

among the French and was successful in creating a relationship with Monsignor Louis Winnaert, a leader of a movement called l'Eglise catholique-évangélique.<sup>24</sup> Sergei of Moscow wrote a declaration in 1936 creating l'Eglise orthodoxe occidentale and specified the various stipulations of its jurisdiction and liturgical activities.<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> By August of 1939, after Sergei was conferred the title of patriarch, he wrote to Lossky praising the brotherhood's missionary work.<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup> 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.<sup>29</sup> 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,<sup>30</sup> initially acted independently, and were subsequently supported by the brotherhood. The two informants sent a secret communication to Eleutherios in Vilnius who forwarded it to Sergei in Moscow.<sup>31</sup> It explained that Bulgakov held doctrines that did not conform to the mother church.<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> 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