



Lev Shestov

The Philosophy
and Works
of a Tragic Thinker

ANDREA
OPPO

Thank you for downloading this free sampler of:

LEV SHESTOV

The Philosophy and Works of a Tragic Thinker

ANDREA OPPO

November 2020 | 346 pp.
9781644694671 | \$109 | Hardback

SUMMARY

This study spans the entire life and work of the Russian philosopher Lev Shestov (1866-1938). It offers keys to understanding his thought, while also tracing the historical itinerary of his work. Shestov's thought is not only interesting in itself, as a "philosophy fighting against philosophy," but also because it reveals an entire world of cultural connections in its extraordinarily keen exploration of other "souls." The reader will find in Shestov some of the sharpest analyses of authors such as Shakespeare, Nietzsche, Tolstoi, Dostoevskii, Luther, Plotinus, Pascal, Kierkegaard, and many others. This study will better determine the controversial and fascinating philosopher's place in the history of Russian and Western thought.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Andrea Oppo is Professor of Contemporary Philosophy at the Pontifical Faculty of Theology of Sardinia (Italy). He is the editor of *Shapes of Apocalypse: Arts and Philosophy in Slavic Thought* (Boston, 2013), and the author of *Philosophical Aesthetics and Samuel Beckett* (Oxford, 2008) and of numerous articles on the relationship between philosophy and the arts in the twentieth century.

PRAISE

"A uniquely comprehensive and insightful study of one of the most complex, contradictory, and influential Russian philosophers, Lev Shestov. ... Oppo's book is a must-read for anyone looking for a lucid, nuanced, and thorough analysis of Shestov's thought and his legacy."

—Svetlana Evdokimova, Professor of Slavic Languages
and Comparative Literature, Brown University

Take 20% off your order when you sign up for our newsletter at
www.academicstudiespress.com/newsletter



Academic Studies Press

.....
Lev
Shestov

The Philosophy
and Works
of a Tragic Thinker

.....



Lev
Shestov

The Philosophy
and Works
of a Tragic Thinker

A N D R E A
O P P O

BOSTON
2020

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Oppo, Andrea, author.

Title: Lev Shestov : the philosophy and works of a tragic thinker / Andrea Oppo.

Description: Boston : Academic Studies Press, 2020. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers:

LCCN 2020030063 (print) | LCCN 2020030064 (ebook) | ISBN 9781644694671 (hardback) | ISBN 9781644694688 (adobe pdf) | ISBN 9781644694695 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Shestov, Lev, 1866-1938.

Classification:

LCC B4259.S54 O67 2020 (print) | LCC B4259.S54 (ebook) | DDC 197--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020030063>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020030064>

Copyright © 2020 Academic Studies Press

All rights reserved.

Book design by Kryon Publishing Services (P) Ltd.

Cover design by Ivan Grave.

Published by Academic Studies Press

1577 Beacon Street

Brookline, MA 02446, USA

press@academicstudiespress.com

www.academicstudiespress.com

Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
Editorial Notes	ix
Introduction	x
Part One—Shestov in Russia	1
<hr/>	
Chapter I The Philosophy Of Tragedy (1898–1905)	2
1.1 Introduction: The Birth of a Tragic Conscience	2
1.2 Shestov before Shestov: Shakespeare and Pushkin	11
1.3 Tolstoi’s Struggle between “Yasnaya Polyana” and “Astapovo”	26
1.4 Friedrich Nietzsche: Truth against Morality	35
1.5 Dostoevskii and Nietzsche as “Philosophers of the Underground”	47
1.6 Apotheosis of “Bespochvennost’”: Towards a Philosophy of Tragedy	56
Chapter II Art As Negativity: The Literary Criticism Years (1901–1910)	69
2.1 Introduction: Shestov and the Philosophical Problem of Art	69
2.2 Aestheticism and Ideology: On Merezhkovskii and Turgenev	78
2.3 Creatio ex Nihilo: Chekhov’s Aesthetics	85
2.4 The “Oracular” Gratuity of Sologub’s Prose and Poetry	90
2.5 Ibsen and the Destiny of Art	94
2.6 Retracting Tragedy: Dostoevskii as an Essayist	98
2.7 The “Magnificent” Vyacheslav Ivanov	100
Part Two—Shestov in France	107
<hr/>	
Chapter III Wandering Through The Souls (1914–1929)	108
3.1 Introduction: The Events of History—Shestov’s Political Views	108

3.2	The Power of Keys: Faith and Church in Martin Luther	120
3.3	The Two Histories of Western Philosophy	126
3.4	The Fight against Self-Evidences: Dostoevskii, Pascal, and Spinoza	134
3.5	Philosophy's Revolt against Itself: Plotinus' Ecstasies	147
3.6	Audacities and Submissions: Shestov's Intellectual World	156
3.7	Shestov and the Russian Philosophers	162
Chapter IV Athens and Jerusalem: The Logic and The Thunder (1930–1938)		171
4.1	Introduction: Shestov as a “Jewish Philosopher”	171
4.2	The Bible and the Original Sin: In Dialogue with Martin Buber	180
4.3	The Last Encounter: Kierkegaard	185
4.4	Étienne Gilson and the Spirit of Medieval Philosophy	196
4.5	Philosophers in Chains: At the Sources of Metaphysics	200
Conclusion		207
1.	Reception and Legacy of Shestov's Philosophy	207
2.	The Question of Irrationalism and of “Antiphilosophy”	220
3.	The (Neo-)Platonic Paradigm: Shestov's “Third Sailing”	226
4.	Afterword: Reading between the Lines	239
Appendices		242
I.	Shestov and Husserl	243
II.	Shestov and Berdyaev	262
III.	Shestov and Fondane	280
Bibliography and Works Cited		289
A.	Shestov's Works	289
A.1	Books	290
A.2	Articles and Correspondence	294
B.	Selected Studies on Shestov	298
B.1	Biographies, Memoirs, Specific Journals, and Bibliographies	300
B.2	Books on Shestov	302
B.3	Articles and Book Chapters on Shestov	303
C.	Further References	314
Index		320

Acknowledgments

I was a young man when my father gifted me a book by an author whose name I had never heard before—Lev Shestov (the book was *In Job's Balance*, in Italian translation). “I thought you might appreciate it,” he said. My appreciation turned immediately into a desire to study Russian philosophy, learn the Russian language, and indeed to explore Shestov’s thought in depth. Suddenly, a whole Russian world I had not been aware of opened up to me—and Shestov was the key to this world. At the same time, I realized that despite the large number of translations of his works in foreign languages, full studies on him were considerably fewer and often incomplete. At that time, Shestov remained to all intents and purposes a mystery: up to the mid-1990s, for instance, his first work on Shakespeare had been read by only a few scholars and his prerevolutionary life in Russia was still largely unknown, especially outside the country. From that point on, I began my long and productive quest: my first trip to Saint Petersburg in the early 1990s to find materials in libraries; my studies at The Lev Shestov Archive at the Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne in Paris; and many conversations with scholars who versed me in the complex and variegated context of Russian religious philosophy (in particular, I remember with gratitude an email exchange with James Scanlan). This work is the result of my long research on Shestov and of a “journey” extending over nearly thirty years. I should thank many people for this, but I will narrow down the list to some essential names: first of all, my father Bachisio, to whose memory I dedicate this work. Then, Ettore Marino, for our decisive conversations during long walks in Florence more than twenty years ago; Daniele Vinci and Massimiliano Spano, for their constant support; Anna Maiorova, for her precious help and for her wonderful generosity; and last, but not quite least, Karen Turnbull who revised my English throughout this book and, as always, was attentive and careful in helping me with this. I would also like to thank Igor Nemirovsky, the director of Academic Studies Press, for believing in this project from

the very beginning, Irene Masing-Delic who always encouraged my studies, Kseniya Vorozhikhina and Sergei Polikin for their kindness and support, and the staff of the Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne in Paris for their kind help in my research in The Lev Shestov Archive.

Editorial Notes

With few exceptions, all the quotations throughout this book have been made from the original Russian texts. All the translations from Russian and French are mine. Since Shestov loved to quote texts in the original language (mostly from German, Latin, and Greek) further translations from these languages, which are also mine, were sometimes required. For reasons of convenience and accessibility for readers, I decided to refer to the French edition of Natal'ya Baranova's biography, while a smaller number of Shestovian texts have been quoted from the English translations made by Bernard Martin. Since the entire context of this book is set against the historical backdrop of emigration from Russia to Europe, the spelling of names may differ depending on the original language of the quoted book: for example, Shestov/Chestov, Baranova/Baranoff, Shlëtser/Schloezer, Zen'kovskii/Zenkovsky, and so forth. But, luckily, these situations are limited. For the transliteration of Russian language into the Latin script, I adopted the BGN/PCGN system, with the sole exception of names that are quoted from books that employed another system. For citations, I used the author-date system with some integration. Since the final bibliography is divided in three sections (A, B, C) and a number of subsections (A1, A2; B1, B2, B3), the quotation sequence will be the following: author (surname), year of the book/article (when needed), and section with subsection (e.g., B1) in which the author's surname must be looked up. In sections A1 and A2, Shestov's publications are listed in chronological order, for each a list number will precede the year of publication of the book (or article) that is indicated: for example, Shestov 8/1993 (A1) (in this case, one must consult the eighth entry on the list in section A1 and within that, among the various indicated editions or translations, the item published in 1993). I have faith this system will be intuitive enough to be easily followed: it has, in my view, the significant advantage of providing a final bibliography list that, since it is divided into thematic sections, is undoubtedly clearer and easier to consult than one single alphabetic list.

Introduction

One of the most eminent Russian historians of the arts, Dmitrii Likhachëv, once wrote that Russian painting is above all a painting of faces (see Likhachëv [C], 23). The same could perhaps be said about Russian philosophy as a philosophy that portrays the human soul: not mere objects of knowledge or “landscapes” of reason but living human problems. Shestov would fit such a definition perfectly. Many—if not all—of his writings concern “people”: they are works that indicate in their own titles the name of a personality (philosopher, writer, artist, intellectual). Shestov is primarily interested in *people* just as Russian painters were interested in *faces*. At the same time, he draws constant comparisons with the tradition of classic Western philosophy (Socrates, Plato, Plotinus, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, Pascal, Kant, Hegel, Spinoza, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Husserl) in a way that few other Russian philosophers do. In this regard, he is undoubtedly a philosopher. But he is also a deep scrutinizer of people, that is, of “philosophical souls” in the way just described.

Lev Shestov (Lev Isaakovich Shvartsman), a Russian born in Kiev into a Jewish family, is mostly known in the Western world as a religious existential philosopher and also as one of the first philosophical interpreters of Dostoevskii, offering a fundamentally tragic reading of the author’s late oeuvre. Following Vasilii Rozanov’s lead, he identified *Notes from the Underground* as the turning point of, and key to, Dostoevskii’s works. Although he always retained a clearly philosophical approach, at the beginning of his career Shestov worked as a literary critic in the circle of Russian artists and intellectuals that gravitated toward Sergei Dyagilev and his journal *Mir iskusstva* [The World of Art]. During those years (1901–1910), he wrote a number of essays on Tolstoi, Dostoevskii, Shakespeare, Turgenev, Chekhov, Sologub, Ibsen, and others. After leaving Russia in 1920 to escape the Bolshevik takeover and finally settling in France, Shestov’s interests increasingly turned away from moral philosophy and literature to focus on religion and theoretical philosophy instead. In the most

famous of the works he wrote in France between 1921 and 1938—*In Job's Balance*, *Kierkegaard and the Existential Philosophy*, and *Athens and Jerusalem*—he developed his predominant philosophical theme: the conflict between faith and reason. Using key notions such as “philosophy of tragedy” or “philosophy of the underground,” Shestov marks the impossibility of any reconciliation between reason and the tragedy of human existence. Nor could morality be considered a defense against the chaos of an existence ruled by absurdity. This impossibility of reconciling rationality with actuality represents the tragic nucleus of the philosopher’s thought, which was first presented in his second published book *The Good in the Teaching of Tolstoi and Nietzsche: Philosophy and Preaching* (1900) and continued to evolve with remarkable consistency throughout his career, with a significant shift towards religious themes in the latter part of his life. In this respect, the final two works he conceived *Athens and Jerusalem* and *Kierkegaard and the Existential Philosophy* can be considered as the summa and coherently conclusive point of that evolution.

This study aims to analyze Shestov’s philosophical work in all its individual parts, even the smaller and lesser-known articles and writings. There is a precise reason for this choice. The paradox as far as Shestov studies are concerned is that, although his works were translated into many languages and already appreciated throughout the world during his lifetime as well as after his death, there has been a much lower output of comprehensive studies on his thought. Shestov’s style is always very clear and understandable. It should come as no surprise that Dmitrii Mirskii describes his as “the tidiest, the most elegant [. . .] in short, the most classical prose in the whole of modern Russian literature” (Mirsky [C], 175). This is one of the reasons why he had such extensive editorial success. But it could also be a red herring, as behind such misleading clarity the reader may be tempted to fall into overly easy interpretations. In fact, when it comes to writing a study or commentary on Shestov or his works, that is, in the case of specific “Shestovian scholarship,” it too often seems impossible to escape a general discourse on wider dichotomies such as “reason vs. faith,” “Athens vs. Jerusalem,” “absolute vs. singularity,” “logic vs. absurdity.” After this “battle” of categories, the reader is left with only one possible Shestovian conclusion, that is, that reason is deceptive and life coincides with absurdity. In many cases, the scholarship on Shestov involves a considerable theoretical effort to push philosophy to its limits, which are the very limits of reason, and thus to face the end of philosophy itself. This is perfectly understandable, as Shestov himself offers such keys to interpreting his thought. On many occasions, he gives the impression of applying the same categories to every author he discusses. His readings on

the history of philosophy or on the history of literature appear anything but “unbiased.” Many commentators have observed this: Albert Camus described Shestov’s prose as “admirable monotony” (Camus 1991 [C], 23). Shestov’s lifelong friend, Berdyaev, famously defined him as “a person with a single idea” (Berdyaev 1992 [C], 249), which he applied systematically to each different author and problem. In conversations with his friend, the poet Benjamin Fondane, Shestov himself referred to having been accused of “Shestovizing” any author he commented on (cf. Fondane [B1], 87).

It is, in many ways, true and undeniable that Shestov is “monotonous” and that he has perhaps one fundamental idea recurring through all of his writings. It is also indisputable that his arguments lead to a constant dead end of rationality, as in reasoning against reason he produces a sense of absurdity. But Shestov is also considerably more than this. In order to understand what that “absurdity” really means, beyond the appearance of a merely impracticable solution, one must look in a different direction, as it were, to uncover what Shestov himself strives to hide. Some of his closer friends, such as Benjamin Fondane and Boris de Schloezer, warned readers about the “traps” in Shestov’s writings: nothing is exactly what it seems. Where all seems hopeless, there is hope; where the discourse does not appear objective, it is in fact objective. In introducing his thought, Paul Rostenne—one of the most influential French scholars of Shestov—once affirmed that “it is absolutely necessary to learn to read between the lines” of Shestov’s philosophy, even of his repetitions or his apparent historical unreliability (Rostenne 1964 [B3], 340). Shestov’s intuitions were relevant not at a first level of reading but, as he used to say, in a “second dimension of thought,” that is, at an end point where things and facts are already beyond our consideration. (cf. Shestov 10/2007 [A1], 360-365) Thus, he does not read Tolstoi or Nietzsche in their actual texts but scrutinizes them at their deepest levels and discovers their ultimate results. Where did Tolstoi’s, or Nietzsche’s, or Dostoevskii’s thought end up? What were their underlying assumptions? These were Shestov’s questions, the only issues he was interested in—not the tangible level, but the often invisible or hidden “beginnings” and “ends.” Not the facts in themselves, but their hindmost limits. I have reason to believe that, within this second and ultimate level, he came to many correct conclusions. Many of his intuitions were confirmed by history as they often came true: I am mostly thinking of Dostoevskii’s and Nietzsche’s tragic interpretations—which were highly fecund and appreciated in the twentieth century—but it would be interesting to also review his portraits of Plotinus, Kierkegaard, Tolstoi, Rozanov, Solov’ëv, Buber, V. Ivanov, Ibsen, and

many others in this light. Not to mention his ideas on Luther or St. Paul, or the possible development of a Jewish philosophy, as well as on the facts and revolutions of contemporary history. In this last case, his notorious detachment from historical facts or, as Dmitrii Mirskii would say, his well-rooted “common sense” (see Mirsky [C], 174), helped him to be more objective and stable than others in his, admittedly rare, consideration of politics and historical events. Shestov’s oeuvre is full of such little “jewels,” that is, small observations, details, and original quotations from the authors and people he describes. He was curious about the world around him, even or especially when he seemed uncaring of it. Each of his writings shows evidence of the same *osnovnaya ideya* [fundamental idea], as Berdyaev called it (Berdyaev 1938-39 [B3]), but it also conceals an original and often truthful vision of that specific author.

Shestov was certainly an atypical thinker. No wonder that, although he had considerable publishing success throughout the world and extensive influence especially in the philosophical tradition of Dostoevskii interpretations, he was not widely quoted within the early histories of Russian philosophy or the studies concerning the Russian religious renaissance. He was there—he was with Dyagilev, Benois, Merezhkovskii, Berdyaev, V. Ivanov, and the other protagonists of the “Renaissance”; he took part in meetings, groups, societies; he followed political and social events—but, at the same time, he was not “there.” If any particular tendency or spirit of the time caught on, he usually took the opposite direction. As an intellectual, he was always idiosyncratic—he had his own way of dealing with historical and philosophical issues and situations, as if he were always “beyond” them. He could talk about Plotinus or Spinoza, or Dostoevskii, but in his analyses, he always flew above them as if their thought might be applicable to any time and any historical space. This is probably what he meant with the expression he liked so much: “to wander through the souls” [*stranstvovat' po dusham*]. Somehow, he believed there was a universal intuition that each of those authors had grasped—in different ways, the same intuition. But at the same time, he was able to identify specific differences among those authors and he had a gift for the relevant theoretical core of any given problem.

For all these reasons, Shestov’s thought will be investigated in this work through all its individual explorations, giving importance to each of them. This study also intends to reveal Shestov from a number of less-considered aspects, including: an initial personal crisis; a defense of morality he sought to pursue at the beginning of his career; his first activity as a literary critic and his aesthetic thought; his relationship with the Russian philosophers; his political views; his studies on Greek philosophy; the experience of exile within the Russian émigré

community; the crucial role of Plotinus within his thought; his relationship with psychoanalysis; the shift towards a more religiously committed philosophy and a sort of return to Judaism; the heritage of his “only disciple” Fondane; the relevance of his meetings with Husserl; and finally the legacy of his thought in Europe.

Aside from its nature as an intellectual biography and an analysis of all of Shestov’s works, this book also advances two main theses: one is of a more historical nature and the other is essentially philosophical. The first concerns the fact that Shestov’s renown as a “lonely thinker” did not fully acknowledge the decisive influence he had on the development of a specifically tragic “Nietzschean-Dostoevskian conscience” within post-Solov’evian Russian religious philosophy and, later, within French and world existential philosophy. This idea is discussed in particular in chapters 1–3 as well as in the conclusion. The second thesis—which is dealt with in chapters 3 and 4, and in the concluding section—questions the idea that Shestov’s philosophy is ultimately directed towards building an irrational thought or rather a religious-fideistic thought. As I aim to demonstrate, Shestov still remains firmly within the boundaries of Western philosophy (probably more than other—apparently less irrational—Russian religious philosophers do), albeit at its very edge and in a constant questioning of that “edge,” just as the Neoplatonic tradition classically did from its beginnings. In this respect, he needs to rely upon those Western philosophers who can offer him the support for such a goal (i.e., remaining within a limit so as to question *that* limit). These philosophers are mainly Nietzsche, Pascal, Kierkegaard and, most significantly, Plotinus.¹ In a way—although a reversed and paradoxical one—Husserl also helps Shestov to define his quest for the ultimate limit of Western philosophy.² Such a quest—as is another implicit hypothesis of this book—lies within a wider paradigm of a “Russian (Neo-)Platonism” for which, at a certain point, the logos itself is called into question as an image of the true reality. Consequently, despite logos being the only “image,” that is, the only way at disposal to reach that reality, it

1 The other nonexplicitly philosophical authors he relies on in a positive way (mainly, Shakespeare, Dostoevskii, and Luther) are however read through very strong Nietzschean and Neoplatonic/Augustinian lenses, that is, either as moral rebels in search of the real truth (e.g., some of Shakespeare’s and Dostoevskii’s heroes) or as those who are skeptical towards the full power of logos (Luther).

2 As is shown in appendix 1 of this book, Shestov sees Husserl as both the highest peak of rational-scientific thought in modern times, and also the one who pointed out the ultimate borders of that same rationality.

is also an unreliable tool in the search for the same truth. It is from this contradiction (in many ways of a Plotinian derivation) of a logos that is at the same time necessary and deceitful, that the main core of Shestov's "philosophy of tragedy" originates.

The analysis of Shestov's thought will follow a chronological order, although some leaps are not excluded where necessary, and later works may be anticipated from time to time solely to offer a better understanding of the issue under consideration. There are also sections that are not intended as analyses of specific books or essays but are, as it were, more theoretical or intertextual. They aim, in fact, to explain some crucial passages of his thought or to give some deeper hints as to how to interpret it. Where necessary, biographical and historical information will be provided. There is a hidden line of development following the events of Shestov's life: for this reason, the book is divided into four main chapters corresponding to the four epochal changes in his life and thought, and it is split in accordance with the two main parts of his biography—the Russian years (1866–1920) and the French years (1921–1938).

Chapter one deals with the early period of Shestov's activity, including his first four books (*Shakespeare and His Critic Brandes*, 1898; *The Good in the Teaching of Tolstoi and Nietzsche: Philosophy and Preaching*, 1900; *Dostoevskii and Nietzsche: The Philosophy of Tragedy*, 1903; *The Apotheosis of Groundlessness [An Experiment in Adogmatic Thought]*, 1905) and the general development of a "philosophy of tragedy," mostly following and commenting on Shakespeare's, Nietzsche's, and Dostoevskii's works. In this phase, Shestov is rather a skeptical philosopher (although he refused such a label) and he is mainly interested in the philosophical opposition between morality and truth.

Chapter two considers the years (1901–1910) in which Shestov worked mainly on the philosophical interpretation of literary works with a number of articles on Merezhkovskii, Shakespeare, Chekhov, Sologub, Tolstoi, Dostoevskii, Ibsen, and an unpublished work on Turgenev. All these articles, except for the one on Turgenev, were eventually included in the two works *Beginnings and Endings* (1908) and *The Great Vigils* (1911). Through these essays Shestov was able to express his idea of art as a privileged place of truth—albeit a tragic truth, which eventually reveals its original bond with nothingness (see his article on Chekhov) but also the risk of taking the place of life itself (cf. his article on Ibsen).

Chapter three is concerned with a long transitional epoch of Shestov's life that started around 1911 and eventually ended up with his definitive exile from Russia (1920) and his early years in France. During this whole period,

he worked on a couple of projects that were published only after his death (a study on the history of Greek philosophy and a book on Luther), on a collection of articles that appeared in 1923 with the title *Potestas Clavium* [*The Power of Keys*], and on another collection of essays (*In Job's Balance: Peregrinations Through the Souls*, 1929) with some of his most famous readings of Dostoevskii, Plotinus, Pascal, Spinoza, and Tolstoi. In this part of his life, the discoveries of Luther, of some biblical themes, and of Greek philosophy are crucial to him in better defining his subsequent path.

In chapter four, finally, Shestov's last and more mature works are investigated (*Kierkegaard and the Existential Philosophy*, 1936; *Athens and Jerusalem*, 1938; and *Speculation and Revelation*, 1964). These works strongly reflect Shestov's more marked interest in the Bible and in Jewish thought as relevant philosophical sources, but also in the philosophy of Søren Kierkegaard. In this original synthesis of an uncompromising Jewish consciousness with some distinctively Christian "tragic" traits (deriving mainly from Luther, Pascal, and Kierkegaard) lies one of the most peculiar results of his religious philosophy.

A concluding chapter is dedicated to a brief analysis and discussion on the historical results of Shestov's philosophy both in Russia and abroad; but also to an evaluation of some possible interpretations of his thought in terms of irrationalism and of "antiphilosophy"; and to a personal examination of his "quest for the limit" within a general paradigm of a Russian Neoplatonism. Finally, the three appendices at the end of the book are aimed at describing the three intellectual relationships that held the most significance for Shestov, and thus involved his entire life and thought, or a good part of them. These are the cases of his relationships with Edmund Husserl, the "master," with Nikolai Berdyaev, the "friend," and with Benjamin Fondane, the "disciple."

At the end of the book, the reader will find a reasoned bibliography that considers works by and on Shestov in three languages: Russian, French, and English. The bibliography is divided into three main sections and further subsections, which include Shestov's books but also his articles and edited correspondence; studies on Shestov (divided into biographies, memoirs, specific journals, and bibliographies; monographs on Shestov; journal articles and book chapters dedicated to him); and further references.

Part One

Shestov in Russia

CHAPTER I

The Philosophy Of Tragedy (1898–1905)

1.1 Introduction: The Birth of a Tragic Conscience

Lev Shestov's thought originates in the domain of the tragic and is directed toward the tragic. This affirmation, which can be easily ascribed to one of the purest Nietzschean motifs, is unquestionably true for a thinker like Shestov, whose philosophy stems from the concept of tragedy but, most of all, remains in it as if it were in a repetitive, inward-turned, often convoluted but still consistent process of self-development. Shestov is a tragic thinker and he reads everything through the lens of tragedy. Unlike the labels of "existentialist," "irrationalist," "nihilist," or "fideist," which Shestov never willingly tolerated for himself, the category of "tragic" à la Nietzsche—which he borrowed from the German philosopher and developed throughout his life—seems to perfectly fit the inner nature of his entire oeuvre.¹ Some of his most important achievements—in

1 This category indicates, even more explicitly than the aforementioned definitions do, the "aporetic nature" of a belief, that is, the "active impossibility" of something—the logical disjunction (or paradox) of a theoretical structure or of a practical situation. Existentialism, irrationalism, or nihilism are normally, in their own way (be it positive or negative), feasible fields or active possibilities for the thought itself. Less frequently, they are intended as aporias or irresolvable self-contradictions, as a "tragic thought" is meant to be. Not by chance, the first article that Shestov's "faithful disciple" Benjamin Fondane dedicated to him, in 1929, put the emphasis on this definition: "Un philosophe tragique: Léon Chestov" (see Fondane 1929a [B3]). In this text, Fondane insists on the aspect of profound "impasse" and "bankruptcy" of the Shestovian thought, which, as he explains, is a different concept than mere irrationality (147–150).

many ways some of the most recognizable marks he left on Russian and world thought—lie precisely in his tragic interpretations of Dostoevskii, Nietzsche, Pascal, and Kierkegaard, as well as in his criticism of whoever and whatever did not recognize or deliberately ignored the truth of the tragic, whether in philosophy or in other fields.

Therefore, answering the question “What, for Shestov, is the tragic?” would probably mean answering Shestov’s most fundamental question—the one to which he devoted his whole life. Although the question of the term “tragedy” is explicitly posed only in the first chapter of this book in terms of Shestov’s initial quest for a “philosophy of tragedy” in his first four books (largely, but not exclusively, intended as a critique of morality), the subsequent years of his life would be no less concerned with the same problem. Shestov’s philosophical search would turn, in fact, to the quest for the tragic in art and literature (chapter two); in the personal lives and thought of the “souls” he was considering and interpreting at various times (chapter three); and, finally, in religious faith itself (chapter four), which to him is the pinnacle of tragedy. This is the development of his research as it is set out in this work, which closely follows the chronological events of his life and the publication of his works. The answer to the question of Shestov’s definition of tragic will thus be dispersed throughout this book, although there will be a special focus on it in the last and concluding section.

But when did all this start? When did Shestov begin to be a philosopher? As he stated more than once (cf. Shestov 11/1982 [A1], 271; Fondane [B1], 148), his “first teacher of philosophy” was Shakespeare. By saying this, he meant of course that reading Shakespeare’s tragedies raised in him some troubling questions and a deep crisis, in particular regarding the nature of morality. This happened, as we know from many sources,² around the mid-1890s, when Shestov was about thirty years old. In a rare and equally precious autobiographical note written in 1911 (Shestov 8/1911 [A2], 173–176), Shestov lists for the first time his earliest publications from those years, which appeared in the main literary journals of Kiev—although some of these works would

2 The first essential source is the biography of Lev Shestov, in two volumes, written by Shestov’s second daughter Natal’ya Baranova (Natal’ya L’vovna Baranova-Shestova [1900–1993]), which was published first in Russian (1983) and then was translated in French (see Baranoff-Chestov 1991, 1993 [B1]). Natal’ya Baranova also published a complete bibliography of Shestov’s works and a bibliography of studies on Shestov up to 1978 (see Baranoff-Chestov 1975 and 1978 [B1]).

remain virtually unknown up to present times.³ But even before those early essayistic writings on Shakespeare, on Solov'ëv, but also on jurisprudential and financial issues—which were marked by a certain attraction towards the biggest questions on morality, justice, and the defense of human rights⁴—there

- 3 “In 1895, I wrote some articles (it seems to me, three) concerning literary and philosophical topics. These articles were not big; at that time, I was living in Kiev and for this reason, of course, I tried to get them to the Kievan journals. At the time, in Kiev, there were three journals: ‘Kievlyanin,’ ‘Kievskoe slovo,’ and ‘Zhizn’ i iskusstvo’” (Shestov 8/1911 [A2], 173). The first article that Shestov mentioned was published in *Zhizn’ i iskusstvo*, with the title “Voprosy sovesti” [Questions of Conscience], while the second article “Georg Brandes o Gamlete” [Georg Brandes on Hamlet] appeared in *Kievskoe slovo*, and the third, “Zhurnal'noe obozrenie (O Vl. Solov'ëve)” [Journal Review (On Vl. Solov'ëv)], again in *Zhizn’ i iskusstvo* (see Shestov 1/1895, Shestov 2/1895, and Shestov 3/1896 [A2]). Shestov did not sign these articles with his own name, however, but with pseudonyms or initials. As he explains in a somewhat polemical tone, the pseudonyms were due to the substantial changes made by *Zhizn’ i iskusstvo* to his two articles, which eventually were not acknowledged as entirely his own (cf. Shestov 8/1911 [A2], 174). Also from 1896 is another text (Ms. 2110-1, file 91, The Lev Shestov Archive, Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, Paris) entitled “Idealizm i simvolizm ‘Severnogo vestnika’” [Idealism and Symbolism of the *Severnii vestnik*], which appeared in *Zhizn’ i iskusstvo* (see Shestov 4/1896 [A2]) and was republished in 1979 in *Russian Literature Triquarterly* (see Shestov 21/1979 [A2]), in which Shestov reviews numbers 11 and 12 (1895) and number 1 (1896) of the journal *Severnii vestnik*. Here, as Natal'ya Baranova also remarks, Shestov shows an “admiration for the people of the 1860s and for the positive preaching of Tolstoi” that he would later recant (Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 29). For a general analysis of this earliest production by Shestov, see in particular Vorozhikhina 2019 (B3) and Ermichëv (B3).
- 4 In a recent study (2019), Kseniya Vorozhikhina discovered a whole unknown essayistic output that Shestov produced between 1895 and 1900 for the Kievan journals *Zhizn’ i iskusstvo* and *Kievskoe slovo* (see Vorozhikhina 2019 [B3]). During this time, Shestov repeatedly collaborated with these journals and he was probably looking for a columnist position with them. The articles written and published within this lapse of time are seemingly much more numerous than the four mentioned by Shestov and by Natal'ya Baranova (see previous note). In her analyses of these texts, Kseniya Vorozhikhina points out their general populist character, which followed the main trend of *Zhizn’ i iskusstvo* in particular. They deal with various topics ranging from literary criticism to the defense of human rights in various forms (e.g., by supporting liberal reforms, such as the introduction of jury trials and softer forms of crime prevention), but they also deal with financial issues, in which he fought for a more equitable distribution of the tax burden. Shestov often discusses what the truest justice is and the difference between human and divine justice. According to Vorozhikhina, in these texts, “the future religious thinker appears to us from an unexpected perspective, that is, as a progressive populist and a literary critic, scourging decadents and symbolists, as a liberal-minded publicist and a lawyer, reflecting on possible ways to improve criminal law and the penitentiary system” (68). This humanitarian and even populist aspect of Shestov, which continues up to 1900, might seem strange considering the amoralistic and skeptical character of his writings starting precisely from 1900 onwards, in which he never tackled any of these subjects. As Vorozhikhina argues, their general tone and content reveal a

was “another” Shestov, with different interests and a different background. In this case, life and thought are intertwined and linked in a mutual and deeply significant bond.⁵

Shestov was born in Kiev, on February 12 (Old Style January 31) 1866, the first child of a large Jewish family (his real name was Yehuda Leib [Lev Isaakovich] Shvartsman). Unlike his father—a deeply committed Jewish observant who developed a shop into a huge textile manufacturing business—Shestov preferred the world of ideas and contemplation. At that time, like the most of his generation, Shestov was interested in politics and considered himself a revolutionary.⁶ In 1883, for political reasons, he had to quit his secondary studies in Kiev and move to Moscow. After he concluded his studies, he began university in Moscow first in Mathematics and then in Law, which he continued to study also in Berlin for a whole semester. After returning to Moscow, he still had problems with authorities and was obliged to return to Kiev where he concluded his degree in 1889—not without some difficulties, since his thesis was precluded from publication by tsarist censorship with the judgment that if it were issued “it would be the revolution” (Fondane [B1], 86).⁷ The

detachment from Marxism and an adherence to more general principles of nonviolence and of humanitarianism, for—as it seems—Shestov “did not pass from ‘Marxism to idealism,’ but from populism to religious philosophy” (60). There are over twenty of these articles, all signed with the initials “L. S.” or the pseudonym “Reader,” although not all of them can be definitively ascribed to Shestov. For a complete list of these works, see Vorozhikhina 2019 (B3).

- 5 In her remarkable monograph in French on Shestov (2010), Geneviève Piron dealt with his thought from exactly such a perspective: that is, through an “*approche génétique*” (as she defines it) of Shestov’s works, Piron managed to find a number of mutual connections between his texts and his life (also by means of a complete reading of his manuscripts and letters). In this way, proceeding as it were with a “*spiral direction*”—that is, not chronological, not thematic—this study pointed out Shestov’s “*subjective critique*” to the authors he commented on so as to finally display a sort of “*archaeology of experience*,” in Piron’s terms, which would reconstruct Shestov’s “*book of life*” (see Piron [B2]. On Shestov’s “*subjective critique*” see also Piron 2003 [B3]). In a different way but also with similar premises, Tat’yana Morozova’s 2007 work seeks to establish a direct relationship between Shestov’s life and thought: see Morozova (B2).
- 6 “I was a revolutionary from the age of 8, to the great despair of my father. I stopped being one much later, when the ‘scientific,’ Marxist socialism appeared” (Fondane [B1], 116). Shestov’s revolutionary attitude found expression mostly in his difficult relationship with paternal authority. “As a matter of fact,” Geneviève Piron writes, “the distinguishing element of Shestov’s biography is that his ‘radical’ phase seems to have been in his childhood rather than in his university years” (Piron [B2], 100).
- 7 The thesis’ title was probably “The Industrial Legislation in Russia,” while the article deriving from it that the censorship council of Moscow prevented from being published was

prohibited publication of his thesis did not prevent Shestov's inscription in the list of lawyers in St. Petersburg (cf. Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 22). In 1890, he attended military service and then began an internship as a lawyer in Moscow. However, he soon realized he was not interested in such a career. He therefore returned to Kiev where he started to work in the family firm although his real interest turned to writing a number of literary texts and tales with an autobiographical character. But once again, he understood that it was not his real aptitude.⁸ In his short autobiography, Shestov admits he unsuccessfully tried to get his literary works published but that even his friends seemed not to appreciate them (cf. Shestov 8/1911 [A2], 173). He had also a beautiful voice as a singer: singing was one of his most important passions and, as he once recalled, he missed out on a career as a singer because of an accident to his vocal chords.⁹ During this time (1890–1894), Shestov was mostly trying to steer away from paternal authority and from Jewish tradition: following a secret liaison with a Russian Orthodox girl who worked in his father's house, Anna Listopadova, a son, Sergei Listopadov, was born in 1892. As Natal'ya Baranova affirms, Shestov was always very attached to his boy and took care of him until his early death, in 1917, in the Great War (cf. Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 33). For this and many other reasons, the relationship with his father became more and more difficult: Shestov had to keep his life secret from him. Yet the troubling quest for his true vocation—in which he swung from anarchist to lawyer, from literary writer to singer, and that somehow explains why Shestov began his “philosophical activity” only at the age of thirty—was not the main issue of his youth.

Even though his family situation provided a wealthy and comfortable upbringing, his early life was not easy. From 1870 up to the assassination of

entitled “The Situation of the Working Class in Russia” (cf. Shestov 8/1911 [A2], 173, and Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 21–22). Shestov's dissertations and works from his time at university have been lost. But their subjects were clear: they dealt with the new industrial legislation and the extreme poverty of workers (cf. Fondane [B1], 86).

- 8 Speaking to Benjamin Fondane in 1935, Shestov recognized that his unpublished prose stories were, in the end, “just bad” (see Fondane [B1], 86). Nevertheless, Natal'ya Baranova largely uses them to reconstruct Shestov's early life because, she writes, “they are interesting as they undoubtedly contain some autobiographical element” (Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 24–27). These mostly unfinished early texts (103 paper sheets in total for ten different draft stories) are held at The Lev Shestov Archive, Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, Paris (Ms. 2110, files 102–111, possibly dated 1890–1896).
- 9 Cf., on this, Malakhieva-Mirovich 2011 (B1), 139; Gertsyk (B1), 101; and Baranoff-Chestov 1991 (B1), 27.

Emperor Aleksandr II in 1881, the political situation in Russia was very unstable and many anti-Jewish pogroms flared up. In Kiev, entire Jewish neighborhoods were plundered and Shestov's father's business was constantly at risk.¹⁰ Within this context, while still a young boy, Shestov was kidnapped, probably in 1878 and in uncertain circumstances,¹¹ by a clandestine political organization—an episode he never cared to comment on, as Natal'ya Baranova writes in the biography of her father (19).¹² Then at the age of twenty-nine a tragic event marked his life, decisively influencing also his interests and the subjects of his later writings. For years, the only mention of it was contained in a short and enigmatic passage he wrote in his 1920 publication *Journal of Thoughts*.¹³ Due to this fact, which even Natal'ya Baranova, in her biography, seems to ignore, he apparently suffered a nervous breakdown and was forced to move to Switzerland for some time to receive treatment.

-
- 10 In a commemorative article after Shestov's death in 1938, Sergei Bulgakov—who was also from Kiev—recalled the problems that Shestov's family had encountered because of the anti-Jewish pogroms, especially after 1905 (cf. S. Bulgakov, "Nekotorye cherty religioznogo mirovozzreniya L. I. Shestova," in Shchedrina 2016b [B2], 441). Shestov himself talks about the problem of the anti-Jewish pogroms in Russia in a letter of 1919 to Mikhail Gershenzon (see Shestov 24/1992 [A2], 103–104).
- 11 From a letter Shestov sent to Aleksei Remizov in 1906 (see Shestov 25/1992 [3] [A2], 171) and thanks to other solid documentation she provides, Geneviève Piron deduces a different date for the kidnapping (1881) than the one advanced by Natal'ya Baranova (1878). This would also change the entire context of this event, which for Piron should be ascribed to Shestov's general rebellion against his father, as well as to his adhesion to a revolutionary clandestine movement, since he basically "se fait kidnapper." See Piron's reconstruction of this event in Piron (B2), 99–100.
- 12 His father, perhaps interdicted by the government, did not pay the ransom for his liberation. However, Shestov was freed "safe and sound" after six months (Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 19). In reconstructing this time of Shestov's life, Natal'ya Baranova quotes testimonies by Shestov's brother-in-law German Lovtskii and by Stanley Grean (son of Shestov's cousin): cf. Baranoff-Chestov 1991 (B1), 17–27 and Lovtskii 1960-1961 (B1).
- 13 "В этом году исполняется двадцатипятилетие как 'распалась связь времен' или, вернее, исполнится—ранней осенью, в начале сентября. Записываю, чтобы не забыть: самые крупные события жизни—о них же никто, кроме тебя, ничего не знает—легко забываются." [This year is the twenty-fifth anniversary since "time went out of joint," or, to be more exact, it will be early this autumn, at the beginning of September. I am writing this down not to forget: the biggest events in life—those no one knows about except you—are easily forgettable] (Shestov 20/1976 [A2], 252). Further references to this fact can be found in the memoirs of Shestov's friend and admirer Evgeniya Gertsyk (Gertsyk [B1], 106), in Shestov's friend Varvara Malakhieva-Mirovich's diaries (Malakhieva-Mirovich 2011 [B1], 138–139; and 2016 [B1], 30, 100–101), and in Natal'ya Baranova's biography (Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 35–36). Shestov's friends Adol'f Lazarev and Sergei Bulgakov also mentioned this tragic event (cf. Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 36).

The mystery of Shestov's deep crisis, which to a large extent lies at the origin of his very desire to "search for the truth" in a philosophical way, has been partly clarified only in recent times thanks to the publication of Varvara Malakhieva-Mirovich's diaries (cf. Malakhieva-Mirovich 2011 and 2016 [B1]), which also shed a new light on a number of letters that Varvara and Shestov exchanged around those years: 1895–1896.¹⁴ Varvara Malakhieva-Mirovich (1869–1954) was a young girl from Kiev who, at the beginning, worked as a governess at the house of Daniil Balakhovskii and his wife Sofiya—Shestov's sister. At that time, around 1894–1895, she met Shestov and the two started an intense friendship and a relationship that was interrupted by Varvara's incapacity to make a final decision between Lev and another of her former loves. At that point, Shestov made a proposal to Varvara's sister, Anastasiya, who had also manifested her love to him as he probably, as Varvara writes, "felt a sense of fault towards her as if it were towards a girl to whom he gave false hopes with his excessively tender and careful behavior" (Malakhieva-Mirovich 2016 [B1], 100–101).¹⁵ But at this point, Shestov's parents opposed the marriage because Anastasiya was not Jewish.¹⁶ Anastasiya, a very sensitive and already mentally

14 Cf. Ms. 2111–1, files 42–46, The Lev Shestov Archive, Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, Paris. By reading only the remaining correspondence between Shestov and Varvara Malakhieva-Mirovich, the exact nature of Shestov's crisis would not have been made entirely clear. This would explain why Natal'ya Baranova, who had access to the correspondence but not to Varvara's diaries, was evasive or incomplete about this point of Shestov's life and also about his relationship with Varvara (see Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 31–32, 36). The fact that Shestov kept the reason for his crisis secret from even his closest friends is also demonstrated by an article Boris de Schloezer wrote in his memory, immediately after his death, in which Schloezer (who was unquestionably one of Shestov's most intimate friends) appeared to be clearly and sincerely unaware of the nature of this crisis although he sensed that something must have happened in Shestov's early life that marked all his subsequent reflection (cf. Boris Schloezer [Shlëtser], "Pamyati L. I. Shestova" 1939a [B3], in Shchedrina 2016b [B2], 438).

15 Varvara recounts that there was an evident conflict going on between herself and her sister Anastasiya about Shestov, but she (Varvara) was not yet ready to accept Shestov's proposal (Malakhieva-Mirovich 2016 [B1], 101). From Shestov's correspondence and from the testimonies of those who were close to him—it has to be said—it becomes clear that he did want to marry Anastasiya (see Ms. 2111/1, file 68; letter dated April 13, 1896). Interestingly, the two sisters adopted as a pseudonym—following their family name Malakhiev—the second name, "Mirovich," the latter being a sort of "literary alter ego" of Shestov, that is, a character—perhaps the most significant—of one of his unpublished autobiographical stories from early 1890s. This would prove Shestov's importance for the two and his charismatic presence in their lives.

16 This, actually crucial, point of Shestov's life is dealt with more deeply in Piron's analysis of Shestov's early correspondence with his father and mother than in Baranova's biography (see Piron [B2], 187–195). Shestov begged his parents to accept Anastasiya and he also pro-

fragile girl, experienced a terrible shock from this and she was committed to a psychiatric hospital, with a diagnosis of mental illness, and remained there until her death eighteen years later.¹⁷ As a consequence of Anastasiya's illness, Shestov also had a nervous breakdown, and he left Russia in March 1896 to seek treatment abroad. He first went to Vienna, then to Germany (where he stayed mostly in Berlin to be treated for his sickness), to Paris and later, in 1897, to Rome, Italy, where he met a Russian Orthodox girl, a student of medicine, Anna Eleazarovna Berezovskaya (1870–1962), whom he married probably in February 1897, keeping it secret from his parents.¹⁸ At the beginning of 1898, after the birth of their first daughter, Tat'yana, they moved to Berne, in Switzerland, where Anna resumed her studies and Shestov worked on his second book on Tolstoi and Nietzsche. In the early months of 1899, he went back to Russia, as a guest of his sister Fanya and her husband German Lovtskii in Saint Petersburg.

This episode concerning Shestov's relationship with the two sisters, along with his sickness, was kept secret even from his closest friends and relatives, since there is no full trace of it other than in Varvara's writings. In her memoirs, Evgeniya Gertsyk—another friend and admirer of Shestov who knew him very well—is not able to fully explain this crisis of his. The same can be said for his siblings and friends. After he left for Europe, Shestov carried on writing letters to Varvara, although mostly on professional and intellectual topics. In subsequent years, he helped her to find a job as an editor of the literary section of

vided medical arguments, both for him and for her, in support of his request. Nonetheless, they continued to resolutely oppose the marriage. Among the letters from Shestov Archive, see in particular: Ms. 2111/1, files 67-68-69, 73–74 (letters dated 1896).

- 17 All these facts are described in detail in Varvara Malakhieva's diaries (originally, 180 notebooks written from 1930 to 1954): see Malakhieva-Mirovich 2011 and 2016 (B1). The manuscripts of the diaries were discovered at the house of Dmitrii Shakhovskoi, Varvara's godson. On this dramatic episode of Shestov's life, see also Ramona Fotiade's biography: Fotiade (B1), 27–31. Shestov's name is a constant presence in Varvara Malakhieva's writings, which sometimes reveal private and unknown details about him. Varvara's style, however, is always very emphatic and poetic so to make it difficult to separate her Romanticism from the facts she tells. She herself was described by Evgeniya Gertsyk, who met her at Shestov's in Moscow, as "a girl full of tragedy" (Gertsyk [B1], 103). For an analysis of Varvara Malakhieva-Mirovich's thought and works, see Vorozhikhina (C). On her biography, see Tat'yana Neshumova's essay "Zhizn' Varvary Grigor'evny Malakhievoi-Mirovich" in Malakhieva-Mirovich (C), 434–481.
- 18 Natal'ya Baranova explains this secrecy by the fact that Anna came from an Orthodox family and this was unacceptable to his father (see Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 37). She also says that the two had to live separate for many years in order to avoid giving Shestov's father such sorrow. The same thing is confirmed by Evgeniya Gertsyk (Gertsyk [B1], 105).

the St. Petersburg's journal *Russkaya mysl'* and he generally acted as a sort of cultural mentor to her. Having begun her career in publishing in this way, years later, in 1910, it was her turn to help Shestov to fulfill one of his dreams, that is, to meet Lev Tolstoi in person. The period between 1895 and 1897, marked by his nervous breakdown and his travels to Switzerland and Italy, represented for Shestov his personal "tragic turn," along with his interest in Shakespeare and the "discovery" of Nietzsche, which happened precisely on that occasion. The Shestov we know, the inner tragic dimension of his thought, was born in this moment. He read Shakespeare and Dostoevskii from a "Nietzschean point of view" to find a solution to his crisis. At the same time, he found a new start for his life, with his marriage and his two daughters, Tat'yana and Natal'ya, born in 1897 and 1900.

Throughout his youth and early adulthood, Shestov developed an inner sense of tragedy. He felt deeply the fallacy of ideals and disenchantment of time: in fact, he borrowed Shakespeare's words "The time is out of joint" as his lifelong motto, as if something were irreparably broken within the laws of nature and morality, and nobody could ever fix it. From then on, the only problem for Shestov would be how to deal with this irreversible and unsolvable fact. No easy solutions could be accepted. The "absolute tragedy" was his definitive arrival point. But however despairing and convoluted he may have been with his "theory," Shestov was entirely different with his relationships in daily life. As most people who knew him testified, he was overall a very generous and warm-hearted man.¹⁹ His friend Evgeniya Gertsyk writes that

there was not a shade of a pose or of moralization in his attitude to people close to him (which, for those years, was extraordinary); only kindness and professional care. He helped get someone out of prison and send them to study to Germany [. . .]. He found an editor for a writer in need of one, when he himself was unknown; he helped out another one with money, he helped to sort out family dramas. (Gertsyk [B1], 103)

"It was impossible not to love him," Sergei Bulgakov says, "this is probably due to an amazing gift of his heart, its charming kindness and benevolence [. . .] and the absence of personal competition (which is so rare in our literary

19 "Throughout his entire life, he helped his friends: some financially, some by helping them out of a difficult situation, and some others by interceding for them" (Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 32).

world).” At the same time, Bulgakov adds, “it was strange to think that a restless heart, a soul that had not found its last limit, was hidden under this cover” (Bulgakov [B3] in Shchedrina 2016b [B2], 441). Shestov lived his whole life with these two parallel dimensions, concreteness, warmth, and care for people in his actions, on the one hand, and an extreme tragic tension within his soul, on the other.

1.2 Shestov before Shestov: Shakespeare and Pushkin

1. For nearly a century, and until recently, Lev Shestov’s first published book remained virtually unknown, not only to general readers of Russian philosophy but—given its very limited availability—even to scholars.²⁰ The author himself hardly ever mentioned this first publication in his subsequent works, and many other “clues” intimate that he may have regretted publishing his maiden work. For these reasons, this first book by Shestov was always wrapped in an aura of mystery.

Shakespeare and His Critic Brandes [*Shekspir i ego kritik Brandes*] was published in 1898 (probably in December) with the publisher Mendelevich in St. Petersburg,²¹ in a limited number of copies at the author’s own expense, under the pseudonym “Lev Shestov,” which he would continue to use for all his subsequent publications.²² The author’s youngest daughter and his first biographer, Natal’ya Baranova-Shestova, writes that the book “did not attract much attention from contemporary critics” (Baranoff-Chestov 1991 [B1], 43)—a few reviews appeared in the years immediately after the book was published, but apparently later it was forgotten.²³ Shestov himself, in a short autobiographical

20 A first critical edition appeared only in 1996, in Tomsk (see Lev I. Shestov. *Sochineniya v dvukh tomakh*. Tom I [Tomsk: Izdatel'stvo “Vodolei,” 1996], 3–212).

21 When quoting from this book I used a reprinted edition included in a collection of Shestov’s works: Shestov 1/2000 (A1), 7–206. All the translations from Russian and from French, here and in the rest of the book, are mine.

22 On the curious and nearly cabalistic reasons for the choice of this pen name—largely connected to a need for independence from and a rebellion against his father—see the explanation given by his friend Aaron Shteinberg (Shteinberg 1991 [B1], 256–258), which coincides with the one given by another of Shestov’s good friends, the writer Aleksei Remizov (Remizov [B1], 220, 561). Cf. also Ramona Fotiade’s introduction to Chestov 34/2015 (A2), 22–23.

23 Some of these reviews (by Yu. I. Aikhenval’d, R. Gebgard, Z. A. Vengerova, and N. K. Mikhailovskii) have been recently reprinted in Tat’yana Shchedrina’s *L. I. Shestov: Pro et contra* (Shchedrina 2016b [B2], 17–35). The general tone of the first two reviews, with regard to Shestov’s work, is not enthusiastic as they raise objections to many points in Shestov’s argumentation, especially from a strictly literary aspect. But the third and fourth