

PETER CHAADAEV:  
**BETWEEN THE LOVE  
OF FATHERLAND  
AND THE LOVE OF TRUTH**

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

---

International Conference  
Krakow Meetings 2016

June 5–8, 2016

Benedictine Abbey in Tyniec, Krakow, Poland

---



**KRAKOW  
MEETINGS**

Krakow  
Conferences  
on Russian  
Philosophy



## ORGANIZERS:

Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow

Instituto de Filosofia Edith Stein in Granada

International Center for the Study of the Christian Orient in Granada

## HONORARY PATRONAGE:

Council of European Bishops' Conferences

## INVITED SPEAKERS:

Andrzej Walicki (Warsaw)

Bernard Marchadier (Paris)

Fr. Georgy Orekhanov (Moscow)

Regula Zwahlen (Fribourg)

## ACADEMIC BOARD:

Teresa Obolevitch (Krakow)

Artur Mrówczyński-Van Allen (Granada)

Paweł Rojek (Krakow)

## CONFERENCE SECRETARY:

Olga Tabatadze (Granada)



Uniwersytet Papieski  
Jana Pawła II  
w Krakowie



INSTITUTO de FILOSOFIA  
EDITH STEIN



CENTRO INTERNACIONAL  
PARA EL ESTUDIO DEL  
ORIENTE CRISTIANO



CONSILIUM CONFIDENTIARUM  
EPISCOPORUM  
EUROPAE  
CCEE



### THE TRUTH OF PATRIOTISM OR THE PATRIOTISM OF THE TRUTH

---

What does it make the inner tension of the title question? It is obvious—at least for rational thinking—that the truth is a predicate that describes the universal, as the patriotism is the one that describes the individual or group. There is only one truth, but there are many patriotisms. Within this coordinate system, we should rather talk about the patriotism of the truth: as the universal bears greater value than individual, so, first, one should be a patriot of the truth, and only thereafter a patriot of a group (the group is not necessarily a people, a nation, or a state). The patriotism of the truth is the true patriotism, as it comprises in itself or replaces itself (or subordinates under itself) the patriotism of a group as it is commonly understood. Thus, we can read and interpret the famous words of Peter Chaadaev that the love of the truth is much more beautiful than the love of the Fatherland.

For a common human thinking, having its point of departure in everyday life rather than in strict laws of logic, as much as for a critical thinking of philosophy, it is evident enough that truth is not too plain, and patriotism is too widely spread and dominating feeling to believe it to be secondary and unimportant. (Common sense, as well as Hegel, and Lenin—following his steps—have kept saying that “truth is concrete”; Leibniz distinguished the truths of reason from the truths of fact). Any group patriotism is justified with the fact of existence of the group, and therefore with existence of certain interests, needs, and desires. It is justified to such an extent, however, as far as it does not infringe justification of other patriotisms, as well as far as the existence of the group is not artificial (or fake, using the contemporary language), but truly real. Here we can refer to an analogy of Simon Frank’s ideas (who himself referred to Vladimir Soloviev), about a relative value of any state, law, politics: these mere tools are of any value as far as they serve to prevent a hell on earth, but they become the hell themselves, whenever they strive to create a paradise on earth. Patriotism is valuable and essential as far as it serves to defend existence of its group, but turns to be spiritual and physical evil, when it places interests of its own group above interests of other groups, endowing its own group with a unique or God-chosen character (racism, chauvinism, messianism; the similar role was ascribed to proletariat by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: they had been saying that other classes could survive only as far as they would be “joining proletariat”).

There is also another “measure” of the truth of group patriotism: it is uniqueness of each human personality. What is higher and more valuable: collective interests or a right of an individual to choose his/her way? In any case, both justification and condemnation of pa

triotism depend upon how much it serves to preserve, or *vice versa* to ruin the principle of personality. Different theories of liberalism, of course, have spotlighted and discussed the subject in details; we can mention here anarchistic ideas as well as, for instance, a personalistic position of N. Berdyaev: the latter opposed the personality, on the one hand, and the society and the state, on the other. In this coordinate system, the truth of human personality is higher and much more evident than the truth of any group or community. Under this God-and-man reading of human being, this position can receive not so much liberal and anarchistic as catholic and all-unity character (similar contexts we can find reading Peter Chaadaev: “a human thought is the thought of the human race”).

The very opportunity of the above-mentioned perversions of (or going beyond) the “measure” of patriotism comes directly from the ideological character of patriotic attitude. In this context, “ideological” sounds as aiming at embodying a system of private ideas that has been accepted as universally true, this means per se that the set is utopian. Any claims of any “true” patriotism in its struggle against “pseudo-“ or “quasi-“ patriotisms inevitably acquire character of such ideological confrontation in which each side claims for monopoly of the truth.

Everything said above enables us to make a twofold conclusion. If there is only one truth, none (and no one’s) patriotism may claim for being the truth, since a particular is unable to take the place of the universal. If there are many truths—truths of being, truths of human community lives (and their patriotisms, correspondingly) and each human being—in this case, the truths are not universal and abstract, but concrete and unique that preserve their concreteness (i.e. the life) with respect to others that are as much concrete as they are, and loosing their true life undertaking any attempts to set up their own uniqueness, excluding all the rest.

It is natural that each concrete situation fills these abstract schemes with lively and, quite often, too emotional content (for instance, current situation in Ukraine). Here, perhaps, we have yet another variant for reading Peter Chaadaev’s ideas: appeal to pure truth as a means to sober down the excessive patriotic hangover.

Berdyaev N. 1952. *The Realm of Spirit and the Realm of Caesar*. London.

Chaadaev P. 1991. *Collected works in 2 vol*. Moscow.

Frank S. L. 2012. *Jenseits von rechts und links. Anmerkungen zur russischen Revolution und zur moralischen Krise in Europa*. Freiburg-München: Alber.

Soloviev V. V. 1989. *Works in 2 vol*. Vol. 1. Moscow.

## A PROBLEM OF PERSONALITY IN PHILOSOPHY OF PETER CHAADAEV AND RUSSIAN THEOLOGICAL PERSONALISM OF TWENTIETH CENTURY

---

The aim of this issue is to reconstruct Chaadaev's conception of personality and to correlate it with some positions of later Russian theological personalism.

It is obvious that Chaadaev was not a personalist in contemporary meaning of a word but a problem of person has a prominent place in his philosophical writings. Chaadaev stands at the origins of the tradition of Russian religious philosophy and his attention to this problematic seems not to be random. At the same time a special analysis of this issue faces a number of essential difficulties. First of all, Chaadaev not always uses the word "person" and its derivatives as philosophical terms. Often enough his usage seems to be quite trivial, though its frequency itself is of considerable interest and suggestive. The other problem is that even terminological usage of the word, which evidently carries a load of meaning in the context of movement of the author's philosophical thought, is not clear enough. A researcher not only cannot find any definition of "personality", but is hardly able to create such definition himself, according to investigation of all contexts of usage of this word. At last, even direct statements of Chaadaev on the issue of personality and self contains evident duality: reality of person is recognized simultaneously as a harmful illusion and as a necessary foundation of self-consciousness.

To solve this problem one can only if he would explore (1) Chaadaev's testimonies of his personal mystical experience; and (2) his understanding of consciousness, cognition and history, were such notion as "tradition" has central place.

As to the first, in Chaadaev's texts one can find a number of witnesses, which may be interpreted as descriptions of some kind of extatic or, saying in more contemporary manner, "transpersonal" states of consciousness. A significant portion of them is located in the *Third Philosophical Letter*. The author speaks there about two kinds of transcending: overcoming of (1) space-time finitude of subject and (2) subject/subject separation in an act of some kind moral empathy. One can assume, that these very states became a foundation for philosopher's distinction of two kinds of personal being, one of which possess negative, and the other—positive connotations in his thought.

A pure philosophical analysis of the problem of freedom and of the human cognitive activity brings him to the same results.

In the first case, one's approximate experience of his freedom, which is responsible for our personal self-awareness, is considered by him as some kind of illusion. This illusion appears

against our depth dependence from outside forces. It, in turn, is clarifying in reflection about human's obedience to moral law, forms of human society, the course of history, divine Providence.

In the second case the subject of Chaadaev's criticism becomes an individualistic theory of knowledge, which is a typical feature of the modern philosophy. The empiricism/apriorism controversy is based, as Chaadaev thinks, on a false understanding of human being, which doesn't take into account all problematic connected with the fall. Intervening in this debate Chaadaev suggests his own decision of the problem of knowledge, which is based on recognition of social and historical nature of apriori forms of cognition, organizing sensual experience.

Basic ideas, which are organizing consciousness, cognition and all wholeness of human experience are, without any doubt, not innate. They translate from generation to generation becoming more or less darkened or clear. This translation far not always realizes through conscious teaching and learning, and Chaadaev was one of the first thinkers who thematized significance of different forms of un verbal communication. This same process of translation of ideas constitutes, according to Russian thinker, history, which through this way is defined as Tradition and traditions, and, at the same time—as “the education of the human race” according to Lessing. Such an approach makes it necessary for Chaadaev to look at the problem of the beginning of history and to describe it as Revelation, which is thought here as primordial act of communication between God and man.

The second primordial event, no less significant for human destiny in the world, is for him the fall. It also gets an original interpretation in the context his understanding of history of philosophy of modern Europe. The basic distress of this philosophy is its rejection of this fundamental idea. As a result, illusions of consciousness are considered in it as its immediate data: available human self, aware its own uniqueness and autonomy, come into focus of its attention as fundamental reality. The source of faith and reason conflict which is a characteristic feature of the Age of Enlightenment is here. Chaadaev suggests that it must be replaced by a new era, aware a specifics of Christian rationality and realizing a new synthesis.

Thus, Chaadaev's thinking is, for first glance, an antipersonalistic one. He has no doubts that the idea of uniqueness and autonomy of human personality is nothing else then illusion of consciousness, the result of the fall, which must be overcome by practice of systematic obedience of human will. Such practice must lead to a transformation of man and his thought and, paradoxically, to attaining of a new, authentic personality, which aware its inclusion to the wholeness of world consciousness, to the unity of Tradition. Thus one can notice that personalistic problematic stay in focus of Chaadaev's attention. Russian thinker obviously perceives it as a most specific feature of thought and culture of Modernity and tries to include it to the structure of his Christian thinking.



From this point of view, Chaadaev unconditionally must be considered as important predecessor of theological personalism of twentieth century. His distinction of false and true personality finds its parallel here in distinction of personality and individuum, and his idea of Tradition obviously precedes an idea of Church (that was pointed out already by V. Zenkovskij). This situation became even more difficult by the fact that such complicated (two and more levels) models of concept of individuality in turn may be considered themselves as nothing else but the product of modern understanding of man.

What was said makes it possible to throw a new look on sources of theological personalism and links between philosophical and theological ideas of Modernity.

Chaadaev P. 1989. *Collected Works*. Moscow.

Kamper D. 2009. *Goethe and the Problem of Individuality in Modern Culture*. Moskva.

Losskij V. 1995. "Theological Notion of Human Personality". In: V. Losskij. *By the Image and Likeness*. Moscow, pp. 106–128.

Smirnova Z. 1998. "A Problem of Reason in Philosophical Conception of Chaadaev". *Voprosy Filosofii* 11: 91–101.

Williams R. 2009. *Theology of V. N. Losskij: Exposition and Criticism*. Kiev.

Zenkovskij V. 2001. *History of Russian Philosophy*. Moskva.

### PETER CHAADAEV AND THE RUSSIAN PERSONALISM

---

It is common to think that the period of the Russian thought flourishing was supposed to be at the turn of nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the period which also could be called the “post-Soloviev” philosophy. At this period of time there were many popular philosophical branches in Russia such as positivism, evolutionism, materialism, etc. On the other hand, there was personalism or neo-leibnizianism which was initiated with the slogan “Back to Leibniz!” of Eugenyi Bobrov, the member of Yuriev School of philosophy and psychology. The most striking representatives of Russian personalism were Nikolai Bugaev, Peter Astafiev, Jacob Ohse, Lev Lopatin and others. Sometimes researchers are finding a part of personalistic ideas in the works of Nikolai Berdyaev, Lev Karsavin, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Alexander Herzen, Semyon Frank, Pavel Florensky, early works of Vladimir Soloviev and others.

But some elements of personalism might be found in the earlier history of Russian philosophical tradition. For example, Eugeni Bobrov in his work *Philosophy in Russia* called Alexander Radishchev “the first Russian personalist and Neo-Leibnizianist”. This position was accepted by Igor Yevlampiev and Vladimir Iliyn. All of them thought that Radishchev laid down the sound foundation of his idealistic doctrine based on the principles of Leibnizian philosophy (*On Man, His Mortality, His Immortality*) (Bobrov 1900).

But apart from Radishchev’s Neo-Leibnizian version of Russian personalism, we could find some examples of Fichtean and Schellingian personalism (we won’t touch the neoplatonic and theological points of view on the same issue). Such example we could find particularly in Peter Chaadaev’s *Philosophical Letters*. In Chaadaev’s philosophy personalism manifests itself in several important aspects: (1) Interconnection between the personality and the nation (as an opposition of the general and particular aspects): “The personality is impossible without the common and collective memory” (Kozyrev 2012: 44); “every nation cannot make a single step on its way to progress without the deepest feeling of its own personal exceptionality” (Chaadaev 1991: 495). (2) The critical rethinking of Kant’s philosophy—a “fallen, terrestrial, sinful author of “Critique Adam’s Reason” (Toropygin 1994: 35). (3) The doctrine of the “world’s consciousness” as the base of the tradition and every nation’s historical memory, where each person is a heir to this tradition (*Fifth Philosophical Letter*) (Chaadaev 1991: 487). (4) The idea of every human’s union within the transcendent God based on a Schelling’s views of the identity (Bobrov 1901: 15). These views later became the basis of the Chomyakov and Kireevsky conception of “solidarity” (*Sobornost*) and the Soloviev’s conception of “pan-unity” (*Vseedinstvo*). This point was emphasized in Nikolai Berdyaev’s works: “The largely predecessor

of Vladimir Soloviev was Chaadaev, not the slavophiles, though this connection stayed unclear to Soloviev himself... His theological universality, the search of the theocracy were the subjects that Chaadaev bequeathed to the future generations of the God-seekers”.

It is an interesting fact that the other philosophers, such as Nikolas Lossky, accentuate that there was the second line of Shellingianism in Russian personalistic thought. According to Lossky, the most striking evidence of this theory could be the ideas of Lev Lopatin, Sergey Alekseev (Askoldov) and Lossky himself with the statement “all is imminent in all” (Losskij 1906: 200). This resonates with the idea that Leibniz’s “Monadology” “could be considered as a variant of the “pan-unity” metaphysics” (Horuzhij 1994: 155).

In conclusion we can summarize that the whole history of Russian philosophy might be represented as a dispute of personalism and impersonalism. In spite of this both these directions point out the same issues concerning the role of personality in a worldwide process. Chaadaev’s philosophic thought could be an excellent example. According to Zenkovsky, it was “significant and important” because of “the number of major Russian philosophers returning back to issues raised by Chaadaev, although his own solutions to them hadn’t received much successors”.

Berdjaev N. A. 1998. “Takova byla filosofija istorii Chaadaeva (iz kn. *Russkaja ideja*)”. In: A. A. Ermichev, S. A. Nenasheva (eds). *P. Ja. Chaadaev: pro et contra. Antologija*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd-vo RHGI, pp. 467–471.

Bobrov E. A. 1900. “A. N. Radishhev kak filosof”. In: Bobrov E. A. *Filosofija v Rossii*. Vyp. III. Kazan’, pp. 55–77.

Bobrov E. A. 1901. “Shelling i Chaadaev”. In: Bobrov E. A. *Filosofija v Rossii*. Vyp. IV. Kazan’, pp. 1–17.

Ermichev A. A., Zlatopol’skaja A. A. 1998. “P. Ja. Chaadaev v ruskoj mysli: opyt istoriografii”. In: A. A. Ermichev, S. A. Nenasheva (eds). *P. Ja. Chaadaev: pro et contra. Antologija*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd-vo RHGI, pp. 7–40.

Zen’kovskij V. V. 2001. *Istorija ruskoj filosofii*. Moskva: Akademicheskij proekt; Raritet.

Kozyrev A. P. 2012. “Shatkost’ individual’nogo”: personalisticheskaja leksika P. Ja. Chaadaeva”. *Voprosy filosofii* 2: 40–49.

Losskij N. O. 1906. *Obosnovanie intuitivizma*. Sankt-Peterburg.

Smirnova Z. V. 2000. “P. Ja. Chaadaev i nemeckij idealizm konca XVIII–pervoj polovina XIX veka”. In: *Istoriko-filosofskij ezhegodnik*. Moskva: Nauka, pp. 207–225.

Toropygin P. G. 1994. “P. Ja. Chaadaev i Kant” *Kantovskij sbornik* 18: 28–37.

Chaadaev P. Ja. 1991. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij i izbrannye pis’ma*. In 2 vol. Vol. 1. Moskva: Nauka.

Horuzhij S. S. 1994. *Posle pereryva: puti ruskoj filosofii*. Sankt-Peterburg: Aletejja.

### SPECIFIC OF PHILOSOPHICAL AND HISTORICAL OPINIONS OF PIOTR CHAADAEV

Following subjects are supposed to be discussed: sense of history and Peter Chaadaev's views on specifics of the European culture development. Place of Russia in the family of European nations. Love to Truth as a basis of freedom and prosperity. The conflict between love to the Truth and love to the Homeland. Role of Christianity as a moral vector of European civilization. A priority of ideas over interests as a challenge of a moral guideline of the European development.

Chaadaev expected future unification of Europe on the basis of Christian religion. Unification is really happened, however not on the basis of Christianity, but on the basis of economic and political interests. The philosopher wrote: "All history of new society happens on the soil of beliefs. This means the real education. The new society approved on this basis moved forward only under the influence of thought. Interests in it always followed ideas and never preceded it. In this society interests have been always created from beliefs, but never interests caused beliefs. All political revolutions were in fact revolutions moral. They looked for truth and found freedom and prosperity. Only in this way the rare phenomenon of a new society and its civilization could be explained, otherwise nothing in it could be understood" (Chaadaev 1991: 334–335).

And here is how other Russian philosopher Feodor Stepun described a situation in the modern European democratic society almost a century later. After Chaadaev, Stepun connected together Truth and idea of freedom, but the ratio of interests and ideas in the modern Europe was seen differently, than by Chaadaev. "Idea of freedom—Stepun is convinced—(idea in Plato's, metaphysical sense of the word) in a lift-off from truth couldn't be learned. Freedom in sense of idea, i.e. in sense of the higher spiritual reality, is a way of Truth to the world, and ways of the world to Truth. "Also learn Truth, and the Truth will make you the free". The democracy doesn't protect this freedom and doesn't deny, it just doesn't adjoin to it". "What it protects—continues philosopher—there is not freedom-truth, but freedom of the fight of all truth against each other, more definitely, not than Truth (the Truth is uniform, in it any fight stops), but all truths and rightness, all semi-truths and a floor- rightness, not truths and falsehood." (Stepun 2000: 356). At the end Stepun marks: "Peering as the impartial observer at life of the Western European democracy, it is necessary to see, it appears, that the absence of moral commitment of political and public life goes too far, i.e. the autocracy of interests turns into idea of denial of any idea, into idea of changeover of ideas interests, into ideology" (ibid.: 357).

Instead of a celebration of Christian values in future Europe for which Chaadaev hoped Stepun states rigid "metaphysical inflation". Today, from our point of view, the speech already goes about threat of demolition of a Christian cultural paradigm about which Chaadaev couldn't even suspect. And there is a question than historian-philosophical views of Chaadaev are up-to-date?

- Chaadaev P. Ya. 1991. *Complete works and the selected letters in 2 volumes*. Moscow: Science.
- Gershenson M. O. 2000. *Favorites, t. 1. Chaadaev. Life and thinking*. Moscow-Jerusalem: The University Book.
- Lebedev A. A. 1965. *P. Ya. Chaadaev*. Moscow: Young Guard.
- Schpet G. G. 1989. *Compositions. Sketches of development of the Russian philosophy*. Moscow: Truth.
- Stepun F. A. 2000. *Works*. Moscow.
- Zelinsky V. V. 1991. *History of the Russian philosophy, t. 1*. Leningrad: Ego.

## Urszula Cierniak

Jan Dlugosz University in Czestochowa, Poland

### PETER CHAADAEV AND RUSSIAN CATHOLICS

---

In 1860 Ivan Sergeevich Gagarin published in Paris in *Le Correspondant* magazine an article entitled *Catholic Tendencies in the Russian Society* (*Les tendances catholiques dans la société russe*), in which the central place is occupied by Chaadaev and his views on Christianity, Russia and Europe. Gagarin—a Russian prince of noble descent—pointed out many times in his writings how important for his life choices was Chaadaev’s historiosophy and his positive views on Catholicism. Whereas, however, Gagarin converted to Catholicism, the “Philosopher of Basmannaya Street”, despite his positive attitude towards Western Christianity, remained an Eastern Orthodox Christian till the end of his life. Inspired by Chaadeyev’s ideas, Gagarin developed his own theory on the future of Russia, which involved conversion to Catholicism and recognizing the supremacy of the Pope. According to Gagarin, only that could save the Empire of the Tsars from an imminent revolution. He wrote about it in his essay *Can Russia Be Catholic?* (*La Russie sera-t-elle catholique?*), published in 1885, which generated a storm of controversy in the Eastern Orthodox world.

During those debates Ivan Sergeevich tries to prove that Catholicism carries that exceptional element which can arouse Russians to action, of which they are incapable if they remain Eastern Orthodox. In the article about Catholic tendencies in the Russian society Chaadeyev is juxtaposed by Gagarin with Russian Catholics of his times: Kozlovsky, Mikhail Lunin and Sofia Svetchina. How close was Chaadeyev to Russian Catholics? Did they finally excuse his indecision and remaining Orthodox? These are the questions which we seek to answer in this paper.

## Vladimir Chernus

Higher School of Economics National Research University, Moscow, Russia

### “THE RUSSIAN IDEA” IN PETER CHAADAEV’S AND NIKOLAI BERYDAEV’S PHILOSOPHY

Peter Chaadaev developed foundation of “the Russian thought”: almost all Russian philosophy of history will be the answer to the questions raised in *Philosophic Letters and Apology of the Madman*.

In *Apology* Chaadaev raises a question of love for the fatherland and love of truth. “Love for the fatherland gives rise to heroes, love of truth creates wise men, benefactors of mankind”. Thereby Chaadaev presents the human to a choice: love for the fatherland, or love of truth.

The radical choice for one of these statements results to catastrophic consequences as both initially good ideas are exposed to inevitable “objectivization” of Nikolai Berdyaev.

So “The love for the fatherland” which has to generate heroes, led Nicholas I to defeat in the Crimean war, and Nicholas II to defeat in World War I, revolution, Civil war and, eventually, crash of the fatherland. In a broader sense most often “the love for the fatherland” as a result of “objectivization” leads to nationalism.

“Love of truth” was understood in Russia as idea of creation of “ideal society” brought in the twentieth century to a social disaster—attempt to construct communism.

Peter Chaadaev’s contradiction between “love of truth” and “love for fatherland” is allowed by an example of life of many outstanding thinkers and writers who being national figures, made a contribution universal, thereby serving truth.

Chaadaev writes about potentiality of Russian people. On the one hand, he testifies that Russian people still haven’t proved in any way great, haven’t created anything, on the other hand—there is a hope that Russian people are urged to carry out great mission, i.e. Russian people have to serve the truth and make the contribution to universal culture. But to actualize the potentiality, Russian people have to pass a self consciousness stage as a subject. *Philosophical Letters*—the beginning of self consciousness of the Russian culture. At the first stage this understanding had “negative character”.

Chaadaev and Berdyaev are united by general passion to freedom. If Chaadaev understood freedom as freedom in a social context: freedom of expression, religions, personal liberty, complained about captivity in Nikolaev’s Russia, N. A. Berdyaev realized basic impossibility of achieving freedom in phenomenal world, he thought that freedom is a noumenal space where subjects exist.

Chaadaev and Berdyaev realized freedom as an incarnate “Kingdom of God”. If Chaadaev wanted an embodiment of this kingdom in empirical reality, thought that it is a certain sum of the phenomenal and noumenal worlds (the similar understanding became a basis for “philosophy of vseedinstvo”), Berdyaev thought the “Kingdom of God” as submission of the phenomenal world—to noumenal world.

Chaadaev realized “The Russian idea” as a potentiality of Russia and Russian people. He thought that Russia will definitely “tell a new word to the world”. Berdyaev realized “The Russian idea” as updating (embodiment) “the Russian Spirit” in the phenomenal world, submission empirical reality to Spirit.

“The Russian idea” is the Russian Spirit.

Blyumenkrants M. A. 2004. *Romantic of Spirit*. Moscow.

Evlampiyev I. I. 2002. *The history of the Russian philosophy*. Moscow.

Gaydenko P. P. 1996. *Philosophy of freedom of Nikolay Berdyaev*. Moscow.

Gulyga A. V. 2003. *Russian idea and its creators*. Moscow.

Levitsky S. A. 1981. *Sketches on stories of the Russian philosophical and social thought*. Frankfurt am Main.

Radzinsky E. S. 2006. *In Russia from mind one grief*. Moscow.

## Maryse Dennes

The Aquitaine House of Human Sciences, The Michel de Montaigne University–3, France

### FROM RUSSIA TO EUROPE: CONTRIBUTION TO THE EXEGESIS OF PETER CHAADAEV'S INTELLECTUAL GESTURE

---

We would like to show, that the distinction slavophile/occidentalists is not relevant to think the complex links between Russia and Europe, and that nowadays, in a time of upheavals and new quests of European identity, Peter Chaadaev can help us to reveal the deep nature and the role of these links. His work, which is now completely published in Russia and studied in detail don't only renew with the origins of Russian Idea ; it allows us to discover an intellectual gesture, which shows not only the way to integrate Russia in Europe but also the bases of the development of European culture.

PETER CHAADAEV: THE FOUNDING MYTH OF RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY —————

I present and argue for two theses: the first concerns the degree to which Chaadaev's thought represents a breakthrough in the development of Russian social philosophy and religious philosophy and the second concerns the Hegelian and Schellingian character of this thinking. I also show that Chaadaev's theory retained an open character closely tied to the crisis character of the social reality of his time and that it depended for its justification on the further course of the historical process, which is impossible to predict. All this leads to an interpretation of Chaadaev's view according to which the standard opposition of Chaadaev's two best-known texts, the *Philosophical Letters*, with their predominantly pessimistic picture of Russia, and the *Apology of a Madman*, which refutes this evaluation, is rejected. The role and importance Chaadaev for Russian thought could be compared to the role of modern philosophy Descartes. It was the role of founding, was to outline a problematic plane, which then could be developed in different, sometimes even contradictory directions; it was so groundbreaking, successful and versatile inspiration. Chaadaev - a fairly common opinion nineteenth-century commentators and contemporary historians of Russian philosophy - has created a kind of intellectual map of Russian philosophical thought and social force in general terms even today. Based on the issues specified by Chaadaev in the *Philosophical Letters* and the *Apology of a Madman* amounted to a classic dispute between Westernism and Slavophilism the 40's and 50's (in nineteenth century), and then a sharp, fast, very interesting, even fascinating, the development of Russian philosophical, social, religious and political thought.

Chaadayev P. Ya. 1991. *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy i izbrannyye pis'ma*. T. 1–2. Moskva: Nauka.

Dobieszewski J. 1998. *Wokół słowianofilstwa. Almanach myśli rosyjskiej*. Warszawa.

Ermichev A. A., Nenasheva S. A. (eds). *P. Ja. Chaadaev: pro et contra. Antologija*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd-vo RHGI.

Evlampiyev I. 2000. *Istoriya russkoy metafiziki v XIX–XX vekakh*. Vol. 1–2. Sankt-Peterburg.

Walicki A. (ed.). 1964. *Rosyjska myśl filozoficzna i społeczna (1825–1861)*. Warszawa.

Walicki A. 2002. *Rosja, katolicyzm i sprawa polska*. Warszawa.

Walicki A. 2005. *Zarys myśli rosyjskiej. Od Oświecenia do renesansu religijno-filozoficznego*. Kraków.



### PETER CHAADAEV'S CONSERVATIVE THOUGHT

---

Peter Chaadaev for many humanists is one of the greatest philosophers in Russian thought. His *First Philosophical Letter* was described as a “shoot in the darkness” in the nineteenth century stagnation which has been caused by new authority - new tsar Nikolay I. Despite that incomparably important reason of this situation was lack of philosophical tradition, including secular philosophy, without relations with religion and theology. Considering these circumstances Chaadaev's critic of Russian nation cannot have been unnoticed. In this speech we want to raise a point this letter but not from historical point of view, nor its consequences for developing Russian thought but in connection with rest “philosophical letter”.

For Chaadaev, as it seems, the most important in research of history and civilization was Christianity. Because it was a great development and possibility for society and culture to save this high level for many centuries. These problems are connected with philosopher conception; he talks about necessity of external beginning. Rule of the universe cannot be a result from the inside; it means that only conception of Christianity, which talks about creation world by God, can lead men to good and truth—to the development. As a result every ancient culture, like Greeks, Egyptians etc. was forced to disappear. They all tried to find beginning in man and this means that they were wrong from the beginning, and cannot go forward. Here we need to ask the question: why Chaadaev criticized Russia in his *First Philosophical Letter* if its in his time had already been for nine centuries Christian? The problem is not here in the religion but in tradition of thought. For Russian philosopher “man” means that he contains in his self everything what was made by people hand and mind until this time. It means that in the world there is no genius—people who make whole new idea, which disrupts actual rules and remade everything in new way—thus who we named that, simply use achievements of civilizations and cultures. Of course it doesn't come in intentional way, Chaadaev was sure, that in every person mind unit all past ideas, which sometimes occur for example in Descartes or in Newton.

In this what was said critics of Russian society seems to be obvious. When philosopher said that Russian take only external part of western ideas, that they don't have any tradition, he means that they don't take part in this continual work of man's mind. Despite they took Christian truth (it means they have the beginning of development), they closed to the whole world (for West and for East), they don't developed this truth. In this point of view Chaadaev is right talking that there is no future for Russia, because future can't arise out of

nothing, if there is no carefully contacts with past thought, there can't appear that "manifestation" of ideas—already mentioned in this paper.

Many philosophers and humanists think that Chaadaev was a westernizer and even a revolutionist, but during reading attentively his papers we can notice something different. With regard to "westernizer" of his thought—it is obviously, but not in the same way like in such bright representative this movement like for example Herzen. It sounds as if Chaadaev thought that Russia doesn't need western form of society or life and doesn't need to be the second German or Great Britain. Questionable aspect are not involved with walking in the same way, the most valuable thing is to take part in Christian tradition of Europe. Russia does not need great structural changes, philosopher postulated changes on man level, it means that people in Russia have to start taking part in intellectual life of Europe and not to be close connected with those what happened in the world. Only in that way Russia can take part in truth which means developing herself.

That is why Chaadaev is opposed to revolution and bigger cardinal changes, he first of all refers to tradition, to the past and he saw in that salvation for Russian nation. Because of that there is no way to speak about "westernizes" of his ideas in common sense of this word and especially speak about him like a revolutionist. It seems to this really widely describe characteristics are not connected with Chaadaev's papers but with consequences of his work. However, in this speech we want to focus on author's *Philosophical Letters* but not on his historical influence, about what was said in the beginning of this paper.

## CONTEMPORARY VISION OF MEMORY POLITICS IN CONTEXT OF THOUGHT OF PETER CHAADAEV

---

The historical ideas have a habit to revolve in the space of culture. Such is the Chaadaev's description of the desire of Historical Memory's rejection and desire of presence in space of total amnesia. Chaadaev's sharp critics of Russian life in context of rejection of critical thinking created him a fame of Russophobe and misanthrope. These notions are quite known and need no repeat. My aim is to analyze the contexts of actualization of Chaadaev's ideas in our days. Here I want to look at Chaadaev's thought the method of a-historical reconstruction (elaborated by Kiev philosopher Vachtang Kebuladze). Here one will not find the historical-philosophical research, but a-historical reconnaissance of the contemporary context of rereading of Chaadaev's texts.

Actualization of Chaadaev's position appeared due to the Nobel Speech of Svetlana Aleksievich (2015). Aleksievich asked in her speech if Chaadaev was right, claiming that Russia is a country without Memory? Nobel laureate reveals the connection between total historical amnesia and absence of critical thinking and reflection. What links we can see between the quality of Historical Memory and presence of critical thinking?

Referring for Chaadaev's texts reveals for us the peculiarities of contemporary commemoration practices. Not in vain S. Aleksievich reminds Chaadaev when describes the main treasure of Russian Historical Memory—the suffering. Why suffering do not converts itself in freedom—asks S. Aleksievich? The special feature of Memorial politics in contemporary Russia is absence of peculiar human voice. So called masculine historical narration, based on military glory, leaves no place for the individual voice of alone person, who brings on his\her shoulders the tragedies of history. The military parade appears the main form of representation of national unity. This form of Historical Memory allows only glorification of common past, no critical thinking. Such position products the aggressive view of alien enemies and our “special way”, which nobody alien can understand. Taking into consideration the descriptions of the enthusiasm for military parades in Russia in texts of Marquis de Custine (1839), we can suppose that the bases of Chaadaev's critics of Russian patriotism.

2014 and 2015 were the year of potent historical anniversaries. The models of commemoration in different countries reveals the crisis of European vision of the Past. We see the sharp separation of the modes of social consolidation in context of history. Chaadaev's vision allows us to reveal the additional features of contemporary crisis of historical conscience.

### PETER CHAADAEV ON RELIGIOUS DETERMINANT OF THE RUSSIAN HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

---

The paper takes a new look at the work of Peter Chaadaev as initiator of the disputes on Russian civilization and national identity. This research focuses on his Russian history direction understanding by means of his religious historiosophy. Chaadaev is the founder of Russian religious philosophy of history, who formulated its general thesis on Christianity as a religion of freedom and progress, system of the universal values such as unity, equality and justice, determined the world history development.

Chaadaev is known as the creator of the “Russian idea”, a set of reasoning about national identity and Russian historical fate. The author was in epicenter of European ideological disputes and interacted simultaneously with such different currents as German idealism, French reactionary romanticism and utopian socialism. The result of this ideological synthesis explains consistently Eurocentric type of his philosophy of history. Chaadaev based his concept on the opposition of East and West as two different axiological, social, cultural and political modes of Christian civilization. Russian thinker noted the role of Catholic Church in the spiritual and political unity of the Christian West, promoting social progress European family of nations, based on shared values of the rule of law.

Chaadaev contrasted social activity and liberating potential of European Christianity to Russian religious and cultural particularism, despotism, severe asceticism and slavish obedience to the will of Russian Emperor. Russian thinker believed slavery and paralysis of Russian people will a consequence of Byzantine perception of the faith and power relationship. The uncertainty of Russian identity and unpredictability of its transformation was the main outline of Chaadaev’s thinking about the Russian history direction. This kind of “tabula rasa” theory subsequently inspired both its critics and apologists to the radical Russian modernization scenarios.

## Tanya Galcheva

Sofia, Republic of Bulgaria

## Inna Golubovych

Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University, Ukraine

### BULGARIAN CHAADAEV: YANKO YANEV'S BOOK AND ITS CRITICS D. MIHALCHEV AND P. M. BITSILLI

---

In 1932, in Sofia, was published in Bulgarian a book entitled *Peter Chaadaev. His Personality and Philosophy* (Yanev 1932). It was written by the young philosopher Yanko Yanev (1900–1945) and provoked an open debate. Two remarkable scientists took part in it: the Bulgarian philosopher Professor Dimitar Mihalchev (1880–1967) and one of the numerous Russian emigrants, who found refuge in Bulgaria after 1917, Professor of World History Peter Mihailovich Bitsilli (1879–1953).

We could hardly expect that it is by a simple coincidence that these two articles appeared one after another. And we should also notice, that they were printed in the most important journals of the time: *Philosophsky pregled and Zlatorog*. The first of them, Mihalchev's critical analysis (Mihalchev 1932), is famous for its sharp pathos and sense of injustice. The second one, Bitsilli's short work (Bitsilli 1932), remains mostly unknown.

Setting aside Mihalchev's biased attitude, we should admit that he is not absolutely wrong, some of his statements couldn't be ignored. The influential philosopher expressed his doubt regarding the right to exist of a book written in Bulgarian. He suspected, that "in Bulgaria one can hardly find ten people who might be interested in the influence of Chaadaev and his role in Russian thinking" (Mihalchev 1932: 191). This question arose in a moment when no separated edition, consisting of the translated Chaadaev's letters, for example, existed in the small country. In this case the critical view outstrips the independent reading.

One of the famous figures of Bulgarian thinking was also irritated by the attitude of his young colleague towards the predecessors (according Mihalchev the author not only underestimated their achievements, but was not even aware of their works). Bitsilli too agreed with this observation, but he mentioned this in a more quiet way ("the author is unjust to his predecessors" (Bitsilli 1932: 283). A well-founded reproach: some of Yanev's insights not only reminded of the conclusions of P. N. Miljukov (Milyukov 1897) and M. O. Gershenson (Gershenson 1908), they were even a literal copy of them.

It is possible to exaggerate the reason for the appearance of Bitsilli's review on the book of Yanev and to look at it as a response to the Mihalchev's one. There are some arguments in

this direction: it appeared some months after Mihalchev's and its tone, more considerate, differed from the previous one. The researchers, however, who are aware of the numerous historian's critical analyses, could be impressed by the author's restraint. He expressed his admiration in only one sentence in which he announced that Yanev's work was a book of great value (Bitsilli 1932: 283). All the professional opinion is limited to this short definition. There's no need to prove anything, the conclusion seems to be a matter of fact, not a proposal or predication about the future of the study.

Bitsilli, according to his own admission, had carefully read Yanev's book in order to note its disadvantages. His objections might be summarized as follows: first, an inappropriate structure of the work leading to repetitions and, second, a few historical inaccuracies through the narrative. In his tone, however, the specialist was extremely abstentious, almost lenient ("I have no doubt that the author knows: the Christianity penetrated into Russia only in tenth century and Patriarch Nikon lived in seventeenth century" (Bitsilli 1932: 283).

Whatever were the motives, the review was written and published and it was the second step in the reception of Bulgarian *Chaadaev*. The affirmative pathos of Bitsilli's work which was strongly opposed to the Mihalchev's criticism, encourages us to note the actual value of Yanev's conception on the life and thinking of Chaadaev. It's easy to find its place in the personal biography of the author: no matter of its disadvantages, this work was the first source in Bulgarian permitting us to approach the first Russian religious philosopher. What is more: despite of his reputation of a wordy author, Yanev had created a book which demonstrated his deep understanding of the history of Russian thinking. Reading this research we should ever remember that it was written by a Bulgarian, who did not bother to inscribe his own ideas as a free subject.

The opened view-mind approach and the lack of complexes allowed the young philosopher to create an integral and harmonious image of Chaadaev and it is exactly in this achievement that we should look for the explanation of the long lasting value of this book.

In Yanev's thinking the biography of the Russian writer, despite its sharp turns and choices does not fall to pieces. All the contradictions mentioned have been overcome by conciliation. Yanev pointed out that it is a rare case in Russian history when "the personality and his philosophy were in agreement" (Yanev 1932: 33).

The author was not afraid of antinomic thinking: the polemics with the Slavophiles was considered as an important part of Chaadaev's world-outlook. In his development the theorist—a convinced Westernist—"turned into a fanatical Slavophile, though not as narrow-minded as his previous enemies" (Yanev 1932: 106). The conciliation made also possible to remove the contradiction between Catholicism and Orthodoxy: according to Yanev, his hero, though influenced by the Latin authors, remained faithful to the Christian ideal preached by the Russian church.

The preface of the Bulgarian book opens by a quotation from the *Apology of a Madman* proclaiming the cult of truth in cognizing the Fatherland. In it the young philosopher in his creative approach based on German and Russian traditions, answered, among other questions, to the following one: How to exist “between” the love of Fatherland and the love of truth? In his emotional assertion he proposed a different conjunction—“within”—that is: within the cognition of the past and within the conciliation of religious principles.

Bitsilli P. M. 1932. “Pet”r Chaadayev” ot Yanko Yanev”. *Zlatorog* 5–6: 282–284.

Gershenson M. O. 1908. *P. Ya. Chaadayev. Zhizn’ i myshleniye*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiya M. M. Stasyulevicha.

Mihalchev D. 1932. “Yanko Yanev. P. Chaadayev”. *Filosofski pregled* 2: 190–195.

Milyukov P. 1897. *Glavnyye techeniya russkoy istoricheskoy mysli*. T. 1. Moskva.

Yanev Ya. 1932. *Pet”r Chaadayev. Lichnost i filozofiya*. Sofiya: Knigoizdatelstvo T. F. Cipev.

### “THE PATRIOTISM WITH OPEN EYES” AND THE TRAUMAS OF HISTORICAL MEMORY

We live in the world which has survived two the world wars and decades of local conflicts, in the world, whose heard is crossed by the multiple scars—the traumas of historical memory. The memory of a trauma survived by a people is similar to the memory of an individual trauma: it defines ourselves, our relation to others, our vision of the past and the future.

It’s remarkable that most conflicts of the last and current centuries (the Greek-Turkish and the Armenian-Turkish conflicts, the civil wars in Spain, in Ruanda and in the former Yugoslavia, the mass repressions in the Soviet Union, the Shoah, the confrontations between the Poles and the Ukrainians, the Ukrainians and the Russians, the Lithuanians and the Poles, and so on)—even those of the conflicts which had an ethnic criterion in their basis—had the character of inner, civil confrontation: “the lines of faults” passed there where the centuries-old experience of social (ethnic, religious) groups’ co-existence subsisted. The extreme forms of cruelty manifested during these conflicts are often explained by this circumstance: the cruelty became here a result of the fundamental social taboo’s break—the violence against the community’s members.

One of the most complicated question here is that of “the memorial politics”: how can one’s patriotism be compatible with the memory of a crime committed by one’s own state, one’s own nation? As Aleida Assmann writes, there are only three roles which a nation’s memory is ready to sanction in the relation to the traumatic history: a role of a victor that had overcome the evil, a role of a fighter and martyr that furnished resistance to the evil and a role of a passive victim of aggression. How is possible a patriotic historical narrative in the situation of evil committed by your own nation?

In the report I plan to discuss some ways by which some nations try to dissolve this problem: (1) non-recognition of a crime (for example: Armenian genocide denial by Turkey; participation of the local population in the Holocaust in Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, west Russia; and so on) and, hereupon, the substitution of the repressed content of historical memory by a surrogate (used often as an official historiographic version), constructed usually as one of the group of historical facts’ absolutization; (2) self-justification (Turkish soldiers and officers in regard to the Greek and the Armenian “separatists” and “*national traitors*” during the I WW): the own guilty’s recognition is rejected by the rhetoric formulas “I had to do this”, “it was a war...”, “my enemies did the same” and so on; (3) the deprecation of the past as a form of emancipation, moving away from it (the case of postwar Germany)—but as an unavoidable consequence of this way of “the memory formatting” a nation gets evident or hidden struggle of the “archival” and “canonical” contents of the historical memory.



One of the most painful aspect of the problem regards to the conception of “the collective guilty” imputed to all the nation including the future generations. Is such conception ethically accepted? Can the guilty for the Nazis’ crimes be imputed to the Germans of Sudetes? Could all the Ukrainians of the Eastern Poland be condemned for the acts of genocide (operation “Vistula”, 1947)? Do the contemporary Russians bear responsibility for the crimes of Stalinism or the Soviet regime as a whole? No doubt, a person who participates in a crime or justifies it does bear responsibility for this crime. But this responsibility can be only personal, it commensures to the measure of participation in the crime.

I suggest that the ethical unacceptability of the “collective guilty” conception does not make unacceptable the conception of the responsibility. The guilty is directed to past; the responsibility is regarded to present and future. The responsibility is imperative. It demand the work of the social memory intended to the healing of wounds and traumas, to articulating of the truth. This work is especially actual in contemporary Russia, in situation of acute militarizing and mythologizing of the historical narrative.

## Vladimir Keidan

Rome, Italy

### THE WISE RAVEN CHAADAEV IS RIGHT... THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHAADAEV'S RUSSIA-EUROPE PARADIGM IN THE RUSSIAN THOUGHT BETWEEN 1908–1911

*The Messianic Idea inherent to the Russian People resulted from both their sufferings and their hopes and strivings towards the Coming City of God. But the Russian Mind has confused and conflated this Russian Messianism with the [original] Jewish one, thus lapsing into nationalism. Our sense of national identity has never been healthy—either too much pride or too much self-negation.—Nikolai Berdiaev, Russia's Destiny.*

This paper traces the Chaadaev Paradigm, of skepticism towards native Russian Orthodoxy and of keen interest in Roman Catholicism, in its turn-of-the-Century guise (1908–1911). I examine the letters of Marietta Shaginian, Zinaida Gippius, Dmitry Merezhkovsky, and Dmitry Filosofov. These express skepticism about the Novoselov Circle type of traditionalist Orthodoxy. I also use the Correspondence between E. N. Trubetskoy and M. K. Morozova, which addresses the internal strife in the Put' Publishing House, concerning the ideological premises underlying their Preface to the 1911 Collection titled "On Vladimir Soloviev".

In 1836, after the publication of Chaadaev's *Philosophical Letter*, Russian Intelligentsia started developing the so-called Chaadaev Complex—a sense of belonging neither to the East/Asia nor to the West/Europe but torn somewhere between the two. It strives to belong to Europe but cannot, really. As N. S. Trubetskoy wrote, "Most educated Russians did not wish to be themselves but strove to be "true Europeans," and, because Russia, despite its keenest desire, could never become a true European State, most of us, Russians, came to despise their Homeland."

Chaadaev's philosophical retrieval started among the figures of the Modernist Russian Religious Revival—such as Gershenzon, Merezhkovsky, and Stepanov. The Chaadaev Paradigm appealed to both the Petersburg New Religious Consciousness circle, as well as the Moscow Publishing House Put' circle which centered on Soloviev's idea of Pan-Unity. On the one hand, both Chaadaev and the New Russian Religious Consciousness thinkers believed that the Human Race needed to be brought back to its Paradise lost en masse but that that task had to be achieved through social and cultural progress. The Put' Circle, on the other hand, believed that Chaadaev was a pioneer in the specifically Russian Philosophy. Chaadaev's original critics, the Slavophiles, had a ready-made Byzantine template for what they perceived as Russian Identity—with the God-Bearing Nation, the Church-State Symphony, etc.

Chaadaev and his original followers, on the other hand, were still searching for an independent Russian identity. E. N. Trubetskoy (his letter to M. Morozova dated 18 June, 1909) cites Chaadaev on this: "One first needs to define what is specific and inherent to Russia and her path. Chaadaev is quite apt on this in his letters... Chaadaev's thought is strikingly similar and kindred to Soloviev's. His mind seems deeper than Soloviev's, though he is less gifted or expressive than Solvyov. His nature is not as exuberant."

In both these branches of the Chaadaev Paradigm, Russian National Messianism took the form of the more or less subtle Russification of Christ and His Gospel. In his book on A. S. Khomiakov, Berdiaev defines Messianism as a claim to a single nation's primacy and uniqueness in Christ. Unlike what Berdiaev calls "Missionism," i.e. the notion of a specific mission to a nation, which missions can be as many as there are nations, Messianism claims not specificity of one nation among many but its primacy.

*Novyj mir* 1993: 10.

*On Vladimir Soloviev*. Moscow: Put' 1911.

Shaginian M. 1988. "Letters to Zinaida Gippius". *Novyj Zhurnal* 171.

Trubetskoy E. N. 1997. "Letter to M. K. Morozova, 3.31.1911". In: V. I. Keidan (ed.). *Vzyskuiushchie grada*. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoj kul'tury.

Trubetskoy E. N. 1912. "Old and New Russian National Missionism/ Messianism". *Russkaia mys'* 3.

Trubetskoy N. S. 2004. *Notes and Letters*. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoj kul'tury. 2004, pp. XX-VII-XXVIII.

Yermichev A. A. 1998. *Russian Philosophy as a Whole: A Historical Reconstruction of a System*. Abstract for Doctoral Dissertation. Sankt-Peterburg.

## PETER CHAADAEV AND ST. INNOCENT OF KHERSON: NEW TRADITION CONTOURS

At first glance, Peter Chaadaev and St. Innocent of Kherson have very little in common. However, there is something that makes a comparison of their ideas possible. Although their origin, social background, education, life experience, etc., are different, both of them belonged to those whose ideas formed under Alexander I, but who themselves became famous in the next, tsar Nicholas, epoch, in particular, in the first twenty years of it. At that time, the intellectuals were actively assimilating the ideas of the German classical philosophy. A comparison of the texts by Chaadaev and St. Innocent of Kherson should reveal what were the first fruits and the strongest impacts of the new concept and terminology assimilation, respectively, in the Russian philosophical and theological tradition of the first half of the nineteenth century.

The philosophical heritage by Chaadaev has been studied much better than the theological works by St. Innocent of Kherson. The doctrine of the Church and anthropology are known to take the biggest part in Chaadaev's philosophical understanding of Christianity. In the doctrine of the Church, Chaadaev focuses mostly on its social role and sees the prototype of the future in the Catholic Church-Kingdom, while his anthropology focuses on the idea of the physical and moral world parallelism and the need to subordinate the individual's mind to the Divine one, which should eventually lead to the transformation of society. The movement on the part of society (the Church) and the individual should lead to the unity of a renewed Divine humanity.

The most common anthropological term used by Chaadaev is the concept of consciousness and it should be emphasized that in the French originals of his texts this concept is expressed through two words diverging in their principal meaning, "la connaissance" meaning "knowledge" and "la conscience" meaning "conscience". A study of the semantic context of their usage leads to the following description of the anthropological model proposed by Chaadaev:

Man is created in the image of God, which is primarily revealed in his freedom, an essential feature of which is the consciousness of our action conformity or non-conformity to God's will or the immutable moral law (Divine mind). This consciousness-conscience in a man is in turn closely connected with his own mind, although it is not quite identical with it in the current (fallen) condition. Formally, mind can't avoid perceiving, i.e. understanding, and this is how our "actual I" ("le moi actuel") appears, but it becomes distorted without the unification with (return to) the Divine mind. Christ provides us with the ideal model of

the moral-and-rational identity. This gives rise to the problem of the conscious movement towards this identity, which is the main problem of the modern philosophy.

Unlike Chaadaev, St. Innocent of Kherson focuses on Christology. However, in his works it is closely connected with ecclesiology, as well as anthropology, which allows us to identify a number of theses that are parallel to Chaadaev's ideas.

First of all, it should be noted that St. Innocent introduces the terminology of the new philosophy into his Christology (as well as into the triadology). Even in the characteristics of the Holy Trinity hypostases, he focuses on the idea of the moral and self-conscious subject. Although he makes a qualitative distinction between the Divine Persons' and the creature's consciousness, the category of consciousness becomes the main to him as well.

He connects the doctrine of the Church with the revelation of Christ's tsar service that naturally produces the doctrine of the Church-Kingdom, which in no way copies Chaadaev's doctrine, but at the same time evokes strong associations with it.

In the anthropology, St. Innocent also makes a distinction between two levels of consciousness: consciousness as conscience and consciousness as self-awareness. Hence the duality of the personal and the Divine in man, which disappears in Christ, in Whom humanity is imbued with the Divine to the extent of a loss of self-awareness; its overcoming is a matter of the future human transformation, when the Church will embrace the whole humanity and our consciousness will be so much imbued with the Divine that it will lose a sense of self, and man who is now saying "I do" will be saying "God does".

To draw a conclusion, strong parallels can be seen in the ideas of such different contemporaries as Chaadaev and St. Innocent of Kherson. As they were unlikely to influence each other, a logical question of the common genesis of their ideas arises.

For the doctrine of the Church, this common source should be the works by Comte de Maistre, which were more positively assimilated by Chaadaev and more critically by St. Innocent of Kherson.

For the anthropology, a similar source could, *inter alia*, be the doctrine of soul by a well-known Schelling's student, G. H. Schubert, who determined conscience as a sense of people's unity, which reveals in a feeling of unconformity between the sinful human will and the Divine law.

Finally, the parallelism of these authors' ideas obviously demonstrates the objective historical demand for the intellectual "expertise" independently conducted by them, as well as for the interpolation into their own arguments of the ideas that emerged in the field of vision of the tradition.

## Lilianna Kiejzik

University of Zielona Góra, Poland

### PETER CHAADAEV IN THE POLISH AND RUSSIAN HISTORIES OF PHILOSOPHY

In my presentation I intend to show the way historians of Russian philosophy—in handbooks of history of philosophy published in Poland and Russia (also in USSR)—look at Chaadaev. I will try to arrive at some kind of general assessment, to show the impact of the outlook of these authors on their evaluation of Chaadaev, and to rate their philosophical characterization of this thinker.

## Svetlana Klimova

Higher School of Economy National Research University, Moscow, Russia

### CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT THE NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS: FROM DIALOGUES WITH THE SUPREME POWER TOWARDS PUBLIC DISCUSSIONS

---

Peter Chaadaev is an ambivalent figure. The significance of his ideas was, in a certain extent, exaggerated and misunderstood both in Russian philosophy and social science.

He is a victim of the most enduring stereotypes about “our first attempts of realising ourselves” (N. Berdyaev) at the Westernisers vs. Slavophiles debate in the 30s of the nineteenth century, representing clearly a historical exaggeration of his own role in that process. The value of Chaadaev ideas is not that he is a pioneer in raising the question of national identity in the historical and religious planes. But he has moved the discussion of the existing problem into the new register, to the level of public discussion.

The problem of “first attempts” was set much earlier, first on the official state level owing to the efforts of two Catherines in the process of creating the Russian Academy 1783, “for the sake of development of Russian language and literature”. In its Statute, the Academy officially declared, as its primary intention, to define the concepts of national culture, Russian language and “national self-consciousness” (E. Dashkova’s expression). By decree of Catherine II, the area of the humanities was outlined, and it started to shape actively in Russia, trying to solve these problems as the most important ones. Public dialogues between ruling elite and intellectuals of that time in Russia became the main form of development. The dialogue of Catherine the Great and D. I. Fonvizin was one of the notable examples.

In the first third of the nineteenth century, the tradition of dialogue with the supreme authority was continued by *Sovremennik*, its editors and writers such as A. S. Pushkin, V. F. Odoevsky, D. I. Jazykov and others. In no. 2, 1836, another example of communication between authorities and savants, Alexander I and N. M. Karamzin, was demonstrated.

In the same issue we see the most destructive criticism against any reforms, initiated by the authorities. The negative assessment of any social events has become the only way of affirming one's own ideas. The ever-present criticism of the authorities and "attacks" against the state became a new style of Russian literary criticism. Odoevsky impartially branded that style as a mercenary self-presentation "to sold their [critic's ] books—and they have succeeded in doing that".

The first *Philosophical Letter* of Chaadaev, published in the same year in "Telescope" (no. 15, 1836), was also such a "mercenary paper", about which Odoevsky wrote so sarcastically. Chaadaev was not the first who described the historical past of Russia negatively, but he was among the pioneers who created a new format for discussing Russian national identity, shifting the discussion from the official polemical public space to the unofficial one. At the same time, he became one of the creators of the space itself, involving into it great masses of the literate (reading) people. The latter has turned, after Chaadaev, into a peculiar intellectual force capable of independent judgment and actions in the field of creating and strengthening the national history and identity. In this respect, the role of Chaadaev is underestimated.

On the one hand, having created a social environment, he approved the space of the liberal opposition instead of a dialogue with the authorities; on the other hand, his rigorism bring him a reputation of a person "responsible" for many unresolved problems in his Fatherland, from the viewpoint of authorities and also in public opinion (formed under his own influence). Speaking figuratively, Chaadaev began to look like a sacred victim which should be "destroyed", albeit symbolically, to "rescue" the supreme power from the revolutionary upheavals that shook Europe. And the society passed, peacefully enough, to a broad literary and journalistic discussion about the fate of Russia and continued searching for its own identity.

**“UTOPIA IN RETROSPECTION” IN THE CONCEPTION OF RUSSIAN NATIONAL POLITICS. THE PROBLEM OF PATRIOTISM AND THE CRIMEAN WAR (1853–55) IN LETTERS BY PETER CHAADAEV**

---

The events of the Crimean war (1853–55) were reflected in a special way in the fate of P. Y. Chaadaev. M. O. Gershenzon in his work *P. Y. Chaadaev. Life and thought*, referring to Suerbaev, notes that Chaadaev “felt bitter about the beginning and the end of the war” (Gershenzon 1989: 219). In his letter of 1854 Chaadaev characterizes the national policy concerning the war as an attempt to implement the “retrospective utopias, the beginning of our return to protective order, rejected by our ancestors in the person of Peter the Great” (ibid.: 218).

Assessing the schemes made by “new patriots”, Chaadaev reveals the main features of their national doctrine: according to it, Russia symbolizes some abstract principle, embodying the “final solution of the social question”. They speak of Russian messianism, i.e. “deliberate mission aimed to absorb all the Slavic peoples into itself and so to perform the renewal of the human race” (ibid.: 217). According to Chaadaev the retrospective utopia in the national conception was based on the idea that Russia is “the legitimate heir of the glorious Eastern Empire, as well as all its rights and dignity” (ibid.: 217).

Also according to Gershenzon the problem of patriotism reveals the conflict between Slavophilistic idea and Chaadaev conception. Gershenzon sees two different types of patriotism here. Chaadaev consciously loves “our own” only so far as it is good but Slavophiles love “our own” without any conditions and reasons (ibid.: 206). Chaadaev sets the messianism of national patriotic idea to against the idea of common policy of mankind. In Chaadaev schemes the idea of a peculiar global mission of Russia, i.e. the Commonness of Humanity, is formed. At the same time this mission of Russia also involves the synthesis of two trends, i.e. ascetic and social, in Russian Church, that will come to being in the future, as Chaadaev hopes.

The conception of patriotism in Chaadaev letters gave impulse to the discussions about the Russian path performed by writers and philosophers in 1900's and 1930's. As I. Vorontsova believes, the patriotic uplift of 1914 turned Merezhkovsky to the messianistic ideas (Vorontsova 2003: 185). In Prishvin journals the criticism directed against the utopian patriotic conception that emerged in the years of WWI is compensated with an image of positive utopia. Prishvin sees the latter as interaction between the immortal individual and space that overcomes the “naïve egoism and fetishism of the state” (Prishvin 2007: 171). In his philosophy centered on the individual the peculiar kind of responsible ministry is



embodied. The person who performs it does not divide the world on “white” and “red”. The idea is to form the connections between the parts of the whole based on the sympathy and compassion and to be opened to the other mind and culture. This image of the Russian path in his journals became, as we believe, an answer to ideas concerning patriotism expressed in Chaadaev letters.

Gershenson M. O. 1989. *P. Chaadaev. Griboyedov Moscow. P. Chaadaev. Essays of the past.* Moscow.

Prishvin M. M. 2007. *Diaries 1914–17.* St. Petersburg.

Vorontsova I. D. 2003. *Moscow*, pp. 200–224.

## Ivan Kokovin

Novosibirsk State University of Economics and Management, Russia

### PHILOSOPHY AS SPIRITUAL EXERCISE IN THE EXPERIENCE OF PETER CHAADAEV

In this article the anthropological concept of spiritual exercises is analyzed; the role of Peter Chaadaev’s philosophe in forming of Russian anthropological idea in nineteenth century is determined; such aspects as the precondition of philosophical-anthropological trends in Russia, as well as the history of philosophizing about a man in the context of ethical and religious-philosophical discourses in ancient times and nineteenth century are researched; and the hypothesis that *Philosophical Letters* contain conceptual content, which is characteristic for practice of spiritual exercises, is substantiated. According to the basic thesis of the article—Chaadaev was one of the first culture bearers in Russia, who worked out not religious, but philosophical practice of spiritual exercises.

## Fr. Kirill Kopeikin

St. Petersburg State University Center of Interdisciplinary Scientific Theological Research and St. Petersburg Theological Academy, Russia

### PETER CHAADAEV AND MODERN PROJECTS FOR CONSCIOUSNESS STUDIES

Currently, one of the most promising projects is the study of the brain and consciousness. One of the main difficulties of modeling of consciousness lies in the fact that mental concepts, in contrast to the concepts related to physical objects (which simply *exists*), *intentional* (lat. *intentio*—*aspiration*), i.e. *aimed* at an object. But how intentionality can appear in the structural mathematical model?

In search of an answer to this question should refer to linguistics. In natural human language, which is, basically, the only way of manifestation of consciousness, in addition to the obvious informative (and how to “impersonal”) function, there is another, at first sight, inconspicuous, but extremely important role—imperative, enjoining. This “strong-willed”, “marking” function of language manifest in the so-called *performative* statements (lat. *per-formo*—act) that represent the *actions* and not the messages.

The performativity of language is extremely clearly expressed in mathematics: it defines the word law itself of the existence of mathematical objects, then creates a “space” in which these objects are being. And it is performativity of language embodied in mathematics can help to fill the mathematical natural science (structural) theory of meaningful sense. But how to describe this performativity, where to find adequate language?

And here theology comes to help. The main feature of the Bible as a sacred text (common to the three so-called Abrahamic religions—Judaism, Christianity and Islam, for whom the Bible is a sacred Scripture) is its performativity. A deep study of the biblical text enables us to formulate a new conceptual language, allowing meaningful interpretation of structural mathematical and physical knowledge.

## PETER CHAADAEV'S RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY AS MODERN THEORETICAL ISSUE

Noting the next milestone in the posthumous glory of Pjotr Chaadaev, modern researchers can open the new horizons in his creative heritage. Having an opportunity to examine a full volume of his works and necessary materials, to overcome the annoying mistakes and delusions of the works which were attributed to him (as Obleukhov's "mystical diary"), we can investigate objectively the character and essential features of Chaadaev's philosophy, and consider him as the most original Russian thinker.

Analyzing Chaadaev's philosophy at the beginning of the new century it is necessary to be discharged of the detailed historical, cultural, and sociopolitical reminiscences toward the Decembrists, as well as the literary and art movements of the beginning of the nineteenth century, and also of an alluvial religious-mystical bias of "the Russian spiritual renaissance" (M. Gershenzon and D. Merezhkovsky), of specific theological considerations (I. Gagarin, V. Zenkovsky, G. Florovsky), of Soviet and Marxist rational-atheistic constructions.

To my mind, it is possible to emphasize some trends in fundamental research of Chaadaev's philosophy.

(1) To characterize systematically the main religious-philosophical Chaadaev's views in the modern framework of specified Russian philosophy. Along with the analysis of the Catholic, the Orthodox, Masonic, Shellingian and many other ideas, it is necessary to examine the metaphysical, historiosophical, religious- philosophical aspects in Chaadaev's philosophy from the extra confessional position.

(2) To reveal a place and the role of Chaadaev's philosophy in the development of Russian philosophical thought. It is obvious now that Chaadaev's role was not only to awake the movements of Westernism and Slavophilism. This Russian thinker actively formed and extended a lot of new ideas not only in philosophy of history and religion, but in gnoseology, anthropology, ethics, aesthetics etc.

(3) To establish the reasons and value of the gender studies in Chaadaev's philosophy and Russian philosophical tradition.

The main task is to outline the multilevel and diverse Chaadaev's philosophical project which put the Russian philosophy in the forefront of the world theoretical thought.

**PETER CHAADAEV ON IMPORTANCE OF BYZANTINE INFLUENCE FOR PHILOSOPHICAL DEVELOPMENT OF RUS'** 

---

The problem of Russian past was of a great interest to Peter Chaadaev. However talking about the Russian past, one cannot help but reflect on the role of Byzantium in the process of development of Russian intellectual culture. It is without exaggeration one of the most important issues of Eastern Slavic studies.

Byzantine cultural patterns strongly influenced Russian civilisation and formation of Russian spiritual and philosophical tradition. The nineteenth century Slavophiles and some religious thinkers of twentieth century (e.g. Pavel Florensky) idealized Old Russia, they thought that it represented a pattern to be followed including the religious outlook which ruled then. Religion - Orthodox Christianity - appeared to them as the most important factor of formation of Russian outlook.

Chaadaev with his views prepared grounds for that discussion. In his works he has been often mentioning and examining the Byzantine problem, though without much consistency. In Chaadaev's work we can see his bias towards the thesis that Byzantine heritage might have delayed the philosophical awakening of Rus'.

It is possible that emotions clouded Chaadaev historical perspective. Shock from the contrast between Russia and Western Europe made his perception of reality biased and forced him to project this contrast onto the Russia's past. Yet it is not only Chaadaev's emotions but also undeveloped state of the early nineteenth century historical sciences are to blame for such a projection.

## CHAADAEV AND “CHAADAEVSCHINA”

---

According to M. Gershenzons opinion A. Herzen is the creator of the following “legend”: Chaadaev being the leader of the revolutionary thought in Russia. The Soviet history of philosophy turned this “legend” into an axiom under the influence of A. Herzen, N. Chernyshevsky and G. Plekhanov. However, Soviet historians of philosophy pointed to Chaadaev’s historiosophical concept as something paradoxical. If Russia has neither past nor future, then how revolutionary change is possible here?

According to the official conclusion by Lord Mersherskoy the confiscated Chaadaev’s archives do not have revolutionary content. But this material contains “desperate Occidentalism” as the worship of the West, which is impossible without a complete negation of its antipode - Russia. Chaadaev’s thought moves within the antagonistic system. In Chaadaev’s historiosophy absolute negative can turn into absolute positive and backwards. Plekhanov’s irony regarding Chaadaev’s *Apology of a Madman*: points to the extreme backwardness of Russia as the main condition for our happy future, because in this case Russia has an opportunity to avoid the mistakes of other countries. Plekhanov notes that the reason for this position is the utopianism of intellectuals: radical words, thoughts and actions can change the world.

Another feature of Chaadaev’s position was connected with the idea of “superfluous man”. In his letter to N. M. Yazykov, P. Kireyevsky entitled deeper layer of the phenomenon of “superfluous man” as “chaadaevschina”. Kireyevsky is referring to the subjective Chaadaev’s motivation: the writing, the distribution and the publication of the *Philosophical Letter* was an “act”, a “call” and a “message” addressed to Russian aristocracy. According to Chaadaev’s biographer M. Zhiharev the *Philosophical Letter* really was perceived as “insulting” and “impudent” but not as a substantial manifesto.

M. Lotman characterizes Chaadaev’s personality as connection with the romantic Byronism. A. Pushkin admired Chaadaev’s Byronism and he hinted in his poetry that Chaadaev’s revolutionism is associated with tyrannicide (“He was in Rome to Brutus...”). But according to Lotman’s notes Chaadaev’s Byronism goes into the Dandyism, which is connected with the demonstrative behavior. Lotman wrote that Russian Dandyism is inseparable from individualism, but at the same time it is in a constant dependence on the observers, and so he constantly oscillates between a claim to a riot and a variety of compromises with the society. This sheds light to the reason why for many Russian intellectuals disgraceful behavior and show off becomes a natural form of protest in a situation of complete impossibility of practical activity.

The Byronism proclaims the originality and the anti-stereotype. But the fight against the stereotypes, as Lotman said, can just as well become a stereotype and an artificial pose. The element of artificiality and disgraceful behavior was named as “chaadaevschina” in the history of the *Philosophical Letter* that is a certain trend in Russian cultural life.

The nihilistic self-affirmation was the element of the complex motives and actions that accompanied the renowned story of Chaadaev’s *Philosophical Letter*. This phenomenon manifested itself at different stages of the cultural life of Russia, albeit under different names.

However, it is quite natural that Herzen, Chernyshevsky and others appreciated the publication of the *Philosophical Letter* as the criticism of the tsarism and the call for revolution. They minded the global meanings of Chaadaev’s actions for Russian history. However, this is ambiguous with respect to the course of Russian History and persons like P. Chaadaev are able to explain different trends of our history.

Ermichev A. A., Nenasheva S. A. (eds.). *P. Ja. Chaadaev: pro et contra. Antologija*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd-vo RHGI, Chaadaev P. Y. Complete works and selected letters. In 2 volumes. Moscow: Thought, 1989.

Gershenson M. 1908. *P. Ya. Chaadaev: life and thought*. Moscow.

Lotman Y. M. 1994. *Conversations about Russian culture. Life and traditions of the Russian nobility*. Sankt-Petersburg: Arts.

Zhiharev M. 1971. “P. Y. Chaadaev. From the memoirs of a contemporary”. *Herald of Europe* 7–8.

## Bernard Marchadier

Paris, France

### FRENCH LANGUAGE VERSUS RUSSIAN: THE WORLD OF CHAADAEV, PUSHKIN, CUSTINE, AND MICKIEWICZ

---

The main points of my presentation will be the following ones : (1) Chaadaev’s friendship with Pushkin ; (2) The linguistic question: French *versus* Russian (Russian as a newly born literary language) and the use of gallicisms; (3) The Polish November 1830 uprising. Pushkin’s poem *To the Slanderers of Russia* and Chaadaev’s reaction (different to Pushkin’s and why); (4) Elements from Chaadaev’s *Letters* in Mickiewicz’s *Ustęp* and Custine’s *La Russie en 1839*; (5) In spite of differing opinions, the world of Chaadaev, Pushkin, Custine and Mickiewicz is one.

### PETER CHAADAEV AT SOURCES OF THE RUSSIAN ORGANICISM AND COSMISM

Works of Peter Chaadaev in many respects encourage development of the civic consciousness in the Russian culture, the very core of which (like in any other national culture) is formed by philosophical reflection aimed at evolving intelligent self-consciousness of a social subject. Later, the Russian civic consciousness was expressed in fiction (poems) by N. A. Nekrasov (rus.: *Poetom mozhesh' ty ne byt', no grazhdaninom byt' obyazan*, eng. literal: "One doesn't need to be a poet, but must be a civil person".), and in the context of comparative studies by N. G. Chernyshevsky and G. V. Plekhanov. The essence for this feature of the culture lies in the fact that for a "talented Russian man" the meaning of their life cannot consist in serving for "pure science" or "pure art", but for what is "much closer to their heart"—for the fortune of the country.

Traumatic inner turmoil for the national fortune enabled Chaadaev to be among the first who had comprehended the historic youth of the Russian culture and its self-consciousness as an intuitive case of the developmental principle applied in the history analysis. This principle has been thoroughly considered a decade after, by T. G. Granovsky, a historian and Russian organicist, who claimed that "...the World History should be told as a history of one person. The goal is great, but by no means yet achieved" (Granovskiy 1900: 212). Chaadaev expressed this idea in his own way: "Peoples are moral beings, as well as certain persons are. They are brought up by centuries, as well as people are formed by their years" (Chaadaev 1989: 21). As the result, "more or less successful world's spirit evolution has been in conformity with different states and ages of societies" (ibid.: 46). Unfortunately, methodological force of the developmental principle in the history analysis has not so far been investigated enough (Masloboeva 2015). Historic youth of Russia, that has lightly been mentioned in "Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View" by I. Kant, with all its advantages and disadvantages is considered by V. F. Odoevsky, T. N. Granovsky, N. Ya. Danilevsky, et al., following Chaadaev: "...if we have some advantages related to young nations and are out of the civilization, then we have none of those distinguishing adult nations" (Chaadaev 1989: 24).

Within the Russian culture, civic consciousness considered as an in-depth historic reflection based on patriotism and responsibility for its fortune, is determined by such genetic aspects of the East-Slavic ethnos as communality of their life-style and way of thinking and, consequently, sobornost and wisdom of the Russian spirit. The conceptual base for the civic consciousness maintenance in the history of the Russian culture was Russian organicism which lead to Russian cosmism (Masloboeva 2007) considering as the content of communal

works by the Russian thinkers. Russian organicism is a philosophical field inquired in the Universe and any element of the united natural and social organism as an “organic whole”, i.e. as a self-organizing, inherently active spherical system. Russian cosmism as a philosophical movement analyses a cosmic function of a person.

Chaadaev in his works contributed to ageing of the transcendent field of communal works by national thinkers, the inherent nature of which is consisted by Russian organicism and cosmism. The antecessor for Russian organicism in the nineteenth century was a doctrine expounded in “A man, his mortality and immortality” by A. N. Radischev. Presumably, V. V. Zenkovsky particularly refers to the influence by Radischev, claiming that we should not “look at the nineteenth century in Russia so, as if it had no demonstration of individual talent. *Vise versa*, we insist on the fact, that all what was grown in the nineteenth century, had begun to appear in the eighteenth” (Zen’kovskiy 1991: 22). *Radischev and Chaadaev’s attitudes are consolidated by the hatred to slave and by such worldview principles as the idea of life universality and declaration of the organic whole*. These principles would become crucial points in philosophical and anthropological taxonomy of Russian organicism and cosmism.

According to the developmental principle mentioned above, the change from adulthood to old age appears as a global worldview refocusing from the position of contemplation on activity, caused by a drastic shift in the role of a person in the world resulting from the industrial revolution at the turn of the nineteenth century (Masloboeva 2014). The idea of the active worldview type understood in the context of organicism, concerns a call for conscious accession to historic liability for the results of performance. Following Chaadaev, the moral law “binds us with sound responsibility for all what we do, for every beat of our hearts, for every passing thought, slightly touched our minds...” (Chaadaev 1989: 33).

Under understanding the global historical responsibility of a person and nation, Chaadaev introduces the reflection on a cosmic function of people. “The only thing we do is gearing ourselves into undirected activity, and shatter the world again and again” (ibid.: 71), he claims bitterly and then reflect on what is needed for a man to “wake up his knowing of the world will” and “deep consciousness of their real participation in the whole Universe” (ibid.: 55).

Chaadaev builds up fundamentals for the leading conception of religious and philosophical branch in cosmism, which was thoroughly investigated in works by V. S. Soloviev as Total-Unity and Divine Humanity. Successive relationship between Chaadaev’s and Soloviev’s works is obvious from the fact that Chaadaev “initiated” a dispute between Westernists and Slavophiles, and V. Soloviev dialectically defused this conflict in the end of the nineteenth century. *The divine human state, according to Chaadaev, is caught at the level of moral freedom and within the comprehension of the human unity*: “How in general could the humanity step forward in its infinite progress, if a man’s heart possessed no world idea of a boon common for all times and countries and, consequently, not created by men? So, why do our activities become moral?



Can it be explained by those imperative feelings which make us to obey laws and respect the truth?" (Chaadaev 1989: 54, 58, 67, 73, 77, 82).

Apart from the insight in structural and dynamic ties of all with everything and all in everywhere, the idea of Total-Unity and Divine Humanity in its essence centers in the principle of Boon, Truth and Beauty unity. Chaadaev was among the first who started developing the organic conception of the truth, which then would become a lifework in co-works by the Russian thinkers and would be most completely studied in "The Pillar and the Ground of the Truth" by P. Florensky. The search for a "lively" (not an abstract and theoretical) truth, according to Chaadaev, leads to freedom and well-being findings which unite all the people.

Chaadaev P. Ya. 1989. *Sochineniya*. Moskva: Pravda.

Granovskiy T. N. 1900. *Sochineniya*. Moskva.

Masloboeva O. D. 2007. *Rossiyskiy organitsizm i kosmizm XIX–XX vv.: evolyutsiya i aktualnost'*. Moskva: Akademiya.

Masloboeva O. 2014. "Global World Outlook". In: A. N. Chumakov, I. I. Mazour, W. C. Gay (eds). *Global Studies. Encyclopedic Dictionary*. Amsterdam-NewYork: Rodopi, pp. 226–228.

Masloboeva O. D. 2015. "Metodologicheskiy potentsial voznrastnogo printsipa analiza istorii". *Vestnik SPbGU* 17/1: 169–178.

Zen'kovskiy V. V. 1991. *Istoriya russkoy filosofii*. T. 1. Leningrad.

## PETER CHAADAEV AND PAVEL MILYUKOV: ON THE VERGE OF PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICS

---

The key thought of theses: the critical comprehension of the past of the country forces the thinker to balance between historico-philosophical reflection and politics. The Russian thinker living during the era of changes full of hopes and disappointments passes this side with a different vector orientation (Chaadaev: from politics to history, Milyukov: from history to politics). They search for the answer to questions: “Who are we?”, “What differs us from others?” and “What is common between us?”.

The strategies of critical comprehension of history, culture and society differently offered by Chaadaev and Milyukov are important as a way of symbolical expression of patriotic experiences of their authors in the long term of national and cultural identity of Russia search.

Milyukov’s choice, for comparison with Chaadaev’s destiny, is interesting in two contexts. Firstly, the choice took place in his creative biography: to stay the scientist or to become the politician. Secondly, he created small on volume, but deep on content research of philosophy of history of Chaadaev. In paper “The main currents of the Russian historical thought” Milyukov showed that the “system” of a religious historiosophy created by Chaadaev was accepted in the basic moments by native philosophers of the most different directions (Zamaleev 2007: 85; Kondurov 2003).

Certainly, Chaadaev’s and Milyukov’s biographies and creativity differ. These differences are found on parentage, on beliefs, on the ideological and theoretical backgrounds creating a world outlook.

(1) *Parentage*. Life of each thinker developed in the lines typical for their circle and generation. Chaadaev took out the impressions corresponding to the highest noble parentage and education. The nephew of princes Shcherbatov and the grandson of the Russian historian Shcherbatov, after death of parents their uncle, prince D. M. Shcherbatov who inherited a great fortune became the trustee of young brothers Chaadaev. Milyukov, on the contrary, was brought up in the environment similar to traditions of small estate noblemen. His father did not possess any inheritable resources, had modest earnings of the employee (a teacher, an inspector of art schools, a city architect, a bank appraiser), and Milyukov’s mother owned a small estate in Yaroslavl region.

(2) *Beliefs*. Chaadaev shared religious beliefs, Milyukov—scientific ones. Chaadaev did not

set hopes on constitution, and wished for restoration of “ancient discipline, public and moral” (Milyukov 1898: 375). Milyukov, on the contrary, was involved in the discussion about prospects of development of the country, started between nineteenth and twentieth centuries; he set hopes for the constitution as the political guarantor of modernization of Russia.

(3) *Ideological basics*. Authors who created a world outlook were different too. For Chaadaev it were religious philosophers - Shilling, de-Mestr, Bossyuet, Bonald. Their ideas: Christianity, in particular, Catholicism as its activity and moral form, represents progress; everything including freedom of human will, it is preset by the Foresight. Milyukov's outlook was formed under the influence of Spencer, Gizo, Vinogradov, Klyuchevsky. Their ideas: the history is not chronological retelling of the facts and events; the history is a diverse combination of cultural and social forms.

Despite world outlook and theoretical and methodological differences of views of Chaadaev and Milyukov, their biography and intellectual constructions are united with a lot of things: specifics of family education, university education, linguistic addictions, life during an era of changes and rough political events.

(1) *Self-education*. In life of each thinker lack of family harmony provided to both of them “freedom of self-education” since early years. It was shown differently: Chaadaev was brought up without parents, but in a warm family circle, Milyukov—with parents, but in constant opposition to parental cares. As a result Chaadaev was the general spoiled child and grew “the willful child” (Gershenzon 1908: 5), and Milyukov, by his own recognition, was “obliged to all himself” (Milyukov 1991: 37–38).

(2) *University circle*. Chaadaev “ate that juice which grew figures on December 14” (Gershenzon 1908: 61). High moral, public and civil belief were peculiar to people of his generation, his friends. In half-century the same heightened sense of responsibility for historical destiny of the country will be also typical for Milyukov. The atmosphere of university (opportunity to think critically and to speak fluently) strengthened a historical and philosophical reflection. Besides, at university, both thinkers received serious philological (language) preparation: Chaadaev—on philological department of philosophical faculty, Milyukov—at historical and philological faculty. It explains their great interest to “word” as an expression facility of their stand in life.

(3) The intellectual shape of both persons developed under impression of the grandiose events shaking Europe and Russia then. Comprehension of sociocultural development questions is always caused by a special life situation. For Chaadaev it was a Great French bourgeois revolution, foreign campaigns as a part of the Russian army of 1813–1815, personal trip abroad of 1821–1825. For Milyukov it became a surge in liberation movement at the turn of the century, revolution of 1905, formation of the Russian parliamentarism, World War I, falling of autocracy, personal trips abroad.

(4) *History and politics*. So different thinkers are united by a similar civic and research attitude: they raised a question of a national and world-wide historical role of Russia. For both thinkers the knowledge of history is an answer to a modernity call. Both thinkers perceived historical material as opportunity “to ask” to receive answers to actual issues of the present days. Chaadaev perceived it through “social mysticism” or “rational mysticism”, according to researchers (Gershenzon 1908: 64; Evlampiev 1998), Milyukov—through scientific empiricism (Milyukov 1991: 55; Mikhailova 2009). Both proved themselves as carriers of intellectual and moral spirit, as bright individualities. Both of thinkers considered historical material not only as an important informative resource, but also as a symbolical way of responsibility expression for historical destiny of Russia. The history interested them as a resource for transformation of the modernity.

Chaadaev’s life shows an example how the politician can learn history lessons. On a life situation, it stood close to those spheres which do politics and in which its direct results are felt. However, the heightened sense of citizenship forced Chaadaev, the potential politician, to refuse fashionable privileges and to plunge into the sphere of a historical philosophical reflection. Milyukov’s life shows the opposite phenomenon, how scientific ideas can influence world outlook purposes. Multivariate vision of historical development promoted formation of liberal views of Milyukov. Owing to turbulence of social and political events in Russia on a turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Milyukov appeared not simply armchair scientist, but the politician.

Evlampiev I. I. 1998. “Metafizicheskoe izmerenie russkoi idei (P. Chaadaev, V. Odoevskii, A. Khomiakov)”. *Filosofskii vek: Al’manakh* 5: 21–52.

Gershenzon M. P. 1908. *Ia. Chaadaev. Zhizn’ i myshlenie*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. M. M. Stasiulevicha.

Kondurov R. V. 2003. *Istoriosofia P. Ia. Chaadaeva kak problema russkoi kul’tury: istoriko-filosofskii aspekt*. Avtoreferat. Krasnodar.

Mikhailova E. E. 2009. “Russkii pozitivizm na puti ponimaniia cheloveka, ego kul’tury i istorii”. *Filosofia i kul’tura* 7: 55–61.

Milyukov P. N. 1898. *Glavnye techeniia russkoi istoricheskoi mysli*. T. 1. Moskva: I. N. Kushnerev.

Milyukov P. N. 1991. *Vospominaniia*. Moskva: Politizdat.

Zamaleev A. F. 2007. “Chaadaev i Gogol”. In: *Russkaia religioznaia filosofia: XI–XX vv.* Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel’stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta, pp. 85–95.

“THE MADMAN” APPEALS TO FAITH AND REASON: ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN *FIDES* AND *RATIO* IN THE OEUVRES OF PETER CHAADAEV

---

According to metaphysical and epistemological conception of Chaadaev, the primordial source of all beings is God—the supreme, absolute Reason revealed in Christ. On the next stage of the ontological ladder there exist the universal reason or common intelligence—“the sum of all the ideas which live on in man’s memory” which manifests in the empirical world. Finally, each man has an individual, subjective, finite, “Adamic,” fallen, artificial and evil reason. Therefore, all human rational activity is a result of participation in the divine mind. In this connection, the revealed truths concern not only the sphere of faith, but the entire domain of cognition. As the divine reason is subordinated to the tools of human language, as the human reason must be obedient to his Creator.

In *Philosophical Letters* faith and reason were treated as two reliable paths representing feeling (of a temporary nature) and reasoning (which is more constant and stable) respectively and both leading to God. Philosophy and Christian Revelation represent are two forms of knowledge and difference between them concerns only the degree to which it is measured.

On the other hand, faith also demands the confirmation of reason: “no matter how strong faith may be, it is beneficial for the intellect to realize how to gain support from the powers found within it.” Reason provides understanding the truth of Revelation, whereas Christian faith clarifies the origin and process of human knowledge.

In his notes (published as “Fragments and Various Thoughts” only in the twentieth century) Chaadaev slightly changed his view on the role of faith. In contrast to *Philosophical Letters* he examined faith not only as feeling, which helps the process of knowledge, but also as an aspect of the process itself. Faith is recognized as a specific faculty which permits an act of reasoning.

Faith and reason might be also seen as two cultural types or paradigms: the Eastern and Western one correspondingly. For Chaadaev, one of the greatest achievements and an attribute of the European civilisation is “the Western syllogism” which is unfamiliar in Russia. Chaadaev maintained the moderate position and stressed out the role of a holistic conception of reality and the coincidence faith and reason in the process of knowledge (both concerning its origin from the “universal mind” and the individual perception of truth) that seems to overcome the alleged opposition between the Western and Eastern mentality,

Catholic and Orthodox approach to cognition. One may say, therefore, that the problem of the relationship between *fides* and *ratio* has not only methodological and epistemological, but also social and ecclesiastical load and implications. What is more, for Chaadaev the question of integration of faith and reason, religion and philosophy and shaping of the universal Christian system served as one of the condition of realization of the Kingdom of God on earth.

Chaadaev interested in empirical science: physics, mechanics, astronomy and other disciplines. Between science and theology not only there is no contradiction; what is more, the scientific discoveries are in tune with religious truths. Simultaneously, Chaadaev opposed to materialism and such a newly established philosophical direction as positivism.

Chaadaev at first glance proclaimed the principle of methodological naturalism according to which science studies the world without taking into account any supernatural factors, thus is limited to the empirical reality. But the more detailed examination shows that in the opinion of the Russian thinker science is by no means religiously neutral. After all, it has its primordial (and ultimate) source in the divine reason, since all physical phenomena could be utterly explained only in this light. Chaadaev's tendency to a harmonious correlation between faith and reason will be taken out by Vladimir Soloviev in his conception of so called integral knowledge.

## Grigory Olekh

Siberian State University of Water Transport, Novosibirsk, Russia

### PETER CHAADAEV AS FOUNDER OF GEOGRAPHIC-DETERMINISTIC SCHOOL OF RUSSIAN HISTORIOSOPHY

---

Classic European theory of geographic determinism, as a paradigm which is explaining the causes, course and consequences of world historic process, even in the second half of the eighteenth century was borrowed and applied by Russian historians M. Shcherbatov and I. Boltin. However, still the first person who tried to use geographic-deterministic approach to the study of the historical development of Russia turned out to be philosopher of the first half of the nineteenth century Peter Chaadaev.

In several of his works—*Philosophical Letters, Apology of Madman, Scriptures and different thoughts 1828–1850*, and others - is contained in a fragmented, sometimes incomplete form a set of theoretical constructs, clearly indicating a complete the choice of the philosopher in favor of the theory of geographical determinism. “There is one fact, says Chaadaev, which imperiously dominates over our historical movement, which as a red thread passes through all our history, which contains in itself, so to speak, all its philosophy, which is evident in all the epochs of our public life and determines its character,... - it is a geographical fact” (Chaadaev 1991: 538). And continues to develop his idea along the same line: “...Every nation bears within itself the particular beginning, which leaves its mark on its social life, which sends its way over the centuries and determines its place among mankind; this forming beginning we have the element of geographic...” (Ibid.: 480–481).

Looking for the place of Russia among mankind, assessing its role and significance in world history, Chaadaev argues that we should talk about the loss of country from the global flow of development and about estrangement of Russian civilization from the East and from the West, primarily because of its geographical location. So, thinking about the detachment of Russia from Eastern traditions, Chaadaev observes: We are not the East. “We are just Northern people and our ideas like climate, are very far from fragrant valley of Kashmir and the holy banks of Ganges. Some of our areas, however, bordering the States of the East, but our centers are not there, not there our life, and it never there will be until some planetary outrage not shifts from place Earth’s axis or new geological upheaval again will not abandon Southern organisms in polar ice” (Ibid.: 531). The trouble of the Russian people, writes the philosopher, is only that it was abandoned on the extreme verge of all civilizations in the world, far from countries where naturally had affected education, far from hot spots, where it shined for so many centuries”; as a result, Russian people “saw the light of day on the soil, are not plowed and not fertilized by the prior generations, where nothing is said... about the leaking centuries, where there were no germs of the new world...” (Ibid.: 536). Due to geographical remoteness from the civilizations of the East and the West, Russians were buried at the “vast tomb”, where they “lived only fossil life” (Ibid.: 532).

Striving to comprehend deeper the “squalor of infant civilization” (Ibid.: 489), to under

stand the origins of the paradoxical combination of its political greatness and mental impotence, its physical strength and moral nullity, the writer refers to the theme of social immobility of Russian society. “The epoch of our social life, writes the philosopher,... was filled with dim and gloomy existence without force, without energy, inspiring by only atrocities and softening by only slavery” (Ibid.: 324). “Examine from the beginning to the end our annals, exclaims Chaadaev, you’ll find on every page the profound impact of power, continuous influence of the soil, and almost never meet expressions of the public will” (Ibid.: 537–538).

The thinker offers his certainly an original response to the question on the causes of impotence of society of and omnipotence of the State in Russia. “All of our history, indicates he, is a product of nature that immense edges, which got us in destiny. It left us in all directions and scattered in space since the early days of our existence; it instilled in us blind obedience to force of things, any power, proclaiming itself to our Lady. In such an environment, there is no place for proper daily mind communication; in this complete separateness of individual consciousness, there is no place for their logical development, for direct impulse to possible improvement, there is no place for sympathy of people to each other, connecting them into a tightly knitted unions, before which inevitably must bow all the material forces; in short, we are simply geographical product of vast spaces where we were abandoned by unknown centrifugal force, just curious page of the physical geography of the Earth” (Ibid.: 480–481).

In the above fragment, there is a great idea, later adopted by geographic-deterministic school of Russian historical science about the effects of territorial size and population density on the relationship of society and the State. Russian historical phenomenon, according to Chaadaev, consists in the fact that the extremely low population density leads to weak or almost complete lack of horizontal communication in society, and this, in turn, entails reduced social activity of society and total domination of the State over society.

Special attention should be given to judgment Chaadaev about the need “to understand the root cause of encouraging this huge Empire to go beyond its borders and forcing a painfully pushing against the rest of the world” (Ibid.: 566–567). According to the philosopher, not the last role in this centuries-old Russian expansion, which has transformed the country in the biggest power on the planet, has played a geographical factor. The thinker does not give an exhaustive explanation for this amazing phenomenon in the history of Russia, but only in passing pointedly observes: “We’re worse than nomads herding flock in our steppes, because they are more attached to their deserts than we are to our cities” (Ibid.: 324).

Equally is interesting a Chaadaev’s indication that the Russian peasantry enslavement is a direct consequence and manifestation of the geographical properties of Russian civilization (Ibid.: 567). Geographic deterministic school of national historical science included these views of prominent Russian philosopher in its theoretical arsenal.

Chaadaev P. Ya. 1991. *Polnoje sobranije sochinenij i izbrannyje pis'ma*. T.1. Moskva: Nauka.



## Fr. Georgy Orekhanov

St. Tikhon's Orthodox University, Moscow, Russia

### LEO TOLSTOY AND PETER CHADAYEV: TWO WAYS TO OVERCOME THE SPIRITUAL CRISIS

In his work “The Ways of Russian Theology”, Fr. Georges Florovsky declared that “the whole history of the Russian intelligentsia was under the banner of religious crisis in the last century”. The main task of this report is to answer following questions: what exactly was the crisis in the spiritual realm as understood by the humanities? What were the main characteristics and the methodology of studying this crisis? And how did this crisis appear in the religious works of Leo Tolstoy and Peter Chaadaev?

It is important to answer the question: what characteristics did the religious crisis have from the point of view of church-historical scholarship? A religious (spiritual) crisis we can define as a situation where the perception of cultural religious constants undergoes a significant transformation. The ultimate religious problem of this generation's representatives is that they could not find a solution inside of the traditional system of spiritual and moral values, so it was necessary to design a new value system and then as a result engage in a reinterpretation of tradition.

The answer to this question can be obtained by isolating that particular group of culture constants which are characterized as the norm of the religious consciousness. In this report an attempt is made to highlight such constants and to describe the process of its transformation within the process of secularization. Among these constants, there are two constants of particular importance.

*The crisis of popular perception of the Church and anticlericalism.* It is crucial to keep in mind that crises phenomena in the religious sphere of the nineteenth century were not limited only to Russia, moreover, it can be argued that the religious crisis in Russia was largely a reflection of similar phenomena in wider European culture. It can be claimed that secularization processes in Europe at that period of time had acquired a broad character, involving politics, law, culture, science, art, and the very life of the Church. However, according to all sources the Russian religious crisis had its own unique features, and it did not have the strong social and political overtones found in the wider European situation. There were also other unique characteristics for Russia: a culture which was determined by a completely different manner of perceiving religious cultural constants, a political context in which the labor movement was still in its infancy, and the driving mechanisms of the crisis were different from those for the rest of Europe.

Throughout the synodal period the Russian clergy had only a secondary role in social life, especially in policy. This is why we should speak not about political and social anticlericalism in the Russian context, but rather about cultural anticlericalism.

*The crisis of perception of the Gospel, and the image of Christ.* We can with all certainty claim that that the religious searching and experiments of Leo Tolstoy were determined not only by his personal predilections, but also the cultural traditions of the era. In this case there was a great importance placed in looking for a new “Image of Christ”, which was outlined in the eighteenth century. The appearance of the idea of the “Image” marked a new stage in the development of Western European thought: the birth of a “new” Christianity, which had no elements of mysticism and dogmatism, and instead placed an emphasis on social and moral terms. A kind of anthropological shift took place: now man, who is called to the angelic beauty and moral perfection, stands in the center rather than the God-man. So once again in human history the heresy of “anthropological optimism” was revived, i.e. an understanding of human nature which is characterized by the denial of any power of sin over man, and the approval of the principal that opportunities for personal and social progress can take place without divine help.

It is indicated in this report that both authors experienced a spiritual revolution. While we have a considerable amount of information about Leo Tolstoy’s revolution, we cannot say the same about Peter Chaadaev. The modern researchers emphasize this: “As a young man close to the Decembrists, a supporter of the ideas of the Enlightenment, and as a deist he experienced a religious conversion (most likely happening during his trip abroad). Some moments of his *Philosophical Letters* can be interpreted as indirect evidence of the fact that a number of significant philosophical intuitions Chaadaev made were gleaned from a special kind of ecstatic (mystical or transpersonal) experiences.”

However, we can find out something about the revolution experienced by Peter Chaadaev according to the very specific source-notes in the margins of religious works in his library. Analyzing these notes, another contemporary scholar, Boris Tarasov, made the following conclusions:

(1) In the late 1810s and early 1820s Peter Chaadaev experienced a spiritual crisis, which ended his conversion to Christianity. These searches are characterized by the admiration for the greatness of God and His goodness, a sense of dissatisfaction, and an understanding of the limits of human nature.

(2) The religious constructions of Peter Chaadaev are characterized by doubt, searching through the understanding of different theological approaches and categories. There are some striking examples of these doubts (notes on the writings of Lamennais, Seneca, Herder, Kant): “salvation? How?... when... when it’s merit? How does it happen? How is it born?...”; “And you, brood of vipers, will you resurrect? “This man keeps telling us about the resurrection, but he doesn’t say how he understands”; “The Spirit of God? Inspiration? Grace? The children of God? Prophecy? Supernatural? Divine? Spiritual? Mind? Miracles? The gifts of God? The voice of God? The Holy Spirit?”; “Christianity, Christ, Orthodoxy.”

In general we have the valid conclusion made by father Georges Florovsky more than seventy years ago: “The image of Peter Chaadaev remains still unclear. And the most obscure thing in

him is his religiosity. At least he was very frank in his letters. In these letters he remains a brilliant debater, witty and sharp writer. This apologist of Roman theocracy has less ecclesiality in his world outlook. He remains an unsociable dreamer, of the type common among Masons and pietists in Alexandrian times. He is an ideologue, not a churchman. From this there is a strange transparency of his historiosophic schemes. Christianity itself shrank in his new idea...”.

General conclusion: *these are two completely different ways to overcome the religious crisis, which still have much in common.*

Common factors in the spiritual biography of these two authors are the skepticism of youth and a search for ways to overcome the religious crisis.

There are different verortung, in particular: the absence of works by Schopenhauer and Rousseau, which were very significant for Leo Tolstoy, from the library of Peter Chaadaev, and the simultaneous absence of Catholic authors, who were so significant for Peter Chaadaev, in the library of Leo Tolstoy.

There is the similarity of approaches: the panentheistic trends that have passed through the positivist temptation (which is also important because Peter Chaadaev has gone through the “academic probation”, and Leo Tolstoy has not.)

The tendency in religious utopianism is the idea of creating the perfect human kingdom, a call to build God’s kingdom on earth.

The difference between their approaches hinges on an acceptance or rejection of human culture and history. From the perspective of Leo Tolstoy, faith and Christianity are opposed to culture. The Church is hostile to progress, and it is the main obstacle for him. In terms of Peter Chaadaev’s work, faith, Christianity, and the Church provide “unity through religion”, which is the real power forming and guarding the historical process. This ecclesiality of Chaadaev’s has a highly conditional and uncertain character, and there is an obvious shift from a soteriological to a social component.

### THE IDEAL OF TRUTH AND HUMANISM: SOME REFLECTIONS ON MASARYK'S RECEPTION OF PETER CHAADAEV

---

T. G. Masaryk (1850–1937) is known primarily as a politician, co-founder and first president of the Czechoslovakia. He is less known as a humanist whose philosophical message—a call to live in the truth, follow the ideals of humanity, moral responsibility and justice, is contained, but often unrecognized in many of his works. Even fewer are known about Masaryk's reflections of Russian culture.

Masaryk's interest in Russian philosophy, literature and religion, which developed and deepened since childhood, later resulted in writing a three-volume work *Russia and Europe*, whose subtitle reads: *A Study of spiritual currents in Russia*. This work he himself calls some kind of sociological sketches, because they reflect the individual Russian thinkers in the background of social movements, particularly in the context of the process that led from czarism to the Bolshevik revolution. In this respect, also it reflects on the future of Russia, its differences and even conflicts with Europe, but also in terms of their linkages and cultural enrichment.

Within the reception of Russian philosophy of history and religion, Masaryk captures their historical, sociological, and even psychological and spiritual background, he highlights many strengths in the dissemination of spiritual ideas, but also the limitations of the Russian environment in the spread of democratic values in post-revolutionary Russia.

In the context of this reception, Masaryk notes also the disputes of the Slavophiles and Westernizers, their arguments in the struggle to understand the historical mission of Russia in world history in general, and culture and religion in particular.

Masaryk's reception of this struggle did not avoid the specific position of Peter Chaadaev and his views on Russia, relationship to the nation, love of truth, and questions of theocracy in the Catholic and Orthodox point of views. The aim of this paper is to present Masaryk's interpretation of Chaadaev's philosophical legacy in light of Masaryk's background considerations of truth and humanism.

Čaadajev P. J. 1947. *Filosofické listy*. Praha: Universum.

Čaadajev P. J. 1989. *Filosofické listy. Apologie bláznova*. Praha: Odeon.

Čapek K. 1969. *Čtení o Masarykovi*. Praha: Melantrich.

- Čapek K. 1990. *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem*. Praha: Československý spisovatel.
- Machovec M. 1968. *Tomáš G. Masaryk*. Praha: Svobodné slovo.
- Masaryk T. G. 1919a. *Ideály humanitní*. Praha: Domov.
- Masaryk T. G. 1919b. *K ruské filozofii dějin a náboženství*, zv. 1, Praha: Jan Leichter.
- Masaryk T. G. 1925. *Světová revoluce*. Praha: Čin a Orbis.
- Masaryk T. G. 1968. *Ideály humanitní. Problem malého národa. Demokratism v politice*. Praha: Melantrich.
- Masaryk T. G. 1995. *Rusko a Evropa. Studie o duchovních proudech v Rusku*, zv. 1. Praha: Ústav T. G. Masaryka.
- Masaryk T. G. 2000. *Moderní člověk a náboženství*. Praha: Masarykův ústav a Archiv AV ČR, Ústav T. G. Masaryka.
- Nejedlý Z. 1931. *T. G. Masaryk*. Praha: Melantrich.
- Nový L. 1994. *Filozof T. G. Masaryk*. Brno: Doplněk.
- Opat J. 1999. *T. G. Masaryk–Evropan, světoobčan*. Praha: Ústav T. G. Masaryka.
- Zouhar J. 2008. *Dějiny českého filozofického myšlení do roku 1968*. Brno: Academicus.

## Andrey Popov

Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia

## PETER CHAADAEV AND ALEXEI KHOMYAKOV

---

The report examines the views of the most important Russian thinkers of the first half of the nineteenth century: Peter Chaadaev and Alexei Khomyakov. In Chaadaev's *Philosophical Letters* reflected the atmosphere of the "historical pessimism", which corresponded to the spiritual condition of the thinking part of Russian society. This work is one of the main intellectual monuments of its time. The main historical mission of *Letters* was the fact that this text have become an ideological catalyst for "philosophical awakening" of nineteenth century Russian thought. Their religious and philosophical content set such a high level of discussion on the historical part of Russia's development that all their opponents were obliged to recon with them. All the religious and philosophical heritage of Khomyakov can be interpreted as a detailed reply to their content.

It is these thinkers who formed the ideological foundation of the Russian intelligentsia. They exercised a direct influence on the entire Russian philosophy in the 1830–1850s by focusing on solving the historical and philosophical as well as cultural issues.

**Boris Pruzhinin**

Journal "Voprosy filosofii", Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

**Tatiana Shchedrina**

Moscow State Pedagogical University, Russia

## RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY AS A CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL PHENOMENON: THE PROBLEM OF COMPLETENESS

---

It is obvious that the topic of completeness of Russian philosophical thought (especially of the twentieth century) requires a very serious conceptual and historical study. This is an extremely large-scale task. In this case we will speak just about several characteristics of this completeness, and we will rely not as much on conceptual constructions and broad historical-philosophical investigations, as on the experience of one concrete edition, to the preparation of which we have relation. However, the talk is about a very extensive edition. The program of this edition that is dedicated to Russian philosophy of the twentieth century assumes the publishing of a series consisting of 60 volumes. Now we will talk about the experience of publishing already released 42 volumes. The experience of working on the volumes of this series showed a lot exactly about the completeness of Russian philosophy.

We purposefully began to work on the blocks that will restore personal fates and relationships between the philosophers. Because philosophy cannot be impersonal. Without this only abstract schemes remain, "dried" ideas, with incomprehensible connection with real life... It seems that Ancient Greeks have already said everything... And there is no sense to repeat it again and again. Meanwhile the history of philosophical thought very brightly demonstrates: their sense and their cultural excuse, their historical life philosophical ideas get through the fates of people who devote themselves to philosophy. Through personal lives this ideas incorporate in the fates of epochs, in the historical fates and there find their full meaning and dignity. Russian philosophy in the twentieth century passed through a series of epoch-making revolutions and breaks. That is why there are many white spots on the level of personal fates. The sphere of communication of Russian philosophers was destroyed numerously. And indeed for Russian philosophy the availability of such a sphere is not just a productive necessity, but its distinctive and meaningful feature. And if we want to save the completeness of Russian philosophy, we must work to restore the chronicle of thinker's lives, clarify their biographies (up to the places where they are buried), that will allow us to make their "sphere of conversation" visible. Today we often hear talks about new "Russian idea", that philosophers must newly formulate it to us. We think that such an idea is not a product of request, it is a result of reinforced work, that each of us does every day in the lecture room, at his desk, in archives, at round tables, conferences and other discussions.

## THE ROOTS OF CHAADAEV'S PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT

---

In Russian thought the opposition culture—civilization is quite frequently identified with the opposition Russia—West, in which the West is associated with the term civilization, a subject of sharp criticism by the Slavophiles.

The Slavophile movement flourished for three decades—from the 1840's to the 1860's. Slavophiles were convinced that Russia's strength was in her indigenous cultural roots and in her adherence to tradition. They idealised her autocratic form of government, Orthodox religion, and the patriarchal organisation of her peasant society. Slavophiles set Russian religiousness against Western rationalism and attacked Western Europe for its materialism, and parliamentary democracy. They saw the self-governing body of the Russian peasants, the village commune as an example of true democracy. Anti-rationalists and romantic idealists, they believed that Russia's religion and culture were better because they were infused with true spirituality and deep feeling, while materialism dominated all phases of life in the West. They were not opposed to, but supported, the introduction of Western technology. In the 1860's the Slavophile group fell apart. The liberation of the serfs and other reforms of this decade, however, brought a partial fulfillment of their demands.

Westernisers, on the other hand, lamented the country's backwardness and isolation and wanted it to catch up with Europe as fast as possible: the reactionary government first of all wanted Western efficiency, liberals looked to the political freedom of England and France, and radicals found inspiration in anarchism. They believed that Russia must adopt not only European technology, but also Western culture and progressive forms of government and social organisation developed by Western political thought. Westernisers (V. Belinsky, T. Granovsky, A. Herzen, K. Kavelin, V. Botkin and others) shared the will to import ideas to overcome the menace of the "lost" past centuries. They postulated the abolition of serfdom, establishing a constitutional monarchy, and, in the future, a parliamentary republic, securing civil liberties. They also demanded social changes: the abolition of the peasant commune and legally sanctioned class inequalities. Unfortunately for them, Westernisers could not express their ideas openly under the reactionary regime of Nicholas I, and the complete formulation of Westernism came only with Alexander Herzen's emigration to the West in 1847. In London he founded a weekly *Kolokol* (The Bell) in 1857. Herzen's later views, however, represent a synthesis of Slavophile and Western ideas in the form of agrarian socialism.

The first Euro-centric conception of the philosophy of history was created by Peter Chaadaev (1793–1856). Its character was conservative. The ideal was best reflected, according to the

thinker, by medieval Christian Europe. Peter Chaadaev's Westernism represented a specific type of conservatism in its accusation that Russian society lacked tradition and grounding in the contemporary history identified with the history of Europe. According to Chaadaev Russian culture is characterised by discontinuity; new ideas appear unexpectedly, lacking grounds and roots in the efforts of earlier generations. It was found completely unsatisfactory by the Westernisers of the 1840's, who followed the liberal and the rationalist tradition of the eighteenth century. When, in 1839, Slavophiles adopted Chaadaev's conservative hierarchy of values, rejecting his pessimistic view of Russia's future, Westernisers associated with Belinsky criticised it openly. But soon nationalist reactions to the admiration of the West set in. The Slavophiles praised the uniqueness of the Russian national spirit and called Russia a world of its own. One of the central issues in the arguments between Westernisers and Slavophiles was the role of the eighteenth-century reforming tsar, Peter the Great. It should be underlined that from the time of Peter the Great (1672–1725), Russian leaders made serious efforts to shape the Russian state in a European way. There was a deep historical and cultural gulf between Russia and the West so it would be detrimental for Russia to blindly imitate the West. The denunciation of the West was primarily a critique of present-day European society in all its materialist degeneration. The common roots of Russia and Europe in Greek culture were stressed, and often Russia was accorded a messianic role as "saviour" of Europe.

It is traditional to consider Peter Chaadaev erudite, but, as he maintained contact with both groups throughout his life and favoured the historical influence of the Roman Church, which was not shared by either Slavophiles or Westernisers. He does not fit closely into the Slavophile-Westerniser dichotomy. Chaadaev had made some study of European, and especially ecclesiastical history, and in his *Philosophical Letters* was to prove the most interesting Russian thinker up to 1840. His eight *Philosophical Letters*, written from 1828–1831, from which only the first is devoted to Russia, are deeply rooted in the European intellectual tradition and contemporary thought. Chaadaev, who read Kant, Hegel and Schelling, was mainly influenced by the French Catholic philosophers: de Maistre, de Bonald, Ballanche, Chateaubriand, and Lamennais. In his letters, Chaadaev's thought does not escape the indictment which he himself levelled against the best thinkers Russia had had so far produced: they lack certain logic and their ideas are paralysed by incoherence. Chaadaev in his famous 1829 *Philosophical Letter*, in punishment for writing which the author was declared insane by the Tsar, proclaims that Russia has no past, no framework of intellectual habits or traditional values: she has come onto the stage of history like an illegitimate child—without inheritance or bonds of former times and generations; her social groupings are rootless and unstable; and her individuals are still in the chaotic fermentation of a primaeval moral world. In the letter Chaadaev writes that Russia has never known the basic Western moral ideas "of duty, justice, law, and order." "We never advanced along with other people; we are not related to any of the great human families; we belong neither to the West nor to the East,



and we possess the tradition of neither.” “Isolated by a strange destiny from the universal movement of humanity, we have absorbed nothing, not even traditive ideas of mankind.” “What is habit and instinct to other people must be forced into our heads with hammer blows.” “We are strangers to our own selves.” “What renders us indifferent to the hazards of life also renders us indifferent to good and evil, to truth and falsehood.” “Even in our glances I find there is something strangely vague, cold, uncertain.”

During the seven years which passed from the composition of his first philosophical letter in 1829, and its publication in the Russian magazine *Telescope* in 1836, Chaadaev’s thought underwent some changes. The July Revolution in France undermined Chaadaev’s faith in Europe, and although he did not change his view on the Russian history, he became more optimistic about the future of his country. A. Walicki claims that the revolutionary movements in Europe contributed to the change in Chaadaev’s perception of Russia, and he began to value his homeland much more.

To diffuse the tense atmosphere caused by the publication of his first philosophical letter, Chaadaev wrote the *Apology of a Madman* (1837). In the work, which was not published in his lifetime, Chaadaev expresses his affirmation of the great mission of Russia. Nevertheless, although Chaadaev did not notice any spectacular greatness in the Russian history or strength of the Russian people in the past, he became an advocate of the country’s great future. According to the thinker, Russia’s hidden potential forces will be able to disclose and discover themselves in the future and help her to take a highest place in the spiritual life of Europe. Chaadaev, who believed in the mystical mission of Russia, in the second part of his life also acknowledged the greatness of Orthodoxy.

According to Chaadaev, “Love of the fatherland is certainly a very beautiful thing, but there is one thing better than that, it is the love of truth. Love of fatherland makes heroes, love of truth makes wise men, the benefactors of humanity, it is love of fatherland which divides peoples, which feeds national hatreds, which sometimes covers the earth with mourning; it is love of truth which spreads light, which creates the joys of spirit, which brings men close to Divinity.” It is not through one’s native land but through the truth that the way to heaven leads. Chaadaev, a true patriot, complains that Russians has always been too little concerned with what is true and what is not, they lack good examples, and there are not many Russians who are in love with truth. Chaadaev explains:

I have not learned to love my country with my eyes closed, my head bowed, and my mouth shut. I think that one can be useful to one’s country only if one sees it clearly; I believe that the age of blind loves has passed, and that nowadays one owes one’s country the truth. I love my country in the way that Peter the Great taught me to love it. I confess that I do not feel that smug patriotism, that lazy patriotism, which manages to make everything beautiful, which falls asleep on its illusions, and with which unfortunately many of our good souls are afflicted today.

### HOW MUST WE LOVE OUR MOTHERLAND? OR PETER CHAADAEV'S "SUSPICIOUS" PATRIOTISM

---

Is it possible to love the motherland and at the same time blame it for? This is the main question of the report. Answering this question explains the attacks on Piotr Chaadaev by his critics.

According to Piotr Chaadaev, patriotism must mature together with civil society, i.e. the state must make efforts for the developing of the citizens to the level, sufficient to objective criticizing of this state. Chaadaev's opponents, on the contrary, regard patriotism as unconditional, blind love, which even the shortcomings evaluates as merits. Ultimately, the dispute revolves around the own way of Russia's development, i.e., its civilizational differences from Europe.

Chaadaev supposes that Russia must catch up with Europe by adopting its best features, while Chomiakov, Danilevsky, and Leontyev, on the contrary, regard the isolation of Russia its merit, because Russia did not commit the blunders which the European nations did (e.g., the Crusades or overstatement of the person's significance). They almost believe lack of will, obedience of the people and the absolutism of the government to be the guarantee for the well-being of Russia.

Chaadaev's patriotism compared to such concepts looks suspicious. It was in the nineteenth century, such is the case in the twenty first.

CHAADAEV—REFLECTED LIGHT: VIEW FROM MOSCOW AND ROME

---

The report examines the central idea of *Philosophical Letters*, *Apology of a Madman* and Chaadaev's *Aphorisms*: the idea of the opposition of “East-West-Russia”—and “Truth”, taken as *in intra*, and from the point of view of two of its essential interpretations. The first interpretation belongs to Chaadaev's biographer M. O. Gershenzon—and has generally been studied thoroughly. The second is much less known and is due to Olga Alexandrovna Schor (1894–1978), long-term and permanent secretary of V. Ivanov. A well-known interpretation of hers on the “Correspondence from two angles” is a highly concise separate study in 1969, dedicated to Gershenzon and fortunately preserved in V. Ivanov's archive, in Rome (Schor 1969). In this study, Chaadaev (or more precisely a book about him) is only mentioned among the other works by Gershenzon, and Gershenzon appears mostly as an opponent of Ivanov in the “Correspondence from two angles”. In the original text, Chaadaev appears to Gershenzon—and for Olga Schor—as a timeless contemporary; like-minded fellow; a fellow traveler on the same path.

Of course, we are dealing with a double interpretation. But the character in these interpretations—Chaadaev—does not disappear in a bad infinity (Hegel's *schlechte Unendlichkeit*). In both views, from Moscow and Rome, there is the abandonment of their authors “in the twentieth century... from some other,... native of the century” (ibid.: 79). Heidegger's word “abandonment” (*Geworfenheit*) is used in Olga Schor's 1969 text in a different form, but close to Heidegger's sense, “she seemed to some untimely, *abandoned* (*zabrosheanoi*) in the twentieth century” (ibid.). A. F. Losev was even sharper, declaring himself in the twentieth century “exiled”. But did it turn out that Chaadaev himself was “abandoned” or “exiled”, from his “heaven”—in the political and cultural context of his century, at his time, his space and his history? This report is an attempt to at least partially understand this question.

Schor O. 1969. *Michail O. Gershenzon. V. Ivanov's archive, Rome. Inv. VIII. Box 5. Folder 8*

CHAADAEV AND TYUTCHEV: HISTORY, SYSTEM AND CHAOS

---

Peter Chaadaev and Fyodor Tyutchev are two outstanding representatives of nineteenth-century Russian thought. Although Tyutchev is now primarily appreciated as a poet, he was known as “the lion of the season” (Pigarev 1962: 119) in the social circles of his day - his political and social analyses from the viewpoint of the European breeding attracted many. Chaadaev also learned the manners and intelligence of high levels. He was also a perfect dandy, winning additional popularity in the secular world. Both thinkers spoke and wrote in French. Both possessed special worldviews that could not be easily labeled as representing the “Slavophilia” or the “Westernizer.”

The two men are seen as mutually incompatible enemies, yet they were true friends. Various opinions exist regarding when their friendship began. In general, however, it must have been in the mid-1840's, after Tyutchev returned to Russia. Tyutchev praised Chaadaev: “the person with whom I agree less than anyone else and whom I nonetheless love more than anyone else” (Fedosov 1989: 108). Chaadaev “could not help but love Tyutchev, could not help but find in him a completely European person, [someone] more European than himself” (Aksakov 1997: 70).

The relationship between Chaadaev and Tyutchev has been studied by R. Tempest and B. Tarasov, among others (Yuri Lotman also hints at the polarity of their opinions in his analysis of Tyutchev's views on the Papacy and monarchism, Lotman 1996: 595–598). Tempest studied the considerable correspondence between the two, providing a detailed sketch of the thinkers' friendship. At the same time, he did not compare their thought. Tarasov, on the other hand, did compare their thought in reference to Slavophilia and the philosophy of F. W. J. Schelling, describing Tyutchev's “humility” and Chaadaev's “reasonable faith.” Tarasov also observed that neither of them could truly come to terms with religion. Further, he compared and contrasted their views on Christianity (Catholicism and Papacy) Fundamentally, I agree with the results of his analyses. Yet, if we pay closer attention to the essence of their thoughts (the so-called “oppositely directed mirror”, Lotman 1996: 598), we might be able to gain a greater understanding of the width and the depth of Russian thought.

In this paper, I will analyze the similarities and differences that emerge in the thought of Tyutchev and Chaadaev, emphasizing two points in particular: (1) The ways in which the two viewed Russia's place in the world in relation to the role of the individual within history and tradition. (2) From the viewpoint of conservatism, Tyutchev and Chaadaev saw Europe (=civilization=Christianity) as a system of historical unity. Yet the two had different ways of using “cosmos” and “chaos.”

- Aksakov I. S. 1997. *Biografiya Fedora Ivanovicha Tyutcheva. (Reprintnoye vosproizvedeniye izdaniya 1886 goda)*. Moskva: Kniga i biznes.
- Degtyareva M. I. 2003. "Osoby russkiy put' glazami zapadnikov : de Mestr i Chaadayev". *Voprosy filosofii* 8.
- Gachev G. D. 1991. *Russkaya дума*. Moskva: Novosti.
- Gershenzon M. O. 1968. *Chaadayev: zhizn' i myshleniye*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kozhinov V. V. 1994. *Tyutchev*. Moskva: Soratnik.
- Lotman Yu. M. 1996. "Tyutchev i Dante. K postanovke problem". In: *O poetakh i poezii*. Sankt-Peterburg: Iskusstvo.
- Pigarev, K. V. 1962. *Zhizn' i tvorchestvo Tyutcheva*. Moskva: AN SSSR.
- Fedosov I. A. (ed.). 1989. *Russkoye obshchestvo 30-kh godov XIX v.: Memuary sovremennikov*. Moskva: MGU.
- Tarasov B. N. 1995. "F. I. Tyuchev i P. Ya. Chaadayev (Zhiznennyye paralleli i ideynyye spory druzey-"protivnikov")". In: *Tyutchev segodnya: Materialy IV Tyutchevskikh chteniy*. Moskva: Izd. literaturnogo instituta.
- Shchukin V. 2002. "Istoricheskaya drama russkogo evropeizma". *Vestnik Evropy* 4.
- Tempest R. 1986. "Chaadaev and Tiutshv". *Studies in Soviet Thought* 32.

## THE PRAGMA-LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DISSIDENTHOOD IN RUSSIA. SAMPLE OF PETER CHAADAEV

---

Dissidenthood is a phenomenon in Russia that represents an original subject for which there are no direct analogues to other discourses, including the West European discourse. The dissidenthood is unique, first of all, as a special speech practice which is being embodied in a special way by a communicative community (*Kommunikationsgemeinschaft*) in the Apel's meaning (Apel 1976) where roles of speech behavior agents are not typically distributed.

According to the late ideas of Wittgenstein, any dialogue is being performed within a language game (communicative community) and this game sets up a unique language. Therefore, any language is given within contexts of speech practice of concrete human groups involved in playing language games. Consequently, on the one hand, a universal language that would consolidate all people into a joint communication, i.e. into a joint game, is not possible, but, on the other hand, an individual language, i.e. a language of a single who was excluded from any possible communication is not possible, too. In this dimension, a universal ethics is not possible also. Ethics always is contextual to a given communicative community. Hence, following the Wittgenstein's late ideas, Apel developed a theory of the so-called applied ethics, i.e. the ethics which cannot be considered universal (because a universal language as such is inaccessible), and this ethics is limited by some discourses within concrete communicative communities (Apel 1976).

In each communicative community there are membership rules, the so-called speech competence or "intersubjective arrangement (*Verstaendigung*) about the language use" (Apel 1976). The important element of speech competence consists in understanding and accepting basic roles of speech interaction agents. Examples of such roles are as follows: (1) an epistemic role in the form of ability to train within the process of knowledge reception due to a self-critical cognitive-based relation to the objective reality, (2) a practical role in the form of ability to obey social norms, (3) a pathic role in the form of ability to self-critically consider an own subjective world (Habermas 1988).

Peter Chaadaev (1794–1856), the Russian philosopher-publicist, offered a special discourse in his work *Philosophical Letters*. This discourse contained norms and rules which were frankly hostile to already existing norms and rules of public discourse for the nobility and officials in the Russian Empire at that time. This new discourse updated epistemic, practical and pathic roles of speech behavior agents in a special way.

The Chaadaev's public position, on the one hand, was regarded as a defiance for the society and an unjustified claim to the existing tradition of public dialogue, and, on the other hand, caused a strong interest of his contemporaries to him and, even more, it led to a movement of admirers of the Chaadaev person (Khomyakov 1986; Sverbeyev 1869; Gershenson 1989). Actually, we deal with a creation of an artificial new communicative community which had some new rules and norms of public discourse and was parallel to already existing communicative communities of the Russian intelligence. In his response to the public negative reaction, entitled *Apologia of a Madman* Chaadaev definitively set up a special dissident discourse. In this discourse the most important information is transmitted beyond official channels, in particular through the so-called *Samizdat* (from the Russian expression "self-publishing") that the Soviet intelligence knew well. Thereby, Chaadaev became a first sample of the Russian philosopher-dissident. Later, the given position was realized by different thinkers many times. For instance, Alexander Zinoviev (1922–2006), the logician and publicist, became one of such thinkers.

In the presented paper, I analyze the dissident discourse and its genesis from the Schelling's attempt to develop a new parallel discourse in opposition to the Hegel's dominating discourse (it was a really important case for Chaadaev) and finishing at Chaadaev. So, I propose a pragma-linguistic analysis of the dissident discourse and consider its importance for social criticism.

Apel K. O. 1976. *Sprachpragmatik und Philosophie*. Ffm.

Gershenson M. O. 1989. *Griboyedovskaya Moskva. Chaadayev. Ocherki proshlogo*. Moskva: Izd-vo MGU.

Habermas J. 1988. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Baden-Baden.

Khomyakov A. S. 1986. "Neskol'ko slov o *Filosoficheskom pis'me*, napechatannom v 15 knizhke *Teleskopa* (Pis'mo k g-zhe N.)". *Simvol* 16: 121–134.

Sverbeyev D. 1869. "Vospominaniya o Petre Yakovleviche Chaadayeve". In: *Russkiy arkhiv* 1868. Moskva 1869, pp. 976–1002.

CULTURAL-HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS OF PETER CHAADAEV (BASED ON G. G. SHPET'S ARCHIVE MATERIALS)

---

Same to *Philosophical Letter* by Chaadaev Shpet's *An Outline of the Development of Russian Philosophy* repelled contemporary readers from itself. Even the researchers who highly appreciated this work reproached "contemptuous attitude to its 'Russian philosophy' origins". Shpet's "Diatribes" on utilitarianism and morality of Russian spirit still cause negative repulsion from this book, despite its colossal scientific solidity, that was mentioned by D. I. Chizhevsky, V. V. Penkovkiy, N. O. Losskiy, B. V. Yakovenko.

Chaadaev raised the problem of Russia, that will be become the main question for Russian philosophy for a long time. But this problem from Shpet's point of view was raised accidentally and therefore in emotional and negative form. Specifically this emotional and negative form acquired the central meaning for Chaadaev's contemporaries and his latest interpreters, obscuring his contribution to Russian philosophy. Emotionally-negative form of critics of Russian and its historical development became the main in Chaadaev's interpretation of Russia's national being. His emotionally-negative interpretation of Russia's problem came between "westernizers [*zapadnikami*]" and "slavophiles [*slavyanophilami*]" (with their intellectual attempts to think through Russia's development) and paved the way to "nihilistic intellectuals", that used this emotionally-negative form and applied it to express their own thoughts in public (unphilosophical in professional sense) form (Belinskiy, Chernyshevskiy etc.). In the history of Russian thought Chaadaev became a symbol of intellectual productivity of emotionally-negative form of philosophical propositions. Shpet emphasized this emotionally-negative Chaadaev's intention in his rigid estimates of his worldview, because he himself faced the historical situation close to Chaadaev's (during his writing of *An Outline* he also felt intellectual helplessness before things happening in the country). That is why Shpet critically evaluated his "diatribes on utility and morality", stated that he himself is poisoned by "Russian spirit" of moralism. But in contrast to Chaadaev who's emotionally-negative "shot in the dark" political "leadership" heard, and positive (reactional and conservative in fact) program was discussed at least in narrow intellectual circles, Shpet's diatribes were completely ignored by the ruling elite of Soviet Russia.



### WORLD OF PETER CHAADAEV'S IDEAS IN THE SPACE OF PHILOSOPHY OF CULTURE

Substantive basis of abstracts is the identification of the heuristic potential of the intellectual heritage of Peter Chaadaev's ideas applied to the problem space of the philosophy of culture. The place of Peter Chaadaev in the nominal continuum of world culture figures is determined in correlation with the A. F. Losev's approach to the question of the identity of Russian philosophy.

While understanding of Russian philosopher works through the prism of philosophy of culture reveals the depth and originality of Chaadaev's approach to the various aspects of the historical movement of humanity to the ideals of freedom, humanism and world improvement. Particular attention is paid to the contribution of Chaadaev into the world experience of understanding of the essence of culture and paradoxes of its dynamics. Semantic aspects are placed on the fact that the Russian thinker considered a number of problems in the unity of the following directions of reflection: epistemology, axiology and historical philosophy; also Chaadaev was interested with the problem of subject of cognitive and creative activity. Specific verge of *Philosophical Letters* and *Apology of a Madman* reflect his belief in the possibility of "transfiguration of the world" in the spirit of Christian doctrine.

An important aspect for understanding the phenomenon of Peter Chaadaev is specificity credo of Russian thinker. Semantic and existential space of Chaadaev personality includes *freedom of thought, theurgic motifs of interpretation of communication between God and man, the directions on the harmony of sacred values and fundamental values of secular culture*. According to the thinker, belief and knowledge don't exclude each other and are not the opposition of ideology: each of these cultural forms has its own abilities of understanding of the eternal problems of life and man's place in the natural world. Chaadaev's epistemological rationalism organically combined with the emotional reflection on the issues of culture and civilization and the ideas of the great thinkers of the world's history - from Plato to Schelling.

Axiological position of Chaadaev is original too. His deep thinking about the ideal as a vector of civilization development is still remain relevant in the format of the concepts of "constructive-destructive" in the life of society and the individual. Russian thinker connected positive ideal type with a focus on improving the reality and the "world of man". Particular place in the philosophy of history and axiosphere of Chaadaev is taken by the *theme of providentialism* that brings together his philosophical ideas with motifs of Schelling's "philosophy of revelation".

Chaadaev did not single out the epistemological and axiological motives in his philosophical texts in the autonomous region of reflection but included them in the space of his *historiosophical thought*. Many Chaadaev's texts reflect the characteristics of its subjective comprehension of the deep meaning of world history movement in a variety of conflicts and its lessons. Among these features is considered *pairing of the problem of free will with the higher meaning of human history*.

Reflection on the cultural and historical aspects of Russia and its prospects associated with marked moments of Chaadaev's philosophy. For example, personality and deeds of Peter the Great, as well as the religious component of Russian culture were considered in the unity of values, cognitive, historiosophical and humanitarian approaches. This feature of Chaadaev's intellectual heritage is differently interpreted by his compatriots in nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but they all noted the uniqueness of his personality.

Finally, it is concluded that Chaadaev's philosophical reflections about culture, civilization, history, freedom, the relationship between faith and knowledge, as well as the divine mind and the appointment of a man in the world are largely in tune with the problems of the modern world.

ON THE CONCEPTS OF ETERNITY AND TIME OF N. I. NADEZH DIN AS THE PUBLISHER OF PETER CHAADAEV'S *PHILOSOPHICAL LETTERS*

---

This study analyzes the concepts of eternity and time of N. I. Nadezhdin (1804–1856) with the aim of clarifying his intentions in publishing the Russian translation of P. Ia. Chaadaev's *Philosophical Letters* in his journal *Telescope* in 1836. Previous studies have noted that Nadezhdin had a Platonic-Christian vision of the future of the world, in which humanity must seek the Kingdom of God just as Plato sought his ideal Republic. But scholars have not yet clarified how he connected his Platonic eternal ideas with the historical phenomena of the world, and how his religious and philosophical views of the world related to his editorial policy for *Telescope*.

In this study it will be shown that N. I. Nadezhdin believed that “time” is the image or likeness of the divine “eternity” in the phenomenal world and that it is assigned to return to its prototype. Consequently, the created beings of the world should gradually move toward the ideal world over a long period of time. Thus, from his point of view, real “time” is nothing other than the movement of the world toward eternal ideas.

From this historical perspective, N. I. Nadezhdin made a positive assessment of the *Letters* of Chaadaev, which completely denied the value of Russia's past. In other words, Nadezhdin considered that the Russian people still did not have a true national identity, which should seek divine eternity through the establishment of “the Kingdom of God.” He criticized the people of his own country for their habit of mind, by which they had always looked solely at their neighbors on the horizontal plane without contemplating their own ideal future.

Therefore, he intended to shock the Russian audience by publishing the Russian translation of *Letters* of Chaadaev and call them to a spiritual awakening. Moreover, it should be emphasized that, in contrast to the perspective of the cultural superiority of the Western nations that was expressed in the *Letters*, he intended to point out the way in which every nation must, in its own image, rise to the height of the universal realization of the perfect idea of humanity. Thus, Nadezhdin's publication of P. Ia. Chaadaev's *Philosophical Letters* established a “critical” direction in Russian journalism, which was inherited by the next generation of realistic critics. In this sense it can be said that his theoretical and practical activity determined the main direction that Russia's intelligentsia would take.

- Bavmeyster Kh. 1807. *Logika*. Moskva.
- Bavmeyster Kh. 1808. *Metafizika*. Moskva.
- Belizhev M. B. 2010. *Petr Yakovlevich Chaadayev*. In: P. Ya. Chaadayev. *Izbrannyye trudy*. Moskva.
- Chaadayev P. Ya. 1991. *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy i izbrannyye pis'ma*. Moskva.
- Chaadayev P. Ya. 1998. *Sochineniya*. Moskva.
- Chaadayev P. Ya. 2010. *Izbrannyye trudy*. Moskva.
- Chernov E. V. 2010. "Ob otnoshenii N. I. Nadezhdina k pervomu Filozofskomu pis'mu P. Ya. Chaadayeva" *Dnipropetrovs'kiy istoriko-arkheografichniy zbirnik 4*.
- Ermichev A. A., Nenasheva S. A. (eds.). *P. Ja. Chaadaev: pro et contra. Antologija*. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd-vo RHGI, Chaadaev P. Y. Complete works and selected letters. In 2 volumes. Moscow: Thought, 1989.
- Golubinskiy F. A. 2006. *Lektsii po filosofii i umozritel'noy psikhologii*. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Gurvich-Lishchiner S. D. 2006. *P. Ya. Chaadayev v russkoy kul'ture dvukh vekov*. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Kamenskiy Z. A. 2000. "Nadezhdin: estetik i filosof". In: N. I. Nadezhdin. *Sochineniya v dvukh tomakh*. T. I. Moskva.
- Kamenskiy Z. 2009. "Paradoksy Chaadayeva". In: P. Ya. Chaadayev. *Filozofskiye pis'ma. Apologiya sumasshedshego*. Moskva.
- Lemke M. 1909. *Nikolayevskiye zhandarmy i literatura 1826–1855 gg.* Sankt-Peterburg.
- Loginov V. 2016. "Istoriya zakrytiya zhurnala N. M [sic!]. Nadezhdina Teleskop" <http://www.netslova.ru/loginov/teleskop.html>.
- Mann Yu. V. 1998. *Russkaya filozofskaya estetika*. Moskva.
- Mil'china V. A., Ospovat A. L. 1998. "O Chaadayeve i ego filosofii istorii". In: P. Ya. Chaadayev. *Sochineniya*. Moskva.
- Miroshenichenko E. I. 2013. *Ocherki po istorii rannego platonizma v Rossii*. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Nadezhdin N. I. 2000. *Sochineniya v dvukh tomakh*. Moskva.
- Nadezhdin N. I. 1972. *Literaturnaya kritika*. Moskva.
- Pustarnakov V. F. 2003. *Universitetskaya filozofiya v Rossii*. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Shpet G. G. 2008. *Ocherki razitiya russkoy filozofii*. T. 1. Moskva.

## CHAADAEV'S VIEWS ON THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE COLLECTIVE

---

The polarity between universal and particular, individual and collective, is widely considered as a peculiar character of Russian philosophical thought. In the classical scheme elaborated by the Slavophiles, the opposition between Western European and Russian cultures was seen exactly in a different attitude toward separation and integrity, individual and collective. As Ivan Kireevskij famously wrote: “in the West we find a dichotomy of the spirit, a dichotomy of thought, a dichotomy of learning, a dichotomy of the state, a dichotomy of estates, a dichotomy of society, a dichotomy of familial rights and duties, a dichotomy of morals and emotions, a dichotomy of the sum total and of all separate aspects of human being, both social and individual. We find in Russia, in contrast, a predominant striving for wholeness of being, both external and inner, social and individual, intellectual and workaday, artificial and moral” (Ivan Kireevskij, “On the Nature of European Culture and on Its Relationship to Russian Culture”). On the opposite side, Westernizers generally maintained the rights of individual reason and the person’s ethical autonomy. Belinskij, for instance, was ready to give up the chance to be “on the top of the stairs of development”, if he could not receive a full account for “all the victims of the circumstances of life and history, all the victims of casualties, superstition, Inquisition, Philipp II etc.” (Vissarion Belinskij, Letter to V. P. Botkin, March 2, 1841).

As it is well-known, though he harshly discussed with Khomjakov, and highly appreciated Western Europe, Chaadaev cannot be considered simply as a Westernizer ante litteram. Particularly his views on the relationship between individual and universal proved to be very original and especially interesting. In his *Philosophical Letters* Chaadaev traced a general hierarchy of being, at the basis of which lays the nature. The immediately superior level is the individual consciousness, over which one finds the social sphere, as a sort of collective consciousness (*Sixth Letter*). At the top there is God, accessible through the universalizing character of the social sphere. Individuals find their own meaning within the context of society, particular issues have to be connected with the universal in order to be properly understood, freedom and responsibility can be conceived only within the social sphere. In his *Fifth Letter*, Chaadaev defines a sort of universal mind, a collective intelligence which is “the sum of all the ideas which live on in human memory”, “the succession of intelligences” conceived “as a single and sole intelligence”. Such a universal intelligence, which enables both knowledge and morality, develops over time, within history. Therefore, as the unfortunate example of Russia itself clearly shows, without history, no collective consciousness can develop (*First Letter*). According to Chaadaev, unlike the Slavophiles’ views, Western Europe and Catholic Church represented the model of proper communality, rather than Russia.

On this general background, my paper will dwell particularly on Chaadaev’s attitude toward

Kant's thought. On the one hand, he criticized Kant because of his "false theory of the autonomy of human reason" (*Fifth Letter*). On the other, he did not deny the subject's active role within knowledge, neither a certain idea of freedom, so that he could even consider his own thought as a "logical consequence" of Kantian philosophy. My hypothesis is that Chaadaev's understanding of the tension between individual and collective can be effectively investigated through his readings of Kantian epistemology and ethics.

Aizlewood R. 2000. "Revisiting Russian Identity in Russian Thought: From Chaadaev to the Early Twentieth Century". *Slavonic and East European Review* 78/1: 20–43.

Cavanagh C. 1990. "Synthetic Nationality: Mandel'shtam and Chaadaev" *Slavic Review* 49/4: 597–610.

Chaadaev P. Ja. 1991. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij i izbrannye pis'ma*, Moskva: Nauka.

Cook G. 1972. "Chaadaev's First Philosophical Letter. Some of the Origins of Its Critique of Russian Culture". *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 20/2: 194–209.

Dioletta Siclari A. 1983. "La culture allemande comme fondement de la divergence entre Chaadaev et Kireevskij sur la philosophie de l'histoire". *Revue des Études Slaves* 55/2: 287–298.

Dobieszewski J. 2002. "Peter Chaadaev and the Rise of Modern Russian Philosophy", *Studies in East European Thought* 54: 25–46.

Glazov Yu. 1986. "Chaadaev and Russia's Destiny". *Studies in Soviet Thought* 32/4: 281–301.

Gurvich-Lishchiner S. 2007. "Chaadaev-Herzen-Dostoevsky: Individual and Reason in the Creative Mind". *Russian Studies in Literature* 43/3: 6–54.

Lavrín J. 1963. "Chaadaev and the West". *The Russian Review* 22/3: 274–288.

McNally R. T. 1964. "The Significance of Chaadaev's Weltanschauung". *The Russian Review* 23/4: 352–361.

McNally R. T. 1966a. "Chaadaev Versus Xomjakov in the Late 1830's and the 1840's". *Journal of the History of Ideas* 27/1: 73–91.

McNally R. T. 1966b. "The Books in Peter Ja. Chaadaev's Libraries". *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 14/4: 495–512.

Mrówczyński-Van Allen A. 2013. *Between the Icon and the Idol. The Human Person and the Modern State in Russian Literature and Thought—Chaadaev, Soloviev, Grossman*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Peterson D. E. 1997. "Civilizing the Race: Chaadaev and the Paradox of Eurocentric Nationalism". *Russian Review* 56: 550–563.

Smirnova Z. N. 1999. "The Problem of Reason in Chaadaev's Philosophical Conception". *Russian Studies in Philosophy* 38/2: 8–24.

Walicki A. 1980. *A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Zeldin M.-B. 1983. "Chaadaev's Quarrel with Kant: an Attempt at a Cease Fire". *Revue des Études Slaves* 55/2: 277–285.

### CHAADAEV'S PHENOMENON: A COSMOPOLITAN AND A PATRIOT

---

The first half of life of Peter Yakovlevich Chaadaev was like a drama saturated with sharp turns of fate and events that mattered a lot. By contrast, the second half, which has its origins in 1836, after the official announcement about the thinker's mentally illness on account of the publication of his works *La lettre philosophique adressée à une Dame* (1829) translated in Russian the drama gave place to not only externally but also internally calm, stable life. In the 1840s "Basmanny sage", how he was remembered by Herzen, found a common language with the author of *My Past and Thoughts* as well as with Khomyakov. Previously, he warmly approved the "anti-Polish" (or rather, counter-insurgent) lyrical trilogy by Pushkin and Hungarian military campaign of Russian army in 1848–1849. However, by the end of life's journey Chaadaev had wrote a tragically sounding article with the eloquent title *The Universe* (*L'Univers*, 1854), in which he accused his country of inability to calm down until it enslaved all civilized nations of the world.

Who was Chaadaev? A hardly speaking Russian cosmopolitan, as it was mentioned by memorialists; a Philocatholic and an implacable Westernizer seemed to be evidenced with his first *Philosophical Letter*; a Great Russian chauvinist despising a desire of "small" European nations for independence from Empires divided Europe, or a Russian patriot "with open eyes" who he considered himself?

Chaadaev's philosophical ideology and his civil position were changing constantly. If we forget about his exalted philosophical ideals for a while and consider only one dialectical dyad "cosmopolitan vs. patriot" (both members of which were always present in consciousness of the thinker), there will be several steps in his evolution:

—1794–1812: youthful years in the family of Prince Dmitry Mikhailovich Shcherbatov where Chaadaev got a Russian aristocratic cosmopolitan education typical for the late eighteenth—early nineteenth century according to the model of pre-revolutionary France that included the obligation to serve the Emperor and the Fatherland;

—since the beginning of the War of 1812 to conversation with Alexander I in Troppau in 1820: life in the name of civic virtue in late Enlightenment Decembrists' understanding, that is ardent patriotism "with open eyes" and beliefs in the power of persuasion and personal examples;

—since 1820 to his departure from St. Petersburg to England in 1823: a deep crisis of patriotism, romantic disappointment with the possibility to transform Russian society in the ways of enlightened absolutism or republicanism: mood that was similar to Lermontov's "Forever you, the unwashed Russia! The land of slaves, the land of lords", which had motivated a desire to leave the country;

—1823–1826: life in the West and a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; fascination with Western Europe and Western Christianity in a variety of forms (English, French, German models of social organization, religious and secular education), with a clear preference for conservative values and French religious philosophy of history adjusted for Schelling’s philosophy of revelation, which result was an appeal to the Western Christian scholasticism in chiliastic sense;

—1826–1830: the emergence of needs to turn back home spiritually and physically (O. E. Mandelstam, “Chaadaev was the first Russian, in fact, ideologically, who visited the West and who had found his way back”); the revival of the old desire to transform Russia, this time in a completely different way—attaching it to the treasury of the specific concepts of Roman Catholic Christianity in the name of the *Regnum Divinum* ideal;

—1830–1841: (including an episode with the publication of the translation of *Philosophical Letter to a Lady*, which had lost its relevance for Chaadaev by the time of publishing): extremely negative attitude towards the revolutionary events in France in 1830 and the Polish Uprising of 1830–1831 (the November Uprising—in Poland); loss of hope for peaceful religious and social evolution of the West with maintaining unshakable foundations of Western education in the proper sense (for example, the ideals of faith in one God as the foundation of human existence and of history, the unity of *Natio Christiana* or superiority of the hierarchy over the natural law and, in particular, individual human rights); hopes for ultraconservative Russia of Nicholas the First with its “privilege of backwardness”;

—1841–1853: anxiety caused by the appearance of Slavophilism that combined conservative ideals close to Chaadaev with sharp criticism of Western rationalism and, in particular, the Catholic scholasticism, with an attempt to replace it with apophatics; and aristocratic honour of the servants of the Fatherland remained by Chaadaev had been replaced with refined nationalism; simultaneous rejection of liberal-democratic humanism and “laicism” of Westerners; protection of previous positions of “scholasticism revelation”;

—from the beginning of the Crimean War in 1853 to his death in 1856: strong hostility of Great Russian chauvinism connected with the beginning of the “war for Tsargrad” and forced Chaadaev to regain an extremely pessimistic position in relation to the opportunity to serve Russia as a patriot and a Christian at the same time.

Despite all changes of the ideological and social position and the nature of patriotism, that have been already meant, Chaadaev abided by the immutable principles of the humanity oneness and a historical continuity which is based on a solid foundation of creative-monotheistic religious faiths. This principle led to the fact that the views of the thinker were always distinguished with universalism, which with the Christian finalism found its expression in Chaadaev’s representation of the ultimate goal of history—a sort of apocalyptic synthesis resembling Solovyev’s *Unity* a lot. From this perspective, his inherent patriotism was getting an integral part of his religious worship of *Regnum Divinum*. Russia had to become a part of such All-One kingdom whenever in future.



PHENOMENON OF “HISTORICAL OBLIVION” IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF PETER CHAADAEV\* 

---

Peter Chaadaev was among the first thinkers to reflect on historical consciousness both of Russian people and of Europeans. In his works he proposed several insights and suppositions that later, since nineteenth century and to nowadays, became the basis of Russian historical and social philosophy. However, despite this important role in historical and philosophical Chaadaev’s thoughts, some aspects of his ideas have never been duly analyzed either Russia or in Europe.

One of these aspects is the notion of “historical oblivion”, proposed by Chaadaev. The analysis and description of this phenomenon may present a valuable contribution to modern humanities. “Historical oblivion (actual “absence” of historical experience) that could be the basis for historical consciousness and support it in the process of decision in different historical circumstances) is one of the major issues in contemporary approach to historical memory studies. This approach was in many ways influenced by the tragic historical experience of twentieth century.

However, long before the twentieth century tragedies, Chaadaev described essential features of the historical oblivion mechanism. To describe this mechanism we can use the following questions:

1. Why can historical memory of certain society and nation be more sensitive to perceiving and memorizing (retrieval a historical experience) some historical events and at the same time ignore other events?
2. What is the mechanism of historical oblivion, considering that the things we forget are always the things we remembered and therefore had once perceived?

\*This work was supported by a grant from RGNE, Russia, nr 16–33–15001.

### PETER CHAADAEV AND VLADIMIR PECHERIN: TWO FLIGHTS FROM THE NATIVE LAND

---

Peter Chaadaev (1794–1856) and Vladimir Pecherin (1807–1885), two leading intellectuals of their time, paved the ground for two paths of dissident thought in Russia, the psychiatric ward and emigration. Officially branded a lunatic, in 1837 Chaadaev writes his *Apologia of a Madman*. He is a former officer, dandy, and familiar face in salons, masonic lodges and other secret societies, but the label that sticks is that of a Catholic. Chaadaev understood Christianity as a “family of nations”. His rejection of the “Russian world” was built on the affirmation of the West.

Chaadaev’s *Philosophical Letters* had an addressee: his neighbour, E. D. Panova, was also accused of lunacy. She shared not only his Catholic faith but also a range of other views, searching for truths which he made public in the epistolary genre. In fact, often Chaadaev’s “answers” can only be fully understood if her questions are also considered, as M. Gershenon has pointed out. Panova’s own fate with her resistance to her husband, who served the political system, was entangled with Chaadaev’s. The accusation of lunacy led to her actual internment in an asylum. This is how the lines of Panova’s family aspirations and private ambitions (outlined by M. Dmitriev) cross those of state power and ideology associated with Chaadaev. Nihilism of thought is mixed with the label of lunacy in a zero-sum game of political manipulation.

While Onegin’s prototype Chaadaev later becomes a symbol of Pushkin’s era, Pecherin represents the era of Lermontov with its despair, scepticism and sense of inevitability. Pecherin not only gave his name to the *Hero of our time* but also some of his character traits (“How sweet it is to hate your native land...”) This well-educated nobleman with his knowledge of the classical languages and a promising career at a prestigious faculty in Moscow’s university departs into a nowhere, explaining his decision with some general motives (V. Pecherin *Autobiography*). Remarkably, Pecherin remains abroad in 1836, the same year when the *Philosophical Letters* are published. But if for Chaadaev, the West is an “intellectual Mecca”, for Pecherin it is a place of service. It is here that he gained his reputation as an orator and preacher. Chaadaev never tested ways of knowing the world from within, while Pecherin devoted his life to it. Even his pseudonym, Fussgaenger (literally, the Pedestrian, or Wanderer), reflected his choice to give his ideas practical meaning. Chaadaev may have shared some ideas of the Decembrists but never joined in their deeds.

On his own, Pecherin tried to solve ontological problems, feeling his way via a religious

search. This was unacceptable for Chaadaev, who made the rejection of individualism his personal “programmatic” requirement (A. Walicki). As a “Westerner”, he elevated the status of God intellectually and with it the idea of history as Providence, point to the place of the Church in the development of humanity. Pecherin rejected Russia as a form of life and meaning, converted to Catholicism and became a Jesuit, insisting on the fecundity of the “small deeds”. Thus he preferred the “isolation” of a chaplain in an Irish hospital to a house arrest in his native country.

## Natalia Vaganova

St. Tikhon’s Orthodox University, Moscow, Russia

### “THE ONLY PITY IS THAT HIS *PHILOSOPHICAL LETTERS* ARE ADDRESSED TO THE LADY” ... LETTERS TO A LADY AS A PHILOSOPHICAL GENRE

---

When Chaadaev refers to “Madam” in the *Philosophical Letters*, he follows the tradition established already. In the history of Russian thought, we can recall the philosophical letters of Dmitry Venevitinov to “Countess NN” (in fact Princess Troubetzkaya) or Catherine the Great’s correspondence with Voltaire and Diderot. The Lady as the destination, or, on the contrary, as the sender of philosophical messages puts participants of the dialogue in a situation where the debate is not expected, priori. Indeed, in a public debate with Chaadaev, not Mrs. Panova, but Pushkin and Khomyakov entered. But the tradition of dialogue between the Philosopher and the Lady is much older. And if the Madam translates wisdom, that Philosopher hears already, like Socrates listened for Diotima respectfully...

The report examines the specificity, meaning and significance of this dialogical situation.

**PETER CHAADAEV: THE TRUTH AND THE FREEDOM.** 

---

The proposed paper intends to analyze Chaadaev's thought with a special attention to his view on Christianity fulfillment through time. A comparison will be made with the theory by Arnold Toynbee, as both elaborated similar concepts of religious development of history. The gaps between the two, in particularly regarding the possibility of building the Heaven on Earth, will entail the critical analysis of Chaadaev's theories.

The issue is to show incoherence of whatever thought willing to give shape to the authentic Christian sense of history without any regard to the concept of person and radical freedom connected to it. Chaadaev faces difficulties defining ethics and the value of human actions: if good actions are just the result of human submission to the Creator, than even Bible is a mere Church product, a book written by men long time ago. In this perspective, Christian understanding of the tradition cannot be maintained. Chaadaev's view of the same Church is controversial: he recommends rites as spiritual exercise, but only unless faith does not reach a higher level. Furthermore, single Churches should spoil themselves of their identity in order to melt in one only institution. This theory highlights the universal and unifying aspect of the Church, while undermines the importance of single communities and different confessions. These controversies will be analyzed, mentioning the importance of the difference within the interfaith dialogue (statement is also important for the understanding of the Eucharist by Chaadaev).

Eventually, it will become clear that all these ambiguities are due to one basic difficulty corroding Chaadaev's theoretical asset: a sacrifice of the particular, the single and the individual, in the name of the universal.

## Fr. Vladimir Zelinsky

Exarchate of Orthodox Parishers of Russian Tradition in Western Europe, Brescia, Italy

### ANSWERING CHAADAEV

---

The author has chosen a personal letter to the philosopher as a literary form of his reflection on Chaadaev's thought because he himself hasn't written anything besides private letters during his life. He reminds that Chaadaev's main philosophical work has come to the world by the letter to an almost unknown woman which the author himself has forgotten to send. Nevertheless its publication in 1836 "thundered like a shot in the dark night" (Herzen). Chaadaev wrote in French which was his mother tongue and the author of the paper begins his own letter also in French and then switches to Russian. First of all, he focuses on the overwhelming fame of the *First Philosophical Letter* of Chaadaev which were offensive for the Russian national pride by its very critical treating of the Russian past and present. Although this letter has remained practically inaccessible for so many years, it marked the destiny of the Russian philosophical thought. Pope John Paul II named Chaadaev amongst the most outstanding Russian religious thinkers. But his reputation was created not only by the text itself, but also by the numerous responses to it. It generated and continues to generate the continuing reply to the pessimistic view of Chaadaev on Russia to begin with the early generation of Slavophil's up to the contemporary nationalist ideologies. One may say that Chaadaev not only got Russia awakened but split it in two parties, one that is "ours" and the other "not ours", in partisans of empire and national traitors; this division remains also today. His very name became in Russian memory as a record of pain which is often concealed and perpetually discussed. The whole image of the author of *Philosophical Letters* remains very controversial, whether as a patriot who hated Russia or as an owner of the serfs who hated slavery; or in other ways.

Paradoxically, this notorious publicity shadowed Chaadaev's own philosophy exposed in other philosophical letters, lost for one hundred years and published for the first time only in 1935. In these letters, the author develops very interesting religious views on the profound connection between man and God which begins at the moment of creation. God put in man the essential knowledge of truth which can be understood as a trace or sign of His Word in the human being. The truth of Revelation is accessible to each of us, insists Chaadaev, and the spiritual world and the material are governed by the same law. In the ontology and the theory of knowledge of Chaadaev we can see the same struggle between East and West as in his vision of the "mystery of time".

### WHAT IS A "HEALTHY NATIONAL FEELING"? SERGE BULGAKOV'S RESPONSE TO CHAADAEV'S DESPAIR

---

Analyzing the links between philosophy, theology and nationality in Russian thought, it is intriguing to look at the intellectual development of Serge Bulgakov, "who walked a fine line between exclusivity and universality when defining the features of Russia's national faith" (Strickland 2013: 177).

Bulgakov walked many fine lines between opposite positions with virtuosity, and his thought can hardly be grasped by assigning him to one particular intellectual tradition. In an early article about Alexander Herzen's struggling with "the West", Bulgakov refers to "the West" as the older brother of "our culturally outdated fatherland". But according to Bulgakov Russian intellectuals should not follow Chaadaev's despair caused by his negation of any Russian cultural capabilities: With regard to Western technical achievements like industrialization, railway, banks and a constitutional state, Bulgakov seemed to be sure that it would only be a question of "cultural maturity" and time, until Russia would adopt them. But he agreed with the Slavophiles, that there is such a thing like spiritual creation, which calls for cultural diversity to which each nation contributes with its own "new word" (Bulgakov 1993: 120–121).

Most of all, Bulgakov was following Vladimir Solov'evs moral critique of official and ethnic nationalisms, while promoting a kind of "true patriotism" (Gaut 1998: 77, 88). The great influence that nationality had gained in the political life of modern Europe as a most productive force in history motivated both Soloviev and Bulgakov to try to formulate their idea of a "healthy national feeling" based on the teachings of the Church (Strickland 2013: 151, 154, 178) and with a special focus on the "people" (Zweerde 2013) Bulgakov also follows Soloviev's (and Johann Gottfried Herders's) idea of the whole mankind as organism with each nation as an organic member with its own function and mission (Gaut 1998: 92). At a time where "the national question", "Russification" and the growth of national consciousness of non-Russian people within the empire were debated vigorously, Soloviev's and Bulgakov's concept of peaceful coexistence in the common house of the empire, whilst only theoretically defending the right of self-determination of each nation, turned out to provide more contradictions than solutions to the problem of reconciliation of Christian universalism and a "healthy" patriotism (ibid.: 87, 92; George 1988).

Together with his fellows on the way "from Marxism to idealism" Bulgakov definitely turned to nationality as a means of unifying Russia's divided society (Zwahlen 2010: 156; Kappeler 1993: 280f.), but despite his obvious approximation to the ideological and influential program of the Orthodox clergy based on the idea of "Holy Rus", Bulgakov's vision of a Russian nation united

by Orthodox faith contained sharp differences, because he rejected autocracy, the conservative patriotic unions in the Duma and the official model of “Orthodoxy, autocracy, nationality” (Bulgakov 1906; about Bulgakov’s later “monarchism” and its rejection see: Zwahlen 2011). On the contrary, he welcomed the Paschal Edict on religious toleration in 1905 (Strickland 2013: 173). Interesting enough, with regard to other nations, Bulgakov (like Soloviev) stresses the need for national humility instead of national pride, which is probably a most innovative idea with regard to Christian politics of international relations (Bulgakov 1994; Gaut 1998: 85ff.).

But nevertheless, it should not be ignored or downplayed, that before the First World War Bulgakov has become one of the intellectual promoters of Russian national messianism in the wave of Nationalist War Commentary—like numerous European intellectuals on the outbreak of war in 1914 rallying to their nation’s banners (Stroop 2013: 113ff.; Zwahlen 2010: 158–161). Bulgakov firmly believed in Russia’s calling “to manifest to the world a new, harmonious social organization” by achieving victory in the spiritual battle of Russia with “Germanism” (Stroop 2013: 113–114), and in 1918 he wrote about the fact, that “Russia betrayed her calling, became unworthy of it, and therefore fell, and her fall was as great as her calling had been” (Bulgakov 1918: 80). In Bulgakov’s reflections in 1931 on the fate of Judas and the fate of Russia we will find a moderated version of Russian messianism: The Russian people is called to the faith of Christ, *together with other peoples*, and *also* bears the seal of apostleship (*italics mine, RZ*)” (Bulgakov 1931: 526), just like Judas, whose apostleship cannot be taken away from him, and who despite his betrayal will “rise from the grave” in Christ.

These subtle changes in Bulgakov’s way of thinking about nationality can be illustrated by citing two passages, the first from his work “Reflections on Nationality” (1910), the second from “Nation and humankind” (1934). Bulgakov’s “Reflections on Nationality” are written in the aftermath of his famous Vekhi essay in 1909, where he had criticized the intelligentsia’s cosmopolitanism and the “absence of a healthy national feeling” (Bulgakov 1994: 43ff.). In his “Reflections”, he tended to diminish the principle of universality in exalting the national faith: “It is possible to speak in full seriousness and without the slightest trace of blasphemy not only about a Russian Christ, but about a Greek Christ, an Italian Christ, and a German Christ... And in this we by no means reduce religion to an attribute of nationality. In fact, just the opposite is true. Here nationality becomes an attribute of religion, or more precisely that particular image in which the universal truth is apprehended” (Bulgakov 1911: 299, as translated by Strickland 2013: 177).

Twenty years later, Bulgakov will leave the idea of a chosen people behind: “The chosenness of a chosen people has ended by achieving the goal of God’s incarnation, and after that there is and cannot be no chosen people, whoever may make a claim to this, because everyone is chosen and everyone has a calling” (Bulgakov 1934: 652). Furthermore, he criticizes the usurpation of Christianity by one nationality: “Christians of different nations should love and honour each others Christian [cultural] gifts, and they can’t and shouldn’t hate each other with nationalist

hate. Such dishonest concepts like 'deutsches Christentum' or, worse, 'arisches Christentum', are contradictory, because they divide Christ" (ibid.: 650).

Hence, in my paper, I will try to trace the development of Bulgakov's thinking about the relation between the love of fatherland and the love of truth by highlighting several important stations on his intellectual path and by exploring their specific contexts and influences. Following Soloviev (Gaut 1998: 92–94), Bulgakov's concept of Christian politics demonstrated, that politics rooted in Orthodox belief need not be conservative or nationalist, but his early, rather static view of "nations" did not provide a basis for formulation a workable policy for interethnic relation within a multinational state, while his later work uncloses some docking stations for more liberal and pluralist views.

Bulgakov S. N. 1906. "Cerkov' i gosudarstvo". *Voprosy religii* 1: 53–100.

Bulgakov S. N. 1911. "Razmyšlenija o nacional'nosti". In: S. N. Bulgakov. *Dva Grada. Issledovanija o prirode obščestvennyh idealov*. Vol. 2. Moskva, pp. 278–313.

Bulgakov S. N. 1918. *Na piru bogov: Pro i contra: Sovremennye dialogi*. Kiev: 1918.

Bulgakov S. N. 1931. "Judas or Saul?" *The Slavonic and East European Review* 27: 525–535.

Bulgakov S. N. 1934. "Nacija i čelovečestvo". *Novyj grad* 8: 28–38.

Bulgakov S. N. 1993. "Duševnaja drama Gercena". In: S. N. Bulgakov. *Sočinenija v 2 tomach*. Vol. 2., pp. 95–130.

Bulgakov S. N. 1994. "Heroism and Asceticism. Reflections on the Religious Nature of the Russian Intelligentsia". In: M. S. Shatz, J. E. Zimmermann (ed.). *Vekhi: Landmarks: a collection of articles about the Russian intelligentsia*. Armonk, London: M. E. Sharpe, pp. 17–49.

Gaut G. 1998. "Can A Christian Be a Nationalist?". *Slavic Review* 57/1: 77–94.

George M. 1988. "Die 900-Jahr-Feier der Taufe Russlands im Jahr 1888 und die Kritik Vladimir Sergeevic Solovevs am Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche in Russland". *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 36/1: 15–36.

Kappeler A. 1993. *Russland als Vielvölkerreich: Entstehung, Geschichte, Zerfall*. München: C. H. Beck.

Strickland J. 2013. *The Making of Holy Russia*. New York: Holy Trinity Publications. Stroop Ch. 2013.

"Nationalist War Commentary as Russian Religious Thought: The Religious Intelligentsia's Politics of Providentialism". *The Russian Review* 72: 94–115.

Zwahlen R. M. 2010. *Das revolutionäre Ebenbild Gottes. Anthropologien der Menschenwürde bei Nikolaj A. Berdjaev und Sergej N. Bulgakov*. Münster: LIT-Verlag.

Zwahlen R. M. 2011. "Pravo kak put' k pravde. Razmyšlenija o prave i spravedlivosti S. N. Bulgakova". Transl. by M. Vargin. In: N. Plotnikov (ed.). *Pravda. Diskursy spravedlivosti v ruskoj intellektual'noj istorii*. Moskau: ID Ključ-S, pp. 264–275.

Zweerde E. Van Der 2013. "The Rise of the People and the Political Philosophy of the Vekhi Authors". In: R. Aizlewood, R. Coates (ed.). *Landmarks Revisited: the Vekhi Symposium One Hundred Years on*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, pp. 104–127.





---

**KRAKOW  
MEETINGS**

[www.krakowmeetings.eu](http://www.krakowmeetings.eu)





