

ABOUT THE ASSESSMENTS OF THE IRONY AND PERSONALITY OF SOCRATES IN WORKS OF F.KH. KESSIDI AND A.F. LOSEV

© *Evgeny E. Nesmeyanov*

Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation
nesmeyanoff.e@yandex.ru

The article is devoted to elucidating the conceptual reasons for the opposite assessments of F. Kessidi and A. Losev of the personality of Socrates and the essence of his method of irony. A possible basis for the discrepancy was the common worldview positions of the secular scientist F. Kessidi and the Orthodox scientist A. Losev (in the monastic life of Andronikos). If F.H. Kessidi focuses on establishing rational principles and categorical apparatus in the teachings of Socrates, then A.F. Losev is also interested in moral assessments of the great Greek's personality. The author considers the influence of Seren Kierkegaard's argument about the personality of Socrates as a "Christian before Christ", which, according to the Danish philosopher, is impossible because of Socrates's tendency to irony adopted by A. Losev. In general, both Kessidi and Losev expanded the understanding of scientists-philosophers about the personality and teachings of Socrates.

Key words: Socrates, Kierkegaard, F.H. Kessidi, A.F. Losev, Christianity, irony, deception.

[Е.Е. Несмеянов Об оценках иронии и личности Сократа у Ф.Х. Кессиди и А.Ф. Лосева]

Выясняются концептуальные причины противоположных оценок Ф. Кессиди и А. Лосева личности Сократа и сущности его метода иронии. Возможной основой расхождения стали общие мировоззренческие позиции светского учёного – Ф. Кессиди и православного учёного – А. Лосева (в монашестве Андроника). Если Ф.Х. Кессиди сосредотачивается на становлении рациональных начал и категориального аппарата в учении Сократа, то А.Ф. Лосева интересуют ещё и моральные оценки личности великого грека. Рассматривается влияние аргументации Серена Кьеркегора о личности Сократа, как «христианина до Христа», что, по мнению датского философа, невозможно по причине склонности Сократа к иронии. В целом и Кессиди и Лосев расширили представление учёных-философов о личности и учении Сократа.

Ключевые слова: Сократ, Кьеркегор, Ф.Х. Кессиди, А.Ф. Лосев, христианство, ирония, обман.

Evgeny E. Nesmeyanov – Ph.D. (Advanced Doctorate) in Philosophy, Professor, Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation.

Несмеянов Евгений Ефимович – доктор философских наук, профессор, Донской государственный технический университет, г. Ростов-на-Дону, Российская Федерация.

In Soviet historical and philosophical science in the 60-80 of the twentieth century in works dedicated to Socrates and his time, the works of F. H. Kessidi occupy one of the central places in their significance. Together with V.F. Asmus; A.F. Losev; I.D. Rozhansky; V.S. Nersesiants; Kessidi F.H. is the founder of the fundamental doctrine of Socrates, as the founder of a new stage in the development of world philosophy, genius personality and "events in universal human history" [6, p. 178].

Kessidi shares Hegel's classical view of Socrates as "in the highest degree a key man in the history of philosophy, as well as a world-famous person" [2, p. 33]. But unlike Hegel, who compared the fate of Socrates with the fate of Christ, who sacrificed himself for new spiritual principles, Kessidi omits this comparison, which is understandable within the framework of the established dialectical and materialistic tradition in the philosophy of the USSR. In a new, expanded version of his famous work "Socrates," published in Rostov-on-Don in 1999 (with a foreword by professor G.V. Drach – "The Word about the Teacher"), Kessidi formulates a high assessment of Socrates's irony [5]. The method of irony is directed

"against blind worship of tradition and various kinds of false authorities, the veneration of which is not reasonably convincing evidence." The purpose of irony "is to help a man to become free, open for the truth and for the propulsion of his spiritual forces [5, p. 183]. The philosophical meaning of Socratic irony consists, according to F. Kessidi, in the rejection of philosophical dogmatism associated with the search for "eternal" and "absolute" truths.

Noting the "ambivalence of the irony of Socrates" (the term of F.H. Kessidi), the author emphasizes both the limitations of human knowledge in the works of Socrates and the philosopher's confidence in the possibility of gaining knowledge of a universal nature. F. Kessidi notes Socrates's definition of knowledge as virtue and makes the final conclusion that "the irony of Socrates pursued constructive purposes, contained positive content" [5, p. 184]. And here, denying the agnosticism of Socrates, F. Kessidi mentions the position of S. Kierkegaard "Thus, the denial accompanying the irony of Socrates, without being a goal in itself, is not the position of nihilism (an expression of absolute negativity, according to Kierkegaard) [5, p. 186]. At the same time, F. Kessidi does not refer to the works of S. Kierkegaard, and there is no name of the Danish philosopher in the references.

Given the above, one can assume that F.H. Kessidi's acquaintance with Kierkegaard's opinion about Socrates is mediated by the work of A. Losev – "The History of Ancient Aesthetics. Sophists, Socrates and Plato" [9]. In this work, A.F. Losev refers to Søren Kierkegaard's master's thesis on theology, defended in 1841, and published in German in Munich in 1929. The title of the dissertation is "On the Concept of Irony with Continual Reference to Socrates." The work of S. Kierkegaard influenced A.F. Losev. Following the Danish thinker, A.F. Losev compares ancient irony and romantic one, genetically related, where he notes "the emergence of the very Satanism that was to the Romantics' liking ... that mixture of joke, bullying, irony and at the same time, flirtatiousness, posturing, primness and virtuoso artistry" [8, p. 688].

Losev knows Hegel's statement about the irony of Socrates, which "(from the outside) is something untrue" [2, p. 45] and reproduces Hegel's opinion in other words. "The irony of Socrates is deception and vain discourse only from the outside" [9, pp. 77-78]. But what does it mean? "Deception and vain discourse" from any side are deception and vain discourse, and "untruthful" is synonymous with the false.

At the same time, one cannot even think that Hegel and Losev are not familiar with Aristotle's assessment of irony as a form of deception (Nikomakhov's ethics 1127a2'25) [1, p. 141]; and also, with Socrates' assessment of irony by Cicero as "duplicity" and "a way of pretending... that is called irony among the Greeks" (Lucullus V.15) [10, p. 95]. Socrates turned out to be more radical than the sophists considering deception to be a norm of political life.

The irony of Socrates is applied in the struggle for the truth, justice and other spiritual values of a citizen of an ancient city state. The paradox is that you can come to the truth and the common good by modifying lies, i.e., irony! Apparently, the inconsistency of A.F. Losev's assessments of the personality and activity of Socrates is associated with the understanding of this "paradox." On the one hand, Socrates is a genius of philosophy, his activity is a "turning point in the entire history of the human spirit" "his irony is aimed at changing life for the better" High marks! And suddenly, here, Socrates "knew something bad in every person" [9, p. 79], "Grimaces of Priapus" [9, p. 80], he is "terrible and ridiculous" [9, p. 81], "a ferociously intelligent decadent," "the first ancient decadent" [9, p. 82], "this brilliant clown knew something, that people do not know" [9, p. 82].

These characteristics are closer to the irony of Satanism or "romantic irony." Losev's reminiscence on the novel of F. M. Dostoevsky "The Brothers Karamazov," which the philosopher knew and loved well is possible. The creature, which Ivan Karamazov calls "a jester" (Losev calls "a brilliant clown"), argues very "socratically." This "jester..." "philosophizes for noble purposes... I love the truth and sincerely wish good, I wish a man to be

exalted with the spirit of divine titanic pride... hourly defeating nature without borders with the will of his own and science" [3, 80-83 pp.].

There is one more aspect of the influence of S. Kierkegaard's master's thesis on the work of A.F. Losev.

Kierkegaard has a negative view of the European tradition of comparing Socrates with Jesus Christ. This tradition, coming from Augustine the Blessed and Thomas Aquinas, led to the Renaissance, where Socrates was even declared "Saint Socrates" (Erasmus of Rotterdam) and "Christ before Christ." Kierkegaard considered the greatest mistake to compare God and a man. "God and a man are two natures that are separated by an infinite difference of qualities. Every doctrine, that is unwilling to be reckoned with it, is insanity for a man and blasphemy for God" [7, p. 345].

One of Kierkegaard's weighty arguments is the impossibility of irony in the teachings of Christ and in His activities during earthly existence. No forms of lies or pretense are compatible with Christ's teaching and personality, including irony. Monk Andronicus in his faith cannot accept a different point of view than S. Kierkegaard. Perhaps this explains Losev's conflicting characterization of the personality and method of irony of Socrates.

F.H. Kessidi is not included in the problems associated with Christianity. This is another type of scientist educated in the USSR. Therefore, he does not attach much importance to the works of Kierkegaard, mentioning him "in passing." For Kessidi, Socrates "symbolized the highest point of transition from myth to logos and the beginning of conceptual philosophy, which in its anthropological orientation became the self-foundation of freedom" [4, p. 95]. Therefore, Kessidi and Losev argued about the problems of "ancient plastic" and discussed "the principles of physicality in ancient culture and philosophy," (which was noted by researchers of the work of scientists) [4, p. 95], but these scholars could not argue about the meaning of the works of a religious Danish thinker and the problem of Socrates as a "Christian before Christ." In general, both Kessidi and Losev made a significant contribution to the world study of antiquity and expanded our view of the personality and teachings of Socrates.

Литература

1. *Аристотель*. Сочинения: В 4 т. Т. 4. М.: Изд-во Мысль, 1983. С. 141.
2. *Гегель Г.В.Ф.* Лекции по истории философии. Т. 2. СПб.: Наука, 1994. 33 с.
3. *Достоевский Ф.М.* Братья Карамазовы // *Достоевский Ф.М.* ПСС. Т. 15. М.: Наука, 1976. С. 80-83.
4. *Драч Г.В.* Феохарий Кессиди: в поисках формулы античности // Научная мысль Кавказа. 2010. № 4. С. 95.
5. *Кессиди Ф.Х.* Сократ. Ростов-на-Дону: Феникс, 1999.
6. *Кессиди Ф.Х.* Сократ. М.: Изд-во Наука, 1976. 178 с.
7. *Кьеркегор С.* Болезнь к смерти // *Кьеркегор С.* Страх и трепет / Пер. с датск. Н. Исаева, С. Исаев. М.: Республика, 1993. 345 с.
8. *Лосев А.Ф.* История античной эстетики. Итоги тысячелетнего развития. Т. 2. М.: Искусство, 1994. 688 с.
9. *Лосев А.Ф.* История античной эстетики. Софисты, Сократ, Платон. М.: Искусство, 1969.
10. *Цицерон М.Т.* Учение академиков / Пер. Н.А. Фёдорова. М.: Индрик, 2004. С. 95.

References

1. *Aristotle*. Sochineniia [Writings]: In 4 volumes. V. 4. Moscow: Publishing House Mysl. 1983. 141 p. (in Russian).

2. *Hegel G.V.F.* Lektsii po istorii filosofii [Lectures on the history of philosophy]. V. 2. Saint Petersburg: Nauka. 1994. 33 p. (in Russian).
3. *Dostoevsky F.M.* Bratia Karamazovy [The Brothers Karamazov]. Dostoevsky F.M. PSS. V. 15. Moscow: Nauka. 1976. pp. 80-83 (in Russian).
4. *Drach G.V.* Feokharii Kessidi: v poiskakh formuly antichnosti. Nauchnaia mysl Kavkaza [Feokhary Kessidi: in search of the formula of antiquity. Scientific thought of the Caucasus]. 2010. No. 4. 95 p. (in Russian).
5. *Kessidy F.H.* Sokrat [Socrates]. Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix. 1999.
6. *Kessidy F.H.* Sokrat [Socrates]. Moscow: Publishing House Nauka. 1976. 178 p. (in Russian).
7. *Kierkegaard S.* Bolezn k smerti. Kerkegor S. Strakh i trepet [Disease to death. Kierkegaard S. Fear and awe]. Translated from Danish by N. Isaeva, S. Isaev. Moscow: Respublika. 1993. 345 p. (in Russian).
8. *Losev A.F.* Istoriia antichnoi estetiki. Itogi tysiacheletnego razvitiia [History of ancient aesthetics. Results of a thousand-year development]. V. 2. Moscow: Iskusstvo. 1994. 688 p. (in Russian).
9. *Losev A.F.* Istoriia antichnoi estetiki. Sofisty, Sokrat, Platon. Istoriia antichnoi estetiki. Sofisty, Sokrat, Platon [History of ancient aesthetics. Sophists, Socrates, Plato]. Moscow: Iskusstvo. 1969 (in Russian).
10. *Cicero M.T.* Uchenie akademikov [Academic Teachings]. Translated by N.A. Fedorova. Moscow: Indrik. 2004. 95 p. (in Russian).

23 August, 2022