

Pregledni znanstveni članek (1.02)  
 BV 72 (2012) 4, 653—664  
 UDK: 27-423.79  
 Besedilo prejeto: 09/2012; sprejeto: 12/2012

*Primož Krečič*

## Development and Reality of Antinomy in Russian Religious Thought

*Abstract:* The article presents the contribution of Russian religious philosophy to the formation of an integral gnoseological, philosophical and theological view, which takes into account both empirical evidence and spiritual experience. This unfolds by means of antinomy, which expresses living experience in all its contradictions and connects them. The most discussed authors Florensky and Bulgakov have each in his own way presented the antinomical thought; the former gave more emphasis to religious experience and the Holy Trinity, while the latter connected theological and cosmological antinomies with sophiological and godmanly antinomies, which presents not only the establishment of the two poles but also their deeper connection, which ultimately corresponds to the Wisdom of God and Godmanhood of Christ and thus to the entire life of the Church.

*Key words:* antinomy, trinitarian philosophy, Sophia, godmanhood, kenosis

*Povzetek:* **Razvoj in realnost antinomije v ruski verski misli**

Razprava želi prikazati prispevek ruske religiozne filozofije pri oblikovanju celovitega gnozeološkega, filozofskega in teološkega pogleda, ki upošteva tako empirijo kakor izkušnjo. Poteka po načinu antinomije, ki izraža živo izkustvo v vseh njegovih nasprotjih in jih povezuje. Posebej izpostavljena avtorja Florenski in Bulgakov sta vsak po svoje predstavila antinomično misel, prvi z večjim poudarkom na religiozni izkušnji in na Sveti Trojici, drugi pa je povezal teološko in kozmološko antinomijo s sofiološko in bogočloveško antinomijo, ki ni le postavitev dveh polov, ampak tudi njuna globlja povezava, kakor jo pomenijo božja Modrost in Kristusova bogočloveškost in z njo vse življenje Cerkve.

*Ključne besede:* antinomija, trinitarična filozofija, sofiologija, gnozeologija

We are interested in the contribution of Russian religious philosophy to the formation of the gnoseological, philosophical and theological view that takes into account both empirical knowledge and spiritual experience. This view unfolds according to the method of antinomy, which expresses living experience in all its contradictions and then joins them. The goal of this path is an all-unification (*vseedinost'*), which Russian thinkers and mystics of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century introduced through the concept and reality of Sophia, the Wisdom of God.

Therefore, this concerns the philosophical turn that occurred in Russian thought with Dostoyevsky and Solovyov; it wishes to reveal the truth in its freedom and infinite gratuitousness without blurring the fundamental questions posed by Kantian theodicy. We will focus particularly on the Russian experience of life and faith, which we will illuminate primarily with the thought of Pavel Florensky and Sergei Bulgakov, who have similarly and each in his own fashion developed a philosophical and theological view in connection with antinomy.

## 1. Truth is Dynamic

Russian Orthodox spiritual and theological thought of the early 20th century is marked by a renewed interest in the mystical experience of Dionysius Areopagite. Another important representative of this path is Gregor Palamas, who collected the legacy of the Eastern Church Fathers and presented the two extremes of antinomy: the visible God, in whom one can share, and the invisible God, in whom it is impossible to participate. He emphasized the uncreated significance of grace and camplight (PG 150, 93, 932D). He thus charted the path of spirituality and theology that has a strong antinomical character.

The theodicy of Russian Orthodox thinkers is thus operating in the thinking of the objective order of the world and is saving/solving it in an existential way. Berdyayev states that science, since it is interested only in nature, can never have full knowledge of truth but only of incomplete truth. The aim of philosophy and metaphysics is to attain knowledge of Truth in its integrity, which also presupposes life (Berdiaeff 1992, 31). As Solovyov in *Critique of Abstract Principles* also points out, it is impossible to say that being is but only what it is, since it is only in existence. Hence the subject of philosophy should not be being in general, but through what it is, i.e., to what a concrete existence belongs. Truth is life that goes on (Solov'jov 1878–1880, 282).

Pavel Florensky, together with other Russian religious thinkers, wished to reveal the powerlessness and failure of one-sided abstract thinking, especially regarding the thought of Kant, and to show the truth in all of its vital integrity as absolute truth in the ontological sense. »Living truth« was important to him, for it was introduced as a philosophical category by slavophiles; he refers to the original meaning of the word *istina*. Florensky investigated the etymological notion of truth, *istina* (Florenskij 1914, 15–22) and emphasized that the Russian people consider *istina* as breathing and unchanging life. Whatever is true must be alive, and whatever is alive is saved from death. This is an existence that not only has biological dimensions but also is accepted in all its spiritual integrity (Florenskij 1909, 608).

Truth as a proper relationship is important for knowledge. An erroneous relationship with reality is a lie or deception, which also implies an erroneous and unsuccessful life. Florensky stresses that this truth is the life and person of Jesus

Christ that Pilate had in front of him but was not in a state of mind to recognize it (Florenskij 1914, 23). It is by all means important for an integral presentation of life to include mystics that is born along with knowledge.

Florensky is convinced that Kant's treatment of cosmological antinomy did not show any detailed analysis of pure reason, for he did not seriously take into account the idea of actual infinity, but he seized it for himself and imposed his categories upon it. The subject was thus incapable of stepping toward the other. Consequently Florensky started to build his own reasoning concerning the antinomical character of reason, which is based on two laws, one static and the other dynamic; the two are partly in opposition while at the same time one cannot do without the other (32). Similarly, intuition and discursive reasoning must be connected. Intuition gives man the capacity to perceive directly; however, reason must search further, otherwise intuition remains in the dark. In inferences that are expressed *per se*, on the basis of intuition, he sees three forms of intuition: (1) perceptive, where the criterion of truth is the outside appearance; (2) reasonable, where the criterion of truth corresponds to what the subject perceives; (3) mystic, where there is a deep perception of unity between the subject and the object. The first two concern bare givens that show the law of identity, where A corresponds to A. However, these inferences explain only the partiality of individual elements of living but not the connections between them (Florenskij 1914, 26). Each A excludes all the elements that are not-A, such that it is impossible to attain the truth. The law of identity thus breaks up, which means it is a law of death and annihilation, for the lack of an authentic encounter with the other and coexistence in diversity (27). Diversity is necessary. If a man does not find his justification outside of self he misses the opportunity to form relationships with others as well as with the transcendental.

Florensky thus surmounted the narrow mindedness and violence of rationalism, and emphasized that the »I« as subject of the truth is justified through the »You«. Through the »You« the »I« becomes objective to him and finds in this his own confirmation and objectivization as the »I« (567). It is through an authentic encounter of the »I« with the »You« that is shown the beginning of a new logic of knowledge and justification of identity.

## 2. Truth is antinomic

**I**n the period when brutal ideologies were felling and breaking any otherness in the name of reason according to the principle of Hegelian dialectics: thesis, antithesis and synthesis, where the antithesis is destroyed and subordinated, Russian spiritual thinkers were realizing that the integral truth of life contains antinomies and that it is impossible to elucidate the mysteries of these opposing relationships in a way that would do away with the mystery (Frank 1949, 29). Florensky particularly dedicated himself to the issue of the truth being antinomic and not possibly being anything else, which means that the truth contains within itself the drama of its fall, incarnation and the cross.

If we observe the soul of the Russian nation and Russia's landscape, we can be struck by their great contrasts. Berdyayev says that the Russian nation is extremely polarized but nevertheless weaves these opposites within itself (Berdiaev 1969, 10). Florensky sees a deeper and fundamental unity before each judgment. The unity stems from the connection between intuition and reasoning and their mutual belonging, of the finite and infinite. A new judgment must hold together these two dimensions, for the truth is an unmoving motion and moving immotion, a unity of opposites, *coincidentia oppositorum* (Florenskij 1914, 43–44). This holistic reality is linked to an infinite paradox; it cannot be only a sum of equals and unequals but also recognition of the infinite that comes true independently of the people. An image of this is in the revelation.

Rationalism does not tolerate antinomy, for it lives a one-sided and brutal relationship with reality. It thus removes one of the poles at the expense of the other or remains in conflict between them, but it is incapable of creating an integral synthesis (44). Florensky emphasizes that, if the only solution resides in connecting the opposites, rationalism has no choice but to be quiet. In order to overcome this constraint, it needs to find a new form of knowledge and freely entrust itself to the truth, which is a coincidence of opposites. This opens up the importance of the relationship between knowledge and faith; these two realities are separated and distant from each other in the western rationalist thought. However, one can pass through only having died to one's own pride and self-sufficiency. Only whoever steps out of himself and proceeds toward the unknown can again find himself. When a man believes and trusts, he can risk leaping into God's hands. Florensky uses the well-known Pascal's wager, which is a heroic leap of faith (72). Tomatis states that here Florensky proves himself a true interpreter in Russia of the later Schelling, as he adopts Schelling's idea of the abyss of reason from Kant and enhances it with convincing emphases of Pascal's thought (Tomatis 1994, 31).

Antinomy is also very important regarding the truths of faith. If they were not antinomic, rationality would not have anything to lean on, for it would lack an extra-rational object to embrace through heroism of faith (147).

### 3. Dogmatic antinomy and trinitarian philosophy

Knowledge sought by Florensky must be the fruit of real internal (not external) unity between faith and reason. This is the key to his theory of knowledge. If it is necessary to believe and trust in order to attain knowledge, it follows that revelation precedes reason in this excursion. This revelation characterizes the image of truth that one needs to experience (64). The starting point of the trans-rational support of reason is a dogma, the trinitarian dogma in particular.

Florensky states, »Between the Triune Christian God and death of foolishness *tertium non datur*« (63). He thus wishes to emphasize that the dogma of the Holy Trinity is an effective answer to the shallowness of modern thinking, which deri-

ves from the analyticity of judgment. At the same time he deepens the meaning of the trinitarian intuition of his predecessors in order to arrive at an explicit philosophical doctrine, in which trinitarity would become the most authentic seal of the ontological composition of reality.

Dogma plays this role, as it is the perfect form of antinomy. With his theory of dogma as the antinomic truth, Florensky is aware that he has attained the summit of concrete metaphysics as well as the climax of the path of faith (Lingua 2000, 118). The large part of Russian thought (S.N. Bulgakov, S.L. Frank, L.P. Karsavin) considers dogma a creation of the Church to preserve the antinomic tension of the contents of the Christian faith without allowing one aspect to be undervalued and some other magnified. Heresy is a victory of one pole of dogmatic antinomy. The meaning/importance of dogma in its integral antinomicity leaves room for faith as an act of freedom (Florenskij 1914, 59). In this form it is possible to express the antinomic truth, as the encounter between Divine revelation and human word is a paradox, however real and historical.

If Solovyov and later Bulgakov employ godmanhood as their fundamental dogmatic principle, Florensky chooses trinitarity as his fundamental ontological principle (Florenskij 1914, 805), with which he succeeds in expressing two essential elements of the human experience: dynamism of life of an individual and fundamental communitarian structure. Here he follows the intuition of Nicene Church Fathers and the dogmatic conscience of the Church, which has preserved the idea of *homousios* (*edinosuščnost*), a single concept that shows through the slim antinomic difference between *ousia* and *hypostasis* real diversity and real unity (54). Florensky claims that *homousios* shows for the first time in human thinking the possibility and necessity for a different form of knowledge with a root in trinitarity and its antinomy (54). He thus fuses his antinomic gnoseology into a philosophy of trinitarian homousianity (Lingua 2000, 117). His connection between antinomy and trinitarity reveals the complexity of antinomy and the necessity to see it within the spiritual context.

He understands the number »three« as an absolute number that is revealed in real things; however, it is impossible to explain the trinary structure of reality without the Heavenly Trinity (585). Florensky thus surmounts the philosophy of subject that has dominated Western thought and presents a higher law of identity, where the acceptance of the subject proceeds as a gift within identity of the subject and non-subject. The subject must leave self so that it can from itself through the other find itself. The other saves it from the oppressive closed-mindedness. Florensky sees this dynamic not in a binary fashion but in a trinary manner, for only in the third can a subject find its justification and full realization (48).

This trinitarian formulation is not a reworking of Hegel's dialectic thesis-antithesis-synthesis. Florensky states that He is the revealed »I« (49), which means that thesis and antithesis, the »I« and the »You«, can remain in their roles because of the third. The third is the conciliatory synthesis, which sets the life between the two in motion. However, Florensky stresses that the continuing revelation

of the Holy Spirit is special, mysterious and non-hypostatic, for it works through other and for other hypostases (119). Although modern culture is tone-deaf for the »third«, the »third« contributes many fundamental experiences of life and opens up knowledge in a free tendency toward the different and discontinuous. Each hypostasis finds its own full confirmation and justifies it as such only in the unity of the three (50). Trinitarian ontology is founded on the act where identity is lost, sacrificed and then found again. It can thus be presented by means of the category of love, which is the most proper substance of God, according to the deep insight of St. John. Hence, a new person and a new community are being born through the kenosis of the subject and the abolition of hardened individualism. The trinitarian community becomes the foundation for relationships between people who cannot bear the rationalistic law of identity, for the person cannot be reduced and contracted to a concept. The place of this experience is the Church. Belonging to the Church means belonging to homousianity; this is commemorated and experienced in the liturgy, which is the blossom of the life of the Church.

#### 4. Antinomy of Bulgakov

Bulgakov lived a different personal and intellectual life than other Russian religious thinkers. He was first a professor of economics and started out from concrete social issues in order to contribute toward creating a more just society for all. In his research, which was based on marxist materialism, he experienced encounters with the Divine in nature, at the artistic depiction of the Sistine Madonna and upon meeting his future wife. His personal experience, immersion into the thought of Dostoyevsky and the metaphysical legacy of Solovyov, Florensky and other thinkers led him to search for an answer to life's questions in Christianity and holistic theological-philosophical thought.

Consequently he wished to establish a unity between thought and life also in the field of gnoseology. He relied particularly on Solovyov and his philosophy of all-unification; he also included the teaching on antinomies that were developed primarily by Florensky and accompanied him throughout his theological endeavors. He was able to present Christianity and Orthodoxy on the basis of antinomy as the foundation of ontology, cosmology, philosophy, culture and gnoseology (Zander 1964, 170–171).

One can find a systematic overview of antinomy in Bulgakov's work titled *Ikona i ikonopočitanie*. First, he presents theological antinomy, which is in the invisibility of God, in His absence and irrecognizability, and in a quiet testimony for Him. Second comes cosmological antinomy, which lies between the thesis that God carries within him all plenitude and blessedness, and the antithesis that God creates out of love relative existence, which is coming into being. The third antinomy is sophiological; God in His eternal life reveals Himself through Wisdom, creates the universe through Wisdom that is founded upon the Wisdom of God and is nevertheless

different from it, since it is creaturely Wisdom.

## 5. Theological antinomy

The Church Fathers already indicated that antinomy prevails in the domain of the divine as well as in the human domain. Bulgakov clearly states that it is impossible to understand antinomy in theology as a clash or contradiction, since all things are united and complete in God (Bulgakov 1917, 231). Mystery requires antinomy, for it is impossible to use normal faculties of learning only (Bulgakov 1937b, 211). Hence, surmounting human knowledge and elucidating the higher reality is not just about simple dialectics of confirmation, negation and synthesis, but it is a leap to another level, where logical faculties are surpassed and rational logical learning finds itself overwhelmed by mystery and revelation.

The first thesis of theological antinomy emerges from apophatic or negative theology that developed mostly from neoplatonism of Dionysius Pseudo-Areopagite and is characteristic of patristics. The Godhead as the Absolute is alien to correlation, differentiation and determination. It is not even existence; it remains beyond distinction between the subject and object. It can only be explained by negating every definition through a NOT or *alfa privativum*, which is some kind of a mystical gesture. Bulgakov has extensively discussed this negation in *Svet nevěčernij* (Bulgakov 1917, 146–148). The Divine nothingness, the absolute God in it and for it, is completely unattainable for thought that derives from the subject and object. This is the reason for the required leap of thought through negation, which is the fruit of mystical dying and dark night. This postulate of apophatic theology is a necessary foundation for the idea of God (Bulgakov 1917, 154; 1931, 29).

The absolute mystical NOT is antinomically joined by the absolute mystical YES, discrimination and determination in God that is the revelation of God as the Holy Trinity. This shows the life of God, which is not abstract or inactive, but a concrete and absolute relationship in God Himself, the trihypostatic Person and Divine triunity (Bulgakov 1917, 103; 1931, 30). It is thus essential for the Absolute to be with the World, to be God in revelation (Bulgakov 1933, 176). The interconnectiveness of the mystical NOT and YES of revelation is antinomic, as an agreement of opposites, *coincidentia oppositorum*. This is the utmost boundary for human reason, where one has to take off his sandals, for this ground is sacred (Bulgakov 1917, 153; 1931, 56–57).

Bulgakov clearly stresses that this antinomy protects the mind from rationalization of God, such that we would not see in Him some genesis or history of Godheadness that would lead us to an impersonal Proto-Godhead, from where a personal God, the Holy Trinity, would appear through free self-determination. This line of thinking was present in mystic rationalism, which was adopted from Plotin and the German school of Meister Eckhart, Jakob Böhme, to Hegel and partly

Schopenhauer and Hartmann (Bulgakov 1917, 160–175; 1931, 30–31). There is no process in the Godhead; his absolute nature is authentic and absolute. God is beyond definitions; He is the Holy Trinity, who is revealing Himself. The dogma of the Holy Trinity is thus at the end of this antinomy.

## 6. Cosmological antinomy

The second antinomy refers to the relationship between God in Himself and God the Creator of heaven and earth. God is absolute in Himself, the complete and fulfilled Holy Trinity. However, He also has a relative relationship, which is His existence outside of Himself; this is His relationship with the world and all creation. This connectedness within God causes antinomy in human thought.

It is impossible to treat the first antinomy on the basis of establishing the second and vice versa (Bulgakov 1945, 43). God in the Holy Trinity is completely fulfilled and happy; He has a fullness of life. In the fullness of this absolute life He enters into a relationship with that which He is not, that is, the world. In spite of the chasm that separates the created reality from God, there exists a certain creative »be it done« that is the foundation to all being (Bulgakov 1917, 148; 163; 184). The world is created from nothing (*ouk on*); there is nothing that exists which would not be from God. However, the world is a relative existence, outside of God and yet divine, for it is established by God and is preserved by God (Bulgakov 1917, 193).

Both elements, not only the Creator but also the created, have full reality and some kind of autonomy of existence at the same time. God is turning toward the world and places it in front of Himself, not to complete it but to make it the object of His Love (Jn 3,16). The Lamb of God was predestined already before the beginning of the world, that is, in eternity (1 Pt 1,20). Bulgakov stresses that it is more suitable for interpretation of creation to use personal categories rather than causal (Bulgakov 1945, 44–45). In addition to His absolute existence the Divinity establishes a relationship with the world and becomes for it God and Creator (Bulgakov 1917, 180).

## 7. Sophiological antinomy

Creation by God leads to the revelation of God in the world. Thus appears a new antinomy, no longer the Absolute *per se* and the Absolute in the relative, but the Absolute who emerges from the fullness of His life and love by throwing Himself at the process of generation and temporal existence (Bulgakov, 1937, 38–39). Bulgakov pays attention to God as Creator and Providence joining in the generation and evolution of the world. God and the world are thus on one hand two ontologically completely different realities, while on the other hand there is between them a certain connection that does not abolish the difference (Bulgakov

1931, 39; 42).

It is important to bear in mind that there is between them an insurmountable abyss and no direct relationship. However, if the creation were completely outside of God, it would revert to its nothingness (Ps 103:29–30; Bulgakov 1931, 40). Therefore, the interconnectedness of God and the world is being revealed and realized through divinization of the world and incarnation of God. The metaphysical space of creation thus constitutes God's permeation of the world and at the same time God's separateness from the world.

Bulgakov makes another step and emphasizes that the nature of sophiological antinomy is not only to link two positions but also to establish an actual connection and identity between them. If we follow rational logic, we now encounter an obstacle where this logic comes to a stop. However, it is right here that, according to Bulgakov, the deeper connection and unity of the opposing positions is demonstrated. Antinomy itself thus affects the vault over the abyss and becomes some kind of a bridge between God and the world in their distinction and unity. Sophia is in its pre-eternal contents the life of God, the revelation of God in Himself and His revelation in the world that He created. In the world this revelation of God, *Deus revelatus*, is associated with shadow and darkness, *Deus absconditus*. Nevertheless, God recognizes Himself in His revelation and loves it (Bulgakov 1931, 42).

Wisdom also constitutes God's world before creation, the design of everything created. The world is created through Sophia and does not have another principle. The created world is thus also Sophia, Sophia in generation, creaturely Sophia (Bulgakov 1945, 80). The world is thus drawn up in God's Sophia, whereby it has its higher reality; on the other hand, the world bears written records of God's prototype, creaturely Sophia, although not all recognize her and some even oppose her. However, the process goes on until this creaturely Sophia is completely realized and God will be all in all (1 Kor 15:28). Bulgakov has written about this especially in *Svet nevečernij*, *Nevesta Agnca* and *The Wisdom of God*, the latter of which is a summary and a clarified presentation of his view of Sophia.

The fundamental sophiological antinomy appears in a series of special antinomies. Bulgakov exposes primarily the antinomy of time and eternity and the antinomy of freedom and necessity, which he has discussed in his work *Nevesta Agnca* (Bulgakov 1945, 65–88; 209–273). Sophiological antinomy gets its essential meaning in christological or godmanly antinomy that Bulgakov presents in connection with the dogma of the Council of Chalcedon concerning the two natures and one hypostasis of Christ (DS 302). This dogma is conceived antinomically, according to Bulgakov; however, he is convinced that it has not showed sufficiently clearly the joining of the two natures into one personal existence (Bulgakov 1933, 206). With regard to this joining one needs to consider that the hypostasis of the Word is co-human and that the human hypostasis is called to live in communion with the Divine Trinity so that man can accept God's hypostasis (Bulgakov 1933, 209). Bulgakov expresses this sophiological godmanly antinomy in such a way that

instead of the fourfold NOT in the relationship between the two natures (NO mixing, NO change, NO distinction, NO separation) he establishes four affirmative designations (YES). If the negations pointed to an evasion of the fusion of the natures as their separation, the positive emphasis wishes to demonstrate a positive meaning, a deeper connection that the negations bring (Bulgakov 1933, 220). The sixth council also took this direction as it spoke of the two wills and energies of Christ, which means that human will completely follows the will of God (DS 556; 557). Therefore, this is about ontological unity of different principles that the created and the Creator are fundamentally connected: the Creator who transits into the created world and the incarnation of God, and the being who tends toward God. This unfolds through kenosis and divinization. Bulgakov is convinced that only through kenosis it is possible to present the coming of the Word into the world and establish a positive relationship between the two natures as well as His entire mission during His earthly living and after the Pentecost (Bulgakov 1933, 239; 266).

After the Pentecost sophiological christological antinomy opens up and continues in the antinomy of the Church, in the paradox of the charismatic-ecclesial godmanhood, since the realization of the synthesis that began with the incarnation continues through divinization and new birth from the Spirit (Bulgakov 1945, 274–291). The Church functions through the power of the Holy Spirit, who does not reveal Himself as a person but antinomically and kenotically acts through others in order to lead the entire humanity into happiness with the Father (Bulgakov 1936, 319). The Holy Spirit will reveal Himself hypostatically, when the entire world and the whole universe are permeated with Christ's godmanhood. God the Father in his love patiently waits for the decision of each human, which is His kenosis (Bulgakov 1936, 434–436). Bulgakov also presents life after death, the judgment and glorification as eschatological antinomy between the promise that God will be all in all (1 Cor 15:28) and the perpetual rebelliousness of the people and of the devil (*Nevesta Agnca; Apokalipsis Ioanna*).

## 8. Conclusion

We hope this brief exposé has bought to bear the importance of Russian religious thinkers, particularly Florensky and Bulgakov, who wished to present, each in his own way, Orthodox metaphysics and theology in connection with modern thought. In building his integral view Florensky gave more emphasis to antinomy and trinitarity, but he was not always consistent in this approach. He simultaneously treated several issues, where the principle of opposites is present; however, he frequently jumped from one topic to another. The weakest point of his philosophical theological religious reasoning is, according to Hučko, his failure to consistently and clearly maintain the distinction and separation between the immanent and the transcendent (Hučko 2000, 144). Nevertheless, he successfully tried to surmount the clash between religion and science, as he emphasized

the possibility of reconciling the antinomy only on the spiritual and transcendental level. The trinitarian approach to the truth and antinomy showed a new way that his friend Sergei Bulgakov further treated in depth.

Bulgakov also wished to establish a holistic theological philosophical thought and derived it from his personal experience, the experience of the Church and knowledge of metaphysical philosophy, particularly of modern idealists. He included into his doctrine the idea of antinomy with regard to the connection between thought and life, as he wished to express the mystical transcendence of the spiritual reality as well as the opposites in knowledge in the fields of theology, cosmology, anthropology, philosophy, culture and life in general. The key issue of his thought revolves around sophiological antinomy, which represents the positive connection between the Wisdom of God and the Wisdom of creation, which in turn is later expressed in the fourfold YES between the natures in Christ that the dogma of Chalcedon expressed in a negative fashion. Various authors reproached him for the insufficient distinction between God and the created. One needs to be aware that he was a great pioneer in many fields and that his view clarified and matured. The distinction between the uncreated and the created by means of Sophia is not about a simple matter of duplication. Many critics ignored that the relationship between God – the Holy Trinity and creation is presented in the light of christological-paschal kenosis. The sophiological and kenotic perspectives are closely linked and intersect in Love, in the unity of the Divine nature, the relationships in the Triune God and His continued revelation in the world, and in the humanity that is capable of accepting it, for it carries the seal of the Divine, the creaturely Sophia, although it is concealed and unrealized. This aspect yet requires new clarifications, as does Bulgakov's intuition about the pre-creational victimhood and humanity in God, which are the foundation of creation and incarnation (Coda 1998, 151–2). It is necessary to regard sophiological antinomy not so much in its protological aspect, which is somewhat burdened with dualism of platonic nature, but more in its eschatological perspective, where Sophia recapitulates creation in Christ through the Holy Spirit, where finally God will be all in all, Mary the Church, and creation the Bride of the incarnate Word. Modern Christian thought and life are lacking the kind of hope and holistic view Florensky and Bulgakov have presented in their philosophical and theological works.

## References

- Berdiaeff, Nicolas.** 1969. *L'Idée russe: Problèmes essentiels de la pensée russe au XIX<sup>e</sup> et début du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle.* Paris: Marne.
- . 1992. *Esprit et Liberté.* Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Bulgakov, Sergej Nikolajevič.** 1917. *Svet nevečer-nij: Sozercanija i umozrenija.* Moskva: Put'.
- . 1931. *Ikona i ikonopočitanie: Dagmatičeskij očerk.* Paris: YMCA Press.
- . 1933. *Agneć Božij: O Bogočelovečestve.* Vol. 1. Paris: YMCA Press.
- . 1936. *Utešitel': O Bogočelovečestve.* Vol 2. Paris: YMCA Press.
- . 1937a. *The Wisdom of God: A Brief Summary of Sophiology.* London: Williams and Norgate, and New York: The Praisley Press.
- . 1937b. *Die christhliche Antropologie.* In: *Kirche, Mensch und Staat*, 209–255. Genf.

- . 1945. *Nevesta Agnca: O Bogočelovečestve*. Vol. 3. Paris: YMCA Press.
- . 1948. *Apokalipsis Ioanna: Opyt dogmatičeskogo istolkovanija*. Paris: YMCA Press.
- Coda, Piero.** 1998. *L'altro di Dio: Rivelazione e kenosi in Sergej Bulgakov*. Rome: Città Nuova Editrice.
- Florenskij, Pavel Aleksandrovič.** 1909. Kosmologičeskija antinomii I. Kanta. *Bogoslovskij vestnik* 4:596–625.
- . 1914. *Stolp i utverždenie Istiny: Opyt pravoslavnoj teodicej v dvenadcati pis'mach*. Moskva: Puts'.
- Frank, Semen Liudvigovič.** 1949. *Svet vo t'me*. Paris: YMCA Press.
- Hučko, Ladislav.** 2000. *Antinomia e mediazione: Indagine sulla prospettiva cosmologia di alcuni pensatori russi tra Ottocento e Novecento*. Rome: Pontificia Università Lateranense.
- Lingua, Graziano.** 2000. *Kénosis di Dio e santità della materia: La sofiologia di Sergej N. Bulgakov*. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Solov'jov, Vladímír Sergeévich.** 1878–1880. Kritika otvlečennych načal. In: *Opera omnia*. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg.
- Tomatis, Francesco.** 1994. *Kenosis del Logos: Ragione e rivelazione nell'ultimo Schelling*. Rome: Città Nuova Editrice.
- Zander, Leon.** 1964. Le Père Serge Bulgakov. *Irenikon* 19:168–185.