

Oksana Krupyna
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7136-6091>

CONFIRMATION OF THE SPIRITUAL NATURE OF INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY IN YEVHEN SPEKTORSKYI'S WORKS OF THE EMIGRANT PERIOD

The article presents the main issues of the works by the famous philosopher, jurist and educator Yevhen Vasyliovych Spektorskyi (1875–1951) written during the period of forced emigration (1920–1951) and professional activity at the universities of Belgrade, Prague, Ljubljana and the St. Volodymyr Orthodox Theological Seminary in New-York. In the intellectual biography of the thinker, these prolific years are marked by the development of issues in social science, philosophy, moral theology, and Christian ethics. In numerous works in various foreign languages, some of which have been analyzed in this article for the first time, Spektorskyi substantiated the importance of moral — as opposed to physical and mental — dimension of the existence of both individuals and society, for which he regarded the Christian religion to be a reference point. The latter, in his opinion, can truly explore the essence of the individual and social with the help of Christian sociology. The history of social philosophy is essential for social science as well as philosophy itself. Positioned between science and religion, philosophy has the capacity for free thinking, which is crucial for achieving a genuine understanding of society. As it is revealed in the article, the philosopher developed ethical guidelines within the framework of moral theology, criticizing naturalistic and mechanistic approaches to understanding society and the individual. Spektorskyi regarded freedom, dignity, and a righteous life according to the Christian ideal, as well as cultural activity, as fundamental values. The author argues that Spektorskyi's affirmation of absolute values and the study of the relationship between the individual and society on the basis of the Christian religion provide grounds for evaluating Spektorskyi as an exceptionally religious philosopher.

Key words: Yevhen Spektorskyi, religion, Christianity, Christian philosophy, Christian sociology, culture, ethics, moral theology, social sciences, social philosophy, person, society.

Yevhen Vasyliovych Spektorskyi (1875–1951) belongs to the circle of those extraordinary intellectuals who combined the qualities of an outstanding scientist, an original philosopher, a talented educator, and organizer of science. He became an integral part of the history of Saint Volodymyr University in Kyiv as a professor (1914–1918), dean of the Faculty of Law (1918) and the last rector (1918–1919). The author of outstanding works on the philosophy of law, methodology of social sciences, ethics, philosophy of culture, Spektorskyi is known as one of the prominent representatives of academic philosophy in Ukraine in the 1910s, one of the initiators and head of the Kyiv Scientific and Philosophical Society (1914–1918).

For many years Spektorskyi had to conduct his academic activities in a forced emigration caused by the establishment of Bolshevik power¹. The stages

of his academic career in Europe were the positions of professor at Belgrade (1920–1924, 1927–1930) and Ljubljana (1930–1945) universities, professor and dean of the Russian Faculty of Law in Prague (1924–1928), as well as activities as the head of a number of several prominent scientific societies, notably the Slovenian Society of Philosophy of Law and Sociology in the 1930s. One of the highest state awards of Serbia (Order of St. Sava, II degree) and election as a corresponding member of the Serbian Royal Academy of Sciences (1934) became clear evidence of his recognition as a scientist and organizer of science.

In his late years Yevgen Spektorskyi had to survive not only another world war, a life under German occupation, an escape from Ljubljana on the eve of the entry of the Soviet army in the fall of 1944 and several years of wandering through Italian camps for displaced persons. He also had to endure

¹ At the beginning of 1920, due to the establishment of Bolshevik power in Kyiv, Spektorskyi had to emigrate to the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (since 1929 — Yugoslavia).

From 1924, the scientist lived in Czechoslovakia for three years, but in 1928 he returned to Belgrade, and in 1930 he moved to Ljubljana.

another emigration — this time to the American continent (1947). Having settled in the suburbs of New York, he actively participated in the establishment of the St. Vladimir Orthodox Theological Seminary as a professor, and became one of the initiators, organizers and the first head of the Russian Academic Group in the USA.

In general, the main events of Spektorskyi's life and professional activity in emigration have already been established by researchers (Kozlitiin, 1996; Ulianovskiy, Korotkiy, & Skyba, 2007; Mykhalchenko & Tkachenko, 2009). In contrast, the republishing of the thinker's works and the conceptual examination of his emigrant heritage are just beginning, particularly in Slovenia, where Spektorskyi spent 15 years of his life (Spektorski, 2018; 2019). The author of this article has recently contributed to such research in her PhD dissertation (Krupyna, 2023). The numerous published works by Spektorskyi of the emigrant period, as well as his manuscripts, correspondence and documents, which are stored in Ljubljana (Archives of the Republic of Slovenia, Historical Archives of the Museum of the University of Ljubljana), Prague (the National Museum Archives, Archives of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague City Archives, National Archives of the Czech Republic, Archives of Charles University) and other archives of European countries (Mykhalchenko & Tkachenko, 2011) still await systematization, processing and proper understanding.

The purpose of this article is to analyze Spektorskyi's works of the emigrant period, focused on researching the issues on social science, philosophy, moral theology, and Christian ethics. These writings chiefly summarize his scientific achievements and philosophical searches. Special attention will be paid to his works on social science, its essence and methodology, which have not yet been sufficiently examined in outlining his intellectual portrait.

In a number of works published in exile, Spektorskyi elaborated the problems of the philosophy of social science, social philosophy, Christian metaphysics and ethics.

Spektorskyi's monograph *Khristianstvo i kultura*, published in Prague in 1925, was the first book that clearly testified to the evolution of Spektorskyi's philosophical beliefs. In particular, his interests shifted from epistemological issues based on Marburg neo-Kantianism and genealogical research into social physics of the 17th century towards a completely different field. In this work Spektorskyi justified the exceptional role of Christianity and Christian philosophy in European culture and at the same time examined the problems of social sciences from a Christian perspective.

Exploring the idea of the endless development of humanity in the context of human cultural activity, he considers culture as a way to rise above the level of instincts, to become a “supernatural” being by overcoming nature at the level of consciousness (spiritual culture regarding religion, philosophy, science, art), society (law, state) and the physical world (material culture). According to the scientist, by creating spiritual, social, and material cultures, a person becomes free from slavery and overcomes the limits of nature, making it their own creation, and not the other way around. Moreover, he considers culture as a defining feature of a person that distinguishes them from other beings (Spektorskyi, 2013b, p. 33). This is how cultural values arise, are transmitted and accumulated by people due to their conscious activity. In this context, history should be understood not as a chain of natural laws, but as a human creation full of drama caused by the mismatch of goals, means and results.

A human as a creative being turns to the dimension of the possible, and on the basis of their belief in their own goal and conscious transformation of reality culture appears as “faith in action.” As Spektorskyi noted, any kind of faith is religious, because it takes a person beyond the limits of their empirical existence and connects them to something transcendent. In addition, religion is profoundly social, for it connects a person with others who also believe and create. The scientist proved that the ideological matrix of European culture is Christianity, because “the Christian cause is a cultural cause. Conversely, any cultural matter is a Christian matter” (Spektorskyi, 2013b, p. 88). As the well-known historian of philosophy Vasyl Zenkovskiy rightly noted, in the work of Spektorskyi “Christianity appears to the reader as the soul of culture as its truly creative force” (Zenkovskiy, 1975, p. 318).

Spektorskyi considered physical, mental, and moral aspects to be essential for social science methodology (Spektorskyi, 2013b, p. 196). The physical is the subject for social physics or social geometry in the literal sense of the word when it comes to the study of some quantitative indicators and functions. Society is considered here as a group of similar beings interacting with each other. Along with natural sociology, it is appropriate to talk about technological sociology, because the created material world operates according to laws that differ from natural ones. In addition, it is connected with the field of social medicine, e.g., the issue of population growth, diseases etc. The mental dimension of society involves exchange of thoughts, emotions, and feelings: “This is how the collective psyche appears, which more or less absorbs the individual

psyche and also subjugates the individual to the general and the whole" (Spektorskyi, 2013b, p. 197). Significantly, nowadays this phenomenon is known as mass psychology. The moral dimension of society refers to spiritualized beings who are able to consciously practice their principles, pursue certain goals, and accept responsibility for their actions. As a result, Spektorskyi noted, "the methodology of cultural sciences is a methodology not of physical phenomena bound by mechanical necessity, but of the conscious efforts of free and spiritual beings who work on improving their values" (Spektorskyi, 2013b, pp. 61–62).

According to Spektorskyi, each of the three specified dimensions of society exists in reality and should be the subject for special scientific studies. However, the very essence of the social, according to him, is captured only by Christianity. Spektorskyi considers society as a free union of spiritual persons whose activities are consciously aimed at achieving a higher idea. Such an interpretation is in stark contrast to the social masses which physical science considers from a mechanical point of view regarding the laws of physics (Spektorskyi, 2013b, p. 199). Spektorskyi believed that the basis of Christian sociology are the following theses: firstly, society is a union of individuals, secondly, this union arises in the name of God, thirdly, living in a community involves cooperation and mutual assistance.

As for the first thesis, along with the priority of the individual as the basis of the social Spektorskyi emphasizes the complementarity of the individual and society: Christian sociology considers the individual in the circle of other individuals forming a union together. The realization of the spiritual dimension of society becomes one of the tasks of cultural existence, "so that the individual, remaining themselves, cultivates sociality both in themselves and in others — social consciousness, social will and social feeling" (Spektorskyi, 2013b, p. 200).

A specific feature of Christian sociology is the ordinance that the cultural creation of society should take place in the name of God. Spektorskyi explains that it is not about the deification of society itself or the absolutization of certain social factors, but about the understanding of God as a transcendent being: "Through God, the individual joins society. And vice versa, through society the individual joins God" (Spektorskyi, 2013b, p. 201).

In Spektorskyi's view, mutual aid and cooperation as principles of social life also distinguish Christian sociology from other ways of considering society, especially those based on the opposition of different social groups. The scientist notes that Christian society "allows social differentiation, and

does not even do without it, but under the necessary condition of maintaining organic cooperation" (Spektorskyi, 2013b, p. 202). Thus, in the work *Khristianstvo i kultura*, Spektorskyi emphasizes the spiritual dimension of society and proposes a project of Christian sociology, which is the only kind of sociology capable of grasping its essential features. It is worth mentioning that the scientist's reasoning regarding Christian sociology seems to be completely consistent with the theoretical developments in sociology and religious studies of recent decades, as well as the general trends of the so-called post-secular stage of the development of society associated with the revitalization of religious life in the world. In this context, Christian sociology appears as one of the alternatives to secular science based on the principles of secularism and a reductionist understanding of religion.

Spektorskyi's main work in Ljubljana was the two-volume textbook *Zgodovina socialne filozofije* (1932–1933), in which he reviewed works on social philosophy from antiquity to the 1920s. This work by Spektorskyi, published in the Slovenian language in the translation by Josip Vidmar, had a great influence on pre-war public opinion in Slovenia. According to modern studies of Slovenian philosophers, Spektorskyi's *Zgodovina socialne filozofije* still has not lost its scientific significance (Grandja, 2014).

Outlining the methodological foundations of his research into the history of social philosophy in the introduction to the first volume of this work, firstly Spektorskyi delimits the competences of science, philosophy and religion, in particular in the understanding of social science issues. In his opinion, philosophy occupies an intermediate place between religion and science standing out due to its freedom. Thus, religious faith is not free, as it is imbued with the positive content of Revelation and the authority of the Church. Scientific knowledge, in turn, is limited by the need to correspond to experiential reality. Only in philosophy is the human mind not shackled either by the mystical experience of religion or by the empirical experience of science. Of the three categories by which we navigate the world (possibility, reality, and necessity), philosophy primarily uses the category of possibility. Despite the advantages of free thinking, Spektorskyi warns against possible delusions and empty rhetorical figures into which philosophy can degenerate. The scientist sees salvation from this in a philosophy based on scientific knowledge or religious revelation, and emphasizes the significant advantages of such cooperation. At the same time, he warns against replacing religion or science with philosophy and vice versa (Spektorski, 1932, pp. 10–11).

Critically comprehending the essence of the term *society*, Spektorskyi examines it in physical, psychological and moral dimensions and emphasizes the priority of the moral dimension and its fundamental importance for social culture, in particular for such phenomena as law, state and economy. Regulating and improving natural human selfishness, human need for food, procreation, and possession of material resources, social culture causes the emergence of private legal institutions that govern persons, property, agreements, family, and legal succession. By developing and improving the natural relations of power and submission, social culture produces public-legal institutions that regulate the subordination of private interests to the general. Social law, which, as Spektorskyi notes, is a phenomenon of modernity, ultimately cultivates interdependence between individuals and groups, and seeks to create institutions capable of coordinating and balancing private and public interests. Thus, Spektorskyi concludes that the culture of statehood changes natural elements of social life and civilizes a person. Economic culture organizes production, distribution, and consumption of material goods within the domestic, political, and social economy (Spektorski, 1932, pp. 12–15).

The philosopher is convinced that the emergence and development of social culture requires science, values and guiding principles, the source of which are social sciences and social philosophy. For Spektorskyi, social sciences (law, politics and economics) either study individual aspects of social life, or try to cover it comprehensively, with all its internal dependencies, as sociology does. These sciences research the history, theory, and technology of social life.

Directing conscious activity towards the development of social culture is a function of social philosophy. Spektorskyi divides the latter into social deontology (evaluates the actual social apparatus from the point of view of some ideal), social ontology (seeks to explain the meaning of society and the changes taking place in it) and social epistemology (critically interprets the reality of our ontological and deontological judgments about society).

As Spektorskyi writes, social philosophy affects social life more than social sciences. He explains this by the fact that science only analyzes and assimilates already existing things, but it is unable to motivate and encourage people or society to certain actions, unlike, for example, journalism, preaching, myth, dream or utopia. Spektorskyi is convinced that ideas which have a real impact on social life are usually expressed by philosophers and publicists, and not by scientists. As an example, he mentions

the influential figure of Karl Marx, who, although he called his socialism “scientific”, was not a scientist, but a publicist and agitator (Spektorski, 1932, p. 16).

According to Spektorskyi, usually social philosophy ignores the data of social sciences, although sometimes it does take them into account. At the same time, social philosophy itself also becomes the subject for scientific studies. For example, if research is conducted by historical science using the appropriate method, the result is a history of social philosophy.

Spektorskyi considers historical research, firstly, as a critical elimination of mythical and unreliable layering from historical sources and, secondly, a reconstruction of facts and connecting them in such a way, that the temporal sequence simultaneously demonstrates a cause-and-effect relation. It is in this context that the history of social philosophy appears as a special part of the history of culture.

Spektorskyi was of the opinion that the relevance and importance of historical research lies in the connection of the past with the present and the future. Comparing the present with the past, we can see either striking differences or, on the contrary, similarities, but every time it enriches our conscious understanding of life. By distinguishing epochs or periods, we highlight differences, and by considering similarities, we realize the immutability of human nature and what remains the same throughout the ages.

In Spektorskyi’s view, a true philosophical understanding of society is impossible without the history of social philosophy. He believed that it is studied with the same methods as any other history of ideas. Spektorskyi consistently examined various methods that single out one dominant factor among historical factors, which allegedly determines the nature of a certain social philosophy, for instance, biography, race, or environment. However, Spektorskyi concludes, the most rational approach to the study of the history of ideas forces one not to reject any method and not to give any of the methods an undisputed preference. Analyzing the history of social philosophy, one should consider both the personality of the philosopher and the spiritual and social circumstances of his life (Spektorski, 1932, p. 16).

Spektorskyi’s critical mindset and philosophical beliefs, which unfolded since the 1920s within Christian idealism, became the basis not only for his emphasis on the spiritual nature of society, but also for reasoned criticism of some methods and postulates of sociology (Spektorskij, 1943, p. 215). According to the scientist, the most threatening for the development of the latter are the tendencies to reck-

lessly borrow certain statements or methods from natural sciences. Spektorskyi devoted a number of articles to criticism of empiricist scientism, positivism, and naturalism in the humanities in general, and sociology in particular.

The philosopher took the view that uncritically accepting metaphysical statements and using them as scientific is a clearly visible problem in sociology. This descriptive science was conceived by Auguste Comte as a strictly positive science that needed philosophy neither as an epistemological critique of the concept of truth, nor as an ontology that would include hypotheses and fictions, or deontological postulates of ethics. Despite his stated intentions, Comte was not consistent. As Spektorskyi notes, in the end Comte himself became a metaphysician (Spektorskij, 1943, p. 205). Instead, those of his followers who proclaimed themselves to be true positivists (Herbert Spencer, Émile Littré, Albert Schäffle, Émile Durkheim, and others) in fact engaged with metaphysics. Spektorskyi claimed that instead of being critical, investigating the “sociological mind” and studying the formation of sociological concepts, sociologists proclaimed the subjective dogmas of physicalism (biologism, psychologism, sociologism) to be an objective truth, excluding any doubts and criticism. On these dogmas they built what they called science (Spektorskij, 1943, p. 213).

In the article *Naturalistična sociolgija* (1944) Spektorskyi debunks the essence of naturalism as a philosophical orientation exclusively towards nature, and not towards human or God. Such an orientation results in either atheism or pantheism and the understanding of man only as an immanent part of nature. In Kant's language, the naturalist chooses a “physiological” anthropology that investigates not the activity of human as a free being (the subject of “pragmatic anthropology”), but how nature works through human. Thus, in such a paradigm everything spiritual is reduced to mental, mental to physical, physical to chemistry, and the latter to mechanics (Spektorskij, 1944, pp. 183–184).

As we have already clarified above, Spektorskyi considered the physical dimension of human existence to be a completely legitimate perspective for scientific research. But for him, this dimension is not exhaustive and, moreover, cannot be decisive for sociologists. When the latter ones discuss social phenomena in naturalistic terms, it only looks like science and actually results not in physics or biology, but in physicalism and biologism. Also, such “research” does not add anything to real natural science. As Spektorskyi demonstrates, all this is not real knowledge, but only a verbal, allegorical science (Spektorskij, 1944, pp. 186–187).

Naturalism in sociology is sometimes justified by the intention to explore the unknown through the known: the unknown social reality through the known concepts and phenomena of natural sciences related to physical aggregates, chemical compounds, plants, animals and their associations (Spektorskij, 1944, p. 191). It was on this methodological basis that sociologists attempted to interpret human life drawing an analogy with the symbiosis of cells, insects, and animals. However, both biologists² and sociologists themselves have already understood the limitations of such analogies. In Spektorskyi's view, attempts to blur the border between the animal world and human society completely negate the human ability in clear language, religion, science, art, technology, law, state and economy. Thus, the philosopher concluded, culture in general and social culture in particular are not compatible with naturalism, because they envisage a person as the one who actively and freely changes the natural elements and does not passively and slavishly bow before them (Spektorskij, 1944, p. 196).

One of the most significant defects of naturalistic sociology, according to Spektorskyi, is the fundamental denial of free activity of a human as a creator of personal and social reality. In the naturalistic worldview the significance of normative laws is downplayed, only “eternal, iron, great natural laws” reign here (Spektorskij, 1944, p. 184).

Spektorskyi argued that the natural scientists themselves were the first to speak out against such a deterministic understanding of human life and the science of it. They question the mechanistic worldview, the indisputability of the laws of nature, and sometimes existence of such laws at all (Spektorskij, 1944, p. 193). Spektorskyi pointed out that among physicists there is a noticeable tendency to rethink the world order and undermine traditional views. Thus, they recognize determinism only in the macroscopic study of nature, but in microphysics they talk about indeterminism. The very concept of determinism appears more and more in the modality of possibility rather than necessity. Evidence of this is Louis de Broglie's assertion of the “arbitrariness” of atoms and Werner Heisenberg's “imprecision” of causality, which contrasts to the denial of human free will by some sociologists. Therefore, as Spektorskyi notes, in connection with the widespread definition of science as natural science, the conclusions of modern physics are essential for the affirmation of both the freedom of the individual and the freedom of scientific research (Spektorskij, 1942, p. 311).

² In particular, Spektorskyi points to the beliefs of zoologists Pierre Grasse and Etienne Rabaud.

Spektorskyi considered fundamental to his anthropology and ethics problems of freedom and determinism in his works written in the USA. According to Vasyl Zenkovskyi, the category of possibility played a special role in the Spektorskyi's philosophical studies: "The possible is between the necessary and the real, therefore it is a condition and principle of freedom" (Zenkovsky, 1975, p. 318). Denying the absolute and universal meaning of pre-determination, Spektorskyi considers determinism as one of the possible theoretical hypotheses, necessary for human knowledge of nature and its transformation (technology) but limited in its application to human life (ethics). In his opinion, for ethics person is "not only *homo technicus* that knows how to set goals and find the necessary means for them, but also *homo ethicus* that is bound by the prescriptions for what is proper" (Spektorskyi, 1967, p. 155).

In the context of considering a person as a moral being, determinism, according to the philosopher, has a different meaning and several varieties. He listed the following kinds: indicative ontological or phenomenological determinism, technological indeterminism, imperative or normal deontological determinism.

Indicative determinism postulates a person as completely subjected to external or internal factors. Among the external factors of enslavement Spektorskyi distinguishes theocratic (renunciation of freedom due to the rule of fate), sociocratic (human is only a derivative of society), physiocratic (human's destiny is completely under the control of nature). A person's behavior and choice can be completely determined by internal factors (physical or mental state) when unconscious behavior is controlled not by motives, but by "motors", as Spektorskyi expressed it. He concludes that "the phenomenology of human life is completely devoid of any ethical qualification" (Spektorsky, 1967, p. 156), therefore it is meaningless to talk about "natural crimes" since a crime should be understood only as a deliberate violation of ethical norms.

Having freed themselves from the above mentioned types of determinism, a person opens the way to technical activity, but does not yet realize their potential as a free being. By overcoming natural determinism, a person has the freedom to set goals and achieve them without regard to ethical values. For instance, in politics, as Niccolò Machiavelli saw it, or in economics or technological progress. However, technical development without ethics during the 19th century caused numerous disasters that befell humanity in the 20th century: world wars, the rise of crime and the emergence of totalitarian states. Spektorskyi believed that only due attention to eth-

ics could change the situation and prevent the death of civilization. He wrote the following: "If we find the strength to throw off the naturalistic influence of the last century, then our consciousness and conscience will be motivated to creative and fruitful, truly progressive knowledge and activity, inspired by faith in undeniable and eternal spiritual values" (Spektorsky, 1971, p. 259).

Consistently advocating the priority of ethical values and ethical regulation of the development of culture and science, Spektorskyi selected three components of a person in the context of ethical determinism – bodily, mental and spiritual, which correspond to the physical, mental and moral aspects of the study of society. The coordination and harmony of these three components in a person is problematic, so "the calling of an ethical person, *homo ethicus*, is to overcome the drama of the struggle of disparate elements that takes place in them, subjecting them to deontological regulations" (Spektorskyi, 1967, p. 157). The scientist divided the latter into subjective (instructions of conscience), objective (customs and law) and absolute ones. The relativity of the first two types of regulations means both the possibility of choosing certain models of behavior and the danger of completely ignoring all moral alternatives. Consequently, there must be absolute regulations of conduct, though such deontology, "like everything absolute, can only be a subject of faith" (Spektorskyi, 1967, p. 158), and its source is religious revelation.

While teaching Christian ethics and canon law at the St. Volodymyr Orthodox Theological Seminary, Spektorskyi paid considerable attention to the issue of absolute regulations of human behavior and social existence. The English-language typescript preserved in the archives of the seminary, published by Slovenian researchers under the title *Vprašanja moralne teologije* (2018), seems to be particularly indicative in this regard. In this concise, but very meaningful text, Spektorskyi provides a philosophical justification of moral theology and draws attention to the social dimension of basic ethical concepts — good, evil, God, and human.

Trying to rationally prove the need for a person to turn to absolute principles, Spektorskyi considered two options for a person's attitude to the absolute: denial or recognition. In the first case, a person inevitably faces the paradox of existence, as well as relativism, in the light of which human goals and ideals become relative and even erroneous. In the end, human imperfection and the vices of the whole world seem insurmountable, because a person does not recognize the existence of the perfection to which they could aspire.

Nevertheless, the situation changes radically if a person believes in God as an absolute ideal. In this case human existence receives an absolute indestructible basis, human aspirations are supported in an ideal, the reflection of which we find in this world, thus human life becomes related to the infinite Good and surpasses the limitations of the created world. So, Spektorskyi states that a human is naturally oriented towards God and absolute being, striving for perfection. On the other hand, atheism is contrary to human nature. Human as a Creation cannot exist without God, and when they strive for perfection and the ideal, they necessarily stride towards Him (Spektorski, 2018, pp. 61–62). The same applies to a person's moral life. Without God, humanity risks experiencing the dangers of moral relativism and pessimism since the struggle against evil and suffering in a godless world becomes hopeless. Spektorskyi concludes that the moral aspirations of humanity are naturally directed towards God (Spektorski, 2018, p. 68).

Spektorskyi defined ethics as knowledge about the good and ways to achieve it (Spektorski, 2018, p. 13). Similarly to how the philosopher rationalizes the necessity of God for human existence in general he emphasizes the non-contradiction of scientific ethics and moral theology, despite the fact that the former is based on human natural knowledge, and the latter on divine Revelation. He argued that moral theology can use scientific knowledge, only considering the possibility of their fallibility. Instead, Revelation is the manifestation of truth as such in the reality that exists in God and the universe. Spektorskyi was convinced that faith and science, if they are objective, have one source which is God's logos. Christianity as a revelation of truth and life seems to him to be more objective than any of the most accurate sciences.

The moral law is revealed to people by God and it is an expression of truth. It brings good for a person and has a reasonable character, so we must not blindly follow it, but understand it and live spiritually. Thus, Spektorskyi's view is that moral theology is not just a list of commandments, but a scientific interpretation of Christian moral doctrine in the light of both faith and science. It is not a sermon, but a scientific system based on the postulates of ethics. He emphasized that moral theology relates to other human sciences, such as anthropology, sociology and psychology. The last two ones, according to Spektorskyi, are full of false ideas and concepts incompatible with Christian ethics (Spektorski, 2018, pp. 18–19).

In the work *Vprašanja moralne teologije* the philosopher outlined the concept of society based on Orthodox doctrine. Emphasizing the value and indispensability of each individual, at the same time Spe-

ktorskyi emphasizes the importance of social ties and lists five of their types: 1) interpersonal relationships, which in Russian philosophy is covered by the concept *sobornost* (conciliarity); 2) a psychological connection that occurs during constant contact between people and results in the emergence of various desires and thoughts; 3) common origin, which emphasizes the connection of descendants with ancestors; 4) social cohesion embodied in the family, society, nation, i.e. certain forms of social life fixed in social institutions, customs and other forms of culture; 5) *consubstantiality* as an internal connection between people according to which the life of each person necessarily and independently of their will affects all other people. The first two forms of connection are mostly under human control, while the last three are partly determined by human nature (Spektorski, 2018, p. 31). According to the specified types of social relations, Spektorskyi saw the foundations of social life in Christian postulates regarding the Godlikeness of human and the Trinity as the ideal of unity, original sin and salvation through Christ, the Christian ideal of perfect unity in faith and love.

Spektorskyi's fundamentally important idea that is not found in his other works is consubstantiality as a special connection between people in society, which is not only a given, but also a purpose of existence. Thus, society is an entity that is simultaneously one-person and many-person. Each member of this formation, despite its essential unity, retains their own identity and independence (Spektorski, 2018, p. 32). For Spektorskyi, the basis of the consubstantiality of society is the direct or indirect connection of all beings and phenomena in a single universe confirmed by both scientific knowledge and religious faith (Spektorski, 2018, p. 42). The source and principle of unity for individual beings and the whole world is God: in God everything is united, and it is from him that the world, humanity, our knowledge and moral life receive their own unity. Striving for unity, we approach God and thus grow spiritually. After all, the inner unity of our soul and spiritual life is a necessary condition for spiritual improvement. Furthermore, unity is an essential characteristic of every being, since what is completely divided ceases to exist. Lack of unity is the cause of suffering, weakness and evil (Spektorski, 2018, p. 62).

Accepting the philosophical foundations of unity, Spektorskyi claimed that social life is a combination of individual lives based on various types of connections and unity entrenched in the peculiarities of human nature, profession, culture and its elements. Such an association is not a mechanical formation, but an *organic whole* which Spektorskyi recognizes as a separate *moral subject*. The latter has a spiritual

nature and lives in all members of society to the extent that they participate in its life not as individuals, but as members of a certain community. Externally, a *moral subject* can manifest itself in some social organization such as the Church, the state, a political organization, etc. Thus, Spektorskyi considers the moral social subject to be single in existence and plural in terms of the number of members.

The acts of the society include the acts of all its members, whereas the responsibility of each individual is personal. Emphasizing the peculiarity of the *moral subject*, Spektorskyi noted that it is possible to have a certain relationship to society, but not be a member of it: for instance, being a foreigner in another country. In such a case, we are responsible for our own actions only as the actions of an individual and not as part of a collective entity. Another consequence of the close relation between society as a whole and its members is the rejection of a complete distinction between the moral law of society and the individual. Thus, Spektorskyi wrote that the solidarity of separate individuals with society provides a reason to attribute social virtues and vices, as well as good or bad deeds, to all members of the community, that is, to apply the same criteria of good and evil to separate individuals and the whole society (Spektorski, 2018, pp. 50–51).

Advancing this thesis, the philosopher writes, firstly, that the personal responsibility of individuals is not the same in social life since it depends on the extent to which a person disagrees with general aspirations. If an individual completely denies some trend, they are only responsible for their own position. Thus, one is able not to support war, revolution, etc., but, in the end, the connection in society is so strong that often the fate of all its members is inevitably determined by a common course. Spektorskyi must have come to this conclusion as a result of two escapes from the Bolsheviks and many years of forced emigration.

Secondly, if the position of an individual is directly opposite to a certain social phenomenon, then the philosopher considers it reasonable to separate from it only if such an act will cause less evil than supporting the path of the whole society. At the same time, Spektorskyi emphasizes that such a scenario is possible only for acts of a person's external behavior, but not for their inner world. And even if committing an evil deed is the only way out, a person must still be responsible for it, because evil is always evil.

Finally, another remark made by Spektorskyi on the subject of personal and collective responsibility concerns the difference between the moral level of the individual and the community. Most people are weak, and therefore, society in general is characterized by an *average* moral level. Although Spektor-

skyi admits that for every rule there are exceptions (Spektorski, 2018, pp. 52–53).

The issue of collective morality deserves special attention due to the great influence society extends on the life of an individual. This can cause the deification of the social and the assertion of the primacy of the collective over the individual and considering members of society as a tool for achieving social goals. The other extreme is the absolutization of private interests when society becomes the means of achieving individual happiness. In Spektorskyi's opinion, the balance between the tendency towards collectivism and individualism is quite rare.

However, every society possesses values of harmony between people, the possibility of coordinated actions for the common good, and the possibility of each member of society to develop their own abilities in certain social roles. Nevertheless, for Spektorskyi no social role should or can replace human dignity, because being a decent person is the first and most important task for everyone (Spektorski, 2018, p. 58).

The final writing by Spektorskyi, which summarizes his long-term search for the ideal foundations of social science, are lectures on the course of Christian ethics, delivered at the St. Volodymyr Orthodox Seminary in the 1950–1951 academic year. The main thesis developed by the philosopher is expressed as follows: “The fundamental basis of Christian ethics and sociology is the Christian worldview. Its metaphysical motive is faith in a supernatural and superhuman God, as well as in the God-man. Its ethical motive is love for God and neighbours” (Spektorskyi, 2013a, p. 31).

It is important to note that Spektorskyi's philosophical reflections on the necessity of the Absolute for human life and moral improvement, the indispensability of freedom as a basic characteristic of a person, his principled rejection of relativism in ethics, as well as his general orientation towards Christianity allow us to draw parallels with the views of his colleague at the Saint Volodymyr Theological Seminary, the famous religious thinker, Nikolay Lossky (1870–1965), deported from Russia in 1922 on the infamous “philosophers' ship.” Spektorskyi highly valued his system in which “the immortal Platonic thought is revived with power and glory, that the idea of good is the greatest knowledge, and that the measure of all things is God” (Spektorskyi, 1976, p. 132). Lossky focused mainly on epistemology and the concept of intuition, as well as the development of the original philosophical system of *ideal-realism*, although accepting Christian worldview as the cornerstone of his philosophy relates him to Spektorskyi and leads both thinkers to simi-

lar ethical and anthropological considerations and conclusions. For both philosophers, existence has a hierarchical structure at the top of which is God as the ideal of personal and social development. Despite the impossibility of achieving this ideal, people (according to Lossky's terms — *substantial actors*) are obliged to consciously improve their lives through creativity, altruistic moral actions and knowledge of God, and in this way approach the ideal. This is how Spektorskyi writes about this idea of Lossky, which is very consistent with his own ethical considerations: "Where there is an actor, there is an activity. Where there is activity, there is freedom. And where there is freedom, there is the opportunity to create both good and evil. Thus, the ontology of substantial actors naturally leads to a moral deontology that is regulated by the Kingdom of God" (Spektorsky, 1976, p. 131). Lossky emphasized that only the path to the Kingdom of God through moral evolution can realize true human nature and lead to a peaceful future for mankind (Plašienkova & Slobodian, 2019).

Spektorskyi drew special attention to the role of the concept of *sobornost* in the philosophy of Lossky, noting that he contrasted philosophical monism with "pluralism [...] in the sense of a strict hierarchy of substantial actors, interconnected by a principle taken from our Church, namely conciliarity" (Spektorsky, 1976, p. 131). It should be noted that in Spektorskyi's writings of the late period the concept of *sobornost* is essential since he understands society precisely as a congregational concept, as a spiritual union and communication of individuals who create society: "And true community is not the one given as a natural fact, but as a moral obligation. This task can be performed successfully only in the name of God" (Spektorsky, 2013a, p. 58).

Spektorskyi asserts that anti-Christian sociology reduces human relations to struggle, parasitism, and adaptation. Instead, the Christian worldview recognizes such phenomena as present in a world full of evil, but denies their importance as essential and unique in the context of human relations. According to Christianity, man is not a wolf to another man, but a human with their dignity and unique value.

The subject of Christian sociology, interpreted by Spektorskyi as a social philosophy, is the duties of a person towards other people and social duties to the family, the people, legal and economic associa-

tions, the state and the church. Such duties are not to glorify or humiliate other people, not to condemn others ignoring one's own sins, not to tempt others, not to do others harm, especially moral harm (Spektorsky, 2013a, pp. 138–139). The positive duties of Christians towards other people are based on the thesis that "Christian society is fundamentally built not on egoism, but on altruism" (Spektorsky, 2013a, p. 139). The first mutual obligation of people is peace and benevolence, followed by compassion and mutual assistance. Human's duties towards God, the God-man, towards themselves and nature are based on the evangelical ideals and values of Faith, Hope and Love.

This article has shown that Spektorskyi's works on issues of social science and social philosophy written during the emigrant period of his life and work (1925–1951) demonstrate the idealistic and Christian foundations of his approach to the history of social doctrines, criticism of naturalism and scientism, as well as justification of the special spiritual nature of society. These works were the result of his rethinking of a wide range of issues related to human existence in society and culture and proved that the philosopher found in Christianity support for his thoughts on morality, society, and science. Demarcating the competences of philosophy, science and religion and defining the latter as the source of knowledge about the Absolute, Spektorskyi was convinced of the complementarity of various areas of human knowledge and did not see any contradiction between them. Developing the issue of moral theology, he considered it as scientific rational knowledge.

As we explained above, during the emigrant period of his life and career Spektorskyi found the substantiation of the view of a human as a spiritual being and freedom as the essence of their existence on the basis of Christianity. Thus, he conducted the study of society within the framework of Christian sociology as a spiritual phenomenon, united by a special bond of consubstantiality, affirming the need for reasonable and peaceful coexistence of people in the community. For Spektorskyi it was the only rational and true way to understand the essence of society, incompatible with a naturalistic view of social life. The results of this study, which prove Spektorskyi to be an outstanding religious philosopher, have not lost their relevance to this day.

References

- Granda, S. (2014). Spektorski in usoda njegove Zgodovine socijalne filozofije [Spektorskyi and the fate of his History of Social Philosophy]. *Monitor ISH*, XVI (1), 157–176.
- Kozlitiin, V. D. (1966). *Ruskaia i ukrainskaia emigratsiia v Yuhoslavii (1919–1945 hh.)* [Russian and Ukrainian emigration in Yugoslavia (1919–1945)]. Khark. hos. ped. un-t im H. S. Skovrody [in Russian].
- Krupyna, O. R. (2023). *Suspilstvoznavcha problematyka u tvorchosti Yevhena Spektorskoho* [The issues of social studies in Yevgen Spektorskyi's legacy] [Doctoral dissertation, National

- university of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy]. Electronic Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Institutional Repository. <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/items/0cd410ce-2dfc-4f9a-b4dd-a5d16a635be5> [in Ukrainian].
- Mykhalchenko, S. Y., & Tkachenko, E. V. (2009). E. V. Spektorsky v emihratsii [Spektorskyi in emigration]. *Slavianovedenye*, 1, 14–24 [in Russian].
- Mykhalchenko, S. Y., & Tkachenko, E. V. (2011). Dokumenty E. V. Spektorskoho v Arkhive Instituta Vostochnoi Evropy Bremenskoho universiteta [E. V. Spektorskyi's documents in the Archive of the Institute of Eastern Europe of the University of Bremen]. *Otechestvennye arkhivy*, 6, 64–68 [in Russian].
- Plašienkova, Z., & Slobodian, O. (2019). Some ethical-religious views of Nikolai O. Lossky and Eugene V. Spektorsky (searching for thought parallels). *Studia Philosophica*, 66 (2), 7–23.
- Spektorski, E. V. (1932). *Zgodovina socijalne filozofije: Vol. 1. Od starega veka do XIX stoletja [History of social philosophy: Vol. 1. From ancient times to the 19th century]* (J. Vidmar, Per.). Slovenska Matica.
- Spektorskij, E. V. (1942). Teorija in empirija [Theory and empiricism]. *Zbornik znanstvenih razprav Juridicne fakultete v Ljubljani*, XVIII, 296–312.
- Spektorskij, E. V. (1943). Sociologija in filozofija [Sociology and philosophy]. *Zbornik znanstvenih razprav Juridicne fakultete v Ljubljani*, XIX, 205–216.
- Spektorskij, E. V. (1944). Naturalistična sociologija [Naturalistic sociology]. *Zbornik znanstvenih razprav Juridicne fakultete v Ljubljani*, XX, 183–197.
- Spektorskyi, E. V. (1967). Svoboda i determinizm [Freedom and determinism]. *Zapiski Russkoi akademicheskoi gruppy v SShA*, 1, 153–159 [in Russian].
- Spektorskyi, E. V. (1971). Dukhovnoe nasledie XIX veka [Spiritual heritage of the 19th century]. *Zapiski Russkoi akademicheskoi gruppy v SShA*, 5, 253–259 [in Russian].
- Spektorskyi, E. V. (1976). Znachenie filosofii N. O. Losskoho [Value of Lossky's philosophy]. *Zapiski Russkoi akademicheskoi gruppy v SShA*, 10, 127–132 [in Russian].
- Spektorsky, E. (1997). *Istoriya sotsyjalne fylozofije [History of social philosophy]*. Sluzhbeny lyst y dr [in Serbian].
- Spektorskyi, E. V. (2013a). *Khristianskaia etika. Lektsii, prochtannye v Sviato-Vladimirskoi dukhovnoi akademii v h. Noi-Yorke v 1950/51 akademicheskome godu [The Christian ethics. Lectures given at Saint Vladimir theological academy in New-York in 1950/51 academic year]* (P. E. Boiko, L. A. Boiko, & Y. V. Popov, Ed.). Tsentr stratezhicheskoi koniunktury [in Russian].
- Spektorskyi, E. V. (2013b). *Khristianstvo i kultura [Christianity and culture]* (P. E. Boiko, & L. A. Boiko, Ed.). Tsentr stratezhicheskoi koniunktury [in Russian].
- Spektorski, E. V. (2018). *Vprašanja moralne teologije [Issues of moral theology]* (M. Jančar, Trans; B. Ivanc, Ed.). Inštitut Nove revije, zavod za humanistiko [in Slovenian].
- Spektorski, E. V. (2019). *Izbrane razprave [Selected works]*. Pravna fakulteta; Inštitut Karantanija; Inštitut Nove revije, zavod za humanistiko [in Slovenian].
- Ulianovskiy, V., Korotkiy, V., & Skyba, O. (2007). *Ostannii rektor Universytetu Sviatoho Volodymyra Yevhen Vasylovych Spektorskyi: Monohrafiia [The last rector of Saint Volodymyr university Yevhen Vasylovych Spektorskyi: a monograph]*. Vyd.-polihraf. tsentr "Kyivskiy universytet" [in Ukrainian].
- Zenkovsky, V. V. (1975). E. V. Spektorsky [E. V. Spektorskyi]. In N. P. Poltoratskyi (Ed.), *Russkaia relihiozno-filosofskaia mysl XX veka. Sbornik statei [Russian religious and philosophical thought in 20th century: A compilation of articles]* (pp. 317–322). Otdel slavianskikh yazykov i literatur Pyttsburhskoho un-ta [in Russian].

Крупина О. Р.

УТВЕРДЖЕННЯ ДУХОВНОЇ ПРИРОДИ ЛЮДИНИ І СУСПІЛЬСТВА У ПРАЦЯХ ЄВГЕНА СПЕКТОРСЬКОГО ЕМІГРАНТСЬКОГО ПЕРІОДУ

У статті представлено основну проблематику праць відомого філософа, правознавця та освітнина Євгена Васильовича Спекторського (1875–1951), написаних у період вимушеної еміграції (1920–1951) і фахової діяльності в університетах Белграда, Праги, Любляни і Свято-Володимирській православної духовній семінарії в Нью-Йорку. В інтелектуальній біографії мислителя ці плідні роки позначені розробленням питань суспільствознавства, філософії, моральної теології і християнської етики. У численних працях різними іноземними мовами, частину з яких саме авторка проаналізувала вперше, Є. Спекторський обґрунтовував винятковість морального — на противагу фізичному та психічному — виміру існування людини та суспільства, орієнтиром для якого вважав християнську релігію. Остання, на його думку, спроможна доглибно дослідити сутність особистісного й соціального за допомогою християнської соціології. Винятково важливою для суспільствознавства Є. Спекторський вважав історію соціальної філософії, адже саме філософія, посідаючи проміжне місце між наукою та релігією, здатна до вільного мислення, без якого неможливе справжнє осягнення суспільства. Як з'ясовано у статті, етичні орієнтири філософ розробляв у рамках моральної теології, критикуючи натуралістичний і механістичний підходи до розуміння суспільства й індивіда. Ключовими цінностями Є. Спекторський вважав свободу, гідність і праведне життя згідно з християнським ідеалом, а також культурну діяльність. Авторка доводить, що ствердження абсолютних цінностей та дослідження взаємин між особистістю і суспільством на основі християнської релігії у працях Є. Спекторського емігрантського періоду увиразнюють у ньому непересічного релігійного філософа.

Ключові слова: Євген Спекторський, релігія, християнство, християнська філософія, культура, етика, моральне богослов'я, суспільствознавство, соціальна філософія, людина, суспільство.

Матеріал надійшов 12.02.2024

