

Conclusion of a Memorandum
from the Revd. Sergius Bulgakov
to the Most Rev. Metropolitan Eulogius

The above may be summarized as follows:-

1. The report of Metropolitan Sergius to the Synod about my doctrine of Sophia is evidently not based upon acquaintance with my writings in the original, but only upon quotations from them, which were furnished to him. Neither was I informed of the trial in process, nor was there any previous consideration by competent theologians. The inaccuracy and incompleteness with which my opinions are treated in Metropolitan Sergius' report are such that I cannot consider that it constitutes a satisfactory judgement. Besides, the personal judgements of Metropolitan Sergius deal not so much with the central points of my doctrine, as with details, sometimes not even connected with it. The report has more the character of a theological polemic, in which, by the way, the personal opinions of Metropolitan Sergius are not always unassailable from the viewpoint of Orthodoxy.
2. In reply to the accusation that my views are "paganistic", I solemnly declare that, as an Orthodox priest, I confess all the true dogmas of Orthodoxy. My Sophiology does not concern the content of those dogmas, but only their theological interpretation. It is my personal theological conviction, which I never have and never shall exalt to the position of obligatory Church dogma.¹ I consider myself as a theologian entitled to hold my own theological ideas, with no pretension to their general acceptance until the Spirit of God makes His judgement known. In the history of the Church there have always been differences in theological schools and opinions (we need only recall the schools of Alexandria and Antioch) and without freedom for theological study, of course within the limits of the Church's dogmas, theology cannot live. Sophiology has always been a teaching at least tolerated in the Russian Orthodox Church. (the priest Florensky, Vl. Solovieff², and myself in the "Unfading Light", 1917.

1. Let me cite as evidence the fact that in my book "L'Orthodoxie" (The Orthodox Church) intended for the information of non-Orthodox about Orthodoxy, the question of Sophiology is not even mentioned.

2. Solovieff's Sophiological doctrine, although subject to question in some points, was admitted even by the Roman Catholic Church in so far as in his work "La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle", he joins it with his defence of the primacy of the Pope.

3. I have given the true exposition of my sophiological doctrine, as related to various dogmatic questions, in a series of books and articles, beginning in 1917 ("The Unfading Light") and especially in books about the Orthodox veneration of the Virgin, St John the Baptist, the angels, about ikons and other veneration and in an extensive study "Of the God-Man" of which the first volume, "The Lamb of God" 1. on Christology has appeared. The second, "The Comforter" is now in press. My doctrine never has included the acceptance of a "fourth hypostasis" in the Holy Trinity, but deals chiefly with the relation between God and the world. Further, it has no connection whatever with pagan gnosis, which I am accused of holding. Rather it is inspired by Russian Orthodox veneration of Sophia, the Divine Wisdom, as expressed in Church architecture, liturgy, iconography, and represents an essay in the dogmatic interpretation of this veneration.².
4. The fact of the condemnation of my doctrine, as it has been pronounced by Metropolitan Sergius, without any general discussion in the Church, is not in keeping with Orthodox "sobornost" and bears rather the character of Roman Catholic pretense to hierarchical infallibility ex sese, in matters of faith. Not recognising any such external hierarchical organ of dogmatic infallibility, the Orthodox Church gives its dogmatic judgements by the action of the Holy Spirit, in various ways, but always in ways of Church "sobornost". (oecumenicity) Sometimes these judgements are arrived at by long and stormy discussions (the Christological disputes) and are consummated by a solemn definition of the faith in oecumenical or local councils, accepted by the Church as the words of truth, (and sometimes rejected, as in the case of the false councils) or else tacite consensu, by the life of the Church itself. In the present instance, as regards my doctrine, its proper general theological discussion has not yet begun, discussion which cannot be achieved by any premature forced judgement. My doctrine belongs not to dogmas, but to theological opinions, in which Orthodoxy, according to its spirit and its dogmatic basis, permits the proper freedom of thought. Interference with, or diminution of this freedom threatens the life of the Orthodox Church and touches the vital interest of all theologians, regardless of the differences in their theological opinions.

Paris. October, 1935.

Rev. S. BULGAKOV.

1. I have presented a brief exposition of the leading ideas of "The Lamb of God" in Russian (PUT" No 41,) in English (Theology" 1934) and in German (Theologisches Zentralblatt" 1934) Hence they are available for anyone.
2. See the table of different icons of Sophia the Divine Wisdom in the new book by Alexis van der Mensbrugge "From Dyad to Triad" 1935. (The Faith Press)

THE FELLOWSHIP OF ST ALBAN AND ST SERGIUS.

20, St James's Square,
London, S.W.1.

December 18th/35.

Dear member of the Fellowship,

It is, we think, very likely that you have heard reports concerning a condemnation of certain theological opinions of Fr. Sergius Bulgakov, and we believe, in consequence of this and also because Fr. Bulgakov is one of the oldest and most venerated of our friends, that you will be glad to have a statement of the actual facts of the case. They are, briefly, as follows :-

Fr. Sergius Bulgakov is one of the leading exponents of the theory of Sophiology, which is an attempt to state and solve the perennial problem of the relation between God and the World and of Creation. This has been a matter of controversy in the Russian Church since the middle of the last century, and the supporters of this line of thought have included such well-known theologians and philosophers as V. Soloviev, P. Florensky, N. Berdyaev, and V. Zenkovsky, each of whom has of course, developed the theory in his own particular way. The discussion has been particularly vigorous in the post-Revolution period in the exile.

At the beginning of October news was received in Paris that the Presiding Bishop of the Church in Russia, the Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow, had issued a censure of Fr. Bulgakov's writings, particularly the sophiological portions. Some time later the document itself reached Paris.

At the request of the Metropolitan Eulogius, Fr. Bulgakov's own superior in Paris, Fr. Bulgakov prepared a reply to the accusations. This reply, together with Metropolitan Sergius' Document, has been published in book form by the Y.M.C.A. Press in Paris at the end of November. Part of it consists of a solemn profession of orthodoxy by Fr. Bulgakov, in which he insists that he has never taught Sophiology as part of Christian dogma, and that it is a private theological and philosophical opinion compatible with Orthodoxy. There, at the moment, the matter rests.

The actual method by which the censure was issued was as follows:-

The information on which Metropolitan Sergius acted was prepared for him by the Brotherhood of St Photius, a small body of laymen, 15 or 20 in number, and was communicated to Metropolitan Sergius by Metropolitan Eleutherius of Lithuania, who is under his immediate jurisdiction. The Russian Diocese of Western Europe, we may remark, to which Fr. Bulgakov belongs and whose head is the Metropolitan Eulogius, was cut off from canonical relations with Russia in consequence of its refusal to accede to a demand received from Moscow in 1927 requiring the clergy of the Exile to affirm their loyalty to the Soviet power, and the status of Metropolitan Eulogius since 1932 has been that of an Exarch of the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. This change of jurisdiction was however resented by a small minority, who eventually acknowledged as their Bishop the Metropolitan Eleutherius of Lithuania, who being a Lithuanian subject, was not included in the demand for a profession of loyalty and so remained in canonical relations with Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow. He was later appointed by Metropolitan Sergius as Administrator of all the Russian Churches abroad, and has now under his jurisdiction three or four parishes.

It will be noticed that Fr. Bulgakov is not under the jurisdiction of either Metropolitan Sergius or Metropolitan Eleutherius and that at no stage was he called to answer the charges made against him. The document of Metropolitan Sergius is of the nature of a solemn warning to his flock rather than of a judicial condemnation passed by a superior on one of his subjects.

It is not of course the business of the Fellowship to try to adjudicate on the orthodoxy of Fr. Bulgakov's opinions, nor as a body are we responsible for the opinions of our members, however venerated and distinguished. It is however right that we should take the keenest interest in all that concerns their welfare and their work and that we should give them the support of our prayers and our friendship in any difficulties through which they may pass. Like the Church of the Anglican Communion, the Orthodox Church has its schools of thought, though the issues that characterise them are different, and particularly prominent is the divergence between the school of which Fr. Bulgakov is a leading member and the less speculative school represented by his opponents. Fr. Bulgakov's case is the first one in which the Fellowship has been brought face to face with a grave problem which threatens the peace of a group of our

Copy of letter from Professor L.Zander in regard to
The Revd.Sergius Bulgakoff.

November 1st/35

In connection with the new trouble connected with the Ukaz of the Metropolitan Sergius regarding Father Bulgakoff, I should like to express my personal view of the situation.

I do not need to dwell on generalities which are obvious to everybody: (1) the condemnation was pronounced without giving Fr.Bulgakoff so much as a chance of defence; (2) the sole basis for it has been a report prepared by a person who can by no means be considered as a peer of Fr.Bulgakov, or at all competent in theology (as a matter of fact, Stavrovsky, whom Metropolitan Sergius actually names as the author of the report is a former student of the Theological Institute in Paris, who spent but a very brief time at the Institute, having been obliged to leave it because of his conduct there). One would utterly fail to understand how such extraordinary circumstances of putting out the Ukaz were possible, if one were not to keep in mind certain external circumstances under which the Moscow Patriarchate has to live, and which have nothing to do with theology.

In this whole situation, the matter which I should like to emphasize most of all, is the fact that the Ukaz ascribes to Fr. Sergius (willfully or not) certain things which he never either taught or proclaimed. In developing his teaching on Sophia, Fr. Sergius himself never considered it as a dogmatic teaching of the Orthodox Church. It was always to him a theologoumenon - one of the philosophical aspects of interpretation of Orthodoxy. Only because of this attitude on his part there was possible the considerable evolution of his teaching, which, while retaining the basic principles of the teaching, was so great (even during these last years) that a whole book might be written on the development and evolution of Fr.Sergius' teaching on Sophia. Such an evolution would not have been possible, and would have meant a complete failure and wreck, if Fr.Sergius had considered his teaching as a dogmatic teaching of the Church.

This attitude on the part of Fr.Sergius to his own teaching may be proven by several tangible facts: (1) when he set before himself the task of describing Orthodoxy to foreign and non-Orthodox readers and wrote his book which first appeared in French under the title "Orthodoxie", and was recently published in the English language under the title of "The Orthodox Church" - in this book he touched upon various aspects of the Orthodox teaching and life, but did not even so much as mention Sophia.

He did not mention it just because it is his personal interpretation and not an accepted dogmatic teaching of the Church. (2) During the ten years of Fr. Sergius' work in the Russian Student Christian Movement we saw him always as our beloved teacher and inspirator, but never did we hear him speak about Sophia. He acted as a priest, and may I say, as a prophet, and never preached to the young people on subjects which can be understood only by those who are more mature and better trained to see their way in the realm of theology and philosophy. Therefore, the Sophia-logical discussions have always been the privilege of a very limited circle of such mature persons of a sufficiently high intellectual standing to follow Fr. Sergius. This is why our Movement as a whole knew Father Sergius Bulgakov rather than the thinker Sergius Bulgakov. (I personally am inclined to deplore this fact). (3) We cannot fail to take into consideration also the fact that during the ten years of Fr. Sergius' work in the Theological Academy he actually created a most valuable group of pious young Orthodox priests, but that among them there is not a single disciple and follower of his doctrine on Sophia. This is an obvious proof that also in his pedagogical activity he kept within the general Orthodox frame of the accepted Church teaching and did not force his ideas upon anybody.

Are not these facts, having the weight of ten years, sufficient proof of the veracity of Fr. Sergius' statement, namely that his ideas are an attempt at a theological and philosophical interpretation of the dogmas of the Church, but that he under no circumstances regarded them, or taught that they were, a exposition of the dogmatic doctrine of the Church.

May I now turn to the teaching as such, with which I am somewhat acquainted, as I happen to be one of the closest and most convinced disciples and followers of Fr. Sergius. I should like to express my bewilderment when reading the Ukaz and seeing the teaching of Fr. Sergius related to gnosticism. It would be too long a matter to write in detail about the difference between Father Sergius and the gnostics. I should like, therefore, just to point out several perhaps external yet characteristic arguments.

We know the course of spiritual and intellectual evolution of most of our thinkers. If Father Sergius is often referred to as a former Marxist,¹ would say that far more important and significant in his "spiritual biography" has been the study and overcoming of German idealistic philosophy, and furthermore and especially the system of Schelling. All these stages are reflected in his books (if I had the time and possibility I should like very much to write a research work on the evolution of Fr. Sergius' ideas). Yet among the various interests which attracted his

spirit during the course of his long life, he never, at any period, was interested in gnosticism (just as never he was interested in theosophy, or Spencer, etc,etc,) Simply, he, if I may say so, never had any taste for gnosticism. Among the contemporary Russian thinkers, the only one who is really inclined to gnosticism is Karsavin who wrote on this subject. To affirm that Fr.Sergius' teaching is gnosticism, means revealing absolute ignorance either of the former or the latter.

I do not go into the analysis of the other accusations contained in the Ukaz. In general, it is written so lightly, and almost as a piece of journalistic work, that a simple layman's conscience cannot hear in it the voice of the Church. The very speed of its issuing, without taking the trouble of having a commission to work it over, giving Fr.Bulgakov a chance to defend his teaching etc) haste in sending it out to the Balkan Patriarchs- all this gives ground to surmise that the inner goal of the Ukaz was the disorganization of our Church life here. I am far from being a victim to the emigre illness of explaining all our troubles by Bolshevik influence or intrigue. Yet I cannot help but see an alien influence in the Ukaz. The teaching on Sophia does not date since yesterday. Fr.Paul Florensky, a friend and partisan of Fr.Sergius', was awarded the degree of Master of Divinity of the Moscow Theological Academy for a book of his in which a chapter on Sophia is the central and basic place. Professor Sergius Bulgakov was ordained a priest at a time when he was the well-known author of a book "The Unfading Light", containing his early teaching on Sophia which in many respects was more "Doubtful" than his present teaching. He was ordained with the consent and blessing of the late Patriarch Tikhon. He was furthermore elected by the Moscow Sobor of 1918 to the Supreme Church Administration which took the place of the Synod. It seems to be good proof that neither Patriarch Tikhon, nor he who ordained Fr.Sergius- the most learned Bishop Feodor- nor the religious consciousness of the Russian people ever saw in him a heretic, although they all knew well that he was the author of the very system of ideas which has now suddenly been condemned as a horrible heresy.

May I say just a few words about my personal feeling regarding this system of ideas of Fr.Bulgakov. We find no answer in official theology to the problem an answer to which is the reaching on Sophia. Yet this problem is facing us and it faces the Christian consciousness as a whole. Answers to it are given by different thinkers. I personally see only three possibilities:(1) The answer given by the Roman Catholicism in the Thomist system; (2) the answer of Barth, and (3) the answer of Fr.Bulgakov. I am quite convinced that if we reject the idea of Sophia, we have to follow either the lines of Barthian's of Thomist course of ideas. I saw once a good illustration of this when an address on this subject was made by a Russian scholar who is in opposition to Fr.Sergius- he was most

warmly greeted by Maritain!

I should like to close my all too long letter by expressing my great anxiety not so much about Fr. Sergius but about our religious work as a whole. Even in the days of the maximum subordination of the Church to the State, we knew no "Index" and Russian theological thought felt itself free. The Ukaz seems to introduce a new practice which aims at the destruction of the most precious possession of Orthodoxy- namely freedom of thought and research on the part of faithful and loyal sons of the Church.

Yours very Sincerely,

L. ZANDER.

Confidential

The censure imposed upon Fr. Bulgakov's teaching by Sergius, Metropolitan of Moscow, has caused a good deal of uneasiness among the friends of the Russian Church.

This short document with the two letters attached to it is intended to throw some light on the events which preceded the censure.

Historical Background:

Modern Russian theology was born in the middle of the XIXth century. Its revival was started by lay theologians like A.S. Khomiakov, and ever since most important and original contributions in the realm of Russian theological thought have been made either by laymen, or by other men who actually stood outside the circle of professional theologians. Russian theology, as soon as it became independent of scholastic influences, plunged into a discussion of the main problem of the relation between God and His created world. Most of the Russian Orthodox original thinkers (such as V. Soloviev, ^{Prof.} N. Berdyaev, Fr. Paul Florensky, Prof. Karsavin, Rev. Prof. S. Bulgakov) have interpreted these relationships in the terms of the doctrine on "Sophia" (the Divine Wisdom).

This school of thought from the very beginning met with opposition, which became especially aggressive within the circles of the Russian emigration. Several factors led to this bitterness. First, the freedom of the press. The Russian Church was at last able to express its opinions without reserve. Second, the political motives brought into the controversy. Metropolitan Eulogius' opponents have attempted to compromise his position by accusing Fr. S. Bulgakov, Prof. N. Berdyaev and other professors and thinkers under his jurisdiction, of political radicalism as well as of theological innovations. Such incriminations were particularly wide-spread in 1925-27 at the time of the split in the Russian Church in Emigration, between Metropolitan Eulogius and the Karlovtsi Synod. But they did not amount to at that time to more than

the publication libellous pamphlets and articles which were gradually discredited and lost any influence with the public. A new element was added to the struggle when the Brotherhood of Photius appeared on the scene.

This is a small society which consists of 12 to 15 young laymen (from 25 to 35 years old) who took as their particular task a heresy hunt of any description and especially used any means possible for an attack on the Christians of the West. This last object of their activity is related to their name, for they chose as their patron Photius of Constantinople, who was prominent in the break which took place between the East and the West. In 1930-31 these young men left the Jurisdiction of Metropolitan Eulogius, for that of Metropolitan Eulepherius of Lithuania, who claims to represent the Church of Russia abroad. Under the leadership of Mr.V.Stavrovsky, an ex-student of the Paris Academy, who on account of serious misconduct was forced to leave the College, and was later on expelled from France, they commenced a very energetic campaign of denunciation against Fr.Bulgakov (the Rector of the Academy). They adopted the method of circularizing the leaders of the Orthodox Church with a long catalogue of their opponents' heresies. One such document reached Metropolitan Sergius in Moscow, who became alarmed and asked the Metropolitan of Lithuania to provide him with further information. The latter entrusted Stavrovsky himself (who had at that time found a refuge in Lithuania and had actually become Eulepherius Secretary) with this commission. Stavrovsky gladly seized this opportunity and composed a long document denouncing Fr.Bulgakov which was forwarded to Moscow.

In the course of time Metropolitan ~~Sergius~~ Eulepherius was informed from Moscow that Fr.Bulgakov's teaching was condemned by Metropolitan Sergius and this information was imparted to various people in Paris. A little later the actual document arrived in Lithuania and its contents, as it now appears, caused a good deal of uneasiness among those who worked towards producing such a condemnation. The

fact is that Metropolitan Sergius made it quite clear in the document that his sole source of information was Stavrovsky, who was mentioned by name in the epistle. Meanwhile the age, education, and the moral conduct of the accuser obviously showed him unsuitable for such a grave task as the accusation/ of a distinguished and learned theologian like Professor S. Bulgakov, of European repute, who is one of the greatest Russian thinkers, and who was a member of the Supreme Council of the Russian Church, to which he was elected by the All-Russian Synod of 1917-18. This probably explains the reason why the document itself has not been actually published in Paris, although through some ^{other} ~~mysterious~~ channels it reached the Churches in the Balkans with great rapidity, as well as the authorities of the Anglican Church.

The fact of such a condemnation taking place and the way it was manifested reveals several facts which are important for all those who are concerned with the future of the Russian Orthodox Church. First of all events show that a thick atmosphere of suspicion and fear, as well as of espionage, created by the Communists, has permeated into the Russian Church and has actually affected the mentality and the outlook of some of its leaders. Persecution purifies the life of the Church, but it also tends to disintegrate and embitter some its members. Secondly, it clearly shows that a certain section of the Russian Church is prepared to fight a battle of obscurantism and is ready to use all means for compromising those who stand for radical thinking and for co-operation with Western Christendom.

This last point brings us to the third and the most delicate side of this whole story. The Communist Government is determined to exterminate the Church. It has succeeded in suppressing every free expression of thought in Russia. The only section of the Russian Church which can still speak freely and is speaking of the persecution in Russia is the small group of Russian theologians in Paris. They are the only Russian religious thinkers whose books and articles are

published in Europe and in the States, and who take part in Ecumenical movements. There is no question that from the Communist point of view the discrediting of a man like Bulgakov is an important victory. This is all that one can say at present the future will probably reveal the motives behind the actions of men like Mr. Stavrovsky and others who have tried to give as wide a publicity as possible in connection with this "condemnation" both in Paris and in other parts of the world. We do not similarly know what are the circumstances which have forced Metropolitan Sergius to act as precipitately as he did when he made his pronouncement on the writings of a man who cannot reply to his accusations because he has never been asked to do so, and whose books are not within his reach because they have been banned by the Government in Russia. In conclusion the question ought to be raised as to what is the bearing of all these events on the life of our Fellowship.

The Future of the Fellowship:

Two paths lie before us. We can either consider all the above as the domestic troubles of the Russians, which do not concern the other members of the Fellowship (such a non-committal attitude can be easily advocated from various points of view!), or there is yet another way which is open to us. This way is more daring and also ^{represents} a more Christian way of action, which is open to us as a Fellowship. It consists in taking the troubles of the Russian section as suffering which affects all our members. Our Fellowship has originated and grown from the living experience of our oneness and unity, revealed to us in the Holy Eucharist. We are already one body in the sight of God. The present crisis is the first occasion when the reality of our unity is being tested. If we are really the members of the same Holy Apostolic and Catholic Church of Christ then surely we have to bear the burdens of one another and of our Churches, even though as yet they are canonically separated.

If we accept this position then the duty of the Russians is to be quite frank with their Anglican brothers and other members of our Fellowship, and to show them

without hiding anything what is happening in their Church. The duty of the Anglicans would similarly be to share any difficulties with the Russians. Such sharing naturally imposes a new responsibility on all our members, it requires a much deeper knowledge of our Churches, and much more courage to be able to stand up for those who are in trouble and who participate in the struggle. The question is - are both parties willing and ready to share each others sorrows and joys, are they ready to try and live the one common life in the Holy Catholic Church? Will the Russians be able to receive with an open heart the interference and the advice of their Anglican brothers? Will the Anglicans and other members be ready to take a real interest in the troubles of their Eastern brothers, and not be shocked by their divisions and lack of external unity?

An answer to these questions can only be given by the life of the Fellowship, which will prove how far we are really members of One Body so that "if one member suffers all the members suffer with it, and when one member rejoices all the members rejoice with it".

MEMORANDUM on UKAZ concerning the Rev. SERGIUS BULGAKOFF.

I. The Ukaz of Metropolitan Sergius dated September 7, 1935.

a. Introduction in the Ukaz.

"Information has come to me that the well known writer, Archpriest S.N. Bulgakoff, professor of dogmatic theology in the Russian Theological Institute in Paris, in his published writings and in his lectures develops the special teaching regarding Sophia - Holy Wisdom. Some are attached to this teaching and themselves begin to understand and interpret Christianity "according to Sophia"; others are disturbed by its peculiarities and its frequent evident lack of accord with the teaching of the Church. I requested the Administrator of our churches abroad in Western Europe, the Most Reverend Metropolitan of Lithuania, to present me with information regarding Bulgakoff's teaching. On the instructions of the Metropolitan, a detailed outline of the Bulgakoff teaching was prepared by A. Stavrovsky. There was also at hand a preliminary review by the Vice-President of the Brotherhood of St. Photius, Lossky, with the report that the Brotherhood had set itself the task of a systematic explanation of Bulgakoff's views. The material presented makes it possible to make the following conclusions regarding Bulgakoff's teaching".

b. Resolutions taken on 24th August, 1935.

"I. The teaching of Prof. Archpriest S.N. Bulgakoff being an eccentric and arbitrary (svoebraznaya i proizvolnaya) Sophianic interpretation, frequently perverting the dogmas of the Orthodox faith, in some of its aspects being even directly a duplication of false teachings already universally (soborno) condemned by the Church, in some of its possible conclusions liable to be even dangerous for spiritual life - to recognize the teaching as foreign to the Holy Orthodox Church of Christ, and to warn all Her faithful servants and members against attraction to it.

"II. Orthodox bishops, priests and laymen who are careless enough to become attracted by Bulgakoff's teaching and to follow him in this teaching, in writings or in printed works, to be called to reform of their error and to unflinching loyalty to 'sound doctrine'.

"III. Regarding Archpriest S.N. Bulgakoff himself, as one not in communion with the Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, to pass no special judgement at this time; but in future, in case of question of receiving Archpr. Bulgakoff into communion, to make the condition of such reception, as well as of authorization for his serving in Holy Orders, his written disavowal of his Sophianic interpretation of the dogmas of the faith and of his other mistakes in the teaching of the faith, and his written promise of unflinching loyalty to the teaching of the Orthodox Church.

The meaning of the Ukaz:

a. It states that:

1. the Teaching is condemned.
2. Father Bulgakoff threatened with defrocking unless he disavows the teaching.

b. Since Fr. Bulgakoff is not in jurisdiction of Metropolitan Sergius:

1. The resolution on teaching is effective for all the Russian Church.
2. The administrative resolution has no immediate effect.
3. Metropolitan Eulogius alone can take administrative action.

III. Conditions under which Metropolitan Sergius wrote his documents

The matter of Fr. Bulgakoff's teachings has been mentioned in several communications the Photius Brotherhood has sent to Metropolitan Sergius during the past several years. The Metropolitan Elevation has concerned himself with these teachings also, partly, probably largely, because of the criticisms raised before him by Evgraf Kovalevsky Jr. and Vladimir Lossky. The result was that in the late spring of this year, the Metropolitan Sergius requested of the Metropolitan Elevation a report on these teachings, and also of the Brotherhood (I am not clear whether the request came direct from Metropolitan Sergius or through Metropolitan Elevation). The Brotherhood replied that they would prepare such a report, but it would take considerable time to do it thoroughly. Metropolitan Elevation in the meantime committed the request to Stavrovsky, who lives in Kovno. It was the Stavrovsky report only, consisting of some quotations from Bulgakoff and criticism of them, which went to Moscow, and which alone, except for the several letters referred to, constituted the basis for Metropolitan Sergius' Ukaz.

IV. The historical background in Russia:

- a. The conflict between the conception of Church as the defender of faith against surrounding enemies, and the conception of Church as creative living organism.
- b. Conditions under the Synod and Procurator in Russia, prohibiting free theological study.
- c. Resulting sense of freedom after the restoration of Patriarchate and Sobor.
- d. The much discussed question of relative standing and authority of:
 1. The Bishops in Council.
 2. The parish clergy.
- e. The implication of the doctrine of Sobornost; only the voice of the Church as a whole is decisive.

The action which Metropolitan Eulogius might take:

- a. He must receive the Ukaz formally, either from the Oecumenic Patriarch, or from Metropolitan Sergius.
- b. He could ask Fr. Bulgakoff for an explanation, and on receiving it, could consider:
 1. Doctrine sound.
 2. Doctrine questionable but permitted.
 3. Doctrine so questionable as to require canonical judgment.
 4. In addition, require temporary retirement of Bulgakoff from Institute.
- c. He could decide upon the procedure for decision:
 - A. The body:
 - (i) His own synod of bishops.
 - (ii) A commission of theologians.
 - (iii) ?
 - B. The process:
 - (i) Secure from Bulgakoff a statement of the teaching and evidence of its Orthodoxy.
 - (ii) A competent study of the teaching and evidence.
 - (iii) A collection of criticisms.
 - (iv) A defense against criticisms (Written and oral).
 - (v) A decision by the body.
- d. Possible results of the decision:
 1. That the teaching need not be considered contrary or specifically condemned. Then Bulgakoff's position would be justified.
 2. That the teaching is questionable. Then Bulgakoff might:
 - (i) still be permitted to hold position, but not to teach the doctrine;
 - (ii) be permitted to hold position on acceptance of doctrinal position held by the canonical body deciding the case;
 - (iii) might be permitted to retire from Institute with liberty to speak and write as an independent thinker within the Church.
- e. The material and results may be published during the procedure or after, upon decision of Metropolitan Eulogius.

VI. The teaching of Fr. Sergius on Sophia, the Holy Wisdom.

Actual nature of the teaching - where found in Bulgakoff's writings.
Relation of the teaching on Sophia to the dogmas and the instruction Bulgakoff gives regarding them.
The evidence that the teaching is Orthodox at least not un-Orthodox.
The contrary evidence.

Line of action for Fr. Bulgakoff.

- a. Prepare a clear statement of doctrine he holds, as object of discussion.
- b. Seriously consider all criticism, and answer to the point, avoiding personalities.
- c. Offer to refrain from bringing in Sophia into instruction in Academy.
- d. Agree to accept the ruling of canonical authority, or state what authority he would accept.
- e. Accept the ruling, even disavowing if required.
- f. Refuse to accept the ruling on doctrine, but accept administrative decision of Metropolitan Eulogius.

VIII. The position of supporters of the Theological Institute.

- a. Think primarily of the uniqueness of the Institute and the imperative importance of its continuance and maintenance.
- b. The Ukaz is a recognition by Metropolitan Sergius himself of the significance of the Institute.
- c. Recognize that Fr. Bulgakoff is only one of the professors at the Institute.
- d. Take into consideration the undoubted Christian life of Fr. Sergius, and the deep spiritual benefits he has brought to the Russian intellectual class.
- e. View the situation in light of points III and IV above.
- f. Recognize the enlivening value for Orthodox thought of a process of free discussion on a doctrinal subject which involves a whole theological system regarding God, Creation, Man and Salvation.
- g. Remember the history of the Tractarians and the Oxford Movement in the early years and the subsequent benefits to the Anglican Communion.

Paul B. Anderson.

Paris, October 30, 1935.