

# Dietrich Bonhoeffer and the Russian Religious Renaissance

Charles E. Ford

11 December 1992

## Introduction

The German Lutheran theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906-1945) is strongly identified with the opposition to Nazism for which he was eventually imprisoned and executed. The purpose of this paper is to explore a rarely studied aspect of Bonhoeffer's thought – his interest in those thinkers who have been identified with the Russian religious renaissance of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Bonhoeffer's encounter with the Russian religious philosophers occurred at a very formative period in his life, during his student years at the University of Berlin from 1924 to 1927. During this period he began to study in depth the theologian who was to make the most profound impact on him – Martin Luther. He also encountered the other theologian who was to have a great impact on him, Karl Barth. The thesis of this paper is that the Russian religious philosophers, whom Bonhoeffer encountered at this early stage in his career, may also have had a significant impact on his thought.

Two of Bonhoeffer's teachers in Berlin, Karl Holl and Adolph Deissmann, had become interested in Russian Orthodoxy and encouraged their students to study it. The Bulgarian Stefan Zankov was invited by Deissmann to give a course of lectures at Berlin University in 1927 on "The Orthodox Christianity of the East," which were later published in book form. Bonhoeffer later acquired this book and met Zankov at ecumenical conferences.

Between 1923 and 1925, Hans Ehrenberg and Nikolai Bubnov published two volumes of German translations of Russian religious writers, including Solovyev, Khomyakov, Florensky, Bulgakov and Berdyayev.<sup>1</sup> Bonhoeffer acquired and read both volumes.<sup>2</sup> Bonhoeffer was especially interested in Berdyayev and in Ehrenberg's postscripts. His biographer adds: "Naturally he also plunged into Dostoyevsky."

Bulgakov and Berdyayev were among the group of authors who had published the collection of essays in 1909 entitled *Vekhi*.<sup>3</sup> These essays were very critical of the modern revolutionary intelligentsia. In the analysis of modernity offered later by Bonhoeffer in his *Ethics* one can detect many similarities with the analysis of the *Vekhi* authors.

Both analyses pointed to the growing secularization and the spread of utopian nihilistic revolutionary ideology. Both analyses saw as decisive the influence of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution on the development of this ideology. Both saw the total rejection of the state and the revolutionary desire to destroy the existing order as particularly dangerous. Both observed that concrete acts of charity on behalf others are rejected by this ideology in favor of the universal salvation of mankind, that the concrete present is sacrificed to the utopian future.

These similarities (and others) are the more remarkable given that the *Vekhi* authors were describing a Bolshevik Revolution that had not yet occurred, while Bonhoeffer was describing the Nazi revolution at the height of its success. The remarkable prescience of the *Vekhi* authors has been noted by many.

Especially noteworthy is Bonhoeffer's insistence that the Nazis are a revolutionary phenomenon. He saw both nationalism and internationalism as revolutionary ideologies, very similar in character, both having roots in the French Revolution. Pyotr Struve, one of the *Vekhi* authors, later offered a similar analysis. Shortly after the outbreak of World War II he wrote:

National Socialism and Bolshevism must be considered together in a spiritual as well as a real sense. Now there are very few who understand this, and practical politicians are even less versed in this regard, although after the joint aggression on Poland and Finland one would expect the situation to be clear to all.<sup>4</sup>

This paper will compare Bonhoeffer's religious views and his analysis of modernity with that of the Russian religious philosophers. It will also touch on Bonhoeffer's view of Russian orthodoxy and the Bolshevik revolution.

### Bonhoeffer and Khomyakov

Already during his student years at the University of Berlin Bonhoeffer took a great interest in Christian unity and in the true meaning of 'catholicity'. This interest was reinforced by his study of Russian Christianity.

The issue of the unity of Christianity occupies a central place in Bonhoeffer's first work, *Sanctorum Communio*, which he presented as his first doctoral dissertation to the theological faculty in Berlin in 1927, at the age of 21. In it he was critical of Kant and Hegel, at least as regards their understanding of the Church. By contrast, he was full of praise for the view of the Church put forward by the nineteenth century Russian religious thinker A. S. Khomyakov.

He referred twice to an article by Khomyakov entitled "The Unity of the Church," which had appeared in the second volume of Ehrenberg and Bubnov. The first reference comes in a discussion of prayers of intercession in the Church, where Khomyakov is quoted with evident approval. In his works Bonhoeffer usually paraphrased or gave only very short quotes from other authors. A quote as long as the following, which he took from Khomyakov, is quite rare:

No man is saved alone; he who is saved is saved in the Church, as its member in unity with the other members. Does anyone believe? – he is in the community of faith. Does anyone love? – he is in the community of love. Does anyone pray? – he is in the community of prayer. Do not ask: "What prayer can benefit the living or the dead, since my prayer is not even sufficient for myself?" Since in any event you do not understand how to pray, what is the purpose of your praying for yourself? The spirit of love prays in you. . . . If you are a member of the Church your prayer is necessary for all its members. . . . But the blood of the Church is the prayer of intercession for one another.<sup>5</sup>

The idea expressed here that "you do not understand how to pray . . . the spirit of love prays in you," is also found in Luther (and St. Paul) and was very important to Bonhoeffer. He developed it in a later book.<sup>6</sup>

In the paragraph immediately preceding the one containing this quote, Bonhoeffer elaborated on the idea that "Christ died for the Church so that its members might lead one

life, with one another and for one another.” He made the following assertion, which was a harbinger of his own future in Germany:

Every gift of a material, spiritual or religious kind fulfills its purpose only in the Church. Love demands that we should sacrifice our own interest. But this may include sacrificing even communion with God himself. Here is manifested the love which of its own free will is ready to incur God’s wrath for its brother’s sake, which even desires God’s wrath if by this means they will be enabled to have communion with him, which takes its brother’s place as Christ took our place for us. The two great examples of this are Exodus 32:32 and Romans 9:1ff. Moses wished to be blotted out of the book of life with his people, and Paul wished that he himself were accursed and cut off from Christ, not in order to be condemned with his bretheren, but to win communion with God for them; he wishes to be condemned in their stead. This is a paradox of love for God which it is difficult to resolve;

It is remarkable that in this passage Bonhoeffer at the very beginning of his career identified what later became central in his life, namely his decision to share the fate of the Christian people of Germany under Nazism. This decision led to his abrupt return to Germany in the summer of 1939, his subsequent involvement in the plots against Hitler, and his arrest in 1943. During his imprisonment, two months after the failure of the plot to assassinate Hitler in July 1944, he wrote a poem entitled “The Death of Moses.”<sup>7</sup> In it he compared his own fate with that of Moses in the same terms quoted above. He described himself as taking, as did Moses, the risk of being blotted out of the book of life with his people. He predicted that, just as Moses did not live to see the promised land, so he would not live to see Germany free of the Nazis. This prediction was fulfilled by his execution on 9 April 1945.

His second reference to Khomyakov refers explicitly to the original meaning of ‘catholicity’ as unity:

... the wish is to show that the Church, being united, is also the one and only Church (original meaning of *katholike* = *una sola*). The Russian Orthodox Church lays an uncommonly strong stress upon the idea of unity. Khomyakov’s presentation, in which he talks essentially of the unity of the Church, has a strength and depth making it almost without parallel among works on the Church.<sup>8</sup>

This reference occurs in a long paragraph in which the problem of human ‘equality’ is discussed. This paragraph continues:

The Christian idea of equality says nothing about interpersonal relationships, ... the equality of men consists in their universal sinfulness (Romans 3:23), that means also their universal need of redemption, and their equal share in God’s grace. ... equality before God cannot be proved or demonstrated, nor is it manifest as ‘similarity’. It rests ultimately upon the fact that God is always the same. Equality has nothing to do with affinity between souls, ... The Christian conception of equality does not make everybody equal, ... This is the difference in principle between the Christian idea of equality and all socialist or idealist ideas of equality. And that in

turn directs us back to the Christian concept of spiritual unity, as represented in a theological concept of the Church.<sup>9</sup>

The idea of equality is elaborated later by Bonhoeffer in his *Ethics* and is similar to that given by Berdyayev in his book *The Philosophy of Inequality*. A comparison of the two views will be given later.

#### Other Russian writers

Bonhoeffer made reference to two other Russian authors in *Sanctorum Communio*. In the second reference to Khomyakov cited above, he also referred to the book *The Church of the East* by Arseniev which had appeared in German 1926 and which he acquired. He also referred to *Society and the Individual* by Kistyakovsky which had appeared in German in 1899. This is the doctoral dissertation of B. A. Kistyakovsky who in 1909 became one of the *Vekhi* authors.<sup>10</sup>

The statement by Bonhoeffer's biographer that "Naturally he also plunged into Dostoyevsky" makes one wish to know more about his interest in Dostoyevsky. Other than a reference to Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor<sup>11</sup>, the only information about this is in a letter to his parents. Written on 13 March 1925 during his student days in Berlin, it reflects his interest in the true 'catholicity' of the Church shortly before he began preparing for his dissertation *Sanctorum Communio*.

I have just been reading Dostoyevsky's highly interesting speech on Pushkin, in which he represents him as the first man to make a distinction between Russian and European and as the herald of the Russian ideal: 'supra-national pan-humanism', as he calls it. It is remarkable that he should call on what is most specific in a nation to show that nation the way to transcending itself, at any rate as a nation. To Dostoyevsky this idea, as he continually emphasizes, is necessarily associated with that of Christianity, and the real 'catholicism' of primitive Christianity is thus re-established.<sup>12</sup>

Bonhoeffer revealed his familiarity with Solovyev at one of the most dramatic points in his *Ethics*.

We begin this section by referring to one of our most astonishing experiences during the period when Christianity was sorely oppressed. The deification of the irrational, of blood and instinct, of the beast of prey in man ... [had placed in danger the defenders of liberal values]. Reason, culture, humanity, tolerance and self-determination, all these concepts which until very recently had served as battle slogans against the Church, against Christianity, against Jesus Christ Himself, had now suddenly and surprisingly come very near indeed to the Christian standpoint. ... it was these concepts that had somehow become homeless and now sought refuge in the Christian sphere, in the shadow of the Christian Church. ... The children of the Church, who had become independent and gone their own ways, now in the hour of danger returned to their mother. ... Reason, justice, culture,

humanity and all the kindred concepts sought and found a new purpose and a new power in their origin.

This origin is Jesus Christ. In Soloviev's story of the Antichrist, in the last days before Christ's return the heads of the persecuted churches discuss the question of what is for each of them the most precious thing in Christianity; the decisive answer is that the most precious thing in Christianity is Jesus Christ Himself. That is to say, that in the face of the Antichrist only one thing has force and permanence, and that is Christ Himself. . . . There seems to be a general unconscious knowledge, which, in the hour of ultimate peril, leads everything which desires not to fall victim to the Antichrist to take refuge with Christ.<sup>13</sup>

This perception about the return of the defenders of liberal concepts to their "mother," the Church, is a central feature of Bonhoeffer's decision to return to Germany. It also represents the development of the most mature and independent phase of his theology and action and the widening gap between himself and Karl Barth.

Karl Barth, a Swiss Reformed theologian and the leading figure in a revival of confessional Christianity during the 1920s, had a major influence on Bonhoeffer. Barth was especially important in the Church struggle ('Kirchenkampf') that took place in the Protestant Churches in Germany after the Nazis came to power in January 1933. Barth was the primary author of the Barmen Declaration in 1934, the central document of the 'Confessing Church' that arose in opposition to Nazi influence in the Protestant Churches.

There were, however, significant differences between Barth and Bonhoeffer, due in part to the profound influence of Luther on Bonhoeffer.<sup>14</sup> This difference is reflected both in their theological views and their views on society and history. Barth was a socialist with sympathies toward Marxism. This became especially clear after the war when he exhibited a complete lack of public opposition to Stalin and the Stalinist regimes in Eastern Europe, in dramatic contrast to his earlier uncompromising public opposition to Nazism. Before the end of the war Barth had become active in a communist-led organization, *The Committee for a Free Germany*.

Although Barth had a great appreciation for Luther, he regarded as fundamentally mistaken Luther's views on the relationship between Law and Gospel and between temporal and spiritual authority ('The Two Kingdoms'). He regarded Nazism as a consequences of these mistakes and saw a direct line leading from Friedrich the Great through Bismarck to Hitler. Bonhoeffer rejected this view as a "grotesque mistake."<sup>15</sup> He had a high opinion of both Friedrich the Great and Bismarck. Nazism he regarded as a fruit of the French Revolution, a subject to which we turn in the next section.

At least twice Bonhoeffer spoke of the suffering of the Russian Christianity under communism. At the seminary in Finkenwalde in 1936 he was giving lectures that would eventually become his book *The Cost of Discipleship*. When he came to the topic of martyrdom, he gave as an example "the cold martyrdom in Russia today."<sup>16</sup> In New York on 25 June 1939, he made a notation in his diary about "the strange silence of the American public over the suffering of Christians in Russia."<sup>17</sup>

In 1941 his views on the dangers posed by the Soviet Union are presented in a document he co-authored:

... as Christians ... we must not minimize the danger which Russia still represents for all that we hold dear. ... Bolshevism may well become a tremendous menace ... There is, furthermore, the very difficult question as to whether the Baltic States, the Bukovina, Karelia, Bessarabia, shall go back to a Russia which recognizes civil and religious liberties just as little as do the Nazis.<sup>18</sup>

### Bonhoeffer and Berdyayev

Berdyayev was part of a group that was expelled from the Soviet Union in 1922 and spent the next two years in Berlin. During these two years Berdyayev published three books in Russian: *The Philosophy of Inequality*, *The New Middle Age* and *The Meaning of History*.<sup>19</sup> The last two appeared in German translation in 1927 and 1925 respectively. Also in 1927 a German translation of Berdyayev's *The Meaning of Creativity* appeared, a selection of which had already appeared in the second volume of Ehrenberg and Bubnov. By 1927 a German translation of *The Tragedy of Philosophy* by Sergei Bulgakov had also appeared.<sup>20</sup>

Bonhoeffer was a student in Berlin from 1924 to 1927. His biographer has stated that he acquired the two volumes by Ehrenberg and Bubnov and that he had a special interest in Berdyayev. Thus it is very possible that Bonhoeffer had become familiar with these German translations of Berdyayev's books. Whether this is the case or not, there are similarities between the thought of Bonhoeffer and that of Berdyayev.

Bonhoeffer's description of the French Revolution focused on the revolutionary drive for complete emancipation from any higher authority. This, he believed, actually leads to complete slavery.

An outcome of the emancipation of reason was the discovery of the Rights of Man. They were found to lie in the innate title of every man to liberty, in the equality of all men before the law, ... man broke free from all repressive coercion, from the chaperonage of church and state, ... 'The law is the expression of the General will' (*The Declaration of the Rights of Man*).<sup>21</sup>

The French Revolution created a new unity of mind in the west. This unity lies in the emancipation of man ... Furthermore there becomes apparent in this an underlying law of history, namely that the demand for absolute liberty brings men to the depths of slavery. ... The creature turns against its creator in a strange re-enactment of the Fall. The emancipation of the masses leads to the reign of terror of the guillotine. Nationalism leads inevitably to war. The liberation of man as an absolute ideal leads only to man's self-destruction. At the end of the path which was first trodden in the French Revolution there is nihilism.<sup>22</sup>

Even at the present day the French Revolution is still the rallying cry of the modern western world. ... The cult of reason the deification of nature, faith in progress and a critical approach to civilization, the bourgeoisie and the revolt of the masses, nationalism and anti-clericalism, the rights of man and dictatorial terror – all this erupted chaotically as something new in the history of the western world. The French Revolution was the laying

bare of the emancipated man in his tremendous power and his most terrible perversity.<sup>23</sup>

The New unity which the French Revolution brought to Europe – and what we are experiencing today is the crisis of this unity – is therefore western godlessness. It is totally different from the atheism of certain individual Greek, Indian, Chinese and western thinkers. It is not the theoretical denial of the existence of a God. It is itself a religion, a religion of hostility to God.<sup>24</sup>

This analysis has much in common with Berdyayev's view, which he offered in his book *The New Middle Ages*

The optimistic presupposition of the natural goodness and kindness of human nature lies at the basis of democracy. The spiritual father of democracy was J. J. Rousseau, and his optimistic ideas concerning human nature have been passed on to the democratic ideology. Democracy does not want to acknowledge the radical evil of human nature. It does not seem to foresee that the will of the people may be directed toward evil, that the majority may stand for the lie and injustice, and that truth and justice may be upheld by a small minority. There are no guarantees in democracy that the will of the people shall be directed toward good, that they shall desire freedom instead of destroying all freedom altogether. During the French Revolution the revolutionary democracy, which had begun with the Declaration of the Rights and Freedom of Man, had by 1793 left no freedom untouched, but had annihilated the last trace of freedom. Human will, the will of the people, had fallen to the Evil One and where this self-proclaimed will is not subordinated to any higher purpose and asserts the claim to determine the fate of society autonomously, then resistance to and betrayal of the truth and the dissolution of all freedom follow easily. . . . However the formally empty and negative interpretation of freedom concealed a poison which overthrew the historical democracies and in them prepared the way for the destruction of the freedom of the spirit. Rousseau denied freedom of conscience as a matter of principle. Robespierre annihilated it in fact.<sup>25</sup>

This critical attitude toward democracy was echoed by Bonhoeffer in the document he co-authored in 1941.

The Anglo-Saxon world summarizes the struggle against the omnipotence of the State in the word 'freedom'. . . . freedom is too negative a word to be used in a situation where *all* order has been destroyed. And liberties are not enough when men seek first of all for some minimum security. These words remind too much of the old liberalism which because of its failures is itself largely responsible for the development towards State absolutism. . . . we believe that the conception of order limited by law and responsibility, an order which is not an aim in itself, but which recognizes commandments which transcend the State, has more spiritual substance and solidity than the emphasis on the rights of individual men.<sup>26</sup>

In the section on Khomyakov we quoted *Sanctorum Communio* giving Bonhoeffer's view that equality before God does not imply a socialist understanding of human equality. Berdyayev expressed similar thought in his book *The Philosophy of Inequality*. Although this work, a passionate, vehement protest against the Bolshevik revolution, was apparently never translated into German, much of it was taken over into *The New Middle Ages*, which was. We quote from it several excerpts that resemble ideas of Bonhoeffer. Berdyayev addresses himself to the Bolsheviks:<sup>27</sup>

You . . . love to make use even of Christianity in defense of your objectives, and have no scruples about referring even to the Gospel in which you do not believe, and which you do not accept. But you cannot find anything in Christianity in your support . . . Christianity acknowledges the absolute worth of every human soul and their equal worth before God. But one cannot derive any conclusion therefrom that would be favorable to external, mechanical equalization and undifferentiation. Christianity did not rise up or revolt against slavery at a certain stage in its development; it only acknowledged that the soul of the man in the social condition of a slave has an absolute worth and is equal before God to that of his master. Slave and master could be brothers in Christ, and a slave could hold a higher position in the Church of Christ than a master.

Berdyayev goes further in asserting an idea that may sound offensive to our modern democratic ears, namely that inequality is necessary for the emergence of human individuality, human personality.

Inequality is the basis of the cosmic order and harmony, and is the justification of the existence of human personality itself, the source of all creative movement in the world.

Your human collective, that anthill of the future, the terrible leviathan, shall finally destroy personality as well as all other reality.

You reject and destroy personality, all you heralds of the materialistic revolution, you socialists and anarchists, radicals and democrats of various shades, all you levelers and subverters, heralds of the religion of equality. You would like to convert men into atoms, and the human society into an atomic mechanism, into a collective of impersonal atoms. But in truth, man is not an atom, but an individuum, an individual, a differentiated being. Every man possesses a unique, individual lot in this life and the life beyond, in eternity.

Berdyayev's biographer is keenly aware of the negative reaction that this defense of inequality may generate and proceeds immediately to offer an explanation of Berdyayev's views, lest they be "misunderstood." Bonhoeffer, like Berdyayev, connects inequality with individuality and is also aware of how offensive this may sound to modern sensibilities.

No one can confer upon himself the warrant for ethical discourse; . . . it is assigned to him, . . . on the basis of an objective position in the world. . . . upon the old man and not upon the young one, upon the father and not

the child, the master and not the servant, . . . What finds expression here is that disparity which is so extremely offensive to modern sensibilities but which is inherent and essential in the ethical, namely the disparity between the superior and the inferior. Without this objective subordination of the lower to the higher, and without that courage to accept superiority which modern man has so completely lost, ethical discourse is dissipated in generalities, it lacks an object and its essential character is destroyed.<sup>28</sup>

The Enlightenment [was] right to oppose a system under which society was divided into privileged and unprivileged sections. The ethical . . . subordination of the inferior to the superior, does not in any way imply a sanctioning of privileges. . . . It was wrong only when it went beyond these polemical arguments and once more made man himself an abstraction, employing this abstraction as a weapon against all human order in the name of human equality and human dignity.<sup>29</sup>

The ethical, therefore, is not a principle which levels out, invalidates and disrupts the whole order of human precedence and subordination, but . . . [instead] implies a definite structure of human society; it implies certain definite sociological relations which involve authority. . . . [This is] in direct contradiction to the interpretation of the ethical . . . which proclaims the equality of all men by virtue of their innate universal human reason. One must be quite clear about the fact – and the history of the past hundred and fifty years [since the French Revolution] has demonstrated it clearly enough – that the actual goal of this new conception of the ethical . . . has not only not been achieved but has turned out to be exactly the opposite of what was intended. . . . [It] ended in the total atomization of human society and of the life of the individual, in unlimited subjectivism and individualism. . . . [L]ife falls apart into an infinite number of unconnected atoms of time, and human society resolves itself into individual atoms of reason.<sup>30</sup>

Bonhoeffer, like Berdyayev, saw that this leveling was motivated by an attempt to correct historical injustices in society, but insisted that the final result was a destruction of the integrity of the individual and society. Both men used the same term “atomization” to describe the effect of modern revolutionary rationalism on the individual and society. The passages also reveal, however, that the two are using quite different concepts to convey their common central point. For Berdyayev personality is the key to the integrity of the Christian person. For Bonhoeffer it is the concrete nature of Christian ethics.

These in turn are derived from concepts which are central to their respective theologies, Berdyayev’s vision of God-Manhood and Bonhoeffer’s of man being conformed with Jesus the Incarnate God. Each of these visions contain very dramatic assertions about the ‘divinity’ of the Christian. The importance of personality for Berdyayev is derived from his view of God-Manhood. Likewise the centrality of a concrete ethics for Bonhoeffer derives from his view of conformation, of man being drawn into the form of Jesus Christ.

There are other issues on which their views are similar. On the relationship between Church and state<sup>31</sup> both adopt, essentially, Luther’s ‘The Two Kingdom Teaching’. Berdyayev also shares with Bonhoeffer a critical view toward a moralistic approach to Chris-

tianity. For example, Berdyayev criticized Lev Tolstoy in the following terms:

For L. Tolstoy, Jesus Christ was not the Redeemer and Savior, but a great teacher of life, the herald of rules of life, of moral commandments. . . . he did not accept Christ inwardly; Christ remained for him an external teacher of life.<sup>32</sup>

Bonhoeffer offered a similar criticism of Tolstoy,<sup>33</sup> and spoke to the issue more generally:

But just as we misunderstand the form of Christ if we take Him to be essentially the teacher of a pious and good life, so, too, we should misunderstand the [Christian] formation of man if we were to regard it as instruction in the way in which a pious and good life is to be attained.<sup>34</sup>

There are, of course, differences as well. Perhaps most noticeably on their views of freedom. Berdyayev's biographer spends an entire chapter (chapter 6) discussing his complicated and controversial views of freedom, including his highly criticized doctrine of "uncreated freedom." His views draw heavily from the theosophical teachings of the mystic Jacob Boehme. These would have been quite alien to Bonhoeffer. Bonhoeffer affirmed Luther's view of freedom, which to Berdyayev appeared to be a denial of freedom of the will. Freedom, inner freedom, is what God gives us when we respond to His call, freedom from the torment of anxiety and freedom in the certainty of our action.<sup>35</sup>

In conclusion we should note that this paper is a tentative exploration of possible connections between Bonhoeffer and the Russian religious philosophers. It remains to determine, if possible, the extent to which Bonhoeffer actually read their works. Also a more careful investigation is needed of the extent to which his views may have been influenced by their works and his knowledge of the fate of Russian Christianity under Communism.

#### Bibliography

<sup>1</sup>Hans Ehrenberg, *Oestliches Christentum*, Oscar Beck, Munich, Band I, 1923, Band II, 1925.

<sup>2</sup>Eberhard Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, Harper and Row, New York, 1970, 47.

<sup>3</sup> Boris Shragin and Albert Todd eds., *Landmarks: A collection of essays on the Russian intelligentsia*, Karz Howard, New York, 1977.

<sup>4</sup>S. L. Frank, *The Biography of P. B. Struve*, Chekhov Publishers, New York, 1956 (Russian), 175, as quoted in *Landmarks*, note 13, xxxiv.

<sup>5</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Communion of Saints*, Harper and Row, New York, 1963, 132.

<sup>6</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Psalms: the prayerbook of the Bible*, Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1970.

<sup>7</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Letters and Papers from Prison*, Macmilan, New York, 1971, 398.

<sup>8</sup>*The Communion of Saints*, note 96, 235.

<sup>9</sup>*The Communion of Saints*, 142-144.

<sup>10</sup>*The Communion of Saints*, In his three references to Kistyakovsky only one, in note 17 page 215, gives any initials – and it gives F. That B. A. Kistyakovsky is intended is made clear in the biographical sketch of him in *Landmarks*, 190.

<sup>11</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, Macmillian, New York, 1965, 128.

<sup>12</sup>*Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 47.

<sup>13</sup>*Ethics*, 55-56.

<sup>14</sup>Charles Ford, "Luther, Bonhoeffer and Revolution," *Lutheran Forum*, **25-4** (Advent 1991), American Lutheran Publicity Bureau, Delhi NY, 24-28. The differences between Bonhoeffer and Barth as well as Bonhoeffer's views on revolution are discussed here.

<sup>15</sup>*Ethics*, 100-101.

<sup>16</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Nachfolge*, Dietrich Bonhoeffer Werke, Band 4, Christian Kaiser Verlag, Munich, 1989, note 4, 76.

<sup>17</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Way to Freedom*, Harper and Row, New York, 1966, 237.

<sup>18</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *True Patriotism*, Collins, London, 1973, 116-117.

<sup>19</sup>Matthew Spinka, *Nicolas Berdyaev*, Westminster, Philadelphia, 1950, 59-60, 66-67, 208. *The New Middle Age* has appeared in English translation as *The End of our Time*.

<sup>20</sup>Nikolas Berdjajew, *Das Neue Mittelalter*, Otto Reichl Verlag, Darmstadt, 1927. Reichl is the publisher of many of the German translations mentioned (though not of Ehrenberg and Bubnov).

<sup>21</sup>*Ethics*, 99-100.

<sup>22</sup>*Ethics*, 102.

<sup>23</sup>*Ethics*, 97.

<sup>24</sup>*Ethics*, 102.

<sup>25</sup>*Das Neue Mittelalter*, 108-109.

<sup>26</sup>*True Patriotism*, 113.

<sup>27</sup>*Nicolas Berdyaev*, 54-55.

<sup>28</sup>*Ethics*, 271-272.

<sup>29</sup>*Ethics*, 273.

<sup>30</sup>*Ethics*, 272.

<sup>31</sup>*Nicolas Berdyaev*, 155-158.

<sup>32</sup>*Nicolas Berdyaev*, 154.

<sup>33</sup>*The Communion of Saints*, 152-153.

<sup>34</sup>*Ethics*, 80-81.

<sup>35</sup>*Ethics*, 280-282.