

ТМ	Г. XXXI	Бр. 3	Стр. 597 - 619	Ниш	јул - септембар	2007.
----	---------	-------	----------------	-----	-----------------	-------

UDK 101.1 (470) (091)

Прегледни научни рад

Примљено: 12.04.2007.

Dmitry A. Olshansky

St. Petersburg (Russia)

HISTORY OF RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY AS AN EVENT OF TRUTH

Summary

Russian philosophy as an independent and unaided tradition emerged at the beginning of the 20th century. The 19th century marked the golden age of Russian literature and critical tradition, and the basis of further development of ethical and aesthetic researches were formed the writers.

It seems that Russian writers were deeper and more original thinkers than all of the university professors of metaphysics at the time. Philosophy in Russia was not an academic science: it was originally created mainly by critics, publicists and writers, and not by naturalists, technician and scientists. Philosophical departments at the universities were too unstable: sometimes they were forbidden and were opened for some terms.

Philosophical books in Russia, for the most part, were written for the educated people and not for the experts in metaphysics. Contrary to European metaphysics, where aesthetics was secondary in relation to ontology and epistemology, the last discipline in total intellectual systems (like in Hegel) or rather supplementary philosophical discipline, aesthetic outlook was the beginning of philosophy in Russia. And it stays to be the basic and central philosophical discipline in Russia during the XX-th century also. Philosophy in Russia was a practice, even when it seems to be mystical one, it was always not only a theory and world-outlook, but world-practice. Although American pragmatism were never recognized in Russia, pragmatic orientation of Russian philosophy is one of the main its features. It could be explained by an influence of Karl Marx, whose ideas were very popular both in Russian Empire and in Soviet Union.

Key Words: Russian Philosophy, Event, Dialogism, Bakhtin, Kojève

Il a seulement raconté l'événement.
Jacques Lacan. Ecrits I. Paris: Seuil, 1999. P. 254

olshansky@hotmail.com

In the Origin was a Translation

It is hard both to trace the birth of an original tradition and to point out when and where philosophy begins. As we know from contemporary phenomenology, *in the beginning was a translation*; it is possible to apply this thesis to the history of philosophy and conclude that any original tradition takes form as the result of borrowing and develops as a dialogue with foreign ways of philosophizing and other discourses (theology, literature and science). Both in European and Chinese and Indian philosophy we can find theological periods, when transcendental problems and religious discourse were the common modes of thought. In such a way, although Homer and Hesiod were poets, they were also involved in theological discourses of writing. We can find in Homer many thoughts that would later reappear in pre-Socratic philosophy, but his own way of thinking was poetical rather than philosophical. On the other hand, we can also remember a period when scientific discourse dominated philosophy. Karl Marx remarked that the philosophy of an earlier time had been a servant of theology, whereas the philosophy of his own time was a servant of science. The philosophers followed both the results of scientific experience and the effort to describe the world in objective terms. There many atavistic attempts to make philosophy more theological, more literary, and more scientific; fortunately, philosophy as a discipline was able to create its own discourse. Therefore philosophy is able to interact with other discourses and create such subfields as philosophy of religion, philosophy of literature and philosophy of science. Russian philosophy was no exception.

Russian philosophy as an independent and unaided tradition emerged at the beginning of the 20th century. Before that time it reiterated a foreign, particularly European tradition and was not original; always there were many secondary influences such as Kantianism, Hegelianism, Nietzscheanism and so on. The pre-philosophical epoch in Russia can be divided into three periods.¹ First came the theological period (9th-17th centuries), which copied Byzantine religious thought. Many Greek orthodox authors (such as Maxim the Confessor and Gregory Palama) were recognized and respected in Russia. During the second period (the late 17th and 18th centuries) the main philosophical principles had to do with political and social studies. Under Peter the Great and his disciples, ideas by thinkers like Hobbes and the more liberal Locke were borrowed by Russian social thinkers, and the ethics of d'Holbach and Rousseau were adapted to Russian reality. The complexity of such doctrines, however,

¹ For another periodisation see: [1] Compleson F.C. *Philosophy in Russia*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986; [2] *Reading in Russian Philosophical Thought*. Ed. by L.J. Shein. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.

was pruned back somewhat. In the third pre-philosophic period (the late 18th and 19th centuries) literary critique served as the cradle of Russian thought. The 19th century marked the golden age of Russian literature and critical tradition, and the basis of further development of ethical and aesthetic researches were formed by the poems and tales of Alexander Pushkin, the stories of Nikolay Gogol and Ivan Turgenev, the novels of Fyodor Dostoevsky and Lev Tolstoy, and the dramas of Nikolay Ostrovsky and Anton Chekhov. It seems that Russian writers were deeper and more original thinkers than all of the university professors of metaphysics at the time. Literary discourse was preferable for Russian thinkers, both in the 20th century and now: Vladimir Solovyov was a poet as well as a professional philosopher. Dmitry Merezhkovsky and Mark Aldanov use the genre of fiction to express their philosophical ideas. Boris Pasternak, educated as a philosopher at the University of Marburg in Germany, retains a philosophical outlook in his poems and novels.

Such history of development defines the peculiarities of Russian philosophy. (1) In spite of wide borrowings from Western Europe, *philosophy in Russia was not an academic science*: it was originally created mainly by critics, publicists and writers, and not by naturalists, technician and scientists like August Comte and John Stuart Mill. The key philosophical ideas in Russia have appeared on the margins of literary investigations not only in XIX-th century (in Vissarion Belinsky, Alexander Herzen and Nikolay Chernishevsky), but also in M. Bakhtin's world-famous book on F. Dostoevsky (1929)² and his Ph.D. thesis on François Rabelais (1941)³, R. Jakobson's articles and books on Russian poets (1920s-1980s)⁴, Yu. Lotman's on Pushkin and Gogol (1992)⁵, M. Mamardashvili's lectures on Marcel Proust (of 1980s)⁶, L. Shestov's monographs on Shakespeare (1898)⁷ and I. Turgenev (1938)⁸ and comparative researches on L. Tolstoy and F. Nietzsche (1900)⁹ and on Dostoevsky and

² Bakhtin M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

³ Bakhtin M. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. by Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968, 1984.

⁴ Jakobson R., *Selected Writings*, in 6 volumes. Ed. by Stephen Rudy. The Hague, Paris, Mouton, 1962 – 1985.

⁵ Lotman Yu. M. *Selected Articles in 3 volumes*. Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1992 – 1993 (Russian only).

⁶ Mamardashvili M., *Lectures on Proust. Psychological Topology of the Path*. Moscow, 1995 (Russian only).

⁷ Shestov L., *Shakespeare and His Critic Brandes*. St. Petersburg, 1898, 1911 (Russian only).

⁸ Shestov L., *Turgenev*. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1982.

⁹ Shestov L., *The Good in the Teaching of Tolstoy and Nietzsche*. St. Petersburg, 1900, 1923; French version: Chestov L. *L'idée du bien chez Tolstoi et Nietzsche*:

Nietzsche (1903)¹⁰. Not mention of works of Russian revolutionaries from the Decabrists (I. Kireevsky, M. Lunin, N. Muravyov, I. Yakushin) to the Populists (P. Lavrov and P. Tkachyov), who could unexpectedly combine anti-government propaganda with pedagogical orientation and aesthetic ideas.

(2) Thirdly an enlightenment in Russia endured till the year 1920 (Lenin's state program of liquidation of illiteracy seems to continue the enlightenment project).¹¹ The social thinkers therefore both in XIX-th century and in XX-th tried to write for general readers, no academic book (like Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, which was translated only in 1907 by Nikolay Lossky or Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, which was translated in 1928 by Gustav Schpet)¹² was called for. Eventually, philosophical departments at the universities were too unstable: sometimes they were forbidden and were opened for some terms. *Philosophical books in Russia, for the most part, were written for the educated people and not for the experts in metaphysics*. Dostoevsky's words, "all real Russian people are philosophers", seems to be literary hyperbola, but it engraves an intention popularize and to find a public welfare in philosophical theories. Russian philosophy has never been an academic discipline, therefore it is difficult to separate Russian philosophy from the other humanitarians: historians, linguists, anthropologists and psychoanalysts. Russian philosophers became famous not by writing imposing volumes, dissertations and scientific treatise, but by their social and literary publications, lectures and dialogues. In such a way Vassily Rosanov failed with his first (and sole) academic book on theory of cognition; very little of the printing has been sold. After that he retired from scientific studies and became a philosopher of literature. Now he is known as an essayist and author of original style of philosophizing.¹³ Paul Florensky turned from mathematics and chemistry to visual studies of church art and wrote world famous book on icon and create the theory of inverse perspective in painting.

(3) Contrary to European metaphysics, where aesthetics was secondary in relation to ontology and epistemology, the last discipline in to-

Philosophie et prédication. Trad. T. Beresovski-Chestov et George Bataille. Paris: Editions du siècle, 1925.

¹⁰ Shestov L., *Dostoevsky and Nietzsche: Philosophy of Tragedy*. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1969.

¹¹ On enlightenment project in Russia see: Walicki A. *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

¹² A lot of Russian intellectuals educated the universities in Germany, Austria and Switzerland, they speak German fluently, therefore could read Kant and Hegel in original. Translations were not need for many years.

¹³ On Rosanov's ontribution to philosophy see: Poggioly R. *Rosanov*. London: Penguin Books, 1970.

tal intellectual systems (like in Hegel) or rather supplementary philosophical discipline, *aesthetic outlook was the beginning of philosophy in Russia*. And it stays to be the basic and central philosophical discipline in Russia during the XX-th century also; therefore we can trace the development of Russian philosophy from P. Florensky's *Iconostas* (1922), M. Bakhtin's works of 1920s: *Questions of Literature and Aesthetics*¹⁴ and *Aesthetic of Verbal Creativity*¹⁵, Alexey Losev's *History of Ancient Aesthetics* (of 1920s, published 1963 – 1994 in 10 volumes) and *The Aesthetics of Renaissance* (Moscow, 1978) to Vladimir Bibikhin's *The Language of Philosophy* (Moscow, 2002) and *The Other beginning* (Moscow, 2003).

Even Edmund Husserl's direct disciple and original representative of phenomenological discourse in philosophy G. Schpet devoted to this theme one of his main book, *Aesthetic fragments* (1923), where he argues his method of philosophical hermeneutics.¹⁶

For Bakhtin literature does not only author's imagine and represent his own fantasies, but is the dimension of aesthetic activity both of author and his hero.¹⁷ Even arts are not an imitation of reality or creation of ideas, but an act of aesthetic evaluation of the world, i.e. both changing of the I-Other relations and reconstruction of the self. The author also changes in an act of creation. Therefore an aesthetic was not a secondary philosophizing, but primary activity of every act in creating.

(5) Philosophy in Russia was a practice, even when it seems to be mystical one, it was always not only a theory and world-outlook [*Weltanschauung*], but world-practice. Although American pragmatism were never recognized in Russia, *pragmatic orientation of Russian philosophy is one of the main its features*. It could be explained by an influence of Karl Marx, whose ideas were very popular both in Russian Empire¹⁸ and in Soviet Union. His last Thesis on Feuerbach "philosophers has only interpreted the world in various ways – the point is to change it" was perceived not only by the revolutionary, but quite conservative thinkers ("le-

¹⁴ First published in 1975 and translated into English as *The Dialogical Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. by Michael Holquist, Trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

¹⁵ First published in 1979 and translated into English as *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Ed. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Trans. by Vern McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.

¹⁶ See also a chapter "Problems in Contemporary Aesthetics" in: Schpet G. *An Introduction to Ethnic Psychology*. Moscow, 1927 (Russian only).

¹⁷ Bakhtin M. *Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity*. / Bakhtin M. *Art and Answerability: Earlier Philosophical Essays*. Ed. by Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Trans. by Vadim Liapunov and K. Brostrom. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990. P. 4 – 256.

¹⁸ On Marxists ideas in Russian Empire see: Haimson L. *The Russian Marxists and the Early Russian Liberalism*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.

gal Marxists"), who also share Marx's intention to make philosophy to change social structure. Philosophy should not go after the social life – like owl of Minerva that flies only after noon, in the evening – but it should to be an avant-garde of social changes. Shestov considers philosophy to begin at the extreme confines of life, to philosophize, for Shestov, means to overcome an impossibility of the Being. Therefore the overcoming of death, eternity and the trivial round are one of the main his themes. In *Speculation and Apocalypse* Shestov writes: "This would truly be the summit of human audacity, this would truly be a "mutiny," a "revolt" of the single human personality against the eternal laws of the all-unity of being!" Philosophy should strive against common categories, conventionalism and rationalism of cognition; therefore he chose the truth rather than knowledge. We can also trace the same pragmatic orientation in phenomenological tradition from Bakhtin's *Toward a Philosophy of Act* (1986) to Bibikhin's *The World* (1995) and *Word and Event* (2001). Philosophy for Bakhtin is not just an asided theorizing, but is an act in the being, that established on the responsibility to the other and that could change the reality. Therefore he describes a reality as an Event-of-Being (*So-Bitie*).¹⁹

According to Bakhtin, philosophical could make a "live event" of a truth: Socrates "knew how to drag the going truths out into the light of day".²⁰ In his dialogues Socrates looks not for the knowledge, but for the truth, which – in Freudian manner – involve the subject's desire to learn. Philosophical event of Socrates consists in facing the subject with his unknown and looking for his desire for a meaning. Meaning is not an information that one could put in a pocket and use it in the case of emergency; it looks to be rather pickpocket, that is both unexpected, sudden and reject any previous positive knowledge, and make new paradigm of existence. This turn of the paradigm (saying in Kuhn's terms) is a philosophical act as it is. Meaning appears only in a dialogue with another body. Philosophy therefore is an interaction between the bodies of human, bodies of discourses, bodies of epochs and bodies of cultures. One of the connoisseurs and most exact translators of Bakhtin, Michel Holquist argues: "Dialogism argues that all meaning is relative in the sense that it comes about only as a result of the relation between two bodies occupying simultaneous but different space, where bodies may be thought of as ranging from the immediate of our physical bodies".²¹ Dialogue is

¹⁹ Bakhtin M. *Towards a Philosophy of the Act*. Ed. by Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Trans. by Vadim Liapunov. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993. P. 42.

²⁰ Bakhtin M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. P. 111.

²¹ Holquist M. *Dialogism. Bakhtin and His World. New Accents*. London: Routledge, 1990. P. 20-21.

not just a conversation between two people, but an inter-action in being that based on comprehension and responsibility to the other. Although Bakhtin himself was not a religious thinker, of course, but meanwhile he agreed that "the real object of study is the interrelationship and interaction of 'spirits'".²² In such a way, dialogue is the fundament of human being: to be means to be recognized in a dialogue with the other, concludes he in his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*.

Literature as a Body of the Truth

Existential writing was a point of departure both for religious philosophy and phenomenological investigations in Russia. Romantic idea that literature is the very body of the truth, while university philosophy just a schematic model of it was very closed to Russian thinkers. To be a philosopher one should to look for the truth out of syllogisms and categories, but in human life, like in classical Russian literature. According to Italo Calvino, a literature verbalizes the truth not through direct terms, but in the very language, form of writing; therefore every writer is an implicit philosopher also. Of course, neither Dostoevsky nor Tolstoy themselves were the philosophers, but the investigation of their ethical and aesthetic ideas has been a prolific source for philosophical writing in XX-th century. This shows that we could not find only one origin of philosophical discourse, because – Freudian logic is helpful here – we can learn about the origin only *post factum* or in a deferred actions [*Nachträglichkeit*]; we can find a primary text only after reading secondary ones, i.e. philosophy is always a comment on the texts of science, literature, and theology, it is a meditation on any positive knowledge, but it produces none knowledge, but desire for the truth. Philosophy, according to a Greek base, is not a wisdom, but a "love to a wisdom": a philosopher should keep the distance to a wisdom, he should not be wise himself, Socrates believed, but in a dialogue with the other should assist in the birth of the truth. In such a Socratic way Shestov forewarned the philosopher against the knowledge, and seduction of being an experts and goes back to totalitarian scientific discourse (or the discourse of the University²³).

Russian authors are known to be precursors of existentialism, because – although they ask many philosophical questions – have less interest to what does it means to be, but how to be the man, how to keeps

²² Bakhtin M. From Notes Made in 1970-71. / Bakhtin M. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Ed. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Trans. by Vern McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. P. 144.

²³ Lacan consider the discourse of the University derives from the discourse of the Master: Lacan J. *Le séminaire, Livre XVII: L'envers de la psychanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1991. P. 237.

the human's dignity (from A. Pushkin). They interested in the very singularity of human's being rather than in history and social ideology. *War and Peace* by Tolstoy was the first novel of "bourgeois realism" as Bakhtin called it; but the theme of singular man was the main for majority of Russian men of letters from N. Gogol to A. Chekhov. Dostoevsky said that all Russian writers (and he himself) have "goes from Gogol's *Raincoat*", the first and program tale about loneliness of human existence in Russian literature.

For these reasons philosophy in Russia has had special interests: in ethics and religious ideas (post-Solovyov's tradition), aesthetics and art critique (A. Losev and M. Bakhtin), visual studies and cinema critique (P. Florensky, V. Shklovsky and Y. Lotman), and in social philosophy (Russian Marxism). Unfortunately there were none Russian followers of original hermeneutics G. Schpet and world-famous phenomenologist Alexander Kojève, who was a teacher of Louis Althusser, Geogre Bataille, Jacques Lacan, and Jean-Paul Sartre. In Russian philosophy there was little interest in ontology, the theory of mind, and the theory of knowledge.

The heir of Russian classical literature and the most expansive philosophical movement at the beginning of XX-th century was *existential utopism* that combines quite different Dostoevsky's, Marx's, Nietzsche's²⁴ and Orthodox ideas.²⁵ Existential utopism was the ideology of the so-called Solovyov's circle. The circle promote the title from Solovyov's main article *Russian idea*, where he proposed an idea to found a global Orthodox empire and create a new mankind of spiritual perfection; but unlike Marx's one, his own project was just a declaration and it was too unreal to be realized ever; and unlike Nietzsche's *Übermensch*, Solovyov's one was not metaphor and looks to be radical moral and religious doctrine. Of course, not all of his disciples share this utopian project, but really a lot of Russian thinkers of that period were Solovyov's followers and venerators: Nikolay Berdyaev, Sergey Bulgakhov, Semen Frank, Nikolay Lossky, Nikolay Fyodorov, Pavel Florensky. All of them were interested in theological ideas rather than in philosophical ones; all the social, ethical and epistemological problems they resolve from the religious point of view; "God-human relation" were the central in all their doctrines. S. Bulgakhov and P. Florensky became priests and received recognition with their *Sophiology* (theory of Saint Sophia); they deny an idea of the Trinity and consider the God have not three, but four faces:

²⁴ On development of Nietzsche's ideas in Russia see: *Nietzsche in Russia*. Ed. by B.G. Rosenthal. London: Princeton University Press, 1986.

²⁵ On crossing between religious and existential thought in the beginning of XX-th century see: [1] Compleson, F.C. *Russian Religious Philosophy*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988; [2] Kline, G. *Religious and Anti-religious Thought in Russia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Father, Son, Saint Spirit and Saint Wisdom (from Greek *Sophia*).²⁶ Key topics of N. Berdyaev's and N. Lossky's investigations were "celestial creativity", "mystical intuition" and "spirituality of Russian soul". N. Fyodorov's philosophy of "public affair" was most closed to Solovyov's existential utopism and develops an idea "resurrection of the dead" and "eternal salvation of the soul". All these themes of theodiceia (an acquittal of the God) and eschatology were rather in the thought mode of the Middle Ages, than at the rise of phenomenology. Therefore Nikolay Zernov calls that period as a "religious renaissance"²⁷, renaissance of medieval metaphysics.

Truth as the Event

In Russian language there are two different words for the "truth". One of them "*istina*" signifies something correct and not wrong; and the other "*pravda*" (which really has no translation into foreign languages) has an ethical and legal shade of meaning: it means to do something right or to be just. First Russian legal codex of XI-th century was titled *Pravda*. And this difference was the key both for XIX-th century literature and for further philosophical and legal research. Russian writers were interested in relation between truth (that belongs to the subject) and justice (that belongs to the society or to the other). That is the main theme both for Dostoevsky's famous novels *Crime and Punishment*, *Brothers Karamazov*, and *The Devils*. Dialectics of singular human being with his own truth and common order keeps the main topic both in Russian literature and in philosophy in XX-th century.

Russian thinkers believe that knowledge differs from the truth, that it is not effect of mind or achievement of science, but – being an existential category – it is cause of human being; it has an existential, but not a rational extent, therefore it should not cognize, but live in. Knowledge should to accumulate and falsificate by the refutation (in Popper's words), but truth could not conquest in Nietzschean manner, because it does not belong to a world, but it is a transcendental basis of final cause (*causa finalis*) of human being. Therefore philosophy could neither verify nor refute the truth, and it is unable to accumulate the truth as any positive information. In *Light in a Darkness* (1949) Semen Frank²⁸ defines a truth as

²⁶ Bulgakhov's research of Sophiology see: *A Bulgakhov Anthology*. Ed. by J. Pain and N. Zernov. London: SPCK, 1976.

²⁷ Zernov N.M. *The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century*. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1963.

²⁸ Further reading on Frank's philosophy: [1] Boobbyer P. *S.L. Frank. The life and works of a Russian philosopher (1877 – 1950)*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1995. [2] Swoboda P.J. *The Philosophical Thought of S.L. Frank, 1902 – 1915*. N.Y.: Co-

"a way of live". Pavel Florensky in his *Pillar and Statement of the Truth* (1924) traces back the derivation of Russian word "truth" (*istina*) from the verb "to be" (*est'*); therefore to be true means to exist and to exist means to be true. In such a way he concludes that false is not an opposition to true, but just an illusion of consciousness and it does not really exists. Aristotelian conception that the truth is a correspondence between reality and its reflection in mind looks to be disputable, because it is unclear, what are the rules of this correspondence: does it depends on objective reality or on the mind games only. It looks to be something else, any third agent, any common basis both for reality and mind that could realize their correspondence.

Other thinkers elaborate that idea and, on the one hand, deny the rationalistic conception truth, which could be received *clare et distincte* (as in Descartes), and on the other hand, they criticize Kant's *a priori forms of perception*, because they describes just visual world, but not the mystery of truth. Therefore we could not cognize the truth, because it is transcendent or belongs to the God. The thought 'truth is out here' was the distinctive slogan of religious Russian philosophy in the beginning of the XX-th century. In his M.A. thesis *Matter of Knowledge* (1915) S. Frank doubt in Descartes's thesis *cogito ergo sum*, because it equalizes the subject and object of cognition and escapes the order, which guarantee the dialectical interaction between mind and the world. Descartes philosophy ignores the basis of judgement, therefore his *cogito* does not resolve the problem. Frank believes that no one could define one's own soul and verbalize one's being, therefore in his main book *Unknowable* (1939) Frank comes to argumentation of the invisible order, which is both out of mind (unknowable) and out of reality (Over-world, *Überweltliche*), that order, which gives *a priori* forms of cognition and the rules of the correspondence between reality and mind (that one, which psychoanalysts call *symbolic order*). The law of identity is not obvious, it is true only if there is any other, who recognizes that "A is A". In such a way no one could say who is (s)he. But the subject could receive recognition of his own existence from the other, who witness about human being in act of faith, i.e. "spiritual meetings" between human soul and the other, as S. Frank argues in his uncompleted last book *Reality and a Man. Metaphysics of Human Being* (published in 1956). But it seems that Descartes also understand the necessity of existence of the other and he eventually came to idea of God.

Also leader of neo-Kantianism in Russia Alexander Vvedensky considered that Kant's "three postulates of practical reason as not suffi-

Iumbia University Press, 1992; [3] Tannert R. *Zur Theorie des Wissens: Ein Neuansatz nach S.L. Frank, 1877 – 1950*. Bern, Frankfurt/ Main: Herdert Lang, 1973.

cient for the full understanding of moral behavior".²⁹ Therefore he proposed fourth principle concerning of the being of the other; a belief in the other he called it moral established faith. While Kant suffered an idea of the God as an optional part of social tradition, for Russian neo-Kantianism it was necessary demand for a truly cognition.

Lev Shestov shared Frank's critics of Cartesian rationalism, because it based on clearness and certainty both of reality and the self. In *The Conquest of the Self-Evident* he said that, "we may perhaps have to admit that certainty is not a predicate of truth, or, to express it better, that certainty has absolutely nothing in common with truth". To be true and to be certain and obvious is not one the same: truth is neither a sentence nor a formula nor a law, it does not belong to a language, and that is why it is unclear for the reason. Truth is unconscious for Shestov, and we could not cognize it by the reason only or by soul only, but by all human being.

In a Heideggerian way – with whom Shestov was familiar and has a correspondence – he suggests that the philosopher should to be in the world (*in-der-Welt-Sein* in Heidegger's term), but not to research it with the help of reason. Because the being is more fundamental than reason. Shestov also shared Heidegger's intent of destruction of metaphysics and for his own part he has undertaken an attempt to overcome the metaphysics with the help of a faith, like other Heidegger's colleague Rudolf Bultmann done.

His second philosophical problem was the relation between reason and belief, which he thematizes in his last book *Athens and Jerusalem* (1938)³⁰, where he asked, what is the basis and the aim of philosophical cognition: Greek knowledge or Jewish faith. Where one could find a real freedom and integrity of the self? He associates reason with captivity of the self and indifference to human existence, it is dialectical, and therefore it splits the subject. In the result he concluded that only faith could be the source of freedom and development of human self as it is, beyond social order, morality and *a priori* forms of the reason. Therefore he creates his religious existentialism as a philosophy of faith of unconscious truth and emancipation from the society, ethics and science. Therefore he has taken Luther's thesis as a title of his book *Sola fide*.³¹

Not surprising that is a looking for the ultimate borders of human existence he turned to Søren Kierkegaard, whom he devoted most influential his book³². In his mind, only faith could show the horizon of human

²⁹ Lossky N. *The History of Russian Philosophy*. New York: International University Press, 1951. P. 161.

³⁰ First edition: Chestov L., *Athènes et Jérusalem: un essai de philosophie religieuse*. Paris, 1938; English version: Shestov L. *Athens and Jerusalem*. Ohio, 1966; N.Y., 1968; 1978.

³¹ Chestov L., *Sola fide*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1957.

³² Chestov L. *Kierkegaard et la philosophie existentielle (Vox clamantis in deserto)*. Paris: Vrin, 1936.

existence and make him free: "Keirkegaard turned, not to reason and morality, which demands resignation, but to the absurd and faith, which give their sanction to daring. His writing and sermons, raging, frenzied, violent, full of intensity, speak to us of nothing else; a mad flight from the god of the philosophers to the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob".³³ In a dilemma between Athens and Jerusalem, Shestov choose the last one, i.e. only faith could overcome an alienation of the reason, open an endless relation with the God, and destruct European metaphysics.

Such a over-philosophical act inspired Shestov's disciple and translator of his texts George Bataille³⁴ to a similar flight from philosophy to mystics, undertaken in his *Summa of Atheology* (1943-45)³⁵ and *Theory of Religion* (1947).³⁶ He develops and radicalizes Shestov's project and tries to overcome the borders of discourse, sexuality, body and even being. Another Shestov's disciple Emmanuel Levinas does not agree with such a turn from philosophy to religious discourse, but Jewish outlook keeps the necessary part of his phenomenology: he also tries to resolve Shestov's dilemma and reconcile the reason with the faith. Also he appreciates Shestov's works on Husserl that was one of the first phenomenological research in France.³⁷ Philosophy in Shestov's project looks to overcomes itself and philosophical discourse regresses to theological one and looses its own way of acting with the truth.

Levinas was rather closed to another philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin, with whom he was not familiar but whose earlier works he read when lived in Russia. Bakhtin is known as an author of *dialogism* that became one of the key concept in contemporary philosophy. In his mind truth is dialectical and it appears in tension between I and the other. "Truth is not born nor it is to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogical interaction".³⁸ Bakhtin was far from conventional theory of truth and his idea of dialogical nature of truth really does not means that truth is the result of agreement between two people, but it rather follows Hegelian dialectics and shows the hemerological essence both of truth and the being as itself. Truth discovers the other, it includes the

³³ Ibid. P. 383 – 384.

³⁴ On Shestov's relation with G. Bataille and W. Benjamin see in: Fondane B. *Recontres avec Léon Chestov*. Paris: Plasma, 1982.

³⁵ Bataille G. *Somme athéologique*. / Œuvres Complètes. T. V, VI. Paris: Gallimard, 1970 – 1988.

³⁶ Bataille G. *Théorie de la religion*. / Œuvres Complètes. T. VII. Paris: Gallimard, 1970 – 1988.

³⁷ For Shestov's research of Husserl's phenomenology see in: *Léon Chestov: Un philosophie pas comme les autres?* Ed. Nikita Struve. Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1996.

³⁸ Bakhtin M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. P. 110.

other in the horizon of self-consciousness. But supplementary to Hegel, Bakhtin insists on valuable dimension of life: "Life knows two value-centers that are fundamentally and essentially different, yet are correlated with each other: myself and the other; and it is around these centers that all of the concrete moments of Being are distributed and arranged".³⁹ Such a relation between myself and the other is the foundation of being for both of them. Two voices is a minimum of being, said Bakhtin in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*: "The very being of man (both external and internal) is the deepest communication. To be means to communicate... To be means to be for another, and through the other, for oneself. A person has no internal sovereign territory, he is wholly and always on the boundary: looking inside himself, he looks into the eyes of another or with the eyes of another".⁴⁰ *The I* is to be found in an answer of the other, it is the gift that exists in a dialogue only. Therefore not surprising to find the same idea in later works of Levinas that I constitute myself in relation to responsibility to the Other.⁴¹

Dialogue with the other in both a way of identification and self-completing according to other's image [*zu gestalten wie das andere*], and at the same time it is a way of self-opening and permanent looking for his own place before the other. Being "live event", a dialogue, which moved the person to a threshold of the other and to a border of the self, could give a new identity and new meaning.

That multiplicity of meanings, which could be found in a dialogue on the threshold, allows Tzvetan Todorov to consider Bakhtin to be one of the greatest theorists of literature of structuralism.⁴² Bakhtin's dialogism becomes not only live event of verbal creating, but quite structural idea of endless reading and open-ended dialogue between author and reader. Bakhtin's point of view is also closed to Emil Benvenist's one, who supposed *the I* to be an element of speech, recipient only, that differs from the subject of speech. Although originally dialogism was phenomenological rather than semiotic term and closed to consciousness and voice,⁴³ in (post)structuralists reading, it becomes closed to theory of text.

³⁹ Bakhtin M. *Towards a Philosophy of the Act*. Ed. by M. Holquist and V. Liapunov. Trans. by V. Liapunov. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993. P. 74.

⁴⁰ Bakhtin M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. P. 287.

⁴¹ Levinas E. *Ethics and Identity*. Trans. by Richard Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1985. P. 101.

⁴² Todorov T. *Mikhail Bakhtine: le principe dialogique (suivi de: Ecrits du Cercle Bakhtine)*. Paris: Seuil, 1981.

⁴³ On dialogue as the notion of voice see a chapter "La Poétique l'histoire chez Bakhtine" in : Meschonnic H. *Pour la poétique*. Vol. II. *Epistémologie de l'écriture: poétique de la traduction*. Paris: Gallimard, 1973. P. 191–203.

In her introduction to French translation to the *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*⁴⁴ Julia Kristeva describes Bakhtin's dialogism as "correlation of text", and she derives from Bakhtin's studies her famous idea of intertextuality, cross-textual relation of meanings.⁴⁵ In her mind, meaning does not belong to one text, but it changes and depends on context and other texts; each text includes extratextual contexts. Therefore literary studies should research the mechanisms and ways of meaning exchanges between different texts. In further works she writes that her "conception of dialogism, of ambivalence or what I have called 'intertextuality', all of which owe a great deal to Bakhtin as well as to Sigmund Freud, were to become gadgets that American academia is now discovering".⁴⁶ Such a neighborhood of Bakhtin and Freud is not an accidental and looks to be prolific topic for further comparative research.

Although Bakhtin was not a follower of Freud, his own horizon of interests was quite wide and psychoanalytic ideas were doubtless influential in his philosophy. In that sense Bakhtin's term *man-as-the-other*⁴⁷ that looks to be closed to Lacanian *moi c'est l'autre*.⁴⁸ There are two important consequences from the thesis that I constitutes in relation to the other: firstly, there is no myself as a starting point of the dialogue and secondly, the other is a previous than the I, it is to be an object of identification. The same ideas we could find in Freud, who considered "the other is also presents in human life as an model, object, assistant or adversary" and the subject "forms his own self according to integral image of the other".⁴⁹ Bakhtin does not follows psychoanalytic way of thinking, but such a coincidence between his phenomenological and analytical discourses have been quite fruitful for (post)structural studies on second part of XX-th century.

⁴⁴ Kristeva J. *Une poétique ruinée*. / Bakhtine M. *La Poétique de Dostoïevski*. Paris: Seuil, 1970. P. 5–27.

⁴⁵ Kristeva J. *Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman*. / Kristeva J. *Semiotike: recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1969. P. 82–112.

⁴⁶ Kristeva J. *Mémoire*. / L'Infini. No. 1, 1983. P. 44.

⁴⁷ Bakhtin M. *Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity*. / Bakhtin M. *Art and Answerability: Earlier Philosophical Essays*. Ed. by Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Trans. by Vadim Liapunov and K. Brostrom. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990. P. 134.

⁴⁸ Lacan J. *Le séminaire, Livre III: Les psychoses*. Paris: l'Association freudienne internationale, 2002. P. 533.

⁴⁹ Freud S. *Masspsychologie und Ich-Analyse*. / Freud S. *Gesammelte Werke. Chronologische Geordnet*. Fischer taschenbuch Verlag, 1999. XIII, S. 73, S. 116.

Marxian Discourse as a Sexual Object

Russian philosophers borrowed from literature of the end of XIX-th century a criticism of Western rationalism, which searching for general laws of being, and indifferent to the person, produced alienation and objectification. The problem of research became very consonant with Marx's appeal to overcome the alienation of capitalism and to change both social and spiritual world. Paradoxically, Dostoevsky's religious ethics dovetailed into Marx's social atheism; these doctrines were coherent as part of the whole: the revolutionary project continues religious and moral doctrines.⁵⁰ A lot of Russian philosophers try to combine socialism with Orthodoxy, and some of them read Marx as a religious thinker.⁵¹ For example, Bulgakhov supposed Marx to be the messiah: he believed that Marx "recall to life ancient Jewish missionary doctrines".⁵² He was also the first ideologist of Christina socialism in Russia⁵³, see his *On the Christian Political Union* (1905).

In the reading of Russian philosophers Marx has become very closed to Orthodox ideology for some reasons. Firstly, an idea of collectivism has found a prolific ground of Russian Orthodoxy and was received very benevolent. If Catholics believe in individual salvation of the soul, Orthodox Church insist on collective salvation, togetherness (*sobornost'*), i.e. all the religious persons should unite in the lap of the Church and reject their individual desires to find an over-human Saint Spirit. Therefore the most welcome feature for Russian church were meekness, absence of proud and suppression of the self. "Humble, proud man... suppress yourself and you will become free", – said Dostoevsky in his most famous Pushkin lecture.⁵⁴ Even in anti-Marxists bourgeois individualism was usually associated with egoism and understood both as atomization and destruction of social hierarchy and as a way to moral decline (for example, in Konstantin Leontiev's *Byzantism and Slavdom*). Lev Tolstoy – who was not Marxist, of course – in epilogue to his *War and Peace* concluded that the history is not the result of one person's will, but of collective movement. Even great kings can nothing to do, but the collective desire of humankind is the power of history. Therefore an idea of collectiveness – borrowed from Marxism – was filled by religious meaning. Although Bakhtin was not an Orthodox thinker, he also shared

⁵⁰ For more on religious grounds of Russian revolution see: Read C. *Religion, Revolution and the Russian Intelligentsia*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1979.

⁵¹ Aptheker H. *The Urgency of Marxist-Christian Dialogue*. New York: Evanston, 1970.

⁵² Bulgakhov S. *Christianity and Socialism*. Moscow, 1917. P. 12 (Russian only).

⁵³ On this theme see: Walters, P.M. *The Development of the Political and Religious Philosophy of Sergey Bulgakov, 1895 – 1922*. London, 1978.

⁵⁴ Dostoevsky F. *Collection of Works*. Moscow, 1975. Vol. XII. P. 425.

an idea of togetherness and supposed dialogue to be joint intellectual creativity.⁵⁵

Secondly, Marx was opposed to nihilism that considered to be the second – after egoism – most danger social evil. Both Marxism and Orthodoxy has an active social position and looks for real social changes. According to S. Frank's book *Theory of Values in Marx* (1902), Marxism creates important values for social and moral progress. An idea of communism has been read in a St. Paul's manner as an international community and brotherhood. Marx proposed not only a social revolution, but a spiritual exchange that allow to remove to new social-economic formation: from capitalism (master-slave relations) to communism (spiritual partnership and brotherhood). But because of Marx does not need in religion as a mistaken ideology, he was criticized, at the same time, as messiah without God and even antichrist (in N. Berdyaev).⁵⁶

Thirdly, Marxism was approved for its critics of rationalism, which was a product of bourgeois society and which should be rejected in communism. There are two conclusions from Marx's thesis that the being determines the consciousness: (1) contrary to Hegel, being and consciousness are not one the same; to be does not mean to be thinkable or to be the part of any absolute idea; (2) Marx's being is previous to the consciousness; it looks to be quite unconscious class power, closed to Nietzsche's will. Orthodoxy respects very much later Byzantine mystics and believes in intuitive cognition of God rather than rational one: there is only one way to God, the way of faith, not a science. That is why Marx's anti-rationalism was also closed to religious outlooks.

Even for the formalists – the representatives of very different ideology and the other epochs – Marxism keeps its philosophical attractiveness, because they accept it not in its religious dimension, but as a prolific method in the humanities and openness of discursivity (in Michele Foucault's words) that was established by Karl Marx. Marxism in their reception was a masterpiece social analysis and became the main humanitarian discourse for many years. In 1920-th Marxian turn in philosophy allows to refuse from mystical, poetical and psychological remains in philosophical research that were dominant in previous metaphysical tradition. Bakhtin's colleague Pavel Medvedev considered Marxism to became a conductor of science, symbol of scientific quality. Although they lived in Soviet epoch and Marxism has already been state ideology,

⁵⁵ Clark K, Holquist M. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984, P. 129.

⁵⁶ On Berdyaev's contribution to philosophy see: Nuch F. *Berdyaev's Philosophy: The Existential Paradox of Freedom and Necessity*. London: Garden City, 1966.

for Bakhtin's Circle⁵⁷ it was creative method rather than dogma. Another his colleague Valentin Voloshinov in his monograph *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (1929)⁵⁸ based on critique of psychologism in the humanities and use Marxism as an objective scientific method of social and literary research.

As a conclusion I could say that there is quite ambivalent relation to Marxism in Russia: in different epochs it was an object of blind worship or an object of indiscriminate critiques or an ideological mainstream of totalitarian state or a prolific philosophical method, but always Marxian discourse was one of the main in Russian philosophy. Some follows it, some refuses it, but all were depends on it. According to Freud, beloved objects and hated objects are all the same, i.e. sexual objects; therefore Marxism was such a sexual object – that truly does not exist – of Russian philosophy. It does not exist, because openness of Marxian discourse does not allows to reconstruct it as any finite and authentic theory of Marxism. Marx said that he himself is not a Marxist, because any comment and secondary construction ultimately differs from an original. Today Marxian discourse remains to be an ideology – in an original sense – way of creating of new ideas, way of philosophizing rather than social theory or revolutionary practice.

No mention of Russian Marxists of XIX-th century – who really does born none fresh ideas except Peter Kropotkin's and Mikhail Bakunin's anarchism – who was the revolutionaries and politicians, and after the revolution of 1917 the leaders of Soviet country. I can hardly call Nikolay Bukharin, Georgy Plekhanov, Vladimir Lenin, Anatoly Lunacharsky, Joseph Stalin and Lev Trotsky to be an original and influential philosophers. Although they wished to realize Plato's ideal of the philosopher the ruler, it seems that if only Slavoy Žižek does not quote Lenin's and Stalin's works, they will stay in history as the dictators rather than intellectuals. Although Alexandre Kojève supposed that there is no essential difference between philosopher and tyrant,⁵⁹ the similarities between them are less obvious. They changed reality politically by terror, but not by the means of philosophy, as Marx believed.

After the exile of religious thinkers from Russia in 1922 Marxism became the only one official philosophy of the Soviet state. Some original version of reading of Marx appeared in 1920-th, when totalitarian ideol-

⁵⁷ Bakhtin's colleagues and followers: Maria Iudina, Matvey Kagan, Ivan Kanaev, Pavel Medvedev, Valentin Voloshinov, Lev Pumpiansky, Boris Zubakin; On their works see: *The Bakhtin Circle in the Master's Absence*. Ed. by Craig Brandist, David Shepherd, and Galin Tihanov. Manchester; Manchester University Press, 2004.

⁵⁸ Voloshinov V.N. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. by L. Matejka and I. Titunik. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.

⁵⁹ Kojève A. *Tyrannie et segesse*. Paris: Gallimrd, 1954. P. 252.

ogy just developed, and in the end of 1990-th, when free of speech returned, but an interest to Marxism has already expired.

But even in the Soviet Union, where the Marxism was an obligatory doctrine for all the sciences and references on Marx's *Capital* opens every academic book – both on chemistry and linguistics – even in the prosperity of communist dogmatism of 1970-80-th, in USSR there were a thinkers who feel and use a creative potential of Marxian discourse. One of them was Merab Mamardashvili, who within his life has published just one book *Forms and Content of Thinking* (1986), but was well known with his lectures, interviews, speeches and talks (like Lacan, he prefers to speak, not to write); all of them were collected and published after his death in 9 volumes.

The reading of Husserl, Marx and Freud – not accidentally that in the same 1960-th he, like Foucault in France, combines these two thinkers – conduced him towards a main interest in his life, to the phenomenon of rationality. He seems to turn to the key thinkers of XX-th century, who researches rationality: individual consciousness (Husserl), class rationality (Marx) and unconscious rationality (Freud). Mamardashvili starts from Husserl, whom he devoted one of his most famous collection of talks "Cartesian meditation" (published in 1993). The main theme of his research here was the relations between language and consciousness. The last one, according to Mamardashvili, is not a natural human capability, it is not also grows up from the environment, but it appears and report itself after a physics, i.e. in metaphysical space of language and human co-operation. Continuing Russian existentialism he considers consciousness to be an act of human existence rather than reaction of brain; he said "act of thinking is correlated with Being as a transcendental level of human existence".⁶⁰

Philosophy is not only what one is thinking about, but also how one is existing. "As far as I understand philosophy, – he said, – it was always interested in one question: how can one think that, which is thinking?"⁶¹ This is not a question about human capability of cognition, but about that, which thinks in a subject; Mamardashvili does not interested in thinking as a phenomenon, but asked about the cause of any thinking. And he found different answers: class's mind, in Marx, is a cause of human thinking, it is previous to individual one, therefore it defines the way of human life; really class thinks not the individual. Or, in Freud: unconscious thinks in a human being beyond his own intention and will. In his own point of view the being is both the cause and the source of thinking;

⁶⁰ Mamardashvili M. *Arrow of Cognition. Sketches on Natural-Historical Epistemology*. Moscow: Nauka, 1996. P. 23 (Russian only).

⁶¹ Mamardashvili M. *As I Understand a Philosophy*. Moscow: Nauka, 1992. P. 5 (Russian only).

therefore the aim of philosophy is to find and keep the unity of the past, present and future in act of existing, keeps the intimate history of the subject. To exist means to be absent in thought, but see the existence of thought as it is; no one idea belongs to a thinker, but a thinker belongs to it. And one should maintain it in one's life. "Philosophy is not a profession, it is rather temperament and way of life, and I can inform you in none sum of knowledge, I can only pass something very intimate and therefore that could remain obscure".⁶²

Russian philosophy in emigration was also abides to Marxist discourse, although it did not accept Soviet propaganda, which was too far both from Marx's social intention and his style of thinking. Russian émigrés played a noticeable part in European philosophy⁶³, because they were really the representatives of the same philosophical tradition, in their youth some of them have educated European universities, speak German, French and English fluently, they were followers of Hegel and Marx, colleagues of Edmund Husserl, Max Scheler and Henry Bergson. An exile – apart from negative sides – assists to integrate Russian thought to European philosophy, to give fresh blood and create an new direction of phenomenology and Marxism. One of such Russian thinkers – who was famous rather as the professor of the École Pratique des Hautes Études (Paris) – who creates an outstanding philosophical perspective where combines Marx and with Hegelian phenomenology, was Alexandre Kojève.

Desire in History: Alexandre Kojève

Born in Moscow in 1902 as Kojèvenikov he left Russia in 1920 and remade his surname in a French manner, that is why he is known as Kojève. Under Jaspers' supervision he studied philosophy in Heidelberg, where in 1931 he defended his Ph.D. thesis "The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov". After that he moved to Paris, where he taught at the *Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes* and began his famous seminar on Hegel's *Phenomanology of Spirit* in 1933 – 1939. There are many philosophers were the participants in the seminar and became his disciples; among them Louis Althusser, Raymond Aron, Georges Bataille, André Breton, Gaston Fessard, Pierre Klossowski, Jacques Lacan, Mauice Merleau-Ponty, Raymond Queneau, Jean-Paul Sartre, Eric Weil and other. That is why Kojève is known to be the progenitor of contemporary phi-

⁶² Ibid. P. 338.

⁶³ On Russian philosophy in emigration see: [1] Beyssac M. *La Vie Culturelle de l'Emigration Russe en France*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1971; [2] Raeff M. *Russia Abroad*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990; [3] Williams R.C. *Culture of Exile: Russian Emigres in Germany, 1881 – 1941*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1972.

losophy and father of "3H generation" – by the first letters from Hegel, Husserl, Heidegger – that mainstream movement of European philosophy in XX-th century. At the same time he also keeps an interest in Marx and looks for social application of his ideas; that is why his philosophy could be called "phenomenological Marxism". Like Shestov, who promoted Husserl's ideas in France and opened an era of French phenomenology, Kojève brought to his disciples an inexhaustible interest in Heidegger and initiated post-Heideggerian movement in philosophy.

Unlike Heidegger, who does not really interested in social application of his ideas⁶⁴, Kojève have been both phenomenologists and political philosopher, who equally follows both Hegel's idea of rational state and Marx's of classless society. His turn from philosophy to applied politics could be also explained by his intention to be influential and answerable to live issue. After the World War II he suddenly left academia and since 1948 for 20 years he was an officer in the Direction of an Exterior Economic Affairs of France (*Direction des relations économiques extérieures*). When giving financial advises to French ministers and even to the President of Republic he seems to feel himself to be more important force in the movement of history than if he has been just a university professor.

As a philosopher Kojève synthesized social theory with phenomenology and create collage from Hegel, Marx, and Heidegger, which would become very prolific for the further philosophy. He has underlines in Hegel's thought (1) a master-slave dialectic that was read as dialectic of desire and in a context of Marx's class struggle. The aim and essence of human life is looking for recognition, because each one depends on someone else (like slave depends on his master and master depends on his slave); therefore to be means to be recognized by the other. Marxian life struggle, in Kojève's reading, seems to be struggle for the recognition. (2) Kojève emphasize an idea of world history that should over in synthesis of oppositions. He looking for the way to satisfy human and overcome an alienation of desire to the other, from whom we are waiting for the recognition. (3) Eventually he was inspired by Hegel's idea of history that is one the same with being; therefore, to be means to be historically.

Kojève shared Heidegger's (1) interpretation of human being as self-care and responsibility for production of human and surround world; he followed existential dimension of the history and world: "The Being

⁶⁴ Although Heidegger was not asocial philosopher, his political ideas considerably yielded to his ontological research: [1] Bourdieu P. *L'ontologie politique de Martin Heidegger*. Paris: Minuit, 1975; [2] Palmier J.-P. *Les écrits politiques de Martin Heidegger*. Paris: Éditions de l'Herne, 1968; [3] Pöggeler O. *Heidegger's Political Self-understanding.// Heidegger: Critical Essays*. Ed. by Herbert Dreyfus and John Harrison. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992; [4] Schwan A. *Politische Philosophie im Denken Martin Heidegger*. Cologne: Westdeutscher verlag, 1965.

without human would be silent: it would be present being (*Dasein*), but it would not be true (*das Wahre*)⁶⁵ There is human being only and there is none another. (2) He borrowed from Heidegger an idea that being is concrete one, not common and abstract: "The Being is always my own [Das Sein diese Seinden ist *je meines*]"⁶⁶ Human being is always a being in time and in-the-world. (3) Kojève also developed an existential conception of the anticipation of death as the basis for the human being.

Following Marx, Kojève developed his thesis that human desire is the power of historical process. Like Marx, Kojève considered the practice to be the criterion of the truth: the real is only that, which could be realized. Therefore he suggests to apply Hegel's dialectics not to abstract spirit, but to a concrete reality: "Everything that said Christian theology, is absolutely true, if only in concerns not transcendental imaginary God, but a real Human, who lives in a world".⁶⁷ Marx misunderstood Hegel, because he read phenomenology as too abstract theory that just describes the world, but not as a live program.

According to Jacques Derrida, the main aim of Marx was study "how to live",⁶⁸ and if follow Kojève, Hegel has interested in the same question: how to live happy, i.e. how to overcome an alienation in the end of history.⁶⁹ "There is no reasons to change the true principles of cognition of the World and the I. All another could endlessly changes: an art, a love, a game, etc., i.e. all that makes Human unhappiness".⁷⁰ Therefore the end of history, according to Kojève, is not the end of humankind existence and the final of development, but truly the end of dissatisfaction, the end of thing-ness [*Gegenständlichkeit*] of the world, which was the cause of alienation. Marxian shift from capitalism to communism Todd McGowan also reviews as "the transformation from the society founded on the prohibition of enjoyment (and thus the dissatisfaction of its subjects) to a society that commands enjoyment or jouissance (in which there seems to be no requisite dissatisfaction)".⁷¹ Although McGowan did not quote Kojève, he truly follows his intention: to come to a perfect society, where all desires would be satisfied and power of enjoyment would rule everyone.

⁶⁵ Kojève A. *Introduction à la lecture de Hegel*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947. P. 42.

⁶⁶ Heidegger M. *Sein und Zeit*. Tübingen: Metzler Verlag, 1963. S. 41.

⁶⁷ Kojève A. *Introduction à la lecture de Hegel*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947. P. 571.

⁶⁸ Derrida J. *Spectres de Marx. L'Etat de la dette, le travail du deuil et la nouvelle Internationale*. Paris: Galilée, 1993. P. 13.

⁶⁹ This thesis Fukuyama took as a title of his book: Fukuyama F. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press, 1992.

⁷⁰ Kojève A. *Introduction à la lecture de Hegel*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947. P. 435.

⁷¹ McGowan T. *The End of Dissatisfaction? Jacques Lacan and the Emerging Society of Enjoyment*. New York: SUNY Press, 2004. P. 2.

Desire and enjoyment are the key terms in Kojève's philosophy; human being, in his mind, is a subject of desire: human is not what he *is*, but what he *wants*. That idea became revolutionary in contemporary philosophy and marked the shift from modern (Cartesian) understanding of subject and his relation to the world to a postmodern conception of subjectivity.

G. Bataille argues desirable subject in his *Theory of Religion and Inner Experience* (1941-42)⁷², Lacan rhymes it with Freudian experience when concludes that "*le désir de l'homme est le désir de l'autre*"⁷³, i.e. desire have a mimetic nature and human borrows the other's desire and follows it as if it were his own. But contrary to Kojève, Lacan does not look for the ways to overcome or satisfy the desire, but analyze it. Lacan really does not interested in an object of desire – because sexual object does not exist – but in the very structure: why human misappropriates exactly that desire and none another? Secondly Lacan continues Kojève's idea of history as a way of being. Subject, in Lacan's mind, is not a immovable thinking substance, as it were in Descartes, but history of his own life. To be subject means to become an author of history.

By his own example, Kojève proves the essence of philosophy as a commentary: he truly did not create his own philosophical theory, did not build his original intellectual system, did invent non new terms, but he doubtless was one of the key philosophers in XX-th century. He just discovers the inner potential of Hegelian discourse, reconstructs in a new manner several well-known theories, give new point of view that changes the field of vision of contemporary philosophy; such a talented montage shows that real masterpiece of philosophy add nothing new information about the world, but meanwhile could change both the world and the human being. Kojève's disciple, Lacan mentions that interpretation does not always explain the original text, to interpret sometimes means to put new punctuation, which could radically change the meaning of the expression. For my part, philosophy looks to be such reconstructive punctuation on the body of culture, an act, which could create an event of the truth.

⁷² Bataille G. *L'expérience intérieure*. / Œuvres Complètes. T. V. Paris: Gallimard, 1970-1988.

⁷³ Lacan J. *Le séminaire, Livre I: Les écrits technique de Freud*. Paris: Seuil, 1975. P. 252; See also [1] chapter *Le désir de l'Autre* in: Lacan J. *Le séminaire, Livre V: Les formations de l'inconscient*. Paris: Seuil, 1998. P. 387 – 404; [2] Lacan J. *Le séminaire, Livre VI: Le désir et son interprétation*. Paris: l'Association freudienne internationale, 2003.

Дмитри Олшански, Санкт Петербург (Русија)

ИСТОРИЈА РУСКЕ ФИЛОЗОФИЈЕ КАО ИСТИНИТИ ДОГАЂАЈ

Резиме

Руска филозофија, као независна и самосвојна традиција, настала је почетком 20 века. Деветнаести век сматра се златним периодом руске књижевности и критичке традиције и тада су писци поставили темеље даљег развоја етичких и естетских истраживања.

Чини се да су руски писци били много оригиналнији и дубљи мислиоци неголи сви професори метафизике у то време. Филозофија није била академски предмет, нити наука у тадашњој Русији: углавном су је креирали критичари, публицисти и писци, а не природњаци, техничари и научници. Филозофски факултети на универзитетима били су нестабилни зато што је њихов рад у извесним периодима био забрањиван, а неки пут су они отворани само на одређено време.

Филозофске књиге су у Русији највећим делом биле писане за образоване људе, а не за експерте у метафизици. Сасвим супротно европској метафизици, где је естетика заузимала секундарно место у односу на онтологију и епистемологију или, пак, била последња дисциплина у укупном интелектуалном систему (према Хегелу) или, још боље, допуњујућа филозофска дисциплина – у Русији је естетика била зачетак филозофије. Свој статус основне и централне филозофске дисциплине у Русији задржава током целог двадесетог века. Филозофија је у Русији била практична наука, чак и када се чинило да је мистична, и представљала је увек не само теорију и поглед на свет, већ практично поимање света. Иако Русија никада није признавала амерички прагматизам, прагматичка оријентација руске филозофије представља њену главну карактеристику. Та се појава може објаснити утицајем Карла Маркса, чије су идеје биле подједнако популарне у руском царству и Совјетском Савезу.

Key Words: руска филозофија, догађај, дијалогизам, Бакхтин, Којеве