

IVANOVO STATE POWER UNIVERSITY

SOLOVYOV STUDIES

Issue 2(50) 2016

Editorial Board:

M.V. Maksimov (Chief Editor), Doctor of Philosophy, Ivanovo, Russia
A.P. Kozyrev (Chief Editor Assistant), Candidate of Philosophy, Moscow, Russia,
E.M. Amelina, Doctor of Philosophy, Moscow, Russia,
I.I. Evlampiev, Doctor of Philosophy, St. Petersburg, Russia,
I.A. Edoshina, Doctor of Cultural Studies, Kostroma, Russia
K.L. Erofeeva, Doctor of Philosophy, Ivanovo, Russia,
N.V. Kotrelev, Senior Researcher, Moscow, Russia,
L.M. Maksimova (responsible secretary), Candidate of Philosophy, Ivanovo, Russia,
B.V. Mezhev, Candidate of Philosophy, Moscow, Russia,
V.I. Moiseev, Doctor of Philosophy, Moscow, Russia,
S.B. Rotsinskiy, Doctor of Philosophy, Moscow, Russia,
V.V. Serbinenko, Doctor of Philosophy, Moscow, Russia,
E.A. Takho-Godi, Doctor of Philology, St. Petersburg, Russia,
S.D. Titarenko, Doctor of Philology, St. Petersburg, Russia,
D.L. Shukurov, Doctor of Philology, Ivanovo, Russia

International Editorial Board:

G.E. Aliaiev, Doctor of Philosophy, Poltava, Ukraine,
R. Goldt, Doctor of Philology, Mainz, Germany,
N.I. Dimitrova, Doctor of Philosophy, Sofia, Bulgaria,
Davidson P., Doctor of Philosophy, London, United Kingdom
E. van der Zweerde, Doctor of Philosophy, Nijmegen, Netherlands,
Ya. Krasicki, Doctor of Philosophy, Wroclaw, Poland,
B. Marchadier, Slavonic studies doctor, Paris, France,
Nemeth T., Doctor of Philosophy, New York, United States of America

Address:

Department of Philosophy,
Russian Scientific and Educational Center of V. S. Solov'ev Studies,
Ivanovo State Power Engineering University
34, Rabfakovskaya st., Ivanovo, Russian Federation, 153003
Tel. (4932), 26-97-70, 26 97-75; Fax (4932) 26-97-96
E-mail: maximov@philosophy.ispu.ru
<http://www.solovyov-seminar.ispu.ru>

Information about published articles is sent to the Russian Science Citation Index by agreement with «Scientific Electronic Library» Ltd. No. № 580-12/2012 LO of 13.12.2012. The journal is registered in the foreign database Ulrich's Periodicals Directory.

- © M.V. Maksimov, preparation, 2016
- © Authors of Articles, 2016
- © Ivanovo State Power Engineering University, 2016

CONTENT

TO THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JOURNAL “SOLOVYOV STUDIES”

COMPLIMENTS

Compliments on the 15 th anniversary of the journal “Solovyov studies”.....	6
---	---

THE HERITAGE OF V.S. SOLOVYOV: RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

M.V. Maksimov. «Solovyov studies» – Russian philosophy journal.....	12
A.P. Kozyrev. In the wake of Solovyov’s “antichrist”.....	26
K.Yu. Burmistrov. Vladimir Soloviev and Western esotericism: the problem of source studies.....	47
T. Nemeth. Solovyov’s crisis and positivism in the late imperial Russia.....	65
M.V. Medovarov. Hallucination or imperfection? “Russkoe obozrenie” journal and the forgotten debate between Vladimir Solovyov and prince Sergey Trubetskoy.....	82
J. Krasicki. «The sign»: Vladimir Solovyov’s second journey to Egypt.....	96

V.S. SOLOVYOV AND RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY

G.E. Aliaie. The idea of the universal church and Vladimir Solovyov’s «conversion» to Roman Catholicism in the late works of Simon Frank.....	114
N.N. Pavliuchenkov. The development of the idea of «whole knowledge» in Russian philosophy (Kireevsky, Solovyov, Florensky).....	135
I.A. Edoshina. Incomplete poem of P.A. Florensky «Saint Vladimir»: contexts, meanings and poetics.....	150
S.D. Titarenko. Metaphysics vs poetics: V.I. Solovyov’s and Vyach. Ivanov’s «message about existence».....	162
S. Garziano. V.I. Solovyov and Russian classics in the critical writings of emigration.....	176
OUR AUTHORS	194
ON «SOLOVYOV STUDIES» JOURNAL	196
ON SUBSCRIPTION TO «SOLOVYOV STUDIES» JOURNAL	197
INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS	197

THE HERITAGE OF V.S. SOLOVYOV: RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

«SOLOVYOV STUDIES» – RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY JOURNAL

M.V. MAKSIMOV

Ivanovo State Power Engineering University
34, Rabfakovskaya St., Ivanovo, 153003, Russian Federation
E-mail: mvmaximov@yandex.ru

The article presents the characteristics of the scientific periodical publication – the «Solovyov studies» journal. It educes the main factors of foundation and development of the journal as one of the institutional forms of the Russian philosophy existence. Effective interconnection between the publication and the Solovyov seminar – the transregional academic centre of V.S. Solovyov legacy research – is shown. The author considers subjective and thematic orientation of the journal, gives analysis of the scientific publications. The analysis allowed to educe prioritized topics and leading trends of the contemporary research of V.S. Solovyov legacy, Russian philosophy and artistic culture. The article gives characteristics of the scientific and academic centres representations as well as status and location of the authors of the publications. The author analyzes the work of the editorial board with authors, work on the journal's correspondence with international requirements of the formatting, the journal promotion in Russia and internationally. The article gives review of of the scientific estimation of the journal and its role in the intellectual life of Russia today. Special attention is paid to the analysis of the form and content of international cooperation of the journal, consideration of the problems of foundation and work of its international editorial board, characteristics of editorial projects aiming at studying V.S. Solovyov's legacy reception research abroad. The author reveals the importance of international cooperation of the journal for the development of the scientific dialogue between Russian and foreign researchers of V.S. Solovyov's legacy and Russian philosophy and culture. It is concluded that relevant amount of publications of candidates and doctors of sciences, location expansion of the authors, growing interest to the journal of the Internet users.

Key words: Russian philosophy, scientific journal, «Solovyov studies» journal, Solovyov seminar, academic centre, subjective and thematic orientation of the journal, V.S. Solovyov's legacy, editorial board of the journal, Scopus, international cooperation.

References

1. Maksimov, M.V. Desyat' let Solov'evskomu seminaru: opyt, problemy i perspektivy [Ten years to Solovyov seminar: experience, problems and prospects], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2008, issue 20, pp. 7–20.
2. Maksimov, M.V., Maksimova, L.M. Materialy k bibliografii rabot o V.S. Solov'evе [Materials to the bibliography of works about V.S. Solovyov], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2007, issue 15, pp. 3–251.
3. Motroshilova, N.V. *Mysliteli Rossii i filosofiya Zapada (V. Solov'ev, N. Berdyaev, S. Frank, L. Shestov)* [Thinkers of Russia and philosophy of the West (V. Solovyov, N. Berdyaev, S. Frank, L. Shestov)], Moscow: Respublika; Kul'turnaya revolyutsiya, 2006. 477 p.
4. Maksimov, M.V. Solov'evskiy seminar v «Dome A.F. Loseva» [Solovyov seminar in the «A.F. Losev's House»], in *Byulleten' Biblioteki istorii russkoy filosofii i kul'tury «Doma A.F. Loseva»*, Moscow, 2007, issue 5, pp. 29–33.
5. Maksimov, M.V., Shchedrina, T.G. Solov'evskie chteniya: poisk novykh metodologicheskikh orientirov [Solovyov read: search of new methodological reference points], in *Voprosy filosofii*, 2003, no. 10, pp. 170–174.

6. Maksimov, M.V. Solov'evskiy seminar kak prostranstvo mezhkul'turnogo i mezhreligioznogo dialoga [Solovyov seminar as a space of intercultural and interreligious dialogue], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2010, issue 1(25), pp. 143–152.

7. Edel'shteyn, M. Solov'evskie chteniya v Ivanove [Solovyov read in Ivanovo], in *Novyy mir*, 2002, no. 8, pp. 217–218.

8. Ermichev, A.A. «Solov'evskie issledovaniya» za 2013 god. Izdanie Ivanovskogo energeticheskogo universiteta [«Solovyov studies» for 2013. The publication of Ivanovo state power engineering university], in *Vestnik Russkoy khristianskoy gumanitarnoy akademii*, 2014, vol. 15, issue 1, pp. 342–344.

9. Alessiya, Dan'ino. Rossiyskaya filosofiya na rubezhe XX i XXI vekov: vzglyad iz Italii [The Russian philosophy at a turn of the XX and XXI century: a view from Italy], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2011, issue 4(32), pp. 5–6.

10. Dimitrova, N.I. Vladimir Solov'ev v bolgarskoy kul'ture (pervaya polovina XX veka) [Vladimir Solovyov in the Bulgarian culture (the first half of the XX century)], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2010, issue 4 (28), pp. 22–27.

11. Dimitrova, N.I. Vladimir Solov'ev i bolgarskaya filosofskaya mysl' vtoroy poloviny XX veka [Vladimir Solovyov and Bulgarian philosophical thought of the second half of the XX century], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2011, issue 2(30), pp. 78–82.

12. Steyla, D. Ideya «russkoy filosofii» kak element kollektivnoy identichnosti. Istoricheskiy ocherk [Idea of «the Russian philosophy» as element of collective identity. Historical sketch], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2011, issue 4(32), pp. 41–55.

13. Krasitski, Yan. Filosofiya V.S. Solov'eva v Pol'she [The philosophy of V.S. Solovyov in Poland], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2013, issue 1(37), pp. 40–54.

14. Kieyzik, L. Pol'skie issledovaniya filosofii V.S. Solov'eva [Polish study philosophy of V.S. Solovyov], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2014, issue 4(44), pp. 21–31.

15. Obolevich, T. Vladimir Solov'ev i Marian Moravskiy [Vladimir Solovyov and Marian Moravsky], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2014, issue 4(44), pp. 31–45.

16. Pis'mo direktora Instituta filosofii RAN, akademika A.A. Guseynova ot 19.12.2013 g. *Iskh. 14204/2113* [Arkhiv redaksii zhurnala «Solov'evskie issledovaniya»] [The letter of the director of Institute of philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the academician A.A. Guseynov from 12/19/2013 Ref. 14204/2113 [Archive of editorial office of the «Solovyov Studies» of the magazine]].

IN THE WAKE OF SOLOV'EV'S «ANTICHRIST»

A.P.KOZYREV

Lomonosov Moscow State University,
27-4, Lomonosvsky prospect, Moscow, 119992, Russian Federation
E-mail: a.kozyrev@bk.ru

The analysis of the evaluation experience of the political events in terms of religion typical for Russian intelligenzia of the first Russian revolution period. Its specificity is marked – correlation of the revolution events of the beginning of the 20th century with Christ and Antichrist – caused mostly by the publication of the work by V.S. Solovyov «Three conversations» with supplement of «Short story about Antichrist». The study is based on the analysis of the documents of the epoch – op-ed pieces, reminiscences, fiction, and epistolary documents. The author considers V.S. Solovyov's estimation of Old Believer identification of the state with Antichrist, D.S. Merezhkovsky's Christ perception as «eternal yes» of the revolution as well as Christian brotherhood of Fight participant V.P. Svenitsky's position that terrorists are saint and invoking to pray for them. The evolution V.P. Svenitsky and N.I. Bukharin's

attitude to the revolutionary events is shown – from appreciation to their recognition the consequence of conscious choice of the evil, Antichrist's work. Existence of the two traditions in Russian philosophy is marked – the one coming from V. Solovyov and connected with absolute incompatibility of Christianity and revolution (A.F. Losev), and another, opposite to that one, leaving out experience of spiritual self-perfecting of the «vekhovtsy» tending to justify revolution and revolutionary violence not only politically but religiously. It is stated that such «political theology» happens also in present-day history when representatives of liberal intelligentsia see in the «light of Maidan» «Christ truth triumph» and complain about insufficient radicality of the Russian society in terms of revolution. The actuality of the critical attitude to the spiritual heritage of Russian intelligentsia not only prerevolutionary but also that one whose progress happened in 60–90s of the 20th century.

Key words: Revolution, religion, Christianity, Christ, the Antichrist, the intelligentsia, the terror; the justification of revolution and terror.

References

1. Blok, A. Dvenadtsat' [Twelve], in Blok, A. *Sobranie sochineniy v 8 t., t. 3* [Collected works in 8 vol., vol. 3], Moscow; Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoy literatury, 1960, pp. 347–359.
2. Solov'ev, V.S. Vladimir Svyatoy i khristianskoe gosudarstvo [St. Vladimir and the Christian State], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Sochineniya v 2 t., t. 2* [Works in 2 vol., vol. 2], Moscow: Pravda, 1989, pp. 247–262.
3. Marshad'e, B. Lik Antikhrista u Vladimira Solov'eva [The Face of the Antichrist in Vladimir Solovyov's Works], in *Materialy II Mezhdunarodnogo simpoziuma po tvorchestvu Vl. Solov'eva «Eskhatologiya Vl. Solov'eva»* [Contributions to the 2nd International Symposium on the Works of Vl. Solovyov «Eschatology of Vl. Solov'ev»], Moscow: Izdanie zhurnala «Kontinent», 1993, pp. 54–60.
4. Merezhkovskiy, D.S. V obez'yan'ikh lapakh (o Leonide Andreeve) [In Monkey Paws (On Leonid Andreev)], in Merezhkovskiy, D.S. *V tikhom omute. Stat'i i issledovaniya raznykh let* [In a silent and deep pool. Articles and studies of various years], Moscow: Sovetskiy pisatel', 1991, pp. 12–39.
5. Berdyaev, N.A. Merezhkovskiy o revolyutsii [Merezhkovskii on Revolution], in Berdyaev, N.A. *Dukhovnyy krizis intelligentsii. Stat'i po obshchestvennoy i religioznoy psikhologii (1907–1909)* [The Spiritual Crisis of the Intelligentsia. Articles on Social and Religious Psychology. (1907–1909)], Saint-Petersburg: Obshchestvennaya pol'za, 1910, pp. 102–119.
6. Balakshina, Yu.V. *Bratstvo revniteley tserkovnogo obnoveniya (gruppa 32-kh peterburgskikh svyashchennikov). 1903–1907* [The Brotherhood of the Adherents of Church Renewal (The Group of 32 St. Petersburg priests). 1903–1907], Moscow: Sv-Filaretovskiy institut, 2015.
7. Svetsitskiy, V.P. *So svyatymi upokoy* [Grant Rest [O Lord] with the Saints]. Available at: http://az.lib.ru/s/swencickij_w_p/text_0160.shtml (data obrashcheniya 22.04.2016).
8. Trubetskoy, E. Godovshchina manifesta [The Anniversary of the Manifesto], in *Moskovskiy ezhenedel'nik*, 1906, no. 31, p. 10.
9. Svetsitskiy, V.P. *Tserkov' i razgon dумы* [Church and Dispersal of the Duma]. Available at: http://az.lib.ru/s/swencickij_w_p/text_0160.shtml.
10. Florenskiy, P.A., svyashch. «K pochesti vyshnyago zvaniya» (Cherty kharaktera arkhim. Serapiona Mashkina) [(«Toward the Mark for the High Calling» (Some Personality Traits of Archimandrite Serapion Mashkin)], in Florenskiy, P.A., svyashch. *Sobranie sochineniy. T. I* [Collected works. Vol. 1], Moscow: Misl', 1994, pp. 205–226.
11. Svetsitskiy, V.P. Antikhrist. Zapiski strannogo cheloveka [Antichrist. Notes by a Strange Man], in Svetsitskiy, V.P. *Izbrannoe* [Selected Works], Moscow: Nikeya, 2014, pp. 145–346.
12. Bukharin, N.I. *Avtobiograficheskaya stat'ya iz Entsiklopedicheskogo slovarya «Granat»* [Autobiographical Article from the «Granat» Encyclopedic Dictionary]. Available at: http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_biography/14673/%D0%91%D1%83%D1%85%D0%B0%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BD

13. *Vzyskuyushchie grada. Khronika chastnoy zhizni russkikh religioznykh filosofov v pis'makh i dnevnikakh* [In Search of the City. A Chronicle of the Private Life of Russian Religious Philosophers in Letters and Diaries], Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kul'tury, 1997.
14. Svetsitskiy, V.P. Antikhrist. Zapiski strannogo cheloveka [Antichrist. Notes by Strange Man], in *Antikhrist. Antologiya* [Antichrist. Anthology], Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1995, pp. 163–176.
15. Belyy, A. *Nachalo veka* [The Beginning of the Century], Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1990.
16. Stepun, F.A. *Byvshee i nesbyvsheesya* [What Happened in the Past and What Did Not Come to Fruition], Saint-Petersburg: Aleteyya, 2000.
17. Vishnyak, M. *Dan' proshlomu* [Tribute to the Past]. Available at: http://modernlib.ru/books/vishnyak_mark/dan_proshlomu/
18. Gershenzon, M.O. Tvorcheskoe samosoznanie [Creative Self-awareness], in *Vekhi. Iz glubiny* [From the depths], Moscow: Pravda, 1991, pp. 73–96.
19. Berdyaev, N.A. *Dukhovnyy krizis intelligentsii* [The Spiritual Crisis of the Intelligentsia], Moscow, 1998.
20. Ivanov, Vyach. G.I. Chulkovu [Dedication to G.Chulkov], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 4* [Collected works in 4 vol., vol. 4], Bryussel', 1987.
21. Kartashev, A. Moi rannie vstrechi s o. Sergiem [My Early Meetings with the Fr. Sergius], in *Pravoslavnaya mys'. Trudy Pravoslavnogo Bogoslovskogo Instituta v Parizhe. Vyp. VIII* [Orthodox thought. Publications of the Russian Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris. Issue VIII], Parizh: YMSA-Press, 1951, pp. 47–55.
22. Bulgakov, S.N. Pyat' let (1917–1922) [Five Years (1917–1922)], in Bulgakov, S.N. *Tikhie dumy* [Quiet Thoughts], Moscow: Respublika, 1996, pp. 330–344.
23. «Tak istyazuetsya i raspinaetsya istina...» A.F. Losev v retsenziyakh OGPU [«In this Way Truth is Tormented and Crucified». A.F. Losev in Reviews of the OGPU], in *Istochnik. Vestnik Arkhiva Prezidenta Rossiyskoy Federatsii*, 1996, no. 4, pp. 115–129.
24. Losev, A.F. Dopolnenie k «Dialektike mifa». (Novyy fragment) [Addition to «The Dialectics of Myth». (New Fragment)], in *Tvorchestvo A.F. Loseva v kontekste otechestvennoy i evropeyskoy kul'turnoy traditsii. XIV Losevskie chteniya. V 2 ch., ch. I* [The Work of A.F. Losev in the Context of the Russian and European Cultural Tradition. XIV Losev Conference in 2 parts, part 1], Moscow, 2013, pp. 381–395.
25. Polivanov, K. O starom kontekste [Concerning an Old Context], in *Segodnya*, 1996, no. 192, 18 oktyabrya, p. 5.
26. Shokhina, V. *Krov' na konchike pera. Oktyabr' 93-go: literaturny ili provokatory* [Blood on the Tip of a Pen. October 1993: Writers or Provocateurs]. Available at: http://www.religare.ru/2_102456.html

VLADIMIR SOLOVIEV AND WESTERN ESOTERICISM: THE PROBLEM OF SOURCE STUDIES

K. Yu. BURMISTROV

Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences
12/1, Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russian Federation
E-mail: kburmistrov@hotmail.com

Many researchers and authors of memoirs wrote about Vladimir Soloviev's acquaintance with the so-called secret (occult) doctrines and traditions, although they might differ in their assessment

of his interest in this field of human knowledge and experience. However, this issue has not become a subject of special study yet. In our opinion, to clarify the situation, it is critical to consider the whole range of relevant sources on the subject – both the works of Soloviev and the original writings of different esoteric schools and occultists, with whom he was or might be acquainted. So far, this work has not been carried out. Moreover, some of Soloviev's writings and notes on this subject has not been published yet and still kept in the archives. It is known that Soloviev himself almost never refers to his sources in his published works. Therefore, it is assumed that, arguing, for example, about alchemy, Kabbalah or Masonic gnosis, he drew his knowledge in these fields primarily from the scholarly works of the time. However, as we found out, Soloviev was familiar with a number of original sources, including manuscripts, in particular, stored in the Masonic manuscript collections. The article discusses some major works of European esotericism, about which we can say with certainty that they were known to Soloviev. Particular attention is paid to some unpublished Soloviev's manuscript materials, stored in the archives of Moscow and St. Petersburg. Thus, we are trying to reconstruct Soloviev's «circle of occult readings», as well as to raise the question of the possible principles he was guided in choosing his sources. It seems that such a preliminary analysis of textual sources should precede any attempts to determine the place of «secret knowledge» in Vladimir Soloviev's outlook and his teachings.

Key words: *textual sources, esotericism, occult, Freemasonry, Kabbalah, alchemy, astrology, magic, mysticism, history of philosophy, sophiology.*

References

1. Hanegraaff, Wouter J. Dictionary of Gnosis & Western Esotericism. Leiden: Brill, 2006. 1228 p.
2. Hanegraaff, W. *Zapadnyy ezoterizm. Putevoditel' dlya zaputavshikhsya* [Western Esotericism: A Guide for the Perplexed], Moscow: Tsentr knigi Rudomino, 2016. 256 p.
3. Nosachev, P.G. *Otrechennoe znanie. Izuchenie marginal'noy religioznosti v XX i nachale XXI veka* [«Heterodox knowledge»: the study of marginal religiosity in the XX century and in the beginning of the XXI century], Moscow: Izdatel'stvo PSTGU, 2015. 336 p.
4. Kozyrev, A.P. *Solov'ev i gnostiki* [Soloviev and Gnostics], Moscow: S.A. Savin, 2007. 544 p.
5. Kravchenko, V.V. *Vladimir Solov'ev i Sofiya* [Vladimir Soloviev and Sophia], Moscow: Agraf, 2006. 384 p.
6. French, M. *Lik Premudrosti. Dilemma filosofii i perspektiva sofologii* [Face of Wisdom: a dilemma of philosophy and perspective of sophiology], Saint-Petersburg: Rostok, 2015. 527 p.
7. Kornblatt, J.D. Russian Religious Thought and the Jewish Kabbala. The Occult in Russian and Soviet Culture. Ithaca & London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1997, pp. 75–94.
8. Kornblatt, J.D. Solov'ev's Androgynous Sophia and the Jewish Kabbalah. *Slavic Review*, 1991, no. 50, pp. 487–496.
9. Rubin, D. Holy Russia, Sacred Israel: Jewish-Christian encounters in Russian religious thought. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2010. 558 p.
10. Burmistrov, K. Yu. Vladimir Solov'ev i Kabbala: k postanovke problem [Vladimir Soloviev and Kabbalah: some preliminary observations], in *Issledovaniya po istorii russkoy mysli. Ezhegodnik za 1998 g.* [Studies in the History of Russian Thought. Yearbook 1998], Moscow: OGI, 1998, pp. 7–104.
11. Burmistrov, K. The interpretation of Kabbalah in early 20th-century Russian Philosophy: Soloviev, Bulgakov, Florenskii, Losev. *East European Jewish Affairs* 37:2 (2007), pp. 157–187.
12. Stremoukhoff, D. Vladimir Soloviev et son oeuvre messianique. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1935. 351 p.
13. Allen, P.M. Vladimir Soloviev: Russian Mystic. Blauvelt (NY): Steiner Books, 1978. 449 p.
14. Shipflinger, T. *Sofiya–Mariya. Tselostnyy obraz tvoreniya* [Sophia – Maria: an integral image of being], Moscow: Gnozis Press, Skarabey, 1997. 400 p.

15. Solov'ev, V.S. *Sobranie sochineniy v 8 t.* [Collected works in 8 vol.], Saint-Petersburg: Obshchestvennaya pol'za, 1902–1907.
16. Solov'ev, V.S. *Pis'ma v 4 t.* [Correspondence in 4 vol.], Saint-Petersburg, 1908–1923.
17. Guberti, N.V. *Materialy dlya russkoy bibliografii v 3 t.* [Materials for the Russian bibliography in 3 vol.], Moscow, 1878, 1881, 1891.
18. Sakulin, P.N. *Iz istorii russkogo idealizma. Knyaz' V.F. Odoevskiy. V 2 ch.* [From the History of Russian Idealism: prince V.F. Odoevsky. In 2 parts], Moscow, 1913.
19. Solov'ev, V.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem. T. 1–4* [Complete works and letters. Vol. 1–4], Moscow: Nauka, 2000–2011.
20. Serkov, A.I. *Russkoe masonstvo. 1731–2000. Entsiklopedicheskiy slovar'* [Russian Freemasonry. 1737–2000. An Encyclopedia], Moscow: Rosspen, 2001. 1224 p.
21. Serkov, A.I. *Istoriya russkogo masonstva XIX v.* [The History of Russian Freemasonry of the 19th century], Saint-Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo im. N.I. Novikova, 2000. 394 p.
22. Zubov, V.P. K istorii russkogo oratorskogo iskusstva kontsa XVII – pervoy poloviny XVIII v. [On the history of Russian oratory of the end of 17th – the first half of 18th centuries], in *TODRL XVI*, 1960, pp. 288–303.
23. Gorfunkel', A.Kh. «Velikaya nauka Raymunda Lyulliya» [The Great Art of Raymund Llull], in *XVIII vek*, 1962, vol. 5, pp. 336–348.
24. Kopp, H. *Die Alchemie in älterer und neuerer Zeit. Erster Theil.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1886. 284 p.
25. Shvarts, I.G. *Lektsii* [Lectures], Donetsk: Veber, 2008. 172 p.
26. McIntosh, C. *The Rose Cross and the Age of Reason.* Leiden: Brill, 1992. 220 p.
27. Kondakov, Yu.E. *Orden zolotogo i rozovogo kresta v Rossii* [The Order of Gold and Rose Cross in Russia], Saint-Petersburg, 2012. 615 p.
28. Endel', M. Ob odnom kabbalisticheskom kodekse v russkoy masonskoy literature [On a kabbalistic codex from the Russian Masonic literature], in *Tirosh: trudy po iudaike. Vyp. 4* [Tirosh: Works on Jewish Studies. Vol. 4], Moscow, 2000, pp. 57–66.
29. Endel', M. Original'nye kabbalisticheskie kontseptsii v masonskom kodekse «O sfirot» (konets XVIII v.) [Original concepts of the Masonic manuscript «On the Sephirot» (late 18th c.)], in *Tirosh: trudy po iudaike. Vyp. 5* [Tirosh: Works on Jewish Studies. Vol. 5], Moscow, 2001, pp. 37–50.
30. Grechishkin, S.S. Arkhiv S.A. Polyakova [S.A. Polyakov's Archive], in *Ezhegodnik rukopisnogo otdela Pushkinskogo Doma na 1978 god* [Yearbook of the Manuscript Department of the Pushkin House 1978], Leningrad: Nauka, 1980, pp. 1–22.
31. David, Z.V. The Influence of Jacob Boehme on Russian Religious Thought. *Slavic Review* 21:1 (1962), pp. 43–64.
32. Smith, O. *The Russian Boehme. An Introduction to Jacob Boehme: Four Centuries of Thought and Reception.* New York & London: Routledge, 2014, pp. 196–223.
33. Boehme, J. *Clavis Oder Schlüssel etlicher vornehmen Puncten und Wörter.* Amsterdam: H. Betkuis, 1662. 118 p.
34. Feuerbach, L. *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie von Bacon bis Spinoza.* Ansbach: Brügel, 1833. 400 p.
35. Boehme, J. *Das Sechste Büchlein: Theosopia, oder Die hochtheure Pforte von Göttlicher Beschaulichkeit. S.I.* [Amsterdam?], 1731. 35 p.
36. Boehme, J. *Der Weg zu Christo.* Amsterdam, 1715. 272 p.
37. Koyre, A. *La philosophie de Jacob Boehme.* Paris: J. Vrin, 1929, XVII. 525 p.
38. Berdyaev, N.A. *Iz etyudov o Ya. Beme. Etyud II* [From the studies on Jacob Boehme. Part II], in *Put'*, 1930, no. 21, pp. 34–62.
39. Moshe ben Maymon. *Mishne Tora. Kn. 1: Sefer'a-mada.* Varshava, 1881 (na ivrite). 121 p.
40. Semiphoras und Schemhamphoras Salomonis Regis. *Wesel–Duißburg–Franckfurth: A. Luppius*, 1686. 24 p.

SOLOVYOV'S CRISIS AND POSITIVISM IN THE LATE IMPERIAL RUSSIA

THOMAS NEMETH

Jordan Center for the Advanced Study of Russia
New York University
E-mail: t_nemeth@yahoo.com

This essay demonstrates that Comtean positivism was already a known intellectual movement in Russia when Solovyov began his thesis, although he did not demonstrate any knowledge at all of its Russian proponents. Indeed, already by the time of his famed thesis defense, positivism had been the subject of an attack by prominent theologians. In particular, Kudrjavcev at the Moscow Theological Academy just weeks before Solovyov's thesis defense gave a talk in which he criticized Comte's philosophy of history along lines similar to Solovyov's. We also see, however, that despite his own remarks on positivism, Solovyov could not find a fitting allocation for positivism within his sweeping history of Western philosophy, thus jeopardizing the accuracy of that portrayal. While this may and should appear amazing to us in light of the final subtitle of the Crisis, «Against the Positivists», it is less so when we realize that in the serial publication of the work in the journal Православное обозрение it bore the quite different subtitle «Concerning Hartmann's 'Philosophy of the unconscious'». This latter subtitle is a more accurate indication of the argument in Solovyov's thesis. In other words, the principal aim of the Crisis was not to combat positivism, but all of abstract philosophy, Hartmann's being the latest and the final possible version of it. In the aftermath of his thesis defense, Solovyov demoted von Hartmann's significance in Western philosophy and promoted positivism, determining it to be a necessary but final word in Western development.

Key words: the history of Western philosophy, positivism of Auguste Comte, the Russian positivists, opponents of positivism, the criticism of positivism, the doctrine of E. von Hartmann.

The appearance in 1874 of Solovyov's *magister's* thesis «Кризис западной философии», ignited a veritable firestorm of criticism in the secular press largely unseen previously for a work in philosophy. The thesis bore the innocuous and, at first sight, unambiguous subtitle «против позитивистов». Little, if any, notice was given to the fact that the bulk of the book, which had been published over the course of that year in the journal «Православное обозрение» («*Orthodox Review*»), bore the quite different subtitle «По поводу „философии безсознательного“ Гартмана». How did this alteration escape the attention of the secular audience of the completed work? Were the serialized chapters even read outside the clerical estate? The subsequent reviews of the thesis made no issue of the change in subtitle. They also failed to inquire just which positivists Solovyov had in mind. We can reasonably conclude that the reviewers' silence indicates positivism was by then a well-known position in Russia. Unfortunately, that assumption itself, in turn, raises a number of questions: What is the relationship between the title and the subtitle? Did Solovyov regard these positivists as those responsible, as causal agents, for this «crisis»? If they were responsible, in some manner, for it, why did Solovyov devote so much attention – indeed, the bulk of his thesis – to non-positivistic philosophy? In this essay, we briefly summarize the dissemination within Russia of positivism, albeit principally of the French, rather than the British, variety, and the reaction to it by other figures contemporary with Solovyov. We, then, examine Solovyov's evolving attitude toward positivism in the hope of shedding light on his youthful philosophical position and the very title of his work.

1. Positivism in Russian Social Science and Philosophy

Positivism had a long history of penetration in Imperial Russia before Solovyov's famed thesis defense. Already as early as the reign of Nicholas I, a young literary critic Valerian Majkov urged the creation of a new, positivistically inspired social science. He, however, mentioned Comte by name only once in his writing¹. More closely aligned to the positivist program was Vladimir Miljutin, a graduate of St. Petersburg University. Miljutin embraced Comte's view that human thought (наука) passed through three stages: the mythological, the metaphysical, and the positivistic. With his primary interest being economics, Miljutin saw the challenge as the construction of a political economics based on a small set of general laws².

Enunciated during the repressive years of the 1840s, the impact of the above ideas could only have been quite limited. However, with the accession of Tsar Alexander II and his relaxation of the censorship, discussions of positivism began to appear in the popular media. Among the most notable of these was Pisarev's lengthy four-part article «Исторические идеи Огюста Конта» (1865–1866), in which he emphasized that human sociality is governed by natural laws just as is the material world³. Metaphysics, he maintained, particularly in the moral sphere, was employed as a weapon by political rulers to discretely reinforce their domination over others. Pisarev also expressed sympathy with Comte's philosophy of history. He realized, however, that Comte's writings alone failed to provide more than a broad outline for the needed science of society.

Pisarev's attitude was shared by a founding member of the revolutionary organization «Земля и Воля», Nikolaj Serno-Solovyovich, who in an article «Не требуется ли нынешнее состояние знаний новой науки?» condemned abstract philosophy, as would Vladimir Solovyov a decade later, although for quite different reasons. As did Pisarev, Serno-Solovyovich believed that abstract knowledge in general helped the ruling class maintain their hegemonic role in society. Knowledge, particularly the natural sciences, had to have a practical intent. At present, a new science of society needed to be created, a science with such an intent but with a methodology adopted from natural science⁴.

Another who brought positivism to public attention was Ernst K. Vatson. His two-part piece in 1865 «Огюст Конт и политическая философия» provided detailed information on Comte's thinking on both the individual natural sciences and particularly on sociology⁵. The 1860s also saw the publication of John Stuart Mill's «Auguste Comte and Positivism» in a Russian translation («Огюст Конт и позитивизм») as well as a translation in 1865 of Mill's «System of Logic» («Система логики»). However, arguably the major figures to bring positivism to the attention of the general public were Petr Lavrov and Nikolaj Mikhajlovskij. Although neither of them was a consistent positivist by any means, the former held that scientific progress would lead eventually to an abandonment of religion and metaphysics. He also shared the positivist view (phenomenalism) that all we can know is natural phenomena, but he dispensed with the invocation of a Kantian «thing in itself» as unnecessary and metaphysical. Unlike the positivists, Lavrov did not believe the methodology of the natural sciences could simply be applied to the study of society, but he did share with the Russian positivists the belief that sociology had a practical purpose, namely to improve society, and with

it the human condition. Like Comte and Lavrov, Mikhajlovskij professed an adherence to phenomenalism and treasured Comte's classification of the sciences.

In the early 1870s – thus, when Solovyov was a student – other figures championed a cautious positivism. For example, Sergej N. Juzhakov in four articles from 1872–1873 expressed his belief that Comte had demonstrated the applicability of the «general laws of life» to society and that truths of natural phenomena are also truths of social phenomena⁶. And also at this time a government functionary and governor, Pavel Lilienfeld, compared society to a biological organism. In his «Мысли о социальной науке будущего» (1872), Lilienfeld expounded his view that the study of the latter could directly help us understand the former, that the developmental process of the two are quite analogous to each other⁷.

Finally, we turn to virtually the sole defender of positivist philosophy within the Russian Empire, a figure whose name Solovyov would come to know at the time of his thesis defense, if he did not know it already. Although his position would change somewhat over the years, Vladimir Lesevich in his earliest philosophical publications up to 1874 maintained that all metaphysical claims were unscientific and as such were to be rejected⁸. What would, at least in the coming years, set Lesevich apart from virtually all other positivists, both those in France as well as Russia, was his familiarity with German philosophy, particularly with Kant, and his recognition that positivism must contain a critique of the human cognitive faculty⁹. That Lesevich must have been generally recognized by this time as a proponent of positivism is clear from his selection to be an opponent at Solovyov's thesis defense. What is especially striking about Lesevich's writings in comparison with Solovyov's is the sheer wealth of scholarship evident in the former and that is wholly lacking in the latter.

2. The Anti-Positivist Rebuttal

Our preceding presentation was by no means an exhaustive discussion of the impact of positivism in XIXth century Russia prior to the publication of Solovyov's *Crisis*. However, already from this brief sketch we see that positivism was a widely influential position within Russia and not just at the fringe of intellectual life then and there. Whatever we may say concerning its reception among the country's professional philosophers, of which there were very few, positivism in Russia promoted and penetrated the nascent social sciences of sociology and psychology. In fact, there can be little doubt that it helped launch them in the first place. Many of the figures discussed above sketched positivistic philosophies of history within their respective works, even though that was far from their central focus. In each instance, the respective philosophies of history were intended primarily to buttress their social theories and how society, they believed, should develop.

Just as positivism had its proponents, it also had numerous detractors. Although little noticed by casual readers of the *Crisis* today and virtually unknown to Western readers, Solovyov's diatribe against positivism in the mid-1870s was far from unique. In fact, several were arguably more erudite, though less dramatic and opinionated than his own. One such discussion occurred in an entry in the third volume of Silvestr Gogockij's notable «Философский лексикон», published in 1866. Gogockij rebuked Comte for his theoretical reliance on physical laws alone to explain not merely all

empirical phenomena, but even moral ones as well. That which is inexplicable in terms of such laws, Comte called «metaphysical» and, as such, were dismissible. Gogockij could not abide Comte's cherished aim to reduce everything, including the ethical realm, to empirically established rules, principles, and laws. Thus, on the one hand, Comte believed morality could be explained scientifically, but, on the other hand, he rejected it out of hand¹⁰.

Another critical presentation of Comte's positivism came in the very year of Solovyov's thesis defense. In his «Обзор философских учений», Petr I. Linickij, who taught at the Kiev Theological Academy, declared that the sensualist theory of cognition is the basis, the necessary assumption, of positivism. A clear and precise thinker, Linickij provided a definition of sensualism. It is the view that «the sole source of our cognition is external sense experience, and the scope of our knowledge is limited to facts accessible to external observation (a rejection of inner self-observation as a means of cognition)» [12, c. 108]. Thus, with this definition, philosophy, being concerned with empirical phenomena and the determination of general laws, is identical to science. What Linickij, in particular, rejected is the positivist portrayal of humanity's intellectual development in terms of historical stages. The positivistic law of such development is, essentially, merely an unfounded opinion. The positivists claim, without any basis, that each of the three stages follows a necessary temporal progression. We can clearly see this from the fact that Comtean positivism, though disclaiming the theological and the metaphysical stages, cannot free itself of religious and metaphysical concepts. Indeed, Comte himself, Linickij claimed, recognized the need for an institution performing the manifest function of a church by establishing a «religion of humanity», which had all the characteristics of a religious cult. In Linickij's eyes, Comte rejected the search for first causes, because such a quest would, perforce, be a transgression beyond the bounds of experience, but at the same time Comte resorted to concepts of a metaphysical character¹¹. Although Linickij gave every indication of taking this as a point against the validity of the positivistic philosophy of history, we would remind Linickij, if that were possible, that his observation of Comte's inconsistency may be due to a personal weakness in Comte's individual psychological makeup and not necessarily a failure in positivist theory as such.

Finally, although it appeared only in 1875, Kudrjavcev-Platonov, a professor at the Moscow Theological Academy, gave a talk in October 1874 – and thus roughly seven weeks before Solovyov's famed thesis defense – on the topic «Religion and Positive Philosophy». In this presentation – at least in the form it has come down to us – Kudrjavcev remarked that in its essential characteristics positivism is not a unique philosophical doctrine. Comte and Hegel, for example, share remarkably similar philosophies of history. Both argue that religion is nothing but a transitional form of knowledge and as such a «lower» form than philosophy. However, both also contend that in time religion will pass to this higher form. The difference between Comte and Hegel is merely that for Hegel the higher and final form of knowledge is his own absolute idealist philosophy, whereas for Comte it is his positivism¹². In this, the reader cannot help but notice the remarkable similarity with Solovyov's position in the *Crisis*. Kudrjavcev recognized that for Hegel and Comte all philosophies prior to their own were necessary, though transitory, stages in intellectual history. We can easily observe that Solovyov shared the same position, substituting his own viewpoint, which he called «concrete thought», as the telos of that history.

Kudrjavcev, of course, was interested in defending religion against what he perceived to be Comte's denigratory evaluation of its role and concerns in human life. Comte failed to see that it was more than merely a cognitive method, although that is certainly part of religion's significance. As for positivism itself, it speaks of three cognitive methods, but in Kudrjavcev's estimation they are not methods, but cognitive spheres. The laws of thought and our cognitive methods are the same across all the spheres. Theology, philosophy and natural science represent three different but compatible worldviews. They have as their respective concerns three different cognitive objects. Because they have different objects and offer different worldviews, it is not impossible for them to co-exist at the same time, indeed within the same individual. Already with Aristotle, we see a philosopher deeply concerned with metaphysics, but also concerned with science¹³. Moreover, in Kudrjavcev's view, there is no basis for Comte's claim that the theological stage represents a lower level of intellectual development than the metaphysical. Again, the example of Aristotle is sufficient evidence to dispense with this assertion. Some investigators direct their inquiries at one level of knowledge, while others at another.

3. The Minor Role of Positivism in the *Crisis*

Our presentation above shows that by the time of Solovyov's *magister's* thesis defense, positivism in general was an international intellectual movement recognized as such within Russia and had already attracted a number of figures to its dissemination over several decades. Given Solovyov's overall position at the time and his general, quite favorable attitude toward metaphysics, it should not be surprising that he would attack positivism to some degree. However, the final subtitle of the *Crisis*, «Against the Positivists», certainly appears to have been an afterthought, a last minute addition. We would expect given the title and this subtitle that the thesis would be an examination of how positivism, if not in Comte's incarnation, then at least in the form espoused by John Stuart Mill or by Comte's somewhat wayward disciple Émile Littré, led to the final «crisis» of Western philosophy along with the author's proposed remedy of the situation. Yet, we find none of that. Indeed, the original subtitle had nothing at all to do with positivism. In its original form in the journal «Православное обозрение» serialized over the course of 1874, the *Crisis* bore the subtitle «Concerning Hartmann's 'philosophy of the unconscious'». The text, with which we are familiar, does indeed present the history of modern (Western) philosophy as leading to von Hartmann's worldview and saw von Hartmann's stand as the culmination of what Solovyov would portray as abstract thought. Thus, we cannot accept S.M. Luk'janov claim, made so many years ago, that the *Crisis* was clearly «directed against the positivists»¹⁴. If it was, it missed the mark; if it was not, it bore an irrelevant subtitle.

As is well known, the pages of Solovyov's «Introduction» to the *Crisis* were not the first to be written, but among the last. The first chapter of what became his thesis appeared in the January 1874 issue of the largely theological journal «Православное обозрение» («Orthodox Review»). There, at the start in Chapter One, Solovyov tells us, that in contrast to positivism, which arose from and with the exhaustion of philosophical doctrines, each claiming to be the absolute truth, a new metaphysics has

appeared. On the one hand, positivism held that «higher questions of thought» – what these are he does not say nor why they are «higher» – could not be resolved and, thus, to pose them would be absurd, presumably, a waste of time and effort¹⁵. However, this newly emerged metaphysics demonstrates that these «higher questions» can neither be simply dismissed nor set aside. The questions must be answered despite the effort required. In order to evaluate the philosophical significance – and tenability – of this metaphysics, we must investigate the development of Western philosophy since Kant, with which its author, von Hartmann, himself sees his ideas linked and as the culmination of that development. Solovyov did not elaborate precisely why we must place von Hartmann's views in their historical setting in order to determine that significance (философское значение). Also left unsaid was whether this alleged culmination is logical, historical or merely contingent. In any case, Solovyov, then, proceeded to a discussion of German Idealism. But it is important for us to recognize that were we to offer an opinion of the general thesis of Solovyov's book on the basis of its first pages – and, thus, Solovyov's initial intent in early 1874 – we would say that the «crisis of Western philosophy» is a result of the failure of von Hartmann's attempted revival of metaphysics. In short, Solovyov viewed positivism in January 1874 as playing nothing more than a secondary role, another way station or stop, along the road that is the historical development of Western philosophy.

After discussing the movement from Kant to Hegel, Solovyov comes by way of, to be charitable, what we can call «non-linear thinking», to the claim that materialism passes into positivism and the materialists' empirical realism led to Comte's empirical criticism¹⁶. Precisely how Solovyov understood «empirical criticism» remains unclarified, but we do know that (a) «criticism» was, for Solovyov and much of XIXth century philosophy, another term for Kantianism, and (b) Solovyov – as did many others in XIXth century Russia – took Kantianism to be a phenomenalism, i.e., the «position that only phenomena are accessible to us, whereas their essence is absolutely uncognizable» [15, c. 59]. On this basis, we can conclude that, for Solovyov, Comte preached a form of phenomenalism much as did Kant¹⁷. However wrongheaded we may feel his interpretation of Kant to be, more astonishing is his immediately following claim that materialism also entails an epistemological phenomenalism. Since materialism says that thinking is a physiological process and that thinking is qualitatively quite different from things existing independently of our thought, our cognition can have no objective significance¹⁸.

We find confirmation of our inference that, for Solovyov, phenomenalism was merely one feature of positivism following his remark on Comte's «empirical criticism»¹⁹. A question remains, though, as to the nature of this phenomenalism. Is it epistemological or ontological? He wrote, «A phenomenon is opposed to what is independent, to what is in itself. ... It is a representation in consciousness. <...> Positivism, starting exclusively from the external empirical domain, considers all other content of consciousness to be empty abstractions without any reality. Comte says that the only cognition to have reality (i.e., expresses a real phenomenon) is one that can be reduced to the data of the external senses» [15, c. 72]. Regrettably, these statements do little to resolve our quandary. One can argue that Solovyov saw Comte as an epistemological phenomenalist, since the former held that for Comte genuine cognition consists of data from external senses. The very use of the word «external» implies an

opposition to what is internal. However, does not ontological phenomenism collapse the former into the latter? On the other hand, in the sentence immediately preceding our extended quotation above, Solovyov contrasted the independently existing being of materialism to the external phenomenon of positivism. Thus, if Solovyov was consistent *and* materialism is itself an epistemological phenomenism, then the contrast is tenable only if positivism is a form of ontological phenomenism. Our final confirmation of positivism's ontological phenomenism can be found in the appendix to the *Crisis*, where Solovyov wrote, «The fundamental principle, or essence, of positivism consists in the fact that for us nothing exists besides observed phenomena as external facts» [15, c. 151]. Since, according to Solovyov, positivism maintains, as a matter of principle, that true or genuine knowledge originates from external experience, but it also preaches, owing to its variety of phenomenism, that what we view as external is merely a bundle of sense perceptions that we take to be external, we have a contradiction. The resolution of this situation, coupled with other issues, led Western philosophy onward to Schopenhauer and then von Hartmann.

The general argument of the *Crisis* is too familiar to recount in detail here. Solovyov's work is virtually a diatribe against what he took to be the dominant trend in Western philosophy, namely, its penchant for rationality and abstract analysis. Allegedly tracing this movement throughout modern philosophy, Solovyov came to his own day. It is remarkable that he had absolutely nothing to say about the nascent neo-Kantian movement, which, with its formalistic interpretation of Kant, could conceivably have fitted well into his portrayal of Western thought. That Solovyov progressed from Kant to the other German Idealists and then to Schopenhauer and von Hartmann with extended discussions of their thought in Chapters Two and Three shows that at least when those chapters were being written Solovyov had already said in Chapter One all he had intended to say about positivism. With regard to his central claim, positivism is of interest only as a form of phenomenism, which he believed he had dealt with exhaustively already in his discussion of Kant. Chapter Four takes us from Hegel through Feuerbach and the young Hegelians with not a single word about positivism. In Chapter Five, we find John Stuart Mill mentioned. Solovyov had previously in Chapter One labeled Mill as a positivist, but the introduction of Mill in this later chapter is as a representative of «the empirical tendency», and, more specifically, of the final stage of empiricism, *not* as a representative of positivism²⁰.

Admittedly, Solovyov devoted an appendix to Comte's theory of the three phases in human intellectual development. This appendix appeared in the final printed version of his thesis as well as in the November issue of «Православное обозрение»²¹. What is of interest in this appendix is neither Solovyov's discussion nor his totally predictable criticism of Comte's philosophy of history. Solovyov recognized that Comte believed theology, metaphysics and science were three historically successive phases. Moreover, the former realized that for Comte the general scientific method entails the limitation of human cognition to external phenomena, relations and laws, i.e., to phenomenism. Of course, Solovyov rejected Comte's claim that science can alone explain everything and prove to be intellectually satisfying as well as his account of the nature of religion and metaphysics²². But, along with Kudrjavcev, he also rejected Comte's claim concerning the historical succession of the three phases. Not only can there be no talk of succession, but also no talk

of substitution: «In fact, from the very start of humanity's intellectual development we find religious faith, philosophical speculations and positive observations existing simultaneously in their respective spheres» [15, c. 148]. Solovyov ended this appendix, writing, «the pretension of positivism to be the universal worldview is completely unfounded» [15, c. 152]. Thus, he believed that with his appendix he had successfully shown the inadequacy of Comte's philosophy of history. In this respect, if the *Crisis* were intended from the start to be a refutation of positivism and, therefore, to be «against the positivists», this appendix alone would have sufficed. That alone has significance for understanding the thesis, but the reader will also note that, although Solovyov did refer in this appendix to positivism as a phenomenalism, he never even attempted to situate Comte's positivism within his outline of the history of Western philosophy. That is, he never mentioned where to place Comte in the historical line leading from Kant to von Hartmann. Although Mill is referred to in the appendix as a positivist, Solovyov had Mill's role in history as an empiricist, as the culmination of a line extending from Bacon through Locke onward. Comte, on the other hand, does not enter the discussion as an empiricist and certainly not as the culminator of any line. Are we to infer that Comte, owing to his phenomenalism, is to be «sandwiched» or squeezed somehow into the development of empiricism? Solovyov never said so, and there is no spot in Solovyov's cherished triadic scheme for Comte. If we accept Solovyov's account(s) of history, Comte is an orphan. All the more startling, then, is Losev's statement that Solovyov's depiction of the transition from Hegel to positivism is impeccable (безупречно). To be precise, there is no transition from Hegel to positivism²³.

Finally, in turning to the «Introduction» to the *Crisis*, we find many of Solovyov's best-known expressions and themes. It also happens to be the only section of the completed book that did not appear separately in a journal. Based on that and the content of this «Introduction», we can state with confidence that it was of comparatively late origin. Whether written in early 1874 or late in that year is of little importance, though, for our purpose here. In its opening lines, Solovyov claimed that, unlike positivism, he believed all of abstract philosophy belongs to the past. Positivism itself claims that the speculative current in Western philosophy has passed and ended, but not the empirical current, of which it is the ultimate and fullest expression. For Solovyov, positivism is insufficiently and inadequately radical. Rather, both the speculative *and* the empirical currents of abstract philosophy have passed²⁴. Thus, accepting these opening words, Solovyov's principal target was *not* positivism, but all of abstract philosophy, von Hartmann, being, in his own eyes, its final expression²⁵. The supposed «crisis» in Western philosophy is neither caused nor even represented by Comtean positivism, which is but a supporting actor in the drama that is Western philosophy. Since much of the «Introduction» is concerned with tracing the development of Western metaphysics from scholasticism to Kant, positivism plays no role there. Positivism is also not so much as mentioned in any of the seven theses Solovyov read out at the start of his *Crisis* defense, although he did mention empiricism and rationalism in the first four²⁶.

On a biographical note, we should recognize that Solovyov displayed only a modest acquaintance with positivist tracts. As for representatives of positivism, he explicitly mentioned only Comte, Littré, Mill and Spencer and rarely referred to their works directly. It is impossible to determine to what extent he had actually read them, as opposed to reading about them in secondary sources. Nor can we say whether Solovyov

knew anything about the history of positivism in Russia. None of the authors we saw earlier in this paper is so much as mentioned in the *Crisis*. Even assuming he was largely disinterested at this time in politics, could he have been unaware of Lavrov and the «going to the people» movement in 1874 inspired by Lavrov's writings? Surely, he must have heard of that largely student movement and thereby had his attention drawn to Lavrov. And what of Kudrjavcev, whose public talk on Comte took place on 1 October? Since the final subtitle of the thesis is so incongruous with its text, is it possible that Solovyov at the last moment changed the subtitle to the one we know as a result of learning of, possibly even attending, Kudrjavcev's talk?

4. Solovyov *Contra* Lesevich

Lesevich served as one of the examiners at Solovyov's thesis defense presumably owing to an already established reputation as a proponent and defender of positivism. Following that event, Lesevich wrote a lengthy review of the thesis for the journal «Отечественные записки» that appeared in the first issue of 1875. Although Lesevich demonstrated therein his erudition, it is not, at least in his reading of Solovyov's thesis, among his more insightful writings. Unlike Solovyov, Lesevich displayed a great familiarity with the German philosophical scene of the day. Unlike Solovyov, Lesevich saw the emergence of German neo-Kantianism. To his credit, he recognized that von Hartmann's ideas by no means exercised a hegemony in the West, and, thus, he, in effect, challenged Solovyov's contention that von Hartmann represented the culmination of Western thought. Lesevich writes: «Positivism, as Solovyov imagines it, does not exist; Hartmann's crisis 'against' Comte and positivism does not exist; the crisis within positivism does not exist. Finally, a crisis in the scientific direction of Western philosophy again does not exist» [18, c. 446]. Lesevich also derided Solovyov for his unfamiliarity with the major secondary histories of philosophy, and those he did appear to know had «a contingent character and are a strange concoction» [18, c. 447].

To his discredit, Lesevich either did not read Solovyov's *Crisis* or, at least, did not read it very carefully. For Lesevich did not recognize so much as the fundamental claim in Solovyov's book. The former stated that Solovyov alleged the impossibility of additional metaphysical systems after the appearance of positivism. Lesevich also hinted that the very appearance of von Hartmann's philosophy itself in Germany constituted a crisis for positivism, rather than a symptom of a crisis within Western philosophy. If that indeed was Solovyov's intention, Lesevich continued, Solovyov «did not know what he was saying» [18, c. 433]. The «crisis», in Lesevich's reading of Solovyov *Crisis*, is a result of the universal dominance of positivism over Western minds being replaced by a similar dominance of von Hartmann's philosophy.

Even the casual reader of the *Crisis*, let alone Solovyov, would recognize that the above points do not represent the position affirmed in that work. We need not dwell on these errors here. However, Solovyov did publish his remarks on Lesevich's misunderstandings, pointing out the obvious, but also making a few clarifications. As we observed in our summary of Solovyov's stand toward positivism, he affirmed, in his reply to Lesevich, a distinction between positivism as a philosophical system and positivism as an anti-metaphysical direction²⁷. He did not clarify, however, where

positivism «fits» into his sketch of the development of Western thought. He affirmed that the subtitle «against the positivists» referred, not to the word «crisis», but to the entire title, in other words that the book was intended as an attack on positivism. However, how could he do otherwise without admitting an error on his part? Clearly, he had to indicate that Lesevich's understanding was wrong, but Solovyov could not rescind the cover page of his work after its publication. More importantly, I believe, Solovyov did add that the subtitle served «only to supplement the title and is an inessential supplement»²⁸. The words are so unimportant that if someone objected to them, the subtitle should be stricken for one's peace of mind. I take this to be an affirmation that Solovyov was having «second thoughts» on its applicability, perhaps even recognizing that he had made a mistake in expression or by including it.

5. von Hartmann's Demotion and Comte's Elevation

Solovyov's reply to Lesevich appeared immediately afterward in early 1875 in the journal «Русский вестник». In March of the following year, he secured a job in St. Petersburg on the Academic Committee of the Ministry of National Education. That month also saw the appearance in the Ministry's own journal of Solovyov's first article of what became the five part «Философские начала цельного знания». In it, Solovyov reassessed and broadened his conception of humanity's historical development. Not unlike some positivists, he saw humankind and society as analogous to a living organism. Keeping to his unsubstantiated triadic scheme, Solovyov divided human life into three spheres, only the second of which concerns us here, viz., knowledge. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that he now significantly diminished von Hartmann's role. No longer did the latter stand at the summit and final stage of Western, i.e., abstract, philosophy. Whereas Solovyov saw Schopenhauer and his successor (продолжатель) von Hartmann as understanding the great significance of mysticism, Solovyov specifically assigned that role to the summit of the creative sphere (сфера творчества), not as we might expect from the *Crisis*, to the sphere of knowledge, in which Solovyov had placed abstract philosophy²⁹. In short, Solovyov «demoted» the philosophers of pessimism from their lofty perch in Western thought. And since Solovyov now in 1877 saw mysticism as the «supreme principle of the entire life of the general human organism» (верховного начала всей жизни общечеловеческого организма), von Hartmann must play a dissimilar, though highly valued, role in our historical development, independent of such geographical divisions as East and West.

As did Comte, Solovyov claimed, albeit with nuanced differences, that human history, along with thinking, must pass through three stages. However, the characteristic feature of intellectual Western development is the successive detachment of each of the three stages from an initial confused unity. By the medieval period, philosophy and empirical science were still a unity but had separated from theology. Solovyov held that in his day science was stepping forward as distinct from philosophy and was exhibiting a pretension to absolute supremacy over the other two, now obsolete stages. The explicit expression of this pretension was so-called positivism and, most importantly, for us «represents in its sphere the necessary final word of Western development»³⁰.

Of course, Solovyov refused to accept that Western civilization represented the ultimate stage of human development. It is merely a transitional phase. However, we see from this that he had reconsidered his stance in the intervening period since his *magister's* work, by accommodating and elevating positivism to a far higher role than it previously occupied. Regrettably, Solovyov paid no attention to positivism in the remaining four parts of the «Философские начала» and consigned the very mention of von Hartmann's name to a single footnote.

6. Conclusion

At the time when Solovyov was composing his *magister's* thesis, both the French and the English varieties of positivism were known intellectual currents in Russia and had domestic adherents and opponents. Yet for whatever reason, he revealed no knowledge at all of the Russian-language literature. Focusing on Comte and, to a significantly lesser degree, Mill and Spencer, Solovyov derided them for their opposition to metaphysics. However, he did this separately from the main argument of his book, which sketched the development of modern Western philosophy and its alleged inadequacies at each stage of that development. His omission of positivism as a transitional moment in the evolution of philosophy was as a result of his inability to account for it as a historical phenomenon within his overall argument. In this sense, his thesis was, by no means, «against the positivists», as it proclaimed. However, Solovyov should have recognized that this inability to allocate a historical position for it jeopardized the cogency of his argument. The subtitle of his work appears to have been a last minute change for unknown reasons from the ongoing subtitle of the serialized individual chapters, possibly in an attempt to deflect attention away from his failure. Whatever the case, within approximately two years he recognized the magnitude and significance of positivism's influence and adjusted his philosophy of history accordingly. In his «Философские начала», he, as it were, vindicated the subtitle of his thesis *ex post facto*.

References

1. Maykov, V.N. Obshchestvennye nauki v Rossii [Social Sciences in Russia], in Maykov, V.N. *Sochineniya v 2 t., t. 2* [Works in 2 vol., vol. 2], Kyiv, 1901, pp. 3–49.
2. Kareev, N.I. *Osnovy russkoy sotsiologii* [Fundamentals of Russian Sociology], Saint-Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo I. Limbakha, 1996. 368 p.
3. Milyutin, V.A. Opyt o narodnom bogatstve ili o nachalakh politicheskoy ekonomii [An Essay on a Nation's Wealth or Principles of Political Economy], in Milyutin, V.A. *Izbrannye proizvedeniya* [Selected works], Moscow, 1946, pp. 358–444.
4. Pisarev, D. Istoricheskie idei Ogyusta Konta [The historical ideas of Auguste Comte], in *Russkoe slovo*, 1865, sentyabr', pp. 42–69.
5. Serno-Solov'evich, N. Ne trebuet li nyneshnee sostoyanie znaniy novoy nauki? [Does the current state of knowledge require a discipline?], in *Russkoe slovo*, 1865, yanvar', pp. 125–136.
6. Watson, E.K. Ogyust Kont i politicheskaya filosofiya [Auguste Comte and political philosophy], in *Sovremennik*, 1865, no. 8, pp. 276–300.
7. Yuzhakov, S.N. *Sotsiologicheskie etyudy v 2 t., t. 1* [Sociological Studies in 2 vol., vol. 1], Saint-Petersburg: Tipografiya M.M. Stasyulevicha, 1891, VIII, 278 p.

8. L[iilienfel'd], P. *Mysli o sotsial'noy nauke budushchego* [Thoughts on a Social Science of the Future], Saint-Petersburg, 1872, VI+403 p.
9. Lesevich, V. Noveyshaya literatura pozitivizma [Contemporary literature of positivism], in Lesevich, V. *Sobranie sochineniy* [Collected Works], Moscow: Knigoizdatel'stvo pisateley, 1915, vol. 1, pp. 86–135.
10. Lesevich, V. *Opyt kriticheskogo issledovaniya osnovonachal pozitivnoy filosofii* [An Attempt at a Critical Investigation of the Fundamental Principles of Positive Philosophy], Saint-Petersburg: Tip. M.M. Stasyulevicha, 1877. XI+295 p.
11. Mozgovaya, N.G. Pozitivizm i Kievskaya dukhovno-akademicheskaya filosofiya: na primere tvorcheskogo naslediya Or. Novitskogo i S. Gogotskogo [Positivism and the philosophy of the Kiev theological academy: on the example of the creative heritage of Or. Nowicki and S. Gogotskogo], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2007, issue 14, pp. 150–159.
12. Linit'skiy, P. *Obzor filosofskikh ucheniy* [Survey of Philosophical Doctrines], Kyiv: Tip. S.T. Eremeeva, 1874. 255 p.
13. Kudryavtsev-Platonov, V.D. Religiya i pozitivnaya filosofiya [Religion and positive philosophy], in Kudryavtsev-Platonov, V.D. *Sochineniya* [Works], Sergiev Posad, 1892, vol. 2, issue 1, pp. 320–350.
14. Luk'yanov, S.M. *O Vl.S. Solov'ev v ego molodye gody. Materialy k biografii. Kniga pervaya* [About Vl. Solovyov in his Younger Years. Materials for a Biography. Book One], Petrograd: Senatskaya tipografiya, 1916. 441 p.
15. Solov'ev, V.S. Krizis zapadnoy filosofii (protiv pozitivistov) [The Crisis of Western Philosophy: Against the Positivists], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem v 20 t. Sochineniya t. 1* [Complete Works and Letters in 20 vol. Works vol. 1], Moscow: Nauka, 2000, pp. 38–153.
16. Strakhov, N. *Filosofskie ocherki* [Philosophical Essays], Saint-Petersburg: Tipografiya Br. Panteleevykh, 1895. 544 p.
17. Losev, A.F. *Vladimir Solov'ev i ego vremya* [Vladimir Solovyov and His Time], Moscow: Molodaya gvardiya, 2000. 650 p.
18. Lesevich, V.V. Kak inogda pishutsya dissertatsii [How dissertations are sometimes written], in Lesevich, V.V. *Sobranie sochineniy* [Collected Works], Moscow: Izdanie Yu.V. Leontovich, 1915, vol. 2, pp. 427–449.
19. Solov'ev, V.S. Strannoe nedorazumenie (Otvét g. Lesevichu) [A strange misunderstanding (Reply to Mr. Lesevich)], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem v 20 t. Sochineniya t. 1* [Complete Works and Letters in 20 vol. Works vol. 1], Moscow: Nauka, 2000, pp. 183–190.
20. Solov'ev, V.S. Filosofskie nachala tsel'nogo znaniya [The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem v 20 t. Sochineniya t. 2* [Complete Works and Letters in 20 vol. Works vol. 2], Moscow: Nauka, 2000, pp. 185–308.

**HALLUCINATION OR IMPERFECTION? «RUSSKOE OBOZRENIE»
JOURNAL AND THE FORGIVEN DEBATE BETWEEN VLADIMIR
SOLOVYOV AND PRINCE SERGEY TRUBETSKOY**

M.V.MEDOVAROV

Lobachevsky State University of Nizhny Novgorod
23, Gagarina pr., Nizhny Novgorod, 603950, Russian Federation
E-mail: mmedovarov@yandex.ru

The article considers the polemics between Vladimir Solovyov and Sergey Trubetskoy devoted to the problem whether the disintegration of the All-Unity (realizing themselves as individuals) is real

or illusory. It also gives review of the peculiarities of the argument closely connected with the beginning of the issue of «Russkoe Obozrenie» journal with Dmitry Tsertelev as the chief editor. It is worth to mention that the debate between the two philosophers has also never been investigated till nowadays. The programme review of Trubetskoy's «Metaphysics in Ancient Greece» by Solovyov, though published in his collected works in the early 20th century, has never been quoted by neither the later thinkers nor by the historians of philosophy. Trubetskoy's detailed answer in his unpublished letter to Prince Tsertelev has remained unknown to the researchers; it is published for the first time as supplement to this article. The main research methods are comparative historical and dialectic methods. In the article the similarities and differences between the two authors' points of view are analysed. The article reveals Solovyov's position, according to which the existence of individual subjects is the harmful and unhealthy hallucination, and nothing except the All-Unity exists. On the other hand, Trubetskoy's point of view is presented, that the imperfection of the world diintegrated to fragments or individual subjects is neither a hallucination nor illusion but the reality though undue one. It is pointed that the problems of the investigated polemics was brightly forestalled by Petr Chaadayev and finally found their completion in the metaphysics of Nikolai Berdyaev and especially by Lev Karsavin. It is concluded that polemics of 1890 touching upon the problem of the character of the Neoplatonic triad (state – outcoming – return or the transition to the new level) was an important, though forgotten milestone in the development of the Russian philosophical mainstream of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Key words: Proklos's dialectics, Neo-Platonism, All-Unity, polemics between Solovyov and Trubetskoy, «Russkoe Obozrenie», hallucination, «Metaphysics in Ancient Greece».

References

1. Pis'ma A.A. Kireeva N.N. Strakhovu [Letters from A.A. Kireev to N.N. Strakhov], in *OR RNB*, fund 747, no. 15.
2. Trubetskoy, S.N. *Metafizika v Drevney Gretsii* [Metaphysics in Ancient Greece], Moscow, 1890. VII + 508 p.
3. Trubetskoy S.N. *Metafizika v Drevney Gretsii* [Metaphysics in Ancient Greece], Moscow, 2010. 589 p.
4. Solov'ev, V.S. [Retsenziya na:] Knyaz' S. Trubetskoy. *Metafizika v Drevney Gretsii* [Review: Prince S. Trubetskoy. *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece*], in *Russkoe obozrenie*, Moscow, 1890, no. 10, pp. 931–945.
5. Lopatin, L.M. *Polozhitel'nye zadachi filosofii. Chast' I. Oblast' umozritel'nykh voprosov* [Positive Tasks of Philosophy. Part I. Sphere of Speculative Questions], Moscow, 1886. 462 p.
6. Berdyaev, N.A. *Smysl tvorchestva* [The Sense of Creativity], in Berdyaev, N.A. *Filosofiya svobody. Smysl tvorchestva* [Philosophy of Freedom. The Sense of Creativity], Moscow, 1989, pp. 252–580.
7. Solov'ev, V.S. Razbor knigi kn. Sergeya Trubetskogo «Metafizika v Drevney Gretsii» [Analysis of the book by Prince Sergey Trubetskoy «Metaphysics in Ancient Greece»], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Sobranie sochineniy v 10 t., t. 6* [Collected Works in 10 vol., vol. 6], Saint-Petersburg, 1913, pp. 293–307.
8. Solov'ev, V.S. Pervobytnoe yazychestvo, ego zhivye i mertvye ostatki (okonchanie) [Primitive Paganism, Its Life and Dead Relicts (the end)], in *Russkoe obozrenie*, Moscow, 1890, no. 10, pp. 485–517.
9. Solov'ev, V.S. Mifologicheskii protsess v drevnem yazychestve [Mythological Process in the Ancient Paganism], in *Pravoslavnoe obozrenie*, Moscow, 1873, no. 11, pp. 635–665.
10. Pis'ma S.N. Trubetskogo D.N. Tsertelevu [Letters from S.N. Trubetskoy to D.N. Tsertelev], in *RGALI* [Russian State Archive of Literature and Art], fund 542, inventory 1, no. 40.
11. Chaadaev, P.Ya. *Filosoficheskie pis'ma (1829–1830)* [Philosophical Letters], in Chaadaev, P.Ya. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i izbrannye pis'ma* [Full Collected Works and Selected Letters], Moscow, 1991, vol. 1, pp. 320–440.

12. Karsavin, L.P. O nachalakh [On Principles], in *Predanie.Ru. Pravoslavnyy portal* [Orthodox Portal]. Available at: <http://predanie.ru/karsavin-lev-platonovich/book/76119-o-nachalah/> (date of access: 26.02.2016).

13. Karsavin, L.P. O lichnosti [On Person], in Karsavin, L.P. *Religiozno-filosofskie sochineniya* [Religious-Philosophical Works], Moscow, 1992? vol. 1, pp. 2–232.

14. Karsavin, L.P. Poema o smerti [Poem On Death], in Karsavin, L.P. *Religiozno-filosofskie sochineniya* [Religious-Philosophical Works], Moscow, 1992, vol. 1, pp. 234–305.

«THE SIGN»: VLADIMIR SOLOVYOVS SECOND JOURNEY TO EGYPT

J. KRASICKI

University of Wrocław,

1, Plac Uniwersytecki, Wrocław, Poland

E-mail: krasicki@uni.wroc.pl

The article deals with Vladimir Solovyov's second journey to Egypt (1898). It is argued that the trip and the resulting inner experiences had a decisive impact on Solovyov's spiritual life as well as the poetry and philosophy of his "eschatological" period (1898–1900). While concentrating on the interpretation of Solovyov's poetry of that time, the author examines the spiritual dimension of the philosopher's experiences of the Sophic and the demonic, and investigates their interdependencies. The problem is undertaken with an eye on Solovyov's own work but it also addresses the spiritual (mystical and ascetic) tradition of the Eastern and Western Church. In conclusion it is shown that independently of the psychic aspect of the philosopher's Sophic and demonic experiences, their most important meaning, i.e. their inner and spiritual meaning (in its phenomenological capacity), remains unchanged. It is pointed that Sophic and demonic experiences of the philosopher influenced his spiritual evolution and his work. The analyses and interpretations presented in the paper confirm the accuracy of the author's main thesis: the ultimate meaning of the philosopher's experiences is articulated in his eschatology. Finally, it is stated that in order to arrive at the correct understanding of the philosopher's spiritual and creative development, one has to take into account its integral character – Solovyov cannot be approached as just an academic scholar but should be seen as a «witness of faith» in the early Christian and nearly forgotten sense of the phrase (Gr. martys, Lat. martyr).

Key words: *sophiology, Mariology, demonology, psychology, evil, spiritual experience, spiritual struggle, Antichrist, apocalypse, eschatology, poetry.*

References

1. Mochul'skiy, K. *Vladimir Solov'ev. Zhizn' i uchenie* [Vladimir Solovyov. Life and Teachings], Parizh: YMCA – PRESS, 1951. 269 p.
2. Solov'ev, S.M. *Vladimir Solov'ev. Zhizn' i tvorcheskaya evolyutsiya* [Vladimir Solovyov: His Life and Creative Evolution], Moscow: Izdatel'stvo «Respublika», 1997. 432 p.
3. Przebinda, G. Apokalipsa Włodzimierza Solowjowa [Vladimir Solovyov's Apocalypse], in *Znak*, Cracow, 1986, no. 11–12 (384–385), pp. 54–70.
4. George, M. *Mystische und religiöse Erfahrung im Denken Vladimir Solov'evs* [The Mystical and Religious Experience in the Thought of Vladimir Solovyov], Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988. 384 p.
5. Berdyaev, N.A. Problema Vostoka i Zapada v religioznom soznanii Vl. Solov'eva [The Problem of the East and the West in the Religious Consciousness of Vl. Solovyov], in *Sbornik pervyy o Vladimire Solov'evе* [The first collection about Vladimir Solovyov], Moscow: Put', 1911, pp. 104–128.

6. Florovskiy, G. V mire iskanii i bluzhdanii [In this World of Conquering and Straying], in *Russkaya Mysl'* [Russian thought], Praga–Berlin: Izdatel'stvo «Russkaya Mysl'», 1923, vol. 3–4, pp. 210–231.
7. Rashkovskiy, E. B. Bibleyskie temy v poezii V.S. Solov'eva [Biblical Themes in the Poetry of V. Solovyov], in *Mir Biblii*, Moscow, 1993, no. 1, pp. 85–92.
8. Sinilo, G. V. *Bibleyskiy i kabbalisticheskiy kontekst misticheskoy poezii V.S. Solov'eva* [The Biblical and Kabbalistic Context of the Mystical Poetry of V.S. Solovyov]. Available at: <http://elib.bs.u.by/bitstream/123456789/56484/1/Sinilo%20G.V.%20Bibleyskiy%20i%20kabbalisticheskiy%20kontekt%20misticheskoy%20poezii%20V.S.Solov'eva.pdf>
9. Solov'ev, V.S. Mistika – mistitsizm [Mystique – Mysticism], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Sobranie sochineniy. T. 10* [Collected Works. Vol. 10], Bryussel': Izdatel'stvo «Zhizn' s Bogom», 1966, pp. 243–246.
10. Kvachan, L. (Avdeychik). *Vetkhovzetnye motivy v tvorchestve Vladimira Solov'eva* [Old Testament Motifs in the Works of Vladimir Solovyov]. Available at: <http://minds.by/zhurnal-stupeni/ arhiv-nomerov-za-2005-god/stupeni-3-19-zhenshhina-v-tserkvi/vetkhovzetnye-motivy-v-tvorchestve-vladimira-soloveva#.VvA-LSIXfo4>
11. Solov'ev, V.S. Znamenie [The Sign], in Solov'ev, V.S. «*Nepodvizhno lish' solntse lyubvi...*». *Stikhotvoreniya. Proza. Pis'ma. Vospominaniya sovremennikov* [Verses. Prose. Letters. Memoirs of contemporaries], Moscow: Moskovskiy rabochiy, 1990, p. 112.
12. Solov'ev, V.S. Tri razgovora [Three Conversations], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Sobranie sochineniy. T. 10* [Collected Works. Vol. 10], Bryussel': Izdatel'stvo «Zhizn' s Bogom», 1966, pp. 81–221.
13. Gaydenko, P.P. Ob avtore i ego geroe [About the Author and his Hero], in Solov'ev, S.M. *Vladimir Solov'ev. Zhizn' i tvorcheskaya evolyutsiya* [Vladimir Solovyov. Life and creative evolution], Moscow: Izdatel'stvo «Respublika», 1997, pp. 382–422.
14. Losskiy, N.O. *Istoriya russkoy filosofii* [The History of Russian Philosophy]. Available at: https://www.google.pl/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwjtn7rG-6fLAhVmJJoKHcRiCWsQFggcMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.krotov.info%2Flib_sec%2F12_1%2Flos%2Flossk_n_00.htm&usq=AFQjCNGEndXK2Pl7yu0S0U9N5DvYtWrEkw
15. Florovskiy, G. *Puti russkogo bogosloviya* [The Paths of Russian Theology], Paris: YMCA-PRESS, 1983. 600 p.
16. Solov'ev, V.S. Das Ewig-Weibliche [The Eternal Female], in Solov'ev, V.S. «*Nepodvizhno lish' solntse lyubvi...*». *Stikhotvoreniya. Proza. Pis'ma. Vospominaniya sovremennikov* [Verses. Prose. Letters. Memoirs of contemporaries], Moscow: Moskovskiy rabochiy, 1990. 113 p.
17. Losskiy, N.O. V zashchitu Vladimira Solov'eva [In Defense of Vladimir Solovyov], in *Vladimir Solov'ev: pro et contra*. Saint-Petersburg, 2000, vol. 2, pp. 34–45.
18. Andreev, I.M. Vladimir Solov'ev – mistik v svete pravoslaviya. Otvet prof. N.O. Losskomu [Vladimir Solovyov – the Mystic in the Light of The Orthodox Church. An Answer to Prof. N.O. Lossky], in *Vladimir Solov'ev: pro et contra*. Saint-Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Russkogo Khristianskogo Instituta, 2002, vol. 2, pp. 46–53.
19. Arkhepiskop Antoniy (Khrapovitskiy). Lozhnyy prorok [The False Prophet], in *Vladimir Solov'ev: pro et contra*. Saint-Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Russkogo Khristianskogo Instituta, 2002, vol. 2, pp. 54–58.
20. Krasitskiy, Ya. *Bog, chelovek i zlo. Issledovanie filosofii Vladimira Solov'eva* [God, Man and Evil. A Study of the Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov], Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya, 2009. 448 p.
21. Khoruzhiy, S.S. Nasledie Vladimira Solov'eva sto let spustya [The Legacy of Vladimir Solovyov One Hundred Years Later], in *Solov'evskiy sbornik* [Solovyov collection], Moscow: Fenomenologiya-Germenevtika, 2001, pp. 1–18.
22. Klinger, J. Dwie postacie prekursorów prawosławnej odnowy [Two Figures of the Precursors of the Eastern Orthodox Revival], in Klinger, J. *O istocie prawosławia*. Warsaw: Instytut wydawniczy PAX, 1983, pp. 270–302.
23. Bouyer, L. *Wprowadzenie do życia duchowego* [Introduction to the Life of the Spirit], Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, 1982. 224 p.

24. Waage, P.N. *Der unsichtbare Kontinent. Wladimir Solowjow der Denker Europas* [The Invisible Continent. Vladimir Solovyov as the Thinker of Europe], Stuttgart: Verlag Freies Geistesleben, 1988. 340 p.

25. Lobanova, I.V. «*Ya v proroki vozveden vragami...*» (*Eskhatologiya Vladimira Solov'eva*) [My Enemies Made me a Prophet. Vladimir Solovyov's Eschatology]. Available at: <https://www.google.pl/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwj1x4D6-afLAhVmYpoKHcMFCmkQFggBMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Frus-istoria.ru%2Fcomponent%2Fk2%2Fitem%2F1478-ya-v-proroki-vozveden-vragami-eshatologiya-vladimira-soloveva&usg=AFQjCNHhpqWqW2WvX7Evxq-sBGPP5HQqhA&bvm=bv.116274245,d.bGs>

26. Losev, A.F. *VI. Solov'ev* [VI. Solovyov], Moscow: Mysl', 1994. 232 p.

27. Przebinda, G. *Od Czaadaewa do Bierdiajewa. Spór o Boga i człowieka w myśli rosyjskiej (1832–1922)* [From Tschaadaev to Berdiaev. The Controversy Over God and Man in the Russian Thought (1832–1922)], Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejetnosci, 1998. 528 p.

28. Strémooukhoff, D. *Vladimir Soloviev et son oeuvre messianique* [Vladimir Soloviev and his Messianic Work], Paris: Sociéétéé d'Édition, 1935. 351 p.

29. Besançon A. *Sfalszowane dobro* [The Counterfeit Good], Poznan, 1989, 6(190), pp. 51–57.

30. Yung, K.G. *Otvét Iovu* [Answer to Job]. Available at: https://www.google.pl/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwja_9WX_KfLAhVsJpoKHf8JAcMQFggBMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ereading.club%2Fbook.php%3Fbook%3D1006301&usg=AFQjCNE0JdiAb_l6a3jcP96gq_rqDcQ3OA&bvm=bv.116274245,d.bGs

31. Shestov, L. *Umozrenie i Apokalipsis. Religioznaya filosofiya VI. Solov'eva* [Speculation and Apocalypse. The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov], in Shestov, L. *Umozrenie i otkrovenie. Religioznaya filosofiya VI. Solov'eva i drugie stat'i* [Contemplation and revelation. Religious philosophy of V. Solovyov and other articles], Paris: YMCA-PRESS, 1964, pp. 23–91.

32. Sudbrack, J. *Mistyka. Doswiadczenie wlasnego ja – Doswiadczenie kosmiczne – Doswiadczenie Boga* [Mysticism. The Experience of the Self – Cosmic Experience – The Experience of God], Cracow: Wydawnictwo WAM, 1996. 146 p.

THE IDEA OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH AND VLADIMIR SOLOVYOV'S «CONVERSION» TO ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN THE LATE WORKS OF SIMON FRANK

G.E. ALIAIEV

Poltava National Technical University Named after Yuri Kondratyuk
24, Pershotravnevy Ave., Poltava, 36011, Ukraine
E-mail: gealyaev@mail.ru

The paper's focus is on the 'turn to Solovyov' in the Simon Frank's late works. Using hermeneutical, historical, critical methods, and the biographical approach, the author analyses specific facts of Simon Frank's last years references to Vladimir Solovyov's ideas, uncovering their causes and explaining the role of their influence on Simon Frank's worldview in the context of his creative evolution. In particular, it is about preparation of the English-language anthology of Solovyov's texts by Frank. The author states that Simon Frank's specific interest to the subject of Roman Catholicism was provoked by a number of external causes (e.g. his desire to represent Vladimir Solovyov's ideas to the English-speaking world in more adequate and appropriate way), as well as also by the strengthening of his own philosophical position of religious universalism and causes of personal kind (the conversion of his elder son to Roman Catholicism). Thus methodological approach of Frank to the analysis of the concept

of Solovyov is based on the principle of integrity of philosophy (outlook) and the identity of the thinker. «Universalism of sobornost'» of Frank is considered not simply as logical conclusion, and as personal experience of the philosopher who wasn't breaking off, however, communication with Orthodoxy. The study of mystical elements results a conclusion about the late Frank's reception of Vladimir Solovyov's religious and philosophical intuitions. However, the main conclusion is that the "turn" was not a result of a transformation of Frank's System, but was rather implied with the further unfolding of Frank's own philosophical intuitions of all-unity and development of the concept of God-Manhood in his late social and ethical and anthropological works. The appendix contains Notes on Vladimir Solovyov by Simon Frank from his notebooks, previously unpublished.

Key words: Simon Frank and Vladimir Solovyov; philosophical biography, philosophy and religion, Christian universalism, Universal Church, all-unity, the Russian philosophy.

References

1. Pis'ma S.L. Franka V.B. El'yashevichu i F.O. El'yashevich [S.L. Frank's Letters for V.B. El'ashevich and F.O. El'ashevich], in *Arkhiv Doma Russkogo Zarubezh'ya* [House of the Russian Abroad Archive]. F. 4. Op. 3. Ed. khr. 1–3.
2. Rezyvkh, T.N. «Moya sud'ba menya ne bespokoit...»: S.L. Frank v okkupirovannoy Frantsii [«My destiny doesn't disturb me ...»: S.L. Frank in the occupied France], in *Sbornik nauchnykh statey «Samyy vydayushchisya russkiy filosof»: Filosofiya religii i politiki S.L. Franka* [Collection of scientific articles «The most outstanding Russian philosopher»: S.L. Frank's Philosophy of religion and policy], Moscow, 2015, pp. 195–240.
3. Bakhmeteff Archive of Russian and East European History and Culture, Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, S.L. Frank Papers.
4. Ern, V.F. Kul'turnoe neponimanie. Otvet S.L. Franku [Cultural misunderstanding. Answer to S. L. Frank], in Frank, S.L. *Sochineniya* [Works], Moscow: Pravda, 1991, pp. 109–126.
5. Frank, S.L. Real'nost' i chelovek. Metafizika chelovecheskogo bytiya [Reality and man. An essay on the metaphysics of human nature], in Frank, S.L. *Real'nost' i chelovek* [Reality and man], Moscow: Respublika, 1997, pp. 207–431.
6. Alyaev, G.E. *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2008, issue 16, pp. 205–218.
7. Frank, S.L. Predmet znaniya. Ob osnovakh i predelakh otvlechnogo znaniya [The Object of Knowledge], in Frank, S.L. *Predmet znaniya. Dusha cheloveka* [The Object of Knowledge. Man's Soul], Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, 1995, pp. 35–416.
8. Frank, S.L. Nepostizhimoe. Ontologicheskoe vvedenie v filosofiyu religii [The Unknowable. An Ontological Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion], in Frank, S.L. *Sochineniya* [Works], Moscow: Pravda, 1990, pp. 181–559.
9. A Solovyov Anthology, arranged by S.L. Frank. London: S. C. M. Press, 1950. 256 p.
10. *Pis'ma Vladimira Sergeevicha Solov'eva T. I–IV* [Vladimir Solovyov Letters. Vol. I–IV], Saint-Petersburg – Petersburg, 1908–1923.
11. Mochul'skiy, K. *Vladimir Solov'ev. Zhizn' i uchenie* [Vladimir Solovyov. Life and doctrine], Paris: YMKA Press, 1936. Available at: <http://www.vehi.net/mochulsky/soloviev/index.html>
12. Frank, S.L. *Russkaya mysl'*, 1912, no. 3, pp. 31–35.
13. Alyaev, G.E. «Religiya v predelakh tol'ko opyta»: nenapisannaya kniga S. Franka (ili napisannaya?). Posleslovie k publikatsii [«Religion within only experience»: the unwritten book of S. Frank (or written?). An epilog to the publication], in *Istoriya filosofii u vitchiznyaniy dukhovnyy kul'turi* [Philosophy history in domestic spiritual culture], Poltava: OOO «ASMI», 2016, pp. 521–534.
14. Frank, S.L. Dukhovnoe nasledie Vl. Solov'eva [Spiritual heritage of Vl. Solovyov], in Frank, S.L. *Russkoe mirovozzrenie* [Russian outlook], Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, 1996, pp. 392–399.
15. Bubbayer, F. *S.L. Frank. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo russkogo filosofa 1877–1950* [S.L. Frank: the life and work of a Russian philosopher. 1877–1950], Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2001.

16. Satton, Dzh. *Religioznaya filosofiya Vladimira Solov'eva. Na puti k pereosmysleniyu* [The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov. Towards a Reassessment], Kiev: Dukh i litera, 2008. 304 p.
17. Aliaiev, G. The Universalism of Catholicity (Sobornost): Metaphysical and Existential Foundations for Interdenominational Dialogue in Semyon Frank's Philosophy, in *Apology of Culture. Religion and Culture in Russian Thought*. Wipf and Stock Publishers, Eugene, OR, USA, 2015, pp. 218–226.
18. Frank, S.L. S nami Bog. Tri razmyshleniya [God With Us. Three Meditations], in Frank, S.L. *Dukhovnye osnovy obshchestva* [The Spiritual Foundations of Society], Moscow: Respublika, 1992, pp. 217–404.
19. Frank, S.L. *Russkaya mysl'*, 1911, no. 9, pp. 1–28.
20. Solov'ev, Vl.S. Chteniya o Bogochelovechestve [Lectures on God-Manhood], in Solov'ev, Vl.S. *Sochineniya v 2 t., t. 2* [Works in 2 vol., vol. 2], Moscow: Pravda, 1989, pp. 3–172.
21. Frank, S.L. <Iz zapisnoy knizhki 1944 goda> [From the Notebook 1944], in *Istoriya filosofii u vitchiznyaniy dukhovniy kul'turi* [Philosophy history in domestic spiritual culture], Poltava: OOO «ASMI», 2016, pp. 517–520.
22. *Beseda s Mitropolitom Antoniem. Vidnye deyateli Russkoy emigratsii. Ch. II* [A talk with Metropolitan Anthony Prominent figures of the Russian Emigration. Part II]. Available at: <http://masarchive.org/Sites/texts/1999-09-08-1-R-R-C-EM00-001.html>
23. Frank, S.L. Dva pis'ma Vyach. Ivanovu (1947 g.) [Two letters for V. Ivanov, 1947], in Frank, S.L. *Russkoe mirovozzrenie* [Russian outlook], Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, 1996, pp. 95–98.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF «WHOLE KNOWLEDGE» IN RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY (KIREEVSKY, SOLOVYOV, FLORENSKY)

N.N. PAVLIUCHENKOV
St. Tikhon's Orthodox university
2/5, Bahrushina str., Moscow, 115184, Russian Federation
E-mail: npavl905@mail.ru

The article considers the main problems, associated with the Russian religious philosophical interpretation of the ideals of «Whole knowledge». The conceptions of I.V. Kireevsky, V.S. Solovyov and P.A. Florensky are expounded sequentially. It is emphasized that in Kireevsky's project of «Whole knowledge», the experience of Christian asceticism became for Kireevsky that foundation, on the basis of which it is only possible «Scientific philosophy» as the result of «Whole life» and «Whole reason». It is shown that as distinct from Kireevsky's view, Solovyov's conception is based on the idea that a human being is unconditional and divine being and it provides a cause for a little interest in the internal life and state of a person. It is noted that his special concern is with «Free Theosophy» as the genuine synthesis of science, philosophy and theology. Florensky's version of solving this problem is also analyzed. It is exposed that Florensky, like Solovyov, considered a human being as belonging to two levels of reality: the empirical and «unconditional» ones but this unconditional reality, according to his opinion is not the divine un-created reality. It reveals the Florensky's views on the identity between deification and «Whole knowledge» and also primary importance of religious cult for the inner unity of a human being. The conclusion is made that, on the one hand, Florensky's conception of «Whole knowledge» involved both the ideas of Kireevsky's conception and the ideas of Solovyov's conception. On the other hand, Florensky made a new contribution to the concept of «Whole knowledge».

Key words: «Whole knowledge», philosophy of «all-unity», faith, religious experience, reason, religious cult, deification, theology, science, Christian asceticism, «Free theology».

Reference

1. Sudakov, A.K. *Tsel'nost' Bytiya. Religiozno-filosofskaya mysl' I.V. Kireevskogo* [Wholeness of Being. Religious and philosophical thought of I.V. Kireyevsky], Moscow: IFRAN, 2011. 191 p.
2. Florenskiy, P.A. *Sochineniya. T. 1 (1). Stolp i utverzhdenie Istiny* [Works. Vol. 1(1). The Pillar and Ground of the Truth], Moscow: Pravda, 1990. 490 p.
3. Kireevskiy, I.V. Otryvki [Excerpts], in Kireevskiy, I.V. *Razum na puti k istine* [The Mind on the way to the truth], Moscow: Pravilo very, 2002, pp. 268–285.
4. Kireevskiy, I.V. O kharaktere prosveshcheniya Evropy [The nature of European education], in Kireevskiy, I.V. *Razum na puti k istine* [The Mind on the way to the truth], Moscow: Pravilo very, 2002, pp. 151–213.
5. Kireevskiy, I.V. O neobkhodimosti i vozmozhnosti novykh nachal dlya filosofii [On the necessity and the possibility of new beginnings for philosophy], in Kireevskiy, I.V. *Razum na puti k istine* [The Mind on the way to the truth], Moscow: Pravilo very, 2002, pp. 213–268.
6. Kireevskiy, I.V. Dnevnik [A diary], in Kireevskiy, I.V. *Razum na puti k istine* [The Mind on the way to the truth], Moscow: Pravilo very, 2002, pp. 412–449.
7. Khomyakov, A.S. Opyt katikhizicheskogo izlozheniya ucheniya o tserkvi [The experience of catechetical exposition of the doctrine of the church], in Khomyakov, A.S. *Sochineniya bogoslovskie* [The theological works], Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, Sankt-Peteburgskaya izd. firma, 1995, pp. 29–97.
8. Solov'ev, V.S. Kritika otvlechenykh nachal [Criticism of Abstract Principles], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Sochineniya v 2 t., t. 1* [Works in 2 vol., vol. 1], Moscow: Mysl', 1988, pp. 581–756.
9. Solov'ev, V.S. Filosofskie nachala tsel'nogo znaniya [Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge], in Solov'ev, V. S. *Sochineniya v 2 t., t. 2* [Works in 2 vol., vol. 2], Moscow: Mysl', 1988, pp. 139–288.
10. Solov'ev, V.S. Chtenie odinnadsatoe i dvenadsatoe [Reading the eleventh and twelfth], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Chteniya o Bogochelovechestve* [Reading about God-mankind], Saint-Petersburg: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1994, pp. 185–203.
11. Solov'ev, V.S. Tri rechi v pamyat' Dostoevskogo [Three speech in memory of Dostoevsky] in Solov'ev, V.S. *Sochineniya v 2 t., t. 2* [Works in 2 vol., vol. 2], Moscow: Mysl', 1988, pp. 289–323.
12. Florenskiy, P.A. Empireya i empiriya [Empyrean and empiricism], in Pavel Florenskiy, svyashch. *Sochineniya v 4 t., t. 1* [Works in 4 vol., vol. 1], Moscow: Mysl', 1994, pp. 146–195.
13. Florenskiy, P.A. Perepiska. 1900 god. I kurs. 1 semestr [Correspondence. The year 1900. The course I. The semester 1], in Florenskiy, P.V. *Obretaya put'. Pavel Florenskiy v universitetskie gody: v 2 t., t. 1* [Finding the way. Paul Florensky in his university years in 2 vol., vol. 1], Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya, 2011, pp. 115–260.
14. Florenskiy, P.A. Perepiska. 1904 god. IV kurs. 8 semestr [Correspondence. The year 1908. The course IV. The semester 8], in Florenskiy, P.V. *Obretaya put'. Pavel Florenskiy v universitetskie gody: v 2 t., t. 2* [Finding the way. Paul Florensky in his university years in 2 vol., vol. 2], Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya, 2015, pp. 479–675.
15. Pavlyuchenkov, N.N. Filosofiya religii svyashchennika Pavla Florenskogo [Philosophy of Religion by priest Paul Florensky] in *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 7. Filosofiya*, 2012, no. 4, pp. 88–102.
16. Pavlyuchenkov, N.N. P.A. Florenskiy o religioznom opyte i religioznoy dogmatike [P.A. Florensky about the religious experience and the religious dogma], in *Vestnik PSTGU. I. Bogoslovie. Filosofiya*, 2014, issue 2(52), pp. 61–77.
17. Pavel Florenskiy, svyashch. *Detyam moim. Vospominaniya proshlykh dney* [My children. Memories of past days], Moscow: Moskovskiy rabochiy, 1992. 517 p.

18. Florenskiy, P.A. Zapisnaya tetrad' (1904–1905) [Personal workbook (1904–1905)], in *Pavel Florenskiy i simvolisty: Opyty literaturnye, Stat'i. Perepiska* [Pavel Florensky and the symbolists: Literary experiments, Articles, Correspondence], Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury, 2004, pp. 329–451.

19. Pavel Florenskiy, svyashch. Okolo Khomyakova [Around of Khomyakov], in Pavel Florenskiy, svyashch. *Sochineniya v 4 t., t. 2* [Works in 4 vol., vol. 2], Moscow: Mysl', 1996, pp. 278–336.

20. Perepiska P.A. Florenskogo i V.F. Erna [Correspondence of P.A. Florensky and V.F. Ern], in *Russkoe bogoslovie: issledovaniya, materialy* [Russian theology: study materials], Moscow: PSTGU, 2014, pp. 199–231.

21. Pavel Florenskiy, svyashch. Ob Imeni Bozhiem [On the Name of God], in Florenskiy, P.A. *Sochineniya. T. 2. U Vodorazdelov mysli* [Works. Vol. 2. In the Watershed of Thought], Moscow: Pravda, 1990, pp. 322–333.

22. Pavel Florenskiy, svyashch. Ikonostas [The Iconostasis] in *Pavel Florenskiy, svyashch. Sochineniya v 4 t., t. 2* [Works in 4 vol., vol. 2], Moscow: Mysl', 1996, pp. 419–526.

23. Trubetskoy, N.E. Svet Favorskij i preobrazhenie uma [Light Tabor and transformation of the mind], in *P.A. Florenskij: pro et contra. Antologiya*. Saint-Petersburg: RKhGI, 2001, pp. 283–313.

24. Pavel Florenskiy, svyashch. *Sobranie sochineniy. Filosofiya kul'ta (Opyt pravoslavnoy antropoditsei)* [Collected Works. The philosophy of worship (The Experience of Orthodox antropoditsei)], Moscow: Mysl', 2004. 686 p.

25. Pavel Florenskiy, svyashch. Itogi [Summation], in Florenskiy, P.A. *Sochineniya. T. 2. U Vodorazdelov mysli* [Works. Vol. 2. In the Watershed of Thought], Moscow: Pravda, 1990, pp. 341–350.

INCOMPLETE POEM OF P. A. FLORENSKY «SAINT VLADIMIR»: CONTEXTS, MEANINGS AND POETICS

I.A. EDOSHINA

Kostroma State University of N.A. Nekrasova
14, 1st May Street, Kostroma, 156961, Russian Federation
e-mail.ru: tettixgreek@yandex.ru

The article considers questions connected with the poetics of the image in the incomplete poem of P.A. Florensky «Saint Vladimir» (1904–1905). The author reveals sources of a keen interest of the Florensky, a student of Moscow Emperor's University to the philosophy and poetic creativity of V.S. Solovjev, influence of his philosophy on the articles of Florensky of that time, their «glimmering» ambiguity which source is the symbolism. The understanding of symbol's nature by the Florensky and influence of Solovjev on this understanding are also considered. The author defines the circle of writers-symbolists common to the Florensky (Andrew Belij, Sergej Solovjev) and those authors whose works he did not recognize (Valerij Brjusov, Dmitriy Merezhkovsky), reasons of sympathies and antipathies influenced on the naming of the characters in the poem are explained. Special attention is paid to the difference of understanding of symbol's nature of Florensky and Andrew Belij, who was for Florensky rather «spontaneous» symbolist than religious person like Vladimir Solovjev. The article demonstrates images which we see in different parts of the poem («glass sea», cock) and motives (ascension, descension) – their bible sources are defined (The gospel from Luka and the Apocalypse). Role of works of Vladimir Solovjev in the poem is researched, namely the poem «Dear friend, oh don't you see...». Composition of the poem «Saint Vladimir», it's structural elements, ways of their organization in the ordered but not complete text are being defined. The different art nature of the organization of the first (kaleidoscope) and the second parts (mosaic) is remarked, predictive character of the first and ideal of the second is

mentioned. In the end of the article the significance of the influence of Vladimir Solovjev, on the oeuvre of Florensky is emphasized even though this phenomenon is ambiguous.

Key words: *meaning context, symbolism, the oeuvre of Florensky, philosopher Vladimir Solovjev, writers-symbolists, nature of symbol, poetics of the image, eschatology, composition of the poem.*

References

1. Kostomarov, N.I. Knyaz' Vladimir Svyatoy [Prince Vladimir Saint], in Kostomarov, N.I. *Russkaya istoriya v zhizneopisaniyakh ee glavneyshikh deyateley: v 3 kn., kn. 1* [Russian History in the Lives of principal figures: in 3 books, book 1], Moscow: Kniga, 1990, pp. 1–7.
2. Solov'ev, V.S. *Ex oriente lux*, in Solov'ev V.S. *Stikhotvoreniya. Estetika. Literaturnaya kritika* [Poems. Aesthetics. Literary criticism], Moscow: Kniga, 1990, pp. 34–35.
3. Florenskiy, P.A. Na smert' V. Solov'eva [At Death of V. Solovyov], in Andronik (A.S. Trubachev), igum. *Put' k Bogu. Lichnost', zhizn' i tvorchestvo svyashchennika Pavla Florenskogo. Kn. 2* [The Way to God. The Personality, the Life and Work of the priest Pavel Florensky. Book 2], Sergiev Posad, 2015. P. 10.
4. *Obretaya put'. Pavel Florenskiy v universitetskie gody. Perepiska: v 2 t., t. 1* [Finding the Path. Pavel Florensky in his University years. The Correspondence: in 2 vol., vol. 1], Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya, 2011. 584 p.
5. *Obretaya put'. Pavel Florenskiy v universitetskie gody. Perepiska: v 2 t., t. 2* [Finding the Path. Pavel Florensky in his University years. The Correspondence: in 2 vol., vol. 2], Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya, 2015. 736 p.
6. Florenskiy, P.A. Empireya i Empiriya. Beseda [The Emypreya and the Emypriya. The Conversation], in Florenskiy, P.A., svyashch. *Sochineniya v 4 t., t. 1* [Works in 4 vol., vol. 1], Moscow: Mysl', 1994, pp. 146–178.
7. Florenskiy, P.A. Belyy kamen' [White Stone], in Andronik (A.S. Trubachev), igum. *Put' k Bogu. Lichnost', zhizn' i tvorchestvo svyashchennika Pavla Florenskogo. Kn. 2* [The Way to God. The Personality, the Life and Work of the priest Pavel Florensky. Book 2], Sergiev Posad, 2015, pp. 156–161.
8. Andronik (A.S. Trubachev), igum. *Put' k Bogu. Lichnost', zhizn' i tvorchestvo svyashchennika Pavla Florenskogo. Kn. 2* [The Way to God. The Personality, the Life and Work of the priest Pavel Florensky. Book 2], Sergiev Posad, 2015, pp. 32–34.
9. Florenskiy, P.A. Svyatoy Vladimir. Poema [Saintly Vladimir. The Poem], in *Pavel Florenskiy i simvolisty: Opyty literaturnye. Stat'i. Perepiska* [Pavel Florensky and Symbolists: The Experiments literary. The Articles. The Correspondence], Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury, 2004, pp. 213–309.

METAPHYSICS VS POETICS: VL. SOLOVYOV'S AND VYACH. IVANOV'S «MESSAGE ABOUT EXISTENCE»

S.D. TITARENKO

Saint Petersburg State University

7/9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation

E-mail: svet_titarenko@mail.ru

The article is devoted to the problem of interaction between philosophical language and literary language. The article investigates aspects of the interaction of philosophic and artistic discourses in the line of the ontological turning in the 20th century. The problem of V.S. Solovyov's philosophy influence

on poetry and prose of Vyach. Ivanov and the low studied problem of philosophical concepts «being» and «existence» in Vyach. Ivanov's poetry and prose are considered in the article. Metaphysical concept interpretation as a process of thinking is investigated on the basis of G. Gadamer's and M. Heidegger's hermeneutics ideas. The author considers the problem of formation of V.S. Solovyov's metaphysical conception that is represented in his works and lectures of 1870–1880s.: «Crisis of Western Philosophy. Against Positivists», «Philosophical Basics of Unitary Knowledge», «Critics of Unrelated Basics», «Readings about Godmanship», «Sofia». It is stated that Plato's ideas had a great influence on metaphysical conception of V.S. Solovyov and Vyach. Ivanov. It is shown that symbolical and metaphorical images in Solovyov's poetry have a philosophical status. Philosophical and religious concepts «being», «reality», «existence», «knowledge», «Sofia», «God» and «Absolute» in Solovyov's lyrics are replaced with artistic images of symbolical sound. The article studies the theory of symbolical concept that is described in his article «The Legacy of Symbolism». It is proved that metaphysical images in Vyach. Ivanov's poetry and prose are based on the principle of artistic symbolical image polysemy. He transforms philosophical concept into symbolical concept. The religious and philosophical poetry and prose of Vyach. Ivanov is analyzed in the article. There are examples of transition of philosophical concepts «being», «existence» into artistic images and consciousness symbols. The conclusion is made that Vyach. Ivanov turned from classical form of philosophy that is based on the concepts of science to metaphysics of artistic thinking based on symbolical concepts.

Key words: V.S. Solovyov's philosophy, Vyach. Ivanov's works, literature and philosophy, neosyncretism, metaphysics and poetics, concept and image, symbolical concepts, metaphysical poetry.

References

1. Solov'ev, V.S. Sofiya [Sofia], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem v 20 t., t. 2* [Complete collection of works in 20 vol., vol. 2], Moscow: Nauka, 2000, pp. 9–16.
2. Gadamer, G.G. Filosofiya i poeziya [Philosophy and Poetry], in Gadamer, G.G. *Aktual'nost' prekrasnogo* [The Relevance of the Beautiful], Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1991. 367 p.
3. Ivanov, Vyach. Avtobiograficheskoe pis'mo [Autobiographical Letter], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 2* [Collected works in vol. 4, vol. 2], Bryussel', 1974, pp. 5–22.
4. Solov'ev, V.S. *Stikhotvoreniya i shutochnye p'esy* [Poems and Comic Plays], Leningrag: Sovetskiy pisatel', 1974. 351 p.
5. Ivanov, Vyach. Religioznoe delo Vladimira Solov'eva [Religious Deed of Vladimir Solovyov], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 3* [Collected works in 4 vol., vol. 3], Bryussel', 1974, pp. 295–306.
6. Ivanov, Vyach. Zavety simvolizma [Symbolism Legacy], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 2* [Collected works in 4 vol., vol. 2], Bryussel', 1974, pp. 588–603.
7. Dem'yankov, V.Z. Ponyatie i kontsept v khudozhestvennoy literature i v nauchnom yazyke [Notion and Concept in Fiction and Scientific Language], in *Voprosy filologii*, 2001, no. 1, pp. 35–47.
8. Freydenberg, O.M. Obraz i ponyatie [Image and Concept], in Freydenberg, O.M. *Mif i literatura drevnosti* [Myth and Ancient Literature], Ekaterinburg: U-Faktoriya, 2008, pp. 289–438.
9. Khanzen-Leve, A. *Russkiy simvolizm: Sistema poeticheskikh motivov: Mifopoeticheskiy simvolizm nachala veka* [Russian Symbolism: System of Poetic Motives: Mythopoetic Symbolism of the Beginning of the Century], Saint-Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2003. 816 p.
10. Solov'ev, S.M. *Vladimir Solov'ev. Zhizn' i tvorcheskaya evolyutsiya* [Vladimir Solovyov, Life and Creative Evolution], Moscow: Respublika, 1997. 431 p.
11. Kozyrev, A.P. *Solov'ev i gnostiki* [Solovyov and Gnostics], Moscow: Izdatel' Savin M.A., 2007. 544 p.
12. Maksimov, M.V., Maksimova, L.M. Metafizicheskie iskaniya V.S. Solov'eva (konets 70-kh – nachalo 80-kh gg. XIX veka) [Metaphysical Search of V.S. Solovyov (the end of the 70s – the beginning of the 80s of the XIX century)], in *Solov'evskie issledovaniya*, 2015, issue 2(46), pp. 51–65.

13. Silard, L. Russkaya germeneytika XX veka [Russian Hermeneutics of the XX Century], in Silard, L. *Germetizm I germeneytika* [Germetizm and Hermeneutics], Saint-Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Ivana Limbakha, 2002, pp.13–26.
14. Losev, A.F. *Vladimir Solov'ev i ego vremya* [Vladimir Solovyov and His Time], Moscow: Progress, 1990. 720 p.
15. Solov'ev, V.S. Krizis zapadnoy filosofii (protiv pozitivistov) [Crisis of Western Philosophy(Against Positivists)], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem v 20 t., t. 1* [Complete Collection of Works in 20 vol., vol. 1], Moscow: Nauka, 2000, pp. 38–152.
16. Luk'yanov, S.M. *O Vladimire S. Solov'eva v ego molodye gody. Materialy k biografii. Kn. 2.* [About V.S. Solovyov in His Early Age. Materialstothe Biography.V. 2], Petrograd, 1918. 366 p.
17. Solov'ev, V.S. Lektsii po istorii filosofii za 1880/81 gody [Lectures on Philosophy History for 1880/81], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem v 20 t., t. 4* [Complete Collection of Works in 20 vol., vol. 4], Moscow: Nauka, 2000, pp. 171–249.
18. Ivanov, Vyach. Dve stikhii v sovremennom simvolizme [Two Movements in Modern Symbolism], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 2* [Collected Works in 4 vol., vol. 2], Brussels, 1971, pp. 536–562.
19. Ivanov, Vyach. Ty esi [You Are], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 2* [Collected Works in 4 vol., vol. 2], Brussels, 1974, pp. 262–268.
20. Ivanov, Vyach. Dostoevskiy i roman-tragediya [Dostoyevsky and Tragedy Novel], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 4* [Collected Works in 4 vol., vol. 4], Brussels, 1987, pp. 399–437.
21. Ivanov, Vyach. Miry vozmozhnogo [Worlds of the Possible], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 1* [Collected Works in 4 vol., vol. 1], Brussels, 1971, pp. 669–679.
22. Ivanov, Vyach. Tishina [Silence], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 1* [Collected Works in 4 vol., vol. 1], Brussels, 1971, pp. 693–694.
23. Ivanov, Vyach. Tantal [Tantalus], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 2* [Collected Works in 4 vol., vol. 2], Brussels, 1974, pp.23–75.
24. Khaydegger, M. *Chto takoe metafizika?* [What is Metaphysics?], Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt, 2013. 277 p.
25. Ivanov, Vyach. Otzyvy [Reviews], in Ivanov, Vyach. *Sobranie sochineniy v 4 t., t. 1* [Collected Works in 4 vol., vol. 1], Brussels, 1971, p. 742.
26. Solov'ev, V.S. Kritika otvlechennykh nachal [Critics of Unrelated Basics], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem v 20 t., t. 3* [Complete Collection of Works in 20 vol., vol. 3], Moscow: Nauka, 2001, pp. 7–360.
27. Khaydegger, M. *Razgovor na proselochnoy doroge: sbornik statey* [A Conversation on a Country Path: Collection of Works], Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1991. 192 p.
28. Gadamer, G.G. K russkim chitatel'nyam [To the Russian readers], in Gadamer, G.G. *Aktual'nost' prekrasnogo* [The Relevance of the Beautiful], Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1991, pp. 7–8.
29. Bird R. *The Russian Prospero: The Creative Universe of Viacheslav Ivanov*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006. 310 p.

VL. SOLOVYOV AND RUSSIAN CLASSICS IN THE CRITICAL WRITINGS OF EMIGRATION

SVETLANA GARZIANO

Jean Moulin University Lyon 3,
6 cours Albert Thomas, 69008 LYON, France
E-mail: svetlana.garziano@univ-lyon3.fr

In this paper we test the hypothesis of the association between the ideas of Vladimir Solovyov and émigré articles about the three great Russian poets of the XIX century. The paper describes émigré critics' opinions on Vl. Solovyov's work through classics of Russian literature. The article focuses on three themes: Pushkin and Soloviev, Lermontov and Solovyev, Tyutchev and Soloviev. The report compares conceptions and estimates from critical articles and essays of the following authors: B. Zaytsev, L. Shestov, Vl. Topor-Rabchinsky, G. Adamovich, F. Stepun, G. Florovsky, S. Frank, V. Andreev, P. Stavrov, G. Meyer and other authors. Methods of literary and linguistic analysis were used, along with comparative analysis of texts, a search and sample method of working with cases and an interdisciplinary method of studying. A considerable body of émigré periodical texts was studied. This scientific work has produced a number of positive results. It has been concluded that Vl. Solovyov's name frequently appears on émigré periodical pages in the 20s and 30s of the XX century, and that it plays an important role in the émigré literary and philosophical criticism. These examples confirm that the literary-critical legacy of Vl. Solovyov ethically and aesthetically influenced the literary and philosophical vision of Pushkin, Lermontov, and Tyutchev in exile. Solovyov's articles about Pushkin and Lermontov are subjected to severe criticism in exile; of three of Soloviev's articles about Pushkin only the first one, about the fate and the death of the poet, is mentioned in émigré literary and philosophical criticism. Solovyov's article about Tyutchev, in contrast, is considered by emigration as the best text on this poet.

Key words: emigration, émigré criticism, V. Soloviev and Pushkin, V. Soloviev and Lermontov, V. Soloviev and Tyutchev, philosophy and poetry, Silver Age, Tyutchev's philosophical worldview.

References

1. Ot redaktsii [From the Editor], in *Novyy korabl'*, 1927, no. 1, pp. 4.
2. Adamovich, G. Tyutchev [Tyutchev], in *Tainnik Nochi. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Tyutchev: iz naslediya russkoy emigratsii* [Night Secret. émigré Russia and Tyutchev : the heritage of Russian emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", Zhizn' i mysl', 2008, pp. 162–175.
3. Adamovich, G. Lermontov [Lermontov], in *Fatalist. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Lermontov: iz naslediya pervoy emigratsii* [The Fatalist. émigré Russia and Lermontov: the heritage of the first emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", 1999, pp. 82–89.
4. Stavrov, P. Vechnyy sputnik [The Eternal Companion], in *Fatalist. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Lermontov: iz naslediya pervoy emigratsii* [The Fatalist. émigré Russia and Lermontov: the heritage of the first emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", 1999, pp. 165–172.
5. Zen'kovskiy, V. F.I. Tyutchev (1803–1873) [F.I. Tyutchev (1803–1873)], in *Tainnik Nochi. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Tyutchev: iz naslediya russkoy emigratsii* [Night Secret. émigré Russia and Tyutchev: the heritage of Russian emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", Zhizn' i mysl', 2008, pp. 313–324.
6. Turoverov, N. Lermontov [Lermontov], in *Fatalist. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Lermontov: iz naslediya pervoy emigratsii* [The Fatalist. émigré Russia and Lermontov: the heritage of the first emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", 1999, p. 175.
7. Terapiano, Yu. K yubileyu Tyutcheva [On the Anniversary of Tyutchev], in *Tainnik Nochi. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Tyutchev: iz naslediya russkoy emigratsii* [Night Secret. émigré Russia and

- Tiutchev: the heritage of Russian emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir ", Zhizn' i mysl', 2008, pp. 255–263.
8. Velichko, V.L. *Vladimir Solov'ev. Zhizn' i tvoreniya* [Vladimir Solovyov. Life and Creation], Saint-Petersburg: Knizhnyy magazin A.F. Tsinkerlinga, 1904. 208 p.
 9. Blok, A. Rytsar'-monakh [The Knight-Monk], in *Vl.S. Solov'ev: pro et contra* [Vl.S. Solovyev: pro et contra], Saint-Petersburg: RKhGI, 2000, pp. 382–388.
 10. Radlov, E.L. *Kharakter tvorchestva Vl.S. Solov'eva* [Vl. Solovyov's Nature of Creativity], Saint-Petersburg: Senatskaya tipografiya, 1909. 18 p.
 11. Radlov, E.L. *Vl. Solov'ev. Zhizn' i uchenie* [V. Solovyov: Life and Teachings], Saint-Petersburg: Obrazovanie, 1913. 267 p.
 12. Mochul'skiy, K.V. Vladimir Solov'ev: Zhizn' i uchenie [Vladimir Solovyov: Life and Teachings], in *Vl.S. Solov'ev: pro et contra* [Vl.S. Solovyev: pro et contra], Saint-Petersburg: RKhGI, 2000, pp. 556–829.
 13. Aykhenval'd, Yu. Vladimir Solov'ev (Ego stikhotvoreniya) [Vladimir Solovyov (his poems)], in *Siluety russkikh pisateley. T. 3. Noveyshaya literatura* [Silhouettes of Russian Writers. Vol. 3. New Literature], Berlin: Slovo, 1923, pp. 104–106.
 14. Iz «al'boma priznaniy» T.L. Sukhotinoy [From the «confessions album» of T.L. Sukhotina], in *Vl.S. Solov'ev: pro et contra* [Vl. S. Solovyev: pro et contra], Saint-Petersburg: RKhGI, 2000, pp. 52–54.
 15. Solov'ev, Vl. S. Prorok budushchego [The Prophet of the Future], in *Vl.S. Solov'ev: pro et contra* [Vl.S. Solovyev: pro et contra], Saint-Petersburg: RKhGI, 2000, pp. 63–64.
 16. Solov'ev, Vl.S. Tri svidaniya [Three Meetings], in *Vl.S. Solov'ev: pro et contra* [Vl.S. Solovyev: pro et contra], Saint-Petersburg: RKhGI, 2000, pp. 70–76.
 17. Zaytsev, B. Pushkin v nashey dushe [Pushkin in our soul], in «*V krayu chuzhom...»*. *Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Pushkin. Stat'i. Ocherki. Rechi* [«In someone else's land...». Émigré Russia and Pushkin. Articles. Essays. Speeches], Rybinsk: Russkiy mir, Rybinskoe podvor'e, 1998, pp. 55–60.
 18. Topor-Rabchinskiy, V. Eticheskoe soznanie Pushkina [Ethical consciousness of Pushkin], in «*V krayu chuzhom...»*. *Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Pushkin. Stat'i. Ocherki. Rechi* [«In someone else's land...». Émigré Russia and Pushkin. Articles. Essays. Speeches], Rybinsk: Russkiy mir, Rybinskoe podvor'e, 1998, pp. 235–257.
 19. Spektorskiy, E. Pushkin [Pushkin], in «*V krayu chuzhom...»*. *Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Pushkin. Stat'i. Ocherki. Rechi* [«In someone else's land...». Émigré Russia and Pushkin. Articles. Essays. Speeches], Rybinsk: Russkiy mir, Rybinskoe podvor'e, 1998, pp. 297–308.
 20. Adamovich, G. Pushkin [Pushkin], in *Odinochestvo i svoboda* [Loneliness and Freedom], Moscow: Respublika, 1996, pp. 320–323.
 21. Shestov, L. Pushkin i Vl. Solov'ev [Pushkin and Vl. Solovyov], in «*V krayu chuzhom...»*. *Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Pushkin. Stat'i. Ocherki. Rechi* [«In someone else's land...». Émigré Russia and Pushkin. Articles. Essays. Speeches], Rybinsk: Russkiy mir, Rybinskoe podvor'e, 1998, pp. 110–111.
 22. Zen'kovskiy, V. Pushkin (iz tsikla «Filosofskie motivy v russkoy poezii») [Pushkin (From the cycle «Philosophical motives in Russian poetry»)], in «*V krayu chuzhom...»*. *Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Pushkin. Stat'i. Ocherki. Rechi* [«In someone else's land...». Émigré Russia and Pushkin. Articles. Essays. Speeches], Rybinsk: Russkiy mir, Rybinskoe podvor'e, 1998, pp. 336–343.
 23. Ivanov, V. O Pushkine [About Pushkin], in *Sovremennye zapiski*, 1937, no. 64, pp. 177–195.
 24. Filin, M.D. Ot sostavitelya [From the Editor], in *Fatalist. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Lermontov: iz naslediya pervoy emigratsii* [The Fatalist. Émigré Russia and Lermontov: the heritage of the first emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir ", 1999, pp. 5–14.
 25. Stréoukhoff, D. Vladimir Soloviev et son œuvre messianique. Paris: Les belles lettres, Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 1935. 351 p.
 26. Il'in, V.N. Pechal' dushi mladoy (M.Yu. Lermontov) [The Sadness of the Young Soul (Lermontov)], in *Fatalist. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Lermontov: iz naslediya pervoy emigratsii* [The Fatalist. Émigré Russia and Lermontov: the heritage of the first emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir ", 1999, pp. 20–30.

27. Meyer, G. Fatalist (k 150-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya M.Yu. Lermontova) [The Fatalist (On the 150th anniversary of Mikhail Lermontov)], in *Fatalist. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Lermontov: iz naslediya pervoy emigratsii* [The Fatalist. Émigré Russia and Lermontov: the heritage of the first emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", 1999, pp. 224–245.
28. Ivanov, V. Lermontov [Lermontov], in *Fatalist. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Lermontov: iz naslediya pervoy emigratsii* [The Fatalist. Émigré Russia and Lermontov: the heritage of the first emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", 1999, pp. 143–164.
29. Zaytsev, K.I. O «Geroe nashego vremeni» [About the «Hero of Our Time»], in *Fatalist. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Lermontov: Iz naslediya pervoy emigratsii* [The Fatalist. Émigré Russia and Lermontov: the heritage of the first emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", 1999, pp. 109–115.
30. Zen'kovskiy, V. M. Yu. Lermontov [M.Yu. Lermontov], in *Fatalist. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Lermontov: Iz naslediya pervoy emigratsii* [The Fatalist. Émigré Russia and Lermontov: the heritage of the first emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", 1999, pp. 178–191.
31. Frank, S. Kosmicheskoe chuvstvo v poezii Tyutcheva [Cosmic feeling in Tyutchev's poetry], in *Tainnik Nochi. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Tyutchev: iz naslediya russkoy emigratsii* [Night Secret. Émigré Russia and Tyutchev: the heritage of Russian emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", Zhizn' i mysl', 2008, pp. 30–76.
32. Zaytsev, B. Tyutchev. Zhizn' i sud'ba (k 75-letiyu konchiny) [Tyutchev. Life and Fate (the 75th anniversary of the death)], in *Tainnik Nochi. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Tyutchev: iz naslediya russkoy emigratsii* [Night Secret. Émigré Russia and Tyutchev: the heritage of Russian emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", Zhizn' i mysl', 2008, pp. 236–254.
33. Andreev, V.F. Tyutchev (1803–1873) [F. Tyutchev (1803–1873)], in *Tainnik Nochi. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Tyutchev: iz naslediya russkoy emigratsii* [Night Secret. Émigré Russia and Tyutchev: the heritage of Russian emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", Zhizn' i mysl', 2008, pp. 87–94.
34. Florovskiy, G. Tyutchev i Vladimir Solov'ev [Tyutchev and Vladimir Solovyov], in *Tainnik Nochi. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Tyutchev: iz naslediya russkoy emigratsii* [Night Secret. Émigré Russia and Tyutchev: the heritage of Russian emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", Zhizn' i mysl', 2008, pp. 124–145.
35. Ivanov, V. «Iz «Rimskogo dnevnika 1944 goda»» [From the «Rome Diary 1944»], in *Tainnik Nochi. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Tyutchev: iz naslediya russkoy emigratsii* [Night Secret. Émigré Russia and Tyutchev: the heritage of Russian emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", Zhizn' i mysl', 2008, 235 p.
36. Meyer, G. Zhalo v dukh. Obmorok very zhivoy (Mesto Tyutcheva v metafizike rossiyskoy literatury) [Sting in the Spirit. The Fainting of Living Faith (Tyutchev's Place in the Metaphysics of Russian Literature)], in *Tainnik Nochi. Zarubezhnaya Rossiya i Tyutchev: iz naslediya russkoy emigratsii* [Night Secret. Émigré Russia and Tyutchev: the heritage of Russian emigration], Moscow: Russkiy mir", Zhizn' i mysl', 2008, pp. 279–312.
37. Solov'ev, S.M. *Zhizn' i tvorcheskaya evolyutsiya Vladimira Solov'eva* [Life and Creative Evolution of Vladimir Solovyov], Bryussel': Zhizn' s Bogom, 1977. 434 p.
38. Rubins, M. Lermontov i russkoe zarubezh'e, ili Al'ternativnyy kanon russkoy klassiki [Lermontov and Russia abroad, or alternative canon of Russian classics], in *Mir Lermontova* [The World of Lermontov], Saint-Petersburg: Skriptorium, 2015, pp. 752–767.
39. Witczak, P. Tanatologicheskie motivy v proze Iriny Odoevtsevoy v kontekste dialoga s literaturnoy traditsiyey [Motif of Death in Irina Odoevtseva's Prose], in *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Litteraria Rossica*, 2014, no. 7, pp. 153–162.
40. Letaeva, N.V. Oppozitsiya «Pushkin – Lermontov» na stranitsakh zhurnala russkogo zarubezh'ya «Chisla» [The opposition «Pushkin – Lermontov» in the magazine of the Russian Diaspora «Chisla»], in *Vestnik Novgorodskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta*, 2015, no. 84, pp. 42–45.

On «Solovyov Studies» journal

«Solovyov Studies» journal is a scientific publication, devoted to the urgent issues of the Humanities like Philosophy, Philology, and Cultural Studies. Results of the Russian and Foreign research are published in the journal.

The journal has been published since 2001, the foremost authorities from the Philosophy and Science Centers of Russia, Germany, France, the UK, Poland, and Bulgaria are the members of the editorial staff of it.

The journal frequency is 4 issues a year; in March, June, September, December.

You can find the information about the journal on <http://www.ispu.ru/node/8026>

The full electronic version of all the issues since 2001 is on <http://www.ispu.ru/node/6623>

«Solovyov Studies» journal is in the list of the leading reviewed scientific journals and issues published, approved by the State Commission for Academic Degrees and Titles of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation. The main research results of theses for Candidate Degree and Doctor Degree are published.

You can subscribe to the quarterly «Solovyov Studies» journal in any post office in Russia.

The subscription conditions are in «Rospechat Catalogue» (section «Journals of Russia»).

The subscription zip in «Rospechat Catalogue» is 37240.

The Editorial Office Address

34, Rabfakovskaya st., Ivanovo, 153003, Ivanovo State Power Engineering University, Department of Philosophy, Russian Research Educational Centre of Solovyev's Heritage (The Solovyev Seminar)

Phone: (4932) 26-97-70, (4932) 26-98-57

E-mail: maximov@philosophy.ispu.ru

koroleva@ispu.ru

The Solovyev Seminar Site: <http://solovyov-seminar.ispu.ru>

You can find the information about the current activities of the Solovyev Seminar on <http://www.ispu.ru/taxonomy/term/1071>

Chief Editor,

Mikhail V. Maksimov

Dr. Philosophy, Professor

Phone: (4932) 26-97-70

fax: (4932) 38-57-01, 26-97-96

E-mail: maximov@philosophy.ispu.ru, mvmaksimov@yandex.ru