

---

## SUMMARIES

---

*Svetlana Mesyats*

### **The temptation of literalism, or What should be the translation of Ancient philosophical texts?**

The growing dissatisfaction with classical Russian translations of Plato and Aristotle of the second half of the 20th cent., as well as the recent efforts to replace them with more exact and accurate ones compel us to raise a question of how to translate ancient philosophical texts. The paper shows that the former soviet translators basically adhered to the principle of "artistic" translation, which involved the re-creation of the Greek or Latin original by means of their native language. On the contrary, modern Russian scholars prefer to follow the principle of the so called "literal" translation, considered to be a more accurate one because of reproducing rather the words of the translated text than the thought of the author, as it is understood by the translator. The article gives a comparative description of both approaches and shows on concrete examples the advantages and disadvantages of each of them.

*Irina Protopopova*

### **The Unity of Plato's "Republic": Two Types of Eidos**

The article deals with the problem of the unity of state and soul in Plato's Republic, as well as the unity of the dialogue itself. The substantial unity of the State is considered through the prism of two different types of eidos (permeating and collective) and the structure of the text. The author believes that the permeating eidos of justice connects the collective eidos of the soul and the state in this dialogue. Such a model of the "whole" is found at least in the dialogues Symposium, Sophist and Timaeus and is a kind of solution to one of the most important problems for Plato "one//many". The work consists of three parts: the first deals with two types of eidos; the second traces how their interaction in terms of content is played out in the dialogue; the third briefly shows how it is refracted in the structure of the text.

*Alexander Stolyarov*

### **The "Jewish Question" in the Mirror of Ancient Philosophy**

This article provides the vision of the "jewish question" in so far as the latter can be illustrated by the opinions of ancient philosophers and authors with semi-philosophical interests. The article rests upon the collections of texts supplied by T.Reinach and M.Stern, the starting point being one of the first works of S.Luria, the prominent Russian researcher of antiquity. Up to my mind, there existed no consistent and centralized antisemitic policy in antiquity. Far from being homogeneous, the attitude of ancient philosophical and semi-philosophical socium towards jews and Judaism compared with that of other ancient intellectuals appears, however, to be marked in its positive aspect by a higher level of reflexion and by intention to find out productive elements in judaism and in monotheistic paradigm.

Such attitude is peculiar to many adherents of platonic and pythagoreic tradition, particularly to Numenius; from the historic-philosophical and from historic-cultural points of view it appears to be more perceptive and decidedly tolerant.

*Stanislav Rykov*

### **Faces of Chinese Rationality**

This article analyses several major theories of Chinese rationality and features of Chinese thought in contemporary sinology. It analyses the discussions about the forms of Chinese reasoning, understanding the role of “numerology” in Chinese thought, as well as the ideas of the influence of Chinese language on Chinese thought. The article considers in detail theories of Chinese thought as “wisdom” of such authors as M. Granet and F. Jullien. It also mentions some ideas of J. Needham, A. Graham, Ch. Hansen, describes the results of reflection on Chinese rationality and Chinese language by Ch. Harbsmeier, gives an idea of the method of “Structural Analysis of Chinese Classics” by V.S. Spirin and A.M. Karapetyants, as well as the idea of Chinese ‘constructivist’ logic by A.A. Krushinsky. It also considers in detail the theory of Chinese “numerological” rationality by A.I. Kobzev. The analysis shows that 1) Chinese thought is fundamentally diverse; 2) Chinese thought is argumentative and polemical; 3) classical Chinese language has a potential for many diverse forms of rationality.

*Artem Krotov*

### **Napoleon and Voltaire**

In article the question of influence of Voltairian ideas on Napoleon’s world outlook is considered. How possible to judge by the remained certificates of contemporaries and own Napoleon’s records, Voltairian tragedies and “Experience about customs and spirit of peoples” (of which Napoleon did extracts) were not bad known to the young officer bearing garrison service. For Napoleon, when he reached tops of political power, Voltaire remained to be interesting, and not only as the historian. Conversations which Napoleon held with his inconsiderable in number environment in the years of exile on the island of Saint Helena quite often concerned Voltairian tragedies. The Voltairian theater became an object of constant criticism which should be perceived, first of all, in the context of changed Napoleon’s relation to the Age of Enlightenment ideals in general. At the same time, side by side with criticism Napoleon stated a great praise to Voltairian “Oedipus” more than once. Corsican patriot, republican close to montagnards, dictator. What in Voltaire’s creativity could attract invariable interest of this person at all stages of his life? Of course, Napoleon was impressed by sublime maxims about a debt, honor, virtue. Introduced in “Oedipus” idea that great warriors “are equal to monarchs” corresponded to his internal beliefs. Napoleon’s judgments of religion directly demonstrate that the prisoner of the island of Saint Helena continued to share many ideas, received by him from Enlightenment philosophy. He reproached priests in orientation to earthly goods. Have been convinced of existence of God, he at the same time didn’t hide that he always considered religion as important political means which should use skillfully by the ruler for giving stability to the state.

*Alexei Krouglov*

**On some sources and problems of Kant's "Ding an sich" translation**

The paper deals with German and Latin philosophical texts, namely Chr. Wolff's "German Metaphysics", A.G. Baumgarten's "Metaphysics", J.H. Lambert's "Architectonics" and J.N. Tetens's "Philosophical essays on human nature and its development", that have contributed to the problem of terminological sources of Kant's "Ding an sich". I deny the terminological influence of Lock's "thing in itself" from his "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding" on I. Kant. Based on comparative analysis of some fragments that have been taken from "Critique of Pure Reason", other published papers, reflections and lectures recordings, as well as all Russian translations of "Critique of Pure Reason" and "Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics", I specify the translation of important terms from the first Kant's "Critique" and, in addition, discuss the problem of synonymy of two Kant's terms "Ding an sich selbst" and "Sache an sich selbst".

*Irina Blauberger*

**Felix Ravaisson and Xavier Leon's Philosophical Project**

The article discusses the main features of the variant of the metaphysics, that was developed by the French philosopher-spiritualist Felix Ravaisson (1813–1900), drawing on the ideas of Aristotle, Schelling, Maine de Biran, Plotin and other thinkers. Ravaisson, who characterized this conception as "spiritualistic realism or positivism", argued in his works the interpretation of this form of philosophy of spirit as the supreme science, exploring principles that are supposed by private sciences, but go beyond their specific areas. The work of Ravaisson, who attempted to revive metaphysics in France in the period of domination of positivism, became in the late nineteenth century a crucial reference point for young intellectuals who were looking for new ways of developing philosophy. One of such ways, as shown in the article, was the creation of the philosophical journal "Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale" (1893); it was Ravaisson who became its first author.

*Felix Ravaisson*

**Metaphysics and Morality**

The work of the French philosopher-spiritualist Felix Ravaisson "Metaphysics and Morality" is translated into Russian by Irina Blauberger from edition: F. Ravaisson, "Métaphysique et morale", *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 1893, № 1, pp. 6–25. In this paper, Ravaisson expounds his ideas about true metaphysics, tracing its origins in the ideas of the philosophers of antiquity and modern times. In his opinion, the practical expression of this metaphysical theory is the ideal of generosity and self-sacrifice, that underlies "heroic philosophy".

*Mariya Savina*

**The problem of subjectivity: interior spaces as the limit of the individual and the collective in Walter Benjamin**

The individual/collective opposition is the one of the key oppositions that organise Benjamin's thinking. In his unfinished work "The Arcades Project", Benjamin applies the methods of conceptualising of history he has developed before by addressing his individual experience in "One-Way Street" and "Berlin Childhood around 1900" to the political and social sphere. He actualises the experience of the historical which is opposed to the prehistoric reality of myth. In contrast to Jung's supposedly reductionist and anti-historical theory of collective unconsciousness, Benjamin develops his original concept of dialectical image and the related concept of collective experience, describing the subject of history in connection with the latter. The paper examines the collective and the individual aspects of subjectivity which Benjamin demonstrates on the example of interior spaces.

*Alexey Zhavoronkov*

**Social Renewal or Intellectual Utopia? Hannah Arendt and Die Wandlung**

The paper presents an analysis of Arendt's essays published in the journal "Die Wandlung" and some of her later works dealing with the topic of intellectual renewal from the background of the crisis of thinking. The core thesis is that Arendt develops the Jaspersian idea of intellectual renewal on a practical level, aiming to overcome cultural boundaries and national prejudices while building a new commonality despite the social atomization after the break with previous traditions. To prove this, I examine Arendt's concept of renewal from the standpoint of its connection with three temporal perspectives – the one of the German national-socialist past, symbolizing the destruction of traditions, the one of the fragile post-war present, oscillating between destructive nihilism and soothing self-deception, and the one of the future where philosophy plays not a leading but still a largely significant role.

*Tamara Dlugatch*

**Florensky and Kant: A Man in Space and Time**

The article deals with the perception of Pavel Florensky of the main philosophical principles of Kant. During analyzing Kant's philosophy a certain logical circle was first revealed. It consists in the fact that it is impossible to know an object without constructing it, but it is impossible to construct it without knowing it. This remains a problem for Kant. The author explains how, from the standpoint of Orthodox symbolism, Florensky criticizes the Kantian principle of human autonomy. The attention is drawn to the difficulties of Florensky to understand the symbol as the unity of the phenomenon and noumena. The ambiguous understanding of the Kantian noumenon is removed by Florensky in the reduction of the noumenon to speculative entities. Time flows in the opposite direction from the effects to the cause for them, and the space "turns out" through itself and becomes imaginary. These ideas of Father Pavel can be further understood through the prism of sci-

ence: thus, a slowing of metabolism in lethargic processes and hibernation of animals indicates a significant change in their time. The question of the reverse course of time in mathematics is touched upon. Attention is paid to the idea of Florensky about the reverse flow of time in creative processes. The article highly appreciates Florensky's desire to understand spatial vision in cultural and historical terms. His research prospects are fruitful. The author proves that it is necessary to compare Western and Russian philosophical ideas.

*Vitaly Makhlin*

**"Participative thinking". Bakhtin's philosophical project  
in a context of the ontological turn of 20th century**

Summary. In this essay the young Bakhtin's philosophical project from the early 1920s, is analyzed in two interrelated directions: first, within the "inner" context of his "first philosophy", secondly, against the "outer" background of the West European (mostly German) turn to the "New Thinking", that is, to the so-called existential ontology, or the "social ontology" (Husserl, Scheler, Buber, G. Marcel, Sartre et al.). Methodologically, in order to answer the question "Where did Bakhtin come from?", the author of the essay, in contrast to the trend of research in the comparative genre of 'Bakhtin and...', works both historically and systematically using the ontological category of the "in-between": his subject is just the "event of being" and the "concrete historicity" as mediation between Bakhtin's project and the projects of his Western contemporaries. Thus, it becomes clear why and under what circumstances the Russian thinker's concept of the "participative thinking" in fact participated in the European turn to the modern, or existential, ontology. Besides, some motives or elements in Bakhtin's early project are taken into consideration, which he later developed in his well-known works written since the mid-1920s and up to the mid-1970s.

*Alexander Tsygankov, Teresa Obolevitch*

**"Germany has already become my second homeland for me": the life  
and creativity of S.L. Frank in correspondence with F. Heiler *et circum***

In the introductory article, based on correspondence between G. Bell, S.L. Frank, V.S. Frank, F. Heiler and the Austrian publishing house Anton Pustet we reconstruct some little-known aspects of the life and creativity of Semen Lyudvigovich Frank during his period of emigration. We clarify the circle of Frank's friends and colleagues with whom he was close after he left Russia and went into exile. Thanks to the correspondence with the German historian and the phenomenologist of religion, Friedrich Heiler, we manage to describe in more detail the "ideological context" of the era of the dialogue of Russian and German thinkers. The presented correspondence contains a rich material on the ecumenical activity of S.L. Frank in 1930s of the last century, connected with the journal issued by F. Heiler "Eine heilige Kirche" ("The Holy Church"). Frank cooperated with Heiler's journal not only as the author of a number of articles but also as a translator for German of S.N. Bulgakov's texts ("Dogmat in the Eastern Orthodox Church", 1935) and B. Sové ("The Sacrament of Confirmation in the Orthodox Church of

the East”, 1936 and “Obituary on N.N. Glubokovsky”, 1937). A special attention is paid to the reconstruction of the history of German edition of the main work of S.L. Frank titled “The Unknowable”: the appearance of various versions of the German text (late 1935 and spring 1937) and a history of unsuccessful attempts of Frank and his friends and colleagues to publish this text in Swiss, Dutch, German and Austrian publishing houses in the 1930s.

**Correspondence of S.L. Frank, V.S. Frank, F. Heiler, G. Bell  
and the Austrian publishing house Anton Pustet**

(Edited by Alexander Tsygankov and Teresa Obolevitch)

The following text is a translation into Russian of the correspondence of S.L. Frank, V.S. Frank, F. Heiler, G. Bell and the Austrian publishing house “Anton Pustet”. This correspondence reflects the difficult period of the life of S.L. Frank during the national socialist rule in Germany. The letters of S.L. Frank and F. Heiler provide an opportunity to restore some elements of German manuscript of Frank's book entitled «The Unknowable» and shed additional light on the history of the attempts to publish this text, which were undertaken in the second half of the 1930s. The correspondence is published with the permission of the heirs of F. Heiler, S.L. Frank and Austrian publisher “Anton Pustet”.

**Antinomies in Development of Philosophy of the Soviet Period.  
Interview with Nelly V. Motroshilova**

This interview with a prominent philosopher Nelly Vasilievna Motroshilova continues the section “Our Interviews” of the Yearbook, that was opened by the interview with A.A. Stoliarov. Nelly Vasilievna Motroshilova – DSc in Philosophy, Professor, Alexander von Humboldt Foundation prize winner, was awarded the Bundesverdienstkreuz am Band (Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany). She is a great scholar of Classical German philosophy and phenomenology, expert on philosophical works and ideas of G.W.F. Hegel, I. Kant, E. Husserl, M. Heidegger, H. Arendt, V. Solov'ev, author of more than 15 monographs. A special place in the N. Motroshilova's area of interests takes the study of interaction between Western and Russian philosophical thought. Among the results of such a research was the book “Russian Philosophy in the 50–80s years of 20th Century and Western Thought” published in 2012. This monograph represents a thorough analysis of contradictory events that took place in philosophy of the Soviet period. This interview is filled with the same spirit of antinomy. Nelly Motroshilova shares memories and thoughts on her postgraduate years; on the Institute of Philosophy; on her foreign philosophical conferences and the related occasions illustrating the situation in the academic philosophical environment of the Soviet Union period; on her colleagues committed to the spirit of philosophy in spite of any obstacles; on the antinomy between the dominant ideology and successful development of philosophical studies in our country. Readers will be able to immerse themselves into the atmosphere of philosophy that took place more than 50 years ago, and experience sorrows and joys that faced philosophers of that time. The interview was conducted by Natalia Tatarenko.

*Artem Iunusov*  
“A Powerless Impossibility”

**(A review of A.V. Markov’s translation of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*)**

In present paper I review the first in more than 100 years completely new translation of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* in Russian. Having examined the principles of this new edition (in pt. 1) and its probable goals (in pt. 3) as well as having thoroughly commented the text of *Metaphysics* A.1 as it is presented in the translation (in pt. 2), I conclude that the text that this edition offers not only cannot be regarded as a translation of Aristotle in any remotely acceptable sense, but barely constitutes a coherent text at all.

*Maria Solopova*  
**Ancient Greek Philosophy and the East. Selected Bibliography.**  
**Part III. Greek Philosophical Heritage**  
**in Arabo-Muslim World (9th–10th cent.)**

This paper presents the final part of the thematic overview bibliography “Ancient Philosophy: Greece and the East”, the purpose of which is to systematize research in Russian and European languages, devoted to the links of Greek philosophy and Eastern wisdom and transformation of the classical philosophical heritage reflected in the sources into other languages (Syrian, Armenian, and Arabic). This part publishes selected literature on the history of perception of the classical philosophical heritage of antiquity in the Arab-Muslim world during the period of the formation of the original Arab-Muslim thought. Primary attention is paid to the history of the translation of ancient authors and texts into Arabic during the reign of the Abbasid dynasty, especially from the 9th–10th centuries. The introductory article on the bibliography provides a commentary on its structure and outlines the main topics and problems organizing it.

## Contributors

**Svetlana Viktorovna Mesyats**, PhD in Philosophy, Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Philosophy of Russian Academy of Sciences, 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russia. E-mail: [messiats@mail.ru](mailto:messiats@mail.ru).

**Irina Alexandrovna Protopopova**, PhD in Philosophy, Senior Research Fellow, the Head of the Platonic research centre at the Russian State University for the Humanities, Miusskaya sq. 6, Moscow, GSP-3, 125993, Russia. Email: [plotinus70@gmail.com](mailto:plotinus70@gmail.com).

**Alexander Arnoldovich Stolyarov**, DSc in Philosophy, Leading Research Fellow at the Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russia. E-mail: [a.stoliarov@mail.ru](mailto:a.stoliarov@mail.ru).

**Stanislav Rykov**, PhD in Philosophy, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences. 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russia. E-mail: [stasrykov@mail.ru](mailto:stasrykov@mail.ru).

**Artem Aleksandrovich Krotov**, DSc of Philosophy, Lomonosov Moscow State University. Lomonosovskiy prospect, 27/4, Moscow, 119234, Russian Federation. E-mail: [krotov@philos.msu.ru](mailto:krotov@philos.msu.ru).

**Alexei Nikolaevich Krouglov**, DSc in Philosophy, Professor, Chair for History of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy, Russian State University for the Humanities; 6 Miusskaya square, Moscow, 125993 Russian Federation. E-mail: [akrouglov@mail.ru](mailto:akrouglov@mail.ru).

**Irina Igorevna Blauberger**, DSc in Philosophy, Leading Research Fellow, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences. 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russian Federation. E-mail: [irinablauberger@yandex.ru](mailto:irinablauberger@yandex.ru).

**Mariya Savina**, MA in Cultural Studies, Russian School for Anthropological Studies, Russian State University for the Humanities; 6 Miusskaya square, Moscow, 125993 Russian Federation; MA Student at the Free University of Berlin (Institute of Philosophy), Habelschwerdter Allee 30, 14195 Berlin, Germany. E-mail: [maria.al.savina@gmail.com](mailto:maria.al.savina@gmail.com).

**Alexey Zhavoronkov**, PhD in philosophy and philology, senior fellow at the Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences. 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russian Federation. E-mail: [outdoors@yandex.ru](mailto:outdoors@yandex.ru).

**Tamara Borisovna Dlugatch**, DSc in Philosophy, Chief Research Fellow, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences. 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russian Federation. E-mail: [dlugatsch@yandex.ru](mailto:dlugatsch@yandex.ru).

**Vitaly L'vovich Makhlin**, DSc., professor, Moscow State Pedagogical University, Institute of Social and Humanitarian Sciences, prospect Vernadskogo, 88, office 812, Moscow 119571, Russian Federation. E-mail: [vitmahlin@mail.ru](mailto:vitmahlin@mail.ru).

**Alexander Tsygankov**, PhD in Philosophy, Research Fellow. Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences. 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russian Federation. E-mail: [m1dian@yandex.ru](mailto:m1dian@yandex.ru).



**Teresa Obolevitch**, Dr. hab., Professor, head of the Chair of Russian and Byzantine Philosophy. The Pontifical University of John Paul II. Kanonicza Street, 9, Kraków, 31-002, Poland. E-mail: tereza.obolevich@upjp2.edu.pl.

**Nelly Vasilievna Motroshilova**, DSc in Philosophy, Chief Research Fellow at the Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences. 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russia. E-mail: motroshilova@yandex.ru.

**Nataliya Anatolievna Tatarenko**, PhD in Philosophy, Research Fellow at the Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences. 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russia. E-mail: nataliya.koreneva@gmail.com.

**Artem Timurovich Iunusov**, PhD in Philosophy, research fellow at the Institute of Philosophy of Russian Academy of Sciences, 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russia. E-mail: forty-two@mail.ru.

**Maria Anatolyevna Solopova**, PhD in Philosophy, Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, 12/1 Goncharnaya Str., Moscow, 109240, Russia. E-mail: msolopova@yandex.ru.