diaspora, which had organized itself ecclesiastically and forms a unity of Russians, (3) a collection of materials reflecting the position of the True Church of the Russian people, who are tortured and tormented by the Soviet yoke, (4) the transmission and spread of the basic values of the Orthodox Faith to the Church people with the aim of a knowledge founded upon the deep truths of the Church. ¹⁵ From 1935, until the outbreak of the War, the newspaper had also published a monthly accompanying issue for the children of the émigrés, *Childhood and Youth in Christ (Detstvo i yunost' vo Khriste)*; 56 issues of this appeared.

Archimandrite Vitalis (Maximenko) was in charge of the printing press until 1934 when he was succeeded by Archimandrite Seraphim (Ivanov), the founder of the New Kursk-Root Hermitage and later Archbishop of Chicago & Detroit. When, in 1944, the Brotherhood fled in the face of advancing Soviet troops via Pressburg and Berlin to the West, even during the flight they published a copy of *Orthodox Russia*, which appeared on 22 October 1944 in Pressburg.

The exact size of the periodical's edition has not been precisely determined, but some 4,000 copies might have been printed.

The Lodomirovo printing press was the most important printing press in the time between the Wars. In it, 75 percent of all the literature of the Church Abroad was published, which was dispatched to fifty countries around the world. ¹⁶

After the Brotherhood fled, other monks joined on the way to the West, and their number grew to 49 monks. While the majority of them waited for a journey overseas or to Palestine, the Monastery of St. Job in Munich-Obermenzing was newly founded for those who remained. In the appeal to reestablish the monastery, the first point listed was to support Metropolitan Anastasius and the Holy Synod by publishing literature. ¹⁷

Due to the Communist seizure of power in Eastern Europe, China, and Manchuria, the Church Abroad lost all its possessions in these areas, including the printing presses in Lodomirova, Harbin, and Peking. Naturally, they also had no further possibility of having anything printed at the private or state printing presses in Eastern Europe. The necessity for a new beginning was even greater than after World War I. In addition to the above losses, there was also the loss of the Jerusalem Mission with its new printing press in 1949 because the Israeli authorities gave the ownership of all property of the Church Abroad on Israeli territory to the Moscow Patriarchate. ¹⁸

In the Athonite printing presses, nothing more was published due to the aging of the monks.

After 1945, the Church had only two small printing presses, in the U.S.A. One was located in Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville and had been in existence since the end of the 1930s. It had been founded by Archbishop Vitalis (Maximenko), and as well as a Church calendar it printed religious educational literature, catechism, and prayerbooks. The second one was in the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God Convent in San Francisco, a sister convent of the Harbin Convent. This printing press can be traced back to an initiative by Archbishop Tikhon (Troitsky) of San Francisco & Western America, and printed the diocesan newsletter, “Orthodox Herald” (“Pravoslavny Blagovestnik”), as well as a church calendar.

It is therefore understandable that special value must be placed upon the establishment of the new printing presses. Three printing presses have continued the work of the St. Job Brotherhood in the Ladomirovo Monastery; they were all set up by the refugee monks: (1) the printing press of the St. Job Monastery in Munich-Obermenzing, at first the most important press, because the fleeing Synod of Bishops had its headquarters from 1945-50 in Munich; (2) the printing press of the St. Job Brotherhood in Jordanville, which since the end of the 1940s, in consequence of the influx of many monks from Europe and the Far East, has become the most important printing press of the Church Abroad and the true heir of the Ladomirovo press; and (3) the printing press of the St. Job Brotherhood in Montréal at the archbishop’s podvorye, with a second printing press in Holy Transfiguration Skete in Canada. It was founded after Bishop Vitalis (Ustinov) moved to Canada in 1956. (In 1950, the Brotherhood had also set up a printing press in São Paulo, when Bishop Vitalis had been appointed vicar bishop of the Brazilian Diocese.)

The first post-War attempts to publish books and periodicals were made even in the refugee camps. In Fischbek Camp, near Hamburg, Archimandrite Vitalis (Ustinov), later Archbishop of Montréal & Canada, with the support of other monks (the present Archbishop Paul of Australia & New Zealand belonged to this Brotherhood) published the first books. The most extensive work was the aforementioned reproduction of the Ladomirovo edition of *the Great Collection (Veliky Sbornik)*. It was published on a German printing press; due to the poor quality of the paper and the simple printing equipment then available, it had to be partly corrected by hand. Prayer books and liturgical books were also printed, including a liturgicon. For the first time, *An Orthodox Survey (Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie)* appeared (see below).

In Munich, publishing similarly made a modest beginning. The first church periodicals appeared: the *Sunday Newsletter (Voskresny listok)* in 1945, *Herald of the Orthodox Church Benevolent Committee of the German Diocese* with 10 pages (1946-1948), which was later continued as *Information of the Orthodox Church Benevolent Committee (Soobshcheniya Pravoslavnogo Tserkovnogo Blagotrovitel'nogo Komiteta)* and had another 24 issues (1949-50). The transregional periodical *Church Chronicle (Tserkovny letopis)* was published from December 1945-1946 with three issues. This was then continued from 1947 as *The Life of the Church (Zhizn' tserkvi)* and concerned itself with Church developments in the emigration since 1945 and the new situation following the reentry of the Moscow Patriarchates into the community life of Western Europe, the Near East, and North America.¹⁹

In 1947, the Monastery of St. Job in Munich also published *Pochaev Notes (Pochaevskie Listki)*, six issues) and the central mouthpiece, *Information and News from the Metropolitan of the*

Central European Metropolitan District (Rasporyazheniya i soobshcheniya Mitropolita sredne-evropeiskogo mitropolicheskogo okruga), which was published monthly in the years 1946-50. In addition to this, there were also books on divine services, Church calendars, prayerbooks, and catechisms. In 1950, the first volume of the twelve-volume *Lives of the Saints* was published.

The press also produced the German diocesan newsletter, *Church News (Tserkovnye vedomosti)*. This periodical, with a content of 15 to 20 pages, appeared from 1951, at first monthly, then every two to three months, and finally quarterly until 1971.²⁰ In addition to news from the German Diocese, it contained information on the life of the Church Abroad, and also longer theological and historical articles on an elevated theological plane. Thus, in 1951-52, from the pen of Professor Mozhaisky came a then little-noticed article, "On a Few Important Moments in the Final Days of His Holiness Patriarch Tikhon's Life (1923-25)," which first found recognition a few years later and has done much to explain the Patriarch's stance against the Communist authorities.²¹

As a consequence of the emigration of most of the monks overseas and the moving of the Synod of Bishops to the U.S. A., the publishing business also moved overseas in 1950. Then, Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville became the new center of the Church Abroad's printing and publishing.

At the printing press of the Munich monastery in the early 1970s, books and literature were still being published. After that, however, on account of the advanced age of the co-workers and the death of the monks, only smaller manuscripts such as *Apologetical Instructions* and short tracts on the Church Abroad were published. These writings, in a small format of some 20-30 pages, were sent by the organization Orthodox Work to the faithful in the USSR or distributed to tourists and groups of travelers from the U.S.S.R. Just recently, a new printing press was installed and more publishing is being done in German, Russian, and English.

The printing press at Jordanville, which had been in existence since the 1930s, received many new valuable workers with the influx of new monks after 1945. Since World War II, it has been expanded, modernized, and developed. Also, an offset printer was installed in the monastery, which made it possible to reprint old editions and which can reproduce photographs, artwork, and graphics. At this time, there is also a photo-offset printer. The printing press will also be moved into its own building because at the present it is in the main building and must work in very confined quarters.

The periodical *Orthodox Russia* has been published in this monastery since that time. It has a circulation of 2,600 copies, of which 400 are sold on the market; the remainder is sent by mail to subscribers throughout the world. The editor of the newspaper for more than 20 years, until his death in 1975, was Archimandrite Constantine (Professor Cyril Iosifovich Zaitsev).

Until 1974, almost all important articles were penned by him; this particularly applied to the chronicle, which gave a vivid picture of the life of the Church Abroad. Archimandrite Constantine, a typical representative of educated Russian monasticism, was born in 1887, in St. Petersburg. He studied at the University of Jura. After the Revolution, he continued his studies in Prague with Professor P.B. Struve and attended courses in political science and economics. At

the same time, he taught at the Prague Law School as a private instructor. For a few years, he worked at the journal *Rebirth (Vozrozhdenie)*, which was published in Paris, and *Russia & Slavism (Rossia and Slavyanstvo)*. In 1935, he became a professor at the Russian Faculty in Harbin. From 1944, he was a member of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking and was ordained a priest upon the death of his wife in 1945. In 1949, he came with other refugees from China via the Philippines to San Francisco and arrived at Holy Trinity Monastery, where, at the new seminary, he became a teacher of dogmatics and church history. In 1949, he received the monastic tonsure and took the name Constantine.

Besides *Orthodox Russia*, Archimandrite Constantine also edited both *Orthodox Life (Pravoslavnyaya Zhizn')* in Russian, which has appeared monthly since 1950, as well as *Orthodox Life* in English, which has appeared bimonthly since 1950 and is addressed to the English-speaking faithful of the Church Abroad. Both periodicals are devoted to deepening the religious consciousness of the faithful and contain articles on Orthodox spirituality, extracts from the writings of the Church Fathers and the great Church leaders of Russia, the lives of the saints, and religious usages and customs in Russia; the English edition also contains translations from the liturgical and divine service books. These periodicals are first and foremost addressed to the Orthodox laypeople. The ecclesia-philosophical annual, *The Orthodox Way (Pravoslavny Put')*, in contrast, presents theological and church historical articles on a lofty plane. Articles on Russian Church leaders, philosophers, and religious-oriented writers from Old Russia were also printed. In addition to editing all these periodicals, Archimandrite Constantine found the time to publish many books and writings on all areas of spiritual life. He compiled a history of the Russian Church under the Soviet regime (*Pravoslavnyaya Tserkov' v Sovetskoi Rossii*, Shanghai, 1947), a Russian history (*Chudo Russkoi istorii* 1970), and a two-volume history of Russian literature (*Lektsii po istorii Russkoi slovestnosti* Vol. I-II, 1967/68), just to name a few of his works.²²

His successor was Priestmonk Ignatius, who has been editor of the two Russian-language periodicals since 1975. Bishop Abercius (Taushëv, d. 1976) of Syracuse & Trinity contributed many articles. Next, Hieromonk Hilarion [Kapral], now Bishop of Manhattan, became managing editor of the English-language *Orthodox Life*; he was succeeded by Hieromonk Luke in 1989.

Besides these periodicals, almost all liturgical books of the Church Abroad are published at the Monastery printing press: new editions and reproductions of *the Great Collection, the Psalter*, prayer books, akathists to the saints, a five-volume edition with Church hymns (which contains 4,000 pages), an edition of the Bible, the New Testament, the Gospels, works on Church history, courses on theology, dictionaries and grammars, the writings of departed hierarchs, and much more. It is quite impossible to mention all the titles. The catalog²³ of available books, published by Holy Trinity Monastery and other Church presses, and which were available in the monastery bookstore in 1977, contains over 300 titles in Church Slavonic, Russian and English. One must also keep in mind that many titles consist of more than one volume, which together may add up to a few thousand pages. For example, the new reprint of the 1898 Petersburg edition of the Works of St. John Chrysostom has 12,271 pages.

As already mentioned, a second group of the Lodomirovo monks had gathered around Fischbek Camp near Hamburg around Archimandrite Vitalis (Ustinov) and had already begun publishing and reproducing books and periodicals during the time in the camps. *Orthodox Survey*, a periodical on Russian Orthodox thought published by the Brotherhood of the Venerable Job of Pochaev in Montreal (*Periodichesky zhurnal Russkoi pravoslavnoi Mysli. Izdanie Bratstvo Prep. Iova Pochaevskogo v Monreale*), appeared for the first time in Fischbek Camp near Hamburg with four issues.

From 1945-47, Archimandrite Vitalis was a priest at the camp and had a small brotherhood of four monks assembled around him. When he was named the administrator of the London communities in 1948, all the monks accompanied him. There, Vitalis founded another printing press, which was steam-driven. He began with the publication of a Church calendar; later followed books and small tracts, among others *The History of the Russian Church* by Smirnov, other issues of *Orthodox Survey*, and catechisms for school instruction.

The appointment of Archimandrite Vitalis as a vicar bishop of the Brazilian Diocese in 1949, led to the resettlement of the group to Brazil, where they founded another printing press. The machines came from London, the typesetters from Germany. The Brotherhood began with a new printing of various books from the time before the Revolution, including the works of Archbishop Hilarion (Troitsky), Khomiakov, and others. Many smaller tracts, and the journal *Orthodox Survey*, were also published; then the Brazilian Diocese's mouthpiece *Sim Popedishi*, the newsletter to the Orthodox Brazilian Diocese, which had been published in typewritten form since 1948 and was now published in printed form monthly. Furthermore, *the Vladimir Herald (Vladimirsky Vestnik)*, a journal with a wealth of Russian national and ecclesiastical-religious thought, was also published. The press in São Paulo still exists today but has had hardly any steady workers since the Brotherhood moved to Canada.

The appointment of Bishop Vitalis as Bishop of Montréal & Canada led to the resettlement of the Brotherhood in Canada and to the establishment of yet another two printing presses. At Holy Transfiguration Skete, in Mansonville, the Brotherhood has a small press. A second is located at the archbishop's residence in Montréal. Its journal, *Orthodox Survey*, has since then been published quarterly in Montréal with a 70-80 page content. According to the preface, it is concerned with the transmission of the old Greek Orthodox world-view, free from Protestant and Catholic influences, which since the times of Peter the Great has intruded upon Russian thought. There are also articles by Russian theologians, both past and present, and articles from religious samizdat, such as the works, letters, and sermons by Fr. Dimitri Dudko, who was held in high esteem by the faithful in the Soviet Union and in the emigration. Also published are essays from Russian religious literature and Church history that dealt with the general position of the Russian Church Abroad, and general articles on the history and culture of Russia. The Brotherhood also publishes liturgical, theological and religious literature and edits larger editions, such as the 17-volume works of the First Hierarch of the Church Abroad, Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky), which was published by Archbishop Nikon (Rklitsky) under the name *Zhizneopisanie*. Since 1964, the press has printed diocesan mouthpiece *Orthodox Herald in Canada (Pravoslavny Vestnik v Kanade)* with a monthly content of 15-20 pages. It often appears

as a double issue. Like other diocesan journals, this Herald reports on diocesan life, the ruling bishop's official visits, the developments in individual communities and monasteries on Canadian soil, and on events throughout the Church.

All of the printing presses mentioned up to this point originated with the Brotherhood of St. Job in Ladomirovo.

A second church printing press of the Church Abroad was blessed in Harbin between the Wars. This press began its work in 1929, at the Monastery of the Kazan' Icon of the Mother of God, the cornerstone of which was laid in 1922 in Harbin. There was also a bookbindery attached. Russian émigrés from the city worked at both businesses, which were under the direction of the monks. In this press, the periodical *Heavenly Bread* (*Khleb nebesny*) was published with the aim of proclaiming the Faith among the émigrés and the local population.

Also, divine service books and textbooks for religious instruction on the history, grammar, and readers were published. The Harbin printing press worked for the needs of the Church Province of the Far East of the Church Abroad, which on account of the great distance from the European and North American ecclesiastical provinces enjoyed far-reaching autonomy. Thus, the press in Harbin, which was also responsible for the parishes in Korea and Japan, remained more of regional importance, although the books, periodicals, and calendar all attained a wide circulation. The aforementioned periodical *Heavenly Bread*, which was begun in 1926, appeared into the mid-1930s with some 10-15 sides per issue, and from 1936 was edited by Archimandrite Basil (Pavlovsky). It reached a circulation of 7,500 copies, with the content of 80-100 pages per issue. Prayer books and church calendars were printed, with a press run of 50,000-100,000 copies. An edition of *The Lives of the Saints* reached 2,500 copies, *the Akathist to the Mother of God* 10,000, and smaller religious educational tracts even reached 100,000-200,000 copies.²⁴

The same applies to the Peking printing press of the Ecclesiastical Mission. In it, the pre-Revolutionary tradition was continued and divine service books and liturgical books were translated from Russian into Chinese and printed, so as to provide the existing Chinese-Orthodox communities in China with the necessary literature. For the Russian refugees living in China, the newspaper *Chinese Herald* (*Kitaisky Blagovestnik*), which had been published since the turn of the century, continued to be published. It remained in existence until the Russian clergy were exiled from China in 1956. Thereafter, the Chinese Autonomous Orthodox Church, which was then established, replaced it with their own journal *Church Newsletter* (*Tserkovny listok*), though nothing is known of its manner of publication, size or content. Presumably, it was published at the printing press of the Peking Mission because a few Chinese monks still lived there. During the Cultural Revolution, this missionary Church was destroyed.

In addition to these two periodicals, Church calendars were published in Russian, Chinese, and English.²⁵

The flight of the monks and nuns from the Far East contributed to the building up of the Convent of the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God in San Francisco, which was the filial convent of the same name in Harbin. Since the early 1940s, there has been a small printing press established by Archbishop Tikhon (Troitsky), which printed a church calendar and the *Orthodox Herald*

(*Pravoslavny Blagovestnik*), as well as shorter religious writings. The periodical was published from 1942-1952. It suspended publication because *Orthodox Russia* had for the most part taken over its tasks. During its existence, Good News was sent to other countries that had no periodicals of their own. It contained news from the life of the Russian parishes in North America and religious articles. In each issue, there were also articles in English, which came from two Orthodox Americans – Eugene Rose and John Gregerson.²⁶ Besides these publications, the convent published a collection of the *Lives of the Saints*, in which also the *Life of the Blessed Fool-for-Christ Xenia of Petersburg* (who lived in the 18th century) was published.

An important printing press among the English-speaking Americans was that of the St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood near Platina, California. This Brotherhood at first consisted only of two monks – one Russian and one convert to Orthodoxy, the aforementioned Eugene Rose, later Hieromonk Seraphim (+1982). Their aim was to carry on a mission among the English-speaking population. For this reason, their press primarily printed English translations of Russian books on Orthodox spirituality, which are used in the English-speaking communities of the Church Abroad.

The St. Herman Brotherhood has published the journal *Orthodox Word* since 1965, which has served to spread the Orthodox Faith and to publish articles on the lives of Russian saints and shrines. At the focal point of the journal, however, is Orthodoxy in North America from its beginnings, and research into the life of the sainted missionary Herman of Alaska, to whom American Orthodoxy can be traced. Additionally, the journal has presented articles on Orthodox spirituality and against secularization, atheism and the loss of faith. It is approximately 200 pages in length and appears bimonthly. The Brotherhood also publishes the St. Herman Orthodox Calendar for English-speaking communities; it is a complete calendar of Orthodox holy days with readings for each day of the year and in an appendix the names of men and women, not canonized but known for their holiness of their lives in recent centuries.²⁷ Since 1967, the Brotherhood had again published the Orthodox Good News, which had been suspended in 1952. This was the mouthpiece of the Western America Diocese and was 16 pages in length.

A small printing press still exists in Sydney, which takes care of the Diocese of Australia & New Zealand. In it, since 1956, *The Word of the Church (Tserkovnoe Slovo)*, the official mouthpiece of the diocese, and since 1957 the journal *The Call (Prizyv)*, (although it has in the meantime again been suspended) have been published. Other smaller tracts of religious-educational content are also printed on the printing press.²⁸

Footnotes

1. *Le Concile à Karlovtsy*, p. 223. This chapter appeared in 1980 in *Ostkirchliche Studien*, 4, pp. 283-300. On account of the special importance of the church printing presses and publishing houses for the Church Abroad, it will be presented here once again in abridged form. ↵
2. Seide, *Schrifttum*, pp. 7-10; Idem., “The Journal” and “Stimme,” pp. 1-3; “Stimme,” pp. 146-171; Rössler, *The Journal*. ↵

3. Yakunin, *O sovremennom polozhenii*, pp. 59-60. ↵
4. Brumberg, p. 468. ↵
5. *Ukazatel' periodicheskikh izdaniy*. ↵
6. Volkmann, pp. 121-125 and Table II, Appendix. ↵
7. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 173-175. ↵
8. *Prav. Rus'* (1974) 22, p. 13; *Le Concile à Karlovtsy*, p. 223. ↵
9. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
10. *Pravoslavny Tserkovny Kalendar'* This calendar was published in Lodomirova from 1924 until 1945. Also, the *Pravoslavny Russky Kalendar'* was published in Lodomirova from 1926. The publication of both has been continued in the USA: *Troitsky Pravoslavny Kalendar'* by Jordanville since 1945, and the *Vladimirsky Kalendar'* by New York and Jordanville since 1945. Along with these, there are numerous other smaller calendars in all dioceses. ↵
11. *Obozrenie* (1977) 42, pp. 12-29, here p. 21. ↵
12. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1942) 9, p. 14; (1942) 5-6, p. 6; (1943) 4, pp. 5-6; 7, p. 107. ↵
13. Cf. *Kratky katalog izdaniy Pochaevsky Tipografy in Pravoslavny Russky Kalendar'* (1939) Appendix, not paginated. ↵
14. *Prav. Rus'* (1972) 23, p. 5. ↵
15. *Ibid.* (1971) 19, p. 11. ↵
16. "Pravoslavny Russky Kalendar'" (Lodomirova, 1939), Appendix, paginated: "Vozstanovlenie Pochaevsky Tipografy vo Vladimirove", pp. 7-15, here p. 12. ↵
17. *Prav. Rus'* (1947) 15, pp. 4-9; 16, pp. 5-9. ↵
18. Seide, *Jerusalem*, pp. 170-171. ↵
19. "Russie et Chretienté" (1947) 15, pp. 4-9. ↵
20. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*, p. 174f. ↵
21. Rössler, *Kirche und Revolution; Felmy, Patriarch Tichon*. ↵
22. *Prav. Rus'* (1975) 12,p.16; 23, pp. 3-6. ↵
23. "Katalog knig izdaniy Sv. Troitskim Monastyrem" in *Prav. Rus'* (1977) 11, pp. 9-20. Also, *Katalog izdaniy Sv. Troitskogo Monastyrya* [Jordanville] (1980). ↵
24. *Church News* (1930) 1, pp. 1-5; (1935) 1, pp. 14-17; (1939) 7, pp. 55-63. ↵
25. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, p. 191. ↵

26. *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 22, pp. 15-16; Seide, *Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 185-186. ↵
27. *Prav. Rus'* (1977) 11, p. 20. ↵
28. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1354. ↵

Part IV, Chapter 4

The Education of Priests and Theological Institutes

Among the Russian émigrés who left their homeland after World War I and II were many representatives of the lesser clergy. Just as in the case of the émigré bishops, monks and nuns, the problem of aging among priests also occurred in the 1930s, followed by a change in generations. After World War II, this development repeated itself again in the early 1960s.

During the 1920s and the 1950s, the care of the communities was largely secured, but 10 to 15 years after both waves of emigration, there was an ever more acutely growing lack of priests. This came about for various reasons. The aforementioned aging was one of the main causes; to this was added the establishment of many newer communities, because the émigrés from Europe moved further overseas and founded new communities. A third reason is closely connected to the Church schism. After 1926, the Church Abroad attempted to care for the faithful who remained true to them by spiritually overseeing the building up of their own communities. Thus, in many cities, new parishes came into existence, where previously only one parish had existed. This required the assignment of additional priests.

After World War I, the Church did not immediately begin establishing its own educational institutions for priests. The reasons for this were the conviction that the emigration was only temporary and the émigrés' hope that they would return to the homeland soon. From 1924, the Soviet regime began to consolidate itself; it became apparent for the first time that the émigrés would be confronted with a more long-lasting period in the emigration, and they worked on plans for the establishment of their own educational institutions. Candidates who had previously felt called to the priesthood had the opportunity to study at the Orthodox faculties in Belgrade, Sofia, Warsaw, and Bucharest (a few even in Athens). Many students took advantage of this opportunity. Numerous professors from Russia also taught on these faculties. The renowned expert on canon law, Professor S.V. Troitsky, taught in Belgrade; Professor Glubokovsky and Archpriest G. I. Shavel'sky in Sofia; and the theologians and Church historians N. S. Arseniev, M. V. Zzyz'kin and K. N. Nikolaev in Warsaw. In addition to these representatives of pre-Revolutionary theological, philosophical, historical and artistic thought, there were also those who had completed their studies and education in Russia but only attained an academic reputation in the emigration. Among them are the representatives of the higher clergy, such as the Metropolitans and Bishops Anthony (Khrapovitsky), Anastasius (Gribanovsky), Eulogius (Georgievsky), Nikon (Rklitsky), Abercius (Taushev), Cyprian (Kern), and Cassian (Bezobrazov), and the theological and religious-philosophical thinkers S. S. Bulgakov, N. A. Berdyaev, F. A. Stepanov, G. V. Florovsky, G. P. Fedotov, K. V. Moshalsky, A. P. Knyazhev, I. M. Andreev (Andreevsky), N. D. Talberg, Archimandrite Constantine (Professor Zaitsev), Archpriest George P. Grabbe (Bishop Gregory), Professor Alexandrov, and many more.¹

These few names alone provide an overview of the diversity incorporated in Russian theological thought in the emigration. Theological study and teaching, and dialogue with other Christian Churches, were from the 1920s onwards completely transferred to the emigration. All theological schools, seminaries, and academies were closed in the Soviet Union within a few years. Also, all

literature connected with religion, Church, and theology were removed from the libraries and were either disposed of or placed under lock and key. The closure of educational institutions and the removal of religious and theological literature led to the demise of “academic theology.” This, however, did not mean that there was a lack of theologically-educated people. Such could be found among the clergy as well as among the people.

Theological thought and teaching must be checked by the divine services. “Liturgical theology is precisely the method thanks to which those who have never attended a theological school are nonetheless theologically well-educated. It would be false to assume that this is merely a result of the self-education of these men. It is rather the result of the liturgical path... upon which one can attain not only to the knowledge of the elementary bases of the Christian teachings but also the heights of Orthodox theology... The divine service is the blood of Church life, and simultaneously also its root and its seed,” writes D. Konstantinov on theological thought in the Soviet Union in the time between the Wars. ²

The necessity of an “academic theology” was almost never felt by the Russian Church over the centuries. In the 18th century for the first time, theological schools, seminaries, and academies were founded in order to promote general education and theological knowledge in a scholarly sense. That at many seminaries this later led to erroneous developments and to an over-emphasis of formal learning, or dry knowledge, was a negative effect and not the aim of this reform. Perhaps this was also a reason that, from the middle of the 19th century, the monasteries so strongly drew in people, because in them prayer and contemplation were central, not theoretical knowledge. The clergy who came out of the monasteries functioned more as theological leaders than the theologically-schooled secular priest.

Also, in the emigration, this double priesthood (black and white clergy, i.e. the unmarried priests who were monastics and the married priests) has been retained. In the emigration, priests were educated in the monasteries and at special courses for priests, which the dioceses established, as well as at the Church’s own seminaries, which over the years were sometimes established even under the most difficult conditions. Before the existence of these seminaries, individual candidates studied in theology departments at institutions of the evangelical Churches and more seldom in Catholic ones.

The oldest, and also over the years the most significant theological institute in the emigration, was doubtlessly the St. Sergius Institute in Paris, which was founded in 1924. Teaching began there in the 1925/26 academic year. Its founding coincides with the year of the Church schism of 1926. Thus, from the time of its founding, it was subject to Metropolitan Eulogius (Georgievsky) and throughout the years of its existence has educated priests mainly for the Paris Jurisdiction. ³ The Institute had a series of professors, such as S. N. Bulgakov, G. V. Florovsky, S. S. Bezobrazov (Bishop Cassian, the rector of the Institute for many years), and G. P. Fedotov, among others who belonged to the faculty for many years, to thank for its reputation. ⁴

A second institute, which was only connected with the Church Abroad in its early years, was founded near New York City; this was St. Vladimir’s Seminary, which educates priests for the Orthodox communities in North America. Since the most recent schism of the North American Metropolia (1946) and the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in America (1970), it has been

subject to the OCA. Going by the number of students and the extent of its library, it is today the largest institution that can trace its founding to the Russian diaspora. At the seminary, English is the spoken language. In the years 1937-46, the Church Abroad's candidates for the priesthood who were to serve in North America studied at St. Vladimir's.⁵

That the Church Abroad felt called to be the successor of the Russian theological seminaries and even the academies was demonstrated long before the foundation of its own educational institution. Archbishop Seraphim [Lukianov] of Finland had at the end of 1921 directed an inquiry to the SEA, as happened in the case of Hieromonk Barsonouphius. The latter wished after the continuation of his studies at a theological seminary in Russia was no longer possible, to obtain his seminary diploma in the emigration. Thereupon, the SEA notified Archbishop Seraphim that the candidate could take the exams for all the courses; the exams were presided over by Archbishop Seraphim and Professor Glubokovsky. After the exams, he would be issued a diploma which would be recognized as a fully-valid certificate of a theological seminary.⁶

The Church Abroad gave special attention to the liturgical education of their future priests. In Russia, most theological seminaries and academies were located in monasteries or in close proximity to them. Thus, the students, through participation in the monasteries' festive divine services, rich in tradition, were able to experience particularly deeply and become acquainted with the essence and form of Orthodox liturgy and piety. The Church Abroad took care to continue this tradition. The pastoral school in Stanimaka (Asenovgrad), the Theological Seminary and Faculty in Harbin, and the pastoral courses in Ladomirovo and Holy Trinity Seminary in Jordanville are one with the monasteries, even if an administrative and economic separation existed. St. Sergius Institute also attempted to preserve this unity between the community and the seminary, though in this case there was a lack of monks to establish a monastic community capable of survival at the podvorye. While the life of the seminarians/students at the Paris Institute and the studies were strongly academically oriented, the Church Abroad made efforts in its institutes to establish a symbiosis between the academic and monastic life of its seminarians during their studies. The seminarians were required to participate in the daily divine services, to sing in the choir, and to serve in the sanctuary. This participation is not part of the official studies but is nonetheless viewed as important preparation for the priesthood. It was also desirable for the students to work in the monastery-owned workshops (printing presses, icon workshops, candle factories, handicrafts, and the farm) in their free time. This monastic life has a strong attraction for many of the seminarians. During their studies, many decide to become monks and, upon completion of their studies, become hierodeacons and hieromonks. As with the hierarchs in the 1930s and 1960s, when a change of generations occurred, most of the bishops of the Church Abroad came from the ranks of the graduates. The close relationship between monastic and academic life is maintained today only in Jordanville's Holy Trinity Seminary. Through the close proximity of the monastery, the students become intimately acquainted with monastic life. Thus, it is no wonder that many students — almost half of all graduates — decide during their studies to enter the monastic life. They then either go into the parish ministry or remain at the monastery. Of the 20 younger monks of Holy Trinity Monastery, the majority of them are from the ranks of students.

At the Paris St. Sergius Institute and St. Vladimir's Seminary of the OCA, this relationship between academic and monastic education is lacking. Unfortunately, only at St. Tikhon's Seminary, in South Canaan, Pennsylvania, is there still left some of the spirits of the Russian Church, though the number of students and monks is small in comparison with St. Vladimir's in Crestwood. Also, the teaching staff at these institutions consists mainly of people not of clerical standing, whereas at the institutions of the Church Abroad the majority of teachers have always been clergy.

The first educational institution to educate priests for the Church Abroad was Bishop Damian's pastoral school in Bulgaria. The school was opened in 1923 and existed until 1937/38. It was located in the Monastery of St. Cyricus (Kirik) in Stanimaka (since 1934, Asenovgrad).⁷ Bishop Damian directed the school. The Bulgarian Orthodox Church had oversight of it but allowed Bishop Damian a completely free hand. The school was practically autonomous. For candidates with a secondary education who spoke Russian, the course lasted three years; for candidates who did not meet these prerequisites, four years. After receiving their diploma, the graduates were either ordained to the diaconate or to the priesthood or were accredited to teach religion. The curriculum was comparable to that of the seminaries in Russia. The teaching staff was primarily made up of men who had received their theological education in Russia. Besides Bishop Damian the following taught at the school: M. A. Kalnev, MTh. at the Kiev Theological Academy, B. Ostroumov and I. N. Quasev, both doctoral candidates of theology at the Kazan' Theological Academy, V. I. Lazarev, a graduate of the Moscow Law Faculty, Hieromonk Nicholas (Zdanevich), and others.⁸

Some 20 to 25 students studied at the school. By 1930, 20 graduates had been ordained to the priesthood; five were monks. The rest received their diploma as teachers of religion. Besides these regular studies, there was the possibility of correspondence courses for external students. Students from Yugoslavia, France, Germany, Poland, Latvia, Estonia, and North and South America enrolled in these correspondence courses. They received the texts of the lectures as manuscripts and had to pass two tests per semester. The school also instituted continuing education courses for priests, deacons, and religious instructors who wanted to expand their theological and pedagogical knowledge during the summer break.⁹

The school received only modest financial support from the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. The Russian St. Alexander Nevsky Monastery in Bulgaria, which was first located in Jambol, was supposed to support the pastoral school materially, though it appears that the monks refused, because Bishop Damian complained to Bishop Seraphim, to whom the monastery was subject, about the lack of help.¹⁰

In order to ensure better cooperation, the Russian monks moved to Stanimaka in the late 1920s, because the St. Cyricus Monastery had a large farm. This source of income formed the economic basis for the students and teaching staff. This also accomplished putting the students in contact with the monastic life. Moreover, the students were able to earn a scholarship by working on the farm.

The number of priests educated there is not precisely known, though it is known that, by 1930, twenty priests had received their education there. Bishop Damian was elevated to archbishop for

his services to this school. The school remained in existence through the 1937/38 academic year. (After the death of Archbishop Damian, Hieromonk Nicholas took charge (1936-38). ¹¹

The importance of this school lay in the fact that it was the first attempt at a theological institution of higher learning that continued the traditions of the homeland's theological seminaries in the emigration. Through the introduction of correspondence courses, the school made it possible for those who, on account of their family and financial responsibilities, were not in the position to undertake a full-time course of study, to graduate from a regular course of studies.

The number of graduates of the school was always considered when one compares it with the number of graduates from other theological schools. The reason that the school has nonetheless not been so impressed upon the consciousness of the Church Abroad probably lies in the fact that the majority of the priests educated there joined the Bulgarian and Polish Orthodox Churches. As priests, a better material life awaited them there than in the Russian émigré communities. This applied moreover to the many Russian graduates of the Orthodox faculties in Sofia, Belgrade, and Warsaw, who at the end of their studies often entered into the service of the local Orthodox Church in the host countries. ¹² This was a painful occurrence for the Church Abroad, though not a new one; many priests had likewise joined the local Orthodox Churches after their flight. In Bulgaria alone, there was supposed to have been educated 100 priests and deacons. ¹³

The situation was entirely different in the Far East where, since 1924, there had been theological courses. Here in the non-Christian environment, all the refugee priests had to remain part of their own Church. Among the 200,000 Russian émigrés, there were numerous candidates for the priesthood. Because there were no pre-existing opportunities to study theology, the Church Abroad had to concern itself relatively quickly with the establishment of its own educational institutions. The higher theological courses were the beginning, with their curriculum modeled upon those of the theological seminaries and academies in Russia. Archbishop Methodius was in charge of the courses. He was supported by the following teachers: Bishops Michael (Bogdanov) and Jonah (Pokrovsky) and Archpriests N. Voznesensky (from 1934 Bishop Demetrius), L. Viktorov (from 1946 Bishop Nicander), S. Rozhdestvensky, as well as Professors Mirolyubov and Nikiforov. The aim of these courses was to educate theologically suitable candidates for the priestly calling. The number of students who took part in these courses is not known. ¹⁴ It appears, however, that the courses were successful, for in 1928 additional missionary courses were added in order to educate missionaries. There were 15 hours of instruction weekly, divided as follows: 3 hours of New Testament (Archpriest Voznesensky); 2 hours of Orthodox Theology (Archpriest Voznesensky); 3 hours of Biblical History (Archpriest L. Viktorov); 3 hours of Christian Apologetics (Priest N. Pokrovsky); 2 hours of the Study of Sects (Archpriest A. Ponomarev); and 2 hours of General & Russian Church History (Professor N. Lifantev). ¹⁵ The courses and the diploma received official recognition from the government and were equivalent to the diplomas of the other colleges in the country. The director of the courses, Archpriest N. Voznesensky, received the right to use the title of dean.

It was only natural that on account of this success, plans were made to establish an institution of higher learning. After two years of preparation, in the summer of 1934, the Institute of St.

Vladimir was founded; it consisted of four faculties. ¹⁶ Bishop Demetrius (Voznesensky) was appointed rector; his assistant dean was Archimandrite Basil Pavlovsky (from 1938, Vicar Bishop of Vienna). In the first academic year, 40 students enrolled at the Theological Faculty, most of them having already attended the theological courses described above. The faculty claimed to be the direct successor to the theological academies of Russia. One bishop, three professors, seven assistant professors, three lecturers and many clergymen of all ranks, taught on the Faculty. The studies consisted of four year-long courses, which were divided into eight semesters. Each course consisted of 20 hours per week:

First year: Introduction to Theology, 3 hours (P.K. Smirnov, MTh); Holy Scripture & Old Testament, 2 hours (Archpriest L. Viktorov); Biblical History & Biblical Archeology, 2 hours (P.K. Smirnov, MTh); General Church History, 2 hours (Sumarokov, DLI); Church Slavonic & History of the Russian Language, 3 hours (Prof. Timbo); ¹⁷ Psychology, 4 hours (I. Kostyuchik); Greek, 2 hours (Archimandrite Basil); Chinese or Japanese, 2 hours (N. D. Glebov), optional.

Second year: Holy Scripture & New testament, 2 hours (Bishop Demetrius); Holy Scripture & Old Testament, 2 hours (Archimandrite Basil); General Church History, 2 hours (Sumarokov); The History & Exposure [Oblichenie] of the Russian Schism & of the Sects, 2 hours (Archpriest A. Ponomarev, Cand. Law); Liturgy & Chant (singing), 2 hours (Priest Pyatelin); Logic, 2 hours (Kostyuchik); Philosophy, 2 hours (Kostyuchik); Greek, 2 hours (Archimandrite Basil); Chinese and Japanese, 2 hours (Glebov); Chant (singing), 2 hours (Archpriest Silaev).

Third year: Holy Scripture & the New Testament, 2 hours (Bishop Demetrius); Dogmatic Theology, 3 hours (Archpriest Gurev, Cand. Th.); Patristics, 2 hours (Archimandrite Basil); Homiletics & History of the Sermon, with Theory, 3 hours (Bishop Demetrius); History of Religion, 2 hours (E. Kvatkovsky, Cand. Th.); History of the Schism & Sects, 2 hours (Ponomarev); Russian Church History, 3 hours (Sumarokov); Philosophy, 2 hours (Kostyuchik); Ethnography of the Far East, 1 hour (Glebov).

Fourth year: Holy Scripture & the New Testament, 4 hours (Bishop Demetrius); Moral Theology, 2 hours (Gurev); Pastoral Theology, 2 hours (Bishop Demetrius); History & the Division of Christians in the West, 2 hours (E. Kvatkovsky); Canon Law, 2 hours (Sumarokov); Church Archeology, 1 hour (Smirnov); Pedagogy, 2 hours (Archimandrite Basil); Philosophy & the History of Literature, 3 hours (Kostyuchik). ¹⁸

The Faculty was located in a large building complex, to which its own church was connected. Providing students with teaching and study materials was problematic because the library was very small and contained only 456 books. Nevertheless, the students were able to use the diocesan library, which had 5,450 books. ¹⁹ The assistant professors of the faculty published the newspaper Heavenly Bread. This had appeared in 1926, and in 1936 the Faculty took over its publication. Thereafter, it had a circulation of 7,500 copies and was 80-100 pages in length. In the journal, articles appeared on the Church Abroad, and there were also many on a lofty theological plane, as well as reports on the life of the Church District of the Far East.

The first students completed their studies in 1937. There were six, including three archpriests, a hieromonk, and two laymen. In 1932, 32 students were enrolled at the Faculty, and there were:

14 students, including a priest, in the first-year course; 6 in the second year course; 4 in the third year course; and 8 in the fourth year, including a priest.²⁰ The theological courses that had been in existence since 1924 were transformed into a theological seminary, which educated priests and deacons in a two-year course, functioning primarily as a preparatory institute that laid the groundwork for studies at the Theological Faculty. The president of the seminary was Archpriest A. Ponomarev; the prefect was I. Kostyuchik.²¹

Thus, the Church Abroad had a fully viable educational system for future priests after 1938, which corresponded to that of the Russian Church before 1917. In consequence of the great distance between Europe and the Far East, the Institute was primarily limited to the Church Province of the Far East, because for many interested students from elsewhere, the costs of the journey were prohibitive. Therefore, it is understandable that, after this success, it seemed desirable to establish a similar institute in Europe, and from 1937, the Church had its own institute (St. Vladimir's) in America.

At the Second Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad in 1938, Count [George] Grabbe, the Secretary of the Synod of Bishops, dealt with the problem of educating priests. He delivered a lecture entitled "The Expansion of the Hierarchy & the Clergy of the ROCOR."²² In his report, Count Grabbe indicated that the current émigré clergy had received their theological education in Russia. Due to aging, the ranks of the clergy were growing smaller and smaller. Therefore, one had to ask how these losses could be recouped. The main problem centered upon the financial aspect, because the necessary means for establishing a theological institute were lacking. In his opinion, more schools should be established in Europe in order to give the students in various countries the opportunity to study. At that time, candidates for the priesthood could only attend either the Theological Faculty in Harbin and the Faculties in Belgrade and Sofia. The St. Sergius Institute in Paris was excluded, because "heretical teachers taught at the top."²³ At the Serbian and Bulgarian seminaries and faculties, the number of Russian students at that time was quite small. Most of the candidates who finish their studies there enter the service of the local Church, however. This is particularly deplorable because these students have excellent theological knowledge and have also been educated in the spirit of the Russian Church.²⁴ Indeed, these students would have served as priests in their homeland, but on account of the financial situation prevailing in the emigration, they have been compelled to take positions with the better-situated Bulgarian and Serbian communities. Also problematic was the instruction in a chant at the Bulgarian and Serbian schools, because this did not correspond with the Russian tones. In order to improve the future education of the students, each should finish a preparatory service at the cathedrals of the Church Abroad or in the Russian monasteries, especially in St. Job's Monastery in Ladomirova, before beginning their studies. Candidates for the future hierarchy should come from the Church's own schools. Therefore, Count Grabbe proposed that a pastoral school should be founded at the Synod of Bishops, which would be placed under the direct supervision of Metropolitan Anastasius. Furthermore, another school in Europe was urgently needed in order to offer the local student opportunities to study similar to those of students in America and the Far East.

Germany was seen as a possible location for such a school when the Evangelical and Catholic Churches and the German government held out the prospect of material support. Bishop Schultze offered a Catholic monastery in Mecklenburg as a possibility; Bishop Hackel offered the University of Breslau, and Bishop Oberheim the University of Bonn. Both universities were renowned because they had extensive East European and Russian libraries. Also, the Universities of Belgrade and Sofia were brought up, where Russian departments could have been set up at the Theological Faculties. Finally, a resolution was passed that recognized the necessity for the foundation of a higher theological institute of learning. In preparation, pastoral schools should be established to educate the clergy. Their curriculum should be comparable to that of the theological seminaries in Russia.

In the autumn of 1940, pastoral and theological courses were opened in the Ladomirova Monastery of St. Job. The course of study was two years in length and was to prepare priests for the parishes of the Church Abroad and theologically-schooled monks who would be sent on a mission to a liberated Russia. The reason for starting these courses was the arrival of Archimandrite Nathaniel (Lvov; later Archbishop and abbot of the Munich St. Job Monastery). Through his joining, the Brotherhood then had three monks with higher education. Archimandrite Seraphim (Ivanov; later Archbishop of Chicago), Hegumen Sabbas (Struve, Abbot of the Monastery from 1944-46), and Archimandrite Nathaniel.

The idea to open a pastoral school modeled on Archbishop Damian's school in Bulgaria originated in the 1920s and had been the wish of the monastery's founder, Archimandrite Vitalis (Maximenko; later Archbishop of New York and Abbot of Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville). From 1924, under the direction of Archimandrite Vitalis, some 20 priests were educated in the monastery, including Archpriests A. Omelyanovich, Alexander and Andrew Tsuglevich, Priests I. Ivanov, A. Romanetsky, the Hieromonks Michael (Nikiforov), Michael (Diky), and many others who worked as pastors in Eastern Slovakia. ²⁵

While the education of these priests and monks was only possible on a small scale and on an individual basis, the establishment of a pastoral school could be systematized, and the number of students increased. The founding of such a school was again and again thwarted. First, the necessary finances, suitable space, and adequate teachers, who would be able to teach at no cost, were lacking. Also, from the side of a few representatives of the Church, concerns were expressed about the advisability of establishing a school with such feeble resources. Because the monastery had been expanded more than once over the years and had also increased its space and its regular income from the printing press and the icon workshops, and teachers without pay were able to teach the courses, the Synod of Bishops finally gave its consent to the founding of the school.

The aim of the courses was to educate priests and missionaries. The curriculum was based on that of the theological schools in Russia. Additionally, the participants in the courses were to be educated for their special work in the diaspora and were prepared for a spiritual dispute with atheism and sectarianism. The two-year course consisted of four classes. Upon successful completion, the candidates were supposed to receive a diploma that would qualify them to administer a parish of the Church Abroad or to teach religion at elementary and secondary

schools. The following were prerequisites for acceptance: The person must be (1) of the Orthodox Faith, (2) preferably of Russian nationality, (3) a graduate of a 4-year secondary school, (4) aged between 17 and 50, (5) if married, never divorced, (6) successfully passed entrance examinations and tests in catechism corresponding to the level of secondary school, (7) provided with recommendations from his diocese or parish, and (8) sign a written vow that, upon completion of the courses, he would allow himself to be placed in the service of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia as a priest, deacon, reader, or missionary. For aspirants without secondary education, a one-year preparatory course was offered, which corresponded to the curriculum of secondary school. The participants had to pay for room and board themselves. The costs were minimal and could be worked off in daily four-hour periods in the monastery printing press. For students without means, stipends were made available. ²⁶

Nothing is known about the number of students and the length of the courses, because, as a result of the war-time confusion, regular studies were no longer possible. The outbreak of the War prevented the realization of the resolutions of the Second Pan-Diaspora Council. The plans for founding a theological institute of higher learning were not abandoned, but rather postponed until the end of the War.

The end of World War II posed almost unsolvable problems for the Church Abroad, especially in the area of priestly education. They had lost their own educational institutions in Harbin and Lodomirova; their students could no longer study at theological faculties in Eastern Europe and the Baltics; and the North American Metropolia's separation from the Church Abroad in 1946 ended the possibility of studying at the St. Vladimir Seminary. Thus, the founding of a new educational institution was most urgent and real. The choice fell to Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville, which many monks expelled from Eastern Europe and the Far East had entered; and in the first years after the War, and where Archbishop Vitalis (Maximenko), an important theologian and pastor, served as its experienced administrator.

With Decree No. 5603, dated 16 August 1948, a seminary was founded dedicated to the Holy Trinity (Svyato-Troitskaya Dukhovnaya Seminariya) by the Synod of Bishops. The curriculum included courses in New and Old Testament, Writings of the Church Fathers, Dogmatic Theology, Ecclesiology, Patristics, Spirituality, Liturgy, Moral Theology, Church History, Liturgical Chant, Russian, Church Slavonic, Greek, and practical subjects such as general history, languages, philosophy and so forth. The course of studies lasted three years, with an additional two-year course to receive the Bachelor of Theology Degree. Tuition was free; room and board in the monastery cost \$250 per year. Students had to have a high school diploma and a recommendation from their diocese or parish. The entrance examination tested knowledge of Russian and basic knowledge of catechism. Archbishop Vitalis was appointed rector of the seminary; Professor N. N. Alexandrov was appointed dean; and Archpriest Michael Pomazansky was appointed vice-rector in 1951. He has been a teacher at the seminary since 1949 and has been on the faculty for more than 30 years. Seven students matriculated in the first course in October 1948; they all completed the first semester successfully. ²⁷

The rectors of the Seminary were as follows: Archbishop Vitalis from 1948-52; Archbishop Abercius (Taushev) from 1952-76, who simultaneously taught Holy Scripture, New Testament,

Liturgy and Homiletics; and, since his death, Archbishop Laurus (Skurla). The faculty consisted of 15-20 people, including Professors N. N. Alexandrov, Andreevsky (pseudonym Andreev), Nikolaev, Talberg, Archimandrite Constantine (Professor K. Zaitsev), as well as archimandrites and priests of the monastery and many others. The number of students has fluctuated over the years: up to 1967, 50 priests were educated at the seminary, including 3 bishops, numerous hegumens and archimandrites, and 24 hieromonks. In the same year, six new students entered seminary. Since the early 1970s, the number of students has been increasing again. In the academic year 1975-76, 39 students were enrolled, including 14 first semester ones. In 1980-81, 25 new students were accepted. ²⁸

By the mid-1970s, the seminary had educated over 100 priests, so that today a third of all the clergy of the Church Abroad are graduates of Holy Trinity Seminary. The costs for tuition, room, and board have increased to \$1,200 per annum. Half of this amount for room and board (\$600.00) may be worked off in 300 hours. For students without means, the cost of tuition can be waived. ²⁹

Until 1956, the seminary was administratively and economically separate from Holy Trinity Monastery. Then it was incorporated into the monastery. The seminary property became part of the Monastery property; the monastery credited \$500,000 to the seminary. This money was applied to building up the seminary, which has had its own spacious premises since the 1960s, beyond the monastery cathedral. In the seminary building are the classrooms, the auditorium, a library, and the administrative offices. The old seminary, which was in a former farmhouse, now provides accommodation for the students. The library, with its 27,000 volumes, is the special pride of the seminary, which since 1948 had been created out of nothing. It has Professor Alexandrov to thank for its rich existence. He bequeathed his private library to the Seminary and took the initiative to make the Seminary library a central library for the Russian emigration. The fund named for him, "The Professor N. N. Alexandrov Pan-Diaspora Theological Library," contributes to the building up of the library. Today, along with theological books, the library contains extensive literature on political, ecclesial-historical and economic developments in the emigration, as well as in Russia and the Soviet Union, along with periodicals and manuscript sections. A fund to support the Seminary was established in early 1977, in memory of Archbishop Abercius, the rector of the Seminary for many years. In the first year alone, this fund received \$13,000 in donations. Since then, it receives some \$10,000 yearly in donations. ³⁰

The Seminary achieved particular success and recognition of its academic qualifications in 1956 when the State University of New York accredited it. Since then it has the right to grant the degree "Bachelor of Theology," which the New York State Department of Education recognizes as a university degree. Since this time, studies have been conducted on two levels. The basis is a two-year course on general subjects such as Russian, Church Slavonic, Greek, History, Literature, Philosophy, and so forth; then a three-year course of theological studies and preparation for the priesthood. Instruction is in Russian and English. Candidates who are proficient in Russian and have a college degree can begin immediately with the theological studies.

In addition to these schools and seminaries, the Church Abroad instituted priestly and pastoral courses in many of the dioceses in which theologically educated clergy with teaching experience were available. These courses served to further educate and deepen the theological knowledge of the priests and also provided the opportunity to train educated laymen to be deacons, readers, and choir directors or to provide guidance for parents in bringing up their children in their religion.

In the German Diocese, which received the mass of émigrés after World War II, including 200 priests, monks, and nuns, early plans emerged to establish the Church's own ecclesiastical school for future priests. In the Fischbek Camp, near Hamburg, Archimandrite Vitalis (Ustinov; later Metropolitan) held courses for priests from 1946-48. Together with other clergies from the camps the first candidates for the priesthood in the post-War period received their education, there.

Bishop Athanasius (Martos) of Hamburg, who had jurisdiction over the British Zone, planned to establish a Russian theological school on German soil, which would later be transformed into a theological institute. This plan had to be abandoned again because the departure of émigrés overseas resulted in a lack of candidates and of the necessary teaching staff. In subsequent years, the lack of priests became more and more acute. In 1954/55, Archbishop Alexander (Lvotsy) decided to hold courses for priests in the Monastery of St. Job in Munich, which were to last two years and provided four two-week sessions for candidates for the priesthood. In the first year, Apologetics, Patristics, and Introduction to Church Slavonic were taught. After one year, the Scriptures of the Old & New Testament, the Church Fathers, general Church History, History of the Russian Church, Liturgics, Dogmatic Theology, Church Slavonic and Liturgical Chant were on the curriculum. These studies were expanded in the second year by the practical participation of the students in the monastery's divine services during the week, and on feast days and Sundays in the Russian Church in Munich. Between the seminary sessions in the St. Job Monastery in August and October 1954/55, the candidates had to further their studies on their own. Altogether, five candidates for the priesthood took part in the course, who completed it in its entirety: two deacons from London, one reader with his wife, and one candidate who only attended the second session. Bishop Nathaniel was in charge of the courses, assisted by Archpriest Basil Vinogradov, supported by the abbot of the monastery, two priests and one deacon. Archbishop Alexander concluded the course with a talk on the priesthood in the Church. The test consisted of a written part and a practical part. The cost of the course was borne by the diocese, which had received \$1,000 in support from the WCC for that purpose.

In the 1960s, plans to establish a theological school in the St. Job Monastery in Munich were not realized. These plans involved a two-year course for candidates between 18 and 60 years of age, who were to be provided with room and board in the monastery.³¹

When Bishop Mark moved to the Munich monastery, the old traditions of the Ladomirova monastery were again revived. In the monastery, candidates are again being prepared for the priesthood. Besides the courses which Bishop Mark offers, these candidates may continue their studies at the University of Munich, with its two theological faculties (departments) and a newly-established seminary for Orthodox Theology. The candidates live in the monastery and take part in the daily divine services. In this way, their theological studies are expanded by the practice of

monastic life. In the interim, five candidates have been ordained priests, so that this new program can already look back upon its initial successes.

Similar courses were also given in other dioceses. Of primary concern was the continued theological education of priests and deacons. Then, there were also seminaries that pursued the aim of educating candidates for the priesthood and the diaconate. Also, for the laity, opportunities were provided for them to attend catechetical and theological courses to assist them in bringing up their children “in the spirit of Orthodoxy”, or to instruct them at the parish schools. Such courses were instituted most successfully by Archbishop John in San Francisco, in 1963. He was supported by archpriests, priests, and deacons. Courses such as the writings of the Church Fathers, the New & Old Testament, Church History, Orthodox Catechism, Church Slavonic, Liturgical Chant, and other subjects were offered. The first semester lasted three weeks. Thirty-two people took part. A total of 154 lectures were given, which on average 15-25 people attended.³²

Footnotes

1. Kasinets, *Bibliographical Census*, pp. 40-45. ↵
2. Konstantino, *Kirche in der Sowjetunion*, pp.222-223. ↵
3. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 439-453; Bogoslovsky Institut, *25-letny yubilei*; Florovsky, *Puti Bogosloviya*; Glubokovsky, *Theological Institute*; P. Grabbe, *O Parizhskikh Bogoslovakh*; Korenchevsky, *Orthodox Academy at Paris*. ↵
4. Zander, *List of Writings*. ↵
5. *Prav. Rus'* (1938) 5, p. 6. ↵
6. *Tserk. Ved.* (1922) 14-15, pp. 3-4; 10-11, p. 14. ↵
7. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, pp. 33; 7, pp. 279-280. ↵
8. *Pravoslavnaya Prikarpatzkaya Rus'* (1929), p. 1 “Notice” on the title page; (1934) p. 74. ↵
9. Ermakov, *Istoricheskaya zapiska*. ↵
10. *Tserk. Ved.* (1928) 9-14, p. 3. ↵
11. *Tserk. Ved.* (1936) 7, p. 99. ↵
12. *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, pp. 170-176. ↵
13. *Pravoslavnaya Karpatskaya Rus'* (1927), p. 36. ↵
14. *Tserk. Ved.* (1925) 7-8, p. 14. ↵
15. *Ibid.*, (1929) 3-12, p. 8. ↵
16. Cf. Part IV, Chapter 1.3. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 10, pp. 19-20. ↵

17. Professor Timbo had translated the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom into Chinese, *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) p. 78. ↵
18. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) pp. 43-45. ↵
19. *Church News* (1940) 2, pp. 33-36. ↵
20. *Ibid.* (1939) 11, pp. 55-60. ↵
21. *Ibid.* (1939) 6, p. 66; Bishop Nathaniel, *Ocherki*, pp. 6-7. ↵
22. *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, pp. 170-176. ↵
23. Bulgakov's teachings on the wisdom of Sophia were denounced as heretical by both the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and the Patriarchal Church. Archbishop Seraphim (Sobolev) critically explicated Bulgakov's work. ↵
24. The seminaries and faculties conformed to the curriculum established by the Russian Orthodox Church. (After their liberation from the Turks, it again became possible for them to develop their own national education system, which had been totally under Greek influence during the period of Turkish domination.) ↵
25. *Pravoslavnaya Karpatskaya Rus'* (1931) 7, pp. 2-3. ↵
26. *Russky narodny kalendar' na 1941 g.*, Appendix, p. 19. ↵
27. *Prav. Rus'* (1949) 2, p. 13; (1963) 11, pp. 8-11; 20, p. 11; (1965) 18, p. 10; (1967) 3, pp. 11-12; 19, pp. 12-13; (1971) 11, p. 9; (1973) 12, p. 4; (1976) 20, p. 16; (1977) 3, pp. 11-12; 24, p. 10; (1978) 12, p. 9. ↵
28. *Ibid.* (1980) 21, p. 12. ↵
29. *Holy Trinity Seminary Catalogue* [Jordanville] (1980) p. 11. ↵
30. *Prav. Rus'* (1979) 21, p. 13. ↵
31. *Tserk. Ved.* [Munich] (1956) 1-2, pp. 19-20; (1955) 10-12, pp. 18-19; *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 23, p. 14. ↵
32. *Prav. Rus'* (1963) 3, p. 10; 16, p. 12. ↵

Part IV, Chapter 5

Church Schools

In all of the larger communities, the Church Abroad maintains parish schools, in which, along with religious instruction, instruction in the Russian language, literature, history, geography, and other subjects is given. The goal of these schools is the dissemination and preservation of the Orthodox Faith among the youth and their upbringing as active and faithful members of their parishes. Through the spread of practical subjects — a type of Russian national knowledge — the children of the émigrés are made aware of the fact that Russia is their homeland, from which their parents and grandparents were driven, and to which many of them hope to return one day. Thus, they must not feel that they would be strangers in a future Orthodox Russia: language, history, and culture bring them closer to their old homeland.

Giving religious instruction to the émigré children has been necessary since the flight from Russia so that the adolescent youth remain bound to the Russian Orthodox Church. The majority of émigrés found themselves in non-Orthodox countries. The Russian emigration did not want to forfeit their national identity and their Faith in these countries; therefore, the youth, in particular, must be entrusted with the positive values of pre-Revolutionary Russia. For them, the danger of assimilation through school attendance in the host countries was particularly great.

This applied to the first wave of emigration as much as to the second (after 1945). One more circumstance was added to the second emigration: their younger generation, which had grown up under the Soviet regime, had had no opportunity other than within the family to become acquainted with the Christian beliefs and truths because, since 1918, religious instruction was banned from schools. In addition, any organized form of religious instruction by the Church was forbidden. Among the adults themselves, many had lost contact with the Church because, until the outbreak of World War II, almost all the churches in the country had been closed. In practice, a whole generation had grown up, whose education and upbringing had been stamped by the Marxist worldview and who lacked any connection with the classic Russian education.¹ That the emigration has nevertheless succeeded in preserving the Russian language and culture among the Russian youth until the present day — one should not forget that present youth are already the second or third generation to grow up abroad — is first of all to the credit of the Russian Church Abroad, which has, in its parish schools today, familiarized the youth with the classical values of the culture. The Church Abroad has always understood itself to be the Church of émigré Russians, and only in second place as the Church of those baptized Russian Orthodox, even if in a few communities today after 70 years in the emigration the Liturgy is already celebrated in English, German, French and other languages. This is, however, more a result of mission in the host countries than a consequence of assimilation. In contrast to the OCA (Metropolia),² which is of Russian origin but is concerned with the assimilation of the faithful and strives to unite all the descendants of Orthodox immigrants, thus using English as the liturgical language while abandoning Church Slavonic, the Church Abroad is concerned with the preservation of the Russian language and culture and rejects to far-reaching an assimilation.

That part of the emigration that has organized itself under the leadership of the Church Abroad has understood itself to be as much the preserver of religious, ecclesiastical heritage as the preserver of the Russian national and cultural heritage. This is not only the success of the Church Abroad, but rather more proof of the justification for its existence. Certainly, the Church Abroad will exist as long as the Russian émigrés hold fast to their national identities.³ On the subject of Russian secondary and tertiary schools that exist in the emigration, a distinction must be made between schools that were founded upon the Church's initiative and those that came into existence with the help of government and social organizations. To the latter belong, for example, many Russian high schools that existed in the 1920s and 1940s, and institutions of higher learning such as the "Russian Law Faculty" and the "Economic Institute", both in Prague. These institutions wanted to guarantee academic studies (independent of a non-Russian world view) and to give Russian students the opportunity to study at their own educational institutions. The many high schools that were founded in the 1920s and 1940s pursued the goal of making it possible for those pupils, who had begun their education in the Soviet Union and had interrupted it on account of their flight, to receive a diploma. Because they did not speak the language of the countries that received them, they either would have had to give up their studies entirely or interrupt them for a long period of time. Thus, primarily with the support of government agencies and international refugee organizations, their own school system came into being. Most of these institutions only existed for a few years and were then dismantled.

In order to prevent émigré children from losing their national identity and their faith, the Church Abroad concerned itself with establishing its own school system. The Church started with catechismal instruction, which was given in groups. From these religious lessons, the clergy then gradually developed the Church schools that exist today, after they recognized that without instruction in Russian language, literature, history, and other subjects the children would lose their national Russian identity.

Besides the schools that the émigrés founded, there were also the schools that had been founded by the ecclesiastical missions before the Revolution. They were either closed during World War I or integrated into the local school systems. The Peking Ecclesiastical Mission had maintained 17 boys' schools and 3 girls' schools. They also continued to exist after 1918, under the direction of the Church Abroad and received state support. The Korean Mission maintained 7 schools; in Japan, there were 2 schools; and the Mission in Urmia (Persia) had 1 school. The largest school network, with approximately 93 schools, was in Palestine and Syria, for the Arab Orthodox population. It was financed by the "Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society," which also provided the means for its own teaching seminars and development for those who taught at these schools.⁴ These schools were almost all taken over by the countries in which they were located, and were integrated into the national school system, thereby losing their status as Orthodox schools.

The Church hierarchy devoted great attention to schooling and group activities (unions). This is emphasized by the fact that the Councils of Bishops and the three Pan-Diaspora Councils discussed in detail youth and group work. At the First Pan-Diaspora Council, this problem received little recognition, because it was still believed that the emigration was temporary;

however, at the Second and Third Pan-Diaspora Councils, in 1938 and 1974, the possibilities and aims of youth work were dealt with in detail. In 1938, Archpriest P. Belovidov and Hegumen Philip (von Gardner) spoke on religious instruction for children and the importance of a Church school system.⁵ They indicated that the foundation of the Christian life must be laid in childhood. One must use all available interests in religion in each child, in order to create the foundations for Christian life. Here, above all, work must be done with the parents, who in turn can help the children by their example in the Faith. The family should be a “house church” of education; the Church and the parishes must strengthen the Faith through pre-school upbringing. Besides catechismal instruction, the children must also be given instruction in Church history. The history of the Orthodox Churches and the Russian Church should be the focal point. The clergy were required to especially concern themselves with youth work, and also the older adolescents and students, who are at a particularly critical age, should be more firmly integrated into parish life. Through religious discussions, youth circles, participation in patriotic assemblies, pilgrimages, and lectures, they should try to awaken the youth’s interest in the Church and to establish ties with the community. In connection with this, they particularly pointed to group work, to which one should draw as many young people as possible.⁶

They cited as an example the St. Seraphim of Sarov Circle, which had existed in Belgrade since 1921. This Circle⁷ met for religious discussions and was under the guidance of Metropolitan Anthony. Men and women belonged to it, as well as youth groups. One can measure the influence this circle had upon the participants by noting that, out of this Circle came five bishops (including Archbishop Nicodemus of Richmond & Great Britain), seven clergymen, and many nuns, including the late Abbess Magdalena (Countess N. P. Grabbe) and the iconographer-nun, Mother Flaviana (E. N. Vorobeva).⁸

A brotherhood that was formed after the Second All-Diaspora Council and still exists today is the St. Vladimir Brotherhood (Bratstvo Svyatoi Khristovoi Rusi imeni sv. kn. Vladimira). It was formed on the occasion of the 950th anniversary of the Christianization of Russia, which was celebrated in 1938. Members could be anyone over 18 years of age. They vowed to live according to the rules of the Church, i.e. by regularly attending the Sunday services, saying daily prayers, reading the Gospels in the family unit, and keeping the Church fasts, and so forth. The members were supposed to swear to establish and support organizations at all cathedrals, missions, and larger communities and to form youth groups for the young people.⁹

At the third Pan-Diaspora Council, youth and group work took on broader proportions in the discussions. Archbishop Seraphim (Ivanov) read a report on “Church Youth Work in the Diaspora”; Bishop Nectarius (Kontsevich) of Seattle spoke on the “Extracurricular Religious and Moral Upbringing of the Youth.”¹⁰ In addition to this there were lectures and reports from the leaders of five Russian youth groups in exile on the following day. Archbishop Anthony (Medvedev) reported on the Church school system, and G. Lukianov, inspector of Church schools in Eastern America, gave a survey on the activities of Church schools of that diocese.¹¹

In the resolutions, the “fundamental importance of the Church schools abroad” for the preservation of Orthodoxy and Russian culture among the growing youth was stressed. The Council called for all parishes and Church workers to give schooling and youth work more

attention, and to establish new schools. It required the clergy to give regular religious instruction in their parishes and, when possible, to introduce a comprehensive study on general subjects such as language, literature, history, and so forth. As much as possible, the instruction at the parish schools should take place at least once per week, as a supplement to school attendance at the local schools. For information and advice in building up the parish schools, as well as for better coordination of the work within the individual dioceses, the Synod of Bishops Department for Academics & Education was established.¹² It was mandated to organize youth camps, extracurricular upbringing modeled on the example of the summer camp in the Chicago Diocese, which had existed since the 1960s, which Archbishop Seraphim had established, and which has since been emulated in many dioceses.¹³

The largest youth group, with branches in all countries of the free world, is the Russian Scouts (Nationalnaya Organizatsia Russkikh Skautov) and the Russian Orthodox Youth Outside of Russia (Russkaya Pravoslavnaya Molodezh Za Rubezhom). The number of its members today is not known. In 1952, 18,000 youth belonged to the Scout Movement.¹⁴ All youth groups met in congresses at specific intervals of time; at these congresses, they reported on their work.

The Third Pan-Diaspora Russian Congress of Orthodox Youth took place in Toronto, in 1978. Several hundred young people participated. At Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville, the St. Herman Youth met in December of 1980 for their third session since 1973. This youth group has conducted research into the life of St. Herman [of Alaska]. At the session, 200 young people from North America participated.¹⁵ In recent years, there has been an annual youth pilgrimage to Jordanville for St. Herman's Day, and a youth conference.

The greatest significance of the schools in the early years of the emigration — and this applies to both waves of emigration — lies in the fact that the youth were offered the opportunity to complete the schooling that was begun in their homeland. This often began in the displaced persons camps, where former teachers and students continued this schooling. One example that can, however, represent the others took place in 1945, in the Parsch Camp, near Salzburg, where a camp high school was founded, which was attended by 350 children. Of them, in the first year of its existence, 100 students received their diplomas, twenty of whom continued their studies on the college level.¹⁶ These camp schools were in many ways the new beginning of the school system. The Church was the only institution in position, during the early year, to take over the education of the youth when the children had not yet mastered the language of the host country. There was, moreover, also a lament that the youth of the second emigration displayed little inclination to preserve their Russianness in the emigration and were concerned with their own assimilation. The reason for this was, for example, the negative experience of Stalinism and the desire to make a new beginning. There were warnings against the dangers of a denationalization. The priests were called upon to strengthen their work with the youth and the education of the youth, and were told not to “shut themselves up in their churches,” but rather to “go into the families” and to intensify youth work.¹⁷ Most dioceses had a pedagogical committee that aimed to set up Russian Church schools to cultivate the Russian language and culture and the deepening of religious upbringing.¹⁸ This schooling extended from kindergarten to preparatory classes with reading courses, from elementary to secondary schools. The latter also were located in the large

cities with numerically strong communities and in refugee camps. In the mid-1950s, most of these schools suspended their work. ¹⁹

Today there are still some 100 parish schools; these may be divided into three separate categories: kindergartens and parish schools from the larger communities. The number of students reaches from 2-5 children to groups of 20 children; the number of classes, including the preparatory and reading classes, consists of up to ten grade levels. ²⁰ In addition to these elementary schools, the Church Abroad has two high schools, in New York and San Francisco respectively, whose diplomas are equivalent to that of the public high schools. Two boarding schools are maintained by nuns in Bethany and Santiago. Both general subjects and religious subjects such as biblical history, the lives of the saints, catechism, ecclesiastical chant and Church history are taught. The general subjects primarily include Russian language, grammar and literature, and additionally Russian history, geography and music. At the larger schools this was supplemented by theater, dance, and instrumental groups and choirs. At these schools, there are libraries with special literature for children and adolescents. Most students celebrate the end of the school year together with their parents, sometimes by theater productions and musical presentations. At Christmas, the children become better acquainted with Russian Christmas customs.

The largest parish schools in existence today are in the United States. Most of them were founded in the 1950s, but new schools were added in the 1960s and 1970s. One of the largest schools is at the Holy Transfiguration Cathedral in Los Angeles, which is attended by 250 children and has 12 classes, which reach from the pre-school (3 classes) to the main school (9 classes). For the younger students, the school has its own school bus, which collects children from the suburbs and the city. There was a large school with 130-150 children at the Archangel Michael Church in Paterson. This school was founded in 1952 and is attended by 35 pupils; the number grew in subsequent years to reach its present-day level. Besides these, there are also large schools in Lakewood, Nyack, Washington D.C., and other cities, which are attended by 50-70 children. ²¹

The most important full-time parochial schools are the Synod's St. Sergius of Radonezh High School in New York and St. Cyril High School in San Francisco. The Synodal school in New York was founded in 1953 and at first located in the House of Free Russia. In the first years of its existence, instruction took place only on a weekly basis. The number of students in these years was between 120 and 150. In 1959, the school was transferred to the Synod building on Park Avenue and began giving daily instruction. Eighteen to twenty teachers taught some 140-160 children in twelve classes. The school had its own 10,000 volume library and a small printing press, in which school books and other teaching materials were printed. In addition to Russian subjects, which were taught in Russian, there was also instruction in English, because the curriculum was equivalent to that in American public schools. The school was accredited by the state as a high school. The school's annual budget is around \$120,000. ²² A second high school is located in San Francisco and attended by 250 students. The school was founded in 1950 and began its educational work with 70 students. It had been preceded by a parish school founded in 1943. When the Russian parishes in the city grew after World War II, the school was turned into

a high school. Today there are still reading classes for the youngest children, three preparatory classes, and seven secondary level classes. Some 15 teachers give instruction. Also, here Russian subjects, such as Russian language, grammar, literature, history, geography, economics, and, of course, religious instruction, are the focal points. These are, as in New York, supplemented by other subjects such as English language and literature, American history and geography. Scientific subjects were taught in Russian. ²³

In addition to the schools in the U.S. dioceses, there are also schools in the Canadian diocese (8 schools, the largest of which is in Toronto, with approximately 100 children) and in the Australian diocese (6 schools). The largest Australian school is located in Brisbane, with 10 classes and 150 students, and a 1,000 volume school library. In South America, there are larger schools in Argentina and Brazil, which on the average are attended by 30-70 students.

The Russian community in Tehran founded its own school in 1962/63, when the parish experienced a revival under the direction of Archimandrite Victorin. In the first academic year, 80 children attended; there were 5 teachers and a 1,200 volume library. ²⁴

Similarly, in Europe there are parish schools in the larger communities. The most important school is doubtless St. Vladimir School in Brussels, which has its own school building and is attended by some 60-70 children, also including Serbian Orthodox children. In the German Diocese, there are about a dozen smaller parish schools. By 1967, 4,000 children had attended these schools. In Bavaria, classes in Orthodox religious instruction were held, in which there were a minimum of 15 Orthodox children. The Ministry of Cults paid the teachers. The larger schools were attended by 20-30 students. Smaller parish schools also existed in Austria, Switzerland, France, Luxemburg, and Great Britain. The London Saturday school was founded in 1954, when the nuns who fled from Palestine under the direction of Abbess Elizabeth (Ampenov) arrived in London and established the Convent of the Annunciation. In the first years of its existence, a total of 84 children attended the school. ²⁵

Both the school run by the nuns in Bethany and the one run by the nuns in Santiago hold a special position within the school system. Besides the school, they also have a boarding house and an orphanage.

In Bethany, a school for girls with a boarding house was founded in 1934, upon the initiative of Mother Mary (Stella Robinson), later the Abbess of the Ascension Convent [on the Mount of Olives], and her coworker, Sister Martha (Alexandra Sprot). The former was Scottish and the latter English; both converted to Orthodoxy in the early 1930s. While Mother Mary took over the direction of the newly-founded convent, Mother Martha headed the school. The school received recognition from the English High Commissioner as an English college and thus the right to grant diplomas, qualifying the recipient to continue his studies on the college level. With this school, the Church Abroad was continuing the tradition of the pre-Revolutionary Russian Church. Even to the present day, it is the only Orthodox school for Arab girls in the Holy Land.

The school is attended by 140 Arab girls, from 6-16 years of age, of which half lived in the boarding house attached to the school. In the first years of its existence, the school was attended by 20-30 children, whose number, however, grew remarkably. The children who board there are

in part orphans, in part children of refugees who fled from the Israeli section during the partition of Palestine. Time and again, some of the children from the boarding house and school enter the three convents.

Instruction is given daily between 8 A.M. and 3 P.M. and corresponds to the curriculum in Jordanian schools. There are ten salaried teachers, and an additional three from the convent. The latter teach religion, Church singing, and, for several older students, icon painting. There are a total of 9 classes, 6 on the elementary level and 3 on an advanced level. In addition to the material covered in Jordanian schools, the girls also receive instruction in religion, home economics, and three languages: Russian, English, and Arabic. Additional subjects are icon painting and Church singing, in which four languages are used: Church Slavonic, Greek, Arabic and English. The school receives a monthly stipend of \$1,600 from various funds of the Church Abroad. For students without means, there is a scholarship.²⁶ Along the lines of the tradition in Palestine is a school run by four nuns under the direction of Mother Juliana in Santiago, Chile, where they live in a convent dedicated to the Dormition of the Theotokos. The nuns came from the Ein Karim Convent which is located in the Israeli part of Palestine; the nuns left it after it was handed over to the Moscow Patriarchate. The orphanage and convent school were founded in 1966. With the financial support of the Church Abroad and the Chilean authorities, the undertaking was realized. In 1969, studies began, and the first 14 orphans came to live in the orphanage. By 1972, the number grew to 40 girls of all ages. Those older than 6 years of age attended the school which, by 1977, 186 children had attended. For most children, there is no tuition, because they are from poor Chilean families. Many children also receive a free breakfast. The school's curriculum corresponds to that of Chilean elementary school. Children also receive Orthodox religious instruction and instruction in the Russian language, history, and church singing. The orphans are all baptized into the Orthodox Faith and speak good Russian, which is an elective subject for the Chilean children.

The school is dependent upon the financial support of the Synod of Bishops and the Chilean authorities, because the convent only has revenues from a small garden, which is not enough to support the school and the orphanage.²⁷

Both of these schools play a special role in helping the Russian Church Abroad to carry on an old tradition from pre-Revolutionary times: instruction and mission for Orthodox minorities, such as in Palestine or for non-Orthodox orphans. The success of these efforts is not wanting. Some two-thirds of all nuns in the Church Abroad's convents are of Arab extraction.

Footnotes

1. In Russia after the Revolution, the entire educational system was revamped in accordance with the Marxist-atheist worldview. Some things representing the old culture were destroyed, others were damaged by intentional alienation and still, others were completely destroyed. Everything of ecclesiastical origin suffered the most. Classics of world literature were banned from the libraries or no longer published. The first edition of Dostoevsky's collected works was only published in 1965 in the Soviet Union. The

publication of this edition, begun at that time and later suspended, was still not complete at the time of the publication of this book. ⇐

2. The Metropolia was the first to initiate the development of church Sunday schools, in which instruction was given in English and which concentrated on catechism. In 1953 there were 76 such Sunday schools; in 1961 there were 141. (Tarasar, pp. 234-239.) ⇐
3. Fr. Johannes Chrysostomus repeatedly prophesied the demise of the Church Abroad without ever having established this in full; compare his essays “Patriarch Tichon” and “Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche.” ⇐
4. Seide, *Jerusalem Mission*; Idem., *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*. ⇐
5. *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, pp. 209-236. ⇐
6. Ibid., pp. 54-56. ⇐
7. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, pp. 130-138. ⇐
8. Ibid., p. 135. Speech by Archbishop Seraphim (Ivanov) at the Third All Diaspora Council in 1974 (Synodal Archives, file 2/72). ⇐
9. *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, pp. 39-50; Shchukin, pp. 102-105. ⇐
10. *Prav. Put'* (1974), pp. 3-26. ⇐
11. *Prav. Rus'* (1947) 17, pp. 10-11; (1948) 4, pp. 10-11; 7, pp. 8-10. ⇐
12. In Munich there were originally 3 Russian high schools. On account of the emigration overseas, two were closed; the third remained in existence until the mid-1950s when it too was closed. *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 5, pp. 15-16. ⇐
13. *Der christlichen Osten* (1963) 1, p. 27. ⇐
14. *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 4, pp. 4-7. ⇐
15. Ibid. (1981) 1, p. 14. ⇐
16. “Proshchai Parsch” in *Russky national'ny kalendar'* [Munich] (1951) p. 131. ⇐
17. *Prav. Rus'* (1947) 17, pp. 10-11. ⇐
18. *Tserkovniya Vedomosti* (Munich) (1952) 3-4, p. 20. ⇐
19. Seide, *Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*, p. 169. ⇐
20. Andreev, “O vospitanii detei.” ⇐
21. *Prav. Rus'* (1960) 15, p. 8; (1964) 16, pp. 10-11; (1965) 1, pp. 9-10; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 764, 824, 879, 1366, 1411, 1420. ⇐
22. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1, pp. 477-481; *Prav. Rus'* (1962) 7, pp. 8-9; (1969) 20, p. 12. ⇐

23. *Prav. Rus'* (1951) 1, pp. 10-11; (1962) 6, pp. 9-10. ↵
24. *Prav. Rus'* (1963) 20, p. 11; (1964) 4, pp. 9-10. ↵
25. *Prav. Rus'* (1960) 15, p. 8; (1964) 16, pp. 10-11; (1965) 1, pp. 9-10; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 879, 1018, 1059. ↵
26. *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 24, pp. 4-7; (1965) 5, pp. 8-9; (1977) 20, pp. 13-14; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 447-460. ↵
27. *Prav. Rus'* (1972) 10, pp. 9-10; Abbess Juliana, "Pis'mo iz Chile," in *Pravoslavnoe obozrenie* [Montreal] (1979) 47, pp. 63-68; "Orthodox Life" (1982) 4, pp. 35-38. ↵

Part IV, Chapter 6

The Missionary Activities of the Church Abroad

Thus far, little research has been done into the mission of the Russian Orthodox Church.¹ This is because the Russian Church possessed vast missionary territories within its own country: Siberia, Central Asia, and the Far East. Only when the people of these areas were converted to Orthodoxy and the Empire pushed forward into Asia and America with the [other] European powers, did the Russian Church establish a new field of activity outside its national borders. In China, Japan, Korea, Persia, Palestine, Alaska, the United States, and Canada, the Russian Church established missions. The majority of these missions came into being in the 19th century; the exception was the Peking Mission.²

The Catholic and Protestant churches viewed this new mission Church with distrust, at times even with enmity. They surmised, not entirely incorrectly, that government interests lay behind the missionary work of the Russian Church: “If Orthodox priests bring the Chinese youth to faith in the Russian God, they also mean thereby faith in the Russian Tsar.”³ These suspicions were not confined to the Far East; they were also raised against the Russian Church in Palestine. Certainly, political considerations must have played a rôle; yet for representatives of the Church, these were entirely secondary.⁴

The Church Abroad inherited the missions abroad after 1920. The Peking and Jerusalem Missions, the Mission in Urmia (Persia) and the missions in North America recognized the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad unreservedly. A certain special development took place in Japan. Bishop Sergius (Tikhomirov: from 1921, Archbishop; and from 1931, Metropolitan) maintained close relations with the Synod of Bishops until 1927. After the break between the Synod and Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky), Archbishop Sergius remained faithful to the Patriarchal Church, but in practice autonomously administered the Japanese Orthodox community, because no direct relations with the Mother Church could be established. In 1940, the Japanese Orthodox community was changed into a “religious corporation” and placed under the authority of a Japanese archpriest, Arsenius Ivasava. Metropolitan Sergius was forced to step down from his office and was retired.⁵

The Russian Church Abroad divided its missionary activities into two types: the internal and the external mission. The internal mission applied to the members of its own nationality, first Russians, then also non-Russians (e.g., Ukrainians, Belorussians, Estonians and other nationalities that were historically subject to the Russian Church).⁶ The external mission was directed at those people who either belonged to non-Christian cultures or who were non-Orthodox Christians, whom one wanted to convert to Orthodoxy. Both forms of mission, the internal as well as the external, were given much attention. During its existence (since 1920), the Church Abroad has enjoyed signal success in both areas.

Nothing further will be said about the internal mission here. It should, however, be noted again that this mission pursued the goal of keeping the Russian faithful in the diaspora a part of the Russian Church, to which end the Church always took care to set up its own parishes and supply them with priests even in the farthest corners of the world. This objective was, by and large,

achieved: the more than 350 parishes of the Church Abroad throughout the world are the most conspicuous expression of this internal mission. This, however, must also be seen in the light of the fact that the Church Abroad was able to bring many back to Orthodoxy who had lost any contact with religion. This was particularly the case with the second emigration, which came to the West in the aftermath of World War II. Because of Stalin's policies concerning the Church, many of them, especially the youth, had had neither a religious upbringing nor a church life before their flight. In the camps, they came into contact with the Russian Orthodox Church for the first time and decided either to be baptized or to take an active part in the Christian life, from which they had previously been barred. This also applies to the current émigrés: dissidents, Jews and other émigrés who often find the Russian Church for the first time in the West, whom those in the Church Abroad are readily prepared to accept. The Church Abroad's parish in Vienna has been able to bring numerous new émigrés to the Church. These people are often a mixture of Jewish and Russian, or Russian and non-Russian, who was granted an exit visa. Generally, these émigrés had had almost no direct contact with the Church. After having become acquainted with the life of the Church as manifested by the Church Abroad, adult and young people alike decide to be baptized.⁷ Likewise, the Patriarchate's church in Vienna was rejected by the émigrés in most cases because it is identified with the Soviet regime.

In most countries in which the Church Abroad has been represented since 1920, there are also local Orthodox communities. In these converts predominate. In a few countries — such as in the U.S.A., France, and Holland — their own the Netherlands, Orthodox missions and churches have been established. Many monks and nuns, priests and bishops, who were tonsured or ordained by the Church Abroad, come from this group of people: Bishop Mark (Dr. Michael Arndt), Metropolitan Seraphim Lade, Bishop Philip von Gardner, Bishop Jacob (Akkersdyk), Archbishop Jacob (James Tooms), Bishop John (Moses Shleman) and Archimandrite Lazarus (Moore), are the best known among these converts. In the monasteries of the Church Abroad today, there are three times as many non-Russians as Russians: Arabs, Greeks, Americans, Englishmen, Germans, Frenchmen, Spaniards, and the Dutch are the largest groups among them. In addition to these non-Orthodox representatives — not including the Orthodox Greeks and Arabs — there are also many Orthodox faithful from Eastern Europe, who have been separated from their Mother Churches under Communist dominion: Romanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, Estonians, and Latvians have in part joined themselves to the Church Abroad in the West.⁸ The Church Abroad developed its most extensive mission in the church province of the Far East. In 1915, there were an estimated 5,587 Orthodox Chinese' whereas, in the 1960s, 20,000-30,000 faithful are estimated to have been members of the Chinese Orthodox Autonomous Church.⁹ Thus, the Church Abroad must have conducted a significant mission among the native population in order for a Church of this magnitude to have developed. From 1924-25, over 400 Chinese were reportedly baptized yearly. In the 1930s, in Manchuria, approximately 50-60 Chinese and Japanese were baptized.¹⁰ Bishop John (Maximovich) of Shanghai and the Chinese priest Nicholas (Li) baptized 102 Chinese in 1936 during a visit to the Diocese of Shanghai.¹¹ From this sparse data, one can, of course, infer nothing about actual missionary activities after 1918. With the help of these statistics and the data on the Chinese Orthodox Autonomous Church of the 1960s, however, one can make certain inferences about the missionary work. If one takes the number of 400 baptisms in China and 50 baptisms in

Manchuria as a constant for each year from 1920-1950, then a total of some 14,000 Chinese must have been baptized in order to at least get to 20,000 faithful because approximately 6,000 Orthodox Chinese had already received baptism by 1920.

The number of baptisms decreased after the Communist seizure of power; many who had been baptized before 1918 had long ago died (one must also take into consideration the Sino-Japanese War and the Chinese Civil War, which both had many victims), the number of actual baptisms yearly must have been at least 800 (1920-1950: 24,000 baptisms). Otherwise, one would not come up with 20,000-30,000 faithful in the 1960s. Because this is a missionary church, one must also count on a relatively high death rate, because many were baptized as adults.

The majority of Orthodox Chinese might have accepted the Christian Faith when the Mission in Peking was subject to the Church Abroad. Also, many Chinese lived and studied in the monasteries in China and Manchuria, as well as in the Theological Seminary in Harbin.¹² From 1932, the diocesan administration in Harbin had its own mission council.¹³ The Peking Mission published literature in Chinese, and there were also schools for Chinese Orthodox children. In Peking, Shanghai, Tientsin, Sindao, and Mukden. Regular catechism classes were instituted for the native population. At the Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking, four out of nine clergymen were Chinese.¹⁴

The Korean Mission also developed favorably. This was founded in 1897 and was subject to the Bishop of Vladivostok from 1908-1923. From 1923, it was subject to Archbishop Sergius of Japan. Thereafter, however, the Church Abroad maintained its own mission in the north of the country, which had much missionary success in the 1930s. In any case, “the interest for Orthodoxy amongst the Korean population was great.”¹⁵ From 1925, Archimandrite Theodosius was in charge of the Church Abroad’s Mission. In 1933, its direction was transferred to Archbishop Nestor, who thereafter bore the title of Archbishop of Kamchatka & Seoul. The South Korean Mission was under the direction of Archimandrite Polycarp.¹⁶ After the partition of Korea, there was a paradoxical situation: in the northern part of the country, the Church Abroad had its mission and in the southern part of the country the Patriarchate had its mission. The authorities of the country closed both missions. A few years later, the South Korean Mission became subject to the American Metropolia.¹⁷

Little is known about the fate of the Mission in Urmia. It was founded in 1898 when Bishop Jonah and 20,000 Nestorians joined the Russian Church. From 1914, Bishop Abun-Mar Elias was head of the Mission. In 1918, together with the other members of the Mission, he was evacuated to Hamadan, but returned to Urmia in 1920. In 1921, he made contact with the Synod of Bishops and, together with his faithful, joined the Church Abroad. Upon his death in 1928, his post at first remained vacant. In 1931, Archimandrite John (Moses Shleman) was consecrated Bishop of Urmia & Salma. He headed the Mission until 1945 when he retired due to old age. He then lived in retirement in the U.S.A. and died in 1962, at the age of 105, at the Convent of Novo-Diveevo, where he had spent his final years. As a representative of the Mission, he participated in the Second Pan-Diaspora Council in 1938.¹⁸ Upon his retirement, it seems that ties between the Church Abroad and the Mission in Urmia were broken; this was no doubt

connected with the flight of the Synod from Karlovtsy and the confusion prevailing during the years immediately following the War.

In southern India, a completely new missionary territory opened up to the Russian Church. This consisted of Syrian-Monophysite Christians, also known as Jacobites.¹⁹ This branch of Syrian Christians is comprised of some 500,000 faithful. A group of 100,000 faithful was subject to the Patriarchate of Antioch; the second largest group separated from Antioch in 1925, because they desired more autonomy. They had founded the “Eastern Orthodox Syrian Church,” which was headed by the Catholicos Basileos Gregor. Subject to the Catholicos were a metropolitan, two bishops, and 470 churches with active parish life.²⁰

Hieromonk Andronicus (Elpidinsky) was their contact with the Church Abroad. He had been a cleric at Belfort (France) in the early 1920s and had decided to go to India in order to care for the 300 Russian émigrés there. Finally, Fr. Andronicus settled in Travancore in southern India and established a hermitage. Besides Fr. Andronicus, Hieromonk Constantine also lived in the area; he was a Russian monk from Mount Athos. He had set up his skete in the middle of the jungle and lived there in complete solitude because no one dared to visit him in a region where leopards and tigers abounded. It was reported of Fr. Constantine that at his skete lived a leopard, which was supposedly completely tame.²¹

The lives of both these hermits made a strong impression on the Christian population. Fr. Andronicus, who barely spoke English himself, had understood how to anchor in the consciousness of the faithful that the Russian Church is the heir of “true Orthodoxy.” The Catholicos himself had expressed the desire to learn more about the life of the Russian Church and implored Fr. Andronicus to intercede. He, in turn, first turned to Metropolitan Eulogius for assistance. Eulogius asked the Ecumenical Patriarch for help, but the latter showed no interest.²² Next, Eulogius turned to the Serbian Patriarchate and declared himself prepared to “entrust Andronicus to the Serbian Church.”²³

The Catholicos had in the meantime undertaken a trip to Palestine, where he met with Archbishop Anastasius, whom he asked to dispatch missionaries. After his return to India, there was an assembly of the episcopate of the Jacobite Christians, which decided to enter into contacts with the Church Abroad, in order to negotiate for a union. In response, the Karlovtsy Synod of Bishops decided to send Bishop Demetrius (Voznesensky) to Southern India in order to study the situation of the church.²⁴ The Serbian Patriarchate financially subsidized Bishop Demetrius’ trip and declared its readiness to give the Russian Church further material support, if the union seemed to be achievable.

Bishop Demetrius traveled to India in February of 1936 and visited the communities and institutions of the church. He was quite impressed by the vibrant and active church life of this group of Christians. For all classes — from the simplest people to the intelligentsia — the Church and the parish formed the center of their lives. The parishes were, as a rule, well-organized and had parish schools and charitable institutions. Clergy were educated at the church’s own seminary, and at Travancore there was a monastery with 20 monks and a small convent.²⁵ Bishop Demetrius remained in the country for two weeks and gave many lectures (in

English) on Orthodoxy and the Russian Church. He particularly addressed the differences with the Monophysites and made it clear that a union would only be possible if the Syrian Christians accepted all the Ecumenical Councils (they recognized only the first three) and would thereby give up the Monophysite dogma. His lectures aroused much interest. In any case, it was asserted that as many as 5,000 faithful attended one lecture. ²⁶

Metropolitan Dorotheus of Zagreb (from the Serbian Church) used the meeting of the YMCA in India to visit these southern Indian Christians as well.

For further negotiations, Archbishop Nestor (Anisimov) was sent to India. He traveled there together with Archimandrite Nathaniel (Lvov). They had decided to make a stop in Colombo [Ceylon, now Sri Lanka], because there were Jacobite Christians there also. During their journey, they made the acquaintance of an Anglican clergyman who offered them his church in Colombo for an Orthodox service. At this service, 20 Anglican clergymen were said to have taken part, who promised Nestor financial support for his missionary work. On account of Bishop Nestor's illness, departure for India was delayed. Meanwhile, several native Anglican and Catholic priests declared their interest in Orthodoxy, which corresponded to the mentality of their faithful more closely than that of Western Christendom. The Catholic priest, J. Alvarez, declared his readiness to place his church at the disposal of the Orthodox for a mission church and signed it over to Bishop Nestor. So, before his departure, this church was declared an "Orthodox Mission." It was supposed to serve as the center and departure point of a mission to Ceylon. The prerequisites for such a mission were, however, most unfavorable: it lacked missionaries, money, icons, church utensils and service books. ²⁷

From Ceylon, Archbishop Nestor and Archimandrite Nathaniel traveled to Travancore, where they sought out the Catholicos immediately upon their arrival. During their stay, they visited many church institutions, celebrated the divine services together, took part in sessions of the synod, and visited the grave of the church's 4th-century founder. On their return journey, they both visited Ceylon again in order to convince themselves of the progress and developments of the mission. They were accompanied by Fr. Andronicus, who was selected as head of the Mission. In the meantime, there had been a change of opinion: part of the Syrian Christians rejected union with the Russian Church. This reversal was alleged to have been provoked by the Anglican and Catholic missionaries, who saw in the Orthodox a difficult opposition. ²⁸ Archimandrite Nathaniel wanted to remain in Ceylon as a missionary in order to give the mission a firmer foundation. On account of the financial situation — during their three-month stay, the money was almost all spent — Archbishop Nestor pressed him to leave. Thus, this mission was left to its own devices, but was supposed to receive financial help and manpower as soon as they were in the position to send it. ²⁹

The outbreak of the World War II prevented further negotiations with the Catholicos and the building up of the Mission on Ceylon. Only 15 years later, under changed conditions, did the Synod decide to take up the southern Indian mission. With the Synodal resolution dated 29 March/11 April 1952, the establishment of a mission in India was undertaken on account of the great importance of the Syrian Christians for Orthodoxy.

Archimandrite Lazarus (Moore) took charge of the mission. He was a native Englishman, who had converted to Orthodoxy. In the 1930s, he was already living in India and had also met with Bishop Demetrius during his stay in Travancore. Fr. Lazarus had previously lived for a few years at the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem, where he had been made an abbot. As a priest there, he had cared for the Ein Karim Convent and the Bethany Convent. He returned to England after the outbreak of the Israeli-Arab War in 1951, resettling in the USA, where he lived in the Kursk Hermitage in Mahopac.³⁰ In 1951, he was elevated to the rank of archimandrite, and the following year he was entrusted with the direction and rebuilding of the Indian Mission.

Joining Archimandrite Lazarus in India in the mid-1960s were Brothers Leon and Mark and the nuns Maria, Gabriella, and Thomais. Except for Sister Gabriella, all the others returned from India after a year.

Archimandrite Lazarus' mission received no financial support and had to get by on the most meager means. Fr. Lazarus had permission from the Synod to conduct negotiations on the union, but under the conditions that the Jacobite Christians would recognize the Seven Ecumenical Councils, because only the three, as the Catholicos had proposed, would not be an acceptable basis. Archimandrite Lazarus headed the mission in Travancore for almost 15 years, but he only succeeded in converting individual believers to Orthodoxy, because the Catholicos and the clergy could not decide to accept the Synod's conditions.³¹

Missionary work in India failed because the mission of the Russian Church Abroad lacked the material means and manpower. Whereas in the 1930s, the Serbian Patriarchate's material support made the building up of a mission feasible, after World War II, the attempt depended upon the strengths of the Church Abroad. The outbreak of World War II interrupted the hopeful and not unsuccessful attempt of the 1930s. The renewed attempt in the 1950s relied more upon the person of Archimandrite Lazarus, who, lacking support, did not succeed in continuing the work of the 1930s.³²

The Church Abroad had more success in establishing local Orthodox parishes in countries where it was represented by its own parishes. In France, England, Holland, Germany and America today, there are many parishes that have the Church Abroad to thank for their existence and that were founded by converts. These communities prove to be especially durable where they have a native priest available to care for them. Another prerequisite for a successful mission is the availability of translations of liturgical and catechetical literature in the community's own language, to facilitate the celebration of the divine services in the language of the country. The Church Abroad is paying more and more attention to and is putting more value upon, the translations being not a simple rendering of the Church Slavonic and Russian texts, but rather the correct rendering of the solemn nature and liturgical form of such texts.³³

One of the first national Orthodox missions was founded in 1951 in the U.S.A. Bishop Jacob (James Tooms) was put in charge of the mission; in the same year, he received the title of Archbishop of the American Orthodox Mission. He was an American by birth and originally an Episcopalian. In 1923, he came into contact with Orthodoxy and finally became Orthodox in the 1930s, after having become acquainted with Archbishop Vitalius (Maximenko). The American

Orthodox Mission was under his leadership and directly under the supervision of the Synod of Bishops.³⁴ The goal of this Mission was the spread of Orthodoxy among the English-speaking Americans. Thus, Archbishop Jacob requested that all the parish clergy give him the names of all the Americans who had married Russians but had not yet converted to Orthodoxy. He also asked for the names of people who were interested in Orthodoxy. In subsequent years, the Mission translated a number of liturgical books into English, thereby meeting the prerequisite for the establishment of English-language Orthodox parishes. Archbishop James retired in 1956. His successor as head of the Mission was Father Andrew Gerrick. Missionary work of this kind is continued by the Saint Herman of Alaska Brotherhood in Platina, under the leadership of Hieromonk Herman (Podmoshensky). This Brotherhood is made up primarily of English-speaking Americans. For years, they performed successful mission work among Americans.

In France there was a similar development to that in the United States. There, a group of former Catholics became Orthodox and founded the Western Rite Orthodox parish in Saint Geneviève near Paris. Archimandrite Irenaeus (Louis Wennaert) took over the direction of this parish from 1925 to 1937; he then, however, joined the Moscow Patriarchate. In 1937, Father Eugraphus Kovalevsky took charge of this parish, which had joined together with other smaller parishes to form the “Orthodox Catholic Church in France.” Father Eugraphus, with the majority of his faithful, broke with the Moscow Patriarchate in 1953. In 1960, the group entered into negotiations with the Church Abroad and asked to be received into its jurisdiction. Archbishop John (Maximovich) supported this union; he had always supported the establishment of national Orthodox Churches under the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad. At this time, some 5,000 to 10,000 faithful belonged to this (French-language) Church, which boasted 23 parishes and 15 priests and 7 deacons. The priests were educated at the “Seminary for Orthodox Theology”, which was recognized by the Paris Sorbonne as an institution of higher learning. Father Eugraphus was in charge of these active communities. He took monastic vows in 1964, and was consecrated Bishop of Saint Denis with the name of Jean [John].

After the death of Archbishop John (Maximovich), there arose differences between Bishop Jean (Kovalevsky) and the Synod, which ultimately led to his separation from the Church Abroad in 1967. His group then entered into negotiations with the Romanian Patriarchate³⁵ and asked to be received into its jurisdiction, which finally occurred in 1972. Five parishes, which did not follow the Western Rite, with as many priests remained canonically true to the Church Abroad, located in Paris, Lyon, Dijon, Montpellier, and Vichy; until a decade ago, all of these parishes were still in the Church Abroad.³⁶

Another active Mission Church was established in Holland. It originated in Orthodox parish in the Hague, which belonged to Metropolitan Eulogius until 1945. After Metropolitan Eulogius broke with the Moscow Patriarchate in 1946, the parish remained with Moscow. In 1948, the Patriarchate elevated the parish to the status of a Dutch Mission, which at first developed most successfully. By 1952, four Dutch Orthodox parishes belonged to the Mission, which were directly subject to Moscow as “stavropeghial parishes.”³⁷ The parishes published a periodical, Herald of the Russian Orthodox Church in Holland (*Vestnik Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi v Gollandii*), which appeared on a regular basis from 1951 and reported mainly on missionary

work in the Netherlands. ³⁸ In 1953, a part of the Haugue parish broke with Moscow and joined the Church Abroad. Its direction was entrusted to Hieromonk Jacob (Akkersdijk), whom Archbishop John, then ruling bishop of the Western European Diocese, had ordained. Hieromonk Jacob was elevated to the rank of abbot in 1956, and Archimandrite in 1962; in 1965, he was consecrated Bishop of the Hague & the Netherlands. Moscow's Dutch Mission was subject to Bishop Dionysius (Lukin) of Rotterdam, who had not separated from the Patriarchate but had only a few faithful. The Russian Church Abroad's Mission developed an active missionary and Church life in subsequent years. In 1969, a monastery and convent joined the "Netherlands Orthodox Church" ("Nederlands Orthodoxe Kerk"). Both monastic communities were located in the same building, a former Catholic monastery in the Hague. Of the nuns, a few had first lived in the Lesna Convent in France and were immersed there in the monastic way of life before they were tonsured, nuns. Two nuns from Holland were trained in iconography by the iconographer Mother Flaviana; they later painted many icons for the Dutch parishes. This monastic community's financial situation was secure because the monastics pursued their learned professions. Only Bishop Jacob devoted himself exclusively to spiritual tasks. In 1971, there arose differences between the community and the Synod. The Dutch wanted to celebrate Pascha according to the New Calendar and not according to the Old Calendar. When the Synod did not comply with this request and wavered in answering, Bishop Jacob announced that he and his faithful had joined the Moscow Patriarchate. ³⁹

Their reception into the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate was all the more surprising in that the Patriarchate celebrates Pascha according to the Old Calendar and has, for the most part, rejected the calendar reform up to the present day. Moscow's preparedness to compromise can only be explained by the fact that the separation of this Mission from the Church Abroad represented a welcome weakening of the Church Abroad's position in the Netherlands, and Moscow, therefore, seized its opportunity.

Today, only nuns remain in the Dutch convent, while no monks are left in the monastery. The Patriarchate named Bishop Jacob Archbishop in 1979. ⁴⁰

Two other missions were established in 1972: a Spanish Mission under the direction of Jacob de Reval, now Archimandrite Hosius, and a Portuguese Mission under the direction of Manuel Fererda de Almada. ⁴¹

In many other countries, including Germany, Switzerland, England, and South America, there are today Orthodox groups which came to Orthodoxy through the Church Abroad. The majority of these faithful attend the divine services of the Church Abroad, where there are also parishes which have services in the local language. In Germany, after World War II, a German-speaking parish came into existence in Munich. Priest Paul Zacharias was rector of the community. He had come to Orthodoxy from the Roman Catholic Church. ⁴² In the 1950s, there were yearly meetings in the Saint Job of Pochaev Monastery in Munich. Archpriest Ambrose Backhaus and Hieromonk Zosima (Merz), both German, led these meetings. ⁴³

Two other forms of missionary activities of the Church Abroad developed in Eastern Europe during the time between the Wars and after the outbreak of World War II. In Slovakia, the Church Abroad strove to bring the Uniates back to Orthodoxy. The Saint Job Monastery in

Ladomirova was founded with the express purpose of conducting missionary work among the Uniates in eastern Slovakia. The brotherhood of the monastery supported the Mission of the Serbian Church, to whom the Orthodox there were subject. As already mentioned, the Saint Job Monastery nurtured zealous missionary activity by its publications. In addition, many priests and monks were educated there and were later sent forth to establish Orthodox parishes. The plan to prepare monks for a liberated Russia in a missionary school at the monastery was only partly realized, because the outbreak of the War in 1939 interrupted the project. Nevertheless, the monastery and its brotherhood served during the War to support the new parishes opened in German-occupied territories.

Despite its noteworthy missionary success, the Church Abroad has taken into its fold only those who were prepared to accept fully and unconditionally the dogmas, holy canons, and the Holy Tradition of the Orthodox Church. A union with the Jacobites would have been achievable if the Synod had made concessions. The Dutch Orthodox Church would not have left the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad had their request to introduce the New Paschalion been met. A collaboration with the Orthodox Ukrainians — especially in Canada — would have been possible if the Church Abroad had granted them an autonomous status and the right to use Ukrainian in divine services. However, the Church Abroad was always so closely bound to the practice and belief of the Orthodox Church of Russia, that to make concessions in these questions was a betrayal of Orthodoxy itself.

For the Church Abroad, the primary concern was the “children of the Russian Church.” The real missionary task in the eyes of the Church Abroad was the aforementioned internal mission. Archbishop Abercius once formulated this as follows:

We, the Orthodox Russian people, are today dispersed, just as Israel of old, amongst all nations of the earth. God has separated us, so that all people of the earth through us may be acquainted with the true Christian Faith — Holy Orthodoxy — and thus we remain Orthodox. Many expect and even demand of us that we proselytize among those who are not our people. This form of missionary activity, however, we avoid, preferring to strengthen ourselves through faith and thereby become models for the non-Orthodox. ⁴⁴

Footnotes

1. Cf. footnote no. 4 of the Introduction. ↵
2. Buevsky, pp. 28-34. ↵
3. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, p. 174. ↵
4. Idem., *Jerusalem*, pp. 151-152. ↵
5. Buevsky, pp. 29-31. ↵
6. Avercius, “Was wir noch verloren haben.” ↵
7. *Prav. Rus'* (1977) 6, pp. 15-16. ↵

8. Cf. Part V, Chap. 3. ↵
9. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 175, 183. ↵
10. *Ibid.*, p. 183. ↵
11. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1937) 2, p. 30. ↵
12. *Prav. Rus'* (1936) 19, p. 6. ↵
13. *Church News* (1939) 6, pp. 42-55. ↵
14. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, p. 187; *Prav. Rus'* (1935) 4, p. 4. ↵
15. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1933) 7, pp. 134-135. ↵
16. *Tserk. Ved.* (1925) 7-8, p. 15. ↵
17. Cf. on the history of the Korean Mission, Theodosius, *Missiya v Koree*; Perevalov, *Rossiiskaya Missiya*; Carusu, *Mission Orthodoxes; Russische Orthodoxe Kirche*, "Einrichtungen" pp. 163-164. ↵
18. *Tserk. Ved.* (1929) 13-24, p. 34; *Prav. Rus'* (1962) 7, p. 6; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, pp. 271, 281. ↵
19. This Church traces its existence back to Bishop Jacob (Cascula), who is supposed to have performed many miracles in the 4th century. The Monophysites recognized only the divine nature of Christ. This teaching was rejected by the Fourth Ecumenical Council, whereupon a part of the faithful went into schism. ↵
20. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 557; Andronnicus, *Vosemnadtsat' let.* ↵
21. Nathaniel, "Zapiski," pp. 34-37. ↵
22. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 562-563. ↵
23. *Ibid.*, p. 563. ↵
24. *Church News* (1937) "Prilozhenie," pp. 1-8. ↵
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-8. ↵
26. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) 4-5, pp. 72-74; *Prav. Rus'* (1936) 4, pp. 2-5; 5, pp. 3-5. ↵
27. Nathaniel, "Zapiski," pp. 34-37. ↵
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 34-37. ↵
29. *Prav. Rus'* (1938) 5, p. 3. ↵
30. *Ibid.* (1949) 23, p. 12; *Tserk Zhizn'* (1952) 3-4, pp. 78-79. ↵
31. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1956) 7-10, p. 73. ↵

32. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, pp. 1280-1281. ↵
33. Vitalis (Ustinov), “Bogosluzhebny yazyk,” p. 61. ↵
34. *Otchet 5-go s'ezda*, pp. 20, 27, 31; *Tserk Zhizn'* (1951) 4, pp. 3-4; *Prav. Rus'* (1951) 14, p. 13; (1953) 21, p. 12. ↵
35. The Romanian bishop, Theophilus, who was living in exile, took part in the consecration of Bishop John (Kovalevsky). Later he likewise joined the Bucharest-based Patriarchate. ↵
36. *Prav. Rus'* (1967) 2, p. 12; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1967) 1-2, pp.2-6; *ECR* (1970) pp.111-112; (1972) pp.79-80; *Vestnik Zapadno-Evropеiskoi Eparkhii* (1972) 3, p. 10. ↵
37. *JMP* (1951) 7, pp.16-17; (1952) 2, pp. 45-49; 9, pp. 21-22; (1954) 1, pp. 30-32; 5, p. 10. ↵
38. *Ibid.*, (1953) 8, pp. 26-27; 11, p. 61. ↵
39. “The Mission to the Netherlands” Synodal Archives File no. 1/65; *Vestnik Zapadno-Evropеiskoi Eparkhii* (1964) 4 (29): p. 113; (1969) 5-6, p. 19; (1965) 3, pp.15-16; 5, pp. 20-21; *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 8, pp. 15-16; (1955) 5, p. 15; (1965) 19, pp. 4-6; “Orthodoxe Rundschau’ (1969) 4, pp. 19-22; David (Hierodeacon) *Netherlands Church*, pp. 72-80. ↵
40. *StdO* (1970) 10, p. 3. ↵
41. *Vestnik Zapadno-Evropеiskoi Eparkhii* (1972) 3, pp. 11, 13. ↵
42. *Prav. Rus'* (1949) 24, p. 17; (1952) 9, p. 14. ↵
43. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in BRD*, pp. 174-176; *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 19, p. 8. ↵
44. *Ibid.*, p. 176. ↵

Part IV, Chapter 7

The Sacred Arts

In Russian art, the 18th century was a deep abyss. The forced opening of Russia to the West by Peter the Great brought Western artists to Russia. Italians, Germans, and French dominated the new Russian art in all areas: architecture, sculpture, music and other branches of art received new impulses from the West. In the place of the sober strict Russian style came the loose forms of Western European style with their individually stamped artistic forms of expression. Two great epochs of Russian art, Old and New Russian Art, can be historically separated from one another.

The elements of Old Russian Art have been increasingly lost since that time. These developments were not limited to the building style, though this was the most obvious change, but also included the realms of sculpture and painting, and even iconography, ecclesiastical chant, church architecture and the sacred arts in the broadest sense. Indeed, since then there have also been individual epochs of the New Russian Art such as Russian Rococo or Classicism (especially in the new residences in Petersburg), then the Russian Empire [style] of Alexander I, and historicism under Nicholas I, though these styles differ basically from those of Old Russian Art. To simplify this characterization, one could call Old Russian Art “anonymous” and the New Russian Art “personal.” Old Russian art was not bound to a particular artist, but rather bespoke a particular style (Novgorod, Kiev, Pskov, Vladimir-Suzdal or Moscow style) or, as in iconography, a particular school (e.g., Stroganov). Names such as the iconographer Theophanes the Greek [Feofan Grek] or Andrew Rublev (the end of the 15th century) are an exception. The general anonymity of the artists of this early period was explained by the “theology of iconography”, because icons may not be an expression of creative, artistic individuality, but rather a manifestation of the heavenly prototype “as not painted by hand.” An iconographer may not raise any personal artistic claim. The turn towards worldly motifs in the 17th and 18th centuries brought completely new styles in painting, which ultimately resulted in a change in iconography. The high point of this development was in the last decades of the 19th century when icons were mass-produced. Individual painters specialized in parts of the painting such as faces, head, garments, lettering, etc. A naturalistic, Italian-influenced style correspondingly encroached on iconography; this new style no longer had anything in common with the Old Russian iconography. Icons from this period can be found in any number of Russian churches in the West that were built in the 19th century as an embassy, memorial, and resort churches. Among these are the churches in Vienna, Bad Ems, Baden-Baden, Stuttgart, Wiesbaden, Weimar, Cannes, San Remo, Pau, and other cities. Most of these churches were built in the eccentric brickwork of Moscow’s Saint Basil Cathedral. The ornamentation of the iconostasis was with icons in the “Russian realistic style” of the time, with many accessories such as frames and columns. The Leipzig Church of Saint Alexis is an exception; it was built in 1912-13 in memory of the Nations, which was fought near Leipzig [in 1813]. With its lofty central tower, it is reminiscent of the Cathedral of the Ascension at Kolomenskoe. Its iconostasis consists of six rows of icons in the Old Russian style, and consciously follows the pre-Petrine tradition. With the slender figures of the saints, the soft colors, and the clear execution, these icons are

reminiscent of the Moscow School of Andrei Rublev, while the icons in the hero chapel are reminiscent of those of the Stroganov School.¹

One may differentiate between three types of churches and chapels founded by émigrés since 1918: (1) newly-built émigré churches in a Russian style, (2) churches which were rented or loaned from other Christian confessions, (3) makeshift or provisional churches. The simplest churches are the third type, which includes all churches set up in the camps and transit stations, where the refugees remained for a short while. They were mostly located in barracks and differed from the other barracks only by small onion domes and crosses set up on the roofs.

Inside, as circumstances allowed, an iconostasis was set up consisting of three tiers, but in most cases, only a few icons were put in the place of an iconostasis and the altar was separated from the nave by a curtain, which inhibited the celebration of the Liturgy to an extent. These barrack churches were torn down after a few years when the refugee camps were disbanded.² Similar makeshift chapels exist today where there are small parishes consisting of only a few families. These chapels are set up in dwellings or in side chapels of larger churches rented by émigrés from other confessions. This type of church can be found most frequently in Germany and Austria, after a larger parish had been diminished by emigration and aging.³

The second type of church is more frequent. These are parishes that have their own church building for divine services; the interior arrangement meets the needs of Orthodox worship. The faithful organized their congregations within churches and chapels of other confessions, who allowed the émigrés to use their buildings. This demonstrates that the other Christian denominations, despite official ecclesiastical policies, have maintained fraternal contacts with the Church Abroad on the local level. This type of church can be found in all dioceses of the Church Abroad and is especially prevalent in North America, where, on account of the general secularization, many churches stand empty or cannot be maintained by the communities. The churches were — as far as the monument and land protection would allow — outwardly “russified,” which included adorning them with three-bar Russian crosses and small onion domes or frescos over the entrance. Typical examples of this are the Cathedral of the Exaltation of the Cross in the Bronx (New York), the Church of the Annunciation [in Flushing,] (New York), the Saint Vladimir Cathedral in Edmonton, the Holy Protection Cathedral in Bamberg, the former Dormition Cathedral in London, the Church of the Lesna Icon of the Mother of God in Provement (France), Saint Nicholas Church in Lyon, or the Holy Protection Cathedral in Melbourne, just to list a few examples.⁴

Whereas the exterior of these churches was permitted to be changed only slightly, the interior was tailored to the needs of the Orthodox liturgy. The sanctuary is separated from the nave by an iconostasis, which, according to the financial ability of the parish, is often adorned with numerous rows of icons. There are adjacent shrines, with icons of the feasts, and candle stands, candelabras, banners, and processional crosses. The interior of these churches differs only in architectural form from other Russian churches (i.e., a longitudinal nave instead of the Byzantine cruciform).

The number of parishes that have built their own churches since World War II might be around 100-120. These were the numerically larger parishes, with 500-2,000 faithful, which were able to raise the money to purchase the plots of land upon which the churches and parish centers could be built. Added to these are yet another few dozen parishes in Eastern Europe and, above all else, in China and Manchuria, which were all lost after 1945-49. In China, most of these churches were leveled during the Cultural Revolution or turned into beer halls, clubs, and movie theatres.⁵ The willingness of the faithful that made the building of these churches possible is probably the clearest demonstration that the mass of émigrés was themselves without means and had only a modest income. Many of these churches were built using subsidies from the government and ecclesiastical institutions of the host country. A few random examples will show what enormous financial burdens are connected with the building of churches and the upkeep of existing churches. For the upkeep of churches and monasteries in the Holy Land in 1968, the following funds were expended: for renovation of the bell tower on the Mount of Olives, \$10,000; for the restoration of the foundation and brickwork of the monastery church, \$60,000; for the roof and the cupola of the church in Gethsemane, \$39,000; for the remaining buildings and land, \$60,000.⁶ For the building of the memorial church in Brussels, which took place from 1938-65, \$189,000 was paid during 1948-62. For the construction of the Saint Procopius Cathedral in Hamburg, \$115,000; and for the renovation of Holy Trinity Cathedral in Jordanville in 1960, \$40,000 was spent. The financial burdens were especially high in the United States, Canada, South America, and Australia, because the majority of the parishes were founded thereafter in 1945. This also applies to the convents, monasteries, and sketes in those places. Holy Trinity Cathedral in Jordanville was expanded more than once: the main building, Holy Trinity Cathedral, the seminary building, the adjacent farm buildings, and the bell tower, as well as the monastery land — it originally had over 300 acres and today has 1,000 — were expanded by the purchase of more land and further construction. Likewise, there were also expansions, additions, and extensions at the Convent of the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God in San Francisco, and at Novo-Diveevo Convent near New York, where, in 1980, a home for the elderly, housing 100 people, was constructed.

The most significant and extensive building between the Wars took place in Harbin, with its churches and adjacent buildings.⁷ Another extensive building complex was the Convent in Bethany, with its own school, boarding house, and clinic. Among the larger building complexes were the Lodomirova Saint Job Monastery, the Tsar-Martyr Memorial Church in Brussels, the Cathedral of the Resurrection in Berlin (since 1945 under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate) and the Saint Vladimir Memorial Church in Jackson, New Jersey. These are followed by several dozen smaller churches, many of which lie today in Eastern Europe, China, and Manchuria. In Manchuria alone, the émigrés built 48 churches from 1920 to 1945, 27 of which were built from 1930 to 1945, including the Church of the Annunciation in Harbin, which accommodated 2,000 faithful.⁸

The majority of these churches were built in an Old Russian style. The size of the churches varies widely, but on average they accommodate 300-500 faithful. There are also churches in San Francisco or Los Angeles which can accommodate 1,000 or more worshippers.

The North Russian style with its clear composition definitely predominates among the new buildings. This strict form was only broken by an entranceway and a belfry, which were built in the Pskov style. Mostly of white stone, they are only broken by narrow arched windows. The roof is crowned by a massive central cupola, which is often surrounded by four smaller gilt onion domes. With its deep blue dark green or gilt onion domes and the gilt three-barred Russian crosses on the tiered structure, these churches and chapels achieve a majestic appearance. A high point of the newer construction work was reached in 1959-62. In barely three years, over twenty new churches were consecrated. Typical examples of such churches built in the Old Russian style are the following cathedrals and churches: the All Saints Church in Burlingame, Saint Vladimir's in Jackson, Saint Seraphim of Sarov's in Sea Cliff, the Joy of All Who Sorrow Cathedral in San Francisco, the Resurrection Cathedral in Berlin, Saint Nicholas Church in Frankfurt, Saint Procopius in Hamburg, the Tsar-Martyr Memorial Church in Brussels, Dormition Church in the cemetery at Jordanville, Saint Nicholas Cathedrals in Caracas and Sao Paulo, the Church of the Resurrection in Tunis, and Saint Alexis Church in Bizerta. All these churches — except for the Berlin and Brussels churches — have been built since 1950.² The walls and ceilings of a few of these churches were frescoed, e.g., Holy Trinity Cathedral and Dormition Church in Jordanville, Saint Procopius Cathedral in Hamburg, Saint Nicholas Cathedral in Caracas, and Saint Vladimir Memorial Church in Jackson.

Aside from these churches in typical Russian style, one can find a series of churches, above all in North America and Australia, which betray the influence of occidental churches. The hallmarks of this style are the longitudinal nave with a pointed roof and high belfries, crowned by small onion domes. The building activities of these parishes have not come to an end. Parishes which hitherto have had only makeshift churches are planning new buildings and community centers.

Icons, reliquaries, church utensils, altar cloths, and church banners, which are for veneration and adornment in the churches, have either come from Russia or are for the most part produced by the émigrés. The wonderworking and highly revered Kursk Icon of the Mother of God (at Synod), the Lesna Icon of the Mother of God (in France), Saint Seraphim's Icon (in the Novo-Diveevo Convent), and the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God (in the convent in San Francisco) are all from Russia and are objects of particular veneration within the Russian Church. Refugee priests, monks, nuns, and faithful also brought many hundreds of old icons with them on their flight from Russia.

In several churches, especially successful iconostases were set up out of old and new Russian icons. For example, Saint Sergius of Radonezh Church at Synod has an iconostasis, the Royal Doors of which come from an old village church in Russia. Other of its icons were painted by the renowned iconographer, D. Alexandrov, in the same style so that the ensemble gives the appearance as if all the icons had been brought in their entirety from Russia.¹⁰ A similar symbiosis of old and new icons can be found in the Church of the Resurrection in Toronto. Part of the icons were painted in the Zhirovitsy Dormition Convent¹¹ and brought by refugees to the West. These icons were supplemented by a new iconostasis.¹² Similar examples abound. Icons and relics brought by émigrés from the Russian monasteries on Athos, the Holy Land, and the monasteries on Valaam and Konevets and given to the churches enjoy particular veneration.

Among the icons which today are preserved in the churches and monasteries are those which have had miracles recorded during the emigration. In the Vladimir Icon Convent in San Francisco, there are two icons, which have renewed themselves several times since the 1920s. ¹³ A similar miracle took place with an icon of Saint Seraphim of Sarov, which is now venerated at the Convent in Spring Valley, NY. In 1944-45, this icon was in the Resurrection Cathedral in Berlin. During the bombings, the church was severely damaged. Some of the falling debris landed upon the icon, yet it suffered no damage. During a second bombing a fire broke out; this icon alone remained untouched this time also.

The monasteries on Mount Athos, which in the time between the Wars were dependent on the financial support of the emigration, offered icons from their own workshops. They also donated icons and particles of relics to many churches founded by the émigrés. ¹⁴

But the donations supplied only a small part of the icons needed for the émigrés' new churches. The majority of icons, church utensils, candle stands, ecclesiastical fabrics, processional crosses, and church banners were produced by the émigrés themselves or by ordering from specialists. The latter included primarily all metalwork such as crosses, icon lamps, candle stands and bells, which had to be made in special workshops. Icons, church fabrics, clerical vestments, ornamentation, mitres, and smaller metal objects on the other hand were and are still produced in their own workshops. This work took place for the most part in the monasteries of the Church Abroad.

Laymen also painted icons and frescoes in the churches. N.N. Papkov painted the convent church in Novo-Diveevo. ¹⁵ Baron N. B. Meyendorff painted the Saint Procopius Cathedral, and George Palmer, an Orthodox Englishman, painted the iconostasis of the London Convent. In Canada, the renowned iconographer S. Shelekhov, whose icons succeeded in attaining an unprecedented intensity and radiance, and of which it has been said that they "glance at and penetrate those who behold them," painted for many years.

Fresco painting, with which many churches are adorned, is especially time-consuming and difficult. The painting is done on plaster which is still moist, so that the colors can sink in. This gives them durability. Especially beautiful examples of this fresco painting are found in Holy Trinity Cathedral and Dormition (cemetery) Church in Jordanville, and also in many parish churches such as in San Francisco, Hamburg, and Caracas.

The most important and famous icon workshops are always located in the monasteries. In the Ladomirova Monastery, two iconographer-monks Fathers Cyprian and Gregory (Pyzhov) worked with each other during the 1930s. Laymen were able to place orders at the monastery. The monks kept the prices very low even for that time; today they seem almost incomprehensibly low. For sizes up to 10 cm — \$1.50; from 11-15 cm — \$2.00; from 16-20 cm — \$3.50; from 21-25 cm — \$5.50, and for 31-35 cm — \$10.00! For icons with a gold background and ornamental decorations, there was an additional 25% charge; for festal icons and icons with several saints, an additional 40% charge. The monastery guaranteed the artistic and precise execution of the work. ¹⁶

Both monks had studied painting in Paris and had later worked for a few years as caricaturists for newspapers before they decided to enter the monastery. Whereas Father Gregory died early, Father Cyprian resettled in the West together with the Brotherhood in 1944, where he finally reestablished his workshop in Jordanville's Holy Trinity Monastery. In the course of his creative work, Father Cyprian has, outside an innumerable number of individual icons, also painted the iconostases and walls of numerous churches. One of his most famous works is his copy of Rublev's Icon of the Holy Trinity, which is found in the gable of the guest house on the veranda of the New Kursk Hermitage in Mahopac. Whereas this fresco is a copy, he has also painted many original icons, which have had great significance for the Church Abroad; copies of these icons hang in many churches of the Church Abroad and of other Russian and Greek jurisdictions. Included among these are the icons of the newly-glorified saints: Saint John of Kronstadt, Saint Xenia of Petersburg, Saint Herman of Alaska, and the Russian New Martyrs and Confessors of the Faith. One of the most famous icons, which can be found in numerous churches, is the Icon of All Saints of Russia.

The original of this icon hangs in the Synodal Cathedral in New York. The icon is designed as a triptych. The middle part measures 400 x 250 cm. In the middle section of this icon are the saints of the Russian Church, who are organized in groups and represent certain regions of Russia, for example, the saints of the Kiev Caves Monastery, the saints of northern Russia, and so on. On the left section of the triptych is the representation of the Baptism of Russia. On the right section are the martyrs and confessors of the latest Russian history who had not yet been canonized: believers, monks, nuns, priests, bishops, who were the victims of the Soviet persecution of the Church. Many confessors are named, including the Imperial Family, Patriarch Tikhon, Peter and Cyril, the locum tenentes of the Patriarch, Metropolitans Vladimir and Benjamin (of Kiev and Petrograd), and many others. This part of the icon can serve as a design for future canonizations. This part of the triptych took on a special significance when the Council of Bishops canonized the New Martyrs in October [November] 1981.¹⁷

The most extensive works of Father Cyprian were the painting in the churches of the Jordanville Monastery, the iconostasis of the Synodal Cathedral in New York, and the Saint Vladimir Memorial Church. The monk Alypius (now Archbishop of Chicago), who was trained to be an iconographer, helped with this work. He also has painted many icons. Both monks received a gold cross for their work at the New York Synodal Cathedral.¹⁸

The Church Abroad has always given iconography great attention.¹⁹ In San Francisco, in the early 1970s, the "Russian Orthodox Icon Society" was founded to help promote understanding of the artistic and theological significance of icons through exhibitions and reproductions. Many collectors' passion for antique art has led to the theft of precious icons from numerous Russian churches in recent decades. Some of these icons have been recovered, but the loss of the rest is particularly painful for the faithful because icons are sacred objects, not mere objects d'art.

Church fabrics, such as altar cloths, priests' vestments, church banners — which are renowned for their exquisite and artistic stitchery — were produced by the convents, which almost all had workshops. In the Holy Land, there are also workshops for the production of priests' and bishops' mitres, crosses, and fine metalwork. Some convents and monasteries have candle

works. Incense is produced at the Saint Edward Brotherhood in England, the Saint Job of Pochaev Monastery in Munich, Holy Trinity Monastery, NY, Holy Cross Hermitage near St. Louis, Missouri, and elsewhere.

Special care has been given to ecclesiastical choral music.²⁰ In the Orthodox Church, hardly any services are performed without chanting. Spoken liturgies or vespers are unknown. Even when divine services served in private homes, e.g., the Office of Thanksgiving (Moleben), they are chanted, either by the priest alone or together with an acolyte. Liturgical chant is an integral part of divine services. “The old Russians denoted the divine services simply as ‘chant’. ‘To go a-chanting’ means the same thing as ‘to attend the divine services.’”²¹ In contrast to Western Christianity, the use of musical instruments in Orthodox churches is forbidden. “Instrumental music was used by the pagans in their cult ceremonies. Christians, on the other hand, praise God not with lifeless instruments, but rather with their noblest instrument — the human voice... The bearer of the divine service is the Word.”²² Thus, the Orthodox service is dependent upon the support of choirs, and every parish or community has a church choir. The choirs vary in size and quality from small groups consisting of two or three people, to choirs with more than twenty people. On account of their high artistic level, many of these choirs have given public concerts and introductions to Russian Church music.

In the time between the Wars, the community in Harbin established its own music courses, which I. A. Kolchin directed. Kolchin had studied choral music at Kazan’ University and the Moscow School of Music, and later established choirs in Harbin, Shanghai, San Francisco, and New York. The courses which he instituted educated numerous singers and choir directors.²³

A second center of Russian Church music was located in Belgrade. There, Archbishop Gabriel of Chelyabinsk founded a large choir, to which A. F. Sinkevich (later Archbishop Anthony of Los Angeles) and Ivan von Gardner belonged. Archbishop Gabriel was especially concerned with old Russian ecclesiastical chant, and which included both the tradition of the Moscow Synodal choir and that of the Kiev Caves Monastery. While active, he collected, composed and harmonized numerous examples of old chants. More than thirty compositions have come down from him, which today form part of the Church Abroad’s chant depository.²⁴

There are famous choirs today in the larger parishes and cathedrals. The largest choir, which at one time had over thirty people, is at the Synodal Cathedral in New York. A. Kolchin founded the choir. From 1952 to 1975, Boris Ledkovsky conducted it. He had begun his education at the Theological Seminary in Novocherkassk and had later continued it with Professor M. Ippolitov-Ivanov in Moscow. Ledkovsky was likewise a representative of the turn of the century school of Russian choral music centered in Moscow. In contrast to most other church choirs, the Synodal choir includes paid singers. In the course of its existence, it has given many concerts, taken tours abroad, and produced recordings.²⁵ His son, Alexander Ledkovsky, now conducts this choir.

Another important choir that has also made many recordings is the Jordanville Seminary Choir, which together with the brotherhood consists of over twenty men. Above all else, the melodies of Russian monastic chant are its concern. In Europe, there is a large choir at the Geneva cathedral. It has been under the direction of V. Dyakov since 1937. The choir consists of about twelve to

twenty people, including several Swiss. In his characterization of the record made by the choir (“Chœur de l’église Orthodoxe Russe de Genève” Prod. BVM st. 2191), I. Gardner, who was by far the most noted expert in the field of Russian Church music, wrote: “The choir is excellent, sings liturgically and without exaggerated effects. The type of choir, a parish church choir with high artistic aspirations and performances, is in the style and spirit of the Petersburg school at the turn of the century. It is the best Russian church choir in Western Europe.”²⁶

A particularly interesting example of the performances of Russian Church music is a memorial recording that includes the funeral service for the slain Imperial Family, which was made in 1968 at the Tsar-Martyr Memorial Church; the service was celebrated by Archbishops Nikon of Washington & Florida, Anthony of Geneva & Western Europe, and Bishops Paul of Stuttgart & Southern Germany and Nathaniel of Vienna. Archpriest V. Ostoich directed the choir and assembled singers from choirs in Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, and Germany. This burial service recognized the fact that the bodies of the Imperial Family had not received a Christian burial, and, based on this premise, a burial service was held in the absence of the bodies of the dead. The divine service was recorded.²⁷

Russian émigré choirs have produced several hundred recordings. This number includes the records of the Church Abroad, the Paris Jurisdiction — the choir of the Cathedral in rue Daru was considered to be the best choir in the emigration — and the OCA. Patriarchal parishes in the West have also produced a few recordings. Indeed, these recordings represent only a small portion of the choirs that exist, though they only hint at the artistic performances that lie hidden behind them.

Footnotes

1. Turchin, *Khram pamyatnik*; Thürmer, *St. Alexij in Leipzig*. ↵
2. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1, pp. 616, 623; 2:903, 1020, 1033. ↵
3. *Ibid.*, 1, pp. 616, 623; 2, pp. 907,915, 930, 947,1094, 1150, 1278. ↵
4. *Ibid.*, 1, pp. 520, 547; 2, pp. 820, 905, 1039. ↵
5. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, pp. 191-2; *Prav. Rus'* (1964) 9, 13. According to the most recent press releases, renovations were begun in 1980 on an Orthodox Church in Harbin, which is supposed to be returned to the faithful for divine services, cf. *Spiegel* (1981) 18, pp. 166, 170. ↵
6. *Prav. Rus'* (1969) 7, pp. 11-12; *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 2, p. 899. ↵
7. *Ibid.*, 1, pp. 219-239. ↵
8. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China*, p. 184. ↵
9. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1, pp. 42, 507, 597, 618, 664-665; 2, pp. 888-893, 1155, 1216, 1248, 1294, 1997. ↵
10. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1958) 7-12, p. 121; (1959) 8-10, pp. 143-144. ↵

11. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*, p. 14. ↵
12. *Prav. Rus'* (1979) 21, p. 4. ↵
13. *Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1, pp. 689-694. ↵
14. *Pravoslavny russky kalendar'* (1934-1939). In the calendars, each entry provides information on the monasteries of Mt. Athos. ↵
15. St. Seraphim's Church. ↵
16. *Russky narodny kalendar' na 1941*. ↵
17. The icons had been in the Cathedral of the Ascension in the Bronx and were transferred to the Synodal Cathedral when the former was closed. (*Russ. Prav. Ts.* 1, pp. 526-527.). A detailed description of the icon can be found in Andreev's "Ikona vsekh svyatykh"; in Seide, "Abriss" (p. 40), there is a description of the icon of the Russian New Martyrs and Confessors. ↵
18. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1959) 5-6, pp. 65-66. ↵
19. Vitalis, "Ob ikonografii"; Cyprian, "Nashi zadachi." ↵
20. *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1959) 11-12, pp. 212-214. Also see the works of Gardner. ↵
21. Gardner, *System und Wesen*, p. 39. ↵
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38. ↵
23. "Church News" (1932) 5, pp.33-34; 8, pp. 78-80. ↵
24. *Tserk Zhizn'* (1934) 4, pp. 63-65. ↵
25. Gardner, "Diskographie" in *Ostkirchliche Studien* (1966) pp. 164-166. ↵
26. *Idem.*, in *Ostkirchliche Studien* (1968) pp. 179-181. ↵
27. *Idem.* (1970) p. 201. ↵

PART V

The Relations between the Church Abroad & Other Christian Churches

Chapter 1

The Relationship to the Moscow Patriarchate

The relationship between the Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate has already been examined from various angles. In this section, a comprehensive summary of the mutual relationship and the stances of both sides will follow.

In the relationship, one must differentiate three periods. The first period comprises the years from the establishment of the Church Abroad to 1927. The second period begins in 1927, with the estrangement of the two Churches, and lasts until 1945. The third period begins in 1945 and lasts until the present day.

During the years 1920-27, both churches maintained normal relations with one another. The Church Abroad considered the Patriarch its head and was concerned, in accordance with his directives, with building up church life in the emigration. The directives of the Patriarch and the Holy Synod concerning the church life of the émigrés were canonically binding and were implemented. The Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration (SEA) and the Synod of Bishops took care to obtain the Patriarch's and the Holy Synod's confirmation of their directives and decrees, e.g., in the case of the appointment of bishops and the transfer of dioceses. Thus, the SEA's appointment of Archbishop Eulogius as ruling bishop of the West European communities subsequently received confirmation from the Patriarch. The Patriarch allowed the émigré bishops to arrange the elevation of the vicariate of Alaska to an independent diocese and the election of its own candidates for this office. Metropolitan Platon received his appointment as head of the North American communities — just as had Eulogius — first from the SEA; this was later followed by the Patriarch's confirmation. This appointment was later confirmed by the Patriarch in a letter to the Synod of Bishops.¹

The Patriarch's decree of 7/20 November 1920 formed the basis for these decisions; it served to legitimize the Church Abroad's reason to exist.² The Patriarch and the Holy Synod had indubitably recognized the existence of the SEA because more than once it had official contacts with this governing body in connection with the regulation of ecclesiastical problems facing the émigrés' life. Also, they had given the SEA the right to a far-reaching independent administration of the émigré communities, including the appointment of bishops and the creation of dioceses, which they either allowed the SEA to do on its own or later confirmed. No instance is known in which the Patriarch and Holy Synod overruled a decision of the SEA or declared it invalid.

In May 1922 (22 April/5 May) Patriarch Tikhon, by Decree No. 348, dissolved the SEA and named Metropolitan Eulogius head of the Russian Orthodox Church outside Russia (ROCOR). The SEA acted in accordance with this decree and dissolved itself in August of 1922.³ In its place, the Provisional Holy Synod of Bishops of the ROCOR came into existence. Members of this Synod of Bishops were Metropolitans Anthony and Eulogius, Archbishop Theophanes, and

Bishops Gabriel and Hermogenes.⁴ At the Council of Bishops, which met from 18-31 May 1923, the Provisional Synod of Bishops was changed into a permanent Synod of Bishops, and the Council of Bishops was established as the supreme ecclesiastical authority of the Church Abroad.

In September of 1923, Patriarch Tikhon sent a letter to the Synod of Bishops confirming the appointment of Metropolitan Platon as head of the North American communities and simultaneously appointing [the widowed] Archpriest T. Pashkovsky as Bishop of Chicago.⁵

The fact that at this point in time the Patriarch addressed the Synod of Bishops says that he viewed this governing body as legal and competent as the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration of the émigré communities. The accusation that the Patriarch had written his Decree No. 348 of 1922 under duress from the Soviet government, as Metropolitan Eulogius had written in his letter to Metropolitan Anthony,⁶ was thereby supported. The existence of the Synod of Bishops thereby received direct confirmation from the Patriarch; otherwise, he would have ignored the Synod of Bishops in Karlovtsy and addressed Metropolitans Eulogius or Platon directly.

In 1926, the Synod of Bishops addressed Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky), who as deputy to the Patriarchal locum tenens had assumed the duties of that office, and implored him to intercede between the disputing hierarchs of the emigration. Sergius answered the bishops in a friendly and conciliatory tone, but declined to intercede, citing ignorance of the real situation. In this letter, he spoke of the “Synod” and the “Synod of Bishops”, and advised the “Supreme Administration” to regulate the matters in dispute. In the event that this might not be possible, he proposed that they submit to the local Orthodox Churches.⁷

This letter simultaneously ended the first phase of these mutual relations. Metropolitan Sergius had not only recognized the Synod but also instructed them to create a “supreme administrative body.” This had already been in existence since 1923.

These first years of mutual relations were distinguished by the fact that the Patriarch and the Holy Synod had given the émigré bishops a far-reaching autonomous administration of émigré communities and, as far as possible, confirmed the measures taken by the SEA and the Synod of Bishops. The relationship was overshadowed when the émigré bishops published a series of open letters on the persecution of the Faith in the Soviet Union and appealed to the Free World to deny the Soviet government diplomatic recognition. The Communists used these open letters⁸ to accuse the Patriarch and the Holy Synod of anti-Soviet propaganda and collaboration with forces abroad hostile to the Soviet Union, and to work against the Church leadership in Russia.

In the event of his death, Patriarch Tikhon had named three metropolitans as his locum tenens: Metropolitans Cyril, Agathangelus, and Peter. Due to the political circumstances, of these only Metropolitan Peter was in the position to take over the Patriarchal Chancery.

Everyone recognized him as Patriarchal Locum Tenens. He [Metropolitan Peter] also appointed three deputies in the event of his arrest or death: Metropolitans Sergius and Michael and Archbishop Joseph. He also ordered that “the commemoration of my name as Patriarchal locum tenens remains obligatory.” The Church Abroad recognized him in October of 1925 as head of

the Church of Russia and commemorated him as such in the divine services until his death in 1936.

In July of 1927, Metropolitan Sergius published his fateful declaration, in which he demanded of the bishops, priests and faithful, both at home and abroad, total loyalty to the Soviet government. In the event of refusal, he threatened the émigré clergy with exclusion from the clergy of the Patriarchal Church.

The Declaration and its consequences are known and have been discussed in an earlier chapter. At the Council of Bishops in 1928, the émigré bishops severed relations with the Church leadership in Moscow, because the maintenance of normal relations with the “canonical Church authority” was no longer possible.⁹ The canonical Church authority, according to the Church Abroad’s Synod, was the Patriarchal *Locum Tenens* Metropolitan Peter, not, however, his deputy, Metropolitan Sergius.

In this correspondence, there are a number of principles, the validity of which remains unchanged to the present day. On the basis of the Patriarch’s Decree of 1 November 1920, [Trans., Decree 362], the Church Abroad will be responsible for its own administration in accordance with the sacred canons and the decisions of the Pan-Russia Council of 1917/18, until normal relations with the Mother Church can be restored. The Church outside the boundaries of Russia is a branch of the great Church of Russia and is inseparably bound to it spiritually.

Metropolitan Sergius’s possible exclusion of the Church Abroad’s clergy from the Patriarchate must be viewed as an uncanonical act, devoid of validity. Metropolitan Sergius replied to this correspondence by excluding the émigré clerics from the clergy of the Patriarchate.

The estrangement of 1927 led to the second phase in the relations between the Church Abroad and the Patriarchate. This lasted until 1945. It is marked by the permanent weakening of the Patriarchal Church by the Soviet regime and the Communist Party, by the almost complete destruction of Church life in the homeland, and by a simultaneous consolidation of the Church Abroad, which, on the eve of World War II, represented almost 90% of the church emigration.

At this point in time, it was completely impossible for the Patriarchate to maintain relations with other Christian Churches. The few Patriarchal parishes in the West — about a dozen in Western Europe and North America — were totally isolated. All Orthodox and non-Orthodox Churches recognized the Church Abroad as the legitimate émigré Church and conducted official Church relations with it.¹⁰ At conferences and interconfessional discussions, the Church Abroad was the spokesman of the Russian Church and was accepted as such. The church leadership in Moscow was rejected as uncanonical because it could not trace its authority back to Patriarch Tikhon, and the rights of its office were overshadowed by the fact that the legal head, Metropolitan Peter, was still alive.

The third phase begins in 1945 with the new Soviet policy towards the Church, which had been in effect since 1943. This phase basically differs from the second because the Patriarchal Church was permitted by the authorities to become active outside the sphere of Soviet influence. In this third phase, the Patriarchal Church succeeded for the most part in isolating the Church Abroad

within the Christian World and excluding it from fellowship in prayer with the other national Orthodox Churches. On the other hand, the Patriarchal Church has been unable up to the present time to officially drive the Church Abroad out of the Orthodox World. The situation is distinguished by the fact that most Orthodox churches — of the 14 autocephalous churches, seven are located in Communist countries ¹¹ — let their official relations with the Church Abroad lapse. The second characteristic of this era is the Patriarchate's attempt to weaken the Church Abroad by the building up of their own communities. If one excludes Eastern Europe, China, and Israel, where the Church Abroad lost their entire property and their parishes, the Patriarchal Church never succeeded in making greater inroads. The building up of their own communities led rather to an additional burden and a poisoning of the relationship between the two Churches. When individual clergy of the Church Abroad has joined the Patriarchal Church, usually the loss of church property followed, leading to lengthy trials for both churches.

Both phases since 1927 have in common the fact that the Church Abroad has untiringly reported on the persecution of the Church and the faithful in the Soviet Union and has accused the Church leadership, not only of silence but also, by their denials of any form of oppression, of indirectly facilitating the government's oppressive measures.

The official stances of the representatives of the Church Abroad and the Patriarchal Church today on the relationship between the two Churches may be summarized as follows. The Church Abroad's position was represented in the past by Archpriests M. Polsky and G. Grabbe and, until 1945, also by S. Troitsky. The Patriarchate's standpoint was represented after 1945 by Professor S. Troitsky and Archpriest A. Schmemmann. Professor Troitsky did not succeed in leaving Eastern Europe in time and was forced to return to the Soviet Union, where he never distanced himself from his earlier works, but simply wrote the opposite. In his work *The Truth about the Russian Church (Pravda o Russkoi Tserkvi)*, Archpriest Grabbe rebutted Troitsky's works in detail with. ¹²

The representatives of the Church Abroad — above all Polsky and Grabbe — accused the Church leadership in Moscow of treading an uncanonical path since 1927. According to their interpretation, Metropolitan Sergius had no right to publish his Declaration of 1927 because he was only the deputy of Metropolitan Peter, the rightful head of the Church. Sergius could not speak and act in the name of the Russian Church. He did not have the authority. His Declaration was purely a personal epistle that was issued without the consent of the head of the Church, of the Holy Synod, or of the ruling bishops. The Declaration, therefore, is of no canonical significance. Metropolitan Sergius's directive of 27 December 1936, that he be commemorated in the divine services, was published without announcing the death of Metropolitan Peter, who had until then been commemorated also in the Patriarchal Church. This was a usurpation of the patriarchal throne. Sergius appointed himself the Patriarchal Locum Tenens. This step was also offensive because, at this point in time, Metropolitan Cyril, whom Patriarch Tikhon had appointed as Patriarchal Locum Tenens, was still alive. The 1930 ecclesiastical trial of Metropolitan Cyril was invalid. During the elections of the patriarchs in 1943, 1945 and 1971, the Patriarchal Church most crudely violated the decisions of the Pan-Russia Council of 1917/18 concerning the ballot for the election a patriarch, because no secret ballot took place. At all three

elections, there was only one candidate, who was “elected” by oral vote. The then Metropolitan Alexis (Shimansky), later Patriarch, verbally expressed himself on these decisions, saying, “I mean that the election of the patriarch, with all the details which usually accompany it, seems to be superfluous for us. I think that none of us bishops can have any other candidate in mind... We already have a definite candidate for the Patriarchal office, and the only one.”¹³ Thereafter, there was general jubilation, which was recorded as consent, and the election ended. Moreover, this election was condemned as completely uncanonical because only 18 bishops participated in it, while another 100 bishops were hindered from exercising their office. Therefore, Patriarch Sergius only had the consent of a minority of the bishops.

Patriarch Sergius died soon after assuming office in 1944. Metropolitan Alexis took over the Church in November of 1944 and convened a Council of Bishops, which worked out a new Church order and was supposed to name a successor for the office of patriarch. This Small Council altered the decisions of the Great Council of 1917/18. The representatives of the Church Abroad did not accept this, because only the full assembly of the Church (including all bishops, representatives of the clergy and laity) could have legitimized it. Concurring later with this understanding of the situation was also a group of bishops of the Patriarchal Church, who were under the leadership of Archbishop Hermogenes (Golubev). Thus, the decisions of the Council of 1944 regarding the election of the patriarch are invalid.

On the same basis, the elections of 1945 and 1971 were condemned as uncanonical, because, again, no secret balloting had taken place. The authors contend that the candidates for the highest office in the Church had already received the consent of the government before the election. The Councils of 1945 and 1971 had passively consented to that which had been determined for them from above.

There is little to refute these arguments. Balloting for the Patriarch conforms to what was also the rule for general elections in the Soviet Union until very recently. “It is readily understandable that the Soviet government can never grant democratic structure and form to the Church, as they were also forbidden to the citizens,” N. Struve writes about the Council of 1945.¹⁴

In addition to these canonical arguments, the Church Abroad accuses the administration of the Patriarchate of having completely subordinated itself to the Soviet regime since Metropolitan Sergius’s Declaration of 1927, and of intensifying this submission through subsequent declarations. Through their actions, the leadership of the Patriarchal Church forced a large part of the clergy and laity to reject them. This rejection went so far, that a portion of the clergy and their faithful separated from the official Patriarchal Church and went underground, where a Catacomb Church existed. This Catacomb Church is the true representative of the Church of Russia in the homeland and the Sister Church of the Church Abroad. The supreme Church leadership and the hierarchs of the Patriarchal Church have tread a path of falsehood and are prepared to cover up and support the lies spread by the Communists about the situation of the Church and the faithful.

An especially crass example of these falsehoods, as represented by the Patriarchal Church, is the book *The Truth about Religion in Russia* (German ed: Zürich, 1944) by Patriarch Sergius. “It is

amazing,” writes Father Chrysostomus, “that Metropolitan Sergius not only openly touches upon the delicate theme of the ostensible freedom of the Church of Russia, but rather makes this the focal point of his explanation, and dares to make it the main theme of the entire book. It was, of course, clear to him that every believing reader in Russia knew precisely what he was presenting a bare-faced lie; of course, it must also have pained him greatly... When he (Sergius) for example, as mentioned above, cited two examples from the émigré press, whose information on persecuted people ostensibly did not agree, he must have known precisely that, alongside these unsubstantiated events, hundreds of proven cases of terrible persecution of Orthodox hierarchs were published by the church emigration, which were truthful and which he did not, however, mention at all... Metropolitan Benjamin of Petrograd (St. Petersburg) received his death at the hands of an executioner... Metropolitan Vladimir of Kiev was brutally murdered... Bishop Hermogenes of Tobolsk was tied to the paddles of a moving steamboat; Archbishop Andronicus of Perm was buried alive. Bishop Platon of Reval was turned into an ice column, having had water poured over him while exposed to subfreezing temperatures. Bishop Theophanes of Solikamsk was thrown alive into a hole in the ice. Bishop Isidore was impaled as a martyr. Bishop Ambrose was bound to the tail of a galloping horse and thus perished...

Metropolitan Sergius passed over all these facts in silence. If one considers that here only the officially announced deaths of bishops are counted and that the number who died in prisons and concentration camps multiply this number many times over, it remains incomprehensible to the believing reader how Metropolitan Sergius can, with an almost painful flourish, dismiss the reports of the murder of bishops as if they were merely the fruit of unbridled fantasy.”¹⁵

Yet the Church Abroad does not accuse the Patriarchal Church of only the denial of such severe persecution in the past but also accuses them of complete submission to the aims and policies of the atheist regime. To quote just a few examples: in an interview, Archbishop Pitirim (Nechaev) maintained that “the Orthodox Church in Russia does not concern itself with the religious instruction of minors because that would mean an assault on their conscience and personality.” To this, Archimandrite (now Bishop) Mark writes: “And that is most deplorable. For what reason do the hierarchs of the Church of Russia feel forced to make such statements, which can only be designated anti-religious propaganda? The fact that no one may give children religious instruction cannot be justified by theological arguments.”¹⁶

Thus, the Church Abroad considers it to be their task, as the free portion of the Russian Church, to speak for all the faithful in the Soviet Union, to expose the persecution, and to reveal the truth about religion in Russia, but not the way Patriarch Sergius did.

The Patriarchal Church accuses the Church Abroad of having tread an uncanonical path since 1927. Because they have refused to follow the directives of the Church leadership and have been disobedient to Church authorities, their clergy were excluded from the clergy of the Moscow Patriarchate. Since then, they have been in schism and have also over the years lost the recognition of world Orthodoxy. They claim that today the Church Abroad is totally isolated and has no fellowship in prayer or communion with any other Church. The Patriarchal Church rejoices that it has the general recognition of all Christian Churches, with which they have full communion of prayer.

The Patriarch's second accusation is directed against the politicking of the Church Abroad. They allegedly left the ecclesiastical path early on, and have through political statements taken a non-ecclesiastical and an anti-Christian path. They have had recourse to lies. The result of this path would be "simultaneous feelings of enmity, bitterness and hate towards their brothers in the Faith... this bitterness will only be justified by the fact that those brothers do not live and act in the same way as seems right to those abroad." ¹⁷

Concerning canonical disputes, both sides have certain weighty arguments on their sides. The history of the Church of Russia, especially the Synodal period after Peter I, is in no way free of violations of canonical order. How the canons can be interpreted to justify one's particular standpoint was demonstrated by the example of Professor S. Troitsky, who defended the Synod's canonicity until 1945, and after that year defended the Patriarchate's! If both hierarchies were as uncanonical as the official announcements of their opponents would lead us to believe, if both sides so little valued their episcopal succession, then one would have to question as to how it is possible for clergy of all ranks, from monk to metropolitan, when transferring to the Patriarchate, to be recognized in their ecclesiastical orders and honors. The ratification of their ordinations simultaneously means that these were performed by bishops who had preserved their full succession. Besides the sacrament of confession, nothing else is required for the reception! Would that be possible if this were a matter of completely uncanonical hierarchs?

The real contrast between the two Churches is in a completely different area: the different assessment of ecclesial developments in the Soviet Union may have opened up grave issues, which today can hardly be overcome. While the hierarchy of the Patriarchal Church made accommodations with the Soviet regime, the Church Abroad uncompromisingly rejected Communism. The accusations of the Church Abroad were directed only against those hierarchs and priests who were prepared, and are still prepared, to fulfill any demands of the atheist Soviet regime, and are prepared to deceive themselves and to lie, to declare what is right to be wrong, to present persecution of the Faith as support of the Church. The worlds that lie between the stances are shown in the fact that the Church Abroad, in October of 1981, canonized the confessors and martyrs of the Russian Church, who lost their lives under the Soviet regime, whereas the Patriarchal Church renounces these victims of the Communist rule, their martyrdom on grounds of their Faith, and to the present day maintains that "in Russia, no one is persecuted on account of his beliefs." Utterances of this kind are what the Church Abroad accuses the hierarchs of the Patriarchate of. Many of the Patriarchal hierarchs have proved themselves to be zealous abettors in implementing Soviet policy and even collaborate in the closure of churches and monasteries. The Church Abroad does not demand that the bishops become martyrs of opposition. It is the passivity of their conduct towards the government measures of force which elicits criticism and makes cooperation seem impossible. The Church Abroad's leadership fears that, in the event of a reunification with the Patriarchate, the bishops, clergy and faithful abroad would be required to agree with the state's policy towards the Church, as in the case of the representatives of the Patriarchate who live in the West. From samizdat, open letters, reports, and memoirs that have reached the West in the last decades, we know what the situation of the Church in the Soviet Union is. We know the hierarchy, the priests and the government policy.

In these documents, criticism similar to that by the Church Abroad is made. Thus, Fr. Gleb Yakunin writes in his report, “However, today in the Moscow Patriarchate, which has lost its internal freedom and is fully dependent upon the State, the charisma of the Patriarch remains practically an unrealized talent that is buried in the earth <...> the candidacy of Patriarch Pimen was not ratified by secret ballot, but rather by oral vote and was, according to reliable information, confirmed ahead of time by the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU, according to the recommendations of the Council for Religious Affairs and the KGB... The pompous Council, which had been carefully and thoroughly planned in advance, had, along with the election of the Patriarch, the task of camouflaging the reality, of creating the appearance of the well-being of the Russian Orthodox Church <...> for the benefit of the many observers at the Council. A symbolic event occurred at the end of the Council, when, for the ultimate in humiliation, the participants and guests were led into the Bolshoi Theatre, where an anti-religious performance was being held — “The Tale of the Priest & his Servant Balda” [Trans., a Pushkin poem, in which the priest tries to cheat his servant Balda, but the latter outsmarts him]. Only Ephrem, the Patriarch of Georgia, and Vladimir, the Metropolitan of Japan, left the hall enraged; the others endured the performance to the end... It raises the question, who had proved themselves to be Balda at this play?”¹⁸ What might a Russian Christian who sat through this performance have felt? What might he have thought when the representatives of the Orthodox, Protestant and Catholic Churches remained in the hall? If one examines the list of participants, it can be seen that almost all of the free Western Churches were represented. Was it solidarity with the oppressed that made the representatives of these Churches remain?

If the Church Abroad always speaks of the fact that it is “completely free”: they did not need to pay heed to the relations between Churches and can freely and openly express their criticism.¹⁹

It is, however, exactly this criticism, which the representatives of the Patriarchate — perhaps also the representatives of the other Christian Churches — find unacceptable. Thus, in the past, the Patriarchate has striven in every way to get the Church Abroad again under its jurisdiction. After World War II, they attempted to annex the Church Abroad’s parishes directly. After this failure in most cases, the Patriarchate, by discrimination and defamation (e.g. accusations of collaboration with the Nazis), strove to isolate the Church and its hierarchs. As a prerequisite of collaboration with other Christian Churches, the Patriarchate demanded the severing of official relations of the respective Church with the Church Abroad, which succeeded in every case. Wherever pressure did not help, however, the Patriarchate resorted to promises.

Patriarch Alexis assured, “each bishop and clergyman <...> that he would be given the honor due his rank and promised them [that he would accept] his hierarchical status suitable to the holy service.”²⁰ Patriarch Pimen took a major step forward and promised in his message to the Third Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad: “We do not summon you to become loyal citizens of this government, which offered you the possibility of living on its territory or in which you might have been born. Yet we have the intention of demanding the psychologically impossible from you, i.e., an insufferable break with your political convictions and the changeover to complete uniformity in thought, feelings and behavior in accordance with the sons of the Church of Russia, who live in deeply-rooted concord with all the citizens of your homeland <...> the

Russian Orthodox Church harbors no grudge against the wayward children of its grace-filled community.”²¹ In his answer to this appeal, Metropolitan Philaret clearly states: “The current appeal differs from previous ones in only a single way, that this time it does not contain the senseless demand directed at us to make a declaration of loyalty to the Soviet government.” The Metropolitan then turns quite resolutely against the Patriarch’s accusation that “feelings of enmity, bitterness, and hate towards one’s brothers in the Faith” are harbored. He continues, “We have for many years accused the Soviet rulers of torturing the Russian people... Our heart breaks each time with pain when news about the suffering of the Russian people under the yoke of atheistic Communism reaches us. In all our churches we pray unceasingly for its deliverance from this torment. With bitterness, we observe the open indifference of the Moscow Patriarchate towards this need... No kind of pressure from any side will bring us to change our stance towards godless Communism, because the teaching of the Apostle Paul applies to us: ‘Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?’ (II Cor. 6: 14-15).”²²

Despite this largely repudiatory stance, it must be stressed that the Church Abroad feels bound to the faithful and many priests in the Soviet Union. The prayer that Metropolitan Philaret mentioned is said in all churches. They are an expression of the unity between the Church Abroad and the Mother Church. During the lifetime of Patriarch Tikhon, in all émigré churches, they prayed first for the Patriarch, then for Metropolitan Anthony, and finally for Metropolitans Peter and Cyril. Today, the Church Abroad prays first for the episcopate of the persecuted Russian Church, next for Metropolitan Philaret, and then for the suffering people. The sequence symbolized the still existent unity of the Church of Russia, which the Church Abroad stresses again and again. They have many contacts with the Russian Church in the homeland. “Contacts, for our part, exist to quite a varied degree. In essence, these are personal contacts, inasmuch as the official Church is affected by that. There are contacts between individual representatives of the official Church (the Moscow Patriarchate with representatives of the Russian Church Abroad). Usually, as the nature of the thing demands, nothing or very little about these matters can be said, because our partner will be put in danger there, a danger which does not exist for us here. Personal contacts with the Church in Russia are made with less difficulty and can be spoken about more freely though anonymously, i.e., without naming names and other details... We have a large number of common tasks and problems. And in some, we do not need to differentiate between the official State Church and the Underground Church in Russia, or the various shades of gray between the two poles. For example, the struggle to preserve the Faith and Traditions represents a common task for the Church in Russia and abroad... The struggle for the propagation of the Faith and Traditions is also a common one, inasmuch as this is possible in general, i.e., missionary activity... The spread of knowledge among the faithful is also a common struggle... The necessity for catechism is also a common one.”²³

The Church Abroad sees this as not only the sharing of common tasks but rather as the binding of all the faithful together who have not betrayed their Christianity by compromising with the atheist state: these include not only the dissidents and members of the catacombs. “We see the so-called Catacombs in their various manifestations. Each priest who undertakes to baptize

children and adults without registration and without a copy of identification papers is prepared to act without the knowledge of the enemy and takes a personal risk to do Christ's will. We have reported that there are also catacomb priests in the real sense, even if their number is small. In recent years, their secret techniques of activity have made advances. We have direct contacts with both types of priests.”²⁴

Fr. Demetrius Dudko saw a path to the reunification of the Church Abroad and the Mother Church. In 1979, he appealed directly to Metropolitan Philaret, writing: “Do not hedge yourselves off from us, but rather come to our churches in order to pray together with us and to communicate.” In the postscript, Dudko adds that he views favorably “even the seemingly unrealistic proposal, that Philaret and the clergy of the Church Abroad should somehow unite with us in an unofficial way, not with the bishops, who are often only creatures of the godless, but rather with the church folk.” Metropolitan Philaret should send bishops to the U.S.S.R., who either openly or secretly would try to ordain worthy priests. “They must come into some kind of contact with us. We look for them with hope.”²⁵

Fr. Gleb Yakunin also saw this possibility. He indicated that the Moscow Patriarchate “has parishes under its jurisdiction that are located on the territory of the American Autocephalous Orthodox Church. If, for example, the O.C.A. could take the suffering Orthodox flock on the territory of the U.S.S.R., not cared for by the Moscow Patriarchate, under their jurisdiction, as brotherly help and as an exchange of experience, then it would be a valuable contribution to balancing out the relations between both Churches and the deepening of relations. And if God gives his blessing to this by the prayers of St. Innocent, spiritual bread will stream from America to the hungering Christians in Siberia and in the Far East.”²⁶

Two voices of the Russian Christians in the homeland, who are far from all politics, show new ways for Russians in the emigration. If today this may have perhaps a fantastic ring to it, perhaps tomorrow it could be realized.

Footnotes

1. Cf. Part I, Chaps. 2 & 3; Part IV, Chap. 1.4. ↵
2. Cf. the text of the Decree in the “Documents Section,” Part. VII, Chap. 2. ↵
3. The delay was caused by, among other things, the fact that after receiving the letter, Metropolitan Eulogius went to Bad Kissingen for a four-week cure. (Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 403-404). ↵
4. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 7, pp. 19-21. ↵
5. *Ibid.*, p. 384. ↵
6. D’Herbigny/Deubner, *Evêques Russes*, pp. 54-55, quoted from *Večernee Vremya* (April 11/24, 1925), 3014. Eulogius mentioned this letter in his memoirs but did not detail its contents. (Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 403). ↵
7. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte* 2, pp. 133-134. ↵

8. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 6:46-222. ↵
9. Ibid. 6, pp. 228-232. ↵
10. Cf. Part V, Chap. 3. ↵
11. *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie* (1976/1977). ↵
12. Cf. the works of these authors in the bibliography. ↵
13. Chrysostomus, *Kirschnengeschichte* 3, p. 43. ↵
14. Struve, *Christen*, p. 89. ↵
15. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte* 3, pp. 16, 20-21. ↵
16. Mark (Archimandrite), “Der Geistliche,” pp. 20, 31. ↵
17. From the epistle of Patriarch Pimen at the Third Council, III *Gesamtkonzil*, p. 62. ↵
18. Yakunin, *Polozhenie*, pp. 9-10. ↵
19. III *Gesamtkonzil*, p. 52. ↵
20. JMP (1957) 3, pp. 5-8, here p. 7. ↵
21. Ibid., pp. 62-64. ↵
22. Ibid., pp. 67-68. ↵
23. Mark (Archimandrite), “Der Geistliche”, pp. 12-14. ↵
24. “The Reply to Solzhenitsyn” by Fr. George Grabbe in III *Gesamtkonzil*, pp. 35-39. ↵
25. *Informationsdienst Glaube in der Zweiten Welt* (May 10, 1979) 8, p. 20-21. ↵
26. Yakunin, *Polozhenie*, p. 73. ↵

Part V, Chapter 2

The Relationship of the Church Abroad to Other Russian Émigré Churches

Since 1926/27, the Church Abroad has claimed to be the only legitimate heir to the Russian Church. In the preceding chapter, an attempt was made to describe the relationship between the Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate. Before the break between the émigré Church and the Mother Church, there was already a schism in the emigration.

As already set forth in detail, the Western European and North American Russian émigré communities, under the leadership of Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon, had already split off in 1926. Both groups, the Paris Jurisdiction, and the North American Metropolia, now claimed to be the only representation of the Russian Church emigration. Although both Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon were agreed that they had more well-founded canonical claims to the leadership of their communities than the Synod in Karlovtsy, these two groups never united against the Church Abroad. A union of both these groups failed, presumably because Metropolitan Eulogius claimed, by right of the Patriarch's Decree of 22 April/5 May 1922, to have been entrusted with the care of "the communities outside of Russia"¹ and understood this to include all communities outside of the Soviet Union, thus, also those in North America; whereas Platon based his claim to the rule of the North American communities on the Patriarch's Decrees of 14/27 April 1922 and of September 1923.² There has been no lack of attempts in the course of history by both these groups to spread its jurisdiction to other territories. However, they avoided intruding upon each other's territory. Metropolitan Eulogius attempted to subject the communities in North Africa and Asia Minor as "Greater Europe" to his jurisdiction. Metropolitan Platon limited himself to the whole of America, the Far East, and Australia. To what extent both jurisdictions entered into conflict over the claim to represent the Church emigration is not known. It is to be assumed that, at least since 1936, when the Metropolia reunited with the Church Abroad, the Paris Group likewise viewed the Metropolia as uncanonical, because the Metropolia was now part of the Church Abroad. There are no public statements on the stance of the Paris Group towards the Metropolia. It would certainly have been interesting if both jurisdictions' press of that time had attempted to reconcile their interrelationship. Such an attempt would also have been significant from the aspect of credibility in the canonical argument because many teachers from the St. Sergius Institute and Paris clergy joined the Metropolia after 1945 and emigrated to the U.S.A. Their number included John (Shakhovskoi), who had joined Eulogius in 1931, and later the Metropolia; on both occasions, he cited "important canonical reasons."³

The real conflict between the three Russian émigré Churches took place between the Church Abroad and the other two jurisdictions. Both in scope as well as in acridity, the strife between the Paris Jurisdiction and the Church Abroad predominated. This applies to the years when Metropolitan Eulogius was head of the Paris Jurisdiction. After his death in 1946, the conflict was greatly stepped down. The reason for this lay not so much with the person of Metropolitan Eulogius, but rather with the general development of the Paris Group, which lost much of its importance after World War II. This was because it lost almost all of its communities outside of France: in England, Belgium, Holland, Italy, Germany, and North Africa many communities

separated themselves from Paris and joined the Church Abroad and the Patriarchal Church. Thus, it lost almost all of its influence in England and Belgium after the communities there chose not to remain with Eulogius, but rather to join the Moscow Patriarchate, with which they united in 1945. There were further schisms in 1965 and 1970 when the Œcumenical Patriarchate released the Russian communities from its jurisdiction and then received them again. This time, most of the parishes joined the Church Abroad. Besides this numerical setback, the Paris group also lost much of its former theological and spiritual importance. The most famous representatives of the St. Sergius Institute died in the 1940s; others immigrated to America and joined the faculty of St. Vladimir's Seminary. Yet it was not the loss of personnel alone that decreased the importance of this institution of learning. The Moscow Patriarchate's reentry into the Church life of the West led to a situation in which the Church of Russia's theological and interconfessional talks could be conducted once again by the Patriarchal Church. Before 1945, St. Sergius Institute in Paris had, for the most part, fulfilled this function — at least with regard to the Protestant and Anglican Churches.

The real discussion with the Paris Group started in 1927. In an anonymous article, which appeared in that year, the author posed the question as to whether one could speak of a "schism" between Eulogius and Anthony in a canonical sense at all. He came to the conclusion that a schism only exists if a separation from the Universal Church takes place on dogmatic grounds and no sacramental community exists any longer. With the schism of the Russian Church, the author contends that this is not the case. This matter lies neither in a struggle over dogmatic questions nor in separation from other Orthodox Churches, including the Mother Church. The separation touches first and foremost upon questions of secular administrative importance. In the instance of a complete separation of individual hierarchs, one could not, in any case, speak of a schism, because both groups still remain part of the Universal Church and maintain communion with other Orthodox Churches.⁴

Even to the present day, the Paris Group, following this argument, has justified their submission to the Œcumenical Patriarch after they left Moscow's jurisdiction in 1931. At the same time, they accused the Church Abroad of being a schismatic Church because, the anonymous writer alleges, in 1945 it left the Universal Church and the communion of other Orthodox Churches.

In the appeal of the Third Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad to the Russian Archdiocese in Western Europe (Paris Jurisdiction) the following argument for the establishment of Church unity was made: "We maintain that one of the reasons that led to our separation indubitably lay in the fact that you are always concerned about attaining recognition of your ecclesiastical existence from the whole of the Orthodox world and have believed that the pallium of the Patriarch of Constantinople guarantees you this... Viewed from your standpoint, we find ourselves bereft of official recognition by the whole Orthodox world (which, however, has never officially expelled us) since the last War and are in a canonically irregular position, having committed an error. Let us assume for a moment that this is true. We, however, perceive the uncertainty of your own situation, that you yourself do not enjoy recognition from anyone except the Patriarch of Constantinople. Think back on that sad moment when, a few years ago, the Patriarch, without regard for any circumstances, left its Russian Exarchate of Western Europe in

the care of the Patriarch of Moscow, which caused grief, confusion, and consternation in your midst. ⁵ <...> Are you safe from similar surprises in the future? Is it not possible to draw the following conclusion from all of this: through the Patriarch of Constantinople, you are recognized by all the Orthodox world, yet for the same reason you are dependent upon unforeseeable, and possibly undesirable, actions of the Patriarchate. ⁶

It has always been its freedom that the Church Abroad has furnished as its main argument, independent of all other conditions, in order to be able to speak and act in the interests of the Church of Russia and of “true Orthodoxy.” The Church Abroad stands upon the conviction that, in holding fast to the unity of the whole Church of Russia, it functions as part of the Universal Church. The Patriarchate also takes part in this grace; even if the leadership of the Church is compromised, the Church of Russia still remains a member of the Universal Church. Therefore, the Church Abroad does not need official recognition by the Orthodox world in order to be part of the Universal Church. The Church Abroad also does not seek this recognition because its canonical existence was vouchsafed by Patriarch Tikhon’s Decree of 1920, which “also guarantees our membership in the Church of Russia tried by suffering.” ⁷

The opponents of the Church Abroad use its isolation within the Orthodox world as the main argument that the Church Abroad is a schismatic group. About that, all the opposing viewpoints — the Patriarchal Church, the Paris Jurisdiction and the American Metropolia — are agreed. ⁸

In the conflicts between the émigré groups, each has tried to trace the “canonically legitimate path and the ecclesiastically legal existence” back to Patriarch Tikhon. Thus, the writings of the disputant parties are all basically concerned with justifying their existence by Patriarch Tikhon’s various decrees. ⁹ Certainly, it is here that the external causes that led to the schism among the three Churches lie. They should not, however, be presented as the only causes of the schism, thereby overestimating their significance. The real causes for the complete split of the three émigré groups should not be sought in canonical disputes alone. If one considers that all three parts can be traced back to the one Church of Russia of 1918, and all highly venerate the head of this Church, Patriarch Tikhon, the question raised is simply this: What so alienated these Churches from one another that appeals to reestablish Church unity if they are published at all, are basically doomed to failure?

This was demonstrated, for example, during the Third Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad in 1974. The Council published appeals to the OCA and the Russian Archdiocese in Western Europe to reestablish Church unity. While the First Hierarch of the OCA, Metropolitan Irenaeus answered the First Hierarch of the Church Abroad directly, Archbishop George (Tarasov) of the Paris Group answered only indirectly. In a communiqué to the faithful of the Archdiocese he assigned Bishop George (Wagner) to reply to the Council’s appeal indirectly. The publisher of “The Herald” (Paris) himself considered it appropriate that this communiqué to the clergy and laity of the Western European Archdiocese was, at the same time, to be regarded as the answer to the Council.” ¹⁰ These appeals all contained conciliatory words, yet all three Churches remained steadfast in their known convictions and justified anew their stance of rejection. A readiness to continue the dialogue was not discernable. Whereas the Paris Group placed the necessity of relations with the Œcumenical Patriarchate, the Mother of the Russian

Church, at the crux of their argument, Metropolitan Irenaeus defended the newly-obtained autocephaly and rejected the reproach that they were dependent upon the Moscow Patriarchate through the granting of autocephaly. Also, “after receiving autocephaly we will never be silenced about the Russian Church, which is tried by suffering”.

The diverse evaluations of the ecclesiastical policies of Metropolitan Sergius and his successors deepened the canonical differences within the Russian émigré Churches. After Metropolitan Eulogius and his parishes joined Metropolitan Sergius, the Church Abroad saw this as “a betrayal” of the Russian Orthodox Church of Patriarch Tikhon. It remains incomprehensible to the Synod how a Russian bishop, living in freedom, could unite with the captive part of the Russian Church. The accusations that a reconciliation with the Patriarchal Church is equivalent to silence about the persecution of the Church and the faithful in the Soviet Union have persisted until the present day. Eulogius’s joining Metropolitan Sergius was therefore always condemned.¹¹ The sharpening of the ecclesial-political style received coverage in the émigré press, where ecclesiastical questions were increasingly forced into the background and political ones into the fore. Over the course of time, there was more and more concern over how to appraise the Soviet regime and what course the Church leadership in Russia had to take.¹² After Metropolitan Eulogius was suspended from serving by Metropolitan Sergius on account of disobedience, there was a general closing of both conflicting émigré standpoints. A reunification of the separated Churches no longer seemed to be impossible. Metropolitan Eulogius himself designated the year 1934 as “conciliatory.” During the reunification talks and shortly before, Metropolitan Anthony stressed that the misfortune of the schism in no way had its roots in the personal relationship between the two metropolitans. They had never “been in a state of enmity” and had always felt a “feeling of deep friendship” towards one another.

Certainly, these words were sincerely meant and corresponded to Metropolitan Anthony’s attitude. In his memoirs, Metropolitan Eulogius also speaks with particular warmth of his meeting with Metropolitan Anthony.¹³ According to sources available to us today and the impressions gleaned by Bishop Gregory (Grabbe) (as secretary, he took part in all negotiations), Eulogius seems, however, to have been under the influence of a wealthy and influential faction in Paris, which did not want the restoration of Church unity under the direction of the Synod of Bishops. It says much that Eulogius’ participation was a result of the more general opinion within the emigration, which at this time desired unity.¹⁴

Moreover, that the personal relationship, despite all disagreements, was good and remained so, may perhaps also illustrate the fact that after the death of Metropolitan Eulogius in 1946, Metropolitan Anastasius served a panikhida (memorial service) and consoled his successor, Archbishop Vladimir over his death.¹⁵ Archbishop Vitalis (Maximenko) behaved likewise upon the death of Metropolitan Theophilus in 1950. He held a panikhida at Holy Trinity Monastery. Archbishop Tikhon (Troitsky) had paid the ailing metropolitan a sick call and after his death served a panikhida at the cathedral in San Francisco.*¹⁶

Indeed, these steps of reconciliation at the end of a short period made a new reunification in North America seem possible. The different interpretations of the ecclesial-political events in the Soviet Union since 1941 had led to a closing between the Metropolia and the Patriarchal

Church, with a simultaneous alienation between the Metropolia and the Church Abroad. This ultimately led to the renewed schism of the Metropolia. After the negotiations with the Patriarchate failed, there was again a closing between the Metropolia and the Synod. After the Synod moved to the U.S.A., Archbishop Leontius (the successor to Metropolitan Theophilus) visited Metropolitan Anastasius. At this meeting, the latter proposed that relations between the two groups be set on a new basis “without the old dispute over canonical questions,” bearing only “the spirit of brotherly love in Christ.” The aim of these new relations was supposed to be the complete restoration of fellowship in prayer. Differences existed only in the evaluation of the Moscow Patriarchate. Leontius set forth his Church’s stance and indicated that only the Metropolia had the right to care for the faithful in America. He also proposed that all the faithful and all the clergy who emigrated to America from Europe should join the Metropolia.¹⁷ In practice, Leontius’ proposal amounted to this: he would be able to accept a union with the Church Abroad under the condition that the latter withdraws from America. Under these circumstances, both Churches would be able to continue as regional émigré Churches and form a spiritual union in place of an administrative one.

At this point in time, the Metropolia was acting, however, out of a certain weakness: the negotiations with the Patriarchal Church from 1943-46 led to the separation of many of its parishes, which then joined the Patriarchate. Though the Patriarchate only had about six parishes in 1945, it suddenly had 50 parishes in the summer of 1947!¹⁸ Some 65 parishes had joined the Synod. That meant a loss of almost one-third of all its parishes. In addition to this, after 1945 the great majority of all émigrés entering from the Far East and Europe joined the Church Abroad.

With the election of Metropolitan Leontius as the new First Hierarch of the Metropolia, the principal proponent of autocephaly reached the pinnacle of the Metropolia. It was not vouchsafed him to see the granting of autocephaly, but under his leadership negotiations with the Patriarchal Church were carried on from 1961, resulting, ultimately in the granting of autocephaly in 1970. That these negotiations were spread out over almost 10 years shows that the Patriarchate had not decided upon the course lightheartedly. It dissolved its “Exarchate of North America,” yet the unique situation existed, whereby over 60 of its own parishes remained on the territory of an autocephalous Church. This circumstance was similar to the situation in Eastern Europe, where the local Orthodox Churches had allowed the Russian émigré communities autonomous administration, and even their own dioceses, after World War I. The only difference was that in the earlier instance it involved real refugee communities, which were granted the status of guests, whereas in the U.S.A. refugees and émigrés had established all the parishes and the OCA understood itself to be the heir to these parishes.

The “semi-autocephaly” leaves many questions open, which the Patriarchate may actually have brought about by this step. Moscow probably hoped that an OCA, standing on its own, having received autocephaly from Moscow, would possess enough power of attraction to draw everyone into it. This would have led to a weakening of both the Church Abroad and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, in that the majority of the faithful of this Patriarchate today live in the U.S.A. The weakening of the Church Abroad was probably the uppermost consideration, because the possibility of a union between the Church Abroad and the Metropolia could never be entirely

ruled out. A unified Church would not have been in Moscow's interests. With the Patriarchate of Constantinople, there were likewise many splits. A group of these divisions resulted in the parishes of the Paris Jurisdiction belonging to Constantinople. If Constantinople had released these parishes from its jurisdiction under pressure from Moscow, then it must have also used the breaks from Moscow, which resulted from the granting of autocephaly, to again receive the Western European Russian communities into its jurisdiction. ¹⁹

The Church Abroad protested against the granting of autocephaly. It even sent a delegation, headed by Bishop Laurus (Skurla) and Archpriest G. Grabbe, to the Independence Day (July 4th) celebrations at St. Tikhon's Monastery. They brought a message from Metropolitan Philaret, in which he set forth his standpoint, that autocephaly would be uncanonical because Patriarch Tikhon had given charge of the North American communities to the Church Abroad. The representatives of the Metropolia refused to discuss this message. ²⁰

With the granting of autocephaly, hope for the reestablishment of Church unity in North America seems to have been lost. Thus, the Third Pan Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad, in its appeal to the OCA, at first proposes collaboration: "We stretch out our hands to you as brothers, in order to seek ways to change the sinful Church schism. What we always desired to attain in this regard — be it collaboration, be it common help for the captive part of the Russian Church, be it our complete reunification — anything would be better than the situation in which we find ourselves now." ²¹ In his reply to this epistle, Metropolitan Irenaeus ²² welcomes the desire to overcome the schism and promises that, on his Church's part, they are prepared to "do everything that is required of them to reestablish the unity of faith and love between us." As the first step on this path, he sees the restoration of unity in prayer, above all else, in the holiest sacrament, the Eucharist." ²³

Since these conciliatory words, nine years have passed. A rapprochement has not been forthcoming. Indeed, a hardening of both positions has taken place. The OCA is still trying to obtain recognition of its autocephaly in the Orthodox world. This has been refused time and again by a part of the Orthodox Churches — most notably those headed by the Ecumenical Patriarch.

The Church Abroad rejects the OCA today most of all for its modernism. For example, the parishes may decide, by voting, whether they want to follow the Old or New Style Calendar. Another example of this modernism was the elevation to metropolitan of the First Hierarch, Metropolitan Theodosius. This did not take place in a church, but rather in a large assembly hall. Within the Church Abroad, this brought about vehement disapproval. ²⁴ Criticisms are, however, also forthcoming in the matter of innovations that disturb the substance of Orthodox piety and tradition. Many parishes have shortened the duration of the Liturgy to 40-45 minutes because the traditional two-hour long divine services are "too much of a demand upon the faithful." ²⁵ Many of the faithful rejected autocephaly as well as this modernism. Various former Metropolia communities joined the Church Abroad. Archbishop Ambrose (Merezhko) of Pittsburgh, an opponent of autocephaly, joined the Church Abroad because he rejected autocephaly and mistrusted too great a closing to the Moscow Patriarchate. ²⁶

For more than two decades there have been no further relations with the Paris Jurisdiction. In 1961, there was an attempt to restore Church unity. An appeal for unity was made by well-known representatives of Russian spiritual life, joined in by various social organizations, and sent to Metropolitan Anastasius and Archbishop George (Tarasov).²⁷ Both hierarchs assured them that the establishment of unity was in their hearts. As the first step towards this, again the establishment of a communion of prayer was deemed necessary. There was a joint service for the consecration of a Russian chapel in the St. Raphael Home for the Elderly, at which Bishop Anthony of Geneva for the Church Abroad and Bishop Methodius of Campanian for Paris concelebrated.²⁸ No other mutual steps followed this modest beginning.

In addition to these other two Russian Churches, there are two other Orthodox groups, which the Church Abroad considers to be in schism from the Russian Church, and which the Church Abroad, the Patriarchal Church, the Metropolia and the Paris Jurisdiction all reject. These are the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Belorussian Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

The Ukrainian Autocephalists, like the Russian Church Abroad, are represented worldwide and have their own dioceses in North and South America, where about 130,000 faithful live, who are cared for by 3 bishops, 116 priests and 10 deacons. They also have their own dioceses in Australia (2,000 faithful), England and Western Europe (France, FRG, and Austria) (4,000 faithful),²⁹ where there are also another two bishops. In addition to these Ukrainian autocephalists, there is another group in Canada called the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church, which came into existence in 1918 and consisted of former Uniates. In their four Canadian dioceses, there are approximately 90,000-100,000 faithful.³⁰ This Church is independent and does not belong to the aforementioned Ukrainian Autocephalous Group.

The Ukrainian Autocephalists trace their existence back to the national Church developments of 1918/19 in Ukraine, when a part of the Orthodox clergy and faithful wanted to separate from the Church of Russia and set up their own Church administration. Because these autocephalic strivings led to the total rejection of the Church of Russia, at a Church assembly in 1921 the Ukrainian Church declared itself autocephalous and consecrated from their midst, without the assistance of bishops, “Archbishop” Basil (Lypkivsky) as Metropolitan and First Hierarch of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church. In 1930, 30 “bishops” already belonged to this Church. Although the Soviet regime first promoted these strivings, just like the many other Church schisms, because they led to the weakening of the Patriarchal Church, after 1927 they turned against it brutally. By 1930, the Church was destroyed; its “bishops” and clergy had disappeared into concentration camps. [Trans., Lypkivsky himself was arrested and perished there; his writings were almost all destroyed in a bombing raid during the War.] This group was schismatic and heretical, and was known as the “self-consecrated” [Trans., “samosvyatsy” in Russian] because the consecration of bishops and ordinations of priests were done in an uncanonical manner, by their own devices, and because autocephaly was self-proclaimed. Its clergy were placed under an anathema, and its faithful were excommunicated. Nonetheless, this Church existed around the world and had its own churches, parish schools, and charitable institutions. There were no seminaries.³¹

The Belorussian Autocephalous Church came into existence through a schism from the Belorussian Autonomous Orthodox Church, which had existed during the German occupation of Belorussia.³² While the latter had worked closely with the Church Abroad and strove only for an autonomous administration (similar to Ukrainian developments), wanting to remain under the jurisdiction of the Church of Russia, the autocephalists wanted to establish a national Church.

Except for Bishop Paul (Melevtsev), the entire Belorussian clergy joined the Church Abroad at the Council of Bishops of 1946. The First Hierarchy, Metropolitan Panteleimon (Rozhnovsky), who was 89 years old in 1946, no longer exercised his office at this time and lived in Camp Schliessheim near Munich, where he cared for a small Belorussian community. He was close to the Church Abroad and maintained warm contacts with it.

A part of the nationalist Belorussians, who also strove for governmental independence, separated from the autonomists and founded the Autocephalous Belorussian Church, whose First Hierarchy was Sergius (Okhotenko), in Constance. About the composition and size of this Church, little is known. In the early 1950s, it was supposed to have had 33 parishes in the U.S.A. and Canada.³³

The Church Abroad also has no official relations with this national Church group and considers them to be schismatic, like the Ukrainian autocephalists.

Footnotes

1. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 7, p. 10. ↵
2. Ibid., pp. 383-385. ↵
3. In addition to this, see both works by John [Shakhovskoi]: (1931) *Pochemu ya ushel*; (1971) *Utverzhdenie*. ↵
4. “Kanonicheskoe polozhenie”, pp. 6-7. ↵
5. Here the Council alluded to the situation in 1965 and 1970. In 1965 the Ecumenical Patriarchate released the Russian communities from its jurisdiction under duress from Moscow. After Moscow had granted the North American Metropolia autocephaly against the wish of Constantinople, the latter again received the Russian communities into its fold. ↵
6. *III Gesamtkonzil*, pp. 51-52. ↵
7. Ibid, p. 51. ↵
8. Manuchina, *Evlogy* pp. 603-648; Maklakov, “Les dissensions”; Popov, *Karlovskaya smuta*; Schmemmann, *Tserkov' i ustroistvo*. ↵
9. Grabbe, *Korni*; Markov, *Pravda o smute*; Idem., “Ocherk polozheniya”; Polsky, *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*; Tal'berg, *Tserkovny raskol*; Idem., “Sorokoletiyu.” ↵

10. *Vestnik russk.* [Paris] 114 (1974) IV, pp. 95-114; 115 (1976) I, pp. 108-116; German text partly in III Gesamtkonzil, pp. 47-54, 69-72. ↵
11. Gorchakov, *Itogi politiki.* ↵
12. Troitsky, *Razmezhevanie.* ↵
13. Manuchina, *Evlogy,* pp. 629-639. ↵
14. *Tserk Zhizn'* (1934) pp. 139-140; (1935) 3, pp. 50-52; (1936) 3, pp. 46-47; 6, pp. 86-89. ↵
15. *Tserkovnaya letopis'* [Lausanne] (1946) 3, p. 57. ↵
16. *Prav. Rus'* (1950) 12, p. 3; 13, p. 16. ↵
17. *Ibid.* (1951) 6, pp. 3-7. ↵
18. Seraphim, *Church Unity,* p. 52; Grigorieff, *Church in America,* p. 215. ↵
19. *ECR* (1971) 4, pp. 450-451. ↵
20. Grabbe, *Otritsanie.* In the appendix to this brochure Archbishop John's [Shakhovskoi] *Utverzhdienie* is mentioned. In this work, the representatives of both parties present their points of view on autocephaly. *Prav. Rus'* (1970) 3. pp. 6-10. ↵
21. *III Gesamtkonzil,* p. 50. ↵
22. Primate of the Orthodox Church in America from 1970-1977. ↵
23. *III Gesamtkonzil,* pp. 69, 72. ↵
24. *Prav. Rus'* (1978) 9, p. 12. ↵
25. *Orthodox Life* (1979) 3, pp. 46-49. ↵
26. *Prav. Rus'* (1972) 4, p. 15; *Tserk, Zhizn'* (1972) 1-6, p. 3; (1974) 1-6, p. 5. ↵
27. Primate of the Paris Jurisdiction. ↵
28. *Vestnik Shveitsarskogo Vikariatsva* (1961) 3, pp. 6-9. ↵
29. *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie* (1976/1977) pp. 185-193. ↵
30. *Ibid.,* pp. 194-200. ↵
31. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte* 1, p. 152; Matwijkenko, *Vergangenheit und Gegenwart;* *Prav. Rus'* (1950) 17, p. 15; (1976) 6, pp. 8-10. ↵
32. Cf. Part I, Chap. 6. ↵
33. *Tserk Zhizn'* (1950) 1-2, pp. 5-7; (1951) 2, pp. 4-5; (1952) 3-4, pp. 48-60; (1953) 5-6, pp. 111-112; *Prav. Rus'* (1950) 4, pp. 13-14; *Der christliche Osten* (1973) 2, pp. 8-10. ↵

Part V, Chapter 3

The Relationship to Other Local Orthodox Churches

On 12 January 1981, Archbishop Philotheus, at that point still ruling bishop of the German Diocese of the ROCOR, was awarded the German Republic's Merit Cross (Bundesverdienstkreuz) First Class by the President of the Republic. The reason this high honor was awarded was, among other things, "his intensive efforts on behalf of the cooperation among the Christian Churches."¹ The representatives of Catholics and Protestants designated the Archbishop as the "ecumenical bridge-builder." How does this designation reconcile with the contention often made that the Church Abroad is not recognized by other Orthodox Churches and has not taken part in the Christian community as a whole. In his appeal to the Third Pan-Diaspora Council, Patriarch Pimen writes, "The Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church watches for the time to come when it may turn with love to you, who call yourselves members of the ROCOR, who find yourselves outside the borders of our homeland and consider it possible to build the foundations of your spiritual life while separated from your brothers in the Faith, alienated from ecclesiastical authority of the National Church in the homeland, which has preserved its succession and is recognized by all Orthodoxy. You have not joined any of the presently existing Orthodox Autocephalous Churches, who jointly form the ecclesiastical fullness of the Ecumenical Church."² In response to this appeal, Metropolitan Philaret points out, *inter alia*, that "In vain does Moscow seek to frighten us by isolation within Orthodoxy, which too often does not understand what is happening in Russia. If several Patriarchs of the East even allowed themselves to be deceived by the Renovationists³ in the 1920s, it is, therefore, for them today even easier to fall into error, because the plight of the faithful is hidden from them by the veil of outward wellbeing of the Moscow Patriarchate. From them, they hear no news about the suffering of the Russian people and especially of the faithful... Among these circumstances is the Church hierarchy, who are controlled by the enemies of the Church and who represent themselves as the legitimate Russian Church authority."⁴

The fact is that the Church Abroad maintained official relations with all other Orthodox Churches, as well as non-Orthodox Churches, until the 1940s. On Church feasts such as Pascha, Christmas and national holidays, the Church Abroad exchanged greetings with other Christian Churches, sent congratulatory messages and received the same. These relations were not limited solely to an exchange of niceties. The Synod was invited to the enthronement festivities of Orthodox Sister Churches, represented the Russian Church at joint Orthodox congresses, took an active part in theological dialogue, and celebrated joint services with Orthodox Sister Churches. The exchange of messages, invitations to participate in conferences, and church festivities are certainly to be evaluated as proof of the official recognition of the ROCOR as a Church.

However, one should draw no rash conclusions on a Church's existence as a Church from these superficialities. The "recognition" of an Orthodox Church by other Orthodox Churches is not expressed alone in the exchange of delegations and greetings or through "official recognition" as an autocephalous or autonomous Church by all other Orthodox Sister Churches. The history of Orthodoxy is rich in examples that illustrate that individual Orthodox Churches over the centuries have at times not been "recognized" by other Orthodox Churches or a part of the

Churches. If one takes only the developments of the last 100 years, then many examples can be found. The Bulgarian Orthodox Church was considered a “schismatic” Church by Constantinople from 1872-1945 because Constantinople did not want to recognize its independence. The autocephaly and autonomy of the Churches of Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Albania, China, Japan and North America were only recognized by a part of the Orthodox Churches for a time. In the Yearbook of Orthodoxy, the publisher lists 14 autocephalous Orthodox Churches and four “other Orthodox Churches,” including the Church Abroad. The 14 “official” Churches themselves do not rejoice in the recognition of their joint Orthodoxy. The Ecumenical Patriarch does not recognize the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church of Czechoslovakia and the OCA, as well as that of several other Orthodox churches. The Ecumenical Patriarch, for example, did not invite the OCA and the Orthodox Church of Japan to the Orthodox Conference on Patmos and did not even enter them in the list of participants as “Orthodox Churches.” The Moscow Patriarchate, which had made them both autocephalous Churches in 1970, protested against this behavior, but without success.⁵ At the same time, both these Churches belong to the WCC and are “recognized” by several hundred Churches, which belong to this organization.

Metropolitan Theodosius, First Hierarch of the OCA, protested to the Ecumenical Patriarch about his reorganization of the Greek Exarchate of North America during which he elevated vicar bishops to the rank of ruling bishops and set up their residences in cities where bishops of the OCA resided.⁶

The existence of the OCA, with almost one million faithful, is a fact, independent of the recognition of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Presumably, time will work for these Churches the way it has for the Bulgarian Orthodox Church.

The fact that “official contacts” do not exist says nothing about the recognition of one Church by another. The Russian Patriarchal Church experienced this itself. From the 1920s onwards, they were unable in practice to maintain contact with other Christian Churches because the rulers of their country prevented them from doing so. They were totally isolated. Did other Churches refuse to recognize them for this reason? It was political circumstances alone which drove them into this isolation; their existence as a Church remained unchanged. Today, it is the Church Abroad that is largely isolated in the Christian world, if one uses “official relations” as the basis for assessment. The fact is that the Church Abroad today no longer participates in the joint Orthodox Conferences, is not represented in the WCC, and does not participate in many interconfessional meetings and ecumenical institutions. The fact is, however, that the Church Abroad rejects the ecumenical services on theological considerations. The Church Abroad considers an “ecumenical service” such as that which took place in the church in Wauwatosa (Wisconsin), in which representatives of all Christian Churches in the city participated, but which also included women clergy and a Jewish rabbi in clerical garb, no longer a divine service, but rather a “scandalous assembly.”⁷

The understanding of the Church Abroad can be described as follows. It does not claim for itself an autocephalous status because it has always understood itself to be a part of the Church of Russia. It has never received special recognition of its independence from other Orthodox

Churches but rather was accepted by them as an autonomously-administered part of the Church of Russia. It has held true to the Holy Traditions of the Russian Church and remains in agreement with the other Orthodox Churches in the joint witness to the message of the Gospel, the preservation of Orthodox Tradition and in common prayer. It is the unity in spirit and in the prayer which binds the Church Abroad to the other Orthodox Churches. Outwardly, this communion receives its confirmation through an atmosphere of sincerity and brotherly respect.

This unity finds its expression in the personal relations of the bishops and clergy of the Church Abroad with the representatives of the other Orthodox and non-Orthodox Churches: a communion of prayer, an exchange of congratulatory messages, discussions, and information on common questions, and joint church feasts as mutual support. In the past, these expressions of oneness were openly displayed. The Churches of Eastern Europe, which earlier were free, had been able to independently and freely conduct their relations with the Church Abroad. Today they must, like a part of the Churches in the West, hold themselves aloof on account of the Moscow Patriarchate. This has resulted in official contacts becoming increasingly rare, though they still exist as before. In earlier contacts, the Church Abroad's participation in Orthodox Conferences was equivalent to a recognition of the Church Abroad. Recognition as an independent Church, in the sense of an autocephalous or autonomous local Church, was never expressed because the Church Abroad never strove for this, though it may have had proponents of this in its own ranks. Thus, the Church Abroad was until 1945 recognized by most Orthodox Churches as an Orthodox Sister Church and considered to be part of the Orthodox world. Today, this still seems to be the case because at no point in time has the whole of Orthodoxy driven them out. This would also be quite difficult to do because the Church Abroad preserves and follows Orthodox Tradition and Faith untainted. The situation could probably be summed up by saying that many Orthodox and non-Orthodox Churches have reduced their relations with the Church Abroad to a minimum in order not to come into conflict with the Russian Patriarchal Church. These "frozen" relations can again be resumed at any time, because the Church Abroad has not to tread a heretical path, and one can again take up where one left off in the 1940s.

In the relations between the Church Abroad and the other Orthodox Churches, there are two separate periods. During the first period, the Church Abroad maintained relations with all of those Orthodox Churches, which they recognized as independent Orthodox Local Churches.

These were the ancient Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople and the Orthodox Churches of Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Romania, Cyprus, and Sinai. Problematic for it were its relationship to the Orthodox Churches of Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Poland, for, like the Russian Patriarchal Church, it challenged their right to exist. In the case of the Church of Poland, a *modus vivendi* was arrived at which made the relationship possible without recognizing the autocephaly of the Polish Church as final. The Orthodox Churches of the émigré Ukrainians were rejected as schismatic because, according to the Russian understanding, they were and remained a part of the Church of Russia.

Especially problematic were its relations toward the Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Here, the old conflict between the Church of Russian= and the Church of the Patriarchate of Constantinople over ecclesial-political influence in the Orthodox World came into play. The

Church Abroad alone represented the stand of the Russian Mother Church against Constantinople until 1945, then jointly with the Patriarchate of Moscow. The relationship between the two Churches was characterized by Constantinople's attempt to use the weakness of the Church of Russia in the years 1920-45 in order to extend its influence. Because the Ecumenical Patriarchate represented the point of view that it has competence over all Orthodox faithful who are not living on the territory of an Orthodox Local Church, this Patriarchate saw itself as heir to those Orthodox groups that lived in Finland, the Baltics, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Western Europe, North America, and, indeed, even in Japan and China, which had formerly been subject to the Church of Russia. In contrast, the Church Abroad and the Patriarchal Church represented the standpoint that these regions and their faithful were still subject to the Church of Russia, to which, until 1917/18, they either directly belonged or of which they were missionary territories. The individual measures which Constantinople took during the time between the Wars were as follows:

- (1) Recognition of the national Orthodox strivings upon the foundation of their own national Churches in Eastern Europe and the granting of autonomy and autocephaly to these Churches, which thereby bound them closely to the Ecumenical Patriarchate.
- (2) Establishment of exarchates in Western Europe, North and South America and other territories for the Orthodox of these countries.
- (3) Claim to the jurisdictional competence over all Orthodox émigrés, regardless of nationality.
- (4) The singular claim to Athos, which Constantinople declared as its exclusive possession, closing to non-Greek monks.

The difficulties encountered when forming independent Orthodox Churches have already been discussed in Part IV, Chapter 1. Therefore it would be superfluous to go into it again. Each time, the Church Abroad, in the name of the Church of Russia, strongly protested to Constantinople against this granting of autonomy and autocephaly to these Churches and declared these acts to be uncanonical.⁸ The bishops consecrated by Constantinople were not recognized by the Church Abroad, which maintained that the Russian bishops of these lands remained as ruling bishops still, even if they had been forced to emigrate. For example, this was the case with Archbishop Seraphim (Lukianov) of Finland.⁹

The creation of Constantinople's own exarchates in Western Europe and North America sharpened the conflict after 1922 because since then Constantinople has rejected the right of Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon to administer these Russian communities.¹⁰ The Ecumenical Patriarchate denied the right of the Russian Church to care for Orthodox communities outside of their national territory. This claim was intensified in 1928 when Patriarch Basil III declared that all Orthodox émigrés were subject to the Ecumenical Patriarchate.¹¹ This claim took on a practical form when Metropolitan Eulogius's communities joined Constantinople in 1931. In 1937, Constantinople consecrated a bishop (Bishop Bogdan) for the Orthodox Ukrainians in North America, and he subordinated the Carpatho-Russian communities in North America to himself. Both groups have their own dioceses even today: The Ukrainian Orthodox Diocese of America, ruled by Bishop Andrew (Kushchak) and the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America with two bishops, presided over by Bishop Orestes (Chornok). The

Church Abroad likewise protested the subordination of these communities, accusing Constantinople of interference in the internal affairs of the Church of Russia. The closure of Athos to Slavic monks met with less protest from the Church Abroad because there were hardly any monks among the émigrés who wanted to join the Athonite monasteries. The Church Abroad, however, recognized the dangers that threatened their converts by this decree: after a monastery no longer had any more monks, its entire property fell to the Greek Church. This ecclesiastical and political conflict overshadowed relations between both Churches, which had begun at least outwardly harmoniously after the SEA's flight to Constantinople.

With Decree No. 9084, dated 22 December 1920, the Ecumenical Patriarch gave the Russian communities and bishops in the territory of Constantinople full authority of self-administration, which (in turn) led to the creation of a practically independent Russian Diocese under the rule of Archbishop Anastasius. Metropolitan Anthony had made this concession; it was said of him that he never did anything that was “not in full accord with the Canons.”¹² After Metropolitan Anthony resettled in Serbia, in the spring of 1921, the SEA remained in Constantinople at first, and the administration was in the hands of Archbishop Anastasius, who also was in charge of the refugee communities in the area.

In these first years of their relations, there were initially no unbridgeable conflicts, if differences of opinion did exist. Later, after 1922, Constantinople sought to extend its jurisdictional power. In general, Constantinople supported the appeals of the Church Abroad over religious persecution in Russia and sided repeatedly with Patriarch Tikhon.¹³ After Constantinople had allowed itself to be deceived by the “Council” of Renovators and had recognized these schismatics as the legitimate Church of Russia, Patriarch Meletius assured the Church Abroad that he only recognized Patriarch Tikhon as canonical head of the Russian Church.¹⁴ The heads of the other Orthodox Churches also did this through the intermediation of the Church Abroad, turning directly to Metropolitan Anthony.¹⁵ A worsening of relations between the two Churches started at the Pan-Orthodox Congress of 1923. Patriarch Meletius IV (1923-24) had convened this. Archbishop Anastasius participated in the Congress as the representative of the Russian Church and was the spokesman of the opposition to the Ecumenical Patriarch's proposals for reform. The most important of these was the introduction of the Gregorian Calendar (also called the New Style or Revised Calendar) in place of the Julian (also called the Old Style),¹⁶ second marriages for priests, permitting married priests to become consecrated to the episcopate, the abridgment of the divine services, changes in clerical dress, and the abolition of fasting periods. Metropolitan Anthony rejected all of these reforms because they were irreconcilable with the traditions of the Orthodox Church. This opposition ruined most of the reform proposals. The greatest difference of opinion came over the introduction of the New Calendar, which effected a change in the celebration of Christmas.¹⁷ At the end of the Congress, the Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria and Serbia, under the influence of Metropolitan Anthony, decided to reject the calendar reform and remained on the Old Style.¹⁸

This led to a schism within Orthodoxy, because now one group of Churches follows the New Calendar and the other follows the Old. In this regard, Metropolitan Anthony appealed in an epistle to all National Orthodox Churches who had introduced the New Style, imploring them to

allow the Russian émigré communities and Russian communities, which through the new drawing of borders lay on their territories, to continue to follow the Old Calendar.¹⁹ This desire was only in part fulfilled. The Romanian Church rejected any special status for the Russian communities there; this led to the severing of relations between the Romanian Church and the Church Abroad. After the Congress, the relations between the Church Abroad and the Ecumenical Patriarchate worsened further. Patriarch Meletius recognized the Renovationists in Soviet Russia as the legitimate Church of Russia. The decision was probably facilitated by the fact that this schismatic group was prepared to accept all his reforms. This recognition was quickly withdrawn, though it had already put additional strain on the relationship between the two Churches. Around the same time (in the summer of 1923), Patriarch Meletius granted autonomy to the Finnish and Estonian communities under his jurisdiction. He demanded that both Archbishops Anastasius and Alexander (Nemolovsky), who were both living in Constantinople, recognize the Ecumenical Patriarch as their jurisdictional head in the future and commemorate him instead of Patriarch Tikhon during the divine services. Also, both hierarchs were supposed to sever relations with the Synod in Karlovtsy and “any other Russian power.” He also required that in the future they not take any anti-Bolshevik stand or touch on any political themes in their sermons.²⁰

The consequence of these unacceptable demands was that both bishops left the country. Archbishop Anastasius went to Jerusalem and lived at the Jerusalem Ecclesiastical Mission and Archbishop Alexander retired to Athos, where he lived in the Russian St. Andrew’s Skete until 1927. Patriarch Meletius was forced to resign from his office as Ecumenical Patriarch in 1924 and was elected to the Patriarchal throne of Alexandria. Under both his successors, Patriarchs Gregory VII (1924-25) and Constantine VI (1925-29), there was a certain easing [of tensions], because both Patriarchs no longer continued the innovative course [of their predecessor].

Metropolitan Anthony addressed to Patriarch Constantine an epistle, dated 4/17 February 1925 (“A Sorrowful Epistle”),²¹ imploring him to revoke the decisions of the Pan-Orthodox Congress, to repudiate the New Style, to force the Finnish communities to celebrate Pascha according to the Eastern calculations, and to take measures for the reestablishment of Church peace. The Patriarch could not decide to fulfill all these wishes; the calendar reform remained untouched, yet he met Metropolitan Anthony halfway, in that he agreed that the change of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Finland and Poland should not be finalized without considering the Church of Russia.²²

After Metropolitan Eulogius joined the jurisdiction of Constantinople, the Church Abroad condemned this step by the Ecumenical Patriarchate as interference in the affairs of the Church of Russia, and also rejected Constantinople’s right to jurisdictional competence. In the first two decades, this jurisdictional claim of Constantinople was a constant cause of protests, as is more recently the claim of the Ecumenical Patriarch to be the “mouthpiece of all of Orthodoxy,” which aroused the protest of the Church Abroad as well as of other Orthodox Churches. Before 1945, the Church Abroad no longer took part in Orthodox conferences, because a conference would only be accepted if the whole Church of Russia, including the Catacomb Church, were to be represented. The Moscow Patriarchate did not have the right, the Church Abroad contested, to

speak for the whole Church of Russia. The Church Abroad received invitations but sent no delegates. Thus, for example, Archbishop Anthony of Geneva & Western Europe was invited to the Prosynodal Conference in Geneva (Chambesy) in 1976, but the hierarch refused, indicating that the time for such a conference was “not yet ripe,” and the “situation of Orthodox Churches in totalitarian lands” was not on the agenda. In the end, the Church Abroad was only represented at the conference, by correspondents, such as the priest Alexander Trubnikov.

The Church Abroad views with alarm the rapprochement between the Œcumenical Patriarchate and the Roman Catholic Church. They condemn and reject it as a unilateral step by the Œcumenical Patriarchate because this rapprochement is being accomplished without the consent of the whole of Orthodoxy. In 1965, Metropolitan Philaret protested against the lifting of the anathema of 1054 by Patriarch Athenagoras and Pope Paul VI. He condemned this step to be an individual act by the Œcumenical Patriarchate, which thereby distances itself from the whole of Orthodoxy. The Archbishop of Athens and the Moscow Patriarchate also protested.

Metropolitan Philaret also warned the Œcumenical Patriarch to renounce the “dialogue” with Rome because it is really a “monologue,” since Rome was striving for the reunification of Churches under the supremacy of the pope.²³ In his epistles to the heads of other Orthodox Churches, Metropolitan Philaret has, since the mid-1960s, indicated that individual Orthodox Churches could not speak for Orthodoxy. Basic questions, such as dialogue with Rome, could only be handled by a council of all Churches. The convening of such a council would, however, only be justified if the Orthodox Churches of Eastern Europe were able to decide freely.²⁴ The relationship of the Church Abroad to the Œcumenical Patriarchate has almost always since the establishment of the Church Abroad, with the exception of the first years, been fraught. Despite this, however, it has been properly maintained even to the present, e.g., the invitation to the Prosynodal Conference in 1976, which was extended at the initiative of Constantinople.

Common divine services could take place on a regional level with the participation of clergy of lower ranks because the Moscow Patriarchate is ever watchful that the Œcumenical Patriarchate has no communion with the Church Abroad. If such divine services come to their attention, Moscow protests against them each time, especially if bishops have taken part, such as in 1965, when Archbishop Anthony and Metropolitan Emilian concelebrated a service.

Constantinople does not reject the Church Abroad’s apostolic succession and canonical basis. Thus, the Patriarchate allows the bishops of the Church Abroad to celebrate on Athos and to celebrate the monasteries’ feasts with the Russian monks there.²⁵

With the Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, there have been good and sincere relations from the beginning. This is large because there were no jurisdictional problems with these Patriarchates, as there were with the Œcumenical Patriarchate. The relationship to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem was and is to the present day especially close. The good relations with this Patriarchate can be traced to the time when Archbishop Anastasius first spent time in Jerusalem to inform himself on the situation of the Jerusalem Ecclesiastical Mission. During his stay in Jerusalem in the spring of 1921, there was a meeting with Patriarch Damian, who was well-acquainted personally with Metropolitan Anthony. The Patriarch of Jerusalem was at this

time in a most difficult situation. His election was contested by some of his episcopate, who refused to collaborate with their First Hierarch. Above all else, these bishops refused to assist in the consecration of new bishops. Archbishop Anastasius declared his readiness to consecrate new bishops together with the Patriarch, whereupon the opposing bishops abandoned their position and declared themselves ready to collaborate. The Patriarch, by and large, attributed the reestablishment of Church peace to Archbishop Anastasius' intervention and he remained closely bound to him for the rest of his life.²⁶ From 1924, Archbishop Anastasius lived for almost a decade at the Mission in Jerusalem and strengthened relations with the Patriarchate, which took part in all church feasts of the Mission and maintained close contacts with the Synod in Karlovtsy. On church holidays, both Churches exchanged regular greetings. In 1932, Archbishop Anastasius concelebrated during the consecration of Archimandrite Timothy to the episcopate. In 1935, the latter was enthroned as Patriarch.

Until 1945, the Jerusalem Patriarchate maintained relations only with the Church Abroad, since then it has resumed relations with the Russian Patriarchal Church, though the relations with Moscow have not been free from divisions.²⁷ The causes of these divisions lie in Moscow's interference in the ecclesial affairs of the Patriarchate. After the division of Palestine, some 25% of the faithful of the Jerusalem Patriarchate lived in Israel. The Patriarchate thereby suffered an enormously high financial loss, because the church tithes paid by the faithful living in Israel were deposited in Israeli banks and not in the Jordanian part of Palestine, where the Patriarch resided and would be paid. Because the higher-ranking Greek clergy had fled from Israel and only the lower-ranking Arab clergy had remained behind, Moscow now felt it was the protector of these faithful in Israel. In the following year, the Moscow Patriarchate attempted, by means of massive financial aid, to "assist" the faithful in the Israeli section, which was to be accompanied by a gradual alienation of the faithful from their Patriarchate. When, in 1952, a "Congress of Orthodox Communities in Israel" was organized, which not only pursued the aim of an autonomous administration but also proposed the election of its own metropolitan and its separation from the Jerusalem jurisdiction, Patriarch Timothy recognized the dangers that this "brotherly help" from Moscow occasioned. In order to ease relations with Moscow, Patriarch Timothy had to bow to the demands of Moscow, including finally breaking off communion with the clergy of the Church Abroad and forbidding them to serve in the holy places. In his note of 29 October 1952 to Patriarch Alexis, Patriarch Timothy promised to stop any communion with the Church Abroad.²⁸ As a result of this declaration, Moscow gave up its policy of division and pursued a flexible policy. Moreover, since then, the financial situation has forced the Jerusalem Patriarchate to take a yearly "donation" from Moscow, ranging from \$100,000 to \$150,000. How long these donations continued to be provided by Moscow is unknown.²⁹

Nevertheless, the Jerusalem Patriarchate seems not to have taken its declaration about breaking off communion particularly seriously, because, in May of 1954, Patriarch Timothy visited the Church Abroad's Mount of Olives Convent, where Bishop Leontius (Bartosevich) and a group of pilgrims were staying and celebrated a liturgy there together with the bishop and the pilgrims. In his sermon, he depicted himself as the "friend of Metropolitan Anastasius."³⁰ Metropolitan Anastasius also seemed not to have placed any particular importance on the declaration. After having received the news of the Patriarch's death, he held a memorial service for the deceased at

the cathedral in New York and praised the good and friendly relations that bind both the Churches even to the present.³¹

This good relationship did not change under Patriarch Benedict. In 1964, he received Archbishop Nikon of Washington; in 1966, he bestowed upon Abbess Mary of the Bethany-Gethsemane Convent the Gold Jerusalem Sepulchre Cross, the highest award that the Patriarchate has to bestow. In 1971, he received Metropolitan Philaret, Bishop Paul, Archpriest George Grabbe, and Deacon N. Chakirov in a “warm atmosphere. Particular honor was shown in that the Church Abroad’s representatives were received in the throne room of the Patriarchate.

Archimandrite Anthony (Grabbe) was invited to the official reception of the newly-elected Patriarch [Diodorus] in February of 1981. After Fr. Anthony had conveyed the Church Abroad’s good wishes, the Patriarch wished the Church Abroad “success and greatness.”³²

The new Jerusalem Patriarch seems to take a clear stance towards the Church Abroad. In the spring of 1982, he visited the convents and Ecclesiastical Mission of the Church Abroad. His participation in the festivities connected with the relics of the two New Martyrs, the Grand Duchess Elizabeth and the nun Barbara, and the addresses held in conjunction with this (see Part II, Chap. 3) show that the Jerusalem Patriarchate recognizes the Church Abroad as an Orthodox Sister Church and its competence to act and speak for the whole Russian Church. Furthermore, the Patriarch assigned a commission to examine the question as to whether the ban on celebrating with the bishops of the Church Abroad, which his predecessor imposed in 1952, has any validity in general.

The relationship to the other two Eastern Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria is free from strife, though Moscow’s politics towards these were more successful. With these two Patriarchates, money played an even greater role than with the Jerusalem Patriarchate. Patriarch Alexander III [of Antioch] declared quite openly that the economic situation of the Patriarchate alone had forced him to again take up relations (1935-1966) with Moscow. Patriarch Christopher of Alexandria commented on the Moscow-propagated peace politics with the words: “The idea of peace recommended by the Patriarch of Moscow is not always the ideal of Christian peace. It relates to the establishment of a new ‘world order’, of a ‘new, better life’.”³³ This correct evaluation of the true interest of the Moscow Patriarchate was also the cause that, until the 1960s, the Patriarchate of Alexandria had relations with the Church Abroad. The Russian émigré communities in North Africa and Egypt received financial help from this Church despite the economically poor situation of the Patriarchate. Also, clergy from the Patriarchate took over the care of the Russian émigré communities for a time.³⁴

The Patriarchate of Antioch continued the good relations with the Church Abroad that it had maintained before 1917, after the severing of relations with the Moscow Patriarchate. It recognized the competence of the Church Abroad for the Russian diaspora, and also held fast to the competence of the Russian Church for North America. The different stance of this Patriarchate and the Œcumenical Patriarchate is best illustrated in the case of North America.

Archbishop Euhymus (Ofiesh) had been consecrated by the Russian Church in 1917 and was head of the Syro-Arabic Mission, which once was subject to the Patriarchate of Antioch;

however, he transferred it to the spiritual supervision of the Russian bishops for North America and entrusted his communities directly to the Russian Church. Upon the desire of the Patriarch of Antioch, the Syrian Orthodox communities in 1923 received full self-administration from the Russian Church, but remained in full communion of prayer with the Church Abroad, to which they felt historically bound.

The status of self-administration was established with the national peculiarities of Syrian Christians. Almost at the same time, Constantinople set up an exarchate with four dioceses for the Greek communities in the U.S.A. Constantinople did not inform the Russian Church, the jurisdictionally competent “Mother Church” for the Orthodox there.³⁵ In 1936, the Synod of Bishops agreed that the Syro-Arabic Christians in the U.S.A. should be placed directly under the Patriarch of Antioch. In South America, where many Syrian diaspora communities were located, both Churches likewise worked closely together, each entrusting its faithful to the other Church if it did not have its own priests or churches.

The aforementioned Patriarchates can, at least in part, make decisions freely about whether or not they also wanted to maintain proper relations with the Church Abroad after 1945. The situation with the Orthodox Churches of Eastern Europe after 1945 was completely different because, through the Soviet influence in these lands, they simultaneously came under the influence of the Moscow Patriarchate. Before 1945, relations with the Serbian and Bulgarian Churches were particularly close. Both churches had granted full self-administration to the Russian émigré communities. The Serbian Patriarchate supported the Church Abroad, not only materially, but was also in complete harmony on all ecclesiastical questions. It was the Serbian Patriarch Barnabas who, in 1934, took the initiative to reconcile the Russian émigré churches with one another.

It is probably not an exaggeration to state that the Serbian Patriarchate recognized the Church Abroad as the canonically legitimate Church and refused this recognition to the Patriarchal Deputy Locum Tenens Sergius (Stragorodsky). When he appealed to Patriarch Barnabas, in March of 1933, to dissolve the Karlovtsy Synod, the First Hierarchy of the Serbian Church did not take a step in that direction but rather defended the Church Abroad against the accusation that it is a political organ.³⁶

After the Communist seizure of power in Yugoslavia, the Serbian Patriarchate had to give its consent to subordinate the Russian émigré communities of Yugoslavia to the Moscow Patriarchate. Because of the break between Tito and Stalin, this did not come about. The communities still in existence were placed under the Church of Serbia, and the émigrés were granted exit visas to the West. By 1954, practically all émigrés had left the country, so that Moscow found it easy to entrust the “Russian Church property and Russian communities” to the Church of Serbia.

The Serbian Patriarchate had at no point in time distanced itself from its pre-1945 policies towards the Church Abroad. Now as before, the Church of Serbia maintains full official relations with the Church Abroad and allows its bishops to concelebrate with the bishops of the Church Abroad. The Serbian Church is probably the only Church to understand how to oppose the

demands of the Moscow Patriarchate so that Moscow found itself prepared to acknowledge that this Orthodox National Church maintains full communion with both parts of the Russian Church. A sign of this maintenance of their relations to both parts of the Russian Church was, for example, is the invitation and participation of Russian bishops from the Church Abroad and the Moscow Patriarchate at the anniversary celebrations of the Serbian parishes in Munich in autumn 1981.³⁷ The relationship between the Church Abroad and the is perhaps also characterized by the fact that the Church Abroad does not serve any Serbian exile community, in contrast to the Bulgarian and Romanian communities. The Church Abroad officially considers the Serbian Church to be — like the other Eastern bloc Churches — a captive Church. They withhold direct criticism, however, in the case of the Church of Serbia because one must, of course, also consider that the Church of Serbia is essentially more independent in its relationship to the Russian Patriarchal Church.

The Russian communities in Bulgaria have had an independent status since 1920. Archbishop Seraphim [Sobolev] was at that time the representative of the Russian Church Abroad to the Synod of the Church of Bulgaria. The relations of both churches were good and sincere from the beginning. In 1921, Bulgarian Metropolitan Stephen had taken part in the opening session of the Pan-Diaspora Council in Karlovtsy, which, it is true, was somewhat problematic for the Church Abroad because Constantinople viewed the Church of Bulgaria as schismatic. During World War II, the Bulgarians supported the missionary work of the Church Abroad directed toward the Soviet Union and made it possible for the St. Job Brotherhood in Ladomirova to print divine service, liturgical and educational literature. Wherever Bulgarian faithful lived in the diaspora and Russian communities existed, these faithful were cared for by the Church Abroad.

After the invasion of the Soviets and the Communist seizure of power in Bulgaria, the Church of Bulgaria came fully under the influence of the Russian Patriarchal Church. They had to sever their relations with the Church Abroad. Archbishop Seraphim, who was the first hierarch consecrated by the Church Abroad, remained leader of the Russian communities in Bulgaria, which were now under the jurisdiction of Moscow. In June of 1947, Bulgarian émigrés, who had left the country after World War II, founded, in Buffalo (New York), a “Supreme Administration of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church,” to which communities in the U.S.A., Canada, and Australia belong. The assembly declared that the Bulgarian émigré communities are an “inseparable part of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church,” but no longer wish to have any administrative unity with it. The émigré Bishop Andrew (Velitsky) took charge of the émigré communities. After the election of the first Bulgarian Patriarch, Cyril, and the declaration of the autocephaly of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, Bishop Andrew and some of the parishes again joined the Mother Church. At a “national Church conference,” some of the parishes declared their autonomy. The communities were in close contact with the Russian Church Abroad. Since then, the leadership of the communities lay in the hands of Hieromonk Cyril (Iontsev), who was the rector at the Bulgarian Church of St. George the Great Martyr in Toledo, Ohio, where there was a large Bulgarian exile community. In 1959, Cyril was elevated to the rank of archimandrite. In 1964, he was consecrated by the Church Abroad at Holy Trinity Monastery as Bishop of Toledo & Toronto. Metropolitan Philaret, Archbishops Nikon, Abercius, Seraphim, and Anthony consecrated him. The Bulgarian communities received an autonomous status within the Church

Abroad. There were large Bulgarian communities in Toledo, Detroit, Syracuse, and Toronto. Bishop Cyril's communities remained under the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad until 1976. On account of many differences of opinion, including the calendar question — Bishop Cyril wanted to follow the New Style with his communities, which the Synod rejected — there was a break with the Synod.

Bishop Cyril joined the OCA with the majority of his parishes. The Bulgarian communities in Niagara Falls and Toronto remained with the Church Abroad, as did the Bulgarian Sts. Cyril and Methodius Parish in Rome, New York.³⁸

The relationship of the Church Abroad to the Romanian Church was strained and poor. At the end of World War I, Romania had annexed eastern Moldavia/Bessarabia. Until 1917, the whole territory had belonged to the Church of Russia. In October of 1918, Archbishop Anastasius, who had been Bishop of Kishinev since 1915, was assigned by Patriarch Tikhon to again take up his diocese, which, however, now belonged to Romania. The new rulers demanded that Archbishop Anastasius join and acknowledge the competence of the Church of Romania for the Diocese of Kishinev & Moldavia. Archbishop Anastasius refused. The main reason for the refusal was that the new ruler had begun a Romanianization in all areas, including the Church, after annexing the territory. It was intended that Romanian replace Church Slavonic as the liturgical language; many Russian communities rejected this. Above all else, the numerous monasteries of the diocese — there were around 30 — took an inveterate stand against these attempts (at least their Russian inhabitants did). The nuns of the former Lesna Convent of the Mother of God were an example of this. They had found temporary refuge in the Ascension Convent in Zhabka. After the introduction and observance of the reforms were demanded of them, 62 nuns decided to emigrate to Yugoslavia, where they reestablished their convent in Hopovo.

Despite these differences, both Churches — the Church Abroad and the Church of Romania — were initially concerned to establish a *modus vivendi* in their relations. The Russian émigrés did not obtain their own church administration. This was rejected, probably in consideration of the large Russian minority in Bessarabia, because a numerically important minority Church would have come into existence. Only the Russian embassy church in Bucharest remained as a Russian parish church. However, this parish was subject to Metropolitan Eulogius and remained, after the schism with the Church Abroad, under the Paris Jurisdiction.³⁹

After the Pan-Orthodox Congress of 1923, the Romanian Church introduced the New Calendar. Many Russian communities rejected this because they felt more closely tied to the Church of Russia than to that of Romania. Many monks and nuns from Bessarabia, as well as many priests, left the country and joined the Church Abroad. Metropolitan Anthony's appeal to the Church of Romania to permit the Russian émigré communities the possibility of following the Old Calendar was rejected. The Romanian Church persecuted the Old Calendarists as a "sect."

Despite this tense situation, Metropolitan Anthony was invited to the enthronization of the Romanian Patriarch in 1925. Metropolitan Anthony spent a week in Bucharest. In his talk at the enthronization, he avoided bringing up the situation of the Russian parishes and exhorted the newly-enthroned Patriarch to observe and follow the dogmas and canons of all Orthodox

peoples.⁴⁰ Whether the situation of the Russian communities was negotiated is not known. It could be assumed, however, that during his stay it was spoken of, although probably also without results because the situation did not change.

Since the end of the 1920s, the relations of both Churches have deteriorated rapidly. The Bucharest parish now belonged to the Paris Jurisdiction, so that the Church Abroad no longer required any representation here. Those Russian communities that followed the Old Style and kept using Church Slavonic met with strife. Because the priests of these communities became fewer and fewer on account of aging, Bishop Seraphim (Lade) decided to consecrate new priests for these parishes. In the mid-1930s, Bessarabia was put under martial law. There were trials against 29 Russian priests who continued to refuse to follow the reforms. Relations between the Church of Romania and the Church Abroad, which had been frozen at an absolutely minimal level already by the early 1930s, were now completely suspended. The usual greetings at Pascha, Christmas, and special church feasts were no longer exchanged.⁴¹ Only after the Communist seizure of power did the Russian Patriarchal Church and the Church of Romania again take up relations, since Moldavia again belonged to the Soviet Union. On the situation of Romanian communities in this territory, almost nothing is known. It is, however, to be assumed that all Orthodox communities in the Republic of Moldavia now again follow the Old Style and use Church Slavonic as the common liturgical language, because the faithful belong to the Russian Patriarchal Church and the re-Russification certainly did not stop at the gates of the Church.

The émigré Orthodox Romanians in the West joined three different jurisdictions: the Patriarchate of Bucharest, the Œcumenical Patriarchate and an autonomous group under Metropolitan Vissarion. The latter cared for more than eight communities in North America and a few in South America and Western Europe. After Metropolitan Vissarion retired, he recommended to the head of this group, Bishop Theophilus (Ionescu), that he join either the Greek Church or the Russian Church Abroad. In 1962, Bishop Theophilus decided to join the Church Abroad, which granted him an autonomous status. In 1972, he joined the Romanian Patriarchate. Three parishes (in Montréal, Buenos Aires and Paris, which all had their own priests and churches) remained under the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad. Since then, they have been subject directly to the Synod of Bishops.⁴²

With the Orthodox Church of Poland, relations have been strained since the early 1920s, because the Church of Russia did not meet the wishes of the Polish Orthodox for autonomy or autocephaly. In that country, there were about 5 to 6 million Orthodox faithful, including only about half a million Orthodox Poles. Patriarch Tikhon appointed Archbishop George of Minsk as head of the Warsaw Metropolia in 1920. After the government authorities made it impossible for him to have normal relations with Patriarch Tikhon, Metropolitan George strove to establish a Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church. These strivings met with total rejection by the Church of Russian — the Patriarchal Church and the Church Abroad. Also, the Russian bishops living there — Archbishop Panteleimon (Rozhnovsky), Sergius (Korolev), and Vladimir (Tikhonitsky) — were resolute opponents of Polish autocephaly. Bishops Sergius and Vladimir were exiled by the Polish authorities, while Archbishop Panteleimon withdrew to the Zhirovitsa Dormition Monastery, where he lived in retirement from that time. Under Metropolitan George's successor,

the Ecumenical Patriarch declared the Church of Poland autocephalous. Patriarch Tikhon protested the autocephaly because it was accomplished without the consent of the Church of Russia. Only a Russian local council would be able to make a valid decision on this question. ⁴³

Metropolitan George terminated communion in prayer with the Church Abroad because it had opposed autocephaly. During the enthronization of the Romanian Patriarch, there was a meeting in Bucharest between Metropolitan Anthony and Metropolitan Dionysius of Warsaw. ⁴⁴ After Metropolitan Dionysius had expressed his regret over the occurrences in Poland and the treatment of the Russian hierarchs, both metropolitans decided to reestablish the communion in prayer and official relations between both Churches. This first meeting was followed by an exchange of letters between the Synod and the Metropolitan of Warsaw, which, in 1927, led to the following union: both Churches confirmed the re-establishment of the communion in prayer. The granting of autocephaly to the Church of Poland falls to the competence of the Russian Mother Church, to which a final decision must remain reserved. ⁴⁵ Since then, normal relations again existed between the two Churches. At the Pan-Orthodox Conference on Athos, at which the Russian Church was not represented, Metropolitan Dionysius declared that Metropolitan Anthony, as a spokesman for the whole Russian Church, should have been invited. The Russian Patriarchal Church recognized the autocephaly of the Polish Orthodox Church in 1948. The Church Abroad, however, refused to recognize the autocephaly because the final recognition must be reserved to a Pan-Russia Council that includes the Patriarchal Church, the Catacomb Church, and the Church Abroad.

With Baltic Orthodoxy, there are no official relations, because the Church Abroad rejected the national church movements in these countries. There were friendly and close contacts only with Bishop John (Pommer) of Riga & Latvia because he was also a resolute opponent of these strivings. An advocate of autonomy for the Latvian Church, Archbishop Augustine (Augustine Peterson) became the successor to the martyred Archbishop John in 1936 and was appointed Metropolitan in the same year. After his emigration to the West, Metropolitan Augustine established full community of prayer with the Church Abroad. Shortly before his death, he bade Archbishop Alexander (Lovtsy) care for his small flock of Latvian Orthodox, whom he urged to join the Church Abroad. ⁴⁶

With the Orthodox Churches of Greece, Cyprus, and Sinai, there were “general church relations.” Behind this general description, the fact was hidden that with these Churches there were in practice no special problems, and the relations were limited to the exchange of congratulatory messages and greetings. Such messages were, for example, exchanged on Metropolitan Anthony’s 50th anniversary of his ordination in 1935 or at Pascha in 1936, when the heads of the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece, Cyprus, Sinai and Poland sent congratulatory wishes. ⁴⁷ The Greek Archbishop of Athens had permitted the Russian communities their own administration. The Russian Diocese established there existed officially until 1929, after which only smaller Russian parishes existed in Athens and Piraeus. Relations with the Church of Greece were overshadowed in part by the fact that the proponents of the Old Style, the Old Calendarists, who were viewed by the Greek Church as schismatics, felt closely bound to the Church Abroad. Thus, the Church Abroad today has a few

Greek parishes, which rejected the calendar reform. For example, in 1972, together with the Abbot of the Greek Holy Transfiguration Monastery in Boston, Bishop Callistus of Corinth, who likewise rejected the calendar reform, visited Holy Trinity Monastery.⁴⁸ In general, the Church Abroad has maintained a restrained stance towards the Old Calendarists in order not to burden its relationship with the Greek Church further by involvement with this group.

To summarize the existing relations of the Church Abroad to the Orthodox Sister Churches, it can be established that the Church Abroad was officially recognized by the Orthodox Local Churches before World War II, and normal Church relations were maintained, which were, in part, overshadowed by historically conditioned tensions, which resulted from the struggle for jurisdictional competence in the diaspora. The most obvious of these was with the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Through the reemergence of the Moscow Patriarchate after the end of World War II, normal relations were restored with this Patriarchate, and the Churches in the West broke off their official relations with the Church Abroad, but only after massive intervention on the part of Moscow: or, more accurately speaking, relations were frozen. This, however, did not prevent these Churches from taking part in jubilees of the Church Abroad and on a regional level, far from “big church politics,” from working together with it. Official condemnation of the Church Abroad as a “schismatic” Church has not at any time been proclaimed by all of Orthodoxy.

In the last two decades or so, forced by the entry of the Orthodox Churches into the Ecumenical Movement and the start of the dialogue with Rome, the Church Abroad considers itself more and more to be a protector of “true Orthodoxy.” Its conservatism in this area has brought it many new members, including Greek faithful from the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch and faithful from the Orthodox Church in America. For example, after the O.C.A. had introduced the New Style (Gregorian Calendar) in September of 1982, four O.C.A. parishes or significant parts of parishes from Pennsylvania (Mayfield, Simpson, Wilkes-Barre and Old Forge) joined the Church Abroad because they rejected the calendar reform. Shortly thereafter, Fr. N. Liberis of the Greek Archdiocese of North America, together with a part of his parish in Glendora, California, likewise joined the Church Abroad, because he rejected the progressive modernism of the Greek Church of North America.⁴⁹ The conservative stance of the Church Abroad is essentially closer to those stances of the Church of Greece, of the Jerusalem Patriarchates and of Athonite monasticism than to the innovationist Churches of Constantinople and the Eastern bloc.

With these conservative Churches, the Church Abroad is bound in a close spiritual family, which finds its expression, among other things, in the fact that these Churches are just as reserved towards the “modernist movement” in Orthodoxy as the Church Abroad, and view dialogue with the non-Orthodox Churches with mistrust. Idiosyncratic paths, such as that which the Ecumenical Patriarchate treads in its rapprochement with Rome, elicit the regular protests of these Churches, which demand greater unity for the whole of Orthodoxy and careful voting by the whole of Orthodoxy on the measures taken by individual Churches.

Footnotes

1. *Orthodoxe Rundschau* (1981) 1, p. 15. ↵
2. *III Gesamtkonzil*, p. 62. ↵

3. A part of the clergy that collaborated with the regime had joined the “Living Church” and the “Renovationist Church.” After the Patriarch’s arrest, this group succeeded in taking possession of the Patriarchal Chancery, whereupon they claimed to be the “legitimate” vestige of the Russian Church and found recognition as such. By this deception, they were able to get bishops of the Patriarchal Church to join them. They also succeeded in gaining the recognition of a few Orthodox Sister Churches. The Church Abroad addressed its Sister Churches in epistles and eventually clarified the situation. Thereupon these churches withdrew their recognition and affirmed that they would only recognize Patriarch Tikhon as the legitimate Primate. Cf. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 6, pp. 119-145. ↵
4. *III Gesamtkonzil*, pp. 67-68. ↵
5. *Prav. Rus’* (1980) 23, pp. 12-13. ↵
6. *Newsletter* (March-April 1980) 29, p. 5. ↵
7. *Ibid.* (Nov.-Dec. 1979) 27, p. 2. ↵
8. Polsky, *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*. ↵
9. Grabbe, *Tserkov’ i uchenie* 1, p. 197. ↵
10. *Ibid.*, p. 196; Polsky, *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*, p. 128. ↵
11. *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*, p. 130. ↵
12. *Ibid.*, p. 126. ↵
13. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 6, p. 138. ↵
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 140-142. ↵
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 133-146. ↵
16. There is a 13-day difference between the two calendars. Thus, the adherents of the Old Calendar celebrate Christmas Eve on January 6th, which corresponds to Dec. 24th on the Old Calendar. ↵
17. Anastasius, *Sbornik*, pp. 12-13. ↵
18. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 10, pp. 39-40. ↵
19. *Tserk. Ved.* (1924) 19-20, p. 5. ↵
20. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 10, pp. 39-40. ↵
21. *Ibid.*, 6, pp. 164-165. ↵
22. Polsky, *Kanonicheskoe polozhenie*, p. 129. ↵
23. *Prav. Rus’* (1965) 24, p. 11; (1966) 3, pp. 3-4; Patock, “Aufhebung.” ↵

24. Ostroumoff, "Appendix" *The History of the Council of Florence*, pp. 193-235. On these pages, there are numerous letters by Metropolitan Philaret on questions concerning Pan Orthodoxy. ↵
25. *Prav. Rus'* (1965) 11, pp. 14-15; (1982) 19, pp. 4-7. ↵
26. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 5, p. 18. ↵
27. Seide, *Jerusalem*, pp. 163-170. ↵
28. *Vestnik patriarshego ekzaarchata* [Paris] (1953) 14, (not paginated); *Prav. Rus'* (1953) 11, p. 16. ↵
29. Seide, *Jerusalem*, p. 168. ↵
30. *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 13, pp. 13-14. ↵
31. *Ibid.* (1956) 1, p. 15. ↵
32. *Ibid.* (1964) 8, p. 11; (1966) 21, p. 12; "Messenger" (1971/1972) 64 [21]; *Newsletter* (Jan.-Mar. 1981) 36, pp. 1-2. ↵
33. Seide, *Jerusalem*, p. 169. ↵
34. Grabbe, *Tserkov' i uchenie* 1, p. 186. ↵
35. *Tserk. Ved.* (1923) 19-20, p. 16. ↵
36. *Echos d'Orient* (1934) 173, pp. 107-108; (1935) 178, pp. 220-223. ↵
37. *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (1981) 14.9, p. 12. ↵
38. *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 11, pp. 2-4; (1963) 24, pp. 9-10; (1964) 1, pp. 10-11; 13, p. 11; 15, pp. 3-5, 9-10; 16, p. 5; (1977) 5, p. 15. ↵
39. Manuchina, *Evlogy*, p. 437. ↵
40. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 7, pp. 103-106; "Echos d'Orient" (1926) 141, pp. 99-100. ↵
41. Grabbe, *Tserkov' i uchenie* 1, pp. 190-191. ↵
42. *Spisok* (1980) p. 27; *Prav. Rus'* (1962) 9, p.12; *Pravoslavny vestnik v Kanade* (1962) 5, p. 12; *Messenger* (1972) 66, pp. 27-30. ↵
43. Grabbe, *Tserkov' i uchenie* 1, pp. 201; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 7, p. 34. ↵
44. *Ibid.*, p. 104. ↵
45. Grabbe, *Tserkov' i uchenie* 1, p. 202. ↵
46. *Prav. Rus'* (1955) 21, p.12; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1956) 1-6, p. 3. ↵
47. *Tserk Zhizn'* (1935) 9-10, pp. 137-140; (1966) 4-5, pp. 52-56. ↵

48. *Prav.Rus'* (1972) 20, p. 15. ⇐

49. *Newsletter* (Oct.-Nov. 1982) 42, pp. 1-2. ⇐

Part V, Chapter 4

The Church Abroad & the Non-Orthodox Churches

Before World War I, there was as little interest in Orthodoxy in the West as there was interest in the Western Churches in the East. The Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Churches existed in proximity to one another because the regions in which their faithful lived abutted each other, though no inter-Church contacts took place. Both Churches — the Catholic and the Orthodox — viewed the other Church as schismatic and saw the conversion of the faithful of the other Church as a missionary task. In the Polish-Ukrainian borderlands and the Seven Mountains, millions of Uniates lived, who had formerly been Orthodox and who, while retaining their liturgy and liturgical language, had recognized the Pope as their head (the Union of Brest) in 1596 [Trans., and in 1698 (Siebenburgen)]. The reason for these unions with Rome was political; there were no theological causes for these unions. They were based solely on the connection between the State and the Catholic unions. Since then, the return of these “erring faithful” from Rome to the “bosom of Orthodoxy” was a goal of Orthodox ecclesiastical politics in this area, whereas Rome simultaneously sought to bring more Orthodox faithful to the Unia. After the collapse of the Polish-Lithuanian State and the obliteration of independent Poland, these faithful lost their political protection. Tsarist Russia, in which the Orthodox Church was the State Church, promoted the remissionizing and return of the Uniate faithful into the “bosom of the Mother Church.”

A typical example of this mission was the foundation of the aforementioned Convent of the Lesna Icon of the Mother of God. It had been founded in 1885, in the Diocese of Kholm, where mainly Catholic and Uniate faithful lived, with the special assignment of serving as a missionary outpost for the conversion of the Uniates.¹ Indeed, the Lesna nuns, who were happy to have such massive State support, enjoyed great missionary success, though the final “winning back” and “reunification of the Uniates” was reserved for the Russian Patriarchal Church.

In 1950, a great event in the life of the Orthodox Church took place: a Synod for the Greek Catholic clergy and laity in the Preshov region in Czechoslovakia decided to break with Rome and to return to the bosom of the ancestral Orthodox Church.”² Behind this benign statement was hidden the annihilation of the Uniate Church, which was accomplished under massive government pressure.

The struggle for influence and mission among the faithful in the borderlands, in which political power was for centuries often the only deciding factor, has overshadowed the relationship between the Catholic and the Orthodox Church, especially with regard to the Russian Church. In the case of the Russian Church, a further factor of mistrust was added: the Polish-Russian relationship on a political level also effected the ecclesiastical realm, because Polish nationalism and Catholicism were inseparable, just as in Russia tsarism and Orthodoxy were.

Thus, political-governmental goals were entangled in many ways with ecclesiastical politics. Less problematic was the relationship to the Reformed Churches. In the Baltic Republics and in Finland there were points of contact, though here there were no numerically significant

conversions or forcible takeovers of entire regions. Both groups perhaps had a mutual rejection of the Roman Catholic Church.

Before the Revolution, there were contacts with the Anglican Church, the Old Catholic Church, and a few Protestant Churches. After the World Mission Conference at Edinburgh (1910), the next contacts with the Ecumenical Movement came during World War I. An “exchange of letters” between the First Secretary of the Movement for Faith and Church Order, the American solicitor R. H. Gardiner, and two prominent representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church..., Archbishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky) of Kiev & Galicia and canon law specialist Archimandrite Hilarion (Troitsky), revealed their opposition, which the Church Abroad later continued. Archbishop Anthony represented the view that, according to Orthodox teaching, all outside the Church are “heathens, heretics, and usurpers of the Christian name.” American attorney R. H. Gardiner referred in his reply to the contrasting utterances of Russian theologians, whose opinion he summarizes as follows: “The schisms and heresies have not made the Christian people from the West into heathens.”³

If this exchange of letters only concerns the positions of individuals in relationship to the Anglican and Old Catholic Church, one can speak of more regular relations and of theological dialogue between these Churches and the Russian Church. Since the 18th century, there had been a close relationship with the Anglican Church.⁴ Since the 19th century there has existed in North America and England a “Committee for Rapprochement with the Orthodox Church” [in England, the Eastern Church Association]. In 1865, there was a conference between the Orthodox and the Anglicans in London, at which the possibilities of a union of both Churches were discussed. “The Lambeth Conference of 1897 expressed the Anglican Church’s desire to grow closer to the Orthodox Church.” In 1906, the Society for the “Union of the Anglican & Orthodox Eastern Church” was formed in England. In 1912, with the blessing of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, the “Society for the Rapprochement of the Anglican & Orthodox Churches” was inaugurated. The first chairman of this society was Eulogius, Bishop of Kholm.⁵ After the outbreak of the War, contacts with the Anglican Church broke off. They were only able to be reinstated in 1943 when a delegation of Anglicans again visited Russia.

Contacts with the Old Catholic movement began in the 1870s. Between 1897 and 1910, representatives of the Russian Church attended Old Catholic Conferences; from 1892, a commission existed at the Holy Synod, which was to study the possibilities of a union between the Old Catholics and the Orthodox. Similar commissions existed to address rapprochement with the Catholics. For about 25 years, there was an intensive dialogue between the two Churches, but relations with the Old Catholics were also interrupted during World War I: “Since World War I, the intercourse between the Old Catholics and the Orthodox has been in abeyance. In 1946, an exchange of letters <...> was again undertaken.”⁶

There were points of contact with the Protestant Churches since the 16th century. “In the 19th century, many renowned theologians of the Russian Church occupied themselves with a thorough study of Protestantism. The Russian theologians made good use of the knowledge of Protestant academics in the realm of Church history, biblical scholarship and Christian ethics.”⁷

All these contacts with the Russian Mother Church broke off after 1920. The rulers [Trans., Soviets] no longer permitted the Patriarchal Church to continue the theological dialogue. Only after World War II was the Patriarchal Church able to again enter into discussions. Today, the Patriarchal Church conducts multi- and bilateral contacts with the non-Orthodox Churches on all levels. Through entrance into the World Council of Churches in 1961, the Patriarchal Church has participated in ecumenical discussions on an interconfessional basis.⁸ Also, the Patriarchal Church conducts bilateral talks with the Reformed and heterodox Churches. Theological talks with the Evangelical Church in Germany have, for example, become an integral part of this bilateral dialogue. Since the Second Vatican Council, at which, for the first time, official representatives of the Patriarchal Church were present, dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church has also been initiated. It must also be pointed out that both the Ecumenical Movement, as well as the dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church, were most closely connected with the name of Metropolitan Nicodemus (Rotov), who, until his death [Trans., in Rome], was not only the initiator but also the moderator of this dialogue. Thus, R. Slenska writes in his condemnation of the ecumenical activities of the Patriarchal Church: "It is only a relatively small group which carries out the ecumenical activities of the Russian Orthodox Church. At ecumenical institutions, one meets the same people again and again, who is much concerned with the corresponding reports and journeys. It is no wonder that not only an ecclesial-political but also a theological opposition is directed against such a grouping. This has occasioned reproaches of renovation and of challenging the basic tenets of the Faith."⁹ Whether the proponents or opponents of dialogue, especially with the Catholic Church, will prevail, cannot now be predicted. As for a continuation, the abiding fact is that the contacts have become such a part of the ecclesial-political routine that cessation would necessarily have serious consequences for the whole ecumenical movement. With Rome, an interruption of the dialogue would be more feasible, because it is only a matter of bilateral talks, limited to the small group around Metropolitan Nicodemus. With the exception of the Ecumenical Patriarch, the dialogue with Rome is viewed with mistrust. From the end of World War I, the dialogue with the Western Churches was exclusively maintained by the emigration. The upkeep of contacts from the time before 1920, as well as generally getting information on the Russian Church and, therefore, also on Orthodoxy within the non-Orthodox world, can, for the most part, be credited to the emigration.

While the Orthodox Church had been limited to eastern and southern Europe, Turkey and the East until the beginning of this century, the situation changed after the 1880s. Particularly in North America, many Orthodox communities made up of immigrants from the Near East and Eastern Europe [e.g., Carpatho-Russia] came into existence. Thus, it is not particularly surprising that the General Convocation of the Anglican Church in North America, rather than the Anglican Church of England, began the dialogue with the Russian Church.¹⁰

After the end of World War II, Russian refugees streamed into Western Europe. The establishment of Russian Orthodox communities in traditionally Catholic and evangelical Protestant countries led to many contacts between representatives of these Churches and the faithful. Russian spirituality, piety, Church customs, and traditional Church art and usages not only became known but also aroused curiosity and, ultimately, academic and theological interest.

Thus, the émigrés, by their mere existence, contributed much to the “discovery” of the Russian Church.

It was not the émigré communities alone that awakened the interest of Western Christians in the Russian Church. It was the situation of the Church and the faithful in Russia itself. The terrible persecutions of the Church, which began at the time of the Communists’ seizure of power, aroused indignation in Western Church circles, as well as admiration for the martyrdom of clergy and faithful. That the full extent of the persecution of religion was known is one of the main contributions of the Church Abroad, which has, since its foundation, taking advantage of every opportunity to point to the difficult fate of their brethren in the faith in their homeland. The persecution of the Church led to the Western Churches feeling solidarity with the Russian Church, because the atheistic and materialistic ideology was the common enemy of all religions, especially the Christian. This evaluation remained commonly in force at least until the 1940s.

Then, on account of the “new church policy” in the Soviet Union, a fresh evaluation of Communism came about, because more and more church representatives in the West received the impression that coexistence with Marxism-Leninism and Christianity would be entirely possible, as the ecclesial-political situation in the Soviet Union and the rest of the Eastern bloc would now prove. It has thus been overlooked even to this day that Communist ideology has not desisted from proclaiming the incompatibility of Marxism-Leninism and Christianity; that religion, now as before, is redundant and a thing of the past, something that has no future. One is thus also helping the State to confirm this prognosis, in that the institution of the Church has limited its activities to a minimum.

Both developments — the establishment of Orthodox communities in the diaspora, especially in Western Europe, and the persecution of the Church in Russia — awakened in the West interest in the Russian Church and Orthodoxy. Such academic interest found its clearest expression in the foundation of numerous institutions concerned with the study of Orthodoxy.

Until 1920, there was hardly any literature on Orthodoxy and the Russian Church in the West; but from the early 1920s, the publishing activities increased greatly. Many academic and church journals started their own chronicles, in which the Orthodox Churches, mostly represented through the Russian Church, were considered. Many studies were done on the Orthodox Churches, especially on the Roman Catholic side, by the establishment of Eastern Church periodicals.

The Church Abroad often viewed this — sometimes mistakenly — merely as an especially ‘refined attempt’ by Rome to bring Orthodox faithful into the Unia or to convert them completely to Catholicism. Thus, at the Second Pan-Diaspora Council in 1938, Hegumen Philip (von Gardner) warned against the journal *Irenikon*, which on its pages pursued a single goal, viz. to prove that there are no differences between the Orthodox Faith and the Roman Catholic faith, except in ritual. Rome would be prepared to accept Orthodox psychology if Orthodoxy would accept the supremacy of the Pope. With this interpretation, it is understandable that in its resolution the Council stressed a proposal, that there must be a particular emphasis in religious instruction on the “great differences” between Orthodoxy and Catholicism. ¹¹

It is impossible for this scholarly undertaking to analyze the theological thought of the Church Abroad, which arose against a dialogue with Rome, the Ecumenical Movement, and the individual Reformed Churches. Here, there can only be a brief overview of the basic position of the Church Abroad. It may appear that the Church Abroad today stands as a forlorn outpost in rejecting the Ecumenical Movement and condemning the dialogue between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Rome as a unilateral move. One should also not draw any hasty conclusions when individual representatives of Orthodox Churches take a liberal or conservative stand on certain questions. The dialogue with Rome and the Ecumenical Movement was condemned in various ways. In each of the Orthodox local Churches, there are opponents and proponents. This also applies to the Russian Patriarchal Church.

If Slenska speaks of a “small group” of representatives, there is also the question of the other group and its size. Did they leave Metropolitan Nicodemus alone because they were unable to prevent his ecumenical contacts, or because they were too small? Another example is the question of the acceptance of the Anglican ordination. Although the two Russian Churches did not recognize Anglican ordinations, the Paris Jurisdiction has recognized them since the 1930s.¹² One could also speak of conservative and liberal Russians. In other Orthodox Churches, there are similarly diverse positions, but, correspondingly, they are not always able to be articulated.

The Church Abroad has to the present time represented the Orthodox standpoint that the Orthodox Church alone is the one Church of Christ.¹³ All other Christian Churches, which have split from it, have gone on a schismatic and heretical path. A reunification of Churches, therefore, could only be accomplished by the non-Orthodox Churches rejoining the Orthodox Church. The Church Abroad based this claim on the fact that until the Great Schism in 1054, only one Church existed that recognized the dogmas established at the Seven Ecumenical Councils. The Roman Church has separated itself from this common path. Through the defilement of the purity of Orthodox teaching by the introduction of new dogmas, the Church of Rome has not only become schismatic but also heretical. The new dogmas of Rome, starting with the Filioque, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and the Virgin Mary’s bodily Assumption into Heaven, to the “completely anti-Christian teaching that the Pope is the Head of the Church and is infallible,” are impediments to any reunification. With the Protestant Churches, most particularly with the Anglican Church, a reunification would be essentially easier to accomplish, because these had not adopted the “new dogmas” of Rome. There would, therefore, also be fewer hindrances on a possible path to unity. But here there should be no misunderstanding: the total reunification of the Churches is also in this case only to be understood as their joining the Orthodox Church.

It may appear as if this view of the current developments in the Ecumenical Movement and of the strides taken in the dialogue with Rome have prevailed. However, reunification is perhaps even more tumor today than 30 or 50 years ago, when romanticized hopes of a joint, reunified Christian Church gave the movement fresh impetus. Today one begins to properly evaluate the actual, divisive factors after extensive theological discussion. One begins gradually to understand that no Church will renounce one of its own dogmas. The readiness to allow a dogma not to be

binding for the whole Church has not been forthcoming. The separation of Churches will continue.

The Church Abroad accuses the Ecumenical Movement, and the Roman Catholic Church above all, of attempting to achieve unity through a minimization of dogmas. The accusation that Rome would attempt to reduce the differences to liturgical forms was made not only at the Council of 1938. Archpriest George Grabbe (today Bishop Gregory) also analyzed the 1952 papal encyclical “Sacro Vergente Anno.”¹⁴ Grabbe sees the real goal of the encyclical to be a “new form of mission among the Russian.” In order to bring the latter to their [Roman Catholic] side, the Pope connected this with a campaign against Communism. In the encyclical, he gives a historical survey of the history of the Russian people and the Russian Church. In the schism between the Eastern and Western Church, according to the Pope, the Russian Church did not take part. The separation took place before the Russian Church took its own path, only in 1448 (autocephaly). The Pope has always felt a particular love for the Russian people. Together, both Churches would avert and condemn Communism.

This response to the encyclical clearly shows that there have been no changes in the consciousness of the Church Abroad toward the Roman Catholic Church during the time of the emigration. The Church Abroad even rejects a joint struggle with Rome against Communism. Already in 1922, Metropolitan Antony had appealed for help on the occasion of Patriarch Tikhon’s arrest to the heads of the non-Orthodox Churches but specifically excluded the support of the pope. The Appeal was entitled: “An appeal of the SEA Abroad to the leaders of the non-Orthodox Churches (excluding the Pope of Rome).”¹⁵ Although this stance may have been prompted by a deep mistrust of Rome, the real reasons for separation are to be found in the claim of the Orthodox Church to be the One Church. The various Orthodox Local Churches approached the possibilities of dialogue in different ways. At the Pan-Orthodox Conferences on Rhodes in 1961, 1963 and 1964, [the Churches] were unable even once to agree on whether or not they should accept the invitation to send observers to Vatican II. While a conservative group, headed by the Church of Greece, brought up the great distance between Orthodoxy and Catholicism, the other group, headed by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, advocated sending observers.¹⁶ The Russian Church was represented at Vatican II only by the Church Abroad’s observers and the Paris Jurisdiction. Archbishop Anthony of Geneva headed the Church Abroad’s group. In conjunction with the opening of the Council, he had served the divine liturgy at the Church Abroad’s St. Nicholas Church in Rome, and in his sermon once again stressed the following position of the Church Abroad: “All attempts, no matter whence they proceed, which aim to introduce something into our Orthodox Faith or change it in any way, will meet with no success. This is the reason why such attempts are unrealistic and impossible.”¹⁷

The Church Abroad did not take part in any sessions of the Vatican II Council. After a delegation of the Patriarchal Church suddenly arrived — the negotiations over participation had taken place without any publicity — the Church Abroad’s delegation withdrew.¹⁸

The dialogue between the Russian Patriarchal Church and the Roman Catholic Church, which has grown more intense over the years, has moreover led to a difference between both parts of the Russian Church in the matter of allowing Catholics Communion. Whereas the Patriarchal

Church permits Roman Catholic Christians to partake of Communion, the Church Abroad denies them Communion.¹⁹

The Church Abroad considered the lifting of the ecclesiastical ban of 1054 by the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Pope to be invalid because only a joint Council could take such a step. The Russian Patriarchal Church was of the same opinion that this step was “an act of the Local Church of Constantinople and could have no theological significance for the Holy Orthodox Church.”²⁰ The Catholic-Orthodox Commission, created by Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Demetrios to clarify the theological questions under dispute, was rejected by the Church Abroad because not all Orthodox Churches participated in the discussion.

The rapprochement between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Pope is viewed by the Church Abroad with great mistrust. Strong reactions have met all attempts of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to give the appearance of being the spokesman for the whole of Orthodoxy. The Church Abroad and the Russian Patriarchal Church have both protested against this. In many instances, Athonite monasticism, which occupies a special place within Orthodoxy, shares the Church Abroad’s view. In an epistle of 9/22 April 1980, the representatives of all 20 Athonite monasteries expressed their concern over the fact that the Ecumenical Patriarch seems to have taken a “dangerous” path, and they stressed that the “Orthodox Church is the One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ,” to whose bosom “the Churches” and “confessions” of the West must return. They warned the Ecumenical Patriarch to avoid everything that could give the appearance that Orthodoxy would be able to lay aside this claim. A hasty dialogue would imply the “spiritual suicide of Orthodoxy.”²¹

The stance towards the Ecumenical Movement and the Anglican Church has become similarly clear. The Church Abroad regularly observed sessions of the Ecumenical Movement, conferences of the Anglican Church, and sessions of the WCC. It was represented at these meetings by observers, who took part in all in-camera sessions, but generally not in the discussions because they had no right to vote. The representatives of the Church Abroad wanted this status because they wanted to work together with the group, but not in any way to pursue the goal of forming a “new united Church.” The Church Abroad wanted to collaborate under the aspect of brotherly help” of the non-Orthodox Christian Churches, on behalf of the Russian Church in the homeland and the émigré Church. As a help for the oppressed Church in the homeland, the Church Abroad had in mind moral support to protect them from persecution. The Church Abroad repeatedly addressed other Christian Churches with appeals and implored them for support for the oppressed Mother Church. The release of Patriarch Tikhon was in part a result of these massive protests. In the time between the Wars, joint prayers for the persecuted Christians in the Soviet Union were no exception. The participation of Metropolitan Eulogius in such prayers led to the break between the Paris Jurisdiction and the Patriarchal Church.

Dialogue with the Anglican Church was carried out by both émigré Churches after the 1926 schism. The Paris Jurisdiction was especially active in this dialogue. Only with this group could intercommunion be established, whereas the other Russian Churches did not take this step.

The Church Abroad took the view towards the Ecumenical Movement, that collaboration would be useful if this collaboration succeeded in bearing witness to Orthodoxy and bringing to the consciousness of the Protestant-Reformed Churches the Orthodox Church as the One Church of Christ. Never would it have been able to join in any movement that had as its objective the foundation a “Christian World Church,” which would be formed out of a compromise of existing Churches. This basic stance has determined the participation of the Church Abroad in the Ecumenical Movement from the beginning. Until today, the Church Abroad, therefore, criticizes those Orthodox Churches that are represented in the WCC and add their opinion to the “ecumenical blather.” If these so-called “ecumenical services,” in which women participate as clergy and which involve even non-Christian religions, were instituted with the goal of underscoring the “common basis of all religions,” the Church Abroad feels compelled every time to present the Orthodox standpoint. They have warned their Orthodox Sister Churches again and again not to deviate from the foundation of Orthodoxy.

Although the Church Abroad had formerly sent observers to the meetings of the Ecumenical Movement and the WCC, ²² since the 1960s they were hardly ever represented with official delegations. The Church Abroad justified its position that as the free part of the Russian Church, it had to instruct its Christian brothers about the situation of the Church and the faithful in the homeland. Until 1954 (Evanston Conference U.S.A.), this was possible. The next conference met in 1955, in Hungary. Thereafter, the situation changed fundamentally. At the Evanston Conference, there were representatives of the Eastern bloc Protestant Churches including the Czech professor of theology, Gromadko, and the Hungarian Bishop Peter, who were predisposed towards pro-Soviet policies; however, they were in the minority. At the Hungarian Conference in 1955, the political resolutions of the Communist representatives were ultimately passed. An Anglican bishop from China maintained that the Communist victory in China brought only good to the country and to its Christian Churches. ²³

The change became apparent since Evanston — moral disarmament before the representatives of Communism — continued steadily in subsequent years and culminated in the reception of the Moscow Patriarchate and the Churches of Bulgaria, Romania, and Poland in 1961 at New Delhi. Since then, the Church Abroad has viewed the WCC as an instrument for influencing Western public opinion in favor of the Soviets. Patriarch Alexis’s message of greeting, which was addressed to the full assembly in New Delhi, should still give one pause. After the Patriarch had emphasized the rôle of the Churches in preserving world peace, he asked the assembly “categorically to summon and bring the statesmen to the negotiating table, to bring about a final agreement over a general and total disarmament under effective international control, as well as to procure a solution to the remaining questions that so disturb the people.” ²⁴

The Church Abroad, which was represented at the session in New Delhi by Archimandrite Lazarus (Moore), has behaved with much more reservation towards the Ecumenical Movement since then. Until then, they had never taken any step to join the WCC. They were, however, always invited to the sessions. They had always declined membership. The Paris Jurisdiction and the North American Metropolia belonged to the WCC. At the WCC, the representatives of the

Patriarchal Church and the Metropolia made the first contacts, which later led to the autocephaly of the OCA.

Prayers for the persecuted faithful in the Soviet Union have become increasingly rare since the entry of the Moscow Patriarchate, because none of the membership wants to be criticized by Moscow. If today the membership of the WCC prays for it persecuted brothers and sisters, it prays for the “oppressed people and the persecuted churches, under whose political rule the members also find themselves, but particularly for the Churches in Central America!”²⁵ This suggests that the situation of the Churches in the Soviet Union and the rest of the Eastern bloc actually corresponds to that situation [in Central America], as the representatives of these Churches gladly present it in interviews if one were to take the reference to Central America seriously.

The real relations between the Church Abroad and the Reformed Churches, the Anglican Church and the Roman Catholic Church today are limited to local contacts. At this level, the Church Abroad is not only supported materially by the Christian Churches of the West, but also morally. It is still possible to speak of the persecution and oppression of the Church in the Soviet Union and to organize aid. These measures, however, rest primarily with the personal contacts between individual representatives of the Church Abroad and the Christian Churches of the West. These Churches must ask themselves how they can answer for their silence over their Russian brothers and sisters before God. This question is today more real than 20 or 30 years ago because today we are better informed about the events in Russia. In contrast to earlier days, we are no longer dependent upon the reports of the émigrés alone, but rather today learn from the dissidents, the human rights movement, samizdat, and visitors, almost everything about the life of the Church and its faithful.²⁶

Footnotes

1. Seide, *Klöster im Ausland*. ↵
2. *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland*, “Einrichtungen,” pp.194-199. ↵
3. Slenczka, “Ökumenische Beziehungen der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche”, pp. 33-46, here p. 39. ↵
4. *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland*, “Einrichtungen,” pp. 194-99. ↵
5. *Ibid.*, p. 194. ↵
6. *Ibid.*, p. 201. ↵
7. *Ibid.*, p. 202. ↵
8. Slenczka, pp. 33-46; Patelos, *The Orthodox Church*. ↵
9. Slenczka, p. 35. ↵
10. *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland*, “Einrichtungen,” p. 194. ↵

11. *Deyaniya vtorogo sobora*, pp. 230-236. ↵
12. Grabbe, "Anglikane i Pravoslavnaya Tserkov'," *Tserkov' i uchenie* 1, pp. 44-67; "Neppravoslavnaya molitva nashikh `Ekumenistov'," *Tserkov' i uchenie* 2, pp. 233-238; Manuchina, *Evlogy*, pp. 572-602. ↵
13. Grabbe, "Evanstonskaya Konferentsia i Russkaya Pravoslavnaya Zarubezhnaya Tserkov'," *Tserkov' i uchenie* 2, pp. 239-245, here p. 240. ↵
14. Grabbe, "Po povodu novoi papskoi entsikliki," *Tserkov' i uchenie* 2, pp. 221-232. ↵
15. Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie* 6, pp. 105-108. ↵
16. Biedermann, *Orthodoxie und Katholizismus*, p. 4. ↵
17. *Der christlichen Osten* (1962) 6, pp. 141-145, here p. 144. ↵
18. Patock, *Auslandskirche und Konzil*. ↵
19. *Prav. Rus'* (1970) 8, pp. 7-8. ↵
20. *StdO* (1966) 3, p. 5. ↵
21. *Newsletter* (June-July 1980) "Appendix," pp. 1-3. In this newsletter, then published by the Synod of Bishops, the developments in the Orthodox world concerning relations with non-Orthodox Churches were attentively pursued. The conservative Orthodox standpoint of the Church Abroad on the dialogue between the Orthodox Churches and Rome and the Ecumenical Movement was reflected in this newsletter with particular clarity. ↵
22. Grabbe, "Mirovoi Sovet Tserkvei, ego tseli i napravlenie deyatel'nosti s tochki zreniya Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi," *Tserkov' i uchenie* 2, pp. 246-259. ↵
23. *Ibid.*, p. 248. ↵
24. *StdO* (1962) 1, pp. 13-15. ↵
25. *Newsletter* (Jan.-Mar. 1981) 36, p. 2. ↵
26. Seide, *Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in der Gegenwart: Rückblick und Ausblick*. ↵

PART VI

Comprehensive Index of the Bishops of the Church Abroad with Short Biographies

In this section, biographical sketches of all the bishops who have been in the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad since 1920 will follow.¹

The length of their membership, jurisdictional change or schism from the Church Abroad have played no role in their inclusion in the index. Thus, for example, all the hierarchs of Metropolitan Eulogius's Paris Jurisdiction or of the American Metropolia have been included while these two jurisdictions were part of the Church Abroad. Likewise included were those bishops who separated from the Church Abroad and went over to the Moscow Patriarchate (e.g., the clergy in the Far East and individual hierarchs in the West).

For hierarchs who separated themselves from the Church Abroad, the biography will cover only the time until their separation and will give only limited data for the subsequent time. The real focal point in the biography is each hierarch's activities within the Church Abroad. The hierarchs will be referred to by the rank which they held during their time with the Church Abroad, that is, not with a rank they may have attained after their separation from the clergy of the Church Abroad. The baptismal name, surname, date, and place of birth and death follow this in parentheses. Beneath that, the year of consecration and the title are given. In most cases, a bishop is first consecrated as a "vicar" (or, titular) bishop. Hierarchs with two titles are ruling diocesan bishops. The title of the city, as a rule, corresponds to the residence of the bishop. The title of the area corresponds to the area of the diocese: Bishop Vitalis of Montréal & Canada means that his residence is located in Montréal, but the diocese extends over the whole of Canada.

Individual data — such as, for example, secular names, date, and place of birth and death — have not always been obtainable because the public sources have partly dried up. In such cases, an attempt has been made, through correspondence with ecclesiastical agencies (synodal, diocesan administrations), to fill the gaps. Unfortunately, these institutions also have sometimes lacked the necessary data, or the inquiries received no response. Occasionally, individual sources contradicted one another, citing different personal data, baptismal names, etc. An attempt has been then made to evaluate the reliability of the various sources and enter the more probable biographical data. If, for example, the official mouthpiece of the Synod of Bishops, *Church Life (Tserkovnaya Zhizn')* gave certain dates, and another newspaper cited other dates, then *Church Life* was given preference, because the Synod of Bishops had its own index. If there were any discrepancies between the Holy Synod's records (*Sostav*) and the church emigration press, then the former was conceded greater accuracy. At the conclusion of each biography, the most important sources are listed, preceded by the letter "S." If no source is listed, the biography was compiled from the information at hand.

In the Orthodox Church, only monks may become bishops. Widowed priests may also be consecrated bishop after they have been received the monastic tonsure, during which they receive a monastic name. The monastic ranks of ordination are: hieromonk (priestmonk), hegumen (abbot), and archimandrite. Three bishops are normally required to nominate a new

bishop. As a rule, the Synod of Bishops makes the nomination. After their nomination, the candidates are consecrated a few days or weeks later by at least two bishops.

In the emigration, the émigré bishops continued to bear the title of their diocese in the homeland. The hierarchs who were consecrated in the emigration received the title of the new vicariate or diocese. In most cases, the rule of a diocese is in the hands of an archbishop; the administrator of a vicariate is a bishop. Since World War II, only the First Hierarchy has been granted the title of metropolitan. Before 1945, the heads of each of the four (from 1942, five) metropolitan districts held the title of metropolitan.

On the whole, before the Revolution, the bishops received the following education: primary in the parish or community school, then the four-year parochial school. Upon completion of both these schools, the real theological studies began at the theological seminary, of which there were 58 in Russia. The complete course of seminary studies lasted six years. After the second year of studies, the candidates could be tonsured a reader or ordained a deacon and enter parish service. After the completion of the fourth year of study, they could be ordained to the priesthood.

Candidates who had successfully completed all six years of study were able to enter one of the four theological academies. There, studies lasted another four years and were completed with a thesis and a candidate degree roughly equivalent to the degree of Doctor of Divinity.

After graduating from seminary, or more frequently during studies at the theological academy, many students became monks. As hieromonks, the supervision of parochial schools and smaller seminaries were given to them. The larger seminaries and the academies were usually headed by a candidate with the rank of archimandrite.

Only monks who lived in a monastery could attain to the rank of archimandrite. A few years after joining the monastery, they could be elevated to hegumen or archimandrite, depending upon their obedience in the monastery and their theological education. In the larger monasteries and lavras, where a bishop was the abbot, there may be several hegumens and archimandrites, who have specific tasks in the monastery. The bishop, who had been consecrated before 1918, hailed from both these groups of archimandrites.

The bishops who were called to the highest office of the Church in the first years of the emigration had received their theological education in Russia. When there was a change of generations in the 1930s, candidates were consecrated who had received their theological education in the emigration and in its educational institutions or (until 1945) in those of its sister Orthodox Churches. Almost all these bishops had spent several years in a monastery of the Church Abroad.

The following index contains the biographies of a total of more than 100 hierarchs who belonged to the Church Abroad. Of these, thirty-four emigrate; ten bishops joined the Church Abroad from the Belorussian and Ukrainian Autonomous Orthodox Churches in 1946; the others were consecrated by the Church Abroad. Two bishops, Archbishop John of Shanghai & San Francisco and Bishop Jonah of Hankow, have been glorified as saints. [N.B.: As of January 2016, a third ROCA hierarch, Seraphim of Boguchar, has also been canonized.]

The decorations mentioned in the biographies are as follows:

Gold cross = pectoral cross for priests who merit it.

White Cross or Diamond Cross = an honor for archbishops and metropolitans (The cross is worn on the klobuk, the head covering of monastics).

Panagias = Pectoral medallion of the Mother of God worn only by hierarchs; metropolitans sometimes are granted the right to wear two panagias.

White Klobuk = the head covering of the metropolitan (all bishops and monks tonsured at least as rasophor wear black klobuks).

METROPOLITAN ANTHONY (Alexey Khrapovitsky, b. 1863 in Vatagin, d. 1936 in Belgrade)
1897 — Bishop of Cheboksary.

First Hierarch of the Church Abroad from 1919-1936.

Born to a family of aristocrats in Vatagin, Novgorod Province. High School in St. Petersburg, 1881-85 Petersburg Theological Academy, which he graduated as a candidate (master's degree). Tonsured and ordained to the priesthood in 1885, became prefect of the Petersburg Academy. 1886 rector of the Kholm Seminary, and in the same year assistant professor at the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, from 1890 rector of the St. Petersburg Seminary and in the same year rector of the Moscow Theological Academy, where he remained for 5 years. 1895-1897 rector of the Kazan' Academy, 1897 Bishop of Cheboksary, 1899 of Zhitomir, 1900 of Ufa, 1902 Volyn', 1906 archbishop of the same. 1911 received Doctorate of Theology, 1912 permanent member of the Synod, 1914 Archbishop of Kharkov & Astrakhan. 1917/18 participant in the Pan-Russia Council, where he was the principal proponent of the restoration of the Patriarchate. During the Council, he was elevated to the rank of metropolitan for the Diocese of Kharkov & Astrakhan. He was a candidate for the office of Patriarch and had the majority of votes; however, the selection of Patriarch Tikhon was decided by drawing lots.

In summer 1918, Metropolitan Anthony succeeded the slain Metropolitan Vladimir (Bogoyavlensky) of Kiev. In December of 1918, he was arrested by the Ukrainian nationalist government and interned in the Uniate monastery in Bugach, where Archbishop Eulogius and Archimandrite Vitalis (Maximenko, later Archbishop) were then also confined. After he was liberated, he returned to Kiev in Sept. 1919 for a short time, but then retreated to White Army territory, where the SEA was located. As the senior hierarch, he was the president of this ecclesiastical institution. After a visit to Mount Athos and a brief return to the Crimea, Metropolitan Anthony, together with remnants of the White Army, was evacuated to Constantinople, where the refugees arrived in Dec. 1920. At the invitation of the Patriarch of Serbia and King Alexander of the Serbs, Croats & Slovenes, Metropolitan Anthony settled in Yugoslavia in February 1921, where he resided at the patriarch's summer residence in Sremsky-Karlovtsy. Until his death, Metropolitan Anthony remained the President of the Synod of Bishops and First Hierarch of the Church Abroad.

Metropolitan Anthony was a representative of the conservative clergy. For his services to the Church, he received numerous ecclesiastical and government honors from the Imperial Russian government and other governments, including the Serbian Order of St. Sabbas (1906) and the Montenegrin Order of Prince Daniel (1910). He was firmly rooted in the traditions and practices of the Russian Church and rejected innovations and reforms. His ecclesial-theological and political convictions were based on the assumption that State and Church are in synergy, and that the monarchy, as it existed in Russia until 1917, was the most suitable form of government for this. Thus, it is understandable that he remained an ardent supporter of the monarchy in the emigration as well. For him, the moral and religious rebirth of the Russian people was only conceivable with a return to the ideals and virtues of Christian teachings. This basic attitude has formed the ecclesiastical and political concept of the Church Abroad. This First Hierarchy of the Church Abroad has most decisively left his stamp upon the whole development of the Church Abroad. Upholding the idea of oneness with the Russian Mother Church in the homeland enabled the Church in the emigration in the Free World to speak and act for the oppressed and persecuted.

As First Hierarchy of the Church Abroad, the Metropolitan must be credited with the consolidation of Church life in the emigration. The fateful schism of 1926 (the defection of Metropolitans Eulogius and Platon) was a setback to his efforts to maintain Church unity. Yet Metropolitan Anthony made every effort to restore Church unity in the emigration, and in the case of the North American Metropolia, he succeeded. The high regard, in which the Metropolitan was held by the entire Orthodox world, facilitated the cultivation of relations between the Church Abroad and local Orthodox Churches.

S: Archbishop Nikon (Rklitsky): *Zhizneopisanie blazh. Antoniia, Mitropolita Kievskago i Galitskago*. Vol. 1-17. New York 1956-1969.

METROPOLITAN ANASTASIUS (Alexander Gribanovsky, b. 1873 in Borisogleb, d. 1965 in New York)

1906 — Bishop of Serpukhov.

First Hierarchy of the Church Abroad from 1936-1964.

Born in the Tambov Province on 6 August 1873 (OS) to the family of a clergyman. He attended parochial school and subsequently the seminary in Tambov from 1890-93. From 1893-97 he studied at the Moscow Theological Academy, whose president at that time was Archimandrite Anthony (Khrapovitsky). Tonsured a monk on 20 April 1898 (Feast of Saint Anastasius the Sinaite) and ordained to the diaconate. 1898-1900 assistant to the rector of the Moscow Theological Academy. 1900 ordained to the priesthood; rector of the Bethany Seminary at Holy Trinity Monastery. 1901 rector of the Moscow Seminary and elevated to archimandrite. 1906 Bishop of Serpukhov, vicar bishop of the Diocese of Moscow. 1913 appointed Bishop of Kholm & Lublin, succeeding Bishop Eulogius (Georgievsky). 1915 evacuation from Kholm and transfer of the diocesan administration to Moscow. At the end of 1915, Bishop of Kishinev, 1916 Archbishop. 1917 participant in the Pan-Russia Council, chairman of the finance commission,

member of the commission for the restoration of the monarchy. 1918 awarded the diamond cross on his klobuk.

In Oct. 1918, went to Odessa on instructions from Patriarch Tikhon, in order to reestablish relations with the Diocese of Kishinev & Moldavia (then under Romanian rule). The Romanian authorities demanded submission to the Romanian Orthodox Church, which he, in turn, refused because the romanianization of the Orthodox Church in this territory was already underway. 1919 after a short stay in Constantinople, returned to southern Russia in 1920 and subordination to the SEA. Evacuation to Constantinople, head of the Russian refugee communities in Constantinople and Turkey, where 100,000 refugees lived. 1921 visit to Athos and the Holy Land to study the situation of the monasteries there. From Nov. 1921, administrator of the Russian communities in the environs of Constantinople.

Participated in the Council in Karlovtsy, chaired the committee for educational matters and spiritual rebirth. 1923 participant of the Pan-Orthodox Congress, which had been convened on the initiative of Patriarch Meletios IV of Constantinople. At this Council, Anastasius was the spokesman for the opposition against proposed innovations, e.g., the introduction of the New Calendar, second marriages for priests, permitting bishops to be married, etc. Relations with Constantinople then worsened, whereupon he left Turkey. After visiting France and Belgium, he traveled to Palestine, where he lived at the Jerusalem Mission until 1934 and maintained friendly relations with the Eastern Patriarchs. From 1924, he was a permanent member of the Synod in Karlovtsy. 1935 he visited Metropolitan Eulogius in order to negotiate the reunification of the divided Church. In the same year, he was elevated to metropolitan. Participated in the discussions for reunification with Metropolitans Anthony, Theophilus and Eulogius, under the aegis of the Serbian Patriarch.

Upon the death of Metropolitan Anthony, on 28 July 1936, Anastasius was elected to be his successor. Reorganization of the administrative divisions of the Church Abroad into four metropolitan districts (Near East, Far East, Western Europe, and North America). 1936-44 administrator of the Russian communities in Yugoslavia with the rights of a diocesan bishop, granted him by the Serbian Patriarch. 1938 president of the Second Pan-Diaspora Council and transfer of permanent residence from Karlovtsy to Belgrade. After the outbreak of war with the Soviet Union, Anastasius gave his blessing to the establishment of the Russian Free Corps against the Soviet Union. In the name of the Church Abroad, he protested against the election of Sergius as patriarch in 1943. 1944 withdrew from the advances of the Red Army via Vienna and Karlsbad to Munich, where the new headquarters would be established. 1945-46 he spent several months in Switzerland. For his service as First Hierarch of the Church Abroad (ten years), bishop for forty years and priest for fifty years, he received the honorary title "His Beatitude" and the right to wear two panagias. 1946-50 he consecrated Archimandrites Seraphim (Ivanov), Nathaniel (L'vov) and Leontius (Bartoshevich) to the episcopate. 1950 Metropolitan Anastasius transferred the residence to Mahopac (New York), consecrated of holy chrism — the Church Abroad had been receiving chrism from the Serbian Patriarchate until 1950. The building up and strengthening of the position of the Church Abroad overseas, especially in the United States and Canada. Beginning 1958, the permanent residence has been located in New York City. 1956

festivities on the fiftieth anniversary of his consecration. Retired in 1964 due to failing health. Reposed on 9/22 May 1965. Buried at Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville.

The particular service of this metropolitan lay in the reorganization of Church life following 1945, after the loss of parishes in Europe and the Far East, the renewed schism of the North American Metropolia, and the re-entry of the Moscow Patriarchate into Church life in the West, when the entire existence of the Church was at risk. The Church Abroad was able to preserve its position in the emigration against the Patriarchate. The relations with other Orthodox Churches, which had been good until then, were frozen by the Patriarchate, because they then entered into official contact with the latter. The clear anti-Communist stance, which the Church Abroad has embraced since 1920, was continued by Metropolitan Anastasius. He personally arranged the election to choose his successor, whom, though the youngest hierarch, he recommended for candidacy and who was able to win all the votes in a secret ballot.

S: *Sostav*, p. 167; *Prav. Rus'* (1965) 10, pp. 9-10; (1973) 15, pp. 2-8; *Tserkovnaya letopis'* (Lausanne, 1946) 3, pp. 7-36; 50-ti Letie Arch. *Sluzh. Vysokop. Mitropolita Anastasia. Yubileiny sbornik*. Jordanville 1956; *Sbornik izbrannykh sochinenii vysokop. Mitropolita Anastasia pervosv. Russkoi Zarubezhnoi Tserkvi*. Jordanville 1948.

METROPOLITAN PHILARET (George Voznesensky, b. 22 March 03 in Kursk, d. 21 November 1985 in New York)

1963 — Bishop of Brisbane.

Metropolitan of New York & Eastern America.

First Hierarch 1964-1985.

Born in Kursk to a family of a clergyman (his father, a widowed priest, was consecrated Bishop of Khailar with the name Demetrius in 1934). 1909 moved to Blagoveshchensk, where he received his education and graduated from secondary school. 1920 escape to Harbin. Attended the Russian Chinese Polytechnic Institute, electrical engineering dept., which he completed, receiving a diploma in engineering. 1928-31 theological and pastoral courses in Harbin. 1931 ordained to the diaconate and priesthood, tonsured with the name Philaret, served as a priest in Harbin (where he was in charge of an orphanage), 1937 archimandrite. After the invasion of the Red Army, he refused to take a Soviet passport as long as the Church in the Soviet Union was persecuted. His implacable stance towards the Moscow Patriarchate — he refused to commemorate the Patriarch of Moscow and continued to commemorate Metropolitan Anastasius — led in 1953 to the Synod in Moscow taking steps against him and demands on the Chinese authorities to extradite him. The latter issued him a passport for “all nations.” Philaret did not take this passport, as he wished to remain with his flock.

He lived in Harbin, where he cared for the ever-shrinking Russian community. In 1962, he left Harbin for Australia. 1963 upon the request of Archbishop Sabbas of Sydney, he was consecrated Bishop of Brisbane, vicar bishop of Australia. 1964 he traveled to the United States, in order to participate in the Council of Bishops. At this Council, Metropolitan Anastasius retired from his position as First Hierarch, giving as reasons his advanced age and failing health. The Council

elected Philaret, the most junior bishop of the assembly, to be his successor. At the same Council, Saint John of Kronstadt was glorified, whereby the Church Abroad underscored its independence and its succession as the rightful heir of the Russian Orthodox Church. This first glorification in over fifty years was followed in 1970 by the glorification of Saint Herman of Alaska, in 1978 the glorification of Blessed Xenia of Petersburg, and in 1981 the glorification of the New Martyrs and Confessors, who had lost their lives since the Revolution of 1917.

When Metropolitan Philaret took over the leadership of the Church Abroad in 1964, he found a Church whose position as the exile Church was for the most part consolidated. With some 350 parishes in the West, it is the only exile Church caring for Russian émigrés worldwide. It was during these years, however, that the question arose as to whether the Russian character of the Church could be maintained in the long run. The lapse in official relations with the other Orthodox Churches led to a situation in which the Church Abroad can, without consideration for Church relations, criticize the measures and stance of these Churches, such as, for example, the politically-motivated resolutions of the WCC, the silence of Western Churches on the persecution of the Church and believers in the East, the abandonment of Orthodox traditions, etc. This fundamentally conservative Orthodox mentality in matters of the Faith and his implacable anti-Communist stance towards the Soviet regime remained unchanged until the end of his life. Thus, the Church Abroad has become an often stern admonisher of its Sister Churches and many governments, though this also guarantees the trust of its members, since it has never strayed from the straight path. Metropolitan Philaret faithfully preserved this line, set forth by his two predecessors, and thus ensured the unity of his Church.

After a lengthy illness, he reposed on the feast of the Archangel Michael in 1985, leaving behind him in print a host of edifying homilies and a collection of essays for young people, to whom he was particularly devoted throughout his life, entitled *Essays in Moral Theology*.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1964) 11, p. 12.

METROPOLITAN VITALIS (Rostislav Ustinov, b. 1910 in St. Petersburg, d. 25 September 2006 in Mansonville, Canada)

1951 — Bishop of Montevideo.

1986 — Metropolitan of New York & Eastern America, Archbishop of Montreal & Canada, 1986-2001 First Hierarch.

Born in Saint Petersburg in 1910, at the outbreak of the Revolution he emigrated with his family to France, where he graduated from the French lycée in Lemain (Dep. Sarthe). He entered the Ladoyrova Monastery of Saint Job, where he received his theological education. 1939 tonsured a monk, 1941 ordained to the priesthood, 1944 hegumen. With the brotherhood, he fled via Karlsbad and Berlin to Hamburg in 1944, where he was appointed priest for the Fischbek Camp. In the camp, he held pastoral courses and reestablished a Brotherhood of Saint Job with new members (e.g., the future Archbishop Paul and Archimandrite Theodore (Golitzyn), which in the following years established printing presses in London, São Paulo, and Canada. 1946 elevated to archimandrite, 1948 appointed to London as an administrator of the London parishes. He was

sent to Brazil to render support to Archbishop Theodosius (Samoilovich), and there in 1951 was consecrated Bishop of Montevideo, vicar bishop of Brazil. The Brotherhood established a printing press, publishing books and journals of a pastoral and missionary content. 1954 Bishop Vitalis was appointed Bishop of Edmonton & Western Canada. The resettlement of the group led to the establishment of the Dormition Skete in the environs of Northville (Alberta). After Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk) was deposed, Bishop Vitalis was appointed Archbishop of Montréal & Canada. The brotherhood's move to Montréal led to the foundation of Holy Transfiguration Skete near Mansonville (Quebec). In the skete the monks set up a printing press, which developed into one of the most important printing presses in the Church Abroad. In subsequent years, diocesan community life was consolidated with its center in Montréal, where a new cathedral and community center were consecrated. For his service to the Church, Archbishop Vitalis received the diamond cross on his klobuk in 1971. From 1976, he was the Second Deputy of Metropolitan, until his election in January 1986 as a successor to Metropolitan Philaret. In 2001 he retired due to memory loss.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1951)2, pp. 19-23; *Prav. Rus'* (1976), pp. 14-15.

METROPOLITAN LAURUS (Basil Skurla, b. 1 January 1928 in Ladomirova, Czechoslovakia, d. 16 March 2008)

1967 — Bishop of Manhattan, Archbishop of Syracuse & Holy Trinity.

2001 — Metropolitan of New York & Eastern America.

2001-2008 — First Hierarch.

In his childhood, he often visited the St. Job Monastery in Ladomirova, which strongly influenced his religious upbringing. His desire to join the monastery was not at first fulfilled, because the brotherhood was evacuated. His family likewise fled to the West. He went with a part of the Brotherhood to Jordanville and entered the monastery in 1946. 1948 tonsured a monk, 1950 ordained to the diaconate. Studied at the seminary there from 1949-54. 1954 ordained to the priesthood, 1959 hegumen, 1966 archimandrite. In 1967 he was consecrated Bishop of Manhattan, after which he lived at the Synod in New York and was occupied with administrative matters. 1976 Bishop of Syracuse & Holy Trinity, abbot of the Monastery and rector of the Seminary. For his service to the seminary and monastery, he was elevated to archbishop in 1981. He was elected First Hierarch in 2001.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1967) 15, p. 8; 16, pp. 3-8.

METROPOLITAN HILARION (Igor Kapral, b. 1948 in Spirit River, Canada)

1984 — Bishop of Manhattan; Archbishop of Sydney & Australia.

2008 — Metropolitan of New York & Eastern America, First Hierarch.

He was raised and educated near his birthplace in Alberta. With the blessing of Bishop Sabbas of Edmonton, he entered Holy Trinity Monastery and Seminary in Jordanville in 1967. He completed his seminary training there in 1972, receiving the B.Th. degree and continued his

studies at Syracuse University, receiving a master's degree. In 1973, he became a novice and in 1974 a rassaphor monk. In 1975 he was tonsured a stavrophor monk, receiving the name Hilarion, after Saint Hilarion the Schema-monk of the Kiev Caves. Later that year he was ordained to the diaconate and on Palm Sunday 1976 to the priesthood. He was one of the monastery confessors. He taught at the Seminary and was editor of *Orthodox Life* (in English) until 1988. Among many other obediences, he had served as a cell attendant to Archbishop Abercius until his repose. On the feast of the Kursk Icon in 1984, he was consecrated Bishop of Manhattan, vicar bishop of Eastern America & New York. He was also Deputy Secretary of the Synod. 1995 Bishop of Washington, then appointed Archbishop of Sydney & Australia in 1996. Metropolitan of New York and Eastern America and First Hierarch in 2008.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1984) 11-12, pp. 261-266, 283-284.

ARCHBISHOP ABERCIUS (Alexander P. Taushev, b. 1906 in Kazan, d. 1976 in Holy Trinity Monastery)

1953 — Bishop of Syracuse & Holy Trinity.

Born 19 October 1906 in Kazan', where he completed elementary and secondary school. After fleeing Russia, he continued his education in 1920-26 at the Russian High School in Sofia. 1926-30 theological studies at the University of Sofia, 1931 tonsured a monk and ordained priest. 1931-40 instructor and inspector for religious instruction at the Orthodox Faculty in Preshov and a member of various academic commissions for the education of priests and religious instruction in public schools. 1937 hegumen, 1938 rector of the Orthodox parish in Mukachevo and administrator of the Mukachevo-Preshov Diocese. After the occupation of eastern Slovakia, he went to Belgrade, where he served at the Russian Holy Trinity Russian Cathedral. Until the evacuation in 1944, he was an assistant professor of pastoral theology and homiletics and director of the missionary courses at Belgrade Theological Faculty. 1945-51 rector of the Munich Synodal Church and religious instructor at both Russian secondary schools in Munich. 1951 moved to Jordanville, where he became professor of church history, New Testament, liturgics, and homiletics. 1952 he became rector of the seminary, retaining this post until his repose. In those 24 years, over 100 priests received their education at Jordanville. 1953 consecrated Bishop of Syracuse & Holy Trinity, from 1960 abbot of the Holy Trinity Monastery. 1961 Archbishop for his services to the seminary and monastery.

His particular services lay in his academic and theological education of candidates for the priesthood and the building up of Holy Trinity Seminary as a state-accredited school. As editor and collaborator on journals, compiler of numerous texts (on church history, homiletics) and religious-educational brochures, he decisively influenced the spiritual and religious life of the Church Abroad.

His main writings include *Handbook for Studies in the New Testament* (*Rukovodstvo k izucheniu Svyashchenago Pisania Novago Zaveta*). Vols. 1 & 2; *A Guide to Homiletics* (*Rukovodstvo po Gomiletiki*); *True Orthodoxy and the Contemporary World* (*Istinnoe Pravoslavie i sovremennyi mir*): A Collection of Articles and Essays; *The Present Times in Light*

of the Word of God (Sovremennost v svete slova Bozhia): Sermons and Speeches in 4 Volumes [All published in Jordanville]: Apocalypse [published in Platina].

S: *Prav. Rus'*. (1960) 10, p. 13; (1976) 9, p. 2ff.

ARCHBISHOP ADAM (Filippovsky, b. 1886, d. 1956)

1921 — Bishop of Canada.

He was a clergyman in the Uniate Church in the United States and joined the Orthodox Church. 1921 he was consecrated bishop. Bishops Stephen (Dzhubai) and Gorazd (Pavlik, of the Czechoslovakian Orthodox Church [now glorified as a hieromartyr]) consecrated him bishop with the consent of the Russian bishop of North America. The Synod appointed him Bishop of Canada. 1924 he succeeded Bishop Stephen, who had defected to the Uniate Church. He was appointed Bishop of Philadelphia & the Carpatho-Russian communities, in the hope that he would bring other Uniate communities back to Orthodoxy. He belonged to the Church Abroad until the schism in 1926, and then again from 1936-38. When he consecrated the Syrian Samuel David as the second Syrian bishop of Orthodox Syrians in the United States without the consent of the Patriarch of Antioch, the Synod began church disciplinary proceedings against him. He was retired, whereupon he claimed to be the “sole representative of the Russian Orthodox Church” in the United States. 1939 he entered into negotiations with Bishop Benjamin (Fedchenko), the representative of the Moscow Patriarchate and joined the Patriarchate.

S: *Ostkirchlice Studien* (1967) p. 221; *One Church* (1952) No. 9-10; (1956) 5/6 and 7/8.

ARCHBISHOP AFTIMIOS (Euthymius) (Abdullah Ofiesh, b. 1880 in Lebanon, d. 1971 in the USA)

1917 — Bishop of Brooklyn.

He belonged to the Antiochian Orthodox Church and came from Lebanon, where he received his theological education at the Seminary in Beirut.

1898 tonsured a monk and ordained to the diaconate, 1902 hieromonk. After that, parish service in the United States. 1915 elevated to archimandrite. 1917, upon the request of the Patriarch of Antioch, he was consecrated Bishop of Brooklyn by the Russian Bishop Alexander (Nemolovsky), after which he was leader of the Syro-Arabic Mission in the United States, which was part of the Antiochian Patriarchate but was subject to the jurisdiction of the Russian Church, which was competent for the Orthodox in America. Bishop Alexander also simultaneously gave Bishop Euthymius custody over the Mission among English-speaking Americans. His subsequent attempt to call into being an “Orthodox Church in America” for Americans failed because of opposition from the Church of Russia and other autocephalous Churches. 1923 Metropolitan Platon elevated him to an archbishop. In 1933 he was laicized. He died in 1971. He belonged to the Church Abroad until 1926.

BISHOP AGATHANGELUS (Pahkovsky, b. 21 November 1956 in Odessa)

1995 — Bishop of Simferopol.

Born 21 November 1956 in Odessa. Tonsured a monk by Bishop Lazarus on 18/31 August 1991. Ordained deacon 19 August/1 September and priest 26 August/ 8 September 1991. Consecrated bishop by hierarchs of the Free Russian Church in Suzdal' on 14/27 March 1994, without the knowledge of the Synod of Bishops. Following a probationary period, his consecration was regularized on 26 November/9 December 1995 in New York and he was appointed Bishop of Simferopol.

BISHOP AGAPETUS (Kryzhanovsky, d. 1966 in São Paulo)

1957 — Bishop of Goiana.

His birthdate and origins are unknown. He came from Kiev, where he lived as a monk in the catacombs. 1944 escaped to the West. 1945 as archimandrite he joined the Saint Job Brotherhood in Berlin and lived until 1946 in the Munich Saint Job Monastery, whence he was transferred to Brazil. Served as a parish priest in the Brazilian Diocese. After the departure of Bishop Vitalis (Ustinov)'s brotherhood, he attempted to establish a convent (two nuns, two novices) at Villa Alpina near São Paulo. In 1957, when he was already very old, he was consecrated Bishop of Goiana, vicar bishop of Brazil. 1963 he retired due to his advanced age. Reposed in 1966.

S: *Vladimirsky Vestnik*. São Paulo (1957) pp. 30-32; *Prav. Rus'* (1957) 11, pp. 11-12; (1966) 19, p. 14.

ARCHBISHOP ALEXANDER (Andrew Lovchy, b. 1891 in Nardochi, d. 1973 in Munich)

1945 — Bishop of Kissingen.

His family was from Nardochi in Volyn'. He attended secondary school in St. Petersburg, entering the seminary there. 1914-18 volunteered for the Army, served on the French Front with special commission, then in the Northwest Army. Interned in Germany. In the 1920s emigrated to Berlin. 1930 entered the Russian Monastery of St. Cyricus in Stanimaka (Asenovgrad, Bulgaria). Theological studies at Archbishop Damian (Govorov)'s pastoral school. On 19 September 1937 Archbishop Tikhon (Lyashchenko) called him to Berlin, where he served, first as a deacon and, after his ordination to the priesthood on 3 October 1937, as priest. On 22 March 1941 he was tonsured a monk and made rector of the Tegel Church by Archbishop Seraphim (Lade). 1942 hegumen, 1943 archimandrite. On 29 July 1945, he was consecrated Bishop of Kissingen, vicar bishop of the Diocese of Germany. 1951, after the death of Archbishop Benedict (Bobkovsky), he took over the administration, and from March 1952 Archbishop of Berlin & Germany. As the closest co-worker with his three predecessors on the German episcopal cathedra, he had the task of reorganizing the diocese after World War II. Most of the refugees emigrated overseas, finally leaving behind about 60 parishes. 1971 he retired due to his advanced age. He died two years later in Munich.

S: *Tserk. Vedomosti*. Munich (1952) 3-4, pp. 11-12, pp. 18-19; *Prav. Rus'* (1973) 21, p. 10.

BISHOP ALEXANDER (Alexander Nemolovsky, b. 1880 in Zhitomir, d. 1960 in Brussels)

1909 — Bishop of Alaska.

Born in 1880 in Zhitomir to a priest's family. Parochial school in Zhitomir, 1893-1897 seminary in Volynia, 1897-1901 Theological Academy in St. Petersburg, celibate priest. Service as a missionary in the United States, first in Philadelphia, from 1906 in Jersey City, 1909 archpriest and tonsured a monk. 28 November 1909 consecrated Bishop of Alaska, 1905-1909 head of the Canadian Mission, 1914 administrator of the North American Diocese until the arrival of Archbishop Eudocimus (Meshchersky) in 1915. 1916 Bishop of Canada with his seat in Winnipeg. However, he did not assume this office, because he had to again take over the North American Diocese when Archbishop Eudocimus journeyed to Moscow to participate in the Pan-Russia Council. Until 1921 Bishop Alexander administered the North American parishes and stepped down upon the arrival of Metropolitan Platon. He then traveled to Europe and lived first in Constantinople, whence, however, he was exiled, whereupon he went to Athos. Until 1927 he lived at the Russian Saint Andrew's Skete. After the North American parishes separated from the Church Abroad, the Synod instructed him to take over the leadership of the North American parishes once again. When he declined to obey this directive, he was tried before an ecclesiastical court and deposed as an administrator of North America. 1928 he left Athos and joined Metropolitan Eulogius, who appointed him Archbishop of Brussels & Belgium. In 1940 he refused to join the Church Abroad and the German authorities occupying Belgium thereupon brought him to Berlin, where he was placed under house arrest. In 1945, after the fall of Berlin, he joined the Moscow Patriarchate, which in 1958 appointed him Metropolitan of Brussels & Belgium. He died in 1960 in Brussels. He only recognized the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad from 1921-1926, because thereafter he joined the Ecumenical Patriarchate on Athos.

S: *Sostav*, p. 321; *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1928) 5-6, p. 1; *Ostkirchliche Studien* (1968) pp. 50-51; *JMP* (1960) 8, pp. 10-12.

ARCHBISHOP ALEXIS (Panteleev, b. 1874, d. 1948 in Omsk)

1927 — Bishop of San Francisco.

Nothing is known about his origins and theological education. 1901 he was ordained priest. In 1927 Metropolitan Platon consecrated him Bishop of San Francisco, replacing Bishop Apollinarius (Koshevoi), who had been ruling that diocese since 1924, and who remained faithful to the Synod. After the reunification of the Metropolia and Church Abroad, Bishop Alexis bore the title of Bishop of Alaska & the Aleutians with his seat in Sitka. 1945 he was elevated to archbishop. He traveled to the USSR to negotiate the unification with the Moscow Patriarchate of the North American parishes. After reunion failed to materialize, he joined the Patriarchate and was appointed Bishop of Omsk & Tyumen. He reposed in Omsk.

S: *JMP* (1947) 1, p. 16; (1948) 10, p. 8; (1950) 7, p. 75; (1957) 6, p. 70.

ARCHBISHOP ALYPIUS (Alexander Gamanovich, b. 1926 in Mayachok, Kherson District)

1974 — Bishop of Cleveland.

Archbishop of Chicago & Detroit. After elementary school, which he attended in the Soviet Union, he went to Germany in 1941, his parents having been deported there as foreign workers. In 1945 he became acquainted with Hieromonk Cyprian (Pyzhov, later archimandrite) from the

St. Job Brotherhood. Because his parents were no longer alive, he joined the brotherhood and immigrated in 1948 to the United States, where he entered Holy Trinity Monastery. 1948 tonsured a monk, 1950 ordained a deacon, 1954 hieromonk. His theological studies at Holy Trinity Monastery were supplemented by studies at Norwich University, from which he was graduated with a master's degree. Trained as an iconographer by Archimandrite Cyprian, with whom he painted numerous iconostases and churches, including the Holy Trinity Cathedral in Jordanville, the iconostasis of the Synodal Cathedral, and many other churches. 1966 he was elevated to hegumen, 1974 to archimandrite.

Shortly thereafter he was consecrated Bishop of Cleveland, vicar bishop of Chicago, Detroit & the Midwest. Not long before the death of Archbishop Seraphim (Ivanov), Bishop Alypius was given full administrative authority over the diocese, and upon the former's death in 1987 he was given the title of Bishop of Chicago, Detroit & the Midwest; since 1990 archbishop. From 1994-1995 Archbishop of Sydney, Australia, & New Zealand. For health reasons, he did not receive a residence permit in Australia and returned to the United States. Since 1995 again Archbishop of Chicago & Detroit. He has supported missionary work in English in his diocese, where many English-speaking parishes and even monasteries have been established.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1974) 22, p. 15.

BISHOP AMBROSE (Pierre Cantacuzène, b. 3/16 September 1947 in Vevey, Switzerland)

1993 — Bishop of Vevey.

Upon completion of secondary school, studied law at the University of Lausanne. From 1968 to 1975 taught French and law at a secondary school. Tonsured a reader in 1972. From 1975 to 1978 served as sacristan at the Cathedral of the Exaltation of the Cross in Geneva and was tutored in theology by Archbishop Anthony (Bartoshevich) of Western Europe. Ordained deacon in the spring of 1976 and priest 13/26 September 1976 for the Geneva cathedral. From 1978 to 1993 rector of the parish in Vevey. At the same time, he served in several parishes in the Diocese of Western Europe: Lyon, Bari, Rome, and Montpellier. 4/17 December 1991 elevated to archpriest. Tonsured a monk with the name Ambrose on 24 August/6 September 1993 and consecrated bishop by Metropolitan Vitalis and Archbishops Anthony of Geneva and Mark of Berlin, and Bishop Seraphim of Lesna, on 13/26 September 1993 in Geneva. This was the last consecration performed by Archbishop Anthony, who reposed six days later. Bishop Ambrose, as a vicar of the Diocese of Western Europe, was responsible for the parishes in Switzerland and Italy.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1993) 20, pp. 11-12.

ARCHBISHOP AMBROSE (Adrian Merezhko, b. 1889 near Kiev, d. 1974 Brookline, Massachusetts)

1955 — Bishop of Sitka & Alaska.

Born into a farming family in the Kiev Province, he grew up in the Caves Monastery. 1905 entered high school and after graduation worked as a secretary at the Ekaterinoslav provincial

administration. 1923 emigrated to the United States. Became acquainted with Archbishop Vitalis (Maximenko), who influenced him greatly and imparted to him a theological education. 1938 ordained to the diaconate and priesthood, served at Holy Ascension Cathedral, in the Bronx. From 1939 rector of the Saint Spyridon Church in Perth Amboy (New Jersey). At the 1946 schism of the North American Diocese he joined the Metropolia. 1950 after the death of his wife, he was tonsured a monk, 1955 Bishop of Sitka & Alaska, 1957 transferred to Tokyo, 1958 Bishop of Pittsburgh. Out of protest against the granting of autocephaly to the Metropolia, he joined the Church Abroad in 1972, served at the Synod and in various parishes in the United States. 1973 entered Holy Transfiguration Monastery in Brookline, which was then part of the Church Abroad. Reposed 1974; buried at the cemetery at Jordanville.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1975) 1, pp. 7-9.

BISHOP AMPHILOCHIUS (Anthony Vokulsky, b. 1870 in Dukudovo, d. 1928)

1924 — Bishop of Alaska.

Born about 1870 in Dokudovo near Siedltse. Tonsured at St. Onuphrius Monastery, in Jablonec, 1893 ordained to the priesthood, 1893-95 attended missionary courses at the Kazan Theological Academy (Mongolian Department). 1901 he was appointed head of the Aleutian Mission and elevated to hegumen. He had great missionary success among the population of Alaska, which was part of the Aleutian Mission. 1914-19 the Mission was interrupted on account of the War. 1914 elevated to archimandrite and appointed administrator of the Canadian parishes. 1924 he was consecrated Bishop of Alaska and continued his pre-1914 missionary work. By 1928, 22,000 inhabitants of Alaska were baptized. He belonged to the Church Abroad from 1924-26.

S: *Pravoslavny russkii kalendar* (1929) pp. 31-2.

ARCHBISHOP ANDREW (Adrian A. Rymarenko, b. 1883 in Romny, d. 1978 in New York)

1968 — Bishop of Rockland.

Born in Romny (Ukraine). Secondary school, including studies in economics at the Petersburg Polytechnic Institute, where he actively participated in various circles of Christian students. 1921 ordained priest and served at the church in Romny until its closure. Numerous arrests of Kiev clergy took place in the 1930s. 1941 served at the Kiev Protection Convent, at the beginning of 1944 evacuated with a group of 40 refugees from Kiev, who later went to the USA with him. From March 1944, rector of Holy Resurrection Cathedral in Berlin, priest in various refugee camps in West Germany until 1949, the year in which he moved to the USA. Together with a group of refugees, he established the Novo-Diveevo Convent (Spring Valley, New York), becoming its priest. In 1956 archpriest. After the death of his wife in 1968, he was tonsured, elevated to archimandrite, and on 19 March 1968, he was consecrated Bishop of Rockland, Vicar Bishop of the Diocese of Eastern America. For his service to the Novo-Diveevo Convent, he was elevated to archbishop in 1973, died at the Convent in 1978. Above all else, he must be credited with the care of indigent and elderly refugees, for whom he also founded a home for the aged, which after repeated expansion offers up to 100 places for elderly women. His modest and

humble manner, his unshakable faith and his deep religiosity attracted the faithful from all corners of the USA.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1968) 5, p. 13; Andrew (Archbishop), *Edinoe na potrebu*. Forestville, CA. (Collection of Sermons).

ARCHBISHOP ANTHONY (Andrew Bartosevich, b. 1911 in St. Petersburg, d. 1993 in Geneva) 1957 — Bishop of Brussels.

Born in 1911 in St. Petersburg. His father fled Russia in 1920 to Yugoslavia, via southern Russia and Constantinople, while Andrew and his mother and brother Leo (the future Bishop Leontius) stayed in Kiev until their emigration in 1924. The family went to Belgrade, where Andrew attended secondary school, finishing in 1931. Together with his brother Leontius (Bishop of Geneva), he often visited the Milkovo Monastery, where Archimandrite Ambrose (Kurganov) served. Theological studies at Belgrade Theological Faculty (1934-1939), tonsured a monk and ordained to the priesthood in 1941 in Milkovo Monastery along with his brother Leontius. Served as a priest in various parishes in Yugoslavia, where he remained until 1949. He refused to join the Moscow Patriarchate. From 1946 he lived as an archimandrite in Belgrade and served at the Holy Trinity Cathedral. After his departure in 1950, he went first to Switzerland and later to Holy Resurrection Church in Brussels, where he was rector from 1953-57. 1957 consecrated Bishop of Brussels, he went in the same year to Geneva, where he succeeded his deceased brother and resided as vicar bishop of Western Europe. 1963 he was appointed Archbishop of Geneva & Western Europe, succeeding Archbishop John (Maximovich). In 1986 he was a candidate for First Hierarch. Reposed just after consecrating Bishops Seraphim and Ambrose as his successors.

As Archbishop of Geneva & Western Europe, all parishes of this large diocese in Western Europe were subject to him. (Germany and England did not form part of this diocese.) The spiritual center of his diocese is the Convent of the Lesna Icon of the Mother of God in France. Archbishop Anthony was also a distinguished iconographer and painted, among others, the iconostasis of the church in Lyon. For many years, he actively sponsored missionary work for faithful in the Soviet Union by publishing and broadcasting (largely in cooperation with Orthodox Action). He reposed in 1993.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* 5-6, 1993, pp. 61-62; *Prav. Rus'* (1993) 20, pp. 7-11, 14.

BISHOP ANTHONY (Dashkevich, b. 1858 in Volynia, d. 1934 in Kazanlike)

1921 — Bishop of Alaska & the Aleutians.

Graduated from the seminary in Volyn'. 1898 tonsured a monk; rector at the Cathedral of Sitka in Alaska. Great service to the Mission in Alaska and the Aleutians, where he consolidated parish life and founded numerous schools; he mastered the native tongues and distinguished himself as a translator. 1906-17 chaplain in the Russian Navy; 1917/18-1921 served at the Russian Church in Copenhagen. His consecration as Bishop of Alaska took place in Karlovtsy. However, only a little while later, he was relieved of his office, because he was unable to travel

to Alaska. He next lived in Dubrovnik, then in retirement in Boston. Shortly before his death, he traveled to Bulgaria and lived there in the Russian Monastery at Shipka-Pass, where he was buried in the Russian Memorial Church.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1934) 4, pp. 65-66.

ARCHBISHOP ANTHONY (Artemius Medvedev, b. 1908 in Vilnius)

1956 — Bishop of Melbourne.

Archbishop of Western America & San Francisco.

Born in Vilnius, he attended the cadet school, then at the outbreak of the Revolution fled with his family to southern Russia, where he attended high school in Crimea. Made the acquaintance of Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky), evacuated to Yugoslavia, 1930 entered the Milkovo Monastery, received religious training and guidance from Archimandrite Ambrose, 1932 tonsured a monk, 1934 ordained to the diaconate, 1938 to the priesthood. Contacts with the Vlasov Movement and from 1941 military chaplain to the Vlasov Army. 1944 he joined the Saint Job Brotherhood and moved in 1947 from Munich to Jordanville. 1948 hegumen, 1951 archimandrite, and 1954 temporary administrator in Canada. 1956 consecrated Bishop of Melbourne, where he remained until 1967. 1968 Archbishop of Western America & San Francisco, a successor to Archbishop John (Maximovich).

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1956) 11-12, pp.112-121; *Prav. Rus'* (1956) 22, pp. 11-13.

ARCHBISHOP ANTHONY (Alexander F. Sinkevich, b. 1903 in Kiev, d. 1996)

1951 — Bishop of Los Angeles.

A primary and secondary school in Kiev, 1920 emigrated to Yugoslavia, where he continued his studies at the Russian Cadet Corps. 1926-30 theological studies at Belgrade Theological Faculty, 1931-33 catechist at the Russian high school in Belgrade and the pedagogical academy. 1930 entered Milkovo Monastery and tonsured monk, ordained to the diaconate and priesthood, 1933 elevated to hegumen in Belgrade and appointed head of the Jerusalem Mission, which he presided over until 1951, from 1936 in the rank of archimandrite. During his direction of the Mission, the Bethany Convent with its boarding school and day school was founded, 1949 through his influence at the Jordanian court, he succeeded in keeping the Church Abroad's property in the Jordanian part of Palestine legally intact. He maintained close and friendly relations with the Jerusalem Patriarchate and contributed integrally to the strengthening and consolidation of the possessions in the Holy Land. For his services, he was appointed Bishop of Los Angeles in 1951, first as a vicar bishop of Western America, from 1961 as archbishop and from 1962 as Archbishop of Los Angeles & Texas, from 1971 of Los Angeles & Southern California.

Retired and reposed in 1996. He was buried 21 June/3 August 1996 at Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville. One of his great contributions to Church life was his effort in collecting material on the New Martyrs and Confessors of Russia.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1933) 2, p. 29; (1951) 3, pp. 6-17.

ARCHBISHOP APOLLINARIUS (Andrew V. Koshevoi, b. 1874 in Poltava District, d. 1933 in New York)

1917 — Bishop of Rylsk.

Born in the Poltava Province, he attended first parochial school and finally seminary from 1897-1901 in Poltava. From 1901-1905 he attended missionary courses at the Kazan Theological Academy, where he was tonsured a monk in 1904 and was ordained by the then president of the academy, Bishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky). 1905 hieromonk and teacher at the parochial school in Zhitomir, then in the Kiev Seminary, first as a teacher and from 1910-17 as prefect. 1910 archimandrite. 1917 Bishop of Rylsk, Vicar Bishop of Kursk. 1919 Bishop of Belgorod, a newly-created diocese. Evacuated to Yugoslavia. 1922-24 at the Jerusalem Mission.

1924, at the request of Metropolitan Platon, transferred to North America as Bishop of Winnipeg, vicar bishop of the North American Diocese. In the same year, Bishop of San Francisco, a participant at the Detroit Council in 1924. Despite his good personal relationship with Metropolitan Platon, he did not follow him into schism, but instead remained faithful to the Church Abroad. The Synod of Bishops first appointed him administrator in North America and in 1929 on account of his "services on the correct canonical path" he was appointed Archbishop of North America & Canada. 1930 he gave Hieromonk Panteleimon permission to found Holy Trinity Monastery in Jordanville. To support him, Archimandrites Tikhon (Troitsky), Joseph (Skorodumov) and Theodosius (Samoilovich) were consecrated bishops and appointed to America. When Archbishop Apollinarius died, 62 parishes in the United States and Canada belonged to the Church Abroad. He was first buried in an urban cemetery in New York City, but in 1965 his remains were transferred to Holy Trinity Monastery and laid to rest in the monastic cemetery. By his faithfulness to the Church Abroad after 1926, he saved the position of the Church Abroad in North America and laid the groundwork for the later existence of the Church in the United States and Canada.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 11, pp. 10-13; (1965) 8, p. 12; (1974) 22, pp. 10-11; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1933) 7, p. 133-134; Nikon: *Zhizneopisanie*. Vol. 7, p. 269, 391; *Severnoi Amerike*, pp. 54-59.

BISHOP ARSENIUS (Chagovtsev, d. 1945)

1926 — Bishop of Winnipeg.

As archimandrite he established, with the blessing of Archbishop Tikhon (later Patriarch), Saint Tikhon's Monastery in 1906 in Pennsylvania, USA, to which besides him five monks belonged. The monastery founded then was to become a base for the Mission of the Russian Church in North America. In 1926, at the stated desire of Patriarch Tikhon, Archimandrite Arsenius was consecrated Bishop of Winnipeg by Metropolitan Anthony in Belgrade. He was part of the Church Abroad only a few weeks before the schism of 1926 and again in the years 1936-46. During the schism, he maintained an irreconcilable stance towards the Church Abroad and supported the separation of the North American Diocese from the Church Abroad. In the years

1935-45, he bore the title in the Church Abroad of Bishop of Detroit & Cleveland and administered parishes in Michigan, Ohio, and Windsor (Canada).

S: *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1926) 13-14, pp. 11-14; *Nikon: Zhizneopisanie*. Vol. 5, p. 272.

ARCHBISHOP ATHANASIOS (Anthony V. Martos, b. 1904 in Zavita, d. 1 1.3 .83 in Buenos Aires)

1943 — Bishop of Vitebsk & Podolsk.

Born in the western part of Belorussia, which belonged to Poland after 1919. After graduation from secondary school, he enrolled in the Theological Faculty at Warsaw University. 1927 tonsured a monk at the Lavra of Pochaev together with Philotheus (Narko). Ordained deacon and priest in 1933, at the same time received a Master's Degree in Theology. 1933-36 pedagogical studies at the Ancient Languages Department at Warsaw University, his work on his dissertation was interrupted in 1939 by the outbreak of World War II. 1938 archimandrite. 1943 Bishop of Vitebsk & Podolsk of the Belorussian Autonomous Church, 1944 evacuation of the Belorussian clergy. 1945 joined the Church Abroad; until 1948 administrator of the northern German parishes, as well as having jurisdiction over the Belorussian and Cossack communities; 1950 Bishop of Melbourne, Vicar Bishop of Australia; 1954 appointment as Bishop of Edmonton & Western Canada, but did not assume this duty on account of the death of Archbishop Joasaph (Skorodumov), whom he then succeeded in the see of Buenos Aires & Argentina (in 1955 as bishop and in 1956 as archbishop). 1956 diamond cross on klobuk. From 1957 he administered the Diocese of Montevideo & Paraguay. His great service was in building up parish life in Argentina. Built Holy Resurrection Cathedral in Buenos Aires; restored Holy Trinity Cathedral to the Church Abroad. Compiled two books on Belorussian Orthodoxy (see bibliography).

S: *Belaya kniga. Zhizn' i deyatelnost Archiepiskopa Afanasia*. Buenos Aires 1971; *Prav. Rus'* (1978) 8, pp. 13-14.

BISHOP BARNABAS (Prokofieff, b. 1945 in Paris)

1982 — Bishop of Cannes.

Born to an émigré family in France, where he attended secondary school. During the 1960s, he spent time on Mount Athos and prepared for the priesthood in the Lesna Convent in France. In 1982 Hieromonk Barnabas was consecrated a bishop by Archbishop Anthony of Geneva and Bishop Mark of Berlin for the Catacomb Church in Russia under the utmost secrecy. News of his consecration was made public only in 1990.

Beginning in 1982, he visited Russia repeatedly. In 1991 he was nominated rector of the Synodal podvorye in Moscow, and official representative of the Synod of Bishops there. The registration of this podvorye was denied by the Moscow authorities. In 1994 he was nominated Bishop of Argentina-Paraguay, but did not exercise this appointment as he was appointed administrator of the Diocese of Australia in February 1995, though he ultimately remained in France.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1990) 18, pp. 1-6; (1992) 20, pp. 7-8, 15.

BISHOP BASIL (Pavlovsky, b. 1880 in Kazan, d. 1945 in Vienna)

1938 — Bishop of Vienna.

Nothing is known of his origins and youth. He presumably studied theology at the Kazan' Theological Academy, where he received a Master's Degree in Theology. In the 1920s, he was the principal of the Russian secondary school in Mukden. In the early 1930s, he moved to Harbin, where he taught higher theological courses. After the establishment of the Saint Vladimir Institute in Harbin, he was appointed dean of the Theological Faculty. He exercised this office until 1939. Co-publisher of the journal *Heavenly Bread*. He was apparently elevated to archimandrite in 1935 because he held this rank as dean. 1938 consecrated Bishop of Vienna, vicar bishop of Germany. After the collapse of the Third Reich, he was named Bishop of Vienna & Austria. He died a few months later in the autumn of 1945.

S: *Irenikon* (1938) p. 470; *Kyrios* (1940) p. 297.

ARCHBISHOP BENEDICT (Basil Bobkovsky, b. 1876 in Zavoloch, d. 1951 in Munich)

1941 — Bishop of Brest.

Born in 1876 in Belorussia, he first attended parochial school in Velikie Luki. From 1902-05 he studied at the Pskov Seminary, then 2 semesters at Yuriev University in Dorpat. 1905 ordained to the priesthood, then served in various parishes in Belorussia. 1914 priest in Novogrudok, where he remained until 1937 without interruption. 1916-18 military chaplain. After the death of his wife, he was tonsured a monk in 1937 and elevated to archimandrite in the same year, becoming abbot of the Zhirovitsy Monastery, where he remained until 1941. In 1941 he was consecrated Bishop of Brest of the Belorussian Autonomous Church, 1942 Archbishop of Grodno & Byelostok. At this time, he entered into contact with the Church Abroad. In 1943 participated at the Vienna Council of Bishops of the Church Abroad, which he then joined. 1944 evacuated to Germany, from 1946 member of the Synod and deputy to Metropolitan Anastasius. In Germany he was entrusted with the care of the Belorussian refugees.

After the death of Metropolitan Seraphim (Lade) he was assigned the rule of the German Diocese, which he was to administer for only a year, until his death in 1951. His faithful particularly praised his goodness and modesty, which was expressed, among other ways, by his refusal to accept elevation to the rank of metropolitan, which had been offered him.

S: *Tserk. Vedomosti* [Munich] (1952) 3-4, p. 2; 5, pp. 11-12; (1955) 10-12, pp. 18-19; *Prav. Rus'* (1950) 22, p. 15; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1951) 3, pp. 17-22; *Orthodoxe Rundschau* (1976) 3, pp. 10-16.

BISHOP BENJAMIN (Basalyga, b. 1887 in USA, d. 1963 in USA)

1933 — Bishop of Pittsburgh.

Born on 1887 in Pennsylvania, he attended seminary in Minneapolis. 1910 entered Saint Tikhon's Monastery, 1911 tonsured a monk and ordained to the priesthood. Served in various parishes in eastern America. 1919 elevated to hegumen, 1920 archimandrite, brief activity in

Canada, then from 1923 Metropolitan Platon's secretary. 1933 consecrated Bishop of Pittsburgh & West Virginia. He took part in the Second Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad in 1938 as a representative from North America. In 1945, appointed Archbishop of the Orthodox Church in Japan. He joined the Metropolia in 1946. In 1953 he returned to the United States, where he died in 1963. He was the first Orthodox bishop of American birth. He belonged to the Church Abroad from 1935-1946 as Bishop of Pittsburgh & West Virginia.

BISHOP BENJAMIN (John Fedchenko, b. 1880 near Tambov, d. 1961 in the Soviet Union)

1919 — Bishop of Sebastopol.

Born in 1880 in the Tambov District, he attended parochial school. From 1900-03 he studied at the Tambov Seminary and from 1903-1907 the St. Petersburg Academy, which he completed as a candidate of theology. In 1907 he was tonsured a monk, ordained a deacon and priest. 1907-08 taught biblical history at the St. Petersburg Academy, 1908-10 secretary to Bishop Sergius (Stragorodsky) of Finland. 1910-11 taught pastoral theology, homiletics and ascetic theology at the St. Petersburg Academy. 1911 appointed prefect of the St. Petersburg Seminary and in the same year rector of the seminary of Taurida. Elevated to archimandrite in 1911. From 1913-17 rector of the seminary in Tver'. 1917-18 participant in the Council as a representative of the lower clergy. In autumn 1918, overseer of the monasteries and academic committees of the Diocese of Kherson, at the same time rector of the seminary of Taurida. In 1919 upon the decision of the Ukrainian Autonomous Orthodox Church and with the consent of Patriarch Tikhon, he was consecrated Bishop of Sebastopol. In the same year, he was appointed Bishop of the White Army and Navy and head of the military chaplains of the White Army. In 1920 evacuated to Constantinople. Member of the preparatory commission for the Constantinople Synod and member of the SEA. 1921 participant in the Council at Karlovtsy and a member of the Russian Council on the staff of General Wrangel. 1922 he received a communication from Patriarch Tikhon, informing him that he was no longer a member of the Ukrainian Autonomous Orthodox Church, to which he formally still belonged. The Synod Abroad appointed him abbot of the Russian Brotherhood at Shabats, which included twenty-five monks. From 1923-24, under the jurisdiction of Constantinople, he was appointed to the Diocese of Carpatho-Russia in eastern Slovakia as vicar bishop to Archbishop Sabbatius in Prague. When Eastern Slovakia became a diocese of the Church of Serbia, Bishop Benjamin returned to Yugoslavia, where he became a religious instructor for the Don Cossack Corps. In 1925 Metropolitan Eulogius appointed him as a member of the founding committee of Saint Sergius Institute, and he moved to Paris. After the break between Metropolitans Anthony and Eulogius, he joined Eulogius, and from 1927 the Moscow Patriarchate. In 1931 he did not join Eulogius in breaking with the Patriarchate and remained with the latter, being appointed head of the patriarchal communities in Western Europe. In 1933 appointed head of the Patriarchal communities in North America. 1946 returned to the Soviet Union. 1951 appointed Metropolitan of Rostov & Novocherkassk, from 1955 of Saratov & Bol'sk. 1958 retired on grounds of old age and entered the Pskov Cave Monastery, where he died in 1961. Compiled many theological works.

S: *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1924) 1-2, p. 4; *JMP* (1962) 11, pp. 47-50.

BISHOP BENJAMIN (Rukalenko)

1990 — Bishop of Gomel.

Bishop of Chernomorsk & Kuban

Tonsured 1990 in Jordanville. Consecrated bishop 15/28 November 1990 in Mansonville by Metropolitan Vitalis and Bishop Hilarion. Bishop of Gomel from November 1990 to October 1991, then Bishop of Chernomorsk & Kuban.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1992) 21, p. 7-9, 15.

BISHOP CONSTANTINE (Manuel Essensky, b. 1907 in St. Petersburg, d. 1996 in Blanco, TX)

1967 — Bishop of Brisbane.

Born 17/30 May 1907 in Saint Petersburg, and grew up in Riga, where he attended secondary school. When his father was killed by the Communists his mother died of grief and shock. 1928 entered the Saint Sergius Institute in Paris. 1932 ordained to the diaconate and priesthood by Metropolitan Eulogius and assigned to the Church of Saint Vladimir in Berlin. Served as a priest in Dresden, Kassel, and Leipzig. In 1938, along with his parishioners, joined the Russian Church Abroad. Took part in the Second Pan-Diaspora Council in 1938. After the War, he was a priest in the DP camps in West Germany. 1949 immigrated to the United States and served in various parishes. 1967 tonsured a monk in Jordanville by Archbishop Abercius, and consecrated Bishop of Brisbane, vicar bishop of Australia & New Zealand. 1978 returned to the United States and named vicar bishop of Eastern America. 1981 appointed Bishop of Richmond & Great Britain. Retired in 1985 due to poor health. He spent his last five years at the Monastery of Christ of the Hills, in Blanco, Texas, where he served as a great inspiration for the young monks. He reposed peacefully on 18/31 May 1996. His funeral was served by Bishops Hilarion and Chrysostomos, with a large number of clergy. [His remains have since been moved to Holy Trinity Monastery, Jordanville NY.]

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1967) 23, p. 9; 24, p.13; *Tserk. Zhizn'* 3-4, 1996, pp. 62-63.

BISHOP CYRIL (Boris Dimitrieff, b. 24 November 1954 in San Francisco)

1992 — Bishop of Seattle.

Born to an Orthodox family of Russian descent. Tonsured a reader in 1972 by Archbishop Anthony of San Francisco, and in the same year graduated from high school. In 1976 received the B.A. degree in San Francisco; and later received the M.Div. degree from Saint Vladimir's Seminary in Crestwood, NY. From 1980-1982 was a member of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission and a teacher of Russian and English at the Bethany school. Tonsured a monk in Jerusalem in 1981, shortly thereafter ordained hierodeacon by Metropolitan Philaret in New York and hieromonk by Archbishop Anthony in San Francisco. For health reasons forced to leave the Holy Land. From 1982-1992 served at the Holy Resurrection Church in San Francisco and as a teacher of catechism at the Saints Cyril & Methodius High School; from 1987 its director. 1987 hegumen, 1992 archimandrite. Consecrated Bishop of Seattle, vicar bishop of the

Western American Diocese 25 May/7 June 1992 by Metropolitan Vitalis, Archbishops Anthony and Laurus, and Bishop Hilarion. Is Headmaster of the Saint John of San Francisco Academy.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1992) 12, pp. 9-12.

BISHOP CYRIL (Elias Iontsev, b. 1920 in Bulgaria)

1964 — Bishop of Toledo & Toronto.

Born in Bulgaria, after finishing elementary school enrolled in seminary in Sofia in 1935, from which he graduated as valedictorian in 1940. During the semester breaks, he lived in the Rila Monastery. 1941 he continued his studies at the Theological Faculty of the University of Sofia. In the same year, he was tonsured a monk and ordained to the diaconate. 1943 ordained to the priesthood. From 1944 instructor at the Plovdiv Seminary. He continued his education in Bern, where he studied theology, philosophy, and German. After the Communist seizure of power in his homeland, he went into exile in the United States in 1950. He took charge of the Bulgarian parish of the Greatmartyr George in Toledo. 1959 he was elevated to archimandrite. After Bishop Andrew (Velitsky) joined the Bulgarian Patriarchate in 1954, Hieromonk Cyril de-facto took over the direction of the remaining émigré communities, which were closely connected to the Church Abroad. In 1964, Archimandrite Cyril was consecrated Bishop of Toledo & Toronto for the Bulgarian Orthodox communities, which received an autonomous status within the Church Abroad. Metropolitan Philaret and Archbishops Nikon, Abercius, Seraphim, and Anthony consecrated him bishop in Holy Trinity Cathedral in Jordanville. In 1976, Bishop Cyril broke with the Church Abroad, because he and his parishes wanted to change to the New Calendar. Only three parishes — in Niagara Falls, Toronto, and Rome (NY) — remained with the Church Abroad; the rest, together with their bishop, joined the OCA. Bishop Cyril as head of the Bulgarian Orthodox exile community with an autonomous status belonged to the Synod from 1964-76.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1964) 15, pp. 3-5, 9-10; 16, p. 5; (1977) 5, p. 15.

ARCHBISHOP DAMIAN (Demetrius Govorov, b. 1854 in southern Russia, d. in Stanimaka, Bulgaria)

1916 — Bishop of Yerevan.

After attending parochial school, he entered seminary in Ekaterinoslav, graduating in 1878. Then taught in Simferopol and after ordination to the priesthood in 1881 pastor of various parishes. 1899 archpriest, from 1905 rector at the Cathedral in Kerch. 1907-11 studies at the Kiev Theological Academy, 1911 tonsured a monk and rector of the seminary in Kishinev, hegumen and archimandrite in 1911. Consecrated Bishop of Yerevan, from 1917 Bishop of Petrovsk, from 1919 Bishop of Tsarytsin. Evacuation and resettlement in Bulgaria, where he founded a pastoral school in the Monastery of Saint Cyricus in Stanimaka (from 1934, Asenovgrad). This school was the first educational institution for priests of the Russian emigration. He directed the school until his death in 1936. In 1931 he was elevated to archbishop for his service to the school.

His particular service was in the establishment of a pastoral school for émigré priests and candidates for the priesthood, the first school of its kind in the emigration, which in spite of its modest financial means educated approximately fifty priests and almost as many religious instructors.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1936) 4-5, p. 75; *Prav. Rus'* (1936) 7-8, p. 7; *Irenikon* (1936) pp. 447-453.

BISHOP DANIEL (Dimitry Alexandrov, b. in 1930 in Odessa)

1988 — Bishop of Erie.

Born into a military family, he spent his early childhood in Odessa, reading in church. In 1944 he escaped to the West with his family via Bessarabia, Austria, and Switzerland, settling in the United States, where he completed high school in Vineland, New Jersey. In 1952 he entered Holy Trinity Seminary, graduating in 1958. He took a keen interest in the Old Ritualists' rites and chant, and in iconography. He worked with the iconographer Pimen M. Sofronov. He painted many iconostases in the United States, including those in Saint Vladimir Memorial Church in Jackson, Holy Trinity Church in Astoria, NY, and Saint John the Baptist Church in Washington. He was tonsured a reader in 1950, in 1965 ordained to the diaconate and the priesthood as a celibate. Several Old Ritualist groups tried to convince him to become their bishop, but he refused each offer as they were still outside the Orthodox Church. During the Millennium celebrations in New York, he was consecrated Bishop of Erie (where there is a major Old Ritualist community which joined the Church Abroad), vicar bishop subordinate directly to the First Hierarch. 1992-1993 administrator of the Australian Diocese.

BISHOP DEMETRIUS (Nicholas F. Voznesensky, b. 1871, d. 1947 in Leningrad)

1934 — Bishop of Khailar.

After graduating from secondary school, 1890-93 studies at the Moscow Seminary and subsequently at the Moscow Theological Academy, graduating in 1897. History teacher at the Cadet Corps, then from 1900 assistant professor of general theology at the Kursk Seminary. 1905 ordained priest in Kharkov and rector of the Annunciation Church until 1909 and from 1909-20 rector of the Kharkov Cathedral. Emigrated to Manchuria and served at various churches in Harbin until 1931. Upon the death of his wife in 1933, he was tonsured a monk, elevated from hieromonk to hegumen and archimandrite. 1934 consecrated Bishop of Khailar, vicar bishop of the Diocese of Harbin. From 1928 directed pastoral courses in the diocese, and from 1934 presided over the Theological Faculty at Saint Vladimir Institute, where he taught New Testament. After the occupation of Manchuria by the Red Army, he joined the Patriarchate together with the other hierarchs in the Far East. He was elevated to archbishop. From 1946, he lived in retirement in the Pskov Caves Monastery. He was the father of Metropolitan Philaret.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1934) 7, pp. 114-119, 121-2; *JMP* (1947) 2, pp. 4-6; *Ostkirchliche Studien* (1968) p. 56.

ABUN-MAR ELIAS (Gevargizov, b. 1858, d. 1928 in Urmia)

1903 — Bishop of Salma.

He was originally a member of the Nestorian Church and joined the Russian Church in 1898 with 20,000 faithful. He audited courses, first at the Kiev Theological Academy, then at the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, where he belonged to the Brotherhood of Saint Alexander Nevsky Lavra for a time. 1903 he was consecrated Bishop of Salma. From 1914 he belonged to the Mission in Urmia, where he remained also after the evacuation. After short visits to St. Petersburg and Moscow he was assigned to direct the Mission and received the title Bishop of Supurgansk & Urmia. 1918 fled to Hamadan, where he remained until 1920, then returned to Urmia. In about 1921 he contacted the Synod of Bishops, which he joined. Died in 1928 in Urmia.

S: *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1929) 13-14, p. 34.

METROPOLITAN EULOGIUS (Basil S. Georgievsky, b. 1868 in Somovo, d. 1946 in Paris)
1903 — Bishop of Lublin.

After graduating from parochial school, he entered seminary in Tula, which he completed in 1889. He continued his studies at the Moscow Theological Academy 1889-93. Religion instructor in Efremovo. 1895 tonsured a monk and ordained to the priesthood, and until 1897 prefect of the seminary in Vladimir, then 1897-1903 at the seminary in Kholm, elevated to hegumen and archimandrite, 1903 consecrated Bishop of Lublin, 1905 of Kholm. From 1907 member of the Duma, Dept. of Church Affairs. 1912 elevated to archbishop, administrator of Galician church affairs and from 1914 Archbishop of Zhitomir & Volyn'. 1917 member of the preparatory commission for the Pan-Russian Council. When after 1918 he was refused permission to return to his diocese, he went into exile in Yugoslavia. Until his schism in 1926 he belonged to the Synod of Bishops in Karlovtsy, by whom, with the consent of Patriarch Tikhon, he was given the administration of the Western European parishes. 1922 elevated to metropolitan by Patriarch Tikhon. After the dissolution of the SEA and the establishment of the Synod of Bishops in 1922, Eulogius voted on all the decisive resolutions of the Synod, including the administrative restructuring in the emigration. The Synod's attempt to limit Eulogius's influence — by the removal of the German Diocese — later led to the 1926 break with the Synod and the splitting off of a number of the Western European communities. The negotiations, undertaken at the initiative of the Patriarch of Serbia, for reunification between the Synod, the American Metropolia and the Paris Jurisdiction, did not meet with success among his communities. 1927-31 Eulogius joined the Moscow Patriarchate, then until 1945 the Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1945-46 again Moscow. His successors again joined Constantinople and today (since 1970) form a Russian Orthodox Archdiocese.

S: *Put' Moei Zhizni. Vospominania Mitropolita Evlogia*. Ed. M. Manuchin. Paris 1947.

BISHOP EULOGIUS (Evtimy Markovsky, b. 1878 in Chotsinia, d. 1951 in Mahopac)
1942 — Bishop of Vinnitsa & Podolsk.

Born in Volyn'. After graduating from parochial school, entered seminary in Zhitomir. Served as priest in Rovno region. 1942 tonsured a monk, elevated to archimandrite and consecrated Bishop of Vinnitsa & Podolsk of the Ukrainian Autonomous Orthodox Church. 1943 evacuated to

Warsaw and in 1945 to Germany. From 1948 a member of the Synod of Bishops of the Church Abroad, which he had joined in 1946. He bore the title of Bishop of Caracas & Venezuela, but lived since resettlement at the Kursk-Root Monastery in Mahopac, New York.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1951) 7, p. 15.

BISHOP EUTYCHES (John Kurochkin, b. 1955 in Ishim)

1994 — Bishop of Ishim & Siberia.

After finishing school, served in the army. Tonsured subdeacon in 1977 by Bishop Maximus of the Moscow Patriarchate, in Omsk. His spiritual fathers were Monk Paul, later Schemamonk Prochorus, and Metropolitan Zeno of Tretickar (Georgia). Both had at one point belonged to the Catacomb Church. 1978-1982 studies at the Moscow Theological Academy. Ordained deacon 25 July, priest 24 October, then tonsured on Lazarus Saturday 1982. 1983 hegumen and confessor of the Omsk-Tyumen Diocese. Served in the newly-opened parish in Shablinkin, near Ishim. In January 1990, he, along with other priests of this diocese, petitioned to join the Church Abroad. Thereafter he served in various parishes of the Free Church in Siberia. 1992 elevated to the rank of archimandrite. Consecrated Bishop of Ishim & Siberia on 11/24 July 1994 in the Synodal Cathedral in New York City.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1994) 17, pp. 4-7.

ARCHBISHOP GABRIEL (Gregory Chepur, b. 1874 in Kherson, d. 1933 in Yugoslavia)

1909 — Bishop of Izmail.

Born in Kherson, the son of a general. Attended high school and then seminary in Kiev. 1892-96 studied at the Kiev Theological Academy, from which he was graduated with a Candidate of Theology degree. Tonsured monk and ordained to the priesthood in 1896. From 1896-99 instructor at the Novgorod Seminary, where he became prefect in 1899. From 1901 prefect at the seminary in Moghilev. 1902 archimandrite and rector of the seminary in Poltava. From 1906 member of the Synod and rector of the Church of the Twelve Apostles. 1908 president of the Bethany Seminary. 30 December 1909 Bishop of Izmail, vicar bishop of Kishinev. 1911 Bishop of Akkerman. Participant in the Pan-Russia Council of 1917/18. Because he refused upon his return to unite his diocese to the Romanian Orthodox Church, he left the diocese and went to Odessa. 1919 appointed Bishop of Chelyabinsk & Troitsa, but on account of the evacuation was unable to take up his post. Evacuated to Yugoslavia, where he became a permanent member of the Synod and chaired various academic committees. 1926-28 instructor of religion. On account of illness he was retired, living the last years of his life in the Pantsevo Monastery, where he reposed on 1 March 1933. For his service to the Church in administrating academic affairs and in his concern for Church music — he was the author of numerous compositions — he was granted the title of Archbishop of Chelyabinsk.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1933) 4, pp. 58-63; (1934) pp. 63-65; *Sostav*, p.169.

ARCHBISHOP GABRIEL (George Chemodakov, b. 1961 in Sydney, Australia)

1996 — Bishop of Brisbane.

Born 2 June 1961 in Sydney, Australia, where he finished high school in 1979. Studied at Holy Trinity Seminary from 1980 to 1984, receiving the B.A. degree. Taught Russian history at the seminary from 1985 to 1989.

From 1990 to 1995 was a cell-attendant to Bishop Hilarion of Manhattan. Tonsured a monk on 16/29 March, 1996 in Holy Trinity Monastery, ordained deacon 18/31 March by Archbishop Laurus, and priest on 25 March/7 April 1996 by Metropolitan Vitalis at the Synodal Cathedral in New York City. Consecrated Bishop of Brisbane on 24 June/7 July in Holy Trinity Monastery by Metropolitan Vitalis, Archbishop Anthony of San Francisco, Archbishop Laurus of Syracuse, Bishop Hilarion of Manhattan, Archbishop Chrysostomos of Etna and Bishop Auxentios of Photiki of the True (Old Calendar) Church of Greece. At the Council of Bishops in September 1996, Bishop Gabriel was named Bishop of Manhattan and Deputy Secretary of the Synod of Bishops. In 2008 he became Bishop of Montreal and Canada and in 2011 Archbishop.

ARCHBISHOP GREGORY (George I. Boriskevich, b. 1889 in Mezhirin, d. 1957 in Chicago)

1943 — Bishop of Gomel & Mozyr.

Born in Rovno Region, where he attended parochial school and seminary from 1905-08, then 1909-13 Kazan Theological Academy. First a reader in Zhitomir, from 1912 deputy prefect at Zhitomir Seminary and instructor of religion. 1916 married and ordained to the priesthood. 1918-20 taught liturgics and history at the seminary in Krenmenets, 1920-24 served in Volyn', from 1924 in the Polish Orthodox Church, from 1927 rector of the Cathedral of Vladimir-in-Volyn', 1930-43 in Kremenets. 1943 tonsured a monk, elevated to archimandrite and consecrated Bishop of Gomel & Mozyr in Vienna by Metropolitan Anastasius. Evacuated to Germany and served in the camps. 1947 Bishop of Montréal & Eastern Canada, 1952 Archbishop of the diocese. 1954 Archbishop of Chicago & Cleveland, from 1957 Archbishop of Chicago & Detroit, d. 1957.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1943) 12, pp.162-68; (1958) 1-6, p. 44.

BISHOP GREGORY (Count George P. Grabbe, b. 1902 in St. Petersburg, d. 1995 in New Jersey)

1979 — Bishop of Manhattan.

Born in St. Petersburg, the son of an army officer. Attended school in Kislovodsk, completed education in Yugoslavia, where his family had fled via southern Russia. 1923-26 theological studies at Belgrade University.

Collaborated in various journals. After marrying, he moved to eastern Poland, where the family had an estate and his parents were living. 1931 tonsured a reader by Metropolitan Dionysius of Warsaw and visited Yugoslavia. Upon the request of Metropolitan Anthony, he remained in Karlovtsy, first as deputy to the Secretary of the Synod, Eksocustodian Macharoblidze, then replacing him. From this time, he was, as secretary and editor of *Tserkovnaya Zhizn'*, informed of all proceedings and decisions of the Synod and became the most knowledgeable person on the history of the Church Abroad. 1944 he saved the most important documents from the synodal

archives in the evacuation from Belgrade via Karlsbad to Munich. He was ordained a priest in 1944. During the years of the emigration in Munich, he was head of the Department of Refugee & Resettlement Problems, as well as being active in a decisive position on the Academic Committee. When the Synod moved to New York, he became the head of the “Department of Public & Foreign Relations,” in which position he negotiated with authorities and officials in the United States and contributed integrally to the consolidation of the Church Abroad there. 1967 he was officially entrusted with the administration of the aforementioned department and was thereafter also responsible for relations with Orthodox Sister Churches. After the death of his wife, he was tonsured a monk in 1978 and in 1979 (12 May) consecrated Bishop of Manhattan, vicar bishop of Eastern America & New York. His particular service to the Church lay in his defense of the canonical position of the Church Abroad against the claims of the Moscow Patriarchate, the Paris Jurisdiction, and the North American Metropolia. He was the leading canonical expert of the Church Abroad after Prof. Sergius Troitsky reversed his position (after WWII). As the author of many articles and books, editor of journals, head of the administration of the Church Abroad for almost fifty years, he played a vital role in the determination of the spiritual and political position of the Church Abroad. November 1981 appointed Bishop of Washington & Florida, administrator of the Vicariate of Manhattan until the consecration of Bishop Hilarion in 1984. In 1983 he presided over the Translation of the Relics of St. Edward, in Brookwood, England. Bishop Gregory retired in 1986 and died in 1995 in New Jersey. While retired, he still participated actively in the sessions of the Synod of Bishops and Councils of Bishops. From 1990 strongly supported the establishment of parishes in Russia, independent of the Moscow Patriarchate. Some weeks before his repose, in the summer of 1995, he visited parishes of the Free Russian Church in Suzdal’, Vladimir, and Moscow.

S: Prav. Rus’ (1979) 11, pp. 6-8; *Vestnik Germanskoy Eparkii* (1995) pp. 19-22; *Tserk. Zhizn’* (1995) 5-6, pp. 48-49. See his listing in the bibliography.

ARCHBISHOP GREGORY (Gregory Ostroumov, b. 1856 in Russia, d. 1947 in Cannes)

1936 — Bishop of Cannes.

Son of a clergyman. After attending the parish school, he studied at the St. Petersburg Seminary 1876-79 and Academy (1879-83), from which he was graduated with the degree of Candidate of Theology. 1883-85 reader at the Karlsruhe Church, then from 1885 priest in Schwerin at the house chapel of the Grand Duchess Anastasia Mikhailovna, who was married to the Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. 1892 awarded the kamilavka, 1893 the gold cross, 1895 archpriest, 1905 awarded the mitre. From 1890-95 he served in the winter as a priest in a house chapel in Cannes, because many Russians traveled for their health. At his suggestion, in 1893 a committee was established to build a church in Cannes, which would be financially supported by the Grand Duke Michael Mikhailovich. 1894 the church was consecrated. After that, Archpriest George remained permanently in Cannes. After the Revolution, he joined the Church Abroad and remained faithful to it after the schism in 1926. He was named protopresbyter in 1929 by the Synod. For his service to the Church, the eighty-year-old priest, who had been widowed in 1917, was consecrated bishop in 1936. By decree of the Synod of Bishops, Cannes was created a vicariate and included the parishes in Cannes, Nice, Menton, and San Remo. From that time,

Bishop Gregory bore the title “Bishop of Cannes & Marseille.” 1945 he joined the Moscow Patriarchate along with Metropolitan Seraphim (Lukianov), the head of the Diocese of Western Europe. He was elevated to archbishop. Shortly before his death in 1947 he returned to the Church Abroad.

S: According to the parish records of the church in Cannes.

ARCHBISHOP HERMOGENES (Gregory I. Maximov, b. 1861 in Nagav, d. 1944 in Yugoslavia)

1909 — Bishop of Aksaya (Don).

Born in the Don Region, the son of a reader. Attended parochial school in Nagav and from 1879-82 seminary in Novocherkassk, then the Theological Academy in Kiev from 1882-86. 1887 ordained to the priesthood. From 1889 taught religion in the Don Region. From 1894, principal of the parochial school in Ust-Medvedick. 1906 archpriest and principal of the school in Vladikavkaz and rector of the Saratov Seminary. 1909 tonsured a monk and elevated to archimandrite, 1910 Bishop of Aksaya, where he remained until his evacuation in 1919. From 1922 member of the Synod of Bishops, head of the Russian parishes in Greece. 1929 appointed Archbishop of Ekaterinoslav & Novomoskovsk. He was simultaneously relieved of his administration of the Russian parishes in Greece and was intended to go to America to strengthen the position of the Church Abroad there. But though he was appointed Bishop of Western America & San Francisco, he was unable to assume this office due to ill health, whereupon Bishop Tikhon (Troitsky) was appointed. 1936 awarded the diamond cross on the klobuk. He spent the last years of his life at the Lesna Convent in Yugoslavia. He was murdered by Croatian partisans in 1944.

S: *Sostav*, S. 133; *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1929) 13-24, p. 6; (1930) 11-12, pp. 2-3; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1937) 1. pp. 7-9; *Prav. Rus'* (1942) 3-4, p. 8.

ARCHBISHOP HIERONYMUS (John I. Chernov, b. 1878 in Vladimir District, d. 1957 in Detroit)

1935 — Bishop of Detroit.

Born in the Vladimir District to the family of a clergyman, he attended parochial school and 1895-99 the Vladimir Seminary. From 1899-1902 he was a catechist in the district. 1902 ordained to the priesthood and served as a pastor in various parishes. 1909-13 studies at the Moscow Theological Academy. 1914 taught sacred history at the Kursk Seminary, from 1915 prefect of the seminary until it was closed by the Bolsheviks in 1919.

Abbot of the Kursk Monastery of the Sign and secretary to Bishop Theophanes (Bystrov), with whom he withdrew to southern Russia, and thence to Yugoslavia. Pastor in various communities in Yugoslavia.

Director of the monastic school in Rakovche. 1923-33 he lived at the Jerusalem Ecclesiastical Mission, which he administered from 1923-24. 1935 he was named Bishop of Detroit & Cleveland. After the reunification with the Metropolia communities in 1936, he was appointed

Bishop of Montréal & Canada from 1936-47. 1946 archbishop and ruled the Church Abroad's Diocese of Detroit & Flint. However, after the renewed schism, the diocese was left with only four parishes, which, upon his death in 1957, were joined to the Diocese of Chicago. In 1953 he received the right to wear a diamond cross on his klobuk in recognition of his correct canonical path.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1935) 16, p.1; (1952) 11-12, p. 30; (1957) 11, pp. 5-6.

BISHOP INNOCENT (John Petrov, b. 26 Dec. 1902 in Yelabuga, Vyatsk District, d. 1987 in Paraguay)

1983 — Bishop of Asuncion.

He received his education in his hometown. After the outbreak of the Revolution, he joined the White Army in Siberia (under General Kolchak). After the liberation of Ekaterinburg, he was one of the first to visit the Ipatiev House, where the Tsar and his family had been martyred. With the White Army, he retreated to Vladivostok, whence he left Russia for Harbin and Shanghai. Eighteen months later he immigrated to Yugoslavia, where he served in the Russian Corps during World War II. In 1948, he settled in Argentina, where he was ordained subdeacon and trained by Archbishop Athanasius in theology and pastoral care. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1957, first serving in Buenos Aires and then in Paraguay, where he resided until his death. He served the communities there and in Uruguay, totally unassisted by another clergy. Following the death of his wife, he was tonsured a monk and consecrated Bishop of Asunción, vicar bishop of the Diocese of Argentina & Paraguay. In 1985, he was named Bishop of Buenos Aires, Argentina & Paraguay. He last participated at a Council of Bishops in 1986, when Metropolitan Vitalis was elected, but at that point, Bishop Innocent was already suffering from cancer.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1987) 5-6, pp. 181-183.

METROPOLITAN INNOCENT (John Figurowsky, b. 1866 near Tomsk, d. 1931 in Peking)

1902 — Bishop of Pereyaslavl.

Born in the Tomsk Diocese 1864 or 1866. Attended the Tomsk Seminary 1878-81. 1883 tonsured a reader, 1884 ordained to the priesthood. 1886-88 St. Petersburg Seminary and then 1888-92 St. Petersburg Theological Academy. Tonsured a monk in 1890; then prefect of the St. Alexander Nevsky School. 1894 archimandrite and rector of the seminary in St. Petersburg. 1895 administrator of Moscow's Holy Protection Monastery. 1896 administrator of the Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking. 1902 Bishop of Pereyaslav and head of the Mission in Peking, in the same year, appointed Bishop of Peking & China. In subsequent years, the Mission in China took a dramatic turn for the better among the Chinese. After the breaking off of relations with the Patriarchal Church, the hierarch, who in the interim had been elevated to the archbishop, entered into relations with the Karlovtsy Synod, whose authority and competence he acknowledged. For his service in building up church life in China, he was elevated to Metropolitan in 1929 and given the right to wear a cross on the white klobuk.

As the first head of the Mission, Innocent managed to make a missionary Church out of the Peking representation, which among the Chinese population has been shown to have had great success and won over to Orthodoxy 20,000-30,000 Chinese. After the Revolution, his diocese received ca. 75,000 refugees.

S: *Sostav*, p. 331; *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1929) 13-24, p. 19.

ARCHBISHOP JACOB (Jakob Akkersdijik, b. 1914)

1956 — Bishop of the Hague & the Netherlands.

Raised a Roman Catholic, he converted to Orthodoxy in 1940. He belonged to the parish in the Hague, which was at that time under the Paris Jurisdiction, and from 1948-1953 under the Moscow Patriarchate. In 1953 this parish joined the Church Abroad. In 1954 Jacob was ordained a priest by Saint John (Maximovich), then of Western Europe, and tonsured a monk in 1955; 1956 hegumen; 1962 archimandrite. For his active missionary work among the Dutch he was consecrated bishop by Metropolitan Philaret, Archbishop Anthony, and Bishop Nathaniel in 1965 for the Dutch Mission. In 1971 he joined the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate because the Dutch parishes desired to follow the New Calendar and even the new Paschalion. These conditions were accepted by the Patriarchate, which took these parishes under its jurisdiction.

S: *Prav. Rus'*, (1965) 20, pp. 4-5; 21, p. 3.

ARCHBISHOP JAMES (James Toombs)

1951 — Bishop of Manhattan.

An American by birth, raised in the Episcopalian Church. After studying medicine, he studied theology and came into contact with Orthodoxy. He joined the Orthodox Church in 1935. He belonged to the Syrian Church in North America at first. Then, through Bishop Vitalis (Maximenko) he came into the contact with the Russian Orthodox Church, which supported him in his desire to set up a mission among the Americans. 1950 an American Orthodox Mission was established, and James Toombs became its head. 1951 he was tonsured a monk. 1951 he was consecrated bishop and received the rights of a diocesan bishop for the American missionary Church. 1956 he was retired. Father Andrew Gerrick took over the direction of the Mission.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1951) 15-16, p. 4; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1951) 1, pp. 27-28.

ARCHBISHOP JOASAPH (John Skorodumov, b. 1888 in Rekovich, d. 1955 in Buenos Aires)

1930 — Bishop of Montréal.

Born the son of a clergyman in the Novgorod District, he first attended parochial school in Tikhvin from 1898-1902, and then seminary in Novgorod from 1905-08. From 1908-12 he studied at the St. Petersburg Academy, from which he was graduated as a candidate of theology. 1912 tonsured a monk, ordained deacon and priest. 1912-14 served on the Academics Committee of the Holy Synod. 1914-19 priest in Yaransk and taught at the seminary in Poltava. White Army chaplain, relocated to Yugoslavia, where he lived until 1926 and taught religion at various

schools. From 1926-30 he cared for the parish in Rives (Dept. Isère) in France. 1930 archimandrite and consecrated Bishop of Montréal, from 1934 of Edmonton & Canada. After the reunification with the Metropolia, he bore the title Bishop of Calgary & Western Canada. 1945 he was elevated to archbishop for his service. From 1946 he administered the Diocese of Edmonton & Western Canada again. 1950-55 Bishop of Buenos Aires & Argentina, from 1951 Archbishop of Argentina, from 1953 of Argentina & Paraguay. 1952 awarded the diamond cross on the klobuk.

His service consisted of the building up and consolidation of parish life in Canada, where the position of the Church Abroad in 1930 was weak. At the time of his transfer in 1950, 40 parishes belonged to the Church Abroad, including a skete in Alberta, the Holy Protection Convent and a podvorye in Edmonton.

S: *Archiepiskop Ioasaf (I. V. Skorodumov) v vospominaniyakh ego sovremennikov*. Buenos Aires 1977; *Prav. Rus'* (1955) 23, pp. 13-14; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1955) 7-12, pp. 115-16.

BISHOP JOHN (Eugraphus Kovalevsky, b. 1905 in St. Petersburg, d. 1972 in Paris)

1964 — Bishop of St. Denis.

He lived as an émigré in Paris from 1920. Studied at the Sorbonne and at the Saint Sergius Institute. 1925 he was a co-founder of the Brotherhood of Saint Photius and the first French-speaking Orthodox parish in Sainte Geneviève, to which other parishes were added. In 1937 he was involved in the establishment of the “Catholic Orthodox Church in France” under the leadership of the Priest Charles Winnaert (d. 1937), which had relations with Metropolitan Eleutherius. Father Eugraphus, whom Metropolitan Eleutherius had ordained in 1937, took over the direction of the communities. 1953 Eugraphus and most of his parishes broke with Moscow and remained independent until ca. 1960 because no other jurisdiction would receive them. Through the intercession of Archbishop John (Maximovich), the group was received in 1960 by the Church Abroad, Eugraphus as John, Bishop of St. Denis, was assigned the direction of the French-speaking parishes. In 1966 tensions arose between the group and the Synod, which led to Bishop John seeking reception into the Patriarchate of Romania. The negotiations continued until his death in 1972. As a bishop, John belonged to the Church Abroad only in the years 1964-67. The numerous jurisdictional changes of the French Orthodox community led to splits and differences within this group.

S: *Eastern Church Review* (1970) pp. 110-112; (1973) pp. 79-80.

BISHOP JOHN (John Legky, b. 29 April 1907 in Dwinsk, d. 1966 in Spring Valley, NY)

1990 — Bishop of Buenos Aires, Argentina, & Paraguay.

Son of a protopriest. Finished the Russian secondary school in Riga, then from 1930 studied at the theological seminary in Riga as an external student while teaching at the Russian school in Illutsk. From 1937-1940 continued his theological studies at the theological faculty in Riga. In 1931 ordained deacon and priest by Archbishop John (Pommer, the New Martyr) for the parish in Illutsk. From 1934 served the Holy Spirit Convent in Riga as a second priest; from that time,

he was a member of the Latvian diocesan council until its evacuation in 1944. From 1941 to 1943 he belonged to the Pskov Mission. 1944 named protopriest for the parishes in Riga. Evacuated in October 1944 to Germany, where he joined the Church Abroad. Assigned by Metropolitan Seraphim (Lade) to serve in various refugee camps in Germany; from 1946-1949 served the camps in Schleswig-Holstein. Emigrated to the United States in 1949, and named the second priest for Holy Ascension Cathedral in the Bronx, then in Paterson, NJ. 1965 mitred protopriest; 1972 protopresbyter. Widowed in 1989 and tonsured in August 1990. Consecrated Bishop of Buenos Aires in 1990 by Metropolitan Vitalis, and Bishops Hilarion, Daniel, and Gregory in the Synodal Cathedral. He served as diocesan bishop for four years and retired for reasons of health in 1994. Returned to the United States and lived in the Novo-Diveevo Convent in Spring Valley, NY. Nominated Bishop of Rockland. Some days before his repose he visited the parishes in Paterson and Nyack. Reposed 25 February/1 March 1995 and buried in the convent cemetery.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1990) 19. pp. 6-9; (1995) pp. 3-4; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1995) 1-2, pp. 48-51.

ARCHBISHOP (SAINT) JOHN (Michael Maximovich, b. 1896 in Adamovka, d. 1966 in Seattle)

1934 — Bishop of Shanghai.

Born in the Kharkov District to an aristocratic family. One of his ancestors was Saint John of Tobolsk. 1907-14 attended cadet school in Poltava, then studied law at Kharkov University. Evacuated to Yugoslavia, where he studied theology at Belgrade University. 1924 tonsured a reader and in 1926 tonsured a monk and ordained to the priesthood, then until 1934 taught catechism and Bible history at various schools and finally at the seminary in Bitol. 1934 consecrated Bishop of Shanghai, where he remained until 1949. He refused to recognize the Moscow Patriarchate after 1945 and did not — contrary to his diocesan bishop, Bishop Victor — commemorate the Patriarch of Moscow. For this reason, Bishop Victor traveled to Shanghai to unite the cathedral in Shanghai with the Patriarchate, but the faithful refused and remained faithful to Bishop John, who finally left Shanghai with 5,000 refugees, days before the city was occupied by the Communists. He traveled to the United States via the Philippines. 1951 he was elevated to archbishop and appointed to the Diocese of Western Europe as Archbishop of Brussels & Western Europe. He was simultaneously responsible for refugees from China. In his new diocese, he was concerned above all else with missionary work and brought to life the Dutch and French Orthodox Churches. From 1956 he was a permanent member of the Synod. After the death of Archbishop Tikhon (Troitsky), he became Archbishop of San Francisco & Western America. He died on 2 July 1966 in Seattle, where he had been accompanying the Kursk Icon. He found his final resting place in the crypt in the Cathedral in San Francisco.

The great veneration in which Archbishop John was already held in his lifetime has continued since his repose. He was in the true sense an ascetic, who spent his whole life in contemplation. He was a monk, a pastor, a holy hierarch, as well as a highly educated man and an aristocrat. He is manifestly one of the greatest hierarchs of the Church Abroad. He was glorified as a saint in 1994, shortly after his relics were found to be incorrupt.

S: *Blazhenny Ioann Maximovich, Arkhiepiskop Shanghaiski, Zapadno-Evropeiski i Zapadno-Amerikanski*. Platina 1971. *Tserk. Zhizn'*, 5-6, 1993, pp. 52-60.

BISHOP JOHN (Moses Shleman, b.1857, d. 1962 in Novo-Diveevo near New York)

1931 — Bishop of Urmia & Salma.

He was one of the Persian Nestorians who joined the Russian Church in 1898. After graduating from an English university, he became a priest in the Ecclesiastical Mission in Urmia. In the mid-1920s, he was elevated to protopriest. He was tonsured a monk at the Jerusalem Mission and in Dec. 1931 was consecrated Bishop of Urmia & Salma at the Holy Trinity Church in Belgrade. He headed the Mission in Persia, succeeding the deceased Mar Elias. In this capacity, he took part in the Second Pan-Diaspora Council of the Church Abroad. In 1945 he stepped down as head of the Mission on account of old age and settled in the USA, where he lived in a home for the elderly. He spent the last years of his life at the Novo-Diveevo Convent, where he died in 1962, aged 105. His final resting place is the cemetery there.

S: Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*. Vol. 5, pp. 271, 281-82; *Prav. Rus'* (1962) 6, p. 6.

BISHOP JOHN (Zlobin)

1946 — Bishop of Sitka.

With the consent of the Synod of Bishops, Metropolitan Theophilus, Archbishop Tikhon, and Bishop Benjamin consecrated him. He succeeded Archbishop Alexis and was the last hierarch to be consecrated before the renewed schism in 1946. He belonged to the Church Abroad for only a few weeks.

BISHOP (SAINT) JONAH (Vladimir Pokrovsky, b. 1888 in Kaluga, d. 1925 in Harbin)

1922 — Bishop of Tientsin.

Born into a peasant family near Kaluga, he attended parochial school, then from 1906-09 seminary in Kaluga and from 1909-13 the Kazan' Theological Academy, where he received a teaching fellowship for his academic achievements. 1912 tonsured a monk. 1914 assistant professor of Holy Scripture at this academy. Field chaplain after the outbreak of the War. 1916 head chaplain for the 16th Army. 1918 arrested, liberated and fled via Turkestan and the Gobi Desert to Peking and China. 1921 elevated to archimandrite and 1922 Bishop of Tientsin, vicar bishop of Peking & China. On account of illness, he moved to Harbin, where he died in Oct. 1925. On the night of his death, he appeared to a lame youth, who was immediately healed.

S: *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1925) 21-22, pp. 5, 15-16; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1934) 1, pp. 4-9; *Prav. Rus'* (1960) 2, pp. 5-8; 5, pp. 8-9; *Pamyat' episkopa Iony*, in *Prav. Put'* (1966) pp. 32-46.

BISHOP JUVENAL (Ivan Kilin, b. 1875 in Armashevo, Sarapul, d. 1958)

1935 — Bishop of Sinkiang.

Born 1875, he entered a monastery in 1894. 1900 tonsured and ordained to the diaconate, 1902 hieromonk. 1904 administrator of the Belgorod podvorye in Perm. 1910-19 abbot of the Tabor

Hermitage, 1912 hegumen, 1914 archimandrite. 1912, 1915 and 1917 he attended missionary courses in Perm. 1919 priest in the province of the Far East. 1921 relocated to Manchuria. 1922-24 in Karlovtsy, then to Harbin, where he founded the Monastery of the Kazan' Icon of the Theotokos, which with its printing press, workshops and charitable institutions became one of the most important spiritual and ecclesiastical centers of the Church Abroad in the time between the Wars and in which 30 monks ultimately lived. 1935 he was consecrated Bishop of Sinkiang. However, he was unable to travel to that province, which was under Soviet influence, and returned to Harbin. 1941 he was appointed Bishop of Chichikar, vicar bishop of Harbin & Manchuria. After the Red Army's occupation of Manchuria, he joined the Patriarchate in 1945, which named him Bishop of Shanghai. 1947 he returned to the Soviet Union and became Archbishop of Izhevsk & Udmutia. He died in 1958, having taken the great schema, with the name John.

S: *Irenikon* (1934) p. 224; (1935) p. 185; *JMP* (1959) 2, pp. 31-32; *Prav. Rus'* (1935) 5, p. 6.

ARCHBISHOP LAZARUS (Zurbenko, b. 10 February 1931 in the Belgorodsky region)

1982 — Bishop for the Catacomb Church, Archbishop of Odessa & Tambov.

Ordained deacon 1/14 January and priest 18/31 January 1971 by Archbishop Benjamin (Moscow Patriarchate). Tonsured monk 9/21 January 1975 by the 102-year old schema-archimandrite Ambrose of Optina Hermitage. Consecrated secretly in Moscow 27 April/10 May 1982 by Bishop Barnabas. Participated for the first time in a session of the Synod of Bishops 19 January/1 February 1990.

BISHOP LEONTIUS (Leo Bartoshevich, b. in 1914 in St. Petersburg, d. 1956 in Geneva)

1950 — Bishop of Geneva.

Born in St. Petersburg in 1914, he moved with his family via southern Russia to Yugoslavia. He attended Russian elementary and high school in Belgrade, then studied at the Theological Faculty of the University of Belgrade. Entered the Milkovo Monastery and received spiritual training from Father Ambrose. Helped at the Russian Holy Trinity Church in Belgrade and attended the Belgrade School of Music. Was tonsured a monk together with his brother Anthony (later Archbishop of Geneva & Western Europe) in Milkovo Monastery. 1941 ordained to the diaconate and priesthood. 1941-43 priest in Belgrade, from 1943 in Geneva as an administrator of the Russian parishes in Switzerland. 1946 elevated to archimandrite. 1950 Bishop of Geneva, vicar bishop of Western Europe. Died in 1956 in Geneva.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1950) 9-10, pp. 10-23; *Prav. Rus'* (1956) 17, pp. 6-7.

ARCHBISHOP LEONTIUS (Filippovich, b. 1907 in Kiev, d. 1971 in Buenos Aires, Argentina)

1941 — Bishop of Zhitomir.

Born in Kiev, he attended parochial school in Ekaterinodar. From 1914 he lived again with his family in Kiev, where he entered the Chinese Hermitage in the early 1920s. 1925 tonsured a monk, 1926 hierodeacon and hieromonk. Arrested many times and served as a priest in

Leningrad, Moscow, Novgorod, Sarov, and other cities. 1940 entered the Pochaev Lavra and elevated to archimandrite. 1941 Bishop of Zhitomir. 1943 fled via Warsaw, Vienna, and Munich to the West. In Munich, he joined the Saint Job Brotherhood from Ladomirova in 1945. 1946-52 he lived in Paraguay, where he had emigrated with four monks from the Saint Job Brotherhood in order to found a monastery. 1947 he was appointed Bishop of Asunción & Paraguay and entrusted with the rule of this new diocese.

1953 he was appointed Bishop of Santiago & Chile. The building of the convent and the cathedral in Santiago can be traced to his initiative. 1969 he became Archbishop of Buenos Aires & Argentina, Chile & Paraguay. He died in 1971 in Buenos Aires. 1950 he had been named Bishop of Edmonton & Western Canada, but never took up this post, because Archbishop Panteleimon (Rudyk) went to Canada.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1971) 14, pp.2-3; *Eparkhialny vestnik* [Venezuela] (1959) 5, pp. 24-25.

ARCHBISHOP LEONTIUS (Leonid Turkevich, B. 1876 in Kremenets, d. 1965 in New York)
1933 — Bishop of Chicago.

Born in Kremenets, he attended parochial school and from 1892-95 seminary in Volyn', then the Kiev Theological Academy 1895-99. In 1902 he became teacher at the Oboyansk parochial school. 1905 ordained to the diaconate and priesthood. From 1906 he served at the church in Minneapolis and was rector of the seminary there. 1912 the school was transferred to New Jersey and he was the rector of Saint Nicholas Cathedral in New York. 1915-30 he was the editor of the American Orthodox Herald (*Amerikansky Pravoslavny Vestnik*). 1917-18 he took part in the Pan-Russia Council. From 1922-34 he was the closest assistant to Metropolitan Platon. 1933 tonsured a monk, elevated to archimandrite and consecrated Bishop of Chicago & Minneapolis. 1945 with the consent of the Synod he was elevated to archbishop. 1950 succeeded Metropolitan Theophilus and remained until his death in 1965 Metropolitan of All America & Canada. He was a zealous proponent of the separation of the North American Diocese from the Church Abroad and voted for autocephaly of the North American parishes in both 1924/25 and 1945/46. He was often designated as "architect of the autocephaly," which was only accomplished five years after his death. He belonged to the Church Abroad from 1936-46, as Archbishop of Chicago & Minneapolis.

S: *Zhizn' i trudy vysokopr. Mitropolita Leontia*. New York 1969.

BISHOP MACARIUS (Michael Ilyinsky, b. 1866 in Gorodya, d. 1953 in New York)
1935 — Bishop of Boston.

Born in the Tver' District, after graduating from parochial school he attended seminary in Tver' from 1884-87, then 1887-91 St. Petersburg Theological Academy, which he graduated as a candidate. 1891 ordained to the priesthood. 1911 he was prefect of the seminary in Minneapolis, by 1917 as protopriest and rector. 1932/33 he was tonsured a monk and shortly thereafter consecrated Bishop of Boston; soon named Bishop of Brooklyn. Before the renewed break in 1946, he joined the Moscow Patriarchate (26 January 1946), which elevated him to archbishop.

From 1947, as Exarch of the Patriarch in North & South America, from 1952 as Metropolitan of New York and Exarch of North & South America. He belonged to the Church Abroad from 1936-46.

S: *Ostkirchlie Studien* (1968) p. 209; *JMP* (1953) 12, pp. 13-15.

ARCHBISHOP MARK (Dr. Michael Arndt, b. 29 January 1941 in Chemnitz)

1980 — Bishop of Stuttgart & Southern Germany; Archbishop of Berlin, Germany, & Great Britain.

Archbishop Mark was born to a German Protestant family and converted to Orthodoxy in the early 1960s. After attending elementary and secondary school, from which he was graduated after passing his final examinations in 1961, he served in the army, attaining the rank of lieutenant in the reserves by the time of his discharge. From 1962 to 1964, instructor of German for Yugoslav students at the University of Heidelberg. From 1963 he studied the Slavic and English languages in Frankfurt and Heidelberg. He received his Ph.D. in 1969; his dissertation was on the theme “The Biographical Literature of the Principality of Tver’ from the 14th to the 16th Centuries.” From 1964 to 1969 was an instructor of Russian and German at the University of Maryland, American Division. From 1972 to 1975 he taught at the Slavic Institute in the University of Erlangen as Assistant Professor of Church Slavonic and Old Russian Literature. During his time as an assistant professor, he studied, from 1973, at the Theological Faculty of the University of Belgrade. During semester breaks, he spent several weeks each year on Mount Athos, at Saint Panteleimon Monastery and Saint Elias Skete. 1975 ordained deacon and tonsured a monk, ordained to the priesthood. After that, served in Wiesbaden. 1976 archimandrite, 1980 consecrated Bishop of Stuttgart & Southern Germany. In 1982 made Bishop of Berlin & Germany. After his consecration, Bishop Mark moved to the Saint Job Monastery in Munich, since in the interim he had gathered together a brotherhood of four novices. At the same time, he was appointed abbot of the monastery, which he thoroughly renovated with his fellow monks. In the monastery, they set up a candle factory, which would cover the needs of the German Diocese. After purchasing new printing facilities, the brotherhood began wide-reaching publishing activity. Since the summer of 1981 the diocesan journal, with both Russian and German editions, was reestablished. Due to the illness of Archbishop Philotheus, Bishop Mark was entrusted with the administration of the German Diocese. Upon the retirement of Bishop Constantine, he was also given the administration of the British Diocese. In 1990 he was made archbishop.

S: *Prav. Rus’* (1981) 1, pp. 11-13;

METROPOLITAN MELETIUS (Michael Zaborovsky, b. 1869 in Gilevsk, d. 1946 in Harbin)

1908 — Bishop of Bizhsk.

Born in the Tobolsk District, he attended parochial school and then seminary in Tobolsk from 1886-89. Ordained to the priesthood 1889, after being widowed, he studied at the Kazan’ Theological Academy 1895-99. Tonsured a monk in 1897, taught at the Kazan’ Theological Academy from 1899-1906.

Archimandrite 1904. 1906-08 rector of the Tomsk Seminary. 1908 Bishop of Bizhsk. 1912-16 Bishop of Yakutsk & Zabaikal, then, until 1920, Bishop of Chita. He emigrated in 1920, with the permission of Patriarch Tikhon, to Harbin, where he lived at the Peking Mission. 1930 Archbishop of Zabaikal & Nerchinsk. 1931 elevated to Metropolitan. 1932-46 Archbishop of Harbin & Manchuria. 1945 after the invasion of the Red Army he joined the Patriarchate, but died a few months later from old age. Under his leadership, the life of the Manchurian Diocese blossomed in the 1930s. Besides a convent and a monastery, more than two dozen churches, a theological faculty and numerous charitable institutions were founded. His final resting place was in Harbin's Holy Annunciation Church.

S: Policarp (Arkh.) Vospominanie o prisnopamyatnom Vladyku Meletiyu, in *Prav. Pyt'* (1963) pp. 34-58; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1934) 1, pp. 12-13; *Prav. Rus'* (1963) 16, pp. 8-9; *JMP* (1946) 5, pp. 11-12; *Church News* (1939) 10, pp. 13-23, 33-38, 53-57.

METROPOLITAN METHODIUS (Maurice Gerasimov, b. 1856 near Tomsk, died 1932 in Harbin)

1894 — Bishop of Bizhsk.

Born in the Tomsk District, he attended parochial school and from 1875-78 seminary in Tomsk. 1878-82 studied at the Kazan' Theological Academy and worked at the Altai Mission. 1885 tonsured a monk, ordained priest. 1892 candidate of theology. 1893 archimandrite and Bishop of Bizhsk. 1898 Bishop of Zabaikal, 1912 Bishop of Tomsk & Altai. 1914 Bishop of Orenburg. After relocation to Manchuria, he was appointed Bishop of the Church Abroad's newly established Diocese of Harbin & Manchuria in 1922, then archbishop and from 1929 Metropolitan with the right to wear a cross on his klobuk. As senior hierarch of this diocese, his main achievement was the organization of Church life there, where some 200,000 refugees came to live after the Civil War. The pastoral and theological courses that he established formed the cornerstone of the subsequent Theological Faculty, the first institute of higher learning for the Church Abroad.

S: *Sostav*, p. 183.

BISHOP MICHAEL (Michael Bogdanov, b. 1867 in the Ryazin District, d. 1925 in Harbin)

1907 — Bishop of Cheboksary.

Born in 1867 near Ryazan', the son of a clergyman. He attended parochial school, then the Kazan' Seminary from 1885-88. Tonsured a reader before 1892, in which year he was ordained to the priesthood and served at various churches in the Ryazan' Diocese. 1896 entered the Kazan' Theological Academy, where he received a stipend as a candidate. After graduating from the Academy, he was appointed as an instructor. 1902 tonsured a monk and became prefect of the Kharkov Seminary. 1905 elevated to archimandrite and rector of the same. 1906 Master's Degree in Theology, 1907 consecrated Bishop of Cheboksar, 1914 Bishop of Samara & Stavropol. Honorary member of the Kazan' Academy in recognition of his early activities as an instructor of Sacred History and the New Testament. After the outbreak of the Civil War, he found himself on the territory of the White Army. 1919 he was appointed Bishop of Vladivostok.

Emigrated to Harbin where, from 1924, he taught the theological courses established there. He protested against the creation of an independent diocese of Harbin 7 Manchuria in 1922 because its territory was taken from the Diocese of Vladivostok.

BISHOP MICHAEL (Simeon Donskoff, b. 1943 in Paris)

1996 — Bishop of Toronto.

Born 29 March 1943 in France, where his father had come in 1927 via Constantinople, Lemnos, and Czechoslovakia after evacuating from Russia with the Don Army. Served in the altar from the age of seven. Served in the army 1965-66. In 1966 received the Diplome de Moniteur de Colonies de Vacances. From 1959 to 1966 directed youth camps in France, and in 1995 and 1995 directed camps in Russia. From 1969 worked in hospitals in and near Paris, and from 1978 also taught in hospitals and medical schools. Tonsured reader in Paris in 1979, by Archbishop Anthony of Geneva; subdeacon in 1980, a deacon in 1981, and priest in 1991. From 1991, spiritual father at Paris youth camps. Tonsured a monk by Metropolitan Vitalis on Bright Friday of 1996, taking the name Michael. Made hegumen on Thomas Sunday, 1996. Consecrated Bishop of Toronto, vicar bishop of the Diocese of Canada, 29 June/12 July, 1996 in New York by five bishops.

S: *Prav. Rus'*, #16 (1565), 15/28 August 1996, *Tserk. Zhizn'*, 3-4, 1996, pp. 60-61.

BISHOP MICHAEL (Michael Kosmodamiansky, b. 1858 near Orlov, d. 1925 in Yugoslavia)

1911 — Bishop of Alexandrovsk.

Born in the Orlov District, he first attended parochial school there and then seminary. 1880-84 he studied at the St. Petersburg Academy, from which he was graduated as a candidate of theology. He taught at the Orlov parochial school for 11 years. 1895 he became superintendent of the parish schools of the Orlov Diocese, and from 1901 the schools of the Stavropol Diocese. 1906 protopriest. After the death of his wife, he was tonsured a monk in 1910 and elevated to archimandrite. 1911 consecrated Bishop of Alexandrovsk, vicar bishop of Stavropol. 1920 emigrated to Yugoslavia and a member of the Synod of Bishops. 1925 he died in the Grgetek Monastery in Yugoslavia.

S: *Sostav* pp. 84-85; *Tserkovnye Vedomosti* (1925) 19-20, p. 3, 8.

BISHOP MITROPHAN (Znosko-Borovsky, b. 4 August 1909 in Brest-Litovsk)

1992 — Bishop of Boston.

Attended the parochial school in Elce, then the Russian secondary school in Brest-Litovsk. He received a scholarship to the Saint Sergius Institute in Paris, but his father rejected this. He began his theological studies at the University of Warsaw (1930-1932), then continued at the University of Belgrade (1932-34). Taught at the Russian school in Brest-Litovsk from 1935-36. Ordained deacon in September 1935; 14 June 1936 ordained priest at the village parish in Omelenec. 1937 Master of Theology at the University of Warsaw. 1937 priest and teacher in Brest. 1939 named protopriest by Metropolitan Panteleimon. From 1941 dean of parishes in the Brest region. 1944

emigrated to Germany and served in various camps. From June 1945 director of the refugee camp in Mönchehof and member of the diocesan council of the German diocese under Metropolitan Seraphim. From 1946 member of the Mission Committee of the Synod of Bishops. From 1948 dean of the newly-established parishes in North Africa and Morocco; from 1954 administrator of the Church Abroad for North Africa. From 1959 rector of the Saint Seraphim Church in Sea Cliff, New York. From 1966 member of the diocesan council of the Eastern American Diocese. From 1967 to 1974 taught at Holy Trinity Seminary in Jordanville. 1986 named Protopresbyter. 1990 elected bishop, 26 October/6 November 1992 tonsured monk (in honor of the New Hieromartyr Mitrophan of Astrakhan) at Holy Trinity Monastery.

November 1992 consecrated Bishop of Boston, vicar of the Diocese of Eastern America & New York by Metropolitan Vitalis, Archbishop Laurus, and Bishops Benjamin, Hilarion, and Cyril.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1992) 23, pp. 3-4.

ARCHBISHOP NATHANIEL (Basil L'vov, b. 1906 in Moscow, d. 1986 in Munich)

1946 — Bishop of Brussels & Western Europe.

Attended school and spent his childhood in Moscow, fled via Siberia to Manchuria, where he was tonsured a monk in 1929. Attended theological and pastoral courses in Harbin. Assistant to Archbishop Nestor (Anisimov) of Kamchatka, whom he accompanied on numerous missionary trips, among others to the Christians of southern India, where they founded a mission and conducted negotiations with the Indian Christians about joining the Church Abroad (1935-36). Returned to Harbin; elevated to archimandrite. 1939 entered the Lodomirova Saint Job Monastery, where with Archimandrites Seraphim and Sabbas he set up pastoral courses. 1944 emigrated to the West, where he established the Committee for Russian Orthodox Emigrants, whose main task was to prevent the deportation of DPs to the Soviet Union. Thousands of refugees were saved, receiving permission to immigrate overseas. 1946-51 Bishop of Brussels & Western Europe, in which capacity he succeeded in getting travel passes from the French authorities for the nuns of the Lesna Convent, who had been living in Yugoslavia, thereby facilitating their resettlement in France, where the convent was reestablished. 1951-52 Bishop of Preston & the Hague, 1952 he was named Bishop of Columbia, but did not assume this office and was instead sent to North Africa as the administrator of the Russian parishes there. From 1954 he lived in Germany and cared for the parishes in Mannheim and Berlin. 1966 he became abbot of Munich's Saint Job Monastery, where he lived until his death. 1971 he was given the provisional rule of the Diocese of Vienna & Austria, 1976 he was appointed Bishop of Vienna & Austria, although, given the poor state of his health, he was barely able to exercise his office. 1980 he retired as abbot of the Saint Job Monastery for this reason. In November 1981 he was elevated to archbishop. Died in Munich in 1986; buried in Wiesbaden. He was the author of many articles and short tracts on church history, questions of the Faith and Orthodox mission.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1947) 1, pp. 8-13; *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 20, p. 16.

BISHOP NECTARIUS (Oleg Kontsevich, b. 1905 in Talsi, d. 1983 in San Francisco)

1962 — Bishop of Mahopac.

Born in Courland, his family moved to Ukraine. There he attended secondary school and then technical institute, which he graduated as a transportation engineer. 1944 emigrated to the West and settled in America. 1952 entered the New Kursk Hermitage near New York, 1953 tonsured a monk and ordained to the priesthood. Served at the San Francisco Cathedral and worked closely with Archbishop Tikhon. 1959 hegumen, 1962 elevated to archimandrite, consecrated Bishop of Mahopac. During Archbishop Tikhon's illness, Bishop Nectarius assumed the administration of the San Francisco Diocese. In October 1962 he was consecrated vicar bishop of Seattle to lend support to Archbishop Tikhon. He remained in that office for twenty-one years.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1962) 1-6, pp. 62-63; *Prav. Rus'* (1962) 6, pp. 4-5, 11; (1983) 3, pp. 8-10.

ARCHBISHOP NESTORIUS (Nicholas Anisimov, b. 1884 in Vyatka, d. 1962 in Moscow)

1916 — Bishop of Kamchatka & Petropavlovsk.

Born in Vyatka into the family of a civil servant, he first attended secondary school in Vyatka, then the Kazan' Seminary and Theological Academy, where he studied in the Mongolian-Kalmuk Dept. 1907 tonsured a monk, ordained to the diaconate and priesthood, after which he was active in missionary work in Kamchatka, where he founded a mission, which was supported by the Kamchatka Brotherhood, which had many branches in Russia. Built churches, schools and charitable institutions for the Mission. 1912 he was appointed director of the Mission. He translated the Liturgy and Gospels into the local languages. 1914 hegumen, 1915 archimandrite. Military chaplain. 1916 consecrated Bishop of Kamchatka & Petropavlovsk, participated in the Council of 1917/18. Emigrated to Harbin when returning to his diocese became impossible. In Harbin he was in charge of refugee matters. On his extensive travels, he visited diaspora communities in Asia, Africa, and Europe. 1933 archbishop and head of the Korean Mission, from that time with the title of Archbishop of Kamchatka & Seoul for the "duration of his temporary stay in Harbin." 1945 upon the Red Army invasion of Manchuria, he joined the Patriarchate. 1946 Metropolitan and Exarch of the Patriarch for Eastern Asia. 1947-56 presumably arrested and exiled. 1956 Metropolitan of Novosibirsk & Barnaul, 1958 retired; administrator of the Diocese of Kirovgrad & Nikolaev. Shortly before his death, he took the great schema with the name Macarius.

S: *Sostav*, p. 73; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1933) 11, p. 201; *JMP* (1962) 12, pp. 17-20.

BISHOP NICHOLAS (Nicholas Karpov, b. 1891 in Moscow, d. 1931 in Yugoslavia)

1929 — Bishop of London.

After attending parochial school and seminary, he continued his studies at Moscow Theological Academy from 1911-15. Tonsured a monk and ordained to the priesthood, then taught at the Oboyansk Seminary in Kursk. Retreated to southern Russia, relocated to Yugoslavia, where he taught at the Bitol Seminary. 1928 elevated to archimandrite and administrated the London parishes. 1929 Bishop of London, vicar bishop of Western Europe. He was the first and the last Orthodox bishop to bear the title "Bishop of London" since the Great Schism. During a trip to Karlovtsy, he fell ill of appendicitis and died at the age of 41. After the schism of 1926, he had the task of consolidating the position of the Church Abroad in England, which he succeeded in

doing even in the short time he was there, because he was much beloved by his flock. His untimely death proved to be a great loss for the position of the Church in England.

S: *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1930) 3-4, pp. 5-6; 5-6, pp. 12-13; Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*. Vol. 7, pp. 272-75.

BISHOP NICHOLAS (Ono, d. 1956 in Tokyo)

1941 — Bishop of Tokyo & Japan.

After 1940 only native Japanese could legally head a religious community. In accordance with this decree, Metropolitan Sergius (Tikhomirov) was forced to retire. He recommended Protopriest Nicholas Ono as his successor. The latter and his wife took the monastic tonsure, and he was duly consecrated by the bishops of the Church Abroad present in Harbin: Metropolitan Meletius and Bishops Demetrius and Juvenal. Following the repose of Metropolitan Sergius in 1945, one group of Japanese Orthodox joined the Moscow Patriarchate, and another group the North American Metropolia. When the Metropolia received autocephaly from Moscow, the Japanese Orthodox Church was given an autonomous status under the Moscow Patriarchate. Bishop Nicholas maintained an independent status within the Church Abroad during the years 1941-1946.

S: *JMP* (1970) 12, pp. 45-47.

BISHOP NICANDER (Nicholas Paderin, b. 1927 in Harbin, d. 1987 in Brazil)

1967 — Bishop of Rio de Janeiro.

Attended elementary and secondary school in Harbin. He continued his studies at the seminary and theological faculty there. 1953 ordained to the priesthood. He refused to take a Soviet passport and emigrated in 1956 to Brazil, where he served as the parish priest in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. 1967 he was tonsured a monk, elevated to hegumen, archimandrite, and consecrated Bishop of Rio de Janeiro. From 1976 he bore the title Bishop of São Paulo & Brazil and ruled that diocese until his death after a brief illness in 1987.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1967) 21, pp. 3-5; (1968) 1, p. 14.

ARCHBISHOP NICODEMUS (Nicholas Nagaev, b. 1883 in Abo, d. 1976 in London)

1954 — Bishop of Preston.

Born 1883 in Abo (Finland), he attended elementary and secondary school and then military school. Later he studied military science. Took part in the War, emigrated to Yugoslavia. In the early 1940s he joined the Milkovo Monastery and was tonsured a monk in 1943. Hierodeacon, hieromonk, and, for a short time, military chaplain. He emigrated to the West, where he joined the Saint Job Brotherhood and became a co-founder of the Munich Monastery. 1946 hegumen, in the same year he resolved to move to France with several other monks, where they wanted to establish a monastery. The plan had to be abandoned, due to a lack of funds. Served in France. 1951 elevated to archimandrite and appointed administrator of the English parishes, from 1953

head of the parishes. 1954 Bishop of Preston, vicar bishop of Western Europe, 1957 Bishop of Richmond, 1963 Bishop of Richmond & Great Britain, from 1969 archbishop.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1954) 15, pp. 5-7; (1976) 21, p. 10.

ARCHBISHOP NIKON (Nicholas P. Rklitski, b. 1882 in Borki, d. 1976 in the United States)

1948 — Bishop of Florida.

Born into a priest's family, he attended parochial school in Chernigov and helped his father in the parish administration. Then he attended seminary in Chernigov. He enrolled in Warsaw University in 1910. Continued his study of law at Kiev University, where he passed the exam in 1915.

Volunteered for military service, took part in the Civil War, fighting for the White Army. 1918 he became acquainted with Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky), with whom he worked most closely from 1922-36 in the emigration. After the death of Metropolitan Anthony he studied theology in Belgrade and prepared to be a missionary. 1941 tonsured a monk, ordained to the priesthood and rector of Holy Trinity Church, Belgrade. Retreated with the Synod in 1944 to Karlsbad and Munich. In Karlsbad he joined the Ladomirovo Saint Job Brotherhood. Elevated to hegumen, exiled to Switzerland, secretary of the Synod. 1946 elevated to archimandrite, moved to Jordanville. Secretary to Archbishop Vitalis (Maximenko). 1948 Bishop of Florida, vicar bishop of Eastern America. 1959 archbishop, from 1967 Archbishop of Washington & Florida, member of the Synod. Died 4/17 Sept. 1976. The author of numerous writings and collaborator on various newspapers, including *Military Herald* (*Voenny Vestnik*) and *Imperial Herald* (*Tsarsky Vestnik*). Best known for the seventeen-volume edition of *Zhizneopisanie Blazhenneishago Antonia, Mitropolita Kievskago i Galitskago* (New York 195, 6-69).

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1948) 11, p.12; 12, pp. 8-12; (1976) 18, p. 16.

ARCHBISHOP PANTELEIMON (Peter Rudyk, b. 1899 in Lipovets, d. 1968 in Edmonton)

1941 — Bishop of L'vov/Kiev.

Born in 1899 near L'vov, he entered Pochaev Lavra as a novice and was tonsured a monk in 1920 upon return of the Brotherhood. After graduating from seminary he continued his studies from 1925 at the Theological Faculty of Warsaw University. He was rector of Saint George's Church in L'vov, 1928 hegumen, 1929 archimandrite and abbot of the Zagaetsky Monastery until 1933. From 1933 Deputy Abbot of Pochaev. In 1941 he was consecrated Bishop of L'vov and given the administration also of the Kiev Diocese. From 1941-45 he belonged to the episcopate of the Ukrainian Autonomous Church under Archbishop Alexis. 1944 emigrated to the West, where he joined the Church Abroad. 1945-48 administered the communities of the Church Abroad in North Africa, 1948 was elevated to archbishop and entrusted with the administration of the Diocese of Buenos Aires & Argentina. The local authorities forced him to leave Argentina in 1950, after which he assumed the rule of the Diocese of Edmonton & Western Canada. 1954-57 Archbishop of Montréal & Eastern Canada. The Synod of Bishops retired him by decree in 1957 for serious offenses. 1959 he joined the Moscow Patriarchate and bore the title

Archbishop of Edmonton & Canada and administered the Patriarchal communities in Canada until his death in 1968.

S: *JMP* (1968) 12, pp. 26-30; (1979) 10, pp. 14-18.

ARCHBISHOP PAUL (Michael Pavlov, b. in 1927 in Warsaw, d. 1995 in Spring Valley, New York)

1967 — Bishop of Stuttgart.

Born in 1927 in Warsaw, where he received his secondary education. 1944 fled to Germany. In Fischbek Camp near Hamburg, he came under the influence of the priest of the camp, Archimandrite Vitalis (Ustinov, later Metropolitan) and in 1946 he became a novice. He was tonsured a monk and was ordained hierodeacon in 1949 in the Saint Job Monastery in Munich. With Archimandrite Vitalis's brotherhood, which set up printing presses in London, São Paulo, and Montréal, he moved first to London and then to Brazil. In 1952 he was ordained to the priesthood and served in São Paulo. 1955 he moved to Canada, where the Brotherhood established the Holy Transfiguration Skete and set up a printing press.

During these years, he studied theology at the University of Montréal. 1957 was awarded the gold cross, 1959 elevated to hegumen, 1966 to archimandrite, 1967 consecrated Bishop of Stuttgart, vicar bishop of the Diocese of Southern Germany. Upon the retirement of Archbishop Alexander (Lovtsy) in 1971, he administered the chancery of the German Diocese and in practice independently ruled the Diocese of Stuttgart & Southern Germany. During this time period, the Synod assigned him to undertake visitations of churches in England, the Holy Land and Australia. 1980 appointed Bishop of Sydney, Australia & New Zealand, from Nov. 1981 archbishop. He suffered a stroke in 1992, from which he never fully recovered and thus retired. He lived his last years at the Novo-Diveevo Convent in Spring Valley, where he reposed in 1995. While he was hierarch in Australia several new churches were built, and with his blessing, the monastery in Bombala was established.

S: *Vestnik Germanskoy Eparkhii* (1995) 2, pp. 25-28; *Prav. Rus'* (1952) 3, pp. 15-16; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1995) 1-2. pp. 43-47.

BISHOP PHILIP (John Gardner, b. 1898 in Sebastopol)

1943 — Bishop of Potsdam.

Born in Sebastopol, he first lived in Moscow, where he attended the lyceum. In 1914 he moved back to Sebastopol and continued his secondary education. He learned traditional chant and Old Russian neumatic notation from the Old Believers. Thenceforth, his interest turned to Russian ecclesiastical chant, which was to determine his academic life's work. On account of his knowledge of languages, he worked at the SEA. Ahead of the advancing Red Army, he emigrated in Nov. 1920 to Yugoslavia. 1922-28 he studied theology at the Theological Faculty of the University of Belgrade. 1931 tonsured a monk, visited Mount Athos and the Holy Land, where he lived from 1934-38 at the Jerusalem Mission and published a journal. At the Second Pan-Diaspora Council in 1938 he took part as one of the monastic representatives. He then went

to Ladomirova and joined the Saint Job Brotherhood. 1939 he became rector of the Russian Church in Vienna and was later summoned to Potsdam, of which he was consecrated bishop, vicar bishop of the German Diocese. After World War II, he was laicized at his own request. After this, he devoted himself to his academic research on Russian chant and neumatic notation. Regarding his academic work, see the bibliography.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1942) 7, pp. 101-107; *Ostkirchliche Studien* (1973) p. 315.

ARCHBISHOP PHILOTHEUS (Vladimir Narko, b. 1905 in Zanarotsy, Belorussia, d. 1986 in Hamburg)

1941 — Bishop of Slutsk.

Born in Belorussia to the family of a priest, Father Eudocimus Narko, he served the Church in various ways from his earliest childhood. He was an altar boy for fourteen years with his father. Graduated from seminary in Vilnius in 1924, then graduated from the theological faculty at the University of Warsaw in 1929, then studied theology and Greek at the Halki Seminary [in Turkey] from 1931 to 1933. Received the master of theology degree in 1937. January of 1928 tonsured a monk at the Pochaev Lavra. 1928 ordained to the diaconate and priesthood. In the following year made deputy superior of the Monastery of Saint Onuphrius. In 1933 made superior, dean, and administrator of the Mission in Galicia. 1934 made archimandrite. In 1936 named prefect and teacher at the Warsaw Seminary, and in 1938 made docent on the faculty of Moral Theology at the theological academy. In the same year, made vicar and chancellor of the Warsaw Cathedral and catechetical teacher in Warsaw secondary schools. In 1941 consecrated Bishop of Slutsk by the Belorussian Orthodox Autonomous Church at the Dormition Cathedral, 1942 Bishop of Moghilev & Mstislav. In March of the same year made temporary administrator of the Minsk Diocese. Elected member of the Holy Synod of the Belorussian Church, and chosen as a deputy to the Metropolitan of Belorussia. In 1942 made archbishop. Evacuated with the Belorussian clergy to Germany. 1946 joined the Church Abroad. 1946 named administrator of the Church Abroad's Vicariate of Hessen., then headed the Northwestern vicariate of the Diocese of Germany. 1971 succeeded Archbishop Alexander as Bishop of Berlin & Germany. For his service in the same year awarded a diamond cross on klobuk in 1971. In 1978 celebrated 50 years of his priesthood in a celebration headed by Metropolitan Philaret. In January 1981 the President of the FRG awarded him the Republic Merit Cross 1st Class. In the spring of 1981, he suffered a severe heart attack, in autumn 1982 he retired. At his initiative, the Cathedral of Saint Prokopius and many other smaller churches and chapels were built in the north of Germany.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1986) 9-10, pp. 176-178.

METROPOLITAN PLATON (Porphyrius T. Rozhdestvensky, b. 1866 near Kursk, d. 1934 in New York)

1902 — Bishop of Kiev.

Born in the Kursk Diocese into the family of a clergyman. Attended parochial school and seminary in Kursk. 1887 ordained to the priesthood. After the death of his wife, he studied at the Theological Academy in Kiev 1891-95. 1894 tonsured a monk, 1896 inspector of the Kiev

Theological Academy. 1902 rector there; vicar bishop of Chigirinsk, vicar bishop of Kiev Diocese. 1907 Bishop of North America, successor of Archbishop [later Patriarch] Tikhon (Bellavin). 1914 Archbishop of Kishinev & Khotin. 1917 Metropolitan of Kherson & Odessa. Co-founder of the SEA of southern Russia. After the evacuation, the Synod appointed him head of the Russian communities in Athens. He was supposedly relieved of this post by an oral communiqué from Patriarch Tikhon and appointed ruling bishop of the North American Diocese on 22 Aug./5 Sept. 1922. There, Platon joined in the already existing attempts to create an independent diocese and separate from the Synod, and he eventually broke with the Synod in 1926. Until his death in 1934, he presided over the “Metropolia” as Metropolitan of All America & Canada. Like Metropolitan Eulogius, from 1926 onwards he disputed the right of the Church Abroad to speak for the Church emigration, despite the fact that he had worked closely with the Synod until 1926 and had considered the Church Abroad as the representative of the church emigration. His brainchild, the “Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church in North America” did not, however, attain the recognition of the Orthodox world. This was later a decisive factor after 1934 in his successor’s growing rapprochement with the Church Abroad and the re-establishment of unity in 1936.

S: Nikon, *Zhizn’ eopisaniye*. Vol. 7, pp. 382-85.

ARCHBISHOP SABBAS (Theodore Raevsky, b. 1892, d. 1976 in Sydney)

1954 — Bishop of Melbourne.

After graduating from secondary school in Yugoslavia, he studied law and theology in Belgrade. Religious instructor at various schools, ordained to the priesthood. 1944 withdrew from Yugoslavia to Austria, then immigrated to the United States. For approximately five years, he was rector of the Russian Church in Miami. 1952 he was named protopriest. After the death of his wife, he was tonsured a monk and was elevated to hegumen and archimandrite. 1954 he was consecrated Bishop of Melbourne, vicar bishop of Australia & New Zealand. In the following year, he became ruling bishop of the same, a position which he retained until 1970, from 1957 as archbishop. As ruling bishop of the diocese, above all else it was his task to take care of all the refugees from China and Manchuria, who came to his diocese during the 1950s and on whose behalf he had appealed for help to numerous institutions and international organizations, to make it possible for them to come to Australia. For his services to these refugees, he was granted the diamond cross on his klobuk. At his initiative, the convent of New Shamordino and numerous homes for the elderly were founded. From 1955 he published his own diocesan journal *Tserkovnoe Slovo*. In 1970 he retired due to ill health. He reposed in Sydney. His service consisted above all else in the consolidation of parish life in Australia and New Zealand and the assimilation of the refugees from the Far East.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn’* (1954), 1-2, pp. 7-22; *Prav. Rus’* (1954) 2, p. 15; 3, pp. 3-6; (1976) 9, pp. 14-15.

BISHOP SABBAS (John N. Saratsevich, b. 1902 in Lutovich, d. 1973 in Edmonton)

1958 — Bishop of Edmonton.

Born near Belgrade, he was of Serbian nationality. After graduating from secondary school, he studied law at Belgrade University from 1924-27. He then worked as a lawyer in Belgrade. 1936-40 he studied theology at Belgrade University and was an active member of the movement "The Servants of God." He was arrested by the German Occupation forces, who incarcerated him in a concentration camp from 1942-45. After his liberation, he joined the Saint Job Brotherhood in Munich and emigrated with a few fellow monks to Paraguay, where he was ordained to the diaconate and a year later to the priesthood. In 1952 he was elevated to hegumen, 1955 to archimandrite. In 1958 he succeeded Archbishop Vitalis and became Bishop of Edmonton & Western Canada. He retired in 1971 due to ill health and died two years later.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1958) 7-12, pp. 88-108; *Prav. Rus'* (1958) 19, pp. 2-5, p. 18; (1973) 6, p. 10.

ARCHBISHOP SERAPHIM (Igor Dulgov, b. 1923 in Russia)

1993 — Bishop of Lesna.

Archbishop of Brussels & Western Europe.

Emigrated from Russia in 1928. After finishing school studied engineering, and theology from 1946 to 1950 at the Saint Sergius Institute in Paris, earning the Licentiate degree. From 1954-1961 worked in Paris and Versailles. Ordained deacon and priest in Geneva in 1961 for the parish in Cannes. From 1963 dean of the parish in Cannes and from 1971 archpriest and dean of the parishes in the south of France. Under his direction, ten future priests for the Western European Diocese were trained. From 1985 rector of the parish in Lyon. Tonsured a monk in 1994 and consecrated Bishop of Lesna on 6/19 September 1993 in Geneva by Metropolitan Vitalis, Archbishops Anthony of Geneva and Mark of Berlin, and Bishop Barnabas of Cannes. Was consecrated at the request of Archbishop Anthony, who wished to see him as his successor. In 1994 Bishop Seraphim was nominated Bishop of Brussels & Western Europe with residence in the Lesna Convent, after 1995 archbishop.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1993) 20, pp. 3-5.

ARCHBISHOP SERAPHIM (Leonid Ivanov, b. 1897 in Kursk, d. 1987 in Mahopac)

1947 — Bishop of Troitsa.

Attended elementary and secondary school in Kursk. 1915 studied at the Faculty of Philosophy at Moscow University. 1916 volunteered to serve in the army, from 1917 in the White Army. Emigrated to Yugoslavia, where he studied at the Theological Faculty of the University of Belgrade. 1926 tonsured a monk at St. Panteleimon's Monastery on Mount Athos. Then served as a priest in Skopje. 1934 joined the Lodomirova Saint Job Brotherhood. 1935-44 abbot of the monastery, from 1935 after elevation to hegumen as an archimandrite. Under his leadership, the monastery and the printing press were built up. Relocated to Germany with the brotherhood, and then on to Jordanville with thirteen of the monks. 1946 he was named Bishop of Santiago, but he never took up this post, because he assumed direction of the monastery at Jordanville, where he re-established the newspaper Orthodox Russia, which since that time has come out every two weeks. 1947 he was appointed Bishop of Holy Trinity. Upon his initiative, the New Kursk-Root

Hermitage at Mahopac was founded, which from 1950 served as the headquarters of the Synod of Bishops.

From 1951-57 he was head of the monastery there and became a permanent member of the Synod. In 1957 he was appointed Bishop of Chicago & Detroit, from 1976 as Archbishop of Chicago, Detroit, & the Midwest. In the early 1960s, he founded in his diocese the “Ladomirova” summer youth camp, which yearly cared for groups of young people. On account of his experience with youth, he was assigned to supervise work with youth throughout the Church. From 1976, he was the first deputy of Metropolitan Philaret. He was the author of many articles in church newspapers and his own books, such as *Pilgrimage to the Holy Land* (Palomnichestvo v Svyatuyu Zemlyu); *The Protectress of the Russian Diaspora* (Odigitria Russkago Zarubezhiya), and others.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1948) 1, pp. 8-13; *Prav. Rus'* (1976) 21, pp. 7-8.

METROPOLITAN SERAPHIM (Albert Lade, b. 1883 in Leipzig, d. 1950 in Munich)

1924 — Bishop of Zmiev.

Born into a Protestant family in Leipzig, where he received his secondary education. 1903 he converted to Orthodoxy in the Russian Orthodox Church in Dresden. 1905-07 studied at the St. Petersburg Theological Seminary. 1907 married and was ordained to the diaconate. Served in Novgorod and Volyn'. 1912 ordained to the priesthood and entered the Moscow Theological Academy, from which he received the degree of Candidate. 1916-19 taught at the Kharkov Seminary. In 1920 he was widowed and in 1924 tonsured a monk. In the same year, he was elevated to hegumen and archimandrite and became abbot of the Holy Protection Monastery in Kharkov. In 1924 he was consecrated Bishop of Zmiev from the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church (by Metropolitan Pimen Pegov). 1925 chairman of the committee on education and the committee for the fight against unbelief. In 1930, he allowed himself to be repatriated. His consecration was regularized by the Church Abroad. From 1931-37 vicar Bishop of Germany and administrator of the Austrian parishes. 1938 Bishop of Berlin & Germany, member of the Synod of Bishops. 1939 archbishop. After the German conquest of Poland, he assumed the church administration after Metropolitan Dionysius of the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church had renounced its leadership. Due to protests on the part of the Ecumenical Patriarch, Archbishop Seraphim gave up that leadership and returned to Berlin, where in 1942 he became Metropolitan of Central Europe. He bore the title until his death in 1950, even though the metropolia only consisted of parishes in the Federal Republic of Germany after 1945. In 1945 he relocated to Munich. The mass of refugees from the East lived in DP camps under his jurisdiction and consisted of over 100 communities with their own school system and charitable institutions.

Thanks to his theological and religious education and also to his German ancestry, he made Orthodoxy known widely among the German population and conducted a regular dialogue with other confessions.

After the end of the war, he was accused of collaboration with the Nazis. These false accusations made the last years of his life most difficult and overshadowed his services as a theologian and pastor. Other lies were also spread after his death, namely that he had intended to join the Patriarchate of Moscow, though this assertion has no basis in fact. As a theologian, he published many writings, which spread the understanding of Orthodoxy in the German-speaking world, including *Science and Religion* (*Wissenschaft und Religion*, 1946); *The Immortality of the Soul* (*Die Unsterblichkeit der Seele*, 1947); *Apologetical Essays* (*Apologetische Aufsätze*, 1948); *Orthodox Dogma* (*Das Orthodoxe Dogma*, 1948); *The Eastern Church* (*Die Ostkirche*, 1950). Metropolitan Seraphim spent more than 20 years studying all the Greek sources concerning the life of Jesus Christ as a historical person and concerning the two natures of Christ. This fundamental research was lost during World War II following the bombardment of the house in which he lived.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1937) 12, pp. 187-92; (1947) 2, pp. 11-12; (1950) 9-10, pp. 5-9; *Prav. Rus'* (1947) 14, p. 14; (1950) 18, pp. 3-4; *Vestnik Germanskoy Eparkhii* (1990) 6, pp. 19-25; The documents relating to the decision of the Synod to accept him into the jurisdiction of the Church Abroad were published in *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1985) 11-12, pp. 332-338.

METROPOLITAN SERAPHIM (Alexander Lukianov, b. 1879 in Saratov, d. 1959 in the Soviet Union)

1914 — Bishop of Serdobol'sk.

Born in Saratov, he attended parochial school and 1897-1900 seminary there and then 1900-04 Kazan' Theological Academy. 1902 tonsured a monk, 1903 ordained to the priesthood. After graduating from the Kazan' Academy, assistant professor of the seminary in Ufa, from 1906 prefect in Ufa. 1907 archimandrite and rector of the seminary in Tavrida, 1911 rector of the seminary in Saratov. 1904 Bishop of Serdobolsk, vicar bishop of the Diocese of Finland. 1917 participated in the Pan-Russia Council. 1918 Bishop of Finland, 1920 archbishop. When the Orthodox community in Finland joined the Ecumenical Patriarchate, he protested and refused to recognize Bishop Germanus (Ava), whom Constantinople had appointed. He finally had to leave Finland under pressure from the authorities and was appointed rector of the Orthodox parishes in England, with his center in London. He became a vicar bishop to Metropolitan Eulogius. After the break between Eulogius and the Synod, Archbishop Seraphim remained faithful to the Church Abroad, who in turn entrusted him with the leadership of the Diocese of Western Europe, with his see in Paris. It is thanks to his authority that the Church Abroad was able to build up numerous parishes in subsequent years in France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and Italy. For his services in consolidating parish life in the Diocese of Western Europe, he was elevated to metropolitan in 1938 during the Second Pan-Diaspora Council. In August 1945 he negotiated with Metropolitan Nicholas (Yarushevich) and joined the Patriarchate with a number of his parishes. Upon the death of Metropolitan Eulogius, who had likewise joined the Moscow Patriarchate, he became the Exarch of Western Europe. As such he bore the title of Metropolitan of Brussels & Belgium, Exarch for Western Europe. In 1949 he was retired "for health reasons." In 1954 he moved to the Soviet Union, where in 1959 he died at the Gerbovetsky Monastery (Moldavia).

S: *Sostav*, p. 39; *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1926) 13-14, pp. 10-11; *JMP* (1959) 12, pp. 26-30; *Ostkirchliche Studien* (1968) p. 217; *Russie et Chretienté* (1938-39) p. 238.

ARCHBISHOP SERAPHIM (Nicholas Sobolev, b. 1881 in Ryazan, d. 1950 in Sofia)

1920 — Bishop of Boguchar.

Born in 1881 into the family of a clergyman in Ryazan', attended parochial school in his hometown and from 1901-03 seminary. 1904-08 he studied at the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, which he completed as a candidate. 1907 tonsured a monk and ordained priest. Teacher at the pastoral school in Zhitomir and assistant prefect at the parochial school in Kaluga. Elevated to archimandrite and prefect of the seminary in Kostroma, then until 1919 in Voronezh. Priest and superintendent of the seminaries in Ekaterinoslav and Simferopol. In 1920 he was consecrated Bishop of Boguchar by the SEA in southern Russia. This was the first consecration by what later came to be called the Synod Abroad; it simultaneously demonstrated the independence and canonical competence of the SEA, which at this point in time began to create new dioceses, which were later confirmed by the Patriarch. Emigrated to Bulgaria, where the Church Abroad appointed him the administrator of the Russian Orthodox communities in Bulgaria and also oversight over Archbishop Damian's pastoral school and both Russian monasteries. His residence was in Sofia. He distinguished himself by his theological works, in which he struggled against the sophiological teachings of Archpriest Sergius Bulgakov. In 1934 he was elevated to archbishop. After the invasion of the Red Army, he joined the Moscow Patriarchate, which confirmed him in his position as administrator of the Russian communities in Bulgaria. He was one of the few hierarchs of the Church Abroad, who after joining the Patriarchate, was allowed to remain in his previous area of activity and was not transferred. After his death in 1952, no further Russian administrator was appointed for Bulgaria because the few Russian émigrés left in Bulgaria after 1945 were assimilated into Bulgarian parishes. The Russian church property was transferred to the Church of Bulgaria, except for St. Nicholas Church in Sofia.

S: Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*. Vol. 5, p. 271; *JMP* (1950) 4, pp. 21-28 (with detailed evaluation of his theological works against S. Bulgakov).

ARCHBISHOP SERAPHIM (Constantine Svezhevsky, b. 1899 in Proskurov, d. 31 Aug./13 Sep. 1996)

1957 — Bishop of Caracas & Venezuela.

Born in the Podolsk district, he attended parish and secondary school in Podolsk, before volunteering for military service in 1917 and later joining the White Army in southern Russia. With the defeat of the Whites, he left the Crimea for Lemnos, and from there emigrated to Yugoslavia. 1945 he joined the Saint Job Brotherhood and was tonsured a monk at the Saint Job Monastery in Munich. In 1948 he was ordained to the diaconate and emigrated to the United States, where he joined Holy Trinity Monastery. He studied theology at the seminary there, where after his ordination to the priesthood in 1955, he also received a position as an instructor. 1956 he was elevated to archimandrite and made rector of the cathedral in Detroit. 1957 Bishop

of Caracas & Venezuela. Upon his initiative, the cathedral and a home for the elderly were established, as well as the building and extension of most of the churches in the country. 1968 he was named archbishop and bore the title of Archbishop of São Paulo, Brazil & Venezuela, because he assumed rule over both dioceses. Until 1977 he maintained this dual responsibility. Thereafter, he only ruled the Diocese of Caracas & Venezuela. He retired to California in 1984 and reposed in Spring Valley, NY, on 31 August/13 September 1996.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1957) 6, pp. 3-6.

BISHOP SERGIUS (Arkady Korolev, b. 1881 in Moscow, d. 1952 in Kazan')

1921 — Bishop of Bely.

Born in 1881 in Moscow, he left the city shortly thereafter, because his father died. He grew up in the village of Obolyanov (Dmitrovsky District), where he attended the parish and parochial school. 1898-1901 studied at the Bethany Seminary, near Holy Trinity Lavra, then theological academy from 1901-05 in Moscow. Under the spiritual influence of Bishop Eulogius (Georgievsky) of Kholm, he was tonsured a monk in 1907, ordained to the priesthood and entered the Jablonets Monastery. 1914 elevated to archimandrite and abbot of the monastery, which after the new national borders were drawn lay in Poland. In 1920 he returned to the monastery, which had been evacuated during the War. As an opponent of the Polish Orthodox Church's attempts at autocephaly, he was arrested in 1922 and interned, a few months after his consecration as Bishop of Bely, vicar bishop of Kholm. His appointment to the episcopate was with the consent of Patriarch Tikhon. In 1924 he and Bishop Vladimir (Tikhonitsky) — likewise an opponent of autocephaly — left Poland and traveled to Prague. In the same year with the consent of the Synod in Karlovtsy, Metropolitan Eulogius named him vicar Bishop of Prague and rector of Saint Nicholas Church there. At his initiative, a church was built in the Olshinsky Cemetery. When Eulogius broke with the Synod, Bishop Sergius did likewise and subordinated himself to Eulogius. After the Red Army's invasion of Czechoslovakia, he joined the Patriarchate and was appointed Archbishop of Vienna & Austria, in 1949 of Berlin & Central Europe, Exarch of Central Europe, from 1950 Archbishop of Kazan' & Chistopol, where he died in 1952.

S: *JMP* (1953) 12, pp. 4-6; *Ostkirchliche Studien* (1968) 2/3, p. 218.

ARCHBISHOP SERGIUS (Stephen Petrov, b. 1864 in the Don Territory, d. 1935 in Yugoslavia)

1899 — Bishop of Biisk.

Born in the south of Russia, after graduating from parochial school, he entered the Don Seminary (1883-86) and studied from 1886-91 at Moscow University. After finishing university, he joined the Kirghiz Mission in Tomsk and became a missionary. 1892 tonsured a monk and ordained to the priesthood. Until 1895 served at the Kirghiz Mission, becoming an archimandrite and its director in 1895-1899. In Dec. 1898 (1899 NS), he was consecrated Bishop of Biisk, 1901 of Omsk, 1903 of Kovno, 1907 of Novomirgorod, vicar bishop of Kherson. 1913 Bishop of Sukhumi in the Georgian Exarchate. Emigrated to Yugoslavia via Constantinople, where he became a member of the Synod and administrator of the Russian parishes in Yugoslavia. For his

services as a permanent member of the Synod and for his administration of the Russian émigrés in Yugoslavia, he was granted the title of Chernomorsk & Novorossiisk. He died in Jan. 1935 in the Serbian Monastery Privina Glava.

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1935) 1, pp. 15-16.

ARCHBISHOP SERGIUS (Sergius Tikhomirov, b. 1863 in Gruzi, d. 1945 in Tokyo)

1908 — Bishop of Jamburg.

Born in 1871 to the family of a priest, in the village of Gruzi near Novgorod, he attended parochial school in Novgorod from 1882-86 and seminary from 1886-92. 1892-96 he continued his study of theology at the St. Petersburg Academy, which he completed as a candidate. 1895 tonsured a monk and ordained to the diaconate and priesthood. 1896 prefect of the St. Petersburg Seminary, from 1899 rector of the seminary and from 1905-08 rector of the academy. In 1908 he was consecrated Bishop of Jamburg and appointed head of the Japanese Mission, with the title Bishop of Kyoto & Japan. 1921 after making contact with the Synod of Bishops, he was elevated to archbishop. In subsequent years, he was closely connected to the Synod, whose competence for the Russian emigration he recognized. To his almost completely Japanese communities, amongst whom he enjoyed great missionary success, the problems of the Russian emigration seemed strange because there were only about 100 Russians émigrés in the whole country, but 40,000 Japanese Orthodox. 1931 nominated metropolitan. Forced to retire in 1940 by the Japanese authorities, as they wanted a Japanese bishop at the head of the diocese. Bishop Nicholas (Ono) became his successor.

S: *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1926) 17-18, pp. 17-19; *Sostav*, p. 327; *JMP* (1960) 7, pp. 53, 54, 58; 8, pp. 58, 64-68.

ARCHBISHOP SIMON (Sergius Vinogradov, b. 1876 in Vladimir, d. 1933 in Peking)

1922 — Bishop of Shanghai.

Born in 1876 in Vladimir-on-the-Klyazma into the family of a clergyman, he attended parochial school and from 1895-98 seminary. He then continued his studies at the academy in Kazan' (1898-1902). 1899 tonsured a monk, 1902 hieromonk and member of the Peking Ecclesiastical Mission, where in subsequent years he enjoyed great missionary success and became a co-founder of numerous missionary stations and churches in China. In 1907 he was elevated to archimandrite for his services and appointed head of the Peking podvorye in Harbin.

1917-18 participated in the Pan-Russia Council. 1918-22 served at the Peking Mission. 1922 Bishop of Shanghai, vicar bishop of the Diocese of Peking & China. During the next ten years, he built up the parish life of the newly-created diocese and founded many new parishes, which came into existence everywhere through the influx of thousands of refugees into the diocese. After the death of Metropolitan Innocent (Figurovsky), he was elevated to archbishop and given rule over the Diocese of Peking & China. As head of the Peking Mission and the Chinese Diocese with its 75,000 faithful, he died suddenly at the age of 58 in 1933. "He was one of the greatest and most praiseworthy hierarchs of the Church Abroad."

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1933) 3, pp. 34-37; *Prav. Rus'* (1958) 3, pp. 4-7.

BISHOP STEPHEN (Alexander Dzhubai)

1917 — Bishop of Pittsburgh.

A Carpatho-Russian by birth, he was a Uniate priest and converted to Orthodoxy in 1917. He was thereupon consecrated Bishop of Pittsburgh by Bishop Alexander in the hope that more Uniate communities would return to Orthodoxy if they had their own Carpatho-Russian bishop. In 1922 together with Bishop Gorazd (Pavlik), he consecrated Bishop Adam as a second bishop for the Carpatho-Russian communities. When Bishop Stephen had little success in missionizing among the Uniates, he returned to the Unia, hoping that Rome would name him Uniate bishop in the USA. However, this did not occur. From 1924 he was completely isolated.

Before rejoining the Unia, he had also attended the 1924 Detroit Council, at which he was a spokesman for the independence of the North American parishes. He belonged to the Church Abroad until 1924.

ARCHBISHOP STEPHEN (Simon Sevbo, b. 1872 in Telusha, d. 1965 in Vienna)

1942 — Bishop of Smolensk & Bryansk.

Born in 1872 into the family of the church reader in the village of Telusha near Minsk. After attending parochial school, he attended the Minsk Seminary from 1891-1894. 1896 ordained to the priesthood and served in the Minsk Diocese. After the new boundaries were drawn in 1919, his parish ended up in Poland. He protested against the autocephaly of the Polish Orthodox Church and refused to recognize the new hierarchy, whereupon he was arrested and incarcerated in various camps and prisons until 1940. After his liberation in that year, he joined the Belorussian Autonomous Orthodox Church, was tonsured a monk and, after being elevated to archimandrite, was consecrated Bishop of Smolensk & Briansk. 1943 he entered into relations with the Church Abroad, which he joined subsequently after resettling in Germany. The Synod appointed him Bishop of Vienna & Austria, where there were large camp parishes.

Despite his advanced age, he visited his parishes constantly until his death in 1965. He always stood up for the interests of his faithful, with whom he enjoyed great popularity as a bishop and pastor. Shortly before his repose, he was able to consecrate the cathedral in Salzburg, which had been built on his initiative.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1965) 3, p. 5-7; 5, pp. 6-7.

ARCHBISHOP THEODORE (Alexander Rafailsky, d. 1955 in Brisbane)

1942 — Bishop of Taganrog.

He lived from 1918 in Poland, where he studied at the theological faculty of Warsaw University. 1942 tonsured a monk and ordained priest, archimandrite, Bishop of Taganrog of the Ukrainian Autonomous Church, 1943 Bishop of Rovno, 1944 evacuated to Germany, where he joined the Church Abroad. From 1948 member of the Synod of Bishops. 1946 appointed Bishop of Brisbane & Australia. Built up parish life in Australia, where from the early 1950s large groups

of refugees from China and Manchuria arrived. At the time of his death in 1955 there were over a dozen parishes with churches in Australia and New Zealand (in comparison with two parishes in 1945).

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1955) 9, p. 16; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1955) 7-12, pp. 114-15.

ARCHBISHOP THEODOSIUS (Sergius Putilin, b. 1897 near Voronezh, d. 1980 in Sydney)

1969 — Bishop of Melbourne.

Born to the family of a clergyman, he wanted to become a priest. He first attended parochial school and then the seminary in Voronezh from 1915-1918. In 1921, the diocesan bishop refused to ordain him to the priesthood on account of the difficult plight of the Church and advised the young candidate to wait for a later call. During World War II, Sergius Putilin worked as a “foreign worker” in Germany and after 1945 decided to remain in Germany as a refugee. In the DP camp near Wendlingen, he came into contact with Protopriest Adrian Rymarenko (later Archbishop Andrew of Rockland) and Archimandrite Dimitry (Byakai) and decided under their influence to become a priest. His ordination took place in 1948. First Father Sergius served German parishes for two years, before deciding to emigrate to Australia in 1950, where he was assigned to care for the Russian refugee community in Perth. Thanks to his initiative, the parish succeeded in just a few years in building the Saints Peter & Paul Church, thereby acquiring its own house of worship. In Perth, he served for nineteen years, during which time he was named protopriest. In 1969 he took monastic vows, was elevated to archimandrite, and was consecrated Bishop of Melbourne, vicar bishop of Australia & New Zealand with the name Theodosius. 1970 he became Bishop of Sydney, Australia & New Zealand, from 1971 archbishop of the diocese. During his years in office as archbishop of the largest diocese of the Church Abroad, he was able to consolidate the position of the Church and prevent the threatened split into minority groups.

The schismatic group returned the Sydney Cathedral to the bosom of the Church, thereby re-establishing unity. Since then the communities have only belonged to the Church Abroad. In 1980, after a lengthy illness, Archbishop Theodosius reposed at the age of 83.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1969) 24, pp. 5-7, 11; (1980) 18, p. footnote 15-16.

ARCHBISHOP THEODOSIUS (Paul I. Samoloivich, b. 1884 in Mokran, d. 1968 in São Paulo)

1931 — Bishop of Detroit.

Born to the family of a priest in the Grodno Province, a parochial school in Zhirobitsy, 1902-05 seminary in Vilnius, then two years as a reader. 1907 married and ordained priest, 1908 widowed. 1910-14 St. Petersburg Theological Academy, 1912 tonsured a monk. 1915 prefect of the Tomsk parochial school and 1915-1917 prefect of the Oboyansk Seminary (Kursk). 1918-20 abbot of the Kherson Monastery of Saint Vladimir. Archimandrite in 1920. Evacuated to Yugoslavia and 1921-30 priest for the Serbian Orthodox Church in various communities in the Timoch, Shabats, Bitol, and Pankrats Dioceses. From 1930, again in the service of the Church Abroad and consecrated Bishop of Detroit, vicar bishop of the North American Diocese (consecration on 28 December 30/10 January 1931). 1934 Bishop of São Paulo and Brazil,

administrator of the South American Diocese excluding Argentina, 1948 diamond cross on the klobuk. From 1959, Third Deputy of Metropolitan Anastasius. Died 1968 in São Paulo. His service consisted of the regularization of parish life in South America and the preparation for the reception of many thousands of refugees after 1945 and their assimilation into the ecclesiastical and economic life of their host countries.

S: *Yubileini sbornik ko dnyu 25 sluzhenia v arkhieireiskom sane Vysokopreosvyashchenneishago Feodosia, arch. San Paulskago i vseja Brazilii* (1930-55). Sao Paulo 1956; *Prav. Rus'* (1968) 5, pp. 9-10, 13; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1968/69) 1-12, pp. 29-30.

ARCHBISHOP THEOPHANES (Basil Bystrov, b. 1873 in St. Petersburg District, d. 1940 in France)

1909 — Bishop of Jamburg.

Parochial school and then seminary in St. Petersburg 1889-92. St. Petersburg Theological Academy 1892-96, from which he was graduated as a Master of Theology. From 1897 assistant professor at the Academy. 1898 tonsured a monk and ordained to the priesthood, 1901 archimandrite and prefect of the St. Petersburg Academy, becoming rector in 1909. In the same year consecrated Bishop of Jamburg, vicar bishop of St. Petersburg. At this time, he was the father confessor of the Imperial Family. 1910 Bishop of Taurida & Simferopol, 1912 Bishop of Astrakhan, 1913 Bishop of Poltava & Pereyaslavl, from 1919 archbishop of the diocese. Participated in the Pan-Russia Council of 1917-18. 1920 evacuated to Yugoslavia, a member of the SEA and from 1922 the Synod.

In 1925 he went to Sofia, where he lived at the hierarchal residence as a complete recluse. He left his cell only to attend Divine Services. In 1931 he moved to Clamart near Paris, where he died in 1940 as an even greater recluse. Archbishop Theophanes spent the last thirteen years of his life in prayer and meditation, retiring completely from ecclesiastical office and public life.

S: Abercius (Archbishop). *Vysokopreosvyashchennyi Feofan, arkhiepiskop Poltavsky Pereyaslavsky*. Jordanville 1974; *Sostav*, p. 279; *Prav. Rus'* (1940) 4, p.6; (1953) 3, pp. 9-11.

ARCHBISHOP THEOPHANES (Theodore G. Gavrilov, b. 1872 in the Kursk District, d. 1943 in Belgrade)

1913 — Bishop of Rylsk.

After graduating from secondary school, he entered the seminary in Orlov, which he attended from 1890-93. Then he taught religion. 1897 ordained to the priesthood. 1902-1906 studied at the Kiev Theological Academy, 1905 tonsured a monk. 1908 prefect of the seminary in Volyn', 1910 rector of the seminary in Vitebsk and elevated to archimandrite. 1913 Bishop of Rylsk, vicar bishop of Kursk and from 1917 Bishop of Kursk, where he remained until 1919. When evacuating from the city, he took with him the wonderworking Kursk Root Icon of the Mother of God, from the monastery of the same name, in order to rescue it from the advancing Reds. Thus, this icon successfully arrived in Yugoslavia, from whence it traveled via Munich to the United States. In the Yugoslav emigration, he headed the Synodal chancery for many years. After the

outbreak of the War, he lived at the Lesna Convent in Hopovo. He turned down an offer by the Croatian Ustasha to become Metropolitan of Croatia. He died in Belgrade in 1943. His particular service to the Church lay in saving the wonderworking Icon from the Bolsheviks. This icon, which also was the object of great veneration, has since then been the Protectress of the Church Abroad.

S: *Sostav*, p. 125; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1943) 7, pp. 105-108; *Prav. Rus'* (1943), 5-6, p. 15.

METROPOLITAN THEOPHILUS (Theodore Pashkovsky, b. 1874 near Kiev, d. 1950 in New York)

1922 — Bishop of Chicago.

Born to the family of a clergyman, he attended parochial school and then seminary in Kiev. 1895 he went to the United States, where he became a reader. 1897 ordained to the priesthood, served in various parishes in North America. 1922 with the consent of the Synod of Bishops he was consecrated Bishop of Chicago. After the death of Metropolitan Platon, he was the successor of the deceased First Hierarch of the Metropolia. He smoothed the way for the reunification talks with the Church Abroad. After the re-establishment of ecclesiastical unity, he bore the title "Metropolitan of All America & Canada" and was head of the Russian parishes in North America. His service was in preserving the unity of all Russian Orthodox communities in America. "It was deplorable, that he agreed to a renewed schism in Cleveland — and one might reckon — with pain in his heart." He belonged to the Church Abroad from 1922-26 and 1936-46 as head of the "Metropolia of North America."

S: *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1937) 12, p. 187; *JMP* (1950) 7, pp. 68-78.

ARCHBISHOP TIKHON (Timothy Lyashchenko, b. 1875 in Voronezh, d. 1945 in Karlsbad)

1924 — Bishop of Potsdam.

Born in the Voronezh District, he attended seminary in Voronezh from 1892-95. 1895 married and ordained to the priesthood. In the subsequent ten years until 1905, he served in the Voronezh Diocese. After the death of his wife, he entered the Kiev Theological Academy in 1905, which he completed in 1909 with the degree of a candidate. The theme of his dissertation was The Life of St. Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria. 1910 assistant professor there in pastoral theology, from 1912 in homiletics. 1914 tonsured a monk and elevated to archimandrite, from that time prefect of the Kiev Academy. Emigrated to Bulgaria, where for a short time he was rector of the embassy church, then from 1921 rector of the embassy church in Berlin. 1924 consecrated Bishop of Potsdam by Metropolitan Eulogius. As a result of the embassy church's closure after the Soviet Union and Germany restored diplomatic relations, he became the priest at the Russian secondary school on Nachod Strasse. After Eulogius's break with the Synod, Bishop Tikhon remained faithful to the Church Abroad and was named Bishop of Germany. His greatest desire at this time was to build a new cathedral in Berlin, which was finally able to be consecrated at Whitsuntide in 1938 (the Cathedral of the Resurrection in Hohenzollerndamm). 1938 he was recalled from Germany and retired in the Rakovica Monastery near Belgrade. The Synod appointed him chairman of the academics committee and he headed this section during the

Second All-Diaspora Council in 1938. 1944 he fled Belgrade while already ill. He died in Karlsbad in February 1945. As a ruling bishop, his main task was to reorder community life in Germany for the Church Abroad after Eulogius's schism. He fulfilled this task with great prudence. In the course of one decade, he managed to establish new parishes all over Germany and to give them a legal basis, which has remained valid even into the present day.

S: *Tserk. Vedomosti* (1924) 9-10, p. 13; *Prav. Put'* (1965) pp. 82-92.

ARCHBISHOP TIKHON (A. Troitsky, b. 1883 in Voskresenskoe, d. 1963 in San Francisco)

1930 — Bishop of San Francisco.

Born in the Kostroma District to the family of a clergyman, he attended parochial school. During adolescence, he helped his father in parish administration and in church. From 1901-04 he attended seminary in Kostroma, then from 1904-08 Kazan' Academy. He was tonsured a monk in 1905 and in the same year was ordained to the diaconate, in 1908 to the priesthood. 1912 prefect of the seminary in Zhitomir, 1914 rector of the seminary in Kharkov, 1917-18 participated at the Pan-Russia Council.

He emigrated to Yugoslavia, where he obtained a professorship at the Bitol seminary. At this time, he was in close contact with the Milkovo Monastery and Father Ambrose (Kurganov). In 1930 he was consecrated Bishop of San Francisco, vicar bishop of North America & Canada, 1934 archbishop and temporary ruler of the Archdiocese of North America.

From Oct. 1934 Archbishop of Western Canada, Alaska & the Aleutians. After the reunification with the American Metropolia, he bore the title Archbishop of Western America & Seattle until 1951, after which he was Archbishop of Western America & San Francisco. In 1945 he was awarded the diamond cross on his klobuk. He died in 1963. His greatest contribution was in the consolidation of the position of the Church Abroad in North America after the divisions in 1926 and 1946. The great respect which he enjoyed from his faithful led to his maintaining the rule of the important San Francisco Diocese as archbishop after the reunification of both churches (1934-46). After 1945 he also succeeded in founding and energetically supporting the construction of the Convent of the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God in San Francisco and making it the spiritual and ecclesiastical center of his diocese. After the old cathedral had become too small, the beginning of the construction of the new cathedral in San Francisco was also at his initiative.

S: Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*. Vol. 7, pp. 276-78; *Prav. Rus'* (1963) 7, pp. 6-9.

BISHOP VALENTINE (Valentine Rusankov, b. 1939 in Krasnodar (Kuban))

1991 — Bishop of Suzdal' & Vladimir.

Ordained reader and subdeacon in 1956 by Metropolitan Nestor (who before 1945 was a member of the Church Abroad) in Novosibirsk. He assisted in parishes in Krasnoyarsk, where he was later ordained priest by Archbishop Anthony of Krasnodar & Kuban. He then served various parishes in the Caucasus region, then was made dean of the parishes in the Vladykavkas region.

In 1972 Archbishop Alexis (the future Patriarch) proposed he go to Suzdal' as there was no priest to serve the parish there.

From 1972 to 1976 he served in a small church in Suzdal', but insisted that the civil authorities open one of the many ancient churches in the city for worship. Finally, in 1976 the Churches of Saint Constantine and the Church of the Mother of God, Joy of All Who Sorrow, were returned to the faithful after having been closed for 40 years. From 1976 the Divine Liturgy could be served in the restored Church of Saint Constantine.

During these years, he was a member of the diocesan council, and for some time secretary of the council. When his diocesan bishop asked him to cooperate with the KGB, he refused and was dismissed from the diocesan council. He came into contact with the Church Abroad in 1989 and was accepted into the Church Abroad together with Suzdal' clergy and about 5,000 faithful. Consecrated Bishop of Suzdal' in February 1991 in Brussels by Archbishops Anthony of Geneva and Mark of Berlin, and Bishops Barnabas of Cannes and Gregory (Grabbe). Difficulties began to arise in 1993-93 concerning the status of the Free Russian Church. When he consecrated bishops with Bishop Lazarus in 1994 without the blessing of the Synod, he was retired in October of 1994, and has since been deposed.

S: *Prav. Rus'* (1991) 17, pp. 9-11.

ARCHBISHOP VICTOR (Leonid Svyatin, b. 1893 near Verkhne-Uralsk, d. 1961)

1932 — Bishop of Shanghai.

Born in 1893 in the region of Verkhne-Uralsk, Orenburg District, to the family of a teacher, who was later ordained to the priesthood. He attended parochial school, then from 1912-15 seminary in Orenburg. In 1915 he enrolled in the Kazan' Academy. He had to interrupt his education because he was drafted. Emigrated to China and became a novice in Peking's Dormition Monastery of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission. 1921 tonsured a monk, ordained hierodeacon and hieromonk. Until 1930 he worked at the Mission. 1929 elevated to archimandrite, from 1930 rector of the Holy Protection Church in Tientsin. 1932 traveled to Yugoslavia for the Session of the Synod, where he was consecrated Bishop of Shanghai, vicar bishop of China. 1937 archbishop. 1936-38 extensive travels to the Malabar Christians of India and to Ceylon, where he handled the matter of their union with the Church Abroad. In 1945 he joined the Patriarchate, which, in turn, in 1950 appointed him exarch for East Asia and head of the Mission in China. After the uprising there in 1956, he returned to the Soviet Union, where he became Archbishop of Krasnodar & Kuban, from 1961 with the rank of metropolitan.

S: Nikon, *Zhizneopisanie*. Vol. 5, pp. 282-283; *Tserk. Zhizn'* (1933) 1, pp. 12-13; *Ostkirchliche Studien* (1968) p. 225.

ARCHBISHOP VITALIS (Basil Maximenko, b. 1873 in Lipki, d. 1960 in New York)

1934 — Bishop of Detroit.

Born in Lipki (Volynia) as the son of a deacon. Attended parochial school and from 1893-96 seminary in Ekaterinoslav. Then studied at the Theological Academy in Kazan', 1899 tonsured a

monk, hierodeacon, 1900 ordained to the priesthood and teacher at the seminary in Alexandrov (in the Caucasus). 1901 elevated to archimandrite. In 1902 he was given charge of the printing press at the Saint Job of Pochaev Monastery, which by then had become insignificant. It was his task to restore to the press the importance and prestige it once had enjoyed when it had been one of the largest in western Russia. By 1914 he had built it up and 150 workers were occupied there. During the War, it was coopted and could only continue printing a small volume of its work. The Soviets arrested Vitalis on account of his “monarchist machinations” and interned him in the Bugach Monastery. After a brief period of liberation, he was arrested again, this time by the new Polish rulers, who sentenced him to death in 1919. Due to international intervention, he was set free and expelled from the country. Exile in Yugoslavia, where he established a small printing press for the needs of the Synod. In 1923 he was sent to Ladomirova (in Eastern Slovakia), where, by the founding of a monastery with a printing press, the monks operated a mission amongst the Uniates. In the next ten years, the Monastery of Saint Job with its printing press became the most important printing press for the Church Abroad and taught the skill of printing to numerous monks, who after their expulsion in 1945 established new or rebuilt older printing presses in the West. He was abbot of the Monastery until 1934, having in the meantime been elevated to archimandrite. 1934 he was consecrated Bishop of Detroit and in the same year named archbishop of the Diocese of North America. The negotiations with the Metropolia over the reunification with the Church Abroad led in 1936 to the re-establishment of unity between the two separated Churches, which lasted until 1946. During these years, Archbishop Vitalis bore the title “Archbishop of Eastern America & Jersey City,” while Metropolitan Theophilus (Pashkovsky) received the title “Metropolitan of All America and Canada.” After the schism in 1946, Archbishop Vitalis was once again head of the Russian parishes for the Church Abroad and bore the title of “Archbishop of Eastern America & New York.” 1945 he received the diamond cross on the klobuk, from 1950 a permanent member of the Synod. He died in 1960 in New York. Archbishop Vitalis’s service to the Church consisted above all else in the preserving the unity of many communities in North America, which recognized the Church Abroad and did not break away from it in 1946. The administrative reorganization and consolidation of parish life after 1946 was made possible by the synod of Bishops moving to the United States. As abbot of the Jordanville Monastery, which had already before the War been an important spiritual center, he created the prerequisites for the reestablishment of the press and publishing house after the War. With the founding of Holy Trinity Seminary in 1947, the education of priests was placed on an academic basis. The monastery itself developed in these years into the spiritual and theological center of the Church Abroad, where many monks and novices from Eastern Europe and the Far East found a new home.

S: Vitalis (Archiepiskop). *Motivy moei Zhizni*. Jordanville 1955; *Prav. Rus’* (1949) 3, pp. 1-3; (1958) 3, pp. 4-7; (1959) 8, pp. 5-6; *Tserk. Zhizn’* (1949) 1-2, pp. 45-47.

ARCHBISHOP VLADIMIR (Vyacheslav Tikhonitsky, b. 1873 in Bystrits, d. 1959 in Paris)

1907 — Bishop of Byelostok.

Born 1873 in Bystrits, Orlov District, he attended parochial school and from 1890-93 seminary in Vyatka, including the Kazan’ Theological Academy, from 1894-98. In 1897 he was tonsured a

monk and ordained to the diaconate, in 1898 to the priesthood. Then he served as a missionary at the Siberian Kirghiz Mission, of which he was in charge of 1901 as an archimandrite. Abbot in the Annunciation Monastery in Suprasl'. 1907 Bishop of Byelostok, vicar bishop of Grodno. 1914 evacuated to Moscow, 1917-18 participant in the Pan-Russia Council. 1918 returned to Grodno, where he opposed the strivings for autocephaly by the Polish Orthodox Church. The Polish authorities arrested him finally in 1923, where he was interned in the Dermansky Monastery. For his faithfulness to the Mother Church, Patriarch Tikhon elevated him to archbishop in 1923. His refusal to recognize Polish autocephaly finally led to his arrest and expulsion by the Polish authorities. He emigrated to Prague. Metropolitan Eulogius named him Bishop of Nice, vicar bishop of France. He only belonged to the Synod until 1926, because after the schism of that year, he joined Metropolitan Eulogius, whom he succeeded in 1946. From 1949 in the rank of metropolitan.

S: *Mitropolit Vladimir. Svyatitel'-molitvennik 1873-1959*. Paris 1965.

Footnotes

1. Translator's note: Due to the high interest that these biographies may be expected to receive, some of the information has been updated, including the introduction, the list of First Hierarchs (by adding the most recent ones: Metropolitan Vitalis, Laurus, and Hilarion), and the hierarchs who have been glorified. Short biographies of the following hierarchs who were ROCOR bishops at the time when the book was preparing to be published in Munich have been added to the original:

Bishop Agathangelus (Pakhovsky),

Bishop Ambrose (Cantacuzène),

Bishop Benjamin (Rucalenko),

Bishop Cyril (Dimitriev),

Bishop Daniel (Alexandrov),

Bishop Eutyches (Kurochkin),

Archbishop Gabriel (Chemodakov),

Bishop Innocent (Petrov),

Bishop John (Legky),

Archbishop Lazarus (Zurbenko),

Bishop Mitrophan (Znosko-Borovsky),

Bishop Valentine (Rusankov). ↵

Published Sources

1. Periodicals

The years of publication of the journals are indicated in parentheses, although not all journals were available to the author and used. The documents' titles of the Russian Orthodox Church are given without any additional commentaries. Only major titles and not subtitles are indicated.

Cerkovnaja Letopis'. Lausanne (1945-1946).

Cerkovnaja Žizn'. Belgrad (1931-1943), Munci (1946-1950), Mahopac, New York (1951-1976).

Cerkovnyja Vedomosti. Karlovac (1922-1930).

Cerkovnyja Vedomosti. Mjunchen (1952-1971).

Chleb Nebesnyj. Charbin (Harbin) (1928-1944).

Der christliche Osten. Würzburg (1952-1981).

Detstvo i Junost' vo Christe. Vladimirovo (1935-1939).

Eastern Churches Review. London (1966-1978).

Herder-Korrespondenz. Freiburg (1949-1960).

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift. Bern (1939-1981).

Irénikon. Prieuré d'Amay-sur-Meuse (1926-1980).

Kyrios. Berlin (1960-1972).

Listok Pravoslavnykh Prichodov v Švejcarii. Genf (1946-1949).

Messenger. Bulletin d'information du diocèse de L'Europe occidentale de l'Eglise Russe hors frontières. Genève (1960-1980).

Newsletter. Department of Public & Foreign Affairs of the Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia. New York (1976-1981).

The Orthodox Chronicle. London (1960er Jahre).

Orthodox Life. Jordanville (1956-1981).

The Orthodox Word. San Francisco, Platina (1965-1980).

Orthodoxe Rundschau. Hochberg (1969-1981).

Ostkirchliche Studien. Würzburg (1952-1981).

Pravoslavnaja Karpatskaja Rus'. Vladimirovo (1933-1935).

Pravoslavnaja Prikarpatkaja Rus'. Vladimirovo (1926-1935).

Pravoslavnaja Rus'. Vladimirovo (1928-1944), Jordanville (1947-1981).

Pravoslavnaža Žizn'. Jordanville (1950-1980).

Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie. London, Sao Paulo, Montreal (1948-1981).

Pravoslavnyj Cerkovnyj Kalendar'. Vladimirovo (1924-1944).

Pravoslavnyj Put'. Jordanville (1950-1980).

Pravoslavnyj Russkij Kalendar'. Vladimirovo (1926-1944).

Pravoslavnyj Vestnik v Kanade. Montreal (1964-1978).

Russie et Chrétienté. Boulogne-sur-Seine (1934-1949).

Russkoe Vozrozdienie. Paris, Moskau, New York (1978-1981).

St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly. Crestwood (1952-1980).

Troickij Pravoslavnyj Russkij Kalendar'. Jordanville (1945-1980).

Vestnik Svejcarskago Vikariatstva. Genf (1960-1964).

Vestnik Zapadno-Evropejskoj Eparchii Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi. Genf (1965-1972, 1974-1980).

Vladimirskij Listok. Sao Paulo (1950-1955).

Vladimirskij Pravoslavnyj Russkij Kalendar'. New York, Jordanville (1945-1980).

Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches. Nashville (verschiedene Jahrgänge; 1960 ff.).

Zumal Moskovskoj Patriarchii. Moskau (1944-1981).

2. Books

AFANASIJ (MARTOŠ, EB) Belarus' v istoriceskoj gosudarstvennoj i cerkovnoj zizni. Buenos Aires 1966.

– Materialy da istoriji pravoslavnoe beloruskoe carkvy. o.O. 1968.

ALEKSANDROV, B. Poezdka Preosvj. Fotija, Archiepiskopa Orlovskogo i Brjanskogo v Avstriju i Cechoslovakiju, in: ŽMP (1945) 11, S. 14-19.

ALEXANDROW, W. Mythos und Wirklichkeit. Zur Frage der Jurisdiktionen, in: OS (1979) S. 317 bis 332.

ALEXEEV, W. (ALEKSEEV, V.) Russian Orthodox Bishops in Soviet Union, 1941-1953. Materials for the history of the Russian Orthodox Church in the USSR. New York 1961 = Mimeographed Series No. 61.

– The foreign policy of the Moscow Patriarchate, 1939-1953. Materials for the history of the Russian Orthodox Church in the USSR. New York 1955.

– L'Eglise orthodoxe russe sous l'occupation allemande, in: Ir (1956) S. 243-276.

– Russkaja Pravoslavnaža Cerkov' na okkupirovannoj nemcami territorii, in: CZ (1956) 7-10, S. 82-92.

– The Orthodox Church under German occupation, in: ECR (1974) S. 131-161.

- Le drame de l'exarque Serge Voskresenskij et l'élection du patriarche de Moscou, in: *Ir* (1957) S. 189-201.
- Amerikanisch-sowjetischer Kirchenstreit, in: *HK* (1956) S. 323-324.
- AMMANN, A. Ostslawische Kirchengeschichte. Wien 1950.
- AMVROSIJ (MEREŽKO, Eb) Pamjati Archiepiskopa Vitalija, 1873-1973, in: *PR* (1973) 15, S. 11-12.
- ANASTASIJ (GRIBANOVSKIJ, M) Besedy s sobstvennym serdam (razmyslenija i zametki). Beograd 1935.
- Sbornik izbrannyh tvorenij vysokop. Mitropolita Anastasija. 50-letija svjascennosluzenija nasego pervosvjatitelja 1898-1948. Jordanville 1948.
- Archipastyrskaja poslanija, slova i reci vysokop. Mitropolita Anastasija, pervoierarcha Russkoj Zarubeznoj Cerkvi. Jubilejnyj sbomik ko dnja 50-letija archierejskago sluzenija, 1906-1956. Jordanville 1956.
- ANDERSON, P. Ecumenical aspects of Eastern Orthodox migration. With special reference to Australia, in: *Migration Today* [Geneva] (1967) 8, S. 4-6, 10-11, 13.
- ANDREEV, I. Zametki o katakombnoj cerkvi v SSSR. Jordanville 1947.
- Kratkij obzor istorii Russkoj Cerkvi ot revolucii do nasich dnei. Jordanville 1952.
- O položenii pravoslavnoj cerkvi v Sovetskom Sojuze. Katakombnaja cerkov' v SSSR. Jordanville 1961.
- Mitropolit Anastasij, oblicitel' cerkovnoj politiki bezboznago kommunizma, in: *Vladimirskij Prav. Russkij Kalendar'* (1967) S. 17-25.
- Ikona vsech svjatyh v zemle Rossijskoj prosijavsich, in: *Vladimirskij Kalendar'* (1970) S. 51-70; (1971) S. 79-110.
- O pravoslavno-christianskom npravstennom vospitanii detej doskol'nago vozrasta, in: *Vladimirskij Kalendar'* (1974) S. 75-90.
- ANDREJ (RYMARENKO, Eb) Edinoe na potrebu. Forestville o. J.
- ANDRONIK [ELPIDINSKIJ] Vosemnadcat' let v Indii. Buenos Aires 1959.
- ANDRONIKOV, O pravoslavii na zapade, in: *Vestnik russk.* [Paris] (1967) 86, S. 27-37.
- ANGELINA Orthodoxie in Argentinien, in: *Orthodoxie heute* (1972) 38, S. 15-24.
- ANTOINE (BLOOM, M) Les problèmes de la diaspora orthodoxe, in: *Contacts* (1968) 62-63, S. 224-227.
- ANTONIJ (BARTOŠEVIČ, Eb) Doklad na 12im s-ezde zapadno-evropejskoj èparchii Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi zagranicej, in: *Russkoe Vozrozdienie* (1979) 5, S. 149-174.
- ANTONIJ (CHRAPOVICKIJ, M) Slova, besedy i reči. O zizni po vnutrennemu celoveki. Jordanville 1968.
- ANTONIJ (SIN'KEVIČ, Arch.) Nemnogoletnyj starec. – Zizneopisanie Schi-Archimandrita Amvrosija Mil'kovskogo, in: *PP* (1952) S. 1-57. – Jordanville 1953.
- K proslavlenuju novykh mucenikov rossijskich. Jordanville 1975.
- ANTONIJ (MARCENKO, B) Moj upečatlenie pri vozvrascenii na rodinu, in: *ŽMP* (1946) 9, S. 54-57.
- Archiepiskop Ioasaf (I.V. Skorodumov) v vospominanijach ego sovremennikov. Buenos Aires [o.J.].
- A.S. 50-letie Svjato-Nikolaevskogo Sobora v g. Vene, in: *ŽMP* (1949) 7, S. 61-64.

L'Assemblée extraordinaire de l'Archevêché Orthodoxe de France et d'Europe Occidentale et des Paroisses Russes de la Diaspora en Europe Occidentale (16-18. Février 1966), in: *Messenger Orthodoxe* (1966) 33-34, S. 22-46.

A.T.S. Politische Pilgerfahrten. Die Rolle der orthodoxen Kirche in der Außenpolitik der S.U., in: *Freie Rundschau* (1961) 4, S. 36-41.

Aus der russischen Emigrantenkirche in Deutschland, in: *Der christliche Osten* (1953) S. 84-85.

AVERKIJ (TAUŠEV, EB) Was wir noch nicht verloren haben und was wir wie unseren Augapfel behüten müssen, in: *OS* (1962) S. 318-326.

– Svjataja Gora Afon i eja sovremennoe sostojanie, in: *PP* (1962) S. 39-48.

– Položenie Russkoj Zarubeznoj Cerkvi v sovremennom mire, in: *PP* (1969) S. 31-50.

– Blažennejšij Mitropolit Anastasij. K stoletiju so dnja roždenija, 1873-1973, in: *PR* (1973) 15, S. 2-8.

– K stoletiju so dnja roždenija Archiepiskopa Vitalija 1873-1973, in: *PR* (1973) 15, S. 9-10.

– Vysokop. Feofan, archiepiskop Poltavskij i Perejaslavskij. Jordanville 1974.

– Sovremennost' v svete slova Božija. Slova i reči. Tom 1-3. Jordanville 1975.

– Istinnoe pravoslavie i sovremennij mir. Sbornik statej i reči ko dnja sorokoljëtija svjascennosluzenija. Jordanville 1971.

Avtokefalija Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Greko-Kafoliceskoj Cerkvi (Mitropolii) Ameriki. Sbornik oficial'nych dokumentov i tekstov „Tomosa“, kak i stat'i polemiceskago charaktera, odnosjascichsja k Avtokefalii Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v Amerike. Nju Jork 1970.

Bej-Guan' siehe M.K.

BELOV, A.; SILKIN, M. Duchovnye mertvecy iz Žordanvillja, in: *Nauka i religija* (1969) 11, S. 42-45.

BENIGSEN, G. Die Kirche in Amerika, in: *Orthodoxie heute* (1971) 34/35, S. 19-26.

BENSIN, B. Russian Orthodox Church in America, 1794-1967. Sitka (Alaska) 1967.

BESPUDA, A. Guide to Orthodox America. New York 1965.

BETH, K. Die orientalische Christenheit der Mittelmeerländer. Berlin 1902.

BEYSSAC, M. La vie culturelle de l'émigration Russe en France, 1920-1930. [o.O., o.J.].

BIEDERMANN H. Die ostkirchlichen Gemeinschaften in USA und Kanada, in: *OS* (1954) S. 164- 178.

– Zur Frage der Synode in der orthodoxen Theologie, in: *OS* (1967) S. 113-131.

– Orthodoxie und Katholizismus nach dem Konzil aus der Sicht eines griechischen Theologen, in: *OS* (1967) S. 289-303; (1968) S. 3-21.

– Der orthodox-katholische Dialog. Sein gegenwärtiger Stand, in: *OS* (1981) S. 3-21.

Blažennyj Ioann Maksimovič, Archiepiskop Šanchajskij, Zapadno-Evropskij i Zapadno-Amerikanskij. Kalifornija 1971.

BOBROV, N. Svjato-Troickij monastyr'. Jordanville 1969.

– 50-letnyj jubilej Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi Zarubeznoj, in: *PR* (1970) 23, S. 3-6.

BOGEVE, J. Les nouvelles autonomies orthodoxes, in: *Echos d'Orient* (1923) 132, S. 478-494.

BOGOJAVLENSKIJ, I. Prekraščenje êstonskij schizm, in: *ŽMP* (1945) 4, S. 3-6.

BOGOLEPOV, A. Toward an American Orthodox Church. New York 1963.

Bogoslovskij Institut siehe: Russkij Pravoslavnyj bogoslovskij institut.

BOLSHAKOFF, S. Mgr. Damien, archevêque de Carycin, 1855-1936, in: *Ir* (1936) S. 447-453.

- Le métropolitaine Antoine de Kiev, président du Synode des Evêques à l'étranger, in: *Ir* (1936) S. 558-577.
- The foreign missions of the Russian Orthodox Church. London 1943.
- Orthodox Missions today, in: *International Review of Missions* [London] (1953) S. 275-284.
- Les Missions étrangères dans l'Eglise orthodoxe Russe, in: *Ir* (1955) S. 159-175.
- BOWDEN-SMITH, A. Russian refugees in the Far East, in: *East and West Revue* (1938) 2, S. 102 bis 114.
- Bratskij Ežegodnik. Pravoslavnyja i Russkaja učreždenija za granicej. Izd. Berlinskago Sv. Kn. Vlad. Bratstva. Peterburg 1906.
- BRJANČANINOV, J. Poseščenie Valaamskoga monastyr'ja, in: *PZ* (1963) 2, S. 26-36; 3, S. 27-36; 4, S. 32-36.
- BRIEM, E. Kommunismus und Religion in der Sowjetunion. Ein Ideenkampf. Basel [o.J.].
- BRUMBERG, A. Russischer Nationalismus und die „Dritte Emigration“. Versuch einer Zwischenbilanz, in: *Osteuropa* (1979) S. 468-475.
- BRUNELLO, A. La Chiesa ortodossa di Cina, in: *Oriente Christiana* [Palermo] (1966) 4, S. 82-84.
- BRYAN, I. The Christian Far East. What the Holy Orthodox Church has done for it, in: *TCE* (1921) S. 31-33.
- BUEVSKIJ, A. Russkaja Pravoslavnaja Cerkov' zagranicej, in: *ŽMP* (1950) 10, S. 28-34
- BURAKOV, B. Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche in Deutschland, in: *StdO* (1966) 1, S. 50-55.
- ČAKIROV, N. [ed.] Svjataja Zemlja – Svjataja Gora Afon – 50-letie Russkoj Zarubežnoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi. Jerusalem – Holy Land – Holy Mount Athos. Fiftieth Anniversary of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia. Mahopac, New York 1970.
- [CARUSU, I.] Mission Orthodoxes en Corée, in: *Ir* (1934) S. 93-104.
- Cerkov' tvoju utverdi. Iz vospominanii o cerkovnoj žizni Charbina. Sao Paulo 1967.
- Charbinskaja Kommerčeskaja Učilišče Kit. Vost. zel. dor. San Francisco 1969-
- CHARLAMPOV, P. K istorii pravoslavnogo monašestva v Zakarpat'e, in: *ŽMP* (1957) 5, S. 61-65.
- CHERNAVIN, J. A famous Russian monastery, in: *TCE* (1927) S. 69-77.
- The old and the new Russian Church. The Valaam Monastery. Only Russian monastery which was not robbed by Bolsheviks. New York 1928.
- Chiesa ufficiale e Chiesa catacombale in Russia, in: *Il Regno. Documentazione* (1972) S. 461-475.
- Chram Prepodobnago Serafima Sarovskago Cudotvorca v Novo-Diveevskom zenskom monastyre. Spring Valley, N.Y. 1960.
- CHRYSOSTOMUS, J. Die religiösen Kräfte in der russischen Kirche. München 1961.
- Kirchengeschichte Rußlands der neuesten Zeit. Band 1-3. München. Salzburg 1965-1968.
- Wie frei ist die Hierarchie des Patriarchats Moskaus? In: *Echo der Zeit* (20. 8. 1967) Nr. 34.
- Die russische Orthodoxie angesichts der zeitgenössischen sozialen Strömungen am Vorabend der Revolution von 1917, in: *OS* (1967) S. 297-314.
- Eine lehrreiche Episode aus der neueren Kirchengeschichte Rußlands. Gedanken über einen Artikel von A. Krasnov-Levitin über den „Untergang der Emeuererbewegung“, in: *OS* (1973) S. 302 bis 315.

- Die Orthodoxie in der UdSSR. Zur Frage der orthodoxen „Katakombenkirche“ in Rußland, in: KNA Ökumenische Information 8-9 v. 20. 2. 1974, S. 9-11-
- Solzenicyn und die russische Auslandskirche. Ein orthodoxer Laie schreibt an die Synode, in: OS (1974) S. 301-310.
- Die dritte Gesamtsynode der russischen Auslandskirche, in: OS (1975) S. 38-50.
- Gedanken zum 50. Todestag des Patriarchen Tichon von Moskau und Ganz Rußland 25. März/7. April 1925, in: OS (1975) S. 318-332.
- Trennungswand wurden durchbrochen. Die russische Orthodoxie und ihr Verhältnis zur katholischen Kirche, in: KNA – Ökumenische Information (Bonn) 42, v. 16. 10. 1974, S. 5-9.
- Keine Öffnung zur Ökumene. Die dritte Gesamtsynode der russisch-orthodoxen Auslandskirche, in: KNA – Ökumenische Information (Bonn) 18, v. 30. 4. 1975, S. 7-8.
- Die russisch-orthodoxe Kirche, in: CO (1975) S. 156-159.
- (I.C.) Gibt es eine Katakombenkirche der orthodoxen Gemeinde in Rußland?, in: CO (1955) S. 104-105.
- Le Concil de l’Eglise russe hors-frontières à Karlovtsy, 10-23 août 1938, in: Russie et Chrétienté (1938-1939) S. 205-237.
- La Confraternité orthodoxe de S. Benoit et son travail pour le rapprochement entre les chrétiens d’Orient et d’Occident, in: Ir (1935) S. 512-523.
- Court of Appeal’s of the State of New York. Saint Nicholas Cathedral of the Russian Orthodox Church of North America. Case on Appeal. Volum 3, pages 997-1672, Folios 4459 to 5016, inclusive. New York o.J.
- CURTISS, J. Die Kirche in der Sowjetunion (1917-1956). München 1957.
- Church and State in Russia. The Last Years of the Empire. 1900-1917. New York 1940.
- DAUBRAY, J. La Mission Russe de Pékin, in: Echos d’Orient (1913) S. 371-372.
- DAVID The Netherlands Orthodox Church, in: The Orthodox Word (1968) S. 72-80.
- DAVID, PIERRE L’Eglise Russe et les Eglises Orthodoxes Autocéphales, in: Ir (1932) S. 5-60.
- Dejanija Russkogo Vsezagraničnago Cerkovnago Sobora, sostojavsagosja 8-20 nojabrja 1921 goda (21 nojabrja – 3 dekabrja) v Sremskich Karlovcach v Korolevstvë S. Ch. i. S. Srem. Karlovci 1922.
- Dejanija sobora siehe: Iz dejanija Archierejskogo sobora.
- Dejanija vtorogo vsezarubežnago Sobora Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi Zagranicej. Belgrad 1939. Delo mitropolita Sergija. Dokument/ 1927-1928. Kitež 1929.
- Dokumental’naja dejanija o načale raskola Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi na „Sovetskuju“ i „Katakombnuju“ in: Vladimirskij kalendar’ (1964) S. 7-16; (1965) S. 7-18; (1966) S. 12-22; (1967) S. 1- 5; (1968) S. 5-14; (1969) S. 1-2; (1970) S. 1-5.
- DNEPROV, R. Pamjati Mitropolita Evlogija, in: ŽMP (1946) 9, S. 30-34.
- Sobiratel’, in: ŽMP (1952) 4, S. 53-58.
- Pod krylom materi-cerkvi. K 10-letiju vossoedinenija zapadnoevropejskich prichodov s Moskovskoj Patriarchiej, in: ŽMP (1955) 8, S. 66-76.
- DOENS, I. Die Slawen auf dem Athos. Die Mönchsrepublik und ihre nichtgriechischen Klöster, in: Wort und Wahrheit (1966) 6-7, S. 706-711.
- DOROSH, J. The Russian Orthodox Missions. Washington 1951.
- DRAŠKOVIČ, C.S. Mitropolit Antonije Chrapovickij kao pastoralista, in: Bogoslovje (Belgrad)

(1963) 1-2, S. 9-15.

DUBNAITIS, E. Der totale Kampf gegen Religion und Geistlichkeit in den besetzten baltischen Ländern, in: *Acta baltica* (1965) S. 127-199.

DÜSING, J. Jerusalem und die Christen Rußlands, in: *CO* (1973) S. 154-162.

Edinstvo Cerkvi i cerkovnyja razdelenija russkago zarubezija, in: *Cerk. Vestn. Zap. Evr. Eparchii* (1937) 9-10, S. 4-12.

EFIMOV, I. Očag pravoslavija v Gollandii, in: *ŽMP* (1952) 2, S. 45-49; (1954) 1, S. 30-32.

ELEVFERIJ (M) Nedelja v Patriarchii. Vпечатlenija i nabljudenija ot poezdki v Moskvu. Paris 1933.

– Moj otvet Mitropolitu Antoniju. Paris 1933.

Das Ende der russisch-orthodoxen Mission in China, in: *HK* (1956-1957) S. 418-419.

Eparchial'noe sobranie siehe: XIV. eparchial'noe sobranie.

ERMAKOV, B. Istoričeskaja zapiska o Pastyrsko-Bogoslovskom učilišče v monastyre Sv. Kirika v Bolgarii, 1922-1932. Sofija 1932.

EVLOGIJ, S. (Arch.) Velikij angel'skij obraz v pravoslavnom monašestve, in: *ŽMP* (1979) 8, S. 23-27.

– (EULOGI) – Das große S'chima: Weg zur Vollkommenheit, in: *StdO* (1981) 5, S. 9-19.

FEDOTOFF, G. The Russian church since the revolution. New York, Toronto, London. 1928.

FELMY, C. Patriarch Tichon im Urteil der Russisch-Orthodoxen Kirche der Gegenwart, in: *KIO* (1965) S. 25-54.

FEODOSIJ (Arch.) Rossijskaja Duchovnaja Missija v Koree. [o.O.,o.J.].

FILARET (VOZNESENSKIJ, M.) Skorbnoe poslanie..., in: *PR* (1969) 15, S. 1-5.

– Vtoroe skorbnoe poslanie..., *PR* (1972) 4, S. 3-8.

FIRESIDE, H. The Russian Orthodox church under German occupation in World War II. [o.O.] 1968.

FLETCHER, W. A Study in Survival: The Church in Russia 1927-1943- New York 1965.

– Underground Orthodoxy: a problem in political control, in: *Canadian Slavic Papers* (1970) 4, S. 363-394.

– The Russian Orthodox Church Underground 1917-1970. London 1971.

– Religion and Soviet Foreign Policy 1945-1970. London 1973.

FLOROVSKIJ, G. Puti russkogo bogoslovija. Paris 1937.

FORSTREUTER, K. Die ersten Gemeinden der griechischen Kirche in Ostpreußen. Ein Beitrag zum Beginn der deutsch-russischen Kulturbeziehungen, in: *Königsberger Beiträge* (1929) S. 88-101.

FRID, Z. Vjerski zaednice u Jugoslaviji. Zagreb 1970.

GAN, R. Ekumenizm, in: *PR* (1975) 2, S. 6-8.

GARDNER, J. v. Drei Typen des russischen Kirchengesanges, in: *OS* (1957) S. 251-267.

– Ukazatel' russkoj i innostranoj literatury po voprosam russkogo cerkovnogo penija. Mjunchen 1958.

– Diskographie des russischen Kirchengesanges, in: *OS* (1960) S. 265-292; (1961) S. 136-154; (1963) S. 39-60; (1964) S. 282-309; (1966) S. 154-181; (1968) S. 174-198; (1969) S. 23-42;

- (1970) S. 185-207; (1972) S. 153-180.
- System und Wesen des russischen Kirchengesanges. Wiesbaden 1961.
 - Stilistische Richtungen im russischen Chorgesang, in: OS (1962) S. 161-182.
 - Bogoslužebnoe Penie Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi. Suščnost', Sistema in Istorija. Tom 1. Jordanville 1980.
- GAVRILOV, A. Zapiski palomnicy. Tri palomicestva v Palestinu. 1945-1946-1947 g. Jordanville 1968.
- Geheime religiöse Akademie in Sowjetrußland, in: West-Östlicher Weg (1931) 3-4, S. 58-61.
- GEORGE (Father) God's underground. New York 1949.
- GEORGE, ST. A Visit to the Russian Orthodox monasteries of Valaamo, Konevitsa, and Petseri, in: The East Church Quarterly (1938) S. 162-170.
- III. Gesamtkonzil siehe: Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland. Ihr III. Gesamtkonzil. Gibt es eine Katakombenkirche der orthodoxen Gemeinde in Rußland? In: CO (1955) S. 104 bis 105.
- GLAZIK, J. Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Heidenmission, in: Osteuropa (1956) S. 403-407.
- GLUBOKOVSKIJ, N. The church in the New European states, in: TCE (1922) S. 156-159.
- The Orthodox Theological Institute of Paris and its international significance, in: TCE (1929) S. 39-42.
 - Vojna i mir v Finljandskoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi. Sofija 1929.
- GOLUBINSKIJ, E. Istorija Russkoj Cerkvi. Tom 1-2. Moskva 1901-1902.
- GORČAKOV, M. Itogi politiki Mitropolitov Sergija i Evlogija. Paris 1930.
- GORDIENKO, N.; KOMAROV, P. Pravda o Russkoj Zarubeznoj Cerkvi. Moskva 1975.
- Vo poiskach opory, in: Nauka i religija (1975) 8, S. 84-88; 10, S. 87-89; 11, S. 85-88; 12, S. 80-83.
- GOUDAL, E. La situation religieuse en Russie, in: Echos d'Orient (1927) 147, S. 304-320.
- GRABBE, G (J.) Kornj cerkovnoj smuty. Belgrad 1927.
- Pravda o russkoj cerkvi na rodine i za rubežom. Jordanville 1961.
 - Cerkov' i eja ucenie v žizni. Sobranie socinenij. Tom 1. Montreal 1964. Tom 2. Montreal 1970.
 - The canonical and legal position of the Moscow Patriarchate. Jerusalem 1971.
 - Otricanie vmesto utverždenie. Po povodu brosjury Archiep. Ioanna Šachovskogo „Utverždenie Pomestnoj Cerkvi“. Jordanville 1971.
 - Sovremennoe ekumeničeskoe obnovlenčestvo i nase otnošenje k nemu, in: PR (1969) 18, S. 10-14.
 - Znamenatel'noe stoletie, in: PP (1973) S. 3-19.
 - Kanoničeskoe položenie Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi Zagranicej, in: PP (1974) S. 27-50.
 - Patriarch Tichon, in: PP (1975) S. 1-32.
 - Po povodu stat'i N.M. Zernova "Jurisdikcionnye spory v Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi i 1-j Vsezarubežnyj Sobor v Karlovcach v 1921 g", in: PR (1976) 8, S. 13-14; 10, S. 12-14; 11, S. 10-11.
- GRABBE, P. O parižskich bogoslovach. Rovno 1936.
- GRIGORIEFF, D. The Orthodox Church in America. From the Alaska mission to autocephaly, in: VTQ (1970) 4, S. 196-218.

- GRIGORIJ (EB) Moskovskaja cerkovnaja delegacija v Bolgarii, in: ŽMP (1945) 5, S. 19-24.
- Poezdka Svjatejšego Patriarcha Aleksija v Bolgariju, in: ŽMP (1946) 6, S. 3-19-
- GÜNTHER, W. Erzpriester Alexej Maltzew, in: Orthodoxie heute (1962) 2, S. 11-14.
- Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in Deutschland am Vorabend des Ersten Weltkrieges, in: KIO (1963) S. 55-64.
- Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Memorandum. Sigmaringen [1980].
- GURJEW, N. Geheime Bruderschaften im bolschewistischen Rußland, in: Stimmen der Zeit (1950/ 1951) S. 332-341, 428-436.
- GUSTAFSON, A. Die Katakombenkirche. Stuttgart 1954.
- HAUGG, W. Die orthodoxe Kirche des Ostens in Deutschland, in: Kyrios (1939/1940) S. 57-67; (1940/1941) S. 288-332; (1942/1943) S. 103-139-
- Die Ostkirche in Deutschland, in: Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte (1941) S. 141-196.
- D'HERBIGNY, M. „L'Eglise vivante“ de Russie d'après ses propres documents. Paris 1923.
- Après la mort du patriarche Tykhon. Grecs et Russes en Europe et en Amérique. Roma 1925.
- L'âme religieuse des Russes d'après leurs plus récente publications. II. En émigration. Roma 1925.
- D'HERBIGNY, M.; DEUBNER, A. Evêques Russes en exil. Douze ans d'épreuves (1918-1930). Roma 1931.
- HEYER, F. Die orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine 1917-1945. Köln 1953.
- Die umgesiedelte Ikone. Eine Studie über die orthodoxe Kirche in Finnland, in: KIO (1958) S. 95-108.
- Geschichte der orthodoxen Kirche in Amerika, in: KIO (1962) S. 9-50.
- Präsent in der ganzen Welt. Ein halbes Jahrhundert russische Kirche im Exil, in: Lutherische Monatshefte (1970) S. 483-487.
- Holy Trinity Orthodox Seminary Catalogue. Jordanville [o.J.].
- Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie. Schematismus 1976/77. Hrsg. v. A. Proc. München 1977.
- JAKUNIN, G. O sovremennom položennii Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi i perspektivach religioznogo vozroždenija Rossii, in: Volnoe Slovo (1979) 35-36, S. 5-78.
- JANIN, R. L'Eglise orthodoxe dans les etats de la Baltique, in: Unite de l'Eglise (1937) 83, S. 29-34.
- Jerusalem. Die letzten hundert Jahre, in: HK (1950) S. 197-199.
- IGNATIJ (Ierom.) Deklaracija 1927 goda, in: PR (1977) 13, S. 1-6.
- In the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Los Angeles. Jordanville 1949.
- INNOCENT (FIGUROVSKIJ, B) The Russian Orthodox mission in China, in: The Chinese Recorder (1916) S. 678-685.
- JOCKWIG, F. Der Weg der Laien auf das Landeskonzil der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche, Moskau 1917/1918. Werden und Verwirklichung einer demokratischen Idee in der Russischen Kirche. Würzburg 1971.
- IOANN (MAKSIMOVIČ, Eb) Russkaja Pravoslavnaja Zarubežnaja Cerkov', in: Vladimirskij kalendar' (1973) S. 38-53.

- Russkaja zarubežnaja cerkov'. Vtoroe izdanie rassirennoe i dopolnennoe, in: PO (1979) 48, S. 80-98.
- IOANN (ŠACHOVSKOJ, Ierom.) Počemu ja ušel iz jurisdikcii Mitropolita Antonija. Paris 1931.
- Utverždenie pomestnoj Cerkvi. Razmyšlenija i utocnenija. New York 1971.
- IOANN (B v. Brooklyn) Puti Amerikanskoj mitropolii. New York 1949-
- IONOV, A. Zapiski missionera. New York 1952.
- Joos, A. L'autocéphalie et l'autonomie ecclésiales d'après de récents documents du patriarcat de Moscou, in: Ir (1971) S. 23-38.
- ISAIJA (Igumen) Gomenskij monastyr', in: ŽMP (1956) 3, S. 18-20.
- Jubilejnyj Sbornik ko dnju 25 služenija v archierejskom sane Vysokopr. Feodosija, archiep. San-Paul'skogo i vseja Brasilii (1930-1955). São Paulo 1956.
- Jubilejnyj Sbornik 1685-1935. Posvjascennyj 250-ti letiju so dnja osnovanija Rossijskoj Pravoslavnoj Duchovnoj Missii v Kitae. (=Kitajskij Blagovestnik 1935). Pékin 1935.
- JUGIE, M. Les Églises rasses à la veille de la guerre actuelle. I. Les Églises russes constituées à l'intérieur des République soviétiques. II Les Églises russes de l'Emigration, in: Echos d'Orient (1940) 197-198, S. 176-189.
- JULIANIJA (Igumen'ja) Pis'mo iz Čili, in: PO (1979) 47, S. 63-68.
- JUSTIN (Arch.) Tajna ličnosti Mitropolita Antonija i ego znacenie dlja pravoslavnago slavjanstva, in: PZ (1976) 8, S. 1-13.
- IVANOV, A. Pravoslavie v Amerike, in: ŽMP (1955) 1, S. 44-55; 3, S. 69-76.
- IVANSON, J. Rußland, Amerika und die orthodoxe Kirchenpolitik. Das Moskauer Patriarchat und die Amerikanische „Metropolia“, in: Österreichische Osthefte (1968) S. 141-161.
- Iz dejanija Archierejskogo sobora Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi Zagranicej 1950 (1959). New York 1950 (1960).
- Iz žizni Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v Severnoj Amerike, in: Cerk. Ved. (Mjunchen) (1951) 1, S. 12-13.
- Iz žizni pravoslavnyh ljudej v Severnoj Amerike, in: Ch.N. (1940) 7, S. 47-51.
- K 75-letiju osnovanija Lesninskij obiteli, in: PR (1960) 18, S. 2-5; 19, S. 8-10.
- KAHLE, W. Fragen der rassisch orthodoxen Theologie, dargestellt am Leben des Berliner Probstes A.P. Maltzew (1854-1915), in: Kyrios (1962) S. 133-147.
- Die Orthodoxie im baltischen Raum, in: KIO (1978/1979) S. 78-107.
- KANDIDOV, B. Cerkovno-belogvardejskij sobor v Stavropol'e v mae 1919 g. Moskva 1930.
- Cerkov' i špionaž. Moskva 1938. v Kanoniceskoe polozenie Pravoslavnoj Russkoj Cerkvi zagranicej. Paris 1927.
- KASACK, W. Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche in der Gegenwart. Beiträge zu einem Symposium für Osteuropakunde. München 1979.
- KASINEC, E. Bibliographical census: Russian émigré theologians and philosophers in the Seminary Library Collection, in: VTQ (1972) 1, S. 40-45.
- Katakombnaja Tichonovskaja cerkov' v 1974 g., in: PR (1975) 13, S. 4-8.
- Katalog knig, izdannyh svj. Troickim monastyrem i drugimi zarabežnymi izdatel'stvami, in: PR (1977) 11, S. 9-20.
- Katalog izdanii Svjato-Troickago Monstyria. Jordanville 1980.
- KELLEHER, A. US Russians and autocephaly, in: One Christ (1965) S. 268-278.
- KERN, K. Le vingt-cinquième anniversaire de la fondation de l'institut de Théologie S. Serge à

Paris. Paris 1950.

– Metropolit Antonij Chrapovickij, in: Vestnik rassk. (1969) 91-92, S. 86-98.

KIPRLAN (PYŽOV) Naši zadači v ikonopisi, in: PP (1954) S. 139-144.

Kirche im Ausland siehe: Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland.

Kirche in Nordamerika siehe: Die russisch-orthodoxe Kirche in Nordamerika.

Kirche in Nordamerika. Geschichte siehe: Die Russische Kirche in Nordamerika. Geschichte.

KISCHKOWSKI, A. Die sowjetische Religionspolitik und die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche. München 1960.

KLESMET, J. Sowjetische Kirchenpolitik in den baltischen Staaten, in: Acta baltica (1965) S. 112-126.

KNIAZEFF, A. L'Institut St. Serge. De L'Académie d'autrefois au rayonnement d'aujourd'hui. Paris 1974.

KOCH, H. Die Kirchenspaltung in der russischen Emigration, in: Die christliche Welt (1931) Sp. 450-461.

– Weltmacht Sowjetkirche, in: Zeitschrift für Geopolitik (1953) S. 662-672.

KOLČICKIJ, N. Pravoslavnye rasskie prichody v Germanii, in: ŽMP (1945) 12, S. 4-13.

KONSTANTIN (Arch.) Pastyrskoe Bogoslovie. Kurs lekcij čitannyj v Sv. Tr. Duchovnoj Seminarii. Čast' 1-2. Jordanville 1960-1961.

– Pamjati Charbina, in: PR (1958) 18, S. 8-12.

– Cudo ruskoj istorii. Sbornik statej, opublikovannyj v Zarubeznoj Rossii za poslednee dvadcatiljetie. Jordanville 1971.

– Vselenskij sobor papy Ioanna XXIII., in: PP (1959) S. 1-37.

– siehe auch ZAJCEV.

KONSTANTINOV, D. Vnesnaja politika Moskovskoj patriarii, in: Grani (1961) 49, S. 166-186.

– Die Kirche in der Sowjetunion nach dem Kriege. Entfaltung und Rückschläge. München, Salzburg. 1973.

KORENCHEVSKY My visit to the Russian Orthodox Academy at Paris, in: TCE (1927) S. 39-42.

KOVACH, M. The Russian Orthodox church in America. Pittsburg 1957.

KOVALEVSKIJ, P. Zarubežnaja Rossija. Un demi siècle d'histoire de l'émigration russe (1920-1930). Paris 1971.

KRASNOV, A. Zakat obnovlenčestva, in: Grani (1972) S. 84-116; (1973) S. 235-274.

Kratkaja istorija Ruskoj Pravoslavnoj missii. Pekin 1916.

Kratkij katalog izdaniij Počaevskoj Tipografii, in: Pravoslavnyj Russkij Kalendar' 1939 g., Anhang.

Kratkij očerk vozniknovenija, ustroenija i žizni Kazansko-Bogôdorickago mužskago monastyrja, 1924-1939. Charbin 1939.

KUZNECKIJ, A. K prebyvaniju parižskoj cerkovnoj delegacii v Moskve, in: ŽMP (1947) 3, S. 3-12.

LAATSI, T. Die estnisch orthodoxe Kirche in der Heimat und im Exil, in: Acta baltica (1966) S. 63-73.

Die Lage der orthodoxen Kirche in Finnland, in: HK (1952/1953) S. 91-93.

Die Lage der russischen Auslandskirche, in: HK (1950) S. 24-25; (1951) S. 276-278.

Die Lage der russisch-orthodoxen Kirche in Amerika, in: HK (1951) S. 140-142.

LAVR (ŠKURLA, B). Opredelenie Archierejskago Sinoda, in: PR (1970) 8, S. 7-8.

LEBEDEV, M. Razruča v Ruskoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v Amerike. Belgrad 1929.

LEONID Afon i russkoe monašestvo, in: ŽMP (1959) 8, S. 60-65.

LEONTIJ (M) Konspekt po istorij ruskoj cerkvi v Amerike. Na pravach rukopisi. New York 1963. Lesninskij monastyr' siehe Svjato-Bogorodickij Lesninskij monastyr'.

LEVITIN-KRASNOV, A.; SAVROV, V. Ocerki po istorii ruskoj cerkovnoj smuty v 3 tomah. Küssnacht, Zürich 1978.

LIALINE, C. Hiérarchies Orthodoxes: L: Moscou et Karlovcy, in: Ir (1935) S. 69-73; IL: Hiérarchie du métropolitte Euloge, in: Ir (1935) S. 179-183.

– Le métropolitte Euloge et le concile de Karlovcy, in: Ir (1935) S. 73-83.

LINK, C. Die Russisch-Orthodoxen Exilkirchen in Deutschland und ihr Kirchengut, in: Zeitschrift für evangelisches Kirchenrecht (1978) 1, S. 89-134.

– Rechtsgutachten. Zur Frage des Eigentumsrechts an der Orthodoxen Hl. Alexandra-Kirche in Bad Ems. [Schreibmaschinenmanuskript]. Wien 1977.

LISSEK, T. Die Heilige Autokephale Orthodoxe Kirche Polens, in: Kyrios (1966) 43-54.

List of writings of the professors of the Russian Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris. 1925-1932. Paris 1933.

LOPUCHIN, M. The Russian Orthodox Church in America, in: VTQ (1964) S. 131-138.

LOWRIE, D. Saint Sergius in Paris. The Orthodox Theological Institute. London 1954.

LUCHTERHANDT, O. Der Sowjetstaat und die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche. Eine rechtshistorische und rechtssystematische Untersuchung. Köln 1976.

LUK'JANOV, V. Svjataja Gora Afon – zemnoj udel' Božiej Materi, in: PP (1972) S. 33-91.

M.B. Tragedija Ruskoj Missii v Palestine (Pis'mo iz Gefsimanii), in: PR (1948) 13, S. 12-13.

M.K. Bej-Guan'. Rossijskaja Duchovnaja Missija v Kitae. Tjan'cin 1939.

MAEVSKIJ Lésna – Chopovo – Furkê. São Paulo 1962.

MACHAROBLIDZE, E. Položenie Pravoslavnoj Ruskoj Cerkvi za Rubežom, in: Cerk. Ved. [Mjunchen] (1952) 12, S. 12-15.

MARK (Arch.) Der Geistliche und seine Gemeinde. Zur Lage in der UdSSR und in der Emigration, in: W. KASACK, Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche in der Gegenwart. München 1979, S. 11-32.

MAIER-HULTSCHIN, J. Die Orthodoxie in Hitlers weltpolitischem Spiel, in: Die neue Ordnung in Kirche, Staat, Gesellschaft, Kultur (1954) 2, S. 90-98.

MAKLAKOV, G. L'orthodoxie et „l'Eglise vivante“, in: Le Monde Slave (1925) 7, S. 1-28.

– L'Eglise orthodoxe russe des émigrés, in: Le Monde Slave (1926) 2, S. 37-62; 5, S. 272-299.

– Les dissensions de l'Eglise russe des émigrés, in: Le Monde Slave (1930) tome 1, No. 3, S. 389-422; tome 2, No. 1, S. 68-87; tome 3, No. 1, S. 59-90; No. 3, S. 227-257.

MAL'CEV, A. K XV-letiju Sv. Knjazja Vladimirskego Bratstva v Berline. Berlin 1906.

MANUCHINA, T. Put' moej zizni. Vospominanija Mitropolita Evlogija, izlozennyja po ego rasskazam T. Manuchinoj. Paris 1947.

MARICHAL, R. L'archevêché orthodoxe de France et d'Europe occidentale, in: Etudes (1966) S. 263-267.

- MARKOV, N. Pravda o smute cerkovnoj. Paris 1927.
- MASSALSKY, N. Die religiösen Strömungen und Bestrebungen in der russischen Emigration, in: Theol. prakt. Quartalsschrift (1938) S. 664-677.
- MATWIJENKO, H. Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. Ukrainisch-Orthodoxe Kirche [Hamburg o.J.]. Memorandum sur la situation de l'émigration orthodoxe dans le diocèse d'Allemagne. Munich 1946.
- Metropolit Anastasius (Alexander Gribanowkij) zum 50jährigen Bischofsjubiläum, in: Orthodoxe Stimmen (1956) S. 1-13.
- MEYENDORFF, J. Le Problème religieux en URSS. Première Partie : Les Relations extérieures du Pa-triarcat de Moscou. Paris 1952. = Notes et Etudes documentaires. No. 1624.
– O putjach Russkoj Cerkvi, in: Vestnik russk. (1972) 104-105, S. 127-141.
- MICHAIL siehe POL'SKIJ
- Mitropolit Vladimir. Svjatitel' molitvennik. 1873-1959. Paris 1965.
- The monks of New Skete. How to be your dog's best friend. Boston. Toronto. 1978.
- Die Moskauer Auslandsexarchate in Amerika und Westeuropa, in: HK 9 (1954/1955) S. 264-265.
- Das Moskauer Patriarchat und die amerikanische „Metropolia“, in: Österreichische Osthefte (1968) S. 141-161.
- N.N. Deux conciles à Moscou (octobre 1925), in: Echos d'Orrént (1926) 143, S. 328-343.
- N.P. Svjataja Gora Afon, in: ŽMP (1952) 6, S. 41-54.
- NAFANAIL (B) Ocerki russkoj cerkovnoj zizni v Man'czurii, S. 1-8 und S. 1-15. = Schreibmaschi-nenmanuskript. Hiob-Kloster. München [o.J.].
– Zapiski Cejlonskogo missionera, in: ChN (1939) 3, S. 34-37.
- NASH L'Eglise Russe „hors frontières“, in: Russie et Chrétienté (1938-1939) S. 238-247.
- NEKLJUDOV, V. Russkaja zizn' v Belgrade, in: ŽMP (1948) 1, S. 66-69.
- NESTOR (B) Man'czurija – Charbin. Belgrad 1933.
- NIKITA (Arch.) Jubilej podvor'ja Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v Sofii. K 25-letiju so dnja otkrytija, in: ŽMP (1978) 10, S. 36-39.
- NIKOLAJ (M) Poezdka v Angliju, in: ŽMP (1945) 8, S. 27-52.
– Nase prebyvanie vo Francii, 24 avgusta – 5 sentjabrja 1945, in: ŽMP (1945) 10, S. 14-25.
– Delegacija Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v Cechoslovakii, in: ŽMP (1950) 4, S. 10-18.
– V Bolgarii (30 maja – 6 ijunija 1952 g.), in: ŽMP (1952) 7, S. 32-46.
– V zapadnoj Germanii, in: ŽMP (1955) 5, S. 68-76.
- NIKON (RKLICKIJ) Zizneopisanie Blazennejsago Antonija, Mitropolita Kievskago i Galickago. Tom 1-17. New York 1956-1969-
– Archierejskie Sobory Russkoj Zarubežnoj Cerkvi. Doklad, in: PR (1962) 21, S. 3-6.
– Moskovskaja Patriarchija i Russkaja Zarubežnaja Cerkov', in: PR (1969) 22, S. 4-8.
– Russkaja Zarubežnaja Cerkov' i duchovnoe vozroždenie, in: PR (1969) 17, S. 3-5.
– O duchovnoj suscnosti Moskovskoj Patriarchii, in: PP (1975) S. 35-50.
- Normal'nyj prichodskij ustav. Jordanville 1951.
- O prebyvanii Moskovskoj delegacii v Belgrade, v fevrále-marte 1946, in: ŽMP (1946) 5, S. 37-44.

OKUNCOV, J. Russkaja emigracija v Severnoj i Juznoj Amerike. Buenos Aires 1967.
 Die Orthodoxen Exilkirchen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. München 1965.
 Orthodoxy in America. Some statistics, in: ECR (1968) S. 70-73.
 Orthodoxy in Finland, in: One Church (1973) S. 138-141.
 OSECKIJ, A. Pomestnyj Sobor. Petrograd 1917.
 Osnovanija Lesninskoj obitelji siehe: K 75-letiju osnovanija.
 OSTROUMOFF, I. The history of the Council of Florence. Translated from the Russian by Basil Popoff. Boston 1971.
 Otec archimandrit Kornilij. K pjatiletiju so dnja koncinu. Kratkoe žizneopisanie. Mjunchen 1971.
 Otcet 5-go eparchial'nago s-ezda Severo-Amerikanskoj i Kanadskoj eparchii Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi zagranicej. New York 1952.
 Otcet desjatago eparchial'nago sobranija Severo-Amerikanskoj i Kanadskoj eparchii Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi zagranicej. New York 1957.

Pamjati episkopa Iony, in: PP (1966) S. 32-46.
 PANIOTI, N. Svjataja Gora Afon i slavjane, in: PP (1962) S. 49-75.
 PARFENOV, P. „Spasaj, da spasaet dusu svoju“, in: PP (1968) S. 103-117.
 PARIJSKIJ, L. Končina i pogrebenie Mitropolita Evlogija, in: ŽMP (1946) 9, S. 9-15.
 Pastyrskoe soveščanie duhovenstva Russkoj Zarubeznoj Cerkvi Severnoj Ameriki i Kanady. Jordanville 1969.
 PATELOS, C. The Orthodox Church in the Ecumenical Mouvement. Documents and Statements 1902-1975. World Council of Churches. 1978.
 PATOCK, C. Bischofssynode der Russisch Orthodoxen Kirche, 18. Juli 1961. In: OS (1962) S. 27-42.
 – Zur Bischofssynode der Russisch-Orthodoxen Auslandskirche in Nordamerika, in: OS (1962) S. 318-326.
 – Die Russische Auslandskirche und das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil, in: OS (1964) S. 33-50.
 – Zur Aufhebung des Bannes vom Jahre 1054, in: OS (1966) S. 196-209.
 – Die Hierarchie der Russisch-Orthodoxen Kirche. Moskauer Patriarchat, in: OS (1967) S. 43-60, S. 220-229; (1968) S. 48-63, S. 203-231.
 – Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche in Westeuropa wird autonom, in: OS (1966) S. 50-59.
 – Solzenicyn und das Moskauer Patriarchat, in: OS (1972) S. 198-208.
 – Die Ostkirchen in Australien, in: OS (1978) S. 174-200.

PEREVALOV, T. Rossijskaja duhovnaja missija v Koree. Charbin 1926.
 PETROV, V. Rossijskaja Duhovnaja Missija v Kitae. Washington 1968.
 – Albazinci v Kitae. [o.O.]. 1968.

Pjatidesjatiletie archierejskago služenija vys. Mitropolita Anastasija, pervoierarcha Russkoj Zarubeznoj Cerkvi, in: PR (1956) Heft 12.
 POLIKARP (Arch.) Vospominanie o prisnopamjatnom Vladyku Meletiju, in: PP (1963) S. 34-58.
 Položenie Pravoslavnoj Russkoj Cerkvi za rubezom, in: Cerk. Ved. (Mjunchen) (1952) 12, S. 12-15. Položenie ob upravlennii germanskoj eparchiej russkoj pravoslavnoj cerkvi, in: Golos Pravoslavija (1952) 7, S. 3-7.
 POLOŽENSKIJ, S. Pamjati Protoiereja A. Mal'ceva, in: Golos Pravoslavija (1954) 2-4, S. 23-

28.

POL'SKIJ, M. Sovremennoe sostojanie Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v SSSR. New York 1946.

– Kanoničeskoe položenie vysšej vlasti v SSSR i zagranicej. Jordanville 1948.

– Očerk položenija ruskaja ekzarchata vselenskoj jurisdikcii. Jordanville 1952.

– Amerikanskij raskol', in: PR (1955) 11, S. 8-12.

– Novye mučeniki rossijskie. Tom 1-2. Jordanville 1957.

– Amerikanskaja mitropolija i Los' Anzeloskij process. Jordanville [o.J.].

– (MICHAIL) Položenie Cerkvi v Sovetskoj Rossii. (Očerk bežavsego iz Rossii svjaščenika). Jerusalem 1931.

POMAZANSKIJ, M. Archiepiskop Vitalij (Maksimenko) i ego dejatel'nost' v sane

Archimandrita Počaevskoj Uspenskoj Lavry, in: PR (1973) 5, S. 6-10; 6, S. 6-9.

Pomestnyj Sobor Rossijskoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi 1923 g. (Bjulleteny). Izd. protopr. V.D. Krasnickago. Moskva 1923.

POPOV, P. Karlovskaja smuta. Jur'ev 1927.

– Gonenie na pravoslavie i ruskich v Pol'se v XX-m veke. Belgrad 1937.

Poslanie Patriarcha Moskovskogo i Vseja Rusi Aleksija i svjaščennogo pri nem sinoda k archipastyrjam i pastve pravoslavnoj ruskoj cerkvi v Amerike, in: ŽMP (1948) 1, S. 9-24.

POTAPOV, I. Ruskaja duhovnaja missija v Palestine, in: ŽMP (1954) 4, S. 55-63.

Pravoslavnoe chramy v Severnoj Man'čžurii. Charbin 1931.

Prebyvanie delegacii Ruskoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v Jugoslavii, in: ŽMP (1957) 11, S. 59-77.

Prebyvanie Belgrade siehe: O prebyvanii ... v Belgrade.

PRILEŽAEV, A. IZ žizni Ruskoj Duhovnoj Missii v Ierusalime, in: ŽMP (1957) 5, S. 20-21.

QUANDALLE, S. Deux monastères orthodoxes en Finlande. Valaamo et Konévet, in: Russie et Chrétienté (1938/1939) S. 37-56.

RAR, G. Russische Kirchen in Deutschland, in: Der Europäische Osten (1967) 143, S. 94-97.

– (VETROV, A.) Plennaja cerkov'. Frankfurt 1954.

– Pravoslavnoe delo na rodine i za rubežom, in: Russkoe vozroždenie (1979) 5, S. 175-194.

– Zarubeznaja Rossija i ee zadači v otnosenii duhovnogo vozroždenie Rossii, in: Russkoe vozroždenie (1979) 6, S. 188-212.

RAZUMOVSKIJ, N. Patriarsaja delegacija v Charbine, in: ŽMP (1945) 12, S. 14-18.

– Pamjati Vysokopr. Meletija, Mitropolita Charbinskogo i Man'čžurskogo, in: ŽMP (1946) 5, S. 11- 12.

READ, J. Orthodoxy in New Zealand, in: ECR (1976) S. 81-84.

REGEL'SON, L. Tragedija Ruskoj Cerkvi 1917-1945. Paris 1977.

La Révérende Mère Rufine, Abbesses du Couvent de N.D. des Vladimir à Charbin, in: Ir (1939) S. 175-177.

REXINE, J. A survey of recent books on Mount Athos on the occasion of the 1000th anniversary of the Holy Mountain, in: Balkan Studies (1965) S. 165-180.

RJASNJANSKIJ, S. V Karpatskoj Rusi s 1924 po 1944 g., in: Vladimirskij kalendar' (1972) S. 110-120.

RIOTTE, J. Die orientalisches-katholischen Gemeinschaften in Kanada, in: OS (1955) S. 97-107

RODZJANKO, M. Pravda o zarubeznoj cerkvi. Po dokumentami i licnymi vospominanijami, in:

- PP (1954) Anhang S. 1-40.
- ROGOŽIN, M. Pravoslavnye duchovnye koncerty v gorode Šanchae, in: ŽMP (1953) 4, S. 31-32.
- ROHLING, H. Die Bedeutung des Athos in der russischen Kirchengeschichte, in: Hellenika (1970) 19/20, S. 36-52.
- ROHNER, T. Die orthodoxe Kirche in Finnland, in: OS (1963) S. 314-325.
- RÖSSLER, R. Das Journal des Moskauer Patriarchats als Spiegel kirchlicher Entwicklung in der S. U. seit dem 2. Weltkrieg, in: Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas N.F. 4 (1956) S. 26-63.
– Kirche und Revolution in Rußland. Patriarch Tichon und der Sowjetstaat. Köln 1969.
- ROK. Einrichtungen siehe: Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche. Ihre Einrichtungen.
- ROSTOV, A. Cerkov' prisposabljuščajasja i Cerkov' gonimaja v SSSR. Jordanville 1965.
- Die Russische Geistliche Mission in Palästina, in: HK (1949/1950) S. 259-260.
- Der russische Metropolit Anastasius fünfzig Jahre Bischof, in: CO (1956) 20-21.
- Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche. Ihre Einrichtungen. Ihre Stellung. Ihre Tätigkeit. Moskau 1958.
- Die Russische Kirche in Nordamerika. Geschichte und Organisation der russisch-orthodoxen Kirche außerhalb der UdSSR, in: HK (1949) S. 135-139-
- Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland. Ihr III. Gesamtkonzil 1974. Mit Solzenicyns Rede. Zürich 1974. = G12W (1974) Q 3-4.
- Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland, insbesondere in Deutschland. [o.O.o.J.] (Maschinen-manuskript im Osteuropa-Institut München, Sep. 211, A 53/1142).
- Die russisch-orthodoxe Kirche in Nordamerika, in: HK (1947) S. 89-90.
- Russkaja cerkovnaja obscestvennaja dejatel'nost' na Bližnem Vostoke (1843-1974). Jerusalem 1974.
- Russkaja Pravoslavnaja Cerkov' v Severnoj Amerike. Istoriceskaja spravka. Jordanville 1955.
- Russkaja Pravoslavnaja Cerkov' zagranicej 1918-1968. Tom 1-2. Red. A.A. Sollogub. New York 1968.
- Russkaja Pravoslavnaja Cerkov' zagranicej, in: PO (1977) 42, S. 12-29.
- Russkij Pravoslavnyj bogoslovskij Institut v Parize. Paris 1925.
- ŠAMORO, A. Po skitam černorizcev, in: Nauka i religija (1964) S. 26-30.
- SAVINSKIJ, S. Pjatnadcat' dnej v Jugoslavii, in: ŽMP (1945) 6, S. 18-28.
- Das Schicksal der russischen Kirche in der Emigration, in: HK (1950) S. 514-521.
- SCHMITT, B. Metropolit Sergius und die russische Emigrationskirche, in: West-östlicher Weg (1930) v S. 171-174; (1931) S. 35-38, 62.
- ŠČUKIN, S. O prichodskoj skolach i kružkach Svjato-Vladimirskoj molodeži, in: CZ (1955) 7-12, S. 102-110.
- SEIDE, G. Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche im Spiegel der „Stimme der Orthodoxie“, in: OS (1969) S. 146-171.
- In Memoriam. Zum Tode des Hochheiligen Patriarchen von Moskau und ganz Rußland, Aleksij, am 17. April 1970, in: Kyrios (1970) S. 129-148.
- Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, in: OS (1971) S. 159-184.
- Die ungarische orthodoxe Kirche, in: Ungarnjahrbuch (1972) S. 101-114.
- Die Russische Geistliche Mission in Jerusalem seit 1918, in: OS (1973) S. 150-171.

- Das Schrifttum des Patriarchats von Moskau, in: G12W (1974) 7, S. 10-14.
- Die Russisch Orthodoxe Kirche in China und der Mandschurei seit dem Jahre 1918, in: OS (1976) S. 166-192.
- Das „Žumal Moskovskoj Patriarchii“ und die „Stimme der Orthodoxie“, Jahrgang 1975, in: G12W (1976) 5-6, S. 1-3.
- Das Druckerei und Verlagswesen der Russisch Orthodoxen Kirche im Ausland, in: OS (1980) S. 283-300.
- Die Klöster der Russisch Orthodoxen Kirche, Teil 1: Patriarchat von Moskau; Teil 2: Auslandskirche, in: Russische Orthodoxe Klöster heute = G12W. (1980) S. 8-23, 35-37.
- Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland. Ihre Institutionen und derzeitige Lage, in: Osteuropa (1982) S. 660-670.
- Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche in Sibirien und Mittelasien seit dem II. Weltkrieg. Ihre Diözesen und Gemeinden, in: OS (1983) Heft 2-3, im Druck ca. 60 Seiten.
- Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland. Kurzer Abriß ihrer Geschichte mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der deutschen Diözese. München 1983-
- Die Klöster der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche im Ausland in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart (60 Jahre Exil, 1920-1980). (München 1983; engl. Ausg. Jordanville 1984).
- SENKOV-POPOVSKIJ, L. Napadenie na Gamburgskaja cerkov'. [o.O.J 1928.
- SERAFIM (IVANOV, Arch.) Doklad Archimandrita Serafima „Monastyri i monasestvo“, in: Dejanija vtorogo Sobora Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi Zagranicej. Belgrad 1939, S. 377-388.
- Odigitrija Russkago Zarubež'ja. Mahopac 1954.
- Pamjatka 25-letija suščestvovanija sinodal'nago podvor'ja „Novaja Korennaja Pustyn'“ v gor. Magopake, stat N'ju Iork. 1950-1975. Montreal 1975.
- SERAFIM (LUKJANOV) Poslanie k kliru i pastve Zapadno-Evropejskoj Eparchii. Paris 1929.
- Bez kanonov, in: ŽMP (1949) 6, S. 34-39,
- SERAFIM (Arch. SURRENCY) The Quest for Orthodox Church Unity in America. New York 1973.
- SERGIJ Neskol'ko slov po povodu raskol'ničej dejatel'nosti Mitropolita Anastasija, in: ŽMP (1946) 3, S. 26-31.
- The Orthodox Church under German occupation: An unpublished memorandum by the Exarch of the Baltic area, Metropolite Sergij, in: ECR (1974) S. 131-161.
- Severnoj Amerike siehe: Russkaja Pravoslavnaja Cerkov' v Severnoj Amerike.
- ŠIDLOVSKAJA, N. Russkij chopovskij (byvsij Lesninskij) zenskij monastyr' v Jugoslavia in: ŽMP v (1948) 7, S. 64.
- ŠIŠKIN, A. Suščnost' i kriticeskaja ocenka „obnovlenskaja“ raskola Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi. Kazan' 1970.
- ŠMEMAN, A. Cerkov' i cerkovnoe ustrojstvo. Po povodu knigu prot. Pol'skago: „Kanoniceskoe polozhenie vysszej cerkovnoj vlasti v SSSR i zagranicej“. Paris 1949.
- Russian Theology: 1920-1972. An introductory survey, in: VTQ (1972) S. 172-194.
- SMOLITSCH, I. Leben und Lehre der Starzen. Köln 1952.
- Russisches Mönchtum. Würzburg 1953.
- Zur Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen der Russischen Kirche und dem Orthodoxen Osten. Die russische kirchliche Mission in Jerusalem (1847-1914), in: OS (1956) S. 33-51, S. 89-136.

- Die Russische Kirche in der Revolutionszeit vom März bis Oktober 1917 und das Landeskonzil 1917-1918 (Zur Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen Staat und Kirche in Rußland), in: OS (1965) S. 3-34.
- Der Konzilsvorbereitungsausschuß des Jahres 1906. Zur Vorgeschichte des Moskauer Landeskonzils von 1917/1918, in: KIO (1964) S. 53-93.
- SOLLOGUB siehe Russkaja Pravoslavnaja Cerkov' zagranicej.
- SOOP, K.; KESKKULA, U. Kuremjajevskij monastyr'. Tallin 1967.
- Sostav Svjatejšago Pravitel'stvujaščago Vserossijskago Synoda i Rossijskoj ierarchii na 1917 god. Moskva 1917.
- Spisok archiereev, svjaščennoslužitelej i prichodov Zarubeznoj Cerkvi s ich adresami. Jordanville 1975-1981.
- SPULER, B. Moskaus kirchenpolitische Offensive im Vorderen Orient, in: Ostprobleme (1951) 22, S. 679-681.
- STAN, L. Pravoslavnaja diaspora, in: ŽMP (1951) 6, S. 22-31.
- STANKO, P.; ALJANCIC, M. Metropolit Antonij über das Wirken der russischen Kirche in Jugoslawien, in: West-östlicher Weg (1929) S. 197-200.
- STAVROU, T. Russian interest in Palestine 1882-1914. A study of religious and educational enterprise. Thessaloniki 1963.
- STEPUN, F. Zerfall der Ostkirche. Die Lage der russischen Kirche in Sowjetrußland und in der Emigration, in: Deutsche Universitätszeitung (1951) 8, S. 12-14.
- STRATONOV, I. Russkaja cerkovnaja smuta (1921-1931). Berlin 1932.
- STROJEFF, W. Die neue Spaltung in der russischen griechisch-orthodoxen Kirche, in: Das heutige Rußland 1917-1922. Teil 2. Berlin 1923, S. 109-118.
- STRUVE (VALENTINOV), N. Die Erstürmung des Himmels. Die Verfolgung der Kirche und Religion in Sowjetrußland. Berlin 1924.
- L'Eglise orthodoxe et Mission, in: Messenger (1960) S. 2-11.
- Die Christen in der UdSSR. Mainz 1965.
- STUPPERICH, R. „Živaja cerkov'“, in: KIO (1960) S. 72-103.
- SÜDOROFF, M. Die orthodoxe Kirche in Finnland, in: Orthodoxie heute (1971) 34-35, S. 12-19. Svetoč ljubvi. Charbin 1939.
- Svetloj pamjati vsečestnoj Igumenii Rufiny. San Francisco 1948.
- Svjaščennyj Sobor Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi. Pribavlenie k dejanijam. Moskva 1918.
- Svjaščennyj Sobor Pravoslavnoj Rossijskoj Cerkvi. Dejanija. Izd. Sobornago Soveta. Moskva 1918. Svjato-Bogodorickij Lesninskij Monastyr'. Madrid 1973.
- Svjatyni obiteli prepodobnago lova v Mjunchene. München 1972.
- SWAN, J. A Biography of Patriarch Tikhon. Jordanville 1964.
- SZCZESNIAK, B. The Russian revolution and religion, 1917-1925: A collection of documents concerning the suppression of religion by the Communists. Notre Dame (Indiana) 1959.
- TAL'BERG, N. Cerkovnyj raskol. Paris 1927.
- Svjataja Rus' na Svjatoj Zemle, in: PR (1958) Heft 8-17 (Serie von Kurzbeiträgen).
- Istorija Russkoj Cerkvi. Jordanville 1959.
- K sorokaletiju pagubnago evlogianskago raskola. Jordanville 1966.
- TARASAR, C.; ERICKSON, J. Orthodox America 1794-1976. Development of the Orthodox

Church in America. New York 1975.

TEODOROVIC, N. The catacomb church in the USSR, in: Bulletin. Inst, for the Study of the USSR (1965) 4, S. 3-14.

THON, N. Das russische Mönchtum auf dem Hl. Berg Athos, in: CO (1975) S. 175-179.

– Ein bedeutendes Kapitel orthodoxer Kirchengeschichte in Deutschland. Probst Aleksij Mal'cev, in: CO (1976) S. 161-163.

THÜRMER, A. Die russische St. Alexij-Gedächtniskirche in Leipzig. Leipzig 1963.

TIMASCHEW, N. Die Religionen im Sowjetstaat 1917-1942. Stockholm 1943.

TITLINOV, B. Novaja Cerkov'. Petrograd, Moskva 1923.

– Živaja Cerkov. Moskva 1923.

TOLSTOJ-MILOSLAVSKIJ, S. Pis'mo Mitropolita Evlogiju. Paris 1929.

TREULIEB, E. Metropolit Sergij von Riga und die „Orthodoxe Mission“ in Pleskau, in: KIO (1965) S. 55-66.

TROICKIJ, S. O pravach episkopov lišivšichsja kafedr bez svoej viny, in: Cerk. Ved. (1922) 14-15, S. 6-8; 16-17, S. 6-8; 18-19, S. 8-9.

– Cto takoe „živaja cerkov“? Warszawa 1928.

– Crkvena jurisdikcija nad pravoslavnom diasporom. Karlovitz 1932.

– Razmeževanie ili raskol? Paris 1932.

– O granicach rasprostranjenja prava vlasti Konstantinopol'skoj Patriarchii, in: ŽMP (1947) 11, S. 34-45.

– Ideologija karlovskago raskola, in: ŽMP (1948) 2, S. 43-50.

– O nepravde Karlovatskogo raskola; razbor knigi Prot. M. Pol'skogo „Kanoniceskoe Položenie vysšej cerkovnoj vlasti v SSSR i zagranicej“. Paris 1960.

– Patriarch Sergij i ruskij zarubežnyj cerkovnyj raskol. K 100-letiju so dnja roždenija Patriarcha Sergija, in: ŽMP (1968) 5, S. 12-15; 6, S. 18-27.

TROUBNIKOV, A. Bliznyj Vostok. Kolybel' Pravoslavija. Madrid 1964.

TURČIN, M. Chram pamjatnik Russkoj slavy v Lejpcige. Leipzig 1975.

Učenie Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi o Svjaščennom Predanii i otnošenje eja k novomu stilju. Jordanville 1959.

Ukazatel' periodiceskich izdanij emigracii iz Rossii i SSSR za 1919-1952 gg. Mjunchen 1953.

Um die Echtheit der russischen Kirche, in: HK (1951) S. 44-46.

USHIMARU, P. Bishop Innocent: founder of American orthodoxy. Bridgeport 1964.

VAŠČENKO V. Skit sv. Proroka Ilii, in: PP (1961) S. 157-170.

VEDERNIKOV, A. Grech protiv materi cerkvi, in: ŽMP (1950) 7, S. 68-78.

– Za ogradnoj materi cerkvi, in: ŽMP (1953) 7, S. 32-39-

– Vnutrennee delo pol'skoj pravoslavnoj cerkvi, in: ŽMP (1950) 8, S. 40-51.

VELLO, S. Die Kirchen in Finnland, Estland und Lettland. Rom 1965.

VETROV, A. siehe RAR, G.

VIKTORINA Iz žizni Russkoj Duchovnoj Missii v Ierusalime, in: ŽMP (1957) 12, S. 21-22.

VINOGRADOV, V. O nekotorych vaznejsich momentach poslednego perioda zizni i dejatel'nosti sv. patriarcha Tichona (1923-1925 gg.) Mjunchen 1959.

VITALIJ (MAKSIMENKO) Motivy moej zizni. Jordanville. 1955.

- VITALIJ (USTINOV) Ob ikonografii, in: Vestnik Kanade (1965) 7-8, S. 1-3.
- Bogoslužbenyj jazyk pravoslavnyh inostrancev, in: Prav. Obozrenie (1979) 47, S. 56-63.
- VOLKMANN, H. Die russische Emigration in Deutschland 1919-1929. Würzburg 1966.
- Vorläufig keine Heiligsprechung durch die russische Auslandskirche, in: HK (1953/1954) S. 363- 364.
- Voss, E. Bischofssynode und Patriarchenwahl der russisch-orthodoxen Kirche 1971, in: Osteuropa (1972) S. 101-113.
- Vosstanovlenie Počaevskij Tipografii vo Vladimirovoj, in: Pravoslavnyj Russkij Kalendar' (1939), Anhang, S. 7-15.
- VRIES, W. Das Patriarchat von Moskau und der sowjetische Einfluß im Nahen Osten, in: Stimmen der Zeit (1955/1956) S. 188-196.
- WAL, A. Een onafhankelijke russisch-orthodoxe kerk in Frankrijk, in: Christlijk Oosten (1966-1967) S. 125-143.
- WIDMER, E. The Russian ecclesiastical mission in Peking during the eighteenth century. Cambridge (Mass), London 1976.
- WUYTS, A. Le deuxième concile de l'émigration russe de Carlovtsi, in: Orientalia Christiana Periodica 6 (1940) S. 495-508.
- Zagraničnoe Russkoe Cerkovnoe Sobranie. Materialy podgotovitel'noj kommissii. Konstantinopel 1921.
- ZAJCEV, K. Pravoslavnaja cerkov' v Sovetskoj Rossii. Shanghai 1947.
- K poznaniya pravoslavija. Shanghai 1948.
- siehe auch KONSTANTIN
- ZANDER, L. List of writings of professors of the Russian Theological Institute in Paris. Vol. I: 1925- 1932; Vol. II: 1932-1936; Vol. III: 1936-1947; Vol. IV: after 1947. Paris 1955.
- ZANDER, V. Seraphim-von Sarov. Ein Heiliger der orthodoxen Christenheit. Düsseldorf 1965.
- ŽELEZNJAKOVIČ, S. K istorii Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi v Pol'se mezduvoennogo perioda (1918 g – 1939 g.) in: Cerk. Ved. [Warszawa] (1966) 3, S. 15-20; 4, S. 13-19; 5, S. 11-20; 6, S. 17-23; 10, S. 18- 23.
- Finljandskaja Pravoslavnaja Cerkov', in: Cerk. Ved. [Warszawa] (1967) 3, S. 19-24; 4, S. 11-13.
- ZERNOV, N. La confrérie anglo-orthodoxe de Saint Alban, Martyr, et du Bienheureux Serge, in: Ir (1935) S. 409-413.
- Za rubezom. Belgrad-Pariz-Oksford. (Chronika sem'i Zernovyh). 1921-1972. Paris 1973.
- The schism within the Russian Church in the diaspora: its causes and the hopes of a reconciliation, in: ECR (1975) S. 59-65.
- The First council of the Russian Church Abroad in Sremski Karlovtsi (21 November – 2 December 1921): The notes of one of the participants, in: ECR (1975) S. 164-185.
- ŽIGANOVSKIJ, V. Russkie v Šanchae. Shanghai 1934.
- Žizneopisanie vsečestnoj Igumenii Rufiny. San Francisco 1948.
- Zur Geschichte der Begegnung mit der Orthodoxen Kirche, in: HK (1947) S. 320-322.
- ZYBKOVEC, V. Nacionalizacija monastyrskich imuščestv v Sovetskoj Rossii 1917-1921. Moskva 1975.
- 25-letnyj Jubilej Pravoslavnogo Bogoslovskogo Instituta v Pariže 1925-1950. Paris 1950. (25-

letnyj jubilej).

50-ti letie archierejskago služenija vys. Mitropolita Anastasija. Jubilejnyj sbomik. Jordanville 1956.

50-letnyj Jubilej Ruskoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi zagranicej. (Svjataja Zemlja. Svjataja Gora Afon.) Cvetnoj al'bom, bol'sogo formata, napečatan v Japonii, v izjaščnom pereplete. [o. O. o.J.].

III. Gesamtkonzil siehe: Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche im Ausland. III. Gesamtkonzil.

XIV. èparchial'noe Sobranie Vostočno-Amerikanskoj i N'ju-Iorkskoj èparchii Ruskoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi zagranicej. N'ju Iork 1961.