ИВАНОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ ЭНЕРГЕТИЧЕСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ

IVANOVO STATE POWER UNIVERSITY

СОЛОВЬЁВСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

SOLOV'EVSKIE ISSLEDOVANIYA

SOLOVYOV STUDIES

Выпуск 1 (41) 2014

Issue 1 (41) 2014

Соловьёвские исследования. Вып. 1 (41) 2014

Журнал издается с 2001 года ISSN 2076-9210

Адрес редакции:
153003, г. Иваново, ул. Рабфаковская, 34, ИГЭУ, кафедра философии,
Российский научно-образовательный центр исследований наследия В.С. Соловьёва

Тел. (4932), 26-97-70, 26-97-75; факс (4932) 26-97-96
E-mail: maximov@philosophy.ispu.ru
http://www.solovyov-seminar.ispu.ru

Журнал включен в Перечень ведущих рецензируемых научных журналов и изданий, рекомендованных ВАК Министерства образования и науки РФ для публикации основных научных результатов диссертаций на соискание ученых степеней доктора и кандидата наук.

Информация об опубликованных статьях предоставляется в систему РИНЦ согласно договору № 29-05/08 от 28 мая 2008 г. с ООО «Научная электронная библиотека». Журнал зарегистрирован в базе данных Ulrich's (США).

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

НАСЛЕДИЕ В.С. СОЛОВЬЕВА

К 140-ЛЕТИЮ СО ДНЯ РОЖДЕНИЯ Н.А. БЕРДЯЕВА

ТВОРЧЕСТВО А.Ф. ЛОСЕВА: К 120-ЛЕТИЮ СО ДНЯ РОЖДЕНИЯ

КРИТИКА И БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ

20. *Pis'ma V.S. Solov'eva* [V.S. Solovyov's Letters], Saint-Petersburg, 1908, vol. I, 283 p.
21. Nikanor (Brovkovich), arkhiep. Tserkov' i gosudarstvo [Church and State], in *Protiv grafa L'va Tolstogo. Vosem' besed Vysokopreosvyashchenneyshego Nikanora Arkhi-episkopa Khersonskogo i Odesskogo* [Vs. Count Leo Tolstoy. Eight conversations of His Eminence Archbishop Nikanor of Kherson and Odessa], Odessa, 1891, pp. 186–231.
22. Solov'ev, V.S. *Pis'ma* [Letters], Petersburg: Vremya, 1923, vol. IV, 244 p.

УДК 172.3:316:27(47)
ББК 87.3(2)522-685

СВОБОДА СОВЕСТИ И ОГРАНИЧЕННОСТЬ ЗАПАДНОГО ПРЕДСТАВЛЕНИЯ О ЛИБЕРАЛЬНОСТИ СОЛОВЬЕВА

ПАТРИК ЛАЛЛИ МИХЕЛЬСОН
Индианский университет, кафедра религиоведения
Блумингтон, Индиана, 47405, США
E-mail: plmichel@indiana.edu

Рассматривается контекстуальная интерпретация главных историографических направлений в англоязычной исследовательской литературе, посвященной Владимиру Соловьеву. Отмечается преобладание интерпретации его идей через призму современного либерализма, акцентирование внимания на размышлениях философа о свободе совести. Ставится задача оспорить видение Соловьева как либерала. На основе анализа публицистических работ представлено соловьевское понимание религиозной свободы. Обосновывается вывод о том, что главным проектом Соловьева было создание не определенного либерального общества, а эсхатологического устройства, в котором Царство Божие на земле устанавливается под покровительством христианской церкви и Российской империи. Утверждается, что создание политической системы, в которой личностная автономия и личные религиозные убеждения являются высшей целью, не было для Соловьева конечным итогом развития общества. Учение Соловьева трактуется как проект имперского христианского мыслителя, предлагающего аполитичные, духовные ответы на социальные и политические вопросы.

Ключевые слова: *свобода совести, свободная теократия, либерализм, христианская империя, староверы, раскол, свобода вероисповедания, христианская политика, эсхатологическое учение В.С. Соловьева.*

FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE AND THE LIMITS OF THE LIBERAL SOLOVYOV

PATRICK LALLY MICHELSON
Indiana University, Department of Religious Studies
Bloomington, Indiana, 47405, USA
E-mail: plmichel@indiana.edu

The article offers a contextual interpretation of the main historiographical developments in English-language scholarship about Vladimir Solovyov. A predominant interpretation of his ideas has been made through the prism of contemporary liberalism, which focuses on the philosopher's thoughts about freedom of conscience. The goal of the article is to challenge the image of Solovyov as

a liberal. The research is based on an analysis of journalistic writings in which Solovyov presented his understanding of religious freedom. The conclusion is that Solovyov's main project was not the creation of some liberal society, but an eschatological polity in which the Kingdom of God would be realized on earth under the auspices of Christian Church and Russian empire. It is established that the creation of a political system in which personal autonomy and individual religious convictions constituted the highest goal was not the end result of Solovyov's project. Solovyov's doctrine was that of an imperial Christian thinker, who proposed apolitical, spiritual answers to social and political problems.

Key words: *freedom of conscience, free theocracy, liberalism, Christian empire, Old Believers, schism, freedom of religious belief, Christian politics, the eschatological doctrine of V.S.Solovyov.*

Few figures in the history of Russian thought have enjoyed greater prominence in English-language scholarship since the collapse of the Soviet Union than Vladimir Solovyov. The initial recovery of Solovyov's life and works was mainly undertaken in the early 1990s by scholars of Russian literature and culture. The principal image of Solovyov to emerge from those studies, an image mainly derived from poetic claims of divine encounter and mystical experience, was that of a playful, provocative, and paradoxical thinker who experimented with literary genres, philosophical categories, Christian and Jewish symbols, even gender norms in a wide-ranging spiritual quest to articulate and realize the universal goal of personal and collective wholeness[1]. Of the many historiographical implications that have resulted from this mode of interpretation, which broadly mirrors the Symbolist exegesis of Solov'ev during the early twentieth century, perhaps the most compelling is the difficulty in essentializing a single Solovyov or reducing him to some fixed ideological category[2]. And even when labels like «mystic», «visionary», or «knightly monk» are applied to Solovyov, they generally, if unintentionally, convey interpretative instability and fluidity, as such an enigmatic figure is always open to mythopoeic reconfiguration.

Parallel to this creative, open-ended reading of Solovyov is another post-Soviet trend in English-language scholarship that seeks to make Solov'ev comprehensible to a modern, secular, and western audience, as well as to render him meaningful to a contemporary Russian audience in need of a usable past free from ideological radicalism and political despotism. Here the emphasis is not on the esoteric or eccentric Solovyov lost in the desert of Egypt and writing poems about Divine Sophia, but on the rational, coherent Solovyov who initiated and embodies one of the major liberal currents in Russian intellectual history. Scholars like Paul Valliere, Greg Gaut, David Wartenweiler, and Randall Poole, and before them Andrzej Walicki, have mainly located this Solovyov in his academic, journalistic, and philosophical writings, especially those published during the 1880s and 1890s (a chronology that neatly fits into the narrative that the liberal Solovyov first emerged around the spring of 1881 in his public opposition to the

[1] For representative scholarship in this field of study see the many works of Judith Deutsch Kornblatt, including most recently Who Is Solovyov and What Is Sophia? // Divine Sophia: The Wisdom Writings of Vladimir Solovyov. Ed. Judith Kornblatt. Tr. Boris Jakim, Judith Kornblatt, and Laury Magnus. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009. P. 3–97.

[2] For a recent appreciation of the «antinomic character of Solov'ev's philosophy» and the «oxymoronic language of his poetry» see Smith Oliver. Divine Sophia: The Wisdom Writings of Vladimir Solovyov by Judith Kornblatt // Slavonic and East European Review. 2011. Vol. 89, no. 3. P. 525–527.

execution of Alexander II's assassins)[3]. It is in this source base that the authentic Solovyov–the Solovyov who articulated a liberal philosophy of law, anticipated and posthumously influenced the «new liberalism» of the early 1900s, and developed a uniquely religious form of Russian liberalism – is imagined to reside.

A particularly vigorous attempt to find and elicit this type of Solovyov has recently been made in scholarly articles about Solovyov's commentary on religious freedom. Vladimir Wozniuk, who has admirably translated many of Solovyov's journalistic writings into English, portrays the author of such essays as On Spiritual Authority in Russia (О духовной власти в России) (1881) as a staunch defender of «full religious and civic rights for all minorities in the Russian empire»[4], including schismatic and sectarian groups. It is the resulting «multiplicity of worldviews» that would be engendered by the actualization of such rights, Wozniuk insists elsewhere, which makes Solovyov a liberal relevant to both the past and the present in Russia and the West[5]. In a similar vein, Randall Poole offers us a liberal Solovyov precisely because he was an adamant champion of religious liberty. «Russian liberal philosophers», Poole contends, «understood freedom of conscience as more than a natural right among others: for them it was the essential quality of personhood itself (self-determination) and thus the foundational value of liberalism»[6]. Since «the central concept of Solovyov's philosophy», namely the idea of Godmanhood (*богочеловечество*), was dependent upon the practical application of «freedom of conscience» and «religious toleration» in law, Solovyov assumes a leading place in Poole's genealogy of Russian liberal thinkers[7]. Because Solovyov so vigorously defended religious freedom, we are told, his political orientation must be that of a liberal, albeit a theological or religious one, who grounded «genuine [social] unity» in the «[a]uthentic diversity and free development» of society's constituent elements, i.e. the individuals who make up a society[8]. It would seem from these interpretations that Solovyov's writings on freedom of conscience, as well as his philosophical reliance on the concept of «human autonomy» in matters of faith and law[9], make for

---

[3] Valliere Paul. Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Solovyov, Bulgakov. Orthodox Theology in a New Key. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2000. 443 pp.; Gaut Greg. A Practical Unity: Vladimir Solov'ev and Russian Liberalism // Canadian Slavonic Papers. 2000. Vol. 42, no. 2. P. 295–314; Wartenweiler David. Civil Society and Academic Debate in Russia 1905–1914. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. P. 93–95; Poole Randall A. Utopianism, Idealism, and Liberalism: Russian Confrontations with Vladimir Solovyov // Modern Greek Studies Yearbook. 2000–2001. Vol. 16, 17. P. 43–87; Poole Randall A. The Greatness of Vladimir Solovyov: A Review Essay // Canadian Slavonic Papers. 2008. Vol. 50, no. 1–2. P. 201–223; Walicki Andrzej. Legal Philosophies of Russian Liberalism. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1992. P. 165–212.

[4] Solovyov V.S. Freedom, Faith, and Dogma: Essays by V.S. Solovyov on Christianity and Judaism. Ed. and tr. Vladimir Wozniuk. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008. P. 2.

[5] Solovyov V. S. Politics, Law, and Morality: Essays. Ed. and tr. Vladimir Wozniuk. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000. P. XIV.

[6] Poole Randall A. Religious Toleration, Freedom of Conscience, and Russian Liberalism // Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History. 2012. Vol. 13, no. 3. P. 613.

[7] Ibid. P. 629–632.

[8] Ibid. P. 630.

[9] Ibid. P. 630.

exceptionally solid ground upon which to erect the liberal Solovyov, as such a freedom and, thus, the pluralism of opinions generated by it are something vital to, even cherished in, the legal and political history of modern western liberalism[10]. The general thrust of this line of reasoning is that Solovyov is someone with whom sophisticated, progressive readers of today are intellectually familiar and with whom they can be ideologically comfortable.

This article intervenes in this particular historiographical development to suggest that some of the sources and utterances used to construct the liberal Solovyov, particularly Solovyov's commentary circa 1881–1883 about the need to grant religious freedom to Old Believers and sectarian groups, actually complicate that image. Far from being the recognizable liberal portrayed by Wozniuk, Poole, and others, Solovyov often deviated or recoiled from the basic suppositions that undergird modern liberalism[11], suppositions that broadly inform the claim that liberalism is best understood «as a political philosophy» which, among other things, promotes the absolute value of the individual and guarantees a «social, economic, or political order» in which this absolutely-valued individual can achieve «the fullest possible self-realization»[12]. If such a depiction accurately portrays Solovyov's understanding of religious liberty, then his argument for granting freedom of conscience should terminate in the inviolability of personal religious convictions and, most importantly, the complete realization of individual religious consciousness in social reality. Yet as we shall see below, Solovyov had no such intention when he demanded that religious freedom be extended to confessional minorities in the Russian empire. Nor did he imagine that freedom of conscience was an end in itself or part of some post-autocratic, rights-based, pluralistic society. Instead, Solovyov's promotion of freedom of conscience was linked to a providential project to establish a «free theocracy» under the dual auspices of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church and Russia's post-Petrine imperial order. In other words, for Solov'ev, religious freedom was not essential to the establishment of some liberal political and social order. Rather, it was essential in realizing an eschatological and ecumenical polity, one that Solov'ev would later (circa 1896) identify in theory as the «Christian monarchic idea» and in practice as the «Christian empire» or «Christian politics»[13].

To demonstrate the eschatological and ecumenical undercurrents in Solovyov's understanding of freedom of conscience and that freedom's relationship to the creation of a Christian imperial political society in Russia, this article will outline the discursive

---

[10] Poole implicitly makes the link among freedom of conscience, the liberal Solovyov, and a particular strand in modern American liberalism when he begins his Religious Toleration article with extended commentary about Nussbaum Martha (Liberty of Conscience: In Defense of America's Tradition of Religious Equality. New York: Basic Books, 2008. P. 416) and the seminal protagonist of her work, Roger Williams.

[11] For representative statements about this type of liberalism. See: Rawls John. Political Liberalism. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005. 576 p.; Spragens Thomas A., Jr. Civic Liberalism: Reflections on Our Democratic Idealism. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999. 296 p.

[12] Poole. Religious Toleration. P. 613. N. 8.

[13] Соловьев В.С. Византизм и Россия // Соловьев В.С. Собр. соч. в 10 т. Т. 7. СПб.: Книгоиздательское товарищество «Просвещение», 1914. С. 285–325.

contexts in which Solovyov's writings on religious freedom originated and operated. Once that has been established, this article will turn to a brief textual analysis of Solovyov's writings on freedom of conscience that upon first glance seem to support the portrayal of him as a liberal, but which in their context suggest something quite different than the normative definition of liberalism used by those who recognize in Solovyov a liberal friend. The ultimate goal of such an endeavor is not to re-align Solovyov with some competing ideological position. Solovyov was certainly moderate in his Christian politics of empire. Nor is it to suggest that Solovyov refrained from making institutional and practical alliances with the so-called liberals of his day, several of whom like P. B. Struve and P. I. Novgorodtsev helped to initiate the liberalization of Solovyov's legacy after his death in 1900[14]. As Greg Gaut has shown in his study of Solovyov's ideological orientation, Solovyov often found common cause with his liberationist friends at *The European Herald* (Вестник Европы)[15]. Instead, this article intends to demonstrate that elliptical readings of Solovyov's works, like the way in which Wozniuk privileges some texts over others in his choice of translation, or philosophical interpretations of Solovyov's utterances about freedom of conscience, like the one offered by Poole, ascribe a familiar liberalism to Solovyov that obscures his intentions more than they clarify them. In other words, this article makes the case for a contextual analysis of Solovyov[16], one that is not hemmed in by the *faux ami* «liberal» or the hermeneutics of coherence. If we are to recover Solovyov's place in Russian intellectual history and his meaning for contemporary Russian and western thought, then it is necessary to situate him and his writings in their operative and meaningful contexts. The result will be a historical Solovyov understood on his own terms, however contradictory, incoherent, or potentially illiberal they might be.

The freedom of conscience discourse in which Solovyov operated and to which he was responding in the early 1880s was a relatively recent invention. In the same edition of *Kritika* in which Poole's article about freedom of conscience and Russian liberalism appears, Victoria Frede and Paul Werth demonstrate that the term freedom of conscience (свобода совести) had little if any meaning in educated society or officialdom prior to the initial implementation of the Great Reforms. Challenged with new socioeconomic and governance realities following the Emancipation of 1861 and the zemstvo and legal reforms of 1864, state agents commonly appropriated the concept and language of freedom of conscience for imperial maintenance. Their understanding of religious freedom was mainly organized around the need to manage a variety of disparate, often antagonistic, religious groups in an increasingly complex, multi-confessional empire. In this sense, the idea freedom of conscience as articulated

---

[14] Струве П.Б. Памяти Владимира Соловьева // Разные темы. (1893–1901 гг.) Сборник статей. СПб.: Типография А.Е. Колпинского, 1902. P. 198–202; Новгородцев П.И. Идея права в философии Вл. С. Соловьева // Вопросы философии и психологии. 1901. Кн. 1. P. 112–29.

[15] Gaut. A Practical Unity. P. 295–314. See also Fedyashin Anton A. Liberals under Autocracy: Modernization and Civil Society in Russia, 1866–1904. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2012. P. 164–167.

[16] For a recent attempt to contextualize Solovyov in the discursive and ideological currents of the 1870s. See: Gillen Sean Michael James. A Foggy Youth: Faith, Reason, and Social Thought in the Young Vladimir Sergeevich Solovyov, 1853–1881. PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 2012. 305 p.

by government officials, most notably by P.A. Valuev, the minister of internal affairs during important years of the reform era (circa 1861–1868), was not oriented toward creating some liberal polity, even if the administrative discourse subsequently assumed the liberal idiom of respecting individual religious convictions. Rather, freedom of conscience was paradoxically oriented toward strengthening the vitality of autocratic authority, as it was thought that such a freedom would alleviate inter-confessional conflicts in the imperial borderlands[17]. A similar instrumentality informed radical interpretations of religious freedom in the late 1850s and 1860s. Advocates of popular revolution in Russia, such as V. I. Kel'siev and N. A. Serno-Solovyovich, maintained that the establishment of freedom of conscience, however problematic due to the religious fundamentalism of sectarians and Old Believers, was a programmatic necessity for the revolutionary cause. Such a freedom would help radicals to garner support among the still-believing people (народ) and, just as importantly, would generate atheistic consciousness among those who were religiously minded, i.e. it would effect the type of secular psychology that radicals imagined was necessary in constructing a new socialist order in Russia[18]. Anxiety about the potentially destabilizing effects of such innovations quickly occupied the minds of ostensibly liberal thinkers like B.N. Chicherin, who despite his repeated claims that freedom of conscience constituted «the first and most sacred right of a citizen», «the best of modern humanity's achievements», and «the inviolable sanctuary of the human soul»[19] frequently recoiled from the practical application of religious freedom, which he regretfully concluded was incompatible with contemporary Russian political and legal consciousness. For Chicherin, freedom of conscience, specifically the non-intervention of civil authority in personal religious convictions, broadly served a pedagogical function in a Hegelian sense. It facilitated the process by which humans participated in the gradual development of the spirit (дух) toward higher stages of historical existence. But when these advancements threatened Russia's sociopolitical order and cultural mores, then it was necessary to check the very freedoms that stimulated such advancements[20].

Perhaps the interpretations of freedom of conscience that most fully shaped the one articulated by Solovyov belonged to the first generation of Slavophiles and, later, to instructors at the Russian Church's clerical academies (духовные академии). Solovyov's indebtedness to the religious and philosophical writings of the Slavophiles, although not exclusive, is well established in scholarship[21], particularly

---

[17] Werth Paul W. The Emergence of «Freedom of Conscience» in Imperial Russia // Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History. 2012. Vol. 13, no. 3. P. 585–610.

[18] Frede Victoria. Freedom of Conscience, Freedom of Confession, and «Land and Freedom» in the 1860s // Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History. 2012 Vol. 13, no. 3. P. 561–584.

[19] See the various quotes cited in Poole (Religious Toleration. P. 627–628).

[20] Poole, Religious Toleration. P. 627; Hamburg G. M. Boris Chicherin and Early Russian Liberalism, 1826–1866. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992. P. 443.

[21] See, for example, Poulin Francis. Vladimir Solovyov's Rossiia i vselenskaia tserkov', Early Slavophilism's Pneumatic Spirit, and the Pauline Prophet // Russian Review. 1993. Vol. 52, no. 4. P. 528–539; Rouleau François. Solovyov, slavophile ou occidentaliste? // Cahiers du Monde Russe. 2001. Vol. 42, no. 1. P. 169–174; Coates Ruth. Religious Writing in Post-Petrine Russia // The Routledge Companion to Russian Literature. Ed. Neil Cornwell. New York: Routledge, 2001. P. 56–57.

in regards to the historiosophical and practical problems engendered by the continued existence of Old Belief in Orthodox Russia[22]. And a recent study on the formation of Solovyov's early social thought emphasizes the year he spent auditing courses at the Moscow Clerical Academy (circa 1873–1874) as a pivotal event in his intellectual biography[23]. Both of these contexts, the Slavophile and the ecclesiastical, suggest that Solovyov's notion of freedom of conscience was not grounded in the tenets of political and civic liberalism, but in a universalist Christian narrative about returning to the Church and, thus, realizing «the Kingdom of God on earth» (царство Божие на земле), terminology that Solovyov used in his writings about freedom of conscience[24]. A. S. Khomiakov, I. V. Kireevskii, and several of their Slavophile confreres broadly understood conscience in terms of an inner moral law, a God-given judge that emotionally regulated and rationally guided the person in his social actions. Freedom of conscience in this sense denoted the liberation of fallen man's mind and conduct from sin so they might be oriented toward God's will, a conversion that generated psychological tranquility in the individual and brought about a just society for the collective[25]. Scripted onto the historiosophical schemes that the early Slavophiles commonly deployed to delineate Russia's spiritual contribution to the advancement of world history, freedom of conscience became a crucial step in the process by which the Russian person and the Russian people could achieve cognitive and cultural wholeness[26]. In regards to the practical application of freedom of conscience, I.S. Aksakov, arguably the most important second-generation Slavophile and certainly the one who enjoyed the largest reading audience during the late imperial period, delineated an argument about the need to grant religious freedom to Old Believers that was to resonate with Solovyov. For Aksakov, in whose *Rus'* (Русь) Solovyov's first article about freedom of conscience and religious dissent appeared, Old Belief constituted an indigenous, traditional, and anti-liberal response to political despotism in Russia, an exemplary type of native cultural resistance which necessitated amelioration if authentic religiosity was to return to the Church and if the Russian people was to realize its historical trajectory[27]. Although Solovyov was much less sanguine than Aksakov about the cultural and ideological value of Old Belief, he similarly wanted to bring Old Believers back to the Church, mainly for providential reasons.

In addition to the imperial, radical, conservative-liberal, and Slavophile discourses about religious liberty then in circulation in public opinion, the Russian Church developed its own response to public calls for the legal establishment of freedom of

---

[22] de Courten Manon. History, Sophia and the Russian Nation: A Reassessment of Vladimir Solovyov's Views on History and his Social Commitment. Bern: Peter Lang, 2004. P. 336–338.

[23] Gillen Sean Michael James. A Foggy Youth. Chap. 2

[24] Соловьев В.С. Примечания // Соловьев В.С. Собр. соч. в 10 т. Т. 3. СПб.: Книгоиздательское товарищество «Просвещение», 1912. С. 424.

[25] Домусчи Стефан. Совесть в философии славянофилов // www.bogoslov.ru/text/2577151.html (accessed 8 Jan. 2014).

[26] Michelson Patrick Lally. Slavophile Religious Thought and the Dilemma of Russian Modernity, 1830–1860 // Modern Intellectual History. 2010. Vol. 7, no. 2. P. 259–261.

[27] Dunn Ethel. A Slavophile Looks at the Raskol and the Sects // Slavonic and East European Review. 1966. Vol. 44, no. 102. P. 167–179.

conscience, most notably in Archimandrite Ioann's (Sokolov) serial study of that topic published in 1864–1865 in the pages of *Christian Reading* (Христианское чтение)[28]. In that text, which represents the first full iteration of freedom of conscience in an Orthodox ecclesiastical idiom, the previously antinomic terms freedom (свобода) and conscience (совесть) were brought together by the then rector of the St. Petersburg Clerical Academy to delineate the Church's understanding of freedom of conscience. Ioann argued that such a concept was not the product of the Enlightenment, which in his estimation only produced a false interpretation of religious liberty that terminated in heresy, paganism, and atheism. Rather, authentic freedom of conscience as articulated in Jewish and Christian scripture, patristic writings, and Church history constituted an injunction that fallen man must liberate himself from his sinful state in order to emulate Christ and, thus, return to God through His Church. Central to Ioann's conception of freedom of conscience was the confessional assumption that Christianity, particularly as it was practiced in the Orthodox Church, was the «one, true religion» toward which one's conscience would lead and around which it should be organized. The Church's salvational responsibility, its sacred mission to save the world, meant that it could not countenance complete freedom of conscience whereby each individual could believe whatever he wanted, including false gods or no God at all, as such unbounded freedom would leave those outside the Church condemned to eternal damnation. What was unique to Ioann's articulation of freedom of conscience in this insistence was his emphasis on «the spiritual power of the word and of persuasion» (духовная сила слова и убеждения), as opposed to violence and coercion, to bring heretics and dissenters back into the Orthodox fold[29]. This conceptualization of freedom of conscience expressed in Ioann's mind the ecclesiastical tenets of Christian love and forgiveness, and it broadly conformed to the language of freedom of conscience used nearly twenty years later by Solovyov.

By the time Solovyov entered public debates about freedom of conscience in the early 1880s, the contours of that discourse had been reconfigured by several intellectual and administrative events. One of Ioann's students from the St. Petersburg Clerical Academy had grafted the archimandrite's conceptualization of freedom of conscience onto a developing historiosophical narrative in educated society, namely that the autocratic state should follow the «direction of the people» (народное направление) in its governance so that the Russian people could actualize its spiritual essence in historical reality[30]. Here, freedom of conscience was to be granted to Old Believers not because they practiced an acceptable form of Christianity, which in the opinion of lay and clerical Orthodox thinkers they did not, but because punitive police actions against Old Believers had generated an «anti-state element» (противогосударственный эле-

---

[28] Иоанн (Соколов). О свободе совести. Религиозные основания и исторические начала этой свободы // Христианское чтение. 1864. Ч. 3. С. 39–103, 115–172, 227–272, 392–416. 1865. Ч. 1. С. 225–286. Ч 2. С. 427–458, 459–502.

[29] Там же. Ч. 3. С. 271. 1865. Ч. 1. С. 268–269. Ч. 2. С. 501.

[30] Фармаковский В.И. О противогосударственном элементе в расколе // Отечественные записки. 1866. Т. 169. С. 487–518, 629–659. (Farmakovskii had attended the St. Petersburg Clerical Academy, where he earned a магистр in theology, during Ioann's tenure there as rector.)

мент) within the Russian people and, thus, marginalized a significant portion of ethnic Russians from their own culture and society. Freedom of conscience in this modified Orthodox-populist sense was meant to create a legal avenue by which Old Believers could freely return to the Church, be absorbed into the political society of empire, and enter the progressive course of universal history. Counter narratives to this Orthodox-populist account, as well as to the Orthodox-ecclesiastical account of Ioann (Sokolov), soon developed in Russian public opinion that extolled Old Belief as vital to the course of Russia's historical development, exemplified in part by L.N. Antropov's claim that the religious diversity to be engendered by granting freedom of conscience to Old Believers would benefit state, society, and even the Russian Church[31]. And at the very moment that Solov'ev made his public pronouncements about religious freedom, V. F. Kiparisov, then a professor of homiletics at the Moscow Clerical Academy, began publishing his study of freedom of conscience as a historical and doctrinal construct of the early Christian and Byzantine Church[32].

More broadly, throughout the 1870s and early 1880s, questions about freedom of conscience–its political meaning, its application in law, and its intended results for Russian society and empire–occupied an increasingly central place in public opinion because of concrete events. This same time period witnessed the rise of evangelical movements in Russia, most notably the missionary work of Lord Radstock and V.A. Pashkov among St. Petersburg's high society, which generated much consternation within and censure from the Holy Synod about the threat that such extra-ecclesial religiosity had on the integrity of the Orthodox empire. These debates over freedom of conscience, especially as it related to Old Belief, were partly structured by political considerations, as the Russian state passed legislation in April 1874 to allow Old Believers to register births, deaths, and marriages in civil records. And in May 1883, just a year or so after Solovyov first entered the on-going polemic about religious freedom, the state passed another law expanding legal freedoms to be enjoyed by Old Believers and members of sectarian groups, who could now hold religious services in their own prayer houses, carry internal passports, and occupy positions in public offices. Theoretical discussions about religious freedom had now become practical, which in turn generated new ways to think and talk about freedom of conscience. It was in this multivalent context that Solovyov offered his interpretation of religious freedom and its historiosophical meaning for Russian culture and society.

The publication history of Solovyov's commentary on religious freedom and religious dissent is somewhat convoluted due to the fact that he subsequently revised the original versions of those articles, often incorporating them into later writings published in different journals or in chapters of larger works. Solovyov's initial foray into the charged question of granting freedom of conscience to Old Believers

---

[31] Антропов Л.Н. Русские раскольники и английские дисиденты // Русская речь. 1881. No. 4. С. 74–109.

[32] Кипарисов. В.Ф. О свободе совести. Опыт историко-критического исследования // Прибавления к Творениям св. Отцов. 1881. Ч. 27. Кн. 2. С. 477–544. Ч. 28. Кн. 3. С. 294–333. Ч. 28. Кн. 4. С. 363–403. 1882 Ч. 29. Кн. 1. С. 206–238. Ч. 30. Кн. 1. С. 176–217. Ч. 30. Кн. 2. С. 443–512. 1883. Ч. 31. Кн. 1. С. 107–200.

appeared, as noted above, in 1882 in Ivan Aksakov's *Rus'*, which just the year before had published On Spiritual Authority in Russia, the article privileged by Wozniuk as one of Solov'ev's liberal statements about the rights of religious minorities. The 1882 article, originally titled On the Church and the Schism (О церкви и расколе), was followed in 1883 with the publication in *Rus'* of Several Words about Our Secular Heresies and about the Essence of the Church («Несколько слов о наших светских ересях и о сущности церкви»). Solovyov subsequently revised the 1882 and 1883 articles and published them in 1884 in the pages of *Orthodox Review* (Православное обозрение) under the single heading On the Schism in the Russian People and Society (О расколе в русском народе и обществе). In turn, this revised and expanded version was included in the second edition of *The Religious Foundations of Life* (Религиозные основы жизни) published in 1885 by M.N. Katkov's University Tipography, which itself was republished in 1897 under the new title *The Spiritual Foundations of Life* (Духовные основы жизни)[33]. With the posthumous publication of volume three of Solovyov's *Collection of Writings* (Собрание сочинений) in 1901 and the second edition of that same volume in 1912[34], Solovyov's understanding of freedom of conscience was marked by the imprimatur of scholarship. What this publication history tells us, besides the difficulty in determining a definitive statement made by Solovyov about freedom of conscience, is that Solovyov's interpretations of that topic found a variety of avenues through which to enter Russian public opinion–from the Slavophile journalism of Ivan Aksakov to the officially sanctioned ecclesiastical reformism of *Orthodox Review* to the academic and popular publishing houses of the capital cities–and that various aspects of those interpretations regularly appeared in print over a thirty-year period. In other words, Solovyov's Christian ecclesiastical rendering of freedom of conscience during Russia's late-imperial period was not unknown to those members of educated society interested in his commentary on such matters.

Although Solovyov did not make a formal statement about freedom of conscience in his article On Spiritual Authority in Russia, it is important to begin an analysis of what he meant by that term with an exegesis of that 1881 text. In many ways, it constituted Solovyov's first attempt to resolve the problematic relationship between ecclesiastical authority and personal religious convictions within the discursive context of Russian backwardness, which Solov'ev claimed was readily evident in the social unrest and cultural fermentation of contemporary Russia, punctuated that same year by the assassination of Alexander II. To delineate how Orthodox Russia had reached this historiosophical or providential impasse, Solovyov constructed a revisionist history of the Russian Church that deviated from official narratives. Russia's present spiritual

---

[33] This publication history comes from Соловьев (См.: Соловьев В.С. Примечания // Соловьев. Собр. соч. в 10 т. Т. 3. С. 422–423, 430). I have not been able to verify every aspect of this account, some of which does not correspond to the bibliographic information available, for example, at http://www.rednet.ru/~zaikin/sol/works.htm (accessed 14 January 2014).

[34] For the sake of clarity and convenience, the text on which I principally rely is Соловьев В.С. О расколе в русском народе и обществе // Соловьев В.С. Собр. соч. в 10 т. Т. 3. С. 245–280.

stasis, according to Solovyov, was the result of an «alien, non-evangelical, and non-Orthodox spirit» (чуждый, не евангельский и не православный дух) having entered ecclesiastical consciousness and administration in the figure of Patriarch Nikon[35], whose reform of ritual and prayer books in the mid seventeenth century had precipitated schism in the Russian Church. In Solovyov's rendition, it was Nikon's prideful reliance on violence and coercion to effect change in the Church that decisively violated «the spirit of Christ, the spirit of love and free harmonious unity» (дух Христов, дух любви и свободного согласного единения). As such, Russia's historical Church, through the office of the Patriarchate, had abrogated its sacred mission to the world, namely the creation of a «free moral union of people in Christ» (нравственное свободное единение людей в Христе), or what Solovyov also called «a spiritual society or the Church» (духовное общество или церковь)[36]. The result of this anti-Christian turn in Russian Orthodox ecclesiology was disastrous: the Church no longer enjoyed «spiritual power» or «moral authority» (духовная власть, нравственный авторитет), which meant it no longer influenced socioeconomic mores; it was subjugated to «secular powers» (светские власти); priests were alienated from parishioners; the clerical hierarchy was divided among itself; higher ranks lorded over lower ranks; ordained clergy protested against their superiors; parishioners had become ignorant of their faith; sectarianism was rampant; and educated society had grown indifferent or hostile to Orthodoxy[37]. Even worse for Russia's development, the ramifications of this disaster had reached into state and society, which could no longer rely on the Church for spiritual guidance and, as such, had «lost sight of the inner meaning and goal of this life» (внутренний смысл и цель этой жизни теряют из виду)[38]. To rectify this ongoing problem, Solovyov insisted, the Church must reclaim its role as a «moral force» (нравственная сила) in social and political relations, partly by renouncing the use of punitive measures to ensure right belief, so that it once again could direct «the will of the people and the action of government» toward their «single eternal goal, the establishment of God's truth on earth» (воля народа и деятельность правительства… единая вечная цель – водворение правды Божией на земле)[39].

But herein resides a problem for those who see Solovyov's demand for religious freedom–understood here exclusively as the freedom to choose Orthodoxy–as the foundational value of Russian liberalism. Solovyov envisioned the Church's mission in Russia to be the Christianization of society and politics, not their secularization, the generic hallmark of modern liberalism, whereby religious convictions are made private and external authority is desacralized. «To maintain that the Christian spiritual principle should not assume a leading role in social life, and through it also [a leading role in] the actions of the state», Solovyov declared, «is to maintain that it has no place there. This means to deny the Church as a social institution. But Orthodox

---

[35] Соловьев В.С. О духовной власти в России // Соловьев В.С. Собр. соч. в 10 т. Т. 3. С. 232, 234, 236, 239.
[36] Там же. С. 227–228.
[37] Там же. С. 236.
[38] Там же. С. 233, 237.
[39] Там же. С. 230–231, 240–41.

hierarchs cannot deny the Church; they cannot deny that it should act upon human society in the spirit of Christ, permeating and regenerating all social forms and relations through this life-creating spirit. Nor can they deny that the visible guide of this spiritual influence on the land and state should first of all be a spiritual government, concentrating in itself the *active* forces of the Church» (Утверждать, что христианское духовное начало не должно входить как руководящая сила в жизнь общественную, а через нее и в деятельность государственную, утверждать, что там ему не место, – это значит отрицать церковь как общественное учреждение. Но иерархи православные отрицать церковь не могут, не могут отрицать, что она должна воздействовать на общество человеческое в духе Христовом, проникая и перерождая этим животворящим духом все формы и отношения общественные. Не могут они отрицать и того, что видимым проводником этого духовного воздействия на землю и государство должно быть прежде всего духовное правительство, сосредоточивающее в себе *деятельные* силы церкви)[40]. Such a project could not be initiated so long as the Church continued to deviate from the principles of Christian freedom, which for Solovyov included persuasion and tolerance toward those both inside and outside the Church. Freedom in this sense was essential to the acquisition of Christian ecumenical consciousness and, thus, the creation of a political community that expressed the goals of Christian eschatology. And even when Solovyov identified what he considered to be the proper relationship between the Russian Church and the Russian state, the freedom he envisioned was a «positive freedom» (положительная свобода) that brought the two distinct institutions together for «one common goal, the building of true community on earth» (одна общая цель–устроение истинной общественности на земле)[41]. In other words, Solovyov's articulation of religious freedom should mainly be understood in relation to an ideal ecclesiastical agenda by which the historical Church regained its Christ-like authority over members and dissenters, an authority that would then allow the Church, in conjunction with the Christianized state, to direct those under its purview to behave and think in the ecumenical and eschatological terms identified and constructed by Solov'ev, namely love and social harmony.

That Solovyov's understanding of freedom of conscience around this time (fall 1881) was structured by eschatological and ecumenical imperatives is evident in his remarks about schism in the Russian Church, which in Solovyov's terminology encompassed both the persistence of Old Belief among the people and more recent forms of non-Orthodox religiosity found in high society. Solovyov made it clear to readers of On Spiritual Authority in Russia that he blamed the schism on the actions of Patriarch Nikon, as well as on later punitive actions conducted by the Church and the imperial regime against Orthodox dissent. It was the anti-Christian violence meted out against Old Believers and sectarian groups that drove them away from the Church.

---

[40] Соловьев В.С. О духовной власти в России. С. 237–238.

[41] Там же. С. 240–241. Such a statement about the state's centrality in constructing an ideal community suggests that Solovyov's understanding of stateness (государственность) corresponded with the dominant political science in imperial Russia, which broadly privileged the prerogatives of the interventionist state.

What was required to heal the schism was an end to religious persecution, i.e. the legal establishment of some kind of religious freedom for dissenters. But here again, the concept of religious freedom articulated by Solov'ev was not the kind of freedom that allowed personal religious convictions to remain private or inviolable in a liberal sense. Nor did it terminate in religious pluralism. Rather, the end of religious persecution would allow the Russian Church, which Solovyov called «spiritual government» (духовное правительство), «to strengthen its enlightened fervor against Old Believers' dark zeal for all that is divine. It should demonstrate that God's truth and Christian life in the spirit and in truth are just as valuable, if not more so, to [the Church] than to all those searching sectarians. Then they would come to [the Church] and receive from it that which they are looking for, the living Orthodox ecumenical faith. This faith, which unconsciously languishes in the soul of the Russian people (the Orthodox faithful, as well as sectarians), would then come to know itself in its ecumenical unity and would be resurrected in new life» (Против темной ревности староверов ко всему божественному оно должно усилить свое просвещенное рвение. Оно должно показать, что ему так же и еще более дорога правда Божия и христианская жизнь в духе и истине, чем всем этим ищущим сектантам,–тогда они пришли бы к нему и от него получили бы то, чего ищут–живую православную вселенскую веру. Вера эта, безотчетно таящаяся в душе русского народа [как православных, так и сектантов], познала бы тогда сама себя в своем вселенском единстве и воскресла бы к новой жизни). Such freedom was to have a similar effect on «the best people of educated society» (лучшие люди образованного общества), who had also left the Church perverted by Nikon and his progeny, but would return to it out of their own «free conviction» (свободное убеждение) once they were persuaded through the practice of Christian love that «higher truth» (высшая правда) again resided in the Church[42]. Solovyov's denunciation of religious persecution was clear and unequivocal: it must end. But his demand was not intended to promote or guarantee a multiplicity of religious beliefs in society. Rather, religious freedom constituted the means by which the reformed Church could create a community of confessional unanimity and doctrinal orthodoxy out of the cacophony of heterodoxy.

Solovyov's discontent with religious diversity and, thus, his ambiguous relationship with the basic tenets of political and civic liberalism found expression in his critique of «schismatics» (раскольники)[43], both in Old Belief and in the sectarianism of Russia's educated, urban population. Although Solovyov's anxiety about this kind of religious disposition was largely veiled in his 1881 article, it was made explicit over the next several years, especially in the revised 1882–1883 text that came to be titled On the Schism in the Russian People and Society. As he had argued in the previous article, the principal goal in establishing religious freedom was to bring those who had left the Church back into its fold, an act of universal conversion that was to help actualize the Kingdom of God on earth. But now the emphasis was on the deleterious effects that

---

[42] Соловьев В.С. О духовной власти в России. С. 241–242.

[43] Solovyov commonly interchanged the pejorative terms «schismatics» and «sectarians» when discussing Old Believers or other Orthodox dissenting groups, as well as the more respectful term староверы.

schismatic consciousness, which constituted an anthropocentric revolt against God, had on the providential course of sacred history and Russia's participation in it. In Solovyov's normative definition of the Church, the «true essence» of which was demonstrated in «its universal or catholic character» (истинная сущность церкви связана с ее вселенским или кафолическим характером), schism was its antithesis, mainly because «sectarianism» (сектантство) was inherently «tribal, local, and temporal» (племенные, местный, временный) in its orientation[44]. To demonstrate this point, Solovyov constructed a historical narrative about the schism in Russia, as well as the advent of sectarianism and «spiritualism» (спиритизм) in high society, that both conformed to and deviated from official ecclesiastical accounts of such religious movements. The «popular schism» (народный раскол) of the seventeenth century, Solovyov contended, rightly began as a «defense of the divine and unchanging forms of the Church against all human innovations» (защита божественных и неизменных форм церкви против всяких человеческих нововведений), but gradually degenerated, partly because of the logic of dissent and partly because of persecution, into a religion that privileged «human arbitrariness and personal whim» (человеческий произвол и личное мудрование) over God's will. The result among those who had left the Orthodox Church was a heretical amalgamation of Christianity's index symbols, in which «the divine was mixed with the human, the eternal with the temporal, the particular with the universal» (смешал божеское с человеческим, вечное с временным, частное с всеобщим). Such a hodgepodge of symbols meant in Solovyov's Orthodox taxonomy that the schism constituted an irreligious religion that dangerously confused man for God[45].

As a Christian thinker committed to the ecumenical realization of Providence in social reality, Solov'ev could not countenance what he perceived to be the religious confusion embodied in schismatic consciousness. It required a response. Here Solovyov drew upon two Orthodox discourses common to his time, a Slavophile one that had been deployed by his friend F. M. Dostoevskii and an ecclesiastical one that was just then beginning to circulate in clerical journalism and scholarship. In a series of essays written in the mid 1870s, Dostoevskii, like the Moscow Slavophiles before him, made the term «Protestantism» Orthodox code for Feuerbachian atheism, i.e. an irreligion that sought «the divinization of humanity» (обоготворение человечества) at the expense of God. By proclaiming personal conviction to be superior to ecclesiastical authority, Dostoevskii argued, Martin Luther and his confessional progeny, personified in *A Writer's Diary* («Дневник писателя») by Christian rationalists in contemporary England, tempted the faithful away from Christ and His Body. Individual judgment now supplanted the Holy Spirit in determining human thought and behavior. Man had dethroned God and taken His place. The result, according to Dostoevskii, was socioeconomic turmoil and cultural fermentation across the European Continent[46]. Solovyov located Old Belief in a similar

---

[44] Соловьев В.С. О расколе в русском народе и обществе // Соловьев В.С. Собр. соч. в 10 т. Т. 3. СПб.: Книгоиздательское товарищество «Просвещение», 1912. С. 245.

[45] Там же. С. 245.

[46] Достоевский Ф.М. Полное собрание сочинений. Т. 11. СПб.: Типография П.Ф. Пантелеева, 1905. С. 106–113.

typology, made evident by frequent analogies between «the western Protestant» (западный протестант) and the «Russian schismatic» (русский раскольник), as well as by Solovyov's claim that «having the embryo of Protestantism in it, the Russian schism had nurtured it to full growth» (имея в себе зародыш протестантства, русский раскол до конца взростил его). At one point in his text, Solovyov even labeled Old Belief's repudiation of ecclesiastical hierarchy and sacraments the «Protestantism of local tradition» (протестантизм местного предания), which he then directly linked to the «Protestantism of personal conviction among Germans» (у немцев явился протестантизм личного убеждения). What Old Believers had done by repudiating the Orthodox Church, albeit a Church that had been perverted by Patriarch Nikon's anti-Christian attitude, was to make the «individual person» (отдельное лицо), not God, the final arbiter in matters of faith, a phenomenon that was being replicated elsewhere in Russia by the «free sectarians» (свободные сектанты) of high society[47]. In other words, Old Belief and sectarianism were anti-Christ, ersatz religions that in their own distinct ways led Christians and those who longed for Christ away from God.

Having now discerned the essence of schism, Solovyov informed his readers, meant that he (and they) had «finally arrived at the deep root of this great moral illness» (наконец дошли мы до самого глубокого корня этой великой нравственной болезни), understood here to be the «self-affirmation of the anthropological principle in the Christian Church» (самоутверждение человеческого начала в христианской церкви), whereby the will of man was valued more dearly than the will of God. This analogy of schism to «illness» was not singular in Solovyov's commentary on freedom of conscience. The term itself appears quite regularly in On the Schism in the Russian People and Society, first in Solovyov's critique of how Old Believers reconfigured the Creed, then in his critique of their fundamentalism. The «disease of schism» (болезнь раскола), Solovyov declared, was «made all the more dangerous» (сделалась тем опаснее) because it often appeared to those who repudiated Nikon's coercive measures to be a sign of «spiritual health» (духовное здравие). Likewise, the departure of Old Believers from the Church was interpreted by Solovyov to be «abnormal» (ненормальное отделение). And the very event of schism in the Church was understood to be a «grave and complicated disease of the people's spirit», which required a «correct and accurate *diagnosis*» (церковный раскол есть тяжкая и сложная болезнь народного духа, и здесь прежде всего нужен верный и точный *диагноз*) before it could be cured[48]. Contextually, the frequency of this language of pathology and remedy suggests that Solovyov's critique of schism as an «illness» was not fortuitous. Rather, it very likely was informed by concomitant attempts in the Russian Church to «medicalize» Old Belief and sectarianism as a contagion that must be quarantined and treated[49]. In this ecclesiastical discourse, the original iteration of which has been dated to the mid 1860s but which

---

[47] Соловьев. О расколе в русском народе и обществе. С. 252–257, 276–280.
[48] Там же. С. 249–251.
[49] Beer Daniel. The Medicalization of Religious Deviance in the Russian Orthodox Church (1880–1905) // Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History. 2004. Vol. 5, no. 3. P. 451–482.

assumed a scientific idiom around 1880, sectarianism was rendered a «disease» that, like a physical ailment, threatened the purity and vitality of the Orthodox community. Although Solovyov's prescription was not as radical or invasive as that of his clerical counterparts, some of whom called for the legal persecution of Orthodox dissenters, the very fact that he deployed such terminology calls into question Solovyov's commitment to what Wozniuk calls a «multiplicity of worldviews» and what Poole calls «[a]uthentic diversity and free development» of personal convictions. Solovyov clearly believed that schism was pathological, and, if left unchecked, would kill the host and spread among the faithful. As such, it could not be allowed to reach a terminal stage, as the spiritual consequences for Russia and the Orthodox Church would be catastrophic. The question is, what cure did Solov'ev offer?

Solovyov's recourse to the cultural and psychological turmoil supposedly engendered by the «moral illness» of schism was not, of course, coercion or violence. He abhorred such tactics, finding them to be anathema to the Word of God, which in Solovyov's rendition, demanded that acts of evil, including heresy and schism, be met with acts of love. The cure resided elsewhere, namely in persuading schismatics that since «their human path will not lead to good», they should «choose another [path]» (если их человеческий путь не ведет к добру, обязательно им избрать другой)[50]. It was at this moment in the text, as he brought his «diagnosis» of schismatic consciousness to an end, that Solovyov returned to the therapeutic language of religious freedom, not, however, with the intent to establish a liberal political society in which a plurality of faiths coexisted. «All of them, Old Believers, mystics, and rationalists», Solovyov declared, «stand and act on the basis of human freedom, the freedom of native customs, the freedom of personal enthusiasm and personal conscience. This freedom cannot and should not be taken away from them. But as people who are searching for good and truth, they should direct this freedom, and all of the energy inherent in the anthropological principle, away from particular goals and turn toward the general will of God. Since they freely left the Church, can they not also freely reunite with it? What is required is not slavish subordination to human arbitrariness but voluntary assent to the will of God…. This free assent of the human will to God's will is the foundation of that new world, which has been promised to us by Him and in which the truth awaits. And now each of you, living in discord and protesting against the will of God, have the power and strength to hasten the revelation of that land promised to us, if only, after having removed the vestige of self-affirmation from your own will, you turn toward the sun of truth and with all of your soul say: Thy will be done. Verily, this will be called great in the Kingdom of God.» (Все они, и староверы, и мистики, и рационалисты, стоят и действуют в силу человеческой свободы–свободы народного обычая, свободы личного вдохновения и личной совести. Эта свобода не может и не должна быть у них отнята. Но как люди, ищущие добра и правды, они должны эту самую свободу, всю эту энергию человеческого начала от своих отдельных целей обратить на общее дело Божие. Если они свободно отделились от церкви, то неужели не могут свобод-

[50] Соловьев. О расколе в русском народе и обществе. С. 274–275.

но с ней соединиться? Ибо требуется не рабское подчинение человеческому произволу, но лишь добровольное согласие на волю Божию…. Это свободное согласие человеческой воли на волю Божию и есть основание той новой земли, которой мы по обетованию Его чаем, в ней же правда живет. И ныне всякий из вас, пребывающих в раздоре и противящихся воле Божией, имеет силу и власть ускорить откровение для нас обетованной земли, если только, удалив из своей человеческой воли всякую тень самоутверждения, прямо обратится к солнцу правды и всей душой скажет: да будет воля Твоя. Воистину такой великим наречется в царствии Божием)[51].

The community imagined by Solovyov, the community to be realized through Christian acts of love, forgiveness, and reconciliation, as evidenced by this statement and his other commentaries about religious freedom, was ecumenical and eschatological. It was to be a post-secular order that, although seemingly enacted through liberal notions of religious freedom, was really to be brought about by establishing a variant of the Orthodox-ecclesiastical idea of freedom of conscience then in circulation in Russian public opinion. Solovyov's call for freedom of conscience, as suggested by the meaning he embedded in that term and the context in which it originated and operated, was made with the intent to actualize the «*free* all-unity» (*свободное* всеединство) of God's Kingdom[52]. The practical goal in this scheme was to take cultural, intellectual, social, and, of course, religious pluralism and transform such variety through persuasion into a single union, symbolized by Solovyov in the providential act of humans freely subordinating their wills to God's will. As such, the multiplicity of contemporary Russian society and culture was to be voluntarily reconfigured into the unity of collective Christian existence. As an expression of heterodoxy and a symptom of «moral illness», religious diversity could not be the standard of Solovyov's imagined polity, as it could be in a liberal pluralistic society. Besides, freedom of conscience had other goals in Solovyov's scheme that clearly demonstrate its variance from the tenets of political and civic liberalism. Once the Russian Church embraced Solovyov's Christian notion of freedom to resolve the problem of schism, it would regain its moral authority, making the Church once again the spiritual guide of Russian state and society. In turn, the state and society to be realized under the guidance of this renovated Church was a Christian state and a Christian society. No other denomination was imagined by Solovyov to express true religion or inform authentic community. Freedom of conscience in this sense was both essential to Christian doctrine and instrumental in the creation of a Christian political society. Perhaps this is why nearly fifteen years later, in 1896, Solovyov declared that the establishment of the «Christian kingdom» (христианское царство) was «impossible» (невозможно) to achieve without such concepts as «human dignity, the right of the person, freedom of conscience» (человеческое достоинство, права личности, свобода совести)[53]. To suggest that Solovyov's understanding of freedom of conscience and the social

---

[51] Соловьев. О расколе в русском народе и обществе. С. 275–276.
[52] Там же. С. 276.
[53] Соловьев. Византизм и Россия. С. 301.

result he anticipated from it constituted a form of liberal political or social thought is to suggest a type of liberalism that is quite unfamiliar, perhaps even incomprehensible, to modern liberalism, whether in Russia or in the West.

Список литературы

1. Соловьев В.С. Византизм и Россия // Соловьев В.С. Собр. соч. в 10 т. Т. 7. СПб.: Книгоиздательское товарищество «Просвещение», 1914. С. 285–325.

2. Соловьев В.С. Примечания // Соловьев В.С. Собр. соч. в 10 т. Т. 3. СПб.: Книгоиздательское товарищество «Просвещение», 1912. С. 422–430.

3. Соловьев В.С. О духовной власти в России // Соловьев В.С. Собр. соч. в 10 т. Т. 3. СПб.: Книгоиздательское товарищество «Просвещение», 1912. С. 227–242.

4. Соловьев В.С. О расколе в русском народе и обществе // Соловьев В.С. Собр. соч. в 10 т. Т. 3. СПб.: Книгоиздательское товарищество «Просвещение», 1912. С. 245–280.

5. Solovyov V.S. Freedom, Faith, and Dogma: Essays by V.S. Solovyov on Christianity and Judaism. Ed. and tr. Vladimir Wozniuk. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008. 262 p.

6. Solovyov V. S. Politics, Law, and Morality: Essays. Ed. and tr. Vladimir Wozniuk. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000. 368 p.

7. Kornblatt Judith Deutsch. Who Is Solovyov and What Is Sophia? // Divine Sophia: The Wisdom Writings of Vladimir Solovyov, Ed. Judith Kornblatt. Tr. Boris Jakim, Judith Kornblatt, and Laury Magnus. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009. P. 3–97.

8. Smith Oliver. Divine Sophia: The Wisdom Writings of Vladimir Solovyov by Judith Kornblatt // Slavonic and East European Review. 2011. Vol. 89, no. 3. P. 525–527.

9. Valliere Paul. Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Solovyov, Bulgakov. Orthodox Theology in a New Key. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2000. 443 p.

10. Gaut Greg. A Practical Unity: Vladimir Solovyov and Russian Liberalism // Canadian Slavonic Papers. 2000. Vol. 42, no. 2. P. 295–314.

11. Wartenweiler David. Civil Society and Academic Debate in Russia 1905–1914. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. 252 p.

12. Poole Randall A. Utopianism, Idealism, and Liberalism: Russian Confrontations with Vladimir Solovyov // Modern Greek Studies Yearbook: Mediterranean, Slavic, and Eastern Orthodox Studies. 2000–2001. Vol. 16–17. P. 43–87.

13. Poole Randall A. The Greatness of Vladimir Solovyov: A Review Essay // Canadian Slavonic Papers. 2008. Vol. 50, no. 1–2. P. 201–223.

14. Poole Randall A. Religious Toleration, Freedom of Conscience, and Russian Liberalism // Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History. 2012. Vol. 13, no. 3. P. 611–634.

15. Walicki Andrzej. Legal Philosophies of Russian Liberalism. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1992. 477 p.

16. Rawls John. Political Liberalism. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005. 576 p.

17. Spragens Thomas A., Jr. Civic Liberalism: Reflections on Our Democratic Idealism. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999. 296 p.

18. Струве П.Б. Памяти Владимира Соловьева // Струве П.Б. На разные темы (1893–1901 гг.) Сборник статей. СПб.: Типография А. Е. Колпинского, 1902. P. 198–202.

19. Новгородцев П.И. Идея права в философии Вл. С. Соловьева // Вопросы философии и психологии. 1901. Кн. 1 (1901). P. 112–29.

20. Gillen Sean Michael James. A Foggy Youth: Faith, Reason, and Social Thought in the Young Vladimir Sergeevich Solovyov, 1853–1881: PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 2012. 305 p.

21. Werth Paul W. The Emergence of «Freedom of Conscience» in Imperial Russia // Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History. 2012. Vol. 13, no. 3. P. 585–610.

22. Frede Victoria. Freedom of Conscience, Freedom of Confession, and «Land and Freedom» in the 1860s // Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History. 2012. Vol. 13, no. 3. P. 561–584.

23. Антропов Л.Н. Русские раскольники и английские дисиденты // Русская речь. 1881. No. 4. С. 74–109.

24. Michelson Patrick Lally. Slavophile Religious Thought and the Dilemma of Russian Modernity, 1830–1860 // Modern Intellectual History. 2010. Vol. 7, no. 2. P. 239–267.

25. Poulin Francis. Vladimir Solovyov's Rossiia i vselenskaia tserkov', Early Slavophilism's Pneumatic Spirit, and the Pauline Prophet // Russian Review. 1993. Vol. 52, no. 4. P. 528–539.

26. Rouleau François. Solovyov, slavophile ou occidentaliste? // Cahiers du Monde Russe. 2001. Vol. 42, no. 1. P. 169–174.

27. Coates Ruth. Religious Writing in Post-Petrine Russia // The Routledge Companion to Russian Literature. Ed. Neil Cornwell. New York: Routledge, 2001. P. 49–63.

28. Домусчи Стефан. Совесть в философии славянофилов // www.bogoslov.ru/text/2577151.html (accessed 8 Jan. 2014).

29. Иоанн (Соколов). О свободе совести. Религиозные основания и исторические начала этой свободы // Христианское чтение. 1864. Ч. 3. С. 39–103, 115–172, 227–272, 392–416. 1865. Ч. 1. С. 225–286. Ч 2. С. 427–458, 459–502.

30. de Courten Manon. History, Sophia and the Russian Nation: A Reassessment of Vladimir Solovyov's Views on History and his Social Commitment. Bern: Peter Lang, 2004. 532 p.

31. Фармаковский В.И. О противогосударственном элементе в расколе // Отечественные записки. 1886. Т. 169. С. 487–518, 629–659.

32. Dunn Ethel. A Slavophile Looks at the Raskol and the Sects // Slavonic and East European Review. 1966. Vol. 44, no. 102. P. 167–179.

33. Hamburg G. M. Boris Chicherin and Early Russian Liberalism, 1826–1866. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992. 443 p.

34. Достоевский Ф.М. Дневник писателя за 1876 г. // Полное собрание сочинений. Т. 11. СПб.: Типография П.Ф. Пантелеева, 1905. С. 408.

35. Beer Daniel. The Medicalization of Religious Deviance in the Russian Orthodox Church (1880–1905) // Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History. 2004. Vol. 5, no. 3. P. 451–482.

36. Fedyashin Anton A. Liberals under Autocracy: Modernization and Civil Society in Russia, 1866–1904. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2012. 282 p.

37. Кипарисов. В.Ф. О свободе совести. Опыт историко-критического исследования // Прибавления к Творениям св. Отцов. 1881. Ч. 27. Кн. 2. С. 477–544. Ч. 28. Кн. 3. С. 294–333. Ч. 28. Кн. 4. С. 363–403. 1882 Ч. 29. Кн. 1. С. 206–238. Ч. 30. Кн. 1. С. 176–217. Ч. 30. Кн. 2. С. 443–512. 1883. Ч. 31. Кн. 1. С. 107–200.

References

1. Solov'ev, V.S. Vizantizm i Rossiya [Byzantism and Russia], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Sobranie sochineniy v 10 t., t. 7* [Collected works, in 10 vol., vol. 7], Saint-Petersburg: Knigoizdatel'skoe tovarishchestvo «Prosveshchenie», 1914, pp. 285–325.

2. Solov'ev, V.S. Primechaniya [Notes], in Solov'ev, V.S. S*obranie sochineniy v 10 t., t. 3* [Collected works, in 10 vol., vol. 3], Saint-Petersburg: Knigoizdatel'skoe tovarishchestvo «Prosveshchenie», 1912, pp. 422–430.

3. Solov'ev, V.S. O dukhovnoy vlasti v Rossii [On spiritual authority in Russia], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Sobranie sochineniy v 10 t., t. 3* [Collected works, in 10 vol., vol. 3], Saint-Petersburg: Knigoizdatel'skoe tovarishchestvo «Prosveshchenie», 1912, pp. 227–242.

4. Solov'ev, V.S. O raskole v russkom narode i obshchestve [On the schism in the Russian people and society], in Solov'ev, V.S. *Sobranie sochineniy v 10 t., t. 3* [Collected works, in 10 vol., vol. 3], Saint-Petersburg: Knigoizdatel'skoe tovarishchestvo «Prosveshchenie», 1912, pp. 245–280.

5. Solovyov, V.S. Freedom, Faith, and Dogma: Essays by V.S. Solovyov on Christianity and Judaism. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008, 262 p.

6. Solovyov, V.S. Politics, Law, and Morality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000, 368 p.

7. Kornblatt, Judith Deutsch. Who Is Solovyov and What Is Sophia? Divine Sophia: The Wisdom Writings of Vladimir Solovyov, Ed. Judith Kornblatt. Tr. Boris Jakim, Judith Kornblatt, and Laury Magnus. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009, pp. 3–97.

8. Smith, Oliver. Divine Sophia: The Wisdom Writings of Vladimir Solovyov by Judith Kornblatt. Slavonic and East European Review, 2011, vol. 89, no. 3, pp. 525–527.

9. Valliere, Paul. Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov. Orthodox Theology in a New Key. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2000, 443 p.

10. Gaut, Greg. A Practical Unity: Vladimir Solovyov and Russian Liberalism. Canadian Slavonic Papers, 2000, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 295–314.

11. Wartenweiler, David. Civil Society and Academic Debate in Russia 1905–1914. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999, 252 p.

12. Poole, Randall A. Utopianism, Idealism, and Liberalism: Russian Confrontations with Vladimir Solovyov. Modern Greek Studies Yearbook: Mediterranean, Slavic, and Eastern Orthodox Studies, 2000–2001, vol. 16, 17, pp. 43–87.

13. Poole, Randall A. The Greatness of Vladimir Solovyov: A Review Essay. Canadian Slavonic Papers, 2008, vol. 50, no. 1–2, pp. 201–223.

14. Poole, Randall A. Religious Toleration, Freedom of Conscience, and Russian Liberalism. Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, 2012, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 611–634.

15. Walicki, Andrzej. Legal Philosophies of Russian Liberalism. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1992, 477 p.

16. Rawls, John. Political Liberalism. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005, 576 p.

17. Spragens, Thomas A., Jr. Civic Liberalism: Reflections on Our Democratic Idealism. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999, 296 p.

18. Struve, P.B. Pamyati Vladimira Solov'eva [Remembrances of Vladimir Solovyov], in Struve, P.B. *Na raznye temy (1893–1901 gg.) Sbornik statei* [Various themes (1893–1901). A collection of essays)], Saint-Petersburg: Tipografiya A.E. Kolpinskogo, 1902, pp. 198–202.

19. Novgorodtsev, P.I. Ideya prava v filosofii Vl.S. Solov'eva [The idea of right in Vl. S. Solovyov], in *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii,* 1901, kn. 1, pp. 112 –129.

20. Gillen, Sean Michael James. A Foggy Youth: Faith, Reason, and Social Thought in the Young Vladimir Sergeevich Solovyov, 1853–1881. PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 2012, 305 p.

21. Werth, Paul W. The Emergence of «Freedom of Conscience» in Imperial Russia. Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, 2012, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 585–610.

22. Frede, Victoria. Freedom of Conscience, Freedom of Confession, and «Land and Freedom» in the 1860s. Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, 2012, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 561–584.

23. Antropov, L.N. Russkie raskol'niki i angliyskie disidenty [Russian schismatics and English dissidents], in *Russkaya rech'*, 1881, no. 4, pp. 74–109.

24. Michelson, Patrick Lally. Slavophile Religious Thought and the Dilemma of Russian Modernity, 1830–1860. Modern Intellectual History, 2010, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 239–267.

25. Poulin, Francis. Vladimir Solovyov's Rossiia i vselenskaia tserkov', Early Slavophilism's Pneumatic Spirit, and the Pauline Prophet. Russian Review, 1993, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 528–539.

26. Rouleau, François. Solov'ev, slavophile ou occidentaliste? Cahiers du Monde Russe, 2001, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 169–174.

27. Coates, Ruth. Religious Writing in Post-Petrine Russia. The Routledge Companion to Russian Literature. Ed. Neil Cornwell. New York: Routledge, 2001, pp. 49–63.

28. Domuschi, Stefan. *Sovest' v filosofii slavyanofilov* [Conscience in the philosophy of the Slavophiles]. Available at: www.bogoslov.ru/text/2577151.html (accessed 8 Jan. 2014).

29. Ioann (Sokolov). O svobode sovesti. Religioznye osnovaniya i istoricheskie nachala etoy svobody [Freedom of conscience. The religious foundations and historical principals of this freedom], in *Khristianskoe chtenie*, 1864, part 3, pp. 39–103, 115–172, 227–272, 392–416; 1865, part 1, pp. 225–286; 1865, part 2, pp. 427–458, 459–502.

30. de Courten, Manon. History, Sophia and the Russian Nation: A Reassessment of Vladimir Solovyov's Views on History and his Social Commitment. Bern: Peter Lang, 2004, 532 p.

31. Farmakovskiy, V.I. O protivogosudarstvennom elemente v raskole [On the anti-state element in the schism], in *Otechestvennye zapiski*, 1886, vol. 169, pp. 487–518, 629–659.

32. Dunn, Ethel. A Slavophile Looks at the Raskol and the Sects. Slavonic and East European Review, 1966, vol. 44, no. 102, pp. 167–179.

33. Hamburg, G.M. Boris Chicherin and Early Russian Liberalism, 1826–1866. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992, 443 p.

34. Dostoevskiy, F.M. Dnevnik pisatelya za 1876 g. [Diary of a writer for 1876], in *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy, t. 11* [Complete collection of writings, vol. 11], Saint-Petersburg: Tipografiya P.F. Panteleeva, 1905, 408 p.

35. Beer, Daniel. The Medicalization of Religious Deviance in the Russian Orthodox Church (1880–1905), in Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, 2004, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 451–482.

36. Fedyashin, Anton A. Liberals under Autocracy: Modernization and Civil Society in Russia, 1866–1904. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2012, 282 p.

37. Kiparisov, V.F. O svobode sovesti. Opyt istoriko-kriticheskogo issledovaniya [Freedom of conscience. An attempt at historical-critical research], in *Pribavleniya k Tvoreniyam sv. Ottsov* [Supplement to works of the holy fathers], 1881, part 27, book 1, pp. 477–544; part 28, book 3, pp. 294–333; part 28, book 4, pp. 363–403; 1882, part 29, book 1, pp. 206–238; part 30, book 1, pp. 176–217; part 30, book 2, pp. 443–512; 1883, part 31, book 1, pp. 107–200.

РЕФЕРАТ

Со времен распада Советского Союза в англоязычном научном сообществе, занимающемся исследованием деятельности Владимира Соловьева, превалируют два историографических течения. Опираясь главным образом на поэзию и художественные произведения Соловьева, литературоведы и культурологи одного течения представляют его нам как мистика, ироничного и парадоксального мыслителя, который экспериментирует с различными литературными жанрами, философскими категориями, христианскими и еврейскими символами и даже гендерными нормами, для того чтобы создать новый порядок личной и вселенской целостности в обществе. Другое течение в англоязычных исследованиях о Соловьеве использует преимущественно его публицистические, богословские и философские работы, чтобы показать нам рационального и убедительного Соловьева, практической задачей которого является становление гражданского общества, основанного на соединении религиозных норм и принципов правового государства. По мнению представителей данного научного течения, Соловьев периодически выступает последователем особой интерпретации философско-религиозного учения И. Канта, в которой делается акцент на незыблемость человеческой личности в ее восприятии Бога как высшей силы, определяющей политические и гражданские права людей. Этот образ Соловьева-либерала сложился совсем недавно и связан он с его высказываниями о необходимости введения свободы совести в России.

В данной статье ставится задача оспорить видение Соловьева как либерала, используя для анализа те же тексты и высказывания, которые повсеместно приводятся западными специалистами в качестве доказательств, характеризующих его либеральность. Отслеживая историческое развитие понятия «свобода совести» у Соловьева, становится очевидно, что, несмотря на определённые ритори-

ческие и концептуальные попытки, предпринимаемые по отношению к основным положениям либерализма, Соловьев не видел в качестве конечного итога создание политической системы, в которой личностная автономия и личные религиозные убеждения являются высшей целью. Напротив, Соловьев призывал к правовому распространению свободы совести на староверов и других сектантов, чтобы они могли самостоятельно осознать свои еретические заблуждения и вследствие этого добровольно вернуться в лоно единой святой, соборной и апостольской церкви. Другими словами, Соловьев не представлял, что свобода совести станет основой современного либерального государства и общества. По его мнению, такой исход был бы несущественным и прозаичным. Соловьев рассматривал свободу совести как эффективный тактический прием, способный привести человеческое сознание назад к Богу. Политические, правовые и познавательные процессы, вызванные введением свободы совести, в конечном счете завершатся восстановлением «христианской политики» и «христианского царства» в России, в результате чего будут сглажены социально-экономические потрясения, культурная враждебность и психологическая аномия, присутствующие в современном обществе.

Особое толкование свободы вероисповедания Соловьевым как ненасильственного изменения человеческой субъективности относительно божественного провидения было отчасти сформировано многообразием дискурсивных и идеологических контекстов, в которых оно возникло и функционировало. После отмены крепостного права свобода совести в России, по сути своей, зачастую использовалась как средство для достижения определенных целей. В 1860-х годах государственные деятели выступали за расширение правовой основы религиозной толерантности, включающей свободу совести, считая это эффективным методом управления многоконфессиональной империей, способствующим укреплению самодержавия. Приблизительно в то же время радикалы начали выдвигать идею о том, что свобода совести должна распространяться на религиозные меньшинства в России, с той целью, чтобы заручиться поддержкой народа, но впоследствии привести религиозно настроенных крестьян к атеизму и разбудить революционное сознание. В сущности, в имперской России позднего периода многие из дискуссий о свободе вероисповедания опирались на историософские схемы, которые рассматривали свободу совести как необходимую ступень в историческом и нравственном развитии человеческого сознания. Особенно важным достижением в этом направлении стало формулирование понятия «свобода вероисповедания» первым поколением славянофилов и последующая разработка православного понимания свободы совести преподавателями духовных академий. И в славянофильском, и в церковном дискурсе свобода совести трактовалась узко: свобода от греховной жизни и свобода обращения к Богу, которые могут быть обретены, только если человек добровольно согласится следовать законам Божиим. В результате этого ожидалось, что история церкви будет завершена и на земле установится Царство Божие. Именно в данном, широком контексте, а не контексте политического и гражданского либерализма, Соловьев разработал понятие «свобода совести».

Перевод А.И. Симончик