

УДК 11/13

Philosophical Dialogue: M. Heidegger and Modern Russian Anthropology

Elena Maksimova and Natalya Fedotova*
*Yaroslav-the-Wise Novgorod State University
316 Antonovo, Veliky Novgorod, 173014, Russia*

Received 22.10.2016, received in revised form 26.12.2016, accepted 30.01.2017

Classical anthropology saw a human being from the center of his existence, from his essence as inward, unchangeable foundation, the source of human power and uniqueness. So long time ago the anthropological paradigm about the priority of human interests over other forms of living appeared, the statement that a few centuries later resulted in ecological crisis. Synergic anthropology of S. Horujy presents the contemporary alternative to the anthropocentric paradigm, presenting the basic characteristic of a human being as the actual living modus of unlocking to the world through ontological boundary.

Keywords: synergic anthropology, ontological boundary, anthropocentrism, human being, hesychasm.

DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0026.

Research area: philosophy.

Introduction

Who comes after the subject? This title of the collective work of twenty European thinkers composed in 1991 by J.-L. Nancy, seemed only to rise its importance in the modern reality of Russian culture in general and in philosophical reality in particular.

Classical anthropology in its greatest names of H. Plessner, M. Sheler, A. Ghelen, was concentrated on the search for the essence of human being. The basic research of contemporary anthropology is about the new modes of subjectivity among the changing boundaries of anthropological types.

Methodology

Russian anthropologist Sergey Horujy notes that the progressive proposition of M. Foucault about “death of the subject” demanded reconsidering anthropocentric position, but it was developed by poststructural philosophy only in a negative way: not towards the «self-care», but towards total disorientation, the loss of the center, diffusion of humanity and “death of a man”.

Russian scholars emphasize that the focus of contemporary philosophy is not at the wholeness of a human being, but at the idea of his delusion (philosophy of J. Deluze). The centered wholeness was changed for a self-constructive man in

postmodern atmosphere of transplantations, artificial intellect and genetic engineering.

Modern Russian anthropology is rethinking the situation of a human being, replacing the denial of human unchangeable essence with the positive idea of being adjacent to the world. Such is the system of synergic anthropology of S. Horujy. Also Saint-Petersburg anthropological school of B. Markov, which refers to M. Scheler, and ethical conception of R. Apresyan (Moscow) are elaborating the necessity of establishing ethical status of human attitude to the ecological surrounding and to the animal world (Apresyan R.G. General problems of environmental ethics. Dilemma of anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism in environmental ethics [Osnovnye problemi ekologicheskoi etiki. Dilemma antropotsentrizma i non-antropotsentrizma v ekologicheskoi etike]. *Etika i ekologiya* (Ethics and ecology); ed. by R.G. Apresyan. V. Novgorod, 2010. pp. 13-26); Markov B. V. Philosophical anthropology of the 20th century [Filosofskaia antropologiya XX veka]. *Istoriia filosofii* (History of philosophy); ed. by A.S. Kolesnikov. St-Petersburg, 2010. 453 p.

Main part

S. Horujy, quoting words of T. Eliott “The centre does not hold”, sees the perspective alternative of the anthropological center in its opposition – the boundary, as a characteristic of a human being and the actual true living modus of openness and unlocking to the world. S Horujy states, that anthropology of unlocking can be considered as a possible answer to the question of Nancy.

The synergic anthropology of S. Horujy is not deprived of historical sources, but it is rooted in Orthodox spiritual tradition. The ascetic Orthodox practice of hesychasm (from the Greek word “hesychia” meaning quietness) includes integral statement of human relationships with outer world. The center of Orthodox

theology – “deification of man” (theosis), which is “the method of anthropological transformation directed to the union with God” (Horujy S.S. What is synergia? The paradigm of synergy in its principal subject fields and discursive links. The talk at the Congress “Synergie: Konzepte, Techniken, Perspektiven”. Berlin, June, 2011. Moscow, 2011. P. 5), the union of two energies, synergia. Since the ascension is directed to the union with God in His energies (but not in His Essence), the human energies are self-transformed in all forms, intellectual, emotional and corporeal ones, so that their configuration (say personality or identity) successively change (Horujy S. Personalistic Dimentions of Neo-Patristic Synthesis and Modern Search for New Subjectivities. Aohna, 2011. P. 419).

In the meantime, to count only on one religious tradition would not be enough in the reality of global problems and religious diversity. Russian researchers suppose that strong support for a new anthropology can be taken not from the denial but from reconsidering classical philosophical heritage, in which Heidegger’s philosophy could play the role of the catalyst of the new understanding of human identity.

The topic of unlocking looks to be applicable to Heidegger’s philosophy, because the nature of Dasein is some unrecoverable incompleteness (Noch-nicht) (Heidegger M. *Sein und Zeit*. Elfte, unveränderte Auflage 1967. Tübingen, 2002. P. 431), that dooms Dasein to be fractional (Unganzheit) (Heidegger M. *Sein und Zeit*. Elfte, unveränderte Auflage 1967. Tübingen, 2002. P. 236) and open to a true mode of being (Kehre). The discourse of openness is tightly connected with the notion “energy”. Heidegger emphasizes that in the latest western philosophy the role of energy was not seen and was forgotten. It was also promoted by entering of Greek philosophy into the Roman world. Heidegger describes it as a tragic event for the notion of energy, because

Aristotle's "ἐνέργεια" in Roman understanding turned into "actus" which is "reality". This was trajectory of classical metaphysics as an "oblivion of being". Horujy reminds that Heidegger ties the possibility to revive the initial sense of "energy" with one special meaning of "energy" in Aristotle's teaching, where "rest" is a fullness of fulfillment. Rest is like a runner, who is ready to run, where the potential and the actual coincide in the circle of being. Dasein is constituted by participating in the energy of being as potentiality. Here the human constitution includes the element of synergia. The openness towards the being is more the "mercy of the being" than the action of a human being.

Heidegger's discourse of energies didn't influence the philosophical thought deeply, and the history of philosophy didn't turn to the Greek channel, but the topos of energy had one important realization – in eastern Christianity, on which Russian synergic anthropology rests upon. G. Palama was the first to present the interpretation of spiritual practice in the forms of energies: divine and human ones. These energies configure a human being. The synergic anthropology borrows this religious idea, while Heidegger's philosophy is not religious at all, but the distinctive feature of both Heidegger's and synergic systems is their ontological character.

In synergic anthropology a human being unlocks himself to the Other form of divine Being, while Heidegger gives the constitutive function of the Other to the Being, which he in some places connects with "gods". S. Horujy remarks, that the discourse of multiple "gods" is the version of a discourse of ontological Other, where gods make parallel with energies.

The dialogue with Heidegger is important, because a contemporary person is more often formed in ontic (in Heidegger's terms) than in ontological way: for example, in ontical openness to virtual reality. To determine the status of human existence – ontological (true) or ontical

(delusive) in the diversity of identity constitutions becomes possible with the help of ontological differentiation. If a human being is ontologically formed by the boundary of his interaction with the world, then such a tough methodological prejudices as dichotomies: "res cogitans" and "res extensa" (R. Descartes), nature and culture (I. Kant), nature and man (E. Fromm), consciousness and body, – lose their modulating strength. Dichotomies have anthropocentric nature and provide the opposition and hostility of a human being to the environment, and, as a consequence, – ecological problems. Besides, "Anthropology of the unlocking shows some new configuration of the relationships between religious and secular schools of thought. This configuration goes in line with the emerging post-secular paradigm that aims to establish a new dialogical type of relations between religious and secular consciousness" (Horujy S. Personalistic Dimensions of Neo-Patristic Synthesis and Modern Search for New Subjectivities. Aohna, 2011. 424 p).

Conclusion

Synergic anthropology presents a positive example of applying continental influence to authentic Russian cultural heritage, of combining phenomenological issues with Orthodox background. Meanwhile the great popularity of M. Heidegger in post soviet Russia has not always produced such conceptive results. The enthusiasm about Heidegger's ideas along with their subjective interpretation in some Russian philosophical schools (often based only on translated text) at a vast degree is flowing not from philosophy itself, but from the strong desire in last 30 years to be participating in western world, where German and French philosophy seemed to be a good bridge. The positivity of this strong attraction without the equivalent awareness inside philosophical field of Russian culture is yet another ambiguous topic to be discussed.

References

Apresyan R.G. General problems of environmental ethics. Dilemma of anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism in environmental ethics [Osnovnye problemi ekologicheskoy etiki. Dilemma antropotsentrizma i non-antropotsentrizma v ekologicheskoi etike]. *Etika i ekologiya* (Ethics and ecology); ed. by R.G. Apresyan. V. Novgorod, 2010. pp. 13-26.

Horujy S.S. What is synergia? The paradigm of synergy in its principal subject fields and discursive links. The talk at the Congress “Synergie: Konzepte, Techniken, Perspektiven”. Berlin, June, 2011. Moscow, 2011. 40 p.

Horujy S. Personalistic Dimensions of Neo-Patristic Synthesis and Modern Search for New Subjectivities. Aohna, 2011. 424 p.

Heidegger M. Sein und Zeit. Elfte, unveränderte Auflage 1967. Tübingen, 2002. 450 p.

Horujy S. Personalistic Dimensions of Neo-Patristic Synthesis and Modern Search for New Subjectivities. Aohna, 2011. 424 p.

Markov B. V. Philosophical anthropology of the 20th century [Filosofskaja antropologija XX veka]. *Istorija filosofii* (History of philosophy); ed. by A.S. Kolesnikov. St-Petersburg, 2010. 453 p.

Философский диалог:

М. Хайдеггер и современная российская антропология

Е. Максимова, Н. Федотова

*Новгородский государственный университет
имени Ярослава Мудрого
Россия, 173014, Новгород, Антоново, 316*

Классическая антропология рассматривает человека из центра его существования, исходит из его сущности как неизменного основания, источника власти человека и его уникальности. Так, много веков назад появилась антропологическая парадигма, утверждающая приоритет человеческих интересов над всеми другими формами жизни, – позиция, результатом которой через несколько столетий стал экологический кризис. Синергичная антропология С. Хоружего представляет современную альтернативу антропоцентристской парадигме, выражая базовые характеристики человеческого существования через парадигму размыкания человека к миру посредством онтологической границы.

Ключевые слова: синергичная антропология, онтологическая граница, антропоцентризм, человек, исихазм.

Научная специальность: 09.00.00 – философские науки.
