

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE «AN ORIGENIST»? A CASE OF ALEKSEY KHOMYAKOV¹

Aleksey Kamenskikh – Vasiliy Kamenskikh

DOI: 10.17846/CL.2022.15.2.139-148

Abstract: KAMENSKIKH, Aleksey – KAMENSKIKH, Vasiliy. *What Does It Mean to be «an Origenist»? A Case of Aleksey Khomyakov.* The article discusses the hypothesis about alleged «Origenism» of Aleksey Khomyakov, one of the leaders of Slavophile movement in 19th-century Russia. Two versions of this hypothesis, “a strong” and “a weak” one, were offered by Basil (Vadim) Lourié in his works of 1994 and 2020.

For clarification of this hypothesis’ “conceptual context” an attempt was made to discern and conceptualize two main approaches in studies on forms of intellectual heritage reception of Origen of Alexandria, first of all in Russia. The first approach can with some degree of convenience be called “realist”: Origenism within it is considered as some stable philosophical or theological position, interpreted in an extremely broad manner – as a kind of sharp platonization of Christianity, or as an attempt at free philosophizing within Christian tradition. In frameworks of this approach, reception of any element of Origenism by a later thinker intends him accept all the position, makes him an “Origenist” and a Platonist.

Unlike this “realist” approach, the “nominalist” one assumes to consider intellectual heritage of Origen of Alexandria as a complex set of theological and philosophical hypotheses, peculiarities of style – and the personality of the Alexandrian thinker. This approach demands much more delicate treatment of the terms “Origenist” and “Origenism”.

Applied to B. Lourié’s hypothesis about Aleksey Khomyakov’s Origenism, this distinguishing interprets “the strong” version of the hypothesis as “extremely realistic” and “the weak” version as a form of moderate realism, much more nuanced and historically correct. This version states the importance which had an image of Origen’s doctrine framed by August Neander in the second volume of his “General History of the Christian Religion and Church” (1843) for Khomyakov’s theological and philosophical views.

Keywords: *Aleksey Khomyakov, Origen of Alexandria, Platonism, Russian philosophy, Slavophiles*

A historian can discern in Russian thought a *doxa* that emerged at least at the last decade of the 19th century and used the name of Origen of Alexandria as a generic term commensurate with almost the entire tradition of Christian philosophy, or at least the tradition of Christian Platonism. For example, in 1895 Amphian Lebedev in a paper devoted to philosophical and theological ideas of a Ukrainian philosopher Gregory Skovoroda directly related these ideas to the tradition of ante-Nicene Alexandrian Christianity (Lebedev 1895). Likewise, some years later Alexander Nikolsky called Vladimir Soloviev “a Russian Origen of the 19th century” (Nikolsky 1902). In fact, arguments used by Nikolsky to prove this comparison are not compelling enough². Origen’s name is used as

¹ The present study is a part of a larger project Nr. 20-68-46021, “Slavophilism in religious and philosophical dialogue,” implemented with a financial support of the Russian Science Foundation.

² See the list of these arguments A. Nikolsky (1902, 24.480-483). Critical analysis of Nikolsky’s arguments gives Aleksey Losev (1990, 171-178).

a generic term by Nicolay Berdyaev (1874 – 1948), a famous Russian Christian existentialist: in a series of works (Berdyaev 1992; Berdyaev 1994, 175; Baranova-Shestova, ed. 1981, 304; Berdyaev 1990, 283)³ the philosopher postulates existence of “Origen’s line” in history of the Christian thought. For Berdyaev, in speculative dimension the notion of this “line” coincides with the possibility of free philosophizing inside the Christian tradition, in ethical and eschatological – with the doctrine of universal salvation: Berdyaev postulates that Origen elaborated the only ethically acceptable version of Christian eschatology “quite free of the sadistic element” (Berdyaev 1990, 283). The example of contemporary historian of philosophy Tatiana Rezvykh, who treats “Origenism” as a slightly Christianized version of (Neo-)Platonism and interprets it so broadly that even the poet Mikhail Lermontov is numbered among the “Origenists” (Rezvykh 2010, 293-295), demonstrates vitality of this *doxa*. Perhaps, such examples of the overly loose use of the term “Origenism” would not deserve to be mentioned, if the real significance of Origen’s ideas for a number of Russian thinkers⁴ did not compel us to raise the question of rigorous methodological tools that would allow us to explore the historical forms of reception of Origen’s intellectual heritage in Russia.

These words are fully relevant to a hypothesis about the reception of Origen’s ideas by Aleksey Khomyakov (1804 – 1860), one of the leaders of the Slavophiles movement. The hypothesis was offered by prof. Basil (Vadim) Lourié in 1994 and 2020 (Lourié 1994) and in commentaries to editions of Khomyakov’s theological writings (Khomyakov 1994; Khomyakov 2020). In this short paper we offer our analysis of this hypothesis and estimation of arguments put for its proof.

METHODOLOGICAL PRELIMINARIES

Before embarking on a discussion of this hypothesis, it is probably worth making a number of general remarks. In order to avoid hasty and imprecise judgments, discussing the history of the reception of the intellectual heritage of Origen of Alexandria in Russian philosophy and theology, it seems reasonable to take into account several questions in each specific case:

1. What are the degree and sources of acquaintance of this Russian author with Origen’s texts? (At the same time, it is clear that the relatively late appearance of Russian translations of Origen’s works⁵ cannot be regarded as an insurmountable obstacle to such acquaintance: for example, it is known that some of Origen’s works were in the personal library of Gregory Skovoroda⁶.)

³ Remarkably, that in the years when Nicolay Berdyaev identifies himself as an “Origenist” – in following the tradition of Christian “religious and philosophical Gnosis” (the letter to Zinaida Gippius, March 1906 – see Berdyaev 1992, 299) and in the accepting of Origen’s idea of universal salvation (the letter to Leo Shestov, April 1924 – see Baranova-Shestova 1983, 290) – he works on the book about Aleksey Khomyakov, in which characterizes the Slavophile thinker as the founder of tradition of original Russian religious philosophy, the predecessor of Feodor Dostoevsky – and of Berdyaev himself (“Khomyakov’s truth passed through Dostoevsky and Soloviev and reached us in a creatively transformed form”, Berdyaev 2007, 437).

⁴ We can mention here an early work by Paul Florensky (1904) “Origen’s Περὶ ἀρχῶν as a metaphysical treatise” (Florensky 2005), importance of “the Origen’s line” for philosophical self-determination of Nicolay Berdyaev, using the category ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων – rare in works of Vladimir Soloviev (1912, 77; 1914, 220) and having principal significance in writings of Sergey Durylin (Reznichenko 2010, 442-455), and in later works of Sergiy Bulgakov (1945; 1948), and so on.

⁵ It’s not wonderful that *De principiis* became the first of Origen’s works translated into Russian. The commented translation by Nicolay Petrov (1899) was published by Kazan’ spiritual academy in 1899. Sadly, the publication, which was conceived as a multivolume, stopped at the first volume.

⁶ See M. Kovalinsky (1894, 14).

2. *In what form* was this reception carried out? Thus, we have to distinguish between academic studies of Origen's works in Russia (alas, relatively few)⁷ and various forms of "Russian Origenism" (examples of which can be found in a number of works by Vladimir Soloviev, Sergiy Bulgakov, Nicolay Berdyaev), when Origen's or quasi-Origen's concepts were included into the circle of ideas of one or another Russian author.

3. What are "the markers of Origenism" in the works of one or another author? For example, researchers who postulate "Origenism" of Gregory Skovoroda prove this statement, as a rule, by similarity of the Bible exegesis method, used by the Ukrainian philosopher, with one of Origen. Likewise, Sergiy Bulgakov avoids to mention Origen's name, but founded the eschatological tenets of his later works on the idea of apokatastasis, and so on.

4. Finally, in the history of the reception of Origenism in Russia, a scholar has to take into account the plots linked with the perception of a certain thinker as an Origenist, despite the fact that the actual influence of Origen's ideas on his thought is at least controversial. The latter can be said, again, about Gregory Skovoroda⁸.

HYPOTHESIS OF A. KHOMYAKOV'S ORIGENISM: A "STRONG VERSION"

All these questions we should take into account during the discussion of B. Lourié's hypothesis on "Origenism" of Aleksey Khomyakov. First of all, this hypothesis is presented in two versions, of 1994 and 2020. In the article "Dogmatic ideas of A.S. Khomyakov" (Lourié 1994), the author sums up the work on the commentary on the theological works of the famous Slavophile and firstly postulates the thesis that Khomyakov makes a theological choice, which places his own theological thought in the field of Origenism. This, according to Lourié, is evidenced already by the first theological works of Khomyakov, published in 1844 and 1846 (the second letter to Palmer and a small treatise "The Church is One"). B. Lourié states that Khomyakov's "Origenism" becomes especially noticeable in the works of the mid and second half of the 1850s – "A few words of an Orthodox Christian about the Western confessions: on one epistle of the Archbishop of Paris (1855)" (the so-called "Brochure II")⁹ and "A few more words of an Orthodox Christian about the Western confessions: on different Latin and Protestant writings on the subjects of faith (1858)" (the so-called "Brochure III")¹⁰.

It is important to notice that Basil Lourié treats the term "Origenism" for a stable metahistorical philosophical and theological position, interpreted in an extremely broad manner – as a form of sharply platonized Christianity; moreover, reception of any element of "Origenism" interpreted in this sense, by a later thinker (Aleksey Khomyakov, in our case) intends him accept *all the position*, makes him an "Origenist" and a Platonist: "Any doctrine, becoming close to the Church, also falls into a special typological series and acquires in it a historical kinship of which its creators are not usually aware" (Lourié 1994, 164). Thus, Lourié finds the evidence of Khomyakov's "Origenism"¹¹ in his interpretation of faith (through which a connection is established between man and the

⁷ The first Russian academic research devoted to Origen was the dissertation "Origen's Teaching about the Holy Trinity" by Vasilij Bolotov (1879).

⁸ Statements about "Origenism" of Skovoroda see Lebedev (1895, 170-177); Ern (1912, 64); Men' (2002, 125); Shpet (2008, 115); Malinov (2013, 297-320). The critical analysis of these statements see Kamenskikh (2015, 446-450).

⁹ See Khomyakov (1886a).

¹⁰ See Khomyakov (1886b).

¹¹ Twenty-five years after been shaped in B. Lourié's works of 1994, this "strong version of Khomyakov's Origenism" was accepted and supported by Lubov Petrova in her (Petrova 2019).

Church) as a “moral principle” and in the subsequent deification and ontologization of this “morality”. Since Jesus is interpreted by Khomyakov as “the completely moral being”, it seems fair to interpret the “lack of manifestation” of the moral principle in empiric existence of humans and angels as a measure of their imperfection and to conclude about the necessary sinfulness of humans and angels, which – quantitatively but not qualitatively, – distinguishes them from God (Lourié 1994, 163): “factually, angels and humans are some degrees of the Deity’s degradation; and their participation in the Church is their striving for the unattainable limit of perfection”. In turn, the idea about the “lack of morality”, immanent to human and angelic existence, in comparison with God, leads, according to Lourié, to the thesis of universal angelic-human corporeality: in such a way, the degrees of corporeality correspond with the degrees of sinfulness. So, in accordance with the hypothesis about Khomyakov’s “Origenism” shaped by B. Lourié in 1994, “if sin could disappear completely, then there would be no difference between the Creator and the creature: this outlines the conclusion about the inseparability of creation and sinfulness, elaborated in Brochure III” (Lourié 1994, 165).

We would take the liberty of characterizing this 1994 hypothesis as “a strong version of Khomyakov’s Origenism”. It is logical in its own way, internally consistent, but vulnerable to criticism. Origen, allegedly echoed by Khomyakov, appears here as an almost pure Neoplatonist: “Origen kept the pagan (Neoplatonic) perception of world and man as a kind of scattering of a single god, who alone is a true individual (“henas”); the very idea of the existence of a human person in such a system does not arise” (Lourié 1994, 164)¹². Meanwhile – considering, of course, that in the third century, of all Christian authors who tried to think philosophically and at the same time be completely free from Platonism, it was, perhaps, only Tertullian who succeeded in it¹³, – the Platonic or Neoplatonic interpretation of Origen’s doctrine looks rather controversial¹⁴. In Origen’s writings there is no trace of the doctrine of emanation; Origen’s “idea of the existence of a human person” is formulated in an extremely clear way in his doctrine of freedom of choice, which exactly Origen introduced into the circle of Christian thought (Origen. *De principiis*. 3.1¹⁵). The belief in the “individuality of created beings” is so significant for Origen that he subordinates his entire cosmology and eschatology to it.

B. Lourié’s judgment of Origen’s eschatology¹⁶, which allegedly postulates “the doctrine of the identity of “the end” and “the beginning”, reducing our salvation only to cleansing from sins” is also vulnerable to criticism. First of all, Origen does not postulate such an identity, he emphasizes the impossibility of a new fall, which makes it incorrect to identify “the end” and “the beginning” – thus, salvation is not reduced only to cleansing from sins, “learning” is added to it¹⁷. Especially important is the interpretation by Origen of “image” and “likeness” according to which the human

¹² See also Lourié (1994,170): “Origen [...] did not believe in individuality of created beings”.

¹³ It could be noticed that with regard to Tertullian’s philosophical experiments, one has to often agree with Etienne Gilson’s assessment about mutual hostility of the African thinker and philosophy (Gilson 1954, 45).

¹⁴ Mark Edwards formulates perhaps the most convincing arguments for considering Origen of Alexandria as an *anti-Platonist* (Edwards 2002). Cf., however, the objections of Ilaria Ramelli, who in her recent article returns to the seemingly disproved hypothesis of the identity of Origen of Alexandria and Origen the Neoplatonist (Ramelli 2017).

¹⁵ Basil the Great then included these chapters of Origen’s treatise in his *Philocalia*.

¹⁶ In a commentary to Khomyakov’s third French brochure (Khomyakov 1994, 395-396).

¹⁷ It’s important to compare the description of “celestial universities” in *De principiis*, 2.11.6-7 (Origène 1978, 364) with pedagogical and therapeutic interpretation of torment in Hell, *De principiis*, 2.10.5-6 (Origène 1978, 384-391).

is created, in Genesis 1:26-27¹⁸: “man received the honor of God’s image in his first creation, whereas the perfection of God’s likeness was reserved for him at the consummation [...] Man should acquire it for himself by his own earnest efforts to imitate God, so that while the possibility of attaining perfection was given to him in the beginning through the honor of the “image”, he should in the end through the accomplishment of these works obtain for himself the perfect “likeness”¹⁹. Similar understanding of Origen’s interpretation of “God’s image”, which is correlated with the act of creation of rational spirits in the beginning of the world, and “likeness” which is the ultimate aim of this process we find also in Henri Crouzel’s work (Crouzel 1989, 92-98). Cited above, B. Lourié’s thesis “if sin could disappear completely, then there would be no difference between the Creator and the creature: this outlines the conclusion about the inseparability of creation and sinfulness, elaborated in Brochure III” is also to be estimated as too simplified interpretation of Origen’s doctrine. In the texts of Origen, the difference between God and the totality of created minds is quite clearly postulated; this difference precedes the cosmogonic fall and cannot be removed by the final apocatastasis.

Thus, the “strong version of Khomyakov’s Origenism” should probably be characterized as a variant of the old *doxa* using the term “Origenism” as a generic notion; moreover, this “generic notion” has some kind of reality and can power to turn into “an Origenist” any thinker who submits himself to inner logic of this metahistorical intellectual position. In such a way, Lourié’s “strong version of Khomyakov’s Origenism” manifests itself as a kind of “universalist approach” in intellectual history studies. Perhaps, it ought to be understood as somewhat artificial (excessively strong) – together with the hypothesis about Khomyakov’s «Origenism» itself – if not for the recent research by Basil Lourié.

A “WEAK” VERSION OF A. KHOMYAKOV’S ORIGENISM

In commentaries to a new edition of A. Khomyakov’s theological works (Khomyakov 2020, 444-505, 601-751) B. Lourié formulates a hypothesis which can be characterized as “a weak version of Khomyakov’s Origenism”. This version is much more nuanced and free from overly straightforward judgments about the “spirit of the system” of Origenism, although it is not completely free from them. So, we cannot agree with interpretation as undoubtedly Origenistic (Khomyakov 2020, 504-505) Khomyakov’s statement about the body of the Church, which in resurrection “will be similar to corporeality of angels” (§ 10 of Khomyakov’s treatise “Church is One”). Really, Origen believed in corporeality of angels, and doctrine of “common corporeality” of angels and humans had principal importance for him: that or another degree of “corporeality” is a general characteristic of all created beings, corrupted by the initial fall in more or less degree. But we do not find in Origen’s writings the statement about reception of *angelic corporeality* by humankind in the resurrection: according to Origen, in the universal restoration angels themselves will be transformed (since their current corporeality is the result of their fallen state)²⁰.

The discovery of the most probable source of Khomyakov’s «Origenism» by B. Lourié in 2020 can be considered as an undoubtedly valuable find. The author finds the source in the second volume of “General History of the Christian Religion and Church” (1843) by August Neander²¹. The fact that Khomyakov was familiar with this edition and used it is evidenced by direct quotations in

¹⁸ Origen. De principiis 3.6.1.11-40 (18-25 especially). See Origène (1980, 236-239).

¹⁹ Translation of G.W. Butterworth (Origen 2013, 321-322).

²⁰ Origen. De principiis 3.6.8-9 (Origène 1980, 250-255).

²¹ See Neander (1843, 1070-1087, 1196-1231).

other works of the Russian philosopher (so called “The first French brochure”, Khomyakov 2020, 29-144).

Two important arguments put forward by Lurié merit attention:

1) Khomyakov in his “The second brochure” says that the creation of the sensible world precedes the universal fall – but Neander considers this very concept to be the original teaching of Origen and devotes a special extensive note to this issue (Neander 1843, 1076-1077)²².

2) Origen’s doctrine of the fall of “minds” is expounded by Neander (1076-1078) using the characteristic vocabulary that will be preserved in Khomyakov: in Neander in German “minds” – *Intelligenzen*, in Khomyakov in French – *intelligences* (in Origen in Greek was *νόες*, in the Latin translation of Rufinus – *intellectus*). If Khomyakov had not been guided by Neander, then it is quite (or even more) likely that he would have chosen *intellects* as a French term²³. Someone might argue that this “lexicographic argument” is not strong enough: probably, both Neander and Khomyakov mean De principiis 2.2.1-2 (Origène 1978, 246-249) – a text that remains only in Latin version of Rufinus and echoes in such a way Rufinus’ manner of translation (in other cases, in Origen’s texts Latin *mens* corresponds to Greek *νοῦς*). However, we tend to agree with Lourié: his argument is connected not with the Latin term used by Rufinus for Greek *νοῦς* (it is not important really, whether Rufinus used *mens* or *intellectus*), but with probable terminological dependence of Khomyakov on the exposition of Origen’s teaching by Neander; “*intelligences*” (not “*intellects*”) in French text of Khomyakov may be evidence of a German mediator in Khomyakov’s reception of Origen.

However, if Khomyakov, following Neander’s interpretation of Origenism, accepts the possibility of a corporeal and at the same time sinless state of creation (before the universal fall), then what remains of the “strong version”, i.e. from Lourié’s hypothesis of 1994, which based all Khomyakov’s “Neo-Origenism” on the identity of the corporeal and the sinful?

Besides, comparing the “most Origenist” text of Khomyakov’s “The second Brochure”²⁴ with the sections devoted to Origen’s teaching in Neander’s work, we are faced with a significant difficulty. Indeed, Khomyakov speaks of the “finite minds” endowed with free will, and of the world of sensual and intelligible manifestations of God that is open to them. This, as well as the thesis of the subsequent “removal” of these created minds from God, could indeed be interpreted as the reception of Origenism in Neander’s interpretation. But Khomyakov introduces a thesis which does not correspond nor to text of Origen, neither to one of Neander: he writes about the *initial hierarchical* order in the world of created minds, and about two stages and forms of fall corresponded to this hierarchical structure. A certain higher kind (or some representatives of this kind: the text can be interpreted in both ways) of these minds commit the fall on their own, “others, placed in a lower position, have moved away from their Creator by an act also free, but caused by the temptation from outside”²⁵. Further, since Khomyakov says that only these second “received the promise of redemption and forgiveness”, due to their lesser fault, we can conclude that the fall of “the first kind” is final and irrevocable. Thus, the eschatological perspective proposed here does not at all imply apocatastasis – without which, it must be admitted, it is rather difficult to

²² See Khomyakov (2020, 704).

²³ See Khomyakov (2020, 704).

²⁴ We say, first of all, about the “theologian and historical” passage of the second volume of Khomyakov’s works, published in 1886 that begins from “От начала творения Бог открыл Себя созданным существам целым миром проявлений” [From the beginning of creation God manifested Himself to the created beings by the whole world of manifestations...] and ends with “и всякая слава Ему принадлежит во веки веков” [... and all the glory belongs to Him forever and ever] (Khomyakov 1886a, 121-122).

²⁵ See Khomyakov (1886a, 121).

talk about *any* Origenism. Further, since Khomyakov directly says (Khomyakov 1886a, 122) that with the revelation of Christ “the bliss of those who avoided falling, only because they were not tempted, was justified and replenished” (i.e., not all representatives of the “first kind” of created minds have fallen), we have to conclude that in the complex of Khomyakov’s concepts there was no the idea of *the universal fall* as an event that initiates the world process.

So: 1) Khomyakov’s postulate about the *initial hierarchy* among the created rational beings (which correspond seemingly to angels and humans), 2) the fall (irrevocable) of *only some part* of “angels” and (with possibility of redemption) “humans” tempted by this fall, and 3) lack of teaching about the “restoration of everything” inevitable in the eschatological perspective – in our opinion, make the interpretation of the discussed Khomyakov’s passage in the terms of “Origenism” difficult.

What we really have in Khomyakov’s texts? – 1) doctrine of the multitude created “finite minds” endowed with free will and of the fall of part of them, caused by undue use of this free will; 2) the probable acquaintance of Khomyakov with Origen’s teaching as presented by A. Neander. Is this enough to draw a conclusion about Khomyakov’s “Origenism”? Hardly. – On the other hand, nothing prevents us from seeing in Khomyakov’s constructions the general logic of “*biblical Platonism*” similar to that which once allowed Philo of Alexandria (in *Quest. et solut. in Gen. 1.53* and *De Cherubim 58–65*) to interpret the fall of Adam and Eve (dressed in “tunics of skin”) as the embodiment of the mind, connected with sensation, into a perishable body²⁶. Notice, that if some contemporary Russian scholar would find a similar theological and philosophical construction in a Russian text of the 19th or early 20th century, he/she would not hesitate to characterize the author of the text as an “Origenist”.

If, nevertheless, we admit the “Origenist” interpretation of these texts of Khomyakov, it would also be worth asking the question: why exactly was Origen’s position chosen by Khomyakov as to the greatest extent responding to his own theological intentions? To some extent, perhaps, the answer to this question lies in the relative ahistorism of the Origen’s system and in the conscious ahistorism of Khomyakov, who considered the historical as only accidental: “This is the meaning of the teachings and Jesus’ life itself: they are completely independent of historical accidents and personal arbitrariness”²⁷.

CONCLUSION

Summarizing, for clarification of “conceptual context” for B. Lourié’s hypothesis of A. Khomyakov’s “Origenism”, we could offer to distinguish two main approaches in studies on forms of intellectual heritage reception of Origen of Alexandria. The first approach can with some degree of convenience be called «realist»: Origenism within it is considered as a stable philosophical or theological position, interpreted in an extremely broad manner – as a kind of sharp platonization of Christianity, or as an attempt at free philosophizing within Christian tradition. In frameworks of this approach, reception of any element of Origenism by a later thinker intends him accept all the position, makes him an “Origenist” and a Platonist. Unlike this “realist” approach, the “nominalist” one assumes to consider intellectual heritage of Origen of Alexandria as a complex

²⁶ In both of the texts Philo offers his exegesis on Genesis 3.1-21. In *De Cherubim 58-65* (Philo 2001, 43-49) Philo discusses the relation between mind-Adam and “outward sense called Eve”, but does not touch the question about body. In *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim 1.53* (Philo 1953, 30-31) he explicitly says about mind-Adam, sensation-Eve, and perishable body created by God *after the fall*. “Origenistic perspective”? – Exactly. But *before* Origen.

²⁷ See Khomyakov (1904, 409).

set of theological and philosophical hypotheses, peculiarities of style – and the personality of the Alexandrian thinker. This approach demands much more delicate treating with the terms “Origenist” and “Origenism”.

Applied to B. Lourié’s hypothesis about Aleksey Khomyakov’s Origenism, this distinguishing implies that “the strong” version of the hypothesis is “extremely realistic” and “the weak” version is a form of moderate realism, much more nuanced and historically correct. Despite the merits of this “weak version of Khomyakov’s Origenism”, our analysis demonstrates that its validity cannot be considered established. At this moment, we have to agree that the earliest undoubted signs of the reception of Origen’s ideas in Russian culture can only be dated by the works of Vladimir Soloviev: conceptual closeness of Soloviev’s philosophy of all-unity with Origen’s eschatological idea of universal salvation allows the Russian philosopher to explicitly use the term “ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων” in “The Lectures on Godmanhood” (1878)²⁸ and “Justification of Good” (1897)²⁹. The popularity of forms of “philosophy of all-unity” in Russia in the first decades of the 20th century ensured interest in the ideas of Origen of Alexandria³⁰ and the widespread use of the term “Origenism” when labelling the ideas of allies and opponents.

REFERENCES

- Baranova-Shestova, Natalia.* 1983. Жизнь Льва Шестова: По переписке и воспоминаниям современников [Life of Leo Shestov: According to correspondence and contemporaries’ memoirs] 1. Paris.
- Berdyayev, Nicolay.* 1990. Самопознание: Опыт философской автобиографии [Self-knowledge: An Attempt of Philosophical Autobiography]. Moscow.
- Berdyayev, Nicolay.* 1992. Письма [The Letters]. In Минувшее [The Past] 9. Moscow.
- Berdyayev, Nicolay.* 1994. Моё философское мирозерцание [My philosophical worldview]. In Ermichev, Aleksander (ed.). Н.А. Бердяев: pro et contra [N.A. Berdyayev: pro et contra] 1, 23-28. Sankt-Petersburg.
- Berdyayev, Nicolay.* 2007. Алексей Степанович Хомяков (1912) [Aleksey Stepanovich Khomyakov], In Berdyayev, Nicolay. Константин Леонтьев (Очерк из истории русской религиозной мысли). Алексей Степанович Хомяков [Konstantin Leontiev (Essay on the history of Russian religious thought). Aleksey Stepanovich Khomyakov]. Moscow.
- Bolotov, Vasiliy.* 1879. Учение Оригена о Святой Троице [Origen’s Teaching about the Holy Trinity]. Sankt-Petersburg.
- Bulgakov, Sergiy.* 1945. Невеста Агнца. О богочеловечестве. Часть III [The Bride of the Lamb. On the Godmanhood. Part III]. Paris.
- Bulgakov, Sergiy.* 1948. Апокалипсис Иоанна: Опыт догматического истолкования [The Apocalypse of John: An attempt of its dogmatic interpretation]. Paris.
- Crouzel, Henri.* 1989. Origen. Edinburgh.
- Edwards, Mark.* 2002. Origen against Plato. Ashgate.
- Ern, Vladimir.* 1912. Григорий Саввич Сковорода: Жизнь и учение [Gregory Savvich Skovoroda: Life and Teaching]. Moscow.
- Florensky, Paul.* 2005. Сочинение Оригена „Περὶ ἀρχῶν“ как опыт метафизики [Origen’s „Περὶ ἀρχῶν“ as a metaphysical treatise]. In Философские науки [Philosophical disciplines] 6–12.

²⁸ See Soloviev (1912, 77).

²⁹ See Soloviev (1914, 220).

³⁰ Cf. an interesting discussion on the subject in (Reznichenko 2010, 426-477, 447 especially) where Segriy Bulgakov and Sergey Durylin are characterized as “two original Origenes, in the Russian manner” (455).

- Gilson, Étienne.* 1954. History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages. Toronto.
- Kamenskikh, Aleksey.* 2015. Origen in Russian Philosophy: From Gregory Skovoroda to Nikolai Berdyaev. In *ΣΧΟΛΗ (Schole)* 9/2, 446-459.
- Khomyakov, Aleksey.* 1886a. Несколько слов православного христианина о западных вероисповеданиях по поводу одного послания Парижского архиепископа (1855) [A few words of an Orthodox Christian about the Western confessions: on one epistle of the Archbishop of Paris (1855)]. In *Khomyakov, Aleksey. Полное собрание сочинений [Complete Works] 2.* Moscow, 93-168.
- Khomyakov, Aleksey.* 1886b. Еще несколько слов православного христианина о западных вероисповеданиях по поводу разных сочинений латинских и протестантских о предметах веры (1858) [A few more words of an Orthodox Christian about the Western confessions: on different Latin and Protestant writings on the subjects of faith (1858)]. In *Khomyakov, Aleksey. Полное собрание сочинений [Complete Works] 2.* Moscow, 169-258.
- Khomyakov, Aleksey.* 1904. Записки о всемирной истории. Часть 2 [Notes on World History. Part 2]. In *Полное собрание сочинений [Complete Works] 6.* Moscow.
- Khomyakov, Aleksey.* 1994. Сочинения в двух томах. Т.2: Работы по богословию [Writings in two volumes. Vol. 2: Theological works]. Kharitonova, E. (ed.). Moscow.
- Khomyakov, Aleksey.* 2020. Collected writings and letters. Theological writings. Dmitriev, Andrey – Egorov, Boris – Lourié, Vadim (eds). Sankt-Petersburg.
- Kovalinsky, Mikhail.* 1894. Житие Григория Сковороды, составленное другом его [The life of Gregory Skovoroda, described by his friend]. In Bagaley, Dmitriy (ed.). Сочинения Григория Саввича Сковороды [Writings by Gregory Savvich Skovoroda]. Kharkov, 1-40.
- Lebedev, Amphian.* 1895. Г.С. Сковорода как богослов [G.S. Skovoroda as a Theologian]. In *Вопросы философии и психологии [Problems of Philosophy and Psychology] 27/2,* 170-177.
- Losev, Aleksey.* 1990. Владимир Соловьёв и его время [Vladimir Soloviev and His Time]. Moscow.
- Lourié, Basil (Vadim).* 1994. Догматические представления А.С. Хомякова (очерк становления и развития) [Dogmatic ideas of A.S. Khomyakov: A sketch of genesis and development]. In Egorov, Boris (ed.). Славянофильство и современность [Slavophilism and modernity]. Sankt-Petersburg, 158-176.
- Malinov, Alexey.* 2013. The method of symbolic interpretation of Grigory Skovoroda. In *Scrinium* 9, 297-320.
- Men', Aleksander.* 2002. Библиологический словарь [Bibliological Dictionary]. Vol. 3. Moscow.
- Neander, August.* 1843. Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche. Zweite und verbesserte Auflage. Bd. 2., welcher den vierten und letzten Abschnitt der ersten Abtheilung enthält. Hamburg.
- Nikolsky, Alexander.* 1902. Русский Ориген XIX века Вл. С. Соловьёв [Russian Origen of 19th century - V.S. Soloviev]. In *Вера и разум [Faith and Reason] 10-19,* 23-24.
- Origen.* 2013. Origen. On First Principles. Cavadini, John (ed.). Notre Dame (Indiana).
- Origène.* 1978. Origène. Traité des principes, Tome I (Livres I et II). In Crouzel, Henri – Simonetti, Manlio (eds). Origène, Traité des principes, Tome I (Livres I et II), Introduction, texte critique de la Philocalie et de la version de Rufin, traduction. Paris.
- Origène.* 1980. Origène. Traité des principes, Tome III (Livres III et IV). In Crouzel, Henri – Simonetti, Manlio (eds). Origène, Traité des principes, Tome III (Livres III et IV), Introduction, texte critique de la Philocalie et de la version de Rufin, traduction. Paris.
- Petrov, Nicolay.* 1899. Творения Оригена, учителя александрийского, в русском переводе. Вып. 1: О началах [Works of Origen, an Alexandrian teacher, in Russian translation. Issue 1: On the Beginnings (with introduction and commentaries)]. Kazan'.

- Petrova, Lubov.* 2019. Концепция соборности А.С. Хомякова в контексте представлений о единстве и множественности в византийской философии [A.S. Khomyakov's concept of sobornost' in the context of ideas of unity and multitude in Byzantine philosophy]. In Христианское чтение [Christian Reading] 2, 119-130.
- Philo.* 1953. Questions and answers on Genesis. Marcus, Ralph (ed.). Cambridge (Mass.) – London.
- Philo.* 2001. Writings, Vol. II. Colson, Francis – Whitaker, George (eds). Cambridge (Mass.) – London.
- Ramelli, Ilaria.* 2017. Origen and the Platonic Tradition. In Religions 8/2.21.
- Reznichenko, Anna.* 2010. Сергей Дурьин: проекты и наброски (к реконструкции ландшафта) [Sergei Durylin: Projects and drafts (to reconstruction of the landscape)]. In Reznichenko, Anna (ed.). С.Н. Дурьин и его время [S.N. Durylin and his time] 1, 426-477.
- Rezyukh, Tatiana.* 2010. «Ищущий Града»: неоплатонические мотивы в работах С.Н. Дурьина 1910-х годов [“Seeking the City”: Neoplatonic Motives in S.N. Durylin's works of 1910th]. In Reznichenko, Anna (ed.). С.Н. Дурьин и его время [S.N. Durylin and his time] 1, 282-298.
- Schpett, Gustav.* 2008. Очерк развития русской философии [Essays on development of Russian philosophy] 1. Moscow.
- Soloviev, Vladimir.* 1912. Чтения о Богочеловечестве [Lectures on Godmanhood]. In Soloviev, Vladimir. Собрание сочинений [Collected Works] 3, 3-181. Sankt-Petersburg.
- Soloviev, Vladimir.* 1914. Оправдание добра [Justification of Good]. In Soloviev, Vladimir. Собрание сочинений [Collected Works] 8. Sankt-Petersburg.

Aleksey Aleksandrovich Kamenskikh, PhD. (Candidate of Sciences)
Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz
Institute for Slavic, Turkic and Circum-Baltic Studies
Jakob-Welder-Weg 18
55128 Mainz
Germany
kamensal@uni-mainz.de

Vasilij Alekseevich Kamenskikh
Novosibirsk State University
Student, Research Fellow at the Institute of Philosophy and Law, Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences
8 Nikolaeva str.
630090 Novosibirsk
Russia
dsttodth@gmail.com