

VLADIMIR SOLOVYOV AND THE RUSSIAN IDEAL OF THE 'WHOLE MAN'

Jonathan Sutton

In talking of religion it is customary, and generally accepted, to distinguish two worlds, a divine world and a secular world. However, Frithjof Schuon observes in his writings that there are, strictly, no grounds for talking in this way. That is, to present a picture of two worlds co-existing, divine and secular, is seriously misleading. To quote Schuon: "There is no secular world. There is only a secular viewpoint".

The following observations about Vladimir Solovyov's philosophy may be considered in the light of this quotation.

Outside the group of early Church Fathers and Russian saints, Vladimir Solovyov is regarded as the leading figure among Russia's religious philosophers. He was born in January 1853 in Moscow, had his first of many articles and books published in 1873, and died in July 1900, at the age of 47.

From the memoirs written by Solovyov's contemporaries it is clear that he had personal qualities of great worth. His personal popularity was immense, and this was even conceded by many who strongly opposed his philosophical teachings.

This point regarding the appeal of Solovyov's personality is significant, but it is not our intention to dwell on it for long. It needs to be said, though, that Vladimir Solovyov exerted an influence that was out of the ordinary — of a charismatic type.

An astonishing number of his contemporaries write of him as being "prophet-like", an Old Testament figure, or "as one crying out in the wilderness". Solovyov did in actual fact oppose the prevailing ideas of his day, radical materialism and notably Positivism, accepted too uncritically by a broad mass of educated Russians. In this respect he took a fiercely independent stand that is to be admired. But I suggest that if we look only at *this* Solovyov we arrive at a slightly romanticized picture of him, and we could rightly be faulted for resting there.

It would involve no exaggeration to speak of Vladimir Solovyov as being the object of cult admiration. With a figure as prominent as this, it is something difficult to avoid. But it is to be regretted, for the reason that cults surrounding a personality typically confuse emotional and spiritual factors, with serious consequences.

We may attribute to the Russians a special concern with the *wholeness* of man. Over a long period a picture of the *whole man* has served Russians as an ideal. Their early iconographic art speaks of this most clearly and consistently. In more recent history, such an ideal played a crucial role for the Slavophiles Ivan Kirejevsky and Alexei Kharyakov, who taught that this ideal could be realized first and foremost in the context of "Sobornost", (an untranslatable Russian word referring to the deep "community" of the Church). Even the very secularly-minded Populist theorists in Russia, notably Mikolai Mikhailovsky, in speaking of agricultural work, condemned division of labour

as something opposed to men's attainment of wholeness. It is a continually present idea.

At the end of the 1870's Vladimir Solovyov completed and published a work called "The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge", (*Filosofskie nachala Tsel'nogo Znaniya*). It is an important work in which he put forward his scheme for bringing together religion, philosophy and science in one body of knowledge. His own extensive study of West European philosophy impressed upon him that philosophy considered as a subject in isolation from the insights of positive religion and from science provided man with an abstract and unsatisfying picture of the world. For their part, indicates Solovyov, science and religion, each taken separately, would lead one to a similarly abstract and incomplete account of reality.

From the very outset, Solovyov sought to show that a true recognition of religion, philosophy and science, and a recognition of their inter-relation, would help man, and would help him specifically to make the transition from abstract knowledge to *integral*, unifying knowledge.

The introduction to Solovyov's first large-scale work, "The Crisis of Western Philosophy" (*Krizis Zapadnoi Filosofii*, 1874) begins thus:

At the heart of this book lay the conviction that philosophy in the sense of abstract *exclusively* theoretical knowledge has finished its development and has passed irrevocably into the world of the past.

This was an important point to affirm, particularly in view of the fact that something like Hegel's speculative philosophy had taken such a hold over Russian minds and that it coloured so much of subsequent European thought.

Vladimir Solovyov conceived his own philosophy as an unreserved affirmation of the spiritual.

For those not familiar with Solovyov's biography, it should be pointed out here that prior to the formulation of all his religious philosophy Solovyov had — in his adolescent years — been a materialist and atheist. V.V. Rozanov writes of Solovyov as being, in an interesting sense, the very best of the "Shestidesyatniki"¹, "the men of the Sixties":

In the form of his thoughts, but especially in the mode of his life and activity, lay the abyss of 'the Sixties', and it is impossible to doubt that though in 'The Crisis of Western Philosophy' he came out against Positivism — that is, against those same people, he loved them deeply and respected them, loved them actually as 'his own'.²

In the 1850s Solovyov was an adolescent, and in that period he wholeheartedly subscribed to the materialist views associated with that decade of Russian thought. Sergei Solovyov, the nephew of the philosopher, quotes him as saying:

Independent mental development began for me with the appearance of religious scepticism in my thirteenth year. The progress of my thoughts in this direction was completely consistent, and in four years I experienced, one after the other, all the stages of the negative direction of European thought over the last four centuries. From doubt about the necessity of religion in external form, from iconoclasm, I passed to rationalism, to disbelief in miracles and in the divinity of Christ, I became a Deist, then a pantheist, then an atheist and materialist.³

Solovyov returned to a recognition of the spiritual and to Christian practice. Opinions vary as regards the question: Was Solovyov already a believer by the time he entered Moscow University (1869) or did he start believing slightly

later? Such a matter is not centrally important, except perhaps for a biographer.

In his life's work Vladimir Solovyov was concerned to show good and reliable grounds for recognition of, and assent to, the truths of positive religion, and primarily of Christian teaching.

One can say that for Solovyov the *sine qua non* was this: religious faith must be an *aware* faith (*soznatyel'naya vera*). Awareness (*soznatyel'nost*) is an essential element of an individual's faith, and this is indeed how faith appears in Solovyov's writings.

It is important to note that his ambitious project of synthesis included evaluations of the relative merit of contemporary philosophies, and, where possible, the drawing of comparisons between these and traditional Christian views. By means of this approach Solovyov endeavoured to get beyond the onesidedness of the commonly studied theologians and philosophers. One can respect both Solovyov's recognition of the very real need for *comprehensiveness*, and his readiness to work for this end.

Throughout, Solovyov's emphasis was on *wholeness*, on unity. The teaching of All-Unity (*vseedinstvo*) is directly associated with his name. In fact he taught that the various ideas with which he was dealing with, both traditional and contemporary, were not simply to be brought together in an *external* sense; their internal interdependence was to be noted, in the same way in which one establishes the various connections between different functioning parts of a living organism. The organic view of life (and of society, and of the Church) is quite central to Solovyov's exposition of philosophy. His teaching of All-Unity is indeed heavily reliant on a view of organic unity, a view where the plain biological aspect could too easily be given undue emphasis.

It is necessary to briefly cite some of the ideas and teachings most closely associated with Vladimir Solovyov; for the present purposes, four areas of his philosophy could be selected. The first of these relates to the need for the *realization* of the Christian ideal *in society*. Solovyov envisages the gradual spiritualization (*odukhotvoren'e*) of the human community. A prime belief for this philosopher was that if the Christian ideal was *not* to be realized in society, its worth was critically limited. Solovyov discusses Byzantine Christian culture in these terms. He sees that the harm came particularly when Christianity was accepted in Byzantium as the *official* state religion. Practice of the religion was eventually enforced by *external* and legal means, but no genuine attempt was made to apply Christian ethics in society. In addition, various forms of injustice were sanctioned by its government, hence compounding society's troubles. For Solovyov Christianity in its Byzantine form was Christianity in name only, not in fact.

Closely connected with this primary idea of Solovyov's are his extensive writings on *theocracy*. (Reference may be made here to the first part of his uncompleted work, "The History and Future of Theocracy", 1887.) Theocracy entails recognition of the principles determining the right relations between the representative of temporal government (the "anointed" representative) and the priestly caste.⁴ Solovyov taught that a truly Christian society could not be achieved while there was no clear and just resolution to the question of where ultimate authority lies. In other words, a community where the representatives of spiritual and of temporal authority were in conflict, were rivals for supremacy, could not in any true sense reflect the Kingdom of God on earth as it is in heaven. Solovyov did conceive schemes

for the resolution and subsequent strengthening of Church-State relations, and these are interesting schemes in that they also provide for the peaceful bringing together of the whole Eastern Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church, separated by schism since 1054. Comments on Solovyov and theocracy could be greatly extended, but here it seems right to confine oneself to two key points:

(i) In his two-volume study of Solovyev's worldview ("Mirosozertsan'e VI. S. Solovyova", Moscow 1913), the philosopher's friend Prince Yevgeny Trubetskoy comes out strongly against theocracy (against what *he* conceives theocracy to be), and admits that his own work is intentionally directed against the theocratic view. What perturbed Trubetskoy was that Solovyov's preoccupation with theocracy appeared unduly centred on *man*. (Trubetskoy associated this tendency with all advocates of theocracy, notably with the West European ones of the Middle Ages, whose prime intentions Trubetskoy has not rightly perceived.⁵ When one notes what reactions the idea of theocracy evokes in some quarters, it seems appropriate and worthwhile to affirm that Solovyov's longlasting and deep loyalty to the theocratic idea is to be commended, and that it rests upon principles well established in the great religious traditions.

(ii) Yet there is this to consider: the various traditions are *unanimous* when they speak of action and the spiritual danger involved in seeking immediate fruits for one's action. There are some indications that Solovyov faced this very danger. During the 1880s he was devoted almost solely to his theocratic schemes. His return to theoretical (speculative) philosophy in the 1890s is interpreted by most as a consequence of complete disillusionment when his practical ideas failed to bear results. However, to relate Solovyov's later years and his works of 1890–1900 to this alone is too rigid an interpretation.

The third area of Solovyov's philosophy that needs to be mentioned should be given more extensive treatment than can be given here: it is Solovyov's teaching on the Absolute. Solovyov is commonly said to follow Schelling's teaching on this. In any event, he distinguishes two forms of the Absolute:

Absolute as Being – the Undifferentiated Absolute

Absolute as Becoming – the created order, manifest being.

For the "created order" Solovyov outlines these stages: an initial act of self-assertion, then a free act of self-surrender to the Divine Will, an act which makes possible a gradual return to the Absolute as Being, Ain-Soph.

Solovyov shows well how the created order serves as a vehicle for the *manifestation* of the Absolute in different aspects. The Solovyovian argument also focuses on the Undifferentiated Absolute. By definition, the Absolute needs to encompass everything — including its "opposite", or "other". (Were anything to exist outside the Absolute, it would limit the Absolute.) For Solovyov this "other" appears as Chaos, Chaos that must ultimately be "contained" by the Absolute. But, the argument goes, before this "containment" can truly be said to take place, the "other" must be afforded a genuine opportunity to assert itself as *distinct* from the Absolute. Without this one could hold that no *true* distinction of Absolute and "other" has taken place. And one could "logically" hold that the Absolute has not been *seen* to contain both itself and its "other".

Such an account of this subject, more especially this deduction drawn therefrom — rests very much in the *human* perspective. An acknowledgement of the Mystery of the Absolute, Undifferentiated and manifest, is at least

temporarily set aside. At this point the significance of "differentiation" is truly *reduced*, made instrumental in satisfying certain requirements of human reason.

Solovyov teaches that it is the created order which asserts itself as distinct from the Absolute. In the terms of this philosophy there is a World Soul (*Mirovaya Dusha*), and this may tend in the direction of further self-assertion and egotism or towards free surrender to the Divine Will.

Bearing in mind the essentially *receptive*, passive aspect of manifest being, Vladimir Solovyov also introduced here the idea of Wisdom in her "feminine" aspect — Sophia. As is generally known, Sophia was crucially important for Solovyov. We did have a chance at the beginning of his writing life to investigate a considerably quantity of Cabalistic sources regarding Her. Contemporaries and later critics have alluded to the occurrence of three mystical visions which Solovyov himself describes in a poem entitled "Three Meetings" (Tri Svidanya).

Solovyov's sense of spiritual affinity with Sophia, incarnate Wisdom, needs to be acknowledged. His reflections on Sophia allow him to re- evoke the unity of the created order which has been obscured. In the expression of these important themes Solovyov spoke as a mystic. His account of the Absolute does present difficulties, as was suggested before, but fundamental to it is the following consideration: the created order is "necessary" for the true "completion" of the Undifferentiated Absolute.

The fourth area of ideas to be examined is Solovyov's "evolutionary"/"historical" view of humanity, a view which (in its general scheme and in many particulars) anticipates the worldview expounded and made current in this century by Teilhard de Chardin. Certain points are to be noted in this regard:

(a) Solovyov regards humanity as a *whole* becoming gradually more spiritualized (*odukhotvorennoye*). This is possible after the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, who was Godman (bearing two natures, divine and human) — Here Solovyov accepts Pauline teaching. Man, not essentially perfect, can, after the Incarnation of Christ, become redirected and gradually make the transition from manhood which is his present imperfect state, to Godman — his *potential* state. Such matters are treated in Solovyov's "Lectures on Godmanhood".

(b) The "evolutionary" view stresses the *gradual* nature of this process — hence the possibility of relating it to Solovyov's own view of creation outlined above, the Absolute as *Becoming*.

(c) The question is yet now wide open, unresolved by Teilhard and likewise by Solovyov: Can humanity rightly be seen as *advancing*? Why should one *presume* that humanity is bound on a forward course? The possibility of "decadence" was too readily discounted by these evolutionist philosophers, and inevitably they failed to achieve a balanced account of the world.

(d) Like Teilhard, Solovyov favours "literate" and educated societies, of technically and scientifically advanced nations.⁶ It is a view where complexity of a society is too readily equated with qualitative improvement. Further, this general view entails a conception of religions as evolving from "primitive" to spiritually advanced. Such conception is to be found in Solovyov's writings.

(e) Directly following from the previous point: Solovyov's marked preference for emphasis on the *active* way in religion rather than the contemplative way. This is interesting in view of the familiar charge of Quietism that is made

against Eastern religions.

(f) A prominent theme in Solovyov's writings is the theme of needing to know the *direction* our religion should take us and also the desired *goal* of our endeavours. This bearing in mind of direction and goal is clearly implied in the very notion of "aware" or "conscious" faith (*soznatyel'naya vera*).

Though Solovyov takes the words of Christ, "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life" and accepts their significance, he holds further that to effectively establish the *direction* we must follow, it is necessary to discover the meaning of life, *osmyslit zhizn*. The Russian verb "osmyslit" has definitely rational connotations, it does *not* denote the experiential. Trusting that he can arrive at the "Meaning" of life in this manner, Solovyov resorts to discursive reason⁷ and to historical arguments,⁸ not to the intuitive type of SEEING cultivated by the contemplative.

It is not our purpose here to negate the worth of Vladimir Solovyov's aims. Clearly, affirming the primacy of the spiritual was of paramount importance in his life. The intention is easily recognisable. This paper seeks clarification about *means*. It is, of course, natural to take into account both the *means* of conveying a message as well as its content. The choice of means, however, does tend to reveal certain salient features.

In presenting the remaining part of this argument, further reference to Solovyov's biography should prove helpful. The critical material written about the philosopher provides us with the picture of a career which can be divided into three parts:

- i. Initial criticism of West European philosophy, and much work in the theoretical field, especially on epistemology
(1874–1880)
- ii. Promotion of the theocratic idea. Plans for the Reunion of Churches. Solovyov's own attraction to Roman Catholicism, and the writing of many publicistic articles, especially in connection with Slavophile beliefs.
(1880–1890)
- iii. Apparent disenchantment with practical ideas on Church reunion, return to theoretical philosophy (on aesthetics and then ethics). An increasing preoccupation with apocalyptic vision and the prospect of an imminent end to world history, these latter ideas taking *very* strong hold in the last two years of Solovyov's life, that is, from 1898 to 1900.

There are two significantly different views of the *last* period in the philosopher's life:

1. Following Yavgeny Trubetskoy, one can look on Solovyov's last 10 years as a marked decline — result of the shattered hopes regarding theocracy.
2. One can follow the argument that Lev Shestov provides.⁷ Shestov writes that the apocalyptic ideas of Solovyov are not evidence or symptoms of a decline. For Shestov they are the first *positive* indications that Vladimir Solovyov saw his rational arguments for Christian belief to be radically insufficient.

Of these two possible viewpoints the reader's attention may now rest on the second one, that is — the Shestovian view. Shestov's forcefully suggests an idea that is central to the latter part of this paper.

One of Vladimir Solovyov's best-known often cited statements is the following declaration:

To justify the faith of our fathers, raising it to a new level of rational consciousness . . . here is the general point of my work.⁸

In looking at Solovyov's account of the world, one encounters, then, a religious view supported by a train of rational argument. As Lev Shestov sees the matter, Solovyov has made his religion accord with reason. Reason has not been a *support* for belief, but often enough an ultimate authority. Solovyov has placed the Christian teachings "in the court of Reason", *pod sudom Razuma* in Shestov's particular phrase.

It appears that Solovyov deemed it quite necessary to provide rational bases or *justifications* for essentially religious beliefs. These are the grounds for Shestov's rejection of Solovyovian philosophy. Considerably more is involved here than simply an argument in favour of "irrational faith". Subsequent comments should show this.

Shestov refers insistently to the Jewish Prophets. Their message was not in any sense reducible to rational explanation, it did not allow for such an interpretation — or even for the *possibility* of such an interpretation. And the person who reduces a prophetic message (or comparable revealed teaching) in this way would be looking from an entirely human, secular viewpoint.

Shestov writes:

Holy Scripture does not stand criticism. It cannot be justified in the court of our reason.

We stand before a dilemma: either the path of prophetic inspiration, or the path of rational philosophical enquiry.

Up to "Three Conversations" (Solovyov's last work, 1899) Solovyov did not see this dilemma, or more true to say, he evaded it.

He strained all the powers of his mind to prove the opposite. In *this* was the task of his first works, and in *this* is the meaning of his "Justification of the Good" (1897 — Solovyov's work on ethics).

He wholly strives to "justify" revelation, he is sincerely convinced that searching out "justification" he is leading people to holy Scripture.

One particular important area where Solovyov brings his arguments to bear is in the teaching on the Trinity, which takes a prominent place in his philosophy. Solovyov indeed recognises the revelatory source of the teaching. But one can here appropriately quote his French work, "La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle":

La trinite des hypostases ou des sujets dans l'unite de la substance absolue est une verite qui nous est donnee par la revelation divine et la doctrine infaillible de l'Eglise.

Nous venons de voir que cette verite s'impose a la raison et peut etre logiquement deduite des qu'on admet que Dieu *est* dans le sens positif et complet de ce terme.⁹

Such statement would incline the reader to feel that it is perfectly in order to place Trinitarian teaching within the categories of our human reason, thinking that it has thus become "accessible" to us. And this very supposition would be the mark of a *secular viewpoint*.

It is noteworthy that when Shestov speaks of the secular viewpoint he should mention the later part of Tolstoy's life. Lev Tolstoy, as is known, devised his own "Tolstoyan" variant of Christianity. It entailed a decisive break with many elements of the tradition, a full-scale re-interpretation of the Gospels, and an insistence that "de-mystification" was needed if people were to grasp the teachings of Christ. Of course, such notions are very familiar to us, as they

have re-emerged in more or less similar form since Tolstoy's day — on an unfortunately wide scale.

Solovyov never reached the point that Tolstoy did, but the comparison between them is still instructive.¹⁰ Though Solovyov and Tolstoy are taken to be opponents, there is a sense in which they approached religion in a like way. Shestov writes:

Really, in his last work, as also in his earlier works, Solovyov polemicizes against the "teaching" of Tolstoy. But that to which he is objecting and with which he struggles in "Three Conversations" is in the same measure the teaching of Tolstoy as it is the teaching of Solovyov himself.

Neither Solovyov, nor those who followed Solovyov, wanted to speak about this . . . They knew that Solovyov did not like Tolstoy and always quarrelled with him; and from this they concluded that they taught something different. In the same way, from the fact that Solovyov glorified Dostoyevsky they concluded that Solovyov and Dostoyevsky were of one mind. Both conclusions are equally mistaken.

In the last years, Solovyov's life changed direction in a major way which entailed much personal suffering. Shestov attributed all of this to the belated realisation on the philosopher's part that the rational approach could not serve properly as a means to clarify Scripture and the tenets of Christian belief.

The change consisted in that he felt the complete impossibility of bowing before that mental truth, which he preached during his twenty-five-year-long activity as a writer.

The fruits from the Tree of knowledge of good and evil began to seem to him as if they bore not life, but death.¹¹

Shestov holds that Solovyov has provided *explanation* and *justification* where neither of these were appropriate. For Shestov it seems that Solovyov has evolved:

a philosophy satisfying "a theoretical demand", giving truths obligatory for all, and a morality obligatory for all.

It is now time to quote Solovyov himself:

It is clear that all the rightful authority of religious teaching, even where there is complete belief in it, cannot, for the thinking part of humanity, in any way abolish or replace those formal requirements of the mind, which produce ethical philosophy.⁷

One notes that Solovyov's concern here has come to be with "the thinking part of humanity" rather than with the *whole man*.

Solovyov writes:

For the philosopher by calling there is nothing more desirable than truth made meaningful, and verified, by thought.

For this reason he loves the very process of thought as the unique means to attain the desired goal, and he gives himself to it without any outside dangers or fears.

The third and last of these quotations may show how very much Vladimir Solovyov values theoretical discursive thought:

Besides the practical goals of life there exists in our spirit (*dukhe*) an independent purely mental or theoretical need, without whose satisfaction the value of life itself becomes dubious.

It will be known to many that Shestov's own philosophy was a *philosophy of the irrational*. Thus, to quote his article so extensively for the purpose of showing how far Solovyov was bound up in rational philosophy may seem

unwarranted. Therefore, it is necessary to affirm that Shestov's article has only a *limited* applicability.

It shows very clearly the sense in which the essential content of religious truths is not accessible to purely discursive thought. It is a central point which at times really eluded Solovyov. As the article "Thought and Apocalypse" shows, Shestov was highly aware that the matter of conveying religious truths in any meaningful sense is something for which our mental-conceptual language is not, ultimately, suited. The other side of the question — how *are* we indeed to express such things, how can we safely make any affirmations of this type, is not considered in Shestov's study of Solovyov's philosophy. Nor does he approach the whole question of the *Via Negativa*.

It is *not* that Shestov was evading either issues or particular conclusions. His interest in the study of Solovyov was directed more towards criticism, and it did not extend to this other area of enquiry. In any event, more is *suggested* by Shestov in his capacity as "philosopher" than the plain confrontation between *rational belief* and *irrational belief*.

There *are* means whereby religious ideas can be effectively transmitted, and, it is important to note, these do not even necessitate a retreat to the *irrational*. One needs to bear in mind the hierarchy of irrational, rational and supra-rational, where the rational has higher and rightful status above the irrational.

There is a language of symbolism and analogy, a symbolism that conveys knowledge, which is markedly *consistent* in the religious traditions of the East and West.¹² Two instances of this would be the symbolism of sacrifice and spiritual rebirth, and that of the arrow hitting its mark. It is *this* order of truth to which the *whole man* can rightly give his assent.

As was emphasized before, Solovyov states as one of his key ideas that faith needs to be supported by *awareness (soznyatel'nost)*. This is in one sense a valuable affirmation, but when Solovyov goes on to talk about *osmyslen'e zhizni* — "finding the meaning of life" — he tends, unfortunately, to turn to discursive thought rather than to the contemplative's SEEING.

References

1. In Russia, materialist ideas and nihilism found wide acceptance during the 1860s. Advocates of this nihilistic view of life came to be known as 'the men of the Sixties', and for the most part they followed the lead of the writers Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov and Pisarev.
2. V. V. Rozanov, in *Okolo Tserkovnikh Sten* ("By the Church Walls").
3. Sergei Solovyov, *Vladimir Solovyov: His Life and Creative Evolution*. (This book has appeared in Russian in Belgium, 1977, though written in 1923.)
4. A valuable source here is Ananda Coomaraswamy's "Spiritual Authority and Temporal Power in the Indian Theory of Government" (1942).
5. See Introduction to Vol. 1, and pp. 564–585 (Vol. 1)
6. Vladimir Solovyov's father can be said to have had considerable influence upon the formation of his son's ideas, and he accepted this view favouring literate and advanced societies. His father was Sergei Solovyov (1820–1879), an eminent liberal historian and a Professor at Moscow University.
7. A particularly clear example is to be found at the beginning of Solovyov's work on ethics, "The Justification of the Good": he seeks to establish which human virtues are most basic to morality. His approach is *empirical*. Frequent reference is made to the animal kingdom, where filial and parental love can be noted and where certain other feelings are absent. This level of reference largely eclipses the transcendent element. Trubetskoy provides a perceptive and critical chapter on this, Ch. XIX, esp. pp. 60–74, 87–100, Vol. II.

8. The fact that Christianity is one of the said "historical" religions is used by Solovyov to the greatest possible extent.
9. Shestov's essay on Solovyov is contained in a collection of essays edited in 1964 under the title "Thought and Revelation" (*Umozren'e i Otkroven'e*), Paris.
10. Introduction to Solovyov's "History and Future of Theocracy".
11. pp. 212-213.
12. In a perceptive article Nikolai A. Vaislyev (of the University of Haran), compares Tolstoy with Solovyov. See "Logical and Historical Methods in Ethics" (*Logicheskii i Istoricheskii Metodi v Etike*), date of publication not available.
13. The above quotations come from Solovyov's uncompleted work "Theoretical Philosophy", notably from the Introduction to that work; *Collected Works*, IX (esp. pp. 89-90). The last quotation appears there on p. 90.
14. Solovyov does bear in mind the feminine aspect of the created order and the symbolism related to it, but the real intrusion of the evolutionary interpretation provides a strong discordant note here and also unresolved complexities which deflect the mind from its true object.