

Perverse heroism. Vyacheslav Ivanov's dialogue with Nietzsche

M. Lechowska

Jagiellonian University,
24, Gołębia str., Kraków, 31-007, Poland

For citation: Lechowska M. Perverse heroism. Vyacheslav Ivanov's dialogue with Nietzsche. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Philosophy and Conflict Studies*, 2020, vol. 36, issue 2, pp. 254–263.
<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu17.2020.204>

The aim of the paper is to analyse the theoretical base of tragic culture in the writings of F. Nietzsche and V.I. Ivanov. The result of the proposed analysis is the comparison of similarities and differences concerning the cultural role of tragedy in the philosophy of mentioned authors. The philosophers — Nietzsche, the implacable enemy of the historical Christianity and Ivanov, the Christian philosopher of culture, philologist and translator — both postulate creating and preserving tragic culture. According to both authors, the main task of culture is to confront the human being with the most terrible aspects of life. This ruthless requirement allows us to claim that perverse heroism is a general mood and the most important imperative of Nietzsche's and Ivanov's philosophy of culture. The imperative to preserve the tragic principle in culture is in fact an imperative to become a superhuman. The starting point of the analysis is the theorem of Nietzsche who defines a tragic worldview as the opposite of a theoretical one. The essence of the theoretical approach is an overlooking of the tragic dimension of life, which allows man to establish a coherent, justified and safe picture of the world. The tragic approach, emphasizing the inevitability of suffering and the lack of metaphysical foundation, opposes the optimism of the theoretical one. Ivanov, as Nietzsche, was fascinated with Dionysian idea but he interpreted it quite differently. The Russian author accepted Dionysus not as the opposite, but as a prefiguration of Christ. Thus, he drew attention to the presence of the tragic moment in Christianity. The height of Ivanov's dispute with Nietzsche is a completely different interpretation of the idea of superhuman, which presents a totally different understanding of self-transgression and vastly different value systems.

Keywords: tragic culture, Christianity, philosophical anthropology, superhuman, godmanhood.

Vyacheslav Ivanov was a Russian poet, philosopher, and translator. He lived his entire creative life under Nietzsche's influence. Ivanov was seduced by Nietzsche's idea explained in his controversial piece of work "The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music". The Russian philosopher was deeply touched by the diagnosis of culture, which is dead without myth and its mythical roots. Ivanov was also fascinated by the idea of the cultural rebirth, impossible without turning to the ideological basis of the main, in this context, form of art — the tragedy. Nietzsche's idea was present as a reference point in all of Ivanov's concepts, even in those that strongly negated the German philosopher's thesis.

Both authors noticed the great value in consciously experiencing the tragedy of human life. They each dreamed of the culture that accomplishes exalted tasks fulfilled in

the ancient Greek tragedy. The culture, which boldly touches the petrifying aspects of the reality, makes human beings suffer (experience the horror and fragility of life) and forced him to be spiritually torn. Culture should shape the human readiness to fearlessness, to provocatively face the tragedy of life. The aim of the following article is the juxtaposition and study of Nietzsche's and Ivanov's theoretical statements concerning the philosophical and anthropological premises of tragedy.

Nietzsche and Ivanov are convinced that culture should not be a tool of easy consolation that cover what is not unbelievable, inconceivable, horrible and dark because it results in unconscientious and weak people. The duty of culture is to reveal the harsh truth which can break a human. The existential uncertainty, the sense of the absurdity of the world (the lack of the metaphysical roots, which despite the fortuitousness of the human existence, would rescue a person in the ultimate perspective), also the sense of fundamental failure understood as a disagreement with yourself, are all necessary to form the spirituality of the protagonist. Both Ivanov and Nietzsche are convinced that the tragic aspect of culture teaches us how to be more human; those who survive the cruelty of tragedy, gain the strength mentioned by both philosophers (however each of them gave strength a completely different meaning). In this context it is clear that, according to both authors, the culture which provides only easy consolation, cheers us up, gives us a fake sense of tranquillity and security, is not a real culture because it avoids the crucial anthropological concepts.

The sense of the tragedy, both as a form of art and as its philosophical and anthropological basis, the experience of the tragedy of life, connects with the ancient tradition reflecting the dynamic of the spiritual human life — the rites of passage. In general, the rites had three phases: separation (preliminal phase), transition (liminal phase), and incorporation (postliminal phase) [1, pp. 10–11]. The term “liminal” comes from Latin and means ‘the threshold’ or ‘entry’ [2, p. 70].

The aim of the liminal phase was to lead the neophyte into personality fission, into the sense of inner chaos. This state results in the deconstruction of the previous vision of yourself and of the world (“In the liminal stage the novice at the threshold, sitting on the fence, is no longer using his previous personality, but he still doesn't possess the new one”³). The rite was supposed to provoke a certain kind of death in the novice's mind. The natural consequence of such death could be rebirth and fusion. Now, the tragedy seems to fulfil the same function as the middle stage of the mystical rite: it brings the human to the liminal stage (the state of personality deconstruction) and it leaves him unmercifully at this point. Why? To develop his spiritual vigour — as both authors would say.

Nietzsche, as an exponent of the extreme form of a tragic worldview, requires a man to overcome the tendencies culminating in resentment, weakness and fear, pushing humanity to build a coherent, and closed — and thus giving a sense of security — vision of the world. The greatest enemies of the tragic worldview are, according to Nietzsche, Socrates (as a prototype of the “theoretical man”¹), and Christ (as an example of life defying morality²). In the context of the Socratic cult of cognition annihilating tragedy, the German philosopher writes about the “eternal conflict between the theoretical and the tragic world view” [3, p. 104]. The latter is thus furthestmost from constructing an internally coherent theory of reality. It is worth mentioning that tragic cognition is difficult

¹ About the man of theory and anti-Dionysiac “metaphysical comfort” see [3, p. 108].

² About life defying morality see [4, p. 174].

to bear³ because unlike the theoretical vision, it does not withhold from noticing (“the tragedy at the heart of things” [3, p. 64]). The essence and ambition of the tragic viewpoint is to self-educate in gravitas and dangers⁴ — shaping people with “undaunted eyes, with a heroic drive towards the unexplored” [3, p. 111]. Based on such a daring attitude, the tragic culture⁵, evokes in a person the Dionysian feeling of power, born in a joyful affirmation of absurdity of existence.

Tragedy and the Dionysian element almost synonymous to it becomes a frenzy of wellness, torment of the mighty one who is not afraid to glance into his own fate, into his everlasting and unavoidable passing [5, p. 10].

Nietzsche by favouring Dionysian vitality over Christianity born, according to the philosopher, out of resentment juxtaposes Dionysus against Christ. Dionysus in *The Birth of Tragedy*, as a bearer of a strength which contradicts Christianity because it is impervious to the imperative of moral norms, is named an Antichrist. In the *Attempt of self-criticism* regarding his previous work *The Birth of Tragedy*, one may find such an excerpt:

My vital instincts turned against ethics and founded a radical counterdoctrine, slanted aesthetically, to oppose the Christian libel on life. But it still wanted a name. Being a philologist, this is to say a man of words, I christened it rather arbitrarily — for who can tell the real name of the Antichrist? — with the name of Greek god, Dionysos [6, p. 11].

The key issue for us is represented in the statement about the hostility of Dionysus towards Christ and Socrates. The former praises the discordances of life and the latter two are trying, in a moral system or theoretic cognition, to nullify them and reduce all variety to superior entirety. If Dionysus is a frenzy of wellness for Nietzsche, than both Socrates and Christ are personifications of an ailment. Such an ailment is the result of losing a myth as fontal energy for culture deriving from *contradiction in unity* (“coincidentia oppositorum”⁶) and what follows, escapist attachment to optimistic ways of explaining the world.

Yet every culture that has lost myth has lost, by the same token, its natural, healthy creativity. Only a horizon ringed about with myths can unify a culture. <...> Let us consider abstract man stripped of myth, abstract education, abstract mores, abstract law, abstract government <...> a culture without any fixed and consecrated place of origin, condemned to exhaust all possibilities and feed miserably and parasitically on every culture under the sun. Here we have our present age, the result of a Socratism bent on the extermination of myth. Man today, stripped of myth, stands famished among all his pasts and must dig frantically for roots, be it among the most remote antiquities [3, p. 136–137].

Nietzschean tragic myth⁷, constitutes a remedy against the ubiquitous, according to the philosopher, weakness of personality; the role of tragedy as a principle of culture is a

³ “A tragic perception, which requires, to make it tolerable, the remedy of art”; see [3, p. 95].

⁴ “The tragic individual of such a culture, readied by his discipline for every contingency, every terror”; see [3, p. 112].

⁵ “A culture which I dare to describe as tragic”; see [3, p. 111].

⁶ Mircea Eliade expresses the nature of divinity in this way. See [7, p. 412].

⁷ “To understand tragic myth we must see it as Dionysiac wisdom made concrete through Apollonian artifice”. See [3, p. 132].

development of a man's spiritual vigour — the attitude of fearlessness when facing their own fate.

The most important characteristic of tragic culture is:

That (Dionysiac. — *M. L.*) wisdom is put in the place of science as the highest goal. This wisdom, unmoved by the pleasant distractions of the science, fixes its gaze on the total constellation of the universe and tries to comprehend sympathetically the suffering of that universe as its own. Let us imagine the rising generation with undaunted eyes, with a heroic drive towards the unexplored; let us imagine the bold step of these St. Georges, their reckless pride as they turn their backs on all the valetudinarian doctrines of optimism, preparing to “dwell resolutely in the fullness of being”: would it not be necessary for the tragic individual of such a culture, reared by his discipline for every contingency, every terror, to want a novel art of metaphysical solace as his Helena... [3, p. 111–112].

This fearlessness, which manifests itself in cultivating the tragedy of the world, is, according to Nietzsche, a trait of a superior one (one pursuing the ideal of superhuman). This is the one who is able to “*commit himself freely to the icy flood of existence*” [3, p. 112].

The lion's share of mankind, prone to escape from what is terrifying in its inconceivability into monologic explanations, is incapable of affirmation of the absurdity of the world. In addition, art is the sole consolation for a man in view of Nietzsche's philosophy. Due only to its Apollonian charm, the terrifying truth about world becomes bearable. It means that the world, in the Nietzschean concept, may be justified only when based on aesthetics. “This world can be justified only as an aesthetic phenomenon” [3, p. 143].

Reality perceived from a tragic viewpoint is intrinsically absurd: the world and man existing within it are in constant danger of misfortune, death, or in short: of non-existence. When facing it, in order to survive a man must become, quoting Nietzsche, the mighty one, whose constitution is best described by the paradoxical formula of “wellness neurosis”; it denotes an attitude in which a man by contradiction affirms absurdity of his fate — his perpetual passing.

A tragic viewpoint endorses the contradiction at the core of existence, “eternal tangle of life and death, primordial contradiction and pain <...> both earlier than appearance and beyond it” [3, p. 46]. This fundamental contradiction can be observed in a following quote:

The only rule of new reality, which manifested itself before the tragic man, when his eyes were suddenly free from an ancient veil, is that it has no rules. The only everlasting truth is that there are no everlasting truths [8, p. 14].

“Truth” expounded in the above quotation about reality is a perfect reflection of the Nietzschean call, full of ominous perversion, for abandoning the metaphysical systems and for a particular form of pessimism.

I would rather <...> teach you how to laugh — if that is, you really insist on remaining pessimists. And then it may perhaps happen that one fine day you will, with a peal of laughter, send all metaphysical palliatives packing, metaphysics herself leading the great exodus [6, p. 15].

It is, indeed, very difficult not to describe such an attitude as perverse — claiming and destroying a man, it is also difficult to negate the vast quantities of fearlessness it carries. Hence, we have called this attitude “perverse heroism”.

Surprisingly, such an attitude was not uncommon for the thinker for whom, despite a great fascination in pagan culture and most of all in the Dionysian cult, Christian ideals remained indisputable throughout his entire life. The thinker in question is Vyacheslav Ivanovich Ivanov, whose philosophy of tragedy will be discussed below.

Ivanov's interest in tragedy appeared alongside his fascination in the ideas of Friedrich Nietzsche who, citing along the graphical description of Heinrich Stammler, reinforced the intellectual and spiritual pulse of the Russian thinker⁸. Nietzsche was always a cardinal point of reference⁹ and was *implicitly* present in his theses that contradicted those of Nietzsche. The early work of this German philosopher *The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music* left a striking impression on the Russian poet. In this masterpiece, Ivanov found a conceptual demonstration of his spiritual hunger as well as an answer to the cause of turbulences of the entire era, not only in the Western Europe, but also in Russia. As for a Russian perspective, it is enough to mention these words: "Nietzsche was in the air. He had an enormous impact on many of the representatives of what we now call the Silver Age of Russian literature and thought" [9, p. 299].

However, despite a genuine admiration for this German philosopher's work, the Russian artist was not satisfied with just obsequious imitation, but he became an original standard-bearer of Nietzsche's thought. Contrary to Nietzsche, the Russian thinker did not compare the Greek god of tragedy, Dionysus, to Christ¹⁰, but rather took him for a prefiguration of Christ. By doing so, he cast both characters into one perspective and depicted them as a single unified voice in the debate over the essence of humanity. Therefore, according to the poet, both characters are carrying a unified message answering to the same anthropological sensitivity. That unified duet, Nietzsche-ism integrated with an acquired in early childhood Christianity, makes Ivanov a representative of the Silver Age in Russia, which saw new religious awareness, so syncretic at its foundations, soaked with the passion of intercultural seeking, vast in quantity of borrowings, and extraordinary openness for new interpretations of what is culturally well known.

Tragedy, closely related to the character of Dionysus («Трагедия <...> есть <...> простое видоизменение дионисийского богослужебного обряда» [10, p. 297]) appears to Ivanov as constituted by the dyad rule («признаем диадой началом Диониса» [11, p. 194]). The dyad experience is based on experiencing unity and separation at the same time. The Russian poet displays elusiveness of the dyadic concept when using the bivalent logic, naming it a logic of element. He defines such logic as a contradiction in the bosom of unity ("первоначальное, коренное единство, в котором вскрывается внутренняя противоположность" [11, p. 193]), a fundamental split in the world's structure («непоправимый разлад мироздания» [12, p. 159]). This original division, when it finds suitable soil in a man's spiritual life, becomes the fuel for a tragedy («искусство диады» [11, p. 193]).

In this context it is very important to distinguish the usual, rooted in social attitude duality, from, the characteristic for a tragedy, which is internal doubling. Let us cite

⁸ See [9, p. 306].

⁹ "Even in later years <...> when it seemed that he (Ivanov. — *M. L.*) had parted ways with him (Nietzsche. — *M. L.*), he returned, indeed critically and with reservations, but again and again, to the idol of his youth". See [9, p. 298].

¹⁰ «В отличие от автора "Рождения трагедии из духа музыки", он (Vyacheslav Ivanov. — *M. L.*) не противопоставляет Диониса Христу». See [10, p. 297].

the fragment that demonstrates the paradox and can be attributed to a dyad category: «мечущиеся две равные силы <...> не хотят исхода и согласия, хотят слепо себя, только себя, — пребыть в себе и в противоположении одна другой» [11, p. 193]. It can be noted that the experience of separation would not be so overwhelming if the unity enabling it would be eliminated. Tragic entanglement establishes two moments: that which entirely prevents the final division and everlasting antinomy breaking this unity.

It is important that Ivanov in his philosophy of tragedy emphasizes the essential division in a particular horizon, formed by Christianity. Such a horizon consists of an intention of godmanhood. Consequently, it becomes clear that Ivanov's tragedy is in a different league than Nietzsche's tragedy. The basis of the second one is anti-Christian at its core while the first one determines the experience of despair at the core of Christian consciousness. The painfulness of experiencing the tragedy of human life is directly proportional for Ivanov, to Christian love — godmanhood — perfection. Inclusion of this reference allows one to comprehend the deep sense of the tragedy from Ivanov's anthropology. This concept was described by the thinker in the formula «Человек един и <...> человек свободен <...> жизнь в основе своей трагична, потому что человек не то, что он есть» [13, p. 488].

According to Ivanov, the tragic gap in the highest acts of a man's spiritual life («видеть до глубины свои внутренние противоречия»¹¹) are radically different from the cultivation of a monolithical truth that erases the significant antinomies in a human: («глубочайшее чувство и безумный пафос космического и человеческого антиномизма» [15, p. 213]). This constitutes the basis of the tragic art as well as the tragic worldview. Cultivating the growth of this tragic worldview in human minds was expressed by the Russian philosopher, primarily in guaranteeing the cultural place for tragedy.

In the most perfect manifestation of a tragic worldview in Greek tragedy, terrifying and sacred at the same time, is the truth which a human being was enchanted in (in the way inconceivable for earthly sensibility). “You have to know how to suffer”¹² — Nietzsche seems to claim. The astounding truth about “the intense susceptibility of suffering” [3, p. 31] is familiar to Ivanov («Эллины умели страдать»¹³). Even though he inherited it from Nietzsche, he still found its deepest meaning, without monotheistic context, in the writers of Greek tragedies. What connects these two is the simultaneous observation of the non-removable tragic characteristic of human faith, and the bizarre theorem about the appearance of everlasting human dignity, in the face of most tragic events and deepest suffering of human existence.

It is worth noting that with this suffering, a man does not build his heroic identity in the afterlife (which would mean a triumph of anthropological monologism where suffering is treated as a measure of building higher unity). Nietzsche wrote about such distortion when tragedy turns into dramatized epos¹⁴. The unavoidable gape is at the core of the tragic sentence, on the basis of which humanity and its unspoken and inconceivable dignity is built on.

¹¹ This expression we can find in Ivanov's works in following form: «Он не видел до глубины своих внутренних противоречий». See [14, p. 546].

¹² “How else (without tragic art. — *M. L.*) could life had been born by a race so hypersensitive, so emotionally intense, so equipped for suffering?” See [3, p. 30].

¹³ The sentence in full form reads as follows: «Народ эллинов поистине достоин считаться образцом человечества и как бы народом всечеловеков. Как их Прометей, они умели страдать». See [16, p. 310].

¹⁴ See [3, p. 97].

Thus, in Ivanov's view, Christian anthropology does not have to omit the tragic dimension of human faith. The tragic perspective includes the Christian vision of man and the world. It is beyond doubt that Ivanov was aware of this inevitable tragedy of human fate («Его (Вячеслава Иванова. — М. Л.) чувство человеческой судьбы глубоко трагично» [17, p. 30] and what is important is that he did not try, by means of homophonic entirety, to diminish the role of this tragedy.

Preceding reflections have led us to a fundamental difference in this discourse, the manifestation of which can be seen in Ivanov's attitude towards Nietzsche's concept of a superhuman¹⁵, one who is supposed to harden himself through exposure to the atrocities of life presented in tragedy.

The concept of a superhuman (in the case of Ivanov — originating from Nietzsche)¹⁶ oriented the poet's train of thought towards the German philosopher's Christian themes — towards St. Augustus' formula *transcende te ipsum*. According to Ivanov, in order to reach the level of true existence it is necessary to breach the narrowness of one's own "self". This transgression cannot be reduced only to a negative act, which is similar to Nietzsche and based on the rejection of all boundaries, on taking control over what is able to dominate a man. Ivanov sets a certain and strict direction of this self-transcendence, thus depicting the anthropological ideal entirely different than Nietzsche: «Проблема сверхчеловечества есть проблема грядущего богочеловечества» [17, p. 39]. From this perspective, culture is derived from a man's religious source, which constitutes, erotic in its roots, the condition of a man. This condition is an everlasting "leaning towards" what supersedes a human being and composes its existence all together. In this context, it is worth mentioning that tragedy as art comes to life by itself due to the religious impulse deeply rooted in man, which, so to say, is ontologically correlative and beyond the individual, communal, and universal level. Consequently, the tragedy is not an expression of the individual mind, but rather a manifestation of a level that is common for all human beings; the tragedy is a testimony of vast universal identity — a pan-human Me («всечеловеческое Я» [19, p. 76]). Therefore, we can say that it is a paradigm of all acts of creation deeply rooted in choral, collective sentience.

The truth about the pan-human Me as the ultimate identity of a man (as opposed to belief being determined by external conditions), in Ivanov's opinion, was captured perfectly by Fyodor Dostoyevsky: «Достоевский подслушал у судьбы самое сокровенное о том что человек един и что человек свободен» [13, p. 488]. According to the philosopher, the two cited descriptions touch upon the essence of a human being: firstly, despite individual differences, man in reality is singular, secondly, a single man or in other words

¹⁵ The Nietzschean idea of superhuman is explained in the following fragment: "In general the doctrine of the Superman can only be understood correctly in conjunction with other ideas of the author's, such as: — the Order of Rank, the Will to Power, and the Transvaluation of All Values. <...> Now, however, a new table of valuations must be placed over mankind — namely, that of the strong, mighty, and magnificent man, overflowing with life and elevated to his zenith — the Superman, who is now put before us with overpowering passion as the aim of our life, hope and will. <...> Stated briefly, the leading principle of this new system of valuing would be: <All that proceeds from power is good, all that springs from weakness is bad>". See [22, p. XXI].

¹⁶ It is worth mentioning here that in the article *Dostojevskij a Nietzsche: antropologické vědomí kreativního člověka* [Dostoyevsky and Nietzsche: The Anthropological Consciousness of the Creative Man], Lenka Naldoniová points out that Russian intelligentsia interpreted the idea of Nietzsche's superhuman in two ways: as a man-godhood by positivism-oriented intelligentsia or as a godmanhood described by Russian religious philosophers who followed V. Solovyov. See [18, p. 54]. Ivanov, of course, belongs to the second group.

this level of humanity, which supersedes the individual self-determination of entities (one in everyone) implicates true freedom.

Freedom is self-restraining of the individual will in relation to the universal level. Reaching this beyond-individual level is equal to the liberation of existence from the deception of subjectivism; mystical experience is a reassurance of such a shift, which determines the true beyond-individual way of existence. «Процесс мистического переживания ведет к пограничному камню, где кончается психологически-субъективное, чтобы уступить онтологически-объективному» [20, p. 287].

Ivanov, it seems, has radically overinterpreted the meaning of superhuman in favour of the concept of godmanhood. This expression is crucial because it illustrates a magnitude of differences (very similar at a first glance) between Ivanov and Nietzsche: the centre of Ivanov's anthropology is not a desire for power, but for godmanhood sacrifice («Сердце <...> рвалось навстречу жертве, подвигу» [20, p. 20–21]) liberating the world from evil and death.

This viewpoint is always a result of longing for eternity, thus drastically different than that of Nietzsche's viewpoint of faith. «Вера призывает нас словами святого Августина *transcende te ipsum*» [14, p. 553]. As confirmation of this argument, that reaching out of one's self is not determined only by a negative motion, it is important to note the following quote: «Через Августиново *transcende te ipsum* к лозунгу *a realibus ad realiora*. Пафос мистического устремления к *Ens realissimum* (эрос божественного)» [14, p. 553].

An act of transcendence is therefore, for both philosophers, directed differently: for Nietzsche — towards negatively defined as superhuman, for Ivanov — towards godmanhood. Ivanov ascertains the existence of two different “selves” in man («Есть в человеке “Я” высшее, его святое святых... И есть “я”, определяемое границами эмпирической личности» [21, p. 129]). In the present context it is clear that Ivanov's overcoming motion is always directed vertically — from empiric “self” to the godly “self”.

In Nietzsche's view, the transcendence of human condition is motivated by the will to power. It is essential, according to Ivanov, that the Nietzschean imperative demanding the restoration of human dignity (concept of the superhuman) brings the latter to the category of a super-entity (or superior-entity). Let us cite a comprehensive statement of the poet:

Продолжая мысль Фейербаха, Ницше думал, что религия возникла из неправой объективации всего лучшего и сильнейшего, что получал и сознал в себе человек, — из ошибочного наименования и утверждения этого лучшего «божеством», вне человека сущим. Он призывал человека вернуть себе свое добровольно отчужденное достояние, сознав богом самого себя. Это принципиальное отрицание религиозного творчества замкнуло его душу в себе самой и ее разрушило. Напрасно он прибегал к последней, казавшейся ему возможною объективации своего «я» в Сверхчеловеке: его Сверхчеловек только — сверх-субъект [21, p. 124].

Super-entity, therefore “self” is not restricted by anything and god-man are two radically different directions, composing the thought of the said authors. In Ivanov's view, the super-entity is an abomination and a tragic misstep on the way to desired godmanhood; a man by “falling into” the will to power develops an opposite anthropological pole — a human-god. Thus, Ivanov, unlike Nietzsche, dreams of a culture which is able to “rip out” man from the web of relations that are strictly horizontal (constituting the essence of human-god's existential level), to make people stop describing themselves in strictly individualistic way (only through “empiric data” — through corporeal, psychological and

sociological element). At the same time, this enables man not to get lost in the anamorphic entirety based on quantity rule (crowd overwhelmed by quantity and external unity) and to build a religious, beyond-empiric, beyond-psychological (not based on collective, emotional euphoria or strictly external group) community.

References

1. Van Gennep, A. (1960), *The rites of passage*, transl. from fr. by Vizedom, M. B. and Caffee, G. L., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
2. Fredericksen, D. and Hendrykowski, M. (2007), *Canal*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza Publ.
3. Nietzsche, F. (1956a), *The Birth of Tragedy and The Genealogy of Morals*, transl. from ger. by Golffing, F., New York: Doubleday & Company.
4. Nietzsche, F. (2009), *Wola mocy*, transl. by Drzewiecki, K. and Frycz, S., Kraków: vis-à-vis etuda.
5. Baran, B. (1994), Metaphysics of tragedy, in Nietzsche, F., *Narodziny tragedii albo Grecy i pesymizm*, transl. by Baran, B., Kraków: inter esse, pp. 7–13.
6. Nietzsche, F. (1956b), A critical backward glance, in Nietzsche, F., *The birth of tragedy and the Genealogy of morals*, transl. by Golffing, F., New York: Doubleday & Company, pp. 3–17.
7. Eliade, M. (1966), *A history of religious ideas*, transl. by Wierusz-Kowalski, J., Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
8. Wodziński, C. (1987), Lev Shestov, in *Dostojewski i Nietzsche. Filozofia tragedii*, transl. by Wodziński, C., Warszawa: Czytelnik, pp. 5–27.
9. Stammler, H. (1986), Vyacheslav Ivanov and Nietzsche, in Jackson, R. L. and Nelson, L. (eds), *Vyacheslav Ivanov: Poet, Critic and Philosopher*, New Haven: Yale Center for International and Area Studies, pp. 297–312.
10. Braginskaja, N. W. (1988), The tragedy and ritual of Vyacheslav Ivanov, in Meletinskij, E. M. (ed.), *Arkhaicheskii ritual v fol'klornykh i ranneliteraturnykh pamiatnikakh*, Nauka Publ., Moscow, pp. 366–399. (In Russian)
11. Ivanov, V. (1974), About the essence of the tragedy, in Ivanov, V., *Sobranie sochinenii*, eds Ivanov, D. V. and Deschartes, O., vol. 2, Brussel: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, pp. 190–202. (In Russian)
12. Ivanov, V. (1974), About an act and action, in Ivanov, V., *Sobranie sochinenii*, eds Ivanov, D. V. and Deschartes, O., vol. 2, Brussel: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, pp. 156–169. (In Russian)
13. Ivanov, V. (1987), *Dostoevsky. Tragedy — myth — mysticism*, in Ivanov, V., *Sobranie sochinenii*, eds Ivanov, D. V. and Deschartes, O., vol. 4, Brussel: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, pp. 483–586. (In Russian)
14. Ivanov, V. (1974), Two elements in contemporary symbolism, in Ivanov, V., *Sobranie sochinenii*, eds Ivanov, D. V. and Deschartes, O., vol. 2, Brussel: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, pp. 536–561. (In Russian)
15. Ivanov, V. (1987), The aesthetic principle of theatre, in Ivanov, V., *Sobranie sochinenii*, eds Ivanov, D. V. and Deschartes, O., vol. 4, Brussel: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, pp. 205–214. (In Russian)
16. Ivanov, V., *Hellenic religion of a suffering god*. Available at: http://www.rvb.ru/ivanov/1_critical/2_eshill/01text/02add/08.htm (accessed: 06.08. 2019). (In Russian)
17. Deschartes, O. (1971), Introduction, in Ivanov, V., *Sobranie sochinenii*, eds Ivanov, D. V. and Deschartes, O., vol. 1, Brussel: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, pp. 7–227. (In Russian)
18. Naldoniová, L. (2001), *Dostoevsky and Nietzsche: The Anthropological Consciousness of the Creative Man*, Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita. (Studia Slavica, XV).
19. Ivanov, V. (1974), New mask, in Ivanov, V., *Sobranie sochinenii*, eds Ivanov, D. V. and Deschartes, O., vol. 2, Brussel: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, pp. 76–82. (In Russian)
20. Ivanov, V. (1974), Anima, in Ivanov, V., *Sobranie sochinenii*, eds Ivanov, D. V. and Deschartes, O., vol. 2, Brussel: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, pp. 269–293. (In Russian)
21. Ivanov, V. (1979), Sporades, in Ivanov, V., *Sobranie sochinenii*, eds Ivanov, D. V. and Deschartes, O., vol. 3, Brussel: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, pp. 111–135. (In Russian)
22. Förster-Nietzsche, E., (1954), Introduction, in *The philosophy of Nietzsche*, New York: The Modern Library, pp. 9–33.

Received: September 8, 2019

Accepted: March 19, 2020

Author's information:

Marta Lechowska — PhD in Humanities, Assistant Professor; marta.lechowska@uj.edu.pl

Превращенный героизм. Диалог Вячеслава Иванова с Ницше

М. Леховска

Ягеллонский университет,
Польша, 31-007 Краков, ул. Gołębia, 24

Для цитирования: *Lechowska M.* Perverse heroism. Vyacheslav Ivanov's dialogue with Nietzsche // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Философия и конфликтология. 2020. Т. 36. Вып. 2. С. 254–263. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu17.2020.204>

Целью настоящей статьи является анализ теоретических основ трагической культуры в трудах Ф. Ницше и В. И. Иванова. Результат предлагаемого анализа — сопоставление сходств и различий в трактовке проблемы трагедии в культуре у обоих авторов. Как Ницше, непримиримый враг исторического христианства, так и его русский последователь — христианский философ культуры, филолог и переводчик В. И. Иванов, говорят о необходимости построения и культивирования трагической культуры. По их мнению, важнейшая задача трагической культуры — поставить человека лицом к лицу с самыми жестокими аспектами жизни. Это беспощадное требование позволяет говорить о перверсивном героизме как общем настроении и императиве и у Ницше, и у Иванова. В данной работе мы анализируем философскую антропологию упомянутых авторов. Исходной точкой рассуждений является философия Ницше, определяющего трагическое мировоззрение как противоположность теоретического видения мира. Сущность теоретического подхода — бегство от трагических явлений жизни, позволяющее выстраивать последовательный, оправданный, безопасный образ мира. Трагический подход, подчеркивая неизбежность страдания и отсутствие метафизического фундамента, на который мог бы опираться человек, ищущий утешения, противоречит оптимизму теоретического подхода. Императив культивировать трагический принцип, т. е. не убегать от ужаса жизни с помощью оптимистических положений, — это на самом деле императив стать сверхчеловеком. Иванов, как и Ницше, увлекся дионисийской идеей, но истолковал ее совсем по-другому: не как противоположность, но как префигурацию Христа. Таким образом, Иванов, приняв Диониса в свое изначально христианское самосознание, обратил внимание на проблему присутствия трагического аспекта в христианстве. Вершиной спора Иванова с Ницше является разное истолкование идеи сверхчеловечества. Мы указываем на совершенно разное понимание проблемы преодоления самого себя у обоих философов, движущихся в рамках разных систем ценностей.

Ключевые слова: трагическая культура, христианство, антропология, сверхчеловек, богочеловечество, человекобожество.

Статья поступила в редакцию 8 сентября 2019 г.;
рекомендована в печать 19 марта 2020 г.

Контактная информация:

Леховска Марта — канд. гуманитар. наук; marta.lechowska@uj.edu.pl