Certain philosophical and historical ideas
of A.S. Khomyakov and Yu.F. Samarin

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

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

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

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

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

I believe it is the idea of the «Slavic Brotherhood» that most precisely expresses Khomyakov's and Samarin's endeavour to implement the principle of sobornost in the Slavs' social life, which, according to them, will lead to the flourishing of the national culture even among the Slavic minorities.
It is specifically important that the Slavic union cannot be amorphous and faceless, where each of the nations would lose its national originality for the sake of another idol if the «Slavdom» is understood this way. A man is similar to a tree which will wither without its ancestral roots going back into centuries. Only in the context of a family the notions of «Vseleinskost'», «Slavdom», «universal human values» gain their genuine meaning. It is also known that at the crucial and critical epochs both for a man and a nation it is important to rely on the existing age-old spiritual tradition. Otherwise, both the man and the nation, according to Khomyakov's figurative expression, are doomed to the «homeless orphanhood» and finally even to downfall.

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

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

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

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

F.F. Zelinsky introduced the notion of «supranationalism» implying the development of the own national traditions and adoption all the «veritable» in the Western life. N.O. Lossky defined that notion as follows: «The true unity of nations ... is not the homogeneity but the vsenarodnost' and their solidarity for the sake of independent and full-blown life of everyone». On that way, not the abstract Marxist «common man» is implemented, but a concrete vsechelovek (panhuman) in a sense that each individual in the sobornoe edinenie (sobor unity) with other individuals shares the whole fullness and variety of the human life. Such ideal is opposite to the all-leveling and unifying internationalism. The sobornoe edinenie of different nations supposes the mutual penetration of national cultures without
losing their distinctness. The creations of different national cultures can penetrate each other and form a superior unity. A sympathetic communication with foreign cultures will lead not to depersonalisation but to a deeper comprehension of one's own culture. I believe the notion of «supranationalism» precisely characterises Khomyakov's position as to the national question.

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

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

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

The problems of the philosophy of history in connection with the comprehension of the existential depth of the human being are the most important ones for Kireevsky, Khomyakov and Samarin. Not only were they the first to describe the philosophical and psychological aspects of the faith in the history of human and world, but also stood at the origins of the philosophy of religion in Russia. They believed that every nation is first determined religiously. According to them, to understand the peculiarity of the nations' faith means to understand its
essence. However, they believed that not any faith can become that life-giving spring which will give scope to the self-realisation and creativity.

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

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

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

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

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

Samarin also found it necessary to implement the Christian moral principles in the social relations. A society living under the Christian laws is a sobor unity in multitude, which is only possible in a community. Beside the boundless development of personality in the Germanic world, the Slavic and Russian world introduced the development of the communal fundamental, which did not at all suppress the personality but only kept it within the voluntarily admitted borders. However, in the end of his life, the philosopher did not write anything either about
the future theocracy or about the universal love or collapse of the history, but he still believed in Russia, its spiritual power available to anyone who needs it.

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

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

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