



# The Name-glorifying projects of Alexei Losev and Pavel Florensky: A question of their historical interrelation

Dmitry Biriukov<sup>1</sup>

Accepted: 21 March 2023 / Published online: 3 May 2023  
© The Author(s) 2023

## Abstract

This article deals with the question of the interrelation between two papers, both called, in short, “Onomatodoxy”, dedicated to the doctrine of Name-glorification (*Imiaslavie*, Onomatodoxy), both of which were created in line with the Neo-Patristic movement in the Russian philosophy of the Silver Age. One of these papers is by Alexei Losev and the other by Pavel Florensky. In my opinion, there are sufficient grounds to state that Losev’s “Onomatodoxy” was written either after Florensky created his own “Onomatodoxy”, i.e., after November 1922, or, at the earliest, after Florensky started to give clandestine lectures about Onomatodoxy in Moscow (where Losev lived), i.e., not earlier than spring 1921. Therefore, Losev’s article “Onomatodoxy” could have been intended for the religious-philosophical collection of articles planned for publishing by Yaschenko in 1922 in Berlin.

**Keywords** Name-glorification · Pavel Florensky · Alexei Losev · Palamism · Kantianism

## The question of dating “Onomatodoxy” by Alexei Losev

The archives of Alexei Losev (1893–1988) preserve the article “Die Onomatodoxie (russisch “*Imiaslavie*”)” (hereafter “Onomatodoxy”), dedicated to the doctrine of Name-glorification (*Imiaslavie*, Onomatodoxy) and the Name-glorifying controversy, which was in line with the so-called Neo-Patristic movement of that time. The text of this article has been preserved in Losev’s archive in German.<sup>1</sup> In the contemporary editions of the article, it is published in the back translation from German by

<sup>1</sup>The original Russian text of “Onomatodoxy” has not survived and was probably translated into German by Maria Grabar-Passek, see: Takho-Godi (2014, p. 165), cf. Losev (2015, pp. 1045–1046); Takho-Godi (2013, p. 228).

✉ D. Biriukov

<sup>1</sup> Institute for East European Studies, Freie Universität Berlin, Garystraße 55, 14195 Berlin, Germany

Andrei Vashestov and edited by Lyudmila Gogotishvili and Aza Takho-Godi (Takho-Godi 2014, p. 61; Losev 2015, p. 1046).

The publishers of Losev's "Onomatodoxy", Aza and Elena Takho-Godi, suppose that this article was written soon after 1917 but before 1919 (Losev 2015, pp. 36–37) for the collection of articles "Russland" published in Zürich in German, edited by Vera Erismann-Stepanova, Theodor Erismann, and Jean Matthieu, where another of Losev's German-language articles, "Russian Philosophy", was published (Russland 1919 (/ 2010), S. 79–109). Aza and Elena Takho-Godi also speculate that this text by Losev could have been intended for a similar collection in German, for example, a religious-philosophical collection which was planned for publication by Alexander Yaschenko in Berlin in 1922.<sup>2,3</sup>

### Palamite background

One of the central lines of this article is the role in the Name-glorifying doctrine of the Palamite controversy in Byzantium and the teaching of Gregory Palamas (c. 1296–1359). The latter argued for the distinction in God between the unknowable and unparticipable essence, on the one hand, and the knowable and participable uncreated energies of this essence, on the other. According to Palamas, the Thaborian light, which was revealed to the Apostles during the Transfiguration of Christ (Matt 17:2), is such an uncreated energy. The representatives of the Russian Name-glorifiers' circle of the beginning of the twentieth century maintained that when Christians think about God and name Him, as in prayer, they participate in God Himself in His energies, and therefore God's names, which a human being thinks of and utters, are themselves divine energies (in the Palamite sense), which means they are God Himself.<sup>4</sup>

### Losev's "Onomatodoxy" and his pro-*imiaslavie* predecessors

A close inspection of Losev's "Onomatodoxy" in the historical context shows that Losev follows the program (relevant for the 1910s) of pro-*imiaslavie* thinkers, such as Mitrophan Muretov, Vladimir Ern, and Pavel Florensky, and, in some essential respects, this article is especially close to Florensky's paper "Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise" (*Imeslavie kak filosofskaja predposylka*) (Florensky 2000, pp. 252–287; the first publication: Boneckaja 1988, pp. 40–68).

<sup>2</sup>See on this collection and on Yaschenko: Makarov (2010, pp. 60–63).

<sup>3</sup>Elena Takho-Godi writes: "Perhaps, the text preserved in Losev's archive in German translation, probably by M. Grabar-Passek, was intended for "Russland" [...] (however, we cannot exclude the possibility that the text was intended for another publication, for example, for the collection of religious-philosophical articles planned to be published in Berlin by A. Yaschenko, who was the editor of the Berlin journal *New Russian Book*)" (Takho-Godi 2014, p. 165). [All quotes are the author's translation from Russian.] See also Losev (2015, pp. 1045–1046); Takho-Godi (2013, p. 228); Troickij (2021, p. 672).

<sup>4</sup>About the Name-glorifiers' controversy and the doctrine of the Name-Glorifiers see Kenworthy (2020, pp. 327–342); Kenworthy (2014, pp. 85–107); Alfeyev (2007); Nivière (1987); Grillaert (2012, pp. 163–181); Dennes (1999, pp. 143–171); Tchantouridzé (2012, pp. 216–228); Kuše (2006, S. 77–110); Prat (1979, pp. 1–21); Dykstra (1988); Sels (2014, pp. 675–685); Biriukov and Gravin (2023, p. 4–5).

This similarity is manifested in the following ways. Firstly, Losev, in his “Onomatodoxy”, follows the paradigm shared by both Florensky and like-minded thinkers, such as Muretov and Ern (see Nivière 1988, pp. 184–185, 187), in identifying Name-glorification with Palamism, and characterizing Name-glorification and Palamism as Platonism (Losev 1999, pp. 228–230). Correspondingly, the anti-Name-glorifiers’ stance is referred to by Losev (Ibid), as well as by Florensky,<sup>5</sup> as Iconoclasm and Kantianism and is marked by each of them as subjective psychologism. In this respect, Losev follows the fundamental historical-philosophical opposition *Platonism–Kantianism* championed by Florensky (Hagemeister 2001, p. 23; Nethercott 2000, pp. 80–82; Oppo 2018, pp. 391–396). Secondly, the antinomical formulas of Name-glorification and Palamism, suggested by Losev,<sup>6</sup> are very close, though not completely identical to, the formulas of Florensky.<sup>7</sup> Thirdly, when Losev (1999, p. 229) discusses the philosophical foundations of Onomatodoxy and Palamism, important and constitutive sources for him are the anathemas to Barlaam of Calabria and Gregory Akindynos from the “Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy”. We see the same in Florensky’s “Onomatodoxy” as well (Florensky 2000, pp. 270–271). Fourthly, Losev and Florensky, expressing the Name-glorifying formula, do it in both Russian and Greek.<sup>8</sup> The Greek formula is very close in both thinkers: Τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ θεὸς ἐστὶ καὶ δὴ ὁ Θεὸς; ἀλλ’ ὁ Θεὸς οὐτ’ ὄνομα ἐστὶ οὔτε τὸ Ἐαυτοῦ Ὄνομα<sup>9</sup> in Losev (1999, p. 236), and Τὸ Ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ Θεός ἐστὶ καὶ δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἀλλ’ ὁ Θεὸς οὔτε ὄνομα οὔτε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ Ὄνομα ἐστὶ<sup>10</sup> in Florensky (2000, p. 269).

### Losev’s “Onomatodoxy” and Florensky’s “Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise”

On reflection, the observation that Losev’s program in his “Onomatodoxy” corresponds to Florensky’s program, elaborated in his “Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise”, presupposes a certain puzzle. If it is really so, then which of these texts depends on the other? Florensky’s text cannot depend on Losev’s as Florensky was Losev’s mentor in respect to the philosophical foundations of the Onomatodox doctrine. At the same time, it would seem that Losev’s article “Onomatodoxy” cannot

<sup>5</sup>Florensky (2000, pp. 268, 273–274) in *Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise*; Florensky (2000, p. 316) in *Notes of Priest Pavel Florensky to the article of Archbishop Nikon “The Great Temptation around the Most Holy Name of God”*.

<sup>6</sup>“The name of God is the energy of God, inseparable from the very essence of God, and therefore it is God himself. However God is different from his energies and his name, therefore God is neither his name, nor a name at all” (Losev 1999, p. 236).

<sup>7</sup>“The name of God is God and precisely God Himself, but God is neither His name, nor His Very Name”. (Florensky, *Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise*, in Florensky (2000, p. 269)). About this formula in Florensky see: Rojek (2015, pp. 136–140); Biriukov (2023).

<sup>8</sup>As Florensky (2000, p. 269) points out, substantiating the necessity of the Greek formula of Name-glorification: “The clearest way to formulate it is in the language, exceptionally fit for the communication of the shades of philosophical thought”.

<sup>9</sup>Literally: “God’s name is god and God Himself; but God Himself is neither a name, nor His very Name” (I keep the lowercase and uppercase letters as in the Greek).

<sup>10</sup>“The Name of God is God and precisely God Himself, but God is neither His name nor His Very Name”.

depend on Florensky's "Onomatodoxy". As we have seen, according to the most probable dating accepted by scholars, Losev wrote his article soon after 1917, while Florensky's text was created<sup>11</sup> later, in October–November 1922, on the basis of his talks and lectures on Name-glorification.<sup>12</sup> Florensky started to deliver such lectures in March 1921 (Trubachyov 2015, pp. 433, 434, 437, 439ff.; Florensky 2017, pp. 146, 155, 161ff.), having rejected his strategy of deliberate silence in public about the Name-glorifying doctrine as "the sacred mystery of the Church", which he had followed before.<sup>13</sup>

I would also like to note that a formula of Name-glorification, similar to the formulas offered by Losev and Florensky, was used by Sergei Bulgakov as well, in his seminars devoted to Sophia, which he conducted in Paris in October–December 1928.<sup>14</sup> Keeping in mind that Bulgakov left Moscow in July 1918, and that this formula was not discussed in the extant correspondence between Bulgakov and Florensky (who stayed in Soviet Russia), which continued until 1922 (Trubachyov 2001), one can conclude that the formula of Name-glorification was common within the circle of Russian pro-*imiaslavie* philosophers before 1918.

### **Florensky's notes on Nikon Rozhdestvensky's article as the prototype for Florensky's and Losev's "Onomatodoxy"**

My research shows that the earliest text-prototype, containing important characteristic lines of the later pro-*imiaslavie* texts of Losev and Florensky, is the latter's notes, containing his commentaries on the anti-*imiaslavie* article of archbishop Nikon (Rozhdestvensky) "The Great Temptation around the Most Holy Name of God" (*Velikoe iskushenie okolo sviateishego Imeni Bozhiia*).<sup>15</sup> These notes, published only relatively recently (Florensky 2000, pp. 299–344 / Nachala 1996, pp. 89–135), were written by Florensky soon after the appearance of Nikon's article in print, i.e., around the middle of 1913 (Trubachyov 2015, pp. 314, 396).

These notes contain some specific lines, which I have mentioned above, common to both Losev's "Onomatodoxy" and Florensky's deliberations in his "Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise". In these notes, we do not yet see a full-fledged appropri-

<sup>11</sup>As Andronik Trubachyov points out, this text was written down by Sofia Ogneva under the dictation of Florensky (2000, p. 555).

<sup>12</sup>Ibid. These clandestine lectures given by Florensky in Moscow happened due to the termination of the activities of the Moscow Theological Academy, where Florensky served, in Sergiev Posad. For this reason, in the middle of 1919 the Academy moved to Moscow (see Trubachyov 2016, p. 258), and then Florensky himself moved to Moscow—probably, in the summer of 1920 (Trubachyov 2016, pp. 423–424). There, his immediate field of activity was related primarily to engineering research.

<sup>13</sup>See Letter of Florensky to Ivan Pavlovich Scherbov. May 13, 1913, Sergiev Posad (Trubachyov 1998, pp. 99–100).

<sup>14</sup>The Protocols of Fr. Sergius Bulgakov's Seminars on Sophia, the Wisdom of God, recorded by Leo Zander. 9th and 10th Seminars. December 24 and 31, 1928 (Struve 2000, pp. 138–143). See: Biriukov (2023).

<sup>15</sup>Archbishop Nikon's article was published in the journal *Tserkovnyye vedomosti*, No. 20, 1913, pp. 853–869. About Pavel Florensky in his relation to Nikon Rozhdestvensky, see: Kenworthy (2014).

ation of the Palamite distinction between the essence and the energy,<sup>16</sup> or an attribution of a universal philosophical meaning to this distinction, as is the case in his later works, in particular, “Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise”. However, here, in the Name-glorifying context, an opposition important for Losev’s “Onomatodoxy” is present, that of *Platonism vs. Kantianism*,<sup>17</sup> or *Platonism vs. subjectivism* (Florensky 2000, p. 319). Most importantly, Florensky (2000, pp. 307, 315, 317) elaborates here his formula of Name-glorification: “The name is God, but God is not a name”,<sup>18</sup> which came to play a fundamental role in the further course of the philosophical comprehension of Name-glorification in Russia. In order to substantiate this formula, Florensky (2000, p. 316) also elucidates specific implicative formulas, which establish the correspondence between a phenomenon and a thing on the basis of the four fundamental philosophical approaches, namely, Platonism, Kantianism, positivism, and immanentism.<sup>19</sup> The corresponding formulas, which were necessary for Florensky to substantiate his formula of Name-glorification,<sup>20</sup> became the basis for Losev (1999, p. 235; cf. Florensky 2000, pp. 273–274; see Obolevitch 2019, p. 99), in his “Onomatodoxy”, to develop his teaching about *absolute symbolism*, and these formulas lie behind Losev’s philosophical formula of Name-glorification as well.

For this reason, one could think that if Losev worked on his “Onomatodoxy” soon after 1917, as Aza and Elena Takho-Godi consider most probable, he bore in mind the notes of Florensky about Nikon’s article, and these very notes had a fundamental influence on the program put forward in his article.

### Lines in Losev’s “Onomatodoxy”, which are absent in Florensky’s notes

However, there are certain lines, which can be found in Losev’s “Onomatodoxy”, but which are absent in Florensky’s notes. Firstly, the line related to the “Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy”: in Losev’s “Onomatodoxy”, we find traces of an attentive reading and analysis of anathemas against Gregory Akindynos and Barlaam of Calabria from the “Synodicon”, whereas Florensky’s notes to Nikon’s article have no traces of this. However, considerable attention to the “Synodicon” is characteristic for Florensky’s “Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise” written in autumn 1922. Here, Florensky (2000, pp. 270–271) even quotes fragments from the anathemas, presented in the “Synodicon”, in his own translation. Secondly, the line connected with the formula of Name-glorification in Greek, which Florensky does not use in his

<sup>16</sup>Palamas and the Palamite controversies are mentioned here, but only in passing (Florensky 2000, pp. 317, 320, 332); the notion of energy and the connection essence–energy are also present here, but not in such an elaborated and systematic form, as in the later works of Florensky.

<sup>17</sup>Notes of Priest Pavel Florensky to the article of Archbishop Nikon “The Great Temptation around the Most Holy Name of God” (Florensky 2000, p. 316).

<sup>18</sup>See the corresponding formula in his “Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise” (Florensky 2000, pp. 269–270).

<sup>19</sup>See the corresponding implicative formulas in “Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise” in Florensky (2000, pp. 273–274); see Seifrid (2005, p. 113).

<sup>20</sup>That is the formula “phenomenon  $\supset$  essence: entity  $\supset$  — essence”.

notes to Nikon's article, appears in his "Onomatodoxy". The Greek formula, almost identical to Florensky's, is used by Losev in his "Onomatodoxy".

Thirdly, in the notes, Florensky, in discussing Platonism, positivism, and immanentism, utilizes the notion of "thing" and not the notion of "essence"—as he will do later in "Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise". It seems to me that this is explained by the fact that Florensky's thought in these notes on Nikon departs from and revolves around the Kantian term *veshh' v sebe*, the "thing in itself".<sup>21</sup> In his "Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise", Florensky (2000, pp. 273–274), when discussing the same foundational premises, utilizes the notion of "essence" instead of "thing". This can be explained by the presence of Palamite terminology, which is typical for that essay (namely, the Palamite distinction between the essence and energies). In this way, we see that, in Florensky, from his early notes on Nikon (Rozhdestvensky) to the essay "Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise", written later, Kantian language is replaced with Palamite language, and the Kantian "thing itself" becomes the Palamite unknowable "essence".<sup>22,23</sup> Tellingly, Losev (1999, p. 230) in his "Onomatodoxy", when talking about the relationship between the manifesting and the

<sup>21</sup>Which is how Florensky (2000, p. 316) reproduced the term, although various ways of translating the Kantian *Ding an sich* in to Russian are possible and were used in Russian philosophical literature. Using the notion of the thing in itself to express *Ding an sich*, Florensky in this respect follows the tradition established in the preceding Russian Kantian literature since the first half of the nineteenth century (Vasilij N. Karpov, Nikolaj G. Debol'skij, Mikhail I. Karinskij, Sylvestr S. Gogotskij, and others, see Abramov and Zhuchkov (2004, pp. 87, 92–93, 99–104, 173, 176–178, 181, 183, 185, 201, 212–215 etc.), as well as presented in the famous Russian translation of Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" by Nikolai Lossky (1907), even though Florensky (2014, p. 524) was occasionally critical of this form of translation of *Ding an sich* to Russian. About the preceding Russian Kantian literature, see Nemeth (2017, pp. 10, 102–104, 113–114, 159–165, 173).

<sup>22</sup>One can say that in the first half of the 1910s, in his notes, Florensky formulated the ontological formulas of Platonism, Kantianism, positivism, and immanentism, which reflect basic possible ontological situations, while using the language of "things," which he combined with criticizing Kantianism and, correspondingly, the Kantian notion of the thing in itself (Florensky 2000, p. 316). This critique of the notion of the thing in itself was developed by Florensky (2014, pp. 103–104, 107, 524; cf. Kruglov 2009, p. 413) in his later essays as well, see, for instance, in "The philosophy of the cult" (1918), by then having already switched, under the influence of Palamism, to the language of essence in formulating these basic ontological formulas. As for Losev, he formulated the same ontological formulas on the language of essence from the very beginning (in his "Onomatodoxy"), without referring to the language of a thing. But like Florensky, Losev (1993, p. 859, cf. Seifrid 2005, p. 171) also criticizes Kantianism and the notion of the thing in itself, for example, in his "The philosophy of the Name" (written in 1923) (Losev 1993, p. 620) and "Thing and Name" (the 1920s).

<sup>23</sup>However, traces of the Kantian "thing in itself", in my opinion, are still evident in Florensky's understanding of "essence" when he utilizes the Palamite distinction between essence and energies. Ultimately, Florensky separates essence from energy too strongly. In his mind, essence is not necessarily linked with energy (as it is in historical Palamism, where the energy is manifested regardless of the presence of an "other" toward which the energy could be directed). This is the difference between Florensky's Palamism and historical Palamas. What is more, one could also say that this is exactly how Kantianism differs from Palamism, despite their formal similarity regarding the basic unknowability of the "thing" in Kantianism and of the divine "essence" in Palamism. The unknowable Kantian "thing in itself" does not produce an energy and is accessible only in the schematic framework of the human mind that examines it. In the teaching of Gregory Palamas, the unknowable essence, maintaining its unknowability, naturally produces energy and manifests itself outward in such a way that energy and essence, being different, remain inseparable, and the energy, in which the essence manifests itself, while remaining knowable, exists with a necessary connection to the essence, regardless of whether someone cognizes it. Cf. Gregory Palamas, Triads, I.3.27; III.2.5–7; 150 Chapters, 72–3, 113, 140 (cf. Biriukov 2021, p. 156).

manifested, uses the concept of essence as referring to the manifestation, which is characteristic of Palamite language, and not the concept of “thing”, characteristic of Kantian philosophical language. Here we also see the correspondence of the language used by Losev in his “Onomatodoxy” to the language of Florensky’s “Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise”, and not that of Florensky’s notes on Nikon (Rozhdestvensky).

## The interrelationship between Florensky and Losev, and the question of dating Losev’s “Onomatodoxy”

It is known from Losev’s memoirs (Rostovtsev and Florensky 1990, p. 9) that Losev and Florensky became acquainted at the meetings of the Moscow Religious-Philosophical Society in memory of Vladimir Solovyov. The meetings took place from 1906 to June 1918 (old calendar) (Ermishin 2011, p. 267). This means that their acquaintance goes back to the middle of the 2nd half of the 1910s (but no later than 1918).<sup>24</sup> However, friendship, though not very closely, bound Losev and Florensky only in 1920–21.<sup>25</sup> Albeit, in 1923, Losev and Florensky were still actively discussing the problems connected with Onomatodoxy.<sup>26</sup>

If the article “Onomatodoxy” was indeed written by Losev soon after 1917, but not later than 1919, as Aza and Elena Takho-Godi suppose, it means that 1) Florensky’s notes were available to Losev at the time when they were not yet friends, but just formal acquaintances. However, these notes were stored in the 1910s in one copy in Florensky’s house in Sergiev Posad;<sup>27</sup> 2) Losev has primacy in respect to the systemic employment of the anathemas against Barlaam and Akindynos from the “Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy” in consistent exposition of the Name-glorifying teaching (in Florensky, this line appears in the end of 1922 in his “Onomatodoxy”); 3) Losev preceded Florensky in using the formula of Name-glorification in Greek to give it more credibility; and 4) Losev coined this formula in Greek, and, as we have seen, it is almost identical in both thinkers (in Florensky this formula appears only in his “Onomatodoxy”).

<sup>24</sup>I also note that Losev’s letter to Florensky, dedicated to the series “Spiritual Rus”, dated March 24, 1918 (old calendar), testifies to their acquaintance by that time (Rostovtsev and Florensky 1990, p. 13). About the series see Takho-Godi (2013, pp. 225–226).

<sup>25</sup>It follows from Losev’s own words: “Since for a few years I rented a dacha in Sergiev Posad, quite often on Saturdays and Sundays I saw Father Pavel [Florensky]. Here some convergence between us took place. But I must say that he was a very reserved man and spoke reluctantly. [...] You see, I had real close communication with Florensky only in the very beginning of the revolution. These were the years 1920–1921 [...]. Our communication was deep, but short-term and very [...] dangerous. And the feeling of danger was immediately realized, for in 1922 many philosophers were exiled abroad” (Rostovtsev and Florensky 1990, pp. 9, 19).

<sup>26</sup>See Losev’s letter to Florensky from January 30, 1923, in which the former sends to the latter the “theses of the Name-glorifying teaching” for corrections and additions, in Rostovtsev and Florensky (1990, pp. 14–17). The reply has not survived, see Rostovtsev and Florensky (1990, p. 17).

<sup>27</sup>It seems it were precisely these notes which Bulgakov asked Florensky to bring from Sergiev Posad (where Florensky lived) to Moscow in his letter to Florensky from December 9, 1917 (Trubachyov 2001, p. 136 and note 2; Trubachyov 2015, p. 428). Whether they were brought for some time to Moscow by Florensky upon Bulgakov’s request, is unknown.

The last three points may mean either that Florensky's "Onomatodoxy" was dependent on Losev's, or that there is a coincidence in the content of these works. The latter seems improbable if we bear in mind that in both texts the Greek formula of Onomatodoxy is used, and the wording of this formula is almost identical. As for the first point, namely, the dependence of Florensky's "Onomatodoxy" on Losev's, its probability is low, based on the particular testimony of Losev that Florensky was a mentor for him in respect to the philosophical foundations of the Name-glorification doctrine and the formula of Name-glorification itself (Rostovtsev and Florensky 1990, pp. 17–18).<sup>28</sup>

## Conclusion

On the basis of the analysis presented above, I conclude that the dating of Losev's "Onomatodoxy", which until now has been accepted as soon after 1917 but not later than 1919, is questionable. The analysis shows that there are traces of the influence of Florensky's "Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise" (written in October–November of 1922) in Losev's "Onomatodoxy". Some features of Losev's "Onomatodoxy" cannot be explained by his acquaintance only with Florensky's notes to archbishop Nikon's article, written in 1913 (and the possibility of Losev's acquaintance with Florensky's notes is also dubious if we take into account the character of their relations before 1920). These features can be explained only by Losev's acquaintance with the material presented in Florensky's "Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise". These are such features as, firstly, the employment of the anathemas against Barlaam and Akindynos from "Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy" as a systemic source for the consideration of the Onomatodox (and Palamite) teaching; secondly, the usage of the formula of Onomatodoxy in Greek; thirdly, the very close correspondence of this Greek formula, quoted by Losev, to the corresponding formula in Florensky; and fourthly, it is Losev's following of the Palamite language of "essence", and not the Kantian language of "thing", in his discussing the relationship between the manifesting and the manifested, as Florensky also did in his "Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise" as opposed to his notes to Nikon (Rozhdestvensky).

Thus, there are sufficient grounds to state that Losev's "Onomatodoxy" was written either after Florensky's, i.e., after November 1922, or, at the earliest, after Florensky started to give talks and lectures about Onomatodoxy in Moscow (where Lo-

<sup>28</sup>In this respect, one can also pay attention to the tone of the above-mentioned letter from Losev to Florensky from January 30, 1923, which testifies to the fact that it was Losev who was eager to study with Florensky, and not the other way round: "Much esteemed and dear f. Pavel! I dare to disturb you with a most humble request to look at the attached theses of the Name-glorifying teaching during your stay in Moscow and mark on the margins all your hesitations, corrections and additions. [...] Since I often have to argue and in a few days I will have to dispute with desperate Onomatoclasts, I would like have solid and systematic, but concise theses, in which it would be preferable if philosophical terminology could be avoided, although the most general and abstract formulas would be given. Since I am interested in a precise edition (which I have not found in the existing Name-glorifying literature), I would ask you to cross out what seems wrong to you and make corrections according to your understanding. [...] I also have purely philosophical theses of Name-glorification, but I do not dare to bother you with them simultaneously with these ones. If I have your permission, please allow me to bother you with them during one of your next visits" (Rostovtsev and Florensky 1990, pp. 14–15).



sev lived), the content of which is reflected in Losev's "Onomatodoxy", i.e., not earlier than spring 1921. Therefore, Losev's "Onomatodoxy" could have been intended for the religious-philosophical collection of articles planned for publication by Yaschenko in 1922 in Berlin. This is the supposition by Aza and Elena Takhogo, which they considered as less probable in relation to the supposition about an earlier dating of Losev's article. It also means that "Onomatodoxy" was written by Losev exactly during the period of the convergence of Losev and Florensky, which is quite evident from the text of Losev's article.

**Funding Note** Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL. This publication was made possible through the support of a grant 'Philosophy in Neoplatonics: New Figures and New Interpretations' from The National Science Centre of Poland (2018/31/B/HS1/01861).

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

## References

- Abramov, A., and V. Zhuchkov (comp.). 2004. Kant: Pro et Contra. *Recepcija idej nemeckoga filozofa i ih vlijanie na razvitie ruskoj filozofske tradicije. Antologija* [The reception of the ideas of the German philosopher and their influence on the development of the Russian philosophical tradition. Anthology]. St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Russkoj hristianskoj gumanitarnej akademii.
- Alfeyev, Hilarion. 2007. *Le Nom grand et glorieux. La vénération du Nom de Dieu et la prière de Jésus dans la tradition orthodoxe*. Paris.
- Biriukov, Dmitry. 2021. 'Synergy', 'energy', 'symbol' in Pavel Florensky and Palamism. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 74: 147–157.
- Biriukov, Dmitry, and Artem Gravin. 2023. Palamism, humboldtianism, and magicism in Pavel Florensky's philosophy of language. *Religions* 14(2): 197. (Special Issue "Holy Grammars: The Linguistic Factor in the Transmission of Sacred Texts"): <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/14/2/197>.
- Biriukov, Dmitry. 2023. Two Russian thinkers in dialogue on Palamism: The sophiological palamism of Sergius Bulgakov and the Neo-Palamism of Georgy Florovsky in the 1920s. In *The legacy of St. Gregory Palamas: Studies in late byzantine theology*. Edited by Tikhon Alexander Pino. (Byzantios). Studies in Byzantine History and Civilization). Brepols (in print).
- Boneckaja, Natal'ja. 1988. "Magichnost' slova" i "Imeslavie kak filozofskaja predposylka" P. A. Florenskogo (Predislovie i primechanija N. K. Boneckoj) ["The Magicism of a Word" and "Onomatodoxy as a Philosophical Premise by P. A. Florensky (Preface and notes by N. K. Boneckaja)]. *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 34: 9–80.
- Dennes, Maryse. 1999. Les glorificateurs du Nom: une rencontre de l'hésychasme et de la philosophie au début du XXe siècle en Russie. *Slavica Occitania* 8: 143–171.
- Dykstra, Tom. 1988. *Heresy on Mt. Athos: Conflict over the Name of God Among Russian Monks and Hierarchs, 1912–1914*. Master's Thesis.
- Ermishin, Oleg, ed. 2011. Moskovskoe religiozno-filozofskoe obshchestvo pamjati Vl. Solov'jova: Hronika ruskoj duhovnoj zhizni [The Moscow religious and philosophical society in memory of Vladimir Solovoyov: A chronicle of Russian spiritual life]. *Literaturovedcheskij Zhurnal* 28: 210–267.
- Florensky, Pavel. 2014. *Filosofija kul'ta (Opyt pravoslavnoj antropodiceji)*. [The philosophy of the cult (The experience of Orthodox anthropology)]. Moscow: Akademicheskij projekt.
- Florensky, Pavel. 2000. *Sochinenija v chetyreh tomah [Works in Four Volumes]*, Vol. 3. Moscow: Misl'.

- Florensky, Pavel. 2017. Trudy i dni (dnevnikovye zapisi) [Works and days (diary entries)]. Ed. Andronik Trubachyov. In Konstantin Antonov, Natalia Vaganova. eds. «Filosofstvovat' v religii»: Materialy konferencii, posvjashhennoj stoletiju vyhoda knigi «Stolp i utverzhenie Istiny» o. Pavla Florenskogo ["Philosophizing in Religion": Materials of the conference dedicated to the centenary of the publication of the book "The Pillar and the Affirmation of Truth" by Fr. Pavel Florensky]. Moscow, 143–176.
- Grillaert, Nel. 2012. What's in God's name: Literary forerunners and philosophical allies of the imjaslavie debate. *Studies in East European Thought* 64: 163–181.
- Hagemeister, Michael. 2001. Wiederverzauberung der Welt: Pavel florenskij's neues mittelalter. In *Pavel Florenskij — Tradition und Moderne: Beiträge zum Internationalen Symposium an der Universität Potsdam, 5. bis 9. April 2000*, Frankfurt a/M. u. a.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1907. *Kritika chistogo razuma* [Critique of Pure Reason], transl. by Nikolai Lossky. St. Petersburg.
- Kenworthy, Scott. 2014. Archbishop Nikon (Rozhdestvenskii) and Pavel Florenskii on spiritual experience, theology, and the name-glorifiers dispute. In *Thinking orthodox in modern Russia. Culture, history, context*, eds. Patrick Lally Michelson and Judith Deutsch Kornblatt, 85–107. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Kenworthy, Scott. 2020. The Name-glorifiers (imiaslavie) controversy. In *The Oxford handbook of Russian religious thought*, eds. Caryl Emerson, George Pattison, and Randall A. Poole. Oxford, 327–342.
- Kruglov, Alexei. 2009. Filosofija Kanta v Rossii v konce XVIII – pervoj polovine XIX vekov [The philosophy of Kant in Russia at the end of the XVIII – first half of the XIX centuries]. Moscow.
- Kuße, Holger. 2006. Von der Namensverehrung zur Namensphilosophie. Ihre Zeichentheoretischen Konzepte. In *Name und Person. Beiträge zur Russischen Philosophie des Namens*. Hrsg. von Holger Kuße. München, 77–110.
- Losev, Alexei. 1993. *Bytie – imja – kosmos [being – name – cosmos]*, ed. Aza Takho-Godi. Moscow: Misl'.
- Losev, Alexei. 1999. *Lichnost' i Absolut* [Personality and the Absolute], ed. Aza Takho-Godi. Moscow: Misl'.
- Losev, Alexei. 2015. *Na rubezhe jepoh. Raboty 1910-h – nachala 1920-h godov* [At the turn of the epochs. Works of the 1910s – early 1920s], eds. Aza Takho-Godi, Elena Takho-Godi, and Victor Troitsky. Moscow: Progress-Traditsia.
- Makarov, Vladimir. 2010. «..Jelement politicheski bezuslovno vrednyj dlja Sovetskoj Vlasti»(po materialam sledstvennyh del v otnoshenii S.N. Durylina 1922 i 1927 godov) ["... An element certainly politically harmful to the Soviet government" (the materials of the investigative cases against Sergei Durylin in 1922 and 1927)]. In *S.N. Durylin i ego vremja. Kniga pervaja. Issledovanija [S.N. Durylin and his time. Vol 1. Research]*, in *M. Kolerov (ed.)*, ed. A. Reznichenko, *Issledovanija po istorii russkoj mysli*, 29–62. Moscow: Modest Kolerov.
- Nachala. 1996. [Origins].
- Nemeth, Thomas. 2017. *Kant in Imperial Russia*. New York: Springer. (Studies in German Idealism).
- Nethercott, Frances. 2000. *Russia's Plato. Plato and platonic tradition in Russian education and philosophy*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Nivière, Antoine. 1987. *Mouvement onomatodexe: Une querelle théologique parmi les moines russes du Mont-Athos, 1907–1914*. Paris IV
- Nivière, Antoine. 1988. Les moines onomatodexes et l'intelligentsia russe. *Cahiers Du Monde Russe Et Soviétique* 29(2): 181–194.
- Obolevitch, Teresa. 2019. Christian philosophy and the Name of God. Aesthetics as a way of life according to Aleksey Losev. *Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 71: 1–2.
- Oppo, Andrea. 2018. Platone e Kant nell'epistemologia di Florenskij. In *Il pensiero polifonico di Pavel Florenskij. Atti del convegno per gli 80 anni dalla morte*, eds. Silvano Tagliagambe, Massimiliano Spano, and Andrea Oppo. Cagliari: PFTS University Press.
- Prat, Naftali. 1979. Orthodox philosophy of language in Russia. *Studies in Soviet Thought* 20(1): 1–21.
- Rojek, Paweł. 2015. Onomatodoxy and the problem of constitution. Florensky on scientific and manifest images of the world. In *Faith and reason in Russian thought*, eds. Teresa Obolevitch and Paweł Rojek, 127–160. Krakow: Copernicus Centre Press.
- Rostovtsev, Yury, and Pavel Florensky. 1990. P.A. Florenskij po vospominanijam Alekseja Loseva [P.A. Florensky according to the memoirs of Alexey Losev]. In *Kontekst-1990. Literaturno-teoreticheskie issledovanija*, ed. Alexander Michailov. Moscow, 6–24.

- Russland*. Teil 1. 1919. Zurich / *Russland*. 2010. I. Teil. Geistesleben, Kunst, Philosophie, Literatur. II. Teil. Politischer Bau, Soziale Bewegungen und Gesellschaftliches Leben. Vol. 2. Part 1 (German Edition). Reprint. Nabu Press.
- Seifrid, Thomas. 2005. *The word made self: Russian writings on language, 1860–1930*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Sels, Lara. 2014. Gregory of Nyssa's Contra eunomium and onomatodoxy in Russian theology. In *Gregory of Nyssa: Contra Eunomium III: An English translation with commentary and supporting studies: Proceedings of the 12th international colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa*, eds. Johan Leemans and Matthieu Cassin. Leuven. 14–17 September 2010, 675–685. Leiden: Brill.
- Struve, Nikita, ed. 2000. *Bratstvo Svjatoj Sofii. Materialy i dokumenty. 1923–1939* [The Brotherhood of St. Sophia. Materials and documents. 1923–1939]. Moscow-Paris: YMCA-Press.
- Takho-Godi, Elena. 2013. Aleksei Losev and *Vekhi*: Strategic traditions in social philosophy. In *Landmarks revisited. The Vekhi symposium 100 years on*, eds. Robin Aizlewood and Ruth Coates. Boston: Academic Studies Press.
- Takho-Godi, Elena. 2014. *Aleksej Losev v jepohu russkoj revoljucii: 1917–1919* [Alexey losev in the era of the Russian revolution: 1917–1919]. Moscow: Modest Kolerov.
- Tchantouridzé, Lasha. 2012. In the Name of God: 100 years of the imiaslavie movement in the Church of Russia. A review essay, *The Canadian Journal of Orthodox Christianity* 3, 216–228.
- Troickij, Viktor. 2021. Kommentarii [Notes]. In *Losev, A. Dialektika mifa. Dopolnenie k "Dialektike mifa" (novoe akademicheskoe izdanie, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe)* [The Dialectics of Myth. Supplement to the Dialectics of Myth] (new academic edition, corrected and supplemented). eds. A. Takho-Godi and V. Troickij. JaSK: Moscow.
- Trubachyov, Andronik. 1998. *Arhiv svjashhennika Pavla Aleksandrovicha Florenskogo. Vyp. 2: Perepiska s M.A. Novoselovym* [Archive of Fr. Pavel Alexandrovich Florensky. Issue 2: Correspondence with Mikhail Novoselov]. Tomsk: Vodolej.
- Trubachyov, Andronik. 2001. *Arhiv svjashhennika Pavla Aleksandrovicha Florenskogo. Vyp. 4: Perepiska svjashhennika Pavla Aleksandrovicha Florenskogo so svjashhennikom Sergijem Nikolaevichem Bulgakovym* [Archive of Fr. Pavel Alexandrovich Florensky. Issue 4: Correspondence of Fr. Pavel Alexandrovich Florensky with Fr. Sergiy Nikolaevich Bulgakov]. Tomsk: Vodolej.
- Trubachyov, Andronik. 2015. *Put' k Bogu. Lichnost', zhizn' i tvorcestvo svjashhennika Pavla Florenskogo* [The way to God. The personality, life and works of Fr. Pavel Florensky]. Book 3. Sergiev Posad: Gorodets.
- Trubachyov, Andronik. 2016. *Put' k Bogu. Lichnost', zhizn' i tvorcestvo svjashhennika Pavla Florenskogo* [The way to God. The personality, life and works of Fr. Pavel Florensky]. Book 4. Sergiev Posad: Gorodets.

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.