Rowe's book is most valuable when he confines himself to patterns in a single text. This is so, for example, in the two essays on Anna Karenina, and particularly so for the one that abundantly details "plays" on meaning in that novel. These involve instances which could escape many readers, for example: Princess Miagkaia's harsh nature; the muddle inherent in the name Katavasov which is given to that Professor of "Natural Science"; the reason and intellect inherent in the Greek root of Karenin's name; Anna's pre-suicidal laughter at the expense of Tiutkin's name which suggests, as Rowe states, "puppy" "young pup, young person" (p. 48), and which, I might add, in Anna's phrasing (je me fais coiffer par Tiutkin) represents a contextually fitting sexual double-entendre based on a dated French idiom meaning "Tiutkin does me." Rowe aptly points out that such semantic play is representative of what post-crisis Tolstoi rejected in literature. Elsewhere, Rowe's exploration of fateful relationships in 'The Queen of Spades' adds appreciably to the stock of "otherworldly" elements brought out by Vinogradov, Leighton and others. Still elsewhere, Rowe's tracing of the many manifestations of "falling" motif in A Hero of Our Time is interesting, although one would have liked Rowe to discuss the interesting irony and ambiguity inherent in the demonic Pechorin arranging for the "starry-eyed" Grushnitskii to fall to his death from a precipice—a commonplace fate that is predictably reserved for Pechorin's villainous predecessors from the Gothic tradition which underlies that climactic motif. The Turgenev chapters are insightful, particularly those devoted to Fathers and Sons. The one on the extensive fourfold orientation of that novel provides a tangible basis for the sense of its "pleasingly balanced structure" (p. 90).

All in all, after a shaky start with the Chekhov chapters, Rowe's second volume of patterns provides solid scholarly fare and merits the attention of those interested in the matter it treats.

R. L. Busch
University of Alberta


This short book opens with an introductory discussion of the fate of philosophy and especially religious philosophy in Russia, from medieval times into the Soviet period. Copleston thus is able to demonstrate the significance of the Slavophile call for a new philosophy and of Solov'ev's response to that call. Stress is put on the significance of Vekhi, and the contributors' relationship to Solov'ev is brought into focus. The central theme of the book that follows is thus clarified: the role of Solov'ev in the development of Russian religious philosophy.
Copleston treats four "selected aspects" of Russian religious philosophy: philosophy of history, Godmanhood, Sophia, and reason vs. faith. In his discussion of history, he quickly reviews the theories of Leontiev and Danilevskii and then focuses on Solov'ev and Berdiaev. With Solov'ev he shows the relationship between his metaphysics and his philosophy of history, albeit in a most general way, and correctly notes the relationship with Schelling (not Hegel!). Unlike many Russian and Roman critics, Copleston maintains a clear head in his analysis of Solov'ev's concept of "free theocracy": he rightly stresses that Solov'ev does not identify the Church with any existing, empirical church, that he "rejects any claim that the Church has a right to exercise coercion, even over its own members" (p. 45), and that Solov'ev's statement that the "state must be the political organ of the Church" was only intended to mean that "politicians are subject to the same moral law as other people, not only in their private lives but also when acting in their public capacities" (p. 46). Throughout his discussion of the philosophy of history, Copleston stresses the teleological element, while showing that with both Solov'ev and Berdiaev the Kingdom of God once attained would amount to the end of history.

Copleston is clearly attracted to the concept of Godmanhood. He notes that while it is not unique to Russian thought as some have claimed, it does receive its fullest treatment there. Copleston reviews the major premises of Solov'ev's notion of Godmanhood and explores its development by Frank. He rightly sees that this doctrine to a certain extent jeopardizes the role of Christ: in both Frank and Solov'ev the historical Christ and His saving work tend to get lost, and the unique relationship of human and divine tends to become universalized. But Copleston knows that these are only problems of wording and, in his final and excellent assessment (pp. 140-44), he at last reveals that he is aware of the assumptions with which these writers work: the tradition of incarnational soteriology from Saints Iraeneus and Athanasius on, coupled with the Platonic notion of methexis viewed from the vantage point of the first chapter of the second Epistle of St. Peter. In the end Copleston endorses Bulgakov's thesis that the doctrine of Godmanhood is useful in confronting the two modern extremes of absolute theism and secular humanism.

Copleston does not like the doctrine of Sophia. He begins with Solov'ev's conception which, with Losskii, he considers "vague and inconsistent" (p. 86). Both Florenskii and Bulgakov are treated in some detail, but with no better fate. What especially bothers Copleston is that to him it seems inevitable that Florenskii and Bulgakov, and it would seem also Solov'ev, conceive of Sophia as a being intermediary between Creator and Creation. Although these thinkers do not assert this, to Copleston it is as clear as logic: "if Sophia in her divine aspect is conceived as distinct from God, and if in her created aspect she is conceived as distinct from the world, it follows that she must be regarded as an intermediary being" (p. 146). Since there is no room in Christian theology for such an intermediary, Copleston finds