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INTRODUCTION

It is the intent of this thesis to examine the ecclesiology (doctrine of the Church) in the writings of Aleksei Khomyakov. The thesis proposes to examine the sources, coherence and the significance of Khomyakov's ecclesiology both in its relation to Khomyakov's overall work and within the larger realm of Orthodox thought.

Why study Khomyakov's ecclesiology? Aleksei Stepanovich Khomyakov (1804-1860) was a significant and prominent figure in nineteenth century Russian thought and culture. He was a man of many and diverse interests among them painting, amateur medicine, inventing (his inventions included a noisy steam engine and a hunting rifle) and linguistics (among his works is a Sanskrit dictionary). These varied pursuits indicate a man of leisure and a landowner and can be properly seen as a sign of dilettantism. Khomyakov is best known as a leader of the Slavophile movement. While historians differ as to whether Khomyakov or Ivan Kireevsky should be termed the founder of the movement, there is no doubt that Khomyakov played a key role in gathering together the Slavophile circle and in promulgating and publicizing the Slavophile critique of Western institutions and culture. Yet Khomyakov's most lasting contribution to Russian thought does not lie in his activity as a Slavophile polemicist. Slavophilism hardly constitutes the mainstream of 19th century Russian thought. Slavophile remedies were largely ignored. Many would argue that classical Slavophilism did not outlive its founders and that such later thinkers as Danilevsky bear at best a tenuous connection to the main concerns of the Slavophile critique.
But if the Slavophile circle did not outlast the 1860's, Khomyakov's ecclesiology has continued to draw attention. Samarin hailed him as a 'doctor of the Church' and Nikolai Berdyaev agreed, finding in Khomyakov's work a take-off point for his own theories of spiritual freedom. While Khomyakov's theories were criticized during his lifetime (his catechism Tserkov' Odna was not allowed to be published in Russia until after his death), his views have gained increased acceptance in the Orthodox Church.

Khomyakov's ecclesiology, then, remains his most lasting and continuing contribution to Russian thought. In examining Khomyakov's ecclesiological views this thesis will center on a study of the ten year correspondence between Khomyakov and the Oxford divine William Palmer. With the exception of the brief catechism Tserkov' Odna Khomyakov's ecclesiological writings (as indeed many of his writings on any subject) are polemical in nature. The correspondence represents Khomyakov's first attempt to formulate his ideas on the nature of the Church. While his later polemical writings on the Church are not strictly speaking developments of the views in the correspondence (Khomyakov's views, as will be seen remained remarkably constant throughout his life), it can be said that the correspondence touches on all the themes of his ecclesiology and states views which his later polemics in French will only re-formulate. The correspondence, then, is crucial to an understanding of Khomyakov's views. In Palmer, Khomyakov found an opponent who shared his views on the central importance of religion in human life and his interest in Christian unity but who also differed with him on important points and offered
friendly but firm criticism of Khomyakov's ideas. The correspondence with Palmer provoked Khomyakov to formulate and clarify his ideas about the nature of the Church -- ideas which have continued to influence Orthodox thinkers in modern times.
Chapter I: Khomyakov: An Overview of His Life and Work

This thesis concentrates on Khomyakov's ecclesiology. In isolating his views on the Church for analysis, I of necessity make an artificial separation. It needs to be constantly kept in mind that all of Khomyakov's writings, diverse in subject matter as they be, form a whole. His philosophical writings build on and develop views parallel to his ecclesiology. His concept of unity and freedom in the commune parallel his views of unity and freedom in the Church. His criticisms of Western society and culture follow directly from his criticisms of Western religion. Nor can one speak of development in Khomyakov's views over time. His ideas and opinions seem remarkably consistent. Various polemics on various occasions merely provided the opportunity to formulate views long held. "I knew Khomiakov for thirty-seven years," wrote his friend Koshelev, "and his basic convictions of the year 1823 remained the same in the year 1860." A profound antipathy to Western culture and ideas characterizes all his work and his polemics seek to prove the superiority and unique quality of Russian culture. What lies behind Khomyakov's life-long consistency and one-ness of views and what led him to formulate them? A brief biographical sketch will shed some light on these important matters.

Aleksei Stepanovich Khomyakov was born in Moscow on May 1, 1804, the descendant of a Russian gentry family dating back at least as far as the time of Vassily III (1503-1533). The family owned several estates in Tula, Riazan, and Smolensk provinces the income from which was
sufficient to support a life of leisure. Christoff estimates that Khomyakov owned some 1,500 serfs and about 19,000 acres of land on three estates plus a sugar factory and that his 1838 income was a sizeable 200,000 rubbles. 2

Khomyakov was raised mainly by his mother who took over the management of the family upbringing and property from Aleksei's father whose indulgence in gambling had brought the family finances into disarray. Maria Alekseevna Khomyakova was evidently a woman of strong personality. Her son, who remained devoted to her always, compared her to Suvorov's soldiers "with their inexhaustible force" 3 and Khomyakov's biographers agree that her devout piety and firm insistence on religious upbringing played a key role in Khomyakov's life-long devotion to the Orthodox Church and the spiritual ideals of his upbringing. 4 Khomyakov's education was not untypical of that of many gentry families at the time. He was educated at home by a series of tutors and he acquired a mastery of Latin and Greek (by the age of 14 he had translated Tacitus' Germania and Horace's Odes) as well as of the modern languages French, German, and English. At the University of Moscow he majored in mathematics. 5

Khomyakov's unswerving devotion to the faith and the traditions of Muscovite society so forcefully urged on him in his youth may be illustrated by two anecdotes. The first anecdote, possibly apocryphal, but as Christoff says, "plausible", recounts Aleksei's first visit to Petersburg in 1815 and of the boy's fears that he be forced to renounce his faith in this 'pagan' city. 6 More reliable testimony of the steadfast nature of Khomyakov's devotion to the Church comes from
Count Osten-Saken, his commander in the cuirassier regiment in which he served in 1822. Osten-Saken remembered that Khomyakov never failed to keep the fasts and observe all the rituals of the Church, even when he met the ridicule of 'free-thinkers' in the regiment. Shortly he transferred to a horse guard regiment in the capital where he met a number of future Decembrists against whose views he argued vigorously. 7

Khomyakov lived all his life the leisurely life of a landowner. He never entered a profession, nor, with the exception of two brief stints in the military, (1822-1825 and 1827-1829 during the Russo-Turkish War) did he engage in government service. He divided his time between his estates and Moscow. Although fluent in several languages, and well-acquainted with Western culture and learning, Khomyakov spent little time travelling abroad. In 1825-1826, tiring of the army, Khomyakov resigned his commission and travelled to Paris where he studied painting. It is noteworthy that Paris, no more than the army, the university, or any other experience could lure him from his firm Orthodoxy and devotion to Russian customs. Khomyakov found little that impressed him in Paris; he found more interesting his return trip which included the Slavic areas of Austria-Hungary as well as Italy and Switzerland. His contact with Slavic lands re-enforced a life-long sympathy for the other Slav peoples which also dates to his youth. 8 Khomyakov travelled abroad only once after this early sojourn, in 1847 when he visited northern Europe and most importantly England, where he visited with William Palmer at Oxford.
If Khomyakov's basic views -- his devotion to Orthodoxy and to Russian customs -- remained constant, his life nonetheless gives evidence of a certain restlessness. It can be seen in his abortive youthful attempt to run away and join the fight for Greek independence; in his brief span of military service, followed by equally brief travel and study in Europe (his studies of painting never developed into anything serious) only to be followed by a return to the army, prompted of course by the excitement and the patriotic fervor of the war against Turkey. This restless energy may also perhaps be seen in the staggering diversity of Khomyakov's interests and pursuits already alluded to (see the introduction). For if the external structure of Khomyakov's life -- the leisured life of a well-to-do landowner alternating his residence between Moscow and provincial estates -- suggests a passive and serene, uneventful life, Khomyakov's personality gives evidence of an energetic and restless nature.

Khomyakov was definitely a forceful and vigorous personality who drew the attention and reaction to all who met him. His wide erudition and brilliance were generally conceded even by those who disagreed with him. The force of his personality and persuasiveness of his arguments were crucial in rallying such younger men as Konstantin Aksakov and Iuri Samarin to the Slavophile cause. As has been noted, Khomyakov never wavered in his beliefs and never hesitated to engage in argument with anyone at all. He seemed a born debater. While all recognized his skill at debate, reactions to him varied and Khomyakov's dialectical skill in argument drew varying appraisals according to whether one found his theories sympathetic or wrong-headed. Thus
Pogodin, whose Russian nationalism and anti-liberal views made him often an ally of the Slavophiles exclaimed:

How can words describe his powerful intellect, the liveliness and richness of ideas which sprang out of his brain on every occasion continually! He possessed a rare and many-sided erudition, which---streamed out of his mouth as a mighty torrent. 9

Herzen, an opponent in the Moscow salons of the early 1840's also attests to Khomyakov's debating skills but not without criticism of his perpetual combativeness:

Khomyakov was really a dangerous opponent; a hardened old duellist of dialectics, he took advantage of the slightest inadvertance, the slightest concession...At any hour---he was ready for the most intricate argument and to secure the triumph of his views turned everything in the world to use [including] the subleties of a tricky lawyer. 10

Khomyakov was self-confident, combative, and assertive. Conversation with him evidently was stimulating but not likely to be relaxing or merely convivial.

What, then, stimulated Khomyakov to write? His life was uneventful and secure, his opinions and faith were formed early and apparently never changed or even wavered. Most likely the challenge which stimulated Khomyakov's natural love of argument and drove him to formulate his views was the challenge of the West and its culture -- a challenge which would have been hard for an educated Russian of Khomyakov's time to ignore.

The Great Fatherland War of 1812 had made Russia one of the great European powers. The result was a resurgence of Russian patriotic feeling as well as a renewed and closer contact with Western culture and
institutions. This led many to consider the nature of Russia and the West and the proper relationships between the two. The Decembrist revolt of 1825, itself an indirect product of this renewed contact, gave the question a particular urgency.

The Slavophile-Westernizer debates can probably not be given an exact chronology or a rigid structure. Yet these debates are crucial for the formulation of Khomyakov's views. It is in response to the challenge of the Westernizers to the value of Russian religion and cultural traditions that Khomyakov was driven to define and clarify his concept of Russian culture and his theory of the Russian Church -- the rock on which Russian culture was founded. Therefore, it is necessary to give some account of the Slavophile-Westernizer debates. Such a review of the debates can make no pretense to be either full or comprehensive since the debates themselves were informal and unstructured, originating in the salons of Moscow and hampered, when they later appeared in the pages of the 'thick' journals, by government censorship and other difficulties. The following chronology is skeletal but will (I hope) serve to indicate the context in which Khomyakov clarified his views.

The beginning of the debate may be conveniently dated to the publication of Chaadayev's "First Philosophical Letter" in 1836. Chaadayev's severe attack on a "nation without history" and on the Orthodox Church provoked spirited debate in "society". Khomyakov was so angered that he apparently contemplated a public, published refutation and was dissuaded only when the Tsar declared Chaadayev insane and placed him under house arrest. Chaadayev's views were the source of
heated discussions in the Moscow salons during the 1830's and it was during these years that Khomyakov began to develop close ties with Kireevsky and others destined to be part of the Slavophile camp. It was in these same salons that Khomyakov encountered Chaadayev, Herzen, Granovskiy and Belinsky (prior to Belinsky's move to Petersburg in 1839) who were to be the major proponents of 'Westernizer' ideas. During the 1830's the debate was still confined to the salons and marked by an informal and friendly nature. Perhaps the word 'debate' is too formal and implies too much structure and coherence for the discussions at this early stage.

Khomyakov's earliest writings had consisted entirely of poems and plays. It is only in 1839 in the article 'On the New and the Old' that he began to write on Russian history and culture. The article was not intended for publication, but rather to be read at a salon and apparently was designed to prod Kireevsky to adopt a more firmly 'Slavophile' position.

It is only in the 1840's that we can speak of a debate properly so called. This decade saw the appearance in print of several major works of Khomyakov as well as of his Westernizer critics. In 1839 The Annals of the Fatherland began publication with Belinsky as a regular contributor. The journal would provide a forum for the views of the radical Westernizers. Moskvitianin followed in 1840. The journal was only briefly (and that during the 1850's) under Slavophile editorship but, under Pogodin, it would often provide space for Slavophile writings. Herzen published his important essay 'Dilletantism in Science' in 1842, giving expression to his growing radicalism. In the same year Belinsky
launched a strong attack on the Slavophile group and Moskvitianin published a reply to the critics of Russian culture. Khomyakov's 'On Rural Conditions' provoked an unpublished response from Chaadayev written in 1845.

By this time a debate definitely did exist and the contestants had taken sides. (This, however, should not imply that either the Slavophiles or Westernizers were organizations or movements rather than collections of like-minded thinkers each pursuing his own path.) As the discussions became debates and moved from the salons to the press, enmity developed and by 1844 the groups had reached the point of formal rupture. This did not mean that the debates ended but the two groups went their own ways and their viewpoints now ceased to be formulated in direct contact with each other. Granovsky in 1844 delivered his public lecture on Russian history which drew great interest and provoked a reply lecture series by Shevyrev the following winter. 1844 also saw Samarin's defense of his thesis on Yavorsky and Prokopovich -- a work heavily influenced by Khomyakov and which marked Samarin's entry into the Slavophile camp. It was also in that year that Konstantin Aksakov, himself a recent convert to the Slavophile camp, made his emotional farewell to Belinsky, his friend from the days of their membership in the Stankevich circle. Disagreements almost came to the point of a duel between Granovsky and Peter Kireevsky. Probably the single most important incident in the estrangement of the two groups was a cycle of poems by Khomyakov's brother-in-law Yazykov attacking the Westernizers often in personal terms. At any rate by 1845 the Slavophiles and Westernizers were two
different camps and had formulated differing and hostile views. While both groups would continue to publish their views in the coming decades the basic points of the debates -- the basic principles of the two sides -- had been made clear. The groups, it may be said, no longer needed each other as sounding boards on which to hammer out their views.

It was on December 10, 1844 that Khomyakov addressed his first letter to William Palmer. It must thus be noted that Khomyakov began to formulate and express his religious views at the same time he was developing his social and cultural views. These views are, as pointed out earlier, parallel. It is, however, perhaps significant, that Khomyakov should seek in 1844 a new and different audience. Now with the Slavophiles and Westernizers no longer providing audiences for each other, Khomyakov needed to find a new opponent -- one who shared his belief in the centrality of religious concerns but would provide criticism as well. Such an opponent was William Palmer. 15 Having taken on the proponents of Western culture in Russia, Khomyakov now would seek to take on Western thinkers directly and on the subject which, Khomyakov believed, played the defining role in any culture -- i.e. religion.

We have noted the remarkable unity of views which prevailed throughout Khomyakov's life -- an unity in seeming contrast to the diversity of his interests and the numerous subjects on which he wrote. This singleness of mind developed very early and its sources are in Khomyakov's upbringing. Strict religious observance was insisted on by
Madame Khomyakova and there is no indication that Khomyakov ever faltered in his belief. Furthermore this devotion to Orthodoxy was from the beginning closely associated with the devotion to the traditions of the Russian gentry also instilled in his youth. Indeed Orthodoxy and nationalist sentiment seem closely allied from the beginning. Thus the young Khomyakov is said to have experienced Petersburg as an alien and foreign city in which he feared he might lose his faith. Also noteworthy is the steadfast manner in which he observed Russian Orthodox practice even as a young man on his first 'fling' -- his trip to Paris. At the center of Khomyakov's view of the world, then, is this deep religious conviction -- a conviction closely intertwined with an equally deep love of country and nationalist pride. Indeed it is not easy to separate Khomyakov's devotion to Orthodoxy from his devotion to Russia and its traditions. The close bond of religious with national thinking provides both strengths and weaknesses to his thought. Thus the conviction that religion is and must always be the central and over-riding concern for mankind provides him with a standard that enables him to view politics, culture, and science as an unified whole -- to analyze society not in separate and distinct classifications but as a unity where thoughts have consequences and the manner of men's moral lives effects even the most technical questions. We shall see how this unified view of man's life is central to Khomyakov's theory of cognition. At the same time, this close identification of religion with nationality also led in Khomyakov's critique of the West to a kind of double standard, as we shall also see.
I have chosen the correspondence with Palmer as the basic document for this thesis. We should be able to find the attitudes I have mentioned prominently displayed in this correspondence and we do. Writing to Palmer on October 8, 1850 Khomyakov enthusiastically calls his attention to the encyclical epistle of the Orthodox patriarchs in 1848 in a reply to Pius IX's letter to the Oriental Christians. This epistle, he declares, is the most significant event of those troubled times and he explains:

No opinion is more common than that the abstract questions of religion are less interesting than the practical questions of diplomacy and politics. I think that opinion very natural, and yet I believe there is none more erroneous and false, not only from the philosophical point of view (as religious questions refer to eternal truths, and to the only true welfare of man), but even from the historical point of view. For example, no man...can doubt for an instant that the Arian doctrine and its rejection at Nicea have for centuries given a peculiar course to the destinies of European nations by having united the interests of Catholicism with some of the German tribes and having put them in opposition to other tribes which were broken down in the conflict...The common answer to such examples is that they are exceptions; but in reality...they are only manifest illustrations of the common rule. Even in our time the greatest part of the European com‐ motions, though seemingly produced by material interests...is nothing but a veil to the deep religious questions which, without his being conscious of the fact, direct the actions of man. I am sure this opinion will find your approbation. 17

Indeed this agreement on the centrality of religious questions in human life was the basis for their mutual interests. We shall see when we come to summarize Khomyakov's ecclesiology and his critique of the West the importance of moral and religious questions in determining the course of history. The 'moral fratricide' which Khomyakov sees in the introduction of the FILIOQUE into the Creed plays the central role
in his conception of the development of Western civilization.

But if religion determines culture, culture may sometimes determine religion. I have noted the close relationship between Khomyakov's religion and his sense of national identity. Given his upbringing and his view of religion as THE determining influence in the lives of men it could hardly be otherwise. For Khomyakov religion and culture are almost too closely related to be distinguished and while Khomyakov holds that religion determines culture he occasionally speaks as if culture determined religion. While he strives in the correspondence with Palmer and in his theological brochures (published in the West) to convert the West to the true faith and salvation, he remains convinced that the corruption of the West makes this all but impossible. In his first letter to Khomyakov (responding to the letter in which the Russian initiated the exchange) Palmer wants to know why if the Orthodox Church is the ONLY true Church and the Western communions are false, that Russia does not dispatch missionaries to England:

...you inwardly say in your heart 'We alone are the true Church and THEY are all heretics'...THEY whom you do not so much as move a finger to bring into your exclusive Ark of Salvation! 18

Khomyakov, however, expressed little optimism that England or other Western nations could be converted merely by receiving the true word. The same cultural predispositions which are claimed to be a result of religious convictions determine the virtual impossibility that religious conviction will change. In a later letter, Khomyakov expresses this pessimism in this manner:

A Frenchman, a German, an Englishman, will go over to Presbyterianism, to Lutheranism, to the Independents,
to the Cameronians, and indeed to almost every form of belief or misbelief; he will not go over to Orthodoxy. As long as he does not step out of the circles of doctrines which have taken their origin in the Western world, he feels himself at home... Now a passage to Orthodoxy seems indeed like an apostasy from the past, from its science, creed, and life. It is rushing into a new and unknown world...

Passages such as this indicate that Khomyakov's faith in the power of religious transformation sometimes wavered. Religious choices had determined the sorry condition and impending collapse of the West, and only a change of religion -- a return to Orthodoxy -- can save the West but Khomyakov seems to lack faith that this conversion is possible. Western culture -- although the product of a false religious development, now is seen as too strong -- a force of independent strength -- to allow in the light of true religious opinions. However he may have doubted that the true Orthodoxy he expounded could break the barriers created by Western nationalist culture, Khomyakov never doubted that all questions of any import to man are religious ones. Reacting to the uprising in France, Khomyakov wrote to Palmer, "The highest questions are stirred up and man hopes to solve them without the aid of religion. I am afraid humanity will pay dearly for the foolish pride of reason." Just exactly how crucial true belief is to man is demonstrated by Khomyakov's theory of cognition -- an outgrowth of his general views of life, as well as a continuation of the religious philosophy first sketched by Ivan Kireevsky.
Khomyakov's philosophical views are closely related to his ecclesiastical world outlook. This of course is not to say that Khomyakov's philosophy is necessarily a development of his ecclesiology or vice versa. Rather the essential unity of his outlook from childhood has been demonstrated and this examination of Khomyakov's philosophy is designed only to illustrate this essential unity. Khomyakov never developed a coherent or complete philosophical system. Nor, however, are Khomyakov's views the result of a polemic. Khomyakov's most important philosophical pieces were written after the death of Ivan Kireevsky and represent a concious attempt to develop and extend the new philosophy which Kireevsky was beginning to formulate. It will be necessary to briefly outline Kireevsky's philosophy in order to see what problems Khomyakov addressed in his own philosophical writing. It is probable that Kireevsky's thought was influenced in these matters by Khomyakov's own thinking and close parallels between the ideas of the two men can be clearly seen.

Ivan Vasilievich Kireevsky (1806-1856) shares honors with Khomyakov as the leader and founder of Slavophilism. He is generally considered the chief philosopher of the Slavophile group. His interest in philosophy dated from his early years. At 17 he joined the first of the important philosophical circles that characterized Russian intellectual life in the first half of the 19th century. This was the Lovers of Wisdom, or the 'Young Men of the Archives' a group that included such thinkers as Prince Odoevsky, Pogodin, and the future member of the
Slavophile circle Aleksander Koshelyov. The group studied the thought of Schelling and Kireevsky travelled to Germany at the end of the decade of the 1820's to study personally under the tutelage of Schelling and Hegel. Kireevsky's important writings as a Slavophile philosopher, however, date from the last few years of his life -- after his interest in Western philosophy had been tempered by a conversion to Orthodoxy under the influence of his wife, and close acquaintance with the ideas of Khomyakov and of the early Church Fathers.

Kireevsky felt that Western European culture had reached a crisis point -- a crisis created by the dead-end in philosophical development represented by Hegelian philosophy. In his article 'The Nature of European Culture and Its Relationship to the Culture of Russia' published in Moskovskii Sbornik in 1852, Kireevsky analyzed the crisis of the West or a crisis in Western thought. Europe had reached a dead end culturally because European thought had pushed the concepts of abstract reason as far as they could go. Kireevsky thought that Western European cultural development was determined by a combination of three factors: Christianity, Roman civilization, and the creation of nation states by force and conquest. The Roman inheritance -- "the preference for mere cerebration as against the inner essence of things" -- and the violent nature of the origins of European nations combined to distort and warp the Christian heritage and Roman Catholicism represented such a warped view. Even before the schism of 1054 the love of rationalism and syllogistic analysis which characterized Roman culture could be seen in the works of Western theolo-
gians, particularly St. Augustine. So long as the Roman Church remained in communion with the whole, universal Christian Church, this desire to give the precepts of faith a coherent rational structure was merely a "legitimate peculiarity", a manifestation of the differences in emphasis that different local churches with their differing historical backgrounds and developments brought to the Universal Church. "Once it (the Catholic Church) split off (from the Universal Church), however it was naturally forced to transform its distinguishing features into exclusive forms through which alone the Christian doctrine could penetrate among the peoples under its control."24 In like manner European political developments also fostered this concern for an external, rational structure at the expense of an inner spontaneous union. European states, he argued, were founded by conquest with the result that society was divided into warring classes and unity could only be imposed externally according to abstract principles of law derived from reasoning. Both the heritage of Roman law, with its emphasis on coherence and distinctions, and feudal society -- in which each knight with his castle was a state unto himself, bound to other knights only by purely 'external' and stylized elaborate systems of fealty -- contributed to this 'externality' -- this division of Western life into compartments:25

This cleavage of the intellect into separate faculties, this predominance of reason over the other components of the human spirit which was ultimately to destroy the entire edifice of European medieval civilization...in the beginning...resulted in an accelerated development. For such is the law of intellectual deviation: external brilliance is coupled with inner darkness. 26

Kireevsky traced the process by which human abstract reason usurped the
place of faith in Western development. The Roman Church having split with the Universal (i.e. Orthodox) Church over the filioque\textsuperscript{27} -- an alteration in the Creed created by rational deduction -- had to replace the spontaneous unity of the Church by a hierarchically ordered external unity. The Protestants, reacting to this imposed unity, substituted the reason of every believing individual for that of a Church hierarchy. This made faith ultimately dependent on reason for reason is the only common denominator, the only common tool by which men, having abandoned spontaneous inner unity, can seek agreement. So now faith is subject to reason; the result is that men who seek to base faith on reason soon lose faith altogether.\textsuperscript{28} Western Europe had now reached precisely this point. In Hegel, man had arrived back at Aristotle -- from the consequences of which Christianity temporarily had saved him. What was wrong with Aristotle as with all systems based on abstract reasoning was that his philosophy:

\begin{quote}
...By undermining all convictions which existed above the level of day and abstract logic, (it) destroyed all motivations capable of elevating man above his personal interests.\textsuperscript{29}
\end{quote}

With Hegel European philosophy reached a point beyond which it could not go. The elevation of human reason over all other aspects of human knowing resulted in a dry and divided mentality

\begin{quote}
...Having left the highest consciousness of truth to detached logical thinking, man lost in the depth of his self-consciousness all connections with reality and himself appeared...as an abstract being...Only one serious thing was left to man and that was industry.\textsuperscript{30}
\end{quote}

Europe was ready for a new philosophy but was unable to create one out of the classical heritage of rationalism and external law. The
task Kireevsky set for himself was to find a philosophy capable of overcoming the dichotomy in all things that he saw evidenced in Western culture. He sought to reconcile and re-unite faith and reason as part of a single process and to overcome the disassociation from reality which he saw in the Hegelean idea that only concepts are real.

For Kireevsky knowledge was not obtained by the correct application of principles of abstract logic. Knowledge was given not to the mind but to the whole man -- knowledge was a moral category. It was necessary for man "to gather into one indivisible whole all his separate forces" and to apprehend the world directly by faith -- or believing reason. It is the spontaneous act of faith that brings man into contact with reality that gives him certainty of his own existence and of that of others. This apprehension of the world as One -- direct and immediate -- is not attained by logic. Rather faith or as Kireevsky usually put it 'integral cognition' perceives the unity of the world in the unity of the soul and thus provides to abstract reason the data with which it works. As long as reason is 'believing reason' subservient to the over-all integral cognition -- the unified and direct perception -- it functions properly and helps man to understand and be conscious of the world without losing sight of the irreducible Oneness of reality. Faith and reason cannot come into conflict because faith is the ground of reason. Faith -- the direct expression of the whole human being reacting to the world -- is the sine qua non of cognition. Therefore reason which is merely the process by which man transforms his direct knowledge into consciousness is dependent on
faith and cannot conflict with it. It is only when abstract reason claims to be able to know reality merely by the application of syllogistic analysis that the harmony of the whole man is disturbed and reason becomes the enemy of faith.

Kireevsky had analyzed the disintegration of Protestantism in the West into atheistic abstract rationalism. Once the spontaneous unity of faith had been shattered, first by Roman Catholicism and then by Protestant individualism, man could seek to establish Truth only by the lowest common denominator available to all -- abstract reason. But recall not for Kireevsky knowledge was a moral category. Knowledge of the truth is given only to those capable of integral cognition -- only to those who have achieved spontaneous unity of the soul who can submit the entire person -- mind, emotions, and all -- to a direct belief in the One Truth. Since the Truth is One, those who seek to obtain it must become One -- one within themselves, achieving a total unity of all desire, knowledge, passion, etc. -- and One with the World -- with others as well. Ultimate knowledge is not given to the individual because the individual is but a part of the One Truth. Faith unites the individual with all believers and in this common faith -- and only in this common faith -- can knowledge be directly apprehended. That is why as long as the Western Church remained in communion with the universal Church, the interest of western theologians in coherent and rational formulations of the faith could do no harm; but separated from the direct communion -- the one faith, Catholicism lost the gift of integral cognition and failing to grasp Truth directly had to seek it by the application of reason. Kireevsky's theory of
cognition was then both collective and elite -- 'elite because true knowledge is not possible for those who lack faith and live divided lives; collective, in that knowledge is not given to the individual per se but is only available to one who unites himself by faith to the collective aspirations of mankind.

There can be no doubt that this concept of faith or integral cognition was a specifically religious concept for Kireevsky. He specifically identified it with Orthodox Christianity and holds that Western philosophy of itself could never arrive at this concept because Western life itself and religion itself is too fragmented and cut off from spontaneity. Integral cognition is the new principle in philosophy that Kireevsky proclaimed in his last article published the year of his death. Abstract reason is entirely appropriate as a tool wholly subordinate to the unified and direct operation of integral cognition -- faith. The concept of integral cognition overcomes the dichotomy, fragmentation and alienation which bedevils Western culture. But Kireevsky died in 1856 with his work incomplete. How, specifically, does faith work? How specifically does it give us knowledge of what is real and what is not? These questions, left unanswered in Kireevsky's epistemology, are the questions which Khomyakov undertook to examine after Kireevsky's death.

Khomyakov sought to continue the philosophic work of Kireevsky in two ways: first, a continuing critique of Western thought directed against the materialists or Left Hegelians and secondly by refining Kireevsky's doctrine of epistemology to deal with the question of how we distinguish the real from its concept.
Kireevsky had argued that with Hegel the development of European thought comes full circle with a return to pure abstract reason now totally divorced from reality -- able only to recognize the concept of a thing as real. Khomyakov summarizes this point neatly:

The founder of the school (Kant) said 'We cannot know the thing (object) in itself.' The thinker who led the school to its consummation said 'The thing (the object) does not exist in itself, it exists only in knowledge (the concept).'

The result was a dead-end for Western thought, for if only the concept exists, all reality including man is a chimera and Hegel is guilty of "thought in which nothing is being thought" as Schelling had noted. Western thinkers themselves could no longer be satisfied with such a pure idealism -- an abstraction, a concept alone having reality. Hence the Left Hegelians thought to "stand Hegel on his head" and to save the Hegelian thought system by introducing into it the missing 'real' ground -- i.e. matter. The materialists thus could avoid the charge that their philosophy was unrelated to reality -- to that non-abstract other of which we have existential consciousness. Khomyakov undertook to prove that the materialism of the Left Hegelians, far from saving Western thought from pure abstraction, is merely pure abstraction in disguise -- a rationalism which lacks the courage of Hegel's rationalism for he was willing to push abstract reason to its limit and did not fear to draw the seemingly incongruous (though perfectly logical) conclusion that the world is nothing other than concept -- the spirit becoming conscious of itself.

Criticism recognized one thing: the complete inadequacy of the Hegelium attempt to create a world without a substratum. Hegel's disciples---imagined that it would be sufficient to introduce this missing substratum into the system---And thus (they)---grabbed hold of Matter---Matter becomes the substratum and
otherwise Hegel's system is retained. 33
Has the introduction of matter as the ground of all being provided thought with something to think about -- thus evading Schelling's critique? No indeed. Khomyakov's critique of the materialists contains three steps. 1. Matter is by definition (i.e. by our very concept of it) measureable, divisible, limited. To say that something is material is to be able to put your hand on it -- to measure and delimit it. 2. The materialists however, insist that matter is the ground of all being -- the infinite substratum. And what are the characteristics of an infinite substratum? The infinite is incapable of limits, immeasurable, and indivisible. 3. "Now when we say that matter is the infinite substratum of all that is, or conversely, that the infinite substration of all that is is matter, i.e. when we bring together two thoughts which are in complete opposition, do we say anything? Apparently as little as when we utter the words 'round square', 'green sound', loud nood' or anything of the sort." 34 Hegel had the virtue of consistency. Once one grants him his premise that cognition is possible only through abstract reason, one is led irresistably to his conclusion that there is no thing-in-itself. Materialism is however nothing but a pathetic absurdity. Such is Khomyakov's view. Materialism did not and could not succeed in freeing Western thought from the dead-end of which Kireevsky spoke. A new philosophy must start by denying the premise of the Idealist school -- the supremacy of reason. Kireevsky had asserted that we know the reality of the world by faith -- by the direct, immediate pre-rational (though not un-rational) contact with it. The world -- the thing-in-
itself is real because our whole being tells us it is so immediately
and directly. But this assertion needs modification. We do experience
reality directly and know it as such by integral cognition but not all
things are real. We conceive of things which are possible but not
actual. Kireevsky's philosophic work was cut off by his untimely
death and there seem to be little more than hints in his published
articles as to how one can know the difference between the possible
and the actual. It is to this question that Khomyakov addressed
himself in his last and unfinished philosophical work, his second
letter to Yurii Samarin.

For Khomyakov as for Kireevsky faith is central to cognition.

Faith---apprehends actual(real) data and makes
them available for analysis---by the understanding.
Only in this area do the data still have the full-
ness of their character---In this area, which PRECEDES
LOGICAL CONSCIOUSNESS (emphasis mine)---man realizes
what belongs to his intellectual world and what to
the external world. Here by the touchstone of his
free will(volya) man perceives what in his (objective)
world is produced by his creative (subjective)
activity and what is independent of it. 35

This statement sums up the Kireevsky-Khomyakov philosophy. The world
is experienced directly, immediately by faith and this same faith --
which is nothing but the expression of the whole man (Kireevsky's
integral cognition or total reason) provides man with the measure by
which he can know the real from the possible. Reason cannot do this
for it can only apply the principles of logic to data perceived
directly by faith. It can only know what is possible (the concept)
without being able to know whether or not it is real.

What, for instance, is a phenomenon? Khomyakov uses the example
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of a man firing a rifle. We speak of the phenomenon of shooting. But wherein does it lie? In the loading of the rifle? The aiming? The explosion of gunpowder? Phenomena are not conceivable apart from space and time: "The world appears to reason as matter in space and energy in time."36 And matter itself, far from being the ground of all being, is merely, in relation to form (and matter by definition must have form) the product of energy for energy precedes a change in form. Matter is therefore but a manifestation of energy and time and space themselves are categories of energy: "Time is energy in its developments; space (is energy) in its combinations."37 The phenomena, the facts, or objects, then are conceived in categories of time and space -- themselves categories of energy which Khomyakov defines as the "actual principle of the change of phenomena".38 How is energy related to facts or objects? Time and space, the categories by which the mind perceives phenomena, are necessary to our conscious conception of them (i.e. at the level of consciousness, or Verstand, we must posit them and space) but "time---is not contiguous in the order of causality, since phenomena linked by the mind in an instant of time were not yet able to react on one another and consequently to be in the conditions of true space."39 Khomyakov has earlier explained what he means by this, using the following example: We say that the sun warms us but we know that the sun is light-years away, that it takes a long time for the rays of the sun to reach us. The rays which warm us now were emitted by a sun which possibly, no longer exists and the sun that exists now emits rays which will warm someone only in a distant future.
In short we are conscious of phenomena, of facts, only in the categories of space and time and these categories do not express the 'Reality' of the situation. Space and time, then, and the phenomena which we cannot CONCEIVE without them (note, however that when we use the word conceive we are speaking of the action of the conscious, analytical reason) have their reality only in relation to the individual mind. It is the individual who apprehends the phenomenon -- the shooting of a rifle from the myriad components of this action. "The world of subjective creation with its space and time, is as actual as the external world but the external world alone is common to all, is God's world." A phenomenon then "is the movement (of that which is) as the object of consciousness (rational activity); consequently it is its movement for the subject of consciousness." When we speak of a phenomenon we are "snatching it from the universal" we are imposing categories of space, time, and causality of a series of events which is on-going. We speak of phenomena only by extracting them from the all -- the universal, God's world. God's world, that world, that all, of which only God could be conscious, is common to all but is not perceived alike by all. The shooting of a rifle, which to one human may appear as a single phenomenon, is not that to a bird or an animal present at the time. For such a creature there is no phenomenon, only inchoate actions. Indeed even for another human being the same concatenation of things may not be perceived as a single phenomenon. What is real is God's world -- the all, the universal. The rational mind cannot apprehend it and tends to reduce it to a series of phenomena. But the ALL is not the sum total of all phenomena; rather
phenomena are conceptualizations snatched from the all. The ALL is fully knowable only in God and to God; hence the highest and true cognition is collective as Kireevsky had pointed out.

We return again to the original question. How do we separate that which is real and external to us from that which is possible, i.e. which can be conceived or thought? The answer is free will:

Free will is the last word for consciousness just as it is the first (and just because it is the first) for actuality -- the FREE WILL OF REASON, and -- I add -- OF REASON IN ITS WHOLENESS: because the change of phenomena is a change in the object of consciousness---and the object of consciousness as such presupposes, or, more exactly includes the inherent existence of pre-objective consciousness, this first stage of the being of thought which does not and cannot pass into the phenomena, but always precedes it---We find the principle of the phenomenon and of its changes, i.e. of energy on a total reason. 42

Free will belongs to the "pre-objective" consciousness, that immediacy of cognition, i.e. that faith, through which data is presented to consciousness. Of the reality of free will there can be no doubt and free will enables man to know what is real and what merely possible or conceivable: "it indicates to man what in himself comes from himself, distinguishes (it from) what does not come from himself."43 I take it that this means that that which we can will, we know to belong to the realm of the possible and not necessarily the actual. But how do we know that free will exists? It is not a concept or category of reason. Rather it is apprehended immediately and inexorably:

Nobody doubts his own free will, because he could not have received a concept of it from the outside world, the world of necessity;
Free will is thus the pre-conscious agent by which we know the real from the possible. It is a direct, non-rational agent of cognition. It is not totally clear to me whether free will and faith are identical for Khomyakov but they are both clearly direct, spontaneous and "integral" -- part of the TOTAL Reason and the oneness by which cognition exists. Khomyakov never completed this article (cast in the form of a letter to Samarin) which was published posthumously in Russkaia Beseda. It seems to me that Khomyakov did not completely clarify the process by which free will works as an agent of cognition. For instance, one can presumably will the impossible. Therefore it still seems unexplained just how free will makes cognition of the actual certain. It does, however, seem possible to say that Khomyakov's philosophical analysis is consistent with his religious world view. For faith alone makes knowledge possible but knowledge is of the All -- of God's world which can only be apprehended by man in so far as he submits himself to that all and abandons his peculiarity for that mutual love or 'sobornost," which we will see is the very essence of Khomyakov's religious views.

A few citations will, I hope, suffice to show the parallels between Khomyakov's epistemology and his ecclesiology. 'Faith' of course is a religious term -- in fact, Khomyakov preferred this term
to 'religion' as a description of the Church. That faith should also be the key term of his epistemology is no accident. I have spoken of the unity of Khomyakov's thought and have sought to illustrate such unity by looking at his views on religion and philosophy and will examine his views on Russia and the West in this regard. For Khomyakov truth is one, the real is not any sum of phenomena but the All and faith, the direct and spontaneous response of the whole man to the All of which he is an integral part is the key to knowledge. It is precisely the same faith of which Khomyakov writes in his ecclesiological polemics for he is not using the same word to cover two distinct meanings. Religious faith is the living response of the whole man; it is not mere assent to a set of doctrinal propositions:

No: Neither God, nor Christ, nor His Church are (constitute) Authority, which is an external thing. They are the truth: they are the life of the Christian, his interior life; more alive in him than the heart which beats in his breast and the blood which flows in his veins. 46

The knowledge of which philosophers speak is for Khomyakov nothing other than the Spirit of God of which he speaks in terms identical to his writings on cognition:

The Spirit of God---is accessible only to all the plenitude of the human spirit under the inspiration of grace. 47

Again Khomyakov describes his religious faith, faith in God in terms identical to faith as an epistemological concept:

Faith is the consequence of a revelation admitted as such; it is belief in an invisible fact manifested by a visible fact; but it is not a belief purely logical or rational; it is much more than
that. It is not an act of reason alone but an act of all the powers--- 48

These citations, all taken from the same essay -- his first polemical brochure published abroad -- indicate how absolutely crucial the concept of faith is for his ecclesiology. They indicate also that his definition of faith is a broad one and that the term means the same whether he is discussing religious creeds or philosophical systems. Since truth is one, religion and philosophy are not separate or different. Khomyakov's epistemology parallels his ecclesiology because it is in fact a part of it.

Truth is one. It is also collective. Kireevsky and Khomyakov had both stressed that full truth is not given to the isolated individual just as truth is not given to reason when it functions apart from faith, apart from the integration of all human faculties. This concept is, as we shall see, the very center of Khomyakov's ecclesiology for the Church is one -- not an unity defined by formal assent to a set of Creeds (though the Church does hold the Nicene Creed as the expression of its faith); nor a union defined by submission to an hierarchical clergy -- but one in the mutual love of Christians, a love expressed by faith and it is in that mutual love that the Church is infallible and mortal man achieves infallibility in it; as Khomyakov notes in his catechism Tserkov' Odna:

But the wisdom that lives within him is not given to him individually, but as a member of the Church, and it is given to him in part, without annulling his individual error; but to the Church it is given in the fulness of truth. 49

The Church is not a building and not an organization or institution
but the collective of believers in their mutual love. It is infallible because, unlike any individual, it approximates the All in its universality and the direct spontaneity of the mutual love of Christians. Just as in Khomyakov's philosophy, human consciousness's inevitable tendency to deal with the All in terms of separable phenomena is an expression of individual weakness, so in Khomyakov's doctrine of sin and salvation, man's separation from God and his fellows is the mark of his fall. Insofar as men are separate, they sin. This is original sin and no man escapes it insofar as no man can escape his individual existence, his separation from God and neighbor. Insofar as he does overcome this separation in the mutual love that is the Church, so also does he escape sin:

We know that when any of us falls, he falls alone; but no one is saved alone. He who is saved is saved in the Church, as a member of her, and in unity with all other members. If any one believe, he is in the communion of faith; if he loves, he is in the communion of love; if he prays, he is in the communion of prayer—everyone who prays asks the Whole Church for intercession--- 50

The above quotation takes us into the very heart of Khomyakov's ecclesiology. But a direct exposition of that ecclesiology must await the next chapter. First we need to conclude our illustration of the unity of Khomyakov's world view by examining his ideas on Russia and especially the West.
We have already seen how closely Orthodoxy and patriotic sentiment are associated in the life of Khomyakov -- that ever since childhood devotion to the Orthodox Church and devotion to the customs and traditions of Russian society went hand in hand. Indeed Khomyakov did not always distinguish Russia and Orthodoxy. He remained throughout his life a steadfast and unswerving patriot and Orthodox believer. Yet, as also has been indicated, Khomyakov could not ignore the West. At least since 1812 Russia played an active part in European politics. Khomyakov himself, not withstanding the piety and patriotism of his mother, was given a typical gentry education that included Western tutors and resulted in his mastery of several Western languages. His own fascination with gadgetry and machines which led to his dabbling in inventions made him aware of the superiority of Western technology. Khomyakov could not ignore the West; no educated and intelligent Russian of his time could. Nor could a man who had read widely in Schelling, Hegel, and the whole corpus of Romantic literature fail to consider what role Russia had to play as a nation and a culture in the history of mankind.

Nicholas Riasanovsky has pointed out that the Slavophiles, as typical nineteenth century Romantic thinkers, tended to divide the universe into 'We' and 'They.' For Khomyakov, Western Europe -- its culture and thought -- were 'they'. It was against Western thought and culture that the unique virtues of Russia were to be defined. A striking example of this feeling of an unfathomable
division between Russia and the West is expressed in an early poem of Khomyakov's 'To a Foreign Girl' written in 1832 in which the poet concludes:

I say to her 'Holy Russia'  
and the heart within her does not tremble.  
And vainly a ray of living light  
falls from her dark eyes.  
To her the proud spirit of the poet  
will not dedicate his love.  

What, then, are the characteristics of this alien 'land' the West? Not surprisingly, the 'West' is a culture dominated by principles exactly opposite of those of Orthodox civilization. The West is certainly the home of superior technology. Khomyakov had a genuine appreciation of Western technological achievement. Of the Slavophile circle, Khomyakov was perhaps the most interested in science and its technological developments. He was a vigorous landowner always in search of the best methods of increased yield and an amateur inventor one of whose machines was even exhibited in London. Khomyakov never pretended that Russian technological achievements could match those of the West. Nor, given his philosophy of unity, could he dismiss this Western superiority as a fluke. It was the necessary flowering of Western spiritual principles.

We have already seen what the dominating principle of Western civilization is in Khomyakov's definition. It is, of course, rationalism. This is the same rationalism which finds its culmination in Hegel, the same rationalism that led to the introduction of the FILIOQUE into the creed with the resulting split between the Churches (and hence societies) of East and West. Having separated itself from
the mutual love of universal Christendom the Western Church had to seek a new basis for authority and found it in rationalism. I have already indicated how according to the critique of Kireevsky and Khomyakov, this initial decision determined the course of Western thought and how the (by then) inevitable development of rationalism proceeded from the hierarchical authority of the Roman Church through Protestant individualism to the final secular and abstract philosophy of the Idealist school. This development, as Kireevsky pointed out, was a gradual one over the course of ten centuries. It is only in the thought of Hegel that, according to Kireevsky Western thought casts aside the last remnants of its Christian heritage and comes full circle back to the logic of Aristotle. For Khomyakov, the superiority of Western science is made clear precisely by this development. Because Western culture increasingly refined and improved the quality of abstract reasoning -- the quality of deduction and induction, etc. For this reason, Western thought was most prepared to understand and formulate the laws of science and consequently the West excelled in scientific progress. Nor was there a false note in this. The development of the scientific mind and the development of applied technology were not alien to the principles of Western culture but rather an appropriate expression of them. Science was the fruit of rationalism -- of the development of the reasoning capacity of the human mind. 53 In Russia the development of abstract thought did not proceed since Russia retained its initial spontaneity and unity and had no need to develop a rational basis for authority; consequently Russian science and technology remained inferior.
Of course, Western superiority was based only on technical -- not spiritual -- achievements and hence only superficial. Even more superficial was the attempt of the Russian intelligentsia to absorb this Western learning. For the spirit which lay behind that learning was alien to the Orthodox principles of Russian society. The result was a deep split in Russian society separating the educated, 'Western-ized' few from the life of the 'unenlightened,' Orthodox many:

Meanwhile those people or classes in which either the thirst for knowledge was stronger, or the bond to historical antiquity was less strong, separated themselves more and more from those who could not and did not want to follow them along the newly discovered path---All, even those who threw themselves in full consciousness into the path of foreign enlightenment, belonged to the Western world only in thought -- but in life, habit and existence they still belonged to their native country---But once the direction was taken, it was necessary to develop more and more under the influence---of logical necessity---The system of enlightenment, spreading from without, carried with it the intellectual fruits of pride which disregards the whole race and its vital fruits in the impoverishment of all the most natural sympathies. This bifurcation has been maintained for a long time. 54

Another component of Khomyakov's analysis of the West is necessity. Since for Khomyakov all important aspects of a culture flow from its dominant first principles, we should not perhaps be too surprised to find necessity as one of the key components of Western culture. If rationalism is the basic principle of the West, necessity follows. Rationalism is at the foundation of Greek and Roman culture and hence is the basis on which Roman law is built. Roman law sets out a formal system of rights and duties in which all members of society have a necessary place and are bound by necessity to follow the forms of the
law. Modern European states have, in varying degrees, incorporated this law into their state structure. Thus European states, even those with democratic or parliamentary systems, are built on necessity for the citizen is bound to the state and to his fellow citizens by a system of formal and external law binding on him. It is of only secondary importance that in democratic countries these laws have been passed by a majority (strictly a majority of the representatives elected by a majority) the law is always an external manifestation -- formally binding, imposed by a numerical majority -- a majority which is always shifting and changing. Thus for Khomyakov the West is unfree. A curious assertion for a citizen of the Russia of Nicholas I. Russia on the other hand is free. It was Konstantin Aksakov who most clearly elaborated the concept of a communal society bound not by formal law but by customary law in which each voice is free as in a chorus. 55

In attempting to grasp this apparently incongruous assertion of Russian freedom and Western unfreedom it is necessary to note that for Khomyakov freedom is not a political concept. It is, as are all important ideas, a religious concept. It is not that Khomyakov finds Western majority politics a sham in which the people, in fact, oppressed, are tricked into imagining they are free. Rather it is that politics and government are secondary concerns. I have quoted earlier 56 a passage from the correspondence with Palmer in which Khomyakov asserts the importance of religious questions and the unimportance of political and social ones. We have seen in looking at the varied aspects of Khomyakov's endeavors and writings that the
whole is united by a concern for religion -- for belief from which is derived every social, political or artistic fact worth mentioning. For Khomyakov, therefore, the form of government is unimportant. Political freedoms are unimportant, except for free speech which is the necessary extension of spiritual freedom. The West is unfree because it recognizes as the organizing principle of society -- law. Law is the abstract, logically thought-out (that is, law aspires to logic whether or not it achieves it) rational ordering of society -- externally imposed on the citizen by the State. The State whether democratic, monarchical or otherwise, is an institution alien to and apart from the citizen. Man is governed by abstract principles of law, arrived at by abstract reason and must consider himself fortunate if he finds these principles applied consistently. All this is external to man, i.e. it inhabits the realm of necessity. Freedom, on the other hand, is a moral category emanating from within. It is inextricably connected to faith and free will. One is free to believe or not to believe, free to take the world on faith or to try to subject reality to the demands of reason. Russian society is free in principle. Russia lives not by law but by custom -- which is not external but an internalized system of values shared with all one's fellows and not just one's contemporaries but with what Chesterton called "the democracy of the dead" as well. Custom is not rational but it is also not imposed by an external authority. It is the communal wisdom of the ages, a consensus arrived at over time whose validity is freely accepted and recognized though no one could put a finger on its origins or explain why the custom had evolved as it did. Custom is
communal. Here again we see the linkages with Slavophile religion and philosophy. True knowledge is collective; salvation is given only in the Church -- the collective of believers. Authority in the secular world is likewise collective -- not the sum total of individual votes counted but the collective voice of community custom and usage evolved gradually over time and internalized by each individual and thus freely acknowledged. The foundation of Russian society is the obshchina (the commune) and the Russian empire is just the commune writ large. For the Slavophiles, following the theories of Haxthausen (more properly the Slavophiles found in Haxthausen the confirmation of their views) the commune was not state-created but an institution of folk custom, whose origins were lost in the mists of time. The commune was governed by custom and in Russia, at least until Peter the Great sought to introduce alien Western principles, even the relationship of citizens to the tsar was customary. Hence Russia is free in principle. It is only the Western-derived, alien concept of a State imposed by Peter and handed down through subsequent rulers, that makes Russian reality unfree. Would the Tsar but return to customary ways, Russia would be free -- not in the form of government but in its essence, in the spontaneous, direct life of the people based on internalized values. 57

Rationalism lay at the root of Western civilization from the moment of the introduction of the FILIOQUE into the creed. The development of rationalism had allowed the West to make great scientific and technological advances. It underlay the system of Roman law which in turn underlay the Rechstat, 58 the modern nation state with
its formal, impersonal structures, separated from and alien to its subjects. But if rationalism had been responsible for the triumph of Western civilization it must ultimately cause its downfall. How could it be otherwise? Rationalism is logic cut off from life, therefore ultimately one-sided and limited. The limits would be reached when European thought pushed the use of abstract reason to its furthest possible limits. For the Slavophiles, the fullest possible extension and perfection of rationalism had been reached by Hegel. We have seen in what contempt Khomyakov held the Left Hegelian materialists. Kireevsky, as well, proclaimed that, although the spirit of rationalist philosophy had permeated Western culture, open and intelligent philosophic thought was dead: after Hegel, philosophy (abstract rational philosophy) having reached its zenith, there was nothing left for Europeans but to busy themselves with industrial development, an activity that for Kireevsky provided proof that Europe was spiritually dead. As for Khomyakov it was inevitable that he would expect to see the intellectual and spiritual dead-end of Western life and thought reflected in a complete cultural crisis. He confidently expected the collapse of Western Europe and looked anxiously for the signs.

The political upheavals of the year 1848 which saw Europe engulfed in revolution seemed to Khomyakov to fulfill his predictions. On March 17, 1848 he wrote to his friend A. N. Popov:

The fall of Austria—is completed or will be completed. For others this is a strictly political matter, for us -- an historic one. The (last) trace of the Carolingian empire is vanishing. The
superiority of the German element has passed---
The papacy of Gregory is going to the same place
as the Carolingian empire -- into the historical
archives. There also following them go
Protestantism and Catholicism. The field is
clear. The Orthodox turn has arrived. 60

Western culture and society of course survived the crisis of 1848 but
this did not and could not be taken as an indication that Western
society was sound. The crisis of 1848 was a clear indication that the
West was in trouble. It was not, alas, the final collapse which
Khomyakov expected. In 1854, however, as Russia prepared for war in
the Crimea against France and Britain, Khomyakov was convinced that the
time of reckoning had arrived for sure. He did not lack the effrontery
to proclaim (or to wish to proclaim) this fact to the Western public
itself. In his last letter to Palmer on March 9, 1854 he included an
'open letter' in French which he hoped might be published in some news-
paper or as a pamphlet.61 The potential English or French reader was
to be assured that this was no ordinary war and no ordinary foe: "The
Russian people do not think at all about glory...It (The Russian people)
thinks about its duty, it thinks about a holy war."62 Khomyakov
did not venture to predict the outcome of battle but that was a secondary
matter anyway; the ultimate, true victory was already Russia's since
her cause was just.63 The time had arrived when the truth which lies
at the bottom of Russian and Orthodox culture would be revealed to the
whole world:

Whatever happens, Providence has marked our times
as an epoch in the destinies of the world. Hence-
forth 2 grand principles are in the ascendant: the
first, the Russian principle or rather the Slavic
principle, that of real brotherhood of blood and
spirit. The second much higher still, that of the
Church -- and it is only under her benevolent wing that the first (principle) could preserve itself in a world of trouble and discord, and it is only by the grace of its divine power that it could pass from the state of an almost instinctive tendency of one race to the dignity of a moral law guiding the future of humanity. 64

It is already clear, I think, that just as Khomyakov saw the West as a political, cultural, and religious whole united by the principle of rationalism -- a principle of immense creative force but ultimately one-sided and insufficient -- so he saw the Orthodox world and particularly Russia as the opposite of the West standing on the true principles of the Orthodox faith -- one of mutual love, spontaneous, and spiritually free. And, true to the traditions of the Romantic era in which he lived, Khomyakov was sure that Russia had its own special role to play in the world. This role was precisely to offer to Europe that integral spirituality which in the course of ten centuries had been lost to the dessication of dry rationality. Russia's world mission was not one of political power and conquest. Political power was an illusion of the secular world. What Russia had to offer was a new philosophy (the creation of which had attempted) and fundamentally a new religion or more properly, the return to the true Orthodox Christian religion from which Western Europe had so tragically split in the ninth century. I mentioned previously that the increased bitterness between Slavophiles and Westernizers in 1844 and 1845, after each group had formulated its separate principles and values, caused Khomyakov to search for a new audience or rather a new opponent for his polemics. It was at this time that he initiated the correspondence with Palmer. I think it
may also be said that the correspondence with Palmer and the theological brochures in French published abroad during the 1850's reflect Khomyakov's pre-occupation with Russia's world mission. Khomyakov did not abandon his conviction that the West had reached a spiritual dead-end. Nor could he have any doubt that the Orthodox faith which he had served all his life represented the answer. It seems to me, therefore, that the conversion of the West, at least at times, seemed to him a possibility. He had written Palmer that the abyss separating Orthodoxy from the Western faiths was all but unbridgeable--that all of culture and all of history separated the two and that the re-unification of the Church was an illusory dream. Certainly his analysis of Western society as being rooted in rationalism led him directly to such a gloomy outlook. Yet his analysis also led him to predict an imminent spiritual-cultural-political crisis in the West which would reveal in no uncertain terms the bankruptcy of Western culture, politics, religion, and philosophy. Once such a crisis had revealed the one-sided insufficiencies of the Western way, only Orthodoxy remained possible. It was the one true way and would be obvious to those whose illusions had been shattered. Therefore I think that the correspondence and the brochures that dominated Khomyakov's later life can be seen as his response to Palmer's critique stated so early in the correspondence:

It matters comparatively little whether you seek our conversion as heretics or schismatics, or our reconciliation, as of brethren---It matters little whether you take the one line or the other, either with the Anglicans, or with Roman Catholics; only, pray, do one or the other; show something like Christian zeal and energy--Not only France, but
North America also and England, are quite open to all religions. Why does not then the sole true Orthodox Greek Church send at least one missionary to England?--- you inwardly say in your heart, 'We alone are the true Church, and THEY are all heretics---THEY, whom you do not so much as move a finger to bring into your exclusive Ark of Salvation!'

Russia's world mission was to save the world by bringing it the true philosophy (integral cognition) based on the true faith (Orthodoxy). Such a mission is not one of politics or statesmanship but of ideas. I believe that Khomyakov in seeking a Western audience desired to do his part in the fulfillment of this Russian mission. Indeed we shall see that he hoped Palmer would convert to Orthodoxy. This expectation—which was a misreading of Palmer's intentions—nonetheless reveals the nature of Khomyakov's concept of his own mission within the greater context of the mission of his nation.

We need, however, to examine more precisely the nature of Russia and her world mission and to see how this Saviour Russia is to be squared with the Russia of Nicholas I. Therein lie some of the weakest parts of Khomyakov's ideology. The Russian mission was certainly not a political or economic one. In this Khomyakov and the early Slavophiles differed from the Pan Slavs of later years. Political and military power is an illusion. In his open letter 'To the Serbsians--A Message from Moscow' written in his last year, Khomyakov notes the pitfalls of imperial power: "The Russian land---has made itself the most extensive of contemporary states. Power gave birth to pride, and when the influence of Western enlightenment distorted the very order of ancient Russian life, we forgot our gratitude to God and our
Russia has paid for her pride and pre-occupation with empire building. Serfdom is one price. Losing the Crimean War was another. Khomyakov had called it a 'holy war' and confidently expected the ruin of sinful Europe. Khomyakov does not doubt in the aftermath that the cause was just but Russian defeat was a punishment for Russian sins: "...for God did not allow us to perform such a clean deed with unclean hands." We can see here some evidence of inconsistency. Khomyakov scorns political power but in 1854 he was very eager to see the fall of the West (which, according to him had already occurred -- the West was spiritually and philosophically dead) manifested in political breakdown as well. Russia's failure to defeat the corrupt West could, of course, only be the result of Russia's own sins and Khomyakov certainly is ready to acknowledge a multitude of Russian sins: serfdom, suppression of free speech and press, etc. Yet it is this Russia so unclean as to be unable to carry out a clean act, that is to offer the world a way out of the spiritual bankruptcy of Western Culture. Khomyakov ought to have been troubled by the question of Russia's worthiness to carry out such an historic role and he was. In his letter to Popov mentioned above, written at a time when he had also expected the demise of the West, Khomyakov had worried whether Russia would be worthy of serving her historical opportunity. Twelve years later he was still worried but nonetheless convinced that the opportunity would come -- that the West was dead and would eventually realize it -- and that Russia would be somehow, ready. He writes to the Serbians that their Orthodox heritage is an occasion for rejoicing but not for pride but it is of precisely this Orthodox heritage that he boasts in his polemics with Western religious
writers. And this Orthodox heritage is more important than Russia's political slavery and oppression. When Khomyakov criticizes the West he demonstrates how the basic insufficiencies as well as the basic strengths of its culture flow from its determining principle. Neither the West's technological superiority, nor the brilliance of German philosophy, nor the imminent collapse of Western society is an unrelated accident. But Khomyakov appeals against the West to an idealized Russia -- one of communal brotherhood and spiritual freedom. Both the communal structure of Russian society and its Church reflect the driving principle of mutual love, of spiritual freedom. But serfdom, tyranny, and censorship are somehow exceptions. Because they are not the results of the overriding Orthodox principle, they are secondary, unimportant. When Palmer criticized the Russian Orthodox Church for the subservience to the state, Khomyakov could not disagree. But the charge was irrelevant to Orthodoxy's universal mission:

A greater share of intellectual liberty would go far to break down the innumerable heresies--which are constantly either springing up or spreading---in the ranks of the common people. But then all this is nothing but a temporary error of rather timid politicians, and will pass; let the principles themselves be more clearly expressed and better understood and all will be well. 71

A remarkable statement. The centuries long subjugation of the Church to the State interests is "a temporary error of timid politicians."
The basic principles of Orthodoxy are sound and cannot be blamed. But all will be well when Orthodoxy is "better" understood. Has Orthodoxy still not been understood after 900 years? Khomyakov, in formulating his ecclesiology, felt that he was doing no more than
merely explaining the Orthodox faith to the West. Russia was free
spiritually and her Church universal. But actually Khomyakov was
idealizing Russian society and her Church. It was in his thought, in
his faith that the concepts of sobornost' and spiritual freedom were
developed and elaborated. That is the measure of his lasting contri-
bution to Orthodox thought: that without leaving the bounds of tradi-
tional Orthodox creed, he developed and gave new coherent expression
to certain concepts and ideas inherent in Orthodoxy but not often
before clearly recognized.
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I have already had occasion in this thesis to quote from Khomyakov's correspondence with Palmer. This was largely unavoidable, since, as I have sought to illustrate, Khomyakov's writings however diverse in subject matter -- are nevertheless marked by a remarkable unity. The source of this unity is Khomyakov's religious faith and his belief that religion determines the life of man both individually and collectively. Therefore it ought not to be surprising to find in the correspondence with Palmer -- a correspondence consciously devoted to religious topics -- the same attitudes and ideas that mark the rest of his work -- and not merely his theological brochures. The importance of the correspondence is that in it we find the essence of Khomyakov's ecclesiology, articulated and defined and defended against the criticisms of a knowledgeable and sympathetic Western critic. In examining the correspondence, then, it is useful to examine the nature of its origin and the possible reasons why Khomyakov might seek to enter into a religious discussion with an opponent from the Western tradition.

In order to see how the correspondence with Palmer provided Khomyakov with a particularly appropriate means of formulating his views it is useful to take a look at the debates in which he had been engaged in the thirties and early 1840's -- the Slavophile -- Westernizer debates. A brief review of this debate may help illustrate the types of questions with which Khomyakov was concerned and shed some
light on the role he saw developing for his own ideas. The Westernizer-Slavophile debate was a debate inspired by the question of Russia's mission. Chaadayev's assertion that Russia as a nation without history and traditions could have no mission except as a dire warning to others had started the debate. In effect, the question of Russia's world mission -- if she had one -- and its nature -- was the question of Russia's relationship to the West -- for the West dominated the world politically, economically, and intellectually. With the exception of Chaadayev, neither Slavophiles or Westernizers doubted that Russia had a role to play but the question turned on the nature of Russia's relationship to Western Europe -- was Russia basically a Western nation merely lagging behind Western development due to such misfortunes as the Tartar yoke? Or was Russia the representative of a different world built on different principles? The Slavophiles, basing their argument on the divergent religious traditions of Western and Eastern Europe, saw Russia as a nation apart from the West, grounded on different, better principles -- those of Orthodox communality. But Russia's principles were not only superior they were -- unlike "one-sided" Western rationalism -- universal. The proof of Russia's mission lay in the salvation of the West from herself -- in the universal triumph of the universal doctrines of communality and mutual love.

By 1845, as the Slavophile-Westernizer split was formal, personal relationships between the two groups were strained where not broken off entirely and the battle had long since been joined in print. famous description of the two groups as Janus, whose heads looked in
opposite directions but in whom beat one heart is a retrospective assessment after time, death, and new issues had relegated the debate to the background. While it is true that both groups concerned themselves with the meaning of Russian history and culture and the possibilities for a Russian 'mission' in the world, it is also true that the two sides spoke in very different terms. Put quite simply, most of the Westernizers were not religious and their concept of Russian importance and development was secular. Slavophile thought (especially that of Kireevsky and Khomyakov) denied to the secular realm anything more than a partial reality and saw no independent significance in political or social events.

This hardening of the lines of battle between Slavophiles and Westernizers in the mid-1840's provides the background for Khomyakov's correspondence with Palmer. It is important here not to claim too much. Khomyakov did not turn his back after 1844 on his Russian audience and critics. He did not cease to concern himself with social matters. He continued to be interested, for example, in the abolition of serfdom (note his memorandum to Count Rostovsev in 1859 on this matter) and was involved right up to the end in the efforts to launch a Slavophile journal and to gain freedom of speech. He did not drop everything (or anything) to pursue his polemics with Western Christians. These polemics -- as all his other polemics -- were an integral part of his unified thought. Nor, of course, can we say that Khomyakov initiated the correspondence with Palmer in order to enter into a debate on the true nature of the Church. That, however, such a discussion was welcome to him will be seen when we examine his first letter.
Nonetheless, it is not insignificant that this correspondence should begin (1844) at a time when the Slavophile-Westernizer debate had become hardened and bitter. Khomyakov needed new opponents -- opponents who shared a common starting premise. Once the Westernizer position had been made coherent, further debate would be less fruitful. Starting as they did from wholly opposite concepts of reality (secular vs. religious) the two groups now faced the prospect of talking at each other rather than with each other. The exchange was fruitful in clarifying the thoughts of its participants. After 1845 increasingly they tended to go their own ways. Khomyakov now needed a critic who shared his basic premise that religion determines life and culture but who nonetheless did not share his own religious heritage or assumptions. Only against such an opponent could his ideas develop and become further clarified.

Khomyakov may also have seen himself as making a small contribution to Russia's historic mission by carrying the message of Russian Orthodoxy directly to Western Christians. What was it that the Russians could bring to the West? Andrej Walicki has argued that the Westernizers and, indeed, many intellectuals in Europe as well were beset with the agony of alienation. The feeling of separation and uprootedness was, in his view, related to rapid social and economic change that fragmented traditional society and isolated individuals. But it was exacerbated by rationalist critical thought, which by making distinctions aggravated the sense of division and isolation of the intellectual, who felt cut off from "the people" and from others. The Slavophiles, had, of course noted this alienation in the works of
their Westernizer opponents and contemporary Western thinkers. They were sure they had the cure: integral cognition, the internalized "free unity" in the communality of the Church. Khomyakov could, therefore, confidently assert to the West that he knew the cause of its ills and the cure. In the correspondence with Palmer this analysis would be put to the test and Khomyakov's confidence in his ecclesiology would grow.

Thus, if Khomyakov was not consciously looking for a Western opponent he certainly was eager to grab at the opportunity for any debate. The origin of the correspondence gives evidence of this. Khomyakov had never met Palmer although the latter had made two trips to Russia. They did, however, have a mutual acquaintance, a Mr. Redkin. Palmer had translated Khomyakov's poem 'To The Children' into English and sent a copy to Redkin who showed it and the accompanying letter to Khomyakov. Khomyakov wrote to Palmer ostensibly to thank him for translating his poem but without much ado he introduces the subject of religion: "It is indeed a great joy to have met with your sympathy, and the more so as I have met with it in the highest of all regions, in the communion of religious sentiments and convictions." He is delighted that Palmer approves of prayers for the dead, such as are alluded to in the poem and he goes on to comment on Palmer's hope, expressed to Redkin, for the unification of all Christians and the restoration of one Church. Right away Khomyakov sets out some of the keys to his concept of the Church:

Union cannot be understood by any Orthodox otherwise than as the consequence of a complete harmony,
or of a Perfect Unity of Doctrine---The Church has in itself nothing of a State and can admit of nothing like a conditional Union---Union is possible with Rome. Unity alone is possible with Orthodoxy. 5

It is hard not to suspect that the poem and its translation are little more than a pretext for a religious discussion, and an unlikely one at that. The poem is one of the least programatic or 'public' that Khomyakov ever wrote. It deals with the poet's personal sadness and sense of loss after the death of his two young sons. Khomyakov's religious faith is expressed in the poem but is certainly not the subject of it. Although there are references to the ikon and to prayers for the dead, the poem would seem surely to be universally comprehensible as an expression of a father's grief. 6 Khomyakov clearly sensed in Palmer a worthy correspondent one who shared his interest in matters religious and who shared especially the desire for the re-unification of the Churches.

William Palmer was, indeed, the type of man who could respond to Khomyakov's theories of the Church with sympathy but not without criticism. Palmer was born into an aristocratic and clerical family. His father was Rector of Mixbury and his brother was Lord Chancellor Selborne. 7 He was born July 12, 1811 -- thus he was younger than Khomyakov by seven years -- educated at Rugby School (1823) and Magdalen College, Oxford (1826) where he won the University (Chancellor's) Prize for Latin Verse (1830) and Latin Essay (1833) and won a First in Classics (1830). After a brief period (1833-36) as tutor at the University of Durham he returned to Oxford as University Examiner (1837-39) and as Tutor at Magdalen College (1838-1843). It was during
these years that he developed a particular interest in the Russian Church. As we shall see he traveled to Russia in 1840 and 1841 and desired to be accepted to Communion in the Orthodox Church. Despite his great interest in and sympathy for the Orthodox Church, he converted to Catholicism (1855). He died at Rome April 5, 1879. His works, as befit an Anglican divine and scholar, deal almost exclusively with religious questions and include an Introduction to the 39 Articles in Latin, A Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Orthodox Communion (1853) and perhaps his major work Patriarch Nikon 6 volumes 1871-1876, which remains a major source on the subject. His Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church, which detail his experiences in Russia and his attempts to be received as a communicant in the Russian Church were published posthumously in 1882 by Cardinal Newman, his literary executor.

This brief chronology indicates several things. Palmer, like Khomyakov, was a member of the aristocracy. Like Khomyakov he was always devout and saw religion as the key to all. Unlike the Russian, he took orders in his Church and devoted all his interest and writing to scholarly examinations of religious topics, many of these topics arcane. His writings were aimed at a rather limited audience mostly of fellow Anglican divines and many were (according to Bloxham's list) unpublished or privately printed. Palmer thus was certainly not a man with wide-ranging interests as Khomyakov was but the interests he had, especially regarding the Unity of the Church and ecumenicism were in line with Khomyakov's own deep religious feelings and his need to assert the universal significance of Orthodoxy. Further, Palmer had early
exhibited a particular interest in the Russian Orthodox Church. Evi-
dently this interest was a result of his passionate desire for the
union of the Churches and his conviction in the three branch theory
of the Church, held widely by Anglicans, especially at Oxford in the
1830's and 1840's. As early as 1839 when Grand Duke Alexander (the
future Tsar Alexander II) visited Oxford, Palmer presented him a
petition urging the necessity of Christian unity and asking that a
Russian cleric be sent to Oxford "capable of examining the theology of
our churches" and asking for the Grand Prince's protection should he,
Palmer, subsequently visit Russia to study the Orthodox Church.\footnote{11}
Palmer did undertake two visits to Russia, described in his \textit{Notes},
with the aim of affirming his three branch theory of the Church by
receiving communion in the Orthodox Church. He traveled there mostly
in ecclesiastical circles, meeting with prelates and members of the
synod. He did not, as we have seen, meet Khomyakov, who had as yet
not published anything on the Church (indeed the Correspondence marks
the start of his formal writings on the Church). Although his mission
was a failure, insofar as the Russian Church would not receive him as
a communicant unless he should formally convert to Orthodoxy, (thus
they rejected his three branch theory of the Church, without even under-
standing it -- so notes Newman\footnote{12}), he never lost interest in or
attraction to the Russian Church -- even after his conversion to Roman
Catholicism -- as is evidenced by his writings and researches. Why
his interest in Unity should lead him to be so pre-occupied with the
Russian Church that even after his conversion to Catholicism -- he
continued to study it (evidently before his conversion to Catholicism
he showed little more than a general interest in the Roman Church),
is not clear from the materials I have been able to examine. No
matter. It is unlikely Khomyakov could have found another European
Christian with as deep an interest in, sympathy for, and knowledge of
his beloved Church.

I have mentioned Palmer's theory of the three branches of the
Church. We will see traces of it in the Correspondence but it must
be summarized here both as an explanation of some of the statement made
above as well as a lead-in to a brief discussion of Palmer's links
(such as they are) to the Oxford movement. The theory may be briefly
summarized: The Church is visible -- manifest as such among men on
this earth. The Church is also Catholic, i.e. universal, Apostolic,
co-eval with the Apostles, and Holy as the dispenser of the Holy Word
and Sacraments. The Church is, in essence, one but its present mani-
festation is in three branches -- Latin, Greek and Anglican. These
are not three different Churches but three parts of the same universal
Church, differing only in secondary, local characteristics. (All
three branches acknowledge apostolicity, the sacraments, etc.) The
word 'parts' ought not to be misunderstood. The one Church is Latin,
Greek, and Anglican all at once and each of the branches is, likewise,
the one, whole Church. Because each branch partakes of the nature of
the whole Church, the branches do not mix. Where Orthodoxy holds
sway, there is no Anglicanism or Romanism. Where Rome holds sway,
there is no Anglicanism or Orthodoxy. And so forth. The three branches
do not have direct relation with the others, since they are not separate
parts but each branch, on the territory in which it finds itself, is the
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whole. Likewise a Christian who is a member of the One Church is automatically a member of any and all of its branches. If he is English, he will be an Anglican and follow the Anglican rite. But should he go to Moscow he will be Orthodox and follow the Orthodox rite. This is not a conversion to Orthodoxy; he takes no new vows, nor, has he, returning to England, ceased to be Anglican. Rather he recognizes that in Moscow, the one true Church of which he is a member takes the form of Orthodoxy. The rites of Orthodoxy are binding on him; the rites of Anglicanism have no relevance, for Anglicanism is only the form the true Church takes in English-speaking lands. Just as the Christian must follow the Orthodox rite in Moscow, and the Latin rite when in Rome, so the various branches of the Church must accept him as a member automatically, for, as a member of the One Church-in-Three-Branches, he is automatically a member of the Anglican Church when in England, the Orthodox Church when in Moscow, and the Roman Catholic Church when at Rome. It is this theory that Palmer held and which he set out to test by journeying to Russia. He desired to be received as a communicant in the Orthodox Church -- not by conversion, abandoning Anglicanism but because the Anglican and Russian Churches were one. He sought to study Orthodox theology and liturgy, with a view to reconciling it with Anglican doctrine. Likewise he sought to convince the Russian prelates that the 39 Articles could be, and should be, interpreted in a sense which was consonant with Orthodox belief.

The theory, clearly, expresses much more of a desire than a reality. It reflects Palmer's passion for the unity of the Church --
a passion parallel to Khomyakov's. Needless to say, the theory did not meet with much official approval. Dr. Routh, President of Magdalen College, endorsed the project and provided a letter sanctioning it; he could not, however, secure the university's blessing for any such communion with the "idolatrous Greeks" (in the words of one of the Fellows) and had to content himself with writing a letter of recommendation, with only his personal endorsement as head of Magdalen College. He suggested Palmer get the counter-signature of the Archbishop of Canterbury, signifying that he undertook the mission as one in Communion with the Anglican Church. The Archbishop, however, having read Routh's letter of introduction and Palmer's introduction to the 39 articles in which he attempted to prove that they were consonant with Orthodox (and Latin) doctrine -- would not sign, although he expressed his good wishes and hoped Palmer might succeed. Thus it was that Palmer went to Russia to confirm his theories with only Routh's letter and letters of introduction to key prelates and government figures but not officially representing the Anglican Church. His failure to achieve communion on his terms from the Russians was even more complete as we shall see.

Palmer's three branch theory of the Church is important for understanding his motives in going to Russia and his standpoint in the correspondence. But does it have a wider significance? Here is the testimony of Cardinal Newman, in his preface to The Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church. Having summarized the three branch theory (my summary above is based on his) he writes:
This I conceive to be the formal teaching of Anglicanism; this is what we held and professed in Oxford 40 years ago; this is what Mr. Palmer intensely believed and energetically acted on when he went to Russia—he hoped to obtain from the Imperial Synod such a recognition of his rights to the Greco-Russian Sacraments, as would be an irrefrangible proof that the doctrine of the Anglican divines was no mere theory—

This testimony is interesting coming from the man who is generally acknowledged to have been the leading spirit of the Oxford movement. However, we can in no way speak of Palmer as a member of the Oxford movement. There is a William Palmer familiar to students of the Oxford movement—another man entirely, William Palmer of Worcester College. William Palmer of Magdalen, the subject of our interest, played no role of any consequence in the Oxford movement. My researches into the Oxford Movement which, of course, do not pretend to be thorough, found only a few, short and uninformative mentions of him. Perhaps the most loquacious of these mentions is that of Owen Chadwick in his introduction to The Mind of the Oxford Movement where he specifically denies Palmer a place in that movement:

---at least individual idiosyncracies may be excluded. William Palmer of Magdalen College—held strange, perhaps bizarre, ideas about the Eastern Orthodox Church; and it is clear that his particular ideas, so far as they were exceptional, are inappropriate as illustrations of any movement, even though something may often be learned about historical groups from the eccentricities which appear in their vicinity.

Chadwick does not explain why Palmer's view of the Orthodox Church is 'bizarre'. Perhaps he thought it bizarre that any Westerner should take Orthodoxy seriously. What we can say about Palmer is this: Palmer was not involved in the Oxford Movement. He was younger than
the moving spirits and arrived at Oxford as tutor only after the movement was well underway and spent much time in Russia during 1840 and 1841 -- crucial years for the Movement. He shared with the Oxford thinkers a devotion to the unity of the Church and a belief that the Anglican Church -- if its principles be truly understood -- was an integral part of that unity but he evidently felt no interest or particular passion to define the nature of the relationship of Church and State (it was after all, Parliamentary measures such as the Reform Bill of 1832 and bills respecting the Tolerance of the Catholic Church in Ireland, that touched off the Oxford movement). His particular interest in the Russian Church was not shared by others and this intense interest in the Orthodox Church seems to be the "eccentricity" to which Chadwick refers. His three branch theory in general is in line with the beliefs of the Oxford thinkers who insisted that Anglicanism was not Protestant but a part of the Universal Catholic and Apostolic Church. However, this teaching of the Oxford dons was not without opposition in the Anglican Church; indeed a number of key figures, notably Newman himself, felt ultimately compelled to abandon Anglicanism for Roman Catholicism, concluding that the Anglican Church had failed in its apostolicity and, especially its Catholicity. It may be worth noting that Tract 90, widely regarded as a turning point in Newman's progress toward Catholicism, was an attempt to reconcile the 39 Articles with Roman teaching, just as Palmer had tried to reconcile them to Orthodoxy. Palmer's particular interests and activity, then, have only a personal significance but in his over-all theory of the Church he shared the feelings and desires
dominant in the Oxford of his day.

It is easy to see that Palmer made an excellent correspondent for Khomyakov. Palmer was an informed student of the Russian Church and had learned the Russian language during his visit to Russia. Khomyakov knew English (the correspondence is conducted in this language) and, while he never made England a particular object of his study as Palmer made Russia, he nonetheless had a high regard for England considering it closest among European (West European) nations to the Russian virtues of Christian living, tradition, and spontaneity. His positive evaluation of England is expressed in an article "Letter From England" published in Moskvityanin in 1848, following his return from a visit to England during which he visited Oxford and met Palmer for the first time.

Such was Khomyakov's feeling of friendship for England that he imagined that one of the early Saxon tribes must have been Slavic and tried to trace a tie between the Slavs of Thuringia and the ancient Angles. Khomyakov especially appreciated English refusal to imitate the cultural fads that swept continental Europe and he admired the serious reverence with which the English observed the Lord's day. He notes the silence of the day, the absence of people from the streets:

This is the way Sunday is kept in London. The emptiness of the streets and the silence of the day the midst of the huge noisy city with its constant movement is indeed strange and striking, and it must be admitted that it is hardly possible to imagine anything grander than this extraordinary silence---2 million of the most commercial, the most active people in the whole world had left their occupations, had made a break in their anxieties and all this in obedience to one lofty idea. 19
Khomyakov saw in England a divided nation, divided in effect between body and mind. The reasoning or analytical powers of individuals which should be exercised in harmony with the organic community traditions of the people, had, alas, gone their own way. England was a nation torn between a devotion to its organic past and its acceptance of the Protestant Reformation -- an imported continental culture. The imported Protestant principles weakened the traditional village life of the country. The longing for tradition, the love of the old, remained alive in modern Britain and was embodied in Toryism, which found support even among the commoners. The 'individualistic and analytical' principle of Reformation Protestantism, more in tune with dessicated continental culture, is embodied by Whiggism. Khomyakov feared that, having adopted, without fully realizing the consequences, the false religion of Protestantism, England would probably not escape the fate of West Europe -- spiritual and social collapse. England was a country possessed of a sound tradition being undermined by the acceptance of false principles. Naturally the same applied to the English Church for as we know, in Khomyakov's mind a nation's fate is based on the nature of its religion. Khomyakov expressed this opinion of Anglicanism to Palmer, who had told him in effect that Anglicanism was not in principle a Protestant Church as it seemed to be in practice. Khomyakov wrote:

My real opinion of the Anglican Church is, in many respects very near to your own. I believe seriously that it contains many orthodox tendencies, perhaps not quite developed, but growing to maturity; that it contains many elements of unity with Orthodoxy; obscured, perhaps, by nothing but unhappy habits
of Roman scholasticism---The seemingly heretical---language should only be explained in an Orthodox sense, and the language and spirit of heresy should be formally rejected and disused for the future---the power usurped in the change of the Symbol (the addition of the FILIOQUE to the Creed) should be frankly condemned as offensive to charity and love---

But such a renunciation would be difficult. It would mean a genuine penitence and would offend pride. The English Church would have to apologize to admit it sins. And it was the more unlikely to do so as it had accepted the Reformation: "As if a church which confesses to a reform did not stand self-convicted of Rationalism!" The true Church is unchanging and infallible; had the English Church remained true she would not have 'reformed'. Khomyakov considered the Anglican Church to have retained many facets of Orthodoxy but, all the same, it was, and could not help being, Protestant. Its historic ties to the Reformation cut it off from the older, genuine tradition. In his third French brochure published under the pseudonym Ignutus in 1858, Khomyakov sums up his view of Anglicanism. The view is essentially the same -- although the emphasis is perhaps harsher and less optimistic-- as the view he expressed to Palmer:

In so far as it is Roman or dissident England sails in the wake of Continental thought; in so far as it is Anglican it is deprived of any basis which can merit a serious examination. Anglicanism is an anomaly in the world of reform as Gallicanism is in the Roman world. Gallicanism is dead; Anglicanism has not long to live---Anglicanism has not a single reason to give, and has not given any, for not being Orthodox.

It is in the Church by all of its principles---it is out of the Church by its historical provincialism, a provincialism which imposes on it a false air of Protestantism which deprives it of all tradition and all basis in logic, and of which it, however, does
Palmer's concern for religious unity and his great interest in and knowledge of the Russian Church made him an ideal correspondent for Khomyakov. It was just such a receptive but critical audience that stimulated Khomyakov to make his ecclesiology explicit. To the explication of this ecclesiology we now turn.

We have asserted the unity of Khomyakov's world view and examined his thought in a number of areas in an attempt to illustrate this unity. Time and time again, whether the subject be philosophy, or Western politics and technology, Khomyakov returns to the question of faith -- of religion. It has been impossible to keep from quoting various of Khomyakov's religious views since they form the base of his entire world-view. Now, however, it is time to draw these strands together and to attempt a coherent summary of Khomyakov's ecclesiology. Naturally in such a summary ideas and concepts already mentioned in connection with other topics will be re-stated and more formally presented.

Khomyakov himself attempted only once to give an ordered and programmatic account of his ecclesiology, in the short catechism Tserkov' Odna (The Church is One) which was not published during Khomyakov's lifetime. The history of this work is curious and not at all clear but is worth summarizing here as it sheds light on the circumstances
in which Khomyakov turned his thought to ecclesiology. Nicholas Arseniev, the editor of the Izbrannie Sochinenya of Khomyakov, dates the work to the 1840's but does not know any exact date for its completion. Birbeck, in his preface to his own translation of the work, dates it circa 1850, "towards the end of the time of Mr. Khomiakoff's correspondence with Mr. Palmer". This statement is a bit vague as the correspondence did not conclude until 1854. 1850 would be the latest possible date. The most complete account I have seen of the origin of the work is that of Serge Bolshakoff in his work The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in the Works of Khomyakov and Möehler. Bolshakoff dates the work as being no later than November of 1845, the date of the death of Khomyakov's nephew Dmitri Valuev, who, apparently had suggested writing it. Bolshakoff does not indicate, however, where or when Valuev made this suggestion. He does trace the first reference to it in a letter of Khomyakov to Iuri Samarin early in 1845. It is noteworthy that, while the work was written in Russian, Khomyakov also had a Western public in mind because he wants Samarin's brother, who was leaving for Western Europe, to arrange for its publication abroad -- having no hope that the ecclesiastic censors would allow it to be published in Russia. What is very curious is that, in his letter to Samarin, Khomyakov hides the fact that the work is his own composition and claims instead that it is a Greek manuscript discovered by Valuev (evidently Valuev had translated it into Greek, hoping to get it published as a Greek manuscript in Athens or elsewhere abroad). Indeed, according to P. I. Bartenev, the editor of the third edition of Khomyakov's collected works, only Valuev was in on the
secret of Khomyakov's authorship. Khomyakov circulated the Russian original among his friends, pretending that it was a translation of the Greek manuscript. Bartenev surmises that Khomyakov hid his authorship in order to receive frank criticism from his friends. He apparently very much wanted his ecclesiological views to be accepted and seen as traditional Orthodox doctrine and not as his personal, original creation. 27 Walicki is more critical, seeing in Khomyakov's attempt to hide his authorship, an unscrupulous desire to see his ideas triumph at any cost. 28 Khomyakov continued this deception and fooled his friends. According to Bartenev, however, he did not fool Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow who recognized the work as being not Greek, and by a layman. 29 All of Khomyakov's attempts to publish the work abroad in this fashion fell through, for reasons that are not known with certainty. Bolshakoff speculates that Metropolitan Philaret may have played a part in preventing its publication. 30 It is known that Khomyakov took the work with him on his voyage abroad in 1847 and showed it to Gogol and Zhukovsky in Ems, 31 again apparently with a view to publication. (He continued his deception about the authorship of the piece.) It was on this same trip abroad that he later visited Palmer at Oxford so it is possible that he may have shown the work to him. But perhaps he did not. Gogol and Zhukovsky suggested that before publishing it Khomyakov should provide an introduction. Khomyakov still had not completed this introduction to his satisfaction by October of 1848 when he wrote of it to Popov. 32 If, as Zavitnevich suggested, the work had been written at Valuev's suggestion and disguised as a Greek manuscript also at his suggestion, in
order to impress Palmer, then Khomyakov may well have decided not to show it to Palmer before it was published, which of course it never was. There is no reference to the work in the correspondence which may indicate that Palmer never saw it.\textsuperscript{33}

Tserkov' Odna then, probably dates to 1845 in its original form. This is not 'towards the end of the correspondence as Birbeck indicates but near the beginning. Bolshakoff concludes that the writing was influenced by the correspondence with Palmer. It was, apparently, as a means of influencing Palmer that Valuev suggested the plan to Khomyakov. Khomyakov, as we will see, was under the misimpression that Palmer was considering conversion to Orthodoxy and the Russian, dissatisfied with the current expositions of Orthodox theology (see the letter of Popov, mentioned above), may have desired to present a better exposition to Palmer, in the guise of manuscript by a cleric expressing the 'official' doctrine of the Church. Since Khomyakov was unable to get the work published in this fashion, the plan -- if such it was -- fell through and quite probably Palmer never saw it -- at least during Khomyakov's lifetime. The work was published posthumously, correctly attributed to Khomyakov, in 1863 in 'Pravoslavnie Obozrenie' and quickly translated into English in 1864 and German in 1870.\textsuperscript{34} Whatever the exact origins of this work, it originated during Khomyakov's correspondence with Palmer and was perhaps directed at the latter. At any rate, it may be said that Khomyakov's one and only systematic exposition of his ecclesiology was probably stimulated by his contact with Palmer.
If we trace the course of this correspondence we will see that the main features of Khomyakov's ecclesiology are already present and that his polemics in French and the Tserkov' Odna represent not so much developments as further elaborations. When Palmer in his letter to Redkin, enclosing the translation of the poem 'To the Children', expressed his deep desire for the union of Christianity, he was touching on the very core of Khomyakov's religious beliefs.

The Church is One. Her unity follows of necessity from the unity of God; for the Church is not a multitude of persons in their separate individuality, but an unity of the grace of God, living in a multitude of rational creatures, submitting themselves willingly to Grace. 35

This is the way Khomyakov announces the theme of unity in the opening of Tserkov' Odna and it is precisely the same theme of the unity of the Church that Khomyakov raises in his first letter to Palmer. What does Khomyakov mean by the unity of the Church? "Union cannot be understood by any Orthodox otherwise than as the consequence of a complete harmony, or of a PERFECT UNITY OF DOCTRINE."36 (emphasis Khomyakov's). Thus Khomyakov begins his answer to Palmer's desire for union. Khomyakov further makes a distinction between union, which is a joining in alliance of separate entities, and unity, which is an organic oneness in which no separate parts exist. Union, for Khomyakov, is a political or secular term. States may make unions or alliances. But only Orthodoxy, the true Church, has unity. Thus the desired Unity of Christianity cannot be brought about by ecumenical discussions of rites or doctrines but only by an internalized, spontaneous acceptance of the Orthodox truth and not just by individuals but by
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the collective of believers. Only such a thorough confession and true repentance by Western believers can bring about unity of all the Christian Churches. 37 We have seen before that Khomyakov expressed little hope that such a complete repudiation of cultural heritage could be accomplished. Unity is a complete harmony of faith and love. It is a moral unity and the obstacles to unity are moral rather than doctrinal.

Khomyakov returns to the point in his second letter:

---the greatest obstacles to Unity are not in the visible and formal difference of doctrine---but in the spirit which pervades the Western communities, in their customs, prejudices, and passions, but, more than all, in a feeling of pride--- 38

The unity of the Church, then, is neither a formal alliance nor a uniformity imposed by a hierarchy nor a negotiated agreement on points of doctrine or rite. The unity of the Church, which is a note of the true Church, is a complete, internalized Oneness given to the Church -- that is the community of believers -- by the grace of God. Khomyakov wrote Palmer that the Roman Church is a State, depending for its cohesion on external, imposed 'unity' enforced by an ecclesiastical hierarchy. The true Unity of the Church is nothing like this. It is not imposed by anything exterior. The unity is in the interior life of the Christian. This unity cannot be understood nor expressed in rational terms. For reason, is, as we have seen, only a part -- and at that a secondary one -- of man's cognitive faculties. It must submit itself to faith. The guarantee of the unity of belief given by God "finds itself in mutual love, and finds its aim in the communion of prayer." The only guarantees of unity are faith and hope. To expect anything more is rationalism. 39
The unity of the Church then is a complete harmony given by Grace to the community of believers and preserved by mutual love and through prayer. The key characteristic of this unity is that it is free, for it cannot be imposed by any hierarchy. Just as he distinguished the secular concept of union from the spiritual concept of unity, so does Khomyakov distinguish between political freedom and spiritual freedom. Writing to Khomyakov on July 5, 1852, Palmer noted one of his major objections to the Russian Church:

As regards Russia, the difficulty which with me seems insurmountable, is this: -- that the present relations of the Spiritual and Civil Powers within the Russian Empire are such as to be inconsistent with the due exercise of the Apostolical office---

In his reply, Khomyakov acknowledges that the Church must be free but "free in its principles, though not always free in its actions or manifestations". This distinction ought not to surprise us; it is clear that for Khomyakov freedom of principle is infinitely more important than freedom "in fact", i.e. freedom in civil and political questions. This is consistent with Khomyakov's principle that belief determines life and culture and belief, as a spontaneous and internal response, is free. Khomyakov argues that the Russian Church is free in essence:

A society may be dependent in fact and free in principle, or vice versa. The first case is a mere historical accident; the second is the destruction of freedom---

Freedom, then, is a spiritual or religious concept as has already been indicated. The Roman Church hierarchy possesses independence -- in regard to the state -- has freedom in the exterior, worldly sense.
But the Roman Church is a slave to the principle of rationalism and is compelled to impose unity on her 'subjects' as the result of clerical dictates. But the Orthodox Church is free in principle, that is, in its belief:

The unity of the Church was free. It was liberty itself in the harmonious expression of its interior accord. 43

Freedom is direct belief, dictated not by external authorities, nor dictated by the laws of reason. The unity of the Church as Khomyakov said in Tserkov' Odna is given by grace and grace is freely accepted or rejected. 44 This freedom is granted to the mutual love of believers and is guaranteed to them by prayer. Khomyakov acknowledges to Palmer the obnoxious quality of Russian ecclesiastic censorship but attributes it to the individual timidity and weakness of the clerical heirarchy. 45 But the Church itself is free in its principle; for freedom to believe or not to believe is free and doctrinal belief is not dictated to Church members, rather the Church as a whole, the collective of believers determines what the Church accepts or rejects as true.

The unity of the Church, its "perfect harmony of doctrine" is granted to the mutual love of Christians. Therefore it is free, a grace freely accepted or rejected. This position implies a certain attitude on authority in the Church. We have seen that one of the chief criticisms of the Russian Church raised by Palmer was state dominance, which interferes with the apostolical office. Palmer affirms a Church apostolic and insists on the independence of bishops. Khomyakov also affirms an apostolic Church but he is less concerned with the position of the heirarchy. Khomyakov was not on close terms with the Russian
Church heirarchy of his times. Throughout the correspondence with Palmer he laments that he has no "pull", that he cannot do much to help Palmer in his desire to receive communion or baptism in the Russian Church. In his letter of Sept. 4, 1852, he complained of the oppressiveness of the ecclesiastical censorship. That he felt inhibited by it is indicated by his request to Palmer to arrange for the publication abroad of his first polemical brochure in French. He explains that the essay is directed to a European audience, written in French as the lingua franca:

---but I have no possibility to give publicity to my essay. I cannot do it in Russia, where it would be prohibited, either as useless, and giving rise only to unnecessary doubts, or as being simply contrary to the rules of the ecclesiastical Censorship. 46

In a subsequent letter he complains that certain books that Palmer sent have not reached him and he suspects that the cause is the suspicion in which he is held in high ecclesiastical and political circles. 47

That Khomyakov should have his disagreements with the Church heirarchy is not surprising. These disagreements flow from his doctrine of authority in the Church, itself an extension of his definition of the unity and freedom of the Church. We have seen that Khomyakov denies 'external' forms of authority. The divine revelation is given to the Church -- not an institution or a hierarchy, but the collective body of Christians -- and guaranteed by their mutual love. This Divine Truth is unchanging and eternal; thus the Church does not 'develop' or change in any way. However since man is fallible, the expression of the divine revelation can be incomplete. Rites may, and do, change, expressing the human need for contemporary expression. But no rite
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can change, nor doctrine be reformulated at the behest of a single spiritual leader such as the Pope, nor can the truth given to the unity of Christians be fragmented as in the Protestant sects where each individual may proclaim his own understanding of the Scriptures. In the Orthodox Church in ancient times, the Ecumenical Council passed on matters of doctrine. But, for Khomyakov, authority cannot be formalized, it is direct and internalized. The ecumenical council is not the final authority. Its prestige is due to the fact that its assemblies gather representatives from all the Patriarchates and thus represent the universal church. But decisions of ecumenical councils are not finally authoritative unless the Church -- the members of the Church, not as individuals but in their mutual love -- accepts these decisions. Such acceptance is not signalled by a vote or any such formal, i.e. 'externa' procedure wherein a majority or separate group determines the outcome. Acceptance is manifested over time by the manner in which Christians in their daily worship acknowledge and use the conciliar definitions. The Orthodox Church acknowledges seven ecumenical councils, the last occurring in the eighth century. This does not mean that the Church is without change since that time although the fundamental Christian truth, revealed to man in the revelation of Jesus Christ, is unchanging and always has been. However in the ongoing need of men to find human expression for this unchanging divine Truth, the Church is not powerless. Since final authority rests in the mutual love of Christians, expressed in the perfect harmony which surpasses and transforms the individual, the formal manner of expressing doctrine is of secondary importance. Ecumenical Councils
are no longer possible since after the schism of 1054 one of the Patriarchates -- Rome -- has separated herself from the Church.

One of the consequences of Khomyakov's doctrine of internal authority, of free acceptance, is the relegation of the clergy to a limited role in the Church. The cleric as an individual can have no authority for, like all individuals, he is fallible. It belongs, however, to the clergy to administer the sacraments and perform the rites. In so doing, they represent the Church and shed their individuality. That is to say that in so far as they administer the Holy Sacraments, their personal insufficiencies are irrelevant as they are of the Church in these acts. Christ has proclaimed a clergy to administer sacraments and this is their exclusive right. If the Sacraments are preserved and properly administered, then is the unchanging revelation protected. The clergy may also preach the Word of Christ and are correct in so far as they preach His Word and not their own. But the right to proclaim the faith belongs to all Christians as well -- lay as well as clerical. Any individual may teach the Word of God -- by speaking, writing, praying, or doing -- in so far as he is in touch with the Universal, mutual love. To the bishops in council is also given the promulgation or declaration of doctrine provided that the whole Church judges and accepts these decisions.48

I have indicated that Khomyakov felt that the was expressing Orthodox doctrine and had no desire to proclaim his ideas as original or unique. However there seems to be no doubt that Khomyakov was often dissatisfied with the manner in which Orthodox doctrine was expressed in official circles (note his letter to Popov, in Bolshakoff, above).
He was therefore anxious that his own ideas be seen as fully Orthodox. The deception apparently involved in the attempts to publish Tserkov's Odna indicate the lengths to which he was prepared to go. For this reason the Encyclical Epistle of the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs in 1848 became particularly important for Khomyakov. He claimed to find in this epistle -- a response to Pope Pius IX -- the confirmation of his views on authority in the Church. The question of authority, as we have seen, is a particularly sticky one for Khomyakov. It is central to his concept of freedom in the Church -- the central concept of his religious thought -- and yet, with its minimizing of the role of the clerical hierarchy, it distanced him from the leaders of the official Church of his day. The full significance of the Encyclical epistle to Khomyakov is set forth in his letter to Palmer of Oct. 8, 1850. The passage, it seems to me, is worth quoting at some length:

I daresay you have long since felt, as have most of us, that the difference between the Eastern Church and all the Western communities---lies not so much in the difference of separate dogmas or portions of creed as in something else---This difference consists in the different manner of considering the Church itself. I have tried---to state that difference clearly and explicitly; still all explanations given by a solitary individual and by a layman had no authority whatsoever, and could not be considered as serious expressions of the Church's own self-notions. Doubts and direct negations were natural, the more so as I must confess that my explanations were in evident opposition to many definitions of the Church and its essence given by some of our divines, educated I fear, under the influence of Western tendencies---The expressions used by a Synod of three Patriarchs and twenty-eight Bishops have a very high authority, and may be considered, now that they have been reprinted in Russia with the assent of our Church authorities, as something very near an ecumenical decision of the Eastern Church. 49
Two sections of the Encyclical Epistle seemed of particular importance to Khomyakov. In the letter to Palmer, Khomyakov quotes from memory from sections 11 and 17 to the effect that the guardian of the dogma of Orthodoxy is not the ecclesiastical hierarchy but the whole people of the Church and that "the knowledge of truth is given to mutual love". Such a doctrine clearly separates the Orthodox Church from the errors of the Western communions:

The gift of truth is strictly separated from the hierarchical functions (viz. from Sacramental and Disciplinarian power), and the essential distinction from the Roman notion is thus established; the gift of unvarying knowledge (which is nothing but faith) is attributed, not to individuals, but to the totality of the ecclesiastical body, and is considered as a corollary to the moral principle of mutual love. This position is in direct contradiction to the individualism and rationalism---of every Protestant doctrine.

The Encyclical Epistle, then, represented for Khomyakov, an official confirmation of his doctrine of mutual love -- hence, of his doctrine of the Church. It is important, therefore, that we examine what Khomyakov claimed to find in this document and the document itself. Khomyakov quoted the document from memory to Palmer. His memory was not exact. Here is Khomyakov's rendering of 17:

The Pope is greatly mistaken in supposing that we consider the Ecclesiastical hierarchy to be the guardian of the dogma (of the Church). The case is quite different. The unvarying constancy and unerring Truth of Christian dogma does not depend on any Hierarchical Order; it is guarded by the totality, by the whole people of the Church, which is the Body of Christ.

Here is section 17 of the Epistle; as translated by Every:
17. Among us neither Patriarchs nor Synods were ever able to introduce new things for the shield-bearer of religion is the body of the Church itself, that is the people, who ever desired their (his) religion to be from age to age unaltered and of the same species as that of their (his) fathers. 

The first quotation, representing Khomyakov's memory of the Epistle, certainly confirms his theory of collective authority. Of course the actual section is notably different and is less strong. Here the body of the Church, its people, is 'the shield-bearer' of religion. Every points out that the shield-bearer is the defender of the faith, not the judge of it. This point is emphasized by a modern Orthodox ecclesiastic, in whose opinion, we can see indications of the caution with which Khomyakov was regarded by contemporary clerics. Germanos, Archbishop of Thyateira, in his letter to Serge Bolshakoff notes that Khomyakov seems to have confused defender with judge. Thus, the defense of the faith, not the proclamation or judging of it, is what is given to the mutual love of Christians. The difference is clearer as regards sec. 11. Here the disparity between Khomyakov's memory and the test is even greater:

Khomyakov: "No Hierarchical Order nor supremacy is to be considered as a guarantee of truth. The knowledge of truth is given to mutual love."

Text, as given by Every: "11. Our fathers teach us not to judge orthodoxy from the holy throne but to judge the throne and him that is upon it by the holy scriptures, the synodical definitions and decisions, and the proclaimed faith, that is by the Orthodoxy of continuous teaching---For if the abomination of desolation could stand in the holy place why cannot innovation and heresy be upon an holy throne?"

Every pointed out that, since this is an Epistle of Patriarchs and
bishops, the heirarchy is the subject of the verb "to judge" in this
section.\textsuperscript{56} Clearly Khomyakov has, as do we all, remembered what he
wanted to remember. The epistle is hardly the explicit, full and
ringing confirmation of his own thought that he claimed. Nor is the
epistle a contradiction of his theories. Section 11 acknowledges the
fallibility of heirarchs in matters of dogma. This does not lead the
Patriarchs to admit any more than Khomyakov's views of the fallibility
of heirarchs lead him to admit the fallibility of the Church itself,
which the Patriarchs proclaim in sec. 12 to be infallible:

\begin{quote}
12. Again the Church shall never apostasize from
the faith, nor sin against the truth of the faith---
we undoubtedly confess, as sure truth, that the
Catholic Church cannot sin, or err, or utter false-
hood---\textsuperscript{57}
\end{quote}

Nor does the Encyclical deny Khomyakov's doctrine that final doctrinal
authority does not lie with Councils or heirarchs per se. For, as
Every notes, heretical councils also presumed to speak for the Church
and also were marked by the presence of Patriarchs and bishops from
around the Orthodox world. Every's note confirms Khomyakov's doctrine:

\begin{quote}
All Orthodox give authority to the councils of the
past because they were councils of the Orthodox and
taught Orthodoxy, and neither because of the par-
ticular sees or local churches represented in them,
nor because of their numbers.\textsuperscript{58}
\end{quote}

Khomyakov, in his ecclesiological writings, was struggling his way to
his own particular formulation of the doctrine of the Church. This
formulation did not represent a new doctrine of the Church but it did
represent a new expression of it. Khomyakov's desire to remain true
to Orthodoxy and to formulate nothing new is indicated by the manner
in which he seized upon the encyclical epistle as a confirmation of his views. It seems to me he read his own views in it and transformed in memory the epistle into a veritable repetition of his own words. As I have remarked before, had Khomyakov merely repeated without change what had already been written, his ecclesiology would not have received attention. Had he formulated a totally new doctrine he would have put himself outside the Orthodox Church.

The Church is One; the Church is Free; the Church is Infallible since it guards the divine revelation of Truth manifested in Christ. The Church includes the community of all Christians living and dead and yet to be and therefore exists in two manners: the visible, or earthly Church, and the invisible Church. The visible Church "is not the fullness and completeness of the whole Church which God has appointed to appear at the final judgment" and consequently she "does not judge the rest of mankind."59 Khomyakov thus holds to the traditional doctrine that God has revealed His Truth to the Church and has guaranteed the continued and unending existence of a visible Church on earth as a testimony of this revelation among men. But what are the consequences, for Khomyakov, of this doctrine? For Palmer the note of the visible Church is one of the crucial tests of the true Church and one of his chief criticisms of Russian Orthodoxy turns on just what emphasis is to be given to the visibility of the Church. For Palmer, the visibility of the Church is not confined to its mere existence on earth; it must be an active witness among men; it must have a mission. In his letter to Khomyakov of July 1, 1846, Palmer denies the claims of the Orthodox Church to be the One True Church --
the only True Church. Referring to the differences between Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism, Palmer asserts:

---I could more easily conceive myself to doubt of the very spiritual existence of the Eastern Church on account of her exclusive pretensions viewed together with the general comparative phenomena of the two rival communions, than I could conceive myself tempted to acknowledge her as the sole true Church, on account of any conviction of my private judgment---that she was right in taxing the Latin Church with essential heresy on the point of the Procession. 60

This statement reveals the crucial importance of the doctrine of the Visible Church in Palmer's mind. He asserts that, even if he felt that the Latin doctrine on the FILIOQUE was heresy and that the Orthodox doctrine were true, he could still not even imagine recognizing the Orthodox Church as the One True Church while he could conceive recognizing the Roman Church to be the True one. The key to his attitude is the idea that the True Church must be visible, existing from the time of Christ to the present on earth and that this visibility have a manifest impact on this earth and constantly be re-affirmed by mission -- the attempt to convert all those it regards as in any way outside the Church. Mission is a key element in visibility:

Individual members of the One True Church may be wanting in zeal to teach and convert the nations -- but the Body as a whole---will always and necessarily have and show forth, even in the eyes of the world, the spirit of its mission. And if any body, as such, is felt and seen BY THE WORLD AT LARGE (emphasis inserted) not to have such a spirit, this alone---is a sufficient refutation of its claim to be alone the True Church. 61

To be visible, then, the Church must not merely exist on earth, capable of being seen, but force itself upon the attention of men -- to make
itself seen. By this standard, of course, the Orthodox Church cannot claim to be the One True Church, but at best a part of it. The Orthodox Church does not proselytize the Latin world. Palmer had been quite serious in suggesting to Grand Duke Alexander that missionaries be sent to England. But the failure of the Russian Church to attempt to convert the Western world was an indication that it lacked the true characteristics of a visible Church and could claim at best to be a part of the True Church (this is in line with the three branch theory). Palmer even thinks Khomyakov had admitted as much in a previous letter when he sought to explain the lack of Russian efforts to proselytize the West. Khomyakov had written:

Apostles brought to the world new tidings of joy and truth; our missionaries could do the same in the pagan or Mahamoten East; but what can we do in the West? What new tidings have we to bring? 62

Palmer takes this as a recognition, albeit unconscious, that Khomyakov does not really believe the Orthodox Church to be the only True Church; if Orthodox really believed such, they would overrun the West with missionaries. The Roman Catholic Church, on the other hand, never ceases to try to convert everyone to Catholicism, be they Protestants, atheists, or pagans. The Catholic Church, having always been a force in the world, thus bears the mark of a visible Church -- despite its errors or seeming insufficiency of doctrine. Palmer attempts to illustrate his point to Khomyakov by a reductio ad absurdum. He takes as an example the heretical Nestorian Church. The Nestorians claim to be the true Church but they do not evangelize the Western world and surely they have excuses -- they are hemmed in by the mountains in Kurdistan, they are poor, they are few, etc. A tiny, isolated sect
may claim to be the One True Church, but it is absurd. The promise of the visible Church includes the idea that that Church will be noticed:

Even if the Nestorians were alone in the world, and no other Christian communities to confront them, it would seem that Christianity has been a failure, that the promises had come to naught, if the true Church had ever come to such a state—63

Khomyakov's reply indicates that his concept of the doctrine of the visible Church is nowhere near as broad as Palmer's. He does not acknowledge the validity of Palmer's *reducio ad absurdum*. Rather he holds that "the truth of a doctrine is not to be measured by the number of its votaries."64 Indeed he seeks to turn Palmer's example against him. The Nestorians were not always few and poor; they once were many, learned, and inspired with missionary zeal. Did this make them the True Church during those years? Are they any more heretical now than they were in the years of their prosperity? Of course not. The Church is infallible because it guards the divine revelation. The Nestorians were heretics, are heretics, and always will be heretics whether they die out completely or prosper and multiply. Palmer's concept of a visible Church is too broad and can lead to error. If the Church visible must be seen to be triumphant or at least triumphing, then there is cause for despair:

A few hundreds of disciples in the space of about two centuries brought to the flock of Christ more millions than there were hundreds in the beginning. If that burning zeal had continued—in how short a time must not all the human race have heard and believed—? Sixteen centuries have elapsed—and we are obliged to confess—that the greater and by far greater majority of mankind is still in the
slavery of darkness and ignorance. Where then
is the zeal of the Apostle? Where is the Church?
That would prove too much if it proved anything
at all. 65

It is enough for the Church to be visible that a remnant exists --
not a remnant of separate individuals, confessing the True Word --
but a Church, a community with an historical continuity from Christ's
day to ours. So long as such a Church exists, keeping the faith and
observing the Sacraments, it is irrelevant whether it is large or
small, wealthy or poor. To judge the Church by its stature in the
world is to judge by a worldly standard and for Khomyakov such a
standard is inappropriate. The issue is also related in Khomyakov's
thought to the key question of freedom in the Church. The visible
Church is but a part of the whole -- not in the sense that it is
separate -- it preserves within itself the whole Truth of revelation --
but in the sense that the Church is a community that transcends time
and space. As such the entire Church including the generations dead
and those yet to come is visible only to God. The earthly and visible
Church, then, is capable of judging only its own members. It cannot
presume to judge those outside of it. It cannot interfere with any-
one's freedom of expression nor impose any kind of restriction or
judgment. 66 All such activity bears the mark not of a true community
united by mutual love but of an institution (a secular concept) or a
state. Khomyakov, while acknowledging the proselytizing zeal of Roman
Catholicism, denies that this zeal evidences Christian feeling and
notes that it tends to produce more persecutors than martyrs. 67

We have seen that for Khomyakov truth cannot be judged by numbers
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and that a significant impact on this world is not the test of a doctrine that "is in but not of" the world. Khomyakov's narrow view of the importance of a visible Church comes close at times to the Protestant concept of an invisible Church. This does not mean that Khomyakov was a crypto-Protestant but it does point to significant differences in emphasis and attitude between Palmer and Khomyakov which may be explored a bit further.

Khomyakov's emphasis on freedom in the Church; his critique of all external authority, and his narrow concept of the visible Church, have caused some to speculate that his thought is really Protestant. Indeed some Catholic writers, notably de Maistre, had levelled the charge of Protestantism at the Orthodox Church as a whole. Khomyakov took pains to deny such charges and to make clear his disagreement with Protestant doctrine. Khomyakov's doctrine of the visible Church seems to come close to Protestant concepts of an invisible church. Certainly this seems so in the correspondence, in which Khomyakov denies the broad view of Palmer. Khomyakov's most straight-forward statements on the visible Church are to be found in Tserkov' Odna. Khomyakov declares:

But the visible Church is not the visible society of Christians, but the Spirit of God and the grace of the Sacraments living in this society. Wherefore even the visible Church is visible only to the believer; for to the unbeliever a Sacrament is only a rite, and the Church merely a society.

But this bold assertion is saved from Protestantism by Khomyakov's elaboration:

But the Christian also knows that the Church upon earth, although it is invisible, is always clothed
The Christian is not abandoned on this earth. He can always point to the place where the Sacraments are kept and the true doctrine preached. Nor has there ever been a time when such a visible Church did not exist for if it did not how could the Biblical promise "I am with you always" be fulfilled? In his third polemical brochure, Khomyakov tackled these questions in replying to a pamphlet of a Lutheran writer, F. J. Stahl. In this passage from Stahl quoted by Khomyakov in his response, it appears that Stahl was quite close to Khomyakov's views:

"Our doctrine" says Mr. Stahl, "is that the divine gifts of grace are promised to the human soul only in the Church, but the Church is in no way an institution exterior to man, it is---the simultaneous and reciprocal action of the grace which God has put in His ordinances---it is the treasure of all divine benedictions and of all human charities; it is the guardian of all holy things---

But, Khomyakov asks where is this Church? Stahl had argued that Catholicism, Calvinism, and Lutheranism all had equally genuine roles to play in the Kingdom of God. Khomyakov holds that such a doctrine is unspecific, lacks clarity, and ultimately is nonsense -- since if Lutheranism is supposed to be a genuine component of the true Church, must we conclude that the Church did not exist before the time of Martin Luther? The mystical conception of the Church evidenced in the thought of Stahl quoted above resembles that of Khomyakov to a certain extent but is incomplete. For Khomyakov asserts, contrary to Protestant thinkers, that the mutual love of Christians -- if real -- will find a visible and concrete manifestation:
There is, therefore nothing more absurd than the supposition of an invisible Church (that is to say, without manifestation) lost during the centuries in the midst of a religious society professing erroneous dogmas and celebrating rites unworthy of Christianity. What kind of thing would it be, this invisible Church the members of which could not hold communion except by corrupted sacraments? What kind of Church would it be, this invisible Church could have neither knowledge of the truth, or courage to proclaim it? If they didn't know (the Truth) where then is the grace of faith? If they knew it, where was the obligatory courage of confession? 72

Khomyakov's analysis of Western culture could have led to no other conclusion than that Protestantism represents no valid religious view. What is Protestantism? A revolt against the Roman Catholic Church. But the rebel bears the mark of the institution it rebels against. We have seen and will examine further, Khomyakov's idea that Rationalism is the basic principle on which Western culture and belief is built. The moral fratricide committed by the West in introducing the FILIOQUE into the Creed without consent or even the advice of the Eastern Christians, is already an act of Protestantism, i.e. an act of a part arrogating to itself a decision that belongs to the whole. 73 This is already Protestantism since it makes no difference whether the unity of mutual love is fractured by a provincial or regional group, acting as if it was the whole Church or by an individual or sect proclaiming the "liberty of conscience". Even in revolt against the Roman Church, the Protestant sects remained the victims of the rationalism which is at the heart of Western society, replacing the authority of the Pope -- an external, imposed unity -- with the 'freedom' of every individual to interpret the Holy Scriptures, which Scriptures are now recognized as the only authority. This doctrine
is rationalist since it depends on the individual reason to interpret scripture. Besides, scripture, being written in books, is itself an external authority. The consequences for Protestantism of its origins are sectarianism -- unity of belief is no longer possible when every man becomes his own theologian -- hence division and ultimately loss of faith, brought about not only by the fragmentation of believers into a theoretically limitless number of quarreling sects, but also because reliance on reason to interpret scripture will inevitably lead to philosophy -- the reliance on reason alone without scripture or Church, or God -- in the search for truth. Besides, scripture is a frail reed. How do we know that St. Paul wrote the letters attributed to him? What would be the consequence if, for example, the letters of Paul were proved to have been written by someone else, much later in time? For one who takes scripture as an external authority, this could shatter his faith. For Orthodoxy, this is no problem, for as Khomyakov says: "It is the Church in its entirety which wrote the Holy Scriptures; Scripture is not of Paul or of Luke but of the Church." Scripture is Holy, not because written by certain people or at certain times; it is Holy because the Church so judges it, finding in the writing in question the expression of the Faith it holds and the revelation it accepts. The Holy words do not compel assent or belief because they are Holy, they are Holy because they express a truth freely believed and assented to by the mutual love of Christians.

Khomyakov seeks to show that Protestantism and Romanism share the same basis in rationalism while differing only on the conclusions drawn:
The papacy says: 'The Church has always prayed for the dead; but this prayer would be USELESS if there was no intermediate state: THEREFORE purgatory exists.' The Reform responds: 'There is no trace of purgatory in the Holy Scripture or in the early Church; THEREFORE it is useless to pray for the dead--- 75

In short, Protestantism is merely a negation of Romanism but a negation that remains based on rationalism and therefore incapable of creating anything new. Protestantism is the creature of Catholicism and is locked in a dispute with it. Protestantism will not outlast the doctrine it was born to assail. This aspect of Khomyakov's view of Protestantism finds curt and direct expression in his second letter to Palmer:

If Protestantism were true to logic as it pretends to be---all Protestant sects---would either admit serious and earnest addresses to saints and angels or reject the mutual prayers of Christians on earth. Why, then, are they rejected?---Simply because Protestantism is forever and ever protesting---Because Protestantism is not, nor ever can be, free. In short because with its unceasing cry 'No Popery' it stands on Popish ground and lives on Popish definitions, and is as much a slave to the doctrine of utilitarianism---as the most fanatical Ultramontist. 76

This review of Khomyakov's attitude towards Protestantism can be brought to a close by examining Khomyakov's view of Protestant liberty. Khomyakov's own stress on the absolute necessity of liberty in the Church -- indeed on liberty as a keynote of the Church -- may seem in line with the freedom of conscience and freedom from externally-imposed belief that is proclaimed by Protestant thinkers. Khomyakov indeed approved of Protestant freedom of investigation and criticism, as he approved of and fought for freedom of speech and press. But his
basic concept of Christian liberty involved more than the mere absence of formal restraints. It is only in contrasting his view with what he holds to be the Protestant view that the full implications of his doctrine of a free Church emerges. The concept of Protestant liberty of individual reason denies the true Christian liberty by denying Christian unity. For Khomyakov, Christian liberty and Christian unity are one:

It is not enough to say that man must be free in his belief; in this Christian liberty does not differ from any other. If the fruits of liberty are interior discords of belief, subjectivism, admitted or inevitable, which is itself a doubt or more exactly a lack of belief, and absence of an objective Faith, that is to say real knowledge; this liberty has not received the divine benediction---The Reforms---ignore the benediction accorded (by God) (to liberty) of which the fruits are concord, faith, and fullness of life. Those who are free in Christ are One in Him---

True faith is truly free and cannot be compelled either by a hierarchy or by miracle -- by seeing Christ. Christ must be accepted within us. This free acceptance is an act of mutual love and is signified and blessed by the Unity granted to mutual love because it is not the acceptance of an individual per se or of his reason, or an assent to authority in Scripture (viewed as external documents) but is a free submission to the One universal truth. Hence the mark of this freedom, the mark of its collective assent (the mutual love of Christians) is precisely the Unity of the Church. Thus the Khomyakov doctrine of freedom goes beyond individual liberty and asserts a free assent, free from rationalism, and free from visible facts; totally direct and immediate, hence totally free.
Khomyakov's views on Protestantism, discussed above, help clarify his concept of the Visible Church as well as his central conception of freedom in the Church. The discussion of this subject is based mostly on the material in Khomyakov's French language brochures. These brochures were published by Protestant firms and are directed, in large part to Protestant audiences. The correspondence with Palmer provides only partial and fragmentary accounts of Khomyakov's views on the Protestant confessions, although the letters touch on almost all the other points at the center of his ecclesiology. The reason for the relative paucity of treatment of Protestantism in his letters to Palmer is not difficult to see; the two men agreed that Protestants did not preserve the true faith and that Protestant sectarianism was a denial of the true Church. Palmer, in fact, was much more severe in his condemnation of Protestantism than was Khomyakov. Khomyakov saw Protestantism as the necessary and inevitable reaction to the falsity and external rigidity of Catholic dogma and if the Protestant shoots remained fruitless, it was the fault of the parent against which they rebelled: Roman Catholicism was the first Protestantism. Palmer, of course agreed with Khomyakov's total rejection of Protestant doctrine but he arrived at the position in a different manner.

Palmer was a member of the Anglican Church (until his conversion to Catholicism in 1855) but he did not regard the Anglican Church as a Protestant communion. This should be clear enough from his three branch theory of the Church which acknowledges ONE CATHOLIC (Universal) Church
in three branches -- Anglican, Roman, and Orthodox. Palmer's stress on a broad conception of the Visible Church, a central issue in his exchanges with Khomyakov, is clearly incompatible with Protestant sectarianism and free critical reliance on individual interpretation of Scripture. In his very first letter to Khomyakov, Palmer is quick to assure the Russian that the Anglican Church is not as Protestant as it seems -- is not, in fact, Protestant at all:

It is unhappily but too true---that Anglicans have practically laid aside that salutary use of the sign of the Cross by which Christians have ever been distinguished from Jews and heathens; also that they have now no Invocation of the Blessed Virgin or of the Saints in the public Offices of their Church---However---the Anglican Church IN HERSELF is not nearly so corrupt---as she is IN THE PREJUDICES OF HER MEMBERS---She actually requires the use of the sign of the Cross in Baptism---and in one of her canons she defends at length its frequent use on all occasions against the objections of the Puritans or Calvinists---Even those Anglican bishops least inclined to favor the spiritual movement called Puseyism do not fail---to acknowledge that their Church has never---condemned apostrophies and poetical addresses to Saints and Angels---(emphasis, Palmer's) 79

This passage indicates that Palmer thought the Anglican Church essentially free from Protestantism but it also hints at his anxiety about the "prejudices of her members"; which were tending to a Protestant denial of the use of the cross, addresses to Saints, etc. Another indication of the depth of Palmer's hostility to Protestantism and his anxieties about Protestant tendencies in the Anglican Church, is his involvement in the attempt to rally opposition to the Jerusalem bishopric in 1841. This concerned a proposal by Frederick William of Prussia, sent through his special emissary the religious scholar C. C. J. Bunsen, in 1841 that the Evangelical Church of Prussia join
with the Anglican Church in joint sponsorship of a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem with a view to protecting Protestant interests in the Holy Land. The project, which had the firm backing of Howley the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop Blomfield, and other high prelates, seemed to Palmer to be yet another indication of the manner in which the Anglican Church was ignoring its ties to the universal tradition and acting as a separate, 'Protestant', profession. Palmer was also concerned that any such joint venture could harm the rapprochement he so earnestly desired between the English and Orthodox Churches. He feared that such a betrayal by Anglicanism of its Catholic heritage would only result in strengthening the trend of Anglican conversions to Catholicism (a trend that included Wiseman, would soon include Newman and Ward and ultimately Palmer himself). Palmer's attempts to rally Anglican churchmen against the project did not prevent the initiation of the bishopric but the bishopric was apparently not much of a success and probably contributed to secessions to the Roman faith. 80

Though Khomyakov found both Romanism and Protestant sectarianism wanting, he was undoubtedly more hostile to Roman Catholicism. The Roman Church, after all, asserts what the Orthodox Church also asserts -- that it, and it alone, is the one, universal church. That the Church is One and all-embracing is a central tenet of Khomyakov's ecclesiology. It was, indeed, in a discussion of the Roman concept of universality, of catholicity, that Khomyakov introduced the term sobornost, a term, which, though defined by him in only one brief work was, as Riasanovsky claims 'of fundamental importance' for his entire thought. 81 In a
letter to the editor of L'Union Chrétienne, responding to a piece by the Russian Jesuit Father Ivan Gagarin. Khomyakov defines sobornoi and indicates what he takes to be the difference between Roman and Orthodox claims to universality. Gagarin had criticized the Russian Church for translating in the Creed the word 'catholic' by the "vague and obscure" term sobornoi. Khomyakov set out to prove that sobornoi is not only a sufficient translation of the Greek katolikos but in fact is closer to the original meaning than the term 'catholic'. Indeed he argues 'catholic' distorts the sense of the original. The linguistic and etymological question need not detain us; what is important is Khomyakov's own definition of sobornoi and how it illuminates his concept of the Church:

Sobor implies the idea of assembly, not necessarily united at any particular place but existing virtually without formal union. It is unity in plurality (or multiplicity). It is therefore evident that the word katolikos—comes not from kath'ola but from kath'olon. Kata means according to---The Catholic Church is the Church according to all or according to the unity of all, the Church of free unanimity, of perfect unanimity, the Church in which there are no longer nationalities---no differences of conditions, no more masters or slaves, it is the Church prophesized by the Old Testament and realized by the New---

Note here that the concept of katolikos for Khomyakov has nothing to do with geography or numbers or the joining of different groups in one Church. The truly Catholic church does not unite men of all nationalities; in the True Church nationalities DO NOT EXIST.

Khomyakov attacks the Roman conception of the Church universal. The universal Church, so Gagarin had claimed, embraces all nations whereas the Oriental, i.e. Orthodox Church, is marked by its exclusivity, thus
lacking Catholicity. This concept of Catholicity or universality is a formal or numerical concept: the Church unites all peoples. Khomyakov notes that this concept could not have been what was meant by the Church fathers because, quite obviously, the Roman Church (or, for that matter the Orthodox Church or any other Christian Church) does not include ALL peoples. There are, and always have been, nations and peoples who do not acknowledge Christ. Therefore if 'catholic' means "belonging to all peoples", the idea is absurd. It is just such an idea, however, that the Roman Church entertains, according to Khomyakov. Gagarin's conception of universality depends upon numbers and geography and this is totally rejected by Khomyakov. We can see in this argument the echoes of his exchange with Palmer where the issue was nearly the same. Against the Roman conception, shared by Palmer, that the true Church, being catholic, must be universally manifest, i.e. throughout the globe, Khomyakov asserts that universality really means unity, unanimity -- a concept of a total and perfect union, independent of all idea of number. What is crucial is not that disparate groups are joined in the Church but that those in the Church are ONE, bound by mutual love and totally beyond any separate existence. 84 Sobornost is the reflection of this free unity, an internalized perfect unanimity beyond formal limit or expression.

It is therefore not surprising that Khomyakov regarded the Roman Church as the chief obstacle to the re-unification of Christians in the true Orthodox Church. The Western Churches had ruptured the primitive Christian unity by the arbitrary insertion of the FILIOQUE in the Creed.
This unity, built on mutual love, could not be regained and the West was forced to seek an external caricature of unity in externally imposed dogma, in granting to the hierarchy power to grant indulgences, etc. That is what Khomyakov meant when he asserted to Palmer that the Church of Rome is a State with which a formal union (but not unity) is possible. The Roman Church achieved an external unity but sacrificed freedom. It was no accident, in Khomyakov's view, that the Roman Church was the Church of the Inquisition and the persecutor of Galileo. It could not be otherwise and retain its unity, for having renounced the perfect unity of mutual love for the prideful and separate reliance on human reason, it had to impose unity on its members externally. The moral fratricide committed by the Latins in the admission of the FILIOQUE severed unity and this caused the Schism which determined the subsequent culture of East and West. As Khomyakov put it in explaining to Palmer the vast difficulties in the way of Christian reunion,

---each half of Christianity began a life apart, becoming from day to day more estranged from the other. There was an evident self-complacent triumph on the side of the Latins; there was sorrow on the side of the East---All these feelings have been transmitted by hereditary succession to our time---

Only penitence could restore the original unity but the Roman Church, having sacrificed that unity, invariably had to seek a new principle in rationalism. But rationalism itself is separation, for it is an human faculty which is part, not the whole, of human personality and which, when used alone, is a critical, hence divisive faculty. Once
this external authority had been established, unity was ruptured and virtually impossible to restore.

The correspondence with Palmer raises all these questions to which we have referred (freedom and unity in the Church, the visible Church, etc.) so central to Khomyakov's ecclesiology. But the question was not merely an abstract debate. I have indicated that in addressing Western Christians with his message, Khomyakov may have felt that he was participating in Russia's mission of salvation of the West through a new Orthodox culture. He was eager to see in Palmer, with his interest in Orthodoxy, a potential convert to the true faith. We have seen that he probably mistook Palmer's original intentions in desiring to be received into communion in the Russian Church, for Palmer originally desired this as a proof of his three branch theory. Yet Palmer, under the weight of Khomyakov's criticisms, and for other reasons, increasingly had doubts as to the position of Anglicanism as a part of the true Church. It will be useful to conclude this chapter on the correspondence by examining Palmer's developing attitudes and the respective positions of the two men at its conclusion.

The ten year period of the correspondence (1844-54) coincides with a period of increasing dissatisfaction of Palmer with the Anglican Church. The correspondence does not go deeply into this dissatisfaction nor do we need to consider it at length here but a few points may be made. I have mentioned Palmer's three branch theory of the Church, a theory which holds Anglicanism to be a branch of the one universal Apostolic Church, and which denies that Anglicanism is a Protestant
confession. I have quoted Cardinal Newman's testimony that this theory was widely held at Oxford in the 1840's. It must not be assumed, however, that the three branch theory was universally accepted in the English Church at that time. There is no place and no need here for a sketch of the progress of the Oxford movement. Suffice it to say that the insistence of the movement on the catholic nature of the Anglican Church and the necessity of independence for the bishop was not unopposed within the Church hierarchy. A number of key figures in the Oxford movement, notably John Henry Newman, the guiding spirit behind the Tracts for the Times, were increasingly attracted to Roman Catholicism. Newman's Tract Ninety attempted to demonstrate a harmony of doctrine between the Anglican thirty-nine Articles and the central tenets of the Roman Catholic Church. The publication of Tract Ninety provoked a storm at Oxford where the work was attacked as "removing all fences against Rome" and led the Heads of Houses at Oxford to condemn the tract as dishonest. The affair resulted in Newman admitting his authorship of the Tract and discontinuing the publication of the series as well as offering to the Bishop of Oxford to withdraw the controversial tract. 87 This incident is often regarded as the beginning of the process by which Newman grew disenchanted with Anglicanism and ultimately converted to Roman Catholicism. Palmer was not involved in the controversy over Tract Ninety but the storm it aroused and the disapproval it met are indicative that a significant segment of the English Church was not prepared to accept it as a catholic, universal church. We have already pointed out that Palmer's own harmony of the
Thirty-nine Articles with Orthodox doctrine and his project of receiving Communion in Russia did not obtain the formal approval of Magdalen College or of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Palmer's opposition to the Jerusalem bishopric also indicates a source of his dissatisfaction, for the leaders of the Anglican Church had entered into a joint venture with despised Protestants and had thus given a practical indication that the Church considered itself more Protestant than Catholic. Palmer's scholarly and ecclesiastical studies during the period of the correspondence all seemed aimed at wringing from the authorities of the Church some formal acknowledgment of its catholic and apostolic nature. For example, in 1849 Palmer wrote to Khomyakov advising him of his appeal to the Scottish bishops, the object of which was to open the way for conferences with the Orthodox Church with a view to unification of the Churches. One of the points that Palmer urged on the Scottish bishops was that an examination for applicants to Holy Communion should be instituted. Palmer admitted that in practice at the least the Anglican Church was far removed from any such usage. Although he felt that the Church in doctrine had no reason to object to such an institution he knew that tradition was against him. The letter indicates the seriousness of the matter for Palmer and his growing doubts about Anglicanism:

---I do not think myself that the Anglican Church has ever yet distinctly crowned this heresy, that persons guilty of excommunicable sins may re-admit themselves penitent, I yet must confess that she has gone very near to doing so by taking away the law of Confession as a general pre-requisite to Communion---it may well be doubted whether the Anglican Church, having gone so far as she has in the direction of error on this sub-
ject, can now retrace her steps. And yet, unless she
does retrace them, I see not how she can prevent every
variety of heresy or sin intruding itself upon her
Communion. 88

Khomyakov, despite his sympathy for England and its Church, con-
sidered Anglicanism to be somewhat of an historical accident -- neither
Protestant nor Catholic but cut off by culture and history from ties
with the true, i.e. Orthodox Church. Sensing Palmer's dissatisfaction
with Anglicanism, Khomyakov did not hesitate to put his criticism of
Anglicanism in direct terms. In the following words of his reply to
Palmer, Khomyakov is speaking, though in general terms, to Palmer's
doubts:

The Church of England, or rather a considerable part
of it, though having broken the ties which made it
dependent on Rome, felt itself menaced by ultra-
Protestantism, and adhered strongly to a shadow of
Catholicity, with a latent hope that some compromise
might still be entered which would give Anglicans a
right to say that they had always held tradition---
Now Rome has decidedly rejected them---They are
forced into Protestantism, which they feel to be the
death of Religion---England has felt that Anglicanism,
such as it is, cannot be upheld---Those who long for
Catholicity feel that tatters of Tradition, arbitrarily
chosen, without continuity and authority---cannot
constitute a Catholic Church. 89

By the end of the year 1851, Palmer's dissatisfaction with Anglic-
anism apparently had reached its limit and he was resolved to make a
move of some sort. His appeal to the Scottish bishops had been con-
cluded by an ambiguous decision of the Scottish synod which refused to
pronounce in favor of either the Orthodox or Protestant parties within
Anglicanism. Palmer could not be satisfied with such a decision, which,
despite its ambiguity, must have given him further cause to despair of
the Anglican Church's commitment to catholicity. Palmer was at this stage ready to seek the Communion of the Eastern Church and to that end he was preparing a series of dissertations on the Eastern Church. The subjects of the dissertations which were to include copious excerpts of translated documents, are outlined by Palmer in a letter to Khomyakov of Sept. 22/Oct. 4, 1851. The subjects give an indication of some of the points about the Eastern Church which continued to trouble Palmer, such as: (1) The present apparent separation and conflict of two attributes of the true Church -- 'Orthodoxy' and 'Catholicism'; (2) The present state and probable future of the Eastern Church; (4) The accusation that the Eastern Church, especially in Russia, is too subordinate to the civil power. One question in particular troubled Palmer in regard to receiving Communion in the Eastern Church. Palmer insisted that his baptism in the Anglican Church was valid -- i.e. certified that he was a Christian and that he ought not to have to be re-baptized by the Orthodox Church. The Russian Church did allow converts to receive Communion without re-baptism but the Greek Orthodox Church did not. Palmer had requested of the Patriarch of Constantinople that the Greek Church receive him as conditionally baptized but suffered a rebuff. Although he could have been received into the Russian Church, Palmer felt that he would have been joining a part of the Church, not the whole.

Khomyakov was eager to help his friend enter the Orthodox communion but frustrated about how to do so. He admitted he had no friends in the high circles of the Russian Church so he undertook to write
Archbishop Gregory of Kazan, whom he did not know, in an effort to help Palmer. The Archbishop's answer gave Khomyakov hope that things were practically settled. An appeal to the Russian Synod had been prepared by English friends of Palmer and awaited only his (Palmer's) signature before being forwarded to Russia (Palmer had been in Athens, seeing to the translations for the dissertations and in Constantinople, concerning the question of conditional re-baptism). The appeal, according to the Archbishop, was totally satisfactory to the Russian Church.

Whatever the fate of this appeal (it is not clear who the 'friends' of Palmer were and whether they were in fact closely associated with him), Palmer's rebuff in Constantinople had evidently by July caused him to despair of entering the Eastern Church on terms acceptable to his conscience. Palmer's objection to the Russian Church was that it was under the sway of the state, so much so that the apostolic office was not free to function as it should. Although he acknowledged the distinction Khomyakov made between subservience in fact and in principle, Palmer as usual, was concerned with the Church as an institution:

What I find fault with is, not the undue timidity or subserviency of a Metropolitan or Patriarch or a Synod, but the permanent existence of irregular institutions calculated and introduced by the Civil Power expressly to transfer to itself—a large portion of that power which belong essentially to the Apostles.

(Palmer is referring to the abolition of the Patriarchate by Peter and the creation of Holy Synod under State supervision.)

Palmer's insistence on the key importance of the apostolic office, ie of the bishops, had been emphasized earlier in Palmer's response to Khomyakov's enthusiasm regarding the Encyclical Epistle:
Whatever share the common faith and charity of the Laity may have in the preservation of the true tradition of the Doctrine, the mission to teach all nations, and the promise to be with them in teaching—a promise which confers doctrinal infallibility so far as it may be necessary, is given to the united College of the Apostles and their successors.

In his letter of July 5, 1852 to Khomyakov, Palmer indicated that he was thinking of studying at Rome with a view to conversion to Roman Catholicism. He felt blocked in his efforts to enter the Eastern Church and felt he no longer could defend his position as an Anglican. He reported that the dissertations upon which he had been working were finished and he intended to submit copies to the Greek and Russian Churches. If the views expressed therein proved acceptable to the Church authorities, then Palmer might enter the Eastern Church but he did not expect this to happen.

Why, then, did Palmer turn to Rome? He admitted that on most points of doctrine he agreed with the Orthodox Church rather than with the Roman one. Again the central point was the concept of the Church itself—the visible church which forms the core of the entire correspondence:

---the points of weakness or difficulty in the Russian Church are such as affect the definition of the Catholic Church itself, but the points on which I now differ from Rome are points of detail---My Roman Catholic friends put the matter to me thus: "If you believe in a VISIBLE Church, the first and only necessary question is 'What is that Church now on earth which is identical in essence (eg in the spirit and idea of universality, in zeal---and in its attitude of independence) with the Church of the first ages?---If, then, your conscience tells you that either the Roman Catholic Church is THE Church or else there is no visible Church on earth---
you ought to have the sense to see that it is for
the Church to teach you, and not for you to teach
yourself or the Church.--- 98

Palmer's *Dissertations Upon Subjects Relating To the Eastern or Orthodox
Church*, referred to in the correspondence, was published in 1853. In
this work Palmer put even more clearly the factor which led him to Rome.
Despite his sympathies for Orthodoxy, he felt compelled to acknowledge
what he deems an evident fact:

The so-called 'Catholic' or 'Roman-Catholic' Church
appears now plainly to ALL MEN to be really Catholic
or universally diffused---in a degree to which the
so-called 'Orthodox' Church does not appear to be
so. This is a fact about which there can be no---
mistake. But on the other hand it is only to those
who think so that the so-called 'Orthodox' Church
appears to be really Orthodox in a degree in which
the so-called 'Catholic' Church does not appear to
be so--- 99

The letter of July 5 indicates that Palmer perhaps still had some doubts
of his course but by 1853 when he published the English edition of the
*Dissertations*, he had made up his mind. He wrote only one further
letter to Khomyakov. He raised no new arguments in the letter but
explained the development of his opinions. He had gone to Russia in
1840-41 still as a convinced Anglican and had no desire to receive
Communion in the Russian Church as a convert but only as confirmation
of his three branch theory. He originally felt that the Latin and
Greek doctrines concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost were essen-
tially the same, even if the wording was not (i.e. the Western creed
admits the FILIOQUE) but came to feel that there was a distinction in
doctrine and sided with the Orthodox claims. This question was one
of the ones he raised with the Scottish bishops and as a result felt
compelled to leave the Anglican Church (which holds the Western doctrine of the Procession). At this point, however, he discovered a new obstacle to becoming Orthodox, i.e., the question of re-baptism. He could not agree with Khomyakov that the difference in practice between Russia and Greece on this point was a minor matter -- a proselyte -- must know whether or not he is validly baptised -- that is the first step. He described his efforts to gain Communion in the Eastern Church, first as a representative of Anglicanism, later as a convert, as knocking his head against a wall. With this personal explanation and expressions of his continued interest in and love for the Russian Church, Palmer brings his portion of the correspondence to a close. In 1855 he became a convert to the Roman Catholic Church.

Khomyakov was elated at the thought that Palmer might convert to Orthodoxy and greatly saddened at the end result. Between the receipt of Palmer's letter of July 5, 1852 in September of that year and his final letter to Palmer on March 9, 1854, Khomyakov wrote five letters to Palmer, urging him to join the Orthodox Church and warning him against Romanism. It is not too strong to say that Khomyakov saw the choice before Palmer as one between good and evil and did not hesitate to speak boldly. Responding to Palmer's concerns about the visible Church, Khomyakov has nothing new to say but, significantly, emphasizes the question of freedom:

Your only answer to yourself---is 'There must be a visible Church, and that Church must be a free one.' This I admit completely; but I must add free in its PRINCIPLES, though not always free in its---actions---I will admit the freedom of the Pope or the hierarchical power; but is that the
meaning of ecclesiastical freedom?---That the Roman Church is independent I will concede; but that it has anything like ecclesiastical freedom, the liberty of the Spirit, that I totally deny. To get rid of the difficulties of your present position you may lull your convictions to sleep, you may silence them---you will not uproot them. You will enter the Roman Communion, as it were, double-minded, with nothing even like a hope of finding the blessed peace of Christ--- 101

Khomyakov in his effort to save Palmer called on the ecclesiastical acquaintances he had and sought out new ones and was frustrated by his inability to remove the obstacles in Palmer's way to Orthodoxy. That his efforts were unavailing is not surprising -- not least because Khomyakov labored under a misunderstanding. He thought Palmer was part of a group of English Churchmen desiring to establish a branch of the Orthodox Church in England. As it turned out, Palmer had no connection with the group mentioned to Khomyakov by the Archbishop of Kazan (see above p. 109).102 Of course the deeper cause of Khomyakov's failure was the irreconcilable difference in the views of the Church held by the two men. Khomyakov regarded Palmer's adherence to Rome as a veritable fall from grace. Looking back on the correspondence, Khomyakov felt sad for the sorry 'fate' of Palmer and bitter about the recalatrance and obstructiveness of the Russian and Greek clerical heirarchy upon whom he blamed Palmer's failure to enter the Eastern Church:

---in these recent times we have seen one of the most worthy children (of England) William Palmer, work with ardor to re-establish the ancient unity (of the Church)---Despite the fact that he later fell into the Roman error, we dare hope that his fault will be pardoned him in view of his so long and dolorous struggle hē sustained. As to those (in whatever high places they be) who closed the door of the Church and occasioned his defection,
all that we can say of them is that we hope God judges them in His mercy because they are indeed guilty. This soul so pure and avid for truth, now cast into the very center of constant and willful falsehood, has no rest to expect on earth—Poor Palmer! If ever these lines come to his attention, I wish him to know that his fall has greatly saddened the hearts of his friends—

With his Sept. 4, 1852 letter to Palmer, Khomyakov enclosed the text of his first French polemic 'Quelques Mots par un Chretien Orthodox a L'occasion d'une brochure de M. Laurentie' with the request that Palmer find a way of publishing it in the West. The essay undertakes to answer Roman accusations against the Orthodox Church and is directed to the Western public in general and against the Catholic writer Pierre Sebastian Laurentie in particular. But of course the subject of the essay -- the true nature of the Orthodox Church and the inadequacies of the Western communions -- is essentially the same as that of his correspondence with Palmer. Although not directed at Palmer, the essay was written during the course of the correspondence and Khomyakov may have hoped that it would influence him. At any rate the commission to Palmer indicates a close connection between the private correspondence between the two men and Khomyakov's public crusade, if that word is not too strong, to convince the West of the error of its rationalist ways and of the superiority of Orthodoxy. The role of unofficial (and pseudonymous -- Khomyakov published his three brochures under the name Ignatus) spokesman for the Russian Church to the West was one that fit in with Khomyakov's concept of Russia's spiritual importance and was a role that he would assume several times between the end of the correspondence with Palmer in 1854 and his death in 1860.
The correspondence with Palmer, then, not only helped Khomyakov articulate and define his position on the nature of the Church but seems to have encouraged him to take his case to the Western public and defend Orthodoxy in the eyes of the world. In so doing he was only re-stating and extending the basic theory of the Church worked out and expressed in his letters to Palmer.
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Chapter III: Conclusion

It is now time to bring this thesis to a close with a brief evaluation of Khomyakov's ecclesiology from two perspectives. First I will undertake a few remarks on the coherence and consistency of Khomyakov's theory and finally I will examine briefly the influence that Khomyakov's ideas have exerted and his place in Orthodox and Russian thought.

In undertaking a brief evaluation of Khomyakov's ecclesiology, I do not intend to judge doctrinal questions nor to make any judgments as to the respective worths of any particular religious communions. Such judgments would be, to say the very least, presumptuous for a layman to make and in any case not relevant to the task at hand. The few points I wish to mention are made with a view to evaluating Khomyakov in line with his own standards. These comments will be brief as some of the points have been touched on in Chapter I.

I have remarked on several occasions in this thesis on the unity of Khomyakov's views. Despite the huge range of his activities and interests, Khomyakov held a consistent and uniform approach to life. At the center of his thinking was, as I have indicated, the idea that religion determines culture, that what men believe or do not believe shapes the nature of their thought and action. This unity of approach explains much of the cogency of his thought. His critique of the Western communions in large part demonstrates this fidelity to a central principle. We have seen that Khomyakov's critique of the Western faiths flows from a central point, i.e., his concept of rationalism as the underlying principle of Western culture. Khomyakov's critique
is consistently high-minded; we get no recitation of the sins of individual priests and prelates, no histories of greed and hypocrisy, no indignant charges of treachery and vindictiveness. Khomyakov denies that one can judge a faith or a nation according to the weaknesses of its members; he holds that one can only judge its principles and their logical consequences. Thus rationalism, the elevation of one abstract human capacity over the unified action of the whole man, leads to a break in the universal harmony of Christians. The arbitrary injection of the FILIOQUE ruptures universal love and necessitates a new unity built of necessity on an externally-imposed heirarchy. But such a formal, total external unity, offends reason by imposing arbitrary restraints upon the critical faculty; hence the Protestant reaction which liberates the individual reason at the expense of unity and leads to the multiplication of countless religious sects, whose partisan squabbles also offend reason and ultimately lead to the assertion of individual reason totally unfettered by any restraints of faith or belief in God. This critique is consistent and faithful to Khomyakov's principle of judging principles rather than facts. It is, no doubt, debateable whether rationalism can be properly called the sole driving force in the development of Western thought and belief. This is certainly a point on which Western Christians can and do differ with Khomyakov. But Khomyakov can certainly not be accused, in his concentration on rationalism, of having focused on a minor principle or one that has played no significant role in Western thought. The Enlightenment philosophes boasted of the independent and free development of reason
and rationalism has continued to this day to be a central and important aspect of Western thought.

However high-minded his critique of the West, Khomyakov may be accused of a certain animus toward the West and special pleading in regard to Russia when he attempts to assert that Orthodoxy is the one true Church. Khomyakov's thought is based on the principle that ideas have consequences. He is quite successful, I think, in showing how the idea of Rationalism has had consequences in the concrete historical life of the Western communions and Western society in general.

Applying these ideas to the Russian faith, Khomyakov asserts that the principle of Orthodoxy is a freely-accepted, expra-rational faith in God and mutual love of Christians. He finds the application of the principles of collective and immediate faith in the organization of the peasant commune and in the organization of the Church. These principles also lie behind the political concepts developed by Konstantin Aksakov. This is fine as far as it goes but Khomyakov's cheery analyses of Russian society leaves out some major faults -- notably the subordination of the Church to the State and the oppressive nature of the State tyranny. Khomyakov was far from ignorant of these conditions. He attempts to excuse them by appealing to the distinction between principles and facts. Thus the subordination of the Russian Church is but an historical accident and cannot be taken as a criticism of Russian principles. But if it is an 'accident', it is certainly a major one. Khomyakov, in dealing with the West, denies that the major features of Western civilization are 'historical accidents' -- the result of par-
ticular historical situations. Rather he asserts the opposite -- that the basic and important features of any culture can be derived from its principles. Khomyakov must therefore either deny that the subjection of the Russian Church to the State is an important characteristic of the Russian Church (a denial which he makes though it does not seem convincing) or he must admit that Russian society is not truly built upon the principles he defines as central to the Orthodox faith (an admission he is unwilling to make). The Westerners, such as Palmer, who brought up the question of religious subjection to the State and of the over-all tyranny of the Russian state were not being petty as Khomyakov claimed. No more than he were they criticizing the Church by recounting the sins of individual prelates or slandering Tsarism by emphasizing the foibles of particular Tsars. It seems reasonable, using Khomyakov's own standards, to assert that the subordination of the Russian Church to the State and the autocratic nature of the political system are important and characteristic features of nineteenth century Russian society (and indeed of Russian society in most previous centuries). As central and important characteristics of Russian society, these phenomena ought to be derivable from the central beliefs and principles of the same society. I do not see how these facts can be derived from the principles of free, internal faith and mutual love that are the core of Khomyakov's ecclesiology. This suggests to me that Russian society and the Russian Church may not be built upon the principles that Khomyakov asserts. In other words, Khomyakov's own patriotic bias has led him to assert that Russian society and the
Russian Orthodox Church embody the ideals of his ecclesiology. That the Church is One and that that Church is the Orthodox Church alone, and the Western communions have forsaken Christianity. Khomyakov's denial of the Christianity of the Western Churches is partial and unfair. He himself, in his Aug. 18, 1845 letter to Palmer, seems to come near to admitting this when he excuses the failure of Orthodoxy to evangelize the West on the grounds that there is nothing to say; the West has already heard the Word of Christ and accepted it (however imperfectly they may follow it). Khomyakov sometimes also excuses Russia in regard to the subjugation of the Church and the autocracy by blaming these features on Western influence. This defense pre-supposes that prior to Peter the Great or prior to the influx of Western ideas and technicians, the Muscovite State did not exhibit these features of oppressive autocracy and Church subjugation. That is indeed the claim of Konstantin Aksakov but it cannot be seriously sustained. The Slavophile idealization of Muscovite Russia has more in it of utopian wish than substantive fact.

Khomyakov's critique of Western culture and faith seem to me to be principled and fair-minded but he appears unwilling to apply the same principles to Russia. When he tries to excuse Russian culture by appealing to principle over fact he is distorting this distinction by forgetting that ideas have consequences. Thus the intense patriotism and anti-Western bias that was noted in Chapter I distort to a certain extent his judgment and render him inconsistent.

This seems to me the basic criticism that can be raised against Khomyakov's ecclesiology but there is another point which I would like...
to raise, with some trepidation. That concerns the institutional embodiment of Khomyakov's viewpoints, i.e. the Church as an institution. Khomyakov does not, indeed, conceive of the Church as an institution at all for an institution is something external to man and not a freely internalized value. Therefore it seems out of place to discuss the Church-as-institution in a discussion of Khomyakov's ecclesiology. But it seems to me that Khomyakov himself opened the door. Despite his insistence on collective cognition and a free, non-rational mutual love, Khomyakov rejected mysticism. While he de-emphasizes and narrows the concept of the visible Church, refusing to draw from it the broad consequences that Palmer did, he most surely does acknowledge a visible Church. For him, the guarantee that mutual love and free, internal faith are not mystic dreams or utopian hopes is in the concrete historical existence of the visible Orthodox Church on earth, existing continuously and uncorrupted from the time of the Apostles. This visible, earthly Church remains uncorrupted, though of course individual prelates and communicants may sin. Every individual Christian may, and does, as a legacy of Adam, fall into sin but insofar as he is in the Church, he does not sin. The individual Orthodox Christian who does sin does so insofar as he is not in the Church -- insofar as his faith and love are incomplete. There arises here, it seems to me, an ambiguity. The Christian who is in the Church does not sin, and the Christian Church on earth is there where men are gathered together in mutual love, i.e. where they have cast away personal and selfish interests and submitted in faith to God's redemption. But if this is so, how can one immediately know where the True Church on
earth is? For the line separating good from evil runs through every human heart and in any given gathering of people that line will be ever-changing. The answer is that the Church is there where the Sacraments ordained by Christ as an "outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace" are faithfully preserved and truly administered. Whatever the spiritual worthiness of the priests who administer the sacraments, so long as they be duly ordained and faithfully administer the sacraments, they are blessed in that function and cannot err therein. It is such a conception that saves Khomyakov's ecclesiology from mysticism and allows him to identify the True Church with that historical Church known, rightly in his view, as Orthodox. This is consistent but it is important to note that it creates a tension in Khomyakov's ecclesiology. The emphasis on freedom of faith, on the full freedom of the layman even to teach the faith and on a collective mutual love may not always seem in harmony with a recognition of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the more structured aspects of the earthly Church. Indeed as we have seen, Khomyakov was not close to the Church hierarchy of his day, harshly criticized the subjection to the State and the 'timidity' and caution of the ecclesiastical censorship, of which he was a victim, and blamed the authorities for bungling, as he saw it, the chance to convert Palmer. Indeed Berdyaev, noting this tension in Khomyakov's work, felt that Khomyakov erred in rejecting the insights of the mystics such as Jacob Boehme and did not push far enough his doctrines on liberty and a non-institutional sobornost.² It must be pointed out, however, that Khomyakov's refusal to eliminate this tension in his thought -- his insistence on identifying the Church
of mutual love precisely with that visible, historically manifest Orthodox Church, is what makes Khomyakov an Orthodox thinker, whose thought remains true to the doctrines of the Church, rather than merely (if that is the right word) a religious thinker who deals with religious questions. Khomyakov's certainty that the True Church was that Church which was established in Russia is what gives his thought its aggressively nationalistic and patriotic flavor.

For the most part, I think, Khomyakov's ecclesiology is marked by unity and cogency. It is a strong statement of faith as the integrating factor in human life, allowing an internal, true freedom and directness beyond the reach of external institutions and structures. It seems to me that it is just this ecclesiology of freedom -- but a freedom within the Church; indeed a freedom realized only in the Church -- that has made Khomyakov a significant figure in Orthodox thought and has given his ecclesiology an influence that has lasted longer than that of his social and political views. Classical Slavophilism, indeed, seems largely to have died out at the end of the 1850's with the deaths of the Kireevskys, Konstantin Aksakov and Khomyakov. But Khomyakov's ecclesiological writings continued to attract interest -- indeed, their influence would seem to have grown greater after his death than during his lifetime when they were not readily available in Russia and known to a limited circle of friends or acquaintances. The final task of this thesis will be to examine the place of Khomyakov's ecclesiology in the context of Russian and Orthodox thought and to sketch briefly some of the receptions which his thought has met.
Khomyakov's ecclesiological works were not published in Russia during his lifetime. The correspondence with Palmer was, of course, a private correspondence, although Palmer excerpted passages from Khomyakov's letters to be printed in his *Appeal to the Scottish Bishops* privately printed at Edinborough in 1849, in order to illustrate Orthodox attitudes towards the re-union of the Churches.\(^3\) The French language treatises were all sent abroad to be published as we have seen. This was primarily because they were directed at a Western audience and designed to defend Orthodoxy from assorted attacks or misrepresentations that had appeared in the Western presses. However, we have also seen that Khomyakov did not have any hopes of getting them published in his own country due to the 'timidity' and 'caution' of the ecclesiastical censorship (see his explanations to Palmer, requesting him to have the first essay published, in his eighth letter to Palmer, Sept. 4, 1852). Obviously during his own lifetime, Khomyakov was viewed with a certain amount of suspicion by the Russian Church heirarchy and we have seen that he, for his part, looked on the heirarchy with a certain amount of distrust. This, however, is not to suggest that Khomyakov was in any serious trouble with the Church. Whatever his criticisms of various heirarchs or prelates he remained all his life as we have noted a faithful communicant of the Orthodox Church, practising all her rituals and observing all the rites as well as zealously defending the Church against critics of all kinds. Certainly in his ecclesiological speculations he wanted to believe that he was saying nothing which went beyond the doctrines of the Church and
he enthusiastically received the Encyclical Epistle of 1848 as confirmation of his beliefs -- although it seems he misinterpreted it to some extent. What were the reasons for the suspicion that some Church heirarchs held for Khomyakov?

Perhaps one of the sources of distrust for Khomyakov was the close relationship of the Russian Church to the State. While the Tsars did not prescribe doctrine or ritual, they did administer the Church through the Over-Procurator of the Holy Synod, a lay official. Khomyakov's opposition to serfdom and his appeal to the traditions of the peasant mir against the Westernized intelligentsia, as well as his condemnation of the Petrine (also Westernized) state made him along with the other Slavophiles, suspect in the eyes of Tsar Nicholas I. Slavophile publishing efforts, such as the publication of Moskvitianin under Kireevsky's editorship, were consistently frustrated. No doubt some of the suspicions of Khomyakov entertained in the State bureaucracy rubbed off on some of the members of the Church bureaucracy. Such general attitudes of suspicion would not, of course, tend to outlast Khomyakov's life and, indeed, after his death, his work did begin to appear in print (his ecclesiastical works).

However, there are other, more specific reasons for the wariness in which Church authorities approached Khomyakov. We have mentioned that his attempts to publish Tserkov' Odna in the disguise of a Greek manuscript were foiled and that Metropolitan Philaret played a large role in this. Philaret had seen through the deception from the start and was bound to object to the fraudulent presentation of a work by a layman as an old manuscript by some anonymous monk. It seems that
in this case Khomyakov's zeal for propagating his ideas (most likely
to Palmer, as Bolshakoff suggests) led him beyond the bounds of pro-
priety. Metropolitan Philaret would naturally not assent to such a
deception.

There are further reasons beyond this one and they run to points
of doctrine, or at least emphasis. Khomyakov felt that the official
presentations of Orthodox thought that dominated Orthodox theology in
his day were insufficiently free of Western influences. Further, he
felt that laymen, if moved by faith, might contribute to the teaching
of the Church. The task of teaching the faith is given not to the
heirarchy alone but to all. Here is how Khomyakov puts it in his first
French brochure, explaining why he takes it upon himself to tell the
West the truth about Orthodoxy, although he is just a layman:

Teaching, instruction (l'enseignement) does not at
all address itself solely to reason—It is not
therefore by Scripture alone—nor by oral com-
mentary or symbolism (of which we don't doubt
the necessity), nor by preaching, nor by theological
study, nor by acts of charity but by all these
manifestations united, that teaching proceeds. He
to whom God has given the gift of the word, teaches
by the word; he to whom God has not given the gift
of the word, teaches by life—Certainly Christianity
has its logical expression confirmed in the Symbol
(of the Creed)—It has also its logical teaching
which we call Theology, but that is only one branch
of teaching in general. To detach it (from the rest)
is a great error; to make it a prerogative is folly;
to make it a divine gift, attached to certain func-
tions, is an heresy—The Church does not recognize
any Teaching Church except in itself in its totality.

In his second French brochure, Khomyakov defines his attitude towards
the apostolic office more precisely:
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We see, therefore, that the laying on of hands—testifies against The Protestant in proving to us the importance of the terrestrial Church in the designs of God—it testifies against the Roman in denying the wall of separation—between the ecclesiastic and the layman, for we are all preachers of the Most-High, all be it in different degrees (preachers, but not pastors). 5

To abolish the episcopate is impossible since it is the plenitude of ecclesiastic rights re-united in an individual—To re-establish it by a consecration conferred from below, that is to say, from individuals who don't have the plenitude of ecclesiastic rights, is to directly violate the most clear precepts of the New Testament—because the bishop and the priest are not functionaries of the partial commune; they are the functionaries of Christ in the general commune and it is through them that the terrestrial Church attaches itself to its divine founder— 6

Such is the reason that she (the Church) admits the decisions of priests in matters of discipline, accords them the honor and right to declare her dogmatic decisions, all the while reserving the right to judge if they have been faithful organs of her faith and tradition, and imposes on them particularly the service of the divine word and the right to spread its teaching, while, however, she deprives none of her members of this divine privilege which has been accorded to all Christians by the Spirit of God. 7

Thus, while not denying the apostolic succession and the necessity of the priesthood, Khomyakov denies to it the exclusive right of spreading the divine word and claims for laics such as himself a role in teaching the word of Truth. Such a view is not heretical but clerics have felt that it can have dangerous implications if pushed too far. Such a doctrine—if taken to an extreme, could be used to deny the priority of the clergy in instruction and to open the gates to a concept of every man his own theologian. Germanos, Archbishop of Thyateira, in his letter to Sergei Bolshakoff, is one prelate of recent times who shares this
suspicion and caution:

Nobody can deny the devotion of Khomyakov to the Orthodox Church, but his ecclesiology lacks of clearness and exactness. It can lead sometimes to perilous conclusions from an Orthodox point of view. It happened, for instance, with Khomyakov's opinion about infallibility as belonging to the congregation as a whole. I am sure Khomyakov misunderstood—the difference between defender and judge—

However, note that Archbishop Germanos' accusation is only that the doctrine of Khomyakov is unclear and MAY LEAD someone to draw wrong conclusions. The Church has not held that Khomyakov himself drew wrong conclusions. If Khomyakov's doctrine of the episcopate is viewed with suspicion in some parts of the Church it is no more than suspicion. The Church did not maintain whatever barriers it may have erected to the publication of Khomyakov's ecclesiological views. (I say may have erected; Khomyakov did try to publish Tserkov' Odna in his lifetime unsuccessfully; he did not, however, attempt to have his theological French brochures published in Russia, partly because he doubted it could be done; partly because (primarily because) they were aimed at a Western audience. Therefore one cannot say that the Church prevented the publication of Khomyakov's ecclesiology in Russia during his lifetime.) A brief review of the publication of these works in Russia is in order before we undertake a few comments on how Khomyakov is perceived by the Russian Church.

Khomyakov did not make much effort to publish or collect most of his work. Gratieux, the French scholar, writes that "Few authors were less pre-occupied with the destiny of their works than Khomyakov" noting that others were responsible for collecting and editing his poetry and
and drama and that he generally made no efforts to publish outside of
the few journals to which he occasionally contributed. But, as Gratieux
notes,\textsuperscript{10} Khomyakov did take an exceptional interest in seeing his theo-
logical works published -- an indication that Khomyakov felt these
efforts to be central to his life's work. We have seen that his efforts
to publish \textit{Tserkov' Odna} failed but it was published not long after his
death -- in 1864 in \textit{Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie}, albeit with an introductory
note by the Holy Synod warning of "inexactitudes" and the possibility
of drawing mistaken conclusions from the work.\textsuperscript{11} Khomyakov was, of
course, able to publish his three polemical French brochures abroad
(Paris 1853, Leipzig 1855, 1858) as well as several letters published
in \textit{L'Union Chretienne} in 1860. These works, plus one letter to Mrsr.
Loos, bishop of Utrecht, which \textit{L'Union Chretienne} did not publish, were
first collected by Dimitry Alexeevich Khomyakov the author's son, and
published in 1872 at Lausanne under the title \textit{L'eglise Latine et le
Protestantisme au Point du vue de L'eglise D orient}.\textsuperscript{12} However, even
before the publication of the French treatises in the original French
in \textit{L'eglise Latine} in 1872, these works had already appeared in Russian
translation. The first translation into Russian was by Archpriest
N. A. Sergievsky for \textit{Pravoslavie Obozrenie}. Hilarov-Platonov and
Iuri Samarin translated them anew for publication in Vol. II of
Khomyakov's \textit{Works}. Vol. II appeared in Prague in 1867 and included
beside the French treatises, the letters to Palmer translated by
Princess Tcherkasskaya, and \textit{Tserkov' Odna}, as well as some translation
of St. Paul and a few other pieces. Vol. II had a second edition

-134-
(Berlin 1868) but was not published in Russia until the third edition (Moscow 1886). The letters to Palmer, as noted, were published in Russian in 1867 but the complete correspondence was first published in the original English by Birbeck in Vol. I of Russia and the English Church During The Last 50 Years (Kings St. Covent Garden 1895). Thus within 26 years of his death, all of Khomyakov's theological works were published in Russia. The interest of Pravoslavie Obozrenie in Tserkov' Odna and the French treatises indicates that the Russian Church, if cautious, was even in the 1860's not opposed to Khomyakov's ideas.

It is true, as Karsavin noted in his introduction to the 1868 Berlin edition of Vol. II that Khomyakov's opinions are those of an individual and not of the Orthodox Church which has not judged them. It also seems true, as Bolshakoff puts it, that Khomyakov's ecclesiology is "in the process of endorsement by the Church". He notes the publications in Pravoslavie Obozrenie and the wide, largely approving commentary by religious thinkers and theologians. Of course Khomyakov has had his critics in the Orthodox Church. We have cited Archbishop Germanos and we may also mention Father Pavel Florensky who accused Khomyakov of a leaning towards Protestantism and a denial of the authority of the Church -- a position which he sees as inclining towards immanentism. The major ecclesiastical critique of Khomyakov has always been of his tendency to downgrade the importance of the episcopate and to assert for the Church as a whole a responsibility for the teaching and defense of doctrine. We have noted that Khomyakov never carried these ideas so far as to deny the Apostolic succession and the necessity of the bishops and priests as the sole performers of the
Sacraments. Nonetheless it is probably correct to say that official representatives of Orthodox theology have placed a greater stress on the institutional definition of the Church than did Khomyakov. Metropolitan Stephan of Sophia, a delegate to the Lausanne and Edinburgh conferences on Christian re-union defines authority in the Church in this manner:

The whole Church of Christ, which comprises all the several churches, is subject to all the bishops, while the centre of the spiritual power of the Church is the Ecumenical Councils, as that centre once rested with the apostles—These councils were the supreme authority in matters of faith and all several Churches, pastors, and believers were required to obey them.---This superior court, in uniting all the bishops who are subject to it in respect to ecclesiastical teaching, ministry, and government, preserves the unity of the universal Church of Christ---

Archbishop Chrysostom of Athens was another prelate who emphasized the importance of the visible Church and its external marks (while not, of course, denying the invisible Church). It must not be maintained, however, that the Orthodox concept of authority in the Church is limited to an external and formal reliance on the decisions of Oecumenical Councils alone. Not all Councils composed of the requisite number and grouping of bishops have been accepted as Orthodox. Only those which found general acceptance by the Church as a whole are recognized as infallible. Furthermore other pronouncements such as Encyclical Epistles may take on the authority of the Church if they meet with the same general acceptance. This acceptance is not defined by any formal process of assent but is manifested in the living worship of Orthodox Christians. Thus while different people may express differing emphasises
on the importance of Councils and the role of the heirarchy (so long as they acknowledge the Apostolic Succession and the Necessity of the Sacraments), Khomyakov's denial that the ultimate authority in the Church is not simply formal and external, is not incorrect.  

Indeed Khomyakov's stress on internal freedom and his critique of purely formal conceptions of authority have found positive responses within the Church as well. Father Sergei Bulgakov also insists on a fully internalized and free acceptance as the basis of authority in the Church:

Orthodox teaching knows no external teaching authority of the Church---the Church is not only thought, or knowledge, or teaching, but the primordial depth of the one who religious experience, in relation to which all the words and thoughts which express it appear as secondary functions---if they claim to be the expression of the whole they must be qualified as inadequate to it. Therefore dogmas, as judgements or thoughts about the faith, are different in kind from the theoretical constructions of science---The criterion of their truth is found not in the agreement of thought with itself---but in their livingness, in that, in fact, which lies in the foundation of their definitions---If it flows from the one and whole life of the Church, if it is of the Church, and true, then also its dogmatic definition conforms with its own designation---For in the measure that the truth of dogma depends on the fullness of life, to that extent the right to express them can belong only to one possessing that fullness, that is exclusively to the Church herself---to the Holy Spirit living in her.  

These words express quite closely the Khomyakovian doctrine of authority in the Church -- on the foundation of the Church on the mutual love of Christians, a free and internalized living in the Church which cannot be limited or confined by external authority either human or written.
Khomyakov's insistence on mutual love and complete harmony of doctrine as a prerequisite for Christian re-union has found a near total agreement in the Orthodox Church. The insistence on this real harmony and the insufficiency of purely formal compromise or artfully vague definitions of terminology characterize the response of Orthodox delegates to such re-union conferences as those held in Lausanne 1927 and Edinburgh, 1937. The insistence that the Orthodox Church remains the one true Church was maintained.  

Today it would seem Khomyakov holds a high position of esteem within the Russian Orthodox Church. Although only his poetry is officially published in the Soviet Union, there are indications that his other work is widely known.  

Outside of the Soviet Union he is regarded highly and this is alike true of the Orthodox Church of America and in the Russian Orthodox Church outside of Russia. We shall see a bit later the influence Khomyakov exerted on a number of lay religious thinkers associated with the Russian Theological Institute at Paris. The attitude of the Russian Orthodox Church outside Russia is best expressed through the views of its founder, Metropolitan Antony of Kiev, as summarized by Archpriest George Grabbe in his introduction to an English translation of The Church is One which is, incidentally, published and circulated by the Church. Metropolitan Antony held that Khomyakov did not introduce any new doctrine into the Church but merely a new method of expression, which seemed new to con-
temporaries, especially those who had grown away from the Church and the patristic literature. Such new expressions appeared at first alien to the Church heirarchs who found traditional formulations quite sufficient and saw no need to express Church dogma in modern form. This, according to Metropolitan Antony, explains the initial suspicion of the heirarchy. The Church now recognizes Khomyakov's thought as fully in line with the ancient doctrine.\footnote{Antony's assertion that Khomyakov introduced no new doctrine is, of course, no criticism but a statement of approval. For no one man can introduce new doctrine into the Church. The Revelation of Truth given in Christ is complete and unchanging, always the same though human attempts to capture it in words (which, being human, are more or less inadequate) may vary. We have seen that Khomyakov insisted that his views were in no way new doctrine and went to extraordinary and not always honest lengths, to make them seem Orthodox. Which, indeed, they were. Timothy Ware in his book \textit{The Orthodox Church}, which apparently is used in the instruction of catechumens in the Orthodox Church in this country,\footnote{Khomyakov several times, particularly his theory of the Church.} quotes Khomyakov several times, particularly his theory of the Church.\footnote{While Khomyakov's ecclesiology has met with a certain approval among heirarches of the Russian Orthodox Church, who find in it a valid exposition, at least in part, of Orthodox ecclesiology, his religious thought had even a greater impact on a number of Russian intellectuals of a religious bent. The opinion of his close friend and disciple, Iuri Fyodorovich Samarin, that Khomyakov was a "Doctor of the Church" is echoed by the 20th century thinker Nikolai Berdyaev who called him \ldots}}
"the first original (Russian) theologian." Samarin himself was greatly influenced by Khomyakov who persuaded him that his early enthusiasm for Hegel could not be reconciled with Orthodox conceptions of the Church and that Reason could never be made the basis of a defense of the Church. Samarin was deeply influenced by Khomyakov and came to adopt his ecclesiology whole-heartedly and to promote it vigorously. He edited the second volume of Khomyakov's works which appeared in Prague in 1867 and it was for this volume that he prepared his famous introduction hailing his master as a Doctor of the Church. Ten years after Khomyakov's death, he testified to the profound personal affect his friend had on his life in a letter to Baroness Von Rahden:

I am quite serious---I have been a little afraid of you and I cannot tell you just how happy I am to have this feeling. It is healthy and there is nothing painful about it. If I did not feel it, I would be missing something that is necessary. Ever since the death of Khomiakov I had lost all fear of anyone.

In calling Khomyakov a doctor of the Church, Samarin asserted that it was Khomyakov who freed Orthodox thought from certain conventional and borrowed patterns of thought. Particularly Khomyakov freed Orthodox thinking from regarding the Church as an institution -- a view not so much incorrect as limiting:

According to our ordinary conceptions, the Church is an institution -- an institution, it is true, of a special kind, and indeed unique, inasmuch as it is divine -- but all the same an institution. This conception---does not in itself contain any direct contradiction to the truth (but) it is inadequate; it brings the idea of the Church down into too low and commonplace a sphere, and in consequence of this...
the idea itself becomes commonplace---The Church is not a doctrine, nor a system, nor an institution. She is a living organism, the organism of truth and love, or rather SHE IS TRUTH AND LOVE, AS AN ORGANISM.

Samarin considered that after the Schism of 1054, the Orthodox world was isolated and did not undergo the Renaissance and Reformation. While the true doctrine was preserved, intellectual thought stagnated. Orthodox theology was stagnant; when, in more recent times, it found itself confronted with Western attacks both Protestant and Catholic, the Orthodox theologians could only attempt to defend the Church by drawing on Western thought. Catholicism was combatted with arguments drawn from Protestant thought and Protestantism was parried with the aid of Catholic thinkers. Within Orthodox theology two schools arose, one leaning to Catholicism and the other to Protestantism. Samarin's thesis, was, in fact, a study of this duality as reflected in the differing positions of two Churchmen of Peter's time -- Feofan Prokopovich, schooled largely in Protestant circles and Stepan Yavorsky, whose conception of the Church was more inclined to the Catholic. It was Khomyakov, Samarin asserts, who liberated Orthodox theology from its merely defensive posture and from its dual nature, according to which Western communion it was dealing with. Khomyakov's thought provides a critique of both Western communions from an entirely independent, Orthodox point of view. Khomyakov succeeded in showing that Latinism and Protestantism are actually two sides of the same false doctrine -- rationalism. Thus Khomyakov not only criticized the Western communions in a far more penetrating manner than previous
theologians had done, but he also provided a firm and positive, unique ground for Orthodoxy. As Samarin wrote,

It is impossible to take the negative side of his controversies---apart from the positive side --- that is to say, his explanation of the teaching of Orthodoxy, and this is so because the one cannot be separated from the other, for they always form one indissoluble whole---Khomiakoff cleared the region of light, the atmosphere of the Church, and consequently false doctrine as it passed across it appeared of its own accord in the shape of a nega­tion of the light...Formerly we saw before us the two clearly defined forms of Western Christianity and Orthodoxy between them---but now we see the Church--- the living organism of truth---and outside the Church---Rationalism--- 32

What attracted Russian intellectuals weary of the secular faith of the revolutionary intelligentsia was Khomyakov's central doctrine of liberty in the Church. Samarin sees the question of how to reconcile freedom of conscience with religious faith as the question that has always troubled religious thinkers and he finds the answer in Khomyakov's ecclesiology:

The third solution can be summed up---faith entrusted to love---If truth is revealed by love, the degree of lucidity of an individual's faith is consequently a variant of the power of love---Love---resides entirely in intention, in will---Therefore faith, too, is accessible to everyone. Here we are touching on the true grounds of equality---In short, love is social by its very nature: it is a matter of man breaking down the limits of his individuality and identifying himself with his fellows; therefore it is unity---in recognizing that faith depends upon a predisposition of the moral individual, which in turn depends only on will power, we place human liberty even higher than the Protestants do. 33

The concept of free unity, of sobornost' is also the characteristic of Khomyakov's thought which appealed to Berdyaev as well as to a like-
minded group of thinkers who were seeking a reconciliation of the intellectuals and the Church -- a reconciliation spurred by the feeling among some intellectuals that the secular radicalism of the alienated intelligentsia of later nineteenth century Russia was bankrupt. It is this feeling which found expression in Vekhi (1909) to which both Berdyaev and another thinker influenced in part by Khomyakov's thought, Sergei Bulgakov, contributed.

For Berdyaev, Khomyakov's concept of freedom was central. He agreed with Samarin's description of Khomyakov as a doctor of the Church although he emphasized the suspicion in which Khomyakov was held by certain contemporary representatives of the official Church. Berdyaev even less than Khomyakov, was interested in the Church as institution. In fact, following Solovyov, he criticized Khomyakov for his failure to recognize that true Christianity also existed in the West. Khomyakov, he noted, applied the double standard -- he criticized Catholicism as it was but lauded an idealized Russian Orthodoxy.\(^{34}\) Khomyakov was mistaken in attempting to identify his concept of freedom within a specific historical Church. In doing so he overlooked the real freedoms in the Western tradition and instead attempted to combine an anarchistic love of freedom with reverence for an autocratic state structure and highly rigid Church hierarchy. What was particularly lacking in Khomyakov's religious thought, in Berdyaev's view, was a messianic or prophetic sense. Khomyakov's rejection of mysticism was precisely his mistake. Berdyaev attributed this lack to the Slavophiles' firm attachment to the Russian soil and to well-
established family patterns and patterns of gentry tradition. This feeling of solidity and tradition narrowed, as Berdyaev thinks, Khomyakov's vision and led him to identify freedom with Russia and ignore it in the West:

A real feeling for freedom existed in Khomyakov. But his doctrine of freedom, which lay at the very foundation of his philosophy and theology, was a possibility only after the doctrine of autonomy and spiritual freedom in Kant--The sources of freedom of the spirit are embedded in Christianity, which guarantees them, and---without Christianity both Kant and all the defenders of freedom would have been impossible. 35

For Berdyaev, spiritual freedom was the centerpiece of his thought and if he believed that Khomyakov's view lacked a messianic and mystic sense, he nevertheless considered Khomyakov a great contributor to Russian thought. Khomyakov's ecclesiology, in his view, points out the true direction for those seeking the spiritual essence of freedom:

It is difficult to find a freer conception, sensation (chustvovanie) of the Church. Nothing constrains Khomyakov. In his relationship with the Church there is nothing external -- all is internal. Life in the Church is also for him life in freedom. The Church is unity in love and freedom. The Church is not an institution (establishment, uchrezhdenie) and not authority. In the Church there is nothing juridical, there is no sort of rationalism. According to Khomyakov, where there is genuine love of Christ, freedom in Christ, unity in Christ -- there is the Church. 36

Another 20th century Russian religious thinker, Nicholas Zernov, has, however, gone so far as to hail Khomyakov as a prophet. Writing in 1944 amid the chaos and destruction of the World War, Zernov saw or thought he saw the spiritual crisis of the West that Khomyakov had predicted:
The crisis Khomiakov predicted has come. The liberal and individualistic civilization of the West with its trust in the self-sufficiency of man, with its belief in uninterrupted progress, has suffered a severe setback—Khomiakov was a genuine prophet because he proclaimed the certainty of the triumph of the Church at a time when it looked little like surviving—He had no false illusions about the state of the Church anywhere, and especially in his own country, yet he never lost faith in the Church nor his firm trust in her ultimate victory. At a time when all the progressive and liberal movements were opposed to the Church as a stronghold of reaction, when the majority of Christians were frightened—Khomiakov dared to insist that the Church alone contained the seeds of a new and better order—37

It is clear that Khomyakov's religious thought has continued to exert an influence on Russian thinkers of a religious bent, within the Church and outside it. The tight-knit patriarchal gentry world that Khomyakov inhabited and defended against the alienating, alienated West and its individualistic and rationalistic culture, has long since gone. While the Slavophiles remain important to an understanding of nineteenth century Russian thought, and while the question of the unique quality (or lack thereof) of Russian and Soviet culture continues to be debated in different forms, Slavophile thought, like the world that produced it, seems remote from us. But Khomyakov's ecclesiology has held its place in Russian religious thinking. Of the many and diverse subjects on which Khomyakov wrote and polemicized, the question of the Church was most close to his heart. We have seen how the unity of his views and world outlook flows from his religious perception of reality. This religious perception and faith did not grow or develop—Khomyakov was remarkable in the steadfastness of his views— but it was challenged by the Westernizers and beyond them by the confident
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and progressive West with its technology, progress, and reason. To the elaboration of the inner peace and freedom he found in the Church and to the defense of this Church against the hostile and formidable challenge represented by Western culture, Khomyakov devoted increasing attention as the Slavophiles and Westernizers went their separate ways. The resulting ecclesiology, though narrow and incomplete, marked by its polemical nature, and marred by a sometimes unfair application of a dual standard in its judgements, has continued to be of significance. It had perhaps its most marked influence on the group Walicki calls the epigones of Slavophilism, intellectuals active in the early twentieth century, notably after the 1905 revolution and later active in emigration. 38 For those who felt that the secular faith in revolution had culminated only in bloody disaster, a return to religious concepts seemed logical and essential. What Khomyakov's ecclesiology offered was a doctrine of freedom in the Church -- an internalized, spiritual freedom independent of the vicissitudes of politics and secular life -- a freedom at once more mystic and more real. Of course the secular faith of the Russian intelligentsia was hardly dead and the 1905 revolution was not an ending but a prelude. Yet Russian religious thought lives on, both within the Soviet Union and in the Russian Church abroad. Khomyakov's ecclesiology has found a place within this on-going tradition. It no doubt is excessive to regard Khomyakov as a prophet as Zernov does. Berdyaev's critique of Khomyakov's inadequate prophetic sense and too narrow outlook come closer to the truth. Khomyakov denied in the Western communions a true Christianity and refused to recognize
therein significant or effective thought not corrupted by rationalism. As Berdyaev, Soloviev, and other critics have pointed out, however, the concepts of mutual love and internal freedom are hardly unknown in the Western Christian tradition. Nevertheless Khomyakov's theory of the free and mutual love of Christians and of collective knowledge through faith gave a new and vigorous expression to Orthodox Christian tradition. It proved a defense of Orthodoxy that could appeal to intellectuals disillusioned with secular panaceas and distrustful of rationalism. Iuri Samarin in his introduction to Vol. II of Khomyakov's works had maintained that the question of the reconciliation of intellectual liberty and liberty of conscience with the demands of faith is one which has always challenged religious thinkers and will continue to challenge them. Khomyakov's effort to deal with this question, born of resentment of the West and a sort of wounded pride, shaped by correspondence with Palmer and polemics with foreigners, has continued as his most enduring contribution to Russian thought.
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