Exiled Russian Orthodox Leaders in Paris and the Struggle to Establish a Home Away from Home (1925-1944)[1]

JONATHAN SEILING
Emmanuel College, Toronto School of Theology

When forces of history move large numbers of religious adherents, new possibilities can open up for communities in exile. Banished from their homeland they move beyond the reach or jurisdiction of their former authority and a new body politic begins to form. The canonical jurisdiction of Orthodox Church communions around the world has received increasing attention due to the current need to restructure what has become its main organizing feature in recent years – the nation-state. When the Russian Orthodox faithful left their country in the early 1920s, they entered western lands in droves and took up residence in what increasingly became an ethnically and religiously pluralistic society; there they faced a new set of dilemmas. The mother church then struggled to retain jurisdiction and a semblance of control over her offspring. Consequently foreign-based believers became estranged from their homeland. They came to recognize that their political and social surroundings could dictate their newfound autonomy and reshape their self-identity.

In 1922-23 when Vladimir I. Lenin exiled a group of some of the most influential political thinkers in Russia, he included a number of prominent religious thinkers, many of whom had advocated political-economic alternatives to Marxist-Leninism prior to the Bolshevik Revolution. They were outspoken in their criticism of what was known as the "intelligentsia," a group that had largely supported economic socialism and political revolution. Many of these renegade critics of the mainstream

intellectual climate of the day had been Marxists until the Revolution of 1905. Insofar as some of them maintained or discovered a religious worldview, they were largely indebted to the work of the recently deceased religious philosopher, Vladimir Solov'ev (1853-1900). It was he who, like a sort of Russian Schleiermacher, appealed to the intellectual masses to return to the traditional, although slightly modified, faith of the Russian Church. Solov'ev had introduced a concept that would strike a chord in the literary movement called Russian Symbolism, and ignite a spark that would create a blaze in Russian religious philosophy. To the degree that it resonated with the *avant guard*, it was firmly rejected in traditional religious sectors. Beginning in 1876, Solov'ev wrote about a personified notion of Divine Wisdom, called Sophia after the Greek word for wisdom. Although many writers made occasional use of this motif of the Divine Sophia, none developed it like the political economist Sergei Bulgakov. As the founder in 1905 of the Moscow Religious Philosophical Society, Bulgakov urged an assessment of Solov'ev's thought from a variety of disciplines in an attempt to offer an alternative to the materialist and positivist assumptions in Russia that fuelled the popular acceptance of Marxism. This intellectual society that the Bolsheviks dissolved, proved to be fertile ground for these dissenters, many of whom would be exiled. It was arguably the key centre in which a new self-identity was formed in the years before Bolshevism.[2] It gave these intellectuals at least a loose sense of unity that sustained them throughout the many heated controversies into which they were thrown in the years that followed their exile. Most of those who were exiled in 1922-1923 settled in Paris within a few years.

In the Russian Orthodox diaspora the various efforts to reshape a collective religious identity, as redefined in the 1917-18 All Russian Reforming Council, was the creation of organized intellectual groups, often called "brotherhoods." The largest movement was the pan-European Russian Student Christian Movement, begun in 1924 at the initiative of Bulgakov; it held conferences and published a mostly Russian-language theological journal called "Le Messager – Вестник. According to the recently published *Orthodox Encyclopedia*, by the Orthodox Patriarchate of Russia, there were two main types of Orthodox brotherhoods. The first type engaged in activities such as publishing literature, charity work, and lay education, while the second was concerned with discussing and addressing the intellectual problems faced by the church and its members in the western context.[3] Bulgakov and a young medievalist named

Vladimir Lossky became prominent leaders of separate brotherhoods in Paris; both fit generally into the second type, but incorporated some elements of the first.[4] Lossky is best known for his 1944 summary of Eastern Orthodox theology in his essay entitled the *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church.*

What follows here is a comparative analysis of the aims and activities of these two brotherhoods including their relationship to various ecclesial hierarchies and the respective involvements of their leaders, Bulgakov and Lossky. Of course the complexity of the entire religious scene in the Russian Orthodox circles of post-WWI Paris can not be fully served by an exposition of these two brotherhoods alone, since there were others in existence. Nevertheless, the definitive clash between the two in 1935, in a controversy called the "Sophia affair," demonstrates how leadership and authority were understood in the exile community in the early years of communist Russia. Vladimir Lossky instigated the controversy by successfully convincing the *locum tenens* of the Patriarch of Russia to summarily condemn Bulgakov's doctrine of the Divine Sophia.[5]

Bulgakov and Братство Святой Софий

After the dissolution of the Moscow Religious Philosophical Society in 1918, Bulgakov moved south to the Crimea where he taught for two years at the University of Simferopol. From the ashes of the relatively open intellectual forums in the pre-Soviet era, there arose a more covert means for Russian intellectuals to communicate and debate the problems of their fast changing society. According to Vasilii Zenkovskii the Brotherhood of the Divine Sophia – The Wisdom of God (hereafter, Brotherhood of St Sophia) was already conceived in 1919,[6] although it is uncertain whether any meetings were held until after 1922 when the emigrations began.

The life and activities of the Brotherhood of St Sophia began with Bulgakov's initiative and concluded at his death. That is not to say that its sole purpose was to rally around or support Bulgakov's theological project. The brotherhood had already been conceived prior to the emigration of most of its members at a time when crucial changes were being made to the status and relationship of the Church with the new post-Revolution government.[7] At the time when it was initiated the brotherhood was not centred around discussions of Sophia or sophiology exclusively,

although it was generally concerned with religious philosophy. It allegedly received the official blessing of Patriarch Tikhon, but could not establish itself overtly due to the tense period in which it was conceived.[8] It may be said that without such an intellectual circle, Bulgakov might otherwise have struggled later on to maintain the degree of collegiality with his fellows that ultimately safeguarded him against further alienation when his theological writings were attacked on several fronts in the mid-1930s.

In 1923, the Brotherhood of St Sophia became a means for a wide variety of exiled professors who had significant religious commitments, mostly in Prague and Paris, to communicate on issues of common purpose. The minutes state that their main concerns included an analysis of the relationship between ecclesiastical and "holy" power, the monarchical consciousness in Orthodoxy, its relationship towards Catholicism, the activity of the Church in everyday life, the position of the Church in Russia as well as the social, cultural and political aspects of the doctrine of sophiology.[9] Its membership in the early days was indeed diverse, including those who were unsympathetic or eventually hostile to sophiology in general or at least to Bulgakov's project. Whatever harmony and unity of vision existed at the outset was short lived as potent personalities such as Berdiaev, Struve, and Florovsky led factions that separated from the brotherhood. This resulted in the eventual formation of a smaller and more unified core group by late 1925. This smaller group was seemingly loyal to Bulgakov and in good relations with the local metropolitan, Evlogii.

In the early days when the Paris community was starting to re-establish for itself the necessary institutions to serve the growing needs of the Orthodox community, the Brotherhood of St Sophia continued to debate issues concerning the relationship of the church to the state. The minutes from the meetings of the brotherhood relate some of the arguments that broke out, showing the internal tension between those who continued to advance the reforming spirit of the 1917-18 Council, and those who remained steadfast in their adherence to prior interpretations of canon law. Often the most contentious debates arose from matters that, due to the changed political environment, could not be resolved by applying existing canon law to the status of the Russian ecclesial hierarchy at home and abroad. Here is precisely where the community of exiles became embroiled in the clashes between its various outspoken leaders, whether ordained or self-appointed.

The drastic transitions that the Church had undergone since the 1917-18 Council made the Paris community a tenuous battleground where internal splits were a near certainty as varying interpretations of the lines of authority or leadership for the exiled Church arose out of the uncertain status of the hierarchy in Russia. The minutes of the 21 May 1925[10] meeting of the brotherhood in Prague, for example, discussed the problem of the deposition and death of Patriarch Tikhon and the possibility of legitimate autonomy for the Orthodox community abroad. Members discussed the canonicity of notions like autocephaly, internal and external freedom, and the option of other ecclesial forms.[11] In general their discussions were lively and deeply concerned with remaining faithful and loyal to the mother church in Russia. The minutes indicate that the frequency and intensity of the meetings reached a peak in the summer of 1925. Subsequent meetings geared more toward intellectual matters as members settled into their academic pursuits and became occupied with appraising each other's publications. This led to further controversy as they debated whether the group could even consider itself to be a brotherhood when it proceeded in such an unbrotherly fashion.[12]

In the late 1920s the meetings used a different format and, for the core members who were generally sympathetic to Bulgakov, they held theology seminars to explore the ideas of Divine Wisdom. These meetings soon expanded to include numerous participants, including several women, beyond the original core.[13] They provided an open forum to discuss theological questions where Bulgakov tested and developed his sophiological doctrines in dialogue with others. The notes taken by V.A. Zander offer an excellent source for further study into this highly developmental period of Bulgakov's thought, and provide a means to understand the social context and resonance of his ideas.[14] The fact that these records were made by a laywoman indicates that Bulgakov, who went from being a political economy professor to an ordained priest in 1918, and finally a leading theologian, should not be mistaken as an obscurantist academic.

Throughout its life, the Brotherhood St Sophia waxed and waned and functioned more as an ad-hoc committee or intellectual organ than an established or regulated society. The one constant thread was the leadership of Bulgakov who was widely respected in the budding intellectual Russian Orthodox community in Paris. The relationship of the brotherhood to the local ecclesial hierarchy was very positive in their mutual aim of re-establishing the educational, diaconal and liturgical life

of the Church. Metropolitan Evlogii was wholly supportive of the vision shared by many in the exile community to establish a Russian Orthodox seminary, to be named L'Institut St. Serge, in Paris. However this close relationship between Evlogii and the brotherhood was not without its severe critics such as members of the Yugoslavia-based Karlovtsy Synod, the so-called Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. One cleric even accused Evlogii, in writing, of capitulating to the demands of the Brotherhood of St Sophia.[15]

Vladimir Lossky and la Confrérie Saint Photius

Another group of intellectuals and clerics who attempted to establish a collective Orthodox identity viewed the mission and destiny of the Orthodox faith, and Russia's role in its furtherance, rather differently than the Brotherhood of St Sophia. They saw themselves as not so much preserving the flame of their native faith as bearing the torch and fanning it in the West. Whereas Bulgakov and his circle sought to build ecumenical bridges with Anglicans and French Catholics in particular, the group named after St Photius had a more explicit missionary agenda. In short, they sought to save western Christianity by helping it to rediscover the orthodoxy it had long since lost. Their goal was no less than to facilitate the "universal triumph of Orthodoxy."[16]

The Brotherhood of St Photius, named after the famously polemical ninth-century patriarch of Constantinople and arch-critic of the western Church, was established in Paris in the mid-1920s sometime between February 1923 and 1928.[17] Whether or not Lossky was a founding member is difficult to determine, but it seems likely that 1925 was the official date of establishing a manifesto for the brotherhood; at that point the young Lossky was already in Paris.[18] Despite the uncertain details of its origin, it is clear that the young Lossky rose quickly as a key leader.

The Brotherhood of St Photius's manifesto was a call for a universalizing movement within Orthodoxy to spread the true faith to every people, while preserving local customs, rites and liturgical languages.[19] It maintained a position of unconditional loyalty toward the institutional hierarchy of its native church and supported its allegiance to the Soviet state; in this way it differed in an essential way from the Brotherhood of St Sophia that repeatedly condemned the Leninist regime. The Photian brethren believed it was actually providential that Russian Orthodox Christians were dispersed and sent away from their homeland

in order that they could witness in other contexts to the truth of the Orthodox Church. They obviously shared little, if any, signs of bitterness about living in Paris after leaving Russia. Their eager adaptation of French further showed where their preferences lay. In the west they viewed "Old Catholics" as the most congenial to their message of the "hidden Orthodoxy" of the west. Rather than transplanting the Russian Orthodox faith into a new context, they wanted to resurrect what they saw as the potential for the Church in the west to discover anew the Orthodoxy it once knew.[20]

The activities of the brotherhood included founding the "Domaine saint Irénée" in 1926, which sought to produce Orthodox liturgical texts in French.[21] In 1927, Evlogii even gave his blessing to the creation of a French-language parish that was apparently initiated by the Brotherhood of St Photius. Until the late 1920s, the brotherhood was still amenable to working under the authority granted by Evlogii, who continued to assist in the furtherance of French-language Orthodox ministry.

The rupture that occurred in the late 1920s between Metropolitan Evlogii of Paris and Metropolitan Sergei of Moscow also caused a decisive break with the majority of Russian Orthodox leaders in Paris. The basic issue of contention was whether the Church outside Russia could criticize the Soviet state. Vladimir Lossky was among the minority in Paris who transferred their ecclesiastical allegiance to Metropolitan Eleutherios of Vilnus, who was now named Exarch of Western Europe. This transfer of jurisdictional authority occurred after 26 December 1930, when a decree from Sergei in Moscow confirmed a prior decision to canonically dissolve the diocesan administration of Evlogii in Paris.[22] After the split in leadership, the community also separated, and many of the earlier French-language efforts taken by the Brotherhood of St Photius remained under the auspices of Evlogii. The minority, who remained loyal to the decree of Sergei, regrouped to celebrate the liturgy in a private apartment while they awaited the consecration of a new canonical parish of the Russian patriarch in Paris, named "la Communauté des Trois Saints Hiérarques." Eleutherios considered the abandonment of their native patriarchal church in its time of persecution to be treasonous.[23] To have supported a church jurisdiction that swore loyalty to the Soviet regime in the period of Stalin's purges and some of the most devastating blows delivered to any nation or church in history, seemed tantamount to the loyalty offered to the Weimar republic by the Deutsche Christen of the same years.

By the mid-1930s this minority group of the Russian diaspora, led by the Brotherhood of St Photius, sought to increase its missionary activity

among the French and was successful in creating a relationship with Monsignor Louis Winnaert, a leader of a movement called l'Eglise catholique-évangelique.[24] Sergei of Moscow wrote a declaration in 1936 creating l'Eglise orthodoxe occidentale and specified the various stipulations of its jurisdiction and liturgical activities.[25] We see here an attempt to recognize the cultural restraints of an Orthodox tradition in Europe that is nearly inextricable from its Byzantine cultural heritage. The brotherhood saw this development as a product of their efforts and other key factors which Lossky described as a culmination of three different elements: the evangelical-catholic movement, the Brotherhood of St Photius and the patriarch in Moscow. He gave much credit to what he called the "clairvoyance" of Metropolitan Sergei.[26] By August of 1939, after Sergei was conferred the title of patriarch, he wrote to Lossky praising the brotherhood's missionary work.[27] He hoped that they would continue to "sensitize the westerners to Orthodoxy" and continue to negotiate with other groups that might possibly join the Orthodox Church.

Finally there is one aspect of Lossky's involvement with the Brotherhood of St Photius that contributed more directly to his alienation from the exiled Russian Orthodox community in Paris, namely his written condemnation of Bulgakov's sophiological doctrines. The theological controversy that broke out in the mid-1930s may be approached from various angles. Lossky both provoked the controversy, justified the essence of the condemnation and Sergei of Moscow's right to pronounce such judgment on Bulgakov, even in his absence. To say the least, there were many in the Church, not only in the diaspora, who objected that the metropolitan was acting *ultra vires*, outside of his canonical role. Considering the concomitant struggles between the hierarchy in Paris and Moscow, it is best to consider the doctrinal controversy over Sophia as having direct relevance to the distressful political context in which the local churches were situated. Lossky's authorship of a booklet published by the Brotherhood of St Photius provides a description of his argument against Bulgakov.[28] In the opening pages, Lossky claimed that Bulgakov's defense of his writings was more out of obstinacy toward ecclesiastical authority in general than out of an objection to Metropolitan Sergei's action.[29] Meanwhile a large percentage of the Russian Orthodox community in Paris had remained under the leadership of Evlogii, who, by the early 1930s, was no longer under the authority of Sergei of Moscow, but the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople in Turkey. To summarize, there were at least two canonical jurisdictions in Paris that were in direct

conflict – one connected to Turkey, the other to Russia through Lithuania. Another one of significance was also based in Serbia (ROCA), and it was equally antithetical toward Bulgakov, but denied the canonical authority of Moscow and then declared itself to be the sole legitimate heir of the pre-Soviet Church.

Two Orthodox Brotherhoods Clash

Members of the Brotherhood of St Photius played an instrumental role in effecting the *Ukaz*, a written declaration, from Metropolitan Sergei. To be fair, there does not seem to be any evidence of an outright conspiracy whereby the entire Brotherhood of St Photius bore collective responsibility for the initial actions taken against Bulgakov. Rather it seems that two of its members, Lossky and a peer named Alexis Stavrovsky, neither of whom had degrees in theology,[30] initially acted independently, and were subsequently supported by the brotherhood. The two informants sent a secret communication to Eleutherios in Vilnus who forwarded it to Sergei in Moscow.[31] It explained that Bulgakov held doctrines that did not conform to the mother church.[32] For Lossky the move signaled the start of an enduring rapport with the church hierarchy in Moscow, which greatly aided the aims of the Brotherhood of St Photius. It would even result in an invitation to Lossky from the Moscow patriarch that would allow him to travel to Moscow, Leningrad, Vladimir and Kiev in 1956.

The two young critics of Bulgakov received a reply from Metropolitan Sergei asking for more detailed information about exactly what Bulgakov was teaching. They responded by describing the doctrines as gnostic and that they erased the division between the Creator and creation. On 7 September 1935, Sergei took action to condemn Bulgakov's teaching, producing the first of two decrees against his understanding of the doctrine of the two-natures in Christ and of the unique hypostasis of Christ.[33] It is important to note that Evlogii and the two main founders of the Brotherhood of the Divine Sophia, Bulgakov and A.V. Kartashev, were all instrumental members at the 1917-18 Council, which had decreed various reforms that were viewed by some conservatives as too progressive. Evlogii had organized the diocese in Paris as laid out by the decrees of the Council.

But Lossky insisted – as the Brotherhood of St Photius had always maintained – that the canonical authority of the Church must not be

challenged or ignored, as he saw happening in Paris. Lossky's extreme loyalty to the jurisdiction of Moscow eventually alienated him not only from the majority of the Parisian Russian Orthodox community, but later from Fr Eugraph Kovalevsky, one of the original founders of the Brotherhood of Photius, who also eventually broke with Moscow in 1953.[34] It was precisely the politically autonomous posture on the part of the Brotherhood of St Sophia and its attempts to support the local metropolitan in Paris that created a background for the doctrinal controversy between Vladimir Lossky and Bulgakov. Here, clothed beneath a debate over questions of the unknowability of the Godhead and the legitimacy of sophiology, they held opposing views of the current relationship between church and state. In addition to their personal convictions, Bulgakov and Lossky were located on opposing sides of a debate on ecclesial politics and both seemed to enjoy the support of their respective brotherhoods.

Today the Orthodox Church in Russia is working on an assessment of its native traditions, while continuing the encounter with the west begun *de rigueur* in the pre-Soviet days when Russians who emigrated to western Europe and other parts of the world retained their native religious identity while accepting many aspects of the foreign culture. New centres of training and higher education have opened, which will further the efforts of Orthodox scholars and lay persons to re-ignite some of the religious flame that had burned until the Council of 1917-18.

Recently, Aleksandr Men', martyred in 1990, has been honoured as one of the key leaders of renewal of Russian Orthodoxy in the glasnost period, and, although he claims no theological dependence on Bulgakov,[35] there exists a connection between the two. While lying on his deathbed in 1944, Bulgakov instructed iconographer Sister Joanna Reitlinger to return to her motherland, take up her cross, and carry it with joy.[36] She eventually returned to Tashkent in 1955, and later came into close contact with Fr Aleksander Men'. She considers herself to have been sent to Fr Aleksander by Bulgakov, linking the spiritual mentor of the early part of her adult life to the man who became her mentor and confessor in the latter part of her life. Her depiction of the Divine Sophia in an icon has become one of the famous symbols of the reconnection of the Paris community and the Church in Russia today.

Although many western scholars still read Lossky's *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* and consider it to have widely accepted authority in the Orthodox Church, there is scarcely any recognition of the

context in which he wrote it. Lossky became a French citizen in 1939, and claimed ultimately to be an "occidentaliste."[37] Ironically he claims that his westernism is also a Russian characteristic, that is, "être plus européen que tous les autres Européens."[38] Whether or not Lossky is correct in ascribing such a characteristic to Russians, the new generation of Orthodox believers will surely benefit from a deeper investigation into the lives of both Bulgakov and Lossky. If it is characteristically Russian to revolt against the prior generation, as Turgenev describes in his novel, *Fathers and Sons,* and in so doing to attempt to strip the new age of its "Russianness," then perhaps Lossky rightly calls himself one who is truly Russian in this rather ironic sense. The new generation may be likewise content to have revolted against him.

Endnotes

1. Dr. T. Allan Smith, University of St Michael's College, deserves credit for directing me in the following study and providing helpful insight and critique.

2. Kristiane Burchardi, *Die Moskauer "Religiös-Philosophische Vladimir-Solov'ev-Gesellschaft" (1905–1918)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Velag, 1998), 13.

3. A.V. Zhuravskii, "Bratstva Pravoslavnye," in *Pravoslavnaia Entsiklopedia* (Moscow: Tserkovno-nauchnyi Tsentr, 2003), 6: 209-210.

4. Zhuravskii, "Bratstva Pravoslavnye," 210. In addition to these two leaders there was also the Brotherhood of Alexander Nevsky (1921) begun by P.E. Kovalevsky, and the Paris Brotherhood of Sergius, started by Ieromonakh Savvoi (Struve).

5. After the completion of this paper a dissertation by Bryn Geffert appeared. It provides rich insights into this period of controversy, especially from the perspective of Anglo-Orthodox relations centering around the Brotherhood of St Alban & St Sergius ("Anglican & Orthodox Between the Wars" [Ph. D. diss., Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2003]; see also Bryn Geffert, "The Charges of Heresy Against Sergii Bulgakov," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 49, no. 1-2 [2005]: 47-66; and Alexis Klimoff, "Georges Florovsky and the Sophiological Controversy," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 49, no. 1-2 [2005]: 67-100).

6. V.V. Zenkovskii, "O Bratstve Sviatoi Sofii v Emigratsii," in *Bratstvo Sviatoi Sofii: Materialy i Documenty 1923-1939*, comp., N.A. Struve (Paris: YMCA-Press, 2000), 5.

7. Noteworthy is Bulgakov's role at the 1917-18 All-Russia Reform Council concerning the relationship of the church and politics. On 2 June 1917, he presented a paper on the "Church and Democracy," and 15 November a paper entitled, "On the Relationship of the Church to the State." These presentations were daring attempts to make the church more responsive to the people and ensure that it would not capitulate to the demands of the state (Kliment Naumov, *Bibliographie des Oeuvres de Serge Boulgakov* [Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 1984], 45; see also Catherine Evtuhov, *The Cross and the Sickle* [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997], 189-206).

8. Zenkovskii, "O Bratstve Sviatoi Sofii v Emigratsii," 5.

9. Zhuravskii, "Bratstva Pravoslavnye," 210; see also Struve, *Bratstvo Sviatoi Sofii*, 9-10.

10. Dates provided throughout this study are from the Gregorian calendar.

11. Struve, *Bratstvo Sviatoi Sofii*, 79-86.

12. "Minutes of 25 December 1925," in Struve, *Bratstvo Sviatoi Sofii*.

13. Photograph #12, in Struve, *Bratstvo Sviatoi Sofii*. Among them were Mat' Maria (Skobtsova), Ioanna N. Reitlinger, V.A. Zander, Mat' Evdokia (Meshchieryakova), A.B. Obolienskaya.

14. The notes of these seminars by V.A. Zander, whose husband later wrote, *Bog i Mir*, the first intellectual biography of Bulgakov, have been published in Struve, *Bratstvo Sviatoi Sofii*, 147-65. The seminars that focused on sophiology were from October-December 1928; other topics were developed at subsequent seminars until 1933.

15. Cited by Ludmilla Perepiolkina in *Ecumenism: The Path to Perdition*; available from http://ecumenizm.tripod.com/ECUMENIZM; accessed 11 January 2004). See N.D. Talberg, *Dvuglavyi Orel,* No. 4 (Paris: Doloi zlo, 1927), 7-8; and "Vozbuditeli Raskola," 12-13.

16. Vladimir Lossky cited in "La Confrérie Saint Photius"; available from http://e.korsoun.free.fr/fr/textes/fondat_tsh_02.htm; accessed 15 July 2004.

17. See Vincent Bourne, *La divine contradiction: L'avenir catholique orthodoxe de la France*, (Paris: Librairie des Cinq continents, 1975), 80. The date of 1923 is disputed in Maxime Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et Occident: Renaissance d'une Église Locale* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994), who claims that it was not founded until 1925. Vladimir Lossky also states that the Brotherhood was founded in 1925 ("Pour Une Orthodoxie Occidentale"; available from http://orthodoxie.free.fr/pour%20une%20orthodoxie%20occidentale.htm; accessed 15 July 2004). To further confuse the matter, the website of l'Institut

Saint-Denys claims that the brotherhood was founded in 1927. The latest date, 1928, is found in Rowan Williams' dissertation on Vladimir Lossky. It was founded by eight men including three brothers: Eugraphe, Maxime and Pierre Kovalevsky, and five others among whom were Nicolas Sakharov, Alexis Stavrowsky, Vsevolod Palachkowsky, Father Sergei Schewitsch and N.A. Poltoratsky.

18. The *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* states in Lossky's necrology that he was one of the founders of the Brotherhood, but this remains uncertain due to conflicting information about its initial inception (Leonid Uspensky, "Professor Vladimir Nikolaievich Lossky [Nekrolog]" *Zhurnal Moskovskii Patriarchii* 4 [1958]: 11).

19. http://e.korsoun.free.fr/fr/textes/fondat_tsh_02.htm; accessed 15 July 2004.

20. http://perso.club-internet.fr/chrysostome/fr/textes/fondation_fr02.html; accessed 15 July 2004. A passionate address delivered by Lossky at the Brotherhood in 1937 summarizes his view of their purpose as: "Face au monde hétérodoxe et à l'incertitude dogmatique de nombreux orthodoxes, [the Church] doit donner une ferme confession de l'Orthodoxie – unique Vérité universelle, dont le patriarcat de Rome s'est détaché . . . L'unité chrétienne ne peut être atteinte qu'en confessant l'Orthodoxie qui doit renaître en Occident . . . [The Brotherhood seeks to] ranimer la conscience ecclésiale des Orthodoxes émigrés et ramener l'Occident à la Tradition Orthodoxe tout en respectant son identité profonde, en un mot, susciter en France une véritable Orthodoxie Occidentale."

21. See detailed examination in Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et Occident*, 313-328.

22. http://e.korsoun.free.fr/fr/textes/fondat_tsh_02.htm; accessed 15 July 2004.

23. http://e.korsoun.free.fr/fr/textes/fondat_tsh_02.htm; accessed 15 July 2004.

24. Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et Occident*, 55.

25. Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et Occident*, 70. For example, using leavened bread, the epiclesis as in the East, utraquist Communion, etc.

26. http://e.korsoun.free.fr/fr/textes/fondat_tsh_02.htm; accessed 15 July 2004.

27. http://e.korsoun.free.fr/fr/textes/fondat_tsh_02.htm; accessed 15 July 2004.

28. Vladimir N. Lossky, *Spor" o Sofii* (Paris: E.I.R.P, 1936).

29. Lossky, *Spor" o Sofii*, 9-12.

30. Struve, *Bratstvo Sviatoi Sofii*, 312.

31. Antoine Arjakovsky, "L'Institut de Théologie Ortodoxe Saint Serge à Paris," in *Bogoslov, Filosof, Myslitel',* N.I. Kateava-Lytkina, Fr Innokentii (Pavlov); and A.I. Velikanova (Moscow: Dom-myzei Mariny Tsetaevoi, 1999), 92.

32. Arjakovsky, "L'Institut de Théologie Ortodoxe Saint Serge à Paris," 93.

33. Arjakovsky, "L'Institut de Théologie Ortodoxe Saint Serge à Paris," 93.

34. Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et Occident*, 137-50. Compare Rowan Williams dissertation where he describes Lossky's attitude towards those who challenged Moscow's ecclesiastical authority as follows: "[S]uch a position [as those who believe they are the true heirs and spokesmen of Russian Orthodoxy] was untenable: it represented a cavalier attitude to the 'given' historical situation of the Russian Church, an implicit refusal to recognise that the Church could continue to function authentically in a dechristianized society, and therefore, an implicit belief that the Church was necessarily bound to certain cultural or national structures" ("The Theology of Vladimir Lossky: An Exposition and Critique" [Ph.D. dissertation, Oxford University, 1975], 9-10).

35. Aleksandr Men', *Mirovaia dukhovnaia kultura, Khristianstvo, Tserkov'* (Moscow: Fond imeni Aleksandra Menia, 1997), 530.

36. Elizabeth Roberts, "The Wise Sky – The Letters Between Father Alexander Men (1935-1990) and Sister Joanna (Julia) Reitlinger (1898-1988)," *Theandros* 1, no. 1 (Fall 2003); available from http://www.theandros.com/wisesky.html; accessed 10 July 2004.

37. Vladimir Lossky to his father, Nikolai Losskii, c. 1956, in Vladimir Lossky, *Sept Jours sur les Routes de France* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1998), 80.

38. Lossky, *Sept Jours*, 81.