

The Symphony of Authorities in Russian Political Thought: The Spirit, the Crown and Chalcedon

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

The notion of the “Symphony of Powers” between the church and crown derives from Chalcedon, perhaps the most important event in western history. There, the doctrine was decreed that Christ's human and divine natures were distinct, existing in voluntary cooperation. All medieval politics proceeds from this idea. Christ has two natures, the human and the divine. The divine side includes the Orthodox church and its clergy. The political side is the human one, civil government, freedom and cooperation.

The two natures are equal in the sense that both serve one another voluntarily. This is why the ancient heresies were so immensely important: if the human side was stressed, then the risk of severing man and God was severe. If the divinity were stressed, man's autonomy would be compromised. The heresies of the ancient church stressed one of the two sides at the expense of the other. The result was perversion, the destruction of autonomy and the destruction of man's connection with the divine. In other words, Chalcedon was an intensely political idea, as the notion of “symphony” shows.

Philosophical Background to the Idea of Sobornost

The work of Leo Karsavin (1952) posits the self as a Trinity of ideas: the hypostasis, that is, the incarnation of substance, the essence itself and prosopon, the mask, or empirical identity. The mark of mental health is the “symphonic personality.” This is based on a set of nesting, interlocking and related unities within which the person finds its place. The family is the locus of this personality. This is manifest again in the relation between the crown and the land. The empire participates in the absolute as real, a single, non-fragmented object. Any unity is the product of love.

For Karsavin, there are four types of unity: first, God as Being, the Ground of all things. Then the unities found in creation based on energy or becoming. Creates unities that are complete and are not becoming and finally, becoming as such, the energetic striving for perfection. The self is a Trinity of ideas: the hypostasis is the incarnation of Substance while ousia is this Being, this substance and the prosopon, the mask, the empirical self.

Karsavin's doctrine is the person: he is the foundation of social values. The relationship between the individual and the supreme personality creates a “symphonic personality.” The essence of the human being, is to strive, to seek reunion with God. The “social personality” is the creation of the whole: there are no isolated egos. The largest functional aspect of the symphony is the nation (that is, the ethnos) since there can be no integrated personality without a common language. The church and nation function as individuals – conflict and all. “personality is unity in multiplicity” is the pregnant phrase of Karsavin.

A. Losev holds that unity must be prior to multiplicity. In human relations, this is found in “myth” or the pre-logical, foundational context for all action. It is the unity of subject and object. The Form in Losev is taken from Plato under 5 headings: It imposes a limit on the flux; it is the function of objects and is not a universal in the abstract sense; it is a subject, not merely a formal

object; it is the maximum content that a Form can comprehend and finally, that it is the necessary element of existence – nothing is real without Form.

Similarly in the work of Pamphil Yurkevich, the experience of any x has several qualities similar to Karsavin's "symphonic personality." First, it is contextualized and never isolated. It is both subjective and objective. It is part of a broader whole that can never be fully systematized. As for the x itself, it exists as a unity only in thought. Since thought is part of the natural order, then the unity must be as well.

For Yurkevich, all phenomena have a residual element that is non-systematic, that is, cannot be made part of a system. The existence of a phenomena show two things: the tendency to drag consciousness down to the accidents, and the tendency to lift up to the ideal. Sense data are the subject's projection – the truth and the Real are the purely objective, the object without any desire imposed upon it. Empiricism and nominalism cannot understand this and see sense as the only reality. Plato saw reality as "open" to the transcendent realm while nominalism is closed in on itself.

Ivan Il'yn sees the Real as the object without accidents. The purely objective – the object without the projections of the human passions. Form seeks to impose itself upon phenomena while the latter seeks liberation – the idea of the French revolution. Dialectics, Il'yn says, is a means by which God purifies the mind. AL Kazin states that the two natures of Christ have a common ground: this is the purpose of philosophy. It is the end of thought: to have some understanding of this ultimate reality.

Ultimately, the fullest conception of Symphony comes from Losev and his understanding of the filioque. For him, western history and culture is based upon it, and all philosophical errors stem from it. The Trinity is this Ground that Kazin mentions. It is the model of being. The One exists, which gives birth to the phenomenon (the image) which in turn creates the manifestation, or the hypostasis.

Now, both the manifestation and the image are created by the One. If the manifestation can be created by the image, then there is no real need for the One. If Christ produces the Holy Spirit, then Christ becomes merely the agent of the Father. For Gregory Palamas, the Father is essence, he alone is being as such. For the west, the Father "transmits" essence or Being to the Son. When all is based on the monarchy of the Father, unity is maintained. When the Son acts as God's agent, then earthly powers can rule autonomously.

Now, all of this seems far removed from the interaction of the crown and the synod (rather than the "church-state" distinction in the west), but it is required for it. Both the crown (which is not the state) and the synod have a common point of origin. Their goal is therefore identical, only their means are distinct.

Sobornost' is an essential concept not only in Orthodox theology, but in Russian history as well. As a philosophical concept, it is the ecstatic discovery and experience of the foundation of all Being. Love is communion, but it is also labor. The Trinity is three persons, but this need not conflict with the fact that their essence is identical. For any two objects to interact, a third object is necessary to provide the meaning and context.

The essence is revealed in action; it is personality. Accident is dead matter, fluid and ultimately meaningless. The purely monotheistic idea is that God is a tyrant – isolated and unrelated, not a father. The trinity is a sobor in that there is a shared essence with independent persons. The Holy Spirit is the action, it is the revelation of personhood; Christ is the head while the Spirit is the Heart. Personhood implies social unity and is the foundation of myth.

For Khomiakov, sobornost' is the measure of truth. Berdyaev says the same: the “outer” church is the place for institutions and rules. The empirical church is distinct from the spirit, the sobor. Bulgakov says that unity implies the person through commonality. What they all have in common is something akin to Spinoza's substance: it is the underlying truth that connects all members of the nation together. Individuals are fictional and irrelevant. Instead communities, *artels*, communes, monasteries, brotherhoods, and other associations were the “individuals” making up the nation.

The Orthodox Conception of the “Church”

Before proceeding, the conception of “church” used in this essay as well as in Orthodox authors in the middle ages needs to be defined. Normally, secular writers use the term “church” to refer to its ruling bishops or, less commonly, a collection of all its members. It is far more than this. Alexei Khomiakov writes:

The church visible, or upon earth, lives in complete communion and unity with the whole body of the church, of which Christ is the Head. She has abiding within her Christ and the grace of the Holy Spirit in all their living fullness, but not in the fullness of their manifestation, for she acts and knows not fully, but only so far as it pleases God.

The church is then a collection of people believing in Christ, but it is also the receptacle of grace. It is almost the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit and hence, is irradiated with grace, a term that means (in the specific Orthodox sense) God's action and presence.

In the famed 17th century *Epistle of the Eastern Patriarchs*, a reply to the Calvinists and their rejection of single visible church wrote this:

We believe, as we have been instructed to believe, in what is called, and what in actual fact is, the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church, which embraces all those, whoever and wherever they might be, who believe in Christ, who being now on their earthly pilgrimage have not yet come to dwell in the heavenly homeland But we do not in the least confuse the Church in pilgrimage with the Church that has reached the homeland, just because, as certain of the heretics think, one and the other both exist, that they both comprise as it were two flocks of the single Chief Shepherd, God, and are sanctified by the one Holy Spirit Such a confusion of them is out of place and impossible, inasmuch as one is battling and is still on the way, while the other is already celebrating its victory and has reached the Fatherland and has received the, reward, something which will follow also for the whole Ecumenical Church (Quoted from Pozamansky, 1994: 222-246.)

Again, the church is a communal body, but one that is part of the manifestation of the Holy Spirit. It is a means for broken humanity to come to the knowledge of truth and align their lives with that of the Scriptures. St. John Maximovich says:

Now the Church consists of both her earthly and heavenly parts, for the Son of God came to earth and became man that He might lead man into heaven and make him once again a

citizen of paradise, returning to him his original condition of sinlessness and wholeness and uniting him unto Himself

The church in its earthly element is a hospital that brings sick people to healing, that is, reveals to them both the end and the means to that end. Grace is the fulfillment of the human condition and human nature. St. John of Kronstadt says,

God has bound the Orthodox faithful to Himself by means of the one Holy Spirit and the one Church, by one faith, by the unity of the law, the Mysteries, and the hierarchy, for the general good of His rational creation. One must hold on to this bond through holiness of life and submission to one another

All of these have many elements in common. There is an earthy and “empirical” side to the church, but its heavenly side is manifest in the Holy Spirit that floods this body with light, another term for grace. Through the sacraments and teaching, the end and purpose of human life is manifest as well as the methods by which it can be gained. Since there is only one truth and one God, there can be only one church. Truth is not just one concept among many, but is one of the terms Christ explicitly said of himself. The church, when used in the phrase “church and state” is thus the institutionalized presence of God that exists for the sake of healing a broken mankind.

The Orthodox Conception of the “State”

The state is more difficult. The church, while surely more than the bishops and more than a divine organism, remains the same throughout time. The present Orthodox idea of the church is the same as in the Apostolic Canons. It is a means for the healing of broken humanity. Certainly, this author will not pretend that “the state” can be defined here any more than “the church” can be. St. Isidore of Seville (d. 636) states:.

Every mark of power is not always useful, but only when it is properly borne. Now it is properly borne when it benefits the subjects over whom it is placed in worldly honor. Power is good which comes from God who grants it, that it may coerce evil by fear, not that it may freely commit evil itself. For nothing is worse than through power to have the liberty of sinning, nothing is more miserable than the power of doing evil (Parsons, 340)

Power is based on authority, two very different things. Power is the ability to coerce another. Authority is the right to do so. St. Isidore, writing in the era after the collapse of old Rome, primarily makes a utilitarian argument for the state. Happiness is found in justice, whether by the state or by the will. Power is used when it benefits the population, and this benefit can only be the destruction of sin. One might have the power to do evil, no one has the authority to do so.

Justinian's legal writings are impressive and remain influential. He writes in his famed Institutes:

Civil law is thus distinguished from the law of nations. Every community

governed by laws and customs uses partly its own law, partly laws common to all mankind. The law which a people makes for its own government belongs exclusively to that state and is called the civil law, as being the law of the particular state. But the law which natural reason appoints for all mankind obtains equally among all nations, because all nations make use of it. The people of Rome, then, are governed partly by their own laws, and partly by the laws which are common to all mankind. We will take notice of this distinction as occasion may arise (Watson, *Institutes of Justinian*, Bk 1, sec 2-1).

Natural law need not enforce uniformity. These are general axioms that make human life actually human. How these are manifest are almost infinitely variable. Since the needs of man are identical in that each must eat, drink and not die from exposure, natural law begins there. How this is carried out is of no concern to natural law, but is really in the domain of custom. Importantly, Justinian is clearly stating that ethnic tradition (that is, the law of nations rather than random assemblies of people) and linguistic unity are how the natural law is made manifest.

Also in the early medieval period, Alcuin writes to Charlemagne:

There have been up to this time three persons most highly placed: the apostolic sublimity which is wont to rule the seat of Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, by vicarious power. . . . Another is the imperial dignity, the secular power of the second Rome. . . . The third is the royal dignity in which the dispensation of Jesus Christ Our Lord has made you ruler of the Christian people greater in power than the other aforesaid dignities, more famous in wisdom, more sublime in ruling power. Lo, upon you the whole safety of the Churches of Christ reposes (Parsons, 342).

This is one of a few times western authors put the emperor above the church. There can be no church without the state, but there can be a state without a church. Such a view was overthrown by the papal ideology that developed in the absence of any functional Roman state. For Alcuin, the emperor (as distinguished from the state) is the ruler of all Christendom. He has more power than the pope and his bishops. Speaking of Charlemagne more specifically, he is to be more wise and more “sublime” in his use of power.

These examples are taken all from the same period of time, that when the notion of Roman authority was being revised in light of Christian teaching. Rome was the center of the world since it provided the backdrop for the Incarnation. The verses for the Nativity services state that the empire “unified the world” through laws and roads, and hence, Christ deliberately came into human flesh only when this unity was manifest.

The liturgical mention of the empire in the verses for the feast of the Incarnation have not been used explicitly to explain the symphony idea. The state is fundamental. Christ did not come except for a time when the law of the empire was one (in Justinian's sense) and its enforcement could be made much easier through a unified infrastructure. During Vespers on Christmas Eve, we read: “When Augustus reigned alone upon the earth, the many kingdoms of men came to an end. . . The cities of the world passe under one single rule; and the nations came to believe in the one single Godhead (Ware, 254). Justinian is making reference to this conception. It is not the negation of nations, but the cooperation and interaction among them so long as they share the

same faith. The customs of the people rule nations, but these are joined together under the emperor to form civilizations. These are nesting, “symphonic persona,” to use Karsavin's term.

Sobornost and Symphony in Orthodox Russia

Chalcedon is manifest in the social doctrine of “symphony” a term often used but always seemingly remaining in vague mists rather than concrete action. The classical Byzantine formula of this relationship is in the second half of the ninth part of the *Epanagoge*, “The temporal power and the priesthood relate to each other as body to soul, necessary for a normal order just as body and soul in a living man. In this connection and harmony of a society lies.” The same idea is also found in Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Synod: “The priest consecrates and strengthens the imperial power, and the imperial power, through fair laws, govern the earth.”

For moderns, this language will appear odd. The “priest” refers to all element's of the church's life: monasticism, lay piety, sacraments, liturgy, and the broad Christian culture of the realm. It is a universal in Plato's sense and refers to the Symbolic connection of heaven and earth. At the same time, the “temporal power” is one strictly Orthodox in its behavior. The modern concept of “state” did not exist, nor did the notion of “secular” meaning “worldly.” Neither the state nor the church are secular.

Metropolitan Plato (Levshin), during some of the darkest days in Russian Orthodox history, writes:

The Church and society are connected in such a way that one is different from the other only in attitude. Civil society is a union of people united by laws and the same form of government, but that this same society is also united by the collective observance of one form of worship and the same sacred rites, the Church (1772, speech on the birthday of Catherine II).

No doubt in speaking to this vapid, heretical tormentor of the Russian church, Plato has no choice but to deny Russian ethnicity altogether. A people united only by the “laws” can be any random group of people forced under the rule of an illegitimate queen. As Catherine was sending Orthodox clergy to the gallows for opposing her secularization of church lands and liquidation of hundreds of monasteries, the church had to be reduced to the worship of a single set of “sacred rights.” Only this sort of description could ever penetrated the sexual deviance and demonic frenzy of this “Empress.” Nevertheless, Plato's words are true: there is one God and one society under the same church. The state and the spiritual power, always using the terms broadly, serve the same end. It is only in their means that they differ.

AD Gradovsky writes:

The rights of the autocratic power relate only to church administration, and not the content of the positive side of the religion, such as doctrine or ritual. This is the same for the Orthodox Church and other faiths [in Russia]. . . The competence of the supreme legal authority is limited to those cases that affect the external side of church administration, that is, that they do not involve acts that define the heart of the universal church such as the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils (Gradovsky, 1875: 151-152).

So to the extent that the church affects the social body in some way, the state has rights over it. The church, Orthodox and otherwise, can come under the control of the crown only when it involves the social unit in a political, economic or legal way. Only doctrine and ritual are removed from its purview. Of course, this gets very sloppy in practice. The church is a deeply social and legal institution as much as the state promotes virtues with the aim of strengthening the spiritual life. One way of viewing this is to see the church as dealing with the “inner” elements of life while the state is concerned with the outer, “external: side.

This is a fairly generous view of the monarch's power. The problem with it is that the royal power has, in Orthodox states in the past, backed heresy as much as Orthodoxy. This is the case in Russia under Peter I and his successors as well as the first centuries of Byzantium. On the other hand, Professor NS Suvorov wrote in 1907 that

The highest authority in the Russian Orthodox Church belongs to the autocratic monarchy. This principle is clearly expressed in the Fundamental Laws of the Russian Empire, but this has been also a tradition inherited from the Greeks. The supreme autocratic power of Russian Emperor contains both state and church authority. The latter is carried out through the synod that justifies the emperor as head of state, has authority over the church located within the national territory. He personally must belong to the Orthodox church and, as Christian monarch, he is the supreme defender and custodian of the tenets of faith, the guardian of Orthodoxy (Suvorov, 1908: 229).

Under the circumstances, this was not written with a sense of irony. In no way can the “synod” be a canonical body. It has no relation to the older conception of a “synod” as identical to the “sobor.” It is not a “council” as in the west, but a state of being: to be of one mind. The “synod” of Peter I was initially called a “college” to differentiate it from the canonical body. Fearing its popular rejection, it was called a “synod” for what seems to be for the sake of deception.

E. Temnikov says the same as Suvorov above: “The emperor is the highest authority in the Russian Orthodox Church; his ecclesiastical authority is one aspect of the supreme power of the state. Russian laws do not know an independent, purely ecclesiastical authority” (Temnikov, 1909). The corrective to this error is granted by Firsov:

The contradiction between the religious and the political ideals can be considered not only a derivative of the abnormal church-state relations that existed in Russia, but also from the personal drama of the last monarch. The legends of the last emperor Nikolai II served as a compensation for this, especially given his mystical moods which remains interesting from a psychological point of view. It serves also as an “answer” to the question why Nikolai did not call a local council of the church. . . Creating an image of the Holy King is complemented by some non-confirmed rumors that Nikolai II wanted to resolve the issue of the church by taking on the burden of the Patriarchal service (Firsov, 2000: 78-79)

Now, tsar Nicholas was in deed a holy king and does not require rumors to explicate that. However, the general argument is correct in that Nikolai inherited a bizarre and totally non-

canonical church structure that oversaw the persecution and decline of the church in the 18th century and into the 19th.

Bishop Basil (Rodzianko) testified: The Emperor Nicholas Alexandrovich was a deeply religious person and a devotee of the Church, and that we know from many, many testimonies. . . It is a known fact that before the revolution, [Nikolai] had dreamed of abdication, but a very different quality. Once the children grew up, Nikolai was intending to enter a monastery for the sake of serving Russia as Patriarch. . . Nikolai spoke of this and I know from my grandfather. This is why he wanted to convene the local council (Rodzianko, 1999).

Fr. Vitaly Kuznetsov reminds us that Emperor John Comnenus insisted that the two powers are very different from one another. He does use the term “symphony” however when dealing with their interaction and uses the example of “Martha and Mary” to explain. When the relations are hostile, nothing but evil can ensure.¹ Like the nature of Christ itself, the human element cannot be dominated. It must of its own will follow Christ.

Seraphim Sobolev argues forcefully that the Byzantine emperors were not involved in dogmatic disputes at the conciliar level. St. Constantine's example became the norm. It is easy to forget that many, many emperors in the first millennium were overtly hostile to Orthodoxy and in Russia, the open Satanist Peter I and his whore-slut “Catherine I” broke the Romanov line. The church was reduced to very little (and in Ukraine, almost nothing) by the end of the 18th century.

On the other hand, the church, since the fall of the monarchy in Russia, has shown it to be incapable of self-government. It is remarkable that the crown (quite distinct from the state), regardless of its errors in other matters, has not attempted to attack doctrine directly. Only liberalism has had that level of audacity.

The 19th century saints of the Russian church have been almost unanimous in the condemnation of this bizarre body and its purpose, which was to harm and weaken the church. Third, Peter the Great and his 18th century successors – save Elizabeth – were not Orthodox monarchs and had no legal legitimacy according to the “Fundamental Laws” of the empire. A perfunctory “conversion,” such as those done by “Catherine I the Whore,” the “two Annas,” Peter III and Catherine II are acts of blasphemy rather than sincere conversions to the faith. Peter himself was a Freemason, automatically barring him from holding the throne of Russia. It is no accident that Peter passed a “law” that allowed there to be no succession law. Anyone can be “tsar of Russia.”

Under Catherine the Whore and the two Annas, there was no “emperor” and the country was placed under foreign control, the “Bironschina.” Ernst Johann von Biron and Ostermann were both Masons who ruthlessly persecuted the church. Hence, Suvorov's comments are useless and irrelevant. The real problem is how Orthodox traditionalists deal with this information. If Patriarch Sergius is Illegitimate because he willingly served an atheist state bent on destroying Christianity, then so are all those who willingly served these false emperors and impostors. They are in a quandary. Generally, they ignore the issue.

Archbishop Ambrose of Petrograd wrote on the Petrine era:

1 (Quoted from Fr. Vitaly Kuznetsov. St. Justinian's Theory of the Symphony of Powers <http://ilya-prorok.org/information/ilinskij-vestnik/izbrannye-materialy/teoriya-simfonii-sv-yustiniana.html?limitstart=0>). Kuznetsov, Igor (2012). Political Traditions of the Russian Government and the Principles of Constitutionalism. The World and Politics, 2012 <http://www.intelros.ru/readroom/mir-i-politika/m12-2012/17332-politicheskie-tradicii-rossiyskoy-gosudarstvennoy-vlasti-i-principy-konstitucionalizma.html>

These [Biron, Ostermann, etc] are enemies. . . obscene and destructive of the church. They see it as a superstition to eradicate. Many of the clergy have been destroyed, monks tortured and tormented; they will use any pretext to destroy the priesthood. . . .any pretext will do so as to beat, ruin, eradicate and annihilate the church from these godless robbers of the state treasury.

Terms like “Caeseropapism” are misnomers, used by lazy people to refer to phenomenon they only dimly understand. Making “Caesar,” “the state,” “the crown” and “the secular power” equivalent is too absurd to even begin to call down heavenly wrath. Yet, this is normal conceptual analysis today. In Peter's case, he literally adopted the Roman, pagan motifs in his rule and dedicated himself to eliminating the Orthodox church as part of Russian life.

Sobolev very importantly speaks against the Judaizing heresy, a heresy that suddenly has ceased to exist among the neo-Orthodox. Not only was this dark Gnosticism that not a single American historian in the universities understands. Anathematized in no fewer than three synods of the Orthodox church *in* Novgorod in the early 16th century, it was more than a heresy, but it was also treason against the state given the economic and social attacks on Russia's sovereignty it entailed. In reality, there are no distinctions between the facts of government, that of economics and that of religion, since our lives are never neatly packaged in such convenient tubes. Heresy has always entailed a strong political and economic origin and purpose, and not the least of which was that of the Jewish-Kabbalah-Gnostic and its ties to international financial capital in the 15th century. Here, the crown (not the state) oversaw the social and political elements of the issue, while the metropolitans of Novgorod dealt with the niceties of theology.²

The State as a Religious Body

A. Zimin, in his “Symphony of Powers” suggests that there are four ingredients to a healthy state of harmony. The first is that the state power has to be legitimate. If it leans towards aristocracy, the symphony is broken when it becomes oligarchy. It is not the crown therefore, but rather the state as a constitution that is working with the church. Second, that there be a great degree of civic association and competence. Third, the church, most of all, must remain faithful to not only doctrine, but behavior. His view is that social evil comes from human beings that over-stresses one sphere at the expense of another. It is an imperialist mentality that seeks to control all things (Zimin, 2013).

The Emperors Basil, Leo and Alexander stated that the “sovereign power” is legitimate over the “common good of citizens.” They say:

[The state], in its activities, it should be guided by the Holy Scriptures, the definitions of the seven Ecumenical Councils and Roman law. He must be firm in Orthodoxy and the religious zeal must exceed all [including all priests]. His explanation of the law needs to coincide with that of custom unless it be contrary to the canons. . . .”

The position of the emperor in this view is a religious and ascetic one. The emperor is a

2 Keep in mind that the support of Judaic causes, the Kabbalah and Zionism all of which were a part of these three synods in Russia) are heresies leading to excommunication and, conditions permitting, death.
<http://www.vizantarm.am/page.php?331>

special sort of bishop who rules by example rather than coercion. Custom is just an expression of natural law, one that is based on a specific people, but with the same essence. “The political” was quite different from the modern conception. Law in the ancient and medieval worlds was not made but discovered and clarified. The Bishop of Dalmatia, Nikodim Milas writes in 1897 that

The powers of the King of God's people, Israel, differ substantially from the authority of the kings of other peoples and states. It is the king that builds the symphonic relationship between the priesthood of his kingdom and God's kingdom.

The emperor as head of state is the supreme patron and protector of the Church in public and civil law. But as a member of the Church, he is subject to its laws on a par with his subjects. . . The Emperor supports the unity of the internal life of the Church, and elevates the dogmatic definition of councils as part of civil law. He punishes heretics and schismatics as state criminals. In matters of church government, the emperor has the right to convene councils and the right to approve to the higher clergy (as choosing one of three candidates chosen by the synod). . . He has the right to monitor the overall progress of church affairs, especially the behavior of clergy and, finally, the right of legislation for the church in the spirit and on the basis of canons as a means to explain and enforce them.

This certainly means that no heterodox ruler can be legitimate in Russia. The tsar is primarily a religious figure whose main purpose is to keep the church close to its canonical foundation. The church provided the content while the civil law provided the form. This is similar to the view of Russian monarch Lev Tikhomirov:

The importance of the Russian tsar is found in its position relative to the worldly problems of Christianity. “All authority is from God” our Church teaches, but the Russian tsar has a particular importance, distinguishing it from other rulers in the world. He is not only the Emperor of the country and the leader of his nation, he is also the guardian and protector of the Orthodox Church. The church does not know of any earthly Vicar and has renounced any action save the spiritual realm. The tsar is in charge of the church's earthly well-being and is thus consecrated by her as the leader of the Orthodox people. The Russian tsar is far more than just the heir of his ancestors, he is also the successor to the Caesars of Rome in the East who were the organizers of the Church synods that established very symbol of the Christian faith. With the fall of Byzantium, Moscow rose. From this comes Russian greatness (Tikhomirov, 1905: 129-130)

The nature of the relationship between state and church in Byzantium is extremely important for understanding the nature and character of the influence of Byzantium on Russia. Russian-language historians of been of two minds on this issue: The first suggests that no symphony existed as the ecclesiastical authority unquestioningly obeyed the unrestricted temporal power. This implies that the emperor served as the de facto head of the church.

Karsavin, NS Trubetskoy and NN Alexeyev outlined the concept of the “Symphonic Personality” (Симфоническая личность). It became an essential element in Russian national and Eurasianist thought. It envisions the social body as a single whole, reflecting the unity of God. However, as the Trinity is three persons within a single substance, so too the social body is split into different functions, practices, that are required for any sort of life.

The doctrine of Chalcedon demands that the communities freely and voluntarily serve the common good and cooperate based on natural affinity rather than coercion. The divine and human natures in Christ did not contract each other, as any creator-creation relationship would. To deny this would be tantamount to heresy, since it would imply that the pattern of Christ's very hypostasis is not significant enough to be manifest in social life.

One of the great myths of modernity is individualism, which comes from the evil of nominalism, the root cause of spiritual death. Nominalism is the belief that words and symbols bear no intrinsic relation to their referents. This seemingly academic concern contains within it the seeds of civilizational death. Industrialism, positivism, Marxism and capitalism would be impossible without the severance of man's culture from the spiritual realm. Definitions are abbreviations, the nominalist says, of a more or less arbitrary grouping of things into classes for the sake of convenience. Language therefore, is the product of utility and thus, has a life of its own. It does not reflect reality but creates it, since these classes only have existence because a society says it does. If reality is created by words, and words do not bear a relation to their referents, then those who control language and communication control what is considered “real.” The universal is no more than this. This author has exhaustively treated this topic elsewhere and will not digress any further.

Individualism in its western form bears no relation to the autonomous acts of the person. These are two very different things. Freedom is to the individual as autonomy is to the person. The isolated ego is worthless. It is born helpless and is raised in a world created by others. In a healthy society, learning the folkways of daily life should not be in any contradiction to human nature.

The Trinity is the ontological ground of being. Its imprint can be found in all creation and thought. The creation of man was a desire of God to manifest this beauty in many creatures with the reason to understand it. However, reason implies autonomy, and man sought short term power at the expense of more ethereal, but less vivid, pleasures. Nominalism was the epitome of this rebellion but Descartes gave it its finishing touches. The ego becomes the self and it is imprisoned in Being – this it takes to be rational, ordered and amenable to manipulation. This is quite a bit to be “deduced” from the cogito.

This ego, that which is essential to liberal thought, is the source and foundation of sin. In the nation, two people united by language and a fundamental agreement on basic moral norms do not create an “I” over and against an “other.” Rather, they create a “we.” The word, that icon of meaning and national tradition over centuries, is the vehicle for this. The word is infinitely more than a vocabulary list or set of definitions, but it contains the entire legal and political history of the people.

Political Theology

St. Photius of Constantinople connects the filioque with the collapse of symphony. It was, in a sense, the origin of the arcane “killing of the king” ritual that is essential to western liberalism. The ancient grasp of the Trinity was an idea with political connotations. The Father was the

source of all. The filioque implies the Father is no longer dominant, but shares this authority with the son. When father and son are equal in their creation of the spirit, hierarchy is destroyed, the mass is born. In Photius' mind, the filioque places essence over being.

The essence of the Symphony is mutual cooperation, mutual support and mutual responsibility, without invading the competence of one within the exclusive competence of the other. The bishop obeys the state as a subject and citizen. Similarly, the government official obeys his bishop, as a member of the Church, as a sinful man. The authority of one does not derive from the other. The state in such a symphonic relationship seeks the church's moral, spiritual support. The Church receives from the state the creation of conditions that are conducive to the gospel and for the spiritual care of the population.

The Metropolitan Ioann of St. Petersburg treats the idea of symphony as the groundwork of all Russian and Orthodox political theory. It implies that this balance is needed to foster a general consensus on the basic questions of human life. Yet, the authority that puts this into action must be legitimate. It must be Orthodox and accept the canons of the church as normative. The state must have a spiritual content that alone gives it legitimacy. The "human" side of this equation is about balancing interests and classes in society to form the General Will or common good. All of this, of course, has to be based on a strong linguistic unity (Snychev, 1998: 160-161).

The symphony of powers requires the "unity of the religious and moral principles" in a single general consensus of action. This fundamental agreement is absolutely essential for even the most rudimentary consensus to emerge. Further, the state itself must be a unified force around a monarchy and chosen council. It cannot be divided among hundreds of local representatives or regional interests. Unity comes first. Third, the church – the spiritual power – must also be unified. It is an ascetic authority and never a coercive power. Given this, Metropolitan Ioann describes the symphony idea like this as a form of "joint action in the service of the common good. The Scriptures lay this out. It is a pledge for social order and equity. . . . Each half of this unity must be integral and unified. There is a single divine source, but two separate and independent fields" (Snychev, 1998: 158).

In Russia, the symphony, deriving from the sobor, can be reduced to two things.

God wants to entrust the preservation of the truths of revelation necessary for the salvation of men, in specific kingdoms, chosen by Him for reasons unknown. In Old Testament times, this ministry was entrusted to Israel. In the New Testament it is consistently entrusted to the three kingdoms. Initially, the Rome as the capital of the world at the time of early Christianity. Having fallen into heresy, the Latins were removed from this office and it was granted to Orthodox Constantinople, the "second Rome" of the Middle Ages. It was eliminated due to selfish political calculations which destroyed the purity of faith, accepting the union with heretics, the Roman Catholics at the Council of Florence in 1439; her ministry was removed from her and this went to Moscow, the capital of the Russian Orthodox kingdom as the Third Rome. . . .

For this mission to be accepted, a new organization of the Church, society and the state is required. This godly organization is the autocracy. The Tsar is God's anointed. He is not "limited" in his autocratic prerogatives except the nature of the service itself. The Gospel is the "Constitution" of the autocracy. The Orthodox

Tsar is the personification of God's chosen people and their God-bearing mission. He is the guardian of the Third Rome (Synchev, 1998: 23-25).

In the political work of St. Epiphanius the Wise, the elements of the symphony of powers are discovered as the ground of legitimacy. The monarch's service to the church is the first. The crown is a monastic calling and primarily a religion office. Importantly, the role of the restrainer is mentioned. The Russian is держатель (or "holder") in that he "holds" the line against the Antichrist. This is connected to his role as protector of the land against heretics and nomadic invaders. This of course, includes heretics and other enemies of order.

The Archbishop is the shepherd and the guardian of souls. He is responsible before God not only for outward decorum, but also the inner state of the people. St. Epiphanius explicitly speaks of the harmony and mutual balancing of powers both secular and ecclesiastical.

Conclusion: Two Natures, Two Authorities

Antony, the patriarch of Constantinople, in his message to the Grand Duke of Moscow Vasily Dmitrievich, instructed the Russian ruler, revealing to him the meaning of the Christian empire: "The holy King holds a high place in the Church" the patriarch states, "emperors called the ecumenical councils; they also confirmed their laws in respect of the civil law for the improvement of Christian life to labor against heresy; and emperors set the bounds of dioceses and created basic administrative procedure for the bishops" (from Synchev, 1998: 170-173).

The idea of symphony derives directly from the idea of sobornost.' Florensky compares it to a folk ensemble, where the singers are not necessarily following a strictly written out composition, but can be flexible and inventive with certain aspects. However, given the basic understanding of all the singers, adjustment to this sort of creativity is easy and organic. Ivanov connected it to the symbols of Dionysus and Apollo: the latter was the form, the limit or the rule in writing. The former was the content, the "grace" that is present only partly abbreviated by the expression in word.

For Khomiakov, the sobor, the common good as manifest in various practices in context, is the very measure of truth. Berdyaev suggests that this concept refers to the inner life of the church as sobor, while its outer, "institutional" life being merely empirical and imperfect. Bulgakov argues that the person, as distinct from the individual, is implied in any rich notion of the common good, the fundamental consensus crated by tradition and experience. The fall creates multiplicity and fragmentation, it is the origin of both egocentrism and collectivism. Only the sobor can produce or even recognize the person.

Bibliography

Pavlenko, V (2012). Byzantium and Russia: The Spiritual and Historical Heritage. The Observer
<http://rossiyanavsegda.ru/read/1003/>

Shpidlik, T. The Russian Idea as a New Vision of Man.

Lubov, K. (2008) The Symphony of Powers in Byzantium: The Experience of Interaction between the State and the Church. The Publishing House of the Ural Legal Institute of the Ministry of Interior of Russia, Yekaterinburg, 8: 29-35
<http://www.bogoslov.ru/text/1609881.html>

Zaitsev, K Arch (1994) The Russian Empire and Holy Rus. Literary Studies

Goldberg A (1974) Three “Messages of Philotheus”(Textual Analysis). Proceedings of the Department of Old Russian Literature, 29 Leningrad

Zimin A (1953) The Political Doctrine of Joseph of Volokolamsk. Proceedings of the Department of Ancient Russian Literature 9

Zimin, A (2013) “Symphony of Authorities” History of Russia until 1917.
http://russiahistory.ru/simfoniya_vlastey/

Snychev, John Metropolitan (1998), Russian Symphony. Essays on Russian Philosophy of History. St. Petersburg

Kazakova N (1970) Essays on the History of Russian Social Thought. The First Third of the XVI Century. Leningrad

Kartashov A., Essays on the History of the Russian Church, vols. 1-2, Moscow, 1991.

Skrynnikov R. (1991) State and Church in Russia XIV-XVI Centuries. Novosibirsk

Medlin W (1952) Moscow and East Rome. A Study of the Political Relations of Church and State in Muscovite Russia. Neuchatel

Gradovsky AD (1875). The Origin of the Russian Legal State. St. Petersburg, vol I

Tikhomirov LA (1905) *The Monarchical State*. Moscow.

Suvorov, NS (1908) *Textbook of Canon Law*. Moscow

Vidya, R (1998) *Masons and Jews in Russian History*

Temnikov, E (1909) *The Position of the Emperor of Russia in the Russian Orthodox Church and the Doctrine of Ecclesiastical Power*. Yaroslavl

Rodzianko, Bp. Basil (1999) *On the Emperor Nicholas II*. *Orthodox Moscow*, 29-30, 10

Firsov SL (2000) *The Synodal Model of Church-State relations*. *Historical Bulletin*, 5-6

Maximovich, John Abp. (nd) *The Church as the Body of Christ*, translated by George Lardas. The Orthodox Christian Information Center
http://orthodoxinfo.com/general/stjohn_church.aspx

Orthodox Life, July-August 1970, 4: 4-29

Watson, Alan, ed (1998). *The Digest of Justinian, Revised English-language Edition*. University of Pennsylvania Press (Two volumes)

Gray, John (2005) *The Legacy of Chalcedon: Christological Problems and their Significance*. In Mass (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge University Press, 215-238

Parsons, W (1940) *The Influence of Romans XIII on Christian Political Thought*. *Theological Studies* 1(4): 337-364

Ware, K, ed (1998) *The Festal Menaion*. St. Tikhon's Seminary Press

Pozamansky, M. *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*. St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood Press, 1994