



KRAKOW
MEETINGS

**KRAKOW
MEETINGS** MAY 28–31 2017
KRAKOW KRAKOW
CONFERENCES BENEDICTINE
ON RUSSIAN ABBEY
PHILOSOPHY IN TYNIEC
VIII

**ALEXEI
KHOMIAKOV:
WE ARE
SOBORNOST'**

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS



**KRAKOW
MEETINGS**

**International Conference
Krakow Meetings 2017**

**May 28–31, 2017
Benedictine Abbey in Tyniec
Krakow, Poland**

**ALEXEI
KHOMIAKOV:
WE ARE
SOBORNOST'**

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

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
Committee on Philosophical Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences

HONORARY PATRONAGE

Committee on Philosophical Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences

ACADEMIC BOARD

Teresa Obolevitch | Krakow
Artur Mrówczyński-Van Allen | Granada
Paweł Rojek | Krakow

ADVISORY BOARD

Prof. Gennadii Aliaiev | Poltava)
Prof. Konstantin Antonov | Moscow)
Prof. Rev. Pavel Khondzinskii | Moscow)
Prof. Marcelo López Cambronero | Granada)
Prof. Daniela Steila | Turin

CONFERENCE SECRETARY

Olga Tabatadze | Granada



ALEXEI KHOMIAKOV: WE ARE SOBORNOST'.

INTEGRAL LIFE IN SLAVOPHILE THOUGHT AS AN ANSWER TO MODERN FRAGMENTATION. THE CHURCH, EMPIRE AND THE MODERN STATE

The second decade of the 21st century, which has been especially rich in events of great importance to the Church, gives us a privileged position from which to try to outline a contemporary view of issues that are key to modern man—and, therefore, fundamental to theology, philosophy, and literature. The specific nature of Russian religious philosophy allows us to build a more complete interpretation of the contemporary world by avoiding the increasingly obvious tricks of modern positivist thought, and to explore the theological and philosophical intuitions of Russian thinkers, which with the passing of time seem to be ever more current and on the mark. This attitude towards the legacy of Russian thought allows us to reaffirm the importance of research on the history thereof. At the same time, it makes it possible for us to try to overcome a certain complex that reduces such studies to a type of “exotic philosophical archeology” within academic theological/philosophical circles, even in Russia. Philosophy cannot exist without the “history of philosophy,” but when it is reduced to mere investigations of the past, it ceases to be philosophy. (The same occurs with theology.) This idea underlies the program proposed for our upcoming conferences, and closely reflects the personality and thought of Alexei Khomiakov, our author for the Krakow Meetings 2017.

For this Russian thinker, one of the founders of the Slavophile school of thought, belief in the Church’s—and Christian thought’s—organic relationship with the society that has been given to us, is an assertion as self-evident as the need to nourish ourselves from the legacy of age-old ecclesiastic experience. Khomiakov was thus able to unreservedly offer an alternative to the also-Christian schools of thought colonized by modernity and shackled in the sterile fields of neo-Scholasticism, Kantianism, liberalism, and capitalism, even overcoming the limits of the deserts of Christian thought mangled by modernity and buried under the names of conservatism, traditionalism, values, etc. The Slavophile proposal of “integral life” entails the need for ontological, epistemological, anthropological, and historiosophical exploration, which, rooted in the experience of *sobornost'*—communion—allows Khomiakov to explore ways to overcome the colonization by modernity, which is something that the Church continues to need today as well. The life of the Church community thus emerges as a true alternative, full of life and hope—and not just as one element of individualized, alienated, and fragmented post-Enlightenment society. Thanks to this position, Khomiakov was able to emphatically affirm,

“Communion in love is not only useful but wholly necessary for the attainment of truth, and the attainment of truth is based on this communion and is impossible without it. Inaccessible to individual thought, truth is accessible only to the combination of thought linked by love. This feature sharply distinguished Orthodox teaching from other teachings: from Latinism, which depends on external authority; and from Protestantism, which emancipates the individual into the desert of rational abstraction.”

The pathologies that Khomiakov attributes to the Latin Church and to Protestantism—namely, authority and individualism alienated in the desert of the abstraction of reason, no less alienated and fragmented—are today the fundamental characteristics of modern states, of the societies in which we live, and to a large extent, of the alternatives that are brought forth in an attempt to counter them, too, whether they be new anarchist and anti-system schools of thought or nationalistic or imperialist claims, that may also be presented as Christian, whether Catholic, Protestant, or Orthodox. For Khomiakov, the Church is not merely an institution or a doctrine, but rather a living body of truth and love, imbued with the spirit of *sobornost'*. Understood in this way, the Church is also a social organization.

His works therefore figure today as a provocation that helps us once again take on the challenge of rescuing Christian thought from modern colonization, of taking it back from the desert of enlightened abstraction so that it can offer modern man a true alternative, a space for love and truth, the living experience of the Church. Alexei Khomiakov's person and thought present us with this challenge, which shapes the objectives of the Krakow Meetings 2017: namely, furthering knowledge of the work of this Russian thinker, advancing studies of his sources and his influence on the development of Russian thought, and exploring the surprising topicality of his philosophical/theological proposal.

KEYNOTE LECTURES



Alexey Malinov | St. Petersburg

Teresa Obolevitch | Krakow

Andrey Popov | Moscow

PROGRAM

MONDAY

May 29, 2017

OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE | St. Petrus Hall

9.00

Rev. Szymon Hiżycki OSB, The Abbot of Tyniec Monastery

Rev. Jarosław Jagiełło, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy at the Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow

Sr. Teresa Obolevitch, The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Head of the Organizing Committee

SECTION 1 | St. Petrus Hall | chair: Paweł Rojek

9.20

Andrey Popov, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia

А.С. Хомяков как один из основателей славянофильского учения

10.00

Alexey Malinov, St. Petersburg State University, Russia

Славянофильская философия истории: от А.С. Хомякова до В.И. Ламандского

10.40–11.20

Discussion

11.20

The Official Photo Shoot

11.30–12.00

Coffee break

SECTION 2A | St. Paulus Hall |
chair: Gennadii Aliaiev

12.00

Boris Tarasov, Maxim Gorky
Literature Institute, Moscow, Russia
А.С. Хомяков и Паскаль

12.30

Nikolai Pavliuchenkov, St. Tikhon's
Orthodox University, Moscow, Russia
*К вопросу о влиянии Шеллинга на
философско-богословское наследие
А.С. Хомякова*

13.00

Marta Łukaszewicz, University of
Warsaw, Poland
*Отражение богословских взглядов
Алексея Хомякова в художественном
наследии Николая Лескова*

13.30

Discussion

SECTION 2B | St. Barnabas Hall |
chair: Natalia Likvintseva

12.00

Dmitrii Badalian, The National
Library of Russia, St. Petersburg, Russia
*А.С. Хомяков и "официальная
народность"*

12.30

Lada Shipovalova, St. Petersburg
University, Russia
*Идея "соборности" А.С. Хомякова
как регулятив межкультурной
коммуникации*

13.00

Elena Tverdislova, Tzur-Hadassah,
Israel
Соборность – как языковая западня

13.30

Discussion

14.00–15.30 | Lapidarium
Lunch

14.45

EXCURSION TO THE ABBEY MUSEUM (GROUP I)

SECTION 3A | St. Paulus Hall |
chair: Oleg Marchenko

15.30

Sergey Troitskiy, St. Petersburg State
University, Russia

SECTION 3B | St. Barnabas Hall |
chair: Ruslan Loshakov

15.30

Olga Masloboeva, Saint-Petersburg
State University of Economics, Russia

Роль славянофилов в истории
изучения народной культуры

16.00

Elena Besschetnova, National
Research University "Higher School of
Economics", Moscow, Russia
**А.С. Хомяков как хранитель
европейско-христианских ценностей**

16.30–17.00

Discussion

Органическая концепция культуры
А.С. Хомякова

16.00

Denis Solodukhin, Moscow
Technological University (MIREA), Russia
**Соотношение словопонятий "закон"
и "правда" у А.С. Хомякова в контексте
русской мыслительной традиции**

16.30–17.00

Discussion

17.00–17.20

Coffee break

SECTION 4 | St. Petrus Hall | chair: Daniela Steila

17.20

Randall A. Poole, College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minnesota, USA
Slavophilism and Russian Religious Philosophy (Khomiakov and Kireevsky)

17.50

Stephanie Solywoda, Stanford University, Oxford, The United Kingdom
Khomiakov, Sacrifice, and the Dialogic Roots of Russian Kenosis

18.20

Jennie Wojtusik, The University of Texas at Austin in Austin, Texas, USA
***Slavophilism and Naturphilosophie: A New Mythology for Identity
Construction***

18.50

Discussion

19.20 | St. Paulus Hall

Banquet

TUESDAY
May 30, 2017

SECTION 5 | St. Petrus Hall | chair: Zlatica Plašienková

8.30

Mikhailina Shibaeva, Moscow State Institute of Culture, Russia
Концепты А.С. Хомякова “живая истина” и “общее дело” в пространстве русской философии

9.00

Natalia Volodina, Cherepovets State University, Russia
“Запрос на мышление”: А.С. Хомяков о статье И.В. Киреевского “О характере просвещения Европы и его отношении к просвещению России”

9.30

Sr. Teresa Obolevitch, The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Poland
Вера и наука в мысли славянофилов (А. Хомяков, И. Киреевский)

10.00

Gennadii Aliaiev, Poltava National Technical Yuri Kondratyuk University, Ukraine
“Жизненное сознание” А. Хомякова и “живое знание” С. Франка: преемственность и развитие

10.30–11.00

Discussion

11.00–11.30

Coffee break

SECTION 6A | St. Paulus Hall |
chair: Françoise Lesourd

11.30

Svetlana Skorokhodova, Moscow Teachers-training State University, Russia
К вопросу о некоторых философско-исторических идеях А.С. Хомякова и Ю.Ф. Самарина

SECTION 6B | St. Barnabas Hall |
chair: Sergey Troitskiy

11.30

Aleksy Kucu, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (UMCS) in Lublin, Poland
Концепт личности в творчестве А.С. Хомякова

12.00

Vladimir Chernus, Higher School
of Economics National Research
University, Moscow, Russia
А.С. Хомяков и “русская идея”

12.30-13.00

Discussion

12.00

Françoise Lesourd, Jean Moulin
University, Lyon, France
Наследие Хомякова в XX веке

12.30-13.00

Discussion

13.00–14.30

Lunch

13.45

EXCURSION TO THE ABBEY MUSEUM (GROUP II)

SECTION 7A | St. Paulus Hall |
chair: Randall A. Poole

14.30

Marcel Martinkovič, Slovak Academy
of Sciences, Bratislava, Slovak Republic
*The significance of religion in the
concept of the Slavism in Alexej
Chomjakov and Ľudovít Štúr*

15.00

Zlatica Plašienková, Comenius
University in Bratislava, Bratislava,
Slovakia

Peter Rusnák, Trnava University,
Slovakia

Lucio Florio, Argentine Pontifical
Catholic University, Buenos Aires,
Argentina

**A.S. Khomiakov, P. Teilhard de Chardin
and L. Hanus: Three Points of View on
Faith and Church in Human Life**

SECTION 7B | St. Barnabas Hall |
chair: Tatiana Rezvykh

14.30

Inna Tkachenko, St. Filaret's Cristian
Orthodox Institute, Russia
*Опыт христианского служения
А.С. Хомякова и учение о соборности*

15.00

Rev. George Belkind, Educational
Fund of Brothers Sergey and Evgeny
Troubetski's, Russia
*Идея соборности Хомякова и теория
соборного сознания Сергея Трубецкого*

15.30

Lyudmila Sidorenko, Central Scientific
Library of the Union of Theatre Union of
the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia
*“Феномен А.С. Хомякова. Личность.
Творческое наследие. Философское*

15.30

Frédéric Tremblay, Saint-Petersburg
State University, Russia
Russian Monadologism and Sobornost

и художественное окружение”:
Проект выставки архивных
материалов в Центральной научной
библиотеке СТД РФ

16.00
Discussion

16.00
Discussion

16.30–16.50
Coffee break

SECTION 8A | St. Paulus Hall |
chair: Elena Tverdislova

SECTION 8B | St. Barnabas Hall |
chair: Victor Troitckii

16.50

Dmitrii Gasak, St. Filaret’s Cristian
Orthodox Institute, Moscow, Russia
Идея христианской соборности
А.С. Хомякова: проекция
церковного единства на
общественную жизнь

16.50

Anna Reznichenko, Russian State
University for the Humanities, Moscow,
Russia
“Соборность” и Собор: идеи А.С.
Хомякова в творчестве членов
“Новосёловского” кружка
(М.А. Новоселов, А.С. Глинка-
Волжский, С.Н. Дурылин)

17.20

Elena Borisova-Yurkovskaya,
University of Warsaw, Poland
Рецепция идеи соборности
А. Хомякова в философско-
богословском наследии митрополита
Антония (Храповицкого)

17.20

Oleg Marchenko, Russian State
University for the Humanities, Moscow,
Russia
Идеи старших славянофилов
в философских размышлениях
неославянофилов-“путейцев”:
В.Ф. Эрн

17.50

Marek Kita, The Pontifical University
of John Paul II in Krakow, Poland
Церковь Хомякова и церковь папы
Франциска. Дальнейшее судьбы
идеи соборности

17.50

Elena Knorre, St. Tikhon’s Orthodox
University, Moscow, Russia
Экклесиология А.С. Хомякова
в религиозно-философских
исканиях первой трети XX века:
концепция Церкви-общины

18.20–18.50

Ludmila Lucewicz, Warsaw
University, Poland

*А. С. Хомяков о цельности русской
жизни и нравственном обновлении
искусства*

18.40–19.10
Discussion

*в христианском персонализме
А. Мейера и М. Пришвина*

18.20–18.40
Roman Turowski, The Pontifical
University of John Paul II in Krakow
*Своеобразие традиционализма
мысли Алексея Хомякова: попытка
интерпретации в контексте
синергической антропологии Сергея
Хоружего*

18.40–19.10
Discussion

PRESENTATION | St. Petrus Hall

19.10–19.30

Rev. George Belkind, Educational Fund of Brothers Sergey and Evgeny
Troubetski's, Russia
Сретенский храм в Богучарово сегодня

19.30 | Lapidarium
Supper

WEDNESDAY

May 31, 2017

SECTION 9A | St. Paulus Hall |
chair: Lada Shipovalova

8.30

Natalia Likvintseva, Alexander Solzhenitsyn Memorial House of the Russian Abroad, Moscow, Russia
Рецепция идей Алексея Хомякова в творчестве Е.Ю. Скобцовой 1920-х – начала 1930-х гг.

9.00

Lidia Kroshkina, St. Filaret's Cristian Orthodox Institute, Russia
"Попробуем осуществить подлинную христианскую соборность": мать Мария об А.С. Хомякове и воплощении его идей

9.30

Natalia Drobot, Hasselt University, Belgium
Ostalgia as a Special Artistic Development in Contemporary Art

10.00–10.30

Discussion

SECTION 9B | St. Barnabas Hall |
chair: Alexey Malinov

8.30

Tatiana Rezvykh, St. Tikhon's Orthodox University, Moscow, Russia
Соборность у А.С. Хомякова и понятие духа у Ф. Эбнера

9.00

Vladimir Keidan, Rome, Italy
Полемика о книге Н.Бердяева "Алексей Степанович Хомяков"

9.30

Mirela Zajega, Jesuit University Ignatianum, Krakow, Poland
Алексей Степанович Хомяков – личность индивидуалиста девятнадцатого века с точки зрения Николая Бердяева

10.00–10.30

Discussion

10.30-11.00

Coffee break

SECTION 10 | St. Petrus Hall, chair: Marek Kita

11.00

Victor Kupriyanov, St. Petersburg State University, Russia
Россия и Европа в творчестве А.С. Хомякова

11.30

Victor Troitckii, The Library of Russian Philosophy and Culture A.F. Losev House
Два памятника: о судьбе идеологического наследия А.С. Хомякова

12.00–12.30

Discussion

CLOSING OF THE CONFERENCE | St. Petrus Hall

12.30–12.45

Sr. Teresa Obolevitch, The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Head of the Organizing Committee

13.00–13.30 | Lapidarium

Lunch

14.00

Philosophical Walk

The Philosophical Walk is guided by the organizers of Krakow Meetings. The participants will be transported from the Abbey by bus to the starting point of the Walk in the city center. It will be possible to leave luggage in a safe place for a time of the Walk. The Walk will take approximately two hours.

Route

- Wawel Castle with byzantine paintings in Chapel of St Cross | Wawel 3
- Bishop Karol Wojtyła's house | Kanonicza St. 21
- Dominican Monastery with St. Hyacinth's tomb | Stolarska St. 12
- Pope's Window | Franciszkańska St. 3
- Collegium Novum with Marian Zdziechowski's Plaque | Gołębia St. 24
- Soloviev in Krakow | św. Jana St. 20
- Jerzy Nowosielski's Icons in Orthodox Church | Szpitalna St. 20

ABSTRACTS

Gennadii Aliaiev

Poltava National Technical Yuri Kondratyuk University

ALEXEI KHOMIAKOV'S "LIVING CONSCIOUSNESS" AND SIMON FRANK'S "LIVING KNOWLEDGE": SUCCESSION AND DEVELOPMENT

Developing in *The Object of Knowledge* his conception of the "living knowledge," Simon Frank makes reference, among others, to "a number of Russian Slavophil-thinkers," which, following Jacobi and Schelling, developed the "doctrine of the living knowledge in contrast with the knowledge as a pure thought." However, he did not make any reference to their works, but to the *Historical Notes* by Michael Herschensohn. In Frank's major works, any direct references to Alexei Khomiakov or Ivan Kireyevsky are rather scarce, except, of course, his articles on Russian worldview and Russian philosophy, wherein he has called them "the most important and the most original thinkers." Certainly, Kireyevsky and Khomiakov had their place in Frank's lectures on the history of Russian thought in the University of Berlin (there is his lecture notes *Die Slavophilen—Kirejewsky und Chomjakow* preserved in The Bakhmeteff Archive, New York, USA).

In all those rare references to Khomiakov and Kireyevsky Simon Frank attributes the notion of the "living knowledge" to Ivan Kireyevsky, as he mentions Alexei Khomiakov with reference to his "renowned doctrine on the nature of Church unity," for instance, while Frank develops his own conception of *sobornost'* (catholicity) with respect to the relation of person to the whole as the relation of love. However, Frank's *Diary* for 1902 already witnesses his acquaintance with Khomiakov's poetry (he also cites Khomiakov's verses in his *Russian Worldview*). Frank describes Khomiakov as a "typically Russian mind" (alongside with Herten and Solovyov), but a "genial dilettante."

Describing Kireyevsky's concept of the "living knowledge," primarily, Frank draws attention to the epistemological component, which is the foundation of the true, fulfilled knowledge in contrast to the abstract knowledge (the grasp of a "particular whole"); and also on its meaningful significance for life, as the foundation of individual worldview and lifestyle, as well as the basis of social order, which is the "ideal of the wholeness of life." It is evident that the predicate "living" or "vital" from Slavophiles' lips means, first of all, a particular living human being, and his/her fullness of relations to a particular environment of the external world. For Frank himself, the "living" (knowledge) means the deep of ontological statues, the mind rooted in being, the (full) self-awareness of being.

The main objective of this presentation is to trace likeness and difference between the concepts: Alexei Khomiakov's "living (or vital) consciousness" or "living (or vital) knowledge" and Simon Frank's "living knowledge," showing as far Frank's conception was defined with succession, and as far it had diverged from the concepts used by Slavophiles.

Dmitrii Badalian

The National Library of Russia

A. S. KHOMIAKOV AND “OFICIAL’NAYA NARODNOST’”

The notion of *narodnost’* (the national ethos, national spirit, nationality), which came into the Russian culture in the 1820s, aroused A. S. Khomiakov’s interest as early as by the beginning of the 1830s, i. e. before Minister of Public Education S. S. Uvarov formed the ideas of *Oficial’naya Narodnost’* (Official Nationality). The latter notion requires a rethink since some works published from 1989 to 2014 showed that the *theory of official nationality* (initially stated by A. N. Pypin in 1872) is a myth created by Russian liberals in their struggle against the traditionalistic school of thought. In actual fact, not only was the *theory of Oficial’naya Narodnost’* never publicly presented as a holistic detailed concept by its creator S. S. Uvarov (exposing it, Pypin did not quote a single thesis from it), but it also became the subject of covert struggle between the government agencies. Yet, it is appropriate to speak about the minister’s attempt to present *narodnost’* as a slogan for the development of the original national culture and about a possible A. S. Khomiakov’s influence on Uvarov, which was first noted by P. I. Bartenev. This fact is indirectly proved by the interest that Uvarov took in Khomiakov in the 1830s. However, after 1843, Uvarov’s interest in Khomiakov decreased noteworthyly or waned completely, and, in the years that followed, the minister treated the idea of *narodnost’* very cautiously.

In 1840–1850s, Khomiakov and other Slavophiles developed their own concept of *narodnost’*, apart from Uvarov’s. In Slavophiles’ interpretations, *narodnost’* is presented both as the object of cognition (people’s everyday life, folklore) and as the form of consciousness (the complex of imagery, perception of the world). At the same time, Slavophiles emphasized that the Russian *narodnost’* is inextricably connected with the Orthodox Faith. According to Khomiakov, “the devotion to nationality is supremely the devotion to the cause of panhumanism,” and, at the same time, “the more a man becomes a servant to the human truth, the dearer is his nation to him.” The influence of Khomiakov’s ideas showed itself in the so called “Pushkin speech” of F. M. Dostoyevsky, who, as well as Khomiakov, did not oppose *national* and *panhuman*, but asserted their antinomic link.

Badalian, D. A. 1999. “A. S. Homiyakov i F. M. Dostoyevsky: K istorii razvitiya ‘idei narodnosti’ v russkoy kul’ture XIX v.” *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Istoriya yazykoznaniiya i literaturovedeniye* 4: 108–111.

Badalian, D. A. 2002. “Dva neizvestnykh proizvedeniya ranney publicistikii A. S. Homiyakova In: *Mir romantizma. Materialy mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferencii ‘Mir romantizma’*. Tver’, p. 340–348.

Badalian, D. A. 2006. “Ponyatie ‘narodnost’ v russkoy kul’ture XIX veka.” In: *Istoricheskiye ponyatiya i politicheskiye idei v Rossii XVI–XX veka. Sbornik nauchnykh rabot*. St. Petersburg, p. 108–122.

Badalian, D. A. 2016. “A. S. Homiyakov, S. S. Uvarov i zhurnal’naya bor’ba 1830–1840-h godov” In: A. P. Dmitriev, P. S. Glushakov, E. P. Shcheglova (eds). *Ostrova lyubvi BorFed: Sbornik v chest’ 90-letiya Borisa Fedorovicha Egorova*. St. Petersburg, p. 178–188.

Kaplin, A. D. 2012. "Glavnye nachala—'Pravoslaviye, Samoderzhaviye, Narodnost': istoricheskiy kontekst, interpretacii, znachenie." In: M. B. Smolina (ed.). *Rossiyskaya gosudarstvennost' i sovremennost': problemy identichnosti i istoricheskoy preyemstvennosti*. Moscow, p. 248–255.

Kazakov, N. I. 1989. "Ob odnoy ideologicheskoy formule nikolaevskoy ehpoi." In: *Kontekst—1989: Literaturno-teoreticheskiye issledovaniya*. Moscow, p. 5–41.

Koshelev, V. A. 1994. "Slavyanofily i oficial'naya narodnost'". In: *Slavyanofil'stvo i sovremennost': sbornik statey*. St. Petersburg, p. 122–135.

P. B. [Bartenev, P. I.] 1868. "Sverbeyev D. N. Vospominaniya o Petre Yakovleviche Chaadayeve." *Russkij arhiv* 6: 989.

Shevchenko, M. M. 2002. "Ponyatiye 'teoriya oficial'noy narodnosti' i izucheniye vnutrenney politiki imperatora Nikolaya I." *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Ser. 8. Istoriya* 4: 89–104

Shevchenko, M. M. 2014. "Oficial'noj narodnosti teoriya." In: *Bol'shaya Rossiyskaya ehnciklopediya*. Vol. 24. Moscow, p. 713–714.

Zhukovskaya, T. N. 2006. "S. S. Uvarov i Kirillo-Mefodievskoye obshchestvo ili krizis 'oficial'noj narodnosti'." In *Otechestvennaya istoriya i istoricheskaya mysl' v Rossii XIX–XX vekov. Sbornik statey k 75-letiyu Alekseya Nikolaevicha Tsamutali*. St. Petersburg, p. 196–207.

Rev. George Belkind

Educational fund of brothers Sergey and Evgeny Troubetski's

KHOMIAKOV'S "SOBORNOST" AND CONCILIAR CONSCIOUSNESS THEORY BY SERGEI TRUBETSKOY

The religious and philosophical idea of conciliarity, which initially was an ecclesiological principle, gradually gets the expressed anthropological measurement. Sergey Trubetskiy's work "About the nature of human consciousness" (1890) became an important milestone of this intellectual movement. The analysis of this theoretical construction has to be done not only retrospectively—as attempt of connection of the Slavophile tradition with the German metaphysics, but also prospectively—as the fruitful hypothesis which gave significant results in the subsequent works of the philosopher ("The doctrine of the Logos in its history," 1900) and his younger brother Evgeny ("Meaning of life," 1918).

Elena Besschetnova

School of Philosophy, National Research University "Higher School of Economics"

ALEXEI KHOMIAKOV AS A KEEPER OF EUROPEAN-CHRISTIAN VALUES

Nikolay Berdyaev noted in his work about Alexey Khomiakov, that the definition of Russian identity started with the Slavophile's ideas. There was no independent ideology in Russia before Ivan Kireevsky and Alexey Khomiakov. They were the first who raised the problem of the being of Russia. Slavophiles and Westernizers started their intellectual development with the studies of the great representatives of Western European thought. The Slavophiles passed through the school of Schelling and Hegel, having perceived their ideas, perhaps deeper than the Westernizers. Khomiakov wrote about the "far west, the country of holy miracles."

Khomiakov did not oppose Russia to Europe. He clearly and distinctly realized their common ground—Christianity. Europe for him was Corpus Cristianum, and Russia was the power that could fulfill the covenant of Love, realize the highest European ideals and help Europe to be Europe. For Khomiakov Russian culture was a part of European culture, based on the synthesis of the ancient and Christian tradition. In this sense he was a Russian European (creator of Great Russia, based on the assertion of European-Christian principles). Khomiakov did not doubt on principles and values that were born in Europe, but on the way of its self-determination. It was the way of revolutions, external prosperity, simplification and the gradual abandonment of God and the Church.

The same conclusion was reached by N. M. Karamzin, who started as a Westernizer. In his famous work *Letters of a Russian Traveler (Pisma russkogo puteshestvennika)* he described Western Europe as a miracle space (a definition similar to Khomiakov's definition), where spirituality and humanism prevailed, where practically every city and every village had its own traditions of the past that compiled their common memory map. After the cruelty and rigidity of the European revolutions, he no longer looked to the West as a miracle place and began to seek spirituality and humanism in Russian state. Alexander Herzen also saw the reverse side of the Western European social order—the emergence of the phenomenon of the average man, the man of the crowd and turned to the Russian "obshchina."

Khomiakov came to similar ideas before Herzen and without the idealization of the West. For the thinker, the Russia "obshchina" was an elementary social body from which the affirmation of the principle of *sobornost'* began. The most complete embodiment of the principle of *sobornost'* is the Church, defined by the thinker as the unity of God's grace. Khomiakov played a huge role in the formation of the Russian national identity, in the formation of the "Russian spirit" and "Russian thought," giving to it religious connotation and its own special direction.

Elena Borisova-Yurkovskaya

Institute of Russian Studies, University of Warsaw

REFLECTION OF THE IDEA OF SOBORNOST PRESENTED BY A. KHOMIAKOV IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL HERITAGE OF METROPOLITAN ANTONY (KHRAPOVITSKY)

The study is dedicated to investigate in which way the heritage of ideas presented by A. Khomiakov affected formation of philosophical and *theological* views of Metropolitan Antony (Khrapovitsky), Supreme Pontiff of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. Particular attention is paid to the idea of sobornost that has been developed in the outputs of Khomiakov. The analysis how Metropolitan Antony perceives the idea of sobornost provides the key to understand essential concepts of his essays and articles. Interest is also focused to the attitude of Metropolitan Antony to hesychasm tradition, his understanding what the essence in religious co-existence actually is and how religious life should be arranged. The category of sobornost serves as a lens to deliberate so hot and controversial topics as the standpoint of Khrapovitsky towards the Renovationist Schism, to the neo-Christian ideology of Russian intellectuals as well as his views to the nature of mutual relationships between church and state, secular world and religious community.

Vladimir Chernus

National Research University Higher School of Economics

A. S. KHOMIAKOV AND THE “RUSSIAN IDEA”

We present the “Russian idea” in the philosophy of A. S. Khomiakov as a triangle relationship between the categories: sobornost, Church and freedom. The triangle relationship of these categories, in turn, can be inscribed in a hermeneutic circle, in which the philosopher’s thought is moving: 1. Sobornost—Church, 2. Church—freedom; 3. Freedom—sobornost; 4. and again, sobornost—Church.

1. Sobornost—Church: Speaking about the “sobornost,” Khomiakov means integrity of the Church. Actually, by the term “sobornost,” he means universality opposing it to “Catholicism,” which also claims to be universal. According to Khomiakov, the Church can only be cathedral, that is gathering and joining all people. Therefore, the Church is sobornost. Russian peasant community served Khomiakov a prototype of the idea of sobornost. It is the sobornost as a natural form of existence of a Russian peasant community that he transferred to the Church ground.

2. Church—freedom: “Khomiakov had an infinitely free feeling of the Church; he exactly felt free within the Church and not outside the Church, and the Church was for him the order of freedom. It would have seemed crazy for him trying to seek freedom outside the Church, freedom from the Church, to

see the source of freedom not in the Church sobornost, but in a solitary individual. Khomiakov always believed that only the Church gives freedom, that the Church itself is freedom" (Berdyayev 1997).

3. Collegiality and freedom: There is an obvious contradiction between the sobornost and individual freedom: the sobornost implies unity of believers in a church community, but this unity is not conceived of as individual freedom of a believer. This contradiction is resolved only in the Church, because in the Church both freedom and sobornost are possible. Khomiakov opposes individual freedom to cathedral freedom, which is embodied in the Church. According to Khomiakov, the Church and freedom, sobornost and the Church are synonymous. Thus, the idea of the Church includes both the idea of freedom and the idea of sobornost.

4. As a result, we have the identity: church = collegiality = freedom = church.

Freedom and sobornost are immanent to the Church. Both categories are revealed through the Church. Nevertheless, the Church is something more than freedom and sobornost. Cathedral and free Church, which seeks, according to Khomiakov, to combine the whole of humanity, can be identified with being, which is revealed through different categories, but is always greater and strives to become everything, because there is nothing outside being.

The Church is freedom and love, but the Church is not the power. The Russian people are not driven by the desire for power, but the desire for freedom and love. The Russian people crave not for the kingdom, but for the Church. Therefore, the "Russian idea" of Khomiakov is not based on the idea of the state.

According to Khomiakov, the power originally belongs to people, but people do not like the power and do not want to rule realizing the power not as a right but as an obligation. Therefore, the Russian people reject the temptation of power, instruct the tsar to bear its burdens and the burdens of the state, and release themselves for the creation of the free and cathedral Church.

Khomiakov was convinced that Russia is intended not for its own national prosperity, but for the salvation of the world. He saw the mission of Russia in that it would tell the world "the secret of freedom," "warm it with the breath of freedom," "bestow a gift of holy freedom on it." The "Russian idea" of Khomiakov lies in the creation of the free, cathedral Church, which would contribute to the universal salvation, gradually expanding its borders to the borders of the whole of humanity. The "Russian idea" of Khomiakov is ontological: creation of the free, cathedral Church, outside of which nothing will remain, can be likened to the knowledge of the whole being without reserve. The "Russian idea" of Khomiakov is the idea of identity of the Church and being.

Berdyayev, N. A. 1997. *Aleksey Stepanovich Khomiakov*. Paris.

Berdyayev, N. A. 1955. *The Origin and Meaning of Russian Communism*. Paris.

Berdyayev, N. A. 2004. *The Russian Idea*. Moscow.

Khomiakov, A. S. 2016. *The World Challenge of Russia*. Moscow.

Khomiakov, A. S. 2016. *Russia and "Lies of the Western World."* Moscow.

Khomiakov, A. S. 2016. *Russian Society—National Consciousness. Ideals and Reality*. Moscow.

Khomiakov, A. S. 2016. *Semiramida*. Moscow.

Losskiy, N. O. 1991. *History of Russian Philosophy*. Moscow.

Zenkovskiy, V. V. 2001. *History of Russian Philosophy*. Moscow.

Florence Corrado-Kazanski

Université Bordeaux-Montaigne

A PHILOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF VIATCH. IVANOV'S ESSAY "LEGION AND SOBORNOST'"

This paper addresses the philosophical and cultural significance of the concept of *sobornost'* both in the cultural context of Silver Age and in the historical context of World War I. The analysis of Ivanov's thought is based on a philological approach of his essay "Legion and *Sobornost'*," in which the author explains his understanding of such terms as organisation, cooperation, collectivism on the one hand, as opposed to, on the other hand, *sobornost'* and harmony, which relate to the Verb.

Natalia Drobot

Hasselt University

OSTALGIA AS A SPECIAL ARTISTIC DEVELOPMENT IN CONTEMPORARY ART

Much attention has been given to the consequences of the falling down of the Soviet Union. One expression of this is the phenomenon of Ostalgia, a form of post-communist nostalgia. Originally the term Ostalgia is limited to feelings of Ossies, former GDR citizens. Today this phenomenon is, however, also recognized by former Soviet citizens.

Ostalgia is studied in philosophical, sociological and psychological studies. In the art Ostalgia is approached by means of using Soviet symbolism, which is rooted in the imagery: consumer products, utensils, objects, photographs, uniforms. In short, everything that people keep from the "good old days," evoking memories, everything that has a sentimental value.

In my opinion Ostalgia is some emotional bond attached to the Soviet past, which reflects a specific selection of autobiographical memory. But is Ostalgia a form of propaganda for an absolute ideology? Must an artist have an experience with the system to be able to create images about? Are these new images, new insights into the past through the eyes of the last Soviet generation of young artists? What feelings are hidden behind this phenomenon? How does it change though the time? Is Ostalgia a longing for the past or a desire for what is not any more? Can Ostalgia be an providing aesthetic beauty of the terrible past?

Within this artistic research Ostalgia is the starting point. Based on existing memories of witnesses from the Soviet era, literature and visual material about the Soviet era, Ostalgias character is examined, and the boundaries of the phenomenon are explored in the Contemporary Art. The research intends to represent Ostalgia as an artistic subject. The process and the final result play an important role during the creating of the artistic work. Installations and objects that are realized during this research will be the artistic result of this complex phenomenon. (see some images of my artworks below or <http://drobotnatalia.tumblr.com/>).

Dmitrii Gasak

St. Filaret's Cristian Orthodox Insnitute

ALEXEY KHOMIAKOV'S IDEA OF CHRISTIAN SOBORNOST: A PROJECTION OF CHURCH UNITY INTO THE SOCIAL SPHERE

Alexey Khomiakov's theological pursuits and his reflections on the nature of the Church posed a number of challenging questions before his Slavophile friends. One of the central issues was the difference in the character of the development of Christianity in Russia, as compared to its evolution in Europe. Khomiakov's efforts also brought to light the question of unity between different Christian churches, the problem of confessionalism, etc.

At the same time, Slavophiles believed that the impact Orthodoxy had on the Russian national character and spiritual culture was what made Russian history both unique and important in the broader context of world history. Many researchers felt that the power and truth of their thought lay in this attempt to reflect on the synthesis between Orthodoxy and the national character and spirit. There were, however, failures as well as successes associated with the Slavophile movement in relation to this particular way of thinking. One interesting issue that we believe is worth discussing was that of sobornost as part of the nature of the Orthodox Church and the way it related to those ideas that Slavophiles believed to be the foundations of social unity in Russia at that time. Insofar as interest in Slavophile ideas is currently on the rise, it may be worth pursuing the question of the influence of thoughts about sobornost on church and society today, given that these thoughts now find themselves in a completely different historical context in modern Russia.

Given the end of the Constantinian era in church history and the Russian government's shift away from official antichristian and anti-church policy and ideology, the Russian Orthodox Church faces the need to change its own attitude to society. Similarly, in a situation of relative freedom from the dominance of just one ideological system, Russian society today seeks a locus of unity of thought, and religion has a part in this pursuit. Is it possible that a 'new synthesis' will be found between the ecclesial and the social, the religious and the secular in this new era of Christian history?

Olga Ivonina

Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University

APOLOGY A. S. KHOMIAKOV'S "RUSSIAN IDEA"

Studies of A. S. Khomiakov's Christian philosophy of history have a long tradition in Russian social thought of the XIX-XXs. The founder of Slavophilism is considered one of the pioneers of the "great ice flow of Russian thought," circling its "eternal questions"—about God, about the meaning of history and the destiny of man. Central theme of his historiosophy was the Russian "riddle-problem" (G. Shpet's definition)—its religious and historical identity, and historical destiny of the world calling. The criterion of normativity as the Russian and world history, thinker believed not local samples of the bourgeois Western civilization but the universal ideals of freedom, brotherhood, social solidarity and equity, first formulated by Christianity. This understanding of the universal values of Christianity determined the original nature of all elements in his philosophical system: ecclesiology, epistemology, anthropology, historiosophy. Worldview foundations of Khomiakov's historiosophy was the idea of Orthodoxy as the ideal type of religiosity, which concentrated expression was "sobornost." A. S. Khomiakov considered it the most comprehensive transcription of the Universal Church idea, embodies the image of man's spiritual integrity and harmony of the individual and society, freedom and "organic togetherness" of life. According to Berdyaev, this category has provided Russian Slavophiles by means of understanding the historical process, adequate domestic consciousness.

It also became the basic category of Khomiakov's historical comparativistics, universal means of the author's criticism to the West as a historical-cultural and socio-political community formed by the religious "origins" of Catholicism and Protestantism. Constant dualism and the conflict nature of Western society Russian thinker explained it's initially inherent contradiction between reason and faith, freedom and unity. The conflict, according to Khomiakov, identified all the features of Western civilization: individualism, social differentiation, the cult of forced life and thinking organization, representing by rationality, including the desire for power and material success. Khomiakov saw the origins of the ideology of nationalism and the "revolt of the masses" in the European political revolutions during the "Age of Reason." Critical assessment the era of modern times, aggravated his intuition about Western civilization spiritual exhaustion, combined with the eschatological idea of the direction of world history, a special role in which he assigned Russia. Following Chaa-

daev, the Slavophiles sought to understand the peculiarity of Russia in the context of its providential task—higher synthesis and reconciliation of different principles, which determine the development of European civilization. Russia, according to Khomiakov, destined to terminate the former course of world history as the manifestation of a distorted Christianity understanding, restore universal brotherhood of nations on the principles of freedom and justice. Russian history was a final stage of world historical process, since in it the history of mankind back to its roots—the original harmony of unity and freedom. Pathos of the return to the Christian people's fraternal unity, whole "living knowledge" about the world and man, gave Khomiakov's historiography features of retrospective utopia.

Russian author was convinced that messianic feat of Russia conditioned by its height and integral wholeness of the religious spirit. A. S. Khomiakov believed that "history calls on Russia to be a front for World Enlightenment; it gives her the right for comprehensiveness and completeness its origins." He believed Russian soul "Christian by nature," seeing her true Christian character in the traditional Russian love of peace and tolerance; in a tense tone of religious expectations of the people, not accepting secular world with its cult of individualism and material power; in the Russian national character, being always ready for self-sacrifice and self-denial for the sake of universal justice celebration.

However, in assessing the impact of Russian universal mission Khomiakov as a historian defeated Khomiakov's prophetic intuitions. He regarded Russia as a potential country. This characteristic of the "Russian way" means that the country has not yet made a final choice in favor of a universal understanding of Christianity as a religion of "public truth," transforming not only individual consciousness, but also social and political institutions on the principles of humanity and mercy. Khomiakov expanded not only the subject field of the "Russian idea," but also its methodological instruments, the style and nature of the study. This original philosophical discourse explained dialectic perception of European intellectual history achievements by Russian thought. Patriotic thought perceived European romanticism ideas about the organic nature of social development, successive connection of past, present and future in the different peoples and cultures historical evolution. Romanticism' influence manifested in changing the Slavophiles methodological tools, focused on an intuitive, empathic approach to the study history, typical also for the Orthodox type of consciousness.

The understanding of history as both a science and art, moral judgment and prophecy, have formed categorical apparatus Slavophile's historiography, full of religious symbols and artistic metaphors. The paradigm of "living knowledge," combining philosophy, science, religion and artistic creativity, deliberately contrasted with the formal standards of scientific and disciplinary limitations, worked out by the positivist historiography. Thus, Khomiakov creativity demonstrated rich heuristic potential of comparative history of mentality and cultural anthropology, reflecting, and partly anticipating the turn of modern science to a new understanding of the subject and methods of historical research in line with the interdisciplinary synthesis.

Ultimately, Khomiakov's conception was aimed to justification of Russian way and the world civilization evolution based on Christian cultural values.

Vladimir Keidan

Rome, Italy

PROUD OF ORTHODOXY. N. A. BERDYAEV'S BOOK ABOUT KHOMIAKOV IN PERCEPTION OF HIS CONTEMPORARIES

The monograph which appeared in a publishing house Put' at the end of 1911 in the *Russian Thinkers* series about the first orthodox secular theologian was met by reviewers of the time press mostly critically (Berdyaev 1912). The books in this series, according to the preliminary drafting unit "should give synthetic images and integrated assessment from the perspective of a specific worldview" (Berdyaev 1912: 178).

See the list of the reviews provided in the book of E. Gollerbakh (2000: 461–462) who it is possible to add with article of book of E. N. Trubetskoy (1912) and a number of critical statements of S. N. Bulgakov in private correspondence. At once it should be noted that the reviewers are "non-core" organs of the press do not delve into central issues Khomiakov: the *national messianism* and the *catholicity (sobornost')*, and their interpretation of Berdyaev, but only judged the author in two-dimensional space: "progressive–reactionary," "Church–revolutionary movement." However, also congenial the authors (employees of the publishing house "Put'") met book of ideological criticism.

E. N. Trubetskoy writes: "Anyway the Russian national messianism was always expressed in the Russian Christ's statement ... Berdyaev perfectly considers a sign of national messianism the statement of exclusive proximity of one people to Christ, recognition of its superiority in Christ. In it he absolutely fairly believes difference of messianism from a missionism ... Meanwhile Nation-Messiya there can be only one ... Essential line of national Messianism consists in national exclusiveness of religious consciousness ... The traditional piety inherited by Slavophiles from ancestors contained strong impurity of it of "organic defect." In Khomiakov's consciousness the messianism still fought against a missionism. However he considered Russia the peculiar people, approved its superiority in Christ and believed in its calling—to save all people. Original Christ—Trubetskoy resolutely objects—connects around himself in one thoughts and in one spirit all people. "Antagonism between national–messianic and universal at Berdyaev affects in extremely bright and certain form. He did not make out daring deception of disguised pagan nationalism. Danger is big; this nationalism more than once turned the Russian heads of the deceptive personal truth; and business always came to an end in devilish dance." Speaking to Berdyaev's words, at Homyakov "all shrine of Christ's universal church—freedom, harmony, catholicity (*sobornost'*)—everything is concluded only in east Orthodoxy, in Catholicism anything there is no it, there are only one evasion and sins human" (Berdyaev 1912: 94). Trubetskoy opposes to rough neoslavophilism of Berdyaev Solovyov's prophecy in "Three talk" where there is no trace of "People-God-bearing" also, and there are three branches of a uniform Christian trunk which it is necessary fill each other, in a wound to a measure preparing coming true the Messiahs.

During war E. Trubetskoy's pupil N. Ustryalov in development of the ideas of the teacher made at MRFO meeting the report in which he developed the teacher's thoughts: "The Russian question is a question of the present Russian day. Events persistently demand that the Russian ethnic question was raised not only as systematic and philosophical, but also as a question concrete and political" (Ustryalov 1916). Russia has to understand itself not the Messiah and to perform a responsible mission between the future original the Messiah and the world.

The former associate on the Christian brotherhood of fight, V. Svetsitsky, declared their creativity: "The people would tell about them:—quiet ... None of them tell something new ... In theoretical area they do not go further Solovyov, in practical "public" further Slavophiles." Liberal Orthodoxy is impossible because Orthodoxy and reaction—two trunks growing from one general horse—as-cetic Christianity ... The Moscow way is not a way to Christ live, the belief in Whom is impossible without full revolution of private life, without repentance, without suffering, without sermon, without Golgotha, without the people ... Moscow "Way" does not conduct anywhere" (Svetsitsky 1913).

The informer of the Moscow Special department of Security office I. Dirlikh reported on moods in "Put'" publishing house: "Very serious step aside towards nationalism is taken also by new ideological group so-called "the puteyets making the most right wing of a kadetizm (whom E. N. Trubetskoy, the prof. S. N. Bulgakov, N. A. Berdyaev, etc. are at the head of book) go in this direction further away of "vekhovets" and win the increasing sympathies not only in narrow and cadet circles, but also in wide intellectual which still so belonged recently to this current with extreme intolerance" (Gollerbakh 2000: 315).

In the official press positive estimates in connection with criticism Trubetskoy of Berdyaev's book prevailed: "Hobby for Russia imagined prevented us to regard, properly, Russia valid and, what is even worse, the Russian national idea. The spiritual image of Russia was chronically covered with a fantastic dream of 'people-bogonostsa'. Having released from false, anti-Christian Messianism, we will be inevitably brought to more Christian solution of an ethnic question" (Critic 1912: 2).

"Logos" regularly reviewed editions of ideological competitors and their general assessment was in general positive. F. Stepun wrote to reviews of the book about Khomiakov (Stepun 1911–1912: 282) and other editions of "Way": "It is necessary to recognize, and having recognized, it is necessary to welcome" the main direction and the purpose of "Way"—to promote religious national revival of Russia, to work on "a riddle of Russia." At the same time it was noted lack of philosophical culture, misunderstanding of "cultural problems of philosophy" (Yakovenko, Ern 1912–1913; Yakovenko 1913: 170).

The reviewer of the newspaper of the left liberals "Speech" regarded Berdyaev's book as a political step: "The name of the author shows that we deal not so much with the objective biography of one of ancestors of Slavophilism how many with implementation of the plan which is drawn up in "Milestones"—restoration of national and religious "tradition" which could be opposed to tradition intellectual" (Berdyaev 1913: 3).

Let's bring into the conclusion of excerpt from personal letters of colleagues of Berdyaev. S. N. Bulgakov to V. F. Ern: "Style of the Berdyaev's monograph about Khomiakov: not so much Khomiakov, how many Berdyaev about Khomiakov, not so much Skovoroda, how many Ern about Skovoroda. If Skovoroda was known though so much how many Khomiakov, situation would be more favorable, than now" (Keidan 1997). E. N. Trubetskoy to M. K. Morozova: "I am going to write the review of Berdyaev's book about Khomiakov, to recommend the book to the reader, but by the way and to rise against russian 'messianism'" (see Trubetskoy 1912).

Berdyaev, N. A. 1912. *A. S. Khomiakov*. Moskva: Put'.

Berdyaev, N. A. 1913. "A. S. Khomiakov." *Rech* 135: 3.

Critic. 1912. "Review of magazines." *Russia* 5: 2.

Ern, V., and B. Yakovenko. 1912–1913. "Fight for Logos." *Logos* 1–2: 397–399.

Gollerbach, E. 2000. *K nezrimomu gradu. The religious and philosophical group "Way" (1910–1919) in search of new Russian identity*. Sankt Petersburg.

Keidan, V. (ed.). 1997. *Vzyskuyushchiye grada. Private correspondence of Russian philosophers*. Moscow.

Stepun, F. 1911–1912. "Nikolay Berdyaev, *Filosofia svobody*; A. S. Khomiakov." *Logos* 2–3.

Sventsitsky, V. 1913. "Moscovskiy 'put'." *Novoye vino* 2: 3–4.

Ustryalov, N. 1916. "A national problem at the first Slavophiles." *Russkaya Mysl'* 10/2: 1–22.

Trubetskoy, E. N. 1912. "Old and new national messianism." *Russkaya Mysl'* 3: 82–102.

Yakovenko, B. 1913. "Filosofskoye donkikhotstvo." *Severnye zapiski* 10.

Marek Kita

Pontifical University of John Paul II

ЦЕРКОВЬ ХОМЯКОВА И ЦЕРКОВЬ ПАПЫ ФРАНЦИСКА. ДАЛЬНЕЙШЕЕ СУДЬБЫ ИДЕИ СОБОРНОСТИ

Доклад задуман как очерк ассимиляции идеи соборности (даже если она не выступает под этим названием) в богословии и церковной жизни современного католицизма.

Исторические судьбы идеи соборности, сформулированной Хомяковым, являются действительно особенными. Концепция сначала довольно спорная с точки зрения официальной теологии собственной конфессии её автора, с течением времени стала признаваться в качестве специфической черты этой конфессии. Будучи выработанной в контексте православной апологии с сильным акцентом полемики, с самого начала она имела общее происхождение

с некоторым многообещающим течением католической мысли—и в конечном счете стала мощным источником вдохновения для экуменически ориентированной теологии “римской” церкви. Католицизм эпохи второго Ватиканского собора, переживающий своеобразное обновление экклесиологии, обязан ей очень многим: Ив Конгар (Yves Congar), классик упомянутого обновления, откровенно признавался в “словянофильском” вдохновении. В современную эпоху кажется, что несмотря на экспонирование идеи соборности в православном богословии, практика жизни отдельных автокефальных церквей постоянно не совпадает с образом “идеального православия” Хомякова, в католической же теологии и церковной жизни идёт—хотя и с трудом—борьба за экклесиологию и духовность “общения.”

Понтификат папы Франциска, который начался с напоминания (уже во время первого выступления нового папы после его избрания) древнехристианского видения взаимозависимости иерархического служения епископа и пребывания в братском общении всех верующих поместной церкви—равно как идеи “председательства в любви” так постигаемую церковью Рима во вселенской общине церквей—представляет собой очередной этап католического воспринимания интуиции соборности, тоже характеризующегося парадоксальностью. Можем увидеть, что поборником церкви постигаемой как общение, соборное тело, или—говоря на языке Франциска—“верующий народ” (у которого не только пастыри, но и “собственное чутьё для поиска Божих путей”), является лично папа, против которого выступают сторонники экклесиологии скорее “ультрамонтанского” типа.

Clement, O. 2008. *Pamiętniki nadziei. Rozmowa z Jeanem-Claudem Noyer*. Poznań: W drodze.

Clement, O. 1999. *Rzym inaczej. Prawosławny wobec papieżstwa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Księży Marianów.

Evdokimov, P. 1964. *Prawosławie*. Warszawa: Pax.

Franciszek. 2013. *Evangelii gaudium*.

Hueck Doherty, C. de. 2009. *Sobornosť. Doświadczenie jedności umysłu, serca i duszy*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Karmelitów Bosych.

Ivereigh, A. 2015. *Prorok. Biografia Franciszka, papieża radykalnego*. Bytom: Wydawnictwo Niecałe.

Illanes, J. L., J. I. Saranyana. 1997. *Historia teologii*. Kraków: Wyd. M.

Kerr, F. 2011. *Katolicycy teolodzy XX wieku. Od neoscholastyki do mistyki oblubieńczej*. Kraków: WAM.

Khomyakov, A. S. 1995. *Sochineniya bogoslovskiye*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka.

Łoski, M. 2000. *Historia filozofii rosyjskiej*. Kęty: Antyk.

Puyo, J. 1982. *Życie dla prawdy. Rozmowy z ojcem Congarem*. Warszawa: Pax.

Skowronek, A. 2003. “Promotor reformy w Kościele.” In: J. Majewski, J. Makowski (eds). *Leksykon wielkich teologów XX/XXI wieku*. Warszawa: Więź, p. 73–80.

Spadaro, A. 2013. *Serce wielkie i otwarte na Boga. Rozmowa z papieżem Franciszkiem*. Kraków: WAM.

Špidlik, T. 2000. *Mysł rosyjska. Inna wizja człowieka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Księży Marianów.

Walicki, A. 2003. *Rosja, katolicyzm i sprawa polska*. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka.

Walicki, A. 2005. *Zarys myśli rosyjskiej. Od oświecenia do renesansu religijno-filozoficznego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Ware, K. 2002. *Kościół prawosławny*. Białystok: Bractwo Młodzieży Prawosławnej.

Wąsek, D. 2014. *Nowa wizja zarządzania Kościołem*. Kraków: WAM.

Elena Knorre

St. Tikhon's Orthodox University

A. S. KHOMIAKOV'S ECCLESIOLOGY IN RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SEARCHES OF THE FIRST THIRD OF THE XX TH CENTURY: THE CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH-AS-A-COMMUNITY IN THE CHRISTIAN PERSONALISM OF A. MEYER AND M. PRISHVIN

The understanding of the earthly Church as a "community" was formed in XIX century culture in the context of religious and philosophical searches of Slavophiles. The most clear manifestation of it can be found in A. S. Khomiakov's ecclesiology. According to Fr. Pavel Khondzinsky, "Khomiakov rethought the concept of the community and gave it a new meaning in theological usage" (Khondzinsky 2016: 188). In his conception of Church Khomiakov also removes the division "that Rome erected between the clergyman and the layman, for we are all priests of the Most High, although in different degrees" (Khondzinsky 2016: 186; Khomiakov 1900: 137–138). As Fr. Pavel Khondzinsky notes, Khomiakov's "communal ecclesiology" had an impact on N. Gogol. One can also see some reflection of this idea in religious searches performed by F. M. Dostoevsky, whose main motives made a significant impact on the literature of the first third of the XX th century.

At the same time, it can be assumed that this tradition became the basis of religious and philosophical searches carried out by Christian personalists in Russia in the first third of the XXth century. We can see these ideas in the religious and philosophical pursuits of A. Meyer, D. Merezhkovsky. Christian personalism also found its reflection in works of M. Prishvin. It plays important role in Prishvin's journalism and diaries where he articulated his philosophy and also in his artistic works where utopian leitmotifs play the main plot-forming role.

In the report we want to consider the main lines of convergence between three conceptions. They are: A. S. Khomiakov's *idea of the Church-as-a-community*; A. Meier's concept of an ideal community (or ecclesia) of the "creative selves" (the so-called Christian personalism); the artistic reception of the Church-as-a-community concept in M. Prishvin's works of the WWI and Civil war. The last point can be illustrated with the images of the Church-the-brotherhood, the Church as Christian flower of *mir* ("the world"), with the images of "peasant We" and "Christian We" and the concept of the priesthood in the world (or the image of the church where "Self" am the priest).

Khondzinsky, P. 2016. *The Church is not an academy: Russian non-academic theology of the XIX century.* Moscow.

Khomiakov, A. S. 1900. *The Complete Works in 8 volumes.* Moscow.

Lidia Kroshkina

St. Filaret's Cristian Orthodox Insnitute

“LET’S TRY TO IMPLEMENT GENUINE CHRISTIAN CONCILIARITY (SOBORNOST’): MOTHER MARIA ABOUT A. S. KHOMIAKOV AND THE EMBODIMENT OF HIS IDEAS

The aim of the report is to show how the views of A. S. Khomiakov were perceived, accepted and embodied in the Russian diaspora, in the “Orthodox Action” (Pravoslavnoe Delo) of mother Maria.

In the 1920s E. Yu. Skobtsova, future mother Maria, as well as other figures of “the Russian religious revival,” turns to the study of Russian thinkers and in particular to the works of A. S. Khomiakov. She writes a monograph “A. S. Khomiakov.” The center of her attention is his ecclesiological view. *Sobornost’* is one of the main grounds on which the “new life” of church should be built.

The vocation that mother Maria sees for herself and her closest associates is to convert all theoretical premises of Russian thinkers, primarily A. S. Khomiakov’s, into practical steps both for personal and any external work. It is not enough only to realize the dome of the Church above yourself you should direct all your creative energy to become one of its live stones.

The content of new creativity is the embodiment of the principles of *sobornost’* and divine humanity. In 1935 mother Maria organized the Association “Orthodox Action,” which was not just a charitable organization, but first of all, it was a community that tried to implement the “conciliar-personal method.”

Berdyayev N. A. 1997. “Aleksey Stepanovich Khomiakov.” In: N. A. Berdyayev. *Collected Works. Vol. 5.* Paris: YMCA-Press.

Mother Maria (Skobtsova). 1992. *Memories, articles, essays.* Vol. 1. Paris: YMCA-Press.

Mother Mary (Kuzmina-Karavaeva). 2001. *The Russian plain.* St. Petersburg.

Mother Mary (Kuzmina-Karavaeva). 2004. “A. S. Khomiakov.” In: *The Reaping of the Spirit.* St. Petersburg.

Zenkovsky, V. V. 1948. *The beginning of “Slavophilism.”* A. S. Khomiakov. Paris: YMCA-Press.

Aleksy Kucy

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (UMCS) in Lublin

КОНЦЕПТ ЛИЧНОСТИ В ТВОРЧЕСТВЕ А. С. ХОМЯКОВА

Исследование концепта личности в творчестве интереснейшего представителя русской религиозной мысли 19 века—Алексея Степановича Хомякова—представляется актуальным ввиду всевозрастающей популярности антропологических исследований в области христианской мысли. Религиозно-антропологическое понимание философом человека крайне отличается от господствующих в его время идей, основанных на методологии материализма.

Творчество Хомякова характеризуется своеобразным подходом к общеевропейскому сознанию и царящих в нем концепций, базируясь на духовном опыте восточного христианства. В религиозной мысли философа отражается антропологическое понимание человека, основанное на богословском наследии отцов Церкви, в частности, рассматриваются вопросы взаимоотношения личности и Церкви, а также соборности как наивысшей формы добровольного единения людей в Боге. Современные исследования антропологии в русской религиозной мысли призваны пролить свет на важную веху в истории русской философско-богословской мысли. К сожалению, творчество Алексея Хомякова все еще не оценено по заслугам не столько интеллигентскими кругами, сколько церковно-богословскими. Отсюда наш интерес к нему, не как к философу, а как к светскому богослову, чья мысль затронула важные вопросы христианской антропологии и экклесиологии, актуальные и по сей день.

Victor Kupriyanov

Institute of Philosophy, St. Petersburg State University

РОССИЯ И ЕВРОПА В ТВОРЧЕСТВЕ А. С. ХОМЯКОВА

В докладе предполагается уделить внимание анализу проблематики соотношения России и Европы в творчестве А. С. Хомякова. Для более “рельефного” изображения позиции Хомякова ставится цель провести сравнение позиции Хомякова и поздних славянофилов по этому вопросу—прежде всего теорией “трех миров Евразии” В. И. Ламанского. Для Ламанского и близкого к нему Н. Я. Данилевского основу различия России и Западной Европы—и, следовательно, основу отношений России и Европы—составлял национальный признак. По мнению В. И. Ламанского—одного из ярчайших представителей славянофильского панславизма—основным элементом отношений между народами является их культура и национальная традиция, однако поскольку национальность, или национальная культура, определяется

языком, то в основе бытия народов и их взаимных отношений лежит именно язык. В силу общности или различия языков народы имеют свойство либо притягиваться к друг другу, либо враждовать. Поэтому с этой точки зрения, взаимная близость или антагонизм народов зависят от их нечем более не обусловленной культурно-языковой специфики, которая не поддается изменению благодаря их собственным усилиям—как своего рода ДНК народов. При этом Ламанский последовательно проводил принцип равенства и свободы каждого народа, признавая, что при всей специфичности и своеобразии каждого народа отношения между ними могут выстраиваться только на основе взаимоуважения. В соответствии с этим подходом на несколько лет ранее Н. Я. Данилевского Ламанский формулирует теорию антагонизма греко-славянского мира Европы и Европы романо-германской. Подчеркнем, что в основе этого деления и, соответственно, в основе решения проблемы соотношения России и Западной Европы, лежит принцип национально-языковой специфики народов, из которого делаются социологические, политологические и иные выводы.

В сравнении с вышеописанным подходом стратегия А. С. Хомякова представляется совершенно иной. Прежде всего, очевидно, что тематика, связанная с национальным вопросом, проблемы языковой определенности народов и национальной культуры, то есть все то, на чем выстраиваются концепции Ламанского и Данилевского, не играют для Хомякова существенной роли. Фундаментальное значение для Хомякова имеет религиозная проблематика. Вопрос о соотношении России, русской культуры и философии и Западной Европы, или Европы и европейской культуры в широком смысле, он решает путем рассмотрения проблемы отличия католицизма и протестантизма от восточной церкви (православия). Интересно в данном случае уже то, что католицизм и протестантизм Хомяков рассматривает как в сущности своей порождения одного и того же принципа, то есть как является одного порядка. Основу же различия протестантизма/католицизма и православия Хомяков усматривает в различии между принципом внешнего авторитета и истины. По мнению Хомякова, обе западноевропейские религии основывается на внешнем авторитете и принуждении, что порождает в католицизме притязания Римских пап на светскую власть и формирование разветвленной церковной организации, копирующей, по сути, модель светского государства, а в протестантизме—стремление к авторитету буквы писания в ущерб внутренней истине веры. Подлинная соборная церковь исповедует внутреннюю истину. Причем, истина выражается в единой соборной церкви, которая не требует наличия видимых глав церкви.

Таким образом, основу различия между западной Европой и Россией составляет религиозный признак. Порок западной цивилизации состоит в том, что она отклонилась от истинной церкви и замкнулась в своей обособленности, обосновав веру с помощью принуждения. Поэтому если для поздних славянофилов (В. И. Ламанского, прежде всего) между востоком Европы (то есть Россией как его главной представительницей) и Западом лежит ряд различий в языке и национальном характере, то для Хомякова основной интерес представляет вопрос религиозных отношений. Но этот факт означает, что Хомяков убежден в изначальном единстве всей христианской культуры и, следовательно, единстве России

и Европы, между которыми нет непреодолимых противоречий—ведь хватает лишь достичь истинного соборного единства в рамках религиозного общения. У поздних славянофилов этот аспект проблематики соотношения России и Европы исчезает: в их теоретических представлениях между Россией и романо-германским миром (собственно Европой, как писал Ламанский) лежит непроходимая, даже врожденная, пропасть, которая неискоренима никакими средствами, поскольку она определяется врожденными особенностями двух главных народов Европы: греко-славянских и романо-германских (собственно Европейских). В этом смысле наследие Хомякова представляет собой огромный интерес и практическую значимость с точки зрения современной проблематики российско-европейского диалога, поскольку именно позиция Хомякова изначально предполагает саму его возможность, и что полностью отвергается поздним славянофильством.

Françoise Lesourd

Jean Moulin University Lyon III

KHOMIAKOV'S LEGACY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

My paper will deal with the problem of a possible continuity between Khomiakov and philosopher Leo Karsavin. First of all is an article by Karsavin written in 1922 entitled "Khomiakov." Khomiakov was at the beginning of the original Russian tradition of secular theology. In this regard, Karsavin inherited his views. Karsavin himself strangely combines a passionate defense of orthodoxy with a deep knowledge and understanding of Western religion during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the topic to which he devoted both his dissertation and his first scientific articles.

In the context of the 1920's, when Russian Orthodoxy came under deadly threat due to the upheaval of the revolutionary events, historians and philosophers thought more than ever about the essence of the "Russian idea" at a time when the historical destiny of Russia was under question. Referring to Khomiakov thus had a special significance.

Khomiakov's influence on Karsavin manifests itself in different ways.

Despite his hostility towards Bolshevism, Karsavin agreed to get involved in the new Soviet experiments in culture and social reorganization. He thought deeply about the opportunity to build a Russian society based on new principles (we know from his "Eurasian" articles that the idea of the Soviets seemed to him acceptable and that he adopted them, albeit in a modified form, in his projects regarding the organization of post-Soviet Russian society).

For Khomiakov, the Church was somehow a prototype of an ideal society. For that reason, reference to its heritage was quite natural for Karsavin, at a time when a new type of society was

coming into being in Russia. The principle of *sobornost'* provided an opportunity to rethink the principles of politics in the new historical context.

Faced with the death of Russia as it was known up to then (which Karsavin regarded as an objective fact), the character of Russia, its historical destiny, stood out with particular acuity. Given these circumstances, Khomiakov's ideas had the potential to throw a new light on what was occurring, and this added a prophetic shade to his teachings.

Defending Russian Orthodoxy not only against the Soviet authorities but also against militant Catholicism, Karsavin nevertheless did not join the radical attitudes of the authors of "Russia and Latinity." His anti-Catholic treatise "Lessons of a renounced faith" goes deeply into theological questions. He thus continued the theological quest undertaken by Khomiakov. For him, the main thing is to reflect upon the most important dogmas (such as the Filioque).

Khomiakov's influence is also seen in his epistemology: from his point of view, the possibility of knowledge depends on belonging to a higher, comprehensive "symphonic" personality, a concept incompatible with individuality cut off from the whole. This vision sends us to Khomiakov's famous words (quoted in the Declaration of the Conference): "truth is not attainable for individual thinking; can be achieved only by persons linked together by a sense of charity and trying to think in common."

This paper examines the peculiar refraction of Slavophile ideas in 20th-century thinking.

Natalia Likvintseva

Alexander Solzhenitsyn Memorial House of the Russian Abroad, Moscow

RECEPTION OF THE THOUGHT OF A. KHOMIAKOV IN WORKS OF MOTHER MARIA (SKOBTSOVA).

In 1929, even before becoming a nun, Elizaveta Skobtsova has published in YMCA-Press Publishers a brochure entitled *A. Khomiakov*. At that time she actively studied and analyzed the heritage of the Russian religious thought of 19th century, reflecting on it in the Russian Studies Group, organized by Russian Students Christian Movement, in lectures, discussions, essays and researches. In that period she is concentrated mainly on Khomiakov's historiosophy (especially on his idea of nation in its distinction from state, as well as on his view of freedom), gnoseology (the idea of wholeness of spirit) and ecclesiology (Church as a "free unity in love"). Later, in the second half of 1930 Khomiakov's concept of *sobornost'* altogether with Soloviov's Godmanhood will become basic concepts of Mother Maria's philosophical and theological reflection, closely linked with

her real life, i.e. a foundation of "The Orthodox Action," an attempt to deal with the problems of refugees and to help emigres in need. She tries not only to reconsider Khomiakov's heritage on the new level, but to show, how his ideas can "work" in the new circumstances, to "project" *sobornost'* "from the Church on all forms of social life." In this reconsidering the original Mother Maria's philosophical thought based on the ideas of the "Liturgy outside the Church walls" and "mysticism of the communication with humans" was born. It was intimately linked with the concrete social work of "The Orthodox Activity." Thus, *sobornost'* became not so much an issue of the purely theoretical speculation, but an essential task, the idea became a part of the practical "act."

Ludmila Lucewicz

University of Warsaw

А. С. ХОМЯКОВ О ЦЕЛЬНОСТИ РУССКОЙ ЖИЗНИ И НРАВСТВЕННОМ ОБНОВЛЕНИИ ИСКУССТВА

А. С. Хомякова принято считать предтечей учения о соборности как единства в многообразии. Сущность этого учения обуславливает цельное коллективное сознание (совокупность мышлений), связавшее воедино разумение (познание, опирающееся на разум и волю), нравственный закон любви и молитвы в акте общения как постижения истины.

В статье "О возможности русской художественной школы" (1847) Хомяков исходит из того, что современное ему русское общество, отойдя от народа, утратило свою народную личность, те живительные силы, которые необходимы для плодотворной творческой деятельности, и превратилось в подражателей Запада (с постоянными сомнениями в самих себе, с чувством мертвенности, болезненным сознанием своего одиночества и своего бессилия). В результате, по Хомякову, сложилось так, что Россия пока не имеет истинного искусства.

Но вместе с тем философ радуется, что пришло время ясного осознания нашей внутренней болезни, т.е. понимания того, что жизненное начало утрачено образованным классом, принявшим ложное полужнание по ложным путям за истинное просвещение. Народная жизнь, убежден Хомяков, осталась цела, крепка и неприкосновенна; и эту жизнь следует восстанавить в себе: стоит только ее полюбить искреннею любовью.

Философ предупреждает, что нравственное обновление не легкое дело, на этом пути необходимы искреннее раскаяние, ведущее к перемене внутреннего существования, смирение, отказ от эгоистических побуждений, от устремлений самолюбия своей личности. Восстановление умственных сил творческой интеллигенции Хомяков видит в живом соединении с стародавней и все-таки нам современной русской жизнью, и это соединение возможно только посредством искренней любви.

Критерии-требования, предъявляемые Хомяковым к возможной русской художественной школе, непосредственно соотносятся с центральным вопросом русского духовного бытия, мыслимого как вопрос о жизни и смерти в самом высшем значении умственном и духовном. Истинное творение искусства, согласно Хомякову, это произведение духа народного в одном каком-нибудь лице.

Именно русская художественная школа, по А. С. Хомякову, призвана стать выражением самобытного взгляда на человека и мир в целом, основу которого определяют православие, национальная ментальность и традиции. Обязательным условием для полноценной духовной деятельности, а значит, и для возрождения искусства является нравственное обновление, восстановление природных русских начал.

В докладе предпринимается попытка рассмотреть одну из тенденций нравственного обновления русской литературы конца XIX века в опоре на соборность.

Berdyayev, N. A. 1997. *Aleksey Stepanovich Khomyakov*. Parizh: YMCA.

Egorov, B. F. 2003. *От Khomyakova do Lotmana*. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur.

Esaulov, I. A. 1995. *Kategoriya sobornosti v russkoy literature*. Petrozavodsk: Petrozavodskiy Gosudarstvennyy universitet.

Khomyakov, A. S. 1900. *Polnoye sobrviye sochinenii*. Moskva: Universitetskaya tipografiya.

Koshelev, V. A. 2000. *Aleksey Stepanovich Khomyakov. Zhizneopisaniye v dokumentakh, rassuzhdeniyakh i razyskaniyakh*. Moskva: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye.

Tarasov, B. N. (red.). 2007. *A. S. Khomyakov—myslitel', poet, publitsist*. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur.

Marta Łukaszewicz

Institute of Russian Studies, University of Warsaw

REFLECTION OF THE THEOLOGICAL VIEWS OF ALEXEI KHOMIAKOV IN NIKOLAI LESKOV'S LITERARY WORK

The journalistic and artistic work of Nikolai Leskov (1831 – 1895) is an evidence of his vivid interest in religious and ecclesiastical issues. In his articles, he touched upon problems, which had been widely discussed by the secular and church press of the second half of the 19th century, such as the level of training of the clergy, parish priests' living conditions, the position of the Orthodox Church in the state system of the Russian Empire. These issues were also present in Leskov's novels and short stories, e.g. *The Cathedral Clergy*, *At the Edge of the World*, *The Priest who was Never Baptized* etc. At the same time, one can find writer's vision of the ideal Church in his literary

works. Thoughtful analysis of these concepts allows us to see a number of similarities with the ecclesiological ideas of Alexei Khomiakov whose theological works Leskov was familiar with and highly appreciated. The objective of this paper is to highlight those parallels and the mode of their embodiment in Leskov's artistic works.

Alexey Malinov

Institute of Philosophy, St. Petersburg State University

SLAVOPHILE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY: FROM A. S. KHOMIAKOV TO V. I. LAMANSKY

Historiography is one of the most representational field of the Slavophile philosophy which partly compensates poor elaboration of the theory of knowledge and ontology. Historiography allows us to show specificity of Slavophile philosophy and mutual connection between its various fields: from conception of "integral personality" to philosophy of language and theology. At the same time, Slavophile's views on history suffered significant change, together with the evolution of the very movement in Russian thinking. A. S. Khomiakov was at the origin of Slavophile historiosophy, although his unfinished work "Semiramis" did not propose any conceptual idea of history. Khomiakov proposed a few philosophemes (first of all, "iranstvo" and "kushitstvo") which, strictly speaking, cannot be considered philosophical, as they retain their metonymical origin. However, Khomiakov shaped firm Slavophile comprehension of religion as a main historical force. "Iranstvo" and "kushitstvo" can be considered quite concrete religious worldviews. The main ideas of Slavophile historiosophy were formulated in the Slavophiles' controversy (J. F. Samarin, K. N. Bestuzhev-Ryumin) with the historians of the "state school" (K. D. Kavelin S. M. Solovyov, B. N. Chicherin). The Slavophile philosophy of history was most fully expressed in the theory of "cultural-historical types" by N. Y. Danilevsky. Nevertheless, if one starts with the works by the "early Slavophiles," all the ideas by N. Y. Danilevsky cannot be acknowledged and justified. This fact also concerns Pan-Slavism. The theory of "three civilized worlds" formulated and published by V. I. Lamansky during the same years appeared to be in the shadow of N. Y. Danilevsky's conception. V. I. Lamansky himself considered his doctrine rather political geography then philosophy of history. His doctrine of "three civilized worlds of Eurasia" can be understood the culmination of the evolution of Slavophile historiosophy not only because in his interpretation of historical process he highlights rather language then religion, but also because eurasianists' conception became the evolution of V. I. Lamansky's theory.

Oleg Marchenko

Russian State University for the Humanities

IDEAS OF SENIOR SLAVOPHILES IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL REFLECTIONS OF NEO-SLAVOPHILES—MEMBERS OF “THE WAY” GROUP: V. F. ERN

The ideas and principles of senior Slavophiles, I. V. Kireyevsky and A. S. Khomiakov, especially “integral knowledge,” “integrity,” “collegiality,” etc. were important themes of reflection of Russian intellectuals—members of the religious-philosophical group “Put’” (“The Way”) (E. N. Troubetzkoy, A. N. Berdyaev, S. N. Bulgakov, V. F. Ern, P. A. Florensky and others). The most famous example of such productive thinking is the book of Nikolai Berdyaev *Alexei Stepanovich Khomiakov*, published by “The Way” in the series “Russian thinkers” in 1912. In our presentation we will focus on neo-Slavophile Vladimir Ern’s work *Grigory Skovoroda. The life and teaching*, published the same year in the same series. Studying the life and career of the Ukrainian philosopher of the XVIII century, Russian thinker of the twentieth century looks at him through the specific prism of the Slavophile ideology, claiming: “Skovoroda was a clandestine father of Slavophilism.” In the same vein this kind of problematics was understood by father Pavel Florensky’s colleague Fedor Andreev in his work *Moscow Theological Academy and Slavophiles* (1915).

Elena Mareeva

Moscow State Institute of Culture

KHOMIAKOV’S IDEA OF SOBORNOST’ AND THE CONFRONTATION BETWEEN THE EASTERN AND THE WESTERN TYPE OF DEMOCRACY

One of the definitions of “sobornost” belonging to A. S. Khomiakov is based on the “identity of unity and freedom expressed in the law of spiritual love.” Accordingly, the unity without freedom is a distinct variant of “sobornost.” Khomiakov insisted that the organic connection of the individual and the family implied a kind of individual liberty for each. But is it possible to explain Khomiakov’s commitment to the principle of personal freedom under the influence of the concept of liberalism?

The attempt to select elements of liberalism, socialism, anarchism in the views of the early Slavophiles was under taken by Soviet historians of the Russian philosophy. But in each of these areas the idea of freedom found its meaning which is associated with how we understand freedom of the whole society, of the state, mankind.

Khomiakov was definitely a Democrat. But his understanding of how to govern people differs from the notions of liberal democracy in the past and present.

It is known that he was against the Social Contract Theory. His position is incompatible with the interpretation of Thomas Hobbes: a social contract is voluntary denial of personal freedom in favour of absolute monarchy. For John Locke, social contract means a way of asserting personal will of each individual with the help of the state, combining the wishes of all in search of a compromise. But these extremes against personal freedom are unacceptable for A. Khomiakov.

As the starting point of liberal democracy in theory and in practice is a separate personality with her natural rights and freedom of choice, the Western way of life is impossible without the procedures of representative democracy and common to all formal laws which A. Khomiakov has repeatedly condemned like other Slavophiles. It is quite clear that this country needs someone, who protects their private property and competes with their peers in the pursuit of material well-being.

Khomiakov uses the term "civil society," from the vocabulary of the liberal democrats but he fills this concept with a different interpretation of a position of an individual within the collective and different understanding of freedom. A. Khomiakov's concept of "sobornost" represents a democracy in which circumstances don't force the individual to confront the others and the collective as a whole. It is primarily about the peasant world but Khomiakov's conviction of his principles of congregational life can be a way of organizing not only the family, of the peasant community, of the parish but of the entire Russian people.

For Khomiakov this problem is even wider, when he sees the relationship of the individual and of the society, he describes personal freedom, primarily, as internal rather than external freedom as the freedom of spiritual but not political. He emphasizes, that "the thunder of the earth" never completely subdued an eastern person, who always understands that "there are interests higher than this earthly tinsel" but the real goal of man is "the manifestation of inner freedom" and guarding it from absorbing interests of political order, that the West is expressed by the word "civilization."

Personal freedom according to Khomiakov is "enlightened freedom" which does not lead to interest conflicts. There is a position of N. Berdyaev which is interesting for us. He showed the link of "sobornost" ideal and leaving from the arena of history patriarchal society. But at the same time he believed that "sobornost" is being saved as the foundation of religious life.

Khomiakov's concept of personal freedom grows on other grounds than individual freedom in Western liberalism, and, accordingly, he understands the unity of the individual and the family differently. But one cannot agree with N. Berdyaev that the eastern democratism represented an "sobornost" ideal together with patriarchal society belongs but to the past.

Berdyaev, N. A. 1912. *Aleksey Stepanovich Khomiakov*. Moskva: Put'.

Galaktionov, A. A., Nikandrov, P. F. 1989. *Russian Philosophy IX–XIX centuries*. Leningrad: Publishing House of Leningrad University.

Khomiakov A. S. 1994. *Works in 2 volumes*. Moskva.

Marcel Martinkovič

Institute of Philosophy, Slovak Academy of Sciences

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF RELIGION IN THE CONCEPT OF THE SLAVISM IN ALEXEI KHOMIAKOV AND LUDOVÍT ŠTÚR

The aim of the study will be to closely examine ideological analogies in the thinking of Alexej Khomiakov and Ludovít Štúr. Both authors contributed in a significant way to the formation of the content of Slavism in the second half of the 19th century and in the scope of it to defining the importance of religion for cultural and spiritual development. A comparison of reflecting the importance of the church and religion for the social upsurge will come especially from Khomiakov's work *Jedna cirkev* (One Church), which was published for the first time in 1864, and the final fundamental work of Ludovít Štúr *Slovanstvo a svet budúcnosti* (Slavdom and the World of the Future). This work of Štúr's, likewise that of Khomiakov, was published well after the author's death. It was published by V. I. Lamanskij during the First Slavic Congress in Moscow in 1867, i.e. 14 years after it was written. Despite these facts, that both works were not known for the mentioned thinkers, there exist interesting ideological intersections of both authors, in particular on questions reflecting the importance of orthodoxy, solidarity and Slavism. Thus, these mentioned aspects will make up the major part of searching for ideological analogies in the reasoning of both thinkers.

Olga Masloboeva

Saint-Petersburg State University of Economics

ORGANIC CONCEPT OF CULTURE BY A. S. KHOMIAKOV

Organic concept of culture by A. S. Khomiakov was a response to historical necessity of the transition from the mechanistic worldview to an organic, and contributed to the development of Russian organicism. There is proposed projects versus the "organic philosophy" of positivism and the Russian organicism. The integrity of the culture is revealed by Khomiakov as "organic polarity," including "sobornost," advocating as "unity in variety." The philosophy of history by Khomiakov unfolds as "organic polarity" of such spiritual principles as "Greeks" and "coststo." Philosophy of history in this turn around the philosophy of culture based on religious beliefs and energy of a contradiction between freedom and necessity.

Teresa Obolevitch

Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow

FAITH AND SCIENCE IN KHOMIAKOV'S THOUGHT

Khomiakov who graduated from the faculty of mathematics of the Moscow university—according to witness given by his contemporaries—“interested in everything, had an extensive knowledge in all fields and there was no subject alien to him” (cited after Koshelev 2000: 43) and was perceived as “a systematic dialectician, with great talents.” (Stojanović 1928: 564) For Khomiakov the true education consisted not so much in training in science as in rational illumination and clarification of spiritual component of person as well as the entire nation. In other words, science as such is just one aspect of education and should be completed with religious element. Khomiakov did not strive for the unification of the Christian truths and scientific data. Quite the opposite, he was convinced that by forcing other sciences to lie or be silent faith undermines not their authority but its own. In so doing, Khomiakov expressed his aspiration of freedom of science that supposed to be in the Orthodox culture. For instance, he wanted to reject the censorship in Russia after the revolutions of 1848 and even advised the future tsar that science. Nevertheless, this announcement not necessary was fulfilled in Russia and often was in contradiction with other remarks of the Slavophiles. For them faith is the premise and the limit of all human knowledge including science.

Koshelev, V. 2000. *Aleksey Stepanovich Khomiakov, zhizneopisanie v dokumentakh, v rassuzhdeniyakh i razyskaniyakh*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.

Stojanović, J. D. 1928. “The First Slavophiles: Homyakov and Kireyevsky.” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 18/6.

Nikolai Pavliuchenkov

St. Tikhon's Orthodox University

TOWARDS SCHELLING'S INFLUENCE ON A. S. KHOMIAKOV'S PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL LEGACY

Arguably, the problem of Schelling's influence on A. S. Khomiakov's philosophy and theology was articulated by V. V. Zenkovsky, a historian of the Russian religious and philosophical thought. Zenkovsky was willing to find out what particular Schelling's ideas were adopted by his Russian followers and in what way they developed them; therefore, Zenkovsky addressed the legacy left by the attendees of the philosophers' meetings, held in St. Petersburg and Moscow, and made several surprising remarks on Khomiakov, stating that “not everything in his philosophy was based on his understanding on the Church.” According to Zenkovsky, Khomiakov did not notice that his thought was “constrained”

by the "fundamentals of transcendentalism," which turned to be the consequence of "the particularly substantial" influence, produced by Schelling. In this context, "transcendentalism" is understood as the willingness to limit the capabilities of rational (reasonable) knowledge to "phenomena," which represent "the shadow of being," its "regularity," rather than "reality" itself. Zenkovsky also remarked that Khomiakov was particularly close to the metaphysical concept, developed by Nicolaus Cusanus, and that he approached the constructs which manifested themselves as sophiological metaphysics. However these ideas, in their turn, are available in Schelling's metaphysics of unitotality.

This viewpoint and conclusions, derived from Zenkovsky's remarks, need an in-depth discussion. In 1827–1831, A. S. Khomiakov attended the St. Petersburg meetings and took part in the debates on Schelling. According to A. I. Koshelev, since the very beginning, Khomiakov "was a scrupulous and devout Christian," while Koshelev supported "accursed" Schelling's ideas. Unlike Kireyevsky and Koshelev, Khomiakov did not undergo any spiritual evolution from Schelling to Orthodoxy; once Khomiakov said that had no fascination for Schelling. However Khomiakov had studied Schelling's works in full, and he knew them so well that he was confident enough to announce Schelling "the most brilliant" German philosopher and to compare different periods of his work in terms of their significance. According to Khomiakov, Schelling's final period of work represented a number of bright misconceptions mixed with superior truths. Khomiakov faults Schelling of the "pure opportunity of being" ("das reine Seyn-konnen"), treated by the German philosopher as the "very starting point of all spiritual development." However Khomiakov didn't worry about the essence of this notion; rather, it was the secret rationalism of the German thinker that bothered Khomiakov most of all.

Also, Khomiakov did not find it possible to accept the idea of the spiritual revolution in respect of the Heavenly Tripersonality, although he believed it acceptable in respect of the world and humankind. In this connection, Schelling's influence is deemed almost doubtless, as Khomiakov believed that his doctrine of "the internal motion of the self-conscious reason" towards "spiritual integrity" was a most important attainment of philosophy.

Khomiakov accepted the difference between reason and sense, and treated the latter as the analytical ability which realized and analyzed the data obtained from the "integral reason." According to Khomiakov, sense was something evidently negative, although he insisted on the need for it: it "took its rightful place among reasonable forces"; "lawlessness" arose whenever sense attempted to replace reason or the whole consciousness. Here arises the idea of the need to ascend to the qualitatively new level of spiritual development through the emergence and temporary development of negative processes, which must take their pre-set position in the general hierarchy of human beings. There is a need to step away, "to fall away" from the true reality to cognize it in its integrity later; evidently, no one, except Schelling, made such an impact on the spiritual consciousness of the Russian thinker.

Khomiakov, same as Schelling (and further authors, including Solovyov and Florensky), spoke about the human banefulness of shrinking into oneself, the love that "carried humans away" as a means that "put humans out of temper." Although his constructs lack the explicit understanding

of this love as an *ontological* force, it represents the unquestionable reality, which clusters humans into the humankind, and gets the latter tied to God. Moreover, the unity of all Christians represents “a living individuality”; according to Khomiakov, the Church is “the personality, inspired by God.” It is not too difficult to notice some understatement here, or, at least, the borderline to be followed by such pattern of sophiological development, which may turn to be quite close to *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth*, also influenced by Shelling (via V. Solovyov, in particular).

Zlatica Plašienková, Peter Rusnák and Lucio Florio

Comenius University in Bratislava, Trnava University and Argentine Pontifical Catholic University

A. S. KHOMIAKOV, P. TEILHARD DE CHARDIN AND L. HANUS: THREE POINTS OF VIEW ON FAITH AND CHURCH IN HUMAN LIFE

The authors of the study analyse and compare the specifics of understanding the importance of faith and church (institutional) life in thinking of three authors. The starting point of comparison is the concept of church orthodoxy (and broader understanding of human identity in an environment of love) of the Russian philosopher A. S. Khomjakov with an emphasis on its interpretation in the original Russian intellectual milieu (Kirejevskij, Florenskij, Losskij). The authors then present comparisons of Khomiakov’s inspiring reflections with the understanding of faith and the importance of the Christian church in the work of French scientist, philosopher and priest Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881–1955). They refer to different specific forms of faith described by him (faith in the world, faith in man, faith in immortality, faith in personality, faith in spirit, faith in Omega Point and Cosmic Christ) and the interpretation of the Church as a biological *fylum* of the Christ. Understood in this way the Church is both an expression of the unity of God and man, the unity that is constantly realized, forms and matures over time. The Church thus presents heart, fire of love, in which the main unifying force is the love of God pervading the physical unity of the Christian *fylum*. Church as *fylum* of love is than a living organism, is a dynamic community formed by love and animated by the power of the risen Christ in which we are united as one. The final part of the study will be a comparison of the previous concepts with opinions of the Slovak philosopher and priest Ladislav Hanus (1907–1994). His concept is an understanding of faith and the Church in the broadest cultural and social context. Very interesting acts in particular polarity of the Christianity and communism, as well as the polarity of Catholicism and Protestantism.

Chomjakov, A. S. 1895. *Katechetický výklad učení o církvi*. Přerov.

Chomjakov, A. S. 2008. *Jedna církev*. Olomouc.

Florenskij, P. A. 2003. *Sloup a opora pravdy*. Olomouc.

Hanus, L. 1997. *Človek a kultúra*. Bratislava.

Hanus, L. 2000. *Pokoništantínska Cirkev*. Bratislava.

Hanus, L. 2003. *O kultúre a kultúrnosti*. Bratislava.

Hanus, L. 2006. *Pamäti svedka storočia*. Bratislava.

Losskij, N. O. 2004. *Dějiny ruské filozofie*. Olomouc.

Teilhard de Chardin, P. 1965. *Coment je crois*. Paris

Randall A. Poole

College of St. Scholastica

SLAVOPHILISM AND RUSSIAN RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY (KHOMIAKOV AND KIREEVSKY)

This essay will explore the Slavophile foundations of Russian religious philosophy. Alexei Khomiakov (1804–1860) and Ivan Kireevsky (1806–1856) are the essential thinkers for this theme; this presentation will focus on Khomiakov. Both Khomiakov and Kireevsky were persons of deep faith, and their faith came from genuine spiritual or religious experience. They were inspired by Hesychast spirituality, mystical theology, and the writings of the Eastern Church Fathers. Kireevsky, in his essay “On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy” (1856), conceived the idea of a distinctive Russian religious philosophy grounded in, and developing from, Orthodox spiritual experience and faith. This conviction in the experiential sources and quality of religious consciousness forms the first Slavophile foundation of Russian religious philosophy. For Khomiakov the Church itself was experience (or an experiential reality): it was a “living organism of truth and love” (Iurii Samarin) in which the faithful transcended individualism and aspired toward divine-human unity. Khomiakov’s idea of *sobornost’* (conciliarity, modeled after the Trinity) is the second Slavophile foundation of Russian religious philosophy. Slavophile experientialism was the basis for Khomiakov’s and Kireevsky’s critique of western rationalism, which according to them displaced concrete experience with abstract thought, isolating us from substantial reality. Rationalism, they claimed, is capable of grasping only phenomena. It removes the subject and object of knowledge from each other, operates at the level of abstractions, and dissolves being into mere concepts. Instead of rationalism the Slavophiles extolled “believing reason” (Kireevsky’s signature concept). Integrating reason and faith, it achieves the wholeness of mind, spirit, and soul that can immediately apprehend reality and penetrate to its ontological or noumenal essence. It is a kind of inner revelation or concrete intuition that goes to the heart of reality, to God, thus grounding the human person in divine being. The concept of believing reason discloses several more Slavophile foundations of Russian religious philosophy: the compatibility, even inner unity, of faith and reason; the “ontological” emphasis on reality or being, which cannot be reduced to abstract concepts and which must be experienced rather than merely thought; and “integral personhood” or

the whole person (body, mind, spirit, soul), in contrast to the Westernizers' "autonomous individual," dominated by abstract rational reason. All these Slavophile foundations of Russian religious philosophy shared another, the most encompassing of all: the ideal of wholeness.

Andrey Popov

Lomonosov Moscow State University

A. S. KHOMIAKOV AS ONE OF THE FOUNDERS OF THE SLAVOPHILE DOCTRINE

The basis of this doctrine lay his Christian faith, marked the beginning of secular theology in Russia. Faith determines the extreme limit of human knowledge. In turn, philosophy is a transitional movement of the human mind from the realm of faith to the diversity of the world around us. Sobornost—the central position of Slavophilism, which originally interpreted the concept of unity, freedom and love. Sobornost was seen as the true form of Christian society, which was interpreted as an alternative to the European model of atomized society. An appeal to Sobornost meant the desire Khomiakov to prove the organic unity of social and religious-based community began. The social ideal of the Slavophiles, developed in the 40-ies of the XIX century, was the first in the history of Russian thought the concept of "communal socialism." Further along this path of building the foundations of "Russian socialism" of A. I. Herzen, N. G. Chernyshevsky, etc. the Doctrine of nationality had been an integral part of the Slavophile doctrine.

Anna Reznichenko

RSUH, Moscow

"CATHOLICITY" AND COUNCIL: THE IDEAS OF A. S. KHOMYAKOV IN THE WORK OF MEMBERS OF THE "NOVOSELOVSKY CIRCLE" (M. A. NOVOSELOV, A. S. GLINKA-VOLZHSKY, S. N. DURLIN)

The report is devoted to the analysis of the reception of the concept of "catholicity" (sobornost'), set forth by one of the founders of Russian Slavophilism, A. S. Khomyakov, in his program work "The Church One" (another title – "Confession," written at the turn of 1844/1845, was published after Khomyakov's death, in 1864). The history of reception (and mystification) of this text in the XIX century is studied well and is associated with such names as N. V. Gogol, Yu. F. Samarin, Metropolitan Filaret, Archbishop Nectarius and others.

In this regard, it is interesting to consider the reception of the Khomyakov treatise in the twentieth century, in the period immediately preceding the All-Russian Council of 1917–1918. Around Mos-

cow neo-Slavophiles—members of the “Circle seeking Christian enlightenment,” or “Novoselovsky circle.” The most interesting interpretations before the Council are related to the texts of prince D. A. Khilkov (“Letters”, 1915), S. N. Durylin (“Head of Silence,” 1916, “Church Council and Russian Church,” 1917), A. S. Glinka-Volzhsy (“Socialism and Christianity. A Sketchy Note,” 1917). Khomyakov’s ideas about the true and false Church are described in terms of “living” and “dead”, the mysticism and the rationalism, The God-manhood and the humaneness, although in each of the authors the emphasis of interpretation is different.

We see the solution of these semantic dichotomies in the post-conciliar texts of M. A. Novoselov (“Letters to Friends,” 1922), where the boundaries of the Church are defined apophatically, and in the S. N. Bulgakov’s “Protocols of the Seminary of the Kingdom of God” (1923–1924), where these same boundaries are given cataphatically, but the essence is one: the Church is a Vivid Life, Living and Complex organism. The Church is that which begins with the outer contours of social life—and becomes the absolute foundation and purpose of life, the Kingdom of God, Haevenly Jerusalem.

*Доклад подготовлен в рамках работы по Гранту № 17-04-00362 РФНФ.
The report was prepared in the framework of Grant 17-04-00362 RF.*

Tatiana Rezvykh

St. Tikhon’s Ortodox University

SOBORNOST AT A. S. HOMYAKOV AND A CONCEPT OF SPIRIT AT F. EBNER

In the report are compared concepts of sobornost and spirit at A. S. Homyakov and F. Ebner. At Homyakov these concepts are in close connection. Sobornost isn’t a collectivism, and unity of people in the spirit of God. This spirit is expressed in Church. This unity of many and diversity in unity. It is impossible to reach spirit by means of I. The similar concept of spirit has appeared at the Protestant F. Ebner. Ebner criticizes the Hegelian concept of spirit in which the spirit is understood as self-consciousness. Ebner proves a concept of spirit that the person is capable to dialogue. In consciousness is found the language fact. In turn, language is pointed to openness of I. Spiritual I is the speaking personality. It is possible to draw a conclusion that Ebner has created the concept of spirit similar to Homyakov’s concept.

Giorgia Rimondi

University of Parma

РАЗЛИЧИЕ В ТОЖДЕСТВЕ И ТОЖДЕСТВО В РАЗЛИЧИИ. СОБОРНОЕ НАЧАЛО В ФИЛОСОФСКОМ ОСМЫСЛЕНИИ А. Ф. ЛОСЕВА

A. F. Losev's philosophy represents an original contribution to the Russian outlook on *sobornost'*. His entire theoretical framework, though not explicitly, intersects with the theme of conciliarity and its philosophical implications. Since his early work Losev sets himself the task of finding a unitary and stable principle which can be able to justify the becoming nature of reality. Thus, the ontological premise of "unity in multiplicity," or, according to Losev's words, "identity in difference," can be understood as the same principle which characterized Russian thought, beginning with A. S. Khomiakov, and in which some researchers find the main feature of the authentic Russian idea. Such a principle, in its losevian reformulation, reveals in its turn several questions (ontological, symbolic, ethical) that are expressed in the dualism of organism and mechanism. In particular, Losev's dialectic of one and multiplicity is fundamental in considering the concept of organicity, primarily understood as a transcendent and ideal unity.

Mikhalina Shibaeva

Moscow State Institute of Culture

THE CONCEPTS OF A. S. KHOMIAKOV "LIVING TRUTH" AND "COMMON CAUSE" IN THE RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY WAY

The main purpose of the paper lies in discovering and understanding the influence of the spiritual way of A. S. Khomiakov into the philosophical thought in Russia in the second half of XIX–early XX centuries. Special attention is paid to such concepts as "living truth" and "common cause." The first concept reflects the specific approach of A. S. Khomiakov to the problems of epistemology, especially to the question of the relation of faith and knowledge about the heuristic potential of the "believer's consciousness. The second concept is inseparable from the idea of unity: the relationship of man with God is interpreted through the lens of Christian humanism.

Typing in the context of a spiritual perspective, the concept of "living truth," A. S. Khomiakov in several of his papers have consistently proven that reaching this "living truth" requires "an infinite wealth of data that are acquired by the clairvoyance of faith, we have analyzed the mind" (Khomyakov 1988: 248). However, he stressed that "the unsolvable questions are not useless: they awaken the activity of the mind and prepares it for future resolution" (Khomyakov 1988: 25).

Being a deeply religious man, Khomiakov was faithful to the idea of the equivalence of faith and knowledge, the synthesis of which leads, in his opinion, the flourishing of culture and of every

nation, and humanity as a whole. The meaning of culture, its special assignment he was associated with sacred values and objectives for the betterment of humanity as a whole. The meaning of culture, its special assignment he was associated with sacred values and objectives for the betterment of humanity as a subject of world history.

Hence the passionate interest of the thinker to the problems of philosophical and theological nature. Epistemological setting Khomiakov interfaced with a number of moments that reflect the essence of the understanding of the Russian thinker living truth as the fundamental values of human culture. One of these meaningful moments, he took a question on the subject of achieving a "living truth." In his works, such subjects appear in the Church and "the unity of the people based on love to the absolute values."

That is why he focused attention on the idea of non-admissibility of individualism in the processes of understanding the world and sharing the values of the highest order: "a separated person is perfect impotence and irreconcilable internal disorder" (Khomyakov 1988: 211). The relationship between the two concepts in philosopheme Khomiakov ("living truth" and "common cause") is clearly detected in the following proposition: "Private thinking may be strong and fruitful only with a strong development of General thinking; the General thinking is possible only when the highest knowledge and the people expressing it are connected with the rest of the body of society by the ties of free and wise love and when the mental strength of each individual gyre enlivened intellectual and moral juices in his people." (Khomyakov 1988: 221). In other words, the concept of a common cause excludes any justification of individualism as an apology for the vanity and selfishness.

Axiological aspects of the relationship of the considered concepts are also found in this particular position of the philosopher regarding the question of freedom. Based on the belief that "the law of Christ is freedom" the thinker seeks to substantiate the thesis that "law is a free obedience, just as "Christian freedom is free consent" (Khomyakov 1994). However, he stressed that the major obstacle to this unity is "unenlightened freedom," whereas "justification of this freedom is in unity with the Church" in the name of achieving "unity in freedom based on love" (Khomyakov 1994).

The concept of a common cause, inseparable from the concepts of freedom and love, meaningful and correlated with historiosophical and ethical aspects of humanity. "Not of folks, not the fate of Nations, but a common cause, the fate of all humanity make up the true subject of history—wrote A. S. Khomiakov. Speaking abstractly, we say that we are small particle of the human race, we see the development of his soul, his inner life for millions of people all over the world... Practically speaking, we can say that in history we are looking for the beginning of the human race, hoping to find a clear word on his initial brotherhood and common source" (Khomyakov 1994: 38).

Overcoming antagonism as a factor of discord in all spheres of life Khomiakov considered essential for the implementation of the principles of Christian humanism. Hence the pathos of promoting the

idea of harmonization of sacred values and the fundamental values of culture on the Foundation of the contingency of faith and knowledge. According to Sergius Bulgakov, "the spirit hovers Khomiakov the Church Council, claiming it in balance, stability and calm, joy-ful clarity" (Bulgakov 1993: 621). This assessment religious thinker of the twentieth century the spiritual heritage of the leader of Slavophilism is one of the evidence that a number of ideas of Khomiakov continued to fuel Russian philosophy in subsequent decades.

Bulgakov, S. N. 1993. "Na piru bogov." In: S. N. Bulgakov. *Sochineniya v dvuh tomah*. Vol. 2. *Izbrannye stat'i*. Moskva: Nauka.

Khomyakov, A. S. 1988. *O starom i novom*. Moskva.

Khomyakov, A. S. 1994. "Raboty po istoriosofii." In: A. S. Khomyakov. *Sochineniya v dvuh tomah*. Vol. 1. Moskva: Moskovskij filosofskij fond. Izdatel'stvo Medium.

Lada Shipovalova

St. Petersburg University

KHOMIAKOV'S IDEA OF SOBORNOST AS A REGULATORY IDEAL OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

In the modern world there are two extremes which define the norms of social and intercultural communication. On the one hand, it is totalitarianism, which presupposes terror against those who do not agree with the only normative approach and ultimately declares the necessity and opens the possibility of destroying entire nations. On the other hand, there are pluralism and disunity, lack of attention towards the Other, his culture and beliefs. It seems that rules of social and cultural relations, which should be recognized as effective, determine the conditions of the movement from these extremes to the "virtuous middle" (Aristotle).

The important role in the establishment of such rules belongs to the research of the interaction of cultural traditions. This course of interaction has two aspects. The first concerns the *influence* of one culture on another, when the specific characteristics of the first are recognized and accepted by the second. The second aspect deals with the *reception*, which assumes not only the submission to influence or imitation but active rethinking of ideas of another culture, an organic combination of these ideas with "the original life of people." The study of the reception of Russian thought abroad as well as the reception of Western thought in Russia is a topical direction of scholarly interest nowadays. Detection, description, and analysis of conditions and forms of reception do not confine with a theoretical value. The results of this study can serve as a basis for practical actions, that is, contribute to the development of norms of intercultural communication.

This report is intended to consider Khomiakov's idea of Sobornost in the two above-mentioned contexts: as a methodological ground of theoretical cultural studies and as a way to explain and justify existing norms of interactions between cultural traditions. This idea can provide the possibility for avoidance the extremes of totalitarianism and individualism. Khomiakov's criticism towards "the universality in the geographical sense," numerical superiority and power advantage as a sufficient basis for the importance of one's own values, allows him to highlight the meaning of "the unity in multiplicity" and free consentience that can serve as a regulatory ideal of social and cultural practices.

As an illustration of such interpretation of Sobornost I am going to analyze two works by A. S. Khomiakov related to the problem of interaction (influence / reception) of cultures: "The Opinion of foreigners about Russia" and "The Opinion of Russians about foreigners." Despite the fact that the concept of Sobornost does not seem to be a key term in any of them, some topics discussed in these works help us to identify this idea as a motive force. Among these topics are criticism of narrow-mindedness and particularity, sharpening the controversy between imitation and originality, servile reverence and the development of "one's own creative principles," "colonialism of knowledge" and the knowledge based on life.

The concepts of local and universal, used by Khomiakov and associated with the concepts of life and knowledge, have great importance for the problem of interaction of cultures. The question of a choice between these concepts, which determines the alternatives for Russia's place in the international community and the understanding of the latter, is just as acute presently, as it was in the nineteenth century. It seems that the opposition of these concepts creates the alternative: 1) subordination to the universal, which can lead to the alienation from the specific life of the people; 2) absolutization of local, which blocks the way to the big world. To my mind, the processes of cultural interaction should be understood as overcoming this alternative and as "entering the universal context with one's own contribution" (S. Horuzhy). Moreover, I am convinced that the universal does not already exist as a norm for everybody but it is a living dialogue based on the possibility of gathering together different cultures. In this context, the idea of Sobornost can be interpreted as a kind of synthesis of concepts of local and universal.

Berdiaev, N. 2005. *Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov*. Moscow.

Cavazza, A. 1997. "Nuova recognizione nell'opera di A. S. Chomiakov." In: A. Cavazza (ed). *A. S. Chomjakov. Opinione di un russo sugli stranieri*. Bologna, p. 19–78.

Horuzhy, S. S. 1994. *Posle pereryva. Puti russkoj filosofii*. St. Petersburg.

Nazarova, O. A. 2015. "Recepcija russkoj religioznoj filosofii v sovremennoj zapadnoevropejskoj hristianskoj filosofii." *Solov'evskie issledovanija* 4: 148–157.

Khomiakov, A. S. 1886. "Pis'mo k redaktoru 'L'Union Chretienne' o znamenii slov: 'Kafolicheskij' i 'Sobornyj' po povodu rechi jezuita otca Gagarina." In A. S. Khomiakov. *Collected papers*. Vol. 2. Moscow, p. 319–328.

- Khomiakov, A. S. 1988a. "Mnenie inostrancev o Rossii." In A. S. Khomiakov. *O starom i novom*. Moskva, p. 82–102.
- Khomiakov, A. S. 1988b. "Mnenie russkih ob inostrancah." In A. S. Khomiakov. *O starom i novom*. Moskva, p. 103–134.
- Obolevitch, T., T. Homa, J. Bremer (eds). 2013. *Russian Thought in Europe. Reception, Polemics, Development*. Krakow.
- Walicki, A. 1994. "Po povodu 'russkoj idei' v russkoj filosofii." *Voprosy filosofii* 1.
- Walicki, A. 2002. *W kregu konserwatywnej utopii. Struktura i przemiany rosyjskiego slowianofilstwa*. Warszawa.
- Zenkovsky, V. V. 2003. *A History of Russian Philosophy*. London.

Lyudmila Sidorenko

Central Scientific Library of the Union of Theatre Union of the Russian Federation

THE PHENOMENON OF A. S. KHOMYAKOV: PERSONALITY—CREATIVE HERITAGE—PHILOSOPHICAL AND ARTISTIC ENVIRONMENT. THE PROJECT OF THE EXHIBITION OF ARCHIVAL MATERIALS IN THE CENTRAL SCIENTIFIC LIBRARY OF THE THEATRE UNION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Careful attitude to the spiritual and creative heritage and active activity in its use in the current conditions of globalization and mediation of the sociocultural space are impossible without the use of the mechanism of cultural and historical memory. The role of this mechanism is enormous because memory „is not a passive store for culture” (Lotman 2010: 255). Hence the value of such parameters of cultural and historical memory as system, cumulative, a variety of cognitive possibilities, associativity, as well as aesthetic potential and ethical “energy.”

In everyday realities of the society, cultural memory manifests itself as an instrument for inheriting traditions, appropriating the achievements of past epochs with new generations, and expanding the possibilities of using them in the “proposed circumstances” of a different reality. In the light of this, the strategy of cultural dialogue with the past and the future, which is to a large extent connected with the multifunctional activity of the memory institutions, is an actual problem. It is no coincidence that the German researcher Jan Assmann defines culture as an “objectified memory of a society that has retained its identity and transmits it through a chain of generations. The forms in which society organizes the transfer of information necessary to preserve this identity, and the institutions that care about the transfer of such information... reveal the uniqueness and unique style of a particular culture.”

As is known, the uniqueness of the style of any “chronotope of culture” (Mikhail Bahtin) is connected with the creative legacy of the “symbolic names” of the era - and above all philosophers, scientists and artists. That is why the active inclusion of their heritage in the cultural space of our time is an important task. The actualization of the cultural heritage as an integral part of the value fund of the society, as well as the reconstruction of the “spirit of the epoch” are realized not only thanks to the texts of the culture of past epochs, but also to the names of their great representatives.

From this point of view, the project of the Central Scientific Library of the Union of Theatrical Figures of Russia, dedicated to the memory of Alexei Khomiakov. In the traditions of the multifaceted work of the CNB, which has a valuable fund of archival and manuscript materials, use of various forms of presentation of cultural heritage. Among them there are exhibitions of unique texts and rare photo documents, theater posters, creative meetings with art historians and critics, as well as compositions that in one way or another were connected with the book and the artistic events of past eras. Each of these forms of presentation in its own way actualizes the memory of the phenomenon of Khomiakov—the Russian thinker, poet, dramatist and cultural ascetic. The main milestones of his biography, the publication of his poetic, dramatic and philosophical texts, photographic materials about the family of Khomiakov and his “near circle” are included in the exhibition from the standpoint of the general cultural context of Russia in the second half of the 19th century.

The Central Scientific Library of the Union of Theatrical Figures (CSN STD RF) was founded 120 years ago, in 1896. Now the fund of the library is about 500 thousand volumes of books in more than 30 languages. And 7 million cards of the reference bibliographic cabinet. Being the institution of memory and the documental basis of the country’s theatrical life, the library has kept rare editions and archival documents in its funds. In particular: the lifetime editions of Khomiakov’s works, later documents, bibliography. The periodicals of 1830–1860 years, including the *Works of the Society of Russian Literature* at the Moscow University, are almost completely represented. Undoubtedly interesting are the rare lifetime editions of writers and publicists of the Khomiakov’s “near circle,” his like-minded people, opponents and critics: V. F. Odoevsky, D. V. Veneviiinov, I. V. Kireevsky, V. G. Belinsky, I. S. Aksakov and others. The journals *The Messenger of Europe*, *The Moscow Observer*, *Mnemosyna*, *The Russian Conversation*, etc. are collected in the collections of the library and are, in essence, primary sources for studying the religious and philosophical views of the Slavophiles and Westerners.

Given the theatrical direction of the Library, one cannot help mentioning the successors of the aesthetic and philosophical ideas of Khomiakov, poets and writers of the Silver Age, such as Andrei Bely, Valery Bryusov and Vyacheslav Ivanov with his idea of “the conciliar theater” in poetic philosophy.

The presentation of this report includes unique photo documents from the collections of the iconographic department of the library, rare portraits of figures of the literary movement of Russia of the mid-19th century, photocopies of pages with personal letters of authors.

The collection of documents in the collections of the Central Scientific Library of the Union of Theatrical Figures of the Russian Federation confirms the importance of studying the works of Khomyakov, the relevance of his philosophical projection.

Svetlana Skorokhodova

Moscow Teachers-training State University

CERTAIN PHILOSOPHICAL AND HISTORICAL IDEAS OF A. S. KHOMIAKOV AND YU. F. SAMARIN

A “figurative” philosophy of the history was born in the Slavophilism. It is based on the issues of spiritual dimension as well as the questions of faith and national politics. In this report we will try to compare certain philosophical and historical ideas of A. S. Khomiakov and Yu. F. Samarin.

In Khomiakov’s philosophy of history, the aesthetical, theological and scientific basics are organically interconnected. Khomiakov believed that only a philosopher could reveal in the chaos of facts and events of the past the sources of modern phenomena.

Samarin’s consideration of the issues of historical epistemology is deeper than that in the works of other Slavophiles. Thus, “the national spirit” and “the integrity of thought,” according to him, are important to comprehend the history. He stood at the origins of the political philosophy in Russia, he linked political problems to the underlying issues of human being. Anthropological and theological aspects are in the centre of his philosophical and historical views.

The principal characters of the history for Khomiakov are personalities and ethnic communities. The providentialism in his philosophy of history was moderated by “the acknowledgment of logics of the historical development, the laws of history and freedom” (A. S. Panarin). At the same time the philosopher believed that there was no historical plan prepared beforehand since the historical arbitrariness of nations was possible. He wrote that there is indifference to the good and evil in the history. According to Khomiakov, the sense of the Christian teaching is that a man receives a possibility of free choice and endless perfection. The theologism is a characteristic feature of Samarin’s philosophical and historical thoughts. The philosopher believed that, in the history, there is an objective immanent to the historical process. At the same time he did not deny the role of the personality in the history. The “World Request” is one of important notions in his works.

One of the principal questions in Khomiakov’s and Samarin’s philosophy of history is the Slavic question. The semantic centre of the Slavic idea, as the members of the Moscow School understood it, was not the Pan-Slavism, but the idea of the “Slavic Brotherhood,” the practical implementation of which will lead to the consolidation of the Slavs, a powerful repulse of the Western claims to the world hegemony. The “Slavic Brotherhood,” according to the “root Slavophiles,” is not opposed to the rest of the humanity and is defensive rather than offensive in nature. “Russia neither strives for takeovers nor political dominance: it only desires the freedom of spirit and life to the Slavic tribes remaining loyal to the Slavic Brotherhood”—summarised I. S. Aksakov.

I believe it is the idea of the "Slavic Brotherhood" that most precisely expresses Khomiakov's and Samarin's endeavour to implement the principle of sobornost in the Slavs' social life, which, according to them, will lead to the flourishing of the national culture even among the Slavic minorities.

It is specifically important that the Slavic union cannot be amorphous and faceless, where each of the nations would lose its national originality for the sake of another idol if the "Slavdom" is understood this way. A man is similar to a tree which will wither without its ancestral roots going back into centuries. Only in the context of a family the notions of *Vselenskost'*, "Slavdom," "universal human values" gain their genuine meaning. It is also known that at the crucial and critical epochs both for a man and a nation it is important to rely on the existing age-old spiritual tradition. Otherwise, both the man and the nation, according to Khomiakov's figurative expression, are doomed to the "homeless orphanhood" and finally even to downfall.

Mechanical, artificial Slavic unions are also impossible because the nations have strong historical memory. Not only the faith, the spiritual basis but also the natural and social fundamentals in their unity are important to determine the cultural and historical identity.

Undoubtedly, there should be a spiritual kernel in a Slavic union. Yet Juraj Križanić, a famous Croatian scientist, wrote about Russia's special role in the Slavdom. The Slavophiles also thought that only the united Slavic world with Russia as its leader can withstand the challenge from the West and maintain its national identity.

Khomiakov tried to discover the meaning of the Slavic world in the history, not to demonstrate its advantage but, as he stated, to restore the objective authenticity of the scientific studies. According to Khomiakov, the union of the Slavs is possible through the *Bratolyubie* ("the brotherly love") and faith as the "highest social basis." The renovation and growth of the national spirit are also essential.

Although Khomiakov described Russia's historical peculiarity, he did not stand at the origins of the civilizational approach: the aim of the history, notwithstanding all the confrontation of the freedom and necessity, the Orthodox Slavic and West-European bases, is to reach the "original unity." "We should talk not about something that divides, but about something that can unite" (V. M. Mezhuev). According to Khomiakov, the Slavic world should lead the world enlightenment relying on its inner spiritual wealth. In "The Semiramis," Khomiakov wrote that in the ancient times, "the word *human family* was not a word but a deed."

F. F. Zelinsky introduced the notion of "supranationalism" implying the development of the own national traditions and adoption all the "veritable" in the Western life. N. O. Lossky defined that notion as follows: "The true unity of nations... is not the homogeneity but the *vsenarodnost'* and their solidarity for the sake of independent and full-blown life of everyone." On that way, not the abstract Marxist "common man" is implemented, but a concrete *vsechelovek* (panhuman) in a sense that each individual in the *sobornoe edinenie* (sobor unity) with other individuals shares the whole

fullness and variety of the human life. Such ideal is opposite to the all-leveling and unifying internationalism. The *sobornoe edinenie* of different nations supposes the mutual penetration of national cultures without losing their distinctness. The creations of different national cultures can penetrate each other and form a superior unity. A sympathetic communication with foreign cultures will lead not to depersonalisation but to a deeper comprehension of one's own culture." I believe the notion of "supranationalism" precisely characterises Khomiakov's position as to the national question.

If Khomiakov indeed was a supporter of *Vselenskost'* and saw Russia still in the family of European countries, it is Samarin whom the Russian philosophical thought owes the idea that different ways of development are possible for the co-existing but dissimilar "worlds." By the way, the philosopher was the first among the "root Slavophiles" to use the notions of "civilization," "Christian civilization," "loan civilization," "native civilization" and so forth. I believe it is Samarin who can be called a forerunner of Danilevsky in a certain sense. Samarin noted that the Slavophiles' opponents tend to play on the notions of "universal" and "national" concealing behind the vague meaning their ideological likings and posing the European as the truth. Ultimately, according to the philosopher, the calls to restrain the national "egoism," that is, the patriotism, to please the ambitions of the West undermine Russia's statehood. At the same time, Samarin noted that the Slavophiles value the "old Russian" not because it is old and not because it is "ours," but because it displays the universal and veritable bases relating to the Christianity. The task of our internal history is to enlighten our national common basis by the communal-Christian one, that is, universal.

In the 60s, he put the "Polish question" point blank, on which we will not be going into detail. This conference convinces us that both Polish and Russian nations seek a dialogue, even if in some spheres only, including the sphere of science. By the way, a Polish delegation was present at the international conference The XII All-Slavic Sobor, which took place in Moscow from 21 to 24 May 2015 and was dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Great Victory. The delegation included a lot of scientists and writers (Ph. D. in Political Science Gracjan Cimek, Professor Adam Karpiński Gdańsk, Doctor of Philosophy Marek Głogoczowski and others).

Samarin associated the "Slavic Brotherhood" with the question of survival of the Slavs, which was only possible in case of their *sobor* unity. At the same time, the philosopher did not exclude the political partnership of the Slavic world with the Western countries, although he noted that they like to resort to Russia's help for the sake of their mercenary ends and unite when Russia thinks of doing something in the spirit of its historical politics. However, the philosopher emphasised that Russia is of significance and power on its own as the "Holy Russia."

The problems of the philosophy of history in connection with the comprehension of the existential depth of the human being are the most important ones for Kireevsky, Khomiakov and Samarin. Not only were they the first to describe the philosophical and psychological aspects of the faith in the history of human and world, but also stood at the origins of the philosophy of religion in Russia. They believed that every nation is first determined religiously. According to them, to understand the pe-

cularity of the nations' faith means to understand its essence. However, they believed that not any faith can become that life-giving spring which will give scope to the self-realisation and creativity.

Khomiakov believed that the historical process always is a struggle of two fundamentals: freedom and necessity, *iranstvo* and *kushitstvo*. The spirit of *iranstvo* was most fully implemented in the Russian Orthodoxy but it also existed in the Zoroastrianism. The philosopher singled out the peculiarities of the Russian Christianity the main of which, according to him, is the *sobornost*. Khomiakov and Kireevsky always emphasised the religious and mystic unity of the whole mankind and believed that it is only the ignorance that "isolates the nations from the lively communication of minds, on which the truth is based, and due to which it moves and grows amidst the people and nations."

Khomiakov criticised the Western religions from the philosophical and religious standpoint (according to him, the principle of *sobornost* was insufficiently implemented in them), while Samarin—from the political philosophy standpoint. He discussed the inseparable connection between the religion and the politics. The philosopher discovered the development vector of the Catholic and Protestant theological ideas. He deciphered certain dead-end schools in those confessions, which were limited to the scholasticism in the thought. Thus, a concrete national colour pertains to the idea that Russia should be diversified with its structure and essence to be changed.

All the principal subjects of the Slavophiles philosophy of the history, the authority and society, the historical destiny of the Christianity in Russia, "The Russian idea" and so forth lead us to one common ending—the question of the meaning of history.

In the works of the Slavophiles, the philosophical and historical problem of the meaning of history turns into a tireless ontological search for the fundamental principle of existence, its centre, the "live root." In the very teaching of Khomiakov on the Church, there is a possibility of the chiliastic ending of the history.

Khomiakov considered the construction of a theocratic state in Russia a possible initial stage of the way to the world chiliastic culture, but he did not recognise any dogmatic development of the Orthodoxy. According to Khomiakov, a man is weak and only relying on the *sobor* mind can he avoid straying from the true course. According to the philosopher, a community is a moral entity. However, short before the death, Khomiakov was overwhelmed by a foreboding of the world cataclysms: "Rumble grows as in the sea / when it sleeps before a gale. / Very soon the world will be / All around a bloody bale."

Samarin also found it necessary to implement the Christian moral principles in the social relations. A society living under the Christian laws is a *sobor* unity in multitude, which is only possible in a -community. Beside the boundless development of personality in the Germanic world, the Slavic and Russian world introduced the development of the communal fundamental, which did not at all suppress the personality but only kept it within the voluntarily admitted borders. However, in the

end of his life, the philosopher did not write anything either about the future theocracy or about the universal love or collapse of the history, but he still believed in Russia, its spiritual power available to anyone who needs it.

Thus, the notion of *sobornost'* plays a significant role in Khomiakov's and Samarin's philosophy of history. Khomiakov was much more attracted by the universality. He thought that the Slavic world keeps for the whole mankind, if not an embryo, then a possibility of renovation. According to Samarin, Russia and the Slavdom is a special world. The philosopher thought that "Russia must develop originally, even if the outcome would differ significantly from the results of development of the Western nations..." Its necessity is caused by Russia's peculiar religious, political and tribal fundamentals. The adoption should be limited to the sphere of factual knowledge, external experience and material improvements, but not concern the fundamentals. I believe the positions of Khomiakov and Samarin are a unity of opposites in a certain sense. Different shades in the philosophy of the "Moscow school" allow to reveal the phenomenon of the Slavophilism most fully.

Important are Samarin's ideas regarding the political significance for Russia of the national outskirts and the Slavic union. Probably, it is nowadays too early to speak about a moral union, a frank endeavour to any solid political connection. On the contrary, in the absence of renovation any endeavour from our side to accelerate the consolidation of the Slavs with Russia can lead to an utter distrust between them. But without the all-Slavic union, as Danilevsky predicted, Russia will turn into a "historical rubbish." The same awaits the scattered Slavic world.

But it is important to remember the deep intuition of the universal in Khomiakov's works. He insisted that the Slavic world is supposed to unite the East and the West. As K. Jaspers wrote, all our deepest distinctions amounting to mutual alienation and hatred are just torments generated by a forgotten kinship that had lost its way to existence.

Antonov, K. M. 2007. "The Missionary Strategies and Tactics of A. S. Khomiakov." In A. S. *Khomiakov—a Thinker, Poet, Publicist*. Vol. 1. Moscow.

Khomiakov, A. S. 1900–1914. *The Full Collected Works: In 8 volumes*. Moscow.

Kohn, H. 1960. *Panslavizm. The History and Ideology*. New York.

Rakitov, A. 1987. *The Historical Knowledge*. Moscow.

Samarin, Yu. F. *The Letters of Yu. F. Samarin to A. S. Khomiakov*. The Manuscripts Research Department of the Russian State Library. Fund 265. Carton 144. Item 13.

Samarin, Yu. F. *The Materials on Poland*. The Manuscripts Research Department of the Russian State Library. Fund 265. Folder 74. Item. 4. Page 1–3.

Samarin, Yu. F. 1871–1911. *The Works of Yu. F. Samarin: Volume 1–10, 12*. Moscow.

Samarin, Yu. F. 2016. *The Collected Works: in 5 volumes*, Vol. 3: *The Russian Self-Consciousness*. St. Petersburg.

Skorokhodova, S. I. 2013. *The Philosophy of History of Yu. F. Samarin in the Context of the Russian Philosophical Thought of XIX–the First Quarter of the XX Centuries*. Moscow.

Walicki, A. 1991. *The Slavophilism and the Westernism: The Conservative and Liberal Utopia*. Moscow.

Denis Solodukhin

Moscow Technological University (MIREA)

THE CONCEPTS OF “LAW” AND “JUSTICE” (PRAVDA) IN ALEXEJ KHOMIAKOV’S DISCOURSE—AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF THE RUSSIAN INTELLECTUAL TRADITION

In my talk I draw, methodologically, on the German, as well as international tradition of the *Be-griffsgeschichte* (conceptual history). According to Gadamer, Koselleck and others, clarification of historical concepts, not only helps highlighting established meanings, but also gives us an opportunity to reveal their initial intentions, beyond their fixed verbal forms of expression. What is at stake here, it seems, is some hermeneutical “revival of the mental effort” (Gadamer), i.e. an approach that allows us to avoid both “archivization” and “modernization” of Khomiakov’s concepts and notions as well as of any historical heritage.

Historically, Khomiakov’s discourse was influenced by two intellectual contexts in Russia of the 1830s and 1840s; it was the famous “Slavophil controversy,” on the one hand, the German Idealism of Schelling and Hegel, on the other. In our talk we try to show that both contexts were absorbed and transformed in Khomiakov’s thinking and discourse against the background of the mainstream of the Russian deeper intellectual tradition or context, beginning with the Hilarion of Kiev (in the 11th century) up to Vladimir Solovyev and his followers (in the 19th and 20th centuries). From these three contextual and discursive perspectives, an attempt is made to reconstruct the Slavophil doctrine of the “living knowledge,” and to comprehend Khomiakov’s views on the “external” Latin (or “Western”) and the “internal” Russian (or Eastern Christian) paradigms, in respect to the fundamental notions about religion, morality, personal development, authority, and the state.

According to Khomiakov, “law,” “faith,” and “person” are interdependent concepts—an approach which seems to have been rooted in the mystical, or “apophatic” (V. Lossky) Christian tradition, as well as the *Corpus Areopagiticum*. Khomiakov’s discourse on “law” and justice, I believe, is quite relevant, particularly in contemporary Russia, for these two concepts and notions include anthropological, even ontological dimension, and they should not be separated in our secular world. Otherwise, as Heidegger remarked, “all law remains merely fabrication of the human reason.”

Stephanie Solywoda

Stanford University

KHOMIAKOV, SACRIFICE, AND THE DIALOGIC ROOTS OF RUSSIAN KENOSIS

The idea of *sobornost'* and the figure of Khomiakov are foundational figures in Russian religious philosophy. This paper looks more closely at the sacrificial aspects of *sobornost'* and their roots in the Russian tradition. Khomiakov's dialogue with Protestantism, and the contemporary Protestant kenosis prevalent in Scotland and Germany, contributed to the resilience and aptness of *sobornost'* in later confrontations with modernity. The central argument of this paper is that commonalities of sacrifice helped Khomiakov's philosophy beget a Russian religious-philosophical idea that directly addressed Western concerns, and was therefore very attractive to subsequent Western thinkers when they encountered *sobornost'* afresh generations later. It is not a 'surprise' that *sobornost'* holds so many keys to modern questions, rather it is a direct consequence of *sobornost'*'s origins in conversation with the West.

Boris Tarasov

Maxim Gorky Literature Institute

A. S. KHOMIAKOV AND PASCAL

The report examines the inner logic of Khomiakov's reflections as revealing his taking Pascal as his teacher. When the founder of Slavophilism refers to the "tomb of egotism" and the limitations of the rational empirical experience; when he is talking about the holistic individuality which embraces the "wisdom of serpents" and the "harmlessness of doves"; or about the holistic knowledge absorbing the totality of mind's, will's and heart's actions; or about the "conciliar gnosiology"; about faith being a fruit of revelation (and not of mere logical reliance) and it embracing spiritual depths; about "the subject of progress" and the necessity of admitting man's own ontological infirmity; about Christianity as the graceful identity of unity and freedom under the law of mutual love; about the toxicity of substituting the Church of Christ with government and authority; about the distorted version of Christianity which preaches lack of faith; and about many other issues; then his reasoning identifies typologically and partly genetically with the speculations of the great French scientist and philosopher upon the poverty and magnificence of man's existence; upon the ranking of the spiritual and psychological forces (mind, heart, will) in man; upon the limitations of scientific cognition of reality; upon the "deceiving forces"; upon the three orders of existence (the order of body, the order of mind, the order of love and mercy); upon the disagreement on the matter principles in the debates between the Jansenists and the Jesuits, the Augustinian Hermits and the Pelasgians; and upon a number of other important questions.

In the conclusion of the report it is emphasized that the both thinkers being engaged in the "mystery of man" implies the timeless universality of their findings which are thus still actual nowadays.

Inna Tkachenko

St. Filaret's Cristian Orthodox Insnitute

A. S. KHOMIAKOV'S EXPERIENCE OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE AND TEACHING ON SOBORNOST

Y. F. Samarin called Khomiakov the Church's teacher. Though the influence of Khomiakov's theology on Russian religious and philosophical thought is a fact which requires no proof, the link between his teaching and church life is a subject which is little studied, especially within Russia.

The breadth and depth of the intuition of this first Russian theologian, as expressed in his teaching on the Church, cause us to pose the question of the role of mission in his personality, life and service, and pointed out how serious the problem of nominal Christianity was to Khomiakov's contemporaries, just as it remains one of the foremost problems for the Russian Orthodox Church today.

Leading students of Khomiakov's works all agree that he employed a new method of doing theology, which reveals the reality of the Church from within and bears, in the words of Fr Georgy Florovsky, "the character of witness." As such, as S. S. Khoruzhsky writes, any accurate interpretation of Khomiakov's works will bear in mind a reading that intends to bring people into the Church.

In speaking of Khomiakov's mission, it is important to remember that we are speaking of a particular good news that is within the Church. This good news has once again shown us the essence of life in the Church as communion in love. The correspondence and recollections of older Slavophiles shows that Khomiakov, for many, became a mentor in the faith and an "emancipator of life." It was their requests, in particular, which encouraged Khomiakov to write his theological works; friends, as a rule, became his first readers.

Khomiakov understood that his work—both in terms of living relationships and in terms of written articles—was directly or tangentially related to mission. But his missionary consciousness was not expressed in particular formulae, but in the contents of the goals he set: "Our main goal is not to introduce or propose direct and practically useful things, but to awaken, come to an understanding of and bring into use norms that are completely at home within true Christianity."

This paper will look at the following questions: 1. What did Khomiakov's teaching really look like in his interaction with others? 2. What were the missionary and catechetical components of his teaching? 3. How were these missionary and catechetical principles reflected in Khomiakov's ecclesiology of sobornost, as seen in his theological works?

Frédéric Tremblay

Saint-Petersburg State University, Russia

RUSSIAN MONADOLGISM AND SOBORNOST

Leibniz's philosophy enjoyed a Russian fandom that endured from the end of the nineteenth century to the death of the last surviving exiled Russian philosophers in the twentieth century. Philosophical Leibnizianism seems to have reached Russia around 1871 when the Leibnizian German philosopher Gustav Teichmüller took a position at the University of Tartu, which was then part of the Russian Empire. Teichmüller then influenced a number of Russian philosophers to adopt a Teichmüllerian version of Leibnizianism. Among these philosophers were Evgeny Bobrov and Alexei Kozlov. Kozlov in turn influenced his son Askoldov, and the latter's friend—Nikolai Lossky. In the meanwhile, Lev Lopatin (who would become the chair of Lossky's doctoral defense) and the mathematician Nikolai Bugaev developed their own Leibnizianism in Moscow in seemingly relative independence from Teichmüller's influence and under the partial influence of Vladimir Soloviev. Despite this relative independence, Bugaev and Lossky both developed their own monadologies and both held monads to evolve into ever more perfect systems of monads (sobornost). In this paper, I tell the story of the intellectual lineage of Russian monadologism with special attention to its connection with the concept of sobornost as understood by Khomiakov.

Victor Troitskii

The Library of Russian Philosophy and Culture

TWO MONUMENTS: ABOUT DESTINY OF IDEOLOGICAL HERITAGE OF A. S. KHOMIAKOV

Here we offer historical and philosophical consideration of significant and even exclusive for Russian culture fact: two monumental architectural constructions which are specially devoted to Alexey Stepanovich Khomiakov's memory (1804–1860) have been installed and existed for a long period.

The first of them—the “Khomiakovskiy hill” arranged in 1886 on the farm Vozdvizhenskoye of Glukhovskiy region of Chernigov province by the local landowner N. N. Neplyuev (1851–1908), founder of the famous Holy Cross Orthodox brotherhood of labor and the initiator of practical implementation of “historical mission of the Russian landowner.” It was quite high artificial hill with the spiral staircase conducting to the alcove carved on top of the hill. At the bottom of a hill on a high pedestal there was a sculpture of an angel towering over the bronze high relief of the philosopher. The metal plate was covered with a words: “To Christian-poet and a deep thinker Alexei Stepanovich Khomiakov.” The mentioned “labor brotherhood” and this architectural complex were destroyed in the 1920th.

The second monument was built in the village Bogucharovo of Tula province, in the family estate of Khomiakovs'. Very unusual bell tower was built 19 1894 near the great temple of the Presentation of the Lord (it is known that A. S. Khomiakov took part in temple building). The bell tower is a small copy of Campanella of St. Mark's Basilica in Venice. The finishing of the building, organized and financed by the son of the philosopher Dmitry Khomiakov (1841–1919), was dedicated to the 90th anniversary of Alexei Stepanovich. The buildings of the manor complex as well as the temple and the memorial bell tower survived. Now here is a municipal cultural institution Museum of History and Art named by A. S. Khomiakov.

Near the big temple of the Presentation of the Lord (it is known that A. S. Khomiakov took part in its construction) in 1894 the belltower—architecture, unusual to Russia—the reduced copy of a kampanella was built in case of St. Mark's Basilica in Venice. Completion of the building organized and financed by the philosopher's son Dmitry Khomiakov (1841–1919) was dated for the 90 anniversary since the birth of Alexey Stepanovich. Buildings of a farmstead complex, and also the temple and a memorial belltower, remained up to now. Nowadays here the local government office of culture "The historical and art museum Ampere-second is located. Khomiakov."

The Monuments visually realize and illustrate the key ideas of social philosophy and theology of A. S. Khomiakov: 1. The Belltower-copy of St. Mark's Basilica—"Church is unified," and "the whole world belongs it, and no area has any special value, but can serve temporarily and serves to glorify of the God's name," 2. "The Khomiakovsky hill" in Neplyuev brotherhood—about the valid and efficient completeness of the Christianity, carrying "the idea of unity and freedom, inextricably linked with the moral law of mutual love."

Sergey Troitskiy

St. Petersburg State University

SLAVOPHILS' ROLE IN THE HISTORY OF FOLK CULTURAL STUDIES

The report provides an overview of the main directions of Slavophiles' activity in research and popularization of Russian folk culture. The main areas of their activity include the interest in the Russian language, the concept of "the people," works of folklore, everyday life, Slavizm. Each of them is considered separately from the others, because its own researchers were concentrated around each of those areas. As a result, separate sets of terminology and own the problem fields were developed.

Roman Turowski

Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow

**СВОЕОБРАЗИЕ ТРАДИЦИОНАЛИЗМА МЫСЛИ АЛЕКСЕЯ ХОМЯКОВА:
ПОПЫТКА ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИИ В КОНТЕКСТЕ СИНЕРГИЙНОЙ АНТРОПОЛОГИИ
СЕРГЕЯ ХОРУЖЕГО**

Одним из мотивов, постоянно присутствующих в русской мысли, является дискуссия на тему ценности западной цивилизации, которая является частью более широкого вопроса миссии России в истории. Обсуждая западный дискурс, русские авторы традиционно подчеркивали его фрагментарный характер. А ведь только синтетический взгляд—по их мнению—делает возможным отыскание правды о человеке, правды понятой не абстрактно, но целостно, экзистенциально, правды как истины. Вышеуказанная фрагментарность и абстрактность проявляется на разных плоскостях, среди прочего—как диссонанс между разумом и сердцем (верой, интуицией), философией и теологией, культурой и красотой, теорией и практикой.

С целью преодоления вышеуказанной ситуации, русская философия с самого начала своего существования как самостоятельной интеллектуальной традиции призывает обратиться к глубинным антропологическим пластам, которые—в то же время—являются пластами и метафизическими. По мнению Сергея Хоружего, такого рода антропологические содержания находят выражение прежде всего в христианской духовной традиции. Местом её верификации, хранения и трансляции есть Православная церковь, являющая собой пример симфоничности Откровения, аскетического опыта и церковной обрядности. Таким образом, христианская религиозная традиция, а шире—христианская духовная традиция, у основ которой лежит христианская духовная практика, становится—по мнению Хоружего—фундаментом для формирования идентичности и личности человека.

Подобное понимание места и роли церковной традиции, как основания для всей культуры, мы находим у многих русских мыслителей начиная от Ивана Киреевского и Алексея Хомякова, который—как пишет Павел Флоренский—есть “весь мысль о церкви”. Уже по мнению Киреевского “Церковь всегда оставалась вне государства и его мирских отношений... как недостижимый светлый идеал, к которому они должны стремиться и который не смешивался с их земными пружинами.” Также и по Хомякову, вне церкви не существует ни настоящая свобода ни правда, самое главное в церкви—это “истина и свобода в Христе.” Правдивая философия невозможна вне церковной традиции, без обращения к аутентичному христианскому опыту. Именно такой опыт, а не рациональная (западная схоластика обращающаяся к авторитету) должна стать источником вдохновения, антропологическим основанием, для всей культуры. По мнению Хомякова, возрождение культуры следует начать от восстановления полноты и чистоты духовного опыта, что сделает возможным достижение единства веры и разума, полноты души, целомудрия. Чистоты христианского опыта следует, в свою очередь, искать в святоотеческой традиции, которая может послужить “зародышем этой

будущей философии..., зародышем живым и ясным, но нуждающимся еще в развитии и не составляющим еще самой науки философии”.

В терминах синергичной антропологии дискурс Хомякова можно определить как “примыкающий дискурс” по отношению к дискурсу церковному. Такой дискурс служит, среди прочего, интеграции духовной (церковной) и культурной (интеллектуальной, художественной, литературной). Таким образом церковь, транслируя аутентичный христианский опыт и содержания Откровения, присутствует в культуре уже не только и не столько в форме внешнего регулятивного авторитета, но скорее—как глубинный источник антропологических содержаний и экзистенциальных смыслов. Последние, в свою очередь, становятся основанием для формирования идентичности и личности человека (участника культуры). Таким образом, светская культура становится органичным образом, у самых своих оснований, тесно сплетенной, сросшейся, с церковной традицией.

Анализируя разнообразные формы традиций (духовную, культурную и народные традиции), Хоружий вводит дихотомию “дискурса сущности” и “дискурса энергии,” который должен служить фундаментом для новой, энергичной антропологии. В этом контексте творчество Хомякова может служить ярчайшим примером “дискурса энергии,” трансляции и творческого развития церковной традиции не по букве а по духу. Так, никогда дословно не цитируя Отцов, “Хомяков сумел проделать, по сути, классическую работу патристики: руководясь живым христианским опытом, достичь творческого переосмысления старых понятий [например понятия соборность], раскрыть их по-новому, как выражение христианской истины; и этот традиционный характер сделанного им, бесспорно, очень содействовал принятию его труда церковным сознанием.”

Нам представляется, что вводимое Хомяковым противопоставление истины и авторитета можно интерпретировать, в том числе, в свете вышеприведенной дихотомии Хоружего, как оппозицию “дискурса энергии” и “дискурса сущности” соответственно. Хомяков видит традицию шире чем подчиненность безусловному авторитету и сохранение определенных застывших форм. Гораздо позже, Мейендорф напишет, что “христианское понятие авторитета исключает слепое подчинение и предполагает свободное и ответственное участие всех в общей жизни Тела Христова.” По мнению Хомякова, идея авторитета (лат. *autoritas*—власть) была реакцией католической церкви на углубляющееся расхождение веры и культуры. Требование подчинения авторитету является, по мнению философа, признаком слабости веры: “Церковь не авторитет, как не авторитет Бог, не авторитет Христос; ибо авторитет есть нечто для нас внешнее. Не авторитет, говорю я, а истина и в то же время жизнь христианина, внутренняя жизнь его.” Как у Хомякова так и у Хоружего мы находим призыв обратиться к аутентичному христианскому опыту, к святоотеческой традиции как к “дискурсу энергии.” Таким образом понятая духовная традиция может стать основой не только для новой антропологии или для возрожденной культуры, но также—для нового динамичного синтеза между религиозной и культурной традицией. Позволив сохранить самоидентич-

ность обеих, подобный синтез должен стать источником новой творческой динамики для многих дискурсов имеющих примыкающий характер по отношению к дискурсу церковному (таких как литература, искусство, философия, общественные науки).

Florenskiy, P. A. 1986. "Okolo Khomyakova." *Simvol* 16.

Frank, S. 1996. *Russkoye mirovozzreniye*. Sankt-Peterburg.

Khomyakov, A. S. 1848. "Pis'mo k A. N. Popovu." 23.10.1848

Khomyakov, A. S. 1994. "Tserkov' odna." In: A. S. Khomyakov. *Sochineniya v 2-kh tt.* Vol. 2. Moskva.

Khomyakov, A. S. 1994. "Pis'mo ob Anglii." In: A. S. Khomyakov. *Sochineniya v 2-kh tt.* Vol. 1. Moskva.

Khomyakov, A. S. 1996. "O starom i novom." In: *Ocherki russkoy filosofii. Antologiya*. Moskva.

Khoruzhiy, S. S. 1999. "Zametki k energiynoy antropologii." *Voprosy Filosofii* 3.

Khoruzhiy, S. S. 2002. "Aleksey Khomyakov: ucheniye o sobornosti i Tserkvi." *Bogoslovskiy trudy* 37.

Kireyevskiy, I. V. 2002. *Razum na puti k istine*. Moskva.

Kontsevich, I. M. 1995. *Optina Pustyn' i eye vremya*. Vladimir.

Lur'ye, V. M. 1994. "Primechaniya k pis'mam Pal'meru." In: A. S. Khomyakov. *Sochineniya v 2-kh tt.* Vol. 2. Moskva.

Meyendorff, I. 1997. *Pravoslaviye v sovremennom mire*. Moskva

Zavitnevich, V. Z. 1913. *Aleksey Stepanovich Khomyakov*. Kiyev.

Elena Tverdislova

Tzur-Hadassah, Israel

UNITY (SOBORNOST') AS A LINGUISTIC TRAP

Alexis Khomiakov, this "systematiser of Slavophile teachings," a "natural-born dialectician" (according to G. Florovsky), a "Knight of the Orthodox Church" (according to Nikolai Berdiaev), liked to engage in debates "in the Socratic way" (as A. Koshelev put it). In so doing, he praised not so much the "visible and invisible Church" but its idealised image. It was a common assumption that his "teachings are alive and life teaches" (A. N. Popov) (The Polish historian Andrzej Walicki has provided the fullest picture of Khomiakov's ideas and teachings, see his Valitskiy 2012: 84–104). These colourful, beautiful concepts, filled with a deep sense of meaning, which Khomiakov introduced, can fill pages. Yet the central assumption in his theological discourse, albeit not one that stands alone, is that of unity—sobornost—which is the focus and essence of his entire ecclesiology. This paradox brings to the fore the "dialectic" and "metaphysics" of his preoccupation with "being": a stance which disregards discussion but is instead intent to demonstrate refusal to accept different

worldviews, or, to be more precise—the exclusive role of the Russian people not just in the context of Slav Orthodoxy but of world religion: “This is why the Church is called Orthodox, or Eastern, or Greco-Russian... When the Church has spread its influence or has taken it the fullness of the peoples of this earth, then all the local names will disappear, for the Church cannot be identified by any region: but it calls itself Unified, Holy, United [*sobornaia*] and Apostolic, knowing that she owns the whole world.” This is how Khomiakov concludes his central treatise “The Church is One.” Following this premise, he develops a method for proving the pro doc self-sufficiency of the Russian people, which is then turned aggressively against other Slavic people, including Orthodox ones. Understanding the unity of the Christian Church turns into an attempt at conquering the world.

Why is this so? First of all: the idea of unity [*sobornost*] as a religious term did not grow out of a religious, social or philosophical movement but from the idea of a single person. This was not a call of the times, but rather, it was Khomiakov himself who was challenging his epoch. He did so very late by comparison to Europe, where the same problems, such as the relationship between the personal and the subjective and the objective, the general and the individual, of faith and the Church, the spiritual cognisance of divine gifts and generally, the concept of communication with God—where these notions have been interpreted very differently, linked to the demands for social change.

In the first instance, a clarification is in order. The term *sobornost* itself sounds in Russian like an adjective derived from the noun “*sobor*” (The terminological aspects of this concepts are discussed in Khoruzhii 2002). Translating *sobornaia* from the Greek *katholike*—whole—signifies as much as “universal” or “cosmic” (or “Catholic”) and immediately brings to mind what Khomiakov’s actual ideological task is: to juxtapose his ideas to the “Catholic universalism,” to develop arguments in a debate with other Christian confessions. To a certain extent, *sobornost* pretended to legitimate a particular, so to speak, neo-Protestant Orthodox consciousness (it is no coincidence that Pavel Florensky likened Khomiakov’s teachings to Protestantism). Khomiakov himself took up the role of Luther when he turned to a new reading of spiritual humanity, in a fight with other churches, including his own, which undercut the idea of *sobornost* as a unifying factor, rather than a dividing one. Contemporaries perceived Khomiakov’s dialectical pathos about the church as a true whole, a living voice calling from the abyss and yet “makes as socialism” (P. Florensky).

Berdiaev was right, in his own way, when he accused Khomiakov of developing a “philosophy with a religious and ethical judgment but no religious or mystical insights,” for his mysticism appears overloaded, as it does in some fairy tales, which underscores his utopianism as developed in the pathway of his myth-making. History has shown that scholars have found the idea of “all-unity” closer to their heart than the individual “I,” whose overcoming had been the rallying cry of most cultural movements at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries/

The main conflict in Khomiakov’s notion of *sobornost* was the combination of irreconcilable units: the spiritual holism as the unity of the popular faith and the Church with God could not be reconciled with the Orthodox Church which did not accept the general Christian discourse.

Khomiakov created this sobornost in order to stand out from the European, and thus, the common Christian movement, to set himself against Catholic universalism which had “global” aspirations. Khomiakov was seeking an open dispute with Catholicism and its principles. This allowed him to lay the foundations for the idea of national peculiarity, and on this basis, to develop his principles of isolationism. The Russian Orthodox Church was declared to be different and to have a special path. The individuality of the person was replaced by the peculiarity of sobornost, of unity. In separating the Church as an institution from the idea of the Church as a spiritual whole, Khomiakov imbued it with those qualities of infallibility which previously had been the property of the Pope, at least according to Catholic dogma. His desire to think through the traditions of the Church metaphysically turned to an ideologically motivated, revanchist calculation to settle accounts with the European Christians: Catholics as well as Protestants.

To be sure, sobornost is a neologism which emerged on the soil of an already existing and established concept. As a consequence, its manifold associations came to encapsulate the Catholicism and universalism of the imperial Church along with its forms of governance, which assumed that its representatives would control it via congregations (sobory). It is noteworthy that today, in order to use the Orthodox concept of sobornost as a working model, we need recourse to a Latin word, which had been used by modern day Catholic theologians: “conciliarnost” (from the Latin consilium—“congregation” or sobor) (See the pathbreaking international conference *Sobornost, conciliarnost and communication: from Khomiakov to Zizioulas*, which took place on 22 October 2008 in the Catholic monastery of Bode, near Magniano).

The concept of sobornost, then, is manifold and deceptive. Having failed in practice in the domain of the Russian lands (while demonstrating its significance in the Russian diaspora), it has come to constitute a linguistic trap of sorts. Changing its linguistic narrative, it acquired purely ideological connotations, rooted in the actual quality of the Russian people to act in concert by “forming heaps.” Khomiakov sensed this peculiarity, which, to his honour, he had discovered and formulated. As a Slavophile, he gave the people, in the sense of a united nation, precedence, without considering the influence of the Golden Horde, for instance, which had shaped this monolith.

At the same time, the traditions of the Novgorod Assembly—also a Cathedral, or sobor—had proved their worth. However, this notion, close to Khomiakov, had only fully developed locally in Novgorod.

In part, the idea of sobornost emerged as a kind of justification—albeit an entirely artificial one—of the messianic calling of the orthodox nation. At this time, messianic thought had become widespread, with each nation willing to take it up, except for one important component: the real foundation of messianic thought is the experience of a national disaster, and the loss of sovereignty. The Russian Slavophiles’ claims to the exclusivity of the fate of the Russian people is merely the product of a “wandering plot” on the messiah. More than that, when it emerged among the Jews, the messianic idea took hold not because the Jews were actually “God’s nation,” but because at

a certain point in its history they were expelled from Israel, their ancestral land, starting the period of its prolonged diaspora. From here, we can trace the Polish diasporic tradition, which rests on the Jewish one. History knows no other people with a similar fate.

With time passing, it became clear that these categories have not only failed to prove their worth, but were not, in the end, confirmed by historical experience. The unity of the Russian believers became incorporated in the zeal with which they destroyed churches and cemeteries, destroying icons and other relics, along with the inventory. Incidentally, no other European language but Russian had a derogatory term for a priest—"pop."

There is also one more paradox to consider. The Russian geologist Khomiakov, one of the instigators of religious revival and a proponent of religious rejuvenation, has also produced some of the gravest defects which still plight the Orthodox tradition. For all its similarity with Protestantism, which had a Church with a community and had this effectively repudiated it, Khomiakov's Church promises to be an agent of unity and gathering, but in fact turns out to be corrosive for the entire work of Christian interaction.

Thus the spiritual unity of people and Church finds itself in different, often mutually exclusive contexts: An historic context—in the sense of providing the people with memory and education (in the experience with the Horde); A traditional context—in the form of the myth of Grad Kitezh and the story of the Novgorod assembly; A spiritual and mystical—the Church as the body of Christ; And a religious one—as a special path of Russian orthodoxy.

Valitskiy, A. 2012. *Rossiya, katolichestvo i pol'skiy vopros*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.

Khoruzhii, S. S. 2002. "Aleksy Khomyakov: ucheniye o sobornosti i tserkvi." *Bogoslovskiy trudy* 37: 153–179.

Natalia Volodina

Cherepovets State University

"THE QUESTION FOR THINKING": A. S. KHOMIAKOV ABOUT THE ARTICLE OF I. V. KIREEVSKY "ON THE NATURE OF ENLIGHTENMENT OF EUROPE AND ITS RELATION TO ENLIGHTENMENT OF RUSSIA"

After publication of Kireevsky's article "On the nature of enlightenment of Europe and its relation to enlightenment of Russia" (1852) A. S. Khomiakov has written his own printing speech (1852). Such form of public communication is traditional for the Russian literary criticism and journalism. At the same time most often this form assumes polemic of authors of articles about discussed subject. As

an example—article of V. G. Belinsky “Response to Moskvityanin” or Druzhinin’s article “Criticism of the Gogol period of the Russian literature and our relation to this Criticism” (the addressee is N. G. Chernyshevsky). However, the main motive of publishing of the article of A. S. Khomiakov was essentially other. He perceives Kireevsky’s work as a reason for a statement of own thoughts on the same subject. His conviction is based on following: “communication between word, thought and feeling is not only question of great importance, but nearly the best property of the person on the earth” (Khomiakov 1900: 198). The dialogical thinking, assuming equality of the parties, is characteristic for Khomiakov’s article: in this case, not so many opponents, how many interlocutors. Khomiakov, stating the vision of a problem, obviously counts on understanding of the addressee and an intellectual and spiritual unification with him. At the same time as “interlocutor” we perceive not only the author of the discussed article, but also reader, who is prepared for her perception.

Khomiakov conceptually describes the main ideas of article of Kireevsky or directly quotes them. In most cases he agrees with these ideas, explains, develops, estimates them, expresses his philosophy about the same questions, protects Kireevsky from charges—but in some cases he is arguing with him. The main problem on which authors of both articles are concentrated is difference of the Russian and European enlightenment. By understanding of this problem Khomiakov and Kireevsky both agreed. Their reasoning is constructed on opposition not only specifics of education, but also on opposition of way of thinking of the Russian and European person, mentality, an image of his life, character of human relations and at last, of the structure of the state. In the opinion of both authors, the mental basis of this opposition is that “bifurcation and reasonableness are the expression of the Western European education; integrity and rationality are the expression of Old Russian education” (Kireevsky 1984: 209). The category of “integrity” is a basic concept as in Kireevsky’s article, and also in Khomiakov’s article. It is possible to relate it to the concept of “conciliarity” which is initially used by Khomiakov for the characteristic of church, but this concept gradually received the universal sense extending to all way of the Russian life.

This opposition demands an explanation, and therefore the reasoning of both authors and methodology of their articles are very similar. Both Kireevsky, and Khomiakov get back to basics of the European and Russian enlightenment: to history of Byzantium, Ancient Greece and Rome; they consider influence of Christianity on type of thinking and ethics of the European and Russian person. However the articles of Khomiakov and Kireevsky have also methodological and “ideological” differences. Khomiakov constantly refers to concrete historical facts, systematizes them, proving the theoretical ideas. Kireevsky prefers generalizations and conclusions, selectively attracting material of the Russian and European history. That’s why the concrete conclusions of both philosophers not always coincide.

The Russian history in Khomiakov’s statement is presented more comprehensive, than in Kireevsky’s article. Kireevsky does not consider those contradictions, national accidents and imperfection of the Russian life which can be observed also in pre-Peter Russia. In addition, Khomiakov position in relation to Europe is more sympathetic. He notes more often than Kireevsky merits of the European

world, the European culture: "We can tell it, paying a tribute of surprise to its great historical, art, and scientific phenomena, be this Gildebrant and Gottfried, or Luther and Gustav Adolphus, either the Sistine Madonna's creator, or the builder of the Cologne cathedral, or Kant, or Hegel" (Khomiakov 1900: 210–211)

Khomiakov, as well as Kireevsky, recognizes advantages of the Russian enlightenment over European, considering this problem in the context of the Russian and European history. Both of authors consider the defining influence of Christianity on the Russian and western culture, consciousness and life of the person. And both thinker see clear advantages of Orthodoxy over Catholicism based from their point of view on reasonableness and "bifurcation," formal and scholastic assimilation of Christianity. Not incidentally neither Kireevsky, nor Khomiakov do not use a concept of belief as a spiritual component of enlightenment in relation to the European person because the belief as Kireevsky writes, was subordinated to "logical conclusions of mind" (Kireevsky 1984: 213). Unlike Europe, the main source and the main feature of the Russian enlightenment, from the point of view of these philosophers, is the belief. At the same time, Kireevsky and Khomiakov do not exclude the role of knowledge and mind. "Unilateral belief in logical knowledge—writes Khomiakov, explaining a role of consciousness and cogitative activity of the person—disheartens true mind and conducts to a self-condemnation of logical mind as we saw from all history of the Western education; but absence or uncertainty of logical knowledge in historical development take away their reasonable sequence and fortress from life and belief" (Khomiakov 1900: 245). Khomiakov accepts coexistence of spiritual and analytical source—provided that the reason does not substitute belief, does not force out it, but supplements and harmonizes. The organic unity of a thought and feeling, belief and reason, according to Khomiakov, is the main condition of integrity of education and its influence on a conduct of life and behavior of the person. Not casually he speaks about "reasonable belief."

But in relation to the Russian life this idea is not so unconditional for Khomiakov, as for Kireevsky. He believes that this idea is present at it more likely as an ideal which is shown in some separate facts, episodes of the Russian history, at last, in the personality and activity of people (for example, Vladimir Monomakh). However, from his point of view, such integrity has no nature of generality. Finding the historical reasons of this phenomenon, as one of main reason Khomiakov considers the nature of distribution of Christianity in Ancient Russia. According to logic of the author of article, the ontologic reasons affected consciousness and behavior of people ("deep bifurcation in sincere mood, in life and in the nature of education") (Khomiakov 1900: 227) and the organization of the social system: on the one hand zemstvo life which was based on "old times and the legend" (Khomiakov 1900: 227); on the other hand, -prince's armed force, which is "more inclined to rational development, formality and acceptance of Roman Byzantinism" (Khomiakov 1900: 227).

Khomiakov believes that all this is contrary to the conclusion of the second half of the Kireevsky's article: "Imperfect completeness with which the Christianity was expressed in public and private life was the cause of prevalence of ceremonialism and formality public and religious" (Khomi-

akov, P. 231). Khomiakov often mentions danger of preservation of external ceremonialism out of internal human life and church. Obviously, it is one of those constantly staticized ideas which are close to a number of religious thinkers of different eras and even faiths. For example one of “provocative” judgments of A. Shmemann: “There is nothing worse than professional religiousness! ‘Churchism’ is an alibi of irresponsibility today: Christian, moral and vital irresponsibility. As if ‘churchism’ exempts from care of something another, the main thing—from essence of Christianity, about its doctrine, an appeal, a revelation” (Schmemmann 2005: 74). In an effort to be objective in the assessment of Russian history, Khomiakov points out the fundamental difference of the nature of duality of the Russian life. He considers that this “bifurcation” “was not based on a radical lie and hostility and is legalized by the mental world as in the West: it existed as the fact, but not as the understood beginning” (Khomiakov 1900: 229).

Thus, polemizing with Kireevsky on a set of questions, Khomiakov agrees with his main ideas: “The rule of integrity which he recognizes remains inviolable despite separation, not symmetry and disorder of historical elements” (Khomiakov 1900: 242). This beginning Khomiakov, as well as Kireevsky, sees in a spiritual and educational role of monasteries, figures of church and spiritual writers. At the end of article mentioning a question of a ratio of the European and Russian education, Khomiakov, as well as Kireevsky, comes to a conclusion that their interference is historically inevitable and enriches the Russian and European cultures. For Khomiakov fundamentally important is the idea of “critical,” creative assimilation of the western education, idea of introduction into it of that spiritual beginning and values, “which are bequeathed to us by Orthodoxy of our ancestors.” “Only thus—he concludes—we can ennoble science, give it an integrity and completeness which it still does not have and to repay a debt to our Western teachers” (Khomiakov 1900: 258).

Essentially important for Khomiakov, as well as for Kireevsky idea of integrity turns into a set of potential meanings which updating, on the one hand, inevitably bears in itself updating in the long term of “big time” (M. Bakhtin), but, on the other hand, reminds of the archetypic essence, returning to the sources.

Berdyayev, N. 1997. *A. S. Khomiakov*. Paris.

Egorov, B. F. 2003. *From Khomiakov to Lotman*. Moscow.

Khomiakov, A. S. 1900. “Concerning the article by I. V. Kireevsky ‘About the nature of enlightenment of Europe and its relation to enlightenment of Russia’.” In A. S. Khomiakov. *Collected Works*. In 2 volumes, vol. 1. Moscow.

Kireevsky, I. V. 1984. “About the nature of enlightenment of Europe and its relation to enlightenment of Russia.” In I. V. Kireevsky. *Selected papers*. Moscow.

Koshelev, V. A. 2000. *Alexei Stepanovich Khomiakov: biography in documents, reasoning and research*. Moscow.

Schmemmann, A. 2005. *The Diaries 1973–1983*. Moscow.

Jennie Wojtusik

University of Texas at Austin

SLAVOPHILISM AND NATURPHILOSOPHIE: A NEW MYTHOLOGY FOR IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION

Like many of the Russian Intelligentsia of the early 19th century, Alexei Khomiakov and Ivan Kireevsky philosophically follow German Romanticism and Idealism to its development in Friedrich Schelling's naturphilosophie. Indeed, these Slavophiles considered sobornost their polemic with the West, and yet Schelling's unification of religion, art and nature, which defines sobornost, allowed Khomiakov and Kireevsky to transcend the rationalism, fragmentation and limitations of Idealism itself. This paper will explore Khomiakov and Kireevsky as inheritors of the cultural identity project forged in German Romanticism, but who expand Romanticism's Bildung into a communal love and ethics unique to Imperial Russian society.

Mirella Zajęga

Academy Ignatianum, Krakow

ALEXEI KHOMIAKOV: THE PROFILE OF THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY INDIVIDUALIST FROM NIKOLAI BERDYAEV'S POINT OF VIEW

In 1912 Nikolai Berdyaev published a monograph *Aleksei Khomiakov*. It is an interesting book written from the point of view of the religious and political philosopher. The book gives a subjective view on personality and achievements of the philosopher and theologian who lived in the 19th century. The reference to Khomiakov's thought appear also in the other texts of this philosopher. Berdyaev drew attention to the correlation between Khomiakov's personality and his thought, the part of his reflection which is the topic of my article. I am presenting Khomiakov's profile following in Berdyaev's footsteps. His character and intellect, which are on its own way original, reflect the best features of its epoch—the style and mentality. What is essential in his doctrine is the work of his exceptional personality, the depth of which creates the Khomiakov's thought and explains it at the same time. It is a proposal of comprehending Khomiakov through the lens of the world which shaped him and through the lens of his individuality. Not only was Khomiakov a talented poet, theologian and philosopher who played a key role in the Slavophile circle, but he also liked hunting, farming, worked on inventions which were intended to facilitate peasant's lives, he wrote icons, was a homeopath, anglophile, he was involved in sugar refining, was interested in public life although he was not into politics. He was a religious man ("a knight of the Church") valuing family life and freedom, a proud Russian gentleman. With reference to the Berdyaev's book, *Alexei Khomiakov*, and to Khomiakov's poems, I attempt to outline his profile.

KEY INFORMATION

Internet Access

Wi-Fi DOM GOSCI - GUESTHOUSE

password: benedyktyni

Social Media

facebook.com/krakowmeetings

instagram.com/krakowmeetings

Taxi iCar

+48 12 653 5555

+48 12 888 0000

(course from Balice Airport to the Abbey costs ca. 30 PLN;

from Main Square in Krakow ca. 38 PLN)

Pawel Rojek

+48 734 146 380

Roman Turowski

+48 794 623 839

Kornelia Dorynek

+48 730 269 023

EX ORIENTE LUX

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON RUSSIAN RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHERS

BOOK SERIES EDITED BY ARTUR MRÓWCZYŃSKI-VAN ALLEN, TERESA OBOLEVITCH, AND PAWEŁ ROJEK

We believe that the Russian religious philosophy of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has a great importance for Christian theology and philosophy. Russian thinkers, rooted in the tradition of the Church Fathers, avoided the theological dualism that so deeply penetrates Western thought. Such philosophers and theologians as Peter Chaadaev, Alexei Khomiakov, Vladimir Soloviev, Evgeni Trubetskoy, Pavel Florensky, Sergey Bulgakov, Nikolai Berdyaev, Georges Florovsky, and Aleksei Losev developed unique views on the relationships between religion and culture, science, philosophy, and social life, which, unfortunately, are missing from contemporary Western debates. The pressing task is to include their legacy to the contemporary philosophical and theological discussions.

The series Ex Oriente Lux aims to meet this need. It serves as a way to bring Eastern Christian intuitions into the current post-secular philosophical and theological context. Each volume focuses on one Russian thinker and includes a selection of essays on his main ideas in historical and contemporary perspectives. The books are prepared by both Western and Russian scholars, thus creating a space for intellectual dialogue.

The series come out of research connected with the annual conferences on Russian religious philosophy held in Krakow, Poland. The “Krakow Meetings” are organized jointly by the Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, the Institute of Philosophy Edith Stein and the International Center for the Study of the Christian Orient, both in Granada, Spain.

Previous Volume

Beyond Modernity: Russian Religious Philosophy and Post-Secularism

Volume in Print

Peter Chaadaev: Between the Love of Fatherland and the Love of Truth

Subsequent Volumes

Alexei Khomiakov: We Are Sobornost'

Evgeni Trubetskoy: Icon and Philosophy

The Series is published by Pickwick Publications, an imprint of Wipf and Stock Publishers
wipfandstock.com

