

UDC 1(4)2-185.2

A. M. MALIVSKYI^{1*}, D. Y. SNITKO^{2*}^{1*}Ukrainian State University of Science and Technologies (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail telepat-57@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-6923-5145^{2*}Ukrainian State University of Science and Technologies (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail dimanche82@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-7417-7958**Gogol on the man's calling in European philosophy and Russian messianism**

The purpose is to study that period of evolution of Gogol's position, in which his ideas of russian messianism are most clearly outlined ("Selected Passages" and "The Author's Confession"). To delineate the forms of determining the influence of messianism on his negative assessments of the anthropology of the Early New Age and the Enlightenment. Realization of the specified purpose presupposes, first, the analysis of his way of interpreting humanism in the European classical philosophy, and, secondly, to clarify the nature of his connection with the way of substantiating the idea of the Russian messianism. **Theoretical basis.** Our view of Gogol's heritage is based on the conceptual positions of phenomenology, existentialism, and hermeneutics. **Originality.** It is revealed, that period of evolution of Gogol's position, which most clearly outlines his ideas of russian messianism ("Selected Passages" and "The Author's Confession"), his position on human nature and its calling is fundamentally different from the position of philosophy of Early New Age and the Enlightenment. If in the first case, it is a question of service to the russian empire, in the last one, it is a question of self-development of the person. Gogol's dehumanization of those perceptions about the man that have occurred in European classical philosophy is a precondition in justification of russian messianism for him. One of its key factors is a narrow understanding of insight the ideas concerning the spiritual foundation of the world, namely – its reduction to the russian empire. **Conclusions.** Gogol's philosophical doctrine of man is only partially described as belonging to the "philosophy of the heart". The disadvantage of this qualification is the impossibility of explaining the question of the origins in Gogol's attempt to substantiate russian messianism. The article demonstrates that the deformation of the basic idea about the connectivity of man with the spiritual arche of the world is its substantive precondition for the philosophy of the Early New Age and the Enlightenment. Gogol narrows it down to the Russian Empire, which makes it impossible to positively delineate the orientations of the russian people. Therefore, his oeuvre during the work on "Selected Passages" and "The Author's Confession" for future generations is a warning about the futility of a single russian path of development, isolated from European civilization. As the further development of russian thought and history proves, Gogol's warning as a Ukrainian thinker really has not been heard. A vivid manifestation of this is the cave nationalism that we see today during the russian-Ukrainian war.

Keywords: Gogol; calling; humanism; messianism; Orthodoxy; rationalism; Enlightenment

*"There is a man standing in front of me,
who laughs at everything we have...*

*No, this is not derision of vices: it is
a disgusting mockery of Russia"*

"You have defeated me, terrible khokhol".

Vasyl Rozanov

*Sometimes it seems that Russia is destined
only to show the world*

how one should not live and what one should not do.

Petro Chaadaiev

Introduction

Nowadays, one of the factors in mainstreaming the interest in the work of Mykola Vasylyovych Gogol is the current war between Russia and Ukraine. This armed aggression determines

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

the existential nature of the question concerning the origins of their way of being and the historical destiny of each nation for decades ahead. This relevance largely outlines the "force field" in which we perceive today's clichés and stereotypes that have been established over the centuries about their national identity, that is, the issue of the originality in the national character. Foremost, we are talking about fateful problems, namely the question: "Who are we?", "What kind of people are we?", "What are our opportunities?", "What is our calling in the Universe?". One of the preconditions for a meaningful clarification of our position on each of the issues is an address to those representative figures who are largely the embodiment of said tension. The Ukrainian thinker Mykola Vasylovych Gogol undoubtedly belongs to them. Traditionally, when he is mentioned, a stereotypical idea of Gogol as a great Russian writer and one of the first developers concerning the idea of Russian messianism involuntarily comes to mind. A significant lack of this interpretation is the neglect of his Ukrainian origin and his undisguised sympathy for everything Ukrainian. A vivid embodiment of the latter is his famous "Evenings on the farm near Dykanka", which demonstrate Gogol's sincere attitude toward the native culture, countrymen, songs, land, cuisine, and more. The concluding lines of "Taras Bulba" can be considered as their representative impersonation, which in the first edition authentically voice the main motives of the Cossack's life: "Be healthy, pans-brothers, comrades! And look, come again next summer, and have a good time properly!...". However, as evidenced by the second edition of this text, Gogol's heritage also includes another, the alternative answer to the question of the man's calling. The freedom-loving spirit of the Ukrainian Cossacks disappears in it and the uniqueness of the Russian Empire comes to the fore: "Wait, the time will come, there will be time, you will find out that it is the Orthodox Russian faith! Even now, distant and close peoples hear: their tsar is rising from the Russian land, and there will be no power in the world that would not obey him! ...". While learning these statements, it is impossible to avoid the dramatic question of what real Gogol is? In the process of its analysis, it is important to avoid the temptation of ideas about the transitional nature of the author's position in the first edition, which is a kind of scaffolding in the transition to the second one. The tension is growing significantly because the latter option is largely related to "Selected Passages" and "The Author's Confession". Studying the issue of the humanism of the latest version, it is difficult to disagree with the fair assessment of Myroslav Popovych (1989), who notes the unacceptability of Gogol's position today for this period of his oeuvre: *"In fact, "Selected Passages" did not become a "big book", because it is impossible to preserve the humanistic impulse towards people while preserving its religious formulation"* (p. 189). Without denying the fairness of this statement, we would like to draw attention to the possibilities of interpreting the factors and nature of the deformation of the ideas of humanism in Gogol's oeuvre, which opens the current level of historical and philosophical science.

According to the thinker himself, from an early age, he was characterized by a relentless pursuit to observe a man. Thereof, his oeuvre can be considered the realization of this striving. For us, the most noteworthy questions are how fully it has been implemented by him and how do his achieved results relate to the level of contemporary philosophy for him? Therefore, special attention should be paid to those studies of Gogol's heritage in which the human problem is central. One of the most recent publications, where his theory is rightly classified as "intelligence anthropology" is an example (Tarnashynska, 2019). The author, based on a detailed studying of the thinker's heritage, proposes to interpret his teachings about a man as a manifestation of the "philosophy of the heart". While reading this text, doubts about its completeness involuntarily arise. First, there is a naive perception of Gogol's inheritance, since the focus is more on the intentions

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

he voiced than on the results obtained. Secondly, it is impossible to clarify the important question for us about how Gogol's substantiation of the idea of Russian messianism became possible.

Comprehension of said doubts encourages us to pay more attention to those examples of a holistic vision in the heritage of a great genius, which still has heuristic potential. Among them is the destructive influence of his spiritual constitution on the project being developed, noted by N. Berdyaev, a graduate of Kyiv University. The most significant flaw in Gogol's oeuvre as the development of the Russian idea, we propose to think the author's inability to seize and reproduce the psychology of living souls: "Gogol's tragedy was that he could never see and portray the human image, the image of God in a man" (Berdyaev, 1990, p. 113).

In the context of reviewing superficial interpretations of Gogol's philosophizing as a study of a man, it is appropriate to refer to the constructive potential of Dmitry Chyzhevskiy's teachings. He rightly notes the inability of the thinker to offer a universal way to improve human nature: "Gogol's letters (not just "correspondence with friends", but real letters, which, of course, no one reads!) – Chyzhevskiy (2005) accentuates – not an empty oddity of "teaching", but a serious – albeit unsuccessful – attempt to master human souls, an attempt at spiritual directing" (p. 397).

The heuristic potential of Gogol's thorough researcher Serhii Yefremov, voiced in the early twentieth century, is also indisputable. Focusing on the internal contradiction of the Ukrainian thinker, he rightly emphasized the difficulties in understanding his extraordinary figure: "It seems difficult to find... the second more disharmonious figure... Stupid schoolboy – and a genius writer; a great humorist... – and no less a pessimist; a recognized realist... and an immense mystic... a Ukrainian who attituded with piety and love to his homeland – and an exclusively Russian writer who left no line in his native language, except for one private letter, in his literary heritage". Even more important for us is the chosen way of the metaphorical depiction of those two principles of Gogol's soul, which are associated with Ukrainianness and the Russian aspect of his soul. Analyzing Gogol's words "I do not know what kind of soul I have", the researcher emphasizes the expediency of talking not about one but about two souls of Gogol. One is young, fresh, poetic, mildly humorous, Ukrainian, the other is Russian, senile, cold, severe, sharply satirical, with an excessive exaltation of official statehood. It was such a split, according to Yefremov, that suppressed and finally broke the artist: "full of contradictions and contrasts, Gogol could not stand it and fell under the weight of his duplicity". Having lost his Ukrainianness at the end of his life, Gogol ceased to be himself and lost his original literary style and the meaning of his own life (Yefremov, 1909, p. 3, p. 8, p. 20). For us today, this means recognizing the absurdity of Russian messianism.

A precondition for its meaningful outline is a detailed study of the Gogol's heritage as a thinker who tends to neglect the idea of humanism as one of the key achievements of philosophy of the Early New Age and the Enlightenment. Addressing them opens up the possibility of understanding those deepest factors that underlie Gogol's justification of the idea of Russian messianism.

Purpose

Based on the above, the purpose of this article is indisputable – to study that period in the evolution of Gogol's position, in which his ideas of Russian messianism are most clearly outlined ("Selected Passages" and "The Author's Confession"). To define the forms of determining the influence of messianism on his negative assessments of anthropology in the Early New Age and the Enlightenment. Realization of the said purpose assumes, first, the analysis of his way of in-

interpreting humanism in the European classical philosophy, and, secondly, to find out the character of his connection with a reasonable way of substantiating the idea of the Russian messianism.

Statement of basic materials

When studying Gogol's oeuvre as aimed at understanding the man's phenomenon, it is important to remember the relationship of his position with contemporary philosophical thought. For Gogol, as well as for his European contemporaries, the low assessment of the current level of development and the urgency of the problem in the human self-knowledge and the search for ways to improve it are axiomatic. This moment of his viewpoint is in common with the opinions of Kierkegaard and Schopenhauer. Outlining it meaningfully, he emphasizes the importance of the task: "to change all humanity, ... to raise human dignity". In other words, Gogol (1978b, p. 373, 1978a, p. 431) connects his own vision of the man's calling with self-improvement, that is the realization of the desire to become better.

By arguing the lawfulness of Gogol's attributing to a number of thinkers, it is reasonable to focus on the features of his philosophical understanding of a man. In particular, it is worth drawing attention to the episode of "Selected Passages", in which he emphasizes the unique status of a man in the Universe since he/she foremost deserves amazement and is its main subject: "I swear, – he writes – a person deserves to be viewed with more interest than the factory and the ruins" (Gogol, 1978b, p. 269). A precondition for a deeper comprehension of his position mentioned here is attention to those personalities of outstanding thinkers who for him have indisputable achievements in understanding human nature. It would seem that the list of his authoritative predecessors, namely Moses, Homer, and apostle Paul gives sufficient grounds for optimism. And although our thinker quotes the apostle Paul's words that man is lies (Gogol, 1978a, p. 421, p. 425), however, unfortunately, this thesis has not received its meaningful clarification in his texts. Evidence of the ambiguity of this situation is the fact that their heritage allows us to comprehend the invariant dimensions of human nature. However, contemplating the factors of their insufficient development in Gogol, it is appropriate to pay attention to his lack of referrals to Socrates, Augustine, Descartes, Kant, etc.

Contemplating the Ukrainian thinker's ideas about men and the preconditions for solving the problem of self-improvement by them, it is necessary to focus attention on peculiarities in his interpretation of the original connection of a man with the spiritual origin of the world. First of all, it is about the specifics of his interpretation of thinkers' teachings of the Early New Age and the Enlightenment. For them, the focus is on the Christian God as the transcendent foundation. Gogol has a much narrower vision in the nature of the primary foundation, namely – Russia and the Russian state. Respectively, in the first case, the way of realizing one's own calling looks like the self-development of a man, which is a form of representation of the divine in a man.

For the Ukrainian thinker, while working on "Selected Passages" and "The Author's Confession" the conception of self-sufficiency and autonomy of a man is unacceptable. As it turns out, his texts show: that such conceptions are dangerous to appear to the wide public, since their "influence is more harmful than helpful". Gogol is firmly convinced that the ability to self-development of a man is not a positive moment. On the contrary, it is arbitrariness as a manifestation of the man's negative aspect: "This development of oneself is necessarily manifested in everything that will come out of his pen", – he writes (Gogol, 1978a, p. 444). As the following narration attests, for Gogol (1978a) only those thinkers who are representatives of their country, that is, "citizens of their land" have an indisputable right to exist (p. 446). The guideline here for

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

the dehumanization of a man for Gogol is closely linked to the idea of serving the state in any even the lowest position. Therefore, Gogol's firm conviction is to realize one's own calling in the form of developing one's own "project", which, strictly speaking, is not own. This development should clarify the question of what "I can be needed and useful to Russia" (Gogol, 1978a, pp. 446-447). As we see, a significant narrowing in the conception of the spiritual primary foundation of the world is one of Gogol's factors in the dehumanization of the human image.

Among the most striking manifestations of Gogol's negative assessment concerning the ideas of autonomy and self-development of a man is his negative attitude toward technology and disbelief in science. A representative example of this is the discourse about the nature of the railways' impact on human lifestyles and prospects. For him, they are meaningless and perspectiveless inventions, the manifestations of which include a pessimistic assessment of the railway. Demonstrating the complete opposite of the optimistic orientation in the European philosophy of the Enlightenment, Gogol outlines his own prejudice and pessimism using a number of rhetorical questions: Why this speed of movement? What has mankind gained through railways and any other roads, and what has it acquired in all its forms of development, and what is the benefit that one city is impoverished now and another has become a crammed market, and the number of "loitering" people around the world has increased? (Gogol, 1978b, p. 316).

Studying Gogol's vision of the factors from the above transformations, it is appropriate to concentrate attention on the peculiarities of his reception of the doctrine of a man in the Early New Age and the Enlightenment. As evidenced by the texts of the thinker, in the European philosophy of this period, he primarily sees the self-love (narcissism) of a man and pride. Demonstrating disrespect to the holy of heavenly love, "... humanity of the present age – he writes – fell in love with its purity and beauty" (Gogol, 1978b, p. 375). Studying the forms of manifestation of this pride in the contemporary twenty-first century, Gogol assigned a prominent place to the pride of the mind. By meaningfully outlining the forms of its manifestation, he demonstrates a simplified vision of Rene Descartes's position. These include, first of all, the mind's trust in its own testimonies and their certitude. The exaggeration of the mind's importance in human nature has gone, according to Gogol, very far. The consequence of the mind's pride is the process of destruction of humanity in a man – "the most important and best in a man".

Retrospectively assessing the significance of "Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends" and "The Author's Confession" in the history of Gogol's anthropological intelligence, we have to state that they never became a manifesto of humanism. Among the key aspects of this failure are both Gogol's inability noted by Berdyaev to seize and reproduce the psychology of living souls (i.e. inability to comprehend and depict God's image in a man) and significant deformations of the role of rationality and higher manifestations of human nature.

One of the preconditions for a critical comprehension of Gogol's position as a dehumanization of the human image is attention to the way he interprets the revolution in philosophy, which took place in the Early New Age and the Enlightenment. It would seem that he fully shares its pathos, emphasizing the high appreciation of the mind and the possibility of a complete understanding of the Universe. Like European philosophers, Gogol (1978a) is firmly convinced that his calling is to become "the solver of contemporary issues" (p. 443). The paradoxicalness of his image of the world as a thinker which is far from science is that in our time the world is no longer unknown and mysterious since today "life is no longer a mystery to us" (Gogol, 1978a, p. 448). As paradoxical as it may sound, we find in Gogol higher assessing opportunities of mind than in the era of rationalism. The considerate and unbiased study of the Early New Age think-

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

ers' heritage shows – they avoid the temptation to universalize the mind since they believe the sensually-passionate component of a man is one of the most important. Therefore, for Descartes as a key figure of this period, the concept of miracles and mysteries are among the cross-cutting issues. The central role of wonder in his classification of passions is closely related to them. See more in detail (Malivskyi, 2019).

In the mentioned context, a certain inconsistency of Gogol becomes apparent, which later has enabled the mentoring tone of his teachings in "Selected Passages". By denying the existence of mystery and enigma of the world, Gogol thus deprives a man of the opportunity to listen to her/his "I", to the inner voice in the process of searching by a calling in the Universe. Strictly speaking, the said moment attests to the evading of Gogol from his attitude during the work on the first volume of "Dead Souls", where we find a panegyric to the sensually-passionate vision of the world. First of all, the author's attention is drawn to the principal immensity of passions and their innumerability. The author of the poem emphasizes the ambivalence of the role of the passions, namely – being submissive to the mind, they simultaneously become "terrible rulers of it". Significant is the fact that in the hierarchy of passions a prominent place is given to the most beautiful of them, the realization of which promises bliss and "boundless paradise of one's souls". In the process of familiarization with this moment, both Plato's idea of good and Descartes' notion of generosity involuntarily appear in the memory. However, in contrast to the latter, Gogol is far from believing that his vision of generosity as the highest passion is the key to all other passions. For him, the existence of those passions, the acquiring of which it is useless for a person to dream of is an undeniable fact. We are talking about those passions that are the embodiment of an invincible necessity – fate, destiny, divine providence. "There are passions – he writes – which are not chosen by a man, [moreover], someone was not given the strength to evade them". Outlining his own vision of those basic passions that largely determine the position of a man in the Universe, Gogol is far from optimistic concerning the possibility of their unambiguous qualification. In particular, when it comes to Chichikov as the main character of "Dead Souls", the author suggests us to agree with the recognition of the limits of our ability to understand and admit the mystery of passions as the driving forces of his behavior. Gogol proposes us to agree that the main factors in Chichikov's destiny are a manifestation of teleology ("the wisdom of heaven") hidden from a man, the comprehension of which relates to the future and is clearly related to him with the completion of the poem. For him, as an artist, those passions associated with the negative dimensions of human existence are primarily important. If in classical philosophy (in particular, in Descartes) their embodiment is an evil genius, whose influence can be overcome with the help of the mind, then Gogol, like his contemporaries, has no such optimism.

While focusing entirely on the specifics of Gogol's posture during the period of work on "Selected Passages" for us the passions that are inherent in the Russian man are especially important. To what extent is it possible to clarify their content? It is a question of considering the idea of a "great writing" in which there must be a holistic vision of good and bad in a Russian man, as well as the basic "property of our Russian nature" is described especially vividly (Gogol, 1978b, p. 325). In the process of realization of this task, the main moments include the tasks of forms of self-knowledge and the realization of a personal calling.

For Gogol, the passions of horror and despair, which are associated with the perception of absurd reality are primarily important. Describing the state of a person who is aware of one's own finitude and spiritual desert, he writes: "It is terrible blackness of soul... when inexorable death is already before our eyes!", "it is scary! ... The soul freezes in horror ..." (Gogol, 1978b,

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

pp. 188-189). Emotionally evaluating his own state of mind in a world devoid of spiritual guidelines, Gogol (1978b) does not hide his pervasive despair: "God! It is empty and scary in your world" (p. 379). As it is known, the Danish thinker Søren Kierkegaard voiced similar sentiments simultaneously with Gogol. For him, fear is evidence of the higher mission associated with faith and human freedom. Over the last few decades, the thesis of the spiritual kinship of the two mentioned geniuses has become increasingly common in the research literature. However, it is obvious to us today that Gogol's pessimistic experiences are largely due to the impossibility of positively outlining the specifics of the Russian people and the interests of the Russian empire. Emphasizing the specific nature of the despair and hopelessness that periodically covered him, it is worth paying attention to the specific forms of overcoming them. We are talking about the influence of Slavophiles, who defended the idea of uniqueness and the special vocation of the Russian people in world history (especially Kostiantyn Aksakov). However, as evidenced by the history of Gogol's persistent work on the meaningful completion of a grandiose plan, he received the torments of Tantalus. In other words, this idea of the Ukrainian thinker was never realized, that is, he failed to outline the humanistic nature of those basic passions that are the driving forces in the behavior of Russian men.

In ascertaining the factors of Gogol's devotion to the idea of messianism, it is worth paying attention to the special personal mission he heard about from his own mother from childhood, as well as to the already mentioned influence of Slavophiles. The latter stubbornly and persistently imposed on him the idea of the special role of the Russian people in world history. One of the preconditions for a deeper understanding of the latter is attention to Hegel's division of peoples into historical and non-historical. And since the Russians are not among his historical peoples, Slavophiles and Gogol advocate an alternative variant as the idea of the superhistoric nature of the Russian people. Its basis is, as you can easily see, the emotional rejection of Hegel's attitude. As it is obvious to us today, the practical realization of the idea concerning the chosenness of the Russian people is performed as a sacrifice of all other peoples, foremost the Ukrainians.

Among the most important for us aspects of Gogol's philosophical attitude, which is a manifestation of these flaws, is the way he interprets the nature of the relationship between panhuman and actually Russian in a man. This is about a contradiction of his approach, in which the proclamation of the interest priority for a man, in general, coexists with the emphasis on the unconditional priority of the Russian man's nature over the West (Gogol, 1978a, p. 424, p. 430, p. 432).

For Gogol, the precondition for resolving the question about the Russian man's calling as a service to the Russian Empire is to identify the essential features of the Russians. According to his texts, he was never able to find a satisfactory answer to the question of those basic principles that meaningfully determine the uniqueness of Russia and the Russians. Evidence of this is the paradoxes presented on the pages of his works. Describing them, Gogol in particular noted the fundamental inability to clarify the uniqueness of Russia among the Russians. Obviously, this problem involves going beyond the boundaries of subjectivism, but it cannot be solved, since almost everyone has their own Russia (Gogol, 1978a, pp. 438-439). The terrible truth, which is connected with the awareness that the Russians from the province have no interest in their own lives and problems, needs special attention and detailed comprehension. In the foreground in a live conversation with them is the content of novels translated from a foreign language. "Russia has dispersed and scattered in my head. I could not put the pieces together", – he states with this undisguised sadness and despair (Gogol, 1978a, p. 439).

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Revealing his own vision of the common welfare, Gogol emphasized the importance of serving the state as a realization of one's own calling by a person. He seeks to portray his own biography as the realization of an a priori designated destiny, where his own function is reduced to the strict performance of official duties. An illustration of the truth of the said thesis is his desire to abdicate responsibility for the version of that project that was implemented in "The Government Inspector" and "Dead Souls" and transfer it to Pushkin (Gogol, 1978a, pp. 426-427). Retrospectively evaluating these writings, he sees their significant flaw in the insufficient thoughtfulness of the overall plan and image of the protagonist. In other words, he considers the implemented project to be artificial and therefore emphasizes the need for a new general plan (Gogol, 1978, p. 326).

Concretizing his outlines, Gogol unambiguously attributes them to the work of a writer as a civil servant who must produce writings useful to the state. In this context, Gogol's most representative writing is his "Selected Passages". However, as we know, on his pages he demonstrates a persistent desire to be useful to the state, which for him is a sufficient reason for those unequivocal recommendations and instructions that offended and annoyed his friends. What are those principles that give Gogol the right to such a mentoring position?

Gogol persistently seeks to convince himself and others in the veracity of ideas about the special opportunities of the Russian people in the context of the general crisis. He notes that although the current crisis situation is hopeless for all people, not for the Russians. A clear sign of the significance of these ideas is both the above-cited conclusion in the "Taras Bulba" second edition and the last pages of "Selected Passages", entitled "Bright Sunday" (Easter), to which he gives the form of expressing his deepest convictions: "Not a grain of what is truly Russian in it and what is consecrated by Christ himself will die from our antiquity". In substantiating these ideas, he draws attention to those signs and symbols that are purely subjective in nature with the help of a series of rhetorical questions. The reader is invited to accept them in faith since, – he writes – "there is something in our nature that foretells this to us". Explaining this thesis in detail, he emphasizes that this is an issue about the unique feature of Russians, which has no analogs in other European cultures: "... we have a courage that is not related to anyone, and if we face some kind of deed that is fundamentally impossible for any other people, even if, for example, to suddenly and simultaneously throw off all our shortcomings that discredit the high nature person". Anticipating possible doubts and arguments, Gogol is persistently looking for a way to reject accusations of bias and subjectivism. And since it is unacceptable for him to appeal to the "natural light of the mind" (as it was in the Early New Age European philosophy), the only possible and acceptable variant for him is to appeal to Divine Revelation. "And my soul speaks firmly to me; – he writes – and this is not a thought imagined in my head. *Such thoughts do not come up* (highlighted by us). They are arisen by God's suggestion of" (Gogol, 1978b, pp. 379-380). Evaluating the originality and direction of the said order of thought, it is difficult not to notice the claims of their author to the role of the modern prophet of Christianity, i.e. the development of the new modern Gospel, similar to Nietzsche's work "Thus Spoke Zarathustra". How promising is the project developed by Gogol in historical perspective?

Turning to the unbiased assessments of Gogol's developed version in answering the question of the man's calling, we have to remember the artificial narrowing of this question. It is a question of his interpretation concerning the project of the future only for the Russian man and Russia. As we study the research literature, we see those interpretations that while reading in our memory inadvertently Gogol's words resurrect about the "terrible humiliation over a man". The grounds for such an interpretation are the assessment of the aforementioned Berdyaev, which has

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

not yet lost its persuasiveness. He describes this project as a "theocratic utopia, a patriarchal idyll". Moreover, "Gogol's utopia is unworthy and slavish" (Berdyayev, 1990, pp. 114-115). For us today, the issue of how consciously these targets were chosen by Gogol comes to the fore? In other words, would he himself agree with the above assessments? The condition for clarifying these issues is to address the peculiarities of the reception of "Selected Passages" by contemporaries of their author. It would seem that he himself was internally ready for harsh criticism, especially if we recall his famous metaphor of the expected slap. But as it turned out, he was depressed and devastated by the reaction caused by the publication of the book. Retrospectively evaluating the significance of this event for history, it should be noted – this is a landmark episode in which Gogol had the opportunity to know an adequate response to his founded project on the messianic nature of Russian literature. His negative obtained result is a warning about the futility of further steps in this direction.

That is why it makes sense to dwell on one of the most important issues for us today. It is an issue of how much the Ukrainian thinker's prophecy about the futility of the Russian messianism ideas was heard? Unfortunately, Gogol's warning, as well as the warning of his contemporary Peter Chaadaev, was not heard. We must state the realities of the early XXI century with convincing evidence – neither Gogol's warnings in the nineteenth century nor their interpretation by Berdyayev in the early twentieth century were not heard. The consequence is the decline of Russia and its loss from the number of cultural nations. Among the most convincing manifestations of danger to human destiny is the very fact of the Ukrainian-Russian war.

Originality

It was found that during the period in the evolution of Gogol's position, which most clearly outlines his ideas of Russian messianism ("Selected Passages" and "the Author's Confession"), his position regarding the man's nature and calling is fundamentally different from the position of the Early New Age and the Enlightenment philosophy. If in the first case we are talking about serving the Russian empire, in the latter, it is a question of the individual's self-development. Gogol's dehumanization of those ideas about a man that took place in European classical philosophy is for him a precondition for the justification of Russian messianism. One of its key factors is a narrow understanding of the ideas about the spiritual basis of the world, namely – its reduction to the Russian Empire.

Conclusions

Gogol's philosophical doctrine of man is only partially described as belonging to the "philosophy of the heart". The disadvantage of this qualification is the impossibility of clarifying the origins of Gogol's attempt to justify Russian messianism. The text of the article demonstrates that its substantive precondition is the deformation of the basic conception of the philosophy of the Early New Age and the Enlightenment about the connectivity of a man with the spiritual origin of the world. Gogol narrows it down to the Russian Empire, which makes it impossible to positively delineate the orientations of the Russian people. Therefore, his oeuvre during the work on "Selected Passages" and "The Author's Confession" for future generations is a warning about the futility of a single Russian path of development, isolated from European civilization. As evidenced by the further development of Russian thought and history, Gogol's warning as a Ukrainian thinker has never been heard. A vivid manifestation of this is the cave nationalism we see today during the Russian-Ukrainian war.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

REFERENCES

- Berdyayev, N. A. (1990). Russkaya ideya. Osnovnye problemy russkoy mysli XIX veka i nachala XX veka. In *O Rossii i russkoy filosofskoy kulture* (pp. 43-271). Moscow: Nauka. (in Russian)
- Chyzhevskiy, D. (2005). Pro "Shynel" Hoholia. In V. S. Lisovyi (Ed.), *Filosofski tvory* (Vol. 3, pp. 384-402). Kyiv: Smoloskyp. (in Ukrainian)
- Gogol, N. (1978a). Avtorskaya ispoved. In *Sobranie sochineniy* (Vol. 6, pp. 420-454). Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura. (in Russian)
- Gogol, N. (1978b). Vybrannye mesta iz perepiski s druzyami (1847). In *Sobranie sochineniy* (Vol. 6, pp. 184-380). Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura. (in Russian)
- Malivskiy, A. M. (2019). *Unknown Descartes: Anthropological Dimension of Rene Descartes' Philosophical Searching*. Dnipro: Herda. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/978-617-7639-22-9> (in Ukrainian)
- Popovych, M. (1989). *Mykola Hohol: Roman-ese*. Kyiv: Molod. (in Ukrainian)
- Tarnashynska, L. (2019). Antropologhiia Mykoly Hoholia: "... pity shliakhom rozviduvannia". *Hoholeznachchi studii*, VIII (25), 212-223. (in Ukrainian)
- Yefremov, S. (1909). *Mizh dvoma dushamy. Mykola Hohol*. Kyiv: VIK. (in Ukrainian)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Бердяев Н. А. Русская идея. Основные проблемы русской мысли XIX века и начала XX века. *О России и русской философской культуре*. Москва : Наука, 1990. С. 43–271.
- Чижевський Д. Про "Шинель" Гоголя. *Філософські твори* : у 4 т. / під заг. ред. В. С. Лісового. Київ : Смолоскип, 2005. Т. 3. С. 384–402.
- Гоголь Н. Авторская исповедь. *Собрание сочинений* : в 7 т. Москва : Художественная литература, 1978. Т. 6. С. 420–454.
- Гоголь Н. Выбранные места из переписки с друзьями (1847). *Собрание сочинений* : в 7 т. Москва : Художественная литература, 1978. Т. 6. С. 184–380.
- Малівський А. М. *Незнаний Декарт: антропологічний вимір у філософуванні*. Дніпро : Герда, 2019. 300 с. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/978-617-7639-22-9>
- Попович М. *Микола Гоголь* : роман-есе. Київ : Молодь, 1989. 208 с.
- Тарнашинська Л. Антропологія Миколи Гоголя: "... піти шляхом розвідування". *Гоголезнавчі студії*. 2019. Вип. VIII (25). С. 212–223.
- Єфремов С. *Між двома душами. Микола Гоголь*. Київ : ВІК, 1909. 31 с.

A. M. MALIVSKIY^{1*}, D. YU. SNITKO^{2*}

^{1*}Український державний університет науки і технологій (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта telepat-57@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-6923-5145

^{2*}Український державний університет науки і технологій (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта dimanche82@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-7417-7958

Гоголь про покликання людини в європейській філософії та російському месіанстві

Мета – вивчити той період еволюції позиції Гоголя, в якому найбільш виразно окреслені його ідеї російського месіанства ("Вибрані місця" та "Авторська сповідь"). Окреслити форми детермінуючого впливу месіанства на негативні оцінки ним антропології Нового часу та Просвітництва. Реалізація зазначеної мети передбачає, по-перше, аналіз його способу тлумачення гуманізму у європейській класичній філософії, та, по-друге, з'ясування характеру його зв'язку зі способом обґрунтування ідеї російського месіанства. **Теоретичний базис**. Наш погляд на спадщину Гоголя заснований на концептуальних положеннях феноменології, екзистенціалізму та герменевтики. **Наукова новизна**. Виявлено, що той період еволюції позиції Гоголя, в якому найбільш виразно окреслені його ідеї російського месіанства ("Вибрані місця" та "Авторська сповідь"), його позиція стосовно природи людини та її покликання принципово відмінна від позиції філософії Нового часу та Просвітництва. Якщо в першому випадку йдеться про служіння російській імперії, то в

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

останньому йдеться про саморозбудову особистості. Гоголівська дегуманізація тих уявлень про людину, які мали місце в європейській класичній філософії, є для нього передумовою обґрунтування російського месіанства. Одним з її ключових чинників є вузьке розуміння уявлень про духовну першооснову світу, а саме – редукція її до російської імперії. **Висновки.** Філософське вчення Гоголя про людину лише частково описується як таке, що належить до "філософії серця". Вадю цієї кваліфікації є неможливість прояснити питання про витоки спроби Гоголя обґрунтувати російське месіанство. В тексті статті продемонстровано, що його змістовною передумовою є деформація базового для філософії Нового часу та Просвітництва уявлення про сполученість людини з духовним першоначалом світу. Гоголь звужує його до російської імперії, що унеможлиблює позитивне окреслення орієнтирів російської людини. А тому його творчість в період роботи над "Вибраними місцями" та "Авторською сповіддю" для наступних поколінь є попередження про безперспективність окремого російського шляху розвитку, ізольованого від європейської цивілізації. Як свідчить подальший розвиток російської думки та історії, попередження Гоголя як українського мислителя так і не було почуте. Яскравим проявом цього є той печерний націоналізм, який ми спостерігаємо сьогодні під час російсько-української війни.

Ключові слова: Гоголь; покликання; гуманізм; месіанство; православ'я; раціоналізм; Просвітництво

Received: 28.02.2022

Accepted: 02.06.2022