



Hong Li

REUNION WITH GOD: COMPARING AND CONTRASTING KIREYEVSKY'S AND SOLOVYOV'S PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS THOUGHTS

Основу статьи составляет сравнительный анализ философских воззрений И. В. Киреевского и В. С. Соловьева, прежде всего их понимание всеединства, любви и красоты, отношение к религии и утопические мысли о будущем России. Сравнение идей Киреевского и Соловьева проводится с целью понять эволюцию философских представлений основателя «философии всеединства» от усвоения им славянофильских теорий до создания собственной и во многом новаторской концепции. Кроме того, в статье представлена критика учений обоих русских философов, вскрываются утопические элементы и уязвимые места как в славянофильстве, так и в соловьевской философии (в частности, критически рассматривается идея «универсальной церкви»). Анализируются также философские идеи Ф. Шеллинга, оказавшие большое влияние как на славянофилов, в том числе и на Киреевского, так и на Соловьева, акцентируется и объясняется своеобразие трактовки понятий шеллинговской философии в русской религиозно-философской традиции. Особое внимание уделяется содержательному анализу сочинений Киреевского, изданных в сборнике «Критика и эстетика», и работ Соловьева «Три силы», «Философские начала цельного знания», «Чтения о Богочеловечестве». Кроме того, учитываются актуальные историко-философские исследования русской философии, выполненные как в России, так и за ее пределами.

Ключевые слова: славянофильство, всеединство, Богочеловечество, любовь, красота, София, православие, Великая схизма И. В. Киреевский, В. С. Соловьев, Ф. Шеллинг.

The article is mainly based on the comparative studies of philosophical positions of I. Kireyevsky and V. Solovyov, first of all their understanding of the ideas of “all-unity”, “love” and “beauty”, their attitudes towards religion and utopian thoughts on the future of Russia. The comparison between Kireyevsky's and Solovyov's philosophical thoughts is also aimed at presenting the process of ideological development of Solovyov, beginning from his borrowing of the Slavophile philosophy to the innovation of his own theories. This article is not only focused on the comparison, explanation or analysis of both philosophers' ideas, it also provides some criticism concerning the utopian elements and vulnerabilities of both Slavophilism and Solovyov's views, especially the conception of “Universal Church”. The cross-analysis of F. Schelling's philosophy with both Kireyevsky's and Solovyov's philosophical views is also presented in this article. In fact, according to Kireyevsky, his philosophy to a large extent was influenced by Schelling, and the further development of the Slavophile conception by Solovyov was stimulated by a dialogue with the German philosopher. A special attention was paid in the article to the analysis of Kireyevsky's works collected in the book “Criticism and Aesthetics” and such Solovyov's treatises as “Three Forces”, “The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge”, and “Lectures on God-mankind”. Also, some research works to support the main arguments in this article are used.

Keywords: Slavophilism, all-unity, God-mankind, love, beauty, Sophia, Orthodox theology, Great Schism, I. V. Kireyevsky, V. S. Solovyov, F. Schelling.

When the Patriotic War against Napoleon ended in 1814, many Russian intellectuals and officers saw the potential to implement the freedom and intellectual liberty that they had experienced in Paris. In little more than a decade, however, the failure of 1825 Decembrist Uprising forced Russian society under the autocratic rule of Nicholas I [13, p. 32]. Russian people never lost their hope in searching for freedom and future, Peter Chaadayev's "Philosophical Letters" (1829–1831) and "Apology of a Madman" (1837) like lightning in the darkness, prompted Russian society to look towards Europe once more. "Peter the Great found at home only a sheet of white paper and with his strong hand he wrote on it the words 'Europe and the West'" [9]. Chaadayev believed, because Russia had no past, she could adopt European experience and create a brand-new future. Society was not sure which path they should take; Chaadayev's "westernization" idea deeply wounded the national self-esteem of the "Slavophiles"¹.

Once, at a philosophical salon in Moscow, Alexey Khomyakov openly criticised Chaadayev for "simply ignoring the fact that Russia protected Europe from the Mongolian, Islamic and Napoleonic threats through the wisdom of Orthodox Slavs" [8, p. 453]. Soon after, Khomyakov published another short essay, entitled "On the Old and New" (1839), in which he stressed his view on the West as "lacking moral value, doomed by individualism, materialism, and separation". He argued that only the traditional values of unity and spiritual development could direct Russia towards a better future [8, p. 463]. Kireyevsky responded to this argument in "An Answer to Khomyakov" (1839). In this publication, he veers away from traditional Slavophilism by partly agreeing on the 'downfall of Western individualism' and different historical path in Russia and the West, but he also considers Western ideas as some of the most important elements for philosophical, social and scientific development [1, p. 120]. He argues that, the amalgamation of Western and Eastern thought is important, paving the way for the creation of a new Russian philosophical idea called "integral knowledge". Kireyevsky, who was first and foremost a literary critic, dedicated the majority of his time to researching contemporary literature rather than forming his own philosophical system; only four of his articles have a clear philosophical message: "The 19th Century" (1832), "An Answer to Khomyakov" (1839), "On the Nature of the Enlightenment of Europe and its Relation to the Enlightenment of Russia" (1852) and "On the Necessity and Possibility of New Beginnings for Philosophy" (1856)

¹ A group of liberal thinkers who see Russia's future in national tradition, people's rights and religion [16, p. 267].

[15, p. 33]. His novel social and philosophical ideas needed to be developed by someone capable of forming the philosophy of ‘Unity’ and ‘Integral Knowledge’ into a fully developed system, namely, Vladimir Solovyov. We still can see the influence of Slavophilism through Solovyov’s early essay “The Crisis of Western Philosophy: Against the Positivists” (1874), but in the 1880s he moved away from narrow Slavophil “Catholicity (Соборность)”² towards an idea of “Unity of All (Всеединство)”³, a development that is found in “Lectures on God-mankind” (1877–1891). Solovyov researched in various spheres, not only philosophy, but also history, social science, law and art. He was also a poet. His combined experiences and knowledge converged in the idea of ‘Integral Knowledge’. His friendly attitude towards the West finally led to his breaking with the more radical Slavophiles [24, p. 53]. Thus, he was a philosopher influenced by Kireyevsky but criticizes what he deems to be Kireyevsky’s inappropriate thoughts, before finally forming his own philosophical system. In this essay, I will talk about the philosophical and religious ideas of both Kireyevsky and Solovyov. I begin by presenting Kireyevsky’s ideas before turning to Solovyov’s adoption and adaption of Kireyevsky’s ideas. I will examine how each of the writers incorporated their ideas into their literature and the judicial system, I will also refer to a few other contemporaneous philosophers’ ideas and Solovyov’s contradictions.

Seeking for the meaning of “integral philosophy” is one of the core philosophical tasks for both Kireyevsky and Solovyov. Kireyevsky stresses that integral philosophy comes “from an abstract conclusion of the mind, which, as an abstract one, did not give strength to the spirit and had no substantial coercion, and from a habit that was composed partly of an abstract desire to agree with the dictates of the mind, partly from the randomness of external circumstances” [1, p. 251]. It is clear from this that both the abstract mind and real experiences are equally important, external existence brings real meaning to internal activities; neither can exist by itself. The problem of Western philosophy is considered by Kireyevsky to rest on too much focus on the purely rational aspect. He thought western thought had lost its connection with the real world and would not be applicable to it [22, p. 117]. Solovyov clearly agrees with this as-

² Catholicity (соборность) is the organic unity of people through love and free will, but within this unity each person remains his own individuality [29, p. 566].

³ All-Unity (Всеединство) is the extension of Catholicity, which extends the organic unity of society to the sphere of an Absolute Unity (God) in universe, people can only find real freedom within this unity, and this unity is created by linking different individual through love [17, p. 376–377].

assessment, stating that, “The will, the mind, and the sense – are important only as ways or means of implementing a certain content, and themselves do not constitute this content” [28, p. 29]. Internal thinking needed to have external manifestations in order to be proven, and external experiences should provoke internal thought in order to explain the meaning of its existence [7, p. 208]; otherwise, pure internal activities will end up as abstractive nihilism [4, p. 597].

Both philosophers agreed that there are things outside the nature, which could not be explained. Thus the third approach to the integral philosophy should rely on theology [1, p. 234; 7, p. 351]. In fact this is an *a priori* approach – to assume God exists and consider God as the Absolute Beginning, Existence and Unity, which contains elements of both internal rational thoughts and external experience [11, p. 225]. According to both philosophers, a higher existence will always contain all elements of the lower ones, since God is the highest existence and all things are within Him and, as the Absolute, there should be nothing outside Him [5, p. 54]. Such a philosophical idea also reflects the strong influence of Kant’s philosophy in Russia. Kant had already suggested that God is the absolute unity and it is impossible to prove God’s existence [25, p. 136]. Kireyevsky clearly understands that “truth of theology cannot be completely explained by rational thoughts due to its individualist character, which is insufficient to understand universal unity created by higher theological element” [22, p. 118]. This interpretation was adopted and developed by Solovyov; although God is the realization of “All”, “multi-characters” are of God, however, “multi-characters” cannot change God’s character as “One”, which means a stronger force of positive unity is within God to hold “multi-characters” together: one is multiple, multiple is within one [5, p. 83–85]. Kireyevsky and Solovyov considered that this unity is impossible to achieve by human power, therefore, the impossibility should be overcome by theological experience, which they both considered to be outside of nature and the rational mind [3, p. 130]. Theological experience is the way to remedy the insufficiency of rational human mind, in order to find the “truth”. However, the two philosophers have disagreement on the approach to the reunion with “truth”. Kireyevsky differed in this regard from Khomyakov who believed that the cultivation of a spiritual life was the chief approach to the knowledge of truth rather than the pure adoption of Church doctrines [29, p. 572]. However, for Kireyevsky the spiritual experience is a passive reaction; man can only submit to God and accept divine wisdom, he should not expect any positive interaction between himself and God when seeking the “truth” [21, p. 600]. According to Solovyov, human is the realistic

element which can practice “Logos” – the principle of order and knowledge from God in the nature [5, p. 119]. However, man can freely choose whether or not he is going to practice “Logos” based on his individual character and will (organic spirit of the world – “Sophia”), thus the pure passive adoption of God’s principle is impossible [5, p. 144–145]. Solovyov stresses that without considering “man” as the object of God’s positive force to apply His principle, and without the interaction between man and God, pure “Logos” does not have any intrinsic meaning [24, p. 50]. This difference shows that Solovyov already turned his focus from pure theological value (Kireyevsky and other Slavophiles) towards a philosophy of humanism; he contemplates the significance of the human value in relation to the divine, and in so doing, he transfers the centre of philosophy from God to humanity [23, p. 39].

This leads to the focus on “freedom” and “individual character”. Kireyevsky argues that freedom is inseparable from philosophy of Unity; eternal unity is the organic union through freedom and free loving, not through force (force only creates temporary union) [13, p. 97]. Unity does not destroy individual character, but supplements and enriches the one-sidedness of one individual character through its interaction with other individual character within a grand unity [1, p. 262]. Solovyov adopts this theory, and further explains the meaning of individual characters: individuals are not universal because they are only particles within the universal unity; they are insufficient to present the integral knowledge, but each of them have potential possibility to unite with others; each different part has a different character, the collection of these “parts” presents the multi-characteristic feature of universal unity [7, p. 246]. In this case, Solovyov not only prevents the separation of the individual from the unity, as individual is always within the unity, but also stresses the importance of individual character in the formation of integral knowledge and universal unity. Solovyov criticizes the pure individualism as one of the most significant insufficiencies of the Western philosophical system; individuals only see themselves as separate independent elements without considering a greater picture of the world as a whole. Solovyov asserts that such one-sidedness is the source of egoism [12, p. 82]. Solovyov goes on to argue that an individual is “just an infinitely small and disappearing point in the world” [31, p. 119], which means, without the interaction with others, a single person will have no reference material to prove his existence; he is just an empty form without real meaning [5, p. 128]. In order to avoid the one-sidedness of individualism and embody the individual character’s role in formation of unity, realization of “love” is fundamental. The definition of love, according to Kireyevsky, is

the desire and will to sacrifice oneself for the good of others, thus achieving mutual interaction and a complementary effect [1, p. 231]. Solovyov calls love “self-denial”; love is the way to see the insufficiencies of a given individual and to share one’s own character in order to enrich others and, in so doing, enrich one’s own character. Unity can be achieved only when individuals interact with one another, and only within this unity can the role of an individual character be fulfilled [31, p. 322–323].

The idea of the relationship between individualism and unity is not new. Both philosophers, clearly, and to a great extent, adopted Schelling’s philosophy. In “On the Essence of Human Freedom” (1809), Schelling explicitly states that the origin of evil is the separation from God and from unity through individualism [11, p. 222]. According to the analysis of Russian philosophers’ ideas referred to above, they are all expansions of Schelling’s philosophy on individualism. However, if God is “all”, “unity” and “all kindness”, why does evil still exist? Schelling and Kireyevsky try to avoid discussing this particular aspect, seemingly because they were unable to justify their ideas on this topic; Solovyov, stresses that “evil” is not an independent existence but a temporary potential possibility to highlight “good”. It is something within God but different from God, the free act of individual will without denying God’s character of “all-kindness” [25, p. 149]. Evil is only the temporary state of limited individual freedom against the eternal unity [27, p. 487]. Prior to Solovyov’s works, many philosophers were only interested in seeking the source of evil but for Solovyov, it would seem that deducing and understanding the role of evil is a more important than philosophical speculation on the origin of evil, itself.

According to Kireyevsky, God is the highest source of goodness and moral values. As has already been mentioned, evil is thought to be a direct consequence of free individualism. Thus, the free rejection of individualism and the deification of moral value to reunion with God can destroy evil [1, p. 266]. The role of the law is to prevent evil occurring at all rather than to apply punishment where evil already exists. This means that the law is considered the tool for moral education [27, p. 487]. According to Solovyov, it is also the realization of the basic moral standard [27, p. 492]. However, Solovyov only presents us an abstract concept; he fails to explain what he means by the “basic moral standard”. In fact, if law only relies on internal moral value without external forcible character, it will cause confusion in the society, because each person’s moral standard is different for the others; besides, to enforce the “basic moral standard” is a forcible action in and of itself, which contradicts Solovyov’s principle of freedom [10, p. 137]. Both philosophers clearly based their ju-

dicial ideas on Christian teaching of common moral value, forgiveness and repentance. From a juridical standpoint, these are characters of “natural law”. However, it is different from external justice of “positive law”⁴ and it rejects the role of the state as an authoritative body. Thus, both philosophers fail to distinguish the difference between “natural” and “positive” law. They seem to have romanticized and idealized ideas about the judicial system based on religious and philosophical ideals. On the other hand, this may be regarded as evidence of the “moral priority” and weak empirical legal consciousness apparent in the Russian tradition [23, p. 14].

Both Kireyevsky and Solovyov are interested in art and literature. Again, Schelling lays out the foundation for their ideas; Schelling believes that “literature is just a means of presenting the eternal life through various aspects”. Here he means that our creativity of art and literature should not only be for the sake of art and literature, but should represent the internal spiritual activity combined with the reflection of the natural world [26, p. 310–311]. Like many other Slavophiles, Kireyevsky considers the “real natural world” to be the “nature of the people” [20, p. 52–60]. For example, a poet is a representative of “the people”; it is impossible to completely separate the poet from “the people’s elements”. On the other hand, only within “the people” can the individual emotion of literature and art be fully embodied in the construction of a “national identity” [2, p. 14]. Each individual artist and writer has no significance in him or herself. Their value only becomes realized through a greater image of history and national identity [20, p. 59]. Kireyevsky applies his thoughts on the relationship between “individual” and “all” into his literary criticism. Yet, he also criticizes the Western idea that art and literature only come from personal emotion. He argues that in such a case literature and art are only abstract catharsis without organic and realistic meaning. He is the first thinker to mention the idea of the “organic nature of the people” in literary criticism [20, p. 209]. Developing Kireyevsky’s ideas on art in “the nature of the people”, Solovyov stresses that the task of art is not only to represent real society, to represent “human organic nature” and to join together with internal spiritual activities, but also to realize “universal beauty”. All the approaches mentioned above are considered as steps towards this realization [31, p. 348].

To understand how art can realize “beauty”, we should understand Solovyov’s definition of “beauty”. Solovyov thought that

⁴ “There is no necessary connection between law and morals... moral judgments, unlike statements of fact, cannot be established or defended by rational argument, evidence, or proof” [18, p. 601–602].

“beauty” represents feeling. It is created when objective elements, such as the implementation of external objective force, presents and interacts with internal thinking processes about this objective existence. Only the combination of objective elements (truth) and internal rational thoughts (ideas) as prerequisites, can bring real meaning to “beauty” [7, p. 346]. Thus, “beauty” is the sublimation of both external elements and internal thoughts; it is not only the third element, interacting with “truth” and “ideas” to achieve “integral philosophy”, but it is also an object of creativity (from the combination of “truth” and “idea”) [31, p. 341]. According to this explanation, “beauty” is the perceptual form of existence of “truth” and “ideas”. The elements of “truth” and “ideas” will always exist in “beauty”. As it is impossible to split these three elements, the idea that “beauty which is only for the sake of beauty” does not exist [31, p. 345]. Therefore, for Solovyov, the task of art and literature is to absorb “truth” from nature and “idea” from rational thought (individual motion), presenting them as “beauty”, then by the interaction of these three elements, the eternal value of unity – the positive object which contains “love” and “truth”, will be fulfilled [16, p. 292]. Overall, we can see many agreements between Solovyov and Kireyevsky on the sphere of “unity”, freedom, individualism, love and “beauty”. Clearly Solovyov expands Kireyevsky’s ideas and forms a more developed philosophical system.

According to Kireyevsky’s view, the (Orthodox) Church is the necessary element to conduct free unity between people, and it is the tool to connect man and God through internal unity, an organic “body” of Christ, the realization of “Catholicity (Соборность)” [15, p. 41]. The mystical experience through prayer is said to create a supernatural free union between God and man, to deify man within a condition of internal peace, and to turn people’s focus from secular (Kireyevsky considers “secular” as “unreal”, “temporary”) to eternal spiritual value [1, p. 70]. The idea that these mystical experiences were means through which reunion with God was possible is the result of the revival of monasticism in the 1830–1840s. According to Hesychasm, “salvation” comes after “deification” through prayer and meditation⁵. We should not deny that such deification is also presented in Solovyov’s idea of the creation of “God-mankind”. However, Solovyov points out that “prayer” is the passive submission to God, “salvation” is not achieved through how much people pray to God and ask for help; God, according to Solovyov, already granted the potential principle of “salvation” for us through “Logos”, all that

⁵ Hesychasm is the process of retiring inward by ceasing to register the senses, in order to achieve an experiential knowledge of God [19, p. 16].

is required is our free and willing response for the potential divine principle to be realized within ourselves [5, p. 164–165]. Here Solovyov criticizes Kireyevsky for ignoring the values and free will of man, “prayer” only consolidates the passive connection between man and God, however, the initiative response to God’s principle is a more positive approach to “salvation” [6, p. 470–471].

In fact, cutting off the link between spiritual and secular life, to achieve internal peace and unity represents the general Slavophil idea of the separation of Church from the state. According to the “Bible”, one must “Give to Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and to God the things which are God’s” (Matth. 22:21). Christians should put more efforts in seeking for greater eternal spiritual value, rather than care much about temporary political events on earth [1, p. 234]. Slavophiles considered political movements and revolutions in the West as “anti-Christ”. They thought that there was too much focus on individual interests in politics in the West, resulting in violence, division and chaos. Slavophiles thought this was in sharp contrast to the supposed peaceful spiritual unity within the Orthodox Church [13, p. 123]. Nonetheless, Peter the Great transformed the Church into a government agency; the Emperor was appointed head of the Church. This “reform” clearly contradicts a fundamental precept of Christianity, namely that the Church is the absolute representative of God on earth and that when politics and the Church mix, the original holiness of Christian belief is destroyed [13, p. 101]. Solovyov argues for the separation of Church and state. However, in contrast with Kireyevsky’s complete segregation between the Church and politics, Solovyov believes that the Church can also act as a positive force, together with state, in construction of a new form of society [31, p. 245]. According to Solovyov’s imagined future society, there would be three separate forces in the society: the Church would deal with moral and spiritual sphere; the government would manage political affairs; and the “prophet” would be responsible for pointing out the future directions of both. Each force should not interfere with the other but all should work together for a common goal, namely, the construction of an “Old Testament model of tri-partite authority”: the “Free Theocratic Politic” [30, p. 318]. Hence, Solovyov transfers Kireyevsky’s passive segregation between Church and the state into a positive approach for the construction of the new society.

The Great Schism breaks up the relationship between Catholicism and Orthodoxy; then the Reformation protested against corruption within Catholic Church. Both philosophers appear regretful about the split between Christian brothers and present us with some different approaches for the reunification, however, there are great dis-

agreements between them. Kireyevsky upholds a Slavophil position, declaring that the reunification of the Church could only come about if the Catholic and Protestant Churches repented and accepted the Orthodox Church as the one true Church [19, p. 17]. Kireyevsky considered the Orthodox Church to not only retain the original Christian teaching, but also to be the Church which sublimates all classical philosophical thoughts, thus presenting us with the integral wisdom without destroying the highest divine value of Christianity [1, p. 252]. Solovyov also agrees that Christianity (not specifically Orthodoxy) is the only religion which rejects the one-sidedness of pure external natural empiricism (nature is only the material foundation), absorbs classical philosophy as subjective rational thinking process (human character), and joins together with Hebrew mysticism of Absolute Existence (divine power). Thus Christianity is the balanced combination of these three major aspects in the world. He sees Christianity as a fully developed religion [5, p. 36–37]. However, Solovyov argues that Western Christianity does not represent such a high achievement of this religion because it put rational thought processes (human character) above divine power, creating an unbalanced distribution of these three aspects, intermingled the internal unity with one-sided rational human value [22, p. 118].

It is clear from his writings that Kireyevsky completely opposed Catholicism. In his opinion, the greatest sin of Catholicism is her separation from the Universal Church [13, p. 92]. He thought that the Pope was more concerned with strengthening his secular power rather than serving God. He also regarded the Pope as enforcing religious dictatorship over European Christians, and flouting the Christian belief of unity under freedom and love [1, p. 213]. However, Solovyov sees Catholicism in a more positive way, although he also regards Catholicism as “the unity without freedom” [5, p. 202]. According to Solovyov, the Pope is the only religious leader outside politics, and the Catholic Church is the only Church which can connect theology with life experience, referred to as “salvation from virtue” [31, p. 264]. In contrast, the official Orthodox Church already became a governmental institution; Solovyov stresses that, although Orthodoxy contains eternal truth, she fails to apply the truth to the society [31, p. 263]. Therefore, in Solovyov’s ideal form of society, the Pope can be the leader of religion in order to ensure that the (Catholic) Church can separate itself from government and ensure the application of theological ideas in society, together join with Orthodox Church’s internal truth, to create an organic and united Universal Church – it is impossible to create the Universal Church without recognizing the “Patriarch of Rome” [24, p. 54]. However, Solovyov’s idea is purely Utopian, the conflict between Catholicism and

Orthodoxy is not only about the position of the Pope, but is founded on more basic theological differences, such as the filioque controversy (the Catholic concept that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son) and many other religious practices [14, p. 78]. The two Churches have followed their own creeds for almost 1000 years and it would be hard to compromise with one another, if by doing so they destroyed their own well-established traditions [1, p. 256]. Kireyevsky already warned of the possible hardship of this (hypothetical) reunion; Solovyov, however, completely ignores this historical fact and does not present any way of resolving the clash on theology. It was only in his later years and without any support from either Catholicism or Orthodoxy that he realized the impossibility of such a reunion and abandoned his early ideas for good [32, p. 24].

As has already been mentioned, due to the fundamental differences in ideas and origin of teachings, Kireyevsky sees little hope in a free union of Catholicism and Orthodoxy in peace and equality [1, p. 238]. Therefore, Kireyevsky focuses more on how Russia can preserve what he regards to be the truth of Orthodoxy and carry it forward in the internal development. Solovyov criticizes this idea as “national isolationism”; he believes that Russia is the only nation which contains both elements of East (divinity) and West (human value). Solovyov thought that she was the realization of an elementary unity of the world [5, p. 207]. Russia should not isolate and hide this character from the world, but this special character should act as a bridge, eliminating the estrangements between West and East in a process of universal development. Just like Kireyevsky’s explanation of the “poet’s” role in the development of “national identity”, the importance of Russia’s special character could only be reflected and sublimated in the universal historical process [3, p. 157]. This idea is an extension of “All-Unity” within a person and society to a greater unity of the world. For Solovyov, the Kingdom of Heaven is not somewhere on the other eternal shore, but within the unity of humanity [17, p. 391]; Russia, as a positive intermediary power in helping the realization of this unity, is the Messiah [17, p. 387].

To sum up both philosophers’ ideas: both of them reflect a mixture of Russian tradition (unity), German philosophy (romanticism) and Christian mysticism (deification, reunion with God, messianism). They expand their philosophical ideas in social, literary, judicial and other spheres to achieve their idea of “applying thoughts in real life”. Clearly there is an inheritance relationship between Kireyevsky and Solovyov, as Kireyevsky lays out the foundation of ideas regarding “integral knowledge” and “unity”, which are then adopted and developed by Solovyov. However, Solovyov does not continue down Kireyevsky’s path as a Slavophil. He rearranges and ‘cor-

rects' Kireyevsky's ideas, expanding and applying them into a larger image of humanity as a whole, together with his own new ideas. All of this is directed towards the formation of a new philosophical system, namely that of "All-Unity". It is evident that both writers were idealists and their thoughts relied heavily on religious transcendentalism; their thoughts can hardly be substantiated if God (Absolute Unity) does not exist, and the realization of their ideas supposes a different historical reality than that which has thus far been experienced.

References

1. Kireyevsky, I.V., *Izbrannye stat'i* [Selected articles], Moscow: Sovremennik, 1984.
2. Kireyevsky, I.V., *Kritika i estetika* [Criticism and aesthetics], Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979.
3. Malinov, A.V., *Filosofiya i metodologiya istorii v Rossii* [Philosophy and methodology of history in Russia], St. Petersburg: Intersocis, 2015.
4. Mochul'skiy, K., Vladimir Solovyov: zhizn' i uchenie [Vladimir Solovyov: Life and Teaching], in *Vladimir Solovyov: Pro et Contra* [Vladimir Solovyov: Pro et contra], St. Petersburg: RHGA, 2000.
5. Solovyov, V.S., *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem v dvadcati tomah* [Complete essays and letters in twenty volumes], vol. 1, Moscow: Nauka, 2000.
6. Solovyov, V.S., Slavyanofil'stvo i yego vyrozhdienie [Slavophilism and its degradation], in *Slavyanofil'stvo: Pro et contra* [Slavophilism: Pro et contra], St. Petersburg: RHGA, 2006.
7. Solovyov, V.S., *Filosofskie nachala tsel'nogo znaniya* [The philosophical principles of integral knowledge], Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt, 2011.
8. Homyakov, A.S., *Sochineniya v dvuh tomah* [Essays in two volumes], vol. 1, Moscow: Medium, 1994.
9. Chaadayev, P.Ja., *Apologiya sumasshedshego* [Apology of a madman], URL: www.vehi.net/chaadaev/apologiya.html.
10. Chicherin, B.N., *Filosofiya prava* [Philosophy of law], St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1998.
11. Romero, M.G., Schelling's reflection on evil in the "Lectures on God-manhood", in *Solovyovskiy sbornik* [Collected works on Solovyov], Moscow: Fenomenologiya-Germenevtika, 2001.
12. Alyoshin, A., The Slavophile lexicon of "Personality", in *Studies in East European Thought*, vol. 61, no. 2/3, 2009.
13. Bai, X., *Russian Slavophilism*, Beijing: Commercial Press, 2006.
14. Bindley, T., *The oecumenical documents of the faith*, Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press, 1980.
15. Chapman, M.C., The role of religious belief and aestheticism in the philosophy of Ivan Kireyevsky, in *New Zealand Slavonic Journal*, no. 1, 1978.
16. Georgieva, T., *Culture and faith – Russian culture and Orthodox Christianity*, transl. by Jiao, D., Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House, 2012.
17. Guo, X., *Russian consciousness of messianism*, Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2009.

18. Hart, H., Positivism and the separation of law and morals, in *Harvard Law Review*, vol. 71, no. 4, 1958.
19. Hughes, M., Mysticism and knowledge in the philosophical thought of Ivan Kireyevsky, in *Mystics Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 1/2, 2004.
20. Ji, M., *Slavophilistic literary theory and culture criticism*, Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2015.
21. Lanz, H., The philosophy of Ivan Kireyevsky, in *The Slavonic Review*, vol. 4, no. 12, 1926.
22. Lavrin, Ja., Kireyevsky and the problem of culture, in *The Russian Review*, vol. 20, no. 2, 1961.
23. Li, X., *Research on Solovyov's philosophy of law*, Beijing: Law Press China, 2015.
24. Przebinda, G., Vladimir Solovyov's fundamental philosophical ideas, in *Studies in East European Thought*, vol. 54, no. 1: Polish studies on Russian thought, 2002.
25. Poole, R., Vladimir Solovyov's philosophical anthropology: autonomy, dignity, perfectibility, in *A History of Russian Philosophy 1830–1930. Faith, Reason, and the Defence of Human Dignity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
26. Schelling, F., *System des transzendentalen Idealismus*, transl. by Liang, Z., Beijing: Commercial Press, 2012.
27. Simons, A., The full and empty formula of Solovyov's legal philosophy: juridical pragmatism and ethical perfectionism, in *Archives for Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy*, vol. 88, no. 4, 2002.
28. Solovyov, V., *Lectures on God-mankind*, transl. by Zhang, B., Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House, 1999.
29. Stojanovic, J.D., The first Slavophiles: Khomyakov and Kireyevsky, in *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 6, no. 18, 1928.
30. Sutton, J., The centenary of the death of Vladimir Solovyov (1853–1900), in *Studies in East European Thought*, vol. 52, no. 4, 2000.
31. Xu, F., *Solovyov's philosophy*, Beijing: Commercial Press, 2007.
32. Zhang, B., A brief account of Solovyov's religious philosophy, in Solovyov, V., *Lectures on God-mankind*, transl. by Zhang, B., Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House, 1999.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31119/phlog.2018.3.3>