

поведение личности происходит, главным образом, из принуждения. Принужденный же к конформизму индивид, не осознающий, ради чего он соглашается с навязанным образом действий, приспособляется к не понятным и не приемлемым для него общественным установкам, скорее, будет действовать деструктивно.

### Список литературы

Маркузе, 1994 – *Маркузе Г.* Одномерный человек. М.: REFL-book, 1994, 368 с.

Мысовских, 2022 – *Мысовских Л. О.* Феномен конформизма: социально-психологический и социально-философский аспекты // Полилог. 2022. Т. 6. № 4.

Мысовских, 2021 – *Мысовских Л. О.* Феномен конформизма во французской социологии культуры // Вестник Московского государственного университета культуры и искусств. 2021. № 3 (101). С. 58-63.

Фромм, 2016 – *Фромм Э.* Бегство от свободы. Sweden: Philosophicalarkiv, 2016, 231 с.

Фромм, 2002 – *Фромм Э.* Гуманистический психоанализ. СПб.: Питер, 2002, 544 с.

Хоркхаймер, Адорно, 1997 – *Хоркхаймер М., Адорно Т.* Диалектика просвещения. М.: Медиум, 1997, 310 с.

УДК 141.319.8

**Азаров К.В.,**

*постдокторальный научный сотрудник, Ph.D.,  
Рейнский Боннский университет Фридриха Вильгельма*

### Толстой и Витгенштейн об образовании

**DOI: 10.33979/2587-7534-2023-3-85-92**

*Толстой оказал глубокое влияние на Витгенштейна. Оба они разделяли антифундаментальную позицию по многим философским вопросам. Неудивительно, что взгляды Толстого и Витгенштейна на образование сопоставимы. Оба выступали за творческий свободный образовательный процесс. В статье показано толстовское влияние в нерелигиозных сферах витгенштейновской мысли, в частности во взглядах Витгенштейна на образование.*

**Ключевые слова:** *антифундаментальный подход; индуктивное обобщение; Витгенштейн; Толстой; философия образования; воспитательное насилие.*

**Azarov K.V.,**  
*Postdoc, PhD*

*Rhenish Friedrich Wilhelm University of Bonn*

### **Tolstoy and Wittgenstein on education**

*Tolstoy deeply influenced Wittgenstein. They both shared an anti-foundationalist position on many philosophical questions. Not surprisingly, Tolstoy and Wittgenstein's views on education were germane. They both advocated a creative free educational process. The two can be compared to how educational philosophy develops out of anti-foundationalist premises. The article shows the Tolstoyan influence in non-religious spheres of Wittgenstein's thought, particularly in Wittgenstein's view on education.*

**Keywords:** *anti-foundationalism; inductive generalization; Wittgenstein; Tolstoy; philosophy of education; educational violence.*

#### **I Tolstoy and Wittgenstein**

Although Leo Tolstoy is viewed as a great writer, many believe he was, if not shallow, only a mediocre religious philosopher, and certainly one with little influence. As a good example of this perception, even brilliant Gertrude Anscombe criticized Tolstoy's philosophy as a set of "miserable failures" [Anscombe, 1959: 170]. This view is especially strong among Wittgensteinian scholars as it relates to the influence of Tolstoy on Ludwig Wittgenstein. Most scholars only see a very narrow religious influence on Wittgenstein, and do not acknowledge Tolstoy's influence in other areas of Wittgenstein's philosophy. However, it is my contention that although Tolstoy had no influence on Wittgenstein's possible religiosity, he had a much broader and deeper influence in other aspects of Wittgenstein's thinking, for example, his educational philosophy.

It is possible that the common academic view on Tolstoy's influence on Wittgenstein is highly stereotyped. Most see Tolstoy as being very religious, and therefore perceive his influence as being religious. Thus, Brian McGuinness interprets Tolstoy's perception of God when he says that according to Tolstoy, there is a world spirit.<sup>1</sup> However, Tolstoy saw God as "reason," (a non-religious concept) as will be shown below.

McGuinness' view, and other similar views, could originate from a superficial reading of Tolstoy. Although McGuinness and others were correct in assuming Wittgenstein was a devoted reader of *The Gospel in Brief* by Tolstoy, a book that "kept him alive" [Monk, 1991: 116] during World War I, the use of the word "gospel" in the title is misleading since Tolstoy's *Gospel* is not a religious text. It is exclusively related to Tolstoyan ethics. Tolstoy was more profoundly influenced by Pushkin [Eikhenbaum, 1969: 131–136, 141],<sup>2</sup> Rousseau [Kovalevsky, 2005], Kant [Kruglov, 2012: 126; Tolstoy, 1953: 219], and Schopenhauer [Tolstoy, 1953: 219] than by any form of traditional Christianity. These influences can be seen in Tolstoy's translation of the Gospels. This is unequivocally seen in Tolstoy's *The Gospel in Brief*, where we find

that, for Tolstoy, God is only reason and moral law. Already when Tolstoy was only planning his Gospel he wrote in the diary that he wants to write a story of a life of “Christ the materialist,” to give a “materialist Gospel” [Biriukov, 1921: 436]. The final text of Tolstoy’s Gospel is true to this intention. For example, according to Tolstoy, it is wrong to translate John 1:1 as “the Word (logos) was God.” Tolstoy translated “logos” as “understanding of life” (“разумение жизни” “razumenie zhizni” [Tolstoy, 1957b: 816]<sup>3</sup> in Russian and “die Erkenntnis des Lebens” in German translation [Tolstoi, 1892: 30] most probably read by Wittgenstein [Chover, 2010: 106-107]), and therefore, “God” in John’s Gospel is merely the “understanding of life.” Moreover, Tolstoy writes in the very beginning of his Confession, “according to some of my memories, I actually never believed in God” [Tolstoy, 1957a: 1]. Therefore, since Tolstoy himself was not religious, and his Gospel not religious, we can conclude his influence on Wittgenstein was not religious either.

Although, as argued above, Tolstoy could not have religious influence on Wittgenstein, Tolstoy certainly had a broader influence on Wittgenstein’s thinking. When considering Wittgenstein’s philosophy, it will be shown to be remarkably close to Tolstoy’s. For example, as I argue, Wittgenstein borrowed the principle structure of Tolstoy’s Gospel for his first book, *The Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Tolstoy’s Gospel begins with the ‘Lord’s Prayer,’ and each line from the prayer is the name of a chapter. Wittgenstein followed a similar approach in *Tractatus*, where each line of the opening paragraph is also a named chapter in his text. Besides the formal similarities, there is a deep inner connection between Tolstoy and Wittgenstein. This comes from the often-overlooked anti-foundationalist stance taken by Tolstoy, from Tolstoy’s scepticism against generalizations, or from his “anti-theory,” to use Archambault’s expression [Archambault, 1969: vi–xvii]. For example, Tolstoy formulated a set of questions which he viewed as unanswerable. “What is the meaning of life?” is such a question. According to Tolstoy, it is impossible to say what the meaning of life is, and one shall just live in a way, such that the question will never arise [Tolstoy, 1957a: 43]. The same can be said about the question of the purpose of the pedagogy. In ‘Popular Education’ Tolstoy wrote: “the definition of pedagogy and its purpose in a philosophical sense is impossible, useless, and harmful” [Tolstoy, 1989c: 69]. The question “what is beauty?” can be another example. In *What is art*, Tolstoy wrote that “this strange conception of ‘beauty,’ which seems so simple to those who talk without thinking, but in defining it all philosophers of various tendencies and different nationalities could not come to an agreement for an entire century-and-a-half” [Tolstoy, 1904: 15].

The clearest expression of this Tolstoyan idea can be found in his diaries: “there is no mystery for rational questions. However, for irrational questions everything is a mystery” [Tolstoy, 2003: 143]. This approach to philosophical questions parallels Wittgenstein’s idea of philosophy as showing a fly out of the bottle in *Philosophical Investigations* [Wittgenstein, 1999: 103e], as a way to avoid intellectual steps “that generate the philosophical disputes that Wittgenstein aimed to dissolve” [Beaney, 2017: 86].

The same can be said about Tolstoy’s and Wittgenstein’s approaches to

educational philosophy. However, here the direct connection between them is not easy to trace down. Indeed, Wittgenstein was a devoted reader of Tolstoy, for example of Tolstoy's Gospel and of Tolstoy's parables, *The Twenty Three Tales*. Malcolm reported that Wittgenstein even examined Malcolm's knowledge of *The Twenty Three Tales* [Malcolm, 2001: 45]. However, there is no direct evidence of Wittgenstein reading Tolstoy's educational works, even if Tolstoy's main pedagogical essay 'On Popular Education' ('О Народном Образовании' 'O Narodnom Obrazovanii') was translated in English in 1904 [Tolstoy, 1904]. But even without Wittgenstein's knowledge of Tolstoy's views on education, Tolstoy and Wittgenstein can be meaningfully compared as two variants of anti-foundationalist style in education which evolved to give close results, as it will be shown below.

## **II Generalizations in Tolstoy and Wittgenstein's educational philosophies**

Tolstoy view on generalization is a direct source of the Tolstoyan denial of compulsory education and educational philosophy underlining this denial. Probably the most special feature of Tolstoyan educational philosophy is Tolstoy's stance against compulsory education. The main arguments by Tolstoy against a compulsory education is that (i) due to the development of humanity, adults cannot give children what they really need for the world in which they will live in the future, and, as a result, adults teach outdated matters [Tolstoy, 1989c: 66–67] and thereby adults have no right to force children in education. The second argument is (ii) that a compulsive approach is not effective [Tolstoy, 1989c: 63–64] – children do not accept what they do not choose. Therefore, the only thing a compulsory education can teach, according to Tolstoy, is a hatred of such education. The children, writes Tolstoy, only get a hatred of enlightenment from a compulsory school. Tolstoy was trying to give a substantial basis to this idea by his research in France and in (would be) Germany ("the mother of schools" for Tolstoy [Tolstoy, 1989c: 54]). According to Tolstoy, one of the negative results of such a system is the dulling of students' minds (Tolstoy uses a German verb, "verdummen," which has this meaning [Tolstoy, 1989c: 60]).

As a corollary, Tolstoy wanted to minimize the generalizations and ready conclusions given to children. Thus, he believes that the teacher must not teach children not to kill. Instead, the teacher's duty is to present an ethical matter in such a form that children themselves would provide such a generalization [Tolstoy, 1989b: 37].

This view has a direct correlation in Wittgenstein's idea that the teacher should let the child decide whether to accept a particular world picture or not:<sup>4</sup>

[y]ou get him to decide on accepting this picture. And you do so by means of the proof, i.e. by exhibiting a series of pictures, or simply by shewing him the picture. What moves him to decide does not matter here. The main thing is that it is a question of accepting a picture [Wittgenstein, 1967: 117e].

Wittgenstein writes how "the teacher's job is to induce it to guess his meaning in the realm of meanings before the child's mind, as though the child could in his own private language ask himself such a question as, 'Does he want me to continue, or repeat what he said, or something else?'" [Peters and Stickney, 2018: 3]. As Michael A. Peters and Jeff Stickney put it, Wittgenstein seeks "to describe (...) rather than prescribe how we learn concepts" [Peters and Stickney, 2018: 44]. Or, as Wittgenstein wrote in

Last Writings on the Philosophy of Psychology “[c]onsider that you have to teach the child the concept. Thus, you have to teach it evidence (the law of evidence, so to speak). (...) Remarkable the concept to which this game of evidence belongs” [Peters and Stickney, 2018: 44].

Some roots of the controversial notion of teaching-drilling (“Abrichtung”) in Wittgenstein can be seen in Tolstoy’s theoretic works on education, or, at least, Tolstoy can help us to understand this notion. The standard translation of Wittgensteinian “Abrichtung” in English, used by Wittgenstein himself and his student Anscombe, is “training.” However, as Norm Frisen puts it, “Abrichtung is notably different from the English ‘training’ [Frisen, 2017: 71]. Moreover, as Michael Luntley argues, modifying the standard translation, “Abrichtung” “is a very minimal notion of training, best expressed in English as conditioning, although even that fails to capture the severity of the German word which, for a native German speaker, would never be used to refer to human infant training” [Luntley, 2015: 70].

However, if we consider Tolstoy’s ambivalence towards educational practices, we can see a new possible interpretation of “Abrichtung.” Tolstoy draws a difference between “education” (“воспитание” “vospitanie”<sup>5</sup>) and “teaching” (“преподавание” “prepodavanie”). According to Tolstoy, education has an unavoidable element of violence, while teaching does not have such an element [Tolstoy, 1989a: 207–208].<sup>6</sup> This is the source of Tolstoy’s ambivalence to education, related to his idea of an unavoidable educational violence that needs a separate article. Because of this ambivalence, from a Tolstoyan viewpoint education needs a justification. According to Tolstoy, it actually cannot be justified, except, probably, for religious education; because from a religious perspective, such compulsion is viewed as the principal duty. Here Tolstoy considers mainly Abrahamic religions; Judaism, Islam, and Christianity in its most widespread forms, but Tolstoy is also deeply interested in Daoism and Buddhism. In his view on a religious education as acceptable, Tolstoy shows his complex attitude towards religion: Tolstoy had a deep respect for folk religiosity combined with the rejection of both the existence of god (in any other form than a metaphor) and of official religion. The former comes from Tolstoy’s ideal of simplicity: a religious peasant is an example of an integral personality for Tolstoy, and peasant’s language is free from unnecessary theorizing and misleading complexities. In 1902 Tolstoy explicitly denies moral integrity of dogmatic religious education [Veikshan, 1953: 116].

The problem of a special kind of violence, which we call here the educational violence, is not limited, according to Tolstoy, to physical punishment in school. The physical punishments in educational philosophy at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century are only an archaic practice excluded from any progressive educational theory. Instead, educational violence consists of the fact that a child cannot determine what to study. The necessity of education is also not up to him or her to decide. Therefore, the attempts to avoid forced generalizations are vulnerable to the necessity of one “meta-generalization” of the education itself, which is unavoidable. The term “educational violence” comes from a polemical exchange between Evgeny Markov and Tolstoy [Markov, 1862: 151]. The educational violence, unavoidable and unacceptable, can

help in understanding why Wittgenstein picked such a strong and peculiar German word as “Abrichtung” for his educational philosophy. For Wittgenstein it is important to describe world as it is, without euphemisms. It is quite possible that Tolstoyan ambivalence towards existing educational practices influenced the Austrian philosopher.

### Notes

1 Brian McGuinness wrote Tolstoy believed the “spirit makes all men the sons of God and the only true life for a man is communion with that spirit” [McGuinness, 1988: 221]. Although McGuinness did not give any references, it seems he could follow the line of thought of a character in one of Tolstoy’s early works, a short story called ‘Lucerne’ (1857).

2 Eikhenbaum’s ‘Pushkin and Tolstoy’ presents the subject in a more detailed way, but in regard of the direct influence of Pushkin on Tolstoy is less illuminating.

3 Here and afterwards the quotations from Tolstoy are my own translations.

4 Here only Wittgenstein’s theory is considered and not his practice. However, there is a strong ethical necessity to acknowledge the controversy related to Wittgenstein’s actual practice of education, especially his systematic abuse of children. This sad fact can only be partially excused by Wittgenstein’s serious psychological problems and inability to manage his anger.

5 It is how Tolstoy himself translated Russian “vospitanie”; another option could be “upbringing” or, in some contexts, “drill.”

6 The translation given here is made according to Tolstoy’s text. Tolstoy seen a difference between “Bildung” (“образование” “obrazovaniye”), a concept present in German and Russian but not in English or French, and “education” which is present in all 4 languages (see Russian “vospitanie,” French “éducation,” German “Erziehung”) [Tolstoy, 1989a: 206–207].

### References

Anscombe, 1959 – *Anscombe*, G. An Introduction to Wittgenstein’s Tractatus, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959, 179 p.

Archambault, 1969 – *Archambault*, R. Introduction // Tolstoy on Education, (tr.) Leo Wiener, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1969, pp. v–xviii.

Beaney, 2017 – *Beaney*, M. Wittgenstein and Frege // A Companion to Wittgenstein, (eds.) Hans-Johann Glock and John Hyman, Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017, 74–91 pp.

Biriukov, 1921 – *Biriukov* P. Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy: biografiia, vol. 1, Ladyzhnikov: Berlin, 1921, 572 p.

Eikhenbaum, 1969 – *Eikhenbaum*, B. Nasledie Belinskogo i Lev Tolstoy (1857–1858) // Eikhenbaum, B. O proze. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1969, pp. 125–166.

Frisen, 2017 – *Frisen*, N. Training and Abrichtung: Wittgenstein as a tragic philosopher of education // Educational Philosophy and Theory, vol. 49 (1), 2017, pp.

185–186.

Kovalevsky, 2005 – *Kovalevsky*, M. *Mozhno li schitat' Tolstogo prodolzhatel'em Russo?* // *Zh.-Zh. Russo: Pro et Contra*, (ed.) A.A. Zlatopolskaya, St. Petersburg: Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy Press, 2005, pp. 693–702.

Kruglov, 2012 – *Kruglov*, A. *Kant i kantovskaya filosofiya v russkoy khudozhestvennoy literature*. Moscow: Kanon R.O.O.I. Reabilitatsiya, 2012, 480 p.

Llinares, 2010 – *Llinares*, Ch. *The early Wittgenstein, Tolstoy's Kurze Darlegung des Evangelium and Nietzsche's Der Antichrist* // *Doubt, Ethics and Religion: Wittgenstein and the Counter-Enlightenment*, (eds.) Luigi Perissinotto and Vicente Sanf elix, Frankfurt, Paris, Lancaster and New Brunswick: Ontos Verlag, 2010, 109–131 p.

Luntley, 2015 – *Luntley*, M. *Wittgenstein: Opening Investigations*, Chichester: Wiley, 2015, 179 p.

Malcolm, 2001 – *Malcolm*, N. *A Memoir* // *Ludwig Wittgenstein: a memoir*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 21–84.

Markov, 1862 – Markov E., *Theory and Practice of Yasnaya Poliyana school* // *The Russian Herald*, vol. 39, 1862, pp. 149–189.

McGuinness, 1988 – *McGuinness* B., *Wittgenstein: A Life: Young Ludwig, 1889–1921*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: The University of California Press, 1988, 322 p.

Monk, 1991 – *Monk*, R. *Ludwig Wittgenstein: The Duty of Genius*, London: Vintage, 1991, 704 p.

Peters and Stickney, 2018 – *Peters*, M. and *Stickney* J. *Wittgenstein's Education: A 'Picture Held Us Captive'*, Singapore: Springer, 2018, 117 p.

Tolstoi, 1892 – *Tolstoi*, L. *Kurze Darlegung des Evangelium*, ed. Paul Lauterbach, Leipzig: Reclam, 1892, 232 p.

Tolstoy, 1904 – *Tolstoy*, L. *On Popular Education* // *Complete Works of Count Tolstoy*, vol. 12, (tr.) Leo Wiener, London: J. M. Dent & Co., pp. 251–323.

Tolstoy, 1904 – *Tolstoy*, L. *What is art*, New York, tr NA, 1904, 237 p.

Tolstoy, 1953 – Tolstoy, L. *Pis'ma, 1863–1872, Sobraniye sochineniy v 90 tomakh*, vol. 61, edited by M. A. Tsiavlovskiy and N. D. Pokrovskaya, Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya Literatura. 435 p.

Tolstoy, 1957a – *Tolstoy*, L. *Ispoved'* // *Sobraniye sochineniy v 90 tomakh*, vol. 23, (ed.) N. N. Gusev, Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1957, pp. 1–59.

Tolstoy, 1957b – *Tolstoy*, L. *Kratkoye izlozheniye yevangeliya* // *Proizvedeniya, 1882–1898, Sobraniye sochineniy v 90 tomakh*, vol. 24, (ed.) N. N. Gusev, Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1957, pp. 801–940.

Tolstoy, 1989a – *Tolstoy*, L. *Vospitaniye i obrazovaniye* // *Leo N. Tolstoy, Pedagogicheskiye sochineniya*, (ed.) I. F. Protchenko, Moscow: Pedagogika, 1989, pp. 207–208.

Tolstoy, 1989b – *Tolstoy*, L. *Pedagogicheskiye zametki i materialy* // *Leo N. Tolstoy, Pedagogicheskiye sochineniya*, (ed.) I. F. Protchenko, Moscow: Pedagogika, 1989, pp. 33–36.

Tolstoy, 1989c – *Tolstoy*, L. *O narodnom obrazovanii* // *Leo N. Tolstoy*,

Pedagogicheskiye sochineniya, (ed.) I. F. Protchenko, Moscow: Pedagogika, 1989, pp. 291–339.

Tolstoy, 2003 – *Tolstoy*, L. *Filosofskiy dnevnik. 1901–1910*, (ed.) Nikol'yukin A. N. Moscow: Izvestia, 2003, 543 p.

Veikshan, 1953 – *Veikshan*, V. L.N. *Tolstoy o vospitanii i obuchenii*, Moscow: Academy of Pedagogical Sciences), 1953, 145 p.

Wittgenstein, 1967 – *Wittgenstein*, L. *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics*, (tr.) G. E. M. Anscombe, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The M.I.T. Press, 1967, 204. p.

Wittgenstein, 1999 – *Wittgenstein*, L. *Philosophical Investigations*, G. E. M. Anscombe (tr.), Oxford and Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1999, 272 p.

**УДК 141.152; 308**

**Кондратенко К.С.,**

*кандидат философских наук, доцент,*

*доцент кафедры политического управления,*

*Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет*

**Сетевая философия искусственной рациональности: эффекты взаимодействия разноуровневых систем. Часть 1**

**DOI: 10.33979/2587-7534-2023-3-92-101**

*Статья представляет собой один из аспектов теории рациональных систем – авторского подхода, предназначенного для интерпретации и моделирования мира «новой рациональности», в которой активное участие принимают не только «традиционные» носители рациональности – люди, сообщества, группы, государства, но и техника. Теория рациональных систем пытается описать «традиционных» и «нетрадиционных» акторов одними и теми же инструментами – кибернетикой, общей теорией систем, структурным функционализмом, сетевым анализом. В данной статье особое внимание уделено именно техническим системам, понимаемым как рациональные системы, однако автор удерживается от акторно-сетевого уравнивания «человеков» и «не-человеков», указывая на несводимость онтологий естественной, самопроизвольной рациональности и рациональности искусственной. Разноуровневые системы, сосуществуя друг с другом, обнаруживают в себе совершенно разную архитектуру. Выявлению этих различий и посвящено исследование.*

**Ключевые слова:** *философия техники; рациональная система; рациональные системы; теория рациональных систем; искусственный*