



KRAKOW MEETINGS JUNE 12-14, 2024
KRAKOW CONFERENCES THE MAIN LIBRARY
OF RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY OF THE PONTIFICAL
2024 UNIVERSITY OF JOHN PAUL II
IN KRAKOW

NICOLAS BERDYAEV AND RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY IN THE WEST

ORGANIZERS

Faculty of Philosophy of the Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow
Northwestern University Research Initiative in Russian Philosophy, Literature, and Religious Thought

ACADEMIC BOARD

Prof. Sr Teresa Obolovitch •
The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Poland
Prof. Randall Poole • College of St. Scholastica, USA
Prof. Ana Siljak • University of Florida, USA

ADVISORY BOARD

Dr. Pawel Rojek • Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland
Prof. Gennadii Aliaiev • Poltava, Ukraine
Prof. Daniela Steila • University of Turin, Italy
Prof. Marina F. Bykova • North Carolina State University, USA

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Prof. Ana Siljak • University of Florida, USA
Rev. Panteleimon Pavlincuc •
Holy Trinity Theological School in Paris, France

HONORARY PATRONAGE

"Studies in East European Thought" • SEET

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME AVAILABLE AT KRAKOWMEETINGS.UPJP2.EDU.PL

ORGANIZERS



Uniwersytet Papieski
Jana Pawla II
w Krakowie

Northwestern
University

HONORARY
PATRONAGE



STUDIES IN
EAST EUROPEAN
THOUGHT

WEDNESDAY, June 12, 2024

9.30 Sr. Teresa Obolevitch, The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Head of the Organizing Committee **Opening of the Conference** (Conference Hall)

Section 1 (Conference Hall, chair: Randall A. Poole)

9.40 Ana Siljak, University of Florida, USA

The Hidden Russia in Continental Philosophy: Preliminary Sketches for Future Research

10.20 Rev. Panteleimon Pavlinciuc, Holy Trinity Theological School in Paris, France

The house of Berdyaev as a croissance between the cultures, religious practices and philosophical ideas

11.00-11.30 Discussion

11.30 The Official Photo Shoot

11.40-12.00 Coffee break

Section 2a (Conference Hall, chair: Ana Siljak)

12.00 Christos Veskokis, University of Exeter, The United Kingdom

"Homo Mysticus": An Exploration of Nikolai Berdyaev's Concept of Intuition

12.30 Victor Chernyshov, National University "Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic", Ukraine (online)

Nicolas Berdyaev's Reception and Criticism of Thomism

13.00 Paweł Rojek, Jagiellonian University, Poland

Hope and Eschatology. August Cieszkowski, Nikolai Berdyaev and John Paul II

13.30-14.00 Discussion

Section 2b (Room 211, chair: Irina Danilova)

12.00 Nataliia Shelkovaia, Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University, Ukraine, USERN

Erotology of Nikolai Berdyaev and Mikhail Epstein

12.30 Rev. Aleksander Posacki SJ, Collegium Verum, Poland

Николай Бердяев как критик теософии Елены Блаватской, антропософии Рудольфа Штайнера и различных форм оккультизма и эзотеризма в России

13.00 Paulina Czoska, University of Warsaw, Poland

Важность понятия Ungrund в философии Николая Александровича Бердяева

13.30-14.00 Discussion

14.00-15.00 Lunch

Section 3 (Conference Hall, chair: Christos Veskokis)

15.00 Elizabeth Blake, Saint Louis University, USA

The Former Prisoners Nikolai Berdyaev and Fedor Dostoevsky on Confinement, Personality, and Revolutionaries

15.30 Maciej Wołkow, University of Warsaw, Poland

Nikolai Berdyaev on Death penalty

16.00 Ivan Kurilovich, Russian State University for the Humanities, Russia (online)

Berdyaev and Kojève: two Interpretations of Freedom

16.30-17.00 Discussion

17.00-17.20 Coffee break

Section 4a (Conference Hall, chair: Hanuš Nykl)

17.20 Iuliia Kuznetsova, The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Kraków, Poland (online)

Бердяев о кризисе искусства: дематериализация и развоплощение живописи

17.50 Elena Tverdislova, Independent scholar, Israel

Актуальность процесса самопознания у Н.А. Бердяева и идеи экзистенциализма и феноменологии

18.20-18.50 Discussion

Section 4b (Room 211, chair: James Roberts)

17.20 Aleksandra Berdnikova, FINO Consortium, University of Turin, Italy

"New Middle Ages" of N.A. Berdyaev in European theology

17.50 Tomasz Herbich, Warsaw University, Poland

Ontological philosophy and the phenomenology of spiritual experience. On Nicolay Berdyaev's two philosophies

18.20-18.50 Discussion

18.50 Dinner

THURSDAY, June 13, 2024

Section 5 (Conference Hall, chair: Larisa Oldyreva)

9.30 Randall Poole, College of St. Scholastica, USA

Nicolas Berdyaev and the Twentieth-Century History of Human Rights

10.00 Sławomir Mazurek, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland

True and False Religious Transformation in Berdyaev's Philosophy of History

10.30 Kåre Johan Mjør, Western Norway University of Applied Sciences

Nikolai Berdiaev and the Meanings of History

11.00-11.30 Discussion

11.30-12.00 Coffee break

Section 6 (Conference Hall, chair: Aleksandra Berdnikova)

12.00 Ekaterina Shashlova, Charles University, Czech Republic

Бердяев и Кожев о свободе, праве на насилие и борьбе за признание

12.30 Anna Reznichenko, Russian State University for the Humanities, Russia (online)

Н.А. Бердяев о рабстве и свободе и проблема "moral qualia": С.Н. Булгаков и Эллис

13.00-13.30 Discussion

13.30-14.30 Lunch

Section 7a (Conference Hall, chair: Romilo Aleksandar Knežević)

14.30 Yuki Fukui, Waseda University, Japan

Thinking about Science and Religion in Russian Religious Thought from Berdyaev's Viewpoint

15.00 Frederick Matern, Saint Paul University, Canada (online)

"Escape from the Last Judgment": Berdyaev's Reception of Cosmism

15.30-16.00 Discussion

Section 7b (Room 211, chair: Elena Tverdislova)

14.30 Mikolaj Banaszkiwicz, National Library, Poland

Либеральные критики Н.А. Бердяева в дореволюционной России

15.00 Vadzim Antsipau, University of Zielona Góra, Poland

За пределами утопии: Бердяев об анархизме Кропоткина и иллюзиях коллективизма

15.30-16.00 Discussion

16.00-16.30 Coffee break

Section 8a (Conference Hall, chair: Kåre Johan Mjør)

16.30 James Roberts, Independent scholar, The United Kingdom

Birth, Freedom and Creativity: Mother Maria Skobtsova's engagement with Nikolai Berdyaev

17.00 Raul-Ovidiu Bodea, University of Oradea, Romania

The Question of Ethical Knowledge in Nikolai Berdyaev and the Wider Context of Existential Philosophy

17.30 Emmanuel Ehinon Arikhan, The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Poland (online)

Edith Stein's Unrepeatable Singularity and Nikolai Berdyaev's Personality as Corrective Framework for Social Media Engagement

18.00-18.30 Discussion

Section 8b (Room 211, chair: Gennadii Aliaiev)

16.30 Hanuš Nykl, Charles University, Czech Republic

Николай Бердяев и Чехия: связи и восприятие

17.00 Larisa Oldyreva and Irina Danilova, University in Gothenburg, Sweden

Интерпретация идей Бердяева современными скандинавскими исследователями

17.30 Svetlana Panich, Wycliffe College, University of Toronto, Canada

Архиепископ Кентерберийский Роуэн Уильямс как читатель Николая Бердяева

18.00-18.30 Discussion

18.30 Dinner

FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 2024

Section 9a (Conference Hall, chair: Bradley Underwood)

9.30 Daniel Kisliakov, University of Divinity, Australia

Consideration of Nikolai Berdyaev from an Anthropological Point of View

10.00 Kamil Wojtowicz, University of Zielona Góra, Poland

Nicolas Berdyaev in Polish philosophical research from 2008 to 2023

10.30 Vladimir Alexander Smith-Mesa, UCL SSEES (School of Slavonic and East European Studies),
Library, The United Kingdom (online)

Berdyaev & Us. Nikolai Alexandrovich in the Hispanic World

11.00-11.30 Discussion

Section 9b (Room 211, chair: Svetlana Panich)

9.30 Gennadii Aliaiev, Independent scholar, Ukraine

«Я признаю основные Ваши утверждения, и расхожусь с Вами только в том, что не разделяю Ваших отрицаний». О переписке между С. Франком и Н. Бердяевым

10.00 Pylyp Bilyi, University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland

Диалог философов об интуиции. Николай Бердяев и Николай Лосский

10.30 Nikolai Kostin, The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Poland

Концепция личности у Н.А. Бердяева и Л.П. Карсавина

11.00-11.30 Discussion

11.30-11.50 Coffee break

Section 10 (Conference Hall, chair: Paweł Rojek)

11.50 Nataliya Petreshak, The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Poland (online)

Nikolas Berdyaev's: The Personality of the Philosopher in Memories

12.20 Romilo Aleksandar Knežević, University of Niš, Serbia

Nikolai Berdyaev: A Third Kind of Non-being and a New Ontology

12.50 Bradley Underwood, Northwestern University, USA

Nothing From Nothing: The Underground in Sergei Bulgakov and Nikolai Berdyaev

13.20-13.50 Discussion

13.50-14.00 Closing remarks of the conference (Conference Hall)

14.00-15.00 Lunch

Meeting link:

<https://upjp2.webex.com/upjp2-en/j.php?MTID=m12472b65f482a40efd1423207d4e45b8>

Meeting number: 2732 702 7749

Password: Nicolas

Internet Access: Internet Access: UPJP2 Czytelnia, password Biblioteka7

Social Media: facebook.com/krakowmeetings, instagram.com/krakowmeetings

Ana Siljak

University of Florida, USA

THE HIDDEN RUSSIA IN CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY: PRELIMINARY SKETCHES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The field of Russian intellectual history contains no shortage of scholarly investigations into the impact of European thought in Russia. By comparison, the Russian influence on European thought receives far less attention, incommensurate with the extent of such influence, especially in the twentieth century. Nikolai Berdiaev is perhaps the most obvious example of a now forgotten philosopher who was once read by a wide array of European thinkers. By providing a few concrete examples of the hidden Russian influence on such disparate philosophers as Sigmund Freud, Max Weber, Jacques Maritain, and Leo Strauss, this talk will speculate on the reasons for the invisibility of Russian ideas in Continental philosophy and will offer some suggestions for further research.

Rev. Panteleimon Pavlinciuc

Holy Trinity Theological School in Paris, France

THE HOUSE OF BERDYAEV AS A CROISSANCE BETWEEN THE CULTURES, RELIGIOUS PRACTICES AND PHILOSOPHICAL IDEAS

The house of Nicolas Berdiaev can be considered a nexus point between different cultures, religious practices and philosophical ideologies. Some places, have a special historical significance, for fostering and preserving understanding and exchange. One such place, is the house of Nicolas Berdiaev. The last years of Berdiaev's life were intense and highly fruitful. From 1937 until 1948, his house, became an active centre for spirituality, philosophy and even political resistance, leading many people with diverse cultural, religious and political beliefs and backgrounds, to pass through this meeting point. We find philosophers, theologians, writers, artists etc., some as friends, others as the adversaries of philosophy, engaged in open dialogue and mutual learning and understanding. How was it possible to transform a Parisian suburban house of emigrants and strangers, into a representative house for France's intelligentsia? The Berdiaev couple, created an atmosphere of peace and comfort and always remained curious and sympathetic to different or opposing views and causes. To shed more light, my presentation, will be focusing on the day-to-day agenda and activities of the Berdeaev home.

Christos Veskoukis

University of Exeter, The United Kingdom

“HOMO MYSTICUS”: AN EXPLORATION OF NIKOLAI BERDYAEV'S CONCEPT OF INTUITION

Although after the 1960s, Berdiaev's widely translated religious-philosophical work lost much of its former popularity and fell almost into obscurity in the West, from the 2000s onwards, there has been a steady increase of interest in Berdiaev's oeuvre in the English language literature. Several scholars have grappled with Berdiaev's ideas, and a notable number of academic books, articles, and doctoral theses examining key aspects of Berdiaev's thought, such as creativity, freedom, and personality, are nowadays available in English. That notwithstanding, a glance at the anglophone Berdiaev scholarship reveals that despite its centrality in Berdiaev's thought, Berdiaev's concept of intuition has not yet been adequately explored by Berdiaev scholars. To fill this gap in the English-language Berdiaev scholarship, my paper focuses on Berdiaev's understanding of intuition and provides a comprehensive presentation of it, guided by three primary objectives. First, to explain the overarching role intuition plays in Berdiaev's religious philosophy. Second, to illustrate how Berdiaev's intuition connects with the Bible, and third, to point out the differences between Berdiaev's intuition and the conception of intuition articulated by German idealist philosophers (mainly Kant).

Victor Chernyshov

National University "Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic", Ukraine

NICOLAS BERDYAEV'S RECEPTION AND CRITICISM OF THOMISM

Being expelled from soviet Russia, and living in exile in Paris, Berdyaev had an opportunity to acquaint closely both with the doctrinal side of contemporary Thomism as well as with a few most brilliant representatives of Thomistic thought. There are many evidences of his close connections and communications with Jacques Maritain, Etienne Gilson, and other scholars and thinkers associating themselves with Thomistic tradition. The major focus of the intended presentation is, however, on Berdyaev's reception and attitude towards Thomism. The analysis of Berdyaev's criticism reveals that the Russian thinker approaches Thomism rather from the standpoint of Modernism than searching unbiasedly for the truth *sub specie aeternitatis* from the position of *Philosophia perennis*.

Paweł Rojek

Jagiellonian University, Poland

HOPE AND ESCHATOLOGY. AUGUST CIESZKOWSKI, NIKOLAI BERDYAEV AND JOHN PAUL II

Young Karol Wojtyła, the future Pope John Paul II, read Berdyaev's *The New Middle Ages* during the Second World War. The book helped him formulate his own position on the possibility of the Christian transformation of the world. Tomasz Herbich in his book *Desiring the Kingdom: August Cieszkowski, Nikolai Berdyaev and the Two Faces of Messianism* pointed out that there were two basic Christian attitudes toward the world. Cieszkowski optimistically believed in the possibility of transforming the world in a Christian way, while Berdyaev, on the other hand, in the face of the communist revolution, abandoned such faith, even though he still preached the necessity of heroic engagement with history. I will try to show that Wojtyła accepted neither the optimism of Cieszkowski nor the fatalism of Berdyaev. For, as his wartime writings show, although human efforts are not sufficient to transform the world, they are not doomed to failure. Ultimately, the fate of the world remains in God's hands.

Bibliography:

Herbich, Tomasz. *Pragnienie Królestwa. August Cieszkowski, Mikołaj Bierdiajew i dwa oblicza mesjanizmu*. Warszawa: Teologia Polityczna 2018.

Rojek, Paweł. "Dwa oblicza mesjanizmu." *Nowe Książki* 6 (2019): 63.

Rojek, Paweł. *Liturgia dziejów. Jan Paweł II i polski mesjanizm*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo M, 2016.

Radziwiłł, Anna. "Człowiek a Bóg w ujęciu Jana Pawła II i rosyjskiej myśli filozoficznej na przykładzie koncepcji Mikołaja Bierdiajewa i Piotra Czaadajewa." In Jan Paweł II. *Apostoł Słowian wschodnich*, ed. by Anna Radziwiłł. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2008.

Nataliia Shelkovaia

Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University, Ukraine, USERN

EROTOLOGY OF NIKOLAI BERDYAEV AND MIKHAIL EPSTEIN

Eros has been an integral theme from antiquity to the present day in both philosophy and art, and it is not only reflected and interpreted in creativity but is also its source. This was paid special attention to by Nikolai Berdyaev, who stood at the origins of erotology as a philosophical discipline, and Mikhail Epstein, who developed the philosophical and philological apparatus of erotology, emphasizing that if you write the Russian word *человек* using the Cyrillic and Latin alphabet, as *chlovek*, then we will see that love is the root of this word, that is, the root from which a person grows. The destruction of this root leads to a person's loss of the ability to love all people and the whole world as God loves them, and, as a consequence, to the death of a genuine, God-like person. And this is very important. Especially today.

Why has the understanding of the essential roots of human being not been developed, and the science of "erotology" still exists only in the concept of Berdyaev and Epstein? Why do the Freudian (and before it, the ancient Indian) concepts of sexual energy (Sanskrit – कुण्डलिनी, *kuṇḍalinī*), as a source of

creativity, develop so little in theories of creativity? Why does the cult of sexuality really flourish today, while love often exists only “in words”? Is sex debauchery or the highest manifestation of God’s first blessing, “Be fruitful and multiply” (Gen. 1:28)? Berdyaev and Epstein are pondering these questions. At the same time, isn’t Berdyaev replacing the concept of “eros” (Ancient Greek –“Ερως”) with the concept of “agape (Ancient Greek – ἀγάπη)”, and isn’t Epstein enriching the concept of “eros” with an organic combination with “agape”? Maybe for a genuine person there is no division into “eros” and “agape”, and genuine, human love is spiritual-mental-physical, otherwise, this is already animal copulation? I will reflect on these questions in my report and invite my listeners to this reflection.

Rev. Aleksander Posacki SJ

Collegium Verum, Poland

НИКОЛАЙ БЕРДЯЕВ КАК КРИТИК ТЕОСОФИИ ЕЛЕНА БЛАВАТСКОЙ, АНТРОПОСОФИИ РУДОЛЬФА ШТАЙНЕРА И РАЗЛИЧНЫХ ФОРМ ОККУЛЬТИЗМА И ЭЗОТЕРИЗМА В РОССИИ

Как заметил однажды известный христианский писатель, православный священник и мученик отец Александр Мень, Николай Бердяев был самым радикальным критиком теософии и антропософии в России. Однако позицию Бердяева следует рассматривать в контексте определенного раскола в русской культуре, отсутствия однозначного восприятия упомянутых доктрин. Большинство русских философов и богословов, таких как Сергей Булгаков, Семен Франк, Николай Лосский, Николай Бердяев, Лев Карсавин, Василий Зеньковский, Георгий Флоровский, Павел Флоренский, Борис Вышеславцев, Алексей Лосев (и даже Лев Толстой) – отвергали теософию и антропософию. Но многие литераторы и известные писатели Серебряного века (например Андрей Белый или Александр Блок) выражали заинтересованность указанными теориями и даже развивали эти концепции в своих произведениях. В связи с этим предметная и точная критика Н. Бердяева представляется чрезвычайно важной для полного понимания творческих дилемм Серебряного века и в целом – сложного духа русской культуры. Прежде всего, мыслителя волновали попытки оккультных учений претендовать на роль религии. Но избежал ли сам философ влияния оккультного мышления, которое он так основательно критиковал?

Paulina Czoska

University of Warsaw, Poland

ВАЖНОСТЬ ПОНЯТИЯ UNGRUND В ФИЛОСОФИИ НИКОЛАЯ АЛЕКСАНДРОВИЧА БЕРДЯЕВА

Цель работы – показать влияние немецкого мыслителя Якоба Беме на философию Николая Александровича Бердяева. Беме создал гностико-теософскую концепцию Ungrund’a, которая предполагает, что до истинного пробуждения Бога существовала бездонная пустота. Только из этой пустоты – Ungrund’a – могли возникнуть Бог, София, мир, а также зло и многое другое. Но сама она еще не являлась ни доброй, ни злой. Беме возразил преобладающим в его эпоху течениям, проповедующим предопределение, которые были несовместимы с его опытом зла. Существование изначальной пустоты давало возможность позднего появления свободы, которую так любил Бердяев.

В работе представлены по очереди: общий подход русского философа к теософским и антропософским течениям, а также особое место в них немецкого мыслителя, который оказывается для Бердяева одним из величайших вдохновителей и философских учителей. Также делается подробный анализ понятия Ungrund с демонстрацией того, что это самое важное и фундаментальное понятие в мысли Бердяева, из которого вырастает концепция свободы. Для исследования в основном будут использованы четыре статьи философа: *Теософия и антропософия в России*, *Спор об антропософии*, а также *Из этюдов о Я. Беме. Этюд I и Этюд II*.

Elizabeth Blake

Saint Louis University, USA

THE FORMER PRISONERS NIKOLAI BERDYAEV AND FEDOR DOSTOEVSKY ON CONFINEMENT, PERSONALITY, AND REVOLUTIONARIES

Although Leonid Grossman, when writing in 1915 of Dostoevsky's Siberian experience, alludes to the novelist becoming acquainted with both the scaffold and the rod, which creates a back of bloodied decaying flesh, in his own autobiography Berdyaev only briefly and without resentment refers to his two detentions under Nicholas II and for participating in demonstrations and for his activities with the Social-Democratic movement (1898). Despite his resultant term in exile in Vologda, Berdyaev nevertheless emphasizes the "dictatorship" and "terror" in the Soviet prison, where he was interrogated by the first Soviet leader of the secret police Felix Dzerzhinskii for his suspected participation in the underground "Tactical Center" (1920), and then recalls that in the spring of 1922 he was again summoned to inform him of his impending deportation and to force him to sign a document recognizing that he would be shot upon any return to Soviet soil. All the same, the impact of his imprisonment and exile under Nicholas II caused him to identify with the Decembrists in the 1918 collection *Out of the Depths (Iz Glubiny)* – a reference to Alexander Pushkin's poem "In the Depths of the Siberian Mines" ("*Vo glubine sibirskich rud*") alluding to the political prisoners – that presaged the persecution of Christians in Russia only then in its nascency. Moreover, in his analysis of the arc of Dostoevsky's career, Berdyaev notes that *Notes from the Underground* – with its hero imagining his own losses stemming from Siberian confinement – divided the novelist's first identity as a psychologist from his second as a "metaphysician" who "researches to the depths [*glubyna*] the tragedy of the human spirit." In other words, Berdyaev identifies with Dostoevsky as a formerly convicted revolutionary and exile whose sympathies lay with "the heroes of the Dead House" despite being well acquainted with the Russian nihilists. This presentation will discuss how their common prison and exile experience impact Berdyaev's dialogue with him, particularly in connection with the development of his understanding of personality – a concept that was central to the self-expression of Dostoevsky's convicts – and with his observations about the novelist's revolutionary types.

Maciej Wołkow

University of Warsaw, Poland

NIKOLAI BERDYAEV ON DEATH PENALTY

In my speech, I will try to present Nikolai Berdyaev's philosophical views on the death penalty, discussing his argumentation against capital punishment and showing it in the perspective of both Russian and non-Russian abolitionist philosophical tradition.

Ivan Kurilovich

Russian State University for the Humanities, Russia

BERDYAEV AND KOJÈVE: TWO INTERPRETATIONS OF FREEDOM

This paper will explore the stark contrasts in the philosophies of Nikolai Berdyaev and Alexander Kojève concerning the concept of freedom and its broader implications, including its political aspects. For both philosophers, freedom is a crucial aspect of the human condition, albeit interpreted differently. The distinct approaches of these thinkers become evident in their treatment of freedom within the realms of philosophy, art, and politics. The report will particularly focus on their divergent understandings of creative freedom and the intellectual's role in society. Berdyaev, a vocal opponent of the stringent Zhdanov Doctrine in the Soviet Union, perceives freedom as an essential precondition for human spiritual growth and vehemently opposes any state-imposed restrictions on creativity. His stance underscores the notion of creative freedom as an intrinsic human right, indispensable for cultural and spiritual progress. Conversely, Kojève, while acknowledging freedom as a defining characteristic of humanity, controversially advocates for censorship, prompting a critical examination of both philosophers' perspectives.

Iuliia Kuznetsova

The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Kraków, Poland

БЕРДЯЕВ О КРИЗИСЕ ИСКУССТВА: ДЕМАТЕРИАЛИЗАЦИЯ И РАЗВОПЛОЩЕНИЕ ЖИВОПИСИ

Как правило, переходы от одной эпохи к другой ознаменованы разными кризисами, в том числе, в искусстве. Бердяев был уверен, что происходящее с искусством в XIX–XX вв. не может быть названо просто одним из кризисов. Старый идеал классического искусства померк, и возврат к его старым образам стал невозможен. На этом фоне осознавалось бессилие всякого творческого акта человека – несоответствие между творческим заданием и его осуществлением. Начиная с XIX века искусство характеризуется небывалым творческим дерзновением, но одновременно с этим и небывалой творческой слабостью. В стремлении сотворить небывалое художник переступает все заданные пределы и границы, но так и не создает таких совершенных и прекрасных произведений, какие создавал человек прошедших эпох. Многие из этих художников мечтали о возвращении к искусству, имеющему особое литургическое и сакральное значение. Искусство храмового и культового происхождения вызывали то стремление к прошлому, которое было сильнее зова будущего: поиск мистерии и попытки возврата к искусству сакральному не были прекращены. Эти поиски были представлены творцами и мыслителями, в которых сохранилось многое от старого и вечного искусства. Одним из таких творцов Бердяев видит Пикассо: «Когда смотришь на картины Пикассо, то думаются трудные думы». Он – разоблачитель иллюзий воплощенной, материально-синтезированной красоты. За пленяющей и прельщающей красотой он видит ужас разложения. Он, как ясновидящий, смотрит через все покровы, одежды, и в глубине материального мира, видит чудовища. Живопись, как и все пластические искусства, была воплощением, материализацией. Высшие подьемы старой живописи давали кристаллизованную, оформленную плоть. Бердяев был уверен, что живопись переживала небывалый еще кризис. Если глубже вникнуть в этот кризис, то его нельзя было назвать иначе, как дематериализацией, развопощением живописи.

Elena Tverdislova

Independent scholar, Israel

АКТУАЛЬНОСТЬ ПРОЦЕССА САМОПОЗНАНИЯ У Н.А. БЕРДЯЕВА И ИДЕИ ЭКЗИСТЕНЦИАЛИЗМА И ФЕНОМЕНОЛОГИИ

Мысли Бердяева ценны своей немедленной реакцией на события и факты, обозначившие жизнь его времени. Высказывая сугубо индивидуальные, скорее даже внутренние наблюдения за тем, что происходило с ним в эпоху катаклизмов, философ выявляет трансформацию себя как: я – дух – человек – личность – субъект и объект – индивидуум – существо. Давая оценку каждой ипостаси в ее постоянном движении, он обнаруживает объемность «я», которое всё в себя вбирает, но именно ему принадлежит приоритет в расслоении «я» на его ипостаси, что было обозначено Бердяевым «процессом самопознания». «Моя личность не есть готовая реальность, я созидаю свою личность, созидаю ее и тогда, когда познаю себя, «я» есть прежде всего акт» (*Самопознание*, 1991, с. 316). И если личность представляет собой «единство в многообразии» (*Царство Духа и царство Кесаря*, 1995, с. 13), по Бердяеву, она – идеал человека, то сам человек «есть существо в высшей степени поляризованное, существо богоподобное и звероподобное, высокое и низкое, свободное и рабье» (*Царство Духа и царство Кесаря*, 1995, с. 12).

Самая большая ценность сказанного философом не только в том, что все написано им «с натуры» – с себя, но и в сделанных им выводах, позволивших ему обозначить проблемы познания в ракурсе их объективизации, бытия и сущего, истории и эсхатологии, наконец, проблемы человеческой антропологии, а в итоге – этики.

Aleksandra Berdnikova

FINO Consortium, University of Turin, Italy

“NEW MIDDLE AGES” OF N.A. BERDYAEV IN EUROPEAN THEOLOGY

N.A. Berdyaev's work, particularly his treatise *New Middle Ages* published in Russian in 1924 in Berlin, played a significant role in bridging the gap between the East and the West, not only philosophically but also theologically [Reichelt, 1999, 57]. Thanks to *New Middle Ages*, Berdyaev connected with Swiss thinker Fritz Lieb (1892–1970) and later with French Catholic theologian Jacques Maritain (1882–1973). Protestant theologians such as Hans Philipp Ehrenberg (1883–1958) and Paul Tillich (1886–1965) also showed great interest in Berdyaev's ideas concerning freedom, objectification, and personalism. Additionally, renowned Protestant theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906–1945) was familiar with Berdyaev's works and drew inspiration from them [Reichelt, 1999, 111–27].

Berdyaev's ideas also garnered attention within the Catholic community. One of the earliest research works on Berdyaev, titled *Berdjajev, der ostchristliche Gnostiker* (1934), was authored by Catholic theologian and follower of Teilhard de Chardin, Karl Pflieger (1883–1975). Notable Catholic figures who engaged with Berdyaev's ideas include Bernhard Schultze (1902–1990) and Georg Koepgen (1898–1975). Schultze produced one of the most detailed European studies on Berdyaev's philosophy titled *Die Schau der Kirche bei Nikolai Berdiajew* (1938). Koepgen's work *Die Gnosis des Christentums* (1939) reflects his engagement with Berdyaev's ideas.

The influence of Berdyaev's ideas continues to be felt in European theology. A noteworthy reinterpretation of Berdyaev's concept of the "new Middle Ages" as "new Christianity" comes from Italian scholar and Church historian, Professor Gianmaria Zamagni, teaching Catholic theology at Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main [see: Zamagni, 2016; Zamagni, 2016].

The reception of Berdyaev's views among Western theologians, particularly Catholic and Protestant, serves as a remarkable testament to the impact of Russian philosophical ideas beyond the Russian-speaking intellectual sphere.

Tomasz Herbich

Warsaw University, Poland

ONTOLOGICAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE. ON NICOLAY BERDYAEV'S TWO PHILOSOPHIES

According to the dominant interpretations of Nicolay Berdyaev's oeuvre in the literature, including that interpretation of his oeuvre which was provided by the philosopher himself in the book *Самопознание*, the various transformations observable in his thought are dominated by a perspective of unity, consisting in organising the various partial, evolving approaches and insights around the central theme of his reflection – freedom. For Berdyaev, freedom is not only a central theme but also a source of ontological reality and a supreme value, and thus it undoubtedly binds his creative efforts into a definite whole. Despite this, however, in my view, the two philosophies of Berdyaev must be decisively distinguished. These two philosophies approach the theme of freedom in different ways and, at the same time, point to different ways of realising the call to freedom. In the first of these philosophies, which can be linked to the main works written by Berdyaev in Russia (such as *Философия свободы*, published in 1911), the call for the recovery of lost being, which would require embarking on the paths of religious philosophy, undoubtedly plays an important role. Berdyaev, who in the aforementioned book *Самопознание* made it clear that in this first main period of his work, he had not fully liberated himself from the 'superstitions of ontological philosophy,' entered a new path in his emigration period (what can be linked with such works like *Философия свободного духа* written in 1927). It was then that ontological philosophy and its 'superstitions' was superseded – according to Berdyaev's own term – by a 'phenomenology of spiritual experience'.

The main aim of the paper will be to systematically juxtapose these two philosophical positions of Berdyaev and to point out the factors that make it possible, in the case of the Russian philosopher, to speak indeed of two philosophies of freedom, and not of one philosophical position preserving its identity despite changes over time. To achieve this goal, Berdyaev's ontology should be first of all considered – for it is this ontology, if we take the suggestions formulated by the Russian himself as our starting point, that is most affected by the change that occurred in his views.

Randall Poole

College of St. Scholastica, USA

NICOLAS BERDYAEV AND THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY HISTORY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

After his expulsion from the Soviet Union in 1922, Nicolas Berdyaev became the most famous Russian philosopher in the West. He was one of the main leaders of the interwar philosophical movement known as personalism, together with Emmanuel Mounier (1905–1950) and Jacques Maritain (1882–1973). As a philosophical doctrine, personalism holds that persons bear an intrinsic worth or dignity and are the highest form of reality and its supreme value. Recently personalism has attracted a lot of attention because of its connection with the twentieth-century history of human rights. In his ironically titled 2015 book, *Christian Human Rights*, the intellectual historian and legal scholar Samuel Moyn shows how personalism became a philosophy of human rights in the 1940s, culminating with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. The main figure in this history is the great Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain, who began to make the turn to human rights in 1938, most directly under the influence of Pope Pius XI. But decades before Maritain, Russian idealist and religious philosophers had developed personalism (before it went by that name) into a robust and theoretically sophisticated defense of human rights. This development began as early as 1880, with Boris Chicherin and Vladimir Soloviev, the greatest philosophers of nineteenth-century Russia. It then became a main current in the Russian Religious Renaissance of the early twentieth century. Berdyaev helped to carry this religious-philosophical legacy to the West in works such as *The New Middle Ages* (1924, French trans. 1927), *The Destiny of Man* (1931, French trans. 1935), and *The Fate of Man in the Modern World* (1934, French trans. 1936). This paper will explore the legacy of the Russian religious-idealist defense of human rights, focusing on Berdyaev and Maritain, whose philosophical collaboration is an important chapter in the twentieth-century history of human rights.

Sławomir Mazurek

Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland

TRUE AND FALSE RELIGIOUS TRANSFORMATION IN BERDYAEV'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

Berdyaev's diagnosis of the crisis of culture has many features typical of similar diagnoses authored by Russian and Western thinkers in the first half of the 20th century, but it has also several aspects that make it stand out as original and particularly valid. Two of them at least deserve special attention: the notion of the crisis of culture in a narrower sense (i.e. crisis of culture as an existential crisis experienced by the greatest creators) and the idea of religious transformation as an antidote for the crisis of culture in a broader sense (i.e. the crisis of culture as a social process). In my paper I attempt to explain the relation between them and their function in the entire structure of Berdyaev's historiosophy. The Russian philosopher hoped that a religious transformation would rescue culture while keeping in mind the risk of taking an illusory transformation for an authentic one. He described different examples of the latter (among them the proposals of his contemporaries, Merezhkovsky and Florensky). The idea of religious transformation incessantly recurs in our era too. Berdyaev's discussion of it not only helps to grasp the essence of the phenomenon of such a transformation, but also helps to recognize the weak points, limits and traps inherent in different projects of revitalizing culture by religious rebirth. For these reasons, this chapter of Berdyaev's historiosophy and philosophy of culture seems to be particularly timely.

Kåre Johan Mjør

Western Norway University of Applied Sciences

University of Bergen, Norway

NIKOLAI BERDIAEV AND THE MEANINGS OF HISTORY

In the revolutionary years from 1917 to his emigration in 1922, Nikolai Berdiaev was active as never before. He was compelled, or so it seems in retrospect, to make sense of the upheavals going on around him, and he did so also by turning to the philosophy of history. Thus, among the new topics that he now committed himself to was the metaphysical “meaning of history,” as was the title of one of his postrevolutionary books. *The Meaning of History* (1919–1920) articulated an eschatological philosophy of history informed by traditional Christian as well as modern philosophical conceptions. An additional source to his thought in this period, however, was Oswald Spengler’s new morphology of history, as can be seen in the small book *The New Middle Ages* (1924). In the latter work, the linear conception of a purposeful history encountered in *Meaning of History* is seemingly replaced by a cyclical one, even though Berdiaev is ambiguous as to whether he by the “new middle ages” understands historical time in a truly cyclical way, or if this is first and foremost a metaphor used to capture a new, imminent age. This paper discusses the different and potentially conflicting models of history that we encounter in Berdiaev’s writings after the revolutions of 1917 and raises the question of whether he managed to combine them or they tended to produce new contradictions in his work, for instance between the universalism that characterizes *The Meaning of History* and the particularism that the Spenglerian model opened up for.

Ekaterina Shashlova

Charles University, Czech Republic

БЕРДЯЕВ И КОЖЕВ О СВОБОДЕ, ПРАВЕ НА НАСИЛИЕ И БОРЬБЕ ЗА ПРИЗНАНИЕ

Доклад посвящен анализу дискуссии Николая Бердяева и Александра Кожева о природе свободы, праве на насилие и борьбе за признание. Цель доклада – реконструировать аргументы обеих сторон относительно государства, насилия и свободы. Бердяев описывает свободу как онтологическую основу, выходящую за рамки господства и рабства, тогда как для Кожева свобода является результатом борьбы Раба и Господина, борьбы за признание.

Ключевые моменты анализа полемики между Бердяевым и Кожевным включают в себя:

- Анализ дебатов 1925–1926 годов между Бердяевым и Карсавиным, а также использование Кожевным аргументов Карсавина.
- Интерпретация Бердяевым Хайдеггера и Гегеля.
- Различия в интерпретации Хайдеггера и Гегеля между Бердяевым и Кожевным.
- Анализ рукописи Кожева «Ответ профессору Бердяеву» в сравнении с анонимным изданием «О свободе творчества. Ответ г-ну Бердяеву» в газете «Советский Патриот» (1946).

Бердяев и Кожев представляют противоположные философские системы, причем Кожев дистанцируется от русской религиозной философии, обосновывая атеизм и рассматривая свободу как борьбу за признание, оправдывая насилие. Таким образом, сравнение Бердяева и Кожева выявляет не только институциональный разрыв между старшим и младшим поколениями первой волны эмиграции, но и различные философские стратегии.

Anna Reznichenko

Russian State University for the Humanities, Russia

Н.А. БЕРДЯЕВ О РАБСТВЕ И СВОБОДЕ И ПРОБЛЕМА “MORAL QUALIA”: С.Н. БУЛГАКОВ И ЭЛЛИС

Настоящий доклад продолжает серию исследований, уже начатых коллегами (в частности, с. Терезой Оболевич), связи теоретического наследия Н.А. Бердяева с его эпистолярным, в данном случае – перепиской с философом и богословом проф. прот. С.Н. Булгаковым и поэтом-мистиком и переводчиком, *enfant terrible* русского символизма, Львом Львовичем Кобылинским (Эллисом), отложившейся в фонде Бердяева в РГАЛИ (Москва).

Булгакова и Бердяева, несмотря на различие в философских системах и разногласия по целому ряду практических вопросов сближает общее поле понимания ключевых тем философии, таких как реальность, человек, мир. Их переписка эмигрантского периода служит фоном, а порой и ключом,

к их творчеству – не случайно к ней обращались в своих интересах исследователи конкретных философских сюжетов (скажем, Регула Цвален Гут, писавшая о проблеме субъекта).

Переписка с Кобылинским-Эллисом – другого, мистико-лирического тона и плана. Письма Эллиса к Бердяеву – это очерки-воспоминания об утраченном мире культуры и мысли, который был в России перед войной, – Китеже, затонувшем волшебном городе, существующем в иной реальности, нежели реальность стран победившего социализма и побеждающего нацизма.

Yuki Fukui

Waseda University, Japan

THINKING ABOUT SCIENCE AND RELIGION IN RUSSIAN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT FROM BERDYAEV'S VIEWPOINT

This paper discusses Nikolai Berdyaev's thoughts about science and religion and those of Russian religious philosophy from his viewpoint.

Berdyaev explains this theme in chapter 2, "Faith and Knowledge," of *Philosophy of Freedom*. He rejects not only the supremacy of science or religion but also their dualism, planning his own philosophical system that unites them within itself. In this respect, he surely inherits Slavophiles' and Soloviev's thinking.

On the other hand, he is distinguished from other Russian religious philosophers in that his integral philosophy is existentialistic. He intends that the free choice of a pure faith leads a scientific knowledge to the height of gnosis by faith. This seems to be too voluntaristic and rejects the possibility of natural theology, i.e. the way to acquire the knowledge of God through nature by reason.

I will consider this matter, going back to Slavophiles' "believing reason," Soloviev's "integral knowledge", and Fedorov's "common task."

Frederick Matern

Saint Paul University, Canada

"ESCAPE FROM THE LAST JUDGMENT": BERDYAEV'S RECEPTION OF COSMISM

Nicholas Berdyaev has been categorized as a "cosmist" in the tradition of the nineteenth-century thinker Nikolai Fedorov. Russian cosmism, as a movement growing from the ideas of Fedorov, is concerned with bending nature, through technological advancement, to the point where humanity could be occupied with the "common task" of resurrecting the ancestors. Young (2012), for example, notes that Berdyaev, together with Soloviev, Bulgakov and Florensky, are often discussed in modern Russian scholarship as "Religious Cosmists" due to certain thematic links that connect them with the ideas of Fedorov. Ideas such as these thinkers' common sophiological concern with cosmic unity, as well as Berdyaev's specific concern with the creative act, in addition to a general admiration for the spirit of Fedorov's project are cited in support of the idea of classifying Berdyaev as a cosmist. There are, however, significant differences between

Mikolaj Banaszkiwicz

National Library, Poland

ЛИБЕРАЛЬНЫЕ КРИТИКИ Н.А. БЕРДЯЕВА В ДОРЕВОЛЮЦИОННОЙ РОССИИ

Доклад посвящен восприятию русскими либералами общественно-политических взглядов Н.А. Бердяева в период между революциями 1905 и 1917 гг. В частности, анализируется либеральная рецепция сборника «Вехи», соавтором которого и являлся выдающийся русский мыслитель. Размышления автора представляют собой попытку осмысления проблемы соотношения либеральной общественной модели и ценностных ориентиров, формирующих мировоззрение Н.А. Бердяева в последнее десятилетие существования Российской империи. Основную базу исследования составляет русская либеральная периодика того времени, в том числе журналы «Вестник Европы» и «Русская мысль».

Vadzim Antsipau

University of Zielona Góra, Poland

ЗА ПРЕДЕЛАМИ УТОПИИ: БЕРДЯЕВ ОБ АНАРХИЗМЕ КРОПОТКИНА И ИЛЛЮЗИЯХ КОЛЛЕКТИВИЗМА

Николай Бердяев, первоначально приверженец марксизма, со временем развивает критический взгляд на коллективизм в любых его формах, в том числе на коллективистские ответвления анархизма. Он рассматривает анархизм как часть русской культурной традиции, утверждая: «Анархизм есть, главным образом, создание русских». Бердяев отмечает всецелое проникновение анархистских идей в русскую литературу и философию, влияющих как на левые, так и на правые течения, выделяя роль России в формировании анархистской мысли через таких мыслителей, как Бакунин, Кропоткин и Толстой. Однако, в то же время, Бердяев не рассматривает Бакунина и Кропоткина исключительно как русских теоретиков, из-за значительного влияния западных идей на их философию.

В критике анархизма Бердяев концентрируется на идеях анархо-коллективизма Бакунина, уделяя меньше внимания Кропоткину, отмечая, что анархизм последнего менее радикален из-за его веры в принцип взаимопомощи. Однако с точки зрения Бердяева, такой подход игнорирует метафизику зла, которая, по его мнению, является фундаментальной для понимания человеческого существования. Анализируя анархо-коммунизм Кропоткина, Бердяев выделяет и саму идею коммунизма, критикуя её как утопическую. Он указывает, что идеализм коммунизма неизбежно превращается в античеловеческую идеологию при попытке реализации на практике. Он особо подчёркивает безбожный аспект коммунизма, видя в нём фундаментальный конфликт с человеческой природой.

В докладе особое внимание уделяется анализу критики Бердяева по отношению к коллективистским формам анархизма. Подчёркивается, что Бердяев часто сконцентрирован на интерпретациях и исторических попытках реализации коллективистских идей, а не лишь на аутентичных теориях, которые, в сущности, различны, или даже противоположны от практических попыток их реализации. Кроме рассмотрения общего подхода к концепциям, акцентируется внимание на принципе взаимопомощи Кропоткина. Вопреки мнению Бердяева, в идеях Кропоткина данный принцип опирается не только на абстрактные представления, но и на научные исследования. Это позволяет рассмотреть критику Бердяева под другим углом и обнаружить потенциальные точки соприкосновения между идеями Бердяева и Кропоткина.

Таким образом, в рамках нашего анализа, мы обнаруживаем сложную сеть критических взглядов на анархизм и коллективизм, выходящих за рамки традиционных интерпретаций. Это исследование не только освещает уникальную перспективу Бердяева, но и способствует к более глубокому пониманию диалектики между индивидуализмом и коллективизмом в политической и философской мысли.

James Roberts

Independent scholar, The United Kingdom

BIRTH, FREEDOM AND CREATIVITY: MOTHER MARIA SKOBTSOVA'S ENGAGEMENT WITH NIKOLAI BERDYAEV

Nikolai Berdyaev (1874–1948) and Mother Maria Skobtsova (1891–1945) were close friends, intellectual interlocutors, and collaborators within the Russian émigré community in Paris. This paper will highlight their relationship and will particularly assess Skobtsova's critique of Berdyaev's understanding of creativity and birth. It seeks to address the paucity of scholarly reflection on the impact this friendship had on their respective theological writings.

Scholarship on Skobtsova's theological work is gradually increasing and deepening. However, there has been relatively little comparative reflection on her thought with that of her contemporaries in Paris (which included Berdyaev, Bulgakov, Fedotov and others). A comparative investigation between Berdyaev

and Skobtsova would therefore be beneficial for Skobtsova studies. However, Skobtsova also presents a unique critique of Berdyaev's work which is important for Berdyaev's legacy (and, importantly, offers the perspective of an Orthodox woman theologian on his understanding of creativity). This paper suggests that Skobtsova's perspective not only allows us a deeper insight into Berdyaev's context, but also provides us with a critique of his system which is worthy of scholarly attention.

There are numerous shared biographical elements to highlight between the two thinkers, which this paper shall consider. In 1927 a discussion group (a 'circle') was formed by the RSCM on the topic of Russia – Berdyaev and Skobtsova were members, and they both spoke at the RSCM conference in July 1927 on the theme of Russia. In addition, Skobtsova dedicates her 1937 collection of poetry (*Stikhi*) to Berdyaev. Berdyaev also coined the name "Orthodox Action" for the group which they formed (which Skobtsova was the president of). Their close biographical connection is reflected in a remarkably aligned theological vision.

Theologically, the two thinkers are working within the same tradition (they share numerous key influences), and reflecting on similar themes including creativity, Russia, the nature of history, and asceticism, as well as analysing the work of their predecessors including Khomiakov and Leontiev. There are also, however, notable differences. The most fruitful point of critical theological engagement between Skobtsova and Berdyaev is around creativity and birth. For Berdyaev, birth is an unfree creative process where sex (and birth-giving generation) squanders creativity and reflects natural necessity. Skobtsova argues that natural birth is indeed an "unfree" process, as it is bound to natural necessity. However, it produces a free personality in the child. Therefore, whilst the process may be unfree, the product is free. In contrast, she suggests that human creativity outside of birth (in art, literature, etc.) can only ever be made from a different essence, but will ultimately always reflect the personality (the hypostasis) of its creator. In this sense, this creation is not free. Therefore, birth has a unique place in creating from the same essence, and producing a free creation. For Skobtsova, this is important for her own notion of Godmotherhood, which presents an alternative to the anti-procreative (and male-dominated) strain within modern Russian Orthodox thought.

By highlighting the theological relationship between Skobtsova and Berdyaev, this paper will show how the influence of one of his closest collaborators in Paris can shed new light onto Berdyaev's intellectual legacy. In turn, this contributes a reading of Berdyaev's work which may resonate with feminist/gender criticism.

Raul-Ovidiu Bodea

University of Oradea, Romania

THE QUESTION OF ETHICAL KNOWLEDGE IN NIKOLAI BERDYAEV AND THE WIDER CONTEXT OF EXISTENTIAL PHILOSOPHY

Existentialist philosophy is marked by a certain ambivalence towards the questions related to ethics, and also on the very possibility of ethical knowledge as such. For many existentialists, ethical thought is something that is to be overcome in a more authentic existence that cannot be defined or described by ethical principles or systems. This attitude is also found in a particular way in the thought of Nikolai Berdyaev (1874–1948). For Berdyaev, there is only one understanding of ethics that needs to be overcome, but at the same time, there is another understanding of ethics that he proposes and with it, the very possibility of ethical thought. What is interesting is that Berdyaev claims that his thought can be described as existentialist, although he distinguishes between himself and other existentialist thinkers. In this paper, I will explore both the meaning of ethical knowledge in Berdyaev as well as how his philosophy fits within the existentialist tradition and how it differs from other existentialists on the issue of ethical knowledge. As part of this endeavor, I will reassess the debate on the nature and possibility of ethical knowledge between Berdyaev and Lev Shestov (1866–1938), the other famous Russian existentialist thinker, but also place the debate in the wider tradition of existential thought. In this way, the paper will underline both the originality of Berdyaev's philosophy on the question of ethical knowledge, as well as the way in which his philosophy stands in relationship to the existentialist tradition.

Emmanuel Ehinon Arikhan

The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Poland

EDITH STEIN'S UNREPEATABLE SINGULARITY AND NIKOLAI BERDYAEV'S PERSONALITY AS CORRECTIVE FRAMEWORK FOR SOCIAL MEDIA ENGAGEMENT

Social media is a dynamic tool for communication and human engagement of ideas. It has proven to be a decisive factor in contemporary human society, by connecting people and defying the limits of spatial distance. It has promoted and built relationships. It has united kins and people of like minds, and facilitated the bonds of human solidarity. Never in the history of humankind has there been so much information readily available for all people, as it is today on social media. Social Media has led to uprisings that shook or toppled oppressive regimes. It has given many oppressed segments of humanity a voice and a will to stand for their rights. However, there is a massive brewing dark side of social media today – social media toxicity. This toxicity is characterized by a new form of dictatorship, herd morality, falsehood promotion, stifling of divergent opinions, racism, intolerance all tied together by a dehumanization of the human person. This is so divisive that the identity of a person is marked by the number of social media likes or social media affiliation they belong to. This paper will tackle this menace using the crucibles of the personalism of Edith Stein and Nikolai Berdyaev as a corrective substructure for human engagement on social media.

Hanuš Nykl

Charles University, Czech Republic

НИКОЛАЙ БЕРДЯЕВ И ЧЕХИЯ: СВЯЗИ И ВОСПРИЯТИЕ

Berdyaev is one of the best-known and most translated Russian thinkers in the Czech Republic. The paper will reflect on his ties to interwar Czechoslovakia and Russian exile institutions and will try to outline the reception of Berdyaev's philosophy in Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic.

Larisa Oldyreva and Irina Danilova

University in Gothenburg, Sweden

ИЗУЧЕНИЕ И ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ ИДЕЙ Н. БЕРДЯЕВА СОВРЕМЕННЫМИ СКАНДИНАВСКИМИ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЯМИ

В предлагаемом докладе рассмотрен вопрос об изучении идей Н. Бердяева скандинавскими исследователями. Цель данной работы – показать разнообразие подходов и принципов анализа идей Бердяева, логику их рассмотрения, а также пути осмысления идей русского философа в международном контексте.

Выводы об оценке идей Бердяева сделаны на основе работ шведских авторов трех поколений от 1940-х годов до наших дней. В представленных нами трудах отражен широкий спектр идей Н. Бердяева с исторической, философской и этической точек зрения.

Svetlana Panich

Wycliffe College, University of Toronto, Canada

АРХИЕПИСКОП КЕНТЕРБЕРИЙСКИЙ РОУЭН УИЛЬЯМС КАК ЧИТАТЕЛЬ НИКОЛАЯ БЕРДЯЕВА

В восприятии одного из ведущих англиканских богословов Роуэна Уильямса русская религиозная философия – не «депозитарий» идей, представляющих исключительно историческую

ценность, а интеллектуальный вызов, брошенный современной мысли о Боге и человеке. Николай Бердяев для него – один из тех мыслителей, у кого этот вызов звучит наиболее радикально.

В сообщении, опирающемся, главным образом, на последнюю книгу Роуэна Уильямса *Looking East in Winter. Contemporary Thought and the Eastern Christian Tradition* (Bloomsbury, 2021) будет предпринята попытка кратко показать, каким образом несколько значимых в Бердяева идей могут прочитываться западным богословом, чье мышление сформировано диалогом с Восточной церковью.

Совершенно так же, как это происходило в жизни основанного матерью Марией Скобцовой парижского дома на ул. Лурмель, 77, в размышлениях Роуэна Уильямса слышна перекличка богословских «голосов» Бердяева и м. Марии. Для него они – «бунтующие мыслители», ставящие под вопрос интеллектуальное благополучие отвлеченного рассуждения о Боге как «предмете». Уильямсу во многом близко, в частности, «политическое богословие» Бердяева, но вместе с тем, он прочитывает бердяевскую мысль не догматически, а критически, сквозь призму современной богословской и социальной повестки. Это открытое прочтение: читателю размышлений Роуэна Уильямса предлагается войти в диалог между русским религиозным философом и его вопрошающим интерпретатором.

Daniel Kisliakov

University of Divinity, Australia

CONSIDERATION OF NIKOLAI BERDYAEV FROM AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

Nikolai Berdyaev continues to be one of the pivotal figures of the emigres of the 20th century, but inasmuch as the history of the Russian Religious Renaissance continues to be reassessed, there is need to examine the multifaceted aspects of its key personalities. Explorations of others of the diaspora milieu have demonstrated the benefit of multidisciplinary approaches – specifically, Bulgakov through an anthropological lens and its relationship to personhood.

The present lecture considers the said approach in relation to the study of Berdyaev. In contrast to his contemporaries, Berdyaev continued to function as a philosopher and demonstrated a methodological uniqueness that differentiated him from his peers.

This corresponded with a respect for human freedom that resulted in his defense of Bulgakov at the time of the Sophia Affair. However, the needs of the time betrayed similarities of conclusions despite the differences that were apparent. Examination of sources demonstrates an ontology of personhood that predated its appropriation by others at a later time.

The analytical part of the thesis compares Berdyaev's approach with one taken – namely, acknowledgement of the human person and his or her uniqueness in relation to God and peers, whilst maintaining a sense of otherness that balances the needs of persons and the community. This results in an anthropological “lens”. The consistency demonstrated between the two protagonists of the diaspora intelligentsia suggests a broad implied ontology of personhood.

Its study contributes to understanding of the background of the multidisciplinary investigation, suggesting a path towards its development at a later time in the 20th century.

Kamil Wojtowicz

University of Zielona Góra, Poland

NICOLAS BERDYAEV IN POLISH PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH FROM 2008 TO 2023

The philosophy of Nicolas Berdyaev (1874–1948) has been in the field of interest for years for many researchers, also in Poland. He was one of the most famous Russian émigré philosophers in the West. His

works have been translated into twenty languages, he referred to various areas of the humanities and attempted a synthesis of the idea of Christian humanism with romantic ideals. Presented in the article is the state of research on the philosophy of Nicolas Berdyaev in Poland in the years 2008–2023. The selection of such a research period was due to the fact that research from earlier years was described in detail in the article by Marek Styczyński “Polish research on the philosophy of Nicolas Berdyaev” (2008). The purpose of the article is analysis of Polish studies of his achievements, as well as reflection on the possible future of research in this field. First, the thought and works of Nicolas Berdyaev are briefly presented, then in the order of diachrony, Polish studies of his thoughts and translations of his works are presented. Article concludes with thoughts related to the (possible) future of research on Nicolas Berdyaev philosophy in Poland and its intellectual attractiveness for subsequent generations. Materials shown and developed in the article were obtained by the author as a result of a search of available databases of scientific studies in philosophy and related fields.

Vladimir Alexander Smith-Mesa

UCL SSEES (School of Slavonic and East European Studies), Library, The United Kingdom

BERDYAEV & US. NIKOLAI ALEXANDROVICH IN THE HISPANIC WORLD

Notes on Berdyaev’s legacy in the Hispanic World: from the publication of the first Spanish translations of his work to the advent of Liberation Theology. How did his work become available in Spanish? Who translated them, when was his first book in Spanish published? What is Berdyaev’s legacy in the Hispanic World? These questions remain a major blind-spot in the bibliography of Hispanic American, Berdyaev and Translation Studies.

Gennadii Aliaiev

Independent scholar, Ukraine

«Я ПРИЗНАЮ ОСНОВНЫЕ ВАШИ УТВЕРЖДЕНИЯ, И РАСХОЖУСЬ С ВАМИ ТОЛЬКО В ТОМ, ЧТО НЕ РАЗДЕЛЯЮ ВАШИХ ОТРИЦАНИЙ». О ПЕРЕПИСКЕ МЕЖДУ С. ФРАНКОМ И Н. БЕРДЯЕВЫМ

В докладе предполагается показать основные темы, которые затрагивались в переписке двух выдающихся русских мыслителей. Это обмен мнениями о работах друг друга, совместная работа в Религиозно-философской академии, публикации С. Франка в журнале «Путь», подготовка антологии русских религиозных мыслителей и другие. Переписка охватывает период с 1923 по 1947 годы. Недавно эта переписка была опубликована, что позволяет теперь активнее вводить её в научный оборот (см.: Гапоненков А.А. *Эпистолярный диалог С.Л. Франка и Н.А. Бердяева. Переписка Николая Бердяева с Семеном Франком и Татьяной Франк (1923–1947)* / Публ., подг. текста и примеч. А.А. Гапоненкова // *Николай Бердяев: эпистолярный разговор. Архивные материалы* / отв. ред.-сост. Т.Г. Щедрина; предисл., подготовка текста, примеч., коммент., А.А. Гапоненкова, Е.В. Сердюковой, И.О. Щедриной, Т.Г. Щедриной. М.: Политическая энциклопедия, 2023. С. 16–158).

Pylup Bilyi

University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland

ДИАЛОГ ФИЛОСОФОВ ОБ ИНТУИЦИИ. НИКОЛАЙ БЕРДЯЕВ И НИКОЛАЙ ЛОССКИЙ

Диалог об интуитивизме между Николаем Бердяевым и Николаем Лосским повлиял на дальнейшее развитие метафизики идеал-реализма. Исследование охватывает период, первой

декады XX века, и фокусируется на выявлении ключевых вопросов гносеологии двух мыслителей, ставших объектами их философских споров.

В докладе рассматриваются основные аспекты философских разногласий между Бердяевым и Лосским, их взгляды на интуитивное познание мира. Несмотря на позитивную оценку Обоснования интуитивизма, Бердяев считал, что всякая гносеологическая теория имеет начало в онтологии. Лосский, однако, изначально подчеркивал беспредпосылочность своего метода. Особое внимание уделяется гносеологическим предпосылкам интуитивного метода Лосского и их обоснованию в самом объекте познания. Сама критика Бердяева, с метафизических позиций, в дальнейшем повлияла на теорию идеал-реализма в работе «Мир как ограниченное целое».

Доклад также предоставляет анализ взаимного воздействия Бердяева и Лосского друг на друга, их изменения в позициях и возможные точки сближения. В заключение предлагаются мысли о том, как эта дискуссия продолжает оказывать влияние на современное понимание философских проблем.

Nikolai Kostin

The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Poland

КОНЦЕПЦИЯ ЛИЧНОСТИ У Н.А. БЕРДЯЕВА И Л.П. КАРСАВИНА

Антропологическое измерение свойственно любой глубокой и целостной мысли. Место человека в мире и его онтологический статус – один из важнейших аспектов каждой философской системы. Идея человека как целостного субъекта духовной жизни у Бердяева и концепция «симфонической личности» Карсавина исходят из одной традиции – восточнохристианской патристической мысли. Тринитарное единство, дихотомия микро- и макрокосма, процесс духовного совершенствования – все это связывает антропологические представления обоих философов. Однако в вопросе о соотношении личности и мира эти представления отличаются. Особый историзм, свойственный Карсавину в аспекте понимания личности, не противоречит, а органично дополняет религиозно-философское решение данного вопроса у Бердяева. Выявлению этого соотношения и посвящён данный доклад.

Nataliya Petreshak

The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Poland

NIKOLAS BERDYAEV'S: THE PERSONALITY OF THE PHILOSOPHER IN MEMORIES

The paper explores the life and philosophical evolution of Nikolas Berdyaev, a prominent philosopher of the 20th century. It examines how Berdyaev's philosophical worldview was shaped by influences from Slavonic religious thought and various philosophical movements of his time. The text delves into debates surrounding Berdyaev's primary philosophical focus, his evolving worldview, and the complexities of his personal life, particularly his unusual lifestyle of marriage. The paper presents a nuanced portrait of the philosopher and analyzes the distinctive features of his character, behavior, and lifestyle. The main sources used to describe Berdyaev's personality are memories and testimonies from his relatives, close friends, and the philosopher himself.

By analyzing Berdyaev's personality, temperament, and interactions with others, the text sheds light on the multifaceted nature of his worldview. It demonstrates that the philosopher's unconventional lifestyle reflects his philosophical outlook, blurring the lines between personal experience and philosophical style of thinking. Despite controversies and conflicts, Berdyaev's intellectual legacy endures, challenging traditional religious and philosophical paradigms while offering insights into the human condition and the pursuit of transcendence. For researchers interested in Berdyaev's personal life and the roots of his philosophy, this paper could be a valuable resource.

Romilo Aleksandar Knežević

University of Niš, Serbia

NIKOLAI BERDYAEV: A THIRD KIND OF NON-BEING AND A NEW ONTOLOGY

Nikolai Berdyaev distinguishes between two kinds of non-being: firstly, platonic, relative non-being or *me on*; secondly, Christian, absolute non-being or *ouk on*. I suggest that both kinds of non-beings denote the nihil of the *creatio ex nihilo*, i.e., the “nothing” from which God created the world. The former Berdyaev calls “relative” non-being in that, unlike its Christian counterpart, it is not a purely logical, non-ontological term. Relative being is ontologically real, but being an unchangeable and closed system it hampers God’s creative freedom. In this paper, therefore, I shall argue that Christian reaction to the platonic *me on* in the form of absolute non-being or *ouk on* did not achieve its main goal of liberating God. Being complete and eternally finished, *me on* presents an obstacle to God’s creative movement – God cannot create a new ontological reality. So the task of *ouk on* was to provide for a *nihil* that would serve as a ground for a radical breakthrough in being.

To be free, God needs to be capable of broadening the being. However, this patristic view of God’s freedom is in contradiction with the doctrine of divine perfection, developed by the same Church Fathers: a perfect God cannot create something new, given that what is perfect is by definition unalterable and immovable. Faced with evident incongruity, the Fathers argued that creation out of nothing/*ouk on* is just another way of saying that God creates out of Himself – *ex Deo*. Thus, the Fathers acknowledged that God repeats Himself in the world.

Hence, one is urged to ponder about the origin and the meaning of the term *nihil*. Why does theology mention the nihil in the first place? Is it really necessary to talk about relative non-being and absolute non-being? Would it not be easier, since both these concepts fail to secure the foundation of God’s freedom, to forget about them and to say that God, as the perfect One, creates out of Himself? Indeed, if God is perfect, then there could be nothing alongside Him, not a *nihil*, not even His nature. Nonetheless, theology has always been talking both about the *nihil* or the divine nature, i.e., it has always seen God as a complex being and as a binary union of opposites, which is in stark contrast to the doctrine of divine simplicity.

God is considered to be free only if He can enlarge His being. This is why He cannot *create ex Deo* since this would be repeating Himself. God needs a non-being that is different both from *me on* and *ouk on* – a third kind of non-being. This new non-being, in Berdyaev’s opinion, must have one new characteristic: it has to be uncreated, or, it has to be outside of God. Mentioning the *nihil* or God’s nature makes sense only if we understand this concept as an infinite and uncreated potency even from God’s perspective. Berdyaev suggests that this bottomless freedom has to be the foundation of every form of being if we are hoping to overcome the platonic notion of a deity enslaved by a potent-less, predetermined, and created freedom.

Bradley Underwood

Northwestern University, USA

NOTHING FROM NOTHING: THE UNDERGROUND IN SERGEI BULGAKOV AND NIKOLAI BERDIAEV

Dostoevsky boasted in his notebooks that “I alone deduced the tragic essence of the underground.” “The underground,” and its anonymous inhabitant, the Underground Man, remain among the most novel contributions of the Russian intellectual tradition. The Underground Man’s liminal personality and hyperbolic arguments have served as a touchstone for psychological and philosophical analysis: for psychologists, to understand the nuances of spite and resentment, for philosophers, to develop insights into language and consciousness. The aim of this paper is to delineate how two Russian philosophers – Nikolai Berdiaev (1874–1948) and Sergei Bulgakov (1871–1944) – use the underground to grapple with the problems of free will and evil. My argument begins with the premise that Berdiaev and Bulgakov approach the Underground Man as someone whose will is grounded in “nothing,” a concept invested with cosmic significance. The Underground Man, in their view, seeks a freedom that approximates the void from which God fashioned humans. For both thinkers, evil is coterminous with the liberty to unmake what God has made. Yet Berdiaev and Bulgakov differ in their understanding of the “nothing” towards which the underground is headed.