

EASTERN ORTHODOX
CHRISTIANITY AND
AMERICAN HIGHER
EDUCATION

Theological, Historical, and
Contemporary Reflections

Edited by

ANN MITSAKOS BEZZERIDES
AND ELIZABETH H. PRODROMOU

University of Notre Dame Press
Notre Dame, Indiana

3. *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, ed. J. Gouillard, *Trauaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967): 59 (trans. mine).
4. In the Byzantine Empire, the words *hellen* and *hellenikos* mean "pagan," rather than bearing an ethnic sense, until the beginning of the second millennium. On the whole subject, see Anthony Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
5. *CL Capita* 25, ed. Robert Sinkewicz, *Studies and Texts* 83 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1988), 109.
6. For what we know about the history of higher education in the Byzantine Empire, see Paul Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin: Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au X^e siècle* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1971).
7. See, for example, the chapter entitled "Master" in M. T. Clanchy, *Abbe-land: A Medieval Life* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), 65–94.
8. See, for example, Anthony Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 189–316.
9. Samuel Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).
10. See *The Rule of St. Benedict*, in Latin and English, ed. and trans. Abbott Justin McCann, OSB (London: Burns Oates, 1952), 160–62.
11. Basil of Caesarea, *Epistles* 14.2, in *The Letters*, vol. 1, trans. Roy F. Defarari (London: Heinemann / Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926), 107. I have used the text given in Basilio de Cesarea, *Le lettere*, vol. 1, ed. Marcella Forlin Parrucco and Corona Parrum (Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1983), with its valuable commentary. Further citations are given parenthetically as epistle numbers.
12. See Anne-Marie Malingrey, "Philosophie," *Études et Commentaires* 40 (1961): n.p.
13. Basilio di Cesarea, *Le lettere*, 1:272.
14. Anna M. Silvas, *The Asketikon of St Basil the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 70.
15. Cf. Simone Weil's thoughts on the place of attention in her notes, entitled (significantly for our context), "Reflections on the Right Use of School Studies with a View to the Love of God," in *Waiting on God*, trans. Emma Craufurd (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951), 51–59.
16. See, for instance, Maximos, *Ambigua* 10.18 (PG 91:1128D–1133A); *Maximos*, *Mystagogia* 6–7, ed. Boudignon, in *Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca* 69 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), lines 507–99.
17. In what follows, I am deeply in debt to a work I read long ago, the ideas of which have remained with me: Josef Pieper's *Leisure, the Basis of Culture* (London: Faber and Faber, 1952).

CHAPTER SEVEN

THOUGHTS FROM ORTHODOXY'S

MODERN PAST

Theology, Religion, and the University in Russia
(Late Nineteenth to Early Twentieth Centuries)

VERA SHEVZOV

On July 23, 2007, a group of ten high-ranking members of Russia's Academy of Sciences, mostly physicists, published an open letter addressed to the president of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin.¹ Highly publicized at the time and still receiving broad public attention almost a decade later, the letter addressed what its authors perceived as an active campaign prompted by the Moscow Patriarchate to introduce theology as a discipline into the curriculum of Russia's secular state institutions of higher education.² Quoting the 1979 Noble laureate and theoretical physicist Steven Weinberg, who maintained that "the experience of being a scientist makes religion seem fairly irrelevant," the academics questioned the premises on which theology could be numbered among academic or "scientific" disciplines. In their estimation, "a scientific discipline is based on facts, logic, and proofs, but not on faith."³ While the signatories on the letter clarified that they respected faith as a private matter, and that they

held no animosity toward religion, as academics they could not remain indifferent to what they saw as attempts to undermine the principles of modern scientific knowledge.

While bound up in the complex web of historical circumstance particular to Orthodox Christianity in post-Soviet society, the academics' letter reverberated beyond the immediate historical context with issues that had occupied Russia's educated society, including its academically trained Orthodox thinkers, more than a century earlier.⁴ Conventional wisdom might presume that, as a state religion, Orthodox Christianity as a subject of study had enjoyed a long history in Russia's universities; in fact, that relationship was problematic and still being forged on the eve of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution. The organization of the university system, Orthodoxy's status as a state religion, and the intellectual challenges of modernity all contributed to Orthodoxy's tenuous position as an academic discipline within Russia's universities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Given that "Russians were the first eastern Christian people to wrestle with the problem of Orthodoxy and modernity,"⁵ it is not surprising that Russia's academically trained Orthodox thinkers found themselves positioned between a modernizing society that questioned the legitimacy of their subject matter in a university setting, a state that sought to promote an Orthodox educational presence for politically motivated purposes, and a hierarchical ecclesiastical bureaucratic structure that sought to oversee the academic output of its scholars. Despite their particular political and cultural historical context in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century imperial Russia, Orthodox theological school graduates and professional Orthodox academics sought to resolve challenges and tensions similar to those their contemporary Orthodox—as well as Western Christian—counterparts often face anew in the twenty-first century. Based on the writings of some of the more vocal late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century academically trained Orthodox thinkers—including university professors who earned their doctoral degrees in Russia's theological academies and taught in Russia's secular universities—this essay examines modern Orthodox views on the topics of theology, higher education, and the secular university, as well as faith and scholarship (*nauka*)⁶ in the critical decades before the cataclysmic events of 1917.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Tracing its roots to the reign of Peter the Great in the early eighteenth century, the modern university in Russia was from its inception a secular institution.⁷ Prior to this time, higher education in Russia was the domain of the church, centered in Moscow's Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy (est. 1685), which had been established primarily by monastic scholars trained in Kiev's Kiev-Mohyla Academy (est. 1632). Motivated by a practical need for native specialists in the natural sciences, history, and law, and by an Enlightenment-inspired desire to lead Russia out of "the depths of ignorance,"⁸ Russia's eighteenth-century emperors and empresses oversaw the establishment of Russia's first state institutions of higher education: the Academic University under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg in 1724 (and St. Petersburg University in 1819) and Moscow University in 1755. Initial plans, including one that Emperor Peter I commissioned from the well-known German philosopher and mathematician G. W. Leibniz (1646–1716), envisioned a theological faculty alongside medical and juridical ones, similar to the structure of German universities. In the end, however, until the nineteenth century, theology—in contrast to mandatory catechetical courses which were retained purely "for show," as one nineteenth-century Orthodox theologian noted⁹—remained relegated to the "spiritual domain," the church, which was considered outside the boundaries of Russia's secular university system.¹⁰ In 1748, the highly revered chemist, physicist, and poet Mikhail Lomonosov noted that Russia's universities should have three faculties—law, medicine, and philosophy—with the fourth faculty characteristic of the German university model—theology—remaining under the administration of the highest administrative organ of Russia's Orthodox church, the Holy Synod. In large part, the rationale for segregating theology from the state university environment stemmed from the fact that Russia's first university professors were largely Europeans and were therefore perceived "outsiders" to Orthodoxy.¹¹ In an effort not to compromise the Orthodox faith, Empress Catherine the Great (1729–96) confirmed this arrangement in 1786, stating that theological faculties were not to be included in universities since the "teaching of theology is conferred to spiritual

[church-administered] schools."¹² Somewhat unwittingly, from its beginning, therefore, unlike the medieval European university and its modern Protestant counterpart in Germany's universities (in which theology remained integral to the university system because of state interest in training ministers),¹³ the secular academic world of eighteenth-century Russia largely marginalized Orthodox theology.

The initial attempts at seeding a European-based system of university education in Russia were slow to bear fruit largely because of the difficulty of securing qualified native professorial staffing and a lack of students. At the end of the eighteenth century, for instance, fewer than one hundred students were enrolled at Moscow University at a given time, and the number of graduates in some years was fewer than ten.¹⁴ In the beginning of the nineteenth century, during the reign of Alexander I, the state embarked on a series of educational reforms, clearing the way for the rapid development of a centralized higher educational system which saw universities open in ten cities in the Russian empire by 1900, only two of which were located in central Russia proper (St. Petersburg and Moscow).¹⁵ Parallel reforms in the Orthodox Church in the early nineteenth century resulted in the establishment of its four theological academies (St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kazan, and Kiev), thereby further reinforcing the development of two parallel educational worlds: the "faith-based" and the "secular."

Given such an arrangement, by the early twentieth century many professors of Orthodox theology (as well as of other related university-taught subjects such as church history) observed that they lacked the living engagement with society the university provided. While university reforms during the nineteenth century (1804, 1835, 1863, and 1884) were accompanied by attempts to integrate the study of Orthodoxy (theology, church history, canon law) into the university curriculum, these attempts were often motivated by state officials' political concerns in the face of unrest in Europe, growing anti-ecclesiastical sentiments, the influence of philosophical and scientific materialism, and a resulting growth of religious doubt. As historian Victoria Frede has recently argued, such intellectual and philosophical dispositions frequently reflected modes of personal resistance to and emancipation from the often humiliating hierarchical and bureaucratic nature of the institutional church.¹⁶ The estab-

lishment in 1819 of a permanent chair in theology and Christian studies (*Bogopoznanie i khristianskoe uchenie*) in Moscow University and the introduction of a mandatory, general Orthodox education course for university students from all faculties were, in part, a means to curb student unrest;¹⁷ similarly, during his tenure as minister of education (1833–49), Count Sergey Uvarov linked Orthodoxy with the notions of "Autocracy" and "Nationality" as those "principles that constitute the unique character of Russia," and which should be included in the system of education in order to thwart the spread of the "destructive concepts" spreading throughout Europe.¹⁸ Consequently, during the first half of the nineteenth century, Orthodoxy's public image was largely formed by state interests rather than by the inherent nature of the subject as a field of historical, cultural, or philosophical inquiry.¹⁹

Such state-motivated attempts to impart a religious quality to Russia's university education in the first half of the nineteenth century were short-lived, and many of Russia's academic theologians ultimately criticized them for undermining Orthodoxy in the eyes of university students and faculty.²⁰ Increasingly aware of their marginalization, the often negative image of the institutional church in Russian society, and modernity's unrelenting challenges to religious faith, many of Russia's trained academic thinkers began actively discussing the prospects of teaching Orthodoxy (and Orthodox theology in particular) in universities on their own terms. Concerned with growing indifference toward and rejection of Orthodoxy, in 1865, Russia's minister of public education, Aleksander Golovnin, appealed to the priest Nikolai Sergievskii (1827–92), professor of theology at Moscow University and graduate of Moscow Theological Academy, to raise the standards of the teaching of Orthodoxy in universities. In response, Sergievskii set out to Kiev, Odessa, Kharkov, Kazan, and St. Petersburg in order to confer with his counterparts regarding their views on the place of theology in the university curriculum.²¹ Despite its initiation by government officials, this report marks the beginnings of reflection among academic theologians and hierarchs concerning the topic of theology, faith, and the secular university in late imperial Russia.

Two decades later, following Russia's revolution of 1905, academically trained Orthodox thinkers began to consider the subject of Orthodoxy, higher education, and the university in a more sustained and

committed fashion. This was a moment when social and political pressures finally pushed the Orthodox Church to embark on an in-depth examination of all facets of its institutional life with hopes of major reform—a decadelong process that culminated in the All-Russia Council of 1917–18. In 1906, the issue of Orthodoxy and the university was raised in preconciliar meetings as part of a broader discussion of Russia's theological academics.²² Throughout this period—from the 1860s to 1917—Russia's thriving theological journals regularly featured articles devoted to the more theoretical and philosophical aspects of this issue, considering topics such as religion and science, faith and knowledge, Christianity and modernity, and “secular scholarship” (*svetskaiia nauka*) and religious (particularly Orthodox) literacy.

THE SECULAR UNIVERSITY AND ORTHODOX THEOLOGY

In his 1897 inaugural address at Kiev University, professor of theology and priest Pavel Svetlov (1861–1945) observed what many academically trained Orthodox thinkers had long considered a truism: although technically a subject of study, Orthodox theology was virtually invisible in the university curriculum. Reviewing a brochure about the university, he noted that among the wide array of disciplines and fields of study representing the realms of knowledge open to students, theology—representative of religious knowledge—was conspicuously absent.²³ Orthodox academics offered various explanations for this lack of serious attention given to the study of theology in the curriculum. Sergei Glagolev, a professor of theology at Moscow Theological Academy, who in 1900 became vice president of the International Congress of the History of Religions, noted that all attempts to blame such indifference on influences from the “rotting West” were misguided at best, if not “rubbish.” “Nowhere as in Russia,” he observed, “is there such a sharp turning away from [the study of] theology.”²⁴ Other Orthodox academics agreed. The problem was not merely modern skepticism, doubt, and the rise of unbelief, but a parallel growing interest in religion and spirituality among Russia's educated elite that bypassed Orthodox Christianity.

Academic theologians sought explanations for this phenomenon within both university and ecclesiastical environments. The teaching

about Orthodoxy in Russia's universities, in their estimation, suffered because of the organization of the university curriculum. Reflecting the modern impulse for rationalization and differentiated spheres of activity and knowledge so aptly described by Max Weber,²⁵ the university curriculum classified and divided knowledge, including history, into separate, seemingly isolated spheres—economic, intellectual, and political. The scientific method, argued Sergei Glagolev, often belied inherent organic links and interrelationships that existed in nature and history; narrow specialization constricted the scope of learning, often promoting understandings of the world that bore little resemblance to the workings of nature and history in their totality.²⁶ Moreover, Pavel Svetlov argued, the current positioning of theology in the university setting contributed to its unfavorable image. Since it did not have its own faculty, but was rather part of an interdisciplinary department that served all university faculties (e.g., the faculty of physical and mathematical sciences; the faculty of ethics and philosophy), pedagogically theology appeared forced upon the curriculum as a bothersome “parasite.”²⁷

Furthermore, Orthodox theologians claimed that insofar as university education was increasingly understood in light of professional advancement and material gain, an appreciation of knowledge for knowledge's sake was difficult to nourish and establish. Learning and education were similar to an “industry,” observed Petr Linitiskii (1839–1906), professor of philosophy at the Kazan Theological Academy.²⁸ Students and scholars mined resources and material “facts,” and then produced knowledge according to often unspecified organizational principles, especially in the humanities.²⁹ Driven primarily by students' professional considerations and ambitions, the university threatened to become little more than a commercial institution.³⁰ In such a climate, theology as a subject of study held little appeal, seemingly unable to offer students any practical training or career opportunities.

Academic theologians also noted that in the face of science—“the idol of our age”³¹—theology was generally relegated to the realm of metaphysics. Considered “purely speculative” and based on “empty abstractions,” it could find no home in the modern university built on the foundations of empirically grounded knowledge and rationally informed and deduced philosophical systems.³² Dismissing theology and religion as “unscientific” and “unscholarly,” students bypassed them as superfluous,

if not harmful insofar as they might detract from free thought.³³ Students who remained believers, in turn, found their intellectual and spiritual energies unnaturally divided in the university context between “two faiths,” academic and religious—faiths that “modern minds” treated as fundamentally incompatible. In this environment, observed Ioann Filevskii (1865–1925), professor of theology at Kharkov University and graduate of Kiev Theological Academy, a unified person is transformed into “a strange spectacle of incessant internal struggle and unrelenting hostility among essential needs and sensibilities,” prefiguring a sensibility that would often accompany what in the American academy came to be known as “methodological secularization.”³⁴

Some of Russia's academic Orthodox thinkers turned to the institutional church, in addition to the university's intellectual climate, to explain the antipathy toward and indifference to the study of theology. Sergei Glagolev, who taught at the Moscow Theological Academy and who, following the Bolshevik Revolution, was executed for counterrevolutionary activity, noted that given the ideals and search for truth that often motivate young adults, the theological academy should, in theory, attract the best and brightest young minds. In reality, it was the institution that Russia's youth avoided most. The reason, Glagolev argued, stemmed from the way in which “truth” was presented in theological academies, which demanded no exertion of energy or quest from students. Their only task was to learn and “preserve” existing views and practices in the name of tradition. “Instead of the great role of prophets,” maintained Glagolev, “students are given the humble, yet dubious role of a constable.” Though he added that “to guard well was an honorable task,” such “guarding” in the context he knew was tantamount to making theology a “dead task.”³⁵

In Russia's universities, on the other hand, some of its academically trained Orthodox thinkers considered the subject “deadened” primarily by its association with the state, which often sought to capitalize on Orthodoxy as a common ideological, identity-forming idiom in order to stave off potentially threatening “foreign influences.” For this reason, students routinely turned a deaf ear to the subject. As one anonymous author wrote in 1862, there is no surer way to undermine Orthodox thought and lessen its credibility among educated members of society than by har-

nessing it to a political or social service role. Arguing against imposing a “pious coloring” to the arts and sciences for the primary purpose of securing political and social order, the author maintained that academic learning and scholarship can bear fruit only when it is conducted independently, free of ulterior motives.³⁶ Furthermore, some academically trained theologians such as the priest Mikhail Pavlovskii, professor of theology in Novorossiisk University for forty years (1838–78), approached the teaching of Orthodoxy from a moral-theological standpoint with the aim of character formation; others, however, such as Nikolai Sergievskii, opposed pitching the teaching of Orthodoxy in this fashion since, in his estimation, it constituted a pastoral enterprise that belonged in churches.³⁷

More troublesome for some Orthodox academics was the fact that the study of Orthodoxy was mandatory. In addition to reinforcing Orthodoxy's association with the state, the requirement led to the perception of the course as little more than an advanced course in catechism, which was already an obligatory subject of study in secondary school. Because Orthodoxy was a required course, argued the highly esteemed scientist and physician Nikolai Pirogov (1810–81) in 1863, its academic integrity as a subject of study was undermined. Moreover, he reminded his readers, not only would students learn nothing new in a catechetical presentation of Orthodoxy, but they would bring to these mandatory courses the critical mind-set they were developing in their other studies. As a result, when taught in such a fashion, the study of Orthodoxy would potentially feed the very skepticism and doubt with regard to faith that its teaching was meant to deflect.³⁸ In his comments on the dangers of a simplistic, catechetical presentation of Orthodoxy on the university level, Nazarii Favorov (1820–97), professor of theology at the University of Kiev, emphasized the otherwise sophisticated modes of thinking and advanced forms of knowledge to which university-aged students were introduced. By keeping the study of religion and Orthodoxy at a simplistic level, the university would leave its students intellectually unchallenged and more likely to dismiss their faith as superficial and naïve.³⁹

While Orthodox theology was technically taught in universities, Orthodox thinkers remained troubled by its status in the curriculum, by prevailing judgments concerning it as a discipline, and by the level of its teaching. While on the one hand these thinkers looked to the organization

of the university curriculum, the reigning philosophical disposition toward empiricism and positivism, and the guiding principles of the modern scientific method to explain the indifference (if not hostility) toward the study of Orthodoxy, on the other hand they also looked to their own theological academy circles and some of their colleagues' views of the "secular world." If students of history and literature in universities might have had an in-depth knowledge of Russian folktales but had never read the Bible, in theological academies, faculty often operated within a mindset that considered secular literature "inappropriate," if not sinful, for spiritual life.⁴⁰ Consequently, if widespread knowledge of Orthodoxy was to move beyond "the latest scandals and gossip about a particular priest,"⁴¹ then the place and teaching of Orthodoxy in the university curriculum needed to be rethought.

TEACHING ABOUT ORTHODOX THEOLOGY IN A UNIVERSITY SETTING

Reflecting on the prevailing biases against teaching about Orthodox theology in Russia's universities, the well-known priest Alexander Ivantsov-Platonov (1835–94), a graduate of the Moscow Theological Academy and well-respected professor of church history at Moscow State University, observed that professors of theology in Russia's universities faced dilemmas that fellow faculty members did not. Among the most pressing of these concerns, he felt, was the incessant need to defend the "right" of their subject matter to exist as a scholarly enterprise within the university.⁴² Pavel Svetlov, a priest and professor of theology at Kiev University, suggested that the least his university colleagues might do is operate according to the legal principle *audiatur et altera pars*, which states that a person should not be judged without a fair hearing.⁴³

Russia's academic Orthodox thinkers usually began their defense of theology's place in the university curriculum by stating their perceived goal of a university education, which inevitably drew on the theme of unity—a hallmark of nineteenth-century Russian religious philosophy, the immediate roots of which stemmed from the thought of Aleksei Khomiakov (1804–60), Ivan Kireevskii (1806–56), Sergei Soloviev

(1820–79), and Sergei Trubetskoi (1820–79). According to the priest Aleksei Preobrazhenskii (1875–1920), a professor of homiletics at Kazan Theological Academy and later professor at Saratov University, the university fostered learning which, in contrast to specialized, vocational schools, embraced "the totality of knowledge available to humans."⁴⁴ Genuine knowledge, in his estimation, consisted of rational development of an "integral consciousness" (*tsel'noe soznanie*), rather than fragmented knowledge resulting from the systematic classification and specialization the contemporary sciences demanded. Truly educated persons, argued Preobrazhenskii, are those who are aware of themselves not only as individuals, but primarily as members of the human race, "the spirit of which . . . has not become entangled in the loopholes of [a person's] own anthill in which the light of science and knowledge shines only through the narrow window of their specialization."⁴⁵ In an attempt to distinguish between forms of erudition, Sergei Glagolev juxtaposed the notion of scholarly learnedness (*uchebnost'*)—which he understood as a narrow, specialized form of knowledge—with education (*obrazovanie*), a more expansive breadth of knowledge.⁴⁶

According to the priest Timofei Burkevich (1854–1925), a graduate of the Moscow Theological Academy and professor of theology at Kharkov University, the quest for what Pavel Svetlov referred to as an "integrated worldview" (*tsel'noe mirovozzrenie*) was a sacred task from an Orthodox anthropological standpoint. In Burkevich's estimation, humans are rational and free beings capable of limitless intellectual and moral development. Insofar as education—including the study of the natural sciences and other "secular" subjects—contributed to the development of a person's reason and capacity for compassion by facilitating lifelong service to others, it ranked among the highest means of serving God.⁴⁷

Given the premise that the university ideal was to help foster an integrated worldview, academic Orthodox thinkers argued that no form of knowledge—including theological knowledge—should be excluded from its curriculum. A university curriculum without offerings in theology, from this perspective, remained incomplete. Arguing for the integrity of theology as a scholarly subject worthy of academic study in its own right, many of Russia's Orthodox academic theologians insisted on the symbiotic relationship between faith, knowledge, and science. Highlighting

its relevance and perceived urgency, the topic of the relationship between faith, learning, and academic and scientific knowledge was the subject of numerous essays in Russia's theological journals during this period.⁴⁸ University professors of theology (who also often served as university chaplains) addressed the topic in sermons as well.⁴⁹ In a sermon delivered in 1908, professor of theology at Kharkov University Ioann Filevskii, for instance, countered the stereotypical modern view that faith would cease to be a reality in the life of a genuinely learned person. Examining what he saw as the inherent relationship between faith and education, he stated that "faith preserves and realizes the ideal of knowledge and dispels faint-heartedness." "Illuminating the boundaries of intellectual activity," he noted, "[faith] rouses a thirst for knowledge, [as well as] deepens and clarifies interest in research. . . . Faith accompanies knowledge on all steps of its development."⁵⁰

According to Pavel Svetlov, while people might differ in their evaluation of the theoretical and practical value of religious knowledge, to remove its study and critical examination from the university curriculum was to "distort reality," if for the simple reason that to do so was to ignore the role it had played universally and historically in personal and social human development. As Nikolai Sergievskii argued, religion and theology constituted not merely subjects of intellectual curiosity, but also "an internal living indelible need of all humans."⁵¹ For Svetlov, as for Sergievskii and Preobrazhenskii before him, theology offered a unifying link that helped to harmonize and synthesize the otherwise fragmented realms of knowledge.

Given their convictions regarding the symbiotic relationship between faith and knowledge and religion and science, many of Russia's Orthodox academic theologians argued that conflicts between these spheres of learning were often the product of prevailing misconceptions of both faith and science. Orthodox theologians, in their estimation, had historically contributed to these tensions no less than secular intellectuals; they, too, had promoted "inauthentic views" of both realms of knowledge.⁵² In order to overcome some of these misconceptions and mutual prejudices—and to establish theology (and religion) as a viable and respected "scientific" discipline—it was imperative that the subject be properly framed for the university context. Only in this way would students be given the

freedom to evaluate, then accept or reject, various "truths" responsibly. Otherwise, students might reject what they simply did not know.

For this reason, those Orthodox academics who understood the university environment emphasized the fact that not every graduate of a theological academy was well suited for teaching about Orthodoxy in the university. Candidates who filled these positions, they argued, must be carefully chosen since, as Pavel Svetlov pointed out, a secular university environment demands more from a professor of theology than a faith-based theological academy. In a secular setting, a professor of theology stands alone to navigate an environment often highly critical of his subject matter.⁵³ Other professors emphasized that a nonconfrontational temperament and flexibility with respect to gauging an audience were critical for an instructor's success. Vasilii Dobrotvorskii (1822–94), professor of theology at Kharkov University, maintained that if teaching is viewed as a process of scaffolding, such a process cannot proceed in a productive fashion before the builder assesses the foundation on which the edifice is to be constructed. In the case of the teaching about religion, this would involve taking the time to address prevailing misconceptions and prejudices that might prevent a student's productive engagement with the subject matter.⁵⁴

Some authors spoke about the importance of presenting Orthodoxy in light of contemporary social, philosophical, and ethical questions and concerns in the university setting.⁵⁵ Vasilii Dobrotvorskii, for instance, argued that professors of theology would do better not to approach their subject matter in confessional terms but to pay more attention to religion in general, and to Christianity in particular, in light of prevailing ideological, philosophical, and scientific trends.⁵⁶ Others considered the necessity of teaching theology in terms of basic religious literacy to help correct widespread ignorance about Orthodoxy among members of educated society.⁵⁷ Still others emphasized that the subject deserved attention simply due to Orthodoxy's importance in the lives of millions of Russia's citizens. Otherwise, its conspicuous absence in the university curriculum would promote a cultural divide and disassociate the university from the realities of the society in which students lived. As one author argued, whether or not an educated person believed in the subject matter was secondary. Even those educated people who felt compelled to "root out" religion

could do so effectively only if armed with knowledge about what they were attempting to eradicate. For such students, the study of Orthodoxy could be justified as a principle of effective warfare: "know your enemy."⁵⁸

While Orthodox academic theologians rarely discussed particular curricular issues, Pavel Svetlov offered his ideas on how Orthodoxy might best be presented and examined in a secular university context. First, he considered it imperative to dispel the view of theology as a system of speculative truths. Christianity, he argued, was not a teaching based on a system of ideas, but rather on a series of historical events. Gospel texts, he argued, bore witness to and offered an interpretation of those events. Accordingly, the study of Christianity involved primarily the history of how those events had been, and continue to be, interpreted. Second, while a historical approach should lie at the foundation of the study of Christianity, Svetlov argued that Christianity is also an experiential phenomenon that informs believers' understanding of life, interpretation of events, and actions. Approaching "Christian knowledge" in this twofold manner—as historical and as "lived"—would enable the topic to be approached empirically and, therefore, accepted as a "science" in the university curriculum.⁵⁹

The university became a subject of particular interest in Orthodox debates about higher education in the early twentieth century, during various deliberations and commissions that met in preparation for the All-Russia Council that finally convened in 1917–18. During this period, moderates such as Nikolai Glubokovskii (1863–1937), professor of New Testament at St. Petersburg Theological Academy, and progressives such as Pavel Svetlov argued for the establishment of theological faculties within Russia's universities. Maintaining that theology could and should be pursued as a subject as any other, some academic theologians saw the university as the best place for its academic study and cultivation. Those such as Glubokovskii argued that theological thought and teaching in the academies was constrained by institutional ecclesiastical interests, and in particular by the main task of training clergy. The university, on the other hand, would provide scholars with an open forum in which to engage in theological reflection and to cultivate theological responses to contemporary issues. Without such a free space, Glubokovskii maintained, theology in Russia would remain isolated from the broader social, political, and philosophical intellectual currents.⁶⁰

Inspired in large part by the idea of a free and autonomous context for the development of Orthodox thought, the priest Pavel Svetlov went even further than Glubokovskii during the debates of the preconciliar commission. He boldly proposed that Russia's theological academies be closed and incorporated into Russia's universities as separate faculties of theology. If theological education exists for the good of the church, he reasoned, then burying that education in Russia's marginalized academies defeated its purpose. The closed world of Russia's theological academies resulted in their social marginalization and in a certain intellectual parochialism and perceived scholasticism that left them unresponsive to the contemporary demands of culture and society. In Svetlov's estimation, the academies did not provide the proper conditions for Orthodox thinkers to engage the challenges of modernity effectively. Within the academies, he insisted, "learning and scholarship [*nauka*] enjoyed no freedom and never could." In such an environment, he provocatively argued, the Orthodox Church remained "without a living witness to Christian truth."⁶¹ Agreeing with Glubokovskii that the primary purpose of the theological academies was to train clergy and cadres to fill various ecclesiastical bureaucratic positions, Svetlov concluded that they lacked the dedication to scholarship as a primary goal.⁶²

Moreover, Svetlov maintained, theological academies could not provide the best environment to nurture free thinking because of their institutional subordination, be it to the local bishop or to the Holy Synod. Knowledge and education in this highly monitored context were merely a means, not an end. In universities, on the other hand, Orthodox thinkers would be forced to engage with colleagues from a wide range of disciplines, including the natural sciences. Such interaction would ensure that Orthodox thought remained "relevant" and Orthodoxy a living faith.⁶³

Professor Ivan Popov (1867–1938), a graduate of the Moscow Theological Academy who taught simultaneously at the Academy and at Moscow University, agreed with Svetlov's evaluation of the dangers associated with the marginalization of theological academies from the broader secular academic world. Such marginalization, in his estimation, resulted in the academies being severed from knowledge of other subjects and disciplines, and, therefore, from the holistic learning context so central to a theologian's work. Consequently, Orthodox thinkers risked remaining ignorant about certain topics—especially the natural and social sciences—

on which they wrote;⁶⁴ such negligence, then, undermined the credibility of their thought. As they stood at the time, the church's schools of higher theological education were simply not staffed with the academic specialists needed to provide foundational coursework for students of theology whose vocation was to write on particularly pressing issues. In Popov's estimation, therefore, linking or combining theological academies with universities would ultimately enrich and invigorate Orthodox thought.⁶⁵ Popov also agreed with Glubokovskii's and Svetlov's observations that academic standards in the theological academies were often sacrificed to address immediate church institutional, political, and social concerns. For instance, Popov related an episode in which a student was denied a master's degree for questioning the historicity of certain lives of saints; the Orthodox hierarch who reviewed the work, Popov recalled, had argued that such a claim was impermissible in light of traditions deeply held by believers. If academies were to be retained at all, Popov urged that students take courses at universities as part of their academy training in order to supplement their biblical, patristic, and theological course of study with courses from other disciplines that would leave them more broadly and publicly conversant.⁶⁶

COUNTERPOINTS

Not all of Russia's academically trained Orthodox thinkers during the second half of the nineteenth and the early twentieth century supported the teaching of Orthodox theology as an academic subject in Russia's universities, or the attempts to "harmonize" its teaching with that of other subjects. The bishop of Smolensk, Ioann Sokolov (1818–69), a member of an 1850 special committee to review the teaching of philosophy and theology in institutions of higher education, for instance, argued that Orthodox theology should remain a subject of study primarily in the domain of Russia's theological seminaries and academies. A graduate of the Moscow Theological Academy, a monk, and a renowned expert in canon law, Bishop Ioann argued in 1866 that because of the university's academic requirements, the teaching of theology in universities would necessarily be superficial. Nothing could be more detrimental to the integrity of the-

ology, he maintained, than "dilettantism." Given that dilettantes often considered themselves experts and presented themselves accordingly, such "dabbling" with respect to theology was worse than simple ignorance. In his estimation, only faith-based schools of higher education—namely, the theological academies—were equipped to provide the proper foundation for the study of theology. Seeing no academic value in the teaching of theology in the university, the bishop supported the teaching of religion in universities exclusively for the purpose of moral and ethical formation. Otherwise, a university education would consist of "propaganda of knowledge without spirit and enlightenment without morality."⁶⁷

During debates over the reform of theological academies some forty years later, during the critical post-1905 period, those who opposed the establishment of faculties of theology in Russia's universities, especially in lieu of the established Orthodox theological academies, did so on the premise that Orthodox thinking cut off from an institutional church context would lose its essential "ecclesiality" (*tserkovnost'*).⁶⁸ Some members of the preconciliar commission also argued that theological faculties at universities would be subject to secular administrative oversight, posing challenges for members of the theological faculty, whose curricular efforts and subject matter would be continually challenged by a "secular spirit."⁶⁹ Others argued that the church's hierarchs would in any case oppose such a rearrangement, and secular universities would oppose it since the church would insist upon oversight of such faculties.⁷⁰ Despite Sokolov's impassioned plea that Orthodoxy "rests on faith, grace, and the freedom of conscience" and not on "hierarchical control and censorship,"⁷¹ many members of the preconciliar commission agreed that the ideal (and potentially most realistic) arrangement would include an eventual coexistence of newly established university faculties of theology alongside the already established Orthodox theological academies.

In the end, no member of the preconciliar commission's working group on religious education supported Svetlov's proposal that Russia's Orthodox theological academies be folded into university faculties of theology. Members of the preconciliar commission, however, supported the basic premise that Orthodox theology could not constructively respond to the demands of modernity without engaging "secular" subjects of study, as well as the view that theological academies should be places of

independent research and development of both theological and humanistic disciplines. They thus began to consider the extent to which "secular subjects" should be taught in theological academies.⁷² For instance, theologian and church historian Ivan Popov argued that literature should be a mandatory subject within the theological academic curriculum since it offered those preparing for pastoral service an understanding of contemporary social and cultural trends, as well as insights into the psychological world of their contemporaries.⁷³ V. S. Serbrenikov (b. 1862), one of the founders of experimental psychology in Russia and a graduate of and professor at St. Petersburg Theological Academy, advocated strongly for the teaching of mathematics and physics in Russia's theological academies, maintaining that students at the St. Petersburg school could not possibly engage or work in the field of modern philosophy without strong grounding in these subjects.⁷⁴ The priest A. P. Rozhdestvenskii (1865–1930), in turn, made a general plea for the teaching of "secular" disciplines in order that through them students would be able to shed "theological light" on life and subsequently develop the skill of developing these secular realms of knowledge in a Christian spirit.⁷⁵ For such Orthodox thinkers, to remain a living mode of apprehension, "ecclesial knowledge" could not and should not be segregated from contemporary culture and the wide array of disciplines that had come to constitute higher education in secular universities.

Many members of the preconcliar commission were not, in theory, opposed to the establishment of theological faculties in secular universities that would coexist alongside theological academies. Some, such as Ivan Popov, however, considered it a better option to offer university students free access to courses taught at the theological academies. Perhaps the most articulate and forward-looking argument for the establishment of theological faculties in secular universities in addition to traditional theological academies was that made by Mikhail Posnov (1873–1931), a biblicalist and church historian who taught at Kiev Theological Academy and, for a time, at Kiev University. Responding in large part to the 1906 decision by a commission of university professors to abolish the teaching of theology in Russia's universities, Posnov maintained that theological faculties in universities and the church's theological academies had markedly distinct functions. Indeed, Posnov advocated a diversification of aca-

demix contexts for the teaching of Orthodox theology, which, in addition to secular universities, would include reorganizing theological academies into two types: for those of monastic leanings and for those not interested in pursuing a monastic path.⁷⁶ In his estimation, this diversification in theological education would lend itself to a creative competition among the different schools, stimulating thought and Orthodoxy's living engagement with pressing contemporary issues.

Posnov was a particular advocate of the teaching of religion (which, for him, included theology) in secular universities. The 1906 decision of university professors to exclude the teaching of Orthodoxy from the university curriculum, in his estimation, was shortsighted and academically unsound. Academics' defense of the university's "a-confessionalism," in his view, was disingenuous, since the methodological positivism that informed modern scholarship was no less a form of confessionalism.⁷⁷ Posnov challenged the conventional modern view that faith by definition was antithetical to scientific knowledge. Faith, or "confessionalism," in his view, simply offered another perspective on a particular religious tradition (in this case, Christianity); it offered one among several "types" of appropriation of Christianity. "Only an extremely crude understanding [of religion], he maintained, "could reduce religious faith to the sum of dogmas, canons, and rituals."⁷⁸ Arguing against such positivist parochialism, Posnov—who might be seen as an early advocate for the discipline of religious studies—claimed that no university education could be academically sound without taking into account the formative influence of Christianity (and religion more broadly speaking) in human history. The task of the university was to introduce those students who were interested, whatever their own religious convictions might be, not only to this history, but to the ideas and philosophical and theological questions that informed Christian worldviews. Accordingly, Posnov favored folding the study of Orthodoxy into a curriculum that focused on the study of Christianity more broadly. Such a context would provide the optimal environment for discussion and debate, in turn stimulating specifically Orthodox thought, which, he believed, should develop and evolve as any other realm of human knowledge.⁷⁹

Anticipating the opposition to his views among some of his church colleagues, Posnov dismissed as a form of sacrilege any fears of the

university's potential corrupting influence on Orthodoxy (or any religious faith). Such fears testified not only to a seeming distrust of the power of faith, Posnov maintained, but also to an improper dualistic understanding of church and world, Christianity and culture.⁸⁰ Posnov criticized both university and ecclesiastical disregard for the interest in religion among Russia's educated elite, pointing especially to the thought of such luminaries of Russian religious thought as Vladimir Soloviev, Sergei Trubetskoi, Nikolai Berdyaev, and the work of the St. Petersburg religious-philosophical society. Although often working independently from the church, Posnov claimed that the teaching of theology in Russia's secular universities would help facilitate dialogue between church and society and, in the end, foster cultural cohesion.

PAST DEBATES, CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

Debates over Orthodoxy and higher education in the decades before the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution reflect an array of issues and concerns which remain relevant not only to post-Soviet Russia, but also to Orthodox Christianity more globally, as its adherents consider the relationships between faith and knowledge, religion, theology, and the university. These debates, along with the history of the university and the theological academy in Russia, provide historical insight into modern Orthodox thinking about religion, theology, and higher education, which helps to contextualize questions concerning Orthodoxy and higher education both in recent decades in the West and in post-Soviet Russia.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, many of Russia's academically trained Orthodox scholars were highly committed to their vocations and sought to incorporate Orthodox theology and the study of Orthodoxy into the university curriculum. Their efforts, however, were often stymied by the perceived ambiguous position they occupied between the "secular" and "ecclesial." Students and university colleagues often viewed these scholars as outsiders because of their ties to the state church; members of the institutional church, in turn—especially its hierarchy—often underestimated or overlooked these scholars' academic efforts as a result of their teaching in secular universities and, therefore,

generally favored appointing ordained clergy to university positions in order to reinforce their institutional bonds to the church and to enable their service as university chaplains.

This paradoxical position of theology as a subject of study in secular universities has emerged once again in post-Soviet Russia.⁸¹ While Orthodoxy in post-Soviet Russia has enjoyed successes with the establishment of more than a half dozen faith-based universities and institutes, not all of which are subsidized by the Russian Orthodox Church, the teaching of Orthodox theology in secular universities has seen a more troubled trajectory.⁸² In 1993, almost immediately following the fall of communism, the Russian government unilaterally—without consulting church officials—embraced the idea of reaching about Orthodoxy (which, at the time, was widely perceived as symbolic of free thought) in Russia's secular universities. Although such initiatives initially met little resistance, the issue eventually garnered widespread attention—as the 2007 open letter of ten academics from Russia's Academy of Sciences quoted at the outset of this essay demonstrates—and reflected the cultural wars in which post-Soviet society became embroiled. Those opposed to the establishment of these faculties viewed them as a flagrant violation of Russia's constitutional separation of church and state and little more than another power play by the Moscow Patriarchate. The establishment of a faculty of theology at Russia's premier National Research Nuclear University in 2012 in particular resulted in a wave of heated public debate, which followed student protests regarding the placement of a cross in a central location on the campus two years earlier.⁸³ The Ministry of Education's decision in September 2015 to include theology (*teologiya*) in its list of academic disciplines for which doctoral degrees may be awarded by Russia's secular universities did not settle the matter.⁸⁴

Perhaps the most significant legacy that Russia's early twentieth-century academic theologians left was their virtually unanimous view that as long as Orthodoxy was associated with the state, its teaching in secular universities would be understood as little more than a politically driven ideology, and would only serve to impede the free, creative thought that a living faith demands. The character of the Moscow Patriarchate's foray into the public sphere since the fall of communism has once again led many of Russia's educated elite to dismiss the teaching of theology in

Russia's secular universities as little more than ideological indoctrination and hegemonic identity formation parallel to that of Marxist-Leninist philosophy during the Soviet era.⁸⁵ The Moscow Patriarchate's arguments about the curricular relevance and strategic "cultural imperative" of the study of religion and theology (Orthodox, Muslim, Jewish, and Buddhist) in secular institutions has done little to calm opponents' fears of any of the religions' intrusion into the university context. Patriarch Kirill has argued that the cultivation of religious literacy from insiders' points of view in Russia's postatheist society can act as a cultural prophylactic against the spread of religious extremism.⁸⁶ Yet, given the history of church and state relations in Russia, the patriarch's simultaneous advocacy of "cooperation" between the university and the dioceses—of a "social partnership" between the church and secular institutions of higher education—has undetermined his insistence that church officials "in no way seek to interfere in the secular processes of education."⁸⁷

Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century debates concerning the teaching of theology in Russia's secular universities raised a host of concerns regarding the teaching of theology and religion that remain unresolved in contemporary post-Soviet Russia and that still persist in the United States as well. The task of the university, definitions of the secular, methodological approaches to the study and teaching of religion and theology in the secular context, the distinction between religious studies and theology, and debates over the critical "insider"/"outsider" perspectives—all of these issues familiar to scholars of religion and theology in the United States have found a new hearing in post-Soviet Russia.⁸⁸ In an attempt to counter what they believe is an "outsider's," if not atheistic, approach claimed by Russia's new faculties of religious studies, advocates of including theology in the university curriculum have argued that only "insiders" to the various religious traditions can offer students genuine understandings of these worldviews, and, in their estimation, the teaching of theology even in the university context presupposes "insiders."⁸⁹ At the same time, such advocates have also acknowledged differences between professional theological education aimed at the training of clergy and theology as an academic discipline in the university. In order to circumvent charges of proselytizing, Orthodox advocates of theological studies in state universities have drawn a terminological distinction between *teologia*—which they identify as a theology packaged for a secular context meant to

cultivate a religiously informed intelligentsia—and *bogoslovie* (technically also translated as "theology"), a subject reserved specifically for seminaries and theological academies.⁹⁰ Detractors have found this distinction also unconvincing, insisting that the subject matter proposed by the discipline of theology overlaps with that of already established departments of religious studies. In their eyes, the establishment of theology departments—even if inclusive of various religious traditions—is simply a way to subject the faculty in these departments to the institutional oversight of the religions about which they teach, thereby, again, infringing on the autonomy that the university setting is meant to foster and protect.

The late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century debates showed that academically trained Orthodox scholars were not uniform in their thinking on issues concerning Orthodoxy and secular higher education. As with their counterparts in other faith traditions, Russia's Eastern Orthodox believers have historically been a highly diverse group, and, therefore, seeking *the* Orthodox view—then as now—on this and related issues would be futile. In this respect, among the more germane views to emerge from debates regarding Orthodoxy, theology, and the university were those concerning the issue of vocation and the place of the scholar vis-à-vis the institutional church. The majority of Russia's academically trained theologians and scholars were laymen who, not being ordained into the clerical ranks of the church's institutional hierarchy or tonsured monastics, often found themselves marginalized within the ecclesiastical establishment.⁹¹ As Natalia Sukhova, a well-known historian of Orthodoxy and higher education in Russia, has noted, the prevailing sensibility that marked much of the discussion concerning Orthodoxy and higher education during this time period was that the academic, scholarly endeavor was a vocation in its own right; scholars need not be "validated" or "confirmed" by ordination or any other church-related service.⁹² Contemporary Orthodox churches, in contrast, often remain very much focused on ordination and monasticism with respect to defining and evaluating ecclesial vocation, and regard work beyond the institutional ecclesiastical structures as "secular" and somehow a "lesser" vocation in Orthodox terms. The ways in which many of Russia's academically trained thinkers' challenged the ecclesiastical institutional status quo, therefore, remains no less relevant than it was more than a century ago.

NOTES

1. "Politika RPTs: Konsolidatsiia ili razval strany?," *Novina Gazeta. Pribozhenie "Keruar,"* no. 3, July 22, 2007. For an English translation, see "Open Letter to the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir V. Putin from the Members of the Russian Academy of Sciences," *SCPESIS*, http://scpsis.net/eng/articles/id_8.php.
2. The topic of teaching theology in post-Soviet Russia's secular universities dates to 1992. Issues concerning the teaching of religion and theology in institutions of higher education continue to attract attention in Russia. See, for instance, the conference "Theology in Institutions of Higher Education," sponsored by the Moscow Patriarchate in November 2012: "Teologiya v vuzakh: Real'nost' i opaseniia," *Pravoslavie i miir*, November 28, 2012, <http://www.pravmir.ru/teologiya-v-vuzax-realnost-i-opaseniya/>. For the consultation's summary points, see "Itogovoi dokument Patriarshego soveshchaniia 'Teologiya v vuzakh: Vzaimodeistvie Tserkvi, gosudarstva i obshchestva,'" *Patriarchia.ru*, accessed November 1, 2015, <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/2622170.html>. The following year, a conference entitled "Scientific and Religious Cognition of the World" was held in Moscow and cosponsored by both secular and faith-based institutions of higher learning: "Konferentsiia 'Nauchnoe i religioznoe poznanie mira,'" December 1, 2013, *Sreda: issledovatel'skaia sluzhba*, last accessed December 20, 2014, <http://sreda.org/ru/2013/konferentsiya-nauchnoe-i-religioznoe-poznanie-mira/32659>.
3. Cornelia Dean, "Scientists Speak Up on Mix of God and Science," *New York Times*, August 23, 2005.
4. The topic of the teaching of theology in Russia's secular universities has been and continues to be a subject of heated public debate in post-Soviet Russia. For overviews of the issues, see Aleksandr Zhuravskii, "Problemy religioznogo obrazovaniia v Rossii," *Kontinent*, no. 114 (2002); Ivar Kh. Maksuov, "Theology in Higher Education in Post-Soviet Russia (1991–2008)," *Journal of Religion in Europe* 1 (2008): 182–99. For examples of debates, see the televised broadcast "Pravoslavnaiia ensiklopediia," hosted by the well-known Moscow priest Aleksei Uminskii, for September 29, 2007, devoted to the topic of Orthodox and secular knowledge, <http://predanie.ru/uminskii-aleksii-tercy/video/1681-cepkovnaya-i-cverckaya-nayka-2007-09-29/>; see also the discussion regarding knowledge and theology on Radio Free Europe's "From the Christian Point of View," hosted by the priest Yakov Kravov, on August 16, 2007, http://kravov.info/library/17_r/radio_svoiboda/20070816.htm.

5. Paul Valliere, *Modern Russian Theology: Bukharin, Soloviev, Bulgakov, Orthodox Theology in a New Key* (Edinburg: T & T Clark, 2000), 2.
6. While often rendered as "science," the term *nauka* in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russia was used more in line with the German notion of *Wissenschaft*, which referred not only to the natural sciences, but to the systematic pursuit of knowledge more broadly speaking, including subjects which today we would place under the umbrella term "the liberal arts." In this essay, I use this term to refer to this broader notion unless otherwise indicated. Thomas Sanders, "The Chechulin Affair, or Politics and *nauka* in the History Profession of Late Imperial Russia," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 49, no. 1 (2001): 1; Alexander Vucinich, *Science in Russian Culture: A History to 1860* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1963), 47.
7. For the history of the university in Russia in general, and the place of theology in its curriculum more specifically, see, as examples, A. E. Ivanov, *Vysshiaia shkola Rossii v kontse XIX-nachale XX veka* (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1991); Anatolii Avrus, *Istoriia naissikh universitetov* (Moscow: Moskovskii obshchestvennyi i nauchnyi fond, 2001); F. A. Petrov, *Formirovanie sistemy universitetskogo obrazovaniia v Rossii*, 4 vols. (Moscow: Izd-vo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 2002–3); A. N. Domin and V. A. Dines, *Universitetskie reformy v Rossii: Obshchestvennaia mysl' i praktika, vtoraiia polovina XIX v.* (Saratov: Saratovskii gosudarstvennyi sotsial'no ekonomicheskii universitet, 2003); A. Iu. Andreev, *Rossiiskie universitety XVIII-pervoi poloviny XIX veka v kontekste universitetskoj istorii Evropy* (Moscow: Znuk, 2009); Yuri Zaretskii, "The Russian State and Its Universities: A History of the Present," December 1, 2012, Social Science Research Network, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2183616>; N. A. Kutsenko, *Filosofiiia, fiologia, teologia v obrazovatel'noi sisteme Rossiiskoi imperii XIX veka* (Moscow: Institut filosofii RAN, 2013).
8. "Proekt ob uchrezhdenii Moskovskogo universiteta," *Istoriia Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta*, http://museum.gunu.ru/relevit/hahiv/ukaz_24011755/ukaz_24011755.phtml.
9. "O prepodavanii bogoslovskikh nauk v russkikh universitetakh," *Pravoslavnoe obzorenie*, no. 5 (May 1862): 43.
10. For an excellent overview of the history of the teaching of theology in Russia's universities, see Natalia Sukhova, "Bogoslovskie nauki v universitetakh—traditsiia i perspektivy," in N. Iu. Sukhova, *Vertograd nauk dukhovnykh: Sbornik statei po istorii vysshego dukhovnogo obrazovaniia v Rossii XIX-nachala XX veka* (Moscow: Pravoslavnyi Sviato-Tikhonovskii gumanitarnyi universitet, 2007), 326–44.
11. "University Rossii," *Iuridicheskii fakul'tet MGU*, accessed September 30, 2015, <http://www.law.msu.ru/teaching/reference/120>. See also Ol'ga

- Kir'ianova, "Razvitiie bogoslovskogo obrazovaniia—uslovie podlinnogo vozrozhdeniia Rossii," December 25, 2008, Pravoslavie.ru, accessed November 1, 2014, <http://www.ppravoslavie.ru/28819.html>.
12. "O sostavlenii plana dlia zavedeniia universitetov v Pskove, Chernigove i Penze," *Polnoe sobranie zakonov rossiskoi imperii*, Ser. 1 (1830), vol. 22, no. 16,315, 526.
13. Linell E. Cady and Delwin Brown, eds., *Religious Studies, Theology, and the University: Conflicting Maps, Changing Terrain* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002); Gavin D'Costa, "Theology and Religious Studies OR Theology versus Religious Studies?" in *Theology and Religious Studies in Higher Education*, ed. D. L. Bird and Simon G. Smith (London: Continuum International Publishing, 2009), 46–47.
14. P. Miliukov, "Universitet v Rossii," in *Ensiklopedicheskii slovar'*, ed. F. A. Brokhaus and I. A. Efron (St. Petersburg: Brokhaus and Efron, 1902), 68:789. The reaching of Orthodox theology, church history, and canon law saw variations among the various universities, especially between those located in central Russia, such as Moscow and St. Petersburg, and western Baltic regions of the empire, such as Dorpat (Tartu) in Estonia.
15. E. S. Liakhovich and A. S. Revushkin, *Universitety v istorii i kul'ture dorevoliutsionnoi Rossii* (Tomsk: Izdatel'stvo Tomskogo universiteta, 1998), 78.
16. For a history of the phenomenon of unbelief in Russia, see Victoria Frede, *Doubt, Atheism, and the Nineteenth-Century Russian Intelligentsia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2011).
17. Vucinich, *Science in Russian Culture*, 234; A. D. Sukhov, *Literaturno-filosofskie krizhki v istorii Russkoi filosofii (20-50-e gody XIX veka)* (Moscow: IF RAN: 2009), 4.
18. Miliukov, "Universitet v Rossii," 791; M. V. Novikov and T. B. Perfilova, "Reviziiia universitetskogo Ustava 1804," *Iaroslavskii pedagogicheskii vestnik* 1, no. 2 (2012): 11–16.
19. Elena Lebedeva, "I slaven nash Tar'tianin den: V Moskovskom Universitete ne bylo 'bogoslovskogo fakul'teta,' no bogoslovie prepodavalos' ne khuzhchem v universitetakh Evropy," *Moskovskii gosudarstvennyi universitet imeni M. V. Lomonosova*, January 25, 2008, http://www.msu.ru/press/smiaboumsu_archiv_slaven_nash_tatianin_den_v_moskovskom_universitete_ne_blylo_bogoslovskogo_fakul'teta_no_bogoslovie_c.html.
20. *Ibid.*
21. The results of these discussions can be found in N. Sergievskii, "O luchshem ustroistve kafedry bogoslovii v nashikh universitetakh," *Pravoslavnoe obozrenie*, no. 10 (October 1865): 186–216. Raised in a clerical family and trained in the specialty of mathematical physics during his seminary years,
- Nikolai Sergievskii completed graduate training in theology at the Moscow and St. Petersburg Theological Academies. Eventually ordained, he began his career as a parish priest who ministered to the poor before being appointed as professor of theology, logic, and psychology in Moscow University in 1858 and of theology alone in 1861, a position he held for some forty years. He also served as founding editor of the progressive theological journal *Orthodox Review* (*Pravoslavnoe obozrenie*).
22. The history of higher theological education in prerevolutionary Russia—especially its theological academies—has become a subject of broad interest in post-Soviet Russia. For examples, see V. A. Tarasova, *Vysshaiia dukhovnaia shkola v Rossii v konitse XIX-nachale XX veka: Istoriia imperatorskikh pravoslavykh dukhovnykh akademii* (Moscow: Novyi khronograf, 2005); N. Iu Sukhova, *Vertograd nauk dukhovnyi*.
23. P. Svetlov, "Mesto bogoslovii v semi'e universitskikh nauk," *Khristianskoe chenie*, no. 11 (November 1897): 320. Pavel Svetlov was a priest and graduate of Moscow Theological Academy and, beginning in 1897, a professor at Kiev University.
24. S. S. Glagolev, "Zadachi russkoi bogoslovskoi shkoly," *Bogoslovskii vestnik*, no. 11 (November 1905): 413–14.
25. Nicholas Wolterstorff, "Scholarship Grounded in Religion," in *Religion, Scholarship, and Higher Education: Perspectives, Models, and Future Prospects*, ed. Andrea Sterk (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), 3–8; Douglas Jacobsen and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen, *No Longer Invisible: Religion in University Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 94.
26. S. S. Glagolev, "Istina i nauka," *Bogoslovskii vestnik*, no. 12 (December 1908): 503.
27. Svetlov, "Mesto bogoslovii," 323.
28. P. I. Lintskii, "Filosofia nashego vremeni," *Vera i razum*, kn. 2, no. 19, ord. Filosofskii (October 1891): 287.
29. T. Butkevich, "Slovo v den' prepodobnago Antoniiia Velikago: O khristianskikh nachalakh nauchnogo obrazovaniia," *Vera i razum*, kn. 2, ord. Tserkovnyi (January 1903): 67–78.
30. Lintskii, "Filosofia nashego vremeni," 287–304.
31. N. N., "Khristianstvo i noveishaiia nauka," *Sravnik*, no. 19 (October 1903): 558.
32. Sv. A. Ivansov-Platonov, "O predubehdenniiakh liudei protiv bogoslovskikh nauk," *Pravoslavnoe obozrenie*, no. 1 (January 1863): 24; Svetlov, "Mesto bogoslovii," 331. It is noteworthy, however, that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, some two-thirds of professors of philosophy in Russia's secular universities were graduates of one of Russia's four theological academies. Kurzenko, *Filosofia, filologiya, teologiya*, 19.

33. A. F. Preobrazhenskii, "Mesto i znachenie bogoslovie v organizme universitskogo obrazovaniia," *Izvestia imperatorskogo Nikolaiuskogo universiteta* 11, vyp. 1 (Saratov: n.p., 1911): 5.
34. Ioann Filevskii, "Slovo v den' prepodobnago Antonia Velikago o soiuze mezhdu veroiu i naukoii," *Vera i razum*, kn. 2, old. Bogoslovsko-filosofskii (January 1908): 176; George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 156.
35. Glagolev, "Zadachi russkoi bogoslovskoi shkoly," 415–16.
36. "O prepodavanii bogoslovskikh nauk," 34–35.
37. Sergievskii, "O luchshem ustroistve," 190, 204–6.
38. N. I. Pirogov, *Dopolnenie k zamechaniiam na proekt obshchego ustanovleniia imperatorskikh russiiskikh universitetov: Universitetskii vopros* (St. Petersburg, 1863), 326–27, 382–83.
39. Sergievskii, "O luchshem ustroistve," 200–204.
40. S. S. Glagolev, "Otsustvie religioznago obrazovaniia v sovremennom obshchestve," *Bogoslovskii vestnik*, no. 10 (October 1912): 284.
41. "O prepodavanii bogoslovskikh nauk," 42.
42. Ivansov-Platonov, "O predubezhdeniakh liudei," 26.
43. Svetlov, "Mesto bogoslovie," 329.
44. Preobrazhenskii, "Mesto i znachenie," 7–8.
45. *Ibid.*, 10.
46. Glagolev, "Otsustvie religioznago obrazovaniia v sovremennom obshchestve," 276.
47. Burkovich, "Slovo v den' prepodobnago Antonia Velikago," 69–70.
48. For a history of the development of theology as a "science" in Russia, see N. Iu. Sukhova, "Stanovlenie i razvitiie bogoslovskoi nauki v Rossii: Problemy i puti ikh reshenie (vtoraia polovina XIX-nachalo XX v.)," in *Materialy XVII Ezhegodnoi bogoslovskoi konferentsii Pravoslavnogo Sviatogo-Tikhonovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta* (Moscow: PSTGU, 2007), 1:325–35.
49. While the majority of doctoral graduates from Russia's theological academies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were not ordained, professors appointed to teach in Russia's universities were usually chosen from ordained clergy in part for the practical reason that they were also able to serve simultaneously as university chaplains and, in part, to ensure the instructor's accountability vis-à-vis church officials. See, for example, the comment of Germogen, the bishop of Saratov, "Preosviashchennyi Germogen, episkop Saratovskii, 7 January 1906," in *Otzyvy eparchial'nykh arkhierieev po voprosu o tserkonnoi forme* (St. Petersburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1906), 3:356–57.
50. Filevskii, "Slovo v den' prepodobnago Antonia Velikago o soiuze mezhdu veroiu i naukoii," 176.
51. Sergievskii, "O luchshem ustroistve," 190.
52. N. N., "Khrisianstvo i novishaiia nauka," 558.
53. "O prepodavanii bogoslovskikh nauk," 56–57; S. S. Glagolev, "Novoe miroponimanie," *Bogoslovskii vestnik*, no. 1 (January 1911): 3–4.
54. Sergievskii, "O luchshem ustroistve," 204–10.
55. N. Drozdov, "Zaprosy sovremennoi zhizni v otnoshenii k bogoslovskoi nauke," *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, no. 10 (October 1885): 221–24.
56. Sergievskii, "O luchshem ustroistve," 209–10.
57. Glagolev, "Otsustvie religioznago obrazovaniia v sovremennom obshchestve," 295.
58. "O prepodavanii bogoslovskikh nauk," 43.
59. Svetlov, "Mesto bogoslovie," 334–35.
60. N. N. Glubokovskii, "K voprosu o postanovke vysshego bogoslovskago izucheniia v Rossii," in *Otzyvy eparchial'nykh arkhierieev*, 3:159–61.
61. P. Svetlov, "K voprosu o reforme vysshego bogoslovskago obrazovaniia v Rossii," *Zhurnaly i protokoly zasedanii Vysochaishie uchrezhdeniia Predobornago priustviia*, vol. 4, old. 5 (St. Petersburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1906), 48, 51.
62. *Ibid.*, 58–61. It is noteworthy that following Svetlov's impassioned speech with its sometimes radical views at the preconciliar sessions, the theologian and biblical scholar Nikolai Glubokovskii reversed many of his earlier views on the topic of theology and the university and came to the defense of the academies. *Ibid.*, 53–54.
63. *Ibid.*, 47–50.
64. See, for instance, Sergius Bulgakov's argument for the inclusion of the teaching of social sciences in theological academies in S. N. Bulgakov, "O neobkhodimosti vvedeniia obshchestvennykh nauk v programmakh dukhovnoi shkoly," *Bogoslovskii vestnik* 1, no. 2 (1906): 345–56.
65. I. V. Popov, *Zhurnaly i protokoly*, 48–50.
66. *Ibid.*, 49–51.
67. Ioann Sokolov, "O prepodavanii bogoslovie v nashikh universitetakh," *Khristsianskoe chtenie*, no. 2 (February 1866): 141–91.
68. See comments by A. I. Almazov (1859–1920) in *Zhurnaly i protokoly*, 4:47, 67. Almazov was a graduate of Kazan Theological Academy and taught canon law as part of the Faculty of Law at Novorossiisk University in Odessa from 1887 to 1912; in 1912 he was appointed professor of canon law at Moscow University and also taught at the Moscow Theological Academy.
69. See, for example, the comments in *Zhurnaly i protokoly*, 47, by Professor M. A. Ostroumov (1847–1920), a graduate of Moscow Theological Academy and later professor at the same academy before accepting a position at the University of Kharkov; by priest S. T. Golubev (1848–1920), professor at the Kiev

Theological Academy and member of the Russian Academy of Sciences; and by A. I. Almazov. For excellent overviews of the debates concerning reform of Russia's theological academies, which included discussion of the potential for faculties of theology in Russia's secular universities, see Prot. Nikolai Emel'ianov, "Bogoslovie v sisteme znaniiia (po materialam diskusii o vysshem dukhovnom obrazovanii v 1905–1906)," *Vestnik PSTGU* 45, no. 2 (2012): 7–19; N. Iu. Sukhova, "Obuzhdenie problem vysshego bogoslovskogo obrazovania na Pomeznom Sobore 1917–1918," *Vestnik PSTGU*, Istoria, vyp. 4 (25) (2007): 28–45; V. A. Tarasova, "Na pereput'e: Polemika po voprosam reform vysshei dukhovnoi shkoly v Rossii v nachale XX veka," *Vstrecha* 1 (7) (1998): 14–22; Tarasova, *Vyshaiia dukhovnaia shkola*, 297–422.

70. See comments by A. I. Almazov and N. A. Zaozerskii (1851–1919), a graduate and professor at Moscow Theological Academy, in *Zhurnaly i protokoly*, 47, 51. It is noteworthy that in 1906, university professors held parallel discussions regarding the role and place of professors of theology in secular universities, with a majority opposing their teaching in universities. See Emel'ianov, "Bogoslovie v sisteme znaniiia," 10; M. Posnov, "K voprosu ob uchrezhdenii bogoslovskikh fakul'tetov," *Trudy Kirevskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, no. 4 (1906): 667–88.

71. Ioann Sokolov, *Zhurnaly i protokoly*, 53.

72. See, for example, the comment of I. S. Pal'mov (1855–1920), a graduate and professor of church history at St. Petersburg Theological Academy and later a member of Russia's Academy of Sciences, in *Zhurnaly i protokoly*, 174–75.

73. Popov, *Zhurnaly i protokoly*, 66; see also comments by T. Burkevich, *Zhurnaly i protokoly*, 168.

74. V. S. Serbrennikov, *Zhurnaly i protokoly*, 171–72. Serbrennikov was among the students and faculty of the theological academies whose work was highly influenced by their education and research trips abroad. See R. K. Lesaev, "Predstaviteli Sankt-Peterburgskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii v nauchnykh zarubezhnykh komandirovках (1869–1917)," accessed December 1, 2015, <http://christian-reading.info/data/2014/0203/2014-0203-07.pdf>.

75. A. P. Rozhdestvenskii, *Zhurnaly i protokoly*, 126.

76. Posnov, "K voprosu ob uchrezhdenii bogoslovskikh fakul'tetov," 679.

77. *Ibid.*, 676–78.

78. *Ibid.*, 679.

79. *Ibid.*, 676, 681.

80. *Ibid.*, 674.

81. Regarding the paradoxical positioning of faculties of theology in Russia's secular universities today, see the comments of Anna Zdor, assistant director of the Department of Theology and Religious Studies, Far Eastern Federal Univer-

sity in Vladivostok, in Prot. Vladimir Vorob'ev, "Nuzhna li 'svetskaiia' teologiya Tserkvi?," *Zhurnal Moskvoi Patriarkhii*, no. 1 (January 2013), http://e-vestnik.ru/science/nuzhna_li_laguosvetskayaraguo_teologiya_cerkvi/. For parallel debates in the West, see, for example, Cady and Brown, *Religious Studies, Theology and the University*.

82. For a list of faith-based institutes and universities in Russia, see "Orthodox Christian Educational Institutions," OCP Media Network, <http://theorthodoxchurch.info/main/ocel/>. Also see Perry L. Glanzer, "Resurrecting Universities with Soul: Christian Higher Education in Post-Communist Europe," in *Christian Higher Education: A Global Reconsideration*, ed. Joel Carpenter; Perry L. Glanzer, and Nick Lantinga (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014), 163–90; Joseph Loya, O.S.A., and Tatiana Kravchuk, "Russian Orthodox Religious Education Initiatives in Post-Soviet Russia: Update and Commentary," *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe* 36, no. 2 (March 2016): n.p.

83. Evgeny Nasyrov, "Bunt v 'kuznitsе kadrov' rossiiskoi iadernoi otrashi: Studenty MIFI protestuiut protiv perenosа pamiatnika MIFiFlezkomu studentu, na meste kotorogo k vizitu Patriarkha ustanovili krest," *Credo.ru*, March 5, 2010, accessed December 1, 2014, www.portal-credo.ru/site/?act=monitor&id=14851. For a more apologetic assessment of the establishment of this faculty, see Anna Danilova, "Kafedra teologii v MIFI: 6 faktor k diskussii," *Pravmir.ru*, June 11, 2013, <http://www.pravmir.ru/teologia-miphi/>.

84. For examples of the controversy, see Oksana Kotkina, "Nepoznavaemoe vozveli v uchennuiu stepen'," *NG. Religii*, October 8, 2015, http://www.ng.ru/ng_religii/2015-10-21/1_theology.html; Elena Kudrjavseva, "Dissertatsiia ot Boga," *Ogonek* 41 (October 19, 2015): 14.

85. Evgenii Tererev, "Umestna li 'religioznaiia nauka' v svetskome gosudarstve?," *Pravda*, no. 118, October 23, 2015; Alisa Orlova, "Teologiya v vuzakh: Real'nost' i opaseniia," *Pravmir.ru*, December 2, 2012, <http://www.pravmir.ru/teologiya-v-vuzakh-realnost-i-opaseniya/>; Aleksandr Soldatov, "'Svetskaiia' teologiya: Nauka o tom, kak nauchit'sia vere, ne stav vernuiushchim," *Orekhovyye zapiski*, no. 1 (2002), <http://www.strana-oz.ru/2002/1/svetskaya-teologiya-nauka-o-tom-kak-nauchitsya-vere-ne-stav-vernyushchim>.

86. In this we find consonance with US Secretary of State John Kerry's support of teaching about religion in America's secular institutions of higher education, maintaining that "we ignore the global impact of religion at our peril." John Kerry, "Towards a Better Understanding of Religion and Global Affairs," *America: The National Catholic Review*, September 14, 2015, <http://america magazine.org/issue/religion-and-diplomacy>; Patriarch Kirill, "Vysuplenie Sviatishnego Patriarkha Kirilla na soveshchanii 'Teologiya vzaimodeistvie Tserkvi, gosudarstva i obshchestva,'" Patriarkhia.ru, November 28, 2012,

- .patriarchia.ru/db/text/2619652.html. On the idea of religious literacy, see Stephen Prothero, *Religious Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know—and Do* (New York: HarperOne, 2008).
87. Patriarch Kirill, "Vysuplenie Sviatshego Patriarka Kirilla."
88. For parallels in the West, see in particular Cady and Brown, *Religious Studies, Theology, and the University*; for the UK, Bird and Smith, eds., *Theology and Religious Studies*.
89. Soldatov, "Svetkaia' teologija"; Aleksandr Krasnikov, "Teologija v sveskikh vuzakh: Pro et contra," *Nezavisimaja gazeta*, July 25, 2001, http://www.ng.ru/ng_religii/2001-07-25/6_teology.html.
90. Olga Samsonova, "V Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi ne schitaiaut prepodavanie teologii vnedreniem tserkvi v obrazovanie," *Ria Novosti*, November 27, 2012, <http://ria.ru/society/20121127/912448040.html>; Vorob'ev, "Nuzhna li 'svetskaia' teologija Tserkvi?"
91. See the interview with historian Natalia Sukhova, "Teologija v Rossii i v mire," *Pravoslavnyi Svjato-Tikhonovskii Gumanitarnyi Universitet*, August 11, 2013, http://psgu.ru/news/life/Teologiya_v_Rossii_i_v_mire/2013/08/13/47603/.
92. Sukhova, "Obsuzhdenie problem," 40.

ENGAGING THE
CONTEMPORARY ACADEMY

PART II