

A. Salikov

THE RUSSIANS
IN KANT-STUDIEN
PART II
1954—2012^{*}

This article is the second part of the research concerning the publications of Russian scholars in Kant-Studien, the leading periodical dedicated to Kant studies and the most important print of the International Kant Society. The article describes the history of publications of Russian authors from 1974 to 2008.

Key words: *Russian Kant studies, Kant's philosophy, Kant-Studien, Russian philosophy, Neokantianism.*

The post-war (or the second) period of Russian authors' publications in *Kant-Studien*, which was relaunched in 1954, can be divided into two subperiods: the Soviet (1954—1991) and post-Soviet (1992—2010) ones. These time intervals have both common and distinctive features. The Soviet period, especially in the first years after the removal of the strict ban on publishing abroad, is characterised by the preponderance of reviews and bibliographies of Soviet Kant studies literature over theoretical articles and informative reports. It gave Western Kant scholars and admirers of Kant's philosophy a certain idea of the general trends and the topics of studies carried out in the USSR; however, it did not provide an opportunity to assess the level of these works, nor to learn their contents. Since the mid-1980s, the number of informative reports increased significantly, there emerged an opportunity for Western and Soviet Kant scholars, though a limited one, to establish academic contacts, which was a result of a more lenient foreign policy of the USSR.

In the first years after the collapse of the USSR, the Soviet trends prevailed: the publications were of mostly informative nature, only few articles were theoretical. At the same time, the post-Soviet subperiod of the history of Russian publications in *Kant-Studien*, is characterised by an increasing trend towards a more active participation of

Russian scientists in the international Kant studies discourse, as well as international conferences and forums. All in all, throughout the existence of the second *Kant-Studien*, i.e. since 1954 (in effect, 1974), almost 50 works of different kind have been published by Russian scholars; theoretical works account for a modest share thereof, approximately 10 %, whereas a half is reviews of Russian primary sources. Most publications of Russian authors and articles about them are reports, reviews, and announcements. Such purely informative presence of Russian authors can be explained by the isolation of Soviet Kant studies from the global Kant studies context, insufficient awareness of modern Kant studies literature, limited access to the global research forum, and the inability to share opinions and participate in discussions with Western colleagues.

Except for a few publications of emigree philosophers: “Personalistischer Idealrealismus” by Nikolai Lossky [35], the review of the book *Kant* by Alexandre Kojève [30], and a few reviews of the works of Nicolai Hartmann and articles about him [20; 21; 27; 29; 59], the period from 1954 (the year *Kant-Studien* was relaunched) to 1991 (the last year of the USSR) can be labelled as ‘Soviet’, since the authors of all other works either published or reviewed in *Kant-Studien* over the period lived on the territory of the USSR. The first Soviet publication in the post-war *Kant-Studien* is dated 1974. Apparently, this hiatus was not caused by the lack of studies in the field of Kant’s philosophy in the USSR: the very first article of a Soviet author — Academician T.I. Oizerman — published in the second issue of *Kant-Studien* indicates the opposite.

Oizerman’s article stands out, first of all, because it offers a comprehensive and detailed review of the works of Soviet Kant scholars from the 1920s to 1970s. So, the article stresses, that over these 50 years, more than 170 studies and popular science reports dedicated to Kant’s philosophy, as well as doctoral and post-doctoral theses, articles in philosophical journals, comprehensive monographic studies, and popular brochures were published in the USSR. Such large number of publications was indicative of the deep interest of the Soviet reader in Kant’s philosophy. This conclusion is substantiated by the fact that 35,000 copies of Kant’s collected works published in the Russian language in 1963–1966 were sold out over a few months. However, until the early 1970s, Russian researchers in Kant’s philosophy had virtually no contacts with their Western colleagues, as a result of which Soviet Kant studies developed within the limited scientific space of the USSR and Soviet bloc countries.

Only in 1974, the authorities sanctioned the first Soviet publication in *Kant-Studien* — “Die Erforschung der Philosophie I. Kants in der Sowjetunion” by T.I. Oizerman [49]. Of course, the article did not go beyond the official ideology (otherwise, the permission for the publication in a Western journal would never have been granted). The future academician (Oizerman became one in 1981) did a comprehensive and rather detailed review of Soviet works on Kant published over the 50 years of the existence of the USSR, which gave a good idea of the way Kant studies developed in the Soviet Union from the 1920s to 1970s. As Oizerman emphasises, the first studies in Kant’s philosophy appeared in the pages of Soviet journals as early as the 1920s, whereas most of them expressed a strongly negative opinion on Kant’s teaching (which was incompetent in some cases, the author of the review stresses). Among those works, the future academician pays special attention to the article “The idealistic legend of Kant” by Iv. Borichevsky published in 1923 in the journal *The Vestnik of the Socialist Academy* [3] written in line with vulgar positivism, which was widely popular at the time.

However, even then, the trend towards an unbiased and systemic analysis of Kant's philosophy was already pronounced. The forefathers of Soviet Kant studies were such scholars as A.M. Deborin (see his articles "The light-minded critic" [8] – a response to the above mentioned article by Borichevsky; "Dialectics in Fichte's system" [7]; "Kant's dialectics" [9]) and V.F. Asmus (see V.F. Asmus's monographs *Dialectical Materialism and Logic. A Review of the Development of Dialectical Methods in Recent Philosophy* [1]; *Kant's Dialectics* [2]). Thus, Marxist Kant studies developed as early as the first years of the Soviet rule; its major area was research on the problem of dialectics in Kant's philosophy. Later, research on the issue of dialectics in Kant's philosophy attracted increasing attention of Soviet scholars. Oizerman mentions the works *The Elements of Dialectical Logic in Kant's Transcendental Philosophy* by I. Ye. Zuyev, "The issue of logic as a science within new philosophy" [11], and "The cosmological antinomies and the problem of dialectical opposition" by A.M. Mostapenko [12].

Studies into the dialectical polemics in Kant's philosophy resulted into the consideration of a wide range of problems in Kant's epistemology. One of the first Soviet works focusing on Kant's theory of cognition was the book entitled *Kant* by V. Serezhnikov [16], where the author attempts at harmonising the solution to the problem of epistemology with the necessity of social transformation and revolution in line with the prevailing attitudes of the time. A number of Soviet researchers in Kant's philosophy – V.F. Asmus, Yu.M. Borodai, Zh. Abdildin, T.I. Ozierman, as well as P.D. Shashkevich attach major significance to the comparative analysis of the problem of epistemological interpretation – the way it is posed by Kant, on the one hand, and the philosophy of Marxism, on the other, – in the book *I. Kant's theory of cognition* [18]. Oizerman identifies the fact that a number of epistemological problems addressed by Kant are also relevant for the philosophy of Marxism as the basic feature of many Soviet studies.

In the 1970s, Western specialists gained access to the works of Soviet Kant studies experts, at least, those in the Russian language. It resulted in the publication of a large number of reviews, which made possible the acquaintance of the international reader with Soviet studies on Kant. Some of these works were later translated into foreign languages and became 'bestsellers', which is indicative of a rather high level of research carried out in the USSR, despite the ideological and political pressure. A rare exception in the series of reviews of Soviet Kant scholars' works is the review of the book *Kant* [30] by the Russian-born French philosopher Alexandre Kojève², which was published in France in 1952. In a strict sense, Kojève was not a Kant scholar; he is more famous for his original interpretation of Hegel's system, which had significant influence on the French and European philosophy of the 20th century. However, the Russian-French thinker was not disinterested in Kant's ideas, which encouraged him to write this excellent work on Kant.

The first post-war review [60] of a Soviet author proper was published in *Kant-Studien* in 1976 – it was a review of the collection of papers entitled *Kant's Philosophy and the Present* [18] edited by T.I. Oizerman and published in 1974. The semi-official (as the reviewer calls it) publication of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR was timed to coincide with Kant's 250th anniversary. Eight out of twelve articles were dedicated to Kant; only one

² Alexandre Kojève, born Alexander V. Kozhevnikov, (1902–1968) was a Russian-born French philosopher.

of them was written by a foreign author – Manfred Buhr. The articles consider the following elements of critical philosophy: the problem of transcendental idealism and transcendental method (V.F. Asmus), antinomies (I.S. Narsky), Kant's ethics (O.G. Drobnitsky), theory of state and law (A.A. Piontkovsky), theory of social contract and moral justification of law (E. Yu. Solovyov), theory of perpetual peace (I.S. Andreev), and aesthetics (A.V. Gulyga). All in all, the reviewer of *Kant's Philosophy and the Present* stressed that the collection of articles was indicative of increasing interest in Kant's philosophy in the USSR.

In 1977, *Kant-Studien* published a review [37] of G. Tevadze's book *Immanuel Kant* [17]. This book of the notable Soviet philosopher and Kant expert, published in Tbilisi in 1974 in the Georgian language, contained overviews in Russian and German, which gave Rudolf Malter an idea of the book's content. The author of the review was surprised to find a German overview in a Soviet edition, which was surprising indeed in view of the isolation of the USSR and almost complete absence of contacts between Soviet scholars and their foreign colleagues. However, the German summary informed Western readers of the existence of Soviet Kant studies, and not only of that in the acknowledged cultural centres of the USSR – Moscow and Leningrad – but also on the "periphery", in Georgia.

In 1979, *Kant-Studien* published a review [52] of Aresniy Gulyga's *Kant* [6], which was published the same year as part of the popular Soviet and Russian series of biographies called *The Life of Remarkable People*. According to the author of the review, Gulyga's *Kant* is, first of all, an interpretation of the history of development of Kant's thinking. The information about Kant's life and character, his relationships with contemporaries and cultural-historical descriptions function as a framework that determines the structure of the book. The reviewer emphasises the unique understanding of Kant presented by Gulyga, which is not a product of any school existing either in Russia or abroad. Of special interest is a piece of advice Gulyga gives those studying Kant's philosophy: first to read *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*, then *The Metaphysics of Morals*, which acquaints the reader with the ethics and theory of law – the alpha and omega of Kant's teaching, – then the *Critique of Judgment*, and only after that *Prolegomena* and the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Thus, the Soviet Kant scholar believes, the *Critique of Pure Reason* can at first be left beyond the scope of attention. In 1981, Gulyga's *Kant* was translated into German; in 1986, *Kant-Studien* published Rudolf Malter's review [38] of the translation of *Immanuel Kant*. As of today, the book has been reprinted in Germany more than once and gained acknowledgement from German readers and specialist.

In 1981, *Kant-Studien* published a review [54] of the book *Immanuel Kant* by D.M. Grinshin, M.M. Mikhailov, and V.P. Prokopyev, which was published in 1976 in Leningrad. This rather concise work (94 pages) presents an overview of the life and philosophy of Kant; the authors of the book depict Kant as an example of devotion to duty and ascetic lifestyle, which never made him an unsociable person. Grinshin, Mikhailov, and Prokopyev characterise the pre-critical works of Kant as inconsistent scientific materialism. The authors believe that Kant's philosophy could be improved through the postulate of "practice as the criterion of truth" developed by Soviet Marxists (the German reviewer calls it the "criterion of material practice"). Despite this ambiguous aspect, the German reviewer praises the authors for their attempt to introduce a wide Soviet audience to Kant's ideas.

In 1982, *Kant-Studien* published a review [53] of a co-authored monograph *Kant and Kantians* [4] edited by A.S. Bogomolov. As the title of the book suggests, it is a review of the philosophy of Kant and his followers; it comprises the following chapters: “The system of Kant’s philosophy and its transformation in Neo-Kantianism” (V.A. Zhuchkov), “Kant, Kantianism, and the European philosophy of the 19th century” (A.S. Bogomolov), “The logical justification of scientific thinking by the Marburg school of Neo-Kantianism” (T.B. Dlugach), “The principle of universal mediation in the Neo-Kantianism of the Marburg School” (P.P. Gaidenko), “E. Cassierer’s philosophy of culture” (A.A. Kravchenko), “Neo-Kantianism in Russia” (L.I. Filippov), and “Kantianism and ethical socialism” (L.V. Konovalov). The reviewer draws attention to the position of Soviet Kant scholars who believe that, although it is clearly defined what should be kept from the legacy of Kant and Kantians, the real followers of Kant are his serious critics, namely, Marxists, who view the great German philosopher as their predecessor. The reviewer finds the chapter on Neo-Kantianism in Russia of special interest – first of all, the reception of Kant’s philosophy within Russian symbolism (A. Bekly, A. Blok), the philosophy of a representative of Russian personalism, N. Berdyayev, and that of N. Lossky, who, despite being rather distant from Kant, does build his philosophy of the foundation erected by Kant.

The same issue of *Kant-Studien* contains a review [55] of the book of I.S. Narsky³ entitled *Immanuel Kant* [13], which was published in the USSR in 1976. In this article, Narsky explains to Soviet readers the basic notions of Kant’s philosophy – such as “a priori”, “pure reason”, etc. The author of the book stresses the need for Marxist-Leninist philosophy to study Kant, and not to pay attention to Hegel’s claims about Kant, which was typical of Marxism-Leninism for a rather long time. Narsky believes that Kant’s greatest achievement was the formulation of the necessity of certain conditions for any experimental knowledge. Kant’s transcendental aesthetics and logic, according to Narsky, demonstrate the incapability of Kant’s apriorism and agnosticism to generate any positive knowledge. At the same time, Narsky emphasises that Kant stressed the inconsistency of the reason and thinking.

Alongside the reviews of Soviet studies on Kant’s philosophy, *Kant-Studien* published several bibliographies of Soviet works on Kant. The first article of the kind was O.I. Polikanova’s “The bibliography of Soviet studies on Kant’s philosophy (1917–1971)” [50] published in *Kant-Studien* in 1976. This comprehensive work conducted by a member of the Department of the History of Philosophy of Western European and American countries contains 167 sources focusing on almost all areas of Kant’s philosophy, which gave the Western reader an opportunity to get a clear idea of the major trends in Soviet Kant studies and its development from 1917 to 1971. Six years later, Polikanova’s bibliography was expanded by a 1982 bibliography of Soviet works published in 1972–1976, which was compiled by V.A. Zhuchkov and covered 113 works [61]. Even a simple comparison of numbers – 167 over 55 years (1917–1971) and 113 works over 5 years (1972–1976) – speaks of not only a significant increase in the interest in Kant’s philosophy that took place in the USSR in the 1970s, but also a “Kantian boom”.

³ Igor S. Narsky (1920–1993) was a Soviet philosopher and historian of philosophy. I. S. Narsky published a series of article on Kant in all issues of *Kantovsky Sbornik* until 1991 since the journal’s foundation in 1974 as *The Issues of Immanuel Kant’s Theoretical Heritage* (it was renamed in 1981).

Of certain interest is a series of reviews and reports on the development of Kant studies in Estonia – then a small Baltic republic of the USSR. In 1987, *Kant-Studien* published a review [48] of a remarkable edition, which, however, had a somewhat indirect relation to Soviet Kant studies (if one understands it as research carried out in the Russian language). However, at the time Estonia was a part of the USSR, hence, Estonian Kant studies of the period is to be considered a part of Soviet Kant studies; therefore, we have all the right to mention it in the present work. Leonid Stolovich and Ülo Matjus, the authors of the review, inform the readers of *Kant-Studien* about a translation of the *Prolegomena* into the Estonian language, which was published in 1982, – the second work of Kant translated into the Estonian language (the first one was the abridged version of the *Dreams of a Spirit-Seer*). The authors of the report describe the difficulties of translating Kant into the Estonian language and emphasise the role of the Department of Philosophy of the University of Tartu in developing the philosophical language and philosophical terminology in the republic. Stolovich and Matjus stress the significance of *Prolegomena* for the formation of philosophical terminology in the Estonian language and the development of philosophical thought in Estonia. A related topic is addressed in the report of Rudolf Mater dedicated to the history of the Kant collection at Tarty University [39]. It is based on Leonid Stolovich's article "On the fate of Tartu Kant collection" published in the Estonian newspaper *Sirp ja Vasar* and the journal of Tartu State University, which tells the story of Kant's manuscripts kept in Tartu. The most valuable element of the Tartu Kant collection is Kant's letters and the working copies of books – Meier's *Auszug aus der Vernunftlehre* and Baumgarten's *Metaphysics* (the fourth edition published in 1757) – a valuable source of margin notes. All these items ended up in Tartu thanks to Kant's student Jäsche. The latter bequeathed his Kant collection to Karl Morgenstern, the founder of the library of the University of Tarty, who personally knew Kant. Morgenstern, in his turn, gave the documents as a gift to the Tarty library, which kept the manuscripts until 1895. By permission of the Soviet government, they were temporarily moved to Berlin, the Royal Academy of Sciences, to be used in the preparation of an academic edition of Kant's work. For a long time, it was speculated that the Tartu collection could have been destroyed during World War II. However, Stolovich managed to find most of the correspondence and Meier's book. Malter emphasises the readiness of the corresponding institutions of the Eastern Bloc to cooperate in the search for the lost manuscripts. In 1987, he reported the results of the search for the items of the Tartu Kant collection [40]. As it was found out, the Tartu Kant collection – alongside the items mentioned above – contains Kreutzfeld's thesis, on the blank pages of which Kant wrote his opponent speech (it is kept in the University library in Tartu). For Kant studies, of special importance, is the copy of Kant's death mask found in the Museum of Classical Antiquities of Tartu University, as well as copies of the portraits of Kant's student Jäsche and J. K. S. Morgenstern, who did a lot to preserve Kant's heritage in Tartu.

In the second half of the 1980s, a large number of reports pertaining to the state of affairs in Kaliningrad, former Königsberg, were published. Foreign readers were interested in almost anything relating to the city of Kant and its condition. However, for a long time, Kaliningrad remained closed for foreigners, thus any relevant information was scarce and difficult to access. Even the 1974 Kant congress, which was to be held in Kaliningrad as an international event, was held in Riga; foreign experts were represented only by Kant scholars from the

Socialist block. Western readers could get only second hand – processed by central Soviet magazines and newspapers – information about the developments in Kaliningrad. The major authors of reports on the state of affairs in Kaliningrad, the condition of Kant relics and memorial places, and the development of Kant studies in Kaliningrad were Rudolf Malter, an eminent German Kant scholar, one of the publishers of *Kant-Studien*, and Ernst Staffa, a Slavic philologist (both of them are from Mainz, where *Kant-Studien* was published at the time). All in all, they wrote more than a dozen reports on Kant studies in the USSR, more than a half of which related to the state of affairs in Kaliningrad.

The first information about the existence of Kant studies in the “closed” city of Kaliningrad was the 1982 review [56] of the philosophical journal *Kantovsky Sbornik* published in Kaliningrad. In effect, the review consisted of a list of articles featured in the sixth issue of the journal, including the works of K.N. Lyubutin, I.S. Narsky, S.A. Chernov, L.A. Kalinnikov, I.S. Kuznetsova, A.N. Troyepolsky, S.V. Kornilov, A.V. Gulyga, B.K. Genzelis, and D.M. Grinshin and I.S. Andreeva, which made it possible to learn about the existence of Kant studies in Kaliningrad.

In 1985, *Kant-Studien* published a review [36] of a 1983 book [46] by Ernst Staffa and Rudolf Malter, which contained an exclusive for the Western reader information on the post-war fate of the Königsberg Kant collection and the condition of Kant studies in Königsberg. As it could be expected, the authors emphasise, hardly anything from the Königsberg Kant collection was left in Kaliningrad: during World War II, the items were either evacuated or destroyed. The exhibits of the Kaliningrad Kant Museum, which was established in 1974, are, with few exceptions, mere photographs and copies. At the same time, in the West, despite the respect-worthy House of Kant in Duisburg, individual fragments of the Königsberg Kant collection are very scattered. As to the interest in Kant and the development of Kant studies in Kaliningrad, Staffa and Malter emphasise an increase in this respect taking place since 1974: alongside the Kant Museum established that year, it manifested in the *Kantovsky Sbornik* journal dedicated to studying the legacy of the great Königsberg philosopher and the *Kant Readings* conference bringing together Kant scholars from throughout the USSR.

In 1988, the “Kant in Königsberg/Kaliningrad” topic was further developed in *Kant-Studien* in Rudolf Malter’s report [41] on the aspiration of Soviet philosophers to continue the Königsberg tradition of Kant studies and refers to the 11 issues of *Kantovsky Sbornik* published before 1986 as a proof thereof. Malter also stresses a remarkable fact: not only Western Kant scholars follow with interest the development of Kant studies in the USSR, but also Soviet specialists in the field of Kant’s philosophy carefully monitor the research conducted by Western colleagues. Largely, it is a hint at the article “The FRG Kant Society and its journal *Kant-Studien*” [14] published in the 10th issue of *Kantovsky Sbornik* in 1985. In 1989, Malter reported the reconstruction of the Cathedral, which was to house the Kant Museum [42]; in 1991, he wrote [44] about the 14th issue of *Kantovsky Sbornik* (1989), which also featured the proceedings of the 4th Kant Readings.

In the first years after the collapse of the USSR, there was a certain increase in publications of Russian Kant scholars in international periodicals; however, first of all, it was a result of the easing and then removing bans on publishing abroad and participating in academic events. Otherwise, the Soviet trends continued: the publications were of mostly informative nature, theoretical articles

were rare. For example, over two decades (since 1992), *Kant-Studien* has published only six articles (three theoretical ones) of Russian authors (however, two of the authors – Elena Tatievskaya and Kirill Faradzhayev have lived and worked in Germany for a long time) against the background of a large number of reports, bibliographies, and reviews. Overall, the post-Soviet period of Russian publications in *Kant-Studien* exhibits a trend towards a more active participation in theoretical discussion of Kant's philosophy, which undoubtedly resulted from an increase in mutual contacts between Russian and international scholars, gaining access to primary sources and critical literature, and the abolition of censorship, etc. after the collapse of the USSR.

Since the early 1990s, one of the major meeting places of Russian and German Kant scholars – alongside Moscow – has been Kaliningrad. As a result, in the 1990s and 2000s, *Kant-Studien* published a significant number of various reports and announcements. The author of the first post-Soviet publication was V.N. Bryushinkin, a well-known Russian logician from Kaliningrad. His report was published in issue 85, 1994 [23]; it focused on the *Logical Kant Studies-3* conference held in the resort town of Svetlogorsk located 40 km away from Kaliningrad in September 1991. The conference brought together approximately 40 participants, including logicians and philosophers from Belgium, Germany, and Hungary. The same issue of *Kant-Studien* announced the foundation of the Russian Kant Society chaired by Prof L. A. Kalinnikov [45] and the restoration of the monument to Kant designed by Rauch: on June 27, 1991, the newly moulded sculpture was placed on the old pedestal. German press (*Königsberger Kurier*, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Neue Zeit*, *Das Ostpreussenblatt*) covered the event extensively. Issue 88, 1997, reports of Prof Kalinnikov's participation in the opening of a monument to Kant in Goldap (this occasion brought together not only the Polish and Germans, but also Russians) [25]. The monument was erected on the road from Goldap to Kaliningrad. The cooperation between German and Russian Kant scholars resulted in the development of the "Immanuel Kant" scholarship programme by "Die Zeit" foundation [28]. This programme, which existed until 2008, aimed to support undergraduate and graduate students of philosophy from Kaliningrad and Saint Petersburg, whose final or PhD theses focused on Kant's philosophy, as well as to develop Kant studies in Russia and foster connections between young German and Russian scientists.

Later, *Kant-Studien* published several other papers either announcing forthcoming international academic events in Kaliningrad or reporting on them. One of them was a report of W. Stark and V. Yu. Kurpakov [34] on the 8th International Kant Conference held under the aegis of the Russian Kant Society and Kaliningrad State University (Leonard Kalinnikov, Vladimir Bryushinkin) in Svetlogorsk, which was timed to coincide with the 275th anniversary of the birth of the Königsberg philosopher, followed by the report by V.N. Bryushinkin on the 9th "Kant between the East and the West" international conference" [24].

As it was mentioned above, over the last 20 years, *Kant-Studien* has published just a few articles by Russian authors. Their number is so modest that it takes little effort to list them all. These are the articles "Kant, Frege, and the problem of psychologism" by V.N. Bryushinkin [22], „Cohns Erkenntnistheorie und Russels Relationsbegriff" by Elena Tatievskaya (she lives in Germany and has been teaching at the University of Augsburg since 2000) [58]; "Kant in Rußland. Bemerkungen zur Kant-Rezeption und Edition in Rußland anlässlich des Projektes einer deutsch-russischen Ausgabe ausgewählter Werke Immanuel

Kants" by Nelly Motroshilova [47]; "Leo Nikolaevič Tolstoj als Leser Kants. Zur Wirkungsgeschichte Kants in Russland" by Alexei Kryuglov [32]; "Rubinsteins Projekt der Praktischen Philosophie des Neukantianismus: Pädagogik Als Angewandtes Wertesystem" by the research fellow of the Ruhr University, Kirill Faradzhaev [26]; "Mein Leben gleicht einem Roman...": Kants Schüler Friedrich August Hahnrieder und seine Geschichte" by A.N. Kruglov [33]. It seems to be the exhaustive list of Russian publications in the chief Kant studies journal over the post-Soviet period. The reasons behind such low publication activity are largely similar to those of the Soviet time. They should be supplemented with the general poor condition of Russian education and science, as well as the change of generations, although, as of yet, the constellation of Kant scholars that formed during the "Kant boom" of the 1970s has not been succeeded by a new generation. Rare exceptions, for example, A.N. Kruglov support the trend established in Russian Kant studies.

As to the content of the works mentioned above, all of them are of interest and do stand comparison to the other works published in *Kant-Studien*. Unfortunately, I have to confine myself to a brief overview of these articles. In the article "Kant, Frege, and the problem of psychologism", Vladimir Bryushinkin, a well-known Russian logician and philosopher from Kaliningrad, attempts at identifying Kant's position on the problem of psychologism in philosophy of logic. He focuses on how Kant's position might look from the perspective of Frege, a representative of consistent antipsychologism, how Kant answers the question about the substantiation of logical procedures and their modelling of thinking, and whether Kant's solution to the problem of psychologism/antipsychologism differs from that proposed by Frege. Traditionally, philosophy interprets the problem of psychologism as, firstly, the question of possibility of justifying logic through psychological terminology and, secondly, the question about the types of relations between logical procedures, on the one hand, and empirical (psychological) data on thinking, on the other. On the basis of Kant's statements from the *Jäsche Logic* and the *Critique of Pure Reason*, Prof Bryushinkin proves that Kant answers the former question as follows: "Logic draws nothing from psychology". However, Prof Bryushinkin believes, it is not enough to call Kant a complete antipsychologist. Frege, adopting the position of extreme antipsychologism, also stresses that some of Kant's statements make it possible to class him as an adherent of psychologism, if one takes into account Kant's statement about the prescriptive function of logic in thinking. The author believes that the example of J.S. Mill is indicative of that the acknowledgement of the prescriptive nature of logic is compatible with the concept of psychologism. At the same time, in the *Critique of Pure Reason* and the *Jäsche Logic*, Kant clearly states that logic cannot be justified with the help of psychology. Here Kant agrees entirely with Frege, if one can say so. At the same time, Kant's statement about the prescriptive function of logic in thinking can be interpreted from Frege's perspective as psychologism. In effect, according to Bryushinkin, Kant acknowledges the prescriptive nature of logic and, thus, does not oppose Frege. However, these statements do not determine the answer to the latter question. This answer is not evident and requires certain efforts aimed at reconstructing Kant's logical and philosophical ideas. According to the author, Kant virtually expands the notion of logical procedures so that it can incorporate not only the logical forms of notions, judgements, and inferences, but also the procedures of inference search. This procedure develop by Kant, which, as Bryu-

shinkin believes, is similar to the modern procedures of inference search, models the activity of reason, which in terms of modern cognitive sciences is the “upper” layer of a certain psychological model of thinking. It makes it possible to put forward the thesis that Kant gives a positive answer to the second question of the psychologism problem.

Nelly Motroshilova’s article “Kant in Rußland. Bemerkungen zur Kant-Rezeption und Edition in Rußland anlässlich des Projektes einer deutsch-russischen Ausgabe ausgewählter Werke Immanuel Kants” (“Kant in Russia. Notes on the reception and publication of Kant in Russia in the light of the project of German-Russian edition of Kant’s selected works”) introduces the German reader to the first Russian-German bilingual edition of the works of the Königsberg philosopher. This edition was prepared by the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences in collaboration with the German Kant Society – the Kant Centre at Mainz University and a group of researchers from Marburg. Motroshilova supplements the presentation of the bilingual edition with an insight into the history of Kant’s philosophy in Russia.

In 2004, *Kant-Studien* published the article by Elena Tatievskaya titled “Cohns Erkenntnistheorie und Russels Relationsbegriff” (“Cohn’s theory of cognition and Russel’s notion of relation”). By the time the article was published, the author had lived in Germany and worked at Augsburg University for several years. Her article focuses on the theory of cognition of the German Neo-Kantianist, Jonas Cohn (1869–1947), presented in his work *Voraussetzungen und Ziele des Erkennens. Untersuchungen über die Grundfragen der Logik* (1908). In his theory of cognition, Cohn uses certain ideas expressed by Bertrand Russel in *Principia Mathematica* (1903), namely, his theory of relations. The author of the article analyses the interpretation of Russel’s notion of relations within Kant’s epistemology, as well as the meaning of this notion for other elements of the theory – the doctrine of value and the concept of cognising subject. This article compares the functions of relation theory in Russel’s and Cohn’s systems, which makes it possible to identify the differences and similarities in the views of the two philosophers on the foundations of logic, mathematics, and philosophy.

The research of the well-known Russian historian of philosophy, A. N. Kruglov⁴, entitled “Leo Nikolaevič Tolstoj als Leser Kants. Zur Wirkungsgeschichte Kants in Russland” (“Leo Tolstoy as a reader of Kant. On the history of Kant’s influence in Russia”) is based on an analogy of the earlier research on Kant’s influence on Dostoyevsky and Vyacheslav Ivanov offered in the works of Ya. Ye. Golosovker, L. A. Kalinnikov, and O. P. Bespalaya, which were widely discussed by the readers. However, Kruglov’s study focuses on Kant’s influence on another author – Leo Tolstoy. On the basis of a record from Count Tolstoy’s library in Yasnaya Polyana, which housed a number of Kant’s works – the *Critique of Pure Reason* in French, the *Critique of Practical Reason* in German, *Religion within the Bounds of Mere Reason* in German *Prolegomena* in the Russian translation of Solovyov (which also contains an appendix – a Russian translation of Kuno Fischer’s text about Kant), and a 12-volume edition of Kant’s collected

⁴ Prof. Aleksey N. Kruglov (born 1973) is a professor of the Department of History of Foreign Philosophy at Russian State University for the Humanities. He graduated from the Faculty of Philosophy of Moscow State University and the Faculty of History of Tver State University and completed PhD studies at the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

works in German (Berlin, 1900–1905) – Kruglov comes to a conclusion that Tolstoy was definitely acquainted with Kant's works, at least some of them. With special attention, Tolstoy read the French translation of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, German editions of the *Critique of Practical Reason* and *Religion within the Bounds of Mere Reason*, as well as the Russian translation of Kuno Fischer's article, since these books contain numerous notes. Kruglov stresses that Tolstoy was an unorthodox admirer of Kant – the *Critique of Pure Reason* interested him not because of Kant's teaching on space and time, category deduction, or the autonomy of pure reason, but because of Kant's views on discipline and the architectonic and history of pure reason. Unlike, for instance, Dostoyevky, Tolstoy was closely acquainted with Kant's text. Kruglov believes that the only question is whether and to what extent Kant's text affected Tolstoy's prose.

The recently published article by K. V. Faradzhev⁵ entitled "Rubinsteins Projekt der Praktischen Philosophie des Neukantianismus: Pädagogik Als Angewandtes Wertesystem" ("Rubinstein's project of practical philosophy of Neo-Kantianism: Pedagogy as an applied system of values") [26] is dedicated to the philosophical and pedagogical ideas of M. M. Rubinstein⁶, a representative of Russian Neo-Kantianism and a member of the Kant Society founded by Hans Vaihinger. Rubinstein was a student of Rickert, under whose supervision he defended a thesis in 1905. Alongside being an active populariser of Kant's philosophy in Russia, he is also known for participating in the polemics between the Slavophiles and admirers of Kant's philosophy, which was triggered by the beginning of World War I and the ensuing deterioration of Russian-German relations. M. M. Rubinstein's essay "Die logischen Grundlagen des Hegelschen Systems und das Ende der Geschichte" ("The logical foundations of Hegel's system and the end of history") [51] was published in *Kant-Studien* in 1906. In his major work – *On the Meaning of Life* – Rubinstein attempted to synthesise Neo-Kantianism and philosophy of life.

One cannot but mention another work of A. N. Kruglov recently published in the 103rd issue of *Kant-Studien*, 2012, entitled "'Mein Leben gleicht einem Roman...': Kants Schüler Friedrich August Hahnrieder und seine Geschichte" ("My life resembles a novel...': Kant's student Friedrich August Hahnrieder and his story" [33]. As of today, it is the last publication of a Russian author in *Kant-Studien*. On the basis of archive and little-known printed sources, the author reconstructs the life story of Kant's student F. D. Hahnrieder, his extraordinary stay in Russia, as well as various attempts to live according to Kant's ethics upon his return to Prussia. Hahnrieder's story sometimes reminds of a tragedy, sometimes of a farce, and, as he himself put it, "resembles a novel". It is valuable, because it is one of the earliest examples of studying and pseudo-studying under Kant and acquaints us with the reaction of the great philosopher to the "fantastic" and "paradoxical" interpretations of the categorical imperative. Moreover, on the basis of the discovered archive data, the article makes corrections to the references offered in the academic edition of Kant's works published by the Prussian Academy of Sciences.

⁵ Dr Kirill V. Faradzhev is a research fellow of the Ruhr University (Bochum, Germany).

⁶ Moisey M. Rubinstein (June 15, 1878 – April 3, 1953) was a Soviet psychologist and pedagogue, the founder and first rector of the East Siberian University (1918-1920) in Irkutsk. He studied the issues of personality theory, social psychology, and psychology of youth; defended the principle of interaction between the family and the school.

The historical and sociological conclusions of not only the present article, but also of the whole study of the Russian contribution to *Kant-Studien* are as follows: throughout the history of this major Kant studies journal, over 100 materials of or about Russian authors were published in its pages, which accounts for 2% of all publications. This number makes it possible to speak of a relatively strong presence of Russian Kant scholars in international Kant studies. The influence of Russian (Soviet) philosophers could have been greater but for the isolation in the times of the USSR. It is obvious that the reason behind rather insignificant participation of Russian philosophers in the global Kant studies forum is the insufficient command of foreign languages, which makes it impossible for Russian authors to present their studies abroad. Recently, this negative trend has reversed, as a result of which a certain quantitative and qualitative (theoretical articles instead of reviews) increase in Russian publications in *Kant-Studien* has become pronounced over the last 10 years, which gives faint hope for the integration of Russian philosophers (and scholars in general) into the global scientific community.

Bibliography

1. *Asmus V. F.* Dialekticheskij materializm i logika. Ocherk razvitija dialekticheskogo metoda v novejshej filosofii ot Kanta do Lenina. Kiev, 1924.
2. *Asmus V. F.* Dialektika Kanta. M., 1929.
3. *Borichevskij I.* Idealisticheskaja legenda o Kante // Vestnik Socialisticheskij akademii. 1923. Kn. 4. S. 285–308.
4. *Bogomolov A. S.* Kant i kantiancy: kriticheskie ocherki odnoj filosofskoj tradicii. M., 1978.
5. *Grinshin D. M., Mihajlov M. M., Prokop'ev V. P.* Immanuel Kant : kratkij ocherk zhizni i nauchnoj dejatel'nosti. L., 1976.
6. *Gulyga A. V.* Kant. M., 1977.
7. *Deborin A. M.* Dialektika u Fihte // Arhiv K. Marksa i F. Jengel'sa. 1927. Kn. 3. S. 7.
8. *Deborin A. M.* Legkomyslennyj kritik (otvet na stat'ju Borichevskogo "Idealisticheskaja legenda o Kante") // Vestnik Kommunisticheskij akademii. 1924. № 7. S. 255–272.
9. *Deborin A. M.* Ocherki po istorii dialektiki. I: Dialektika u Kanta // Arhiv K. Marksa i F. Jengel'sa. 1924. T. 1. S. 13–75.
10. *Zuev I. E.* Jelementy dialekticheskij logiki v transcendental'noj logike I. Kanta. Smolensk, 1960.
11. *Il'enkov Je. V.* Predmet logiki kak nauki v novoj filosofii // Voprosy filosofii. 1965. № 5. S. 71–82.
12. *Mostepanenko A. M.* Kosmologicheskie antinomii Kanta i problema dialekticheskogo protivorechija // Vestnik LGU. 1970. № 11. S. 71.
13. *Narskij I. S.* [Immanuel] Kant. M., 1976.
14. *Narskij I. S., Kalinnikov L. A.* Kantovskoe obshhestvo v FRG i ego zhurnal «Kant-Studien» // Kantovskij sbornik. 1985. № 10. S. 94–98.
15. *Rubinshtejn M. M.* O smysle zhizni. L., 1927. T. 1.; Filosofija cheloveka. L., 1927. T. 2.
16. *Serezhnikov V.* Kant. M.; L., 1926.
17. *Tevezadze G.* Immanuel Kant. Tbilisi, 1974.
18. *Filosofija Kanta i sovremennost' /* pod red. T. I. Ojzermana. M., 1974.
19. *Shashkevich P. D.* Teorija poznaniya Immanuila Kanta. M., 1960.
20. *Brelage M.* (Buchbesprechung) N. Hartmann. Kleinere Schriften. Bd. 2: Abhandlungen zur Philosophie-Geschichte // Kant-Studien. 1958/59. № 50. S. 240–244.
21. *Brelage M. N.* Hartmann. Kleinere Schriften. Bd. 3: Von Neukantianismus zur Ontologie // Kant-Studien. 1958/59. № 53. S. 107–111.

22. *Bryushinkin V.* Kant, Frege and the Problem of Psychologism // *Kant-Studien*. 1999. № 90. S. 59–74.
23. *Bryuschinkin W.* Kants Philosophie und moderne Logik. Eine Tagung in Swetlogorsk // *Kant-Studien*. 1994. № 85. S. 85.
24. *Call for Papers: Kaliningrad 2004* // *Kant-Studien*. 2003. № 94. S. 400–401.
25. *Ein Kant-Denkmal in Goldap* // *Kant-Studien*. 1997. № 88. S. 512.
26. *Faradzhev Kirill. M.* Rubinsteins Projekt der Praktischen Philosophie des Neukantianismus: Pädagogik Als Angewandtes Wertesystem // *Kant-Studien*. 2011. № 102 (2). S. 191–201.
27. *Herrigel H.* Der philosophische Gedanke Nicolai Hartmanns // *Kant-Studien*. 1959/1960. № 51. S. 3–29.
28. *Kant-Stipendien* für Nachwuchswissenschaftler aus Kaliningrad und St. Petersburg // *Kant-Studien*. 1999. № 90.
29. *Keber E. N.* Hartmann. Kleinere Schriften Bd. I, Abhandlungen zur systematischen Philosophie // *Kant-Studien*. 1958/1959. № 50. S. 233.
30. *Kojève Alexandre.* Kant. P., 1952.
31. *Kopper J. A.* Kojève. Kant // *Kant-Studien*. 1975. № 66. S. 142–145.
32. *Krouglov Alexei N.* Leo Nikolaevič Tolstoj als Leser Kants. Zur Wirkungsgeschichte Kants in Russland // *Kant-Studien*. 2008. № 99. S. 361–386.
33. *Krouglov Alexei N.* "Mein Leben gleicht einem Roman...": Kants Schüler Friedrich August Hahnrieder und seine Geschichte Heft 2 der KS 2012, S. 242–253 // *Kant-Studien*. 2012. № 103. S. 242–253.
34. *Kurpakov V., Stark W.* Kaliningrad, 21. – 24. September 1999, ein kurzer Bericht [über eine Kant-Tagung] // *Kant-Studien*. 2000. № 91. S. 255–256.
35. *Lossky Nikolai.* Personalistischer Idealrealismus // *Kant-Studien*. 1959/60. № 51. S. 387–409.
36. *Lütte R. E. Staffa / R. Malter.* Kant in Königsberg seit 1945 // *Kant-Studien*. 1985. № 76. S. 355.
37. *Malter R. G.* Tewsadse. Immanuel Kant // *Kant-Studien*. 1977. № 68. S. 360.
38. *Malter R. G.* Immanuel Kant // *Kant-Studien*. 1986. № 77. S. 355–365.
39. *Malter R. G.* (Berichte und Diskussionen) Kantiana in Dorpat // *Kant-Studien*. 1983. № 74. S. 479–486.
40. *Malter R. G.* Kantiana in Estland // *Kant-Studien*. 1987. № 78. S. 515.
41. *Malter R. G.* Kant in Königsberg («Kaliningrad») // *Kant-Studien*. 1988. № 79. S. 129–130.
42. *Malter R. G.* Kant in Königsberg («Kaliningrad») (II) // *Kant-Studien*. 1989. № 80. S. 126.
43. *Malter R. G.* Kant in Kaliningrad (III) // *Kant-Studien*. 1990. № 80. S. 128.
44. *Malter R. G.* Kant in Kaliningrad (IV) // *Kant-Studien*. 1991. № 82. S. 518–519.
45. *Malter R. G.* Kant in Kaliningrad (V) // *Kant-Studien*. 1994. № 85. S. 126–127.
46. *Malter R., Staffa E.* Kant in Königsberg seit 1945. Eine Dokumentation, unter Mitarbeit von Peter Wörster. F. Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1983.
47. *Motroschilowa Nelly.* Kant in Rußland. Bemerkungen zur Kant-Rezeption und – Edition in Rußland anlässlich des Projektes einer deutsch-russischen Ausgabe ausgewählter Werke Immanuel Kants // *Kant-Studien*. 2000. № 91. S. 73–95.
48. *Matjus Ü., Stolorowitsch L.* Kant. Prolegomena igale tulevasele metafüüsikale, tri Saar // *Kant-Studien*. 1987. № 78. S. 333.
49. *Oizerman T. I.* Die Erforschung der Philosophie I. Kants in der Sowjetunion // *Kant-Studien*. 1974. № 65. S. 284–300.
50. *Polikanova O. I., Naumenko I. A.* Bibliographie Sowjetischer Untersuchungen zur Philosophie Kants (1917 bis 1971) // *Kant-Studien*. 1976. № 67. S. 253–267.
51. *Rubinstein M.* Die logischen Grundlagen des Hegelschen Systems und das Ende der Geschichte // *Kant-Studien*. 1906. № 11. S. 40–108.
52. *Seeböhm Thomas M. A. Gulyga.* Kant // *Kant-Studien*. 1979. № 70. S. 234–236.
53. *Staffa Ernst. A. S. Bogomolov (ed.)* Kant i kantiancy // *Kant-Studien*. 1982. № 73. S. 374–375.

54. *Staffa Ernst*. D. M. Grinišin, M. M. Michajlov, B. P. Prokop'ev: Immanuel Kant // Kant-Studien. 1981. № 72. S. 110.
55. *Staffa Ernst*. I. S. Narskij. Kant // Kant-Studien. 1982. № 73. S. 363–364.
56. *Staffa Ernst*. Kantovskij Sbornik // Kant-Studien. 1982. № 73. S. 375.
57. *Staffa Ernst*. O. I. Polikanova, I. A. Naumenko, Moskau, R. D. Kluge, Mainz. Bibliographie sowjetischer Untersuchungen zur Philosophie Kants (1917–1971) // Kant-Studien. 1976. № 67. S. 253–267.
58. *Tatievskaya Elena*. Cohns Erkenntnistheorie und Russels Relationsbegriff // Kant-Studien. 2004. № 95. S. 355–375.
59. *Wolandt Gerd*. Hartmanns Weg zur Ontologie // Kant-Studien. 1963. № 54. S. 304–317.
60. *Zeman Vladimir*. T. I. Oizerman (ed.). Filosofija Kanta I sovremennost // Kant-Studien. 1976. № 67. S. 598.
61. *Žučkov V. A.* Bibliographie sowjetischer Untersuchungen zur Philosophie Kants (1972–1976) // Kant-Studien. 1982. № 73. S. 488.

About the translator

Dr Alexei Salikov, deputy director of Kant Institute, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, e-mail: salikov 123@mail.ru