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INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS
The article proves the hypothesis that F.M. Dostoevsky in «A Writer’s Diary» of May-June 1877) published a prophecy about the “soaring of the Great Eastern Eagle over the world” based on the Latin extract of Johannes Lichtenberger’s book «Pronosticatio» (1528) which Vl. Solovyov made during his trip to London in 1875 and later gave to Dostoevsky. To investigate the question, the author of the article used Vl. Solovyov’s extract «1528. Lichtenberger» that is stored in the archives of the Russian Literature Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences and had been unknown before. A detailed textological reconciliation of F.M. Dostoevsky’s, Vl. Solovyov’s and J. Lichtenberger’s texts has shown that Vl. Solovyov somewhat shortened and compiled the text, which was authentically reproduced by Dostoevsky in “A Writer’s Diary”. This fact proves that it is Solovyov’s extract that Dostoevsky’s work was based on. This urged the author of the article to analyse the religious-philosophical and prophetic context underlying the fragments of Lichtenberger’s book, which aroused the Russian thinkers’ interest. The influence of Vl. Solovyov and F. Dostoevsky’s conversation, in which they interpreted the prophecy, on Solovyov’s philosophy is shown by analysing the philosopher’s last book-parable «Three Conversations on War, Progress and the End of World History» (1900) as an example. The eschatological context of the prophetic biblical quotations which became the basis for the finale of the religious-philosophical parable is shown. A hypothesis is expressed and substantiated that F.M. Dostoevsky became one of the prototypes of «Mr. Z» in the parable: the reliance on biblical revelation, propheticism and eschatological historiosophy shared by both thinkers are reflected in the allusions of the Mr Z image to Solovyov’s earlier characteristics of Dostoevsky’s worldview where Dostoevsky is shown through the prism of Solovyov’s own religious and philosophical ideas. It is concluded that Vl. Solovyov’s Latin extract can be considered from the perspective of Joachim of Fiore’s doctrine about the three eras which J. Lichtenberger relied upon and which became one of the foundations for chiliasm in Dostoevsky’s later writings and for Vladimir Solovyov’s Trinitarian historiosophy.
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**APPLICATION**

THE TEXT OF THE "LATIN EXTRACT" VL. SOLOVYOV

*(published for the first time).*

*Publication preparation and comments by A.L. Rychkov*
The article represents a study of F.M. Dostoevsky’s and Vl. Solovyov’s views on the essence of Christianity enabling a conclusion that neither of the thinkers recognized historical, ecclesiastical Christianity as the true form of Christianity. It is shown that F. Dostoevsky in “A Writer’s Diary” of 1880 defines Christianity as the desire of man and mankind for “absolute self-improvement”. Since this is the ideal of perfection that pertains to the earthly world, and not to the transcendent divine reality (the Kingdom of Heaven), this understanding of the essence of Christianity is incompatible with the dogmatic teaching of the church. Vl. Solovyov’s views on ecclesiastical Christianity are analysed based on his works “Three Speeches in Memory of Dostoevsky” (1883) and “On the Decline of a Medieval Worldview” (1891), in which he also contrasts ecclesiastical Christianity, which has a formal character and does not affect people’s lives, and true Christianity, which should radically transform human society and the whole world. As a result, a conclusion was made that both Russian thinkers recognized ecclesiastical Christianity as a sharply distorted version of Jesus Christ’s teachings, replacing the idea of transfiguration of man and the world with the idea of formal faith in dogma. It is shown that, in their opinion, there are still very few representatives of true Christianity among people, though they believed that someday true Christianity would become the religion of all people, and then it would turn into the main force of history that would make man and mankind perfect. The article states that in his later work “Three Conversations about War, Progress and the End of the World History” Solovyov refuses from his previous ideas and supports the position of ecclesiastical Christianity.

Keywords: “A Writer’s Diary” of Dostoevsky, Vl. Solovyov’s philosophy, ecclesiastical and true Christianity, ideal of earthly perfection, kingdom of God on earth.
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The article considers the history of Vladimir Solovyov’s cooperation with the journal «Russkoe Obozrenie». By employing comparative-historical and dialectical methods, the author describes in detail Solovyov’s publications in the general context of his works and the editorial policy of the journal. It is suggested that Solovyov’s works in the «Russkoe Obozrenie» should be divided into four thematic categories: philosophy, history of religion, political controversy, and fiction. It is shown that the journal preferred to publish Solovyov’s philosophical reviews on the works of Russian and foreign thinkers; only the first issue of the new journal contained Solovyov’s translation of one of Eduard von Hartmann’s works as an exception. Of greatest importance are the polemical articles by Solovyov and his opponents, including General Alexander Kireev and Prince Tseretelv, on current political and religious themes. It is revealed that some of Solovyov’s texts in the «Russkoe Obozrenie» were reprinted in later editions of his collected works and letters without editorial notes. Attention is drawn to the fact that the texts of Solovyov’s verses and poetic translations on the pages of the journal are also sometimes different from those included in the publications of his works in the twentieth century. The article demonstrates the peculiarity of the position of Dmitry Tseretelv and Anatoly Aleksandrov as the chief editors of the «Russkoe Obozrenie» on Solovyov and his opponents.

Key words: Vladimir Solovyov’s poetry, Philosophical Pessimism, Alexander Kireev’s journalism, journal «Russkoe Obozrenie», Orthodox Theology, pedagogical thought, Paganism of Eurasian peoples, Russian Conservatism, Slavophilism, Afanasy Fet’s poetry
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The author of the article uses historical, comparative and hermeneutical methods of research to review the religious directions in Islam and Judaism correlating with Christian faith in a varying degree. The article considers Vladimir Solovyov’s views on non-Christian Abrahamic religions in the context of the All-Unity, outlines the bases of Jadidic reforms in a historical and cultural context and analyses the cooperation between the figures of the Tatar Enlightenment and Russian intellectuals. It also discusses the reasons for the disagreement between Vladimir Solovyov and Gataullah Bayazitov concerning the progress in Islam. The Jadidic reform in the Tatar (Turkic) Islam in the late 19th century and early 20th century led to changes not only in the primary religious education of the Tatars, but in the whole culture, liberating the approach to the Koran hermeneutics and also changing the attitude towards woman and progress. As a result of the research the author makes a conclusion that Vladimir Solovyov in his polemic with the imam Bayazitov came to the subject of progress which was the most relevant problem in Islam of that time in the context of Jadids’ polemic with their opponents.

Keywords: V. Solovyov’s philosophy of All-Unity, Islam in Europe, Jadidism, religion and society, Tatar Enlightenment, ecumenism, religious reform, progress and religion, Russian intellectuals, the Russian Empire in the XIX – early XX centuries.
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The study explores the concept of individual «I» from the Vl. Solovyov’s all-unity philosophical position in relation with personality as a phenomenon of symbolic, empirical and theological dimensions. In this way "I" acts as a center of self-awareness and intentional beginning of philosophical constructs, and personality phenomenon has a wider range of interpretations. Author claims that the problem of human and divine personality is the key problem of the “Silver Age”. The target is to determine the place and role of the “I” (ego-beginning) in the personality system as it’s understood by the philosophers of Russian all-unity. The degree of Solovyov’s idea of the all-inclusive personality and it’s sophiological aspect succession in Russian philosophy (L.P. Karsavin, S.N. Trubetskoy, S.L. Frank) and the artistic-theoretical researches of symbolists (Vyach. Ivanov, A. Beliy) is revealed. This allows us to speak of symbolism not only as a phenomenon of artistic creativity, but also as an independent school of philosophy. Author shows a number of differences in understanding the anthropological problem of individuality in the presented theoretical systems. The differences lie in three ways of the «I» and «personality» relating, such as: the mystical-theological (the relationship of Sophia and Logos), the cathedral-symphonic (in the new religious consciousness of the symbolists) and the biographical method, a special case of which is A. Beliy’s concept of the self-conscious soul. Conclusions are drawn about the impact of ideas of all-inclusive personality and the phenomenon of the collective «I» both on the paradigm of Russian symbolism, and on the philosophy of history and culture. In the theory of biographical personalism of A. Beliy a new approach to the socio-philosophical problem of relations between the individual and society is being formed.

Key words: all-unity, personality, Russian symbolism, individuality, I-other, collegiality, subjectivity, Sophia, self-conscious soul, collective “I”
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VLADIMIR SOLOVYOV AND MAXIM GORKY:
TWO VIEWS OF THE NATURE OF THE SUPERHUMAN IN MAN

Y.K. VOLKOV
National research N.I. Lobachevsky Nizhny Novgorod State University. Arzamas branch
K. Marx str., 36, Nizhegorodsky region, c. Arzamas, 607220, Russian Federation
E-mail: yu.k.volkov@yandex.ru

The thematic similarity and ideological difference between the ideological positions of Vladimir Solovyov and Maxim Gorky in understanding the nature of the superhuman in man an attempt is made to show. It is suggested that the foundations of M. Gorky’s anthropocentrism are the principles of secular quasi-religion which sacra lazing the image of a person and a working collective. To this end the main stages of the creative evolution of the writer are analyzed. It is shown how the idea of the initiative of the elected people transforming the old world naturally led Nietzschean and God-fighter M. Gorky to the camp of the socialist-God-builders and then made him an adherent of the secular ideal of a new type of collectivist personality. It is noted that in their resulting estimates of the philosophy of Nietzsche M. Gorky characterizes Nietzscheanism as a «philosophy of the masters» and «the morality of the sirs» with their principle «pushes the falling» and the idea of a superman as a reactionary project to create a special type of people whose existence is conditional on slaver is presented. A comparison was made between the anti-nietzscheanistic class-ideological position of M. Gorky and the positive critical attitude of the «late» Vladimir Solovyov to the idea of the Nietzschean superhuman. The features of «reasonable criticism» by Solovyov Nietzsche's understanding of the idea of superman as a person’s desire and ability to go beyond his own reality and defeat death are shown. It is noted that the Solovyov's position which does not contradict the natural history is additionally argued by reference to the example of Socrates. From this it is concluded that for the Solovyov's ideal of the superman it is not enough just the bodily completeness of man, the personal power of mind, genius, moral will, and even decent death. The man can be embodying superhuman in him then when he will be «real significant of God-man».

Key words: superhuman, Nietzscheanism, anthropocentrism, God-seeking, God-building, quasi-religion, collective labor, new man, death, immortality, God-man.
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The article analyzes the onto-gnoseological coordinates of Vladimir Solovyov’s semiotic world view. Semiosphere of Solovyov, as well as his semiology (general theory of symbols), are shown as a kind of terra incognita for the history of Russian philosophical thought. The main idea of the paper is to understand the complementarity of Solovyov’s semiology and his semiosphere through the author’s original bookish representations. The resemblance of Solovyov’s semiology of reality to the ideas of pneumatosphere (P. Florensky), semiosphere (Yu. Lotman) and logosphere (G. Bachelard) is established. Within the framework of the noospheric approach, Solovyov's semiosphere is stated as a representation of a qualitatively different reality in a diverse empirical (symbolic) reality. The place of the Solovyov's symbolism as one of the sign systems is stated in the structure of his semiology. It is substantiated that the realism of Solovyov’s semiology is revealed not so much in modeling, but in constructing a picture of reality through the signs and symbols, accessible to human perception. An «intensive» version of Solovyov’s semiotic world view reconstruction was carried out in profound reading of the letter to A. Fet through the system-hermeneutic analysis of the text. The autotrophic semiotic of the crypto-symbolic representations of the philosopher in the system of relations «idea – symbol – image», defining the ontological independence of symbolic reality, is revealed. The features of his pansemiotic semiotic world view – strange subjectivity of the symbolic reality, a special semiotic chronotopos, the peculiar «magic optics» of the world perception, used by the philosopher, the non-utilitarian nature of both individual images and the semiosphere as a whole – are established. The conceptual post-non-classical character of Solovyov’s semiology, which in many respects anticipated the development of semiosphere representations in the XX-th century, is revealed.

Key words: holistic model of the world, semiotics and semiology of Solovyov, philosophical symbolism, semiotic determinism, everywhere-eternity, semiotic autotrophy, pansemiotism, spheric approach.
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SOME SPECIFICS OF THE SLAVOPHILIC STANCE
OF N.P. GILYAROV-PLATONOV
(AS EVIDENCED IN HIS LETTER TO O.A. NOVIKOVA
ABOUT RUSSIA AND ENGLAND)

A.P. DMITRIEV
Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkin House), Russian Academy of Sciences
4, Makarov embankment, Saint-Petersburg, 199034 Russian Federation
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For the first time the conceptually significant letter of N.P. Gilyarov-Platonov (1885) – prominent Moscow journalist, literary critic, memoirist, philosopher, and Slavophile sympathizer – addressed to O.A. Novikova (nee Kireeva) in London – publicist, correspondent for several Russian and Britain periodicals, hostess of a high society salon – is published in full. It turns out that N.P. Gilyarov-Platonov’s views on the future fate of Russia, England, as well as the Slavic lands of the Balkan peninsula are partly polemical in respect to O.A. Novikova’s viewpoint. Differences in judgement between N.P. Gilyarov-Platonov and Vl.S. Solovyov on the foreign policy of England are revealed in the current article. Positions of the interlocutors on “the policy of national interests” are correlated: its condemnation by Vl.S. Solovyov, relying on Christian ethics, and its full approval, proceeding from Slavophilic notions about the vocation of Russia, by N.P. Gilyarov-Platonov. The attitudes of N.P. Gilyarov-Platonov, O.A. Novikova, and the elder Slavophiles towards Panslavism is clarified. Thanks to historiosophical accentuation in the journalism of Vl.S. Solovyov, N.P. Gilyarov-Platonov, and W. Gladstone it is possible to speak of a substantial similarity in their approach to understanding current events in the world.

Key words: N.P. Gilyarov-Platonov’s correspondence with O.A. Novikova, Anglophobia, Pan-Slavism and Slavophilism, historiosophical accents in the journalism of William Gladstone, N.P. Gilyarov-Platonov and Vl.S. Solovyov, policy of national interests.
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APPLICATION

LETTER N.P. GILYAROVA-PLATONOV TO O.A. NOVIKOVA
ON DECEMBER 12, 1885.

Publication preparation and comments A.P. Dmitriev
The article deals with three circles – three main components of the creative credo of Dmitry Merezhkovsky, a significant figure of the Russian religious Renaissance, whose personality and ideas still arouse disputable. The article also substantiates the interrelation between the creative "multigenre" of D.S. Merezhkovsky and the main directions of his activity. Merezhkovsky's main creative ideas are analysed through the prism of "event" as the literary and artistic circle, "temporary" as the socio-political and "eternal" as the religious and philosophical ones. It describes the concepts of "subjective-artistic criticism", "new ideal art", "religious culture", "new religious consciousness", "culture and revolution", "religious revolution", "religious society", which became the essence and revealed the specificity, diversity and depth of the content of Merezhkovsky's "three circles". By analysing Merezhkovsky's creative heritage, the author shows that the thinker was not only able to "engage" in the cultural context of the Russian religious renaissance, but also determined the epoch mentality with his ideas. It is revealed that Merezhkovsky's call to move "from the great contemplation" "to great action, from word to deed" did not only gain the status of a key symbol, but also became a dominant principle of culture, a manifestation of social and religious activism, and for many years determined the direction of creative discussions and search for new forms of harmonious existence. It is concluded that D.S. Merezhkovsky's participation in the cultural and socio-political life, on the one hand, and his ability to refract the sociohistorical experience of the Russian reality in his artistic works and philosophical journalism, on the other hand, allow a new understanding of the history of the development of the ideas of the literary and artistic, socio-political and religious-philosophical processes in the Russian philosophical thought.

Key words: history of Russian thought, Russian religious philosophy, symbolism, symbol, subjective criticism, new religious consciousness, culture, civilization, revolution, religious culture, socio-cultural crisis, new ideal art, religious community.
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At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, Russian thinkers of the Merezhkovskys’ circle actualize the themes, problems, ideas traditionally associated with the personality and creativity of Rousseau: the truth of culture and the truth of nature; the truth of reason and the truth of feeling; religion in its relationship with culture; nature and civilization, art and morality; intellectuals and revolution; personality as an individual; personality in its relations with the state; social inequalities; social contract theory; the idea of national sovereignty, etc. The author’s focus is on the public speeches by three Russian thinkers: Dmitry Merezhkovsky (Russo, 1889), Dmitry Filosofov (Jean-Jacques Russo. On the Bicentennial of His Birth, 1912) and Vasily Rozanov (J.-J. Rousseau, 1912). Based on the comparative method, the author concentrates not so much on the detection of similarities, but rather on the statement of differences in the characteristics of the French enlightener by Russian thinkers. As a result of the analysis, the author of the article comes to the following conclusions: 1) Merezhkovsky, describing Rousseau from the populist-sociological position, points to Rousseau’s ignorance of the laws of social reality and the hypertrophied attention of the French writer to his own personality; 2) The philosopher sees in Rousseau a personality that is close in its spiritual and psychological essence to the Russian heroes of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, the axiological significance of which is due to the concept of “all-human”; 3) Rozanov relates Russo’s vagrancy, instability, throwing, suffering, tragedy with the universe of Revolution as such.

Key words: three faces of Rousseau, Merezhkovsky on the sociality of Rousseau, Philosophov about the all-humanity of Rousseau, Rozanov on vagrancy and revolutionism of Rousseau
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PYTHAGOREANISM, ALCHEMY AND ANDROGYNOUS LOVE IN THE POETIC TEXT «YOU:» (1905) BY ZINAIDA GIPPIUS

O.A. BLINOA
Lycée René Cassin
4, rue Schoch BP 67, Strasbourg cedex, 67046 France
E-mail: blinova.olga.aleksandrovna@gmail.com

It is proposed to consider the poetic text «You:» (1905) by Z.N. Gippius as an expression of her theory on personal love, explicitly worded in the most accomplished manner in her speech «The Arithmetics of Love» (1929). The possibility of interpretation of «You:» is argued for the first time through the angle of pythagoreanism, a vast and eclectic speculative system which was at the foundation of many esoteric disciplines, including alchemy. A poetic approach centered on finds in narratological studies is used in this analysis. In line with this approach, the lyrical subject and its addresser, being considered from a dynamic viewpoint, are created by and within the poetic text. It is evidenced that the dualistic vision of a universe specific to pythagoreanism is noticed through the signified as well as through the subtle disposition of the signifiers in the poem «You:». An attempt to apply the mystical arithmology of pythagoreanism for the comprehension of hermetic meaning is also undertaken. In conclusion, it is deduced that the author’s creative process is assimilable to the demiurgic act and that her theory of love had already existed in its final form at the very start of the twentieth century.

Key words: symbolism, theory of personal love, androgyny, pythagoreanism, alchemy, mystical arithmology, duality, masculine and feminine principles, the Rebis, chiasmus, oxymoron
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ALEXEI LOSEV AND BORIS STOLPNER:
TO THE HISTORY OF THEIR ACQUAINTANCE

K.Yu. BURMISTROV
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12/1, Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russian Federation
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The article presents a comparative analysis of the ideas about the essence of Judaism and Jewish mysticism in two Russian philosophers – Alexei Losev and Boris Stolpner. Boris Grigor’evich Stolpner (1871–1937), a significant but undeservedly forgotten representative of Russian thought of the Silver Age, only recently attracted the attention of historians of philosophy. Based on the fact of the personal acquaintance of two thinkers, we make a supposition about the possible influence of Stolpner’s views on Losev’s understanding of the nature of Jewish mysticism. We have identified the main theses characteristic of the interpretation of Kabbalah, proposed by Stolpner, including an idea of the magical-theurgic influence that the Jewish people exerts on the entire universe and on the divine world in order to correct them. Based on the analysis of the text of the “Dialectic of Myth” and some other Losev’s writings of the late 1920s - early 1930s, we express and prove the assumption that Stolpner’s ideas directly affect Losev’s views on this issue and, above all, Losev’s statement that mystical pan-Israelitism is the key concept of Kabbalah. The article substantiates the conclusion that the source of Losev’s understanding of this issue was the controversy in Jewish thought of that time, of which Boris Stolpner was an active participant.

Keywords: Silver Age, Russian philosophy, Kabbalah, Judaism, Christianity, anti-Semitism.
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BUDDHIST MOTIVES AND IMAGES IN THE POETRY OF V.F. PERELISHIN
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The object of the analysis is the poetry of V.F. Pereleshin (V.F. Salatko-Petrishche) and some other poets of the Russian Far Eastern emigration of the 1920s-1940s. In the article the author analyzes the reflection of Buddhist philosophy in the poetry of Pereleshin – a Harbin poet-emigrant who was well acquainted with Oriental culture and translated the ancient Chinese treatise "Tao Te Ching". The study employs the philological method of motive analysis and some interdisciplinary methods of research such as cultural-typological, comparative-historical, hermeneutic methods. It is taken into account that the idea of all-unity, put forward by V.S. Solovyov, who refers to Buddhism as a negative universalism played an important role in Russian literature and culture at the beginning of the 20th century. The author of the article considers the Buddhist concepts of "samsara” and “emptiness” that do not only denote the passive mood, but also the awakening of a poet's consciousness. Attention is drawn to the motive of eternal circulation that penetrates all Pereleshin’s works and is, in his understanding, one of the most important motives for Buddhism. It implies the conditions required to achieve Nirvana. It is alleged that Buddhist ideas are important for realizing the principle of self-disclosure in Pereleshin’s representation. It is noted that the characteristics of Pereleshin’s interpretation of Buddhist philosophical ideas are reflected in the harmonious combination of two different origins – the motive of self-denial, impermanence of life, passivity, on the one hand, and the motive of universal love, liberation from illusions and moral conditions of comprehending the true existence – on the other. It is revealed that Oriental ideas and Buddhist philosophical concepts have shaped Pereleshin’s understanding of the unity of God and the world, the absolute connection of all living beings on the earth, which embodies the ideas of “all mankind” and “universal responsiveness”. It is concluded that Pereleshin in his works reflects the way from the external perception of Buddhist philosophical views to their inner experience, which indicates his profound understanding of the essence of this ancient philosophy.

Key words: literature of the Russian Far Eastern emigration, Valeriy Pereleshin’s poetry, Buddhist philosophy, V.S. Solovyov’s philosophy, Chinese Buddhism, Buddhist motives and images, motive of eternal circulation, concept of “emptiness”, principle of self-disclosure.
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RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY IN EUROPEAN CONTEXT

PRE-MUNDANE FALL AND EVOLUTION IN THE RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH RELIGIOUS THOUGHT OF THE 1870–1920SS

A.V. KHRAMOV
Borissiak Paleontological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences
123, Profsozunaya str, Moscow, 117997, Russian Federation
Cyril and Methodius School of Post-Graduate and Doctoral Studies
4/2 b.1, Pyatnitskaya str., Moscow, 115035, Russian Federation
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During the late 19th-early 20th centuries attempts to reconcile evolutionary theory with Christian beliefs sparked interest in the teaching about the pre-mundane Fall. It gained popularity in the Russian religious philosophy due to V.S. Solovyov, whose ideas were later developed by E.N. Trubetskov, Berdyaev N.A. and N.O. Lossky. Around roughly the same time similar ideas were expressed by Anglican theologians P. Green and N. P. Williams in Britain (Darwin's homeland). It has been shown in the paper that both groups of thinkers used the concept of the World soul independently from each other, to some extent equating it with the notion of the ideal (archetypal) Man, which preceded the existence of empirical humans on the Earth. Author argues that both groups referred to the teaching about the pre-mundane Fall in order to establish Christian theodicy, capable to account for origin of natural evil in the creation of loving God. According to the supporters of this approach, the visible world has deviated from God's original plan in its very foundations, so evolution which is going on in it cannot be identified with the creative activity of God. It has been concluded that Russian religious philosophers and their Anglican counterparts are dissimilar to theistic evolutionists, who equate evolution of matter with the process of Divine creation and deny the reality of the Fall. It is emphasized that drawing comparisons between the works of Anglican theologians of the early 20th century and the Russian religious philosophy helps to shed new light on some aspects of the latter. However, author demonstrates that after the World War II theistic evolution ultimately prevailed in the West, so the parallelism between Russian and Anglican religious thought regarding the teaching about the pre-mundane Fall ceased to exist.

Key words: the Fall, theory of evolution, the World soul, sophiology, gnosticism, origenism, the World will, problem of evil, philosophy of V.S. Solovyov, creation through evolution
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WHY HAVE THERE BEEN NO GREAT WOMEN PHILOSOPHERS
(IN RUSSIA)?

LILIANNA KIEJZIK
71 A, ul. Wojska Polskiego, Zielona Góra 65-001, Poland
E-mail: l.kiejzik@ifil.uz.zgora.pl

«Invisible: women in Russian philosophy» is a grant of the National Science Center (Poland) in the OPUS 13 competition (UMO-217/25/B/HS1/0053), being undertaken by scholars of the Institute of Philosophy of the University of Zielona Góra (Poland) as a joint international research effort with scholars from the Russian Federation. Its Principal Investigator is Lilianna Kiejzik, prof. dr. hab. (Institute of Philosophy, University of Zielona Góra, Poland). An overview of the basic ideas of the project includes the following: 1) development of original Russian philosophy as related to the work and activity of women; 2) the «background» role of women in Russian philosophy; 3) Polish connections of Russian female philosophers (J. Reitlinger, Z. Gippius); 4) Russian inspirations in foreign philosophies: L. Salome, A. Tumarkin. To verify the main hypothesis we’ll employ the broadly defined critical analysis method as postulated by Prof. Wł. Tatarkiewicz, a Polish historian of philosophy. The multidisciplinary method for organizing the four above-mentioned pillars of our research allows for a custom fitting according to the unique intellectual features of each of the studied thinkers (both male and female).

Key words: woman question, female philosophers in Russia, Russian philosophy of the XIX/XX century, Silver Age, the Higher Courses for Women.
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Реферат
В названии сообщения заключен отрицательный тезис: не было великих женщин философов в России. Мы спрашиваем только (и пытаемся ответить в проекте), почему их не было. Конечно, можно бы сказать, что в других странах Европы тоже не было великих женщин-философов. Совершенно верно, но нас не интересуют другие страны. Хотя в России встречались женские имена в фи-
лософии (например, Безобразова, Тумаркина), создательниц философских систем среди них не было. Каковы причины этого?

В проекте анализируются философские дискуссии во второй половине XIX и начале XX века (Бакунин, Розанов, Михайловский и др.) на тему «женского вопроса», обосновывается тезис о том, что русское философское сообщество было заинтересовано в активном присутствии женщин. Но женщины появляются только как ассистентки преподавателей философии на Высших женских курсах, профессоров университетов или как переводчицы трудов зарубежных философов, нет женщин – творцов оригинальных философских концепций. Были еще в России различные философские кружки и сообщества, которые организовались и финансировались женщинами и имели практическую философскую тематику. Были женщины – меценатки, финансирующие научные издательства (Морозова), однако печатались там исключительно мужчины-философы. Женщины издавали свои труды за свой счет.


О новаторском характере исследования свидетельствует тот факт, что оно не ограничивается представлением философских портретов женщин и анализом так называемого «женского вопроса» философами-мужчинами. Выявленная потребность включить в философское сообщество женщин. Показано, как они функционировали в качестве членов философских обществ и кружков. Одновременно подчеркнуто, что проект не является гендерным исследованием, он не включается в дискурс на тему роли и значения культурной функции «женственности», не входит в полемику с феминистскими тенденциями. Проект огра-
ничен рамками Серебряного века и не вступает в пространство écriture feminine. Приняв все вышеизложенное во внимание, надеемся, что результаты проекта расширят знания, прежде всего, польских читателей о русской философии, откроят для них новые персонажи русской философской культуры.

Результатом гранта будут две книги и ряд статей. Первая монография «Второй план, или женщины в русской философии. Судьбы – творчество – деятельность» представит широкий спектр исследовательских проблем женщин-философов. Вторая, под названием «Женщины в русской философии. Русские философы о женщинах», будет сборником философских эссе и имеет целью популярно изложить взгляды философов на так называемый «женский вопрос». В 2018 году по результатам нашей работы опубликованы четыре статьи.
REFLECTIONS ON I.I. EVLAMPIEV’S REPLY TO THE CRITICISM
OF HIS MONOGRAPH «UNDISTORTED CHRISTIANITY
AND ITS SOURCES»
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