論文の英文要旨

論文題目	ベルジャーエフの思想
氏 名	大須賀　史和

The purpose of this study is to elucidate the philosophical formation, development and issue of Nikolai Aleksandrovich Berdiaev (1874-1948), who was one of the most important religious philosophers in 20 century in Russia and West Europe. We handle his early times, about 1900-1916, which correspond to the period, from his debut to the publication of his first best result, The meaning of the creation. His sphere of activity was so wide, then we must limit our investigation to his gnoseology, the view of world and metaphysics. But, we will show the overview about his relation to the Vekhi dispute, which was the greatest event in the world of Russian thought of those days. Our sources are his articles, books and letter. Our paper is constituted of 2 parts, 4 chapters; in the first part, mainly we describe and clarify his substance of his step in the period 1900-1907; in the second part, we investigate his main themes in the religious philosophy, which he argued in his books "The philosophy of Freedom" and "The meanings of creation." Detail contents of this paper are as follows.

In the first chapter, the first subject is about his theme "combination of Marxism and critical philosophy," which was his starting position. Although he defined himself as Marxist at first, he accepted the concepts of Kant and Neo-Kantiant's philosophy. His purpose of this trial was to show a clue to the new solution for the social problems, on the basis of objective points of view. We insist that there was the influence of his surrounding in the University of Kiev at that time. Secondly, we examine his concept "realinost'", which he presented in his debut article. It was made from a phenomenological interpretation of the Kant's "realität". He gave it the meaning, which is completed

by the relationship of subject and object. He aimed at establishing the philosophical illustration, which was constructed without Kant's the thing-in-itself. But he turned his own position as his thought requested idealistic conception, which combined "Reason ideas" and social-ethical ideals. He began to criticize Marxism because of its philosophical defects, and he allowed the metaphysical, transcendental elements in philosophy. In ethics he also spread his points of view.

We meet the questions about the next step of Berdiaev's thought, the period 1903-1907 in the second chapter. This was his most important season, when he showed his foundation in his future thought. He started from the entire criticism for Marxism, which was accepted as whole point of view, included the view of the world, the philosophy of history and ethics. At this time he tried to show his own opinion, which recognized that the religion and the view of the world were equal as the things to define the human spirituality. Berdiaev set the transcendental value like truth, goodness and beauty, as the destination of life. He wanted to define the human growth as the progression to these aims. And on this basis, he showed his other concepts like the freedom and the individuality in his philosophy. Therefore, he already had an inclination to metaphysical philosophy of history, for example Hegel or Fichte, but his fundamental policy was different from theirs. Because he wished to defend the individualism against the monism, and also hoped construct the mono-pluralism, which admitted individualism and universalism at the same time. We can point out that he acquired the critical points of view to the West European philosophy in this time. He began to criticize the rationalism and expressed anticipation of new Russian national philosophy, which should have the world importance and significance. We must insist that this thought is the origin of his view on the Russian renaissance, for instance "the new religious consciousness" including to the theme of Merezhkovsky's "body". Here is the reform of the concept "real'nost'" for showing the recognition of spiritual beings. About the Vekhi dispute we only indicate that his ignorance was caused by its unexpected political character.

In the third chapter we examine his argument about his evolution in gnoseology, from the religious view. At first we look around the Kant's line in his philosophical foundation and Fichte's proposition of "self-recognition." Berdiaev insisted the inability of the consistent theory formation on condition that subject and object are isolated each other. Secondary we check up on the difference in the Lossky's intuitivism and Berdiaev's ontological gnoseology. Lossky thought that the action of recognition combined the being, which was transcendental, and the knowledge, which was immanent. Berdiaev proposed that it is able to permit the direct contact of spiritual beings. He introduced Christian thought, for example sin and self-sacrifice into his conception of gnoseology, and tried to interpret the conditions surrounding all human. He wanted to overcome the gnoseological problems of Kant as the results of the Protestant individualism, according to the concept of sobornost', which meant the commune of love and freedom. He insisted that the identity of subject and object was

based on the Logos, universal and divine Reason, and that gnoseology was justified by the love as the activity of Logos.

In the forth chapter we offer the interpretation of Berdiaev's thought in his most important book "The meaning of creation" in this period. We look over his question of the dual self-conscience, which represents that human recognizes himself as the center of the world and one of the innumerable things in the sea of nature. He renewed Fichte's theory of self-conscience by dualism. This prepares to connect his anthropology and original Christology. His Christology insists that Christ was androgyny, and had dual character s, God and human. On this point of view, He tried to build the new aspect of human being which also had the same feature as Christ. Consequently, human is sinful as corrupt creature, and at the same time he has the power like God and the mission of continuing the process of God's creation. Berdiaev expanded the relation of God and Christ to his unique interpretation of Trinity. He gave the view that the world is the dynamic process of Trinity, and that human is indispensable factor there. In his theory the creation is based on the establishment of individual freedom and independence, because these factors are the backbone of the will to creation. At last we point out that his idea of the creation originated in the view on the Italic Renaissance, and that his arguments were connected other questions, for instance the analysis of the nature of culture or the humanism, and the view of civilization.