



# REVISTA INCLUSIONES

CENCIA EN TIEMPOS DE CAMBIOS

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número Especial

Julio / Septiembre

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

**CUERPO DIRECTIVO**

**Directores**

**Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda**

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

**Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras**

Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile

**Editor**

**Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda**

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

**Editor Científico**

**Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo**

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

**Editor Europa del Este**

**Dr. Aleksandar Ivanov Katrandzhiev**

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

**Cuerpo Asistente**

**Traductora: Inglés**

**Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero**

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

**Portada**

**Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos**

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

**COMITÉ EDITORIAL**

**Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado**

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

**Dra. Heloísa Bellotto**

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

**Dra. Nidia Burgos**

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

**Mg. María Eugenia Campos**

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

**Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera**

Universidad de Valladolid, España

**Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González**

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

**Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy**

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

**Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes**

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

**Dr. Werner Mackenbach**

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

**Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín**

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

**Ph. D. Natalia Milanese**

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

**Ph. D. Maritza Montero**

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

**Dra. Eleonora Pencheva**

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

**Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira**

Universidad de La Coruña, España

**Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona**

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

**Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra**

Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

**Dra. Mirka Seitz**

Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

**Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov**

South West University, Bulgaria

**COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL**

**Comité Científico Internacional de Honor**

**Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía**

Universidad ICESI, Colombia

**Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas**

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

**Dr. Martino Contu**

Universidad de Sassari, Italia

**Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo**

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

**Dra. Patricia Brogna**

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

# REVISTA INCLUSIONES

REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES  
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

**Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez**

*Universidad de Barcelona, España*

**Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Lancelot Cowie**

*Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago*

**Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar**

*Universidad de Los Andes, Chile*

**Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo**

*Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla,  
México*

**Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto**

*Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina*

**Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco**

*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo**

*Universidad de Chile, Chile*

**Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandía**

*Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España*

**Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar**

*Universidad de Sevilla, España*

**Dra. Patricia Galeana**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dra. Manuela Garau**

*Centro Studi Sea, Italia*

**Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg**

*Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia  
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos*

**Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez**

*Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia*

**José Manuel González Freire**

*Universidad de Colima, México*

**Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera**

*Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España*

**Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre**

*Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil*

## CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

**+ Dr. Miguel León-Portilla**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura**

*Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel",  
España*

**Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros**

*Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil*

**+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández**

*Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela*

**Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango**

*Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México*

**Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut**

*Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España*

**Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa**

*Dilemas Contemporáneos, México*

**Dra. Francesca Randazzo**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras,  
Honduras*

**Dra. Yolando Ricardo**

*Universidad de La Habana, Cuba*

**Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha**

*Universidade Católica de Angola Angola*

**Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza**

*Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica*

**Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix**

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades  
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

**Dr. Luis Alberto Romero**

*CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig**

*Dilemas Contemporáneos, México*

**Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Juan Antonio Seda**

*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva**

*Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil*

**Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso**  
*Universidad de Salamanca, España*

**Dr. Josep Vives Rego**  
*Universidad de Barcelona, España*

**Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni**  
*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo**  
*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Comité Científico Internacional**

**Dra. Elian Araujo**  
*Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil*

**Mg. Romyana Atanasova Popova**  
*Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria*

**Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa**  
*Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal*  
*Centro de Estudios Africanos, Portugal*

**Dra. Noemí Brenta**  
*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Ph. D. Juan R. Coca**  
*Universidad de Valladolid, España*

**Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel**  
*Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España*

**Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik**  
*Universidad de Colonia, Alemania*

**Dr. Eric de Léséulec**  
*INS HEA, Francia*

**Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti**  
*Universidad de Barcelona, España*

**Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant**  
*Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalem, Israel*

**Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro**  
*Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia*

**Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov**  
*Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria*

**Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez**  
*Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia*

**Dr. Gino Ríos Patio**  
*Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú*

**Dra. María Laura Salinas**  
*Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina*

**Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo**  
*Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina*

**Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec**  
*Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia*

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía  
Santiago – Chile  
Representante Legal  
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

## Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad de Concepción



BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN

**THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL TRADITION IN RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY**

**Ph. D. Elena A. Schastlivtseva**

Vyatka State University (VyatSU), Russia  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3281-5760>  
abcr@yandex.ru

**Ph. D. Natalya V. Kazakova**

Vyatka State University (VyatSU), Russia  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3686-636X>  
natalyalipilina@yandex.ru

**Fecha de Recepción:** 05 de abril de 2020 – **Fecha Revisión:** 21 de mayo de 2020

**Fecha de Aceptación:** 21 de junio de 2020 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de julio de 2020

**Abstract**

The purpose of this article is the historical and philosophical reconstruction of phenomenological tradition in Russian philosophy of the late XIX - first half of the XX century; to reveal its epistemological specifics. We disclose the issue of phenomenological philosophy in Russia, its significant influence was rendered by immanentism and organicism. According to our hypothesis, it is the organic understanding of the world that becomes the main idea of the new philosophical worldview in XX century. The organic understanding of the world was inherent in the most prominent representatives of Russian philosophy such as N.E. Lossky and S.L. Frank, as well as the neo-Kantian S. Hesse. It is largely determined by their egotological perception.

**Keywords**

Immanentism – Organicism – Intuition – N.O. Lossky – Gustav Shpet – Husserl – Gadamer

**Para Citar este Artículo:**

Schastlivtseva, Elena A. y Kazakova, Natalya V. The phenomenological tradition in Russian philosophy. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 255-273.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported  
(CC BY-NC 3.0)

Licencia Internacional



## Introduction

Phenomenological ideas of Russian philosophers of the late XIX and early XX centuries acquire a special significance in modern Philosophy and the humanities. They clarify our historical horizon, allow us to better see those possible movements of thought that once remained unfulfilled in history and appeal, which allow us to return to the historical tradition of Russian philosophizing, opening a new perspective to us today.

The emergence of the phenomenological tradition in Russia today is a real problem. First of all, due to insufficient knowledge of this topic. The study reveals the ambiguity of interpretations of the ideological content of "Russian phenomenology" and the problem of its occurrence, which requires additional study of sources. The approach proposed in this study allows us to consider the ontological problems in Russian philosophy of the late XIX - early XX century as the foundation of the phenomenological tradition. The thematization of these ideas as phenomenological leads the Russian intellectual tradition to the level of understanding of thingness as a philosophical issue. In the context of this tradition, an object cannot be directly given, it is presented to consciousness in the form of a specific phenomenon, or event.

To date the urgency issue is also the material and ideal thingness represented by I. Kant, Ed. Husserl and M. Heidegger. Russian philosophy, comprehending the teachings of G.V. Leibniz, Chr. Wolff, I. Kant and E. Husserl, was in line with modern approaches to epistemology. In this sense, the ideas of N. Lossky, S. L. Frank, Prince. S.N. Trubetskoy, L.M. Lopatin, and V. Solovyov. The concept of ontological rationality, which was conceived in the works of P.D. Yurkevich and the Slavophiles, is ultimately realized in the philosophy of G. G. Shpet, where the hermeneutic problems, enriched by phenomenological ideas (in particular, the problem of meaning and meaning, word and sign) come to the forefront.

In addition, one cannot ignore the rich experience of Russian philosophy in studying the issues of consciousness, which is understood not from the natural and psychological side, but from the transcendental and phenomenological side (for example, the ideality of meaning). The issue of hypostasis is closely intertwined with this problem, when various ideal objects are mistaken for "really existing" objects. Due to this, today one can raise the question of the ontological status of phenomenological method in the Russian phenomenological tradition, which determines the special place of such tradition in the world phenomenological movement. This study is devoted to the substantiation of this thesis.

The phenomenological concepts of Russian philosophers also acquire their relevance due to overcoming the emphasis on the Christian Orthodox nature of their work. The methodology of social and humanitarian cognition was developed successfully in the concepts of Russian philosophers. In particular, the semiotical concepts of G. G. Shpet become extremely modern, especially if one takes into account the specificity of humanitarian knowledge as a whole, focused on communication, on understanding the deep meanings of objects. Moreover, in this context the special scientific significance is acquired by the concept of a rational orientation of thought, which is presented in the works of G.G. Shpet, S.N. Trubetskoy, V. Solovyov and others.

G.G. Shpet has developed an effective methodology of humanitarian knowledge, relying on phenomenology, hermeneutics, and combining the principles of classical dialectics and classical rationalism. The basis of this methodology is based on the recognition of the word by an independent source of knowledge (concept of the inner form



of the word), which is consistent with contemporary semiotic and structuralist studies. The linguistic and hermeneutic turn, implemented by G.G. Shpet, is relevant in the framework of phenomenological tradition itself against the backdrop of Russia.

The relevance of appeal to the Russian phenomenological tradition allows us today to realize the closer connection of Russian philosophy with European intellectual streams (in particular, in the field of phenomenology and its reception).

The modern historical and philosophical study is possible both as a history of contents and a history of forms of thought. The first type of study affects the ontological status of concepts and the statement of their existence, the second type is the history of consciousness in general, the history of thought according to its forms and structures. Proceeding from this typology, we must distinguish between two methodological approaches to the historical and philosophical study of phenomenological issues in Russian philosophy. The central one of them is the phenomenological concepts themselves, the internal problems of phenomenology as a philosophical trend. Within this approach, the content of phenomenological concepts is at the center of attention of researchers, and the reception from Husserl's works in Russia, as well as related philosophical and scientific discussions, comes to the fore. First of all, this area includes the study of the issues of "pure consciousness" and "intersubjectivity", "egology" and "reduction", as well as "vital world" and "strict science". And in this case, we can say that phenomenological issues began to be developed in the late XIX - early XX century in the works of P.D. Yurkevich<sup>1</sup>, V. Solovyov<sup>2</sup>, L.M. Lopatin<sup>3</sup>, S.N. Trubetskoy<sup>4</sup>, N.O. Lossky<sup>5</sup>, S.L. Frank<sup>6</sup>, B.V. Yakovenko<sup>7</sup>, G.G. Shpet<sup>8</sup>, A.F. Losev<sup>9</sup>, and others. Within another approach, the historians of philosophy are focused not as much on the content of phenomenology against the backdrop of Russia, as the original epistemological methods for the development of phenomenological concepts in Russia, and it is in this case we can distinguish the pre-phenomenological period in the studies of phenomenological issues against the backdrop of Russia. Within the second approach, it is possible to single out the works of historians of Russian philosophy - V. V. Zenkovsky<sup>10</sup>, N. Lossky<sup>11</sup>, who begin to wonder whether there are any phenomenological concepts in Russia its own and whether they add up to a special tradition. Unfortunately, these attempts at historical and philosophical self-identification of Russian philosophers and phenomenologists were interrupted violently, and as V.I. Molchanov states in the encyclopedic article "Phenomenology in Russia" since 1930 until the end of the 1960s, phenomenology was assessed in the USSR as "a kind of reactionary bourgeois philosophy"<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> P. D. Yurkevich, *Philosophical Works* (Moscow: 1990).

<sup>2</sup> S. M. Soloviev, "The first beginning of theoretical philosophy". *Issues of philosophy and psychology*, num 5 Vol: 40 (1897): 867-915.

<sup>3</sup> L. M. Lopatin, *Axioms of Philosophy* (Moscow: 1996).

<sup>4</sup> S. L. Frank, *Knowledge subject. The soul of man* (St. Petersburg: 1995).

<sup>5</sup> N. O. Lossky, *Justification of intuition* (Moscow: 1991).

<sup>6</sup> S. L. Frank, *Knowledge subject...*

<sup>7</sup> B. V. Yakovenko, "Philosophy of Edmund Husserl". *New concepts in philosophy. III. Theory of knowledge. I.* (St. Petersburg), 74-146.

<sup>8</sup> G. G. Shpet, *Phenomenology and meaning: Phenomenology as the main science and its issues.* (Moscow: 1914).

<sup>9</sup> A. F. Losev, *Personality and Absolute* (Moscow: 1999).

<sup>10</sup> V. V. Zenkovsky, *History of Russian philosophy*, Vol: 2. Moscow-Rostov n / D, 1999.

<sup>11</sup> N. O. Lossky, *History of Russian Philosophy* (Moscow: 1991).

<sup>12</sup> V. I. Molchanov, "Phenomenology in Russia". *New Philosophical Encyclopedia*, Vol: 4 (2010).

The next stage of these issues development in the framework of the first approach begins in the 1960s and is connected with new interpretations of E. Husserl's phenomenological concepts in the works of N.V. Motroshilova<sup>13</sup>, V. I. Molchanov<sup>14</sup>, P.P. Gaidenko<sup>15</sup>, A.P. Ogurtsov<sup>16</sup>, and others.

The greatest interest in the phenomenological tradition against the backdrop of Russia arises in the 1990s, due to the revitalization of phenomenological studies in Russia (see the first phenomenological issues of Logos journal, the first issue of which was published in 1990). At the same time, some articles appear in dictionaries and encyclopedias, wherein the attempts are being made to determine the historical and philosophical status of phenomenology in Russia. And this interest remains stable until now.

Over the past twenty years, the phenomenological tradition in Russian philosophy has been studied by domestic and foreign philosophers and scholars of humanities (A.I. Brodsky<sup>17</sup>, M. Denn<sup>18</sup>, I.I. Evlampiev<sup>19</sup>, J. Seifert<sup>20</sup>, V.P. Zinchenko<sup>21</sup>, T.D. Marcinkovskaya, V.I. Molchanov<sup>22</sup>, N.V. Motroshilova<sup>23</sup>, A.A. Mityushin, I.M. Chubarov<sup>24</sup>, A. Haardt<sup>25</sup>, T.G. Shchedrin, but even today this thematic plane requires the active research development. For example, the European researcher of phenomenological tradition in Russia, J. Seifert, analyzed the concepts of F and Lossky in their comparison, while he pointed to the direct (immanent) nature of the phenomenology of the Russian philosopher, his personalism, which essentially distinguishes the Lossky phenomenology from phenomenology of Husserl and Lossky in their comparison, while he pointed to the direct (immanent) nature of phenomenology of the Russian philosopher, his personalism, which essentially distinguishes the Lossky's phenomenology from the Husserl's phenomenology.

---

<sup>13</sup> N. V. Motroshilova, Concepts of Edmund Husserl as an introduction to phenomenology (Moscow: 2003).

<sup>14</sup> V. I. Molchanov, "Foreword". Phenomenology of the inner consciousness of time. Collected Works Vol: 1. (1994): 7-14.

<sup>15</sup> P. P. Gaidenko, "Hierarchical personalism N. O. Lossky". Lossky N. O. Sensual, intellectual and mystical intuition (1999): 349-370.

<sup>16</sup> A. P. Ogurtsov, "Reflexion", Philosophical Encyclopedia. Vol: 4 (1967) "Phenomenology". Philosophical Encyclopedia, Vol: 5 (1970).

<sup>17</sup> A. I. Brodsky, "On One Error of Russian Liberalism", Issues of Philosophy, num 10 (1911): 154-159.

<sup>18</sup> M. Denn, "Imedism and its philosophical vices: from the substitute of glossolalia to the justification of temporality", Issues of Philosophy, num 12 (2002): 93-104.

<sup>19</sup> I. I. Evlampiev, Phenomenological philosophy of Shpet. History of Russian philosophy (Moscow: 2002) y I. I. Evlampiev, "A Man in the Face of Absolute Being: Mystical Realism of Semyon Frank".

<sup>20</sup> J. Seyfert, "Significance of Husserl's logical research for realistic phenomenology and criticism of some Husserl theses", Issues of Philosophy, num 10 (2006): 130-152.

<sup>21</sup> V. P. Zinchenko y M. K. Mamardashvili, "Study of higher mental functions and category of the unconscious", Issues of Philosophy, num 10 (1991): 34-40.

<sup>22</sup> V. I. Molchanov, "Foreword". Phenomenology of the inner consciousness of time, Collected Works Vol: 1 (1994): 7-14.

<sup>23</sup> N. V. Motroshilova, Concepts of Edmund Husserl as an introduction to phenomenology (Moscow: 2003).

<sup>24</sup> I. M. Chubarov, "Modification of the phenomenological paradigm of understanding consciousness in the project of hermeneutic dialectics by Gustav Gustavovich Shpet". The creative heritage of G.G. Shpet and modern philosophical issues: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference. Tomsk, 1997. 27-33.

<sup>25</sup> A. Haardt, "Edmund Husserl and the phenomenological movement in Russia in the 10th and 20th years", Issues of Philosophy, num 5 (1994): 57-63.

The phenomenological concepts of Russian philosophers are widely in demand today by scholars of the humanities. A significant contribution to their development was made by such psychologists as V.P. Zinchenko<sup>26</sup>, T.D. Marcinkovskaya<sup>27</sup>, N.S. Poleva<sup>28</sup>. V.P. Zinchenko considers Shpet's concepts in the context of contemporary issues of cultural and historical psychology. His last works are devoted to that: "Consciousness and creative act" (Moscow., 2011), as well as a collective monograph dedicated to the 80th anniversary of V.P. Zinchenko, "The style of thinking: the issue of the historical unity of scientific knowledge" (ed. by G. Shchedrina, Moscow, 2011). T.D. Marzinkovskaya actualizes the philosophical concepts of Gustav Shpet and his philosophical school of the methodology of humanitarian knowledge in the context of contemporary issues of psychology<sup>29</sup>. She shows that Shpet's concepts are enriched with new modern scientific concepts and presents them in the context of psychological discussions on the issues of human identity and socialization, ethnopsychology, and constructionism. N. S. Poleva draws attention not only to Shpet's concepts, but also to the concepts of his followers and disciples, i.e. on the community of scientists of the State Academy of Arts (GAKhN). It was in this social institution where Shpet and his colleagues tried to implement the principle of the unity of scientific knowledge, to bridge the gap between natural science and humanities in the field of methodology.

In this article, the phenomenological tradition is also studied on the part of its rapprochement with hermeneutic issues, so the discussion that developed twenty years ago between V.G. Kuznetsov<sup>30</sup> and V. V. Kalinichenko<sup>31</sup> acquires a special significance for the author of this work. And the point here is not so much whether to call Shpet's concept "hermeneutics of sociality" or "hermeneutic phenomenology", but that in this discussion the phenomenological tradition of Russia is actualized. The principles of Shpet's conception of the methodology of humanitarian cognition are analyzed in the context of positive philosophy tradition against the backdrop of Russia (V.G. Kuznetsov), on the basis of "Russian ontologism" as the mainstream tradition of Russian philosophy (V. V. Kalinichenko).

V.I. Molchanov offers an interesting interpretation of the phenomenological concepts development. He denotes the phenomenological tradition of Russia as a "paradigm of consciousness" and shows its specificity with respect to the "Kantian paradigm" and the "phenomenological paradigm" (Husserl). Speaking generally on the ontological interpretations of the consciousness problematics in Russian philosophy, the dissertator considers it important to pay attention to their transcendental nature associated with the comprehending tradition by Kant. Due to that, the issue arises of collective subject, the

---

<sup>26</sup> V. P. Zinchenko y M. K. Mamardashvili, "Study of higher mental functions and category of the unconscious", *Issues of Philosophy*, num 10 (1991): 34-40.

<sup>27</sup> T. D. Marcinkovskaya, "Issues of the psychology of social life in the work of G.G. Shpet". *Issues of art history XI*, num 2 (1997): 50-60 y T. D. Martsinkovskaya, "The issues of ethnic experiences in the concept of "psychology of social life" by G.G. Shpet (To the 120th anniversary of his birth)". *Issues of psychology*, num 6 (1999): 119-127.

<sup>28</sup> N. S. Poleva, "The inner form of a work of art as an object of scientific research". *Gustav Gustavovich Shpet: archival materials, memoirs, articles* (Moscow: 2002).

<sup>29</sup> T. D. Marcinkovskaya, "Issues of the psychology of social life in the work of G.G. Shpet", *Issues of art history XI*, num 2m (1997): 50-60 y T. D. Martsinkovskaya, "The issues of ethnic experiences in the concept of "psychology of social life" by G.G. Shpet (To the 120th anniversary of his birth)", *Issues of psychology*, num 6 (1999): 119-127.

<sup>30</sup> V. V. Kalinichenko, "Gustav Shpet: from phenomenology to hermeneutics", *Logos*, num 3 (1992): 37-61.

<sup>31</sup> V. G. Kuznetsov, "Hermeneutics and its path from a specific technique to a philosophical stream", *Logos*, num 10 (1999): 43-88.

conciliarly of consciousness, which is discussed in the works of V. Solovyov, S.N. Trubetskoy, Gustav Shpet, and meaningful in the works of contemporary philosophers: P.P. Gaidenko, V.A. Lectorsky<sup>32</sup>, L.A. Mikeshina, V.I. Molchanov<sup>33</sup>, B.I. Pruzhinin<sup>34</sup>, T.G. Shchedrina<sup>35</sup>, I.M. Chubarova<sup>36</sup>, and others.

In addition, the issues related to modern phenomenological hermeneutics, of which there is the extensive fundamental literature, acquire a special significance. The issue of understanding by Gustav Shpet has a phenomenological and semiotic nature, and here one can already speak of phenomenological hermeneutics, as in the case of G.G. Gadamer. In line with this, the collective monograph "The origins of cultural and historical psychology: philosophical and humanitarian context" was written (Moscow, 2010), the authors of which<sup>37</sup>, problematize the status of understanding in the works of Gadamer and Shpet.

The phenomenological concepts of Russian philosophers are also in the focus of attention of modern European philologists and the Slavists. Over the past five years the international scientific conferences devoted to the works of S.N. Trubetskoy, S. L. Frank, Gustav Shpet have been held, two permanent seminars are being held: Solovyov's Workshop (Ivanovo) and a seminar, wherein the concepts of A.F. Losev (Moscow) are discussed, "Shpet readings" are periodically held in Tomsk. One of the last scientific conferences devoted to the structuralist and semiotic concepts of Gustav Shpet was held in Bordeaux (France) led by M. Denn. Humanities scientists and philosophers from Russia, France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, Hungary, the USA, the Netherlands, etc. took part in it. Although the conference was devoted to Shpet's concepts, the focus of discussions was precisely the phenomenological tradition in Russia, since most of the reports were comparative. It should be noted that all these conferences and seminars are focused on the epistemological specificity of Russian phenomenological tradition.

The phenomenological method and its possible applications to modern literary studies have been the subject of discussion among many researchers: A. Khan (Hungary), M. Venditti (Italy), M. K. Gidini (Italy), G.B. Köhler (FRG), R. Grübel (Germany), and others.

Fundamental methodological developments for the issue of humanitarian knowledge, including in the field of phenomenological method, were made by E.V. Borisov, N. Z. Brosova, P. P. Gaidenko, L. A. Gogotishvili, V. G. Kuznetsov, V. A. Lectorovsky, T.D. Martsinkovskaya, V. L. Makhlin, L. A. Mikeshina, A. A. Mikhailov, I. A. Mikhailov, V. I.

---

<sup>32</sup> V. A. Lectorsky, "German philosophy and Russian humanitarian thought: S.L. Rubinshtein and G.G. Shpet", *Issues of Philosophy*, num 10 (2001): 129-139.

<sup>33</sup> V. I. Molchanov "Paradigms of consciousness and the structure of experience", *Logos*, num 3 (1992): 7-36; V. I. Molchanov, "The concept of reflexion in the context of phenomenological doctrine of time", *Criticism of the phenomenological direction of modern bourgeois philosophy*. Riga. 1981: 121-140 y V. I. Molchanov, *Distinguishing and experience: the phenomenology of non-aggressive consciousness* (Moscow: 2004).

<sup>34</sup> B. I. Pruzhinin, "Ratio serviens?". *Contours of cultural and historical epistemology* (Moscow: 2004).

<sup>35</sup> T. G. Shchedrina, "I write like an echo of another...". *Essays on the intellectual biography of Gustav Shpet* (Moscow: 2004).

<sup>36</sup> I. M. Chubarov, *Modification of the phenomenological paradigm of understanding consciousness in Russian philosophy the end of XIX - the early XX centuries*. Dis. Cand. Philos. Sciences. D. 8381-98 (Moscow: 1997).

<sup>37</sup> B. I. Pruzhinin, "Ratio serviens?". *Contours of cultural and historical epistemology* (Moscow: 2004) y T. G. Shchedrina, "I write like an echo of another...". *Essays on the intellectual biography of Gustav Shpet* (Moscow: 2004).

Molchanov, N.V. Motroshilova, B. I Pruzhinin, I.N. Inishev, A.E. Savin, N.M. Smirnova, T.G. Shchedrina, and others.

In general, the phenomenological tradition is represented quite well in the philosophical literature, and the question, in our opinion, is to think and understand the phenomenological concepts in their dynamics and historical contexts, that is the goal, and at the same time the method of this study, and creates new meanings relevant to today's times background. Thus, the materials of the "round table" in the journal "Questions of Philosophy" "Gustav Shpet and the modern philosophy of humanitarian knowledge. To the 130th anniversary of Gustav Shpet. The second meeting" (2010) reveal several fundamental issues, which concern not only the concept of G. Shpet, but also the phenomenological tradition in Russia as a whole.

### **Materials and Methods**

Organic understanding opposes the naturalistic picture of the world, wherein the individual-psychological approach to the phenomena of nature prevails, and at the same time the desire for objectivism in spite of subjective cognition is dominated. The naturalistic philosophy proceeds from the opposition of subject and object, and, on the contrary, the organic understanding proceeds from the initial absence of subject-object dichotomy and recognizes their fusion in the organic whole of the world.

We affirm that the organic understanding of the world was inherent in the Russian ontological tradition. This circumstance brings the Russian phenomenological philosophy to ontology, to things, beyond the rational understanding of truth, which is hidden in ontological, existential notions of people. According to Gadamer, such "prejudices" form the core of a preconception. At the same time, existential "prejudices" are the beginning of a rational understanding of reality.

In our study we apply mainly the phenomenological and hermeneutic methods, as well as a historical and philosophical method, which consists in describing and analyzing the philosophical texts of certain philosophers in a certain period of time (the turn of XIX and XX centuries).

In the phenomenological method, Lossky's approach to immanent, inner perception of the subject was very important. The phenomenological method of Lossky differs somewhat from the Husserl's method of phenomenology. And this is not surprising, because the phenomenological methodology is full of variations. In Husserl's phenomenology, the world is gradually awakening, on the contrary, in the immanent philosophy the world is already in me as explicit, at this time it is enough for me to look at the thing. Husserl conducts a complex methodological operation of manifesting an object in consciousness: speaking metaphorically, the subject "come to the fore" for us. This process is similar to the slow opening of eyes of the awakening consciousness. As a method Husserl uses a transcendental reduction and a reflection carried out by a transcendental subject. Husserl is interested primarily in the boundaries of perception, color shades, angles, etc. Lossky's immanent method, on the contrary, is aimed at the presence of finished object in our minds, as it is in reality. At the same time, Lossky distinguishes between the intuitive process of perception and the process of awareness and signification of things. Criticism of the immanent method can include the following question: how does an object enter into consciousness? At the same time, for immanentism there is no gap between matter and act. Immanent philosophy defends the principle of "everything is imminent to everything". Nevertheless, it is impossible to prove this.

According to Husserl, the intentional act as an ideal act does not contain a subject, it is correlative to this subject. At the same time, immanentism allows us to achieve the complete evidence of the subject, since the intentional act initially contains the subject as a given. On the contrary, Husserl distinguishes between meanings of the terms "representation" ("Vorstellung") and "content" ("Inhalt"). From this follows "a radical difference between the immanent real contents of the life of the individual consciousness and this experience as something transcendental in relation to the opposing objects"<sup>38</sup>. Seyfert argues that the most important thing is to know the original given, which is hidden in the object (the subject of the study). In his opinion, the truth is experienced in the knowledge of evidence. And if the immanentism principle is recognized, "the possession of truth" occurs, because the obvious judgment is the consciousness of the original given "<sup>39</sup>.

A different point of view is presented by G. Spiegelberg. He believes that in the process of transcendental analysis Husserl is increasingly convinced that the roots of cognition lie much deeper than ontology, namely in the mind of the cognizing subject. Husserl calls this provision "transcendental subjectivity"<sup>40</sup>. Seyfert rejected the transcendental subjectivity. In his opinion, the concept of intentionality exhausts the concept of transcendental subjectivity, and this very concept is a serious mistake made by Husserl<sup>41</sup>.

At the same time, the truth does not enter our consciousness. But the coincidence of thought about an object in a concept is the truth<sup>42</sup>. In other words, the object of perception must coincide with the concept. Truth itself as belonging to the objective world finds a way of its realization in the subject consciousness. For example, the number "five" is realized in five fingers. Proceeding from this, the transcendental method has the task of projecting an internal object, or the content of consciousness outside. This operation is called concretization (Vygotsky) or objectification (Shpet). One can draw the following conclusion: an immanent and realistic philosophy does not investigate the genetic constitutive structure of consciousness. Its main core is the direct perception of evidence, which directly enters our consciousness by intuition. Truth mysteriously enters us, and on the basis of this act we are the happy owners of the truth. The method of N.O. Lossky contains analogous concepts about the truth. In this circumstance, we agree with Seyfert. We also agree with him that a realistic understanding of the truth led N. Lossky to personalism, which was not developed in the phenomenology of E. Husserl.

The method of N.O. Lossky. Lossky thinks big. Human senses are the continuation of a material world process, and thinking is the continuation of a spatio-temporal continuum. In Lossky's philosophy, the personality, the "I", is absolute. "I" is the creator of his wishes and desires, his feelings: I'm sad, I'm hungry, I'm happy, I'm upset, I'm going to a friend, etc. In Lossky, evidence is a property of the very material process of life that is immanently contained in the subject. The consciousness of Lossky moves along the path of mystical intuition in a personalistic way. The higher substantial figures as the bearers of the absolute consciousness have the experience of the truth creation. In this case, the finding of truth is a creative act of self-disclosure by a substantial figure who follows the path of knowing God, or the Absolute. Love in its highest manifestation among the substantial figures makes it

<sup>38</sup> J. Seyfert, "Significance of Husserl's logical research for realistic phenomenology and criticism of some Husserl theses", *Issues of Philosophy*, num 10 (2006): 130-152.

<sup>39</sup> J. Seyfert, "Significance of Husserl's logical research..."

<sup>40</sup> G. Shpigelberg, *Phenomenological movement* (Moscow: 2002).

<sup>41</sup> J. Seyfert, "Significance of Husserl's logical research..."

<sup>42</sup> G. Lantz, "Edmund Husserl and the psychologists of our days", *Issues of philosophy and psychology*, num 98 (1909): 393-494.

possible to know each other and divine knowledge. It opens up the possibility of manifesting the truth outside for a more complete realization in the world. This circumstance opens the Lossky system to cognition by higher-level substantive figures.

About the method of Edmund Husserl. The Brentano's intentionality gives Husserl the opportunity to comprehend a pure subject in the concept. Husserl's method (transcendental subjectivity) left its mark on the concept of G.-G. Gadamer. According to Gadamer, pre-understanding is deeper than ontology. These are the so-called "prejudices" of the subject.

The making of phenomenological tradition in Russia. In the phenomenological tradition of Russia, we note the features of immanentism, transcendentalism, the concept of "pure consciousness" (V. Solovyov), ontology (positive philosophy), ideal-realism (Lossky), organicism, and correlation method. Ontologism is influenced by Plato, organicism is influenced by immanent philosophy. Transcendentalism is influenced by Kant, immanentism is influenced by V. Schuppe. The Husserl's method is superimposed on the Russian philosophical tradition: correlation method, phenomenological description, pure perception. B.V. Yakovenko, G.G. Shpet, S.L. Frank, A.F. Losev are representatives of phenomenology in Russia. Russian ontologism has the nature of merging subject and object. The Russian ontological tradition gradually acquires phenomenological features under the influence of Husserl's phenomenology.

The aim of our study is to demonstrate the making process of the phenomenological concepts in Russia. We also use the Gadamer's method to achieve our result.

- 1) Gadamer considers a tradition as the source of truths;
- 2) Language has a strong influence on tradition;
- 3) Language cannot completely get rid of "pre-understanding", i.e. originally given meaning. We must know the original meaning of the word. Without this value, we cannot understand the further meanings.
- 4) Gadamer recognizes the metaphysical meaning of the word, which becomes its original meaning.

Let us say in passing about the philosophy of outstanding philosopher Gustav Shpet. He is at the origins of phenomenology in Russia. It is worth mentioning some of his contemporaries in this field. They are G. Lantz, N. Vokach and some other philosophers. P.D. Yurkevich and V.I. Solovyov were the forerunners of phenomenology in Russia, contemporaries, which preceded the emergence of phenomenological tradition in Russia.

The analysis of works by V.I. Solovyov, S.N. Trubetskoy and L.M. Lopatin reveals the sore point of the transition to a new philosophy. It was a new reading of Kant, Hegel, which influenced the emergence of new philosophical trends: immanentism, intuitionism, ideal-realism, phenomenology, and other. N.O. Lossky most clearly indicated the relevance of the turn to a new philosophy. His work "Justification of intuition" (1906) reached the world level [19]. Western contemporaries praised it almost immediately after publication. In his works, Shpet calls Kant's philosophy as a positive, ontological philosophy. This tradition includes the teachings of L.M. Lopatin, P.D. Yurkevich, V. Solovyov, and N.O. Lossky. The concepts of criticism and empiricism in the philosophy of Mach and Avenarius influenced the Russian positive ontological tradition. In what way do we see this influence?

- 1) Criticism of mechanistic understanding in the area of ideal and social relations;

- 2) Identification of the issue of objective cognition, in other words, the issue of the subject role in the cognition of the world;
- 3) Question of the unity, integrity of the world;
- 4) The subject is understood as a collective entity;
- 5) Issue of distinguishing the physical and mental in the process of cognition.

The phenomenological direction in Russia stands out against the backdrop of ontological philosophy. Gustav Shpet is its most vivid representative. He develops a hermeneutic project of phenomenology. He analyzes the concepts of ancient, medieval philosophy, the philosophy of modern times, transcendentalism, neo-Kantianism, immanentism, Husserl's phenomenology of Husserl and Hegel, rationalism, and Marxism. His thought moves from ontology, historical science while developing the issues of humanitarian cognition. Shpet stands at the origins of symbolism and semiotics. He creates the original concept of the word, expands the meaning of the word to a semantic and symbolic understanding. And this was a fundamentally new concept of language. We consider the concept of Gustav Shpet as a "project" of ontological philosophy and an ontological method in the theory of knowledge. The aim of our study is seen as the finding of a "thematic unity"<sup>43</sup>, the general, binding principle of Russian philosophy, which allows us to talk about the phenomenon of Russian philosophy from the point of view of epistemology and ontology, and not only in the sense of religious Orthodox philosophy. It seems to us that ontological issues of the turn of the XIX-XX century, or, in other words, the philosophy of ontologism, become such a binding unity. The philosophy of ontology has gathered all the best traditions of the preceding philosophy and has its origin even from the Plato's philosophy<sup>44</sup>.

Gustav Shpet's methodology. We try to interpret Shpet, Lossky, in our educational phenomenological method. According to Shpet, the experience itself must be pure (logical), and not a mental experience of the subject. The philosophy of G.G. Shpet has much in common with the philosophy of G.-G. Gadamer (in the illustration of the sign and meaning), as well as with the philosophy of M. Heidegger (in the style of "ontical dialectics").

Shpet develops a semiotic concept<sup>45</sup>, in which a phenomenological intuition and an indirect understanding of words as signs have a meaningful role. The problem is seen in how is possible to combine the theory of signs and immediate phenomenological perception of the concept? Immediately make a reservation. Shpet differentiates understanding and explanation. In the natural sciences, the leading positions are occupations, but in the social – relations of understanding.

The doctrine of signs becomes the main point in the philosophy of Shpet. He raises the question: how to achieve a rational understanding in history? Husserl reveals the concept of intellectual intuition and relies on it in his studies. Shpet talks about intelligent intuition. This intuition works in the sphere of social relations and connection with the phenomenon of understanding.

---

<sup>43</sup> T. G. Shchedrina, "I write like an echo of another...". Essays on the intellectual biography of Gustav Shpet (Moscow: 2004).

<sup>44</sup> G. G. Shpet, Essay on the development of Russian philosophy. Vol: 1 (Moscow: 2008).

<sup>45</sup> T. G. Shchedrina, "At the origins of Russian semiotics and structuralism (research of the family archive of Gustav Shpet)", Issues of philosophy, num 12 (2002): 75-78.



Understanding, according to Shpet, serves the purposes of explanation, which act as a historical (social) description. Shpet considers the phenomenon of regional understanding of rational knowledge. He reveals the "rational" (logical, ideal) through the ontology of the object and the sign correlative to it. First, the "logical" expresses the essence of an object or thing, and then the essence of a phenomenon (phenomenon) that is perceived by our consciousness. According to Shpet, the phenomenon cannot reveal the meaning to a person by simply "grasping" an object ("Erfassung"). First, a word-concept is formed that points to a thing. On the contrary, Husserl connects the object (denotation) and meaning in a single noesis-noematic "grasp". Shpet does not do that. He comes to the hermeneutic problem of understanding, where meaning is comprehended only through language, word, verbal expression.

The description of the thing contains its understanding. The concept is a logical unit with which the process of "grasping" begins. Shpet believes that the process of understanding is still the theoretical stage of "signification" (the stage of "giving meaning") of objectivity. Thus, Shpet comes to understanding the origins of hermeneutic.

Shpet pays an important attention to the concept of "goal". The purpose serves to describe phenomena. Phenomenological analysis begins with an examination of a thing, its meaning in a certain context. Such research is opposed to a formal approach in logic. In logic, we are talking only about the relationship between concepts without regard to the subject. At the same time, Shpet shows that the concept is broader than its formal definition, and this circumstance leads us to the problem of the formation of concepts, which are largely formed in an intuitive act, and are not formed by the formalization method from species to genus and back. For example, to call a person a person by analogy with his essence (a person is one who is able to perceive - Dialog "Cratylus" Plato), according to consonance, etc. Shpet claims the concept as intuition. But, nevertheless, the concept is a form, "exciting within its limits," possibly topical subjects. The concept has an internal logical form that delivers the "objective laws of thought itself". Before the logical "design" (in the form of a concept, a word), we are dealing with the idea of possibility. Understanding is an already realized thought, the unity of internal logical forms (concept, meaning, subject) as pure ideal forms and external grammatical forms. When we encounter the thought in possibility, we face the intuition of pre-emptive forms (Shpet calls it an intelligible intuition) as pure, ideal forms that connect the ideal being. Pre-predictive experience is social. In this experience, the leading elements are goals, motives. In Husserl's phenomenology, all ideals, all meanings, including logical-mathematical constructions, originate from the pre-predictive experience. When Husserl discovered the phenomenon of pre-predicative experience, he realized that the logical and pre-hyprological (pre-predicative) experience are correlated with each other. In the phenomenology of Shpet, the ontological basis becomes a correlative sign, its meaning and meaning. He sets for philosophy the task of "returning to the spring of pre-theoretical, living knowledge". We need to "remove the veil" and "catch" some genuine intimacy and in it the fullness of being". These are ciphers, or meanings of being. The concept does not contain a sense, but is formed about the already given meaning. This meaning is "the true fullness of being", its essence.

This approach of Shpet to the word-concept is consistent with the concept of Gadamer. When there is an explication of thinking in a word, the logical accomplishment of the language becomes visible. And then the reality comes to the fore. The natural system of concept formation subordinates the logic to itself. Otherwise, speech would always be brought to the already known verbal meaning. Meanwhile, it is a process of the continuous formation of concepts, of all possible meanings. Extremely common concepts (categories)

are so general that they hardly emerged in an abstract way without the involvement of ontological understanding and practices. The genius of linguistic consciousness is that it is able to express linguistic similarity without resorting to classifications and abstractions. Gadamer calls this phenomenon of language a fundamental metaphor. A portable meaning of the word he suggests including in the rank of all values of the word without exception<sup>46</sup>. Gadamer believes that it is "the linguistic character of our experience of the world that precedes everything that we know and express as being"<sup>47</sup>. On the other hand, the factuality (empiricality, spontaneity) of the language does not need to be confused with the factuality of science, since the language itself already has a distance in relation to facts, therefore the language itself does not create the objectivity that natural sciences achieve by eliminating subjectivity.

Thus, in the theory of knowledge, Shpet acts as an ontologist. But can he be attributed to real phenomenologists?

Some scientists consider Shpet to be the real phenomenologists<sup>48</sup>, which is a special issue. Nevertheless, there is an issue of ontology in Russian philosophy.

## Study results

1. Epistemological foundations of the phenomenological tradition in Russia, on the one hand, are manifested in a peculiar understanding of Kantian transcendental subjectivism and the rejection of agnosticism and, on the other hand, detect their expression in the original reception of Husserl's phenomenology, in particular, in a peculiar interpretation, an epistemological problem of the relationship between logical and mental stated by him.

2. Phenomenological tradition in Russian philosophy of the late XIX - first half of XX century is not reduced to the reception of Husserl's phenomenology, which is primarily evidenced by the comparison of Husserl's phenomenology with the phenomenological-hermeneutic concepts of G.G. Shpet.

3. In the philosophical concepts of the pre-phenomenological period P.D Yurkevich<sup>49</sup>, V. Solovyov<sup>50</sup>, L.M. Lopatin<sup>51</sup>, S.N. Trubetskoy<sup>52</sup> Kantian anti-metaphysical attitudes and the criticism of Kantian agnosticism are combined. At the same time, they clearly see criticism of subjectivism and an appeal to the "common" (in communicating the emerging) nature of consciousness, which allows us to talk about the phenomenological direction of their epistemological quests.

5. Specificity of the phenomenological tradition of the first half of XX century in Russia is manifested as a special epistemological perspective of the consideration of cognitive

<sup>46</sup> G. G. Gadamer, *Truth and method* (Moscow: 1988).

<sup>47</sup> G. G. Gadamer, *Truth and method...*

<sup>48</sup> A. A. Shiyan, "Husserl's Phenomenology or Realistic Phenomenology? To clarify the phenomenological position of Gustav Shpet", *Phenomenological and ontological design of G.G. Shpet and humanitarian projects of the XX-XXI centuries: G.G. Shpet / Comprehensio. Sixth Shpet readings*. Tomsk: 2015.

<sup>49</sup> S. L. Frank, *Knowledge subject. The soul of man* (St. Petersburg: 1995).

<sup>50</sup> S. N. Trubetskoy, *Written Works* (Moscow: 1994).

<sup>51</sup> L. M. Lopatin, *Axioms of Philosophy* (Moscow: 1996).

<sup>52</sup> S. N. Trubetskoy, *Written Works...*

problem, continuing the tradition of pre-phenomenological period: in the treatment of Russian philosophers to the study of intellectual intuition (G.G. Shpet, B.V. Yakovenko), transcendental phenomenological reduction (S.L. Frank, N.O. Lossky); in the anti-psychological sense of logic (G.G. Shpet, A.F. Losev), as well as in substantiating the collective as an intersubjective character of consciousness (G.G. Shpet, S.L. Frank, and A.F. Losev). Phenomenological concepts constituted an epistemological core in the concepts of Russian philosophers.

6. For the phenomenological concept of Shpet, taken in the hermeneutic perspective, it is fundamentally important that the meaning of the concept expressed in language is not simply "grasped", but located on the boundary of contemplated and intelligible. This opens up for Shpet a perspective of semiotic and structuralist issues. Ontologizing the phenomenology at the level of the phenomenon, Shpet, nevertheless, rationalizes understanding through a sign and the associated verbal meaning.

7. The undivided nature of the subject and the object in a single cognitive act has a phenomenological nature in A.F. Losev's concept and in fact serves as an epistemological basis for his conception of the myth, wherein the subject and the object are not dissected in the concept, word, symbol, mythical and come from the depth of understanding of the subject.

8. Dialectics of Losev's identity and differences and Shpet's "dialectic of scientific concepts" are correlative to each other in interpreting the word as a sign of communication and understanding. In Losev, both poetic and mythical being is immediate. He grasps a purely phenomenological understanding of myth and poetry. Shpet has a different understanding. In the word, he finds logical forms of expression that convey meaning to the word.

## Discussions

According to Berdyaev, philosophy is an ontology, because it seeks to know the subject. We tried to identify the difference between the philosophy of Lossky and Shpet. This difference is on the borderline of thinking and being. In Lossky's philosophy, thinking becomes itself. This process is largely mystical. Lossky's goal is to show how knowledge itself is in reality, because being is always immanent in thought. The main task of Lossky is to demonstrate the immediacy of the perception of the external world, the non-self world. Lossky calls this perception mystical empiricism. He says that, like internal and external perception, it is also directly. According to Lossky, existence exists as an independent substance, but, nevertheless, in the act of perception it becomes immanent subjective consciousness. However, not consciousness at all, as in the philosophy of V. Schuppe. In the act of perception, the external world becomes an immanent inner world. Consequently, Lossky affirms the immediacy of the perception of the external world. The presence of cognizable being in the cognitive act is the main thing in his teaching. Being dominates man, enters into it with necessity, and the laws of logic are a function of the being itself, but not the subject. The criterion of truth is in the world itself, and not in the subject's thinking. Lossky singles out a primary, irrational consciousness in which living connections with being are given. His initial feelings are a life drama. Separation into a subject and an object is secondary. Initially, there was only coherence, wholeness, non-division into subject and object. This is the so-called pre-philosophical, pre-reflective consciousness. At the same time, Lossky, unlike Avenarius, proceeds from universal being, sees in the thinking the function of the world spirit, and not the psychology of the individual, so Lossky believes that

any perception is mystic. "The metaphysical principles that are in the world, and even the supernormal beginning, God, are known by mystical intuition," he says. So, the person is available, not only his own, but another's mental life<sup>53</sup>.

In this article, we will not protest or argue against this statement. Our method does not allow us to give an exact answer to this statement, which runs beyond time and space. This circumstance is the main contradiction of Lossky. To all other things, he has lost the content of knowledge (the semiotic problem of the meaning of the word). But the knowledge of the world should not be based on a naive ontological foundation, but be a rational ontology. Gustav Shpet lays the foundation for rational ontology. *Essentia*, or essence (*Wesen*) is the carrier of a rational foundation. *Essentia* is also a source of internal understanding of things. The essence of things (*essential rerum*) is the totality of its essential attributes. These signs make up the content of things. For example, an equilateral triangle has three equal sides. Essence (*essentia*) is the ideal source of being. In order for a thing to be actual, another physical reason is needed. For example, the sun heats a stone. One can not ignore the fact that Kant destroyed the explanation of a thing from its essence, that is, of an internal cause and left only an explanation from external, natural causes. Kant introduces the concept of transcendental subjectivity and flushes the ontological foundation from philosophy. This ontological basis (objective, natural) in philosophy is at the same time a rational basis. Nevertheless, Kant divided the basis of knowledge into logical and real, and at the same time asked the question: "How do I understand that if something exists, then there is another?"<sup>54</sup>. Kant, according to Shpet argues a misunderstanding of Wolff's philosophy, which soon passed into the history of philosophy as a tradition. Thus, Kant lost the sufficient foundation of Wolff as a qualitative explanation of the *essentia* of things and at the same time introduced a logical explanation into philosophy<sup>55</sup>. This logical explanation is performed by the transcendental subject.

On the other hand, Lossky also has another reason for criticism. This fact is Kant's doctrine of the "thing-in-itself". The "thing-in-itself" is a consequence of the washing away of the ontological, and therefore rational basis from the thing.

In Husserl's philosophy, the role of the rational basis is played by a pure intuitive perception of the object (see "pure object"). This circumstance contributed to the further development of phenomenology in the direction of language and the meaning of concepts. This understanding we see in Heidegger, Gadamer and Shpet. We believe that a rational understanding of the ontological problem marked the beginning of phenomenology in Russia. Meanwhile, the Russian phenomenological philosophy begins to take shape only under the influence of Husserl. Separate philosophers, such as N.O. Lossky, S.L. Frank, and A.F. Losev, advanced their phenomenological concepts and did not strictly follow Husserl's phenomenology. However, this circumstance is not too out of the general diverse background of the phenomenological movement.

The study reveals the issue of phenomenological tradition, the origins of phenomenological tradition in Russia at the end of the XIX - first half of XX century, and its epistemological specificity is grounded. A comparative analysis of the concepts of E. Husserl

---

<sup>53</sup> N. V. Motroshilova, *Concepts of Edmund Husserl as an introduction to phenomenology* (Moscow: 2003).

<sup>54</sup> G. G. Shpet "On the history of rationalism of the XVIII century", *Issues of philosophy and psychology*. Moscow, num 126 (1) (1915): 1-61.

<sup>55</sup> G. G. Shpet "On the history of rationalism..."

and H. Shpet, and the main provisions of the phenomenological studies of P.D. Yurkevich, V. S. Solovyov, S. N. Trubetskoy, L. M. Lopatin are carried out.

The question of the legitimacy of phenomenological tradition isolation in Russian philosophy is debatable and causes a controversy among historians of philosophy. And not only because the very concept of "tradition" in the historical and philosophical context has many interpretations. In the Russian language, the word "*традиция*" (tradition) (from the Latin *traditio* - transfer) has the following meanings:

- 1) something that passes or passed from one generation to another by tradition, oral or literary transmission (e.g. ideas, knowledge, views, mode of action, tastes, etc.);
- 2) a custom, entrenched order in anything.

For the author of this work, as will be proved below, the first meaning is important. It should be borne in mind that, for example, G.-G. Gadamer understands the "tradition" in at least three senses:

- 1) a continuity of transmission and preservation of intellectual and cultural experience in any historical changes;
- 2) the content of something transmitted, concluded in the texts;
- 3) a recognition of historical authority.

Here, Gadamer notes that the very recognition of authority is not dogmatic, but critical and dialogical. And, finally, for us the interpretation of the concept of "tradition", which was implemented by Jaspers, is important. He understood the tradition as a "historical memory", i.e. as a search for "the deep movements of human development, its origins, enlightenment and great steps. Usually they can be achieved only in the break through dense undergrowth of the secondary". With all the variation in the meaning of the word "tradition", we adhere to the meaning of this concept in Jaspers, with Gadamer's first meaning taken into account. And above all, because it is not a historical tradition of intellectual culture in Russia, but a certain specific tradition: phenomenological.

In Jaspers' term, the "secondary" nature of historical tradition emphasized by him is important, which for the author of this article acquires a special significance. After all, as we know, phenomenology is a European phenomenon and its source - in Husserl's reasoning. Consequently, the Russian phenomenological tradition is a "secondary" phenomenon with respect to Husserl's reasoning. However, in the very Russian philosophy of the late XIX and early XX centuries, a special style of philosophical thinking in relation to the issue of consciousness - "ontologism" (or, according to Shpet, the tradition of "positive philosophy") developed, so to speak. And in this sense, Russian philosophers of the late XIX and early XX centuries were in a special "sphere of conversation", in which a thought was understood. And this "sphere of conversation", according to the author believes, is the "tradition" (in the first sense of Gadamer). Thus, the appropriateness of historical and philosophical reconstruction of the phenomenological concepts of Russian philosophers as a special "phenomenological tradition" is also legitimate due to the secondary nature of this phenomenon (as a dialogical response to Husserl's concept), and at the same time because of its uniqueness as a special epistemological phenomenon.

A fundamental analysis of phenomenological tradition was made by J. Seifert. In his works he projects ontological issues on the European personalist tradition. This approach seems to the author of the article to be extremely promising, but requiring a critical analysis,

since the interpretation of J. Seifert overlooks the concept of Shpet. No less interesting is the interpretation of I.M. Chubarov, who distinguishes the reception of Husserl phenomenology and phenomenological philosophy in Russia at the end of the XIX - first half of XX century. He also formulates the thesis that the Russian philosophy of this period has its own specifics and enters with a phenomenological concept of Husserl into a complex and contradictory relationship.

The fact is that the very ontological issue really occupies a rather significant stratum in Russian philosophy and is one of the main issues of the late XIX - early XX century. If by phenomenology we mean the Kantian issue of consciousness phenomena, then the Russian ontology can also be called phenomenology. But if we understand phenomenology according to Husserl, its phenomenology, then we can say that the issue of consciousness phenomena was not solved uniquely by Russian, not by the phenomenological method, and sometimes by other methods (for example, immanence and personalism of N.O. Lossky). So, the author proceeds from the premise that the phenomenological tradition in Russia began long before Husserl and his "Logical studies".

Thus, this article justifies the legitimacy of investigating the phenomenological concepts of Russian philosophers as a special tradition that has its own epistemological specifics. Also, the thesis that epistemological foundations of the phenomenological tradition in Russia, on the one hand, are manifested in a peculiar understanding of the Kantian transcendental subjectivism and the rejection of agnosticism and, on the other hand, find their expression in the original reception of Husserl's phenomenology, in particular, in the peculiar interpretation of gnosiology issue set by him to the relation between logical and mental.

## Conclusion

This study fills the gap in the problem field of research on the history of philosophy. The proposed work carried an independent historical and philosophical analysis that contributes to a better understanding of Russian phenomenological tradition and helps to comprehend its place, role and significance in the history of philosophy and philosophical thinking. The study contributes to the discovery of new research perspectives: its content and conclusions can be used in further works devoted to the study of phenomenological philosophy, the history of Russian philosophy and epistemology in general. The theoretical significance of study results also is also in the establishment of the relevance of domestic phenomenological philosophy for modern scientific and philosophical studies of the methodology of humanitarian knowledge, which allows us to take a fresh look at the phenomenological movement represented by various streams. The materials of this study can be used in preparing and reading the training courses for students, undergraduates and graduate students in philosophy, history of philosophy, philosophical anthropology, history of Russian philosophy, and also involved in the preparation of courses in logic, psychology, ontology, and theory of knowledge.

## References

Brodsky, A. I. "On One Error of Russian Liberalism". *Issues of Philosophy*, num 10 (1911): 154-159.

Chubarov, I. M. "Gustav Shpet and the modern philosophy of humanitarian knowledge. To the 130th anniversary of G.G. Shpet. The second meeting. Proceedings of the "round table". *Issues of philosophy*, num 7 (2010): 1-69.

Chubarov, I. M. "Modification of the phenomenological paradigm of understanding consciousness in the project of hermeneutic dialectics by Gustav Gustavovich Shpet". The creative heritage of G.G. Shpet and modern philosophical issues: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference. Tomsk, 27-33. 1997

Chubarov, I. M. Modification of the phenomenological paradigm of understanding consciousness in Russian philosophy the end of XIX - the early XX centuries. Dis. Cand. Philos. Sciences. D. 8381-98. Moscow. 1997

Denn, M. "Imedism and its philosophical vices: from the substitute of glossolalia to the justification of temporality". Issues of Philosophy, num 12 (2002): 93-104.

Evlampiev, I. I. "A Man in the Face of Absolute Being: Mystical Realism of Semyon Frank".

Frank S.L. Subject of Knowledge. The soul of man. St. Petersburg: 1995.

Evlampiev, I. I. Phenomenological philosophy of Shpet. History of Russian philosophy. Moscow. 2002.

Frank, S. L. Knowledge subject. The soul of man. St. Petersburg. 1995.

Gadamer, G. G. Truth and method. Moscow. 1988.

Gaidenko, P. P. "Hierarchical personalism N.O. Lossky". Lossky N.O. Sensual, intellectual and mystical intuition. Moscow. 1999.

Gessen, S. I. Selected works. Moscow. 1999.

Haardt, A. "Edmund Husserl and the phenomenological movement in Russia in the 10th and 20th years". Issues of Philosophy, num 5 (1994): 57-63.

Kalinichenko, V. V. "Gustav Shpet: from phenomenology to hermeneutics". Logos, num 3 (1992): 37-61.

Kuznetsov, V. G. "Hermeneutics and its path from a specific technique to a philosophical stream". Logos, num 10 (1999): 43-88.

Lantz, G. "Edmund Husserl and the psychologists of our days". Issues of philosophy and psychology, num 98 (1909): 393-494.

Lectorsky, V. A. "German philosophy and Russian humanitarian thought: S.L. Rubinshtein and G.G. Shpet ". Issues of Philosophy, num 10 (2001): 129-139.

Lopatin, L.M. Axioms of Philosophy. Moscow. 1996.

Losev, A. F. Personality and Absolute. Moscow. 1999.

Lossky, N. O. History of Russian Philosophy. Moscow. 1991.

Lossky, N. O. Justification of intuition. Moscow. 1991.

Lossky, N. O. The doctrine of reincarnation. Intuitionism. Moscow. 1991.

Marcinkovskaya, T. D. "Issues of the psychology of social life in the work of G.G. Shpet". Issues of art history XI, num 2 (1997): 50-60.

Martsinkovskaya, T. D. "The issues of aesthetic experiences in the concept of G.G. Shpet". Gustav Gustavovich Shpet: archival materials, memoirs, articles. Moscow. 2000.

Martsinkovskaya, T. D. "The issues of ethnic experiences in the concept of "psychology of social life" by G.G. Shpet (To the 120th anniversary of his birth)". Issues of psychology, num 6 (1999): 119-127.

Martsinkovskaya, T. D., y Yaroshevsky M. G. "Unknown pages of papers by G.I. Chelpanov". Issues of philosophy, num 6 (1999): 99-107.

Molchanov, V. I. "Analytical phenomenology in the logical study of Edmund Husserl". E. Husserl. Logical research. vol II part I. Studies on phenomenology and the theory of knowledge. Moscow. 2011.

Molchanov, V. I. "Foreword". Phenomenology of the inner consciousness of time. Collected Works Vol: 1 (1994): 7-14.

Molchanov, V. I. "Phenomenology in Russia". New Philosophical Encyclopedia, Vol: 4 (2010).

Molchanov, V. I. "Prerequisites and non-predispostality of phenomenological philosophy". Logos, num 10 (1999): 16-28.

Molchanov, V. I. "The concept of reflexion in the context of phenomenological doctrine of time". Criticism of the phenomenological direction of modern bourgeois philosophy. Riga: 1981: 121-140.

Molchanov, V. I. "The premise of identity and the analyst of differences". Logos, num 11-12 (1999): 183-208.

Molchanov, V. I. Distinguishing and experience: the phenomenology of non-aggressive consciousness. Moscow. 2004.

Motroshilova, N. V. Concepts of Edmund Husserl as an introduction to phenomenology. Moscow. 2003.

Ogurtsov, A. P. "Reflexion", Philosophical Encyclopedia. Vol. 4. (1967). "Phenomenology". Philosophical Encyclopedia, Vol: 5 (1970).

Poleva, N. S. "The inner form of a work of art as an object of scientific research". Gustav Gustavovich Shpet: archival materials, memoirs, articles. Moscow. 2002.

Pruzhinin, B. I. "Ratio serviens?". Contours of cultural and historical epistemology. Moscow. 2004.

Seyfert, J. "Significance of Husserl's logical research for realistic phenomenology and criticism of some Husserl theses". Issues of Philosophy, num 10 (2006): 130-152.



Shchedrina, T. G. "I write like an echo of another...". Essays on the intellectual biography of Gustav Shpet. Moscow. 2004.

Shchedrina, T. G. "At the origins of Russian semiotics and structuralism (research of the family archive of Gustav Shpet)". Issues of philosophy, num 12 (2002): 75-78.

Shiyan, A. A. "Husserl's Phenomenology or Realistic Phenomenology? To clarify the phenomenological position of Gustav Shpet". Phenomenological and ontological design of G.G. Shpet and humanitarian projects of the XX-XXI centuries: G.G. Shpet / Comprehensio. Sixth Shpet readings. Tomsk. 2015.

Shpet, G. G. "On the history of rationalism of the XVIII century". Issues of philosophy and psychology. Moscow: Vol: 126 num 1 (1915): 1-61.

Shpet, G. G. Essay on the development of Russian philosophy. Vol: 1. Moscow. 2008.

Shpet, G. G. History as an issue of logic. Critical and methodological studies. Moscow. 2002.

Shpet, G. G. Phenomenology and meaning: Phenomenology as the main science and its issues. Moscow. 1914.

Shpigelberg, G. Phenomenological movement. Moscow. 2002.

Soloviev, S. M. "The first beginning of theoretical philosophy". Issues of philosophy and psychology, num 5 Vol: 40 (1897): 867-915.

Trubetskoy, S. N. Written works. Moscow. 1994.

Vokach, N. "Zigwart and the Problem of Logic". Issues of Philosophy and Psychology, num 109 (1911): 449-471; num 110 (1911): 681-724.

Yakovenko, B. V. "Philosophy of Edmund Husserl". New concepts in philosophy. III. Theory of knowledge. I. St. Petersburg. 74-146.

Yurkevich, P. D. Philosophical works. Moscow. 1990.

Zenkovsky, V. V. History of Russian philosophy, vol 2. Moscow-Rostov n / D. 1999.

Zinchenko, V. P. y Mamardashvili Moscow. K. "Study of higher mental functions and category of the unconscious". Issues of Philosophy, num 10 (1991): 34-40.

## CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo  
Puede hacerse sin permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**, citando la fuente.